**From the holdings of the Department of Special Collections , Princeton University Library, Princeton, NJ**

These documents are either in the public domain, or can only be used for educational and research purposes (Fair use) as per U.S. Copyright law (text below). By accessing this file, all users agree that their use falls in the public domain or within fair use as defined by the copyrightlaw. We do not charge any permission or usage fees for the publication of images of material inour collections, including those provided by Princeton University Library, via our website, catalog, or directly from staff.For more information regarding copyright, credit, and citation please review the information onthe Copyright, Credit and Citation Guidelines page of our website.
https://library.princeton.edu/special-collections/policies/copyright-credit-and-citation-guidelines. If you have any questions, including how to order higher-quality images from the collection, contact Special Collections Public Services via our Ask Us! Form. https://library.princeton.edu/special-collections/ask-us

---

Doctoral Dissertations, 2011-2026 East Asian Studies

2023

# The Synthetic Tongue: Speech, Writing, and "Speech Writings" in Early China

Yao, Zhuming

Princeton, NJ : Princeton University

---

http://arks.princeton.edu/ark:/88435/dsp01p2676z81c

*U.S. Copyright law: The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, §108, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research. If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of fair use that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve a violation of copyright law. https://www.copyright.gov/title17/title17.pdf*

# THE SYNTHETIC TONGUE:
# SPEECH, WRITING, AND "SPEECH WRITINGS" IN EARLY CHINA

Zhuming Yao

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY

OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE

OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

RECOMMENDED FOR ACCEPTANCE BY

THE DEPARTMENT OF

EAST ASIAN STUDIES

Adviser: Martin Kern

May 2023

© Copyright by Zhuming Yao, 2023. All rights reserved.

**Abstract**

Many early Chinese writings feature a scene of speech. In more literary writings as in more technical ones, writing often puts in the mouth of a speaker what the text tries to get across. Frequently, the speaker's spoken words, comprising a text either in full or in part, also occupy the center stage of writing's attempt at narrating a story, arguing a point, imparting a skill, or simply sorting things out. The list goes on. This lasting, shared, and versatile appeal to, and of, the spoken word in early Chinese writings is the topic of this dissertation. It argues that speech representation is first and foremost a narrative device serving a text's rhetorical aims. Writing does not represent speech as a mere technology of transcription; rather, writing creates a world-in-itself with and through the representation of speech, a highly elevated medium of expression since early on. In the process, this dissertation also shows, there developed a set of representational structures and narrative techniques with which speech representation was approached. The former supply writing with the forms, shapes, and tropes that underlie the representation of speech; the latter the means to make creative but circumscribed variations. Together, they cement the role of the spoken word as a narrative construct that different writings can use and adapt for their own rhetorical purposes. In highlighting these aspects of the spoken word, this dissertation offers an account of a core but underemphasized attribute of early Chinese textuality, models a new methodological approach, and proposes a range of interpretations of texts old and new intended to reevaluate their meaning and significance. Its goal, ultimately, is to promote a new way of reading.

**Acknowledgment**

I would like to take this opportunity to thank my dissertation committee, Martin Kern, Anna M. Shields, Paul R. Goldin, and Matthias L. Richter for their help and guidance during the preparation of this dissertation. I'm particularly grateful to Professors Goldin and Richter for taking me on as an external advisee. Thanks are due as well to Paul W. Kroll, Antje Richter, and Terry Kleeman, who, together with Matthias L. Richter, gave me the best possible education before I moved to Princeton. Yixin Gu, Yunxiao Xiao, and John O'Leary provided comradeship as we trained under the same master, so did Xi'an Guo all the critical attention to every bit of scholarly detail.

Multiple funding agencies supported my final years of research and writing, during which time parts of the dissertation were also presented at several conferences and workshops. For that, I thank the Princeton Writing Program, the Princeton Institute for International and Regional Studies, the Humanities Council at Princeton University, and the following chairs, organizers, respondents, interlocutors: Edward L. Shaughnessy, Haun Saussy, David Schaberg, Denis Feeney, Andrew Ford, Barbara Graziosi, Jianwei Xu, Jacqueline Vayntrub, and Federico Marcon.

The following friends and colleagues made my time at Princeton forever memorable: Luke Waring, Yuanxin Chen, Sooji Han, Joshua Seufert, Margo Orlando, Chao-Hui Jenny Liu, Yalin Du, Junnan Chen, Yutong Li, Zheng Guan, and Jeremy Chang.

I would not have attended graduate school without the support and understanding of my parents, who were deprived of their right to education when they were young. And I owe to Sinae, my partner, the joy, serenity, and sanity that have accompanied the completion of this dissertation. To her I'm immeasurably grateful.

# Table of Contents


*Abstract* 3

*Acknowledgment* 4

**Introduction** **6**

**1. The Enumerative Voice** **19**

*Voicing Confucius* *22*

*"The Medium is the Message"* *34*

**2. The Triading Voice** **45**

*Thus Says Mozi* *47*

*Mozi as Rhetorical Device* *57*

**3. The Protreptic Voice** **70**

*Monologic Dialogue* *72*

*The Theatricality of Knowledge* *86*

**4. Between Speech and Narrative** **93**

*Words on the Move* *96*

*Narrative Elasticity* *107*

**5. Across Speech and Narrative** **120**

*Shapes of Clustering* *123*

*Performative Clustering* *133*

**6. Rhetoric, Once Again** **148**

*The Primacy of Direct Speech* *150*

*The Efficacy of Speech* *163*

**7. Of Change and Continuity** **177**

*Speech, framing versus framed* *180*

*The Voice of Heaven's Mandate* *191*

**8. Of Everyday Politics** **209**

*A Vessel of Ideas* *211*

*Story "Telling"* *215*

*Hypertextual Road Trips* *224*

**Coda: A Ritualistic Aesthetics of Writing** **241**

*Works Cited* 244

**Introduction**

Writing in early China has an affinity for the spoken word. As early as the oracle bone inscriptions dating to the twelfth century BCE, an element of speech is found comprising the divination records of the late Shang (?-1046 BCE).[1] The king, typically, is attributed with the prognostication (*zhanci* 占辭) part of the inscription, presented further as an oral utterance marked by the standard formula of *wang zhan yue* 王占曰, "the king, reading the cracks, said…"[2] In the Western Zhou (1046-771 BCE), spoken words continue to make up the lengthiest of the so-called investiture or appointment (*ceming* 冊命) inscriptions, now featured not only in the king's voice but also those of his high officials and regional lords.[3] Although the latter went on to overtake the former as the dominant speaking voice in Eastern Zhou (770-256 BCE) bronze inscriptions,[4] it is in the non-epigraphical materials of the time that speaking began to "acquire" a larger and more diverse basis of speakers. From historical to philosophical to many technical types of writings, rulers speak with their advisors, masters disciples, scholar-officials other scholar-officials,[5] the commoner other commoners. They speak also in more

---

[1] For the structure of oracle bone inscriptions, see David N. Keightley, *Sources of Shang History: The Oracle Bone Inscriptions of Bronze Age China* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978), 28-56.

[2] For this particular feature of oracle bone and other divinatory inscriptions, see Stephen L. Field, "Who Told the Fortunes? The Speaker in Early Chinese Divination Records," *Asia Major* 13.2 (2000): 1-14.

[3] About a hundred inscriptions feature a *ceming* speech from a high official, regional lord, or lineage head. For that group of the materials, see Zou Fudu 邹芙都 and Zha Feineng 查飛能, *Xizhou "fei duiyang wangxiu" mingwen yanjiu* 西周"非對揚王休"銘文研究 (Beijing: Kexue chubanshe, 2017). For a model of the structural composition of all *ceming* inscriptions, see Lothar von Falkenhausen, "Issues in Western Zhou Studies: A Review Article," *Early China* 18 (1993): esp. 145-171. While popular in English scholarship, Falkenhausen's model has recently inspired many modifications by Chinese scholars. See, for example, Yao Sujie 姚蘇傑, "Shangdai qingtongqi mingwen de tishi yu gongneng" 商代青銅器銘文的體式與功能, *Zhongguo gaoxiao shehui kexue* 2017.3: 107-120; Li Guanlan 李冠蘭, "Xizhou ceming wenti de wenben shengcheng" 西周冊命文體的文本生成, *Zhongshan daxue xuebao* 2019.6: 36-44.

[4] For a recent discussion on some of the materials, see Robert Eno, "Reflections on Literary and Devotional Aspects of Western Zhou Memorial Inscriptions," in *Imprints of Kinship: Studies of Recently Discovered Bronze Inscriptions from Ancient China*, ed. Edward L. Shaughnessy (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2017), 261-85. I discuss this type of bronze inscriptions in Chapter 6.

[5] By which I mean the semantically much broader *shi* 士, also translatable as "gentleman," "man of service," "knight," depending on the context. For a nuanced account of the *shi*, see Yuri Pines, *Envisioning Eternal Empire: Chinese Political Thought of the Warring States Era* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2009), 115-184.

ways, at varied lengths, but still largely in direct speech like their more powerful predecessors, even when referenced in another direct speech. This preference writing has for the spoken word *and* the dramatic representation of it lasts well into the Western Han (206 BCE-9 CE). As the epideictic *fu* 賦, the *shelun* 設論, the *qi* 七, all different designations for the same poetic form, join most other genres in the staging of a speaking scene in which the interlocutors speak, now, in meter, rhyme, and an elevated vocabulary, the spoken word also becomes an aesthetic pursuit where writing's attention is paid "not only to the matter discussed but also to the language of [the] discussion itself."[6]

Sketched in broad strokes, this history of writing's fascination with speech sounds more teleological than the historical complexities will suggest. Nevertheless, it points to a core aspect of early Chinese textuality best observed from a height of abstraction. In writing, that is, the spoken word is as enduring a category of representational object as it is a common component of meaning construction, of narrative configuration, and of rhetorical, argumentative, and stylistic practices. Genre, materiality, and periodization hardly separate anything when it comes to writing's intimate relationship with the spoken word; provenance, authorship, and other equally hard-to-ascertain facets of a text like editorial, transmission, and reception history also change little the spoken word's central place in the *longue durée* of written texts. To be sure, some texts never invoke a single word either marked as spoken or reads like speech—the word *yue* 曰 as a standard marker is itself a marker of many things. But those texts also number far less than the ones that do.[7] In general, therefore, speech representation can be said to constitute a basic attribute of early Chinese writings. In many instances, writing entails nothing but the written representation of speaking.

---

[6] Martin Kern, "Western Han Aesthetics and the Genesis of the *Fu*," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 63.2 (2003): 401.

[7] There is also a group of texts that would lie somewhere in between. Just as the *Laozi* 老子 can be imagined as aphoristic sayings like the explicitly marked *Lunyu* 論語 is, the long and enigmatic poem "Tian wen" 天問 seems to lose nothing if the opening *yue* 曰 is omitted—although, it is unclear what this *yue* is really marking. Centuries of commentaries pay next to no attention to this introductory *yue* that subsumes the entire poem under a particular mode of representation.

Not uncommon in the world's other ancient literatures,[8] early Chinese writings' overall interest in speech representation across genres, among the many texts that have been described as "[having] a transmission history" is, however, unique.[9] It raises many questions culminating in just one: what, in fact, are we reading? For any or any type of text, the question is a question to begin with because speech and writing have always had a complex relationship. It was not until Derrida, for instance, that writing's perceived role in the Western traditions of philosophy, linguistics, and anthropology as derivative of, and supplemental to, speech was, since this view's first articulation traceable to Plato, brought under sustained critique.[10] For a manuscript culture like early China, the issues of orality and scribal practice also further complicate writing's relationship with speech. Especially when writing appears to write nothing but speech, those who view writing as a mere supplement to speech can reasonably question whether a transcription of some sort is what writing is trying to achieve.

This question, once generative of entire disciplines like oral poetics,[11] carries arguably more weight for early Chinese writings since much of what we know about early China we learn from the texts that "speak" in some ways. Writing does not describe the *doings*, for example, of Confucius, the

---

[8] The Platonic dialogues, the Hebrew Bible, the Babylonian Talmud, for example, are some of the canonical literatures that reply heavily on the representation of speech for their structural, narrative, and/or rhetorical compositions. See, for example, accounts from a literary perspective in Andrea Wilson Nightingale, *Genres in Dialogue: Plato and the Construct of Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Daniel Boyarin, *Socrates and the Fat Rabbis* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2009); Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, 1981).

[9] See Martin Kern, "Methodological Reflections on the Analysis of Textual Variants and the modes of Manuscript Production in Early China," *Journal of East Asian Archaeology* 4.1 (2002): 143-181. These texts, "not confined to a single, geographically, chronologically, and functionally specific purpose—an inventory slip, an administrative order, a divination record, and so on" (p.145), are, for instance, what Mark Edward Lewis refers to for the most part in his exhaustive *Writing and Authority in Early China* ([Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999]) as the "types of writings employed in state and society to generate and exercise power" (p.1). Some of the texts "without a history" is discussed in Charles Sanft, *Literate Community in Early Imperial China: The Northwestern Frontier in Han Times* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2019).

[10] Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976).

[11] Scholarship on the origin, history, mechanism, and numerous applications of oral poetics is impossible to list here. For a magisterial synthesis, critique, and theory in its own right, of oral poetics, see Haun Saussy, *The Ethnography of Rhythm: Orality and Its Technologies* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2016).

Zhou kings, or any other familiar figures of the time even remotely as much as it shows us what they are attributed to be *saying*. Purely descriptive accounts providing basic "facts" also exist in small numbers.[12] Instead, across the modes of discourse early Chinese writings usually engage with—narration, exposition, argumentation, and description—putting words in the mouth of a speaker is a shared, lasting, and prominent phenomenon. Not all writings speak, but enough do that the spoken word must mean something.

Intrigued by the spoken word's prevalence across early Chinese writings, this dissertation investigates the meaning and significance of it. It shows that in writing, speech representation is first and foremost a narrative device serving a text's rhetorical aims. For the various texts I call "speech writings"—texts that rely on speech representation for the communication of their core messages—the spoken word is a site in which meaning is constructed, negotiated, and presented. "Supplement" is the least useful description of writing vis-à-vis speech. Instead, speech in early Chinese writings is a representational construct of writing, one informed by the logic of historicity and verisimilitude but not constrained by it. In other words, the representation can be said to be mimetic so long as the word mimesis is understood not as "a response to a reality…that is believed to exist outside and independently of art," but as "an imaginary world-in-itself, which may resemble or remind us of the real world in certain respects…but is not to be judged primarily or directly by comparison with it."[13] The first sense of mimesis is what modern translations of the Greek word *mimēsis* through its Latinized form of *imitatio* often connotes; the second, by contrast, highlights the worldmaking potential of representational activities. As the dissertation will show, speech representation is one major tool for early Chinese writings to propose an idea, propagate an ideology, and project a world

[12] One can think of the *Zhushu jinian* 竹書記年, the *Chunqiu* 春秋, and the tables in the *Shiji* 史記. Curiously, even in the *Shiji* tables, there are several instances of speech representation where words are quoted.

[13] Stephen Halliwell, *The Aesthetics of Mimesis: Ancient Texts and Modern Problems* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), 23.

of order and ideality. It does not interest writing as a mere technology of transcription, about which we also lack the methodology to establish any basic facts regarding the mechanism.[14]

In resorting to the spoken word, this dissertation further shows, early Chinese writings share among them a set of representational structures and narrative techniques. The former supply writing with the forms, shapes, and tropes that underlie the representation of speech; the latter the authorial, editorial, and compilatory freedom—and approach—to make creative but controlled variations on speech representation both independently of and in coordination with its narrative context. Both undergird the numerous speech writings we have and the similarities and differences between them. Both also combine into a system of conventions early Chinese writings developed early on and have since adhered to rather closely. There do exist innovations and exceptions, and highly remarkable ones. But in general, the persistence of the conventions helps to explain in part why early Chinese writings remained extradiegetic-heterodiegetic for the most part: typically, that is, a text is "narrated" by a voice, be it authorial or narratorial, whose owner is absent from the text.[15] The general difficulty in establishing authorship for early Chinese writings goes hand in hand with the relegation of the authorial voice to the voices of the speakers in the text.[16] As a result, speech representation also conditions an aesthetics of reception, since we as modern readers do not so much read the texts as we watch, and listen to, the speakers speak. This kind of theatricality derived from early Chinese writings' artifactual construction of the spoken word will be discussed throughout the chapters.

---

[14] This does not mean efforts have not been made in this regard. See, for example, a discussion in Charles H. Egan, "Were *Yüeh-fu* Ever Folk Songs? Reconsidering the Relevance of Oral Theory and Balladry Analogies," *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews (CLEAR)* 22 (2000): 31-66.

[15] The terminology belongs to Gérard Genette. Originally intended for narrative writings like fiction as a description of the narrator's status, I adapt it here to refer to all writings. See Genette, *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*, trans. Jane E. Lewin (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980), 212-262.

[16] In this context, the authorial "I" we can indeed hear in certain chapters of the *Xunzi* 荀子, in Sima Qian 司馬遷, and in *Chuci* 楚辭, for example, are very much exceptions that merit a separate investigation. To begin with, see a discussion of first-person pronouns in early China in Christoph Harbsmeier, "Authorial Presence in Some Pre-Buddhist Chinese Texts," in *De l'un au multiple: Traductions du chinois vers les langues européennes*, ed. Viviane Alleton and Michael Lackner (Paris: Maison des sciences de l'homme, 1999), 219-254.

It is obvious, then, that this dissertation departs from existing scholarship on the topic both in methodology and in objective. No study has addressed speech representation at a comparable scale. Insofar as they do, current investigations concern themselves with only one text or one type of speech representation. Their interest is also "historical-critical" for the most part, a term Biblical scholars use to describe the kind of inquiries that, on the one hand, aims to uncover the historical events underlying the biblical text and, on the other, to delineate the history of the biblical text itself.[17] The disagreement over the nature of the speeches in the *Zuozhuan* 左傳, for example, is one case in point where all proposals are motivated to address either one or both of the concerns. Be it faithful transcription, literary re-creation, or accretion and sedimentation, the speeches are approached as a window into their historical formation and, by extension, source value.[18] The same interest prompts textual studies of other corpora like the oracle bone and bronze inscriptions, the *Lunyu* 論語, *Mozi* 墨子, and *Shangshu* 尚書, among numerous other smaller-scale speech writings.[19] While illuminating, this group of scholarship also reinforces the appeal of conventional approaches, given the central place *Zuozhuan* occupies in recent discussion of speech representation.[20] No other

---

[17] See an introduction and critique in John Barton, *The Nature of Biblical Criticism* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007).

[18] See, respectively, Yuri Pines, "Intellectual Change in the Chunqiu Period: The Reliability of the Speeches in the *Zuo Zhuan* as Sources of Chunqiu Intellectual History," *Early China* 22 (1997): 77-132; David Schaberg, *A Patterned Past: Form and Thought in Early Chinese Historiography* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001), esp. 21-56, 315-327; Wai-yee Li, *The Readability of the Past in Early Chinese Historiography* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2007), esp. 29-84. A critique of Pines and Schaberg is also available in Barry B. Blakeley, "'On the Authenticity and Nature of the *Zuo Zhuan*' Revisited," *Early China* 29 (2004): 217-267.

[19] Except for the oracle bone inscriptions, I address all these texts in the main chapters. For the oracle bone inscriptions, see, for example, David N. Keightley, "Shang Divination and Metaphysics," *Philosophy East and West* 38.4 (1988): 367-397.

[20] A related debate is the nature of the "junzi yue" 君子曰 versus the "Zhongni yue" 仲尼曰 comments in the *Zuozhuan*—specifically the provenance of those comments. See Eric Henry, "'Junzi Yue' Versus 'Zhongni Yue' in *Zuozhuan*," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 59.1 (1999): 125-161; Newell Ann Van Auken, "Judgments of the Gentleman: A New Analysis of the Place of *Junzi* Comments in *Zuozhuan* Composition History," *Monumenta Serica* 64.2 (2016): 277-302. David Schaberg offers a different angle by examining such attributed comments as a rhetorical device across early Chinese writings. See Schaberg, "Platitude and Persona: *Junzi* Comments in *Zuozhuan* and Beyond," in *Historical Truth, Historical Criticism, and Ideology: Chinese Historiography and Historical Culture from a New Comparative Perspective*, ed. Helwig Schmidt-Glintzer, Achim Mittag, and Jörn Rüsen (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 177-196.

text, which I will address when relevant, has inspired a more concerted effort in the unpacking of the spoken word's origin and significance. This also means that no other framework is readily available for the analysis of either other speech representations or speech representation in general.

Like those on the *Zuozhuan*, another body of scholarship motivated, too, by "historical-critical" interests looks into a broader base of texts but focuses mainly on the historical occasions of textual composition. Named by its proponents the study of "genres of speaking" 語體, it attempts to situate what I call here early Chinese speech writings in what it believes to be their originating occasions and, from there, evaluate those texts' historical context, formation, and significance.[21] Based squarely in a sensible line of inquiry about genre's relation to occasion, one that has proved to be immensely productive in the field of, for example, Greek lyric poetry, studies on the early Chinese "genres of speaking" tend to, however, oversimplify the mediating role history and literary conventionalization play.[22] Privileging the contextualizing information extracted both from the texts themselves and from other circumstantial materials, they often far too quickly equate the purported occasion with the actual occasion of a text's historical origination. But as scholars of Greek lyrics have long illustrated, genre has a way to grow out of its originating occasion, mimic it, and even stage and recreate an occasion for itself.[23] In early China, the same "occasion-engendering" speech writings also exist. As will be shown, some speech representations call for their own occasions

---

[21] The scholarship is large and growing, See, for example, Guo Yingde 郭英德, *Zhongguo gudai wenti xue lungao* 中國古代文體學論稿 (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2005), 29-50; Hu Dalei 胡大雷, "Lun 'yuti' ji wenti de qian 'wenti' zhuangtai" 論"語體"及文體的前"文體"狀態, *Wenxue yichan* 2012.1: 17-24; Fu Gang 傅剛, "Lüe shuo Xianqin de yuti yu yushu" 略說先秦的語體與語書, *Zhongshan daxue xuebao* 2013.5: 1-7; Chen Tongsheng 陳桐生, "Xianqin duihuati sanwen yuanliu" 先秦對話體散文源流, *Xueshu yanjiu* 2017:8: 150-164; Yu Zhihui 俞志慧, *Gu yu youzhi: Xianqin sixiang de yizhong beijing yu ziyuan* 古語有之：先秦思想的一種背景與資源 (Shanghai: Huadong shifan daxue chubanshe, 2010); Xia Dekao 夏德靠, *Xianqin yulei wenxian xingtai yanjiu* 先秦語類文獻形態研究 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2015); Liao Qun 廖群, *Xianqin shuoti wenben yanjiu* 先秦說體文本研究 (Beijing: Zhongyang bianyi chubanshe, 2018).

[22] So far as I can tell, Guo Yingde 郭英德 is the first to have emphasized the importance of occasion for the study of genre among the proponents of this scholarship. All later research follows from his rather schematic but programmatic essay in Guo, *Zhongguo gudai wenti xue lungao*, 29-50.

[23] See, for example, R. L. Fowler, *The Nature of Early Greek Lyric: Three Preliminary Studies* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987), 86-104; Gregory Nagy, "Transmission of Archaic Greek Sympotic Songs: From Lesbos to Alexandria," *Critical Inquiry* 31.1 (2004): 26-48.

because doing so both complies with convention and circumscribes the speech's intended meaning. The spoken word is not constructed in isolation from other conditions of speaking.

Between a larger and more diverse set of materials and a conventional, "historical" approach *literary* in nature,[24] this dissertation arrives at its claims by beginning with a literary approach. It compares the final forms of the various speech writings in an effort to identify common structures I categorize as representational and, on that basis, investigates the literary mechanism of their varied iteration and transformation.[25] My approach is thus rooted in intertextual relations but goes beyond surface resemblance for the condition of intertextual relations. The individual, historical expressions of intertextuality, as I will show, can be deceptive.

This approach I adopt stems from the impression that many early Chinese texts—though typically of unknown and composite authorship subject also to the influences of historical layering and retrospective standardization—do, however, have a final form indicative of authorial, editorial, and/or compilatory control. And that control is able to offset and withstand the vicissitudes of such

---

[24] As Barton notes, the "historical-critical" method is premised on the "attention to semantics, to the meaning of words, phrases, sentences, chapters, whole books" (*The Nature of Biblical Criticism*, 58). The approach Li uses, for example, requires the noticing and reading of certain aspects of semantics as inconsistencies, a kind of source criticism inseparable from a sense of literary understanding. The disagreement between Pines and Schaberg, on the other hand, speaks to the varying objectives of textual and form (*Gattungen*) criticisms. The latter is by definition a literary operation, as is in Schaberg's application as well. The former both in general and in the specific case of Pines' application requires an *initial* determination of textual meaning as well. While his statistical results hold, Pines' choices of criteria (the particles *yu* 于 and *yu* 於, the key terms like *xiao* 孝, *de* 德, *ren* 仁, and *dao* 道) already signal a literary judgement over the semantic and interpretive value of such words. One could give the explanatory weight to other terms and words, as is often shown by the critics of such approaches, and yield completely different results (see an example in Li Rui 李锐, *Renwu, wenben, niandai: Chutu wenxian yu Xianqin gushu niandaixue tansuo* 人物、文本、年代：出土文獻與先秦古書年代學探索 [Beijing: Zhongguo renmin daxue chubanshe, 2017], 9-113). Both, however, are again a literary operation to begin with. No textual criticism can be accomplished by a pure "mechanical operation."

[25] In a way, my approach is what in Biblical criticism often called redaction criticism. And as John Barton has noted, when "the excitement of reconstructing the earlier stages in the text's growth" has receded, a type of reconstruction achieved by the "historical-critical" methods like form, source, and textual criticism, "it is only a matter of time" before interests in redaction criticism will grow. That is, "the attempt to give what is sometimes called a 'close reading' of the text, analyzing how the author/editor achieves his effects, why he arranges his material as he does, and above all what devices he uses to give unity and coherence to his work" (Barton, *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996], 45, 46, 52). I thus also see myself as the beneficiary of past scholarship, without which the guiding questions of this dissertation would not have been asked.

a decentralized mode of textual formation due to the heavier influence of conventions. There is a great deal of troping in early Chinese speech representation, a kind of figurative representation Hayden White has famously recovered in reference to nineteenth-century European historiography but is constitutive, he maintains, of all discourse. The figuration is tropological because an author "shares with his audience *general notions* of the *forms* that significant human situations *must* take by virtue of his participation in the specific processes of sense-making."[26] Although authorial figures are elusive in early China, the speech representations we have exhibit ruling tropological principles even—and especially—in the sources often dismissed as "mere" compilations of heterogenous and incoherent materials. The tropes and conventions are where generations of authors, editors, and compilers all cohere in their imagination of the spoken word. Speech, in other words, has a way to oversee its own representation.

To answer the question raised earlier, what we are reading, then, is writing's creative but circumscribed use of the spoken word for the rhetorical purposes it aims to achieve. It might be arguing, explaining, teaching, admonishing, sorting things out, or drawing attention to its own art and craft in handling language, but it does so through the spoken word when it chooses to do so. As a narrative device, the spoken word enjoys tremendous privilege in early Chinese writings due to its early history, lasting influence, and association with authority and authenticity. Like some of the world's other textual traditions, most of which religious, oral speech is an elevated medium of textual communication; except that in early China, it all happens within, not alongside or despite, writing.[27] In highlighting this aspect of the spoken word, this dissertation offers an account of a core but underemphasized attribute of early Chinese textuality, models a new methodological framework,

---

[26] Hayden White, *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978), 86.

[27] The Oral Torah and the Vedas are good examples. The Vedic tradition is especially invested in oral means of scriptural transmission, prevailing oral chanting and oral memorization even long after the scripture is written down. See, for example, Guy L. Beck, *Sonic Theology: Hinduism and Sacred Sound* (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1993); Annette Wilke and Oliver Moebus, *Sound and Communication: An Aesthetic Cultural History of Sanskrit Hinduism* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011).

and proposes a range of readings of texts old and new, which, I believe, will helps us re-evaluate those texts' meaning and significance in the larger tradition of early Chinese writings.

The dissertation has three parts and eight chapters. Part I introduces the representational structures of speech representation; Part II the narrative techniques of variation and coordination—both based on comparative analyses of a large variety of source materials. Part III, on the other hand, applies the findings and the newly developed perspectives to a fresh reading of the *Shangshu* 尚書, arguably the most complex, canonical, and yet disputed collection of early Chinese speech writings. Through these new readings, this Part illustrates the interpretative gains and advantages this dissertation offers.

In three chapters, Part I illustrates the construction, use, and significance of three widely shared representational structures. The first, which I call the "enumerative voice," puts enumeration in the mouth of a speaker who goes on to string together a catalog of some sort in an oral utterance long or short, linear or hierarchical, orderly or disorderly, oriented or left to interpretation. The second, "the triading voice," has the same speaker speak about something in three different iterations, sometimes in drastically different ways, which then combine into a coherent narrative, a series of interrelated but independent speeches, arguments, expositions, or something in between. The third, what I call the "protreptic voice," stages a ventriloquized conversation between two interlocutors who act out a choreographed scene of teaching, learning, or advising that the author has full control over. All three types of the representational structures provide a shared basis for varied instantiation; all three types comprise a text either in part or in full. In all cases, however, the three "voices" are voiced through the manipulation of what I describe as the "speaker function" and "speech function" of speech representation, two concurrent considerations that inscribe (additional) meaning onto the spoken word by the speaking voice in which it is put and the type of speech in which it is uttered. It is with all three that most figures from early China have an identity.

Part II, also in three chapters, demonstrates the ways in which speech representation can be constructed and varied both on its own and in a larger narrative context. These narrative techniques,

as I call them, manifest by way of dramatization and narration and their interdependence. Chapter 4, "Between Speech and Narrative," shows how dramatic speech and nondramatic narration routinely change into a variant shape, wear each other's disguises, and transform altogether into the other. The same speech event, that is, can be both dramatized and narrated and dramatized and narrated in different ways; as does a narrative event. Chapter 5, "Across Speech and Narrative," shows how, at a larger scale, this fluidity of and coordination between the two representation modes of dramatization and narration leads to a popular argumentative structure I call the "anecdote cluster." In the cases discussed in both chapters, as in speech representation more generally, direct speech is given preference as the center stage of meaning construction and narrative variation. This preference is the topic of Chapter 6, in which I trace its origin to bronze inscriptions and its influence on, and later development in, what is commonly called early Chinese "rhetoric." In all these references to the spoken word, the same set of narrative techniques underlies its change and development over time, across differing contexts of textual production.

Part III, finally, brings the first two Parts together by demonstrating the wider applicability of the findings and analytical perspectives thus far derived. In two chapters of more circumscribed close reading, one on the "oaths" 誓 in the *Shangshu*, one on the "proclamations" 誥, this Part shows how the representational structures and the narrative techniques combine to generate more coherent genres of speech representation. As basically a set of genre strategies, they undergird the production as well as transformation of these types of speeches. The kind of differences traditionally viewed as evidence for or against the "authenticity" of those speeches bespeaks, first and foremost, varied materialization of the shared genre strategies. The speeches differ not because one is "authentic" and the other "inauthentic" but because each addresses a different rhetorical aim through the means and particularized iteration of a highly constructed literary form. What is on display are different genre dynamics like imitation, appropriation, and what Gérard Genette calls hypertextual transformation. Like all instances of speech representation this dissertation discusses, every speech here is authentic in that every speech has a rhetorical role to play in the spoken word's commitment to a worldmaking

kind of mimesis. And the *Shangshu* speeches, in the final analysis, sit at the forefront of the mimetic projection of an idealized world, regulated by an unchanging traditionalist ideology.

## — PART ONE —

## Voice and Voicing

1. The Enumerative Voice
2. The Triading Voice
3. The Protreptic Voice

## 1. The Enumerative Voice

"In traditional Chinese discourse," proclaims Judith Zeitlin, "voice isn't a central metaphor or keyword." It does not "lead us in the direction of individual identity, personal agency, collective will, subjectivity, authenticity, style, or any other of the main figurative connotations we take for granted when writing about the voice in English or other European languages."[28] The word "voice," Zeitlin implicates, is more often confined to the literal sense, referring to the physical voice we humans can be said to uniquely possess.[29] In this crude, cross-cultural comparison lies an assumption central, in fact, to both "English or other European" figuration of the voice and to the presumed insignificance of it in "traditional Chinese discourse": that the voice be traceable to an "author," whether of a written text or of an oral utterance. And that "author," it seems, is further imagined as an individual, historical figure one can name, date, or place among other human creators of linguistic expression. The voice as a figure is "by definition" a figuration of the authorial voice.

When we insomuch as take persona into consideration, a liminal presence in its own right, the divide between the literal voice and the figurative voice also breaks down.[30] Just as the "Homeric voice," for instance, does not describe the style of a historical poet so much as it does a tradition of oral poetics sustained by a multiplicity of unnamed rhapsodes,[31] the same kind of imagination (and construction) of a voice also underlie the poetry of Qu Yuan 屈原 (trad. 340-278 BCE), the well-

---

[28] Judith T. Zeitlin, "From the Natural to the Instrumental: Chinese Theories of the Sounding Voice before the Modern Era," in *The Voice as Something More: Essays towards Materiality*, ed. Martha Feldman and Judith T. Zeitlin (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2019), 54.

[29] Indeed, in her essay Zeitlin goes on to focus on the voice first as a physiological phenomenon and then as a source of aesthetic admiration, about which "a rich vein of discourse" does exist in comparison to voice "on its own…as a master trope or signifier." Zeitlin, "From the Natural to the Instrumental," 54.

[30] For the tremendous conceptual challenges to defining the concept of "voice" alone, see Mladen Dolar, *A Voice and Nothing More* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2006).

[31] See, for example, James I. Porter, *Homer: The Very Idea* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2021). For the elusiveness of the "poet" Homer to begin with, see Barbara Graziosi, *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of Epic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

known "poetic hero" more comfortably viewed by most as *the* "heroic poet" in ancient China.[32] In both cases, the poetic persona *is* the voice in the literal as well as the figurative sense. There is not a single authorial voice to which every line in the poems can be traced; and "individual identity," for example, is every bit as entangled with "collective will" as "collective will" is with "subjectivity," "authenticity," and "style."[33] The same conflation of the literal, individual voice and the figurative, collective voice is in most cases the only kind of voice we hear when it comes to the writings of early China.[34] For compared to the extreme difficulty in locating historical authors, we are presented with an overabundance of speakers right in the texts. Simply owing to the textual nature of most early Chinese writings, no such speaking voice is not voiced somehow by the unknown collectivity of authors, scribes, editors, compilers, and/or commentators we now recognize is responsible for the shaping of almost all texts.[35] Voice is still, and thanks to the invisibility of authors, a particularly essential keyword to this literature. But that voice is already, one could even say by convention, a figurative voice. It belongs most concretely to the in-text speakers.[36]

---

[32] For this unconventional view, which I find convincing, see Martin Kern, "Cultural Memory and the Epic in Early Chinese Literature: The Case of Qu Yuan 屈原 and the *Lisao* 離騷," *The Journal of Chinese Literature and Culture* 9.1 (2022): 131-169.

[33] The constructed persona of Qu Yuan has been reenacted by generations of poets, including those writing today. See, for example, one of the earliest discussions in Hellmut Wilhem, "The Scholar's Frustration: Notes on a Type of *Fu*," in *Chinese Thought and Institutions*, ed. J. K. Fairbank (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), 310-19.

[34] David Schaberg's account of the *Zuozhuan* 左傳 and *Guoyu* 國語 is an exemplary exposition of this phenomenon. See Schaberg, *A Patterned Past: Form and Thought in Early China Historiography* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2001), esp. 258-270.

[35] Scholarship on this topic is too large to enumerate. For a few important ones, see Yu Jiaxi 餘嘉錫, *Gushu tongli* 古書通例 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1985); Stephen Owen, *The Making of Early Chinese Classical Poetry* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2006); Paul Fischer, "Authentication Studies (辨偽學) Methodology and the Polymorphous Text Paradigm," *Early China* 32 (2008-09): 1-43; Zhang Hanmo, *Authorship and Text-making in Early China* (Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2018); Martin Kern, "Kongzi as Author in the Han," in *Confucius and Analects Revisited: New Perspectives on Composition, Dating, and Authorship*, ed. Michael Hunter and Martin Kern (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 268-307; Kern, "'Xishuai' 蟋蟀 ('Crickets') and Its Consequences: Issues in Early Chinese Poetry and Textual Studies," *Early China* 42 (2019): 39-74; Heng Du, "The Author's Two Bodies: The Death of Qu Yuan and the Birth of *Chuci zhangju*," *T'oung Pao* 105 (2019): 259-314; and Kern, "Cultural Memory and the Epic in Early Chinese Literature."

[36] Film theorists speak of the "acousmatic voice" to describe the same phenomenon in sounds studies, a voice whose real source (in our case, the authors behind the speakers) one cannot see. See, for example, Pierre Schaeffer, *Treatise on Musical Objects*, trans. Christine North and John Dack (Berkeley: University of

This speaker's voice, as this and the next two chapters will show, is figurative in another, and more significant, sense: despite the nominal difference between the ascribed identities of the speakers, many of them speak in the same shapes, forms, styles, and tropes I describe altogether as the shared "representational structures" of early Chinese speech representation. Such structures do not dictate the manner of every speaker, nor do they comprise on their own personas, but enough speakers speak in those exact ways if not depend on them for more complex utterances. These "structured speakers," so to speak, are the backbone of early Chinese speech writings; they speak not only in the texts, in front of a readership, but also to the representational discipline of those who gave them a voice in the first place. Instead of authors, editors, compilers, or any other role possibly involved in the production and transmission of the speakers, we stand on firmer ground when we treat the amorphous "voicing party" of the various speakers as the representational conventions that unite both the voicing and the voiced. Few speakers speak freely in this tradition; the ones that seem to do will, in light of the commonplaceness of structured speaking, require a separate investigation.[37]

In either case, voicing a speaker is achieved in concert with naming the speaker and with having him (there are far fewer hers) speak in a particular type of utterance. Insofar as the sources can indicate, neither is without patterns, principles, as well as interesting exceptions that resist a purely historicist explanation. In other words, even if what we hear is what a speaker had actually said, which is both impossible for us to verify and improbable for it to have occurred in the first place, that voice is already modulated in some ways.[38] In conjunction with the representational

---

California Press, 2017), 64-69; Michel Chion, *Sound: An Acoulogical Treatise*, trans. James A. Steintrager (Durham: Duke University Press, 2016). The term can be traced back to the Greek philosopher Pythagoras who is said to have taught his disciples only from behind a curtain until they had proven their worthiness.

[37] I am thinking, for example, of the familiar personas like Qu Yuan and Sima Qian 司馬遷. Both speak in ways uncommon to the tradition, but both also betray influence by the conventions.

[38] I like the following description from Hayden White of the kind of relationship I am positing here between presentation and representation. Although he is concerned with nineteenth-century European historiography, what he says extends to far more types of writing from early China as well: "What are historical representations *representations of*? It seems to me that we must say of histories what [Northrop] Frye seems to think is true only of poetry or philosophies of history, namely that, considered as a system of signs, the historical narrative points in two directions simultaneously: *toward* the events described in the narrative and *toward* the story type or mythos which the historian has chosen to serve as the icon of the structure of the events. The narrative itself is not the icon; what it does is *describe* events in the historical record in such a way

structures, I thus also demonstrate how the forms, shapes, and styles of the spoken word constitute, partially or fully, a speaker's identity as embodied by the name he is known and by the ways he tends to speak. Refereed to hereinafter as the "speaker function" and the "speech function" of a voice, both enable the representational structures to become voices, voices that are animate, persistent, and resounding even today only through the amplification of the two functions.[39]

*Voicing Confucius*

The first kind of the representational structures underlying the voicing of many speakers is one in which the speaker is made to enumerate, hence the "enumerative voice." To be sure, enumeration is everywhere present. As a compilatory principle, juxtaposition of similarly-structured discursive units make up such works as genealogy, lexicon, annalistic history, and bibliography.[40] As a rhetorical device, a mode of composition, that is, enumeration undergirds verbal patterning familiar to us by way of early poetry.[41] As a way of speaking, on the other hand, enumeration is no less capacious, because in addition to engendering what can be called catalogic thinking, it also materializes as the more familiar products of that type of thinking like lists, inventories, numeric sets of abstract ideas,

---

as to inform the reader *what to take as an icon* of the events so as to render them 'familiar' to him." White, *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978), 88.

[39] In this sense, I am excluding from analysis such stylized voices as the anonymous *huo yue* 或曰 (someone says) and the deindividualized *junzi yue* 君子曰 (the gentleman says). They both serve a narrow narrative function and have been discussed elsewhere (the latter more so than the former). To begin with, see Eric Henry, "'Junzi Yue' versus 'Zhongni Yue' in *Zuozhuan*," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 59.1 (1999): 125-161.

[40] A convenient, overall reference for these kinds of textual productions is *Literary Information in China: A History*, ed. Jack W. Chen, et al. (New York: Columbia University Press, 2021).

[41] See for example David Knechtges, *The Han Rhapsody: A Study of the* Fu *of Yang Hsiung (53 B.C.-A.D. 18)* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 12-43; Dore Levy, "Constructing Sequences: Another Look at the Principle of Fu 'Enumeration'," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 46.2 (1986): 71-493; Martin Kern, "Western Han Aesthetics and the Genesis of the *Fu*," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 63.2 (2003): 383-437; Jia Jinhua, "An Interpretation of the Term *fu* 賦 in Early Chinese Texts: From Poetic Form to Poetic Technique and Literary Genre," *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews* 26 (2004): 55-76.

and other catalogs of all sorts.[42] Speaking in the enumerative voice is thus necessarily a diverse way of speaking. Nonetheless, most of such utterances will entail brief and associative "idea fragments" successively strung together by the specific patterning principle in which catalogic thinking operates.

Among early Chinese speakers, Confucius is one who exhibits a particular penchant for the enumerative voice. Not only does Confucius the speaker—so emphasized so as to differentiate him from the historical Confucius—enumerate often, in a wide array of source materials,[43] the ubiquitous figure also enumerates in ways that span the full range of the shapes and manners enumeration can take. Accordingly, he is synonymous with the common interpretative problems this kind of speaking often imposes on its readers. The name "Confucius" alone triggers all sorts of imagination when one tries to make sense of what one is really reading and how to even attempt an answer, evaluate it, or defend it against other possible propositions.

In the *Lunyu* 論語, for example, seven separate sayings of enumeration follow one another from *Lunyu* 16.4 to 16.10, aside from a dozen or so more scattered across the entire compilation.[44] Whitin this narrower but more often consulted group of materials, common shapes and variations of the enumerative voice also already abound. Some, like *Lunyu* 2.4, dive straight into enumerating without any sign of its oncoming: "Confucius says, 'I, at fifteen, set my heart on learning, at thirty found my foothold, at forty grew free of confusion, at fifty understood Heaven's Mandate, at sixty trained my ears to be more attuned, and at seventy followed my heart's desire without overstepping boundaries" 子曰. 吾十有五而志于學. 三十而立. 四十而不惑. 五十而知天命. 六十而耳順. 七

[42] Different cultures usually have a different set of such products. In the case of early China, David Schaberg has examined numeric sets in the *Zuozhuan* speeches in Schaberg, *A Patterned Past*, 34-50.

[43] For an overview of the vast diversity of source materials in which Confucius appears, see Michael Hunter's and Scott Cook's respective chapters, one focusing on transmitted and the other excavated materials, in *A Concise Companion to Confucius*, ed. Paul R. Goldin (Hoboken, N.J.: Wiley Blackwell, 2017), 15-34; 35-51.

[44] To different readers, not all these sayings will strike as equally enumerative. But adopting a more generous criterion, I include the following in my count, which also does not claim to be exhaustive but only indicative: *Lunyu* 2.3, 2.4, 2.14, 2.15, 4.16, 5.16, 6.20, 7.2, 7.3, 7.6, 8.8, 9.29, 12.1, 12.2, 14.28, 16.4-16.10, 19.9.

十而從心所欲. 不踰矩.[45] Others, like *Lunyu* 5.16, orient the readers by first announcing a "labeled catalog" before it goes on to list the items included: "Confucius says to Zichan, 'The way of the gentleman has four counts to it: in conducting himself he is respectful; in serving his superior he is reverent; in providing for the people he is generous; in employing the people he is just'" 子謂子產. 有君子之道四焉. 其行己也恭. 其事上也敬. 其養民也惠. 其使民也義. Although unannounced, the former is as intelligible as the latter because the enumeration itself has an obvious logic to it.

This intelligibility, however, is not always guaranteed. When equally unannounced, some enumerations open themselves up to discrepant readings. *Lunyu* 9.29, for example, presents three separate dictums simply juxtaposed together: "Confucius says, 'A man of wisdom is one who is not perplexed; a man of benevolence is one who does not worry; a man of valor is one who does not fear'" 子曰. 知者不惑. 仁者不憂. 勇者不懼. For the Liang 梁 dynasty Confucian scholar Huang Kan 皇侃 (488-545), this is a demonstration that "human nature has different orientations" 人性分不同也. For Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130-1200), however, it is the predicate part of each pronouncement that interests him, as "the sequence in which one learns" 學之序也.[46] In addition to their varying interpretations of the entire catalog, Zhu Xi is thus further reading order into the items that Huang Kan only sees as logically parallel. Yet, in *Lunyu* 14.28, the same catalog is still described to be the way of the gentleman: "Confucius says, 'The way of the gentleman has three counts to it, of which I have succeeded in none: a man of benevolence does not worry; a man of wisdom is not perplexed; a man of valor does not fear" 子曰. 君子道者三. 我無能焉. 仁者不憂. 知者不惑. 勇者不懼. It is unlikely that this "internal reference" is unfamiliar to the two commentators since both wrote their commentaries on the entire *Lunyu*. Yet, by interpreting the same saying in their own ways (notice the inversed order, too, of the first two of the three items in *Lunyu* 14.28, which Zhu Xi says nothing

[45] All *Lunyu* citations in this chapter are taken from *Lunyu Zhengyi* 論語正義, comp. Liu Baonan 劉寶楠 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1990). For convenience, I will only provide the conventional numbering for the sayings and not the page numbers in *Lunyu zhengyi*, except where I quote the commentaries therewith.

[46] Quoted from *Lunyu huijiao jishi* 論語彙校集釋, comp. Huang Huaixin 黃懷信 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2008), 9.828-29.

about[47]), both readers already ascribe meaning to what is supposedly Confucius's words when the catalogs themselves do not signal their own import.[48]

Along with the initial announcement that may or may not open—and circumscribe the meaning of—the enumerated catalog, enumeration also operates on a range of organizational principles. Just as, for example, *Lunyu* 2.4 on the different phases of one's life is progressive along a biographical timeline, *Lunyu* 16.9 is progressive along an evaluative hierarchy, also a kind of linear advancement: "Confucius says, 'Those who are born with knowledge are the highest; those who learn to gain knowledge come next; those who learn only when stranded come further next; and those who are stranded and yet still do not learn are of the people that are the lowest'" 孔子曰. 生而知之者上也. 學而知之者次也. 困而學之. 又其次也. 困而不學. 民斯為下矣. Both culminate in a logical endpoint to which all previous steps naturally lead.

By contrast, *Lunyu* 5.16, 9.29, and 14.28 all appear to be built on the principle of equality and complementarity. There is no apparent reason for one item in the catalog to have to either precede or follow any other. They seem to complete each other however sequenced. This equality among the enumerated also marks the progression of *Lunyu* 7.6: "Confucius says, 'Set your heart on the way; base yourself in virtue; rely on benevolence; roam in the arts'" 子曰. 志於道. 據於德. 依於仁. 游於藝. Unannounced and not exhibiting any inherent logical connection like *Lunyu* 9.29, this four-fold catalog is once again taken by different commentators like Huang Kan and Zhu Xi in different directions. Anyone could reasonably ask just what is being enumerated here. Yet, Huang Kan's insistence on the catalog's relevance to humanity ("this chapter elucidates [the ways of] human life in a social world" 此章明人生處世) and Zhu Xi's to learning ("this chapter speaks of people's approach to learning" 此章言人之為學) both betray hermeneutic predeterminism whereby the

[47] It is unclear what the difference in order means. But it certainly, in this case, contradicts Zhu Xi's point made earlier about the sequence 序 of learning.

[48] For the phenomenon of "doublets" 重章 in the *Lunyu*, approached typically from an authorship perspective, see Zhang Hanmo, *Authorship and Text-making in Early China*, 149-50; Christopher Harbsmeier, "The Authenticity and Nature of the *Analects* of Confucius," *Journal of Chinese Studies* 68 (2019): 187-89; Thomas Crane, "Confucius Repeats Himself: On the Nature and Sources of the *Lunyu* 論語," *T'oung Pao* 108 (2022): 3-10.

sage's saying is now being coopted to serve the exegetes' own intellectual program.[49] In a way, Confucius as the presumed speaker of those words deters poorly the "proliferation of meaning."[50] Instead, the name lends authority to the exegetes' own meaning-making.

By far the most common of the *Lunyu* enumerations operate on the principle of contradistinction. Much of the *junzi* 君子 versus *xiaoren* 小人 discourse, for example, is expressed in contrastive enumerations. And unlike the former, the latter is almost exclusively defined by being the opposite of *junzi.* Although most such enumerations appeal only to a single pair of contrasting, as in *Lunyu* 4.16 ("Confucius says, 'The gentleman comprehends by analogy with propriety; the petty man comprehends by analogy with profit'" 子曰. 君子喻於義. 小人喻於利), some, like *Lunyu* 16.8, go up to one of *Lunyu*'s favorite number of three: "Confucius says, [+] 'The gentleman holds three things in awe: Heaven's Mandate; the great men; and the words of the sages. [-] The petty man, ignorant of Heaven's Mandate, does not stand in awe of it; he is impertinent toward the great men; and he is derisive of the sages' words'" 孔子曰. [+] 君子有三畏. 畏天命. 畏大人. 畏聖人之言. [-] 小人不知天命而不畏也. 狎大人. 侮聖人之言.

This unusual tripling of the contrastive enumeration also demonstrates a particular shape so far unseen in the *Lunyu*: an announced catalog (marked [+] above) followed by an unannounced one (marked [-] above). And it differs further in arrangement from other paired enumerations also for the purpose of contradistinction. *Lunyu* 16.4, for example, opens with both announcements fully spelled out, one next to the other, before going "down" a level to enumerate each:

> Confucius says:
> "[A] To gain, one befriends three kinds of people.
> [B] To be diminished, one also befriends three kinds of people.
> [a] He who befriends the forthright, the trustworthy, and the well-learned gains.
> [b] He who befriends the ingratiating, the fawning, and the glib is diminished."
>
> 孔子曰. [A] 益者三友.

[49] *Lunyu huijiao jishi*, 7.572, 573.

[50] Michel Foucault, "What Is an Author?" trans. Josué V. Harari, in *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism*, ed. Josué V. Harari (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1979), 159.

[B] 損者三友.
[a] 友直. 友諒. 友多聞. 益矣.
[b] 友便辟. 友善柔. 友便佞. 損矣.

Enumeration, therefore, also has a variable spatial dimension similar to the shape of a *stemma*—in this case—*catalogorum*, or a tree of folders one can expand or collapse. In the *Lunyu*, one level down is already as deep as it goes, but the *stemma* can go further, sometimes much further.[51]

Quick, coherent, and tightly compressed, the enumerations in the *Lunyu* are, however, of a very special type. They contribute to the *Lunyu*'s literary economy as the "quotable Kongzi," to borrow from Michael Hunter,[52] but they also separate this Confucius from other Confuciuses. As the size of the enumeration becomes larger, its shape more complex, and the relationship between the enumerated more ambiguous, the more verbose Confucius also disappears from the *Lunyu* and speaks to us, instead, from other sources. Manuscript finds especially from the Shanghai Museum collection alert us back to the enumerating Confucius in the *Liji* 禮記, *Da Dai liji* 大戴禮記, and *Kongzi jiayu* 孔子家語 by the existence of parallel materials.[53] In all those instances, Confucius the speaker enumerates just like "he" does in the *Lunyu*, only less quotably and more expansively. The dissimilarity raises the question of who Confucius really is: a figure who is the source of a protean voice, or a protean voice wearing the name tag of Confucius?

Among the more expansive enumerations, Confucius goes for instance in the **Min zhi fumu* 民之父母 manuscript into a lengthy exchange with Zixia 子夏 where he enumerates three catalogs, first the "Five Arrivals" 五至 together with the "Three Withouts" 三亡, then the "Five Arisings" 五

[51] The "Hong fan" 洪范 chapter in the *Shangshu* is a good example. See, for example, Michael Nylan, *The Shifting Center: The Original "Great Plan" and Later Readings* (Sankt Augustin: Institut Monumenta Serica; Nettetal: Steyler Verlag, 1992), 14-44.

[52] Michael Hunter, *Confucius beyond the Analects* (Leiden: Brill, 2017).

[53] The prominence of Confucius in the Shanghai Museum manuscripts has inspired entire studies that focus precisely on that Confucius as an independent analytical category. See for example Hou Naifeng 候乃峰, *Shangbo Chu jian Ruxue wenxian jiaoli* 上博楚簡儒學文獻校理 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2018); Gu Shikao 顧史考 (Scott Cook), *Shangbo zhushu Kongzi yulu wenxian yanjiu* 上博竹書孔子語錄文獻研究 (Shanghai: Zhongxi shuju, 2021). New dissertations of the same kind also come frequently out of the most prestigious Chinese universities for manuscript studies. See for example Wei Houkai 尉候凱, "Shangbo jian Lunyu lei wenxian yanjiu" 上博簡《論語》類文獻研究 (Ph.D. diss., Wuhan University, 2019).

起. In the text's transmitted counterparts in both the "Kongzi xianju" 孔子閒居 chapter of the *Liji* and the "Lun li" 論禮 chapter of the *Kongzi jiayu*, an additional "Three Impartialities" 三無私 is also appended.[54] In each case, this Confucius first announces the catalogs to Zixia, upon whose request for elaboration goes on further to enumerate each of the components of all those catalogs. The unfolding of the *stemma catalogorum* is thus propelled by an interlocutor who "knows" precisely when and how to insert himself, so that Confucius is never interrupted in the middle of his enumeration or not prompted to unfold the catalogs at all. These kinds of dialogic enumeration, though less common but not entirely absent in the *Lunyu*,[55] are the more typical way Confucius enumerates outside it. Without the anchoring of the *Lunyu*, Confucius the speaker seems to require a whole different dramatic staging for his discursive engagement.

The one monologic enumeration outside the *Lunyu* in which Confucius enumerates as expansively occurs in the **Kongzi shilun* 孔子詩論. In that text, Confucius is attributed by six "Confucius says" 孔子曰 to be speaking about, without any announcement, all but seven of the fifty-eight titles of the *Shi* 詩 that are then named, responded to, and commented on.[56] The title of the manuscript, "Confucius discussing *Poetry*," one given by the editors of the manuscript, is thus their summation of this large and unannounced catalog, much like how Huang Kan and Zhu Xi had tried to tame the meaning of *Lunyu* 7.6 and 9.29. Unsurprisingly, this interpretation is disputed by Li Xueqin 李學勤, among others, who advocates for the removal of "Confucius" from the title. For in his reading, Confucius is not the author of the text as the editors have implied but an invocation, a

---

[54] For the most comprehensive study of the **Min zhi fumu* as well as its relationship to the transmitted versions, see Matthias Richter, *The Embodied Text: Establishing Textual Identity in Early Chinese Manuscripts* (Leiden: Brill, 2013).

[55] Exceptions include *Lunyu* 12.1 and *Lunyu* 12.2. In each case, a disciple asks about benevolence, and in each case, Confucius replies with an unannounced enumeration on what constitutes benevolence.

[56] Scholarship on the **Kongzi shilun* is massive. For a recent one in English, See Martin Kern, "Speaking of Poetry: Pattern and Argument in the 'Kongzi shilun'," in *Literary Forms of Argument in Early China*, 175-200. See also a full translation (and reconstruction of the manuscript) in Thies Staack, "Reconstructing the *Kongzi shilun*: From the Arrangement of the Bamboo Slips to a Tentative Translation," *Asiatische Studien* 64 (2010): 857-906. The most extensive study so far published in any language is Chao Fulin 晁福林, *Shangbo jian Shilun yanjiu* 上博簡《詩論》研究 (Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan, 2013).

quotation, by Zixia—to Li the real author.[57] Confucius, that is to say, is first of all a voice in which the catalogs are put and only secondarily a figure who may or may not have uttered those words. For Li Xueqin, the **Kongzi shilun* is obviously a case illustrating the primacy of the voice over the figure, for to his ears what is being attributed to this Confucius simply does not "sound like Confucius."[58] One has to wonder how Li can defend that comparison, but a sense of "style" is apparently what he has in mind, a style he must have another, "correct," albeit unsaid, model for.

All these issues about the enumerative voice that are now issues about source, authorship, and style converge to reach a point of implosion in the lengthy "Ru xing" 儒行 chapter of the *Liji*, the longest enumeration attributed to the voice of Confucius.[59] Since its canonization in the Han, the text has been contested over and over again; scholars past and present seem simply uncertain what to do with this familiar and yet unusual Confucius.[60] In the text, Confucius "enumerates one by one" 悉數 to his interlocutor Duke Ai of Lu 魯哀公 a seventeen-item catalog on the proper conduct of a *ru* 儒 person, each comprising an average of forty to fifty words. All but two of them follow the same structural pattern, beginning with the introductory formula "as for a *ru*, there is…" 儒有 and ending with a one-to-four-word recap in the form of "his…is like this" 其…有如此者. In place of the ellipses, we thus find a wide range of personal attributes like "appearance and demeanor" 容貌, "unyielding resoluteness" 剛毅, "approach to service" 仕, and "socializing and friend-making" 交友. The list is as diverse in scope as Confucius is uncharacteristically unreserved *and* as Duke Ai is supremely cooperative, never once interrupting Confucius after having put to him the initial question, "May I ask what the conducts of a *ru* are" 敢問儒行?

---

[57] See Li Xueqin 李學勤, "Shilun de ticai he zuozhe" 詩論的體裁和作者, in *Shangbo guancang Zhanguo Chu zhushu yanjiu* 上博館藏戰國楚竹書研究, ed. Shanghai daxue gudai wenming yanjiu zhongxin 上海大學古代文明研究中心 and Qinghua daxue sixiang wenhua yanjiusuo 清華大學思想文化研究所 (Shanghai: Shanghai shudian chubanshe, 2002), 51-61. For a critique of the traditional concern with establishing clear authorship and the harms it does to our reading of the **Kongzi shilun*, see Kern, "Speaking of Poetry," 175-81.

[58] See especially Li Xueqin, "Shilun de ticai he zuozhe," 53-56.

[59] A slightly variant version is also found as the "Ru xing jie" 儒行解 chapter in the *Kongzi jiayu*.

[60] For a brief account of the text's reception history, see Chen Lai 陳來, "*Liji Ruxing* pian de lishi quanshi yu shidai yiyi" 《禮記・儒行》篇的歷史詮釋與時代意義, *Shangdong daxue xuebao* 2020.2: 154-161.

In Zheng Xuan's 鄭玄 (127-200) reading, this text was composed (*zuo* 作) by Confucius himself soon after he had returned to Lu 魯 from Wei 衛; to Kong Yingda 孔穎達 (574-648), it was transcribed by a scribe attending to the conversation with Duke Ai; to Sun Xidan 孫希旦 (1736-1784), by contrast, all the words are fabricated by some followers of Confucius and put, here, in his mouth.[61] The list of divergent opinions goes on. To the Northern Song classicist Lü Dalin 呂大臨 (1044-1091), however, the text is all and none of the above. While he, as Sun Xidan does, "suspects that the text is what the *ru* of the later ages used to elevate their own teachings, thus seeing it as the words of Confucius is fairly questionable" 竊意末世儒者將以自尊其教. 謂孔子言之殊可疑, he also concedes that "when the words are investigated, those that do not conform to [Confucian] propriety or principle also turn out to be very few" 然考其言. 不合義理者殊寡. Hence his final verdict: "If people who aim to learn can put these words into practice, they indeed will not be ashamed as a *ru*. Is this perhaps the reason why the former *ru* preserved all these words in this chapter" 學者果踐其言. 亦不愧於為儒矣. 此先儒所以存於篇也與?[62]

Of all the commentators, Lü Dalin's view is a breath of fresh air amid the traditional obsession with establishing clear authorship and then attributing to it judgments about authenticity and authority. It also articulates a different aesthetics of reception more accommodating of the enumerative voice. Whether all those words—to Lü's ears, "exuding a zest for boastfulness and belligerence but lacking an air of poise and depth" 有誇大勝人之氣. 少雍容深厚之風[63]—belong to the historical Confucius is not at all a problem. Rather, it is their commensurateness with what Confucius *can* be imagined to have said that makes them justifiable as what he now appears to have said—as, most importantly, an authoritative guide from the sage himself capable of leading its users toward proper assimilation into Confucian teachings. For Lü Dalin, the "Ru xing" succeeds as a good speech act: Confucius enumerates, people "listen" and learn, and "Confucianization" happens. Duke Ai is the sole interlocutor but not the only addressee.

---

[61] See quotes in Sun Xidan 孫希旦, *Liji jijie* 禮記集解 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1989), 57.1410.

[62] *Liji* jijie, 57.1398.

[63] Ibid.

This view of the "Ru xing" has important implications for our recognition of the enumerative voice more generally; it highlights some of the more subdued dynamics underlying early Chinese textuality. At the base of the issue is a prevailing assumption, typically undifferentiated by text type, that authoring and compiling account for two distinct modes of textual production, and that coherence, a rather nebulous concept to begin with, somehow marks the former but not the latter. Combined with the often-referenced idea that early Chinese texts, also undifferentiated by text type in that invocation, tend to be composite in one way or another,[64] coherence further becomes a criterion for the consideration of authorship mode. What has emerged, then, is a "shortcut" to the determination of authorship: if a text reads coherent, it likely is authored; if a text reads incoherent, it likely is composite, hence compiled. With regard to the "Ru xing," for example, Oliver Weingarten first posits that "a text might be assumed to be of a composite nature when instances of discontinuity, inconsistency and repetition occur that affect the style, structure, terminology or topic."[65] From there, he goes on to identify thematic as well as stylistic "shifts and contradictions" both within and across the seventeen items of the catalog. Such "shifts and contradictions" lead, then, to a conclusion that they must be a "symptom of the fact that [the text] was assembled from heterogeneous sources and made to fit the larger structural framework of Confucius's speech."[66] Although remarkably scrupulous, the conclusion also circles back to the assumption. Neither the assumption nor the conclusion is in and of itself unwarrantable, but composite nature does not necessarily preclude the possibility of coherence, nor does incoherence always entails compilation.

---

[64] By now, several models have been developed to explain the composite nature of early Chinese texts. See for example Boltz, "The Composite Nature of Early Chinese Texts," in *Text and Ritual in Early China*, ed. Martin Kern (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2005), 50-78; Lothar Ledderose, *Ten Thousand Things: Module and Mass Production in Chinese Art* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); Owen, *The Making of Early Chinese Classical Poetry*; Kern, "'Xishuai' 蟋蟀 ('Crickets') and Its Consequences"; and Kern, "Cultural Memory and the Epic in Early Chinese Literature."

[65] Oliver Weingarten, "The Sage as Teacher and Source of Knowledge: Editorial Strategies and Formulaic Utterances in Confucius Dialogues," *Asiatische Studien* 68.4 (2014): 1180.

[66] Ibid., 1183.

More importantly, there exist many more types of coherence than discursive, formal, and stylistic coherence which can equally underlie the composition, especially composite composition, of a text: structural, material, rhetorical, pragmatic, to name a few. Depending on the specific text type, some will carry more weight than others.[67] Enumeration, like anthologization, is by definition structurally coherent before it is or needs to be coherent in some—any—other way. Speaking of the "Five Arisings" of the **Min zhi fumu* that "seem to follow no logical sequence," Matthias Richter for instance accepts that perceived incoherence by positing that "The reason why these five sets were put down in writing is simply to preserve existing alternatives for future readers to choose from, but not necessarily to read all five of them as a continuous and coherent text."[68] Enumeration, that is to say, is a mode of textual production, an act of voicing in this case, that can, and is equipped to, absorb all sorts of coherence problems. Not every enumeration is produced under the same conditions or for the same purposes, nor is enumerating a "coherence-friendly" form of discourse to begin with. In the larger picture, the logical, coherent, and patterned enumerations in the *Lunyu* very much constitute the exceptions. The interpretative problems we have stem primarily from privileging the voiced—the voice's "actual" owner—over the voicing—those who represent that voice—as our frame of reference (recall Li Xueqin's reasonable conclusion but dubious reasoning).

Instead of deriving its *raison d'être* from a seemingly authoritative source of origin one can clearly identify, the "Ru xing" works *because* it is placed in the voice of Confucius. The catalogs may just as well have been fabricated in some ways, but Confucius the speaker confines the possibilities

---

[67] A good reference point is the art of commonplacing in early modern Europe. Although in that case, compiling is typically based on excerpting, of which we know little about in early China and often have no way to prove with certainty (exceptions can be found in certain theories about the *Lunyu*). Nevertheless, commonplacing allows for a variety of different organizational principles as well as practical purposes to guide the compilation of oftentimes heterogenous materials. Internal coherence among the collected is not always a concern. See for instance the following for a varied overview of commonplacing: Mary Thomas Crane, *Framing Authority: Sayings, Self, and Society in Sixteenth-Century England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993); Ann Blair, *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010); Jeffrey Todd Knight, *Bound to Read: Compilations, Collections, and the Making of Renaissance Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013); Anthony Grafton, *Inky Fingers: The Making of Books in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, MA.: Belknap, 2020), esp.105-185.

[68] Richter, *The Embodied Text*, 171.

of fabrication as it does the range of interpretation. If fabrication hopes to retain the name's significatory value, which to fabrication is perhaps the very point of its endeavor, it will not abuse it to the extent that interpretation can easily expose.[69] As such a "speaker function," this Confucius speaks for, as, and to all those who participate in the text. As Lü Dalin has posited, the potential fabricators, the present-day learners, *and*, by his time, generations of arbiters ("the former *ru*" 先儒) all cohere right in the text, through the voice of Confucius and his not-so-ill-fitting teachings. If the text is indeed compiled instead of authored, in the sense that it was put together by multiple hands from multiple sources, it is only all the more deserving of incoherence or any other kind of "play." Such play as seen in the "Ru xing" is only the most immediate trace of what seems to have been a vibrant practice of voicing a cultural hero that has involved more figures than just Confucius.[70] Like every other name in this cultural and literary game, Confucius's speaker function provides the ultimate reference of coherence.

Such a Confucius—unreserved, "incoherent," controversial—puts back into perspective the Confucius we think we know, that of the *Lunyu*. For the canonicity of the *Lunyu* entails not just a controlling view of what Confucius says but how he says what he says: how, that is, he "sounds." As Lü Dalin has remarked, it is really the voice, "lacking an air of poise and depth," that gives the "Ru xing" away as a later attribution, not its overall correctness as a Confucian manifesto. And if Hunter is right about the Western Han "origin" of the *Lunyu*,[71] then the quotability of this "quotable

---

[69] For the symbiotic relationship between fabrication and scholarship, see Anthony Grafton, *Forgers and Critics: Creativity and Duplicity in Western Scholarship* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990; new edition 2019).

[70] For other early Chinese figures that have been produced and appropriated much in the disguise of mythmaking, see Mark Edward Lewis, *Sanctioned Violence in Early China* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990), 165-212; Michael Puett, *The Ambivalence of Creation: Debates Concerning Innovation and Artifice in Early China* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001), 92-140; Mark Edward Lewis, "The Mythology of Early China," in *Early Chinese Religion, Part One: Shang through Han (1250 BC-220 AD)*, ed. John Lagerwey and Marc Kalinowski (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 543-594.

[71] Hunter does not differentiate between two distinct claims and defends only the first of the following: that the *textus receptus* of the *Lunyu* was compiled in the Western Han, and that the material itself dates to the Western Han. For a critique, see Paul R. Goldin, "Confucius and His Disciples in the *Lunyu*: The Basis for the Traditional View," in *Confucius and the* Analects *Revisited*, ed. Michael Hunter and Martin Kern (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 92-115.

Kongzi" should also be recognized as a literary construct. Unless we were to imagine the *Lunyu* Confucius as an unmediated voice who speaks with a natural knack for concision and pattern, this Confucius is more unreal than all the other Confuciuses who are in essence an editor away from the *Lunyu* Confucius. In comparison, Confucius's various voices across available sources already cohere more than they depart from one another, owing precisely, I believe, to the name's more powerful speaker function.[72] Style varies a lot more for other speakers, who easily risk recognition should they speak in an unfamiliar voice.

*"The Medium is the Message"*

The kings of Zhou, for example, are a group of speakers whose voices vary far more drastically than those of Confucius. Along with the Duke of Zhou 周公, they enumerate in both the *Shangshu* 尚書 and the *Yi Zhoushu* 逸周書 but in patently different ways. If the canonicity of the two texts is any indication, the relative insignificance accorded to the latter correlates rather well with the more robotic ways of speaking the speaker functions of Kings Wen 文, Wu 武, Cheng 成, as well as the Duke of Zhou can be observed to model in the *Yi Zhoushu*. In comparison, they enumerate almost exclusively large and monotonous numeric catalogs, which also occupy the core if not the entirety of their speeches (I address the *Shangshu* in Part III).[73] Every enumeration looks like one and the same; so long as it is one of the sovereigns, who is speaking appears to otherwise signal no difference.

---

[72] A good comparison is with Zengzi 曾子. While in the *Lunyu*, *Liji*, and most other sources Zengzi speaks in a likewise concise manner, he in the so-called "ten Zengzi chapters" 曾子十篇 of the *Dadai liji* goes much further than Confucius normally does outside the *Lunyu*. Particularly in the "Zengzi lishi" 曾子立事 chapter, that Zengzi utters a 1,757-word long (by my count) enumeration which also loses its initial tightness as the text continues and descends into a kind of entropic self-destruction in terms of formal and discursive coherence. Scholars have largely dismissed the "Zengzi chapters" as either compiled or fabricated until parallel materials from the Shanghai Museum collection came along. But like in the case of Confucius, much of the dispute is in essence a judgement about voice. The enumerating Zengzi can be easily edited down. For an analysis of the "Zengzi lishi," see Matthias Richter, "Self-cultivation or Evaluation of Others? A Form Critical Approach to *Zengzi lishi*," *Asiatische Studien* 56.4 (2002): 879-917.

[73] See chapters "Feng bao" 酆保, "Rou wu" 柔武, "Da kai wu" 大開武, "Xiao kai wu" 小開武, "Bao dian" 寶典, "Feng mou" 酆謀, "Da kuang" 大匡, "Wu quan" 五權, "Cheng kai" 成開, "Da jie" 大戒, "Ben dian" 本典, "Guan ren" 官人. For studies on enumerations in the *Yi Zhoushu*, see Zhao Fengrong 趙奉蓉, *Yi*

In the "Da kai wu" 大開武, for example, the Duke of Zhou spells out for King Wu five catalogs in a row, each fully enumerated and each component of which successively numbered. No comment is appended anywhere during the enumeration; the speech simply goes through all the catalogs in the same mechanical way until each is expanded. The first two catalogs, just to give a sense of the voice, look like this:

> [1] The "Four Favorings": One. Within, favor those from the same families. Two. Without, favor those related by marriage. Three. In employing, favor those from the same teacher. Four. In sympathizing, favor those who share the same labor. [2] The "Five Harmonies": One. When you have Heaven's grace, the state will be braced. Two. When you have Earth's favor, righteousness will be upheld. Three. When you have the same likings, joy will overspread. Four. When you have the same dislikes, laments will overlap. Five. When far away, no vying.
>
> [1] 四戚. 一. 內同姓. 二. 外婚姻. 三. 官同師. 四. 哀同勞. [2] 五和. 一. 有天維國. 二. 有地維義. 三. 同好維樂. 四. 同惡維哀. 五. 遠方不爭.[74]

In the "Xiao kai wu" 小開武, the duke in the exact same manner enumerates another five catalogs to King Wu, who in the "Bao dian" 寶典 chapter reciprocates with his own set of five. This is also how the duke speaks to King Cheng in four other chapters. Although in the majority of cases, the catalogs are ordered by size in the enumeration—the "Four Favorings" and "Five Harmonies" are followed in the "Da kai wu" by the "Seven Mishandlings" 七失, "Nine Adherences" 九因, and "Ten Excesses" 十淫—not much else explains why this series of catalogs is made up by these five catalogs and not some others. Nor is it always clear why each catalog has for instance four instead of five items in it and how each of them is derived or related. As David Schaberg has noted of the enumerations in the *Zuozhuan* 左傳 and *Guoyu* 國語 speeches, "In many cases, it is impossible to determine whether the speaker is applying an existing categorization to historical contingencies or

---

*Zhoushu wenxue yanjiu* 《逸周書》文學研究 (Beijing: Zhongguo kexue shehui chubanshe, 2013), 42-73; Yegor Grebnev, "Numerical Lists of Foundational Knowledge in Early Chinese and Early Buddhist Traditions," *Asiatische Studien* 74.3 (2020): 453-484.

[74] Huang Huaixin 黃懷信, *Yi Zhoushu huijiao jizhu* 逸周書彙校集注 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2007), 3.263.

drawing a provisional abstraction from these contingencies."[75] Here, these catalogs of catalogs also betray little logic from inside the enumeration.

