

ON THE MEANING OF THE MORPHEME 嫌 SHYAN IN PRE-HAN AND HAN TEXTS

N.G.D. MALMQVIST

The aim of this paper is to elucidate the meaning of the morpheme *shyan* in pre-Han and Han texts. The corpus covers all occurrences of *shyan* in the *Thirteen Classics* (the *Chou yi* [1], the *Li chi* [7], the *Kung-yang chuan* [6] and the *Ku-liang chuan* [13]). Additional examples have been taken from the following pre-Han and Han works: the *Mo-tzu* (1), the *Kucn-tzu* (1), the *Hsün-tzu* (2), the *Lü-shih ch'un-ch'iu* (2), the *Huai-nan-tzu* (3), the *Ch'un-ch'iu fan-lu* (9), the *Lun heng* (2), the *Po-hu-t'ung* (1) and the *Han shu* (1).

In all but one of these instances *shyan* can be shown to have one of the following basic meanings: "deceptive resemblance giving rise to uncertainty as to the correct identification", or "to be so deceptively similar as to give rise to uncertainty with regard to the correct identification". The fact that the meaning of "to dislike; to object to" can be attributed to none of these occurrences of *shyan* affords conclusive evidence, that this meaning of *shyan* is the result of a secondary, possibly late Han or post-Han, semantic development.

In the following I shall have occasion to critically examine a number of translations of passages containing *shyan*. I wish to make it clear, that the purpose of my criticisms is to demonstrate the validity of my thesis, rather than to find faults in the works of scholars, for whose contributions to sinology I have the deepest respect and admiration.

The occurrences of shyan in the Kung-yang chuan:

1. *Duke Yin*, 7.2:

The passage, together with the comments of Ho Hsiu (A.D. 129-182), which are given within parentheses, reads as follows:

滕侯卒，何以不名（據蔡侯考父卒名）微國也，（小國故略不名）微國則其稱侯何。（據大國稱侯小者稱伯子男），不嫌也。（滕侯卒不名，下常稱子，不嫌稱侯爲大國）春秋貴賤不嫌同號（貴賤不嫌者通同號稱也。若齊亦稱侯，滕亦稱侯微者亦稱人，貶亦稱人，皆有起文，貴賤不嫌同號是也），美惡不嫌同辭。

Two Western sinologists have drawn far-reaching conclusions on the basis of their mistaken interpretations of this passage, which is of considerable importance for our understanding of the fanciful elaborations of the praise-and-blame doctrine of the *Kung-yang* school. In his brilliant essay entitled "Interpretation of the Ch'un-ch'iu" (in *Selected Works of George A. Kennedy*, New Haven 1964) Kennedy translates as follows: "Why is the personal name not given? Because the state was small. If it was a small state, why is he called an earl? *To avoid discrimination. The Ch'un-ch'iu has no objection to applying the same title to high and low alike, or the same term to good and bad alike*".¹

Kennedy adds the following note: "The deaths of 7 rulers of this state are chronicled. In the first 3 cases the personal name is not mentioned, but in the last 4 it is. There is no evidence that the state grew any larger during the second part of the period. The second part of Kung-yang's comment seems to destroy the very foundation of his exegesis, for if the Ch'un-ch'iu uses identical terms for good and bad alike, there is no medium for ethical teaching left" (*op. cit.*, page 87).

The following interpretation is found in Burton Watson's *Ssu-ma Ch'ien Grand Historian of China* (New York 1958): "Under Duke Yin, seventh year, we read in the *Annals*: 'The Marquis of Teng died'. The *Kung-Yang Commentary* says of this: 'Why does it not record his name? Because Teng is a minor state. If it is a minor state, then why does it call him 'Marquis'? *There is no objection to this. In the cases of both noble and lowly the Annals does not object to using the same terminology*'.¹ Ho Hsiu (A.D. 129-182), the Latter Han commentator on the *Kung-yang* adds that "rulers who succeeded their fathers are said to 'ascend the throne', while those who assassinated their lords are also said to 'ascend the throne'". In other words the *Annals* is a straightforward record which does not hesitate to state facts whether it approves of them or not". (*op. cit.*, pp. 79-80).

The comments of Ho Hsiu, and other commentators, make it quite clear that the passage must be interpreted in the following way:

"The marquis of T'eng died. Why is he not referred to by his personal name? (Ho Hsiu: "The question is based on the fact that the personal name is given in the entry concerning the death of K'ao-fu, marquis of Ts'ai"). [T'eng] was a small state. (Ho Hsiu: "Since it was a small state, [the *Ch'un-ch'iu*] treats

1. The italics are mine.

it summarily, without giving the personal name [of its ruler]”). Since it was a small state, why does [the *Ch'un-ch'iu*] refer to [its ruler as] marquis? (Ho Hsiu: “The question is based on the fact that [rulers of] large states are referred to as marquises, while [rulers of] small states are referred to as earl, viscount and baron”). *There was no deceptive resemblance*. (Ho Hsiu: “Since the personal name was omitted from the entry concerning the death of the marquis of T'eng, and since he in the following normally is referred to as a viscount, it cannot be wrongly assumed that, the ruler being referred to as a marquis, his state was a large one”). *When there is no deceptive resemblance* [giving rise to uncertainty as to the correct identification] between the noble and the mean, the *Ch'un-ch'iu* uses the same appellation in both cases; (Ho Hsiu: “In those instances where there is no deceptive resemblances between the noble and the mean [the *Ch'un-ch'iu*] uses the same appellation in both cases. Thus, both [the ruler of] Ch'i and [the ruler of] T'eng are referred to as marquises; the term *ren* ('man') is used both of persons of inferior rank and in order to express degradation. In all these instances, however, [the *Ch'un-ch'iu*] has explicit references [to the correct status of the person concerned]. This is what is meant by the expression “*guey jiann buh shyan, torng haw*”). *When there is no deceptive resemblance between the good and the evil*, the *Ch'un-ch'iu* uses the same terms in both cases”.

