Early China (2018) vol 41 pp 87–148
doi:10.1017/eac.2018.4

POETRY, "THE METAL-BOUND COFFER," AND THE DUKE OF ZHOU

Kuan-yun Huang*

Abstract

The two parts of this study concern the three extant versions of "The Metal-bound Coffer" ("Jin teng"): the two received texts in the *Book of Documents* and the *Grand Scribe's Records* and the newly recovered Warring States manuscript now at Tsinghua University in Beijing. The first part considers an uncontroversial detail shared by all three versions: the reference to a poem composed by the Duke of Zhou called "The Owl" ("Chixiao"). Cross-referencing "The Metal-bound Coffer" with a poem of the same title, now found in the *Book of Odes*, it is possible to explain not only the place of this poem in the overall narrative of "The Metal-bound Coffer," but also the considerations of the poem's two ancient commentators, Mao and Zheng Xuan. In the second part of the study, the discussion turns to the three versions of "The Metal-bound Coffer," looking in turn at three different passages. By positing a greater number of testimonies than the ones that happen to survive, I argue that a comparison of the extant versions reveals an effort by transmitters, commentators, and the re-teller Sima Qian to teach a single lesson: the Duke of Zhou occupied a subordinate place vis-à-vis the ruler, and must never undermine him in any way.

The story is well-known. Shortly after the founding of the Western Zhou, King Wu became critically ill. His younger brother, the Duke of Zhou, prayed to the ancestors, and without letting anyone know, offered to exchange his life for his brother's. This prayer was recorded and stored in the "metal-bound coffer," and King Wu miraculously recovered. Sometime thereafter, after King Wu passed away due to an

---

* Kuan-yun Huang, 黃冠雲, City University of Hong Kong; email: bce551@gmail.com.
Earlier versions of this article were presented between 2013 and 2017 at Hong Kong Baptist University, Feng Chia University, Yantai University, the Institute of Chinese Literature and Philosophy at Academia Sinica, Fudan University, and Shanghai Jiao Tong University. I am grateful to all those who were kind to offer me their comments. To my students at National Tsing Hua University, especially Chien Yü-heng 簡于恆, Mandy Sit 薛廸文, Yang Zihan 楊紫涵, and Wang Tzu-ying 王紫瑩, I owe many thanks for their thoughtful comments on several test runs. The final version has benefitted from the input of Sarah Allan, William Boltz, Nicholas Morrow Williams, and the anonymous reviewers.

© The Society for the Study of Early China and Cambridge University Press 2018

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

unrelated cause, the Duke of Zhou became regent to King Wu's young son, King Cheng, and rumors began to spread that he was going to usurp the throne. Although these rumors would eventually die down, particularly after the Zhou royalties who were responsible for circulating them in the first place had been captured and put to justice, they drove a rift between the young ruler and his regent. To explain himself to King Cheng, the Duke of Zhou composed a poem called "The Owl"; but the young ruler was unmoved. It was not until sometime later, during the harvest season, when an imminent storm threatened to destroy all the crops, that King Cheng went to the "metal-bound coffer" and discovered the prayer the Duke of Zhou had deposited. Realizing that the Duke of Zhou had been loyal all along, King Cheng admitted his mistake, the storm passed, and the crops were saved.

This famous story about the Duke of Zhou is recorded in three different versions: "Jin teng" 金縢 (The Metal-bound coffer) of the *Book of Documents*;[1] the opening section of the "Lu Zhougong shijia" 魯周公世家 (Hereditary household of the Duke of Zhou in the state of Lu) in the *Grand Scribe's Records* by Sima Qian 司馬遷 (c. 145–86 B.C.E.);[2] and a newly discovered manuscript, now at Tsinghua University in Beijing, which bears its own title: 周武王又（有）疾周公所自㠯（以）弋（代）王之志 (A record of how the Duke of Zhou offered himself to replace the king when King Wu of Zhou fell ill).[3] As three versions of the same basic

1. Li Xueqin 李學勤, ed., *Shangshu zhengyi* 尚書正義, traditional character edition (Beijing: Beijing daxue, 2000), 392–403. The commentaries that I consult regularly are Bernhard Karlgren, *Glosses on the Book of Documents* (Stockholm: Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities, 1970); Yang Yunru 楊筠如, *Shangshu hegu* 尚書覈詁 (Xi'an: Shanxi renmin, 2005), 224–36; and Cheng Yuanmin 程元敏, *Shangshu Zhoushu Mushi Hongfan Jinteng Lüxing pian yizheng* 尚書周書牧誓洪範金縢呂刑篇義證 (Taipei: Wanjuanlou, 2011), 129–285. Important previous translations include Bernhard Karlgren, *The Book of Documents* (Göteberg: Elanders, 1950), 35–6; and David S. Nivison, "Metal-bound Coffer," in *Sources of Chinese Tradition*, Vol. 1: *From Earliest times to 1600*, 2nd ed., ed. Wm. Theodore de Bary and Irene Bloom (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 32–5. The latter can be read together with Nivison's "A New Interpretation of the Jin Tvng," *Warring States Papers: Studies in Chinese and Comparative Philology* 1 (2010), 84–92.

2. Takigawa Kametarō 瀧川亀太郎 and Mizusawa Toshitada 水澤利忠, *Shiji huizhu kaozheng fu jiaobu* 史記會注考證附校補 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 1986), 33.1–18. See also the translation in William H. Nienhauser, Jr, ed., *The Grand Scribe's Records* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006), vol. 5.1, 131–40.

3. Li Xueqin, ed., *Qinghua daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian* 清華大學藏戰國竹簡 (Shanghai: Zhong Xi, 2010), vol. 1. Although the authenticity of this corpus is sometimes questioned, such doubt is not shared by the overwhelming majority of scholars who work on paleographical sources, and it can be put to rest by a simple observation: the back of the bamboo slips contain markings made by a sharp object, intended to facilitate the ordering of the slips. Such physical feature can be found in other provenanced Warring States manuscripts, but it was not known until pointed out by Sun

footnote continued on next page

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

text, the "Jin teng," "Lu Zhougong shijia," and the Tsinghua manuscript bear an unmistakable resemblance with one another, though there are also discrepancies in diction, syntax, scenario, and other details. While the date of the "Jin teng" is somewhat uncertain, the Tsinghua manuscript is written in the scripts of the Warring States and is generally dated by scholars to the late fourth century B.C.E., and the "Lu Zhougong shijia" is from the first century B.C.E. Thus these three testimonies are removed by several centuries from the events they describe, and they are valuable not so much for their documenting the beginning of the Western Zhou in the eleventh century B.C.E., as for their imaginative retelling of that glorious but tumultuous period, even the psychology of the protagonist who stands at the story's very center, the Duke of Zhou.

What I propose to do in the present study is to use the three versions of "The Metal-bound Coffer" and other related sources to explore the discourses about the Duke of Zhou from roughly the fourth century to the first century B.C.E. Such discourses involved several different parties. These include the transmitters whose imprints are reflected in the Tsinghua manuscript as well as several variant readings preserved in ancient commentaries, which must have been based on versions of "The Metal-bound Coffer" no longer extant; commentators such as Kong Anguo 孔安國 (c. 100 B.C.E.) for the *Documents*, and a scholar with the surname Mao 毛 (Warring States) and Zheng Xuan 鄭玄 (127–200 C.E.) for the *Book of Odes* (about whom I will have more to say below); and the re-teller Sima Qian. With intentions every bit as complex as an original

---

Peiyang 孫沛陽 in "Jian'ce bei huaxian chutan" 簡冊背劃線初探, *Chutu wenxian yu guwenzi yanjiu* 出土文獻與古文字研究 4 (2011): 449–62. It would not have been possible for a forger to anticipate Sun's finding and incise the markings before they were known to the scholarly world. For studies on the manuscript that also compare it with the other two versions, see the work by Cheng Yuanmin cited above in n.1; Chen Jian 陳劍, "Qinghua jian 'Jin teng' yandu santi" 清華簡《金縢》研讀三題, in idem, *Zhanguo zhushu lunji* 戰國竹書論集 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 2013), 404–33; and Feng Shengjun 馮勝君, "Qinghua jian 'Jin teng' ji Shi 'Binfeng' 'Chixiao' suo jian Zhouchu shishi zaiyi" 清華簡《金縢》及《詩・豳風・鴟鴞》所見周初史事再議, paper presented at the *Zhongguo jianboxue guoji luntan* 中國簡帛學國際論壇 at Wuhan University, October 10–11, 2017. The last item is especially noteworthy because it shares my own interest in the "Chixiao" 鴟鴞, and I am grateful to its author for providing me with a copy. Two studies in English are Dirk Meyer, "The Art of Narrative and the Rhetoric of Persuasion in the '*Jīn Téng' (Metal Bound Casket) from the Tsinghua Collection of Manuscripts," *Asiatische Studien/ Études asiatiques* 68.4 (2014), 937–68; and Magnus Ribbing Gren, "The Qinghua 'Jinteng' Manuscript: What it Does Not Tell Us about the Duke of Zhou," *T'oung Pao* 102.4–5 (2016): 291–320. Both articles are reprinted in Martin Kern and Dirk Meyer, eds., *Origins of Chinese Political Philosophy: Studies in the Composition and Thought of the Shangshu (Classic of Documents)* (Leiden: Brill, 2017), though I have not been able to consult this collected volume.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

author, these different parties wielded their ink brushes and imposed their understandings of the Duke of Zhou onto the texts that they left behind. Although the information currently available leaves much to be desired about the true identities of these individuals or the scholarly traditions behind them, a careful reading will reveal distinct positions that can be placed in a sequence and shown to be in dialogue with one another.[4] It was through their assertions that the image of the Duke of Zhou as a loyal and virtuous minister gradually came into being. By recognizing the constructed nature of this image, one can peel away the multiple layers, catch a glimpse of the man behind the verbiage, and become reacquainted with this most eminent of ancient sages, as if for the very first time.

I divide the study into two main parts. The first focuses on an uncontroversial detail shared by all three versions: the reference to a poem composed by the Duke of Zhou called "Chixiao" 鴟鴞 (The Owl).[5] Cross-referencing "The Metal-bound Coffer" with a poem of the same title, now found in the *Odes*, it is possible to explain not only the place of this poem in the overall narrative of "The Metal-bound Coffer," but also the considerations of the poem's two ancient commentators, Mao and Zheng Xuan, as they presented their interpretations. By understanding them in the intellectual context of the Warring States, Qin and Han, I will argue that Mao and Zheng belonged with a broader effort to defend the Duke of Zhou and emphasize his virtue of benevolence.

In the second part of the study, I turn to the three versions of "The Metal-bound Coffer," and provide a detailed analysis of three different passages. Here my approach is somewhat different from previous studies, and I should explain it in some detail.

It is customary for previous scholars comparing the three versions of "The Metal-bound Coffer"—indeed, any ancient text with multiple testimonies—to identify one as the most original, perhaps also to reconstruct the hypothetical ancestral text from which all extant versions are

4. In discussing these different parties, I prefer to put their dates aside for a moment and suspend any judgment regarding their relations with one another—except to point out that they all belong to roughly the same milieu. The fact is that ancient texts and commentaries were often accumulated over an extended period, and they were usually combined with sources hailing from different origins, whether this means different chronological layers, regional traditions, interpretative lineages, an author's own literary or philosophical idiosyncrasies, or what not. To be flexible on such matters is to assume a broader background behind any given piece of information, not necessarily visible to the modern eye.

5. The Tsinghua manuscript actually gives a slightly different title for the poem, but as I point out below, it still identifies the same bird.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

derived.[6] Thus, the scholar who is an expert on paleographical sources favors the Tsinghua manuscript, whereas one who is used to reading the *Documents* judges the received "Jin teng" to be best. What I propose to do is different. Following the assumption that there were broader discourses behind the three versions of "The Metal-bound Coffer," I begin by positing a much greater number of testimonies than the three which happen to survive, each with its own point of origin in time, space, scholarly tradition, and personal idiosyncrasies, each with its own unique history of transmission and reception. Rather than deciding which testimony is better than which—a most fruitless labor that immediately runs into the question of "better according to whom?"—it is much more interesting to ask about the dynamic relations among the three extant versions and the discourses underlying them. What does a text say relative to another text? What position does this statement represent vis-à-vis the broader discourses about the Duke of Zhou? And most importantly, does one's account of these relations present a hypothesis that can be tested against the rest of the literary record?

In practice, these considerations begin with a case-by-case examination of the discrepancies among the three testimonies. For each case, I provide an account of the relation among the three versions, regardless whether this relation is the same for one set of discrepancies as it would be for another. Thus, in one instance, I might argue that that it is version A that gave rise to the reading found in version B. In another, I might posit version C as the earliest to account for what appears in version A. Regardless how the sequence is shuffled, what is most crucial is the *dynamic force* behind each relation. If, upon close analysis, I discover that the reason for a relation to occur in one instance is the same as that for a relation in another instance, then the more frequently this reason is detected, the stronger my claim will be. It is also helpful to my claim if this particular reason can be correlated with evidence found elsewhere in the literary record, whether in content or form.[7] Both of these criteria

---

6. For previous discussions laying out the methodological issues involved in the examination of such variant readings, see William G. Boltz, *The Origin and Development of the Chinese Writing System*, 2nd ed. (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 2003), 156–77; idem, "Textual Criticism *more sinico*," *Early China* 20 (1995), 393–406; and idem, "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: The Society for the Study of Early China, 1997), 253–83.

7. For a valuable study that, in spite of its primarily historical interest, covers a large number of sources about the Duke of Zhou, see Hayashi Taisuke 林泰輔, *Shū Kō to sono jidai* 周公と其時代 (Tokyo: Ōkura Shoten, 1920), known to many readers through Qian Mu's 錢穆 partial translation as *Zhougong* 周公, in *Qian Binsi xiansheng quanji* 錢賓四先生全集 (Taibei: Lianjing, 1994), vol. 26, 1–118. See also Gu Jiegang 顧頡剛, "Zhougong

footnote continued on next page

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

provide checks against the possibility of the analysis becoming a kind of free-for-all where one is randomly choosing from the three versions one's most preferred readings. The result is a more nuanced understanding of the discourses or ancient traditions about the Duke of Zhou. It also presents an approach that can be attempted on other similar sets of texts and gradually modified and refined.

As I will show in my comparison of the three versions of "The Metal-bound Coffer," in their writing, rewriting, and reinterpreting of the text, transmitters, commentators, and the re-teller Sima Qian all converged to teach a single lesson: the Duke of Zhou occupied a subordinate place vis-à-vis the ruler, and must never undermine him in any way.

The Owl in the *Odes* and Other Ancient Literature

In all three versions of "The Metal-bound Coffer," there is reference to the Duke of Zhou's composition of the "Chixiao" as he attempts to allay King Cheng's suspicion. What is this poem about, and what does the Duke of Zhou wish to accomplish with it? None of the three versions say. Assuming that "Chixiao" is the poem of the same title now found in the *Book of Odes*, the earliest commentators Mao and Zheng Xuan match

---

dongzheng shishi kaozheng" 周公東征史事考證, in idem, *Gu Jiegang quanji* 顧頡剛全集 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 2010), vol. 11. More recent studies include Edward L. Shaughnessy, "Duke Zhou's Retirement in the East and the Beginnings of the Minister–Monarch Debate in Chinese Political Philosophy," in idem, *Before Confucius: Studies in the Creation of the Chinese Classics* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997), 101–36; Mark Edward Lewis, *Writing and Authority in Early China* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999), 209–18; Tamaki Shigetoshi 玉置重俊, "Shūkō tensetsu no keisei ni tsuite" 周公伝説の形成について, *Hokkaido jōhō daigaku kiyo* 北海道情報大学紀要 18.1 (2006), 77–89; and Michael Nylan, "The Many Faces of the Duke of Zhou," in *Statecraft and Classical Learning: The Rituals of Zhou in East Asian History*, ed. Benjamin A. Elman and Martin Kern (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 94–128. For useful summaries of traditional scholarships on various aspects related to the Duke of Zhou, see Benjamin A. Elman, "Ming Politics and Confucian Classicism: The Duke of Chou Serves King Ch'eng," in *Mingdai jingxue guoji yantaohui lunwenji* 明代經學國際研討會論文集, ed. Lin Qingzhang 林慶彰 and Jiang Qiuhua 蔣秋華 (Taipei: Institute of Chinese Literature and Philosophy, Academia Sinica, 1996), 93–143; Peng Meiling 彭美玲, "'Bin feng' chuantong Shishuo yu Zhougong xingxiang"《豳風》傳統《詩》說與周公形象, *Taida zhongwen xuebao* 臺大中文學報 40 (2013), 1–54; and Liu Guozhong 劉國忠, "Qinghuajian 'Jin teng' yu Zhougong ju dong de zhenxiang" 清華簡《金縢》與周公居東的真相, in idem, *Zuo jin Qinghua jian* 走近清華簡 (Beijing: Gaodeng jiaoyu, 2011), 93–108. See also Sarah Allan, *The Heir and the Sage: Dynastic Legend in Early China* (San Francisco: Chinese Materials Center, 1981), 118–21. Especially interesting is Allan's note that her teacher Peter A. Boodberg (1903–1972) "first pointed out to me the paradoxical position of the Duke of Zhou as both regent and potential usurper" (xiii).

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the content of the poem with the events described in "The Metal-bound Coffer," an interpretation that I will consider in some detail below. Before doing so, however, I would like to first conduct a quick survey of the owl in the *Odes* and other ancient literature. This will provide a basis for reading the "Chixiao" and understanding the thinking of its two ancient commentators.

The first to be considered is the "Zhan ang" 瞻卬 (Looking up), which concerns Bao Si 褒姒, the evil consort of King You of Zhou 周幽王 (r. 781–771 B.C.E.). In a line from this poem: 懿厥哲婦，為梟為鴟；婦有長舌，維厲之階 "Beautiful is the clever woman, but she is an owl; a woman with a long tongue, she is the steps to calamity," the owl is identified as a direct reference to Bao Si by Zheng Xuan. According to Zheng: 梟鴟，惡聲之鳥，喻褒姒之言無善 "*Xiaochi* is the bird of wicked sound and is a metaphor that there is nothing good in Bao Si's words."[8] And later he adds: 長舌喻多言語，是王降大厲之階 "The long tongue is a metaphor of her loquaciousness and is the king's steps for descending into great calamity." This explanation corresponds with what the poem goes on to say about Bao Si and her cronies: 鞫人忮忒，譖始竟背 "When they pick people to pieces, their slander is first entirely disregarded." Formally, although *wei xiao wei chi* 為梟為鴟 is not exactly the same as *chixiao*, *xiao* 梟, and *xiao* 鴞 have such similar pronunciations in Old Chinese that they are simply different ways of writing the same word.[9] After all, in several other poems of the *Odes*, Mao identifies *xiao* 鴞 as *e'sheng zhi niao* 惡聲之鳥 "the bird of wicked sound," a characterization that matches Zheng's explanation for *xiao* 梟 under the "Zhan ang." These are the "Mu men" 墓門 (The gate of the graveyard), "Pan shui" 泮水 (The Semi-circular water), and "Xiao bi" 小毖 (Small chastisement).[10] Thus, it should be

8. Li Xueqin, ed., *Maoshi zhengyi*, 1476–85. The translation is from Karlgren, *The Book of Odes: Chinese Text, Transcription and Translation* (Stockholm: The Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities, 1950), 236–38, with slight modifications.

9. Old Chinese reconstructions are based on William H. Baxter and Laurent Sagart, *Old Chinese: A New Reconstruction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014). The authors provide a list of reconstructed words online (http://ocbaxtersagart.lsait.lsa.umich.edu/, accessed March 1, 2017). Thus, *xiao* 鴞 is *[G]ʷ(r)aw, and *xiao* 梟 is not too different, since the sounds of the two words differ only in that one is division III in Middle Chinese, the other division IV.

10. See Li Xueqin, ed., *Maoshi zhengyi*, 524–27, 1642–54, 1587–91. In the last of these poems, a bird, *taochong* 桃蟲, is identified by Mao as *jiao* 鷦, though Zheng Xuan suggests that it is *xiao* 鴞, and once again, adds that it is *e'sheng zhi niao* "the bird of wicked sound." Interestingly, the commentator Kong Yingda 孔穎達 (574–648) cites the following commentary by Lu Ji 陸璣 (c. third century): 今鷦鷯是也，微小於黃雀，其雛化為雕，故俗語鷦鷯生雕 "Nowadays this is the *jiaoliao*; it is smaller than the Yellow Sparrow; its chick transforms into the *diao*, hence the common saying: *jiaoliao* gives birth to *diao*." See also Guo Pu's 郭璞 (276–324) gloss under the *Er ya* 爾雅 entry for *taochong* in

footnote continued on next page

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

clear that whether called *xiao* 鴞, *xiao* 梟, *chixiao* 鴟鴞 or *xiaochi* 梟鴟, the owl is interchangeable with slander or "wicked sound" in the literature of the Warring States, Qin, and Han.[11]

For example, in one of Xunzi's 荀子 (active third century B.C.E.) poetic expositions, there is a discussion that in time of political turmoil, the good and the bad are easily confused: 螭龍為蝘蜓，鴟梟為鳳皇 "Dragons have become chameleons and geckos; owls have become phoenixes." This is immediately preceded by the statement: 道德純備，讒口將將；仁人絀約，敖暴擅彊 "Against those in whom the Way and its power are richly perfected, tongues buzz in a chorus of slander. Humane men are degraded and reduced to poverty, while proud and violent men usurp and tyrannize at will."[12] That is, those who are morally just are maligned,

---

Hao Yixing 郝懿行, *Erya yishu* 爾雅義疏 (Ji'nan: Qi Lu, 2010), 3697–98. Cf. the *Yiwen leiju* 藝文類聚 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 1965), 92.1603 and the *Taiping yulan* 太平御覽, print edition circa 1022–1063 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1960), 923.7. Here the mentioning of *diao* explains why the manuscript version of "The Metal-bound Coffer" identifies the poem composed by the Duke of Zhou as "Diaoxiao" 周（雕）鴞. The *diao* is a later manifestation of the *taochong*, hardly small, and identical with the *xiao* 鴞. I also believe it is related to the name of another bird, *zhoujiao* 啁噍, seen in *Lüshi chunqiu* 呂氏春秋 "Qiu ren" 求人; see Chen Qiyou 陳奇猷, *Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi* 呂氏春秋新校釋 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 2002), 1524. For a more detailed discussion of these bird names and the lore associated with them, see below.