Like *Lunyu* 7.6, 9.29, and the **Kongzi shilun*, the catalogs in both speeches acquire coherence and meaning from the outside, this time from the speakers' own framing instead of from the Huang Kans and Zhu Xis of subsequent ages. The speeches and dialogs in which all these enumerations are embedded close them off from unintended signification. For the duke and the Zhou kings, they are enumerated because they are important to know.[76] The catalogs in the "Da kai wu," for instance, are presented to King Wu because the king himself has only "heard about" them but not in detail: "I have heard that for a state there are the 'Four Favorings,' 'Five Harmonies,' 'Seven Mishandlings', 'Nine Adherences,' and 'Ten Excesses.' It is not that I do not respect them. I do not know about them" 余聞國有四戚. 五和. 七失. 九因. 十淫. 非不敬. 不知.[77] In the "Xiao kai wu," the duke gives the king another set of five because the king wants to "respectfully listen to" 敬聽 the "finest of the Way" 道極, to which the duke responds first with a prefatory preview of the catalogs before he goes into the unpacking:

> During the time of our deceased father King Wen, he compliantly made manifest the "Three Extremes," personally affirmed the "Four Inspections," closely adopted the "Five Elements," cautiously supervised the "Seven Observations," and orderly followed the "Nine Cycles." When the "Three Extremes" were made manifest, the "Five Elements" also became constant. When the "Four Inspections" were affirmed, the "Seven Observations" also grew discernable. When it was clear that every circumstance is but the way of Heaven, the "Nine Cycles" also corresponded. When one makes plans according to virtue, there will be nothing that does not carry itself through.

---

[75] Schaberg, *A Patterned Past*, 47.

[76] In examining the same group of speeches, Yegor Grebnev identifies the following types of formulaic expressions that speak to the point I am making here: 1.) ones that acknowledge ignorance; 2.) ones that "warn against the loss of knowledge"; 3.) ones that request the "due application of knowledge"; and 4.) ones that "call to posterity to be alert." See Grebnev, *Mediation of Legitimacy in Early China: A Study of the* Neglected Zhou Scriptures *and the Grand Duke Traditions* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2022), 111-16.

[77] *Yi Zhoushu huijiao jishi*, 3.261.

在我文考. 順明三極. 躬是四察. 循用五行. 戒視七順. 順道九紀. 三極既明. 五行乃常. 四察既是. 七順乃辨. 明勢天道. 九紀咸當. 順德以謀. 罔惟不行.[78]

This kind of prefatory remark also opens the enumerations in the "Bao dian," "Wu quan" 五權, and "Cheng kai" 成開, except that in those cases the catalogs are directly told to the interlocutors rather than solicited by them—because, again, they are important to know. The "Cheng kai" gives a similar reason for the importance of its five catalogs, i.e., their origin in the exemplary past of King Wen:

> In the past, during the time of our deceased father King Wen, he personally refined the "Five Precepts" and diligently propagated the "Nine Exploits." In honoring the people and revering Heaven, he taught the "Six Standards," "Four Keeps," "Five Reveals," and finally, the "Three Extremes." By respectfully receiving everyone from everywhere, dedication and propriety also resulted.
>
> 在昔文考. 躬修五典. 勉茲九功. 敬人畏天. 教以六則. 四守. 五示. 三極. 祇應八方. 立忠協義乃作.[79]

In the *Yi Zhoushu*, hearsay and origination in King Wen justify the significance of nearly every catalog the kings and the duke enumerate to each other.[80] In a way, both justifications are the same because both appeal to what Schaberg has called "inherited wisdom." Although this particular type of origin-chasing is unique only to the spoken exchanges between the kings and the duke, providing "raw data" with some kind of a backstory is, however, not. The *Yi Zhoushu* comes with a comparable number of chapters where catalogs are enumerated in the same way, where their origins and significance are likewise introduced, but where the presentation of the catalogs are now put in an expository prose expressed in a non-speech form.[81] The kings no longer enunciate them. Before going down the stemma to unpack the catalogs, the "Wen zhuo" 文酌, for instance, opens with a

---

[78] Ibid., 3.273.

[79] Ibid., 5.499.

[80] The "Da jie" invokes King Wu instead of King Wen whereas the "Guan ren" catalogs are unattributed.

[81] See "Chang xun" 常訓, "Wen zhuo" 文酌, "Da wu" 大武, "Da ming wu" 大明武, "Da kai" 大開 , "Wu mu" 武穆, "Wen zheng" 文政, and "Wu ji" 五紀.

prefatory remark situating the catalogs in the context of human life (underlined; the catalogs are then introduced in reverse order from how the keywords are listed):

> As for people, each is born with [1] desire, [2] aversion, [3] joy, [4] sadness, [5] virtue, and [6] standards. In terms of [6] standards, there are the "Nine Accumulations." In terms of [5] virtue, there are the "Five Treasures." In terms of [4] sadness, there are the "Four Forbearances." In terms of [3] joy, there are the "Three Abundances." In terms of [2] aversion, there are the "Two Faults." In terms of [1] desire, there is the "One Extreme."
>
> 民生而有[1]欲有[2]惡. 有[3]樂有[4]哀. 有[5]德有[6]則. [6]則有九聚. [5]德有五寶. [4]哀有四忍. [3]樂有三豐. [2]惡有二咎. [1]欲有一極.[82]

From there, the "Wen zhuo" goes further down the stemma to reveal that each of the six catalogs also has its own catalogs, and the rest of the text continues to enumerate only those sub-catalogs.[83] Although such selective unpacking is rather exceptional in the *Yi Zhoushu*, the way these catalogs are contextualized is shared by the other non-spoken enumerations: stripped of any historicizing information, they are presented to be absolute, timeless precepts. The "Da wu" 大武, for example, opens with its own overarching categories by which its catalogs are named in a likewise unqualified and unconditional way: "As for warfare, there are six standard tactics: expedition, assault, secret invasion, open attack, close-range combat, and battle in formation" 武有六制. 政. 攻. 侵. 伐. 搏. 戰.[84] The "Wu mu" 武穆, further, simply claims that "When one reveres the [following] three matters, there will forever be fortune" 敬惟三事. 永有休哉.[85] No apologetics ever attempted.

In early Chinese rhetoric, appeals to "inherited wisdom" and to timeless truth claims belong in the same category; "inherited wisdom," whether of words or deeds, *is* timeless truth.[86] Both afford

---

[82] *Yi Zhoushu huijiao jizhu*, 1.57-58.

[83] From "joy" 樂, for instance, we are given "Three Abundances" 三豐; and from "Abundances" 豐, the text goes on to give us "Three Persistence" 豐有三頻. Only the "Three Persistence" is unpacked, not the "Three Abundances."

[84] *Yi Zhoushu huijiao jizhu*, 2.104

[85] Ibid., 3.323.

[86] Speaking of the *Zuozhuan* and *Guoyu*, Schaberg has remarked that "inherited words are the soundest source of authority for historiography and are constantly cited in speeches as unerring tokens of the truth." This is

the catalogs one of the best possible reasons for propagation, and perhaps the best excuse for their mechanical presentation too. From how enumeration is done to how the catalogs are framed, the chapters in speech form are thus not unlike those that are not. What differentiates them in the most conspicuous way is precisely the mode of presentation—one in speech and one not.[87] This is already indication that speech as a discursive form is likely a choice, a contextualizing frame, not necessarily a historical context. As many commentators past and present like to put it, most of the words spoken in the *Yi Zhoushu* seem to have been "fictitiously entrusted" 假託 to the kings and the duke.[88] The question, however, is not that they are fictitious; they almost certainly are. The question is why entrust them as *spoken* words uttered in speech. Half of the enumerations remain, after all, in in a non-speech form.

Part of the answer can be attributed to the rhetorical style of the *Yi Zhoushu*. Insofar as enumeration is concerned, the compilation is among the most "undetermined" of all. It lacks the persistence of the *Shangshu* to present every instance of enumeration in speech; it also differs from the *Han Feizi* 韓非子, for example, where enumerations of various sorts also abound but not once appearing in speech.[89] Instead, the *Yi Zhoushu*'s inconsistency as to whether and when to turn an enumeration into speech manifests itself even below the chapter level, in the ongoings of the textual progression from one paragraph to the next.

---

certainly right but for other works beyond the scope of historiography, the observation also holds. Schaberg, *A Patterned Past*, 26.

[87] All these chapters belong to the thirty-two chapters Edward L. Shaughnessy has identified as the "basic core" of the *Yi Zhoushu* which are, he also points out, "remarkably consistent in both language and thought." Shaughnessy, "*I Chou shu* 逸周書," in *Early Chinese Texts: A Bibliographical Guide*, ed. Michael Loewe (Berkeley: Society for the Study of Early China and the Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 1993), 229.

[88] See Luo Jiaxiang, *Yi Zhoushu yanjiu*, 14; Zhou Yuxiu 周玉秀, *Yi Zhoushu de yuyan tedian jiqi wenxianxue jiazhi* 《逸周書》的語言特點及其文獻學價值 (Beijing: Zhonghua shujui, 2005), 236-250.

[89] In the *Hanfeizi*, for example, the "An wei" 安危 chapter opens with the enumeration of two catalogs as a lead into the rest of its discussion on stability and endangerment. More expansively than that, a ten-member catalog structures the entire "Shi guo" 十過 chapter where after the enumeration of the catalog, each of the ten members is additionally exemplified by one or more anecdotes. Further add a comment to or directly elaborate on the members of a structuring catalog, line them all up before the anecdotal exemplifications, and you get the six "Chuo shuo" 儲說 chapters.

The "Feng bao" 酆保 chapter, for instance, interrupts a dialogue between King Wen and the Duke of Zhou with a massive catalog, thus breaking the conversation into two halves. In the first half, King Wen asks the duke what to do now that he has vanquished Lord Hu of Chong 崇侯虎 and annexed Chong 崇, to which the duke replies with his usual emphasis on ritual and moral propriety. Hearing that, the king orders an immediate ritual sacrifice in the presence of all his officials and guests who have come to celebrate his victory. The moment the ensuing description of the ritual ceremony is over (underlined below), the text somewhat jarringly transitions to the listing of a two-fold, nine-member catalog of catalogs (dotted):

> Sacrifice to the Shang started with the Shang kings. Following that, the vassal lords were feasted, and the many officials ceremoniously received. After they were escorted out to the suburbs, a stele was erected in Chong. Within, one must procure the "Five Propitiousness," "Six Cautions," "Seven Stimuli," "Ten Ruins," and the "Four Coverings." Without, one must employ the "Four Vermins," "Five Falls," "Six Tolerances," and "Seven Aversions."
>
> 商饋始于王. 因饗諸侯. 重禮庶吏. 出送于郊. 樹砆于崇. 內備五祥. 六衛. 七厲. 十敗. 四葛. 外用四蠹. 五落. 六容. 七惡.[90]

Once all these catalogs are unpacked in the next bit of the text, the duke returns to the dialogue and starts to invoke the catalogs in the exact same wording and order as if he was the one who had just gone through them:

> Dan bows to the king and says, "*Wuhu*! You, my king, should humbly treat all under heaven with respect. Do not blame others; do not indulge in self-aggrandization; only by that manifest your presence. *Wuhu*! Be reverent! Watch over the "Five Propitiousness," "Six Cautions," "Seven Stimuli," "Ten Ruins," and the "Four Coverings." If they are not cultivated, the state will not hold fast. Apply yourself to the complete materialization of the "Four Vermins," "Five Falls," "Six Tolerances," and the "Seven Aversions." If you are not timely, not approving, not compliant, and not measured in regard to all those, you will on the contrary deplete yourself. *Wuhu*! Keep them deep in mind! Tie yourself seriously to them! If not deep, then your authority will have no weight. When people comply with your authority, you will have peace. When people do not, you will face collapse. Once collapsed, there is no going back. Make sure that your descendants will make cautious use of your strategies too!"

[90] *Yi Zhoushu huijiao jizhu*, 3.197.

旦拜曰. 嗚呼. 王孫其尊天下. 無見過適.[91] 無好自益. 以明而跡. 嗚呼. 敬哉. 視五祥. 六衛. 七厲. 十敗. 四葛. 不修國乃不固. 務周四蠱. 五落. 六容. 七惡. 不時不允. 不率不緩. 反以自薄. 嗚呼. 深念之哉. 重維之哉. 不深乃權不重. 從權乃慰. 不從乃潰. 潰不可復. 戒後人. 其用汝謀.[92]

This strange coordination between the catalogs first narrated and then spoken is not unique; it occurs one more time in the "Feng mou" 酆謀 chapter. In both cases, the catalog could have been introduced by one of the speakers but is not. Instead, the duke is turned into a "reader" of the very text in which he speaks, who then relays the message to the king in emphatic reiteration. But the duke, of course, could not have been a reader. In the larger picture, the coordination here betrays both the constructedness of this text and the flexibility with the form of content more generally. Insofar as content delivery is concerned, the catalogs can be placed anywhere; but when all or part of the enumeration is presented in speech, the delivery takes on an extra layer of significance that is driven by the specific medium of speech.

That significance is what I have earlier called "speech function," a more principal rationale than corpus-level stylistic preference behind the representation of the catalogs in a speech form. Marshall McLuhan's famous dictum that "the medium is the message" is quite relevant here,[93] and speech function registers in three ways.

At the most basic level, speech entails a certain degree of "speechness": what is in speech should feel speechlike, however subjective or culture-specific that feel might be. In the context of early China, it translates to a sense of textuality, narrativity, and a judgment over the literary institutions behind textual production. Although no such feel can be measured objectively, some speeches—the "Ru xing," for example—will strike most readers as less speechlike than most other spoken enumerations. This is likely one of the reasons why, as the shape of the enumeration becomes more complex, the act of enumerating also begins to shed its otherwise speech clothing.

---

[91] I follow Wang Niansun's 王念孫 emendation for the reading of this clause. *Yi Zhoushu huijiao jizhu*, 3.209.

[92] *Yi Zhoushu huijiao jizhu*, 3.209-211.

[93] See McLuhan, *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1994), 7-21.

Texts like the "Shi guo" 十過 and the "Chu shuo" 儲說 chapters of the *Han Feizi*, both taking enumeration to a new level whereby anecdotal illustrations are now included, will be hardly containable in a speech form.[94] Instead, both devise new ways for the rearrangement but not renouncement of the *stemma catalogorum*, so that room can be made for the additional materials. In either case, whether a speech "feels" like a speech is anyone's decision; the more important message is the medium of speech itself when the utterance can be equally imagined—or found, in fact—in a non-speech form. Many speech acts, for example, are simply narrated while many narrative events rely on speech representation. Both, as I will show in Part II, send a different message.

At the pragmatic level, speech entails the existence of a speaker, so the previously mentioned speaker function comes back into play. That speaker does not have to have a name; anonymity has its own values and is often associated with authority even in cultures that valorize individuality.[95] But when the speaker is Confucius, the Zhou kings, or the Duke of Zhou, their names afford what they say a natural tint of authority. Outside those figures, few other speakers have been associated with enumeration the way they do it. In early Chinese writings, certain types of speakers only make certain kinds of speeches; their speaker function goes hand in hand with the ways they usually speak. In this context, the decision to enumerate in one's own voice as the narrator(s) in the *Han Feizi* do also becomes understandable. As one of the few early Chinese texts in which the narrator's voice is more proudly foregrounded, borrowing another voice means not only a lost opportunity to establish one's own but also an importation of that other voice's speaker function one may not want.

Finally, speech function also disaggregates into different speech types, each type typically having its own signification. All the enumerations so far discussed, for example, appear only in two kinds of speech: what can be broadly categorized as the "proclamation" 誥 and what I shall name hereinafter as the "question-and-answer." None of this is accidental. Among the various speech

---

[94] For an account of how the "Chu shuo" chapters work, see Heng Du, "The Mastery of Miscellanea: Information Management and Knowledge Acquisition in the 'Chu shuo' Chapters of the *Hanfeizi*," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 140.1 (2020): 115-141.

[95] See for example Tom Geue, *Author Unknown: The Power of Anonymity in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2019).

types in early China, both prove to have been associated with authority and both specialize in the production, presentation, and promulgation of ideas, claims, and, more generally, knowledge. Like a toolbox but for discursive purposes, each speech type has its own use and function.

The proclamation, for example, exploits the authority of the speakers—typically kings and their advisors—and the imposing language they use to make demands of the addressee. The duke's final speech in the "Feng bao" translated above is a good example of resorting to the speech type of proclamation to emphasize the importance of the catalog. In both language and rhetoric, the duke speaks just as he and the kings do in the better-known proclamations of the *Shangshu*. Although less dramatic, this is also how the "Rou wu" 柔武, "Bao dian," "Wu quan," "Cheng kai," and "Feng mou" chapters of the *Yi Zhoushu* present their enumerations, with the distinctive "genre markers" of "wuhu" 嗚呼 and "be reverent" 敬/敬哉 both prominently featured. In every case, proclamation as a particular speech type lends urgency and significance to the catalogs otherwise dry and tedious; it signals an appeal to the tradition's available discursive strategies a contemporary reader would recognize. The addressee is thus not simply the interlocutors in the text but the larger audience outside it as well. The speech type of proclamation itself commands attention from the audience and directs their interpretation.

The question-and-answer, on the other hand, derives authority from a semblance of what is often called the "scene of instruction," not necessarily the reality of it. The occasion must have had a historical basis but was stylized in most iterations of the speech type (more in chapter 3). Just as Confucius, for instance, never met any interruption in the "Ru xing," his interlocutors in the **Min zhi fumu* and many other such questions-and-answers also "know" perfectly well when to speak and what to say. Such is also how the kings and the duke converse in the *Yi Zhoushu*. In both cases, as in many others, the instructed also fully accepts if not additionally praises what the instructor says. In the *Yi Zhoushu* alone, all but one of the enumerations presented in the question-and-answer have the instructed say "indeed!" 允哉 or "be reverent!" 敬哉 at the end of the conversation, performatively acknowledging the significance of the catalogs. When no such response is articulated, either in the *Yi Zhoushu* or elsewhere, the acknowledgment can be assumed.

Thus understood, speech function complements speaker function in giving us many of the eloquent cultural heroes seen in early Chinese writings. Not only do they speak, their speeches also tend to fall under a narrow range of speech types. Just as Confucius and the Zhou kings do not, for instance, promise, persuade, or please, other figures like Zhang Yi 張儀 and Su Qin 蘇秦 also do not teach, instruct, or command. When a familiar name is aligned with a speech type untypical of his or not represented to be speaking at all, question *will* arise about authenticity (recall, again, the "Ru xing" and the **Kongzi shilun*). A Confucius who makes promises is as suspicious as a Confucius who silently does something. What merits cautioning is simply that the two speech types are highlighted here as analytical abstractions. As readily employable as they are, many texts and speakers use them in more creative ways. So do there exist other speech types (like remonstrance and persuasion that Schaberg has written about) that are equally prevalent in the sources. The "over-representation" of the proclamation and the question-and-answer in the enumerative voice indicates not their relative weight over other speech types but the commensurateness between the message and the medium. As the following chapters will show, other voices also make good use of these two speech types.

## 2. The Triading Voice

In a way, the enumerative voice belongs not only to speakers but to all those who play a role in voicing a speaker. A number of speakers, for instance, are seen speaking in a set of three separate but closely related texts commonly grouped under the same title. In the *Shangshu* 尚書, for example, four such triads, as I like to call them because of the harmonic overtones the speaking voices in each strike, make up twelve of the altogether fifty-eight chapters.[96] In the *Mozi* 墨子, the so-called "core chapters" (*Mozi* 8-37[97]) consist entirely of ten triads in which the teachings we know Mozi by are all, with few exceptions, presented as Mozi's spoken words.[98] More recently, manuscript finds from the Tsinghua University collection present to us previously unseen triads where entire narratives can now be reconstructed about the legendary Shang 商 advisors Yi Yin 伊尹 and Fu Yue 傅說, two speaking protagonists in their respective triads.[99] The number three appears to have had a range of significances in early China: there are three commentaries to the *Chunqiu* 春秋; one examines oneself three times a day (*Lunyu* 1.4); among three people there is bound to be a teacher (*Lunyu* 7.22); mourning is to last for three years; filial impiety manifests in three ways (*Mengzi* 4A); so on and so forth. But as an order of textual organization, the triads only include those speech writings in which

---

[96] The four triads being the "Tai jia" 太甲, "Pangeng" 盤庚, "Yue ming" 說命, and "Tai shi" 泰誓. I address the "Yue ming" and "Tai shi" in Part III of this dissertation and the "Pangeng" in a forthcoming manuscript.

[97] There are some controversy as to whether the two "Fei ru" 非儒 (*Mozi* 38-39) fall also within the "core chapters." For my purpose, I only count the texts that appear in a set of three. For reasons to exclude the "Fei ru" from the core chapters, see, for example, Karen Desmet, "All Good Things Come in Threes: A Textual Analysis of the Three-fold Structure of the Mohist Ethical 'Core Chapters'" (Ph.D. diss., Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 2007), 224-243.

[98] The first of the "Fei gong" 非攻 (*Mozi* 17) is the only chapter in which no Mozi saying is quoted.

[99] The complete narrative about Yi Yin is told in three separate manuscripts that prove to have been originally bound together as one continuous scroll. The legend about Fu Yue, on the other hand, are written in three separate iterations. See Xiao Yunxiao 肖雲曉, "Shi lun Qinghua zhushu Yi Yin sanpian de guanlian" 試論清華竹書伊尹三篇的關聯, in *Jianbo* 簡帛, ed. Wuhan daxue jianbo yanjiu zhongxin 武漢大學簡帛研究中心, vol.8 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2013), 471-76; Sarah Allan, "'When Red Pigeons Gathered on Tang's House': A Warring States Period Tale of Shamanic Possession and Building Construction Set at the Turn of the Xia and Shang Dynasties," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 25.3 (2015): 419-438; and Dirk Meyer, *Documentation and Argument in Early China: The Shangshu* 尚書 *(Venerated Documents) and the Shu Tradition* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021), 201-221.

the same speaker(s) speak about a topic specific only to the housing triad.[100] Often, they also speak in a mix of speech types across the individual members of a triad.

How any of the triads came about is hard to know. While some triads appear to have been composed in three parts, others either suggest one single text in three iterations or three texts about the same subject matter. The line between the latter two is also difficult to draw. In any case, however, the same speaker(s)—it is always the same speaker(s) in any given triad—speaks in three textual instances on or about the same topic, hence the "triading voice" in my nomenclature as the second type of the representational structures common to early Chinese speech representation. Given the variable and equivocal configurational possibilities of the existing triads, who or what combination of roles joined to voice the speakers is also hardly ascertainable.[101] Nonetheless, the triads as finished, concrete textual presences all impress something on their readers. The specter of uncertain provenance does not preclude the texts from having their own structures of meaning.[102]

And that meaning, I believe, lies precisely in the triading voice's varying rhetorical effects achieved through the manipulation of the same speaker function in but differing speech functions. Whether composed by the same author with that goal in mind or selected from more variations, the members of a triad all end up fulfilling a rhetorical act either reinforcing the rhetorical purpose of the entire triad or complementing that of the other members. By authorial design or by compilatory

---

[100] Into three parts is also how the *Shijing* 詩經, *Zhuangzi* 莊子, and *Lüshi chunqiu* 呂氏春秋, for example, are divided. But in those cases, the division signals a lot more of other differences.

[101] This is not to say that efforts have not been made. Most scholarship on the various triads is concerned first and foremost with authorship and dating (see discussion below). With the Tsinghua manuscripts, traids that appear to have transmitted counterparts also prompt debates about authenticity. See, for example, Lu Shuguo 祿書果, "Qinghua jian shulei wenxian wenben zuhe de sanzhong xingtai" 清華簡《書》類文獻文本組合的三種形態, *Zhongzhou xuekan* 2018.9: 127-133.

[102] More can be said about this hermeneutic stance I am adopting—since Roland Barthes has famously pronounced the "death of the author," the "intent" of the text itself has given rise to a series of theorizations that attempt to do away with biographism. In invoking this understanding, I am not trying to echo any of the calls for a reader-centric interpretation but to simply caution against the hermeneutic losses we might suffer when we place too much emphasis on either the composite nature of early Chinese texts or their uncertain and/or collective authorship. As with the "Ru xing," neither stops the text from establishing a relationship with the reader. For the risks of biographism as it pertains to the study of early Chinese writings, see Yang Lei's review of Stephen Durrant, Wai-yee Li, Michael Nylan, and Hans van Ess, *The Letter to Ren An and Sima Qian's Legacy* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2016) in *Early China* 40 (2017): 311-315.

intent, the triading voice appears to embody just another Confucian ideal about the number three, this time analogically articulated in *Lunyu* 7.8: when one is made aware of "one corner" 一隅, in this case the overall intent of the triad, one "returns with the other three" 以三隅返, the actual triad that delivers that intent in three iterations. The triads are not three variants found and grouped together for the simple purpose of preservation; variants are hardly preserved at all in early Chinese writings. They are, rather, constructed variations iterating, and reiterating, the triads' aims in multiple ways.

Purely for analytical purposes, we can posit the existence of an "implied author," the imagined source for all the meanings a reader reads in the text, for each triad and its three members.[103] This fully abstract concept more often used for narrative writings helps us name and analyze, under one single term, the rhetorical and narrative constructions of the triads whose historical origins simply elude recovery. As I will show both in this and the later chapters, even if collective and uncoordinated, the implied authors of early Chinese speech writings more generally all resort to the same set of representational structures and narrative techniques. Both the voicing and the voiced cohere in the codes and conventions of speech representation.

### *Thus Says Mozi*

Among the existing triads, the "Shang xian" 尚賢 from the *Mozi* (*Mozi* 8, 9, 10) is a particularly illustrative example of the triading voice's construction, variation, and rhetorical implications that result. Thanks to the triad's expansive but oftentimes unmarked reliance on the various narrative devices of speech representation, the "Shang xian" has also generated a plethora of readings that conflict with one another in their portrayals of Mozi the speaker and his speaking voice. There are as many Mozi as there are editions and translations of the *Mozi*. Hardly consequential ideationally

[103] The concept goes back to Wayne Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961). Speaking of the analytical usefulness of the term, Seymour Chatman remarks, and I concur, "The question is not whether the implied author *exits* but what we *get* from positing such a concept." See Chatman, "In Defense of the Implied Author," in *Coming to Terms: The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), 75.

speaking—the "Shang xian" is unambiguous in the argument it makes—the resulting proliferation of Mozi as the voice of Mohism directly complicates the perception of both: depending on the specific text of the *Mozi* one consults, Mozi the speaker varies from a pithy quotation feeding someone else's passionate exposition to a verbose orator who goes to great lengths defending his own ideas. Such is indeed the *range* of speech functions Mozi the speaker function is seen to have adopted in the "Shang xian," but within each member of the triad, every edition and translation has further created their own Mozi different from the others. To borrow the textual critic G. Thomas Tanselle's distinction, what we have is not *the* text of the *Mozi*, not even the *text* of the *Mozi*, but a number of different *readings* passed off as one and the same *Mozi*.[104] To be sure, my discussion of the "Shang xian" is also premised on my own reading of the text, but I intend for that reading to be itself an argument, for my reading especially of Mozi's voice is informed by the conventions of creative variation and of speech representation more generally.

In that reading, the three "Shang xian" bespeaks a rhetorical endeavor in presenting the same claims and same argumentation in three different ways. Whether composed to that effect or compiled or even evolved to reflect the range of rhetorical needs (and possibilities), the triad each approaches the claim of "elevating the worthy" in ways that would fulfill a particular purpose of the implied author, both with regard to the presentation of Mozi's teaching and to its addressing of an audience. The implied author(s) freely employ Mozi as a speaker function for their own cases made either for or with the triad's core claims. What, how, how much Mozi speaks, and in what forms all depend on the rhetorical aims of the texts.

---

[104] G. Thomas Tanselle, *A Rationale of Textual Criticism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992), 11-38. As Tanselle says, "It is often said that textual criticism is a fundamental branch of scholarship because the textual critic must provide an accurate text before the literary critic can profitably begin to analyze it. But any text that a textual critic produces is itself the product of literary criticism, reflecting a particular aesthetic position and thus a particular approach to what textual 'correctness' consists of" (p. 35). The so-called "textual correctness" is in this case closely related to an implicit "regulation" of Mozi's voice. Like how Li Xueqin and other critics before him (cf. chapter 1) all have their own opinions about how Confucius should "sound," the authors of the editions and translations of the *Mozi* also project every different images of Mozi's voice.

In this context, whether the triad falls along factional lines or dates to different times remains an open question. These popular propositions regarding the provenance of the triad overemphasize, on the one hand, the explanatory weight of certain grammatical, formal, indexical, or ideational orientations of the texts and attribute, on the other, discrepancies among those to a difference in historical—that is, temporal, spatial, or authorial—origin.[105] In theory, a single author could have produced all such differences; in actuality, there also exist substantial intertextual connections within the triad which suggest a close affinity between each triad member's implied author. Provenance is thus impossible to delineate and not crucial to every line of inquiry, to begin with. What is more tangible is the construction of the triad that makes it a remarkable example of the triading voice. Not only are the three "Shang xian" fully structured around a more sophisticated iteration of the enumerative voice Confucius and the Zhou kings only utter rather rudimentarily, the range of narrative devices employed by the triad for its variation on Mozi's speaking also nears what can be deduced from the tradition of speech writings more generally. Echoes of the "Shang xian" will be heard over and over again.

The ways the three "Shang xian" chapters open mark right away the workings of the triading voice. The first "Shang xian," *Mozi* 8, presents the core claims of the triad in the following manner:

> [Q1] Master Mozi says, "Today's kings, dukes, and great men in governing a state all wish for their state to be wealthy, their people to be numerous, and their penal system to be well ordered. Yet, they gain not wealth but poverty, not numerousness but scarcity, not order but disorder. This means that, fundamentally, they have failed to obtain what they wanted and instead gained what they detest. What is the reason for that?"

[105] For an overview of the various proposals (i.e., those by A. C. Graham, Taeko Brooks, Watanabe Takashi 渡邊卓, etc.), see Carine Defoort and Nicolas Standaert, "Introduction: Different Voices in the *Mozi*: Studies of an Evolving Text," in *The Mozi as an Evolving Text: Different Voices in Early Chinese Thought*, ed. Carine Defoort and Nicolas Standaert (Leiden: Brill, 2013), esp. 9-19. See also in Chinese, Yang Yi 楊義, *Mozi huanyuan* 墨子還原 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2011), 53-62. A useful critique of the methodologies can be found in Erik W. Maeder, "Some Observations on the Composition of the 'Core Chapters' of the *Mozi*," *Early China* 17 (1992): 27-82.

[Q1] 子墨子言曰. 今[106]者王公大人為政於國家者. 皆欲國家之富. 人民之眾. 刑政之治. 然而不得富而得貧. 不得眾而得寡. 不得治而得亂. 則是本失其所欲. 得其所惡. 是其故何也.

[A1] Master Mozi says, "This is because the kings, dukes, and great men in governing a state have failed to uphold [the principles of] 'elevating the worthy' and 'employing the capable' in their governance. When a state has the worthy and the good in great numbers, its well-orderedness will be substantial. When the worthy and the good are scarce, its well-orderedness will be tenuous. Thus, the commitment of the great men is in nothing but the proliferation of the worthy."

[A1] 子墨子言曰. 是在王公大人為政於國家者. 不能以尚賢事能為政也. 是故國有賢良之士眾. 則國家之治厚. 賢良之士寡. 則國家之治薄. 故大人之務. 將在於眾賢而已.

[Q2] [One might] say, "If so, what are the ways to proliferate the worthy?"

[Q2] 曰. 然則眾賢之術將柰何哉.

[A2] Master Mozi says, "It is just like when you wish to proliferate in number those in your state who are skilled in archery and charioteering—you have no better choice but to enrich them, honor them, respect them, and praise them. For only then will a state see an increase in the number of those who are skilled in archery and charioteering. How much more, then, is the case with the worthy and the fine who are deeply rooted in virtuous conducts, eloquently articulate in their use of words, and broadly learned in [all] the ways and methods! They are assuredly the treasures of a state and the guardians of the [altars of] soil and grain, and thus must be enriched, honored, respected, and praised. Only then will a state see an increase in its number of fine gentlemen."

[A2] 子墨子言曰. 譬若欲眾其國之善射御之士者. 必將富之. 貴之. 敬之. 譽之. 然后國之善射御之士將可得而眾也. 況又有賢良之士厚乎德行. 辯乎言談. 博乎道術者乎. 此固國家之珍. 而社稷之佐也. 亦必且富之. 貴之. 敬之. 譽之. 然后國之良士. 亦將可得而眾也.[107]

The three "Master Mozi says" 子墨子言曰 (in Q1, A1, and A2) are the first clues that someone is here voicing Mozi. He is quoting from Mozi and in this case putting Mozi quotations in dialogue. This is already an act of curation and a well-coordinated one. Q1 raises a paradoxical scenario that

[106] Some editions, such as the *Mozi jiaozhu* 墨子校註 I am using here for my base text has *gu* 古 for *jin* 今. I adopt the emendation to *jin* because it is more consistent with the rhetoric both of *Mozi* 8 and that of the other two. As with this case, consequential variations will be noted when it occurs, especially those from Sun Yirang's 孫怡讓 *Mozi xiangu* 墨子閒詁 ([Beijing: Zhonghua shuju], 2001).

[107] Wu Yujiang 吳毓江, *Mozi jiaozhu* 墨子校註 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1993), 2.65.

asks for an explanation ("What is the reason for that?" 是其故何也); A1 gives the answer right away ("This is because…" 是在…) before it continues to propose a solution to the problem ("Thus, the commitment of the great men is in nothing but the proliferation of the worthy" 故大人之務. 將在於眾賢而已). Q2, then, seeks a more specific approach to bringing that solution into fruition ("If so, what are the ways to proliferate the worthy?" 然則眾賢之術將柰何哉), and A2, finally, gives away the ultimate answer to the paradox through an analogy: in order for a "state to be wealthy, its people to be numerous, and its penal system to be well-ordered" 國家之富. 人民之眾. 刑政之治 (Q1), the rulers "have to enrich, honor, respect, and praise" 必將富之. 貴之. 敬之. 譽之 the skilled "archers and charioteers" 射御之士 in the same way it does "the worthy and the fine" 賢良之士 (A2). A catalog is answered by another catalog.

This piecemeal, step-by-step progression toward the final point made in A2 is a slowed-down, dialogized approach to an otherwise directly obtainable—and indeed, presentable—answer. In the third "Shang xian," *Mozi* 10, the entire "dialogue" is collapsed into one long and continuous "monologue" spoken by Mozi. First, Q1 and A1 merge into one single declarative statement:

> Master Mozi says, "[~Q1] The kings, dukes, and great men in the world all wish for their state to be wealthy, their people to be numerous, and their penal system to be well-ordered. [~A1] Yet, they do not recognize that one has to elevate the worthy in order to govern his state and his people. The kings, dukes, and great men utterly miss the point that elevating the worthy is the foundation of governance."
>
> 子墨子言曰. [~Q1] 天下之王公大人皆欲其國家之富也. 人民之眾也. 刑法之治也. [~A1] 然而不識以尚賢為政其國家百姓. 王公大人本失尚賢為政之本也.[108]

Same problem posited by Q1; same answer given in A1. The well-coordinated question and answer connecting Q1 and A1 (是其故何也/是在…) are now entirely gone. Next, Q2 and A2 turn into a self-questioning and self-answering exchange, further dramatized in a double scene of hypothetical analogies, hence enumerative in structure. As this Mozi continues:

[108] *Mozi jiaozhu*, 2.94.

"[SQ2] Say that the kings, dukes, and the great men have indeed, fundamentally, missed the point that elevating the worthy is the foundation of governance, should I not provide an analogy so as to illustrate for them [the issue at hand]?

[SQ2] 若苟王公大人本失尚賢為政之本也. 則不能毋舉物示之乎.

"[SA2.1] Now, if there is a vassal lord here who runs the government of his state and who says, 'Of all those in my state who are skilled in archery and charioteering, I will reward them and honor them; of all those who cannot do archery or charioteering, I will punish them and debase them.' If I were to ask the gentlemen of his state the question of 'who will be delighted and who will be frightened,' I am certain that those who are skilled in archery and charioteering will be delighted while those who cannot do archery or charioteering frightened."

[SA2.1] 今若有一諸侯於此. 為政其國家也. 曰. 凡我國能射御之士. 我將賞貴之. 不能射御之士. 我將罪賤之. 問於若國之士. 孰喜孰懼. 我以為必能射御之士喜. 不能射御之士懼.

"[SA.2.2] Say that I try to further entice them by saying, 'Of all those in my state who are dedicated and trustworthy, I shall reward and honor them; of all those who are neither dedicated nor trustworthy, I shall punish and debase them' If I were to ask the gentlemen of that state the question of 'who will be delighted and who will be frightened,' I am certain that those who are dedicated and trustworthy will be delighted while those who are neither dedicated nor trustworthy will be frightened."

[SA2.2] 我賞因而誘之矣. 曰. 凡我國之忠信之士. 我將賞貴之. 不忠信之士. 我將罪賤之. 問於若國之士. 孰喜孰懼. 我以為必忠信之士喜. 不忠不信之士懼.

"Now, one must elevate the worthy in order to govern one's state and one's people, so that in one's state, those who do good are motivated and those who do violence are dispirited. Only then can one govern all under heaven—in such a way that those in the entire world who do good are motivated, and those who do violence are likewise dispirited."

今惟毋以尚賢為政其國家百姓. 使國為善者勸. 為暴者沮. 大以為政於天下. 使天下之為善者勸. 為暴者沮.[109]

This entire stretch of text mirrors closely the question and answer raised in Q2 and A2 of *Mozi* 8. The hypothetical question here (SQ2) aims to illustrate the general *shu* 術, technique, asked in Q2 also with analogies; and the answer SA2 acts out in two dramatized hypotheticals (SA2.1and 2.2) the exact scenarios posited in A2 ("it is just like…" 譬若): the "archers and charioteers" 射御之士 are

[109] *Mozi jiaozhu*, 2.94.

re-invoked verbatim while "the worthy and the fine" 賢良之士 are replaced with "the dedicated and the trustworthy" 忠信之士. Both, however, comprise the very targets of recognition and elevation in the answers through both monetary rewards (*fu* 富, *shang* 賞) and class distinction (*jing* 敬, *yu* 譽, *gui* 貴). In both answers, the two illustrations also lead to a final conclusion (underlined) confirming the positive results of "elevating the worthy," the fundamental principle behind all the honoring and rewarding. The similarities in the diction, logic, and rhetoric of the argumentation along with the use of first-person pronouns make it possible to read this entire progression as Mozi answering a question he himself raises.[110] The more significant departure from *Mozi* 8 lies in how SA2 dramatizes the answers given in A2 by voicing the hypothetical interlocutor ("if there is a vassal lord here" 今若有一諸侯於此) through the use of prosopopoeia.

Dramatization and prosopopoeia mark two of the most common devices of speech-making in early China; they signal a preference for direct speech whenever possible and turn what is usually understood as pure narration (the analogies as described in A2) into a scene of (exchanged) speech (the analogies as presented in SA2). Such dramatization of narrative prose and, from the opposite direction, narrativization of speech events is what Gérard Genette has termed "transmodalization" between the two modes of representation.[111] It is in fact a standard technique used in early Chinese writings for the production of creative variations (more on this in Part II) and it goes back as early as the bronze inscriptions. Commensurate with, and further derived from it is the two-way shift made between dialogic and monologic presentations within the dramatic mode, or what Genette calls further "intramodal transmodalization." As is obvious from the comparison above, *Mozi* 8 presents

---

[110] Immediately following the SA2 translated above, the text goes on to raise another hypothetical question by using a different first-persona pronoun, *wu* 吾: "That being so, in the past I have esteemed the ways of Yao, Shun, Yu, Tang, Wen, and Wu. What is the reason for that?" 然昔吾所以貴堯舜禹湯文武之道者. 何故以哉. If we disregard the change in the pronoun and still read this *wu* 吾 as Mozi referring to himself, this long monologue would seem to go further on. If we read the *wu* 吾 instead as an impersonal first-person pronoun as "one," then it's just as likely that a different voice is now entering the text. It is impossible to be certain which is the actual case. One must decide for oneself. For the complexities concerning *wo* 我 and *wu* 吾 as both personal *and* impersonal first-person pronouns, see Christoph Harbsmeier, "Xunzi and the Problem of Impersonal First Person Pronouns," *Early China* 22 (1997): 181-220.

[111] See Genette, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, trans. Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 277-293.

the same argument and in the same terms as *Mozi* 10 does, only in an overt dialogic exchange between Mozi quotations instead of a monologic presentation fully voiced by Mozi—even though the internal progression of Mozi's monologue is still dialogic. Both must have been constructed.

Apart from the seamless transition made from Q1 to A1 via the anaphoric *shi* 是, Q2 is especially revealing in this regard. In phrasing, it picks up right from the last few words of A1, a typical way to construct a follow-up question; in function, it creates an additional turn-taking, a buffer between two consecutive claims; and in form, it helps to reenact the "scene of instruction" which is now a mere textual imitation. The *yue* 曰 leading Q2, translated above as "one might say," is thus a "dummy question" added by the implied author so as to fully dialogize while slowing down the same progression *Mozi* 10, by contrast, quickly goes through. As with most dummy turn-takings, they are useful not as indication of voice change but for the purpose of pacing, of formal decorum. This entire progression in *Mozi* 8 is a local enactment of the question-and-answer speech type I will discuss fully in the next chapter.

What this all indicates is that the representation of Mozi in the openings of both *Mozi* 8 and *Mozi* 10 is not mimetic, at least not chiefly so. Neither seeks to recreate what might have empirically happened but to create what seems most effective for a certain rhetorical purpose. Compared to the A2 of *Mozi* 8, SA2 in *Mozi* 10 turns the same analogies into a vivid reenactment of two imaginary scenes, likely so that an audience attuned to less abstract ways of thinking can more easily relate. This representation is rhetorical, aiming to exert an impact on the readers.[112] Because of that, both dialogic and monologic representations share the freedom to creatively inscribe rather than truthfully transcribe form and thought. What is changed here are the speech functions of Mozi. In the opening lines of *Mozi* 9, a dialogic exchange is found directly in a monologic articulation of the same argument, a kind of performative embedding of the form of *Mozi* 8 into that of *Mozi* 10:

[112] The idea of rhetorical representation goes back to Wayne Booth's *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. For a more recent treatise, see for example James Phelan, *Somebody Telling Somebody Else: A Rhetorical Poetics of Narrative* (Columbus, OH.: The Ohio University Press, 2017).

Master Mozi says, "Today's kings, dukes, and great men in ruling the people, presiding over the altars of soil and grain, and governing their states all wish to prolong stability and avoid mishaps.

> [RQ1] How then have they not come to the realization that elevating the worthy is the foundation of governance?
>
> [RQ2] By what do I know that elevating the worthy is the foundation of governance?
>
> [RA2.1] From this: when the honored and wise run the government, the foolish and lowly will be well-ordered; when, however, the foolish and lowly run the government, the honored and wise will be thrown into chaos.
>
> [RA2.2] By that do I know that elevating the worthy is the foundation of governance."

子墨子言曰. 今王公大人之君人民. 主社稷. 治國家. 欲脩保而無失. [RQ1] 故[113]不察尚賢為政之本也. [RQ2] 何以知尚賢之為政本也. [RA2.1] 曰. 自貴且智者為政乎. 愚且賤者則治. 自愚且賤者為政乎. 貴且智者則亂. [RA2.2] 是以知尚賢之為政本也.[114]

Right at the outset, this Mozi asks two rhetorical questions (RQ1 and RQ2) and answers only one of them (in RA2.1 and RA2.2, a two-part answer). RQ1 needs no answering because it is not really a question but an assertation, one that feeds the wording of the following RQ2 the same way A1 does Q2 in *Mozi* 8 and ~A1 SQ2 in *Mozi* 10. At this point, the core argument of elevating the worthy is already given. Beginning from RQ2, this Mozi gives the most unadorned reasoning among the triad for its core claims, this time without any analogies and likely, again, aiming to address a different rhetorical purpose.

Published readings of this brief passage have inadvertently created three mutually incompatible presentations of Mozi, none providing any justification. In the first case, RQ2 and RA2.2 are put instead in the voice of the author, who appears to be stringing two separate Mozi quotations so that one (RA2.1) is used to address the other (RQ1).[115] In between the two quotations, the author speaks as if he was offering interlinear commentary. A variation on this first reading is

---

[113] *Gu* 故 (*k$^{\varsigma}$a(ʔ)-s) is in many other editions written as *hu* 胡 (*[g]$^{\varsigma}$a) and should be read as such.

[114] *Mozi jiaozhu*, 2.73.

[115] See Li Yushu 李漁叔, *Mozi jinzhu jinyi* 墨子今註今譯 (Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1974), 45.

one that gives RA2.2 back to Mozi, so that the author is attributed only with RQ2, which then constructs this strange correspondence between the author's question (何以知…, in that reading "how do we know…") and Mozi's answer directly addressing the author (是以知…"hence we know…").[116] The second reading, in comparison, is one where everything from RQ2 to RA2.2 is put in the author's voice, who in that reading also begins each of the three sentences with a "we" as the grammatical subject, thus implying that the disciples of Mozi are here speaking.[117] Mozi, then, disappears completely after raising RQ1.

The third reading, one that parses this passage the same way as I do, points nevertheless to another, more subdued area of disagreement. Instead of reading the dangling *yue* 曰 leading RA2.1 as a marker of decorum, of dummy turn-taking, in fact also an optional marker as we shall soon see (hence my intentional translation into "from this"), the otherwise compatible reading interprets this unattributed *yue* as "I say," creating as such the impression that an actual turn-taking is taking place.[118] This is likely the reason why RQ2 has been taken to necessitate a voice change from RQ1 in the first two readings, so that RA2.1 can address RQ2 the same way RQ2 is taken to address RQ1. But as the same unattributed *yue* in Q2 of *Mozi* 8 and its complete absorption into SQ2 of *Mozi* 10 shows, this *yue*, too, is a "silent" *yue*. It marks form, not necessarily addressivity between the staged "exchanges." In other sources, it is more familiar as the marker equating an earlier statement with a later one (e.g., A 曰 B = A means/is B). *Mozi* 9 here simply subsumes that structure under a question-and-answer, once again embedded in a larger, monologic structure.

The three readings, therefore, transform Mozi from one brief to two separate quotations and then to a completely self-contained and much longer speech in which Mozi also quotes himself.

---

[116] See Chris Fraser, *The Essential Mozi: Ethical, Political, and Dialectical Writings* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), 22.

[117] See Burton Watson, *Basic Writings of Mo Tzu, Hsün Tzu, and Han Fei Tzu* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1964), 22; John Knoblock and Jeffrey Riegel, *Mozi: A Study and Translation of the Ethical and Political Writings* (Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California Berkeley, 2013), 88. Both choose not to indicate the extent of Mozi's speech by the proper punctuation marks, so there is a possibility that the "we" means for them Mozi's shy-away from "I."

[118] See Ian Johnston, *The Mozi: A Complete Translation* (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2010), 63.

Although none makes too much difference insofar as the argument is concerned, the nuance is all that matters for the narrative construction and accordingly rhetorical effects of the texts. Faithfully documenting Mozi's sayings or even critically engaging with them calls for a different configuration of Mozi's speech functions than, for instance, borrowing his voice for some other purposes. And when it comes to such efforts in speech representation, convention exists in most instances. There is no reason for the "Shang xian" to be an exception in this regard; so far, the triad has only displayed close adherence to the structures and variations characteristic of those conventions. The rhetorical effects that result from such controlled variation in narrative construction are what differentiate the three "Shang xian" from one another in the most impactful way, not that they might represent factional or evolutionary views. These openings only foreshadow more sophisticated manipulation of Mozi's speech functions in the remainder of the three texts, all for the addressing of varying rhetorical aims.

### *Mozi as Rhetorical Device*

After putting Mozi quotations into a dialogized exchange, *Mozi* 8 continues to justify Mozi's argument for elevating the worthy by appealing to the exemplary past. In three statements of *gu* 故 ("thus") or *shi gu* 是故 ("this is why"), each organized around the enumeration of a catalog, the implied author continues to thread together material after material for his paced exposition of Mozi's argument. First, he claims that the "sage kings of antiquity" 古者聖王 spoke about *yi* 義, righteousness, without which one should not have wealth, esteem, a close relationship, and the convenience of proximity (不義不富. 不義不貴. 不義不親. 不義不近). To further emphasize its importance, he creates four parallel scenes of prosopopoeia in which adherence to righteousness is verbally avowed by someone. Second, he goes back to the keyword of worthiness by stating that the sage kings of antiquity all "rank the virtuous and exalt the worthy" 列德而尚賢, by which he means that toward those people, the sage kings "raised their ranks, increased their salaries, tasked them with duties, and executed their orders" 高予之爵. 重予之祿. 任之以事. 斷予之令. This second catalog

resembles the solutions raised in A2 and will appear again in *Mozi* 9. Lastly, he goes straight into an unannounced list of sage kings who are known to have elevated either their successors or advisors due to their worthiness. Although the lineup varies, the same kind of enumeration of the sage kings comprises the two other "Shang xian" as well. The three segments of "thus/this is why" constitute an overarching catalog in which *Mozi* 8 continues.

In some readings, this is all presented to be Mozi speaking, a continuation of his words in A2. That Mozi is therefore not just proclaiming the arguments but also substantiating himself with reason and evidence, in a much longer speech.[119] To me, as in most other readings, the implied author is in control of the text. The opening "dialogue" and the ensuing substantiation both follow the author's voicing, as is evident from the narratorial markers of "Master Mozi says" and "thus/that is why." No sign of voice change has interrupted the transition from the former to the latter. This pattern continues until the concluding part of *Mozi* 8 where the author brings Mozi back for a final reiteration of the argument in the master's own voice:

> It is for this reason that Master Mozi says, "If one gains one's way, the worthy cannot but be elevated. If one does not gain one's way, the worthy also cannot but be elevated. When the aspiration is to inherit and emulate the ways of Yao, Shun, Yu, and Tang, then one cannot but elevate the worthy. For elevating the worthy is the foundation of governance."
>
> 是故子墨子言曰. 得意賢士不可不舉. 不得意賢士不可不舉. 尚欲祖述堯舜禹湯之道. 將不可以不尚賢. 夫尚賢者. 政之本也.[120]

The final anaphoric *shi* 是 refers back to the three-part substantiation just outlined. Consistent with the opening curation of Mozi quotations, the author is here presenting, perhaps even inventing, a fourth Mozi saying so as to wrap up the entire text. In so doing, he lends substance and coherence to the otherwise programmatic pronouncements that may or may not have appeared in the way they are presented here. Unlike the much "rawer" *Lunyu*, this is already a kind of reception of Mozi, one

[119] Ian Johnston for example brackets everything here in quotation marks in his translation. See Johnston, *The Mozi: A Complete Translation*, 54-61.

[120] *Mozi jiaozhu*, 2.67.

that unpacks and defends his arguments *for* him, in a way that in turn portrays a Mozi image much in line with that of the aphoristic Kongzi. Whoever the implied author is, or however many roles the implied author stands for, *Mozi* 8 functions to introduce the idea of elevating the worthy in a claim-evidence-summary structure. Those responsible may just have been Mozi's disciples, but nothing in the text itself implies an "insider" perspective.

In complete contrast to *Mozi* 8, the author of *Mozi* 10 disappears into the background. He leaves the entire text in Mozi's voice, never once surfacing again after the initial "Master Mozi says." This Mozi, then, speaks far more profusely than most other Mozis do in the core chapters, and he speaks with point, structure, numerous supporting materials, and a penchant for dramatization—much in the manner of an orator and at many places epideictically so.[121] At the same time, Mozi the orator also incorporates into a long speech the voice of his addressee, a form of dialogism largely unrecognized in current readings. Unusual for Mozi but not uncommon in speech representation, this dialogism further illustrates the constructed, and rhetorical, nature of the speech.

Following his paced and structured opening translated above, in which SQ2 and SA2 already display more rhetorical sophistication than *Mozi* 8, this Mozi slowly goes into another structurally enumerative rhetorical move of past-present comparison for the substantiation of his argument, and he compares not once but twice as well. If *Mozi* 8 is a treatise on "elevating the worthy," *Mozi* 10 launches now into a persuasion calling for action.

In the first comparison, Mozi narrows down the difference between the sage kings and the contemporary rulers to one about execution. When "governing the populace by overseeing the mass and issuing ordinances" 臨眾發政而治民, he says, only the former had elevated the worthy while the latter merely paid lip service to the idea. In both cases, this Mozi like he does in the opening poses a rhetorical question to himself in the form of "why is this the case?" 何故以哉 or "by what do I know this is the case?" 何故知其然乎. He then reaffirms his own answers by repeating "that

[121] In addition to enumeration, the basis of epideictic speech, the three most common types of nondeductive argumentation—paradox, analogy, appeal to examples—also all appear in the speech. See Paul R. Goldin, "Nondeductive Argumentation and the Art of Chinese Philosophy," in Goldin, *The Art of Chinese Philosophy: Eight Classical Texts and How to Read Them* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2020), 13-27.

being so, this indeed is X" 然則此 X 者也 or "by this do I know that is X" 我以此知 X 也. With regard to the contemporary rulers he is critiquing, for instance, he says that the reason they stop short of actually elevating the worthy is that they "have a discerning mind only for the trivial but not for the grand" 明於小而不明於大也. And his evidence for that assertion, one that occurs in *Mozi* 9 too, is the paradox that in terms of butchery, tailoring, veterinary medicine, and weapons upkeep they all know enough to consult a specialist, but when it comes to statecraft, they turn instead to "their flesh-and-bone kinsmen, the unjustifiably rich and esteemed, and the good-looking" 骨肉之親. 無故富貴. 面目美好. This catalogic characterization of the contemporary rulers' "staffing preference" feeds then into the next comparison. Here, though, the overall rhetorical orientation of the entire *Mozi* 10 is already evident: apart from a paced progression enabled by rhetorical questions-and-answers, each claim made is buttressed by a slew of repetitive examples. The force of the argument lies in the dramatization of enumeration.

In the second comparison, the earlier claim made about nepotism becomes the new point of departure from which this enumerating Mozi continues to amass an overabundance of evidence for illustration. Regarding the exemplary past, he enumerates a list of historical exemplars the same way the author does in *Mozi* 8, this time with a different lineup of sage kings but the same type of stories. More than the author of *Mozi* 8, this Mozi further invokes the exemplary words of the sage kings "written on bamboo and silk, inscribed onto trays and jars, and left for the descendants of later generations" 書之竹帛. 琢之槃盂. 傳以遺後世子孫. The same appeal to inherited words, a rhetorical complement to inherited deeds, is seen again in *Mozi* 9 but in that case back in the author's voice. This entire fluidity between the speaker's and the author's voices in addition to the flexibility of monologic-to-dialogic transformation is evidence that the "Shang xian" triad might actually go back to a single author—or a few authors who had the other texts in view.

Regarding the present he now turns to indict, this Mozi in congruence with his overall affinity for repetition and enumeration reprimands the contemporary rulers for choosing nepotism over worthiness also not once but twice. Here, however, the way Mozi goes about the comparison suggests an audience Mozi the speaker is poised to address directly. Such a deictic, dialogic aspect of

Mozi's dramatized question-and-answer is sometimes effaced even in the standard Chinese editions of the text. Following his earlier remarks on the exemplary sage kings, this Mozi says:

> [Q3] "(Someone/you might) say, 'As for today, all the gentlemen-in-service in the world desire wealth and honor and detest poverty and lowliness. [Q3-b] If so, what should you do to gain wealth and honor and avoid poverty and lowliness?'"
>
> [A3] "(I would) say, 'Nothing compares to acting worthy.'"
>
> [Q4] "'What then is the way of acting worthy?'"
>
> [A4] "(I would) say, 'Those who have strength should rush to help others; those who have wealth should strive to divide it among others; those who possess the Way should aim to teach others. In that way, those who are hungry will have food, those who are cold will have clothing, and those who are disruptive will be well-ordered. If the hungry gain food, the cold clothing, the disruptive order, then secure livelihoods will come about.'"
>
> [Q3] 曰. 今也天下之士君子. 皆欲富貴而惡貧賤. [Q3-b] 然女何為而得富貴而辟貧賤.
> [A3] 曰. 莫若為賢.
> [Q4] 為賢之道將柰何.
> [A4] 曰. 有力者疾以助人. 有財者勉以分人. 有道者勸以教人. 若此則飢者得食. 寒者得衣. 亂者得治. 若飢則得食. 寒則得衣. 亂則得治. 此安生生.[122]

This is the *Mozi jiaozhu* 墨子校註 edition in Sun Qizhi's 孫啟治 emendation and punctuation. In Sun Yirang's 孫怡讓 (1848-1908) earlier *Mozi xiangu* 墨子閒詁, the *yue* 曰 leading A3 is moved to mark the preceding Q3-b, thus rendering Q3 to Q4 in the following way:

> [Q3] 曰. 今也天下之士君子. 皆欲富貴而惡貧賤.
> [Q3-b] **曰**. 然女何為而得富貴而辟貧賤. [A3] 莫若為賢. [Q4] 為賢之道將柰何.
> [A4] 曰. 有力者疾以助人…[123]

Adopting Sun Yirang's edition, John Knoblock and Jeffrey Riegel translate the above as follows:

> [Q3] "We say: Today those in the world who occupy official positions all desire wealth and high office and hate poverty and low office."

[122] *Mozi jiaozhu*, 2.96.

[123] *Mozi xiangu*, 2.70.

> [Q3-b] "We say: If that is true, then what should you do to obtain wealth and eminent position and avoid poverty and a humble position? [A3] Nothing is as important as being worthy. [Q4] What is the Way of the worthy?"
>
> [A4] "We say: Let him who has strength be anxious to help others…"[124]

Ian Johnston, on the other hand, follows the *Mozi jiaozhu* as I do, but attributes everything to an "I":

> [Q3] "I say that at the present time officers and gentlemen of the world all wish for wealth and nobility and abhor poverty and baseness. [Q3-b] This being so, how can they attain wealth and nobility and avoid poverty and baseness?"
>
> [A3] "I say there is nothing to compare with being worthy."
>
> [Q4] "What is the way of worthiness?"
>
> [A4] "I say that one who has strength must hasten to use it to help people…"[125]

Within the space of a few exchanges, we have thus three readings (mine included), each differing from the others in significant ways.[126] While Johnston's translation reduces the dramatized questions-and-answers in my reading to a rhetorical self-questioning and self-answering all uttered in the voice of Mozi, that is, his "I," Knoblock and Riegel attribute everything to a "we," presumably the disciples of Mozi, and further collapse the second round of question-and-answer (Q4 and A4) into a self-exchange all vocalized again by "we."

These readings derive not only from a rigid understanding of *yue* but also from a narrow view of what can be regarded as early Chinese representation of dialogism. For "I" and "we" to utter all the questions and answers is to deny heteroglossia, whether genuine or imagined, and to present *Mozi* as a closed, hegemonic discourse. Like in the case of the dramatized archers and charioteers in

---

[124] Knoblock and Riegel, *Mozi*, 105.

[125] Johnston, *The Mozi*, 87.

[126] Li Yushu's *Mozi jinzhu jinyi* (p.66) for some reason misses the entire line of 然女何為而得富貴而辟貧賤 and is thus not considered here.

the opening of this "Shang xian," Q3 and Q4 both constitute prosopopoeia as well. Unlike the opening where Mozi explicitly states that he was reenacting an imagined analogy ("should I not provide an analogy so as to illustrate for them?" 則不能毋舉物示之乎), both Q3 and Q4 do not have to, but can be, attributed to an actual audience Mozi is now either implicitly or explicitly invoking, hence my translation into the ambiguous "someone/you might say." Those are the people this Mozi is now giving voice to and also addressing. The form of the exchange is still that of a question-and-answer, one that replicates the exact same progression of the opening "dialogue" in *Mozi* 8, but the two sides no longer speak from the same perspective but two. Rather than enacting a dialogic exchange, it is a dialogic exchange reenacted. And the second-person pronoun *ru* 女 in Q3-b, although translating literally to "you," means in this context the generic "one." It is a question posed to Mozi asking about others. The entire exchange is still fully voiced by Mozi, yet this Mozi is incorporating a second voice in this part of the speech. This kind of staged dialogism is by no means uncommon; it marks some of the most complex *Shangshu* speeches as well (see Part III). In general as it is in the specific case here, the speaker reenacts other voices through the use of prosopopoeia and addresses them in what can be loosely understood as apostrophe—all in his own dramatization of either a past or a "synchronous" speech event.

The exchange between prosopopoeia and apostrophe happens again in the next repetition of practically the same question-and-answer. In that case, the same Q3 is raised again but without the opening *yue* [Q3-v.2], and what is in the first case A3 through A4 merges into one single answer [A3-4], with the intermediary and dummy Q4 again dropped:

> [Q3-v.2] "Today's gentlemen-in-service in the world all desire wealth and honor and detest poverty and lowliness. That being the case, what should you do to gain wealth and honor and avoid poverty and lowliness?"
>
> [A3-4] (I would) say, "Nothing compares to being the flesh-and-bone kinsmen of the kings, dukes, and great men, or to being rich and honored for no reason, or to having a fine appearance. Being the flesh-and-bone kinsmen of the kings, dukes, and great men, being rich and honored for no good reason, and having a fine appearance are not things one can obtain through learning."

[Q3-v.2] 今天下之士君子皆欲富貴而惡貧賤. 然女何為而得富貴而辟貧賤哉.

[A3-4] 曰. 莫若為王公大人骨肉之親. 無故富貴. 面目美好者. 王公大人骨肉之親. 無故富貴. 面目美好者. 此非可學能者也.[127]

In no edition or translation is this exchange read differently, presumably because the only *yue* here falls on an obvious moment of transition from a question to an answer and is not complicated by more *yue*. But in comparison with the first case above, the flexibility of the marker *yue* itself is also apparent. Wherever and whether *yue* appears at all, the question-and-answer structures itself.

With two sets of substantiations for both the exemplary past and the ruinous present in the second such comparison complete, the speech also draws to a quick conclusion. In light of *Mozi* 8, *Mozi* 10 presents Mozi in a different speech function, as an orator epideictically promoting his own ideas. The plentiful but repetitive assertations, contradistinctions, and exemplifications all combine to overwhelm the audience this Mozi first charms with staged, easy-to-envision analogies and then directly addresses. In terms of speech-making, this text appears rather pedagogical in effect if not in aim. It showcases some of the commonest devices of speech representation, all juxtaposed together in one long speech. This is not the typical Mozi we usually envision, but this Mozi speaks just like some kings do in the *Shangshu*. It is curious how, unlike Confucius, Mozi's voice can sound—or, be made to sound—this elastic but not "inauthentic."

The remaining "Shang xian," *Mozi* 9, is also the most distinctive in the triad, hence my discussion at last. Not only does it exhibit in one text elements seen respectively in *Mozi* 8 and 10, this member of the triad also splits the speaking scene between a third kind of speech function of Mozi's and the author who later "imitates" that Mozi's rhetorical style. The text is clearly divided into two parts. In both parts, Mozi and the implied author contrast the ruinous present with the exemplary past as *Mozi* 10 does. But overall, the author appears to be using Mozi as a mere prelude to his own critique. Mozi, then, becomes a proof of some sort, a source of (temporary) authority the author later subjugates to a higher one, the will of Heaven. *Mozi* 9 is thus an application, one could

[127] *Mozi jiaozhu*, 2.97.

also say appropriation, of Mozi. It is the author's own rhetorical purpose through his invocation of Mozi that is the clearest objective of this "Shang xian." Mozi still speaks, and at great length too. But he speaks no longer as the protagonist but as the author's rhetorical instrument. Mozi as a speaker function that signifies certain meanings is what enables the author to invoke him in the first place.

Given the overlap with *Mozi* 8 and 10, the first half where Mozi speaks needs only a quick sketch. After the opening remarks translated earlier, this Mozi goes over catalogs after catalogs for his comparison between the past and the present. Most of the catalogs are familiar already from the two other "Shang xian"; in fact, the speech uses materials seen in *Mozi* 8 before it turns next to those rehearsed in *Mozi* 10. The few new ones prove to be constructed either as an extension of or as a contrast to the existing catalogs.[128] In a way, the entire speech weds *Mozi* 8 with *Mozi* 10 and supplements the many catalogs and their associated paradoxes and examples with new or more materials.[129] Not much is new until the very conclusion of this speech. For the first and only time in the triad, this Mozi self-referentially summarizes his own foregoing words: "Thus, achieving order by elevating the worthy and employing the capable in governance is like what I have just said. Causing disorder by debasing the worthy in matters of governance is [also] like what I have just said" 故以尚賢使能為政而治者. 若吾言之謂也. 以下賢為政而亂者. 若吾言之謂也. In light of the two other "Shang xian," this is also the only instance where a conclusion is made about Mozi's *speech*, not his argument for elevating the worthy.

---

[128] To the two-fold 尚賢事能/使能 (elevate the worthy and employ the capable) seen in both *Mozi* 8 and *Mozi* 10 and also reiterated here, for example, *Mozi* 9 follows up with a tripartite catalog: "thus, [1] those who can be employed to run a state are employed to run a state; [2] those who can be employed to preside an office are employed to preside an office; [3] those who can be employed to run a district are employed to run a district" 故可使治國者使治國. 可使長官者使長官. 可使治邑者使治邑. To the four-fold catalog of 高予之爵. 重予之祿. 任之以事. 斷予之令, *Mozi* 9 here adds a reverse catalog it calls 三本, "the three fundamentals": "if their [i.e., the employed] ranks are not high enough, people will not respect them; if their salaries are not substantial enough, people will not trust them; if their orders are not executed, people will not fear them" 爵位不高則民不敬也. 蓄祿不厚則民不信也. 政令不斷則民不畏也.

[129] Within both sections on the past and the present, *Mozi* 9 introduces a description on the result of either elevating or failing to elevate the worthy. And both are divided into common spatial catalogs like 上/外/內 (above/without/within the state) or 出/入 (when you go out/when you return home).

Immediately following Mozi, the author enters from behind the scene and lays bare his real purpose letting Mozi speak—that is, quoting him—at length:

> If today's kings, dukes, and great men truly wish to bring order to their states, prolong stability and avoid mishaps, how come they have yet to realize that elevating the worthy is the foundation of governance? Moreover, as for elevating the worthy as the foundation of governance, how is it something said by Master Mozi alone? It is the Way of the sage kings, the writings by the former kings, and words that have endured ages.
>
> 今王公大人中實將欲治其國家. 欲脩保而勿失. 胡不察尚賢為政之本也. 且以尚賢為政之本者. 亦豈獨子墨子之言哉. 此聖王之道. 先王之書. 距年之言也.[130]

Repeating Mozi's opening lines but with an emphatic "truly" 中實, the author is on the one hand acknowledging Mozi's premises and on the other questioning the absurdity that today's rulers still have yet to adopt such an obvious solution to their problems. When he says next that elevating the worthy goes back not only to Mozi but to the sage kings, one could, however, read more nuance into it. Perhaps he is implying that Mozi is the one who has discerned the larger truth, a truth that is grounded in a long and glorious tradition. Or, if not so charitably, he is perhaps implying that Mozi is simply stating the obvious, which one could easily find in the sage kings' writings. As the author goes next to quote a line from the *Shangshu* and later on a few more again, it indeed seems that the truth is already "there," in the words passed down to the author's time.

This is in fact the exact same move Mozi the orator does in *Mozi* 10, but what for Mozi in that case was evidence for his claims is now the author's first step away from Mozi and toward the larger truth. Following the *Shangshu* quotations, he supplies another enumeration of the sage kings' exemplary deeds seen also in the two other "Shang xian." From that point on Mozi never appears again in the remainder of the text. His rhetorical function to open the text, to situate the readers in a topic which they perhaps know best from Mozi, and as such to prepare the readers for a larger agenda is completed. Instead, by starting with Mozi, the author is showing that *he* is the one who can

[130] *Mozi jiaozhu*, 2.76.

discern the larger truth in its full glory, for *he* is the one who is now unveiling the roots of Mozi's claims and demonstrating for us their proper lineage.

In the next passage of the text, the author's aim in critiquing the present *through* Mozi as his proof of choice is made fully manifest. He first locates the source for the sage kings' behaviors, claiming that the reason they "knew perfectly well to elevate the worthy and employ the capable in matters of governance is that they took the model from Heaven" 審以尚賢使能為政. 而取法與天. Heaven's will is the theme of another triad (*Mozi* 26-28), but in the "Shang xian" Mozi never once alludes to it. By identifying Heaven as the source of behavioral guidance for Mozi's favorite sage kings, the author is setting himself up as the ultimate exegete who sees more than Mozi does.

This all-knowing exegete goes then into a catalog of examples to illustrate the point that "although Heaven certainly did not discriminate poverty from wealth, esteem from humbleness, far from near, closeness from distantness, all those who were worthy He elevated and exalted, and all those who were incompetent He demoted and dismissed" 雖天亦不辯貧富貴賤. 遠邇親疏. 賢者舉而尚之. 不肖者抑而廢之. Reminiscent of *Mozi* 8—both its catalogs centered on righteousness and its illustration through four parallel prosopopoeiae—the author here in the same way goes down his catalog (underlined) by constructing four sets of dramatic exchanges. In each case, the author first asks a rhetorical question in the form of "as for X, who are they" X 者誰也, and then supplies a list of historical examples followed by another question about them before eventually concluding with a reiteration of his answers in the form of "this, then, is X" 則此 X 也.[131] Only the last set breaks the pattern by culminating in a series of quotations attributed to the sage kings, both as a way to wrap up this part of the text on the exemplary deeds of the sage kings (聖王之道) and as an additional set of written evidence (先王之書. 距年之言) for the final conclusion: "Thus, the virtue of the sage men is what binds together Heaven and Earth" 故聖人之德蓋總乎天地者也. Elevating the worthy is indeed not just Mozi's teachings.

---

131 Both answers in each exchange is marked by *yue* while the questions are not. As with their handling of *yue* in the earlier cases I have discussed, Johnston still puts an "I" before *yue* while Knoblock and Riegel as well as Fraser a "we." Only Watson reads this use of the *yue* by leaving it not only unmarked but also untranslated. See Watson, *Basic Writings of Mo Tzu, Hsün Tzu, and Han Fei Tzu*, 30-32.

Having performatively demonstrated his more profound views on the problems, the author turns back to the present time he started with. To that end, however, he chose to let the foregoing part on the past ring a while longer and only briefly suggests that today's rulers should find a way to care for the people, noting in conclusion that elevating the worthy is the "generous conduct of the sage men" 聖人之厚行也. The second mention of *shengren* 聖人 in the space of 116 words, this emphasis in which the entire *Mozi* 9 now culminates is not insignificant. For the author at this point has completely bypassed Mozi in his critique of the present time. To him, what is the problem is the loss of a tradition, to which Mozi is but one witness who has somehow given it perhaps the most popular expression. But as the author shows, the sage kings of antiquity have already modeled the ideal governance both in practice and in the words they left. Compared to the narrower focus of Mozi's, the author's critique evinces a "humanistic" interest in a social and political problem Mozi only seeks to readdress but not address. Like how Mozi has in his earlier speech looked merely back to his own argumentation (…若吾言之謂也), the author's vision goes far beyond that. He surveys the entire history and observes the mechanisms of the cosmological order, presenting himself to be a contemporary *shengren* in the etymological sense of the phrase: a man, *ren* 人, who is penetrating, perspicacious, and attuned to really *listening*, *sheng* 聖.[132]

This image of the author is somewhat reminiscent of the Mozi in "Heaven's Will" 天志. In that triad, Mozi is the one who traces the ultimate authority to Heaven. But here, Mozi remains the author's proof, one that is appealed to not only for his signifying speaker function which likely was synonymous with the discourse of "elevating the worthy" but also in his proper "existential form"—a speech function of some kind. A Mozi paraphrased in another voice would be a Mozi stripped of his known mode of existence. Like Confucius, the Duke of Zhou, and the Zhou kings, Mozi is Mozi because he appears in writing speaking. It is through speaking that these figures gained authority and authenticity; it is also through speaking that they can maintain that authority and authenticity. Not every name in early China can be alluded to instead of dramatized, staged, and voiced; most come

[132] 聖 (*l̥eŋ-s) is cognate with 聲 (*[l̥]eŋ) and 聽 (*l̥ˤeŋ).

down to us in a certain form of "representational decorum." Such is why Mozi can range from a brief quotation to a full-length epideictic oration but not further on—insofar as the sources show—to a pure description or even indirect discourse. The three "Shang xian" exhibit more sophistication in the codes and conventions of speech representation than just their exemplarity in the narrative and rhetorical construction of the triading voice.

As an example of the triading voice, however, the "Shang xian" combines to illustrate how variation in speech representation achieved through the various devices of voice representation—prosopopoeia and apostrophe, monologic-to-dialogic transformation—along with such common narrative tropes of enumeration, contradistinction, exemplification, and the speech type of question-and-answer can aid in the production of rhetorically distinctive variations. Such variations in the context of the triading voice happen to have an overarching formal structure whose origin is unclear. But in the larger, unstructured world of early Chinese speech writings, the same representational and narrative structures and techniques are the basis of all creative variations whose ultimate difference will register as rhetorical orientations. Remarkable as the three "Shang xian" may seem, the triad is as conventional as creative variation mechanistically is.

