



BRILL



brill.com/joch

## Citation of Han *Fu* in *Shijing* Exegetical Works

Wang Sihao 王思豪

Associate Professor of Faculty of Arts and Humanities,

University of Macau, Macau, China

[sihaowang@um.edu.mo](mailto:sihaowang@um.edu.mo)

### Abstract

The various rhapsodies or poetic expositions of the Han dynasty known as Han *fu* are replete with passages from the classic Chinese poetry collection the *Shijing*, or *Book of Poetry*. The reverse is also true: *Shijing* scholarship has likewise cited Han *fu* in many of its exegetical works. As a result, the various editions of the Han *fu* are important sources in the study of the Confucian classics, a discipline commonly known in Chinese as *jingxue*. The classical citations of the *Shijing* throughout the Han *fu* can be placed into one of two categories: “language citation” and “meaning citation”, while the “ironic citation” of Han *fu* in exegeses of the *Shijing* that is prevalent in the interpretative system of the Confucian classics can be further broken down into three types: “meaning and principle”, “verification and justification” and “language and exposition”. In the meaning-based citations of the *Shijing* by the Han *fu* – especially those of “persuasive remonstrance” and “hymns and eulogies” – the conveyed messages were ironically cited by later generations of interpreters of Confucian classics, which helped form new meanings and principles. The main themes, subject matter, emotional expression and language style of Han *fu* are lifted heavily from the *Shijing*. Later generations of Confucian scholars then cited text from the Han *fu*, thereby constructing new forms of language and exposition. The unique characteristics of *fu* to “describe things and express themselves clearly” and reference a wide range of “names and things” were used by later Confucian scholars who sought to better understand a whole host of signifiers referred to in the classic texts, from herbs, trees and birds, to beasts, insects and fish. Meanwhile, the perception of *fu* as knowledge-laden texts inspired Confucian scholars to carry out textual research on them. Scholarly comparisons in premodern China between the *Shijing* as a Confucian classic, the *Shijing* as a literary corpus, and Han *fu* developed during a process of ordinary citation and ironic citation. This resulted in the practice of “complementary citations” of meaning and principle, verification and justification,

and language and exposition. A scholarship cycle was thus formed in which the classics were used to revere the *fu*, then the classics were used to enrich the *fu*, and interpretations of the *fu* started to be used to transmit canonical messages. It was a cycle that was imbued with a cross-permeation of neo-Confucian, historical and literary dimensions, eventually resulting in the construction of a new interpretative system for premodern Chinese scholarship of classic texts.

## Keywords

*Shijing* – *Book of Poetry* – Han *fu* – complementary citation

### 1 Problem Statement

The relationship between Han *fu* 漢賦 and the study of the Confucian classics can not be said to be equivalent to the relationship between Han *fu* and Confucianism itself. One must look to citations to explore the relationship between Han *fu* and the study of the Confucian classics. It is only by collecting and interpreting classical citations in Han *fu* that one can understand their significance. The quintessential tradition within Chinese literature of Han *fu* classical citation is an important one. However, there has not been much in-depth discussion on the topic due to a lack of theoretical criticism. From the functional practice of “reciting the odes” [*fu shi* 賦詩] that was prevalent during the Warring States Period [475–221 BCE], to later “revering the classics” [*zong jing* 宗經] and “seeking [the way of] the Sage” [*zheng sheng* 征聖], approaches to literature ultimately transitioned to “deriving meaning from the classics” [*yi jing li yi* 依經立義]. This trend was manifested in a particularly explicit fashion in the early development of Chinese literature and is demonstrated by the disputes on the origin of the *fu* form and the “unified” [*yi* 一] and “varied” [*bai* 百] debates on the topic of “persuasive remonstrance” [*fengjian* 諷諫]. During the Han dynasty [206 BCE–220 CE], most of the *fu* that were composed revolved around the classics, and among the Five Classics [*wujing* 五經], the relationship between the *Shijing* 詩經 [*Book of Poetry*] and the Han *fu* is the closest, with the former being a model for a generation of Confucian scholars, and the latter being an archetype for a generation of literary figures. Contemporaries of the Han dynasty read the classics so as to make use of them. Thus, sources for much of the literature of the Han dynasty can be traced back to the Six Classics [*liujing* 六經], and citation of the classics is

widespread among the literary works of the Han dynasty.<sup>1</sup> However, of particular note is the “ironic citation” [*fanyong* 反用] of Han *fu* by *Shijing* exegetical works. “Understanding the Great Way through language” [*yin wen jian dao* 因文見道] is only possible by accessing speech in the written form. Composers of *fu* who used writing to study the Confucian classics believed that “their speech stands on its own” [*qi yan you li* 其言猶立] because they lived at a time “not too distant from the Sage” [*qu sheng wei yuan* 去聖未遠] and therefore could act as a “personified voice of the Sage” [*sheng she ren* 聖舌人].<sup>2</sup> As a result, words written by composers of *fu* have been conducive to the interpretive practices of later generations of Confucian scholars. This is particularly obvious in scholarship on the *Shijing*, from *fu* citing *Shijing*, to *Shijing* scholarship citing *fu*. In this way, the various editions of the Han *fu* are critical documentary sources to be consulted when tracing the original meaning of the Confucian classics.

So how do exegetical works employ ironic citations of passages from Han *fu*? This question touches upon the nature of traditional Chinese scholarship. During the Western Han [206 BCE–25 CE] dynasty, there was “learning of New and Old Script classics” [*Jing jin gu wen xue* 經今古文學] both in the officialdom and hidden among academic circles. Scholarship consisted mainly of “chapter-and-verse commentaries” [*zhangju* 章句] and investigations into “meaning and principle” [*yili* 義理] and “philology” [*xungu* 訓詁]. During the Northern Song [960–1127] dynasty, distinctions were made between studies of “belles-lettres” [*wenzhang* 文章], philology and “literati” [*ruzhe* 儒者]. However, sole reverence for the study of the literati resulted in a preference for meaning and principle. The Qing [1616–1911] philosopher Dai Zhen 戴震 [1724–1777] said, “When it comes to ancient and contemporary scholarship, there are three approaches: some deal with meaning and principle, some systems, some belles-lettres. The approach that deals with belles-lettres is the last of the three.” He went on to say, “There is study of meaning and principle, study of belles-lettres and study of examination and evaluation.

1 Regarding the question of classical citations of Han *fu*, the reader may consult the three articles, all of which offer a relatively detailed discussion. See Xu Jie 許結 and Wang Sihao 王思豪, “Hanfu yongjing kao 漢賦用經考 [A Study of Classical Citations in Han *Fu*],” *Wenshi* 文史, no. 2 (2011): 5–46; Xu Jie 許結 and Wang Sihao 王思豪, “Han fu yong *Shi* de wenxue chuantong 漢賦用《詩》的文學傳統 [Literary Traditions Surrounding Citation of the *Shijing* in Han *Fu*],” *Zhongguo shehui kexue* 中國社會科學, no. 4 (2011): 190–204; Wang Sihao, “The Creation of a ‘Magnificent Literary Style’: Stylistic Innovation in Borrowings in Han Rhapsodies from *The Classic of Poetry*,” *Frontiers of Literary Studies in China* 15.1 (2021): 109–135.

2 Gong Zizhen 龔自珍 and Wang Peizheng 王佩誥, *Gong Zizhen quanji* 龔自珍全集 [*The Complete Works of Gong Zizhen*] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1959), 632.

Meaning and principle is the source of belles-lettres and examination and evaluation. Once one becomes familiar with meaning and principle, one may carry out examination and evaluation and compose belles-lettres.”<sup>3</sup> This perspective considers the study of belles-lettres to be the last step in the process. Yao Nai 姚鼐 [1732–1815], who was the epitomy of the Tongcheng School 桐城派, wrote in the “Preface to the Writings of Shu’an [Shu’an wenchao xu 述庵文鈔序],” “I have previously spoken on the topic of scholarship, that there are three essential elements: meaning and principle, verification and justification, and belles-lettres. Those who become adept at employing them may find they complement each other. Those who cannot become adept at employing them may find they interfere with each other.”<sup>4</sup> These three points of scholarship can be similarly applied in investigating the phenomenon of ironic citation of classic texts in chapter-verse commentaries of Han *fu*. This article explores the use of such ironic citation by exegetical works on the *Shijing*. This will be done by examining the complementary scholarly relationship between meaning and principle, verification and justification [*kaoju* 考據], and language and exposition [*cizhang* 辭章]. The interpretive system formed during this process of “cross-justification” [*huzheng* 互證] will also be discussed.

## 2 Verification and Justification: “Examining Antiquity” via *Fu* Commentaries

There are no records of Han *fu* citations in either the *Mao Commentary to the Shijing* [*Mao zhuan* 毛傳] or the *Zheng Annotations on the Mao Text* [*Zheng jian* 鄭箋]. Current documentary sources indicate that the earliest instance of Han *fu* citation in *Shijing* exegetical scholarship was made by Lu Ji 陸璣 [261–303] from the Wu 吳 domain of the Three Kingdoms Period [220–280] in his *Commentary on Herbs, Trees, Birds, Beasts, Insects and Fish in the Mao Edition of the Shijing* [*Maoshi caomu niaoshou chongyu shu* 毛詩草木鳥獸蟲魚疏]. There were four citations of Han *fu*, and all were made in the interests of verification and justification of “names and things” [*mingwu* 名物]. For example, in the upper facsimile it reads: “*Shaoyao* is a medicinal herb used today. It is not the case that it does not have a fragrance. It is not clear what herb it is today. Sima Xiangru mentioned in his *fu* that *shaoyao* was a mixing herb, while Yang

3 Dai Zhen 戴震, *Dai Zhen ji* 戴震集 [*The Collected Works of Dai Zhen*] (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1980), 189, 451–2.

4 Yao Nai 姚鼐, *Xibao xuan shiwen ji* 惜抱軒詩文集 [*Anthology of Yao Nai*] (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1992), 61.

