Doubling in Dzwǒ Jwàn

Eric Henry
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

12th WSWG Conference (Amherst, 2 May 1999)

I here provide examples of some of the more regularly occurring varieties of doubling in Dzwǒ Jwàn. These include: (1) repetition of witticisms, (2) repetition of allusions, (3) repetition of argumentative motifs, and (4) repetition of stories. The first three varieties of doubling indicate that, whatever its ultimate sources, the material in Dzwǒ Jwàn as we now have it was filtered through a single authorial consciousness when the text took shape in the late 04th century. The fourth type, on the other hand, indicates that much of the narrative material was drawn from a dispersed storytelling tradition in which individual narrators transposed elements from one place to another in a free, spontaneous, and largely unconscious manner.

Repetition of Witticisms: Protecting One's Feet

An unattached item under the year 0678 (Jwānggūng 16:3) relates that in that year Jv̀ng Lìgūng returned to the Jv̀ng throne after twenty years of exile and meted out punishments to those who had previously conspired with the then prime minister Jàı Dzú to drive him from the state. One such person, Chyáng Chú 強鉏, had his feet cut off, while a confederate of his, Gūngfǔ Dìng-shú 公父定叔 (the grandson of Gūngshú Dwàn of Jv̀ng) saved himself by fleeing to Wèı 衛. At this juncture the "superior man" or jyw̄ndž says, 強鉏不能衛其足.

This is a joke, the humor of which arises from the two ways in which the sentence can be read: (1) Chyáng Chú was unable to protect his feet, and (2) Chyáng Chú was unable to cause his feet to be in Wèı. Legge, troubled no doubt by the cruelty of the witticism, remarks that it is "a poor joke." But cruelty is inherent in the nature of humor, which requires one to distance oneself from its objects. It seems likely to this writer that the Dzwǒ Jwàn author found this play on words to be a delicious, irresistible joke, which accounts for its partial reuse later in the text.

In 8/16:a narrative attached to a Chūn/Chyōu entry for 0574, Bāu Jwāngdž of Chí (a descendant of the well-known Bāu Shú-yá) tries to put a stop to an illicit relationship between a court officer of Chí and Shv̄ng Mv̀ng Dž 聲孟子, the consort dowager of the state. Angered at this, the lady slanders Bāu to her son Chí Línggūng, with the result that Bāu's feet are amputated. A comment attributed to Jùngní (Confucius) then appears in the text: "The wisdom of Jwāngdž was not equal to that of a sunflower; a sunflower can at least protect its feet." The idea is perhaps that the sunflower protects itself by keeping its gaze fixed upward, as if demonstrating constancy and devotion to a superior. Legge again shows discomfort, saying that "this is certainly not like one of Confucius's remarks." What is more to the point is that the remark is quite in keeping with the outlook and language of Dzwǒ Jwàn as a whole.

Repetition of Allusions: When the People Have Perversities

Quotation from the Songs is a constant feature of Dzwǒ Jwàn storytelling. It would appear from the multiple appearance of some allusions that the Dzwǒ Jwàn compiler had a number of favorite passages. Here we shall concentrate on a couplet from the Bǎn 板 (Shī 254) which appears, used in much the same way, in two locations:

> 民之多辟，無自立辟
> When the people have many perversities,
> Do not set up your own perversity before them.

In its Shr̄ setting, a lament directed against the misdeeds of Jōu officeholders, the couplet means that officers should set a seemly example for the people. As used in Dzwǒ Jwàn, however, it means that if you see a ruler or a powerful person committing a crime or a monstrous violation of propriety, you should not confront the perpetrator with remonstrances; people who act in this way generally get themselves killed. Getting oneself killed (say most of Dzwǒ Jwàn's expounders of doctrine) is indicative of a reprehensible lack of wisdom. Besides, it is not polite to scold powerful people.

The first instance occurs in a narrative appended to an entry under 0600. Chv́n killed its officer Syè Yě. The narrative explains that Chv́n Línggūng (r 0613-0599) and two of his chīng or great ministers of state (Kǔng Níng and Yí Syíngfǔ) had for some time been engaging in illicit relations with Syà Jì, the widow of a Chv́n nobleman closely connected with the ruling house. They would often, in fact, wear items of this lady's underclothing at court, and would exchange ribald pleasantries concerning their extracurricular activities. The court officer admonished Línggūng about this, saying, "When ruler and ministers thus flaunt their licentiousness, the people have nothing good to imitate, and the report of such things is unseemly – let your Lordship put that article away." Línggūng said he would change his ways, but afterward allowed his two ministers to kill Syè Yě. This is followed by

> Master Kǔng said, The Songs say, When the people have many perversities, do not set up your own perversity before them. Does not this sum up the case of Syè Yě?

