

REVIEW ARTICLE

Some Glosses on the *Xunzi*: A Review of Eric Hutton, *Xunzi: The Complete Text* ^{*†}

Jeffrey Riegel
The University of Sydney

展轉以求其通鑿矣——王引之

Eric Hutton's work is the latest in a notable line of translations into English of all or part of the text of the *Xunzi* 荀子. These include the works of Homer H. Dubs, Burton Watson, and John Knoblock.¹ Hutton lists several reasons why at this point in time, twenty years or so after the publication of the last of Knoblock's three volumes, we should welcome a new translation of the *Xunzi*, not the least of which are the "substantial inaccuracies and technical flaws" in Knoblock's efforts.² In generous

* *Xunzi: The Complete Text*. Translated and with an Introduction by Eric L. Hutton. Princeton, NJ and Oxford, England: Princeton University Press, 2014. Pp. xxx + 397. \$27.97/£27.95.

† This review article is dedicated to the memory of my teacher, Professor David Shepherd Nivison (1923–2014). I am grateful to Professor Huang Kuan-yun 黃冠雲 of National Tsinghua University and Professor Winnie Sung 宋曉竹 of Nanyang Technological University for their bibliographic assistance in the compilation of these notes. And I wish to thank the staff of the East Asian Library of the University of California, Berkeley, for their help in locating essential reference materials.

¹ Homer H. Dubs, *The Works of Hsüntze* (London: Arthur Probsthain, 1928); Burton Watson, *Hsün Tzu: Basic Writings* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1963); John Knoblock, *Xunzi: A Translation and Study of the Complete Works* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, vol. I, 1988, vol. II, 1990, vol. III, 1994). References to Knoblock below are to volume and page numbers separated by a period.

² Eric L. Hutton, *Xunzi: The Complete Text*, pp. xi–xii. I hereafter abbreviate references to the book and refer in my notes to Hutton's page and line numbers separated by a period.

and gentlemanly fashion, Hutton does not dwell on these nor frame his work as a correction to Knoblock's. He has other purposes, mostly pedagogical it seems, for producing his translation.

It is also worth noting, however, that, in addition to the reasons that Hutton provides, one important justification for a new translation is that, in the years since Knoblock's volumes first appeared, there has been significant new scholarship on the text. I have in mind the several annotated editions and translations into modern standard Chinese that have been published in Taiwan and China, of which in my view the most valuable is the *Xunzi jiaoshi* 荀子校釋 of Wang Tianhai 王天海.³ Knoblock had relied heavily on the *Xunzi jijie* 荀子集解 of Wang Xianqian 王先謙 (1842–1918) because it collected in one work of scholarship virtually all of the important textual notes on the *Xunzi* composed by the great Qing dynasty text critics and philologists, most notably Wang Niansun 王念孫 (1744–1832).⁴ So essential is Wang Xianqian's edition that it remained the base text for Hutton's translation. What Wang Tianhai's work contributes to bringing our understanding of the *Xunzi* more up-to-date is not strictly speaking new evidence. It is rather the arduous work he has done of juxtaposing not only the opinions of the major twentieth-century authorities on the *Xunzi* but also early Chinese commentaries overlooked by Wang Xianqian as well as the researches of Japanese scholars, some as early as the seventeenth century, whose work is less well-known.⁵

While Knoblock's translation is flawed by inaccuracies, it remains—even with the addition of Hutton's contribution—the most scholarly and carefully wrought

³ Some of these new scholarly works are included in Hutton's bibliography. See Hutton 385–86. Wang Tianhai's two-volume edition of the *Xunzi* was first published in Shanghai in 2005 by Shanghai guji chubanshe 上海古籍出版社. A problem with Wang Tianhai's work is that he occasionally abridges the commentaries he quotes. Thus for the sake of a full understanding of their interpretations one may still need to turn to the original versions of Wang's sources.

⁴ The edition of the *Xunzi jijie* that I use throughout this review article is the one punctuated and collated by Shen Xiaohuan 沈嘯寰 and Wang Xingxian 王星賢, and published in Beijing in 1988 by Zhonghua shuju 中華書局. I have on occasion modified the punctuation for the sake of having the Chinese text appear consistent with a translated passage being discussed.

⁵ Although Knoblock made frequent reference to Japanese commentaries in his translation, his citations of them were not as thorough and systematic as Wang Tianhai's. It should be noted that, throughout his work, Wang refers to the scholar more commonly known as Ogyū Sorai 荻生徂徠 (1666–1728) by an alternate form of his name, Butsu Nabematsu 物雙松. In my glosses, however, I consistently call him Ogyū Sorai because this is how he is usually referred to in the scholarly literature. Ogyū Sorai's pioneering scholarship on the *Xunzi*, his *Toku Junshi* 讀荀子 was published in Heian 平安 (present-day Kyoto) by Kasai Ichirobē 葛西市郎兵衛 in 1765. A rare copy of this early edition of the *Toku Junshi* is part of the Mitsui Collection of the East Asian Library at the University of California, Berkeley. I am grateful to the staff of the library for allowing me to consult it.

translation. And, in my view, Knoblock's detailed annotations and copious introductory materials will stand the test of time and remain essential reading for those who desire a full acquaintance with *Xunzi*, his times, and the philosophy of the text attributed to him. Nevertheless what I say about Hutton's work in this review should in no way be construed as a defence of Knoblock's. Although the glosses I present below inevitably focus on some of the weaknesses of Hutton's translation, they contain numerous instances where I identify errors made by Knoblock.⁶

Rather than work my way through Hutton's translation, making a selection of passages for discussion, I have chosen to concentrate on Hutton's "Textual Notes" because they provide a convenient and ready-made entry into his work as well as insight into Hutton's understanding of the language of the *Xunzi* and of how one should go about solving some of the text's more difficult problems of interpretation.⁷ Hutton's "Textual Notes" of course do not discuss all the passages he found problematic, only "those cases where [he is] not following any of the commentaries cited by Wang [Xianqian]." ⁸ Likewise my glosses should be seen as only treating a very small part of Hutton's translation.⁹ Since I have adopted Hutton's "Textual Notes" as a framework for this review article, I have felt obligated to summarize and comment on all of them even though several of my "glosses" are of minor interest with respect to the language of the *Xunzi* and Hutton's approaches to it.

The many places in his "Textual Notes" where I agree with Hutton, along with my overall reading of his translation, have left me with the strong impression that, measured solely in terms of the number of translation errors in each, Hutton's work is an improvement over that of Knoblock, as well as that of Dubs and Watson. It is an enormous task to translate from beginning to end a text as difficult as the *Xunzi*. We should be grateful to Hutton for undertaking it and for devoting so much hard work to completing it.

But Hutton's work is not free of questionable interpretations and translation errors. My purpose in this review is not simply to point these out but rather to explore more fully the textual problems that Hutton attempted to solve and to lay out the evidence more fully than Hutton chose to do. Where possible I offer alternatives to the translations of Knoblock and Hutton. In some instances there is no completely

⁶ I point all this out for the sake of transparency. As is, I believe, well known by those in the field, I was, before his death in 1999, a former student and close friend of John Knoblock. He dedicated the third volume of his translation of the *Xunzi* to me and I receive annually a tiny amount in royalties from the Stanford University Press.

⁷ Hutton's "Textual Notes" are found on pp. 359–84 of his volume.

⁸ That is, Wang Xianqian's *Xunzi jijie* (hereafter abbreviated *XZJJ*).

⁹ J. J. L. Duyvendak's "Notes on Dubs' Translation of *Hsün-tzü*," *T'oung Pao* 29 (1932), pp. 1–42, provided a list of corrections to the translation of Homer Dubs. My glosses are more modest in scope.

satisfactory solution and all we can do is consider the diverse interpretations available to us. However, it must be noted that the accumulation of Hutton's mistakes and what I take to be bad philological decisions on his part do cast doubt on whether we can regard Hutton's contribution as the panacea for the problems in the work of his predecessors. My glosses indicate that Hutton's volume has a large enough share of errors and infelicities that it too should be approached with care and caution. Those who desire a translation of the *Xunzi* that is both readable *and* fully reliable will be disappointed by Hutton's work.

My "glosses" or discussions of Hutton's "Textual Notes" usually include (though not always in this order): (1) the Chinese text of the passage in question (and where it appears in the *XZJJ*); (2) Hutton's translation; (3) Knoblock's translation for comparison; (4) Hutton's explanations of his translation choices; and (5) my comments and supplementary notes. There are, however, a few general observations on Hutton's "Textual Notes" and translation that can serve as an introduction to my "glosses."

Hutton gives Chinese graphs in his "Textual Notes" but not the transcriptions of the words they represent.¹⁰ Since a graph can be used to write a number of words, this practice makes it difficult to follow Hutton's arguments based on his "Textual Notes" alone. For example, Hutton's note "a" to chapter 8 is devoted to 屏 but Hutton does not say in the note whether the graph stands for the word pronounced in modern standard Chinese *bing* or the word pronounced *ping*. To determine that one must infer it from the translation. Hutton's practice in this regard, and the way he frequently refers to the "characters" and not to the words of the text, might give the uninitiated the impression that he is analysing graphs rather than the words they represent. It is not always clear whether Hutton himself knows the difference.¹¹

His "Textual Notes" are intended, Hutton says, for specialists and so it is understood that those who want to pursue his arguments will need to consult the original Chinese text of the *Xunzi* and of the various commentaries that Hutton makes use of. But Hutton makes it unnecessarily difficult to do so. In discussing the opinions of earlier authorities Hutton usually lumps them together by referring to the "commentators" without distinguishing among them. Or he will say he is following a particular scholar but will not reveal in his "Textual Note" exactly which word in the original Chinese text poses a problem. On other occasions Hutton will give a one-word Chinese gloss quoting an earlier authority but will neglect to say how he

¹⁰ In one odd exception, see his note "b" to chapter 19, Hutton gives the transcriptions instead of the graphs—which is, of course, even less helpful.

¹¹ Nor does Hutton know the difference between a manuscript and a printed edition. In several of his "Textual Notes" Hutton refers to evidence from a "manuscript tradition" of the *Xunzi*. Of course we possess no manuscripts, only printed editions, and the evidence to which Hutton refers comes from the latter. See Hutton's note "d" to chapter 26, and notes "d," "r," and "dd" to chapter 27.

understands the gloss or how his English translation derives from it. For example, in his note “c” to chapter 8, Hutton says he is following Liu Shipai 劉師培 (1884–1919) in reading the difficult word *lou* 樓 as *qu* 曲. But he does not disclose exactly how Liu took *qu*, nor the fact that his own translation has nothing to do with Liu’s understanding of the word. Practices such as these are not the sort of scholarship one would encourage a student to emulate.¹²

In the body of his translation Hutton too often gives the transcription of terms rather than translate them. For terms as important to our understanding of early Ru thought as *ren* 仁 and *yi* 義, I suggest that Hutton owed it to his readers, in each context in which the terms occur, to fix on a rendering that best fits that context and at the same time communicates the weight, subtlety, and complexity of the terms. Transcribing rather than translating might appear to some a way to avoid that responsibility.

Finally, I confess that I found grating the oddly rhymed English doggerel into which Hutton has rendered many—though thankfully not all—of the poetical parts of the text. For example,

All the things and the kinds that come about
Surely have a point from which they start out.
Honor or disgrace that comes unto you
Surely reflects your degree of virtue.
In rotten meat bugs are generated.
In fish that’s spoiled maggots are created. (Hutton 3.57–62)

The rhymes and regular line lengths he concocts do not make the translation more engaging or representative of the original. Some are so far-fetched that, by deploying them as relentlessly as he does, Hutton not only diminishes the textured richness of the language of the *Xunzi*, but also undercuts the seriousness that he has otherwise brought to this endeavour.¹³

¹² Another troubling practice is Hutton’s preference for dictionary entries of questionable relevance over commentaries written specifically to solve a difficult *Xunzi* passage. For examples, see his “Textual Notes” “a” to chapter 6, “d” to chapter 12, “n” to chapter 26, “v” and “ee” to chapter 27, and “d” to chapter 31.

¹³ Hutton even goes so far as to rhyme in his translation passages that are not rhymed in the Chinese original and to make regular in English the lengths of lines that are irregular in the *Xunzi*. (See, for example, Hutton, p. 284, n. 24.) And, on occasion, Hutton allows this misplaced concern with rhyme and fixed line length to weigh more heavily on his translation decisions than the semantics and grammar of the language of the text. To cite but one of several examples of the latter see Hutton’s note “k” to chapter 26: “My translation . . . does not fully reflect my understanding of the grammar because of the restrictions imposed by the rhyme scheme and syllable count.”

Glosses on Chapter 1: *Quan xue* 勸學

1.a 強自取柱，柔自取束。(XZJJ 6)

Rigid things get themselves used for bracing.

Pliant things get themselves used for lacing. (Hutton 3.65–66)

The rigid cause themselves to be broken; the pliable cause themselves to be bound. (Knoblock I.137)

Following Zhong Tai 鍾泰 (1888–1979), Hutton takes *zhu* 柱 “in the sense of” *zhu* 拄 (Hutton’s “bracing”) “because it stays closer to the received text, and because it fits the analogy with building materials implied by [*shu*] 束 in the next line.”¹⁴ Hutton notes, and dismisses, the proposal that *zhu* 柱 be read as *zhu* 祝 in the sense of “broken, snapped.”

Shu does not necessarily imply the act of building something from materials. This is a conclusion to which Hutton has jumped. And there is no need, given Hutton’s understanding of the text, to take *zhu* 柱 as anything other than what it basically means: “post, pillar.” But the more fundamental issue is do we understand the mention of the qualities of rigidity and pliancy as a neutral statement of natural facts or as a warning about excesses that lead to unwanted consequences. Hutton’s interpretation is at best ambiguous. I favour the latter because of the context: the lines before and after the passage refer, for example, to rotten meat producing maggots and the animosity engendered by corruption. Wang Yinzhi 王引之 (1766–1834), not his father Wang Niansun as Hutton mistakenly claims, had already rejected the line of interpretation followed by Hutton. Wang’s interpretation is confirmed by the “Quanxue” chapter of the *Da Dai liji* 大戴禮記, an early witness to the *Xunzi* chapter. It reads: 強自取折 for the first phrase.¹⁵ (Hutton ignores the evidence provided by this important early textual witness in his reading of chapter 1 as well as other *Xunzi* chapters.)

1.b 騰蛇無足而飛，梧鼠五技而窮。(XZJJ 9)

Though footless, the *teng* snake moves quick as flying,

Yet five limbs give the *wu* rodent no safety. (Hutton 4.111–12)

¹⁴ Zhong Tai, who was mostly productive in the 1920s and 1930s, is the author of *Xun zhu dingbu* 荀注訂補 (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1936). His commentary on the present passage can be found in Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 16, n. 3.

¹⁵ Huang Huaixin 黃懷信, ed., *Da Dai liji huijiao jizhu* 大戴禮記彙校集注 (Xi’an: San Qin chubanshe, 2005), p. 821.

The wingless dragon has no limbs, but it can fly; the flying squirrel has five talents, but it is reduced to extremity. (Knoblock I.139)

Hutton finds this couplet “puzzling.” Since he cannot comprehend how having no feet would be an impediment to flying and how it is opposed to having five talents, Hutton opts for a workaround of his own creation in which he takes *fei* not literally to mean “flying” but as “hyperbole for running fast” and emends *ji* 技 (talent, skill) to *zhi* 支 (branch, limb) (without providing any evidence for either). With these changes made, Hutton proposes that the line is intended to contrast a limbless snake that can nevertheless run fast with a five-limbed rodent that is at a loss to survive.

Hutton chooses, however, not to render the words *teng* 騰 and *wu* 梧 but leaves them in transcription and thus avoids having to deal with identifying more precisely the creatures they help name. The *teng she* 騰蛇 is sometimes simply called the *teng*. It is the name of a mythological snake—the *Shuowen jiezi* 說文解字 of Xu Shen 許慎 (c. 67–c. 148) says that it is a *shen she* 神蛇 (spirit snake)—that can fly.¹⁶ Because it can “rise up through the clouds and mists,” Guo Pu 郭璞 (276–324), in his *Erya* 爾雅 commentary, defines it as a member of the dragon category of creatures.¹⁷ *Teng* described the spiralling ascent of the dragon and is etymologically related to a group of words—e.g., *teng* 騰, *teng* 滕, *sheng* 勝—all of which share the common meaning “rising up.”

Hutton also ignores the substantial scholarship, starting with the Tang commentator Yang Liang 楊倞 (fl. eighth–ninth centuries), that shows that *wu* 梧 is an error and that the text should properly read *shi shu* 鼯鼠 (squirrel), a reading attested by the *Da Dai liji*.¹⁸ Early sources say it is of the same category of creature as the *wu shu* 鼯鼠 (flying squirrel). (This similarity may have led to the original *shi* 鼯 of the text being mistakenly written *wu* 鼯 and then *wu* 梧.) Yang Liang records what must have been a popular account of the flying squirrel’s “five talents”: “It can fly but it cannot reach the roof; it can climb a tree but not to the top; it can swim but it cannot cross a mountain gorge; it can dig a hole but not deep enough to hide itself; and it can run but not so that it is ahead of others.”¹⁹

All of this suggests that, contrary to Hutton, the text is not juxtaposing a footless snake (that is capable of “running fast,” says Hutton) and a five-limbed rodent—whose tail is, according to Hutton, one of its five limbs—but rather a dragon-like flying snake with a multi-talented but still limited flying squirrel.

¹⁶ Duan Yucai 段玉裁, *Shuowen jiezi zhu* 說文解字注 (Taipei: Hongye wenhua shiye youxian gongsi, 1998), *pian* 13A, p. 41b.

¹⁷ *Erya zhushu* 爾雅注疏 (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 1999), p. 302.

¹⁸ *Da Dai liji huijiao jizhu*, p. 829.

¹⁹ See XZJJ 9: 五技，謂能飛不能上屋，能緣不能窮木，能游不能渡谷，能穴不能掩身，能走不能先人。

1.c 禮之敬文也，樂之中和也，詩書之博也，春秋之微也，在天地之間者畢矣。
(XZJJ 12)

In the reverence and refinement of ritual, the balance and harmony of music, the broad content of the *Odes* and *Documents*, the subtleties of the *Spring and Autumn Annals*, all things between Heaven and Earth are complete. (Hutton 5.141–44)

The reverence and refinement of the *Rituals*, the concord and harmony of the *Music*, the breadth of the *Odes* and *Documents*, the subtlety of the *Annals*—all the creations of Heaven and Earth are completed in them. (Knoblock I.139–40)

Hutton is doubtful that the terms *li* 禮 (ritual) and *yue* 樂 (music) are titles of texts rather than references to “the rituals and music themselves.” His doubt is not based on specific evidence but rather on uncertainty with regard to “the extent to which [ritual and music] were organized into distinct works.”

I agree that one should approach with a degree of scepticism the question of whether there were in Xunzi’s time distinct written sources with the titles *Li* and *Yue*, and I concur with Hutton’s judgement that “little turns on the issue philosophically,” but the fact that the immediate context refers to the texts of the *Shi* 詩, *Shu* 書, and *Chunqiu* 春秋, makes it much more likely than Hutton acknowledges that, in this *Xunzi* passage, *Li* and *Yue* should also be understood as the names of texts.

1.d 方其人之習君子之說，則尊以徧矣，周於世矣。(XZJJ 14)

However, if you imitate the right person in his practice of the precepts of the gentleman, then you will come to honor these things for their comprehensiveness, and see them as encompassing the whole world. (Hutton 6.163–66)

It is just on these occasions that the man of learning repeats the explanations of the gentleman. Thus, he is honored for his comprehensive and catholic acquaintance with the affairs of the world. (Knoblock I.140)

Hutton takes *zun* 尊 and *zhou* 周, rendered as “honor” and “encompassing” in his translation, to refer not to the accomplishments of a student—as the passage has been frequently understood—but rather to an implied object, “namely the principles and precepts underlying the materials studied, which are made clear by the teacher.” (Knoblock’s translation suggests that he, too, was uncomfortable with the notion that, as a result of his studies, a student would become highly honoured and gain an understanding that penetrated all corners of the world. But it is otherwise difficult to credit Knoblock’s interpretation that it is “the man of learning” who accomplishes these things.)

The elliptical, almost fragmentary, nature of the line invites a measure of extrapolation. But Hutton goes too far. It would be better to cleave more closely to what is actually written in the text. Taking *fang* 方 in its original sense, but otherwise following the glosses and interpretation found in the *Xunzi xinzhū* 荀子新注,²⁰ I suggest the following: “By being in the presence of the right person as he recites the precepts of the gentleman, you will cultivate an honourable character and obtain a far-reaching understanding, thus gaining acquaintance with all the affairs of the world.” The company of a single individual—if that individual is good and well-versed in the teachings of the gentleman—is sufficient to give one knowledge of the whole world.

1.e 將原先王，本仁義，則禮正其經緯蹊徑也。(XZJJ 16)

If you are going to take the former kings as your fount and make *ren* and *yi* your root, then rituals are exactly the highways and byways for you. (Hutton 6.173–75)

If you would take the Ancient Kings as your source and the principle of humanity and justice as your foundation, then ritual principles will rectify the warp and woof, the straightaways and byways of your life. (Knoblock I.141)

In this passage, as Hutton notes, we should understand *jing* 經 and *wei* 緯 not as the warp and woof of a loom but as the highways that run north-south and east-west. (Although he does not make a point of it, Hutton is also correct in taking *zheng* 正 as an adverb meaning “precisely, exactly” and not as a transitive verb with what follows as its direct objects.)

Nevertheless, Hutton does not bother to pursue fully in his translation the significance of the metaphor of “highways and byways” in distinguishing between, on the one hand, *xianwang* 先王 (the former kings) and *ren yi* 仁義 (humaneness and propriety) that serve as starting points—the *yuan* 原 (source) and the *ben* 本 (root) respectively—of one’s studies and, on the other hand, *li* 禮 (ritual) that, by metaphorically extending in all directions and penetrating down to the smallest places, allows the individual who is mindful of it to perfect and develop himself in his studies, extending himself beyond “the former kings” and bringing to completion his moral sensibilities. A failure to emphasize the superiority of “ritual” vis-à-vis these other, more limited, virtues is to miss a key element of the text’s philosophy.

1.f 若挈裘領，誦五指而頓之，順者不可勝數也。(XZJJ 16)

It will be like the action of turning up your fur collar by simply curling your five fingers and pulling on it—it goes smoothly numberless times. (Hutton 6.176–78)

²⁰ Beijing daxue *Xunzi zhushi zu* 北京大學《荀子》注釋組, *Xunzi xinzhū* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1979), p. 10, n. 4. I hereafter refer to the anonymous members of the Peking University Philosophy Department who authored this work as “the editors.”

It is like lifting a fur collar by turning under your fingers to grasp it to raise it up. Those that fall into their proper place are too many to be counted. (Knoblock I.141)

Hutton regards the “fur collar” metaphor as consisting of only the first two lines of the text and as illustrating “the ease with which learning will proceed if done according to ritual.” That is, he chooses in his interpretation to separate the last phrase—“it goes smoothly numberless times”—from the remainder of the line and thus not to regard it as part of the metaphor of the “fur collar,” but to see it instead as “meant to summarize by saying that all will go smoothly.” For Hutton, reading the phrase as a more general summary permits one to see it as a parallel to a phrase a few lines later, viz. *bu keyi de zhi* 不可以得之 (One cannot achieve it), that refers both to a general point as well as to the metaphors employed to illustrate it.

This reading is implausible because (1) it requires Hutton to introduce from thin air the idea of ease of learning, and (2) if the phrase is separated from what immediately precedes it, the metaphor is then deprived of a proper conclusion. It is best to follow Lu Wencao 盧文弨 (1717–1796) and Wang Niansun and to understand that what fall smoothly when a fur lapel is given a proper tug by all five fingers curled around it are the innumerable hairs that make up the fur. Ritual is like the collar: when properly grasped all of its details fall into place.

1.g 天見其明，地見其光，君子貴其全也。(XZJJ 20)

Heaven shows off its brilliance, Earth shows off its breadth, and the gentleman values his perfection. (Hutton 8.235–36)

Just as the value of Heaven is to be seen in its brilliance and that of Earth in its vast expanses, so the gentleman is to be valued for his completeness. (Knoblock I.142)

In this note Hutton raises the seeming anomaly of having *xian* 見 (make manifest) as the verb in the first two phrases only to have it be replaced by *gui* 貴 (prize, value) in the third and last. Hutton suggests the difference in verb usage was perhaps “motivated by the thought that while Heaven and Earth proudly display their most valuable qualities, the gentleman is ideally somewhat humble.”

The late Qing dynasty commentator Yu Yue 俞樾 (1821–1907), whose opinions are quoted in the XZJJ, eliminates the anomaly by emending the text so that the verb is *gui* in all three phrases. This textual surgery is done without evidence but seems nevertheless to account for Knoblock’s translation which is, no matter how you cut it, a grammatically questionable rendering of the Chinese text. Though Hutton leaves the text as it is—and, moreover, offers a satisfactory translation—it is difficult to see how he finds in the line an expression of the gentleman’s humility.

Glosses on Chapter 2: *Xiu shen* 修身

2.a 見善，修然必以自存也。(XZJJ 20)

When you observe goodness in others, then inspect yourself, desirous of cultivating it. (Hutton 9.1–2)

When a man sees good, being filled with delight, he is sure to preserve it within himself. (Knoblock I.151)

Hutton notes that his translation is based on Wang Niansun's gloss of *cun* 存 as *cha* 察 (inspect, examine) and on his understanding of *xiu ran* 修然 “as describing the manner of someone trying to cultivate himself.”

The glosses that inform Hutton's translation are on the mark but I suggest that his rearranging of the order of the phrases in his translation results in giving insufficient weight to the importance of the sequence of examining others, reacting emotionally to what one sees, and then being motivated by that emotional response to conduct a self-examination. Thus I propose: “Upon observing good in others, being desirous of cultivating it, one must examine oneself (to discover whether it is there).” I would suggest a similar rearrangement in Hutton's translation of the three sentences that follow this one in the text.

2.b 故非我而當者，吾師也。(XZJJ 21)

And so, he who rightly criticizes me acts as a teacher toward me . . . (Hutton 9.6–7)

As of old, those who consider me to be in the wrong and are correct in doing so are my teachers . . . (Knoblock I.151)

Hutton notes: Christoph Harbsmeier, “Xunzi and the Problem of Impersonal First Person Pronouns,” *Early China* 22 (1997), pp. 181–220, “rightly points out that in many cases, these first-person pronouns have an impersonal sense.” Hutton adds that since first-person pronouns in English can also be understood as impersonal he frequently uses “first-person expressions,” i.e., “I” and “me,” in his translation rather than the impersonal “one.” Knoblock does the same.

2.c 扁善之度：以治氣養生，則後彭祖；以修身自名，則配堯禹。宜於時通，利以處窮，禮信是也。(XZJJ 21–22)

The measure for goodness in all things is this:

Use it to control your *qi* and nourish your life,
Then you will live longer than Peng Zu.

Use it to cultivate yourself and achieve fame,
Then you'll be equal to Yao and Yu.
It is fitting in times of prosperity.
It is useful in facing adversity
—truly such is ritual. (Hutton, 10.30–37)

If you employ the measure of excellence in every circumstance to control the vital breath and nourish life, you will outlive even Patriarch Peng, and if you use it to cultivate your character and strengthen your self, you will establish a reputation equal to that of Yao or Yu. It is suitable to living in times of success and beneficial when dwelling in impoverished circumstances. This measure is ritual principles and being trustworthy. (Knoblock I.152)

The passage is difficult and worth discussing but not only for the reasons Hutton mentions. In the opening phrase, *du* 度 (standard, measure) should, as noted in *Xunzi xinzhū*,²¹ be understood as “rule” or “principle.” The phrase is, as Hutton correctly indicates by his punctuation, an introduction to the six phrases that follow. But in case it is not completely clear from Hutton’s translation, the reference of the “it” in phrases one, three, five, and six, is *li* 禮 (ritual), something made clear at the conclusion of the passage. Knoblock mishandles the opening phrase. His interpretation of the concluding line—*li xin shi ye* 禮信是也—is equally problematic though not without precedent. While it is possible to understand *xin* 信 here as “trustworthy,” nowhere else in the *Xunzi* are *li* and *xin* juxtaposed in this fashion. It is after all best to follow Yang Liang, as Hutton does, and understand *xin* as an adverb meaning “truly.”

Taking *hou* 後, as both Hutton and Knoblock do, to mean “live longer” (than Peng Zu) is an error. The phrase, correctly rendered, means that one will “be a follower” of Peng Zu, i.e., part of the lineage of those who achieved great longevity, a successor to Peng Zu, or a latter-day Peng Zu. Wang Yinzhī noted that there appears to be a problem with the wording of the last two phrases and suggests that a superior reading is found in the *Hanshi waizhuan* 韓詩外傳: *xiushen ziqiang, ze ming pei Yao Yu* 修身自強, 則名配堯禹.²² (This emendation is the basis for Knoblock’s translation of the two phrases.) The emended reading appears to be confirmed by the occurrence of the phrases *ze ming pei Yao Yu* 則名配堯禹 and *ze ming pei Yu Shun* 則名配禹舜 elsewhere in the text of the *Xunzi*, for which see Wang Yinzhī’s comments quoted in the *XZJJ*. I translate the emended phrases: “Use it to cultivate your person and strengthen yourself, then your fame will equal that of Yao and Yu.”

²¹ See *Xunzi xinzhū*, p. 17, n. 1.

²² Toyoshima Mutsumi 豊嶋睦, ed., *Kanshi gaiden sakuin* 韓詩外傳索引 (Hiroshima: Hijiyama joshi tanki daigaku, 1972), p. 3, par. 1–6.

2.d 愚款端慤，則合之以禮樂，通之以思索。(XZJJ 26)

For simple-minded rectitude or scrupulous honesty, make it suitable with ritual and music, and enlighten it with reflection. (Hutton 12.88–89)

What is simpleminded but sincere, upright and diligent, consolidate with ritual and music. [What is . . .], make comprehensive with thought and inquiry. (Knoblock I.154)

Hutton is correct in taking *zhi* 之, in this and the preceding eight sentences that share its grammar, to refer to the faults listed in the first half of each sentence. I also agree with Hutton that the last five characters of the sentence need not be taken as excrescent (as Yu Yue proposes) nor is there a compelling reason to suppose, as Knoblock does, that something has dropped from the text.

2.e 故學曰遲。彼止而待我，我行而就之，則亦或遲、或速、或先、或後，胡為乎其不可以同至也！(XZJJ 32)

And so one who learns rightly says, “I may be slow, but it stops and awaits me, and I go and approach it. So whether slow or fast, first or last, how could I not likewise arrive there?” (Hutton 13.149–51)

Hence it is said:

Learning is slow-going. That stopping place awaits us. If we set out for it and proceed toward the goal, though some will move quickly and others slowly, though some will lead the way and others follow, how could we all not be able to reach the same goal! (Knoblock I.156)

Hutton notes that he takes *xue* 學 to refer to a learner, *yue* 曰 to mark the beginning of the learner’s words, *chi* 遲 to be the adjective “slow” with which the learner describes himself, and *bi* 彼 to refer to “the object of learning” though he mentions that Zhang Jue 張覺 says that it refers to a person, presumably another student or students with whom the speaker is pursuing his studies.²³

But Hutton fails to notice, or at least to mention, that his reading of the opening words of the passage poses a grammatical problem—namely that *chi* whether read as an adjective or a verb requires a subject—that has led earlier authorities to suggest that the text may be corrupt and in need of correction. Thus Wang Niansun argues that *yue* is a mistaken truncation of the graph *zhe* 者, omitting its upper left side. Momoi Hakuroku 桃井白鹿 (1722–1801), whose reading of the passage was adopted by Knoblock, proposes that the order of the words *xue* and *yue* should be reversed. In

²³ See Zhang Jue, *Xunzi yizhu* 荀子譯注 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2012), p. 16.

either case *xue* (or *xue zhe*) is then the subject of *chi*.²⁴ Standing alone as it does in the text, *bi* is somewhat obscure. Hao Yixing 郝懿行 (1757–1825), the unacknowledged source of Zhang Jue’s interpretation of the word, notes that *bi* refers to a person and Wang Niansun concurs that the passage describes the varying progress of a group of learners rather than only one. Thus we should read *bi* “that one” or “those others” and *wo* 我 (I) as forming a sort of “that and this” or “them and us” pairing.

An alternative translation: “Hence when a learner tarries others pause and wait for him, and so he moves to catch up to them. In this way, though some are slow while others fast, some move ahead while others fall behind, how could it be that they do not all arrive together at the goal?”

Glosses on Chapter 3: *Bu gou* 不苟²⁵

3.a 盜跖吟口…… (XZJJ 39)

Robber Zhi was terrifying enough to make people stutter . . . (Hutton 16.13–14)

²⁴ See Knoblock I.119 and I.278, n. 60.

²⁵ A gloss not occasioned by Hutton’s “Textual Notes.” Apropos the line *fu ci shunming, yi shen qi du zhe ye* 夫此順命，以慎其獨者也 (XZJJ 46): His orders are obeyed with such diligence because he is vigilantly steadfast (Hutton 20.134–35); Because he preserves the authenticity of his individual uniqueness, he is obedient to his destiny (Knoblock I.178). The key part of this line is the phrase *shen qi du* 慎其獨. Knoblock explains his translation of it and the remainder of the line in an endnote (for which see Knoblock I.284–85, n. 60). Hutton, in hydroplane fashion, says nothing about the basis for his unusual translation of the term *du* 獨 as “steadfast” nor about the language and significance of the line more generally. The issues are complex. I refer readers to Jeffrey Riegel, “Eros, Introversion, and the Beginnings of *Shijing* Commentary,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 57, no. 1 (June 1997), pp. 165–71. To paraphrase a page from that study: The phrase *junzi shen qi du ye* 君子慎其獨也, seen in recently excavated manuscripts and known from a number of classical sources, appears for the first time in extant literature in the “Bu gou” chapter of the *Xunzi*, a highly-crafted representation of Xunzi’s most mature thinking and his masterful ability to exploit the aphorisms and poetical imagery of ancient Chinese philosophical discourse. In this line Xunzi portrays the Gentleman’s careful attention (*shen*) to his inner and most authentic self (*du*) as a characteristic that distinguishes him from lesser beings who, in their futile attempts to influence or win the allegiance of others, rely on a forced display of power and largesse. Looking at the passage in which the line occurs as a whole, we can see that Xunzi equates the Gentleman’s attentiveness to his authentic self with the silent workings of Heaven, Earth, and the Four Seasons. He then identifies the quietude of the Gentleman as the method to which he has unwaveringly adhered in order to shed his original evil nature and create himself anew as the embodiment of a virtue capable of transforming everything in the world.

The name and reputation of Robber Zhi are on everyone's lips . . . (Knoblock I.174)

Hutton points out that the words *yin kou* 吟口 are “hard to make sense of” and notes that various emendations have been proposed, of which Hao Yixing's suggestion that the words are an error for *tan xiong* 貪凶 (greedy and violent), based on a parallel reading in the *Shuo yuan* 說苑, Hutton says, is “the most promising.”²⁶ He nevertheless opts not to emend the text but to follow Wang Xianqian's suggestion that *yin kou* be read as *kou yin* (as in a *Hou Hanshu* 後漢書 passage) which meant “stutter” or “stammer.”²⁷

It may be seen from his translation that Hutton does not take *yin kou* to describe Robber Zhi but rather he twists it into a causative even though such usage is attested nowhere else in the language and doing so forces him to add that Robber Zhi “was terrifying” and thus effectively to emend the text. Knoblock follows a Yang Liang gloss also adopted by the editors of the *Xunzi xinzhū*,²⁸ but his rendering seems equally unsatisfying.

A Gloss on Chapter 4: *Rongru* 榮辱

4.a 〔是又人之所生而有也，是無待而然者也，是禹桀之所同也。〕 (XZJJ 63)

Hutton deletes from the text these twenty-three graphs—he mistakenly says twenty-two—that occur immediately following the sentence he translates as, “It all rests in how you grasp the accumulated results of refinement and training” (Hutton 27.190–91). The proposal to eliminate the text was originally made by Wang Niansun because it is an example of dittography and was also adopted by Knoblock in his translation.²⁹

Glosses on Chapter 5: *Fei xiang* 非相

5.a 相人，古之人無有也，學者不道也。 (XZJJ 72)

Physiognomizing people is something that the ancients would not embrace, something that a learned person does not take as his way. (Hutton 32.1–2)

In antiquity, physiognomy did not exist, and the learned did not discuss it. (Knoblock I.203)

²⁶ For the proposed emendations as well as the *Shuo yuan* parallel, see Knoblock I.282, n. 24.

²⁷ *Hou Hanshu* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1965), p. 1178.

²⁸ See *Xunzi xinzhū*, p. 27, n. 4.

²⁹ See Knoblock I.290, n. 65.

