

THE DATE AND COMPOSITION  
OF LIEHTZYY 列子

by A. C. GRAHAM

Part 1. Introduction.

Section 1. The controversy over the date of *Liehtzyy*.

2. The Jang Jann 張湛 Preface and the Liou Shianq 劉向 Report.

Part 2. Passages shared by *Liehtzyy* and other texts.

Section 1. Introduction and list of parallels.

2. *Mohtzyy* 墨子

3. *Juangtzyy* 莊子

4. *Leushyh chuenchiou* 呂氏春秋

5. Other pre-Hann and Former Hann Texts.

6. Hwan Tarn 桓譚

7. *Muh tiantzyy juann* 穆天子傳

8. Explicit quotations in *Liehtzyy*.

Part 3. Linguistic evidence of date.

Section 1. Personal Pronouns.

2. *Kee* 可

3. *Fwu* 弗

4. *Wang* 亡

5. *Du* 都

6. *Yan* 焉

7. *Shiang* 相

8. *Chiee* 且

9. *Jwo* 箸

10. Inversion of the pronoun object.

Part 4. The composition of *Liehtzyy*.

Section 1. Unknown sources.

2. The fatalist and hedonist chapters.

3. Conclusion.

---

ABBREVIATIONS

- BMFEA *Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities.*  
BSOAS *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies.*  
HN *Hwainantzyy* 淮南子

JS	<i>Liehtzzy jyishyh</i> 集釋, edited by Yang Borjiunn 楊伯峻 (Shanghai, 1958).
JT	<i>Juangtzyy</i> .
JY	<i>Jiayeu</i> 家語
LSCC	<i>Leushyh chuenchiou</i> .
LT	<i>Liehtzzy</i> .
SY	<i>Shuoyuann</i> 說苑
WSTK	<i>Weyshu tongkao</i> 僞書通考, edited by Jang Shincherng 張心澂 (Shanghai, 1957).
j	<i>jiuann</i> 卷

References, unless otherwise stated, are to the editions of the *Syhbuh tsongkan* 四部叢刊, and to the Baenah 百衲 editions of the histories.

## Part I. INTRODUCTION

### 1/1. *The Controversy over the Date of Liehtzzy.*

*Liehtzzy* is not the only Chinese philosophical text of disputed date, but it is perhaps the most important. In Dr Waley's *The Way and its Power and Three Ways of Thought in Ancient China* it stands beside the *Dawderjing* 道德經 and *Juangtzyy* 莊子 as one of the main sources for the Taoism of the third century B.C.; in Feng Yu-lan's *History of Chinese Philosophy*, on the other hand, it reflects materialistic and hedonistic tendencies of the third and fourth centuries A.D. Whether the book belongs to the first or to the second great creative period of Taoism is a question which affects one's whole interpretation of the history of this philosophy. A remarkable feature of the controversy is that by and large it is Western sinologists who prefer the earlier date, Chinese scholars who prefer the later.

Most of the disputants have confined themselves to footnotes, appendices, and articles on specific themes or passages in the book. Almost the only scholar who has presented a detailed case is Maa Shiuhluen 馬敘倫, who put forward twenty objections to the authenticity of *Liehtzzy*.<sup>1</sup> Most of these objections, easily refuted by Takeuchi Yoshio 武内義雄,<sup>2</sup> are based on two invalid assumptions:

(1) Proof that a supposedly ancient book is later than the date of its traditional author is proof that it is a forgery of the Three Kingdoms or the Six Dynasties.

(2) If a passage in the book is also found in another text, it must have been borrowed from the other text.

In the West Maa Shiuhluen's arguments served only to convince sinologists that the case against *Liehtzzy* is an unhappy survival from an older tradition of Chinese textual criticism, the unscientific nature of which

<sup>1</sup> *Inquiry into the forged Liehtzzy*, in *Guushybiann* 古史辨 4 (1933), 520-8.

<sup>2</sup> *Liehtzzy falsely accused*, in *Shianhyn jingjyi kao* 先秦經籍考, articles translated from the Japanese by Jiang Shyaan 江俠菴 (Commercial Press, 1929), 363-76.

has been attacked by Karlgren,<sup>3</sup> Maspero, Waley, and at first Karlgren, continued to include *Liehtzzy* among the pre-Hann sources.<sup>4</sup> However, Maspero and Waley confined themselves to countering Chinese objections. The only positive argument on the Western side was Karlgren's—that from the end of the third century B.C. Taoist texts base themselves on Laotzyy 老子 as a scriptural authority (*Hwainantzzy* 淮南子, *Wentzzy* 文子 and the Taoist element in *Harn Fei tzyy* 韓非子), while *Liehtzzy* quotes him only three times.

Recently there have been signs that Western resistance to the prevailing Chinese opinion is beginning to weaken. Karlgren<sup>5</sup> is now impressed by cases in which *wu* 吾 "I, my" is used as object, against pre-Hann usage. He no longer insists on the scarcity of quotations from Laotzyy, but still maintains that, since some of the rhymes are demonstrably archaic,<sup>6</sup> the book cannot be later than the Former Hann dynasty. Bodde<sup>7</sup> shows that the custom of releasing doves on New Year's Day, mentioned in a *Liehtzzy* story<sup>8</sup> and often regarded as Buddhist, existed during the Later Hann. Since there are no references to this and other manifestations of the Hann dove cult before the first century A.D., he concludes that the *Liehtzzy* story is late, but does not commit himself as to the date of the book as a whole. Zürcher<sup>9</sup> considers the book quite heterogeneous; many parts are pre-Hann, others are as late as A.D. 300. Finally Creel<sup>10</sup> holds that, in spite of the presence of some early material, most of the book "was produced early in the Christian Era, at a time when Buddhist philosophy and Taoist philosophy were influencing and enriching each other".

Thirty years ago it was easy for European readers of Maa Shiuhluen's twenty objections to suppose that the rejection of *Liehtzzy* was merely a temporary aberration like the rejection of the *Tzuojuan* 左傳. But Chinese scholars soon recovered their faith in the antiquity of the latter text, while most of them remain unshakable in their conviction that *Liehtzzy* belongs to the third or fourth century A.D.<sup>11</sup> Moreover if we examine

<sup>3</sup> *The Authenticity of Ancient Chinese Texts*, BMFEA 1 (1929), 165-83.

<sup>4</sup> H. Maspero, *La Chine Antique* (1929), 491 f. Arthur Waley, *Three Ways of Thought in Ancient China* (London, 1939), 257-9. B. Karlgren, *Poetical Parts in Lao-tsi* (Göteborg, 1932), 26 n.

<sup>5</sup> *Legends and Cults in Ancient China*, BMFEA 18 (1946), 203 f. For *wu*, cf. p. 170, n. 100 below.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. pp. 187-8 below.

<sup>7</sup> *Lieh-tzu and the Doves*, in *Asia Major* (New Series) 7 (1959), 25-31.

<sup>8</sup> j.8, 7B/3-6.

<sup>9</sup> *Buddhist Conquest of China* (Leyden, 1959), 274-6.

<sup>10</sup> *What is Taoism?* in *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 76/3 (1956),

139-52.

<sup>11</sup> Exceptions are Liou Ruulin 劉汝霖, who thinks that little of the book is later than the Former Hann (JS 206-8), and Tsern Jonqmean 岑仲勉 (*Leang Fou wenshyy luenmtsong* 兩周文獻論叢, Peking 1958, 313-33), who dates it in the third century B.C.

consecutively the arguments proposed by various Chinese critics,<sup>12</sup> including several of Maa Shihluen's, it is hard to resist their cumulative effect. The absence of external proof of the existence of the book before the fourth century, the suggestions of Buddhist influence, the consistent policy of claiming Confucius as an ally, as though Confucian supremacy could no longer be challenged,<sup>13</sup> all tell against the antiquity of the book. The fact that some of the thought resembles Buddhism is already noticed in the fourth century preface of Jang Jann 張湛. Two passages seem to refer to transmigration.<sup>14</sup> The idea that life is a dream, hardly more than a provocative fancy in early Taoism, occupies the whole third chapter of *Liehtzyy* and is developed as a theory; although the treatment of the theme is not Buddhist its new prominence is surely inspired by Buddhist influence, and the chapter uses the word *huann* 幻 "illusion", absent from pre-Hann literature but the standard Buddhist equivalent of *māyā*. The story of the mechanical man<sup>15</sup> is very like an Indian story in the Buddhist *Shenqjing* 聖經, translated into Chinese in A.D. 285.<sup>16</sup> Although in many cases of parallel texts there is no evidence which is primary, there is good reason to believe that Hwan Tarn 桓譚 (died A.D. 56) was the first to write down the story of Confucius and the two children, and that the *Muh tiantzyy juann* 穆天子傳 (discovered in A.D. 281) is *Liehtzyy's* source for the travels of King Muh.<sup>17</sup> In the story of the man who lost his memory,<sup>18</sup> the Confucian doctor is called a *rusheng* 儒生, a term first current in the Hann period.<sup>19</sup> At the end of ch. 5 the reference to a man who doubted reports of

<sup>12</sup> There are convenient selections in WSTK 818-33, JS 185-245.

<sup>13</sup> There is only one episode which makes fun of Confucius in the manner of some *Juangtzyy* stories, the story of the two children arguing about the distance of the sun (j.5, 5A/9-14). But this may not be Taoist at all; it is perhaps a tale to amuse children and encourage them in their studies. Hwan Tarn heard the story as a child (cf. p. 163 below). It may seem surprising that children should be encouraged to laugh at Confucius. Yet the dialogue in which the child Shianq Tuo 項託 (彙) always defeats Confucius stands at the front of the Ming 明 lesson book *Dongyuan tzartzyh* 東園雜字; and according to Michel Soymié (*L'Entrevue de Confucius et de Hsiang T'o*, Journal Asiatique 242 (1954), 311-91) the Duenhwang 敦煌 MSS of the dialogue are students' exercises (364). Soymié mentions the *Liehtzyy* anecdote as the only other story of children laughing at Confucius which he has found, and points out similarities between the two which can hardly be accidental (380).

<sup>14</sup> j.1, 5A/4; 7, 1B/10.

<sup>15</sup> j.5, 7A/7-7B/6.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Jih Shianlin 季羨林, *Liehtzyy and the Buddhist Sutras*, in his *Jong Yinn wenhuah guanshih shyy luentsong* 中印文化關係史論叢 (Peking, 1957), 75-86. (English translation, *Studia Sinica*, 9/1 (1950), 18-32). For the Indian story, see E. Chavannes, *Cinq Cents Contes et Apologues*, 3/170-2.

<sup>17</sup> Maa Shihluen, *Objections* Nos. 17 and 5. For King Muh's travels, cf. Chern Wenbo 陳文波, *A Proof that Liehtzyy is a Forgery*, in *Guushybiann*, 4/529-38. See also pp. 163ff below.

<sup>18</sup> j.3, 4B/8-5A/11.

<sup>19</sup> Maa Shihluen, *Objection* No. 7.

a jade-cutting knife and a fireproof cloth, and was discredited when barbarian tribes presented them to the Emperor, exactly fits Tsaur Pi 曹丕 (A.D. 187-A.D. 226).<sup>20</sup>

The dates proposed for *Liehtzyy* are separated by more than half a millenium of social, intellectual and linguistic change, and one might well suppose that it should be easy to choose between such drastic alternatives. But both parties agree that the book is heterogeneous, that if it is pre-Hann it contains later interpolations, and if it is post-Hann it utilizes ancient sources. The controversy concerns the date of *most* of the book, and proofs that *some* of the book is late or early do not convince members of the opposite camp. However, there are two questions which do go to the heart of the matter:

(1) Where a passage is common to *Liehtzyy* and another text, which text is primary?

(2) When known parallels are excluded, are there stylistic uniformities of a kind which would help us to date the rest of the book?

Scholars seldom argue over the first question; they simply assume the answer which fits their case. For most of the Chinese critics, any common passage is proof that *Liehtzyy* is a late forgery borrowing from earlier sources. For Waley, on the other hand, the more of the book we find in admittedly pre-Hann texts the more we know to be early, and the greater is the likelihood that the rest is also early.<sup>21</sup> Maspero fixes the date very precisely by pointing out that *Liehtzyy* quotes the *Gwoyue* 國語, *Yanntzyy chuenchiou* 晏子春秋, *Muh tiantzyy juann* and *Joulii*, 周禮, and is itself quoted in the *Leushyh chuenchiou*.<sup>22</sup> Zürcher says that *Hwainantzyy* quotes *Liehtzyy*, and smiles at the oversight of Feng Yu-lan, who uses the *Yang fu* chapter in his *History of Chinese Philosophy* as a document of the third or fourth century A.D., without noticing that it is quoted in the *Hannshu* 漢書.<sup>23</sup> Clearly we need criteria to decide who is borrowing from whom.

As for the second question, Maa Shihluen followed his twenty objections with the remark that "the parts of the book which are not from earlier sources do not in the least resemble the Jou 周 and Chyn 秦 writers in their manner of expression".<sup>24</sup> Liang Chiuchau 梁啓超 declared that the hedonist chapter "is admittedly written with elegance, but in the style of post-Hann writers".<sup>25</sup> This impression probably has a great deal to do with

<sup>20</sup> Yu Jenqshieh 俞正鑾 (1775-1840), *Goeisyh tswengao* 癸巳存稿 (*Tsongshu iyicherng* 叢書集成 363), 291 f.

<sup>21</sup> *op. cit.* 257.

<sup>22</sup> *op. cit.* 491 f.

<sup>23</sup> *op. cit.* 422 n.157.

<sup>24</sup> *op. cit.* 528.

<sup>25</sup> Liang Remngong shyueshuh jeangyeen jyi 梁任公學術講演集 (Commercial Press, 1922), First collection, 22.

the Chinese conviction that most of the book is late, although only Yang Borjiunn has looked for particular examples of late words and constructions.<sup>26</sup> Such judgments are highly subjective, but we cannot afford to ignore them. If a Chinese specialist in English literature were to defend the Mediaeval origin of the Rowley poems, and make damaging criticisms of the accepted arguments for ascribing them to Chatterton, he would convince few English readers. We should continue to feel that the verses produced by Chatterton simply do not sound like Mediaeval poems, and that only a scholar whose native language is not English could think otherwise. We may suspect that Chinese scholars react in the same way to Japanese and Western criticisms of Maa Shiuhluen. But if so, we need to find linguistic criteria by which to test their intuition.

1/2. *The Jang Jann Preface and the Liou Shianq Report.*

*Liehtzyy* has existed since the fourth century as a book in eight chapters, with a preface and commentary by Jang Jann 張湛 (late fourth century<sup>27</sup> and an attached report ascribed to Liou Shianq 劉向 (79-8 B.C.) and dated 14 B.C. The commentary guarantees the chapter divisions by notes after the chapter headings, and the preface mentions the *muhluh* 目錄, evidently the Liou Shianq report.<sup>28</sup> *Liehtzyy* in eight *jiuann* 卷 is entered in the table of contents of the lost *Tzyychau* 子鈔 of Yeu Jonqrong 庾仲容 (476-549),<sup>29</sup> and reappears in every historical bibliography from the Swei 隋 dynasty (589-617) onwards. There is a Duenhwang 敦煌 manuscript of a fragment of the *Yang ju* 楊朱 chapter with Jang Jann's commentary, written before 627.<sup>30</sup> Extracts from *Liehtzyy*, all to be found in the present book, appear in the *Chyunshu jyyhaw* 羣書治要 of Wey Jeng 魏徵 (presented in 631) and in the *Yihlin* 意林 (latest preface 787), an abridgement of the *Tzyychau* made by Maa Tzoong 馬總 (died 823); both include some of Jang Jann's notes. In the eighth century the Liou Shianq report and Jang Jann preface are quoted in Lu Chorngshyuan's 盧重玄 preface to his new commentary, and in the ninth century they are annotated in the *Liehtzyy shyhwen* 釋文 of In Jinqshuenn 殷敬順, which survives in a text revised by Chern Jiingyuan 陳景元 (Preface

<sup>26</sup> JS 220-44.

<sup>27</sup> For Jang Jann, cf. *Jinshu* 晉書, Biographies, j.45, 17B, which mentions him in the time of Wuudih 武帝 (373-96), and *Shyhsuho shinyeu* 世說新語, 下之上, 46A, B (and commentary). These materials are collected in JS 176, except for the last *Shyhsuho* reference.

<sup>28</sup> The report has the heading *Liehtzyy shinshu muhluh* 新書目錄 in the *Shyhwen*.

<sup>29</sup> Preserved in the *Tzyyliueh* 子略 of Gau Syhsuen 高似孫 (jinnsyih 進士 1184). *Shybhuh beyyaw* 四部備要, *muh* 目, j.1. 10B.

<sup>30</sup> Lionel Giles, *Descriptive Catalogue of the Chinese MSS from Tun-huang in the British Museum* (London 1957). No. 6813. Wang Jonqmin 王重民, *Duenhwang Guuji* *shyhluh* 敦煌古籍敘錄 (Peking 1958), 257 f.

dated 1069). The earliest printed edition is the Northern Song 宋 edition reproduced in the *Syhbuh tsongkan*. This lacks the report and the preface, which are supplied in the *Syhbuh tsongkan* from the Heikou 黑口 edition (Ming).

But there is only one witness earlier than the fourth century, the entry "*Liehtzyy*, eight *pian*" (列子八篇) under the Taoist school in the bibliographical section of the *Hannshu*. The many scholars who have investigated *Liehtzyy* have found no external evidence that the present book existed before Jang Jann,<sup>31</sup> and no reference to a book of this title independent of the *Hannshu*. According to Jang Biinglin 章炳麟<sup>32</sup>:

"No Hann writer quotes *Liehtzyy*. From Wang (Bih 王弼, 226-249), Her (Yann 何晏 c. 193-249), Ji (Kang 嵇康 223-262) and Roan (Jih 阮籍 210-263) down to Yueh Goang 樂廣, among the documents through which the mysticism of the *chingtarn* 清談 school is scattered, there are still no quotations from *Liehtzyy*."<sup>33</sup>

Ger Horng 葛洪 (254-334), complaining of the paucity of alchemical information in the Taoist philosophers, mentions Laotzyy, Juangtzyy, even Wentzyy 文子 and Guanyiintzyy 關尹子, but not *Liehtzyy*.<sup>34</sup>

Jang Jann's preface gives a detailed account of the transmission of the book, derived from his father Jang Kuanq 曠. According to this, Jang

<sup>31</sup> Wen Tyngshyih's 文廷式 bibliography of the Jinn dynasty (*Ellshyrwuu shyh buubian* 二十五史補編, 3751) records a lost commentary on *Liehtzyy* by Shianq Shioh 向秀 (f. 261). But this is a mistake. The supposed quotation from this commentary is in fact from Shianq Shioh's commentary on *Juangtzyy* as quoted in Jang Jann's commentary on *Liehtzyy* (j.2, 6B/8-10).

<sup>32</sup> *Daw Hann chang yan* 劉漢昌言 (*Jangshyh tsongshu shyuhbian* 章氏叢書續編) j.4, 5A.

<sup>33</sup> *Liehtzyy* shares a number of passages with the *Gausyhyjuann* 高士傳 of Hwang-fuu Mih 皇甫謐 (215-82) and the *Borwuhjyh* 博物志 of Jang Hwa 張華 (232-300). The *Syhbuh chyuanshu* 四庫全書 editors believed, with good reason in the former case, that the extant books are recombinations from quotations and from other sources, of which *Liehtzyy* was one. In the case of the *Borwuhjyh* this hypothesis (which assumes the disappearance of the book after the Song) was discredited by the discovery of the Northern Song Yeh 葉 version, first printed in the *Shyhlüüiu tsongshu* 士禮居叢書. However, the very uncertain textual history of the book makes it doubtful when the *Liehtzyy* passages entered it. Two details suggest that they come from a text already carrying Jang Jann's commentary:

(i) Jang Jann's note: 此事亦見墨子 "This episode also appears in *Mohtzyy*" (LT j.5, 5A/9) is reproduced in the *Borwuhjyh* (*Yüingyinn jyyhae* 影印指海), j.5, 1B/6, unaltered except for the omission of the third character.

