

Review Article:  
**The Present State and Future Prospects of Pre-Hàn Text Studies**

E Bruce Brooks  
 University of Massachusetts at Amherst

LOEWE Michael (ed). *Early Chinese Texts: A Bibliographical Guide*. Society for the Study of Early China (Early China Special Monograph Series No. 2), 1993. xiv + 546 pages. \$35 from Publications, Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, 2223 Fulton Street, Berkeley CA 94720; or £20 (or equivalent in ECU) from Sinobiblia, 15 Durham Road, Harrow, Middx, HA14PG, United Kingdom.

As the British say, or as C P Snow says they say, one should “declare one’s interest straight away”. The present reviewer has long studied the chronology and interrelations of the Warring States texts, and is presently writing a book covering, and disputing, much of the ground treated by Loewe and collaborators. He welcomes the appearance of the Loewe volume as a much-needed tool, which also defines the consensus against which he hopes to make his own contribution. This article comprises (I) a descriptive comment on Loewe and (II) on the consensus about the early texts which it reveals, plus (III-XVI) a sample of how the present writer proposes, eventually, to go beyond that consensus.

I

This work, in a gesture of respect to the 64 hexagrams of the Yi (page x), treats 64 texts “of which the greater parts could reasonably be accepted as having reached their present form before the end of the Han dynasty”; articles thus average 7•7 pages each. Within this, in almost-standard order (a precisely-standard order would have been even more convenient for readers), are given summaries of content, sources, date, authenticity, text history, commentaries, editions, translations, and indexes. Arrangement of entries is alphabetical in Wade-Giles spelling, with Pinyin forms retained in book titles; as a step toward something more serviceable than either, I here use the Hepburn system extended to Chinese by adding “v” (the linguists’ inverted v, but uninverted) for the vowel of “bug” and a few other vowel changes, plus archaic initials (and abbreviating -dž as Z in book titles) to reduce the effects of Mandarin homophony. By whatever convention, phonetic arrangement increases ease of reference, though making it proportionately difficult to obtain a chronological overview. Contributors range from established to eminent; two (A C Graham and Timoteus Pokora) did not live to see the book published. Bibliographies are at once concise and judicious, and note is taken of recent archaeology. The book is admirably set (by Birdtrack Press, in Zapf Calligraphic with characters), produced (16 signatures, hardbound without dust-jacket), and priced (US 6•25¢ per page). Every scholar in the field can afford to acquire the work; none can afford *not* to do so.

## II

The reader may be surprised to find, in these clear and cogent entries, how much textual uncertainty attends even Hân-dynasty works. But it is to the more notoriously controversial pre-Hân works that a curious new owner of the book will likely first turn. Of late (as I found by asking participants at a scholarly roundtable), users of Warring States materials have sometimes relied, for a safe list of early sources, on such surveys as the appendix on “Sources” at the end of Creel’s 1970 *Origins of Statecraft in China*. These makeshifts are surely now replaced by the Loewe volume. To what effect?

In general, verdicts on dating can be described as on the antique end of responsible. The traditional ascription of the Yi to Jōu Wán-wáng is dismissed by Shaughnessy as unsupported by modern criticism. The 06th century (oh-sixth: 6th century BC) dating of Lăudž, upheld by Chan as late as 1963, is rejected by Boltz as based on mere “lore”. Graham’s proof that Lyèdž is from the 3rd (3rd AD) rather than the 03rd century is upheld with further evidence by Barrett (who however notes that this position is still not accepted by Chinese and Japanese sinologists). All this is most admirable. But wherever reputable opinion gives a range, Loewe’s contributors tend to opt for the early end of it. Examples would include Dzwō Jwàn, placed by Cheng (contra Húng and Kamata) in the late 05th or early 04th centuries (hereinafter 05c, 04c); Hán Fēidž, regarded by Levi (contra Hú Shī and Rúng Jàu-dzǔ) as mostly by the real Hán Fēi, not bad for a prisoner; and Sūndž, referred by Gawlikowski and Loewe (contra Lyáng and Chí) to the early 05c. The connection of the Dzwō Jwàn with the original Confucius circle (despite the fact that Dzwō-chyōu Míng in LY 5:25 cannot be of that circle) and of Sūn Wǔ with the harem girls of Wú (ignoring the close fit of Sūndžian tactics with the mass army of maneuver, successor to the Spring and Autumn elite chariot force, not reliably attested until mid 04c) is thus, one might say, piously maintained.

