

## The Relationship between the *Zhou xun* 周訓 and *Lüshi chunqiu* 呂氏春秋 in the Context of the Late Warring States Period\*

Andrej FECH

Department of Chinese Language and Literature, Hong Kong Baptist University

In this article, I compare two lengthy parallel anecdotes found in the newly discovered manuscript *Zhou xun* 周訓 and the philosophical compendium from the late Zhanguo period, *Lüshi chunqiu* 呂氏春秋. Based on this comparison, I argue that the authors of the *Lüshi chunqiu* borrowed from the *Zhou xun*. The techniques employed in incorporating the borrowed materials into the respective chapters proved to be virtually identical. Given that the materials under consideration appear in different parts of the *Lüshi chunqiu*—the relation, the time and the order of composition of which have been the subject of long debates—the present study promises to help us gain a better understanding of the process and principles of its creation. Moreover, I discuss the appearance of the main protagonist of the *Zhou xun*, Lord Zhaowen of Zhou 周昭文君 (4th c. BC), in the *Lüshi chunqiu*. In some chapters, he is portrayed as a ruler who acquired considerable fame among his contemporaries. Especially in the state of Qin, his renown was said to have culminated in his recognition as “teacher” (*shi* 師) by King Hui(wen) of Qin 秦惠(文)王 (356–311 BC, r. 338–311 BC). In view of these attempts to establish the (historically unlikely) close ties between Lord Zhaowen (and his teachings) and the state of Qin, in the concluding part of this paper, I conjecture in regard to the place of origin of the *Zhou xun*.

**Keywords:** *Zhou xun*, *Lüshi chunqiu*, Zhou Dynasty, the State of Qin, anecdotes

\* The present paper was written as part of the ECS project “‘Elevating the Worthy’ and ‘Mandate of Heaven’ in the Late Warring States Period: Philosophy of the *Zhou xun*” (project no. 22613218), funded by the RGC. I would like to cordially thank P.J. Ivanhoe and Eirik Lang Harris for the great support and valuable feedback in regard to the translation and interpretation of the *Zhou xun*, which I received in the setting of a reading group. My sincere thanks also go to Yuri Pines for his valuable comments on my translation of the text. Last but not least, I am indebted to the two anonymous reviewers, who provided critical comments and great improvement suggestions on the first draft of the paper.

## Introduction

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

However, some of these features, such as their calendrical structure, are common to a number of early Chinese texts, while others, such as the "Daoist" traits of the *Zhou xun*<sup>2</sup> and its place of origin, are by no means obvious. Therefore, a careful analysis of the two textual parallels is in order. The fact that the main protagonist of the *Zhou xun*, Lord Zhaowen of Zhou 周昭文公 (4th c. BC), plays a prominent role in the *Lüshi chunqiu* has to be considered as well. In addition to clarifying the textual links between the *Zhou xun* and *Lüshi chunqiu*, this investigation attempts to view them in the context of the relationship between the two states they are associated with, namely the Zhou 周 and Qin 秦.

## I. The *Zhou xun* 周訓

The *Zhou xun* is part of the Peking University collection (*Beijing daxue cang Xi-Han zhushu* 北京大學藏西漢竹書), a group of bamboo-strip manuscripts dated to the Western Han and donated to Peking University in 2009.<sup>3</sup> Being illegally retrieved by a private party, the circumstances of their

- 1 Han Wei 韓巍, "Xi-Han zhushu *Zhou xun* ruogan wenti de tantao" 西漢竹書《周訓》若干問題的探討, in *Beijing daxue cang Xi-Han zhushu. San* 北京大學藏西漢竹書·叁, ed. Beijing daxue chutu wenxian yanjiusuo 北京大學出土文獻研究所 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2015), 278.
- 2 Andrej Fech, "The *Zhou xun* 周訓 and 'Elevating the Worthy' (*shang xian* 尚賢)," *Early China* 41 (2018): 176–77.
- 3 Beijing daxue chutu wenxian yanjiusuo, "Beijing daxue cang Xi-Han zhushu gaishuo" 北京大學藏西漢竹書概說, *Wenwu* 文物 (2011.6): 49–56, 98.

discovery and curation remain unknown. Hence, the Peking manuscripts, alongside the Shanghai Museum and Tsinghua University collections, can be characterized as “looted” artefacts. As such, they present scholars with a series of concerns. Among the most serious ethical problems is the fact that the purchase of looted manuscripts raises the concern of complicity of academics in practices of grave desecration by encouraging a black market in stolen artefacts.<sup>4</sup> As for scholarly issues, not being able to study the manuscripts in their original archeological environment gives us only a limited picture of their function and purpose.<sup>5</sup> The most general problem, however, is that, regardless of how genuine a particular looted document might appear to be, we simply have no means of proving that it is actually not a forgery, at least when using conventional ways of determining the authenticity of manuscripts.<sup>6</sup> In the case of the Peking University collection, the suspicion of forgery was raised against the *Laozi* 老子, its most prominent text.<sup>7</sup> Even though this suspicion has been persuasively refuted,<sup>8</sup> the mere fact that it could be raised is indicative of the problematic status of the looted manuscripts.

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

4 Paul R. Goldin, “Heng Xian and the Problem of Studying Looted Artefacts,” *Dao* 12 (2013): 153–60.

5 For the arrangement and function of texts in early Chinese graves, see, for instance, Guolong Lai, *Excavating the Afterlife: The Archaeology of Early Chinese Religion* (Seattle, Wash.: University of Washington Press, 2015).

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

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

8 See Christopher J. Foster, “Introduction to the Peking University Han Bamboo Strips: On the Authentication and Study of Purchased Manuscripts,” *Early China* 40 (2017): 167–239; Thies Staack, “Could the Peking University *Laozi* 老子 Really be a Forgery? Some Skeptical Remarks,” heiDOK – The Heidelberg Document Repository at Heidelberg University, January 10, 2017, accessed April 20, 2020, [http://archiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/volltextserver/22453/1/Staack\\_2017\\_Peking%20University%20Laozi.pdf](http://archiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/volltextserver/22453/1/Staack_2017_Peking%20University%20Laozi.pdf).

Likewise, the study of the Peking university manuscripts, in general, and the *Zhou xun*, in particular, has the potential to provide new evidence about early China.

Returning to the *Zhou xun*, the corresponding bamboo strips measure 30.4 cm in length and, when fully written, contain 24 characters. The calligraphic style of the work, “Silkworm’s Head and Swallow’s Tail” (*can tou yan wei* 蠶頭燕尾), was found to be closest to the clerical script of the Dingzhou Bajiaolang 定州八角廊 strips.<sup>9</sup> Because the latter were discovered in a grave whose occupant died in 55 BC, it was assumed that the available copy of the *Zhou xun* was produced some time prior to that, probably during the last years of Emperor Wu of Han 漢武帝 (r. 141–87 BC). In its recovered version, which was published in September 2015, the *Zhou xun* contains slightly fewer than five thousand characters.<sup>10</sup> This is about one thousand characters fewer than indicated on one of the bamboo strips belonging to this manuscript: “Roughly six thousand (characters)” (*da fan liu qian* 大凡六千).<sup>11</sup> In terms of philosophical affiliation, the text is mostly believed to be a representative of “Daoism” (*dao jia* 道家), because the earliest extant catalogue of the Han imperial library, *Han shu* 漢書 “Yiwen zhi” 藝文志, lists a work titled *Zhou xun* in fourteen chapters (*pian* 篇) in the Daoist section.<sup>12</sup> However, as I argued elsewhere, the philosophical thought of the work is by no means specifically Daoist. So even if the two *Zhou xun* texts in question are, in fact, one and the same text, we have to conclude that its attribution to the Daoist school was most likely based on considerations other than its content.<sup>13</sup>

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

The *Zhou xun* contains thirteen chapters corresponding to the twelve months of the year and the “intercalary month” (*run yue* 閏月) as well as one chapter related to the day of new year’s court ceremony (*xianghe zhi ri* 享賀之

9 Yan Buke 閻步克, “Beida zhushu *Zhou xun* jianjie” 北大竹書《周訓》簡介, *Wenwu* (2011.6): 71.

10 *Beijing daxue cang Xi-Han zhushu*. San, 121–45 (Henceforth: *Zhou xun*). The edited transcription was prepared by Han Wei and Yan Buke.

11 *Zhou xun*, 144, strip 211.

12 *Han shu* 漢書 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju), 30.1730, 1732n9. For a detailed analysis, see Han Wei, “Xi-Han zhushu *Zhou xun* ruogan wenti de tantao,” 265–79.

13 Feich, “The *Zhou xun* and ‘Elevating the Worthy,’” 176–77.

日 ).<sup>14</sup> Accordingly, on the first day (*geng dan* 更旦 ) of every month as well as on the day of the *xianghe* ceremony, Prince Gong 龔 ( 共 ) 太子 is reported to come to the court of his father, Lord Zhaowen of Zhou, to receive instructions on how become a “worthy” (*xian* 賢 ) successor to his father’s position. In each case, the instruction is introduced with a standard formula:

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

維歲 [X] 月更旦之日，龔（共）太子朝，周昭文公自身貳（敕）之，用茲念也。曰：

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

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

已學（教），太子用茲念，斯乃受（授）之書，而自身屬（囑）之曰：女（汝）勉毋忘歲 [X] 月更旦之訓（訓）。

Because Lord Zhaowen is reported to be based in Chengzhou 成周 , the capital of the East Zhou, while Prince Gong resides in Jia Ru 郊郚 , the capital of the West Zhou,<sup>15</sup> it appears that the author of the *Zhou xun*, with blatant disregard for historical facts, presented West and East Zhou as a political unity. While this is not the only historical inaccuracy in the text, it is sometimes believed that Lord Zhaowen and Prince Gong really met and that the *Zhou xun*

14 However, there are also a number of passages that cannot be associated with any specific month or date. Han Wei, “Xi-Han zhushu *Zhou xun* ruogan wenti de tantao,” 252, gives them the designation: “small chapters” (*xiao zhang* 小章 ).

