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ABBREVIATIONS

HN Hewainantzyy 淮南子
has been attacked by Karlgren, Maspero, Waley, and at first Karlgren, continued to include Liehtzy among the pre-Hann sources. 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 Lao tzu 老子 as a scriptural authority (Hwaianantszy 淮南子, Wentai 文天子 and the Taoist element in Horn Fei tszy 韓非子), while Liehtzy quotes him only three times.

Recently there have been signs that Western resistance to the prevailing Chinese opinion is beginning to weaken. Karlgren is now impressed by cases in which the term “I, my” is used as object, against pre-Hann usage. He no longer insists on the scarcity of quotations from Lao tzu, but still maintains that, since some of the rhymes are demonstrably archaic, the book cannot be later than the Former Han dynasty. Bodde shows the custom of releasing doves on New Year’s Day, mentioned in a Lao tzu story and often regarded as Buddhist, existed during the Later Han. Since there are no references to this and other manifestations of the Hann dovecult before the first century A.D., he concludes that the Lao tzu story is late, but does not commit himself as to the date of the book as a whole. Zürcher considers the book quite heterogeneous; many parts are pre-Hann, others are as late as A.D. 300. Finally Creel 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 Shihlulue’s twenty objections to suppose that the rejection of Liehtzy was merely a temporary aberration like the rejection of the Tseoujuann 左傳 in China. But Chinese scholars soon recovered their faith in the antiquity of the latter text, while most of them remain unshakable in their conviction that Liehtzy belongs to the third or fourth century A.D. Moreover if we examine

---

4 Of pp. 187–8 below.
6 J., 7b/3–6.
7 Buddhist Conquest of China (Leyden, 1939), 274–6.
9 Exceptions are Liou Ruolin 歐汝新, who thinks that little of the book is later than the Former Han (JS 206–8), and Tsern Jongkun 孫仲刊 (Leang Tou wen hsii-lu 聽唐文史叢談, Peking 1938, 313–23), who dates it in the third century B.C.
consecutively the arguments proposed by various Chinese critics, including several of Mao 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, 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 張廓. Two passages seem to refer to transmigration. The idea that life is a dream, hardly more than a provocative fancy in early Taoism, occupies the whole third chapter of Liehzyu 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 mâyâ. The story of the mechanical man is very like an Indian story in the Buddhist Shengjing, translated into Chinese in A.D. 285. Although in many cases of parallel texts there is no evidence which is primary, there is good reason to believe that Hwan Tarn 楊諭 (died A.D. 56) was the first to write down the story of Confucius and the two children, and that the Muh tiantzyu juann 無天子傳 (discovered in A.D. 281) is Liehzyu’s source for the travels of King Muh. In the story of the man who lost his memory, the Confucian doctor is called a rusheng 儒生, a term first current in the Hann period. At the end of ch. 5 the reference to a man who doubted reports of

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). The dates proposed for Liehzyu are separated by more than half a millennium 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 Liehzyu 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 Liehzyu 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. Maspéro fixes the date very precisely by pointing out that Liehzyu quotes the Guoyue 國語, Yanntzyu yanntzyu 禹 者 亜 gtw 古 者 古 者, and according to Michel Soymié (L’Entrevue de Confucius et de Hsiang T’o, Journal Asiatique 242 (1934), 317–91) the Duenhwang 敦煌 MSS of the dialogue are students’ exercises (36). Soymié mentions the Liehzyu anecdotes 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 (38).

14 J. 5 A. 4; 7 B. 10.
15 J. 5 A. 7 B. 6.
17 Mau Shihluen, Objections Nos. 17 and 5. For King Muh’s travels, cf. Chen Wenbo 陳文波, A Proof that Liehzyu is a Forgery, in Gaushiybian, 4/299–338. See also pp. 169f below.
18 J. 5 A. 7 B. 6.
19 Mau Shihluen, Objection No. 7.

See page 143 for continuation.
the Chinese conviction that most of the book is late, although only Yang Borjuna has looked for particular examples of late words and constructions. 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 Shiu-huen. But if so, we need to find linguistic criteria by which to test their intuition.


Liehtzy has existed since the fourth century as a book in eight chapters, with a preface and commentary by Yang Jann 张浩 (late fourth century) and an attached report ascribed to Liou Shian 畫良 (79-8 B.C.). The commentary guarantees the chapter divisions by notes after the chapter headings, and the preface mentions the mahulu 目錄, evidently the Liou Shian report. Liehtzy in eight juan 卷 is entered in the table of contents of the lost Tsyhchau 子書 of Yeu Jiongroung 熊仲容 (475-548), and reappears in every historical bibliography from the Sui dynasty (589-617) onwards. There is a Duenhwang 敦煌 manuscript of a fragment of the Yang Joo 楊州 chapter with Jang Jann's commentary, written before 627. Extracts from Liehtzy, all to be found in the present book, appear in the Chywhau jhyhwa 羽書治要 of Wey Jeng 魏徵 (presented in 631) and in the Yihin 意林 (latest preface 787), an abridgement of the Tsyhchau made by Maa Tzoong 閨總 (died 825); both include some of Jang Jann's notes. In the eighth century the Liou Shian report and Jang Jann preface are quoted in Lu Chornghyuwan's 魯重玄 preface to his new commentary, and in the ninth century they are annotated in the Liehtzy shihhuen 釋文 of In Jingshuen 楊敬順, which survives in a text revised by Chern Jiingyuan 潜景元 (Preface dated 1069). The earliest printed edition is the Northern Song 宋 edition reproduced in the Syuhhu tongshan. This lacks the report and the preface, which are supplied in the Syuhhu tongshan from the Heikou 黑口 edition (Ming).

But there is only one witness earlier than the fourth century, the entry "Liehtzy, eight juan" (列子八篇) under the Taoist school in the bibliographical section of the Hannshu. The many scholars who have investigated Liehtzy have found no external evidence that the present book existed before Jang Jann, and no reference to a book of this title independent of the Hannshu. According to Jang Biinglin 章炳麟 "No Han writer quotes Liehtzy. From Wang (Bih 篇 226-249), Her (Yann 何晏 c. 193-249), Ji (Kang 權康 223-262) and Roan (Jih 伍氏 210-263) down to Yuen Coang 鄭康, among the documents through which the mysticism of the chingtarn 清談 school is scattered, there are still no quotations from Liehtzy." 

Ger Horng 葛洪 (254-334), complaining of the paucity of alchemical information in the Taoist philosophers, mentions Laozi, Juangtze, even Wentzy 文子 and Guanyintzze 閎尹子, but not Liehtzy.

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

1/3. Sun Yungui's 蘇貞侯 bibliography of the Jann dynasty (Ellihyuwau shuy 樂府書譜, 372) records a lost commentary on Liehtzy by Shian Shio (from I.312). But this is a mistake. The supposed quotation from this commentary is in fact from Shian Shio's commentary on Juangtzy as quoted in Jang Jann's commentary on Liehtzy (I.I 8/10).

Dau Hanno chang yon 任風昌言 (Junguyong tongshu 桐氏通書) I.4, 5A.

Liehtzy shares a number of passages with the Gouhhyoun 宮氏傳 of Hwang-fu Mih 夏侯民 (235-82) and the Boruwhy from the glossary of Jang Hwa 王華 (232-309). The Syuhhu yihin 西漢意林 editors believed, with good reason in the former case, that the extract texts are recompositions from quotations and from other sources, of which Liehtzy was one. In the case of the Boruwhy this hypothesis (which assumes the disappearance of the book after the Song) was discredited by the discovery of the Northern Song Yeh edition, version first printed in the Syuhhu tongshan 士習編纂. However, the very uncertain textual history of the book makes it doubtful when the Liehtzy passages entered it. Two details suggest that they come from a text already carrying Jang Jann's commentary:

(i) Jang Jann's note: "This episode also appears in Mehtzy" (LT I.5, 3A/5) is reproduced in the Boruwhy (Yingyihyoun 影印本) I.5, 8/6, unaltered except for the omission of the third character.