### 3. The Protreptic Voice

In the enumerative voice and the triading voice, we hear already the echoes of a third voice. Both the **Min zhi fumu* 民之父母 and the "Ru xing" 儒行 are conversations between Confucius and an interlocutor. In both conversations, Confucius answers questions raised by his interlocutors. In the *Yi Zhoushu* 逸周書, the same kind of conversation is exchanged between the enumerating Zhou kings and the Duke of Zhou, who also answer questions each poses to the other. In the "Shang xian" 尚賢, finally, what I have come to call the question-and-answer undergirds not only staged dialogues between Mozi quotations but also prosopopoeia and apostrophe found within Mozi's own dramatizing speeches. In all cases, the question-and-answer provides a structure for the progression of the texts and is thus a speech type enactable both on its own and inside other structures. Insofar as the "Shang xian" has shown, the progression of the question-and-answer itself also need not be propelled by such signaling words as *yue* 曰; on the contrary, *yue* has no bearing on the turn-taking between the question and the answer.

These instantiations of the question-and-answer are brief and basic, not exceeding two or three turn-takings and uncomplicated by any other interactions possible between two interlocutors. In the larger world of speech writings, however, both extended and complex questions-and-answers exist in no small amount. That notwithstanding, the question-and-answer as a prevalent speech type is by no means dialogic if "dialogic" is understood as exchanges between two different voices each represented by a discrete thinking mind. There is no real heteroglossia. Rather, this type of dialogue is monologic in the sense Mikhail Bakhtin has described: it represents only one set of viewpoints—that of the author's—and no genuine challenge to it.[133] The author gives voice to all his interlocutors in the question-and-answer like a puppeteer gives motion to his marionettes, and the interlocutors'

[133] The idea of monologism is described most clearly by Bakhtin in his long essay "Discourse in the Novel." In it, he says that a "rhetorical double-voicedness…may be adequately unfolded into an individual dialogue, into individual argument and conversation between two persons, even while the exchanges in the dialogue are immanent to a single unitary language: they may not be in agreement, they may even be opposed, but they are diverse neither in their speech nor in their language." Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), 325.

questioning and answering all comprise what the author wants them to say through ventriloquism. The interlocutors' words may not always sound fictional, but the way they converse very much is—the turn-takings are always staged in a highly stylized fashion.

Despite the lack of dialogism between the interlocutors, the question-and-answer is marked nonetheless by a different kind of dialogism between the ventriloquizing author, implied or real, and his ventriloquized protagonists as well as his dramatic presentation of their conversation.[134] As seen in the question-and-answer's cameo in the previous chapters, the speaker function of the interlocutors contribute to the meaning of the exchange; so is, for example, a dialogical form easily transformable into a monologic one at no expense of the dialogic nature of the utterance. There are more "genre-specific" attributes to this author-representation dialogism this chapter will introduce, but the thinly veiled presence of such authorial control over his textual production across in fact many more early writings indicates that the question-and-answer is likewise a shared representational structure just as the enumerative and the triading voices are. The speech type gives form to what I would call the "protreptic voice," so named because the question-and-answer is what authors employ to instruct, exhort, or persuade their readers through the instruction, exhortation, or persuasion done by one of the interlocutors to the other.[135] A degree of theatricality accompanies the presentation and reception of the protreptic voice.

Compared to the two other voices, the protreptic voice involves also the manipulation of the speaker function and the speech function of a voice. Unlike either of the two other voices, the protreptic voice calls for a particular type of speaker to help augment the unchanging protreptic aim of the question-and-answer. In the process, the protreptic voice exploits, regulates, even programs

---

[134] Scholars have also characterized the Socratic dialogues in similar ways. For a synthesis of that scholarship and a comparison with the monologic undertones of the Babylonian Talmud, see the highly innovative Daniel Boyarin, *Socrates and the Fat Rabbis* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2009).

[135] The word "protreptic" comes from the Greek *protrepein*, meaning to "turn (someone) forward," hence "propel," "urge on," "exhort." In Aristotle's *Protrepticus* (I thank Paul R. Goldin for the reminder), the aim is to encourage the young to specifically study philosophy. Bearing that connotation in mind (and for want of a better word), I nonetheless use this word in a broader sense, because the questions-and-answers as we have them instruct, exhort, and persuade their readers with regard to far more types of disciplines and knowledge.

the significative value of the speaker functions in which is it voiced. Not every speaker, that is to say, will command the same amount of attention; nor will every kind of protrepsis be heard without the authority a certain speaker's name-value can bring to the utterance of it. The question-and-answer is choreographed both structurally and symbolically.

*Monologic Dialogue*

Two signs attest to the monologic nature of the protreptic voice. The first, also the more apparent, is the certain success of one interlocutor in teaching, exhorting, or persuading the other in any instantiation of the question-and-answer. This interlocutor, typically the more superior in intellect or intellect-based status, tends to also dominate the exchange whereas the other (there is usually only two interlocutors) simply agrees with him, either in silence or with avowed enthusiasm. This other consenting interlocutor, as it were, has thus a textual function to play before he is significative in other ways. Such is why the oft-seen "unenlightened ruler" who typically occupies that consenting position is a trope representing an ideology.

We have seen, for instance, how the Duke of Zhou always commands the king's attention and approval ("indeed!" 允哉/"be reverent!" 敬哉) with his lengthy enumerations in the questions-and-answers of the *Yi Zhoushu*. The same also marks the so-called "Qingzhong" 輕重 chapters of *Guanzi* 管子 (chs.68-86), a large and representative specimen of ruler-advisor exchanges in the Eastern Zhou, where Duke Huan 桓公 of Qi answers Guanzi's replies to his endless questions with a frequent "excellent!" 善.[136] For the *Yi Zhoushu*'s Duke of Zhou, only in the "Guan ren" 官人 does he not receive a response after answering the king's question, but it does not mean that the king

136 See Tamara Chin, *Savage Exchanges: Han Imperialism, Chinese Literary Style, and the Economic Imagination* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2014), 32-68, for an account of these chapters' literary form and its corresponding implications. My only quibble with the account is with the claim that these dialogic chapters "appropriate" the form of, in her words, "'Masters' (*zi* 子) philosophy" (p.33). As I will show later, master's literature has a much wider range of discursive forms, and the question-and-answer that the *Guanzi* chapters indeed adopt is not appropriation but the most typical form for the presentation of more technical knowledge in early China.

does not concur. In other instances like the "Ru xing," this kind of silent agreement can be signaled narratively: after hearing Kongzi answer his question, Duke Ai is said "in speech, to strive for more trustworthiness and in conduct, more righteousness" 言加信. 行加義. When the interlocutors do not, the author will sometimes step in so that no one reads the protrepsis against the grain. No response usually means positive response.

The second sign of the monologic nature of the protreptic voice is seen in the coordination between the questions and answers in any question-and-answer. As the earlier examples have shown, one interlocutor always asks the right question at the right time. The answering party, even those non-stopping ones like the Kongzi in the "Ru xing" and the Mozi in the longest of the so-called "defense chapters" (*Mozi* 52 and 62), never once meet interruption or an interlocutor who does not ask for the lecture in the first place. Duke Ai, for instance, still "directed [Kongzi] to take a seat" 命席 and speak on after Kongzi had warned him that "even with speedy enumeration, [the conducts of *ru*] will not be exhausted" 遽數之不能終其物. The feeding, goading, and humoring of even the most tedious answers is a hallmark of the question-and-answer; it is matched, reversely, only by the kind of piecemeal progression I will describe later as pacing. Both attest to the monologic voicing of the conversing interlocutors where the author is in ultimate control of the turn-takings. In less "supervised" iterations of the question-and-answer, the same authorial control is still discernable. What covers but does not erase its trace is the dialogue's less lopsided turn-takings and more "spontaneous" interactions. But that is a stylistic preference certain authors do enjoy having.

Among the existing questions-and-answers, another conversation between Confucius and Duke Ai in three instantiations is a remarkable example of the protreptic voice's construction and variation. In many ways, the conversation is also enumerative and, thanks to the exact number of variations, "secretly" triading. The three voices contribute to each other's materialization. In the *Da Dai liji* 大戴禮記 version of the conversation titled "Aigong wen wuyi" 哀公問五義, the exchange opens in the following way:

> [Q1] Duke Ai of Lu asked Kongzi, "I wish to rank the men of service in my state so that I can share governance with them. How do I go about selecting from them?"
>
> [A2] Kongzi replied, "Born into today's world but bent on the way of the ancients; lodged in today's customs but dressed in the clothes of the ancients—is it not indeed rare to abide by all these and yet still do wrong?"
>
> [Q2] Duke Ai said, "If that is the case, are those dressed in Shang dynasty caps and nosed shoes while having their court tablets tucked in their sash belts all men of worthiness?"
>
> [A2] Kongzi said, "No, not necessarily. However, those who are dressed in ritual robes, dark pants, and ceremonial caps while riding the chariot do not have their will set on spices and savories; those who don coarse hemp, straw sandals, and lean on a staff while sipping gruel do not have their will set on food and water. Thus, born into today's world but bent on the way of the ancients; lodged in today's customs but dressed in the clothes of the ancients—even if there exists a case of abiding by all these and yet still do wrong, is it not indeed rare?"
>
> [Q1] 魯哀公問於孔子曰. 吾欲論吾國之士. 與之為政. 何如者取之.
> [A1] 孔子對曰. 生乎今之世. 志古之道. 居今之俗. 服古之服. 舍此而為非者. 不亦鮮乎.
> [Q2] 哀公曰. 然則. 今夫章甫句屨紳帶而搢笏者. 此皆賢乎.
> [A2] 孔子曰. 否. 不必然. 今夫端衣玄裳冕而乘路者. 志不在於食葷. 斬衰簡屨杖而歠粥者. 志不在於飲食. 故生乎今之世. 志古之道. 居今之俗. 服古之服. 舍此而為非者. 雖有. 不亦鮮乎.[137]

Duke Ai wants to "rank" (I read 論 not as *lùn* {*[r]ˤu[n]-s} but *lún* {*[r]u[n]} for reasons to be soon discussed) the men of service in his state, so he asks Kongzi how it can be done. Kongzi in his reply returns a rhetorical question, saying essentially that if someone has both his "will" 志 and "garment" 服 modeled after the ancients, then he will not do wrong. Duke Ai, in turn, misses the point. Instead of focusing on will, he asks more about garments, a kind of external expression of will. In response, Kongzi gives Duke Ai a qualified "no" as to whether one's garment can be a sure sign of one's will. But in a further elaboration, he also concedes that even if that is not the case, it is equally rare for external expression to misrepresent one's inner inclination. Through two rhetorical questions, a favorite move of Kongzi's, he is implicitly telling Duke Ai to observe one's appearance as a proxy for one's inner qualities. The duke's "confusion" gave Kongzi a chance to repeat and clarify.

[137] Wang Pinzhen 王聘珍, *Da Dai liji jiegu* 大戴禮記解詁 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983), 1.8-9.

This part of the exchange has nothing special to it other than Kongzi's somewhat circuitous answers; all three instantiations read the same except for some minor variant expressions. How the exchange proceeds from here, however, starts to diverge. Still in the *Da Dai liji* version, Duke Ai replies to A2 above with an "excellent" 善. But then, somewhat jarringly, he poses further a seemingly unrelated question:

> Duke Ai said, "Excellent! What must one be like in order for one to be called an ordinary man?"
>
> 哀公曰. 善. 何如則可謂庸人矣.[138]

Undisturbed by the sudden change of topic, Kongzi answers Duke Ai just as usual, making no more extended reference to either garment or will:

> Kongzi replied, "As for the ordinary man, he is someone who cannot utter fine words but someone whose will is nonetheless still not chagrined. He is unable to pick either the worthy or the fine to whom he can entrust his own person and who, then, will worry his worries. In taking action, he does not know where to put his efforts; in resting, he does not know where to settle himself. Daily, he chooses among numerous things but does not know what to value, so in following the current of those things he does not know where to return either. His five senses govern him, his heart follows his senses, and therefore falls to ruin. If someone is like that, he can be called an ordinary man."
>
> 孔子對曰. 所謂庸人者. 口不能道善言. 而志不邑邑. 不能選賢人善士而託身焉. 以為己憂. 動行不知所務. 止立不知所定. 日選於物. 不知所貴. 從物而流. 不知所歸. 五鑿為政. 心從而壞. 若此. 則可謂庸人矣.[139]

From here on, the exchange picks up a new rhythm as Duke Ai continues to ask about four more types of people in the exact same manner as he has asked about the "ordinary man" 庸人: i.e., the "official in service" 士, the "gentleman" 君子, the "worthy" 賢人, and the "sage" 聖人. Before asking about each, he as in the earlier turn-taking does first acknowledge Kongzi's foregoing answer

---

[138] Ibid., 1.9.

[139] Ibid.

with a simple "excellent." Kongzi, on the other hand, also patiently answers each of the questions Duke Ai poses to him. In each answer, Kongzi adopts the same syntax bookended between the opening "as for X" 所謂 X 者, X being the specific type of people now being addressed, and the affirmative "if someone is like that, he can be called X" 若此則可謂 X 矣. These further exchanges surrounding an apparently ascending catalog proceed in ways so consistent and so disconnected from the prior ones about will and garment that they look like an entirely separate conversation. But after the duke's final "excellent" to Kongzi's final reply to his final question, the author steps in with a narratorial comment to enclose as one text all the preceding exchanges: "Kongzi stepped out, and Duke Ai saw him off" 孔子出. 哀公送之. Perhaps the catalog bespeaks the exact order by which a ruler should rank people, and Duke Ai knew about it all along.

This entire interaction between Kongzi and Duke Ai has a parallel version in the "Ai gong" 哀公 chapter of the *Xunzi* 荀子, a mini-collection of more exchanges between the two interlocutors. In this iteration, an additional round of exchange occurs before the duke plunges into his cascading questions about the five groups of people. Following Kongzi's A2 translated above, the text goes:

> [Insert 1] Duke Ai said, "Excellent!"
>
> [Insert 2] Kongzi said, "As for people, there are five degrees of deportment: there is the ordinary man, the officials in service, the gentlemen, the worthy, and the great sage."
>
> [Insert 1] 哀公曰. 善.
> [Insert 2] 孔子曰. 人有五儀. 有傭人. 有士. 有君子. 有賢人. 有大聖.[140]

This simple addition does two things at once. On the one hand, it yanks the dialogue back on track, for this five-fold catalog is so far the only direct answer from Kongzi to Duke Ai's opening question about ranking, *lún* 論, his subjects. On the other, it gives Duke Ai all the exact topics of his ensuing questions that in the *Da Dai liji* version came out of his own devising, both in terms of the naming of the catalog and the sequence in which the constituent items are ordered. It turns a question-

[140] Wang Xianqian 王先謙, *Xunzi jijie* 荀子集解 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1988), 20.635-36.

driven progression where the questioner provides the topic for the answering party into an answer-driven one in which the answering party supplies all the topics for more questions to target, usually one by one as well. In both cases, the unfolding of a catalog underlies the dialogic progression of the questions and answers. At the same time, it also turns Duke Ai, who in the *Da Dai liji* "knew" his own lines full well and who had been propelling the orderly progression of that exchange, into the "unenlightened ruler" who is now only following Kongzi's lead, mechanically asking for elaboration. Once they finish their last exchange about the sage, at which point the duke also spoke his last "excellent," the *Xunzi* version of the text also draws to an end. With the extra turn-takings "overlooking" the integrity of the entire exchange, there is no more need to mark its boundaries narratively; the protrepsis has finished running its own course.[141]

Question-driven or answer-driven, the two instantiations of the same question-and-answer attest to the underlying logic of the dialogue's monologicity. Instead of questions and answers, which all too deceptively register as two different voices, the locutions assigned to each can be more transparently described as a unitary pair of topic and comment. Wherever they fall between the two illocutions, topic always leads to comment and comment sometimes more topic. In less extended questions-and-answers, which is also the more common type, a question is most useful *only* as the provider of topics. When, for instance, an "answer" already operates on a topic-comment syntax, like the forty-something sayings in the *Lunyu* all about *junzi* 君子, only one (*Lunyu* 12.4) comes with a redundant question reiterating the topic ("Sima Niu asked about the gentlemen" 司馬牛問君子). On the contrary, some answers will read incomplete if the topic-supplying question is not present. Without Zigong's contribution in *Lunyu* 2.13, for example, Kongzi's answer will have no subject:

---

[141] In both John Knoblock's and Eric Hutton's translations, they interpret the conclusion by typographically marking this final part of the exchange off from the next dialogue that in the Chinese editions is unmarked. However, they also divide this exchange into two separate ones, assigning the extra "excellent" from the duke to the earlier discussion on will and garment and Kongzi's "five degrees of deportment" to lead the remaining questions. In that reading, *lun* 論 is translated instead into "assess" and "judge." See Knoblock, *Xunzi: A Translation and Study of the Complete Works*, vol.3 (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994), 259; Hutton, *Xunzi: The Complete Text* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014), 333.

> Zigong asked about the gentleman.
> The Master said, "[A gentleman] first puts his words into action; only then does he let his words follow his action."
>
> 子貢問君子.
> 子曰. 先行其言. 而後從之.

Without Zigong's further contribution, this time not only with regard to the syntactical topic ("a single word" 一言) but also to the particular kind of *yan* 言 being asked about that is qualified too in the question ("by which one can act throughout a lifetime" 可以終身行之者), Kongzi's answer in *Lunyu* 15.24 also loses both the topic and half of the appeal his idea of *shu* 恕 has—that not imposing onto others what oneself does not want is a *lifelong* principle:

> Zigong asked, "Is there a single word by which one can act throughout a lifetime?"
> Kongzi said, "Is [the word] not *shu*? What you yourself do not desire, do not impose it onto others."
>
> 子貢問曰. 有一言而可以終身行之者乎.
> 子曰. 其恕乎. 己所不欲. 勿施於人.

As should be obvious, the questions here all work to complete the answers, both syntactically and propositionally. Who asks the question may have other significances, but insofar as they appear in the question-and-answer, they are first and foremost a discursive function of the protrepsis. Such is the basis for the erasure of the interlocutor's identity altogether, as is familiar from the well-known questioner by the "name" of *huo* 或 in, for example, the *Fayan* 法言, someone who cannot and has no need to be identified.[142]

In the more extended questions-and-answers like the two instantiations of the Kongzi-Duke Ai exchange on the "five degrees of deportment" 五儀, the topic-comment symbiosis also governs the shape and progression of the questions and answers. Instead of syntactically reaching into each

[142] "Someone says" 或曰 exists, of course, outside the speech type of the question-and-answer. In those cases, it tends to mark an unattributed (or unattributable) quotation that the text somehow wants to engage with.

other like in the case of the less extended ones, they tend to build upon one another in the manner of a *stemma catalogorum*. Both the *Da Dai liji* and the *Xunzi* versions, for example, go down a five-fold catalog of personalities, one without announcement, one with. Kongzi and Zixia's exchange in the **Min zhi fumu* also does the same, first with two catalogs announced together by Kongzi ("the Five Arrivals" 五至 and "the Three Without" 三亡), then another one solicited by Zixia ("the Five Arisings" 五起). As with any enumeration, when the number of catalogs grows, the logic of their juxtaposition also becomes more important for our perception of coherence. While the five groups of personalities exhibit an internal and culturally familiar hierarchy, nothing, for instance, seems to hold those catalogs in the **Min zhi fumu* together. It is perhaps no surprise that on account of "the logic of the narrative as well as…formal features," the "Five Arisings" seems like a later addition.[143] But, as discussed earlier, seemingly incoherent juxtaposition is not a problem but an attribute of enumerative catalogs. If the protrepsis has several parts to it, then that is where the coherence lies. In the *Lunyu*, commentators have only rushed to defend rather than explain similar "incoherence" in the many "logicless" questions-and-answers one can identify, likely due to *Lunyu*'s presumed relation to Kongzi as *his* words.[144] Our own bias as the reader should also be acknowledged.

---

[143] Richter, *The Embodied Text*, 158.

[144] While some catalogic questions-and-answers exhibit a hierarchical structure like that in the two "Aigong" chapters (cf. *Lunyu* 12.7 and 13.20), others like *Lunyu* 6.22, 11.12, and 12.22 juxtapose two questions for no apparent reason. In *Lunyu* 11.12, for example, Zilu 子路 first asks Kongzi about "the serving of ghosts and spirits" 事鬼神. After Kongzi has answered that one needs to care for the living first (未能事人. 焉能事鬼), Zilu goes on to ask about "death" 死. Some commentators hold that ghosts and spirits represent the past while death the future, therefore a sense of temporal linearity underlies Zilu's questions. Others contend that ghosts and spirits is a metonymic way to speak of sacrificial rituals while death is the telos of every human life, hence Zilu's questions converge in the desire to be thorough. Yet still, there are others who claim to the contrary that Zilu is asking actually about living a proper life, since how one serves ghosts and spirits and how he dies his death can be indication of just that (*Lunyu jishi*, 22.760-61). This kind of hermeneutic gymnastics with a positivistic bent goes to the extreme in the case of *Lunyu* 6.22 and 12.22, in which cases Fan Chi 樊遲 asks Kongzi in one single exchange first about *zhi* 知 and then about *ren* 仁. Since in the *Lunyu*, *zhi* is never once discussed in the terms of *ren* but juxtaposed one more time in *Lunyu* 9.29 by Kongzi himself, a Mr. Qu 瞿氏 explains Fan Chi's twice asking of both as such: that after Kongzi gave him a very brief answer in 12.22, Fan Chi felt unsatisfied and thus asked again in *Lunyu* 6.22. According to Mr. Qu, this is beyond stupid given how being unable to digest a short answer Fan Chi should not expect to understand a longer one (*Lunyu jishi*, 12.406). One can see how an urge to impart coherence on juxtaposition can drive criticism to the edges of reason. The simplest explanation is that the protreptic message has two tangentially related parts. Those

What this means is that the question-and-answer follows a grammar of its own for its growth into more extended exchanges; the dialogic structuring of the questions and answers aimed at a monologic delivery of the protrepsis comes before all other considerations. Like the two other voices, the protreptic voice also translates into a set of narrative conventions that privileges certain order over others. It was shared by early Chinese authors who wrote in reference to the underlying codes of those conventions rather than to other, existing instantiations. Some authors do go a little further than others in their more creative engagement with the conventions, but that is again not a problem but a feature of the protreptic voice. Instead of "responding" to one other, different iterations of the same protrepsis signal different textual events altogether.[145]

The third version of the Kongzi-Duke Ai exchange in the "Wuyi jie" 五義解 chapter of the *Kongzi jiayu* 孔子家語 is precisely one such new textual event. Not only does it smooth out all the rough edges in the turn-takings, the way it further grows also illustrates how easily the question-and-answer can go on to seemingly no end. In the same A2 seen above both in the *Da Dai liji* and *Xunzi* versions, the *Kongzi jiayu* inserts between Kongzi's "no, not necessarily" and his ensuing clarifications a line of self-referential summarization (underlined) of his earlier point that was lost to the duke:

| *Da Dai liji* | *Kongzi jiayu* |
|---|---|
| Kongzi said, "No, not necessarily. | Kongzi said, "Not necessarily.<br><br><u>What I have said does not mean that.</u> |
| However, those who are dressed in ritual robes, dark pants, and ceremonial caps while riding the chariot do not have their will set on spices and savories; those who don coarse hemp, straw sandals, and lean on a staff while sipping gruel do not have their will set on food and | However, those who are dressed in ritual robes, dark pants, and ceremonial caps while riding the chariot do not have their intent set on spices and savories. Those who don coarse hemp, straw sandals, and lean on a staff while sipping gruel do not have their will set on wine |

multi-round exchanges in the *Lunyu* where one asks consecutively about several disciples (e.g., *Lunyu* 6.8 and 14.9) should also be understood as catalogic questions-and-answers.

145 I am biased toward a philology that seeks to situate a text in its own context of production even if the context is to respond to a prior text by copying or fixing that text. To me, even mechanical reproduction is a motivated act that can be investigated for an understanding of the very motivation.

| | |
|---|---|
| water. Thus, born into today's world but bent on the way of the ancients; lodged in today's customs but dressed in the clothes of the ancients—even if there exists a case of abiding by all these and yet still do wrong, is it not indeed rare?" | and meat. Thus, 'born into today's world but bent on the way of the ancients, lodged in today's customs but dressed in the clothes of the ancients'—this is speaking exactly of this kind of people." |
| 孔子曰. 否. 不必然.<br><br>今夫端衣玄裳冕而乘路者. 志不在於食葷. 斬衰簡屨杖而歠粥者. 志不在於飲食. 故生乎今之世. 志古之道. 居今之俗. 服古之服. 舍此而為非者. 雖有. 不亦鮮乎. | 孔子曰. 不必然也.<br><br>丘之所言. 非此謂也.<br><br>夫端衣玄裳冕而乘路者. 則志不在於食煮. 斬衰菅菲. 杖而歠粥者. 則志不在酒肉. 生今之世. 志古之道. 居今之俗. 服古之服. 謂此類也.[146] |

After that, one extra line (underlined) is also found in each of the additional two locutions that *Xunzi* introduced into the progression:

| *Xunzi* | *Kongzi jiayu* |
|---|---|
| Duke Ai said, "Excellent!"<br><br>哀公曰. 善. | The duke said, "Excellent! But is that all?"<br><br>公曰. 善哉. 盡此而已乎. |
| Kongzi said, "As for people, there are five degrees of deportment: there is the ordinary man, the officials in service, the gentlemen, the worthy, and the great sage."<br><br>孔子曰. 人有五儀. 有傭人. 有士. 有君子. 有賢人. 有大聖. | Kongzi said, "As for people, there are five degrees of deportment: there is the ordinary man, the officials, the gentleman, the worthy, and the sage. When you have examined all these five groups, the way for governance will also be complete."<br><br>孔子曰. 人有五儀. 有傭人. 有士人. 有君子. 有賢人. 有聖人. 審此五者則治道畢矣.[147] |

[146] Chen Shike 陳士柯, *Kongzi jiayu shuzheng* 孔子家語疏證 (Shanghai: Shanghai shudian, 1987), 1.29.

[147] Ibid.

For some readers who are more concerned with textual lineage, this is evidence of the *Kongzi jiayu* author's "editorial refashioning" of an earlier text (the *Xunzi* version). The aim, according to that account, is to "create a smoother, more coherent and readable text."[148] All the additions indeed create that effect. But what is changed far exceeds such surface-level "smoothness" and "coherence." The additional exchange *Xunzi* has, as mentioned earlier, already transforms a question-driven protrepsis into an answer-driven one in which Duke Ai also went from a penetrating ruler who knew exactly what to ask to one that needed enlightenment. His additional "But is that all" 盡此而已乎 in the *Kongzi jiayu* also derives not from one single "editorial" intervention but belongs to a larger trope of solicitation of which there are multiple expressions. The exact same phrase here, "Is that all," is for example seen in **Min zhi fumu* and its two transmitted counterparts; so does it frequent the many exchanges in the "Qingzhong" chapters of the *Guanzi*. In other places, the same function is fulfilled by such expressions that say to the effect of "can I hear about it" 可得聞乎 or "I wish to hear about it" 願聞之. Further, the *Kongzi jiayu* is itself the most elaborate when there exist parallel versions of the same materials it contains (more on this in chapter 5). Like *Lunyu*, *Yi Zhoushu*, and many other works, the *Kongzi jiayu* as a compilation has its distinctive stylistic preferences.

Rather than a "smoother" version, the *Kongzi jiayu* iteration of the same protrepsis is instead evidence of its author's dialogism with his own presentation of it. So are the two other versions. As long as the protrepsis, which must have been familiar to all three sources, is delivered, the rest is all stylistic embellishment that different sources can and do decide for themselves. The question-and-answer is nothing less than a kind of "oral poetics," and its performers have liberty in some areas but not in others. Even if some of them did have a preexisting version, which is not my dispute here since neither possibility can be proved, that preexisting text is still not a problem to be "fixed" but simply another instantiation guided by its own messaging of the common protrepsis. The rest of the

[148] Oliver Weingarten, "The Sage as Teacher and Source of Knowledge," *Asiatische Studien* 68.4 (2014): 1192, 1195. See also more generally Wu Kejing 鄔可晶, *Kongzi jiayu chengshu kao* 《孔子家語》成書考 (Shanghai: Zhongxi shuju, 2015).

*Kongzi jiayu* version indicates exactly that *Xunzi* may indeed have been a source, but not one that has dictated the performance of the *Kongzi jiayu*.

After the catalog of the "five deportments" has been fully expanded through the questions and answers by the two interlocutors, the *Kongzi jiayu* follows up with a few additional rounds of exchange unseen in either the *Da Da liji* or the *Xunzi*. In his final response to Kongzi's final answer about the sage, the duke in the *Kongzi jiayu* continues to speak after uttering his usual "excellent" which concludes the conversion in the two other versions. In that continuation of his response, what is in the *Xunzi* a separate question-and-answer on a different protrepsis (underlined) is woven right into the duke's ask for even more elaboration on the "five deportments":

> The duke said, "How excellent! If not for the worthiness of yours, Master, I would not have heard something like this. That being the case, however, I was born into the innermost of the palaces and grew up under the care of the women therein. I have not once experienced sorrow, not once experienced worry, not once experienced burden, not once experienced fear, and not once experienced danger. I am afraid I do not have what it takes to implement your teachings on the five deportments. What can I do about it?"
>
> 公曰. 善哉. 非子之賢. 則寡人不得聞此言也. 雖然. 寡人生於深宮之內. 長於婦人之手. 未嘗知哀. 未嘗知憂. 未嘗知勞. 未嘗知懼. 未嘗知危. 恐不足以行五儀之教. 若何.[149]

Duke Ai's seamless continuation following his "excellent" makes sure that the exchange has not reached its end in this iteration. On the one hand, the duke is acknowledging Kongzi's unpacking of the catalog on the "five deportments," on the other, he is now pushing the exchange ahead with a new question on the execution (*xing* 行) of Kongzi's teaching. Like in the cases of *Mozi* 8 and *Mozi* 9, an introduction to models and principles (*fa* 法) prompts the transition to an elaboration on the methods (*shu* 術) for bringing them into materialization.

This additional turn-taking, however, introduces something new to the protrepsis only by reversing the progression of the question-and-answer from an answer-driven one back to a question-

[149] *Kongzi jiayu shuzheng*, 1.30.

driven one and by integrating another protrepsis into a narrative trope commonly used to prolong the question-and-answer. In other words, nothing is really new. As mentioned earlier, the additional catalog (underlined) on sorrow 哀, worry 憂, burden 勞, fear 懼, and danger 危 appears also on its own in the "Ai gong" chapter of the *Xunzi*. In that version as is in the *Kongzi jiayu* now, the catalog prepares the ensuing exchanges by offering all the topics to be elaborated upon. While in the *Xunzi* the catalog comprises the entire locution of Duke Ai's question, it in the *Kongzi jiayu* is presented as the reason for the duke's ignorance of the "five deportments." In both cases, Kongzi does not answer the duke directly but defers a little, which prompts the duke to further encourage Kongzi to speak on:

| *Xunzi* | *Kongzi jiayu* |
|---|---|
| Kongzi said, "What you ask, sir, is a question only a sage ruler would ask. I, Qiu, is a petty person. How would I know the answer?"<br><br>孔子曰. 君之所問. 聖君之問也. 丘小人也. 何足以知之. | Kongzi replied, "As you have just said, sir, you already know about it. I, Qiu, has heard nothing further about it either."<br><br>孔子對曰. 如君之言. 已知之矣. 則丘亦無所聞焉. |
| [Duke Ai] replied, "If it were not from you, my master, there would be no one else from whom I can hear about it."<br><br>曰. 非吾子無所聞之也.[150] | The duke said, "If not for you, my master, I would have no one to enlighten my heart. Please speak on, my master."<br><br>公曰. 非吾子. 寡人無以啟其心. 吾子言也.[151] |

This deference in both instances is a trope of false modesty. It softens Kongzi's tone for the time being while offering the duke another chance to insist on an answer, another trope triggered by the deference trope. The interlude helps to pace the progression of the exchange as it prepares for the transition to a new catalog. Unsurprisingly, upon the duke's insistence, Kongzi proceeds straight into

[150] *Xunzi jijie*, 20.641.

[151] *Kongzi jiayu shuzheng*, 1.30.

his unpacking of the new catalog. Without any more hesitance, he in one breath explains to the duke how in the position of a ruler now fully grown and out of the innermost palaces he can still experience sorrow, worry, burden, fear, and danger in ways appropriate to his stature. Whereas the *Xunzi* version of this new protrepsis concludes after Kongzi has reached the final topic of danger, the *Kongzi jiayu* version puts one more line in Kongzi's mouth to fit this catalog back into an answer Duke Ai sought initially about the execution of the "five deportments": "Once you are clear about these five, my lord, should you also pay some attention to the 'five deportments,' how are you going to have any mishap in matters of governance?!" 君既明此五者. 又少留意於五儀之事. 則於政治何有失矣.[152] The additional catalog is now literally bundled with the original one.

Overall, then, the *Kongzi jiyu* version of the "five deportments" is the most rhetorically complex instantiation of the same protrepsis. The surface-level smoothness is not so much the motivation of its existence as it is the result of a more sophisticated performance of the protreptic voice to begin with. In comparison, the *Da Da liji* and *Xunzi* versions both present the question-and-answer in its *formal* completeness which on its own warrants the coherence of the protrepsis. All of this is the author's doing, implied or real. He writes for an audience that shares with him "general notions of the forms that significant human situations must take by virtue of his participation in the specific progress of sense-making which identify him as a member of one cultural endowment rather than another."[153] As modern readers, we and our notions of coherence do not fit spontaneously into that cultural endowment. Formal decorum instead of stylistic preference is what really marks the architectonics of the question-and-answer. As Bakhtin has rightly noted, "Style is inseparably linked to particular thematic unities and—what is especially important—to particular compositional unities."[154] Style, that is to say, is a function rather than a criterion of genre. In contrast to the *Kongzi jiayu*, some sources eschew stylistic embellishments altogether and instead experiment with formal

---

[152] Ibid.

[153] Hyden White, "Historical Text as Literary Artifact," in White, *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1978), 86.

[154] Bakhtin, "The Problem of Speech Genres," in *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, trans. Vern W. McGee (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986), 64.

decorum.[155] Neither is any less of a question-and-answer than the other; both exploit the speech type's compositional unity in different ways.

### *The Theatricality of Knowledge*

In whichever iteration, the exchanges on the "five deportments" teach, exhort, or persuade. Such are the projected rhetorical aims of the question-and-answer as the material support of the protreptic voice. The monologic nature of the speech type ensures that the interlocutors coordinate with each other in the delivery of the author's protrepsis, which means, in turn, that the readers are turned into overhearers. We do not simply read a text thus presented; we listen to the interlocutors perform a choreographed conversation. Just like the so-called "indirect remonstrance" David Schaberg has

---

[155] A good example is again the *Lunyu*. *Lunyu* 5.4, for example, illustrates a paced sort of unfolding of a protreptic message, one that places emphasis on piecemeal progression. After Zigong has asked for Kongzi's opinion of himself, Kongzi tells him "you are a vessel" 女器也. Upon Zigong's further push for clarification, "What kind of vessel?" 何器也, Kongzi finally replies, "the Hu/Lian sacrificial vessel." 瑚璉也. Kongzi could have given his answer directly in his first answer, but he adds an intermediary step because pacing is apparently important. One needs to follow a procedural decorum in the pursuit of truth and knowledge. When that decorum is endangered, Kongzi himself will find ways to restore it. In *Lunyu* 2.5, "Meng Yizi asks Kongzi about filial piety" 孟懿子問孝, to which Kongzi simply says, "there is to be no deviation" 無違. Normally, the exchange will either end here (like in the cases of *Lunyu* 2.6-2.8 also on filial piety) or see the interlocutor ask a follow-up question, like Zigong just did in *Lunyu* 5.4. But here, the text says instead that "Fan Chi was driving [Kongzi], to whom Kongzi said, 'Meng Sun asked me about filial piety, to which I replied, there is to be no deviation'" 樊遲御. 子告之曰. 孟孫問孝於我. 我對曰無違. Traditional commentators like Huang Kan, Xing Bing 邢昺 (932-1010), Zhu Xi, and many others all find this unusual episode comment-worthy, and they maintain that Kongzi repeated his exchange with Meng Yizi to Fan Chi because he feared that Meng Yizhi would someday ask Fan Chi what "no deviation" means—since he somehow did not ask Kongzi when told so. But a simpler explanation is just that the protrepsis is not finished yet. In response to Kongzi's telling him of a conversation he is not a part of, Fan Chi did nothing but said, almost too cooperatively, "what does it mean?" 何謂也, upon which Kongzi finally gave his elaboration: "Kongzi said, 'It means that when [your parents are] alive you serve them according to the rites; when [they are] dead you bury them according to the rites; when making sacrifices [to them] you do it according to the rites'" 子曰. 生事之以禮. 死葬之以禮. 祭之以禮. The "ball" of the topic is dropped by Meng Yizi; Kongzi passes it onto Fan Chi, whose role as the charioteer is now repurposed as the new interlocutor, who then asks Kongzi to comment as a proper interlocutor should. On that very cue Kongzi is waiting for, like he does too in the latter part of the *Kongzi jiayu*, he finally gives the full comment. The formal decorum of the question-and-answer was nearing violation, but Kongzi the interlocutor made sure it did not break down. Only an author who knew his game can play with the question-and-answer like that. Kongzi never did the same thing for a second time in the *Lunyu*.

written about, the protreptic voice also initiates "a game of decoding" by not addressing its audience directly: in the same way as a ruler has to translate a riddle or a song into a critique he "himself uncovers," the audience of the question-and-answer also partake in their own distillation of the protreptic message.[156] One will not be caught up in the rough edges in the turn-takings if one shares with the author an understanding of the *form* of sense-making, to invoke Hayden White again.[157] And that form, long ago noticed by Stephen Owen with regard to *Mengzi* 孟子 2A.2, is indeed dialogic.

As Owen says in response to Willard Peterson's and Peter Bol's respective reading of this famous passage, "'What Mencius had to say' cannot be separated from the way in which knowledge can appear." What we are reading "is not a dialogue in the oral sense, or even the accurate transcription of such a dialogue" but, Owen adds, a "drama of knowledge."[158] Even though the drama is closely directed by the author, certain kinds of knowledge must be represented as drama. The author, then, hides behind the interlocutors while his real addressees are left "watching" the drama in an unsupervised "sideplay," free to develop their own understanding of the performance.[159]

This kind of theatricality, understood by both authors and readers, has several implications. On the one hand, it offers a readily available and, judging from its popularity, culturally recognized literary form for the author to remain anonymous. On the other, it justifies the protreptic voice as a staged exchange between, typically, known, respected, and authoritative interlocutors. As a textual imitation of the "scene of instruction," hence learning as well, an unknown speaker "sells" nothing. One would need—especially an anonymous author—an appropriate speaker function to signify the value of the protrepsis and guide his partner in the question-and-answer itself through the

---

156 David Schaberg, "Playing at Critique: Indirect Remonstrance and the Formation of *Shi* Identity," in *Text and Ritual in Early China*, ed. Martin Kern (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2005), 197.

157 Cf. note 21.

158 Stephen Owen, "Perspective on Readings of *Mencius* 2A.2," in *Ways with Words: Writing about Reading Texts from Early China*, ed. Pauline Yu, et al. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 55, 54.

159 I use "overhearer" and "sideplay" in the sense the sociologist Erving Goffman made popular in his notion of the "participation framework." Briefly, "overhearer" is one among several kinds of the unaddressed audience in a speech event and "sideplay" the exchange between the unaddressed. Together, they form a second theater of conversation like when a group of passersby stop to watch and comment on a couple's public spat. See Goffman, *Forms of Talk* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981).

acquisition of the protrepsis. Thirdly, like any good theatrical performance, the protreptic voice is but a structure, a solution, a module of building blocks that invites creative re-creation. The *Kongzi jiayu* iteration of the "five deportments" is already a good example. The same can be said also of *Mengzi* 2A.2 on which Owen has based his very sensitive comments. The exchange is difficult to read in large part because it integrates the question-and-answer into especially the first half, thus frustrating a reading principle focused solely on either the questions or the answers, as Peterson and Bol do.[160] Outside of philosophical writings, which in general are more versatile insofar as form is concerned (recall the "Shang xian" triad), the protreptic voice also has echoes in such poetic works as Sima Xiangru's 司馬相如 *fu* and such historiographical accounts as the "Yueyu xia" 越語下 of the *Guoyu* 國語.[161] The versatility of the voice is evidenced by more examples than I can enumerate.

Where the question-and-answer commands the most interest as the "drama of knowledge" is also none other than the various fields of specialized knowledge like medicine, mathematics, military arts, civil engineering, macroeconomy, so on and so forth. Their affinity in form with works of most obviously political and moral nature (the philosophical and historiographical questions-and-answers) is perhaps not surprising considering how every early Chinese text is political in some ways. These disparate writings often share the same set of interlocutors who *are* the very paragons of politics and morality. Unlike the poetic, historiographical, and philological questions-and-answers, knowledge production and, more apparently, knowledge representation in these specialized disciplines adopt the protreptic voice typically in an unadorned fashion that emphasizes instead formal decorum. In most of these writings, two interlocutors will engage in one or more rounds of questions and answers wherein the questioner also provides the topic for the answerer's comment. In most cases, the exchange is also put in the voice of at least one famous cultural hero, whose voice is apparently

---

160 For a new reading of the passage which takes into consideration this very aspect of the exchange, see Matthias Richter "Must We All Have a Vast, Flowing *Qi*? Revisiting *Mengzi* 2A.2," *Nanyang Journal of Chinese Literature and Culture* 1 (2021): 25-44.

161 For the *fu* integration of the question-and-answer, see Gao Jiyi 郜積意, *Jingdian de pipan: Xihan wenxue sixiang yanjiu* 經典的批判：西漢文學思想研究 (Beijing: Dongfang chubanshe, 2000), 209-28. In the "Yue yu xia," on the other hand, the entire progression of the text is structured around the unpacking of a three-fold catalogue expressed in speech by the King Goujian's 句踐 interlocutor Fan Li 范蠡.

borrowed for the value his speaker function brings. In addition to the "Qingzhong" chapters of the *Guanzi* and the "defense chapters" of the *Mozi*, a brief inventory-taking yields the following results out of many more. The list is meant to simply illustrate the breadth of the disciplines involved:

- The *Huangdi neijing* 黃帝內經: the classic medical text featuring questions-and-answers between the Yellow Thearch 黃帝 and most primarily his advisor Qi Bo 岐伯.[162]
- The Mawangdui 馬王堆 "Shi wen" 十問 manuscript: an excavated medical text with a host of different interlocutors.[163]
- The *Zhoubi suanjing* 周髀算經: one of the mathematical texts featuring questions-and-answers between the Duke of Zhou and a number of interlocutors.[164]
- The *Jiuzhang suanshu* 九章算術: another mathematical text that turns voiced questions-and-answers into narrated ones whereby a question is marked by "how long / tall / wide / deep / many is X" 問 X 幾何 and the answer "the answer is…" 答曰 Y.
- The *Wuzi* 吳子 and *Liutao* 六韜: two military texts proceeding via stacks of questions-and-answers. In the *Liutao*, we also find the most humble of Kings Wen and Wu, deferring both to the intellectual superiority of Grand Master Jiang Shang 姜尚.[165]

---

[162] According to Paul Unschuld's count, "Of the 79 discourses constituting the text receptus of the *Su wen*, 68 are structured as dialogues between Huang Di and one of his three advisors…A Similar distribution of dialogues and nondialogue discourses is found in the *Ling shu*." Paul Unschuld, *Huang di nei jing su wen: Nature, Knowledge, Imagery in Ancient Chinese Medical Text* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), 8.

[163] For the "Shi wen," see Ma Jixing 馬繼興, *Mawangdui gu yishu kaoshi* 馬王堆古醫書考釋 (Changsha: Hunan kexue jishu chubanshe, 1992), 867-976. For a translation, see Donald Harper, *Early Chinese Medical Literature: The Mawangdui Manuscripts* (New York: Kegan Paul International, 1998), 385-411. More broadly, You Kun discusses the role the interlocutors in the *Shiliu jing* 十六經 play as paratext. See You, "The Yellow Emperor as Paratext: The Case of *Shiliu jing* 十六經 (Sixteen Guidelines)," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 141.1 (2021): 931-940.

[164] For the dialogues in the *Zhoubi suanjing*, see Christopher Cullen, *Astronomy and Mathematics in Ancient China: the Zhou bi suan jing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 172-81.

[165] For a convenient source of introduction to and translation of both texts, see Ralph Sawyer, *The Seven Military Classics of Ancient China* (New York: Basic Books, 2007), 19-105; 187-224. It is interesting to note that the most well-known of all military texts, the *Sunzi bingfa* 孫子兵法, is structured instead more like the *Lunyu* with quotations only of "Sunzi *yue*" 孫子曰. I am not ready yet to make the argument that the question-and-answer as a form caters to more practical than abstract knowledge, but it is surely worth mentioning that commentators tend to characterize the *Sunzi bingfa* as precisely more philosophical than pragmatic. See, for

- The Shanghai Museum "Cao Mo zhi chen" 曹沫之陳 manuscript: also one of the longest military texts. The latter 53 of its 65 slips contain questions-and-answers between Lord Zhuang of Lu 魯莊公 and Cao Mo 曹沫 over a small and weak state's strategies to prevail in military operations.[166]
- The "Duo di" 度地 chapter of the *Guanzi*: one of the earliest technical discussions on water and flood management voiced by Guanzi and Duke Huan.
- The "Zengzi wen" 曾子問 chapter of the *Liji*: questions-and-answers between Kongzi and Zengzi on burial and sacrificial rituals.
- The Tsinghua University "Tang zai chi men" 湯在啻門 and "Yin Gaozong wen Sanshou" 殷高宗問三壽 manuscripts: two questions-and-answers featuring the two eponymous sage kings asking questions about Heaven, Earth, people, governance, life, etc.[167]
- And most interestingly, the "Wu di de" 五帝德 chapter of the *Da Dai liji* (found also in the *Kongzi jiayu*). This text presents in a neat question-and-answer dialogue between Kongzi and Zaiwo 宰我 what is essentially a tighter and more metrical iteration of the "Wu di benji" 五帝本紀 chapter of the *Shiji* 史記. If as Sima Qian has revealed that his chapter is based on a "'Wu di de' [text] asked by Zaiyu and transmitted by Kongzi" 孔子所傳宰予問五帝德,[168] and if his "Wu di de" is in some ways similar to the *Da Dai liji* version not just demonstrably in content but also in form, one could very well ask why Sima Qian only referenced the

example, Li Ling 李零, *Sunzi shisan pian zonghe yanjiu* 《孫子》十三篇綜合研究 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2006), 8-10; Roger Ames, *Sun-tzu: The Art of Warfare* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1993), 39-43.

[166] For two of the most extensive studies so far produced on the "Cao Mo zhi chen," see Wang Qing 王青, *Shangbo jian Cao Mo zhi chen shuzheng yu yanjiu* 上博簡《曹沫之陳》疏證與研究 (Taipei: Taiwan shufang chuban youxian gongsi, 2009); Gao Youren 高佑仁, *Shanghai bowuguan cang Zhangguo Chu zhushu (si) – Cao Mo zhi chen yanjiu* 《上海博物館藏戰國楚竹書(四)·曹沫之陳》研究 (Taipei: Huamulan chubanshe, 2008).

[167] The best collection of studies on these two texts is *Qinghua jian yanjiu* 清華簡研究, ed. Qinghua Daxue Chutu Wenxian Yanjiu Yu Baohu Zhongxin 清華大學出土文獻研究與保護中心, vol.3 (Shanghai: Zhongxi shuju, 2019). See also Cao Feng 曹峰, "Daojia dishi lei wenxian chutan" 道家「帝師」類文獻初探, *Zhexue lunji* 49 (2018): 33-60.

[168] *Shiji*, 1.46. For a discussion, see Li Lin 李霖, "Cong 'wu di benji' qucai kan Taishigong zhi shuzuo" 從《五帝本紀》取裁看太史公之述作, *Wenshi* 2020.1: 87-128.

content but rejected the form, and how adopting a different, non-dialogic form makes his account (and authorial image) different.

Most scholarship on these texts begins with an investigation of authorship and authenticity. Especially with regard to the excavated materials, the concern is always how, for instance, such remote figures like Kings Tang 湯 and Wuding 武丁 could have said what they are attributed to be saying. But all these texts are monologic dialogues. They are best read as their authors' protreptic messages performed by their more recognizable character-interlocutors. Regardless of historical basis, all the speakers fulfill first and foremost a discursive function; they are all authentic as evidence of a larger tradition in which names have both validating and marketing values. Given how some of the larger works among these examples are also compilations, we could speak of the protreptic voice likewise more broadly as a principle of collective authorship. When a compilation adheres to the same, consistent form and/or style across the entire corpus, compilatory work is also authorial work (more on this in chapter 5). The possible range of the materials' provenance does not constitute a problem for the integrity of the works but an attestation to the prominence of the question-and-answer, especially among authors of specialized knowledge.

As readers watch these exchanges unfold, those who are so inclined will hear the teaching, exhortation, and persuasion through the speakers' questions and answers. "Indirect remonstrance" as Schaberg calls it can be understood not just as a type of speech but an aesthetics of reception. Knowledge representation in the protreptic mode functions like a stage performance. The words exchanged, although between the interlocutors, address really the audience outside the text. There are more forms of the protreptic voice that are configured in other ways, but the voice's addressivity over an audience is what unites the voice's various expressions and what leads us back to the author, implied or real, as the ultimate source of its voicing.

## — PART TWO —

## Speech and Narrative

4. Between Speech and Narrative
5. Across Speech and Narrative
6. Rhetoric, Once Again

## 4. Between Speech and Narrative

Speech cannot be separated from narrative. Even something as simple as "Confucius says" is an act of narration by someone who is telling us what Confucius said. The three voices discussed in the last Part do not go much further than such simple narrations of some select speakers' spoken words, but many more speakers speak in a concrete historical context narration further specifies. Compared to the aphoristic sayings and protreptic teachings, the so-called early Chinese anecdote is, for example, one basic unit of what can be otherwise described as "contextualized speaking," thanks to the additional narrative frames that "establish a new temporal and spatial setting and name individuals whose actions will make the plot of the anecdote."[169]

In contextualized speaking, however, there already appears to lie a paradox. For if the following differentiation is to be trusted, the "recording of words" 記言 is said to have been a separate job from the "recording of events" 記事; and if the works synonymous with each are any indication, "words" (*yan* 言) indeed do not appear in "events" (*shi* 事): in the annalistic records of the *Chunqiu* 春秋, there is no representation of the spoken word even remotely resembling those in the *Shangshu* 尚書.[170] In this sense, the anecdote is an anomaly. And even though the form appears to have been a later development, scholarship on the anecdote disagrees precisely over the place of *yan* in *shi*. While to David Schaberg, anecdote has a "morphological structure" centered on an element of speech,[171] in Paul van Els and Sarah Queen's introduction to the "first English-language book-length study" on the same topic, not a single example given contains any spoken word, nor is

---

169 Schaberg, *A Patterned Past*, 182.

170 In the "Yiwen zhi" 藝文志, the line goes: "The scribe on the left records words; the scribe on the right records events. 'Events' is the *Chunqiu*; "words" is the *Shangshu*" 左史記言. 右史記事. 事為春秋. 言為尚書. *Hanshu* 漢書 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1962), 30.1715. In the "Yuzao" 玉藻 chapter of the *Liji* 禮記, the duties are reversed: "when [the Son of Heaven] does something, the scribe on the left will record it; when [the Son of Heaven] says something, the scribe on the right will record it" 動則左史書之. 言則右史書之. Sun Xidan 孫希旦, *Liji jijie* 禮記集解 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1989), 29.778.

171 See Schaberg, *A Patterned Past*, 171-183.

speech one of the "characteristic features" they ascribe to the early Chinese anecdote.[172] More recently, Heng Du distinguishes what she calls the "capsular anecdotes" from what she names the "narrative anecdotes." The former feature a "narrative frame [that] performs paratextual functions in service of the sayings, verses, and lists encapsulated within." The latter, by contrast, "focus on narrating deeds…which are less likely to function as capsular anecdotes."[173] Although "sayings, verses, and lists" are what appear to separate the two types of anecdotes, such didactic materials are usually "encapsulated" not merely *in* an anecdote but *as* someone's spoken words. The difference posited is still one between *yan* and *shi*, except that *yan* here has been limited to a very special type.[174]

This tension between *yan* and *shi* is in part attributable to the ambiguity of both designations. Speech is certainly a type of event, and many events are no more than some exchanged speech. It just so happens that *yan* in reference to the *Shangshu* refers narrowly to dramatized direct speech, and *shi* in reference to the *Chunqiu* pure, nondramatic narration. The disagreement over the anecdote translates in essence to whether the narrative form should be defined by an element of speech fully dramatized and whether dramatized speech constitutes a criterion for further differentiation. What is more problematic in this pair of dicta is the verb *ji* 記. Meaning with a strong connotation of transcription "to record," the word leaves few clues as to how exactly *yan* and *shi* are recorded and to what, then, we are really reading. While few have disputed the nature of the *Chunqiu*, for instance, that of the *Shangshu* has long inspired controversy.[175] We seem to intuitively place more faith in the *shi* rather than the *yan* when both are said to have been "recorded." As is telling from the debate on

---

[172] See Paul van Els and Sarah Queen, "Anecdotes in Early China," in *Between History and Philology: Anecdotes in Early China*, ed. Paul van Els and Sarah Queen (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2017), 1-37.

[173] Heng Du, "The Author's Two Bodies: Paratext in Early Chinese Textual Culture" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 2018), 74.

[174] Du does not focus on the mediality of the encapsulated materials, but what I have described as the speech (and speaker) function will help explain some of the appeals in putting those materials in a speech form. The *Yi Zhoushu* examples discussed in chapter 1 illustrate the same narratorial consideration.

[175] I address the *Shangshu* in Part III. For the *Chunqiu*, Newell Ann Van Auken argues that the records are produced by the record-keeps of Lu 魯, not a later editor. See Van Auken, *Spring and Autumn Historiography: Form and Hierarchy in Ancient Chinese Annals* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2023).

the nature of the speeches in the *Zuozhuan* 左傳 as well, *yan* in the narrow sense of direct speech always invites some sort of justification that nondramatic narration rarely does.[176]

There are, however, good reasons to question both *yan* and *shi* as the target of *ji*. Neither is simply a category of things (speech, action, event, etc.) to be represented in writing but those very categories in a particular mode of representation as well. *Yan* is always dramatized and *shi* narrated. However, as this and the next two chapters will show, dramatization and narration prove to work intimately together in the context of the anecdote in bringing forth a textual presence whose narrative configuration depends on—and varies by—the rhetorical aim or function the anecdote serves. In the process, this chapter first demonstrates, *yan* and *shi* as specific categories of dramatized speech and narrated event rather routinely change into a variant shape, wear the other's disguise, or metamorphose altogether into the other category. Coordinated transformation both within and between the two modes of dramatization and narration marks the very manner of *yan-shi* variation. This variation is not the result of a manuscript culture's lack of control over textual fluidity or fidelity; rather, it is a shared narrative technique commonly used in early Chinese speech writings. Authors actively adapt and modify so that the materials they work with fulfill the rhetorical aims of their texts. Like how the three voices discussed in the last Part all give a particular structure to the

---

[176] For the various propositions, see Yuri Pines, "Intellectual Change in the *Chunqiu* Period: The Reliability of the Speeches in the *Zuozhuan* as Sources of *Chunqiu* Intellectual History," *Early China* 22 (1997): 77-132; Schaberg, *A Patterned Past*, esp. 22-30, 315-324; and Wai-yee Li, *The Readability of the Past in Early Chinese Historiography* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2007). Barry Blakeley offers a critique of Pines and Schaberg in Blakeley, "'On the Authenticity and Nature of the *Zuozhuan*' Revisited," *Early China* 29 (2004): 217-267. In Chinese scholarship, a similar but broader interest in speech gave rise to a body of literature concerned with what it calls "genres of speaking" 語體, a coinage designating the various source materials believed to have been the very product of the "recording of words" scribes. Its focus lies, therefore, in the recovery of the originating occasions of speech-making, in how they differed from one another, and in how they had evolved over time. See, for example, Guo Yingde 郭英德, *Zhongguo gudai wenti xue lungao* 中國古代文體學論稿 (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2005), 29-50; Hu Dalei 胡大雷, "Lun 'yuti' ji wenti de qian 'wenti' zhuangtai" 論"語體"及文體的前"文體"狀態, *Wenxue yichan* 2012.1: 17-24; Fu Gang 傅剛, "Lüe shuo Xianqin de yuti yu yushu" 略說先秦的語體與語書, *Zhongshan daxue xuebao* 2013.5: 1-7; Chen Tongsheng 陳桐生, "Xianqin duihuati sanwen yuanliu" 先秦對話體散文源流, *Xueshu yanjiu* 2017:8: 150-164; Yu Zhihui 俞志慧, *Gu yu youzhi: Xianqin sixiang de yizhong beijing yu ziyuan* 古語有之：先秦思想的一種背景與資源 (Shanghai: Huadong shifan daxue chubanshe, 2010); Xia Dekao 夏德靠, *Xianqin yulei wenxiann xingtai yanjiu* 先秦語類文獻形態研究 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2015); Liao Qun 廖群, *Xianqin shuoti wenben yanjiu* 先秦說體文本研究 (Beijing: Zhongyang bianyu chubanshe, 2018).

spoken word, the narrative techniques used in speech representation heavily modulate *yan* and *shi* as equal, fluid, and interchangeable components of the same narrative construction that, in this case, produces for us contextualized speaking in the form of the anecdote.

*Words on the Move*

Speech or no speech, a definition of the anecdote based on this particular element of the narrative results from examining the anecdote in isolation. When an anecdote appears in several parallel versions, as it often does, speech is the very component of the anecdote that varies: the same words can appear fully dramatized, in indirect discourse, or suppressed altogether. Take, for example, this highly economical passage from the "Taizu xun" 泰族訓 chapter of the *Huainanzi* 淮南子, in which four nondramatic narrations appear in a row:

> [1] When the Great King Danfu was residing at Bin, the Di tribes attacked him, [upon which] he left, leaning on a staff. The hundred clans, all carrying their young and holding their old, packing their pans and pots on the back, crossed Mount Liang [after him] so as to establish a [new] kingdom at Qizhou. This is not something obtainable by decree. [2] Duke Mu of Qin, afraid that the rustics who ate horse meat would be harmed by it, treated them to some fine wine. [Later,] at the battle of Han(yuan), the rustics repaid the duke with utmost valor. This is not something exactable by contract. [3] When Mizi was ruling in [the land of] Danfu, Wuma Qi went to observe the changes. What he saw was the night fishermen releasing their catch if too small. This is not something prohibitable by punishment. [4] When Kongzi was the Minister of Justice in Lu, no one would pocket other people's lost items on the street, nor were there pricing swindles at the market. In farming and fishing, people all deferred to the seniors; and the grizzled never had to carry any weight. This is not something effectible by rules.
>
> [1] 太王亶父處邠. 狄人攻之. 杖策而去. 百姓攜幼扶老. 負釜甑. 逾梁山. 而國乎岐周. 非令之所能召也. [2] 秦穆公為野人食駿馬肉之傷. 飲之美酒. 韓之戰. 以其死力報. 非券之所責也. [3] 宓子治亶父. 巫馬期往觀化焉. 見夜漁者得小即釋之. 非刑之所能禁也. [4] 孔子為魯司寇. 道不拾遺. 市買不豫賈. 田漁皆讓長. 而斑白不戴負. 非法之所能致也.[177]

[177] He Ning 何寧, *Huainanzi jishi* 淮南子集釋 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1998), 20.1383-84.

In the context of the "Taizu xun," these four narrations of what appear to be anecdotal stories follow an opening claim outlining what is essentially the "non-action" 無為 of a sage ruler. It says, "The sage ruler, presiding from above, is boundless and shapeless, still and soundless. His administrative offices look as if they had no business; his royal court looks as if it was unattended" 聖主在上. 廓然無形. 寂然無聲. 官府若無事. 朝廷若無人.[178] The claim goes on for a bit longer and in more detail, but from the narrator's comments that such and such cannot be achieved by "decree" 召, "contract" 券, "punishment" 刑, and "rules" 法—all human contrivances—it is obvious that the four anecdotal stories, invoked here as proof materials, function to illustrate the point made about administrative non-action.

Consistent with all the other anecdotal materials woven into the "Taizu xun," these four contain no representation of speech. They are all pure, nondramatic narrations. The narrator appears to prize both economy and effectiveness in his choice of proof materials; for apparently, he has a multiplicity of claims he wants to make in the scope of one single chapter.[179] In other sources where variant versions of these stories appear, an element of speech is first of all introduced. In the case of the third story, for instance, the *Lüshi chunqiu* 呂氏春秋,[180] *Kongzi jiayu* 孔子家語,[181] and the "Daoying xun" 道應訓 chapter of the *Huainanzi* all include a brief exchange between Wuma Qi and the fishermen.[182] In all three cases, Wuma Qi asks the fishermen why, if fishing aims to net the catch, they on the contrary release their catch; and in all three cases, the fishermen answer it is because of Mizi, their district governor. The *Kongzi jiayu* version further spells out the complete

---

178 Ibid., 20.1382. In Sarah Queen and John Major's translation, this opening claim is, in my view, mistakenly separated from the anecdotes. See Major, et al., *The Huainanzi: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Government in Early Han China* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010), 801-802.

179 As Queen and Major note, this chapter of the *Huainanzi* "relates and brings into sharper focus the lessons of the preceding nineteen chapters. A summary of 'The Exalted Lineage' is therefore, to some extent, a summary of the *Huainanzi* as a whole." Major, et al., *The Huainanzi*, 790.

180 Chen Qiyou 陳奇猷, *Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaozhu* 呂氏春秋新校釋 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2002), 18.1236.

181 *Kongzi jiayu shuzheng*, 8.218.

182 *Huainanzi jishi*, 12.890-91.

reasoning the other two versions brushed aside in favor of a simpler answer—that "Mizi does not want people to keep the small fish" 宓子不欲人之取小魚也.[183] The complete exchange in the *Kongzi jiayu* goes:

> Wuma Qi asked the fishermen, "As for fishing, the aim is to net the catch. How come after having caught them, you immediately released your catch?" The fishermen said, "The biggest of all fish is called *chou*; our governor cherishes them. The smallest of all fish is called *ying*; our governor wishes for them to grow. It is because of that when we catch either kind, we immediately let them go."
>
> 巫馬期問焉. 曰. 凡漁者為得. 何以得魚即舍之. 漁者曰. 魚之大者名為鰳. 吾大夫愛之. 其小者名鱦. 吾大夫欲長之. 是以得二者輒舍之.[184]

More interestingly, the first story of King Danfu's relocation not only has more variant versions, but the variant versions combine to illustrate a full range of variation speech representation can be subject to, all in the context of one and the same anecdotal story. More evidently than with the case of the fishing story, the reason for each variation is also suggested by the respective sources. While the *Kongzi jiayu* and *Mengzi* 孟子 1B.15 each include a version that gives voice to both King Danfu and the people who followed him to the new kingdom,[185] the *Shuoyuan* 說苑,[186] *Zhaungzi* 莊子,[187] *Lüshi chunqiu*,[188] and once again "Daoying xun" chapter of the *Huainanzi*[189] only allowed King Danfu a few words about his desertion of his old state. The people's voice disappears. See for example the *Kongzi jiayu* version versus the *Lüshi chunqiu* version. For comparison, I juxtapose the two versions segment by segment:

| *Kongzi jiayu* | *Lüshi chunqiu* |
|---|---|

[183] This is the *Lüshi chunqiu* version; the "Daoying xun" version is the same.

[184] *Kongzi jiayu shuzheng*, 8.218.

[185] *Kongzi jiayu shuzheng*, 2.68-69; *Mengzi zhengyi* 孟子正義 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1987), 5.163-67.

[186] Xiang Zonglu 向宗魯, *Shuoyuan jiaozheng* 說苑校證 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1987), 14.345-46.

[187] *Zhuangzi jishi* 莊子集釋 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1961), 9.958.

[188] *Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaozhu*, 21.1463-64.

[189] *Huainanzi jishi*, 12.847-49.

| opening | |
|---|---|
| Earlier, when the Great King was residing at Bin, the Di tribes attacked him. He appeased them with fur and silk, but without success in expelling them. He appeased them with pearl and jade, but without success in expelling them either. | When the Great King Danfu was residing at Bin, the Di tribes attacked him. He appeased them with fur and silk, but they refused to accept it; he appeased them with pearl and jade, but they were unpersuaded too. What the Di sought was the king's land. |
| 初. 大王都豳. 翟人侵之. 事之以皮幣. 不得免焉. 事之以珠玉. 不得免焉. | 太王亶父居邠. 狄人攻之. 事以皮帛而不受. 事以珠玉而不肯. 狄人之所求者地也. |

| king speaking | |
|---|---|
| Thereupon, the king gathered all the elders and said to them, "What they want is our land. I have heard that the gentleman does not harm people with that which sustains them. Why would you folks worry about not having a ruler?" | Great King Danfu said, "To live with one's older brother only to have his younger brother murdered; to live with one's father only to have his son murdered—I cannot bear to do it. You should all strive to stay here! How does being my subject differ from being the Di's, anyway? Moreover, I have heard that one does not harm those who he cares for with that which sustains them." |
| 於是屬耆老而告. 之所欲. 吾土地. 吾聞之. 君子不以所養而害人. 二三子何患乎無君. | 太王亶父曰. 與人之兄居而殺其弟. 與人之父處而殺其子. 吾不忍為也. 皆勉處矣. 為吾臣與狄人臣奚以異. 且吾聞之. 不以所以養害所養. |

| relocating | |
|---|---|
| So, with Queen Jiang alone, the king left Bin. He crossed Mount. Liang and established a new city by the foot of Mount. Qi. | Leaning on a staff, the king left. His people followed him one after another, and they established a new kingdom by the foot of Mount. Qi. |
| 遂獨與太姜去之. 踰梁山. 邑于岐山之下. | 杖策而去. 民相連而從之. 遂成國於岐山之下. |

| people speaking | |
|---|---|
| The people of Bin said, "This is a ruler who is also a benevolent person; we cannot lose him." They thus all followed him like market-goers rushing to the market. | / |

| | |
|---|---|
| 豳人曰. 仁人之君. 不可失也. 從之如歸市焉. | |
| ending | |
| That Heaven sided with Zhou and that the people left Yin had been long in the making. If by that one still fails to obtain All-under-Heaven, there has never been such a case. | The Great King Danfu can be said to honor life. If one honors life, even if one is wealthy and esteemed, one will not harm one's person with that which sustains him, and even if one is poor and lowly, one will not burden one's body with that which benefits him. Nowadays, when people have inherited their ancestors' nobility and wealth, they all, with no exception, take losing them seriously. But it has been long that one's life comes by itself, yet people take losing life all too lightly. Is this not indeed foolish? |
| 天之與周. 民之去殷. 久矣. 若此而不能天下. 未之有也. | 太王亶父可謂能尊生矣. 能尊生. 雖富貴不以養傷身. 雖貧賤不以利累形. 今受其先人之爵祿. 則必重失之. 生之所自來者久矣. 而輕失之. 豈不惑哉. |

Before arriving at two different but not unrelated endings, the two versions of the King Danfu story reveal several differences worth highlighting, each hinting at the considerable variability of speech representation. First, both versions, as are the cases of *Mengzi* 1B.15, *Shuoyuan*, *Zhuangzi*, and "Daoying xun," cared enough to supply the reason for King Danfu's move that the "Taizu xun" version omits: as much as he has tried to appease the invaders, he could not stop them from wanting to lay claim on the land he owns. Second, whereas the *Lüshi chunqiu* version, alongside its very similar parallels in the *Zhuangzi* and "Daoying xun," presents the reason through the narrator's narration ("What the Di sought was the king's land" 狄人之所求者地也[190]), the *Kongzi jiayu* and *Mengzi* 1B.15

[190] This is the *Lüshi chunqiu* version. The other two do not differ except for some minor variants in wording. It should be noted that the "Daoying xun" version in the *Huainanzi jishi* edition comes with an extra *yue* 曰 before—in that version's phrasing—"What the Di sought was the land. They had no use for the material treasures" 翟人之所求者地. 無以財物為也. As He Ning's notes show, this *yue* should be edited out (*Huainanzi jishi*, 12.847). Sarah Queen's translation (Major, et al., *The Huainanzi*, 451) is debatable. By keeping

both let King Danfu articulate that piece of information in his own voice ("Thereupon, the king gathered all the elders and said to them, 'What they want is our land' 於是屬耆老而告. 之所欲. 吾土地[191]). What in the former instance is part of the narrative frame appears thus as speech in the latter. And third, this dramatization-narration transformation takes a third form in the *Shuoyuan* version of the anecdote. Instead of dramatized direct discourse, the same information is in that version presented as indirect discourse, in the narrator's reported summary of the exchange:

> The Great King has the grace of the utmost benevolence. He cannot bear the thought of frightening the hundred clans. Therefore, he served the Xunyu and the Rong tribes with dogs, horses, and treasured gems, but the invasion still would not stop. He then asked them what it was that they really wanted. They said they wanted his land.
>
> 大王有至仁之恩. 不忍戰百姓. 故事勳育戎氏以犬馬珍幣. 而伐不止. 問其所欲者. 土地也.[192]

With the narrator voicing the king's words in yet another way, the king in the *Shuoyuan* version goes on to say something different. Immediately following the above, the king "gathered the ministers and the elders and said to them, 'Land is that which sustains people. [One does not harm those whom he cares for with that which sustains them.] I shall now leave'"屬其羣臣耆老而告之曰. 土地者. 所以養人也. [不以所以養而害其慈也.] 吾將去之. Notice also how the same reason for the king's desertion of the old territory (bracketed) is in this case presented as his own words rather than hearsay, as are both the *Kongzi jiayu* ("I hear…" 吾聞之) and *Lüshi chunqiu* ("I hear…" 吾且聞之). For the *Shuoyuan* at least, speech not only can be narrativized but also reassigned to a different source.

Compared to the minimalist "Taizu xun" version, *Shuoyuan*'s take on the same story also reveals the boundaries of variation. If having both voices represented can be said to comprise the

---

the *yue*, her translation also has the Di people refer to themselves as *diren* 翟人 ("…and said: 'What we, the Dee people, want is [your land]. We will not accept these material goods as substitute.'").

191 This is the *Kongzi jiayu* version. *Mengzi* 1B.15 simply adds *diren* 狄人 before *zhi suoyu* 之所欲.

192 *Shuoyuan jiaozheng*, 14.345.

fullest instantiation of this anecdotal story whilst the king's voice alone a selective one, the *Shuoyuan* variation follows the latter route but turns the anecdote outside-in by allowing far more narratorial mediation into the presentation of the story. In addition to the transmodalization between direct and indirect discourse regarding Di's desire for the land, the narratorial description that "the Great King has the grace of the utmost benevolence" 大王有至仁之恩 is also in the fullest instantiations of the story what is said by the people (cf. the *Kongzi jiayu* version). Because of such flexibility with regard to who says what and in what form, when the invaders' true target is explained by the narrator, the *Shuoyuan* does not need the king to announce the same information again as the king in the *Kongzi jiayu* and *Mengzi* 1B.15 has to. Instead, the *Shuoyuan* along with other similarly structured variations—the *Lüshi chunqiu*, *Zhuangzi*, and "Daoying xun"—has the king focus solely on the rationale behind his decision to leave. So long as all the narrative information is delivered, the variation in who says what and in what narrative mode answers neither to the historicity of the story nor to any "original" version of how that story is told. Rather, a new instance of storytelling runs its own course.

Like the protreptic voice discussed in chapter 3, this kind of storytelling derives justification from the rhetorical purpose it serves. As Schaberg has noted, "historicity mattered to the users of anecdotes, but as a complement to rhetorical aims rather than as a goal in its own right."[193] In the case of the Danfu and many other anecdotes, this is precisely the grounds for all the variations provided that "historicity" is understood both in terms of the story and of its discourse. The former refers to the agents, events, and actions that make up a narrative; the latter to the many possible shapes that narrative can take.[194] One does not exist without the other, and "the didactic pay-off"

---

[193] Schaberg, "Chinese History and Philosophy," in *The Oxford History of Historical Writing, Volume 1: Beginnings to AD 600*, ed. Andrew Feldherr and Grant Hardy (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 398.

[194] The relation between story and discourse is foundational to any narrative theory. Unlike, however, most narrative theories whose aim is to develop a set of universal and ahistorical vocabularies with which one can describe *how* exactly story and discourse are related, I am more interested in a particular version of it that is historically and ideologically specific to the early Chinese materials. Only by acknowledging the situatedness of that relation, I would argue, can we begin to explain *why* at a certain time and space one particular kind of relation prevailed over many potential others.

does vary, I would argue instead, "whether one retells the anecdote or merely mentions it."[195] The *Kongzi jiayu*, for instance, presents both the king and the people to be speaking in their own voices presumably in order to support the dual claims made in the ending. Although the context does not offer more clue than the passage's adherence to the general tendency of the *Kongzi jiayu* to be more elaborate than others when there exist parallel materials, the specific conclusion here is also the only instance where the people, *min* 民, are not only named but also given equal emphasis as what together with Heaven 天 made King Danfu the chosen sovereign. Agency, which according to the ending is for Heaven "to side with" 與 Zhou and for the people "to leave" 去 Yin, is most forcefully expressed by the agent's own words.