15 Li Xueqin, *Eastern Zhou and Qin Civilizations*, trans. K.C. Chang (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1985), 17; Wu Rongzeng 吳榮曾, “Dong-Zhou, Xi-Zhou liangguo shi yanjiu” 東周西周兩國史研究, in idem, *Xian Qin Liang Han shi yanjiu* 先秦兩漢史研究 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1995), 137–38.

represented the actual record of their conversations.<sup>16</sup> However, as I argued elsewhere, the evidence speaks for the late Warring States period as the time of the text's creation.<sup>17</sup>

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

Despite his portrayal as a “worthy” ruler in the *Zhou xun*, Lord Zhaowen remains a marginal figure in the pre-Han and early Han sources, appearing, except for the *Lüshi chunqiu*, only in the *Zhanguo ce* 戰國策 (Stratagems of Warring States).<sup>20</sup> And even there, it is not actually certain whether the related stories feature the protagonist of the *Zhou xun*. In the “Dong Zhou” 東周 chapter there is first a story about Lord Wen of Zhou 周文君, mostly identified as Lord Zhaowen of Zhou due to the similarity in their posthumous titles.<sup>21</sup> He received advice not to reinstall a popular prime minister Gongshi Ji 工師籍, dismissed earlier, because historical evidence often suggested that the assassins of their rulers “were great officials, who received much praise” (*jie da chen*

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

17 Fech, “The *Zhou xun* and ‘Elevating the Worthy,’” 157, 171, 172–76.

18 *Shiji* 史記 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1959), 4.161; *Zhanguo ce jianzheng* 戰國策箋證, ed. and comm. Fan Xiangyong 范祥雍, coll. Fan Bangjin 范邦瑾 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2006), 69 (§1.24: “Zhou Gong Taizi si” 周共太子死).

19 For more, see Fech, “The *Zhou xun* and ‘Elevating the Worthy,’” 157–58.

20 For a comprehensive study on various aspects of the work, see He Jin 何晉, *Zhanguo ce yanjiu* 《戰國策》研究 (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2001). For a brief overview, see Tsien Tsuen-hsuin, “Strategies of Warring States,” in idem, *Collected Writings on Chinese Culture* (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2011), 37–38.

21 See Fan Xiangyong, ed. and comm., *Zhanguo ce jianzheng*, 34n1, and *Zhanguo ce jijiao huikao* 戰國策集注匯考, ed. and comm., Zhu Zugeng 諸祖耿, ext. and rev. ed. (Nanjing: Fenghuang chubanshe, 2008), 26–27n1.

*jian yu zhe ye* 皆大臣見譽者也).<sup>22</sup> In another story from the same chapter, we find a conversation between a ruler of Zhou (*Zhou jun* 周君) and Du He 杜赫, who advises the ruler, the head of a small state with limited resources, to employ a minister of great abilities who has not yet become prominent and whose service is thus still relatively inexpensive.<sup>23</sup> This ruler is identified as Lord Zhaowen mainly based on the fact that the *Lüshi chungiu* also mentions a dialogue between Du He 杜赫 and Lord Zhaowen (see Section VI below).<sup>24</sup> Even if these two stories featured Lord Zhaowen of Zhou, we do not find any particular praise for him here. He is depicted as one among many other rulers of that turbulent period, concerned with his own survival.

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

### III. The *Zhou xun* (Ch. 7) and the *Lüshi chungiu* (8.5 "Ai shi" 愛士)

The first common story appears in the "seventh month" instruction in the *Zhou xun* and in the "Ai shi" chapter in the *Lüshi chungiu*, the last chapter

22 *Zhanguo ce jianzheng*, 33–34 (§1.11: "Zhou Wenjun mian Gongshi Ji" 周文君免工師籍). For translation, see Chan-Kuo Ts'e, trans. James I. Crump, Jr. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), 50–51.

23 *Zhanguo ce jianzheng*, 67 (§1.23: "Du He yu zhong Jing Cui yu Zhou" 杜赫欲重景翠於周). For translation, see Crump, trans., *Chan-Kuo Ts'e*, 46.

24 Wu Rongzeng, "Dong-Zhou, Xi-Zhou liangguo shi yanjiu," 146. Zhu Zugeng, ed. and comm., *Zhanguo ce jijiao huikao*, 50n1, quotes Gu Guanguang 顧觀光 (1799–1862), who maintains that this encounter took place in the 36th year of Xian Wang of Zhou 周顯王 (r. 368–321 BC), which was around the year 333 BC.

25 For a comprehensive analysis of the historical anecdotes and their role in philosophical texts, see David Schaberg, "Chinese History and Philosophy," in *The Oxford History of Historical Writing*, vol. 1, *Beginnings to AD 600*, ed. Andrew Feldherr and Grant Hardy (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 394–414.



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

• It was on the first day of the seventh month, when crown Prince Gong came to court. Lord Zhaowen of Zhou personally cautioned him with the following reminders. [92] He said:

“In the past, when Duke Mu of Qin rode in a chariot, it had a mishap. The right horse got loose and was caught by some country-people. When Duke Mu went himself to find [93]...”

{it, he saw that the country-people were about to eat it on the southern slope of Mount Qi. The duke exclaimed, “Eating the meat of a noble steed and not washing it down with wine, I am afraid it will hurt you.” So, passing around some wine, he left. A year later was the battle of Hanyuan. The army of Jin} <sup>26</sup> ...

had already surrounded Duke Mu’s chariot and Liang Youmi of Jin had already grabbed ahold of Duke Mu’s left horse. [Sitting] to the right of Duke Hui of Jin, [94] Lu Shi seized a spear and attacked Duke Mu’s left arm, striking off six layers of his armor.

[At this time,] more than three hundred men [from the families of those] <sup>27</sup> who had eaten the meat of [Duke Mu’s] horse at the southern slope of Mount Qi [95], all started fighting for Duke Mu at the side of his chariot. As a result, the duke won a great victory over Jin, captured [96] Duke Hui and returned.

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

“When ruling gentlemen, be upright to elicit their virtue.

[When ruling] men of low rank, be lenient to exhaust their [97] strength.”

How can a ruler not strive to be kind towards commoners?”

Having instructed the Crown Prince with these reminders, [Lord

26 Compare the translation in *The Annals of Lü Buwei*, trans., annot., and intro. John Knoblock and Jeffrey Riegel, (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2000), 202–3.

27 Commenting on this passage in the *Lüshi chunqiu*, Chen Qiyu 陳奇猷 notes that the text should be interpreted as saying that the men who had eaten the animal gathered a 300-men-strong force out of the members of their families, and not that those same three hundred men actually ate one horse. See *Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi* 呂氏春秋新校釋, ed. and comm. Chen Qiyu (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2002), 8.468n14.



Zhaowen] [98] gave him the manuscript [of his speech] and personally enjoined him, saying:

“Make effort not to forget these admonitions, [which you have received] on the first day of the seventh month.” [99]

• 維歲七月更旦之日，龔（共）太子朝，周昭文公自身貳（敕）之，用茲念也。[92] 曰：

昔秦穆公乘馬而車為敗，右服失而野人得之，穆公自往求 [93]……

{ 之，見楚人方將食之於岐山之陽。繆公歎曰：「食駿馬之肉而不還飲酒，余恐其傷女也！」於是徧飲而去。處一年，為韓原之戰，晉人 } <sup>28</sup>……

已環穆公之車矣，晉梁（梁）囚（由）靡已扣穆公之左驂矣，晉惠公之右 [94] 路石奮投擊穆公之左袂，其甲隕者已六札矣。野人嘗食馬肉 [95] 於岐〈岐〉山之陽者三百於餘人，畢為穆公奮於車下，述（遂）大剋（克）晉，虜 [96] 惠公以歸。此《書》之所謂曰「君君子則正以行德，賤人則寬以盡其 [97] 力」者也。人君其胡可以毋務惠於庶人？已學（教），太子用茲念，斯乃 [98] 受（授）之書，而自身屬（囑）之曰：女（汝）勉毋忘歲七月更旦之馴（訓）。[99] <sup>29</sup>

The story about how Duke Mu of Qin 秦穆 / 繆公 (r. 659–621 BC) was saved by some country-people, whom he previously treated graciously by not only forgiving them for eating his escaped horse but also offering them some wine to properly digest their meal, belongs among the most popular early Chinese anecdotes. As it appears in the *Huainanzi* 淮南子, *Han Shi waizhuan* 韓詩外傳, *Shiji* 史記 and *Shuoyuan* 說苑, it shows significant deviations from the *Zhou xun*.<sup>30</sup> These deviations only underscore the latter's affinity to a story in *Lüshi chunqiu* 8.5 (“Ai shi” 愛士), which is almost identical (apart from the two “framing” formulas of the *Zhou xun*). The two accounts are juxtaposed in the table below:

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

29 *Zhou xun* 130–31.

30 In the *Han Shi waizhuan* (*Han Shi waizhuan jishi* 韓詩外傳集釋, ed. Xu Weiyu 許維通 [Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980], 10.351–52) and *Shiji* (5.188–89), no moral is given to the story. The *Huainanzi* (*Huainanzi jishi* 淮南子集釋, ed. and comm. He Ning 何寧 [Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1998], 13.975) interprets it as “an example of earning [people's] gratitude with little effort” (*ci yong yue er wei de zhe ye* 此用約而為德者也). The *Shuoyuan* (*Shuoyuan jiaozheng* 說苑校證, ed. and comm. Xiang Zonglu 向宗魯 [Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1987], 6.125), finally, sees it as a case of “how blessings return to the one who spreads kindness” (*ci de chu er fu fan ye* 此德出而福反也).

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

		<i>Zhou xun</i>	<i>Lüshi chungiu</i>
I	1	昔秦穆公乘馬而車為敗，	昔者秦繆公乘馬而車為敗，
	2	右服失而野人得之，	右服失而楚人取之。
	3	穆公自往求	繆公自往求之，
	4	……	見楚人方將食之於岐山之陽。
	5	……	繆公嘆曰：
	6	……	「食駿馬之肉而不還飲酒，
	7	……	余恐其傷女也！」
	8	……	於是徧飲而去。
	9	……	處一年，為韓原之戰，
	10	已環穆公之車矣，	晉人已環繆公之車矣，
	11	晉 梁由靡已扣穆公之左驂矣，	晉 梁由靡已扣繆公之左驂矣，
	12	晉惠公之右   路石奮投擊穆公之左袂，	晉惠公之右路石奮投而擊繆公之甲，
	13	其甲隕者已六札矣。	中之者已六札矣。
	14	野人嘗食馬肉   於岐山之陽者三百于餘人，	楚人之嘗食馬肉於岐山之陽者三百有餘人，
	15	畢為穆公奮於車下，	畢力為繆公疾鬥於車下，
	16	述大剋晉，	遂大克晉，
	17	虜   惠公以歸。	反獲惠公以歸。
II	18	此《書》之所謂曰	此《詩》之所謂曰
	19	「君君子則正以行德；	「君君子則正，以行其德；
	20	賤人則寬以盡其   力」者也。	君賤人則寬，以盡其力」者也。
III	21	人君胡可以毋務惠於庶人？	人主其胡可以無務行德愛人乎？
IV	22		行德愛人則民親其上， 民親其上則皆樂為其君死矣。 <sup>32</sup>

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

31 *Lüshi chungiu xin jiaoshi*, 8.464.

be happy to die for their lord.”