Hsü Yen 徐彥, author of the sub-commentary on the *Kung-yang chuan* (*Ch'un-ch'iu kung-yang su* 春秋公羊疏), writes as follows:

不論貴賤，不嫌者通其同號。

“Whether noble or mean, whenever *there is no deceptive resemblance* [the *Ch'un-ch'iu*] uses the same appellation in both cases”.

K'ung Kuang-sen 孔廣森 (1752-1786), author of the *Kung-yang Ch'un-ch'iu ching-chuan t'ung-yi* 公羊春秋經傳通義 comments: 貴賤易辨，不相嫌者。則可以同號。

“When the noble and the mean are easily distinguished and *when there is no deceptive resemblance* between them, then it is possible to use the same appellation in both cases”.

The correct punctuation of the phrase *guey jiann buh shyan, torng haw* has been indicated by Liao P'ing 廖平 (1852-1932), in his *Ho-shih Kung-yang chieh-ku san-shih lun*, 7a (*Ssu-yi-kuan ching-hsüeh ts'ung-shu*.) (何氏公羊解詁三十論，四譯館學經叢書)

2. *Duke Huan*, 12.9:

十有二月及鄭師伐宋，丁未戰于宋，戰不言伐，此其言伐何，辟嫌也，惡乎嫌，嫌與鄭人戰也，此偏戰也，何以不言師敗績，內不言戰，言戰乃敗矣。

"In the 12th month [our army] and the army of Cheng attacked Sung. On the day *ting-wei* a battle was fought in Sung. [The term] *fa* ('to attack') is not [normally] used in conjunction with [the term] *jann* ('to battle'). Why does the text use the term *fa* here? *In order to preclude uncertainty [arising from a deceptive resemblance]. Uncertainty as to what? Uncertainty as to whether [an army of Lu] fought with men of Cheng. This was a battle the time and place of which had been previously agreed upon. Why does the text not state, that [our] army was utterly defeated? [The term] *jann* is not used of the Interior. When it is so used it signifies defeat*".

The comment of Ho Hsiu reads as follows:

時宋主名不出，不言伐則嫌內微者與鄭人戰于宋地。

"On this occasion the role of Sung does not appear. But for the use of [the term] *fa* ('to attack'), *it may be wrongly assumed* that a commander of low rank of the Interior fought with men of Cheng in the area of Sung".

It is of incidental interest to note that the *Ku-liang commentary* accepts the interpretation which the *Kung-yang commentary* here seeks to avoid. The corresponding *Ku-liang* passage reads as follows:

非與所與伐戰也，不言與鄭戰恥不和也。於伐與戰，敗也，內諱敗，舉其可道者也。

"[The *Ch'un-ch'iu*] condemns [the army of Lu] for having fought the troops with which they had attacked [Sung]. That [the *Ch'un-ch'iu*] does not clearly state that [the army of Lu] fought [with the army of] Cheng indicates that [the *Ch'un-ch'iu*] considers their lack of harmony shameful. The addition of [the term] *fa* ('to attack') signifies defeat. For the Interior avoidance is made of defeat. [The *Ch'un-ch'iu*] uses a term which can be mentioned".

3. *Duke Chuang*, 1.4:

秋，築王姬之館于外，何以書，譏何譏爾，築之，禮也，于外，非禮也。于外，何以非禮。築于外，非禮也。其築之，何以禮。主王姬者，必爲之改築。主王姬者，則曷爲必爲之改築。於路寢則不可，小寢則嫌，羣公子之舍，則以卑矣。其道必爲之改築者也。

"In the Autumn[we] built a reception house for the King's daughter outside [the city wall]. Why was this entry made? In order to criticize. To build it was in accordance with the rites. [To build it] outside [the city wall] was not

in accordance with the rites. Why was it in accordance with the rites to build it? The one who acted as host for the King's daughter must build a new building for her. Why is that so? [To receive the King's daughter] in the official palace (*lu-ch'in*) would not do. [To receive her] in the palace of the duke's wife (*hsiao-ch'in*) would constitute *a deceptive resemblance* [between the status of the King's daughter and that of the duke's wife]. The residence of the duke's daughters was too humble [an abode for the King's daughter]. The correct principle herefore necessitated the building of a new reception house for her".

Similar views are expressed in the *Po-hu-t'ung* (*Ssu-pu ts'ung-kan* edition, 9.13 a). Tjan Tjoe Som² translates as follows: "Why must a special reception-house be built? It is to honour [the King's daughter]. She is not lodged in the *lu-ch'in*, it being the place for the administration of the government, and not fit for a woman to dwell in. The *hsiao-ch'in* would be *too depreciatory* (the italics are mine), while the room for the Duke's daughters would constitute a slight to her. Therefore a special building within the city wall is erected. The *Chuan* says: "To build [a reception-house] is according to the rites. [To build it] outside [the city wall] is not according to the rites". (*op. cit.*, vol. I, page 257)

In a note Dr. Tjan refers to Hsü Yen's sub-commentary on the *Kung-yang chuan*, wherein "the *lu-ch'in* is explained as being not fitting, because by using it no distinction would be made between outside (state affairs) and inside (household affairs), while the use of the *hsiao-ch'in* would mean contempt 褻瀆 for the King's daughter." For Hsü Yen's statement *shezu chin tzer shyan jee, shyan shieh duh* 小寢則嫌者嫌褻瀆 I suggest the following translation: "The phrase *shezu chin tzer shyan* means that *it may be wrongly assumed that* [the King's daughter] was defiled [by the duke]".

The occurrences of shyan in the Li chi:

1. *Li chi* 21 (*Li yüan*), 26 a:³

是故禮者君之大柄也，所以別嫌，明微，儆鬼神，考制度，別仁義；所以治政安君也。

"Therefore the rites are a great instrument in the hands of the ruler. By them he *resolves deceptive similarities*, reveals subtle distinctions, welcomes

2. *Po Hu T'ung, The comprehensive Discussions in the White Tiger Hall*, Leiden 1949.

3. References to the Classics, other than the *Kung-yang chuan* and the *Ku-liang chuan*, are to the *Mo-wang-hsien-kuan* edition of 1887.

the souls and the spirits, examines regulations and rules, defines the virtues of goodness and righteousness; by them he orders well his government and safeguards the [position of] the ruler”.