When the people are not the emphasis, as in the *Lüshi Chunqiu*, *Zhuangzi*, "Daoying xun," and *Shuoyuan*, their voice is also shelved. As the ending to the *Lüshi chunqiu* shows, the anecdote is meant both to illustrate and to induce the claim that King Danfu "can be said to honor life" 可謂能尊生矣. This case-specific evaluation of King Danfu alone leads then to a more general comment on the importance of setting straight a ruler's priorities—that is, knowing what to "take seriously" 重 and what to "take lightly" 輕. In the *Lüshi chunqiu* chapter where this anecdote appears, two other anecdotes illustrating the same point join this one to support the chapter's overall argument that "when one examines what one does, one will be able to tell the important from the trivial" 審所以為而輕重得矣.[196] Although one could say the same thing about the people, it is the king's examination of his choices, evidenced by his own words establishing the value of life over power, that gives this version of the story the most illustrative force.

The same version's use in the *Zhuangzi*, "Daoying xun," and *Shuoyuan* also exploits the same illustrative value since those three contexts demand likewise one or more examples that will speak to some exemplary kingly virtues.[197] The people are no one's point or concern. Nonetheless, leaving the

---

[195] Schaberg, "Chinese History and Philosophy," 398.

[196] *Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaozhu*, 21.1463.

[197] The *Zhuangzi* includes this version of the anecdote in the "Rang wang" 讓王 chapter as one of many stories illustrating the chapter's theme on voluntary abdication of power; the "Daoying xun" uses this version

people's voice unrepresented or narrativized contributes to the same effect the "Taixu zun" version strove for: economy and effectiveness. The "Taizu xun" version's further omission of the king's failed effort to appease the invaders serves only to strengthen the point the anecdote is illustrating. Had the king been described to have done *anything* between the attack and—in the impression left by that version—his immediate next move to leave ("when the Di tribes attacked him, he left, leaning on a staff" 狄人攻之. 杖策而去), he would have failed to illustrate the overarching point made about non-action.

This rhetorical underpinning of the anecdote's variable representation of speech can be illustrated most clearly by the Danfu story's two drastic variations in the *Mengzi*. In the received redaction of *Mengzi*, they also appear one after the other. In *Mengzi* 1B.14, the anecdote appears in Mengzi's answer to a question from Duke Wen of Teng 滕文公. In that instance, however, the anecdote is compressed even more tightly than that of the "Taizu xun" version, leaving the people completely out of the story:

> Duke Wen of Teng asked, "The people of Qi are going to fortify Xue, and I am gravely apprehensive. What countermeasure is permissible?"
>
> Mengzi replied, "In the past when the Great King was residing at Bin, the Di tribes attacked him, [upon which] he left for the foot of Mount. Qi to reside there instead. The king did not take leave because he had a choice; rather, he was forced to. If one does good, among one's later descendants there will be someone who will rule as a king. That a noble man initiates an undertaking and leaves behind a tradition is just so that it can be succeeded. If he does succeed, it is all because of Heaven. What can you do about that? Please just do good, strenuously."
>
> 滕文公問曰. 齊人將築薛. 吾甚恐. 如之何則可.
>
> 孟子對曰. 昔者大王居邠. 狄人侵之. 去之岐山之下居焉. 非擇而取之. 不得已也. 苟為善. 後世子孫必有王者矣. 君子創業垂統. 為可繼也. 若夫成功. 則天也. 君如彼何哉. 彊為善而已矣.[198]

to support a *Laozi* saying about giving power to he who values life; and the *Shuoyuan*, like the "Rang wang," combines this anecdote with many others to illustrate the different facets of an "utmost ruler" 至公.

[198] *Mengzi zhengyi*, 5.160-162.

Mengzi is thus telling the duke that he should not worry about Qi, since worrying does not help. Instead, he ought to simply "do good" 為善 and thereby provide a model for his descendants, one of whom will, then, have the potential to become a sage king. The Danfu anecdote invoked here, however, is carefully "trimmed." Danfu *did* have a choice in all the other versions; he could have stayed if he felt no sympathy for the people. In the *Lüshi chunqiu* version as well as the *Zhuangzi* and "Daoying xun," he explicitly says that he would not let the people suffer (吾不忍為也/吾弗為). In all the other versions where the king speaks too, he also says that he does not want to keep the land at the cost of the people (君子不以所養而害人). In fact, it is for this very reason that the *Lüshi chunqiu* together with the *Shuoyuan*, *Zhuangzi*, and "Daoying xun" all praise the king for his respect for life, benevolence, and sacrifice. Unless *this* Mengzi has no knowledge of any other version of the story, its selective representation here must be motivated by this Mengzi's rhetorical need to use and interpret the story selectively. Had the king been given a voice in the way he is in the other versions, he would have contradicted Mengzi's point.

In comparison, *Mengzi* 1B.15 presents a version of the story in its fullest instantiation, with the king and the people both speaking. Unlike any other version, they are given a voice not only because it is rhetorically instrumental to do so, but because their voices enable the speaker, Mengzi, to avoid culpability for his own—yet another rhetorical consideration:

> Duke Wen of Teng asked, "Teng is a small state. If we strive to serve the large states, there will be no going back for us. What solution is permissible?"
>
> Mengzi replied, "In the past when the Great King was residing at Bin, the Di tribes attacked him. He appeased them with fur and coins, but it did not stop them. He appeased them with dogs and horses, but it did not stop them. He appeased them with pearls and jade, but it did not stop them either. He therefore gathered all the elders and said to them, 'What the Di want is our land. I have heard that a nobleman does not harm people with that which nourishes people. Why would you folks worry about not having a ruler? I shall leave.' The king, then, left Bin, crossed Liang, and established a new city by the foot of Mount. Qi. The people of Bin said, 'This is a benevolent person; we cannot lose him.' Thus, they followed him like market-goers going to the market. Someone has said, 'Bin has for generations been their keep. This is not something they can do just on their own. They should have defended it with their lives, not abandoned it.' You, my lord, will need to choose between the two."
>
> 滕文公問曰. 滕. 小國也. 竭力以事大國. 則不得免焉. 如之何則可.

> 孟子對曰. 昔者大王居邠. 狄人侵之. 事之以皮幣. 不得免焉. 事之以犬馬. 不得免焉. 事之以珠玉. 不得免焉. 乃屬其耆老而告之曰. 狄人之所欲者. 吾土地也. 吾聞之也. 君子不以其所以養人者害人. 二三子何患乎無君. 我將去之. 去邠. 踰梁山. 邑于岐山之下居焉. 邠人曰. 仁人也. 不可失也. 從之者如歸市. 或曰. 世守也. 非身之所能為也. 效死勿去. 君請擇於斯二者.[199]

Unlike in the previous instance, Mengzi in this exchange holds off his real answer until much later. By presenting the anecdote in full, with no more mediation than the opening gesture of invoking a past example (i.e., 昔者), Mengzi is here setting the stage for the duke to "watch" the story play out. By the time Mengzi returns to it, he quotes from an anonymous "someone" 或 who for the first time disapproves of both the king and the people for leaving Bin. The king's relocation is no longer praiseworthy but heterodox, thus inviting censure by this moralist someone who prefers martyrdom. By means of all that, Mengzi finally addresses the duke directly ("you, my lord" 君), asking him to choose between what King Danfu did and what that moralist said.

In contrast to *Mengzi* 1B.14, this Mengzi answers the duke by not really answering him. Such an "impartial" stance this Mengzi takes could not have been achieved if he had not shifted the focus back to King Danfu and the people of Bin. It is the king and the people who said what was said, in their own voices expressing their own choices. It is also that moralist someone who voiced that alternative, also in his own words. As basically a messenger reporting to the duke some "borrowed, historical precedents," this Mengzi distances himself from giving what seems like an incriminating answer either way, a gesture diametrically opposed to that taken in *Mengzi* 1B.14. But the gesture here is no less considered. By neither interrupting nor truncating the story, by having all parties speak for themselves rather than spoken for, and by letting their voices guide his own, this Mengzi is creating the condition for those voices to speak directly to the duke. Like quotations of the *Shi* 詩, the *Shu* 書, and Confucius, the authoritativeness of any proof material lies in part in its unmediated representation. Once mediated, the mediation shifts the balance of immediacy and veracity. In this sense, there is nothing cleverer than to hide behind the original speaker functions of the historical exemplars, so that a fully opinionated answer (both alternatives are extreme solutions) can be

[199] *Mengzi zhengyi* 5.163-166.

proposed while the "messenger" himself can claim disinterestedness. Like every variation in speech representation seen so far, the variation is actively produced in view of a rhetorical purpose.[200]

*Narrative Elasticity*

Like speech, narrative in the narrow sense of "narrative frame" also varies by rhetorical aims, often considerably, and often in coordination with speech. The same anecdotal story would appear in different source materials with different emphasis in the way the story is told. While some variations of the same story briefly narrate, others can fully dramatize the same detail otherwise narrated. In the most extraordinary case, an entire anecdote can be told completely from another perspective. The idea of a "frame" in the sense of the nondramatic, supposedly contextualizing part of an anecdote is thus itself a special category when the anecdote adopts a particular shape.[201] It is not something that is simply the historical context, given, factual, and "as is." What in narratology is called "summary" and "scene" is in practice highly interchangeable among early Chinese anecdotes.[202]

Consider, for example, the widely referenced story about the flooding of Jinyang 晉陽, a city established by Zhao Jianzi 趙簡子 (d. ca. 476 BC), patriarch of the Zhao clan of the Springs and Autumns state of Jin 晉. The following account from the "Zhao shiji" 趙世家 chapter of the *Shiji*

---

[200] As Schaberg has remarked, "It is conceivable, then, that the anecdote was in early China typically adapted to polemical uses and that many of the anecdotes that have come down to us were retold for the sake of the arguments they supported and were shaped by their uses in these arguments." Schaberg, *A Patterned Past*, 190. Although the remark is not made in reference to the creative variation of the anecdotal materials but to their widespread use in works other than historiography, it still captures the rhetorical functions anecdotes play in a broad range of early Chinese writings.

[201] "Narrative frame" is not a well-defined concept. In Schaberg' use, it refers to the opening part of an anecdote that a.) defines the chronotopic context of the anecdote, b.) introduces the actors, and c.) establishes the pretext for, usually, the middle part of the anecdote where the characters speak/converse. The "frame" has a spatial feel to it because it literally surrounds speech, and in its typical use since Schaberg the "frame" seems to refer to everything in an anecdote that is simply not the dramatized direct speech and not the commentarial materials sometimes following the anecdote.

[202] See Genette, *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*, 86-112.

can be viewed as the baseline version of the story, given the "disinterestedness" of the "Hereditary Houses" 世家 as a type of historiographical account:

> [A] Three states [i.e., Jin 晉, Han 韓, and Wei 魏] launched an attack on [Zhao's] Jinyang. After a year [of unsuccessful operations], they diverted the Fen River to flood the city. What remained unsubmerged measured only three wall planks [from the top]. Within the city, people all hung their pans to cook and exchanged their children to eat.
>
> [A] 三國攻晉陽. 歲餘. 引汾水灌其城. 城不浸者三版. 城中懸釜而炊. 易子而食.
>
> [B] All ministers developed a dissenting heart; they also grew increasingly negligent toward matters of propriety. Only Gao Gong did not presume to deviate from propriety. Xiangzi [of Zhao] was apprehensive, so he sent his minister Zhang Mengtong to Han and Wei, secretly at night. Zhang [managed to] scheme with Han and Wei that on the Binxu day of the third month, the three states would turn instead on the Zhi clan [of Jin] and carve up *their* land.
>
> [B] 羣臣皆有外心. 禮益慢. 唯高共不敢失禮. 襄子懼. 乃夜使相張孟同私於韓魏. 韓魏與合謀. 以三月丙戌. 三國反滅知氏. 共分其地.
>
> [C] Upon success, Xiangzi doled out commendations, the highest of which went to Gao Gong. Zhang Mengtong protested, saying, "At the siege of Jinyang, Gao Gong alone contributed nothing." Xiangzi replied, "When Jinyang was in grave danger, all the ministers grew negligent. Only Gong did not presume to lose his manners as a subject to a ruler. For that reason, I put him ahead of all others."
>
> [C] 於是襄子行賞. 高共為上. 張孟同曰. 晉陽之難. 唯共無功. 襄子曰. 方晉陽急. 群臣皆懈. 惟共不敢失人臣禮. 是以先之.
>
> [D] From there on, Zhao acquired Dai in the north and annexed the Zhi clan in the south, overpowering Han and Wei. They also made sacrifices to the three gods across a hundred cities and established the Yuanguo Temple as the primary sacrificial site on Mount. Huotai.
>
> [D] 於是趙北有代. 南并知氏. 彊於韓魏. 遂祠三神於百邑. 使原過主霍泰山祠祀.[203]

There goes Zhang Mengtong's daring maneuver out of imminent surrender. Regardless, in terms of storytelling, the *Shiji* version gives a full account of the causes and consequences and of all the actors and their roles in the story. The incident draws to a full conclusion with the introduction of its long-term consequences in part D. The protagonist, Xiangzi, also dies of natural course soon after.

[203] *Shiji*, 43.1795.

In the *Shuoyuan* and *Lüshi chunqiu*, the same story appears in a much-compressed form, with both parts A and B of the *Shiji* version summarized down to a brief contextualization of the verbal exchanges paralleling that of *Shiji*'s part C. At the same time, part D is also replaced by a comment attributed to Kongzi, thus concluding the anecdote in a more directed way.[204] The *Lüshi chunqiu* version runs one comment longer than the *Shuoyuan*:

| *Shuoyuan* | *Lüshi chunqiu* |
|---|---|
| Xiangzi of Zhao fell under besiegement at Jinyang. When an end was put to it, he awarded five of his ministers who deserved merit for it. Gao He [i.e., Gao Gong] was meritless but was given top commendation. All five ministers were enraged.<br><br>趙襄子見圍於晉陽. 罷圍. 賞有功之臣五人. 高赫無功而受上賞. 五人皆怒. | Xiangzi of Zhao escaped from besiegement. He awarded five people who deserved merit for it, and Gao He [i.e., Gao Gong] was ranked first.<br><br>趙襄子出圍. 賞有功者五人. 高赦為首. |
| Zhang Mengtan [i.e., Zhang Mengtong] said to Xiangzi, "During the fall of Jinyang, Gao He achieved no merit of any significance. Yet, you gave him top commendation. Why is that?" Xiangzi replied, "When I was in dire straits, Gao He alone did not grow remiss of the propriety between a ruler and a subject. Although you, on the other hand, established merits, you all were imperious toward me. Is it not indeed permissible that I give Gao He top commendation?"<br><br>張孟談謂襄子曰. 晉陽之中. 赫無大功. 今與之上賞. 何也. 襄子曰. 吾在拘厄之中. 不失臣主之禮唯赫也. 子雖有功. 皆驕寡人. 與赫上賞. 不亦可乎. | Zhang Mengtan [i.e., Zhang Mengtong] said, "During the fall of Jinyang, Gao He achieved no merit of any significance. Why in your commendation do you put him first?" Xiangzi replied, "When my state was in danger, my altars of soil and grain in peril, and many people in mournful stress, among those who interacted with me while still adhering to the propriety between a ruler and a minister, there was only Gao He. I, for that reason, put him above all others."<br><br>張孟談曰. 晉陽之中. 赦無大功. 賞而為首何也. 襄子曰. 寡人之國危. 社稷殆. 身在憂約之中. 與寡人交而不失君臣之禮者惟赦. 吾是以先之. |
| | |

[204] As Schaberg has noted, "The anecdote ends with an invitation to judgment, which may take any of several forms. The narrators may dictate this judgement by recounting the remarks of the gentleman or Confucius, they may narrate events that confirm a judgment presented in a character's speech, or they may leave the problem of judgment to the well-trained reader." Schaberg, *A Patterned Past*, 183.

| | |
|---|---|
| Zhongni heard of it and said, "Xiangzi of Zhao can be said to reward people properly. By rewarding one person, none of the other subjects to a ruler dared again to transgress the propriety between a ruler and a subject."<br><br>仲尼聞之曰. 趙襄子可謂善賞士乎. 賞一人而天下之人臣莫敢失君臣之禮矣.[205] | Zhongni heard of it and said, "Xiangzi can be said to give proper rewards. By rewarding one person, none of the other subjects to a ruler dared again to transgress propriety."<br><br>仲尼聞之曰. 襄子可謂善賞矣. 賞一人而天下之為人臣莫敢失禮. |
| / | In running the royal armies, this [principle] cannot be changed either. That Zhao acquired Dai in the north, pressed into Qi in the east, sent Zhang Mengtan across cities in secrecy to scheme with Wei Heng and Han Kang against Zhibo, to the effect of severing his head into a wine cup by which, then, all the three houses were kept in control—was it not all because Xiangzi's reward and punishment were mighty proper?"<br><br>為六軍則不可易. 北取代. 東迫齊. 令張孟談踰城潛行. 與魏桓韓康期而擊智伯. 斷其頭以為觴. 遂定三家. 豈非用賞罰當邪.[206] |

Compared to the *Shiji*, both the *Shuoyuan* and *Lüshi chunqiu* gloss over the narrative frame leading up to the verbal exchange and thus focus the reader's attention further on the conversation. What Kongzi says right after the exchange also affirms that narrative emphasis by praising Xiangzi's reasoning for his decision, which is explained in Xiangzi's own words in the speech part of this anecdote that remains complete across all three versions. Although the three speeches all differ somewhat from each other, suggesting a non-copying kind of interrelationship, the message remains the same. By contrast, the entire interlude of Zhang Mengtong's secret rendezvous with Han and Wei is omitted altogether. Instead, ruler-subject propriety, *yi* 義, is here placed ahead of merit, *gong*

[205] *Shuoyuan jiaozheng*, 6.117-18.

[206] *Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi*, 14.787.

功, without any narrative clues as to what that merit might be. The preference for propriety is in these cases unconditional.

In both of these variations, the compression of the narrative frame helps to foreground Xiangzi's judgment. The goal is not to retrace the story in full chronological detail but to set the stage for Xiangzi's utterance articulating the moral of the anecdote, again in an economical and effective way. In the *Shuoyuan*, for example, twenty-three other anecdotes join this one to illustrate the point about *fu'en* 復恩, "returning favors," either by a subject to a ruler or a ruler to a subject. Although Gao He was placed *first*, all the five others likewise received commendation for the part they played, thus bearing out simultaneously a sub-claim made in support of the main argument of "returning favors": that "if a ruler cannot repay the merits of his subjects and instead quails at distributing rewards, it too lays the foundation for disorder" 君不能報臣之功而憚行賞者. 亦亂之基也.[207] Big or small, graded or not, repayment is a must.

The weighing and ranking side of repayment is underscored, by contrast, in the *Lüshi chunqiu* reference to the anecdote. Paired with another popular anecdote in which Duke Wen of Jin 晉文公 in the wake of the battle of Chengpu 城濮 awarded likewise "mere" proponents of ritual and rites over the actual deceit that had won him the battle, the two anecdotes combine to illustrate a chapter-level claim made about "proper rewarding" 義賞: that is, "as for the application of reward and punishment, one cannot but be prudent" 賞罰之所加. 不可不慎.[208] In light of the *Shuoyuan*'s emphasis on repaying *per se*, the import here is the proper basis of repaying as well as its careful measurement. The extra narratorial comment following that of Kongzi's evaluates the characters and events in the story precisely against those criteria. Zhao Mengtong's merit in securing the pact with Han and Wei is duly acknowledged, but only as further evidence of Xiangzi's properly scaled rewarding criteria. That aside, that additional comment's specific content also betrays the familiarity of this anecdote among its users, since what in the *Shiji* are descriptions of the story—the exact

[207] *Shuoyuan jiaozheng*, 6.117.

[208] *Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi*, 14.786.

detail left out by this iteration of the anecdote—are here woven into the comment as evidence for the final evaluation.[209] This, again, speaks to the source's own adaptation of shared materials.

Just as narrative frames can be compressed, other versions of the story slow the storytelling down by zooming in on Zhang Mengtong's rendezvous with Han and Wei, the part the *Shiji* quickly describes in two verbal phrases: that Zhang "sneaked" 私 into what must have been the joint camps of Han and Wei, and that he "schemed" 謀 with them. In addition, what the *Shiji* only summarizes, likewise briefly, as "the three states turned around to eliminate the Zhi clan" 三國反滅知氏 is also given its own, separate account.[210] The first elaboration on the rendezvous is achieved through transforming the nondramatic narration into two dramatized speaking scenes (marked [1] and [2] below); the second on the reverse attack also through transmodalization, but from a brief narration into a standalone anecdote (marked [3] below). The beginning and end of the story remain the same. The "Renjian xun" 人間訓 chapter of the *Huainanzi* features this expansive variation as such:

> [0] Zhibo led the two states of Han and Wei on a joint expedition against Zhao. They laid siege to [Zhao's] Jinyang and diverted the Jin River to flood the city. In the city, people climbed onto trees to reside and hung their pots to cook.
>
> [0] 智伯率韓魏二國伐趙. 圍晉陽. 決晉水而灌之. 城下緣木而處. 縣釜而炊.
>
> [1] Xiangzi said to Zhang Mengtan, "Our city is depleted of strength, our food is running low, and our officials are in distress. What can I do about it?" Zhang Mengtan replied, "If one cannot preserve extinction, cannot stabilize endangerment, one has nothing to do with being called an esteemed and wise fellow. I ask to sneak my way to meet the rulers of Han and Wei and negotiate an agreement with them."
>
> [1] 襄子謂張孟談曰. 城中力已盡. 糧食匱乏. 大夫病. 為之奈何. 張孟談曰. 亡不能存. 危不能安. 無為貴智士. 臣請試潛行. 見韓魏之君而約之.
>
> [2] So, Zhang Mengtan saw the rulers of Han and Wei. He persuaded them thus, "I have heard that when lips are gone teeth will feel cold. Now, Zhibo is leading the two of you on an attack on Zhao, and Zhao is nearing peril. When Zhao has met her demise you two will

---

[209] The same can be observed in the *Han Feizi*. In the first of the "Nan" 難 chapters, what is basically the shared parts of the anecdote here is invoked for Han Fei's criticism of Kongzi's remark as well as the Confucian insistence on *yi* 義 as the principle of rewarding. In that criticism, Han Fei also comments on the details of the flooding the invoked version of the anecdote does not include. See *Han Feizi xin jiaozhu*, 15.857.

[210] For a more general study on narrative speed in early Chinese historiography, see Lei Yang, "How versus What: Changes in Narrative Speech from *Zuozhuan* to *Shiji* to *Hanshu*," *Monumenta Serica* 68.1 (2020): 1-27.

follow too. If as of now we still do not plan for it, disaster will for sure reach the two of you." The two rulers replied, "Zhibo as a person is cruel at heart and scarcely trusting. If our plan is leaked, our endeavor will for sure fail. What do you propose to do about that?" Zhang Mengtan said, "The words will come out of your mouths and enter only my ears. How is anyone else going to know about it? Moreover, people facing the same circumstances should complete one another; people sharing the same gains should die for one another. Please do plan with me!" The two rulers thus schemed with Zhang Mengtan in secret and agreed on a date with him.

[2] 乃見韓魏之君. 說之曰. 臣聞之. 脣亡而齒寒. 今智伯率二君而伐趙. 趙將亡矣. 趙亡則君之次矣. 及今而不圖之. 禍將及二君. 二君曰. 智伯之為人也. 粗中而少親. 我謀而泄. 事必敗. 為之奈何. 張孟談曰. 言出君之口. 入臣之耳. 人孰知之者乎. 且同情相成. 同利相死. 君其圖之. 二君乃與張孟談陰謀與之期.

[3a] Zhang Mengtan reported the pact back to Xiangzi. [3b] On the night of the day they agreed upon, Zhao generals killed the soldiers who kept guard at the dam and rediverted the Jin water to flood Zhibo. Zhibo's army went into chaos trying to fight the flood, when Han and Wei hit them from the flanks while Xiangzi's troops slaughtered the enemy from the front. They handed an utter defeat to Zhibo, killed him, and divided his state three ways.

[3a] 張孟談乃報襄子. [3b] 至其日之夜. 趙氏將殺其守堤之吏. 決水灌智伯. 智伯軍救水而亂. 朝魏翼而擊之. 襄子將卒犯其前. 大敗智伯軍. 殺其身而三分其國.

Xiangzi thereupon rewarded those who earned merit, and Gao He was put above all others. The many ministers protested in remonstration, saying, "The preserving of Jinyang is all Zhang Mengtan's accomplishment. Yet, Gao He leads the reward list. Why is that?" Xiangzi replied, "During the besiegement of Jinyang, my state was in danger and the altars of soil and grain were nearing collapse. Among you, my many ministers, no one did not grow a mind of willful affront. Only Gao He alone did not ignore the propriety between a ruler and a subject. I, for that reason, put him first."

襄子乃賞有功者. 而高赫為賞首. 羣臣請曰. 晉陽之存. 張孟談之功也. 而赫為賞首. 何也. 襄子曰. 晉陽之圍也. 寡人國家危. 社稷殆. 羣臣無不有驕侮之心者. 唯赫不失君臣之禮. 吾是以先之.

Judging from this, propriety is the fundamental basis of personhood. Even if one has the merit of winning a battle or preserving extinction, it does not compare to the preponderance of upholding propriety. That is why the nobleman says, "Fine words can earn people shared respect; fine deeds put them ahead of others."

由此觀之. 義者. 人之大本也. 雖有戰勝存亡之功. 不如行義之隆. 故君子曰. 美言可以市尊. 美行可以加人.[211]

What is succinctly reported in the *Shiji* is thus staged, presented as drama, here in the "Renjian xun."

Both Xiangzi and Zhang Mengtan speak now with more rhetorical sophistication the other versions

[211] *Huainanzi jishi*, 18.1265-68.

do not have, suggesting once again that speech can be creatively reworked to fit the rhetorical aim of the author's storytelling, which in this case is likewise the evidential illustration of a (philosophical) argument. From a narrative point of view, the two dramatic elaborations (parts [1] and [2]) not only bespeak the commonplaceness of transmodalization but also suggest the "hiddenness" of speech in any narrative storytelling. Behind the narrative frames, that is, there looms a potential speech scene waiting to be activated. Instead of differentiating between the kind of anecdotes *with* an element of speech from those *without*, an alternative line can be drawn between an anecdote that chooses to dramatize narrative events and one that narrativizes speech events. The relationship is not one of "either-or" but "on or off," "dominant or recessive," like that between genes.

In comparison, although part [3] expands *Shiji*'s "scheming together" 合謀 into instead a nondramatic, "recessive" anecdote in its own right, in yet another variation of the story the "speech gene" is flipped on again. In *Zhanguo ce* 戰國策 18.2, what is narrated here simply as a report from Zhang Mengtong back to Xiangzi (part [3a]) is expanded into as many as three speaking scenes fully revealing what has transpired between Zhang's persuasion of Han and Wei (part [2]) and the three states' reverse strike against Jin (part [3b]). The following quote from the *Zhanguo ce* version of the story follows its own parallels to parts [1] and [2] of the "Ren jianxun" version:

> Zhang Mengtan, following an audience with Zhibo, exited the encampment. Outside the thills-gate, he ran into Zhiguo. Zhiguo went inside to see Zhibo and said, "I fear that the two rulers [of Han and Wei] are going to rebel." Zhibo asked, "How is that so?" Zhiguo replied, "I ran into Zhang Mengtan outside the thills-gate. He looks spirited and he acts pompous." Zhibo said, "That cannot be the case. I already reached an agreement with the two rulers that when Zhao falls, we shall split it three ways. This is what I have personally negotiated. It will never be betrayed. You should let go and not mention it again."
>
> 張孟談因朝知伯而出. 遇知過轅門之外. 知過入見知伯曰. 二主殆將有變. 君曰. 何若. 對曰. 臣遇張孟談於轅門之外. 其志矜. 其行高. 知伯曰. 不然. 吾與二主約謹矣. 破趙三分其地. 寡人所親之. 必不欺也. 子釋之. 勿出於口.
>
> Zhiguo left, saw the two rulers, and went in again to persuade Zhibo: "The two rulers show a difference both in look and at heart. They are definitely going to betray you. It would be best to have them killed." Zhibo replied, "Our troops have been stationed at Jinyang for three years now. Within days, we shall be able to seize the city and relish our booty. It cannot be the case that they have another mind at this point. Mind yourself and say no more." Zhiguo said, "If you don't want to kill them, then go ahead and indulge them." Zhibo said,

"Indulge them how?" Zhiguo said, "Xuanzi of Zhao has an adviser named Zhao Jia, Kangzi of Han has one named Duan Gui. Both of them are able to shape the policy of their rulers. If you promise them both a district of ten thousand households upon Zhao's fall, then the hearts of their rulers will not change. You will also get what you desire." Zhibo said, "On Zhao's fall, we would already have split it three ways. If I further enfeoff each with a district of ten thousand households, then my share would be too small. I cannot allow it." Seeing that his ruler would neither adopt his strategy nor listen to his advice, Zhiguo left, changed his surname to Fu, and was never seen again.

知過出. 見二主. 入說知伯曰. 二主色動而意變. 必背君. 不如今殺之. 知伯曰. 兵著晉陽三年矣. 旦暮當拔之而饗其利. 乃有他心. 必不然. 子慎勿復言. 知過曰. 不殺則遂親之. 知伯曰. 親之奈何. 知過曰. 魏宣子之謀臣曰趙葭. 韓康子之謀臣曰段規. 是皆能移其君之計. 君其與二君約. 破趙則封二子者各萬家之縣一. 如是則二主之心可不變. 而君得其所欲矣. 知伯曰. 破趙而三分其地. 又封二子者各萬家之縣一. 則吾所得者少. 不可. 知過見君之不用. 言之不聽. 出. 更其姓為輔氏. 遂去不見.

Zhang Mengtan got news of it and went to see Xiangzi, saying, "I ran into Zhiguo outside the thills-gate. He looked at me as though he was suspecting me of something. He then went inside to see Zhibo. When he left, he changed his surname. If we do not strike tonight, I'm afraid it will be too late." Xiangzi replied, "Fine." Zhang Mengtan, then, saw the rulers of Han and Wei and said, "Tonight is the time." They thereupon killed the soldiers watching the dam and diverted the river to flood Zhibo's army. Trying to fight the flood, the army soon fell into chaos. Han and Wei struck them from the flanks while Xiangzi's troops assaulted the front. They handed Zhibo's army an utter defeat and captured Zhibo himself.

張孟談聞之. 入見襄子曰. 臣遇知過於轅門之外. 其視有疑臣之心. 入見知伯. 出更其姓. 今暮不擊. 必後之矣. 襄子曰. 諾. 使張孟談見韓魏之君曰. 夜期. 殺守堤之吏而決水灌知伯軍. 知伯軍救水而亂. 韓魏翼而擊之. 襄子將卒犯其前. 大敗知伯軍而禽知伯.[212]

Why Zhang Mengtan sought an audience with Zhibo is unclear,[213] but from the same ending that concludes this variation (underlined), it is obvious that the intervening episode is thought of as belonging to the same story. A counterpart to this *Zhangguo ce* version is also found in the "Shi guo" 十過 chapter of the *Han Feizi*. In both cases, Zhiguo plays an important role in predicting the mutiny but ends up being dismissed by Zhibo despite his prescience and persistence. What, again, in one case is subsumed under a quick narration is in two others returned to full dramatization.

Like the compressions seen in the *Shuoyuan* and *Lüshi chunqiu*, the "decompressions" here also serve the rhetorical purposes of the respective source materials. In the case of the "Renjian

[212] *Zhanguo ce jianzheng* 戰國策箋證 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2006), 18.937-38.

[213] One commentator speculates that he wanted to feign surrender. See *Zhanguo ce jianzheng*, 18.945.

xun," the speaking scenes support the final judgment, a quote we now associate with the *Laozi* 老子, that "[Although] fine words can earn people shared respect; fine deeds put them ahead of others" 美言可以市尊. 美行可以加人. "Fine words" refers naturally to Zhang Mengtong's persuasion of Han and Wei, which, like those of King Danfu's in *Mengzi* 1B.15, is performed by Zhang himself, in his own speaker function. The change here made to the speaker of the same complaint from Zhang to the "many ministers" 羣臣 also gives "shared respect" 市尊 a basis in the story. "Fine deeds," on the other hand, captures nothing but Gao He's adherence to propriety that in every iteration of the story is relayed by Xiangzi rather than described in any concrete detail. Except here, his topping the reward list for that very reason substantiates literally the *jiaren* 加人 half of the judgment. Every change is made so as to support the *Laozi* saying, in as unmediated a way as possible.

In the case of the *Zhanguo ce*, on the other hand, the additional speaking scenes illustrate a core principle of the compilation more generally: that attempts at persuasion are usually successful speech acts; if they fail to persuade, it is due solely to the ruler's misjudgment (more on this in chapter 6). The contrast between Zhibo's fate with that of Xiangzi's speaks directly to this corpus-level lesson: while good judgment leads to success, misjudgment of a good persuasion results instead in calamity. In the "Shi guo," Zhibo's dismissal of Zhiguo's good prediction is the very reason this particular presentation of the story is once again invoked. As one of the "ten faults" that the "Shi guo" names and illustrates with select anecdotes, "greedy and headstrong" 貪愎, the fifth one, is precisely what Han Fei says of Zhibo. In the "Shi guo," it is also the "root cause for the demise of a state as well as the slaughter of a life" 滅國殺身之本也[214]—literally what Zhibo suffered in the end. In both cases, the lesson is left performed by the original protagonists of the story; and in both cases, creative reuse of the same story informs its narrative variation. Like *Shuoyuan* and *Lüshi chunqiu*, *Zhanguo ce* and *Han Feizi* also exploit the varying illustrative uses of even the same variation.

By far the most remarkable evidence of the anecdote's controlled but creative variation—all for rhetorical purposes and all achieved through the narrative techniques so far discussed—is found

[214] *Han Feizi xin jiaozhu* 3.215.

in the storyteller's maneuver in his narrative point-of-view. The same story, that is to say, can be presented from the perspective of the outmaneuvered instead of the outmaneuvering, the conquered instead of the conqueror, the anti-hero instead of the hero. This shift in narrative perspective is how the *Shiji* among other ways handles parallel materials across its different narrative sections and how the Mandate of Heaven is sometimes approached in the *Shangshu* as well. In the case of the Jinyang story, both the *Shuoyuan* and *Zhanguo ce* also include a comparable iteration of the story which in chronological coverage overlaps with the first half of the "Renjian xun" version.[215] Where they both differ is in how the story is now told entirely from Zhibo's perspective and his adviser, Chi Ci's 郄疵. The *Zhanguo ce* version (18.1) is slightly more elaborate:

> Zhibo had the armies of Han and Wei follow him in an expedition against Zhao. They besieged the city of Jinyang and flooded it. The part of the city that was unsubmerged measured only three wall-planks deep [from the top].
>
> 知伯從韓魏兵以攻趙. 圍晉陽而水之. 城下不沉者三板.
>
> Chi Ci said to Zhibo, "The rulers of Han and Wei will for certain turn against us." Zhibo replied, "How do you know that?" Chi Ci said, "I know from observing human affairs. You had the armies of Han and Wei follow your lead on an attack against Zhao. When Zhao meets its peril, the disaster will for certain reach Han and Wei. Now, you have an agreement that upon Zhao's defeat, its territory will be split three ways. Despite that, now that only three wall planks of the city remain unsubmerged, that in the pots and stoves there grow frogs, that people and horses each feed on their own kind, and that the fall of the city is within days, the rulers of Han and Wei not only show no delight but instead anxiety. If this is not [a sign of] mutiny, then what is it?"
>
> 郄疵謂知伯曰. 韓魏之君必反矣. 知伯曰. 何以知之. 郄疵曰. 以其人事知之. 夫從韓魏之兵而攻趙. 趙亡. 難必及韓魏矣. 今約勝趙而三分其地. 今城不沒者三板. 臼灶生蛙. 人馬相食. 城降有日. 而韓魏之君無喜志而有憂色. 是非反如何也.
>
> The following day, Zhibo addressed the rulers of Han and Wei, saying, "Chi Ci says you two are set to turn against me." The rulers of Han and Wei replied, "We have agreed that when Zhao is defeated, we would divide their state three ways. Now that the city is on the verge of falling, even though we indeed are foolish, we would not abandon the gains that are right in front of us, turn our back on the agreement, and instead risk danger to do the impossible. The circumstances are right in front of your eyes! This must be Chi Ci scheming on Zhao's behalf—to make you question where our hearts lie, and therefore call off the attack on Zhao. Your listening to the words of a slanderous minister and your, for that reason, driving a wedge between our relationship makes us feel sorry for you." The two rulers hurried out.

[215] *Shuoyuan jiaozheng*, 13.318; *Zhanguo ce jianzheng*, 18.932.

明日. 知伯以告韓魏之君曰. 郄疵言君之且反也. 韓魏之君曰. 夫勝趙而三分其地. 城今且將拔矣. 夫三家雖愚. 不棄美利於前. 背信盟之約. 而為危難不可成之事. 其勢可見也. 是疵為趙計矣. 使君疑二主之心. 而解於攻趙也. 今君聽讒臣之言. 而離二主之交. 為君惜之. 趨而出.

Chi Ci said to Zhibo, "What were you trying to accomplish by telling the rulers of Han and Wei what I said to you?" Zhibo said, "How do you know that?" Chi Ci replied, "The two rulers of Han and Wei saw me, straightened their backs, and scurried away." Chi Ci knew that his advice was not heeded, so he asked to be sent to Qi. After Zhibo had sent him off, the rulers of Han and Wei indeed turned on him.

郄疵謂知伯曰. 君又何以疵言告韓魏之君為. 知伯曰. 子安知之. 對曰. 韓魏之君視疵端而趨疾. 郄疵知其言之不聽. 請使於齊. 知伯遣之. 韓魏之君果反矣.

Compared to all the other variations, this is a lone peek into the Jin side of things. It begins with the same narrative frame as that of the "Renjian xun" version and concludes where the counterstrike is briefly noted. Everything in between is Jin's perspective on the attack, some detail of which parallel those in the "Shi guo" and *Zhanguo ce* 18.2. Most notably, what is in the "Renjian xun" version Zhang Mengtan's persuasion is here Chi Ci's reasoning for the predicted insurrection (underlined); what Chi Ci then says of the submerged Jinyang is in the *Shiji* the narrator's description of the besiegement (double underline); and, what Chi Ci bases his likewise unheeded predictions on—facial and behavioral clues—is all that had informed Zhiguo's prediction in *Zhanguo ce* 18.2 as well. Every narrative element of the story can be reused, redistributed to a different character, and transformed into a different mode of representation.

When the rulers of Han and Wei recycled Chi Ci's words and turned them against him (wavy underline), this fourth instance of reusing and reassigning of the narrative materials works only to reinforce the rhetorical lesson the *Zhanguo ce* illustrates on the whole: as Zhibo once again misjudges, his defeat is doubly prefigured. Every speech act in the story, though presented now from a different point of view, exists again in support of its larger context's rhetorical aims. While some sources mark that for us through explicit commentaries, the *Zhanguo ce* performs it by juxtaposing the same lesson and repeating it. In either case, for the various users of the anecdote, the same narrative techniques enable their varying presentation of the shared anecdotal materials. *Yan* and *shi* are most productive

when understood not as the objective ends of representation but a pair of interdependent, creative means constitutive of representation.

**5. Across Speech and Narrative**

Like the two drastic variations of the Danfu anecdote, the two instantiations of the Jinyang story narrated from opposing points of view also follow one another. Striking as the contrast might seem in both cases, the juxtaposition of the anecdote is a commonplace order in early Chinese writings. In general, that is, the anecdote does not appear alone but in clusters. All the examples so far discussed reside in a larger context that juxtaposes two or more anecdotes in some sort of an arrangement. While the "Taizu xun" paragraph weaves several nondramatic anecdotal proofs into a single line of argument, the "Renjian xun" combines blocks of anecdotes into a series of such blocks.[216] Compared to the "Shi guo" and the "Daoying xun" where longer processions of anecdotes comprise the entire lengths of both chapters, the *Lüshi chunqiu*, *Shuoyuan*, and *Zhanguo ce* take juxtaposition to the corpus level by compiling none other than similarly-structured chapters. Large or small, clustering is a fundamental aspect of the anecdote, and therefore of the relationship between speech and narrative, *yan* and *shi*.

Some anecdote clusters are already known by a different name. The aggregation of individual anecdotes allowing the *Zuozhuan* and *Guoyu* to recount more complex chains of events is labeled by David Schaberg as the "anecdote series";[217] minus what he sees as didactic and moralizing ingredients, what is left of the linked anecdotes in the "Xinian" 繫年 manuscript is declared by Yuri Pines to be a hitherto unknown genre, the so-called "informative history."[218] Among the masters texts, the hyper-structured anecdotes gathered into what she calls "branching catalogues" bespeak, in Heng Du's analysis of the "Chuo shuo" 儲說 chapters of the *Han Feizi*, an instance of "information

---

216 As Andrew Meyer writes, "the anecdotes in [the 'Renjian xun'] are set in a formal matrix framed by linking segments of parallel prose and verse…Each of the twenty-six segments following the first exhibits the same basic structural properties, with some slight degree of deviation overall." Major, et al., *The Huainanzi*, 714.

217 See Schaberg, *A Patterned Past*, 192-207.

218 The argument has been made in several iterations. For the most recent version, see Yuri Pines, *Zhou History Unearthed: The Bamboo Manuscript* Xinian *and Early Chinese Historiography* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2020), esp. 37-67.

management."[219] By contrast, the lack of an overt order behind the grouped anecdotes in the "Waiwu" 外物 and other "miscellaneous" chapters of the *Zhuangzi* has prompted A. C. Graham to dismiss them as "ragbags of odds and ends,"[220] a view Wim De Reu has recently contested based on his vision of an underlying, "coherent philosophical treatise."[221] In the same vein, for every argument that the *Shuoyuan* or *Lüshi chunqiu* is "compiled," "miscellaneous," or "haphazard," there is a counter-argument for the "authored," "homogenous," or "coherent" nature of either work.[222] Depending on size and placement, degree and type of paratextual curation, and the critic's own sense of order and meaning, the anecdote cluster has sparked ingenuity both in explaining it and in explaining it away.

Seen together, however, most anecdote clusters take one of a set of common shapes if the interest is not specifically in the chronological ordering of the anecdotes. Texts like the *Zuozhuan*, *Guoyu*, and "Xinian" all have their own principles other types of writing do not follow. Instead,

---

219 Heng Du, "The Mastery of Miscellanea: Information Management and Knowledge Acquisition in the 'Chu shuo' Chapters of the *Hanfeizi*," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 140.1 (2020): 115-141.

220 A. C. Graham, *Disputers of the Tao: Philosophical Arguments in Ancient China* (La Salle, Ill: Open Court, 1989), 173.

221 Wim De Reu, "A Ragbag of Odds and Ends? Argument Structure and Philosophical Coherence in *Zhuangzi* 26," in *Literary Forms of Argument in Early China*, ed. Joachim Gentz and Dirk Meyer (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 243-294. This type of scholarship has a much larger footprint in Chinese academia. Especially with regard to the *Zhuangzi*, scholars have come up with all sorts of neologisms to describe the inner chapters of the *Zhuangzi*, which in structure also string together a diversity of anecdotes but in authorship are believed to be genuine works by the historical Zhuang Zhou. The motive is to reinforce this traditional view by rebranding potential incoherence as authorial intricacy endowed with hidden meaning. On the other hand, those who want to overturn the traditional view try the same analysis on the "miscellaneous chapters" and argue for their complex but hidden design as well. In that way, they conclude that those chapters have a gifted author as well. In addition to conflating composition with coherence, compilation with incoherence, both sides contribute to the perpetuation of the same, to my mind parochial, scholarly motive: that one needs to argue *against* someone or something. Disagreement is a good result, but too often it appears to be the goal. In addition to Wim De Reu's essay, see, for example, Ye Shuxian 葉舒憲, *Zhuangzi de wenhua jiexi* 莊子的文化解析 (Wuhan: Hubei renmin chubanshe, 1997), 79-87; Liu Shengliang 劉生良, *Pengxiang wujiang: Zhuangzi wenxue yaunjiu* 鵬翔無疆:《莊子》文學研究 (Beijing: Renmin chubanshe, 2004), 225-84; Jia Xuehong 賈學鴻, *Zhuangzi jiegou yishu yanjiu* 《莊子》結構藝術研究 (Beijing: Xueyuan chubanshe, 2013).

222 For the *Shuoyuan*, see most recently Christian Schwermann, "Anecdote Collections as Argumentative Texts: The Composition of the *Shuoyuan*," in *Between History and Philosophy*, 147-192. Literature on the *Lüshi chunqiu* is much larger. See, for example, He Zhihua 何志華, *Lüshi chunqiu guankui* 呂氏春秋管窺 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2015), 1-26; Guan Zongchang 管宗昌, *Lüshi Chunqiu wenxue yanjiu* 《呂氏春秋》文學研究 (Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 2016); Mark Edward Lewis, *Writing and Authority in Early China* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999), 302-308; Scott Cook, "The *Lüshi chunqiu* and the Resolution of Philosophical Dissonance," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 62.2 (2002): 309.

clustering in most other instances is premised on a nonlinear but catalogic order.[223] Like the enumerative voice, its coherence is first and foremost structural. Arguments such as those mentioned above either for or against the coherence of a certain cluster tend to read the cluster as a linear narrative. But as this chapter will show, the anecdote cluster derives the value—and the immense popularity—of its form from the freedom to juxtapose, repeat, and amass. It is a central argumentative device in and of itself, in which all the anecdotes combine to illustrate a point either explicitly or implicitly made. And that illustrated point, in turn, provides a means of overseeing and understanding the whole cluster. In the case of the "anecdote series," for example, the aggregation is underlain by "a principle of recompense."[224] For other clusters, their principles of juxtaposition are tied to the particular shape the cluster takes.

Not coincidentally, clustering as an argumentative device is made possible by the role speech representation plays. Most anecdotes in a cluster still center on an element of speech. More so than the individual anecdotes, the clusters also rely on the coordination between dramatization and narration for the fulfillment of their rhetorical aims, achieved now on a much larger scale and across all the constituent anecdotes. In the process, individual anecdotes not only work in sync with one another but also with other types of illustrative materials altogether that feature prominently in the more capacious instances of clustering. To some authors, the anecdote is nothing but narratively fluid materials that serve the same rhetorical function as, for example, philosophical exposition. From there, it is also a short step to the most remarkable of all rhetorical use and adaption of the anecdote, where the author speaks through the interlocutors in the anecdotes to the point illustrated by the entire cluster. A kind of author-representation dialogism underlying the protreptic voice is

---

[223] It is worth noting that the "Arrayed Biographies" 列傳 section in the *Shiji* has many accounts constructed from an anecdote cluster that is both linear and catalogic. It is linear because, like in the *Zuozhuan*, the anecdotes are by and larger chronologically ordered. It is still catalogic because all anecdotes illustrate the core attributes of the biographee in an equal, undifferentiated way. The "Su Qin liezhuan" 蘇秦列傳 and "Zhang Yi liezhuan" 張儀列傳, for example, consist only of anecdotes of the two roaming persuaders' persuasions; the "Cike liezhuan" 刺客列傳 only of anecdotes of each assassin's assassination stories; and the "Bian Que Canggong liezhuan" 扁鵲倉公列傳 only of anecdotes of the two physicians' diagnoses. These figures have no other identity than their "professional achievements," enumerated one after another in their accounts.

[224] Schaberg, *A Patterned Past*, 191.

also at play here. All of these belong, again, to the set of narrative techniques used in speech representation. These techniques reveal no particular origin or affiliation; to the extent the source materials can indicate, they amount to a set of lasting conventions that have guided the many efforts at clustering, either by a single author or a team of compilers.

### *Shapes of Clustering*

There are four basic shapes to clustering, dependent on the three components that make up a cluster. The most familiar shape of the anecdote cluster is one where a claim is made, followed then by a number of anecdotes illustrating or supporting the claim. In the tradition, it is known as the *jingshuo* 經說 structure. The anecdotes in the cluster may betray a connection between some portions of them, but most characteristically they radiate directly from the claim, the guiding principle (*jing* 經) of their juxtaposition. Like any catalog, no juxtaposition is completely arbitrary.[225] Given its explicit articulation of the principle, the ensuing clustering of anecdotal illustrations, and in this case a general lack of commentarial materials attached to the anecdotes, I notate this shape as the P-A-~~C~~ shape (explicit principle – anecdote cluster – no comment).

The *Shuoyuan*, for example, is a corpus-level instantiation of this shape across its twenty-one chapters,[226] so are many chapters in the *Zhuangzi* (e.g., "Yuyan" 寓言, "Da sheng" 達生, "Zhi le" 至

[225] Such is why I remain unconvinced by those studies that attempt to impart coherence and, by extension, authorship, value, and authenticity on certain anecdote clusters. Their analyses typically fall on the identification of local pockets of meaning along the progression of the anecdotes and equate the stringing together of those pockets of meaning with argumentative coherence. Necessitating a particular compositional mode notwithstanding, what they find should also not surprise us. Some clustering naturally displays more or more explicit inner connections than others (recall the enumerations attributed to Kongzi in chapter 1). As Schwermann notes, somewhat contradictorily to his own claims of designed coherence, *associative* thinking is a primary logic behind clustering. The difference is not categorical but gradual like, again, any catalogic form will be. For those who have read something like the *Collected Sayings of Chairman Mao* 毛主席語錄, the, likewise, a.) diverse perspectives, b.) contrastive or complementary pairings, and c.) repetitions of keywords and core themes that accounts like Schwermann's and De Reu's repeatedly stress have nothing to do with a real Chairman Mao sitting at a desk crafting his own arguments.

[226] Except for the first chapter, which presents its core theme in the form of an anecdote placed before all others, all the rest of the chapters begin with a prose statement of the guiding principle. This is first noted by

樂, etc.). As the earlier discussion has mentioned, leaving the anecdote uncommented, unmediated, and its speech scene fully dramatized enables the speakers, typically exemplary figures of every stripe, to speak directly to the claim and the claim's addressee both in and outside the text. Whereas scholars like Xu Jianwei 徐建委 take these "raw" anecdotes to be an indication of a lack of editorial work (沒有特別明顯的刪改痕跡), of the anecdotes still remaining in their original shapes (原始面目), and thus of an effort in simply preserving earlier documentary materials (保存早期文獻為目的),[227] I see a consistent and considered editorial decision in letting the anecdotes and the speakers do their own best work. If Zeng Gong's 曾鞏 (1019-1083) postulation that the *Shuoyuan* was "intended as a model and an admonition" 欲以為法戒 for the young Emperor Chen 成 (r.33-7 BCE) has any historical truth to it,[228] then no voice, certainly not Liu Xiang's 劉向 (77-6 BCE), could rival those of the speakers in the anecdotes, which include the illustrious Zhou kings, Confucius, among other cultural-political and legendary heroes. Not only do they speak in their own speaker functions, they also speak to teach, explain, caution, and model in their words the various themes of the *Shuoyuan* on rulership, morality, politics, and so forth. Short of a full-blown dramatic art, this is early China's own avenue to catharsis should the emperor really read through the compilation.[229]

Closely resembling the P-A-C is the P-A-C shape, an anecdote cluster with an articulated principle, a mix of examples, and this time an attached comment to most if not all the anecdotes in the cluster. Different scales of this shape can be found in the "Taizu xun" (paragraph level), "Renjian xun" (unit level), and "Shi guo" (chapter level). A lion's share of the *Lüshi chunqiu* also adopts this shape. According to Tian Fengtai's 田鳳台 survey, seventy of the hundred-and-sixty *pian*

---

Xu Fuguan 徐復觀 in his *Liang Han sixiang shi* 兩漢思想史 (vol.3 [Shanghai: Huadong shifan daxue chubanshe, 2001], 39-42).

[227] Xu Jianwei 徐建委, *Shuoyuan yanjiu: yi Zhanguo Qin Han zhijian de wenxian jilei yu xueshushi wei zhongxin* 《說苑》研究：以戰國秦漢之間的文獻積累與學術史為中心 (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2011), 85.

[228] *Shuoyuan jiaozheng*, "Shuoyaun xu" 說苑序, 1.

[229] In this sense, the admonition is achieved in the same way the Western Han *fu* appears to deliver its didactic lessons. For this argument, see Martin Kern, "Western Han Aesthetics and the Genesis of the *fu*," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 63.2 (2003): 383-437.

篇 of the compilation begin with a statement of a claim, followed then by a list of anecdotes as illustration (首段議論. 後全舉例證); another twenty-seven cap their anecdote clusters with an additional remark reiterating the opening claim.[230] Commensurate with this structural arrangement, the *Lüshi chunqiu* also circumscribes the meaning of the anecdotes by commenting, typically, only on the characters and events in the anecdotes, thus ensuring their illustrative force toward the guiding claim. The most common way across the compilation is to equate the protagonists of the anecdotes with the thematic topic of the housing chapter, through the formula "A [a person] can be said to be B [an attribute]" A 可謂 B 矣. Like the more targeted comments seen also in the King Danfu and Jinyang anecdotes, this formula ensures linkage between the historical particulars and the more global claims they are made to illustrate.

Revealingly, the linkage between what can be alternatively understood as evidence and analysis is not always "organic" but choreographed. It points to the subjugation of the anecdotal materials to the rhetorical functions they serve. On more than one occasion, that is, the *Lüshi chunqiu* interprets an anecdote in a manner unlike any other interpretation; otherwise, the illustration would not work (recall *Mengzi* 1B.14). Consider, for example, the following anecdote invoked in the "Zhi yue" 制樂 chapter of the "Jixia ji" 季夏紀:

> Therefore, during the time of King Tang the Accomplished, a mulberry tree sprouted in his courtyard. It appeared at dusk and by dawn was already an arm's width. Tang's officer asked to have its cause divined, but Tang turned away the diviner, and said, "I have heard that an auspicious sign is the harbinger of blessing; when one sees an auspicious sign but does evil, the blessing will not come of it. Abnormity, on the other hand, is the harbinger of calamity; when one sees abnormity and does good, then calamity will not materialize." Thereupon the king attended court early and retired late. He inquired after the sick, mourned the dead, and applied himself to the conciliation of the hundred clans. Within three days the mulberry tree disappeared. Hence: calamity is that on which blessings lean; a blessing is that behind which calamities loom. This is the lone insight of a sage person. How will the average man ever grasp the depth of it?!
>
> 故成湯之時. 有穀生於庭. 昏而生. 比旦而大拱. 其吏請卜其故. 湯退卜者曰. 吾聞祥者福之先者也. 見祥而為不善則福不至. 妖者禍之先者也. 見妖而為善則禍不至. 於是早

[230] He offers both a final tally and a chapter-by-chapter description. See Tian Fengtai 田鳳台, *Lüshi chunqiu tanwei* 呂氏春秋探微 (Taipei: Xuesheng shuju, 1986), 340-355.

朝晏退. 問疾弔喪. 務鎮撫百姓. 三日而穀亡. 故禍兮福之所倚. 福兮禍之所伏. 聖人所獨見. 眾人焉知其極.[231]

Many parallels of this protean anecdote exist in extant sources, but the interlocutors vary in all cases.[232] Instead of King Tang, his role has been played by Kings Taiwu 太戊 and Wuding 武丁; rather than the king himself, all the other versions feature either an actual diviner or a trusted advisor who then decodes the sign. While the king's interlocutor in most parallels only offers him a diagnosis, Yi Zhi 伊陟 in the *Shiji* jumps straight into the solution. Prompted in that version by King Taiwu's befuddlement over the mulberry tree, Yi Zhi says in admonition, "I have heard that the abnormal does not rival the virtuous. Is your rule not lacking in some way? You ought to cultivate virtue" 臣聞妖不勝德. 帝之政其有闕與. 帝其修德.[233]

In the *Lüshi chunqiu*, however, Tang's assumption of the diviner's role makes a big difference to the illustrative value of this anecdote. By "turning away" 退 the diviner and by uttering his own reading of the sign,[234] the king's perspicacity anticipates the final comment that only a "sage person" 聖人 can see through omens. The "average man" 眾人, the court diviner included, would not have the vision. No other version reads this anecdote this way. Insofar as a comment is appended, they focus on the awe of Heaven that a wise ruler would obey, by correcting his wrongdoings that have triggered the omen in the first place. Yi Zhi's admonition in the *Shiji* is the moral of all other versions. Yet, the *Lüshi chunqiu* is the only instance where emphasis is placed instead on the king's *reading* of the sign rather than his observation of good advice; his ensuing remedies narrated here attest indeed to the latter, but only as a result of his own perspicacity (獨見).

---

231 *Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshii*, 6.350.

232 In, for example: the "Jundao" 君道 chapter of the *Shuoyuan*; the third chapter of the *Hanshi waizhuan*; the "Jingshen" 敬慎 chapter of the *Shuoyuan*; the "Wuyi jie" 五義解 chapter of the *Kongzi jiayu*; the "Yin benji" 殷本紀 of the *Shiji*; the "Yi xu" 異虛 chapter of the *Lunheng* 論衡; the *Zhushu jinian* 竹書紀年; and, a little more differently, the "Gaozong rongri" 高宗肜日 chapter of the *Shangshu* where the omen is not the mulberry tree but a bird.

233 *Shiji*, 3.100.

234 John Knoblock and Jeffrey Riegel translate 湯退卜者曰 as "Tang withdrew and the diviner said." This reading is at odds with the final comment. See Knoblock and Riegel, *The Annals of Lü Buwei: A Complete Translation and Study* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000), 163-64.

This peculiar take on the anecdote, supported by the reassignment of roles, coincides with the juxtaposition of two other anecdotes presented in similar ways. In one of them, the venerable King Wen is recounted to be refuting a reading of an earthquake by his hundred officials 百吏, for he alone is said to have understood that Heaven is sending *him* a warning that only *he* can resolve by correcting *his* wrongdoings ("I must have incurred blame. That is why Heaven is punishing me by means of the earthquake…I, Chang, am being asked to change my conduct and multiply my good deeds" 我必有罪. 故天以此罰我也…昌也請改行重善.[235]). In the other, Duke Jing of Song 宋景公 thrice rejects his advisor Ziwei's 子韋 solution to an astronomical omen, insisting that the sign signals *his* demise and only *he* should take responsibility by giving up *his* life ("This means my life has reached its allotted limit" 是寡人之命固盡矣[236]). As in the first case, both anecdotes put in the two rulers' own voices the correct reading of the signs in the form of the correct solution to "expel" 移 the omen, this time against the wrong readings by their advisors; in both cases, their insight over these "ordinary men" also acquires confirmation by the narrative. King Wen ruled forty-three more years because he executed the solution he himself proposed; Duke Jing lived twenty-one more years because each rejection of a wrong solution earned him seven. The entire cluster, then, illustrates an opening claim made about "utmost music" 至樂, which goes, "In order to rejoice in the utmost music, one would have to find it in the utmost rulership" 欲觀至樂. 必於至治.[237] One claim is thus illustrated by three examples, ordered sequentially but with equal weight. The utmost rulership is not only a set of kingly attributes; it has to be modeled by the ruler himself. In a way, what they *say* is in part the "utmost music."[238]

---

[235] *Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshii*, 6.350.

[236] Ibid., 6.351

[237] Ibid., 6.350.

[238] Some commentators have puzzled over the title "Zhi yue" 至樂 and its relationship to the anecdotes, saying that none is related to music *per se*. But as Chen Qiyou 陳奇猷 remarks correctly, music in early Chinese philosophy is intimately connected to governance. What he does not mention is the possibility, to me at least, of reading the ruler's words as music in the figurative sense. See *Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshii*, 6.351-52.

Sometimes, the central point a cluster illustrates is implicit rather than explicit; it calls for the reader's inference in addition to observance. What can be called the P-A-C shape, the third variety, is the first of the two remaining shapes that both leave their principles of juxtaposition unarticulated. In the P-A-C, each anecdote, often in a much larger cluster, is accompanied by an explicit comment. Yet, the principle of their coexistence, whether of composition or compilation, is nowhere provided in the cluster itself. The "Daoying xun," for example, combines fifty-six anecdotes into one single place, fifty-three of them capped by a *Laozi* 老子 quotation. Although the text does not indicate it, Sarah A. Queen is right to infer that the combinations "demonstrate the versatility of the *Laozi* as an authority of sagely rules," that a single source of wisdom is presented here to "speak to virtually any and every occasion."[239] In the process, Queen notes, "the situational and speech-laden characteristics of the *Huainanzi* anecdotes, which generally portray a context or occasion that prompts a crucial conversation or incisive persuasion, suit the philosophical arguments that the chapter seeks to clarify."[240] As with most illustrations by the anecdote cluster, speech is overburdened with the signification of meaning.

This kind of "performative argumentation," one completed by doing rather than saying, is seen also in the *Hanshi waizhuan* 韓詩外傳 and the "Yu Lao" 喻老 chapter of the *Han Feizi*. Queen groups them as a separate "genre of anecdotal literature,"[241] but in practice, the "genre" is essentially one of the clustering shapes adoptable by other kinds of writings as well. The anecdote does not really comprise "a distinct type of writing…occupying the liminal space…between history and philosophy."[242] It in many ways *is* those types of writings since much of the peculiarity of early

---

[239] Sarah A. Queen, "The Creation and Domestication of the Techniques of Lao-Zhuang: Anecdotal Narrative and Philosophical Argument in *Huainanzi* 12," *Asia Major*, 3rd series 21.1 (2008): 202, 203.

[240] Ibid., 202.

[241] Ibid., 204-209.

[242] Paul van Els and Sarah Queen, "Anecdotes in Early China," 16.

Chinese history and philosophy is the very peculiarity of the anecdote.[243] In the *Hanshi waizhaun*, for instance, the same P-A-C shape is given a new twist. As James Robert Hightower has noted, the work's unity, the P left unsaid, "derives from its purpose and appears in the inevitable 詩曰 at the end of each paragraph."[244] In other words, the *Shi* is shown to be the hermeneutical lens, like the *Laozi* is in the "Daoying xun," through which an entire world can be understood.[245] That demonstration, however, is in the *Hanshi waizhuan* achieved both recursively and more capaciously. Recursive because a single line from the *Shi* is used to conclude several illustrations; capacious because the illustrative materials now include more than just the anecdote.[246]

The King Tang anecdote, for example, appears also in the *Hanshi waizhuan*. This time divined by his adviser Yi Yin 伊尹, the king's ensuing actions that helped to eliminate the omen are used to illustrate a line from the Hymns of Zhou 周頌: "The *Shi* has it, 'Be reverent to Heaven's awe; by being timely you can preserve [Heaven's favor]'" 詩曰. 畏天之威. 于時保之.[247] Immediately after it, the same King Wen anecdote accompanying this King Tang one in the *Lüshi chunqiu* also appears to help illustrate the exact same line. While the King Wen anecdote remains the same in both iterations, King Tang's perspicacity in the *Lüshi chunqiu* version gives way now to his kindred reverence toward Heaven. He no longer speaks about the interdependence between blessing and

---

243 In addition to Schaberg, *A Patterned Past*, see also Paul R. Goldin, "Nondeductive Argumentation and the Art of Chinese Philosophy," in *The Art of Chinese Philosophy: Eight Classical Texts and How to Read Them* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2020), 13-27. An earlier version is included in van Els and Queen.

244 James Robert Hightower, "The Han-shih wai-chuan 韓詩外傳 and the San Chia Shih 三家詩," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 11.3 (1948): 242.

245 Scholars past and now have debated whether the *Hanshi waizhuan* aims to "interpret the *Shi*" 解詩 or "apply the *Shi*" 用詩, but that distinction is unnecessary because they are the two sides of the same coin. The anecdote and the *Shi* constrain each other's meaning. See discussions of the debate in Yu Shujuan 于淑娟, *Hanshi waizhuan yanjiu: Handai jingxue yu wenxue guanxi toushi* 韓詩外傳研究：漢代經學與文學透視 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2011), 75-240; Ai Chunming 艾春明, *Hanshi waizhaun yanjiu* 《韓詩外傳》研究 (Shenyang: Liaoning daxue chubanshe, 2010), 37-48.

246 Different anecdotes that illustrate the same lines are typically grouped together in the anthology. In the first *juan* 卷, for instance, one *Shi* line is illustrated four times, three three times, and one twice, all consecutively. For the best resource on this, as well as the invoked anecdotes and their parallels in other sources, see Fan Dong 樊東, "Hanshi waizhuan zhushu tili ji xiangguan wenti yanjiu" 《韓詩外傳》著述體例及相關問題研究 (Ph.D. diss., Shanghai University, 2016).

247 Xu Weiyu 許維遹, *Hanshi waizhuan jishi* 韓詩外傳集釋 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980), 3.81.

calamity; instead, the same precept is now said by Yi Yin from whom King Tang learns about Heaven's awe. The same line from the *Shi* is illustrated twice, once by invoking the mulberry tree anecdote in its more typical shape and interpretation, once by reading the same King Wen anecdote in a different way.

Following this twice-derived applicability of one *Shi* line, the next unit of materials enshrine another line by referencing it three times. For the line "Bright and glorious is the Zhou; by order she has succeeded her place" 明昭在周. 式序在位, a lengthy anecdote is preceded by two expository, self-contained claims, traceable both to the *Xunzi* 荀子.[248] The first and briefer one goes like this:

> The king in assessing virtues does not honor those without merit, does not employ those without potency, and does not punish those without guilt. At court, there is no position of opportunism; among the people, there is no unearned life. Therefore, when the worthy is elevated, the capable employed, ranks and hierarchies will not be transgressed; when cruelty is overpowered, brutality outlawed, punishment will not be overprescribed. The people will fully understand all this. They will all know that when doing good at home they will receive commendation at court; when doing evil in secret they will suffer punishment in public. Now, this is what can be called a sure judgment. It is the virtue of the king. The *Shi* says, "Bright and glorious is the Zhou; by order she has succeeded her place."
>
> 王者之論德也. 不尊無功. 不官無德. 不誅無罪. 朝無幸位. 民無幸生. 故上賢使能而等級不踰. 折暴禁悍而刑罰不過. 百姓曉然. 皆知夫為善於家取賞於朝也. 為不善於幽而蒙刑於顯. 夫是之謂定論. 是王者之德. 詩曰. 明昭有周. 式序在位.[249]

Instituting good order is thus the point here. In the following part of this unit, a quotation attributed to an unspecific commentary ("*Zhuan* says" 傳曰), the same point is expressed by a ranking of and comparison between different degrees of virtue as embodied by the people, the nobleman, and the sage. Although more concrete, this quotation as the second piece of illustrative material supporting the same *Shi* line still remains expository in its narrative construction. Only then does a lengthy, fully

[248] First one to the "Wang zhi" 王制 chapter, second one to the "Ru xiao" 儒效. Hightower counts 54 parallels with the *Xunzi*.

[249] *Hanshi waizhuan jishi*, 84.

dramatized anecdote follow to illustrate once again the same *Shi* line. This time, the same moral of good order, of evaluation and comparison, is verbally taught and explained by a speaker:[250]

> Duke Wen of Wei wanted to appoint a minister. He summoned Li Ke and asked, "I wish to appoint a minister. If it is not Zhai Huang it will have to be Wei Chengzi. Allow me to make my selection with you." Li Ke rose from his seat and demurred, saying, "I have heard that the lowly do not counsel the honorable; the unacquainted do not come between the close. I am someone who resides on the outside. I dare not answer your command." Duke Wen replied, "Sir, do you take it up and do not hold back!" Li Ke thus went on, "When looking at a person: if seated [in power], you look at who he is close with; if wealthy, you look at what he gives away; if untrammeled, you look at whom he promotes; if stranded, you look at what he does not do; and if impoverished, you look at what he does not take. These five areas would suffice for your contemplation." Duke Wen said, "You may go home, sir. I have decided on the ministership."
>
> 魏文侯欲置相. 召李克問曰. 寡人欲置相. 非翟黃則魏成子. 願卜之於先生. 李克避席而辭曰. 臣聞之. 卑不謀尊. 疏不間親. 臣外居者也. 不敢當命. 文侯曰. 先生臨事勿讓. 李克曰. 夫觀士也. 居則視其所親. 富則視其所與. 達則視其所舉. 窮則視其所不為. 貧則視其所不取. 此五者足以觀矣. 文侯曰. 請先生就舍. 寡人之相定矣.
>
> Li Ke left and ran into Zhai Huang, who asked, "Today, I heard that our lord summoned you, sir, to discuss the ministership. Who will it be?" Li Ke replied, "It will be Wei Chengzi." Bursting into anger, Zhai Huang charged, "How am I losing to Wei Chengzi?! The guardian of Xihe was recommended by me. When our lord was troubled by Ye, I put forward Ximen Bao. When our lord wished to attack Zhongshan, I gave him Le Yang. When Zhongshan was seized and in want of a governor, I named you to the position. And when our lord needed a tutor for the prince, I nominated Zhao Cang. All those that I recommended have measured up to their appointments, how am I losing to Wei Chengzi?"
>
> 李克出. 遇翟黃. 曰. 今日聞君召先生而卜相. 果誰為之. 李克曰. 魏成子為之. 翟黃悖然作色. 曰. 吾何負於魏成子. 西河之守. 吾所進也. 君以鄴為憂. 吾進西門豹. 君欲伐中山. 吾進樂羊. 中山既拔. 無守之者. 吾進先生. 君欲置太子傅. 吾進趙蒼. 皆有成功就事. 吾何負於魏成子.
>
> Li Ke replied, "When you mentioned me to our lord, surely you were not sowing seeds for a higher office?! When the lord said to me that he wanted to appoint a minister and that it would either be Cheng or Huang, I told him, 'Your asking for my opinion is because you have not considered [the criteria]. If one is seated [in power], you look at who he is close with; if one is wealthy, you look at what he gives away; if one is untrammeled, you look at whom he promotes; if one is stranded, you look at what he does not do; and if one is

[250] A parallel of the anecdote is found in the "Wei shijia" 魏世家 of the *Shiji*, where Li Ke 李克 convinces Zhai Huang 翟黃 that Wei Chengzi 魏成子 is a better candidate for Duke Wen of Wei's 魏文侯 next minister position. *Shiji*, 44.1840.

impoverished, you look at what he does not take. From these five criteria, you will be able to make your decision. How is my opinion worth your wait?' This is how I know that Wei Chengzi will be appointed minister. Moreover, how will you rival Wei Chengzi? Wei Chengzi has an allowance of a thousand jugs per day. Only one-tenth of it is spent on himself. The other nine-tenth he uses to attract and appoint talents from all over the world. That is how he obtained Bu Zixia, Tian Zifang, and Duangan Mu. All those three our lord treats as teacher and friend, whereas all your recommendations are mere subjects to him. How can you compare yourself to Wei Chengzi?" Zhai Huang stepped back, bowed twice, and said, "This uncouth person is indeed far too ignoble. My response was inappropriate." The *Shi* says, "Bright and glorious is the Zhou; by order she has succeeded her place."

克曰. 子之言克於子之君也. 豈比周以求大官哉. 君問置相. 非成則黃. 二子何如. 臣對曰. 君不察故也. 居則視其所親. 富則視其所與. 達則視其所舉. 窮則視其所不為. 貧則視其所不取. 五者以定矣. 何待克哉. 是以知魏成子為相也. 且子焉得與魏成子比. 魏成子食祿日千鍾. 什一在內. 九在外. 以聘約天下之士. 是以得卜子夏. 田子方. 段干木. 此三人. 君皆師友之. 子之所進皆臣之. 子焉得與魏成子比乎. 翟黃逡巡再拜曰. 鄙人固陋. 失對於夫子. 詩曰. 明昭有周. 式序在位.[251]

Progressing from the most abstract to the most concrete, from the most "tell, not show," to the most "show, not tell," this cluster of materials indicates the authorial equation of the anecdote with other types of illustrative materials. Like inherited words and inherited deeds, the juxtaposition of "anecdote, pun, aphorism, and philosophy that makes up the *HSWC*" [252]attests to the use of the anecdote—and its focus on speech representation—as an integral device of argumentation. In clusters, they do the same thing as the non-anecdotal claims and aphorisms that likewise underwrite the wide applicability of the *Shi*. But by dramatizing a dry precept, by placing it in a concrete context, and by having Li Ke teach the moral of the story not once but twice, the anecdote provides a livelier, if not more accessible avenue to understanding. Speech shoulders the moral of the anecdote, and in this case on a par with the more abstract, philosophical pronouncements. For some readers, Li Ke's speech might be the only access they will take into the teachings behind the dramatization.

In the larger picture, this is what the *Hanshi waizhuan* routinely demonstrates across the entire compilation—by blending different types of materials in the same cluster centered on the same *Shi* quotation, and by having someone speak, perform, and model the arguments alongside more direct

[251] *Hanshi waizhuan jishi*, 86-88.

[252] Hightower, "The Han-shih wai-chuan 韓詩外傳 and the San Chia Shih 三家詩," 263.

"theorizations." The "Yu Lao" does not repeat the same *Laozi* quotation, but it likewise employs a comparable range of materials.[253] Everything quoted in both places is in practice a form of inherited (or borrowed) wisdom that fuels argumentation. They combine to illustrate a grand point about the capaciousness of their chosen reference. When a collection of three-hundred-and-six anecdotes and what Hightower refers to collectively as "ethical-philosophical disquisitions" come (with some exceptions) capped by a *Shi* quotation,[254] the cumulative force of the work, even if not intended, is beyond tangible. The consistency of the Cs combined with the illustrations of the As (and other non-anecdotal materials, for that matter) inspire a P unsaid but implied. In practice, that hidden P is easily compensable by a preface we do not have or an oral instruction we are not the addressees of.

