

Sources for the Analects 8 Layers

Robert Eno

Indiana University

WSWG Query 88 (17 Feb 1997)

Abstract. As Kimura and others have noted, LY 8 has a tripartite structure, comprising, in the Brookses' nomenclature, (C) 8:1 and 18-21, reflections on past sage kings, (B) 8:2 and 8-17, collected sayings of Confucius, and (A) 8:3, 5-7 collected sayings of Dz̄vngdž. Bruce and Taeko focus on the last as the key to dating the book, as it includes the "deathbed" utterances of Dz̄vngdž, hence, accepting Chyén Mù's dates, it can be attributed to 0436. They see LY 8A as a "memorial text" composed shortly after Dz̄vngdž's death (c0436), and the other two layers as intrusions. I do not quarrel with their dating of 8:3, 5-7, but note that the proposed c0436 "mini-book" contains only four entries (four bamboo strips? one per passage?). I am not sure how to picture what this proposal implies, and I think we need a fuller discussion of LY 8. I here suggest prior sources for all three LY 8 layers.

LY 8C. If we reunite the various passages in 8:1 and 18-21, and tweak them a bit, they show elements of thematic, lexical, and logical continuity:

- 8:1 Celebrates Tàì-gūng's insistent renunciation of his birthright
- 8:18 Celebrates Shùn and Yǔ for renouncing [self]-interest in their realms
- 8:19a Celebrates Yáu for emulating Tyēn [Heaven]
- 8:19b Adds comments on his success and culture
- 8:20a Numbers the ministers of Shùn and Wǔ-wáng. Confucius comments
- 8:20b Celebrates the virtue of the Jōu, who renounced the opportunity to rule
- 8:21 Celebrates Yǔ's combination of simplicity and ritual care

8:18-19a appear nearly verbatim in MC 3A4, though Yǔ is not included and the order is reversed. There is lexical overlap among these passages: the opening phrase of 8:1, followed by a phrase headed by the number three, is the close of 8:20b, preceded by a phrase headed with the number three. The closing phrase of 8:1 recurs slightly altered in 8:19a. 8:18 and 19 share an exclamatory phrase. 8:20a and 21, however, do not seem to share the features of the other passages. I think we should regard 8:1, 18, 19a, and 20a as an independent text which was cut and modified in the Analects. Since we seem to have a post-Mencian emendation in 8:18, its date must be later than c0300. The theme is renunciation, with a prologue about Yáu's emulation of Tyēn as the source of renunciation.

If we prefer the MC to the LY version, we might reconstruct as follows:

大哉堯之爲君！惟天爲大，惟堯則之。蕩蕩乎民無能名焉
 君哉舜也。巍巍乎！有天下而不與焉
 □□哉泰伯也。蕩蕩乎！三以天下讓，民無德而稱焉
 □□哉文王也。三分天下有其二，以服事殷，其可謂至德也已矣

This reconstruction omits Yǔ in 8:18, regards 8:19b as embellished, perhaps by the authors of LY 5:13 (where Tyēn and wǐn-jāng 文章 are in opposition), makes all passages parallel, interprets Jōu as Wǐn-wáng, and takes 20a as a later insertion. 8:21 is regarded as an attempt to co-opt the Mohist paragon Yǔ (who seems like a Mohist miser-ruler, but followed the Confucian norm of lavishness in ritual life), which was added at the same time as the mention of Yǔ in 8:18.¹ The result is a text with one rough parallel in LY 20:1. In that passage (regarded by the Brookses as a separate text which they date to c0250, between LY 19, c0253, and the rest of LY 20, 0249), we also see Yáu linked with Shùn; the connecting theme is the product of Yáu's dzí-Tyēn activity: the calendar. Again, there is an intrusion in LY 20:1. At the mention of Yǔ there is a break in the text, and a passage associated with the Shāng founder Tāng (parallel to a passage in MZ 16, the third of the Jyēn Ài chapters) appears, before the text moves on to the Jōu. Thus we have a parallel slant in the intrusions in LY 8C and LY 20:1. Note that if LY 8C and 20:1 are removed, so are all substantive passages concerning Yáu and Yǔ, and Shùn appears substantively only in LY 12:22 and 15:5.

