

The Voice out of the Whirlwind : A Possible Solution to the Thematic Problem of *T'ien Wen*

Chen Tze-yun

The purpose of this paper is to apply a convincing explanation for the voice out of the whirlwind, the speeches of God in the *Book of Job*, to the interpretation of *T'ien Wen* (天問, *Heaven Questions*), an ancient Chinese poem attributed to Ch'ü Yüan (屈原), collected in the *Ch'u Tz'u* anthology (楚辭, *The Songs of the South*). What I attempt to do is, as it were, to use the whetstone of another's mountain to sharpen my own tool.

The interpretations of God's speeches in the *Book of Job* have not been unanimous. It has been pointed out that as the speeches make no reference to the theme of man's suffering, with which the rest of *Job* is concerned, some critics have been led to assume that they are irrelevant. While others, who admit their relevance, have misconstrued their meaning.¹ R. H. Pfeiffer, for example, maintains that the speeches of God are meant to reveal "the power and wisdom of the creator" in contrast with "his contempt for miserable human beings, in whom God is no more interested than in wild animals."² E. M. Good, for another example, finds that the speeches of God make Job realize his sin before he acquits him. Therefore the *Book of Job* exhibits "the irony of reconciliation."³

A convincing interpretation for the speeches of God is offered by Gordis. He emphasizes their allusiveness as the key to our understanding of their meaning.⁴ Paradoxically, in asking Job a series of questions that are apparently irrelevant to Job's immediate concern, God is actually answering him indirectly through the implications and connotations of his words. When finally Job declares that his eye sees God and he repents in dust and ashes, we can conclude that Job has come to this understanding: "just as there is order and harmony in the natural world, though imperfectly grasped by man,

so there is order and meaning in the moral sphere, though often incomprehensible to man."⁵ This interpretation is satisfying for some reasons too subtle to be fully stated. For one thing, the original text of the *Book of Job* can be kept intact. There is no need to reconstruct the book as some critics have tried to do. For another, the *Book of Job* was, so to speak, a blurred picture, because it was out of focus. Gordis has brought it into focus and we enjoy seeing it suddenly become vivid and meaningful.

T'ien Wen is one of the seventeen works in the *Ch'u Tz'u* anthology, and in the consensus of readers and critics, the most difficult one. Its difficulty arises partly from the archaism of its language and prosody, partly from its historical allusions, some of which are either lost or unascertainable, but most important of all from the fact that the whole poem is made up of a long series of questions, which is unique among the Chinese classics. The poem consists of 353 verses, about 170 questions.⁶ For the convenience of our discussion, I have used David Hawkes' translation as our reference. He has combined many pairs of tetrasyllabic verses into single lines, resulting in 187 lines for the whole poem.⁷

If *T'ien Wen* is such a difficult poem, why do we read or study it? A partial answer is offered by Hawkes. He points out that it "is in some ways the most fascinating of the seventeen works in the *Ch'u Tz'u* anthology. From it we are able to gain a comprehensive picture of the world and its history as seen through the eyes of a Chinese living in about the fourth century B.C."⁸ I may add that because of *T'ien Wen*, the great T'ang poet Liu Tsung-yüan (柳宗元, 773-819) wrote a companion poem, *T'ien Tui* (天對, *Heaven Answers*), to complement it.⁹ In *T'ien Tui* Liu tried to the best of his knowledge to solve the questions of *T'ien Wen* one by one. Later the encyclopedic Sung Neo-Confucianist Chu Hsi (朱熹, 1130-1200) also essayed to answer them in his commentary in the *Variorum Edition of Ch'u Tz'u* (楚辭集注 *Ch'u Tz'u Chi-chü*).¹⁰ And after Chu Hsi, many other commentators followed Chu's suit.¹¹ Because both Liu Tsung-yüan and Chu Hsi were men of great learning and to some extent representative of their age, a comparative study on *T'ien Wen*, *T'ien Tui*, and the commentaries on *T'ien Wen* can be very valuable to the students of Chinese intellectual history.

But *T'ien Wen* as a social document is not our major concern, since we are students of literature. What is the intrinsic value of *T'ien Wen* as a poem? Some critics have maintained that *T'ien Wen* is the most exotic piece in the anthology. And in importance as well as in excellence, it is only next to *Li*

Sao (離騷).¹² As the judgment of a poem is often influenced by personal taste, we do not have to agree or quarrel with such an opinion. We all know that *T'ien Wen* has more than 170 questions. We also know that sometimes questions can be very boring, especially when there are many of them and they come in succession. When we recall how we hate examination questions, how we yawn at a three-page questionnaire, and how hard we try to be patient with an inquisitive interviewer, we may begin to see some literary merits in *T'ien Wen*. How did the author of *T'ien Wen* manage to be quite entertaining when he showered upon people so many questions? The answer is twofold. First, the questions are interesting and provoking. Second, they are asked in an infinite variety of ways.

