

The Hàn Dz̄ngd̄ 曾子

E Bruce Brooks 白牧之

University of Massachusetts at Amherst

WSWG Query 88 (17 Feb 1997)

Abstract. I have suggested¹ that the account of Dz̄ngd̄'s death in Dà Dài Lǐ Jì 大戴禮記 (DDLJ) 57:1 is from the Dz̄ngd̄ (DZ) text listed in the HS 30 catalogue (#127) as having 18 pyēn, 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 Hàn Dz̄ngd̄, and may include *all* of it.

DDLJ and LJ. Neither DDLJ nor Lǐ Jì 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 Tsáu Bāu 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 Dz̄ngd̄ chapters (DDLJ 49-58) probably have an outside source. The Hàn Dz̄ngd̄ text would be the obvious source.

Riegel argues that DDLJ 52 contains part of LJ 24, and that DDLJ 58 draws on Hwánánd̄ 3 and 4, implying the sequence LJ 24, HNZ 3-4 > DDLJ. He suggests (p457) that “the remainder are probably fabrications of the Hàn 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 Hàn Dz̄ngd̄ itself. Even if the Dz̄ngd̄ had a pre-Hàn core, it may still have been accretionally active in Hàn. DDLJ 58, elaborating the Hwáng/Lǎu 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 Hàn tastes. The value of a Hwáng/Lǎu 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 Kūng Gwǎng-s̄n 孔廣森 (1752-1786) also identifies DZ as the source for this part of the DDLJ.

¹In the comment appended to Eno **Sources**.

²Dv̄ng and Wáng 387f note that Dv̄ng Jv̄ng-shū (c0179-c0104) quotes a line now found in DDLJ 57, and infer that the Dz̄ngd̄ was put together before his time. This evidence points to much the same period of final DZ compilation as the previous considerations.

The Chyṽn-shū Jř-yàu 群書治要 (CSJY) was compiled by Ngwèi Jṽng 魏徵 (580-643) during his tenure as Táng 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 Swéi Library, which in turn was the nucleus of the Táng library. The presumption is that Ngwèi Jṽng, being in charge of the Táng 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 Dzṽngdž as its source. The source text for the CSJY was then probably the Dzṽngdž listed in the Swéi catalogue in 2 jywàen plus 1 jywàen of contents, and the CSJY 35 extracts were drawn from that still extant Hàn Dzṽngdž. It is probably a copy of the same Dzṽngdž 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 "Dzṽngdž" section. The CSJY extracts turn out to be a skillful abridgement of passages which are included in DDLJ 49, 51, 54, and 57.³ 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 Hàn Dzṽngdž.

Given that the DDLJ 49-58 material was drawn from the Hàn Dzṽngdž, 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* Hàn DZ.

Hàn. We must then explain why DDLJ 49-58 are only 10 chapters, but the HS 30 entry describes the Hàn 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 pyēn worked for the DZ compilers, perhaps because the text was written on short strips.⁴ 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 pyēn. That is, *if it were distributed as in other pyēn*, the material of DDLJ 49 would make 8 pyēn, and the total DDLJ Dzṽngdž would be 17 pyēn, which is perhaps near enough to the "18 pyēn" figure in HS 30 to permit the inference that DDLJ 49-58 *are* the Hàn 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-syèn, and named by its editors 儒家者言, which has at most 13 characters per strip; see WW 1981 #8 6f.

Retrospect: The Death of Dz̄vngd̄ž

With this working hypothesis in hand, and not discouraged by the fact that Rwǎn Ywǎn had earlier come to the same conclusion (his commentary on the Dz̄vngd̄ž takes the DDLJ text as its base), we may revisit the three variants of the Dz̄vngd̄ž 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 Dz̄vngd̄ž memorial collection): Unnamed followers hold Dz̄vngd̄ž'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): Dz̄vngd̄ž's sons support his head and embrace his feet. Moral (Yén Hwéi): *Only greed* threatens moral achievement.

LJ 2 (Hàn): Dz̄vngd̄ž's sons and followers attend; no contact until he is lifted from the Jì 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 Dz̄vngd̄ž text belongs to a later stage of intellectual history than the LY 8:3 Dz̄vngd̄ž death scene, and that the independent Dz̄vngd̄ž tradition (insofar as it is witnessed by the Dz̄vngd̄ž text) was ideologically distinct from, and not a mere transplant of, the historical Dz̄vngd̄ž.

For one thing, the Hàn text shows Dz̄vngd̄ž as identified with filial piety, an association which (as Hsiao has noted) is not present in the Dz̄vngd̄ž 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 Dz̄vngd̄ž section of LY 19 (19:17-18) is that virtue clearly linked with Dz̄vngd̄ž. A separate Dz̄vngd̄ž tradition might have arisen as early as the replacement of the Dz̄vng line of Analects School heads by the Kǔng line (c0400), or by the time of Dz̄vngd̄ž's banishment from the Lǔ Confucian school as part of the Kǔng family rewriting of school history (LY 11:3, c0360), which cleared the way for Dz̄vngd̄ž 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.

Works Cited

- Robert Eno. Sources for the Analects 8 Layers. WSP v1 (2010) 93-99
 Harry Hsin-i Hsiao. Problems Concerning Tseng Tzu's Role in the Promotion of Filial Pietism. Chinese Culture v19 #1 (1978) 9-16
 Rwǎn Ywǎn 阮元. 曾子注解, in 皇清經解