Although the above juxtaposition reveals a number of deviations on the level of individual words, these mainly concern characters that are similar either graphically ( 岐 and *qi* 歧, line 14; *shu* 述 and *sui* 遂, line 16), or phonetically (*s-ju* 囚 and *ju* 由, line 11; *wa* 于 and *wə?* 有, line 14; *mə* 毋 and *ma* 無, line 21)<sup>32</sup> or semantically (*de* 得 and *qu* 取, line 2; *fen* 奮 and *dou* 鬥, line 15; *lu* 虜 and *huo* 獲, line 17; *jun* 君 and *zhu* 主, as well as *hui* 惠 and *ai* 愛, line 21). Some variants reflect the inconsistent use of semantic determinatives in early manuscripts (*liang* 梁 and *liang* 梁, line 11; *shu* 投 and *tou* 投, line 12; *ke* 剋 and *ke* 克, line 16). All this was very common in the early periods of Chinese history when the writing system was not yet standardized.<sup>33</sup>

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

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

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

33 For some studies of the variants in early Chinese texts, see William G. Boltz, “Manuscripts with Transmitted Counterparts,” in *New Sources of Early Chinese History: An Introduction to the Reading of Inscriptions and Manuscripts*, ed. Edward L. Shaughnessy (Berkeley, Calif.: The Society for the Study of Early China; The Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 1997), 253–83; Edward L. Shaughnessy, “The Editing of Archaeologically Recovered Manuscripts and Its Implications for the Study of Received Texts,” in idem, *Rewriting Early Chinese Texts* (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 2006), 19–61; Matthias L. Richter, “A Hierarchy of Criteria for Deciding on Disputed Readings,” in idem, *The Embodied Text: Establishing Textual Identity in Early Chinese Manuscripts* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 65–72; Richter, “Variants of Little Consequence for the Content of the Text,” *ibid.*, 73–98.

phrases (*zhe* 者, line 1; *er* 而, line 12; *zhi* 之, line 14; *qi* 其, lines 19 and 21; *jun* 君, line 20) and the cases in which they are significant for the content of the story (*li* 力 and *ji* 疾, line 15; and *fan* 反, line 17). Particularly interesting appears to be the phrase “exerted their entire strength” (*bi li* 畢力) (line 15), because it corresponds to the quote from the *Odes* (unit II, line 20), which states that for a “lenient” (*kuan* 寬) ruler people of low social standing (*jian ren* 賤人) will “exhaust their strength” (*jin qi li* 盡其力). In the *Zhou xun*, where such correspondence is missing, the connection between the anecdote and the relevant quote from the *Documents* seems less evident.

The same applies to the link between the quotation of the authoritative source (unit II) and the subsequent rhetorical question (unit III). In the *Lüshi chunqiu* (line 21), this question uses the expression “to perform acts of kindness” (*xing de* 行德), thus establishing a link to the *Odes* quotation (*yi xing qi de* 以行其德). Such a direct verbal link is missing from the *Zhou xun*. However, by thus connecting the two units, the reading of the *Lüshi chunqiu* becomes problematic insofar as, in the quoted Classic, a ruler does not perform “acts of goodness,” but elicits them from the “gentlemen” (*junzi* 君子)<sup>34</sup> by being “upright” (*zheng* 正). In other words, the rhetorical question as formulated here confuses the role of a ruler with that of his subordinates as expressed in the preceding quote.

The last passage (part IV), absent from the *Zhou xun*, uses *sorites* to arrive at the general conclusion that, when treated by their ruler with kindness, the people will willingly sacrifice their lives on his behalf. Yet because it starts with the phrase to “perform acts of kindness” (*xing de* 行德) as related to a ruler, it also appears problematic.<sup>35</sup> Furthermore, this conclusion seems redundant as it merely reiterates, in exaggerated form, the already established point that the people will readily exert their utmost efforts for a kind ruler.

The question why the two works identify the authoritative source differently is not trivial and needs to be addressed. Han Wei maintains that the

34 For the original content and the subsequent semantic changes in the notion *junzi*, see Robert H. Gassmann, “Die Bezeichnung *jun-zi*: Ansätze zur Chun-qiu-zeitlichen Kontextualisierung und zur Bedeutungsbestimmung im *Lun Yu*,” in *Zurück zur Freude: Studien zur Chinesischen Literatur und Lebenswelt und ihrer Rezeption in Ost und West. Festschrift für Wolfgang Kubin*, ed. Marc Hermann, Christian Schwermann, and Jari Grosse-Ruyken (St. Augustin, Nettetal: Steyler Verlag, 2007), 411–36.

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

literary form of the quoted lines is closer to the *Documents* than the *Odes*.<sup>36</sup> Indeed, we have a similar sounding passage in the ancient-script *shu* chapter “Lü ao” 旅獒：

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

德盛不狎侮。狎侮君子，罔以盡人心；狎侮小人，罔以盡其力。<sup>38</sup>

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

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

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

37 *The Shoo King or the Book of Historical Documents*, trans. James Legge, 2nd ed. (1893–94, rpt. Taipei: SMC Publishing Inc., 1992), 348.

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

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

40 See Tien Feng-tai 田鳳台, *Lüshi chunqiu tanwei* 呂氏春秋探微 (Taipei: Xuesheng shuju, 1986), 356–57; Hsu Tan-huei 許燦輝, *Xian Qin dianji yin Shangshu kao* 先秦典籍引《尚書》考 (Yonghe, Taipei: Huamulan wenhua chubanshe, 2009), 326–31.

41 Tien Feng-tai, *Lüshi chunqiu tanwei*, 357–59.

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

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

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

42 For instance, the notion of "uprightness" is especially prominent in the first chapter of the *Zhou xun*. According to Han Wei, "Xi-Han zhushu *Zhou xun* ruogan wenti de tantao," 266, it resembles the concept of "valuing uprightness" (*gui zheng* 貴正) as attributed to Liezi 列子 in the *Zhanguo ce*. On the other hand, the importance of the ruler's "leniency" towards the masses is discussed in the twelfth chapter (*Zhou xun*, 138, strips 149–50).

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

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



for their exhaustion. Such a ruler will have an eminent reputation and will win the support of the *shi* of his state.<sup>45</sup>

衣，人以其寒也；食，人以其饑也。饑寒，人之大害也。救之，義也。人之困窮，甚如饑寒，故賢主必憐人之困也，必哀人之窮也。如此則名號顯矣，國土得矣。<sup>46</sup>

Without this introduction, it would remain unclear how the tale about Duke Mu of Qin's generosity towards some uncivilized country-people fits into a chapter that, at least in the present version,<sup>47</sup> has the title "Loving the *shi*." After all, the *shi*—a term which I will leave untranslated due to its multiple connotations—initially belonged to "the lowest stratum of hereditary aristocracy" but retained the air of nobility even during the Zhanguo period, a time of great social mobility.<sup>48</sup> The introduction clarifies that it is by empathizing with the common people that a ruler can win over the able *shi*.

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

Now, if you were able to be worthy, then, although the City of Ru is small, how would it be inferior to the three Jin in their beginning? [But] if you are [129] not worthy, then, although the Zhou have one thousand war chariots, it would almost be as if they merely fought on foot.

Now, to start off fighting on foot and end up with one thousand chariots, is something that the world [130] holds in esteem.

But to start off with one thousand chariots and forfeit them, ending up fighting on foot, is something that the ancients regarded as disastrous.

Not only can it be regarded as disastrous, but it actually harms one's ancestors [131].

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

45 Compare the translation in Knoblock and Riegel, trans., *Annals of Lü Buwei*, 202.

46 *Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi*, 8.464.

47 In an early edition, it had the title "Paying Attention to Difficulties" (*Shen qiong* 慎窮). Chen Qiyong, ed. and comm., *Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi*, 8.465n1.

48 Yuri Pines, *Envisioning Eternal Empire: Chinese Political Thought of the Warring States Era* (Honolulu, Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i Press, 2009), 117–18, 137.



今女（汝）能賢，則蓐（鄆）邑雖小，其庸不如三晉之始也？爾為<sup>【129】</sup>不賢，則周雖千乘，其徒步幾矣。夫從徒步而為千乘，此世之所<sup>【130】</sup>上（尚）也。夫從千乘而去之徒步，此古之所病也。不徒可病，其於先<sup>【131】</sup>人有傷。此《書》之所謂曰：「女（汝）毋遺祖巧（考）羞哉」者，其此之謂乎？<sup>49</sup>

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

The last common element of the two accounts, namely, the rhetorical question addressing a ruler (*ren jun* 人君 / *ren zhu* 人主) and based on the phrase “how can ...” (*hu ke* 胡可), can be, with some variations, found on eight occasions in seven different chapters of the *Zhou xun*,<sup>50</sup> while appearing only three times in the *Lüshi chunqiu*. In addition to the above story, it also features in the subsequent anecdote from the same chapter “Ai shi” about another Jin minister and the founder of the Zhao state, Zhao Jianzi 趙簡子, or Zhao Yang 趙鞅 (d. 476 BC), sacrificing his beloved white mule to save the life of a minor official named Yangcheng Xuqu 陽城胥渠. Because later this man proved to be instrumental in Zhao’s victory over Di 翟, the anecdote concludes with the question: “How can a ruler not be fond of the *shi*?” (*ren zhu qi hu keyi bu hao shi* 人主其胡可以不好士).<sup>51</sup> Whatever the connection between the *Zhou xun* and *Lüshi chunqiu*, the fact that this uncommon formula (at least for the *Lüshi chunqiu*) appears in two subsequent (chronologically ordered) stories of the same chapter, shows that its authors were attempting to unify its format. It is also noteworthy that both stories include depictions of combat and that the concluding passage of the chapter likewise deals with military matters.<sup>52</sup> This is consistent with the overall topic of book 8, which,

49 *Zhou xun*, 137.