Because the text, subsequent to this opening passage, names ancient practitioners of physiognomy, it seems to contradict itself here by claiming that the practice did not exist (*wu you* 無有) in antiquity. Hutton attempts to explain away the contradiction by claiming that *you* 有 which usually means “exist” does not have that meaning here. He argues that it means “embrace.”

Although Hutton offers an example from the *Hanfeizi* 韓非子 in support of his reading, it not entirely convincing. Wang Niansun explains that the text originally lacked the graph *ren* 人 (people) after *xiang* 相 (physiognomize) and so is merely claiming that the art of physiognomy did not exist, not that there were no practitioners. Wang Xianqian rightly finds Wang Niansun’s distinction far-fetched and reminds readers that the text is engaging in a polemic in which such contradictions do not matter. *Dao* 道 should probably not be understood as “take as his way” but rather as “speak.” The point of the text is that the learned do not speak of a practice as detestable as physiognomy in their lessons and persuasions.

5.b 且徐偃王之狀，目可瞻馬。(XZJJ 74)

Moreover, the appearance of King Yan of Xu was such that his eyes were as big as a horse’s. (Hutton 33.40–41)

Moreover, in appearance King Yan of Xu’s eyes were so protruded that he could see his forehead. (Knoblock I.204)

Hutton takes *zhan* 瞻 (look upwards) as an error for *zhan* 詹 which he claims “can mean 給 or 足 (as 澹).” This in turn leads him to conclude that the phrase *mu ke zhan ma* 目可瞻馬 means that the king’s eyes “could supply a horse” or, he elaborates, “were as big as those of a horse.”

Hutton offers his reading without supplying proof of any sort. I cannot find any that would support the notion that *zhan ma* 詹馬 or *dan ma* 澹馬—if these phrases occurred anywhere in the literature, which they do not—could mean “supply a horse,” let alone “big as a horse’s.” There is, however, a perfectly acceptable explanation of the sentence that is known to Hutton and has been adopted by most contemporary scholars. The Yuan woodblock edition of the *Xunzi* has *yan* 焉 in place of the *ma* 馬 of the received text (which derives from the lineage of a Song dynasty edition). In early texts we find that *yan* 焉 is frequently substituted for *yan* 顏 which means, among other things, “forehead.” This is the basis for Knoblock’s translation.

5.c 鄉則不若…… (XZJJ 76)

If he is courteous toward others when face to face with them . . . (Hutton 34.88–89)

To be agreeable to a person’s face . . . (Knoblock I.205)

Hutton notes merely that his reading of this sentence is “following Long Yuchun [龍宇純] (1987).”³⁰ Knoblock provides the full reasoning that underlies an understanding of the line on which both Knoblock and Hutton agree.³¹ It is, in brief, that *ruo* 若 should be understood as a truncated version of *nuo* 諾 and that the phrase *bu nuo* 不諾 means “to reply to a request politely and formally”; hence, Knoblock’s “agreeable” and Hutton’s “courteous.”

5.d 知行淺薄，曲直有以相懸矣，然而仁人不能推，知士不能明……(XZJJ 77)

If his understanding is shallow and his conduct base, and if his views on the crooked and the upright are far from correct, but the person of *ren* cannot move him, and knowledgeable men cannot enlighten him . . . (Hutton 34.91–35.94)

To be so superficial and shallow in knowledge and behavior that one makes no distinction between crookedness and uprightness and thus is unable to encourage humane men and to bring glory to wise scholars . . . (Knoblock I.205)

Hutton departs from the *XZJJ* commentaries and the *Xunzi xinzhū* understanding of the text and instead follows Knoblock in rendering *qu zhi* 曲直 as “crooked and upright” rather than as “talents, abilities.” He moreover characterizes as “a strained reading of the grammar” the received wisdom on the third and fourth phrases that *ren* 仁人 (the humane) and *zhi shi* 知士 (the wise) are the pre-posed objects of the transitive verbs they precede. Crediting Wang Tianhai for his analysis, Hutton takes them as the subjects of the verbs.³²

Whatever one’s reading of *qu zhi*—I prefer Yang Liang’s gloss followed by Wang Niansun and numerous others that it means one’s range of abilities or talents—it is clear that the verbal phrase *xiang xuan* 相懸 that follows it does not mean “far from correct” as Hutton has it; nor is Knoblock’s “makes no distinction between” on the mark. It refers to how its subjects or implied subjects are far distant from one another. More precisely, it means in this immediate context that, in terms of their respective *qu zhi*, the person of shallow understanding and base conduct is far different from others. These others we can assume to be worthy individuals whose knowledge is deep and behaviour dependably honourable.

³⁰ Hutton is referring to Long Yuchun’s “*Xunzi jijie buzhen*” 荀子集解補正 which was originally published in 1955 in the journal *Dalu zazhi* 大陸雜誌. Together with several other studies of the *Xunzi* by Long, it was included in the *Xunzi lunji* 荀子論集 (Taipei: Taiwan xuesheng shuju, 1987). Long’s note on this passage is found on p. 134 of the *Xunzi lunji*.

³¹ See Knoblock I.296, n. 43.

³² See Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 173, n. 15.

Moreover, the context makes clear that, Wang Tianhai and Hutton to the contrary, *ren ren* and *zhi shi* are indeed the pre-posed direct objects of their respective transitive verbs, an interpretation assumed in Wang Niansun's paraphrase and adopted by a host of other scholars. Taking the grammar this way is not at all "strained"; having a direct object precede a verb for the sake of emphasis or contrast is a commonplace occurrence in the language of the *Xunzi* and other contemporaneous texts. Thus we should understand the third and fourth phrases to mean that, because he is blind to his own shortcomings, the subject of the sentence does not *tui* 推 (promote) the humane nor does he *ming* 明 (illuminate) the wise. This understanding of the two verbs is based on Wang Niansun's commentary. Hutton's translating *tui* as "move," presumably in the sense of "affect" or "change," is an untenable and wholly unsupported interpretation of the verb's meaning.³³

5.e 然則人之所以為人者，非特以二足而無毛也，以其有辨也。(XZJJ 78)

However, that by which humans are human is not because they are special in having two legs and no feathers, but rather because they have distinctions. (Hutton 35.109–11)

But even so, what makes a man really human lies not primarily in his being a featherless biped, but rather in his ability to draw boundaries. (Knoblock I.206)

Apropos his reading of this sentence, Hutton says merely that he is following Knoblock. In his note, the only point that Knoblock makes is that, because of the context, he does not read *wu mao* 無毛 as "hairless" but as "featherless."³⁴

5.f 遠舉則病繆，近世則病備。(XZJJ 84)

But if one raises remote parallels, then one risks being misunderstood, and if one cites closer events, then one risks being crude. (Hutton 37.196–38.198)

If one adduces distant examples, they are annoyed at the exaggerations; if one cites recent examples, they are annoyed at their commonplaceness. (Knoblock I.208–9)

Hutton, as did Knoblock, has emended *shi* 世 to *yi* 拙 (cite, adduce), following the suggestion of Liang Qixiong 梁啟雄 (1900–1965).³⁵

³³ Though the source of Hutton's understanding of the grammar of the phrase, Wang Tianhai nevertheless understands *tui* as "promote."

³⁴ See Knoblock I.296, n. 51.

³⁵ See *Xunzi jianshi* 荀子簡釋 (Beijing: Guji chubanshe, 1956), p. 55. This work is missing from Hutton's bibliography.

5.g 故君子之度己則以繩，接人則用拙。(XZJJ 85)

Thus, in measuring himself, the gentleman uses an ink-line, but in dealing with others, he uses lenience. (Hutton 38.204–6)

Hence, the gentleman measures himself with the exactness of the plumbline, but when he comes into contact with others, he uses the less demanding bow-frame. (Knoblock I.209)

Because *ye* 拙 “does not seem to fit the context,” Hutton proposes that it is an error for *shi* 贖, a verb that means “pardon” and is the basis for his “lenience.” He points out, correctly in my view, that the context demands a word that communicates accommodation or tolerance, i.e., the indulgence and forbearance that the gentleman allows others while being strict with himself.

Hutton notes, however, that in the context one should expect a noun that more closely parallels *sheng* 繩 (ink-line or plumbline), and concedes that in that regard *shi* is deficient. More specifically, one should expect a word for a tool or device that parallels a *sheng* and its practical uses. Hence Wang Niansun’s argument that the text should properly read *xie* 榘 (a stand for bending a bow) presents a somewhat more attractive alternative. This is the basis for Knoblock’s translation. In his note, Knoblock appears to suggest, a bit too elliptically, that the way in which a bow frame bends a bow so that it is curved is more “accommodating” than the use of the *sheng* to create straight lines.³⁶

Glosses on Chapter 6: *Fei shi er zi* 非十二子³⁷

6.a 以不俗為俗，離縱而跂訾者也。(XZJJ 101)

³⁶ Knoblock I.298–99, n. 78.

³⁷ A gloss not occasioned by Hutton’s “Textual Notes.” Apropos the line *shize Zisi Meng Ke zhi zui ye* 是則子思孟軻之罪也 (XZJJ 95): Such is the crime of Zisi and Meng Ke (Hutton 42.64–65); It is in just this that they offend against Zisi and Mencius (Knoblock I.224). Looking for a way to explain Xunzi’s apparent criticism of the Ruhist luminaries Zisi and Mengzi 孟子 in the passage for which this line serves as the climax, Knoblock claims that the whole thing is an attack not on them but on those who have abused their teachings. This involves adopting a translation of the line first proposed by Arthur Waley, *Three Ways of Thought in Ancient China* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1939), p. 205. Waley justifies his unusual rendering of *zui* 罪 by referring to *Mengzi* 6B7: 五霸者，三王之罪人也 (The Five Hegemons were offenders against the Three Kings). (Waley translates *zui ren* 罪人 as “sinners.”) But while the surface grammar of 三王之罪人 is similar to 子思孟軻之罪—both take the form X 之 Y, i.e., the Y possessed by X—the absence of the word *ren* 人 in the latter makes a crucial difference in the meaning of the two lines. We must read the line as Hutton does: It refers to the crime of Zisi and Meng Ke not to a crime committed against them. For a recent analysis of Xunzi’s view of Zisi, see Kuan-yun Huang, “Xunzi’s Criticism of Zisi—New Perspectives,” *Early China* 37 (2014), pp. 291–325.

He takes what is unusual as his personal custom, and though he avoids ordinary licentiousness, he still proceeds to slander others. (Hutton 45.181–83)

They take the extraordinary as the ordinary, behaving eccentrically and without restraint, out of conceit and self-indulgence. (Knoblock I.228)

Because of what he understands as the grammar of the line, Hutton takes the terms *li* 離 and *qi* 跂 as antonyms meaning, respectively, “go away” and “go toward.” Hutton has overlooked, or chosen to ignore, however, that the two terms *li* and *qi* occur together as the *dieyun* 疊韻 (rhyming binom) *liqi* 離跂 found twice in the *Zhuangzi* 莊子. In these occurrences, *liqi* refers to how schools of thought the *Zhuangzi* found objectionable “regarded themselves as different from all others.”³⁸ In his commentary Yang Liang cited an alternative text tradition in which the *cong* 縱 in the line from the *Xunzi* is given as *xi* 緘. Adopting this reading, Wang Niansun points out that both *lixi* 離緘 and *qizi* 跂訾 are rhyming binoms and that their meaning is synonymous with that of *liqi*, a meaning that is properly derived by considering each binom as a whole not by analysing the graphs that are paired to represent—“spell” if you will—the sound of the binom.³⁹ It should also be noted that, while his translation differs from Hutton’s, Knoblock’s approach to these lexical items is equally piecemeal.

6.b 士君子之容：其冠進，其衣逢，其容良……(XZJJ 102)

The appearance of the well-bred man and gentleman: His cap is forward, his clothes are worn snugly, and his countenance is glad. (Hutton 45.198–99)

The Demeanor of the Scholar and Gentleman . . . his cap should protrude straight out and his robes be full, his demeanor should be relaxed . . . (Knoblock I.228)

Because *feng* 逢 elsewhere means “meet,” where it “implies a kind of conformity or fitting with the thing met,” Hutton suggests as a “tentative” meaning of the term here that it refers to “form-fitting” clothing. He believes this meaning serves as a better contrast than its usual interpretation (viz. “ample, full”) with the term *huan* 緩, which occurs a few lines later and “seems clearly to refer wearing [*sic*] clothes loosely.” Hutton’s rendering is, to say the least, a stretch not relieved by labelling

³⁸ See Guo Qingfan 郭慶藩, *Zhuangzi jishi* 莊子集釋 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1961), pp. 377 and 453. For the meaning of *liqi* in the *Zhuangzi* see Guo Qingfan’s comments, p. 378, n. 2. Guo refers readers back to this *Xunzi* line but mistakenly identifies the chapter in which it occurs as “Rongru” rather than “Fei shi er zi.”

³⁹ Wang’s wise advice on how to read *dieyun* is found at XZJJ 101: 凡疊韻之字，其意即存乎聲，求諸其聲則得，求諸其文則惑矣。 There is a large corpus of linguistic scholarship on ancient Chinese rhyming binoms.

it “tentative.” The idea that the Confucian moral paragon wore form-fitting clothes seems uninformed given literary descriptions and early artistic portrayals. And what are we to make of the common expression *feng ye zhi yi* 逢掖之衣, take it to refer to robes that fit snugly around the armpits? It is still best to accept Yang Liang’s gloss on *feng* that it means *da* 大 (big). As for the contrast with *huan* that worries Hutton, there is none. *Huan* describes cap strings worn loosely, not clothes.

6.c 偷儒而罔，無廉恥而忍謾詢。(XZJJ 104)

He tries to put it off and disappears, and lacking all shame, he is willing to endure the disparagements of others. (Hutton 45.216–46.217)

. . . they become dispirited and passive, evasive, timorous, and irresolute, lacking integrity and a sense of shame, but rather acting cruelly, disgracefully, and insultingly. (Knoblock I.229)

Hutton notes that he takes *wang* 罔 as a “loangraph” for *wang* 亡, hence his translation, “disappears.” But this reading is unnecessary. Yang Liang notes that *wang* 罔 is the equivalent of the Middle Chinese expression *wang mao* 罔冒 (impervious to the criticisms of others). Otherwise, Hutton’s translation of the passage is a vast improvement over Knoblock’s.

6.d 弟佻其冠，神禪其辭，禹行而舜趨。(XZJJ 104)

They arrange and prettify their caps. They amplify and aggrandize their words. They try to walk like Yu and run like Shun. (Hutton 46.219–20)

Their caps bent and twisted, their robes billowing and flowing, they move to and fro as though they were a Yu or a Shun. (Knoblock I.229)

Because the two words make little sense in the context, Hutton emends *zhong dan* 神禪 to *chong tan* 沖潭 and says of the latter pair that both words “can mean ‘deep.’” He suggests that the line in which the words occur refers to how the Confucians in question dress up their words just as they do their appearance. I have been unable to locate in the language of the time of the *Xunzi* another occurrence of the word *chong* in the meaning of “deep.” Moreover, there appears to be no other occurrence of a compound *chong tan*. It appears to be a Hutton invention created to fit what he understands to be the immediate context. But that too is problematic. The first four-word phrase that contains the difficult terms *di tuo* 弟佻 is usually understood to mean that the caps are askew and practically falling off those who wear them.⁴⁰ To

⁴⁰ See, for example, *Xunzi xinzhu*, p. 75, n. 1.

parallel this meaning it would be best to adopt Yang Liang's emendation of *zhong dan* to *chong dan* 沖澹, a well-attested compound that means "weak and insipid." (Knoblock's translation depends on another set of emendations proposed by Zhong Tai.⁴¹)

Finally, it is worth noting that while Hutton's translation of the last phrase is truer to the original than Knoblock's, neither of them has paid sufficient attention to the larger significance of the line. It is likely that *Yu xing* 禹行 (walking like Yu or doing the Yu walk) is an allusion to the famous limp that the legendary founder of the Xia ruling house suffered from as a result of his labours to control the flood. In most early sources, including manuscripts excavated at the sites of Mawangdui 馬王堆 and Shuihudi 睡虎地, Yu's afflicted walk is called *Yu bu* 禹步 (Pace of Yu), and scholars such as Marcel Granet have argued that it should be connected to shamanistic traditions in early Chinese religion.⁴²

Glosses on Chapter 7: *Zhongni* 仲尼

7.a 雖在貧窮徒處之執，亦取象於是矣。(XZJJ 110)

Be such that even in circumstances of poverty and homelessness you take your model from this. (Hutton 49.93–95)

Although you are poor, impoverished, and out of office, choose to mold yourself in this way. (Knoblock II.60)

Hutton says that he takes the words *tu chu* 徒處 "literally" as "dwelling while on the move." He interprets this to mean that one has "no fixed residence" or is, as he translates, "in circumstances of . . . homelessness." But this interpretation is untenable. Except for this one passage where he, and he alone, says it does, nowhere in the text of the *Xunzi* does *tu* mean "to move." In this context we should understand *tu* to mean "alone, solely," an interpretation supported by another text tradition, cited by Yang Liang, that read *du chu* 獨處 (dwelling alone).

⁴¹ See Knoblock I.307, n. 104.

⁴² In *Xunzi* chapter 5 (XZJJ 75) there is a reference to *Yu tiao* 禹跳 (the hop of Yu) that Yang Liang defines as *Yu bu*. For a fuller discussion of *Yu bu* see Donald Harper, "A Chinese Demonography of the Third Century B.C.," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 45, no. 2 (December 1985), pp. 469–70; idem, *Early Chinese Medical Literature: The Mawangdui Medical Manuscripts* (London: Kegan Paul, 1998), pp. 167–69; and Mu-chou Poo, "Ritual and Ritual Texts in Early China," in John Lagerwey and Marc Kalinowski, eds., *Early Chinese Religion: Part One: Shang through Han (1250 BC–220 AD)* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), vol. 1, pp. 301–3, 309. Harper was the first scholar to recognize that the occurrence of *Yu bu* in the Mawangdui medical manuscripts should be read in light of Granet's scholarship on religious Daoism and its shamanistic roots.

7.b 以吝嗇而不行施道乎上，為重招權於下以妨害人。(XZJJ 112)

He holds to stinginess and does not practice generous ways. He hails his superiors as important, but gathers power for himself from his subordinates, so as to harm others. (Hutton 50.133–51.135)

When holding high office, his parsimony and greed prevent him from acting with kind generosity. In a subordinate position, he acts to increase his importance and abuses his power, thereby inflicting harm and injury on others. (Knoblock II.61)

Hutton's translation is based on his own parsing of the Chinese text. He thus punctuates the passage: 以吝嗇而不行施道。乎上為重，招權於下，以妨害人。 Hutton additionally reads *hu* 乎, understood by others to be a preposition in this context, as *hu* 呼 (call) which, in his view, “forms a nice parallel with [*zhao*] 招 ‘summon.’”

Both his parsing of the text and taking *hu* and *zhao* in the meanings he provides for them pose problems that Hutton has not adequately addressed. In combination with *quan* 權 (power), *zhao* does not so much mean “summon” or “gather” as it does “seek after, desire.” (It is also perplexing to figure out what “power” Hutton imagines one might appropriate from subordinates. One would expect it to be the other way around.) Thus the parallel between *zhao* and *hu* 呼 is not quite as “nice” as Hutton claims. And, in any case, Hutton's *hu shang* 呼上 would have to mean to “call superiors” or “hail superiors” as one does a cat, a taxi, or a houseboy—a bit inappropriate as a way to get a boss's attention. Are these questionable interpretations sufficiently worthwhile if, as a result of adopting the parsing of the Chinese text that makes them a possibility, the parallelism between *hu shang* 乎上 (in a superior position) and *yu xia* 於下 (in a subordinate position) is lost? Probably not.

An alternative translation (based on the punctuation found in the 1988 edition of the *XZJJ*): “When in a superior position, because of his greed he fails to practise the way of distributing largesse to others. When in a subordinate position, he seeks after power for his own enrichment, thereby afflicting harm on others.”

7.c 可立而待也，可炊而僥也。(XZJJ 112)

These are things one can simply stand by and wait for, things that will be over in the space of a breath. (Hutton 51.139–41)

One can simply stand there and wait for it to happen, or one can merely blow at him and he will fall. (Knoblock II.61)

Hutton notes that he has adopted an interpretation of this passage by Guo Qingfan 郭慶藩 (1844–1896) (included in the *XZJJ*). What this means is that, like Guo, Hutton reads the extremely rare *qing* 僥 as *jing* 竟 (done, finished). According to Lu Wenchao, a Yuan woodblock edition has *jiang* 僵 in place of *qing* 僥 and Knoblock

understands the former to mean “fall, overthrown.”⁴³ Both Hutton (in a departure from Guo’s interpretation) and Knoblock take *chui* 炊 to be *chui* 吹—a reading originally noted by Yang Liang—though their renderings are different because of differences in how they deal with *qing*. I prefer not equating *chui* 炊 to *chui* 吹 and instead follow Guo Qingfan and the editors of the *Xunzi xinzhu*⁴⁴ in understanding the term to mean “prepare a meal.” Thus I render the passage in question: “These are things one may simply stand and await, things that will be finished in the time it takes to prepare a meal.”

Glosses on Chapter 8: *Ru xiao* 儒效⁴⁵

8.a 武王崩，成王幼，周公屏成王而及武王，以屬天下，惡天下之倍周也。(XZJJ 114)

When King Wu had fallen in death and King Cheng was still a youth, the Duke of Zhou put aside King Cheng and took up from King Wu in order to keep the empire subordinate, because he hated that the empire should betray the Zhou. (Hutton 52.1–4)

When King Wu died, King Cheng was only a child. The Duke of Zhou acted as a screen for King Cheng and succeeded King Wu in order to keep the allegiance of the world, since he dreaded the prospect of a general revolt against Zhou throughout the empire. (Knoblock II.68)

Following Ikai Hikohiro 猪飼彦博 (1761–1845) and Sun Yirang 孫詒讓 (1848–1908), Hutton reads 屏 as *bing*, meaning “put aside.”⁴⁶ Knoblock reads the word as

⁴³ See Knoblock II.279, n. 35.

⁴⁴ See *Xunzi xinzhu*, p. 84, n. 8.

⁴⁵ A gloss not occasioned by Hutton’s “Textual Notes”: Apropos the title of the chapter, Knoblock translates it as “The Teachings of the Ru,” explaining that “*xiao* 效 ‘imitate, follow the example of’ may refer either to the teachings or to the achievements that result from those teachings.” (See Knoblock II.63.) But Knoblock is inconsistent in how he translates the term elsewhere in the chapter and the first few paragraphs seem to make clear that the intended meaning is “achievements” not “teachings.”

⁴⁶ As is his usual practice in his “Textual Notes,” Hutton does not indicate what word he thinks the graph stands for. We must infer this from his translation. For Sun Yirang’s commentary on the passage see Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 262, n. 3. Ikai Hikohiro was also known as Ikai Keisho 猪飼敬所. (Knoblock incorrectly transcribes Ikai as Igai.) Ikai’s work on the *Xunzi*, the *Junshi hoi* 荀子補遺, was first published in Kyoto in 1830, later reprinted in Tokyo in 1911, and then included in the *Zengbu Xunzi jijie* 增補荀子集解 (Taipei: Lantai shuju, 1983). See page 5b of the 1830 *Junshi hoi* and *juan* 卷 4, page 1 of the *Zengbu Xunzi jijie* for Ikai’s commentary on this passage.

ping, meaning “screen,” and understands it in the somewhat technical sense, attested in the *Zuozhuan* 左傳, of “serving as a defence for the Zhou house.”⁴⁷ Knoblock also explores various ways the text might be interpreted if it is indeed saying that the Duke of Zhou unceremoniously seized power.⁴⁸ Ikai simply observes: 言成王當立而周公退之，身繼武王，踐天下之位，以服屬天下也。此言固誤矣，然文意如此。 (The passage is saying that King Cheng ought to have been on the throne but the Duke of Zhou put him aside, succeeded King Wu, and occupied the position of Son of Heaven to subjugate the world. What this passage says is wrong but its meaning is as I have described it.)

8.b 居於闕黨，闕黨之子弟罔不分，有親者取多，孝弟以化之也。(XZJJ 119–20)

When he [i.e., Confucius] lived in Quedang, there was nothing that the sons and younger brothers of Quedang did not share, and those with parents still alive were given more. This is because he used filial piety and being a good younger brother to transform them. (Hutton 54.65–68)

When he lived in Quedang 闕黨, youngsters of the village apportioned the catch of their nets so those who had parents took more, because his cultivation of filial piety and fraternal submission so transformed them. (Knoblock II.70)

Hutton understands *wang* 罔 not as “net” but as the negative. He also rejects the argument put forth by Wang Niansun (as well as others before him) that the negative *bu* 不 is an error for *fu* 罟 (trap [for catching wild game]). Thus while others interpret the three word phrase to mean “divide the catch of nets and traps,” Hutton understands it to mean that everything was divided. Hutton’s reading is possible, though I prefer Wang Niansun’s emendation. My preference aside, where I fault Hutton’s rendering is in his not making clear that the point of the passage is not that things were shared but that there was in everything an apportionment that favoured those with parents. In the Ru scheme of things parents always receive the largest portion and they receive it first so that there is no possibility that it might be diminished due to some misguided generosity towards others. Equal sharing of income was of course the preference of Mozi 墨子 and his followers.⁴⁹

⁴⁷ See *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhengyi* 春秋左傳正義 (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 1999), Xi 僖 24, p. 422: 以蕃屏周。

⁴⁸ See Knoblock II.279–80, n. 1.

⁴⁹ For a recent elaboration on this distinction between the Ru and the Mo, readers may consult Jeffrey Riegel, “A Root Split in Two: *Meng zi* 3A5 Reconsidered,” *Asia Major*, 3rd ser., vol. 28, pt. 1 (2015), pp. 37–59.

8.c 雖有聖人之知，未能僂指也。(XZJJ 124)

Even if one should have the wisdom of a sage, one could not comprehensively point out answers for them [i.e., the paradoxes put forward by the logicians]. (Hutton 56.146–47)

Although he possessed the wisdom of a sage, still he would be unable [to explain them as simply as] bending his fingers. (Knoblock II.72)

Puzzled by *lou zhi* 僂指 and unimpressed by Yang Liang's brief note that *lou* (Yang reads *liū*) means *ji* 疾 (quickly, rapidly), Hutton claims to have adopted the explanation of Liu Shipei. But Liu says only that *lou* should be understood to mean *qu* 曲 (bent, crooked); Hutton's "comprehensively" is his own invention.⁵⁰ Based on Liu's definition, the editors of the *Xunzi xinzhū* say that *lou zhi* refers to a rapid way of counting on the fingers of one's hands and that the phrase is used metaphorically in the passage in question to describe how even one with the knowledge of a sage is unable to figure out quickly the famous paradoxes put forward by logicians such as Hui Shi 惠施 (380–305 B.C.E.) and Gongsun Longzi 公孫龍子 (c. 320–c. 255 B.C.E.).⁵¹ Knoblock obviously chose another way to regard the meaning of bending the fingers but his basis for doing so is unclear.

8.d 詩曰：「為鬼為蜮，則不可得，有覩面目，視人罔極。作此好歌，以極反側。」(XZJJ 125)

The *Odes* says:

If either you were a ghost or you were a *yu*,
Getting at you would be impossible to do.
But you possess a shameful human face and eyes,
And you show others a lack of correctness, too.
So I have now created this good song I sing,
To correct your ways, which are faithless and untrue. (Hutton 57.160–67)

An Ode says:

If you were a specter or a water-imp
you could not be caught sight of;
but since you have a face with the normal countenance and eyes,
I regard you as a man who observes no limits.
I am writing this good song
to show the extremes of your turning back and twisting away. (Knoblock II.73)

⁵⁰ For Liu Shipei's commentary, see Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 281, n. 24.

⁵¹ See *Xunzi xinzhū*, pp. 93–94, n. 5.

A quotation from the *Shijing* 詩經 poem, “He ren si” 何人斯 (What Man Is It?), which is the subject of this “Textual Note,”⁵² comes at the conclusion of a long passage in which Xunzi excoriates the transmitters of what he describes as useless and incomprehensible doctrines and paradoxes, using brilliant invective to call such people at one point *kuang huo zhuang lou* 狂惑戇陋 (addled and ignorant). The original poem, of which the quoted portion is only the last of its eight six-line stanzas, appears, however, to be a complaint against someone—a marauder with demonic powers or perhaps a wayward lover—whose behaviour is variously characterized in its lines as devious, unpredictable, and inconstant. One frequently encounters in reading the *Xunzi* the problem of reconciling the quotation of a canonical source with the context in which it is quoted. Hutton says that he is basing his interpretation of the lines of verse on the *Shijing* commentary of Qu Wanli 屈萬里 (1907–1979).⁵³ Hutton summarizes the significance of the quotation to be that “the purveyors and followers of vile doctrines are also just human beings and can be corrected if shown their faults, as Xunzi is trying to do in the passage.”

There are several problematic terms in the quoted lines the interpretation of which has been controversial. The *Shijing* commentarial tradition, starting with Zheng Xuan 鄭玄 (127–200) and including Kong Yingda 孔穎達 (574–648) as well as Qu Wanli, agrees that the phrase *bu ke de* 不可得 should, in this context, be understood to mean “cannot be seen.”⁵⁴ Though *de* alone does more generally mean “get, obtain,” Hutton’s “getting at you” is justified neither by the immediate context nor by other occurrences of the term.

In addition to Mao 199, *tian* 覩 also occurs in passages in the *Guoyu* 國語 and the *Hou Hanshu*.⁵⁵ Moreover, the *Erya* defines *tian* as *hua* 媧 (a gloss that is repeated in the Mao commentary 毛傳 to the *Shijing*)⁵⁶ and the *Shuowen jiezi* defines *tian* as *mian jian* 面見.⁵⁷ These various sources have been closely examined by Qing dynasty scholars who, in their scholarship on the meaning of the word *tian*, have paid especially close attention to its definition in the *Shuowen*. Duan Yucai emends the *Shuowen* definition to read *mian jian ren* 面見人 because this is how Kong Yingda

⁵² For the entire text of the “He ren si” (Mao 199), see *Maoshi zhushu* 毛詩注疏 (1815 wood-block edition from Nanchang 南昌; reprint, Taipei: Yiwen yinshuguan, 1973), p. 425, register 2, to p. 428, register 1.

⁵³ For Qu Wanli’s glosses, see his *Shijing quanshi* 詩經詮釋 (Taipei: Lianjing chuban shiye gongsi, 1983), p. 381, nn. 21–25.

⁵⁴ The Zheng Xuan and Kong Yingda commentaries on this phrase are found at *Maoshi zhushu*, p. 427, register 2, and p. 428, register 1. For Qu Wanli’s, see his *Shijing quanshi*, p. 381, n. 22.

⁵⁵ See *Guoyu* (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1978), p. 657, and *Hou Hanshu*, p. 1673.

⁵⁶ *Erya zhushu*, p. 90, and *Maoshi zhushu*, p. 427, register 2.

⁵⁷ The entry on *tian* is found at *Shuowen jiezi zhu, pian* 9A, pp. 15a–b.

defines both *tian* and *hua* in his *Shijing* subcommentary.⁵⁸ Duan Yucai understands the emended *Shuowen* definition of *tian* to refer to the feelings of shame and self-disgust that show when meeting others face to face.⁵⁹ Wang Niansun addressed many of these same sources in a commentary he wrote on the *Hou Hanshu* occurrence of *tian*.⁶⁰ Basing himself on the early *Erya* commentaries of Li Xun 李巡 (*fl.* late second century) and Sun Yan 孫炎 (*fl.* third century), Wang argues that the correct reading of the *Shuowen* definition is *ren mian mao ye* 人面貌也 (the appearance of a human face). He concludes that *tian* and *hua*, properly understood, mean simply having a human face and do not describe a face on which either feelings of shame or a thick-skinned attitude of shamelessness are registered.⁶¹ Thus, Wang Niansun observes, in Mao 199, the human face is contrasted with those of demons and monsters that cannot be glimpsed; in the *Guoyu*, it is contrasted with the look of wild beasts; and in the *Hou Hanshu*, *tian* refers to a normal human exterior that is belied by a debauched heart.⁶² Qu Wanli and Wang Tianhai adopt Duan Yucai's interpretation of *tian*.⁶³ This is the source of Hutton's translation. Several *Shuowen* scholars accept Wang Niansun's emendation of the text (though they have reservations about his analysis of the meaning of *tian*).⁶⁴ Bernhard Karlgren, in his *Shijing* glosses, embraces Wang Niansun's opinions and this is the basis for Knoblock's translation of the word.⁶⁵

Qu Wanli understands the four-word line *shi ren wang ji* 視人罔極 to mean *gongran zuo buliang zhi shi* 公然作不良之事 (publicly reveal to others the evil things one does).⁶⁶ (This is the basis for Hutton's translation.) But Qu cites no evidence for this interpretation and the early *Shijing* commentators have a different understanding of the line. Zheng Xuan, followed by Kong Yingda, defines *shi ren* 視人 as *ren xiang*

⁵⁸ *Maoshi zhushu*, p. 428, register 1: 覩與媿皆面見人之貌也。

⁵⁹ *Shuowen jiezi zhu*, *pian* 9A, p. 15a: 面見人謂但有面相對自覺可憎也。

⁶⁰ Wang Niansun, *Dushu zazhi* 讀書雜誌 (1827 woodblock edition; reprint, Nanjing: Jiangsu guji chubanshe, 2000), *Zhiyu* 志餘 A, pp. 6b–8a.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 7a: 然則覩與媿皆人面之貌，而非無恥之貌明矣。

⁶² *Ibid.*, pp. 7a–b.

⁶³ *Shijing quanshi*, p. 381, n. 23, and Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 283, n. 31.

⁶⁴ See the excerpts from the *Shuowen Duan zhu jian* 說文段注箋 of Xu Hao 徐灝 (1810–1879) and the *Shuowen jiezi tongxun dingsheng* 說文解字通訓定聲 of Zhu Junsheng 朱駿聲 (1788–1858) quoted in Ding Fubao 丁福保 (1874–1952), *Shuowen jiezi gulin* 說文解字詁林 (1932; reprint, Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1988), pp. 8896 and 8897.

⁶⁵ Bernhard Karlgren, “Glosses on the Siao Ya Odes,” *Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities* 16 (1944), p. 115, Gloss 614. Karlgren fails to take into account Duan Yucai's emendation of the *Shuowen* entry when he claims that there is a consensus that Wang Niansun's reading of the *Shuowen* is correct.

⁶⁶ *Shijing quanshi*, p. 381, n. 24.

shi 人相視 (to see and recognize another's human visage) and *wang ji* 罔極 as *wu you ji shi* 無有極時 (without a time limit), and thus understands the whole line to mean: "I will see your human visage eventually."⁶⁷

The poet who composed the piece concludes it by saying that it was made *yi ji fan ce* 以極反側. In his translation of the line on which hangs his understanding of the significance of the quotation, Hutton has adopted the interpretation of Qu Wanli that *ji* 極 means *zheng* 正 (correct, rectify). But Qu cites no evidence for this explanation of the word and I have been unable to locate another example in early texts where *ji* functions as a transitive verb with this meaning. Zheng Xuan understands *ji* to mean *qiu* 求 (seek) and Kong Yingda, following that lead, glosses it more precisely as *qiong ji* 窮極 (plumb the extremes). The editors of the *Xunzi xinzhū* interpret the latter to mean "to lay bare, expose fully."⁶⁸ *Fan ce* 反側 is difficult to understand in this context. It occurs famously in the opening poem of the *Shijing* where it describes the emotion-filled tossing and turning of a deeply besotted man who longs for but cannot be with his beloved.⁶⁹ Perhaps in Mao 199 it describes irresoluteness on the part of the person addressed in poem.⁷⁰ Or it is possible that, as in Mao 1, *fan ce* is expressive of deep frustrations on the part of the song's persona, in this case caused by the odd behaviour of the mysterious "person" to whom the song's title refers.

Thus it is likely that the *Shijing* stanza is quoted because it, like the passage that immediately precedes it in the *Xunzi*, is a relentless exposé, laying bare the faults of those it chastises. In neither the *Xunzi* nor the poem is the concern with correcting those faults. For neither work is the intended audience those who committed the wrongs. Both passages are about unmasking bad behaviour for all to see so that we may react with appropriate indignation and, in the case of the song, sympathize with the poet whose suffering led to the composition of its lyrics. An alternative translation:

Were you a demon or a monster,
you could not be seen.
But you have a face clearly human
that eventually others will see.
I have made this good song
to plumb the depths of how I turn from this side to that.

⁶⁷ *Xunzi xinzhū*, p. 94, n. 10: 人們終究會將你的真象看清, adopting Zheng Xuan's interpretation.

⁶⁸ Cf. *Xunzi xinzhū*, p. 94, n. 10: 盡情地揭露 .

⁶⁹ "Guan ju" 關雎 (Mao 1), *Maoshi zhushu*, p. 21, register 2. See also Jeffrey Riegel, "Eros, Introversion, and the Beginnings of *Shijing* Commentary," p. 150.

