11
The Nature and Historical Context of the *Mencius*

E. Bruce Brooks and A. Taeko Brooks

Later ages ascribe all the sayings in the *Mencius* 孟子 (MC) equally to the historical Mvng Kv [Meng Ke] 孟軻, but the text contains differing statements of view that are not easily explained as variant statements of a single view.[1] As we shall argue, they are more plausibly seen as early and late phases in a development. That is, the text seems to have a time depth. If so, its thought will be best understood not as a unity, diverse but ultimately consistent, but rather as a sequence of positions, nourished by continued thought and perhaps also shaped by the continuing pressure of outward circumstances. This essay, though philological in nature, is thus ultimately offered as a contribution to a proper understanding of the thought of Mencius—in which term we would include the thought of those followers who preserved and continued his contribution in the years after his death.

To anticipate, we believe that the structure of the text is as follows: (1) a series of genuine official interviews by Mencius, preserved together with an equal number of later, imagined interviews in MC 1; (2) a conflated but original private discourse of Mencius in 2A2, this together with the MC 1 core constituting the heritage of the historical Mencius as it was put into text form shortly after his death in c0303; and (3) not one but two series of textual records left by posthumous Mencian schools, one comprising the rest of MC 1–3 and the other all of MC 4–7, each being added to over time and interacting with the other and with outside texts and events, and their respective final sections MC 3 and 7 being from the same period,

the years just before the final conquest of Lǔ in 0249.[2] We suggest that this hypothesis, together with outside evidence, not only leads to a consistent view of the text but also can clarify some otherwise perplexing individual passages and shed light on some longstanding Mencian controversies.

In the present essay we will give reasons for doubting the standard view (section 1), argue in general terms for our hypothesis of the text (sections 2–9), see whether that hypothesis in fact removes the previously noted contradictions (section 10), and suggest that the hypothesis may help to clarify issues or explain anomalies that have been raised or noticed by previous scholars (section 11).[3]

1. Against the Consistency Hypothesis

Here are three observations that invite doubt as to the internal consistency and singleness of viewpoint of the *Mencius*. We will return to them later (in section 10). We cite them here to show that the standard hypothesis of authorial consistency fails, so as to clear the way for an alternate hypothesis.

Yī Yǐn 伊尹. Yī Yǐn is mentioned in various Warring States texts as an emblematic figure, that is, as one who represents a particular kind of ministerial conduct in or out of office. We are not here concerned with the truth of any of these representations, or with the historicity of Yī Yǐn himself, but only with the consistency of Yī Yǐn's emblematic value in the *Mencius*. There are eight passages in all. In MC 2A2 and 5B1, Yī Yǐn is invoked as an example of one who would accept office under any ruler, and 6B6 describes him as going to more than one ruler, whereas in 7B38 and in most other passages he is associated only with the Shang ruler Tāng (in 7A31 he banishes Tāng's unworthy son and, after the son's reform, restores him). This might be rationalized by taking 2A2, 5B1, and 6B6 in a general, and 7B38 and other passages in a more focused, sense. In 5A7, Yī Yǐn is said to have accepted office only reluctantly; in 6B6 he is said to have actively sought it.[4] These passages clearly differ as to the motives behind Yī Yǐn's career. In 2B2 he is said to have gained office not by appointment but by advancing from a subordinate position (tutor); in 5A7 an extreme version of this story (the subordinate position being that of a cook) is explicitly denied. Not only do these two pas-

sages differ as to the history of Yī Yĭn, but the second also openly disputes the first. As to Yī Yĭn's emblematic value, in 2A2 he is ranked lower than Confucius, whereas in 5A6 and by implication in 7A31 he is bracketed with Confucius' ideal, Jōu-gūng [Zhou-gong], his integrity in that role contrasting strongly with the political flexibility in 6B6. Given any of these passages, it would seem somewhat risky to guess what position the next passage will take concerning the life or the exemplary value of Yī Yĭn. Such a contrast might be expected between two rival texts, but it is surely problematic when it occurs within a single, supposedly consistent text.

Confucius and the *Chūn/Chyōu* [*Chunqiu*] 春秋. It is here assumed that Mencius was at the School of Lŭ (the group whose text was the *Analects*) before embarking on his own career in 0320.[5] If so, we should expect him to be informed about the role of Confucius in the formation of the *Chūn/Chyōu*. The subject is twice mentioned in the *Mencius,* but the two passages give different accounts. MC 3B9 says that Confucius "made" (作) the *Chūn/Chyōu* and that, on his completing it, evil ministers and undutiful sons were put in fear and confusion. MC 4B21 merely says that the *Chūn/Chyōu* is one of several chronicles written in the "historical" style (其文則史) and that Confucius "ventured to take his principles from it" (Lau; 其義則丘竊取之矣). Legge renders this as "make its [righteous] decisions," but there is in any case no claim of authorship of the whole *Chūn/Chyōu*. We feel obliged to doubt that a student in the successor school of Confucius in Lŭ would be this unclear about the nature of Confucius' supposed contribution to the *Chūn/Chyōu*.

Good Government 善政. In 2A1 the phrase "good government" is positive, referring to the lingering effects of the wise rule of the Shang founders. In 7A14 the term has bitterly negative overtones: "He who practices good government is feared by the people; he who gives the people good teaching is loved by them. Good government wins the wealth of the people; good teaching wins their hearts." We might for the word "good" in this usage of "good government" substitute "efficiently rapacious." With this much oscillation in the meaning of basic vocabulary, we question whether a single-author presumption can be maintained for the *Mencius*.

Examples might be multiplied. We take it that the point is made or at least raised by these three.

2. The Alternate Hypothesis: Separation within MC 1

The Historical Mencius. Lau observes that the interviews of MC 1 appear to be in chronological order.[6] We would offer two amendments. (1) The final 1B16 is clearly out of sequence. It depicts Mencius as having returned from Chí [Qi] to bury his mother, and so it must be before his final departure from Chí (in 0313, following the Yēn [Yan] incident). It cannot be earlier than Lǔ Píng-gūng's [Lu Ping-gong] first year, 0317,[7] and its hope of a private rather than a full court meeting would be consistent with any mourning restrictions that may have obtained in that year, the first after Píng-gūng's accession.[8] If so, then its date is 0317, and its proper chronological place in MC 1 would be after 1B1. It may have been placed last editorially because its comment about fate makes a suitable epigraph, or epitaph, for the public career of Mencius. (2) The MC 1 interviews readily divide themselves into two groups:[9]

1A1, 1A3:1–3, 1A5:1–3, 1A6, 1B1, [1B16], 1B9, 1B10, 1B12, 1B13, 1B14, 1B15 (total 12)

*1A2, *1A4, *1A7, *1B2, *1B3, *1B4, *1B5, *1B6, *1B7, *1B8, *1B11 (total 11)

Of the 1A1 group, all the following statements can be made: their implied duration is not more than three minutes; the ruler sets the theme (when it is specified who sets the theme, as it is not in 1B9) and may develop it by a further question; Mencius observes reasonable propriety; and he does not quote the *Shī* [*Shi*] 詩 or the *Shū* 書, nor does he assume that the ruler is familiar with them, but uses instead illustrations drawn from common experience. Of the *1A2 group (the asterisk indicates passages in MC 1 that we believe are interpolated), one or more of the following may be said: they are long; Mencius defines the theme; he is accusatory of the ruler; and he or the ruler quotes the *Shī* or *Shū*. This suggests that besides the modest genuine 1A1 group of interviews, we have a second, imagined *1A2 set, in which Mencius has a more dominating role, discourses freely, and occupies a learned and specifically Confucianized context characterized by familiarity with the classic writings. The two groups clearly inhabit different circumstantial and rhetorical worlds, and of them, the *1A2 group would have been far more grateful to Confucian sensibilities and in particular to the self-esteem of the followers of Mencius. We take them as imaginative retrospections and not historical transcripts.

Further Evidence for the Hypothesis. (1) Other traits divide the proposed genuine and spurious interviews. With the exception of the narrated noninterview 1B16, and some details in 1A6 to be discussed below, no genuine interview describes persons or actions, whereas in 1B6 we have the narrative line 王顧左右而言他, "The King looked left and right and spoke of other things." The use of narrative techniques suggests a retrospectively visualized, not a verbally reported, meeting. (2) The general form of interview implied by the 1A1 group (though not that of the *1A2 group) is also exemplified in the interviews in the *Sywńdž* [*Xunzi*] 荀子 (SZ). Sywńdž's interviews run a little longer but otherwise a similar situation obtains: Sywńdž speaks on an assigned theme and maintains decorum, and the interviewer is not represented as versed in Confucian culture. In SZ 15 (not an interview but a command performance), from c0250, the only expertise shared by ruler and adviser is military, represented in part by quotations from the *Sūndž* [*Sunzi*] 孫子. The expertise displayed by Lyáng Hwèi-wáng [Liang Hui-wang] in MC 1A3:1–3 and 1A5:1–3 (c0320, genuine) was also military. We conclude that these passages accurately reflect a military rather than learned outlook on the part of Warring States rulers and that they also imply a more or less standard format for Warring States interviews. (3) Separating the *1A2 group as spurious removes some contradictions in MC 1. 1B9 (genuine) advocates delegation to the talented, whereas in *1B7 (spurious) it is a last resort. The economic policy of 1A3:1–3 (genuine) differs from that of *1A7 (spurious). The ability to remove such difficulties is evidence in favor of this (as it is of any) proposed text reconstruction.

Another argument in favor of the reconstruction is a high degree of continuity in the series of Lyáng Hwèi-wáng interviews—1A1-1A3-1A5, which has been obscured by the addition of *1A2 and *1A4. In 1A1 the king, calling Mencius *sŏu* 叟 (old man), asks what Mencius can say that will benefit his state. Mencius objects to the term *lì* 利 (value, benefit, profit). In 1A3 (though not in the intervening *1A2), the king again refers to Mencius as *sŏu* (since in 0320 the king was more than seventy years old, apparently the threshold of "old age" in this culture, and Mencius, born in c0387, was younger than this and certainly younger than the King, this respectful epithet may have had a humorous tone). In 1A3 the king returns to the question of 1A1, but indirectly, saying what he has himself been doing to benefit his state and asking why it is not working. Mencius

this time answers with an economic program: not overusing the food resources. Mencius uses a military metaphor in the course of explaining this program. In 1A5, perhaps taking the metaphor as an indication that Mencius is willing to discuss military matters, the king introduces his military efforts, again as a failed program, and invites comment. Again Mencius responds with a policy suggestion (and makes his first use of the phrase 仁政), again the policy is economic, and again it is along the lines of resource conservation, but here not only the food resources (fish and turtles) but also the revenue resource (the people) are not to be overexploited. 1A3 deals with the question of people not immigrating into Ngwèı [Wei] 魏; 1A5 discusses the question of motivating the people already resident in Ngwèı to fight for Ngwèı. The sense of progression from 1A1 to 1A3 to 1A5 is very strong.[10] It vanishes if we restore 1A2 and 1A4 to the series. That fact strongly supports the proposal that the sequence 1A1-1A3-1A5 was the whole of the original text.[11]