(ii) In LT j.5, 7A/1 Jang Jann explains that the 發 of the text means 遣. The *Borwuhjyh* text (j.5, 3A/3) has the latter character in place of the former. This criterion has only a limited value in the case of rare words, since if there is a common word generally recognized as its equivalent a commentator and a scribe simplifying the text might both choose this word independently. (For example, in LT j.8, 4A/8 Jang Jann notes '拓' 舉也; the *Leushyh chuenchiou*, originally written six hundred years before Jang Jann, actually reads the latter word where *Liehtzyy* reads the former). But here the word in question is a common one used obscurely in its context.

<sup>34</sup> *Bawpwtzyy* 抱朴子, j.8, 5B.

Jann's grandfather Jang Yi 焜<sup>35</sup> was a friend of Liou Taur 劉陶 and Fuh Fu 傅敷 (c. 273-c. 318). All three were ardent book collectors; and Jang Jann makes a point of mentioning that all were related to the Wang family, and that Jang Yi's maternal uncle was a cousin of the brothers Wang Horng 王宏 and Wang Bih (226-249), the owners of a library of nearly ten thousand volumes passed down from Wang Tsann 粲 (177-217). He evidently wishes us to understand that *Liehtzzy* may have belonged to this famous library, presented to Wang Tsann by Tsay Iong 蔡邕 (132-92).<sup>36</sup> At the time of the breakdown of the Western Jinn 晉 dynasty, during the Yeongjia 永嘉 period (307-312), Jang Yi fled South. He took with him only his rarest books; these included *Liehtzzy* in eight *pian*, but on the journey he lost all except the *Yang fu* 楊朱 and *Shuofwu* 說符 chapters and the *muhluh* (the Liou Shianq memorial). He recovered four *juann* from the house of Liou Taur, who had crossed the Yangtse earlier, and six from the house of Jaw Jihtzzy 趙季子, son-in-law of Wang Bih. By collating these he restored the complete text.

Three points deserve attention:

(1) According to this account, *Liehtzzy* was a rare book during the Western Jinn, and after the migration across the Yangtse the complete text was unknown outside Jang Jann's own family. He writes as though he is making public an unknown book, and does not expect others to accept it without credentials. He therefore offers proof of its existence before the migration, and a hint that the book known before this catastrophe can be traced back to the end of the Hann.

(2) Jang Jann is generous in naming people who knew *Liehtzzy*, but none of them is more recent than his grandfather's generation. Nothing said about the transmission of the book would be easily proved or disproved in Jang Jann's own time.

(3) Jang Yi is said to have collated three texts, in the manner of the collations reported in Liou Shianq's memorials on books. Even if we accept this, the three texts must have disappeared before Jang Jann's time. If he had known them, he would surely have quoted variants where they overlap. His commentary often emends the text, using such formulae as 當為 "should read X".<sup>37</sup> But his few variants (introduced by 或作 X "some read X") are from the parallel text in *Juangtzyy*.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>35</sup> For the names of Jang Jann's father and grandfather (not given in the preface and its *Shyhwen* notes), see Liou Jiunn 劉峻 (462-521), commentary on *Shyhshuo shinyeu*, 下之上 46A.

<sup>36</sup> *Boruwhjyh* j.4, 4B/6-5A/1.

<sup>37</sup> LT j.1, 4A/1.2, 5B/7, 6A/4, 6/B1 and *passim*.

<sup>38</sup> LT j.2, 7A/4, 8, 12, 7B/12. Alternative characters for the names of two states, differently written in nearly every text which mentions them, are given with the formula 又 X, "also X" (LT j.5, 5A/5.7). For these names, cf. Wang Shwumin 王叔岷, *Liehtzzy buajenq* 補正 (Commercial Press, 1948), j.3, 20A, 21B.

The memorial ascribed to Liou Shianq announces the collation of the new text in eight *pian* from copies of five, three, four, six and two *pian* respectively. The table of chapter titles which precedes some of Liou Shianq's extant reports is missing; but in the course of the memorial four chapters are named and described in a way which agrees with the present *Liehtzzy*. The report mentions that the book was popular during the reign of Jiingdih 景帝 (156-141 B.C.), but has since become rare.

The *Byeluh* 別錄, a collection of the reports on books of Liou Shianq and his son Shin 歆, was still known during the Tarnq 唐 dynasty.<sup>39</sup> The presumption is therefore that this report, attached to the book since the fourth century, is a genuine work of Liou Shianq, especially since it is more critical of the book than we should expect of a forgery by the book's author.<sup>40</sup> The question is whether

(1) it guarantees the existence of the present book in the last century B.C., or

(2) it was taken from the *Byeluh* after the disappearance of the original *Liehtzzy*, and attached to a new book designed to fit Liou Shianq's description. This certainly happened in the case of the *Denq Shi tzyy* 鄧析子, where the statement in the attached memorial that Denq Shi discusses *wuhow* 無厚 ("the dimensionless") in the manner of the sophist Gongsuen Long 公孫龍 does not agree with the contents of the present *Wuhow* chapter.

Two points favour the second alternative. The document is not in its original context, for it lacks the table of contents and it begins "The new text on the right . . ." 右新書.<sup>41</sup> In the present book the memorial is

<sup>39</sup> For Liou Shianq's bibliographical work, cf. P. van der Loon, *On the Transmission of Kuan-tzu* (*T'oung Pao* 41, 4-5/357-93).

<sup>40</sup> The two reports most likely to be forgeries, those attached to *Guanyintzyy* and *Tzyyhwaatzzy* 子華子, are not attested before the Song dynasty (WSTK 801-11, 1001-6). Chyan Muh 錢穆, in *Yenching Journal of Chinese Studies* 7 (1930)/1215 f, doubts the genuineness of the *Liehtzzy* report, on the ground that it mentions as Liou Shianq's collaborator a certain Tsan 參 (so read according to the *Shyhwen*) who died ten years before its supposed date. His authority is the note of Yan Shyguu 顏師古 on the writings of 杜 Duh Tsan in the Hann bibliography (*Hannshu* j.30, 15B/3). This gives a quotation from the *Byeluh*, which mentions Liou Shianq's collaborator as Duh Tsan, and another from Liou Shin which says that Tsan (no surname) died in 24 B.C. However, as Van der Loon points out (*ut sup.* 361 n. 2), the *Goantzzy* 管子 report gives Tsan's surname as Fuh 富, Yan Shyguu has evidently confused two people, and it is not clear which of them died in 24 B.C.

<sup>41</sup> The Heikouu edition, and the two Taoist canon editions (vols. 455, 461) which contain the report, all lack the table. There is a table, with notes from the *Shyhwen*, in the Shyhderarnq 世德堂 edition of 1533 (*Liowtzyy chyuanshu* 六子全書), reproduced in JS 177. But this is a reconstruction; the *Shyhwen* has no notes on any table preceding the report, and the notes used stand under the chapter titles in the book itself.

itself at the front (the "right"), and it has held this position at least since the T'ang dynasty.<sup>42</sup> Moreover, Liou Shianq says:

或字誤，以‘盡’爲‘進’，以‘賢’爲‘形’，如此者衆，及在新書有棧 (= 剪)。

"There are some mistaken characters. (Two examples follow.) Such cases are numerous; but in the new text they are eliminated."<sup>42a</sup>

But in the present text there are nine cases of the former confusion<sup>43</sup> and one of the latter;<sup>44</sup> they go back to the fourth century, since Jang Jann's commentary notes them. The text cannot be Liou Shianq's, since the errors are uncorrected; but neither can it be one of the older texts which he collated, since the number of chapters is that established by Liou Shianq. It follows that the book is a later compilation, which either incorporates material descended from the older texts, or else deliberately introduces the characters noticed by Liou Shianq as proofs of antiquity, without noticing the dilemma which results. We shall leave the choice between these alternatives until later.<sup>45</sup>

## Part 2. PASSAGES SHARED BY LIEHTZYY AND OTHER TEXTS

### 1. Introduction and List of Parallels.

About a quarter of *Liehtzzy* is found in other sources, but most of the parallels are concentrated in ch. 2, 8, and to a lesser extent 1. The following list is based on Wang Shwumin's *Liehtzzy buujeng*,<sup>46</sup> supplemented by further examples noticed by other scholars or by myself. I apologise in advance for any oversights, and will be grateful to anyone who informs me of them. The list covers pre-Hann and Hann texts, and is confined to parallels close enough to imply the borrowing of a fixed text, presumably written, although the possibility of oral transmission need not be excluded. It does not take account of versions of a story which use different words except in key sentences which are likely to remain constant when a story is retold.<sup>47</sup> Although important for other lines of inquiry, such passages are irrelevant to our present task, which is to find evidence that *Liehtzzy* uses or is used in documents of known date.

<sup>42</sup> The *Shyhtwen* has it in this position.

<sup>42a</sup> Mr. D. C. Lau has pointed out to me at page proof stage that the meaning of the last clause - crucial to my argument - is far from evident.

<sup>43</sup> LT j.1, 3B/14, 4A/2, 6A/5. j.2, 1A/6, 2A/3, 2B/2 (= j.4, 4A/7). j.4, 3B/10. j.7, 3A/1. j.8, 6B/9.

<sup>44</sup> LT j.1, 5B/7.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. p. 190 below.

<sup>46</sup> As n. 38 (p. 146) above.

<sup>47</sup> For example,

LT j.5, 7A/2-7 Cf. LSCC j.14, 4B, *Harnshy wayjuann* j.9, 3A, SY j.8, 9B  
8, 2B/13-3A/2 SY j.13, 16A  
8, 5B/5-12 LSCC j.14, 22B, j.18, 14B.

j.1	1B/3-5 1B/6f	<i>Dawderjing</i> 6 Cf. Jang Jann, "JT also has this saying". (Not in extant JT)
	1B/10-2A/9	<i>Yih woei Chyan tzuoh duh</i> 易緯乾鑿度 ( <i>Wuuingdiann jiuhenbaan</i> 武英殿聚珍版 上 5A, B=下 1B-2B JT j.6, 36A <i>Mohitzzy</i> j.10, 8A/5 f JT ap. <i>Taypyng yuhlaan</i> 太平御覽 j.887 JT j.6, 36B <i>Dawder jyyguei luenn</i> 道德指歸論 ( <i>Jinday mihshu</i> : 津逮秘書), j.6, 7A Letter of Yang Wangsuen 楊王孫 (c. 100 B.C.), ap. SY 20/16A, <i>Hannshu</i> j.67, 2A HN j.7, 1A SY j.17, 17B, JY j.4, 7A, B <i>Shyuntzzy</i> 荀子 j.19, 20A JY j.5, 19B cf. <i>Harnshy wayjuann</i> 韓詩外傳 j.8, 13A-13B <i>Yanntzzy chuenchiou</i> 晏子春秋 j.1, 20B <i>Shytzzy</i> 尸子 ( <i>Syhbuh beyyaw</i> ) B, 1A/12 f JT j.7, 45A
	2B/14-3A/10 3A/4 3A/10-13 3B/6-9 3B/10-13	
	4A/8-10	
	4A/10 4B/2-8 5A/9-12	
	5B/2 5B/3 6B/13-7A/5	
j.2	1B/10 1B/10 f, 2A/2 2B/9-3A/11 4B/10-12 5A/2-11 5A/12-5B/7 5B/7-14 6A/1-3	<i>Shanhaejing</i> 山海經, 下 57B/2 JT j.1, 11B, 12B JT j.7, 38B JT j.2, 21B JT j.7, 5A JT j.7, 10B JT j.7, 4A JT ap. commentaries on <i>Shyhshuo shinyeu</i> 上之 上, 33B 文選 <i>Wensheuan</i> j.31, 28A (not in extant JT) JT j.7, 57A JT j.3, 32A JT j.10, 12A JT j.9, 17A JT j.7, 28A, <i>Harn Fei tzyy</i> 韓非子, j.7, 9B HN j.1, 9B <i>Dawderjing</i> 76) JT j.1, 30B ( <i>Taypyng yuhlaan</i> j.964 quotes 10A/3-6 as from JT, but Wang Shwumin takes this as a mistake for <i>Liehtzzy</i> , op. cit. 1/68A)
	6A/4 6B/8-7B/12 7B/12-8B/1 8B/1-9 8B/9-12 9A/5-9 (8 f 10A/6 f	

- 10A/8-12 JT j.7, 10A  
10A/13-10B LSCC j.15, 13A, HN j.12, 4A
- j.3 1A/12-14 HN j.19, 13B  
2A/4-13 *Muh tiantzzy juann* 8A, 9A, B, 15A, B, 19B-20A  
3A/4-6 *Joulii* j.6, 28B  
3A/10-12 *Lingshujing* 靈樞經 j.7, 5B
- j.4 2A/3 f JT j.8, 1A  
3A/3-10 SY j.17, 14B, JY j.4, 6B  
7A/9, 11, 13 JT j.10, 41A, 41B, 42A  
7B/2 f *Mohtzzy* j.10, 4B/2 f  
7B/14-8A/2 JT j.10, 35A
- j.5 1B/13-2A/3 HN j.3, 1A, j.6, 6B *Luennherng* 論衡 j.11, 1A  
2B/9-12 JT j.1, 5B  
2B/12 f JT j.1, 6B  
3A/10 f *Joulii* j.11, 3A  
4A/3-5 *Shanhaejing* 下 81A/3-5, 44A/7-9  
4A/5-7 *Shanhaejing* 下 36A  
5A/5-9 *Mohtzzy* j.6, 14B  
5A/9-13 Hwan Tarn, *Shinluenn* 新論 ap. *Faayuann julin*  
法苑珠林 j.7, 16A; *Liehtzzy shyhwen* (Taoist  
canon 466), 下 4B; commentary in Tarn MS of  
*Shyhsuo shinyeu* (reproduced as appendix in  
*Wenshyue guuyi kanshyng sheh* 文學古籍刊行  
社 edition, Peking, 1956. 22B, 23A)  
5B/1 f *Mohtzzy* j.10, 18A/3  
5B/4 f *Shytzzy*, ap. *Duh gongbuh Tsaotarng shyjian* 杜  
工部草堂詩箋 (*Tsongshu jyicherng*) 651/3 f  
8B/1-4 HN j.9, 13B  
9B/2-5 *Joushu* 周書 ap. *Koong tsongtzyy* 孔叢子  
j.5, 2B *Borwuhjyh* j.3, 5B (not in extant *Yih Joushu*  
逸周書) Cf. Jang Jann's note.
- j.6 2B/1 f *Shyyjih* 史記 j.32, 8A  
2B/4-10 *Shyyjih*, j.62, 1B  
2B/13-3A/9 JT j.8, 30B  
3A/12 *Deng Shi tzyy*, attached memorial of Liou Shianq  
or Liou Shin, 1A  
4A/14 *Dawderjing* 73

- 5B/4-6A/1 *Yanntzzy chuenchiou* j.1, 19B, 20A conflated with  
*Harnshy wayjuann* j.10, 9A  
6A/1-3 *Janngwotseh* j.3, 55A
- j.7 5B/11-6A/3 SY j.7, 17B  
6A/8-11 *Hannshu* j.23, 1A  
7A/6 JT j.1, 10B
- j.8 1A/8-10 *Shytzzy* B, 9B  
1B/8-12 LSCC j.9, 7B  
2A/4-6 *Harn Fei tzyy* j.7, 3B HN j.20, 2A  
2A/2-13 JT j.9, 22B, LSCC j.16, 5B, *Shinshih* 新序 j.7, 9B  
3A/11-3B/4 SY j.17, 16A, JY j.2, 9A  
3B/4-13 LSCC j.18, 7A, HN j.12, 1B  
3B/13-4A/10 LSCC j.15, 4A, HN j.12, 3B  
(3B/13 f *Gwoyey* j.15, 8B  
4A/10-4B/3 HN j.18, 5B *Luennherng* j.6, 3A  
4B/8-5A/8 HN j.12, 9A  
5A/8-12 HN j.12, 7A cf. LSCC j.17, 19A  
5A/12-5B/1 *Harnshy wayjuann* j.7, 9A, HN j.12, 12A cf. *Shyun-*  
*tzyy* j.20, 28B  
5B/1-4 LSCC j.10, 8B cf. HN j.18, 2A  
5B/12-6A/3 HN j.18, 20B  
6A/5-8 LSCC j.12, 5B *Shinshih* j.7, 14A  
6A/10-14 LSCC j.20, 2B SY j.4, 15A  
7A/3-6 *Harn Fei tzyy* j.8, 2A  
8A/2-4 LSCC j.16, 18A  
8A/4-7 LSCC j.13, 6A  
8A/8 f *Harn Fei tzyy* j.7, 4A HN j.12, 16B  
8A/9 HN j.1, 17A  
8A/10-12 LSCC j.16, 18A HN j.13, 18B  
(This article will not give further references to parallel texts, since they  
can be found through the above table.)

Our purpose in examining parallel texts is to find evidence that one borrows from the other—for example, stylistic features characteristic of one of the books containing the passage, expressions intelligible in one context but not in the other, juxtaposition in one text of passages widely separated in the other, conflation of two versions of a story to make a third. I propose to ignore accidental textual corruption almost entirely. In view of the elaborate apparatus which Haloun developed to deal with parallel texts,<sup>48</sup> this may seem rather a surprising omission. But Haloun's method

<sup>48</sup> Cf. G. Haloun, *Legalist Fragments*, Part 1, *Asia Major* (NS) 2 (1951), 85-150.

was designed for quite a different purpose, the restoration of the original form of texts preserved in several versions. Textual corruption may, it is true, vitiate our evidence in two ways:

(1) In passages common to books X and Y, it may deface the features that would betray that X borrowed from Y.

(2) It may destroy the consistency with which X and Y use their characteristic words and constructions.

But if we suspect such corruption, and try to emend the text, we run against a serious obstacle; in neither case can we use the most important tool of textual criticism, the argument that one reading makes better sense than another.

(1) If we apply it to a sentence common to two books, we are trying to restore the sentence as originally written. But this has nothing to do with the original reading of X or Y. There remains the possibility that the sentence was corrupt when first borrowed; and at the outset of the inquiry we do not know which is the borrower, nor even that they are not both borrowers from a common source.

(2) If, for example, some editions omit a particle in a certain sentence, there is only one internal test for choosing between the readings—that the presence or absence of the particle agrees with the regular usage within the book. But since the discovery of such regularities is one aim of the inquiry, to use this test would involve us in a vicious circle. Suppose that I propose a generalization, and note a variant for the one exception. If I claim that this variant throws doubt on the exception, a critic is entitled to ask me for every variant which throws doubt on cases which support the rule.

The establishment of a reliable family tree of MSS and printed editions would enable us to exclude certain variants as corruptions appearing at particular stages in a book's transmission; but we cannot wait until this is done for every document relevant to the inquiry. We must therefore work with standard texts, and ignore variants unless there is a specific reason for preferring them, a reason based on the history of the text and not on the sense of the passage.

We are looking for uniformities of a kind which corruption can destroy but not originate, and which are unlikely to be the effects of systematic recension. If corruption has gone too far, the search will be fruitless; but if we do find them, the possibility of corruption has no bearing on their validity.

#### 2/2. *Mohtzzy*

Of the four passages shared with *Mohtzzy*, three belong to the Canons and Explanations. In *Mohtzzy* the canons are collected in ch. 40 and 41, their explanations in ch. 42 and 43. The explanations are linked to the corresponding canons by two devices:

(1) The explanation begins by repeating the first word of the canon.

(2) In the second series (ch. 41) most canons contain the formula 說在 . . . "Explanation in . . .", ending with one or two words summarizing the explanation, but seldom intelligible without referring to its text.

The presence of these devices in two of the *Liehtzzy* parallels makes it plain that *Liehtzzy* borrows directly from *Mohtzzy*.

*Mohtzzy* j.10, 4A/2 均之絕不 (= 否), 說在所均。

18A/3 (均)。髮均懸, 輕而髮絕, 不均也。均, 其絕也莫絕。

Canon "Whether or not it will snap if the give and pull are equal. Explanation in 'What is made equal'

*Explanation* Let a hair hang so that the give and pull are equal. If the hair is snapped by a light pull it is because the give and pull are unequal. If they were kept equal, nothing that snaps would snap."<sup>49</sup>

LT j.5, 5B/1 f 均髮均懸, 輕重而髮絕, 髮不均也。均也, 其絕也莫絕。

Here *Liehtzzy* reproduces the whole explanation including the introductory reference to the canon, which is meaningless in its new context.

*Mohtzzy* j.10, 4B/2 f 景不從 [read 徙], 說在改爲。

Canon "A shadow does not move. Explanation in 'replacement'."

LT j.4, 7B/2 f 景不移者, 說在改也。

Here *Liehtzzy* reproduces the whole canon including the reference to the explanation, which is not supplied.