### *Performative Clustering*

The three varieties of the anecdote cluster give us a way to describe clustering with reference to the configuration of its three structural components. The principle of clustering, articulated or not, provides a means of overseeing the entire cluster. The anecdotes, juxtaposed with one another or other types of illustrative materials, supply substantiation with equal argumentative weight. The comment, if available, mediates the relationship between the individual anecdote and the principle of juxtaposition. With A always in clusters, that is, P and C both have the freedom to be either present or absent. All further variations, rare but not unseen, derive from these four basic and yet most employed shapes (two possibilities for P times two possibilities for C).[255]

---

[253] Sarah A. Queen argues that the "Yu Lao" differs from the "Jie Lao" 解老 in that the former only "makes use of illustrative examples culled from a wide pool of anecdotes" while the latter "typically employs philosophical reasoning and argumentation." This is not true. A good portion of the materials capped by a *Laozi* saying in the "Yu Lao" is exactly what can be called "philosophical reasoning and argumentation." Queen simply reads them as argumentative frame rather than illustrative counterparts to the anecdotes, despite the structure that suggests otherwise. See 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 (New York: Springer, 2015), 197-256.

[254] Hightower, "The Han-shih wai-chuan 韓詩外傳 and the San Chia Shih 三家詩," 241.

[255] The "Chu shuo" 儲說 chapters, for example, separate P from A and regroup a cluster of anecdote clusters by first juxtaposing all the Ps before returning to them their respective As. The As are in general not followed

With the anecdote in clusters, speech that carries the illustrative weight of the anecdote also coordinates with the anecdotal narratives on a broader scale. In the *Shuoyuan* iteration of the P-A-C̶, for instance, an array of speaker functions engaging in a variety of speech acts combine to shepherd the reader into selected spheres of moral, ethical, and political suasion. In the "Zhi yue" use of the P-A-C shape, speech not only switches speakers so as to facilitate a unique reading but to parallel other speeches that bear out the same reading. In the *Hanshi waizhuan*, finally, the work's reliance on the P-A-C also confirms a larger trend that regards anecdote, speech, and quotation as belonging in the same league as aphorism, dictum, and other expository forms of writings when used as evidential materials for other arguments. The anecdote *is* all those types of writings.

Everything arising from the three varieties prepares us for the reading of the final and most elusive variation of the anecdote cluster, the P-A-C̶ shape. As the notation indicates, this variation lacks both an apparent P and a (consistent) provision of Cs in the anecdote cluster. Although infrequently met in the available source materials, the existing examples illustrate, however, a strand of clustering that can be described as performative: the kind of argument one can construct from the text depends on one's mode of engagement with it. A silent reader will see a different picture than a student learning from a teacher. For some of the audiences at least, the anecdotes will speak to them in ways more than the speakers in the anecdotes do.

One of the most representative but also most deceptive case of the P-A-C̶ is the "Shui lin" 說林 of the *Han Feizi*.[256] Consisting of seventy-one anecdotes as well as other illustrative materials,

---

by any C but are occasionally joined by non-anecdotal materials such as aphoristic sayings. The similarly unusual "Nan" 難 chapters in the same *Han Feizi*, on the other hand, adopt the P-A-C structure just like the *Hanshi waizhuan* does but turn all the Cs into an opportunity for more elaborate engagement with the As. The As therein are likewise joined by other materials such as Guanzi's 管子 sayings and the unsaid P, as the title suggests, is to interrogate, repudiate, and rebut all the As, thus establishing the superiority of a different hermeneutic system. The clustering of such discursive engagements is part and parcel of the argument because it demonstrates the system's capacity and applicability. The *Han Feizi* also includes other instances of "Nan"-like operations, but they operate largely in isolation, not in clusters (cf., "Wen bian" 問辨, "Wen tian" 問田, "Dingfa" 定法, "Nan shi" 難勢). For the best study on the "Nan" chapters so far published, see Zhang Suzhen 張素貞, *Han Feizi Nan pian yanjiu* 韓非子難篇研究 (Taipei: Xuesheng shuju, 1987).

256 For a systematic study and translation of the "Shui lin," see Michael Andrew Hall Reeve, "Demonstrating the World: Mind and Society in the Shuo lin Chapters of the *Han Fei Zi*," (Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 2003). Reeve's goal is to read the two chapters as a unified, coherent philosophical work that addresses the

the "Shui lin" in two chapters has been taken to comprise either "a collection of raw materials" 原始資料彙編 or an orchestrated work sprinkled with authorial insights: close to a dozen of the collected materials feature some sort of a commentarial language at the end.[257] The former view is premised on the haphazardness of the two chapters—there is indeed no obvious order one can easily discern—as well as the heterogeneity of the materials both in form and in theme;[258] the latter on the belief that the comments are authored by the historical Han Fei. Zheng Liangshu 鄭良樹, one of the first proponents of this latter view, goes on from there to proclaim Han Fei's hand in selecting all the other materials as well.[259]

Considered as an anecdote cluster, however, the "Shui lin" is more than either. It is both a collection of persuasion in its various possible shapes and one that imparts authorial or compilatory intention not through saying it but through doing it. The first aspect of the "Shui lin" is displayed by a liberal understanding of the anecdote, of its fluid configuration, illustrative potential, and equal footing with other types of illustrative materials; the latter by the nature of the anecdote cluster as an argumentative device that the *Han Feizi* on the whole commands at ease. The text tests our common assumptions about the anecdote, speech, and argument-making. Naturally, it renders certain notions of authorship and textuality inadequate.

The "Shui lin" consists of four groups of materials, each differing from the others but all intermixed with one another. The first group, twenty-five out of seventy-one, is the anecdote in its

---

interaction between what he calls "mind, language, and society." He argues that the chapters develop the philosophy by "establishing themes and configurations from one vignette to the next" and by "intertwining themes and configurations to create resonant implications" (p. 414). In other words, Reeve reads the text as a linearly structured string of ideas that builds up, over time, a theory on (mostly) mind and society. While I also argue for an inferable principle of juxtaposition, I do not believe that the text has a hidden significance in the linearity of the materials itself. To me, the text is catalogic and its significance lies elsewhere.

257 See an overview of the debate in Zheng Liangshu 鄭良樹, *Han Fei zhi zhushu ji sixiang* 韓非之著述及思想 (Taipei: Xuesheng shuju, 1993), 244-62; Ma Shinian 馬世年, *Han Feizi de chengshu jiqi wenxue yanjiu* 《韓非子》的成書及其文學研究 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2011), 129-42.

258 Reeve's dissertation is the only study I am aware of that tries to extract coherence from the juxtapositions.

259 For those who believe it, this is the sense in which the "Shui lin" is considered "authentic." See also Bertil Lundahl, *Han Fei Zi: The Man and the Work* (Stockholm: Institute of Oriental Languages, Stockholm University, 1992), 153-54.

full, dramatized shape. In all these instances, the anecdote narrates a speech act of persuasion whose success is confirmed by the narrative. The text opens, for instance, with the following:

> Having overthrown Jie, Tang feared that the world would say that he did it out of greed, so he offered to abdicate the throne to Wuguang. But fearing that Wuguang might actually accept it, he sent someone to dissuade him, saying: "Tang murdered his ruler and wished to pass the stigma onto you, hence his abdication in favor of you." Wuguang thereupon threw himself into a river.
>
> 湯以伐桀. 而恐天下言自己為貪也. 因乃讓天下於務光. 而恐務光之受之也. 乃使人說務光曰. 湯殺君而欲傳惡聲于子. 故讓天下於子. 務光因自投於河.[260]

Tang's unusual hypocrisy aside,[261] the final line that "Wuguang thereupon threw himself into a river" 務光因自投於河 confirms by way of conclusion the success of the persuasion. Tang managed to have someone trick Wuguang into suicide. The verb *shui* 說 (translated above as "dissuade") specifying the illocution of the speech act does not have to be present; a generic *yue* 曰 would have sufficed. But its use precludes misreading. On many other occasions, persuasion is only expressed on the locutionary level, in the words a speaker says. Yet, the illocution is persuasion nonetheless. Consider, for example, the following:

> Having prevailed over Yin, the Duke of Zhou, Dan, was about to attack Shanggai. The Duke of Xin, Jia, said to him, "Bigger forces are harder to conquer; smaller ones are easier to subdue. It is better to first subdue the many small powers before taking on the big ones." Thus, they attacked instead the nine barbarian tribes, after which Shanggai was subdued too.
>
> 周公旦已勝殷. 將攻商蓋. 辛公甲曰. 大難攻. 小易服. 不如服眾小以劫大. 乃攻九夷而商蓋服矣.[262]

---

260 *Han Feizi xin jiaozhu*, 7.461.

261 In all other versions of this well-known story, Wuguang declined the offer on his own. See for example *Zhuangzi jishi*, 28.985-86; *Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi*, 19.1242-43.

262 *Han Feizi xin jiaoshi*, 7.482.

Not anticipated by *shui*, the *buru* 不如 ("not as good as") in the Duke of Xin's words opens his persuasion. In the same manner, the final narration that the plan was changed confirms the success of the persuasion. Marked or not, a character's persuasion of another character springs by necessity from the words he says.

Sometimes, not one but two persuasions are strung into one anecdote, creating a sense of narrative flow otherwise arrested in the more common "set pieces" like the ones above:

> [1] Having defeated Wu, Yue sought soldiers from Jing in a bid to attack Jin. Yixiang, the minister on the left, said to the King of Jing, "Now that Yue has penetrated Wu, their elite personnel are all killed, their frontline soldiers depleted, and their heavy armor damaged. That they seek, now, soldiers from us to attack Jin is simply a pretense that they are not in distress. It would be better for us to raise our army and split Wu with them." The King of Jing said, "Excellent!" Thereupon, Jing raised their army to follow Yue's.
>
> [1] 越已勝吳. 又索卒於荊而攻晉. 左史倚相謂荊王曰. 夫越破吳. 豪士死. 銳卒盡. 大甲傷. 今又索卒以攻晉. 示我不病也. 不如起師與分吳. 荊王曰. 善. 因起師而從越.
>
> [2] The King of Yue was infuriated and wished to strike Jing. But Zhong, his grand minister, said to him, "Do not do it! Our elite personnel are all killed, our heavy armors now in pieces. Should we fight them, we will have no chance at winning. It is better for us to bribe them." Thus, Yue carved up 500 miles of territory north of Mount. Lu to bribe Jing with.
>
> [2] 越王怒. 將擊之. 大夫種曰. 不可. 吾豪士盡. 大甲傷. 我與戰必不剋. 不如賂之. 乃割露山之陰五百里以賂之.[263]

Two exchanges, two persuasions, two narrative confirmations of success. The king's "excellent" 善 is with the causal connectives *yin* 因 and *nai* 乃 the most common—and formulaic—expressions of result. In the majority of cases, the persuasion is also the centerpiece of narration. But occasionally, a few more exchanges join the narrative frame to lay the groundwork for the persuasion materializing only at the end of a conversation.[264] In either case, a clearly articulated persuasion is first situated in a

[263] *Han Feizi xin jiaoshi*, 7.513.

[264] See for example the Tian Si 田駟 anecdote (*Han Feizi xin jiaoshi*, 7.475) and the Lord Jingguo 靖郭君 anecdote (*Han Feizi xin jiaoshi*, 8.517).

concrete context and then acknowledged to have worked. Dramatization and narration substantiate the role each other plays in the anecdote.

Joining this first group of materials are seventeen anecdotes that uniformly lack a concluding narration but instead come to a full stop whenever the speaker has finished speaking. The story ends *in medias res*. One of the first examples looks like this:

> King Hui of Wei went into the Covenant of Jiuli, which would restore the position of the Son of Heaven. Peng Xi said to the ruler of Zheng: "Do not listen to it, your Lordship. Big states loathe the existence of the Son of Heaven, only small states benefit from it. If you and the other big states turn a deaf ear to it, how is Wei going to restore the Son of Heaven with the other small states?!"
>
> 魏惠王為臼里之盟. 將復立於天子. 彭喜謂鄭君曰. 君勿聽. 大國惡有天子. 小國利之. 若君與大不聽. 魏焉能與小立之.[265]

Although left open-ended, the strong negation *wuting* 勿聽 ("do not listen to it") in Peng Xi's speech signals early on that what follows is also an act of persuasion. Someone is going to be dissuaded from something. In another example, this unmarked illocution of persuasion is made doubly clear by the addition of *buru* 不如 in the locution, which introduces a way out of mere disapproval:

> Zhou Zao said to Gong Ta, "Please say this for me to the King of Qi, 'If Qi is willing to help me prevail in Wei, I shall serve you with Wei.'" Gong Ta said, "This is not advisable. This would be you showing the King of Qi that you do not possess Wei; he is for sure not going to aid someone who does not possess Wei but will instead grow antagonistic to he who does. You, my lord, had better say, '*per* your desire, I wish to submit to you with Wei.' The King of Qi will then think that you already have Wei, and will therefore grant you his favor. By thus gaining Qi, you will have both Qi and Wei.'"
>
> 周趮謂宮他曰. 為我謂齊王曰. 以齊資我於魏. 請以魏事王. 宮他曰. 不可. 是示之無魏也. 齊王必不資於無魏者. 而以怨有魏者. 公不如曰. 以王之所欲. 臣請以魏聽王. 齊王必以公為有魏也. 必因公. 是公有齊也. 因以有齊魏矣.[266]

---

[265] *Han Feizi xin jiaoshi*, 7.463.

[266] Ibid., 8.508.

Gong Ta is thus handing Zhou Zao both a quick disapproval and a clear alternative. Such two-part persuasions mark the speakers' speech in most members of this group.[267] It compensates for the underdetermined illocutions marked here all by *yue*. While typical in this group of the materials, some anecdotes forego such markers of persuasion altogether (*wuting*, *buke*, and *buru* included) in favor of subtler ways of expression. Nevertheless, even if the locution sounds more subdued, the illocution is still unambiguously a persuasion. Consider, for example, the following:

> Duke Mu of Lu sent his many princes to take up offices either in Jin or Jing. Li Chu said, "Say that you borrow someone from Yue to rescue a drowning child here, even though the Yue people are skilled at swimming, the child will not live. Say, again, that you have a fire, but you go fetch your water from the sea. Even though the sea has plenty of water, the fire will not be extinguished. Water faraway does not eliminate a fire nearby. Now, even though Jin and Jing are both powerful, Qi is, however, closer to us. Does Lu really worry about their not coming to her rescue?"
>
> 魯穆公使眾公子或宦於晉或宦於荊. 犁鉏曰. 假人於越而救溺子. 越人雖善遊. 子必不生矣. 失火而取水於海. 海水雖多. 火必不滅矣. 遠水不救近火也. 今晉與荊雖強. 而齊近. 魯患其不救乎.[268]

Couched in two analogies, Li Chu is telling Duke Mu that his plan is miscalculated, that Jin and Jing will not reward him for volunteering, basically, his children as hostages. Instead, he implies, Lu should cultivate (that) relationship with Qi. For geopolitically, the two bordering states would share more interests. The same disapproval-alternative progression unfolds, in this case, more artfully.

In whichever case, speech in this second group of materials remains that of persuasion. The only difference with the first group is the absence of a final narration, of an "end" to the story that also confirms the success of the persuasion. For readers who want consistency, this may just as well suggest incoherence, haphazardness, a lack of authorship. But if so willing, one could also follow the grain of the text and assume the opposite. As Schaberg has written of the *Zuozhuan*, "when it is not

[267] See also *Han Feizi xin jiaoshi*, 7.462, 468 (second anecdote), 471 (second anecdote), 477 (first anecdote), 483 (second anecdote), 8.508 (both anecdotes), 516, 519.

[268] *Han Feizi xin jiaoshi*, 7.476.

stated, the habits of reading prompt readers to enunciate the judgment for themselves."[269] In a text where the first group, although scattered, all combine to establish a clear reference for judgment, it would not be unthinkable for a silent reader, for example, to pick up the habit while reading the text. The persuasions here can be likewise successful, if only because the author/compiler took the trouble to put them in writing, together, in this particular setting. In reality, the final narration may not even have mattered if the reader approached the text under the instruction of a teacher. Reader's engagement notwithstanding, a strong authorial or compilatory control is discernible in at least the selection of the materials—that is, selection of the same speech act of persuasion, expressed so far in the voice of the anecdotes' protagonists.

The third group, still anecdotes and eleven in number, are the very materials that led some accounts of the "Shui lin" to argue for Han Fei's authorship, and against "thoughtless" compilation. Next to the anecdotes, there are now commentarial languages that trigger a different mode of interpretation. The first anecdote in this group reads like this:

> Guan Zhong and Xi Peng accompanied Duke Huan of Qi on an expedition against Guzhu. They left in the spring, returned in the winter, and got lost on the road. Guan Zhong said, "The wit of an old horse can be borrowed." They thus set free an old horse, followed it, and found their way. While they were trekking through the mountains they ran out of water. Xi Peng said, "Ants live on the south side of the mountain in the winter and the north side in the spring. For every inch of the ants' nest [above ground], there will be water one *ren* [seven to eight *chi* 尺] beneath." So, they dug up the ground and found water. With Guan Zhong's wisdom and Xi Peng's intellect, when facing things they did not know, they still felt no shame in learning from horses and ants. Is it not too absurd that today's people, foolish as they are, do not know well enough to learn from the wisdom of the sage?
>
> 管仲隰朋從於桓公而伐孤竹. 春往冬反. 迷惑失道. 管仲曰. 老馬之智可用也. 乃放老馬而隨之. 遂得道. 行山中無水. 隰朋曰. 蟻冬居山之陽. 夏居山之陰. 蟻壤一寸而仞有水. 乃掘地. 遂得水. 以管仲之聖. 而隰朋之智. 至其所不知. 不難師於老馬與蟻. 今人不知以其愚心而師聖人之智. 不亦過乎.[270]

[269] Schaberg, *A Patterned Past*, 181.

[270] *Han Feizi xin jiaozhu*, 7.474.

Unlike the previous examples, the characters and events in the anecdote are now commented on. In a departure from the earlier speeches, the words uttered also no longer read like a persuasion. Both Guan Zhong and Xi Peng simply addressed a situation they were facing. The first peculiarity saves the "Shui lin," claims Zheng Liangshu, from being discounted in value (價值就必須大打折扣), that is, from having no place in the discussion of Han Fei's thought (在討論韓非思想時，它們恐怕無法佔一席之地了).[271] The second, argue Zheng's critics in favor of conventional wisdom, shows that 說, the keyword in the title, should be pronounced *shuo*. Instead of persuasion, the argument goes, speech here is more generally something spoken, hence *shuo* in the most basic sense but for the purpose of explication, illustration, or allegorization.[272] No matter how one looks at it, this group of materials seems to complicate any explanation of the larger text.

It does not necessarily, however, when we put on hold some of the hermeneutic premises implied in either view. *Shuo* and *shui*, first of all, do not conflict.[273] While the protagonists of the anecdote might be simply saying something, their *shuo* can be the author's *shui*, against his audience. As in the case of the Duke Mu anecdote where Li Chu's persuasion is phrased strictly as a question ("Does Lu really worry about their not coming to her rescue?" 魯患其不救乎), the author's one particular illocution can be fulfilled by a diversity of locutions as well. In that sense, when the comment here is not differentiated from the anecdote, read as paratext, or considered (only) as an "inward-looking" effort to contain the meaning of the anecdote,[274] what is said in it makes a perfect

---

271 Zheng Liangshu, *Han Fei zhi zhushu ji sixiang*, 246. See also his analysis (of this anecdote too) in p.252-26.

272 See for example Ma Shinian, *Han Feizi de chengshu jiqi wenxue yanjiu*, 129-142.

273 A strict differentiation is often insisted on for other arguments about compilation and composition. See for example Schwermann, "Anecdote Collections as Argumentative Texts: The Composition of the *Shuoyuan*," 153, 56; Du, "The Mastery of Miscellanea: Information Management and Knowledge Acquisition in the 'Chu shuo' Chapters of the *Hanfeizi*," 121. For a more nuanced discussion of the two, see Martin Kern, "'Persuasion' or 'Treatise'? The Prose Genres of *Shui* 說 and *Shuo* 說 in the Light of the *Guwenci leizuan* of 1779," in *Ad Seres et Tungusos: Festschrift für Martin Gimm*, ed., Lutz Bieg, Erling von Mende, and Martina Siebert (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2000), 221-243.

274 There is a tendency to assume all such things when examining an anecdote with the addition of a comment. As Schaberg has written, "Marked judgment…lies at the margins of anecdotes without themselves constituting anecdotes" (*A Patterned Past*, 174). While applicable on many occasions, this should not be over-generalized without pausing at the specific context (Newell Ann Van Auken, for instance, questions the case of *Zuozhuan* in her "Judgments of the Gentleman: A New Analysis of the Place of *Junzi* Comments in

*shui* out of this anecdote. The two speeches by Guan Zhong and Xi Peng feed into a more general statement about the significance of learning, humility, and knowledge. The message is that you, dear readers, should learn too from the wise if you heed the moral of the story. As in the Duke Mu anecdote, the final question here is not inviting an answer but, by being rhetorical, reflection and conversion. The success of the persuasion depends again on the audience's participation. And the speaker's *shuo* becomes part of the author's *shui*. Like the protreptic question-and-answer, the entire anecdote is the locution of the author's illocution.

For all the other members of this group, this is precisely how persuasion works. When, for example, a certain Wei 衛 parent told his daughter that "you must secretly stock up and stash away" 必私積聚 after marrying her off, resulting in her expulsion from the in-laws', a comment attributes blame to the father as someone who "does not fault himself for teaching his daughter indecency but rather consider himself to be accumulating wealth" 不自罪於教子非也. 而自知其益富. From there, the comment concludes, "Nowadays, people occupying offices are all of the same type" 今人臣之處官者皆是類也,[275] hinting now at a broader audience by means of, likewise, an analogy. The father's spoken instruction to the daughter prefaces the two-part comment that includes in it a persuasion, or dissuasion rather, that doing so will get you, current and future officials, out of a job as well. A dark, sarcastic cautionary tale is also a persuasion.

Alternatively, consider this slightly lengthier but much more direct expression of persuasion, still through the commentarial language but not merely implied:

> Bole was teaching two people how to appraise the Kicker, a horse breed, and they went together to Jianzi's stable to look at horses. One of them identified a Kicker. The other went

*Zuozhuan* Composition History," *Monumenta Serica* 64.2 [2016]: 277-302). The "Nan" chapters of the *Han Feizi* offer another counterexample. Of the four anecdotes that conclude with a comment attributed to Zhongni 仲尼, the ensuing critique targets Zhongni's comment more than it does the anecdote *per se*. While perhaps unprovable, it suggests the likelihood that the anecdote and the comment belonged together: not only do the four comments in every single case begin with a judgement on the main character in the anecdote, they also, like in the Guan Zhong and Xi Peng anecdote, go from there to say something more general. Without the anecdote, the comments will lack the referents that comprise the comments' exact content.

[275] *Han Feizi xin jiaozhu*, 7.487.

around to its back, stroked its rump three times, but the horse did no kicking. The first person therefore thought he had failed the appraisal. The other person said, "You did not. This horse is suffering from broken shoulders and swollen knees. When a Kicker kicks his hind legs, he has to put his weight on the front legs. This one's swollen knees cannot bear his weight, so he did not kick. You indeed are skilled at appraising the Kicker, but you are clumsy at recognizing swollen knees." Now, everything goes back somewhere. This is how everything…[276] That swollen knees cannot bear weight is what only the wise can see. Master Hui once said, "When you encage a gibbon, it will be no different from a piglet." Therefore, when the circumstances are not favorable, it is not the time to showcase one's skills.

伯樂教二人相踶馬. 相與之簡子廄觀馬. 一人舉踶馬. 其一人從後而循之. 三撫其尻而馬不踶. 此自以為失相. 其一人曰. 子非失相也. 此其為馬也. 踒肩而腫膝. 夫踶馬也者舉後而任前. 腫膝不可任也. 故後不舉. 子巧於相踶馬而拙於任腫膝. 夫事有所必歸. 而以有所 X. 腫膝而不任. 智者之所獨知也. 惠子曰. 置猿於柙中. 則與豚同. 故勢不便. 非所以逞能也.[277]

As in the Guan Zhong and Xi Peng anecdote, nothing said by the two speakers is in any sense a persuasion. Yet, the *shuo* feeds into a layered progression of commentarial materials that eventually arrives at a generalized point. It goes from a targeted remark on the anecdote to an intermediary quotation from Master Hui to an unqualified claim on *shi* 勢, circumstances, and the timing of one's endeavor. Both the horse and the appraiser can be said to be the victim of unfavorable *shi*. Although some members in this group leap straight to the final step, marking likewise a highly generalized comment with *gu yue* 故曰,[278] the transference of the persuasive message from the anecdotal story *per se* to the comment concluding it remains the same. The anecdote prepares the ground, the comment ties everything up, and both make up the entirety of the author's persuasion, which in this case is presented as an axiom instead of a rhetorical question. Whether Han Fei authored any of the comments is unverifiable; they could have belonged with the anecdotes to begin with. What is more evident is the consistency of the format, of the coordination between the anecdotal stories and the comments, and of the comments "speaking" the persuasions. All of that is an aspect of authorship,

[276] As the commentary notes, it is very likely that some part of the text is missing here. See *Han Feizi xin jiaozhu*, 8.492.

[277] *Han Feizi xin jiaozhu*, 8.490.

[278] See for example *Han Feizi xin jiaozhu*, 7.478-79, 488 (second anecdote); 8.496 (second anecdote), 498, 505, 506.

implied or real, more broadly conceivable. The "value" and "thought" of the "Shui lin" lie in the authorial/compilatory principle that is shown, not told.[279]

The last group of materials calls also for the reader's keenest participation—willing accommodation, even. The eighteen pieces of materials depart quite a bit from the others and divide further into two subgroups: one of cautionary tales, the other anecdotes of prediction. Among the cautionary tales, a finer distinction can be still drawn between an allegory-based tale (marked [T-al] below) and an anecdote-based one (marked [T-an]). See, for example, the following:

> [T-al] Among birds there is a breed known as "Feathery Heady." Its head is heavy and its tail short. Whenever it tries to drink water from a river, it will inevitably topple. Only by clinging onto its own feather can it drink from a river. If among people there are those who cannot drink with their feet planted, they cannot but seek their own feathers as well.
>
> [T-al] 鳥有翽翽者. 重首而屈尾. 將欲飲於河則必顛. 乃銜其羽而飲之. 人之所有飲不足者. 不可不索其羽也.[280]
>
> [T-an] King Zhou drank all night long. Reveling, he lost track of time. He asked his left and right, but no one knew either. King Zhou, then, sent someone to ask Jizi. Jizi said to his disciples, "When someone presides over the entire world but all his statesmen lose track of time, the world is in peril. If the entirety of the statesmen does not know while I do, then I will be in danger." Feigning intoxication, Jizi said he did not know either.
>
> [T-an] 紂為長夜之飲.懽以失日. 問其左右盡不知也. 乃使人問箕子. 箕子謂其徒曰. 為天下主而一國皆失日. 天下其危矣. 一國皆不知而我獨知之. 吾其危矣. 辭以醉而不知.[281]

How is either of the above a persuasion? When read equally as cautionary tales. As tautological as it may sound, reading them as cautionary tales is the strongest faith a reader can place in the "Shui lin," in the possibility that a collection of diverse materials can somehow make coherent sense. The T-al example presents less of an obstacle since the persuasion is already expressed in the second half of

---

[279] On this point, I agree (mostly) with Reeve that "Like a demonstration in a chemistry class, the Shuo lin demonstrations sever as a telling and an acting out of their arguments." Reeve, "Demonstrating the World," 89.

[280] Ibid, 8.494.

[281] *Han Feizi xin jiaozhu*, 7.483.

the tale. Like materials in the third group, the first part on the unfortunate bird supplies the second part with evidence, context, and a very particular, analogical entry point into a more general claim. Whether read as persuasion or dissuasion, the example will spark some thinking and, eventually, a conclusion. In form, all the T-al inclusions differ from the anecdotes but corroborate the latter's equal status shared with more expository writings as illustrative materials; in function, they provide another "medium" of, or approach to, persuasion, but persuasion nonetheless.

As with the equation of the anecdote with other types of illustrative materials, the formal line between an allegory and an anecdote is fairly thin as well. Not only can the allegory be reimagined as an anecdote, with perhaps lively conversations between two birds,[282] some other examples in this subgroup already resemble an anecdote, only removed of speech.[283] This fluidity we have already seen in the earlier chapters is one of the reasons the T-an example can be read as a cautionary tale as well. The dramatization is easily transformable back into a drier narration. Regardless, a moral is already embedded in the story. It is just not articulated. The judgment, like in the case of the entire second group of the "Shui lin" materials, is left to be made by the readers. In the same way the first group of anecdotes differs from the second group, T-al likewise provides a conclusion that T-an omits.

---

[282] That the characters are insects is not a problem. One of the anecdotes in the first group feature four lice talking to each other. See *Han Feizi xin jiaozhu*, 8.503. Animal protagonists are common in other sources too.

[283] A good example is the following:

> "Among the rich merchants of Song there is one named Jian Zhizi. When he was once competing with others to buy a jade worth of a hundred gold, he pretended to have dropped it, thus damaging it. For that, he paid the owner a hundred gold. He then fixed the damage and gained a thousand more. For any enterprise, there will be both the undertaking of it and the abandoning of it. When you prefer not to undertake it, it already spells failure for you."
>
> 宋之富賈有監止子者. 與人爭買百金之璞玉. 因佯失而毀之. 負其百金. 而理其毀瑕. 得千溢焉. 事有舉之而有敗. 而賢其毋舉之者. 負之時也. (*Han Feizi xin jiaozhu*, 8.500.)

What seems really problematic are the three remaining anecdotes that are all predictions. Out of the seventy-one, only these exceptions do not constitute a persuasion in any way imaginable. The most enigmatic one looks like this:

> A son of Zheng origin was about to take up office. He told his family, "We have to fix the broken walls. Bad people will try to steal from us." People in the neighborhood also said the same. Before the walls were fixed, someone indeed stole from them. The family thought that the son was wise, and that whoever in the neighborhood that told others about it must have been the thief.
>
> 鄭人有一子. 將宦. 謂其家曰. 必築壞牆. 是不善人將竊. 其巷人亦云. 不時築. 而人果竊之. 以其子為智. 以巷人告者為盜.[284]

More charitably, one could say that prediction is in some sense a persuasion as well: the one who makes a prediction is persuaded of something, hence the prediction. Less charitably, we have every reason to consider this example, and the two others as well,[285] as a glitch, a contradiction, a witness to the lack of coherence, coordination, and authorial oversight in the "Shui lin." All such claims have been made on similar bases. Yet, the most reasonable solution to me is to exercise some tolerance for *play*, for what is an enumerative mode of textual production to admit and display entropy, for the uncertainties in an early text's transmission history to take their rightful toll. Few collections are without some kind of peculiarities, and play is not a problem but an aspect of collected works. Even the *Wenxuan* 文選, the collection *par excellence*, is not perfect in every way.[286] Much less should we demand from an earlier text typically fraught with all sorts of textual problems. How *much* play one

---

[284] Ibid., 8.520.

[285] See the anecdotes about Zangsun Zi 藏孫子 (*Han Feizi xin jiaozhu*, 7.468) and Lu Dan 魯丹 (*Han Feizi xin jiaozhu*, 7.488).

[286] For instance, the genre terms listed in the preface do not match those used to categorize the selections; some genre categories appear to be *ad hoc* designations while others mere filters. See for example James Robert Hightower, "The *Wen Hsuan* and Genre Theory," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 20 (1957): 512–33; David Knechtges, "The Problem with Anthologies: the Case of the 'Bai yi' Poems of Ying Qu (190-252)," *Asia Major*, *3rd Series* 23.1 (2010): 173–99.

can entertain before it becomes a problem is of course another issue, but three out of seventy-one seems far from alarming. In fact, it only bespeaks the quality of this collection.

Taken together, the "Shui lin" is neither a "collection of raw materials" nor a half-hearted exercise in philosophical reasoning. Rather, it is a collection of persuasion in its various possible shapes, and a very coherent one. There is both diversity and consistency within each of the varieties. Both, then, combine to bear out the connotations of *lin* 林, forest, in the title. Like the "*forest* of persuasions," an actual forest would also consist of multiple species, an amount of each, and a few rabbit holes. One would not question the integrity of the forest because of the rabbit holes. As the materials are in the "forest of *persuasions*," the trees in a real forest would also follow no particular order. Those who enter it will make their own way, be led or misled, and leave with different sorts of impressions. Structural haphazardness is part and parcel of the argument, for the juxtaposition is catalogic. It is, then, in the unity of the persuasions that the "Shui lin" cohere as a text, and it is owing to the demonstrably conscientious author/compiler that an overarching P can be observed in the "Shui lin" as an exceptional P-A-C type of anecdote cluster. In all cases, clustering is a product of the narrative techniques that have sedimented into a set of conventions. Dramatized direct speech takes the center stage of meaning-making, but always in coordination with narration that prepares the stage, large or small.

## 6. Rhetoric, Once Again

The "Shui lin" is an exceptional case. Nonetheless, it is not the only case where the anecdote cluster as a commonplace structure is reaching the limits of its formal recognizability. Nor is it the only instance where the author's voice is fulfilled by, blended into, and even juxtaposed with those of the protagonists of the anecdotes. Far less unique is its reliance on speech representation as the focus of narration, the main theater of meaning construction. The preponderance of speech in the "Shui lin" illustrates in fact a more general tendency the foregoing chapters all serve to corroborate: in speech representation, that is, preference is given to dramatized direct speech. Indirect speech is also seen, but only in the absolute minority of cases. On the contrary, even within dramatized direct speech, reference to another voice is still, more often than not, represented as dramatized direct speech. Such is how the narrative devices of prosopopoeia and apostrophe are widely observable as well. In the most remarkable cases, a speaker will instruct his addressee, in a direct speech made to the addressee, what to say to the addressee's addressee by modeling for him, still in dramatized direct speech, how exactly to say it.[287] The preference occurs at every diegetic level.

There is no "theory" in early Chinese sources that accounts for, much less stipulates, this representational peculiarity. Generations of scribes, authors, and compilers appear to have simply done it this way when it comes to speech representation. Direct speech can be therefore said to constitute both a convention and a technique, one that apparently *defines* the early Chinese approach to the spoken word, especially as it pertains to writing.[288] As a convention, however, it does allow us

---

[287] I will show some examples in Part III. In the last chapter, Li Ke's 李克 speech to Zhai Huang 翟黃 is a variation on the same trope. Instead of instructing the addressee what to say, it is an example of retelling one's addressee in direct speech what one has earlier said to a different addressee. Although not used for the purposes of either modeling or repeating, the formulaic expression "let me tell you" 吾語汝 often stresses self-referentially the significance of one's direct speech to another.

[288] In the Hebrew Bible, direct speech is also given special privilege over narration. In other traditions like the Rigveda, the spoken word is the medium in which texts are created and transmitted, even after written recessions have been created. See, respectively, Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, 2011), 79-110; Stephanie W. Jamison and Joel P. Brereton, "Introduction," in *The Rigveda: The Earliest Religious Poetry of India*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 1-84.

to trace its origin and development and by means of all that make conjectures about its value, appeal, and constraints. As mentioned earlier, direct speech is the very trigger and target of both traditional and contemporary disputations on issues like authorship, authenticity, and increasingly textuality.[289] To that end, this chapter highlights two moments in the long tradition of speech representation where the same preference for dramatized direct speech affords us more insight into its prevalence and longevity. The first reveals an effort at conventionalization at a time when the tradition seems to have just begun. The second betrays how, after centuries of change in the cultural, social, and political contexts of textual production, speech is still given privilege as a special form of expression, a site of aesthetic production.

Both, in turn, will join all the other chapters in this dissertation to help us rethink the issue of early Chinese rhetoric. Recognizing, now, the incomparability of the otherwise paradigmatic Greek and Roman notions of rhetoric, scholars have recently turned to emic Chinese discourse for new frameworks of analysis.[290] But the difference they maintain between *bianshui* 辯說, "the mastery of a set of pragmatic oratorical skills related to the effective use of language," and *xiuci* 修辭, "aesthetically appreciable exposition of an argument," still implies a distinction between oral and written communication.[291] The question is not that *bianshui* and *xiuci* thus defined "are not necessarily contradictory, but rather complementary…thus requiring further adjustments."[292] The

---

[289] As the first scholar of early China to have written extensively on paratextuality, Heng Du alerts us to the relevance Gérard Genette has to our materials. In Genette's system, however, paratextuality is only one among five types of "transtextual relationships" whose interconnections to "one another are numerous and often crucial" (i.e., intertextuality, paratextuality, metatextuality, hypertextuality, and architextuality). To me, situating paratextuality in this larger network of interrelationships will further help us elucidate the various aspects of early Chinese textuality that are also, as Genette says, "reciprocal" and "overlapping" (Genette, *Palimpsests*, 1-10.) In that sense, the "Shui lin" examples from earlier illustrate how commentarial language, for example, can stride the boundaries between both paratext and metatext, on the one hand, and, on the other, comprise the same *text* of the author's illocution as his in-text speakers' speech does. Retaining this hermeneutic flexibility is beneficial to the reading of many more texts.

[290] See, for example, Lisa Indraccolo and Wolfgang Behr, "Introduction," *Asiatische Studien - Études asiatiques* (Special Issue: Masters of Disguise? – Conceptions and Misconceptions of 'Rhetoric' in Chinese Antiquity) 68 (2014): 889-913; Indraccolo, "What is 'Rhetoric' Anyway? Briared in Words in Early China," *Asiatische Studien* 68.1 (2014): 331-341.

[291] Indraccolo and Behr, "Introduction," 906.

[292] Ibid., 907.

question is that oral communication does not exist outside of, and cannot be extricated from, the mediation of writing. Insofar as "oratorical skills" are accessible to us, they reside already in written representations of direct speech. Whatever "pragmatic art of argumentation and persuasion which abides by a set of predictable communication delivery frameworks" there was in early China, it came down to us in the "communication delivery frameworks" circumscribed by writing.[293] The question-and-answer discussed in chapter 3 is already a good example that "communication" between two interlocutors can be itself a creation of a ventriloquizing author. As this chapter will show further, more "oratorical skills," especially those related to "argumentation and persuasion," also derive from the "predictable…frameworks" that writing prescribes in the first place. Rhetoric in early China cannot but be approached as a written construct.[294]

### *The Primacy of Direct Speech*

The earliest speech representation that proves to have retained a profound influence ever since can be found in the bronze inscriptions.[295] Known by the name of *ceming* 冊命 (investiture, appointment), these inscriptions follow from and center on a royal speech in the voice of a king who

---

[293] Ibid., 908.

[294] What appears to underlie (although not indicated) Indraccolo and Behr's approach to rhetoric, especially when they mention such notions as "communication framework" and "communication circumstances," is a difference Mikhail Bakhtin has made between what he calles primary (simple) and secondary (complex) speech genres. Secondary speech genres, primarily written, is according to Bakhtin what "during the process of their formation…absorb and digest various primary (simple) genres that have taken form in unmediated speech communication." Both speech genres, Bakhtin maintains, are "determined by the specific nature of the particular sphere of communication." An academic essay, that is to say, is as dependent on the context of scholarly communication for its "thematic content, style, and compositional structure" as a coffee shop conversation with a chance encounter is. Just as Bakhtin's primary speech genres cannot be recovered in the case of early China, any contention for "oratorical skills" have to reconcile with the fact that oratory is already a secondary speech genre. See Bakhtin, "The Problem of Speech Genres," esp. 60-67.

[295] Strictly, the oracle bone inscriptions are the first instances of speech appearing in writing. The charge is typically marked as speech. Given the inscriptions' extreme brevity and formulaicity, I exclude them from discussion. In terms of historical influence, they are also less relevant to my purpose than bronze inscriptions.

is thereby conferring title, office, land, and/or gifts on an awardee of such honor and obligation.[296] In some cases, the inscription is narrated entirely in the third person, but in the more typical cases, the king's speech, also the narrative core of a *ceming* inscription, is quoted at length if not in full.[297] With bronze being a costly material, the decision to represent a speech in that way entails a decision to privilege the spoken word in the most sumptuous way possible;[298] used in ancestral sacrifices and other ritual ceremonies, bronze vessels together with the inscriptions on them also signify culture, power, and esteem. The speech has documentary, commemorative, and symbolic values.[299]

Within this entire enterprise, it is curious, however, that an inscription presumably dedicated to one's ancestors should feature a speech from the king so prominently. Granted, the king's charge is according to all evidence delivered orally at the *ceming* ceremony, and the awardee who is now the donor of the vessel (or vessels) likely is given a copy of the charge as well. Furthermore, it is in the speech that the charge's specific content is recorded. But why does the donor opt to reproduce the charge not only with regard to its content but also to the "original" medium, that is, the king's voice,

---

[296] In addition to the king's *ceming*, about 100 inscriptions feature *ceming* from a high official, regional lord, or lineage head. They very much resemble the king's *ceming* in terms of rhetoric and structure. For a recent study focusing specifically on this corpus, see Zou Fudu 邹芙都 and Zha Feineng 查飛能, *Xizhou "fei duiyang wangxiu" mingwen yanjiu* 西周"非對揚王休"銘文研究 (Beijing: Kexue chubanshe, 2017). For the king's *ceming*, see basic introductions to the rituals and procedures in Martin Kern, "The Performance of Writing in Western Zhou China," in *The Poetics of Grammar and the Metaphysics of Sound and Sign*, ed. S. La Porta and D. Shulman (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 109-75; Ondřej Škrabal, "From Royal Court to Ancestral Shrine: Transposition of Command Documents in Early Chinese Epigraphy," *Manuscript and Text Cultures* 1 (2022): 144-204; Lothar von Falkenhausen, "Issues in Western Zhou Studies: A Review Article," *Early China* 18 (1993): esp. 141-171; Chen Hanping 陳漢平, *Xizhou ceming zhidu yanjiu* 西周冊命制度研究 (Shanghai: Xuelin chubanshe, 1986).

[297] While it is not difficult to identify a *ceming* inscription, scholars do disagree on the exact configuration of the *ceming* corpus—due largely to their varying understanding of what counts as *ceming*. See for example a comparison in He Shuhuan 何樹環, *Xizhou ximing mingwen xinyan* 西周錫命銘文新研 (Taipei: Wenjin chubanshe, 2007), 11-84.

[298] It has long been argued that more perishable materials like bamboo slips must have been used as the primary carrier of the king's decree before they are given to the appointee and then transferred onto bronze. For a most recent study on the manuscript basis of bronze inscriptions, see Ondřej Škrabal, "Writing before Inscribing: On the Use of Manuscripts in the Production of Western Zhou Bronze Inscriptions," *Early China* 42 (2019): 273-332.

[299] See, for example, Wu Hung, *Monumentality in Early Chinese Art and Architecture* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995), 53-63.

with which it is associated?[300] Why is reported speech not the more common solution when the donor is apparently addressing his own ancestors at the ancestral sacrifice? Regardless of whether the donor wants the inscription to be seen, read, or even reenacted at the sacrifice,[301] presenting the charge in dramatized direct speech leaves both the ancestors and the living mere overhearers of the king's speech addressed to the donor alone. Like almost all later speech representations, the speaker speaks to an external audience indirectly.

The answer appears to have little to do with literary technology since reported speech is routinely used, especially in regard to the king. One of the formulaic components of the *ceming* inscription is where the king "calls on," *hu* 呼, someone, usually a *shi* 史 (archivist) of some kind, to announce the *ceming* for him (e.g., "the king called on the head of the recording office to read out[302] the decree to Qiu" 王呼尹式册命逑; 43rd-year Qiu-*ding* 四十三年逑鼎). Another, this time a regular part of the *ceming* speech itself, the king can *hu* his aid to also give out the gifts on his behalf (e.g., "the king called on Archivist Bo to bestow on Mao cowries" 王呼史伯賜懋貝; Shi Mao-*hu* 史懋壺). Unless *hu* is imagined to be a wordless gesture the meaning of which is perfectly transparent to the king's aids in every single case, reproducing the king's words in his own voice must have been a choice.

In that choice, a sense of representational decorum seems to have outweighed other considerations as well. The king in writing exists as a speaker function, a "body sonic," so to speak,[303] when it comes to the exercising of his authority. Material cost, for example, presents no

---

[300] Whether the charge is uttered by the king at the ceremony or by a delegate of his has been the subject of a longtime debate. In either case, the *speech act* of charging an awardee is only successful when the voice of that speech is the king's, whether personally delivered or reenacted by a delegate. It is in that sense that the king's voice is the original medium of the charge.

[301] A common observation is that the inscriptions, due to their placement inside the vessels, will be covered by sacrificial food and thus rendered invisible. That being the case, Škrabal argues that the vessels will be on display at social events as well, so people can observe them more closely. See Škrabal, "From Royal Court to Ancestral Shrine," 175-180.

[302] For this reading of the ambiguous *ceming*, I follow Kern, "The Performance of Writing in Western Zhou China," 152-57.

[303] I am thinking of *The King's Two Bodies* by Ernest Kantorowicz ([Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957]) and specifically the differentiation made between the "body politic" and the "body natural."

obstacle to reproducing the king's speech at length. In one of the longest inscriptions known to date, the Mao Gong-*ding* 毛公鼎 devotes 477 of the 497 graphs to the king's speech in his own voice.[304] The remaining 20 graphs are spent on a condensed version of the statements of dedication and purpose, appended to the end of the speech.[305] No narration precedes the dramatized direct speech. Likewise, the progression of history also brought little change. The well-known Qin Gong 秦公 vessels (Qin Gong-*bo* 秦公鎛, Qin Gong-*gui* 秦公簋, Qin Gong-*zhong* 秦公鐘), datable in the earliest to the pre-imperial state of the Qin, feature a similarly minimally contextualized speech in which the Duke of Qin sings the praise of both his ancestors and himself.[306] Not a *ceming* inscription featuring also not any of the Zhou kings, the three inscriptions nonetheless present the speaking voice of the Qin ruler the same way the Mao Gong-*ding* that of the Zhou king.

Some other differences separate the Mao Gong-*ding* from the Qin Gong vessels, but none prevented either donor from dramatizing the spoken word. While the Mao Gong-*ding* and all other *ceming* inscriptions reproduce the king's speech as a quotation, the Qin Gong vessels represent a different type of bronze inscription often dubbed *qizhu yue* 器主曰, "the donor says."[307] The coinage describes a kind of inscription that began also in the early Western Zhou in which the donor presents a speech of his own on a bronze vessel, marked explicitly by *yue*.[308] Focusing on the retelling

---

304 For an introduction and translation, see, *A Source Book of Ancient Chinese Bronze Inscriptions, Revised Edition*, ed. Constance A. Cook and Paul R. Goldin (Berkeley: The Society for the Study of Early China, 2020), 204-209.

305 For the terminologies, see Lothar von Falkenhausen, "Issues in Western Zhou Studies: A Review Article," 152-61.

306 See *A Source Book of Ancient Chinese Bronze Inscriptions*, 245-250; Martin Kern, *The Stele Inscriptions of Ch'in Shih-Huang: Texts and Ritual in Early Chinese Imperial Representation* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 2000), 59-105.

307 The phrase is first coined by Qiu Xigui 裘錫圭. See Qiu Xigui, "Rongsheng bianzhong mingwen kaoshi" 戎生編鐘銘文考釋, in *Qiu Xigui xueshu wenji, disanjuan: jinwen ji qita guwenzi juan* 裘錫圭學術文集（第三卷）：金文及其他古文字卷 (Shanghai: Fudan daxue chubanshe, 2012), 102-121.

308 Unlike the *ceming* inscriptions, the *qizhu yue* inscriptions lasted into the Eastern Zhou. See Gilbert Mattos, "Eastern Zhou Bronze Inscriptions," in *New Sources of Early Chinese History: An Introduction to the Reading of Inscriptions and Manuscripts*, ed. Edward L. Shaughnessy (Berkeley: Society for the Study of Early China and the Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, 1997), 85-124; Huang Tingqi 黃庭頎, *Zhule gongming: Chunqiu qingtong liqi mingwen de yanbian yu tese* 鑄勒功名——春秋青銅禮器銘文的演變與特色 (Taipei:

of the donor's merits and those of his ancestors, this group of bronze inscriptions also represents a change in direction as to the topic of a speech worth casting—or the type of content representable as speech.[309] In any case, dramatized direct speech remains the predominant mode of representation, and most such speeches are explicitly marked.[310] From the kings to the donors who are usually local lords, one could also speak of a trickle-down effect of the representational decorum that gradually permeated all aristocratic textual productions. For some reason, once dramatized direct speech took hold, few changes are ever made to it. As writing continues to develop, the only change appears to have been the diversification of speakers. Kings and lords are joined by other types of speakers, but all speak, typically, in dramatized direct speech.

Already in bronze inscriptions, direct speech is also the mode in which an external voice is invoked in the invoking speaker's own direct speech. As one of the lengthiest iterations of, as I will show, *qizhu yue* inscriptions, the Qiu-*pan* 逑盤 dating to the reign of King Xuan 宣王 (r.827-782 BCE) is a good but controversial example.[311] Below, I quote the relevant parts in Lothar von Falkenhausen's translation, so as to reproduce the basis of a reading he proposes:

---

Wanjuanlou tushu gufen youxian gongsi, 2018); Deng Peiling 鄧佩玲, *Tianming, guishen, yu zhudao: dongzhou jinwen guci tanlun* 天命、鬼神與祝禱——東周金文嘏辭談論 (Taipei: Yiwen yinshuguan, 2011).

309 In the earlier *qizhu yue* inscriptions dating to the mid- to late Western Zhou, the donor first praises the merits of his ancestors before he goes on to list his own merits. It is only beginning from the Eastern Zhou that the ancestors start to disappear from such inscriptions. For the best study so far produced on this topic, see Huang Tingqi 黃庭頎, "Cong shuzu dao yangji: Liangzhou qizhuyue kaipian mingwen yanjiu" 從述祖到揚己——兩周「器主曰」開篇銘文研究, *Qinghua zhongwen xuebao* 2017.6 (2017): 33-71. See also Chen Yingjie 陳英傑, *Liangzhou jinwen zuoqi yongtu mingci yanjiu (xia)* 兩周金文作器用途銘辭研究（下）(Beijing: Xianzhuang shuju, 2008), 818-35. Robert Eno also discusses this type of inscriptions but only a small portion of the corpus. See Eno, "Reflections on Literary and Devotional Aspects of Western Zhou Memorial Inscriptions," in *Imprints of Kinship: Studies of Recently Discovered Bronze Inscriptions from Ancient China*, ed. Edward L. Shaughnessy (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2017), 261-85.

310 Some Eastern Zhou inscriptions, like the oft-referenced Wangzi Wu-*ding* 王子午鼎 and Wangsun Yizhe-*zhong* 王孫遺者鐘, do not have *yue* in the inscriptions. But the inscriptions with their liberal use of first-person pronouns like *yu* 余 and *wo* 我 make these inscriptions *read* like a direct speech. See translations in *A Source Book of Ancient Chinese Bronze Inscriptions*, 270-276.

311 For the Yangjiacun 楊家村 vessels more generally, see Lothar von Falkenhausen, "The Inscribed Bronzes from Yangjiacun: New Evidence on Social Structure and Historical Consciousness in Late Western Zhou China (c.800 BC)," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 139 (2006): 239-293.

"I, Qiu, diligently have been continuing my august ancestors' and deceased father's service; devotedly by day and by night I have been reverently attending to my affairs of death-earnestness. Hence the Son of Heaven has in manifold ways bestowed his munificence on me, Qiu. May the Son of Heaven [live for] a myriad years without end, attaining great longevity, preserve and secure the Zhou kingdom, making order and governing the four directions."

逑肇帀朕皇且(祖)考服虔夙夕敬朕死事. 肄(肆)天子多錫(賜)逑休. 天子其萬年無疆. 耆黃耇. 保奠周邦. 諫辟(乂)四方.

The King approvingly said, "Qiu! That the greatly manifest [Kings] Wen and Wu accepted and received the great mandate and held fast to the four directions is due precisely to the fact that your former saintly ancestors and deceased father aided and assisted the former kings in exerting themselves and laboring on behalf of the great mandate. Now I, by way of following [the precedents of] your saintly ancestors and deceased father, extend and confirm your mandate. I order you to assist Rong Dui in comprehensively managing the Inspectors of the Forests of the four directions so that the temple-palaces be supplied. I bestow on you a red pendant and a dark-polished *huáng* jade as well as bronze-studded bridle gear."

王若曰. 逑. 不(丕)顯文武. 膺受大令(命). 甹(敷)有四方. 則鄰隹先聖且(祖)考夾豐先王爵堇大令(命). 今余隹(唯)巠乃先聖且(祖)考. 闢豪(就)乃令(命). 令(命)女(汝)疋(胥)榮兌胜(並)嗣(司)四方吳(虞)林(林). 用宮御. 易(賜)女(汝)赤市(珮). 幽黃(璜). 攸勒.[312]

This part of the inscription follows a long list of praises Qiu lavished on his ancestors, each applauded in reference to their merit serving the Zhou kings. The first half quoted above is thus Qiu's turn to comment on himself, having gone through his entire family saga. In *qizhu yue* inscriptions dating to the mid- to late Western Zhou, prefacing one's self-panegyric with those of one's ancestors is a shared narrative trope. While most go back two or three generations, the Qiu-*pan* enumerates seven.[313] Regardless, the shared narrative shape lends the Qiu-*pan* to comparison. The second half, on the other hand, is a standard *ceming* speech insofar as structure, content, and rhetoric are concerned. The one feature that renders this speech exceptional is its placement *after*

312 Lothar von Falkenhausen, "The Royal Audience and Its Reflections in Western Zhou Bronze Inscriptions," in *Writing and Literacy in Early China: Studies from the Columbia Early China Seminar*, ed. Li Feng and David Prager Branner (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2011), 242-43.

313 See, for example, Xing-*gui* 癲簋, Xing-*zhong* 癲鐘, Shi Wang-*ding* 師望鼎, Guo Shu Lü-*zhong* 虢叔旅鐘, Jing Ren Nao-*zhong* 井人妄鐘, Liang Qi-*zhong* 梁其鐘, Shan Bo Hansheng-*zhong* 單伯昊生鐘, Yu-*ding* 禹鼎. The formulaicity of the narrative is first discussed in Huang Tingqi, "Cong shuzu dao yangji: Liangzhou qizhuyue kaipian mingwen yanjiu."

Qiu's self-panegyric. Only in the Da Ke-*ding* 大克鼎, notes Falkenhausen, does the same juxtaposition occur for a second time, which "would have been interpreted as combining two unconnected episodes."[314]

Confronted with such an exceptional inscription featuring two voices, Falkenhausen argues that the Qiu-*pan* in fact recounts a transcribed oral exchange between Qiu and the king that had occurred earlier at a court audience. In that audience, Qiu is said to have first recounted to the king his family saga before the king responded directly to Qiu, hence the juxtaposition of the two speeches. In the process, Falkenhausen further claims, the king borrowed Qiu's language used to praise his ancestors to help complete his own. The parallels identified include:

| Qiu's comments on Shan Gong | King's *ceming* to Qiu |
|---|---|
| **不(丕)顯**朕皇高且(祖)單公. 趄趄克明悆(慎)毕(厥)德. **夾鑄文王**. 武王達殷. **膺受天魯令**(命). **匍有四方.** 並宅毕(厥)堇(勤)疆土.用配上帝. | 速. **不(丕)顯**文武. **膺受大令(命)**. **匍(敷)有四方.** 則譱佳先聖且(祖)考**夾鑄先王**爵堇大令(命). |
| My **greatly manifest** august high ancestor Shangong was able to watch courageously over his virtue and thus aid and **assist Kings Wen and Wu** in battering Yin, **accepting and receiving Heaven's excellent mandate**, **holding fast to the four directions**, establishing their residence within the territories they had labored [to conquer], and thereby being a counterpart of God on High. | Qiu! That the **greatly manifest** [Kings] Wen and Wu a**ccepted and received the great mandate** and **held fast to the four directions** is due precisely to the fact that your former saintly ancestors and deceased father **aided and assisted the former kings** in exerting themselves and laboring on behalf of the great mandate. |

Based on this "audience protocol" that Falkenhausen reconstructs from the two speeches, he then interprets *wang ruo yue* 王若曰 as *wang nuo yue* 王諾曰, "the king approvingly said," thus introducing a narratorial transition between the two otherwise "unconnected episodes."[315] As the king approves

[314] Falkenhausen, "The Royal Audience and Its Reflections in Western Zhou Bronze Inscriptions," 243.

[315] Falkenhausen, "The Royal Audience and Its Reflections in Western Zhou Bronze Inscriptions," esp. 240-251.

Qiu's words, the two speeches become one exchange. Examining the same intertextual parallels highlighted above, Edward L. Shaughnessy argues instead for a reverse relationship: that Qiu was the one who quoted the king, not from the king's speech made at the audience but from the physical copy of the king's charge Qiu was sent home with.[316]

An oralist interpretation, on the one hand, and a textualist one, on the other, both arguments downplay the formulaicity of the Qiu-*pan* inscription itself. The parallels between Qiu's comments on Shan Gong and the king's as well belong to a larger repertoire of inscriptional language common to the *qizhu yue* vessels, another indication of Qiu-*pan*'s membership in that category. First, *pixian* 丕顯 (greatly illustrious) is how almost every *qizhu yue* inscription around the same time begins, as an epithet applied to the highest ancestor.[317] Second, the middle part of Qiu's praise of Shan Gong—[1] 夾豐文王武王達殷 [2] 膺受天魯令(命) [3] 匍有四方—basically combines the opening of Shan Bo Hansheng-*zhong* 單伯昊生鐘 with that of Yu-*ding* 禹鼎:

| Shan Bo Hansheng-*zhong* | Yu-*ding* |
|---|---|
| 單白(伯)昊生曰. 不(丕)顯皇且(祖)剌(烈)考. 倏匹之先王. **[2] 爵堇(勤)大令**. | 禹曰. 不(丕)顯桓桓皇且(祖)穆公. **[1]克夾豐(紹)先王 [3]奠四方**. 肆武公亦弗段望(忘)朕(朕)聖且(祖)考幽大弔(叔)懿弔(叔) |
| Haosheng, Elder of Shan, said, "Greatly illustrious, my august ancestors and blazing father—you aligned yourselves with the former kings and [2] **assisted them with the fostering of the Great Mandate**." | Yu says, "Greatly illustrious and valiantly courageous, my august ancestor Patriarch Mu—**[1] you managed to assist the former kings in [3] settling the four quarters.** Nor did Lord Wu let recede from memory my sage grandfather, You the Younger, and my after, Yi the Younger."[318] |

316 Edward L. Shaughnessy, "The Writing of a Bronze Inscriptions," *Asiatische Studien* 61.3 (2007): esp.855-56.

317 Cf. note 27 for the inscriptions I am referring to.

318 The transcriptions are taken from the "Digital Archives of Bronze Images and Inscriptions" 殷周金文暨青銅器資料庫 and the "Lexicon of Pre-Qin Oracle, Bronze Inscriptions and Bamboo Slips" 先秦甲骨金文簡牘詞彙資料庫, both maintained by the Institute of History and Philology at Academia Sinica. The translations are mine unless otherwise noted.

Notice also how the Yu-*ding* uses the same descriptions for Patriarch Mu (*pixian* and 趕趕, "valiantly courageous") as Qiu does for Shan Gong. In addition, Qiu's following comment that Shan Gong is "able to make illustrious and stay attentive to his virtue" 克明悆(慎)毕(厥)德 is also attested in at least three other *qizhu yue* inscriptions:

> Grand-Master-and-the-Little-One-Master Wang says, "Greatly illustrious my august father Patriarch Jiu—dignified and courtly, **you managed to make manifest your heart and stay attentive to your virtues**. With that, you served the former kings, achieving much substance without any exertion."
>
> 大師小子師望曰. 不(丕)顯皇考(宄)公. 穆穆**克盟(明)毕(厥)心. 悆(慎)毕(厥)德.** 用辟于先王. (得)屯亡敃.
>
> (Shi Wang-*ding* 師望)

> Ren Ning of Jing says, "Illustrious and pure, my accomplished ancestors and august father—**you were attentive to your virtues**, you achieved substance and gained abundance, and you lived out your full lives in good fortune."
>
> 井(邢)人曰. 顯盭(淑)文且(祖)皇考. **克質(慎)毕(厥)德.** 得屯用魯. 永冬(終)于吉.
>
> (Jing Ren Nao-*zhong* 井人鐘)

> Liang Qi says, "Greatly illustrious, my august ancestors and father—courtly and warily, **you were attentive to your virtues**. In diligently serving the former kings, you achieved much substance without any exertion."
>
> 梁其曰. 不(丕)顯皇且(祖)考. 穆穆異異. **克質(慎)毕(厥)德**. 農(努)臣先王. 旱屯亡敃.
>
> (Liang Qi-*zhong* 梁其鐘)

Additionally, the entire opening of the king's comments on Qiu's ancestors is closely paralleled in the Shi Ke-*xu* 師克盨, to the extent that only the addressees are different:

| Qiu-*pan* | Shi Ke-*xu* |
|---|---|
| 逑. 不(丕)顯文武. 膺受大令(命). 鬲(敷)有四方. 則隹先聖且(祖)考夾先王爵堇大令(命). | 師克. 不(丕)顯文武. 膺受大令. 鬲有四方. 則(隹)乃先且(祖)考又(有)爵于周邦. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Qiu! That the greatly illustrious Kings Wen and Wu accepted and received the great mandate and held fast to the four directions is due precisely to the fact that your former sagely ancestors and deceased father aided and assisted the former kings in exerting themselves and laboring on behalf of the great mandate. | Master Ke! That the greatly illustrious Kings Wen and Wu accepted and received the great mandate and held fast to the four directions is precisely to the fact that your former ancestors and deceased father held high ranks at the Zhou state. |

Every expression is formulaic; every line is composite. From a narrative perspective, both the king and Qiu "copied" from the speech type of *qizhu yue* inscriptions.

More important than the shared language, Qiu-*pan* exemplifies one of two ways *qizhu yue* inscriptions construct the donor's self-panegyric. In both cases, the king's *ceming* is referred to as the donor's grandest achievement. For these donors, being recognized, valued, and awarded by the king is how they present their own selves. As the descendants of glorious ancestors whose own identities are defined by their service to the king, having likewise received *ceming* is also what makes these donors comparable to their ancestors. The only difference here lies in the mode of representation, that is, in whether the *ceming* is alluded to, narrated, or quoted. The following five inscriptions, all very similar, exemplify the nondramatic approach:

> I do not dare to not follow [my ancestors] and keep at it from dawn to dusk. The king thus responded to my diligence by awarding me dangling jade ornaments.
>
> 不敢弗帥用夙夕. 王對楸(懋)易(賜)佩.
>
> (Xing-*gui* 簋)

> I, Xing, do not dare to not follow my ancestors and deceased father in holding fast to luminous virtues. Seizing dawn and dusk, I have aided the Chiefs of Government. The August King responded to my, Xing's diligence, by awarding me dangling jade ornaments.
>
> 不敢弗帥且(祖)考秉明德. (劭)夙夕左尹氏. 皇王對身楸(懋)易(賜)佩.
>
> (Xing-*zhong* 鐘)

> I, Wang, have since the beginning followed and modeled myself on my august deceased father. Reverently from dawn to dusk, I have issued and received our king's orders. Nor have I dared either not to follow through or see things to the end. The king does not let

recede from his memory the descendant of the sage man and has thus amply commended my merits[319] and bestowed on me his grace.

望(望)肇(肇)帥井(型)皇考. 虔夙(夙)夜出內(入)王命. 不敢不豕(遂)不妻(盡). 王用弗諆(忘)聖人之後. 多蔑曆易(賜)休.

(Shi Wang-*ding* 師望鼎)

I, Lü, have since the beginning dared to follow and model myself on my august father's Awesome Decorum and [missing character] serve the Son of Heaven. The Son of Heaven thus amply bestowed on me, Lü, his grace.

旅敢肇帥井(型)皇考威義(儀). X 御于天子. 迺天子多易(賜)旅休.

(Guo Shu Lü-*zhong* 虢叔旅鐘)

I, Liang Qi, have since the beginning followed and modeled myself on my august ancestors and deceased father in holding fast to luminous virtues. Reverently from dawn to dusk, I have served the Son of Heaven. The Son of Heaven imposed on me, Liang Qi, the office of the Lord of the Fief and Great Regulator. By the Son of Heaven's favor, he has commended my, Liang Qi's merits.

汓(梁)其肇(肇)帥井(型)皇且(祖)考秉明德. 虔夙夕辟天子. 天子肩事汓(梁)其身邦君大正. 用天子寵蔑汓(梁)其曆.

(Liang Qi-*zhong* 梁其鐘)

All these inscriptions follow their praise of the ancestors like the Qiu-*pan* does and transition now to the merit account of the donor himself. Several clues in the speeches point to an underlying *ceming* event that the donors here are retelling. First, the graph 易, read as *ci* 賜 (to bestow on), is a regular verb of choice used in *ceming* inscriptions for the gifting of the king's awards. Second, *suxi* 夙夕 or *suye* 夙夜 (dawn and dusk) is likewise what the king routinely says to his awardees, usually to conclude the *ceming* speech, as in "from dawn to dusk tend to your obligations; do not squander my commands" 夙夜用事勿廢朕令. Third, recounting the donors' achievements for which the appointments and awards are made also parallels the narrative progression of the *ceming* inscriptions.

[319] There is some controversy regarding the meaning of 蔑曆. Here, I follow Shirakawa's interpretation of the phrase as meaning "to commend one's (especially, military) merits." See Shirakawa Shizuka, 蔑曆解, in Shirakawa, *Shirakawa Shizuka chosakushū: Bekkan Kōkotsu kinbungaku ronsō* 白川靜著作集 - 別卷甲骨金文学論叢 (Tōkyō: Heibonsha, 2012), 1253-95.

The achievement or merit is not provided in every *ceming* speech, but when it is, it always proceeds the specific charge like the speeches here too. And fourth, for at least the first three inscriptions, we have actual *ceming* inscriptions that belong to the same donors. Xing 㝬, for instance, boasts three *ceming* inscriptions (Xing sannian-*hu* 㝬三年壺, Xing-*xu* 㝬盨, and Xing shisannian-*hu* 㝬十三年壺) that are nine years apart from each other,[320] and Wang, on the other hand, one (Wang-*gui* 望簋[321]). Although it is unclear whether any of the *ceming* inscriptions represent the very events these two donors are referring to here, it also does not matter because they suffice to show that the donors *had* been appointed and *were* familiar with *ceming* language. Instead of reproducing the speech, they in the above examples opted to speak of the experience.

In comparison, the Qiu-*pan* at the same place in the narrative sequence decided to reproduce the king's *ceming* speech instead of narrating it. Like Xing and Wang, Qiu also has another vessel, the Qiu-*zhong* 逑鐘, in which the very speech he dramatized in the Qiu-*pan* is instead alluded to.[322] Falkenhausen recognizes this connection but describes the Qiu-*zhong* as "an abbreviated version of the [Qiu-*pan*]."[323] While not unlikely, it does not explain what it means that the same *ceming* event can be dramatized in one case and narrated in another. In the larger picture, the free transformation between narrative modes speaks only to a convention of so doing than to the "audience protocol" Falkenhausen posits. There is no exchange in the inscriptions except for the exchange the donor makes between his own and the king's voice. In the Yu-*ding* 禹鼎, a rather exceptional *qizhu yue* inscription in its own right, *both* narrated and dramatized *ceming* occur in the same speech uttered in Yu's voice. Following Yu's formulaic praise of three of his ancestors translated above, he in the self-panegyric section of the speech first narrates an appointment by Lord Wu 武公:

---

320 See *A Source Book of Ancient Chinese Bronze Inscriptions*, 115-19.

321 Ibid, 77.

322 See Falkenhausen, "Royal Audience and Its Reflections in Western Zhou Bronze Inscriptions," 243-45; Shaughnessy, "The Writing of a Bronze Inscriptions," 868-75.

323 Falkenhausen, "Royal Audience and Its Reflections in Western Zhou Bronze Inscriptions," 245.

> He [i.e., Lord Wu] has ordered me, Yu, to follow the footsteps of my ancestors and deceased father and assume the government in Xing. I, Yu, have not dared to be careless; in awe and reverence have I obeyed my lord's charge.
>
> 命禹𠂤(肖)䏒(朕)且(祖)考. 政于井邦. 隼(肆)禹亦弗敢憃(憃). 昜(惕)共(恭)䏒(朕)辟之命.

Immediately following this first merit of his, Yu goes on to narrate his military achievements which in general are less talked about in *qizhu yue* inscriptions than in *ceming* inscriptions.[324] Here, however, Yu refers to two *ceming* speeches associated with the same event, both reproduced in direct speech, in the original voices of King Li 厲王 and, again, Lord Wu:

> But alas! Oh woe! Heaven sent down great scourge to the states below. And Yufang, the Maquis of E, led the Southern Yi of the Huai River and the Eastern Yi in broadly attacking the states both to our South and East, encroaching all the way into my jurisdiction. The king thereupon commanded the Sixth Battalion of the West and the Eighth Battalion of Yin, saying, "Wipe out Yufang, the Marquis of E, spare neither young nor old." But the troops were engulfed in fear and overwhelmed with dread, and thus could not attack E.
>
> Lord Wu, then, ordered me, Yu, to lead one hundred of his war chariots, two hundred charioteers, and a thousand soldiers on foot, saying, "Fulfill my resolute plan! Assist the Sixth Battalion of the West and the Eighth Battalion of Yin in the strike against Yufang, Marquis of E. Spare neither young nor old." Thereupon I, Yu, led the troops of Lord Wu all the way to E. Handing them a heavy blow, I in triumph seized their lord, Yufang.
>
> 烏虖(乎)哀哉. 用天降大喪于下或(國). 亦唯噩(鄂)侯馭(馭)方率南淮尸(夷)東尸(夷). 廣伐南或(國). 東或(國). 至于歷內. 王遹命西六𠂤(師)殷八𠂤(師). 曰. 剿(撲)伐噩(鄂)侯馭(馭)方. 勿遺壽幼. 隼(肆)𠂤(師)彌寍(怵)匍匿(愜).弗克伐噩(鄂).
>
> 隼(肆)武公遹遣禹率公戎車百乘. 斯(廝)馭(馭)二百. 徒千. 曰. 于匡(將)䏒肅悤. 隹(惟)西六𠂤(師)殷八𠂤(師). 伐噩(鄂)侯馭(馭)方. 勿遺壽幼. 𠂤禹𠂤(以)武公徒馭(馭)至于噩(鄂). 𦎫(敦)伐噩(鄂). 休隻(獲)乒(厥)君馭(馭)方.

The marker *yue* and the first-person pronouns leave little doubt that Yu is enacting the two other voices in direct speech, in one of which Lord Wu also repeats the king's charge. Despite that, this unusual self-panegyric still falls under the opening "Yu says" 禹曰 that oversees this entire

[324] For a good survey and study, see Shang Yantao 商艷濤, *Liangzhou junshi mingwen yanjiu* 兩周軍事銘文研究 (Guangzhou: Huanan ligong daxue chubanshe, 2013).

inscription, hence Yu's quotation of the *ceming* speeches just like Qiu's in the Qiu-*pan*.[325] In Qiu's case, the entire self-panegyric is fulfilled by the king's *ceming*; for Yu, the two *ceming* are woven into a narrative of Yu's own. Although different in orientation, both self-panegyrics dramatize the *ceming* speech that "certifies" their merit and their place in the family lineage. What underlies both is an early but lasting narrative technique used in voice representation. The kings and the awardees must have conversed in some ways at the *ceming* ceremony, but the Qiu-*pan* is evidence of an inscriptional convention, not the "audience protocol." All these inscriptions only show that transmodalization between narration and dramatization goes back as early as the Western Zhou, and dramatized direct speech has remained since the mode in which one voice is represented in another.

*The Efficacy of Speech*

In all likelihood, bronze inscriptions may have remained a model—and a memory—of speech representation long after the Western Zhou. Those who were in the position to represent remained hidden behind the texts; those who needed or merited representation are represented to be speaking.

---

[325] In other instances where the speaker tells of his military endeavors, the *ceming* behind his assumption of duty is usually narrated instead of dramatized. See for example the following lines from the Rong Sheng-*bianzhong* 戎生編鐘 and the Jin Jiang-*ding* 晉姜鼎, respectively:

> I was luckily given a pile of salt and tasked with attacking and punishing Fantang. I took their auspicious metals to make these treasured and harmonious bells.
>
> 劼(嘉)遣鹵 (積). 卑(俾)譖征 (繁)湯(陽). 取乎(厥)吉金. 用乍(作)寶協鐘.
>
> I was luckily given the gift of a thousand taels worth of salt. In order not to squander the illustrious mandate [bestowed on] Lord Wen, I was tasked with the thorough penetration into and complete assault on Fantang and Yuan, [upon which] I seized their auspicious metals to make this treasured, venerable cauldron.
>
> 嘉遣我易(賜)鹵責(積)千兩. 勿 (廢)文侯 令. 卑(俾)貫 (通)弘征 (繁)湯(陽). 取乎(厥)吉金. 用乍(作)寶鼎.

On the other hand, how the audience of a bronze inscription, dead or living, received the text is also how later readers received later speech writings: by watching the represented speak to an addressee in the text, in a theatrical setting introduced by the text. As Falkenhausen has noted, bronze inscriptions are ritual documents; the language is "highly formulaic, biased, and vague."[326] Although rituals no longer regulate later textual productions, the theatricality characteristic of both ancestral sacrifices and the textual products remained a core attribute of speech writings.