⁷⁰ Cf. the relevant glosses and paraphrases provided in *Xunzi xinzhū*, p. 94, n. 10.

8.e 要時立功之巧，若詔四時……(XZJJ 130)

. . . and if his skill for grasping opportunities and making accomplishments is as constant as the coming of the four seasons . . . (Hutton 59.258–60)

. . . when he seeks the occasion to establish the meritorious in his accomplishments as though he were proclaiming the four seasons . . . (Knoblock II.76)

Hutton finds a problem in the text's use of *zhao* 詔 since parallel phrases lead him to expect that the phrase in which it occurs should involve an easy activity. Because, Hutton claims, “summoning” the four seasons would not be a human task and “announcing” the four seasons is not a simple one, involving as it does elaborate rituals he does not bother to identify, he says the word means “make come.” This refers, in turn, to how “the seasons reliably come on their own, independently of human intervention, and the sage’s knack for acting at the right time and in the right way is as reliable as this process.”

Hutton’s semantic contortions with regard to *zhao* are unappealing. There is no reason to bother with what he takes to be the word’s “literal meaning,” i.e., “summon,” since no one ever proposed that that is the way the word should be read in this line; nor can one translate *zhao* in such a fashion that its function as a transitive verb is lost. It is difficult to fathom reasoning that equates “X compels Y” with “Y acts on its own irrespective of X.” Proclaiming the seasons cannot have been all that difficult. One consulted the calendar, put on the silk booties appropriate to the season, ordered the court musician to sound the gong, and then announced: “Goodbye Winter! Welcome Spring!”

8.f 禮言是其行也，樂言是其和也。(XZJJ 133)

The *Rituals* tells of his conduct. The *Music* tells of his harmoniousness. (Hutton 60.284–85)

. . . the *Rituals* [express] his conduct; the *Music* his harmoniousness . . . (Knoblock II.76)

Here, unlike with some other occurrences in the text, Hutton identifies *Li* and *Yue* as the titles of canonical works.⁷¹

8.g 履天子之籍，負宸而坐，諸侯趨走堂下。(XZJJ 134)

He [i.e., the Duke of Zhou] occupied the position of the Son of Heaven, sat with his back to the *yi** screen, and the feudal lords hastened to the foot of his hall. (Hutton 61.306–8)

⁷¹ See above, my discussion of Hutton’s “Textual Note” 1.c.

When [the Duke of Zhou] took his position, standing with his back to the ornamented screen, the feudal lords hastened with quick steps to their positions at the lower end of the audience hall . . . (Knoblock II.77)

The question that concerns Hutton in this passage is whether, when he assumed the position of Son of Heaven, the Duke of Zhou sat or stood in the required ritual position thus compelling the feudal lords to rush to the hall. Hutton says: “Commentators [by which he means Wang Niansun and others] suggest changing ‘sat’ to ‘stood’ [i.e., regarding *zuo* 坐 as a scribal error for *li* 立], on the grounds that there are no records of the Son of Heaven sitting while having an audience with the feudal lords.” Since Hutton finds that the remainder of the passage of which this sentence is a part “does not fit with certain standard historical accounts”—though Hutton does not bother to identify these accounts or detail the disagreements he has in mind—he thinks it therefore unsurprising that this particular detail differs from the “records” or “standard historical accounts” (whatever those are). An almost identical sentence occurs in the “Zheng lun” 正論 chapter of the *Xunzi* (see *XZJJ* 334) and in translating that passage, for which see Hutton 192.318, Hutton again rejects the emendation of *zuo* to *li* preferred by Wang Niansun.

Wang Niansun’s proposed emendation is partly based on the observation by Wang Zhong 汪中 (1745–1794), a famous Qing dynasty authority on the *Mozi* and the author of a biography of Xunzi, that “in antiquity there was no ritual that involved sitting while granting an audience to the feudal lords.”⁷² Wang is not talking about “historical accounts” or “records” but rather ritual precedents as preserved in the early ritual compilations—precedents of which one could expect the author of the *Xunzi* passage to be mindful. Quite apart from the weight one ought to give to the close attention to ritual details that is characteristic of the *Xunzi*, there is solid support for the emendation that Wang Zhong and Wang Niansun propose in a parallel passage in the *Liji* 禮記—a source that otherwise bears the stamp of the *Xunzi*’s influence—that Hutton appears to have overlooked or fails to mention. There the “Qu li” 曲禮 chapter records: *Tianzi dang yi er li* 天子當依 (= 屨) 而立 (The Son of Heaven stands with his back to the ornamented screen).⁷³

8.h 輿固馬選矣，而不能以至遠一日而千里則非造父也。(XZJJ 137)

If the chariot is sturdy and the horses are of select quality but the man cannot use them to go as far as a thousand *li* in a single day, then he is not a Zao Fu. (Hutton 62.350–53)

⁷² See *XZJJ* 134: 古無坐見諸侯之禮。

⁷³ See *Liji zhushu* 禮記注疏 (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 1999), p. 137.

If a man with a strong chariot and evenly matched horses cannot reach a good distance, a thousand *li* in a single day, he is no Zaofu. (Knoblock II.78)

Hutton's translation of *ma xuan* 馬選 follows Wang Tianhai.⁷⁴ Knoblock's translation adopts the interpretation of Liang Qixiong but perhaps reads too much into the meaning of *xuan* (choose, select).⁷⁵

8.i 逢衣淺帶，解果其冠。(XZJJ 138)

Another sort of person wears large clothing with a slack belt. He wears his cap looking like split-open fruit. (Hutton 63.390–91)

The vulgar Ru 俗儒 wear large-sleeved robes with a narrow sash and a crab-snail cap. (Knoblock II.79)

Hutton says that his rendering of *jie guo* 解果 as “looking like split-open fruit” is based “with hesitation” on Yang Liuqiao 楊柳橋.⁷⁶ Hutton, moreover, intends by his translation—which he elsewhere labels “tentative”—to describe the way in which the vulgar Ru wears his cap rather than the particular shape of the cap itself, a part of the Ru uniform that, according to Yang Liang, the vulgar Ru forces himself to wear though he lacks the substance (of the true Ru).⁷⁷ Hutton attempts to buttress his rejection of Yang Liang's interpretation by suggesting that “this line seems intended to justify the claim a few sentences later that the vulgar *ru* is hardly any different from vulgar people”—that is, wearing a Ru cap would not make one resemble the vulgar more generally but wearing a cap improperly would. Hutton does not make clear what impropriety is limned by “looking like split-open fruit.”

Hutton's attempt to make sense of *jie guo* involves what he takes to be a literal translation of the text as it stands. But the grammar is in that case problematic since we would expect the two-word phrase to be descriptive of the cap itself and there is nothing in the text to justify Hutton's “looking like.” Moreover, in the larger context in which the phrase appears, Hutton's distinction between the cap and how one wears it seems difficult to maintain: one could argue that appropriating articles of clothing not proper to one's station or identity is characteristic of vulgar behaviour more generally.

Another interpretation: Citing passages from the *Shuo yuan*, Lu Wenchao proposes that the two problematic graphs be understood to write the binom *xie ke*

⁷⁴ See Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 311, n. 4.

⁷⁵ See *Xunzi jianshi*, p. 91.

⁷⁶ See Yang Liuqiao, *Xunzi guyi* 荀子詁譯 (Jinan: Qi Lu shushe, 1985), p. 179, n. 9.

⁷⁷ See XZJJ 138: 謂強為儒服而無其實也。

(usually written 蟹堞) which means “high in the middle and deep on the sides.” The binom typically describes topography but in this *Xunzi* passage should be understood as descriptive of the shape of the hat. Some editions of the *Shuo yuan* write the binom with *luo* 螺 in place of *ke* 堞. Because he fails fully to appreciate that the syllables form a binom, Knoblock mistakenly translates *xie ke* as two separate words. He does, however, understand that they describe a hat with “a high, curved spine with low sides.”⁷⁸ Hutton’s translation of *qian dai* 淺帶 as “slack belt” is preferable to Knoblock’s “narrow sash.”

8.j 人無師法則隆性矣，有師法則隆積矣，而師法者，所得乎情，非所受乎性。不足以獨立而治。(XZJJ 143)

If people have no teachers or proper models, then they will take human nature as their exalted standard. If they have teachers and proper models, then they will take accumulated effort as their exalted standard. Following teachers and proper models is something one gets from one’s dispositions, not something one receives from human nature, because it is insufficient to stand on its own and be well-ordered. (Hutton 65.474–80)

If a man has neither teacher nor model, then he will exalt inborn nature; if he has both, he will exalt accumulated effort.

Now the state of becoming a teacher and the creation of a model are the result of accumulated effort and are not something received from one’s inborn nature, for inborn nature is inadequate to establish by itself a state of good order. (Knoblock II.81)

Hutton notes that “most modern editors,” following the lead of Wang Niansun, emend *qing* 情 to *ji* 積 in the text of this passage and the one immediately following (for which see “Textual Note” 8.k). Hutton rejects the emendations; that is, according to Hutton, we should not understand the text to be a continuation of the contrast between “human nature” and “accumulated effort” with which the longer passage begins, but rather, to use his translation, a contrast between “human nature” and the “dispositions.” Hutton claims that his translation and notes reflect his view of how the text “makes sense without the emendations.”

The textual history of these lines and more generally of the larger passage in which they occur is more problematic than Hutton indicates. (For a fuller presentation of these complexities see Knoblock II.289–90, nn. 104–6.) For example, as Lu Wenchao notes, a Song dynasty edition of the *Xunzi* wrote *long xing* 隆性 as *long*

⁷⁸ See Knoblock II.287–88, n. 82.

qing 隆情 and *long ji* 隆積 as *long xing* 隆性. Because these readings appeared to Lu to contradict the concept of human nature found in the *Xunzi*, Lu adopted the readings found in a Yuan dynasty edition and emended the text. Moreover, Yang Liang noted in his commentary that some scholars had stated that *qing* 情 should be written *ji* 積 in the two places in the text where Hutton rejects this emendation. Thus the proposed changes are not only based on the arguments of Wang Niansun, nor are they merely a feature of the work of “most modern editors.” What these examples illustrate is that the received version of a text is often the product of a series of errors and changes as well as editorial corrections and revisions that may or may not be close to the versions that circulated in antiquity. Thus it would be naïve to assume that cleaving to what one takes to be the received text involves fewer textual intrusions than adopting a text that has been emended by Qing dynasty philologists.

It is also worth noting that Hutton’s acceptance of the received text, without the emendations he questions, is anticipated by Yang Liang, a fact that Hutton does not bother to mention. Yang wrote in his commentary to this passage:

By *qing* (feelings or emotions) is meant the joy, anger, love, and hate that are stimulated by external things. The passage is saying that a person’s accepting the guidance of a teacher and proper models [my rendering of Yang’s 師法之於人] is obtained from external feelings [i.e., the feelings that are experienced when one is stimulated by external things] and is not what is received from one’s heaven-given nature. Therefore human nature is not sufficient standing on its own to bring about good order; it must depend upon external feelings to transform it.⁷⁹

Yang’s understanding seems to be that it is through the experience of feelings and emotions that a person realizes the need for the guidance of a teacher and other proper models of behaviour. But Yang Liang equivocates. After he notes the alternative reading proposed by “others” he takes the trouble to elaborate upon it: “[Accepting the guidance of a teacher and proper models] is what one gets from accumulated effort and repetition and not what one receives from one’s heaven-given nature. If it is not the heaven-given nature then the latter is not sufficient standing on its own to bring about good order; one must rely on transforming it.”⁸⁰ It should also be noted at this point that Knoblock’s rendering of *er shi fa zhe* 而師法者 as “Now the state of becoming a teacher and the creation of a model . . .” is untenable in the context.

Between the alternative readings provided by Yang Liang, it seems to me, in balance, that the first is correct and that here and in the following passage we should,

⁷⁹ See XZJJ 143: 情，謂喜怒愛惡，外物所感者也。言師法之於人，得於外情，非天性所受，故性不足獨立而治，必在因外情而化之。

⁸⁰ See XZJJ 143: 所得乎積習，非受於天性，既非天性，則不可獨立而治，必在化之也。

as Hutton does, contrary to Knoblock, read *qing* and not *ji*. In other words, I agree with Hutton that the passage “makes sense without the emendations,” though not quite the sense he prefers. Hutton says: “The point is that one cannot alter the fundamental impulses constituting human nature (e.g., one cannot make it so that one has no desire for food when one is hungry . . . but the expression of these impulses can be ‘transformed’ in various ways so as to produce civilized and well-ordered behavior.” I see *qing* somewhat differently, not as a repertoire of “dispositions” that are transformed—I have difficulty grasping the distinction that Hutton draws between “alter” and “transform” as well as between his “impulses” and “dispositions”—but as feelings the experience of which discloses to a person inadequacies and excesses and hence the need to improve the self by finding a teacher and otherwise adopting the proper standards of behaviour.⁸¹

8.k 性也者，吾所不能為也，然而可化也。情也者，非吾所有也，然而可為也。
(XZJJ 143–44)

Human nature is something I cannot remake, but it can be transformed. The dispositions are something I do not have complete grasp of, but they can be remade. (Hutton 65.480–82)

“Inborn nature” is what it is impossible for me to create but which I can nonetheless transform. “Accumulated effort” consists in what I do not possess but can nonetheless create. (Knoblock II.81)

As in the previous passage, here, again in opposition to the argument of Wang Nian-sun and others, Hutton reads *qing* 情 and does not see the need to emend it to *ji* 積—a textual move on Hutton’s part with which I concur. In addition, Hutton understands *you* 有 as “have mastery of,” an interpretation he relates to his translation of the word as “embrace” when it occurs in chapter 5. Hutton elaborates on his translation in a footnote: “That is, one cannot simply choose whether to experience emotions like anger, sorrow, etc., but through training and habituation, one can alter one’s dispositions to feel them, so that one experiences them on the proper occasions, and does not experience them when they would be inappropriate.”⁸²

⁸¹ I discuss this conception of *qing* in several earlier studies which I list here not because I think they are the last word on the subject but because they are absent from Hutton’s bibliography and the “general reader” for whom Hutton has made his translation might find them useful: “Eros, Introversion, and the Beginnings of *Shijing* Commentary”; “A Passion for the Worthy,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 128, no. 4 (October–December 2008), pp. 709–21; and “Curing the Incurable,” *Early China* 35–36 (2012–2013), pp. 225–46.

⁸² Hutton, p. 65, n. 47.

Hutton's explanation of how emotions work is problematic. There is nothing in the text of the *Xunzi* that justifies a distinction between emotions as experience and one's disposition to feel them. And claiming that one could or should stop experiencing emotions under any circumstances short of death is contrary to the conception of them as preserved in the text. Yang Liang's commentary on the part of the line that defines *qing* is a better interpretation: "Feelings are not what one has [or exist] as part of heaven-given nature but one can create them when external things entice."⁸³ In other words, feelings do not exist as some static component of human nature but are created in reaction to things. In my comments on "Textual Note" 5.a, I find unconvincing and unsupported Hutton's reading of *you* 有. *Wie dort, so hier*. Hutton's "have mastery of" is a contrived rendering more or less forced on him by his odd understanding of the workings of emotions in the *Xunzi*. The same goes for his translating *wei* 為 as "remake" rather than simply "make" or "create."

Glosses on Chapter 9: *Wang zhi* 王制

9.a 分未定也，則有昭繆。(XZJJ 148)

If social divisions are not yet set, then take control of illuminating the proper bonds. (Hutton 68.6–7)

Although the distinctions between social classes have not yet been fixed, there will still be [such basic distinctions as] primary and secondary. (Knoblock II.94)

Yang Liang observes that 繆 is used here to write the word *mu*, usually written 穆, and that *zhao mu* thus refers to how by arranging the ancestral tablets of its senior members of a lineage on the left, or *zhao* 昭 (bright), side of the temple and arraying those of its junior members on the right, or *mu* 穆 (dark), side, a lineage made important hierarchical distinctions even before these became defined in the society at large. (This is the interpretation that informed Knoblock's translation though his "primary" and "secondary" is a bit far removed from the literal sense of *zhao* and *mu*.) Hutton rejects Yang Liang's explanation of this occurrence of *miu* 繆 and instead takes it "in its sense of a binding, i.e., social bonds." But elsewhere in the text of the *Xunzi*, *miu* means "wrap" or "twist," not "binding," let alone "social bonds," a metaphorical usage that seems to be Hutton's own invention. Moreover, there is in the "Da zhuan" 大傳 chapter of the *Liji* another occurrence of *zhao mu* written 昭繆 and there can be no doubt that it refers to the arrangement of the tablets in ancestral

⁸³ XZJJ 144: 言情非吾天性所有，然可以外物誘而為之。As with the earlier passage discussed in "Textual Note" 8.j, Yang Liang follows his explanation by noting the existence of a variant interpretation in which *qing* is written *ji* and providing an elaboration on that reading.

temples.⁸⁴ Hutton's unsupported reading of *zhao mu* may account for his equally mistaken rendering of *you* 有 as "take control of."⁸⁵ Or perhaps it is the other way round.

9.b 累多而功少。(XZJJ 155)

They may have accumulated much, but they will have accomplished little. (Hutton 72.162–63)

As involvements become more numerous, accomplishments decrease. (Knoblock II.99)

Hutton reasons that, "since the previous sentence contrasts apparent gains with actual losses, and this sentence is clearly meant to parallel that one," it is best to understand *lei* 累 as "accumulations" rather than "worries," which, he says, is the meaning preferred by anonymous "commentators."

The immediately preceding sentence reads: *Di lai er min qu* 地來而民去. (Lands are acquired but their populations flee.) Though Hutton's understanding of the present sentence is possible, I see no reason to insist that it follow a literal parallelism, especially as Hutton construes it. I prefer to read this sentence as a comment on the one that precedes it, describing the many troubles that were endured to acquire the land only to have the outcome diminished as the population fled. Yang Liang defines *lei* 累 as *you lei* 憂累, the meaning of which is in this context closer to "troubles" rather than "worries" or "anxieties." (Yang Liang's gloss is probably the source of Knoblock's "involvements." The editors of the *Xunzi xin zhu* define *lei*, perhaps a bit too narrowly, as *lao ku* 勞苦 [hard and bitter work].⁸⁶) Following this sentence, the text goes on to explain not apparent gain *versus* actual loss but how the *means* employed to gain territory were in the end self-defeating and led to lands being pared away.

9.c 析愿禁悍，而刑罰不過。(XZJJ 159)

He cuts off false shows of virtue and prohibits brutality, but his punishments and penalties are not excessive. (Hutton 73.239–74.241)

⁸⁴ See *Liji zhushu*, p. 1000: 旁治昆弟，合族以食，序以昭繆，別之以禮義，人道竭矣。(With respect to laterally governing older and younger brothers, when gathering the lineage for meals, set the sequence according to the *zhao mu* system and make distinctions among them using the rituals and rules of propriety—thus the needs of a humane society are fully met.)

⁸⁵ The phrase *you zhao mu* 有昭繆 (there exists the *zhao mu* system) occurs in the "Ji tong" 祭統 chapter of the *Liji*. See *Liji zhushu*, p. 1245.

⁸⁶ *Xunzi xin zhu*, p. 121, n. 4.

The cunningly shrewd are restrained and violent behavior is forbidden, but there is no excess in the application of rebukes and punishments. (Knoblock II.101)

Hutton's translation of the first two words in the line is based on the conjecture that *yuan* 愿 is a "shorthand" for *xiang yuan* 鄉愿, in contemporary sources often translated "hypocrite," a meaning that derives from an occurrence of *xiang yuan*, written 鄉原, in *Lunyu* 論語 17.13. There it refers to someone who has a reputation for being honest and sincere but only among the indiscriminate people in the lowly place from which he comes. His true character is quite the opposite and thus he gives a bad name to those who are genuine and true.⁸⁷ But *xiang yuan* does not occur in the *Xunzi*. Hutton's reason for thinking that *yuan* nevertheless serves as such a shorthand is flimsy: the *Xunzi* condemns in chapter 3 those who "steal a reputation" (*dao ming* 盜名) that they do not deserve.⁸⁸ But to make the connection with that passage one must in effect permit Hutton to insert the word *xiang* in the text since there is no evidence of *yuan* functioning as a shorthand for *xiang yuan* anywhere else in the *Xunzi* or, for that matter, in the corpus of literature transmitted from the age of the text. While I find Hutton's translation of the remainder of the line precise and elegant in its economy, we must put aside his rendering of its opening words.

That does not mean, however, that an alternative reading of the opening words is easily come by. Consider, for example, the struggle of Wang Niansun. In Wang's first attempt to make sense of them he argued that *xi yuan* 析愿 is a scribal error for *zhe bao* 折暴 (cut off violence) because the latter occurs in a parallel passage in the *Hanshi waizhuan*⁸⁹ and also because it forms a good semantic and grammatical match for *jin han* 禁悍 (prohibit brutality). Wang marshals a number of other sources in support of this seemingly happy solution, including similarly worded passages that occur later in this chapter (*zhu bao jin han* 誅暴禁悍) as well as in chapter 10 "Fu guo" 富國 (*jin bao sheng han* 禁暴勝悍).

Later, however, Wang disowned his earlier explanation saying that it was incorrectly based on the ready-to-hand meaning supplied by the *Hanshi waizhuan* parallel but in fact lacked a solid textual basis. Moreover, the passages in chapters 9 and 10 that he had earlier taken as support of his argument no longer seemed to Wang to contain wording that was sufficiently similar to the emendation he had initially suggested. As he put it, "We cannot on the basis of those passages change this one" (未可據彼以改此).⁹⁰ Instead, Wang proposed that *yuan* 愿 should be understood as the homophonous

⁸⁷ See *Lunyu zhushu* 論語注疏 (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 1999), p. 238.

⁸⁸ See *XZJJ* 52 and Hutton 22.225–27.

⁸⁹ *Kanshi gaiden sakuin*, p. 29, par. 3–4.

⁹⁰ For Wang Niansun's commentary see *XZJJ* 159–60. In this same commentary Wang also takes the opportunity to disown a similar emendation he had proposed for a subsequent chapter 9 passage, *bian ji jin han* 拏急禁悍 (for which see my gloss on "Textual Note" 9.e).

yuan 原, defined in the *Shuowen jiezi* as *xia* 黠 (wily, cunning), and that *xi* 析 should be understood as *zhe* 折 but in the sense of *zhi* 制 (restrain, control), a variant reading for an occurrence of *zhe* in the *Lunyu*.⁹¹ (Wang’s revised argument is the basis for Knoblock’s translation.) Such willingness to revisit and acknowledge faults in his earlier scholarship is emblematic of Wang Niansun’s rigorous methodology and one of the reasons his opinions are worth careful consideration.

9.d 修採清，易道路，謹盜賊，平室律，以時順修，使賓旅安而貨財通，治市之事也。(XZJJ 169–70)

The work of the Overseer of Cities is to cultivate cleanliness, to make the roads easy to pass, to watch out for robbers and murderers, to keep the prices of lodging fair, and to cultivate these tasks at the appropriate times, so that guests and travelers will be secure and goods and wealth will flow. (Hutton 78.422–26)

The duties of the *director of the marketplace* 治市 are to care for the disposal of dung and nightsoil, to keep the roads and highways in good repair, to repress bandits and highwaymen, to adjust the rules pertaining to hostelries, and to follow the appropriate season in his preparations so as to enable merchants to travel about in security and foods and products to circulate freely. (Knoblock II.107)

In this passage, one of a series that describes the duties of the various officers who serve at the court of a true king, Hutton is concerned with the meaning of the phrase *ping shi lü* 平室律. Hutton notes that, although the editors of the *Xunzi xinzhu* propose, on the basis of what they take to be a parallel passage in chapter 11 “Wang ba” 王霸, to emend text *shi* 室 to *zhi* 質, and thus take the phrase to mean something like “adjust the rules pertaining to the prices of commodities,” he bases his translation (as does Knoblock) on the text as it is without any changes.

9.e 抃急禁悍……司寇之事也。(XZJJ 170)

The work of the Director of Justice is to strike down false shows of virtue and prohibit brutality . . . (Hutton 78.426–27)

The duties of the *director of crime* 司寇 are to eliminate violent behavior and proscribe cruelty . . . (Knoblock II.107)

⁹¹ For *yuan* 原 see *Shuowen jiezi zhu, pian* 8A, p. 19b. For the occurrence of *zhe* 折, see *Lunyu* 12.12, *Lunyu zhushu*, p. 164. Wang Niansun credits the commentary of Zheng Xuan with the observation that, in *Lunyu* 12.12, *zhe* should be understood as *zhi* 制. It appears, however, that it originated with the *Jingdian shiwen* 經典釋文 of Lu Deming 陸德明 (c. 550–630). See *Shisan jing zhushu* 十三經注疏 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980), p. 2505, register 3: 《釋文》……魯讀折為制. (The *Shiwen* [says]: In the Lu [version of the *Lunyu*] *zhe* is read as *zhi*.)

Yang Liang notes that *bian* 抔 is a scribal error for *xi* 析 and *ji* 急 is a scribal error for *yuan* 愿. Hutton adopts Yang Liang's note with regard to *ji*; however, as in the passage discussed in my gloss on "Textual Note" 9.c above, 析愿禁悍, Hutton claims that *yuan* is a "shorthand" for *xiang yuan* 鄉愿—hence his "false shows of virtue"—an interpretation that lacks adequate textual support for reasons already stated in my analysis of 9.c. Wang Niansun had previously proposed that the *yuan* in this passage is an error for *bao* 暴 but he eventually came around to the view that Yang Liang's interpretation is the correct one. Wang points out that here, as in the earlier passage, *yuan* 愿 should be understood as the homophonous 原 (wily, cunning).⁹² (Knoblock adopted Wang's interpretation in his translation of the earlier passage but failed to note that Wang intended it to apply to this passage as well. Knoblock's translation of the present passage is based on taking *ji* as *bao*, the argument originally made by Wang Niansun but one he later disowned.)

The effect of Yang Liang's note on the present passage is to make it identical with the earlier one. Thus Hutton's decision to adopt Yang Liang's emendation of *ji* 急 but to leave in place *bian* 抔 is a questionable textual move. In any case *bian* is literally "slap, beat," meanings inappropriate in a context that has to do with the workings of legal institutions (which is perhaps why Hutton chose to translate the word as the somewhat ambiguous "strike down"). It is preferable to read *bian* as *xi* 析, as Yang Liang proposes, and to understand the latter as a scribal variant of *zhe* 折, which in this context means "restrain, control."

9.f 功名之所就，存亡安危之所墮，必將於愉殷赤心之所。(XZJJ 171)

What merit and reputation accrue to, and where survival and destruction, security and danger fall to, will surely be that wherein my joy and pain, my true heart, are located. (Hutton 80.471–73)

That one attains to merit and fame and conforms to the conditions required for survival and security must be advanced by the real intentions one harbors in one's heart in times of abundance and good fortune. (Knoblock II.108)

This sentence is among the most elegant in the *Xunzi* and Hutton's translation captures its rhythms and expressiveness in a way that makes Knoblock's rendering seem, in comparison, wooden and awkward. Yet I find that Hutton's decision to read *yin* 殷 as *yin* 愆 detracts from communicating the sentence's full meaning.⁹³ Hutton apparently thinks that the alliterative word pair *yu yin* 愉殷 describes the emotions of the true

⁹² See above, n. 91.

⁹³ Hutton has adopted an interpretation found in Wang Zhonglin 王忠林, *Xinyi Xunzi duben* 新譯荀子讀本 (Taipei: Sanmin shuju, 1972), p. 151, n. 146.

heart. But this sentence contrasts with the preceding one in which the argument is made that in extremely adverse circumstances, “when the world is threatened by violent states” (*tianxia xie yu baoguo* 天下脅於暴國), expedient policies and actions, no matter how wrong, will have no impact on one’s reputation and the effectiveness of one’s governance. The test comes in good times when one’s state is flourishing. It is then that one’s heart must be in the right place. Hao Yixing and others propose that we should understand *yu yin* as descriptive of such good times when one’s state is joyful and flourishing.⁹⁴ This is the basis for Knoblock’s translation of *yu yin*.

9.g 殷之日。(XZJJ 172)

On the day when one has things aright . . . (Hutton 80.477)

In days of plentitude [*sic*] . . . (Knoblock II.108)

Hutton says that *yin* 殷 should be understood to mean *dang* 當 but provides no basis for his doing so. It seems preferable to take *yin* to have the same meaning it has in the passage discussed above in my gloss on “Textual Note” 9.f.

A Gloss on Chapter 10: *Fu guo* 富國

10.a 掩地表畝。(XZJJ 183)

Irrigating the land and marking out plots . . . (Hutton 88.201–2)

The responsibility for examining the soil and marking off the acreage . . . (Knoblock II.127)

Because *yan* 掩 does not appear to make good sense in this context Hutton reads it as *yan* 淹. But the latter means “inundate,” not “irrigate” as Hutton would have it. Yang Liang says that the *yan* of the text means “to till the soil” (*geng* 耕) but Wang Yinzhì finds that an improbable meaning of the word. He prefers treating the graph as an error for *liao* 撩 which he says means “arrange, put in good order” (*li* 理). Knoblock, following Liu Shipèi,⁹⁵ takes *yan* as an error for *kui* 揆 which he understands to mean “survey” (*duo* 度) and otherwise measure the quality of the soil. None of these explanations is completely convincing.⁹⁶

⁹⁴ See XZJJ 171–72 and *Xunzi xinzhù*, p. 133, n. 6.

⁹⁵ Liu Shipèi’s opinion is quoted favourably by Liang Qixiong at *Xunzi jianshi*, p. 124.

⁹⁶ See Knoblock II.305, n. 57.

Glosses on Chapter 11: *Wang ba* 王霸

11.a 故國者，世所以新者也，是憚憚非變也。(XZJJ 208)⁹⁷

But the state is such that what it relies upon to support it is new with each generation. That way of doing things would be to reject change fearfully. (Hutton 102.145–47)

Thus, so far as the state is concerned, innovations introduced as one generation succeeds another are only a case of handing over authority from one to another. They are not radical transformations. (Knoblock II.153)

Though “most commentators and editors” find the occurrence of the graph problematic in this line, Hutton retains *dan* 憚 as written and translates the doublet as “fearfully.” He does this because he prefers “retaining the original reading” of the text—others might hesitate in using the term “original” to describe a reading found in the present-day text of the *Xunzi*—and also because, in an earlier passage in the chapter, not far removed from the present one, *dan* occurs uncontroversially in two closely similar sentences as a transitive verb that can be rendered “fear.”⁹⁸ Hutton’s reading of *dan dan* in the present text is unique as is his taking *fei* 非 not as a negative but as a verb he translates as “reject.”

Since I comprehend neither the meaning of Hutton’s translation of 是憚憚非變也 nor how he relates it to his translation of the remainder of the passage, I will mention a few of the alternative readings that others have proposed. Yang Liang reads *dan* as *tan* 坦 and understands the line in question to mean that, although the state is governed by a new ruler each generation, this happens in a calm and stable fashion and does not constitute a great transformation. Hao Yixing thinks Yang’s gloss possible but prefers reading *dan* as an error for *chan* 憚, noting that the doublet *chan chan* 憚憚 occurs in the *Shijing* where the Mao commentary defines it as descriptive of something old and worn-out. For Hao Yixing the doublet contrasts with *xin* 新 (new) and refers to how innovations occasioned by a new generation mean that, although some things may be old and shabby, they are renovated rather than exchanged for something else. Knoblock’s translation, “handing over authority from one to another,” is based on taking *dan dan* as a “graphic variant” of *shan shan* 禪禪, an interpretation he adopts from Liu Shipai and Zhong Tai.⁹⁹

⁹⁷ Punctuating the Chinese text so that it reflects Hutton’s translation. The punctuated XZJJ edition that I use throughout this review has a comma between 憚 and 非.

⁹⁸ See XZJJ 205.

⁹⁹ See Knoblock II.312, n. 29. Liu Shipai’s opinion is quoted by Liang Qixiong at *Xunzi jianshi*, p. 143.

11.b 心欲綦佚。(XZJJ 211)

... and their bodies desire the utmost in comfort. (Hutton 104.221–22)

... and his mind the fullest relaxation and repose. (Knoblock II.156)

Following Ikai Hikohiro, Hutton emends text *xin* 心 to *shen* 身 so that it is the body and not the heart that desires ease and comfort.¹⁰⁰ The change seems justified since later in the chapter the present passage is elaborated upon by a line that opens *xingtǐ hao yì* 形體好佚 (the body loves ease and comfort) and in that passage the heart is said to love *lì* 利 (profit), not ease.¹⁰¹

11.c 如是，則雖臧獲不肯與天子易執業。以是懸天下，一四海，何故必自為之？(XZJJ 213)

If things are like that, then even a lowly servant would not be willing to exchange places and tasks with the Son of Heaven. But if one is going to use such a lofty position to manage all under Heaven and unify the lands within the four seas, then for what reason must one do everything oneself? (Hutton 106.278–82)

In this circumstance even a slave would be unwilling to exchange places and responsibilities with the Son of Heaven. Thus, for what possible reason must a person rely on his own efforts as the means of “balancing the world” or of “unifying all within the Four Seas?” (Knoblock II.158)

Hutton suggests that the pronoun *shi* 是 (this) in the opening of the second sentence resumes the words *shi ye* 執業 in the previous line but, contrary to what he says, the “place and work” mentioned in the text refer not only to those of the Son of Heaven but also to those of the slave. It is preferable to understand *shi* as referring to the state of affairs in which a slave would be unwilling to swap the circumstances of his life for those of the Son of Heaven.

11.d 兩者竝行而國在。上偏而國安在。下偏而國危。(XZJJ 219)¹⁰²

When both types are present in equal measure, then the state will go on existing.

¹⁰⁰ For Ikai’s commentary see *Zengbu Xunzi jijie*, *juan* 7, p. 13.

¹⁰¹ See XZJJ 217. Each passage lists five agents that desire pleasure but the lists are slightly different. The earlier passage lists eyes, ears, mouth, nose, and heart; the later passage gives mouth, ears, eyes, body, and heart. The difference in the two lists suggests that the text of one or both has been corrupted.

¹⁰² Punctuating the text to reflect Hutton’s interpretation. The edition of the XZJJ referred to herein punctuates after the *an* 安 in the second phrase thus having the *zai* 在 that follows it begin the third phrase.

When the state inclines to the superior kinds, then it will exist and be secure. When it inclines to the inferior kinds, then it will be in danger. (Hutton 109.415–19)

Where the two series are combined equally, a country merely survives; where it is inclined toward the former series, the country will be secure and survive; where it is inclined toward the latter series, it will be endangered. (Knoblock II.162).

There is no disagreement between Hutton and Knoblock in terms of how they punctuate, parse, and understand the lines. Hutton’s rendering of *shang* 上 and *xia* 下 as “superior” and “inferior” seems more apt than Knoblock’s “former series” and “latter series.”

11.e 孔子曰：「審吾所以適人，適人之所以來我也。」(XZJJ 226)

Confucius said, “I am careful about how I go to meet people, because it creates a match in how people come to me.” (Hutton 114.630–32)

Confucius said:

Careful examination will show that my conduct toward others is why they are attracted to me. (Knoblock II.168)

Hutton’s solution to the problematic second occurrence of *shi* 適 in this saying is, he says, to treat it as a “causative verb”; that is, we should understand the line to mean that my treatment of others makes it so that their treatment of me is a match for how I treat them. While I would not rule out this inventive interpretation as a possibility, it still seems preferable to adopt the wording of the *Qunshu zhiyao* 羣書治要 quotation of the passage (for which see XZJJ 226) and delete the second *shi* altogether. However, Hutton is doubtlessly correct in his translation of the opening of the saying. It has to do with Confucius’s careful attention to his own behaviour and is not a rhetorical invitation that others examine him closely.

Glosses on Chapter 12: *Jun dao* 君道¹⁰³

12.a 狂生者不胥時而落。(XZJJ 235)

... and one who lives recklessly will not have to wait even a moment before getting burned. (Hutton 122.169–70)

What is born of sheer madness will not produce even a single instant of happiness. (Knoblock II.180)

¹⁰³ Because the Yang Liang commentary for this chapter is missing, it presents especially difficult challenges of interpretation.

Claiming to follow the lead of Wang Xianqian, Hutton emends text *luo* 落 to *luo* 爍. But Hutton has elided crucial details in Wang Xianqian's note. Wang Xianqian and others reject the reading of *luo* 落 given in the edition of Xie Yong 謝墉 (1719–1795) that adopted Lu Wenchao's collation and instead recognize as the correct reading the word *luo* 樂 found in an important Song dynasty edition. Wang Xianqian defines *luo* 樂 with a series of words that share in common meanings such as “burn” and “combust” because in his view such an understanding of *luo* 樂 fits best this passage in the *Xunzi*. Wang notes, in support of his exegesis, that *luo* 樂 is “the same graph” as *luo* 爍—i.e., both 樂 and 爍 were used to write the word *luo* (burn)—but at no point does he suggest that the text should be emended to read 爍.¹⁰⁴ While interpreting the 樂 of the Song dynasty edition thus remains an open question, the graph usually writes the word *le* (joy) and only in extremely rare circumstances—Wang Xianqian is only able to quote one—does it stand for a word meaning “burn.” My reading of the passage suggests that it is meant to underscore the irony that one who pursues pleasure, mindless of the circumstances, will not get to enjoy it. But note, however, that Hutton's “one who lives recklessly” is the correct translation of *kuangsheng zhe* 狂生者; Knoblock's rendering is a mishandling of the grammar of the phrase.