#### 2/3. *Juangtzyy*

At first sight it may seem pointless to look for evidence that common passages in *Juangtzyy* and *Liehtzzy* are directly borrowed by one from the other. It is natural to suppose that both books are miscellanies drawing on a common stock of Taoist stories and saying. But on closer inspection it becomes plain that the two books are very dissimilar. The stories in *Juangtzyy* are either brief and simple anecdotes like the story of the keeper of monkeys,<sup>50</sup> or mere settings for dialogue; even the lengthy story of Confucius visiting Robber Jyr in the *Daw Jyr* 盜跖 chapter is merely a slightly dramatized conversation. Nothing in *Juangtzyy* resembles the intricately organized narrative of the stories of the old peasant Shangchiou Kai 商丘開, of King Muh and the wizard, of the avenging son and the three swords.<sup>51</sup> On the other hand the *Liehtzzy* stories, although more complex as narrative, are much simpler in style. In the parts of *Liehtzzy* without parallels, even the Taoist discourse is generally as prosaic as the stories, bare of imagery and unrhymed.<sup>52</sup> If we isolate the passages common to the two books, it is soon clear that they are in the manner of *Juangtzyy*—

<sup>49</sup> The passage is obscure, but this is its general meaning within its *Liehtzzy* context.

<sup>50</sup> JT j.1, 30B.

<sup>51</sup> LT j.2, 3B-4B. j.3, 1A-2A. j.5, 8B-9B.

<sup>52</sup> For exceptions, cf. p. 187 below.



dramatized dialogues full of rhymed passages, in a style made both exciting and obscure by unexpected metaphors, rare words and abrupt transitions of thought, and obscured still further by radical textual corruption. No doubt it is hardly a scientific argument to point out that in general *Liehtzzy* is one of the easiest of ancient texts and *Juangtzyy* one of the most difficult, but this is a difference which few readers can have failed to notice; and when preparing a translation of *Liehtzzy* I had as much trouble with passages common to the two books as with the rest of *Liehtzzy* taken together.

These general impressions are confirmed if we examine the use of certain particles:

(1) Preposition HU 乎

The preposition *hu* is used in *Juangtzyy* almost as freely as *yu* 於. In passages shared with *Liehtzzy* it is as common as elsewhere:

	<i>Liehtzzy</i>	<i>hu</i>	<i>yu</i>
j.1	2B/14-3A/10	4(3)	2(3)
	3B/6-9	1	3
	6B/13-7A/5	1	-
j.2	2B/9-3A/11	9	5(4)
	3A/11-3B/5	-	1
	5A/2-11	3(2)	-
	5A/12-5B/7	6	6
	5B/7-14	-	2
	6B/8-7B/12	1	3(2)
	7B/12-8B/1	3	3(4)
	8B/2-9	-	2(3)
	8B/9-12	-	1
j.6	2B/13-3A/9	2	5
		—	—
		30	33
		—	—

(The figures exclude 惡乎 and 於是. The numbers in brackets are those of the *Juangtzyy* text, where it differs from the *Liehtzzy* text.)

In *Liehtzzy* *hu* is rare except in passages shared with other texts:

Parallels with <i>Juangtzyy</i>	30
„ „ <i>Hwainantzzy</i>	6 . . . j.5, 8B/1 f (HN 于), j.8, 4A/7, 5A/7
„ „ <i>Jiayeu</i>	2 . . . j.1, 4B/2, j.8, 3A/11 (JY 于)
„ „ <i>Joushu</i>	1 . . . j.5, 9B/5
„ „ <i>Harnshy wayjuann</i>	1 . . . j.6, 5B/11
No known parallel	10
	—
	50
	—

Of the ten cases peculiar to *Liehtzzy*, four are from the composite section on metamorphoses, which will be discussed shortly.<sup>53</sup> There can be little doubt that the whole of it is assembled from written sources. Otherwise *hu* is confined to three stories without known parallels:

The man who was afraid the sky would fall down, j.1, 6B/3,4

The two brothers educated for peace and for war, j.8, 2B/5,11

The man who knew the secret of immortality but died, j.8, 7A/10,11.

(2) Pronoun ERL 而

*Juangtzyy* is one of the few texts which regularly uses the pronoun *erl* "you, your". *Liehtzzy* uses it nine times in passages shared with *Juangtzyy*:

j.1, 3A/2

j.2, 5A/6, 6B/12, 14. 8A/12, 13. 8B/6 ter.

Elsewhere it appears twice, in the story of the man who walked through stone and fire.<sup>54</sup> This immediately follows the story of the boy who loved seagulls, known by quotations to have belonged to the lost longer version of *Juangtzyy*. The two stories are preceded by three also found in the present *Juangtzyy*, and followed by four more. It is therefore likely that this story too once belonged to *Juangtzyy*.

(3) Interrogative Particle YU 與, 歟

In *Juangtzyy* the particle is written without the addition of Radical 76. In *Liehtzzy* it occurs twenty times in passages without parallels, and with one exception<sup>55</sup> is written with the radical. This is a graphic difference which one might expect to be especially vulnerable to textual corruption. However, we have a good ninth century witness in the *Liehtzzy shyhwen*, which ignores the particle when it is written with the radical, but makes a note (音余 "Pronounce *yu*") when it is not. In all the cases peculiar to *Liehtzzy* it confirms the reading of the Northern Song edition reproduced in the *Syhbuh tsongkan*.

The particle occurs three times in passages shared with another text, which in all cases is *Juangtzyy*:

j.2, 5A/6	Radical omitted, in a sentence missing from the present text of the <i>Juangtzyy</i> parallel. Confirmed by <i>Shyhwen</i> .
6B/12	Radical omitted, as in <i>Juangtzyy</i> . Confirmed by <i>Shyhwen</i> .
j.6, 7A/1	Radical included, in contrast with <i>Juangtzyy</i> . The quoted character in the Taoist canon text of the <i>Shyhwen</i> also has the radical, but the note ("Pronounce <i>yu</i> ") shows that the ninth century text omitted it.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. p. 156 below.

<sup>54</sup> j.2, 6A/11 bis. It may be mentioned that, although I have elsewhere (BSOAS 22 (1959) 558 n. 3) argued against Dobson that *erl* is almost exclusively possessive in the *Tzuoojuann* 左傳, his claim that it also serves as agent is certainly true of *Juangtzyy*.

<sup>55</sup> j.4, 7A/2.

Thus *Liehtzzy* has copied from *Juangtzyy* without adapting it to its own graphic convention. This rather extraordinary fact suggests that the borrowing was very late, at a period when even the forms of characters were becoming firmly standardized.

The relationship between the texts of *Juangtzyy* and *Liehtzzy* is very complicated; there is abundant evidence both that *Liehtzzy* depends on *Juangtzyy* and that it uses a different, fuller and in some ways better text than that which survives. A detailed textual study is outside the scope of this study, since a proof that *Liehtzzy* is secondary would have little bearing on its date; it might still be as early as the third century B.C. However, a single example will illustrate the nature of the relationship. A well-known passage in *Juangtzyy* presents a chain of transformations and strange births by which men descend from the primaeval germs. *Liehtzzy* gives a much longer version. Its first addition is a phrase from the Mohist canons:

*Mohistzyy* j.10, 2B/6 化，徵易也。

8A/5 (化)。若鼃爲鶉。

Canon "Transformation is change involving the marks of identity.

Explanation Like frogs becoming quails."

*JT* j.6, 36A 種有幾，得水則爲鶉。

"Within the seeds are germs. When these reach water they become *jih*"

*LT* j.1, 3A/3 f 種有幾，若蠶爲鶉，得水爲鶉。

In the previous section we noticed two other quotations from the Mohist canons, one of which is an integral part of the story making fun of the sophist Gongsuen Long.<sup>56</sup> An interest in the Mohist canons is unusual at any period in Chinese history, and we can hardly doubt that the editor who expanded this *Juangtzyy* passage also inserted the other quotations and wrote the Gongsuen Long story.

The next additions mend breaks in the evolutionary chain:

*LT* j.1, 3A/9 斯彌爲食醴頤輅。(食醴頤輅)生乎食醴黃輅。  
[食醴黃輅]生乎九猷，(九猷生乎替芮)，替芮生乎腐蠹。

"The *symi* becomes the *shyrshiyiluh*, which gives birth to the *shyrshih-wangkuanq*, which gives birth to the *jeouyou*, which gives birth to the *mawruuey*, which gives birth to the *fuuhuan*."

But there remains one break in *Juangtzyy*'s chain, immediately following the sentences just quoted. Into this gap *Liehtzzy* inserts a miscellaneous collection of metamorphoses and unusual births which destroys the sequence and hides the point of the passage. As will be seen from the table f parallels, part of the interpolation comes from a lost *Juangtzyy* passage quoted in the *Taypyng yuhlaan*.

*LT* j.1, 3A/10-13 馬血之爲轉鄰也，人血之爲野火也，鷓之爲鷓，鷓之爲布穀，布穀久復爲鷓也，燕鳥之爲蛤也，田鼠之爲鶉也，朽瓜之爲魚也，老韭之爲莧也，老獺之爲獾也，魚卵之爲蟲也，此皆物之變者。

"The blood of horses becoming the jack-o'-lantern, the blood of men becoming the will-o'-the-wisp; kites becoming sparrow-hawks, sparrow-hawks becoming cuckoos, cuckoos in due course again becoming kites; swallows becoming oysters, moles becoming quails, rotten melons becoming fish, old leeks becoming sedge, old ewes becoming monkeys, fish roe becoming insects:—these are all examples of things altering."<sup>57</sup>

The same sequence of quotations in the *Taypyng yuhlaan* also includes the evolutionary passage as we find it in the present *Juangtzyy* except that the text is entirely free from breaks in the chain. The interpolation therefore comes from a different context in *Juangtzyy*.

We may draw two conclusions:

(1) *Liehtzzy* expands the *Juangtzyy* text with additions from various sources which destroy the evolutionary sequence.

(2) Nevertheless in the second passage quoted above *Liehtzzy* preserves a fuller text mutilated in the extant *Juangtzyy*. Its editor is not deliberately repairing breaks in the chain, for he is quite indifferent to such breaks. The one break common to both texts is presumably the result of still earlier textual corruption.

The abridgement of the longer *Juangtzyy* in fifty-two *pian* recorded in the Hann bibliography was the work of Guo Shianq 郭象 (died 312), according to the postface to his commentary, preserved in a MS at the Kōzanji 高山寺, Kyoto.<sup>58</sup> Among the commentaries used in the *Juangtzyy shyhwen* of Luh Derming 陸德明 (died 627), only those of Symaa Biau 司馬彪 (died 306) and Menq 孟 covered the full text. The editor of *Liehtzzy* evidently knew the full text, since he incorporated passages known only by quotation. But it is worth noting that his version of the story of *Liehtzzy* and the shaman<sup>59</sup> shares readings which Luh Derming quotes from the text of the commentator Tsuei Juann 崔譔 (fourth century), and

<sup>57</sup> The last seven characters, needed to complete the sentence, are preserved only in the *Taypyng yuhlaan* parallel. But Jang Jann's note paraphrases them, showing that they also stood in his text of *Liehtzzy*.

<sup>58</sup> It is included in *Juangtzyy buajenq* 補正, edited by Liou Wendean 劉文典 (Commercial Press, 1947), j.10B, 24B, 25A. Cf. Wang Shwumin, 'On an Old and Incomplete MS of Chuang tzü (*Academia Sinica*), 22 (1950), 161-70.

<sup>59</sup> j.2, 6B-7B

<sup>56</sup> j.4, 7B/2 f.

that the readings of the *Liehtzyy shyhwen* for this passage are even closer to the Tsuei text.<sup>60</sup>

#### 2/4. *Leushyh chuenchiou*

The *Leushyh chuenchiou* is among the best preserved of pre-Hann texts. It was compiled under the direction of Leu Buhwei 呂不韋 (died 235 B.C.); certain passages are later than his death, but the book seems to have reached substantially its present form before the end of the Chyn 秦 dynasty (207 B.C.).<sup>61</sup>

Each chapter has a single theme illustrated by stories. The stories often come from earlier sources, but the introduction and conclusion of the chapter and the consecutive argument which links the stories must be credited to the authors of the *Leushyh chuenchiou* themselves. One passage shared with *Liehtzyy* begins with a story and continues with the succeeding argument right to the end of the chapter.<sup>62</sup> It contains a sentence which confirms the impression that the *Leushyh chuenchiou* cannot be borrowing from an earlier source:

LSCC j.15, 4B/10 齊荆吳越皆嘗勝矣而卒取亡，不達乎持勝也。

"Chyi, Jing, Wu and Yueh were all victorious once, but ended by bringing ruin on themselves, because they did not understand how to hold on to victory."

This is obviously one of the latest passages in the *Leushyh chuenchiou*, later than the final destruction of Jing or Chuu 楚 (223 B.C.) and Chyi (221 B.C.). However, it is not much later, since it uses the name "Jing" in obedience to the Chyn taboo on "Chuu", the personal name of Shyy-hwangdih's 始皇帝 father. The whole sentence appears in *Liehtzyy*,<sup>63</sup> including the preposition *hu*, already noticed as a mark of borrowed passages. Apart from two differences in the grammatical particles, its only alteration is the replacement of "Jing" by the tabooed "Chuu". The only other case of "Jing" in the common passages is similarly replaced.<sup>64</sup> We may well suspect that *Liehtzyy* borrowed these passages after the beginning of the Hann dynasty, although it is possible that both readings are merely copyist's corrections.

<sup>60</sup> For two recent attempts (using criteria which seem to me unsatisfactory) to prove that some *Liehtzyy* passages are earlier than their *Juangtzyy* parallels, see:

Amano Shizuo 天野鍊雄 *On the Precedency of the Lieh-tsu's Narratives—The Comparison of Overlapping Phrases between Lieh-tsu and Chuang-tsu*, Shibun 斯文 21 (1958), 28-45, Yan Lingfeng 嚴靈峰, *Liehtzyy Jangjiuh Shinbian* 列子章句新編, Taipei 1960, 199-209.

<sup>61</sup> WSTK 1014-16.

<sup>62</sup> LT j.8, 3B/13-4A/10.

<sup>63</sup> 4A/6 f.

<sup>64</sup> LT j.8, 5B/3.

The *Leushyh chuenchiou* tends to show the relevance of a story to the argument of the chapter by using the formula 非獨 X 也, T 亦 . . . , "It is so not only of X but also of Y". Although the formula is not quite confined to this text,<sup>65</sup> its presence in a common passage is a useful sign that the *Leushyh chuenchiou* version is primary. For example, the story of the lute-player Bor Ya 伯牙 ends with the sentence:

LSCC j.14, 5A/1 非獨琴若此也，賢者亦然。

"It is like this, not only in the case of the lute, but also in the case of men of worth."

The formula reappears with the story in the *Harnshy wayjuann*.<sup>66</sup>

Similarly, the story of Mohtzyy and the dyers has the comment:  
LSCC j.2, 8B/2 非獨染絲紗(Read 然)也，國亦有染。

"It is not only of dyeing threads that this is so; there is also dyeing of the state."

The whole chapter on dyeing is also found as ch. 3 of *Mohtzyy*. Since it mentions King Kang 康 (328-286 B.C.) of Sonq 宋 by his posthumous name, it has long been suspected that it entered *Mohtzyy* from the *Leushyh chuenchiou*.<sup>67</sup> The presence of the formula, which appears a second time later in the chapter, strongly supports this hypothesis.<sup>68</sup>

The story of *Liehtzyy* learning archery has a comment in the same form  
LSCC j.9, 8A/6 非獨射也。國之存也，國之亡也，身之賢也，身之不肖也，亦皆有以。

"Archery is not the only case; the survival or ruin of the state, the worth or incapacity of the individual, also always have reasons."

The story also appears in *Liehtzyy*, followed by the same comment, slightly abridged:

LT j.8, 1B/11 非獨射也。爲國與身亦皆如之。

"Archery is not the only case; the government of state and individual also are always like this."

This is the only example of the formula in *Liehtzyy*.

#### 2/5. *Other pre-Hann and Former Hann Texts*

Several features of *Liehtzyy* make it necessary to consider a number of texts together. In the first place, the dialogues which make up a large part of the book are generally cast in the form: "X said. . . Y said". The formula "Y answered (對曰)", so common in most texts, occurs only fifteen times. But all but one of these fifteen cases are in passages with known parallels:

<sup>65</sup> Cf. *Mohtzyy* j.7, 1A/8.

<sup>66</sup> 9/3A.

<sup>67</sup> Wu Yuhjiang 吳鎮江, *Mohtzyy jiauwuh* 校注 (Dwulih chubaa sheh 獨立出版社 1944), j.1, 6A.

<sup>68</sup> *Mohtzyy* j.1, 5B/1, 6B/8.

- j.1, 4B/3 (SY, JY)  
 2, 8B/11 (JT), 10B/1,7 (LSCC, HN)  
 5, 7A/11 (No known parallel)  
 6, 5B/9 (*Yanntzzy chuenchiou*)  
 7, 5B/13 (SY)  
 8, 1B/9 (LSCC 荅 for 對), 3B/1 (SY, JY), 4B/10 and 5A/1 (HN),  
 5A/9, 10 (HN), 5A/13 (*Harnshy wayjuann*, HN), 8A/12 (LSCC,  
 HN)

This formula is therefore a nearly infallible sign that a passage is borrowed, although not necessarily from any of the books in which we now find it; there is always the possibility of a common unknown source.

In the second place, there is the fact that *Liehtzzy* includes every scrap of information about Liehtzzy himself contained in *Juangtzyy*, the *Leushyh chuenchiou* and *Hwainantzzy*. It includes, not only the eight stories, but three quite casual references:

- (1) JT j.1, 8A/6 夫列子御風而行。

"Liehtzzy travelled by riding the wind."

LT j.2, 2A/3 列子師老商氏,友伯高子,進(=盡)二子之道,乘風而歸。

"Liehtzzy studied with old Shang as his teacher and Borgautzzy as his friend. After exhausting the Way of these two men, he returned riding the wind."

An anecdote follows, in which Liehtzzy tells a would-be disciple how he learned to ride the wind. This is the only passage in the book which credits Liehtzzy with any kind of abnormal powers.

- (2) LSCC j.17, 18B/1 *Shytzyy* A, 14B/3 列子貴虛。

"Liehtzzy valued emptiness" (In both books this occurs in a list of the characteristic doctrines of different philosophers)

LT j.1, 5B/10 或謂子列子,曰,子奚貴虛。

"Someone said to Liehtzzy: 'Why do you value emptiness?'"

Liehtzzy answers the question; but in the whole book he never again reverts to this concept, which in the third century B.C. was quoted as the central idea in his philosophy.

- (3) HN j.10, 11A/6 f 列子學壺子觀景柱(讀枉)而知持後矣。

"Liehtzzy, having learned from Hwutzzy to watch a shadow bend, knew how to keep to the rear."

LT j.8, 1A/4-6 子列子學於壺丘子林。壺丘子林曰,子知持後則可言持身矣。……列子顧而觀影。形枉則影曲。

"Liehtzzy was studying under Hwuchiou Tzyylin, who said: 'When you know how to keep to the rear we can talk about personal conduct' . . .

Liehtzzy looked round and watched his shadow. When his body bent his shadow was crooked."

One might explain the extraordinary comprehensiveness of *Liehtzzy* on the assumption that from *Juangtzyy* downwards the man was known only by the book. This explanation would imply that the book has survived from 300 B.C. or earlier without losing any of the eleven stories about Liehtzzy which the three texts happen to mention. If we reject this explanation, and discount the possibility of accident, we must conclude that the book is later than *Hwainantzzy*, and that its compiler incorporated every reference to his hero that he could find.<sup>69</sup> The three stories considered above may come from lost sources, but we cannot ignore the possibility that he improvised them to fit the references known to us.