There is also, as in the case of the Analects, some outright uncertainty, with divergent scholarly opinions simply listed, as in many a Chinese commentary, without the author taking a clear stand as to which is to be preferred; and occasional failure to push a known situation to its determinable conclusion, as with Hán Shī Wài-jwàn and Hwái-nándž, assigned to plausible points within the lifespans of their respective authors or patrons, but ignoring political and textual evidence which, if applied, would either sharpen or extend these suggestions, and also clarify the relation of the text to its historical environment.

Finally, the conclusions themselves, “established” (page ix) or no, are here and there at odds with each other. If Yi divination reflects the practice of the 09c Jōu court (“Western Jōu” is a redundancy; as LY 17:4 shows, there was no historic “Eastern Jōu”), as is stated on p219, relying in part on linguistic similarities with the Shī; and if the Shī in turn, with its presumptive poems of that Jōu court, is from the period c01000 to c0600, as is stated on p415, why then is there, except for two irregular and thus suspect stanzas, no mention of sortilege (shī) as distinct from bone divination (bǔ; 5 times in safe stanzas) in the entire 305-poem corpus of the present Shī?

One feels, at such points, that the intended consensus does not after all quite consense

There are, however, favorable elements in the imperfect consensus which offer some hope that, after two millennia of floundering on this subject, Sinology may be on the verge of something more adequate. One such element is the demythologizing tendency noted above as affecting the Lǎu Dǎn myth (if not yet the Sūn Wǔ myth, or for that matter the Confucius culture-hero myth). This demythologizing trend is likely to be productive of solutions that will more closely reflect the real world of the Warring States. Another positive element is a willingness to see some of these texts not as composed at a single *moment* in time, but as accumulated over a sometimes considerable *span* of time. Such is the treatment of the Gwǎndǔ chapters by Rickett, who assigns them individually a wide variety of dates from the 04c to early Hàn. The operational point here is that dates attach not to *texts*, but to *chapters or layers*. Cheng's treatment of the Analects, on the other hand, though admitting it to be heterogeneous, leaves it as a whole uniformly valid as a source of Confucius's ideas. The difference in handling is probably due not to any difference in the nature of the respective texts, but rather to the fact that Confucius is central for posterity, which is reluctant to relinquish anything associated with him, whereas nobody now cares two squirts of swamp water about Gwǎn Jǔng. It seems likely that the matter-of-fact Gwǎndǔ approach can be fruitfully applied also to the Analects and to other culturally "hot" texts, and that this extension of a successful method might, in these more hallowed textual areas also, lead to the solution of many long-debated and presently intractable textual puzzles. This seems a promising direction for future work.

What is missing from the Loewe treatments as a whole is a sense of the engagement of Warring States writers with current issues, and the acrimonious debate between the writers themselves, which must have characterized the period, one phase of which indeed is known as the "Hundred Schools". As a modest expectation, we may feel that we have satisfactorily solved these texts when their contemporary urgency is individually apparent, and when their bitter opposition to each other is collectively intelligible. This goal seems now to be reachable by anyone armed with a sufficient range of single-text paradigms, and unencumbered by the old unimpeachable assumptions.

### III

As a sample of how the next steps might be taken, I will here consider several texts, beginning with the Hàn, when solid biographical data sometimes exists outside the texts, and need not be, as in earlier periods, circularly deduced from the texts themselves.

**Hán Shǐ Wàì-jwàn (HSWJ).** Hightower infers a birthdate of c0200 (circa 200 BC) for Hán Yīng from the Shǐ Jì (SJ) and Hàn Shū (HS) accounts (which would make him the same age as the prodigy Jyǎ Yí when they both came to Wǎn-dì's court; a safer guess is c0210), and from this a date of c0150 for the HSWJ. 50 is as good as any other modal expectation for age at book composition, but rather than extrapolate life dates from Yīng's career, and then intrapolate back a standard book-composition expectation, we may lose less detail by simply staying with the career, not least since it may well include the immediate context and conditioning factors of the book we are trying to place.

