The Editing of Archaeologically Recovered Manuscripts and Its Implications for the Study of Received Texts

Jingzhou 荊州, Hubei, is located in the heart of central China, just about one thousand kilometers south of Beijing, one thousand kilometers north of Hong Kong, about eight hundred kilometers west of Shanghai, and about eight hundred kilometers east of Chengdu 成都, Sichuan. Just to the north of the modern city lies the site of Jinan cheng 紀南城, the capital of the state of Chu 楚 during the Warring States period (453–222 BC). And just to the north of Jinan cheng there is an extensive slightly elevated plateau area that seems to have served as the primary burial ground for Chu officials and their families. Since the 1950s, numerous graves have been unearthed here, the grave goods providing manifold evidence for the thriving cultural life of this important state.[1] Among these grave goods have been numerous bamboo strips bearing writing in ink, the earliest form of the "book" in China.[2] In most cases, these strips have been records that the deceased had created during their lifetimes (either in their public or private lives), or that were produced for their burials. The grave of one Shao Tuo 邵𤰞, discovered early in 1987 in the village of Baoshan 包山,

---

1. For a good introduction to the cultural history of Chu, see Constance A. Cook and John Major, *Defining Chu: Image and Reality in Ancient China* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999).

2. For the classic Western-language study of the early development of the book in early China, see Tsuen-hsuin Tsien, *Written on Bamboo and Silk* (1962; 2nd rev. ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).

is a particularly good example of the sorts of records typically found in these tombs. Shao Tuo was Chief Minister of the Left (*zuoyin* 左尹), a local administrator in the Chu government, and many of the strips derive from court cases in which he presided; these constitute the earliest evidence presently available for the development of law in early China. Other records concern divinations that were performed on behalf of Shao Tuo during the illness that eventually claimed his life in 316 BC, and still others carry an inventory of the various goods that were put into his tomb after his death.[3] All of these types of strips are undeniably precious evidence for the institutional and literary traditions of China, but the difficulty of the script in which they were written restricted access to them to just a relative handful of paleographers and their formulaic nature limited their interest to all but the most specialized research.[4]

This situation changed dramatically beginning late in 1993. Two different tombs in the area produced bamboo-strip manuscripts of early philosophical texts that immediately attracted the attention of everyone interested in early China, whether in China or abroad. First to be announced was the discovery of a tomb in the village of Guodian 郭店. In August 1993, tomb robbers dug down to the wooden planks covering the outer coffin of the tomb before apparently giving up their efforts. Since no harm was done to the tomb chamber itself, archaeologists simply filled it in again. Two months later, tomb robbers struck the same tomb again, this time opening a shaft into the tomb chamber itself, taking out some of the grave goods and damaging many of the rest. Moreover, before the archaeologists could return this time, rain and mud poured into the tomb chamber from the robbers' shaft. Nevertheless, archaeologists from the Jingmen City Museum were able to salvage much of the contents of the tomb, including a large cache (804 strips) of bamboo strips, most of which were intact.[5] Unlike previous discoveries of bamboo strips in the area, these bore philosophical texts. Since the script on the strips and the style of the rest of the grave goods were very similar to those found in the grave of Shao Tuo at Baoshan, who, as noted above, died in 316 BC, the archaeologists dated the tomb to the end of the fourth century BC, making these the earliest examplars of philosophical texts ever found in China.

Attracting immediate attention were three discrete texts made up exclu-

---

3. For these strips, see *Baoshan Chu jian* 包山楚簡, ed. Hubei sheng Jing Sha tielu kaogudui (Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe, 1991).

4. For the most thorough study of all aspects of the Baoshan strips, see Chen Wei 陳偉, *Baoshan Chu jian chu tan* 包山楚簡初談 (Wuhan: Wuhan daxue chubanshe, 1996).

5. For an account of the excavation of the Guodian tomb, see Hubei sheng Jingmen shi bowuguan, "Jingmen Guodian yihao Chu mu" 荊門郭店一號楚墓, *Wenwu* 1997.7: 35–48. For the bamboo strips, see Jingmen shi bowuguan, ed., *Guodian Chu mu zhu jian* 郭店楚墓竹簡 (Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe, 1998).

sively of material found in the received text of the *Laozi* 老子, one of the most widely studied and hotly debated texts in the traditional literary and philosophical tradition.[6] Within a month of the publication of the Guodian texts in the spring of 1998, a much-publicized international conference was held in the United States to discuss the significance of these *Laozi* manuscripts.[7] Meanwhile, scholars identified other texts in the cache as deriving from a lineage of Confucianism centering on Kong Ji 孔伋, better known as Zi Si 子思 (483–402 BC),[8] the grandson of Kong Qiu 孔丘 or Confucius (551–479 BC). Zi Si seems to have been crucial in the transmission of Confucian teachings from the time of Confucius himself down to that of Meng Ke 孟軻 or Mencius (c. 390–305 BC), who was to a very great extent responsible for what would ultimately be recognized as Confucian orthodoxy. The study of the Zi Si-Mencius lineage of Confucius has now become the hottest topic in a "fever" of Confucian studies in mainland China.[9]

Apparently at about the same time that the Guodian tomb was being robbed and then excavated, another tomb, presumed to be of similar date and similar nature, was also being robbed somewhere else in the same general vicinity. One can only say "apparently" because, aside from whispered rumors, the only evidence of this tomb was a cache of bamboo strips that appeared on the Hong Kong antiques market early in 1994. These strips, most of them still encased in the mud of the tomb, were immediately purchased by the Shanghai Museum. They proved to be of the same general nature as the Guodian strips, but were even more numerous, numbering over 1,200 strips in all. Although only a portion of this find has been published to date, it is already clear that its

---

6. For the first of these texts, generally referred to as Guodian *Laozi* A (*Jia* 甲), see *Guodian Chu mu zhu jian,* 3–6 (photographs) and 111–17 (transcription); for Guodian *Laozi* B, see 7–8 (photographs) and 118–20 (transcription), and for Guodian *Laozi* C, see 9–10 (photographs) and 121–22 (transcription).

7. For the proceedings of this conference, see Sarah Allan and Crispin Williams, eds., *The Guodian* Laozi: *Proceedings of the International Conference, Dartmouth College, May 1998* (Berkeley, Cal.: Society for the Study of Early China and the Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 2000).

8. Dates for Kong Ji and other figures of the Warring States period are taken from Qian Mu 錢穆, *Xian Qin zhuzi xi nian* 先秦諸子繫年 (Xianggang: Xianggang daxue chubanshe, 1956).

