

## Shī 195 and Húng Fàn 洪範6

E Bruce Brooks 白牧之

University of Massachusetts at Amherst

*WSWG Note 212 (1 Feb 2000)*

**Abstract.** Nylan **Plan 122** notes the similarity between five terms in Shī 195E and in §6c of Shū 32, the Húng Fàn. As to which is indebted to which, she cites conflicting opinions, and finds that if “any conscious borrowing occurred at all,” the matter is an “irresolvable chicken-and-egg problem.” She elsewhere (p122) concludes that Shī 195 may be assigned to the 08c and (p46), that the Húng Fàn core is from “late Warring States.” If so, then the directionality problem, so far from being “irresolvable,” is in fact resolved: the answer is Shī 195 > Shū 32. As a study in method, I here ask whether the directionality of these two *passages* can be determined. I find that it can, and that the result agrees with Nylan’s relative sequence for the two *texts*.

**Options** for presumptively related passages in any two texts are:

1. Both are consistent in context. There is no firm directionality indication. If either was derived from the other, it has been smoothed in its new setting. The two may also be independent adaptations of some third source.
2. One is consistent in context. The presumption is that the consistent passage is the source, and that it is intrusive in the other text.<sup>1</sup>
3. Neither is consistent in context. There is probably an outside source, which has been separately intruded into the two texts in question.<sup>2</sup>

Shī 195A-C contain eight 4-syllable lines, but with longer lines toward the ends of stanzas. 195D-E have seven rather than eight lines, again with some long lines toward the end of stanzas. 195E keeps the general theme of complaint, and prosodically is like 195D. There may be a problem with the last stanza, 195F, which has textual overlaps with the end of Shī 196. But 195E is not similarly suspect.

Nylan 125 calls the Húng Fàn core “a pastiche of . . . works of different date and intent.” §5 and §6 are lists of five items followed by not one but two explications, so we may agree that §6 is part of a “pastiche,” and heterogeneous in the core Húng Fàn. This fits Option 2 and suggests Shī > Shū, but the indication is a rather weak one.

We may also ask which passage is more readily derivable from the other. All details should be checked. Directionality determinations are not chain arguments, where a “weakest link” rule obtains. Rather, if most of the details, or the seemingly clearest details, point in one direction, the case is stronger than if they do not.

<sup>1</sup>But there can be complications. An interpolation which is rough in text A (eg Mark 16:7 between 16:6 and 8) may be smoothed when it is copied into B (as at Matthew 28:6-8).

<sup>2</sup>But it may also be that an interpolation which is rough in text A (eg Mark 14:28, between 14:27 and 29) may *fail* to be smoothed when it is copied into B (as at Matthew 26:31-33).

The verbal similarity which gives rise to our problem is five terms of approval in Shī 195E (in the matrix 或 A 或 B) which also appear in the Five Duties (Nylan p14) or 五事 section, §6c, of the Húng Fàn core. In Shī 195 order, and with Nylan's translations (p122) for the Húng Fàn terms, the correspondences are:

Shī 195E	Húng Fàn §6c
1. shǜng 聖 “sagely”	5. [shǜng 聖] <sup>3</sup> “sagehood”
2. fǒu 否 [”or not”]	-
3. jí 哲 “wise”	3. jí 哲 “wisdom”
4. móu 謀 “judicious”	4. móu 謀 “deliberation”
5. sù 肅 “grave”	1. sù 肅 “reverence”
6. yì 艾 “dignified”	2. yì 义 “good order”

We may note the following differences:

(1) The orthographic variant 艾 / 义 for yì “dignified” is apparently within the Warring States scribal range. It does not clearly indicate a direction.

(2) The order is different (reversed by pairs) in the two lists. Which order is more natural? Even if it does not refer to the ruler, shǜng 聖 is the most strongly positive of these terms, since at minimum it implies the special insight which is needed by a qualified advisor. Sù/yì, on the other hand, fall in the lower category of deportment. Most listings in early Chinese run from socially high to low. We may thus be inclined to regard the Shī 195 order as the original. But there is always the possibility that an original upward order was later adjusted to the more conventional downward order.

(3) A stronger argument is that the Húng Fàn sequence appears to be influenced by the order of the Five Shì 五事, of which they are the second gloss, and which in turn are probably intended to be parallel to the Five Syíng 五行 in the preceding §5. Here is the lineup, and it clearly suggests that the Five Syíng are the controlling factor in the Húng Fàn §6c order:

§5a 五行	§6a 五事	§6b	§6c
水	~ 貌	> 恭	> 肅
火	~ 言	> 從	> 义
木	~ 視	> 明	> 哲
金	~ 聽	> 聰	> 某
土	~ 思	> 睿	> 聖

The Húng Fàn §6c order is then locally constrained, while there is no sign of context pressure in Shī 195. This more strongly suggests the direction Shī > Shū.

**External Indicators** include any evidence for the composition dates of the two texts. The Húng Fàn is traditionally linked with the Jōu conquest of Shāng, at the *beginning* of Jōu, whereas Shī 195 is traditionally ascribed to the time of the Jōu king Yōu-wáng (early 08c, toward the *end* of effective Jōu power). Waley has argued in support of the late Jōu dating for Shī 195. If so, we would then have an indication in favor of Shū > Shī. But traditional datings always require investigation. One way to investigate them is to consider external evidence, in order to determine when the texts are first attested by being mentioned *in other texts*, themselves presumably datable.

<sup>3</sup>Given by Nylan 122 as “jung 容,” apparently an error.