Xiong said in his *fu* said that *shaoyao* was sweet and delicious.”<sup>5</sup> Here, the *fu* of Sima and Yang are being cited – the “Fu on Sir Vacuous [*Zi xu fu* 子虛賦]” and “Fu on the Capital of Shu [*Shu du fu* 蜀都賦]” respectively. In the Tang dynasty [618–907], *The Correct Significance of the Mao Edition of the Shijing* [*Maoshi zhengyi* 毛詩正義] by Kong Yingda 孔穎達 [574–648] cited Han *fu* seven times in its exegetical text. In addition to three instances of verification and justification of names and things, there are also two instances of word interpretations. For example, in “There Was a Girl with Us in the Carriage [*You nü tong zhe* 有女同車]” there is the sentence, “She is the fair Meng Jiangnü, an elegant and generous lady”. Here, the *Correct Significance of the Mao Edition of the Shijing* cites Sima Xiangru’s 司馬相如 [179–118 BCE] “Fu on the Imperial Park [*Shang lin fu* 上林賦]” – “fair and elegant” 妖冶閑都 – interpreting *du* 都 as *xian* 閑.<sup>6</sup> In the Ming dynasty [1368–1644], the *Textual Research on the Ancient Pronunciation of the Mao Edition of the Shijing* [*Maoshi guyin kao* 毛詩古音考] by Chen Di 陳第 [1541–1617] used Han *fu* to justify the ancient readings of many of the characters used in the *Shijing*. In its “Preface” [*zixu* 自序] he wrote: “The rhyme schemes used in the *Zuozhuan* 左傳, *Guoyu* 國語, *Yi* 易, *Xiang* 象, *Chuci* 楚辭, Qin stelae, Han *fu*, even the folk songs of antiquity, and admonishing epigraphs and tributes often echo those used in the *Shijing*. In fact, this can be taken as evidence for ancient pronunciations.”<sup>7</sup> Later, Gu Yanwu 顧炎武 [1613–1682] and Jiang Yong 江永 [1681–1762] would consult Han *fu* in their respective works *Original Rhymes in the Shijing* [*Shi ben yin* 詩本音] and *Standards of Ancient Rhymes* [*Guyun biao zhun* 古韻標準] to verify and justify the pronunciation and meaning of passages in the *Shijing*. Some scholars also referred to *fu* in their textual criticism of the astronomical topics laid out in the *Shijing*. For example, in the *Maoshi tianwen kao* 毛詩天文考 [*A Study of the Astronomical Information in the Mao Edition of the Shijing*], Hong Liangji 洪亮吉 [1746–1809] of the Qing dynasty writes: “According to the *Classic of Heaven and Earth*, ‘quail’s head’ refers to the territory of Qin. In ‘Fu on the Western Metropolis [*Xijing fu* 西京賦], Zhang Heng states, ‘In ancient times, the Celestial Ruler was pleased with Duke Mu of Qin, so he summoned

5 Lu Ji 陸璣, *Maoshi caomu niaoshou chongyu shu* 毛詩草木鳥獸蟲魚疏 [*Commentary on Herbs, Trees, Birds, Beasts, Insects and Fish in the Mao Edition of the Shijing*], in *Wenyuange siku quanshu* 文淵閣四庫全書 (Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1986), 70:15.

6 Zheng Xuan 鄭玄, comm., Kong Yingda 孔穎達, coll., *Maoshi zhengyi* 毛詩正義 [*The Correct Significance of the Mao Edition of the Shijing*], in *Shisanjing zhushu* 十三經註疏 [*Annotations and Commentaries on the Thirteen Classics*], ed. Ruan Yuan 阮元 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980), 412–3.

7 Chen Di 陳第, *Maoshi guyin kao* 毛詩古音考 [*Textual Research on the Ancient Pronunciation of the Mao Edition of the Shijing*] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2008), 10.

him for an audience. Thereupon, the Celestial Ruler bestowed to the Duke a golden slip with which to rule the land and wipe out many of the tribes on the Qin domain.”<sup>8</sup> It is thus evident that, when citing Han *fu*, verifications can be made of words, pronunciations, names, and astronomical phenomena laid out in the *Shijing*.

The earliest instance of citing Han *fu* to verify and justify names and things in the *Shijing* is that of the aforementioned case of *shaoyao* in the *Commentary on Herbs, Trees, Birds, Beasts, Insects and Fish in the Mao Edition of the Shijing* by Lu Ji. Although the *Mao Commentary* defined *shaoyao* as a kind of herb, Lu was not sure what herb was being referred to. In the *Dissection and Interpretation of the Mao Commentary to the Shijing* [*Maoshi zhuanjian tongshi* 毛詩傳箋通釋], Ma Ruichen 馬瑞辰 [1782–1853] writes:

In the *Mao Commentary* it is recorded that *shaoyao* is a kind of fragrant herb. In the *Zheng Annotations* it is written that the herb is given to a lady on departing to symbolize a blossoming of affection ... *Shaoyao* also means “to mix”. The “Fu on Sir Vacuous” reads, “*Shaoyao*, as in to mix.” Yang Xiong’s “Fu on the Capital of Shu” reads, “*Shaoyao*, as in to mix soup.” The “Seven Stimuli” reads, “*Shaoyao*, as in to mix sauce.” The *Seven Commands* reads, “*Shaoyao*, as in to mix medicine” ... All take *shaoyao* to mean “to mix” and not as a kind of herb.<sup>9</sup>

This reading of *shaoyao* as “to mix” is reflected in the *fu* of Mei Cheng 枚乘 [ca. 210–138 BCE], Yang Xiong 揚雄 [53–18 BCE] and Zhang Heng 張衡 [78–139]. Regarding this, Ma Ruichen provides the following inference: “I suspect that the Qi and Lu editions of the *Shijing* interpret *shaoyao* as ‘to mix’, so it is very tempting to take this as a basis.”<sup>10</sup> Chen Qiacong 陳喬樞 [1809–1869] even took the words used in the Han *fu* and directly added them to *A Study of the Missed Insights of the Lu Edition of the Shijing* [*Lushi yishuo kao* 魯詩遺說考].<sup>11</sup> Later, in *A Compilation of Three Schools of Commentaries on the Shijing* [*Shi*

8 Hong Liangji 洪亮吉, *Maoshi tianwen kao* 毛詩天文考 [A Study of the Astronomical Information in the Mao Edition of the Shijing], Qing Daoguang sanshi nian Zhang shi chongsu tang keben 清道光三十年張氏崇素堂刻本.

9 Ma Ruichen 馬瑞辰, *Maoshi zhuanjian tongshi* 毛詩傳箋通釋 [*Dissection and Interpretation of the Mao Commentary to the Shijing*] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1989), 290.

10 Ma Ruichen, *Maoshi zhuanjian tongshi*, 290–1.

11 Chen Shouqi 陳壽祺, *Lushi yishuo kao* 魯詩遺說考 [A Study of the Missed Insights of the Lu Edition of the Shijing], vol. 1 of 2 卷二之一 Qing ke Zuo Hai xuji ben 清刻左海續集本.



*sanjia yi jishu* 詩三家義集疏], Wang Xianqian 王先謙 [1842–1917] likewise deferred to this reasoning.<sup>12</sup>

Let us now turn to the verification and justification of the term *zouyu* 騶虞 as denoting either the name of a creature or the title of an official in charge of birds and beasts on behalf of the Son of Heaven [*tianzi* 天子]. *Zouyu* is the title of a section of the “South of Shao [*Shao nan* 召南]” chapter of the *Shijing*. In the *Mao Commentary* it is written: “The *zouyu* is a righteous beast. It is a white tiger with black markings that does not eat living things. Those of utmost virtue respond to it.”<sup>13</sup> It is clear that the *Mao Commentary* interprets *zouyu* as the name of a creature. However, in *Differing Interpretations of the Five Classics* [*Wujing yiyi* 五經異義] by Xu Shen 許慎 [ca. 58–147] it is written: “At present, the Han and Lu Editions of the *Shijing* state that *zouyu* was an official in charge of birds and beasts on behalf of the Son of Heaven.” In a recompilation of the Qi 齊 edition of the *Shijing* by Wang Xianqian it is said that, “The appointment of a suitable official to oversee the animal enclosures is something to rejoice about,”<sup>14</sup> also supporting the interpretation of *zouyu* as an official title. In “Fu on the Eastern Metropolis [*Dongjing fu* 東京賦]”, Zhang Heng states, “The stable is used to raise the righteous beast *zouyu* of the Lin clan domain; it also tames the celestial horses *zema* and *tenghuang*.”<sup>15</sup> Here, Zhang juxtaposes *zouyu* with *tenghuang*, both referring to the names of beasts. In *Selections of Refined Literature* [*Wenxuan* 文選], Li Shan 李善 [630–689] annotates the “Charts of Auspicious Correspondences [*Ruiying tu* 瑞應圖]” thus: “*Tenghuang*, a celestial horse, is also known as *jiguang*.”<sup>16</sup> Xu Shen points out that the Lu 魯 edition of the *Shijing* believes that *zouyu* is the title of an official in charge of birds and beasts on behalf of the Son of Heaven, while Zhang Heng’s mention of *zouyu* in “Fu on the Eastern Metropolis” refers to the name of a righteous beast. Typically, Zhang defers to the Lu edition. It is unclear why he did not do so in this case. In “Fu on the Eastern Capital [*Dongdu fu* 東都賦]”, Ban Gu 班固 [32–92] writes, “The system is similar to that of the *zou* official in Liang”, and notes, “having read ‘*Zouyu*’ [chapter of the *Shijing*].” Chen Shouqi 陳壽祺

12 Wang Xianqian 王先謙, *Shi sanjia yi jishu* 詩三家義集疏 [A Compilation of Three Schools of Commentaries on the *Shijing*] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1987), 373.