One can see from this that the speaker, in this case Confucius, feels that Syè Yě was an idiot to get himself killed.

The second use of this allusion occurs in a narrative concerned with the 0514 extinction of the Yáng Shv́ clan in Jìn – this was the clan of the illustrious minister Shú Syàng – and the clan's destruction is in part attributed to Shú Syàng's unwise marriage to a daughter of Syà Jì; thus the narrative serves among other things to bring to a conclusion the hundred-year-long train of unfortunate events connected with that femme fatale. It is appropriate that the same allusion should occur at the beginning and at the end of her saga. The narrative relates that the Yáng-shv́ clan chief is about to seize and punish two Yáng-shv́ noblemen who have been openly exchanging wives. Another clan member, Shú Yóu, advises the clan chief not to intervene, saying:

> Disorder (wú Dàu) is now the norm. I fear you will not escape death. The Songs say, When the people have many perversities / Do not set up your own perversity before them. Suppose you put this matter aside for now.

We may note in passing that the above is an example, not only of a repeated allusion but of a repeated witticism. The element of wit arises from the purposeful misapplication of the allusion. The word mín 民 "the people" clearly shows that the couplet was meant to admonish superiors against setting bad examples for inferiors. The altered use of the couplet is mordantly humorous, in much the same way that congratulating a person for his understanding of the principle that one should "do unto others before others do unto you" would be mordantly humorous.

Repetition of Argumentative Motifs: X is a Great Talker

One striking feature of the world portrayed in Dzwǒ Jwàn is the regularity and accuracy with which its personages make predictions based on minute details of gesture and physiognomy. The Chūn/Chyōu era, if we are to believe the text, was a time of marvels when the world operated according to laws that have never since been replicated. Skepticism about the art of prophecy is almost never expressed in the text. A rare exception occurs in connection with an 0495 (Dìnggūng 15) narrative, in which Confucius's disciple Dž Gùng, observing the gestures of a Jū viscount and the Lǔ ruler at a court audience, predicts that both will soon die. When his words are later borne out, Confucius remarks, "Sž̀ (Dž Gùng) unfortunately hit the mark with his prediction. This will turn him into an even greater talker (是使賜多言者也)."This echoes a skeptical speech about prediction made earlier in the text by Dž Chǎn of Jv̀ng. In an 0524 (Jāugūng 18) narrative appended to a Chūn/Chyōu entry about fires in the capitals of Sùng, Wèı, Chv́n, and Jv̀ng, Bì Dzàu 裨灶, who had predicted the fires, urges Dž Chǎn to direct that precious objects be used as sacrifices so as to avoid a future fire that will otherwise inevitably occur. Dž Chǎn scoffs at this:

> "The Way of Heaven is distant and that of man near. We cannot reach to the former; what means have we of knowing it? How could Dzàu know the Way of Heaven? It is because he is a great talker – how could he not occasionally hit the mark? (是以多言矣，豈不或信)." He accordingly refused the request, and the fires did not recur.

This is not the only place in Dzwǒ Jwàn where Dž Chǎn is given speeches that anticipate the attitudes and arguments of the Confucian school.

Repetition of Stories

The Diagnosis. In the latter portions of Dzwǒ Jwàn (specifically in what I call Dzwǒ Jwàn C and Dzwǒ Jwàn D, comprising about the last 120 of the years covered), it sometimes happens that variants of the same tale are assigned to different years, and sometimes to a different, though generically similar, cast of characters.

There was, for example, a story making the rounds of the state courts and clan strongholds of the mid Warring States era that Dž Chǎn of Jv̀ng once came to the court of Jìn, and finding that Jìn Pínggūng was suffering from a serious illness, determined the cause of that illness by means of a marvelously acute analysis of some attendant circumstances in his court. As the story got passed around, the details of Dž Chǎn's analytical procedure varied, so that some versions came to be markedly different from others, until one version was assigned in Dzwǒ Jwàn to the year 0541 (Jāugūng 1) and another to 0535 (Jāugūng 7).

In the first anecdote, Dž Chǎn rejects the possibility (suggested by Jìn court diviners) that the illness is caused by the spirits of two legendary chieftains, and suggests instead that it has arisen from the lack of a clearly laid out work schedule and from the presence in the inner palace of concubines bearing Pínggūng's Jì 姬 surname.