The authorship of *T'ien Wen*, to my mind, is an important question, for any author other than Ch'ü Yüan would make the poem less meaningful. Traditionally it is attributed to Ch'ü Yüan. This attribution is strongly supported by the fact that most of the historical allusions in *T'ien Wen* also appear in *Li Sao*, whose authorship has never been questioned except by a few modern scholars, who, ignoring the fact of Ch'ü Yüan being a historical figure, went so far as to suggest that he was a Chinese Homer.¹³ The only difference between the historical allusions of *Li Sao* and those of *T'ien Wen* lies in form. They appear in the former in statements, and in the latter in questions.

Ch'ü Yüan's biography can be found in the Grand Historian Ssu-ma Ch'ien's (司馬遷, c. 146-86 B.C.) *Shih Chi* (史記, *Historical Records*).¹⁴ For the purposes of our discussion, it suffices to say that Ch'ü Yüan (c. 343-278 B.C.) flourished in the Warring States Period, that he was of the family of the King Huai (懷王, reg. 328-299 B.C.) of Ch'u, and that like Pier delle Vigne, he was a highly accomplished man and an able minister of the king, once trusted but who later suffered from "the blows of Envy."¹⁵ He was twice exiled and finally committed suicide by drowning himself in a river.

There are indeed a number of striking affinities between Ch'ü Yüan and Pier delle Vigne.¹⁶ But their reputation after death is quite different. Ch'ü Yüan has become, ethically, the paragon of loyal ministers in China, and literarily, not only the progenitor of the *Sao*-style of poetry, but also, in the opinion of many Chinese critics, the greatest poet that China has ever produced. The Dragon Boat Festival, one of the three important festivals of China, has been held annually in honor of his tragic death. In addition, after the founding of the Republic of China, the day of the Dragon Boat Festival,

which falls on the fifth day of the fifth moon according to the lunar calendar, has been designated as Poet's Day to commemorate his poetic achievements. Pier delle Vigne, on the other hand, was so unfortunate as to be assigned a place in the inferno by Dante. Had he been born a Chinese, he might have received honors comparable, if not equal, to those of Ch'ü Yüan's. Or should I say that if Ch'ü Yüan had been born a Florentine, he might have gone to the seventh circle to keep delle Vigne company.

Not unlike that of the *Book of Job*, the theme of *T'ien Wen* has been a moot question since antiquity among Chinese scholars. The orthodox view is from Wang I (王逸, d. 158 A.D.), who is the first commentator of the *Ch'u Tzu* anthology. As a brief introduction to *T'ien Wen*, Wang I writes:

T'ien Wen is written by Ch'ü Yüan. Why not *Wen T'ien* (To question Heaven)? Heaven is too sacred to be questioned. Therefore the wording is *T'ien Wen* (Heaven Questioned). When Ch'ü Yüan was in exile, he was heartbroken and wasted away through his concern for the kingdom. He wandered along the rivers and lakes, through hills and plains, sighing and crying at high Heaven in despair. One day he came to the ancestral temple of the kings of Ch'u, on whose walls were paintings about heaven and the earth, about the gods and spirits of the mountains and rivers. They were magnificent yet weird. Also there were paintings about ancient sages and fabulous animals. After viewing all of them, he was tired and took a rest under them. When he raised his head and saw the paintings again, he put questions on the walls to give vent to his indignation and sorrows. The people of Ch'u took pity on Ch'ü Yüan and cherished his memory. They joined in composing and transmitting his words. Therefore there are inconsistencies in the text.¹⁷

天問者，屈原之所作也。何不言問天？天尊不可問，故曰天問也。屈原放逐，憂心愁悴，彷徨山澤，經歷陵陸，嗟號昊旻，仰天歎息。見楚有先王之廟及公卿祠堂，圖畫天地、山川、神靈，琦瑋僂佹，及古賢聖怪物行事，周流罷倦、休息其下，仰見圖畫，因書其壁。何而問之，以瀟憤懣，舒瀉愁思。楚人哀惜屈原，因共論述，故其文義不次序云爾。