13 Ma Ruichen, *Maoshi zhuanjian tongshi*, 104.

14 Wang Xianqian, *Shi sanjia yi jishu*, 119.

15 園林氏之騶虞，擾澤馬與騰黃。Zhao Kuifu 趙逵夫, ed., *Lidai fu pingzhu, Handai juan* 歷代賦評注：漢代卷) [Commentary on Fu Poetry Throughout the Dynasties] (Chengdu: Bashu shushe, 2010), 672.

16 Zhao Kuifu, *Lidai fu pingzhu, Handai juan*, 673.

[1771–1834] also mentioned this as the content recorded in the Qi edition of the *Shijing*.<sup>17</sup>

Alternatively, one needs to consider whether *xiejiao* 歇驕 refers to the name of a dog or something else. The “Odes of Qin [Qin *feng* 秦風]” chapter of the *Mao Edition of the Shijing* [*Maoshi* 毛詩] reads: “The *luan* bells jingle as the light carriage travels, carrying with it a hunting dog of meritorious service.” In the *Mao Commentary* it is written: “*Xian* 獫 and *xiejiao* are both names for hunting dogs. The long-snouted one is known as a *xian*, while the short-snouted one is known as a *xiejiao*.”<sup>18</sup> Here it is clear that the Mao edition believed that *xiejiao* referred to the name of a dog. However, Song dynasty [960–1279] scholar Yan Can 嚴粲 believed that *xiejiao* was not the name of a dog, but rather meant “becoming arrogant and complacent due to sluggishness.”<sup>19</sup> Nevertheless, Hu Chenggong 胡承珙 [1776–1832] stated that, “The ‘carrying with it a hunting dog of meritorious’ service passage in ‘Fu on the Western Metropolis’ referred to a time before going hunting ... Later scholars thought that the hunting was over, and so they played in the North Garden and transported the hunting dogs in their carriages to cultivate their strength. It is common to play after hunting, but it is not necessary follow with a hunting dog.”<sup>20</sup> The verification and justification of *xiejiao* as referring to the name of a dog by way of consulting the descriptions contained in the *Shijing* and “Fu on the Western Metropolis” defers to the reasoning set out in the *Mao Edition of the Shijing*.

The composition of Han *fu* exhibits certain historical tendencies. As a result, their language and exposition have been applied to the verification and justification of historical events mentioned in the *Shijing*. There is, for instance, the question of Xi Si 奚斯 [ca. b. 650 BCE] in the “Eulogies of Lu [*Lu song* 魯頌]” chapter of the *Shijing* in which it is written:

松栢有梲，	The pine wood square rafters are large and thick,
路寢孔碩。	The grand chamber is spacious and magnificent.
新廟奕奕，	The new temple is splendid,
奚斯所作。 <sup>21</sup>	Made by Xi Si.

17 Chen Shouqi 陳壽祺, *Qishi yishuo kao* 齊詩遺說考 [A Study of the Missed Insights of the Qi Edition of the *Shijing*], Qing ke Zuo Hai xuji ben 清刻左海續集本, vol. 1.

18 Mao Heng 毛亨, annot., Zheng Xuan 鄭玄, comm., and Lu Deming 陸德明, coll., *Maoshi zhuanjian* 毛詩傳箋 [Explanations to the Mao Commentary to the *Shijing*] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2018), 161.

19 Chen Qiyuan 陳啟源, *Maoshi jigu bian* 毛詩稽古編 [Examining Antiquity in the Mao Edition of the *Shijing*], Qing Daoguang jiumian Guangdong xuehai tang kan *Huangqing jingjie* ben 清道光九年廣東學海堂刊《皇清經解》本, vol. 2.

20 Hu Chenggong 胡承珙, *Maoshi houjian* 毛詩後箋 [An Epilogue to the Mao Edition of the *Shijing*] (Hefei: Huangshan shushe 黃山書社, 2014), 561.

21 Mao Heng, *Maoshi zhuanjian*, 489.



In the *Mao Commentary* the following explanation is given: “The new temple is that of Duke Min of Lu. It is an ancestral hall made by the high officer Xi Si.”<sup>22</sup> By *zuo*, is it meant that Xi Si wrote the poem or built the temple? In “Preface to the Fu on Two Capitals [*Liang du fu xu* 兩都賦序]” Ban Gu wrote: “Gao Yao sung the praises of [Shun of] Yu, while Xi Si sung the praises of [the domain of] Lu. Both were adopted by Kongzi and listed in the *Shijing* and *Shangshu*.”<sup>23</sup> In “Preface to the Fu on Lingguang Palace [*Lu lingguangdian fu xu* 魯靈光殿賦序]”, Wang Yanshou 王延壽 [140–165] writes: “The poet is inspired to write from the perception of objective things. Therefore, Xi Si wrote the ‘Bi Gong 闕宮’ hymn in the ‘Eulogies of Lu’ chapter of the *Shijing* to praise Duke Xi of Lu and the palace he built. Thereupon, Duke Xi’s meritorious service remains in the verse, while his virtuous words are manifested in the music.”<sup>24</sup> This account differs from that recorded in the *Mao Commentary*; both *fu* agree that Xi Si wrote a poem to eulogize the domain of Lu. Fan Chuyi 范處義 [fl. 1154], a scholar of the Song dynasty, disagreed with the reasoning of Ban and Wang, writing that,

The “Bi gong” hymn clearly states that the new temple is splendid, that it was made by *Xi Si*, and the *Hanshi zhangju* 韓氏章句 states that Xi Si eulogized the domain of Lu by making it, claiming the *Shijing* as basis. Thus, the Mao edition of the *Shijing* is correct. The claim by the *Hanshi zhangju* is absurd, it is plain to see. Meanwhile, Ban Gu’s “Preface to the Fu on the Western Capital [*Xi du fu xu* 西都賦序]” and Wang Yanshou’s “Preface to Fu on Lingguang Palace” both state that Xi Si eulogized Lu. Yang Xiong’s “Model Sayings [*Fa yan* 法言]” also says, “Prince Xi Si admired Zheng Kaofu.” This is probably because the three of them had not seen the Mao Edition of the *Shijing*.<sup>25</sup>

Other scholars of the Song like Wang Zhi 王質 [1135–1189] and Zheng Qiao 鄭樵 [1104–1162] also agreed with the perspective set forth in the Mao edition of the *Shijing*, believing that Xi Si built the temple. Scholars of the Qing like Ma Ruichen and Wang Xianqian critiqued this view from the perspective of the scattered Qi, Lu, and Han 韓 editions of the *Shijing*, known as the *sanjia shi* 三家詩.<sup>26</sup> How *zuo* should be interpreted here depends on the four different understandings of meaning and principle prevalent during the Han dynasty.

22 Mao Heng, *Maoshi zhuanjian*, 489.

23 Wang Xianqian, *Shi sanjia yi jishu*, 27.1062.

24 Zhao Kuifu, *Lidai fu pingzhu*, *Handai juan*, 803.

25 Fan Chuyi 范處義, “Lu song 魯頌 [Eulogies of Lu],” in *Shi buzhuo* 詩補傳 [A Supplementary Commentary on the *Shijing*], in *Wenyuange siku quanshu*, 72:27.401.

26 Ma Ruichen, *Maoshi zhuanjian tongshi*, 1155–1156; Wang Xianqian, *Shi sanjia yi jishu*, 1088.

Verification and justification – whether directed at names and things or historical events – is done on the basis of the various editions of Han *fu*. It also requires changing the way meaning and principle are sought.

### 3 Meaning and Principle: Interpreting the *Shijing* by Citing *Fu*

Prior to the arrival of Western modes of learning, scholarship in China had for almost two thousand years been dominated by the “ancient-script/modern-script debate” [*jin gu wen zhi zheng* 今古文之爭] and “Han/Song learning debate” [*han song xue zhi zheng* 漢宋學之爭]. These disputes mostly centered around meaning and principle on the one hand and verification and justification on the other. In essence, they were controversies arising from two different ways of studying and interpreting the classics between Confucian schools of different periods. Scholarship surrounding verification and justification involved carrying out tasks on written works and historical materials, such as rhyming, phonological and etymological research, and collating and comparing texts. It also required precise descriptions and critiques of historical institutions, events and personages, with the ultimate aim of observing and understanding meaning and principle. Regarding scholarship on the *Shijing*, the Han/Song learning debate was mostly tangled up on the question of whether to “respect the preface” [*zun xu* 尊序] or “discard the preface” [*fei xu* 廢序], while the ancient-script/modern-script debate pitted the Mao edition of the *Shijing* on one side against the *sanjia shi* on the other. Eventually, a tacit understanding between the contenders was reached: they would cite *fu* to justify the meaning and principle contained in the *Shijing*. This understanding was made in the midst of a burgeoning “revitalization of classical traditions” [*fugu zhuyi* 復古主義].

In the “Odes of Cao [*Cao feng* 曹風]” chapter of the *Shijing*, there is a poem titled *houren* 候人 to which the “Preface to the Maoshi [*Maoshi xu* 毛詩序]” comments: “*Houren* mocks verse that comes close to *xiaoren* [petty men]. Lord Gong of Cao keeps his distance from *junzi* [men of integrity], and yet is fond of approaching *xiaoren*.”<sup>27</sup> Song-dynasty scholars Li Chu 李樞 and Huang Chun 黃樞 [fl. 1187] cite a passage from “Fu Lamenting Qu Yuan [*Diao Qu Yuan fu* 吊屈原賦]” by Jia Yi 賈誼 [200–168 BCE] to justify their interpretation of *junzi* 君子 and *xiaoren* 小人. Li Chu follows the reasoning of Su Zhe 蘇轍 [1039–1112] as set forth in the *Collected Commentaries to the Shijing* [*shi ji zhuan*

<sup>27</sup> Mao Heng, *Maoshi zhuanjian*, 186.