Partition. If on this evidence we accept the 1A1 set of twelve interviews as the only genuine ones and regard the others as later additions, then besides the line drawn across the text by Lau's observation about MC 1,

MC 1 / MC 2–7

we must also draw a second line separating the genuine MC 1 interviews from the spurious ones:

MC 1A1 etc. / MC *1A2 etc. / MC 2–7

Scenario. If the 1A1 set are genuine transcripts, how were they taken down? There is a hint in MC 1A6, the only interview with Ngwèı Syāng-wáng [Wei Xiangwang], which, uniquely in the book, remarks that Mencius emerged from the interview and told "someone" (*rv́n* [*ren*] 人) what had transpired. A few descriptive remarks are made, and the interview transcript itself follows. What is going on here? We note the following. (1) By the sequence of MC 1, this interview occurred soon after the death of Syāng-wáng's father, Hwèı-wáng. (2) 04-century rulers seem to have succeeded directly, without a mourning interval, but it is still reasonable to suspect that court ceremonial was for a time reduced from its normal level, and individuals meeting with the ruler might, out of respect for that reduction, have had to leave their retinues at the door. (3) 1A6 may

then show Mencius emerging from a low-key interview in 0319 and repeating the gist of the interview to the amanuensis for writing down. (4) Can we test this? We believe so, as follows: 1A6 is the only interview to give Mencius' highly negative personal impression of the ruler. To whom would he have spoken such comments? Surely not to the ruler, but quite possibly to one of his own party. In 1A6, where (as we infer) that description was delivered along with Mencius' repetition of the interview proper, it might then have been atypically but naturally incorporated in the transcript of the interview. The implication is that Mencius normally had an amanuensis present at his court interviews, but when none was present, he reported the interview to his amanuensis for transcription at the first opportunity.

3. The Core Text and Its Physical Form as of c0303

The Physical Text. The hypothesis that MC 1 was originally only half its present size will also help to explain an otherwise perplexing feature of the *Mencius:* its double chapters. Many early books are divided into *pyēn* [*pian*] 篇, presumably separate rolls of bamboo strips, which in some cases (among them the *Analects* [*Lunyu;* abbr., LY] and the *Jwāngdž* [*Zhuangzi*] 莊子) take their titles from the first words of the included text (thus LY 1: 學而). This pattern also applies to the *Mencius,* with the difference that each named unit is divided into two, labeled with the *pyēn* name plus 上 or 下. Why? In particular, why is not 1B called "Jwāng Bàu" [Zhuang Bao] 莊暴 from its first-named person? We may note that the sizes of these half-chapter *pyēn* are within the rather narrow range of 2,277–2,927 characters. Depending how we imagine the text as being written (an average for the period might be 25 characters per bamboo strip), that may imply a roll of bamboo strips whose diameter is approaching its length. We have suggested that this is the limit of physical stability for such a roll.[12] That is, the original interviews as we here identify them would have made a large roll but still a manageable single one. However, any further increase in contents, such as would have occurred when the later school felt impelled to add to the genuine record, would very soon require a division into two rolls. If the second roll was split off in this way from the first by accretional pressure, it might well retain the name that had by then become familiar for the single roll. Hence we would logically have,

for the title of the split-off second roll, not 莊暴 but 梁惠王下. That formal device being once adopted for the core collection of transcripts, it would very naturally be generalized to any later *pyēn*. Here the accretional hypothesis offers an explanation for a fact that is less readily explained on the standard theory.

The Position of MC 2A2. In the perception of many readers, 2A2 is unique among *Mencius* passages. It is not only among the longest (1,097 characters; second only to the 1,313 characters of *1A7), but it also conveys a uniquely intimate feeling of conversation between Mencius and his followers, who are not (as they mostly are elsewhere in the text) mere receptors for the delivery of maxims but press Mencius as to his personal preferences and practices. We believe that 2A2 may well be a record of just such informal questioning and that at one point it existed in parallel to the one-*pyēn* form of the public MC 1 as a private memoir of the school founder. We would exclude the final section (Legge, secs. 24–28, which ends with a repeat of the line that concludes sec. 23), and we would make a division between sections 1–17, which are largely taken up with breath control and related matters, and sections 18–23, which are more conventionally political. These two series look like separate remembered conversations that were combined, probably at the time of Mencius' death, c0303, into a consecutive document.[13] We presently see no intrinsic or positional reason to suspect their genuineness as Mencian memories. Accepting them as genuine, then as of Mencius' death in c0303, the complete textual repertoire of his remaining followers would have consisted of the 1A1 group of twelve interview transcripts (total 1,942 words) plus the 2A2:1–23 conversational memoir (908 words), each occupying its own generous, but stable, roll of bamboo strips.

The Ideas of the Historical Mencius. The conclusion that in the 1A1 set we have literal transcripts of the arguments of the historical Mencius may justify spending a moment to see what range of ideas we can, on that basis, firmly attribute to him. We have elsewhere suggested that the philosophy of Mencius as it is implied in the MC 1 interviews is largely derived from LY 12–13, the part of the *Analects* that we conclude was added to the text during Mencius' last years at the school of Lŭ, and in whose composition he may have been involved.[14] We feel that this philosophical agreement between

MC 1 and LY 12–13 needs no separate exposition here. We invite readers to observe, however, that the seemingly disconnected observations of LY 12–13 have a more integrated and worked-out character in MC 1. They would appear to have been subjected to considerable thought in the meantime and not to be mere reiterations of *Analects* maxims.

For example, LY 13.16 (c0322) states the basic principle of attracting new populace, which is also found in *Gwǎndž* [*Guanzi*] 管子 3[15] and was evidently familiar to Lyáng Hwèi-wáng himself. LY 13.9 prescribes that the people must first be made numerous, then made prosperous, and only then instructed. LY 13.29–30 make plain that the instruction in question is to make them viable soldiers. We can by our own further effort assemble these separate sayings into a coherent political philosophy, but LY 13 itself does not do so, and any such assemblage can be objected to as imposed on the unsystematic *Analects* material. Again, filial piety appears explicitly in 13.20 as a proper trait of the gentleman and in 13.18 as a duty of the commoner that transcends obedience to law. Since a consistent respect for law is not readily inferable from LY 13 and is indeed contradicted by the implication of 13.18, it is arguable whether filial piety forms part of the LY 13 system, if indeed LY 13 can be said to constitute a system. In MC 1, on the other hand, there is no question: filial piety is part of the system. It defines privileged needs (the support of elders) that give the people a right not only to survival rations but also to reasonable surplus (1A3). Lack of that reasonable prosperity is said to lead in turn to popular resentment and military instability in the state (1A5; cf. 1B12). A government that shows reasonable consideration for the needs of others (*rén* [*ren*] 仁), not out of charity but simply out of self-interest, and yet not under the rubric of an admitted self-interest, will find its self-interest well served. For Syāng-wáng, the next year (1A6), Mencius repeats some of these arguments and makes clear that in his view a reasonably supportive government not only will secure its own strength but also will attract the strength, that is, the people, of the opposing states, thus undermining their power to conquer or to resist conquest, and leaving the way open for a merely nominal military force (that is, for a small but virtuous state) to achieve the desired political unification.

What is new in this is the integration of some of the LY 12–13 insights into a connected body of doctrine, the quantitative terms in which that doctrine is sometimes expressed, and the explicit placing

of that doctrine at the service of the large powers in their struggle to obliterate each other. Of the three, it is perhaps the quantitative aspect that is the largest departure from *Analects* precedent. LY 13.20 had ridiculed the sort of granary accountancy in which Lŭ petty officials were engaging, but Mencius clearly sees the point of grain supplies and ration equivalents. And unlike the political theorists of the *Dàu/Dý Jīng* [*Daodejing*], he has no illusions about how big a country has to be before it can aspire to dominate others. For little Tźng [Teng] 滕, below the 100:1 minimum area (1A5), he offers no prospect other than an honorable defeat (1B13–15). Only the big states have a discussable chance.

It would be inadequate to call Mencius, the historical Mencius of the MC 1 core, a social philosopher on the strength of his use of the word "*rźn*" 仁, just as it would be absurd to call him a domestic philosopher because he mentions *syàu* [*xiao*] 孝. He might with some justice be called an economic philosopher, since much of his program lies within that sphere, and since his acceptance of quantitative statements indicates an openness to logistic as well as moral thinking. But Mencius goes beyond economics to the insight of 1A1, that the principle of utility or benefit, though crucial in assessing the functioning of a bureaucracy, is also fatal to that functioning if it becomes a principle of open self-interest among the bureaucrats. Mencius has reflected not only on the purpose of government, like everyone else in his time, but also on the way government can work without losing its public efficiency to private greed. We might validly call him a systems philosopher, noting that his system includes, and rests on, a sense of human values and responses.

The Successor Mencians. Any summary of the thought of the remainder of the book must, on the present hypothesis, count as a characterization of the posthumous Mencian school or schools. Of the successor Mencians in general, we may at this point reasonably infer the following. (1) A successor group must have existed, because not only was the original *Mencius* preserved, but also interpolations were later made in it so as to enhance the image of Mencius and to extend and develop his ideas. This implies an active custodianship, by people for whom Mencius remained an authenticating figure, hence most probably by his successor school or schools. (2) Among their concerns was to attribute to the late 04 century a general Confucianization of culture. This goes beyond what the core

MC 1 or other slightly later texts such as the *Syúndž* will countenance, and it indicates a degree of counterfactual thinking that may be of interpretive value at a later stage of the investigation. (3) It is reasonable to attribute to the successor school or schools not only the MC 1 interpolations (and the codicils to 1A3, 1A5, and 2A2) but all the rest of the present *Mencius*—the balance of MC 1 and MC 2 and all of MC 3–7.[16] In what follows, we will argue that there were not one but two successor schools, which evolved in parallel and came to an end at essentially the same time, namely the year 0249, when Chŭ conquered Lŭ and its satellite states.

4. The Alternate Hypothesis: The Division between MC 1–3 and MC 4–7

Despite wide agreement that the *Mencius* offers a consistent sample of Warring States language,[17] the text does show signs of internal inconsistency and thus of complex origin. Linguistic evidence suggests a division into two groups, one being the additions to MC 1 plus MC 2–3, and the other being MC 4–7. A study of the content of the respective chapter series confirms this difference and also suggests that each series shows growth over time, with the more advanced governmental theories and the more subtle philosophical insights tending to come at the ends of the respective series.

Linguistic Evidence. A line drawn between MC 1–3 and MC 4–7 defines areas that are not identical linguistically. Chinese shows a general tendency for adverbs to migrate from the postverbal, or F, position to the preverbal, or B, position in the sentence. This process can be seen during the period documented by the *Chūn/Chyōu* (0721–0481); it has gone almost to completion in modern Mandarin, where the F adverb is attested only by a few duration-of-time idioms (e.g., 坐了半天) and some analogous fossilized expressions. Over the short time depth of the *Mencius,* we have so far detected no evolution, but the two series tend to show different states of equilibrium within the larger development. The evidence does not permit concise summary here.[18] Among vocabulary traits that tend to distinguish the two series are the negatives *fút* [*fu*] 弗 (38 times, 32 of them in MC 4–7) and *vùt* [*wu*] 勿 (24 times, 20 of them in MC 1–3). These may have a phonological, and thus ultimately a dialect, basis.