9. The identification of this Zi Si-Mencius lineage is due primarily to the work of two scholars: Li Xueqin 李學勤 and Pang Pu 龐樸; for their first expressions, see Li Xueqin, "Jingmen Guodian jian zhong de Zi Sizi" 荊門郭店簡中的子思子, *Wenwu tiandi* 文物天地 1998.2: 28–30; rpt. *Zhongguo zhexue* 中國哲學 20 (1999): 75–80; see too, "The Confucian Texts from Guodian Tomb Number One: Their Date and Significance," in *The Guodian* Laozi, 107–11. For two other influential studies, see Pang Pu 龐朴, "Kong Meng zhi jian: Guodian Chu jian de sixiang shi diwei" 孔孟之間：郭店楚簡的思想史地位, *Zhongguo shehui kexue* 中國社會科學 1998.5: 88–95; rpt. *Zhongguo zhexue* 20 (1999): 22–35; and Liao Mingchun 廖名春, "Jingmen Guodian Chu jian yu Xian Qin Ru xue" 荊門郭店楚簡與先秦儒學, *Zhongguo zhexue* 20 (1999): 35–74.

contents are every bit as important as the Guodian texts.[10] For instance, the first text in the first published volume is an unprecedented discussion of the *Shi* 詩 or (*Classic of*) *Poetry* attributed to Confucius himself; the editors have entitled it *Kongzi Shi lun* 孔子詩論 or *Confucius's Essay on the Poetry*.[11] The first volume also includes two texts also found at Guodian: a version of the *Zi yi* 緇衣 or *Black Jacket*, known already as one chapter of the *Li ji* 禮記 or *Record of Ritual*, and another text variously known as *Xing zi ming chu* 性自命出 or *The Inborn-Nature Comes from the Mandate* or as *Xing qing lun* 性情論 or *Essay on the Inborn-Nature and the Emotions*. The second volume contains two texts related to the *Kongzi Shi lun* (entitled *Zi Gao* 子羔 and *Lu bang da han* 魯邦大旱 or *The Country of Lu's Great Drought*), another text (entitled by the editors *Min zhi fumu* 民之父母 or *The Parents of the People*) related to the "Kongzi xian ju" 孔子閒居 or "Confucius at Rest" chapter of the *Li ji*, as well as an important narrative of China's earliest history (entitled *Rong Cheng shi* 容乘氏), while the third volume contains the earliest manuscript version of the *Zhou Yi* 周易 or *Zhou Changes*. Any one of these texts would be of major significance; the Shanghai Museum cache is said to contain more than eighty in all.

The significance of the texts is manifold. For the history of thought in China, they are undeniably precious. The Warring States period has always been regarded in China as the fountainhead of Chinese thought, the classic age to which all subsequent thinkers looked back for inspiration. Yet, for a period so important, there are relatively few texts that can be securely dated to it. Thus, each new text that is found adds dramatically to the corpus. Perhaps as important as these additions to the corpus are the new versions of texts that have long been known. The *Laozi* materials from Guodian or the *Zi yi* texts from both the Guodian and Shanghai Museum caches provide not just new early editions of these texts, but by virtue of having been copied before the standardization of the script in the subsequent Qin (221–207 BC) and Han (202 BC–AD 220) periods, they take us a very large step closer to the original forms of the texts.

That these texts were physically copied in the fourth century BC, almost

---

10. The Shanghai Museum strips, as these strips are now known, are being published serially: Ma Chengyuan 馬承源, ed., *Shanghai bowuguan cang Zhanguo Chu zhu shu* 上海博物館藏戰國楚竹書, (Shanghai: Shanghai Guji chubanshe); Volume 1 was published in 2001, Volume 2 in 2002, Volume 3 in 2003; subsequent volumes are expected at the rate of about one per year. For an account of the purchase of these strips and related issues, see "Ma Chengyuan xiansheng tan Shang bo jian" 馬承源先生談上博簡, in *Shang bo guan cang Zhanguo Chu zhu shu yanjiu* 上博館藏戰國楚竹書研究, ed. Liao Mingchun 廖名春 and Zhu Yuanqing 朱淵清 (Shanghai: Shanghai shudian chubanshe, 2002), 1–8.

11. *Shanghai bowuguan cang Zhanguo Chu zhu shu*, Vol. 1, 13–41 (photographs) and 121–68 (transcription). For some discussion of this text, see below, pp. 20–21, 31–33.

certainly within the lifetime of Mencius and not long after the time of Zi Si, or of Confucius or Laozi 老子 (if there actually were a Laozi),[12] for that matter, lends them an immediacy that even the most beautifully printed and bound editions can never have. Of course, very few scholars have the privilege (and the responsibility) of working with the original bamboo strips.[13] Most others have access to them only through their final published form. In the case of both the Guodian and Shanghai Museum strips, these publications have appeared in a very timely manner, printed to the highest standards, with beautifully clear photographs of the bamboo strips. But these publications include much more. Not only do they present the strips in certain prescribed orders, but they also provide full transcriptions into modern Chinese characters and copious notes explaining various points. The reader of the publications cannot help but be influenced by the decisions of the editors. This is not to say that those decisions are always the final word. Indeed, many of the hundreds of articles that have already been published in China regarding these bamboo-strip texts have attempted to "correct" one or another of the editors' readings.[14] It would be very, very difficult at this point to try to issue a new edition that reflected all of the different ways that scholars have sought to rewrite these texts, and I will certainly not try to do so here.

Instead, what I will do, in this chapter, is first to describe in detail the process involved in the production of these editions. Then I will explore some of the problems that other scholars have identified, touching as well on some of the broader questions in the study of the early Chinese literary canon. Some of the problems will be familiar from traditional Chinese textual criticism

---

12. Qian Mu, *Xian Qin zhuzi xi nian*, 221–26 argues against any particular person named Laozi as the author of the *Laozi*.

13. In fact, after the strips are photographed (for which, see below, p. 15), even the editors work primarily from the photographs, rather than with the bamboo strips themselves. See Li Ling 李零, "Shang bo Chu jian jiaodu ji: *Zi Gao* pian 'Kongzi Shi lun' bufen" 上博楚簡校讀記: 子羔篇孔子詩論部分, *Zhonghua wenshi luncong* 中華文史論叢 2001.4: 1–2, for an account of how one of the first editors of the Shanghai Museum corpus worked from photographs.

14. Trying to keep abreast of the flood of publications on the Guodian and Shanghai Museum strips is proving daunting, even with the inception of widespread use of the internet in China. For instance, Wuhan daxue Zhongguo wenhua yanjiuyuan, ed., *Guodian Chu jian Guoji xueshu yantaohui lunwenji* 郭店楚簡國際學術研討會論文集 (Wuhan: Wuhan Renmin chubanshe, 2000), the proceedings of a conference held just over one year after the initial publication of the Guodian strips and itself published just two years after that initial publication, includes a bibliography of more than four hundred works, most of them already published. For a brief bibliography of scholarship on the Shanghai Museum strips, see *Shang bo guan cang Zhanguo Chu zhu shu yanjiu*, 465–77. For a more up-to-date bibliography, see Paul R. Goldin, "A Bibliography of Materials Pertaining to the Kuo-tien and Shanghai Museum Manuscripts," at http://www.lib.uchicago.edu/earlychina/res/bib/manuscripts_bib.html. For an internet site devoted to the discussion of these manuscripts, see http://www.bamboosilk.org.

(*jiaochouxue* 校讎學 or *jiaokanxue* 校勘學);[15] others will be unique to these bamboo strips. But in all cases, they are the best evidence that we now have for the way in which the Chinese editing process worked and works.