2. *Li chi* 51 (*Fang chi*), 15 b:

子云君不與同姓同車。與異姓同車不同服，示民不嫌也，以此仿民，民猶得同姓以弑其君。

“The Master said: ‘The ruler does not share a carriage with those who have the same surname as himself. When he shares a carriage with those of a different surname, he wears a different dress, in order to show the people, that *there should be no deceptive similarities*. By this he intended to bar the people, and yet the people found instances of assassinations of a ruler by those of the same surname”.

Cheng Hsüan 鄭玄 comments as follows:

同姓者，謂先王先公子孫，有繼及之道者也。其非此則無嫌也。

“The expression ‘those of the same surname’ refers to such sons and grandsons of former kings and dukes as had the right of succession. As regards categories other than these, *there was no deceptive similarity*”.

We shall have occasion to return to this comment in our discussion of the *Ku-liang* examples of *shyan*.

3. *Li chi* 49 (*Chi tung*), 3 b:

君迎牲而不迎尸，別嫌也，尸在廟門外則疑於臣，在廟中則全於君，君在廟門外則疑於君，入廟門則全於臣、全於子。是故不出者，明君臣之義也。

“That the ruler went to meet the sacrificial victim, but that he did not go to meet the impersonator of the deceased, was in order *to avert a deceptive resemblance [which may give rise to uncertainty as to the correct identification of the ruler and the impersonator]*. When the impersonator is outside the gate of the temple, the doubt concerns his status as a subject. [When the impersonator is] inside the temple, then [the dignity] is complete in the [deceased] ruler. When the [living] ruler is outside the gate of the temple, the doubt concerns his status as ruler. When he enters the temple his role is entirely that of a subject and a son. Therefore in not leaving [the temple] the ruler manifests the correct principles underlying the relation between ruler and subject”.

My rendering of 疑 *yi*, which follows the interpretation of Kung Ying-ta, deviates from that of Legge, who translates as follows: “While the representative

was outside the gate of the temple, he was to be regarded only as a subject; inside the temple, he had the full character of a ruler. While the ruler was outside the gate of the temple, he was there the ruler; when he entered that gate (on the occasion of the sacrifice), he had the full character of a subject, or a son" (*The Li Ki*, vol. 11, pp. 245-6).

Cheng Hsüan comments as follows:

不迎尸者，欲全其尊也，尸神象也，鬼神之尊在廟中，人君之尊，出廟門則伸。

"That the ruler does not meet the impersonator of the deceased is due to his wish to preserve intact his dignity. The impersonator is a symbol of the spirit. The dignity of souls and spirits is manifested in the temple. The dignity of the [living] ruler is such that, should he leave the temple, it would extend [above that of the impersonator]".

4. *Li chi* 62 (*Yen yi*), 19 a:

不以公卿爲賓，而以大夫爲賓爲疑也，明嫌之義也。

"That [the ruler] treats his great officers, but not the ducal ministers, as his guests is on account of the doubts [that might arise]. [By so doing he] *reveals the concept of deceptive resemblance* [between ruler and subject]".

Cheng Hsüan comments as follows:

公卿尊矣，復以爲賓則尊與君大相近。

"The ducal ministers already possess high dignity. If they in addition were to be treated as guests [by the ruler], then their dignity would be too close to that of the ruler".

5. *Li chi* 3 (*Ch'ü li*), 17 b:

禮不諱嫌名

"The rites do not require the avoiding of names which [merely] have a *deceptive* [phonetic] *resemblance* [to the tabooed forms]".

6. *Li chi* 1 (*Ch'ü li*), 3 a:

夫禮者所以定親疏，決嫌疑，別同異，明是非也。

"As to the rites, they are the means of determining [what relations are] near and [what are] remote; of *resolving instances of deceptive similarity which may give rise to doubt*; of distinguishing what is the same and what is different, and of revealing what is right and what is wrong".

7. *Li chi* 3 (*Ch'ü li*), 19 a:

龜爲卜，筮爲筮，卜筮者先聖王之所以使民信時日，敬鬼神，畏法令也，所以使民決嫌疑，定猶與也。

“[To take the oracle by] the tortoise shell is called *buh*; [to take the oracle by] the stalks is called *shyh*. By these two methods the former sage kings made the people put their faith in seasons and days, revere souls and spirits, fear the laws and orders. By these methods they made the people *resolve instances of deceptive similarity which may give rise to doubts* and to settle their misgivings”.

One occurrence of shyan in the Chou yi:

Chou yi 1 (*K'un, wen yen*), 7 b:

陰疑於陽必戰，爲其嫌於无陽也。故稱龍焉。猶未離其類也，故稱血焉。夫玄黃者天地之雜也，天玄而地黃。

Legge translates as follows: “(The subject of) the yin (or divided line) thinking himself equal to the (subject of the) yang, or undivided line, there is sure to be ‘a contest’. *As if indignant* (the italics are mine) at there being no acknowledgment of the (superiority of the subject of the) yang line (the text) uses the term ‘dragons’. But still the (subject of neither line) can leave his class, and hence we have ‘the blood’ mentioned. The mention of that as being (both) ‘azure and yellow’ indicates the mixture of heaven and earth. Heaven’s (colour) is azure and earth’s is yellow” (*The I Ching, The Book of Changes*, page 421).

Legge’s rendering of *shyan* (“*as if indignant*”) is obviously incorrect.

John Blofield’s rendering of the same passage is utterly incompetent: “When the passive dark force seeks to vie with the creative light force, *the lack of which is bitterly regretted*, (the italics are mine), a struggle is inevitable. That is why the dark force is called a dragon (normally a yang symbol), even though it still belongs to its own (yin) category and is therefore also symbolized by blood (a yin symbol). In truth, the black and the yellow betoken an intermingling of the celestial and terrestrial forces, with the black symbolizing the former and yellow the latter” (*The Book of Change*, London 1965; page 93).

