Abstract. I have suggested¹ that the account of Dzvngdž’s death in Dà Dát Lí Jì 大戴禮記 (DDLJ) 57:1 is from the Dzvngdž (DZ) text listed in the HS 30 catalogue (#127) as having 18 pyên, and that this version, though probably not early, is at least earlier than the one in Tán-gūng 1A18. Riegel (Loewe ECT 457) disagrees. I here argue that DDLJ 49-58 are derived from the Hán Dzvngdž, and may include all of it.

DDLJ and LJ. Neither DDLJ nor Lí Ji 禮記 (LJ) appears in the HS 30 catalogue; both probably took shape after its compilation (026-c03). Compatibly with this, Riegel (p294) notes that neither DDLJ nor LJ was fixed as of the later White Tiger Hall debate of 79, which cites by individual title texts now in those collections. He attributes the compilation of LJ to Tsâu Bâu 曹褒 (d 102). For DDLJ, he proposes a still later date, and notes that DDLJ is at several points indebted to LJ. DZ (which was clearly extant before the HS 30 catalogue was compiled) was thus available as a source for LJ and DDLJ. DDLJ is an eclectic work, so its Dzvngdž chapters (DDLJ 49-58) probably have an outside source. The Hán Dzvngdž text would be the obvious source.

Riegel argues that DDLJ 52 contains part of LJ 24, and that DDLJ 58 draws on Hwánandž 3 and 4, implying the sequence LJ 24, HNZ 3-4 > DDLJ. He suggests (p457) that “the remainder are probably fabrications of the Hán dynasty which use Tseng Tzu’s name for the prestige and orthodoxy that it might lend to the teachings which they espouse.” This might indeed have been the motive of the DDLJ compilers, but it could equally well have been that of the compilers of the Hán Dzvngdž itself. Even if the Dzvngdž had a pre-Hán core, it may still have been accretionally active in Hán. DDLJ 58, elaborating the Hwáng/Lâu idea that Heaven is round and Earth is square, might well have been added (with an eye to HNZ 3-4) by the DZ proprietors to shape their text to early Hán tastes. The value of a Hwáng/Lâu element would probably have decreased after the establishment of Confucianism in 0136, so that year is a likely terminus ante quem for this stage of the DZ. Borrowing from the Confucian text LJ 24 might have occurred at a time nearer to 0136.² That relationship with the individual LJ 24 could easily have preceded the later finalizing of the LJ collection.

For what late evidence may be worth as confirmation, it may be noted that the annotated table of contents to the DDLJ commentary of Kíng Æwáng-svn 孔廣森 (1752-1786) also identifies DZ as the source for this part of the DDLJ.

¹In the comment appended to Enos Sources.

²Dvng and Wáng 387f note that Dvng Jóng-shũ (c0179-c0104) quotes a line now found in DDLJ 57, and infer that the Dzvngdž was put together before his time. This evidence points to much the same period of final DZ compilation as the previous considerations.
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The Chyorraine Jhi-yau 群書治要 (CSJY) was compiled by Ngwèi Jvng 聶敬 (580-643) during his tenure as Tâng Palace Librarian, and presented to the throne in 631. It comprises extracts from 67 different texts: the classics and standard histories and a few other well-regarded works which were considered relevant to government. All 67 CSJY sources are listed in the catalogue of the Swé Library, which in turn was the nucleus of the Tâng library. The presumption is that Ngwèi Jvng, being in charge of the Tâng library, worked from the originals and not from intermediate collections. CSJY credits LJ, but not DDLJ, among its sources. For the material here discussed, it credits the Dzvängdz as its source. The source text for the CSJY was then probably the Dzvängdz listed in the Swé catalogue in 2 jywæ plus 1 jywæn of contents, and the CSJY 35 extracts were drawn from that still extant Hân Dzvängdz. It is probably a copy of the same Dzvängdz that figures in Fujiwara Sukeyo’s catalogue of Chinese books. Those books were brought to Japan by embassies beginning in 600.

As a check, we may compare the CSJY extracts with the DDLJ “Dzvängdz” section. The CSJY extracts turn out to be a skillful abridgement of passages which are included in DDLJ 49, 51, 54, and 57. Together, the CSJY extracts cover about 30% of the DDLJ material. It turns out that, in the area covered by the CSJY extracts, DDLJ has the same order of chapters, and of passages within chapters, as the CSJY extracts. DDLJ differs from those extracts only in small points of orthography. This result makes it reasonable to take DDLJ 49-58 as also derived from the Hân Dzvängdz.