(ii) In LT I.5, 3A/1 Jang Jann explains that the word 彼 means "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 I.8, 4A/8 Jang Jann translates 彼 as 彼, used in the Leuchy chuenchou, originally written six hundred years before Jang Jann, actually reads the latter word where Liehtzy reads the former.) But here the word in question is a common one used obscurely in its context.

Bongpaztzy 梁朴子, I.8, 3B.
Jann's grandfather Jang Yi 亙 was a friend of Liou Taur 剃陶 and Fuh Fu 傳敷 (c. 275-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 (246–249), the owners of a library of nearly ten thousand volumes passed down from Wang Tsann 業 (177–217). He evidently wishes us to understand that Lichtzwy may have belonged to this famous library, presented to Wang Tsann by Tsay Long 真隆 (132–93). At the time of the breakdown of the Western Jin 唐 dynasty, during the Yangtzu 永嘉 period (307–312), Jang Yi fled South. He took with him only his rarest books; these included Lichtzwy in eight pian, but on the journey he lost all except the Yang Ja 楊朱 and Shuafou 謝符 chapters and the meihuch (the Liou Shianq memorial). He recovered four jiann from the house of Liou Taur, who had crossed the Yangtze earlier, and six from the house of Jaw Jihtzwy 業季子, son-in-law of Wang Bih. By collating these he restored the complete text.

Three points deserve attention:

(1) According to this account, Lichtzwy was a rare book during the Western Jin, and after the migration across the Yangtze 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 Han.

(2) Jang Jann is generous in naming people who knew Lichtzwy, 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 "should read X". But his few variants (introduced by or 作"some read X") are from the parallel text in Jiuntzwy. ⑩

⑩ For the names of Jang Jann's father and grandfather (not given in the preface and its Shyhuen notes), see Liou Jann 劉案 (482–521), commentary on Shyhuen shiyun, 夏士言 46A.

⑪ Boroulylthj 4, 4B/6–5A/1.

⑫ LT 1–1, 4A/1–2, 5B/8, 5A/9, 6B/6 and passim.

⑬ LT 1–2, 7A/4, 8, 12, 17B/12. Alternative characters for the names of two states, written in nearly every text which mentions them, are given with the formula for X, "also X" (LT 3, 5A/5, 5A/7). For these names, cf. Wang Shwumin 王秋敏, Lightzwy bujing 禮正 (Commercial Press, 1948), 1–3, 20A, 21B.
Part 2. PASSAGES SHARED BY LIEHTZYY AND OTHER TEXTS

1. Introduction and List of Parallels.

About a quarter of Liehtzyy 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 Liehtzyy bwejeng, 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. Although important for other lines of inquiry, such passages are irrelevant to our present task, which is to find evidence that Liehtzyy uses or is used in documents of known date.

---

42 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.
43 Cf. p. 190 below.
44 A. C. Graham
45 For example.
46 For example.
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10A/8-12 JT.j.7, 10A
10A/13-16LSCC.j.15, 13A, HN.j.12, 4A

j.3 1A/12-14 HN.j.19, 13B
2A/4-13 Mah tiantzyy juamu 8A, 9A, B, 15A, B, 19B-20A
3A/4-6 Joulii j.6, 28B
3A/10-12 Lingshuang 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 Mohitzzy j.10, 48B/2 f
7B/14-8A/2 JT.j.10, 35A

j.5 1B/13-2A/3 HN.j.3, 1A, 6, 6B Luennherng 論衡 j.11, 1A
2B/9-12 JT.j.5, 5B
2B/12 f JT.j.1, 6B
3A/10 f Joulii j.11, 3A
4A/3-5 Shanhaeijing 下 81A/3-5, 44A/7-9
4A/5-7 Shanhaeijing 下 36A
5A/5-9 Mohitzzy j.6, 14B
5A/9-13 Hwan Tarn, Shinluwn 新論 ap. Faayuann julin

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, this may seem rather a surprising omission. But Haloun's method

Cf. G. Haloun, Legalist Fragments, Part 1, Aria 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.

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.

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 uniformity 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. Mohtzy

Of the four passages shared with Mohtzy, three belong to the Canons and Explanations. In Mohtzy 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 "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 Liefzy parade makes it plain that Liefzy borrows directly from Mohtzy.

Mohtzy 12, 4A/2 之之之 

18A/3 (之). 之之之之之之之之之

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."

LT j.3, 5B/2 之之之之之之之之之

LT j.4, 7B/2 之之之之之之之之之

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

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

Mohtzy 12, 4B/2 之之之之之之之之之

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

LT j.4, 7B/2 之之之之之之之之之

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

2/3. Juangzy

At first sight it may seem pointless to look for evidence that common passages in Juangzy and Liefzy 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 Juangzy are either brief and simple anecdotes like the story of the keeper of monkeys, or mere settings for dialogue; even the lengthy story of Confucius visiting Robber Jyr in the Dow Jyr 窮 章 chapter is merely a slightly dramatized conversation. Nothing in Juangzy resembles the intricately organized narrative of the stories of the old peasant Shangchiou Kai (該 齊 齊), of King Muh and the wizard, of the avenging son and the three swords. On the other hand the Liefzy stories, although more complex as narrative, are much simpler in style. In the parts of Liefzy without parallels, even the Taoist discourse is generally as prosaic as the stories, bare of imagery and unrhymed. If we isolate the passages common to the two books, it is soon clear that they are in the manner of Juangzy——
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 Liehtzyy is one of the easiest of ancient texts and Fuangzzyy one of the most difficult, but this is a difference which few readers can have failed to notice; and when preparing a translation of Liehtzyy I had as much trouble with passages common to the two books as with the rest of Liehtzyy taken together.

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

1. Preposition HU

The preposition hu is used in Fuangzzyy almost as freely as yu 禹. In passages shared with Liehtzyy it is as common as elsewhere:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hu</th>
<th>Yu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2B/14-3A/10</td>
<td>4(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B/6-9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B/13-7A/5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B/9-3A/11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A/11-3B/5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A/2-11</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A/12-5B/7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B/7-14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B/8-7B/12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B/13-8B/1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B/2-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B/9-12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.6</td>
<td>2B/13-3A/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The figures exclude 禹 and 禹. The numbers in brackets are those of the Fuangzzyy text, where it differs from the Liehtzyy text.)

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

Parallels with Fuangzzyy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parallels with Fuangzzyy</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Hwainantzzyy</td>
<td>6... 8B/1 f (HN 于), j.8, 4A/7, 5A/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Jicyu</td>
<td>2... j.1, 4B/2, j.8, 3A/11(JY 于)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Joshu</td>
<td>j.5, 9B/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Harshy wayjuann</td>
<td>j.6, 5B/11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No known parallel

---

Of the ten cases peculiar to Liehtzyy, four are from the composite section on metamorphoses, which will be discussed shortly.\(^{48}\) 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 面

"you, your". Liehtzyy uses it nine times in passages shared with Fuangzzyy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ERL</th>
<th>Fuangzzyy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J.1</td>
<td>3A/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.2</td>
<td>5A/6, 6B/12, 14, 8A/12, 13, 8B/6 ter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elsewhere it appears twice, in the story of the man who walked through stone and fire.\(^{44}\) This immediately follows the story of the boy who loved seagulls, known by quotations to have belonged to the lost longer version of Fuangzzyy. The two stories are preceded by three also found in the present Fuangzzyy, and followed by four more. It is therefore likely that this story too once belonged to Fuangzzyy.