Thirdly, there are cases in which the *Liehtzzy* version is clearly secondary because it conflates passages found in other texts:

(1) The story of Duke Jiing 景 of Chyi on Ox Mountain exists in two independent versions, in the *Yanntzzy chuenchiou* (of uncertain date) and the *Harnshy wayjuann* (c. 150 B.C.). At the end of ch. 6 *Liehtzzy* reproduces the former version expanded by the insertion at five points of extracts from the latter.<sup>70</sup>

(2) In *Hwainantzzy* the stories of Neugua 女媧 cutting off the legs of the tortoise to support the earth, and of the breaking of one of the pillars of heaven in a battle between Gonggong 共工 and Juanshiu 顓頊 appear in different contexts.<sup>71</sup> *Liehtzzy*<sup>72</sup> reproduces the latter story, inserts an abridged version of the former after the introductory 昔者 "formerly", and links the two by an intermediate 其後 "afterwards". The *Luennherng* of Wang Chong 王充 (born A.D. 27) also combines the stories, but in the reverse order, taking the damage caused by the battle as the reason for Neugua's repairs.<sup>73</sup>

(3) There are two independent versions of the story of Jaw Shiangtzyy's victory over the Dyi 翟, in the *Gwoyey* and the *Leushyh chuenchiou*. The latter version, written after 221 B.C.,<sup>74</sup> reappears in the *Hwainantzzy*, with the conclusion slightly altered to give it a Taoist moral (the last four characters, 以術強弱 "uses strategy to turn weakness into strength" become 以強爲弱 "makes his strength seem weakness"). The same version appears in *Liehtzzy*, in a text which sometimes agrees with the

<sup>69</sup> I am aware of only one pre-Hann or Former Hann reference to Liehtzzy which does not appear in the book; *Janngwotseh* j.5, 48A, where he is said to have "valued correctness" (in the use of names) 貴正.

<sup>70</sup> j.6, 5B, 6A.

<sup>71</sup> j.3/1A, 6/6B, cf. j.1/7A.

<sup>72</sup> j.5, 1B, 2A.

<sup>73</sup> j.11, 1A.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. p. 158 above.

*Leushyh chuenchiou* and sometimes with *Hwainantzyy*, but shares the latter's Taoist ending. But in the opening sentences it also borrows from the other version, that of the *Gwoyeu*:

*Gwoyeu* j.15, 8B 趙襄子使新釋穆子伐翟。勝左人中人。遽人來告。

"Jaw Shiangtzyy sent Shinjyh Muhtzyy to attack the Dyi. He conquered Tzuoren and Jongren. A dispatch rider came to report."

LSCC j.15, 4A 趙襄子攻翟。勝老人中人。使使者來謁之。

"Jaw Shiangtzyy made war on the Dyi. He conquered Laoren and Jongren. A messenger was sent to announce it to him."

Comment of Gau Yeou 高誘 (168-A.D. 212) 襄子趙簡子之子無恤也。使辛穆子伐翟。勝之，下老人中人城。使使者來謁襄子。

"Shiangtzyy was Jaw Jeantzyy's son Wushiuh. He sent Shin Muhtzyy to attack the Dyi. He conquered them, won the submission of the cities Laoren and Jongren, and sent a messenger to announce it to Shiangtzyy."

HN j.12, 3B 趙襄子攻翟而勝之。取尤人終人。使者來謁之

LT j.8, 3B 趙襄子使新釋穆子攻翟。勝之，取左人中人。使遽人來謁之。

Since this is the only place at which his text agrees with the *Gwoyeu*, it is hard to resist the suspicion that the editor of *Liehtzyy* knows the *Gwoyeu* version only through Gau Yeou's commentary. However, we cannot insist on this hypothesis, which assumes corruption of Gau Yeou's commentary (presumably by assimilation to the *Leushyh chuenchiou* text) in cases where the *Gwoyeu* and *Liehtzyy* agree against it.<sup>75</sup>

All the three lines of argument in the present section, as well as the evidence of the preposition *hu*, confirm that *Liehtzyy* borrows passages now found only in *Hwainantzyy* (compiled by the clients of Liou An 劉安, Prince of Hwainan, who died in 122 B.C.). It is conceivable that all such passages come from older common sources; but there is one detail which suggests that *Liehtzyy* is later than Liou An himself. Gau Yeou's preface to *Hwainantzyy* mentions a taboo: Liou An, "because his father's name was Charng, always uses *shiou* for *charng* in his writings (以父諱長故其所著諸'長'字皆曰'脩')." The cases of *charng* in the extant text are no doubt copyist's corrections, since Gau Yeou explicitly says that its avoidance was invariable; in any case the tendency to prefer *shiou* is beyond question:

*Dawderjing* 2 長短相形 [Wang Bih text: '較'], 高下相傾。

"Long and short shape each other, high and low depend on each other."

<sup>75</sup> For other cases of the fusion of passages elsewhere separate, cf. j.1, 2B/14-3B/9 (see pp. 156-7 above), j.2, 1B/10, j.8, 8A/9-10. Cf. also Maa Shihluen's Objection No.15.

HN j.11, 1B 故高下之相傾也，短脩之相形也，亦明矣。

"Therefore it is plain that high and low depend on each other, short and long shape each other."

The taboo forced the writers of *Hwainantzyy* to modify the use of *shiou*. Previously it meant "length" in contrast with "breadth", *goang* 廣;<sup>76</sup> in the pre-Hann texts concordanced in the Harvard-Yenching Sinological Index Series *shiou* is never the opposite of *doan* "short". But under the influence of *Hwainantzyy* the phrase *shiou*doan "long and short" became common. The *Peywen yunnfuu* 佩文韻府 records five cases, the *Tsyrtong* 辭通 of Ju Chifeng 朱起鳳 records four; none is earlier than the *Hannshu*.

The phrase *shiou*doan occurs twice in *Liehtzyy*, although not in passages with *Hwainantzyy* parallels.<sup>77</sup>

#### 2/6. Hwan Tarn

The story of Confucius and the two children<sup>78</sup> was in the *Shinluenn* of Hwan Tarn (died A.D. 56), now known only by quotations. Maa Shihluen<sup>79</sup> already noticed the significance of his introduction to the story, as quoted in the *Faayuann julin*: "I heard this told in the byways when I was young . . ." (予小時聞閭巷言). It is common enough for a Chinese writer to say that he has "heard" a story which appears in the same words in earlier sources; but there seems to be no reason why we should not take quite literally Hwan Tarn's explicit statement that he heard the story as a child, and has therefore presumably written it down in his own words. If so the *Liehtzyy* story, which has only minor variants, cannot have entered the book before the first century A.D.

Another detail deserves notice. In both *Liehtzyy* and the *Shinluenn* the numeral used for the two children is not *ell* 二 but *leang* 兩. As Wang Lih 王力 has pointed out,<sup>80</sup> *leang* is used to number objects which are not natural pairs only from the Hann dynasty.

#### 2/7. Muh tiantzyy juann

Defenders and critics of the antiquity of *Liehtzyy* agree that the account of the travels of King Muh in ch. 3 is based on the *Muh tiantzyy juann*. This section is indeed a cento of passages from six different places in the book, and retains the particle *yu* 于 characteristic of the *Muh tiantzyy juann*, against *Liehtzyy*'s normal practice of using *yu* 於. Since the *Muh tiantzyy juann* is one of the books, of dubious antiquity, which are said to

<sup>76</sup> Ode No. 177. *Mohtzyy* j.10, 3A/8, 12A/7 (read 脩 for 翟) JT j.1, 6B/7.

<sup>77</sup> j.5, 2A/3, 3A/12.

<sup>78</sup> LT j.5, 5A

<sup>79</sup> Objection No 17

<sup>80</sup> *Hannyeu shyygao* 漢語史稿 (Peking 1958, vol. 2, 248-251). His earliest examples are from the *Hannshu*.

have been discovered in the tomb of a King of Wey 魏 in A.D. 281, Maa Shihlun and Chern Wenbo<sup>81</sup> argue confidently that *Liehtzyy* must be later than this date.

Maspero and Tsern Jonqmean<sup>82</sup> accept the pre-Hann origin of the *Muh tiantzyy juann*, and admit no difficulty in assuming that *Liehtzyy* quotes it in the third century B.C. However, the Hann bibliography does not record its title, and there is no reference to it in sources known to be earlier than the date of its supposed discovery. We must conclude that if the book is ancient it had a very limited circulation before its disappearance, and that there is a very strong presumption that a text which quotes it is later than A.D. 281. Waley is the only defender of *Liehtzyy*'s antiquity who has proposed a counter argument:

"The quotation from the *Mu T'ien Tzu Chuan* (rediscovered in A.D. 281) which follows the story of King Mu and the wizard is an obvious interpolation. The wizard has just explained that the King's journeyings were not actual travels in a geographical sense, but 'wanderings of the soul'. Legend, however, attributed to King Mu an actual Westward journey, and some unreflecting copyist has inserted an account of this physical journey, not seeing that by doing so he destroyed the whole intention of *Lieh Tzu's* fable."<sup>83</sup>

At first sight this objection is very plausible, but closer inspection reveals many signs that on the contrary the quotations are integral parts of the story. We must look first at "the whole intention of *Lieh Tzu's* fable". Throughout the story King Muh is a hedonist, spiritually too blind to appreciate the significance of his "wanderings of the soul". He can find no way to show his respect for the wizard except to build him a mansion of unparalleled luxury. The wizard cares nothing for the gift, and takes him to see his own far more splendid mansion in the clouds, which is in fact merely the King's palace transformed by magic. From there he tries to lead the King to a still higher region where there are no sun and moon above nor rivers and seas below; but the King is terrified and begs to return to earth. The King wakes, finds that he has been dreaming, and is told by the wizard that he has been on a journey of the soul. He is delighted, loses interest in state affairs, and devotes his thoughts to "far wanderings" 遠遊.<sup>84</sup> He has

<sup>81</sup> Maa Shihlun, Objection No. 5. Chern Wenbo 陳文波, *A Proof that Liehtzyy is a Forgery*, (*Guushybiann* 4/529-38). For the date of the *Muh tiantzyy juann* cf. WSTK 619-24.

<sup>82</sup> Maspero, *op. cit.*, 491. Tsern Jonqmean, *op. cit.*, 322-24.

<sup>83</sup> *Three Ways of Thought in Ancient China*, 258 f.

<sup>84</sup> j.3, 2A/5. In the shamanistic culture of Chuu 楚 this phrase was used of trance journeys, as in the poem in the *Chuutsyr* 楚辭 of which it is the title. But the phrase is also common enough in its literal sense; even in the Chuu literature it refers to a physical journey in the *Dentgwutzzy hawseh fuh* 登徒子好色賦 ascribed to Song Yuh 宋玉 (*Wensheuan*, j.19, 13B/8).

learned nothing from his experience but a taste for travel. Here we come to the summary of his travels in the West, which end in disillusionment:

j.3, 2A/12 f 於乎，予一人不盈于德而諧於樂。後世其追數吾過乎。

"Alas! Imperfect in virtue, I have been subtle in seeking pleasure. Will not later generations look back and blame me for my errors?"

The story concludes with this judgment:

2A/13 f 穆王幾神人哉。能窮當身之樂，猶百年乃徂。世以爲登假焉。

"How can King Muh be considered a Divine Man!<sup>85</sup> He was able to enjoy his lifetime to the full, but still he died when his hundred years were up. The world supposed that he had 'risen into the distance' (become an immortal)."

The effect of this conclusion depends on its relationship to the conclusion of the story of the Yellow Emperor at the head of the previous chapter. These two stories, from which the chapters which they introduce take their titles (*The Yellow Emperor* 黃帝 and *King Muh of Jou* 周穆王), are deliberately contrasted; the Yellow Emperor succeeds where King Muh fails. The Yellow Emperor begins as a hedonist like King Muh, then experiments with Confucian methods of government. Disillusioned with both, he retires to meditate, and like King Muh dreams of a journey to a far country, the ideal kingdom of Hwashiusyh 華胥氏, governed according to the Taoist principle of spontaneity (*tzyhran* 自然). After returning from this journey (called like King Muh's a "wandering of the soul") he applies the principle of spontaneity to the government of the Empire. The conclusion of this story contrasts with that of the story of King Muh:

j.2, 1B/8 又二十有八年，天下大治，幾若華胥氏之國，而帝登假。百姓號之，二百餘年不輟。

"After another twenty-eight years, when the Empire was almost as perfectly governed as the kingdom of Hwashiusyh, the Emperor 'rose into the distance'. The people did not stop crying for him for more than two hundred years."

Except for the preliminary description of King Muh's chariots and horses, all passages from the *Muh tiantzyy juann* are chosen, and in some cases adapted, to contribute to the scheme of the two stories:

(1) In the *Muh tiantzyy juann* King Muh visits "the men of Jiuhsou" (巨蒐之人). In *Liehtzyy* this becomes "the kingdom of Jiuhsoushyh"

<sup>85</sup> The character 幾 is written for 豈, as the *Shyhwuen* states and Jang Jann implies (言非神也 "Meaning that he was not a *shenn*"). Cf. Peir Shyuehae 裴學海, *Guushu shiutzzyh jyishyh* 古書虛字彙釋 (Peking 1954), 417-21. There is a clear case a few pages later, also noted in the *Shyhwuen*: 古之真人，其覺自忘，其寢不夢，幾虛語哉 "It is no empty saying that the True Men of old forgot themselves while awake and did not dream when they slept". (j.3, 3B/4 f.)

(巨蒐氏之國), as though to recall the very different country visited by the Yellow Emperor (華胥氏之國).

(2) Among the incidents in the *Muh tiantzzy juann*, the *Liehtzzy* story concentrates on two; the Jihsou tribesmen give King Muh snowgoose blood to drink and wash his feet with milk, and Shiwangmuu 西王母 gives a banquet in his honour. Both incidents are definitely unpleasant, however romantic the latter may seem in the deceitful light of more recent plays and stories; the fourth century commentator Jang Jann finds it necessary to point out that the tribesmen were trying to honour King Muh according to their own customs, and he reminds us that Shiwangmuu had tiger's teeth and tangled hair. *Liehtzzy* picks only incidents which demonstrate that the pleasures of King Muh's earthly journey compared very unfavourably with those of his journey of the soul.

(3) King Muh passes a palace of the Yellow Emperor . . . another detail which underlines the relationship between the two stories. It may be noticed that King Muh's Westward journey ends at Mount Yean 弁 where the sun goes down.<sup>86</sup> It is surely not a coincidence that the kingdom of Hwashiusyh is "West of Yean 弁 province and North of Tair 台 province".<sup>87</sup> King Muh follows unwittingly in the tracks of the Yellow Emperor.

(4) The passage already quoted, in which King Muh regrets giving his life to pleasure, has an inconspicuous position quite early in the *Muh tiantzzy juann*. In *Liehtzzy* it is put after the other extracts, all of which precede it in the original book, so that it becomes an expression of disillusionment with the whole journey to the West.

There is bound to be a certain degree of subjectivity in this kind of interpretation, which almost crosses the borderline between textual and literary criticism; and different readers will weigh some of these proposals very differently. But their cumulative effect seems to me considerable. The extracts from the *Muh tiantzzy juann* are an integral part of the stories of King Muh and of the Yellow Emperor, the title stories of two chapters, and provide strong evidence that both were written after A.D. 281.

#### 2/8. *Explicit Quotations in Liehtzzy*

Most of the parallel passages are either stories, or accounts of supposed fact (strange trees and animals, classes of dreams, barbarous customs), and are presented without any indication of source or appeal to authority. But there are also many pieces of philosophical discourse, generally introduced by the formula "X says". In four cases this "X" is the supposed author of (or an author quoted in) another extant book which contains the passage:

- j.1, 5B/2 (*Yanntzzy chuenchiou*) "Yanntzzy (died 493 B.C.) says:"  
 4, 7B/14 (Guanyiin, quoted JT) "Guanyiin Shii 關尹喜 says".  
 5, 4A/5 (*Shanhaejing*, ascribed to Yeu 禹) "The Great Yeu says".  
 6, 4A/14 (*Dawderjing*) "Lao Dan 老聃 told Guanyiin".

In these cases the author or speaker is earlier than the supposed date of *Liehtzzy*, about 400 B.C.<sup>88</sup> In all other cases the authority quoted has no connection with the texts in which we now find the passage:

- j.1, 1B/3 (*Dawderjing*) "The Book of the Yellow Emperor says" (黃帝書曰)  
 1B/10 (*Yih woei Chyan tzuoh duh*, Hann apocryphal work ascribed to Confucius) "Liehtzzy says"  
 3B/10 (*Jynguei*, ascribed to Yan Tzuen 嚴遵, end of last century B.C.) "The Book of the Yellow Emperor says"  
 4A/10 (HN) "The Yellow Emperor says"  
 j.2, 9A/5 (HN) "Yuhtzzy (粥 (= 鬻) 子, tutor of King Wen 文王) says"  
 9A/8 (HN adapting *Dawderjing*) "Lao Dan says"  
 j.7, 6A/8 (*Hannshu*) "Yang Ju 楊朱 says"  
 7A/6 (JT) "Laotzzy says"  
 j.8, 1A/8 (*Shytzzy*, ascribed to Shy Jeau 尸佼, late fourth century B.C.) "Liehtzzy says"

Except in the first two cases, the book which shares the passage with *Liehtzzy* is traditionally dated after 400 B.C.; *Liehtzzy*, as we should expect, ascribes the passage to an authority earlier than 400 B.C. A very curious and suggestive feature is that in all these thirteen cases the passage is *immediately* preceded by the formula "X says". There is plenty of philosophical discourse in *Liehtzzy* without the introductory formula, and when it is present there is no reason why the paralleled passage, often quite short, should come immediately after it. In no less than nine of these examples a large part of the section introduced by "X says" is peculiar to *Liehtzzy*, yet the common passage always comes first. The most natural explanation is that the editor of the book is deliberately taking precautions against the suspicion that he is using sources later than 400 B.C. In the case of stories and information which are common property, passing in the same words from one book to another, no precautions are necessary; readers will simply assume that later writers copied from *Liehtzzy* or from some other source. But when he borrows discourses in which Juangtzzy and the clients of the

<sup>88</sup> The chronology of *Liehtzzy* and of all Taoist books is quite vague; Laotzzy, Guanyiin, Liehtzzy, Yang Ju, are timeless figures who live in the reign of no particular feudal prince or Jou Emperor. But the editor does give *Liehtzzy* a definite place in the sequence of pre-Hann writers. *Liehtzzy* often mentions Mohtzzy (?479-?381 B.C.), Mohtzzy never mentions Liehtzzy; *Liehtzzy* never mentions Juangtzzy (?369-?286 B.C.), Juangtzzy often mentions Liehtzzy. The date 400 B.C. is chosen solely to indicate the position in this sequence.

<sup>86</sup> LT j.3, 2A/12 (Cf. Jang Jann's note), j.5, 7A/8.

<sup>87</sup> j.2, 1A/11.

Prince of Hwainan seem to be expressing their opinions in person, he is careful to make it plain that these words were uttered by sages earlier than 400 B.C.

There is a single case,<sup>90</sup> not yet mentioned, of a passage with a parallel elsewhere but without an immediately preceding "X says".<sup>90</sup> But there is another respect in which this case is unique; the parallel, in a letter of the Taoist Yang Wangsuen (c. 100 B.C.), is itself a quotation, introduced by the phrase "Moreover I have heard . . ." (且吾聞之). A reader who noticed the connection would naturally assume that Yang Wangsuen is quoting *Liehtzzy*. Further, the editor of *Liehtzzy* might have a very good motive for creating this impression. A quotation by a Taoist of 100 B.C. would seem to confirm that this book is the one which Liou Shianq (79-8 B.C.) edited and which, according to Liou Shianq's report, circulated widely in the time of the Emperor Jiing (156-141 B.C.).

A point which emerges from this argument is that it is always dangerous to take quotations in *Liehtzzy* at their face value. For example, of the three passages shared with the *Dawderjing*, the first is ascribed to the Yellow Emperor, the second is credited to Laotzzy but shows marked variants, the third is introduced as a saying of Laotzzy to Guanyiin. In addition to these, we find a saying from *Juangtzyy* ascribed to Laotzzy. It seems natural to assume that the text of the *Dawderjing* was still in a fluid state, and that *Liehtzzy* is a valuable witness to its history. Consequently, Maa Shihluen includes the *Juangtzyy* saying in his collection of fragments of missing parts of the *Dawderjing*,<sup>91</sup> and it has come to be widely believed that ch. 6 of the *Dawderjing* once stood in a lost work called the *Book of the Yellow Emperor*.<sup>92</sup> But inspection of the book's method of composition suggests another possibility; whether it is more than a possibility will depend on our final decision as to the date of the book.

(1) According to stories<sup>93</sup> already found in *Juangtzyy* and the *Leushyh chuenchiou*, Liehtzzy was acquainted with Guanyiin, the keeper of the pass to whom Laotzzy gave his book when he set out for the West. So a quotation from the *Dawderjing* headed "Lao Dan told Guanyiin" is merely an implicit claim to have heard directly from the mouth of Guanyiin sayings which later generations know only from the written text.