Two modern theories can be cited to show the chaotic condition of the thematic problem of *T'ien Wen*. One is proposed by Yu Kuo-en (游國恩). He suggests that *T'ien Wen* should mean "Universal Questions," for they are questions on the ways of Heaven and all natural phenomena.¹⁸ The other is by Ho Chi-chang (何籟章) who maintains that the poem is a prayer. He deplores the fact that though Wang I's view is unfounded, it has been believed as true for over a thousand years and only until very recently did scholars begin to doubt it.¹⁹

To confound our confusion, two well-known sinologists give us two more explanations. David Hawkes, our first English translator of *T'ien Wen*, argues with much erudition that the purpose of the poem is for pure entertainment, for the questions asked in it are riddles.²⁰ The other hypothesis is put forward by Burton Watson, who suggests that the questionnaire is the storytellers' "table of topics."²¹

I have no intention to refute the theories and explanations put forward by the modern scholars, because there are too many to be dealt with adequately in this short paper. My modest proposal, just as the title of my paper indicates, is to point out that the voice out of the whirlwind is a possible solution to the thematic problem of *T'ien Wen*. In other words, by drawing our attention to the fact that the questions asked in *T'ien Wen*, similar to those asked by the voice out of the whirlwind in the *Book of Job*, are asked by Heaven (or the Lord God), we shall be better able to understand the significance of the questions. In the meantime, I suggest that the title "*T'ien Wen*," should be translated literally as "Heaven Questions" or "The Lord God Asks."

Though many critics are dissatisfied with Wang I's interpretation, none of them, so far as I know, has clearly explained what is wrong with it. Wang I's introduction to *T'ien Wen* can be divided into three parts. The first part, from "*T'ien Wen* is written by Ch'ü Yüan" to "the wording is *T'ien Wen*," is his speculation on the wording of the title. The second part, from "When Ch'ü Yüan was in exile" to "to give vent to his indignation and sorrows," is an account of the circumstances leading to the composition of the poem. The last part, from "The people of Ch'u took pity" to the end of the introduction, is his explanation for the obscurity of the work. With the purpose of making my modest proposal more acceptable in mind, I shall attempt to discuss this orthodox theory in detail.

The first part, in my opinion, is Wang I's weakest point. What he

implies in his comment on the title is that Ch'ü Yüan meant to ask (*wen*) Heaven (*t'ien*) questions. But Heaven is too sacred to be asked, and to show his respect to Heaven, Ch'ü Yüan reversed the order and the title becomes "*T'ien Wen*." A few points are enough to prove that Wang I is mistaken here.

First, I have indicated that "*T'ien Wen*" literally means "*Heaven Questions*." Because of the great flexibility of the Chinese language, however, it can be argued that the phrase could mean "*Heaven Questioned*," and that would fit Wang I's speculation nicely. But such an unnatural usage. "*wen*" as a verb in the passive voice, used as a modifier, to my limited knowledge, had never been used in classical Chinese before *T'ien Wen*. It is true that this usage, probably fathered by Wang I, has become current in later literary works. Liu Tsung-yüan, for example, has an essay entitled "*Tsin Wen*" (晉問), meaning "*Tsin Questioned*" or "*Questions on Tsin*." But to cite Liu Tsung-yüan to support Wang I would amount to saying "*The Child is father of the Man*," an anachronism.

Second, it is very unlikely that Ch'ü Yüan had ever entertained the notion that "*Heaven is too sacred to be questioned*." A few lines from his *Li Sao* will demonstrate this point:

I watered my dragon steeds at the Pool of Heaven,
And tied the reins up to the Fu-sang tree.
I broke a sprig of the Jo-tree to strike the sun with:
I wanted to roam a little for enjoyment.
I sent Wang Shu ahead to ride before me;
The Wind God went behind as my outrider;
The Bird of Heaven gave notice of my comings;
And the Thunder God told me when all was not ready.

(L1. 98-101)

飲余馬於咸池兮，
總余轡乎扶桑。
折若木以拂日兮，
聊逍遙以相羊。
前望舒使先驅兮，
後飛廉使奔屬。
鸞皇爲余先戒兮，
雷師告余以未具。

It is doubtful that a man who commands the gods and fabulous animals as his lackeys would ever feel the need to change his word order to pay homage to Heaven. Ch'ü Yüan's other poems in the anthology also give us the impression that he did not hold the gods and spirits in awe. On the contrary, he was on intimate terms with them.