THE "ORGANIZATION" OF
ARCHAEOLOGICALLY RECOVERED MANUSCRIPTS

To describe the various steps in the treatment of paleographic materials after their first discovery and leading up to their eventual publication, contemporary Chinese archaeologists use the term *zhengli* 整理, which means generally "to put into order, to organize." Needless to say, the steps vary according to the nature of the materials and the circumstances of their discovery. Thus, perhaps the most famous paleographic discovery of modern times, the Mawangdui 馬王 堆 silk manuscripts, discovered in 1973 in Changsha 長沙, Hunan, presented relatively few difficulties for their editors (at least in retrospect). These texts were, for the most part, written in a clear Han-dynasty clerical script (*lishu* 隸 書) on rolls of high quality silk that had been carefully folded and placed in a lacquer container.[16] But the Mawangdui manuscripts were unusual for several reasons, perhaps the most important being that they were written on silk, which was prohibitively expensive for most texts.[17] Until the use of paper became widespread in the fourth and fifth centuries AD, most manuscripts in early China

---

15. I will not reproduce here the typologies illustrated in numerous excellent studies of textual criticism that have been available in China since the middle of the Qing dynasty. The first systematic illustration of the problems involved in textual recensions was probably the *Jiaochou tongyi* 校 讎通義 of Zhang Xuecheng 章學成 (1738–1801), while Wang Niansun 王念孫 (1744–1832) demonstrated the application of these principles to one text (the *Huainanzi* 淮南子) in his *Du shu za zhi* 讀書雜志. An expanded typology was given in the *Gu shu yi yi ju li* 古書疑義舉例 of Yu Yue 俞樾 (1821–1907), which then served as the basis for several more studies during the first half of the twentieth century, all of which were published as *Gu shu yi yi ju li wu zhong* 古書疑義 舉例五種 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1956). For recent overviews of the subject, see Guan Xihua 管錫華, *Jiaokanxue* 校勘學 (Hefei: Anhui Jiaoyu chubanshe, 1991), and Cheng Qianfan 程千帆 and Xu Youfu 徐有富, *Jiaochou guang yi: Jiaokan bian* 校讎廣義：校勘編 (Jinan: Qi Lu shushe, 1998).

16. For the Mawangdui manuscripts, see, for instance, Guojia Wenwu ju Guwenxian yanjiushi, ed., *Mawangdui Han mu boshu (yi)* 馬王堆漢墓帛書（壹）(Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe, 1980); this volume contains the two *Laozi* manuscripts and related texts.

17. Other than the famous Chu Silk Manuscripts, probably discovered in Changsha in 1942, the Mawangdui texts are the only significant archaeological discovery of early textual materials written on silk. For the Chu Silk Manuscripts, see Li Ling 李零, *Changsha Zidanku Zhanguo Chu boshu yanjiu* 長沙子彈庫戰國楚帛書研究 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1985); and Li Ling and Constance A. Cook, "Translation of the Chu Silk Manuscript," in *Defining Chu: Image and Reality in Ancient China,* ed. Constance A. Cook and John Major (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999), 171–76.

were written on bamboo or wooden strips. One or the other of these materials was readily available throughout China, and bamboo was especially well suited to the nature of the Chinese script, which from its earliest appearance tended to be written in vertical columns. However, both wood and bamboo strips, particularly when placed in ancient tombs,[18] typically present numerous problems for the archaeologists who discover them, and for the paleographers who try to decipher the texts written on them.

The Guodian strips, so beautifully presented in *Guodian Chu mu zhu jian* 郭店楚墓竹簡 or *Bamboo Strips of the Chu Tomb at Guodian,* are an excellent case in point; the following description of the "organization" process will focus on them.[19] When the archaeologists took them from the side compartment of the tomb's outer coffin, they were encased in mud. After the surface mud had been removed, the individual strips were separated. At this stage, the strips were completely black from the mud; the writing on them, in black ink, was therefore illegible. After a chemical treatment restored a natural color to the strips, thus rendering the writing visible, the strips were photographed and then conserved in test tubes filled with distilled water.[20] This constituted only the physical *zhengli* process. Thereafter began the editorial work proper.

Because the straps that had originally bound together the bamboo strips had long since decomposed, and ground pressure had disarrayed the strips (not to mention the damage possibly done by the tomb robbers), the editorial team next had to sort them into discrete units. To do this, they relied first of all on the physical properties of the strips (fortunately, but rather unusually, most of the strips had survived intact): their length, the way that the ends of the strips had been cut (flat or beveled), the number and placement of binding straps (though the straps had decomposed, the places where they had passed over the strips were left without writing, making it easy to determine where they had been), and the calligraphy of the writing. Based on these properties, the editors divided the 730 strips bearing writing into sixteen discrete texts (most

18. Wooden strips discovered along the *limes* of Central Asia tend to be better preserved upon excavation, even though in many cases they come from the equivalent of garbage dumps. This is due, of course, to the dry, desert conditions there.

19. The "organization" of the Shanghai Museum strips included most of the same steps as those described below for the Guodian strips. However, since these strips were purchased on the antiques market and not excavated by archaeologists, it seems preferable here to limit these remarks to just the Guodian strips.

20. For an excellent description of the work done in the context of the Guodian discovery, see Peng Hao, "Post-Excavation Work on the Guodian Bamboo-Slip *Laozi*: A Few Points of Explanation," in *The Guodian* Laozi: *Proceedings of the International Conference, Dartmouth College, May 1998,* ed. Sarah Allan and Crispin Williams (Berkeley, Cal.: Society for the Study of Early China and the Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 2000), pp. 33–37; the information here is taken from p. 33.

of the titles of which were assigned by the editors):[21] three texts of *Laozi* 老子 materials (generally referred to in English as Guodian *Laozi* A, B, and C), *Tai Yi sheng shui* 太乙生水 or *The Great One Generates Water*, *Zi yi* 緇衣 or *The Black Jacket*, *Wu xing* 五行 or *The Five Deportments*, *Cheng zhi wen zhi* 成之聞之 or *Cheng's Hearing about It*,[22] *Zun de yi* 尊德義 or *Revering Virtue and Propriety*, *Xing zi ming chu* 性自命出 or *The Inborn-nature Comes from the Mandate*,[23] *Liu de* 六德 or *The Six Virtues*, *Lu Mu Gong wen Zi Si* 魯穆公問子思 or *Duke Mu of Lu Asks Zi Si*, *Qiong da yi shi* 窮達以時 or *Failure and Success are Based on Timeliness*, *Zhong xin zhi dao* 忠信之道 or *The Way of Loyalty and Trust*, *Tang Yu zhi dao* 唐虞之道 or *The Way of Tang and Yu*, and four texts referred to as *Yu cong* 語叢 or *Thicket of Sayings:* A, B, C and D. Physical characteristics allow some of these texts to be grouped together. For example, *Cheng zhi wen zhi*, *Zun de yi*, *Xing zi ming chu*, and *Liu de* are all written in the same hand on strips 32.5 cm long with beveled ends, and with a distance of 17.5 cm between the two binding straps; it is generally assumed that they constitute four chapters of a single bound text. *Zi yi* and *Wu xing* (and perhaps also *Laozi* A) are also written on strips 32.5 cm long and with the same beveled ends, but the distance between their binding straps is only 12.8–13 cm; thus, while they too could have been bound together with each other, they could not have been bound together with *Cheng zhi wen zhi* and the other three texts.