**Structure.** HSWJ consists of ten series of anecdotes, most of which end in a sometimes tenuously relevant Shī quote. Hightower, and the S̄-z-kù editors before him, are irked by this unscholarly procedure; the S̄-z-kù puts HSWJ with works of Shī exegesis only because there is no other place in the catalog for it. We thus start with a question about the *nature* of the work before us. There is also the question of its *identity*: HS 30 lists a Nèi-jwàn in 4 chapters and a Wài-jwàn in 6; Swéi Shū (SS) a Wài-jwàn in 10. Yáng Shù-dá suggests that the SS's 10ch Wài-jwàn is the old Nèi and Wài run together. Hightower (in a 1948 HJAS article referenced at Loewe p126) proposes a variant of this, to account for the fact that the order of Shī tags in *HSWJ anecdotes* is not always that of *our Shī text*, divergences being especially marked at beginnings and ends of HSWJ chapters. One of these divergences (Hightower notes) is not really a difference, but evidence that the Hán-school order of some Dà Yǎ poems diverged from that of our present (Máu) text. This observation has consequences for the history of the Shī itself. For now, we may regard these sequences as simply normal in terms of Hán Yīng's text. The true differences between HSWJ and the Hán Shī (from Hightower 1948, p291f) are **emphasized** in the summary below, which cites Shī by their overall sequence numbers:

- HSWJ 1: **21 17 9 52 26 33** (1-40 incomplete but in order; from Fv̄ng) **16**  
 HSWJ 2: (53-158; Fv̄ng)  
 HSWJ 3: (270-276; Sùng) **254** (280-304; Sùng) **200 63**  
 HSWJ 4: (198-230; Syǎu Yǎ)  
 HSWJ 5: (1-304 in Hán Shī order; covering whole Shī) **197**  
 HSWJ 6: (256-265, Hán; Dà Yǎ) **195**  
 HSWJ 7: (162-168, Hán; Syǎu Yǎ) **214** (183-229; Syǎu Yǎ)  
 HSWJ 8: (260-273, Hán; Dà Yǎ) **212 196 255 288 299 207 301 299 304 162 255**  
 HSWJ 9: (5-80; Fv̄ng) **29 35 37** (109-165; Fv̄ng) **152**  
 HSWJ 10: (235-257; Dà Yǎ)

Hightower feels (1948, p243) that HSWJ originally ran in Hán Shī order (or more precisely, represented two distinct traversals of that order), and that the above anomalies, together with the absence of concluding Shī tags from 25 of the total 306 anecdotes, are due to disarrangement of the bamboo slips on which the work was written. Of the 25 missing tags he says "I surmise that the quotation from the [Shī] was put at the beginning of a new column of characters; it would then frequently occur on an isolated slip, and once detached, the ingenuity of even a [bwó-shr̄] of the [Hán] school would be taxed to match it correctly with the paragraph with which it originally belonged". But the assumption that the tags began a separate slip is not in accord with observable practice in Hàn and Warring States texts, where sentences do not coordinate with slips, and where disarrangement thus produces grammatical chaos. The only successful bamboo-slip reconstructions known to me (Graham on Mician logic, Shaughnessy on Bamboo Annals) involve transfers of common-length strips not coordinated with grammatical *units*. Transfers of integral sentences or anecdotes (such as in Duyvendak's now-forgotten Dàu-Dv̄ Jīng restructuring, or Graham's more recent Jwāngdž arrangement) are wholly unconvincing *as restorations*; they stand or fall on their merits as literary re-editings.

Even if, following Hightower, we suppose that there might have been separate-slip placement of the Shī tags, and that these, though text-internal, had become separated from the respective anecdotes (without the anecdotes themselves being disarranged!), this might at worst lead to their being wrongly reattached to open anecdotes, not to their being lost altogether. Further, whatever might be the difficulty of reattaching stray poem-tags, the proper reordering *of the anecdotes which still possessed their concluding tags*, so far from being beyond the art of a Hàn bwó-shr, would not have baffled a twelve-year-old. Why then, in the conjectured attempt to reconstitute the disordered bamboo, were these obvious resequencings neglected? And finally, the whole premise that we are here dealing with a bamboo-slip text is, as Hightower candidly notes, contrary to the HS 30 evidence, which describes a text in jywàn (rolls of silk) rather than pyēn (bundles of bamboo slips). I think we must judge this proposed reordering to be both unconvincing and unjustified. This, of course, leaves us where we began: with the messy and unscholarly HSWJ text. Even with Hightower's tidying, the HSWJ remains in any case a subscholarly production.