LY 8B. Turning to the B layer, we see the following array:

- 2a Formulaic text noting necessity of lǐ to four modes of goodness
- 2b The jywǎndǔ sticks by family and old acquaintances
- 8 The importance of poetry, lǐ, music
- 9 People can be led but may not understand
- 10 Courage may lead to excess
- 11 Nothing can make up for excess
- 12 Students rarely long delay employment in favor of study
- 13a Persevere in the Dào unto death and avoid danger (timeliness)
- 13b/c Two additional formulations of timeliness
- 14 Do not interfere in others' responsibilities
- 15 Music criticism
- 16 Formulaic text noting necessity of mitigating virtues for faults
- 17 Encouragement to study hard

There are parallels with LY 17. (1) 8:2a and 17:7 pair jí 直 and jyǎu 絞 (the only LY instances of the latter term), and yǔng 勇 and lwàn 亂, in formulas that substitute “love of learning” for possession of lǐ. The yǔng/lǐ/lwàn set occurs also in 17:21-22.² (2) The 8:8 phrase “rising up with the Shī” is close to 17:8 “the Shī may be employed to rise up” (“rise up,” syīng 興, occurs in 8:2 as well; the other LY instances do not use this intransitive sense with regard to people). (3) 8:10, which picks up the yǔng/lwàn link of 8:2a, is close to 17:21, which also states this in two stages. (4) 8:16 and 17:14 bemoan faults unmitigated by positive qualities, and name strings of faults that begin with kwáng 狂.

¹I will not here pursue the overlap between MC 3A4 and LY 14:5.

²Lwàn 亂 occurs in 13 Analects passages: 4 of them in LY 8B and 1 in 8C, plus 1 in LY 1 and 3 in LY 17, the two chapters I suggest are linked to LY 8. The senses of lwàn in LY 8 vary, but it is notable that 62% of all lwàn passages are in LY 8 or LY 17.

Suppose these passages (LY 8:2a, 8, 10, 16) were initially independent of the rest of B (2a and 16 form a balanced bracket for the set). If we remove them, as a B2 group, we see that of the B1 group, 2b and 9 are linked by concern for the *mín* 民; 11 and 12 are on failures of talented people; 13a and 14 are on pursuing the *Dào* while avoiding entanglements (13b is a later intrusion, but with no agenda apart from 13a); 15 and 17 celebrate music and study. This is a cogent paired structure, à la Brooks:

- 8:2b The *jiwǎndǔ* sticks by family and old acquaintances (and *mín*)
- 8:9 The people (*mín*) can be led but may not understand
- 8:11 Nothing can make up for *arrogance*
- 8:12 Students rarely long delay employment in favor of study (*ambition*)
- 8:13a Persevere in the *Dào* unto death
- 8:14 Give counsel only when in office
- 8:15 Music criticism (music being a proper Confucian study)
- 8:17 Encouragement to Confucian study

Merging the later B2 with B1 works well. 8:8 picks up the *syīng* of 8:2b, and is presumably placed there for that reason. 8:10-12 plus 13c form a group on the balance of ambition with goodness and the doctrine of timeliness. (I take the reference to *Jōugūng* to include his reputation for wealth; see 11:17). 8:2a and 16 would serve as brackets on the theme of balance; perhaps 16 and 17 were later reversed. We might date B1 to the period of LY 17. I have no proposal for B2. There may be a resonance with LY 1, in that 8:2b may say what the last phrases of 1:13 mean; 8:9 has vocabulary and an issue related to 1:12 (both *Yǒu Rǔwò* passages); the association of wealth and arrogance is an issue in 1:15 (a *Dǔgūng* passage). Perhaps B1 was produced by the group that produced LY 17, and B2 by the group that produced LY 1. In the Brookses' scheme, this would place their dates rather close (though they do not regard 1:12 as an original LY 1 passage), c0301/0272. Given the Brookses' dates, we might have B2 created in c0301, B1 interpolated in c0272, and 8C bracketing both of them sometime after 0249.