In the second anecdote (which also occurs in the Gwó Yǔ "Discourses of Jìn," where it is related at greater length), Dž Chǎn suggests that the illness is caused by Pínggūng's failure to conduct sacrifices to the spirit of Gǔn 鯀, the father of Yǔ the Great. Though the second anecdote is assigned to a later date, no one in it, not Dž Chǎn himself, nor Pínggūng, nor any of the officers of Jìn, show any awareness that this diagnostic feat is a repetition of an action performed by the same person in the same setting on the same subject six years earlier. This is a strong indication that both anecdotes had an independent, out-of-context existence before they found their way into Dzwǒ Jwàn. The text even has a third variant of the Pínggūng diagnosis story (also assigned to Jāugūng 7), in which the learned analysis is delivered by a Physician Hv́ from the state of Chín, but this narrative need not detain us here.

The Culpable Fugitive. Another example of a story with multiple occurrences in Dzwǒ Jwàn is what I shall call the "culpable fugitive" story. The four versions of this story, in which a prince, officer, or commoner from Jyǔ or Jū (small semi-barbarous neighbors of Lǔ) seeks refuge in Lǔ for a gift of stolen treasure or cities or territories, are assigned to the years 0609, 0552, 0537, and 0511. In this story, the appearance of the fugitive poses a moral dilemma for the rulers and officers of Lǔ – they have to decide whether to yield to their greed for the stolen booty or to highmindedly refuse the booty and drive the fugitive away.

In the first story, the fugitive, a prince guilty of regicide, is sternly driven away by Lǔ's officers, even though the newly installed Lǔ Sywǣngūng, greedy for treasure, wants him to be hospitably received. In the other three stories, the fugitives, a great officer and two commoners, are welcomed and rewarded in Lǔ. Three out of four of the stories give rise to reflections on the consequences of rewarding theft and treachery, in which argumentative tropes and verbal formulae are echoed and repeated. In short, these four stories have every appearance of being one story that evolved into four stories due to random variation arising from casual repetition.

Penal Codes. Another case of story-proliferation concerns the casting of vessels bearing written penal codes, viewed as a sign of decadence and impending disaster. This story occurs twice in Dzwǒ Jwàn. In the first example, Dž Chǎn of Jv̀ng in 0536 has bronze vessels cast with a penal code of his own devising set forth upon them. When Shú Syàng of Jìn hears of this he sends a letter of protest to Dž Chǎn, in which he predicts that when people know what the laws are they will no longer stand in awe of their superiors, will cast propriety aside, and develop a contentious spirit.

In the second example, members of the clans of Jūngháng and Jàu require the people of Jìn in 0513 to contribute a quantity of iron to cast vessels bearing the penal code of Jàu Sywǣndž, a celebrated clan-chief of a former era. When Kǔng Chyōu of Lǔ hears of this, he observes that Jìn will surely perish: when written laws are substituted for traditional practices, the people will study the vessels and care nothing for men of rank. The distinction of noble and mean will cease to exist.

These penal code stories are often cited in discussions of the evolution of law and society in ancient China as if they were dependable records of fact; the great similarity between them, which seems to reflect derivation from a common story or pool of stories about penal-code cauldrons, is never pointed out. Both episodes, moreover, are "floating" stories, unattached to any entry in the Lǔ Annals. Furthermore, the story involving Dž Chǎn does not harmonize well with other Dž Chǎn material in Dzwǒ Jwàn, in which this figure is portrayed as a resourceful, farsighted minister whose measures, though often initially unpopular, always prove to be correct. Usually in this text, one has merely to come across the name Dž Chǎn to know that an amazing demonstration of wisdom, courage, or humanity is about to take place. Nowhere else in Dzwǒ Jwàn does he figure as a short-sighted pragmatist leading his state down a mistaken path. In fact, this is a place where the Dzwǒ Jwàn redactor blundered through putting a piece of ready-made material into the text without adjusting it to its surroundings. It should have been Shú Syàng or anther Jìn clan chief who cast the cauldron, and Dž Chǎn who anticipated Confucius's judgement by lodging a protest.

Comment

A Taeko Brooks (2011)

Two different Dzwǒ Jwàn models are in circulation: (1) DJ is a commentary to the Chūn/Chyōu of Lǔ, which outgrew its first liturgical focus and became a moralizing history of China; or (2) DJ is a work in its own right, originally independent of CC, compiled from pre-existing narrative sources. Eric here inclines toward the latter view; I am on record as favoring the former. How might his data be construed my way?

First, the DJ point of view of *persons* sometimes brings it into conflict with its view of *principles*, as when Chín Mù-gūng is described as now insightful, now stupid; the DJ constant here being that fortune in war reflects Heaven's approval or disapproval.[1] Inconsistency in the DJ portrayal of Dž-chǎn may be of this type: Dž-chǎn is usually positive in DJ, but in conflicts of law versus custom, he is liable to figure otherwise. The ground of the inconsistency in treatment may thus be a DJ consistency of theme.