Content Evidence. Most vocabulary contrasts between the two series, however, seem to reflect differing subject emphasis—MC 1–3 are chiefly governmental, whereas MC 4–7 are more theoretical. The *Chywún-shū Jŕ-yàu* [*Qunshu zhiyao*] 群書治要 of 631, compiled under imperial auspices and thus likely to represent a governmental point of view, selects equally from both series (7 from each; total 14). More philosophically inclined works show a marked preference for the MC 4–7 series; thus Dài Jvn's [Dai Zhen] *Mvngdž Dz-yì* [*Mengzi ziyi*] 孟子字義 of 1777 discusses in all 40 different passages, of which 11 are from MC 1–3 and a preponderant 29 are from MC 4–7. Among the latter, only 9 are from MC 4–5, and the remaining 20 passages are from MC 6–7. The index locorum of any recent work on the philosophy of Mencius will also tend to list MC 4–7 (especially MC 6–7) passages more frequently than MC 1–3 passages.[19] The MC 4–7 series, and especially its later chapters, thus seems to be of greater interest to a philosophically inclined posterity.

***Analects* Relations.** We assume that Mencius knew all the *Analects* through LY 13 (that is, all of the text that had been compiled before his departure from the school in 0320), and through ongoing personal contact with the Lŭ school, he might before his death in c0303 have come to know LY 2 (c0317) and even LY 14–15 (the latter c0305), but not LY 1 (c0296) or chapters beyond LY 16 (c0285).[20] If we list the latest *Analects* saying of which each chapter of the *Mencius* seems to be aware, and we distinguish the two series as two columns, we obtain the following:

	MC 2A2: LY 9.6 (c0405)
MC 4: LY 2.9 (c0317)	
MC 5: LY 10.14 (c0380)	
MC 6: LY 13.29 (c0322)	
	MC 2: LY *14.35 (c0298)[21]
MC 7: LY 17.1, 11, 16, 22 (c0270)	
	MC 3: LY *18.18, *19 (c0260)

A presumed Mencian heritage will account for all *Analects* quotations or references in MC 1 and in MC 4–6, as well as MC 2A2, but the quotation of LY *14.35 in MC 2, and of material from LY 17 and later in both MC 3 and MC 7, require the assumption of a post-Mencius contact with the *Analects* group and imply a time depth in the Mencian material that forbids the attribution of all of it to Mencius or to disciples who had cherished and recorded his sayings without adding anything from their own thought or experience.

5. The Division into Two Schools

The characterization of MC 1–3 as governmental and MC 4–7 as philosophical may seem to be contradicted by the fact that the notorious Mencian theory of the right of revolution is found in both strands. We here explore that detail and take a closer look at the interpolations in MC 1, concluding with a suggestion about the cause and the date of the division of the successor Mencians into two schools.

The right of revolution is an aspect of Mencian populism. The basic tenet of Mencian populism is that the people are the foundation of the state and that the test of a state is its ability to protect and provide for its people. As an implication, this is present in the Lyáng Hwèi-wáng dialogue in MC 1A1-1A3-1A5; in 1A1, for example, the king asks why his concern for his people is not achieving the expected condition of good order. The genuine MC 1 transcripts do not go beyond this position.

The MC 1 addenda do go beyond it. Some of the extensions to the original transcripts already show the distinctive accusatory tone of the MC additions as a whole. In MC *1A3:5 the king of Lyáng is told, "Dogs and pigs eat the food of men, and you do not know enough to stockpile; roads are filled with the corpses of the starving, and you do not know enough to distribute; if people die, you say, 'It wasn't me; it was the harvest'. How is this different from stabbing someone to death and saying, 'It wasn't me; it was the knife'?" This is already pretty strong,[22] but the newly invented passages go further, to ask what follows when the ruler fails to nurture his people or actively oppresses them. In *1B6, "Mencius" is made to ask King Sywān [Xuan] of Chí a series of questions: what happens if a friend betrays a trust, or an officer shows himself unworthy of his commission, and finally, "If all within the four borders is not well ordered, then what?" The king glances to left and right and talks of other things. Even more aggressively, in *1B8, "Mencius" replies to a question about the bad last Shang ruler, "I have heard about the killing of the ordinary fellow Jòu 紂, but I have not heard of the assassination of any ruler." The sanctity normally attaching to the ruler's person is lost when his behavior violates the expectations that (in this theory) define a ruler. *1B11 mentions the killing of bad local rulers as a detail of the conquests of the good first Shang ruler, Tāng, at which "the people were greatly delighted." In this view of things, it is the people who shall judge.[23]

In the MC 4–7 series we find analogues to the stages just described. (1) 4A5 asserts the primacy of the people, and 4A20 notes the importance of criticizing the ruler. This does not depart significantly from the implications of the authentic Mencius interviews. (2) 4B3 introduces the note of hostility toward the ruler: "When the ruler looks on his ministers as dirt and weeds, then the ministers will look on the ruler as a thief and an enemy." (3) The following chapter has several yet more drastic statements, challenging the theoretical position of the ruler. One is 5A5, which denies the principle of succession: "The Son of Heaven cannot give the world to another.... Heaven gave it to him [Shùn]; the people gave it to him." 5B9 concludes, "If the ruler has great faults, then [the ministers related to the ruler] will remonstrate. If he repeats [his errors] and does not heed [the criticism], then they will change incumbents." The king falls silent and changes his expression. In addition to this graphic touch, the assertion of the right to replace the ruler puts this on a par with *1B8. Later references to this theory do occur in both strands, but they are much less heated.

The parallels then seem to be as follows.

MC 4A5, 4A20	MC 1A1-1A3-1A5 etc.
MC 4B3	MC *1A3:5
MC 5A5, 5B9	MC *1B6, *1B8, *1B11
[returns to mere populism]	[repeats some earlier statements]

It is easy to imagine that after the death of Mencius, the more theoretically intemperate of the posthumous school were forced to leave and founded the separate MC 4–7 school. Yet the above pattern suggests that the increasingly strident Mencian theory of rulership developed in parallel in both schools. The split between them must thus have been relatively early, and the theory itself must have developed in response to some external situation, presumably the doings of a bad contemporary ruler, which impinged on both groups. If we take it as the least unlikely possibility that one group remained in Tźng while another relocated slightly to the north in Dzōu [Zou] 鄒, then the obvious candidate for this bad ruler is the notorious king of Sùng [Song] 宋, whose realm lay a day's journey southward from Dzōu and shared a common border with Tźng. That king's excesses, doubtless in exaggerated form, have left traces in other texts and are taken as obvious in the later MC 3B5.[24] The extirpation of Sùng by Chí in 0286 (which is described as imminent in

3B5) will have removed that king from the scene, and the lower intensity of Mencian revolution statements after MC 5 and the MC 1 interpolations may well reflect that removal. Then the separation of schools probably occurred not long after Mencius' death in c0303, and MC 4–5 and its counterparts in the southern school text should occupy the period c0300–0286.

Is there any clue as to the reason for the division of the schools? We think it possible that the northern passage MC 4B3 may contain an echo of that school's own departure from Tźng. The relevant lines are these: "But now those who act in ministerial capacity: if their responses are not followed, and their words are not listened to, so that benefits do not descend upon the people; if they for any reason leave the state, the ruler tries to seize and detain them, and will also retaliate against them in the place to which they have gone, and on the very day of their departure will summarily take back their lands and settlements; this is what one calls a thief and an enemy." Construed as a recent memory, this suggests that the departure of the northern group was voluntary, induced by political frustration rather than forced by higher disapproval, and that it was resented by their patron in Tźng. The patron's retaliation may have been due to the Mencians' being considered an asset to his public image, just as benefits were showered on the Jì-syà [Jixia] 稷下 stipendiaries in Chí, at about the same time, to show the world that Chí "knew how to treat officers."[25] That retaliation may also help explain why the northern group seems never to have gained comparable access to power in their new location.

6. The Alternate Hypothesis: Synchronicity of MC 3 and MC 7

We here take up the proposition that MC 3 and MC 7, the respective last chapters in the two strands of the *Mencius* text, are from the same absolute time period.

Among features that suggest that MC 3 and 7 are responding to the same external world are the following. (1) *Syìng* [*xing*] 性 (nature) and *tyēn* [*tian*] 天 (Heaven) are linked only in 7A1 and 3A5.[26] This ethical theory thus unites these chapters. (2) Both chapters use the self-designation Rú 儒 for the school of thought to which they themselves belong, a term that is prominent in that sense in the Syẃndzian writings but is unknown elsewhere in the *Mencius*. (3)

Both chapters, but no other *Mencius* chapter, refer to the opposing schools as Yáng 楊 (Jū) [Yang Zhu] and Mwò 墨 (Dí) [Mo Di]. Though Micianism [Mohism] was part of the scene from the early 04 century until Hàn, Yáng's movement seems more limited. His views are little known, and his background is even less known. Yángist prominence in Warring States debate was thus probably not protracted,[27] and it is likely that these chapters (and the *Jwāngdž* primitivist chaps. 8–10, which also oppose "Yáng and Mwò"), are from the same relatively short period. From the *Analects,* which has links to both the *Mencius* and the *Jwāngdž,* that period can in turn be identified as roughly the decade before the Chǔ conquest of Lǔ in 0249.[28] (4) Another vocabulary item that is unique to these two chapters is *háu-jyé jr̄ shr̀* [*haojie zhi shi*] 豪傑之士, which occurs in 3A4:12 (Lau, "an outstanding scholar") and 7A10 (Lau, "an outstanding man") and nowhere else in the text. There are other common vocabulary traits that are not readily attributable to random factors but seem to imply a common discourse style. (5) That commonality does not preclude some mutual antagonisms. On the assumption that the MC 1–3 series represents the continuation of Mencius' followers in Tźng, whereas the MC 4–7 series reflects a separate strand whose likeliest location is Dzōu, and noting that Gūngsūn Chǒu [Gongsun Chou] figures prominently in the former chapters (he gives his name to MC 2) and Wàn Jāng [Wan Zhang] in the latter (he gives his name to MC 5), there are passages that can be construed as barbs exchanged between the two schools. MC 7A32 in effect calls Gūngsūn Chǒu (the hero of MC 1–3) a primitivist, and 7A39 brands him a Mician.[29] As though in response, 3B5 portrays Wàn Jāng as a political dunce who credits evil Sùng with good intentions ("Mencius," in a long and exasperated diatribe, will have none of this).[30] As perhaps a further rejoinder, the odd and seemingly pointless tale 7B30 records an accusation that the Mencians in Tźng [*sic*] are little better than thieves (for whom again "Mencius" disclaims individual responsibility). These little intergroup squabbles, as they seem to be, are much more plausible as between separate and rival groups than as among the remembered chief disciples of a single movement. In no chapters other than MC 3 and 7 does this impression of intergroup asperity arise. Neither the uniquely common features of these chapters nor the differences and the rancor that divide them are readily accounted for by the standard theory that the *Mencius* is the sayings of one man.