**A New View.** Perhaps, rearrangement having failed, we would do well to admit that the HSWJ *really is* a messy and unscholarly text, and try to explain it as such. First, we might reconsider Yáng Shù-dá's "too facile" suggestion that our present HSWJ contains the original Nèi-jwàn (as HSWJ 1-4) and also the original Wài-jwàn (as HSWJ 5-10). Yáng noted that HSWJ 5, which starts with Shī 1, looks like a second beginning. Indeed. Digressive as it may be, HSWJ 1-4 does eventually visit most of the divisions of the Shī; so, in a somewhat differently digressive way, does HSWJ 6-10 (HSWJ 5 is itself a short tour of the whole text). There is another distinguishing feature of HSWJ 5-10 as distinct from HSWJ 1-4: *all the cases of anecdotes without Shī tags occur in HSWJ 5-10*. It is thus, so to speak, a less finished production than HSWJ 1-4, though of much the same kind. As to what kind that kind might be, Hightower has well observed that none of the HSWJ anecdotes can safely be called original: they are, so far as can be now discovered, drawn (and altered) from various texts generally current in early Hàn: *they are popular*. So here again, as in the above-noted vagueness of the link between anecdote and poem, we discover that we have unavoidably to deal with a vulgar rather than an erudite work, or rather with two closely associated vulgar rather than erudite works.

I do not know how it may appear to the reader, but the poem-sequences at left look to me very much like a teaching order of the Shī. However full the world may now be of people operating on a contrary presumption, the simple fact is that there are pedagogically more effective approaches than opening a difficult classic at page 1 and thrusting it in the face of the student. One normally tries to find a more ingratiating line. This would apply with special force to a young or unwilling student. We may then ask: was there any period in Hán Yīng's otherwise dignified life when he was confronted with such considerations? Yes, there was: in 0145 Emperor Jīng appointed him tutor to the Emperor's youngest son, Lyóu Shùn, who was in that year, at the minimum age of 16, made King of Cháng-shān (north of Hándān, in the old Jàu territory). Here is the clash: a Shī specialist on the one hand, and a spoiled, sports-minded young royal on the other. May not the HSWJ plausibly have emerged from just this sort of confrontation?

**Origin.** The scenario may have been something like this. Hán Yīng, a Shī specialist, will surely have made the Shī the backbone of the curriculum he customized for the King. The pupil is 16, and so Yīng has four years at his disposal before formal lessons end at the King's majority (his 20th year). He will thus try to give an idea of the Shī in four annual cycles of regular lessons, omitting abstruse or irrelevant pieces and concentrating on those with not too difficultly pointable morals. The pupil has some official duties and many personal distractions, so that relevance and appeal are crucial; a lead-in device, using, say, a familiar or popular anecdote as a lesson-opener, will break the ice and prove the utility of the Shī as training in recognition-repartee. The lesson proper then follows. This much gives us the 4 lesson-cycles, each lesson comprising anecdote plus Shī tag, of the original Hán Shī Nèi-jwàn (nèi, here clearly not "esoteric", may mean "palace").

**Details.** Given this strategy, where do we begin? Not with gwān-gwān jyw-jyōu, concerning whose oddly ambivalent nature-image the learned are still writing exegeses, and whose wimpy protagonist is no figure for a hot-blooded young king to identify with. We will instead use the Szmǎ Syàng-rú technique (an anachronism; Syàng-rú is of the next generation, but is in the persuasion-tradition to which the HSWJ itself belongs): explore the ruler's vice as a hook for a sermon against vice. Our King is mobbed by acquiescent ladies. We cite acquiescent ladies to interest him (the concubines of Shī 21), temper his arrogance by evoking sympathy for them, and then extend this sympathy to the plaint of a common woman (the litigant of Shī 17). Both these are from the Shàu-nán section, leading to free conversation about the estimable Shàu-gūng. Then we go back to the Jōu-nán with its emphasis on marriage protocol, to read, no, not yet Shī 1, but the easier Shī 9, emphasizing the proper access to women and *preparing the way* for Shī 1. We introduce the male world with a condemnation of impropriety in Shī 52 (sharpened in the attached anecdotes to warnings against insubordination, conquest, and unrituality), and with the plaint of an officer in Shī 26. Shī 33 zigzags closer to Shī 1 with its lament of a lovesick woman (it will be a man in Shī 1), introducing (*from a woman*, cf Shī 21) the first praise of a male figure. All this uses easily-decoded poems to implant feelings of human sympathy, respect for women, public duty, and ardor for right conduct.