　　Only after these several more or less mechanical sortings had been accomplished could the editorial team turn to the reading of the texts. This reading involved two preliminary and interrelated steps: the transcription of the

---

21. In assigning these titles, editors attempt to replicate the way titles were given to texts in antiquity. For most pre-Qin texts, titles were given in one of three ways: the name of the author (whether real or putative), such as in the case of the *Laozi;* the first two words of the text (or the first two important words), such as in the case of the *Zi yi;* or a general description of the main theme of the text, such as in the case of the *Wu xing* 五行 or *The Five Deportments*.

22. This is the title assigned to the text by the editors of *Guodian Chu mu zhu jian* based on the first characters of what they have placed as the first strip. The editors do not suggest any interpretation of these characters, though Liao Mingchun 廖名春, "Jingmen Guodian Chu jian yu xian Qin Ru xue" 荊門郭店楚簡與先秦儒學, *Zhongguo zhexue* 中國哲學 20 (1999): 54, interprets Cheng 成 as the name of Confucius's disciple Xian Cheng 縣成. However, it seems clear that this strip has been misplaced, and that it should perhaps follow after what the editors have numbered as strip 30; for this suggestion, see Guo Yi 郭沂, "Guodian Chu jian Cheng zhi wen zhi pian shuzheng" 郭店楚簡成之聞之篇疏證, *Zhongguo zhexue* 20 (1999): 281. If the bamboo strips comprising the text are to be rearranged in this way, then the rationale for this title becomes moot. Other titles that have been proposed for it include *Qiu ji* 求己 or *Seeking in the Self;* Liao Mingchun, "Jingmen Guodian Chu jian yu xian Qin Ru xue," 52, and *Tian jiang da chang* 天降大常 or *Heaven Sends down the Great Constant;* Guo Yi, "Guodian Chu jian Cheng zhi wen zhi pian shuzheng," 279.

23. As noted above (p. 12), another version of this hitherto unknown text was discovered among the Shanghai Museum texts, the editors there assigning it the title *Xing qing lun* 性情論 or *Essay on the Inborn-Nature and the Emotions*.

individual characters, in this case written in what is referred to as Chu 楚-script, after the southern state near the capital of which the texts were discovered; and the determination of the sequence of the strips within individual texts. In both of these steps questions of editorial judgment come very much into play, and consequently they are the steps in which errors are most likely to occur. It is these two steps with which we will be primarily concerned below.

In the case of the Guodian manuscripts, the editorial team responsible for the formal publication had the advantage of one final step. Publication was undertaken by the prestigious Wenwu 文物 (Cultural Relics) Press of Beijing. Before producing the final copy, Wenwu Press sent the draft of the transcription and notes to Qiu Xigui 裘錫圭, professor of Chinese at Peking University and universally acclaimed to be the finest paleographer in China, for his comments and corrections. Many of Qiu's suggestions were apparently silently introduced into the final draft; others, which the editorial team either did not accept or which were meant only as a supplementary opinion, were entered into the notes supporting the published transcription.

The formal publication, though not without its flaws, as we will see, is of extraordinarily high quality. It includes full-size photographs of the original strips, a transcription, and notes. The photographs are for the most part remarkably clear. The transcriptions adhere rigorously to a format that has become conventional in formal publications of paleographic materials in China. They are in vertical columns; although these columns do not replicate the strips of the manuscripts, strip numbers are indicated with a small Chinese number after and slightly to the right of the last character on a strip. When a character can be transcribed unproblematically into a modern equivalent, then that modern equivalent is given (usually in standard [i.e., *fanti* 繁體] rather than simplified [*jianti* 簡體] characters, unless the character in the manuscript is directly equivalent to the simplified form, as for example is 弃, i.e., *qi* "to discard" [the standard form of which is 棄] of strip 1 of the *Laozi* A manuscript). When one character is used in the text but context suggests that another character would conventionally be used in standard Chinese orthography (what is usually referred to as a loan word), the original character is given followed by the conventional character in parentheses immediately after it, as for example 智 (知) or 覙 (盜), both again on strip 1 of the *Laozi* A manuscript. Less often, when an original character is regarded as a mistake for another character, the original character is followed by the "correct" character written inside brackets (〈〉), as for example the 季, conventionally read as *ji* "last, youngest," which the editors instead identify as the graphically similar *xiao* 孝 "filial."[24] In some cases, the identification is more involved. For instance, in the *Wu xing* text,

---

24. For discussion of this identification, see, below, p. 24 n. 41.

the graph 東 (used to represent the word *dong* "east," in conventional script) appears four times (on strips 37, 38, 39, and 40) in contexts where a parallel in the same text (strip 22) uses the graphically similar 柬 (*jian* "invitation"), and where in the Mawangdui version of the same text is found 簡 (*jian* "simple"). It is clear here that *jian* "simple" is the word that was intended and that 東 is a graphic error for the phonetic loan 柬. In this case, the transcription accounts for both steps of this identification: 東〈柬 (簡)〉.

These identifications are often routine amd quite unexceptional, as for example understanding *zhi* 知 "to know" for the manuscripts' 智 , which in conventional script usually represents *zhi* "knowledge, wisdom," or the numerous cases of understanding *you* 有 "to have" for the manuscripts' 又, conventionally used for *you* "again." However, there are other identifications, often but by no means always substantiated in the notes, that are more problematic. Some of these will be discussed in detail below. There is one philosophy of transcription that regards all such identifications as inappropriate in a transcription.[25] But the Chinese editorial practice is one of long standing, and is quite systematic in its application; photographs of the original strips are always available to adjudicate different readings.

Characters that cannot be identified with any modern equivalent are given directly, either in a transcribed version of the components of which they are composed (as for example 雀 in the first strip of the *Tang Yu zhi dao* manuscript, which the editors do not identify with any conventional character but suggest means "to yield, to abdicate"), or simply drawn as they appear on the original strip (as for example 訧 in the first strip of *Qiong da yi shi,* which Qiu Xigui suspects should be identified as *cha* 察 "to examine"). Lacunae in the text are indicated by square boxes (□); if a character is partially visible, it is written inside such a square box, as for example 困 on strip 26 of the *Laozi* A manuscript. When it is possible to restore the text in the lacuna (whether from parallels with other copies of the text or from internal parallels), this text is provided in the notes. The Guodian transcriptions also display most, but not

---

25. This position has been stated forcefully by William G. Boltz with respect to the Guodian manuscripts: "Manuscripts should be transcribed to reveal the exact form of what is written as precisely and unambiguously as possible without introducing any interpolations, alterations or other extraneous material based on assumptions, biases or subjective decisions of the scholar-transcriber or of anyone else. In a nutshell, this means that the transcription should reflect exactly what is written and nothing more"; "The Study of Early Chinese Manuscripts: Methodological Preliminaries," in *The Guodian* Laozi, 39–40. Li Ling 李零 has explicitly countered this view, stating that the conventions used in modern published transcriptions are nothing more than a rationalization of traditional Chinese "reading practice" (*du fa* 讀法); "Guodian Chu jian yanjiu zhong de liangge wenti: Meiguo Damusi xueyuan Guodian Chu jian Laozi guoji xueshu taolunhui ganxiang" 郭店楚簡研究中的兩個問題: 美國達慕思學院郭店楚簡老子國際學術討論會感想, in *Guodian Chu jian Guoji xueshu yantaohui lunwenji,* 49–50.

all, of the non-character marks found on the original bamboo strips; these apparently indicated different sorts of punctuation.[26] Finally, the transcriptions also introduce, systematically, such modern punctuation marks as commas, periods, colons, semicolons, quotation marks (in the Chinese style, i.e., 『』), and indications of book titles (again in the Chinese style, 《》); these, of course, derive from the editors' interpretation of the text.