Those qualities suggest an outward event, one that pushed the schools into closer conjunction than previously. One candidate event is the preliminary conquest by Chŭ of the southern portion of Lŭ in 0255/0254. We may note that Syẃndž's influence on both MC 3 and 7 is visible in their use of his signature term "Rú," and recall that Syẃndž moved to Chŭ as director of Lán-líng, a town located at 34°44′N, 117°54′E, just south of the old Lŭ southern boundary and somewhat east of Warring States Syẃjōu [Xuzhou] 徐州, 120 km on a line southeast from the Lŭ capital Chw̄fù [Qufu] 曲阜. Syẃndž's appointment brought him close to the southern edge of Lŭ, so it could have been made only after Chŭ controlled Lán-líng, and that was true only after 0254. Then the possible dislocation of one or both Mencian schools, and the strong influence of Syẃndzian vocabulary on both, would seem to be best dated to 0254 and the few years that elapsed before 0249, when Chŭ completed its conquest and absorbed Lŭ and its satellites entirely into the Chŭ polity.[31]

7. The Alternate Hypothesis: Developments in the Proposed Text Strand MC 1–3

It has been suggested above that (1) MC 1–3 and 4–7 are separate text strands and that (2) their respective ends, MC 3 and 7, are not only near each other in time but also different in character from the rest of their groups. If this is so, we might expect to be able to detect a certain progression of ideas within each of the two proposed text strands. In this and the next section, we will cite details that tend to show that the text does not merely contain internal differences but that any developments implied by those differences tend to be in the same direction, and that this direction is toward MC 3 or 7, not the reverse. We may begin with economic matters, since for these there is sometimes corroborating text or archaeological evidence.

Rural Mobility. As noted above, Mencius, and indeed Lyáng Hwèi-wáng, envisioned a populace that was mobile and thus capable of being attracted from one state to the next by a benign government (1A5). This assumption seems to hold true as late as 2A6, but it is not present in still later economic passages such as 3A3. Archaeological and literary evidence from the period generally attests the increasing subjection of the populace and thus supports the idea of a gradual loss of what might be called residential mobility.[32]

Rural Independence. The early Mencian policy statements can be interpreted as applying to single-family farms. Late policy statements, such as the well-field proposal in 3A3, instead envision a pooling of labor within an eight-family group. Such 03-century statecraft texts as the *Gwǎndž* [*Guanzi*] show the coresponsibility principle in process of development,[33] and as is well known, coresponsibility was further extended and enforced under the Chín [Qin] empire.[34] The *Mencius* passages that we are here considering take their place without difficulty in the 03-century stage of that larger general development.

Rural Diet. Early Mencian economic passages speak of fish and turtles as endangered by overuse (1A3) but as providing an animal protein supplement to the basic grain diet. The later *1A7:24 and the very late 7A22 refer to barnyard animals but not to fish or turtles. The implication is that the ponds where these used to grow have been drained to make plowlands. The motive for doing this is obvious. Farming is several times more efficient, in terms of net caloric yield, than fishing.[35] As agriculture became more "rationalized," that is, as its caloric yield was made to increase in the 03 century, the ponds were presumably sacrificed to the goal of maximum output. By Hàn times, one scholar concludes that pigs in the rural economy functioned primarily not as a source of meat but rather as a source of manure.[36] Again, the implied development fits easily into what the scanty evidence suggests is the probable long-term developmental picture.

***Rv́n Jvèng* [*Ren Zheng*] 仁政.** The term "*rv́n jvèng*" turns up first in 1A5, where it means leaning easier on the people so that they can gratify their filial instincts and thus feel gratitude toward the state, which they express in willing military service.[37] The converse of this theory is expressed in 1B12, where lack of willing military service is ascribed to the resentment of the people. In none of these early and genuine pieces is there any hint of moral self-cultivation, by the people, the ministers, or the ruler. They focus instead on the basic economic needs of the people. If these are met, loyalty ensues, and the state is strong. If not, resentment ensues, and the state is weakened. This is the entire content of *rv́n jvèng* as expounded by Mencius himself.

In the interpolated *1B11, Chí is said to have courted military intervention by annexing Yēn, doubling its area without also practic-

ing *rún jùng*. In the authentic 1A5:1–3, *rún jùng* was recommended as strengthening the state, leaving open the possibility that this new strength might provoke preemptive attack by other states. The *1B11 *rún jùng* seems to deal with this difficulty by operating so as to prevent intervention, presumably because the people of those states (and, in the age of the mass army, thus the armies of those states) will not support a campaign against a *rún jùng* state. This goes beyond the 1A5:1–3 idea that *rún jùng* will attract population. It asserts that it will also enlist the sympathies of the people of the other states, making them willing to be conquered. This more developed view of *rún jùng* as a principle of policy is shared by 2A1.

By 3A3, *rún jùng* is defined not in terms of interstate rivalry but in terms of land distribution and the imposition of family coresponsibility. The chief responsibility is the common field that they must cultivate before beginning work on their private fields. There is no longer any idea of attracting population; rather, the mechanism for holding it in place seems to be highly developed. As attested in LY 12–13, and as admitted by MC 3A3 itself, earlier taxation was at the rate of 1 in 10. The new well-field system gives a rate of 1 in 9. The state is clearly not losing by this change. The theme of a mobile population recurs in 3A4, but it is set in a frame story designed to argue against an autonomous rural culture. The general social development that seems to be reflected in these recommendations is in the direction of an increasingly less mobile rural populace.

Remonstrance. The original *Mencius* (1A3:1–3, 1A5:1–3) uses only the device of persuasion. The *Mencius* of the interpolated *1B4 speaks of "restraining" the ruler. MC *1B8 even countenances killing a ruler on grounds that he had ceased to function as a true ruler. These are fairly extreme (and thus perhaps not literally transcribed) examples of remonstrance. After this point in the MC 1–3 series, *jyèn* [*jian*] 諫 declines. In 2A5:2 a minister resigns when his remonstrance is unheeded. 2B12:6 ridicules remonstrance as a deed of petty men. MC 3 never mentions it. That chapter criticizes policy in the presence of ministers (3B8) but attributes the shortcomings of rulers to the inadequacies of their advisers (3B6). The ruler has become unavailable to direct criticism. Instead, policy failures are attributable to ministers. This is probably a reflection not of the increasing policy role of ministers but, more likely, of an increasingly exalted and eventually uncriticizable role for rulers. The develop-

ment in the political sphere is toward autocracy, just as the earlier-noted development among the people is toward increased subjugation of the people.

8. The Alternate Hypothesis: Developments in the Proposed Text Strand MC 4–7

***Rén Jèng* 仁政.** The term *rén jèng* is common in MC 1–3; in MC 4–7 it is confined to 4A1 and 4A14. In neither passage is it described sufficiently closely that its content can be stated. It is praised in 4A1 as the only way to "rule the world equitably" (平治天下; Legge prefers "tranquilly"). It is mentioned almost in passing in 4A14 (essentially a commentary on LY 11.17) as defining the type of government that it is acceptable to "enrich" by collecting taxes. We may say that MC 4 regards a *rén* government as the only one that can rule properly and tax validly, but the content of that government, how it works and what it is supposed to achieve, is unclear. *Rén jèng* is thus a perfunctory term in the first chapter of the MC 4–7 series and is absent altogether from the remainder of that series.

***Shàn Jèng* [*shan zheng*] 善政.** The phrase "*shàn jèng*" should mean "good government," and in 2A1 that is what it does mean, in the most general sense: the heritage of good government left over from the past (specifically, from the good early rulers of a dynasty, such as Wŭ-dīng of the Shang). But in 7A14, where it occurs three times, the same phrase refers sarcastically to a government that is "good" at getting every ounce out of the people: "He who practices good government is feared by the people," and again, "Good government wins the wealth of the people." What 7A14 recommends instead is not *rén jèng* and not any kind of government whatever. It recommends education as the way to win the hearts of the people. So in parallel with the increasing severity of policy recommendations toward the end of the MC 2–3 sequence, we find the end of the MC 4–7 sequence commenting adversely on a merely "efficient" government. Taking these two terms together, we may say that the tendency in MC 4–7 is to mention *rén jèng* in passing at the beginning, drop the subject in the middle, and denounce "efficient" governments under another rubric at the end. This implies not unconcern for government but a growing revulsion for government. It makes a plausible parallel to the increasingly severe limitations

under which, as noted above, the MC 1–3 theorists of government apparently had to operate.

Remonstrance and Revolution. The political theory of MC 1–3 is administrative, whereas that of MC 4–7 is populistic: the latter chapters are concerned with political theory as seen from below. They parallel MC 1–3 in attesting the vanishing of remonstrance but become increasingly shrill on the topic of replacing the ruler. 4A1 (like 1A5) uses persuasion on the ruler, 4B3 implies retaliation by the ruler against remonstrance, and 5B9 limits the right of remonstrance to ministers of royal blood, thus making it acceptable only within the ruler's own family. There is no later use of the term in that text strand. MC 5B9 at the same time marks the beginning of the idea of replacing the ruler, not in ancient instances (as in *1B11) but as a possibility for the historic present. MC 7A8 and 7B35, at the end of the series, both show contempt for the ruler, and 7B14 reaffirms that a bad ruler may be replaced, this time without the 5B9 limitation to the ministers of the blood. The hostility to the ruler does not increase after MC 5, but it remains a well-remembered position in MC 7. Neither here nor in the dwindling of interest in ministerial protest in MC 1–3 is there any ground for inferring a mitigation of political conditions. Both strands rather suggest a political situation in which protest continued to be relevant but was increasingly futile.

The People. The historical Mencius (1A3, 1A5) had said that the people were the basis of state power. The related interest in rural mobility and rural independence dwindles, as noted above, throughout the course of MC 1–3. By contrast, the focus on the people as the basis, and indeed the definition, of the state increases during MC 4–7. MC 4A9, in the tradition of 1A3, ascribes winning the world to winning the hearts of the people. 5A5 makes the voice of the people the voice of Heaven, in confirming the ruler (Shùn) in possession of the world. The people rank higher even than the ruler in importance to the state in 7B14. This theoretical defense of the people contrasts and dovetails with the practical abandonment of the people as an element in the statecraft of MC 1–3. That extreme difference of principle possibly helps explain the rancor of the "good government" passage 7A14. It may well be a criticism of the harder, less populistic tendency in MC 1–3.