12.b 今人主有六患……(XZJJ 240)

Now there are the following great errors that the ruler of men may make . . . (Hutton 126.338–39)

The rulers of today make calamitously great blunders. (Knoblock II.185)

Because the text mentions only three calamitous mistakes rather than six, Yu Yue proposes that *liu* 六 is a scribal error for *da* 大. Knoblock and Hutton adopt this emendation.

12.c 則夫人行年七十有二，鬮然而齒墮矣。(XZJJ 243)

But that man had passed seventy-two years, and he was bald and his teeth had fallen out. (Hutton 129.440–41)

. . . a man of 72 with teeth so ravaged that he appeared to be toothless. (Knoblock II.188)

Lu Wenchao proposes that 鬮 be emended to 鬮 because it is identical with 鬮, the word that appears in the *Hanshi waizhuan* passage that parallels this part of the *Xunzi* chapter.¹⁰⁵ Hao Yixing recommends that we simply adopt the *Hanshi waizhuan* version

¹⁰⁴ For the text of Wang Xianqian's note, see XZJJ 235.

¹⁰⁵ See *Kanshi gaiden sakuin*, p. 54, par. 4–15.

of the text. The three graphs appear to have been used interchangeably (though perhaps mistakenly) to write the word now pronounced *yun*, which means “toothless.” There appears to be a rough consensus that, of the three, 齠 is preferable.¹⁰⁶ Concluding that it would be redundant within a single phrase to describe someone as both “toothless” and “with teeth falling out”—others have not seen it as redundant—Hutton emends the text so that *yun* is replaced by a word that means “bald.” Hutton does not reveal what that word is, choosing merely to disclose that he is relying upon “Long Yuchun (1987).” But when we turn to Long’s note on the passage we find that he is not proposing that the text be emended. Long’s intent is, in fact, to illustrate the point that since the three graphs discussed above were used interchangeably there is no need to emend 齠 in the ways that Lu Wenchao and Hao Yixing propose.¹⁰⁷

12.d 不還秩，不反君，然而應薄扞患，足以持社稷。(XZJJ 244–45)

They must not circumvent protocols or act confrontationally toward other lords, but nevertheless their response to derogatory treatment and their defense against troubles must suffice to uphold the state’s altars of soil and grain. (Hutton 131.514–18)

. . . when they neither revert to private interests nor turn against their lord. By resisting the pressures brought against them and guarding against calamitous blunders, they are capable of maintaining his altars of soil and grain. (Knoblock II.190)

Correctly emphasizing—as Knoblock fails to do—that the phrases that precede the conjunction *raner* 然而 (“this is so and yet,” “although . . . nevertheless,” or “but nevertheless”) should contrast in meaning with what follows, Hutton argues that the *zhi* 秩 and *jun* 君 of these phrases refer, respectively, to the “protocols” (according to Hutton) and ruler of a foreign state the emissary—who is the subject of these phrases—is visiting. Part of what underlies Hutton’s understanding of the two terms is his acceptance of an argument by Li Disheng 李滌生 that Wang Niansun is mistaken in regarding *zhi* as a scribal error for *si* 私. And indeed it does seem that Wang Niansun’s interpretation would yield an overall meaning in which there is no contrast between what comes before *raner* and what follows the conjunction. In connection

¹⁰⁶ See *Xunzi xinzhu*, p. 206, n. 18.

¹⁰⁷ Long Yuchun’s commentary on this passage, part of his “Xunzi jijie buzheng,” is at *Xunzi lunji*, p. 147. The source of Hutton’s confusion is that, for the purpose of illustrating that the graphs in question were interchangeable, Long referred to a parallel set of interchangeable graphs that involved the 頁 radical rather than the 齒 radical, but with the same three phonetic elements, i.e., 困, 困, and 軍. One of them, *kun* 頤, is defined by the *Shuowen jiezi* as *wu fa* 無髮 (hairless). See *Shuowen jiezi zhu, pian* 9A, pp. 11b–12a. Long does not, however, say that it should be substituted for the 齠 of the *Xunzi* text.

with these interpretations Hutton takes both *huan* 還 and *fan* 反 to mean “oppose”—though in a leap of meaning unsupported by evidence he translates the first as “circumvent” and the other as “act confrontationally.”

But his proper emphasis on *raner* does not make Hutton’s interpretation of the remainder of the passage as inevitable as he seems to think. The glosses provided by the editors of the *Xunzi xinzhū* yield a perfectly acceptable alternative translation: “Although he may neither completely fulfill his mission nor return to the side of his ruler, his dealing with coercion and preventing troubles are sufficient to maintain the altars to the soil and grain.”¹⁰⁸

Glosses on Chapter 13: *Chen dao* 臣道

13.a 因其喜也而入其道。(XZJJ 253)

Take advantage of his joyful moods to rein in his ways. (Hutton 137.145–46)

... depend on his pleasures to gain entrance for the Way ... (Knoblock II.201)

Because the paragraph advises a minister on how to deal with and improve the behaviour of a violent ruler, and because elsewhere in the paragraph *qi* 其 is the possessive pronoun that refers to this ruler, Hutton insists that the second *qi* in this passage must also refer to the ruler and hence the *dao* 道 (Way) cannot refer to a proper and moral path but rather to the immoral practices that have marked the behaviour of the violent ruler. This interpretation forces Hutton to read *ru* 入 as a transitive verb meaning “rein in,” a usage that Hutton claims is “roughly the same as [*na*] 納, like the use of [*na*] 內 in the previous paragraph.” Hutton is alluding to *shi guan na zhi* 時關內之, an especially elliptical and difficult to understand line.¹⁰⁹

While *ru* and *na* are cognates, it is not at all obvious that *ru* in the present passage equals the *na* 內 of the earlier one to which Hutton refers; nor, in any case, does it seem that that *na* 內 means “rein in”—Hutton himself translates it as “win him over” while others suggest it means something like “get him to accept [one’s influence or advice].” Moreover, while the regular and rhythmic repetition of the possessive *qi* is a pattern meant to emphasize a close link between the sentences in which it occurs, that does not necessarily mean that the referent of the pronoun must be the same in every instance of its occurrence. In the line that immediately precedes the one in question, there is another occurrence of *qi* that is at the very least ambiguous in its referent. The text reads: 因其憂也而辨其故, which I suggest should

¹⁰⁸ See *Xunzi xinzhū*, p. 208, n. 11: 不完成任務不回到君主身邊……應付緊迫的事，抵禦患難……

¹⁰⁹ The passage is found at XZJJ 252. For its interpretation see *Xunzi xinzhū*, pp. 216–17, n. 3.

be translated, “Take advantage of his anxieties to analyse for him their cause”¹¹⁰ Following consistently his view of how parallelism functions in the *Xunzi*, but without providing any additional explanation, Hutton translates this line “Take advantage of his worried moods to scrutinize his habits.”

By taking the first *qi* in the line to refer to the violence-prone ruler but the second to refer to the minister faced with the unenviable task of having to influence him for the better, there is an alternative translation: “Take advantage of his moments of joy to get him to accept your Way.”

13.b 不論曲直。(XZJJ 257)

Straight or bent he does not weigh. (Hutton 140.256)

. . . not examining matters in terms of their crookedness or straightness . . . (Knoblock II.204)

Following Long Yuchun, Hutton emends *zhi* 直 to *zheng* 正 because the latter forms an end-rhyme with other words in the passage.¹¹¹

Glosses on Chapter 14: *Zhi shi* 致士

14.a 聞聽而明譽之。(XZJJ 259)

He listens to what he hears and with understanding decides its proper class. (Hutton 141.11–12)

He listens broadly and examines into things with intelligence . . . (Knoblock II.206)

Hutton credits Wang Niansun’s commentary to a passage in chapter 8 for his understanding that “[*Yu*] 譽 is equivalent to [*yu*] 與, which means [*lei*] 類.” If Wang Niansun had intended his emendation to apply as well to the present chapter he would have mentioned it. In any case, contrary to what Hutton seems to imply, in his commentary to the chapter 8 passage, Wang only claims that *yu* 譽 and *yu* 與 are interchangeable and does not define the latter as *lei* (class, category)—that is Hutton’s innovation and it seems here and more generally to be an unsupported

¹¹⁰ See XZJJ 253. In his commentary to this line Wang Niansun proposes that *bian* 辨 be understood as *bian* 變. If this proposal were adopted the line would read: “Take advantage of his anxieties to alter [i.e., eliminate] their cause.”

¹¹¹ See Long Yuchun, “Xian Qin sanwen zhong de yunwen” 先秦散文中的韻文, in idem, *Sizhu xuan xiaoxue lunji* 絲竹軒小學論集 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2009), p. 254.

definition.¹¹² As for the present passage, Liu Shipai and others propose that *yu* 譽 is an error for 警, a form of the graph 察 that writes *cha* (investigate).¹¹³ This is the basis for Knoblock's translation of the line's conclusion. However, I take Hutton's "He listens to what he hears . . ." to mean "He listens closely and carefully," an interpretation of the line's opening preferable to Knoblock's unexplained "He listens broadly . . ."

14.b and 14.c 定其當而當，然後士其刑賞而還與之。(XZJJ 259)

When he has determined what is appropriate and an appropriate case occurs, only then does he employ punishments and rewards to repay it in kind. (Hutton 141.12–14)

. . . determining wherein they are correct and wherein they are incorrect, and only then does he order punishments and rewards to be promptly distributed. (Knoblock II.206)

Hutton notes—correctly in my view—that *dang* 當 (proper, appropriate) makes sense as it is and thus it is unnecessary to adopt Wang Yinzhi's suggestion that we understand it to be synonymous with *shi* 實 (truth, actuality). However, in his commentary, Yang Liang used the wording *ding qi dang fou* 定其當否 which strongly suggests that the text he was annotating had *bu* 不 instead of the *er* 而 of the received text. If this reading is correct then we should translate the phrase, "When he has determined whether something is appropriate or not . . ." Hutton also notes that "commentators" (Wang Yinzhi for example) want to substitute other graphs for *shi* 士 which again he sees as unnecessary since the word can be read "as a verb, 'treat as one's [*shi*] 士,' i.e., employ." I find this an odd claim. The use of *shi* 士 as a verb is usually written 仕 and means "serve in a position" or "use one's abilities" in doing so. To interpret *shi* 士 to mean employ rewards and punishments as one would, say, tools or implements seems a doubtful explanation of the word. If this is our only option to explain its occurrence in this passage, I would prefer to adopt one of the proposals to emend the text.

Glosses on Chapter 15: *Yi bing* 議兵

15.a 仁人上下，百將一心，三軍同力。(XZJJ 267)

And so, when a *ren* person is in charge of those below, the hundred generals share one heart, and the three armies merge their strengths. (Hutton 146.42–44)

¹¹² For Wang Niansun's commentary to the chapter 8 passage see XZJJ 128–29. In that commentary Wang makes clear that he understands *yu* 與 to mean something like "associate" or "collaborator."

¹¹³ See *Xunzi xinzhū*, p. 223, n. 7, and Knoblock II.328, n. 6.

In the relations between superior and subordinate under the rule of a humane man, the hundred generals

will be of one mind and the three armies will make a common effort. (Knoblock II.220)

Understanding the grammar of the first of this passage's three phrases to parallel that of the other two, Hutton takes *shang xia* 上下 to be "a verb-object structure." There are a few problems with this interpretation that should give one pause. First, in all of the twenty-four other occurrences of *shang xia* in the *Xunzi*, the two-word phrase means "those above and those below." Moreover, even if one by some wild stretch were to take *shang* as a transitive verb, it would then mean "to elevate, to put on top." Understanding the two words as "to be superior over those below," as Hutton renders them in his "Textual Note," is not to take *shang* as a transitive verb but as an intransitive verb, i.e, to be in a superior position vis-à-vis those below, in which case *xia* is not the object of the verb but rather its complement. One should conclude from this that there is no grammatical parallelism among all three of the phrases.

15.b 齊人隆技擊，其技也，得一首者，則賜贖鎰金。(XZJJ 271)

The men atop Qi exalt hand-to-hand fighting. In hand-to-hand encounters, he who obtains an enemy head is given as recompense gold in the amount of one *zi*. (Hutton 149.132–34)

The men of Qi stress skill in hand-to-hand combat. Such is their skill that when a man takes the head of an enemy, it is redeemed by a bounty of eight ounces of gold . . . (Knoblock II.222)

Wang Tianhai changes this and two other occurrences of *ji* 技 in this paragraph to *pu* 技. He also changes the word in the commentary of Yang Liang. Though Wang provides no proof of any sort in support of his radical excision of *ji* from the received text,¹¹⁴ Hutton nevertheless adopts Wang's textual changes in his translation. (Hutton understands Wang to say that *pu* is attested "in multiple editions of the text," but what Wang actually says is that "the many other editions and the commentaries that write *ji* are wrong."¹¹⁵) Since Wang cites *Zhengzi tong* 正字通 stating that *pu* 技 is a "vulgar form" of *pu* 支 and notes that it is equivalent to *pu* 扑 (beat, strike), Hutton translates *pu* as "hand-to-hand."

Reading *pu* 支 in place of *ji* 技 is problematic. The *ji* 擊 that follows already suggests hand-to-hand fighting. Also, the second occurrence of *pu* 技 (in Wang's version of the text) forces Hutton to add "encounters" in his English translation though there

¹¹⁴ See Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 611, n. 16.

¹¹⁵ Wang's exact wording is: 別本正文及注多誤作「技」，非也。He does not elaborate.

is nothing in the Chinese text to justify the addition. Finally, in a commentary to a *Hanshu* 漢書 quotation of the passage mentioned by Knoblock, Meng Kang 孟康 (fl. third century C.E.) elaborates on the meaning of *ji ji* 技擊, saying among other things that it involved ingenious fighting techniques using the hands and the feet as well as employing various military machines. This very much suggests that we should retain the original reading of *ji* (skillful, clever).¹¹⁶

15.c 改造則不易周也。(XZJJ 273)

Even when these soldiers are rotated out of service, no alterations are made to what they were given. (Hutton 149.152–54)

And if one were to start anew and train and perfect other soldiers, this could not easily be carried through. (Knoblock II.223)

It almost seems that Hutton and Knoblock are not translating the same text. Knoblock's rendering is based on the definitions of *gai zao* 改造, *bu yi* 不易, and *zhou* 周 given in the *Xunzi xinzhū*.¹¹⁷ Hutton does not mention his source for his rendering of *gai zao* but acknowledges Zhang Jue and Wang Tianhai in reading *zhou* 周 as *zhou* 賙 and for his understanding of *yi*.¹¹⁸ It should be noted that *zhou* 賙 means “alms” or “to give something as a form of charity” and so does not seem an appropriate verb for describing the rewards given by a state to its soldiers.

15.d 有遇之者，若以焦熬投石焉。(XZJJ 274)

If the former were to try to stand against the latter, the result would be the same as if one took something that had been burned to a crisp and threw a rock against it. (Hutton 150.179–80)

Anyone who tried to meet them in battle would end up “scorched and roasted” or “thrown against a stone.” (Knoblock II.223)

The point of Hutton's “Textual Note” with regard to this passage is that the occurrence of the *yan* 焉 at the end distinguishes the grammar of 若以焦熬投石焉 from that of 以卵投石 (to throw an egg against a rock). Thus he does not in his translation treat *yi* 以 as a co-verb that preposes the object of *tou* 投 (throw) but rather as a verb in its own right meaning “take.” Its object *jiao ao* 焦熬 is, in Hutton's interpretation, then resumed by *yan* which he renders “against it.”

¹¹⁶ For the passage and Meng Kang's commentary, see *Hanshu* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1962), p. 1085 and p. 1087, n. 6.

¹¹⁷ See *Xunzi xinzhū*, p. 236, n. 14.

¹¹⁸ See Zhang Jue, *Xunzi yizhu*, p. 201, n. 17, and Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 613, n. 28.

But Hutton has perhaps misconstrued the grammar of the line. It is possible that *yan* here is the equivalent of *ran* 然 in the grammatical pattern 若 X 然 (“It is like X” or “It is like the sort of thing that X is”), a pattern that occurs in the *Xunzi* and other early sources.¹¹⁹ This suggests interpreting the line as Yang Liang does: “It resembles tossing an object burnt to a crisp against a rock.”¹²⁰ Knoblock’s translation follows a separate line of interpretation in which the passage is seen to consist of two separate metaphorical images, one having to do with burning and the other with throwing.¹²¹ None of these solutions is completely satisfactory.

15.e 諸侯有能微妙之以節，則作而兼殆之耳。(XZJJ 274)

If among the feudal lords there were one who was able to refine these soldiers so as to make them regulated, then when he went into action he would indeed make them even more dangerous. (Hutton 150.187–89)

If one of the feudal lords had the capacity to grasp the subtle and mysterious essence of it through true discipline, then he would become ascendant and threaten the others.” (Knoblock II.224)

Hutton understands both occurrences of *zhi* 之 in this passage as the object pronoun the referent of which in both cases, he says, is soldiers. Hutton is careful to point out that this reading causes him to understand *dai* 殆 not as “endanger” but as a causative verb meaning “make dangerous.” (Hutton refers to a *Hanfeizi* passage in which *dai* occurs as an adjective, a usage that he believes permits him to take the word as a causative verb here.) But equally odd—and problematic—in this context are Hutton’s interpretations of *weimiao* 微妙 and *zuo* 作 as well as his neglect of the adverb *jian* 兼. He has nothing to say about these.

I see no reason to take the first occurrence of *zhi* as the object pronoun. In my view it serves to mark or emphasize that *weimiao* (extremely refined and subtle) adverbially modifies the verb phrase *yi jie* 以節 (to use the regulating principles). (Yang Liang says that the “regulating principles” refer to *ren yi* 仁義 [humaneness and morality]; others say they are the *li yi* 禮義 [rites and morality].) It is unclear how Knoblock arrives at “grasp the subtle and mysterious essence of it.” An alternative translation: “If one among the feudal lords were able with the utmost refinement and subtlety to use the regulating principles, then he would rise up and endanger all the others.”¹²²

¹¹⁹ For this pattern in the text of the *Xunzi*, see XZJJ 73, 241, and 283.

¹²⁰ XZJJ 274: 猶以焦熬之物投石也。

¹²¹ See for example the commentary of Yu Yue quoted at XZJJ 274.

¹²² Yang Liang notes that another way of saying *qi er jian wei ci shu guo* 起而兼危此數國 (rise up and endanger all the other states) is *qin mie zhi* 擒滅之 (seize and annihilate them).

15.f 犇命者不獲。(XZJJ 278)

Those who flee over to one's side to offer their lives before the battle are not to be taken as prisoners. (Hutton 154.315–17)

... nor are those who flee for their lives made prisoners. (Knoblock II.227)

For the meaning of *benming zhe* 犇命者, Hutton adopts the interpretation of Kubo Ai 久保愛 (1759–1832).¹²³ Kubo Ai's understanding was no doubt based on Yang Liang's commentary in which the Tang scholar says that *benming* means *guiming* 歸命 (“offer one's loyalty to,” “entrust oneself to”). Knoblock's reading does not make good sense.

15.g 以故順刃者生，蘇刃者死，犇命者貢。(XZJJ 278)

For this reason, those who yield to one's blade will live. Those who take on one's blade will die. Those who flee over to one's side to offer their lives before the battle will join one's camp. (Hutton 154.321–23)

For this reason, those who are obedient to the blade live, those who resist the blade die, and those who flee for their lives are treated as precious tribute. (Knoblock II.227)

In this note Hutton's sole focus is on the word *gong* 貢. Unhappy with definitions suggested by the “commentators,” Hutton searched through a recent dictionary to find an odd occurrence of the word in a classical passage in which it is defined as *jinru* 進入 (enter into), a meaning which in his translation he twists into “join one's camp.” As translation methodologies go, one cannot get much looser than this: (1) in dealing with a word one finds difficult, dismiss the opinions of other authorities without stating a specific reason for doing so; (2) locate an unusual occurrence in a context unrelated to the immediate one; (3) accept uncritically the definition given there; and then (4) change that definition to have it fit a preconceived notion of what the original context is about.

Although Hutton may have found them “unsatisfying,” Yang Liang's explanation that *gong* means *xian* 獻 (offer up) is perfectly serviceable though I find preferable the explanation of Tao Hongqing 陶鴻慶 (1859–1918) that *gong*, originally written 贛, should be understood to mean *ciyu* 賜予 (grant or confer favours upon).¹²⁴ If, as Hutton claims, the phrase in question is illustrated by the immediately following

¹²³ See Kubo Ai's commentary in his *Junshi zōchū* 荀子增注 (Kyoto: Suigyokudō, 1796), *juan* 10, p. 12b, and in *Zengbu Xunzi jijie*, *juan* 10, p. 18.

¹²⁴ For Tao Hongqing's commentary, see Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, pp. 624–25, n. 35.

example—in which Weizi Qi 微子啟,¹²⁵ a relative of the Shang king, was rewarded with a fief by the Zhou after he fled the Shang and joined forces with the conquering Zhou army—then it appears clear that Tao’s reading is best. (Knoblock’s English rendering was apparently influenced by Yang Liang and the editors of the *Xunzi xinzhu*, but does not yield a good parallel with the preceding phrases.) An alternative translation: “For this reason, those [among the enemy] who submit to the blade live, who confront the blade die, and who pledge themselves to us are rewarded.”

15.h 兵格不擊。(XZJJ 279)

He will not attack military forces that are boxed in. (Hutton 155.339–40)

... where the soldiers offer resistance, no attack is made. (Knoblock II.227)

Hutton characterizes his understanding of *ge* 格 as “blocked” as going against the tide of received opinion—yes, the “commentators” that take the word to mean here, as elsewhere, “resist.” Hutton’s rendering is not only a bit eccentric it is also not consonant with the context. The passages that surround this one describe how the true king, who chastises the wicked but does not wage war, will hesitate to attack when the enemy has fortified its cities and otherwise shown military ardour and a unity of purpose that links leaders and their fighting men. Thus it would be odd in this phrase to describe the enemy army as “blocked” from fleeing rather than prepared to “resist” an attack.

15.i 故亂者樂其政，不安其上，欲其至也。(XZJJ 279)

And so, the people of chaotic states take joy when he launches war, because they are not at ease with their own superiors, and instead desire his arrival. (Hutton 155.344–46)

Thus, those who live in anarchy rejoice in his government and those discontent with their own ruler desire that he should come. (Knoblock II.227)

Following the lead of Hoashi Banri 帆足萬里 (1778–1852) and Wang Tianhai,¹²⁶ Hutton emends *zheng* 政 to *zheng* 征. Yang Liang’s brief commentary on the line also appears to support this emendation. (Knoblock’s translation misconstrues the syntax of the second and third phrases.)

¹²⁵ Weizi’s name is given as Kai 開 in the text in avoidance of the taboo name of Han dynasty Emperor Jing 景帝.

¹²⁶ For their comments, see Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, pp. 626–27, n. 48.

15.j 然而國晏然不畏外而明內者……(XZJJ 284)

Nevertheless, the state was calm, not fearing those outside its borders, and instead enlightening those within its borders . . . (Hutton 158.449–51)

Despite this, the state was tranquil, not fearing outside aggression, feeling secure in its position. (Knoblock II.230)

Yang Liang notes that *nei* 內 is an error for *gu* 固 and quotes a parallel passage in the *Shiji* 史記 in support of this. Wang Niansun proposes that the reading in the *Shiji* parallel, which also does not have the *ming* 明 of the *Xunzi* text, is correct.¹²⁷ This is the source of Knoblock's translation. Hutton, however, following the lead of Tsukada Tora 冢田虎 (1745–1832), disregards the *Shiji* parallel and bases his translation on the unemended version of the *Xunzi*.¹²⁸

15.k 為人主上者也，其所以接下之百姓者，無禮義忠信，焉慮率用賞慶、刑罰、執詐，除隄其下，獲其功用而已矣。(XZJJ 285)

In serving as people's ruler and superior, if the way that one treats the common people below is lacking in ritual, *yi*, loyalty and trustworthiness, how can one think simply to make thoroughgoing use of rewards, prizes, punishments, penalties, circumstantial conditions, and deception to control one's subordinates, subject them to austerity, and reap accomplishments and results from them? (Hutton 159. 473–79)

If a ruler or a superior does not deal with his people and with the Hundred Clans according to the dictates of ritual and moral principles and does not show them loyalty or good faith, but rather thinks only of using rewards and commendations, or of punishments and penalties, or authority and dissimulation that oppress and place difficulties on his subordinates, then he can demand more accomplishments and more services from them, but he can expect nothing more. (Knoblock. II.231)

Hutton notes only that he takes the passage as a question rather than a declarative statement and that rather than emend *chu* 除 to *xian* 險 as the “commentators” do, he understands it to mean *xiuzhi* 修治, which he translates as “control.” However, read this way, *chu* does not mean “control” but rather “mend or repair something that has been damaged.” (Thus reading *chu* as a scribal error for *xian*, as indicated by Yang Liang's paraphrase and formally proposed by Wang Niansun, still makes the best sense of the text.)

¹²⁷ *Shiji* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1962), p. 1166: 然而國晏然不畏外而固者。

¹²⁸ For Tsukada's note and other arguments in support of Hutton's reading, see Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 635, n. 44.

I leave it to other readers to determine whether rendering the passage as a question provides greater rhetorical clarity. I note simply that it is doubtful that we should understand in this context *lū* 慮 as a verb meaning “think.” This definition, proposed by Kubo Ai, is adopted by both Knoblock and Hutton. Yang Liang, Wang Niansun, and others regard it as an adverbial expression—for which they give various, roughly synonymous, glosses such as *dafan* 大凡 (in most cases, generally), *daduo* 大多 (mostly), and *dadi* 大抵 (on the whole, in the main)¹²⁹—that, together with *shuai* 率 (as a rule, uniformly), modifies the long sentence’s main verb *yong* 用 (use, apply). I suggest that, given their similarity of meaning, *lū* 慮 and *shuai* 率 could be read together in this context as a synonym binom.

An alternative translation: “A ruler or superior who, in treating the common people below, lacks ritual, moral principles, loyalty, and good faith, but instead uniformly uses rewards, prizes, punishments, penalties, authority, and deception to intimidate those below, is doing nothing more than grabbing from them the beneficial results of their labours.”

15.1 得之則凝，兼并無強。(XZJJ 290)

When one obtains it, then one will consolidate one’s grip on that as well, and one’s capture and taking over of lands will have no boundaries. (Hutton 162.594–96)

If one obtains territory and then consolidates a hold over it and annexes further territories, there will be no limit. (Knoblock II.234)

Both Knoblock and Hutton read *qiang* 強 (also written 疆) as *jiang* 疆 (border, limit). (Hutton cites as his source the commentary of Tsukada Tora.) However, Liu Shippei maintained that the text should be read as it is.¹³⁰ This would yield the following alternative translation: “There is no stronger way to appropriate and annex territory than to get it and then consolidate one’s grip on it.”

Glosses on Chapter 16: *Qiang guo* 疆國

16.a 執拘則最，得閒則散，敵中則奪……(XZJJ 292–93)

If they are held in check, then they will join together, but if they get an opening, then they will scatter. If they become enemies of those in central positions, then they will create upheaval. (Hutton 164.46–49)

¹²⁹ For the commentaries of Yang Liang, Kubo Ai, and the others, see XZJJ 285; *Xunzi xinzhū*, p. 247, n. 3; and Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 639, n. 3.

¹³⁰ For Tsukada’s note and Liu Shippei’s commentary, see Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 644, n. 41.

. . . as long as they are held by force, they will assemble, but whenever they find a weak point, they will scatter; and whenever enemies are in the vicinity, they will abscond. (Knoblock II.240)

The larger context of this passage is a description of how the *baixing* 百姓—consistently translated by Knoblock as “the Hundred Clans” and by Hutton as “the common people”—behave when they live under a regime whose power derives from its harsh practices and stringent policies. Hutton’s rendering of *di zhōng* 敵中 (“become enemies of those in central positions”) is questionable. There is no need, as Hutton claims, to take the phrase this way in order to maintain a grammatical parallel between it and the *de jian* 得間 of the preceding phrase because no such parallel exists with the *zhi ju* 執拘 of the phrase before that. Moreover, in the language of the *Xunzi*, *di* is not used to mean animosity between subjects and their superiors, as Hutton would have it, but rather describes foreign antagonists. I agree with Hutton that taking *di zhōng* as “enemies in the vicinity” or “enemies in one’s midst” are unhappy renderings of the phrase. It therefore seems that, if we are to understand *di* as “enemy,” then Yang Liang’s alternative reading in which he reads 中 as *zhòng* (strike, attack) is the best way forward.¹³¹ Hutton’s main focus in this note is *duo* 奪 to which he assigns the unusual meaning of “create upheaval.” But such a reading, already problematic in the present context, seems unsustainable if *di zhōng* does not mean what Hutton wants it to mean. An alternative rendering: “. . . when they are held tightly in check they will group closely together, but when they find an opening they will disperse, or when an enemy strikes they will be snatched away.”

16.b 如是，下比周賁潰以離上矣。(XZJJ 293)

When things are like this, then those below will definitely conspire together secretly and move in a surge to abandon their superior. (Hutton 164.59–61)

In such a situation, subjects become partisans, and intimates are filled with dissatisfaction and violent turbulence through alienation from their superiors. (Knoblock II.240)

It is difficult to determine whether we should take *ben* 賁 to mean “filled with dissatisfaction” as Knoblock, adopting Yang Liang’s interpretation, does or take it to mean “surge” as does Hutton, following Ikai Hikohiro. The first involves reading

¹³¹ XZJJ 293: 一曰：中，擊也，丁仲反。The 丁仲反 here is equivalent to the 陟仲切 in the *Guangyun* 廣韻. Yu Yue, Wang Tianhai, and others have argued that *di* in this context does not mean “enemy.” But it is difficult to determine what overall meaning for the passage would result from their interpretations. See XZJJ 293 and Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 651, n. 22.

ben as *fen* 憤 and the second takes *ben* to be *pen* 瀆.¹³² The text may not have distinguished between the psychology of the people—their anger and indignation—and how they acted. No matter which aspect one chooses to emphasize, it seems best to understand *ben kui* 賁瀆 as a pair of synonyms that together describe swelling emotions and/or surging movements.¹³³ As for the remainder of the line, Hutton’s accounting for *yi li shang* 以離上 is preferable to Knoblock’s.

16.c 夫尚賢使能，賞有功，罰有罪，非獨一人為之也。(XZJJ 294)

In honoring the worthy and employing the capable, when one rewards those who have meritorious accomplishments and punishes those who are guilty of crimes, it is not because the person acted so alone. (Hutton 165.86–89)

Indeed “to honor the worthy and employ the able” and “to reward where there is achievement and punish where there is fault” are not the idiosyncratic views of a single individual. (Knoblock II.241)

The translation by Hutton of *fei du yiren wei zhi ye* 非獨一人為之也 as “. . . it is not because the person acted so alone” is not only at odds with received opinion, as he himself readily acknowledges, but also with the context in which the phrase occurs. The point of the larger passage is not to reject Zi Fa’s 子發 “narrow conception of merit,” as Hutton reads it. The point is that, because reward and punishment are not the unique practices of a single individual but rather “the way of the former kings” (*xianwang zhi dao* 先王之道) and “the foundation for unifying the people” (*yi ren zhi ben* 一人之本), one should not resist them because of a stubbornly held view of what constitutes merit. An alternative translation: “As for elevating the worthy and employing the capable, rewarding accomplishments and penalizing crimes—these were not uniquely put into practice by a lone individual.”

16.d 今秦南乃有沙羨與俱，是乃江南也。(XZJJ 301)

Nowadays in the case of Qin, to the south it has Shayi to serve as its shared border—this amounts to possessing the area south of the Yangtze River. (Hutton 169.255–57)

Today Qin to the south possesses Shaxian 沙羨 with all the lands in between, including even the area south of the Yangtze. (Knoblock II.245)

¹³² For the commentaries of Yang Liang and Ikai Hikohiro see XZJJ 293 and *Zengbu Xunzi jijie*, *juan* 11, p. 4.

¹³³ Yang Liang says that *kui* 瀆 refers to *min tao qi shang* 民逃其上 (the people fleeing their superiors). Knoblock ignores this and translates *kui* as “violent turbulence.” Hutton credits Ikai with how he reads *ben kui* but in fact Ikai has no note on *kui*.

Following Jin Zhuo 晉灼, Lu Wenchao says that 沙羨 is to be pronounced Shayi not Shaxian. As Yang Liang notes, the “Geography Treatise” in the *Hanshu* 漢書 identifies Shayi as part of Jiangxia commandery 江夏郡.¹³⁴ Wang Xianqian says that it was located to the southwest of what was in his day (i.e., the late nineteenth century) known as Jiangxia county. This corresponded roughly to the area of the modern-day Wuhan districts of Hongshan 洪山 and Jiangxia on the south bank of the Yangzi. Wang Tianhai takes *yu ju* 與俱 to describe how Shayi, previously part of the state of Chu, had come (by the time the *Xunzi* passage was composed) to be joined with the state of Qin so that it “formed a common border” between Chu and Qin. This is the basis for Hutton’s translation.¹³⁵ There is, however, nothing in the expression *yu ju* that suggests the meaning Wang Tianhai supplies for it. It seems closest to the literal meaning of the phrase to accept Yang Liang’s explanation that, as part of Qin’s expansion southward, Shayi had become an integral part of the state.

16.e 觀其朝廷，其間，聽決百事不畱。(XZJJ 303)

“When I observed its court, I saw that the way it hears and decides the hundred affairs when court is held is such that no tasks are left over. (Hutton 171.311–13)

I noted how in the operation of your court adjudications, the Hundred Tasks of government are decided without delay . . . (Knoblock. II.247)

In support of Hutton’s translation “when court is held,” see also Yang Liang’s note that *qi jian* 其間 means *chao tui* 朝退, i.e., the time between dawn, when officials attend court, and when they withdraw at the conclusion of business.

16.f 亡國之禍敗，不可勝悔也。霸者之善著焉，可以時託也；王者之功名，不可勝日志也。(XZJJ 304–5)

The disaster and defeat for him who loses his state are more than can be lamented, while the effectiveness and prominence of a hegemon can be entrusted to seasonal efforts, but for achieving the accomplishments and fame of a true king, nothing can surpass daily focusing one’s intentions on them. (Hutton 172.350–55)

. . . the calamitous ruination of a doomed state cannot be overcome with mere regrets. The excellence of the lord-protector is manifest, and it can be attributed to him by the season. The solid achievements of the king are such that even day-by-day records cannot fully encompass their merit. (Knoblock II.248)

¹³⁴ See *Hanshu* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1962), p. 1568.

¹³⁵ See Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 666, n. 11, for these various commentaries.

Hutton clearly signals his readers that he finds this passage problematic, perhaps even corrupt, and so his translation should be regarded as tentative. Reviewing the various commentaries included in the *XZJJ* as well as in Wang Tianhai's work, it seems that the most fundamental controversies in the text are whether it is best to break the sentence before or after *yan* 焉 and what meaning should be assigned to *tuo* 託. The remainder is not controversial—Wang Tianhai even observes that he finds nothing corrupt in the received text—although Hutton introduces some additional dissonance by understanding *zhi* 志 as “focusing one's intentions,” when there seems to be a consensus that the word is synonymous with *ji* 記 (record).¹³⁶

While most scholars appear to assume that *yan* means something like “in this place, in these circumstances,” Wang Tianhai reads it as an interrogative that marks what follows it as a question. (Hutton equates *yan* with *an* 案 though he provides no basis for doing so nor is his decision reflected in his translation.) Yu Yue and others argue that *tuo* should be understood as an error for *ji* 記, thus fashioning a close textual parallel with *zhi*. Yu Xingwu 于省吾 (1896–1984) sees it as a loan graph for *duo* 度 (calculate, measure). Wang Tianhai finds no reason to emend the text and reads *tuo* as synonymous with *ji* 寄 (entrust, convey). Wang says that the rhetorical question—焉可以時託也 in Wang's parsing—is meant to suggest that the hegemon's good deeds are numerous in the same way that other parts of the passage tell us that the calamities of a ruined state are too many to regret and the achievements of a king too many to record. One can question, however, whether Wang's understanding adequately captures the difference between the *shi* 時 (seasonal) conveyance of the deeds of the hegemon and the *ri* 日 (daily) recording of the achievements of the king. (Hutton's translating *shi* as “seasonal efforts” and the way he otherwise renders the syntax of the phrase are good examples of what he himself identifies as his “strained” readings of the text.)