Given that the DDLJ 49-58 material was drawn from the Hân Dzvängdz, it is then of interest that the 28 passages cited in CSJY as from DZ, without mention of DDLJ, are all found in DDLJ. If the DDLJ material had been an abridgement of the DZ made from a ritual point of view (as its title invites us to suspect), and if CSJY were an independent abridgement made from a governmental point of view (as the title of that work implies), we would expect some difference of content. But there is no difference. This lack of divergence ceases to be curious if DDLJ 49-50 are the entire Hân DZ.

Hân. We must then explain why DDLJ 49-58 are only 10 chapters, but the HS 30 entry describes the Hân DZ as having 18 chapters. The sizes of DDLJ chapters permit a suggestion. DDLJ 49 contains 45 sayings, whereas the other DDLJ chapters range on average from 3 to 10 sayings (I omit the DDLJ 58 essay in this calculation), the average sayings per chapter being just under 6. We must conclude that small pyên worked for the DZ compilers, perhaps because the text was written on short strips. If we divide the 45 passages of DDLJ 49 by the 5.875-saying average for DDLJ 50-57, we get 7.656, which rounds to 8 pyên. That is, if it were distributed as in other pyên, the material of DDLJ 49 would make 8 pyên, and the total DDLJ Dzvängdz would be 17 pyên, which is perhaps near enough to the “18 pyên” figure in HS 30 to permit the inference that DDLJ 49-58 are the Hân DZ, but with the original material redivided. I offer that inference as my suggestion.

3The corresponding passages are DDLJ 49:1-5, 9, 11, 15-16, 21, 38-39, 41, 43; 51:1-4; 54:1-2, 4; and 57:1-7. The total is 28 passages, out of a DDLJ total of 93.

4Like the Confucian text recovered at Ding-syen, and named by its editors 儒家省言, which has at most 13 characters per strip; see WW 1981 #8 6f.
Retrospect: The Death of Dżngdź

With this working hypothesis in hand, and not discouraged by the fact that Rwän Ywën had earlier come to the same conclusion (his commentary on the Dżngdź takes the DDLJ text as its base), we may revisit the three variants of the Dżngdź death story. Those stories, in the order LY 8 > DZ 17 [DDLJ 57] > LJ 2 which I have suggested for them, show the following thematic progression:

LY 8:3 (c0436, the first item in this brief Dżngdź memorial collection):
Unnamed followers hold Dżngdź’s hands and feet, he asks them to release him. Moral: No mere physical contortion threatens moral achievement.

DZ 17:1 (date uncertain; originally the last item in this work): Dżngdź’s sons support his head and embrace his feet. Moral (Yên Hwën): Only greed threatens moral achievement.

LJ 2 (Hàn): Dżngdź’s sons and followers attend; no contact until he is lifted from the Jį mat. Moral: Only political impropriety threatens moral achievement.

As we consider these stories in the suggested order, notice the fading of the “contact” motif, and the rise of the “political” motif. This seems to make a plausible evolutionary sequence: from an ethical to a political sensibility. It could not have been predicted, but it is also not intrinsically unlikely, that the direction of this evolution is from the personal to the public. Society was moving in somewhat the same direction.

It would seem to follow that the Hàn Dżngdź text belongs to a later stage of intellectual history than the LY 8:3 Dżngdź death scene, and that the independent Dżngdź tradition (insofar as it is witnessed by the Dżngdź text) was ideologically distinct from, and not a mere transplant of, the historical Dżngdź.

For one thing, the Hàn text shows Dżngdź as identified with filial piety, an association which (as Hsiao has noted) is not present in the Dżngdź sayings of c0436 (LY 8:3, 5-7), but is common in Hàn. In general, filial piety is not found as a virtue in the 05c Analects. When introduced into the Analects in the late 04c, filial piety is associated with several disciples. Not until the Dżngdź section of LY 19 (19:17-18) is that virtue clearly linked with Dżngdź. A separate Dżngdź tradition might have arisen as early as the replacement of the Dżng line of Analects School heads by the Kǔng line (c0400), or by the time of Dżngdź’s banishment from the Lū Confucian school as part of the Kǔng family rewriting of school history (LY 11:3, c0360), which cleared the way for Dżngdź to be portrayed as the founder of his own school. Whenever that independent school began, it adopted filial piety as a signature theme sometime before Analects LY 19 (c0253). That filial piety continued to be highly valued in Hàn times will be obvious to anyone familiar with Hàn writings, including the sacrificial epithets of the Hàn Emperors.
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