At which point, 15 lessons (anecdotes) have passed, and Hán Yīng, whose feelings about the enterprise were no doubt precisely those of Hightower and the Sž-kù editors, heaves a sigh of relief and at long last feels that he is safe in opening the book at Shī 1. From there, he zigzags through the early Fvng in proper order, departing from it only at final-exam time, when he introduces (as many of us would have done earlier, perhaps directly after the second Shàu-nán piece, Shī 17) the praise-song of Shàu-gūng, Shī 16, to tie the year's work together and, subtly but necessarily, to commend his pupil.

And so on, for three more years. None of this is deductive, or even demonstrable, but all of it is situationally plausible, and, unlike the alternative hypotheses, it leads us to a Hán Shī Nèi-jwàn: a "Palace Introduction to the Shī as Taught by Master Hán" in 4 fully finished chapters, representing 4 year-long series of easy, relevant, progressive tutorials, with pedagogically intelligible departures from an underlying Shī sequence of material, and all now exactly datable to the years 0144-0141.

Which is to say that the 1963 Nishimura article cited by Hightower (Loewe p128), which I have not seen, may have been on the right track. A conception of HSWJ as a pedagogical rather than exegetical work also explains the instances where successive anecdotes end *on the same poem*. Here, plausibly, is the principle of classroom economy: once you have worked up a text, exploit it from several angles before taking up the next. On this recurrent feature of the text, which is fully intelligible in practical teaching terms, the Hightower “exegetical” reconstruction sheds no light whatever.

**The Nèi-jwàn.** So much for the conjectural Nèi-jwàn. It brings us to the majority of the King of Cháng-shān and the accession of Emperor Wǔ, both occurring in 0140. It is to be assumed that regular tutorials stopped at this time, but it is self-evident that the original plan had been successful enough to warrant its continuation, unchanged in essential features, during the tutorial years proper. In 0140 Hán Yīng will have put aside his four-year syllabus, but he was perhaps, after all, rather pleased with it. In 0137, the King formally visited the central court, with Yīng probably in attendance, and possibly receiving imperial commendation for his performance as tutor. It is then conceivable that the Nèi-jwàn was itself presented to the throne at this juncture, and subsequently stored, as presumably all such presented texts were stored, in the Palace library.

**The Wài-jwàn.** For the original Wài-jwàn, only a frankly conjectural suggestion can be made. It is this: that with august approval (and wider knowledge) of his Nèi-jwàn, Yīng may have been moved to consider extending his method to a more general audience (the Wài of the title), and thus over the next few years sketched out some alternate sequences on the same general plan, concentrating this time on the more difficult pieces (there had been no Dà Yǎ at all in the Nèi syllabus, whereas there are several traversals in the Wài material). Their unfinished state (some overlap, some missing tags) suggests that these were never put to practical use, like 6 volumes of intermediate Chinese readings which I once sketched out as a projected continuation of a rather successful 4 volumes of beginning readings, the whole now deposited not in the Palace library but in my attic. The point is that, however humble the task, one is glad of its success, and may then waste more time on it out of mere momentum. If Yīng did fall into such an involvement-trap (when he could instead have been winning favor with Hightower and the Sẏ-kù editors by compiling a series of closely-argued glosses on the more inscrutable Shĕ passages), then the mildest assumption is that he fussed at them off and on, at the same pace as the original lessons, the 6 Wài-jwàn drafts thus perhaps occupying the years 0136-0131.

**Death.** If Yīng was 32 when given scholarly recognition by Emperor Wǔn (c0179; for his arrival at Jǐng-dì’s court see p16 below) he will have been about 74 on his return to court in 0137. His debate with Dǔng Jùng-shū (born c0179; 31 years Yīng’s junior) is undated, but must follow Yīng’s return to court in 0137. If it was intended as a Confucian/Confucian generation confrontation to highlight the 0136 Confucian triumph, it may have occurred in c0135: Yīng was then 76 and Jùng-shū 45. Given the 80-year lifespan conjectured by Hightower, Yīng’s death will have come in c0130. Assuming that Yīng was then still in favor, his six Wài-jwàn drafts may have been presented to court (at the court’s request) by Yīng’s pupil and probable executor, Master Féi of Hwái-nán.

**So.** We have spent 4 pages on HSWJ, reached a new theory of the work, and dated it to c0144-0141 (Nèi-jwàn) and c0136-0131 (the unfinished supplementary Wài-jwàn). This is only 6 to 19 years off Hightower's c0150. Has the result been worth the effort?