Third, when we take the title "*T'ien Wen*" (*Heaven Questions*) as it is, it makes sense, and very good sense at that. For one thing, it will accommodate the word "yüeh" (曰) with which the poem begins. Many commentators have been puzzled by this unusual beginning, for the word "yüeh" is superfluous when "*T'ien Wen*" means "*Heaven Questioned*." Being unable to explain it, some of them simply ignore it. But when "*T'ien Wen*" means "*Heaven Questions*," the word "yüeh" becomes functional, for it can be construed as a participle, used to modify "*T'ien Wen*." Put into English, "*t'ien wen yüeh*" will be "Heaven questions, saying," or "The Lord God asks, saying." For another, when the first person "I" is the speaker of the poem, *T'ien Wen* sounds like the soliloquy of a long-winded skeptic. But when we restore Heaven (or the Lord God) to his place as the speaker of the poem, *T'ien Wen* can be considered a dramatic monologue, and the questions will take on new meanings.

That Wang I had failed to see Ch'ü Yüan's design in making Heaven the speaker of the poem is quite understandable, for he was of limited imaginative power and familiar with nothing but the first person narrative. But why did he say that Heaven is too sacred to be questioned? A little knowledge of Chinese history can go a long way here. In Ch'ü Yüan's time Confucius (551-479 B.C.) was simply one of the philosophers who had many followers. But in the Later Han Dynasty (25-220 A.D.), Confucius was apotheosized the Highest Sage by Emperor Wu (reigned A.D. 25-56) and Confucianism became a sort of National religion. In a Confucian society, which lays great stress on filial piety and social order, Heaven is indeed very sacred, for Heaven comes at the head of the Five Hierarchies (五倫, *wu lun*), that is, Heaven, Earth, Emperor, Parent, and Teacher. All these five are to be unquestionably respected. Besides, a Confucianist often associates "*t'ien*" with "*t'ien tzu*" (天子, Son of Heaven), the emperor, who is worshipped by all his subjects, and whose favor, to all his officials, is the royal road to success. Whether Wang I was intent on currying favor with Emperor An (reigned A.D. 107-125) when he made that statement is difficult to tell. But he was certainly guilty of forcing his own Confucian point of view on Ch'ü Yüan.

The second part of Wang I's introduction to *T'ien Wen* is valuable, for it is the only extant account of the circumstances leading to the genesis of the poem. We regret that its authenticity cannot be verified. But we are grateful for his having given us a convincing picture of the context in which Ch'ü Yüan wrote. It also points out that the purpose of the poem is to give vent to his indignation and sorrows. This, I believe, is fully supported by the text.

Wang I's explanation for the obscurity of *T'ien Wen* is very interesting. In stating that the people of Ch'ü have a hand in its composition, he seems to anticipate the communal authorship theory of folk poetry advocated by F. B. Gummere.²² But he didn't specify how the Ch'ü people handed down the poem to us. As *T'ien Wen* is a very learned poem, one in which very few ordinary people would be interested, the chances that it has come to us through oral tradition are very slim indeed. It seems to me that Hawkes' theory is more persuasive:

Ancient Chinese books were written on flat strips of bamboo which were threaded together on strings or thongs, rather like a picket fence. When the strings decayed the slips could easily get shuffled up in the wrong order. This seems to have happened on a large scale in the case of *T'ien Wen*, particularly towards the end of the poem.²³

What kinds of questions are asked in *T'ien Wen*? Roughly speaking, there are three kinds. The first group is on the mystery of the universe. The second on the fabulous animals. And the third group concerns itself with the history and legends of the past. A few lines from the first group of questions will unmistakably show that there are striking parallels between *T'ien Wen* and the *Book of Job*. For the convenience of comparison, I will quote them side by side:

Who was there to pass down the story of the beginning
of things in the remote past?
What means are there to examine what it was like before
heaven above and earth below had taken shape?
How is it possible to probe into that age when the light
and darkness were still undivided?
And how do we know of the chaos of insubstantial form?

Who planned and measured out the round shape and nine-fold gates of Heaven?

whose work was this, and who first made it?

(T'ien Wen, 1-4, 7-8)

遂古之初，誰傳道之？
上下未形，何由考之？
冥昭薈閭，誰能極之？
馮翼惟像，何以識之？

圖則九重，孰營度之？
惟茲何功？孰初作之？

Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth?

Declare, if thou hast understanding.

Who determined the measures thereof, if thou knowest?

Or who stretched the line upon it?

Whereupon were the foundations thereof fastened?

Or who laid the corner stone thereof?