***Jìn Syīn* [*Jin Xin*] 盡心.** In 1A3, Lyáng Hwèi-wáng says that he has "done everything he can think of" (*jìn syīn*) in caring for his people, including moving both food and populace in times of famine. The phrase recurs in *1A7 as "putting all your heart and strength" (盡心力) into the pursuit of some goal, and again in 2B7, where the people "fully express their natural human feelings" (盡於人心) in the splendor of their funerary goods. None of these usages moves much beyond the basic meaning of the phrase. When it occurs in the MC 4–7 sequence, however, namely in 7A1, it is a technical term of psychology: one who gets to the end of his heart will come to understand his nature (*syìng*). This seems to envision a conscious mind (*syīn*) beneath which, and accessible through which, is the underlying nature of the person (*syìng*), through which in turn, as the next phrase tells us, the natural order (*tyēn*) of which that *syìng* is a part may be apprehended. This geometry of the soul is unique in the *Mencius,* but its similarity to that of the meditation texts is manifest.[38]

***Tsún Syīn* [*Cun Xin*] 存心.** A less precise geometry than that of 7A1 is implied by 6A8, on the general subject of the original ethical inclination (*syìng*, propensity), which speaks of how the original heart or disposition (*syīn*) may be kept amid the difficulties of life. In this passage, *syīn* and *syìng* are essentially synonyms. In 7A1 they have become distinct, and different actions are recommended for them ("To retain the heart, and nourish the nature, is the way to serve Heaven"). The evolution here is toward greater specificity, and greater complexity, in the way the human inward realm is perceived.[39] The larger movement, including these details, is from political populism in MC 4–5 to increasingly inward activism (and an increasing frustration with outward situation) in MC 6–7.

9. The Common Developmental Tendency

The above examples of evolution (or innovation as a special type of evolution) are, we suggest, individually coherent. They imply a reasonably consistent line of development for each of the two text strands. Taken together, they show several common qualities shared, or common situations attested, in the whole of the later *Mencius* over time. As a review of the developmental hypothesis, it will be useful to summarize and add some detail to these common qualities.

Retreat from Politics. The political strand MC 1–3 does not disengage from politics, but it does cut back on the policies it thinks it can afford to recommend; the late policies are less compassionate than the early ones. The theoretical strand MC 4–7 opens with a repetition of the *rén jùng* phrase, and drops it thereafter; its politics is the outpolitics of the people. It develops this to a point of acrimony, in apparent opposition to the increasingly less people-centered policies of the other school, and perhaps also in contempt for the more demeaning role (5A7; compare 5A8–5A9, on the same theme) that the members of the other school may have been accepting. MC 3B6 may be a complementary gesture: a complaint by that other school, that by whatever accommodations of original theory it had been gained, their court access was not, after all, effective in influencing policy.

Discouragement. It seems fair to say of the historical Mencius, in the twelve genuine passages in MC 1, that he has the answer to the political problems facing Ngwèı and Chí and that the answer is a simple one. The rest of the text in various ways recedes from that simplicity and that assurance.

In the early layers of the text, it is asserted that the ruler has only to make the right move, and the people in response will surge toward him like an irresistible force of nature (1A6, 1B15; also 4A9) and will fight for him with mere sticks against the mailed warriors of the enemy (1A5). This assertion logically contains within it a theory providing for an immediate ethical response by the people to the ethical initiative of the ruler. By 6A8, the famous Ox Mountain passage, the text is trying to explain why the expected ethical response is lacking in some people. Many consider this to be the most beautiful passage in the book.[40] Perhaps all parties can agree on "poignant." To us it is one of the most bleak. We find in it less a theory of the goodness of human nature than an account of the loss of goodness from human nature. MC 6A8 as it stands seems to accept, and merely tries to explain, that some men are unable to respond to the good. Their nature (*syìng*) is absolved of blame (irresistible circumstance is at fault) and the theory is salvaged, but the fact of loss remains. By 7A3 the very idea of the consequences of action, and thus the efficacy of action, is called into question. The only sphere of action in which seeking leads dependably to getting is within the self. Seeking in the outer world has no guarantees; it is a matter of fate whether success follows effort. The implication is that the only

quest that offers a reasonable chance of success is the inner quest. The inward turning recommended in 7A3 is echoed in the injunctions of 7A8 (forget power), 7A9 (self-cultivation in obscurity), 7A20 (abandon rulership for familial and personal satisfaction), 7A24 (Confucius regards the world as small), and 7A35 (Shùn casts aside the world for family duty).

It is an interesting world and, when properly cultivated, no doubt an admirable world, but it is surely much reduced in scope and ambition from the plan for social integration, and indeed for world conquest by the most compassionate, which had been put forward by the historical Mencius.

Social Separation. Meanwhile, what of the lyrical identity of the hearts of king and commoners that Mencius recommended in 1B1 and was elaborated in *1A7? The MC 1–3 series even at its end (3A1) continues to assert that the gentleman is of one substance with Yáu [Yao] (3A1). But less is claimed for the common people, and their difference from the gentleman comes to be emphasized. 3A3 states the famous principle that some use their minds and some use their backs and calls it "consistent throughout the world" (天下之通義). Even the right of self-determination, the core of the former assumption of a mobile population, is denied in 3A3: "On the occasion of death or removal, there will be no leaving of the country." The coresponsibility group members are fettered to each other and collectively chained to the land. If they have an idea that life would be better over the border, they cannot act on it. This in effect violates and ultimately abandons the policies of the historical Mencius.

Confucianization. It was noted that the MC 1 interpolations, unlike the original interviews, imply a world in which knowledge of the *Shr̄* and the *Shū* was shared by Mencius and the rulers he addresses. A more striking type of Confucianization is the appearance of Confucius as the historical sage in 3B9 and as one of the sequence of sage-rulers in 7B38. This amounts to a substitution of the house icon Confucius, of whom 03-century Confucians could speak and mythologize at will, for the perhaps less interpretationally tractable historical rulers cited in earlier passages.

Interiorization. A similar retreat to a zone of greater control, but one with less public influence, is the tendency toward interiorization and inner self-cultivation already noted in MC 7. The most

psychologically sophisticated part of the *Mencius* (that is, MC 7) is also the most politically attenuated part of the *Mencius*.

All these trends can be seen as responses to, and in some cases protests against, the same trend toward autocracy in the state and the same frustration at the ineffectiveness of protest by the elite. The text largely abandons the people it had first championed, either by accepting their loss of social freedom (MC 1–3) or by abandoning politics altogether and taking up instead the interior quest (MC 4–7).

10. A Return to the Inconsistency Problem

Of the internal inconsistencies cited at the beginning of this essay as arguments against single authorship of the *Mencius,* we may now ask: Does the present hypothesis better account for these inconsistencies, or do problems remain? Before applying this test, we should first emphasize that the hypothesis here offered is incomplete in many respects. The date of the MC 1 interpolations, the growth patterns around each chapter core, and the exact relations between the two later chapter sequences all remain to be worked out in detail. With that qualification, it should still be possible to see if the alternate hypothesis offers a better account of the inconsistencies noted above.

Good Government. The fact that government itself is positive in MC 1–3 or the southern school, with its consistent governmental focus, will explain the casual use of *shàn-jèng* 善政 in 2A1. The indignation felt in the northern school (7A14) for increasingly severe governmental schemes (perhaps, as suggested above, the schemes such as the southern school advances in 3A3) would be in line with the increasing retreat of the northern school from all outward situations. The seeming difficulty would appear to be explained by the proposed alternate hypothesis.

Confucius and the *Chūn/Chyōu*. The contributory role of Confucius assumed by the early 4B21, and the constitutive role claimed by the late 3B9, would be consistent with a general tendency, over time, to attribute more of the authorship or preservation of earlier culture to Confucius personally. In addition to this time factor, it is also understandable that the ethical side of the *Chūn/Chyōu*

should be emphasized by the philosophical school's 4B21 and that the governmental consequences of the composition of the *Chūn/Chyōu* are instead emphasized in the governmental school's 3B9. The seeming difficulty would appear to be explained by the proposed hypothesis.

Yī Yĭn. The problem with the Yī Yĭn motif in the supposedly integral *Mencius* was that it showed an unlikely degree of thematic and emblematic variation. This problem will be reduced if arranging the data in the proposed order of composition yields either a developmental picture, showing the Yī Yĭn myth as such in the process of evolving, or a circumstantial picture, which would plausibly fit the needs of the two Mencian schools. What we seem to see is a combination of the two.

(1) The original Mencian position will have been that of 2A2, echoed in 5B1. These passages accept Yī Yĭn's willingness to benefit any ruler, or himself rule any people, as one valid type of the sagely minister persona. This is the flexible Yī Yĭn. Both the historical Mencius, with his wandering from Ngwèı to Chí and then to smaller courts, and the northern successor school, splitting off after Mencius' death from the court at which his movement seems to have become established, would have found this flexible Yī Yĭn persona congenial to their situation and supportive of their hopes. (2) 5A7 and 2B2 seem to be reacting to a development of the Yī Yĭn story, presumably outside the *Mencius,* in which Yī Yĭn's flexibility is exaggerated by having him initially accept service in a humble position. 5A7 denies that he stooped so low as to serve as a chef and thus attempts to preserve his previous statesmanly image. The seemingly later 2B2, on the contrary, accepts a variant of the new development in which Yī Yĭn's first position is that of tutor. We suggested above that the southern school may at some point have accepted a less than ministerial position in order to maintain continued access to power; if so, this humble Yī Yĭn persona may have served as a symbolic justification. Both 5A7 and 2B2, in slightly different ways, emphasize that the content of Yī Yĭn's expertise was his knowledge of the ways of the ancient rulers—essentially a preceptorial role. (3) 5A6 compares Yī Yĭn with Jōu-gūng; both served the larger interest of the state and its people but never actually held power; 7A31 emphasizes Yī Yĭn's principled and temporary stewardship. The same lack of desire for power is present in 5A7, and all these passages

(which are from the northern school sequence MC 4–7) would be congenial to the self-image of the northern school, which as far as we can discern never achieved a regular relationship with a court. (4) That the southern school never mentions Yī Yǐn after his "tutor" appearance in 2B2 would be consistent with its increasing loss of real policy influence; a strong ministerial symbol might well have been more than the group's modest status and negligible success could sustain. (5) It may seem anomalous that Yī Yǐn should continue to be mentioned in the northern school, but the details highlighted in those occurrences are different from those stressed earlier (for instance, the element of flexibility is no longer included) and are consistent with that school's continued hostility to government, its own attenuated political interests, and its final abandonment of the dream of good government. Thus, in 5B1 and 6B6, Yī Yǐn is not praised for his knowledge of the ancient rulers (the technica of government, as it had been defined in the previous 5A7 and 2B2), but for a more general knowledge of the Way (*dàu* [*dao*] 道) and the more inward quality of benevolence (*rén* 仁) toward the people. The more political elements in Yī Yǐn's legend are not mentioned (nor is the earlier term *rén jèng* revived). In the muted protest piece 7A31, Yī Yǐn's disinterestedness qualifies him to remove a ruler if necessary; he is thus a useful spokesman for the Mencian "right of revolution" in the less assaultive but still fervent form in which we find it in these late northern chapters. In the last piece in the book, 7B38, Yī Yǐn has none of these specific attributes; he is merely one among several ancient worthies with whom the present age has somehow lost all contact and continuity.

The diverse estimates of Yī Yǐn thus become intelligible on assuming a slight mythological development in the Yī Yǐn legend itself and on noting that the emphasis on different aspects of his historical persona in different parts of the *Mencius* are appropriate to the varying political situations of the two schools. The seeming difficulty would appear to be explained by the proposed hypothesis.

11. Examples of the Practical Application of the Alternate Hypothesis

There are many other *Mencius* cruxes than the above three, some of them being vigorously debated at the present time and even in the present volume. It may also be of interest to see if the

hypothesis developed above, which it may now be appropriate to refer to as a theory, can contribute anything to the resolution, or the redefinition, of those cruxes.