Over time, both the kind of speakers that became speaker functions and the types of speech that sedimented into speech functions also evolved to include more and more nuanced varieties. No longer does the sovereign dominate the speech scenes, nor does he speak or speak about *ceming* only. At the same time, this historical development appears to have also afforded speech itself tremendous privilege as a particular mode of expression, especially with regard to the efficacy it has as a narrative and rhetorical device for the author, and as the carrier of speech acts that not just say things but do things to an audience in or outside the text. The former we have seen amply in the earlier chapters, the latter also a glimpse of in the "Shui lin." When what is important in writing is typically expressed in speech, by speakers usually of esteem and authority, neither seems surprising. But in some cases, the efficacy of speech especially as speech acts appears to divorce itself both from the necessity of a speaker and even the language that sustains speaking. What is said by the speaker—any speaker—still matters, but the efficacy of the speech act does not depend on it. Instead, what speech achieves is regulated by writing and by the "communication frameworks" writing constructs. What is usually understood as persuasion, for example, is one such written construct.

The *Zhanguo ce*, for example, is an illustrative example where the efficacy of speech is both constructed and regulated, sometimes independently of the language spoken. Rhetoric in the sense of persuasive speaking comprises a dominant portion of the compilation, but only as one among many other speech acts that prove to have an effect on an audience. In the process, nondramatic narration is compressed to the minimum. Even in the most elaborate instances, the narrative frames

[326] Falkenhausen, "Issues in Western Zhou Studies: A Review Article," 169.

that result function primarily to stage speech, provide transition, and substantiate the efficacy of speech. The compilation celebrates the spoken word more than anything else, and it does so by resorting to clustering as its organizational principle. Compared to the other anecdote clusters discussed earlier, the *Zhanguo ce* assigns to its numerous "anecdotal speeches" not just the role of the illustrative but also that of the illustrated—the principle of juxtaposition. As one speech follows another, they all constitute evidence of their own efficacy in one way or another.

To see the *Zhanguo ce* in the light described, one that I believe throws into better relief the core attributes of the compilation, four aspects of the work merit foregrounding.[327] First, the *Zhanguo ce* is an anthology comprised of anecdote clusters, and a carefully compiled one. Although the word "anecdote" might seem a misnomer for the speeches which are typically minimally contextualized, it nevertheless points to the episodic nature of the speeches. Like the "Chu shuo" chapters of the *Han Feizi*, the clusters in the *Zhanguo ce* are also mapped onto an external structure editorially imposed on them. As Liu Xiang describes in the preface to the *Zhanguo ce*, "I, your subject Xiang, divided [the materials] by state and ordered them, roughly, by chronology" 臣向因國別者. 略以時次之.[328] As an anthology, standard caveat about play-tolerance should apply.

Second, the speeches anthologized are primarily, though not only, persuasions.[329] And unlike the "Shui lin," the persuasions are made fully in the speech acts of the speaking protagonists who speak directly to their audience in and outside the text, unmediated by the author-compiler. Typically situated in a concrete context, with also several rounds of exchanges between the interlocutors, both

---

327 The *Zhanguo ce* remains understudied in both English and Chinese scholarship. Since J. I. Crump's seminal study and translation, not much progress has been made. See, Crump, *Intrigues: Studies of the Chan-kuo ts'e* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1964); Crump, *Chan-kuo ts'e* (Ann Arbor: Center for Chinese Studies, The University of Michigan, 1996).

328 "Liu Xiang shulu" 劉向書錄 in *Zhanguo ce jianzheng* 戰國策箋證, ed. Fan Xiangyong 范祥雍 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2006), 1.

329 Paul R. Goldin makes the same observation in an incisive critique of Crump's popular conclusions about the *Zhanguo ce*. Speaking of the "pieces that have established the book's reputation as a repository of brilliant rhetoric," Goldin cautions that "there are other kinds of stories in the collection as well: often, the characters dispense with rhetoric altogether and resort to such methods as conspiracy, espionage, or false incrimination." Goldin, "Rhetoric and Machination in *Stratagems of the Warring States*," in Goldin, *After Confucius: Studies in Early Chinese Philosophy* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2005), 88.

the lengthiest and the briefest persuasions also, however, try often to "stand on their own." Both can be opened only by the formula of "A says to B" A 謂 B 曰 or "A persuades B, saying" A 說 B 曰, and both can conclude once the speakers finish speaking.[330] There are thus next to the more complete anecdotes what look like *Lunyu* and *Shangshu* types of utterances.

Infrequently but quite consistently across the work, speaker A is either anonymized as *huo* 或, an unidentified "someone," or completely omitted, as in 謂 B 曰, "to B is said." I count sixteen and twenty-two instances, respectively. In either case, A's identity is not as important as his utterance. Just as these erased identities cannot be restored with any degree of certainty,[331] even the named speakers signify first and foremost a speaker function instead of an actual speaker. Both Zhang Yi 張儀 and Su Qin 蘇秦, for instance, speak only persuasions both in the *Zhanguo ce* and in their biographies in the *Shiji*. They are not known for other types of speech acts, and we know little about how they grew up, why they entered their profession, or what they did outside of "work." Both identities are tied with, defined by, and secondary to, their persuasions. Both names, one could even say, are "created" by the persuasions attributed to them. Overall, then, the precedence speech representation takes over narration as well as the naming and supplying of speakers illustrate the anthology's focus on speech itself above all other considerations.

Third, among the mainstream inclusions that are persuasions, situated in full-on anecdotes, there also exist finer distinctions like those in the "Shui lin." Some persuasions are never indicated of their result; some apparently fail;[332] some combine into a larger narrative;[333] some, additionally, are

---

330 The two longest speeches, for example, are both presented in this way. See "Zhang Yi persuades the King of Qin" 張儀說秦王 in Qin 1 (*Zhanguo ce jianzheng*, 3.171-75) and "Su Qin persuades King Min of Qi" 蘇秦說齊閔王 in Qi 5 (*Zhanguo ce jianzheng*, 12.670-76).

331 For persistent attempts nevertheless, see, for example, Zheng Jiewen 鄭傑文, *Zhanguo cewen xinlun* 戰國策文新論 (Ji'nan: Shandong renmin chubanshe, 1998), 128-35.

332 When Su Qin, for instance, first tried to convince King Hui of Qin 秦惠王 of the horizontal alliance, he is said to have failed ten times. See "Su Qin's First Persuasion of King Hui of Qin of the Horizontal Alliance" 蘇秦始將連橫說秦惠王 (*Zhanguo ce jianzheng*, 3.141-143).

333 "Lü Buwei, A Man from Puyang" 濮陽人呂不韋 (*Zhanguo ce jianzheng*, 7.449-451) is one of several stories where a series of persuasions are narrated. In this famous one, Lü Buwei basically persuades his way to fame and status, from a local merchant to the prime minster of Qin.

pitted against each other.[334] Most, however, reside in a single anecdote where the persuasion's success is confirmed by the narrative. And like the "Shui lin," the confirmation is indicated in the final narration either by such logical connectives as *nai* 乃, *sui* 遂, *yin* 因, *yushi* 於是, and *guo* 果, or by the ruler's approving "excellent" 善. Only rarely is there a comment further following the anecdote.[335] All this is another indication of the compilation's privileging of speech, for narration exists only for the purpose of substantiating the speeches. It also speaks to the narrative construction of speech acts, as the results of persuasions are always, and only, determined by the narrative confirmations. The aim here is not to compare or evaluate persuasions based on their own rhetoric or persuasiveness.

Where the *Zhanguo ce* differs is also where the work's main point is made additionally clear. Not only does a successful persuasion, when indicated, effect change, advancement, or success, when a persuasion is "not heeded" 不聽, as it happens not infrequently, a disastrous outcome would inevitably follow. This is not evidence against the general efficacy of speech; rather, it from the reverse side corroborates the prescience that gives rise to persuasion and condemns the ruler for not recognizing it. For according to the narratives in those cases, if the speech *had* been heeded, calamity would not have ensued. Foolish rulers exist in a way also as narrative substantiation. These ultimate adjudicators of sometimes antithetical persuasions are rarely shown to have a mind of their own.[336]

The story "Qi aids Chu in attacking Qin" 齊助楚攻秦 is a wonderful example of all the usual and unusual attributes of the *Zhanguo ce* I have so far mentioned. It features in one extended

---

[334] A remarkable example in this regard is the story "Qin Attacked Zhao at Changping" 秦攻趙於長平 (*Zhanguo ce jianzheng*, 20.1112-1115). There are many instances where a ruler is presented to be adjudicating two contending persuasions, but here, the king of Zhao relays one persuader's speech to another and then relays back to him that other persuader's counter-persuasion, for a total of five times. Only then did he decide on the final course of action. The two persuaders never once met; they argued through the king as a messenger in the middle.

[335] Zheng Liangshu 鄭良樹 counts 18 in total. See Zheng, *Zhanguo ce yanjiu* 戰國策研究 (Singapore: Academia Publications, 1972), 10-12. See also Zhu Dugeng 諸祖耿, *Zhanguo ce jizhu huikao* 戰國策集註匯考, vol.1 (Nanjing: Fenghuang chubanshe, 2008), 71-81.

[336] There are, however, instances where the rulers speak at length trying to persuade their interlocutors. See for example *Zhanguo ce jianzheng*, 19.1069-70 ("王立周紹為傅"), 19.1078-79 ("王破原陽以為騎邑"), 25.1467-68 ("秦王使人謂安陵君曰").

anecdote a successful persuasion, two unheeded persuasions that result in immediate problems, a rare comment at the end, and several extra exchanges that speak to the overall art and aim of the *Zhanguo ce* in retelling these stories. The episode begins with King Hui of Qin 秦惠王 seeking advice from Zhang Yi over Qi 齊 and Chu's 楚 alliance against him:

> Qi helped Chu attack Qin. Together, they seized Quwo. Later, Qin wished to strike Qi, but Qi and Chu shared an amicable alliance. King Hui (of Qin) was worried by that, so he said to Zhang Yi, "I wish to strike Qi. But Qi and Chu just forged an alliance. Would you think on that for me, and tell me what to do?" Zhang Yi replied, "If you, my king, load a chariot with gifts, I shall go and try on your behalf."
>
> 齊助楚攻秦. 取曲沃. 其後秦欲伐齊. 齊楚之交善. 患王患之. 謂張儀曰. 吾欲伐齊. 齊楚方歡. 子為寡人慮之. 奈何. 張儀曰. 王其為臣約車並幣. 臣請試之.[337]

Thus sought out by the king, a common trope of advice-seeking, Zhang Yi travels to Chu:

> Zhang Yi headed south to see the King of Chu, and said, "Of all the people that delight the king of my humble state, none is comparable to you, my lord. Of all the people under whom I wish to serve, none is comparable to you either, my lord. On the other hand, of all the people the king of my humble state detests, none equals the king of Qi. Of all the people that I, Zhang Yi, also detest the most, none equals the king of Qi either. Now, the crimes that the king of Qi has committed against my humble state have been so egregious that we wish to strike them. Yet, since your mighty state shares an amicable relationship with them, the king of my humble state dares not to proceed, nor can I fulfill my role as his advisor. If you, my lord, would consider shutting down your border passes and severing your relations with Qi, I will see to it that the king of Qin repays you with the land of Shangyu measuring six hundred squared *li*. That way, Qi will diminish, and when Qi diminishes, they will for certain become mere servants to you. In the north you will have weakened Qi; in the west, you will have graced Qin; and for yourself, you alone will have acquired the advantage that is the territory of Shangyu. With a single decision, all three benefits will be yours."
>
> 張儀南見楚王. 曰. 弊邑之王所說甚者. 無大大王. 唯儀之所甚願為臣者. 亦無大大王. 弊邑之王所甚憎者. 亦無先齊王. 唯儀之甚憎者. 亦無大齊王. 今齊王之罪其於弊邑之王甚厚. 弊邑欲伐之. 而大國與之歡. 是以弊邑之王不得事令. 而儀不得為臣也. 大王苟能閉關絕齊. 臣請使秦王獻商於之地方六百里. 若此. 齊必弱. 齊弱則必為王役矣. 則是北弱齊. 西德於秦. 而私商於之地以為利也. 則此一計而三利俱至.[338]

---

337 *Zhanguo ce jianzheng*, 4.230.

338 Ibid., 4.230-31.

"Greatly delighted" 大說, the Chu king announced to his court that he intends to grant Zhang Yi his offer. Amid a wave of sycophant congratulations from his various ministers, only Chen Zhen 陳軫 demurred in silence. The king thus addressed him directly to find out why:

> "By not feeding or employing any troops, by not injuring a single person, we gain the land of Shangyu measuring six hundred squared *li*. I personally think it is a wise trade. All my various ministers have congratulated me on the deal; why is it that you alone did not?" Chen Zhen replied, "I thought that the land of Shangyu would not be yours. On the contrary, only trouble will arise. I thus dare not congratulate you for no good reason."
>
> 不穀不煩一兵. 不傷一人. 而得商於之地六百里. 寡人自以為智矣. 諸士大夫皆賀. 子獨不賀. 何也. 陳軫對曰. 臣見商於之地不可得. 而患必至也. 故不敢妄賀.[339]

Pressed by the king to explain himself, Chen Zhen said:

> "The reason Qin values you, my lord, is because you have Qi [as your ally]. If before you actually acquire the land you first sever your relationship with Qi, it would be like isolating Chu on your own. Why would Qin value a state that is isolated? Moreover, handing you that piece of land before you break with Qi is something Qin would never do, but if you first break with Qi thinking you could demand the land later, you will for certain be duped by Zhang Yi. If you end up being duped by Zhang Yi, my lord, you will truly have cause for lament. When things come to that point, you would, in the west, sow friction with Qin and, in the north, forfeit your alliance with Qi. Both, then, would definitely come to attack you."
>
> 夫秦所以重王者. 以王有齊也. 今地未可得而齊先絕. 是楚孤也. 秦又何重孤國. 且先出地絕齊. 秦計必弗為也. 先絕齊. 後責地. 且必受欺於張儀. 受欺於張儀. 王必惋之. 是西生秦患. 北絕齊交. 則兩國兵必至矣.[340]

The king, however, "did not listen" 不聽. Instead, he ordered Chen Zhen to shut up: "My plans are well taken care of. Why don't you shut your mouth and say no more. Just wait to see my plans come through!" 吾事善矣. 子其弭口無言. 以待吾事.[341]

---

339 Ibid., 4.231.

340 Ibid.

341 Ibid.

At this point, the narrative comes to a temporary resolution of the initial conflict. As King Hui of Qin sought help from Zhang Yi, who then successfully persuaded the king of Chu to sever his alliance with Qi, the latter's decision to follow through blinded him to Chen Zhen's analysis of the situation, which the king of Chu also solicited on his own. A successful persuasion is followed by a dismissed one, both affirmed by the narrative ("the king of Chu was greatly delighted" 楚王大悅 / "the king of Chu did not listen" 楚王不聽). The unheeded persuasion, however, is a good prediction. Everything Chen Zhen said came true. As the narrative immediately follows:

> The king of Chu sent an envoy to sever relations with Qi. Before the envoy made his way back, the king sent another one. Zhang Yi returned. Qin sent someone to visit Qi, and with Qi they secretly aligned with each other. Thereupon, Chu sent a general to accept the land from Qin. Although Zhang Yi had already returned, he declined court audience on account of illness. The king of Chu said, "Does Master Zhang think I have yet to break with Qi?" [To prove it], he dispatched a courageous soldier to curse at the king of Qi. Now, assured that Chu had indeed severed with Qi, Zhang Yi came out to see the envoy, saying, "From here to here, six *li* north to south, six *li* east to west." The envoy said, "But what I have heard was six hundred squared *li*, not six." Zhang Yi replied, "I am but an insignificant person. Whence would I have control over six hundred squared *li* of land?"
>
> 楚王使人絕齊. 使者未來. 又重絕之. 張儀反. 秦使人使齊. 齊秦之交陰合. 楚因使一將軍受地於秦. 張儀至. 稱病不朝. 楚王曰. 張子以寡人不絕齊乎. 乃使勇士往詈齊王. 張儀知楚絕齊也. 乃出見使者曰. 從某至某. 廣從六里. 使者曰. 臣聞六百里. 不聞六里. 儀曰. 儀固以小人. 安得六百里.[342]

Played indeed by Zhang Yi, the king of Chu was beyond furious, and he wanted to raise an army to punish Qin. Chen Zhen tried to stop him, arguing instead for a new alliance with Qin through bribery. But the king ignored him again and went along with his expedition. The result, as Chen Zhen had predicted, was a complete defeat at the hands of both Qin and Qi. By way of conclusion, the narrative adds to the story one of the few comments in the *Zhanguo ce*:

> Thus, it is not that Chu's land was carved up or that its people were enfeebled. That Chu ended up having to save herself from extinction is because in matters of strategizing the king failed to heed Chen Zhen while in matters of transgression he gave credence to Zhang Yi.

[342] Ibid.

故楚之土壤士民非削弱. 僅以救亡者. 計失於陳軫. 過聽於張儀.[343]

Unlike the clustering of persuasions and the narrative marking of both success and failure, this comment is an exception that proves a rule. It gives only a quick, *realpolitik*, and most noticeably amoral analysis of the characters and events in the story. No more, no less. Even though the entire episode revolves around Zhang Yi's deception, the comment remains unaffected, looking instead at the mechanics of the power plays. As far as the commentarial materials are concerned, all sixteen comments found in the *Zhanguo ce* operate in exactly the same way.

This kind of amoral attitude toward what was indeed trickery and deception brings us to the fourth aspect of the *Zhanguo ce*: that the efficacy of speech, *irrespective* of its ethical or any other undertone, is what is truly on display. As Liu Xiang writes in the preface:

> During the time of the Warring States, the rulers were shallow and deficient in terms of virtue. Those who strategized for them had no choice but to capitalize on the circumstances and rely on timing for their [missing character]. Thus, their strategies that helped to ease emergencies and stabilize overturning were all for the sake of expediency. Although they are not that with which one can guide his state or transform his military, they were (indeed) what was poised to aid in emergency situations. [Those who devised the strategies] were all great talents and fine minds. Gauging what their rulers at the time were able to do, they contributed unusual stratagems and eccentric wits, by which danger was turned into safety, demise perseverance. It was indeed something one can take delight in, and something all worth looking at.
>
> 戰國之時. 君德淺薄. 為之謀策者. 不得不因勢而為資. 據時而為□. 故其謀扶急持傾. 為一切之權. 雖不可以臨國教. 化兵革. (亦) 救急之勢也. 皆高才秀士. 度時君之所能行. 出奇策異智. 轉危為安. 運亡為存. 亦可喜. 皆可觀.[344]

Not a single word here is denunciatory. The advisors are said to be constrained by "circumstances" 勢 and "timing" 時, with which come "emergencies" 急 and "overturning" 傾. What they formulate aims at "expediency" 權, not the "guidance of a state" 國教 nor the "transformation of its military"

[343] Ibid., 4.232.

[344] "Liu Xiang shulu," 3.

兵革. For that reason, their "unusual" 奇 and "eccentric" 異 stratagems that help counter "danger" 危 and "demise" 亡 are indeed, says Liu Xiang, something that can be "looked at" 觀. Like the comment in the anecdote, Liu Xiang is likewise separating strategy from morality.

This comment of Liu Xiang's, however, is focused only on the stratagems and persuasions that are indeed immoral in nature, as Zhang Yi's deception is in the story above. He just chose to disregard morality, since the time and circumstances left people with "no choice but to capitalize on the circumstances" 不得不因勢而為資. In many other instances, well-intentioned and even highly moral stratagems and speeches not only exist but also succeed as well. In one case, for example, Queen Dowager Xuan 宣太后 wanted to kill and entomb a man she liked as her human sacrifice, but was persuaded not to because she was made to realize that dead people have no feelings—otherwise the deceased former king would be disappointed by her.[345] In another, Yu Rang 豫讓 twice tried to avenge Zhi Bo 知伯 but was twice stopped and forgiven by his target, Xiangzi 襄子, who called him a "worthy man" 賢人 for his devotion to the cause. Eventually, on Yu Rang's third attempt, Xiangzi allowed him to choose his own resolution. Unable to stab Xiangzi, Yu Rang asked for Xiangzi's robe for him to stab as a token, before killing himself. Moved by his loyalty and devotion, everyone at Xiangzi's own state of Zhao mourned Yu Rang's suicide.[346]

Stories like these join those of "conspiracy, espionage, or false incrimination" in the *Zhanguo ce*,[347] and they equally illustrate the role speech plays in effecting an outcome. In these cases, they are not play that needs tolerating but part and parcel of the compilation's broader principle. Persuasions of all stripes illustrate the efficacy of speech, but they are not the only type of efficacious speech acts in the text. The advice, for example, that dissuaded Queen Dowager Xuan simply lays bare a general truth to her. Yu Rang's speeches about loyalty, devotion, and persistence are also what convinced his wife, friends, and eventually Xiangzi to let him finish what he had set out to do. Even in the Zhang Yi and Chen Zhen story, Chen's failed persuasion serves more as a foil for Zhang's success than as

345 "Queen Dowager Xuan loves an ugly man from Wei" 秦宣太后愛魏醜夫 (*Zhanguo ce jianzheng*, 4.280).

346 "Yu Rang, grandson of Bi Yang from Jin" 晉畢陽之孫豫讓 (*Zhanguo ce jianzheng*, 18.955-956).

347 Goldin, "Rhetoric and Machination in *Stratagems of the Warring States*," 88.

evidence of inefficacy. In stories of antithetical persuasions, both a good (in terms of the strategies therein) but unheeded persuasion and a foolish ruler often combine to accentuate the efficacy of another speech and persuasion.[348] When the Chu king is so headstrong as to first dismiss Chen Zhen and then send an envoy to curse at the Qi king just to prove that he had indeed severed the alliance, the success of Zhang Yi's persuasion seems almost predetermined. Regardless, plenty of successful persuasions rely not on bad faith or deception but on cool-headed analyses of the circumstances, and on strategic thinking that aims for maximum, practical gains.[349]

Most remarkably, speech can effect a series of outcomes somewhat independently of the words said. As is told in the well-known story about Feng Xuan 馮諼, Lord Mengchang's 孟嘗君 longtime advisor, his initial untruthfulness and covetousness earned him, however, the Lord's generous accommodation.[350] A story, in part, about the Lord's indiscriminating sponsorship of retainers,[351] it nevertheless says a lot more about the role speech plays in "serendipitously" achieving things.

Feng Xuan sought sponsorship from Lord Mengchang himself, but when asked about his abilities, he said none, twice ("There is nothing in which I excel" 客無好也 / "There is nothing of

---

348 A similar example is the story "Qi and Wei fought at Malin" 齊魏戰於馬陵 (*Zhanguo ce jianzheng*, 23.1337). In the story, Wei, after losing to Qi, tries to anger Chu by feigning submission to Qi, on the account that Chu will be weary of a stronger Qi. Pleased by the prospect, Tian Ying 田嬰 accepted Wei's offer over his advisor Zhang Chou's 張丑 counter-persuasion. The result, as expected, is Chu's preemptive attack on Qi.

349 Some of the longest persuasions are also the best examples. In "Zhang Yi persuades the King of Qin" 張毅說秦王 (*Zhanguo ce jianzheng*, 3.171-175), Zhang Yi persuades King Zhao 昭王 to try and unite all the other states by analyzing for him the institutional and geopolitical advantages Qin enjoys, the necessity to use force, the regretful historical antecedents where force was not followed through, and the power of decisiveness and determination. In "Things, when reaching extremes, will reverse course" 物至必反 (*Zhanguo ce jianzheng*, 6.400-403), Huang Xie 黃歇 of Chu dissuades King Zhao from annexing Chu by laying bare to him the importance of balancing, of anticipating possible complications, and of long-term geopolitical calculation. In a more compact but more visceral persuasion ("The king of Qin sends someone to speak with Lord Anling" 秦王使人謂安陵君曰, *Zhanguo ce jianzheng*, 25.1467-68), Lord Anling's advisor Tang Qie 唐且 warns the king (Ying Zheng 嬴政) not to impose his awe on the people because the people, when pushed to the extreme, will strike back by murdering even the Son of Heaven, thus sending Ying Zheng to his knees begging for forgiveness.

350 See *Zhanguo ce jianzheng*, 11.620-622.

351 See the biography of Lord Mengchang in *Shiji*, 75.2351-63.

which I am capable" 客無能也). Promised nothing in return, Lord Mengchang still accepted him, with a chuckle on his face ("Lord Mengchang, chuckling, took him in" 孟嘗君笑而受之). When in residence, Feng Xuan did nothing but make growing demands, voiced uniformly in rhymed, rhythmic chanting: "Longsword, shall we go? In my meals, there is no fish" 長鋏歸來乎. 食無魚 (*[r.ŋ]a); "Longsword, shall we go? When I go out, there is no chariot" 長鋏歸來乎. 出無車 (*[t.q$^{h}$](r)A); "Longsword, shall we go? I have nothing to make a home" 長鋏歸來乎. 無以為家 (*k$^{ʕ}$ra). Despite contempt from all the other retainers, Lord Mengchang nevertheless met all his demands, providing even for his mother. Only then did Feng Xuan stop.

Every step of the way, language does not communicate true intention. Rather, it fills space, creates drama, tests understanding, and signals acknowledgment. It takes two discerning but also colluding minds to playfully develop trust through the use of speech, speech that transcends the surface meaning of language. Otherwise, the chain of exchange would have long broken down. When Feng Xuan finally said that he can help collect the lord's debts at Xue 薛, Lord Mengchang remarked, "You, Mr. Retainer, do have talents after all" 客果有能也, thus concluding the game of mutual admiration never once said but amply implied. Like a competent judge of good predictions, the moment the Lord chuckled is also the moment he heard "I have talents" in Feng Xuan's "there is nothing in which I excel" and "there is nothing of which I am capable." Speech has an effect even when language says otherwise.

In that sense, rhetoric in the early Chinese case will have to be reconciled with the ongoings beyond speech, between speakers, and across the receiving end of the text as well. For it is ultimately a narrative matter, constructed and regulated by writing. Ever since dramatized direct speech became a convention of speech representation, in which oratory and rhetoric inevitably reside, speech became a narrative, rhetorical, and argumentative device as well. Its meaning no longer lies solely, or even primarily, in the reference to any external speech writing indeed has the ability to capture, but in the roles it can play in writing, in conjunction with speakers, the narrative context, and the author's aim and dialogism with all his materials. The bronze inscriptions and the *Zhanguo ce* help to foreground these attributes more prominently than other materials, thanks to the orientations and

focuses of the two corpora. But they derive too from the narrative conventions and techniques shared by other speech writings. The difference is one of degree rather than kind.

## — PART THREE —

## The Sovereign Voice

7. Of Change and Continuity
8. Of Everyday Politics

## 7. Of Change and Continuity

From the earlier discussion we derived a set of tools to consider speech representation as a narrative matter. The voicing across different texts of the structures, tropes, and variations I have described as the three shared "voices" suggests a textual order of representation when it comes to the staging of a speaker and the words attributed to him. As in the confines of the early Chinese anecdote, historicity matters for speech representation more broadly, but likewise "as a complement to rhetorical aims rather than as a goal in its own right."[352] The interchangeability as well as interdependence, on the other hand, between dramatization and narration as two modes of representation further speak to the rhetorical underpinning of speech representation. Who speaks, in what manner, for how long, and to what end all betray some basis in the narrative configuration of a text. What motivates speech representation in as many instances as I have so far analyzed is a binding interest in the role certain speakers and certain speech forms can play in the fulfillment of a text's rhetorical purpose.

In this larger enterprise of speech writings, some texts by their formal likeness combine into "genres." The didactic question-and-answer that gives the commonest form to medical, mathematical, and many other technical types of knowledge alike is, for example, one of the most productive of such "genres." They are differentiated not by a form's alignment with theme but mode of representation, in this case a dramatic dialogue between (typically) two interlocutors who converse as the voice dummies of authorial ventriloquism (chapter 3). This "genre" I speak of is thus a mode of discourse, a strategy of textual production that allows for the addressing of variant thematic concerns. The more thematically diverse, the more capacious the genre.[353]

---

[352] David Schaberg, "Chinese History and Philosophy," in *The Oxford History of Historical Writing, Volume 1: Beginnings to AD 600*, ed. Andrew Feldherr and Grant Hardy (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 398.

[353] Another way to think about this is by reference to what Gérard Genette has called "archigenres": "*Archi-*, because each of them is supposed to overarch and include, ranked by degree of importance, a certain number of empirical genres that—whatever their amplitude, longevity, or potential for recurrence—are apparently phenomena of culture and history; but still (or already) *-genres*, because…their defining criteria always involves a thematic element that eludes purely formal or linguistic description." In this terminology, the question-and-answer would be considered an archigenre while texts that employ it like the *Huangdi neijing* 黃帝內經, *Zhoubi*

This generative sense of the genre is one in which the venerated speeches in the *Shangshu* 尚書 can also be reconsidered. As one of the most canonical sources of speech representation, the *Shangshu* also features some of the most sophisticated speeches the early Chinese tradition has seen, hence my treatment at last. Likely owing to the ostensible differences in theme, form, and structure, these speeches have since early on been classified into different groups. The classification not only proceeds by the surmised types of the speeches—in a long-lasting system still referenced today: *dian* 典, *mo* 謨, *xun* 訓, *gao* 誥, *shi* 誓, and *ming* 命[354]—but also, thanks to growing suspicion over their provenance since the Northern Song,[355] by a judgment of authenticity. The early Qing scholar Yan Ruoqu 閻若璩 (1636-1704), for example, is celebrated as *the* figure in a long roster of critics who has definitively demonstrated the *wei* 偽, "forged," nature of the twenty-five chapters in the anthology collectively referred to as the "ancient-script *Shangshu*" 古文尚書.[356] In both cases, the interest in differentiation leads to the elision of meaningful connections, both intertextual and intergeneric.[357]

---

*suanjing* 周髀算經, and *Taigong liutao* 太公六韜 some of its "empirical genres." Genette, *The Architext: An Introduction*, trans. Jane E. Lewin (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 64-65.

354 The classification is attributed to Kong An'guo 孔安國. See Kong Yingda 孔穎達, *Shangshu zhengyi* 尚書正義 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2007), 1.11. Kong Yingda himself (2.27) expands the classification into ten categories. For more recent studies that continue this tradition, many involving comparison with manuscript finds in the Tsinghua University collection, see, for example, Cheng Hao 程浩, *You wei yan zhi: Xianqin Shu lei wenxian de yuan yu liu* 有為言之：先秦「書」類文獻的源與流 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2021); Ye Xiucheng 葉修成, *Xizhou lizhi yu Shangshu wenti yanjiu* 西周禮制與《尚書》文體研究 (Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 2016); Pan Li 潘莉, *Shangshu wenti leixing yu chengyin yanjiu* 《尚書》文體類型與成因研究 (Beijing: Zhishi chanquan chubanshe, 2016); Ozawa Kenji 小沢賢二, "Seikakan Shosho buntai kō" 清華簡『尚書』文体考, in *Shutsudo bunken kara mita koshi to juka kyōten* 出土文献から見た古史と儒家経典, Asano Yūichi 浅野裕一 and Ozawa Kenji 小沢賢二 (Tokyo: Kyūko shoin, 2012), 229-261.

355 This history has been told for numerous times. For a most recent account written from the vantage point of newly available materials, see Liu Guangsheng 劉光勝, *Chutu wenxian yu Guwen Shangshu yanjiu* 出土文獻與《古文尚書》研究 (Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 2020).

356 Yan's evidence and analysis in the form of over 100 separate notes are reprinted in Yan, *Shangshu guwen shuzheng* 尚書古文疏證 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2010).

357 What Stephen Owen says of Liu Xie 劉勰 (ca.465-522) applies to genre scholarship more generally: "Liu Hsieh follows conventional (if not rigid) rules of exposition: tracing the origins of a term or genre, developing each element of a compound, drawing analogies from other uses of the terms, mentioning important source passages, and building highly structured sets of illustrative examples." Owen, *Readings in Chinese Literary Thought* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992), 184. See also Wu Chengxue 吳承學, "Bianti yu poti" 辨體與破體, *Wenxue pinglun* 1991.4: 57-65.

Taking a generative view, I show in this and the next chapter that the variously classified speeches in the *Shangshu* originate from a shared set of genre strategies. These genre strategies encompass the narrative techniques and ideals discussed in the earlier chapters, and differences observable either within a particular speech type or between the "authentic" and "forged" members of it owe to the genre strategies' various materialization. For our interpretation of early Chinese writings, genre as a concept is most instructive when understood as something still in the making; it offers a spectrum of discursive possibilities that are far more formative than normative. However made (or not made) use of, genre exists in the individual totality that is every empirical iteration of it. The ostensible differences between the speeches do not always imply genre "transgression." Rather, they signal the capaciousness and productivity of genre as a discursive strategy to begin with. As we observe these "transgressions," we are shown in replay different dynamics of genre operations as it functions to *produce* texts, often under and for different contexts.[358]

---

[358] Addressing similar issues in the Tsinghua manuscripts, Dirk Meyer adopts the *fabula-sjuzhet* model made popular by structuralist narratology to explain the variant iterations of what can be surmised as the same text or story (see Meyer, *Documentation and Argument in Early China: The Shangshu* 尚書 *(Venerated Documents) and the Shu Tradition* [Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021]). I remain suspicious of this model because the application of it tends to assume the precedence and priority of known *fabula* that are only later "reworked" into a new *sjuzhet*. It does not allow for the possibility—a common critique of the model—that *fabula* only exists because of, and therefore is produced by, *sjuzhet* (see, for example, Jonathan Culler, "Story and Discourse in the Analysis of Narrative," in *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, deconstruction* [London: Routledge, 2001], 188-208.) As a result, the model compels the critic to always keep in view the controlling force of a preexisting *fabula*, even notionally, and to explain every of its disuse, nonuse, or "misuse" in a new or different *sjuzhet*. When Meyer says that he "understand[s] cultural memory as the material that frames the experience of a society and that can be worked into different narratives" (p.21); that "taking different aspects to and from what informs their cultural awareness, [meaning communities] make it into a narrative that suits their needs" (p.22); and that "a certain event may be interpreted in different ways by different text communities and their respective sub-groups" (p.22); he is privileging a '"backward-looking" mode of textual production which justifies its own existence in relation to a presumed precedent of some sort. By taking a generative view, by contrast, I want to highlight a "forward-looking" type of textual production whereby a text addresses the context of its own instantiation through what scholars of linguistic anthropology have called "generic intertextuality." "When discourse is linked to a particular genre," this model posits, "the process by which it is produced and received is mediated through its relationship with prior discourse. Unlike most examples of reported speech, however, the link is not made to isolated utterances, but to generalized or abstracted models of discourse production and reception" (Charles L. Briggs and Richard Bauman, "Genre, Intertextuality, and Social Power," *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 2.2 [1992]: 147). In other words, genre provides a strategy, a roadmap, a range of possibilities where, as I will show, room is left for "creative transgression" of prior examples. A balance is maintained between genre convention and genre transformation due to changing context of genre activation.

This chapter, focusing on the *shi* 誓, will illustrate one such dynamics; the following chapter, prompted by the *gao* 誥, another. Both kinds of genre dynamics stride the boundaries of genre formation and genre transformation, while every iteration of the underlying strategies, I argue, addresses a specific rhetorical aim through the means and controlled variation of a literary form. What is, especially, *wei* about any iteration is only *wei* in that the so-charged iteration appears to address a new purpose, context, or audience. Its aim, I believe, is not to pass as what is presumably the original. In that sense, even the "authentic" chapters suggest not an innocent judgment about, but motivated regulation of, what a genre should look like and *do*.

*Speech, framing versus framed*

One of the most cohesive speech types in the *Shangshu* is the *shi* 誓, "oath." During the Springs and Autumns period as indicated by the *Zuozhuan* 左傳, an oath can be uttered when a covenant 盟 is made.[359] In the *Shangshu*, however, all the *shi* appear to be speeches uttered on the battlefield, and all but one, the "Qin shi" 秦誓, are given before the battle in which the ruler urges his troops to fight.[360] This group of materials is thus partial, favoring one type of *shi* over others. Within the selection, the most consequential battles preceded by a *shi* speech also result in regime change. The "Tang shi" 湯誓 sounds the replacement of Xia 夏 by Shang 商; the "Mu shi" 牧誓 Shang by Zhou 周; and the three "Tai shi" 泰誓 accompany prior battles leading up to the eventual downfall of the Shang. A change is always in the making, regardless of the scale.

---

Both models, to be sure, are speculations given our limited access to historical realities. I adopt the latter for my reading of the *Shangshu* because it dovetails with the observations I have made in the earlier chapters.

[359] Some of the texts are discovered in the city of Houma 侯馬, Shanxi province, and Wen Country 溫縣, Henan province. See an introduction to the materials in Susan R. Weld, "The Covenant Texts from Houma and Wenxian," in *New Sources of Early Chinese History: An Introduction to the Reading of Inscriptions and Manuscripts*, ed. Edward L. Shaughnessy (Berkeley: The Society for the Study of Early China and the Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, 1997), 125-160.

[360] For a convenient summary of all the purported occasions of the *shi* in the *Shangshu*, see Martin Kern, "The 'Harangues' (*shi* 誓) in the *Shangshu*," in *Origins of Chinese Political Philosophy: Studies in the Composition and Thought of the Shangshu (Classic of Documents)*, ed. Martin Kern and Dirk Meyer (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 286.

Some but not all of these battlefield *shi* feature a sequence of compositional elements that distinguishes them from other speeches in the *Shangshu*. In Martin Kern's analysis, a complete progression would include "[1] a brief prose introduction that sets the scene; [2] the king's speech beginning with an exclamation; [3] the king explicitly addressing his troops; [4] the indictment of the enemy; [5] the assertation that Heaven has withdrawn its support from the enemy; [6] the claim that the king will now execute the punishment appointed by Heaven; [7] the exhortation of his troops to fulfill their duties; and finally, [8] a violent threat to exterminate those who do not obey the kings' command."[361] The "Gan shi" 甘誓, "Tang shi," and "Mu shi," Kern shows, are the three iterations of the *shi* that align most closely with this compositional makeup. The "Bi shi" 費誓 and "Qin shi," by contrast, "are altogether different in structure, outlook, and diction, so are the three parts of the received 'Great Harangue' ['Tai shi']."[362]

This differentiation made between all the currently available *shi* is both illuminating and obscuring. On the one hand, it brings attention to the structural affinities between some of the *shi* that appear to constitute their own (sub)genre; on the other, it separates them from other iterations of the *shi* that rely on the same underlying genre strategies but for a different purpose—hence the difference in "structure, outlook, and diction." All the dissimilarities between the "Gan shi," "Tang shi," and "Mu shi" versus the "Bi shi" and "Qin shi" are, in fact, what make *every* iteration of the *shi* both recognizable as a *shi* and distinctive on its own. There are no simple repetitions in the *Shangshu*, even with "a common underlying hypotext" behind some of the speeches.[363] Already in the "Gan shi," "Tang shi," and "Mu shi," for example, variation in the mode of representation between their "activations" of the same structural components lends veritable individuality to the three otherwise

---

361 Ibid., 291.

362 Ibid., 289.

363 Ibid., 307. In some ways, no two hypertexts are exactly the same unless one is the photocopy of another. For a hypotext even to exist, the hypertext must by definition be different from it (and from one another) in some ways. In Genette's original formulation, the difference is a condition of hypertextuality and a result of either "simple or direct transformation" or "complex and indirect" transformation. Genette, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, trans. Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 5-6.

highly comparable speeches. Compared to the quick and condensed indictment of the enemy in the "Gan shi," the "Mu shi" enumerates a catalog of transgressions a dissolute last ruler never fails to commit: he succumbs to sexual pleasure, pampers his favorite confidants, ignores his ritual and administrative obligations, disregards filial and moral standards, prefers nepotism over meritocracy, and inflicts tyranny on the people. In Kern's translation: [364]

| "Gan shi" | "Mu shi' |
|---|---|
| 有扈氏威侮五行. 怠棄三正. | 今商王受. 惟婦言是用. 昏棄厥肆祀弗答. 昏棄厥遺王父母弟不迪. 乃惟四方之多罪逋逃. 是崇是長. 是信是使. 是以為大夫卿士. 俾暴虐于百姓. 以奸宄于商邑. |
| The Lord of Hu violates and despises the five moving forces, and he neglects and discards the three standards. | Now for Shou, the king of Shang, it is indeed the words of his wife that he follows. He blindly discards the sacrifices he should present and fails to respond [to the blessings he has received from the spirits]. He blindly discards his paternal and maternal uncles who are still alive and fails to employ them. Thus, indeed, the vagabonds of the four quarters, loaded with crimes—these he honors, these he exalts, these he trusts, these he enlists, these he takes as high officials and dignitaries, to let them oppress and tyrannize the people and bring villainy and treachery upon the City of Shang. |

Although neither the "Five Forces" 五行 nor the "Three Standards" 三正 invoked by the "Gan shi" has an unambiguous meaning,[365] they nevertheless point to the ruler's relationship with the cosmological order, on the one hand, and the sociopolitical order, on the other—precisely what the "Mu shi" takes time to enumerate in concrete categories. The "folding" and "unfolding" of a catalog

[364] Kern, "The 'Harangues' (*shi* 誓) in the *Shangshu*," 290, 298.

[365] For a range of explanations provided by traditional commentaries, see Gu Jiegang 顧頡剛 and Liu Qiyu 劉起釪, *Shangshu jiaoshi yulun* 尚書校釋譯論 vol.2 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2005), 868-873.

is a familiar technique in speech writings (chapter 1); here, the difference likewise produces the kind of variation derived directly from the mode of textual composition.

For the same purpose of indicting the enemy, the "Tang shi" differs further from the "Gan shi" and "Mu shi" by presenting it in a reported dialogue between King Tang, the speaker, and his addressees. Retold all in the king's own voice through the use of prosopopoeia, another common technique not only in speech representation but in varying the mode of speech representation, the indictment here is delivered in a dramatized exchange rather than monologic pronouncement. Also in Kern's translation:[366]

> 今爾有眾. 汝曰. 我后不恤我眾. 舍我穡事. 而割正夏. 予惟聞汝眾言. 夏氏有罪. 予畏上帝. 不敢不正. 今汝其曰. 夏罪其如台. 夏王率遏眾力. 率割夏邑. 有眾率怠弗協.
>
> "Now, you are in multitudes; you say: 'Our lord has no compassion for us multitudes. He causes us to cast aside our husbandry and to bring disaster on the correct Xia [way of government].' I, indeed, hear the words of you multitudes. The house of Xia has crimes. I am fearful of the God-on-High and do not have the temerity not to be correct. Now you may say, 'The crimes of Xia—what can be done about them! The king of Xia in everything obstructs the efforts of the multitudes, in everything brings disaster upon the City of Xia; the multitudes are in peril and not harmonized.'"

From here on, the king vows to proceed forward in his insurrection against Xia. But having the enemy's people indict their own ruler, although unique among the *shi*, is not uncommon in the *Shangshu*. It is a change in narrative perspective done for a rhetorical effect, which in this case helps to justify the challenger's claim to power. As Kern has remarked as well, "Of course, the seemingly dialogical structure…where the future king responds to the plaint of the suffering folk, is a rhetorical construction. The multitudes, after all, do not speak; their voices are created within Tang's own speech."[367] What merits emphasizing is that this prosopopoeia, also the highlight of the "Tang shi" variation on the shared element of indictment, is very much a function of the *shi* as a valorized type of speech. As noted in the earlier chapters, every popular speech type in early Chinese writings

[366] Kern, "The 'Harangues' (*shi* 誓) in the *Shangshu*," 293.

[367] Ibid., 297.

gathers over time meaning to its very form. The top-down, monologic configuration of the *shi* is what gives the speech type a tint of authority. The form itself invites attention and recognition. In order to retain this formal semiotics of the *shi*, an "external" voice can only be recounted by the voice directly speaking it, in the form of prosopopoeia.

Such controlled variation in how the structural components are weighted and with what narrative construction contributes to Kern's characterization of these *shi* as "imagined speeches."[368] "Imagined" neither *ex nihilo* nor according to a hypotextual model but, I would argue, to a sense of genre construction. That is, to a generalized and abstracted mode of discourse production fulfilled empirically by the narrative techniques available to or preferred by it. This allows situated textual productions to index a set of discursive strategies without being tied to every externalized element of the strategies. In other words, materials attributable to a narrative repertoire are not equally reusable, because not all modules comprising what has come to be called "modular composition" are of the same type or significance.[369] Of the structural components that comprise these three *shi*, for example, the elements numbered [1] through [3] (the introduction; the exclamation; the direct addressing of the addressee) work together to set the "generic context" for the content of the speech ([4] through [7]), which, then, concludes with [8], the threat, a common ending to other types of *shi* as well.[370] The *shi*, therefore, *encloses* what it tries to pronounce in a structure that self-identifies as *shi*. Unlike the anecdote where an embedded speech is typically framed by the narrative around it, speeches in the *Shangshu* frame themselves.

Recognizing this difference between the "framing modules" of a speech (in this case, elements [1]-[3] and then [8]) and the "framed modules" ([4]-[7]) is a crucial step toward the realization of the genre productivity of *shi*. The former, with its self-reference to the speech type, is part and parcel of the mode of representation of the *shi*. One cannot enact a *shi* speech by not

368 Ibid., 306.

369 For the idea of "modular composition," see Martin Kern, "'Xi Shuai' 蟋蟀 ('Cricket') and Its Consequences"; Kern, "Cultural Memory and the Epic in Early Chinese Literature."

370 In the covenant texts from Houma and Wenxian, a threat in the formulaic expression of "may ruin befall my lineage 麻夷非是 is made to the speaker of the oath himself.

directly addressing one's audience and, in this case, by not also ordering them to pay serious attention to the utterance itself. Dramatization is always marked in some ways. The framed modules, on the other hand, express the real "stuff" of the speech, its ideational content. In both structural and discursive ways, the framed modules are entextualized into the framing modules. The indictment of the enemy and the avowed warfare mandated by Heaven fits well with the framing modules in the cases of "Gan shi," "Tang shi," and "Mu shi," but they are not the only possible content of a speech thus configured. Like the *gao*, which I will illustrate in the next chapter, even the narrowly-focused battlefield *shi* can be a "discursive vessel," a genre outlet, so to speak, for other thematic concerns.

Between the "Qin shi" and "Bi shi," which according to the exegetical tradition are also "authentic," the "Qin Shi" is a particularly good example of the thematic capacity of *shi*.[371] First, unlike the other *shi*, the "Qin shi" purports to be a speech made much later in history, traceable according to the *Shiji* 史記 to the thirty-sixth year of Lord Mu of Qin 秦穆公 (627 BCE).[372] Second, it lacks a prose introduction (like the "Tang shi" and "Mu shi") that prepares the reader for the speech, and thus goes directly into speaking. Third, as mentioned earlier, it is the only *shi* available to date that is made after, not before, a battle. Fourth, in the speech itself, after the framing modules that have the speaker first exclaim ("Ah!" 嗟), then address his addressee ("My officers, listen to me without any noise" 我士. 聽無嘩), and finally announce the type of utterance he is giving ("I shall announce to you in this *shi* the foremost of all sayings"予誓告汝群言之首),[373] the remaining body part of the speech never returns to any of the other components that make up the body parts of the "Gan shi," "Tang shi," and "Mu shi." Instead, as has been noted by many commentators, Duke Mu

---

[371] The "Bi shi" 費誓 illustrates the same phenomenon but is less interesting of a case. Despite major structural differences with the "Gan shi," "Tang shi," and "Mu shi," they all revolved around the preparation for warfare. See an analysis in Maria Khayutina, "'Bi shi' 費誓, Western Zhou Oath Texts, and the Legal Culture of Early China," in *Origins of Chinese Political Philosophy*, 416-445.

[372] *Shiji*, 5.193-194.

[373] *Shangshu jiaoshi yulun*, 2168.

goes on to express regret and hope over the loss of three officers in a military operation,[374] in a speech that is really a stream of thought. Despite all that, the "Qin shi" is never doubted of its authenticity, although far less commented on than other "authentic" iterations of the *shi*.[375]

What does it mean, then, that the "Qin shi" is *also* "authentic"? Although never shown but only assumed to be so by Yan Ruoqu and others, the fact that the "Qin shi" can be anchored in various ways in other textual materials that seem "early" and "credible" would, according to Yan's criteria, justify the speech's authenticity. In fact, these reference materials comprise the main source of evidence for traditional commentaries on the "Qin shi." To begin with, the purported historical context of the speech is mentioned in the *Shiji* and *Zuozhuan*. In both accounts, Duke Mu is said to have given a tearful speech after losing a battle and three of his commanders to Jin 晉 at a place called Yao 崤. Although the *Zuozhuan* (Xi, 33) records an entirely different set of words ("I alone went against [the advice of] Jian Shu and thereby brought shame on you. This was my fault alone" 孤違蹇叔. 以辱二三子. 孤之罪也[376]), the *Shiji* account opens the speech with the same framing modules as the "Qin shi"—"Ah! My officers. Listen without noise. Let me tell you in this *shi* the following" 嗟. 士卒. 聽無譁. 余誓告汝—and then repeats, in the remainder of the speech, a brief couplet seen also in the "Qin shi" with minor variation: "Men of old consult the yellow-haired. By doing so they avoid erring" 古之人謀黃髮番番. 則無所過.[377] The provenance, occasion, and basic emotional texture of the "Qin shi" are thus compatible, at least, with what history remembers.

In addition, almost the entire "Qin shi" has parallels in other—and canonical—sources. As noted by Matsumoto Masaaki 松本雅明, the first half of the speech reverberates with various lines

---

374 See, for example, *Shangshu jiaoshi yulun*, 2191.

375 Following their predecessors like Kong Yingda 孔穎達 and Sun Xingyan 孫星衍, who have little to say about the "Qin shi" in their commentaries, Gu Jiegang 顧頡剛 and Liu Qiyu 劉起釪 simply state that despite some issues in dating, "this chapter has no major issues that need to be discussed" 本篇沒有較大的問題需要討論. *Shangshu jiaoshi yulun*, 2186.

376 Yang Bojun 楊伯峻, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu* 春秋左傳注 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1982), 500.

377 *Shiji*, 5.194.

from across the *Shijing*.[378] Although the parallel is never perfect, nor overlapping with more than any one line from any one poem, the tetrasyllabic meter, the repeated use of reduplicatives,[379] as well as the overall parallelism throughout this part of the speech suggest close affinity—and therefore "trustworthiness"—with the language and style of the *Shijing*. Following the framing modules that end with "I shall announce to you in this *shi* the foremost of all sayings," the speech goes:[380]

古人有言曰. 民訖自若是多盤.
It is this which the ancients have said, "Thus it is with all people: they mostly love their ease.

責人斯無難. In reproving others there is no difficulty,
惟受責俾如流. but to receive reproof, and allow it to have a free course,
是惟艱哉. this is difficult!"

我心之憂. The sorrow of my heart is this:
日月逾邁. that the days and months pass away,
若弗雲來. as if they would not come again.

惟古之謀人. There were my old counselors—
則曰未就予忌. I said to them that their not accommodating me made me hate them;
惟今之謀人. There were my new counselors—
姑將以為親. I would for a time give my confidence to them.

雖則云然. 尚猷詢茲黃髮. 則罔所愆.
Although it may be so with old men and new, hereafter I will take advice from the men of yellow hair, and then I shall be free from error.

番番良士. That good old officer—
旅力既愆. all his strength is exhausted,
我尚有之. but may I still have him!
仡仡勇夫. That dashing brave officer—
射御不違. his shooting and charioteering are faultless,
我尚不欲. but I had rather not wish him!

惟截截善諞言. 俾君子易辭. 我皇多有之.[381]

---

[378] Matsumoto Masaaki 松本雅明, *Shunjū Sengoku ni okeru Shōjo no tenkai* 春秋戦国における尚書の展開 (Tokyo: Kōsei shorin, 1988), 576-577.

[379] Kern also notes this feature of the "Qin shi." See Kern, "The 'Harangues' (*shi* 誓) in the *Shangshu*," 289.

[380] The translation is James Legge's, with minor modification, for convenience. See Legge, *The Chinese Classics: The Shoo King or the Book of Historical Documents* (Taipei: SMC Publishing Inc., 1991), 626-28.

[381] *Shangshu jiaoshi yilun*, 2168-69.

As to men of quibbles, skillful at cunning words, and able to make the superior man change his purposes, what have I to do with making use of them?

Following these loosely connected couplets of remorse and desire, the second half of the speech is found almost entirely in the "Da xue" 大學 chapter of the *Liji* 禮記, as a quotation from a text also titled "Qin shi." In addition, a fragment of it (underlined) appears also in high fidelity in the *Gongyang* 公羊 commentary to the *Chunqiu* (Wen, 12).[382] Only the very beginning and end of this part (bracketed) are not paralleled:[383]

[昧昧我思之.]
I have deeply thought and concluded—

<u>如有一介臣. 斷斷猗無他技. 其心休休焉. 其如有容.</u>
Let me have but one resolute minister, plain and sincere, without other abilities, but having a simple complacent mind, and possessed of generosity.

人之有技. 若己有之. 人之彥聖. 其心好之. 不啻若自其口出. 是能容之.以保我子孫黎民. 亦職有利哉.
Regarding the talent of others, it would be as if he himself possessed them; when he finds accomplished and sage-like men, he would love them in his heart more than his mouth expresses. This is really showing himself able to bear them. Such a minister would be able to preserve my descendants and my people, and would indeed be a giver of benefits.

人之有技. 冒疾以惡之. 人之彥聖而違之. 俾不達. 是不能容. 以不能保我子孫黎民. 亦曰殆哉.
But if the minister, when he finds men of ability, be jealous and hates them; if, when he finds accomplished and sage-like men, he opposes them and does not allow their advancement, this is showing himself really not able to bear them. Such a man will not be able to protect my descendants and people; and will there not indeed be dangers from him?

[邦之杌隉. 曰由一人. 邦之榮懷. 亦尚一人之慶].[384]
The prosperity and unsettledness of a state may rise from one man.
The glory and tranquility of a state may perhaps also arise from the excellence of one man.

---

[382] For a complete overview of the parallels, see Chan Hung Kan 陳雄根 and Ho Che Wah 何志華, *Xian Qin Liang Han dianji yin "Shangshu" ziliao huibian* 先秦兩漢典籍引《尚書》資料彙編 (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 2003), 287-289.

[383] The translation is still Legge's, with minor modification.

[384] *Shangshu jiaoshi yilun*, 2169.

Parallel at a larger scale and contrastive from one to the next segment, this part transitions to a description of the desired counselor. The duke has finished bemoaning his own fault and is now looking forward to a better future, for he has, after some deep (*meimei* 昧昧) thinking, concluded that he would heed good advice for a change, implicitly echoing the regret and remorse articulated in the *Zuozhuan*. In the larger context of the story, it *was* due to the duke's injudiciousness in weeding out bad advice that caused his defeat. Now seen in both the "Da xue" and the *Gongyang*, these words further gather credibility as genuine, unfabricated, materials of the time.

Despite (and due to) the parallels, the "Qin shi" is itself modular. That half of the speech is *Shijing*-esque while the other half has parallels in the "Da xue," another modular composition, suggests an effort in compiling similarly-themed content for the expression of a ruler's remorse. None of the materials here is proprietary; rather, their reiteration in multiple sources either in compatible diction or style points to a shared memory of these materials as portable discursive fabrics.[385] There is no narrative logic to the "Qin shi"; it coheres only in the emotional tenor of the speech. More importantly, the speech thus configured could have been said by *any* ruler on *any* occasion. Nothing in the speech points to an identity or context that would put it at the moment Duke Mu of Qin is said to have uttered a tearful speech. Nothing in the speech itself suggests a background story in which the speaker has lost a battle, together with some of his officials, to a specific opponent. The only thing that chimes well with the historical memories given in the *Shiji* and *Zuozhuan* is the mood of the speech. And yet the dictions, including those paralleled in the "Da xue," are non-deictic, non-specific, one could even say abstract and universal. Without the framing modules, the speech as well as any part of it, like the second half, could be placed anywhere, in any mode of representation. As indicated by the "Da xue" and *Gongyang*, they fit just as well into narrative contexts that are not direct speech.[386] Only with the minor preface to the "Qin shi," an

---

[385] For quotation of the *Shangshu* in particular, see David Schaberg, "Speaking of Documents: *Shu* Citations in Warring States Texts," in *Origins of Chinese Political Philosophy*, 320-359.

[386] The *Gongyang* tradition adopts a dialogical, question-and-answer structure for the exegesis but never in dramatized direct speech. For the lines discussed here, see Liu Shangci 劉尚慈, *Chunqiu Gongyang zhuan yizhu* 春秋公羊傳譯注 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2010), 310.

instance of interpretation no doubt, is this collection of materials given a set of historical coordinates as, further, a set of *spoken* words: "Duke Mu of Qin launched an attack on Zheng. Duke Xiang of Jin led an army and defeated him at Mount. Yao. Upon return, Duke Mu made the 'Oath of Qin'" 秦穆公伐鄭. 晉襄公帥師敗諸崤. 還歸. 作秦誓.[387]

Such narrative and compositional aspects of the otherwise traceable and "verifiable" textual materials are what Yan Ruoqu and other like-minded textual critics do not hold in high regard. Their main focus is on locating evidence in existing source materials that would corroborate the meaning, dating, and usage of words and phrases. For the "Qin shi," however, the "authenticity" of its words and phrases belies the constructed nature of *every shi*: the framing modules can contain any content deemed fit for the speech type. Duke Mu's speech as uttered in the "Qin shi," in that sense, found its own way into the *shi* because the *shi* provides the otherwise unmoored words a fitting generic context. The speech function of the *shi*, that is to say, is what appealed to the textual productions that were in need of, or could benefit from, a recognized generic outlet. In all likelihood, even the battlefield occasion of these *shi* was conventionalized into a genre feature for good reasons. It contributes to the urgency of the speech and thus the gravity of the words. In this regard, the *shi* is no different from, for example, deathbed speeches given by the wise but soon-to-be deceased.[388]

If the "Gan shi," "Tang shi," and "Mu shi" indeed have a history in ritual performance, as Kern has argued,[389] then the "Qin shi" (and the "Bi shi," for that matter) should be recognized as a different "application" of the *shi* genre. At least to the critical tradition, none is *more* authentic than the others. They together illustrate the capacity of the *shi* as a set of genre strategies. Within this set

---

387 *Shangshu zhengyi*, 813.

388 In addition to the well-known speech Sima Qian heard from his dying father in the "Taishigong zixu" 太史公自序, two Tsinghua manuscripts, the "Bao xun" 保訓 and "Zhai gong" 祭公, both turn a *gao* 誥 speech into a deathbed scene that is likewise urgent. The "Bao xun" is better studied in English. See, for example, Sarah Allan, *Buried Ideas: Legends of Abdication and Ideal Government in Early Chinese Bamboo-Slip Manuscripts* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2015), 263-314; Rens Krijgsman, "Cultural Memory and Excavated Anecdotes in 'Documentary' Narrative: Mediating Generic Tensions in the Baoxun Manuscript," in *Between History and Philosophy*, 301-330; Dirk Meyer, *Documentation and Argumentation in Early China*, 120-57.

389 Kern, "The 'Harangues' (*shi* 誓) in the *Shangshu*," 306-311.

of strategies, the framing modules play double duty in enacting the dramatic mode of the speech, on the one hand, and in identifying its more specific type—as, for example, a *shi* rather than a *gao*—on the other. What remains to be enclosed as the framed modules which function to carry the ideational content of the speech is a phenomenon of history and ideology. This mode of textual production gives part of a speech, on the narrative plane, paratextuality over another part of it.[390] It is a common literary practice to which are owed many more speeches in the *Shangshu*, the "forged" ones included. "Authenticity," as I will discuss further in the next section, is an empty word without reference to the mechanisms and motivations on which it tries to pass judgment.[391]

### *The Voice of Heaven's Mandate*

Among the *shi*, the three "Tai shi" 泰誓 have been ensnared in controversy since around the first century BC. Suspicions abound regarding the dating, provenance, number of redactions, and number of chapters within each redaction of the "Tai shi." Based solely on folkloric, bibliographical, and citational information gathered from other sources, these suspicions agree on nothing but the "forged" nature of the current "Tai shi," believed to have been put together as late as the Eastern Jin 東晉.[392] Despite *this* version's canonization all the way up to the Tang, from the Song to the Qing the three "Tai shi" gradually lost their prestige as trusted words from antiquity, thanks to the

---

390 Borrowed from Gérard Genette, paratext in its current use has mostly been limited to somewhat separable portions of a larger text, whether physically, materially, codicological, or by the distinctions made between prose and verse and/or narrative and speech. While productive, we must be reminded that only, for example, in ancient Greek and Roman manuscripts are paratext physically separated from text (e.g., commentaries on Homer). In early China, this is often not the case. What is seen as paratext depends more heavily on our own judgements about text and textuality. For a more innovative study on paratextuality, see Heng Du, "The Author's Two Bodies: The Death of Qu Yuan and the Birth of *Chuci zhangju*," *T'oung Pao* 105 (2019): 259-314.

391 In saying so, I am inspired by Anthony Grafton, *Forgers and Critics: Creativity and Duplicity in Western Scholarship* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990).

392 Reception history of the "Tai shi" can be found in Chen Mengjia 陳夢家, *Shangshu tonglun* 尚書通論 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1985), 58-77 and Jiang Shan'guo 蔣善國, *Shangshu zongshu* 尚書綜述 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1988), 213-225. The most thorough review of the controversies, however, is still Matsumoto Masaaki 松本雅明, *Shunju Sengoku ni okeru Shojo no tenkai* 春秋戦国における尚書の展開 (Tokyo: Kōsei shorin, 1988), 59-190.

renewed suspicion culminating in Yan Ruoqu's extensive philological examination that has since remained paradigmatic both as a method for the study of early texts and as a literary historical judgment.[393]

During this entire history of critical engagement, few have read the "Tai shi" for what they are; the aim has always been the exposure of the individual components of the texts that can sustain claims of forgery. Nomura Shigeo's 野村茂夫 argument that the "Tai shi" stands not so much for a single, discrete text but an entire repertoire of similarly-themed texts *preconditioned* on variation comes closest to a description of the "Tai shi" in its own right.[394] Yet, it still does not tell us why the current "Tai shi" in three iterations look the way they do—even if assembled later and from preexisting materials—and what the texts do to their readers who, like most in the Tang, never saw the texts as anything less than serious. Conventional concern with textual authenticity leaves out the consideration of *culturally* authentic engagement with textual production and reception.[395]

Compared to the "authentic" *shi*, the three "Tai shi" exhibit both resemblance and difference. In terms of thematic focus and structural composition, they are more in line with "Gan shi," "Tang shi," and Mu shi" than with "Bi shi" and "Qin shi." In terms of language and diction, the "Tai shi" shares parallel materials with the "Mu shi" but, on a more general level, adopts a

---

393 The techniques used in textual authentication through history are surveyed in Bernhard Karlgren, "The Authenticity of Ancient Chinese Texts," *Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities* 1 (1929): 165-183 and Paul Fischer, "Authentication Studies (辨偽學) Methodology and the Polymorphous Text Paradigm," *Early China* 32 (2008-2009): 1-43. See also Anke Hein, "Concepts of 'Authenticity' and the Chinese Textual Heritage in Light of Excavated Texts," in *China and the World—the World and China: Essays in Honor of Rudolf G. Wagner (Volume 1: Transcultural Perspectives on Pre-modern China)*, ed. Joachim Gentz (Gossenberg: Ostasien Verlag, 2019), 37-63.

394 Nomura Shigeo 野村茂夫, "Senshin ni okeru Shōsho no ruden ni tsuite no jakkan no kōsatsu" 先秦における尚書の流傳についての若干の考察, *Nihon Chūgoku gakkai hō* 日本中國學會報 17 (1965): 1-18; See also a brief discussion of the implications of the argument in Kern, "The 'Harangues' (*shi* 誓) in the *Shangshu*," 303-308.

395 A good comparison can be made with the mythologization of cultural heroes in which what they are tasked to say, do, or signify is obviously an imaginative enterprise that has to be captured in some textual form. See for example Mark Edward Lewis, "The Social History of Violence," in *Sanctioned Violence in Early China* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990), 165-212; Michael J. Puett, "Sages, Ministers, and Rebels: Narratives from Early China Concerning the Initial Creation of the State," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 58.2 (1998): 425–79.

rhetoric similar to that of the "Qin shi." Authenticity is not a one-dimensional measure. More substantially, the three "Tai shi" represent a more institutional and more literary application of the *shi* genre intended, I would argue, for the ideological perpetuation of Heaven's Mandate. As the speeches progress, the speaker is not reacting to the contingencies of an imminent battle in a seemingly extemporized manner flowing spontaneously from a charismatic personality;[396] rather, he reenacts, repeatedly and programmatically, the absolute authority of Heaven's Mandate in adjudicating power and its transfer. Something never changes, even in the face of a changing world. This rhetorical maneuver made with and in a literary form is also achieved through the same genre strategies underlying all other *shi*. In "assembling" the three "Tai shi," the compositions of each not only take advantage of the same narrative techniques that help to produce controlled variation but also coordinate together in the creation of another "protreptic triad" (chapter 2). The voicing of the same message through the repeated but varied dramatization of a speaker function—the significative value of a name for both meaning and interpretation—is what justifies the "Tai shi" in not one, not two, but three separate but mutually congruent iterations.[397]

All three "Tai shi" begin with a brief prose introduction that sets the scene for the speech. The first one (hereinafter TS-A) occurs in "the spring of the thirteenth year [of King Wu], when [the king] assembled a great conference at the Ford of Meng" 惟十有三年春. 大會于孟津;[398] the second (hereinafter TS-B) "on the *Wuwu* day, [when] the king has reached the north side of the River, where all the various lords also gathered with their troops" 惟戊午. 王次于河朔. 羣后以師畢會;[399] and the third (hereinafter TS-C), finally, "at the next daybreak, when the king greatly inspected the six regiments" 時厥明. 王乃大巡六師.[400] Seemingly a sequential order of three

396 See Kern, "The 'Harangues' (*shi* 誓) in the *Shangshu*," 305-07.

397 Although, as I have noted in chapter 2, it is not entirely clear why three is the apparent "norm."

398 I follow the *Shangshu zhengyi* 尚書正義 edition of the three "Tai shi." *Shangshu zhengyi*, 10.400.

399 Ibid., 10.407

400 Ibid., 10.414.

separate speeches, one made before crossing the river, one after, the third the following morning,[401] the content of the three speeches will suggest a generic, not historical, order of differentiation.

Having specified the occasions, the three "Tai shi" go on to announce themselves all as *shi*, all the while addressing their audience first with an exclamation. The framing modules of the *shi* are thus fully present to signal the exact speech type of the utterances:

> [TS-A] The king says, "Ah! Rulers of my ally states, officers who manage my affairs, listen carefully to my oath…"
>
> 王曰. 嗟. 我友邦冢君. 越我御事庶士. 明聽誓…[402]
>
> [TS-B] The king, then, inspected the troops and uttered an oath, saying, "*Wuhu*! You multitudes of the western lands, listen, all of you, to my words…"
>
> 王乃徇師而誓曰. 嗚呼. 西土有眾. 咸聽朕言…[403]
>
> [TS-C] In a clear oath to the various officers, the king says, "*Wuhu*! Gentleman of my western lands…"
>
> 明誓眾士. 王曰. 嗚呼. 我西土君子.[404]

From there on, the three "Tai shi" move straight to the next component shared by the "Gan shi," "Tang shi," and "Mu shi" and launch into an indictment of the enemy. All six speeches concern themselves with the replacement of an inadequate ruler. It is also starting from here that the three "Tai shi" begin to adopt a rhetoric that gradually but steadily separates them from the "Gan shi," "Tang shi," and "Mu shi." The same thematic concern, that is, is now being addressed with a change

---

401 See for example Kong Yingda's claim on this sequence in *Shangshu zhengyi*, 10.400-401, 407, 414.

402 *Shangshu zhengyi*, 10.401

403 Ibid., 10.407.

404 Ibid., 10.414.

in rhetorical coloration. Instead of charging the enemy head-on, the three "Tai shi" all pad their indictment with an aphoristic statement of principle that can be plugged into any text:[405]

> [TS-A] Heaven and Earth are the parents of the myriad things. Of the myriad things, man is the most numinous. Only those who are keen-eared and clear-sighted can become a great sovereign; and the great sovereign is the father and mother to the people.
>
> 惟天地. 萬物父母. 惟人. 萬物之靈. 亶聰明. 作元后. 元后作民父母.[406]
>
> [TS-B] I have heard that a benevolent man, when doing good, laments the scarcity of time; a malevolent man, when doing evil, also laments the scarcity of time.
>
> 我聞吉人為善. 惟日不足. 凶人為不善. 亦惟日不足.[407]
>
> [TS-C] Heaven has clear courses of action, the patterned of which especially pronounced.
>
> 天有顯道. 厥類惟彰.[408]

Seen elsewhere only in the "Mu shi,"[409] this rhetorical move in prefacing the ensuing indictment of the enemy (in this case, the last Shang king, Shou 受) with a statement of principle helps to shift the authority of adjudication from the personal judgment of the speaker to that of inherited wisdom, i.e., of tradition. The hearsay marker "I have heard" 我聞 leading the principle statement in TS-B can be added to either of the other two or left out altogether; the gesture of citing the tradition would not be lost. The indictment is thereby institutionalized, in which process the challenger to power, King Wu, acquires both the lexicon and legitimacy to represent no longer himself, at this point a seditious

---

405 Curiously, however, none of the following has too many parallels in other sources. See Chan and Ho, *Xian Qin Liang Han dianji yin Shangshu ziliao huibian*, 161, 164, 167.

406 *Shangshu zhengyi*, 10.401-402.

407 Ibid., 10.408.

408 Ibid., 10.414.

409 The indictment in the "Mu shi" is prefaced by a saying attributed to the ancients. In Kern's translation, "The ancients had a saying: 'The hen should not call the morning. If the hen calls the morning, the house will come to an end.'" 古人有言曰. 牝雞無晨. 牝雞之晨. 惟家之索. Kern, "The 'Harangues' (*shi* 誓) in the *Shangshu*," 298.

rebel, but a higher, more sanctioned source of authority.[410] Like in the upcoming execution of Heaven's Mandate, little room is left for personal agency in any part of this, now, "regularized" process of regime change. The charismatic speaker has become an instrument.

What follows these statements of principle also reinforces the institutionalized voice in the three "Tai shi." As in the "Mu shi," the actual indictment opens with the word *jin* 今, a rhetorical marker of both "time and contrast":[411]

> [TS-A] **Now**, the Shang king, Shou—above, he does not revere Heaven; below, he brings calamities to the people; he succumbs to inebriation and lust; he abuses violence and brutality; he punishes people by lineage; he employs people by blood; he revels in the pursuit of palaces, towers, ponds, and luxury garments, at the harmful expense of the myriad people; he burns the loyal and the good; and he rips open pregnant women.
>
> **今**商王受. 弗敬上天. 降災下民. 沈湎冒色. 敢行暴虐. 罪人以族. 官人以世. 惟宮室. 臺榭. 陂池. 侈服. 以殘害于爾萬姓. 焚炙忠良. 刳剔孕婦.[412]
>
> [TS-B] **Now**, the Shang king, Shou—he exerts himself in licentiousness; he casts away the elders; he aligns himself with the deplorable; he drowns himself in alcohol and cruelty; his ministers are turned into him; his associates rival each other; cling to the king's power, they exterminate one another; the innocent cry at Heaven; his vile conducts widely known.
>
> **今**商王受. 力行無度. 播棄犁老. 暱比罪人. 淫酗肆虐. 臣下化之.朋家作仇. 脅權相滅. 無辜籲天. 穢德彰聞.[413]
>
> [TS-C] **Now** the Shang king, Shou—he holds in contempt the five constants; he is idle and shows no respect; he severs himself from Heaven; he sows resentment among the people; he cuts through the leg-bones of those who wade in the morning; he split open the heart of the worthy man; he uses his power to kill and slaughter; he poisons the four seas; he favors and trusts the treacherous; he ousts and expels his teachers; he throws away rules and penal laws; he imprisons and enslaves the upright men; he neglects sacrifices to Heaven and Earth; he discontinues offerings to the ancestral temples; he crafts bizarre devices and excessive skills, so as to please his women.

---

410 Kern ("The 'Harangues' (*shi* 誓) in the *Shangshu*," 301-302) makes a similar argument for the "Mu shi."

411 Ibid., 291.

412 *Shangshu zhengyi*, 10.402.

413 Ibid., 10.408.

今商王受. 狎侮五常. 荒怠弗敬. 自絕于天. 結怨于民. 斫朝涉之脛. 剖賢人之心. 作威殺戮. 毒痛四海. 崇信奸回. 放黜師保. 屏棄典刑. 囚奴正士. 郊社不修. 宗廟不享. 作奇技淫巧. 以悅婦人.[414]

All three indictments go to some length in their accusation of the last Shang king, but they uniformly voice the same *kind* of critique, also in a shared tetrasyllabic meter. First, the word *jin* 今 in all three instances strikes up a contrast not between a "terrible status quo" and a "world as it should be," as in the "Gan shi" and "Tang shi,"[415] but between the absolute standards represented by the principle statements and the abysmal conduct of the Shang king. Second, the enumerated crimes are so phrased that they read more generic than specific, turning the king into a caricature, a target of discursive polemics *in addition to* how he is remembered historically. A long catalog of transgressions—cruelty, lasciviousness, unlawfulness, among others—are piled onto Shou, when the *Shiji*, for example, recounts only a fraction of the transgressions that the indictments here also mention but ever so vaguely: his lust for sex and his concubines, his construction of the pleasure quarters, his extreme cruelty and torturing machines, and his famous "stunt" gouging out Bigan's 比干 heart.[416] Aside from those, the range of transgressions represented here are catalogic in their narrative construction, much like how the "Mu shi" expands on the indictment as well. There is a kernel of truth to the accusations, but the rhetoric operates on its own.