11. As a further note on the *xiao* 鴞, I should point out that under the "Mu men," Kong Yingda has the following commentary: 鴞，惡聲之鳥，一名鵩，與梟異；梟一名鴟 "The *xiao* 鴞 is the bird of wicked sound. One view is that it is called *peng* and is different from the *xiao* 梟, which some also call *chi*." While agreeing with Mao and Zheng that *xiao* 鴞 is "the bird of wicked sound," Kong notes the alternative view that it should be distinguished from *xiao* 梟. With regard to the *peng* 鵩 that Kong mentions as an alternative name for *xiao* 鴞, this is consistent with Lu Ji's commentary under the "Mu men," and it is collaborated by the *Shi ji* 史記 biography of Jia Yi 賈誼 (201–169 B.C.E.), where *peng* is given as the name for *xiao* 鴞 in the Chu 楚 region of the south. However, this equation is questioned in Ban Gu's 班固 (32–92) version of the same biography, which hints that they are different by stating that the *peng* "resembles" (*si* 似) the *xiao*, thus implying that they are different. This last view is collaborated by Jia Gongyan's 賈公彥 (fl. 650) commentary for a passage in the *Zhou li* 周禮. All of these texts are cited in Wang Xianqian 王先謙, *Shi sanjiayi jishu* 詩三家義集疏 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1987), 472–73. My sense is that ancient scholars disagreed about the identification of *xiao* 鴞 as *peng*, just as there were different views about the identification of *xiao* 鴞 as *xiao* 梟. Perhaps Kong Yingda was also torn between the two possibilities. It is interesting to note that under the line from the "Zhan ang": "Beautiful is the clever woman, but she is an owl," Kong understands "beautiful" (*yi* 懿) as a sigh and compares it to another exclamation in the "Jin teng," *yi* 噫. Given that there is no other reason for Kong to make this connection, perhaps he does so because on some level, he accepts that *wei xiao wei chi* 為梟為鴟 of the "Zhan ang" is the same as *chixiao* of the "Jin teng."

12. Wang Xianqian 王先謙, Kubo Ai 久保愛, Ikai Hikohiro 猪飼彥博, and Hattori Unokichi 服部宇之吉, *Junshi* 荀子, Kanbun taikei 漢文大系 15 (Tōkyō: Fuzanbō, 1913),

footnote continued on next page

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and true gentlemen go into hiding to avoid being bullied. In the "Diao Qu Yuan wen" 弔屈原文 (Essay consoling Qu Yuan) by Jia Yi 賈誼 (201–169 B.C.E.), there is the line: 鸞鳳伏竄兮，鴟梟翱翔 "The phoenixes hunched down and hid away, while owls soared on high."[13] This is preceded by the line: 遭世罔極兮，乃隕厥身 "You encountered an era where there were no restraints, and thus you lost your life." Here the expression *wang ji* 罔極 "to have no restraint" is a reference to the "Qing ying" 青蠅 (Green flies) of the *Odes*, one of the classic statements about slander, as can be seen in the line from that poem: 讒人罔極，交亂四國 "The slanderous men have no restraint, they bring into disorder the states of the four quarters."[14] Finally, in the *Chunqiu fanlu* 春秋繁露 (Luxuriant dews of the Spring and Autumn) associated with Dong Zhongshu 董仲舒 (c. 179–104 B.C.E.), a text called the "Wuxing shunni" 五行順逆 (Complying with and going against the five activities) contains the following:

> 摘巢探鷇，咎及羽蟲，則飛鳥不為，冬應不來，梟鴟群鳴，鳳凰高翔。
>
> If one were to remove the bird's nest, snatch the chicks, and bring harm to the winged creatures, then birds will not fly, the signs of winter will not show, owls will gather shrieking together, and the phoenixes will fly high and away.

This is preceded by a warning that the ruler should not associate with the wrong persons:

> 如人君惑於讒邪，內離骨肉，外疏忠臣，至殺世子，誅殺不辜，逐忠臣，以妾為妻 。[15]
>
> If the people's ruler is deluded by the slanderous and deceitful, then inside his household he will grow estranged from his relatives, and outside his household he will grow distant from his loyal officials. He

18.29–31. The translation is from John Knoblock, *Xunzi: A Translation and Study of the Complete Works* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994), vol. 3, 202–203, with slight modifications.

13. Takigawa Kametarō and Mizusawa Toshitada, *Shiji huizhu kaozheng fu jiaobu*, 84.23–27; Wang Xianqian 王先謙, *Han shu buzhu* 漢書補注 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 2008), 3637–42; *Wen xuan* 文選 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 1986), 2590–94. The translation is from Nienhauser, ed., *The Grand Scribe's Records*, vol. 7, 303–304, with slight modifications.

14. Li Xueqin, ed., *Maoshi zhengyi*, 1025. The translation is from Karlgren, *The Book of Odes*, 172, with slight modifications.

15. Su Yu 蘇輿, *Chunqiu fanlu yizheng* 春秋繁露義證 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1992), 373–74. The translation is from Sarah A. Queen and John S. Major, *Luxuriant Gems of the Spring and Autumn* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2016), 476–77, with some modifications.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> will even go to the extreme of killing the heir apparent, punishing the innocent with execution, expelling the loyal officials, and taking the concubine as his principal consort.

It is clear that regardless of the variations in the name of the *chixiao*, the equation of the owl and slander is standard in ancient literature.[16]

For further comparison, one can turn to the "Shenwu fu" 神烏賦 (Poetic exposition of the divine crows), a manuscript excavated from an Eastern Han tomb in Yinwan 尹灣, Jiangsu Province, dated around 10 B.C.E.[17] Although no owl appears in this poem, the "Shenwu fu" tells the story of a pair of crows being robbed of their nest, and in that sense shares with the "Chixiao" a literary theme that was common throughout the entire ancient period.[18] Interestingly, the "Shenwu fu" ends with

---

16. There are additional references to the owl in ancient literature where the topic of slander is only implicit. In Liu Xiang's 劉向 (79–78 B.C.E) "Jiu tan" 九嘆, there is the line: 葛藟虆於桂樹兮，鴟鴞集於木蘭；偓促談於廊廟兮，律魁放乎山間 "Weeds overrun and choke the cassia bushes; owls roost in the magnolia trees. Stupid bigots hold forth in hall and temple, while the great and magnanimous are banished to the mountains." Wang Yi's 王逸 (2nd century B.C.E.) "Jiu si" 九思 says the following about the *guishu* 桂樹 "cassia": 實孔鸞兮所居，今其集兮惟鴞 "Truly a place for phoenixes to nest in! Yet now the owl alone roosts in them." These two passages can be found in Hong Xingzu 洪興祖, *Chu ci buzhu* 楚辭補注 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 1983), 299–302, 326–27; and the translation in David Hawkes, *Songs of the South: An Anthology of Ancient Chinese Poems by Qu Yuan and Other Poets* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985), 293–95, 317–18. In addition, Yang Xiong's 揚雄 (53 B.C.E.–18 C.E.) "Jie chao" 解謿 has the line: 今子乃以鴟梟而笑鳳皇，執蝘蜓而謿龜龍，不亦病乎！"Now you take the owl and laugh at the phoenix, grasp the gecko and mock the tortoise and dragon. Are you not ill with error?"; see Wang Xianqian, *Han shu buzhu*, 5389–90; also *Wen xuan*, 2009–2010; and the translation from David R. Knechtges, *The Han shu Biography of Yang Xiong (53 B.C.–A.D. 18)* (Tempe: Center for Asian Studies, Arizona State University, 1982), 51. In *Guanzi* 管子 "Xiao kuang" 小匡, the following statement suggests that the world has not seen true peace and prosperity: 夫鳳皇鸞鳥不降，而鷹隼鴟梟豐 "The phoenixes have not appeared, while hawks and owls abound"; see Li Xiangfeng 黎翔鳳, *Guanzi jiaozhu* 管子校注 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 2004), 425–26; and the translation in W. Allyn Rickett, *Guanzi: Political, Economic, and Philosophical Essays from Early China* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), vol. 1, 340–41. See also *Shi ji* "Rizhe liezhuan" 日者列傳, which has the statement: 子獨不見鴟梟之與鳳皇翔乎 "Have you not seen owls soaring side by side with the phoenixes?" in Takigawa Kametarō and Mizusawa Toshitada, *Shiji huizhu kaozheng fu jiaobu*, 127.6–7; and the translation in Burton Watson, *Records of the Grand Historian: Han Dynasty II*, 2nd ed. (Hong Kong: Renditions, 1993), 428.

17. This is the date appearing on a calendar found in the same tomb. For both, see *Yinwan Hanmu jiandu* 尹灣漢墓簡牘 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1997). A study in English is Hans van Ess, "An Interpretation of the *Shenwu fu* of Tomb no. 6, Yinwan," *Monumenta Serica* 51 (2003), 605–28.

18. Cf. Ting Nai-tung, *A Type Index of Chinese Folktales—in the Oral Tradition and Major Works of Non-Religious Classical Literature* (Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica, 1978), 43A, "Taking over another animal's house."

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a warning against slander, quoting the "Qingying" that I mentioned above (slips 127–128): 云云青蠅，止于杆；豈弟君子，毋信讒言 "The green flies go buzzing about, they settle on the fence; joyous and pleasant lord, do not believe slanderous words."[19]

Related to the "Shenwu fu," in the "Yanzi fu" 燕子賦 (Poetic exposition of the swallows) discovered at Dunhuang 敦煌, another literary work about a bird protecting its home, one finds the same concern with slander.[20] In describing the conflict between two swallows, this poem even includes a courtroom scene where the two swallows confront each other before a judge. Such a dramatic and popularized scenario is of course a far cry from the "Chixiao," but it shares with that poem the same interest in telling truth from lies.

Against this background about the owl and other related fowls, it is now possible to turn to the "Chixiao":

> 鴟鴞鴟鴞，既取我子，無毀我室。恩斯勤斯，鬻子之閔斯。
> 迨天之未陰雨，徹彼桑土，綢繆牖戶。今女下民，或敢侮予？
> 予手拮据，予所捋荼，予所蓄租，予口卒瘏。曰予未有室家？
> 予羽譙譙，予尾翛翛。予室翹翹，風雨所漂搖，予維音嘵嘵。[21]

> Oh owl, oh owl! Having taken my children, do not destroy my nest! For it I have toiled. For this young one you should have pity.
> At the time when heaven was not yet clouded and raining, I took those mulberry roots, twined them and made window and door. Now you low-down people, does anybody dare insult me?
> My hands were grasping the herbs which I picked, the bundles of straw which I hoarded; my mouth was all sore. Do you say that I still have no home?
> My wings are reduced, my tail is shrunk. My house is perilously high up, it is tossed about by wind and rain. My cry is alarmed.

Reading this against the story of "The Metal-bound Coffer," I would connect the two as the following.[22] The Duke of Zhou composes the

---

19. Li Xueqin, ed., *Maoshi zhengyi*, 1025. The translation is from Karlgren, *The Book of Odes*, 172, with slight modifications.

20. Or, more precisely, seven manuscripts of varying lengths, all recording the same poem. Although the date of the poem is uncertain, the fact that it mentions the Kaiyuan 開元 reign (713–741) suggests that it must be somewhat later. See Huang Zheng 黄征 and Zhang Yongquan 張涌泉, *Dunhuang bianwen jiaozhu* 敦煌變文校注 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1997), 376–422.

21. Li Xueqin, ed., *Maoshi zhengyi*, 599–606. The translation is based on Karlgren, *The Book of Odes*, 99–100, with modifications that reflect my own understanding of the poem; see below.

22. The "Chixiao" is often identified as the first fowl fable in Chinese literary history; see, for instance, Qian Zhongshu's 錢鍾書 discussion of the Song poet Zhou

footnote continued on next page

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

"Chixiao," as a response to the rumors spread by his detractors. With the line: 鴟鴞鴟鴞，既取我子，無毀我室 "Oh owl, oh owl! You have taken my children. Do not destroy my nest!" this is a plea for *chixiao*, the owl or the "bird of the wicked sound" to stop its slandering. Despite mentioning his *zi* 子 "children," he senses the futility of saving them, and instead turns his attention to protecting his home, the main focus of the poem. As he goes on to say: 恩斯勤斯，鬻子之閔斯 "For it I have toiled. For this young one you should have pity," I take *en* 恩 and *qin* 勤 to denote the same action, performed on the nest, more commonly written *yinqin* 殷勤 "to toil";[23] and I understand *yuzi* 鬻子 "the young one" to be the speaker's reference to himself, powerless before the intruding owl. The rest of the poem goes into greater detail about the building of the nest. For the Duke of Zhou, this could be his own home or the dynastic house of the Zhou.[24]

For the ancient commentators of the *Odes*, however, this is not what the "Chixiao" means. Both Mao and Zheng Xuan identify *chixiao* as the Duke of Zhou, so it is the *chixiao* that tries to protect its home.[25] They also identify the *zi* "children" mentioned in the poem. For Mao, they are the

---

Zizhi 周紫芝 (b. 1082) in *Songshi xuanzhu* 宋詩選注 (Beijing: Sanlian, 2001), 252–53. While non-literal reading is the norm in its interpretation throughout history, this practice can now be grounded based on evidence from the Tsinghua manuscripts, where "The Metal-bound Coffer" (with its reference to the "Chixiao") is juxtaposed with such texts as the "Qi ye" 耆夜, "Zhougong zhi qin wu" 周公之琴舞, and "Rui liangfu bi" 芮良夫毖. All of these works supply historical context for poems now found in the *Odes*. As publication and study of the Tsinghua corpus are still ongoing, one can expect these sources to shed more light on the historicizing tendency that is so influential in the history of the interpretation of the *Odes*. For a previous discussion of the "Chixiao" and more generally the interplay between poetry and history, see Haun Saussy, *The Problem of a Chinese Aesthetic* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993), 139–47.

23. The compound *yinqin* can be seen in Zheng Xuan's paraphrase of the line, though he is of the view that the action is directed towards the "children" of the Duke of Zhou; see below.

24. This reading of the "Chixiao" is consistent with the interpretation of Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130–1200) and several subsequent scholars; see the summary of their views in Peng Meiling, "'Binfeng' chuantong Shishuo yu Zhougong xingxiang," 24–6. It is also the reading accepted in several translations of the poem into English. See James Legge, *The Chinese Classics, Vol. 4: The She King* (1893–94; reprinted in Taipei: SMC Publishing, 1991), 233–35; Arthur Waley, *The Book of Songs: The Ancient Chinese Classic of Poetry* (New York: Grove Press, 1996), 122–23; and Karlgren, *The Book of Odes*, 99–100. Of course, none of these scholars cites the evidence from the *Odes* and other ancient literature, as I have just presented. Nor do they explain the rationale behind Mao and Zheng's interpretation, as I am about to do.

25. For Mao, the identification of *chixiao* as a bird that attempts to protect its own home, and in turn, the Duke of Zhou, involves a play of words. After commenting that the *chixiao* is the *ningjue* 鸋鴂, Mao goes on to point out that this bird *ning wang*

footnote continued on next page

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Zhou royalties Guan 管 and Cai 蔡, "taken away" (*qu* 取) because they have been lured to defect to the enemy camp. For Zheng, they are the followers of the Duke of Zhou, about which I will have more to say when I turn to the text of "The Metal-bound Coffer." But the biggest problem for Mao and Zheng's interpretation is that by identifying the *chixiao* as the Duke of Zhou, they have to read the poem's opening line according to Zheng's paraphrase: 鴟鴞言：已取我子者，幸無毀我巢 "The *chixiao* says: I hope he who has taken my children would not destroy my nest."[26] Such a reading is extremely awkward and not supported at all by the grammar of the sentence, which requires *chixiao chixiao* 鴟鴞鴟鴞 to be understood as the *addressee*, not the *addresser*.

How does one account for this difference between my reading, on the one hand, and those of the poem's ancient commentators, on the other? It is possible to simply dismiss the reading by Mao and Zheng, just as one might reject their understanding of the opening poem of the *Odes*, the "Guan ju" 關雎 (The ospreys), in light of a recently excavated manuscript, the "Wu xing" 五行 (Five conducts) from the Han tomb at Mawangdui 馬王堆.[27] But I think it is equally important to ask why Mao and Zheng interpret the poem the way they do. The following gives two explanations, one in the discussion immediately below, and one in my later discussion of ancient owl lore. There may well be others, which need not be mutually exclusive. Since Mao and Zheng merely comment on the poem without explaining why, one can only deduce their reasoning based on the commentaries themselves and reflect on them in the broader context of ancient discourses about the Duke of Zhou.

In my view, the key to understanding the interpretations of Mao and Zheng Xuan lies in the identity of the *chixiao*. In my reading, the *chixiao* is the clear villain of the poem, and this is supported by evidence about the owl seen elsewhere in the *Odes* and other ancient literature. If Mao and Zheng are correct in identifying the *chixiao* as the Duke of Zhou, then one has to look elsewhere to identify the figure who intruded and

---

erzi 寧亡二子 "would rather lose his two children," which clearly takes advantage of the homophony or near homophony of *ning* 鸋 and *ning* 寧.

26. Once again, Zheng's reading also involves a play of words. For Zheng, the repetition of the name *chixiao* indicates that this bird places special emphasis on what it is about to say, or *dingning zhi ye* 丁寧之也 "to serve as a reminder."

27. See the particularly nuanced discussion of the different interpretative possibilities examined in Jeffrey Riegel, "Eros, Introversion, and the Beginnings of *Shijing* Commentary," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 57.1 (1997), 143–77, in many ways a model for my own discussion of the "Chixiao." See also Martin Kern's brilliant summary of this article in "Early Chinese Poetics in the Light of Recently Excavated Manuscripts," in *Recarving the Dragon: Understanding Chinese Poetics*, ed. Olga Lomová, (Prague: Karolinum Press, 2003), 54–60.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

threatened to destroy the bird's nest. In Mao's reading, this figure is an unspecified *ren* 人 "someone." By contrast, Zheng suggests it is the young King Cheng, or *yuzi* 鬻子 "the young one"; more specifically, because King Cheng is deluded by the rumors and is dissatisfied with the Duke of Zhou, he is directing his anger at the Duke of Zhou's followers, and the Duke of Zhou urges him to stop the persecution and the confiscation of land and property belonging to them.[28] Even leaving aside all the inconsistencies in this reading, Zheng's suggestion is problematic because it weakens the conflict at the heart of "The Metal-bound Coffer."[29] In spite of all the disagreements and misunderstandings, King Cheng is not a villain in the eyes of the Duke of Zhou, and yet a villain is what one expects to find in the "Chixiao" if one takes into account some of the discussions cited above, especially the "Shenwu fu" and "Yanzi fu." If this analysis is correct, then we might pose the question a little differently: why do Mao and Zheng want to remove the villain from their interpretation of the "Chixiao," or at least make him less of a factor?

There are several ancient discussions about the Duke of Zhou where an author questions or even criticizes his intentions during the events described in "The Metal-bound Coffer." In particular, these discussions raise the question whether the Duke of Zhou was really *ren* 仁 (benevolent). I believe such discussions would have been a main motivation behind the interpretations by Mao and Zheng. If my reading is correct that the *chixiao* refers to the detractors of the Duke of Zhou, particularly the brothers Guan and Cai, and the "Chixiao" is his protest in response, then such reaction would *not* have been regarded as *ren*, at least in some

28. Note that Mao also thinks *yuzi* is King Cheng, but he does not suggest, as Zheng does, that King Cheng is in a position to harm the Duke of Zhou.

29. First, it is unreasonable that *yuzi* "the young one" would end up hurting the *zi* "children" of the phrase *ji qu wo zi* 既取我子 "you have taken my children." Second, as already pointed out by Wang Su 王肅 (195–256), the Duke of Zhou's followers are nowhere mentioned in "The Metal-bound Coffer" or indeed any other text, so there is no corroborating evidence for Zheng's reading; see Li Xueqin, ed., *Maoshi zhengyi*, 602. Finally, it is possible to refer to a later line in the poem: 今女下民，或敢侮予 "Now you low-down people, does anybody dare insult me?" Following Zheng's reading, which understands the poem as a plea to King Cheng, one has to take *xiamin* 下民 "low-down people" as a reference to the young ruler, an unacceptable choice for obvious reasons. This is the reason that Zheng's wording in this part of the commentary is extremely vague, as he never directly names King Cheng. It is also why Kong Yingda, in his further elaboration of Zheng's reading, attempts to smooth it over by suggesting that while the line shows discontent, it is really not directed at King Cheng: 喻先臣之怨恨耳，非恚怒王也 "[The line] illustrates only the grievances of the former ministers, not that they are angry at the king"; see Ibid., 603.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

eyes. In fact, any reaction on the Duke of Zhou's part would have had its repercussions. For there not to be any, the reaction would have to be directed at someone who is completely indefensible, like Bao Si, the evil consort mentioned in the "Zhan ang" cited above.