Richard Wilhelm’s unequalled rendering reads as follows: “When the dark seeks to equal the light principle, there is certain to be a struggle. *Lest one think that nothing of the light remains* (the italics are mine) the dragon is mentioned. But to make clear that there is no deviation from their kind blood is also mentioned. Black and yellow are heaven and earth in confusion. Heaven is black and earth yellow” (*The I Ching or Book of Changes, Rendered into*

English by Cary F. Bayne, London 1964; vol. II, page 29).

It will immediately be seen that Wilhelm's rendering is in accordance with the present interpretation of *shyan*.⁴

One occurrence of shyan in the Mo-tzu:

Mo-tzu, chapter 45 (*Hsiao-ch'ü*):⁵

夫辯者將以明是非之分，審治亂之紀，明同異之處，察名實之理，處利害，決嫌疑。

"By argumentation one intends to distinguish right and wrong, to discriminate the norms of order and disorder, to reveal the limits of sameness and difference, to investigate the principles underlying name and reality, to settle questions relating to gain and loss and *to determine deceptive similarities which may give rise to doubt*".

One occurrence of shyan in the Kuan-tzu:

Kuan-tzu (*Chün-ch'en, hsia*):⁶

明男女之別，昭嫌疑之節，所以防其姦也。

"By clarifying the distinction between men and women and by displaying *the precept concerning deceptive resemblances* one guards against adulterous behaviour".

Two occurrences of shyan in the Hsün-tzu:

Hsün-tzu (*Chieh pi*):⁷

故導之以理，養之以清，物莫之傾，則足以定是非，決嫌疑。

"If you guide it (the mind) with reason, nourish it with clarity, and do not allow external objects to unbalance it, then it will be capable of determining right and wrong and of resolving doubts" (Burton Watson, *Hsün Tzu, Basic Writings*, Columbia University Press 1963)

4. The commentary by Wang Pi says: 爲其嫌於非陽而戰 *wey chyi shyan in fei yang erl jann* "The struggle was occasioned by the fact that *the deceptive resemblance* [between the culminating yin and the yang] *might give rise to the mistaken assumption* that yang no longer existed". It would seem that Wang Pi connected *wey chyi shyan in wu yang yee* to the immediately preceding clause. Wilhelm's translation, which connects the same phrase to the following clause, follows the interpretation of K'ung Ying-ta. It is possible that K'ung Ying-ta has followed the variant reading without yee: *wey shyan in wu yang*.

5. Sun Yi-jang, *Mo-tzu hsien-ku* (Chung-hua shu-ch'ü edition) ch. 11, page 260. 孫詒讓，墨子閒詁。

6. *Ssu-pu pei-yao* edition, 11/6 b.

7. *Ssu-pu pei-yao* edition, 15/7 a.

*Hsün-tzu (Cheng ming):*⁸

其累百年之欲，易一時之嫌，然且爲之不其數也。

Burton Watson translates as follows: "Any man who would actually exchange that which can gratify the desires of countless years for that which brings only a single moment of gratification simply does not know how to do arithmetic" (*op. cit.*, page 154).

Watson notes, that he reads 慊 *chieh* for 嫌 *shyan*. I suggest that *shyan* be retained, in its basic sense of 'deceptive resemblance'. The clause may then be rendered in the following way: "exchange that which can gratify the desires of countless years for *a fleeting moment's illusion*".

Two occurrences of shyan in the Lü-shih ch'un-ch'iu:

*Lü-shih ch'un-ch'iu (Shen-shih):*⁹

諸侯不欲臣於人而不得已。其勢不便則奚以易臣。權輕重，審大小，多建封，所以便其勢也。王也者，勢也。王也者，勢無敵也。勢有敵則王者廢矣。有知小之愈於大，少之賢於多者，則知無敵矣。知無敵則似類嫌疑之道遠矣。故先王之法，立天子，不使諸侯疑焉。立諸侯不使大夫疑焉，立適子不使庶孽疑焉。

"It is not that a feudal lord wishes to serve as a subject under [another] man, but that he has no choice. If his strength is inadequate, how could he change his status as a subject? By weighing the light and the heavy, by discriminating the great and the small, and by establishing many fiefs [the feudal lord] may render his power adequate [to the task]. To rule as king implies power. To rule as king implies that one's power is unrivalled. If his power is rivalled, then [his authority as] king is no longer upheld. If there be one who knows that the small excels over the great, and that the few are superior to the many, then his knowledge is unrivalled. If one's knowledge is unrivalled, then *the workings of deceptive resemblances between analogous categories are kept at a distance*. Therefore, according to the laws of the former kings, when the Son of Heaven was established [in his position], one did not allow a feudal lord to measure up to him; when a feudal lord was set up, one did not allow a great officer to measure up to him; when an heir was set up, one did not allow a son of a concubine to measure up to him".

*Lü-shih ch'un-ch'iu (Kuei chih lun):*¹⁰

8. *Ssu-pu pei-yao* edition, 16/10 b.

9. *Ssu-pu pei-yao* edition, 17/14 b.

10. *Ssu-pu pei-yao* edition, 23/2 a.

固嫌於危

"Thus one is definitely close to danger".

This is the one exceptional occurrence, which has already been referred to. The commentary of Kao Yu 高誘 equates *shyan* with 近 *jinn* 'close; near'. This is obviously a case of semantic extension: 'near; close; close in appearance; similar to, but not identical with; deceptively resembling'.

Three occurrences of shyan in the Huai-nan-tzu:

*Huai-nan-tzu (Fan-lun hsün):*¹¹

夫物之相類者，世主之所亂惑。嫌疑肖像者，衆人之所眩耀。

"It is when objects are classed together [without being truly identical] that rulers of our time are confused and deluded; it is by *points of deceptive similarity and resemblance* that the ordinary people are dazed and confused".

The commentary of Kao Yu says:

肖像似也，嫌疑謂白骨之肖像牙也，碧盧似玉，蛇牀似麋蕪也。

"*Shiaw-shiang* means to resemble; deceptive similarity refers to such instances as white bone resembling ivory, green stone being similar to jade, and the 'snake-bed plant' being similar to the 'deer-grass'".

*Huai-nan-tzu (Fan-lun hsün):*¹²

同異嫌疑者世俗之所眩惑也

"It is by a *deceptive similarity between* [what belongs to one and] the same [category] and [what belongs to a] different [category] that the common people are dazed and deluded".