Once this contrastive indictment of the enemy based heavily on verbal polemics is complete, the three "Tai shi" also begin to part ways with the "Mu shi" in their structural progression. Instead of transitioning to the exhortation part of the *shi*, the three "Tai shi" reinforce their commitment to an institutionalized voice by launching into another round of indictment. This time, the challenger to power is situated in a long lineage of historical exemplars and thereby presented as the inheritor of that glorious tradition. Individual agency is once again inserted into the course of historical change. TS-A, for example, goes back to King Wen, father of the speaker, King Wu:

---

414 Ibid., 10.415.

415 See Kern, "The 'Harangues' (*shi* 誓) in the *Shangshu*," 291-292.

416 See *Shiji*, 3.107-09.

> The August Heaven seethed with furor. He charged my deceased father, Wen, to reverently execute Heaven's might. Yet, the great achievement is yet to be completed.
>
> 皇天震怒. 命我文考. 肅將天威. 大勳未集.[417]

TS-B, on the other hand, goes all the way back to Shang's own deposing of Xia, further extending the stretch of historical change:

> Heaven favors the people, and the sovereign holds in the highest regard Heaven. Jie, the ruler of Xia, was not able to bring himself to follow Heaven. Instead, he spread poison throughout the kingdoms. Heaven thus aided and commanded the Accomplished King Tang in the revoking of Xia's mandate.
>
> 惟天惠民. 惟辟奉天. 有夏桀弗克若天. 流毒下國. 天乃佑命成湯. 降黜夏命.[418]

This appeal to the distant past, a common rhetorical strategy dating back to the bronze inscriptions, places the challenger in an empirical type of wisdom to which he is just a filial and devout follower. The rhetorical effect it creates is the same as invoking an aphoristic statement of principle, as done in the first round of indictment, since both gesture at universal, unchanging truth. By invoking King Tang, King Wu the speaker also implies that he is replicating a historical precedent sanctioned long ago by Heaven. Just like it was Heaven who "aided and commanded" 佑命 King Tang to "degrade" 降 and "expel" 黜 Xia from Heaven's Mandate, King Wu is likewise positioning himself for the next execution of Heaven's will. For the same purpose of rhetorically padding the second indictment, TS-C supplies an inherited saying in place of another history-tracing: "The ancients have this saying: he who soothes us is the sovereign, he who torments us is the enemy" 古人有言曰. 撫我則后. 虐我則仇.[419] Now a literal principle attributed to the ancients 古人, whose words pronounce a

---

[417] *Shangshu zhengyi*, 10.404.

[418] Ibid., 10.409.

[419] Ibid., 10.416.

categorical judgment (he who X is Y, "X 則 Y"), this saying leaves King Wu, again, no option but to rebel.

Following this second appeal to traditional wisdom, the three "Tai shi" give another contrastive indictment of the Shang king. In both rounds, the assertation, first, of a truth statement, whether ideational or historical, serves to emphasize the inevitability of regime change. The narrative focus is put on the rules for change themselves since, in contrast to the truth statements made in different ways (inherited wisdom and historical exemplars *are* the two common forms of variation in early Chinese writings), the second indictment once again proceeds in all three "Tai shi" along a generic catalog of transgressions. The relative disinterestedness in this part of the speech is obvious:

> [TS-A] I, Fa, the little one, together with you, rulers of my ally states, witnessed the governance of Shang. Shou indeed has not the heart of repentance. He carries himself in a careless manner; he does not serve the High God or the spirits; he does not make sacrifices to the temples of his ancestors; and the sacrificial animals and food all fell prey to robbers. Yet, he still says, "I have the people. I have the Mandate"—never once correcting his own affront.
>
> 肆予小子發. 以爾友邦冢君觀政于商. **惟**受罔有悛心. 乃夷居. 弗事上帝神祇. 遺厥先宗廟弗祀. 犧牲粢盛. 既于凶盜. 乃曰. 吾有民有命. 罔懲其侮.[420]
>
> [TS-B] Shou's crimes indeed exceed those of Jie. He persecutes the finest men; he maltreats his remonstrating aids; he claims that he has Heaven's Mandate, that reverence is not worth practicing, that sacrifice is of no use, and that tyranny inflicts no harm. His "mirror image" is not far from us—look at the king of Xia!
>
> **惟**受罪浮于桀. 剿喪元良. 賊虐諫輔. 謂己有天命. 謂敬不足行. 謂祭無益. 謂暴無傷. 厥監惟不遠. 在彼夏王.[421]
>
> [TS-C] Shou, the sole person (in this), has indeed wielded much tyranny; and has become the enemy of our lifetime. In cultivating virtue, one must let it spread; in eliminating evil, one must tend to its root.
>
> **獨夫**受洪**惟**作威. 乃汝世仇. 樹德務滋. 除惡務本.[422]

[420] Ibid., 10.404.

[421] Ibid., 10.409-410.

[422] Ibid., 10.416.

In addition to the consistent use of *wei* 惟 in place of *jin* 今, a phrase- or sentence-initial indicating decisive truth, and to the repetition of the kinds of crimes already enumerated in the first indictment, this part of the text also begins to exhibit overlapping among the three. A part of TS-A (underlined) appears in TS-B as reported speech (double underlined), in which King Shou's earlier claim in his own voice on "having" 有 the Mandate is now retold by King Wu in indirect speech. What in TS-A is King Wu's narrated description of King Shou's negligence of ritual matters (dotted) is also in TS-B recounted by King Wu (wavy). Only TS-C remains independent. This type of overlapping is not a sign of mindless copying but the very marker of triading as a mode of textual production. As seen also in the *Mozi* examples discussed in chapter 2, although the narrative content is repetitive, the narrative mode of representation keeps varying. And within speech representation, the variation is routinely achieved by turning direct speech, for example, into indirect speech. Intertextuality here is modulated by hypertextuality, that is, by the transformation in representational mode, style, mood, and so forth.[423]

The same kind of inter- *and* hyper-textual transformation manifests also in the next part of the speeches: Heaven's redistribution of the Mandate King Wu claims to execute:

| TS-A | TS-B |
|---|---|
| [1] Heaven aids the people below by establishing for them both rulers and teachers, [hoping that] they will assist the High God in bringing peace and grace to the four quarters. Whether there is crime or no crime, how dare I impose my own judgment on Heaven's?<br><br>[1] 天佑下民. 作之君. 作之師. 惟其克相上帝. 寵綏四方. 有罪無罪. 予曷敢有越厥志. | |

[423] As Genette notes, "one must not view the five types of transtextuality [by which he means intertextuality, paratextuality, metatextuality, architextuality, and finally hypertextuality] as separate and absolute categories without any reciprocal contact or overlapping. On the contrary, their relationships to one another are numerous and often crucial." Genette, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, 7.

| | |
|---|---|
| [2] When strengths match, one measures virtue. When virtues match, one measures righteousness. Shou has myriads and myriads of ministers, but they are of myriads and myriads of minds; I have only three thousand ministers, but they are all of one mind. Shang's crimes are overflowing, and Heaven has ordered her demise. If I do not follow Heaven, my own crime will equal that of Shang. | It appears that Heaven wants to rule the people by means of me—my own dreams are in line with my divination. With both overlapping on auspiciousness, my attack on Shang will surely prevail. Shou has myriads and myriads of men, but they unite not in mind nor in virtue; I have ten random ministers, but they share the same mind and the same virtue. Although Shou has close relatives by his side, they are nothing like my virtuous men! What Heaven sees comes from what the people see; what Heaven hears comes from what the people hear. If the people have faults to find, the responsibility lies in me and me alone—I must now march on! |
| [2] 同力度德. 同德度義. 受有臣億萬. 惟億萬心. 予有臣三千. 惟一心. 商罪貫盈. 天命誅之. 予弗順天. 厥罪惟鈞.[424] | 天其以予乂民. 朕夢協朕卜. 襲于休祥. 戎商必克. 受有億兆夷人. 離心離德. 予有亂臣十人. 同心同德. 雖有周親. 不如仁人. 天視自我民視. 天聽自我民聽. 百姓有過. 在予一人. 今朕必往.[425] |

As both passages articulate the actual logic of Heaven's Mandate—that Heaven is the ultimate sovereign ("Heaven aids the people below by establishing for them both rulers and teachers"); that Heaven observes through the eyes and ears of the people ("What Heaven sees comes from what the people see; what Heaven hears comes from what the people hear"); that Heaven orders regime change or else punishes he who does not comply ("If I do not follow Heaven, my own crime will equal that of Shang")—what is said in TS-A about hearts and minds (underlined) appears in TS-B once again in a different but meaningfully different manner.

Unlike TS-A, which begins with another aphoristic statement of principle ("When strengths match, one measures virtue. When virtues match, one measures righteousness"), against which the speaker juxtaposes his and his enemy's status quo ("Shou has myriads and myriads of ministers, but they are of myriads and myriads of minds; I have only three thousand ministers, but they are all of

[424] *Shangshu zhengyi*, 10.404-405.

[425] Ibid., 10.410-412.

one mind") without saying but only implying what it means (that his army, though smaller, is united and thus more virtuous and more righteous), the speaker in TS-B integrates the aphoristic principle into his judgment directly of his match against the enemy ("Shou has myriads and myriads of men, but they unite not in mind nor in virtue; I have ten random ministers, but they share the same mind and the same virtue"). What in TS-A are imported criteria for judgment, in other words, is presented in TS-B as the speaker's own observation and claim. The step TS-A took to reason is gone in TS-B.

This difference in how the same textual materials are narrated differently is not random; it aligns with the larger rhetorical orientations of both of the "Tai shi." While TS-A punctuates almost every reference to the Shang king so far made with a more general statement of principle (notice the earlier half of this part marked [1] above as well), TS-B resorts to a richer variety of rhetorical constructions and adopts the speaker's narrative perspective throughout the speech. It is the only iteration that marks the first allusion to inherited wisdom with "I have heard" 我聞; it in the second indictment reports in the speaker's own voice rather than dramatize what his enemy says ("he claims he has…" 謂己有); it also, in this part, has the speaker first narrate a dream he had, also a trope for the justification of his resurrection,[426] before going on to evaluate the enemy's moral disintegration. Despite the difference, which again suggests protreptic triading because each iteration adheres to its own narrative order, or, one might say, to an iteration-specific hypertextual modulation of intertextual relations, both contribute to the transposing of the adjudicating authority from the speaker to Heaven. No other *shi* spends this much effort on Heaven's Mandate; they simply assume the authority of the Mandate rather than explain, use, and valorize it.

TS-C, for some reason, does not participate in this part of the speech that also comprises the "Gan shi," "Tang shi," and "Mu shi." It moves directly from the second round of indictment to the exhortation of the troops. Nevertheless, whereas TS-A and TS-B also exhort, only TS-C includes a threat to those who do not obey (underlined). This kind of modular *nonparticipation* means little, for genre as a strategy guarantees room for deviation. What is more noteworthy is the rhetorical

[426] For divination as a trope, see Martin Kern, "Early Chinese Divination and Its Rhetoric," in *Coping with the Future: Theories and Practices of Divination in East Asia*, ed. Michael Lackner (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 255-88.

orientation of the exhortations. Unlike the performance-oriented exhortations in the "Gan shi," "Tang shi," and "Mu shi" which address the "here" and "now," deictically, of the duties, formation, and spirit of the soldiers, all three "Tai shi" continue to place the battle in the context of executing Heaven's Mandate, of carrying on the glorious examples set by past dynastic founders, of eradicating the crimes that prompt the regime change in the first place. Like everything up until this point of the textual progression, the three "Tai shi" are far more literary than performative:

> TS-A: I, the little one, am apprehensive day and night. I have received the mandate from my deceased father; I have made sacrifices to the High God and performed my service to Earth. And now I lead you, people, to execute the punishment by Heaven. Heaven is sympathetic toward the people. Whatever the people want, Heaven will grant it. May you all assist me, the solitary man, to forever cleanse the four seas. Now is the time—we cannot miss it!
>
> 予小子夙夜祗懼. 受命文考. 類于上帝. 宜于冢土. 以爾有眾. 厎天之罰. 天矜于民. 民之所欲. 天必從之. 爾尚弼予一人. 永清四海. 時哉弗可失.[427]
>
> TS-B: My military power is now displayed. I enter his territory, to capture that wickedness. My punishment, once extended, will be glorious as that of King Tang. Strive, you all! Do not any of you be afraid. Just think that he cannot defend us. All his people are trembling, like the horns of beasts falling from their heads. *Wuhu*! Unite your strengths. Unite your hearts. Once the work is accomplished, it will outlast all ages to come!
>
> 我武維揚. 侵于之疆. 取彼凶殘. 我伐用張. 于湯有光. 勖哉夫子. 罔或無畏. 寧執非敵. 百姓懍懍. 若崩厥角. 嗚呼. 乃一德一心. 立定厥功. 惟克永世.[428]
>
> TS-C: Now I, the little one, with the help from you, my officers, will completely destroy our enemy. My officers, may you march forward with resolute determination, so you can fulfill the [mandate] of your lord, me. To those who achieve merit, my reward will be plenty; to those who disobey, there awaits cardinal punishment! *Wuhu*! My deceased father Wen is like the sun and moon that shines above us. His brilliance extends to the four quarters and is even more manifest in the western lands. That is why our Zhou has received the allegiance of many states. If I subdue Shou, it will not be my martial prowess but my deceased father's not having any fault. If Shou subdues me, it will not be my deceased father's fault but because I, the little one, am no good.

[427] *Shangshu zhengyi*, 10.406-407.

[428] Ibid., 10.412-13.

肆予小子誕以爾眾士殄殲乃仇. 爾眾士其尚迪果毅. 以登乃辟. 功多有厚賞. 不迪有顯戮. 嗚呼. 惟我文考若日月之照臨. 光于四方. 顯于西土. 惟我有周. 誕受多方. 予克受. 非予武. 惟朕文考無罪. 受克予. 非朕文考有罪. 惟予小子無良.[429]

For most commentators since the Han, the three "Tai shi" simply illustrate "inauthenticity," "forgery," or at best "imitation," and the judgment is made by isolating fragments from the "Tai shi" for comparison with other source materials deemed trustworthy. Judgment about authenticity is thus inextricably linked to one's views on intertextual relations. Yan Ruoqu, for instance, details multiple instances either observed by himself or reported by other commentators where discrepancies exist between the current "Tai shi" and one's reference materials.[430] When there is a purported quotation of a text titled "Tai shi" but one that differs in the slightly way from the current "Tai shi," he concludes that the latter must be a different, later version of the title, assembled from those very quotations.[431] When there exist close parallels with the current "Tai shi" that are, however, either not presented as quotation or as quotation from a different title in his reference materials, he claims that those materials must have "sneaked into" 竄入 the current "Tai shi" as well.[432] Such unforgiving

429 Ibid., 10.416-417.

430 For a convenient compilation of all of Yan's comments on the "Tai shi," see Wu Tongfu 吳通福, *Wan chu Guwen Shangshu gong'an yu Qing dai xushu* 晚出《古文尚書》公案與清代學術 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2007), 73-81.

431 In one instance, Yan Ruoqu quotes Ma Rong's 馬融 (79-166) comments that the quotations of a "Tai shi" text as seen in the *Chunqiu* 春秋, *Guoyu* 國語, *Mengzi* 孟子, *Sunzi* 孫子, and *Liji* 禮記 do not match the "Tai shi" Ma had. On the contrary, they are seen in the received "Tai shi" currently available. This, then, means for Yan that the current text is evidently forged (其偽之愈不可掩也). *Shangshu guwen shuzheng* 1.27-28. In another, Yan argues that TS-A borrowed from the *Mozi* 墨子 (a shared quotation found in "Tian zhi, zhong" 天志・中, "Fei ming, shang" 非命・上, and "Fei ming, Zhong" 非命・中) but replaced part of the "original" with a new, "foreign" line (*Shangshu guwen shuzheng*, 1.43).

432 Examples of the former include parallels between TS-B and *Mengzi* 7b.4 (*Shangshu guwen shuzheng*, 1.37-38). Examples of the latter kind include a parallel between TS-A and *Mengzi* 1B.3 where Yan accuses the "Tai shi" for incorporating a quotation attributed to *Shu* 書 by *Mengzi* and also changing a part of the quotation, which Yan says is the original words of King Wu that *Mengzi* quoted from historical records (*Shangshu guwen shuzheng*, 4.139-140).

stance on intertextuality has remained influential ever since. Yet, with other models being developed in recent decades,[433] Yan's view has also attracted ever more critique.[434]

Regardless of how the "Tai shi" are intertextually related to other materials, the three texts themselves follow closely the genre construction of the *shi*. They may very well have been a later compilation, assembled from preexisting materials as well, but the composition of each and all three suggests careful narrative attention, the kind I have described as protreptic triading. In many ways, only with such self-referential generic operations can a genre last; and what comes with that exercise is what sustains a literary *history*. In the case of the *shi* and its iterations in both performative-oriented and literary-oriented manners, the literary history we would otherwise dismiss is one in which a new ground of literary aesthetics is being broken: that is, the literary appropriation of an oral form.

In her study of eighteen-century imitations of the epic, fable, and ballad, all earlier, oral forms of literature, the scholar of English literature Susan Stewart writes that such attempts "recoup the voice of orality in all its presumed authenticity of context…[and] mime the oral's mode of

---

433 In addition to the ideas of "modular composition," "repertoire," and "cultural memory" that Martin Kern has written about, Heng Du's model of "paratextual packaging" (in Du, "The Author's Two Bodies") also seeks to explain intertextuality on a broader scale. For other approaches to intertextuality (like textual memory and *mouvance*), see, for example, Rens Krijgsman, "Traveling Sayings as Carries of Philosophical Debate: From the Intertextuality of the **Yucong* 語叢 to the Dynamics of Cultural Memory and Authorship in Early China," *Asiatische Studien* 68.1 (2004): 83-115; Oliver Weingarten, "Intertextuality and Memory in Early Chinese Writings: A Case Study from *Huainanzi*," *Early China* 42 (2019): 201-236; Christopher M. B. Nugent, "*Mouvance* in Medieval Chinese Textual Culture: *Lunyu* 論語 in a Dunhuang Florilegium," *The Journal of Chinese Literature and Culture* 9.1 (2022): 170-194.

434 See, for example, Liu Renpeng 劉人鵬, *Yan Ruoqu yu Guwen Shangshu bianwei: Yige xueshushi de ge'an yanjiu* 閻若璩與古文尚書辨偽：一個學術史的個案研究 (Taipei: Huamulan chubanshe, 2005); Xu Huafeng 許華峰, *Yan Ruoqu Guwen Shangshu shuzheng de bianwei fangfa* 閻若璩《古文尚書疏證》的辨偽方法 (Taipei: Huamulan chubanshe, 2005). As expected, proponents of Yan also remain strongly committed to his methodology. In a recent publication, Liu Guangsheng 劉光勝 adopts Yan's faith in the absolute authenticity and authority of the reference texts the "ancient-script" chapters of the *Shangshu* are being compared to but transposes that authority to the Tsinghua manuscripts. In other words, when the "ancient-script" *Shangshu* differs from the Tsinghua materials, former's inauthenticity is proven. Liu Guangsheng 劉光勝, *Chutu wenxian yu Guwen Shangshu yanjiu* 出土文獻與《古文尚書》研究 (Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 2020). Targeting this methodological premise, Li Rui 李銳 offers a sensitive critique in Li, *Renwu, wenben, naindai: Chutu wenxian yu Xianqin gushu niandaixue tansuo* 人物、文本、年代：出土文獻與先秦古書年代學探索 (Beijing: Zhongguo renmin daxue chubanshe, 2017).

production and project the authority of the oral world."[435] This kind of literary imitation "marked off a space for representation in which literature was able to make broad claims over the more 'limited' temporal and spatial contexts of the oral."[436] As seen in the "Tai shi," all three speeches are situated in the generic occasion of the *shi*, the battlefield, and all three reproduce many of the generic features and components the "authentic" *shi* also exploit. Although the content of the speeches does not really address the "here" and "now" of the purported occasion, much like the "Qin shi," all three speeches' concern with Heaven's indictment of the Shang ruler is nonetheless "orally" delivered at an occasion presumably befitting for the indictment. Such is how representation can "make broad claims" over the limitations of the oral form, for the "Tai shi" can be "heard" and "reheard" in contexts far broader than the purported occasions. Nothing would have been lost. This exploitation of what I have described as the speech function of an oral form is, in fact, one of Yan Ruoqu's main complaints about the "Tai shi." For he argues that King Wu's speech appropriates materials from historical records, which must remain in their original, non-speech form in order to be considered proper.[437] Modal fluidity between narration and dramatization is to Yan also transgression.

Yet, as Stewart continues, such literary imitations "just surely suffer from an inauthenticity of presentation, a loss ensuing from the very periodization that is the foundation of their aesthetic."[438] We do not know for certain how to date each of the *shi.* Assuming that the "Tai shi" are indeed later productions, which is likely the case, the discrepancies between them and, for example, the "Gan

---

435 Susan Stewart, *Crimes of Writing: Problems in the Containment of Representation* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1994), 68.

436 Ibid., 69.

437 Speaking of King Wu's speech in TS-A, Yan argues that because in *Mengzi* 1B.3 a close parallel is attributed simply to *Shu* 書, these words, then, should be the written words of a historian (蓋史臣所作) that were later "sneaked into the mouth of King Wu by the forgers" 偽作者欲竄入武王口 (*Shangshu guwen shuzheng*, 4.139-140). Such is why, Yan continues, the "original" phrasing, "How dare *All under Heaven* impose their judgment on Heaven's" 天下曷敢有越厥志, as the *Mengzi* has it, is changed to "How dare *I* impose my own judgment on Heaven's" 予曷敢有越厥志. This "I," in other words, is foul play because it changes the sentence into one that is now *spoken.*

438 Stewart, *Crimes of Writing*, 68.

shi," "Tang shi," and "Mu shi" are only expected. And implied by Stewart's "periodization" is really a change in historical context in and for which texts are produced. If the aim of the "Tai shi" is not to produce or reproduce a text intended for ritual performance, just why *would* they be more like the "Gan shi," "Tang shi," and "Mu shi"? To Yan and his followers, any such discrepancy is again evidence of inauthenticity. Taking both the *texts* and the purported *occasions* of the "Gan shi," "Tang shi," and "Mu shi" to be what is "authentic" of all *shi*, he points out both factual errors and conventional violations that would disprove the Zhou origin of the "Tai shi." There is no such thing, for example, as the "six regiments" 六師 at King Wu's time, which TS-C mentions;[439] *mengjing* 孟津 (the ford at Meng) and *hesshuo* 河朔 (north of the river), the two venues of TS-A and TS-B, also in fact refers to one and the same place;[440] and the date notations in TS-A, finally, deviate from historiographical conventions at the time.[441] No allowance is made for any literary operation or just historical influence like transmission complexities that would have explained the textual "impurities" in another way.

The one feature of the "Tai shi" Yan does not comment on is also what I would argue affords the triad the most appeal. The three texts' commitment to an institutionalized voice, their exposition on Heaven's Mandate, as well as their emphasis on the unchanging rule for change itself suggest to me a guiding interest in the reproduction of a cultural and ideological value through the means of a literary form. None of the "transgressions" Yan highlights matters in light of the triad's concerted investment in Heaven's Mandate. As Stewart says by way of conclusion too, such literary operations "involve a process of separation and manipulation serving certain ideological functions."[442] As the three "Tai shi" articulate, dramatize, and repeatedly enshrine Heaven's Mandate, the speaker also reframes an insurrection into a sanctioned process of historical change, to which he is just a lawful adherent and faithful facilitator. Nothing about that is not a value statement

---

[439] *Shangshu guwen shuzheng*, 4.132.

[440] Ibid., 6.381-382.

[441] Ibid., 4.149-150.

[442] Stewart, *Crimes of Writing*, 68.

that is now expressed via the artifactual construction of a text. Whoever the author was, he gave a voice to Heaven's Mandate by voicing King Wu, the Mandate's best advocate and "namesake." Just like all the other *shi*, the three "Tai shi" are three instantiations of the same set of genre strategies whose particular narrative configurations owe in large part to their rhetorical purposes.

## 8. Of Everyday Politics

By far the most productive type of speech in the *Shangshu* is the *gao* 誥, "proclamation." It boasts the greatest number of iterations both according to past commentaries and in the transmitted redaction of the anthology.[443] It is uttered not only on the battlefield but also before insurrections, after capital relocation, and during many other occasions, though not specified, that appear nonetheless to be of significance. In keeping with the larger quantity and freer occasionality, the *gao* also specializes in more topics, delivered in a richer variety of narrative shapes. While some repeatedly hammer at a more general principle with quick and forceful "punches," others take time to expound on the history and logic of a particular course of action. This allows the *gao* to partake in and dilute the discursive domains of other speech types, frustrating efforts at clean and rigid categorization.[444] Besides the conventional separation by authenticity,[445] finally, the *gao* also appears to have had a history outside the transmitted collections.[446] As recent finds from the Tsinghua manuscripts show,

---

443 Lu Deming 陸德明 (ca.550-630) is the first to have numbered all the six categories of the *Shangshu* speeches first articulated by Kong An'guo 孔安國 (156-74BC). He counts 25 *dian* 典, 3 *mo* 謨, 16 *xun* 訓, 38 *gao* 誥, 10 *shi* 誓, and 18 *ming* 命. In Kong Yingda's 孔穎達 (574-648) ten-fold categorization in the *Shangshu zhengyi* 尚書正義, the current redaction we have, he assigns 2 chapters to *dian*, 2 to *mo*, 1 to *gong* 貢, 1 to *ge* 歌, 8 to *shi* (the "Tai shi" 泰誓 in three chapters), 8 to *gao*, 1 to *xun*, 9 to *ming* (the "Yue ming" 說命 in three chapters), 1 to *zheng* 征, and 1 to *fan* 範. For a convenient survey of all the relevant discussions, see Cheng Yuanmin 程元敏, *Shangshu xueshi* 尚書學史, vol.1 (Shanghai: Huadong shifan daxue chubanshe, 2013), 63-87.

444 The *gao* is particularly cognate with the *ming*, two speech types that are often intermixed in the individual iterations we have in the *Shangshu*. In addition, it also resembles the *xun* 訓 in rhetoric, structure, and aim. For a study that reads *gao* and *xun* together as "wisdom literature," see Michael Hunter, "Against (Uninformed) Idleness: Situating the Didacticism of 'Wu yi' 無逸," in *Origins of Chinese Political Philosophy*, 393-415.

445 Much has been written on this topic in Chinese. In English scholarship, the most extensive study so far is Kai Vogelsang's comparison of the *gao* to bronze inscriptions. See Vogelsang, "Inscriptions and Proclamations: On the Authenticity of the 'gao' Chapters in the *Book of Documents*," *Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities* 74 (2002): 138-209.

446 It is worth noting that the *Yi Zhoushu* 逸周書, though not the attention of conventional criticism, also features a group of speeches very much like the *gao* (i.e., the *jie* 解 chapters like the "Xiaokai jie" 小開解, "Wenjing jie" 文儆解, "Duyi jie" 度邑解, "Wujing jie" 武儆解, "Wuquan jie" 五權解, and "Chengkai jie" 成開解). For a recent study of the *Yi Zhoushu* more generally, see Yegor Grebnev, *Mediation of Legitimacy in Early China: A Study of the Neglected Zhou Scriptures and the Grand Duke Traditions* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2022).

some speeches in that corpus emanate an unmistakable *gao* influence whereby King Wen, a central figure in many speech writings far more spoken of than himself speaking, is now voiced too in none other than the speech type of *gao*.[447]

Despite all such fluidity unparalleled by any other speech type in the *Shangshu*, the *gao*, this chapter shows, derives just as fundamentally from the same set of genre strategies as the more congruent *shi* does. Both feature a speaker, already a figure of power and esteem, speaking from a position of authority; both address an audience while alerting them to the exact type of utterance being given. There is no fundamental difference in their approaches to the speaker as well as speech functions of an oral address. What sets the *gao* apart is its more capacious accommodation of the framed modules that are responsible for the speeches' thematic focus, more radical experimentation with mode of representation *within* the confines of dramatization, and more tolerance for stylistic differentiation. In this group of materials, we see some of the most unique innovations made in speech representation, some of which challenge our assumptions about early Chinese textuality.

As the *gao* materializes, it coheres in preaching the most cherished values of a traditionalist ideology, all the while "transgressing" the genre "conventions" otherwise delineable from other speeches in the *Shangshu*. As in the case of *shi*, this is not a failure of genre in regulating writing's relationship with form and expression. Rather, it marks the unsung efforts in exploiting the possibilities of a literary tradition's tools, skills, and ideals for the ideological propagation of sanctioned values. We have no access to every audience of these texts, but posterity and their ideological cultivation must have been a consideration behind the *gao*'s innovation and

[447] The "Bao xun" 保訓 presents a *gao* by King Wen 文王 on his deathbed. The "Zhai gong" 祭公 has King Mu 穆王 rush to Duke of Zhai's deathbed for some last-minute admonition. And the "Cheng wu" 程寤 appropriates the *gao* for the interpretation of an alarming abnormality attributed also to King Wen. See *Qinghua daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian* 清華大學藏戰國竹簡, ed. Qinghua Daxue Chutu Wenxian Yanjiu Yu Baohu Zhongxing 清華大學出土文獻研究與保護中心, vol. 1 (Shanghai: Zhongxi shuju, 2010), 141-148, 173-79, 135-41.

transformation. An ideology that has no audience needs no expression, much less repeated, and variously shaped, expressions that are the *Shangshu* collection of the *gao*.[448]

### *A Vessel of Ideas*

Featuring the same kind of framing modules as the *shi* does, with the only exception that the utterance is identified now as *gao* 誥/告, the *gao* provides a genre outlet for a much broader range of thematic concerns. Because the locution of *gao* is less conditioned by the illocutionary connotations of the speech type—one cannot anticipate what is to be "proclaimed," even though one can expect the kinds of messages normally associated with the "proclamation" if one is familiar with the genre—the *gao* in its extant iterations covers topics both generic and specific, but all relating to the political, ethical, and technocratic concerns of everyday governance. These everyday concerns are expressed in the *gao* to an audience, emphatically, and as general truth or wisdom expected to be accepted without question. In that sense, a speech can be categorized as *gao* when it explicitly addresses an audience, prefaces its ideational content with such exclamatory remark as *wuhu* 嗚呼, exhorts its audience to be reverent, *jing* 敬, toward the speech and the instructions, and, finally, identifies itself as *gao*, which, like *shi*, is used as both a noun and a verb.[449] The thematic

---

[448] I like Fredric Jameson's claim that "ideology is not something which informs or invests symbolic production; rather the aesthetic act is itself ideological, and the production of aesthetic or narrative form is to be seen as an ideological act in its own right, with the function of inventing imaginary or formal 'solutions' to unresolvable social contradictions." Jameson, *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981), 79. David Schaberg has made illustrative use of this perspective in his characterization of the *Zuozhuan* historiographers. The *gao*, I believe, reflects the same kind of relationships between the two sides of a literary production. Although no author can be recovered for any of the *gao*, they share the same set of worldviews which they try to project through their symbolic productions. In that sense, what we read in the *gao* is a *proposition* for an idealized world more than it is a description of the real world. The kinds of questions we tend to pose to this literature—dating, provenance, authorship, etc.—need to be rethought in order to bring out its historical potentials as "an ideological act." The very *Shangshu* speeches, for instance, increasingly found themselves quoted, today, by the Chinese president Xi Jinping.

[449] Many speech genres in particular are so named in traditional sources by taking their genre designations from the verbs used. See Wu Chengxue 吳承學 and Li Guanlan 李冠蘭, "Wenci chenyin yu wenti guannian de fasheng: Zhongguo zaoqi wenti guannian fasheng yanjiu" 文辭稱引與文體觀念的發生—中國早期文體觀念發生研究, *Beijing daxue xuebao* 53.4 (2016): 66-75.

capaciousness of the *gao* is very much determined by these genre features circumscribing only the mode and mood of the speech. No other consideration seems as important.

On the more generic side of the thematic spectrum, the "Kang gao" 康誥, for example, revolves around the perennial ideal of "making illustrious one's virtues and being prudent with punishment" 明德慎罰. Perennial, because Feng 封, the addressee, who is set to take up lordship in the "eastern lands" 東土 of Wei 衛, is told repeatedly such is how former rulers from the "sage kings of Yin" 殷先哲王 to his own ancestors Kings Wen and Wu managed to maintain Heaven's approval, people's support, and therefore their reigns.[450] Transitioning, then, to a catalog of instructions on how punishment is to be applied in different scenarios (e.g., "petty crime" 小罪, "grave crime" 大罪, "ministerial affairs" 外事), toward different categories of people (e.g., "son" 子, "father," 父, "presiding officials" 正人, "menial clerks" 小臣),[451] the king in the "Kang gao" concludes the speech by urging Feng to "heed my proclamation, so you can by means of the [former] Yin folks enjoy generations of sacrificial offerings" 聽朕誥. 汝乃以殷民世享.[452]

The "Shao gao" 召誥, on the other hand, preaches the same idea of "being reverent to virtues" 敬德, for otherwise "one would prematurely forfeit one's Mandate" (惟不敬厥德. 乃早墜厥命).[453] Also repeatedly iterated, the "Shao gao," by contrast, shifts its focus from the kind of pragmatic instructions given in the "Kang gao" to the unchanging, absolute weight of virtue in Heaven's consideration of favor. As it illustrates the principle by the examples of both Yin's demise and Shang's collapse, the speech urges the young King Cheng to "by his virtue, pray for Heaven's perpetual (granting) of the Mandate" 王其德之用. 祈天永命.[454] One geared toward present-day

---

[450] Gu Jiegang 顧頡剛 and Liu Qiyu 劉起釪, *Shangshu jiaoshi yilun* 尚書校釋譯論, vol.3 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2005), 1299, 1300, 1309.

[451] *Shangshu jiaoshi yilun*, 1319, 1327, 1336,

[452] Ibid., 1356. The identity of the king is of considerable dispute. See a survey of the opinions in *Shangshu jiaoshi yilun*, 1362-65.

[453] *Shangshu jiaoshi yilun*, 1434, 1441.

[454] Ibid., 1442.

application, one "theoretical" exposition, both the "Kang gao" and the "Shao gao" deliver the same generic lesson on the ruler's moral composition.

On the more granular side, most *gao* concentrate on the proclamation of one specific message essential to the health of a well-functioning regime. The "Jiu gao" 酒誥, to begin with, assembles a slew of historical exemplars and inherited sayings to drive home one single point: in state affairs as in personal conduct, there is not to be excessive drinking. The "Wu yi" 無逸, by means of the same appeal to the same past, warns solely against the human propensity for idleness, inertia, inaction (*yi* 逸).[455] The "Da gao" 大誥, though more complex in narrative configuration, has likewise one goal and one goal only: to convince the addressees to assist the king in quelling rising rebellions. Similarly, both the "Duo shi" 多士 and "Duo fang" 多方 through reason and intimation threaten the submission and compliance from the newly conquered Yin people since Heaven has, once again, manifested approval.[456] Less imposing but more part and parcel to the daily functioning of Heaven-granted rule, both the "Li zheng" 立政 and "Jun shi" 君奭 emphasize the technocratic pursuits of good governance: the former regarding the indispensability of establishing clear lines of offices and duties; the latter, additionally, the need for the highest officials to be loyal, principled, and mutually supportive.[457] Although variously oriented, all of these *gao* speeches draw from past

[455] The "Wu yi" does not begin with the addressing of an audience but dives straight into proclaiming, each one segment of which is led by *wuhu* 嗚呼. Despite that, its structure, rhetoric, and mode of representation all differ little from, say, the "Kang gao" and "Jiu gao," whose membership in the *gao* are signaled additionally by their titles. The similarities they share in the speeches themselves are what allow Michael Hunter to read all three speeches together as one and the same type. See Hunter, "Against (Uninformed) Idleness: Situating the Didacticism of 'Wu yi' 無逸."

[456] For an analysis of these two speeches, see Joachim Gentz, "One Heaven, One History, One People: Repositioning the Zhou in Royal Addresses to Subdued Enemies in the 'Duo shi' 多士 and 'Duo fang' 多方 Chapters of the *Shangshu* and in the 'Shang shi' 商誓 Chapter of the *Yi Zhoushu*," in *Origins of Chinese Political Philosophy*, 146-192. Like the "Wu yi," the titles of these two speeches are not good indications of their generic features. As Gentz shows (esp.157-172), the "Duo shi" and "Duo fang" share similarities with not only the *shi* but also the *gao* in terms of structural components and rhetorical elements. *Gao* 告, for example, is the self-referential verb both speeches use.

[457] Both speeches fit into the *gao* by addressing their audiences directly, by self-identifying as *gao*, by exclaiming, and by demanding their addressee to be "reverent" 敬 toward the teachings.

history and Heaven's role in adjudicating power for their argumentation. The narrative fabrics and aims they share outweigh the slight differences in their formal entextualization into the *gao*.

By far the best evidence for the thematic capacity of the *gao* comes from the "Lü xing" 呂刑. Structured most similarly to the "Wu yi," "Li zheng," and "Jun shi," the "Lü xing" likewise opens into a long appeal to the past as a preface to the proclamation made to the present addressee. In the proclamation marked by the speaker's self-referential identification of the utterance ("listen to my words, all of you" 皆聽朕言; "let me tell [*gao*] you about litigations and punishments" 告爾祥刑[458]), a lengthy legal treatise on the "Five Punishments" 五刑 is announced.[459] The treatise expounds on its rather abstract rules concerning procedural justice by means of catalogs and categories, in a style and register fully describable as "impersonal" and "bureaucratic" and therefore "distinct" from the rest of the "Lü xing,"[460] which, as is characteristic of all *gao*, is more dramatic, deictic, performative.

On the whole, however, the treatise is included in the "Lü xing" the same way the "Wu yi," "Li zheng," and "Jun shi" introduce their core of the speech: by the shared exclamation *wuhu* that both punctuates the speech into smaller segments and stresses the importance of it. While *wuhu* in the "Lü xing" is further joined by *jie* 嗟 and *yu* 吁, two common variants of the expression, the exclamation's structuring and signaling functions remain the same. Combined with another generic marker signaling the exhortation part of the *gao*, "be reverent!" 敬哉, which in this case brackets the entire legal treatise on both ends (first, "be carefully reverent of the Five Punishments" 惟敬五刑; then, "*wuhu*! Be reverent!" 嗚呼. 敬之哉[461]), the "Lü xing" quite literally contains the legal treatise just as any other *gao* would frame their body part of the proclamation. Like the "Qin shi," the "Lü xing" gains more expressive force as a *gao*. The "Five Punishments" may very well stand on its own in an expository form of some sort, but being spoken by a king in a *gao* type of speech furnish the

458 *Shangshu jiaoshi yilun*, 1982, 1994.

459 For the specific content of the treatise, see for example Charles Sanft, "Concepts of Law in the *Shangshu*," in *Origins of Chinese Political Philosophy*, 446-74.

460 Kai Vogelsang, "Competing Voices in the *Shangshu*," in *Origins of Chinese Political Philosophy*, 90, 98.

461 *Shangshu jiaoshi yilun*, 1982, 2055.

treatise with additional signification. The part of the speech that frames elevates the part of the speech therein framed to a new league of discursive distinction. As discussed in the last chapter, the spoken word has since the bronze inscriptions embodied, by its very medium of expression, truth, wisdom, and authoritativeness.

*Story "Telling"*

Commensurate with its thematic capacity, the *gao*'s productivity manifests also in the form of formal innovation. It is the single most important speech type responsible for the creative representation of the early Chinese speaking scene, where nested structures of monologues and dialogues take on, now, the role of storytelling, the task of voice manipulation, and the dramatic enactment of familiar speech events typically only narrated. But first and foremost, the *gao* comes down to us already in several distinctive narrative shapes. Every single iteration of the "modern-script"—that is, to the critical tradition "authentic"—*gao* in its characteristic monologic form is, for example, punctuated by multiple *yue* 曰 into briefer segments of shorter utterances.[462] The "Kang gao," most remarkably, features as many as eleven *wang yue* 王曰 (the king says), sandwiched between another two *wang ruo yue* 王若曰 (the king thus says).[463] By contrast, all but one of the "ancient-script"—in other words, "inauthentic"—*gao* also in monologue come only in one single *yue*. They also tend to be shorter.[464]

462 By which I am referring to "Gaozong rongri" 高宗肜日, "Da gao" 大誥, "Kang gao" 康誥, "Jiu gao" 酒誥, "Zi cai" 梓材, "Duo shi" 多士, "Wu yi" 無逸, "Jun shi" 君奭, "Duo fang" 多方, "Li zheng" 立政, and finally, "Lü xing" 呂刑.

463 The meaning of *wang ruo yue* 王若曰 has been a longtime debate. Scholars disagree over what *ruo* means and whether *wang ruo yue* is any different from *wang yue*. By reading *wang ruo yue* as "the king thus says," I follow the conventional interpretation first proposed by Yu Xingwu 于省吾 and Chen Mengjia 陳夢家 (Yu, "'Wang ruo yue' shiyi 王若曰釋義," *Zhongguo yuwen* 1966 [2]: 147-149; Chen, *Xizhou tongqi duandai* 西周銅器斷代 [Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2004], 400-414). For a different reading of the phrase as "the king said *approvingly*," see Falkenhausen, "The Royal Audience and Its Reflections in Western Zhou Bronze Inscriptions."

464 The exception is "Zhou guan" 周官. Other ancient-script *gao* in monologue include "Tang gao" 湯誥, "Yin xun" 伊訓, "Taijia, xia" 太甲下, "Xianyou yide" 咸有一德, and "Lü ao" 旅獒.

Within the "modern-script" *gao*, some also share a particular rhetorical orientation that maps onto the structural progression of the speech. If the "Kang gao," with its quick transitions from the punishment's one application to the next, can be described as catalogic, the "Shao gao," "Duo shi," "Duo fang," and "Li zheng," by their common appeals first to the past, exhibit a tripartite structure organized also by clear transitions from that past to the present (i.e., the actual proclamation to the addressee) and then the "future" (the exhortation demanding action). In comparison, the "ancient-script" *gao* puts more weight on past-present comparison and only briefly goes into exhortation as the speech concludes. While exhorting, direct addressing of the addressee typical of the "modern-script" *gao* is also avoided, leaving only exclamations like *wuhu* leading the charge. No single shape of the *gao* should be considered *the* shape of the *gao*; the speech type thrives on formal, structural, and rhetorical differentiation.[465]

Most remarkably, the "Da gao" 大誥 stands out from all the monologic *gao* with its uniquely complex maneuvers in speech representation which allows the speech to tell a story, a story in which Heaven's Mandate is the "plot." Consisting of essentially two parts, the "Da gao" also demonstrates how speech can frame speech *within* the framed modules of the same speech. Narrative layering and (extra) opaque language make the "Dao gao" a curious but curiously intriguing speech among all the *gao*,[466] one that represents the farther ends of generic innovation.

Like any "good" *gao*, the "Da gao" opens immediately into the framing modules:

> The king thus says, "Let me make a grand proclamation to you, governors of my many states and officers of my affairs—Not pitying me, Heaven has sent down calamities on my house, without a slight moment of hesitation. Now I, the little one, have inherited the patrimony, all its boundless, far-reaching reigns and institutions. But I have yet been blessed with good fortune, nor have I yet led the people to well-being, how much less can I claim to have fully comprehended the Mandate of Heaven?!"

---

[465] A further observation can be drawn from the *gao* type speeches in the *Yi Zhoushu*, which tilts the balance by spending most of the time on the exhortation of the addressee.

[466] As Gu Jiegang and Liu Qiyu note, the "Da gao" is not paralleled in any part in any of the pre-Qin texts. The *Shiji* also mentions the text only by title. See *Shangshu jiaoshi yilun*, 1261.

> 王若曰. 猷大誥爾多邦越爾御事. 弗弔天降割于我家. 不少延. 洪惟我幼沖人嗣無疆大歷服. 弗造哲. 迪民康. 矧曰其有能格知天命.[467]

"Let me make a grand proclamation to you" 猷大誥爾 declares the speech's generic identity while rhetorically setting the stage for the speaker's following performance. The framing modules do not appear in every *gao* because some dive straight into the proclaiming, but once the proclaiming begins the feel of a *gao* can also be felt in those cases.[468] When a genre is familiar to its users, there is no need for the full set of genre markers. Here, however, the framing modules lead not to the proclamation nor to the usual prefacing of proclamation with history-tracing, but to a digression, a pre-story, as it were, about Heaven. Specifically, about how Heaven has thrown the young King Cheng into an abrupt succession crisis by "sending down calamities on [his] house" 天降割于我家, that is, by claiming the life of his father, King Wu. The "little one" of the royal family is unprepared, apprehensive, but determined to carry on:

> "Alas, it is as if I, the little one, were to wade deep water. I have to go seek something by which I can make the cross. In extending our grandeur[469] and in lengthening the Mandate received by my former ancestors so as not to squander their great achievement, I do not dare to become an obstruction.[470]"
>
> 已. 予惟小子. 若涉淵水. 予惟往求朕攸濟. 敷賁. 敷前人受命. 茲不忘大功. 予不敢于閉.[471]

---

[467] *Shangshu jiaoshi yilun*, 1262.

[468] The "Wu yi," for example gives up the thrust of the speech the second it begins: "Duke of Zhou says, '*Wuhu*! Isn't perhaps not indulging in indolence the proper place for a gentleman?'" 周公曰. 嗚呼. 君子所. 其無逸. *Shangshu jiaoshi yilun*, 1530. Cf. also note 13 above.

[469] Gu Jiegang and Liu Qiyu read *bi* 賁 as *fen* 賁 and interpret it as *fengui* 賁龜, a three legged species of turtle used for divination. Like Legge and Karlgren, I prefer to read this obscure character less concretely.

[470] In most other editions, 予不敢于閉 is followed by 天降威 as in 予不敢閉于天降威 (I do not dare to cause obstruction to Heaven's sending down of its awe). Here I follow Gu Jiegang and Liu Qiyu's acceptance of Yu Yue's 俞樾 (1821-1907) emendation. See *Shangshu jiaoshi yilun*, 1266.

[471] *Shangshu jiaoshi yilun*, 1265.

"I do not dare to become an obstruction" 予不敢于閉, the king says. This is the first hint of what is to come in the remainder of this *gao*, for not daring to "squander their [i.e., the ancestors'] great achievement" 茲不忘大功 means that the young king is set to take over and preserve in his family the royal reign, which will, in turn, set the tone for his ensuing proclamation. Something will be said to the "governors of [his] many states and officers of [his] affairs" 爾多邦越爾御事 about how the reign is to be transferred to and/or maintained by him. Such quick but guiding tone-setting is nothing special in the *Shangshu* instantiations of the *gao*; it appears also in the "Kang gao" before the king there launches into his proclamations. But here, the young king's lament only leads the digression even further, into an exceptional analepsis recounting an earlier exchange between him and the same addressees he is now speaking to *for the second time*:

> "When Heaven first sent down its awe, I used the great, precious tortoise left to me by the Tranquilizing King[472] to impart on me Heaven's clairvoyance and immediately charged it, saying:
>
> > 'There is now great trouble in the western lands, and the people of the western lands have ceased to be calm as well. Hence the commotion. Yin, now slightly better off, even presumes to resume their lines of succession. When Heaven sent down its awe, they knew that our state has flaws and that our people are not well. So, they said, 'we shall reverse course,' meaning to re-subjugate our states to their far-flung territories. Now they crawl about, now they buzz about. But recently among the subdued worthy men, there are ten who have come to my aid—to help me restore tranquility and valorously accomplish my plans. We are about to have grave warfare; will we have good fortune?'
>
> [As it turned out], my charges have all been answered with auspiciousness."
>
> 天降威. 用寧王遺我大寶龜紹天明. 即命曰.
>
> > 有大艱于西土. 西土人亦不靜. 越茲蠢. 殷小腆. 誕敢紀其敘. 天降威. 知我國有疵. 民不康. 曰. 予復. 反鄙我周邦. 今蠢今翼. 日民獻有十夫予翼. 以于敉寧武圖功. 我有大事. 休.

[472] *Ning wang* 寧王 (the Tranquilizing King) is often changed to *wen wang* 文王 (King Wen) in most of the editions, which is an overdetermined reading premised on the positivist identification of the speaker. I prefer to leave the problem "unsolved" because nothing intrinsically points to King Wen as the Tranquilizing King. Both Karlgren and Legge opted for the same in their translations.

朕卜並吉.[473]

"So I told you, governors of my states, chiefs of departments, various officers, and managers of my affairs, that I have obtained auspicious divinations, that I would now, with you, my various states, go attack the fugitives and vagabonds of the Yin. But you, governors of my states, various officers, and managers of my affairs—none of you does not retort on me and say:

> 'The difficulties will be great. That the people's not being at ease owes to the royal palace and the chambers of the princes. We as ourselves the little ones [in our own families] are filial and prudent, so we cannot approve of the strike. Why don't you, your majesty, go against the divination?'"

肆予告我友邦君越尹氏庶士御事曰. 予得吉卜. 予惟以爾庶邦于伐殷逋播臣. 爾庶邦君越庶士御事罔不反曰.

> 艱大. 民不靜. 亦惟在王宮邦君室. 越予小子考翼. 不可征. 王害不違卜.[474]

"I, the little one, always bearing difficulties on my mind, replied [to you]:

> '*Wuhu*! Should the commotion become [more] real, the old, widowed folks will be miserable. I am the person who has been entrusted by Heaven, who has greatly laid this difficulty on me. I, the little one, do not pity myself. And it is only right for you, governors of my states, and you, various officers, chiefs and managers of my affairs, to soothe me by saying, 'Do not burden yourself with self-pity. You should not but accomplish your Tranquilizing father's great plan!'"

肆予沖人永思艱. 曰.

> 嗚呼. 允蠢. 鰥寡哀哉. 予造天役遺. 大投艱于朕身. 越予沖人不印自恤. 義爾邦君越爾多士尹氏御事綏予曰. 無毖于恤. 不可不成乃寧考圖功.[475]

A lengthy, almost theatrical analepsis, this recount is exceptional in several ways. First is the analepsis itself. In the *Shangshu*, when a past event is appealed to, the event points typically to a story about the speaker's ancestors, predecessors, or a historical anecdote about someone who is *not* the speaker. This is how the *gao* prefaces the proclamation with what I have called exemplar- or history-

[473] *Shangshu jiaoshi yilun*, 1266.

[474] Ibid., 1270-71.

[475] Ibid., 1272.

tracing. Hardly ever does the speaker talk about his own past, which in the case of the "Da gao" is also referred back to later in the text. There is thus a narrative role to an otherwise rhetorical move.

Second and further, the past event appealed to here begins with the king's oracle divination upon "Heaven's sending down of His awe" 天降威. The exact charge (*ming* 命), however, is far more imaginative than any of the existing records we have. No extant oracle bone inscription compares remotely to the length, complexity, and narrativity of the king's query here. To the extent it does, only the final question ("we are about to have grave warfare; will we have good fortune?" 我有大事. 休.) aligns with the range of topics as well as the syntax of oracle bone inscriptions.[476] This divination plays thus also a historically-informed narrative role. In one single charge to the tortoise, the king simultaneously introduces the conflict now emerging in the spoken narrative (a simmering insurrection), the status quo (the king having *some* help but not all), and the proposed solution (the king suppressing the insurrection with the assistance of all his addressees). By presenting the narrative conflict in a divinatory charge, the text here is additionally exploiting the "divination trope" where one's desired prognostication is always granted.[477] Heaven's approval is expected once the trope is enacted, but the king's ensuing narration ("my charges have all been answered with auspiciousness" 朕卜並吉) makes sure of it and, more importantly, sublimates the king's proposed solution into Heaven's original intention. "It is not me; it is what Heaven wants, in the first place"—so goes the logic of Heaven's Mandate. Thanks to the additional confirmation from the speaker himself, this logic becomes now also the logic of the remaining narrative. As the king relays the divination results to his addressees ("so I told you…that I have obtained auspicious divinations" 肆予告我友邦君越尹氏庶士御事曰. 予得吉卜), the narrative is now set on a path to resolve the conflict it began with.

---

[476] Although, it has to be noted, whether the charge is a question has been the topic of considerable dispute. For a most comprehensive overview of the debate, see Zhang Yujin 張玉金, *Jiagu buci yufa yanjiu* 甲骨卜辭語法研究 (Guangzhou: Guangdong gaodeng jiaoyu chubanshe, 2002).

[477] Cf. Martin Kern, "Early Chinese Divination and Its Rhetoric," in *Coping with the Future: Theories and Practices of Divination in East Asia*, ed. Michael Lackner (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 255-88.

Third and formally, this entire recount is presented in the king's speech in which all his interlocutor-addressees are reenacted by the king himself. The range of deictic second-person pronouns marking every turn-taking of this exchange leaves no room for a different reading. But the reported exchange is not just any exchange but a confrontational one where a dissenting viewpoint is admitted, one that culminates in the suggestion of direct defiance of the oracle ("why don't you, your majesty, just go against the divination?" 王害不違卜). Dialogism is nothing new, even and especially when nested in a monological presentation. Yet, among the *Shangshu* iterations of the *gao*, this is the only instance in which a different opinion is represented and dialogized, only to be crudely suppressed. As the king responds to the dissent, he simply "stuffs" a string of new words into the mouths of his addressees ("it is only right for you…to soothe me by saying…" 義爾邦君越爾多士尹氏御事綏予曰…). This dialogism is thus a narrative foil, but a useful foil because it retains the unidirectional speech function of the *gao* without turning the king into a *total* authoritarian. He does consider dissent; he just rejects it. The more authoritarian force here is Heaven since, by literally shutting down his addressees, the king is gesturing that Heaven cannot be defied. Manifestation of its will combined with absolute compliance comprise the two-part logic of Heaven's Mandate. The narrative is bound to shut down dissent because the Mandate is its very plot.

In the king's following words, he accordingly spells out the entire logic in plainer language:

> "Alas! I, the little one, do no dare to abandon the Mandate of the God on High. Heaven has already favored the Tranquilizing King, giving prosperity to our small state of Zhou. It was because the Tranquilizing King followed divination that he was able to uneventfully receive the Mandate. Now, Heaven is on the side of the people, how much more must I follow the divination! *Wuhu*! Heaven has made clear its awe. Help me make my great endeavor great!"
>
> 已. 予惟小子不敢替上帝命. 天休于寧王. 興我小邦周. 寧王惟卜用. 克綏受茲命. 今天其相民. 矧亦惟卜用. 嗚呼. 天明畏. 弼我丕丕基.[478]

Thus concludes the first part of the "Da gao." Halfway into the text, the exhortation is still pending. Instead, between two identical exclamations ("Alas, I, the little one" 已. 予惟小子), the

[478] *Shangshu jiaoshi yilun*, 1273-74.

king gives a deliberative account of what can be called a thought process. He is thinking—recalling—out loud in front of his addressees before giving the call to action another try. Such a heavy, introspective speech is in the *Shangshu* only paralleled in the "Qin shi." Equally unique is the resultant extent of framing effect the deliberation has on the forthcoming exhortations. Nowhere else, except to a lesser degree in the "Duo shi" and "Duo fang," does a *gao* prepare us for the exhortation, introduce its provenance, or explain its significance. The speaker simply dives into exhorting, as if what he says is naturally important. Interestingly, when the "Da gao" starts to exhort, the text also picks back up the usual rhythm of the *gao* by separating about the same number of words as the foregoing analepsis into three shorter segments of *wang yue*. There seems to be *some* difference behind the choice between *wang ruo yue* and *wang yue*.[479]

With the speech transitioning now to the exhortations, its second half, the plot of Heaven's Mandate is nonetheless still ongoing. In the first of the three *wang yue*, the king stresses once again "now that Heaven has carefully tasked me with the means by which I can accomplish the work" 天閟毖我成功所, alluding to the oracle divination, "I dare not spare any effort in swiftly fulfilling the Tranquilizing King's planned endeavors" 予不敢不極卒寧王圖事.[480] In the second, referring back to his earlier deliberation altogether, "Earlier, when I was about to go [on the expedition], I said that I think daily of the difficulties" 若昔朕其逝. 朕言艱日思,[481] the king also refutes his addressees' earlier excuse that they are beholden to their ancestors ("We as ourselves the little ones [in our own families] are filial and prudent, so we cannot approve of the strike" 越予小子考翼. 不可征) by turning their reasoning against them: "If [a father has among] the elders of his family someone who

[479] One of the disagreements over *wang yue* versus *wang ruo yue* is whether they are meant to lead different types of utterances or contents. Here, I only wish to highlight the apparent case for the disagreement as seen in the "Da gao" alone. For a more thorough study, see Li Guanlan 李冠蘭, "Xizhou ceming wenti de wenben shengcheng" 西周冊命文體的文本生成, *Zhongshan daxue xuebao* 2019 (6): 36-44.

[480] *Shangshu jiaoshi yilun*, 1275.

[481] Ibid., 1277.

attacked his son, will his people and his dependents just look on and not come to the son's rescue?" 若兄考乃有伐厥子. 民養其勸弗救.[482]

Only then, in the third and final *wang yue*, does the king move on to the exact exhortation, complete with *wuhu* and the addressing of the addressee. Yet, the exhortation, brief already, is still steeped in the logic of Heaven's Mandate. Before the king urges his addressees to act, he first of all tries to pinpoint the cause of their inaction—a lack of understanding of how the Mandate works:

> The king says, "*Wuhu*! Now, let me make this proclamation to you (once again), governors of my states and you, managers of my affairs—the brightening of a state lies with the wise, that is, with the ten men who understood the decree of God on High as well as Heaven's assistance of the sincere.[483] None of you dared at the time to challenge this fact. And now, now that Heaven has sent down calamity on the Zhou states, that the great troublemakers [i.e., the king's three uncles] presume to wait in ambush within the royal house, do you still not understand that Heaven's Mandate does not change?"
>
> 王曰. 嗚呼. 肆我誥爾庶邦君越爾御事. 爽邦由哲. 亦惟十人迪知上帝命越天棐忱. 爾時罔敢易法. 矧今天降戾于周邦. 惟大艱人誕以胥伐于厥室. 爾亦不知天命不易.[484]

Having done that, the king finally brings his speech altogether by revealing to the addressees and us that the solution to the conflict, both narrative and historical, is already predetermined: "Heaven indeed favored the former Tranquilizing One. How can I exhaust the divination and then presume not to follow it to the end?" 天亦惟休于前寧人. 予曷其極卜敢弗于從. Certainly, he cannot, and would not. Thereupon, the king makes a final call, bringing both the narrative and its logic to a full completion: "I shall thus grandly with all of you march to the East. Heaven's Mandate does not err; and the cracking of the oracle shows exactly that" 肆朕誕以爾東征. 天命不僭. 卜陳惟若茲.[485]

The speech says a lot. But it also says little. The final exhortation is so completely engulfed in the dramatized exposition of Heaven's Mandate that the proclamation is really one made about the

---

[482] Ibid., 1278.

[483] This is perhaps referring to the ten men mentioned earlier who came first to the king's help.

[484] *Shangshu jiaoshi yilun*, 1279.

[485] Ibid., 1280.

Mandate itself rather than about the need to suppress rebellions. It is a *performance* of the Mandate that is being narrated here by the speaker. The message is not in the slightest intended for the named addresses but for the unnamed readers of the speech.[486]

### *Hypertextual Road Trips*

With the "Da gao" concluding by circling back to its opening, the oracle divination, the "deep structure" of this intricate speech is also fully manifest. It starts with [a.] a trigger ("Not pitying me, Heaven has sent down calamities on my house" 弗弔天降割于我家), to which the king [b.] responds with a *gao* calling for action (first half of the analepsis: "So, I told you…that I have obtained auspicious divinations, that I would now, with you…go attack the fugitives and vagabonds of the Yin" 肆予告我友邦君越尹氏庶士御事曰. 予得吉卜. 予惟以爾庶邦于伐殷逋播臣), to which he receives [c.] a response (in this case negative: "but you…none of you does not retort on me and say…" 爾庶邦君越庶士御事罔不反曰), to which he then [d.] repeats the *gao* calling again for action (the second half of the analepsis and the entire second half of the speech).

This trigger-*gao*-response-repeat sequence is in the "Da gao" achieved entirely through a series of nested monologues. In some other *gao*, however, the exact same sequence underlies the progression of dialogic exchanges, a sign of hypertextual transformation through variation in the narrative mode of representation. In addition, within the dialogic instantiations of this "genre roadmap," some further distinguish themselves by adopting a different stylistic orientation. This is by far the clearest evidence that genre was a discursive strategy used for textual production, the historical materializations of which drew from the narrative techniques available to them. Much of the *gao* corpus iterates and reiterates the same ideas; its repeated and varied expressions could only mean that the demand for such messaging was high while the targeted audience required different

[486] Wang Mang 王莽 (45 BC-23) is said to have composed his own "Da gao" based on a model in the *Book of Zhou* 周書 in an effort to argue for his legitimacy before the rebellion. Wang's "Da gao" is very similar to this one and is obviously intended for a larger audience. See the text in *Hanshu* 漢書 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1962), 84.3428-34.

rhetorical accommodation. Compared to the monologic *gao*, a dialogic presentation turns the reader from the "overhearer" of a direct address to the "spectator" of a theatrical exchange. As the "Da gao" already shows, the address they overhear, however, is not that different from the exchange they watch. And oftentimes, the boundaries between the two are thin.

The "Luo gao" 洛誥 and the third of the "Yue ming" 說命, the only two dialogic *gao* in the *Shangshu*, represent precisely such theatrical dramatizations of the "Da gao" address-cum-sequence. One "authentic," one "inauthentic," according to conventional categorization, both put the *gao* on show in eerily similar dialogic progressions, but each adopts a distinct style. For traditional critics like Yan Ruoqu, style is a core criterion for the authentication of the *Shangshu*. What he calls *wen ci ge zhi* 文辭格制 (the patterning of words, the arrangement of structure) stand next to bibliographical information as the two pillars of his investigation.[487] To me, however, such stylistic variation on the same modal transformation of the *gao* speaks further to the genre's popularity. The culture and history of the *gao*, one of the most vibrant, in fact, of all genres in early China, is not deniable by the narrow standards Yan upholds.[488]

Both the "Luo gao" and the "Yue ming" belong to a larger narrative. The former combines with the "Shao gao" and "Kang gao" to tell a story of the founding of the early Western Zhou city of Luo 洛/雒邑;[489] the latter, on the other hand, represents just one expression of the legend about Fu Yue 傅說, a trusted advisor of the Shang King Wuding 武丁, seen in other versions also in the Tsinghua manuscript "Fu Yue zhi ming" 傅說之命 and the *Shiji*. Neither, therefore, can be presented here in its fullest context. Nevertheless, the two chapters of the *Shangshu* are both

---

[487] Yan says in a rare statement of his principles that "leaving aside the stark dissimilarities in *wen ci ge zhi*, merely from the mismatch in the number of chapters is forgery recognizable" 無論其文辭格制迥然不類. 而只此篇數之不合. 偽可知矣. *Shangshu guwen shuzheng*, 1.2.

[488] With the discovery of the Tsinghua "Fu Yue zhi ming" 傅說之命, some scholars have renewed the dismissal of the "Yue ming" as a set of forgeries. Like Dirk Meyer, I would rather understand both texts as simply different expressions of the "Yue ming" lore. See Meyer, *Documentation and Argument in Early China*, 207-222.

[489] For a recent discussion, see Michael Nylan, "Cross-reading 'Kang gao,' 'Shao gao,' and 'Luo gao'," *Journal of Asian History* 54.1 (2020): 1-62.

sufficiently self-contained, with the so-titled "Yue ming, xia" 說命下 coinciding with the entire narrative sequence on which the "Luo gao" is also built.

Right from the beginning, the two texts exhibit shared approaches to the dialogic realization of the trigger-*gao*-response-repeat sequence (hereinafter YM for "Yue ming," LG for "Luo gao"):

> [YM] The king says, "Come, you, Yue! I, the little one, used to learn from Gan Pan. After that, I withdrew to the wilderness and lived on the He river. From He I then went to Bo. Still, in the end I did not become enlightened. May you instruct me with regard to my aims. Be to me like yeast and malt are to the making of sweet wine. Be to me like salt and plum are to the making of fine soup. Befriend me and cultivate me. Never give up on me. I shall make every effort to put into practice your instructions."
>
> 王曰. 來. 汝說. 台小子舊學于甘盤. 既乃遯于荒野. 入宅于河. 自河徂亳. 暨厥終罔顯. 爾惟訓于朕志. 若作酒醴. 爾惟麴蘗. 若作和羹. 爾惟鹽梅. 爾交修予. 罔予棄. 予惟克邁乃訓.[490]
>
> ~ ~ ~ ~ ~
>
> [LG] The king bows with his hands and head and says, "Duke—not daring to not revere the grace of Heaven you have come to inspect the new site, and to establish grace matching that of Zhou's. Having settled on the site, you sent for me to come. I came, and you showed me that the divinations have always been auspicious. And together, we two interpreted the divinations. May you, Duke, by means of me for tens and thousands of years revere the grace of Heaven. Bowing with my hands and head I ask for your words (of instruction)."
>
> 王拜手稽首曰. 公. 不敢不敬天之休. 來相宅. 其作周匹休. 公既定宅. 伻來. 來. 視予卜休恆吉. 我二人共貞. 公其以予萬億年敬天之休. 拜手稽首誨言.[491]

Despite the difference in tone, one of hierarchy, one of parity, both speeches point toward the final moment of solicitation, a common trope of advice-seeking serving here as the trigger. King Wuding in the "Yue ming" is more direct and commanding, addressing Fu Yue by name, ordering him to "come" 來, and twice asking him for "instruction" 訓. In the "Luo gao," on the other hand, the speaker, King Cheng, is responding to a prior speech by the Duke of Zhou (omitted here) who was reporting back to the king that he had completed inspecting the new site for the Zhou capital and

---

[490] *Shangshu Zhengyi*, 9.373-74.

[491] *Shangshu jiaoshi yilun*, 1457.

that Luo 洛, the new site, has twice passed the sanction of divination. Hence the king's "bowing with hands and head" 拜手稽首, always a gesture in response, always a gesture of respect. The respect for the Duke of Zhou, the king's uncle, is maintained throughout the speech both here and after: there is no direct calling of names, no undisguised imperatives; instead, the Duke is praised, his doings re-narrated, and his advice requested with another "bowing with my hands and head" bracketing the other end of this opening.[492] The contrast in tone between the two dialogues is only appropriate to the respective power relations between the interlocutors and to the circumstances of their exchange; so is their shared solicitation both the first step into the genre sequence.[493]

Now that the trigger is laid down, both texts proceed immediately to the next stop in the sequence, the *gao* itself. From here onward, however, the "Luo gao" starts to exceed the length and rhetorical complexity of the "Yue ming" at every turn:

> [YM] Yue says, "My king—that people seek to hear much is because they aim to establish their affairs. Yet, to learn from the teachings of the ancients is [the real way] to attain anything. In one's affairs if he does not emulate the ancients but still manages to somehow perpetuate his endeavors—this is something I have not heard of. In learning, only when you humble your will and focus on being constantly attuned will cultivation come. When you truly embrace these virtues, they will accumulate in you too. Teaching is only half of learning. When your thoughts fixate from day and night on learning, your virtues will be cultivated without you even realizing it. Compare yourself to the accomplished exemplars of the former kings, so you may never err. I shall then bring myself to reverently follow you, and to broadly employ men of excellence to be placed in the various positions."
>
> 說曰. 王. 人求多聞. 時惟建事. 學于古訓. 乃有獲. 事不師古. 以克永世. 匪說攸聞. 惟學遜志. 務時敏. 厥修乃來. 允懷于茲道. 積于厥躬. 惟敷學半. 念終始典于學. 厥德脩罔覺. 監于先王成憲. 其永無愆. 惟說式克欽承. 旁招俊乂. 列于庶位.[494]

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

[492] This unique parity between the speakers is also noted in David Schaberg, "Foundations of Chinese Historiography: Literary Representation in *Zuozhuan* and *Guoyu*" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1995), 101-28.

[493] It is worth noting that both iterations of the sequence are embedded in a larger text or narrative.

[494] *Shangshu zhengyi*, 9.374-75.

[LG] The Duke of Zhou says, "My King—start to follow the rites of Yin and make sacrifices in the new city. Do everything in order and without transgression. I will marshal the hundred offices and have them follow you, the king, at Zhou. I shall say,

> 'There will be a sacrifice.'

And you, my king, shall then command and say,

> 'We will take stock of the most meritorious of all and assign precedence in the first sacrifice by merit.'

Then command and say,

> 'You all have my order to diligently aid me; greatly show me your merit.'

You shall then yourself teach them their duties. [Oh!] Young son, make [proper] associations. [Oh!] Young son, make [proper] associations. Go. Do not be like fire: it may first flicker and glimmer but when it blazes up it also by-and-by cannot be put out. Let them serve you according to the rites. I will lead the officials stationed at Zhou and go on to the new city and have them join their colleagues there. They will greatly make an effort to acquire merit and abundantly bring forth great prosperity. You will then forever enjoy commendation."

周公曰. 王. 肇稱殷禮. 祀于新邑. 咸秩無文. 予齊百工. 伻從王于周. 予惟曰.
　　庶有事.
今王即命曰.
　　記功宗. 以功作元祀.
惟命曰.
　　汝受命篤弼. 丕視功載.
乃汝其悉自教工. 孺子其朋. 孺子其朋. 其往. 無若火始焰焰. 厥攸灼. 敘弗其絕. 厥若彝及撫事. 如予惟以在周工. 往新邑. 伻嚮即有僚. 明作有功. 惇大成裕. 汝永有辭.

The duke says, "Alas! You are a young son, make sure you last to the end. You should carefully recognize the offerings of the hundred lords; recognize those among them who do not make offerings too. In offerings there is to be much observance. If observance does not match the things offered, then it cannot be said to be an offering. If in offerings the heart is not devoted, the people will not consider it an offering, and the sacrifice will both err and insult. Young son, you are to shoulder all this; I will not have the time to judge [for you]. I can teach you how to aid the people to observe the rites, but if you do not exert yourself, you will not last for long. Diligently regulate your chief officials, so none is unlike me, and none dares to ignore your orders. You, go, and be reverent! Here I will make bright husbandry, there you shall make our people prosperous. Do not distance those who are ungovernable!"

公曰. 已. 汝惟沖子. 惟終. 汝其敬識百辟享. 亦識其有不享. 享多儀. 儀不及物. 惟曰不享. 惟不役志于享. 凡民惟曰不享. 惟事其爽侮. 乃惟孺子頒. 朕不暇聽. 朕教汝于棐民

> 彝. 汝乃是不蘱. 乃時惟不永哉. 篤敘乃正父. 罔不若予. 不敢廢乃命. 汝往敬哉. 茲予其明農哉. 彼裕我民. 無遠用戾.[495]

Right on the structural level, the two speeches already gravitate toward the respective orientations of the ancient-script *gao* and the modern-script *gao*: while Fu Yue finishes in one go, the Duke of Zhou speaks "twice," in two instances of "the duke says." A "universal" pattern is here observed "locally," and very consistently as well, as we shall see in the following parts of each text. In keeping with the structural orientations, the rhetoric of the two speeches also differs along the lines of the ancient-/modern-script divide. While "Yue ming" unfolds on a rather "flat" narrative plane, gradually and orderly moving through the need to learn from the ancients to the prerequisites of doing so and finally to Fu Yue's pledged role in the future, the first of the two "the duke says" passages adopts a much more rhetorical flair. There is the analogy of the fire whose exact meaning is obscure to me;[496] and there is, preceding that, the feeding of words also seen in the "Da gao." Putting words in the interlocutor's mouth is a distinctive rhetorical device only seen among the modern-script *gao*; in addition to the "Da gao" and "Luo gao," it appears also in the "Shao gao" and "Zicai" 梓材.

Behind the rhetorical flair, however, the messages that the Duke of Zhou has for King Cheng are nearly the same as Fu Yue's for King Wuding. The Duke's advice to "follow the rites of Yin and make sacrifices in the new city" 肇稱殷禮. 祀于新邑 *is* an act of Fu Yue's admonition to "learn from the teachings of the ancients" 學于古訓, for the ancients always set the models for the moderns to follow, especially with regard to ritual matters. When the duke promises that "I will lead the officials stationed at Zhou and go on to the new city and have them join their colleagues there" 如予惟以在周工. 往新邑. 伻嚮即有僚, that "they [i.e., the officials] will greatly make an effort to acquire merit, and abundantly bring forth great prosperity" 明作有功. 惇大成裕, both *are* the same pledges Fu Yue makes when he says "I shall then bring myself to reverently follow you, and to

---

[495] Ibid., 1468.