Here I can illustrate my point with a passage from the *Mengzi*, 2B9. This passage contains a question for Mencius (active fourth century B.C.E.), posed by a challenger Chen Gu 陳賈:

> 周公使管叔監殷，管叔以殷畔；知而使之，是不仁也；不知而使之，是不智也。仁、智，周公未之盡也，而況於王乎？[30]

> The Duke of Zhou made Guanshu overlord of Yin and Guanshu used it as a base to stage a rebellion. If the Duke of Zhou sent Guanshu knowing what was going to happen, then he was not benevolent; if he sent him for lack of foresight, then he was unwise. Even the Duke of Zhou left something to be desired in the matter of benevolence and wisdom. How much more in the case of Your Majesty?

Here the king is the ruler of Qi 齊, who earlier in the passage expresses that he is no match for a sage such as the Duke of Zhou. In response to this, Chen Gu explains that if the Duke of Zhou already anticipated his brother's plot of mutiny, then it was not *ren* of him to dispatch his brother to oversee the Shang, because this would have been akin to luring him into the crime. On the other hand, if the Duke of Zhou had no clue, then he was simply not *zhi* 智 (wise). Either way, Chen Gu implies, the Duke of Zhou was not the enlightened leader that Mencius and other Confucian scholars took him to be. In his response, Mencius denies that the Duke of Zhou was not *ren*; at most, he was not *zhi*, but this was unproblematic because he was also capable of admitting his own mistakes and correcting them. Such exchange between Chen Gu and Mencius is representative of the debates concerning the Duke of Zhou that circulated from the Warring States to the Han. Chen Gu's question is an example of the criticism against him, whereas Mencius' response represents the defense. I would understand Mao and Zheng's interpretation of the "Chixiao" in the same way. By doing away with the villain in their readings of the "Chixiao," these commentators purposely weakened the conflict at the heart of the poem and made the Duke of Zhou a more

30. Jiao Xun 焦循, *Mengzi zhengyi* 孟子正義 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1987), 291–97. The translation is from D.C. Lau, *Mencius*, 2nd ed. (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2003).

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

benevolent figure than he otherwise appeared. In this way, Mao and Zheng cleared the Duke of Zhou's name and helped to consolidate his image as a moral exemplar.[31]

Mengzi 2B9 can be read with another passage from Mencius, 2A4, which actually contains a quotation of the "Chixiao":

> 孟子曰：「仁則榮，不仁則辱；今惡辱而居不仁，是猶惡濕而居下也。如惡之，莫如貴德而尊士，賢者在位，能者在職；國家閒暇，及是時，明其政刑。雖大國，必畏之矣。《詩》云：『迨天之未陰雨，徹彼桑土，綢繆牖戶。今此下民，或敢侮予？』孔子曰：『為此詩者，其知道乎！能治其國家，誰敢侮之？』」[32]
>
> Mencius said, "Benevolence brings honor; cruelty, disgrace. Now people who dwell in cruelty while disliking disgrace are like those who are content to dwell in a low-lying place while disliking dampness. If one dislikes disgrace, one's best course of action is to honor the virtuous and to respect gentlemen. If, when good and wise men are in high office and able men are employed, a ruler takes advantage of times of peace to explain the laws to the people, then even large states will certain stand in awe of him. The *Odes* say, 'At the time when heaven was not yet clouded and raining, I took those mulberry roots, twined them and made window and door. Now you low-down people, does anybody dare insult me?' Confucius' comment was: 'The writer of this poem must have understood the way. If a ruler is capable of putting his state in order, who would dare insult him?'"

In this discussion, Mencius cites the "Chixiao" to support his point about the state: just as a bird's nest needs to be diligently maintained, the state prospers only when it draws on all the inputs of its worthy men.[33] The ruler who has the virtue of *ren* (benevolence), or a genuine concern for the people, would devote himself wholeheartedly to this endeavor.

---

31. Cf. the exchange between Wan Zhang 萬章 and Mencius in *Mengzi* 5A2, on whether the ancient sage Shun 舜 knew about his brother's plot to kill him. This is basically the same question as that raised in 2B9, and for this Mencius also has an interesting reply; see Jiao Xun, *Mengzi zhengyi*, 618–28.

32. Jiao Xun, *Mengzi zhengyi*, 223–26. The translation is from Lau, *Mencius*, though I have replaced his translation of the *Odes* with the one cited at the beginning of this study, and I have also changed the wording in Confucius' comment to be consistent with it. Note that the passage also includes quotations from the "Wen wang" 文王 of the *Odes* and the "Taijia" 太甲, the latter now attested as one of the "ancient script" texts of the *Documents*.

33. For a similar comparison, see Xu Weiyu 許維遹, *Hanshi waizhuan jishi* 韓詩外傳集釋 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1980), *juan* 8, 304–5.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Interestingly, the discussion makes no reference to the Duke of Zhou, and in fact the early commentator of the *Mengzi*, Zhao Qi 趙岐 (d. 201) understands the poem to be a criticism against an unspecified ruler of Bin 邠. This is a line of interpretation that has puzzled many later scholars, given the clear indication in "The Metal-bound Coffer" that it is the Duke of Zhou who composed the poem. It is difficult to imagine that Mencius or Zhao Qi had no knowledge of this work.[34]

To account for this problem, one possibility is of course to concede that there were simply different interpretations of the "Chixiao": "The Metal-bound Coffer" tied it with the Duke of Zhou, Mencius did not. But in light of the discussion about *Mengzi* 2B9 from above, I would propose tying together the two interpretations in the following way: what 2A4 stands for is not just another reading, but an attempt to offer an interpretation different from "The Metal-bound Coffer"—one that steers the poem away from the Duke of Zhou and his fratricide and emphasizes a more positive and thus uncontroversial aspect of his career. By the time of Zhao Qi, this new interpretation had become so entrenched that the Duke of Zhou was not acknowledged at all.[35] If this understanding is correct, then 2B9 and 2A4 constitute a concerted effort by Mencius to represent the Duke of Zhou in a more favorable light. The first defends him against the accusation of fratricide, and the second takes the poem that could be used as evidence against him and simply offers a different reading of it. In both cases, Mencius emphasizes the virtue of *ren*, a motivation that I believe is also shared by the commentaries by Mao and Zheng as well as many other ancient discussions.

---

34. Wang Xianqian tries to account for this by suggesting that when the Duke of Zhou submitted the poem, he might have done so under the pretense of criticizing the Bin ruler mentioned by Zhao Qi, so as not to offend King Cheng; see Wang Xianqian, *Shi sanjiayi jishu*, 529.

35. It is noteworthy that in the parallel to this passage in *Kongzi jiayu* 孔子家語 "Hao sheng" 好生, the rhetorical question from the "Chixiao," *huo gan wu yu* 或敢侮予 "Does anybody dare insult me?" is echoed not only in Confucius' comment, but also in a further question not seen in *Mengzi* 2A4: 武庚惡能侮 "How could Wu Geng insult me?" Wu Geng 武庚 is of course the Shang rebel contemporaneous with the Duke of Zhou. This is an indication that the *Kongzi jiayu* understands the "Chixiao" to concern the Duke of Zhou or events related to him, a rare instance where the *Kongzi jiayu* has preserved credible material unseen in other ancient texts. It also points to the likelihood that this text identifies Wu Geng to be villain of the poem. For the *Kongzi jiayu*, see Yang Chaoming 楊朝明, *Kongzi jiayu tongjie–fu chutu ziliao yu xiangguan yanjiu* 孔子家語通解——附出土資料相關研究 (Taibei: Wanjuan lou, 2005), 128–30. Note that the same identification is made by Zhu Xi; see *Shi jizhuan* 詩集傳 (Taibei: Taiwan guji, 1978), 93–4. Among the various proposals concerning *chixiao*, this must be my personal favorite.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The following are additional examples of criticisms against the Duke of Zhou, similar to the question raised by Chen Gu in *Mengzi* 2B9:

1. 王季為適，周公殺兄，長幼有序乎？（《莊子・盜跖》）[36]
   King Ji received the inheritance, the Duke of Zhou killed his elder brother—does this indicate any proper order between elder and younger?
2. 弟賢不過周公，而管叔誅。（《韓詩外傳》卷八）[37]
   No younger brother was more worthy than the Duke of Zhou, but Guanshu was punished.
3. 周公誅管叔、蔡叔，以平國弭亂，可謂忠臣矣，而未可謂弟弟也。（《淮南子・泰族》）[38]
   The Duke of Zhou executed Guanshu and Caishu to bring peace to the country and end their rebellion. You could call him a loyal minister, indeed, but you could not call him a good brother.
4. 周公放兄誅弟，非不仁也，以匡亂也。（《淮南子・齊俗》）[39]
   That the Duke of Zhou exiled his older brother and executed his second brother was not that he was not humane; it was that he was rectifying chaos.
5. 詘寸而伸尺，聖人為之；小枉而大直，君子行之。周公有殺弟之累，齊桓有爭國之名，然而周公以義補缺，桓公以功滅醜，而皆為賢。（《淮南子・氾論》）[40]
   Curling up to the shortness of an inch or extending to the length of a foot are things the sages do. Minimizing wrongs and maximizing rights are things the superior man practices. The Duke of Zhou was saddled with the burden of killing a brother, and Duke of Huan of Qi had a reputation for competing with other states. Yet the Duke of Zhou relied on rightness to compensate for his shortcomings, and

---

36. Wang Shumin 王叔岷, *Zhuangzi jiaoquan* 莊子校詮 (Taipei: Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, 1988), 1194–1205. The translation is from Burton Watson, *The Complete Works of Chuang Tzu* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1968), 331–35.

37. Xu Weiyu, *Hanshi waizhuan jishi*, 299–300. The translation is from James Robert Hightower, *Han shih wai chuan: Han Ying's Illustrations of the Didactic Application of the Classic of Songs* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952), 283–84.

38. He Ning 何寧, *Huainanzi jishi* 淮南子集釋 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1998), 1395. The translation is from John S. Major, Sarah A. Queen, Andrew Seth Meyer, and Harold D. Roth, *Huainanzi: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Government in Early Han China* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010), 810.

39. He Ning, *Huainanzi jishi*, 815–17; Major, et al., *Huainanzi*, 442–43.

40. He Ning, *Huainanzi jishi*, 961–62; Major, et al., , 510–12.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Duke Huan relied on his merit to eradicate evil, so that both became worthies.

6. 夫觀逐者於其反也，而觀行者於其終也。故舜放弟，周公殺兄，猶之為仁也；文公樹米，曾子架羊，猶之為知也。（《淮南子・泰族》）[41]
Evaluate those who pursue by what they bring back; evaluate those who flee by where they end up. Thus, Shun banished his younger brother; the Duke of Zhou executed his older brothers, but they both alike were considered humane. Duke Wen planted rice, Zengzi yoked a goat, but they both alike were considered wise.

7. 故以枝代主而非越也，以弟誅兄而非暴也，君臣易位而非不順也。（《荀子・儒效》）[42]
Hence, for a cadet branch of a family to supplant the main line does not constitute a "transgression"; a younger brother's execution of an older brother does not constitute a "crime of violence"; and for the ruler and minister to change positions does not constitute an "act of disobedience."

Items 4, 5, 6, and 7, though attempts to defend the Duke of Zhou, are clearly made in response to discussions such as those in items 1, 2, and 3. Item 6 is especially close to *Mengzi* 2B9 in that it juxtaposes *ren* (benevolent) and *zhi* (wise).

The discussion in the first part of this study has focused on a small but significant detail in "The Metal-bound Coffer": the composition of the "Chixiao" by the Duke of Zhou. Drawing on evidence from the *Odes* and other ancient literature where the owl is frequently associated with slander, I believe it is possible to posit a different interpretation of the "Chixiao" than the one proposed by the ancient commentators Mao and Zheng Xuan. By reference to the *Mengzi* and other related discussions, I have shown that the reading devised by Mao and Zheng was part of a debate about the Duke of Zhou's moral character, particularly the question whether he was *ren* (benevolent).

The rest of this section will consider some remaining issues about "The Metal-bound Coffer" as it relates to the "Chixiao," or to be more precise, some points of connection between the Duke of Zhou story at large and the greater body of ancient owl lore. The first concerns two poetic fragments from the Warring States now at the Shanghai Museum, which editors entitle "Youhuang jiang qi" 有皇將起 (The phoenix is

41. He Ning, *Huainanzi jishi*, 1408–1410; Major, et al., *Huainanzi*, 821–23.
42. Wang Xianqian, et al., *Junshi*, 4.1–4. The translation is from Knoblock, *Xunzi: A Translation and Study of the Complete Works*, vol. 2, 68–69.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

about to rise) and "Liuli" 鶹鷅.[43] As pointed out by scholars soon after their publication, the two manuscripts are actually one text, since they share the same physical attributes, calligraphy, and literary form (both consisting of four or five-character phrases, followed by the disyllabic particle *jinke* 今可); and I believe this is valid.[44] Leaving the more technical details for the appendix, here I will highlight only some of the most prominent themes and comment on their relation with the present study. To begin, like the "Chixiao" and many of the sources about the owl in ancient literature, this poem juxtaposes two kinds of bird. One is reprehensible for its indolence, comparable to the intruding owl that only takes the fruits of the labors of others, seen in the "Chixiao"; this is identified as the *liuli* 婁（鶹）䖵（鷅）.[45] The other is the *jiaofan* 膠膰, a more lofty, virtuous bird that exemplifies purity in the face of slander.[46] Here the keyword is of course *bang* 旁（謗）"slander," a theme that echoes the "Chixiao" and other ancient literature. Thus the two manuscripts from the Shanghai Museum add to the list of examples cited above, and in fact should appear at the top of that list, given their unmistakable Warring States origin.

This being said, the "Youhuang jiang qi" and "Liuli" are more than just another example of the theme of slander in ancient bird lore. A closer examination of the content of the two manuscripts reveals a more striking feature. As seen in the opening line of the "Youhuang jiang qi" (s. 1), the poem is an instruction offered by the persona to a prince, or *baozi* 保子 "protected son." On the one hand, the prince is instructed to be *ren* (benevolent). On the other hand, he is encouraged to work with the persona in weeding out the bad influences, identified rather explicitly as those who have "different minds within a single state," or *tongbang*

43. Ma Chengyuan 馬承源, ed., *Shanghai bowuguan cang Zhanguo Chu zhushu* 上海博物館藏戰國楚竹書 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 2001–), vol. 8.

44. For a summary and discussion of this, see Bing Shangbai 邴尚白, "Shangbo Chu zhushu 'Youhuang jiang qi' xintan" 上博楚竹書《有皇將起》新探, paper presented at the conference, "Chutu wenxian de yujing" 出土文獻的語境, National Tsing Hua University, August 27–29, 2014.

45. After all, as Lu Ji explains in his commentary of the "Mao qiu" from the *Odes*: 流離，梟也，自關而西謂梟為流離 "*Liuli* is *xiao*; west of the pass, the *xiao* is called *liuli*"; see Li Xueqin, ed., *Maoshi zhengyi*, 182–88. *Liuli* 流離 is a variant of the name *liuli* 鶹鷅, just as *xiao* is a variant of the *chixiao*. Of course, the emphasis of the "Chixiao" is on the diligence of the bird defending its nest, not the indolence of the intruding bird that tries to take over the nest; but it is clear that these characters belong to the same story.

46. The identification of *jiaofan* as a bird is my proposal, based on the parallel between the discussion of this entity in the "Youhuang jiang qi" and that of *liuli* in the "Liuli." For further discussion, see the appendix.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

yixin 同邦(邦)異心 (s. 2). Finally, the persona makes two separate references to reforming past mistakes.[47]

Comparing the two manuscripts with ancient discourses surrounding the Duke of Zhou, the connections are striking. The persona is the Duke of Zhou, and the prince is King Cheng. The virtue of *ren* that the persona singles out is one of the recurring themes in the debates surrounding the Duke of Zhou, as shown in my discussion above. The bad influences are the brothers Guan and Cai, and it is precisely King Cheng's allegiance that the Duke of Zhou seeks in order to overcome the dissension within the royal family. The reference to "different minds within a single state" cannot be more direct. As for the admonitions to reform one's past mistakes, this refers to King Cheng's initial credulity of the rumors against the Duke of Zhou. As told in "The Metal-bound Coffer," the purpose of the Duke of Zhou's composition of the "Chixiao" is precisely to diffuse those rumors, and the story ultimately ends with King Cheng realizing he was wrong.

Here one is likely to raise the question whether I am forcing the two Shanghai Museum manuscripts into conformity with the Duke of Zhou story, whether "connections" should be "parallels" at best, whether my reading is too heavy-handed. But how else does one understand the remark from the "Youhuang jiang qi" (s. 6) that one should emulate the bird *jiaofan* in order to *she sanfu zhi bang* 誝(舍)三夫之旁(謗) "cast aside the slanders of the three men"? The "three men" (*sanfu* 三夫) must be a direct reference to the rebels spreading rumors about the Duke of Zhou, identified as the *sanjian* 三監 "three guards" in various ancient sources.[48] To be sure, "three men" could be a general reference to a multitude; and there is also some disagreement over the identities of the "three guards" from the Shang–Zhou transition.[49] But in the light of all the other similarities between the two manuscripts and the Duke of Zhou story, I think one would be remiss not to recognize the connection. In fact, all the variations in the identification of the "three guards" (clearly there

47. Here my treatment of the text is somewhat disjointed, because the text itself is disjointed. None of the seven bamboo slips from the two manuscripts is complete, making it difficult to determine whether they read continuously, and indeed, how much additional text has been lost.

48. One of these is the Warring States manuscript "Xi nian" 繫年 (Chronicle) now at Tsinghua University in Beijing; see Li Xueqin, ed., *Qinghua daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian* 清華大學藏戰國竹簡 (Shanghai: Zhong Xi, 2011), vol. 2. The expression *sanjian* appears in section 3, s. 13.

49. Besides the brothers Guan and Cai, two other candidates for the "three guards" are Wu Geng the Shang scion and a third Zhou royalty named Huo 霍. Wang Yinzhi 王引之 suggests that the combination of Guan, Cai, and Wu Geng is the earliest; see *Jingyi shuwen* 經義述聞 (1827 woodblock edition; Nanjing: Jiangsu guji, 2000), 3.50–3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

were more than three people involved) are indicative: the wide currency enjoyed by the expression *sanjian* must have not been the invention of a single author, but the product of a broader tradition. Such a tradition would have also been the basis for the two manuscripts from the Shanghai Museum.

All this points to the conclusion that the "Youhuang jiang qi" and the "Liuli," as a single poem, was written to comment on the Duke of Zhou story. Thus, rather than comparing it to the "Chixiao" and other ancient owl lore, I find it more productive to place it side-by-side with "The Metal-bound Coffer." If the Shanghai Museum poem had made any reference to "The Metal-bound Coffer," it would have been plausible to characterize it as a poetic commentary of that text, much like some parts of Zhao Qi's commentary of Mencius. That it does not do so suggests a different relation: both this poem and "The Metal-bound Coffer" are part of a broader discourse about the Duke of Zhou, and they parallel each other in drawing on the equally rich and extensive ancient owl lore in commenting on the Duke of Zhou story. Where the Shanghai Museum poem differs from "The Metal-bound Coffer" is of course its poetic form. If one is of the view that such literary device reflected a more popular or even performative medium, then this text would open up all kinds of possibilities in the exploration in those directions. Recall that two of the literary works related to the owl cited above are the "Shenwu fu" and "Yanzi fu," two poetic expositions that must have been transmitted on a more popular level than the "Chixiao" now found in the *Odes*.

I turn now to the poem "Xiao bi" from the *Odes*, the second text that I would like to consider in connection with the Duke of Zhou story. In so doing, I will have opportunity to mention some of the most important themes in ancient owl lore. This is a body of literature that I have alluded to at various points in the discussion above, but much remains that is simply too rich and too fascinating to relegate to the background.

I begin with the following line from the "Xiao bi": 肇允彼桃蟲，拚飛維鳥 "At first, one trusted those *taochong*, and they flew up and became birds."[50] Regarding *taochong* 桃蟲, Mao's commentary identifies it as *jiao* 鷦, adding that it is "a bird that starts out small but ends up big" (*niao zhi shi xiao zhong da zhe* 鳥之始小終大者). To this Zheng Xuan suggests the following: 鷦之所為鳥，題肩也，或曰鴞，皆惡聲之鳥 "The kind of bird that *jiao* is is the *tijian*, or some say *xiao*. Both are birds of wicked

50. Li Xueqin, ed., *Maoshi zhengyi*, 1587–91. The translation follows the interpretation by Zheng Xuan, cited below.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sound." Related to this, Kong Yingda notes that the identification of *tao-chong* as *jiao* can also be seen in the *Er ya* 爾雅[51] and the commentary of that work by Sheren 舍人.[52] Moreover, Kong cites the view of Guo Pu 郭璞 (276–324): 鷦鷯，桃雀也，俗名為巧婦；鷦鷯小鳥，而生鵰鶚者也 "*Jiaomiao* is 'Peach Sparrow,' popularly called 'Clever Wife.' Though the *jiaomiao* is a small bird, it gives birth to the *pengdiao*."[53] This is consistent with the view of Lu Ji 陸璣 (c. third century) also cited by Kong: 今鷦鷯是也，微小於黃雀，其雛化而為鵰，故俗語鷦鷯生鵰 "This [*taochong*] is the *jiaoliao* of the present. It is smaller than the 'Yellow Sparrow.' Its chick transforms into the *diao*. Thus, the popular saying is that the *jiaoliao* gives birth to the *diao*."[54]

Among the various opinions cited here, Zheng Xuan's identification of the *xiao* as a "bird of wicked sound" (*e'sheng zhi niao* 惡聲之鳥) is one I have already mentioned. But I did not draw attention to Zheng Xuan's connection of the "Xiao bi" with the Duke of Zhou story. This is Zheng's glosses for the same "Xiao bi" line:

> 肇，始；允，信也。始者信以彼管、蔡之屬，雖有流言之罪，如鷦鳥之小，不登誅之，後反叛而作亂，猶鷦之翻飛為大鳥也。
>
> *Zhao* is *shi* "at first." *Yun* is *xin* "to trust." At first, [King Cheng] believed that with regard to the likes of Guan and Cai, though they were wrong to spread rumors, they were small like the *jiao*, and he did not immediately punish them. Later on they rebelled and created trouble, and this was like the *jiao* flying up and turning into a big bird.