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

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

52 *Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi*, 8.465. For translation, see Knoblock and Riegel, trans., *Annals of Lü Buwei*, 204.

corresponding to autumn, implies initiation of warfare.<sup>53</sup>

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

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

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

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

{ In the past, when Zhao Xuanmeng was on his way up to [the Jin capital] Jiang, he saw a starving man who was lying beneath a withered mulberry, unable to rise. Xuanmeng stopped his }<sup>54</sup> ...

chariot and lowered [a pot with] rice porridge. Tilting [the pot], [Xuanmeng] fed it to him. The hungry man choked several times before regaining his vision. Xuanmeng asked him: “What did you do [111] to be starving like this?” The man replied: “Your servant had an office in Jiang. When returning home, my supplies of grain ran out. I was ashamed to beg and resented to steal. So I ended up [112] in this state.” Xuanmeng gave him two strips of dried meat. The man bowed receiving them but did not dare to eat. When asked why, he replied: “Your servant has an aged mother. I am going [113] to give the meat to her.” Xuanmeng said: “Eat this

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

54 For this paragraph, translation quoted from Knoblock and Riegel, trans., *Annals of Lü Buwei*, 352; for the rest of the anecdote, compare with *ibid.*, 353.

and I will give you more.” He then presented the man with another two bundles of dried meat as well as [more than] a hundred pieces of cash and left, [114] resuming his journey up the river.

Three years later, Duke Ling of Jin wanted to have Xuanmeng killed. He had knights (*shi* 士) hide in a chamber to await him. When the wine was served, Xuanmeng [115] realized what was happening and left in the middle of drinking. Duke Ling ordered the knights hiding in the chamber to quickly chase after and kill him. One man quickly pursued Xuan [116] meng and was first to catch up with him. [But] when he saw Xuanmeng’s face, he said: “Oh! It is your lordship! I ask for permission to go back and die on your lordship’s behalf.” Xuanmeng asked: “What is your name?” Turning to go, [117] the man replied: “What difference would my name make? Your servant is the man who was starving beneath the withered mulberry.” He then returned, fought and died. As a consequence, Xuanmeng was able to survive. [118]

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

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

And so, if by being once kind to a single *shi*, one could keep his own life, how much greater [would the result be of] being kind to ten thousand [119] men?

And so, the *Odes* says:

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

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

How can a ruler [120] not devote himself to caring for the *shi*?

Having instructed the Crown Prince with these reminders, [Lord Zhaowen] gave him the manuscript [of his speech] and personally enjoined him, saying: [121] “Make effort not to forget these admonitions, [which you have received] on the first day of the ninth month.” [122]

{ • 維歲九月更旦之日，龔（共）天子朝，周昭文公自身貳（敕）之，用茲念也。曰： }

{ 昔趙宣孟將上之絳，見飢桑之下，有餓人卧不能起者，宣孟止 } <sup>55</sup>

.....

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

車，為下餐（飧），搯（灑）<sup>56</sup>而舖之，餓人再咽而能視矣。宣孟問之曰：「爾何為【111】而飢若此？」對（對）曰：「臣宜於降（絳），歸而糧絕，羞行乞（乞）而曾（憎）自取，故至於【112】若此。」宣孟予之脯二朐，拜受而弗敢食。問其故，曰：「臣有老母，將【113】以遺之。」宣孟曰：「斯食之，吾更予女（汝）。」乃賜之脯二束與餘布百，述（遂）【114】去之上。處三年，晉靈公欲殺宣孟，伏士與房中以侍（待）。發酒，宣孟【115】智（知）之，中飲而出。靈公令房中之士疾追殺之。一人追遽，先及宣【116】孟，見宣孟之面，曰：「欵！君邪！請為君反死。」宣孟曰：「而名為誰？」反走，【117】且對（對）曰：「何以名為？臣，夫委桑下之餓人也。」環（還）斲（鬪）而死。宣孟述（遂）生。【118】此《書》之所謂也，「德幾無小」者也。故壹德一士，猶生其身，兄（況）德萬【119】人瘡？故《詩》曰「赳赳武夫，公侯之干城」，「濟濟多士，文王以甯（寧）」。「人君其胡【120】可以毋務愛士？已學（教），大子用茲念，斯乃受（授）之書，而自身屬（囑）之曰：【121】女（汝）勉毋忘歲九月更旦之馴（訓）。【122】<sup>57</sup>

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

56 Unlike the editors of the *Zhou xun* (134n3), who interpret the character 搯 as *juan* 灑 (cleanse, making clean), Chen Jian 陳劍 argues that the graph in question should be read as *qing* 傾 (tilt, pour out), see “*Zhou xun* ‘wei xia sun gui er bu zhi’ jie” 《周馴》「為下飧搯而舖之」解, Center for Research on Chinese Excavated Classics and Paleography at Fudan University, June 18, 2016, accessed April 20, 2020, <http://www.gwz.fudan.edu.cn/Web/Show/2835>. I agree with this interpretation as the object of this action is represented by the graph 餐, which is evidently a variation of the character *sun* 飧 / 飧, designating a kind of rice porridge that the ancient Chinese kept in a pot when traveling. It is noteworthy that, in an account of Zhao Dun's earlier assassination attempt at the behest of Duke Ling of Jin, the *Gongyang zhuan* 公羊傳 emphasizes Zhao Dun's frugality. It reports that, despite his elevated position, he dined on a simple rice porridge with fish (*yu sun* 魚飧); see *Chunqiu Gongyang zhuan zhushu* 春秋公羊傳注疏, comm. He Xiu 何休, sub-comm. Xu Yan 徐彥 (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2000), 15.385 (Xuan 6). For translation, see *The Gongyang Commentary on The Spring and Autumn Annals*, trans. Harry Miller (Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 15.150. Thus, it is tempting to think that “rice porridge” as mentioned here was supposed to invoke other stories about Zhao Dun among the educated readers.

57 *Zhou xun*, 134.

two different men: his guard named Ti<sup>58</sup> Miming 提彌明, who recognized Duke Ling's plans to ambush Zhao Dun and helped his master escape the scene, sacrificing his life in the process, and a man called Ling Zhe 靈輒, who, prior to this event, was saved by Zhao Dun from starvation and eventually became Duke Ling's bodyguard. Unlike Shi Miming, Ling Zhe seems to have managed to escape the scene unharmed.<sup>59</sup> The *Shiji*, on the other hand, reports that Shi<sup>60</sup> Miming 示眯明 (sometimes transcribed as Shimi Ming), previously saved by Zhao Dun from starvation, was the only person who rescued the latter at Duke Ling's banquet and who managed to escape.<sup>61</sup>

This happy ending takes a tragic turn in the corresponding accounts of the *Zhou xun* and *Lüshi chunqiu*, which place great emphasis on how eagerly the (anonymous) man sacrificed his life to repay Zhao Dun's kindness. Unlike the story about Duke Mu of Qin, in this case, we have a third text that shows great affinity to the *Zhou xun* and *Lüshi chunqiu*, namely, the *Shuoyuan* 說苑. Thus, in the tables below, I juxtapose these three texts. Given the length of the story, I divide it into two parts. The first part is:

58 In the parallel account of the *Gongyang zhuan*, the family name of the guard is recorded as Qi 祁 (*Chunqiu Gongyang zhuan zhushu*, 15.386 [Xuan 6]).

59 *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu* 春秋左傳注, ed. and comm. Yang Bojun 楊伯峻, rev. ed., 4 vols. (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1995), 2:659–62 (Xuan 2); For English translation, see *Zuo Tradition / Zuozhuan: Commentary on the "Spring and Autumn Annals,"* trans. and intro. Stephen Durrant, Wai-ye Li, and David Schaberg (Seattle, Wash.: University of Washington Press, 2016), 595. For the discussion on whether Ling Zhe escaped the scene, see the commentary in *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, 2:662n.

60 Yang Bojun pointed out the phonetic proximity of the four variants *Ti* 提, *Qi* 祁, *Qi* 祇, and *Shi* 示 (*Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, 2:659n [Xuan 2]).

61 *Shiji*, 39.1674; *The Grand Scribe's Records*, vol. 5.1, *The Hereditary Houses of Pre-Han China, Part I*, ed. William H. Nienhauser, Jr., trans. Zhao Hua, William H. Nienhauser, Jr. et al. (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 2006), 350–51.

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

		<i>Zhou xun</i>	<i>Lüshi chungiu</i>	<i>Shuoyuan</i>
	1	……	昔趙宣孟將上之絳，	趙宣孟將上之絳，
	2	……	見飢桑之下，	見翳桑下
	3	……	有餓人卧不能起者，	有卧餓人，不能動，
	4	車，	宣孟止車	宣孟止車
	5	為下餐，拑而饋之，	為之下食，燭而饋之，	為之下，自含而饋之，
	6	餓人再咽而能視矣。	再咽而後能視。	餓人再咽而後能視。
	7	宣孟問之曰：	宣孟問之曰：	宣孟問：
	8	「爾何為   而飢若此？」	「女何為而餓若是？」	「爾何為饑若此？」
	9	對曰：	對曰：	對曰：
	10	「臣宦於降，歸而糧絕，	「臣宦於絳，歸而糧絕，	「臣居於絳，歸而糧絕，
I	11	羞行乞而曾自取，	羞行乞而憎自取，	羞行乞而憎自取，
	12	故至於   若此。」	故至於此。」	以故至若此。」
	13	宣孟予之脯二朐，	宣孟與脯一朐，	宣孟與之壺浪脯二朐，
	14	拜受而弗敢食。	拜受而弗敢食也。	再拜頓首受之，不敢食。
	15	問其故，	問其故，	問其故，
	16	曰	對曰：	對曰：「向者食之而美，
	17	「臣有老母，將   以遺之。」	「臣有老母，將以遺之。」	臣有老母，將以貢之。」
	18	宣孟曰：	宣孟曰：	宣孟曰：
	19	「斯食之，吾更予女。」	「斯食之，吾更與女。」	「子斯食之，吾更與汝。」
	20	乃賜之脯二束與餘布百，	乃復賜之脯二束與錢百，	乃復為之簞食，以脯二束與錢百。
	21	述   去之上。	而遂去之。 <sup>63</sup>	去之絳。 <sup>64</sup>

On the level of individual words, differences between the texts, again, mostly involve characters that are similar either graphically (對 and *dui* 對, line 9; *shu* 述 and *sui* 遂, line 21), or phonetically (*khəs* 气 and *khət* 乞, line 11; *la?* 予 and *la?* 與, lines 13 and 19), or semantically (*ji* 飢 and *e* 餓, line 8; *ci* 此 and *shi* 是, line 8; *bu* 布 and *qian* 錢, line 20). Some variants again demonstrate the ambiguity in regard to semantic determinatives (*ceng* 曾 and *zeng* 憎, line 11) in early texts. Characters without counterparts (if we exclude the *Shuoyuan*) mostly serve as emphasis (*yi* 矣, line 6) or for grammatical clarification (*hou* 後, line 6; *zhi* 之, line 13; *er* 而, line 21). The *Shuoyuan* version sometimes supports the reading of the *Zhou xun* (*e'ren* 餓人, line 6; *ji*

62 *Lüshi chungiu xin jiaoshi*, 15.901.