(Job, 38: 4-6)

How does Heaven co-ordinate its motions? Where are the twelve Heavenly Houses divided?

How are the sun and moon connected with them, and the stars spaced out over them?

(T'ien Wen, 13-14)

天何所沓？十二焉分？
日月安屬？列星安陳？

Canst thou bind the cluster of the Pleiades,

Or loose the bands of Orion?

Canst thou lead forth the Mazzaroth in their season?

Or canst thou guide the Bear with her train?

(Job, 38: 31-32)

Just as these questions are similar in form, I believe that they are similar in intent. That is to say, they are meant to show the omnipotence of God in contrast with the puniness of human knowledge, implying that the Ways of Heaven are incomprehensible to man.

The God of *T'ien Wen* seems to take less interest in animals than in human beings. Unlike the Joban God, who takes great delight in depicting the behemoth and the leviathan, Ch'ü Yüan's God only gives us a sketchy picture of his fabulous creatures:

Where is the stone forest? What beast can talk?
Where are the hornless dragons which carry bears on
their backs for sport?
Where is the great serpent with nine heads that comes
and goes in a flash?²⁴

How large is the snake that can swallow an elephant?²⁵
Where is the Black Water that dyes the feet and the
mountain of Three Perils?
The folk there put off death for many years. What is
the limit of their age?
Where does the manfish live? Where is the Monster
Bird?

(*T'ien Wen*, 47-49, 52-55)

焉有石林？何獸能言？
焉有虬龍，負熊以遊？
雄虺九首，慘忽焉在？

一蛇吞象，厥大何如？
黑水玄趾，三危安在？
延年不死，壽何所止？
鯪魚何所？窟堆焉處？

The third group of questions, questions on historical figures and legends, constitutes the bulk of the poem. In proportion to their greater length, greater importance should be accorded to them. The following lines are representative of their kind:

God sent down I Yi to overcome the calamities of the
people below.
How did he shoot the River Lord and take to wife the
Lady of Lo?
He bent his bow to the full and made good use of his

thimble, and Feng the Swine was shot.
Why, when he offered fat of his flesh cooked as a
sacrifice, was the Lord God displeased?
Cho took to wife the Black Fox, and that Dark Wife
plotted with him.
How was Yi's body boiled, and how did they conspire
to have him eaten?

(*T'ien Wen*, 67-72)

帝降夷羿，革孽夏民，
胡射夫河伯，而妻彼雒嬪？
馮珧利決，封豨是舛，
何獻蒸肉之膏，而后帝不若？
泥娶純狐，眩妻爰謀？
何羿之舛革，而交吞揆之？

We can easily notice that these are rhetorical questions. They are asked in fact to admonish the king to reform, from whom he was estranged. Their counterparts can be found in *Li Sao*:

Yi loved idle roaming and hunting to distraction,
And took delight in shooting at the mighty foxes.
But foolish dissipation has seldom a good end:
And Han Cho covetously took his master's wife.
Cho's son, Chiao, put on his strong armour
And wreaked his wild will without any restraint.
The days passed in pleasure; far he forgot himself,
Till his head came tumbling down from his shoulders.

(*Li Sao*, 76-79)

羿淫遊以佚畋兮，
又好射夫封狐；
固亂流其鮮終兮，
泥又貪夫厥家。
澆身被服強圉兮，
縱欲而不忍；
日康娛而自忘兮，
厥首用夫顛隕。

If we admit that the lessons of history cited in *Li Sao* do reveal Ch'ü Yüan's loyalty to his king, we cannot deny that those put in question form in *T'ien Wen* are also an expression of his faithfulness. Unfortunately, the king refused to take his admonishment. "He lent ear, instead, to slander, and raged against me [Ch'ü Yüan]"²⁶ (反信讒而齟怒).

It is true that misery loves company. In contemplating his own miserable situation, Ch'ü Yüan found some famous fellow sufferers in history. One of them is Kun (紃). Kun was given the charge of allaying the flood. He had done his best to carry out the duty, but he was severely punished by the Lord God (*T'ien Wen*, 23-26). At the same time Hsiang (象), that wicked brother of Shun's (舜), who had done many evil things to hurt Shun, enjoyed a life of prosperity and his descendants were numerous (*T'ien Wen*, 99-100, 119-120).