Along the same line, Mao's commentary (as explained by Kong Yingda, based on Wang Su's suggestion, since Mao never directly states his opinion) understands the metaphor of the *taochong* to be an "evil that is about to come" (*jiang lai zhi e* 將來之惡). Given the connection between this and Duke of Zhou story, it is necessary to comment on Zheng's commentary at some length.

According to Zheng, the "Xiao bi" is concerned with the conflict between the Duke of Zhou and his brothers Guan and Cai. Curiously,

---

51. Hao Yixing, *Erya yishu*, 3697–98.

52. Cf. Duan Yucai 段玉裁, *Shuowen jiezi zhu* 說文解字注 (1815 woodblock edition; Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 1988), 4a.44.

53. Guo Pu's gloss is also found under the *Er ya* entry for *taochong*; see Hao Yixing, *Er ya yishu*, 3697–98.

54. Cf. the *Yiwen leiju*, *juan* 92, 1603, where the quotation of Lu Ji's comment has two additional comments: 焦贛《易林》亦謂桃蟲生蜩，或云布穀生子，鷦鷯養之 "Jiao Gong's *Yi lin* also says that the *taochong* gives birth to *diao*. There is also the suggestion that the *bugu* gives birth to a chick, and the *jiaoliao* rears it." See also the *Taiping yulan*, 923.7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Zheng makes no reference to the "Chixiao" in spite of its connection with the same conflict. This is true even in the light of Zheng's identification of *taochong* as the *xiao* that also appears in the name *chixiao*. I would tie the two poems together as the following: the brothers Guan and Cai are the Duke of Zhou's blood relatives (the *taochong* that starts out a small bird), but later on, as they spread the rumors and slander his character, they become his enemies (the *xiao* that ends up a big bird). In order to explain himself to King Cheng, the Duke of Zhou makes a plea to the two brothers, asking them not to push him to the brink (this is the content of the "Chixiao"). Such a narrative is based on Zheng's reading of the "Xiao bi" and my own interpretation of the "Chixiao," and it is consistent with the various ancient owl lore, cited earlier. Of course, as mentioned before, Zheng has a different understanding of the "Chixiao," and I have also speculated on the reason why. Here I would only add that judging from the "Xiao bi," it is evident that another interpretation of the "Chixiao" was not completely unimaginable for Zheng. For Zheng to ultimately choose the interpretation such as currently found under that poem, he must have had a very strong incentive.

It remains for me to go over some other themes in ancient owl lore. Some explanatory remarks are in order. First, my discussion is not exhaustive and considers only those accounts that have a direct bearing on the present study. Second, to avoid overwhelming the readers, the sources that I consider are generally no later than the Western Han (206 B.C.E.–25 C.E.), except when a later source is the sole testimony of an account, and even then it must be corroborated in some way by other earlier sources. Finally, when looking at the various accounts, I do not place any great emphasis on the names by which the birds are identified. Instead, it is the information about the birds and the recurring themes that receive my attention. One will see when all the accounts are lined up that the multiple names of the owl form a kind of chain, such that A is defined as B, B as C, C as D, and so on. Although I do not state this explicitly, readers who are interested to do so will find that it is quite easy to connect the dots. This last point is related to a broader question about the study of ornithology in general. While there must be some basis in reality for the body of lore considered here, indeed any lore about zoological creatures in ancient China, the attempt to match it with present-day knowledge needs to proceed with caution, recognizing the following possibilities: 1) the sources may have different standards and degrees of rigorousness when discussing the creatures; 2) they may inherit traditions or information passed on from other sources, without verification; 3) they may be mistaken; 4) they

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

may deliberately fabricate.[55] Such matching is beyond the scope of my discussion here, which is mainly concerned with how some birds were imagined and what were the ideological concerns underlying the sources; but I hope the findings presented here may pave the way for further research.[56]

A significant number of the sources identify the owl as a bird that eats its own mother. An example of this appears in connection with the "Mao qiu" 旄丘 (Backward-sloping hill) of the *Odes*. Under the line: 瑣兮尾兮，流離之子 "How small and beautiful are the chicks of the *liuli*," Lu Ji says the following: 流離，梟也，自關西謂梟為流離；其子適長大，還食其母 "*Liuli* is *xiao*. West of the pass *xiao* is called *liuli*. When its chick grows up, it returns to eat its own mother."[57] This is echoed by a textual fragment now preserved in the *Yi lin* 意林 (Forest of meaning): 梟生子，子長，食其母，乃能飛 "The *xiao* gives birth to its chick. The chick grows up, eats its own mother, and then has the ability to fly."[58] Although neither of these sources gives the reason for the chick's appalling behavior, there is some indication in other accounts that this is a result of the mother's doting on its chick. Thus, in *Lüshi chunqiu* 呂氏春秋 (Annals of Lü Buwei) "Fen zhi" 分職 (Distinguishing proper functions), a narrative reports that the Duke of Bai 白公, upon usurping the throne in the state of Chu 楚, appropriated the booty and was ultimately murdered because of it. The narrator compares the Duke of Bai's greed to the *xiao* that loses its life because of its unconditional love for its chick: 譬白公之嗇也，若梟之愛其子也 "One can compare the Duke of Bai's miserliness to the love of the *xiao* for her chick."[59] Parallel accounts can be found in *Huainanzi* 淮南子

55. Cf. the thoughtful reflections in Roderich Ptak, "Literary Species or Real Species? Some Notes on Animals in Chinese Classics," in *Zhengtong yu liupai: lidai Rujia jingdian zhi zhuanbian* 正統與流派：歷代儒家經典之轉變, ed. Lin Qingzhang 林慶彰 and Su Feixiang 蘇費翔 (Christian Soffel) (Taibei: Wanjuanlou, 2013), 585–608. Ptak comments at length on Roel Sterckx's earlier monograph, *The Animal and the Daemon in Early China* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002).

56. Previous efforts to sort through this body of lore range from Guo Pu of the third and fourth centuries to Duan Yucai (1735–1815). But they consider only a small number of sources, far fewer than what I report here, and consequently the value of their conclusions is somewhat limited. For Guo's view, see Hua Xuecheng 華學誠, *Yang Xiong Fang yan jiaoshi huizheng* 揚雄方言校釋匯證 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 2006), 8.564–68. For Duan's, see *Shuowen jiezi zhu*, 4a.43.

57. Li Xueqin, ed., *Maoshi zhengyi*, 182–88.

58. Wang Tianhai 王天海 and Wang Ren 王韌, *Yi lin jiaoshi* 意林校釋 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 2014), 324–25.

59. Chen Qiyou, *Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi*, 1667–68. The translation is from John Knoblock and Jeffrey Riegel, *The Annals of Lü Buwei: A Complete Translation and Study* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000), 635, with slight modifications.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

"Dao ying" 道應 (Responses of the way) and *Wenzi* 文子 "Wei ming" 微明 (Subtle brightness).[60] Though brief, these references must be based on more extensive lore about the owl, and I believe the account about the chick eating its own mother is the most extreme manifestation. In fact, appalling as this tradition is, it hints at a theme of *aberration* that I believe is comparable to the reference in the "Xiao bi" about a small bird transforming into a big bird. One can imagine how following this metamorphosis, a bird appears a stranger before its own mother, perhaps even a mortal enemy. This is consistent with what one finds in Mao's commentary of the "Mao qiu," which suggests that the *liuli* is "fine in its youth but ugly when grown" (*shao hao zhang chou* 少好長醜).[61]

In contrast to the lore about the owl eating its own mother, there is another set, equally prominent, where the owl is a victim of harm.

1. 南方有鳥焉，名曰蒙鳩，以羽為巢，而編之以髮，繫之葦苕。風至苕折，卵破子死。巢非不完也，所繫者然也。（《荀子・勸學》）[62]
   In the southern regions, there is a bird called the *mengjiu* that builds its nest out of feathers woven together with hair and attaches the nest to the flowering tassels of reeds. The winds come and the tassels snap off, the eggs break, and the baby birds are killed. It is not that the nest was not well made; rather, it resulted from what it was attached to.

2. 臣見鷦鷯巢於葦苕，著之髮毛，建之，女工不能為也，可謂完堅矣。大風至則苕折、卵破、子死者，何也？其所託者使然也。（《說苑・善說》）[63]
   Your servant has seen the *jiaoliao* that builds its nest in the flowering tassels of reeds, weaving it out of hair … so well that even a weaving girl could not have done it; it can truly be called well-made and solid.[64] But when a great wind comes along, the

60. He Ning, *Huainanzi jishi*, 832–33; and Wang Liqi, *Wenzi shuyi*, 335–43.

61. Li Xueqin, ed., *Maoshi zhengyi*, 182–88. Similar accounts can be found in the *Er ya*: 鳥少美長醜為鶹鷅 "The *liuli* is the bird that is fine when young and ugly when grown"; see Hao Yixing, *Er ya yishu*, 3728–29. The same definition is found under the *Shuowen jiezi* gloss for *liu* 鶹; see Duan Yucai, *Shuowen jiezi zhu*, 4a.44.

62. Wang Xianqian, et al., *Junshi*, 1.5. The translation is from Knoblock, *Xunzi: A Translation and Study of the Complete Works*, vol. 1, 136–37, except that I romanize the name of the *mengjiu* rather than follow Knoblock in translating it as "dunce dove." The same passage also appears in *Da Dai liji* 大戴禮記 "Quan xue" 勸學, where *mengjiu* 蒙鳩 is written *mengjiu* 鳩; see Huang Huaixin 黃懷信, *Da Dai liji huijiao jizhu* 大戴禮記彙校集注 (Xi'an: San Qin, 2005), 806–23.

63. Zuo Songchao, *Shuoyuan jizheng*, 695–700. The translation is from Knoblock, *Xunzi: A Translation and Study of the Complete Works*, vol. 1, 268, n. 17, with slight modifications.

64. The ellipsis indicates the possibility that some text may be missing.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tassel snaps, the eggs break, and the baby birds are killed. Why is this? It results from what it puts its reliance on.

3. 有鳥於此，架巢於葭葦之顛，天喟然而風，則葭折而巢壞，何也？其所托者弱也。（《韓詩外傳》）[65]
Here is a bird that has built its nest in the top of some reeds. A puff of wind from the sky, the reeds break, and the nest is ruined. Why? Because what [the bird] put its reliance on was weak.

4. 桃雀竊脂，巢於小枝，搖動不安，為風所吹，心寒慄慄，常憂殆危。（《易林》謙之遯）[66]
The "Peach Sparrow" steals lard and builds its nest on a small branch. Shaking and without rest, it is blown by the wind. Its heart freezes with fear; the dire situation it constantly dreads.

Also relevant may be a passage from *Zhuangzi* "Xiaoyao you" 逍遙遊 (Free and easy wandering): 鷦鷯巢於深林，不過一枝 "When the *jiaoliao* builds its nest in the deep wood, it uses no more than one branch."[67]

In all of these sources, a tiny bird builds its nest in a precarious place. Blown by the wind, not only does the nest get destroyed, but also the eggs or the chicks are harmed. It seems to me that much of this is directly parallel to the "Chixiao," where one finds not only a detailed description of a bird's labor in its building a nest, but the same concern for its chicks. This is no doubt the reason that under the "Chixiao," Lu Ji provides the following gloss about the *chixiao*:

> 鴟鴞，似黃雀而小，其喙尖如錐，取茅莠為窠，以麻紩之，如刺襪然。縣著樹枝，或一房，或二房。幽州人謂之鸋鴂，或曰巧婦，或曰女匠。關東謂之工雀，或謂之過羸；關西謂之桑飛，或謂之襪雀，或曰巧女。[68]
>
> *Chixiao* is like "Yellow Sparrow," but smaller. Its beak is sharp like the awl. It picks up fine hay for its nest, weaving it with hemp, like a sock with a pointed end, which is hung on a tree branch, with one or two compartments. Natives of Youzhou calls it *ningjue*, or "Clever Wife,"

---

65. Xu Weiyu, *Hanshi waizhuan jishi*, *juan* 8, 304–305. The translation is from Hightower, *Han shih wai chuan*, 289.

66. Xu Chuanwu 徐傳武 and Hu Zhen 胡真, *Yi lin huijiao jizhu* 易林彙校集注 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 2012), 595–96; see also 828, 1550, 2058, 2310.

67. Wang Shumin 王叔岷, *Zhuangzi jiaoquan*, 22–24; and the translation from Watson, *The Complete Works of Chuang Tzu*, 32–3, with slight modifications. An almost identical statement appears in *Lüshi chunqiu* "Qiu ren," where the name of the bird is given as *zhoujiao* 啁噍; see Chen Qiyou, *Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi*, 1524.

68. Li Xueqin, ed., *Maoshi zhengyi*, 601. The main part of Lu's gloss is based on the *Fang yan*; see Hua Xuecheng, *Yang Xiong Fang yan jiaoshi huizheng*, 8.564–68.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> or "Female Artisan." East of the pass it is called "Skilled Sparrow," or "Overburdened." West of the pass it is called "Mulberry Flyer," "Sock Sparrow," or "Clever Girl."

This is also reminiscent of Guo Pu's gloss for the *taochong* from the "Xiao bi": 鷦鷚，桃雀也，俗名為巧婦 "*Jiaomiao* is 'Peach Sparrow," popularly called 'Clever Wife.'" Many of these names hint at the skillfulness of the bird in building a nest.[69] In connection with the earlier part of the study, I should mention that it was perhaps due to such lore about the *chixiao* that Mao and Zheng Xuan identify this bird as the persona of the "Chixiao,"' the addresser rather than the addressee. This provides another motivation for the readings by Mao and Zheng, but it does not contradict the one that I pointed out earlier.

From this quick survey, one can see that there are two groups of lore about the owl. One concerns a small bird and its toilsome but ultimately futile effort to build a nest; the other is about a mother's doting on its chick, which has the unintended consequence of the chick's returning, as a big bird, to harm its own mother. Interestingly, these two groups are sometimes merged. For instance, in Chen Lin's 陳琳 (d. 217) essay, "Xi Wu jiangxiao buqu wen" 檄吳將校部曲文 (Proclamation to the generals, officers, and troops of Wu), there is the line: 鸋鴂之鳥巢於葦苕，苕折子破，下愚之惑也 "The *ningjue* builds its nest in the flowering tassels of reeds, and the tassels snap off and the chicks are ruined; such is the confusion of the ignorant ones at the bottom." In his commentary for the *Wen xuan* 文選 (Selections of refined literature), Li Shan 李善 (630–689) suggests the following, based on a Han 韓 tradition of the *Odes*:

> 鴟鴞所以愛養其子者，適以病之。愛憐養其子者，謂堅固其窠巢。病之者，謂不知託於大樹茂枝，反敷之葦苘，風至，苘折巢覆，有子則死，有卵則破，是其病也。[70]

---

69. As a note on the side, these texts mention that the bird builds its nest on the tip of the reeds, whether it is called *weitiao* 葦苕, *jiawei* 葭葦, or simply *xiaozhi* 小枝 "small branch," and under the "Chixiao," Mao's commentary identifies *huantiao* 萑苕 as *tu* 荼. This last plant is identified by Zheng Xuan as *maoxiu* 茅秀 under the "Chu qi dongmen" 出其東門 of the *Odes*, and this is of course the same *maoyou* 茅莠 mentioned in Lu Ji's gloss under the "Chixiao," cited immediately above; see Li Xueqin, ed., *Maoshi zhengyi*, 373. This might give some hint for the content of a lost poem, "Mao chi" 茅鴟, mentioned but not cited in the *Zuo zhuan* 左傳 (Xiang 28); see Yang Bojun 楊伯峻, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu* 春秋左傳注 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1981), 1145–49.

70. *Wen xuan*, 1984. Cf. *Fengsu tongyi* 風俗通義 "Guo yu" 過譽, which contains the following: 鴟鴞之愛其子，適所以害之 "That the *chixiao* dotes on its child is precisely what harms it"; see Wang Liqi 王利器, *Fengsu tongyi jiaozhu* 風俗通義校注 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1981), 183–86.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> That the *chixiao* rears its child with love is precisely what causes it pain. It rears its chick with love by making the nest strong and solid. It causes it pain by not knowing to entrust it to a great tree and its flourishing branches, but by covering it with the flowering tassels of reeds. When the wind blows, the tassels snap, the nest falls, the chicks die and the eggs break.

Note that the identification of *ningjue* as *chixiao* echoes what one finds in Lu Ji's commentary of the "Chixiao," as given in the previous paragraph, and is ultimately traceable to Mao's commentary of the same poem. Here the theme of the building of the nest such as seen in the first group is tied with the theme of the mother's doting on its child, which ultimately brings harm to the chick, as seen in the second group.

But it is by going back to in the interpretative traditions surrounding the "Xiao bi" that one can see how two groups of lore which appear so different from one another come to center on a single bird, the owl. According to commentators from Mao and Zheng Xuan to Lu Ji, the *taochong* featured in this poem can "start out small but end up big," literally transforming into a bird of a different species. Although such metamorphosis seems quite incredible from an ornithological perspective, it was evidently thought possible by the ancient commentators, and similar claims can be found throughout the literary record.[71] Perhaps it was the "Xiao bi" that led to the confusion of the two groups of lore. Perhaps the existence of the two groups enabled the interpretations about the "Xiao bi." What is clear, in spite of this chicken-egg (or rather, owl-egg) question, is that two different types of bird were collapsed into one, one small, one big, as were the two groups of lore associated with them.

In the end, what one finds in all the sources considered in this section are reflections of the rich and extensive owl lore that must have circulated quite widely during the ancient period. For the "Chixiao" and the "Xiao bi," regardless what the poems originally meant, ancient commentators made an effort linking the poems to discourses about the Duke of Zhou. In the case of the "Chixiao," one might argue that this was prompted by the reference to that poem in "The Metal-bound Coffer." But I believe it is more plausible to suggest that "The Metal-bound Coffer" only took part in a much more pervasive practice. After all, no such reference exists with regard to the "Xiao bi." If the two Shanghai Museum manuscripts are any indication, the poem preserved in them was also independent of "The

71. The basis in reality for this might be the phenomenon of a bird placing its egg into the nest of another bird, thus tricking the second bird into treating the chick that is soon to be born as one of its own. See the general discussion in Sterckx, *The Animal and the Daemon in Early China*, 165–204.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Metal-bound Coffer," and yet it made its own connection to the Duke of Zhou. (Recall that the Mengzi 2A4, in its quotation of the "Chixiao," also steered clear of "The Metal-bound Coffer," whether deliberately or not.) It is worth asking where one should situate the origin of this allegorical mode of reading, particularly the attempt to link the Duke of Zhou story with ancient owl lore. This is a question that I cannot answer, except to point out that such an effort involved the author of "The Metal-bound Coffer" and the poet behind the Shanghai Museum poem, not to forget the commentators behind the *Odes* and *Documents*. None of these figures was able to make the match perfectly, and my reconstruction of their rationales is, at the end of the day, both speculative and heuristic. Nevertheless, this is an investigation that has taken me deeper into the hearts of these texts than I could have ever imagined, and like bird-watching, the pleasure derived from it has been immense, indeed.

The "Metal-bound Coffer" and Its Three Testimonies

I now come to the second part of the study, where I turn to the rest of "The Metal-bound Coffer," looking in turn at three passages that have considerable discrepancies among the three versions. At first glance, some of these discrepancies may seem rather disparate, even trivial, and it is true that a difference is sometimes just that, the result of what must have been multiple lines of transmission not wholly aligned with one another. But there are other instances where the discrepancies *are* meaningful, and still others where it is possible to show how one testimony settled on a certain reading *in response* to another. In this way, by lining up the different testimonies into a sequence and offering an explanation about their relationship with one another, it is possible to get in the mind of the individual passing down the text and specify how he imposed his understanding on the text that he left behind. As in the previous section, one will learn how transmitters, commentators, and the re-teller rewrote or reinterpreted the text in order to teach a lesson: the Duke of Zhou occupied a subordinate position vis-à-vis the ruler, and must never undermine him in any way.