3. Interrogative Particle YU 與, 欄

In Fuangzzyy the particle is written without the addition of Radical 76. In Liehtzyy it occurs twenty times in passages without parallels, and with one exception,\(^{46}\) it 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 Liehtzyy shyken, which ignores the particle when it is written with the radical, but makes a note (音 "Pronounce yu") when it is not. In all the cases peculiar to Liehtzyy it confirms the reading of the Northern Song edition reproduced in the Syhbuu tsonkan.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parallels</th>
<th>Fuangzzyy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J.2, 5A/6</td>
<td>Radical omitted, in a sentence missing from the present text of the Fuangzzyy parallel. Confirmed by Shyken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B/12</td>
<td>Radical omitted, as in Fuangzzyy. Confirmed by Shyken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.6, 7A/1</td>
<td>Radical included, in contrast with Fuangzzyy. The quoted character in the Taoist canon text of the Shyken also has the radical, but the note (&quot;Pronounce yu&quot;) shows that the ninth century text omitted it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{48}\) Cf. p. 156 below.

\(^{44}\) J.2, 6A/11 67. It may be mentioned that, although I have elsewhere (BSOAS 22 (1959) 538 n. 3) argued against Dobson that "erl" is almost exclusively possessive in the Fuangzzyy, his claim that it also serves as agent is certainly true of Fuangzzyy.

\(^{46}\) J.4, 7A/2.
Thus Liehtzyy 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 Liehtzyy is very complicated; there is abundant evidence both that Liehtzyy 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 Liehtzyy 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 primordial germ. Liehtzyy gives a much longer version. Its first addition is a phrase from the Mohist canons:

Mohtzyy j. 10, 2B/6 《化》, 微易也。

8A/3 《化》。若必為是。

Canon "Transformation is change involving the marks of identity.

Explanation Like frogs becoming quails."

LT j. 6, 36A 《化》。 得水為鴨。

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

LT j. 1, 3A/3 《化》。若無為鴨。得水為鴨。

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 Gongshen Long. 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 Gongshen Long story.

The next additions mend breaks in the evolutionary chain:

LT j. 1, 3A/9 斯晩為食蟲頭銜。《食蟲頭銜》生子食蟲頭銜。

[食蟲頭銜]生子九兇，[九兇生子替芮]，替芮

生惡蠻。

"The symii becomes the shyrshih liuh, which gives birth to the shyrshih-wangkuang, which gives birth to the jooeyou, which gives birth to the mawruey, which gives birth to the fushuan."

But there remains one break in Liehtzyy's chain, immediately following the sentences just quoted. Into this gap Liehtzyy 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 yuhaan.
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LT j. 1, 3A/10-11 馬血之為轉鄉也，人血之為野火也，螟之為鴨，鴨之為布硬，布硬久復為頑也，燕　　之為蛤也，田鼠之為蠟也，朽瓜之為魚也，老鮑之為木也，老腸之為緩也，魚卵之為鱉也，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 cucuoos, cucuoos 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."

The same sequence of quotations in the Taypyng yuhaan 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) Liehtzyy expands the juangtzyy text with additions from various sources which destroy the evolutionary sequence.

(2) Nevertheless in the second passage above Liehtzyy 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 東象 (died 312), according to the postface to his commentary, preserved in a MS at the Kōzanji 寒山寺, Kyoto. Among the commentaries used in the juangtzyy shyhuen of Luh Derning 畊德朋 (died 627), only those of Syma Biau 司馬彪 (died 306) and Meng 孟 covered the full text. The editor of Liehtzyy 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 Liehtzy and the shaman shares readings which Luh Derning quotes from the text of the commentator Tsuei Juann 崔讚 (fourth century), and

---

**Footnotes:**

18 The last seven characters, needed to complete the sentence, are preserved only in the Taypyng yuhaan parallel. But Jang Jann's note paraphrases them, showing that they also stood in his text of Liehtzyy.


20 1.2, 6B-7B
that the readings of the Liehtzzy skyhwen for this passage are even closer to
the Tauei text. 60

2/4. Leushy rhcnehchicou

The Leushy rhcnehchicou is among the best preserved of pre-Hann
texts. It was compiled under the direction of Leu Buhwei (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.). 61

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 Leushy rhcnehchicou themselves. One passage
shared with Liehtzzy begins with a story and continues with the succeeding
argument right to the end of the chapter. 62 It contains a sentence which
confirms the impression that the Leushy rhcnehchicou cannot be borrowing
from an earlier source:
LSCC j.15, 4B/10 齊荆賈切者 胸而卒取亡，不遑乎持
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 Leushy rhcnehchicou,
later than the final destruction of Jing or Chuu 趙 (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-
hwangdi’s 始皇帝 father. The whole sentence appears in Liehtzzy, 63
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. 64 We may
well suspect that Liehtzzy borrowed these passages after the beginning of
the Hann dynasty, although it is possible that both readings are merely
copyist’s corrections.

60 For two recent attempts (using criteria which seem to me unsatisfactory) to
prove that some Liehtzzy passages are earlier than their Juangtzy parallels, see:
Amano Shizuo 天野修雄 On the Precedence of the Liehtz-zu’s Narratives—The
61 WST 1014-16.
62 LT j.8, 5B/13-4A/10.
63 LT j.8, 5B/3.

The Leushy rhcnehchicou 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, 65 its presence in a common passage is a useful sign
that the Leushy rhcnehchicou 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 古此也, 聲者亦然。

“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. 66
Similarly, the story of Mohczas and the dyers has the comment:
LSCC j.2, 8B/2 非獨染絲絨 (Read 然然) 也, 國亦有染。 67

“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 Mohczas. Since it
mentions King Kang 康 (328-286 B.C.) of Sonq 子 by his posthumous
name, it has long been suspected that it entered Mohczas from the Leushy
rcnehchicou. 68 The presence of the formula, which appears a second time
later in the chapter, strongly supports this hypothesis. 69

The story of Liehtzzy 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, 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 Liehtzzy, followed by the same comment,
slightly abridged:
LT j.8, 1B/11 非獨射也。為國亡也, 身亦如之。

“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 Liehtzzy.

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

Several features of Liehtzzy 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:

60 Cf. Mohczas j.7, 1A/9.
61 9A/1.
62 Wu Yuhjiang 吳錫江, Mohczas jiaowuhj 投注 (Dwulh chubaan sheh 菱立出
版社 1944), j.1, 6A.
63 Mohczas j.1, 5B/1, 6B/8.
Liehtzy looked round and watched his shadow. When his body bent his shadow was crooked."

One might explain the extraordinary comprehensiveness of Liehtzy on the assumption that from Juangtzzy 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 Liehtzy 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 Huainantzy, and that its compiler incorporated every reference to his hero that he could find. 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 Liehtzy version is clearly secondary because it conflates passages found in other texts:

1. The story of Duke Juang of Chyi on Ox Mountain exists in two independent versions, in the Yunnntzy chuenchiou of uncertain date and the Harshy wayjuann (c. 150 B.C.). At the end of ch. 6 Liehtzy reproduces the former version expanded by the insertion at five points of extracts from the latter.

2. In Huainantzy 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 神工 and Juanshi 縷沛 appear in different contexts. Liehtzy reproduces the latter story, inserts an abridged version of the former after the introductory 出其 "formerly", and links the two by an intermediate 劍後 "afterwards". The Luenhnbng 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.

3. There are two independent versions of the story of Jaw Shiangtzy's victory over the Dyi 琥, in the Cenuyu and the Luenhky chuenchiou. The latter version, written after 221 B.C., reappears in the Huainantzy, with the conclusion slightly altered to give it a Taoist moral (the last four characters, 以強弱 "uses strategy to turn weakness into strength", become 以弱 uses "makes his strength seem weak"). The same version appears in Liehtzy, in a text which sometimes agrees with the

I am aware of only one pro-Hann or Former Hann reference to Liehtzy which does not appear in the book: Jamgntzch 5. 5A, where he is said to have "valued correctness" (in the use of names) 右正.