*Huai-nan-tzu (T'ai-tsu hsün):*¹³

知足以決嫌疑……者，人之豪。

"The one whose knowledge is sufficient to determine instances of deceptive similarity is a hero amongst men".

*Nine occurrences of shyan in the Ch'un-ch'iu fan-lu:*¹⁴

1. *Ch'un-ch'iu fan-lu (Chu-lin)* 2/5 a:

逢丑父殺其身以生其君，何以不得爲知權。丑父欺晉，祭仲許（=詐）宋，俱枉正以存其君。然而丑父之所爲，難於祭仲，祭仲見賢而丑父猶見非，何也。曰是非難

11. *Ssu-pu pei-yao* edition, 13/16 b.

12. *Ssu-pu pei-yao* edition, 13/20 b.

13. *Ssu-pu pei-yao* edition, 20/11 a.

14. All references are to the *Ssu-pu pei-yao* edition of the *Ch'un-ch'iu fan-lu*.

別者在此，此其嫌疑相似而不同理者不可不察也。

“Feng Ch'ou-fu gave up his own life in order to save the life of his ruler. Why may he not be considered to have known how to weigh and evaluate circumstances? Ch'ou-fu tricked Chin and Chai Chung cheated Sung. Both acted contrary to the correct principles in order to preserve the lives of their rulers. But Ch'ou-fu's task was more difficult than that of Chai Chung. Why, then, was Chai Chung considered capable, while Ch'ou-fu, on the contrary, was criticized? The answer is: the difficulty of distinguishing right and wrong lies in this. *This instance of deceptive resemblance, involving items which, while appearing similar, are governed by different principles*, shall have to be investigated”.

O. Franke's rendering of this passage misses the force of *shyan-yi*: “*Man Könnte hier in der Tat vermuten* (the italics are mine), dass beide Fälle einander sehr ähnlich seien, und doch ist ihr inneres Wesen verschieden” (*Studien zur Geschichte des Konfuzianischen Dogmas und der chinesischen Staatsreligion*, Hamburg 1920, page 298).

2. *Ch'un-ch'iu fan-lu* (*Yü-ying*), 3/3 a:

春秋理百物，辨品類，別嫌微，修本末者也。

“The *Ch'un-ch'iu* is a work which puts the hundred things in order, distinguishes classes and categories, *discriminates subtleties of deceptive resemblance* and elaborates the beginning and the end”.

3. *Ch'un-ch'iu fan-lu* (*Sui pen hsiao-hsi*), 5/4 a-b:

別嫌疑之行以明正世之義

“To make manifest the principle of correcting the world by *discriminating conduct based on deceptive resemblances*”.

4. *Ch'un-ch'iu fan-lu* (*Shih-chih*), 5/5 b:

別嫌疑，異同類一指也。

“*To discriminate deceptive resemblances* and to keep [apparently] identical classes separate is the first precept”.

5. *Ch'un-ch'iu fan-lu* (*Shih-chih*), 5/6 a:

別嫌疑，異同類則是非著矣。

“*If deceptive resemblances be discriminated* and [apparently] identical categories be kept separate, then the right and the wrong will be clearly manifested”.

6. *Ch'un-ch'iu fan-lu* (*Chung cheng*), 5/6 b:

明其義之所審勿使嫌疑，是乃聖人之所貴而已矣。

“To reveal the discriminations which are inherent in the principles [of *jen* and *yi*] and to avoid causing any deceptive resemblances, it is this that the Sage held in honour”.¹⁵

7. *Ch'un-ch'iu fan-lu* (*Tu-chih*), 8/1 b:

凡百亂之源皆出嫌疑纖微，以漸寢稍長至於大。聖人章其疑者，別其微者，絕其纖者不得嫌。

“The source of the hundred disorders issues from *the subtle minutiae of deceptive resemblances*.¹⁶ By a gradual process [these subtle minutiae] increase and eventually become great. The Sage displays that which is doubtful, distinguishes that which is minute, and cuts out that which is subtle, thus disallowing any deceptive resemblance”.

8. *Ch'un-ch'iu fan-lu* (*Shen-ch'a ming-hao*), 10/5 b:

聖人之所命天下以爲正，正朝夕者視北辰正嫌疑者視聖人

“What the Sage ordered is considered correct by the world. To correct the course of day and night one looks towards the polar star; to correct what is *deceptively similar* one looks towards the Sage”.

9. *Ch'un-ch'iu fan-lu* (*Shih hsing*), 10/6 b:

正朝夕者視北辰，正嫌疑者視聖人，聖人之所名（=命）天下以爲正

“To correct the course of day and night one looks towards the polar star; to correct what is *deceptively similar* one looks towards the Sage. What the Sage ordered is considered correct by the world”.

Two occurrences of shyan in the Lun heng:

1. *Lun heng* (*Tzu-chi p'ien*):¹⁷

嫌疑隱微盡可名處且名白，事自定也。

“Lest things should remain doubtful and obscure to us, we can describe them all by names, and, provided that the names are clear, all the things become defined” (A. Forke, *Lun Heng, Wang Chung's Essays*, Berlin 1907; part I, page 71).

2. *Lun heng* (*Tzu-chi p'ien*):¹⁸

15. The translation of the first part of this sentence is tentative.

16. I follow the punctuation *shyan yi shian uei. yii*.....

17. *Ssu-pu pei-yao* edition, 30/4 b.

18. *Ssu-pu pei-yao* edition, 30/5 a.