The first passage I examine is a statement from the Duke of Zhou's prayer, a plea to the ancestors to exchange his life for his brother's. The three versions of the text can be listed as the following:

1. 隹（惟）尓（爾）元孫發也，不若但（旦）也，是年（佞）若丂（巧）能，多忖（才）多埶（藝），能事魂（鬼）神。（清華簡）
   Your chief descendant Fa is unlike me, Dan, who is capable of being pleasing and clever, and who is possessed of many abilities and arts, which fit me to serve ghosts and spirits. (Tsinghua)

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

2. 予仁若考能，多材多藝，能事鬼神。乃元孫不若旦多材多藝，不能事鬼神。（《尚書》）
   I am capable of being pleasing and clever, and I am possessed of many abilities and arts, which fit me to serve ghosts and spirits. Your chief descendant is unlike me, Dan, in having many abilities and arts, and is not so capable of serving ghosts and spirits. (*Documents*)

3. 旦巧能，多材多藝，能事鬼神。乃王發不如旦多材多藝，不能事鬼神。（《史記》）
   I, Dan, am capable, and I am possessed of many abilities and arts, which fit me to serve ghosts and spirits. Your king Fa is not like Dan in having many abilities and arts and is not so capable of serving ghosts and spirits. (*Shi ji*)

Comparing the three testimonies, it seems to me that the manuscript is the most direct and easiest to understand. For the expression *ning ruo qiao* 年（佞）若丂（巧）, I follow previous scholars in reading *nian* 年 as *ning* 佞 "pleasing" and *kao* 丂 as *qiao* 巧 "clever," with *ruo* 若 being a coordinative conjunction meaning "and." In this way, *ning ruo qiao* is simply another form of *ningqiao* 佞巧, a compound well attested in ancient texts. Here its purpose is to describe the Duke of Zhou's ability to please the ancestors, and it can be read together with his follow-up statement that he possesses many talents.[72] Turning to the received text of the *Documents*, the commentary attributed to Kong Anguo offers the following paraphrase: 我周公仁能順父，又多材多藝，能事鬼神 "I the Duke of Zhou have the virtue of benevolence such that I am capable of complying with the elders, and moreover I am possessed of many abilities and arts which fit me to serve ghosts and spirits." Such a reading not only involves a reshuffling of the expression *ren ruo kao neng* 仁若考能 (in effect reading it as **ren neng ruo kao* 仁能若考), but it also understands *ren* as the virtue "benevolence."[73]

In light of the argument presented in the first part of this study, where I draw attention to the prominence of *ren* in ancient discourses about

72. This is the view of the scholars Wang Niansun 王念孫, Yu Yue 俞樾, and Yang Yunru, commenting on *ren* 仁 in the received text. Note that *kao* 丂 and *qiao* belong to the same phonetic series. As for *nian* 年 (*C.nˤi[ŋ]) and *ning* (*nˤiŋ-s), they are placed in the same phonetic series by Zhu Junsheng (朱駿聲), together with *ren* 仁 (*n[ə]m-s), which I discuss immediately below. Zhu also cites an example of their interchange under *nian*; see Zhu Junsheng, *Shuowen tongxun dingsheng* 說文通訓定聲, 1851 woodblock edition (Taibei: Yiwen, 1975), 16.11–12.

73. Regarding the word *neng* 能 Wang Niansun says nothing, Yu Yue understands it as *er* 而 "and" and reads it with the following phrase, and Yang Yunru thinks it is excrescent. Given that all three testimonies have this word, I follow Kong Anguo in taking it as a verb placed in the sentence's final position.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the Duke of Zhou, I believe the reading of *ren* in the *Documents* should be understood against this background. I would suggest the received text gives *ren* rather than the more natural *ning* "pleasing" in order to emphasize the Duke of Zhou's possession of that virtue. However, in saying this, it would be improper for the text to continue with the comparison of the Duke of Zhou and King Wu and state that the Duke of Zhou is more benevolent than his brother. Such a statement would undermine the ruler and be at odds with other ancient discussions: the Duke of Zhou can advise King Wu about *ren*, and he himself can even be praised for the same virtue, but he must never surpass the ruler in this regard.[74] This must be the reason that the received text leaves out the reference to *ren* when it goes on to compare the two brothers, thus breaking the parallel between the first and second half of the statement. This is supported by the text of the *Shi ji*, which closely resembles the *Documents*, with the sole exception that it omits the character *ren*, thus removing the possibility that the Duke of Zhou might be more benevolent than King Wu, as I have just mentioned. The result is also an imbalance between the two halves of the statement.

For further indication of the notion that the Duke of Zhou must not undermine the ruler, I turn to the second passage from "The Metal-bound Coffer," a more complex example that involves several textual variants. Using the received text from the *Documents* as the basis, I mark out the Chinese text using double underline and the corresponding spots in the translation using single underline:

> 武王既喪，管叔及其群弟乃流言於國，曰：「公將不利於孺子。」周公乃告二公曰：「我之弗辟，我無以告我先王。」周公居東二年，則罪人斯得。于後，公乃為詩以貽王，名之曰《鴟鴞》。王亦未敢誚公。
>
> After King Wu died, Guanshu and the younger brothers spread talk around the country, saying, "The Duke will do no good to the king's young son." The Duke of Zhou accordingly declared to the two dukes, "If we do not punish them, we will have nothing to report to the royal ancestors."[75] The Duke of Zhou spent two years in the east, whereupon the guilty men were apprehended. Afterward the duke made a poem and presented it to the king, calling it "The Owl." The king on his part did not dare blame the duke.

---

74. See the discussions in *Shuo yuan* 說苑 "Guide" 貴德, in Zuo Songchao 左松超, *Shuoyuan jizheng* 說苑集證 (Taipei: Guoli bianyi guan, 2000), 255–57; Xu Weiyu, *Hanshi waizhuan jishi*, *juan* 3, 94–7; and Liu Dianjue 劉殿爵 (D.C. Lau), ed., *Shangshu dazhuan zhuzi suoyin* 尚書大傳逐字索引 (Taipei: Taiwan Shangwu, 1994), 15.

75. The two dukes are the Duke of Shao and Taigong Wang 太公望, two other senior statesmen at court.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In the first instance, the received text has *pi* 辟 "to punish," whereas Zheng Xuan gives the reading of *bi* 避 "to escape."[76] As Kong Yingda explains, Zheng's reading reflects an entirely different narrative of the events: upon hearing the rumors, the Duke of Zhou does not punish the rebels, but rather, *bi* "escapes" or goes into retirement in the east; and the *zuiren* 罪人 "guilty men" that are apprehended are not the rebels, but the Duke of Zhou's followers who have been implicated in their leader's crimes. In an effort to seek their pardoning, the Duke of Zhou composes the "Chixiao" and pleads for King Cheng's mercy. It is only later, after the coffer is opened and their misunderstanding resolved, that the Duke of Zhou returns to be regent once again, and it is then that he sets off on a campaign to quell the rebellion, thus heading out to the east a second time.[77]

For this part of the text, the *Shi ji* has the statement: 我之弗辟而攝行政者，恐天下畔周，無以告我先王 "I do not avoid serving as the regent because I am afraid that the world will rebel against the Zhou and we will have nothing to report to the royal ancestors." This is evidently reading *pi* as *bi* "to escape," *a la* Zheng Xuan, even though the overall sense is closer to the received text.

In the second instance, the received text has *yi* 貽 "to present," and even though this is given as *wei* 遺 "to leave with" in the "small preface" of the "Chixiao" found in the *Odes*, the change in meaning is not significant. Once again, it is Zheng Xuan who has a completely different reading: rather than the Duke of Zhou presenting the poem to King Cheng or leaving it with him, Zheng has the Duke of Zhou attempting to *yi* 怡 "appease" King Cheng with it. The purpose of this is so that King Cheng would pardon the Duke of Zhou's followers; and in this way it is tied with Zheng's narrative of the events, mentioned immediately above.

Based on the first two variants and the different narratives in which they are embedded, one finds two images of the Duke of Zhou. The received text has him playing an active role, full of authority, as he

---

76. This is reported by Lu Deming 陸德明 (556–627) in the *Jingdian shiwen* 經典釋文, now included in the *Shisanjing zhushu* 十三經注疏. As Lu notes, the same reading is also shared by Ma Rong 馬融 (79–166). For further discussion of this line of thinking, see the discussion on *Mozi* 墨子 "Geng Zhu" 耕柱 and "Fei ru" 非儒 in the last section of this study.

77. Zheng Xuan's narrative is also reflected in the placement of the "Dongshan" 東山 immediately after the "Chixiao" in the *Odes*. The "small preface" of that poem identifies it as concerning the Duke of Zhou's campaign to the east. Its appearance after the "Chixiao" implies that the campaign takes place only after the Duke of Zhou has resolved his conflict with King Cheng. Similarly, in the received text of the *Documents*, the "Jin teng" is followed immediately by the "Da gao" 大誥, the "great proclamation" made by the Duke of Zhou prior to his campaign to attack the rebels.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

shows no hesitation "punishing" the rebels, and later on, in an effort to clarify his misunderstanding with King Cheng, simply "presents" or "leaves" him with the poem. By contrast, Zheng Xuan's understanding has the Duke of Zhou in a more passive role. Faced with the challenge by the rebels, his first impulse is to "escape" from it, and later on, it is as a supplicant that he attempts to "appease" King Cheng with his poem. This second understanding removes or at least weakens the conflict between him and his brothers. Rather than punishing these guilty men, the Duke of Zhou now labors to save those other culprits, or his followers. However, because these followers are nowhere mentioned in "The Metal-bound Coffer," Zheng Xuan's understanding seems more a supposition than a reading based on the details of the text.[78] I believe Zheng's effort here is consistent with his interpretation of the "Chixiao" as described in the first part of the study.[79]

For the first two variants, the manuscript version of "The Metal-bound Coffer" is damaged in the first instance; and in the second instance, it has *wei* "to leave with," the same as the "small preface" of the "Chixiao," and there is no reason to believe that it should read otherwise. It is only with the third variant that it gives a reading with

---

78. Cf. the view of Wang Su 王肅, cited by Kong Yingda; see Li Xueqin, ed., *Maoshi zhengyi*, 602.

79. Here it is possible to note that there was an ancient tradition that the Duke of Zhou "was forced to run to Chu" (*ben Chu* 奔楚). This is mentioned in the *Shi ji*, in an account about the Duke of Zhou praying for King Cheng when the latter falls ill (see discussion below); and once again in another text from Sima Qian, the "Meng Tian liezhuan" 蒙恬列傳 in Takigawa Kametarō and Mizusawa Toshitada, *Shiji huizhu kaozheng fu jiaobu*, 88.9. It is also discussed in *Lun heng* 論衡 "Gan lei" 感類 and mentioned in the "Lei hai" 累害; see Huang Hui 黃暉, *Lunheng jiaoshi* 論衡校釋 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1990), 786–802, 15–17. Most importantly, it appears to be the basis of a reference in the *Zuo zhuan* (Zhao 7): when Duke Xiang of Lu 魯襄公 went to Chu in 545 B.C.E., he had a dream that he was being led by the Duke of Zhou, thus implying that the Duke of Zhou had also visited Chu; see Yang Bojun, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, 1285–87. If this last account is valid, then the *Zuo zhuan* would attest to the pre-Qin roots of this tradition. Even if, as suggested by some scholars, the identification of Chu came about due to a mistaken reading of another character, this misreading would have occurred quite early on. Whichever the case, the rationales behind this tradition are complex and await further research. But I think a part of the reason must be the attempt to create a certain image of the Duke of Zhou, such as discussed here. Thus, if it was to Chu, rather than the east, that the Duke of Zhou went involuntarily, then this would be an even more benevolent, even more passive Duke of Zhou than described by Zheng Xuan, since he would have been physically so far removed from his brothers that it would have been out of the question for him to bring any action against them. For summaries of previous discussions about the Duke of Zhou's activities in Chu, See Gu Jiegang, "Zhougong dongzheng shishi kaozheng," 874–86; and Shaughnessy, "Duke Zhou's Retirement in the East," 121–25.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

significant difference, and this calls for a more detailed discussion. When describing King Cheng's response upon receiving the poem from the Duke of Zhou, the manuscript says: "The king did not greet the duke" (*wang yi wei ni gong* 王亦未逆公).[80] Here the word *ni* 逆 "to greet" indicates King Cheng's reaction if he believed the Duke of Zhou's explanation; and he does not, because he remains displeased with the Duke of Zhou and refuses to greet him in person. The same word appears again later in the manuscript, after King Cheng realizes he was wrong to distrust the Duke of Zhou, and he makes the following statement: 隹（惟）余沓（沖）人丌（其）親逆公，我邦家（家）豊（禮）亦宜之 "I, princeling, will greet him in person, and indeed, this is appropriate according to the rites of our state." This is immediately followed by the statement: 王乃出逆公至鄗（郊）"The king went forth to the suburbs to greet the duke."

Comparing the manuscript with the *Shi ji* on this point, the difference is striking. According to the *Shi ji*, by the time King Cheng comes around to recognizing his mistake, the Duke of Zhou has been deceased for some time. Thus it is the remains of the Duke of Zhou that King Cheng welcomes back and goes out to "greet." As for King Cheng's comment about such a gesture adhering to the rites, the meaning of this also changes accordingly, understood by commentators to refer to ceremonies performed in the suburbs. Such difference is consistent with an earlier part of the story. Whereas the manuscript says "the king does not greet the duke" in describing King Cheng's response to the "Chixiao," the *Shi ji* has the following: 王亦未敢訓周公 "The king did not dare admonish the Duke of Zhou." This indicates the same displeasure that one finds in the manuscript, but by putting *gan xun* 敢訓 "to dare admonish" in the place of *ni* "to greet," the possibility that King Cheng might personally meet the Duke of Zhou at a later point is denied altogether in the *Shi ji*.

What do these differences mean? With the manuscript, King Cheng goes out to greet the Duke of Zhou, a move that is ritually improper by those at court who are careful to maintain the strict hierarchy between the ruler and his subjects, hence King Cheng's remark in anticipation of the criticism: "This is appropriate according to the rites of our state." By contrast, no such problem exists for the *Shi ji*, given that the Duke of Zhou is already deceased by this point. This makes it possible for King Cheng to treat him with maximum ceremony without any fear of disrupting the hierarchy between the two, perhaps much in the same way that it was only after his death that Confucius came to be referred to as

80. It is not clear how Zheng Xuan understands this point, because his views as reported by Kong Yingda are vague on this part of the text. For further discussion, see below.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

suwang 素王 "the unadorned king."[81] In fact, such a gesture on King Cheng's part only reinforces the ruler's authority and entrenches the Duke of Zhou in his subordinate position.[82]

The same concern in the hierarchy between King Cheng and the Duke of Zhou is pervasive throughout the *Shi ji*, and it is worth looking at several details unparalleled in either the manuscript or the received text. The first is an episode about the Duke of Zhou's anticipation of his death:

> 周公在豐，病，將沒，曰：「必葬我成周，以明吾不敢離成王。」周公既卒，成王亦讓，葬周公於畢，從文王，以明予小子不敢臣周公也。
>
> The Duke of Zhou was in Feng and fell ill. When he was about to die, he said, "Make sure to bury me at Cheng Zhou, so as to make clear that I do not venture to leave King Cheng." After the Duke of Zhou expired, King Cheng indeed yielded to him and buried him at Bi to follow King Wen, so as to make clear that "I, the little one," did not venture to treat the Duke of Zhou as a vassal.[83]

As is consistent with the interest in the Duke of Zhou's post-mortem treatment, pointed out earlier, this passage reports a disagreement between the Duke of Zhou and King Cheng over the rites that he is to receive after his death. Here King Cheng is unreserved in his decision to bury the Duke in the same royal cemetery as King Wen, thus affording him a regnal privilege: 以明予小子不敢臣周公也 "To make clear that 'I, the little one,' did not venture to treat the Duke of Zhou as a vassal."[84] By contrast, it is perhaps an indication of the Duke of Zhou's humility that before his passing, he expresses the wish to be buried elsewhere: 以明吾不敢離成王 "To make clear that I do not venture to leave King Cheng." In a closely related account in a fragment of the *Shang shu*

---

81. For a recent discussion of Confucius as the "unadorned king," see Asano Yūichi 淺野裕一, "'Junzi wei li' yu Kongzi suwang shuo" 《君子為禮》與孔子素王說, in idem, *Shangbo Chujian yu Xian Qin sixiang* 上博楚簡與先秦思想 (Taibei: Wanjuanlou, 2008), 55–81.

82. See the view of Liang Yusheng 梁玉繩 (1745–1819) and Wei Yuan 魏源 (1794–1857), cited in Takigawa Kametarō and Mizusawa Toshitada, *Shiji huizhu kaozheng*, 33.6–7.

83. The translation is from Nienhauser, ed., *The Grand Scribe's Records*, vol. 5.1, 139.

84. I note with some interest that the Duke of Zhou is often credited with initiating the institution of joint burials. The relevant sources include *Li ji* 禮記 "Tan Gong" 檀弓 in Li Xueqin, ed., *Liji zhengyi* 禮記正義, traditional character edition (Beijing: Beijing daxue, 2000), 198, 228–29; *Baihu tong* 白虎通 "Beng hong" 崩薨 in Chen Li 陳立, *Baihu tong shuzheng* 白虎通疏證 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1994), 558; and *Kongzi jiayu* "Gongxi Chi wen" 公西赤問 in Yang Chaoming, *Kongzi jiayu tongjie—fu chutu ziliao yu xiangguan yanjiu*, 571–73.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

dazhuan 尚書大傳 (Great commentary of the *Book of Documents*), this last statement is stated more explicitly: 示天下臣于成王 "to show the world that I am a vassal to King Cheng."[85] This completes the parallel and reveals how the topic of the Duke of Zhou's post-mortem treatment was embedded in the more serious concern about the respective places between him and King Cheng.[86] In another passage from earlier in the *Shi ji*, again unattested in either the manuscript or the received text, one finds the following:

> 成王長，能聽政。於是周公乃還政於成王，成王臨朝。周公之代成王治，南面倍依以朝諸侯。及七年後，還政成王，北面就臣位，匑匑如畏然。[87]
>
> When King Cheng grew up, he was able to preside over the government. At this time, the Duke of Zhou returned power to King Cheng, and King Cheng held court. When the Duke of Zhou governed the state in King Cheng's place, he faced south with his back toward the axe screen so as to meet the feudal lords in the court. Seven years later, he returned power to King Cheng, facing north and taking his position as a subject, in a respectful manner as if in awe.

Particularly noteworthy in this passage is the attention to the detail about the Duke of Zhou's position vis-à-vis the ruler. As a regent, the Duke of Zhou assumes the place of the ruler and faces south, looking out to his subjects; but as soon as he returns power to King Cheng, he takes

---

85. Wang Kaiyun 王闓運, *Shangshu dazhuan buzhu* 尚書大傳補注, 1923 woodblock edition (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 1995), vol. 55, 5.7a-b.

86. See also the discussions in *Baihu tong* "Sang fu" 喪服 and "Feng gonghou" 封公侯 in Chen Li, *Baihu tong shuzheng*, 532, 156–57. It is also mentioned in a memorial submitted by Gu Yong 谷永 (d. 8 B.C.E.) to Emperor Cheng 成帝 (r. 33–7 B.C.E.), recorded in *Han shu* "Rulin zhuan" 儒林傳; see Wang Xianqian, *Han shu buzhu*, pp. 5436–38. Interestingly, in another text from the *Han shu*, a memorial submitted by Mei Fu 梅福, also to Emperor Cheng, the author observes that because King Cheng buried the Duke of Zhou with the rites befitting only a feudal lord (as opposed to the ruler), a storm came about; see Ibid., pp. 4601–04. This is elaborated further in a remark by Emperor Shun 順帝 (r. 125–144), made in 136 C.E., which points out that it was only after King Cheng reverted to the rites befitting a ruler that the storm subsided; see *Hou Hanshu* 後漢書 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1965), pp. 2027–28. These last two accounts are an effort to interpret the narrative of "The Metal-bound Coffer" in the light of the tradition about the Duke of Zhou's burial.

87. Takigawa Kametarō and Mizusawa Toshitada, *Shiji huizhu kaozheng fu jiaobu*, 33.11–2. The translation is from Nienhauser, ed., *The Grand Scribe's Records*, vol. 5.1, 136–37, with slight modifications.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the place of the subject, now facing north.[88] This betrays the same concern as what I have suggested above, only that one is concerned with the Duke of Zhou's place while he is still alive, and one with that after his death. In both cases, the Duke of Zhou is to occupy a subordinate place. And if he was to be elevated any higher, this could only come about as a result of the ruler's order.[89]

For another detail from the *Shi ji*, absent from the both the manuscript and the received text, it is possible to mention the suggestion that King Cheng is still a swaddled infant when he inherits the throne, with the Duke of Zhou acting as regent. As pointed out by several scholars, such a detail is inconsistent with the rest of "The Metal-bound Coffer,"

---

88. Other references to the Duke of Zhou's position vis-à-vis the ruler can be found in *Xunzi* "Ru xiao" 儒效; see Wang Xianqian, et al., *Junshi*, 4.1–4; *Huainanzi* "Fan lun" 氾論 in He Ning, *Huainanzi jishi*, 923–27; and *Hanshi waizhuan*, 7.241. A passage from *Li ji* "Mingtang wei" 明堂位 also contains the following: 昔者周公朝諸侯于明堂之位，天子負斧依，南鄉而立 "In the past the Duke of Zhou held audience with the feudal lords, with all in their respective places in the Bright Hall. The Son of Heaven had his back to the screen with axe-shape decorations, standing facing south"; see Li Xueqin, ed., *Liji zhengyi*, 1085–96. Note that Zheng Xuan equates the Duke of Zhou with the Son of Heaven (*tianzi* 天子), a move that is unproblematic for him, presumably because the reference to the *fuyi* 斧依 "screen with axe-shape decorations" clearly indicates the Duke of Zhou's regency and hence the provisional nature of the arrangement. (The real Son of Heaven, or King Cheng, would be seated behind the same screen.) Zheng's commentary, in fact, opens with the statement: 周公攝王位 "The Duke of Zhou served as regent to the king."