Cf. p. 158 above.
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HN j.11, 1B 故高下之相傾也，短長之相形也，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 Hwainantzzy to modify the use of shiou. Previously it meant "length" in contrast with "breadth", goang,"""" in the pre-Hann texts concorded in the Harvard-Yenching Sinological Index Series shiou is never the opposite of doan "short". But under the influence of Hwainantzzy the phrase shiouran "long and short" became common. The Peyuen yünsh""""fú佩文韻府 records five cases, the Tsytung 西通 of Ju Chiienq 朱起鳳 records four; none is earlier than the Hannshu.

The phrase shiouran occurs twice in Lieh-tz""""y, although not in passages with Hwainantzzy parallels.77

2/6. Hwann Tarn

The story of Confucius and the two children28 was in the Shinlun of Hwan Tarn (died A.D. 56), now known only by quotations. Maa Shiuh-luen29 already noticed the significance of his introduction to the story, as quoted in the Fauyawm juian: "I heard this told in the byways when I was young..." (子小時聞聞者言). 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 Lieh-tz""""y story, which has only minor variants, cannot have entered the book before the first century A.D.

Another detail deserves notice. In both Lieh-tz""""y and the Shinlun the numeral used for the two children is not eil 二 but leang 两. As Wang Lib 王力 has pointed out,30 leang is used to number objects which are not natural pairs only from the Hann dynasty.

2/7. Muh tiantzzy juann

Defenders and critics of the antiquity of Lieh-tz""""y agree that the account of the travels of King Muh in ch. 3 is based on the Muh tiantzzy juann. This section is indeed a cento of passages from six different places in the book, and retains the particle yu 子 characteristic of the Muh tiantzzy juann, against Lieh-tz""""y's normal practice of using yu 訥. Since the Muh tiantzzy juann is one of the books, of dubious antiquity, which are said to

---

77 For other cases of the fusion of passages elsewhere separate, cf. j.11, 2B/14-3B/9 No.15.
78 Ode No. 277. Mohtz""""y j.10, 3A/8, 12A/7 (read 鳥 for 鳥) JT j.1, 6B/7.
79 j.5, 2A/3, 3A/12.
80 Observation No 17
80 Hsuinmu ch""""k"""", 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 in A.D. 281; Maa Shiuibluen and Chen Wenbo argue confidently that Lietzzy must be later than this date.

Maspero and Tsern Jongmeen accept the pre-Hann origin of the Muh tiantzy juan, and admit no doubt in assuming that Lietzzy 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 Lietzzy's antiquity who has proposed a counter-argument:

"The quotation from the Mu T'ien Tsu 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 unreflective copyist has inserted an account of this physical journey, not seeing that by doing so he destroyed the whole intention of Lietzzy's fable." 83

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 Lietzzy's fable". Throughout the story King Mu 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. He has 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, 子一人不盈子彊而 諸於樂。後世其迫數 善過乎。

"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 稀王幾神人哉。能窮當身之樂，猶百年乃徃。世以為登假焉。

"How can King Muh be considered a Divine Man? He was able to enjoy his lifetime to the full, but still he died when his hundreds 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 Mu fails. The Yellow Emperor begins as a hedonist like King Mu, then experiments with Confucian methods of government. Disillusioned with both, he retires to meditate, and like King Mu dreams of a journey to a far country, the ideal kingdom of Hwashiushy 豪胥氏, governed according to the Taoist principle of spontaneity (Izhyran 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 又二十六年，天下大治，幾者華胥氏之國，而 帝登假。百姓號之，二百餘年不窺。

"After another twenty-eight years, when the Empire was almost as perfectly governed as the kingdom of Hwashiushy, 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 Mu's chariots and horses, all passages from the Muh tiantzy juan are chosen, and in some cases adapted, to contribute to the scheme of the two stories:

(1) In the Muh tiantzy juan King Mu visits "the men of Jiuhou" (巨蒐之人). In Lietzzy this becomes "the kingdom of Jiuhoushiy" 85
(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 tiantzys juann, the Liehtzy story
concentrates on two; the Jihsou tribesmen give King Muh snowgoose
blood to drink and wash his feet with milk, and Shwiamgmu 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
giving according to their own customs, and he reminds us that Shwiamgmu had
tiger's teeth and tangled hair. Liehtzy 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 尧 where
the sun goes down.86 It is surely not a coincidence that the kingdom of
Hwashiubhy is "West of Yean 尧 province and North of Tair 台 province".87 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 inconspicious position quite early in the Muh
tiantzys juann. In Liehtzy it is put after the other extracts, all of which
precede it in the original book, so that it becomes an expression of disilluisionment
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 tiantzys 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 Liehtzy

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 intro-
duced 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:

87 j.2, 4A/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,98 not yet mentioned, of a passage with a parallel elsewhere but without an immediately preceding "X says".99 But there is another respect in which this case is unique; the parallel, in a letter of the Taoist Yang Wangsueng (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 Wangsueng is quoting Liehtzyz. Further, the editor of Liehtzyz 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 (79–83 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 Liehtzyz at their face value. For example, of the three passages shared with the Dawderjerj, the first is ascribed to the Yellow Emperor, the second is credited to Laotzyz but shows marked variants, the third is introduced as a saying of Laotzyz to Guanyiin. In addition to these, we find a saying from jiangtzyz ascribed to Laotzyz. It seems natural to assume that the text of the Dawderjerj was still in a fluid state, and that Liehtzyz is a valuable witness to its history. Consequently, Maa Shihluuen includes the jiangtzyz saying in his collection of fragments of missing parts of the Dawderjerj,91 and it has come to be widely believed that ch. 6 of the Dawderjerj once stood in a lost work called the Book of the Yellow Emperor.92 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 stories93 already found in jiangtzyz and the Leushzh chuenchau, Liehtzyz was acquainted with Guanyiin, the keeper of the pass to whom Laotzyz gave his book when he set out for the West. So a quotation from the Dawderjerj 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 jiangtzyz saying is ascribed to Laotzyz 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

text of the Dawderjerj is part of a passage taken from Hwainantzzy, the editor ascribed the part adapted from the Dawderjerj to Laotzyz and the rest to Yuhzyz, 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 Liehtzyz recalls over forty years later.94 But if Liehtzyz knew Guan-yiin personally, a reader might well wonder how his teacher could know the Dawderjerj 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 it95 are found in other works (Dawderjerj, Hwoainantzzy, Itzyguyz), none of which mentions that its words have the authority of this most venerable document. Jang Jann did not know of it,96 although he was extremely well informed about books with parallels in Liehtzyz,97 and wrote only a century after the appearance of the last one to engage our attention, the Muh tiantzyz juann.

Part 3. Linguistic Evidence of Date

As we have seen, there is evidence that Liehtzyz borrows from several documents of the third and second centuries B.C., from Hwan Tarn (died A.D. 56), and from the Muh tiantzyz juann, which became available in A.D. 281. We cannot always find evidence that the Liehtzyz 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 Borjiunn98 has already noticed several linguistic signs of late date. These are of great interest, but with a single important exception99 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 你 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

---

90 LT j.1, 4A/8–10.
91 That is, I have noticed only a single example. It is much easier to overlook a parallel in Taoist discourse than in narrative.
92 Laotzyz jiengwu 劉子校校 (Peking 1956), 202.
94 LT j.1, 2B/3–5. Cf. 1A/5, 9 f.
95 LT j.1, 2B, 3B, 4A.
96 LT j.1, 1B/3.
97 Cf. p.198 below.
98 JS 220–44.
always "wo". Karlgren has noticed that there are exceptions in Lieh-tzu-yi. 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".