16.g 堂上不糞，則郊草不瞻曠芸。(XZJJ 305)

When the area within one's hall is not cleared, then the weeds in the countryside are not expected to be removed. (Hutton 173.390–91)

If the trash has not been cleared from before the pavilion, then you will not notice whether the grass on the suburban altar is growing. (Knoblock II.249)

¹³⁶ See *XZJJ* 304–5 and Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 673, nn. 11 and 12. The only disagreement I see among the many scholars whose opinions are recorded in these two volumes is that Ogyū Sorai (quoted by Wang Tianhai) takes *zhi* 志 to mean “remember,” i.e., to make a mental note of something rather than a written one.

Hutton's translation of the received text corrects the errors in the Knoblock rendering.¹³⁷ It is worth noting, however, that, based on Yang Liang's quotation of a saying he attributes to the Qi 齊 military strategist Lu Lianzi 魯連子 (c. 305–245 B.C.E.),¹³⁸ Wang Niansun proposes that the *Xunzi* text should be emended to read: 堂上不糞，則郊草不芸。 (The interior of the hall not swept, the weeds on the suburban altar not cut.) The received version can be regarded as an anonymous editor's attempt to fill in what this rhymed couplet left unsaid.

Glosses on Chapter 17: *Tian lun* 天論

17.a

In the middle of a paragraph found on page 179, lines 150–69, of Hutton's translation, Hutton inserts an endnote reference "a" that refers to a "Textual Note" that acknowledges that he is "following the emendations suggested by Wang Niansun." In the *Xunzi jijie* edition of the Chinese text, the paragraph in question begins on page 314, starting with the words *wu zhi yi zhi zhe* 物之已至者, and ends on page 316 with the words *ke guai ye er bu ke wei ye* 可怪也而不可畏也. The text of the paragraph is more problematic than Hutton's note reveals and Wang Niansun's emendations, which involve a rearrangement of the passages of the received text, extend beyond the lines that Hutton appears to refer to in his note. It is difficult to determine which parts of Wang Niansun's commentary Hutton has chosen to follow and which parts he is purposefully ignoring. It is clear, however, that whether one follows the received text or adopts Wang Niansun's emended text, Hutton's translation on page 179, lines 158–60, is out of place. (The Chinese text reads *zhengling bu ming, jucuo bushi, benshi bu li* 政令不明，舉錯不時，本事不理 which Hutton translates, "when government orders are not clear, when policies are not timely, when the fundamental tasks are not well ordered.") It is possible that Hutton is here following the beat of a different

¹³⁷ In support of his translation Hutton proposes, based in part on his understanding of *Mengzi* 4A10, that *kuang* 曠 be understood as the transitive verb "empty, clear." In the *Mengzi* passage—for which see *Mengzi zhushu* (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 1999), p. 199: 曠安宅而弗居—I understand the word to mean "leave empty or vacant" rather than "make empty" and in the present passage, if *kuang* is retained as a proper part of the text, it should be read to mean "vacant and open spaces."

¹³⁸ A biography of Lu Lianzi is found in the *Shiji*, pp. 2459–69. (For a translation see William H. Nienhauser et al., *The Grand Scribe's Records*, Volume VII [Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1994], pp. 281–86.) Lu also appears in various *Zhanguo ce* 戰國策 passages. A now-lost *Lu Zhong Lianzi* 魯仲連子, in 14 fascicles, is listed in the "Bibliographic Catalogue" of the *Hanshu*, p. 1726.

drummer but he has neglected to share with us that drummer's identity.¹³⁹ In Knoblock's end notes he provides the full Chinese text of Wang Niansun's emended version of the passage and compares it with other versions.¹⁴⁰

17.b 思物而物之。(XZJJ 317)

To long for things and appraise them— (Hutton 180.217)

How can contemplating things and expecting them to serve you . . . (Knoblock III.21)

Hutton's translation of the second *wu* 物, which must be read as a transitive verb, as "appraise" follows Liu Shipai. Knoblock's translation appears to be based on Yang Liang's commentary. One might also consider Kubo Ai's explanation that to *wu* something means to take something as one finds it in its natural state, not ordering or evaluating it.¹⁴¹

Glosses on Chapter 18: *Zheng lun* 正論

18.a

Hutton notes that his translation of the title of this chapter as "Correct Judgements" takes its syntax to be an "adjective + noun" construction identical to that of the chapter title "Zheng ming" 正名. Yang Liang paraphrases the title in a way that suggests he understood it as Hutton does.¹⁴² Most other *Xunzi* scholars take the syntax of the title to be verb-object. Hence Knoblock's translation: "Rectifying Theses."

¹³⁹ Hutton's translation of the last line of the paragraph—his 179.169—as "These are worth marveling at, and also worth fearing" suggests that he reads the *bu ke wei ye* 不可畏也 of the received text as *yi ke wei ye* 亦可畏也, but here again he fails to note what textual changes his translation involves.

¹⁴⁰ See Knoblock III.299–301, n. 45. Knoblock also notes that in reconstructing the text of this paragraph one should not only consult the edition that Wang Niansun favoured but also the parallel passage in the *Hanshi waizhuan*. Basing himself on both of these sources, Knoblock produces his own reconstruction.

¹⁴¹ For the commentaries of Liu Shipai and Kubo Ai, see Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 697, n. 10.

¹⁴² See XZJJ 321: 此一篇皆論世俗之乖謬，荀卿以正論辨之。(This chapter is completely devoted to setting forth the absurdities of the vulgar and unrefined; Xun Qing uses correct discourse to dispute them.)

18.b 唯其徙朝改制為難。(XZJJ 332)

He moves the court, and changes the regulations, but only with reluctance. (Hutton 191.288–89)

Only when there is the removal of a dynasty and the creation of new regulations are difficulties engendered. (Knoblock III.40)

The context in which this sentence occurs is a refutation of the proposition that, upon their deaths, the *shengwang* 聖王 (sage kings) Yao 堯 and Shun 舜 relinquished the throne to someone else. The refutation describes how, when a sage king has died, if there is no sage in the world then there is no one worthy to whom the deceased sage king could have bequeathed the world. But if there is a sage, either among the dead king's descendants or among those appointed to the highest offices—the *sangong* 三公—that sage will readily win the adherence of the people. With regard to the succession by a sage who is a descendant, the text makes three claims to demonstrate that this is not an abdication:

1. 天下不離 The world does not abandon him.
2. 朝不易位，國不更制 Positions in the court do not change and the regulations of the state are not altered.
3. 天下厭然與鄉無以異也；以堯繼堯，夫又何變之有矣！ The world is contented and there is no difference with what was before. A Yao succeeded a Yao so what change could there have been!

With respect to succession by a sage who had occupied high office—that is, when Shun succeeded Yao and Yu 禹 succeeded Shun¹⁴³—the text also makes claims:

4. 天下如歸，猶復而振之矣 The world turns to him as if restoring him and rousing him to action.
5. 天下厭然與鄉無以異也；以堯繼堯，夫又何變之有矣！ The world is contented and there is no difference with what was before. A Yao succeeded a Yao so what change could there have been!

Comparing the claims the text makes for each it seems clear that 1 and 4 are similar in content, 2 is not repeated, and 3 and 5 are identical. Since 3 and 5 are identical, Yang Liang worried that the second occurrence of the claim is an error in the text. Knoblock, following Yang Liang, also identified it as “redundant.”¹⁴⁴

¹⁴³ See Yang Liang's commentary to claim 4 at XZJJ 332.

¹⁴⁴ Knoblock III.310, n. 71. I tend to agree with Yang Liang and Knoblock on this point. Though if there is indeed an error in the text, one can, however, reasonably ask which of the two occurrences is the result of dittography.

Because claim 2 is missing from the text's account of what happens when a sage who held high office takes the throne, Hutton argues, correctly in my view, that the sentence that is the topic of his "Textual Note" refers exclusively to the steps taken by such a sage when the people have roused him to action. Of these, "It is only shifting positions in the court and changing regulations that he regards as difficult" (my rendering of *wei qi xi chao gai zhi wei nan* 唯其徙朝改制為難). Clearly a sage simply does "what he finds difficult and unbearable," to adopt Yang Liang's paraphrase of *wei nan* 為難. The sage's "difficulties" are meant to indicate, however, how radical and yet far-reaching the changes alluded to in the highly-compressed four-word phrase *xi chao gai zhi* were thought to be. (There is, however, no suggestion that the sage hesitates before he acts and so I do not share Hutton's view that the text compels us to understand *nan* 難 less literally as "reluctance.") Thus Yang Liang notes that, although Shun's following Yao and Yu's following Shun are no different to the throne having been handed down from father to son, "when later ages view their changes and alterations, they regard (their successions) as abdicating the throne and yielding it to someone else."¹⁴⁵

18.c 論德而定次，死則能任天下者必有之矣。(XZJJ 332)

He assigns rank by judging virtue, and when he dies, then whoever is able to assume responsibility for the world is sure to take possession of it. (Hutton 191.291–93)

. . . and the assessment of moral worth has fixed the precedence of rank. When he dies, then there will certainly be someone who is able to carry the responsibility for the empire. (Knoblock III.40–41)

Following Tao Hongqing, Hutton does not regard the first phrase of this sentence as a continuation of the sentence that precedes it but rather translates it as the beginning of a separate sentence. Moreover, he takes the object pronoun *zhi* 之 to refer to *tianxia* 天下 (the world) rather than to *neng ren tianxia zhe* 能任天下者 (one who can assume responsibility for the world). However, Wang Tianhai rejects Tao Hongqing's punctuation of the text,¹⁴⁶ and in other instances in the *Xunzi* of a *zhe* 者 noun phrase preceding a *you zhi yi* 有之矣 construction, the noun phrase is the preposed object of *you* and is resumed by *zhi*.¹⁴⁷ I therefore find Knoblock's punctuation and translation preferable in this instance.

¹⁴⁵ For Yang Liang's commentary, see XZJJ 332: 舜、禹相繼，與父子無異，所難而不忍者，在徙朝改制也。後世見其改易，遂以為擅讓也。

¹⁴⁶ For Tao's and Wang's remarks see Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 726, n. 18.

¹⁴⁷ See for example XZJJ 151: 故有良法而亂者有之矣；and Hutton 69.62–63: Thus, there are indeed cases where having a good model still results in chaos.

18.d 備珍怪，期臭味。(XZJJ 333)

. . . [they] prepare precious and unusual dishes, and assemble fragrant and flavorful ingredients. (Hutton 192.312–13)

[His food and drink are] . . . replete with rare and exotic delicacies, and with the most refined aromas and tastes. (Knoblock III.41)

Hutton adopts Long Yuchun's interpretation that *qi* 期 is here a verb meaning *hui* 會 and thus parallel to the verb *bei* 備 (prepare) of the previous line.¹⁴⁸ But where *qi* is otherwise attested as synonymous with *hui*, it is the intransitive verb “gather, meet (at an appointed time or place),” not the transitive “assemble, collect together.”¹⁴⁹ Yang Liang proposes that *qi* should be understood as *qi* 綦. The former is frequently attested in early sources in the meaning of “limit” and is closely related to the latter, which means “extreme” or “utmost.”¹⁵⁰ Knoblock adopted Yang Liang's gloss and therefore reads the word as part of an elaboration on the preceding phrase, describing the fragrances and flavours of the “delicacies.”

18.e 曼而饋。(XZII 333)

They play assorted instruments as the meal is presented. (Hutton 192.313–14)

With an array of dancers the food is presented . . . (Knoblock III.41)

Yang Liang claims that *man* 曼 should be read as *wan* 萬, an ancient dance that involved a large number of performers. Kubo Ai says that the graph should be understood as a short form for writing the word *man* 縵 which some sources identify as a form of music created through the blending of a variety of sounds. Others, such as Hao Yixing and Wang Tianhai, think that the word should be understood to have a meaning more concerned with the presentation of food.¹⁵¹ In brief, a cacophony of opinions.

18.f 負依而坐，諸侯趨走乎堂下。(XZJJ 334)

. . . he sits with his back to the *yi** screen, and the feudal lords hasten to the foot of his hall. (Hutton 192.318–19)

¹⁴⁸ For Long Yuchun's commentary, see Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 727, n. 24.

¹⁴⁹ See the occurrence of *qi* 期 in the “Zhou yu (zhong)” 周語中 at *Guoyu*, p. 68: *qi yu sili* 期於司里.

¹⁵⁰ Yang Liang gives the same gloss for the occurrence of *qi* in chapter 10, at XZJJ 196. Hutton 96.516 translates *qi* there as “align (oneself),” but it is unclear on what basis he does so.

¹⁵¹ Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 727, n. 25.

. . . when he takes his position standing with his back to the ornamented screen, feudal lords hasten with quickened steps to their positions at the lower end of the audience hall. (Knoblock III.41)

See my discussion of “Textual Note” 8.g above.

18.g 則求利之詭緩，而犯分之羞大也。(XZJJ 339)

It is because their yearning to seek profit is slackened, and their shame at going against what has been allotted is great. (Hutton 196.421–22)

It is because the people found tricks in the pursuit of profits were ineffective and that the shame of offending against their proper social station was great. (Knoblock III.44)

Knoblock adopts Yang Liang’s definition of *gui* 詭 as synonymous with *zha* 詐 (cheat, trick, swindle). Hutton prefers Wang Tianhai’s analysis that *gui* should be understood as *ze* 責 in its sense of *yu qiu* 欲求 (desire).¹⁵² But Wang’s definition is incorrect. The *Shuowen jiezi*, Wang’s source for defining *gui* as *ze*, defines *ze* as *qiu* (seek).¹⁵³ Thus *ze* should be understood to mean not “desire” but rather “demand” as, for example, in the *Zuo zhuan* line *Song duo ze lu yu Zheng* 宋多責賂於鄭 (Song demanded numerous gifts from Zheng).¹⁵⁴ An alternative translation: “It is because cunning in pursuit of profit is gratuitous and the shame of offending against social divisions is great.”

18.h 藉靡舌繯。(XZJJ 343)

. . . or when one’s family records are destroyed or one’s descendants are eradicated. (Hutton 199.524–25)

. . . chained and fettered, with tongue split in two. (Knoblock III.46)

The received text is difficult and probably corrupt. There have been numerous attempts to make sense of it. Knoblock follows Yang Liang and Sun Yirang.¹⁵⁵ Hutton’s translation is the result of a series of fanciful and unsubstantiated claims about what these four words mean. He says, for example, “[*ji*] 藉 is to be read as [*ji*] 籍, with which it is interchangeable, and [*ji*] 籍 in turn is to be taken as referring to ‘family records.’” It would be better to leave the line untranslated than to address its problems in this fashion.

¹⁵² Ibid., pp. 738–39, n. 26.

¹⁵³ *Shuowen jiezi zhu*, pian 3A, p. 29a; pian 6B, p. 19b.

¹⁵⁴ *Chunqiu Zuo zhuan zhengyi*, Huan 桓 13, p. 202.

¹⁵⁵ See Knoblock III.315, n. 123, and Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 747, n. 31.

Glosses on Chapter 19: *Li lun* 禮論

19.a 刑餘罪人之喪，……棺槨三寸。(XZJJ 361)

For the funeral of an executed convict . . . [t]he coffin's thickness may be only three inches. (Hutton 207.239–42)

The funeral of a castrated criminal . . . [h]is inner and outer coffins are but three inches thick . . . (Knoblock III.63)

Kubo Ai points out that criminals who had been executed could not be buried with a *guo* 槨 (outer coffin or vault). He therefore proposes that *guo* be emended to *hou* 厚 (thick), which is the basis of Hutton's translation of the line. Kubo Ai cites no supporting evidence.¹⁵⁶

19.b 故如死如生，如亡如存，終始一也。(XZJJ 366)

Thus, one treats the dead as if still alive, and one treats the departed as if they survive, in order that end and beginning be given one and the same care. (Hutton 211.378–81)

Thus one treats the dead like the living and one treats their absence just as one treated them when they were still present, so that end and beginning are as one. (Knoblock III.67)

There appears to be an error in Hutton's Textual Note. He says that he is adopting "Yu Yue's suggestion to reverse *cun* [存] and *wang* [亡]," but Yu Yue makes no such suggestion and Hutton's translation retains the original order of the two words in the received text.¹⁵⁷ Yu Yue does propose in his commentary that we adopt the reading of a parallel saying in the "Zhongyong" 中庸 chapter of the *Liji* 禮記: 事死如生，事亡如存， thus replacing the first *ru* in each four-word phrase with *shi*. This is evidently the reading adopted by Knoblock in his translation.¹⁵⁸ And based on his translation, I assume that Hutton also reads the text this way.

19.c 始卒，沐浴、髻體、飯含，象生執也。(XZJJ 366)

When a person has just died, one washes the hair and the body, binds up the hair and trims the nails, and fills the mouth and covers it, in order to resemble the person's condition during life. (Hutton 211.381–83)

¹⁵⁶ See Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 776, n. 12.

¹⁵⁷ For Yu Yue's commentary see XZJJ 366.

¹⁵⁸ I say "evidently" because, even though Knoblock credits Yu Yue, he nevertheless says, quite mistakenly, that Yu Yue proposed emending *ru* to *shi* 飾. The latter occurs in the previous line of the text, viz. *yi shengzhe shi sizhe ye* 以生者飾死者也 (use life to ornament death).

When a person has just died, his hair is washed, his body is bathed, his hair tied in a knot, his nails are trimmed, and food is put in his mouth, imitating what one did for him when he was still alive. (Knoblock III.67)

Yu Xingwu proposes, and both Wang Tianhai and Hutton agree, that *zhi* 執 is a scribal error for *shi* 勢 (circumstances, situation).¹⁵⁹ The emendation is unnecessary since *zhi*, understood as “carry out, manage,” makes good sense in the context. Hutton mistakenly translates *han* 含 as “cover.” The word refers to the mortuary practice of filling the mouth with food or precious objects such as pearls or jade. In elite burials the eyes were covered and the ears and nostrils filled. There was no practice of covering the mouth.

19.d 詩曰：「愷悌君子，民之父母。」彼君子者，固有為民父母之說焉。(XZJJ 374)

The *Odes* says, “The contented and tranquil prince is mother and father to the people.” Thus there was originally a saying that the prince is mother and father to the people. (Hutton 214.515–18)

An Ode says:

This amiable and fraternal gentleman
is the father and mother of his people.

Here the term “gentleman” assuredly has as its meaning his acting as the father and mother to his people. (Knoblock III.71)

Hutton affirms that, contrary to “some commentators” (i.e., Yu Yue etc.), the text of the passage that follows the quotation from the *Shijing* is correct in reading *junzi zhe* 君子者, rather than simply *jun zhe* 君者.¹⁶⁰ (Knoblock also took the received text as is.) Hutton further says that, in the ode as well as in the passage that follows it, *junzi* is best translated “prince” in keeping with its being “originally an aristocratic title.” Hutton’s “prince” perhaps captures that sense better than “gentleman” does. However, there is some virtue in Yu Yue’s proposed emendation: as Hutton acknowledges, the topic of the context in which this passage occurs is “jun zhi sang” 君之喪 (the period devoted to the mourning of a ruler) and internal consistency would suggest that the text here also read *jun* rather than *junzi*. If that reading were adopted then the demonstrative pronoun *bi* 彼—more or less ignored by both Knoblock and Hutton—might have indicated that the text is saying, in effect, “As for that *jun* (ruler),” i.e., the one referred to as the *junzi* in the *Odes*, “there was assuredly a saying that . . .”

¹⁵⁹ Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, pp. 787–88, n. 3.

¹⁶⁰ Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 803, n. 4, approvingly quotes Yu Yue’s proposed emendation.

19.e 祭者、志意思慕之情也。(XZJJ 375)

The sacrificial rites are the refined expression of remembrance and longing. (Hutton 215.551–52)

Sacrifice originates in the emotions stirred by remembrance and recollection of the dead and by thinking of and longing for the departed. (Knoblock III.72)

Both Knoblock and Hutton reject Wang Niansun's proposed emendation that *qing* 情 be read as *ji* 積 (accumulation). Knoblock attempts to interpret the text as it is. Hutton, however, emends *qing* to *jing* 精. He does this because it seems to him that, when this line is repeated four or five sentences later in the text, his emended form of it better parallels the two phrases with which it is juxtaposed there. Wang Niansun had observed that, in terms of his understanding of the language of the *Xunzi*, while it would make sense to speak of *zhiyi zhi qing* 志意之情 (the feelings of remembrance), one could not say (as the text does), *zhiyi simu zhi qing* 志意思慕之情 (the feelings of remembrance and of longing). Wang concludes that if emended the text should read, "Remembrance and longing accumulate within and appear without in sacrifices."¹⁶¹

The basis for Wang Niansun's observations on how the term *qing* is properly used in the *Xunzi* is not immediately apparent and must be the subject of more extensive research into the text.¹⁶² At one point in his argument, however, Wang quotes, in support of his emendation, a passage in chapter 8 in which *qing* occurs and Yang Liang noted that an early commentary had said that it should be written *ji*. In my discussion of that passage in my gloss on "Textual Note" 8.j above, I agree with Hutton that it should not be emended. In brief, I find Wang Niansun's arguments for emending *qing* to *ji* unpersuasive. Yet I am willing to accept his claims that *qing* cannot properly stand at this point in the text. The question, which remains very much open in my view, is what we are to do with it.

19.f 是君子之所以為憚詭其所敦惡之文也。(XZJJ 377)

. . . these are the forms used by the gentleman when he is moved by what he finds odious and hateful. (Hutton 216.582–83)

. . . these the gentleman considers the proper form expressive of unexpected feelings of loathing and hatred. (Knoblock III.72)

Kubo Ai, followed by Hutton, reads *dui* 敦 (esteem, respect) as its antonym *dui* 慝

¹⁶¹ Wang's paraphrase is found at XZJJ 376: 志意思慕積於中而外見於祭 .

¹⁶² Knoblock III.324, n. 129, briefly comments on Wang's opinion.

(abhor, detest).¹⁶³ The pair of graphs serves to distinguish the Janus-faced meanings of the core word that underlies both.

A Gloss on Chapter 20: *Yue lun* 樂論

20.a 舞意天道兼。(XZJJ 383)

On the meaning of the dance: The way of Heaven is all-encompassing. (Hutton 222.165–66)

. . . and the spirit of the dance is conjoined with the Way of Heaven. (Knoblock III.85)

Concerned with the correct understanding of *jian* 兼—which he thinks should function as an “active transitive verb”—Hutton concludes that this phrase introduces what follows in the text rather than concludes what precedes it; that *wu yi* 舞意 is a topic heading; and that *tian dao* 天道 is, therefore, the sole subject of *jian*. The line can be read in a way that allays Hutton’s worries about *jian*. Understanding *wu yi* to be the subject of *jian* and *tian dao* the verb’s preposed object, we get: “The meaning of the dance encompasses the way of Heaven.”¹⁶⁴ There is no need to divide the phrase in two and the context, moreover, strongly suggests that the phrase as a whole sums up the preceding list of the musical instruments (including the human voice) and the natural phenomena they symbolize.

Glosses on Chapter 21: *Jie bi* 解蔽

21.a 凡人之患，蔽於一曲，而闇於大理。治則復經，兩疑則惑矣。(XZJJ 386)

In most cases, the problem for people is that they become fixated on one twist and are deluded about the greater order of things. If they are brought under control, then they will return to the right standards. If they are of two minds, then they will be hesitant and confused. (Hutton 224.1–5)

It is the common flaw of men to be blinded by some small point of the truth and to shut their minds to the Great Ordering Principle. If cured of this flaw, they can return to the classical standard, but if they remain with double principles, they will stay suspicious and deluded. (Knoblock III.100)

¹⁶³ *Zengbu Xunzi jijie*, juan 13, p. 38.

¹⁶⁴ Or more literally: “The meaning of the dance, it is the way of Heaven that it encompasses.” For this understanding of the syntax of the line see Zhang Jue, *Xunzi yizhu*, p. 297.

Hutton follows Long Yuchun in transposing *yi* 疑 and *ze* 則. Knoblock's translation adopts the same transposition.¹⁶⁵

21.b 妬繆於道，而人誘其所迨也。(XZJJ 386)

They resent what they consider to be erroneous views of the Way, and others are seduced into following their same path. (Hutton 224.11–13)

[The lords of disorderly states and men from disorderly schools] . . . having misconstrued the proper Way, others entice them with what pleases them. (Knoblock III.100)

Because he finds it “strange” to understand *du* 妬 to mean “jealous” in this context, Hutton prefers to “take it in its more general sense as ‘resent,’ and take [*miu yu dao*] 繆於道 as its object.” But Hutton provides no examples or evidence of this “more general sense” of *du*.¹⁶⁶ Hutton is equally creative in rearranging the grammar of the second part of the passage: he would insert a *yu* 於 between *you* 誘 and *qi* 其, making the verb *you* passive, he says, and rendering *qi suo dai* 其所迨 into some sort of verb complement Hutton calls “the agent of change.” Though breathtaking, none of Hutton's textual acrobatics is supported by a safety net of evidence. Under the circumstances it seems wisest to adopt Yang Liang's paraphrase of the passage: “The lords of chaotic states and the followers of chaotic schools of thought originally sought the right principles but, because of their jealousies and misconceptions with regard to the Dao, others could rely on what they favoured to seduce them.”¹⁶⁷ Yang Liang gives as examples rulers obsessed with austerity falling victim to the Mohists and those with a fondness for disputation being led astray by the logician Hui Shi.

21.c 是以與治雖走，而是己不輟也。(XZJJ 387)

Therefore, they depart further and further from getting under control and think they are right not to stop. (Hutton 224.16–17)

¹⁶⁵ Hutton refers to Long Yuchun (1987) by which he means Long's 1955 work, the “Du Xun Qingzi zhaji” 讀荀子札記, which was originally published in the journal *Dalu zazhi*. This work was later included in the 1987 *Xunzi lunji*, for which see above, n. 31. For Long's commentary on this passage see p. 210 of the latter. Knoblock III.328, n. 13, says that he is following the alternative Tang dynasty edition of the text cited by Yang Liang.

¹⁶⁶ It is undeniable that interpreting *du* presents a challenge. Knoblock ignored it. Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 835, n. 6, says that it makes no sense in the immediate context.

¹⁶⁷ XZJJ 386: 亂君、亂人本亦求理，以其嫉妒迷繆於道，故人因其所好而誘之。Hao Yixing notes that Yang Liang's understanding of *dai* 迨 as *jin* 近 (approach near to) or *suo hao* 所好 (what they favoured) suggests that he understood the graph as a loan for *dai* 殆.

This is why they abandon and run away from anything that would cure the faults in their knowledge. (Knoblock III.100)

Yang Liang cites a Tang dynasty edition of the *Xunzi* that has *li* 離 in place of *sui* 雖. Both Knoblock and Hutton follow this alternative reading.

21.d 況於使者乎？(XZJJ 387)

How much more so in the case of that which is applying itself in the first place! (Hutton 224.22–23)

How much more then is this true of a person whose mind is obsessed like theirs! (Knoblock III.100)

The question here is whether or not to emend *shi* 使 to *bi* 蔽 as Yu Yue proposes. Knoblock does; Hutton does not. Yu Yue's emendation seems far-fetched. Yet I find *shi* problematic and, moreover, doubt that translating it as “apply itself,” either in this phrase or in the previous lines in which the proper functioning of the ears and eyes is mentioned, sufficiently captures either the meaning of the term or the nature of the heart's relationship to the sense organs.

21.e (1) 未得道而求道者，謂之虛壹而靜。作之則……(XZJJ 396)¹⁶⁸

As for those who have not yet grasped the Way but are seeking the Way, I say to them: emptiness, single-mindedness, and stillness—make these your principles. (Hutton 228.186–229.188)

One who has not yet attained the Way but is seeking it should be told of emptiness, unity, and stillness and should make of them his example. (Knoblock III.104)

Several early Japanese commentators on the *Xunzi*—most notably Ogyū Sorai and Kubo Ai—argued that the three words *zuo zhi ze* 作之則 should be grouped together as a phrase, in which *zuo* is a transitive verb with two objects—the pronoun *zhi* and the noun *ze*—and read in close connection with the sentence that immediately precedes them rather than with those that follow.¹⁶⁹ Both Knoblock and Hutton adopt

¹⁶⁸ For ease of discussion I have broken this “Textual Note” into two parts.

¹⁶⁹ The commentaries of both Ogyū Sorai and Kubo Ai are found at *Zengbu Xunzi jijie*, *juan* 15, p. 13, and Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 851, n. 26. As noted above, Wang Tianhai refers to Ogyū as Butsu Nabematsu; Kubo Ai calls him Butsu Shigenori 物茂卿, using still another form of the scholar's name.

this parsing and interpretation and translate, respectively, “make of them his example” and “make these your principles.”¹⁷⁰

This is the only occurrence in the entirety of the *Xunzi* of this sequence of words or, for that matter, of the two words *zuo zhi*; hence the uncertainty surrounding their proper construal. But there is a significant alternative to the approach favoured by the old Japanese school of interpretation. Wang Yinzhi argues that *zuo zhi* alone constitute a phrase and that the *ze* is a conjunction that links this phrase to the text that follows in an “if . . . then . . .” construction.¹⁷¹ A number of Chinese scholars in the twentieth century followed Wang Yinzhi’s lead but were concerned with explaining how to interpret *zuo zhi* in the parsing of the passage that Wang proposed. For example, Liu Shippei suggests the two words mean *ruo yong zhi* 若用之 (if one puts them [i.e., emptiness, unity, and stillness] into practice . . .). Zhong Tai says they should be understood to mean *xing qi zhi* 興起之 (if one causes them to start up)—an interpretation perhaps based on the well-attested use of *zuo* as an intransitive verb meaning “rise up.”¹⁷² It is also noteworthy that Fujii Sen’ei 藤井專英, in what is perhaps the definitive twentieth-century Japanese translation of the *Xunzi*, abandons the explication of the text of his Japanese predecessors and embraces the parsing of Wang Yinzhi. Fujii’s explanation of the meaning of the two-word phrase is close to that of Liu Shippei.¹⁷³

(2) 將須道者之虛則人，將事道者之壹則盡，盡將思道者靜則察。(XZJJ 396)

If one who would search for the Way achieves emptiness, then he may enter upon it. If one who would work at the Way achieves single-mindedness, then he will exhaustively obtain it. If one who would ponder the Way achieves stillness, then he will discern it keenly. (Hutton 229.188–92)

If you intend to seek the Way, become empty and you can enter into it. If you intend to serve the Way, attain oneness and you can exhaust it. If you intend to ponder the Way, attain stillness and you can discern it. (Knoblock III.104)

Having accepted the parsing of *zuo zhi ze* (discussed in the first part of this gloss), Knoblock and Hutton are likewise in general agreement about the grammar and

¹⁷⁰ This punctuation and interpretation was also adopted by Xiong Gongzhe 熊公哲, *Xunzi jinzhu jinyi* 荀子今注今譯 (Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1975), p. 431, n. 13, and by *Xunzi xinzhū*, p. 352, n. 11.

¹⁷¹ XZJJ 396–97. Most of Wang Yinzhi’s commentary is devoted to textual problems in the passage treated in the second part of this “Textual Note.”

¹⁷² For the arguments of Liu and Zhong see Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 852, n. 26.

¹⁷³ Fujii Sen’ei, *Junshi* 荀子 (Tokyo: Meiji shoin 明治書院, 1966–1969), pp. 629–31. Fujii translates *zuo zhi* as 之を作へば (if one puts them into practice).

meaning of this part of the passage. While thus ignoring Wang Yinzi's parsing of the three words, Hutton, like Knoblock, nevertheless accepts parts of Wang's editing of the text that follows so that *ren* 人 is understood as an error for *ru* 入 and the second occurrence of *jin* 盡 is deleted on the basis of dittography. Starting with Yang Liang, all seem to agree that this passage is corrupt and thus in places words are missing while elsewhere they have been mistakenly added. Various reconstructions have been offered but none is sufficiently compelling.

21.f 故曰：心容其擇也，無禁必自見，其物也襍博，其情之至也不貳。(XZJJ 398)

And so I say: if the heart allows its choices to be without restraint, then when it reveals its objects they will surely be broadly varying. Its perfected disposition is to be undivided. (Hutton 229.218–21)¹⁷⁴

Therefore, it is said that the state of the mind is such that of necessity it perceives on its own. No prohibitions can be placed on what it selects. Its objects are diverse and extensive. When it has perfect concentration, it is not divided in purpose. (Knoblock III.105)

Though Hutton claims that his translation is based upon Yang Liang's paraphrase of the passage, a comparison of the two shows that the translation, at key points, reflects his own, and not Yang's, understanding of the meaning and syntax of the passage.¹⁷⁵ (It is also worth noting that, apart from its differences with Yang's paraphrase, Hutton's rendering of the received text does not seem to have taken full account of the function of the pronominal adverb *zi* 自, treats *bi* 必 as if it preceded *zabo* 襍博, and ignores without comment the weighty evidence that supports reading *qing* 情 as *jing* 精.) The odd discrepancies between Yang's paraphrase and the received text suggest that the latter is different from the editions that Yang examined

¹⁷⁴ Within his Textual Note, Hutton offers an alternative translation: "The condition of the heart is such that its choices are without [external] restraint—rather, it is sure to show itself through them. And even though its objects are broadly varied, at the utmost of its refinement, it is undivided." Hutton dismisses this alternative as both "more popular" and "unusually strained" and chooses instead, he says, to follow Yang Liang's reading.

¹⁷⁵ XZJJ 396: 心能容受萬物，若其選擇無所禁止，則見襍博不精，所以貴夫虛壹而靜也。(The heart is able to accept all the myriad things such that if its selections lack prohibition and restraint they appear varied, extensive, and not refined. Therefore the heart values emptiness, single-mindedness, and stillness.) Note the difference in Hutton's understanding of the verb *rong* 容 and its direct object and also that in Yang's reading of the line it is the heart's selecting, rather than the things it selects, that the text characterises as eclectic and broad in scope.

and commented upon. As can be seen from his translation, Knoblock rearranged what he thought was “scrambled” in the received text and he also understood *rong* 容 to be a noun rather than a verb. Knoblock’s unscrambling of the text seems to me only a minor improvement over the received version.¹⁷⁶

21.g 有人也，不能此三技，而可使治三官。曰：精於道者也。精於物者也。
(XZJJ 399)

There is a person who is incapable of any of their three skills, but who can be put in charge of any of these offices, namely the one who is expert in regard to the Way, not the one who is expert in regard to things. (Hutton 230.239–42)

There are men incapable of these three skills who could be commissioned to put in order any of these three offices. I say that they are men who concentrate on the Way and [not] merely on things. (Knoblock III.106)

Both Knoblock and Hutton follow Yu Yue and add a *fei* 非 before the second occurrence of *jing* 精. Hutton’s treatment of the construction formed by *you ren ye* 有人也 and *yue* 曰 is preferable to Knoblock’s.

21.h 此人之所以無有而有無之時也，而已以正事。(XZJJ 405–6)

These are the occasions when people believe something there is not there, or believe something not there to be there, and Juan Shuliang had already used this experience to determine things. (Hutton 233.355–58)

These are occasions when these men take what does not exist for what does and what does exist for what does not, and they settle the matter on the basis of their own experience. (Knoblock III.109)

This passage is a comment inspired by the story of Juan Shuliang 涓蜀梁, a “fool” who, because he thought he had seen ghosts and monsters, frightened himself to death.¹⁷⁷ It is meant to be an observation on how people in general might come to deceive themselves into thinking that ghosts exist, but the wording of the concluding phrase is problematic, and perhaps corrupt.¹⁷⁸ Hutton says that the XZJJ reads *yi* 已

¹⁷⁶ For details see Knoblock III.330–31, n. 49.

¹⁷⁷ The Juan Shuliang story and the text’s explanation of how it is that people delude themselves are part of a Chinese literary tradition that had its roots in the time of Xunzi and survives until the present. See Jeffrey Riegel, “Defining the Demonic in Ancient China,” in L. E. Semler, Bob Hodge, and Philippa Kelly, eds., *What is the Human?: Australian Voices from the Humanities* (Melbourne: Australian Scholarly, 2012), pp. 203–18.

¹⁷⁸ See Knoblock III.332, n. 77.

but that “most commentators . . . emend or otherwise read” *yi* to be *ji* 己. In fact, some editions of the *XZJJ*, including the electronic version found on the Academia Sinica website,¹⁷⁹ have *ji*, while others have *yi*.¹⁸⁰ It would have been helpful if Hutton had identified which commentators discuss the word or propose the emendation. I have examined the work of all the usual suspects and can find only one example: Kubo Ai says that the graph, which very much looks like *yi*, or perhaps even *si* 巳, in the 1796 woodblock edition of his *Junshi zōchū*, is to be pronounced 紀, i.e., *ji*.¹⁸¹ Hutton opts for *yi* and proposes that, read with *yi* rather than *ji*, the last phrase makes best sense if it refers to Juan Shuliang in particular. Hutton characterizes his eccentric interpretation of this passage as “not impossible.” I suppose that if the text in fact read *ji*, then the interpretation is slightly more impossible.