詩集傳] – that the *Preface* was written by Lord Mao. Huang Chun provides a further explanation:

Jia Yi, having been banished from Chang'an, was discontented. When he was crossing the Xiang River, he wrote a *fu* in homage to Qu Yuan as a self-analogy ... The text subverted the *junzi* and the *xiaoren* to such an extent that the ruler could not distinguish between loyalty and treachery. The upstanding men of the domain of Wei became officials in charge of music, while the *junzi* of the domain of Cao were employed as *houren* – officials of the lookout office – in charge of meeting and seeing off visitors on the road.<sup>28</sup>

The description provided by Jia Yi was that of a chaotic, upside-down world. Both Li Chu and Huang Chun used messages contained in the *fu* to interpret meaning and principle in the *Preface to the Shijing*.

Li Chu and Huang Chun took the “Preface to the Maoshi” to be true and the prefaced attributed to Wei Hong 衛宏 [fl. 25–57] to be false. This is a much discussed issue in *Shijing* studies. In *Discussion on Literature* [*Jingji lun* 經籍論], Song-dynasty scholar Ye Mengde 葉夢得 [1077–1148] wrote,

There are no citations of the “Preface to the Maoshi” in the Cao edition of the *Shijing*. There is an imperial edict from the fourth year of the Huangchu era of Wei that reads, “The Cao edition of the *Shijing* mocks the ruler for being far from *junzi* and close to *xiaoren*.” It was around about this time that the “Preface to the Maoshi” started to become popular.<sup>29</sup>

In the second fascicle of the *History of the Wei* [*Wei shu* 魏書] in the *Treatises of the Three Kingdoms* [*Sanguo zhi* 三國志] – it is recorded, “In the fourth year [of the Huangchu era of Wei] ... In the fifth month of summer, pelicans gathered at Lingzhi Pond. An imperial edict proclaimed, “This is none other than the water bird depicted by the poets. The Cao edition of the *Shijing* mocks the Lord for being far from *junzi* and close to *xiaoren*.”<sup>30</sup> Here, Ye reveals two key points of scholarly value. One is that the *Preface to the Shijing* was not in circulation until the Cao Wei [220–265] dynasty, which suggests that it is probable

28 Li Chu 李樛 and Huang Chun 黃樛, *Maoshi jijie* 毛詩集解 [*Collected Commentaries to the Mao Edition of the Shijing*], in *Wenyuange siku quanshu*, 71:16, 329–30.

29 See Wang Yinglin 王應麟, *Kun xue ji wen* 困學紀聞 [*Record of Observances from Arduous Studies*], comp. Sun Haitong 孫通海 (Zhengzhou: Daxiang chubanshe, 2019), 3:195.

30 Chen Shou 陳壽, *Sanguo zhi* 三國志 [*Treatises on the Three Kingdoms*] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1959), 82–3.

that Wei Hong wrote it. This would also correspond with the doubting of the *Preface* by Zheng Qiao. Two is that one may confirm a lack of citations of the *Preface to the Shijing* among the belles-lettres of the Han dynasty.

This raises the question of whether the *Preface to the Shijing* was extant during the Han dynasty. Chen Qiyuan 陳啟源 [d. 1683], a scholar of the Qing dynasty, set about recompiling the Han-era *Preface to the Shijing*. He did this in *Examining Antiquity in the Mao Edition of the Shijing* [*Maoshi jigu bian* 毛詩稽古編]. Passages from Han *fu* were important documentary sources during this process. In the ninth fascicle, “Fish-scale [Yuli 魚麗]”, he offers a retort of the reasoning put forth by Ye Mengde, stating,

What Ye Mengde said is incorrect. In *Refuting the People of Shu* [*Nan shu fu lao* 難蜀父老], Sima Xiangru stated, “It is not the case that a true king did not start with worry and diligence and end with happiness and comfort.” This is a preface to “Fish-scale”. In “Fu on the Eastern Capital”, Ban Gu spoke of “benevolence spread wide”. This is text from the preface to the “The Han River is Wide [*Han guang* 漢廣]”, as well as “Drum and Bell [*Gu zhong* 鼓鐘]” from the *Mao Commentary to the Shijing*. One originates from the time of Emperor Wu of Han, while another originates from the time of Emperor Ming of Han 漢明帝. Both use speech from the “Preface to the Maoshi”. Could it be said that it is not from the Han dynasty?<sup>31</sup>

Chen lists *Shijing* citations from *fu* composed by Sima Xiangru and Ban Gu: “Moreover, it is not the case that a true king did not start with worry and diligence and end with happiness and comfort. However, the tallies showing the reception of the mandate are all here. The *feng*-sacrifices at Mount Tai and the services at Mount Liangfu will cause the *luan*-bells on the chariots to jingle harmoniously with the sound of music. Above he comes close to the Five Emperors, while below he mounts to the heights of the Three Dynasties.”<sup>32</sup> It is not clear which edition of the *Shijing* Sima Xiangru consulted. However, there is no doubt a match between the message conveyed in the *fu* and the preface to “Fish-scale”. In addition, Chen Qiyuan writes in a preface to the poem “The Cricket [*Xishuai* 蟋蟀]”:

In *Fu on Dance*, Fu Yi of the Han dynasty wrote, “*Ai* [Sympathize with] the *jucu* 局促 of the cricket.” The ancient poem goes, “The cricket has *shang*

31 Chen Qiyuan, *Maoshi jigu bian*, vol. 9.

32 Ban Gu 班固, *Hanshu* 漢書 [*History of the Former Han*], annot. Yan Shigu 顏師古 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1962), 57.2588.

[sorrow] for *jucu*.” The meaning of *jucu* can be compared to the sense of “frugality to the point of ritual failure” in the “Preface to the Maoshi”. Both *ai* and *shang* may be taken as *lian* [to take pity], as recorded in the *Preface ...* At that time, Mao poetics had not yet become popular. Nevertheless, there were grounds for talking about the *Shijing* and the *Preface* in this way. That can be acknowledged. Zhu Xi’s *Collected Commentaries to the Shijing* thought of the populace as being hard-working and frugal, which is a virtue. How could this be described as *jucu*?<sup>33</sup>

“The Cricket” is a poem in the “Odes of Tang [*Tang feng* 唐風]” chapter of the *Shijing*. In the “Preface to the Maoshi” it is written: “‘The Cricket’ makes a mockery of Lord Xi of Jin. Lord Xi was frugal but did not abide by the rituals. Thus, this poem expresses a sense of regret and a hope that Lord Xi can perform the ritual music for Yu on time. It is an expression of deep concern expressed by the domain of Jin under the guise of Tang that takes local customs as its basis. Frugality and respect for the ritual system is the legacy of Yao.”<sup>34</sup> Though the “Preface to the Maoshi” had not yet emerged in the times of Emperor Jing of Han 漢景帝 [r. 157–141 BCE] and Emperor Ming of Han 漢明帝 [r. 57–75 BC], its meaning was already in existence. Therefore, it can be taken that there was an extant version of the *Preface* at that time.

During the Song, there was an ideological trend of being doubtful towards or even discarding the preface, led mostly by Zheng Qiao, Zhu Xi 朱熹 [1130–1200], Wang Bo 王柏 [1197–1274] and Ye Mengde. In response to this trend, scholars of the Qing retorted by espousing a reverence for the preface in the name of “examining antiquity”, which was mainly supported by passages from *Han fu*. This “citing *fu* to justify interpretations of the *Shi*” [*yin fu yi zheng shi yi* 引賦以證詩義] was an outstanding contribution to the debate. Chen Qiyuan had the following to say about the poem “White Flower [*Baihua* 白華]”:

The *Preface* took the position that this poem was composed by a man of the Zhou, just like how the poem *Little Crest* was composed by the Mentor of the Heir Apparent. Zhu Xi’s *Collected Commentaries to the Shijing* claimed that Consort Shen of King You of Zhou wrote it. I am not sure what the basis of this is. Pieces written by later generations like “Fu on Changmen Palace [*Changmen fu* 長門賦]” and “Ci on the Wise Ruler [*Mingjun ci* 明君詞]” came from the pens of the literati. How could

33 Chen Qiyuan, *Maoshi jigu bian*, vol. 6.

34 Mao Heng, *Maoshi zhuanjian*, 147.

it be that Empress Chen and Wang Zhaojun wrote a piece like this by themselves?<sup>35</sup>

Here, Chen uses the depiction by Sima Xiangru of the misfortune of Empress Chen 陳皇后 [fl. 140 BCE] in “Fu on Changmen Palace” to counteract claims by Zhu Xi that *Baihua* was written by Consort Shen 申后 [fl. 782 BCE] herself. There is also the poem “Moat by the Eastern Gate [*Dongmen zhi chi* 東門之池]”. In the “Preface to the Maoshi” it is written: “Moat by the Eastern Gate’ is a mockery of the times that expresses the hope that a virtuous lady may be matched with a *junzi*.”<sup>36</sup> In the *Collected Commentaries to the Shijing* by Zhu Xi, the *Preface to the Shijing* is discarded. Zhu stated that he believed the poem was a “poem [depicting] a gathering between men and women”. In *Investigation into Questions on the Shijing* [*Shi yi bian zheng* 詩疑辨證], the Qing-dynasty scholar Huang Zhongsong 黃中松 provides a retort, the grounds for which derive from the creative style of *fu* and their distinctly ornate rhetoric.<sup>37</sup>

Naturally, excessive praise for the Mao edition of the *Shijing* may be ill-advised. In “Fu on a Northward Journey [*Beizheng fu* 北征賦]”, Ban Biao 班彪 [3–54] wrote:

日暍暍其將暮兮，	The sun is dim and it is almost dusk,
睹牛羊之下來。	The cattle and sheep have descended the hills.
寤怨曠之傷情兮，	I feel the pain of unmarried men and unmated women,
哀詩人之嘆時。 <sup>38</sup>	And the sadness of the poet’s lament.