89. Several other texts exploit and develop further the Duke of Zhou's potential to subvert King Cheng's authority. In *Lüshi chunqiu* "Li wei" 離謂, there is a discussion on how ministers are *shang* 傷 "maligned" when they have too many or too few achievements: 周公、召公以此疑 "The Duke of Zhou and the Duke of Shao were doubted because of this"; see Chen Qiyou, *Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi*, 1187–88, and the translation from Knoblock and Riegel, *The Annals of Lü Buwei: A Complete Translation and Study*, 453–54, with slight modifications. In spite of the reference to Shaogong 召公 or the Duke of Shao, it is clear that the focus is on the Duke of Zhou, particularly his illustrious career and the threat he posed to the ruler. Even more extraordinary is a text collected in the *Yi Zhoushu* 逸周書 called the "Du yi" 度邑. In a private conversation that takes place on the eve of the conquest of the Shang, King Wu designates the Duke of Zhou, not King Cheng, as his successor: 乃今我兄弟相後，我筮龜其何所即？今用建庶建 "Now with us brothers succeeding one another, what is there to approach our milfoil stalks and turtle for? Now I will establish by establishing the concubine's son"; see Huang Huaixin 黃懷信, Zhang Maorong 張懋鎔, and Tian Xudong 田旭東, *Yi Zhoushu huijiao jizhu* 逸周書彙校集注, 2nd edition (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 2007), 465–83. While the last sentence, like many parts of the "Du yi," may be corrupt, the general sense is clear: King Wu is choosing his brother as the successor and noting the fact that the Duke of Zhou was the son of his father's concubine, not of the principal consort. It is not difficult to see how such a text could have been used both to legitimize the authority of the Duke of Zhou and to undermine that of King Cheng.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

including King Cheng's reading of the "Chixiao" and his reconciliation with the Duke of Zhou; it would be more plausible if he was older when he became ruler and older still when the said events took place. This view is undoubtedly correct, though I also think King Cheng's infancy is not simply a bungling of the timeline, but instead an attempt to legitimatize the Duke of Zhou's regency. The weaker or more infantile King Cheng is, the more natural and more unproblematic it is for the Duke of Zhou to dominate the court as he does. While such a tradition is unique to the *Shi ji* among the three versions of "The Metal-bound Coffer," it can be found in several other sources and must have not been the invention of Sima Qian alone.[90]

Related to the controversy about King Cheng's age when he assumes the throne, one might think of two further details in early Western Zhou chronology, touched upon by "The Metal-bound Coffer": the precise year of King Wu's passing, and the number of years that the Duke of Zhou spends in the east, regardless of the purpose. Like the controversy about King Cheng's age, these are two events about which there are many disagreements among the sources, even though the evidence does not permit one to reach any certain conclusions. Still, it should be clear from the discussion above how attempts to reconstruct early Western Zhou chronology could be extremely problematic, failing as they do to take into account the ideologies behind the sources. This is a topic on which I will have more to say later in the study.

Finally, the *Shi ji* is also unique among the three versions of "The Metal-bound Coffer" in that it reports an additional prayer made by the Duke of Zhou, on behalf of King Cheng, when the latter falls ill. This episode so closely resembles the earlier account of the Duke of Zhou's prayer for King Wu that it can only be regarded as a variation on the same theme. As in his prayer for King Wu, the Duke of Zhou offers to exchange his life for King Cheng's. However, this second prayer says nothing about the Duke of Zhou's talents or his assumption of the ruler's responsibilities (see discussion below). I believe these differences

---

90. These are the "Meng Tian liezhuan" and the "Fengshan wen" 封禪文 cited in the "Sima Xiangru liezhuan" 司馬相如列傳; see Takigawa Kametarō and Mizusawa Toshitada, *Shiji huizhu kaozheng fu jiaobu*, 88.9, 117.93. See also *Lüshi chunqiu* "Xia xian" 下賢 in Chen Qiyou, *Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi*, 886–87; Jia Yi's biography in Wang Xianqian, *Han shu buzhu*, 3676–83; *Xinshu* 新書 "Bao fu" 保傅 in Yan Zhenyi 閻振益 and Zhong Xia 鍾夏, *Xinshu jiaozhu* 新書校注 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 2000), 183–84; *Da Dai liji* "Bao fu" in Huang Huaixin, *Da Dai liji huijiao jizhu*, 326–28; *Huainanzi* "Yao lue" 要略 in He Ning, *Huainanzi jishi*, 1457–59; Xu Weiyu, *Hanshi waizhuan jishi*, *juan* 7, 241; *Yantielun* 鹽鐵論 "Wei tong" 未通 in Wang Liqi 王利器, *Yantielun jiaozhu* 鹽鐵論校注 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1992), 192–93; and *Kongzi jiayu* "Guan Zhou" 觀周 in Yang Chaoming, *Kongzi jiayu tongjie—fu chutu ziliao yu xiangguan yanjiu*, 134–35.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

only underscore his loyalty to King Cheng, not the possibility that he might overtake him. This is no doubt the reason that Sima Qian does not think it redundant to include this episode.

In this way, coming back to the received text of the "Metal-bound coffer," one can see how it understands the last part of the narrative in a way consistent with the *Shi ji*. Where the manuscript records the first instance of *ni*, about King Cheng not "greeting" the Duke of Zhou, the received text has *gan qiao* 敢誚 "to dare blame," a reading that does not differ significantly from *gan xun* "to dare admonish" of the *Shi ji*. Where the manuscript has King Cheng actually meeting the Duke of Zhou, the received text merely says that he "goes forth to the suburbs" (*wang chu jiao* 王出郊), thus leaving it unclear whether this is to "greet" the Duke of Zhou in person or to receive his remains. The only appearance of *ni* in the received text is King Cheng's assertion that his "greeting" of the Duke of Zhou is ritually proper, but this, too, can be interpreted either way. Whoever transmitted the received text must have thought, as Sima Qian did in writing the *Shi ji*, that it was problematic for King Cheng to greet the Duke of Zhou. However, having removed this scenario, he did not change the narrative as radically as Sima Qian did by reshuffling the events or introducing additional content to it. The result is a certain ambiguity as to which version of the story he really wanted to tell.

As for the ancient commentators, in the case of Kong Anguo, the Duke of Zhou is still alive when King Cheng realizes his mistake, and in the latter's anticipation of his return, he does consider "greeting" him. However, by insisting that the word modifying this act of greeting, *xin* 新, should be read as it is, meaning "anew" (rather than the more natural *qin* 親 "personally" from the same phonetic series), Kong is able to twist the meaning of the text so King Cheng avoids a direct encounter with the Duke of Zhou.[91] As Kong explains, it is after King Cheng has "reformed and renewed himself" (*gaiguo zixin* 改過自新) that he "dispatches an envoy to greet him" (*qian shizhe ying zhi* 遣使者迎之). As for Zheng Xuan, he is silent on this part of the received text, and only alludes to King Cheng's greeting of the Duke of Zhou under another poem from the *Odes*, the "Jiu yu" 九罭 (Nine nets), thus leaving one guessing whether he has a position worked out.[92] Perhaps for Zheng, any kind of transgression on the Duke of Zhou's part was permissible as long as he served as regent, nominally a position ordained by the ruler.[93]

91. *Qin ying* 親迎 "to greet personally" is from the text of Ma Rong, as noted by Lu Deming, but no further detail is available. It is also what one finds in the manuscript.

92. Contrary to what Karlgren suggests under *Glosses on the Book of Documents*, #1583. For the "Jiu yu," see Li Xueqin, ed., *Maoshi zhengyi*, 622–26.

93. Cf. the discussion in n.86 above.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The remainder of this section will look at one more set of discussions about the Duke of Zhou and ritual. This is a minor but not insignificant detail about ancestral sacrifices, particularly the type of bull offered to the Duke of Zhou. For those who have little interest in such a matter, I suggest skipping over the rest of this sub-section to go directly to my analysis of the next variant in "The Metal-bound Coffer." For those who do not mind working through the relevant scholastic debates, I believe this topic uncovers the reasoning behind one of the Duke of Zhou's most lasting legacies.

I will begin with a discussion attributed to Dong Zhongshu and recorded in *Chunqiu fanlu* "Jiaoshi dui" 郊事對 (An official response regarding the suburban sacrifice).[94] This is a discussion concerning the *jiao* 郊 "suburban" sacrifices, offerings made to Heaven and the ancestors in exchange for a year of success in the cultivation of the crops. Arguably the most important ritual for an agricultural society, such sacrifices were made by the royal court and the various polities, each with its own ancestors. According to Dong, whereas the Duke of Zhou, as the ancestor of the state of Lu, was offered the *baimu* 白牡 "white bull," the royal ruler was offered the *xinggang* 騂犅 "red bull," and the other feudal lords were offered the *bumao* 不毛 "motley bull." As Dong explains: 故成王使祭周公以白牡，上不得與天子同色，下有異於諸侯 "Thus King Cheng used a white bull when ordering the sacrificial offering for the Duke of Zhou. With respect to his superior, it was not the same color sacrificial victim as that used by the Son of Heaven, and with respect to his subordinates, it was different from that used by the feudal lords." In other words, the bulls used in ancestral sacrifices are distinguished according to the statuses of the figures to whom the offerings are made, with the ruler being the most elevated, followed by the Duke of Zhou, and finally the rest of the feudal lords. Intriguingly, when one compares this with a similar account in the *Gongyang zhuan* 公羊傳 (The Gongyang tradition of the Spring and Autumn), one finds an important difference.[95] While the two texts concur on what the feudal lords and the Duke of Zhou received, the *Gongyang zhuan* states that it was the later rulers of Lu, rather than the Son of Heaven as asserted by the *Chunqiu fanlu*, that received the red bull. In this way, the particular type of sacrificial animal offered to the highest authority, according to one text, was now given to a lesser figure, according to another. This is all the more unusual given that a part of the *Gongyang zhuan* is actually quoted by the *Chunqiu fanlu*.

---

94. Su Yu, *Chunqiu fanlu yizheng*, 414–18. The translation is from Queen and Major, *Luxuriant Gems of the Spring and Autumn*, 532–34, with some modifications.

95. Li Xueqin, ed., *Chunqiu Gongyang zhuan zhushu* 春秋公羊傳注疏, traditional character edition (Beijing: Beijing daxue, 2000), Wen 13, 350–53.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Needless to say, such a difference is important because the grading of the red, white, and motley bull has a direct bearing for understanding how the Duke of Zhou was regarded: did he enjoy a privilege that equaled the Son of Heaven?

To account for this disagreement, I believe it is necessary to look more carefully at the *Chunqiu fanlu* and the nature of the discussion by Dong Zhongshu. Here the dialogic format is characteristic of the scholarly tradition of the *Chun qiu* 春秋 (Spring and autumn annals), seen sporadically in the *Zuo zhuan*, but more frequently encountered in the *Gongyang* and *Guliang* 穀梁 commentaries. The very fact that some matters need to be explained and clarified suggests that the ritual institutions were being codified and standardized as the interlocutors spoke. Thus one should be careful not to take Dong's response at face value, but instead look into the particular concerns that his response addresses. In this way, it is worth reading more closely the question that prompts Dong's reply about sacrificial bull: 周天子用騂犅，群公不毛；周公，諸公也，何以得用純牲 "The Zhou Son of Heaven used a red bull to offer in sacrifice, whereas the numerous dukes used motley bulls to offer in sacrifice. The Duke of Zhou was a duke. How then was he able to use a pure-colored bull to offer in sacrifice?" What confuses the novice is why the Duke of Zhou, a mere feudal lord like the other ones, should have been treated any differently and offered the *chunsheng* 純牲 "pure-colored bull" rather than the more conventional *bumao* "motley bull." Notice that the question implies an equation of the bull that the Duke of Zhou receives with that for the ruler: whether it is the *xinggang* "red bull" or the *baimu* "white bull," as seen earlier in the *Chunqiu fanlu*, both are *chunsheng* "pure-colored bulls." Certainly this is what the novice observes, that there does not seem to be any distinction between the Duke of Zhou and the ruler in this regard. It is also what is implied in the *Gongyang* commentary: both the Duke of Zhou and his descendants, i.e. the later rulers of Lu are offered pure-colored bulls, whereas the other feudal lords are offered the motley bulls of a lower grade. Herein lies the crux of the matter and the source of all the discussions to follow. For the novice, this is a matter of some concern, hence the question about ritual propriety. In his reply, Dong attempts to account for this by suggesting that the red and white bulls are slightly differentiated, but such a response is prescriptive in nature and introduces a distinction that is more Dong's innovation than reality as perceived by the novice.[96]

---

96. This can be compared with the explanation by He Xiu 何休 (129–182), the Han commentator of the *Gongyang zhuan*: 周公死有王禮，謙不敢與文、武同也 "Though the Duke of Zhou received the rites befitting a king upon his death, he was humble in not

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The background of these scholastic discussions is the widely shared tradition that the state of Lu was permitted to perform the suburban sacrifices that were otherwise the exclusive privilege of the Zhou ruler, thanks to the distinguished career of the Duke of the Zhou and the honor that King Cheng had bestowed on him.[97] Like the discussion about the reception of his remains and that about his burial in the royal cemetery, this tradition also concerns the question whether the status of the Duke of Zhou might have been so elevated that it ended up surpassing that of the ruler.

From an even broader perspective, it is not insignificant that ritual institution is the topic underlying all of the discussions about the Duke of Zhou, cited in this sub-section. No doubt these discussions played a role in the oft-repeated tradition that it was the Duke of Zhou who instituted the rites and music of the Zhou. One could go a step further and emphasize the importance of the events narrated in "The Metal-bound Coffer." By returning the throne to King Cheng, the Duke of Zhou safeguarded the succession from King Wu to King Cheng and set a precedent for primogeniture that was to become the norm for the remainder of the Zhou, and indeed much of Chinese history. This contrasted with the Shang, where the genealogies recorded in both the received literary record and inscriptional sources confirm that succession was determined by seniority within an enclosed group. In the eyes of later authors, the Zhou marked the beginning of a new era. Once the institutions surrounding succession were put in place, not only was it clear where the Duke of Zhou stood vis-à-vis King Wu and King Cheng, but it was natural for the other rites (e.g. whether to inter one in the royal cemetery and whether descendants such as the rulers of Lu were permitted to perform the suburban sacrifices) to fall in line.[98]

---

daring being identical with King Wen and King Wu." He explains the difference in terms of the color associated with each of the three dynasties: the Duke of Zhou received bull of the color esteemed by the Shang, rather than the Zhou, in order to differentiate himself from King Wen and King Wu before him. But such explanation is unfounded because, one, there is no reason to believe that the color of the sacrificial bull should have anything to do with the colors associated with the three dynasties; and two, it is odd that the Duke of Zhou, a royal member of the Zhou, should opt for the color preferred by the Shang. If anything, He Xiu's explanation only indicates an effort to relegate the Duke of Zhou to a lower status.

97. This can be seen in two passages from the *Li ji*, "Mingtang wei" and "Ji tong" 祭統; see Li Xueqin, ed., *Liji zhengyi*, 1085–96, 1595–96. It can also be found in the passages from the *Shangshu dazhuan* and *Baihutong*, cited above.

98. The classic statement of what I am merely paraphrasing in this paragraph is Wang Guowei 王國維, "Yin Zhou zhidu lun" 殷周制度論, in idem, *Guantang jilin* 觀堂集林, in *Wang Guowei quanji* 王國維全集 (Hangzhou: Zhejiang jiaoyu, 2009), vol. 8, 302–320.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Thanks to the study, *Chinese Society in the Age of Confucius (1000–250 BC): The Archaeological Evidence*, by Lothar von Falkenhausen, the tradition that the Duke of Zhou instituted the rites and music of the Zhou has received much attention recently. Drawing on earlier research by Jessica Rawson, Falkenhausen comments at length on the so-called Late Western Zhou ritual reform and corroborates it with evidence from the archaeological record for which his monograph offers such a valuable synthesis.[99] Yet it seems to me that Falkenhausen overstates his case when he uses these findings to challenge any possible role that the Duke of Zhou might have played. After all, the archaeological record and the tradition about the Duke of Zhou largely speak past one another: the Duke of Zhou belonged to the highest level of Western Zhou society and was active during the period of its founding, and it is difficult to find evidence for either in the archaeological record. If one were to try to incorporate evidence from the archaeological record into the tradition about the Duke of Zhou and early Western Zhou (more plausible and probably easier than the other way around), then it seems to me that one ought to begin by entertaining the possibility that they do not contradict one another.

A final passage to be considered is from the first part of "The Metal-bound Coffer": after the Duke of Zhou has prayed to the ancestors about King Wu's illness, he performs a divination. Meeting a favorable result, he consults a divination guidebook and confirms that it is indeed auspicious. The Duke of Zhou goes on to make a statement, reported in the received text as the following:

> 乃卜三龜，一習吉。啟籥見書，乃並是吉。公曰：「體，王其罔害。予小子新命于三王，惟永終是圖；茲攸俟，能念予一人。」公歸，乃納冊于金縢之匱中。王翼日乃瘳。
>
> He then divined with three turtle shells, and all alike were favorable. He opened the lock and read the oracle texts, and these too were favorable. The duke said, "Oh, the king will suffer no harm. I, humble prince, have a renewed mandate from the three kings. It is for a lasting future that I have planned. What I now await is that they will have concern for me the lone man." The duke went back and then placed

99. Lothar von Falkenhausen, *Chinese Society in the Age of Confucius (1000–250 BC): The Archaeological Evidence* (Los Angeles: Cotsen Institute of Archaeology, 2006), Part I, especially 154–61. Thus, for instance, Falkenhausen comments insightfully on how the archaeological record reflects a changing conception of ritual that corresponds with or anticipates Confucian philosophy, but in my view this does not deprive the same conception of the possibility that it might have earlier roots.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the document with the charge in the metal-bound coffer. On the next day the king recovered.

In my reading of this passage, the statement by the Duke of Zhou is his prognostication, a prediction based on the results of the divination. As noted by previous scholars, such expressions as *yi xi ji* 一習吉 "all alike were favorable" and *wang qi wang hai* 王其罔害 "the king will suffer no harm" resemble the language of divinatory records from the Shang and are indications of their very ancient roots.[100] The same is true with the expression *yu yiren* 予一人 "I the lone man," a form of self-address used by the ruler, seen also in inscriptional sources.[101] In the context of "The Metal-bound Coffer," I understand this to be the Duke of Zhou's reference to himself, and I take the related *yu xiaozi* 予小子 "I the humble prince" to be a variation, a humbler form that emphasizes the Duke of Zhou's inferior place vis-à-vis the ancestors.[102] When he says "It is for a lasting future that I have planned" (*wei yongzhong shi tu* 惟永終是圖), this

---

100. Cf. Li Xueqin, "Shang shu 'Jin teng' yu Chujian daoci" 《尚書・金縢》與楚簡禱辭, in idem, *Wenwu zhong de gu wenming* 文物中的古文明 (Beijing: Shangwu, 2008), 408–12, especially 411.

101. See Hu Houxuan 胡厚宣, "Chong lun 'yu yiren' wenti" 重論「余一人」問題, *Guwenzi yanjiu* 古文字研究 6 (1981): 15–33. Among the examples from received literature cited by Hu, there are several spoken by the Duke of Zhou, though in every case except one, the context makes it clear that he is speaking either on the ruler's behalf or about him. The exception is *Yi Zhoushu* "Huang men" 皇門, a text made famous in recent years thanks to the inclusion of an alternate version in the manuscripts kept at Tsinghua University. What this suggests is that the appearance of this expression in "The Metal-bound Coffer" is not an idiosyncrasy of the transmitter of this text, and it is echoed by at least one other. That being said, it is unusual for the Duke of Zhou to identify himself as "I the lone man," and no doubt this was regarded as problematic by the various figures involved in the production of these discourses. In the case of the "Huang men," this resulted in the exclusion of this text from the canon, or the received *Documents*, and the text would have remained mostly forgotten if it were not for the Tsinghua corpus. I suspect this is also what would have happened to "The Metal-bound Coffer" if it were not for its high literary merit and the succinct encapsulation of the Duke of Zhou's virtue. Instead, as I will suggest presently, transmitters and commentators found another way to sidestep the problem, through reinterpretation and rewriting.

102. It is not impossible that the expression *yu xiaozi* refers to King Wu, in which case the "renewed mandate from the three kings" would be a new beginning for his reign after the temporary setback caused by his illness. As one will see below, this is also Kong Anguo's understanding. But I still stand by the identification of the Duke of Zhou, for two reasons. The first is the text of the *Shi ji*, discussed immediately below, where *yu xiaozi* is replaced by the Duke of Zhou's personal name. The second is the expression *yuzi* 鬻子 "this young one" from the "Chixiao," which I also understand as the Duke of Zhou's self-address in the face of the other Zhou royalties. In any case, the identification of *yu xiaozi* does not affect the meaning of the more important *yu yiren*, which in my understanding can only refer to the Duke of Zhou.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

does not refer to his own longevity, but the welfare of the state that will be enhanced by his self-sacrifice. When he says "What I now await is that they will have concern for me, the lone man" (*zi you si, neng nian yu yiren* 茲攸俟，能念予一人), this refers to the summoning of the ancestors, or death. The word *si* 俟 "to await" carries the same meaning from an earlier statement in the Duke of Zhou's prayer: 爾之許我，我其以璧與珪，歸俟爾命 "If you grant what I request, I will take these discs and this mace and will go back and await your command." There the Duke of Zhou is negotiating with the ancestors over King Wu's recovery and pledging the precious objects as well as his own life. "To await" implies the surrender of any further action in anticipation of one's death. In his later statement, the Duke of Zhou tries to reinforce this earlier agreement: the ancestors should "have concern" (*nian* 念) only for him, because he, the lone man, has taken on all the ruler's responsibilities, for the moment at least, and now stands as the sole representative of the descendants in the human realm.

It is possible to compare this section of "The Metal-bound Coffer" with a passage in *Mozi* "Jian ai (zhong)" 兼愛中 (Ungraded love [middle]), where King Wu discusses his principle of governing. When encouraging the people to do good, he reserves his highest esteem to those who have the virtue of *ren* (benevolence), and when punishing them, he the "lone man" takes all the blame that might be incurred. In the account by Mozi: 雖有周親，不若仁人；萬方有罪，維予一人 "Although I have close relatives, their help was not equal to that of the benevolent men. Should crimes be committed any place, I, the one man, alone am to blame."[103] Here, as is consistent with my reading of "The Metal-bound Coffer," the expression *yu yiren* appears as a form of self-address, not a reference to another person, and it is an assertion of the ruler's absolute power. To be sure, there are several other ancient texts where this same adage is found, as an advice offered to King Wu by the Duke of Zhou.[104] In all of these cases, however, there is no confusion between the two figures. If the Duke of Zhou makes an appearance, then he appears as a loyal subject, subordinate to King Wu and never to supplant the ruler in any way.[105]

---

103. Wang Huanbiao 王煥鑣, *Mozi jigu* 墨子集詁 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 2005), 334–43. The translation is from John Knoblock and Jeffrey Riegel, *Mozi: A Study and Translation of the Ethical and Political Writings* (Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, 2013), 154–55, with slight modifications.

