

## The Disunity of the Jwāngdǔ “Inner” Chapters

E Bruce Brooks 白牧之

University of Massachusetts at Amherst

WSWG Note 114 (24 Dec 1996)

**Abstract.** It is not widely known that A C Graham’s 1979 study **How Much** proved the stylistic disunity of the so-called Inner chapters (内篇, JZ 1-7); that study has even been cited in the opposite sense. This note attempts to clarify the matter.

Graham’s purpose was to detect affinity between the JZ Inner chapters (assumed to be by Jwāng Jōu) and material he suspected had been displaced from those chapters. The unearned assumptions are: (1) the authorial unity and stylistic homogeneity of the Inner chapters, for which no proof is given save to ridicule Fù Sǐ-nyén’s 1936 suggestion that JZ 2 might be by Shèn Dào; (2) the attribution of the Inner chapters to Jwāng Jōu, which is meaningless, since nothing is firmly known of Jwāng Jōu, and unlikely, since the chapters contain *stories of Jwāng Jōu*, and early thinkers do not typically narrate themselves in the third person; and (3) that a scenario exists for displacement of coherent text so as to yield dispersed *but still coherent* text. Graham’s own reconstruction of the Mician logic chapters (**Later Mohist**) suggests the opposite: that damage to a bamboo text leads not to integral-segment displacement, but to chaos, with sentences broken into unintelligible fragments which require care to reassemble.<sup>1</sup>

**Method.** There have been studies on proving text affinity by vocabulary in various languages, among them Mosteller **Federalist**. Graham ignores them. He lists 114 traits<sup>2</sup> as “characteristic of the Inner chapters or missing from them,” only 85 of which are lexical; within that subgroup of 85, 56 usages are present in the Inner chapters. Graham does not specify what density of common usage would for him constitute a threshold of significance, above which two texts may be authorially related, and below which they would not. He proceeds ad hoc, to seek for supposed missing portions of JZ 3 in the “Miscellaneous” chapter group (279f). He finds a total of four candidates. Their credentials as originally part of JZ 3 are stated thus (p74):

JZ 25 lines 51-54 (25:9)	usages #27, 36
JZ 24 lines 105-111 (24:13f)	usages #4, 36
JZ 32 lines 50-52 (32:15)	usages #19, 31-34 (“1/4/15”)
JZ 24 lines 103-105 (24:13e2)	usage #19

<sup>1</sup>Graham explicitly disavows the bamboo-strip model which had guided his Mwòdǔ reconstruction (“I nowadays have rather less confidence in these mathematical games than in the past,” **Textual Notes** 25), in effect claiming the esteem of posterity for his Jwāngdǔ rather than his Mwòdǔ. I venture to suspect that posterity itself will judge otherwise.

<sup>2</sup>Or so. I here follow, as best I can, the divisions in the original JAAR version of **How Much** as reprinted in Roth **Companion**; the **Studies** reprint is even more ambiguous.

An unwary reader might assume that these usages occur in JZ 3, but this is not in fact the case. If we note which Inner chapters display these usages, we get:

JZ 25 lines 51-54 (25:9)	usages #27, 36	in: JZ 2 and JZ 1, 4
JZ 24 lines 105-111 (24:13f)	usages #4, 36	in: JZ 2, 4, 6 and JZ 1,4
JZ 32 lines 50-52 (32:14b)	usages #19, 33	in: JZ 1, 2 and 2, 4
JZ 24 lines 103-105 (24:13e2)	usage #19	in: JZ 1, 2

Usage #33 爲之使 (from the cluster Graham labels 1/4/15) *never occurs* in the Inner chapters, or in any other JZ chapter except JZ 32 itself. It thus makes an odd exhibit for the affinity of that passage with JZ 3. Of the other items (#31-32, 34) in his 1/4/15 cluster (爲人使, 爲天使, and 所爲使), the first two occur in a JZ 4 passage, and the third in a JZ 2 passage, but none of them occurs anywhere else in the JZ. Like usage #33, they are unique to the passages in question. Even if we choose to ignore these differences, and treat all items in Graham’s cluster 1/4/15 as equivalent for present analytical purposes, the most we can say is that the JZ 32 passage shows affinity with JZ 4 and JZ 2. There is no warrant in this evidence for joining it to JZ 3. The reader will readily see that the same is true of the other candidates. We have overlaps with JZ 1, 2, and 4, and in one case with JZ 6, *but not one single usage in common with JZ 3*. To justify his conclusion that these four passages are the missing parts of JZ 3, Graham resorts to the terms 無崖 and 有崖 (“unbounded and bounded”) and the verb 殆 “dangerous” (p297). That is, he must go outside his previous list of “characteristic Jwāng Jōu usages” to make a case for Jwāng Jōu’s authorship of JZ 3. This has the air of a procedure that is meant to give a predetermined result.