I would say so. For one thing, no one will mistake Hightower's c0150 as meaning "probably in 0150"; it is a way of saying "mid 02c", and not really a date at all. As such, it is not subject to routine refutation (no future archaeology will turn up evidence placing the HSWJ *out* of the timespan 0180-0120). But it is *for that very reason* not actionable. It just sits there. My c0144-0141, on the other hand, looks like, and is, a real proposal. It invites reference to contemporary events, and in so doing courts refutation as a result of that comparison. To put it positively, it is a hypothesis which by its precision is liable to be confirmed or refuted by other evidence, and if refuted, to be modified in the direction of the truth. Let us subject it to that test, and see if anything turns up.

**Context.** What chiefly turns up is the court battle between Confucianism (favored by several emperors) and Dàuism (supported by palace womenfolk, notably Empress Dòu). As every 12-year-old knows, this battle culminated in Emperor Wǔ's 0136 establishment of Confucianism as the official doctrine of the empire (followed in 0135 by the death of Empress Dòu), but it had a long seesaw history before then. Wǎn-dì's giving recognition to Hán Yīng *for his Shī expertise* is an early pro-Confucian step. In 0156 Jǐng-dì took the throne, and continued to bring Confucians to court; in 0148 the Shī expert Ywǎn Gù offended Empress Dòu, and was forced to duel with a boar (a duel which he won only because the Emperor saw that he was given a sharp weapon). The next year, 0147, Gù was reassigned from the court to a Tutorship of the King of Chīng-hí (in old Chí); this was surely to get him out of harm's way while still using him in the construction of a Confucian future for the court itself. The reassigning of Hán Yīng from *his* court post to a Tutorship in Cháng-shān (in old Jàu) seems in this context not like a routine chore, but like another instance of prudent relocation of national resources. This in turn means that the assignment was not a perfunctory one, but was intended to produce educational results in future. Such seriousness would explain the care with which Hán Yīng did his planning, and the pride which (as conjectured above) he felt on completing it, which is attested by the preservation of the work itself, not to mention its continuation past the period of the tutorship proper, if one may so interpret the supposed Wài-jwàn (HSWJ 5-10). The "internal" conjectures, above, may thus now be fruitfully reconsidered in the light of these external factors. As to HSWJ 5-10, the above suggestion, based on individual "momentum," while not impossible, is also personalistic and thus thin. A better motive lies in the fact that the proposed Wài-jwàn beginning date, 0136, is the year of Wǔ-dì's establishment of Confucianism, which would in turn immediately have created a much wider need for Confucianizing teaching materials. Here, then, is a real motive. And if HSWJ 5-10 were a purposive activity rather than a leisured pastime, its interruption by death in c0130, and its receipt even in incomplete form by the Hàn court (in whose archive it was thus later available to Lyóu Syàng) makes better sense.

HSWJ emerges from these conjectures as part of the history of Confucian pedagogy, before (Nèi) and after (Wài) the official establishment of Confucianism at the Hàn court.

**Interplay.** As such, it may have something to tell us about interactions between the several strains of thought in these philosophically tumultuous years. It is not surprising, in view of Yīng's HSWJ 1 emphasis on the ruler's empathy with his subjects, that he elsewhere comes to the defense of Mencius. In HSWJ 4:22 he cites the Sywǎndž (SZ) 6 attack on twelve philosophers, *leaving out the last pair*, who originally (pace Dubs, who would rewrite the SZ 6 text from HSWJ 4:22) were Dž-sž and Mencius. This does not make Hán Yīng anti-Sywǎnzian; the majority of his anecdotes are drawn from Sywǎndž. It merely shows that, for all his seeming eclecticism, *he has a point of view*.

**Dàuism.** The same applies to his relation with Dàuism. Seven HSWJ passages have sources or counterparts (ranging in size from a single line to a long anecdote) in the Jwāngdž (JZ) text. On this seeming indifferentism, Hightower has this to say (1948 p250): "The [Dàuist] sources used by [Hán Yīng] in connection with a Confucian Classic show to what extent [Dàuist] thought was acceptable to a [Hàn] Confucianist". We can now be a little more exact than this, since for us Hán Yīng is not merely a "Hàn Confucianist" but a "late transitional 0144-0131 Mencius-prone Sywǎnzian Hân Confucianist".

