

Shī 195 and Shū 32

E Bruce Brooks 白牧之

University of Massachusetts at Amherst

WSWG Note 212 (1 Feb 2000)

Abstract. Nylan **Center** 122 notes the similarity between five terms in Shī 195E and in §6c of Shū 32, the Húng Fàn 洪範. As to which list 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 also finds that Shī 195 may be ascribed to the 08c (p122) and that the Húng Fàn core is from “late Warring States” (p46). 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 competent independent adaptations from a third source.
2. One is consistent in context. The presumption is that the consistent passage is the source, and that the other passage is clumsily derivative.¹
3. Neither is consistent in context. There is probably an outside source, from which the passage was clumsily introduced into both the texts in question.²

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 ends of stanzas. 195E retains the general theme of complaint, and is prosodically 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 calls the Húng Fàn core “a pastiche of . . . works of different date and intent” (p195). §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.

¹But 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).

²But 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 as the second of two transforms (§6b, 6c) of the Five Duties (Nylan p14) or 五事 section, §6 of the Húng Fàn core. In Shī 195 order, and with Nylan’s translations (p122) for §6c, the correspondences are:

Shī 195E	Húng Fàn §6c
1. shǜng 聖 “sagely”	5. [shǜng 聖] ³ “sagehood”
2. fǒu 否 [’or not”]	[no corresponding term]
3. jǜ 哲 “wise”	3. jǜ 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 variant 艾 / 义 for yì “dignified” is apparently within the range of Warring States scribal usage. 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 it is always possible that an original upward order was adjusted, in Shī 195, to the more conventional downward order.

(3) The Húng Fàn §6b sequence is a transform of the Five Shì 五事, §6a, and §6c is a further transform of §6b. The sequence clearly lying behind all the transforms is the Five Syíng 五行 in the preceding §5. Here are those transforms in Húng Fàn order:

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

They clearly show that the order of §6c is generated by that of §5a. Then the Húng Fàn §6c order is locally constrained, whereas there is no clear context pressure in Shī 195. This suggests the direction Shī > Shū. The order that can be explained as changed from the other is derivative, and the text in which the change can be seen actually taking place is presumptively later than the text displaying the original order.

External Evidence. The Húng Fàn is traditionally linked with the Jōu conquest of Shāng, at the *beginning* of Jōu. 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 a 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, including the dates when the texts are first attested by being mentioned *in other texts*, themselves presumably datable.

³Given by Nylan 122 as “jung 容,” apparently an error.

The earliest witness to Shī 195 is LY 8:3, where the dying Dzṽngdž quotes it.⁴ Dzṽngdž died in 0436, late in the early Warring States. This is a traditional date, but one which can be supported from a network of other evidence.⁵ Then 0436 is the terminus ante quem for the date of LY 8:3.⁶ The earliest witnesses to the Húng Fàn are quotations in the Dzwǒ Jwàn 左傳 (DJ; completion date late 04c).⁷ The terminus ante quem for Shī 195 is thus distinctly earlier than that for the Húng Fàn, in agreement with Nylan's relative dating. Such limits are not decisive, but these limits are at least compatible with the inference that Shī 195 is earlier. This agrees with the internal evidence, all of which is consistent, and part of which is strong. No strong indicators seem to point in the opposite direction. We may thus workably conclude that the order of the two passages is Shī 195E > Shū 32 §6c.

Plausibility Check. Dating the Húng Fàn to the 04c rather than to the 011c is not useless; there are secondary benefits. One is that it explains the radical Húng Fàn passage which prescribes how conflicting advice from two divination sources and three human sources, *including popular opinion*, is to be resolved. That passage is most readily intelligible as an expression of the new populist theories which, in one way or another, engaged several 04c thinkers, but are unknown in texts firmly datable to earlier periods. There is no violation of known social history, and the criterion of historical plausibility is met. Plausibility is the usual final check on dating hypotheses.

Conclusion. No one indicator here is decisive, nor is the cumulative effect of all the indicators decisive. Historical inferences are not *in their nature* decisive; they are always open to new evidence, or to a better argument from the old evidence. That is the nature of historical knowledge. The role of method is to produce, not truth, but an actionable inference. I submit herewith that the present Shī 195 > Shū 32 inference is actionable: that when applied, it will yield a better understanding of the sources, and of the social, intellectual, and literary situations which lie behind those sources, without creating new problems elsewhere for the systematic investigator.

Works Cited

- E Bruce Brooks and A Taeko Brooks. The Original Analects. Columbia 1998
 Robert Eno. Sources for the Analects 8 Layers. WSP v1 (2010) 93-99
 Henri Maspero. China in Antiquity. 1925; rev 1965; tr Massachusetts 1978
 Michael Nylan. The Shifting Center. Steyler 1992
 Arthur Waley. The Eclipse Poem and Its Group. T'ien Hsia (October 1936) 245-248

⁴There are also resemblances to Shī 196F (see Brooks **Analects** 47), but the lines do not fit that context equally well. Note that stanza 195E is not involved in the LY 8:3 quote.

⁵Including the traditional date of Confucius's death. Maspero **Chine** 376n (**China** 449f) suggested that this might be a generation later than the previously supposed 0479. This would put the climax of his career under a later ruler than Aī-gūng. But no preserved anecdotes, including hostile anecdotes, display that situation, and other traditional dates, among them the death of Dzṽngdž, contradict it. For a general review of the position, see Brooks **Analects** 263.

⁶On this passage, see further Eno **Sources** 97.

⁷DJ Syāng 3 (as from the "Shū"); W'vn 5 (as from the "Shāng Shū").