獄當嫌辜，卿決疑事，渾沌難曉，與彼分明可知，孰爲良吏。

Forkes rendering of this passage is obviously incorrect: "A judge must *hate* (the italics are mine) wrong. Now, would a magistrate, who while deciding a doubtful case gives a confuse and unintelligent verdict, be a better official than another, who clearly distinguishes every point and can easily be understood?" (*op.cit.*, part I page 72). I suggest the following translation: "When a law-case concerns a dubious crime, and when judges decide on doubtful matters, if [one verdict which is] confused and difficult to understand is compared to that of another judge, which is clear and easy to understand, who is then the better judge?"¹⁹

One occurrence in the Po-hu-t'ung:

Po-hu-t'ung (*Ssu-pu ts'ung-k'an edition*, 1/3 a):

「春秋傳曰：『合伯子男以爲一爵』。或曰：『合從子，貴中也』。以春秋名鄭忽。忽者鄭伯也。此未踰年之君，當稱子，嫌爲改赴，故名之也。」

Tjan Tjoe Som's translation reads as follows: "The *Ch'un ch'iu chuan* says: "[The titles of] *po*, *tzu* and *nan* were combined into one". Some say: "They were combined and brought under *tzu* to honour the middle", [and prove it] from the *Ch'un ch'iu*, which mentions Hu of Cheng by his personal name. Hu was *po* of Cheng. Here was [a case of a Prince who became] ruler when the year [of the mourning-term for his father] had not yet expired, and who should have been called *tzu* 'Child', [but] *not wishing to* (the italics are mine) change [the title of] *po* into *tzu*, was mentioned by his personal name". (*op. cit.*, page 220)

Tjan Tjoe Som follows the emendation of *shyan wei gae bor tsornng tzyy* 嫌爲改伯從子 for *shyan wei gae fuh, guh ming jy yce* 嫌爲改赴，故名之也 as suggested by Lu Wen-ch'ao in his *Pao-ching-t'ang ts'ung-shu* edition of the *Po-hu-t'ung*. I suggest the following rendering of Lu Wen-ch'ao's emendation: "*The deceptive similarity between the term tzu 'viscount' and tzu 'Child' might give*

19. I am by no means convinced that my own rendering of the second half of this passage is correct. It seems certain, however, that the first two clauses (*yuh dang shyan gu, ching jyue yi shyh*) exhibit a syntactic parallelism, and that *shyan gu* is the antonym of *jy gu* 知辜 'a criminal case, the circumstances of which are known'. Cf *Lun heng* (*Tzu-chi-p'ien*), 30, 3 b: 斷決知辜，不必臯陶。"To decide a criminal case, the circumstances of which are known, one need not be a Kao Yao". Forke's rendering of this passage is incorrect: "To give a decision, and understand a grievance, one must not be a Kao Yao" (*op. cit.*, Part I, page 69).

rise to the mistaken assumption that the noble of *po* 'earl' had been changed into title that of *tzu* 'viscount'. The text therefore refers to him by his personal name".

This interpretation tallies with the comment by Ho Hsiu on the *Kung-yang* passage *Huan* 11.6:

春秋伯子男一也，辭無所貶。

"The *Ch'un-ch'iu* treats the ranks of earl, viscount and baron as one. This term could therefore not be used to signify degradation". Ho Hsiu says of this:

春秋改周之文，從殷之質，合伯子男爲一。一辭無所貶，皆從子。夷狄進爵稱子是也。忽稱子則與諸侯改伯從子辭同，於成君無所貶，故名也。

"The *Ch'un-ch'iu*, changing the principle of Form which was adhered to by the Chou and following the principle of Substance, which was adhered to by the Yin, combined the three noble ranks of *po*, *tzu* and *nan* into one. This one term could not be used to signify degradation, since the one term *tzu* was followed in all instances. This is instanced by the fact that barbarian chiefs, when promoted to noble rank, are referred to as *tzu*. If Hu had been referred to as *tzu* ('Child'), then the terminology would have been the same as that applied to feudal lords, whose rank was changed from that of *po* to that of *tzu*. This would in no way have signified a degradation of his position as an established ruler".

One occurrence of shyan in the Han shu:

Han shu (81, the biography of K'uang Heng 匡衡):²⁰

適子冠乎阼，禮之用醴，衆子不得與列，所以貴正體而明嫌疑也。

"The son of the principal wife was capped by the main staircase; in this ritual one used new sweet *li* wine. Sons of concubines were not given admission to the train [of participants]. This ritual served to honour [the one who had] the right of succession and to make manifest [the concept] of deceptive resemblance".

.....

In the *Ku-liang chuan* the morpheme *shyan* has taken on a specialized meaning, which may be conveyed by the following somewhat tortuous paraphrase: "a deceptive resemblance which enables one to claim an identity or a position to which he is not entitled; pretence; presumption; duplicity; arrogation".

Thirteen occurrences of shyan in the Ku-liang chuan:

20. *Ssu-pu pei-yao* edition 81/6 b.

1. *Duke Yin* 4.2:

戊申衛祝吁弑其君完，大夫弑其君以國氏者嫌也，弑而代之也。

"On the day *Wu-shen Chu-yü* of Wei assassinated his ruler Wan. To use the name of the state in the place of the surname of a great officer who has assassinated his ruler indicates *arrogation*. [He assassinated [his ruler] in order to succeed him".

Fan Ning's commentary says: 凡非正嫡則謂之嫌

"The term *shyan* ('arrogation') is used of anyone who is not the eldest son of the principal wife".

Chung Wen-cheng 鍾文丞 (*Ku-liang pu-chu*, 穀梁補注 *loc. cit.*) notes, that the *Ku-liang* term *shyan* is equivalent to the *Kung-yang* term *dang guo* 當國 'to arrogate the power of the state'.

2. *Duke Yin*, 4.6:

九月衛人殺祝吁于濮，稱人以殺，殺有罪也。祝吁之挈失嫌也，其月謹之也，于濮者譏失賊也。

"In the 9th month the men of Wei killed *Chu-yü* in Pu. The use of the term *ren* ('men') as the agent of a killing denotes the killing of someone guilty. That *Chu-yü* is referred to [simply] by his personal name indicates *the lapse of his [attempt at] arrogation*. The text gives the month in order to exercise special care. The phrase 'in Pu' implies criticism of the fact that the assassin (*Chu-yü*) was allowed to escape [abroad]".

Fan Ning says:

衆所同疾，威力不足以自固，失當國之嫌。

"Resented by all and lacking sufficient power to reinforce his own position he failed in his attempt to arrogate the power of the state".

3. *Duke Chuang*, 8.3:

This passage is identical with that of *Duke Yin*, 4.2.