**The Prior Question.** Graham claims that his usage evidence for the above candidate passages proves that they “are cognate with the *Inner* and not with the *Outer Chapters*.” But even this less precise statement is precarious. Graham distinguishes, without proof, *two sets* of non-*Inner* chapters. One, called Group B in the Appendix below (Group A is the Inner chapters themselves), comprises JZ 23-27 and 32. This is the part of the text in which Graham expects to find Inner-chapter affinities. The other set (Group C) is JZ 8-22, 28-31, and 33, which Graham considers to be alien ground. *By these definitions*, usages having a significant Inner chapter affinity might recur in Group B, but *not* in Group C. We have already seen that, of the eight usages that figure on the table above (#4, 19, 27, 31-34, and 36), #33 does not occur in the Inner chapters at all. Of the rest, #4, 19, and 36 occur in Group C chapters; only #27 (已乎已乎) is confined to Groups A (Inner) and B (presumed cognate). That is, many of the test usages eliminate themselves as contrastive diagnostics because they also occur in the Group C chapters, which are presumptively unrelated. This is surely not a very strong showing for the Graham list as a tool for detecting affinities.

**The Ultimate Question.** When carefully considered, Graham’s data suggest that the four candidate passages overlap stylistically with JZ 1-2, 4, and perhaps also with JZ 6, but *not* with JZ 3. To reach Graham’s conclusion linking them with JZ 3, we must additionally grant the premise that the Inner chapters *are themselves authorially identical*, so that a passage with *general* Inner-chapter affinities can as desired be assigned to any *specific* Inner chapter. This is utterly circular.

Let us however take a further look at it.

**The Inner Chapter Assumption.** To test this fundamental premise, we may undertake to see whether the Inner chapters are themselves, in Graham's term, "cognate." For that purpose, it will surely be appropriate to use Graham's own proposed list of stylistic indicators.

We first note that some of the Graham usages (marked in the Appendix with an asterisk) blur differences, such as coverb hú 乎 versus coverb yú 於, which might distinguish one speaker within a more general style, and which have been found by Graham himself to be analytically consequential in the Mwòdž. If any Inner chapter authors are distinguished by such subtleties, the Graham usage list will not reveal those distinctions. Graham's list is thus biased toward his single-author conclusion.

But not enough. Here are some facts about these 56 usages. (1) 18 of them, or 32%, occur in only one Inner chapter. This tends to prove that each Inner chapter has a unique style, which it shares with no other Inner chapter. (2) At the other end of the spectrum, only 1 item occurs in every Inner chapter, and thus tends to link them as a domain of mutually consistent usage. That item is #57, the adverb 今 (or 今也) "now." Even in the limited sense probably intended by Graham, this is not a very distinctive usage. He himself reports it as occurring "passim" in both the B and C chapter groups; that is, promiscuously throughout the entire Jwāngdž as he himself has divided it. Its value as an indicator for the specific authorial Jwāng Jōu would thus seem to be nil. Statistically speaking, the only thing that can be said with assurance of a passage which contains the common Chinese word 今 is that *it is written in Chinese*.

Perhaps a case can be made for stylistic affinity among a majority of the Inner chapters? Of the 56 usages, only 13, or 23% (their numbers are given in **bold** in the Appendix), occur in a majority of the Inner chapters. From this already modest statistic we must then eliminate as inconclusive the common adverb 今 (#57), and also interrogative 惡 (#48), perfective 既 . . . 矣 (#53), and Sywǎndzian 是之謂 (#42). Further, we note that all of these also occur in Graham's Group C, the part of the text which Graham considers *unlikely* to display the supposedly unique Jwāng Jōu style. If from the majority Inner-chapter usages we eliminate those with Group C affinities, as insufficiently contrastive for our purpose, we get, not 13 usages, *but 1 usage*. This is #29, 未定, found in JZ 2, 4, 6, and 7 and nowhere else in the text. One usage would seem to be a weak reed on which to base an Inner chapter affinity theory.