Why would C bracket B? We may suspect two reasons. First, if B were bound strips, there would be plenty of room for more; B has only 11 passages, all short, except the composite 8:2 and 13. Even if A was added earlier, the book would still be shorter than most. Second, there is thematic resonance between the renunciationist interest of 8C, which focuses on *ràng* (yielding official position) and the theme of timeliness and renunciation of ambition in 8B (8:11-14). The theme of timeliness is that of 8:3 also. *Dzǔngdǔ*'s display of his bodily integrity – proof that he had “escaped” the dangers of the times – begins 8A, and is presumably the contact point for 8B. The final passage in 8B does not deal with timeliness, but links with 13a on the theme of the *Dào* followed till death.³

Thus, the most likely formula for the growth of LY 8 would then be: 8A (Brooks c0436), wrapped by 8B (Brooks c0272), and this in turn wrapped by 8C (after 0249), with B2 (c0301) having been previously wrapped by B1.

³Note that 8:14 recurs at 14:26 with an amplifying comment from *Dzǔngdǔ*, though taking it in a direction different from the one I'm giving 8:14 here.

Dating. Is it conceivable that in the Brooks' accretion theory, the tiny 8A remained sandwiched between LY 4-7 (0479-0450) and 9-10 (0405-0380), and later LY 2-15 (added 0356-0308) and perhaps 1 and 16 (added 0301-0284), until at last the generation of LY 17 joined with texts of the generation of LY 1 (8B2) and wrapped 8A in c0272 – 8A having remained a tiny, isolated bundle in the midst of the growing LY for over 150 years? I don't think that will work – the wrapping would have been too obvious. Had LY 8 consisted only of 8A all that time, it would have been conspicuous among the other books for a century: the Dzṽngdž book. The logic of any generation of disciples collectively hiding that text within an unremarkable set of Confucius quotes is too elusive – whatever the motive, would there not have been someone with a copy or a memory of the text who would have said, “Hey! What did you do with Dzṽngdž!?” An explanation would be needed even without the Dzṽngdž problem – how could a book in the LY 8 position be completely repackaged by the 8C-level wrapping in the mid 03c?

LY 8:3 and the Tán-gūng

The Lǐ Jì document Tán-gūng offers an alternative explication of LY 8:3. That tale concerns Dzṽngdž's deathbed command to lift him off a bed mat that he viewed as dishonorable – it was a gift from the Jì family. The mat removal was a close call: his son opposed it on the grounds that so sick a man should not be moved, but Dzṽngdž insisted. He died shortly after lying back down. Tán-gūng is probably of Hàn date, but it fits the text as a contextualizing teaching tradition. The need to import Dzṽngdž's filial reputation into exegesis disappears. What he has evaded is not bodily harm and dishonor to his parents, but the dishonor of obligation to an illegitimate warlord, which would have reflected upon him and his school, and was almost incurred through inattention, mitigated by alertness like that of one walking near a cliff or on thin ice.

This explanation requires two text emendations. The problematic *chǐ* 啓 (never well explained; the usual gloss “expose” has, I believe, no parallel) must be replaced by *chǐ* 起 “lift up.” By GSR, this emends *k'ïər with *k'ïəg; not as close as we might want, but consideration of the phrase “he who *bears me up* is Shāng” in 3:8 suggests the reverse loan there (“He who enlightens me is Shāng”). In addition, in 8:3 *shǒu* 手 “hands” should be replaced by *shǒu* 首 “head,” as in the Dà Dài Lǐ Jì (DDLJ 57:1) and Shwō Ywèn versions of the deathbed scene.⁴ This involves giving the Tán-gūng a certain priority over the LY. It assumes that Tán-gūng has an independent source more transparent than the LY – clearly, the Tán-gūng anecdote could not be derived directly from LY as we have it, with “hand” for “head.”

This somewhat undermines the notion of the canonicity of the LY Dzṽngdž fragments for the Dzṽngdž teaching tradition (which surely lies behind Tán-gūng), and suggests a rather fluid picture of the core Confucian texts in the period 0479-c0150.