104. See the texts cited above in n.74, also the quotation of the same statement in *Shuo yuan* "Jun dao," in Zuo Songchao, *Shuoyuan jizheng*, 20–1; and *Han shu* "Yuandi ji" 元帝紀, in Wang Xianqian, *Han shu buzhu*, 411–12.

105. Here it is possible to note that the wording of King Wu's utterance or, in some cases, the Duke of Zhou's advice, closely resembles the wording of a prayer made by Tang 湯, the founder of the Shang. This other prayer has not gone unnoticed by

footnote continued on next page

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

On this basis, one can turn to the *Shi ji* and consider how it conveys the Duke of Zhou’s prognostication:

> 周公入賀武王曰：「王其無害。旦新受命三王，維長終是圖。茲道能念予一人。」
>
> The Duke of Zhou entered and congratulated King Wu: “The king will suffer no harm. I, Dan, have newly received a mandate from the three kings. It is for a last future that I have planned. This way of ours will care for you, our lone man.”[106]

By prefacing the statement with the phrase: 周公入賀武王曰 “The Duke of Zhou entered and congratulated King Wu,” the *Shi ji* makes it clear that the Duke Zhou is speaking to King Wu, thus removing any doubt that *yu yiren* “I the lone man” at the end could refer to anyone but King Wu. With regard to *yu xiaozi* “I the humble prince” from the received text, the *Shiji* has in its place Dan 旦, the Duke of Zhou’s personal name, and this, too, is unambiguous. Such differences result in a text where King Wu and the Duke of Zhou are firmly lodged in their respective places as ruler and subject, but in my view, they are also the smoking gun that hints at a deliberate effort to rewrite what must have been regarded as a problematic text.

The same is true with the commentary by Kong Anguo. Consider his paraphrase of the Duke of Zhou’s statement: 周公言：我小子新受三王之命，武王惟長終是謀周之道 “The Duke of Zhou says: Our humble prince has newly received a mandate from the three kings; it is for a lasting future that King Wu makes plans for the Zhou.” And for the second part: 言武王愈，此所以待能念我天子事，成周道 “This says that King Wu is cured and awaits here to concern himself with his affairs as the Son of Heaven and to bring the Zhou way to completion.”[107] In the first

---

scholars of “The Metal-bound Coffer,” and indeed there are striking similarities between the two: both contain the statement by the speaker that “I the lone man” (*yu yiren*) am willing to sacrifice myself. See the passages in *Guo yu* 國語 “Zhou yu” 周語, in Xu Wengao 徐文誥, *Guoyu jijie* 國語集解 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 2002), 31–5; *Lüshi chunqiu* “Shun min” 順民, in Chen Qiyou, *Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi*, 485; *Mozi* “Jian ai (xia)” 兼愛下, in Wang Huanbiao, *Mozi jigu*, 372–76; and *Lun heng* “Gan xu” 感虛, in Huang Hui, *Lunheng jiaoshi*, 245–49. See also the passages in *Lun yu* 論語 20.1, in Cheng Shude 程樹德, *Lunyu jishi* 論語集釋 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1990), 1345–70; and Liu Dianjue 劉殿爵 (D.C. Lau) and Chen Fangzheng 陳方正, eds., *Shizi zhuzi suoyin* 尸子逐字索引 (Hong Kong: Shangwu, 2000), 10. For these last two passages, Tang’s statement is juxtaposed with a discussion of the Zhou.

106. This last sentence is difficult to construe, and I have translated it to correspond with Kong Anguo’s paraphrase, cited below.

107. This is followed by Karlgren, though he takes the speaker to be King Wu (because, according to him, an introductory “The king says” has accidentally dropped

footnote continued on next page

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

instance, Kong understands *wo xiaozi* 我小子 to refer to King Wu, and this is how I have translated his paraphrase; and he inserts Wuwang 武王 to emphasize the continuity between the two phrases.[108] In the second instance, by replacing *yu yiren* with *wo tianzi* 我天子 "our Son of Heaven," this also resolves the ambiguity of the original statement, since there can only be one Son of Heaven: King Wu.

In light of this discussion, when one turns to the manuscript, it is striking that the prognostication does not appear there at all. After the account about the Duke of Zhou's prayer to the ancestors, the manuscript simply reports that he stores the prayer in the metal-bound coffer, and then the narrative skips right to the beginning of his regency. Given what is known about the manuscript—it is an authentic document from the Warring States, relatively early in date and untouched by later transmitters—and given that there is no clear rupture in the narrative, many scholars have suggested that the absence of this section represents the earliest and most original among the three testimonies.[109] I would like to suggest differently. If, as previous scholars say, "The Metal-bound Coffer" did not originally have the prognostication by the Duke of Zhou, it would be difficult to explain why ancient transmitters introduced this section, only then to look for ways to rewrite it. Instead, it is more likely that they included this section because they had to; it had been handed down from a credible ancient source. This is consistent with the linguistic features of the additional section, as noted before, which correspond to inscriptional sources from as early as the Shang. In this way, I believe the received text and the manuscript simply represent two different transmissions of "The Metal-bound Coffer." If the received text was "later," that is, it introduced materials to "The Metal-bound Coffer" that had not been there before, these materials must have been culled from another source no later than the original "Metal-bound Coffer." Similarly, if the manuscript was "later," that is, "The Metal-bound Coffer" had certain materials to begin with, only to have them removed at a later point, one cannot completely rule out that this removal took place at an earlier point prior to the writing of the manuscript, and the manuscript was simply inheriting this excised version from an earlier

---

out); see *Glosses on the Book of Documents*, #1576. By contrast, Nivison accepts Kong's reading but suggests that this is the Duke of Zhou speaking in King Wu's voice; see "A New Interpretation of the Jin Tvng," 85–6.

108. One recalls that in the same prognostication, the received text has the Duke of Zhou referring to King Wu as *wang* 王 "the king." Earlier in his prayer, when the Duke of Zhou is addressing the ancestors, he refers to King Wu as *er yuansun* 爾元孫 or *nai yuansun* 乃元孫, both "your chief descendent."

109. See, for instance, Chen Jian, "Qinghua jian 'Jin teng' yandu santi," 425–33.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

testimony. I make these comments in order to complicate one's understanding of a potentially controversial conclusion. Whichever the case, it was in the hands of Sima Qian and Kong Anguo that the prognostication underwent a radical transformation as the most problematic statements were rewritten or reinterpreted to reflect a more proper relation between the Duke of Zhou and King Wu.

For each of the three passages considered in this section, I begin with a comparison of the three testimonies of "The Metal-bound Coffer." For the first two passages, it is possible to posit the manuscript as the earliest reading and proceed to understand the other testimonies, the received text of the *Documents* and the *Shi ji*, on that basis. In the case of the third passage, I believe the received text is the earliest, though this is not the received text as interpreted traditionally, but a simpler and more direct reading, proposed by me and based on evidence internal to the text. This allows me to consider the differences with the *Shi ji*, the interpretation attributed to the early commentator Kong Anguo, and the manuscript. The lack of any consistency in the ordering of the testimonies is unsurprising, given what must have been a much greater number of testimonies in circulation during this period; the three that happen to have survived represent only three instantiations in these multiple lines of transmission, and one cannot assume any absolute relation. That being said, the story they tell is the same over and over again. In each case, the comparison reveals an effort by transmitters, commentators, and the re-teller to emphasize the Duke of Zhou's subordinate role vis-à-vis the ruler. By matching this understanding with other ancient sources independent of "The Metal-bound Coffer," I am able to suggest that such an effort was no isolated phenomenon; instead, it reflects a broader discourse about the Duke of Zhou, both a debate of conflicting opinions about him and a concerted move to cast him in a certain light.

As encountered in these three passages, their discrepancies may include textual variants that can be further analyzed as words from the same phonetic series (*ning* 佞 versus *ren* 仁, *pi* 辟 versus *bi* 避, *yi* 貽 versus *yi* 怡, and *qin* 親 versus *xin* 新), phonetic loans (*yi* 貽 *lə versus *wei* 遺 *[G][r]uj-s) or near synonyms (*qiao* 誚 "to blame" versus *xun* 訓 "to admonish"). In the case of *qiao* 誚 and *ni* 逆, the relation is less certain and perhaps involves both graphic confusion and phonetic loaning.[110] But these are only some of the differences. If one included the insertion of additional words, sentences, even sections; the introduction of scenarios and the rearrangement of the sequence of events, then the matter is

110. Chen Jian, "Qinghua jian 'Jin teng' yandu santi," 411–12. Chen's view is that *qiao* 誚 came about due to confusion with a graphic form such as [illegible], which can be read *yu* 御, a word close to *ni* in both sound and meaning.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

even more complex. Surely it is no accident that such variations all occur within a text that is also politically sensitive, to say the least. While this illustrates the multivalence enabled by the Chinese writing system and attests to the "joyful excess" of manuscript culture, it is most primarily driven by textual exegesis, or more precisely, the ideological interests of the various parties involved in the discourses about the Duke of Zhou—the transmitters, commentators, and the re-teller—all of whom sought to fashion a certain image of the Duke of Zhou.[111] For a text such as "The Metal-bound Coffer," where each variation can have significant ramifications for the entire narrative, meaning was created, literally, by all these individuals working within the same textual tradition. Simply put, these later readers portrayed a Duke of Zhou who, in spite of his close ties with King Wu and his high position under King Cheng, must not undermine the ruler in any way. From this emerged the Duke of Zhou the loyal minister, an image every bit as constructed as the benevolent sage that I discussed in the first section, and every bit as influential.

The Duke of Zhou, Alone and Silent

It remains for me to consider some additional discussions of the Duke of Zhou in ancient texts. In a passage from *Mozi* "Geng Zhu" 耕柱, the Duke of Zhou appears as someone who was so misunderstood by the world that he was called *kuang* 狂 "demented":

> 古者周公旦非關叔，辭三公，東處於商蓋，人皆謂之狂。後世稱其德，揚其名，至今不息。[112]
>
> In antiquity, Dan, the Duke of Zhou, opposed Guanshu, resigned his position as one of the Three Elders, went eastward to live at Shangyan, and men all called him demented because of it. But later ages have extolled his virtue and praised his name for this, and even to the present day have not stopped doing so.

In spite of this, as Mozi points out, he was vindicated and ultimately saw his reputation change for the better. What is most interesting about the discussion is its reference to the Duke of Zhou's taking up residence

111. The phrase comes from one of the chapter titles of Bernard Cerquiglini's *In Praise of the Variant: A Critical History of Philology* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999).

112. Wang Huanbiao, *Mozi jigu*, 1017–22. The translation is from Knoblock and Riegel, *Mozi: A Study and Translation of the Ethical and Political Writings*, 332–33, with slight modifications.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in the east. Elsewhere in the *Mozi*, there is another passage in the "Fei ru" 非儒 (Condemn the *Ru*), which also seems to allude to this episode in his career. This is a cryptic comment attributed to Confucius: 周公旦非其人也邪？何為舍亓家室而託寓也 "How can Dan, Duke of Zhou, be regarded as the right person? He abandoned his familial home and went off to live alone."[113] Though Confucius never explains the reasons for his disapproval, one does find Mozi's disapproval of Confucius' disapproval, which is that the venerated master has placed too much emphasis on *xinshu* 心術 "the workings of the heart," or what the heart dictates. Presumably, for Confucius, the Duke of Zhou's abandonment of his home was a breach of the virtue of *ren*, defined elsewhere by Confucius as the love for one's kin. Instead, this decision by the Duke of Zhou was evidence of his devotion to the state and the welfare of the people, and for Mozi this (perhaps an indication of the Duke of Zhou's sense of public duty, or *yi* "righteousness") was good enough. If this reading is correct, then the two positions represented by Confucius and Mozi would be consistent with the debate about the Duke of Zhou's moral character, mentioned in the first section of this study. Whereas those other discussions criticize the Duke of Zhou for not being *ren*, these two passages from the *Mozi* simply accept it, make no attempt to defend him, and instead find in him another virtue worthy of praise.

As mentioned in the second section, the suggestion that the Duke of Zhou "escaped" to the east can be seen in Zheng Xuan's commentary on "The Metal-bound Coffer." The two passages from the *Mozi* reinforce my earlier point that this was part of a larger interpretative tradition surrounding the Duke of Zhou, by no means Zheng Xuan's innovation alone. In fact, a comparison of the two shows that they are not wholly consistent with one another. On the one hand, Zheng Xuan takes the retirement to emphasize that the Duke of Zhou was *ren* in avoiding the conflict with his brothers. By contrast, Mozi evidently takes it to be a manifestation of his *yi*, since he was acting out of his concern for the people. Thus the same event is interpreted differently according to the interests of different authors. A further difference is that Mozi takes the "home" of the "Fei ru" to refer to the Duke of Zhou's own home, whereas for Zheng Xuan, it is the homes of his followers. With this

113. Here my translation follows the text as given in Wang Huanbiao, *Mozi jigu*, 983–88, but note Sun Yirang's 孫詒讓 view that the first part of the statement can be emended to the following: 周公旦其非人也邪, where *ren* 人 is read *ren* 仁 (benevolent). Sun's emendation is accepted by Knoblock and Riegel in their translation; see *Mozi: A Study and Translation of the Ethical and Political Writings*, 324. Emended or not, it seems to me quite clear that the virtue of benevolence is at the center of Confucius and Mozi's discussion.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

example, I hope I have drawn attention once again to the complexities of the various opinions about the Duke of Zhou.[114]

Finally, one can also compare the two *Mozi* passages with another comment attributed to Confucius in a fragment of the *Shizi* 尸子. Here Confucius expresses his opinion about the Duke of Zhou's stepping down from the position of regent and returning power to King Cheng:

> 昔周公反政，孔子非之曰：「周公其不聖乎！以天下讓，不為兆人也。」[115]
>
> Formerly, the Duke of Zhou returned power, and Confucius disapproved of this, saying: "How unbecoming of a sage was the Duke of Zhou! By giving up the world, he was not serving the people."

In other words, if the Duke of Zhou had truly been concerned about the welfare of the people, he would have retained his power, rather than returning it to King Cheng. In terms of their critical tone, these remarks resemble those words attributed to Confucius in the "Fei ru," but in their actual content, they are closer to Mozi's position in emphasizing the Duke of Zhou's service to the people. The *Shizi* fragment is also interesting for hinting at the possibility that the Duke of Zhou might supplant King Cheng on the throne, a theme touched upon in the discussion above.

But the topic that I want to return to is the one about the Duke of Zhou being misunderstood. As I read through the "Chixiao," "The Metal-bound Coffer" and various ancient discussions about the Duke of Zhou, the following image lingers on with me: night, the Duke of Zhou alone, accompanied by a shadow only barely visible, with a dim light in the distance. If one tries to imagine what it was like to be the Duke of Zhou,

---

114. For additional discussions of *yi* "righteousness," the passage from *Huainanzi* "Fan lun" cited earlier suggests that in spite of his lack of *ren*, the Duke of Zhou has *yi*: 周公有殺弟之累，齊桓有爭國之名，然而周公以義補缺，桓公以功滅醜，而皆為賢 "The Duke of Zhou was saddled with the burden of killing a brother, and Duke of Huan of Qi had a reputation for competing with other states. Yet the Duke of Zhou relied on rightness to compensate for his shortcomings, and Duke Huan relied on his merit to eradicate evil, so that both became worthies." Also cited before, in the second passage from *Huainanzi* "Tai zu" 泰族, one finds a criticism of the people of the present, who do not have the Duke of Zhou's *ren*, but claim to have his *yi*: 分別爭財，親戚兄弟搆怨，骨肉相賊，曰「周公之義也」"When there is division, differentiation, and competition for resources; when relatives and brothers hold grudges against one another; when bone and flesh rob each other, people call this the 'righteousness of the Duke of Zhou.'" For the two passages, see He Ning, *Huainanzi jiaoshi*, 961–62, 1408–1410; and the translation from Major et al., *Huainanzi*, 510–12, 821–23, with slight modifications.

115. Liu Dianjue and Chen Fangzheng, eds., *Shizi zhuzi suoyin*, 12. The translation is from Paul Fischer, *Shizi: China's First Syncretist* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 142–43, with slight modifications.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

there must have been a moment in this man's life when he was alone, isolated, and understood by no one. Much of this was a result of his unusual role: a powerful statesman who also happened to be the king's younger brother, and later the successor's uncle. Whenever a vacuum of power appeared at court, the Duke of Zhou was the incumbent whether or not he actually took over the throne.[116] One recalls that this was a time when the remnant forces of the Shang were not yet fully subjugated, and internally, some dissensions were brewing among the other royalties (and eventually led to the breakaway of the brothers Guan and Cai). To assist the ruler, the Duke of Zhou had to stand in his place, yet if his effort proved effective and his capacity as a ruler thus validated, he would have to step aside immediately. Such was the dilemma that he faced. In the context of "The Metal-bound Coffer," this dilemma is illustrated by the object that gives the text its title: sealed away and unknown to others, his true intentions were nevertheless good. It is also the reason that several ancient texts mention the Duke of Shao, another senior statesman at court and a royalty, being *bu yue* 不說 "displeased" with him.[117] But the basis of my imagination is the following statement in *Huainanzi* "Miu cheng" 繆稱 (Profound precepts): 夫察所夜行，周公慙乎景，故君子慎其獨也 "Now when he examined his evening gait, the Duke of Zhou was embarrassed by his shadow; thus the gentleman is watchful over himself when alone."[118] The great Qing philologist Wang

116. Such a question was once the subject of a scholarly debate on whether the Duke of Zhou ever formally declared himself "king," a controversy of nomenclature, in my opinion. Until there is an excavated document descended directly from the Western Zhou, with the specific indication that the Duke of Zhou changed his title from "duke" to "king" (and even then one could question the validity of this source as a historical document), the traditional view that he did not should suffice for all practical purposes. For me, the more interesting question is not the nature of the Duke of Zhou's authority, since one knows that he was the regent and the de facto ruler for several years at the beginning of the Western Zhou; but his psychology. For a review of this debate, see Shaughnessy, "Duke Zhou's Retirement in the East," 103–7.

117. According to the "preface" of the *Documents*, the Duke of Zhou composed the "Jun Shi" 君奭 in order to pacify the Duke of Shao; see Li Xueqin, ed., *Shangshu zhengyi*, 517. This is collaborated by the Warring States manuscript "Cheng zhi wen zhi" 成之聞之 excavated from Guodian, in the discussion accompanying a quotation of the "Jun Shi" on s. 29; see *Guodian Chumu zhujian* 郭店楚墓竹簡 (Beijing: Wenwu, 1998). For other related passages, see Takigawa Kametarō and Mizusawa Toshitada, *Shiji huizhu kaozheng fu jiaobu*, 34.3; and Wang Xianqian, *Han shu buzhu*, 6083.

118. He Ning, *Huainanzi jishi*, 722. The translation is from Major, et al., *Huainanzi*, 361. It is possible to consider this together with a statement about the Duke of Zhou in *Mengzi* 4B20: 周公思兼三王，以施四事；其有不合者，仰而思之，夜以繼日；幸而得之，坐以待旦 "The Duke of Zhou sought to combine achievements of the Three Dynasties and the administrations of the Four Kings. Whenever there was anything he could not understand, he would tilt his head back and reflect, if need be, through the night as

footnote continued on next page

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Niansun 王念孫 believes that a character *bu* 不 has accidentally dropped from the text, and the text should read *Zhougong bu can hu ying* 周公不慙乎景 "The Duke of Zhou was *not* embarrassed by his shadow." In many ways, this proposal and one's decision to accept or reject it mirror the choices that the Duke of Zhou must have faced: whether or not to step in King Wu's place and offer himself in sacrifice; whether or not to punish his siblings in the interest of the nascent state; whether or not to return the throne to young King Cheng and resume his role as a minister. Such are the choices that break or make a hero. As for which side of history the Duke of Zhou finally came out on, it depends on who you ask. Personally, I think he fared pretty well.

The hiddenness of the Duke of Zhou's intentions lies at the heart of another discussion, an anecdote from *Shuo yuan* (Garden of Sayings) "Zhi wu" 指武 (Rebuffing prowess):

> 齊人王滿生見周公，周公出見之，曰：「先生遠辱，何以教之？」王滿生曰：「言內事者於內，言外事者於外。今言內事乎？言外事乎？」周公導入。王滿生曰：「敬從布席。」周公不導坐。王滿生曰：「言大事者坐，言小事者倚。今言大事乎？言小事乎？」周公導坐。王滿生坐，周公曰：「先生何以教之？」王滿生曰：「臣聞聖人不言而知，非聖人者雖言不知。今欲言乎？無言乎？」周公俛念有頃不對。王滿生藉筆牘書之曰：「社稷且危。」傅之於膺。周公仰視見書曰：「唯唯，謹聞命矣！」明日誅管、蔡。[119]
>
> Master Wang Man of Qi had an interview with the Duke of Zhou. The Duke of Zhou came out to see him and said, "You, sir, have graced me with your presence from afar. What is it you have to teach me?" Master Wang Man said, "One speaks of essentials inside, and of externals outside. Now shall I speak of essentials or of externals?" The Duke of Zhou led him inside. Master Wang Man said, "I respectfully wait for you to spread the sitting mat." The Duke of Zhou did not lead him to a seat. Master Wang Man said, "One speaks of important affairs sitting, and of minor affairs standing. Now shall I speak of important affairs or of minor ones?" The Duke of Zhou led him to a seat. When Master Wang Man had sat down, the Duke of Zhou said, "What is it, sir, you have to teach me?" Master Wang Man said, "I have heard that the sage knows

---

well as the day. If he was fortunate enough to find the answer, he would sit up to await the daybreak"; see Jiao Xun, *Mengzi zhengyi*, 569–72, and the translation from Lau, *Mencius*.