63 *Shuoyuan jiaozheng*, 6.127–28.

饑, line 8; *er* 二, line 13; *shang* 上 / *jiang* 絳, line 21), and sometimes that of the *Lüshi chunqiu* (*yu* 與, lines 13 and 19; *fu* 復, line 20), while other times it deviates from both (lines 5, 13–14, 16). This suggests that even if the compiler of the *Shuoyuan* borrowed this tale from either the *Zhou xun* or the *Lüshi chunqiu*,<sup>64</sup> he used a text version that was different from what is available to us today.

The second part of the story is juxtaposed here:

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

		<i>Zhou xun</i>	<i>Lüshi chunqiu</i>	<i>Shuoyuan</i>
I	1	處三年，	處二年，	居三年，
	2	晉靈公欲殺宣孟，	晉靈公欲殺宣孟，	晉靈公欲殺宣孟，
	3	伏士與房中以侍。	伏士於房中以待之，	置伏士於房中，
	4	發酒，	因發酒於宣孟。	召宣孟而飲之酒，
	5	宣孟   智之，中飲而出。	宣孟知之，中飲而出。	宣孟知之，中飲而出，
	6	靈公令房中之士疾追殺之。	靈公令房中之士疾追而殺之。	靈公命房中士疾追殺之，
	7	一人追遽，先及宣   孟，	一人追疾，先及宣孟，	一人追疾，先及宣孟，
	8	見宣孟之面，曰	之面曰：	見宣孟之面，曰：
	9	「欵！君邪！	「嘻，君轡！	「吁，固是君耶！
	10	請為君反死。」	吾請為君反死。」	請為君反死。」
	11	宣孟曰：「而名為誰？」	宣孟曰：「而名為誰？」	宣孟曰：「子名為誰？」
	12	反走，  且對曰「何以名為？」	反走對曰：「何以名為？」	反走，且對曰：「何以名為？」
	13	臣，夫委桑下之餓人也。」	臣散桑下之餓人也。」	臣是夫翳桑下之卧人也。」
	14	環斲而死。宣孟述生。	還鬪而死。宣孟遂活。	還鬪而死，宣孟得以活。

<sup>64</sup> For references to this account in the encyclopedias from the Tang and Song periods, see Ho Che Wah and Chu Kwok Fan, eds., *Citations of the Lüshi Chunqiu Found in the Leishu Compiled in the Tang and Song Dynasties*, 15.127–28.



I.1	15			此所謂德惠也。
	16			故惠君子，君子得其福；
	17			惠小人，小人盡其力；
	18			夫德一人猶活其身，
	19			而況置惠於萬人乎？
	20			故曰德無細，怨無小。
	21			豈可無樹德而除怨，
	22			務利於人哉？
	23			利出者福反，
	24			怨往者禍來，
	25			刑於內者應於外，
	26			不可不慎也。
II	27	此《書》之所謂也，	此《書》之所謂	此《書》之所謂
	28	「德幾無小」者也。	「德幾無小」者也。	「德無小」者也。
	29	故壹德一士，	宣孟德一士	(18 夫德一人)
	30	猶生其身，	猶活其身，	(18 猶活其身，)
	31	兄德萬   人虐？	而況德萬人乎？	(19 而況置惠於萬人乎？)
	32	故《詩》曰	故《詩》曰：	《詩》云：
	33	「赳赳武夫，公侯之干城」，	「赳赳武夫，公侯干城」，	「赳赳武夫，公侯干城。」
	34	「濟濟多士，文王以寧」。	「濟濟多士，文王以寧」。	「濟濟多士，文王以寧。」
III	35	人君其胡   可以毋務愛士？	人主胡可以不務哀士？	人君胡可不務愛士乎？ <sup>66</sup>
IV	36		士其難知，唯博之為可，博則無所遁矣。 <sup>67</sup>	

Again, we see that the variants between the individual characters are similar either graphically (*shu* 述 and *sui* 遂, lines 14), phonetically (*?oi-* 委 and *?oi-* 飢, line 13), or semantically (*ju* 遽 and *ji* 疾, line 7; *sheng* 生 and *huo* 活, lines 14 and 30; *ai* 愛 and *ai* 哀, line 35). There are, again, examples for deviating semantic determinatives (*shi* 侍 and *dai* 待, line 3; *huan* 環 and *huan* 還, line 14; *xiong* 兄 and *kuang* 況, line 31; 甯 and *ning* 寧, line 34). Characters without counterparts mostly serve the purpose of grammatical clarification, as, for instance, the particles *qie* 且 (line 12 in the *Zhou xun*) and *er* 而 (lines 6 and 31 in the *Lüshi chungiu*). The *Shuoyuan*, while alternately supporting variants of the *Zhou xun* (*san* 三, line 1; *qie* 且, line 12; *ai* 愛, line 35) and the *Lüshi chungiu* (*huo* 活, lines 14 and 18), contains a long passage (I.1) which is absent from both. It reads,

65 *Shuoyuan jiaozheng*, 6.127–28.

66 *Lüshi chungiu xin jiaoshi*, 15.901–2.

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

It is remarkable that the two sentences juxtaposing gentlemen and petty people (16–17) appear, with some variations, in the anecdote about Duke Mu of Qin and the country-people,<sup>67</sup> whereas the two subsequent lines (18–19) appear in the *Zhou xun* and the *Lüshi chungiu* between the citations of the *Documents* and the *Odes* (lines 29–31). This validates the assumption that many early Chinese texts are formed out of interchangeable and malleable “building blocks.”<sup>68</sup> In the given passage, different “blocks” are connected by means of rhyme, as the characters *shen* 身, *ren* 人, *shen* 慎 (lines 18, 19, 22 and 26) all belong to the rhyme group *zhen* 真.

Just like in the example from the previous chapter, the *Zhou xun* and *Lüshi chungiu* share the first three units, which are: (I) the anecdote, (II) the quotations from the *Documents* and *Odes*, and, finally, (III) the rhetorical question emphasizing the necessity of caring for the *shi*. In the *Lüshi chungiu*, there is again an additional unit (IV) following the rhetorical question: “The *shi* are surely hard to find. Only he who searches broadly will succeed. If he searches broadly, none will remain hidden from him” (line 36).<sup>69</sup> This part is not directly connected to the story, but seems to reflect the text's overall concern with recognition of worthies. It has to be noted that this part appears to be similar in structure to the additional sentences from the first story we analyzed. That is to say, it starts by repeating the last phrase of the preceding

67 *Shuoyuan jiaozheng*, 6.125. This anecdote appears in the same chapter, titled “Fu en” 復恩 (Requiting a favor), as the story about Zhao Dun and a starving man.

68 For more, see William G. Boltz, “The Composite Nature of Early Chinese Texts,” in *Text and Ritual in Early China*, ed. Martin Kern (Seattle, Wash.: University of Washington Press, 2005), 50–78.

69 Compare the translation in Knoblock and Riegel, trans., *Annals of Lü Buwei*, 352–53.

part, in this case *shi* 士, and concludes with an exclamatory particle *yi* 矣.

As for the formula “this is what the *Documents* is referring to when it says” (*ci Shu zhi suo wei ye* 此《書》之所謂也), while being very common in the *Zhou xun*, it appears only at this juncture in the *Lüshi chungiu*, where other *Shu*-sources are always preceded by the verb *yue* 曰.<sup>70</sup> In fact, as discussed above, the term *Shu* 書 is itself highly unusual in the *Lüshi chungiu* when used alone to reference a text. As for its content, the *Shu*-line “No act of kindness, however minute, is small” (*de ji wu xiao* 德幾無小) is not part of any transmitted compilations of the *Documents*. This phenomenon is characteristic of most *Shu* citations found in the transmitted sources as well as the newly unearthed manuscripts.<sup>71</sup> At the same time, this line is phonetically identical to the first part of the saying attributed to the text *Qin Ai* 禽艾 in the chapter “Ming gui, Xia” 明鬼下 (Perceptive Ghosts III) of the *Mozi* 墨子: “No pearl is too small to obtain; no lineage is too great to exterminate” (*de ji wu xiao, mie zong wu da* 得璣無小，滅宗無大).<sup>72</sup> Variants based on phonetic proximity such as this are among the most common patterns of variation among *Shu* citations found in different texts.<sup>73</sup>

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

70 Tien Feng-tai, *Lüshi chungiu tanwei*, 356–57.

71 David Schaberg, “Speaking of Documents: *Shu* Citations in Warring States Texts,” 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), 324–26, 333. For *Shu* citations in Guodian manuscripts, see Liao Mingchun 廖明春, “Guodian Chu jian yin *Shu lun Shu kao*” 郭店楚簡引《書》論《書》考, in idem, *Xin chu Chu jian shilun* 新出楚簡試論 (Taipei: Taiwan guji chubanshe, 2001), 83–110.