(2) The *Juangtzyy* saying is ascribed to Laotzzy simply because it has to be ascribed to some respected authority earlier than 400 B.C.

(3) The only quotation which differs significantly from the Wang Bih

<sup>90</sup> LT j.1, 4A/8-10.

<sup>90</sup> That is, I have noticed only a single example. It is much easier to overlook a parallel in Taoist discourse than in narrative.

<sup>91</sup> *Laotzzy jiatgguu* 老子校語 (Peking 1956), 202.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. Gau Herng 高亨, *Laotzzy jenqguu* 正詁 (Peking 1956), 18. Waley, *The Way and its Power* (London 1934), 57.

<sup>93</sup> LT j.2, 2A. j.8, 1B.

text of the *Dawderjing* is part of a passage taken from *Hwainantzzy*. The editor ascribed the part adapted from the *Dawderjing* to Laotzzy and the rest to Yuhtzzy, again in order to establish its existence before 400 B.C.

(4) One of the quotations is in a discourse of his teacher Hwutzzy which Liehtzzy recalls over forty years later.<sup>94</sup> But if Liehtzzy knew Guanyiin personally, a reader might well wonder how his teacher could know the *Dawderjing* so long before. The quotation is therefore pushed back to the Yellow Emperor. We have no reason to take it for granted that the *Book of the Yellow Emperor* ever existed. Three of the four passages ascribed to it<sup>95</sup> are found in other works (*Dawderjing*, *Hwainantzzy*, *Jyyguei*), none of which mentions that its words have the authority of this most venerable document. Jang Jann did not know of it,<sup>96</sup> although he was extremely well informed about books with parallels in *Liehtzzy*,<sup>97</sup> and wrote only a century after the appearance of the last one to engage our attention, the *Muh tiantzzy juann*.

### Part 3. LINGUISTIC EVIDENCE OF DATE

As we have seen, there is evidence that *Liehtzzy* borrows from several documents of the third and second centuries B.C., from Hwan Tarn (died A.D. 56), and from the *Muh tiantzzy juann*, which became available in A.D. 281. We cannot always find evidence that the *Liehtzzy* version of a passage is secondary, and when we do we cannot always exclude the possibility that the known versions depend on a common source now lost; but wherever we have found such evidence it points in one direction only. We now need evidence for the dating of the three quarters of the book for which there are no known parallels. In this section we shall look for recurring stylistic indications of date, not confined (except for a couple of grammatical usages of especial interest) to single passages which might be either later interpolations or borrowings from older sources.

Yang Borjiunn<sup>98</sup> has already noticed several linguistic signs of late date. These are of great interest; but with a single important exception<sup>99</sup> they occur only once or twice, and will not convince defenders of the pre-Hann origin of the book, who are generally willing to admit a few interpolations.

#### 3/1. Personal Pronouns

In pre-Hann texts the pronoun *wu* 吾 is nearly always subject or possessive ("I, my"). In negative sentences the pronoun object placed before the verb is sometimes *wu*; otherwise the object ("me") is nearly

<sup>94</sup> LT j.1, 2B/3-5, cf. 1A/5, 9 f.

<sup>95</sup> LT j.1, 2B, 3B, 4A.

<sup>96</sup> LT j.1, 1B/3.

<sup>97</sup> Cf. p.198 below.

<sup>98</sup> JS 220-44.

<sup>99</sup> Cf. p.174-6 below.



always 我 *woo*.<sup>100</sup> Karlgren has noticed that there are exceptions in *Liehtzyy*.<sup>101</sup> This is his main reason for abandoning his former opinion that it is a pre-Hann document and placing it in the Former Hann period, when "as a rule *wu* means 'I, my' but occasionally the rule is broken".<sup>102</sup>

But it is doubtful whether the rule applies to *Liehtzyy* at all. If we exclude passages with known parallels, and cases of the impersonal *woo* "oneself" (which cannot be replaced by *wu*), there are twenty cases of *woo* as object and ten of *wu*, the latter all in affirmative sentences:

*woo* j.2, 2A/7, 2B/5, 4A/9, ter, 4A/14

j.4, 2A/12, 3A/3

j.5, 8A/1, 9A/1, 9B/1 bis, 2 bis

j.6, 1A/4, 3B/14

j.7, 3B/11

j.8, 5B/8 bis, 8A/4<sup>103</sup>

*wu* j.2, 2A/13, 5A/1

j.4, 4A/5, 4B/12

j.5, 8A/11

j.8, 2B/7,8,9, 5B/11, 8A/4<sup>104</sup>

Passages with parallels make a very striking contrast. *Wu* "me" is limited to two cases at the end of a story also found in the *Shuoyuann* and *Jiayeu*:

LT j.4, 3A/9 f 兼四子之有以易吾，吾弗許也。此其所以事吾而不貳也。

"If I could take the virtues of all four men together in exchange for my own, I should not agree to it. This is why they serve me without having two minds."

The *Shuoyuann*, edited by Liou Shianq (79-8 B.C.), lacks this passage, and gives the story a different ending. The *Jiayeu* contains it but omits the

<sup>100</sup> Cf. Karlgren. *Le proto-chinois, langue flexionnelle* (Journal Asiatique, 15 (1920), 205-33). Kennedy, in his *Re-examination of the Classical pronoun-forms NGO and NGA* (Academia Sinica, 28 (1956), 275-82), suggests that *wu* and *woo* belong to a series of paired words of which one has the level and one the deflected tone. (His examples of the latter are indeed all third tone, including, as Prof. Pulleyblank has pointed out to me, *shyh* 是, later fourth tone). He suggests that a word assumed the deflected tone before a pause, and that *woo* is therefore either exposed at the beginning of the sentence or the final word in the sentence. But even if we admit the right to assume (without the possibility of verification) a pause whenever *woo* is subject, *woo* is often found in positions where a pause is scarcely conceivable—before *jee* 者 or *yee* 也, with *yii* 以 or *yeu* 與 before a verb, as "my" before a noun. Kennedy's new approach seems likely to be very fruitful; but his examples suggest rather that the third tone word is free moving, the level tone word bound to a succeeding noun or verb.

<sup>101</sup> Cf. p.141 above.

<sup>102</sup> His examples of sporadic *wu* "me" in the early Hann are from the *Shyyjih*, *Shinshu* 新書, *Shuoyuann* and *Luennherng*.

<sup>103</sup> The sentence is not found in the largely different *Leushyh chuenchiou* parallel.

<sup>104</sup> As preceding note.

first *wu*. This is one of the many passages shared by these two texts; but the history of the *Jiayeu* down to the third century A.D. is complicated, and it is not certain which text is primary.<sup>105</sup> Three of the passages appear in *Liehtzyy*, the readings of which tend to agree with the *Jiayeu*.

With this exception, the first person pronoun object in a common passage is also in the other text which shares the passage. There are eighteen cases, and the pronoun is always *woo*:

(*Juangtzyy*) LT j.2, 7A/7, 8A/5 bis. j.8, 2A/12 ter

(*Leushyh chuenchiou*, *Hwainantzzyy*) LT j.8, 4A/4, 6A/2,7,13

(*Shyyjih*) LT j.6, 2B/5,6,7,8,9 bis, 10

The pronouns in *Liehtzyy* show another late feature. Wang Lih<sup>106</sup> points out that *jy* 之 is uncommon after any pronoun in the pre-Chyn literature. But the pronouns in *Liehtzyy* (*wu*, *woo*, *jenn* 朕, *ruu* 汝, *ruoh* 若, *eel* 爾) are followed by *jy* as many as forty-three times. The following passage shows *wu* both as object and with *jy*:

j4, 4B/11 視人如豕，視吾如人。處吾之家如逆旅之舍，觀吾之鄉如戎蠻之國。

"I regard other men in the same way as pigs, myself in the same way as other men. I live in my house as though it were an inn, and look at my native land as though it were a country of barbarians."

Two only of these cases are in a passage with parallels, which again are in the *Shuoyuann* and *Jiayeu*:

j.8, 3B/1 f 始吾之入也，先以忠信。及吾之出也，又從以忠信。

"When I first enter I use loyalty and good faith in advance, and when I come out I proceed to use them again." (The *Shuoyuann* has only the second *jy*, the *Jiayeu* both.)

### 3/2. Kee 可

In pre-Hann literature there are only sporadic exceptions to the rule that the verb is active after *keeyii* 可以, passive after *kee* alone.<sup>107</sup> At a later period it becomes common to omit the *yii* with active verbs.

<sup>105</sup> Cf. R. P. Kramers, *K'ung tsü chia yü* (Leiden 1950), 179-81.

<sup>106</sup> *op. cit.*, 335.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. Jou Faagau 周法高, *Notes on Ancient Chinese Grammar*, Academia Sinica 22 (1950), 171-207, Section 6. I use the words "active" and "passive" only for convenience. There are advantages in a more complicated description: the verb after *kee* is subjectless and refers back to the immediately preceding noun as object, without the need of a resumptive *jy* 之; the *yii* of *keeyii* is itself such a verb, allowing the addition of another verb which can point forward to a succeeding object. This description would cover cases in which the resumptive *jy* actually appears or the verb is negated by *fwu* 弗, cases which seem to be exceptions only if we take the word "passive" too literally: *Analects* 13/20 何如斯可謂之士矣

"What must a man be like, that one may call him a knight?"  
Tzuoujuann, Duke Jau 昭, first year 弗可久已矣  
"One cannot give him long."

In passages peculiar to *Liehtzzy* an active verb is preceded by *keeyii* twelve times. Eight of these are concentrated in a single passage where the parallelism imposes uniformity.<sup>108</sup> But there are nine cases of *kee* alone with active verbs, for example:

LT j.7, 6A/13 f 雖全生身，不可有其身。雖不去物，不可有其物。

"Even if we keep life and body intact, we cannot possess this body. Even if we do not dispense with things, we cannot possess these things."<sup>108</sup>

There are two cases of *kee* with active verbs in sections with parallels, one with *yii* and the other without. The parallels are in the *Shuoyuann* and *Jiayeu*, texts which, as we have already noticed in connection with the pronouns, also show late features.

LT j.7, 6A/2 (SY) 黃鐘大呂不可從煩奏之舞。

"The Hwangjong and Dahleu music cannot follow popular dances."

LT j.8, 3A/14 意者難可以濟乎 (SY, JY 可濟也)。

"I think it will be hardly possible to cross?" (SY, JY "... hardly possible for it to be crossed").<sup>110</sup>

### 3/3. *Fwu* 弗

The resumptive *jy* 之 is comparatively rare in negative sentences (except with *wey* 未 and *moh* 莫), as Dobson has noticed.<sup>111</sup> There are, however, two negatives, *fwu* 勿 and *wuh* 勿, which from the period of the *Odes* until early in the Hann dynasty are used almost invariably with verbs which refer back to a preceding noun as object; they are occasionally reinforced by *jy* but more often are not. It is common to describe the functions of *fwu* and *wuh* by saying that the former combines the functions of *bu* 不 and *jy*, the latter of *wu* 毋, 無 and *jy*; but although I have myself used this convenient description I now believe that it should be avoided, since

(1) It invites confusion with the theory that *fwu* and *wuh* are actual phonetic fusions, never more than an interesting possibility and by now exploded.

(2) It involves the unnecessary embarrassment of having to treat sentences in which *fwu* and *wuh* are reinforced by resumptive *jy* (or *shyh* 是 or *tsyy* 此) as exceptions to the rule. Yet the fact that when the verb has a

<sup>108</sup> LT j.6, 3B/2-7, cf. also j.2, 4B/3, j.5, 6A/9, j.6, 2A/14, j.8, 1B/13. (In j.2, 1B/7 the verb is passive and *yii* detached from *kee*.)

<sup>109</sup> Also j.4, 4B/14, j.5, 5A/1, 7B/5, 12, 8A/12, j.7, 3B/10, j.8, 1A/4. (But in two of these cases the object is *jy*.)

<sup>110</sup> There are also cases of the verb with *yii* detached from *kee*: j.2, 7A/2 (JT), j.8, 4B/10 (HN), *yii* dropped in LT), 3B/4 (SY, JY).

<sup>111</sup> *Late Archaic Chinese* (Toronto 1959), 3.4.8. I have discussed the still controversial question of *fwu* in BSOAS 22 (1959), 564-6. Cf. also *Beiträge zum Problem des Wortes im Chinesischen*, edited P. Ratchnevsky (Berlin 1960), 48-70.

succeeding object this is generally a resumptive pronoun merely confirms that the verb refers back.

In *Liehtzzy*, *wuh* occurs four times in unparalleled and once in paralleled passages.<sup>112</sup> All accord with pre-Hann usage, but the instances are too few to permit conclusions. However in the case of *fwu* it is immediately obvious that this negative is no longer distinguished from *bu*. Out of thirty-six examples in unparalleled passages, no less than six have a succeeding object—a figure which exceeds the total number in the concordanced texts from the *Odes* to the *Lijih* 禮記.<sup>113</sup>

LT j.5, 3A/3-5 離朱子羽方晝拭皆揚眉而望之，弗見其形。臯俞師曠方夜適耳俛首而聽之，弗聞其聲。

"Li Ju and Tzyyueu rubbed their eyes and raised their eyebrows to peer after them by day, but did not see their shapes. Chyh Yu and Music-master Kuanq scratched their ears and bowed their heads to listen for them by day, but could not hear their voices."<sup>114</sup>

There are seventeen cases of *fwu* in passages shared with other texts. Comparison with these texts shows that variants are much more common for this negative than for the other particles studied in this essay. In as many as nine of these cases *Liehtzzy* has *fwu* where another text has *bu*.<sup>115</sup> This twice results in violations of pre-Hann usage:

<sup>112</sup> j.7, 2B/1 bis, j.8, 1B/11 (LSCC), 2B/13, 7B/5.

<sup>113</sup> *Fwu* appears more than six hundred times in the fully concordanced texts included in the Harvard-Yenching Sinological Index Series, in the *Shisho sakuin* 四書索引 and *Gokyō sakuin* 五經索引 of Morimoto Kakuzō 森本角藏, and the *Lao jiee Lao* 老解老 of Tsay Tyngann 蔡廷幹. Excluding the resumptive pronouns (*jy*, *shyh*, *tsyy*), there is never a succeeding object in the *Analects*, *Mencius*, *Yihjing*, *Juangtzyy*, *Dawderjing*, *Shyuntzyy* and *Mohtzyy*. (The Harvard-Yenching entry for *Mohtzyy* 91/49/65 follows a conjectural emendation from the *Mohtzyy jiannguu* 墨子閒話.) There is one case in the *Tzuotjuann* (Duke Juang 莊, twelfth year). At the beginning of the period when *fwu* and *bu* were distinguished we find one example in the *Odes* (No. 256/3), and at the end of the period two in the *Lijih*, which is partly Hann (Morimoto 24/38, 41/10), and one in the *Guiliangjuann* 穀梁傳 (Hwan 桓, seventh year).

Hwang Jiingshin 黃景欣, attacking the theory that *fwu* is equivalent to *buh jy* in *Yeuyan yanjiou* 語言研究 (1958, 3/1-23), gives a magnificently comprehensive list of sentences with *fwu* and an object after the verb (p. 11 f.). He gives many instances from the *Book of History*, and after a long interval from the *Shyujih*. But his examples from the intervening period only confirm that the succeeding object is generally a resumptive pronoun (*jy*, Nos. 16-20, 24, 25, 28, 44-50, *tsyy* No. 13). From the concordanced texts, he gives all the examples just mentioned (Nos. 12, 15, 23, 26, 32), with a few more which seem to be questionable (Nos. 14, 21, 22, 27). He has found only two more examples in other texts (No. 29, *Woyeyu*, No. 30, *Janngwotseh*).

<sup>114</sup> Other examples with a succeeding object are j.2, 1B/7, j.4, 3A/2, j.6, 3A/11, j.7, 3B/4. The verb is apparently intransitive in j.5, 6B/12 左右以其人弗去. ("Bystanders thought the woman had not gone") and is preceded by *tzyh* 自 "self" and *shiang* 相 "mutually" in j.5, 3A/3, 6B/14.

<sup>115</sup> LT j.2, 3A/8 bis (JT), 10B/2 (LSCC *fwu* HN *bu*), j.8, 3A/12-14 (four cases, SY, JY), and the two quoted.

LSCC j.15, 13B/5 夫不敢刺不敢擊，非無其志也。

"Not daring to stab or strike is not the same as lacking the will to."<sup>116</sup>

LT j.2, 10B/4 夫弗敢非无其志也。

Shyyjih, j.32, 8A/8 君且欲霸王，非管夷吾不可。

"If you wish to be hegemon or Emperor, it is impossible without Goan Jonq."

LT j.6, 2B/1 f 君如欲霸王，非夷吾其弗可。

### 3/4. Wang 亡

This character is traditionally given two readings:

(1) *wang* "lose, destroy, go into exile"

(2) *wu* "have not; there is not" (= 無).

But a rhyme in the *Odes* shows that even in the second sense it was originally read *wang*,<sup>117</sup> and it is clearly related graphically, phonetically and semantically to *woang* 罔.

Yang Borjiunn makes the important observation that "In the *Analects* an object is not used after *wang*, but there is always an object after *wu* 無."<sup>118</sup> Examples are:

*Analects* 3/5 夷狄之有君，不如諸夏之亡也。

"Barbarians who have rulers are not as good as Chinese who do not have them."

12/5 人皆有兄弟，我獨亡。

"Everyone has brothers, I alone do not."

Yang Borjiunn admits one apparent exception, which he explains by claiming that *ji* is here not a pronoun but an empty suffix:

6/10 亡之，命矣夫。

"We have lost him, was it not destined so?"

Yet the hypothesis hardly requires us to suppose that *wang* cannot have a succeeding object even in the sense "lose, destroy". *Wang* in this sense, as well as related words such as *wang* 忘 "forget", can be taken as causative usages of the negative verb: "cause or allow to become absent or non-existent".

Yang Borjiunn's claim that *wu* is always followed by an object is not true outside the *Analects*, but throughout the concordanced pre-Hann literature *wang* is followed by an object only when it is used causatively. In the third century B.C. its use diverges still further from that of *wu*. The preceding noun to which it refers back comes to be treated as its subject; it

<sup>116</sup> The *Hwainantzzy* parallel also has *bu*.

<sup>117</sup> *Ode* No. 35.

<sup>118</sup> *Luenyeu yihjuh* 論語譯注 (Peking 1958), 26. There is no object after *wu* in *Analects* 8/5 有若無，實若虛 "possessing but as though lacking, full but as though empty". But it may well be claimed that here *wu* is virtually intransitive, with no possibility of either forward or backward reference to an object.

ceases to be the opposite of *yeou* 有 "there is" and becomes the opposite of *tzay* 在 "is in":

*Shyuntzzy* j.12, 19B/3 然則鬪與不鬪邪，亡於辱之與不辱也，乃在於惡與不惡也。

"If so, whether or not he fights does not depend on whether or not he is disgraced, but on whether or not he dislikes it."

*Juangtzzy* j.7, 40A/2 其在彼也亡乎我，在我也亡乎彼。

"If it is outside it is not in me, if it is in me it is not outside."

The *wang* of the *Analects* refers back to a preceding noun as object without a resumptive *ji*, in the same way as the verb negated by *fwu* or *wuh*. Phonetically *wang* (\* MI<sub>1</sub>WANG) of course does not share the common final of *fwu* (\* PI<sub>1</sub>WəT) and *wuh* (\* MI<sub>1</sub>WəT). But if we look for a connection between the phonetic form and grammatical function of these negatives, we must seek it in the pre-classical language of the oracle bones, bronzes and *Book of History*, in which all three (if we take *woang* as the ancestor of *wang*) can be used with an object after the verb. All three developed on parallel lines at a time when they were phonetically fixed, becoming indicators of a backward reference to a preceding noun, perhaps in order to dispel ambiguities caused by the tendency to avoid *ji* in certain kinds of negative sentence. The specialization of *wuh* almost confined the imperative *wu* to intransitive verbs and verbs with succeeding objects;<sup>119</sup> *fwu*, on the contrary, never dispossessed *bu* of its right to stand before any kind of verb; *wang* confined the existential *wu* to positions with a succeeding object in the *Analects* but not in other texts.