***Syìng* 性.** There is a difference of opinion on whether *syìng* is innate or acquired, as asserted, respectively, in a long-running argument between Irene Bloom and Roger Ames. Kwong-Loi Shun points out cases where *syìng* is exceptionally used as a verb—in 7A30 性之 (presumably the causative "internalized as a propensity"; in Legge's translation, "were natural to"; in Lau's, "had it as their nature"), 7A21, and 7B33—as most strongly supporting the Ames position.[41] Ames cites these passages as showing that "*syìng* is not given, but is an accomplished project."[42] On the other hand, the passages chiefly relied on by Bloom for the intrinsic view of *syìng* are the 6A1 injunction not to do violence to one's *syìng* (cf. 6A6–6A7 and 6A15), which has earlier counterparts in 2A6 and the original 2A2 (where the inner quality to be let alone is *chì* [*qi*] 氣).[43] Accepting for purposes of present discussion that the respective passages have all been correctly interpreted, it is striking that the ones cited in support of an "innate" or "noninterfering" theory of nature are in MC 6 and earlier, whereas the passages attesting a concept of "acquired" or "accomplished" nature are in MC 7. On the present theory that MC 6 precedes MC 7, this implies that an early concept of intrinsic *syìng* was first asserted (2A2), then defended against opponents (6A1), and finally replaced by a concept of acquired *syìng*. The distribution of *syōu shvn* [*xiu shen*] 脩身 (cultivate the self), which is confined to 7A1, 7A9, and 7B32, would seem to support this inference by emphasizing the act of cultivation over the earlier assumption of innate qualities. It was noted above that MC 7 emphasizes working on the self as something in which the doer has control and is sure of results, and that MC 3 and 7 lie in the zone of possible Sywndzian influence, the Sywndzian view being that our good impulses are not given but rather are acquired through personal effort. This gives a consistent picture, in which both interpretations of *syìng* are correct but refer to different stages in the philosophical development represented within the time span of the *Mencius*.

***Chúng* [*Cheng*] 誠.** The term "*chúng*" occurs in 4A12 and 7A4 in a technical philosophical sense, not with the common meaning of "sincere." Kwong-Loi Shun notes that the progression from indi-

vidual to family to state to world is "somewhat different" in 4A12 and the nearby passage 4A5, but he does not adjudicate the difference.[44] Van Norden notes further that 4A12 is also found in the *Jūng Yūng* [*Zhongyong*] 中庸, where it is not attributed to Mencius, and that the related passage 7A4 also contains the only Mencian occurrence of the *Jūng Yūng* term "*shù*" 恕, as well as the phrase "*wàn wù*" 萬物 (the myriad things, all things), which, however, is found in the *Jwāngdž* and the *Syúndž*.[45] The relation of 4A12 and 7A4 to each other and to the *Jūng Yūng* and other texts, and their uniqueness in or difference from the rest of the *Mencius,* certainly invite an explanation. Van Norden proposes that the two *Mencius* passages are interpolations, but it is not obvious how, or even why, substantive interpolations would have been added to a book that seemingly did not circulate very widely after it was composed.[46] It will suffice if the passages instead represent contemporary influence from the *Jūng Yūng* (on the early 4A12) and also from the mid 03-century texts *Jwāngdž* and *Syúndž* (on 7A4).[47] This hypothesis of lateral influence, made possible by dating the later *Mencius* to the first half of the 03 century, seems to suffice also as an explanation for the anomalous features of MC 4A12 and 7A4.

Tyēn 天**.** Nivison points out that, in 2B13, Mencius is asked to explain his seemingly dissatisfied expression on leaving Chí, despite his previous remark that a *jyūndž* [*junzi*] 君子 neither resents Heaven nor blames men (all commentators equate this with LY *14.35).[48] He responds, "彼一時, 此一時也" (most naturally, "That was then; this is now"), and after a seeming explanation of why he might indeed be dissatisfied, concludes, "吾何為不豫哉" ("Why should I be dissatisfied?"). Legge resolves the non sequitur by reversing the final sentence: "How could I be *otherwise than* dissatisfied?" (emphasis added). Waley finds the reversal unjustified.[49] Nivison concurs, though noting that in this meaning the sentence would have been "perfectly natural." If we eliminate this "natural" conclusion, then a conversation that seems to begin in disappointment must end in affirmation. Ivanhoe, after reviewing commentaries, proposes two possible solutions: (1) Mencius from the first intends to show contentment with Heaven, and hence his seeming disappointment is specious, and (2) 2B13 shows him as "talking himself out of his initial feeling of distress."[50] Ivanhoe prefers the first, in part because it is compatible with the Mencian "unmoved mind" of 2A2 and thus

gives a consistent Mencian persona. But the consistency comes at a price. For one thing, if the passage merely intended to elicit an affirmation from Mencius, the disciple's question could have been framed ("Do you not feel disappointed?") to do so less problematically. For another, though it also occurs in other texts, the saying about resentment is treated in 2B13 as Mencius', not Confucius'; hence interpreting 彼 with the time of Confucius is awkward, Jàu Chí [Zhao Qi] 趙岐 notwithstanding. Finally, in this interpretation, the balancing (一時) predicates must be construed to assert not contrast (the natural interpretation) but identity between the two periods. This would be more naturally expressed by a single predicate after a double subject (as A/B, 一也).

The present theory, with its different alignment of the texts, favors a version of Ivanhoe's second option. (1) By the *Analects* chronology here assumed, LY 14 (c0310) was written after Mencius had left Chí (c0313), and the interpolated *14.35 sometime later (we suggest c0296, after Mencius' death). The historical Mencius thus could not have known it as a saying of Confucius, and its presence in 2B13 makes that piece a retrospective envisioning by his followers rather than a true report of his own situation. (2) MC 2B13 seems to return to the situation of the genuine 1B16, where again confidence in Heaven is asserted against a merely circumstantial setback ("That I failed to find favor with the Lord of Lŭ is due to Heaven; how could some son of the Dzàng [Zang] 臧 clan prevent me?"). (3) This genuine comment does reflect the imperturbability that Mencius claims in 2A2—a disappointment expressed in a larger context of imperturbable acceptance. (4) Both by position and by featuring description of persons, 2B13 is a literary construct rather than a contemporary transcript. It is thus not necessary to make its Mencius consistent with the historical Mencius; the 2B13 persona may symbolize later concerns. This frees up interpretation or, more precisely, imposes a different sort of consistency constraint upon interpretation. (5) 2B13 is the next-to-last piece in the chapter. The last is 2B14, where Mencius asserts that he never meant to stay long in Chí. These are paired in a way that is frequent in the *Analects,* one saying being a complement rather than a parallel to the other. It is typical of this device that an initially expressed disappointment (2B13) should be balanced—put in a larger context—by a more comprehensive expression of ultimate unconcern for outcomes (2B14). The thread linking the pair is the idea of personal emotional

engagement. (6) Jū Syī [Zhu Xi] 朱熹 has seen that the disappointment expressed at the beginning of 2B13 must be at a different level from the assertion made at the end. The contrast seems to be a disappointment that it has not happened (in contrast with the serenity of 1B16) versus a stoic confidence that if it does happen, it will be through Mencius' efforts. (7) This darker reinterpretation fits the downward developmental pattern that we have seen is present in this text strand, tending from greater to less optimism about outcomes. (8) A further stage in that same process of disengagement from optimism is seen in 7B38, the last piece in the book: "But if there isn't anybody, well, then, there *isn't* anybody" (emphasis added). The goal is, in fact, not going to be achieved. We wish to suggest that 2B13 can be intelligibly seen as a point in that trajectory of discouragement.

More generally, subsuming all the above examples, we submit that these evidences of intelligible development of ideas within the text support our theory, and that our theory in turn provides a dynamic overview against which many of the text's internal inconsistencies can be at least partly resolved, leaving for close analysis indeed a residue, but one from which considerable material not requiring or not amenable to such analysis has first been eliminated. We offer this theory, then, not in place of analysis but ultimately as an aid and precursor to analysis. The argument for the theory is its success in accounting for difficulties in the text.[51] Its proof will lie in the success of future analysis using it as a starting point.

12. Envoi

The *Mencius* is a difficult text, and apart from the text itself and a few other contemporary texts of contrasting outlook but ultimately of similar nature, we have very little knowledge of the time in which it was written. We must therefore expect that there will always be points, or whole passages, whose intent eludes us and that thus present themselves to us as having general meaning or none at all, whereas contemporary readers might have had much more specific reactions. We believe that the present theory offers the possibility of recovering, from the structure and interrelationships of the text, some sense of its original specificity. If that possibility should prove fruitful, it may lead to an increased appreciation of the evidently dif-

ficult conditions under which the authors worked, and the degree to which, despite disappointments and reverses and against the course of the mainstream of history in their own time, they persisted in their advocacy of a better world, inhabited by better people. For their insights into how society works or how it might work if it realized the best possibilities of its human material, and above all for their courage in maintaining and developing those insights until the very end of their time in the world, the present world may well be grateful.

Appendix: Diagrammatic Representation of the Present Theory

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Original Mencius interviews, c0320–c0310
1A1, 1A3:1–3, 1A5:1–3, 1A6; 1B1, [1B16], 1B9, 1B10, 1B12, 1B13, 1B14, 1B15</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Composite remembered Mencian conversations, c0303
2A2:1–23</td></tr>
<tr><td>Northern school separates, c0300
MC 4A</td><td>Southern school early addenda, c0300
MC 2A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Northern school extensions, post–c0300
MC 4B</td><td>Addenda to MC 1, post–c0300
*1A3:4–5, *1A5:4–6, *2A2:24–28</td></tr>
<tr><td>Northern school second chapter
MC 5</td><td>Interpolated inverviews
*1A2, *1A4, *1A7, *1B2, *1B3, *1B4, *1B5, *1B6, *1B7, *1B8, *1B11</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Chí conquest of Sùng, 0286</td></tr>
<tr><td>Northern school third chapter
MC 6</td><td>Southern school later addenda
MC 2B</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Syẃndž becomes director of Lán-líng, 0255</td></tr>
<tr><td>Last northern layer, c0254–c0249
MC 7</td><td>Last southern layer, c0254–c0249
MC 3</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Chŭ absorbs Lŭ and surrounding territory, 0249</td></tr>
</table>

Note: The above diagram represents the main points of the accretional *Mencius* theory as developed in the present paper. For simplicity, we have ignored differences of date among the interpolated interviews, and instances of overlap between the layers here shown (as the sequence of the MC 1 and MC 2 addenda). This schematic view will, it is hoped, serve the purposes of the present argument. We hope to offer a more detailed account of the theory on a subsequent occasion.

Notes

The authors are grateful to the National Endowment for the Humanities for a 1996–1997 Fellowship under which part of the research reflected in the present essay was carried out.

1. Chinese words are romanized in this paper according to the Common Alphabetic convention, which is designed to exploit the existing reflexes of Latin alphabet users. It uses the standard guideline "consonants as in English, vowels as in Italian," plus the following conventions for vowels not found in Italian: *r* as in "fur," *z* as in "adz," *v* as in "up," and *yw* (after *l* and *n,* simply *w*) for "umlaut *u*." (Pinyin romanization has been supplied at a character's first appearance by the editor.) To distinguish the two states whose names are presently pronounced identically as Wèı, a lost initial *ng-* is restored for that of the larger of them, thus Ngwèi 魏 versus Wèı 衛.