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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{woo} & \quad j.2, 2A/7, 2B/5, 4A/9, \text{ter}, 4A/14 \\
& \quad j.4, 2A/12, 3A/3 \\
& \quad j.5, 8A/1, 9A/1, 9B/1, 2 \text{ bis}, 2 \text{ bis} \\
& \quad j.6, 1A/4, 3B/14 \\
& \quad j.7, 3B/11 \\
& \quad j.8, 5B/8, 6B/8, 8A/4
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{wu} & \quad j.2, 2A/13, 5A/1 \\
& \quad j.4, 4A/5, 4B/12 \\
& \quad j.5, 8A/11 \\
& \quad j.8, 2B/7, 8B, 59B/11, 8A/4
\end{align*}
\]

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 Shu-o-yuan and Jiayu-yu:

\[
\text{LT} \ j.4, 3A/4 \ f \ 質於子之有以易吾, 吾弗許也。此其所以事吾而不忍也。}
\]

"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 Shu-o-yuan, edited by Liou Shian-q (79-8 B.C.), lacks this passage, and gives the story a different ending. The Jiayu-yu contains it but omits the first "wu". This is one of the many passages shared by these two texts; but the history of the Jiayu-yu down to the third century A.D. is complicated, and it is not certain which text is primary. Three of the passages appear in Lieh-tzu-yi, the readings of which tend to agree with the Jiayu-yu.

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 "wu":

\[
\begin{align*}
(\text{Jung-tzu}) & \quad LT \ j.2, 7A/7, 8A/1, 3A/9, 2A/12 \ \text{ter} \\
(\text{Leuskh chuen-chiou, Hwana-tzu}) & \quad LT \ j.3, 4A/4, 6A/2, 7A/13 \\
(\text{Shyyi-ku}) & \quad LT \ j.6, 2B/5, 6B/8, 9A/10
\end{align*}
\]

The pronouns in Lieh-tzu-yi show another late feature. Wang Liht points out that "ji" is uncommon after any pronoun in the pre-Chen literature. But the pronouns in Lieh-tzu-yi ("wu", "wo", "jenn", "ruu", "ruuk", "eel") are followed by "ji" as many as forty-three times. The following passage shows them both as object and with "ji":

\[
\text{j.4, 4B/11 見人如家, 見吾如人。處吾之家如逆旅之舍, 見吾之鄉如戎營之國。}
\]

"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 Shu-o-yuan and Jiayu-yu:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{j.8, 3B/1f} & \quad 始吾之入也, 先以忠信。及吾之出也, 又從以忠信。
\end{align*}
\]

"When I first enter I use loyalty and good faith in advance, and when I come out I proceed to use them again."

(Shu-o-yuan has only the second "ji", the Jiayu-yu both.)

3/1. Kee 可

In pre-Hann literature there are only sporadic exceptions to the rule that the verb is active after "kee" 可以, passive after "kee" alone. At a later period it becomes common to omit the "ji" with active verbs.

\[
\text{Cf. R. P. Kramer, K'ung ts'ai chia yu (Leiden 1950), 170-81.}
\]

100 Cf. Le proto-chinois, langue flexionnelle (Journal Asiatique, 15 (1930), 205-33). Kennedy, in his Re-examination of the Classical pronoun-forms NGO and NGA (Academia Sinica, 26 (1958), 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, skyh 詩 is, later fourth tone.) He suggests that a word assumed the deflected tone before a pause, and that "wu" 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 "wu" is subject, "woo" is often found in positions where a pause is scarcely conceivable—before "jie" 羣 or "yee" 群, with "jie" 羣 or "yee" 群 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.

101 Cf. p.147 above.

102 His examples of sporadic "wo" "me" in the early Hann are from the Shyyi-ku, Shanghu 父昔, Shu-o-yuan, and Luen-herrng.

103 The sentence is not found in the largely different Leusky chuen-chiou parallel.

104 As preceding note.
In passages peculiar to Liehtzyz an active verb is preceded by *kee* 
twelve times. Eight of these are concentrated in a single passage where the 
parlelisms impose uniformity.110 But there are nine cases of *kee* alone with 
active verbs, for example:

LT j.7, 6A/13 f. 電全生身，不可有其身。雖不睹物，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."110

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

LT j.7, 6A/2 (S) 黃鏡大可學師之舞。

"The Hwangiong and Dahau music cannot follow popular dances."

LT j.8, 3A/14 意者難可以濟乎 (S) YY 可濟矣。

"I think it will be hardly possible to cross?" (S) YY "... hardly possible for it to be crossed."110

3/3. *Fuw* 弗

The resumptive *jy* 之 is comparatively rare in negative sentences 
(except with *wey* 未 and *mah* 好), as Dobson has noticed.111 There are, 
however, two negatives, *faw* and *wuh*, which from the period of the 
*Odes* until early in the Han 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 
*faw* and *wuh* by saying that the former combines the functions of *bu* 不 
and *jy*, the latter of *wu* 勿, 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 *faw* 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 *faw* and *wuh* are reinforced by resumptive *jy* (or *sky* 是 
or *tsy* 此) as exceptions to the rule. Yet the fact that when the verb has a

---

110 LT j.7, 2B/1 bis, j.8, 1B/11 (LSCC), 2B/13, 7B/5.
111 *Fuw* appears more than six hundred times in the fully concorded texts 
includes in the Harvard-Yenching Sinological Index Series, in the *Shiho yukan* 四書索引 and *Gokyo sakubun* 玉鑭索引 of Morimoto Kaku (森本要), and the 
*Luo jie Lao* 老解放, who Tyongmeng 蒂戎等. Excluding the resumptive pronouns 
(*jy*, *sky*, *tsy*), there is never a succeeding object in the *Anekota*, *Menchi*, *Yuki*, 
*Shyyw*, *Downdown*, *Shyywz* and *Mohtsz*. (The Harvard-Yenching entry for 
*Mohtsz* 9/29/65 follows a conjectural emendation from the *Mohtsz* jinmawu 
孔子左詩.) There is one case in the *Tsunjuan* (Duksus Jeung), twelfth year. At 
the beginning of the period when *faw* and *bu* were distinguished we find one example 
in the *Ode* (No. 256/3), and at the end of the period two in the *Luhw*, which is partly 
Han (Morimoto 23/4, 41/10), and one in the *Gauliyanjuan* 燕鶴 (Hwanso, 
seventh year).

Hwaw Jiawshin 藥籍, attacking the theory that *faw* is equivalent to *bu* *jy* in 
Yeuon hyeong 言語研究 (1958, 3/1-23), gives a magnificently comprehensive 
list of sentences with *faw* 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 *Shyyw*. 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, *tsy* No. 13). From the concorded 
texts, he gives all the examples just mentioned (Nos. 12, 15, 23, 26, 32), with 
a few which seem to be questionable (Nos. 14, 21, 23, 27). He has found only two 
more examples in other texts (No. 29, Gongyu, No. 30, Yanmungswit). 

112 Other examples with a succeeding object are j.2, 1B/1, 7.4, 3A/3, 3A/6, j.7, 3B/4. The verb is apparently intransitive in j.5, 6B/12 (Wright, 1958, 3/1-23).

113 LT j.2, 3A/8 bis (JT), 7B/2 (LSCC *faw* HN *bu*), j.8, 3A/12-14 (four cases, 
SY, YY, and the two quoted.)
ceases to be the opposite of yeau 有 “there is” and becomes the opposite of tzay 在 “is in”:

Shyntzyz j.12, 19B/3 然則麗與不麗耶, 亡於麗之與不麗也, 乃在於麗與不麗也。

“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.”

Juangtzyj 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 jy, in the same way as the verb negated by fun or wu. Phonetically wang (*MIWANG) of course does not share the common final of fun (*PIWAV) and wu (*MIWAV). 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 wu 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 jy in certain kinds of negative sentence. The specialization of wu almost confined the imperative wu to intransitive verbs and verbs with succeeding objects;119 fun, on the contrary, never dispossessed hu of its right to stand before any kind of verb; wu and 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 wu freely with a succeeding object, for example:

Hannshu j.74, 8A/10 亡輕重, 一切皆數之。

“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 Shyntzyj it uses systematically certain archaic words where the other texts use common ones; among these it uses wang for wu.120 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 archaizing style of state documents, is a question which might repay inquiry. A detail which certainly suggests

118 Cf. my A Probable Fusion-word: wu = wu + jy. BSOAS 14 (1951), 139-48. I should no longer insist on the very forced explanation of the Taojuhshun sentence 有是 “Let us not have this” in this article (143). Shy is resumptive, and does not need to be explained away.