This originates from the “Odes of Wang [*Wang feng* 王風]” chapter of the *Shi*:

君子于役，	My husband is away on service,
不知其期，	And I know not when he will return,
曷至哉？	Where is he now?
雞棲於塒，	The fowls roost in their holes in the walls,
日之夕矣，	And in the evening of the day,

35 Chen Qiyuan, *Maoshi jigou bian*, vol. 16.

36 Mao Heng, *Maoshi zhuanjian*, 176.

37 The source reads: 朱子以詩中不見可刺之故，改為男女聚會之詞，而以淫詩例之，玩經彼美淑姬句，乃男悅女之詞，淫放之人自以為美，自以為淑，正如後世詞賦家敷華揚藻，艷羨誇美之語，非真有賢淑之德也。See Huang Zhongsong 黃中松, *Shi yi bianzheng* 詩疑辨證 [*Investigation into Questions of the Shijing*], in *Wenyuange siku quanshu*, 88:3,321.

38 Zhao Kuifu, *Lidai fu pingzhu*, *Handaijuan*, 376.



羊牛下來。                   The goats and cows come down [from the hill].  
君子于役，                   But my husband is away on service,  
如之何勿思。<sup>39</sup>               How can I but keep thinking of him?

Wang Xianqian believed that “long separation and sentimental feelings” [*yuan kuang shang qing* 怨曠傷情] conveyed the message contained in the song “My Lord is On Service [*Junzi yu yi* 君子于役]” in *Qi Poems* [*Qi shi* 齊詩].<sup>40</sup> Hu Chenggong believed that “long separation and sentimental feelings” in fact referred to the poem “Male Pheasant [*Xiong zhi* 雄雉].”<sup>41</sup> According to what is recorded in the “Preface to the Maoshi”, “*Male Pheasant* is a satire of Duke Xuan of Wey. The Duke was promiscuous and did not care about affairs of the state. War broke out many times, the nobles served a long time in the military, and men and women grieved in separation. The people of Wey resented this, so they wrote this poem.”<sup>42</sup> Hu Chenggong had high regard for the Mao edition of the *Shijing*, and thus cited Li Shan’s annotations to the “Preface to the Maoshi”. It is not clear whether Li Shan had seen the Qi edition of the *Shijing* or Ban Biao’s Preface to it.

#### 4 Language and Exposition: Citing *Fu* to Interpret *Shi*

The citing of language and exposition in Han *fu* that is present in the *Shijing* exegetical works is intrinsically a literary practice. When writing the *Summary to the Commentary on Herbs, Trees, Birds, Beasts, Insects and Fish in the Mao Edition of the Shijing* [*Maoshi caomu niaoshou chongyu shu guangyao* 毛詩草木鳥獸蟲魚疏廣要] by Lu Ji, the Ming scholar Mao Jin 毛晉 [1599–1659] added additional explanations to Lu’s *fu* citations which were philological studies of particular names and things. For example, regarding the aforementioned case of *shaoyao*, Mao added the following text: “In ancient times there was *shaoyao* sauce, a mixture of five flavors of orchid and osmanthus. It was used to add flavor to food. The five-flavor sauced was called *shaoyao*. ‘Seven Stimuli [*Qi fa* 七發]’ talks about *shaoyao* sauce, while ‘Fu on Sir Vacuous’ talks about

39 Mao Heng, *Maoshi zhuanjian*, 97.

40 The source reads: 班氏世習齊詩，賦云：怨曠傷情，知齊義以此詩君子為室家之詞。郭引詩泛曆樞云：牛羊來暮，亦用齊文，是齊作牛羊也。See Wang Xianqian, *Shi sanjia yi jishu*, 318.

41 The source reads: 不知李善注文選於上二句引此詩，於下二句引雄雉序曰：“大夫久役，男女怨曠”，是則怨曠者，並不指此詩，不得援以為證。See Hu Chenggong, *Maoshi houjian*, 336.

42 See Mao Heng, *Maoshi zhuanjian*, 46.

presenting food served with *shaoyao* [to the King of Chu].<sup>43</sup> After Lu's citation of Sima Xiangru's "Fu on Sir Vacuous" and Yang Xiong's "Fu on the Capital of Shu", he also cited passages from the "Seven Stimuli" and "Fu on Sir Vacuous". This formed a practice of increasing literariness in which *fu* and annotations ran parallel with each other. Another case in point is Mao Jin's addition of the following text: "The *fu* bird portrayed by Jia Yi is active after dark ... When Jia Yi was banished to Changsha, it gathered at his residence. Jia Yi believed that its lifespan was not long, so he wrote poems to comfort himself, but in the end he could not prevent it from dying young."<sup>44</sup> This is a discussion of why Jia Yi wrote the *fu* after the verification of the names and things, seemingly composing a preface to the *fu*. He supplemented that with two instances of verification and justification of names and things in the language and exposition of the *fu*.<sup>45</sup> This may be read as a conscious effort to increase the literariness of the text by adding a philological study of names and things, and is consistent with the custom of using literature to interpret the *Shijing* that prevailed during the Ming era.

Consider, also, the literary aspects of philological studies. *Philology of the Shijing* [*Shijing xiaoxue* 詩經小學] by Duan Yucai 段玉裁 [1735–1815] is a relevant case in point. The language and exposition it employs is highly literary.<sup>46</sup> The use of Han *fu* citations to carry out philological studies on passages from the *Shijing* not only interprets the meanings of individual words, but also reveals deeper meanings in the wider text. What is perhaps of even more interest is that Hu Chenggong believed that the literariness of Duan's interpretations could have been raised. As a result, Hu added his own citations after Duan's, in this case referencing the poem "Fu to Mourn Madam Li [*Dao li furen fu* 悼李夫人賦]" composed by Emperor Wu of Han 漢武帝 [r. 141–87 BCE].<sup>47</sup> This added

43 See Lu Ji 陸璣 and Mao Jin 毛晉, *Maoshi caomu niaoshou chongyu shu guangyao* 毛詩草木鳥獸蟲魚疏廣要 [Summary of the Commentary on Herbs, Trees, Birds, Beasts, Insects and Fish in the Mao Edition of the *Shijing*], Ming Chongzhen nianjian yushan Mao shi jiguge kan *Jindai mishu ben* 明崇禎年間虞山毛氏汲古閣刊《津逮秘書》本.

44 Lu Ji and Mao Jin, *Maoshi caomu niaoshou chongyu shu guangyao*.

45 Consider, example, the lower fascicle in which Mao Jin cited the "Fu on the Imperial Park": 鴻鵠鵠鵠，駕鵝屬玉，交精旋目，煩驚庸渠，箴鴉鷓盧，群浮乎其上也。See Lu Ji and Mao Jin, *Maoshi caomu niaoshou chongyu shu guangyao*.

46 For example, note this passage which cites six different *fu*: 宋玉賦“眉聯娟以蛾揚”，揚雄賦“何必揚累之蛾眉”，“慮妃曾不得施其蛾眉”，皆娥之假借字。娥者，美好輕揚之意。《方言》：“娥，好也”。秦晉之間，好而輕者謂之娥。《大招》“娥眉曼只”，枚乘《七發》“皓齒娥眉”，張衡《思元賦》“嬌眼娥眉”。See Duan Yucai 段玉裁, *Shijing xiaoxue* 詩經小學 [Philology of the *Shijing*], Qing Jiaqing er nian Wujin Zang shi baijing tang keben 清嘉慶二年武進臧氏拜經堂刻本, vol. 1.

47 The passage read: 連流視而娥揚。See Hu Chenggong, *Maoshi houjian*, 291.

an extra layer of detail and richness to the literary flavor of the philological critique.

In “A Letter to Master Chen [Yu Chen shuoshi shu 與陳碩士書],” Yao Nai wrote: “[Regarding] the best place to carry out verification and justification of belles-lettres, [we happen] to be in it.”<sup>48</sup> On the contrary, the use of belles-lettres to bolster the process of verification and justification is precisely the “best place” of exegetical works. The aforementioned practice in which *fu* and annotations are placed side by side to examine names and things, distinguish characters and interpret words is a highly literary tendency. Meanwhile, when interpreting the meaning and principle contained in the *Shijing*, citing the perceived motivations for composition, and language and exposition, of *fu*, is likewise an interpretation of *Shijing* through a literary lens.<sup>49</sup> This method involves using the *Preface* to the interpret the *Shijing*, a typical classicist approach.<sup>50</sup> Fan Yichu, when discussing the meaning of *zheng xiao ya* 正小雅, cited text written by Sima Qian 司馬遷 [145–87 BCE] that read, “The Major Court Hymns [*Da ya* 大雅]’ first talks about the virtues of the nobles and then the people. The ‘Minor Court Hymns [*Xiao ya* 小雅]’ first mocks the suffering of the self, which is related to the gain and loss of the reigning monarch.”<sup>51</sup> The creative thought process that Sima Xiangru had when composing *fu* can be said to be derived from the same origin as that of the *Shijing*. It is a case of using the mind of the *fu* composer to guess at the mind of the *Shijing* composer.

48 Yao Nai 姚鼐, “Yu Chen shuoshi shu 與陳碩士書 [A Letter to Master Chen],” in *Yao Xibao xiansheng chidu* 姚惜抱先生尺牘 [Letters of Yao Nai], Qing Xuantonq yuannian xiao wanliu tang keben 清宣統元年小萬柳堂刻本, vol. 6.

49 Consider that, in their interpretation of the verse, “You do not think of the former days / And are only angry with me” [不念昔者，伊余來壑] in the “Odes of Bei [Beifeng 邶風]” chapter of the *Shijing*, Li Chu and Huang Chun wrote: 壑，息也，言君子忘舊，不念往昔年，我始來之時，安息我也，欲其不忘舊也。夫妻者，齊也，一與之齊，則終身不改，豈有淫其新昏者，一為好色所移，則棄舊而圖新哉。

50 Note, however, the subsequent passage of interpretation: 司馬相如為陳皇后嘗作長門賦，哀陳皇后之見棄，及其惑於嬖妾，而文君又有白頭吟之嘆，躬自蹈之，好色之事，其惑於人者如此。It aims to compare the psycho-creative process of the *fu* author with that of the *Shijing* so that the reader may better understand the *Shijing*. See Li Chu and Huang Chun, *Maoshi jijie*, 71:120.