72 *Mozi jiangou* 墨子閒詁, ed. and comm. Sun Yirang 孫詒讓, coll. and punc. Sun Qizhi 孫啟治 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2001), 8.248. In light of the parallel in the *Lüshi chungiu*, the expression *de ji* 得璣 (to obtain pearl) has been mostly interpreted as the phonetic variant of *de ji* 德幾 (kindness that is minute) (ibid.). Compare the translation in *The Mozi: A Complete Translation*, trans. and annot. Ian Johnston (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2010), 303.

73 Schaberg, “Speaking of Documents,” 332–33.

point that the warriors are protectors *of* their lords. What is the reason for this move, given that it was not only redundant but also changed the tetrasyllabic meter of the poem? Now, the omission of some particles, such as the final *xi* 兮, and the ensuing change of meter was quite common in the *Shi*-quotations found in the early manuscripts.<sup>74</sup> However, such a deliberate addition in the manner seen in the *Zhou xun* was indeed rare, at least in the available documents. It is noteworthy that in the only other available early instance of this line's citation, which is found in the *Zuozhuan*,<sup>75</sup> the sentence is interpreted to the effect that it is the lords who are the shields and walls of the people and not vice versa.<sup>76</sup> It is thus tempting to think that the *Zhou xun*'s characteristic reading could be an attempt to redress the *Zuozhuan*'s playful interpretation of the line, but that conjecture has to remain speculative given the available evidence and given the fact that the *Zhou xun* also took considerable liberty with its exegetic approach to this Classic.

Concluding the comparison between the *Zhou xun* and *Lüshi chungiu*, I would like to point out that the manner in which the two works connect the authoritative sources by introducing a bridging passage (lines 29–31) that contains the common terminology, namely *de* 德 (lines 28, 29 and 31) and *shi* 士 (lines 29 and 34), is not characteristic of the rest of the *Lüshi chungiu*, while frequently featuring in the *Zhou xun*.<sup>77</sup>

## V. Lord Zhaowen in the “Bao geng” Chapter

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

74 Martin Kern, “The *Odes* in Excavated Manuscripts,” in *Text and Ritual in Early China*, 176.

75 Ho Che Wah and Chan Hung Kan 陳雄根, eds., *Citations from the Shijing to Be Found in Pre-Han and Han Texts* 先秦兩漢典籍引《詩經》資料彙編 (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2004), 9.

76 *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, 2:858 (Cheng 12). For translation, see Durrant et al., trans., *Zuo Tradition*, 799. See also, Christoph Harbsmeier, “On the Scrutability of the *Zuozhuan* (Review Article of *Zuo Tradition*),” *Journal of Chinese Studies* 中國文化研究所學報 67 (2018): 265–66.

77 See, for instance, chapter one. *Zhou xun*, 123, strips 14–17.

Zhang Yi was a “minor son” of the house of Wei. When travelling west to Qin, he passed through East Zhou. A retainer spoke to Lord Zhaowen about [Zhang Yi], saying: “Zhang Yi of the house of Wei is a talented *shi* and he is travelling west to Qin. I hope your lordship will treat him with courtesy.” Lord Zhaowen received him in an audience and said to him: “I have heard that you are going to Qin. My own state is small and insufficient to keep you. But, even though you are leaving [for Qin], can you be really sure to be given an opportunity [to implement your policies]? Should you not be given such an opportunity, then I would like to ask you to return as a favor to me and, even though my state is small, I will be willing to share it with you.” When Zhang Yi turned to go, he bowed twice facing north. When Zhang Yi finally departed, Lord Zhaowen saw him off and provided him with supplies. Zhang Yi arrived in Qin and, after some time, King Hui was pleased with him and made him prime minister. Of those whom Zhang Yi treated with kindness, none equaled Lord Zhaowen. Zhou had one thousand chariots, yet Zhang Yi treated it with more respect than a state with ten thousand chariots. He made King Hui of Qin regard Lord Zhaowen as his teacher. At Fengze meeting, the king of Wei served as Lord Zhaowen’s driver and the king of Han as his guard on the right. Even today his reputation has not been forgotten. This is due to Zhang Yi’s influence.<sup>78</sup>

張儀，魏氏餘子也，將西游於秦，過東周。客有語之於昭文君者曰：「魏氏人張儀，材士也，將西遊於秦，願君之禮貌之也。」昭文君見而謂之曰：「聞客之秦。寡人之國小，不足以留客。雖游然豈必遇哉？客或不遇，請為寡人而一歸也，國雖小，請與客共之。」張儀還走，北面再拜。張儀行，昭文君送而資之，至於秦，留有間，惠王說而相之。張儀所德於天下者，無若昭文君。周，千乘也，重過萬乘也，令秦惠王師之，逢澤之會，魏王嘗為御，韓王為右，名號至今不忘，此張儀之力也。<sup>79</sup>

If we take the *Shiji* as a reference, then this account appears to show similar disregard for historical facts as the *Zhou xun*. According to the former, the meeting at Fengze took place in 342 BC, long before Zhang Yi assumed the prime minister position in Qin (i.e. 328 BC).<sup>80</sup> Moreover, Sima Qian 司馬

78 Compare the translation in Knoblock and Riegel, trans., *Annals of Lü Buwei*, 354.

79 *Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi*, 15.902.

80 *Shiji*, 5.203. For translation, see *The Grand Scribe’s Records*, vol. 1, *The Basic Annals of Pre-Han China*, ed. William H. Nienhauser, Jr., trans. William H. Nienhauser, Jr. et al. (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1994), 110.

遷 suggests that the meeting was organized to pay respects to Zhou's "Son of Heaven" (*Tianzi* 天子) for bestowing the status of "hegemon" (*ba* 伯) upon Duke Xiao of Qin 秦孝公 (r. 361–338 BC), King Hui of Qin's father, in 343 BC. Thus, presenting Lord Zhaowen as the main beneficiary of the Fengze meeting was inaccurate for a number of reasons. His fame in Qin and his position as "teacher" of King Hui of Qin, likewise, appear questionable.

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

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

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

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



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

Returning to the story about Lord Zhaowen and Zhang Yi, we see that it does not seem to have been part of the common lore, as no other known source mentions their encounter and Zhang Yi's gratitude. Lord Zhaowen's supposed fame (*xian* 顯) as a wise ruler, heralded in the introductory passage of the "Bao geng" chapter,<sup>83</sup> is likewise missing from the extant sources. On the contrary, according to the *Han shu* "Gujinren biao" 古今人表, Lord Zhaowen belonged to the "lower" section of the "middling" group (*zhong xia* 中下).<sup>84</sup> This made him, at best, a mediocre ruler, even less prominent than the roughly contemporaneous head of the rival West Zhou, Duke Wu 武公, listed two positions above. Moreover, Lord Zhaowen's allegedly unrestrained respect for the *shi*, as depicted in the story, seems over-amplified even when compared to "his" teachings in the *Zhou xun*. Thus, it is not unlikely that the story either goes back to a lost anecdote or that it was, in fact, fabricated by the authors of the chapter.

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

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

84 *Han shu*, 20.946.



## VI. Lord Zhaowen in Other Chapters of the *Lüshi chungqiu*

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

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

[So,] the settling of the base and the small depends on the honorable and the large, which is explained in [the cases of] Bo Yi’s persuading Lord Si of Wei to use methods of [true] kingship, in Du He’s persuading Lord Zhaowen of Zhou to bring peace to All-under-Heaven, and in Kuang Zhang’s refuting Hui Shi with regard to making a true king of the king of Qi.<sup>85</sup>

季子曰：「……故曰：『天下大亂，無有安國；一國盡亂，無有安家；一家皆亂，無有安身』，此之謂也。故小之定也必恃大，大之安也必恃小。小大貴賤，交相為恃，然後皆得其樂。」定賤小在於貴大，解在乎薄疑說衛嗣君以王術，杜赫說周昭文君以安天下，及匡章之難惠子以王齊王也。<sup>86</sup>

Book 13 ( “Youshi lan” 有始覽 ) is often regarded as containing clues about the intended design of the “Examinations” (*lan* 覽 ) part of the work. This design involved a strict separation between the more philosophical guidelines (*jing* 經 ) and explanatory stories (*jie* 解 ); however, it was not realized.<sup>87</sup> The “theoretical” part in this chapter emphasizes the dependence of the “small” on the “large,” while also mentioning their interdependence. The corresponding

85 Compare the translation in Knoblock and Riegel, trans., *Annals of Lü Buwei*, 299–300.

86 *Lüshi chungqiu xin jiaoshi*, 13.727–28.

87 D.C. Lau, “A Study of Some Textual Problems in the *Lü-shih ch’un-ch’iu* and Their Bearing on Its Composition,” *Bulletin of the Institute of Chinese Literature and Philosophy, Academia Sinica* 中國文哲研究集刊 1 (1991): 67–68; Knoblock and Riegel, intro., *Annals of Lü Buwei*, 30–32; Ho Che Wah 何志華, “*Lüshi chungqiu* bianpai jiegou chongtan” 《呂氏春秋》編排結構重探, in idem, *Lüshi chungqiu guankui* 呂氏春秋管窺 (Hong Kong: Chung Hwa Book Company [H.K.], 2015), 82.

content to the brief mentions of Lord Si of Wei 衛嗣君 (d. 293 BC) and Lord Zhaowen of Zhou can be found together in chapter 26.2 (“Wu da” 務大).<sup>88</sup> Book 26 (“Shi rong lun” 士容論), in which it appears, is the last book of the entire work and is sometimes viewed as having been created in a hasty attempt to “fill in the gaps that existed in the overall design of the text.”<sup>89</sup> The relevant passage, which remarkably is not identified as an “explanation” to any theory, reads:

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

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

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

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

Du He replied, “If what I teach is unfeasible [for you], then Zhou cannot be at peace. If what I teach is feasible [for you], then Zhou will be at peace of itself.” This is what is called “bringing peace without bringing peace.”<sup>90</sup>

薄疑說衛嗣君以王術。嗣君應之曰：「所有者千乘也，願以受教。」薄疑對曰：「烏獲舉千鈞，又況一斤？」杜赫以安天下說周昭文君。昭文君謂杜赫曰：「願學所以安周。」杜赫對曰：「臣之所言者不可，則不能安周矣；臣之所言者可，則周自安矣。」此所謂以弗安而安者也。<sup>91</sup>

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

88 The relevant dialogue between Kuang Zhang 匡章 (aka. Tian Zhang 田章, fl. 334–295) and Hui Shi 惠施 (ca. 380–ca.305 BC) is found in book 21 (*Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi*, 21.1474). For the arrangement of “explanations” in different chapters of the work, see Ho Che Wah, “*Lüshi chunqiu* bianpai jiegou chongtan,” 72–74.