2. Dates "B.C.E." are here identified, in what we feel is a more culturally neutral way, by a prefixed zero. We prefer this to Needham's solution for the same problem—namely, a prefixed minus sign—because the latter confusingly invokes astronomical usage for what are rather "historical" dates, and because it precludes the use of hyphenation for spans; cf. "Confucius, 0549–0479."

3. An anonymous reader for the University of Hawai'i Press has suggested that the integral view of the *Mencius* is a "paper tiger" that no one in fact holds and that the present argument against that view is thus superfluous. We forbear to weary our own readers by citing in extenso scholars who subscribe to some variant of the *Shř Jî* [*Shiji*] 74 statement that the text was written by Mencius in retirement, in collaboration with several disciples, and who regard our *Mencius* as "one of the best preserved texts from the Warring States period" (D.C. Lau, trans., *Mencius* [Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1970], 222). The same reader asserts that our alternate hypothesis, attributing to the text a significant time depth, "has been noted by others, for example Nivison and Riegel." We have been unable to verify this assertion and have referred it to the scholars in question. Professor Riegel has replied, "I have not made the claim about the *Mencius* ascribed to me," and Professor Nivison has responded, "I don't know what that guy's talking about."

4. This inconsistency is also noted, though not explained, in Lau, *Mencius,* 231.

5. For this date, see ibid., app. 1.

6. Ibid., 9, 209.

7. In Chyén Mù [Qian Mu], *Syēn-Chín Jū Dž Syì-nyén* [*Xian Qin zhu zi xi nian*], 2d ed., 2 vols. (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1956), numbers 106 and 112 argue for 0322 as the beginning of Píng-gūng's reign; Lau also uses this date. There are several anomalies in the *Shř Jî* dates for Lŭ and other rulers that have to be resolved in a mutually compatible way; for our solution, see E. Bruce Brooks, "Chronology of the Princes of Lŭ" (Warring States Working Group [WSWG] Note 10, 1 August 1993). References to WSWG internally circulated papers are given here, though they are not presently publicly available. Conference papers by Stephen C. Angle and Manyul Im (April 1997) ex-

plored and largely confirmed, respectively, the separation here proposed between the northern and southern Mencian schools and the conjunction here asserted between MC 3 and MC 7; and an October 1997 WSWG conference paper by Dan Robins on animal imagery in Mencius further showed the fruitfulness of our proposed northern/southern contrast. It is hoped that these and other relevant results, including the WSWG internal Notes, will presently be formally published.

8. We see a parallel in the fact that when meeting with Ngwèı Syāng-wáng [Wei Xiangwang] in the first year of his rule (MC 1A6), Mencius emerged from the interview and recounted it to "someone." For details, see the text below, under the heading "Scenario."

9. In order not to burden the main argument, we summarize here briefly the reasons for regarding the final sections of MC 1A3 and 1A5 as later additions. (Asterisks relate to grouping of MC 1 interviews; see text.) (1) These passages end satisfactorily from a literary and policy point of view at 1A3:3 and 1A5:3. The proposed cores 1A3:1–3 and 1A5:1–3 are consistent with themselves, with each other, and with 1A1. With 1A1, they form a plausible series of consecutive interviews. (2) 1A3:4 presents a more elaborate farmstead than the preceding 1A3:1–3 and thus appears to be an elaboration on it. (3) 1A3:4 is a near duplicate of *1A7:24, implying some relationship between them. Since *1A7:24 is introduced by a phrase about "going back to fundamentals," it is likely that 1A3:4 existed earlier than *1A7. Then the spuriousness of *1A7 does not impugn the earlier 1A3:4. 1A3:4 still makes best sense as an evolutionary stage from the simple 1A3:1–3 to the elaborated *1A7. (4) 1A3:5 has a strident, anti-ruler tone, at variance with that of the preceding passages. (5) Coming now to 1A5:4–6, unlike the preceding 1A5:1–3 (but like 1A3:5) it is directly critical of rulers, who "rob the people of their time" and make their parents suffer from hunger and cold. (6) It also advocates military expeditions (*jīng* [*zheng*] 征) to punish the evil rulers of other states; this agrees with the interpolated *1B11 and differs from the genuine 1B10, which sees military occupation as relieving the suffering, not punishing the guilty. The original Mencian position seems to have consisted of recommendations for one state, including its protection from enemies; it is only in what seems to be later material that we find the idea of invading other states. The more aggressive position may plausibly be seen as a later development.

10. Here and in the text that follows, where no confusion is likely, we will by "1A3" and "1A5" indicate the original cores of those passages, 1A3:1–3 and 1A5:1–3.

11. We notice that the pieces that we conclude were the original MC 1 interviews, as they stand in the text, make a perhaps intentional three-part pattern: three (MC 1A1, 1A3, 1A5) with Lyáng Hwèı-wáng followed by one (1A6) with his successor Lyáng Syāng-wáng [Liang Xiangwang]; three (MC 1B1, 1B9–10) with Chí Sywǣn-wáng [Qi Xuanwang] followed by one (1B12) with Dzōu Mù-gūng [Zou Mugong]; and three (1B13–15) with Tvng Wén-gūng [Teng Wengong] followed by one chronologically misplaced noninterview (1B16) with Lŭ Píng-gūng. Literarily, this assigns three pieces each to the two major rulers in Mencius' career (Lyáng Hwèı-wáng, Chí Sywǣn-wáng) and to

the minor ruler under whom he apparently finished his career (Tźng Wén-gūng). It then appends to each of these series what might be called a transition away: the unsympathetic Syāng-wáng as the end of Mencius' hopes under Hwèi-wáng, Mù-gūng as a stopover in Mencius' travels away from Chí, and Píng-gūng (as above suggested) as a comment on the failure of Mencius' career as a whole. Three hopes ending in three denials. The pattern seems intentional enough that we suspect that the compiler of the memorial text must have exercised some options of selection in order to produce it. (We may note, however, that the added MC 1 material is sufficiently different in character that it probably represents later composition and not a later insertion of unused earlier material.)

12. See E. Bruce Brooks, "The Bamboo Slip Factor" (WSWG Query 18, 24 October 1993).

13. For the dates of Mencius, which we do not believe have been adequately settled by Chyén Mù, *Syēn-Chín Jū Dž Syì-nyén,* #63, see E. Bruce Brooks, "The Dates of Mencius" (WSWG Note 99, 22 June 1996).

14. E. Bruce Brooks and A. Taeko Brooks, *The Original Analects* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 97.

15. W. Allyn Rickett, *Guanzi*, 2 vols. (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1985 and 1998), 1/52.

16. We leave aside the difficult question of the lost four chapters of the *Mencius* and of the probity of the various reconstructed *Mòngdž Wài-shū* 孟子外書. We may, however, add that the generally recognized Mencian character of the commentary to the *Wŭ-syíng* [*Wuxing*] document in the Măwángdwēi [Mawangdui] group of texts (whose terminus ad quem is the tomb date of 0168) would seem to prove that a Mencian point of view continued to be active, and to leave textual traces, into the early years of the Hàn dynasty. This is a much stronger result than can be deduced from the *Hán Shī Wài-jwàn* [*Han Shi Waizhuan*] 韓詩外傳 or the *Shř Jì*, which prove only that our *Mencius* text was known and favorably regarded during the reign of Hàn Wŭ-dì. They do not imply a continued active Mencian school.

17. Hán Yŵ's [Han Yu] 韓愈 famous characterization of Mencius as "the purest of the pure" (醇乎醇者; see Charles Hartman, *Han Yü and the Tang Search for Unity* [Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press [1986], 181, and Hán Yŵ, *Hán Chāng-lí jí* [Shangwu, 1964], 3/72) referred to his ideological continuity from Confucius, but the purity of the text is certainly implied. Jörg Schumacher, *Über den Begriff des Nützlichen bei Mengzi* (Peter Lang, 1993), 79, speaks of an "Eindruck einer fast wunderbaren Konsistenz in Mengzis Sprache," and the author himself quoted this line to us to register his surprise at the proposal summarized in section 2 above. Linguists have tended to treat the *Mencius* as a pure linguistic sample. George A. Kennedy ("Word-Classes in Classical Chinese," in Li Tien-yi, *Selected Works of George A. Kennedy* [Far Eastern Publications, 1964]) implies that opinion, and Edwin Pulleyblank (*Outline of Classical Chinese Grammar* [University of British Columbia Press, 1995], 3) treats the *Mencius* as a specimen of the Lŭ dialect "more evolved" than the *Analects*.

18. A sample complexity: The existence of both 易之以羊 and 以羊易之 (equally "change it for a sheep") in MC *1A7 does not show that the position of

the instrumental adverb is indifferently F (following the verb) or B (before the verb), because on the second occasion another B adverb interferes: 我非愛其財而易之以羊. The better analysis is that the instrumental phrase 以羊 has been displaced from its normal B position in the second instance by a higher-ranking B-preference element.

19. In addition to the examples given in E. Bruce Brooks, "Mencius and Posterity" (WSWG Note 133, 20 March 1997), we may add the statistics of Kwong-Loi Shun, *Mencius and Early Chinese Thought* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1997), which are 48 passages (27 percent) from MC 1–3 and 131 passages (73 percent) from MC 4–7; within the latter series, MC 4–5 contribute 40 percent and MC 6–7 contribute 60 percent of the total number. If we eliminate passing mentions and give full weight to repeated passages, the prominence of MC 6–7 in the discussion becomes still greater.

20. For our view of *Analects* chronology, see *Original Analects;* the argument for that view is presented briefly in app. 1.

21. It is here assumed that LY 19.21 (c0253) quotes from MC 2B9, rather than the reverse. For the awareness in LY 19 of the contemporary and competing schools of Mencius and Syŵndž, see *Original Analects,* 185 (headnote), 190 ("Interpolations"), and 193 ("Reflections"). Notice also the mentions of the *Mencius* in the commentary, passim. LY 19.21, as our commentary neglects to say, extracts as an independent saying (of Dž-gùng [Zigong]) the climactic maxim of MC 2B9 (there represented as spoken by Mencius). The section of LY 19 in which Dž-gùng figures (19.20–25) generally adopts a Mencian and anti-Syŵndzian position; Dž-gùng's extravagant praise of Confucius in 19.24–25 echoes the tone of such passages as the end of MC 2A2 and has a phrase in common with MC 7A41.

22. In fact, the language is so strong that translators and commentators have been reluctant to render or acknowledge its simple force as language, feeling no doubt that such a statement would have been situationally impossible before an actual ruler. With this feeling we agree; it is one of the strongest reasons for regarding these as fictive rather than transcribed interviews. But as they stand, they are among the high points of Warring States rhetoric and deserve to be rendered in all their audacity.