120 For example, Shyntzyj j.109, 1B/5, 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."

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

j.2, 5B/3 (JT) ‘謂問間水有道乎。曰，亡，吾無道。’

"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 Han shu, 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。’ 商丘問曰，‘吾無道。’

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

j.6, 4B/6-8 夫信任者亡善天，信理者亡非。信心者亡逆順，信行者亡安危，則謂之餌亡所信，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 Bojinn has noticed,132 "du" "completely", ancestor of the modern "du" "all", is found seven times in Lieh-tzu. The last quotation illustrating "wang" contained one example; these are the others:

j.2, 1B/2 都無所愛惜，都無所畏忌。

"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 阪年之疾，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，車服象觴。

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

131 See the rhyme in the Yeushehshu 良師訥 of Yang Shyong 邱雄 (33 B.C.-A.D. 18), Wenshen 四插 j.3, 32B/10. Han shu j.87, 1A/2.
132 JS 229-32, cf. also Li Shyujinn 申行謨, Comparison of the Uses of the Particles Du and LEAU in the Shihshuo shinyeu, in Yujian shuo lun cong 語音學論叢 2 (1958), 73-83.

Du is very common in Taoist literature of the third and fourth centuries A.D., in Banpuln, in Jang Jann's commentary on Lieh-tzu, and especially in Guo Shianq's commentary on Shuyjih. Yang Bojinn quotes twenty-four examples from the Shihshuo shinyeu. His earliest example is from the Han shu:

Han shu j.24, 17B/1 當平準於京師，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 Shuyjih.133 Since we cannot quite take it for granted that the Shuyjih was not expanded with passages taken from the Han shu, this is not conclusive proof that the word was used before the first century A.D. Feir Shyuheae133 notes one case from the Luennhong 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 般

In pre-Han Chinese the pronoun "jy" substitutes for the noun which immediately follows a verb as object, "yan" for the noun which follows with an intermediate "yu" 喜. It is convenient to say that "yan" is equivalent to "yu jy", although strictly speaking this phrase is a barbarism, since "jy" 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 Lieh-tzu 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 Mui and the magician:

j.3, 1A/11 土木之功，緒冕之色，無遺巧焉。

"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 乃王而視之，其宮楊若累塊積蘇焉。

"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，王若楓虛焉。

133 Shuyjih j.30, 1A/6. Another parallel, in Yenthaluwen 良師訥 j.1, 4B/1, has a different phrasing and no "du."

There is another passage using "du" in Shuyjih j.121, 9A/7, Han shu j.38, 11A/7.
action during the immediate future ("Let us for the moment"). A text which shows chiee in the course of transition is the Shvyjih, which provides the last thirteen examples of the older usage and the first four examples of the later usage in the Tsychiuus 訳本 by Yang Shuhdar 防書達. 127

Shvyjih j.66, 2A/2 f 伍著有二子，皆賢。不誅，且為患憂。
"Wu She has two sons, both clever. If we do not execute them, they will give Chuu cause for anxiety." 128

8A/10 民勞，末可。且待之。
"The people are exhausted, it is not possible yet. Let us wait for the
time being."

In the unparalleled parts of Liehtzy, 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 且使士師之言可也。
"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 after-
wards."

j.5, 9A/3 f 且先言其狀。
"Let me spend a moment describing them first."

j.6, 1B/11 且言之。
"Tell me now."

j.6, 4A/6 且食之。
"Let him stay for a meal."

j.7, 2A/6 且趣當生，奚遂死後。
"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 Hannshiu:

LT j.1, 4B/9 九腸年且百歲。
"Lin Ley was nearly a hundred."

j.5, 3A/14–3B/1 北山愚政者年且九十。
"Mister Stupid of North Mountain was nearly ninety."

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

3/7. Shiang 相

Leu Shwhiariang 吕叔湘 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 pro-
nominal adverb if we are not quite ready to acknowledge it as a pronoun." 129

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

In Liehtzy there are fourteen cases where the reciprocity of the recip-
ocity is weak or absent, all in sections without parallels. Some are clear
cases of Leu Shwhiariang's "pronominal adverb":

j.5, 3B/1 f 聚室而謀曰……莫然相許。
"He called together his family and made a proposal. . . . They all
agreed to it."

j.8, 5B/8 f 聚族相謀曰……
"He called together his clansmen, and warned them, saying . . . ." 128

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

127 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.
128 Poir Shyuehâe (op. cit., 320) takes this as equivalent to guchie 功且; he gives an
example from the Hannshiu in which gu is also written 固, and one from the Shvyjih in
which it is written 固.
short-lived and never very common, of placing the pronoun object before the verb even in affirmative sentences:

Jang Heng 張衡 (A.D. 78–A.D. 139), Dongjing fuhu 東京賦 (Wenshuoan j.3, 35B/5) 萬物我願，亦不何求。

“All things depend on me; whom else should they seek!”

Comment of Li Shu 李善 (preface dated A.D. 658): 我願，願我也。

Tsaur Jyr 曹植 (192–232), Taenq Bairmaa wung yihshoo 諸白馬王一首 (Wenshuoan j.24, 8A/9)

“真求列仙，松子久吾欺。”

“Nonsense to seek the immortals, Sonqtszy has long deceived me.”

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

“執素素之款質兮，懷新新之我欺。

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

Tsaur Jyr, Kunghour yiin 國魂引 (Wenshuoan j.27, 27B/2)

“盛時不可再，百年忽我逝。

“The prime of life cannot be recalled, the end of my hundred years’ span suddenly presses on me.”

Luh Ji 陸機 (261–303) Biann wang luenn, shiah 辯亡論, 下 (Wenshuoan j.53, 34B/5), 潼誠信士，不恥人之我欺。量能授器，不恥權之我逼。

“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.”

Shih Hueylian 謝惠蓮 (397–433), Yu Anchersn dar Lingyun 與安城答靈運 (Wenshuoan j.25, 29A/7) 親親子敦子，實賢吾爾賞。

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

Jyar jyou cheeui hooa shyrep 橘樹垂華葉 (Hann poem)

人僅欲我知，因君為羽翼。

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

Comment of Yu Guangshun 趙冠生, Henn Wey Lioucha shyr sheum 漢魏六朝詩選 (Peking 1958), 83, n. 5 ‘欲欲知我，君欲欲知我。

Maan ge shyn 魔歌行 (Jinn yuehue, Yuehue shyjyij j.43, 9A/1)

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

There is one striking example of this construction in Lichzyw:


The verb jyar, “adhere to” (variously written 紇, 著, 着) is the ancestor of the modern durative particle 着 j. Wang Liang has outlined the history of its development.\(^{100}\) His earliest example of jyar 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 jyar as a full verb:

j.6, 21B/4 能知如龍母者，著於草木，不著五敗。

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

j.17, 12B/7 今鐘鼓無所懸者，當公之足無所躅履。

“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 jyar in Lichzyw, written with Radical No. 118 in the Northern Song edition and with Radical No. 140 in the Shhywun text:

j.5, 3A/12 五山之根無所連著。

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

j.8, 8A/9 語之所屬者，實行足頭糍疊，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 Hwaûmantzy parallel, but with a different beginning: 神有所著者 “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,
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 ăw, the formula "Y answered" in dialogue, the pronouns wu and wao as object, possessive pronouns with ji, the negative wang, temporal and injunctive chieh. 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.4. 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 ruok 若 (but not erl 耳) by the side of ruo 么 "you",132 shì 真 (but not u 悉) by the side of her 何 "what?" "how?"133; wàng (but not mì 隱, a favourite existential negative of Guo Shiang and Jang Jann) by the side of wu, "there is not". It does not use the temporal particle tseng 會, but does use the character with the reading taeng followed by a negative, "not even"135; it uses ju 諸 for ji ju 之於 but not for interrogative ji hu 之乎.136 It prefers nayher 来何 to herry 何 如 "what about . . . ?", shou 就 to shuei 誰 "who?", erhow 而後 to ranhow 然後 "only then". It drops the preposition yu 於 after wen 向 "ask" (someone).137 When it falls into regular parallellism (as it generally does outside narrative), it tends to avoid the final yee 也 even in nominal sentences.138 It frequently uses the double "yi 當 . . . yi 誰" for concomitance and the double "swem . . . swem 這" for simultaneity.141

The extent of this stylistic uniformity may be illustrated by a couple of examples. It is widely suspected that the story in which Yün Wen 云文 explains that the world is huann 好 "illusion"142 is influenced by Buddhism.143 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 interrelations:

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.