4. *Duke Chuang*, 9.1:

This passage follows the pattern of that of *Duke Yin*, 4.6.

5. *Duke Chuang*, 22.1:

二十有二年春王正月，肆大眚，肆失也，眚災也，災紀也，失故也，爲嫌天子之葬也。

"In the 22nd year, in Spring, in the King's first month, there was a pardon of great offences. *Syh* means *shy* (= 佚 *yih*) ('to remit'); *shceng* means *tzai*

('offence'). [To punish] offences is the norm; to remit [offences] there must be a cause. [The offences were pardoned] *in order to create a deceptive resemblance to a funeral sanctioned by the Son of Heaven* (i. e. in order to make appear that the funeral was sanctioned by the Son of Heaven).²¹

6. Duke Hsi, 17.5:

多十有二月，乙亥，齊小白卒，此不正，其日之何也，其不正前見矣。其不正前見何也，以不正入虛國，故稱嫌焉耳。

"In Winter, in the 12th month, on the day *yi-hai*, Hsiao-po, marquis of Ch'i, died. He did not have the right of succession. Why, then, does the text give the day of his death? That he did not have the right of succession has already appeared from the preceding text. How has this appeared? Not having the right of succession he entered an empty state (i. e. a state without a ruler). Therefore [the *Ch'un-ch'iu*] [on that occasion] *used an expression implying arrogation*."²²

7. Duke Wen, 14.10:

齊公子商人弑其君舍。舍未踰年，其曰君何也。成舍之爲君所以重商人之弑也。商人其不以國氏何也，不以嫌代嫌也。

"Prince Shang-jen of Ch'i assassinated his ruler She. Since She had not yet passed the year [of mourning for his father] (and should therefore be referred to as *tsu* 'Child'), why does the text refer to him as ruler? Giving full expression to She's position as ruler is a means of aggravating the fact that Shang-jen assassinated him. Why is not [simply] the name of the state given in the place of the surname in Shang-jen's case? [The *Ch'un-ch'iu*] *does not let one instance of arrogation be followed by another*".

8. Duke Chao, 13. 2 and 3:

21. Duke Chuang's mother, who was guilty of having murdered her husband, duke Huan, had died in the previous year, and was buried in the Spring of the 22nd year. The Ku-liang school argues, that it was necessary to absolve her crime before she could be buried in accordance with the rites ordained by the Son of Heaven.

22. This refers to the *Ch'un-ch'iu* entry Duke Dhuang 9.4 齊小白入于齊。

"Hsiao-po of Ch'i entered into Ch'i". The *Ku-liang chuan* comments as follows:

大夫出奔反以好曰歸，以惡曰入，齊公孫無知弑襄公，公子糾公子小白不能存，出亡，齊人殺無知而迎公子糾於魯。公子小白不讓公子糾，先入又殺之於魯，故曰齊小白入于齊，惡之也。

"The term *guei* ('to return,') is used of a great officer who returns with good intentions after having fled his state; the term *ruh* ('to enter') is used when he returns with evil intentions. Kung-sun Wu-chih of Ch'i assassinated duke Hsiang, whereupon Prince Chiu and Prince Hsiao-po could no longer remain [in Ch'i] and [therefore] left in exile. The people of Ch'i killed Wu-chih and went to meet Prince Chiu in Lu. Prince Hsiao-po would not yield to Prince Chiu, entered [Ch'i] before him, and, in addition, had him killed in Lu. Therefore [the *Ch'un-ch'iu*] says: 'Hsiao-po of Ch'i entered into Ch'i' in order to condemn him".

夏四月，楚公子比自晉歸于楚，弑其君虔于乾溪。自晉，晉有奉焉爾。歸而弑，不言歸，言歸非弑也。歸一事也，弑一事也，而遂言之，以比之歸弑，比不弑也。弑君者日，不曰，比不弑也。楚公子棄疾殺公子比，當上之辭也。當上之辭者，謂不稱人以殺，乃以君殺之也。討賊以當上之辭，殺非弑也。比之不弑有四，取國者稱國以弑。楚公子棄疾殺公子比，比不嫌也。春秋不以嫌代嫌。棄疾主其事，故嫌也。

"In Summer, in the 4th month, Prince Pi of Ch'u returned from Chin to Ch'u, and assassinated his ruler Ch'ien at Kan-ch'i. The phrase 'from Chin' indicates, that Chin had instructed him in this regard. [If it were really a case of his] returning and assassinating [his ruler] the text would not use the term *guci* ('to return'). Since the text here uses the term *guci* there was no assassination [of Ch'ien by Prince Pi]. The return of Pi was one event, and the assassination of Ch'ien was [a different] event. That these two terms are here used in conjunction indicates, that the assassination occurred upon the return of Pi. [This is evidence of the fact that] Pi did not assassinate [Ch'ien]. The text indicates the day of assassinations of rulers. That the text does not do so here [is evidence of the fact that] Pi did not assassinate [Ch'ien].

Prince Ch'i-chi of Ch'u killed Prince Pi. This is an expression indicating command of authority. This 'command of authority' is revealed by the fact that the text does not use the term *ren* ('men') as the agent of the killing, but expresses the event in such terms as are used when a ruler has a man killed. When the punishing of an assassin is expressed in terms denoting command of authority [the proper term] is *sha* ('to kill') and not *shyh* ('to assassinate'.) Thus there are four items of evidence to show that Pi did not assassinate [his ruler]. The one who assassinates his ruler and takes his state is referred to by his personal name, to which is added that of his state. [In this instance] the wording 'Prince Ch'i-chi of Ch'u killed Prince Pi' indicates that *Pi was not guilty of arrogation. The Ch'un-ch'iu does not allow one instance of arrogation to be followed by another.* [And yet,] as Ch'i-chi was chiefly responsible for this matter (i.e. the killing of Pi) he should, consequently, have been guilty of *arrogation*".