The Jwāngdž (JZ) lies at some remove behind whole anecdotes or single lines at seven places in HSWJ, and Jwāng Jōu himself is characterized in an eighth; the distribution is HSWJ 1 (twice), 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8 (also twice), an exactly even division between the original Nèi and Wài. Given the nature of the HSWJ text, it is assumed that the HSWJ is secondary (if not tertiary) in all instances of common material. This of itself does not make HSWJ particularly hospitable to Dàuism per se. The Jwāngdž, however subversive in intent, is frequently Confucian in its presentational format: Confucius (as is often remarked) is quoted more often in the work than Jwāng Jōu, and Yén Hwéi appears in it as a paragon of meditational skill. Such Confucian-toned sections, further adjusted in HSWJ or its intermediate sources, account for four JZ contacts. These are: HSWJ 1:9, a blend of two Dzvǎngdž poverty stories from JZ 28:11-12; HSWJ 2:12, a chariot-driving parable with a kindness-to-the-people moral from JZ 19:14 via the version in LSCC 19E; HSWJ 7:7, a Dzvǎngdž filial piety story expanded from JZ 27:3; and HSWJ 8:3, a virtuous-refusal-of-office story expanded from JZ 28:10 and further extended (Hightower 1952 p254 n1) to have a moral opposite to the original. Even in the last case, the original Jwāngdzian principled refusal of office is actually a classic Confucian position in this ongoing issue, not a distinctively Dàuist one. If a lost JZ 27-28 were to be excavated next week, *without label*, it would be a rash commentator who would dare to posit a "Dàuist" source for them. A striking but not specifically Dàuist image, the great fish who, once stranded, becomes prey to insects, occurs in JZ 23:1 and also in HSWJ 8:36. This use of neutral or already-Confucian material, as we see from the HSWJ chapter numbers, equally characterizes the Nèi and Wài series.

None of this has anything to do with Confucian eclecticism. It rather attests the Confucian nature of the common meadow in which, at this time, the several philosophical reapers independently gathered their hay. In this unfenced field, among other grasses, Confucius, several of his followers, and several of their favorite attitudes and issues, bloomed at large, and were more or less equally available for harvesting by all comers.

The remaining three instances of JZ contact, to which for completeness we may add as a fourth the one case of HSWJ borrowing from Lǎudž, depart from this common usage and tell a quite different tale. They attest a change of stance from the sharply oppositional pre-Establishment Nèi-jwàn to the genially assimilative post-Establishment Wài-jwàn.

Two of these four Dàuist contacts fall in the Nèi-jwàn. In HSWJ 1:14 a “traditional saying” is quoted from JZ 8:3, to the effect that the senses are intrinsically selfish. The quotation formula is notable: the “common-pasture” material discussed above was simply offered in HSWJ’s own narrative voice, as a primary statement. The clearly irreconcilable content of the JZ 8:3 quote is also notable: the argument is neither classic nor current Confucian, but hedonist. Having quoted this saying, HSWJ then bends it, with a complete absence of logical connection, to a Confucian conclusion anchored with the final Shī tag. The feeling is not of a bit of common lettuce plucked for the Confucian sandwich, but of a renegade opinion strenuously lassoed off the meadow and rebranded. The second Nèi case is HSWJ 4:22, the Sywǎndž 6 denunciations, where the name of Jwāng Jōu replaces one of the original, obsolete renegade philosophers on Sywǎndž’s original list. Than this, opposition can scarcely be more openly acknowledged. The implication of these passages is that the Nèi-jwàn dates from a period of open Dàuist/Confucian conflict. This agrees with the chronological position above assigned to it: a phase of the court ideology battle in which the Confucians were momentarily in retreat.