Another precedent is succinctly put into the following lines: "How had Pi Kan offended that he should be suppressed? / And how had Lei K'ai pleased that he should be given a fief?" (比干何逆，而抑沈之？雷開阿順，而賜封之？) (*T'ien Wen*, 145-146). Pi Kan, a famous loyal minister, was one of the uncles of King Chou (紂王, reigned 1154-1123 B.C.), the last king of Shang Dynasty. His remonstrance enraged Chou and Chou had his heart taken out to see what a loyal heart looked like. Ch'ü Yüan was angry at the injustice. But we know that he would rather die in Pi Kan's fashion than consent to ape Lei K'ai, the flatterer. These innocent sufferers, Kun, Pi Kan, and Ch'ü Yüan himself, all remind us of the devout Job who suffered so much "as a result of a half-jocular bet between God and Satan."²⁷

But what course should Ch'ü Yüan take once he determined to remain loyal to his king? "Mei Po was sliced and salted, but Chi Tzu feigned madness. / Why is it that wise men whose virtue is the same yet act in different ways?" (梅伯受醢，箕子狂。何聖人之一德，卒其異方？) (*T'ien Wen*, 147-148). There is the rub. This question must have occupied Ch'ü Yüan's mind for a long time. Hawkes' note to these two lines reads: "some prefer martyrdom and some prefer to survive by cunning and clean up the mess. An interesting question."²⁸ It is an interesting question all right. But it is a very serious one to Ch'ü Yüan. He was debating with himself about which wise men he should follow. When Ch'ü Yüan was in his second exile, he was, in a sense, always between the Scylla of Mei Po and the Charybdis of Chi Tzu. But in the end, he fell in between and committed suicide by drowning himself.

I hope that I have, in the preceding paragraphs, convinced my readers that *T'ien Wen*, like *Li Sao*, is a highly personal poem. It is neither written for pure entertainment, nor a collection of topics for storytellers.

To conclude, I maintain that by making the Lord God the speaker of *T'ien Wen*, Ch'ü Yüan seems to be able to contemplate his own problems and the condition of man with detachment. His suicide, by the Chinese standard, is not an act of cowardice, but an act of moral courage, a philosophical acceptance of fate. It is appropriate to say that his life is perfected by death.

Notes

1. Robert Gordis, *The Book of God and Man: A Study of Job* (Chicago and London, 1965), pp. 117-34.
2. R. H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the old Testament* (New York, 1941), p. 689.
3. Gordis, p. 125.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 132.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 133.
6. This is a rough estimate. A certain pair of tetrasyllabic verses can be counted as containing either one or two questions. In addition, I suspect that a few of the verses, which contain the word "yüan" (爰), traditionally taken as statements, are questions.
7. David Hawkes, trans., *Ch'u Tz'u (The Songs of the South)* (Oxford University Press, 1959), p. 45.
8. *Ibid.*
9. Liu Tsung-yüan, *The Complete Works of Liu Tsung-yüan* (柳河東全集 *Liu Hō-tung Ch'uan Chi*) (Shih Chieh Book Store, 1970), pp. 152-183.
10. To be found in Yang Chia-lo (楊家駱), comp., *Ch'u Tz'u Chu Pa Chung* (楚辭注八種 *Eight Commentaries on the Songs of the South*).
11. Notably Tai Chen (戴震).
12. Yu Kuo-en, *Ch'u Tz'u Lun Wen Chi* (楚辭論文集 *Essays on Ch'u Tz'u*), p. 260.
13. Hawkes, p. 46.
14. A complete translation of Ch'ü Yüan's biography is available in Hawkes' general introduction to *Ch'u Tz'u*, pp. 11-15.
15. John Ciardi, trans., *The Inferno*, p. 121.
16. See Ciardi's note on the life of Pier delle Vigne, *The Inferno*, p. 125.
17. This is my own translation.
18. Yu Kuo-en, pp. 152-153.
19. Ho Chi-chang, *Li Sao T'ien Wen Kao Pien* (離騷天問考辨, *A Study on Li Sao and T'ien Wen*). pp. 139-145.

20. Hawkes, pp. 45-46.
21. Burton Watson, *Early Chinese Literature* (New York and London, 1965), pp. 246-7.
22. See F. B. Gummere, *The Beginning of Poetry*, 1901, and *The Popular Ballad*, 1907.
23. Hawkes, p. 46.
24. This line is my translation. Hawkes' reads: "Where is the great serpent with nine heads and where is the Shu-Hu?"
25. This line is my translation. Hawkes follows the variant and his line reads: "How does the snake that can swallow an elephant devour its bones?"
26. *Li Sao*, 20. See Hawkes, p. 23.
27. Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism* (Princeton University Press, 1973), p. 142.
28. Hawkes, p. 54.