9. Duke Chao, 22.8:

劉子單子以王猛居于皇，以者不以者王猛嫌也。

"The viscount of Liu and the viscount of Shan together with Meng of the Royal House resided in Huang. The use of the expression *yü* 'together with'

indicates, that their action was irregular.²³ *The expression 'Wang Meng' ('Meng-of the Royal House')* indicates arrogation".²⁴

10. *Duke Chao*, 22.10:

冬十月，王子猛卒，此不卒者也，其曰卒失嫌也。

"In Winter, in the 10th month, Meng, son of the king, died. Meng did not belong to the category of persons, the deaths of whom are recorded. That the death [of Meng] is recorded indicates *the lapse of his arrogation*".

11. *Duke Chao*, 23.10:

尹氏立王子朝，立者不宜立者也，朝之不名何也，別嫌乎尹氏之朝也。

"The Yin family set up Chao, son of the King. The term *lih* ('to set up') indicates, that it was improper to set up Chao [on the throne]. Why is Chao not referred to [simply] by his personal name? *In order to avert a deceptive resemblance that may give rise to the wrong assumption that Chao belonged to the Yin family*".

The special connotation of *shyan* which obtains in the majority of the *Ku-liang* examples, is found also in Cheng Hsüan's comment on *Li chi* 51 (*Fang-chi*), 15.b, and in the example from the *Han shu* (See above).

The grammatical functions of shyan 嫌 and shyan-yi, 嫌疑。

These forms may function as

1) *attribute* to a following nominal expression:

Li chi 62 (*Yen yi*), 19.a: *ming shyan jy yih yee*;

Li chi 3 (*Ch'ü li*), 17.a: *lii bwu huey shyan ming*;

Lü-shih ch'un-ch'iu (*Shen-shih*), 17/14.b: *syh ley shyan-yi jy daw*

Kuan-tzu (*Chün-ch'en*), 11/6.b: *jau shyan-yi jy jye*;

Ch'un-ch'iu fan-lu (*Tu chih*), 8/1.b: *shyan-yi shian uci*;

Lun heng (*Tzu chi p'ien*), 30/5.a: *shyan gw*;

2) the *predicate of a clause*:

Kung-yang, *Yin* 7.2: *buh shyan yee*;

ibid. *gucy jiann buh shyan*;

ibid. *mcci ch buh shyan*;

Kung-yang, *Huan* 12.9: *u-hu shyan*;

23. For an explanation of the formula *yii jee buh yii jee yee* see *Ku-liang chuan*, *Duke Huan* 14.7.

24. The commentators argue, that the term 'Wang' here is used as an equivalence of the name of a state, and that the resultant phrase ('Wang Meng') therefore indicates arrogation.

Kung-yang, Chuang 1.4: *sheau chin tzer shyan*;
Ch'un-ch'iu fan-lu (Chu-lin), 2/5.a: *tsyy chyi shyan yi shiang syh erl*
buh torng lü jee;

Ku-liang, Yin 4.2: *shyan yee*;
Ku-liang, Chuang 8.3: *shyan yee*;
Ku-liang, Chao 13.3: *Bü buh shyan yee*;
ibid. *guh shyan yee*;
Ku-liang, Chao 22.8: *Wang Meng shyan yee*;

To this group belong also the following three examples:

Huai-nan-tzu (Fan-lun hsün) 13/16.b: *shyan yi shiaw shiang jee*;
ibid., 13/20.b: *torng yih shyan yi jee*;
Ch'un-ch'iu fan-lu (Chung cheng), 5/6.b: *wuh shyy shyan yi*;

3) the *object* of a verb:

Kung-yang, Huan 12.9: *bih shyan yee*;
Li chi 21 (*Li yü*n), 26.a: *bye shyan*;
Li chi 49 (*Chi t'ung*), 3.b: *bye shyan*;
Ku-liang, Yin 4.6: *shy shyan yee*;
Ku-liang, Chuang 9.1: *shy shyan yee*;
Ku-liang, Chao 22.10: *shy shyan yee*;
Ku-liang, Hsi 17.5: *guh cheng shyan yan cel*;
Ku-liang, Wen 14.10: *buh yü shyan day shyan yee*;
Ku-liang, chao 13.3: *Chuen-chiou buh yü shyan day shyan*;
Hsün-tzu (Cheng ming), 16/10.b: *yih yih shy yj shyan*;

This is the favourite function of the expression *shyan-yi* 嫌疑。

Li chi 1 (*Ch'ü li*), 3.a: *jyue shyan-yi*;
Li chi 3 (*Ch'ü li*), 19.a: *jyue shyan-yi*;
Mo-tzu (Hsiao-ch'ü): *jyue shyan-yi*;
Huai-nan-tzu (T'ai-tsu hsün) 20/1.a: *jyue shyan-yi*;
Han shu 81 (*K'uang Heng chuan*): *ming shyan-yi yee*;
Ch'un-ch'iu fan-lu (Yü-ying), 3./3.a: *bye shyan uei*;
ibid. (*Shih chih*), 5/5.a: *bye shyan-yi*;
ibid., 5/6.a: *bye shyan-yi*;
ibid. (*Shan ch'a ming hao*), 10/5.b: *jenq shyan-yi jee*;
ibid. (*Shih hsing*), 10/6.b: *jenq shyan-yi jee*;

4) a *transitive verb*, followed by

(i) a substantival phrase as object:

Ku-liang, Chuang 22.1: *wey shyan Tian-tzyy jy tzang yee*;

(ii) an unmarked verb phrase as object:

Kung-yang, Huan 12.9: *shyan yeu Jenq ren jann yee*;

Po-hu-t'ung: *shyan wei gae bor tsorng tzyy*;

(iii) a prepositional phrase:

Chou yi 1 (*K'un, Wen-yen*), 7.b: *wey chyi shyan iu wu yang yee*;

Ku-liang, Chao 23.10: *bye shyan hu Yün-shyh jy Jau yee*.

This transitive function of *shyan* is frequently found in the works of commentators from the Later Han and onwards.

.....

The morpheme *shyan* is in all probability cognate to the morpheme *jian* 兼 (*jian*: 'to combine two functions; to be both x and y; to be also y'; *shyan*: 'to be so deceptively similar as too appear to (or claim to) combine two functions; to appear to (or claim to) be both x and y; to appear to (or claim to) be also y'). A detailed study of this problem lies outside the narrow scope of this paper.