Glosses on Chapter 22: *Zheng ming* 正名

22.a

Hutton notes that he translates the title of the chapter as “Correct Naming” because this best reflects the syntax of an occurrence of the term *zheng ming* within the chapter.¹⁸² Knoblock justifies his “On the Correct Use of Names” by referring to the meaning of the words more generally and to their history in Ruhist thought.¹⁸³

22.b 散名之加於萬物者，則從諸夏之成俗曲期，遠方異俗之鄉，則因之而為通。
(*XZJJ* 411–12)

In applying various names to the myriad things, they followed the set customs and generally agreed usage of the various Xia states. Villages in distant places with different customs followed along with these names and so were able to communicate. (Hutton 236.3–7)

In applying various names to the myriad things, they followed the established custom and general definitions of the central Xia states. For villages of distant regions

¹⁷⁹ See hanji.sinica.edu.tw.

¹⁸⁰ The woodblock edition of the *XZJJ* in Changsha with woodblocks carved in 1911 has *ji* 己 (for which see *juan* 15, p. 14a). The edition of the *XZJJ* printed in Shanghai in 1925 by the Saoye shanfang 掃葉山房 has *yi* 已 (for which see *juan* 15, p. 20). The edition first published by the Zhonghua shuju in 1988, and reprinted in 2010, reads *ji*.

¹⁸¹ I was able to examine a copy of the 1796 edition of Kubo Ai’s work kept in the Wang Anguo Reading Room 王安國閱覽室 at the Suzhou Dushuhu Library 蘇州獨墅湖圖書館. My thanks to the staff of the library.

¹⁸² See Hutton 236.34.

¹⁸³ See Knoblock III.113–14.

that practice divergent customs, they relied on the standard terminology [of the Xia states] and enabled these villages to be put into communication. (Knoblock III.127)

Knoblock follows Liu Nianqin 劉念親 (*fl.* 1920) and Liang Qixiong in his punctuation and interpretation of the “obscure term” *qu qi* 曲期.¹⁸⁴ Hutton’s essentially identical understanding he credits to Long Yuchun.¹⁸⁵ In their reading, we should regard *qu qi* as parallel in syntax and meaning to *cheng su* 成俗, punctuate after *qu qi*, and understand the resulting phrase 遠方異俗之鄉 as an adverbial adjunct to 則因之而為通.

Wang Xianqian and Fujii Sen’ei, however, offer an alternative interpretation.¹⁸⁶ As they read the passage, the *houwang* 後王 (later kings) are not only the implied subject of the first two phrases—as both Knoblock and Hutton seem to understand—but also of the remaining two phrases. Moreover, Wang and Fujii both punctuate before *qu qi* and take the words to be a verbal phrase to be read with what immediately follows in the text. Adopting their reading suggests the following translation: “In applying various names to the myriad things, they followed the established customs of the various Xia states, so that when they encountered villages in remote places with different customs, they relied upon them [i.e., the names used in the Xia states] and thus could communicate.”

22.c 散名之在人者：生之所以然者謂之性。(XZJJ 412)

As for the ways the various names apply to people, that by which they are as they are at birth is called “human nature.” (Hutton 236.8–9)

The various names for what is within man: What characterizes a man from birth is called his “nature.” (Knoblock III.127)

Hutton refers readers to a brief note he published in the journal *Dao* in which he takes exception to an interpretation of this line offered by Dan Robins.¹⁸⁷ Robins translates the line: “*Xing* is that by which *shēng* is as it is.” Hutton argues that this translation rests on two claims: “that (i) the *only* possible grammatical subject for the verb *ran* 然 is the word *sheng* 生, and that (ii) when *sheng* 生 is taken as that subject, then it is not plausible in context to understand it as ‘birth,’ so only ‘growth’

¹⁸⁴ For Liu Nianqin’s commentary, see Liang Qixiong, *Xunzi jianshi*, p. 309.

¹⁸⁵ Long Yuchun’s comments can be found at *Xunzi lunji*, pp. 215–16.

¹⁸⁶ For Wang Xianqian’s commentary see XZJJ 411–12. See also Fujii Sen’ei, *Junshi*, pp. 655–57.

¹⁸⁷ Eric L. Hutton, “A Note on the *Xunzi*’s Explanation of *Xing* 性,” *Dao* 10, no. 4 (Winter 2011), pp. 527–30. The publication of Robins to which Hutton is responding is his “The Warring States Concept of *Xing*,” *Dao* 10, no. 1 (Spring 2011), pp. 31–51.

remains as a possible meaning.” Part of Hutton’s challenge to these claims is the argument that, in grammatical constructions of the sort the phrase *sheng zhi suoyi ran* 生之所以然 exemplifies, the word that precedes the *zhi* is “often . . . but *not always*” the subject of the verb phrase that follows it. Hutton provides as an example of such an exception the *Xunzi* phrase *xuyu zhi suo xue* 須與之所學 (a moment’s worth of learning) in which *xuyu* is not the subject of the verb phrase but rather modifies it. Hutton concludes from this exception that we are free to look for another subject in interpreting the *Xunzi* phrase whose meaning he and Robins dispute. But it seems worth pointing out that the exception noted by Hutton displays a different grammatical form and a different meaning from the phrase in question: its verb phrase is *suo* 所 Y and that of the latter is *suo yi* 所以 Y. (*Suo xue* means “what one studies” or is the nominalized “studies” or “learning”; *suo yi xue* would mean “the means by which one studies.”) In all the occurrences in the *Xunzi* of phrases of the grammatical type “X *zhi suoyi* Y” (X 之所以 Y)—of which there are sixty-five according to my rough count—X is, without a single exception, the subject of the verb phrase *suoyi* Y. In his reply to Hutton, Robins reasserts his claim that *sheng* is the subject.¹⁸⁸

22.d 智所以能之在人者謂之能。(XZJJ 413)

That by which people are able to do things is called “ability.” (Hutton 236.22–23)

The means of being able that is within man is called “ability.” (Knoblock III.127)

Both Lu Wenchao and Kubo Ai note that the initial *zhi* 智 in this passage is excrescent due to dittography.

22.e 疾、養、滄、熱、滑、鉞、輕、重以形體異。(XZJJ 417)

Pain, itch, cold, hot, slippery, sharp, light, and heavy are differentiated by the body. (Hutton 238.85–86)

Pain and itching, cold and heat, smoothness and roughness, and lightness and heaviness are differentiated by the body. (Knoblock III.129)

Yang Liang notes that *pi* 鉞 is a scribal error for *se* 鋏 which, he says, should be understood in the sense of homophonous 澀, i.e., “rough, unpolished.” Alternatively, Kubo Ai takes *pi* as an error for *jun* 皸 (chapped skin).¹⁸⁹ Knoblock adopted the former; Hutton neither, attempting to make sense of *pi*. Observing that the word meant needle, he claims, without proof or examples from other sources, that it can

¹⁸⁸ Dan Robins, “Reply to Hutton,” *Dao* 10, no. 4 (Winter 2011), pp. 531–34.

¹⁸⁹ For Kubo Ai’s note, see Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 897, n. 12.

mean “sharpness” in this context. Hutton further claims that the contrast between *pi*, understood by him as “sharpness,” and *hua* 滑 (smooth), “works just as well as” the contrast between *ji*, understood by Yang to mean “rough,” and *hua*. It doesn’t.

22.f 故其民之化道也如神，辨執惡用矣哉！(XZJJ 422)

Thus, his people’s transformation by the Way is spirit-like. What need has he for demonstrations and persuasions? (Hutton 240.165–67)

Thus, his people’s conversion to the Way is as if by magic. What need, indeed, would he have for dialectics and explanations! (Knoblock III.132)

Knoblock and Hutton both adopt Lu Wenchao’s note that *shi* 執 is an error for *shuo* 說.

22.g

The lines from the *Shijing* quoted at XZJJ 426 are the same as those quoted above in chapter 8. For their translations of the lines in chapter 22, see Hutton 243.259–64 and Knoblock III.134–35. For a discussion of the textual issues in these lines, see above, my gloss on 8.d.

Glosses on Chapter 25: *Cheng xiang* 成相

25.a 飛廉知政任惡來。卑其志意，大其園囿高其臺。(XZJJ 458)

Fei Lian was in charge of the government.

Wu Lai held official authority.

The lord lowered his thoughts and intentions,

Expanding his parks and preserves greatly,

And building pavilions high and lofty. (Hutton 263.45–264.49)

When Feilian was in charge of the government and gave office to Wulai,

they debased their lord’s ambitions and ideas,

enlarging his parks and gardens,

raising high his pavilion towers. (Knoblock III.174)

Hutton’s translation is based on the assumption that Feilian 飛廉, an evil minister who served the tyrant Zhou 紂, is not the subject of the verbs *ren* 任, *bei* 卑, *da* 大, and *gao* 高. Instead Hutton supposes that Zhou, although not mentioned until the following stanza, is the subject of the verbs—even if he must, for the sake of his clumsy English rhymes, express that interpretation with regard to *ren* by making Feilian’s son Elai 惡來 effectively its subject. There is no justification for introducing

Zhou into the song's narrative at this point. Feilian, as the subject of *zhizheng* 知政, should be the subject of the remaining verbs in the stanza. Hutton says somewhat redundantly: “. . . in all known discussions of Fei Lian and Wu Lai of which I am aware, there is no mention of Fei Lian being the one who employed Wu Lai.” Faced with such reasoning one can only counter: What about unknown discussions of which you are not aware?

25.b 請牧基。 (XZJJ 459)

Allow me to look at fundamentals: (Hutton 265.78)

Let us be as shepherds to its foundations; (Knoblock III.175)

Knoblock's translation is an unlikely rendering of the syntax of this line. The *Fangyan* 方言, quoted by Yang Liuqiao, defines *mu* 牧 (shepherd) as *cha* 察 (examine).¹⁹⁰ This is the basis of Hutton's translation. Yang Liang defines it as *zhi* 治 (govern), a commonplace synonym of *mu*. If we adopt Yang Liang's gloss, the line should probably read: “Allow me (to speak of) the foundations of good shepherding . . .”,¹⁹¹

25.c 讒夫棄之，形是詰。 (XZJJ 461)

And slanderers reject it completely;
They treat its realized form reproachfully. (Hutton 266.104–5)

Slanderers try to get them to reject it,
punishments are what they inquire about. (Knoblock III.176)

Perhaps because *jie* 詰 refers to judicial investigations and criminal accusations, some scholars, as early as the anonymous commentaries quoted by Yang Liang, propose that *xing* 形 (shape) should be understood as *xing* 刑 (corporal punishment). Basing his interpretation on a mistaken understanding of Yang Liang's interpretation of *xing* 形, Hutton rejects reading it as *xing* 刑 and also wrongly concludes that in this context *jie* means “reproach.” (Knoblock is of course equally mistaken in translating it “inquire about.”)¹⁹² Yang Liang's definition of *xing* 形 as *xingzhuang* 形狀 should

¹⁹⁰ For Yang Liuqiao's commentary to this passage see Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 984, n. 27.

¹⁹¹ See *Xunzi xinzhu*, p. 414, n. 1.

¹⁹² Hutton, p. 374: “Pace Knoblock, Yang's gloss of [*jie*]: 詰 as [*jie wen*] 詰問 means not simply ‘inquire about’ but rather ‘to question’ in an accusing and reproachful tone (i.e., [*zewen*] 責問).” Pace Hutton, the *jie* in this context and Yang's gloss on it mean not merely “‘to question’ in an accusing and reproachful tone” but rather “‘to make a criminal accusation.’” For a full understanding of the meaning of the term in pre-Han and Han sources, see Donald Harper, “A Chinese Demonography of the Third Century B.C.,” pp. 471–79.

not be understood to mean something as vague as “shape” or “form,” “realized” or otherwise, but rather to the facts or circumstances of a criminal case that is being investigated. I suggest, however, that, even given Yang Liang’s legalistic reading of *xing* 形 in this context, reading *xing* 刑 is preferable. An alternative translation: “It is punishments that they use in their criminal accusations.”

25.d 直而用拙必參天。(XZJJ 461)

Who is upright but can show leniency,
Will be a partner to Heaven surely. (Hutton 266.111–12)

being straight yet useful as a bow-frame,
he is sure to form a Triad with Heaven. (Knoblock III.176)

Ye 拙 also occurs in chapter 5. For a discussion of how Knoblock and Hutton understand it here as well as there, see above, my gloss on 5.g.

25.e 禹傅土。(XZJJ 463)

Yu did bring the land back under control. (Hutton 270.210)

Yu laid out the land . . . (Knoblock III.181)

Yang Liang notes that *fu* 傅 should be understood as *fu* 敷 and quotes from the commentary attributed to Kong Anguo 孔安國 (c. 156–c. 74 B.C.E.) to a passage that reads *Yu fu tu* 禹敷土 in the “Yugong” 禹貢 chapter of the *Shangshu* 尚書 or *Documents* (to which the *Xunzi* text here seems to be alluding), in which *fu* 敷 is defined as *bu zhi* 布治 (put in order by distributing). Liang Qixiong quotes the *Shangshu* commentary of Ma Rong 馬融 (79–166) in which he defines *fu* 敷 simply as *fen* 分 (divide).¹⁹³ While accepting that *fu* 傅 equals *fu* 敷, Hutton prefers to follow a second tradition of *Shangshu* interpretation found in the *Mengzi* 孟子 3A4 commentary of Zhao Qi 趙岐 (c. 108–201 C.E.). There *fu* 敷 is defined as *zhi* 治 (put in order, govern).¹⁹⁴

25.f 患難哉！阪為先。(XZJJ 465)

What troubles and difficulties there are!
In leading positions crooked men sit. (Hutton 271.238–39)

¹⁹³ For the *Shangshu* passage as well as Ma Rong’s commentary, see *Shangshu zhengyi* (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 1999), p. 133.

¹⁹⁴ *Mengzi zhushu*, p. 145. The *Mengzi* line upon which Zhao Qi is commenting reads *ju Shun er fuzhi yan* 舉舜而敷治焉. It is possible that its juxtaposition with *zhi* influenced Zhao’s gloss on *fu* 敷.

Distress and difficulties indeed!
Rebellion causes it! (Knoblock III.182)

Hutton cites Liang Qixiong for his understanding of the meaning of *ban* 阪. In fact, Liang does not define the term as “crooked men” but as *xieshu* 邪術 (evil techniques).¹⁹⁵ Liang understands the three-word phrase to mean “evil techniques are made the most prominent schemes for governing.”¹⁹⁶

25.g 己無郵人，我獨自美，豈獨無故？(XZJJ 465)

Without a person who gives one rebukes,
One will only think of oneself finely,
But how could such a one act blamelessly? (Hutton 272.263–65)

Do not personally find fault with others
considering that you yourself alone are fine
—how could you be without blame? (Knoblock III.183)

Hutton is following Kubo Ai in his understanding of *wu you ren* 無尤人. Interpreting the first phrase in this fashion obscures, however, the important contrast between the self and others limned in the phrase and the one that follows it. It is preferable to understand the occurrence of *wu* as an example of its use as a prohibitive negative. Both Knoblock and Hutton adopt Ikai Hikohiro’s doubtlessly correct interpretation of *gu* 故 as *gu* 辜.¹⁹⁷

25.h 不知戒，後必有。(XZJJ 465)

Those who do not know to heed forewarnings
Are certainly by bad outcomes beset. (Hutton 272.266–67)

Where they know no need for precaution,
they are certain to repeat it, (Knoblock III.183)

The interpretation offered by Li Zhongsheng 李中生, and adopted by Hutton, that *hou* 後 is the object of *you* 有 proposed for the sake of rhyme seems the best way

¹⁹⁵ See *Xunzi jianshi*, p. 350: 以邪術為首要之計謀。 *Xunzi xinzhū*, p. 421, n. 1, agrees with Liang’s understanding of *ban* as does Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 997, n. 4.

¹⁹⁶ Wang Niansun’s proposal for emending *xian* 先 to *zhi* 之—part of the basis for Knoblock’s translation—seems forced.

¹⁹⁷ For the commentaries of both Kubo Ai and Ikai Hikohiro, see *Zengbu Xunzi jijie*, *juan* 18, pp. 12–13, and Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 998, n. 12.

to understand the three-word phrase.¹⁹⁸ Wang Niansun’s proposed emendations—the basis for Knoblock’s translation—seem by comparison far-fetched and gratuitous.¹⁹⁹

25.i 人之態，不如備。(XZJJ 466)

In these people’s practice of deception
They never know a lack of energy. (Hutton 272.273–74)

Such appearances of men
—they do not know the need for preparation. (Knoblock III.183)

Though the context suggests it, Hutton’s translation of *tai* 態 as “practice of deception” is not fully justified by the text as it stands. To get something akin to this meaning it would be best to adopt Wang Niansun’s argument that *tai* should be read as *te* 慝 in its sense of “wicked, crafty” here and in the immediately preceding *Xunzi* passage.²⁰⁰ With regard to the second three-word phrase, both Knoblock and Hutton accept Yang Liang’s emendation of *ru* 如 to *zhi* 知. Hutton, in addition, adopts Ikai Hikohiro’s note that *bei* 備 (prepare) should be read *bei* 憊, i.e., “tired, fatigued.”²⁰¹ Ikai’s reading, while possible, seems an unnecessary change since the text makes sense as it is. An alternative translation:

Since people are crafty,
if you fail to anticipate (them) . . .

25.j 欲衷對，言不從。(XZJJ 467)

Though one desires to answer in earnest,
If none will follow one’s words willingly . . . (Hutton 273.293–94)

Desiring to reply with inward good feelings
even when his words of advice are not heeded . . . (Knoblock III.184)

Hutton claims to follow Yu Yue in rearranging the order of the words in the first phrase so that it reads *yu dui zhong* 欲對衷, a change justified by the rhyme scheme of the stanza. But, as Hutton himself acknowledges, he is not in fact following Yu Yue

¹⁹⁸ Li Zhongsheng, *Xunzi jiaogu congkao* 荀子校詁叢稿 (Guangzhou: Guangdong gaodeng jiaoyu chubanshe, 2001), p. 241. Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 999, n. 13, quotes Li’s interpretation favourably.

¹⁹⁹ For Wang’s proposed emendations, see Knoblock III.356, n. 80.

²⁰⁰ XZJJ 466. Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 999, n. 14, also adopts the emendation.

²⁰¹ *Zengbu Xunzi jijie*, *juan* 18, p. 13.

since what distinguishes Yu's interpretation is the recognition that, when the positions of *zhong* and *dui* are reversed, the meaning of *dui zhong* 對衷 is like that of *sui zhong* 遂衷.²⁰² That is, *dui* means "comply or agree with" and *dui zhong* is not a verb plus adverb construction, as in the translations of Knoblock and Hutton, but rather an intransitive verb with a noun complement. Genuinely following Yu Yue would yield another translation:

Though desirous that his innermost feelings be met with approval,
If his words of advice are not heeded . . .

25.k 利往印上，莫得擅與。(XZJJ 469)

Let them look above to have profit come;
But let none usurp control of giving. (Hutton 274.325–26)

There is profit only from looking up to one's superiors,
and none will try to presume power over others. (Knoblock III.186)

Wang Yinzhì and others propose that *wang* 往 is a scribal error for *wei* 隹 (understood as *wei* 唯 [only]). This is part of the basis for Knoblock's translation. Hutton follows the interpretation offered by Liao Jilang 廖吉郎 and Wang Tianhai that *wang* be understood to mean "come" or "arrive." But there are reasons to question this. The only evidence that Liao and Wang adduce is a *Guangya* 廣雅 entry for *wang* in which *zhi* 至 is listed as a synonym.²⁰³ But *zhi* need not mean "arrive here," i.e., "come." It can also mean "arrive there," i.e., "go away from here"—a meaning that will not at all fit this *Xunzi* passage. It should also be noted that, among the several occurrences of *wang* elsewhere in the *Xunzi*, there is no other that could be (or has been) interpreted to mean "come." Yang Liang and others suggest that *ang* 印 (look up) should in this passage be understood as *yang* 仰 (rely upon), but both Knoblock and Hutton reject this reading in their translations. *Yu* 與, correctly translated by Hutton as "giving," was overlooked by Knoblock.

25.l 莫不說教名不移。(XZJJ 469)

²⁰² See XZJJ 467. In rearranging the word order and retaining *dui*, Yu Yue is adopting the interpretation of Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130–1200). See Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1000, n. 23. Bernhard Karlgren, "Loan Characters in Pre-Han Texts IV," *Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities* 38 (1966), p. 18, with reference to Character 1725, questions whether *zhong* is of the appropriate rhyme category to rhyme with *cong* 從 in the three-word phrase that follows.

²⁰³ Liao Jilang, *Xinbian Xunzi* 新編荀子 (Taipei: Guoli bianyiguan, 2002), p. 1945, n. 144; Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1003, n. 7.

Then none will not delight in his teachings,
Nor will any alter their assigned share. (Hutton 275.337–38)

None will fail to enjoy his teachings and his names will not be altered. (Knoblock III.186)

Knoblock follows Yang Liuqiao's interpretation of *ming* 名; Hutton adopts Tsukada Tora's understanding of the term. Neither these nor other explanations seem completely satisfactory.²⁰⁴

25.m 五聽修領，莫不理續主執持。(XZJJ 470)

If he heeds these five to refine his reign,
And all are done with coordination,
He will have a firm grasp on his station. (Hutton 275.353–55)

When the Five Judicial Examinations are cultivated and regulated,
and none fail to apply reason to their duties,
the ruler's authority is maintained. (Knoblock III.187)

Hutton suggests that *wu* 五 (five) may refer back to five principles alluded to earlier in the text and hence perhaps to the contents of five stanzas (that constitute 274.314 to 275.348 in Hutton's translation).²⁰⁵ The connection is made explicitly by Gu Qianli 顧千里 (1766–1835) who summarizes the five as: *chenxia zhi* 臣下職 (ministers and subordinates have their tasks), *shou qi zhi* 守其職 (they keep to their assigned tasks), *junfa ming* 君法明 (the ruler's laws are clear), *junfa yi* 君法儀 (the ruler's laws are the standard), and *xing cheng chen* 刑稱陳 (punishments are apt and clearly set forth).²⁰⁶ Understanding *ting* 聽 to refer to judicial inquiries or investigations (the basis for Knoblock's "Judicial Examinations") and not simply as "obey" or "heed," Yang Liang argues that *wu ting* refers to five aspects of the behaviour of someone accused of a crime that a judge must carefully examine: speech, facial colour (or expression), breathing, listening, and gaze.²⁰⁷ Presumably Yang understood the text to be saying that, in determining the character and performance of an official, a ruler should regard his demeanour as carefully and closely as a judge does someone

²⁰⁴ Yang's and Tsukada's comments are found at Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1004, n. 12.

²⁰⁵ Hutton, p. 275, n. 72, says: "The 'five' here appears to refer back to the five points mentioned in line 309 above." In his note to line 309 (Hutton, p. 274, n. 64), Hutton says that, according to "commentators," the "five points" refer to the five stanzas that follow in the text.

²⁰⁶ Gu's commentary is quoted at XZJJ 470–71. Gu's interpretation is adopted by Wang Tianhai, p. 1006, n. 18.

²⁰⁷ See *Xunzi xinzhū*, p. 425, n. 2, and Knoblock III.357, n. 101.

accused of a crime. In the stanza that immediately follows, *ting* occurs again—and is understood by all including Hutton to mean “hearing judicial cases”—and thus there may be some basis for preferring Yang Liang’s interpretation to that of Gu Qianli.

Hutton argues that the pronominal negative *mo* 莫 (none) resumes the “five.” His interpretation departs, however, from the use of the word elsewhere in the immediate context to refer to the various officials who serve the ruler. Wang Niansun proposed that *xu* 續 be understood as a scribal error for *ji* 績. Hutton, along with Knoblock, adopts this emendation but Hutton goes on to argue that *ji* should be glossed as *cheng* 成 which he translates (in his “Textual Note”) as “accomplished.”²⁰⁸ All others who adopt Wang’s interpretation understand *ji* to mean *shi* 事 (task, job). An alternative translation of the line: “None fail to keep their tasks orderly.”²⁰⁹

25.n 吏謹將之無鉞滑。(XZJJ 471)

If officials carefully uphold them,
And to harshness or leniency don’t tend, (Hutton 276.379–80)

Officials will assiduously follow it with no treachery. (Knoblock III.188)

Hutton claims to have adopted Yu Xingwu’s overall interpretation of this line. But it is difficult to reconcile Hutton’s translation with Yu’s explanation of the language of the line. Adopting Yang Liang’s commentary to an earlier occurrence of the word in chapter 22, Yu regards *pi* 鉞 as a scribal error for *se* 鋏 and understands the latter to have the same meaning as the homophonous 澀, i.e., “rough.” As in chapter 22, *se* contrasts in meaning with *hua* 滑 (smooth). Here the contrasting pair should be taken metaphorically to describe, Yu elaborates, officials who, being assiduously attentive to their tasks, are neither *ju zhi* 拘滯 (dilatatory) nor *liu dang* 流蕩 (hasty) as they perform their tasks.²¹⁰ As he did in his note “e” to chapter 22, Hutton takes *pi* to mean sharp and, for the purpose of understanding the present passage, he stretches that meaning so that it refers to “harshness.” He then twists *hua* into “leniency.” Thus blithely mapping the contours and boundaries of his understanding of contemporary

²⁰⁸ See Hutton, p. 374, note “m” to chapter 25. I can find no basis for understanding *ji* as Hutton wishes to do. It appears to refer to something completed, i.e., to an accomplishment rather than to the act of accomplishing something. In any case, for the sake of his English rhyme, Hutton puts aside the “literal meaning” of the line and translates *li* 理 (put in order) and *ji* together as “done with coordination.”

²⁰⁹ Tao Hongqing, quoted by Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1006, n. 18, notes that *zhi* 執 should be emended to *shi* 執. The latter serves here, as frequently elsewhere, as a short form for *shi* 勢 (power, position). Knoblock, p. 357, n. 103, misstates Tao’s proposed emendation.

²¹⁰ For Yu Xingwu’s commentary see his *Shuangjian yi zhuzi xinzheng* 雙劍詒諸子新證 (Beijing: Haicheng Yu shi 海城于氏, 1940), vol. 4, pp. 1b–2a, as well as Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, pp. 1007–8, n. 29.

English meaning onto classical Chinese vocabulary, Hutton seems unaware that his understanding of *pi* and *hua* renders them a contrasting pair only in his translation and not in the language of the *Xunzi*.

25.o 各以宜，舍巧拙。(XZJJ 471)

Each will by what's appropriate . . . fend,
And bring cheating the inept to an end. (Hutton 276.382–83)

each using what is appropriate to his station,
so that artfulness and ineptitude are stopped. (Knoblock III.188)

Knoblock explicitly and Hutton implicitly (and in spite of his use of the ellipses) accept that the text should have a *suo* 所 before *yi* 宜. Hutton's rendering of *qiao zhuo* 巧拙 as “cheating the inept,” for which he credits Zhu Xi, makes the best sense in the context.²¹¹

Glosses on Chapter 26: *Fu* 賦

26.a 性得之則甚雅似者與？(XZJJ 473)

But if human nature does obtain it,
Then one behaves extremely gracefully? (Hutton 277.24–25)

And if inborn nature does acquire it, it produces elegant forms? (Knoblock III.195)

This line is one of several questions asked by an unnamed ruler in his attempt to solve a riddle. The correct answer—which the ruler does in the end identify—is *li* 禮 (ritual). For Hutton the textual issue in the line is what to do with *si* 似. He adopts—correctly in my view—the solution offered by Liu Shippei that *si* has been purposefully substituted for *ru* 如 because it forms a rhyme with *li* 理, the end word in the previous line.²¹² If we take *si* to be functioning like *ru* then we should understand *ya si* 雅似 to mean “in *ya* fashion” or “in the manner of *ya*.”²¹³ But how should *ya* be interpreted? The text is talking about how “obtaining” or “acquiring” ritual influences one's *xing* 性 (basic nature). Yang Liang defines *ya* as *zheng* 正 (correct, upright). The editors of the *Xunzi xinzhu*, elaborating upon Yang's gloss, say that it refers to correct moral behaviour.²¹⁴ Wang Tianhai relates the line to *Xunzi*'s argument that

²¹¹ Zhu Xi's interpretation is quoted by Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1008, n. 30.

²¹² For Liu Shippei's commentary, see Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1011, n. 12.

²¹³ In chapter 8, “Ru xiao,” there occurs the phrase *yangyang ru* 揚揚如 (in a completely satisfied fashion). See XZJJ 139 and Hutton 63.403.

²¹⁴ *Xunzi xinzhu*, p. 429, n. 8.

human nature is evil until it is subjected to the refining and regulating influences of ritual.²¹⁵ Note also that the interrogative *yu* 與, an allegro form of *ye hu* 也乎, asks a question of the form, “Is it not the case that . . .” or “Is it not that which . . .” An alternative translation:

Is it not that which . . . if human nature *does* acquire it, makes one come to behave in an extremely upright manner?

26.b 印印今天下之咸蹇也。(XZJJ 475)

Lofty, oh so lofty, do they rise up,
And round the whole world they perambulate. (Hutton 280.95–96)

How they gather in lofty heights, letting the whole world take from them!
(Knoblock III.198)

In this line from a riddle on *yun* 雲 (clouds), adopting—though with “reservations”—the interpretation of Yang Liuqiao, Hutton reads *jian* 蹇 as *qian* 蹇.²¹⁶ Hutton’s hesitation is well placed. The two words are basically synonymous in meaning “crippled.” Though the latter is sometimes construed as “walk with difficulty,” Yang’s opinion aside, there is scant evidence that it means simply “walk” or “move.”²¹⁷ So what to do with these otherwise limping clouds? Neither Yang Liang nor the Qing authorities offer a happy solution.²¹⁸ Pointing out that *xian* 咸 and *jian* 蹇 are the names of two hexagrams in the *Zhouyi* 周易, Ma Jigao 馬積高 (1925–2001) thinks that the line is an allusion to passages in that text that have to do with water. Wang Tianhai rightly dismisses that reading as “strange” and, noting that none of the explanations works, proposes that *jian* be understood as an acoustical particle similar to *jie* 嗟 and expressive, like a heartfelt sigh, of deep emotion and wonderment.²¹⁹

26.c 往來愒愒，而不可為固塞者與？(XZJJ 477)

Are their comings and goings dark and dim
But they cannot serve as screens fixedly? (Hutton 280.117–18)

²¹⁵ Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1011, n. 12. Note, however, that Wang does not accept Liu’s gloss of *si* and prefers instead to understand it to mean *zhi* 治 (govern, regulate).

²¹⁶ Yang Liuqiao, *Xunzi guyi*, p. 712, n. 7.

²¹⁷ The *Shuowen jiezi* definition, cited by Yang, is *zou mao* 走貌 (walking in a fashion). This is surely meant to suggest walking but with some hindrance or difficulty.

²¹⁸ Yu Yue, quoted at XZJJ 475, reads *jian* as *qian* 攬 (take). This is the basis of Knoblock’s translation.

²¹⁹ Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, pp. 1017–18, n. 6.

Does not their passing to and fro in an obscure and puzzling fashion make it impossible to stop them or make them stationary? (Knoblock III.198)

Hutton cites Yang Liuqiao as his source for translating *gusai* 固塞 as “screens fixedly.” Even allowing for Hutton’s mashing things up to serve his rhymes, the translation still seems too far from Yang’s note that the words “refer to making city walls and defences firm.”²²⁰ Yang Liang paraphrases the line: “Though they [i.e., the clouds] move to and fro, only dimly seen if at all, covering and screening the myriad things, if one wished to use them as a solid barrier, it would not be possible.”²²¹ Knoblock’s translation seems a misreading of the grammar of the line.

26.d 五泰占之曰……(XZJJ 478)

The sovereign divines and then conveys, . . . (Hutton 281.151)

The Five Great Ones divined it and said: . . . (Knoblock III.200)

Hutton says that he is following “manuscript traditions” that read *di* 帝 instead of *tai* 泰. We possess no manuscript evidence for the text of the *Xunzi*, only printed editions. According to Lu Wenchao, a Song dynasty edition has *di* rather than *tai*. But that reading was discarded by Lu, on the basis of the text’s rhyme scheme, in favour of the Yuan woodblock editions that read *tai*. Wang Niansun noted, however, that *di* does in fact rhyme with other end words in the lines of this stanza.²²² Though he neglects to mention it, Hutton is presumably following Kubo Ai in regarding *wu* 五 (five) as excrement.²²³ Those who accept *wu tai* as the correct reading nevertheless disagree on who these “Five Great Ones” were, some identifying them as legendary sovereigns and others, for example Knoblock, interpreting them to have been “shamans with divine gifts for foretelling whether a man would lie or die, survive or perish, be lucky or unlucky, or would die young or old.”²²⁴

26.e 蛹以為母，蛾以為父。(XZJJ 479)

For pupae, this thing acts as a mother,

And for moths, the role of father it plays. (Hutton 282.168–69)

²²⁰ Yang Liuqiao, *Xunzi guyi*, p. 713, n. 16: 謂城防要塞也。

²²¹ XZJJ 477: 雖往來晦暝，掩蔽萬物，若使牢固蔽塞，則不可。

²²² For these commentaries, see XZJJ 478.

²²³ Kubo Ai is quoted by Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1022, n. 7. Wang Tianhai argues that, rather than being excrement, *wu* is a scribal error for *shang* 上。

²²⁴ Yang Liang, quoted at XZJJ 478, identifies them as five legendary sovereigns. For Knoblock and his sources, see Knoblock III.358, n. 16.

The pupa functions as its mother,
The moth as its father. (Knoblock III.200)

The question raised by these contrasting translations is in brief: are *yong* 蛹 (pupae) and *e* 蛾 (moths) the parents (Knoblock) or the progeny (Hutton) of the *can* 蠶 (silkworm)—the topic of this riddle—or, to put it in grammatical terms, are *yong* and *e* the preposed objects (Knoblock) or the subjects (Hutton) of the verb *yi* 以? Knoblock follows Yang Liang. Hutton follows, well, himself.

26.f 簪以為父，管以為母。(XZJJ 480)

This thing is the father unto hairpins
And mother whence shuttle-bobbins arose. (Hutton 284.206–7)

The hairpin serves as its father;
The reed as its mother. (Knoblock III.202)

The contrasting translations of this passage raise exactly the same question as that in 26.e, except that we should substitute *zan* 簪, *guan* 管, and *zhen* 箴 for *e*, *yong*, and *can*, respectively. Lu Wenchao proposes reading *zan* 簪 as *zuan* 鑽 (drill). Yu Yue disagrees with Lu and suggests reading *zan* 簪 as *zan* 鐸 (nail). However they, along with Yang Liang, Hao Yixing, Tsukada Tora, and Wang Tianhai understand the syntax of the line as Knoblock renders it.²²⁵ Hutton is, once again, on his own.

26.g 旦暮晦盲。(XZJJ 480)

Both day and night it is dark and gloomy. (Hutton 285.217)

Morning and evening, darkness envelops all. (Knoblock III.202)

With Yang Liuqiao, Hutton understands *mang* 盲 in this passage to be synonymous with *ming* 冥 (dark, obscure).²²⁶

26.h 志愛公利，重樓疏堂。(XZJJ 481)

Those who intend and love the public weal
Stack buildings and raise halls for royalty. (Hutton 285.222–23)

Those whose inner minds love public benefit
Are said to advocate multistoried towers and spacious pavilions. (Knoblock III.202)

Hutton discusses at great length his reasons for construing the second half of this

²²⁵ For these various commentaries, see XZJJ 480 and Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1026, n. 13.

²²⁶ Yang Liuqiao, *Xunzi guyi*, p. 720, n. 3.

couplet to mean that those who are devoted to the public good are constructing lavish buildings not for their own benefit but “for royalty”—these last words added by Hutton to make his point clear. I fear, however, that Hutton has misunderstood the relationship between the two halves of this couplet and of the couplets that surround it in the context. The text is not saying that those described as good and virtuous in the first half of the couplet nevertheless suffer some catastrophe described in the second half. The point seems to be that, in the upside down world bemoaned in this poem, those who do good are accused of having done something contrary to their particular reputation for goodness. That is why, several lines later, this section of the poem is summarised by the couplet:

道德純備，
讒口將將。

Those whose moral behaviour is pure and intact
A host of slanderous mouths attack.

Thus the couplet in question should be understood to mean that those who have wholeheartedly devoted themselves to the public good are slandered and accused of constructing lavish buildings for their own personal and private use.

26.i 無私罪人，懲革貳兵。(XZJJ 481)

Those who without selfishness sentence men
Bring out armor and double weaponry. (Hutton 285.224–25)

Those who pursue no personal interest by accusing others of crimes
Are said to promote the military in order to caution military preparedness.
(Knoblock III.203)

As in the couplet discussed in my gloss on 26.h, the second half of this couplet should be understood as a slander, in this case accusing those who have never prosecuted criminals for some selfish end of having brought out weapons and warned of the need for military preparations in order to attack their own private enemies. In his translation of the second half of the couplet, Hutton says that he follows Liao Jilang in understanding *er* 貳 to mean “double.” But he is mistaken about Liao’s commentary²²⁷ and, in any case, *er* in its basic sense of “two” means “divided” not “doubled.” It is preferable in this passage to read *er* as a scribal error for *jie* 戒 (warn, caution).²²⁸

²²⁷ See Liao Jilang, *Xinbian Xunzi*, p. 1987, n. 139.