89 Knoblock and Riegel, intro., *Annals of Lü Buwei*, 32, quoting Kusuyama Haruki 楠山春樹.

90 Compare the translation in Knoblock and Riegel, trans., *Annals of Lü Buwei*, 649.

91 *Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi*, 26.1714. Xu Fuhong, *Lüshi chunqiu xian Qin shiliao kaoding biannian*, 91, places this encounter in the year 314 BC.

大制無割 ).<sup>92</sup> This demonstrates how one and the same anecdote, when used in different contexts, can substantiate very different positions.<sup>93</sup> In contrast to the anecdote in the *Zhanguo ce*, in which Du He advises a ruler of Zhou to make his political decisions based on the fact that Zhou is a small state with limited resources, here, the same advisor urges Lord Zhaowen to adopt the broadest possible perspective on governing affairs, focusing on the All-under-Heaven. This inconsistency could be resolved by disassociating Lord Zhaowen from the unnamed ruler of Zhou whom Du He was persuading. Some evidence for this disassociation could be seen above. However, it could also be the case that multiple anecdotes about Lord Zhaowen and Du He circulated in early China, supporting different intellectual and political agendas.

When mentioned in the “Bao geng” chapter together with Zhao Dun and Lord Mengchang 孟嘗君 (born Tian Wen 田文, d. ca. 280 BC), Lord Zhaowen served as a prime example for how one can benefit from respecting the *shi*. Here, however, the point seems less obvious and less laudatory. Accordingly, Lord Zhaowen, just like Lord Si of Wei,<sup>94</sup> (falsely) assumed that ruling their small states involved a different set of principles than ruling All-under-Heaven. While having been corrected by their advisors, it is unclear from the stories, as they are portrayed in the text, whether the two rulers concurred with their

92 *Huainanzi jishi*, 12.842 ( “Dao ying” 道應 ). For translation, see Sarah A. Queen, trans. and intro., “Responses of the Way,” in *The Huainanzi: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Government in Early Han China*, trans. and ed. John S. Major et al. (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010), 12.448.

93 For other examples, see Paul van Els and Sarah A. Queen, “Anecdotes in Early China,” in *Between History and Philosophy: Anecdotes in Early China*, ed. Paul van Els and Sarah A. Queen (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 2017), 11–16.

94 Lord Si of Wei is mentioned in the *Han shu* “Gujinren biao” (20.945–46) as elder contemporary of Lord Zhaowen of Zhou, while according to the *Shiji* (15.730) he ascended the throne only in 324 BC. In Ban Gu’s 班固 (32–92) classification, this ruler belonged to the “higher” subsection of the lowest group (*xia shang* 下上 ), occupying one rank below Lord Zhaowen who is listed in the “lower” subsection of the “middling” group (*zhong xia* 中下 ).

advisors and, if so, what this actually entailed politically.<sup>95</sup> It is tempting to relate Lord Zhaowen's separate encounters with Zhang Yi and Du He, for instance, to the effect that his kind treatment of Zhang Yi was based on Du He's advice. However, in the end, it has to be stated that the transmitted *Lüshi chunqiu* does not provide any evidence for such claims. In view of this, this compendium's anecdotes about Lord Zhaowen appear to fall into two categories: the one associating him with Du He (possibly highlighting his confusion about the principles of governance) and the one presenting him as Zhang Yi's benefactor (yielding him respect from Qin and other mighty states).

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

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

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

95 In some other texts, Lord Si of Wei is depicted as someone who refuses to make a distinction between "big" and "small" in his political decisions, placing instead emphasis on upholding a single principle of governing. This principle is reported to be, respectively, the people's "transformation through education" (*jiao hua* 教化) in the *Zhanguo ce* (*Zhanguo ce jianzheng*, 1845 [§32.14: "Wei Sijun shi xu mi tao zhi Wei" 衛嗣君時胥靡逃之魏]. For translation, see Crump, trans., *Chan-Kuo Ts'e*, 571–72) and application of laws (*fa* 法) and penalties (*zhu* 誅) in the *Han Feizi* (*Han Feizi jijie* 韓非子集解, ed. and comm. Wang Xianshen 王先慎 [Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2003], 9.228 [ "Nei chu shuo" 內儲說]. For translation, see *The Complete Works of Han Fei Tzū: A Classic of Chinese Legalism*, vol. 1, trans. W.K. Liao [London: Arthur Probsthain, 1939], 298–99). Yet, to stipulate a direct relationship between these anecdotes and the *Lüshi chunqiu* would certainly go too far.

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

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

96 Han Wei, “Xi-Han zhushu *Zhou xun* ruogan wenti de tantao,” 255.

97 *Zhou xun*, 140, bamboo strip 167. I would like to thank Thies Staack for pointing this out to me.

98 Thies Staack, “Single- and Multi-Piece Manuscripts in Early Imperial China: On the Background and Significance of a Terminological Distinction,” *Early China* 41 (2018): 280.

99 Staack, “Single- and Multi-Piece Manuscripts,” 282.

100 Robin D.S. Yates, “Slavery in Early China: A Socio-Cultural Approach,” *Journal of East Asian Archaeology* 3 (2002): 283–331; Anthony Jerome Barbieri-Low and Robin D.S. Yates, *Law, State, and Society in Early Imperial China: A Study with Critical Edition and Translation of the Legal Texts from Zhangjiashan Tomb no. 247*, vol. 2 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 415n27.

101 Lothar von Falkenhausen with Gideon Shelach, “Introduction: Archeological Perspectives on the Qin ‘Unification’ of China,” in *Birth of an Empire: The State of Qin Revisited*, ed. Yuri Pines et al. (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2014), 44.

102 Especially after Lü Buwei 呂不韋 led the final campaign against the East Zhou, sealing the fate of the Zhou dynasty (*Shiji*, 5.219. For translation, see Nienhauser et al., trans., *The Grand Scribe’s Records*, 1:122).

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

## Conclusion

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

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

103 Yuri Pines, “Disputers of Abdication: Zhanguo Egalitarianism and the Sovereign’s Power,” *T’oung Pao* 91 (2005): 282.

104 Zhang Shuangdi 張雙棣, *Lüshi chunqiu shihua* 《呂氏春秋》史話 (Beijing: Guojia tushuguan chubanshe, 2019), 26.

## Bibliography

- The Annals of Lü Buwei*. Translated, annotated, and with an introduction by John Knoblock and Jeffrey Riegel. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2000.
- Barbieri-Low, Anthony Jerome, and Robin D.S. Yates. *Law, State, and Society in Early Imperial China: A Study with Critical Edition and Translation of the Legal Texts from Zhangjiashan Tomb no. 247*. Vol. 2. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2015.
- Beijing daxue cang Xi-Han zhushu*. San 北京大學藏西漢竹書·叁. Edited by Beijing daxue chutu wenxian yanjiusuo 北京大學出土文獻研究所. 2 vols. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2015.
- Beijing daxue chutu wenxian yanjiusuo 北京大學出土文獻研究所. “Beijing daxue cang Xi-Han zhushu gaishuo” 北京大學藏西漢竹書概說. *Wenwu* 文物 (2011.6): 49–56, 98.
- Boltz, William G. “Manuscripts with Transmitted Counterparts.” In *New Sources of Early Chinese History: An Introduction to the Reading of Inscriptions and Manuscripts*. Edited by Edward L. Shaughnessy, 253–83. Berkeley, Calif.: The Society for the Study of Early China; The Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 1997.
- . “The Composite Nature of Early Chinese Texts.” In *Text and Ritual in Early China*. Edited by Martin Kern, 50–78. Seattle, Wash.: University of Washington Press, 2005.
- Carson, Michael Frederic. *The Language of the “Lü-shih ch’un-ch’iu”: Some Characteristic Features of Grammar and Style in a Third Century B.C. Text*. Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Washington, 1980.
- Chan-Kuo Ts’e*. Translated by Crump, James I., Jr. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.
- Chen Jian 陳劍. “Zhou xun ‘wei xia sun gui er bu zhi’ jie” 《周馴》「為下飧揅而饋之」解. Center for Research on Chinese Excavated Classics and Paleography at Fudan University, June 18, 2016. <http://www.gwz.fudan.edu.cn/Web/Show/2835>.
- Chunqiu Gongyang zhuan zhushu* 春秋公羊傳注疏. Original commentary by He Xiu 何休. Sub-commentary by Xu Yan 徐彥. 2 vols. Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2000.
- Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu* 春秋左傳注. Edited and commented by Yang Bojun



- 楊伯峻 . Rev ed. 4 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1995.
- The Complete Works of Han Fei Tzŭ: A Classic of Chinese Legalism*. Vol. 1. Translated by W.K. Liao. London: Arthur Probsthain, 1939.
- Fech, Andrej. "The *Zhou xun* 周訓 and 'Elevating the Worthy' (*shang xian* 尚賢)." *Early China* 41 (2018): 149–78.
- Foster, Christopher J. "Introduction to the Peking University Han Bamboo Strips: On the Authentication and Study of Purchased Manuscripts." *Early China* 40 (2017): 167–239.
- Gassmann, Robert H. "Die Bezeichnung *jun-zi*: Ansätze zur Chunqiu-zeitlichen Kontextualisierung und zur Bedeutungsbestimmung im *Lun Yu*." In *Zurück zur Freude: Studien zur Chinesischen Literatur und Lebenswelt und ihrer Rezeption in Ost und West. Festschrift für Wolfgang Kubin*. Edited by Marc Hermann, Christian Schwermann, and Jari Grosse-Ruyken, 411–36. St. Augustin, Nettetal: Steyler Verlag, 2007.
- Goldin, Paul R. "Heng Xian and the Problem of Studying Looted Artefacts." *Dao* 12 (2013): 153–60.
- The Gongyang Commentary on The Spring and Autumn Annals: A Full Translation*. Translated by Harry Miller. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- The Grand Scribe's Records*. Vol. 1, *The Basic Annals of Pre-Han China*. Edited by William H. Nienhauser, Jr. Translated by Tsai-fa Cheng, Zongli Lu, William H. Nienhauser, Jr., and Robert Reynolds. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1994. Vol. 5.1, *The Hereditary Houses of Pre-Han China, Part I*. Edited by William H. Nienhauser, Jr. Translated by Weiguo Cai, Zhi Chen, Scott Cook, Hongyu Huang, Bruce Knickerbocker, William H. Nienhauser, Jr., Wang Jing, Zhang Zhenjun, and Zhao Hua. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 2006.
- Han Feizi jijie* 韓非子集解 . Edited and commented by Wang Xianshen 王先慎 . Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2003.
- Han Shi waizhuan jishi* 韓詩外傳集釋 . Edited and commented by Xu Weiyu 許維通 . Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980.
- Han shu* 漢書 . 12 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1962.
- Han Wei 韓巍 . "Xi-Han zhushu *Zhou xun* ruogan wenti de tantao" 西漢竹書《周訓》若干問題的探討 . In *Beijing daxue cang Xi-Han zhushu. San*, 249–98. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2015.
- Harbsmeier, Christoph. "On the Scrutability of the *Zuozhuan*." *Journal of Chinese Studies* 中國文化研究所學報 67 (2018): 253–79.