What if we forget about B and C affinities, and simply confine ourselves to JZ 1-7? The fact, noted above, that 32% of the Graham usages are found only in *one* of JZ 1-7 will discourage us from concluding that *all* of them cohere stylistically. But perhaps there is a more limited coherence? Let us then proceed to ask, of each chapter, which *second* chapter is closest to it in Graham terms. Here is the pattern of overlaps:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Conclusion
JZ 1	—	6x	4x	5x	5x	5x	2x	No outstanding affinity
JZ 2	6x	—	7x	<b>19x</b>	11x	<b>21x</b>	4x	Affinity with JZ 4 and 6
JZ 3	4x	<b>7x</b>	—	4x	5x	6x	3x	No outstanding affinity
JZ 4	5x	<b>19x</b>	4x	—	11x	<b>17x</b>	4x	Affinity with JZ 2 and 6
JZ 5	5x	11x	5x	11x	—	11x	4x	No outstanding affinity
JZ 6	5x	<b>21x</b>	6x	<b>17x</b>	11x	—	7x	Affinity with JZ 2 and 4
JZ 7	2x	4x	3x	4x	4x	<b>7x</b>	—	Mild affinity with JZ 6

This suggests an affinity among even-numbered chapters (JZ 2, 4, 6) but less among *odd-numbered* chapters (JZ 1, 3, 5, 7). That distinction is supported by other features. Apart from JZ 2:6, *only the odd-numbered chapters* have stories about Dàuist figures: Jwāngdǔ (JZ 1:5-6, and 5:6), Lǎu Dàn (3:4, 5:3b, 7:4), Lyèdǔ (7:5). What this signifies may be left to future research. Meanwhile, the Graham affinity pattern refutes the idea of a coherent JZ 1-7, or of a coherent and consecutive group *within* JZ 1-7.

**Again JZ 1-7.** Thus Graham’s statistics, though biased in favor of his conclusions, do not *support* his conclusions. They suggest certain relationships within JZ 1-7, but they do not imply Jwāng Jōu authorship. Further, we may note that there was not, in early times, any disposition to regard JZ 1-7 as a special or authorially privileged zone:

- The earliest text to be closely engaged with the Jwāngdǔ is the Analects, in LY 18:5-7 (c0262). It reacts to a group of JZ passages (JZ 4:7, 9:1, 12:9a, and 25:6) which must be *earlier* than c0262. The Analects in turn is answered by several JZ passages (4:1-3, 20:4) which must be *later* than c0262. The implication is that parts of JZ 1-7 are relatively early, but that parts of JZ 8-33 are *equally* early. This does not suggest that the LY 18 people *did*, or that we *should*, see JZ 1-7 as having a special status within the work.

- Sywǎndǔ (SZ) 21:4, mid 03c, faults “Jwāngdǔ” for emphasizing “Heaven” and imperfectly understanding “man.” This objection may have been provoked by JZ 17:1d (牛馬四足 .是謂天 , 落馬首 .穿牛鼻 .是謂人), a protest against Sywǎndzian social engineering with all its artifice (僞). More certain are SZ 18:7 (graves are robbed only in the present corrupt age) as answering JZ 26:4 (where Big and Little Rú, for whom see SZ 8:10, rob a grave in accordance with Confucian propriety); SZ 18:4 (which refers to the JZ 17:4 frog in the well), and SZ 19:5a, which says of JZ 6:4a (praising equanimity in the face of death) that those who show no grief in mourning are like animals. The contact chapters are JZ 6, 17, and 26. There is no focus on “Inner” chapters.

- The Lǎ-shì Chūn/Chyōu (the core chapters 1-12 are dated by a postface to 0241; the rest is later) quotes from JZ 1, 3 [NB: *odd-numbered* Inner chapters only], 10, 12, 19, 20, 21, 24, 26; most of 28, and 29).<sup>3</sup> Some LSCC passages are stories *about* Jwāngdǔ, but only JZ 19:4 is explicitly *attributed* to “Jwāngdǔ” (in the late chapter LSCC 13:3). Only JZ 19 is explicitly associated with Jwāng Jōu – in LSCC 13, and thus as of some time posterior to 0241.