²²⁸ For this emendation see Wang Niansun’s commentary quoted at XZJJ 481, and *Xunzi xinzh*, p. 436, n. 7. Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, pp. 1029, n. 7, citing Yu Xingwu, favours emending *er* (properly written 二 in his view) to *shang* 上.

26.j 郁郁乎其遇時之不祥也。(XZJJ 482)

Lamentable, oh how lamentable!

Their meeting such times was so unlucky! (Hutton 285.238–39)

How utterly unpropitious that they should meet with no opportunity! (Knoblock III.203)

Hutton says that he follows Yang Liuqiao in understanding *yu yu* 郁郁 as *yu yu* 鬱鬱. Yang cites as appropriate glosses of the latter *zhi bu tong* 滯不通 (stagnant) and *chou* 愁 (sad, depressed).²²⁹ The word describes a state of mind not a situation; it is thus difficult to determine on what Hutton bases his “lamentable.” A translation closer to Yang Liuqiao’s interpretation of the text should read:

How sad! How depressing!

The impropitiousness of the times they met with!

However, because Yang Liang understands *yu yu* 郁郁 to mean something like “rich, refined, variegated”—a meaning that fits poorly with the remainder of the line—he proposes that *yu yu* should be transposed with *fu* 拂 in the line that follows (discussed in 26.k). Yang Liang notes, moreover, that *fu* means *wei* 違 (reverse, turn away from), a meaning he finds to fit better with the present line.²³⁰ Knoblock’s translation of both this line and the next reflects this transposition (though it is hard to see how in his translation of this line he is rendering *fu*). An alternative translation based on Yang Liang’s emended text:

How contrary, how much the reverse of expectations!

The impropitiousness of the times they met with!

26.k 拂乎其欲禮義之大行也。(XZJJ 482)

So corrective were the great acts they did

In their desire for ritual and *yi*! (Hutton 285.240–41)

How elegant and refined was their desire to practice in a grand manner ritual and moral principles! (Knoblock III.203)

As noted immediately above, Yang Liang would emend the text of this line so that *yu yu* 郁郁 is swapped with *fu* 拂. Hutton rejects Yang Liang’s proposed emendation and reads the text as it is but understanding *fu* to mean “correct.” Hutton says that he

²²⁹ Yang Liuqiao, *Xunzi guyi*, p. 721, n. 11.

²³⁰ For Yang Liang’s commentary see XZJJ 482. The editors of the *Xunzi xinzhū* adopted Yang’s proposed transposition. See *Xunzi xinzhū*, p. 436, n. 12.

“follow[s] his [i.e., Yang Liuqiao’s] understanding of the sense of that character.” But Yang Liuqiao’s understanding of *fu* does not seem consistent with Hutton’s translation of the word. Yang glosses it as *fu* 輔 (support) but quotes a passage from chapter 13 of the *Xunzi* that suggests that such support is actually closer to a sort of principled defiance in which a subject resists, opposes, and otherwise works to reverse the excesses and errors of his ruler.²³¹ It should be noted, however, that Hutton argues—correctly in my view—that the grammar of the line is such that its opening words—whether one takes them to be *fu hu* or *yu yu hu*—should be read as a comment on *daxing* 大行 and not on the entire verb phrase beginning with *yu* 欲.

26.l 弟子勉學，天不忘也。(XZJJ 482)

So, disciples, work hard at your learning,
And Heaven will not act divergently. (Hutton 286.248–49)

Students! Devote yourselves to study,
For Heaven will not forget you. (Knoblock III.203)

Hutton has adopted in his translation the proposal by Professor Chow Tse-tung that *wang* 忘 be understood as *wang* 妄 (deviate).²³² The gloss is useful, even if finally unnecessary, because it encourages us to consider that Heaven’s “forgetting” an individual would have meant aberrations of nature and other divergences from the constant patterns upon which people habitually depend.

26.m 與愚以疑，願聞反辭。其小歌曰：念彼遠方。(XZJJ 482)

Some join with fools, and confusion possess;
I wish to sound words of their backwardness.

The little song goes:

I think of that location far away. (Hutton 286.252–55)

²³¹ Yang Liuqiao, *Xunzi guyi*, pp. 721–22, n. 11. For the passage in the “Chen dao” chapter that Yang Liuqiao cites see XZJJ 250. It reads as follows: 有能抗君之命，竊君之重，反君之事，以安國之危，除君之辱，功伐足以成國之大利，謂之拂。(Being able to resist his ruler’s orders, steal his ruler’s weighty power, oppose his ruler’s deeds, thereby pacifying what endangers the state and eliminating what has brought shame to his ruler, and work sufficiently hard to bring about great benefits for the state, may be described as principled defiance.)

²³² For Chow’s comment on the word *wang*, see David Knechtges, “Riddles as Poetry: The ‘Fu Chapter’ of the *Hsün-tzu*,” in Chow Tse-Tsung, ed., *Wen-lin: Studies in the Chinese Humanities*, vol. 2 (Madison, WI: Department of East Asian Languages and Literature, University of Wisconsin, 1989), p. 13, n. 60.

Let us, the stupid, in our puzzlement,
Be willing to hear the reprise.

His short song said:
I recall that distant region: (Knoblock III.203–4)

My abbreviated quotations of their translations obscure significant differences between Knoblock and Hutton in how they group the several lines of verse that close chapter 26. Hutton separates what appear as lines 252–53 in his translation from the poem that precedes them, rather than group them together as Knoblock does, and he takes “the little song” not as a reprise or coda but as an independent piece that includes the lyrics that Knoblock translates as the *Short Song* as well as the lyrics Knoblock translates as *Fu for the Lord of Chunshen*. I tend to agree with Hutton in these editorial decisions. Yang Liang had said that *fanci* 反辭 refers to *fanfu xushuo zhi ci* 反覆敘說之辭 (lyrics that repeat and resume, i.e., a reprise) and he compared the term with the *luan* 亂 (coda) that appears frequently in the *Chuci* 楚辭. Though I agree with Hutton that what follows is not a reprise in this sense it is difficult to accept his translation of *fanci* as “words of their backwardness.” There is no basis for construing *fan* in this fashion. If we are to reject “reprise” as a translation of *fanci*, then it would be preferable to adopt the view of the editors of the *Xunzi xinzhu* that *fanci* refers to “words that run counter to conventional views but that are nevertheless true.”²³³

26.n 仁人絀約，暴人衍矣。(XZJJ 482)

People of *ren* are dismissed and held back.
Violent men advance successfully. (Hutton 286.257–58)

Humane men are degraded and reduced to poverty,
Tyranical men spread everywhere. (Knoblock III.204)

In addition to referring to the relative resources and opportunities available to people, *chuyue* 絀約 (reduced and constrained) and *yan* 衍 (limitless and boundless) may refer as well to their numbers. An alternative translation:

The humane being constrained grow fewer
While the violent unrestrained multiply endlessly.

26.o 琬、玉、瑤、珠，不知佩也。(XZJJ 483)

A beautiful jade or a lovely pearl

²³³ *Xunzi xinzhu*, p. 436, n. 17: 違反通常的說法而實際是正確的言辭. Yang Liuqiao, *Xunzi guyi*, p. 722, n. 14, retains Yang Liang’s explanation of *fanci*.

Some don't know to make their accessory. (Hutton 286.261–62)

Agates and jades, jasper and pearls,

He knows not how to wear them as girdle pendants. (Knoblock III.204)

Hutton follows Wang Tianhai in regarding this line to involve only two precious gems rather than four and cites early texts that suggest that *xuan* 璇 and *yao* 瑤 do not name objects but rather describe the qualities of *yu* 玉 and *zhu* 珠 respectively.²³⁴

Glosses on Chapter 27: *Da lüe* 大略

27.a 詩曰：「物其指矣，唯其偕矣。」(XZJJ 488)

The *Odes* says:

These things, they are so lovely;

Only, let them match rightly. (Hutton 290.52–54)

An Ode says:

These things are beautiful,

yet they are plentiful. (Knoblock III.209)

The line quoted here is from the poem entitled “Yu li” 魚麗 in the “Xiao ya” 小雅 section of the *Mao shi* 毛詩.²³⁵ Knoblock’s rendering is based on Bernhard Karlgren’s interpretation.²³⁶ But Karlgren’s understanding of *xie* 偕 as “plentiful” lacks sufficient textual support. It is best to adopt the *Shijing* glosses of Zheng Xuan and understand the term to mean *qideng* 齊等 (fitting, adjusted, balanced). I take this to be the basis of Hutton’s translation of *xie* though see no reason to take the line in which it occurs as “hortatory.” Rendered as a simple declarative, the couplet serves to illustrate the larger point of the *Xunzi* that it is not enough for ritual to be beautiful, it must also be performed in a way that is suitable to its context.

27.b 舜曰：「維予從欲而治。」(XZJJ 489)

Shun said, “It is the case that I follow my desires yet attain order.” (Hutton 291.66)

Shun said: “It is only through following my desires that I have become orderly.” (Knoblock III.210)

²³⁴ See Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1032, n. 1.

²³⁵ In the overall numbering of *Shijing* poems, “Yu li” is 170 and is found at *Maoshi zhushu*, p. 341, register 1, to p. 342, register 2.

²³⁶ See Bernhard Karlgren, “Glosses on the Siao Ya Odes,” p. 45, Gloss 440.

Hutton correctly observes that *wei* 維 is best rendered here as “It is the case that . . .” rather than as “only.” The line in question appears to be a quotation of an alternate version of a passage found in the “Da Yu mo” 大禹謨 chapter of the *Shangshu*.²³⁷ But neither in the version of the passage we have here nor in its *Shangshu* version is there any reason to interpret it as if there were a disjunction between “following desires” and “achieving good order.” The orderliness should instead be seen as a consequence of following desire. This sentiment can be compared with Kongzi’s famous declaration at *Analects* 2.4: “At seventy I indulged my heart’s desires and did not transgress the boundaries.”²³⁸

27.c 君子之於子，愛之而勿面，使之而勿貌，道之以道而勿彊。(XZJJ 490)

The way a gentleman treats his children is that he loves them but is not besotted with them, he assigns them tasks but is not demeaning toward them, and he guides them with the Way but does not force them. (Hutton 292.93–96)

In his relations with his son, the gentleman loves him but does not show it in his face. He assigns his son tasks, but does not change expression over it. He guides him using the Way, but does not use physical compulsion. (Knoblock III.211)

This passage has a parallel in the “Zengzi li shi” 曾子立事 chapter of the *Da Dai liji*.²³⁹ Knoblock’s translation follows the interpretation of Yang Liang. Hutton, along with Wang Tianhai, adopts Gao Heng’s 高亨 proposal that *mian* 面 be read as *mian* 漚 (steeped in, besotted with) and *mao* 貌 as *miao* 藐 (look down upon, belittle).²⁴⁰ *Mian* 漚 is attested as referring to being drunk on alcohol but there is no evidence of it referring to showing excessive affection. Indeed, it seems inappropriate to establish as the parameters of how a *junzi* (gentleman) treats his son the extremes of besotted love and belittling regard.

27.d 禮以順人心為本，故亡於禮經而順人心者，皆禮也。(XZJJ 490)

Ritual has making people’s hearts agreeable as its root. And so, those things that are not in the *Classic of Rituals* yet make people’s hearts agreeable are still things that carry ritual propriety. (Hutton 292.97–99)

Ritual principles use obedience to the true mind of man as their foundation. Thus, were there no ritual principles in the *Classic of Ritual*, there would still be need for some kind of ritual in order to accord with the mind of man. (Knoblock III.211)

²³⁷ See *Shangshu zhengyi*, p. 92.

²³⁸ *Lunyu zhushu*, p. 15: 七十而從心所欲不逾矩。

²³⁹ See *Da Dai liji huijiao jizhu*, p. 503.

²⁴⁰ Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, pp. 1045–46, n. 4.

Hutton reads *bei* 背 (carry on the back) instead of *jie* 皆 (all), following what he says is an “older manuscript tradition.” As noted above, in my discussion of “Textual Note” 26.d, there is no manuscript evidence for the text of the *Xunzi*, only printed editions. Lu Wenchao noted that various editions of the text he examined had *bei* but he regarded them as mistaken and so emended the text to read *jie*. Wang Tianhai argues that Lu’s emendation was wrong.²⁴¹ As for whether the verb *shun* 順 should be read as intransitive (Knoblock) or transitive (Hutton), it is worth noting that elsewhere in *Xunzi* in which the verb appears in a parallel grammatical construction—for example, *shun ren zhi qing* 順人之情—it is intransitive.²⁴²

27.e 親親、故故、庸庸、勞勞，仁之殺也。(XZJJ 491)

To treat relatives as is appropriate for relatives, to treat old friends as is appropriate for old friends, to treat servants as is appropriate for servants, to treat laborers as is appropriate for laborers—these are the gradations in *ren*. (Hutton 292.104–7)

The graduated scale of humane conduct is to treat relatives in a manner befitting their relation, old friends as is appropriate to their friendship, the meritorious in terms of their accomplishment, and laborers in terms of their toil. (Knoblock III.211)

Yang Liang defines *yong* 庸 as *gong* 功 (merit, accomplishment) but Hutton reads *yong* as *yong* 傭 (servant). I can find no parallel in the various commentaries for such an interpretation and assume, based on his translation, that Hutton makes the change in order to maintain a parallelism with how he translates the two phrases (“to treat X as is appropriate for X”) that precede the one involving *yong*. Knoblock is less concerned with preserving the parallelism in his translation. I propose a third rendering: “To care for relatives, remember old acquaintances, prize the accomplished, and be solicitous to those who toil—these are the gradations of humaneness.”²⁴³

27.f 推恩而不理，不成仁；遂理而不敢，不成義。(XZJJ 491)

To extend kindness without good order does not constitute *ren*. To follow good order without proper regulation does not constitute *yi*. (Hutton 293.122–23)

To extend kindnesses to others but not in accord with natural order is not to perfect humane conduct. To proceed in accord with natural order but not to show due measure is not to perfect moral conduct. (Knoblock III.212)

²⁴¹ Ibid., p. 1046, n. 5. Wang also quotes Lu Wenchao’s commentary.

²⁴² See XZJJ 435. Hutton 248.10–11 understands *shun* in this passage to be intransitive.

²⁴³ This translation is based on the commentary of Yang Liang as well as on *Xunzi xinzhū*, p. 444, n. 1, and Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1046, n. 7.

Both Knoblock and Hutton follow Ikai Hikohiro in regarding *gan* 敢 as a scribal error for *jie* 節 (due measure, proper regulation).²⁴⁴

27.g 有亡而無疾。(XZJJ 494)

You may leave him, but you may not simply run off. (Hutton 296.215–16)

. . . should absent himself but not fall into hatred inspired by jealousy . . . (Knoblock III.215)

Yang Liang proposed that *ji* 疾 be understood as *ji* 嫉 (hate) presumably because its more ordinary meanings—“illness, feverish, hurried”—seemed to him unsuitable. Hutton finds Yang Liang’s interpretation “out of character with surrounding lines” but he fails to provide any evidence in support of his own odd interpretation of *ji* 疾 to mean “rushing off” or “storming away.”

27.h 君子聽律習容而後士。(XZJJ 496)

The gentleman heeds proper standards, practices proper deportment, and only then takes office. (Hutton 298.255–56)

The gentleman, having listened to the pitch pipe and practiced his demeanor, goes out. (Knoblock III.217)

A similar, and probably related, passage in the “Yu zao” 玉藻 chapter of the *Liji* reads: 既服，習容觀玉聲，乃出。(Having dressed, he rehearses his comportment, observing the jade sounds, and only then goes out.)²⁴⁵ This line suggested to Yang Liang that *ting lü* 聽律 (literally “listening to the pitch-standards”) refers to how the *junzi* rehearses his movements to ensure that they are as measured as the ringing of the jade pendants that sound as he walks.²⁴⁶ Also taking heed of the line, Wang Xianqian and Ikai Hikohiro proposed that *shi* 士 should be emended to *chu* 出.²⁴⁷ Hutton disagrees with the “commentators” that this line should be grouped together with the immediately preceding passage and its several references to music and he doubts the relevance of the *Liji* passage. But Hutton’s scepticism with regard to the

²⁴⁴ For Ikai’s commentary, see *Zengbu Xunzi jijie*, juan 19, p. 8.

²⁴⁵ *Liji zhengyi* 禮記正義 (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 1999), p. 885.

²⁴⁶ Yang Liang’s interpretation of the *Liji* passage is consistent with that of Zheng Xuan and Kong Yingda.

²⁴⁷ For Wang Xianqian’s comment see XZJJ 496. For Ikai Hikohiro’s see *Zengbu Xunzi jijie*, juan 19, p. 13. *Xunzi xinzhū*, p. 450, n. 2, and Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1060, n. 8, agree with this emendation.

opinions of others is not balanced by a compelling alternative interpretation. Given the verb *ting* (listen), it seems somewhat perverse to insist that *lü* has no musical association here and is simply “proper standards.” And to understand *shi* to mean “take office,” involves emending 士 to 仕, a change for which Hutton cites no evidence, not even a passage as distant from the one in question as he claims the *Liji* passage to be.²⁴⁸

27.i 冰泮殺內。(XZJJ 496)

When the ice melts, then such receptions are to decrease. (Hutton 298.258)

. . . when the ice begins to melt, executions are halted . . . (Knoblock III.217)

Knoblock misreads 殺 as *sha* (kill), rather than as *shai* (decrease). Liu Shiwei, the source for Hutton’s translation of *nei* 內, says that it should be understood as *na* 納, refers to a woman becoming betrothed, and should be read together with *shai*.²⁴⁹ However, it is equally possible that the text originally had *zhi* 止 immediately following *shai* and that the two words read together meant “cease.”²⁵⁰ In this case *nei* is read with what follows and means simply “within the private quarters.”

27.j 凡百事異理而相守也。(XZJJ 500)

All the hundred affairs follow different patterns but maintain each other. (Hutton 302.328–29)

As a rule, the hundred affairs, though different, have a rational order that they mutually observe. (Knoblock III.220)

The question for Hutton is whether this sentence is best read with what immediately precedes it in the text or with what follows (for which see 27.k). He opts for the latter. But depending upon one’s perspective it is possible to prefer the former (XZJJ and Wang Tianhai²⁵¹) or, as I do (along with the editors of the *Xunzi xinzhū*²⁵²), to connect the sentence to both the previous passage and the one that follows it.

²⁴⁸ It is worth noting in this regard, though Hutton pays his opinions no mind, that Yang Liang understands the *junzi* in this passage as someone who already holds office and that *shi* 士, which Yang accepts as the correct reading, is the title by which one refers to someone in office.

²⁴⁹ See Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, pp. 1060–61, n. 9.

²⁵⁰ Both Hao Yixing and Wang Yinzhi make this argument. See XZJJ 496–97 and Knoblock III.365, n. 59.

²⁵¹ Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi* p. 1063 and p. 1065, n. 13.

²⁵² *Xunzi xinzhū*, p. 453.

27.k 慶賞刑罰，通類而後應；政教習俗，相順而後行。(XZJJ 500)

When prizes, rewards, punishments, and penalties have interlinked categories, only then are they appropriate responses. (Hutton 302.329–30)

In offering congratulations and making rewards, in applying penal sanctions and punishing, thoroughly understand the proper category before responding. (Knoblock III.220)

I agree with Hutton that our understanding of *tong lei* 通類 is enhanced by taking into account an occurrence of the words in the “Sishi zhu fu” 四時之副 chapter of the *Chunqiu fanlu* 春秋繁露.²⁵³ There they seem to refer to *lei* (categories) such as the seasons and government activities that are *tong* (interlinked or, perhaps, interchangeable).

27.l 子謂子家駒續然大夫，不如晏子。(XZJJ 500)

The Master remarked: Zijia Ju was a grand officer who behaved solemnly, but he was not the equal of Yanzi. (Hutton 302.342–43)

The Master said of Zijia Ju that he was a rigidly correct grand officer, but was not the equal of Yan Ying . . . (Knoblock III.221)

What exactly the text intends to say about the character of Zijia Ju in its use of *xu* 續 is problematic. Lu Wenchao and others refrained from offering an opinion. Hao Yixing’s commentary is the source for Knoblock’s rendering.²⁵⁴ Hutton adopts Wang Tianhai’s proposal that we should read *xu* as a “(phonetic) loan” for *su* 肅.²⁵⁵

27.m 上好羞，則民闇飾矣。(XZJJ 503)

If superiors are fond of a sense of shame, then the common people will quietly make themselves decorous. (Hutton 305.405–6)

²⁵³ Hutton quotes the passage in his “Textual Note,” for which see Hutton, pp. 380–81: 天之道，春暖以生，夏暑以養，秋清以殺，冬寒以藏。暖暑清寒，異氣而同功，皆天之所以成歲也。聖人副天之所行以為政，故以慶副暖而當春，以賞副暑而當夏，以罰副清而當秋，以刑副寒而當冬。慶賞罰刑，舉事而同功，皆王者之所以成德也。慶賞罰刑與春夏秋冬，以類相應也，如合符。故曰王者配天，謂其道。天有四時，王有四政，四政若四時，通類也，天人所同有也。 It can also be found in Liu Dianjue 劉殿爵, ed., *Chunqiu fanlu zhuzi suoyin* 春秋繁露逐字索引 (Hong Kong: Shangwu yinshugan, 1994), p. 58, lines 11–15.

²⁵⁴ Hao Yixing’s interpretation is also adopted by *Xunzi xinzhū*, p. 454, n. 1.

²⁵⁵ See Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1068, n. 1.

When superiors love moral conduct, then the people conduct themselves in a refined manner even in private. (Knoblock III.223)

Wang Niansun and Kubo Ai propose that *xiu* 羞 is a scribal error for *yi* 義. The phrase *hao yi* 好義 (being fond of moral conduct) occurs earlier in the chapter.²⁵⁶ Wang provides as well other textual evidence in support of the emendation.²⁵⁷ In this interpretation of the text, the ruler's fondness for righteousness is contrasted with his fondness for wealth. The former leads to refinement among the people while the latter takes them down the path of greed that leads ultimately to social chaos. However, Yang Liang read the text as it is received and seems to understand *hao xiu* 好羞 to mean *hao xiu pin* 好羞貧 (being fond of feeling ashamed of poverty). Wang Tianhai agrees with Yang Liang and suggests that *hao xiu* alludes to the occurrence in the preceding passage of the phrase *xiu wu you* 羞無有 (to be ashamed of not possessing [goods]).²⁵⁸ In this interpretation the ruler's fondness for such embarrassment on the part of his people leads them to pretend to great wealth. Wang Niansun characterizes Yang Liang's interpretation as *yuqu* 迂曲 (convoluted) and Wang Tianhai's seems to me little better. It is unclear how their understanding of the text explains the contrast between this line and what ensues when a ruler is fond of wealth. Hutton also reads the text as received, without emendations, but he takes *xiu* to be a positive moral quality, comparable to the occurrence of *chi* 恥 (a sense of shame) in *Analects* 2.3, and does not relate it to the earlier passage in which it refers to being embarrassed by one's poverty.²⁵⁹ No matter how one understands *hao xiu*, it is problematic that, aside from the passage in question, the phrase occurs nowhere else in the corpus of ancient Chinese texts with a meaning that would make sense in this context.²⁶⁰

27.n 民語曰：「欲富乎？忍恥矣！傾絕矣！絕故舊矣！與義分背矣！」(XZJJ 503)

A saying of the common people states, “Do you want to be rich? Then endure what is disgraceful. Incline toward what is extreme. Forsake your old friends and acquaintances. Depart from and turn your back on *yi*.” (Hutton 305.408–11)

²⁵⁶ See XZJJ 502.

²⁵⁷ For Kubo Ai's commentary see *Zengbu Xunzi jijie*, *juan* 19, p. 22. For Wang Niansun's see XZJJ 503.

²⁵⁸ Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1073, n. 4.

²⁵⁹ For the *Analects* passage see *Lunyu zhushu*, p. 15.

²⁶⁰ The single other occurrence of *hao xiu* 好羞 is in the *Zhouli* 周禮 but must be understood there as *hao xiu* 好饈 (fine delicacies). See *Zhouli zhushu* 周禮注疏 (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 1999), p. 6.

A proverb among the people says: “Do you desire wealth? You will have to bear shame, throw out scruples, destroy yourself, cut yourself off from old friends and old ties, and turn your back on duty and station in life.” (Knoblock III.223)

Zhong Tai finds *qing jue* 傾絕 incomprehensible and Kubo Ai judges the words excrescent. Wang Tianhai proposes emending *jue* 絕 to *ce* 側 and understands *qing ce* 傾側 to mean “perverse and wicked.” Wang notes that there are five other occurrences of the phrase in the text of the *Xunzi*, but it should be noted that in none of these does it stand alone, bereft of a verb or noun to modify, as it would here if we were to accept Wang’s reading of this passage.²⁶¹ Knoblock’s translation is based on Yang Liang’s commentary and a paraphrase of the line offered by the editors of the *Xunzi xinzhū*.²⁶² Hutton understands *jue* 絕 to be similar in meaning to *ji* 極 (extreme). The close juxtaposition of *jue* in this phrase with a second occurrence in the phrase that immediately follows suggests that the received reading is corrupt.

27.o 君子之學如蛻，幡然遷之。(XZJJ 505)

The gentleman’s process of learning is like molting—continually it changes him. (Hutton 307.450–51)

The effect of learning on the gentleman is analogous to the changes of the butterfly in its chrysalis: having undergone change, he emerges altered. (Knoblock III.225)

Hutton’s more literal translation is superior to that of Knoblock’s, particularly with regard to the rendering of *tui* 蛻 and of *qian zhi* 遷之.

27.p 臨患難而不忘細席之言。(XZJJ 505)

When he confronts troubles and difficulties, he does not forget those doctrines that he has set out in detail. (Hutton 307.463–64)

Although he observes the threat of calamity or great difficulties, he does not forget the smallest measure of the doctrine. (Knoblock III.225)

Hao Yixing, followed by Wang Niansun, proposes emending *xi* 細 to *yin* 茵. Wang Niansun defines *yinxi zhi yan* 茵席之言 (literally “pillow-and-mat words”) to be “teachings from olden days,” a meaning he relates to a parallel passage found in the *Shizi* 尸子 (quoted by Yang Liang) that reads *xixi zhi yan* 昔席之言. Hutton prefers

²⁶¹ For the commentaries of Zhong Tai, Kubo Ai, and Wang Tianhai, see Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1073, n. 6.

²⁶² *Xunzi xinzhū*, p. 457, n. 4.

to interpret the text as it stands but takes *xi* 席 as a verb.²⁶³ The two syllables *xixi* 昔席 in the *Shizi* version form a rhyming binom (pronounced *[s]Ak *s-m-tAk in Old Chinese²⁶⁴), the uncertain meaning of which cannot be unravelled by analysing its component parts.²⁶⁵ The *Xunzi* version does not form a rhyming binom in Old Chinese which suggests that 細 is a scribal error of some sort, probably a misspelling of the syllable written 昔 in the *Shizi*.²⁶⁶

27.q 雨小，漢故潛。(XZJJ 506)

With the raining down of little droplets, the Han River thereby becomes deep. (Hutton 307.469–70)

When rainfall is small, the Han River does not for that reason become [the size of its tributary] the Qian. (Knoblock III.226)

Yang Liang finds this brief passage baffling as does Hao Yixing. A more daring Yu Yue cites the *Erya*'s gloss of *qian* 潛 as *shen* 深 (deep).²⁶⁷ Liang Qixiong adopts this reading and is followed by Hutton.²⁶⁸

27.r 行盡而聲聞遠。(XZJJ 506)

His conduct is flawless and his reputation is heard far and wide. (Hutton 307.473–308.474)

When his conduct fully realizes it, his reputation is known from afar. (Knoblock III.226)

²⁶³ Hutton's interpretation of *xi* is based on Zheng Xuan's commentary to an occurrence of the word at *Liji zhengyi*, p. 1578: 席，猶鋪陳也。

²⁶⁴ See William H. Baxter and Laurent Sagart, *Old Chinese: A New Reconstruction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), p. 366, for these reconstructed pronunciations.

²⁶⁵ On the semantics of rhyming binoms, see above, my discussion of Hutton's "Textual Note" 6.a and n. 39.

²⁶⁶ The Old Chinese pronunciation of *xi* 細 should be reconstructed as *[s]ʰe(k)-s according to the reconstruction table provided by Baxter and Sagart at <http://ocbaxtersagart.lsa.umich.edu/>. Cf. also Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1078, n. 9, who agrees that the *Shizi* version is the correct one.

²⁶⁷ For the commentaries of Yang Liang, Hao Yixing, and Yu Yue, see XZJJ 506. For the *Erya* gloss, see *Erya zhushu*, p. 64.

²⁶⁸ Liang Qixiong, *Xunzi jianshi*, pp. 377–78. Knoblock III.368, n. 103, mistakenly attributes to Hao Yixing an opinion that is the basis of his translation. In fact it is Yang Liang's opinion and Hao Yixing has labelled it "wrong."

Hutton reads *wen* 聞 instead of *wen* 問 attributing the former to a “manuscript tradition.” As previously noted, there is no manuscript evidence for the text of the *Xunzi*. The printed editions that read *wen* 聞 are cited by Wang Tianhai.²⁶⁹ Knoblock also adopts the variant reading.

27.s 善為詩者不說，善為易者不占，善為禮者不相，其心同也。(XZJJ 507)

Those who are good at the *Odes* do not make a show of discoursing on it, those who are good at the *Changes* do not make a show of divining with it, and those who are good at rituals do not make a show of conducting them, because they are of the same mind as this. (Hutton 308.487–91)

That one who is expert in the *Odes* does not engage in persuasions; that one who is expert in the *Changes* does not prognosticate; and that one who is expert in ritual principles does not act as master of ceremonies—all these involve the same frame of mind. (Knoblock III.226)

Yang Liang explains the identical workings of the minds of the specialists mentioned in this passage as examples of *minghui* 冥會, the “dark mastery” of a subject that is not expressed by words nor given form in gesture or practice, but remains unspoken and internal.²⁷⁰ As such they may be compared with and related to *junzi shen qi du* 君子慎其獨, mentioned in chapter 3 of the *Xunzi*, the Gentleman’s careful attention (*shen* 慎) to his inner and most authentic self (*du* 獨) that distinguishes him from lesser beings who rely on displays of power and largesse to influence others.²⁷¹ Considered in this light, Hutton’s “make a show of” is an unneeded addition to the text for which, in any case, he fails to provide adequate evidence. Moreover, contrary to both Knoblock and Hutton, we should understand *Li* 禮, as we do *Shi* 詩 and *Yi* 易, to refer to a canonical text.²⁷²

27.t 示諸櫟栝，三月五月，為疇菜，敝而不反其常。(XZJJ 507)

Expose them to the shaping frame for three to five months, and the trees become wheel rims, and even if the spokes break, they will not return to their once-usual shape. (Hutton 309.505–8)

²⁶⁹ Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1079, n. 13. See also above, my discussion of “Textual Notes” 26.d and 27.d.

²⁷⁰ *Xunzi xinzhuzhu*, p. 461, n. 3, and Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1081, nn. 21 and 22, elaborate on Yang Liang’s explanation.

²⁷¹ See above, n. 25.

²⁷² See above, my discussion of “Textual Notes” 1.c and 8.f.

Placed in the press-frame for three to five months, wood can be used for the cover or hub of the wheel even until it wears out, yet it will never revert to its regular form. (Knoblock III.227)

Although Hutton credits the editors of the *Xunzi xinzhū* for their interpretation, their commentary suggests that we understand the text to say “even if the wheel is worn out and old,” not, as Hutton has it, “even if the spokes break.”²⁷³

27.u 和之璧，井里之厥也。(XZJJ 508)

The *bi* disc of He was a stone dug out from a well . . . (Hutton 309.518–19)

The *bi* disc made from the Bian He and the stone from Jingli . . . (Knoblock III.228)

Perhaps the most complete version of the story of the *He zhi bi* 和之璧 (jade disc of He) is found in the “He shi” 和氏 chapter of the *Hanfeizi*. It tells of how Master He, a native of Chu found an uncut piece of jade that he wanted to present to the king of Chu, only to have his gift identified as a fake and his feet chopped off for lying. Though not exactly a happy ending, eventually the true nature of the jade was recognized.²⁷⁴ Quotations of this story in medieval encyclopaedias give Master He’s name as Bian He 卞和.²⁷⁵ Knoblock’s translation of the first three-word phrase makes

²⁷³ *Xunzi xinzhū*, p. 462, n. 3: 車輪做成後，即使破舊了它也不會恢復原來的形狀。

²⁷⁴ For this story, see Chen Qiyou 陳奇猷, ed., *Hanfeizi jishi* 韓非子集釋 (Taibei: He Luo tushu chubanshe, 1974), p. 238: 楚人和氏得玉璞楚山中，奉而獻之厲王，厲王使玉人相之，玉人曰：「石也。」王以和為誑，而刖其左足。及厲王薨，武王即位，和又奉其璞而獻之武王，武王使玉人相之，又曰：「石也」，王又以和為誑，而刖其右足。武王薨，文王即位，和乃抱其璞而哭於楚山之下，三日三夜，淚盡而繼之以血。王聞之，使人問其故，曰：「天下之刖者多矣，子奚哭之悲也？」和曰：「吾非悲刖也，悲夫寶玉而題之以石，貞士而名之以誑，此吾所以悲也。」王乃使玉人理其璞而得寶焉，遂命曰：「和氏之璧。」 (Master He of Chu found an uncut piece of jade in the mountains of Chu. He offered it to King Li but when the king had his jade specialist examine it the man said, “It is stone,” and so the king, thinking He a liar, had his left foot cut off. When King Li died, He offered his uncut jade to King Wu whose jade specialist also declared it a stone. The king also thought He a liar and had his right foot cut off. When King Wu died and King Wen came to the throne, He carried his uncut jade to the foot of the Chu mountains where he cried for three days and three nights, until his tears were bloody. Hearing of this the king sent someone to enquire about the reason, “There are many people in the world who have had their feet cut off so why cry out of sadness for that?” He replied, “I am not distraught because my feet were cut off. I am distraught because a valuable jade has been labelled a stone and an honest man has been called a liar.” The king then had his jade specialist discover the venation in the uncut jade and obtain the treasure from it. The treasure was then called, “The jade disc of Master He.”)

²⁷⁵ See Chen Qiyou, *Hanfeizi jishi*, p. 239, n. 1.

little sense. I suspect that he intended: “The *bi* disc made from the uncut jade of Bian He . . .” The main problem with the passage involves the remainder of the line: *jingli zhi jue ye* 井里之厥也. Knoblock adopts Yang Liang’s note that *jingli* is a place name. (But Knoblock mistakenly regards the phrase as referring to a separate story rather than as a comment on the preceding phrase.) Yang Liang did not venture a gloss for *jue* 厥 but cites an anonymous source that it should be understood as *shi* 石 (stone). Yang Liang also quotes a passage in the *Yanzi chunqiu* 晏子春秋 that refers to a *jingli zhi kun* 井里之困.²⁷⁶ In their commentaries to the *Yanzi chunqiu* passage, Sun Xingyan 孫星衍 (1753–1818) notes that the *Yilin* 意林 writes *pu* 璞 (uncut jade) instead of *kun* 困 and Liu Shipai notes that several other medieval encyclopaedias and florilegia write *pu* 朴 (plain, unadorned). Sun concludes that the *jue* of the *Xunzi* and the *kun* of the *Yanzi chunqiu* both refer to “a piece of stone.”²⁷⁷

Partly based on the *Yanzi chunqiu* passage, Lu Wenchao and Hao Yixing conclude that *jue* 厥 should be read *jue* 礩 which they interpret to be “a block of stone that serves as a doorstep.” (Lu also noted that the *kun* 困 of the *Yanzi chunqiu* passage should be read as *kun* 榦 [doorsill], which he takes to be synonymous with *jue* 礩.)²⁷⁸ The editors of the *Xunzi xinzhū* conjecture that *jing li zhi jue* perhaps refers to “an ordinary piece of stone lying beside a well.”²⁷⁹ Unlike the *Xunzi xinzhū* editors, Wang Tianhai regards *jingli* as a place name but he adopts the explanation found in Duan Yucai’s commentary to the *Shuowen* entry on *jue* 厥 that the word, whose basic meaning is “unearthed stone,” means “by extension, anything that has been dug up.”²⁸⁰ Hutton, without acknowledging the sources of his interpretation, argues that *jingli* is not a place name, but simply means “well,” and that *jue* 厥 means “a stone dug out” from it.²⁸¹ The *Yanzi chunqiu* parallel suggests that this may not be best reading of the *Xunzi* passage.