51 Note his verification and justification follows thus: 遷之言為司馬相如而發，論大雅固已近之，論小雅獨取諷刺，與相如詞賦相似者：如賓之初筵言天下之淫佚，以諷幽王之荒廢。白華言下國之用孽妾，以諷幽王之黜後，所謂譏小己之得失，其流及上者如此，然特變雅之事耳，概而言之，亦非通論也。See Fan Chuyi, *Shi buzhuann*, 72:177.

*Fu* are considered one of the “six principles” [*liuyi* 六義] of traditional Chinese poetics. It is said that “*Fu* are a development of the ancient *shi*.”<sup>52</sup> Naturally, much discussion on the meaning of *fu* can be found among the *Shijing* exegetical works, which in turn may be used to support literary criticism of the *fu* form. In addition, the exegetical works contain a large amount of content which discuss passages of *fu*. These passages hold significance in literary criticism.<sup>53</sup>

In *General Discourse on the Shijing* [*Shijing tonglun* 詩經通論], Qing-dynasty scholar Yao Jiheng 姚際恆 [1647–1715] offers the following discussion on “The Peach Tree Is Flourishing [*Tao zhi yaoyao* 桃之夭夭]”: “The color of peach blossoms, being most resplendent, is used as a metaphor for women. It gave rise to the longstanding practice of eulogizing beauties through *ci* and *fu*.”<sup>54</sup> To this one may add the discussion of another Qing scholar, Cheng Tingzuo 程廷祚 [1691–1767]. In part one of “On Saofu [*Sao fu lun shang* 騷賦論上],” Cheng writes: “When it comes to describing affairs and objects, ‘Four Iron-black Horses [*Si tie* 駟驥],’ ‘Our Chariots Attacked [*Che gong* 車攻]’ and ‘Auspicious Day [*Ji ri* 吉日]’ were the originators of literature about hunting. ‘Assorted Banks [*Si gan* 斯干]’ and ‘Numinous Terrace [*Ling tai* 靈臺]’ were the first to portray imperial palaces and gardens. ‘The Vastness of Bin’ in ‘Patriarch Liu [*Gong Liu* 公劉]’ and ‘As Far as the Foot of Qi Hill’ in ‘Silk Floss [*Mian* 綿]’ were the first literary works that described scenes of a capital.”<sup>55</sup> The discussions on *fu* present in the *Shijing* exegetical works can be said to resemble Cheng’s remarks on *fu*, which demonstrates a clear sense of literary criticism.

The *Shijing* exegetical works also contain passages that are relevant to points of discussion in the field of *fu* literary criticism. Yang Xiong put forth the distinction between “*fu* of the poets” [*shiren zhi fu* 詩人之賦] and “*fu* of the rhetoricians” [*ciren zhi fu* 辭人之賦]. Regarding the poem “Our Chariots Attacked,” Li Chu and Huang Chun wrote:

52 Ban Gu, *Hanshu*, 483.

53 Take, for instance, the following text on the “Originators of the *fu*” [*Fu zu* 賦祖] contained in the *Shijing*: 宋儒嚴粲《詩緝》：“《小雅·斯干》‘秩秩斯干，幽幽南山’，《西京賦》言長安‘於前則終南、太一’，猶此詩言‘幽幽南山’；‘於後則據渭、踞涇’，猶此詩言‘秩秩斯干’，《西京賦》祖述《斯干》也。” See Yan Can 嚴粲, *Shi ji* 詩緝 [*Compilation Concerning the Shijing*], in *Wenyuange siku quanshu*, 75:19.254.

54 Yao Jiheng 姚際恆, *Shijing tonglun* 詩經通論 [*General Discourse on the Shijing*], Qing Daoguang shiqi nian tieqin shanguan keben 清道光十七年鐵琴山館刻本, vol. 1.

55 Cheng Tingzuo 程廷祚, “Sao fu lun shang 騷賦論上 [On Elegiac Rhapsody I],” in *Qingxi ji* 青溪集 [*Qingxi Collection*], Jinling congshu (yi ji) ben 金陵叢書(乙集)本, vol. 3.

There are eight chapters in the poem “Our Chariots Attacked”, which describe the graceful demeanor of King Xuan of Zhou 周宣王, which can be said to be perfect. It has been written that King Xuan’s chariots were repaired, and that he was fully equipped. Archery and driving, all kinds of excellent skills that are possessed by the lord – this is what the poet is good at describing. Like Sima Xiangru’s “Fu on the Imperial Park”, it is probably an imitation of this poem, but the length of that *fu* is many times as long as that of “Our Chariots Attacked”, even dozens of times as long. How does the morality of the prince described in it compare to “Our Chariots Attacked”? ... Judging from this poem and that *fu*, the difference between composers of poetry and composers of *fu* is very clear.<sup>56</sup>

There has been a wide range of views discussed on the topic of “*fu* of the poets” and “*fu* of the rhetoricians” in the field of *fu* literary criticism. Indeed, scholarly consensus has not been reached. Comparing “Our Chariots Attacked” with “Fu on the Imperial Park” to demonstrate the difference between the “poets” and “rhetoricians” may be considered an original approach.

Now let us turn to the question of “praise and mockery” [*meici* 美刺] in the composition of *fu*. In the “Greater Encomia [*Daya* 大雅]” chapter of the *Shijing* it is written:

王猶允塞，	The king’s plans were directed in truth and sincerity,
徐方既來。	And the region of Xu came [at once to terms].
徐方既同，	Its [chiefs] were all collected together,
天子之功。	Through the merit of the Son of Heaven.
四方既平，	The country was all reduced to order,
徐方來庭。	Its [chiefs] appeared before the king.
徐方不回，	They would not again change their minds,
王曰還歸。 <sup>57</sup>	And the kings said, ‘Let us return.’”

From a specific chapter analysis perspective, Fan Chuyi points out that the tendency of Han *fu* to “advise one hundred and persuade the one” [*quan bai feng yi* 勸百諷一] originated from the *Shijing*.<sup>58</sup> However, a more detailed literary

56 Li Chu and Huang Chun, *Maoshi jijie*, 71:422.

57 Mao Heng, *Maoshi zhuanjian*, 442.

58 The source reads: 前數章所稱宣王之用兵，盛矣美矣！而非常武之所尚也。召穆公之意謂：德為可常，武不可黷，故先極言其盛美，以滿宣王之欲，卒章乃陳警戒之言，故其言易入也。後之為辭賦者，或竊取其義，而學者以曲終奏雅，勸百諷一譏之，是不知其得古詩人之遺意也。 See Fan Chuyi, *Shi buzhuang*, 72:372.

interpretation of the *Shijing* necessitates an understanding of the cohesive devices in the source text. Liu Yuru 劉玉汝 [fl. 1341] of the Yuan dynasty [1206–1368] took a passage from the “South of Shao” chapter that read:

何彼禮矣，	How great is that luxuriance,
唐棣之華.....	Those flowers of the sparrow-plum!
其鈞維何。 <sup>59</sup>	What are used in angling?

and analyzed the use of *he* [何] as follows: “*He* is an interrogative word that should be placed at the beginning of the next sentence. This structure has been used before in Song Yu’s ‘Nine Variations [Jiu bian 九辨]’ and Sima Xiangru’s ‘Fu on Changmen Palace’. The use of *he* at the end of a section is a way to avoid repetition and use synonyms in adjacent sentences to express the same meaning.”<sup>60</sup> This is an example of using *fu* to interpret the *Shijing* from a syntactic perspective. In his analysis of the poem “Determining the Cardinal Directions [Ding zhi fang zhong 定之方中]”, Gu Yanwu, stated, “Zhang Heng’s ‘Fu on the Eastern Metropolis’ wrote phrases like, ‘the divination gives an auspicious reading’, grammar of this nature.”<sup>61</sup> When Zhang Heng cited the *Shijing*, he often altered the text. Here, Gu was pointing out changes in the grammar arising from such alterations. Ming-dynasty scholar Wan Shihua 萬時華 [1590–1639] was a poet who was fond of composing poems to discuss the *Shijing*.<sup>62</sup> This involved interpreting textual features in Han *fu* like word selection, literary style, semantic creativity, “word smelting” [*lianzi* 煉字] and scenic descriptions to better understand the *Shijing*.

The practice seen in exegetical works in which Han *fu* are cited to interpret the *Shijing* can be considered a kind of literary interpretation in *Shijing* scholarship. During this process, the verification and justification of particular passages results in a kind of literariness emerging from the literary language of the *fu* source text. Moreover, this kind of interpretative practice of the *Shijing* is characterized by reference to literature. First, the citing of language and

59 Mao Heng, *Maoshi zhuanjian*, 30.

60 Liu Yuru 劉玉汝, *Shi zuanxu* 詩續緒 [A Compilation of the *Shijing*], in *Wenyuange siku quanshu*, 77:2.591, 648.

61 Gu Yanwu 顧炎武, *Shi benyin* 詩本音 [Original Rhymes of the *Shijing*], in *Wenyuange siku quanshu*, 241:2.48.

62 In particular, consider his poem *Old Together* [*Xielao* 偕老] in which he wrote: 胡然而天，全是詫異，聲響如雲，恍惚天仙帝女下臨人世，不知何處得來。子虛賦：眇眇忽忽，若神仙之方髯。正此意，然為蚊為螭為雲為雨之狀，筆端自寫出。 See Wan Shihua 萬時華, *Shijing oujian* 詩經偶箋 [Occasional Annotations on the *Shijing*], Ming Chongzhen liu nian Li Tai keben 明崇禎六年李泰刻本, vol. 2.



exposition of Han *fu* invites a comparison between the creative mindset of the composers of *fu* with that of the perceived authors of the *Shijing* to facilitate reader understanding of the *Shijing*. Second, the deliberate placement of *fu* with annotative descriptions in parallel form allows for the revelation of meanings within the *Shijing*. Third, by using verses of *fu* to gain a thorough understanding of the *Shijing*, the myriad purposes of the source text can be ascertained. In this way, a literary interpretation of the *Shijing* that offers a wide range of approaches and layers of meaning is made possible. The various proponents of the “appreciation school” [*xinshang pai* 欣賞派] in their *Shijing* exegetical works made a large quantity of *fu* citations for the purposes of interpreting meaning and principle, carrying out verification and justification, and examining questions of phonology and etymology. As a result, they were able to attempt to better appreciate the *Shijing*, and generate new language and exposition in the process. In the “cross-justification” of the classics, this led to the formation of a new kind of literary interpretation of the *Shijing*; it is also a unique approach to literary criticism in Chinese literature.