The distinction between *wang* and *wu* did not survive into the Hann. The *Hannshu*, and the earlier documents contained in it, use *wang* freely with a succeeding object, for example:

*Hannshu* j.74, 8A/10 亡輕重，一切皆殺之。

"He killed them all, whether important or not."

Mr Michael Loewe has shown in an unpublished paper that in passages which the *Hannshu* shares with other texts such as the *Shyyjih* it uses systematically certain archaic words where the other texts use common ones; among these it uses *wang* for *wu*.<sup>120</sup> *Wang* seems to have been comparatively rare during the Former Hann; whether its use, in cases where we do find it, reflects the influence of the archaising style of state documents, is a question which might repay inquiry. A detail which certainly suggests

<sup>119</sup> Cf. my *A Probable Fusion-word: wuh = wu + ji*. BSOAS 14 (1952), 139-48. I should no longer insist on the very forced explanation of the *Tzuojuann* sentence 勿有是 "Let us not have this" in this article (143). *Shyh* is resumptive, and does not need to be explained away.

<sup>120</sup> For example, *Shyyjih* j.109, 1B/6, 8B/1 have *wu*; parallels in *Hannshu* j.54, 1B/2, 7B/10 have *wang*.

artificial revival after a break in the word's transmission is the fact that the character was apparently already read *wu*.<sup>121</sup>

Returning to *Liehtzzy* after this long digression, there is only one case of *wang* in sections with parallels. It is a neat example of the pre-Hann usage:

j.2, 5B/3 (JT) '請問蹈水有道乎'。曰, '亡, 吾无道'。

"May I ask whether you have the Tao of walking on water?' 'I have not, I have no Tao'."

In sections without parallels, *wang* appears forty-three times spread over seven chapters. It is used in the manner of the *Hannshu*, with a succeeding object forty-one times. The first of the following examples contrasts clearly with the preceding one:

j.2, 4A/9 '敢問其道'。商丘開曰, '吾亡道'。

"May I inquire about this Tao?' Shangchiou Kai said: 'I have no Tao'."

j.6, 4B/6-8 夫信命者亡壽夭, 信理者亡是非, 信心者亡逆順, 信性者亡安危, 則謂之都亡所信, 亡所不信。

"For the man who trusts destiny there are no long life and early death, for the man who trusts principle no right and wrong, for the man who trusts mind no going with the stream or pushing against it, for the man who trusts his nature no safety and danger; so we may say that there is nothing at all which he either trusts or does not trust."

### 3/5. *Du* 都

As Yang Borjiunn has noticed,<sup>122</sup> *du* "completely", ancestor of the modern *du* "all", is found seven times in *Liehtzzy*. The last quotation illustrating *wang* contained one example; these are the others:

j.2, 1B/2 都无所愛惜, 都无所畏忌。

"There is nothing at all that they grudge or regret, nothing at all that they dread or envy."

j.2, 2B/4; j.4, 4A/8 心凝形釋, 骨肉都融。

"Mind congealed and body relaxed, bones and flesh fused completely."

j.3, 5A/5 積年之疾, 一朝都除。

"The illness of successive years was completely dispelled in a morning."

j.7, 4A/7 都散其庫藏珍寶, 車服妾媵。

"He scattered all the treasures in his storehouses, his carriages, robes and concubines."

<sup>121</sup> See the rhyme in the *Yeuliehfu* 羽獵賦 of Yang Shyong 揚雄 (53 B.C.-A.D. 18), *Wensheuan* 文選 j.8, 32B/10. *Hannshu* j.87 上, 24A/2.

<sup>122</sup> JS 229-32, cf. also Lii Shyngjiann 李行謹, *Comparison of the Uses of the Particles DU and LEAU in the Shyhsuo shinyeu*, in *Yuyanxue luncong* 語言學論叢 2 (1958), 73-83.

*Du* is very common in Taoist literature of the third and fourth centuries A.D., in *Bawpuutzzy*, in Jang Jann's commentary on *Liehtzzy*, and especially in Guo Shianq's commentary on *Juangtzzy*. Yang Borjiunn quotes twenty-four examples from the *Shyhsuo shinyeu*. His earliest example is from the *Hannshu*:

*Hannshu* j.24, 17B/1 置平準於京師, 都受天下委輸。

"He established in the capital an office for the equalization of grain supplies; it received all deliveries from throughout the Empire."

This passage, including the *du*, is also found in the *Shyyjih*.<sup>123</sup> Since we cannot quite take it for granted that the *Shyyjih* was not expanded with passages taken from the *Hannshu*, this is not conclusive proof that the word was used before the first century A.D. Peir Shyuehae<sup>124</sup> notes one case from the *Luennherng* of Wang Chong 王充 (born A.D. 27):

儒不能都曉古今。

"Confucians cannot completely understand past and present."

### 3/6. *Yan* 焉

In pre-Hann Chinese the pronoun *ji* substitutes for the noun which immediately follows a verb as object, *yan* for the noun which follows with an intermediate *yu* 於. It is convenient to say that *yan* is equivalent to *yu ji*, although strictly speaking this phrase is a barbarism, since *ji* must be immediately preceded by a transitive verb.

It is difficult to find exact criteria to decide whether or not *yan* retains its function in a particular text, since one can nearly always, when in difficulties, account for *yan* as a vague "there" or "with regard to it". However, it is hard to resist the impression that in *Liehtzzy* the decay of *yan* is already far advanced. As a characteristic sample we may take the six occurrences of *yan* in one of the longest episodes, the story of King Muh and the magician:

j.3, 1A/11 土木之功, 繕塗之色, 无遺巧焉。

"His craftsmen in clay and wood, and decorators in red ochre and whitewash, devoted all their skill to it."

1B/4 望之若屯雲焉。

"Seen in the distance it was like a congealed cloud."

1B/6 f 王府而視之, 其宮榭若累塊積蘇焉。

"When the King looked down at them, his palaces and arbours were like rows of clods and heaps of brushwood."

1B/10 化人移之, 王若碩虛焉。

<sup>123</sup> *Shyyjih* j.30, 19A/6. Another parallel, in *Yantieeluenn* 鹽鐵論 j.1, 4B/4, has a different phrasing and no *du*.

There is another passage using *du* in *Shyyjih* j.121, 9A/7. *Hannshu* j.58, 11A/7.

<sup>124</sup> *Op. cit.*, 449.

"The magician pushed him, and the King felt as though he were dropping through space."

2A/11 西王母爲王謠，王和之。其辭哀焉。

"Shiwangmu sang for the King, who sang in reply; the words were sad."

(This copies the *Muh tiantzzy juann*, but omits the texts of the two songs; "The words were sad" replaces the second song.)

2A/14 猶百年乃祖。世以爲登假焉。

"Still he died when his hundred years were up. The world thought that he had 'risen into the distance' (become an immortal)."

The claim that *yan* is equivalent to *yu jy* is hardly convincing except in the first example.

### 3/7. *Shiang* 相

Leu Shwushiang 呂叔湘 has traced the history of the adverb *shiang*:

"The adverb of reciprocity in Chinese, *hsiang*, denotes that an action is reciprocal between two terms, A and B. By an extension, it is also applied to cases of 'one-way traffic' in which only A does something to B, but not *vice versa*. In these cases *hsiang*, devoid of any connotation, comes to denote that the verb has an object (B) to it, which is now understood. It is then very convenient to take '*hsiang v.*' as equivalent to '*v. me*' or '*v. you*' or '*v. him*', as the case may be. Thus we are warranted to regard it as a pronominal adverb if we are not quite ready to acknowledge it as a pronoun."<sup>125</sup>

The one-way usage appears sporadically in pre-Hann literature and steadily becomes more common until the Six Dynasties.

In *Liechtzzy* there are fourteen cases where the implication of reciprocity is weak or absent, all in sections without parallels. Some are clear cases of Leu Shwushiang's "pronominal adverb":

j.5, 3B/1 f 聚室而謀曰.....雜然相許。

"He called together his family and made a proposal . . . . They all agreed to it."

j.8, 5B/8 f 聚族相戒曰 . . . .

"He called together his clansmen, and warned them, saying . . . ."<sup>126</sup>

### 3/8. *Chiee* 且

Besides its use as a conjunction ("Moreover"), *chiee* is used in pre-Hann literature as a temporal particle ("About to"). During the Hann dynasty this function changes; *chiee* comes to be used to propose a course of

<sup>125</sup> *Hannyeu yeufaa luemwen jyi* 漢語語法論文集 (Peking 1955), 36-45. (The quotation is from the English summary, 207). Cf. also K. Yoshikawa, *The Shih-shuo hsün-yü and Six Dynasties Prose Style*, (HJAS 18 (1955, 124-41), 129.

<sup>126</sup> Cf. also j.2, 3B/8 bis, 10A/7. j.3, 3B/10 bis, 13. j.7, 2A/12 f (five cases). j.8, 7B/5.

action during the immediate future ("Let us for the moment"). A text which shows *chiee* in the course of transition is the *Shyyjih*, which provides the last thirteen examples of the older usage and the first four examples of the later usage in the *Tsyrcchiuan* 詞詮 of Yang Shuhdar 楊樹達.<sup>127</sup>

*Shyyjih* j.66, 2A/2 f 伍奢有二子，皆賢。不誅，且爲楚憂。

"Wu She has two sons, both clever. If we do not execute them, they will give Chuu cause for anxiety."

8A/10 民勞，未可。且待之。

"The people are exhausted, it is not possible yet. Let us wait for the time being."

In the unparalleled parts of *Liechtzzy*, the transition is already complete:

LT j.2, 4B/8 且一言我養虎之法。

"Let me spend a few moments telling you something about my method of training tigers."

j.3, 4B/8 且恂士師之言可也。

"For the present we may as well respect the judgment of the Chief Justice."

j.5, 6A/12 且小假之，以觀其後。

"Let me give it up for a while, and we shall see what happens afterwards."

j.5, 9A/3 f 且先言其狀。

"Let me spend a moment describing them first."

j.6, 1B/11 固且言之。

"Tell me now."<sup>128</sup>

j.6, 4A/6 且食之。

"Let him stay for a meal."

j.7, 2A/6 且趣當生，奚遑死後。

"Hurry to enjoy your life while it lasts, why waste time on what comes after death?"

There are also two cases of *chiee* "nearly" preceding a number, for which Yang Shuhdar takes his three examples from the *Hannshu*:

LT j.1, 4B/9 林類年且百歲。

"Lin Ley was nearly a hundred."

j.5, 3A/14-3B/1 北山愚公者年且九十。

"Mister Stupid of North Mountain was nearly ninety."

Neither usage is found in passages with parallels; but the older *chiee* "about to" occurs three times in passages shared with *Juangtzzy*:

<sup>127</sup> Yang Shuhdar's example of *chiee* "for the present", from *Ode* No. 115, even if accepted, has no bearing on the history of the word in the classical language.

<sup>128</sup> Peir Shyueh (op. cit., 329) takes this as equivalent to *guchnee* 姑且; he gives an example from the *Hannshu* in which *gu* is also written 固, and one from the *Shyyjih* in which it is written 顧.

j.2, 7A/12 f 吾无得而相焉。試齋，將且復相之(JT omits 將)。

"I have no means of reading his face. Let him try fasting, and I will read it again."

j.2, 8A/13 且必(JT 必且)有感也，搖而本身，又无謂也。

"There will certainly be excitements which will shake your basic self, and to no purpose."

j.8, 2A/12 以人之言而遺我粟。室(Read 至)其罪我也，又且以人之言。

"He sent me grain because of another man's words. Should he ever condemn me, it will also be because of another man's words."

### 3/9. *Jwo* 著

The verb *jwo*, "adhere to" (variously written 著, 著, 着) is the ancestor of the modern durative particle 着 -j. Wang Lih has outlined the history of its development.<sup>129</sup> His earliest example of *jwo* as a verbal suffix, still retaining the meaning "adhere to", is from the *Luennherng* of Wang Chong (born A.D. 27), which also provides a good contrasting example of *jwo* as a full verb:

j.6, 21B/4 f 甘露如飴蜜者，着於草木，不着五穀。

"The fresh dew which is like sweets and honey, sticks to grass and trees but not to cereals."

j.17, 12B/7 今鐘鼓無所懸着，雷公之足無所蹈履。

"Now if bells and drums have nothing to hang on to, the thunder god's feet have nothing to tread on."

There are two examples of the verbal suffix *jwo* in *Liehtzyy*, written with Radical No. 118 in the Northern Song edition and with Radical No. 140 in the *Shyhwen* text:

j.5, 2A/12 五山之根无所連着。

"The bases of the five mountains were not attached to anything."

j.8, 8A/9 f 意之所屬着，其行足蹟株培，頭抵植木而不自知也。

"When his thoughts are fixed on something, a man walks with his feet stumbling over tree-stumps and holes and his head knocking against door-posts and trees, without coming to himself." (There is a *Hwainantzzy* parallel, but with a different beginning: 神有所繫者 "A man whose spirit is tied to something.")

### 3/10. *Inversion of the Pronoun Object*

In pre-Hann Chinese the pronoun object may stand before the verb in negative sentences. During the early centuries A.D. we find the practice,

<sup>129</sup> *Op. cit.*, 308-11.

short-lived and never very common, of placing the pronoun object before the verb even in affirmative sentences:

Jang Herng 張衡 (A.D. 78-A.D. 139), *Dongjing fuh* 東京賦 (*Wensheuan* j.3, 35B/5) 萬物我賴，亦又何求。

"All things depend on me; whom else should they seek?"

Comment of Liu Shann 李善 (preface dated A.D. 658): 我賴，賴我也。

Tsaur Jyr 曹植 (192-232), *Tzenq Bairmaa wang yihshoou* 贈白馬王一首. (*Wensheuan* j.24, 8A/9)

虛無求列仙，松子久吾欺。"Nonsense to seek the immortals, Songtzyy has long deceived me."

Tsaur Jyr, *Luoh shern fuh* 洛神賦 (*Wensheuan* j.19, 17B/10)

執眷眷之款實兮，懼斯靈之我欺。

"Though I hold on to unalterable sincerity, I fear that this spirit is deceiving me."

Tsaur Jyr, *Konghour yiin* 樂府引 (*Wensheuan* j.27, 27B/2)

盛時不可再，百年忽我遒。

"The prime of life cannot be recalled, the end of my hundred years' span suddenly presses on me."<sup>130</sup>

Luh Ji 陸機 (261-303) *Biann wang luenn, shiah* 辨亡論，下 (*Wensheuan* j.53, 34B/5) 推誠信士，不恤人之我欺。量能授器，不患權之我逼。

"They were completely sincere in trusting scholars, and did not worry about being deceived by other men; they gave office in accordance with a man's ability, and did not care if other men's powers encroached on their own."

Shieh Hueylian 謝惠連 (397-433), *Yu Ancherng dar Lingyunn* 於安城答靈運 (*Wensheuan* j.25, 29A/7) 親親子敦予，賢賢吾爾賞。

"You are generous to me because I am your kin; I value you because of your worth."

*Jyu yow chwei hwa shy* 橘柚垂華實 (Hann poem)

人儻欲我知，因君爲羽翼。

"If anyone wishes to know me, I depend on you to serve as my wings."

Comment of Yu Guanng 余冠英, *Hann Wey Liowchaur shy sheuan* 漢魏六朝詩選 (Peking 1958), 83. n. 5 '欲我知', 就是欲知我。

*Maan ge shyng* 滿歌行 (Jinn yuehfu, *Yuehfu shyjyi* j.43, 9A/1) 憂來填心，誰當我知。

"Anxiety comes to fill my heart; who will recognize my worth?"

There is one striking example of this construction in *Liehtzyy*:

<sup>130</sup> There are other cases of 我欺 "deceive me" and 我遒 "press on me". Cf. Koong Jyhguei 孔稚圭 (448-501), *Beishan yi wen* 北山移文, Sheen Iue 沈約 (441-512), *Suh Dongyuan* 宿東園 (*Wensheuan* j.43, 39B/7, j.22, 30A/1).

j.6, 1B/2-4 朕與子並世也而人子達，並族也而人子敬，並貌也而人子愛，並言也而人子庸，並行也而人子誠，並仕也而人子貴，並農也而人子富，並商也而人子利。

"I belong to the same generation as you, but it is you whom others advance; to the same clan, but it is you whom others respect. I look the same, but it is you whom others love; I talk the same, but it is you whom others employ; I act the same, but it is you whom others trust. In office together, it is you they honour; farming together, it is you they enrich; trading together, it is you they profit."

Tsern Jonqmean<sup>131</sup> quotes this as an example of archaic word-order and a proof that the book is ancient. It is true that there are a few such cases in pre-classical texts,<sup>132</sup> although the rule that inversion is confined to negative sentences already operates in the language of the oracle bones.<sup>133</sup> But even if *Liehtzyy* is as early as the third century B.C., it is too late to contain traces of pre-classical word-order.

#### Part 4. THE COMPOSITION OF *LIEHTZYY*

##### 4/1. *Unknown Sources*

About a quarter of *Liehtzyy* is borrowed from known sources. If all sources survived intact, should we find that the greater part of the book is pre-Hann and early Hann, and that passages from the third or fourth century A.D. are exceptional? If the editor of the book had made it his habit to revise his sources radically, it would be difficult to answer this question. Fortunately for us, he reproduced them without adapting them to his own style. Comparison with parallel texts shows variants, which we have noticed, for some of the particles discussed above; but except in the case of the negatives *fou* and *bu* these variants are only sporadic. When copying the interrogative final particle *yu* in passages from *Juangtzyy*, the editor even follows the graphic convention of the latter text. We have noticed that comparison between parallel passages in the *Shyyjih* and *Hannshu* shows systematic differences in the use of particles, for example the replacement of the negative *wu* in the former by *wang* in the latter;<sup>134</sup> on the other hand in *Liehtzyy*, although *wang* appears no less than forty-three times, this word never replaces the *wu* of a parallel passage. By reproducing his borrowed passages more or less intact, the editor has left clear stylistic evidence that

<sup>131</sup> *Op. cit.*, 326.

<sup>132</sup> Wang Lih, *op. cit.*, 357.

<sup>133</sup> Goan Shiehchu 饒楚初, *In shiu jeaguu kehtryr de yeufaa yanjiou 殷虛甲骨刻辭的語法研究* (Shanghai, 1953), 15 f.

<sup>134</sup> *Cf.* p. 175 above.

they are foreign bodies in the text of *Liehtzyy*. Again and again we have encountered fairly consistent differences between sections with parallels and sections without—in the use of the preposition *hu*, the formula "Y answered" in dialogue, the pronouns *wu* and *woo* as object, possessive pronouns with *ji*, the negative *wang*, temporal and injunctive *chiee*. Late usages are scattered fairly evenly over the unparalleled passages. We must conclude, therefore, that although some of these passages may come from older sources now lost, the majority do not.

Known parallels are concentrated in certain parts of the book, in j.2 and 8 and to a lesser extent j.1. The greater part of j.3-7, and a large proportion of the rest, is very uniform in style, and must come from one period if not from one hand. It uses *ruoh* 若 (but not *erl* 而) by the side of *ruu* 汝 "you",<sup>135</sup> *shi* 奚 (but not *u* 惡) by the side of *her* 何 "what?" "how?"<sup>136</sup>; *wang* (but not *mii* 靡, a favourite existential negative of Guo Shianq and Jang Jann) by the side of *wu*, "there is not". It does not use the temporal particle *tserng* 會, but does use the character with the reading *tzeng* followed by a negative, "not even"<sup>137</sup>; it uses *ju* 諸 for *ji* *yu* 之於 but not for interrogative *ji* *hu* 之乎.<sup>138</sup> It prefers *nayher* 奈何 to *herru* 何如 "what about . . .?", *shwu* 孰 to *shwei* 誰 "who?", *erihow* 而後 to *ranhow* 然後 "only then". It drops the preposition *yu* 於 after *wenn* 問 "ask" (someone).<sup>139</sup> When it falls into regular parallelism (as it generally does outside narrative), it tends to avoid the final *yee* 也 even in nominal sentences.<sup>140</sup> It frequently uses the double "*yih* . . . *yih* 亦" for concomitance and the double "*swei* . . . *swei* 隨" for simultaneity.<sup>141</sup>

The extent of this stylistic uniformity may be illustrated by a couple of examples. It is widely suspected that the story in which Yiin Wen 尹文 explains that the world is *huann* 幻 "illusion"<sup>142</sup> is influenced by Buddhism.<sup>143</sup> At first sight it might seem possible to dispose of it as a late story inserted by the compiler in predominantly early material. But short as the story is, it is attached to other parts of the book by a number of stylistic inter-relations:

三年不告 "He did not tell him for three years". Also j.5, 8A/9.  
屏左右 "He shut out his attendants". Also j.3, 5A/4.