133 Wang Lih, op. cit., 357.
134 Quan Shiehchü 萬質初, In shiu jaunw kehtsyr de yefaa yanjiou 總論甲骨刻
    錯的詐論研究 (Shanghai, 1953), 15 f.
135 Cf. p. 175 above.
136 Cf. p. 155 above.
137 For erl cf. p. 155 above.
138 For wu, cf. p. 188 below.
139 Cf. pp. 184–5 below.
140 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
    2B/7.
141 Cf. p. 188 below.
142 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, j.7, 2B/7 f, 7A/3.
143 Cf. p. 184, p. 187 below.
144 LT j.3, 2B/1–13.
145 Cf. p. 142 above.
THE DATE AND COMPOSITION OF LIEHTZY

first character always has the reading tseng 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).

The quotation from the Joushu noted by Jang Jann is not in the extant Yih joushu. 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 Liehtzy from lost sources traditionally dated before 400 B.C. For example, we can discount the possibility that Liehtzy borrowed extensively from the Woeishu, (Hann apocrypha few of which survive), even though there is a parallel with one still extant, the Yih woei chyan tsuoh dui, and Jang Jann quotes others.

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. Liehtzy is primary. However, his preface lists seven pre-Hann and former Hann works which quote Liehtzy. The latest, the fuyygei, is contemporary with

145 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 Liehzyy used the text in fifty-two p’ian, now lost. 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.

(ii) Shenm Data. The Hann bibliography records a Shenm Data in forty-two p’ian, which reappears in the Swieh bibliography with ten juan. In the Son dynasty only a fragment consisting of five essays survived. This is printed in the Shouwushanger tsongkhu, with other fragments preserved by quotation; there are no parallels with Liehzyy. There are parallels in the Shenm Data published during the Ming dynasty by Shen Mawshaang and reproduced in the Syuhbuh tsongkhu; but this is well known to be a forgery.

(iii) Harn Fei zyy.

(iv) Shkytzyy. The Shkytzyy was reassembled from quotations by Suen Shingyean (Preface dated 1799); several passages with parallels in Liehzyy survive.

(v) Hwoainantzyy.

(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 Liehzyy shuwen mentions two works with this title, neither of them extant.

(vii) Jyyguei. According to the Shuwen this is the Davoder jyyguei luenn 道德指歸論 of Yan Tzen 圓漵, a contemporary of Yang Shyong (53 B.C.-A.D. 18). Only the second half of this verse exposition of the Davoderjng survives, and its textual history is very uncertain. There is one parallel with Liehzyy.

It is therefore certain that there are unidentified passages in Liehzyy which once stood in Shenm Data and the Shyyuanshi, and at least probable that others appeared in lost parts of Juangtzyy, Shkytzyy, and the Jyyguei. Further, since Jang Jann ignores such well-known sources as the Leushy chuenchiong and the Shueyuanna, 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:

---

1. **Rhymed Passages**

Karlgen, defending his claim that Liehzyy dates from the Former Hann, offers seven examples of archaic rhymes. 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 rhymed discourse characteristic of Liehzyy is marked by parallelism without rhyme, the repetition of key words, and sequences of clauses bound together by yih "also" or interrupted by stweiran "however":

```
 j.1, 6B/9-12 言天地之壎者亦誕，言天地不壎者亦誕。壎
 與不壎，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 Karlgen in j.2-8, one is from Juangtzyy, one from Shkytzyy, and two from a song. But in j.1 there is a great deal of rhymed discourse devoid of the stylistic characteristics of Liehzyy; its identification and study must be left to those with a sufficient grounding in Chinese phonology. Karlgen notes three archaic rhymes in j.1:

(A) 2A/11 P‘iOÔ 悶 TSaG 輒
(B) 2A/12 XWA 化 NGIA 宜
(C) 4A/2 SJaG 始 KIuG 久

The work on Hann rhymes of Luo Chingpei and Jou Tzuomo 作詞譜 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 Hwoaiantzyy. Rhyme B was valid only to the end of the Former Hann. Rhyme C was already invalid during the Former

---

110 Cf. pp. 157-8 above.
111 Cf. p. 155 above.
112 WSKY 9217.
113 WSKY 871 f.
Hann,188 but it is almost certain that 九 is a graphic error for 久 (=有).189 in which case the rhyme remained valid throughout the Later Hann.190

Rhyme C stands in a passage which begins with three sentences also found in the Jyiyuei,184 The passages which Jang Jann found also in the Shuanjk and the Jyiyuei, 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 Shu Ching: 討之問故也是已 "Tang’s questions to Jyi were about this."182 Jyi’s name is written with another character ( shortcomings), suggesting that here Liehtzzy is not dependent on Shu Ching. The theme is the problem of infinity, discussed in the manner of the pre-Hann sophists; but Liehtzzy never elsewhere discusses logical puzzles, except when making fun of the sophist Gong-ju Long 公孫龍.186 Jyi’s second answer is one of the rare rhyming passages.

There are also two linguistic features of interest, u 恕 “how?” and wnn 与 关於 “ask.” U is used twice; it is never found elsewhere in the book except in passages borrowed from Shu Ching.188 Wnn 与 is normal pre-Hann usage. By the third century B.C., the preposition 与 was sometimes dropped, as in the sentence from Shu Ching just quoted. In Liehtzzy the preposition is always dropped, except in the construction wnn 与 y, “ask Y about X,”186 and in passages from Shu Ching.190

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 Liehtzzy 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, 1A/1, 2, j:3, 4A/2, j:5, 4B/10.

異 X “different from X” (without the preposition 与). Also j:2, 9B/6, j:3, 2A/11, j:4, 3B/11.

188 ut sup., 16 f.
189 Luo and Jou, ut sup., 135.
190 LT j:1, 14/10-13.
191 LT j:1, 6B.
192 LT j:4, 6B-7B. Cf. my Book of Liehtzzy (London 1961), 78 f, 92, 94 f.
193 LT j:2, 3A/10, 7B/13, j:5, 6B/14.
194 LT j:7, 3A/14.
195 LT j:1, 6B/13, j:2, 3A/2. (In both cases the preposition is 与 与.) LT j:8, 3B/5 omits the 与 of LSCC, HN.

(3) Mohist Passages

I have argued elsewhere191 that the dialogue between Yang Ju and Chyn Guuli 禽骨_rules comes directly or indirectly from a Mohist source, and suggested tentatively that its immediate source may have been Shu Ching, which included a large Mohist element. There is another fragment, standing immediately after a passage known by quotations to have belonged to Shu Ching, which seems to be of Mohist origin.190 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 (利 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 Huainan.193 Afterwards Confucians remembered him only as the archetypal egoist denounced by Mencius, while Taoists often accepted him as one of themselves. Throughout most of Liehtzzy 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 chapter194 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.195 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.196 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.
The Date and Composition of Lieh-tzyy

We have already noticed that certain confusions between characters which Liou Shianq claimed to have corrected are actually found in Lieh-tzyy, 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 Lieh-tzyy and Lao Shang, discussed in detail above, contains two examples of 難 for 難.175

4/2. The Fatalist and Hedonist Chapters

With the glaring exception of one chapter, Lieh-tzyy 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. 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. 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 Chornghsyuan 廖重玄 treats the fatalism and hedonism of the adjacent chapters as equally obnoxious.

If we admit that the extant Lieh-tzyy 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/13 f. 至於命命，惟分命，楊子之篇，唯貴於 178逸，二義貫一，不似一主之書。然各有所明，亦有可靠之者。

“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

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-yuan, a text which Liou Shianq edited even if he did not compile it:179

SY j.13, 2A 楊子曰，事之可以之者，可以之者，其傷行者也。事之可以之者，可以之者，其傷行者也。儒子曰，楊子哲而不知命，故其知少疑。

“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’. Pevtzyy 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 Pevtzyy’s charge. Yet there are a number of indications of some special connection with the fatalistic chapter. Jang Jann181, without mentioning Liou Shianq by name, defends Lieh-tzyy 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) Lieh-tzyy 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:

Yang Ju

j.6 3B-4B Passim

178 Cf. WSTK 760-1.
179 One passage concerns destiny (j.7, 6B/3-7). It asks “How can we yearn for long life unless we rebel against destiny?” (不違命，何以長) and declares that if we do not pursue external goals such as rank, power and wealth, destiny can no longer fulfill us, since “the destiny which decides is within us” (命在內).
180 LT j.6, 1A/12-1B/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 Liehtzy into this part of the book, because he does not want to give Liehtzy’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 Liu 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 Liehtzy, 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 peculiarity 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 Liehtzy given in the preceding section\(^{144}\) applies perfectly to this chapter, except that, as in several other chapters, there are no examples of tseng and swai . . . . swai. Most of the linguistic indications of late date appear in this chapter:—pronouns followed by jj, kee with an active verb, fow 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, 因周, 而相术, “the central land” (China) occur in this chapter\(^{145}\)—the last is a very striking example. Other cases are:

- 2A/7, 8 X 之 鈎 (~尤) “an extreme case of X”. Also j. 2, 5B/7. \(^{146}\)
  - Cf. also 神尤 j. 4, 7A/8.

- 2B/7 凡 此 談 誤 “all these restrictions”. Cf. j. 4, 4B/13 凡 此 禁 禁 (Read 禁, J.S. 84:2) “all these ailments”.

- 3A/1 進 深, one of the unorthodox characters mentioned by Liu Shianq\(^{147}\). The editor never substitutes them in passages from known sources.

---

\(^{144}\) Cf. pp. 183–5 above.

\(^{145}\) Cf. p. 184, p. 188 above.

\(^{146}\) Cf. p. 148 above.
5A/13 f 應...“accept an invitation”. Also j.4, 2A/6.

When the theme of pleasure-seeking appears elsewhere in Liehtzzy, 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 應意之所欲行 “give yourself up to whatever your thoughts desire to do”. Cf. j.3, 4A/3 應意所欲

We also find the same words for articles of luxury:

2A/13 珠玉 “pearls and jade”. Also j.3, rB/3.

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

2B/5 椠蘭 “spices and orchids”. Also j.5, 4B/2 (order reversed).

4A/2 嫔御 “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 Liehtzzy fall into three main patterns:

(i) 且 “......” 對 且 “......”
(ii) 且 “......” 且 “......”
(iii) “......” 且 “......”

The second pattern is the normal one. The first is almost confined to passages borrowed from other sources.\(^{180}\) 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.\(^{182}\)

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 Liehtzzy, I still cling to the common-sense opinion that this chapter must be the work of a separate author, however near to the editor of Liehtzzy 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, edel 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 近然. Also j.6, 2A/6.

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

2B/8 遠違爾

1B/8 彼爾. Also j.6, 1B/9 (omits edel).

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

\(^{180}\) Cf. pp. 159–60 above.

\(^{182}\) LT j.7, 1A/12–2B/2, 2A/8–11, 4A/13–4B/4. But questions as well as answers are indicated in 2A/14–3A/1.

\(^{181}\) 真人 “true man” (3B/12), 路外 “inner” “outer” (3B/8–10, 6B/3–7, 7A/5).

\(^{181}\) Cf. the translation in Book of Liehtzzy 14B–57, where the interpolations are printed in italics.

\(^{181}\) 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 Hanhsi and, in a shorter and slightly different form, in the Leushkyh chuanchiou.\textsuperscript{105} 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 Liehtzy than any other part of the Yang Ju chapter:

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

自以故之恒 "He himself thought it normal to his nature". Cf. j.6, 4B/14 自以智之恒也 "They themselves thought it the profoundest wisdom" (Pattern repeated j.6, 5A/1, 3, 6). Yi alone used like yi 考以, "consider" is common in Liehtzy cf. j.1, 7A/10, j.3, 3B/7, j.5, 6B/12, 9A/12. Other examples of the combination 考以 "himself thought" are j.6, 1B/7, 5A/5.

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

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

狐貉 "fox and badger". Also j.6, 2A/4.

麊 (=茂) "broad beans". Also j.6, 2A/5.

其大慮 "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 Yuhtzy and Laozzy, found twice elsewhere in the book, betrays the hand of the editor.\textsuperscript{106}

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 Yannzy, the story of Tszychaa’s brothers, and the story of the voluptuary Duamuh 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.\textsuperscript{107} 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".\textsuperscript{108} Very probably Yang Ju was absent from the original source, which the editor has converted into the "chapter about Yang Ju" mentioned by Liu 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 Liehtzy. In the opening story of the second chapter the Yellow Emperor begins his reign as a hedonist, later abandons the pursuits 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,\textsuperscript{109} 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 Liu 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 Liehtzy of the Hann bibliography disappeared at an early date, but Liu Shianq’s report on the book survived, presumably among the reports collected in the Byeluh. Not long after the appearance of the Muh tinzy zhuan in 281 and the translation of the Buddhist Shemajing\textsuperscript{110} in 285, someone composed a new Liehtzy modelled on Liu Shianq’s account of the original book. He incorporated extensive passages from pre-Hann and Former Hann works down to the period of Liu 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 Liu 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

\textsuperscript{105} LSCC j.20, 1A.

\textsuperscript{106} LT j.7, 2A/8-11. Yang Borjiam (JS 140/2-5) rightly prints this as a dialogue in which, obeying the convention of this chapter, only the answer is marked by jie, "said".

\textsuperscript{107} Cf. pp. 164-6 above.

\textsuperscript{108} 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 Liehtzuy 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. For example, he notes all the parallels with Mohistzuy, including a phrase of four characters taken from the obscurest part, the Mohist Canons, and interpolated in a passage from Juangzuy. 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 Liu Shianq who supposedly borrow from Liehtzuy. His commentary makes explicit the purpose of the complementary fatalist and hedonist chapters, and points out the confusions between characters which identify the book with the one known to Liu Shianq.

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

---

188 Cf. p. 169 above.
190 LT j.1, 3A/4. Cf. p. 156 above.
192 LT j.6, 1A/12-18/1. Cf. p. 191 above.
191 LT j.4, 4A/1, 3B/7.
193 Cf. p. 185 above.
194 JS 4:4. If we exclude paralleled sections, and passages which may be from unknown sources (JS 3/9-10, on a rhyming passage, 149/19 f.), it is seldom easy to fault Jang Jann's explanations. But in the tale of the three swords, a very characteristic Liehtzuy story, there can be little doubt that 彼陰之間 (i.e. 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 (i.e. 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).