The notes are entirely technical in nature, substantiating problematic transcriptions, indicating parallel passages from which lacunae have been filled or which present alternative readings, and identifying quotations. As mentioned above, the notes to *Guodian Chu mu zhu jian* also contain Qiu Xigui's suggestions, explicitly marked "According to Qiu" (Qiu *an* 裘按).

The foregoing description of the *zhengli* process that went into the making of *Guodian Chu mu zhu jian* should give some idea as to the favorable circumstances and the truly exceptional publication results that were achieved in less than five years from the date of the Guodian tomb's excavation. The Shanghai Museum strips have been presented, if possible, even more beautifully. Entitled *Shanghai bowuguan cang Zhanguo Chu zhu shu* 上海博物館藏戰國楚竹書 or *Warring States Chu Bamboo Texts Housed at the Shanghai Museum,* the volumes contain not only full-size full-color photographs of all of the original strips, but also provide photographs of important corroborating strips mentioned in the extensive notes to the transcriptions. Nevertheless, in the few short years since the publication of the Guodian strips in 1998, and the first volume of the Shanghai Museum strips at the end of 2001, faults have been found even with these excellent editions. In the following sections, I will consider various types of problems that have been the subject of debate.

DIFFERENCES IN TRANSCRIPTION

The reading of any text begins with the word, and the editing of the bamboo-strip texts begins with the transcription of the individual graphs from the Chu script of the fourth century BC into the standardized Chinese script of today. As mentioned in passing above, many of these transcriptions are unproblematic, others require one or more steps of interpretation, while still others are the subject of very different interpretations. One of the most celebrated recent debates over the transcription of a character concerns the first character in the Shanghai Museum text that the editors have entitled *Kongzi Shi lun.* Ma

---

26. For a succinct survey of these marks, see Peng Hao, "Post-Excavation Work on the Guodian Bamboo-Slip *Laozi*," 34–36. For a systematic survey of punctuation marks, primarily based upon excavated manuscripts, see Guan Xihua 管錫華, *Zhongguo gudai biaodian fuhao fazhan shi* 中國古代標點符號發展史 (Chengdu: Ba Shu shushe, 2002).

Chengyuan 馬承源, the Director Emeritus of the Shanghai Museum and the primary editor of this text, first presented it publicly at a scholarly conference held at Peking University on 19 August 2000. In the course of his presentation, Ma showed slides of each of the strips of the text, including especially that which he and almost all other scholars identify as the opening of the text. According to this sequence, the text begins with the character 𡥚, which Ma suggested should be read as 孔子 "Kongzi" or "Confucius." The = in the bottom right quadrant of the character 𡥚 is a standard symbol in early Chinese writing, indicating either that the character, or some portion of it, should be read twice (and thus known as a *chongwen hao* 重文號 or duplicating mark) or that two characters have been written together as one (known as a *hewen* 合文 or compound character). According to Ma's interpretation, the character 𡥚 can be transcribed as 孔, and the = symbol indicates that the 子 of 孔 should be read twice, giving 孔子 or "Confucius." When Ma finished his presentation, Qiu Xigui, who was in the audience, questioned Ma's reading, and suggested instead that the element 卜 in the upper-righthand quadrant of the graph 𡥚 should be transcribed as the modern character *bu* 卜, and that the = in the lower righthand quadrant indicates that this is a compound character, combining 卜 and 子, to be read as 卜子, "Buzi," apparently a reference to Bu Shang 卜商, better known as Zi Xia 子夏 (b. 507 BC). Zi Xia was the disciple of Confucius most acknowledged for his mastery of the *Shi* or *Poetry* and the reputed author of the *Shi Da xu* 詩大序 or *Great Preface to the Poetry,* to which the *Kongzi Shi lun,* or *Buzi Shi lun* 卜子詩論 if Qiu were right, has more than a passing affinity. Qiu's suggestion was immediately seconded by Li Xueqin 李學勤, modern China's second great paleographer, who adduced evidence that the character *bu* 卜 was indeed written 卜 in Warring States script, at least as an element in complex characters.[27]

　　Shortly after this conference, Li Ling 李零, the third of the great contemporary Chinese paleographers and the only one who had been involved in the editing of the Shanghai Museum bamboo strips, said that he too had thought of the possibility of reading 𡥚 as Buzi 卜子, but had ultimately rejected it because of other evidence still to be revealed among the Museum's manuscripts.[28] Nevertheless, the authority of Qiu Xigui and Li Xueqin was persuasive to many. For the next year, prior to the publication of the first volume of *Shanghai bowu-*

---

27. For a full account of this debate, see Pu Maozuo 濮茅左, "Guanyu Shanghai Zhanguo zhu jian zhong 'Kongzi' de rending: Lun *Kongzi Shi lun* zhong hewen shi 'Kongzi' er fei 'Buzi' 'Zi Shang'" 關於上海戰國竹簡中孔子的認定: 論孔子詩論中合文是孔子而非卜子子上, *Zhonghua wenshi luncong* 中華文史論叢 67 (2001.3): 13–14.

28. Li Ling, "Canjia xin chu jian bo Guoji xueshu taolunhui de jidian ganxiang" 參加新出簡帛國際學術討論會的幾點感想, originally published at http://www.jianbo.org/Wssf/Liling3-01.htm, date 16 November 2000.

guan cang Zhanguo Chu zhu shu, the volume containing the text in question, most scholars in Beijing tended to refer to the text in question simply as *Shi lun* 詩論 or *Essay on the Poetry,* implying thereby that they did not accept Ma Chengyuan's transcription of the first character or his identification of the text with Confucius. The air went out of the debate in December 2001, when that first volume of manuscripts was formally published. In a note substantiating his transcription as 孔子, Ma Chengyuan published the following passage from a related text referred to as *Lu bang da han* 魯邦大旱 or *The Country of Lu's Great Drought.*

> 魯邦大旱，哀公謂🀄：子不爲我圖之？🀄答曰：邦大旱，毋乃失諸刑與禮乎？⋯出遇子貢曰：賜，爾聞巷路之言，毋乃謂丘之答非歟？

> There was a great drought in the country of Lu. Ai Gong said to 🀄:: "Sir, will you not help us with it?" 🀄 answered saying: "When the country has a great drought, is it not a matter of being deficient with respect to punishment and ritual?" . . . He exited and encountered Zi Gong, saying: "Ci, you have heard the talk of the lanes and the streets; are there those who say that Qiu's answer was wrong?"