Second, I have shown that the DJ viewpoint is not itself consistent, especially at the end, when it came under Chí influence, dropped populism, and accepted conquest.[2] The new DJ line shows in two stories of the deaths of Jìn rulers. Both are literarily composite, and in effect reject old views in favor of new ones. In DJ 8/10:4, a tale of popular retribution blames the Jìn ruler's death on his killing of Jàu family members; it is interrupted by a rationalist story in which a Chín physician diagnoses the illness, in medical and thus scientific terms, as incurable. In DJ 10/1:12, various explanations of Jìn Píng-gūng's illness, including a sacrifice theory like that proposed by Dž-chān in 10/7:7, are rejected in favor of a sexual indulgence theory, again offered by a physician from Chín, and founded on the Yì, not as a divination text (the 10/1:12 story also rejects the results of an earlier divination) but as a wisdom text. DJ 10/1:12 is thus entirely aware of the Dž-chǎn story, 10/7:7, and *rejects its sacrifice solution*.

[1]See Goldin **Emmentaler** 77. DJ at this point was still in its moral Heaven phase.

[2]Brooks **Heaven** 77-80 (especially 78-79), 86-87.

The slightly cynical sense given to Shr̄ 254E7-8 民之多辟，無自立辟, "if people do bad things, don't add your own error," is at least consistent in the two DJ quotes. I doubt that any large inferences about the DJ can be drawn from this tiny consistency.

The two "protect his feet" comments are not quite identical; the more opaque one involves the sunflower (kwéı 葵), perhaps an allusion to the mythical Kwéı 夔 (the one-legged monster who appears as Shùn's music master in Shū 2), who like the sunflower has at least one foot (夔一足).[3] One story (8/17:6) is attached to a CC entry. That story is complete in itself; the exile's virtue is narrated at length, and is rewarded. The other story (3/16:3) has no CC connection; it is a free DJ composition. It has no internal moral; it needs the jyw̄ndž quote (with the pun on 衛) to complete it. Perhaps: (1) the later story introduced the cynical idea that remonstrance is unwise policy, and (2) the earlier story was then cynically reinterpreted by adding the "sunflower" quote. Can awareness of DJ compositional layers explain these DJ thematic inconsistencies?

So also, I suspect, with the prophecy stories. Dž-gùng's prediction (11/15:1) is about a violation of ritual resulting in death; like much of the early DJ, it takes ritual as the determining factor in events. Dž-chǎn's refusal to sacrifice (10/18:3), by contrast, is in the later DJ rational vein: a character in the story explains the occasional success of prophecy as a statistically random result. So much for modernization. It then occurred to the author of the late story to go back and shift the meaning of the earlier ritual story in the new direction, by adding to it a Jùng-ní comment (11/15:3) echoing the later story's Dž-chǎn comment. Here and in the "feet" stories, I see the added cynical "Confucius" comments as tending to homogenize the previous material along the lines of the text's later viewpoint. I think it unlikely that stories merely transcribed intact from outside sources would present this layered textual structure.

Last, does not Eric exaggerate the culpability of fugitives? In Spring and Autumn, fugitives were routinely welcomed, not least when they brought territory with them. It is DJ, judging the matter in the 04c when the idea of national loyalty had arisen,[4] that finds them so reprehensible. DJ tells a good story (sometimes more than once), and arouses our feelings of moral indignation (in its final Realpolitik phase, it can instead *offend* our feelings of moral indignation), but its sense of Spring and Autumn conceptions of protocol and propriety is demonstrably defective. Our enjoyment of the stories (and DJ is insidiously enjoyable) should perhaps not obliterate our awareness that the DJ viewpoint is anachronistic for the period it purports to describe.

Works Cited

A Taeko Brooks. Heaven, Li, and the Formation of the Zuozhuan. OE v43 (2003) 51-100
A Taeko Brooks. The Historical Value of the Chūn/Chyōu. WSP v1 (2010) 71-74
Alvin P Cohen. Supernatural Retribution in Warring States Texts. WSP v2 (2018) 236-240
E Bruce Brooks and A Taeko Brooks. The Emergence of China. WSP 2015
E Bruce Brooks and A Taeko Brooks. The Original Analects. Columbia 1998
Paul R Goldin. The Hermeneutics of Emmentaler. WSP v1 (2010) 75-78

[3]I am indebted for this suggestion to my colleague E Bruce Brooks.

[4]For the late 04c rise of state rather than personal loyalty, see Brooks **Analects** 113, 120.