

**The Rabbit Question***Textual Continuity (or Not) Beyond the Hàn Palace Library (c020)***Group 1**

LSC 17:6 慎子曰 今一兔走 ， 百人逐之。非一兔足爲百人分也。由 未定 [也]。  
 SJS 26 [CSJY] 一兔走 ， 而百人追之。非以兔爲可分以爲百，由名之未定 也。  
 YWZ 彭蒙曰 雉兔在野， 衆人逐之。 分未定 也。  
 SD #82 [Th1970] 一兔走街， 百人追之。  
 SD #82 [Th 1979] 一兔走街， 百人逐之。非一兔足爲百人分也。由 未定分也。

**Group 2**

LSC 17:6 [分] 未定。堯 且屈力，而況衆人乎？  
 SJS 26 [CSJY] 夫賣兔者滿市，盜不敢取，由名分之定也。故名分 未定，堯舜禹湯且皆加務而逐之 。  
 YWZ 雞豕 滿市，莫有志者。 分定故也。 物奢 則仁智 相屈 。  
 SD #82 [Th1970] 稽兔 於市，過而不顧。  
 SD #82 [Th1979] [分] 未定 ， 堯 且屈力，而況衆人乎？

**Group 3**

LSC 17:6 稽兔滿市，行者不顧。非不欲兔也，分已定矣。 分已定，人雖鄙不爭 。  
 SJS 26 [CSJY] 名分已定， 貪盜不取 。  
 YWZ 分 定則 貪鄙不爭 。  
 SD #82 [Th1970] 非不欲兔 ， 分 定 不爭也。  
 SD #82 [Th1979] 稽兔滿市，過者不顧。非不欲兔也，分已定矣。 分已定，人雖鄙不爭 。

**Group 4**

LSC 17:6 故治天下及國，在乎定分而已矣。 [Continues with a related topic]  
 SJS 26 [CSJY] [continues with discussion of the concept of 定分, which is also the title of SJS 26]  
 YWZ [continues with a different topic]  
 SD #82 [Th1970]  
 SD #82 [Th1979] 故治天下及國，在乎定分而已矣。

**Notes**

**LSC** 呂氏春秋: [也], Group 1, HK concordance; 由 > [分], Group 2, Thompson 1970 (inadvertent duplication of previous 由).

**SJS** 商君書: Text from earliest quote: CSJY 群書治要 (631). Thompson criticizes 以 as a corruption of 一 (Group 1), but it is part of the 以爲 idiom in the rephrased passage, not an error. He also criticizes 夫賣 as an error for 積 (Group 2), but the following 者 shows that the writer was trying to make sense of an orthographically unclear original; it is an emendation, not an error.

**YWZ** 尹文子: The attribution to Píng Míng 彭蒙 is apparently not a slip; the previous passage cites Tyén Pyén 田駢. This argues against the firmness of the attribution of this example to Shǔn Dào, at this period.

**SD 慎到 #82 [Th1970]:** This line is the reconstruction of Fragment 82 in Thompson: The Shen Tzu Fragments (UMI 1970). I silently correct 遂 to 逐 in the LSC transcript (this error is corrected in Th1979). The YWZ version is only partly given (Group 2 from 物奢 onward, and all of Group 3, are omitted), but it is conceded in this 1970 study that the YWZ order supports SJS against LSC. Thompson modifies the LSC version accordingly (p240). A very spare reconstruction of Fragment 82 results (p396)

**SD 慎到 #82 [Th1979]:** This line is the reconstruction of Fragment 82 in Thompson: The Shen Tzu Fragments (Oxford 1979). The YWZ version is here dismissed as “at best an uninformative, paraphrastic adaptation,” and the SJS version called “clearly the inferior text” as against LSC. Shǔn Dào Fragment 82 is modified in the direction of the LSC version (p280) This revised reconstruction enhancing the conclusion that Warring States testimony establishes the wording of the Shǔndǎo original, from which point all divergences “can be accounted for perfectly plausibly by supposing no more than normal transmissional error in either or both the direct and the indirect traditions of the Shen Tzu” (p168).

**Conclusion**

The variants are *not* failed attempts to copy the Shǔn Dào correctly; they are stages in the literary wearing down of an illustrative example into a cliché. Major steps are (1) Rearrangement of the sequence of two elements in SJS, followed by YWZ. (2) Reduction to a brief, virtually mnemonic version in the Hàn version of the Shǔndǎo, which does not preserve the more loquacious earlier version. There is no direct continuity, rather an evolutionary link, between the text that LSC and SJS were looking at, and the Hàn Shǔndǎo.