- Jyǎ Yì 賈誼 (0200-0168) incorporates many JZ phrases in his works. Strictly speaking, they are not citations, and so are not firm evidence as to what was included in the book “Jwāngdǔ” at this period, but at minimum they show knowledge of parts of JZ 2, 6, 8, 11, 15, 16, 17, 20, 22, 23, 25, and 32. This seems to imply an early Hàn literary affinity for the *middle* of the text (and, among the Inner chapters, only for the *even-numbered* JZ 2 and 6).

- The Hwánánǎndǔ (HNZ), 0161-0139) often quotes from the JZ, but the only chapter it *explicitly attributes* to “Jwāng Jōu” is JZ 1 (in HNZ 12). This seems to be the earliest claim that Jwāng Jōu himself wrote *any* Inner chapter.

<sup>3</sup>In the Jì (LSCC 1-12), JZ 3, 10, 24, 28 and 29; in the Lǎn (LSCC 13-20) JZ 12, 19, 20, 21, 26, and 28; in the Lùn (LSCC 21-26), JZ 1 and 28. Of the Inner Chapters, LSCC as a whole quotes only JZ 1 and 3. Other chapters greatly predominate.

- The Shǐ Jì is sparing of JZ quotes, but in SJ 23, 55, 61, and 129 there are echoes of JZ 29, and the brief note on Jwāng Jōu in SJ 63 attributes this chapter to him. The full list of Jwāng Jōu attributions in SJ 63 is JZ 10, 23, 29, and 31. Note that *none* of these are Inner chapters. SJ seems to be most impressed by, and it is certainly most engaged with, the Miscellaneous chapters JZ 29 and 31.

- Finally, the earliest bibliographic description of the JZ (HS 30, late 01c) does not distinguish Inner and Outer chapters. In that entry, all 52 chapters are equally attributed to Jwāng Jōu. The Inner/Outer distinction does not appear in that entry, and it does not seem to appear anywhere else before the 3rd century edition of Tswēi Jwàn (see Brooks **Editions**). The Inner/Outer distinction thus has no real status *in the text* as far as its early readers and cataloguers seem to have been aware. Its real context may be in the early Six Dynasties fascination with esoteric 內 teachings, a fascination which was quite possibly stimulated by the presence of transplanted Buddhist tradition.

We thus find that early opinions do not distinguish, let alone privilege, JZ 1-7. With only one exception, they attribute no “Inner” chapter specifically to Jwāng Jōu. From Graham’s data, we must further add that JZ 1-7 do not cohere stylistically as the work of a single author, whether Jwāng Jōu or anyone else; nor does any consecutive subset of those chapters cohere in that way. It would seem that the proper investigation of this portion of the Jwāngdǔ will have to proceed from different premises.

### Retrospect

In conclusion, let us look back on what Graham’s word tests, suitably applied, *actually tell us* about the Jwāngdǔ “Inner Chapters.”

The Inner chapters which most strongly cohere, when tested by Graham’s usages, are JZ 2 and 6. It is thus these two chapters, not all seven, which his material suggests may be authorially special. The only Graham philosophical term which is *unique* to those JZ chapters is #068 大塊 “the Great Clod,” an image of a nonsentient universe. JZ 2 and 6 both emphasize the suppression of feelings, and the confusion that results (puzzling Jwāng Jōu himself, be it noted, in JZ 2:6) when humans rely on their states of consciousness. This apparent materialism (note the term 物化 “the mutation of things” in JZ 2:6) is associated in JZ 33, no less, with Shèn Dào, which quotes as his the line 塊不失道 (“not even a clod can miss the Way”), which is surely reminiscent of JZ 2’s 大塊. For the Great Clod, Shèn Dào and thinkers like P’ng M’ng 彭蒙 who are often linked with him, and JZ 2, see further the discussion in JZ 33, which may conceivably be relevant, and that in Fung **History** 1/153-158, which concludes that the doctrines of [Lǎudǔ and] Jwāngdǔ “are simply those of [P’ng M’ng] and his circle developed one step further.”

Perhaps, after all, we should check out Fù Sǎ-nyén?