- He Jin 何晉. *Zhanguo ce yanjiu* 《戰國策》研究. Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2001.
- Ho Che Wah 何志華. “*Lüshi chunqiu bianpai jiegou chongtan*” 《呂氏春秋》編排結構重探. In idem, *Lüshi chunqiu guankui* 呂氏春秋管窺, 27–86. Hong Kong: Chung Hwa Book Company (H.K.), 2015.
- Ho Che Wah, and Chan Hung Kan 陳雄根, eds. *Citations from the Shijing to Be Found in Pre-Han and Han Texts* 先秦兩漢典籍引《詩經》資料彙編. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2004.
- Ho Che Wah, and Chu Kwok Fan 朱國藩, eds. *Citations of the Lüshi Chunqiu Found in the Leishu Compiled in the Tang and Song Dynasties* 唐宋類書徵引《呂氏春秋》資料彙編. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2006.
- Hsu Tan-huei 許燦輝. *Xian Qin dianji yin Shangshu kao* 先秦典籍引《尚書》考. 2 vols. Yonghe, Taipei: Huamulan wenhua chubanshe, 2009.
- Kern, Martin. “The *Odes* in Excavated Manuscripts.” In *Text and Ritual in Early China*. Edited by Martin Kern, 149–93. Seattle, Wash.: University of Washington Press, 2005.
- . ““Xi shuai” 蟋蟀 (‘Cricket’) and Its Consequence: Issues in Early Chinese Poetry and Textual Studies.” *Early China* 42 (2019): 39–74.
- Lai Guolong. *Excavating the Afterlife: The Archaeology of Early Chinese Religion*. Seattle, Wash.: University of Washington Press, 2015.
- Lau, D.C. “A Study of Some Textual Problems in the *Lü-shih ch’un-ch’iu* and Their Bearing on Its Composition.” *Bulletin of the Institute of Chinese Literature and Philosophy, Academia Sinica* 中國文哲研究集刊 1 (1991): 45–87.
- Li Xueqin 李學勤. *Eastern Zhou and Qin Civilizations*. Translated by K.C. Chang. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1985.
- Liao Mingchun 廖明春. “Guodian Chu jian yin *Shu lun Shu kao*” 郭店楚簡引《書》論《書》考. In idem, *Xin chu Chu jian shilun* 新出楚簡試論, 83–110. Taipei: Taiwan guji chubanshe, 2001.
- Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi* 呂氏春秋新校釋. Edited and commented by Chen Qiyu 陳奇猷. 2 vols. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2002.
- The Mozi: A Complete Translation*. Translated and annotated by Ian Johnston. Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong, 2010.
- Mozi jiangou* 墨子閒詁. Edited and commented by Sun Yirang 孫詒讓. Collated and punctuated by Sun Qizhi 孫啟治. 2 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2001.
- Pines, Yuri. “Disputers of Abdication: Zhanguo Egalitarianism and the Sovereign’s Power.” *T’oung Pao* 91 (2005): 243–300.

- . *Envisioning Eternal Empire: Chinese Political Thought of the Warring States Era*. Honolulu, Hawai‘i: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2009.
- 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. Dordrecht: Springer, 2013.
- , trans. and intro. “Responses of the Way.” In *The Huainanzi: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Government in Early Han China*. Translated and edited by John S. Major, Sarah A. Queen, Andrew Seth Meyer, and Harold D. Roth, with additional contributions by Michael Puett and Judson Murray, 429–82. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010.
- Richter, Matthias L. “A Hierarchy of Criteria for Deciding on Disputed Readings.” In idem, *The Embodied Text: Establishing Textual Identity in Early Chinese Manuscripts*, 65–72. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- . “Variants of Little Consequence for the Content of the Text.” In idem, *The Embodied Text*, 73–98.
- Schaberg, David. “Chinese History and Philosophy.” In *The Oxford History of Historical Writing*. Vol. 1, *Beginnings to AD 600*. Edited by Andrew Feldherr and Grant Hardy, 394–414. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- . “Speaking of Documents: *Shu* Citations in Warring States Texts.” 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, 320–59. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Schuessler, Axel. *Minimal Old Chinese and Later Han Chinese: A Companion to Grammata Serica Recensa*. Honolulu, Hawai‘i: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2009.
- Shangshu zhengyi* 尚書正義. 2 vols. Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2000.
- Shaughnessy, Edward L. “The Editing of Archaeologically Recovered Manuscripts and Its Implications for the Study of Received Texts.” In idem, *Rewriting Early Chinese Texts*, 9–61. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 2006.
- Shiji* 史記. 10 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1959.
- The Shoo King or the Book of Historical Documents*. Translated by James Legge. 2nd ed. 1893–94. Reprint, Taipei: SMC Publishing Inc., 1992.
- Shuoyuan jiaozheng* 說苑校證. Edited and commented by Xiang Zonglu 向

- 宗魯 . Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1987.
- Staack, Thies. "Could the Peking University *Laozi* 老子 Really be a Forgery? Some Skeptical Remarks." heiDOK – The Heidelberg Document Repository at Heidelberg University. January 10, 2017. [http://archiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/volltextserver/22453/1/Staack\\_2017\\_Peking%20University%20Laozi.pdf](http://archiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/volltextserver/22453/1/Staack_2017_Peking%20University%20Laozi.pdf).
- . "Single- and Multi-Piece Manuscripts in Early Imperial China: On the Background and Significance of a Terminological Distinction." *Early China* 41 (2018): 245–95.
- Tien Feng-tai 田鳳台 . *Lüshi chungiu tanwei* 呂氏春秋探微 . Taipei: Xuesheng shuju, 1986.
- Tsien Tsuen-hsün. "Strategies of Warring States." In idem, *Collected Writings on Chinese Culture*, 33–46. Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong Press, 2011.
- van Els, Paul, 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, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 2017.
- von Falkenhausen, Lothar, with Gideon Shelach. "Introduction: Archeological Perspectives on the *Qin* 'Unification' of China." In *Birth of an Empire: The State of Qin Revisited*. Edited by Yuri Pines, Gideon Shelach, Lothar von Falkenhausen, and Robin D.S. Yates, 37–51. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2014.
- Wu Rongzeng 吳榮曾 . "Dong-Zhou, Xi-Zhou liangguo shi yanjiu" 東周西周兩國史研究 . In idem, *Xian Qin Liang Han shi yanjiu* 先秦兩漢史研究 , 133–47. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1995.
- Xing Wen 邢文 . "Beida jian *Laozi* bianwei" 北大簡《老子》辨偽 . *Guangming Daily* 光明日報 , August 8, 2016, 16.
- Xu Fuhong 許富宏 . *Lüshi chungiu xian Qin shiliao kaoding biannian* 呂氏春秋先秦史料考訂編年 . Nanjing: Fenghuang chubanshe, 2017.
- Yan Buke 閻步克 . "Beida zhushu *Zhou xun* jianjie" 北大竹書《周訓》簡介 . *Wenwu* (2011.6): 71–74.
- Yates, Robin D.S. "Slavery in Early China: A Socio-Cultural Approach." *Journal of East Asian Archaeology* 3 (2002): 283–331.
- Zhang Shuangdi 張雙棣 . *Lüshi chungiu shihua* 《呂氏春秋》史話 . Beijing: Guojia tushuguan chubanshe, 2019.
- Zhangguo ce jianzheng* 戰國策箋證 . Edited and commented by Fan Xiangyong 范祥雍 . Further collation by Fan Bangjin 范邦瑾 . 2 vols. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2006.

*Zhanguo ce jijiao huikao* 戰國策集注匯考 . Edited and commented by Zhu Zugeng 諸祖耿 . Extended and revised ed. 3 vols. Nanjing: Fenghuang chubanshe, 2008.

*Zuo Tradition / Zuozhuan: Commentary on the "Spring and Autumn Annals."*  
Translated and Introduced by Stephen Durrant, Wai-yee Li, and David Schaberg. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2016.

# 論戰國晚期背景下北大竹書 《周訓》與《呂氏春秋》之關係

費安德

香港浸會大學中國語言文學系

本文研究對象分別為新近發現的西漢竹書《周訓》（現藏北京大學），以及成書於戰國晚期、集先秦諸子思想之大成的《呂氏春秋》。通過對比兩段同時見於二書的古史軼聞，筆者提出《呂氏春秋》的編撰者不單採用了《周訓》的材料，在收進〈仲秋紀〉和〈慎大覽〉時運用的剪裁技巧更是如出一轍。鑑於學界對〈十二紀〉、〈八覽〉、〈六論〉三部分之間的關係、成書時間和編排次序訖無定論，本文將有助局部釐清《呂氏春秋》的成書過程和編撰原則。此外，本文著力探討《周訓》的主人公周昭文君在《呂氏春秋》是如何呈現的。在某些章節裡，他被描繪成備受當世諸侯推崇的明君，秦惠王甚至「師之」。考慮到周昭文君與秦國之間的密切關係（儘管史實應非如此），文末將提出《周訓》成於何地的新說。

**關鍵詞：**《周訓》 《呂氏春秋》 周朝 秦國 古史軼聞