This text was written in the same calligraphy as the *Kongzi Shi lun,* and was apparently originally bound together with it. It includes the same character 🀄 read by Ma as "Kongzi" (i.e., Confucius) and that Qiu and Li had read as 卜子 or Buzi. But here 🀄 goes on to refer to himself by the personal name Qiu 丘, which was the personal name of Confucius. The debate over this character ended,[29] and most scholars are now content to refer to the text as *Kongzi Shi lun.*

---

29. At least the debate was resolved. The final word may have been that of Pu Maozuo 濮茅左, another senior paleographer at the Shanghai Museum. He separately published a lengthy article (cited above, n. 27) proving beyond any doubt both that the graph in question should be read as "Kongzi" and that "Buzi" would be an anachronistic reading. First, he adduced considerable evidence to show that the element 卜 in the top righthand quadrant of the character ought not be read as the modern character 卜 at all. Rather, it is a slightly deformed version of 人. Indeed, in other Shanghai Museum manuscripts, Kongzi is written as 🀄. This reading is confirmed by the Song-dynasty *Guwen si sheng yun* 古文四聲韻, in which under the entry for Kong 孔, there is the notation that it was anciently written 孔; see Guo Zhongshu 郭忠恕, *Han jian / Guwen si sheng yun* 汗簡/古文四聲韻 (rpt. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983), 3a (p. 36). Second, he also demonstrated that there is no evidence in any pre-Qin texts that Bu Shang or Zi Xia was ever called Buzi (there is one ambiguous reference to him in the *Lü shi chunqiu* 呂氏春秋 (Sibu beiyao ed. ["Cha xian" 察賢], 21.3b) as Bu Zi Xia 卜子夏, but as Pu notes the "Zi" 子 here is certainly attached to the "Xia" 夏 [i.e., Zi Xia] and not to the "Bu" 卜). Indeed, it was not until the Ming dynasty, in the ninth year of the Jiajing 嘉靖 reign era (i.e., 1530), that he was posthumously awarded the honorific title "Xian xian Buzi" 先賢卜子 or "Prior Worthy Buzi."

Not all of the questions about the transcription of the *Kongzi Shi lun* have been, or can be, resolved so easily. The next three phrases in the text, the first words that Confucius is quoted as saying, each contain another character the transcription of which has engendered perhaps even more debate and has proved much more intractable. The phrases in question read: *shi wang* 隱 *zhi* 詩亡隱志, *yue wang* 隱 *qing* 樂亡隱情, and *wen wang* 隱 *yan* 文亡隱言. The first of these phrases immediately calls to mind the famous formulations "*shi yan zhi*" 詩言志 "poetry gives voice to the will,"[30] or "*shi zhi zhi suo zhi ye*" 詩志之所至也 "poetry is that at which the will arrives,"[31] but apparently does so in a negative fashion; thus, "poetry does not 隱 the will." In the formal publication of the text, Ma Chengyuan transcribes the word 隱 as *lin* 婪 (archaic *mrjəns),[32] an elaborated form of *lin* 吝 "to begrudge," but reads it as a phonetic loan for *li*/*rjəj 離 "to depart"; thus, "poetry ought not depart from the will," "music ought not depart from the emotions," and "eloquence ought not depart from the words."[33] This reading has met with little acceptance. Both Li Xueqin and Pang Pu 龐樸, a senior scholar at the Institute of Philosophy, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, and director of the web site dedicated to bamboo and silk-manuscript texts (http://www.bamboosilk.org), have argued that the archaic pronunciation of *li* 離 was too different from that of *lin* 吝, which they agree is the correct transcription of the graph written in the manuscript, to be a possible phonetic loan. Instead, they have proposed another phonetic loan, with *yin*/*ʔjəm 隱 "shady"; thus, "poetry does not shade (i.e., obstruct) the will," "music does not shade the emotions," and "eloquence does not shade the words." Others have suggested other possible phonetic loans: *min*/*mjiən 泯 "to destroy" [34]; *ling*/*rjən 陵 "to surpass";[35] *men*/*mərjənʔ 悶 "pent-up";[36] and *lian*/*rin 憐 "to pity."[37] As both Li Ling and Rao Zongyi 饒宗頤 have pointed

---

30. The *locus classicus* of this much quoted formulation is the "Shun dian" 舜典 chapter of the *Shang shu* 尚書; *Shang shu Kong zhuan* 尚書孔傳 (Sibu beiyao ed.), 1.9b.

31. This is the famous opening of the *Shi Xu* 詩序 or *Great Preface to the Poetry*. The *Preface* continues: "*Zai xin wei zhi, fa yan wei shi*" 在心為志，發言為詩, "In the heart it is the will; expressed in words it is poetry"; *Mao Shi Zheng jian* 毛詩鄭箋 (Sibu beiyao ed.), 1.1a.

32. Reconstructions of ancient pronunciations, marked with *, are as given in Axel Schuessler, *A Dictionary of Early Zhou Chinese* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1987).

33. *Shanghai bowuguan cang Zhanguo Chu zhushu*, vol. 1, 125–26.

34. Qiu Dexiu 邱德修, "*Shang bo jian* (yi) 'Shi wang lin zhi' kao" 上博簡一詩亡隱志考, in *Shang bo guan Zhanguo Chu zhushu yanjiu*, 298.

35. He Linyi 何琳儀, "Hu jian *Shi lun* xuan shi" 滬簡詩論選釋, in *Shang bo guan Zhanguo Chu zhushu yanjiu*, 244.

36. Li Rui 李銳, "Du Shang bo Chu jian zha ji" 讀上博楚簡劄記, in *Shang bo guan Zhanguo Chu zhushu yanjiu*, 398.

37. Li Ling, "Shang bo Chu jian jiaodu ji," 7–8, points out this loan, though in the end he suggests that the direct reading of *lin* is smoother.

out,[38] while all of these proposed phonetic loans make reasonable sense of the phrases, none of them would seem to be preferable to reading the graph directly as the word *lin* 吝, which means something like "to begrudge" or "to withhold." One of the Guodian texts, *Qiong da yi shi* or *Failure and Success are Based on Timeliness*, uses the same character in a context familiar from the opening lines of the *Lunyu* 論語 or *Assayed Sayings* (i.e., *Analects*) of Confucius: "*mo zhi zhi er bu lin*" 莫之知而不吝, "no one knows him and yet he does not begrudge it." In the context of the *Kongzi Shi lun* quotation of Confucius's opening remarks, this would give "Poetry does not begrudge the will," "music does not begrudge the emotions," and "eloquence does not begrudge the words." Perhaps this is not so very different from the sense obtained from most of the phonetic loan suggestions. It seems that everyone knows more or less what the quotation must mean, but each different reading imparts a slightly different nuance. Unlike the case of reading 𡥈 as "Kongzi" or as "Buzi" discussed above, here it is very difficult to say which, if any, of these nuances is "correct." Perhaps all, or at least most, of these nuances were pregnantly intended by the original graph 隱, and the best transcription is the one that does the least, in this case leaving the graph in its manuscript form.

Li Ling has pointed out, however, that this alternative was not necessarily available to earlier editors of ancient manuscripts, such as Liu Xiang 劉向 (79–8 BC) and his son Liu Xin 劉歆 (53 BC–AD 23), whose work in organizing the texts in the Han imperial library was discussed in the Preface. They had to choose one reading or another, and their choices necessarily excluded other possible readings.