[496] Schaberg posits that the fire metaphor "likely refers to the intensity of private friendships, which must not be allowed to spread uncontrolled beneath the ordered public realm." Schaberg, "Foundations of Chinese Historiography," 111.

broadly employ men of excellence to be placed in the various positions" 惟說式克欽承. 旁招俊乂. 列于庶位. Further, in the second "the duke says," when the duke warns that "Young son, you are to shoulder all this; I will not have the time to judge [for you]. I can teach you how to aid the people to observe the rites, but if you do not exert yourself, you will not last for long" 乃惟孺子頒. 朕不暇聽. 朕教汝于棐民彝. 汝乃是不蘱. 乃時惟不永哉, this premonition *is* what Fu Yue means by "Teaching is only half of learning. When your thoughts fixate from day and night on learning, your virtues will be cultivated without you even realizing it" 惟斆學半. 念終始典于學. 厥德脩罔覺. Both are saying, essentially, that "I indeed can help you but only so much. The rest is you. All. You." Nothing here is unique to either of the speakers.

With the *gao* completed in both exchanges, it is now the addressee's turn to respond, the response that propels both texts to the third stop in the narrative sequence. One can either agree or disagree, as the previous examples have shown. In most of the *gao*, the response is rather brief. But in the "Yue ming" and "Luo gao," the two kings have a lot more to say. This is exceptional among the *gao* but perhaps not so surprising for the role of the king, who in general tends to dominate any conversation in the *Shangshu*:[497]

> [YM] The king says, "*Wuhu*! Yue—If all within the four seas were to look up to my virtues, it is owing to your admonition. Without legs and arms, there is no man. Without good ministers, there is no sage king. When formerly the previous minister Baoheng "made" our former king, he said,
>
> > 'If I fail to make my sovereign like Yao and Shun, my heart will be filled with shame. It will be like I am being whipped on the marketplace.'
>
> If a commoner cannot get what he wanted, [Baoheng] will then say,
>
> > 'This is all my fault.'

[497] Curiously, the sovereign in general tends to fall on the receiving end in Eastern Zhou narratives while his interlocutors speak at length *to* him. Aside from genre differences, this perhaps has to do with changed circumstances of textual production and with changed power dynamics between the representing and the represented. As Schaberg has noted in reference to the *Zuozhuan*, "Many of the historiographers' narrative choices can be explained as results of an attitude that Nietzsche referred to as *ressentiment*, an animosity that jaundices a weaker group's view both of a dominant group and of its value" (Schaberg, *A Patterned Past*, 259).

As such, he assisted my blazing ancestors in their measuring up to the August Heaven. May you brightly protect me. Do not let A'heng [i.e. Baoheng] be the sole blessing to our Shang. A sovereign does not rule except with a worthy minister; a worthy minister does not take a salary except from a [deserving] sovereign. May you make your lord a successor to the former kings, and forever bring calm and peace to the people."

王曰. 嗚呼. 說. 四海之內咸仰朕德. 時乃風. 股肱惟人. 良臣惟聖. 昔先正保衡作我先王. 乃曰.

予弗克俾厥后惟堯舜. 其心愧恥. 若撻于市.

一夫不獲. 則曰

時予之辜.

佑我烈祖. 格于皇天. 爾尚明保予. 罔俾阿衡專美有商 .惟后非賢不乂. 惟賢非后不食. 其爾克紹乃辟于先王. 永綏民.[498]

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

[LG] The king thus says, "Duke—brightly protect me, the young son. You, Duke, with your greatly illustrious virtues have by means of me, the young son, made manifest the blazing glory of Wen and Wu and, in reverent response to Heaven's Mandate, harmoniously preserved the people of the four quarters in their settlement here. I will honor the ancestral temple with rites, uphold orderliness in the first sacrifice, and do everything in order without any transgression. The illustriousness of your—the duke's—virtues shine above and below; diligently you extend yourself to the four quarters. Everywhere you are courtly and stately, never in the comings and goings of governance lose the diligent teachings of Wen and Wu. I, the young son, shall day and night tend to the sacrifices."

The king says, "Your service, Duke, has aided me and guided me with earnestness. Nothing will be unlike this."

The king says, "Duke, I, the young son, will return and assume my rule in Zhou. I order you, Duke, to stay behind. The Ways of the four quarters are in disorder. The ancestral rites have yet to be settled, so is your work yet to be completed. Commence already the things that will last. Oversee my retainers, troops, and artisans. Grandly preserve the people accepted by Kings Wen and Wu and use them to aid your four sides."

The king says, "Duke, be settled. I will now go. Your service will be solemnly upheld and reverently rejoiced in. Do not, Duke, consider them difficult. I on my part will not derail this pacifying arrangement either. Do not replace this model, Duke; the four quarters will for generations benefit from it."

王若曰. 公. 明保予沖子. 公稱丕顯德. 以予小子揚文武烈. 奉答天命. 和恆四方民居師. 惇宗將禮. 稱秩元祀. 咸秩無文. 惟公德明光于上下. 勤施于四方. 旁作穆穆. 迓衡不迷文武勤教. 予沖子夙夜毖祀.

[498] *Shangshu zhengyi*, 9.375-76.

王曰. 公功棐迪篤. 罔不若時.

王曰. 公. 予小子其退. 即辟于周. 命公後. 四方迪亂. 未定于宗禮. 亦未克救公功. 迪將其後. 監我士師工. 誕保文武受民. 亂為四輔.

王曰. 公定. 予往已. 公功肅將祗歡. 公無困哉. 我惟無斁其康事. 公勿替刑. 四方其世享.[499]

Most obviously, here is again the ancient-/modern-script difference in structure. As the "Yue ming" continues to say everything in one *yue*, the "Luo gao" blows up to four. Both sets of the kings' responses nevertheless do the same two things. First, the king praises his advisor as an emphatic way of agreeing with and accepting his *gao*. And both sets praise the advisors by comparing them to the former kings' advisors, i.e., to the glorious past that in this rhetorical tradition is the highest form of commendation. The king in "Yue ming" compares Fu Yue to A'heng, who "assisted [his] blazing ancestors in their measuring up to the August Heaven" 佑我烈祖. 格于皇天, and then implores Fu Yue to "not let A'heng be the sole blessing to our Shang" 罔俾阿衡專美有商. The king in the "Luo gao," on the other hand, cannot mention the Duke of Zhou without putting him in the same sentence as Kings Wen and Wu. As the advisor to both the current and the previous king *and* a member of the royal lineage, the Duke of Zhou himself represents tradition as well as the continuity of that tradition. Precisely for that reason, both kings ask their advisors to "brightly protect me" 爾尚明保予/明保予沖子, so that they, the "little ones" of the royal lineage and of the monarchical tradition, can be well initiated into, and long preserved within, that future-going past.

Second, both kings follow up their praise with a charge (*ming* 命) to their interlocutors.[500] The "Yue ming" delivers the charge a bit more subtly, simply by saying "May you brightly protect me…May you make your lord a successor to the former kings, and forever bring calm and peace to

---

[499] Ibid., 1468-69.

[500] The mixing of *gao* with *ming* is very common both in and beyond the *Shangshu*. In addition to the "Yue ming" and "Luo gao," all but one (i.e., "Wenhou zhi ming" 文侯之命) of the speeches conventionally grouped as *ming* ("Caizhong zhiming" 蔡仲之命, "Junchen" 君陳, "Bi ming" 畢命, "Jiong ming" 冏命, and "Junya" 君牙) in fact mix the *ming* with *gao* in one single speech. The intermixing of the two is also seen in the He-*zun* 何尊. This is further reason that rigid differentiation is neither necessary nor productive.

the people" 爾尚明保予…其爾克紹乃辟于先王. 永綏民. Its soft, optative mood expressed by the word *shang* 尚, however, has to be compromised with the decisive shift in pronoun from the first-person "me" 予 to the third-person "your lord" 乃辟 in how the king refers to himself in the charge. The latter is the proper bureaucratic language used in the *ceming* ceremony and inscription, the implicit ongoing of which here in the "Yue ming" will be confirmed by Fu Yue's following response. The "Luo gao," on the other hand, transitions into the charge with the "right" word and the "right" mood, all at once also with the "right" kind of content: "I order [*ming* 命] you, Duke, to stay behind…Commence already the things that will last. Oversee my retainers, troops, and artisans. Grandly preserve the people accepted by Kings Wen and Wu and use them to aid your four sides." 命公後…迪將其後. 監我士師工. 誕保文武受民. 亂為四輔. King Cheng, in other words, is appointing the Duke of Zhou to rule as his delegate if not counterpart at the new site, Luo, and to take full responsibility for staffing his own government. The king himself will go back to the old capital ("Duke, be settled. I will now go" 公定. 予往已), so that this new model of power-sharing can be enacted and forever preserved (公勿替刑. 四方其世享).[501]

The final turn-taking in both dialogues shows beyond doubt that a *ming* is what was heard by both addressees. This extra response to the response in the narrative sequence, the third stop of the genre "roadmap," is, however, quite unusual. It shows how genre as a strategy for textual production both encourages "deviation" and compliance with "convention." In either case, the *production* part of the genre function is what is on display. As both the "Yue ming" and "Luo gao" approach their respective conclusions, the constructedness of both exchanges in their entirety is further revealed by how each handles speech representation at this rare juncture of "deviation meets convention":

> [YM] Yue bows, knocks his head to the ground, and says, "I dare to extol in response the grace and charge of the Son of Heaven."
>
> 說拜稽首曰. 敢對揚天子之休命.[502]

[501] The exact arrangement of this power-sharing scheme has been a longtime dispute. I do not wish to enter the dispute other than offering this understanding of the text as reflected in my translation.

[502] *Shangshu zhengyi*, 9.376.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

[LG] The Duke of Zhou bows with his hands and head and says,

> [A] "You have charged me, my king, to preserve and protect the people your cultured deceased grandfather has received per his Mandate, and to glorify the great teachings of your blazing deceased father King Wu."
>
> [B] "In reverence of you, young son, I came here to inspect the new site, to greatly bestow favor on the worthies among the Yin people, to make for the four quarters new rules, and thus to be the first of all future respect for Zhou to come."
>
> [C] "I say, 'from this center we shall rule; all the states will be blessed, and the king will have achievements.' I, Dan, will have the many decedents and various officers dedicate themselves to the upkeeping of the glories of the predecessors, have them respond to their teachers, and be the first of all the future trust in Zhou to come. In making bright your, the young son's model, I follow only the virtues of your cultured grandfather."
>
> [D] "Now, you have sent for me to take up the [affairs] in Yin and have ordered to reward me with two cups of millet brew, saying, 'make bright the *yin* sacrifice.' I bow with my hands and head toward your grace and gifts. I did not dare to sleep before I had made the sacrifice to Kings Wen and King Wu."
>
> [E] "I will diligently create regulations so that no one is mired in their own fault but instead for ten thousand years be filled with your virtues. Yin will then extend their years. And you, the king, will then send for Yin to carry on successions, and for ten thousand years forever observe you, my son, and cherish your virtues."

周公拜手稽首曰. [A]王命予來. 承保乃文祖受命民. 越乃光烈考武王弘朕. [B]恭孺子來相宅. 其大惇典殷獻民. 亂為四方新辟. 作周恭先. [C]曰其自時中乂. 萬邦咸休. 惟王有成績. 予旦以多子越御事篤前人成烈. 答其師. 作周孚先. 考朕昭子刑. 乃單文祖德. [D]伻來毖殷. 乃命寧予. 以秬鬯二卣. 曰. 明禋. 拜手稽首休享. 予不敢宿. 則禋于文王武王. [E]惠篤敘. 無有遘自疾. 萬年厥于乃德. 殷乃引考. 王伻殷乃承敘. 萬年其永觀朕子懷德.[503]

A *ming* necessitates a response, but only insofar as bronze inscriptions are concerned. At this point in both dialogues, this time-tested discursive habit has apparently taken precedence, although neither follows the convention of bronze inscriptions. The "Luo gao," by its length alone, strikes the most

[503] *Shangshu jiaoshi yilun*, 1492-93.

discord. The Duke of Zhou first "bows with his hands and head" 拜手稽首, which is a normal and formulaic response to *ceming* in bronze inscriptions but one that is not always recorded. He then starts to speak, which, as the immediate next move, is even rarer.[504] The typical follow-up is to *duiyang* 對揚, "extol in response." When the actual speech starts, it can be confirmed that the "Luo gao" operates on completely different assumptions. The duke first repeats the king's charge to him, nearly verbatim as the king has earlier repeated his *gao* too (part [A] above). He then repeats the task of inspecting the new site the king had trusted him with, followed by the ensuing duties to be done at the new site (part [B]). Following that, he vows the same thing he has earlier promised the king in his *gao*, i.e., to lead the officials at the new site toward good governance (part [C]). After these three rounds of repetition and affirmation, which in a way recapitulates the entire story so far told, the duke in part [D] narrates still again (notice the second "you order me to…" 命予) the king's *ming*, this time filling in the gift list not mentioned in the king's original charge.

Only until part [E] does the duke break free of this cycle of "mimetic repetition," to borrow Schaberg's characterization,[505] and say something new. But not entirely. His "I will diligently create regulations so that no one is mired in their own fault" 惠篤敘. 無有遘自疾 reuses the same diction and admonition he has proclaimed to the king: "Diligently regulate your chief officials, so none is unlike me" 篤敘乃正父. 罔不若予. His following "And you, the king, will then send for Yin to carry on successions, and for ten thousand years forever observe you, my son, and cherish your virtues" 王伻殷乃承敘. 萬年其永觀朕子懷德 sounds an awful lot like the formulaic ending to bronze inscriptions: "may the sons of sons and grandsons of grandsons forever cherish it" 子子孫孫永寶用. As now the new descendants of the king, the people of Yin will prosper under the duke's reign until one day the king has become an ancestor of theirs too. The "order of mimesis, political control, and generational succession" is still ongoing.[506]

---

504 I count about five inscriptions that do so: Hu-*ding* 曶鼎, Ban-*gui* 班簋, Li-*zun* 盞尊, Li-*fangzun* 蠡方尊, Li-*juzun* 盞駒尊.

505 Schaberg, "Foundations of Chinese Historiography," 124.

506 Ibid., 103.

By contrast, the "Yue ming" concludes with the briefest response both here and by the standard of bronze inscriptions. The familiar bowing (說拜稽首) and the stock *duiyang*, however, is far from conventional. For although *duiyang* has been viewed by many as essentially a speech act, only in three bronze inscriptions are a version of the words "I dare to extol in response the grace and charge of the Son of Heaven" 敢對揚天子之休命 the actual locution of that presumed speech act.[507] Insofar as bronze inscriptions can indicate, *duiyang* stands *outside* speech as a declarative statement describing the enactment of that speech act.[508] Fu Yue's response here may indeed have reproduced the actual locution of an articulated *duiyang*, but none of the available bronze inscriptions will be able to either corroborate or contradict it. In the handful of instances where the awardee actually speaks something following a *ceming* ceremony, they speak neither the language in the "Yue ming" nor that in the "Luo gao."

What the "Yue ming" has here is thus a dramatization of a speech act typically only narrated. It is also possible that *duiyang* was mistaken as the actual locution of the speech act. In either case, the corresponding response in the "Luo gao" is not of a different type. Duke of Zhou's full-on speech *is* in many ways a particularized act of "extolling the king in response" even though the phrase *duiyang* does not once appear: the duke repeats the words the king has said to him (the *dui* 對) and then vows to follow the model the king has set (the *yang* 揚). His "spelling out" the *duiyang* is the direct opposite of Fu Yue's "summary" of his response by describing *duiyang* as *duiyang*.

---

507 The closest case is the mid-Western Zhou Wuqi-*gui* 無㠯簋 (JC 04225), in which the exact words said are "I dare to extol in response the bountiful grace and command of the Son of Heaven" 敢對揚天子魯休令. See Shi Anrui 石安瑞 (Ondřej Škrabal), "You tongqi mingwen de bianzuan jiaodu kan Xizhou jinwen zhong 'baishou jishou' de xingzhi" 由銅器銘文的編纂角度看西周金文中"拜手稽首"的性質, in *Qingtongqi yu jinwen* 青銅器與金文, ed. Beijing Daxue Chutu Wenxian Yanjiusuo 北京大學出土文獻研究所, vol.1 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2017), 550-551.

508 Some scholars do not even regard *duiyang* as a *description* of the speech act but as a customary formula added to *ceming* inscriptions when the inscriptions are casted. The function, they argue, is to express gratitude but only "on paper." In addition to Shi Anrui, see also Yu Wanli 虞萬里, "Jinwen 'duiyang' lishiguan" 金文"對揚"歷史觀, *Yanyan yanjiu* 1992 (1): 84-95; Zhu Fenghan 朱鳳瀚, "Ye lun Xizhou jinwen zhong de 'baishou jishou'" 也論西周金文中的"拜手稽首," in *Qingtongqi yu jinwei* , vol.3 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2019), 1-16.

In a way, then, although the "Yue ming" concludes with the "response" part of the narrative sequence, the "Luo gao" already builds the last part, the repeat, into its response part. As the duke responds to the king's charge, he repeats not only the king's charge, which in the "Da gao" is repeated by the king himself, but also the entire narrative event. This curious double duty played by the same set of words continues into the actual last part of the "Luo gao" iteration of the narrative sequence. And the very repeat that concludes the entire "Luo gao" has for the interpretive tradition been a tremendous anomaly. It goes:

> [A] On the *wuchen* day, the king was at the new city. He performed the winter sacrifice and the sacrifice for the new year. King Wen received a merlot-colored ox, King Wu also received a merlot-colored ox. The king commended Yi, the *zuoce*, to be the cantor and to *ce*, making the proclamation that the Duke of Zhou is to say behind. The king's (spirit) guests, following the burning smoke of the sacrificial slaughters, all made their appearance. The king then entered the great chamber for the libation.
>
> [B] The king commanded the Duke of Zhou to say behind and had Yi, the *zuoce*, make the proclamation, all in the twelfth month. The Duke of Zhou grandly preserved the Mandate received by Wen and Wu. It was the seventh year.
>
> [A] 戊辰. 王在新邑. 烝祭歲. 文王騂牛一. 武王騂牛一. 王命作冊逸祝冊. 惟告周公其後. 王賓. 殺禋. 咸格. 王入太室. 祼.
>
> [B] 王命周公後. 作冊逸誥. 在十有二月. 惟周公誕保文武受命. 惟七年.[509]

The *gao* does not come with narrative endings. In the *Shangshu*, the "Luo gao" is the only *gao*, where, when the speaker finishes, the text doesn't. Insofar as narratives are concerned, they *precede* the *gao*, often simply providing the occasional context as to who is speaking, when, and where. At most, as in the case of the "Shao gao," the opening narrative situates the speech in a long sequence of events of which it is a part. Only the "Luo gao"—even if placed instead at the beginning—has a narrative component that does not lead into, but *overlaps* in narrative time with, the speech. The sheer existence of it is already an unusual narrative repetition of the speech event.

---

[509] *Shangshu jiaoshi yilun*, 1496-97.

Adding to the unexpectedness, this unusual narration also has a great deal of ambiguity and circularity to it. It starts *in medias res* with the king making a sacrifice at the new city (戊辰. 王在新邑. 烝祭歲)—something the king was asked to do by the duke at an earlier point. It then narrates the king's command to the duke, with the presence of an official named Yi (王命作冊逸祝冊. 惟告周公其後). Whereas *zuoce* 作冊 and *zhu ce* 祝冊 seem uncontroversial in terms of grammar and syntax, who does the *gao* 告 and in what ways is far less clear in the narration. If Yi is to read out the *ce*, that is, the document with the *gao* charge on it, it seems reasonable that Yi is also the person who voices the *gao*. In that case, however, the narration leaves zero indication that a dialogue between the king and the duke was in fact going on. The only person speaking according to the narration is Yi, for he is both the cantor and the announcer. If, on the other hand, Yi is there to transcribe the *gao* while the king himself is doing the *gao*, then at least one party of the dialogue earlier recounted is somewhat represented while the duke is still left out—so, then, is the *form* of a dialogue.

After that, the narration returns to the ceremonial rituals that began with the sacrifices made to Kings Wen and Wu (文王騂牛一. 武王騂牛一) and is now, following the *gao*, transitioning to the welcoming of the spiritual guests (王賓. 殺禮. 咸格. 王入太室. 祼). At this point, the narration for some reason goes to repeat itself and states again that "the king commanded the Duke of Zhou to stay behind" 王命周公後. This time, syntax dictates that Yi, the *zuoce*, is the one who did the *gao* (作冊逸誥), presumably verbally on behalf of the king, thus again erasing the dialogue between the king and the duke. Until, that is, the final sentence. To say that "the Duke of Zhou grandly preserved the Mandate received by Wen and Wu" 惟周公誕保文武受命 is to acknowledge on the part of the narration a small but relevant part of the dialogue, for it is in the dialogue alone that the specifics of the king's *gao* to the duke is ever spelled out.

Without that knowledge, it is equally reasonable to read this part of the narration as neither about the charge nor about the duke's acceptance of the charge but in connection with 惟七年 as about the "happily ever after" of the entire narrative event, as in "the Duke of Zhou grandly preserved the Mandate received by Wen and Wu *for seven years*." For many readers past and present,

this is indeed how they understand it.[510] Yet, such a reading does not explain why the king's charge is narrated for a second time. Alternatively, one can read this entire repetition (part [B]) one discursive level up as a commentary on the entire first part of the narration (part [A]), perhaps by a different narrator who is concerned with supplying the dates for the events. As in: "the king's commanding of the Duke of Zhou to stay behind and Yi, the *zuoce*'s making of the *gao*, occurred in the twelfth month. The Duke of Zhou's grandly preserving the Mandate received by Wen and Wu occurred in the seventh year." This reading will explain the repetition, and to some degree the unusual placement of the date notations. But it still leaves open the question of whether the narration was unaware of the duke's lengthy dialoguing with the king or simply uninterested in mentioning him.

In whichever case, the narration is in tension with the dialogue: it runs parallel to the dialogue but refuses to acknowledge, even erases, the dialogue. Or is it? When narration is viewed as a framing device over speech, as it typically is and with good reasons, it certainly is. In this case, however, the narrative does not even try to frame the speech but to replicate it, some of it. When narration is instead viewed as "substantiation," as in Schaberg's reading,[511] the tension is gone but only half gone. For the narrative here substantiates only half of the story told in the dialogue and only one side of the dialogue. The Duke of Zhou, otherwise sustaining the king's speech and giving him an occasion to speak in the first place, is still silenced.

When narration is viewed as a hypertextual *equivalent* to dramatization, the tension, I believe, will be mostly gone. Mostly because nothing explains why the narration here starts *in medias res*, but still mostly gone because all else that is told in the foregoing dialogue is here mentioned once again. The "Luo gao" completes the "repeat" part of the narrative sequence by repeating the entire narrative. And unlike the "Yue ming" with the *duiyang*, in which case a typically narrated event is dramatized, "Luo gao" here opts for the opposite where a typically dramatized event is instead narrated. The sacrifice, the ritual, and the *gao* all belong to the same speech event of the *ceming* and

[510] See *Shangshu jiaoshi yilun*, 1501. Both Legges and Karlgren also translate it this way. In my own translation I follow Gu Jiegang and Liu Qiyu (and David Schaberg) but remain noncommittal.

[511] Schaberg, "Foundations of Chinese Historiography," 125.

the *gao*. Whereas most iterations of such speech events, including the foregoing portions of the "Luo gao," fully dramatize them, the narrator in this last part of the text somehow decided to narrate—and narrate with a perspective focusing only on the king. The duke is still present but present as the grammatical object of the king. In that sense, the narration does not in fact erase the dialogue; it simply presumes it. It knew that a *ming* requires a response; it likely knew too that the sacrifices to Kings Wen and Wu were made at the behest of the duke. But in narrating, the narration only placed its gaze on the king. Such is perhaps how the king's charge is narrated twice, for the king did charge twice in the dialogue. The narrator, though bold by asserting his own voice through narrating an otherwise dramatized event, still kept his gaze on every single move of the king.

In any case, as the "Luo gao" concludes the narrative sequence, it joins the "Yue ming" and the "Da gao" as the three fullest instantiations of the trigger-*gao*-response-repeat variety of the *gao* genre. All the speaking here is carefully voiced, for everything that makes these *gao* special is seen in other speeches both in and beyond the *Shangshu* as well. When genre as a strategy meets a set of shared narrative techniques, the speech writings that result also comprise just "one speech," one synthetic speech with but many accents.

**Coda: A Ritualistic Aesthetics of Writing**

When Mark Edward Lewis' *Writing and Authority in Early China* came out over twenty years ago, two scholars who both called it a monumental achievement did something that has remained itself a monument of scholarly engagement. Each wrote a forty-plus-page review, both within a year of the book's publication whose length is every bit of its monumentality as its coverage, originality, and theoretical acumen.[512] Although the two reviews broach their critique in different ways, both express nonetheless a shared hesitance in giving writing, as unqualifiedly as Lewis does, the privileged role in the generation of power and authority over other forms of expression and/or representation. Oral communication and ritual practice, for instance, are the two main "contenders" in early China for the same cultural-political status Lewis ascribes to writing, in at least some arenas of the society and at certain times of the long history. Any claim operating at a higher level of generalization necessarily opens itself up to more nuanced counterclaims; the ones made in this dissertation are no exception. But generalizations are also indispensable for scholarly advancement, especially when they inspire productive reflections.

In a way, writing, orality, and ritual practice all have their separate but overlapping spheres of influence in early China. The question is rarely which reigns supreme at any historical moment but how that moment is served by, or calls for, one or a combination of the three (among many others, for certain) means of representation—representation of language, meaning, intention, signs. Scholars of various cultural traditions, not necessarily ancient ones, have all advocated a version of that analytical position. What remains to be supplemented are the historical institutions and processes specific to each. In that sense, the early Chinese experience provides just as good of a reference as, for example, the Gecko-Roman tradition does for a general investigation into the dynamic development, even contentious politics, of cultural representation, of writing and orality, and of the socio-political and/or literary-aesthetic circumstances of textual production. Lewis and his readers

[512] Martin Kern, "*Writing and Authority in Early China* by Mark Edward Lewis," *China Review International* 7.2 (2000): 336-376. Michael Nylan, "Textual Authority in Pre-Han and Han," *Early China* 25 (2000): 205-258.

*combine* to present us a fuller picture of the early Chinese case. His book is incomplete without the two—and, for that matter, other, less in-depth—reviews.

In that fuller picture, another perspective should also be recognized. For although writing, orality, and rituals all have a rightful place to claim in the larger scheme of representation, they also converge into one particular form of representation, the written representation of the spoken word. And that representation, curiously, proves to be "ritualistic." Although not all writings can be said to be ritual or even ritualized texts, that is, those that focus on speech representation "capture first of all the principle of iterability…along with a certain ceremoniousness, and the possibility of making something happen in the world."[513] This "ritualistic"—or, in other words, repeatable, pragmatic, and rhetorical—dimension of textual production is what Jonathan Culler has recently used to highlight a revised notion of the Western lyric: "the effects of *presentness* of lyric utterance, the *materiality* of lyric language that makes itself felt as something other than signs of a character and plot, and the rich texture of *intertextual relations* that relates it to other poems rather than to worldly events" (italics mine).[514] All three characterizations of the lyric apply equally well to early Chinese speech writings, noticeable through the circumscribed variations made to the speaker and speech functions, and through the shared narrative materials and rhetorical tropes supplying both hypertextual and intertextual means of mimetic representation. The iterability of early Chinese speech writings, like the Western lyric in Culler's conceptualization, manifests precisely in the possibility of reading them beyond the "living presence" of their author and context of origination, the very definition of "iterability" according to Derrida. In fact, as bronze inscriptions routinely proclaim on their own, most speech writings addressee a later, uninitiated readership like posterity just as well as it does a contemporary one who might have been the original addressee.

To an aesthetics of textual production thus conceived, approaches motivated by the interests describable as "historical-critical" can be obscuring. Like the two contrasting notions of *mimēsis* noted in the Introduction, a world-making mode of representation calls for a different kind of

---

[513] Jonathan Culler, *Theory of the Lyric* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 2015), 123.
[514] Ibid., 119.

analytical armature than that of the world-reflecting type. One is more constructive and imaginative, the other "excavative," to borrow Robert Alter's famous characterization of Biblical criticism in the historical-critical fashion.[515] By means of the latter, early China has already sustained a rich tradition of scholarly investigations. And it continues to. By means of the former, I wish to show that much more awaits exploration from a different angle. Writing, for instance, is inseparable from a notion of the spoken word that renders it an elevated means of expression, within writing and likely beyond writing as well. Representation, on the other hand, also registers more as a means of imagination, an act of creation. Any effort in sorting out the complex relationship between writing, orality, and their embedding contexts like ritual practice will have to reconcile with the "oral" texture of early Chinese writings more basically. The "Synthetic Tongue" hints thus both at the artifactuality of early Chinese speech writings and the communality of the language they "speak." What these claims need further are the kinds of nuancing, finetuning, even correcting any larger-scale assertions would wish to undergo. But first, the problematic must be established. It is in that spirit that I offer this dissertation—as, likewise, a means of "making something happen in the world."

言之鑿鑿. 亦拋磚引玉爾.

[515] Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 14.

**Works Cited**

Primary sources:


*Chunqiu Gongyang zhuan yizhu* 春秋公羊傳譯注. Commented by Liu Shangci 劉尚慈. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2010.

*Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu* 春秋左傳注. Yang Bojun 楊伯峻. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1982.

*Da Dai liji jiegu* 大戴禮記解詁. Compiled by Wang Pinzhen 王聘珍. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983.

Digital Archives of Bronze Images and Inscriptions 殷周金文暨青銅器資料庫. Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica 中央研究院歷史語言研究所. https://bronze.asdc.sinica.edu.tw/qry_bronze.php

*Guanzi jiaozhu* 管子校注. Compiled by Li Xiangfeng 黎翔鳳. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2004.

*Hanfeizi jijie* 韓非子集解. Compiled by Wang Xianshen 王先慎. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1998.

*Hanfeizi xin jiaozhu* 韓非子新校注. Commented by Chen Qiyou 陳奇猷. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2000.

*Hanshu* 漢書. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1962.

*Huainanzi jishi* 淮南子集釋. Compiled by He Ning 何寧. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1998.

*Kongzi jiayu shuzheng* 孔子家語疏證. Compiled by Chen Shike 陳士柯. Shanghai: Shanghai shudian, 1987.

Lexicon of Pre-Qin Oracle, Bronze Inscriptions and Bamboo Slips 先秦甲骨金文簡牘詞彙資料庫. Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica 中央研究院歷史語言研究所. https://inscription.asdc.sinica.edu.tw/c_index.php

*Liji jijie* 禮記集解. Compiled by Sun Xidan 孫希旦. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1989.

*Lunheng jiaoshi* 論衡校釋. Compiled by Huang Hui 黃暉. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1990.

*Lunyu huijiao jishi* 論語彙校集釋. Compiled by Huang Huaixin 黃懷信. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2008.

*Lunyu zhengyi* 論語正義. Compiled by Liu Baonan 劉寶楠. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1990.

*Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaozhu* 呂氏春秋新校釋. Commented by Chen Qiyou 陳奇猷. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2002.

*Mengzi zhengyi* 孟子正義. Compiled by Jiao Xun 焦循. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1987.

*Mozi jiaozhu* 墨子校注. Compiled by Wu Yujiang 吳毓江. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1993.

*Mozi jinzhu jinyi* 墨子今註今譯. Commented by Li Yushu 李漁叔. Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1974.

*Mozi xiangu* 墨子閒詁. Compiled by Sun Yirang 孫怡讓. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2001.

*Hanshi waizhuan jishi* 韓詩外傳集釋. Commented by Xu Weiyu 許維遹. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980.

*Qinghua daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian* 清華大學藏戰國竹簡. Edited by Qinghua Daxue Chutu Wenxian Yanjiu Yu Baohu Zhongxing 清華大學出土文獻研究與保護中心, vol. 1. Shanghai: Zhongxi shuju, 2010.

*Shangshu guwen shuzheng* 尚書古文疏證. Yan Ruoqu 閻若璩. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2010.

*Shangshu jiaoshi yilun* 尚書校釋譯論. Gu Jiegang 顧頡剛 and Liu Qiyu 劉起釪. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2005.

*Shangshu zhengyi* 尚書正義. Commented by Kong Yingda 孔穎達. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2007.

*Shiji* 史記. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1959.

*Shuoyuan jiaozheng* 說苑校證. Collated by Xiang Zonglu 向宗魯. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1987.

*Xunzi jijie* 荀子集解. Compiled by Wang Xianqian 王先謙. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1988.

*Yi Zhoushu huijiao jizhu* 逸周書彙校集注. Compiled by Huang Huaixin 黃懷信, Zhang Maong 張懋鎔, and Tian Xudong 田旭東. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2007.

*Zhanguo ce jizhu huikao* 戰國策集註匯考. Compiled by Zhu Dugeng 諸祖耿. Nanjing: Fenghuang chubanshe, 2008.

*Zhanguo ce jianzheng* 戰國策箋證. Commented by Fan Xiangyong 范祥雍. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2006.

*Zhuangzi jishi* 莊子集釋. Compiled by Guo Qingfan 郭慶藩. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1961.

Secondary sources:

**Ai**, Chunming 艾春明. *Hanshi waizhaun yanjiu* 《韓詩外傳》研究. Shenyang: Liaoning daxue chubanshe, 2010.

Allan, Sarah. *Buried Ideas: Legends of Abdication and Ideal Government in Early Chinese Bamboo-Slip Manuscripts*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2015.

———. "'When Red Pigeons Gathered on Tang's House': A Warring States Period Tale of Shamanic Possession and Building Construction Set at the Turn of the Xia and Shang Dynasties." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 25, no. 3 (2015): 419-38.

Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic Books, 1981.

Ames, Roger T. *Sun-Tzu: The Art of Warfare: The First English Translation Incorporating the Recently Discovered Yin-Ch'üeh-Shan Texts*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1993.

**Bakhtin**, Mikhail M. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Edited by Caryl Emerson and Michael

Holquist. Translated by Vern W. McGee. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986.
———. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Edited by Michael Holquist. Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.
Barton, John. *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.
———. *The Nature of Biblical Criticism*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007.
Beck, Guy L. *Sonic Theology: Hinduism and Sacred Sound*. Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1993.
Blair, Ann M. *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.
Blakeley, Barry B. "'On the Authenticity and Nature of the *Zuo Zhuan*' Revisited." *Early China* 29 (2004): 217-67.
Boltz, William G. "The Composite Nature of Early Chinese Texts." In *Text and Ritual in Early China*, edited by Martin Kern, 50-78. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2005.
Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. 2nd ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983.
Boyarin, Daniel. *Socrates and the Fat Rabbis*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2009.
Briggs, Charles L., and Richard Bauman. "Genre, Intertextuality, and Social Power." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 2, no. 2 (1992): 131-72.

**Cao**, Feng曹峰. "Daojia dishi lei wenxian chutan" 道家「帝師」類文獻初探. *Zhexue lunji* 49 (2018): 33-60.
Chan, Hung Kan 陳雄根, and Ho Che Wah 何志華. *Xian Qin Liang Han dianji yin Shangshu ziliao huibian* 先秦兩漢典籍引《尚書》資料彙編. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 2003.
Chao, Fulin 晁福林. *Shangbo jian Shilun yanjiu* 上博簡《詩論》研究. Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan, 2013.
Chatman, Seymour. *Coming to Terms: The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.
Chen, Hanping 陳漢平. *Xizhou ceming zhidu yanjiu* 西周冊命制度研究. Shanghai: Xuelin chubanshe, 1986.
Chen, Jack W., Anatoly Detwyler, Xiao Liu, Christopher Nugent, and Bruce Rusk, eds. *Literary Information in China: A History*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2021.
Chen, Lai 陳來. "Liji Ruxing pian de lishi quanshi yu shidai yiyi" 《禮記·儒行》篇的歷史詮釋與時代意義. *Shangdong daxue xuebao* 2020.2: 154-161.
Chen, Mengjia 陳夢家. *Shangshu tonglun* 尚書通論. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1985.
———. *Xizhou tongqi duandai* 西周銅器斷代. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2004.
Chen, Tongsheng 陳桐生. "Xianqin duihuati sanwen yuanliu" 先秦對話體散文源流. *Xueshu yanjiu*

2017.8: 150-164.

Chen, Yingjie 陳英傑. *Liangzhou jinwen zuoqi yongtu mingci yanjiu* 兩周金文作器用途銘辭研究. Beijing: Xianzhuang shuju, 2008.

Cheng, Hao 程浩. *You wei yan zhi: Xianqin Shu lei wenxian de yuan yu liu* 有為言之：先秦「書」類文獻的源與流. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2021.

Cheng, Yuanmin 程元敏. *Shangshu xueshi* 尚書學史. Shanghai: Huadong shifan daxue chubanshe, 2013.

Chin, Tamara T. *Savage Exchange: Han Imperialism, Chinese Literary Style, and the Economic Imagination*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2014.

Chion, Michel. *Sound: An Acoulogical Treatise*. Translated by James A. Steintrager. Durham: Duke University Press, 2016.

Cook, Constance A., and Paul R. Goldin, eds. *A Source Book of Ancient Chinese Bronze Inscriptions, Revised Edition*. Berkeley: The Society for the Study of Early China, 2020.

Cook, Scott. "Confucius in Excavated Warring States Manuscripts." In *A Concise Companion to Confucius*, edited by Paul R. Goldin, 35-51. Hoboken, NJ.: Wiley Blackwell, 2017.

———. "The *Lüshi chunqiu* and the Resolution of Philosophical Dissonance." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 62, no. 2 (2002): 307-45.

Crane, Mary Thomas. *Framing Authority: Sayings, Self, and Society in Sixteenth-Century England*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Crone, Thomas. "Confucius Repeats Himself: On the Nature and Sources of the *Lunyu* 論語." *T'oung Pao* 108, no. 3-4 (2022): 289-318.

Crump, J. I. *Chan-kuo ts'e*. Rev. ed. Ann Arbor: Center for Chinese Studies, The University of Michigan, 1996.

———. *Intrigues: Studies of the Chan-kuo ts'e*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1964.

Cullen, Christopher. *Astronomy and Mathematics in Ancient China: The Zhou bi suan jing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Culler, Jonathan. *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction*. New York: Routledge, 2005.

———. *Theory of the Lyric*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 2015.

**De Reu**, Wim. "A Ragbag of Odds and Ends? Argument Structure and Philosophical Coherence in *Zhuangzi* 26." In *Literary Forms of Argument in Early China*, edited by Joachim Gentz and Dirk Meyer, 243-294. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Defoort, Carine, and Nicolas Standaert, eds. *The Mozi as an Evolving Text: Different Voices in Early Chinese Thought*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Deng, Peiling 鄧佩玲. *Tianming, guishen, yu zhudao: dongzhou jinwen guci tanlun* 天命、鬼神與祝禱—東周金文嘏辭談論. Taipei: Yiwen yinshuguan, 2011.

Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*. Translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore, MD.: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976.

Desmet, Karen. "All Good Things Come in Threes: A Textual Analysis of the Three-fold Structure of the Mohist Ethical 'Core Chapters.'" PhD diss., Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 2007.

Dolar, Mladen. *A Voice and Nothing More*. Cambridge, MA.: The MIT Press, 2006.

Du, Heng. "The Author's Two Bodies: Paratext in Early Chinese Textual Culture." PhD diss., Harvard University, 2018.

———. "The Author's Two Bodies: The Death of Qu Yuan and the Birth of *Chuci zhangju* 楚辭章句." *T'oung Pao* 105 (2019): 259-314.

———. "The Mastery of Miscellanea: Information Management and Knowledge Acquisition in the 'Chu shuo' Chapters of the *Hanfeizi*." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 140, no. 1 (2020): 115-41.

**Egan**, Charles. "Were *Yüeh-fu* Ever Folk Songs? Reconsidering the Relevance of Oral Theory and Balladry Analogies." *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews* 22 (2000): 31-66.

Els, Paul van, and Sarah A. Queen. "Anecdotes in Early China." In *Between History and Philosophy: Anecdotes in Early China*, edited by Paul van Els and Sarah A. Queen, 1-37. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2017.

Eno, Robert. "Reflections on Literary and Devotional Aspects of Western Zhou Memorial Inscriptions." In *Imprints of Kinship: Studies of Recently Discovered Bronze Inscriptions from Ancient China*, edited by Edward L. Shaughnessy, 261-85. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2017.

**Falkenhausen**, Lothar von. "Issues in Western Zhou Studies: A Review Article." *Early China* 18 (1993): 139-226.

———. "The Inscribed Bronzes from Yangjiacun: New Evidence on Social Structure and Historical Consciousness in Late Western Zhou China (c.800 BC)." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 139 (2005): 239-95.

———. "The Royal Audience and Its Reflections in Western Zhou Bronze Inscriptions." In *Writing and Literacy in Early China: Studies from the Columbia Early China Seminar*, edited by Li Feng and David Prager Branner, 239-70. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2011.

Fan, Dong 樊東. "Hanshi waizhuan zhushu tili ji xiangguan wenti yanjiu" 《韓詩外傳》著述體例及相關問題研究. PhD diss., Shanghai University, 2016.

Field, Stephen L. "Who Told the Fortunes? The Speaker in Early Chinese Divination Records." *Asia Major, Third Series* 13, no. 2 (2000): 1-15.

Fischer, Paul. "Authentication Studies (辨偽學) Methodology and the Polymorphous Text

Paradigm." *Early China* 32 (2008-2009): 1-43.

Foucault, Michel. "What Is an Author?" Translated by Josué V. Harari. In *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism*, edited by Josué V. Harari, 141-160. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1979.

Fowler, R. L. *The Nature of Early Greek Lyric: Three Preliminary Studies*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987.

Fraser, Chris. *The Essential Mòzi: Ethical, Political, and Dialectical Writings*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2020.

Fu, Gang 傅剛. "Lüe shuo Xianqin de yuti yu yushu" 略說先秦的語體與語書. *Zhongshan daxue xuebao* 2013.5: 1-7.

**Gao**, Jiyi 郜積意. *Jingdian de pipan: Xihan wenxue sixiang yanjiu* 經典的批判：西漢文學思想研究. Beijing: Dongfang chubanshe, 2000.

Gao, Youren 高佑仁. *Shanghai bowuguan cang Zhangguo Chu zhushu (si) – Cao Mo zhi chen yanjiu*《上海博物館藏戰國楚竹書(四)・曹沫之陳》研究. Taipei: Huamulan chubanshe, 2008.

Genette, Gérard. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Translated by Jane E. Lewin. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980.

———. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Translated by Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky. University of Nebraska Press, 1997.

———. *The Architext: An Introduction*. Translated by Jane E. Lewin. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

Gentz, Joachim. "One Heaven, One History, One People: Repositioning the Zhou in Royal Addresses to Subdued Enemies in the 'Duo shi' 多士 and 'Duo fang' 多方 Chapters of the *Shangshu* and in the 'Shang shi' 商誓 Chapter of the *Yi Zhoushu*." In *Origins of Chinese Political Philosophy*: *Studies in the Composition and Thought of the* Shangshu *(Classic of Documents)*, edited by Martin Kern and Dirk Meyer, 146-192. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

Geue, Tom. *Author Unknown: The Power of Anonymity in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 2019.

Goffman, Erving. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981.

Goldin, Paul R. "Confucius and His Disciples in the *Lunyu*: The Basis for the Traditional View." In *Confucius and the* Analects *Revisited: New Perspectives on Composition, Dating, and Authorship*, edited by Michael Hunter and Martin Kern, 92-115. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

———. "Nondeductive Argumentation and the Art of Chinese Philosophy." In *The Art of Chinese Philosophy: Eight Classical Texts and How to Read Them*, 13-27. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2020.

———. "Rhetoric and Machination in *Stratagems of the Warring States*." In *After Confucius: Studies in*

*Early Chinese Philosophy*, 76-89. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2005.

Grafton, Anthony. *Forgers And Critics: Creativity and Duplicity in Western Scholarship*. New edition. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019.

———. *Inky Fingers: The Making of Books in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge, MA.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2020.

Graham, A. C. *Disputers of the Tao: Philosophical Argument in Ancient China*. La Salle, Ill: Open Court, 1989.

Graziosi, Barbara. *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of Epic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Grebnev, Yegor. "Numerical Lists of Foundational Knowledge in Early Chinese and Early Buddhist Traditions." *Asiatische Studien* 74, no. 3 (2020): 453-84.

———. *Mediation of Legitimacy in Early China: A Study of the Neglected Zhou Scriptures and the Grand Duke Traditions*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2022.

Gu, Shikao 顧史考 (Scott Cook). *Shangbo zhushu Kongzi yulu wenxian yanjiu* 上博竹書孔子語錄文獻研究. Shanghai: Zhongxi shuju, 2021.

Guan, Zongchang 管宗昌. *Lüshi Chunqiu wenxue yanjiu*《呂氏春秋》文學研究. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 2016.

Guo, Yingde 郭英德. *Zhongguo gudai wenti xue lungao* 中國古代文體學論稿. Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2005.

**Halliwell**, Stephen. *The Aesthetics of Mimesis: Ancient Texts and Modern Problems*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Harbsmeier, Christoph. "Authorial Presence in Some Pre-Buddhist Chinese Texts." In *De l'un au multiple: Traductions du chinois vers les langues européennes*, edited by Viviane Alleton and Michael Lackner, 219-54. Paris: Maison des sciences de l'homme, 1999.

———. "The Authenticity and Nature of the Analects of Confucius." *Journal of Chinese Studies* no. 68 (2019): 171-233.

———. "Xunzi and the Problem of Impersonal First Pronouns." *Early China* 22 (1997): 181-220.

Harper, Donald. *Early Chinese Medical Literature: The Mawangdui Medical Manuscripts*. New York: Kegan Paul International, 1998.

He, Shuhuan 何樹環. *Xizhou ximing mingwen xinyan* 西周錫命銘文新研. Taipei: Wenjin chubanshe, 2007.

He, Zhihua 何志華. *Lüshi chunqiu guankui* 呂氏春秋管窺. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2015.

Hein, Anke. "Concepts of 'Authenticity' and the Chinese Textual Heritage in Light of Excavated Texts." In *China and the World—the World and China: Essays in Honor of Rudolf G. Wagner (Volume 1: Transcultural Perspectives on Pre-modern China)*, edited by Joachim Gentz, 37-63.

Gossenberg: Ostasien Verlag, 2019.

Henry, Eric. "'Junzi Yue' Versus 'Zhongni Yue' in *Zuozhuan*." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 59, no. 1 (1999): 125-61.

Hightower, James Robert. "The *Han-shih wai-chuan* 韓詩外傳 and the *San chia shih* 三家詩." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 11, no. 3/4 (1948): 241-310.

———. "The *Wen hsüan* and Genre Theory." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 20 (1957): 512-33.

Hou, Naifeng 候乃峰. *Shangbo Chu jian Ruxue wenxian jiaoli* 上博楚簡儒學文獻校理. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2018.

Hu, Dalei 胡大雷. "Lun 'yuti' ji wenti de qian 'wenti' zhuangtai" 論"語體"及文體的前"文體"狀態. *Wenxue yichan* 2012.1: 17-24.

Huang, Tingqi 黃庭頎. "Cong shuzu dao yangji: Liangzhou qizhuyue kaipian mingwen yanjiu" 從述祖到揚己—兩周「器主曰」開篇銘文研究. *Qinghua zhongwen xuebao* 2017.6: 33-71.

———. *Zhule gongming: Chunqiu qingtong liqi mingwen de yanbian yu tese* 鑄勒功名—春秋青銅禮器銘文的演變與特色. Taipei: Wanjuanlou tushu gufen youxian gongsi, 2018.

Hung, Wu. *Monumentality in Early Chinese Art and Architecture*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995.

Hunter, Michael. "Against (Uninformed) Idleness: Situating the Didacticism of 'Wu yi' 無逸." In *Origins of Chinese Political Philosophy*, 393-415.

———. *Confucius Beyond the Analects*. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

———. "Early Sources for Confucius." In *A Concise Companion to Confucius*, 15-34.

Hutton, Eric L. *Xunzi: The Complete Text*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014.

**Indraccolo**, Lisa. "What Is 'Rhetoric' Anyway? Briared in Words in Early China." *Asiatische Studien - Études Asiatiques* 68, no. 1 (2014): 331-41.

Indraccolo, Lisa, and Wolfgang Behr. "Introduction." *Asiatische Studien - Études Asiatiques* 68, no. 4 (2014): 889-913.

**Jameson**, Fredric. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981.

Jamison, Stephanie W., and Joel P. Brereton. "Introduction." In *The Rigveda: The Earliest Religious Poetry of India*, vol. 1, 1-84. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Jia, Jinhua. "An Interpretation of the Term *fu* 賦 in Early Chinese Texts: From Poetic Form to Poetic Technique and Literary Genre." *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews* 26 (2004): 55-76.

Jia, Xuehong 賈學鴻. *Zhuangzi jiegou yishu yanjiu* 《莊子》結構藝術研究. Beijing: Xueyuan chubanshe, 2013.

Jiang, Shanguo 蔣善國. *Shangshu zongshu* 尚書綜述. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1988.
Johnston, Ian. *The Mozi: A Complete Translation*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010.

**Kantorowicz**, Ernst. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology*. 3rd ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016.
Karlgren, Bernhard. "The Authenticity of Ancient Chinese Texts." *BMFEA*, no. 1 (1929): 165-83.
Keightley, David N. "Shang Divination and Metaphysics." *Philosophy East and West* 38, no. 4 (1988): 367-97.
———. *Sources of Shang History: The Oracle-Bone Inscriptions of Bronze Age China*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.
Kern, Martin. "Cultural Memory and the Epic in Early Chinese Literature: The Case of Qu Yuan 屈原 and the *Lisao* 離騷." *Journal of Chinese Literature and Culture* 9, no. 1 (April 2022): 131-69.
———. "Early Chinese Divination and Its Rhetoric." In *Coping with the Future: Theories and Practices of Divination in East Asia*, edited by Michael Lackner, 255-88. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
———. "Kongzi as Author in the Han." In *Confucius and Analects Revisited: New Perspectives on Composition, Dating, and Authorship*, edited by Michael Hunter and Martin Kern, 268-307. Leiden: Brill, 2018.
———. "Methodological Reflections on the Analysis of Textual Variants and the Modes of Manuscript Production in Early China." *Journal of East Asian Art* 4 (2002): 143-81.
———. "'Persuasion' or 'Treatise'? The Prose Genres of *Shui* 說 and *Shuo* 說 in the Light of the *Guwenci leizuan* of 1779." In *Ad Seres et Tungusos: Festschrift für Martin Gimm*, edited by Lutz Bieg, Erling von Mende, and Martina Siebert, 221-243. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2000.
———. "Speaking of Poetry: Pattern and Argument in the 'Kongzi shilun'." In *Literary Forms of Argument in Early China*, 175-200.
———. "The 'Harangues' (*shi* 誓) in the *Shangshu*." In *Origins of Chinese Political Philosophy*, 281-319.
———. "The Performance of Writing in Western Zhou China." In *The Poetics of Grammar and the Metaphysics of Sound and Sign*, edited by S. La Porta and D. Shulman, 109-75. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
———. *The Stele Inscriptions of Ch'in Shih-Huang: Text and Ritual in Early Chinese Imperial Representation*. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 2000.
———. "Western Han Aesthetics and the Genesis of the *Fu*." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 63, no. 2 (2003): 383-437.
———. "*Writing and Authority in Early Chin*a by Mark Edward Lewis." *China Review International* 7.2 (2000): 336-376.
———. "'Xi shuai' 蟋蟀 ('Cricket') and Its Consequences: Issues in Early Chinese Poetry and Textual Studies." *Early China* 42 (2019): 39-74.

Khayutina, Maria. "'Bi shi' 費誓, Western Zhou Oath Texts, and the Legal Culture of Early China." In *Origins of Chinese Political Philosophy*, 416-45.

Knechtges, David R. *The Han Rhapsody: A Study of the Fu of Yang Hsiung (53 B.C.-A.D. 18)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

———. "The Problem with Anthologies: The Case of the 'Bai Yi' Poems of Ying Qu (190-252)." *Asia Major, Third Series* 23, no. 1 (2010): 173-99.

Knight, Jeffrey Todd. *Bound to Read: Compilations, Collections, and the Making of Renaissance Literature*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.

Knoblock, John. *Xunzi: A Translation and Study of the Complete Works*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988.

Knoblock, John, and Jeffrey Riegel. *The Annals of Lü Buwei: A Complete Translation and Study*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000.

———. *Mozi: A Study and Translation of the Ethical and Political Writings*. Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 2013.

Krijgsman, Rens. "Cultural Memory and Excavated Anecdotes in 'Documentary' Narrative: Mediating Generic Tensions in the *Baoxun* Manuscript," in *Between History and Philosophy*, 301-329.

———. "Traveling Sayings as Carriers of Philosophical Debate: From the Intertextuality of the **Yucong* 語叢 to the Dynamics of Cultural Memory and Authorship in Early China." *Asiatische Studien - Études Asiatiques* 68, no. 1 (2014): 83-115.

**Legge**, James. *The Chinese Classics: The Shoo King or the Book of Historical Documents*. Taipei: SMC Publishing Inc., 1991.

Levy, Dore J. "Constructing Sequences: Another Look at the Principle of *Fu* 賦 'Enumeration.'" *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 46, no. 2 (1986): 471-93.

Lewis, Mark Edward. *Sanctioned Violence in Early China*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990.

———. "The Mythology of Early China." In *Early Chinese Religion, Part One: Shang through Han (1250 BC-220 AD)*, edited by John Lagerwey and Marc Kalinowski, 543-594. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

———. *Writing and Authority in Early China*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999.

Li, Guanlan 李冠蘭. "Xizhou ceming wenti de wenben shengcheng" 西周冊命文體的文本生成. *Zhongshan daxue xuebao* 2019.6: 36-44.

Li, Ling. 李霖. "Cong 'wu di benji' qucai kan Taishigong zhi shuzuo" 從《五帝本紀》取裁看太史公之述作. *Wenshi* 2020.1: 87-128.

———. *Sunzi shisan pian zonghe yanjiu* 《孫子》十三篇綜合研究. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2006.

Li, Rui 李銳. *Renwu, wenben, niandai: Chutu wenxian yu Xianqin gushu niandaixue tansuo* 人物、文本、

年代：出土文獻與先秦古書年代學探索. Beijing: Zhongguo renmin daxue chubanshe, 2017.

Li, Wai-Yee. *The Readability of the Past in Early Chinese Historiography*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2007.

Li, Xueqin 李學勤. "Shilun de ticai he zuozhe" 詩論的體裁和作者. In *Shangbo guancang Zhanguo Chu zhushu yanjiu* 上博館藏戰國楚竹書研究, edited by Shanghai Daxue Gudai Wenming Yanjiu Zhongxin 上海大學古代文明研究中心 and Qinghua Daxue Sixiang Wenhua Yanjiusuo 清華大學思想文化研究所, 51-61. Shanghai: Shanghai shudian chubanshe, 2002.

Liao, Qun 廖群. *Xianqin shuoti wenben yanjiu* 先秦說體文本研究. Beijing: Zhongyang bianyi chubanshe, 2018.

Liu, Guangsheng 劉光勝. *Chutu wenxian yu Guwen Shangshu yanjiu* 出土文獻與《古文尚書》研究. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 2020.

Liu, Renpeng 劉人鵬. *Yan Ruoqu yu Guwen Shangshu bianwei: Yige xueshushi de ge'an yanjiu* 閻若璩與古文尚書辨偽：一個學術史的個案研究. Taipei: Huamulan chubanshe, 2005.

Liu, Shengliang 劉生良. *Pengxiang wujiang: Zhuangzi wenxue yanjiu* 鵬翔無疆:《莊子》文學研究. Beijing: Renmin chubanshe, 2004.

Lu, Shuguo 祿書果. "Qinghua jian Shu lei wenxian wenben zuhe de sanzhong xingtai" 清華簡《書》類文獻文本組合的三種形態. *Zhongzhou xuekan* 2018.9: 127-133.

Lundahl, Bertil. *Han Fei Zi: The Man and the Work*. Stockholm: Institute of Oriental Languages, Stockholm University, 1992.

**Ma**, Jixing 馬繼興. *Mawangdui gu yishu kaoshi* 馬王堆古醫書考釋. Changsha: Hunan kexue jishu chubanshe, 1992.

Ma, Shinian 馬世年. *Han Feizi de chengshu jiqi wenxue yanjiu* 《韓非子》的成書及其文學研究. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2011.

Maeder, Erik W. "Some Observations on the Composition of the 'Core Chapters' of the *Mozi*." *Early China* 17 (1992): 27-82.

Major, John S, Sarah A. Queen, Andrew Seth Meyer, and Harold D. Roth, eds. *The Huainanzi: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Government in Early Han China*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010.

Matsumoto, Masaaki 松本雅明. *Shunjū Sengoku ni okeru Shōjo no tenkai* 春秋戦国における尚書の展開. Tokyo: Kōsei shorin, 1988.

Mattos, Gilbert. "Eastern Zhou Bronze Inscriptions." In *New Sources of Early Chinese History: An Introduction to the Reading of Inscriptions and Manuscripts*, edited by Edward L. Shaughnessy, 85-124. Berkeley: Society for the Study of Early China and the Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, 1997.

McLuhan, Marshall. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press, 1994.

Meyer, Dirk. *Documentation and Argument in Early China*: *The Shàngshū* 尚書 *(Venerated Documents) and the Shū Traditions*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021.

**Nagy**, Gregory. "Transmission of Archaic Greek Sympotic Songs: From Lesbos to Alexandria." *Critical Inquiry* 31, no. 1 (2004): 26-48.

Nightingale, Andrea Wilson. *Genres in Dialogue: Plato and the Construct of Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Nomura, Shigeo 野村茂夫. "Senshin ni okeru Shōsho no ruden ni tsuite no jakkan no kōsatsu" 先秦における尚書の流傳についての若干の考察. *Nihon Chūgoku gakkai hō* 日本中國學會報 17 (1965): 1-18.

Nugent, Christopher M. B. "*Mouvance* in Medieval Chinese Textual Culture: *Lunyu* 論語 in a Dunhuang Florilegium." *Journal of Chinese Literature and Culture* 9, no. 1 (April 2022): 170-94.

Nylan, Michael. "Cross-Reading 'Kang Gao,' 'Shao Gao,' and 'Luo Gao'." *Journal of Asian History* 54, no. 1 (2020): 1-63.

———. "Textual Authority in Pre-Han and Han." *Early China* 25 (2000): 205-258.

———. *The Shifting Center: The Original "Great Plan" and Later Readings*. Sankt Augustin: Institut Monumenta Serica; Nettetal: Steyler Verlag, 1992.

**Owen**, Stephen. "Perspective on Readings of *Mencius* 2A.2." In *Ways with Words: Writing about Reading Texts from Early China*, edited by Pauline Yu, Peter Bol, Stephen Owen, and Willard Peterson, 54-7. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

———. *Readings in Chinese Literary Thought*. Cambridge, MA.: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 1992.

———. *The Making of Early Chinese Classical Poetry*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2006.

Ozawa, Kenji 小沢賢二. "Seikakan Shosho buntai kō" 清華簡『尚書』文体考. In *Shutsudo bunken kara mita koshi to juka kyōten* 出土文献から見た古史と儒家経典, edited by Asano Yūichi 浅野裕一 and Ozawa Kenji 小沢賢二, 229-61. Tokyo: Kyūko shoin, 2012.

**Pan**, Li 潘莉. *Shangshu wenti leixing yu chengyin yanjiu* 《尚書》文體類型與成因研究. Beijing: Zhishi chanquan chubanshe, 2016.

Phelan, James. *Somebody Telling Somebody Else: A Rhetorical Poetics of Narrative*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2017.

Pines, Yuri. *Envisioning Eternal Empire: Chinese Political Thought of the Warring States Era*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2009.

———. "Intellectual Change in the Chunqiu Period: The Reliability of the Speeches in the *Zuo Zhuan* as Sources of Chunqiu Intellectual History." *Early China* 22 (1997): 77-132.
———. *Zhou History Unearthed: The Bamboo Manuscript Xinian and Early Chinese Historiography*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2020.
Porter, James I. *Homer: The Very Idea*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2021.
Puett, Michael. "Sages, Ministers, and Rebels: Narratives from Early China Concerning the Initial Creation of the State." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 58, no. 2 (1998): 425-79.
———. *The Ambivalence of Creation: Debates Concerning Innovation and Artifice in Early China*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001.

**Qiu**, Xigui 裘錫圭. "Rongsheng bianzhong mingwen kaoshi" 戎生編鐘銘文考釋. In *Qiu Xigui xueshu wenji, disanjuan: jinwen ji qita guwenzi juan* 裘錫圭學術文集（第三卷）：金文及其他古文字卷, 102-21. Shanghai: Fudan daxue chubanshe, 2012.
Queen, Sarah A. "*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*, edited by Paul R. Goldin, 197-256. New York: Springer, 2015.
———. "The Creation and Domestication of the Techniques of Lao-Zhuang: Anecdotal Narrative and Philosophical Argumentation in *Huainanzi* 12." *Asia Major, Third Series* 21, no. 1 (2008): 201-47.

**Reeve**, Michael Andrew Hall. "Demonstrating the World: Mind and Society in the Shuo Lin Chapters of the *Han Fei Zi*." PhD diss., Princeton University, 2003.
Richter, Matthias L. "Must We All Have a Vast, Flowing *Qi*? Revisiting *Mengzi* 2A.2." *Nanyang Journal of Chinese Literature and Culture* 1, no. 1 (2021): 25-44.
———. "Self-Cultivation or Evaluation of Others? A Form Critical Approach to *Zengzi li shi*." *Asiatische Studien - Études Asiatiques* 56, no. 4 (2002): 880-917.
———. *The Embodied Text: Establishing Textual Identity in Early Chinese Manuscripts*. Brill, 2013.

**Sanft**, Charles, "Concepts of Law in the *Shangshu*." In *Origins of Chinese Political Philosophy*, 446-74.
———. *Literate Community in Early Imperial China: The Northwestern Frontier in Han Times*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2019.
Saussy, Haun. *The Ethnography of Rhythm: Orality and Its Technologies*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2016.
Sawyer, Ralph D. *The Seven Military Classics of Ancient China*. New York: Basic Books, 2007.
Schaberg, David. *A Patterned Past: Form and Thought in Early Chinese Historiography*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2001.

———. "Chinese History and Philosophy." In *The Oxford History of Historical Writing, Volume 1: Beginnings to AD 600*, edited by Andrew Feldherr and Grant Hardy, 394-414. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

———. "Foundations of Chinese Historiography: Literary Representation in *Zuo Zhuan* and *Guoyu*." PhD Thesis, Harvard University, 1996.

———. "Platitude and Persona: *Junzi* Comments in *Zuozhuan* and Beyond." In *Historical Truth, Historical Criticism, and Ideology: Chinese Historiography and Historical Culture from a New Comparative Perspective*, edited by Helwig Schmidt-Glintzer, Achim Mittag, and Jörn Rüsen, 177-96. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

———. "Playing at Critique: Indirect Remonstrance and the Formation of *Shi* Identity." In *Text and Ritual in Early China*, 194-225.

———. "Speaking of Documents: *Shu* Citations in Warring States Texts." In *Origins of Chinese Political Philosophy*, 320-359.

Schaeffer, Pierre. *Treatise on Musical Objects: An Essay across Disciplines*. Translated by Christine North and John Dack. Oakland, California: University of California Press, 2017.

Schwermann, Christian. "Anecdote Collections as Argumentative Texts: The Composition of the *Shuoyuan*." In *Between History and Philosophy*, 147-192.

Shang, Yantao 商艷濤. *Liangzhou junshi mingwen yanjiu* 兩周軍事銘文研究. Guangzhou: Huanan ligong daxue chubanshe, 2013.

Shaughnessy, Edward L. "*I Chou shu* 逸周書 (*Chou shu*)." In *Early Chinese Texts: A Bibliographical Guide*, edited by Michael Loewe, 229-33. Berkeley: Society for the Study of Early China and the Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 1993.

———. "The Writing of a Late Western Zhou Bronze Inscription." *Asiatische Studien* 61, no. 3 (2007): 845-77.

Shi, Anrui 石安瑞 (Ondřej Škrabal). "You tongqi mingwen de bianzuan jiaodu kan Xizhou jinwen zhong 'baishou jishou' de xingzhi" 由銅器銘文的編纂角度看西周金文中"拜手稽首"的性質. In *Qingtongqi yu jinwen* 青銅器與金文, edited by Beijing Daxue Chutu Wenxian Yanjiusuo 北京大學出土文獻研究所, vol.1, 541-59. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2017.

Shirakawa, Shizuka 白川靜. *Shirakawa Shizuka chosakushū: Bekkan Kōkotsu kinbungaku ronsō* 白川靜著作集 - 別卷甲骨金文学論叢. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 2012.

Škrabal, Ondřej. "From Royal Court to Ancestral Shrine: Transposition of Command Documents in Early Chinese Epigraphy." *Manuscript and Text Cultures* 1 (2022): 143-204.

———. "Writing before Inscribing: On the Use of Manuscripts in the Production of Western Zhou Bronze Inscriptions." *Early China* 42 (2019): 273-332.

Staack, Thies. "Reconstructing the *Kongzi shilun*: From the Arrangement of the Bamboo Slips to a

Tentative Translation." *Asiatische Studien* 64 (2010): 857-906.

Stewart, Susan. *Crimes of Writing: Problems in the Containment of Representation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

**Tanselle**, Thomas G. *A Rationale of Textual Criticism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989.

Tian, Fengtai 田鳳台. *Lüshi chunqiu tanwei* 呂氏春秋探微. Taipei: Xuesheng shuju, 1986.

**Unschuld**, Paul U. *Huang Di nei jing su wen: Nature, Knowledge, Imagery in an Ancient Chinese Medical Text*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.

**Van Auken**, Newell Ann. "Judgments of the Gentleman: A New Analysis of the Place of *Junzi* Comments in *Zuozhuan* Composition History." *Monumenta Serica* 64, no. 2 (2016): 277-302.

———. *Spring and Autumn Historiography: Form and Hierarchy in an Ancient Chinese Annals*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2023.

Vogelsang, Kai. "Competing Voices in the *Shangshu*." In *Origins of Chinese Political Philosophy*, 62-105.

———. "Inscriptions and Proclamations: On the Authenticity of the 'gao' Chapters in the *Book of Documents*." *Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities* 74 (2002): 138-209.

**Wang**, Qing 王青. *Shangbo jian Cao Mo zhi chen shuzheng yu yanjiu* 上博簡《曹沫之陳》疏證與研究. Taipei: Taiwan shufang chuban youxian gongsi, 2009.

Watson, Burton. *Basic Writings of Mo Tzu, Hsün Tzu, and Han Fei Tzu*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.

Wei, Houkai 尉候凱. "Shangbo jian Lunyu lei wenxian yanjiu" 上博簡《論語》類文獻研究. PhD diss., Wuhan University, 2019.

Weingarten, Oliver. "Intertextuality and Memory in Early Chinese Writing: A Case Study from *Huainanzi*." *Early China* 42 (2019): 201-36.

———. "The Sage as Teacher and Source of Knowledge: Editorial Strategies and Formulaic Utterances in Confucius Dialogues." *Asiatische Studien - Études Asiatiques* 68, no. 4 (2014): 1175-1223.

Weld, Susan R. "The Covenant Texts from Houma and Wenxian." In *New Sources of Early Chinese History: An Introduction to the Reading of Inscriptions and Manuscripts*, 125-160.

White, Hayden. *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*. Baltimore, MD.: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.

Wilhelm, Hellmut. "The Scholar's Frustration: Notes on a Type of *Fu*." In *Chinese Thought and Institutions*, edited by J. K. Fairbank, 310-19. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Wilke, Annette, and Oliver Moebus. *Sound and Communication: An Aesthetic Cultural History of Sanskrit Hinduism*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011.

Wu, Chengxue 吳承學. "Bianti yu poti" 辨體與破體. *Wenxue pinglun* 1991.4: 57-65.

Wu, Chengxue 吳承學 and Li Guanlan 李冠蘭. "Wenci chenyin yu wenti guannian de fasheng: Zhongguo zaoqi wenti guannian fasheng yanjiu" 文辭稱引與文體觀念的發生—中國早期文體觀念發生研究. *Beijing daxue xuebao* 53.4 (2016): 66-75.

Wu, Kejing 鄔可晶. *Kongzi jiayu chengshu kao* 《孔子家語》成書考. Shanghai: Zhongxi shuju, 2015.

Wu, Tongfu 吳通福. *Wan chu Guwen Shangshu gong'an yu Qing dai xueshu* 晚出《古文尚書》公案與清代學術. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2007.

**Xia**, Dekao 夏德靠. *Xianqin yulei wenxian xingtai yanjiu* 先秦語類文獻形態研究. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2015.

Xiao, Yunxiao 肖雲曉. "Shi lun Qinghua zhushu Yi Yin sanpian de guanlian" 試論清華竹書伊尹三篇的關聯. In *Jianbo* 簡帛, edited by Wuhan Daxue Jianbo Yanjiu Zhongxin 武漢大學簡帛研究中心, vol.8, 471-76. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2013.

Xu, Fuguan 徐復觀. *Liang Han sixiang shi* 兩漢思想史. Shanghai: Huadong shifan daxue chubanshe, 2001.

Xu, Huafeng 許華峰. *Yan Ruoqu Guwen Shangshu shuzheng de bianwei fangfa* 閻若璩《古文尚書疏證》的辨偽方法. Taipei: Huamulan chubanshe, 2005.

Xu, Jianwei 徐建委. *Shuoyuan yanjiu: yi Zhanguo Qin Han zhijian de wenxian jilei yu xueshushi wei zhongxin* 《說苑》研究：以戰國秦漢之間的文獻積累與學術史為中心. Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2011.

**Yang**, Lei. "How versus What: Changes in Narrative Speed from *Zuozhuan* and *Shiji* to *Hanshu*." *Monumenta Serica* 68, no. 1 (May 2020): 1-27.

Yang, Yi 楊義. *Mozi huanyuan* 墨子還原. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2011.

Yao, Sujie 姚蘇傑. "Shangdai qingtongqi mingwen de tishi yu gongneng" 商代青銅器銘文的體式與功能. *Zhongguo gaoxiao shehui kexue* 2017.3: 107-120.

Ye, Shuxian 葉舒憲. *Zhuangzi de wenhua jiexi* 莊子的文化解析. Wuhan: Hubei renmin chubanshe, 1997.

Ye, Xiucheng 葉修成. *Xizhou lizhi yu Shangshu wenti yanjiu* 西周禮制與《尚書》文體研究. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 2016.

You, Kun. "The Yellow Emperor as Paratext: The Case of *Shiliu jing* 十六經 (Sixteen Guidelines)." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 141, no. 4 (2021): 931-40.

Yu, Jiaxi 餘嘉錫. *Gushu tongli* 古書通例. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1985.

Yu, Shujuan 于淑娟. *Hanshi waizhuan yanjiu: Handai jingxue yu wenxue guanxi toushi* 韓詩外傳研究：

漢代經學與文學透視. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2011.
Yu, Wanli 虞萬里. "Jinwen 'duiyang' lishiguan" 金文"對揚"歷史觀. *Yanyan yanjiu* 1992 (1): 84-95.
Yu, Xingwu 于省吾. "'Wang ruo yue' shiyi 王若曰釋義." *Zhongguo yuwen* 2 (1996): 147-49.
Yu, Zhihui 俞志慧. *Gu yu youzhi: Xianqin sixiang de yizhong beijing yu ziyuan* 古語有之：先秦思想的一種背景與資源. Shanghai: Huadong shifan daxue chubanshe, 2010.

**Zeitlin**, Judith T. "From the Natural to the Instrumental: Chinese Theories of the Sounding Voice before the Modern Era." In *The Voice as Something More: Essays towards Materiality*, edited by Martha Feldman and Judith T. Zeitlin, 54-75. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2019.
Zhang, Hanmo. *Authorship and Text-Making in Early China*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018.
Zhang, Suzhen 張素貞. *Han Feizi Nan pian yanjiu* 韓非子難篇研究. Taipei: Xuesheng shuju, 1987.
Zhang, Yujin 張玉金. *Jiagu buci yufa yanjiu* 甲骨卜辭語法研究. Guangzhou: Guangdong gaodeng jiaoyu chubanshe, 2002.
Zhao, Fengrong 趙奉蓉. *Yi Zhoushu wenxue yanjiu* 《逸周書》文學研究. Beijing: Zhongguo kexue shehui chubanshe, 2013.
Zheng, Jiewen 鄭傑文. *Zhanguo cewen xinlun* 戰國策文新論. Ji'nan: Shandong renmin chubanshe, 1998.
Zheng, Liangshu 鄭良樹. *Han Fei zhi zhushu ji sixiang* 韓非之著述及思想. Taipei: Xuesheng shuju, 1993.
———. *Zhanguo ce yanjiu* 戰國策研究. Singapore: Academia Publications, 1972.
Zhou, Yuxiu 周玉秀. *Yi Zhoushu de yuyan tedian jiqi wenxianxue jiazhi* 《逸周書》的語言特點及其文獻學價值. Beijing: Zhonghua shujui, 2005.
Zhu, Fenghan 朱鳳瀚. "Ye lun Xizhou jinwen zhong de 'baishou jishou'" 也論西周金文中的"拜手稽首." In *Qingtongqi yu jinwei*, vol.3, 1-16. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2019.
Zou, Fudu 邹芙都 and Zha Feineng 查飛能. *Xizhou "fei duiyang wangxiu" mingwen yanjiu* 西周"非對揚王休"銘文研究. Beijing: Kexue chubanshe, 2017.