## Appendix: The Graham Usage Traits

Only linguistic usages, and only those occurring in the Inner chapters, are included. Numbering follows the divisions in the table in Graham **How Much**,<sup>4</sup> but usages are here listed in order of the first Inner chapter in which they occur. A number in **bold** means that that usage occurs in a majority of the Inner chapters. An asterisk (\*) means that Graham has combined two or more usages into one row on his chart. Beyond the Inner chapters (Group A), occurrences are indicated by group: B consists of chapters (JZ 23-27, 32) which Graham thinks are likely to contain displaced Inner-chapter fragments; C is the rest of the text (JZ 8-22, 28-31, 33).

#	Group A Chapters	Item	B	C
011	1	奚以知		
019	1 2	不亦悲乎	x	x
<b>028</b>	1 2 3 4 5	軒		x
<b>057</b>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	今 “now”	x	x
<b>047</b>	1 2 3 4 6	惡乎 (interrogative)	x	x
<b>045</b>	1 2 3 5 6	其 “or rather . . .”	x	x
044	1 2 6	特 “only”	x	x
036*	1 4	可不 . . . 乎 / 邪 / 與	x	x
039	1 4 7	乃今 “only now”	x	
030	1 5	以爲事	x	x
021	1 5 6	形骸		x
008	2	惡乎知		x
026	2	因之以		
034	2	所爲使		
060	2	曩		
070	2	因是	x	
071	2	爲是	x	
074	2	天倪	x	
075	2	天鈞	x	
076	2	曼衍	x	x
<b>054</b>	2 3 4 5 6	況 . . . 乎	x	x
<b>069</b>	2 3 5 6 7	受 “receive endowment”	x	x
006*	2 3 6	進於 / 乎 . . .		
005	2 4	盡矣	x	
027	2 4	已乎已乎	x	
077	2 4 5	寓		
<b>007</b>	2 4 5 6	. . . 之盛		x
<b>017</b>	2 4 5 6	若然者	x	x
<b>042</b>	2 4 5 6	是之謂 . . .	x	x
<b>048</b>	2 4 5 6	惡 (interrogative)	x	x
<b>053</b>	2 4 5 6	既 . . . 矣	x	x

<sup>4</sup>With the caveat as to the difficulty of numbering these usages expressed in n2 above.

#	Group A Chapters			Item	B	C
003	2	4	6	悅生·惡死		
004	2	4	6	至矣 (full phrase)	x	x
009*	2	4	6	惡知 / 識		x
035	2	4	6	敢問其方		x
049	2	4	6	庸詎 (cf #010)		
<b>029</b>	2	4	6 7	未定		
<b>038</b>	2	4	6 7	未始 “never yet”	x	x
010	2		6	庸詎知 (cf #049)		
068	2		6	大塊		
059*		3	7	向 / 鄉	x	
031		4		爲人使		
032		4		爲天使		
062		4		於是	x	x
037		4 5		有德者	x	
082		4 5		止止 “stills the still”		
002*		4	6	未 / 不終其天年		
024*		4	6	惡 / 惡可		
050			5	安 (interrogative)	x	x
001			5 6 7	死生存亡		
081			5 7	止水 “still water”		
016			6	古之真人	x	x
066			6	造化者		
067			6	造化		
025			6 7	因以	x	
065			6 7	造物者	x	x

### Works Cited

- E Bruce Brooks. Jwāngdž Editions. WSP v2 (2017) 141-143
- Fu Ssu-nien. On the Authorship of Ts'i-wu Lun in Chuang-tzu. BIHP v6 #4 (1936) 557-577
- Fung Yulan (tr Bodde). A History of Chinese Philosophy. Princeton v1 1952
- A C Graham. Divisions in Early Mohism Reflected in the Core Chapters of Mo-zi. National University of Singapore 1985
- A C Graham. How Much of Chuang-tzu Did Chuang-tzu Write? JAAR v47 #3 (1979) 459-501; in Studies in Chinese Philosophy, 1986; SUNY (1990) 283-321
- A C Graham. Later Mohist Logic, Ethics and Science. Chinese University Press 1978
- A C Graham. Textual Notes to Chuang Tzu: The Inner Chapters. 1982; in Roth **Companion**
- Frederick Mosteller and David L Wallace. Inference and Disputed Authorship: The Federalist. Addison-Wesley 1964
- Harold D Roth. A Companion to Angus C Graham's Chuang Tzu. Hawaii 2003