> The ancient books that we read all derive from the Han dynasty, and especially the Eastern Han. The Eastern Han texts of the classics were conflations of texts that were in modern script (*jin wen* 今文) with those that were in ancient script (*gu wen* 古文). However, regardless of whether the source text had been in modern or ancient script, the recension invariably used modern script, which is to say the Han-period clerical script (*lishu* 隸書) that derived from Qin script. The editors' standard practices were far removed from the forms of the ancient texts, but they did not have available the sort of parenthetical notations that we now have, so no matter how the source text may have read and no matter how many different versions they drew from, what they have transmitted to the present is in all cases a direct conflation and direct revision.[39]

A possible error in the transcription of the Guodian *Laozi* manuscripts

---

38. Li Ling, "Shang bo Chu jian jiaodu ji," 8; Rao Zongyi, "Zhushu *Shi Xu* xiao jian" 竹書詩序小箋, in *Shang bo guan Zhanguo Chu zhushu yanjiu,* 228.

39. Li Ling, "Guodian Chu jian yanjiu zhong de liangge wenti," 50.

transcription, pointed out by Qiu Xigui himself after the publication of *Guodian Chu mu zhu jian*, provides a good illustration of the problem that editors of manuscripts, both ancient and modern, faced and face. The third sentence of what has been designated the first of the Guodian *Laozi* manuscripts (or Guodian *Laozi* A) has already been much discussed by scholars interested in intellectual history because it seems to mute explicit criticism of some of the core tenets of Confucius's thought that is found in the received text of the *Laozi*. The parallel passage in chapter 19 of the received text counsels doing away with "humaneness" (*ren* 仁) and "propriety" (*yi* 義), saying that doing so will have the effect that the people will return to "filial piety" (*xiao* 孝) and "parental love" (*ci* 慈).

> 絕仁棄義，民復孝慈。

> Cut off humaneness and discard propriety, and the people will return to filial piety and parental love.

The Guodian text, on the other hand, reads:

> 絕𢝔弃慮, 民復季子,

which the critical edition published in *The Guodian* Laozi, explicitly following the interpretation of Qiu Xigui, interprets as:

> 絕偽棄詐, 民復孝慈

> Cut off artifice and discard deceit, and the people will return to filial piety and parental love.[40]

Much of the discussion, and also Qiu's correction, has focused on the character 慮, and this certainly does present an interesting problem in transcription. In addition, we will see that there is also another important problem in just the first half of this sentence.[41]

---

40. *The Guodian* Laozi, 195.

41. There is also an interesting problem in the second phrase of the sentence, the variorum between the *jizi* 季子 of the manuscript and the *xiao ci* 孝慈 of the received text. Most scholars have assumed that *ji* 季 is a graphic error for *xiao* 孝, and that *zi*/*tsjəʔ 子 is a phonetic loan for *ci*/*tsjə 慈, such that the reading of the received text is "correct" here; see, for instance, Gao Ming, "Some Observations concerning the Transcription and Punctuation of the Guodian *Laozi*," in *The Guodian* Laozi, 66. This was the original reading of both *Guodian Chu mu zhu jian* (p. 111) and also of *The Guodian* Laozi "Edition" (p. 195). However, in the same discussion of this sentence where he discussed the graph 慮 (for which, see, below, n. 45), Qiu Xigui has also suggested that *jizi* understood as "infant" is also a possible reading of the manuscript. There seems to be no conclusive evidence on which to decide between the two readings.

In his note in *Guodian Chu mu zhu jian*, Qiu had suggested that 慮 be read as a word having the signific 心 "heart" and the phonetic *qie*/*tshjaʔ 且, that is, 悬, which he further suggested was a phonetic loan for *zha*/*tsrakh 乍.[42] Since the heart and language (言) significs are frequently interchangeable in the script of ancient manuscripts, from this it is a simple step to arrive at a word such as *zha* 詐 "deceit, treachery," which was Qiu's original suggestion. This suggestion was criticized immediately after the publication of *Guodian Chu mu zhu jian* for at least two reasons. First, Pang Pu argued that it is philosophically trite to say "cut off artifice and cast away deceit, and the people will return to filial piety and parental love," and is in any event antithetical to what we know of the thought of the *Laozi*.[43] Also voicing criticism was Xu Kangsheng 許抗生, professor of philosophy at Peking University, who found in the "Tai Jia xia" 太甲下 chapter of the *Shu jing* 書經 or *Classic of Documents* an explicit contrast between *wei* 爲 "to do," and *lü* 慮 "to deliberate," similar to that which would obtain here if 慮 were transcribed as the graphically similar *lü* 慮 rather than as *zha* (or any of its derivatives): *fu lü hu huo, fu wei hu cheng* 弗慮胡獲, 弗爲胡成 "not deliberating about it how can one gain; not acting on it how can one succeed?"[44] In his contribution entitled "Jiuzheng wo zai Guodian *Laozi* jian shidu zhong de yige cuowu" 糾正我在郭店老子簡釋讀中的一個錯誤 or "Correcting a Mistake I Made in Reading the Guodian *Laozi*," presented to the International Conference on the Guodian Chu Strips held in Wuhan 武漢, Hubei, in October 1999, Qiu accepted these suggestions, but only after exploring the issue more thoroughly than either Pang Pu or Xu Kangsheng had done.[45] Examining all cases of the graph that occur in the Guodian strips, he concluded that the character must indeed be 慮, which could suggest such phonetic loans as *zha* 詐 "deceit," *ju*/*tshjaʔ 怚 "arrogance," or *ju* or *zha*/*tshjaʔ 媎 "pride." Nevertheless, he also noted that there are cases in the manuscripts where 膚 and 盧, when used as components of other characters, are written interchangeably, and also that in other Warring States manuscripts *lü* 慮 is sometimes written with an "eye" (目) signific with a line under it (*viz.* 慮), even more similar to 慮. Thus, it is not impossible, and perhaps likely, that the manuscript's copyist had here mistakenly written 慮 for *lü* 慮 "to deliberate."

---

42. *Guodian Chu mu zhu jian,* 113, n. 3. This was apparently one of Qiu's suggestions that the editors of *Guodian Chu mu zhujian* did not incorporate into their transcription, which simply presents a literal transcription of the character as found in the manuscript.

43. Pang Pu, "Gu mu xin zhi: Man du Guodian Chu jian" 古墓新知──漫讀郭店楚簡, *Zhongguo zhexue* 中國哲學 20 (1999): 11.

44. Xu Kangsheng, "Chu du Guodian zhu jian *Laozi*" 初讀郭店竹簡老子, *Zhongguo zhexue* 中國哲學 20 (1999): 102, n. 1; for the *Shu* quotation, see *Shang shu Kong zhuan* 尚書孔傳 (Sibu beiyao ed.), 4.10a.

45. Qiu Xigui, "Jiuzheng wo zai Guodian *Laozi* jian shidu zhong de yige cuowu," *Guodian Chu jian Guoji xueshu yantaohui lunwenji,* 25–30.

To decide if such a mistake had indeed been made, Qiu said that "it is necessary to consider fully the context."

By "context" here, Qiu means the contrast with 爲 in the first half of the phrase. Although the parallel adduced by Xu Kangsheng was from an "ancient text" (*guwen* 古文) chapter of the *Shu jing,* and therefore suspect,[46] Qiu found several other texts in which *lü* "to deliberate" is paired with *wei* 爲 "to do," including the following from the "Yuan dao" 原道 chapter of the *Huainanzi* 淮南子: "*bu lü er de, bu wei er cheng*" 不慮而得, 不爲而成 "to obtain without deliberation, to succeed without acting."[47] From all of this, Qiu concluded that *lü* 慮 "deliberation, mentation" should be the preferred reading here, even though it was slightly miswritten on the manuscript.