119. Zuo Songchao, *Shuoyuan jizheng*, 962–63. The translation is from Hightower, *Han shih wai chuan*, 157, n.1, with slight modifications. Hightower cites the *Shuo yuan* because it is closely parallel with a passage from the *Hanshi waizhuan*. I discuss immediately below another parallel passage found in the *Lüshi chunqiu*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> without being told, and that one who is not a sage does not know even with telling. Now do you want me to speak or not?" The Duke of Zhou lowered his head for some time in thought without answering. Master Wang Man took brush and tablet and wrote, "The state is in danger," and held it next to his heart. The Duke of Zhou looked up. Seeing what was written he said, "Yes, yes. I respectfully attend your command." Next day he punished the princes Guan and Cai.

This anecdote follows a conventional setup seen in countless ancient texts: the exchange between a teacher and his pupil. The narrative is told skillfully. As the main interlocutor Master Wang Man draws closer to the Duke of Zhou, he reveals more of his lesson. In this way the anecdote dramatizes the theme of hiddenness central to "The Metal-bound Coffer." Just as his decision to punish his brothers is understood by no one in that story, here the Duke of Zhou is advised to do so by a mysterious interlocutor whose message is ultimately unspeakable. Note that an episode similar to the *Shuo yuan* anecdote is recorded in a *Lüshi chunqiu* text called the "Jing yu" 精諭 (On subtle communication), and there the exchange is between the Duke of Zhou and a speaker identified as Sheng Shu 勝書, literally "more preferable than writing."[120] In both cases, the factitiousness of the narrative cannot hide the Duke of Zhou's predicament, and yet it is through such imaginary retelling that one catches a glimpse of what might have been his actual state of mind. As with the numerous texts cited throughout this study, there is much in the literary record about the Duke of Zhou and the discourses that have dominated later perceptions of him, waiting to be excavated and reread from a fresh perspective.

Appendix: Further Notes on the Two Manuscripts from the Shanghai Museum

As mentioned in the main part of the study, the two Warring States manuscripts from the Shanghai Museum that editors entitle "Youhuang jiang qi" 有皇將起 (The phoenix is about to rise) and "Liuli" 鶹鷅 are actually one text, sharing the same physical attributes, calligraphy, and literary form (both consisting of four or five-character phrases, followed by the disyllabic

120. Chen Qiyou, *Lüshi chunqiu xin jiaoshi*, 1177. Note that in this episode, the secret message for the Duke of Zhou is not about the punishment of the brothers, but the other "conspiracy" of the conquest of the Shang. I would understand this as a variation on the theme that I discuss here. Other anecdotes about the secrecy of the conquest can be found in *Yi Zhoushu* "Da kai wu" 大開武 and "Wu jing" 寤儆; see Huang Huaixin, et al., *Yi Zhoushu huijiao jizhu*, 257–71, 303–9.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

particle *jinke* 今可).[121] Neither manuscript is long. The "Youhuang jiang qi" originally consisted of six slips. Upon closer scrutiny, scholars suggest that slip 1 should be broken into two unrelated fragments, with the second of them joining the end of slip 3. This still gives six slips: 1a, 3+1b, 2, 4, 5, 6. As for the "Liuli," the manuscript originally consisted of two slips, but further research also reveals a different analysis; they are actually one long slip.[122] This gives a total of seven slips for the two manuscripts combined. In any event, as I also mentioned above, none of the slips is complete, thus making it difficult to determine whether they read continuously, and indeed, how much additional text has been lost. This presents great challenges to the reader, and one must do with them what one can. To avoid any confusion, I will continue to refer to the two manuscripts by the titles and slips numbers as assigned by the original editors.

I begin with the "Liuli." To facilitate discussion, I provide two transcriptions of the text below. The first is a detailed transcription that reflects the structure and all the graphic elements of significance in the characters; this is given according to the slip numbers assigned by the editors. The second is a simplified transcription, removing the disyllabic particle *jinke* and dividing the text into lines; this is organized by alphabets. Needless to say, both transcriptions are heuristic in nature. Other readers may play with the text however they like, but I judge this presentation of the text to be most appropriate for my discussion below.

1… … 子[illegible]余鸓[illegible]含可鸓[illegible]之止含可欲衣而亞[illegible]含可鸓[illegible]之羽含可子
可舍=含可鸓[illegible][illegible]飛含
2可不戠而欲衣含可■
A … … ，子遺余鸓鷅。
B 鸓鷅之止，欲衣而惡枲。
C 鸓鷅之羽，子何舍余。
D 鸓鷅翩飛，不織而欲衣。
… You have presented me with the *liuli*.
The *liuli* stops: it wishes to wear clothes, but it hates hemp.
The *liuli's* feathers—why do you bestow them to me?
The *liuli* takes flight: it wishes to wear clothes, but it does not sew.

---

121. Ma Chengyuan, ed., *Shanghai bowuguan cang Zhanguo Chu zhushu*, vol. 8. The observation that the two manuscripts are one has been made by several scholars. For a summary and discussion, see Bing Shangbai 邴尚白, "Shangbo Chu zhushu 'Youhuang jiang qi' xintan" 上博楚竹書《有皇將起》新探, paper presented at the conference, "Chutu wenxian de yujing" 出土文獻的語境, National Tsing Hua University, August 27–29, 2014.

122. The rearrangement of the "Youhuang jiang qi" is discussed by Bing Shangbai in Ibid. See also Cheng Shaoxuan 程少軒, "Shangbo ba 'Liuli' yu 'Youhuang jiang qi' biance xiaoyi" 上博八《鸓鷅》與《有皇將起》編冊小議, *Zhongguo wenzi* 中國文字 new series 38 (2012), 113–20.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In this way, the structure of the text becomes very clear. As one can see, in spite of the missing text, lines A and C correspond to each other: both refer to the persona's being given the *liuli*, expressed with the verbs *wei* [illegible]（遺） and *she* 舍. The same is true for lines B and D. One is about the bird's wanting to wear clothes without utilizing the hemp fabric, or *xi* [illegible]（枲）. The other is about its wanting to wear clothes without engaging in weaving. This suggests that *zhi* 止 "to stop" and *fanfei* [illegible]（翩）飛 "to take flight" also correspond to each other: one is about the bird's alighting, the other is about its taking off. As lines B and D also reveal, the *liuli* is not an exemplary bird. While being averse to hemp and weaving, it still has a fondness for clothes. This is akin to the *chixiao* that robs another bird of its nest, as I pointed out in the main part of the study.

This understanding of the "Liuli" paves the way for reading the last part of the "Youhuang jiang qi," the most difficult and least talked about part of that manuscript. Following the lead of my discussion from above, I would also present the text as the following:

> 6 … … 也含可[illegible]三夫之旁也含可膠膰秀余含可蜀[illegible]三夫含可膠膰之腈也含可[illegible]夫三夫之[illegible]也含可
> A (missing)
> B … … 也，捨三夫之謗也。
> C 膠膰誘余，獨捨三夫。
> D 膠膰之清也，捨三夫之竫也。
> (missing)
> … To cast aside the slanders of the three men.
> The *jiaofan* lures me to alone cast aside the three men.
> The purity of the *jiaofan* is that it casts aside the clever words of the three men.

Once again, this clarifies the structure of the text considerably. Here I assume that that a line A and the first half of line B are lost.[123]

One can begin with the character [illegible] in what I regard as line B. The identification is confirmed by the appearance of *she* 舍 in the "Liuli," written without the *yan* 言 classifier.[124] But note that whereas *she* 舍 in the "Liuli" means "to bestow," *she* [illegible] here has the sense of "to cast

123. It is also possible, since s. 6 ends with a full stop, indicated by a disyllabic particle, that there is an additional line after it, rather than before. This would affect my analysis somewhat, but it would not change the main point, which is to observe a parallel every other line. This is lines B and D according to my scheme, and it would not matter if the lines were designated A and C instead.

124. See also Bing Shangbai's analysis, who adduces another example of *she* 舍 that matches the character from the "Youhuang jiang qi" even more closely.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

aside." This would explain the additional graphic element in the latter character, which functions to distinguish the two meanings of the same word. The resulting sense is that one should cast aside the slanders of the three men. Once again, proceeding on the basis of my structural analysis, it is possible to make a number of proposals with regard to line D. The first is to understand the character [illegible] that is graphically very similar to [illegible] as a mistaken form of that latter character, and to emend it accordingly. The second is to regard the first *fu* 夫 of the same line as excrescent. The third is to read the character [illegible] in a way that corresponds to bang 旁（謗）.

In my view, this last character should be read *jing* "clever words," and it can be written 靜, 靖, or 竫 in the literary record.[125] In the "Yao dian" 堯典 (Canons of Yao) of the *Documents*, Yao 堯 describes Gonggong 共工 in the following terms: 靜言庸違，象恭滔天 "He is clever with his words, but his actions are perverse. He is in appearance respectful, but he swells up to Heaven."[126] Similar usage of *jing* 靜 can be found in *Guanzi* "Chi mi" 侈靡 (On extravagance in spending): 曲靜之言，不可以為道 "Deviant and clever words cannot express the way of good government."[127] In *Guiguzi* 鬼谷子 "Quan" 權 (Weighing), there is also the statement: 靜言者，反而干勝 "He who is clever with words seeks victory by looking everywhere except in oneself," where *fan* 反 has the somewhat technical sense that one does not reflect on one's own inadequacies, but instead attack others for their mistakes (*xianfen buzu yi zhi fei zhe, fan ye* 先分不足以窒非者，反也).[128] In the *Gongyang zhuan*, under Duke Wen, 12th year, a famous ruler from Qin is described as being tolerant and accepting of those in his service: 惟諓諓善竫言，俾君子易怠，而況乎我多有之 "The shallow insincere ones, who are good at clever speeches, cause the ruler to be easy and idle. How much more so that we have many of them?"[129] It is clear that in spite of its being written as 竫, the word is the same one as seen in the other texts cited above. Finally, the *Zuo zhuan* under Duke

---

125. None of these words is reconstructed by Baxter and Sagart, but they do give *zheng* 爭 as *[ts]ˤreŋ and *qing* 青 as *[s.r̥]ˤreŋ.

126. Li Xueqin, ed., *Shangshu zhengyi*, 46–53; and the translation from Karlgren, *The Book of Documents*, which I have modified according to my understanding. I believe my understanding of *jing yan* 靜言 as "to be clever with words" is consistent with Kong Anguo's glosses of *jing* 靜 as *mou* 謀 "to scheme."

127. Li Xiangfeng, *Guanzi jiaozhu*, 737–41; and the translation in Rickett, *Guanzi: Political, Economic, and Philosophical Essays*, vol. 2, 331.

128. Xu Fuhong 許富宏, *Guiguzi jijiao jizhu* 鬼谷子集校集注 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 2008), 131–34.

129. Li Xueqin, ed., *Chunqiu Gongyang zhuan zhushu*, 347–49. This is based on a passage from the "Qin shi" 秦誓 of the *Documents*, and I have consulted Karlgren's translation in *The Book of Documents*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Wen, 18th year, contains the following description about an ancient mythical figure: 靖譖庸回，服讒蒐慝，以誣盛德 "He was clever with slanders and employed the unruly; he acted according to calumnies and hid wickedness, thereby vilifying men of abundant virtue."[130] Though sometimes understood as "to feel at home," *jing* 靖, as can be seen from the parallel with the other examples must record the same word and have the meaning of "to be clever with words." Long recognized as an allusion to the "Yaodian" passage cited above, the *Zuo zhuan* statement is also noteworthy because it contains explicit references to slander. In all of these cases, what I have translated as "to be clever with words" has the more basic meaning of *zheng* 爭 "to quarrel," and it is also closely related to *zheng* 諍 "to criticize," even though the latter is usually understood to have a positive connotation.[131]

From this, one could turn to the first half of line D, and I would suggest that 腈 should be read *qing* 清 "purity," a meaning that is the exact opposite of *jing* 竫 "clever words" and *bang* 旁（謗） "slanders." Related to this, *jiaofan* 膠膰 must be a person, a creature, or any entity with a positive connotation. Not only is it lauded for its "purity," but also note how such an understanding is consistent with line C, which suggests that it *you yu* 秀（誘）余 "lures me" to *du she sanfu* 蜀（獨）⿰言舍（舍）三夫 "alone cast aside the three men." Once again, I understand the character usually transcribed 論 as a mistaken form of *she* ⿰言舍. It is noteworthy that the word *du* 蜀（獨） "alone" contrasts with the plurality of the three men. In spite of the views and actions of the multitude, I alone follow a different path.

What exactly is this entity *jiaofan* 膠膰? Returning to my structural analysis one last time, it is clear that it occupies a position in the poem comparable to the *liuli*, only that one is lofty and virtuous, whereas the other is vile and reprehensible. I would identify it as a bird comparable to what is called *jiaoming* 焦明 in the literary record.[132] At first glance, this

---

130. Yang Bojun, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, 639; and the translations from James Legge, *The Chinese Classics, Vol. 5: The Ts'un Ch'ew with the Tso Chuen* (1893–94; reprinted in Taipei: SMC Publishing, 1991), 283, and Stephen Durrant, Wai-yee Li, and David Schaberg, *Zuo Traditions = Zuozhuan: Commentary on the "Spring and Autumn Annals"* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2016), 575, both modified according to my understanding.

131. Much of my discussion in this paragraph is based on Zhu Junsheng, *Shuowen tongxun dingsheng*, 17.12b.

132. Besides the ones cited below, references to the *jiaoming* (and variants thereof) can be found in *Chu ci* 楚辭 "Jiu huai" 九懷, "Zhu zhao" 株昭 and "Jiu tan" 九嘆, "Yuan you" 遠遊; see Hong Xingzu, *Chu ci buzhu*, 279, 310. It is also seen in the "Yuexie tuzheng" 樂叶圖徵; see Nakamura Shōhachi 中村璋八 and Yasui Kōzan 安居香山, *Weishu jicheng* 緯書集成 (Shijiazhuang: Hebei renmin, 1994), 560–61. See also *Shuowen*

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

proposal might seem a bit unexpected on linguistic grounds: whereas *fan* 膰 (*pʰar) and *ming* 明 (*mraŋ) are phonologically close, *jiao* 膠 (*[k]ˤriw) and *jiao* 焦 (*S.tew) are not. But note that the *Shuowen jiezi* 說文解字 (Explaining graphs and analyzing characters) contains a character *liu* 翏隹, which it glosses as "a grown chick" (*niao dachu* 鳥大雛), but also cites an alternative explanation: 一曰雉之莫子爲翏隹 "One view is that it is the chick borne by an old pheasant."[133] In turn, the *Fang yan* 方言 (Speeches of the regions) gives another name for the chick: 雞雛，徐魯之間謂之秋隹 "Chicks are called *jiu* in Xu and Lu.[134] This provides a kind of bridge to an attempt to link *jiao* 膠 and *jiao* 焦, with *jiu* 秋隹 as the intermediary. That the second and third words are related can be seen from the onomatopoeia *jiaojiao* 噍噍 that imitates the cry of a bird, which one medieval commentator equates with *jiu* 啾.[135] In other words, if A (*liu* 翏隹) is B (*jiu* 秋隹), and B (*jiu* 啾 is C (*jiao* 噍), then A (*jiao* 膠) is equal to C (jiao 焦).

The reading of *jiaoming* has the advantage that it is amply attested in the literary record. Thus, one finds the following from *Fa yan* 法言 (Model sayings) "Wen ming" 問明 (Asking about illumination):

> 或問「君子」。「在治曰若鳳，在亂曰若鳳。」或人不諭。曰：「未之思矣。」曰：「治則見，亂則隱。鴻飛冥冥，弋人何慕焉？鷦明遴集，食其絜者矣；鳳鳥蹌蹌，匪堯之庭。」[136]
>
> Someone asked me about the noble man. "In times of good rule, he is like a phoenix. And in times of misrule, he is like a phoenix." The interlocutor does not understand. "You certainly have not yet thought it through! I mean that in times of good rule, he reveals himself, and during times of misrule, he hides himself away. Like a bird, he soars on

---

jiezi, 4a.19; and Wang Niansun, *Guangya shuzheng* 廣雅疏證 (1796 woodblock edition; Nanjing: Jiangsu guji, 2000), 10b.48–9.

133. *Shuowen jiezi*, 4a.13. This is corroborated by the *Er ya*: 雉之暮子為翏鳥 "Liu is the chick borne by an old pheasant," for which Guo Pu adds: 晚生者，今呼少雞為翏鳥 "A chick born late; now a young chick is called *liu*"; see Hao Yixing, *Er ya yishu*, 3727–28.

134. Hua Xuecheng, *Yang Xiong Fangyan jiaoshi huizheng*, 8.578–79. The text originally gives *Qiuhouzi* 秋侯子 in the place of *jiu*, but the emendation as proposed by several Qing and modern authorities is supported by the *Guang ya*, which glosses *jiu* as *chu* 雛 "chick," consistent with the *Shuo wen* and *Er ya*; see Wang Niansun, *Guangya shuzheng*, 10b.44. *Jiu* is also attested as *qiuji* 秋雞 in Gao You's commentary to *Huainanzi* "Yuan dao" 原道; see He Ning, *Huainanzi jishi*, 11.

135. This is Yang Xiong's "Yulie fu" 羽獵賦; see *Wen xuan*, 396, and the translation in David R. Knechtges, *Wen xuan, or Selections of Refine Literature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), vol. 2, 115–36.

136. Wang Rongbao 汪榮寶, *Fayan yishu* 法言義疏 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1987), 194–97. The translation is from Michael Nylan, *Exemplary Figures* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2013), 93–5, with slight modifications.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

high, into the lofty realms beyond the heavens, so that the archer with his arrow on the string has no hope whatsoever of snaring him. The *jiaoming* are very choosy about where they settle, and they eat only the purest of foods. The phoenix takes flight to nowhere but Yao's court."

Among the various birds identified in this passage, all of them related to the phoenix (*feng* 鳳 or *fenghuang* 鳳鳥), the *jiaoming* is noteworthy in that it consumes only what is "pure" (*jie* 絜). This directly corresponds with the synonymous *qing* from the "Youhuang jiang qi," which characterizes the *jiaofan* from that poem. This is the first reason for equating the *jiaofan* with the *jiaoming*.[137]

The *jiaoming* is also attested in the "Shanglin fu" 上林賦 (Rhyme-prose of the Imperial Park) by Sima Xiangru 司馬相如 (c. 179–111 B.C.E.).[138] For this Zhang Shoujie 張守節 (fl. 737) supplies the following comment in his "Zhengyi" 正義 (Correct significance) commentary for the *Shi ji*: 非幽閑不集，非珍物不食 "It will not gather nowhere but the quiet and secluded, and it will eat nothing but precious food."[139] This is an indication of the bird's loftiness, and seems to illustrate, once again, its *qing* "purity." This is the second reason for equating the *jiaoming* with the *jiaofan*. Related to this, note that the description by Zhang resembles that of another bird mentioned in *Zhuangzi* "Qiu shui" (Autumn floods): 夫鵷鶵，發於南海而飛於北海，非梧桐不止，非練實不食，非醴泉不飲 "The *Yuanchu* rises up from the South Sea and flies to the North Sea, and it will rest on nothing but the *Wutong* tree, eat nothing but the fruit of Lian, and drink only from springs of sweet water."[140] Here the name of the bird *yuanchu* evokes the "chick" (*chu*) that is the *liu* 鷚, according to the sources cited above. Perhaps there is additional lore about the *liu* that underlies the linguistic connection I made just now between *liu* 鷚 and *jiao* 焦.

In this way, the short analysis presented here removes some of the major obstacles to the reading of the "Youhuang jiang qi" and "Liuli," and makes it possible for the two manuscripts, fragmentary, disjointed, and terse as they are, to be appreciated as a whole.

137. Another reference to the same bird in the *Fa yan* can be seen in the "Gua jian" 寡見; see Wang Rongbao, *Fayan yishu*, 228–29.

138. Takigawa Kametarō and Mizusawa Toshitada, *Shiji huizhu kaozheng fu jiaobu*, 117.49; Wang Xianqian, *Han shu buzhu*, 4140; and *Wen xuan*, 373.

139. Sima Xiangru makes another reference to the same bird in his "Nan Shu fulao" 難蜀父老; see Takigawa Kametarō and Mizusawa Toshitada, *Shiji huizhu kaozheng fu jiaobu*, 117.74–5; Wang Xianqian, *Han shu buzhu*, 4172; and *Wen xuan*, 1995.

140. Wang Shumin, *Zhuangzi jiaoquan*, 633, and the translation from Watson, *Chuang Tzu*, 188.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press

周公、《金縢》與《鴟鴞》

黃冠雲

提要

現存三種《金縢》文本存在細微差異，關係重大。這些文本差異都涉及周公是忠是奸的問題，源自其亦臣亦君的微妙身分，具體表現有二：一是武王病危，周公以君王的身分為之禱祠； 二是成王年幼，周公攝政，最終篡位或反政的抉擇。時代背景是商、周之際，周人的統治尚未穩固、禮儀規範尚未完備的交接，而這也構成王國維《殷周制度論》的討論對象。本論文著重討論戰國秦漢作者對周公的想像，通過三本《金縢》與當時關於周公的眾多傳聞軼事，探討周公的形象如何通過傳承、注釋與再述而逐漸被塑造 。

Keywords: the Duke of Zhou, Metal-bound Coffer, *Book of Odes*, *Book of Documents*, Tsinghua bamboo slips, *Grand Scribe's Records*
周公、金縢、詩經、尚書、清華簡、史記

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2018.4 Published online by Cambridge University Press