²⁷⁶ Wu Zeyu 吳則虞, ed., *Yanzi chunqiu jishi* 晏子春秋集釋 (Taipei: Dingwen shuju, 1977), p. 347.

²⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 350, n. 13. The *Yi lin* is a Tang dynasty abridgment of the *Zi chao* 子抄 of Yu Zhongrong 庾仲容 (476–549).

²⁷⁸ For the commentaries of Lu and Hao, see XZJJ 508.

²⁷⁹ *Xunzi xinzhū*, p. 463, n. 3: 就好像是井旁一塊普通的石頭。

²⁸⁰ *Shuowen jiezi zhu, pian* 9B, p. 20a: 厥，發石也。[Duan comments:] ……引伸之凡有掘發皆曰厥。

²⁸¹ A reason given by Hutton for not taking *jingli* as a toponym is that this would contradict the story that the jade disc of He came from the Chu mountains. But interpreting the words to mean “in a well” seems unlikely for the same reason.

27.v 孔子曰：「望其壙，皋如也，墳如也，鬲如也，此則知所息矣。」(XZJJ 510)

Confucius said, “Behold the grave: so final, blocked up, and cut off! With this, one knows where to find rest!” (Hutton 311.580–81)

Confucius replied: “Look into that grave pit and see how marsh-like it is, how precipitous its sides, and how it resembles the hollow legs of the *li* tripod. In that you will know what resting up really is!” (Knoblock III.230)

This passage, which has a close parallel, noted by Yang Liang and others, in the “Tian rui” 天瑞 chapter of the *Liezi* 列子,²⁸² has been read in two different ways. One group of scholars interprets it to describe the great height and grand scale of a burial mound.²⁸³ A second group sees it as the description of how a burial pit is a closed, sealed-off space that is separated from the living.²⁸⁴ Both Knoblock and Hutton tend to side with the second group (as do I), though Hutton’s interpretation involves understanding *gao* 皋 in this passage as “final,” a reading unique to him.²⁸⁵ Most interpreters, no matter their reading of the other words in the passage, take *li*

²⁸² Yang Bojun 楊伯峻, ed., *Liezi jishi* 列子集釋 (Shanghai: Longmen lianhe shuju, 1958), p. 26. The *Liezi* passage reads *gao* 罌 instead of the *gao* 皋 in the *Xunzi*, and *fen* 墳 in place of *dian* 墳.

²⁸³ Yang Liang and the editors of the *Xunzi xinzhu* say that *kuang* 壙 means “tomb mound.” They, along with Lu Wenchao, Hao Yixing, Liu Taigong 劉台拱 (1751–1805), and Wang Niansun, take *gao* 皋 to mean “high.” Lu Wenchao and Hao Yixing, followed by the editors of the *Xunzi xinzhu* read *dian* 墳 as *dian* 顛 (mountain peak). See XZJJ 510–11; *Xunzi xinzhu*, p. 465, n. 10.

²⁸⁴ Ogyū Sorai and Wang Tianhai understand *kuang* to mean “tomb pit.” See Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, pp. 1088–89, n. 7. Wang Tianhai agrees with Ogyū Sorai because a passage in the “Tan gong” 檀弓 chapter of the *Liji* says, “The ancients built tombs but not tomb mounds” (古也墓而不墳). But Wang’s reservations are misplaced. We know that, by the time of the *Xunzi*, tomb mounds, some of them quite grand in scale, had become a commonplace. See Liu Yang, “City, Palace, and Burial: An Archaeological Perspective on Qin Culture in Shaanxi,” in Liu Yang, ed., *China’s Terracotta Warriors: The First Emperor’s Legacy* (Minneapolis, MN: Minneapolis Institute of Arts, 2012), p. 49 and p. 61, n. 40. Ogyū Sorai takes *gao* 皋 to be synonymous with *ze* 澤 (marsh). Wang Tianhai understands it to mean *ze an* 澤岸 (bank of a marsh)—presumably referring to the edge of the opening of a burial pit so deep its base was wet and marsh-like. Yang Liang, Ogyū Sorai, and Wang Tianhai read *dian* 墳 as *tian* 填 (filled with earth)—a reading that is supported by the *Liezi* variant *fen* 墳 (blocked off).

²⁸⁵ Hutton reads *gao* 皋 as *gao* 罌 (the *Liezi* variant)—which he presumably reads as *yi*, though he does not say. He claims that Wang Tianhai understands 罌 as a loan for *ze* 澤, but Wang makes no such argument (cf. above, n. 286). Hutton himself takes it as a “loan” for *yi* 繹, “one meaning [of which] attested in the dictionaries is [*zhong*] 終.” He seems oblivious to the fact that in the *Liezi* it is a variant of *gao* 皋.

鬲 to refer to a hollow-legged ritual tripod that was used for steaming food.²⁸⁶ For Lu Wenchao, Hao Yixing, and others, this means that the vessel-shape, with its broad base and slightly narrower neck was imitated by the tomb mound. It is also possible that it described the shape of the vertical tomb shaft.²⁸⁷ Both schools understand the symbolism of the tomb to be a reminder that *xi* 息 (rest)—the “big sleep”—only comes with death. Yang Liang quotes the Eastern Jin *Liezi* commentator Zhang Zhan 張湛 (*fl.* 373–396): “When you see how it is sealed and separated you know that it is a place to rest” (見其墳壤鬲翼，則知息之有所也). For the editors of the *Xunzi xinzhū*, the lofty and steep mountain-like tomb mound is an unmissable symbol of “what point in time you may stop studying.”²⁸⁸

27.w 《小雅》不以於汙上。(XZJJ 511)

The “Lesser *Ya*” does not take the approach of smearing superiors. (Hutton 312. 588–89)

The people of the period of the “Lesser Odes” would not be used by vile superiors . . . (Knoblock III.230)

Yang Liang paraphrases this line as *zuo Xiao ya zhi ren bu wei jiaojun suo yong* 作《小雅》之人不為驕君所用. (The poets who composed the “Xiao ya” songs would not be employed by arrogant rulers.) Yang’s odd understanding of *wu* 汙 (sully, pollute) as *jiao* 驕 (arrogant) is perhaps the result of his linking the “Xiao ya” 小雅 poets with Kongzi’s disciple Master Xia 子夏 who, in a subsequent passage, is quoted as saying that he will not serve or meet a second time with those who are arrogant towards him because of his poverty and worn-out clothes.²⁸⁹ While they accept Yang Liang’s overall understanding of the grammar of the line, the editors of the *Xunzi xinzhū* and Knoblock opt for a more literal rendering of *wu* 汙.²⁹⁰ Zhong Tai’s interpretation of

²⁸⁶ Yang Liang and Wang Tianhai (as well as Hutton) favour regarding *li* 鬲 as a scribal error for *ge* 隔 (sealed off, separated). Ogyū Sorai seems to suggest that the term refers to ritual objects placed in the tomb but his note is too elliptical to determine its full meaning.

²⁸⁷ Vertical pit tombs of the Eastern Zhou and later are usually wide at the top and narrower at the base. But there are examples of Western Zhou tomb pits in Shanxi that are wide at the base and narrow at the top. See Xie Yaoting 謝堯亭, *Faxian Baguo: Jiangshu Dahekou mudi kaogu fajue de gushi* 發現霸國：講述大河口墓地考古發掘的故事 (Taiyuan: Shanxi renmin chubanshe, 2012), p. 19.

²⁸⁸ *Xunzi xinzhū*, p. 465, n. 10: 甚麼是停止學習的時候了。

²⁸⁹ XZJJ 513: 諸侯之驕我者，吾不為臣；大夫之驕我者，吾不復見。Master Xia’s traditional association with the *Shijing* may have suggested this linkage to Yang Liang.

²⁹⁰ *Xunzi xinzhū*, p. 466, n. 3. Here *wu* is glossed as *fu xiu* 腐朽 (rotten).

the line emphasizes how it parallels the one that follows it in the text: *zi yin er ju xia* 自引而居下 (They pull themselves back and dwell among the lowly). That is, rather than confront their superiors and condemn them with vile language, the “Xiao ya” poets restrain themselves and dwell in humble obscurity. Gao Heng and Yang Liuqiao adopt Zhong Tai’s interpretation and it is also the basis of Hutton’s translation.²⁹¹ Wang Tianhai’s understanding is similar though he prefers taking *wu* 汙 as *kua shi* 夸飾 (boast, exaggerate) on the basis of an occurrence of the word in *Mengzi* 2A2.²⁹² An alternative translation: “Those who composed the ‘Xiao ya’ songs did not use them to sully superiors.”

27.x 柳下惠與後門者同衣，而不見疑，非一日之聞也。(XZJJ 513)

Liuxia Hui had the same clothes as the keepers of the city’s back gate but was not considered doubtful, because he rejected momentary fame. (Hutton 313.624–26)

Liuxia Hui wore the same clothing as the people at the Aft Gate, yet he encountered no suspicion and not a day went by but that he was heard. (Knoblock III.232)

Yang Liang assumes that this brief allusion to the Lu 魯 worthy Liuxia Hui is part of a quotation of Master Xia that immediately precedes it in which Kongzi’s disciple complains about those who treat him arrogantly because of his poverty and shabby clothes. Thus Yang Liang understands this passage to be referring to how, although Liu Xiahui wore the same clothes as the lowly keepers of the city’s rear gate, because of how long his reputation was known, his virtues were not in doubt. This interpretation is adopted by the editors of the *Xunzi xinzhū* and by Wang Tianhai, as well as by Knoblock and Hutton, though in their translations there is a difference in how each takes *fei yiri zhi wen ye* 非一日之聞也.²⁹³

There is, however, a radically different interpretation of the allusion that involves seeing it, not as part of what Master Xia is quoted as saying, but rather as an independent story. Kubo Ai quotes a passage from the *Kongzi jiaoyu* 孔子家語 that alludes to Liuxia Hui:

²⁹¹ For these commentaries, see Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1090, n. 11. In Zhong Tai’s interpretation, the parts of the phrase that carry significant meaning are *bu yi* 不以 and *wu shang* 汙上. Since it parallels the conjunction *er* 而, *yu* 於 is a grammatical word that Zhong Tai ignores. Hutton’s “take the approach of” misconstrues Zhong Tai’s understanding of the grammar of the line and, in any case, is not a credible rendering of *yi yu* 以於. Gao Heng reads *yu* 於 as *yu* 淤 because the latter is synonymous with *wu* 汙. The parallelism noted by Zhong Tai makes Gao Heng’s reading unlikely.

²⁹² Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1090, n. 11.

²⁹³ *Xunzi xinzhū*, p. 468, n. 4; Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1095, n. 10. Hutton’s translation of 非一日之聞也 is closer than Knoblock’s to the intent of Yang Liang’s interpretation.

婦人曰：「子何不如柳下惠？然嫗不逮門之女，國人不稱其亂。」

The lady said to him, “Why not be like Liuxia Hui? He warmed with his body a woman who could not reach the city gate (before it closed for the night), and his countrymen did not consider him unruly.”²⁹⁴

The earliest version of this story—one more complete than that preserved in the *Kongzi jiayu*—is found in the Mao commentary to the second stanza of the *Shijing* poem “Xiang bo” 巷伯 (Mao 200).²⁹⁵ Lu Wenchao says that the *Xunzi* passage is a reference to this story and that it was Liuxia Hui’s chaste behaviour that others trusted. Referring to passages in the *Lüshi chunqiu* 呂氏春秋 and *Hanfeizi*, Wang Niansun argues that the *hou men zhe* 後門者 of the *Xunzi* passage refers not to the lowly gate keepers of the rear gate, as Yang Liang says, but rather to “those who arrive at a gate after it has closed,” i.e., to the *bu dai men zhi nü* 不逮門之女 (woman who could not reach the city gate), that Liuxia Hui had kept warm with his body in the Mao commentary/*Kongzi jiayu* tale.²⁹⁶ An alternative translation: “Although Liuxia Hui shared clothing with someone who arrived after the gates had closed, he was not regarded with suspicion, because his reputation had long been known.”

27.y 藍直路作，似知而非。(XZJJ 514)

Laying wily traps and plotting deceptive strategies resemble wisdom but are not it. (Hutton 314.641–42)

²⁹⁴ For Kubo Ai’s commentary, see *Zengbu Xunzi jijie*, *juan* 19, pp. 33–34. The quoted passage is found in *Kongzi jiayu*, in *Xinbian Zhuzi jicheng* 新編諸子集成 (Taipei: Shijie shuju, 1978), vol. 2, p. 23. For a full translation of the *Kongzi jiayu* story in which this quoted passage occurs, see R. P. Kramers, *K’ung Tzu Chia Yü: The School Sayings of Confucius* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1949), pp. 248–49.

²⁹⁵ *Maoshi zhushu*, p. 428, register 2. This more elaborate version was misattributed by some to the *Lüshi chunqiu*. For a discussion and translation, see John Knoblock and Jeffrey Riegel, *The Annals of Lü Buwei: A Complete Translation and Study* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000), pp. 681–82. For a translation of Mao 200, see Arthur Waley, *The Book of Songs* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1937), pp. 315–16.

²⁹⁶ For *hou* 後 (arrive after a gate has closed) see Chen Qiyu, ed., *Lüshi chunqiu jiaoshi* 呂氏春秋校釋 (Shanghai: Xuelin chubanshe, 1984), p. 1337 and p. 1343, n. 30 (Knoblock and Riegel, p. 517) and Chen Qiyu, *Hanfeizi jishi*, pp. 709–10, n. 2. Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1095, n. 10, explicitly rejects the interpretation of Lu Wenchao and Wang Niansun as well as any connection between the *Xunzi* passage and the story in the Mao commentary because he finds that Yang Liang’s explanation provides a better account of how the passage fits in the context of the passages that precede and follow it.

Wearing tattered clothes and sackcloth garments while acting in a grand manner may seem like knowledge, but it is not. (Knoblock III.232–33)

The first four words of this line, as written in the received text, make little or no sense in the context. Yang Liang is at a loss to decipher them. Wang Tianhai collects the opinions of nine other Japanese and Chinese authorities on how the text might be emended to yield a better reading.²⁹⁷ Hutton finds that, among these, the emendations proposed by Liu Shipai seem the “most plausible,” and thus his translation is based on reading *lan ju lu zuo* 藍苴路作 as *lan ju lue zha* 濫狙略詐.²⁹⁸ I agree with Wang Tianhai that, given available evidence, it is futile to attempt to make sense of these four words.

27.z 凡物有乘而來，乘其出者，是其反者也。(XZJJ 515)

In every case, there is that upon which the coming of a thing depends. To regard the result as what is depended upon is getting it backward. (Hutton 314.651–53)

As a general rule, things come about because something occasioned them. For what occasioned them turn back to yourself. (Knoblock III.233)

Hutton’s rendering of this line is flawed by not giving sufficient weight to the pair formed by *chu* 出 (come out from) and *fan* 反 (return to).²⁹⁹ It seems that the best way to account for the meaning of the pair in the overall context of the line is to adopt Wang Niansun’s proposals that *cheng* 乘 is synonymous with *yin* 因 (rely upon), and the second occurrence of the word is excrescent.³⁰⁰ An alternative translation: “It is ever so that a thing’s arrival relies upon something. Its coming out is its return.” I take this to mean that if you wish to know the cause of things look to what bears the consequences of their occurrence.³⁰¹ Wang Niansun takes this to be the self.

²⁹⁷ Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, pp. 1096–97, n. 18.

²⁹⁸ Knoblock III.370, n. 134, says that he is “following Karlgren,” but he does not provide further details on Karlgren’s proposed emendations nor does he indicate which of Karlgren’s many studies he is referring to.

²⁹⁹ The words are recognized as an essential pair in the commentaries of Yang Liang and Tsukada Tora. Tsukada’s note is found at Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1097, n. 23.

³⁰⁰ Luo Ruihe 駱瑞鶴, quoted in Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1097, n. 23, disagrees that the second occurrence of *cheng* is excrescent but he recognizes that the phrase *qi chu zhe* 其出者 should stand apart and not include the word.

³⁰¹ Tsukada Tora cites a relevant passage he attributes to Zengzi 曾子: *chu hu er zhe, fan hu er zhe ye* 出乎爾者，反乎爾者也。 (What emerges from you returns to you.) See Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1097, n. 23.

27.aa 言之信者，在乎區蓋之間。(XZJJ 515)

Talk that is trustworthy rests between what is empty and what is overstated. (Hutton 314.658–59)

The words of a trustworthy person lie in between “cover and concealment.” (Knoblock III.233)

There is a consensus among Yang Liang, Hao Yixing, Luo Ruihe, and Wang Tianhai that *qu gai* 區蓋 should be read as *qiu gai* 丘蓋 which occurs as a binom in the *Hanshu* with the odd meaning “doubtful, uncertain.”³⁰² It has this unusual meaning in the *Hanshu* because it is quite likely an allusion to *Lunyu* 7.27: 子曰：「蓋有不知而作之者，我無是也。……」³⁰³ (The Master said, “There may well be those who do not know yet act, but I am not of this sort . . .”) The point is that when Kongzi did not know the proper course of action he did not act but remained silent. Since Kongzi is speaking, his personal name Qiu 丘 plus *gai* 蓋 (the first word he says) together became a sort of shorthand reference for expressing doubt and uncertainty.³⁰⁴ (Other commentators recognize that, in light of the *Hanshu* passage, *qu gai* should be regarded as equivalent to *qiu gai* and understood to mean “doubtful, uncertain” though they do not make the connection with the *Lunyu*.³⁰⁵) An alternative translation of the *Xunzi* passage based on this interpretation: “The sincerity of one’s words lies in the space between doubt and uncertainty.”

Other commentators read the text as it is without emending it. Thus Liu Shippei defines *qu* 區 and *gai* 蓋 as two separate and independent words. He defines the first as “affirming the truth” and the second as “scepticism.” While Liu attempts to link his understanding to passages elsewhere in the *Xunzi*, the basis for the specific definitions he assigns to the words is unclear.³⁰⁶ Gao Heng defines *qu gai* as a binom that means *cangni fuyan* 藏匿覆掩 (hide and cover). He does not elaborate on his reasons for

³⁰² *Hanshu*, p. 3610. For the meaning of *qiu gai* see the commentary of Yan Shigu 顏師古 (581–645).

³⁰³ *Lunyu zhushu*, p. 94.

³⁰⁴ Hao Yixing and the *Hanshu* commentator Yan Shigu identify the *Hanshu* passage as an allusion to *Lunyu* 7.27.

³⁰⁵ See the commentaries of Luo Ruihe and Wang Tianhai in Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1098, n. 25.

³⁰⁶ Liu refers to the chapter 6 passage: 信信，信也；疑疑，亦信也 (XZJJ 97). (To believe the believable is sincerity; to doubt the doubtful is also sincerity.) Liu equates *qu* 區 with *yi yi* 疑疑 and *gai* 蓋 with *xin xin* 信信. Liu Shippei’s interpretation suggests an alternative translation: “The reliability of one’s words resides in the space between affirming the truth and scepticism.”

doing so.³⁰⁷ Gao is evidently the source of Knoblock's translation. Hutton's interpretation is his own invention.

27.bb 曾子食魚，有餘，曰：「泔之。」門人曰：「泔之傷人，不若奧之。」曾子泣涕曰：「有異心乎哉！」傷其聞之晚也。(XZJJ 516–17)

Zengzi ate fish, and there were leftovers. He said, "Use rice-water to keep them." His disciples said, "When kept in rice-water, they become harmful to people. It is better to pickle them." Zengzi cried and said, "How could my heart be so aberrant!" He was aggrieved that he was late in learning this. (Hutton 315.674–78)

Master Zeng ate some fish, but had leftovers. He said: Put rice water over it."

A disciple replied: "Putting rice water over it may harm you; it would be better to cook it."

Master Zeng wept, saying: "How could I have had so aberrant a mind as not to realize this!" He was hurt that he had heard this so late in life. (Knoblock III.234)

What to do with leftover fish? Zengzi tells his followers to "gan 泔 it." They reply that that is harmful and tell him it would be best to "ao 奧 it." Attempts to explain what these verbs mean range from Yang Liang's profession of ignorance to Wang Tianhai's epicurean references to the *Qimin yaoshu* 齊民要術, a mid-sixth-century agronomy manual that includes information on food preparation. Wang Tianhai and others conclude that "to gan it" means to steep it in the water in which rice was cooked. Wang, moreover, says that "to ao it" means the same thing as "to yan 腌 it," i.e., to preserve or pickle the fish, presumably in salt, a method mentioned in the *Qimin yaoshu*.³⁰⁸ This is the basis of Hutton's translation. I prefer Jin Qiyuan's 金其源 (1889–1961) explanation of what his disciples told Zengzi to do with his leftover fish: "Toss it in the pig pen."³⁰⁹

27.cc 故塞而避所短，移而從所仕。(XZJJ 517)

Thus, inhibit and avoid those things where you fall short, but shift to and follow those things to which they applied themselves. (Hutton 315.680–82)

Thus, put to an end and leave behind your shortcomings; advance and follow your abilities. (Knoblock III.234)

³⁰⁷ For the commentaries of Liu and Gao, see Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1098, n. 25.

³⁰⁸ Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, pp. 1100–1101, n. 1; Miao Qiyu 繆啟愉, ed., *Qimin yaoshu jiaoshi* 齊民要術校釋 (Beijing: Zhongguo nongye chubanshe, 1998), p. 505 and p. 507, nn. 3 and 4.

³⁰⁹ Jin is quoted in Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1101, n. 1: 奧之者，投諸豕牢也。

The sentence that precedes this one advises: 無用吾之所短，遇人之所長. (Do not use your shortcomings to counter the strengths of others.) This sentence advises what strategy one *should* adopt in countering the strengths of others: “Block off and push aside your shortcomings while shifting to and following what you are capable of doing.” My interpretation of the present passage adopts Yang Liang’s proposal that *shi* 仕 be understood as *shi* 事.³¹⁰ Hutton also adopts Yang’s gloss but he understands the subject of that verb to be “others,” an interpretation that is not supported by the wording of the passage.³¹¹

27.dd 疏知而不法，察辨而操辟……(XZJJ 517)

Being thoroughly clever yet not adopting proper models, being acute in debate yet upholding things that are deviant . . . (Hutton 315.682–84)

Knowing things comprehensively but not according to the model; scrutinizing and discriminating but holding on to perverse doctrines . . . (Knoblock III.234)

Hutton says that he reads *cha bian* 察辯 in place of *cha bian* 察辨 and cites a “manuscript tradition.” I have been unable to locate a commentary that sorts out these variants but have noted in passing that some printed editions write the latter while most have the former. There is no manuscript evidence.

27.ee 多言無法而流喆然，雖辯，小人也。(XZJJ 518)

He who speaks much but does not follow the proper model, and whose words are perverse and twisted, even if he argues keenly, is nothing but a petty man. (Hutton 315.688–90)

A petty man speaks frequently but in a manner that does not adhere to the model, his thoughts drowning in the verbiage of his idle chatter even when he engages in the disciplined discourse of formal discriminations. (Knoblock III.234–35)

A passage with closely similar wording appears in chapter 6: 多少無法而流湏然，雖辯，小人也。³¹² The slight differences in wording suggested to Yang Liang that, in the chapter 6 version, *shao* 少 is perhaps an error for *yan* 言 and, in the chapter 27

³¹⁰ Knoblock’s translation adopts Yu Yue’s proposal that *shi* 仕 be emended to *ren* 任, an emendation also accepted by the editors of the *Xunzi xinzhu*. See p. 471, n. 1, of the latter.

³¹¹ In the preceding passage the shift in subjects is explicit: *wu* 吾 (self) versus *ren* 人 (others). The absence of such a shift in the present passage is a clear signal that the subject should be the same for both of its phrases.

³¹² XZJJ 97.

version, *zhe* 喆 should be *mian* 澗. Others have disagreed on the question of which version's readings should be judged preferable. One school of interpretation follows Yang Liang.³¹³ Another group insists that *zhe* 喆—a variant of *zhe* 哲 (wise, clever)—is the correct reading.³¹⁴ Ikai Hikohiro also accepts *zhe* 喆 as the correct reading but he understands it as a variant of *jie* 詰 which, in this context, he takes to mean *zhengbian mao* 爭辯貌 (in an argumentative manner).³¹⁵ Hutton says he follows Ikai—but he defines *jie* as “twisted” or “bent,” which means, in effect, he does not follow Ikai but rather the unnamed “dictionaries” whose definition he has adopted.³¹⁶ Wang Tianhai attempts to reconcile the chapter 6 and chapter 27 versions: He says that *mian* 澗 of chapter 6 is an error for *tian* 覲 and that the latter is also the meaning of *zhe* 哲, the variant of *zhe* 喆 in chapter 27. Wang defines *tian* as “thick-skinned” and “displaying no sense of shame.” But, in fact, determining the meaning of *tian* is considerably more controversial than Wang indicates.³¹⁷

Glosses on Chapter 28: *You zuo* 宥坐

28.a 若不可，尚賢以綦之。(XZJJ 522)

When some people still did not approve of it, the former kings raised up those who were worthies, as a means to educate them. (Hutton 320.75–77)

If it still could not be attained, they would honor the worthy in order to teach them. (Knoblock III.246)

Hutton's interpretation of the subject of *ruo bu ke* 若不可 follows Yang Liang and serves to correct Knoblock's mistaken rendering. It is possible, however, that the subject of this verb phrase are the *shang* 上 (superiors) mentioned in the preceding passage.³¹⁸ Both Knoblock and Hutton adopt Kubo Ai's suggestion that *qi* 綦 should

³¹³ *Xunzi xinzhū*, p. 471, n. 2. This is also the basis for Knoblock's translation.

³¹⁴ See the commentaries of Fu Shan 傅山 (1607–1684), Kubo Ai, Long Yuchun, and Luo Ruihe, all of which are quoted in either Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 217, n. 4, or p. 1102, n. 6.

³¹⁵ See *Zengbu Xunzi jijie*, *juan* 19, p. 38. Ikai neglected to say whether he would emend the chapter 6 version of the passage.

³¹⁶ Hutton also disagrees with Ikai's parsing of the line. It is perhaps worth noting that in other occurrences of *jie* 詰 in the *Xunzi* it does not mean what Ikai and Hutton say it means. See my discussion of “Textual Note” 25.c.

³¹⁷ For his analysis of the meaning of *tian* 覲, see Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 217, n. 4. For other views of the meaning of the word see my discussion of “Textual Note” 8.d. It is also unclear on what Wang bases his claim that *zhe* 哲 is synonymous with *tian*.

³¹⁸ See *Xunzi xinzhū*, p. 479, nn. 1 and 2.

be *ji* 基 which Kubo Ai takes to mean *jiao* 教 (instruct, teach).³¹⁹ However, *shang xian* 尚賢 refers not simply to the act of promoting those around the ruler who were capable but also to the principle of favouring for office and in other respects those who were educated and qualified rather than relatives and court favourites. Similarly, in the passage that follows, *fei bu neng* 廢不能 (Discarding the Incapable), refers to a policy, not simply an action. An alternative translation: “When superiors still proved incapable of the Way, the former kings instructed them in the principle of ‘Elevating the Worthy.’”³²⁰

28.b 子貢……出而問於孔子曰：「……吾亦未輟，還復瞻被九蓋皆繼，被有說邪？匠過絕邪？」孔子曰：「……蓋曰貴文也。」(XZJJ 527–28)

Zigong . . . went out and asked Confucius, “. . . I looked continuously, going back and forth inspecting the nine doors. Each of them has been patched together. Is there some explanation for this? Did the carpenters originally cut off too much?” Confucius said, “. . . We may perhaps say that it is because they simply valued these patterns.” (Hutton 324.207–17)

Zigong . . . proceeded to go and ask Confucius about it: “. . . Just as I was about to finish, I looked a second time and noticed that the north doors were both cut off. Does that have some proper explanation, or did the carpenters simply saw off too much?” Confucius responded: “. . . Probably I should say that it was a matter of prizing this design.” (Knoblock III.250)

This passage involves technical references and vocabulary the intent and meaning of which can only be conjectured about. Hutton adopts for the most part the notes and translation into modern Chinese of Liao Jilang.³²¹ Aside from reading *jiu gai* 九

³¹⁹ See *Zengbu Xunzi jijie*, *juan* 20, p. 4. As Kubo Ai notes, Du Yu 杜預 (222–285) in his commentary to the *Zuozhuan* defines *ji* 基 as *jiao* 教 (teach). See Yang Bojun, ed., *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu* 春秋左傳注 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2009), Xuan 宣 12, p. 741. In the passage that follows this one we are told that, when some still proved incapable, the former kings cast them aside in order to *dan* 單 (= 憚, i.e. frighten) the remainder into reforming themselves. We should perhaps expect the verb in the present passage to provide a positive contrast with the *dan* in the subsequent passage. It is thus noteworthy that a related passage in the *Kongzi jiayu* has *quan* 勸 (encourage) in place of *qi* 綦: 尚賢以勸之，又不可，即廢之，又不可，而後以威憚之。(Use “Elevating the Worthy” to encourage them, and if they are still unable cast them aside, and if they are still unable only then use your awesome might to frighten them.) See *Kongzi jiayu*, p. 3.

³²⁰ We may regard this passage as an example of the *Xunzi* deploying and hence coopting teachings and principles that were closely associated with the Mohists.

³²¹ Liao Jilang, *Xinbian Xunzi*, pp. 2190–94.

蓋 as “nine doors,”³²² Hutton’s translation is not far different from that of Knoblock. There remain, however, numerous problematic points of interpretation. These include: whether *jiu gai* 九蓋 should be read as *bei gai* 北蓋 and the meaning of *gai* 蓋; whether *ji* 繼 should be emended as Wang Niansun proposes;³²³ and whether the phrase *jiang guo jue xie* 匠過絕邪 should be interpreted as both Knoblock and Hutton do or understood in the novel way proposed by Fu Shan and Wang Tianhai.³²⁴

A Gloss on Chapter 29: *Zi dao* 子道

29.a

In his translation of a conversation between Kongzi and Zilu 子路, Hutton rightly indicates, as did Knoblock before him, that a particular utterance is spoken by Zilu and not by Confucius.³²⁵

Glosses on Chapter 31: *Ai gong* 哀公

31.a 孔子對曰：「所謂庸人者，口不能道善言，心不知色色……」(*XZJJ* 538–39)

Confucius answered, “As for the one called a vulgar man, his mouth cannot speak good words, and his heart does not know to control the expression on his face . . .” (Hutton 333.25–27)

Confucius responded: “Those who are called common men have a mouth that is unable to utter good words and a heart that is insensible to the need for concern . . .” (Knoblock III.260)

Yang Liang understands *se se* 色色 to mean that one can “use one’s own countenance to gaze at the countenance of others and thus know whether they are good or bad.”³²⁶ Hutton refers to an occurrence of *se se zhe* 色色者 in the *Liezi* as justification for interpreting *se se* in the *Xunzi* passage as verb plus object which he understands to

³²² On this point Hutton departs from Liao’s interpretation and adopts one proposed by Zhang Jue, *Xunzi yizhu*, p. 440, n. 3.

³²³ Wang Niansun, quoted at *XZJJ* 528, argues that, for the sake of consistency of rhyme, *ji* 繼 should be emended to the old script form of *jue* 𠄎 (now written 絕). This is the basis of Knoblock’s translation of the term.

³²⁴ Both Fu Shan and Wang Tianhai say that the four-word phrase means that the carpenters had gone beyond unsurpassed skill. See Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1125, n. 37.

³²⁵ See Hutton 326.66 and Knoblock III.253.

³²⁶ *XZJJ* 539: 以己色觀彼之色，知其好惡也。

mean literally, “to make one’s countenance a certain countenance.”³²⁷ It is possible to understand the grammar of the two words as Hutton does without coming to the same conclusion with respect to their meaning. A parallel passage in the *Da Dai liji* suggests to Lu Wenchao and Hao Yixing that *se se* is an error for *yi yi* 邑邑, which they take to be *yi yi* 悒悒 (sorrow, worry), and Liu Shipai and Wang Tianhai take to be *yi yi* 挹挹 (restrained, humble).³²⁸ An alternative translation: “Kongzi replied, ‘Those we call common men have mouths that do not speak good words and hearts that do not know humility.’”

31.b 繆繆肫肫，其事不可循。(XZJJ 541–42)

Mixed up and jumbled,
His works cannot be followed. (Hutton 335.86–87)

With their formless majesty and their profound and pure mystery, their activities cannot be grasped. (Knoblock III.261)

Since *chunchun* 肫肫 (sincere, honest) seems an inappropriate way to describe deeds that *bu ke xun* 不可循 (cannot be followed), Yang Liang understands it as *zhunzhun* 沌沌 (chaotic, confused), a variant of which is *zhunzhun* 沌沌, the reading that Hutton chooses. Wang Tianhai reads the text as *dundun* 沌沌, which is roughly synonymous with *chunchun* 肫肫.³²⁹ Hao Yixing and others, citing a parallel passage in the *Da Dai liji*, prefer to understand *chunchun* 肫肫 as *chunchun* 純純 (pure, refined).³³⁰ Similar problems surrounding the interpretation of *miumiu* 繆繆 make it difficult to determine which, if any, of the proposed readings of *chunchun* 肫肫 is best.³³¹

31.c 孔子對曰：「古之王者，有務而拘領者矣，其政好生而惡殺焉。……」(XZJJ 542)

³²⁷ Yang Bojun, *Liezi jishi*, p. 6. In the *Liezi* passage *se se* 色色 means “colour” and the phrase *se se zhe* 色色者 is probably to be translated “what makes a colour a colour” or “what causes a colour to be a colour.” Ogyū Sorai also notes that the *Liezi* passage is relevant to understanding *se se* in the *Xunzi*. See Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1149, n. 12.

³²⁸ For these commentaries and the *Da Dai liji* passage, see Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1149, n. 12.

³²⁹ Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1154, n. 37.

³³⁰ See XZJJ 542 and *Xunzi xinzhū*, p. 499, n. 15.

³³¹ True to his somewhat eccentric approach to interpreting the *Xunzi*, Fu Shan sees no problem with reading *chunchun* 肫肫 and labels unnecessary Yang Liang’s reading it as *zhunzhun* 沌沌 and defining that as *zaluān* 雜亂 (chaotic and confused). See Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, pp. 1153–54, n. 37.

Confucius replied, “The kings of ancient times were men who, when there were tasks to be done, kept to leadership, and that is all. In their government, they valued life and hated killing . . .” (Hutton 335.98–100)

Confucius replied: “The kings of antiquity had helmets and tight-fitting collars. Their government was such that good was produced and evil was destroyed . . .” (Knoblock III.261–62)

There is universal agreement among *Xunzi* commentators, both early and contemporary, that the point of this passage is to contrast the early kings’ indifference to their clothing as against their attention to humane government. There are numerous parallel passages that confirm that *wu* 務 should be understood to refer to headware and *juling* 拘領 to a round collar.³³² Knoblock misunderstands the grammar of *hao sheng* 好生 and *wu sha* 惡殺. Nor is Hutton’s reading of *hao sheng* correct. *Hao*, pronounced in the fourth tone, means “to love or to show favour towards.”³³³ An alternative translation: “The kings of antiquity had caps and round collars but in their government they were good to the living and detested killing.”

31.d 且丘聞之，好肆不守折，長者不為市。(XZJJ 544)

Moreover, I have heard it said that those who are fond of business do not preserve the sacrificial grounds, while elders do not act for the sake of the market. (Hutton 337.146–48)

Moreover, I, Qiu, have heard that

people who are good at trading in the marketplace do not allow their stores to diminish in value and that those who have superior natures do not engage in commerce. (Knoblock III.263)

Hutton disregards the opinion of Yang Liang and those who follow him as well as the evidence of parallel texts that *zhe* 折 refers to a “decrease in the value of a merchant’s goods,” and opts instead for the meaning it has in some occurrences in ritual texts to which he was pointed by the *Ciyuan* 辭源 dictionary.³³⁴ But what Hutton has failed to notice (or acknowledge) is that, in chapter 2 of the *Xunzi*, *zhe* is

³³² See Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1156, n. 2, for a sampling of the commentaries and the passages that confirm these readings of *wu* 務 and *juling* 拘領. Hutton’s rendering is his own and lacks textual support for his understanding of *juling*. He also fails to grasp that the passage’s contrast between the plain clothing of the early kings and their fastidiously humane government is in keeping with the overall theme of Kongzi’s replies to Duke Ai 哀公.

³³³ See *Xunzi xinzhū*, p. 500, n. 3.

³³⁴ Hutton refers readers only to the *Ciyuan*, not to the sources on which it bases its definitions.

also used in a description of what an adept businessman does when goods have lost their value: *lianggu bu wei zhe yue bu shi* 良賈不為折閱不市. (A skilled merchant does not stop marketing his goods because he has to sell them at a reduced price.)³³⁵ Hutton and his readers would have been better served had he left his copy of the *Ciyuan* on the shelf.

³³⁵ *XZJJ* 27. Cf. Hutton's correct translation at Hutton 12.105–6. Kubo Ai alludes to this earlier passage in his commentary. See Wang Tianhai, *Xunzi jiaoshi*, p. 1159, n. 20.