<sup>135</sup> For *erl* cf. p. 155 above.

<sup>136</sup> For *u*, cf. p. 188 below.

<sup>137</sup> Cf. pp. 184-5 below.

<sup>138</sup> LT j.3, 4A/11. j.5, 3B/4. j.7, 2B/13 bis, 5A/9 (also 5B/11 f, SY). j.8, 1B/2 zB/7.

<sup>139</sup> Cf. p. 188 below.

<sup>140</sup> For example, j.1, 6A/11 f bis, 6B/5 f. j.2, 2B/8 bis. j.3, 3A/1, 3B/6 bis. j.4, 2B/3, 4, 5. j.7, 2B/7 f, 7A/3.

<sup>141</sup> Cf. p. 184, p. 187 below.

<sup>142</sup> LT j.3, 2B/1-13.

<sup>143</sup> Cf. p. 142 above.

造物者其巧妙，其功深 “The skill of the Creator is subtle, his achievement profound”. Cf. j.5, 7B/5.

人之巧乃可與造化者同功乎 “Then can man's skill share the achievement of the Creator?”

難窮難終 “Hard to exhaust and bring to an end”. Also j.1, 6B/6.

隨起隨滅 “Extinguished as soon as it arises”. The pattern *swei* . . . *swei* indicating simultaneity is common in *Liehtzzy*: j.1, 6A/4,7. j.5, 9A/8. j.6, 4B/5, 5A/10.

用...之言 ‘Act on X's words’. Also j.3, 4A/13. j.7, 3A/12 f. j.8, 7B/1.

As a second example we may take a story of *Liehtzzy* and his teacher Lao Shang 老商 which appears twice.<sup>144</sup> The two versions are adapted to the themes of their respective chapters, the Taoist art of eluding external obstacles in the *Yellow Emperor* chapter, the Taoist rejection of knowledge in the *Confucius* chapter. It might seem natural to suspect that this is an old story, and the fact that elsewhere in the book *Liehtzzy*'s teacher is called *Hwutzzy* 壺子 seems to confirm the hypothesis. Yet the story is full of stylistic evidence both of late date and of common authorship with the main body of the book:

師老商氏，友伯高子 “Had Lao Shang as his teacher and *Borgautzzy* as his friend”. We find the same pairing of “teacher” and “friend” in j.4, 3A/9, 6B/7.

因閒 (= 閒) “Taking advantage of a moment of leisure”. Also j.7, 3A/13.

Possessive pronouns (*wu*, *woo*, *ruu*) followed by *iy* five times out of seven.

庚 *genq* “again” (written 更 in the shorter version), four times. *Genq*, rare in pre-Hann literature, is common in *Liehtzzy*: j.3, 1B/13, 5B/13. j.4, 7B/7. j.5, 7A/5. j.6, 2B/11 bis,

*wu* “me” Cf. 171 above.

亦不知.....亦不知.....亦不知 “I did not know whether . . . nor whether . . . nor whether . . .” Also in j.6, 4B/10. Series of parallel clauses with *yih* “also” in each (including the first) are very common in *Liehtzzy*; for example, j.4, 3B/10-13, 8A/3-6. j.6, 5B/1-4. j.7, 2A/4 f, 2B/12-14.

眼如耳 “My eyes became like my ears”. Wang Lih<sup>145</sup> points out that down to the Hann period *yeau* means “eyeball”; his latest illustrations are from the *Shyyjih* and *Hannshu*. Here it is already synonymous with *muh* 目 “eye”.

*du* “completely”. Cf. pp. 176-7 above.

曾未浹時 “Before even a year has come round”. In *Liehtzzy* the

first character always has the reading *tzeng* and is followed by a negative, “not even”. Cf. j.1, 4B/11. j.5, 3B/3, 7, 8 (Also j.2, 8A/10 JT).

可幾 “to be expected”. Also j.2, 9B/3.

良久 “for some time”. Also j.4, 7B/7.

不敢復言 “He did not dare to speak again”. Also j.6, 2A/4.

However, there are of course passages where such indications are absent or too rare to make a convincing cumulative effect; and it is reasonable to assume that some of these passages are from lost pre-Hann and Former Hann works. The preface and commentary of *Jang Jann* contain useful information on this question. *Jang Jann* makes a clear distinction between works written before and works written after 400 B.C. He assumes that a parallel with a work traditionally dated before 400 B.C. is a quotation by *Liehtzzy*, and generally notes it. Among the passages listed in Part 2/1 above, he notes all parallels with *Mohtzzy*, the *Muh tiantzzy juann*, the *Yih woei chyan tzuoh duh* (ascribed to Confucius), and the *Joushu*. For the *Dawderjing* and the *Jouliu*, he either notes the source or implies it by quoting the commentary. Of three parallels with the *Shanhaejing* (ascribed to Yeu), he ignores only the one which is virtually a direct quotation in the text, being introduced by “The Great Yeu said”.<sup>146</sup> But he does not mention the passage found also in the medical classic *Lingshujing*; and he definitely overlooks the two parallels with the *Yanntzzy chuenchiou*.<sup>147</sup>

The quotation from the *Joushu* noted by *Jang Jann*<sup>148</sup> is not in the extant *Yih Joushu* 逸周書. But this is the only case in which he introduces us to an unknown source. In view of the thoroughness with which *Jang Jann* sought out and noted parallels, and the evidence already assembled that the compilation of the book is not much earlier than his time, we must conclude that there is little or nothing in *Liehtzzy* from lost sources traditionally dated before 400 B.C. For example, we can discount the possibility that *Liehtzzy* borrowed extensively from the *Woeishu* 緯書 (Hann apocrypha few of which survive), even though there is a parallel with one still extant, the *Yih woei chyan tzuoh duh*, and *Jang Jann* quotes others.<sup>149</sup>

In the case of parallels with documents later than 400 B.C., *Jang Jann* often shows his awareness that the passage appears in another work by quoting the latter's commentary, but he scarcely ever notes the parallel explicitly. Evidently he assumes that in all cases after 400 B.C. *Liehtzzy* is primary. However, his preface lists seven pre-Hann and Former Hann works which quote *Liehtzzy*. The latest, the *Jyyguei*, is contemporary with

<sup>144</sup> LT j.5, 4A/5-7.

<sup>147</sup> Commenting on one of these, *Jang Jann* assumes that the saying continues after the parallel stops, and he doubts its attribution to *Yanntzzy* (LT j.1, 5B/5).

<sup>148</sup> LT j.5, 9B/5.

<sup>149</sup> LT j.5, 2A/5, 2B/7, 8, 9.

<sup>144</sup> LT j.2, 2A/3-2B/9. Shorter version j.4, 4A/2-9.

<sup>145</sup> *op. cit.*, 499.



Liou Shianq; the purpose of the list is evidently to convince us that the book which Jang Jann is making public is that on which Liou Shianq reported.

(i) *Juangtzyy*. The compiler of *Liehtzyy* used the text in fifty-two *pian*, now lost.<sup>150</sup> Our table of parallels notes several passages known by quotations to have belonged to the lost parts of *Juangtzyy*, and there may well be more. A probable example is the story of the man who walked through stone and fire.<sup>151</sup>

(ii) *Shenn Daw* 慎到. The Hann bibliography records a *Shenntzyy* in forty-two *pian*, which reappears in the Swei bibliography with ten *jiuann*. In the Song dynasty only a fragment consisting of five essays survived. This is printed in the *Shooushanger tsongshu* 守山閣叢書, with other fragments preserved by quotation; there are no parallels with *Liehtzyy*. There are parallels in the *Shenntzyy* published during the Ming dynasty by Shenn Mawshaang 慎懋賞 and reproduced in the *Syhbuh tsongkan*; but this is well known to be a forgery.<sup>152</sup>

(iii) *Harn Fei tzyy*.

(iv) *Shytzyy*. The *Shytzyy* was reassembled from quotations by Suen Shingyeon 孫星衍 (Preface dated 1799); several passages with parallels in *Liehtzyy* survive.

(v) *Hwainantzyy*.

(vi) *Shyuanshyh* 玄示. An unknown work; judging by its title and position in the series, it must have been a Taoist mystical work of the Former Hann, of the same nature as the *Jyyguei*. The *Liehtzyy shyhwen* mentions two works with this title, neither of them extant.

(vii) *Jyyguei*. According to the *Shyhwen* this is the *Dawder jyyguei luenn* 道德指歸論 of Yan Tzuen 嚴遵, a contemporary of Yang Shyong (53 B.C.-A.D. 18). Only the second half of this verse exposition of the *Dawderjing* survives, and its textual history is very uncertain.<sup>153</sup> There is one parallel with *Liehtzyy*.

It is therefore certain that there are unidentified passages in *Liehtzyy* which once stood in *Shenntzyy* and the *Shyuanshyh*, and at least probable that others appeared in lost parts of *Juangtzyy*, *Shytzyy*, and the *Jyyguei*. Further, since Jang Jann ignores such well-known sources as the *Leushyh chuenchiou* and the *Shuoyuann*, there may well be lost sources which he does not mention.

Among passages which may come from unknown sources, there are four classes which deserve examination:

<sup>150</sup> Cf. pp. 157-8 above.

<sup>151</sup> Cf. p. 155 above.

<sup>152</sup> WSTK 901-5.

<sup>153</sup> WSTK 871 f.

### (1) *Rhymed Passages*

Karlgren, defending his claim that *Liehtzyy* dates from the Former Hann, offers seven examples of archaic rhymes.<sup>154</sup> Rhymes are obviously criteria of great importance, which my ignorance of phonetics prevents me from exploring. However, they have little bearing on the date of the book as a whole, since there is a strong presumption that any rhymed Taoist discourse is from an older source, whether its rhymes are demonstrably archaic or not. The type of rhythmic discourse characteristic of *Liehtzyy* is marked by parallelism without rhyme, the repetition of key words, and sequences of clauses bound together by *yih* "also" or interrupted by *sweiran* "however":

j.1, 6B/9-12 言天地壞者亦謬,言天地不壞者亦謬。壞與不壞,吾所不能知也。雖然,彼一也,此一也。故生不知死,死不知生,來不知去,去不知來。

"It is nonsense to say either that heaven and earth will perish or that they will not. Whether they perish or not we can never know. However, from that side there is one point of view, from this side another. Hence the living do not know what it is like to be dead, the dead do not know what it is like to be alive. Coming, we do not know those who went before, going we shall not know those who come after."

Outside j.1 rhyme is infrequent except in sections with parallels and in verses specifically presented as songs. Of the four archaic rhymes noticed by Karlgren in j.2-8, one is from *Juangtzyy*, one from *Shytzyy*, and two from a song.<sup>155</sup> But in j.1 there is a great deal of rhymed discourse devoid of the stylistic characteristics of *Liehtzyy*; its identification and study must be left to those with a sufficient grounding in Chinese phonology. Karlgren notes three archaic rhymes in j.1:

(A) 2A/11 P'ĪŌG 覆 TSəG 載

(B) 2A/12 XWA 化 NGĪA 宜

(C) 4A/2 ŚĪəG 始 KĪŪG 久

The work on Hann rhymes of Luo Charngpeir 羅常培 and Jou Tzuomo 周祖謨 gives no example of rhyme A (illegitimate in the rhyme scheme of the *Odes*, but permitted by the freer system of the pre-Hann philosophers) later than *Hwainantzyy*.<sup>156</sup> Rhyme B was valid only to the end of the Former Hann.<sup>157</sup> Rhyme C was already invalid during the Former

<sup>154</sup> Cf. p. 141 above.

<sup>155</sup> LT j.2, 8B/6. j.6, 4A/1. j.8, 1A/10.

<sup>156</sup> *Hann Wey Jinn Nanbeeichaur yunnbuh yeanniann yanjiou* 漢魏晉南北朝韻部演變研究 (Peking 1958), vol. 1, 247.

<sup>157</sup> *ut sup.*, 153 f, 158.

Hann;<sup>158</sup> but it is almost certain that 久 is a graphic error for 又 (=有)<sup>159</sup>, in which case the rhyme remained valid throughout the Later Hann.<sup>160</sup>

Rhyme C stands in a passage which begins with three sentences also found in the *Jygyuei*.<sup>161</sup> The passages which Jang Jann found also in the *Shyuanshyh* and the *Jygyuei*, mystical documents of the Former Hann the latter of which at least was largely in rhyme, were very probably among the rhymed sections of j.1.

### (2) *The Questions of Tang*

It is likely that the first three questions and answers of the *Questions of Tang* are a fragment of the document mentioned in the first chapter of *Juangtzyy*: 湯之問棘也是已 "Tang's questions to Jyi were about this".<sup>162</sup> Jyi's name is written with another character (革), suggesting that here *Liehtzyy* is not dependent on *Juangtzyy*. The theme is the problem of infinity, discussed in the manner of the pre-Hann sophists; but *Liehtzyy* never elsewhere discusses logical puzzles, except when making fun of the sophist Gongsuen Long 公孫龍.<sup>163</sup> Jyi's second answer is one of the rare rhyming passages.

There are also two linguistic features of interest, *u* 惡 "how?" and *wenn yu* 問於 "ask". *U* is used twice; it is never found elsewhere in the book except in passages borrowed from *Juangtzyy*.<sup>164</sup> *Wenn yu* is normal pre-Hann usage. By the third century B.C. the preposition *yu* was sometimes dropped, as in the sentence from *Juangtzyy* just quoted. In *Liehtzyy* the preposition is always dropped, except in the construction *wenn X yu Y*, "ask Y about X",<sup>165</sup> and in passages from *Juangtzyy*.<sup>166</sup>

The fragment ends at Jyi's third answer. From this point the logic of infinity is forgotten and the dialogue soon turns into a record of marvels. Stylistic interconnections with the rest of *Liehtzyy* already appear in the fourth answer:

齊州 "The central region" (China). Also j.2, 1A/12. j.3, 3B/8. j.5, 4A/13. j.7, 4A/3.

人民 "people". Also j.2, 10A/1, 2. j.3, 4A/2. j.5, 4B/10.

異 X "different from X" (without the preposition *yu*). Also j.2, 9B/6. j.3, 2A/1bis, j.4, 5B/11.

<sup>158</sup> *ut sup.*, 16 f.

<sup>159</sup> JS 11/10. Cf. 10/13, 12/5.

<sup>160</sup> Luo and Jou, *ut sup.*, 125.

<sup>161</sup> LT j.1, 3B/10-13.

<sup>162</sup> JT j.1, 6B.

<sup>163</sup> LT j.4, 6B-7B. Cf. my *Book of Lieh-tzu* (London 1961), 74 f, 92, 94 f.

<sup>164</sup> LT j.2, 5A/10, 7B/13, j.6, 2B/14.

<sup>165</sup> LT j.7, 2A/14.

<sup>166</sup> LT j.1, 6B/13. j.2, 5A/2. (In both cases the preposition is *hu* 乎.) LT j.8, 3B/5 omits the *yu* of LSCC, HN.

### (3) *Mohist Passages*

I have argued elsewhere<sup>167</sup> that the dialogue between Yang Ju and Chyn Guuli 禽骨釐 comes directly or indirectly from a Mohist source, and suggested tentatively that its immediate source may have been *Shytzyy*, which included a large Mohist element. There is another fragment, standing immediately after a passage known by quotations to have belonged to *Shytzyy*, which seems to be of Mohist origin.<sup>168</sup> Its theme is evidently the principle that we should love others, although the introduction which must have stated the principle is missing. The fragment asserts that we should judge by our own experience and verify the judgment by the experience of others. We know from our own experience that we love those who love us, hate those who hate us; and we can verify the principle by history, which shows that rulers who love the world prosper while rulers who hate the world perish. Unless we act on this principle we cannot hope for benefit (*lih* 利). The emphasis on love, the concern with methods of proof, and the appeal to the utilitarian test, all suggest the Mohist school.

### (4) *Passages connected with the original school of Yang Ju*

Yang Ju (c. 350 B.C.) left no book, and the latest document which shows knowledge of his original doctrines is *Hwainantzzy*.<sup>169</sup> Afterwards Confucians remembered him only as the archetypal egoist denounced by Mencius, while Taoists often accepted him as one of themselves. Throughout most of *Liehtzyy* Yang Ju is simply a mouthpiece for the author's own ideas, whether Taoist or hedonist. But I have argued elsewhere that two passages in the *Yang Ju* chapter<sup>170</sup> must be earlier than the disappearance of the "Hundred Schools" since they reflect what seems to have been the original theme of Yang Ju's teaching, the relative importance of the body and of external possessions.<sup>171</sup> Yang Ju appears to have held that, since possessions can be replaced while the body can not, we ought never to sacrifice as much as a hair of the body even to gain the whole Empire.

The final chapter contains a group of four sayings and stories of Yang Ju.<sup>172</sup> The two sayings, although separated by the stories, evidently belong together; the point of both is that it is important to avoid any action which may invite others to injure oneself, and that even benefits to others may, by attracting reputation and profit, involve us in contention. It is likely that they come from a period when Yang Ju's original teaching was still remembered.

<sup>167</sup> *The Dialogue between Yang Ju and Chyntzyy*, BSOAS 22/2 (1959), 291-9.

<sup>168</sup> LT j.8, 1A/10, 1B/2. Translated *Book of Lieh-tzu*, 159.

<sup>169</sup> HN j.13, 7A/12-7B/1.

<sup>170</sup> LT j.7, 4B/8-5A/5. (The dialogue with Chyn Guuli), 6A/8-6B/2. For the latter, cf. p. 195 below.

<sup>171</sup> BSOAS *ut sup.*, *Book of Lieh-tzu*, 135 f, 149, 154.

<sup>172</sup> LT j.8, 6B/1-7A/8.

We have already noticed<sup>173</sup> that certain confusions between characters which Liou Shianq claimed to have corrected are actually found in *Liehtzzy*, and suggested two possible explanations—that the passages concerned are fragments of a text earlier than Liou Shianq, and that the editor has deliberately introduced the characters mentioned by Liou Shianq in order to give an impression of antiquity. The former explanation would provide us with a very useful test for identifying early material; but unfortunately the characters mentioned by Liou Shianq appear in sections which are certainly very late. For example the story of Liehtzzy and Lao Shang, discussed in detail above,<sup>174</sup> contains two examples of 進 for 盡.<sup>175</sup>

#### 4/2. The Fatalist and Hedonist Chapters

With the glaring exception of one chapter, *Liehtzzy* is a consistently Taoist document; a few stories bear the marks of their Confucian or Mohist origin, but it is generally clear that they are being used to make a Taoist point.<sup>176</sup> The exception is the *Yang Ju* chapter, which preaches an uncompromising hedonism implicitly rejected in the opening stories of the *Yellow Emperor* and *King Muh of Jou* chapters.<sup>177</sup> The immediately preceding *Endeavour and Destiny* chapter also occupies a special position; although the extreme fatalism of this chapter is developed in Taoist terms, there is no hint of it elsewhere in the book. It is worth mentioning that the eighth century commentary of Lu Chornghshyuan 盧重玄 treats the fatalism and hedonism of the adjacent chapters as equally obnoxious.

If we admit that the extant *Liehtzzy* is later than the report ascribed to Liou Shianq, we must conclude that these chapters were deliberately designed to agree with this passage in the report:

2A/11 f 至於力命篇，一推分命，楊子之篇，唯貴於<sup>178</sup>逸，二義乖背，不似一家之書。然各有所明，亦有可觀者。

“As for the *Endeavour and Destiny* chapter, which reduces allotted destinies to one principle, and the chapter about Yangtzyy, which values leisure only, the two doctrines are contradictory, and they seem not to be

<sup>173</sup> Cf. p. 148 above.

<sup>174</sup> Cf. p. 184 above.

<sup>175</sup> LT j.2, 2A/3, 2B/2 (=j.4, 4A/7).

<sup>176</sup> Several stories in the last chapter, *Explaining Conjunctions*, are not Taoist. But they illustrate a Taoist thesis, that fixed standards are misleading since the rightness of an action, as well as the manner in which others interpret it, depend on the particular situation. Cf. *Book of Lieh-tzū*, 159, 161, 166, 174.

<sup>177</sup> LT j.2, 1A/4 f, 7 f. j.3, 2A/12-14.