⁴Note the oddity of *yǎ* 予 as verb object in 3:8 and 8:3. There are only 14 LY passages with this pronoun; 2 are in cited Shū-like contexts (8:20a, 20:1), 1 in cited speech (13:15), 1 by a self-styled ruler (17:1, mock-humble), and 6 in Tyēn-related contexts (humble). This leaves 4 passages, including 3:8 and 8:3, with similar attached verbs.

Comment

E Bruce and A Taeko Brooks (1997)

First, some small points. (1) Bob begins with the supposed implausibility of a small separate text (8A, 138 characters), but ends by proposing a 4-entry urtext about half that size (81 characters). Perhaps we may agree to assume that small texts are after all viable. (2) The status of pronoun yú 予 is problematic. We had first suspected that it was a dialectal y-variant of the standard ng- pronouns 吾 and 我. On further study, we see it as a pseudo-sacral literary archaism: not a dialect form that might be a marker for the Dzǔng family, rather, an archaism that was first introduced by Dzǔngdǔ and his son in LY 7-9.

In general, Bob's view of LY 8 agrees with ours: an encapsulating structure, whose three layers accumulate over almost two centuries. In particular, we accept as a helpful contribution his suggestion of cores *within each* of the A/B/C layers we had recognized. The word affinities he has noticed between the B/C layers and certain later LY chapters are in part additional to the usages on which we had based our placement of 8B/C in the later LY chapters. His data by themselves suggest a placement perhaps a decade earlier (8C) or later (8B) than ours, though the pull of 8C toward LY 17 seems in part offset by one (based on different affinities) toward 20:1. Our present dating (after LY 18, c0262) may or may not be a suitable compromise. We are presently content to let the question float, pending further evidence. Meanwhile, we foresee an acknowledgement to Bob in any 2nd edition of our Analects commentary.

We doubt, however, that the layer cores require to be located outside the Analects school. The 8:3 deathbed scene was probably the first LY 8 passage to be written down; its existence might have suggested the addition of three other Dzǔngdǔ *sayings*, these four together echoing the four *sections* of the Confucius memorial in LY 4.

We acknowledge the cogency of the two-phase model for 8B. We had earlier recognized two phases in the LY 15 interpolations, in which the first phase is more consistently built on paired sayings, whereas the second is a less neat structure, superimposed on it after a short interval. We see an analogous process in LY 3, 16, and 17, where a formal layout is interrupted and completed by the insertion of topical material which is inconsistent with the formal expectations of the original. We take Bob's 8B1 > 8B2 sequence as one more instance of this pattern. Given those further examples, we find the pattern to be intelligible as something which occurs wholly within the Analects text-formation process.

Scenario. As to the "outside" scenario,⁵ we doubt that any Warring States text can survive unless protected by some institution *continuous over time*: a government repository (as with the Chūn/Chyōu), or an advocacy group with a succession structure (like the Lǔ Confucians), which had physical custody of the text and could add to it. Texts, we feel, especially in this early period, can neither emerge nor subsist in a void.

⁵"For me, there are no "outside" sources – I see the LY itself as layers of assembly, rather than layers of creation; a gathering of texts, rather than one written and extended, though core sections of individual books (or in my mind, groups of books) may have had more simultaneous moments of creation" – Robert Eno, personal communication, 18 Feb 1997.

Kimura. The obvious suggestion for a non-Analects group with custody of the Dz̄vngd̄ material, made by Kimura **Kōshi** 322-329, is a *school of Dz̄vngd̄*; he puts LY 8C in the 4th disciple generation, or (at 40 years per such generation) at c0280, not that far from our dating. Dz̄vngd̄ might have founded a school, but as we read LY 8, he was himself a successor *in the school of Confucius*, and not a separate leader. The disciples in LY 8:3 are then simply *the students in the Analects school* as of 0436.