## 5 Conclusion: An Interpretative System for Complementary Citation

Among the Five Classics, the *Shijing* has been most frequently cited in Han *fu*. Furthermore, this article has demonstrated that, among the many literary forms present in Chinese literature, there is none that has been so widely used in the interpretation of the *Shijing* like Han *fu*. Considered as a development of the ancient *shi*, *fu* are also considered “originally a vassal among the six principles of poetry that now assumes the status of a great domain.”<sup>63</sup> As a literary form, *fu* are intimately bound up with the *Shijing*. They are unique among all other literary forms in that they have the potential to “integrate [the study of] canon with [that of] history.”<sup>64</sup> Han *fu* are laden with knowledge and are characterized by their ability to “promote the virtues of rulers and express the feelings of the people.”<sup>65</sup> Their historical emergence is deeply rooted in the tradition of *Shijing* scholarship during the Han dynasty. Composers of *fu* not only used the *Shijing* to enrich their prose, but also used their poetic expositions

63 Liu Xie 劉勰, *Wenxin diaolong yizhu* 文心雕龍譯注 [Translation and Annotation of the *Wenxin Diaolong*], trans. and annot. Lu Kanru 陸侃如 and Mou Shijin 牟世金 (Jinan: Qilu shushe, 2009), 163.

64 Zhu Tingzhen 朱庭珍, “Xiaoyuan shihua 筱園詩話 [Notes on Poetry by Zhu Xiaoyuan],” in *Qing shihua xubian* 清詩話續編 [Collection of Notes on Poetry from the Qing Dynasty], ed. Guo Shaoyu 郭紹虞 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1983), 4:1.2348.

65 Zhao Kuifu, *Lidai fu pingzhu*, *Handaijuan*, 484.

to carry on the teachings of the *Shijing*, allowing for the further interpretation and consolidation of canonical messages. The reception of Han *fu* transitioned from “a grown man does not compose *fu*” to being perceived as “governing the state and managing the outer divisions, their meaning being to honor glory and grandeur.” This transition, along with the simultaneous praising of *fu* as a literary form, meant that the Six Classics ended up being used to promote the merits of *fu*. This is a classic example in literary history of “integrating the meaning of the classics [with that of literature]” and “making grand speech for the self”.<sup>66</sup> This meant that the thoughts Liu Xie 劉勰 [ca. 465–532] had on “[seeking] evidence from the Sage” [*zheng sheng* 徵聖] and “revering the classics” [*zong jing* 宗經] were well-founded in the context of literary texts.

Interpretation of classic texts in China has long been characterized by a reverence for traditional approaches. As a result, classicists throughout the ages have adopted the examining-of-antiquity paradigm, or similar means, to comprehend the classics. The understanding was that Han-dynasty composers of *fu*, perceived as being not too distant from the Sage, could speak for the ancients. Furthermore, they believed that their speech could stand on its own. Thus, the *fu* they composed naturally became reference material for the classicists. Later generations of scholars then started to use *fu* to interpret *Shijing*, a reversal of the original state of affairs in which composers of *fu* cited the *Shijing* during their creative process. This was a historical merging of disciplines: the study of literature merging with the study of the classics. This led to using the classics to revere *fu*, using the classics to enrich *fu* and using *fu* to transmit the classics.<sup>67</sup> This culminated in the *fu* being used to interpret the classics, which closed the loop. This had paradigmatic significance in the history of the study of classics and literature.

Citations of the *Shijing* in Han *fu* were both linguistic and semantic in function. Meanwhile, *Shijing* exegetical works carried out ironic citations of Han *fu* in an interpretative system. These citations were targeted at meaning and principle, verification and justification, and language and exposition. There are also the six principles of traditional Chinese poetics: “ballads” [*feng* 風], “exposition”

66 Huang Kan 黄侃, *Wenxin diaolong zhaji* 文心雕龍札記 [*Reading Notes to the Wenxin Diaolong*] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2006), 29.

67 Xu Fuguan 徐復觀 [1904–1982] believed that “the *Zuozhuan* used historical events to interpret *Chunqiu*” [以歷史之事實解釋春秋] and that it “used historical accounts to transmit canonical meanings” [以史傳經]. See Xu Fuguan 徐復觀, *Lianghan sixiangshi* 兩漢思想史 [*An Intellectual History of the Han Dynasty*] (Shanghai: Huadong shifan daxue chubanshe, 2001), 164–7. Han *fu* citation of the classics as a vehicle for canonical transmission can be referred to as “using *fu* to transmit canonical meanings” [以賦傳經]. For a relevant discussion on this topic, see Xu Jie and Wang Sihao, “Hanfu yongjing kao.”

[*fu* 賦], “comparison” [*bi* 比], “stimulation” [*xing* 興], “elegance” [*ya* 雅] and “hymn” [*song* 頌]. In the view of Kong Yingda, “Exposition, comparison and stimulation are the rhetorical methods employed in the *Shijing*. Ballads, elegance and hymns are the three literary forms of the *Shijing*. The three methods and the three forms are called together by the common name of meaning.”<sup>68</sup> Ballads, elegance and hymn make up the “three forms” [*santi* 三體], while exposition, comparison and stimulation make up the “three uses” [*sanyong* 三用]. In the latter, exposition – unlike the other two – forms an independent literary form, which creates a kind of demand for deriving meaning from the classics. The reliance *fu* had on *Shijing* for this establishment of meaning is intrinsically linked with the traditional use of *Shijing* during the Warring States Period as an educational vehicle. Han *fu*, which were used as documentary sources by later generations of scholars, were a highly developed literary form as early as the Warring States Period. Moreover, *fu* primarily originated from the *Shi*. In the Han dynasty, composers of *fu* carried on the tradition of “citing poetry to express intent”, which entailed reciting the *Shijing* in various social situations to express personal positions, points of view and feelings. Han *fu*, as originators of ancient poetry, to some extent were also originators of *Shijing* teachings. There was a shift from *fu* taking the canonical messages of the *Shijing* out of context, to deriving meaning from them. Consider the following quotation from the Grand Scribe [*Tai shi gong* 太史公], aka Sima Qian: “Although there is much fictitious speech and obscene rhetoric, the subject matter is frugality. They may be in the same category as the hymns and eulogies of the *Shijing*.”<sup>69</sup> Here, Sima provides a description of how the various editions of the Han *fu* were created.<sup>70</sup> Meaning-based citations of the *Shijing* by Han *fu* are mostly references to the significance of persuasive remonstrances and hymns and eulogies [*yasong* 雅頌] contained in the *Shijing*. Moreover, the meaning and principle of these passages were later ironically cited by classicists of later generations in their literary interpretations, thereby creating new kinds of meaning and principle.

It can be said that the “narration and exposition” [*pu cai chi wen* 鋪採摛文] of Han *fu*, although mere citations of the *Shijing*, surpassed them in literary achievement. A writer of the Eastern Jin dynasty [317–420] Ge Hong 葛洪 [283–363] made the following observation:

68 Zheng Xuan and Kong Yingda, *Maoshi Zhengyi*, 271.

69 Sima Qian 司馬遷, *Shiji* 史記 [*Records of the Grand Historian*], comm. Pei Yin 裴駟, Sima Zhen 司馬貞, and Zhang Shoujie 張守節 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1982), 117.3073.

70 Alternatively, consider the words of Ban Gu: 或以抒下情而通諷喻, 或以宣上德而盡忠孝……抑以雅頌之亞也。

*The Mao Edition of the Shijing* is a work of literary grace. However, it cannot be compared to the magnanimity and erudition of “Fu on the Imperial Park”, “Fu on the Beplumed Hunt [*Yu lie fu* 羽獵賦]”, “Fu on Two Capitals”, and “Fu on Three Metropolises [*San du fu* 三都賦]” ... In describing the imperial palace, how could the odes *Xi Si* and *Dew Court* compare to Wang Yanshou’s “Fu on Lingguang Palace”? Similarly, on narrating playing and hunting, how could the poems *Shu Lue* and *Lu Ling* compare to Sima Xiangru’s “Fu on the Imperial Park”<sup>71</sup>

However, this also demonstrates how the themes, subject matter, emotional expression and language style of Han *fu* are mostly borrowed from the *Shijing*. Thus, later generations of classicists went the reverse direction by making language-based citations of Han *fu*, which helped form new language and exposition. One of the basic functions of *fu* is to describe names and things, something that was taken advantage of by later generations of scholars in their quest to better understand exact referents for herbs, trees, birds, beasts, insects and fish. The various designations given to *fu* – like “rhyming text” [*you yun zhi wen* 有韻之文], “forest of characters” [*zilin* 字林], “miscellany” [*leishu* 類書] and “gazetteer” [*zhicheng* 志乘] – also suggest that Confucian scholars were able to consult Han *fu* in their research on historical and textual matters.

The Qing dynasty historian Zhang Xuecheng 章學誠 [1738–1801] once said: “Meaning and principle lie in knowledge. Language and exposition lie in talent. The verification and justification of truth lie in erudition.”<sup>72</sup> The dialogue between the various editions of Chinese classic texts such as the *Shijing* with the early editions of the *Shijing* and Han *fu* created space for ordinary and ironic citation, which in turn allowed for the complementary citation [*xiang ji wei yong* 相濟為用] of meaning and principle, verification and justification, and language and exposition. The cross-justification of canonical text with *fu* compositions created a cycle of scholarship with neo-Confucian, historical and literary dimensions. This formed an interpretive system for premodern Chinese philology that benefitted from the exemplary and pioneering nature of the *Shijing* and the Han *fu* themselves.