<sup>178</sup> There is a variant 放, in the two Taoist canon and *Shyhdertarng* editions (Cf. above). The phrase 放逸 is in fact found in the *Yang Ju* chapter: j.7, 2B/7.

writings of one school; but each is illuminating in its own way, and makes points which deserve consideration.”

The chapter about Yang Ju known to Liou Shianq advocated a retired life free from the cares of office; but it can scarcely have recommended sheer hedonism, since Liou Shianq treats it with some respect, although he roundly condemns *King Muh of Jou* and the *Questions of Tang* as “not the words of a gentleman” (非君子之言也). Moreover it specifically contradicted the *Endeavour and Destiny* chapter, whereas the present *Yang Ju* chapter is utterly out of keeping with every other part of the book. We can guess the nature of this contradiction from an anecdote in the *Shuo-yuann*, a text which Liou Shianq edited even if he did not compile it<sup>179</sup>:

SY j.13, 2A 楊子曰，事之可以之貧，可以之富者，其傷行者也。事之可以之生，可以之死者，其傷勇者也。僕子曰，楊子智而不知命，故其知多疑。

“Yangtzyy said: ‘Actions which decide whether one becomes poor or rich are the ones which corrupt behaviour. Actions which decide whether one lives or dies are the ones which corrupt bravery’. Pwutzzy said: ‘Yangtzyy for all his wisdom did not understand destiny, and so the more he knew the more he doubted’.”

The present *Yang Ju* chapter contains nothing which exposes the author to Pwutzzy’s charge.<sup>180</sup> Yet there are a number of indications of some special connection with the fatalistic chapter. Jang Jann<sup>181</sup>, without mentioning Liou Shianq by name, defends *Liehtzzy* against the charge that the two chapters are contradictory; he insists that they present two extreme alternatives, between which the sage strikes the mean. There is in fact a remarkable series of similarities and contrasts between the two chapters which cannot be accidental, and which suggests that Jang Jann has rightly interpreted the compiler’s intention:

(A) Liehtzzy himself appears in neither chapter; in both the main philosopher is Yang Ju.

(B) The historical (although not the fictitious) characters are the same in the stories of both chapters:

	j.6	j.7
Yang Ju	3B-4B	Passim

<sup>179</sup> Cf. WSTK 760-1.

<sup>180</sup> One passage concerns destiny (j.7, 6B/3-7). It asks “How can we yearn for long life unless we rebel against destiny?” (不逆命，何羨壽) and declares that if we do not pursue external goals such as rank, power and wealth, destiny can no longer foil us, since “the destiny which decides is within us” (制命在內).

<sup>181</sup> LT j.6, 1A/12-1B/1.

Goan Jonq 管仲 and Baw Shwu 鮑叔	2A-3A	2A-3A (Baw Shwu 3A/1)
Yanntzyy	5B	2A, B
Tzyychaan 子產 and Denq Shi 鄧析	3A, B	3A, B

(C) Five of the eight historical examples of the inequality of destiny quoted in the dialogue between Endeavour and Destiny which begins the fatalist chapter<sup>182</sup> are given hedonist applications in various parts of the *Yang Ju* chapter:

The misfortunes of Confucius in Chern 陳 and Tsay 蔡	j.7, 5A/14
The tyrant Jow 紂	5B/5-7
Bor Yi 伯夷 and Shwu Chyi 叔齊 starving to death	1B/1 f, 2A/7
Tyan Herng's 田恒 usurpation in Chyi	1A/11 f
Jaan Chyn 展禽 (Jih 季)	2A/7

(D) The sentence "Valuing life cannot preserve it, taking care of the body cannot benefit it" (生非貴之所能存, 身非愛之所能厚) appears in both chapters,<sup>183</sup> in one as an argument for resignation to destiny, in the other as an argument for enjoying life without vainly seeking to prolong it. There is also a clear case of a fatalist interpolation in a hedonist context:

j.7 1B/14-2A/5 萬物所異者生也, 所同者死也。生則有賢愚貴賤, 是所異也。死則有臭腐消滅, 是所同也。  
〔雖然, 賢愚貴賤非所能也。臭腐消滅亦非所能也。故生非所生, 死非所死, 賢非所賢, 愚非所愚, 貴非所貴, 賤非所賤。然而萬物齊生齊死, 齊賢齊愚, 齊貴齊賤〕  
十年亦死, 百年亦死, 仁聖亦死, 凶愚亦死.....

"It is in life that the myriad things of the world are different; in death they are all the same. In life, there are clever and foolish, noble and vile; these are the differences. In death there are stench and rot, decay and extinction; in this we are all the same.

(However, whether we are clever or foolish, noble or vile, is not our own doing, and neither are stench and rot, decay and extinction. Hence we do not bring about our own life or death, cleverness or foolishness, nobility or vileness. However, the myriad things all equally live and die, are equally clever and foolish, noble and vile.)

Some in ten years, some in a hundred, we all die; saints and sages die, the wicked and foolish die . . . ."

<sup>182</sup> LT j.6, 1A/5-8.

<sup>183</sup> LT j.6, 4A/9. j.7, 4B/1.

Besides interrupting the sequence, the interpolation obscures the thought. The appeal to enjoy life while it lasts, because in death we are all the same, conflicts with the Taoist thesis that differences are unreal, including the difference between life and death.

By making Yang Ju the spokesman of fatalism in one chapter and of hedonism in the next, and showing that the same facts can be used to support either doctrine, the author or editor invites us to strike a balance between the two extremes. He does not introduce Liehtzyy into this part of the book, because he does not want to give Liehtzyy's authority to either doctrine. Odd as this procedure may seem, it is intelligible on the assumption that he was forced to work within the limits set by Liou Shianq's description of the book. A Taoist faced with the necessity of including in his book two chapters representing opposing schools might well find this the most convenient solution.

It is generally taken for granted that the hedonist chapter is not by the same hand as the rest of the book. But the correctness of this assumption is not quite as obvious as might be supposed. Against it is the uniformity of style throughout the unparalleled sections of *Liehtzyy*, including almost the whole of j.3-7. On a superficial reading the style of the hedonist chapter feels quite different from that of the rest of the book. But the difference is in the theme, thought and mood; if we look for peculiarities in the use of words, it is as difficult to find them here as in any other chapter. The general account of the style of *Liehtzyy* given in the preceding section<sup>184</sup> applies perfectly to this chapter, except that, as in several other chapters, there are no examples of *tzeng* and *swei* . . . *swei*. Most of the linguistic indications of late date appear in this chapter:—pronouns followed by *yy*, *kee* with an active verb, *fwu* and *wang* with a succeeding object, *du* "completely", the "one-way" *shiang*, *chiee* "for the time being". Among stylistic interconnections between the parts of the book, we have already noticed that 用 X 之言, 因間, and 齊土, "the central land" (China) occur in this chapter<sup>185</sup>—the last is a very striking example. Other cases are:

2A/7,8 X 之卸 (= 尤) "an extreme case of X". Also j.3, 5B/7. Cf. also 其尤 j.4, 7A/8.

2B/7 凡此諸闕 "all these restrictions". Cf. j.4, 4B/13 凡此衆庶 (Read 疾, JS 81/2) "all these ailments".

3A/1 進 for 盡, one of the unorthodox characters mentioned by Liou Shianq<sup>186</sup>. The editor never substitutes them in passages from known sources.

<sup>184</sup> Cf. pp. 183-5 above.

<sup>185</sup> Cf. p. 184, p. 188 above.

<sup>186</sup> Cf. p. 148 above.

5A/13 f 應...聘 "accept an invitation". Also j.4, 2A/6.

When the theme of pleasure-seeking appears elsewhere in *Liehtzyy*, the phrasing is very like that of the *Yang Ju* chapter:

3B/5 窮當年之樂 "exhaust the joy of the prime of life". Also j.3, 2A/14 (身 for 年).

2B/2 恣意之所欲行 "give yourself up to whatever your thoughts desire to do". Cf. j.3, 4A/3 恣意所欲

We also find the same words for articles of luxury:

2A/13 珠玉 "pearls and jade". Also j.3, 1B/3.

2A/13 文錦 "patterned brocade". Also j.6, 1B/5.

2B/5 椒蘭 "spices and orchids". Also j.5, 4B/2 (order reversed).

4A/2 嬪御 "wives and concubines". Also j.3, 1A/10.

4A/7 珍寶 "treasures". Also j.1, 7B/2.

I have noticed only one striking peculiarity in the *Yang Ju* chapter, its treatment of dialogue. Dialogues in *Liehtzyy* fall into three main patterns:

(i) 曰 *iue* "....." 對曰 *duey iue* "....."

(ii) *iue* "....." *iue* "....."

(iii) "....." *iue* "....."

The second pattern is the normal one. The first is almost confined to passages borrowed from other sources.<sup>187</sup> The third, in which the question is marked only at the first introduction of the speakers, and is sometimes difficult to distinguish from the preceding answer, is confined to three of the four hedonist dialogues.<sup>188</sup>

It seems natural to assume that, at least at the present state of our knowledge of ancient Chinese, we cannot argue from uniformity of style to unity of authorship, only to community of period and background. When preparing the *Book of Lieh-tzu*, I still clung to the common-sense opinion that this chapter must be the work of a separate author, however near to the editor of *Liehtzyy* in time and milieu. But the more closely one examines the style, the harder it becomes to deny unity of authorship. Thus adverbial expressions with the suffixes *ran*, *eel* and *yan* are among the most variable elements in classical Chinese; yet of the seven found in the hedonist document, all but one appear elsewhere in the book:

1B/5 適然. Also j.6, 2A/6.

1B/5 介焉. Also j.4, 2A/11 (*ran* for *yan*).

1B/8 遑遑爾

1B/8 偶偶爾. Also j.6, 1B/9 (omits *eel*).

2B/8, 5B/5.7 熙熙然. Also j.6, 1B/5 (not reduplicated).

<sup>187</sup> Cf. pp. 159-60 above.

<sup>188</sup> LT j.7, 1A-1B/2, 2A/8-11, 4A/13-4B/4. But questions as well as answers are indicated in 2A/14-3A/1.

2B/9, 5A/8, 11, 13, 5B/1 戚戚然. Also j.8, 6B/5 (not reduplicated).

3B/11 忙然. Also j.4, 1B/10 (written 茫).

The linguistic uniformity cannot be the result of editorial revision, since there are no signs of systematic redaction in the passages from known sources, and a thorough-going stylistic adaptation would surely have been accompanied by an attempt to overlay the hedonist doctrine with a surface of Taoism. Yet the linguistic evidence seems to be flatly contradicted by other evidence that when the editor designed his contrasting fatalist and hedonistic chapters he was adapting to his own purposes a pre-existing hedonist document. The *Yang Ju* chapter has—admittedly this is a highly subjective judgment—a ring of sombre and passionate conviction which makes it impossible to regard it merely as an exercise in a philosophy which the author does not personally accept. In any case the purely hedonist parts are entirely devoid of Taoist ideas, and the occasional phrases shared with Taoists are given an entirely different sense.<sup>189</sup> If the editor wrote the chapter himself as a companion to the fatalist chapter, there is no reason why he should not have made it equally Taoist; after all, Chinese poets in their cups have always found it easy to mix hedonism with mysticism. We have already noticed one interpolation in the manner of the fatalist chapter, which clashes violently with its context. There are five self-contained stories and essays which are not hedonist and are also evidently interpolations. Their arrangement is remarkable; they are not grouped together nor scattered over the whole chapter, but placed symmetrically so that they alternate with the last five hedonist sections, in one case breaking the sequence.<sup>190</sup>

(i) 4B/8-5A/5. The dialogue with Chyn Guuli. This is a story about the historical Yang Ju which comes ultimately from a Mohist source.<sup>191</sup>

(ii) 5B/11-6A/3. The dialogue with the King of Liang 梁. Another story about the historical Yang Ju, also found in the *Shuoyuann*.

(iii) 6A/8-6B/2. An essay about the relative importance of the body and external possessions. This is the problem which engaged the historical Yang Ju, who refused to sacrifice a hair for the sake of any possession. The author of this essay is less extreme, and argues that the use of knowledge to control external things is necessary for self-preservation. The essay may well come from some branch of the original school of Yang Ju. It is no more Taoist than it is hedonist; the rejection of knowledge is the theme of the *Confucius* chapter and recurs throughout the book.

<sup>189</sup> 真人 "true man" (3B/12), 內, 外 "inner" "outer" (3B/8-10, 6B/3-7, 7A/3).

<sup>190</sup> Cf. the translation in *Book of Lieh-tzu* 148-57, where the interpolations are printed in italics.

<sup>191</sup> Cf. p. 189 above.

The opening passage, which asks why man is master of the animals in spite of his physical inferiority, is also found in the *Hannshu* and, in a shorter and slightly different form, in the *Leushyh chuenchiou*.<sup>192</sup> In its three contexts it introduces three different accounts of the civilization which distinguishes man from the beasts. It was evidently an established conventional introduction to the theme, and there is no reason to suppose that one text is borrowing directly from another.

(iv) 6B/8-7A/2. A Taoist interpolation on the advantages of the simple life, breaking the connection between the preceding section on the four false ambitions and the succeeding section on the four true ambitions. It contains a much greater concentration of phrases found elsewhere in *Liehtzzy* than any other part of the *Yang ju* chapter:

周諺曰 "A proverb of Jou says". Also j.8, 3A/8.

自以性之恆 "He himself thought it normal to his nature". Cf. j.6, 4B/14 自以智之深也 "They themselves thought it the profoundest wisdom" (Pattern repeated j.6, 5A/1, 3, 6). *Yü* alone used like *yü wei* 以爲, "consider" is common in *Liehtzzy* cf. j.1, 7A/10, j.3, 3B/7. j.5, 6B/12, 9A/12. Other examples of the combination *tzyh yü* "himself thought" are j.6, 1B/7, 5A/5.

梁肉 "fine rice and meat". Also j.6, 1B/5.

廣夏 (= 厦) "wide halls". Also j.6, 2A/5.

狐貉 "fox and badger". Also j.6, 2A/4.

戎 (= 菽) 菽 "broad beans". Also j.6, 2A/5.

其人大慙 "The man was very embarrassed". Also j.3, 5B/12.

(v) 7A/6-10. A conclusion which tempers the hedonist's uncompromising rejection of reputation (*ming* 名). The coupling of quotations from *Yuhtzzy* and *Laotzzy*, found twice elsewhere in the book, betrays the hand of the editor.<sup>193</sup>

It is by no means certain that Yang Ju was the hero of the original hedonist document. The hedonist sections consist of eight discourses headed "Yang Ju said", three dialogues between Yang Ju and others, a long dialogue between Goan Jonq and Yanntzzy, the story of Tzyychaan's brothers, and the story of the voluptuary Duanmuh Shwu. The last of the headings "Yang Ju said" must be an addition of the compiler, who has broken up a single discourse by his fourth interpolation.<sup>194</sup> The three dialogues have no narrative setting, and one, instead of naming the questioner, has the same heading, "Yang Ju said"; this has surely replaced an

introduction in the ordinary form "X asked Y".<sup>195</sup> Very probably Yang Ju was absent from the original source, which the editor has converted into the "chapter about Yang Ju" mentioned by Liou Shianq by introducing the philosopher's name at the front of each discourse and dialogue.

Thus we are driven to two apparently contradictory conclusions:— that the editor adapted a pre-existing document, and that he wrote it himself. How are we to resolve this contradiction? Hedonism appears twice elsewhere in *Liehtzzy*. In the opening story of the second chapter the Yellow Emperor begins his reign as a hedonist, later abandons the pursuit of pleasure to govern the Empire on Confucian lines, and is finally converted by a dream to the Taoist principle of spontaneity. In the contrasting story at the head of the third chapter,<sup>196</sup> King Muh is a lifelong hedonist whom the magician fails to awaken to the Taoist vision. The two stories gain in significance if we suppose that the author is a former hedonist who has seen the error of his ways. This is admittedly speculation, but if we accept it there is no longer any difficulty. Forced by Liou Shianq's description of the book to design chapters representing schools other than Taoism, the author has adapted a document written by himself at an earlier stage in his spiritual development.

#### 4/3. CONCLUSION

The *Liehtzzy* of the Hann bibliography disappeared at an early date, but Liou Shianq's report on the book survived, presumably among the reports collected in the *Byeluh*. Not long after the appearance of the *Muh tiantzzy juann* in 281 and the translation of the Buddhist *Shenqjing*<sup>197</sup> in 285, someone composed a new *Liehtzzy* modelled on Liou Shianq's account of the original book. He incorporated extensive passages from pre-Hann and Former Hann works down to the period of Liou Shianq—that is, from works earlier than the disappearance of the old book, early enough to quote it or be quoted in it. He also prepared contrasting fatalist and hedonist chapters to fit Liou Shianq's description, and worked in examples of the irregular characters mentioned in the report. The book is not only later than its supposed date, it is a deliberate forgery—a conclusion which of course does not reduce its considerable value both as literature and as philosophy.

About a quarter is copied directly from known sources, and there are certainly passages from sources now lost; but the rest is homogeneous in style. The techniques with which we have investigated the language are too

<sup>192</sup> LSCC j.20, 1A.

<sup>193</sup> LT j.2, 9A/5-9. j.6, 4A/13 f.

<sup>194</sup> LT j.7, 7A/2. Cf. (iv) above.

<sup>195</sup> LT j.7, 2A/8-11. Yang Borjiunn (JS 140/2-5) rightly prints this as a dialogue in which, obeying the convention of this chapter, only the answer is marked by *üe*, "said".

<sup>196</sup> Cf. pp. 164-6 above.

<sup>197</sup> Cf. p. 142 above.

crude to establish unity of authorship conclusively; but even in the case of the hedonist chapter, which differs radically from the rest in thought although not in style, the evidence suggests a different stage in one author's intellectual development rather than a different author.

Jang Jann wrote his commentary in the second half of the fourth century. His preface introduces *Liehtzzy* as a book known inside his family for more than three generations, and implies that the complete text has been unknown to outsiders since the migration of the Jinn across the Yangtse. It is therefore likely that the book was written inside Jang Jann's family, perhaps by his grandfather Yi (fl. 307), stated to have recompiled the book from three defective copies, or by his father Ku nq, on whose authority Jann presents his very questionable account of the book's transmission. Evidence which supports this suspicion is the fact that Jang Jann is extraordinarily well informed about the avowed and unavowed sources of the book.<sup>198</sup> For example, he notes all the parallels with *Mohtzzy*, including a phrase of four characters taken from the obscurest part, the Mohist Canons, and interpolated in a passage from *Juangtzyy*.<sup>199</sup> Moreover, he calls our attention to the very points which an accomplice in forgery would wish us to notice. His preface lists the writers earlier than Liou Shianq who supposedly borrow from *Liehtzzy*. His commentary makes explicit the purpose of the complementary fatalist and hedonist chapters,<sup>200</sup> and points out the confusions between characters which identify the book with the one known to Liou Shianq.<sup>201</sup>

Jang Jann was not himself the author of the book. Although aware of most of the sources, he overlooked the *Yanntzzy chuenchiou*.<sup>202</sup> Yang Borjiunn notes that his understanding of the text is not quite perfect.<sup>203</sup> His style is also distinctive; two of his favourite particles *jyi* 卽 "then" and *jyr* 直 "only", are not used at all by the author of *Liehtzzy*. His commentary is perhaps an act of family piety, by which he makes the work of an ancestor known to the world.

<sup>198</sup> Cf. p. 169 above.

<sup>199</sup> LT j.1, 3A/4. Cf. p. 156 above.

<sup>200</sup> LT j.6, 1A/12-18/1. Cf. p. 191 above.

<sup>201</sup> LT j.1, 4A/1, 5B/7.

<sup>202</sup> Cf. p. 185 above.

<sup>203</sup> JS 243. If we exclude paralleled sections, and passages which may be from unknown sources (JS 2/8-10, on a rhyming passage. 149/10 f), it is seldom easy to fault Jang Jann's explanations. But in the tale of the three swords, a very characteristic *Liehtzzy* story, there can be little doubt that 莫陰之間 (j.5, 9A/10) means "between light and dark", in spite of Jang Jann's note that the first character means "evening" (cf. JS 117/12 f). Moreover, Jyi's final answer in the dialogue with Tang certainly ends with the recapitulation of the final question (j.5, 3A/12 f cf. 2A/3 f); Jang Jann is deceived by a reappearance of Jyi into supposing that the dialogue ends much later (4A/11 f).