The Dz̄vngd̄ School. But on the evidence of the late HFZ 50 (c0150), which lists eight extant or remembered Confucian groups, a Dz̄vngd̄ school probably existed at some point; it may have been responsible for the Dz̄vngd̄ text listed in HS 30 (#127) in 18 pyēn. When did it come into being? Among the moments when a Dz̄vngd̄ group might have split off from the main Lǚ Confucian group are: (1) c0400, when the Kǔng family took over the headship of the Lǚ school from the Dz̄vng family at the death of Dz̄vng Ywán, the hostility of LY 11 to Dz̄vngd̄ being exacerbated by rivalry with this parallel Dz̄vngd̄ school; (2) before c0326, exerting a *positive* influence on the reappearance of Dz̄vngd̄ in LY 12 and 14; and (3) c0300, affecting Dz̄vngd̄'s new image in LY 1 as a model of filial piety (Waley **Analects** 20; Hsiao **Role**). If we take the ten Dz̄vngd̄ chapters of the Dà Dài Lǚ Jì (in the extant text, DDLJ 49-58) as reflecting this separate tradition,⁶ we find best support for the last of these options, since DDLJ 49 (on study) is followed by DDLJ 50-53 (on filial piety); a thematic mix very like the new Dz̄vngd̄ persona of LY 1. No DDLJ material seems to suggest the earlier options above conjectured. Such a Dz̄vngd̄ group, founded in c0300, might have produced 8B/C as Bob describes them, at about the time he suggests for them.

Both scenarios being thus open for consideration, we must say that we find the Analects school one (says the Analects student, “Hey, where’s the Dz̄vngd̄?” and the Analects librarian answers, “Right where it always is, dummy; there behind the Dz̄vng Ywán”) more plausible than the Dz̄vngd̄ school one, since any Dz̄vngdziana which such a Dz̄vngd̄ school composed would most plausibly have gone into its own book (says the Dz̄vngd̄ librarian, “Where do I add *this* stuff?” and the Dz̄vngd̄ principal answers, “Not *that*, dummy, it’s waiting for the Analects pickup at 4:30”). If a separate Dz̄vngd̄ school did exist (and if it did not, *there is not going to be any Dz̄vngd̄ text*), it would surely have tended to consume its own stuff.

Tán-gūng. We are uneasy with sentences beginning “Of course, the . . . is a Hàn text, but . . .” For that reason, we are wary of the Tán-gūng theory of LY 8:3. More specifically, we do not see LY 8:3 as being about filiality, but (with Waley and Hsiao) as expressing moral resolution, and reflecting an early and pre-filial Dz̄vngd̄. The practice of preventing the bodies of the dying from assuming nonritual postures, asserted by Waley and intuitively convincing, may have died out later; at any rate, it is absent in the Tán-gūng and the DDLJ 51:7 versions. DDLJ substitutes “head” for “hands” but has Dz̄vngd̄’s two sons lifting (抑) his head and embracing (抱) his feet, and receiving his last words, which he identifies as from Yén [Hwéi]. This seems to articulate, though differently than LY 8:3, the gentleman’s need to do his ethical duty and avoid disgrace.

⁶Or its core. Riegel (Loewe ECT 457) doubts this, but see now Brooks **Dz̄vngd̄**.

The Tán-gūng version (LJ 2 1A18) involves holding neither head/hands nor feet, and describes the raising 起 of the body only later in the story. The point of that story is political scruple and honorable death, not ethical intensity. It seems to be simply a third version, made with knowledge of the earlier two. Like the interpolated LY *8:4, it emphasizes the political importance of Dz̄vngdž. It shows a nicety of scruple (Dz̄vngdž will *lie* on, but not *die* on, a mat given him by the Jì clan) that is at odds with the more elementary tone of LY 8A (reflecting the first Dz̄vngdž persona), and it is thus probably not itself early. We see no reason not to assign to this third version the Hàn date which seems probable for the Tán-gūng text in which it now appears.⁷

Works Cited

- E Bruce Brooks. The Hàn Dz̄vngdž 曾子. WSP v1 (2010) 168-170
E Bruce Brooks and A Taeko Brooks. The Original Analects. Columbia 1998
Kimura Eiichi 木村英一. Kôshi 孔子と論語. 創文社 1971
Harry Hsin-I Hsiao. Problems Concerning Tseng Tzu's Role in the Promotion of Filial Pietism. Chinese Culture v19 #1 (1978) 9-16
Arthur Waley. The Analects of Confucius. 1937; Grove 1960

⁷For a further consideration of these three passages, see Brooks **Dz̄vngdž** 170.