We now turn to the Wài-jwàn cases, which we attribute to the years immediately after the court triumph of Confucianism and the death of its great enemy, Empress Dòu. And we find there a different atmosphere. The first point is that the open hostility of HSWJ 4:22 does not recur in any form in the Wài-jwàn material. The second is that when HSWJ 5:6 borrows the famous wheelwright story from JZ 13:8, with its explicit challenge to any text-based tradition whatever, it neither distances it by explicit quotation nor subverts it by rewriting. Instead, *it agrees with it*, closing with a Shī quote on the mystery of antiquity, and a final rhetorical question: who can attain to the understanding of the sages of old? The answer, obviously in the Mencian-leaning context of HSWJ, is: the perceptive Confucian. The original JZ story has been not so much *reinterpreted* as *incorporated whole* into the outlook of the HSWJ. The third and last point is raised by HSWJ 9:16, which states that the sage will not endure shame or disgrace for mere success (the classic pure-Confucian tradition, also strongly articulated in the Mencian writings). We expect that this will be gently led, as was the pure and scrupulous JZ 27:3 tale in HSWJ 8:3, into its opposite, emphasizing the need to function in the end as the saviour of the world. But no, nothing of the kind. There follows an explicit quote from “Lǎudž” (an abridged Dàu-Dý Jīng 44-46), in praise of individual contentment, ending with no Shī tag whatever, but with a reaffirmation. As with the wheelwright challenge, so with this rejection-of-fame challenge: HSWJ *simply agrees with it*.

**One World.** What is going on here? I would suggest: now that the court war is won, and the Dàuists are no longer to be feared, they can with impunity be simply ingathered, increasing the richness of the Confucian discourse medium, which with the end of enmity expanded at this point to become, as it still is, *simply the Chinese discourse medium*.

**Legalism.** To see if similar conditions obtain, we may briefly reconnoiter the Legalist counterpart frontier via the six HSWJ borrowings from the Hán Fēidǔ (HFZ).

Of these there are two in the Nèi-jwàn (HSWJ 2:5, 3:21) and four in the Wài-jwàn (7:10, 7:20, 9:11, 9:24). None is introduced by a distancing formula; as with the common-discourse Jwāngdǔ contacts, they are simply given. Nor have the Nèi-jwàn ones a Legalist character: 2:5 is a discussion between two Confucians on the result of study, 3:21 is a colloquy with a minister of Lǔ about accepting gifts. Some Wài-jwàn pieces are on this level (7:20 on choosing, 9:11 on recommending, the right men), but in others a statecraft element appears: HSWJ 7:10 (from HFZ via HNZ) tells of a minister given so much power over punishments (as distinct from rewards) that he ousts the ruler, and 9:24, the corrupting of a Rúng King and the luring away of his minister by a Chín diplomat. Advice to rulers does occur in the Analects/Mencius tradition, but the Confucians prefer to present such topics as advice to ministers; the theory of the ruler/minister relation, above the level of minister procurement, is beyond their usual range. These two HSWJ tales show Yīng working in a wider range. Here, as with the Dàuist wheelwright, the Confucians after 0136 seem to have annexed intellectual ground from their former rivals.

**Conclusion.** In summary: (1) with both Dàuists and Legalists, there is on both sides of 0136 a zone of common practice, with Confucian figures and Lǔ rulers as characters and the trials of public service as plots, available to all three factions; (2) before 0136, the Confucians also recognize with Dàuists, *though not with Legalists*, a zone of conflict, where lines are drawn, texts are cited, and names are named, thus attesting the court conflict between the two; finally (3) from both Dàuists and Legalists, the Confucians after 0136 annex previously unshared ground, and take over nearly all aspects of the public philosophical debate. These stages show in fine detail how the Confucians, formerly one of many contending viewpoints, became after 0136 *synonymous with China*.

As for the mere HSWJ, it seems, on the above inferences, to work like this:

- 0145 Hán Yīng appointed tutor to Lyóu Shùn
- 0144 HSWJ 1 completed; lesson sequence for Lyóu Shùn
- 0143 HSWJ 2; ditto
- 0142 HSWJ 3; ditto
- 0141 HSWJ 4; ditto (Nèi-jwàn now complete)
- 0141 Lyóu Shùn reaches 20; regular lessons cease
- 0140 Wǔ-dì 1st year
- 0137 Lyóu Shùn visits court, Hán Yīng presents Nèi-jwàn (HSWJ 1-4)
- 0136 Wǔ-dì establishes Confucianism as official state ideology
- 0136 Hán Yīng remains in capital; HSWJ 5 sketched as sequel
- 0135 Confucian Hán Yīng debates Confucian Dǔng Jùng-shū; HSWJ 6 sketched
- 0134 HSWJ 7 sketched
- 0133 HSWJ 8 sketched
- 0132 HSWJ 9 sketched
- 0131 HSWJ 10 sketched (Wài-jwàn now roughed out)
- 0130 Hán Yīng dies; Wài-jwàn sketches (HSWJ 5-10) posthumously presented