23. Nothing later, no passage in a higher-numbered chapter, in the series MC 1–3 sustains this level of invective. The exceptions to this statement are largely doublets of the MC 1 interpolated passages, such as *1A4 and 3B9, which have identically the following: "In your kitchen there is fat meat, in your stables there are fat horses, but on your people's faces is a hungry pallor, and in the wilds are the corpses of the starved. This is leading on animals to eat men." The audacious *1A4, developing *1A3:5, is addressed to the king of Lyáng, whereas the verbally identical 3B9 is represented as a quotation from Gūngmíng Yí [Gongming Yi] 公明儀. Beyond noticing this particular case of attenuated reuse of earlier material, we cannot here pursue the topic of the Mencian doublets. For the special climate of discouragement that seems to attend MC 3 in particular, and that may help to explain the recurrence of this theme in 3B9, see further discussion in the text below.

24. *Jàn-Gwó Tsv̀* [*Zhanguo ce*], #479 (J.I. Crump Jr., *Chan-kuo Ts'e*

[Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970], 565) records misdeeds of King Kāng of Sùng, which have already been mythically exaggerated, but there is no reason to discount altogether the idea of misrule in Sùng (as does Arthur Waley, *Three Ways of Thought in Ancient China* [London: Allen and Unwin, 1939], 137–143, pursuing a vendetta against Mencius). "Mencius" in 3B5 (on which see further in the text below) refuses to accept a claim of Sùng's noble intentions, and it is probable that, in this text, the Mencius persona is expressing the view and the historical memory of the school. We feel safe in concluding that the king of Sùng was a bad egg, if on a less epic scale than the *Jàn-Gwó Tsv̀* makes out, and safe in relying on that conclusion for our argument at this point.

25. *Shř Jì* 74 (5/2348).

26. Kwong-Loi Shun, "Mencius on *Jen-hsing*," *Philosophy East and West* 47.1 (1997): 10.

27. Yáng Jū's name continued to be associated with a philosophical position as late as Hàn, but that position does not seem to be identical with the one held by what appears in the mid 03 century to have been the Yáng Jū movement, and the movement in any case seems not to have continued past the mid 03 century. The question is greatly complicated by the rhetoric of opposition that affects virtually all the texts that mention Yáng Jū and together constitute our entire body of evidence about him.

28. By far the most unmistakable instance of *Jwāngdž/Analects* textual relatedness is the three anecdotes of LY 18.5–7. We deal in *Original Analects,* 183, with the notion (see Waley, *The Analects of Confucius* [London: George Allen and Unwin, 1938], 21) that these can be later hostile interpolations. They rather represent creative (if of course adversative) interactions between two texts still in process of formation—an argument at the time, not an anomaly intruded afterward.

29. Gūngsūn Chǒu here adopts a Mician position on mourning observances similar to that of the renegade Confucian disciple Dzǎi Wǒ [Zai Wo] in LY 17.19 [17.21 in Lau's numbering]. See our *Original Analects,* 165, 258.

30. This passage has been criticized as showing Mencius' pedantic refusal to inquire into "what is asserted to be happening now and close at hand" (Waley, *Three Ways of Thought,* 143). We are reluctant to differ with the redoubtable Waley in two successive footnotes, but 3B5 makes much more sense if its point is not Mencius' unreality (contrast the extreme reality of such populist passages as 1B15) but rather the political naivete of Wàn Jāng. Sensitive readers will not fail to see the similarity in tone between this disciple rebuke and such a prototype as LY *13.3 (which we date to a similar period, namely, c0253; see *Original Analects,* 190).

31. This scenario puts Syẃndž in Lán-líng later than is often supposed, but it is consistent with a close reading of the biographical evidence for Syẃndž; see E. Bruce Brooks, "The Dates and Career of Syẃndž" (WSWG Note 142, 9 September 1997).

32. For a survey of slavery as evidenced by archaeologically recovered slave chains and collars, see E. Bruce Brooks, "Warring States Slavery" (WSWG Note 90, 23 August 1995), which in turn is based on the material reported in Donald B. Wagner, *Iron and Steel in Ancient China* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993).

33. As in *Gwăndž* 4.4 (c0250), Rickett 1/105.

34. For an example of the extremely detailed Chín regulations governing the responsibilities and liabilities of the urban residential group of five, see A. F. P. Hulsewé, *Remnants of Ch'in Law* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985), s.v. "D80–82."

35. Fish provides high-quality protein, but its final value as a supplement to a grain diet is a function of the effort that must be expended to obtain it. For an analysis showing the problems with relying on hunting and fishing as alternative food sources in times of poor grain yield, see Thomas W. Gallant, *Risk and Survival in Ancient Greece* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1991), 119–121. Gallant usefully remarks that the input-to-output ratio is different for well-equipped elite hunters than for "the humble peasant setting a simple trap for an unsuspecting hare," the effort input being greater in the latter case.

36. Francesca Bray, "Agricultural Technology and Agrarian Change in Han China," *Early China* 5 (1979): 3.

37. This is perhaps an oblique way of expressing the little people's reasonable desire for enough to eat. It is notable that in all 03-century writings, including the comprehensive and merciless anti-Confucian satires of the *Jwāngdž,* filial piety is the one value that is never criticized or ridiculed. It seems to have been, at any rate in the literature available to us, a cultural untouchable. That would have made it highly valuable rhetorically, as a carrier or protector of other, less self-justifying concepts.

38. The sequence of meditation texts in the *Gwăndž*—namely 49, 37, 36, and 38—goes into great and relevant detail. We date the first of these, the "Nèı Yè," to c0305 (in general agreement with Harold D. Roth, "Redaction Criticism and the Early History of Taoism," *Early China* 19 [1994]: 16; and Rickett, *Guanzi*, vol. 2, 37) and the others at intervals of approximately one generation thereafter, respectively: c0290 (Syīn shù syà [Xinshu xia]), c0265 (Syīn shù shàng), and c0240 (Bái syīn [Baixin]). See A. Taeko Brooks, "The Gwăndž Meditation Texts" (WSWG Note 198, 5 September 1999).

39. The rapprochement with meditation in MC 7 is one factor that has probably made this chapter attractive to later Confucianism, in which personal self-cultivation had a central role. This may partly account for the high rate of quotation from MC 7 (and from MC 6, whose human nature emphasis provides, in retrospect and probably also in historical fact, a theoretical substrate for MC 7) in later Confucian writings down to our own time, a phenomenon briefly noted above.

40. For a notably moving example, discordant in terms of the present argument but humanly beautiful, see Naomi Lewis, "The Silences of Arthur Waley," in Ivan Morris, *Madly Singing in the Mountains* (New York: Walker, 1970), 81, on Arthur Waley's funeral; and compare Waley, *Three Ways of Thought,* 115–118.

41. Kwong-Loi Shun, "Mencius on *Jen-hsing,*" 3.

42. Roger Ames, "The Mencian Conception of *Ren Xing,*" in *Chinese Texts and Philosophical Contexts,* ed. Henry Rosemont Jr. (La Salle, Ill.: Open Court, 1991), 159 f.

43. Irene Bloom, "Human Nature and Biological Nature in Mencius,"

Philosophy East and West 47.1 (1997): 26f. See also Bloom, "Mencian Arguments on Human Nature," *Philosophy East and West* 44.1 (1994): 19–53.

44. Shun, *Mencius and Early Chinese Thought,* 164.

45. Bryan W. Van Norden, "Comments and Corrections to D.C. Lau's *Mencius,*" ⟨http://faculty.vassar.edu/~brvannord/lau.html⟩, 1998, s.v. "4A12."

46. Kennedy ("Review of Creel, *Literary Chinese by the Inductive Method,*" in Li Tien-yi, *Selected Works of George A. Kennedy*, 493) convincingly points out an included gloss that separately defines the halves of two near-reduplicative expressions in MC 1B4 (the segment is sec. 7 in Legge's text; it will be noted that 1B4 reads perfectly smoothly if sec. 7 is eliminated). The incorporation of a scholarly gloss is a not uncommon occurrence in otherwise well-preserved texts. The argument for 4A12 and 7A4 as interpolated passages is their unlikeness to the rest of the *Mencius*. We feel that they fit well with the gradual change in its tenor and with its relations to chronologically parallel texts, which we are here pointing out. See further in the text below.

47. Brooks and Brooks, *Original Analects,* 176 (s.v. "LY *6.29"), note that a similar *Jūng Yūng/Analects* overlap occurs in an *Analects* passage that, though interpolated in the relatively early chapter LY 6, is best dated to the 03 century. For contact between the unambiguously 03-century portion of the *Analects* and the contemporary *Jwāngdž* and *Syúndž,* see, respectively, *Original Analects,* 174f. and 190f.

48. David S. Nivison, "On Translating Mencius," in Nivison, *The Ways of Confucianism* (La Salle, Ill.: Open Court, 1996), 188f.

49. Arthur Waley, "Notes on Mencius," *Asia Major,* n.s., 1.1 (1949).

50. Philip J. Ivanhoe, "A Question of Faith," *Early China* 13 (1988): 158.

51. The present essay has focused on what might be called the internal argument for its view of the *Mencius*. Synchronisms with other texts, such as the *Jwāngdž* and the *Syúndž*, have been mentioned only in passing. It is perhaps not inappropriate to add that the system of synchronisms that constitutes our working theory of the Warring States text corpus as a whole is also part of the argument, and that this larger system received confirmation in an important detail in 1998, when after years of editorial preparation the transcriptions of the Gwōdyèn [Guodian] 郭店 texts were finally made available to scholars. Following Li Xueqin's opinion ("Recently Discovered Confucian Texts from Guodian," Lecture, Dartmouth College, 22 October 1998) that the Gwōdyèn 1 tomb occupant was tutor to the Heir Apparent who later became King Kǎu-lyè [Kaolie 考烈] of Chǔ, the span of possible years for the tomb itself is from 0298 (the accession of Kǎu-lyè's father) to 0278 (the abandonment of the Jing-mýn [Jingmen] site), with both extremes being for various reasons unlikely. The current best guess is thus c0288. The tomb includes three selections made at some time before that date from the *Dàu/Dý Jīng* [*Daodejing*] (DDJ), emphasizing (unsurprisingly, in this statecraft context) its statecraft maxims, which, as is well known, tend to be more common toward the end of the DDJ. Our general theory of the DDJ (see E. Bruce Brooks, "The Present State and Future Prospects of Pre-Han Text Studies," *Sino-Platonic Papers* 46 [1994]: 63f., and the more detailed synchronisms in *Original Analects*, passim) is that it was undergoing grad-

ual compilation during this period and that a version of it from the year c0288 should show an incomplete state of that growth; specifically, it would probably contain DDJ 1–55 and might contain passages as high as DDJ 65, but it ought not to contain anything from the span DDJ 70 or higher; a strikingly different result would seriously challenge our general theory of the texts. We thus in effect predicted a range of DDJ 1–65 for the Gwōdyèn extracts. The actual range of chapters represented in the Gwōdyèn materials is DDJ 2–66. The very close agreement of the archaeological fact and the textual theory offers, we feel, striking confirmation of the soundness of the text theory. For a slightly more detailed statement of this situation, see E. Bruce Brooks and A. Taeko Brooks, "Response to Professor Slingerland," *Philosophy East and West* 50.1 (2000): 141–146.