The contrast with 爲 also led Qiu to discuss further the correct reading of this character. He noted that the verb *wei* 爲, "to act, to do," is used numerous times throughout the Guodian manuscripts and, in that sense, is never written with a heart signific (心). Therefore, he suggested, when it is written with such a signific, as it is here, that signific should be significant. This led him to conclude in this case that the character should be read as *wei* 僞 "artifice." He noted in passing that Pang Pu had argued against this reading of his as well, proposing instead that the 爲 portion of the character does mean something like "activity," but that the heart signific specifies this as emotional activity as opposed to physical activity. Qiu simply dismissed this suggestion as being a bit "abstruse" (*xuan* 玄). However, in his refusal to consider this possibility, it seems to me that Qiu has made the sort of mistake that appears from time to time in traditional texts. Since modern Chinese script does not have a character such as 爲 or 僞, Qiu considered as possible transcriptions for 爲 only the conventional characters 爲 or 僞. As Li Ling pointed out with respect to the Han and Jin editors, in this case, at least, so too does Qiu's "recension invariably use modern script" to transcribe the ancient script of the manuscript. By doing so, it seems to me that he unnecessarily limits the range of nuances that may have been available to the Warring States author or editor of the manuscript.

In his contribution to the same conference at which Qiu was discussing Pang Pu's reading of 爲 as referring to emotional activity, Pang Pu himself presented a systematic examination of characters in the Guodian manuscripts containing heart significs that would be anomalous in later conventional script.[48] For instance, Pang pointed to the differentiation in conventional

---

46. The demonstration of the spurious nature of the "ancient text" chapters of the *Shu jing* is generally regarded as the crowning success of Qing-dynasty textual criticism. We will have occasion to see below (pp. 55–58) that the Guodian manuscripts seem to provide evidence corroborating this conclusion.

47. *Huainanzi* 淮南子 (Sibu beiyao ed.), 1.7a.

48. Pang Pu, "Ying Yan shu shuo: Guodian Chu jian Zhongshan san qi xin pang wenzi shi

orthography between the two words *wang* 忘 "to forget" and *wang* 迡, for which there is at least one definition as "to flee, abscond." Both of these words obviously derive from the same root, *wang* 亡, "to perish; not to exist," but the significs of the two characters specify different parameters of meaning: The heart signific, 心, indicates mental or emotional activity, thus the disappearance of a thought (i.e., "to forget"), while the locomotion signific, 辶, indicates physical movement, and thus the disappearance of a person by running away (i.e., "to flee"). This would seem to be elementary Chinese etymology. But the next example introduced by Pang complicates the issue somewhat. In the phrase "*junzi dun yu* 忎 *ji*" 君子惇于忎己 "the gentleman is sincere in 忎 himself" of the Guodian text *Qiong da yi shi*, the character 忎 would seem to present a similar situation. It is clear that 忎 derives from the root word *fan* 反 "to turn back," but while there is a word *fan* 返 "to return" that specifies the physical motion of "turning back," there is no corresponding character in conventional Chinese script that specifies the emotional activity of "turning back," such as "retrospection," which however the context here would seem to require (viz., "the noble man is sincere in turning back to himself"). As Pang Pu suggests, the proper transcription here would surely be a direct transcription of both the 反 and 心 elements of the graph (i.e., 忎 or 忛), both of which are essential to the correct understanding of the word intended.

By forcing the script of the Warring States period to correspond to the script of the Han and later, is it not possible that we lose some of the nuance of the original? Consider the following passage from the "Zheng ming" 正名 or "Rectification of Names" chapter of the *Xunzi* 荀子, a received text that was edited by Liu Xiang at the end of the Western Han dynasty:[49]

> 不事而自然謂之性。性之好惡喜怒哀樂謂之情。情然而心爲之擇謂之慮。心慮而能爲之謂之僞。慮積焉，能習焉而後成謂之僞。

> What is not put into service but is so of itself is called the nature. The nature's loving or hating, being delighted or being angered, being sad or being amused are called the emotions. The emotions being so and the heart making a choice is called deliberation. The heart deliberating and one's capacity acting on it is called *artifice*. When one succeeds only after deliberations are accumulated with respect to it and one's capacity is practiced with respect to it, this is called *artifice*.

The repetition of *wei* 僞, "artifice," in the last two sentences suggests that

---

shuo" 郎燕書說: 郭店楚簡中山三器心旁文字試說, in *Guodian Chu jian guoji xueshu yantaohui lunwenji*, 37–42.

49. *Xunzi* (Sibu beiyao ed.), 16.1b.

something has gone wrong with this carefully argued text.[50] Pointing to another Guodian manuscript, *Xing zi ming chu*, Pang Pu suggests how the *Xunzi* passage can be restored to a more logical original.

> 身欲靜而毋訑，慮欲淵而毋僞。

> For the body to be calm, don't snarl; for the deliberations to be profound don't be emotionally active.

As is probably the case in the Guodian *Laozi* A manuscript, there is a contrast here between *lü* 慮 "deliberation," and 僞, which, as Pang argues, seems surely to mean "emotional activity" here as well. Since *lü* "deliberation" is the topic of the fourth sentence of the *Xunzi* chain of definitions, it is likely, as Pang Pu concludes, that the *wei* 偽 "artifice" at the end of the sentence was originally written 僞 "emotional activity," such that the sentence should read something like "the heart deliberating and one's capacity acting on it is called *emotional activity*." The internal redundancy and contradiction of the last two definitions of the *Xunzi* are doubtless due to the disappearance of the word 僞 "emotional activity," from the language and script of the Han dynasty. Faced with a manuscript that probably read 僞, but without a corresponding character in the modern script into which he was transcribing the definitive edition, Liu Xiang made the same choice that Qiu Xigui would make two thousand years later: to preserve a specialized sense of the root word, in this case *wei* 爲 "to do, to act," by writing it with a character with a special signific, but silently changing the signific from "heart" to "man." As Li Ling pointed out in the passage quoted above, Liu Xiang did not have available an editorial apparatus with parentheses and colons that would allow him to show this change, and so ended up introducing ambiguity into a passage that might otherwise have illustrated just how rich early Chinese notions of emotional activity were.

The two cases examined above in the first phrase of the first chapter of the Guodian *Laozi* A manuscript present two different lessons for the reading of both manuscripts and received texts, lessons with important general implications for the development of writing in early China. In the first case, after an examination that probed from such different angles as phonetic loans, graphic appearance, linguistic parallels, and philosophical significance, the foremost contemporary Chinese paleographer has concluded that the manuscript's copyist miscopied a graph, simply turning one vertical stroke into a horizontal stroke, but in the process writing a completely different word, which entirely by

---

50. Wang Xianqian 王先謙, *Xunzi jijie* 荀子集解 (1891; rpt. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1988), 412, quotes various commentators and editors from the Tang dynasty through the mid-Qing dynasty who have discussed the confusion of the two words *wei* 偽 "artifice" and *wei* 爲 "to do, to act" in this passage.