*Translated by Carl Gene Fordham*

71 Ge Hong 葛洪, *Baopuzi* 抱朴子 [*The Book of the Master who Embraces Simplicity*] (Shanghai: Shanghai shudian, 1986), 155.

72 Zhang Xuecheng 章學誠, “Shuolin 說林 [A Collection of Thoughts],” in *Wenshi tongyi jiaozhu* 文史通義校注 [*Critically Commented Edition of the Wenshi Tongyi*] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1985), 351.

## Works Cited

- Ban Gu 班固. *Hanshu* 漢書 [History of the Former Han]. Annotated by Yan Shigu 顏師古. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1962.
- Chen Di 陳第. *Maoshi guyin kao* 毛詩古音考 [Textual Research on the Ancient Pronunciation of the Mao Edition of the *Shijing*]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2008.
- Chen Qiyuan 陳啟源. *Maoshi jigu bian* 毛詩稽古編 [Examining Antiquity in the Mao Edition of the *Shijing*]. Qing Daoguang jiumian Guangdong xuehai tang kan *Huangqing jingjie ben* 清道光九年廣東學海堂刊《皇清經解》本.
- Chen Shou 陳壽. *Sanguo zhi* 三國志 [Treatises on the Three Kingdoms]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1959.
- Chen Shouqi 陳壽祺. *Lushi yishuo kao* 魯詩遺說考 [A Study of the Missed Insights of the Lu Edition of the *Shijing*]. Qing ke Zuo Hai xu jiben 清刻左海續集本.
- Chen Shouqi 陳壽祺. *Qishi yishuo kao* 齊詩遺說考 [A Study of the Missed Insights of the Qi Edition of the *Shijing*]. Qing ke Zuo Hai xu jiben 清刻左海續集本.
- Cheng Tingzuo 程廷祚. "Sao fu lun shang 騷賦論上 [On Elegiac Rhapsody I]." In *Qingxi ji* 青溪集 [Qingxi Collection]. Jinling congshu (yi ji) ben 金陵叢書 (乙集) 本.
- Dai Zhen 戴震. *Dai Zhen ji* 戴震集 [The Collected Works of Dai Zhen]. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1980.
- Duan Yucai 段玉裁. *Shijing xiaoxue* 詩經小學 [Philology of the *Shijing*]. Qing Jiaqing er nian Wujin Zang shi baijing tang keben 清嘉慶二年武進臧氏拜經堂刻本.
- Fan Chuyi 范處義. *Shi buzhuo* 詩補傳 [A Supplementary Commentary on the *Shijing*]. In *Wenyuange siku quanshu* 文淵閣四庫全書. Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1986.
- Ge Hong 葛洪. *Baopuzi* 抱朴子 [The Book of the Master who Embraces Simplicity]. Shanghai: Shanghai shudian, 1986.
- Gong Zizhen 龔自珍 and Wang Peizheng 王佩誥. *Gong Zizhen quanji* 龔自珍全集 [The Complete Works of Gong Zizhen]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1959.
- Gu Yanwu 顧炎武. *Shi benyin* 詩本音 [Original Rhymes of the *Shijing*]. In *Wenyuange siku quanshu* 文淵閣四庫全書. Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1986.
- Hong Liangji 洪亮吉. *Maoshi tianwen kao* 毛詩天文考 [A Study of the Astronomical Information in the Mao Edition of the *Shijing*]. Qing Daoguang sanshi nian Zhang shi chongsu tang keben 清道光三十年張氏崇素堂刻本.
- Hu Chenggong 胡承珙. *Maoshi houjian* 毛詩後箋 [An Epilogue to the Mao Edition of the *Shijing*]. Huangshan shushe, 2014.
- Huang Kan 黃侃. *Wenxin diaolong zhaji* 文心雕龍札記 [Reading Notes to the *Wenxin Diaolong*]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2006.
- Huang Zhongsong 黃中松. *Shiyi bianzheng* 詩疑辨證 [Investigation into Questions of the *Shijing*]. In *Wenyuange siku quanshu* 文淵閣四庫全書. Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1986.

- Li Chu 李樛 and Huang Chun 黃樞. *Maoshi jijie* 毛詩集解 [Collected Commentaries to the Mao Edition of the Shijing]. In *Wenyuange siku quanshu* 文淵閣四庫全書. Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1986.
- Liu Xie 劉勰. *Wenxin diaolong yizhu* 文心雕龍譯注 [Translation and Annotation of the Wenxin Diaolong]. Translated and annotated by Lu Kanru 陸侃如 and Mou Shijin 牟世金. Jinan: Qilu shushe, 2009.
- Liu Yuru 劉玉汝. *Shi zuanxu* 詩續緒 [A Compilation of the Shijing]. In *Wenyuange siku quanshu* 文淵閣四庫全書. Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1986.
- Lu Ji 陸璣. *Maoshi caomu niaoshou chongyu shu* 毛詩草木鳥獸蟲魚疏 [Commentary on Herbs, Trees, Birds, Beasts, Insects and Fish in the Mao Edition of the Shijing]. In *Wenyuange siku quanshu* 文淵閣四庫全書. Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1986.
- Lu Ji 陸璣 and Mao Jin 毛晉. *Maoshi caomu niaoshou chongyu shu guangyao* 毛詩草木鳥獸蟲魚疏廣要 [Summary of the Commentary on Herbs, Trees, Birds, Beasts, Insects and Fish in the Mao Edition of the Shijing]. Ming Chongzhen nianjian yushan Mao shi jigū ge kan Jindai mishu ben 明崇禎年間虞山毛氏汲古閣刊《津逮秘書》本.
- Ma Ruichen 馬瑞辰. *Maoshi zhuanjian tongshi* 毛詩傳箋通釋 [Dissection and Interpretation of the Mao Commentary to the Shijing]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1989.
- Mao Heng 毛亨, annot., Zheng Xuan 鄭玄, comm., and Lu Deming 陸德明, coll. *Maoshi zhuanjian* 毛詩傳箋 [Explanations to the Mao Commentary to the Shijing]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2018.
- Sima Qian 司馬遷. *Shiji* 史記 [Records of the Grand Historian]. Commentary by Pei Yin 裴駟, Sima Zhen 司馬貞, and Zhang Shoujie 張守節. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1982.
- Wan Shihua 萬時華. *Shijing oujian* 詩經偶箋 [Occasional Annotations on the Shijing]. Ming Chongzhen liu nian Li Tai keben 明崇禎六年李泰刻本.
- Wang Sihao. "The Creation of a 'Magnificent Literary Style': Stylistic Innovation in Borrowings in Han Rhapsodies from The Classic of Poetry." *Frontiers of Literary Studies in China* 15.1 (2021): 109–135.
- Wang Xianqian 王先謙. *Shi sanjia yi jishu* 詩三家義集疏 [A Compilation of Three Schools of Commentaries on the Shijing]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1987.
- Wang Yinglin 王應麟. *Kun xue ji wen* 困學紀聞 [Record of Observances from Arduous Studies]. Compiled by Sun Haitong 孫通海. Zhengzhou: Daxiang chubanshe, 2019.
- Xu Fuguan 徐復觀. *Lianghan sixiangshi* 兩漢思想史 [An Intellectual History of the Han Dynasty]. Shanghai: Huadong shifan daxue chubanshe, 2001.
- Xu Jie 許結 and Wang Sihao 王思豪. "Han fu yong Shi de wenxue chuantong 漢賦用《詩》的文學傳統 [Literary traditions surrounding citation of the Shijing in Han Fu]." *Zhongguo shehui kexue* 中國社會科學 4 (2011): 190–204.
- Xu Jie 許結 and Wang Sihao 王思豪. "Hanfu yongjing kao 漢賦用經考 [A study of classical citations in Han Fu]." *Wenshi* 文史 2 (2011): 5–46.



- Yan Can 嚴粲. *Shi ji* 詩緝 [Compilation Concerning the Shijing]. In *Wenyuange siku quanshu* 文淵閣四庫全書. Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1986.
- Yao Jiheng 姚際恆. *Shijing tonglun* 詩經通論 [General Discourse on the Shijing]. Qing Daoguang shiqi nian tieqin shangguan keben 清道光十七年鐵琴山館刻本.
- Yao Nai 姚鼐. *Xibao xuan shiwen ji* 惜抱軒詩文集 [Anthology of Yao Nai]. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1992.
- Yao Nai 姚鼐. "Yu Chen shuoshi shu 與陳碩士書 [A Letter to Master Chen]." In *Yao Xibao xiansheng chidu* 姚惜抱先生尺牘 [Letters of Yao Nai]. Qing Xuantong yuan-nian xiao wanliu tang keben 清宣統元年小萬柳堂刻本.
- Zhang Xuecheng 章學誠. "Shuolin 說林 [A Collection of Thoughts]." In *Wenshi tongyi jiaozhu* 文史通義校注 [Critically Commented Edition of the Wenshi Tongyi]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1985.
- Zhao Kuifu 趙逵夫, ed. *Lidai fu pingzhu, Handaijuan* 歷代賦評注: 漢代卷 [Commentary on Fu Poetry Throughout the Dynasties]. Chengdu: Bashu shushe, 2010.
- Zheng Xuan 鄭玄, comm., Kong Yingda 孔穎達, coll. *Maoshi zhengyi* 毛詩正義 [The Correct Significance of the Mao Edition of the Shijing]. In *Shisanjing zhushu* 十三經註疏 [Annotations and Commentaries on the Thirteen Classics], edited by Ruan Yuan 阮元, 259–628. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980.
- Zhu Tingzhen 朱庭珍. "Xiaoyuan shihua 筱園詩話 [Notes on Poetry by Zhu Xiaoyuan]." In *Qing shihua xubian* 清詩話續編 [Collection of Notes on Poetry from the Qing Dynasty], edited by Guo Shaoyu 郭紹虞, 2323–2414. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1983.