Zeitschrift: Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Asiengesellschaft = Études asiatiques : revue de la Société Suisse-Asie

Herausgeber: Schweizerische Asiengesellschaft

Band: 56 (2002)

Heft: 3: Textual scholarship in Chinese studies : papers from the Munich conference 2000

Artikel: Cognate texts : technical terms as indicators of intertextual relations and redactional strategies

Autor: Richter, Matthias

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-147578

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Mehr erfahren

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. En savoir plus

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. Find out more

Download PDF: 24.11.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, https://www.e-periodica.ch

COGNATE TEXTS: TECHNICAL TERMS AS INDICATORS OF INTERTEXTUAL RELATIONS AND REDACTIONAL STRATEGIES

Matthias Richter, University of Hamburg

It is well known that many Chinese texts of Han 漢 (206 B.C. – A.D. 220) and pre-Han origin are compilations of heterogeneous material or at least contain passages of earlier independent texts. The source material is taken over either word by word or in a slightly altered fashion and is by no means always treated as a quotation. For the interpretation of such texts it is therefore essential to consider their heterogeneous nature and determine which parts of the respective text derive from a common source. In the following I will demonstrate that seemingly marginal terms of a rare specialized usage can on the one hand corroborate assumptions about different sources of one text and on the other hand serve as indicators of intertextual relations, i.e. of common textual traditions. Furthermore, such special terms can in some cases provide information about the redaction of texts.

What follows is mainly based on the observation of some peculiarities in the parallel texts *Da Dai Liji* 大戴禮記 72 (henceforth: DL) and *Yi Zhoushu* 逸周書 58 (YZ), both of which are titled "The appointment of officials" (*Guan ren* 官人).[1] Both texts are largely identical in structure and language and

1 The redaction of both texts presumably dates from the 2nd to the 1st century B.C. The slight difference between their actual titles *Wen wang guan ren* 文王官人 for DL and *Guan ren jie* 官人解 for YZ may here be neglected as it is of no consequence for the following argumentation. (The significance of the titles for the different intentions of the respective texts—i.e. their being related to different local traditions—is discussed in my as yet unpublished doctoral thesis *Guan ren: Texte der altchinesischen Literatur zur Charakterkunde und Beamtenrekrutierung*, Hamburg 2000.) Both texts will in the following be quoted from the *Sibu congkan* (四部叢刊, ed. Zhang Yuanji 張元濟 et al., Shanghai 1919–36, repr. *Sibu congkan chubian suoben* 四部叢刊初編縮本, ed. Wang Yunwu 王雲五, 110 vols., Taibei [2]1967 [[1]1965]), which reproduces the oldest extant editions: a Ming print of the *Da Dai Liji* edition by Han Yuanji 韓元吉 (1118–87, preface of 1174) and the *Yi Zhoushu* edition by Zhang Bo 章檗 (dated 1543). These editions by no means offer the "best" text but they provide the best basis for a critical approach to the texts as they are still free from the numerous emendations of Qing 清 (1644–1911) and later scholars, which are

certainly derive from a common ancestor. This hypothetical ancestral text, which I shall hereafter conveniently call *Guan ren*, is itself a compilation of heterogeneous material. About eighty per cent of this text consists in the explication of a catalog of six criteria (*liu zheng* 六徵) for the recruitment of officials, i.e. criteria for the evaluation of candidates by means of a diagnosis of their personalities.

The criteria are named as follows: 1. "the scrutiny of sincerity" (*guan cheng* 觀誠), 2. "the examination of intentions" or: "the examination of words" (DL: *kao zhi* 考志, YZ: *kao yan* 考言), 3. "the inspection of the inner" or: "the inspection of the voice" (DL: *shi zhong* 視中, YZ: *shi sheng* 視聲), 4. "the scrutiny of facial expression" (*guan se* 觀色), 5. "the scrutiny of the hidden" (*guan yin* 觀隱), and 6. "the assessment of virtue" (*kui de* 揆德).[2]

Judging from the textual structure, I assume four sources which provided the material for the six paragraphs: Paragraph 1 is a catalog of some thirty methods of examination, each checking a certain quality of character (source one). Paragraphs 2, 5 and 6 list descriptions and definitions of different kinds of personalities (source two)—these parts of the text derive from a source closely related to that of paragraph 1. The texts of paragraphs 3 and 4, which deal with the diagnosis of character by voice and facial expression respectively, derive from entirely different sources (three and four). As the source material of all six paragraphs is of a specialized, technical nature, it contains a number of technical terms or at least uses some words in a specialized way. The distribution of such words in the text *Guan ren* can serve to verify the above-mentioned hypothesis with regard to its different sources.

I would like to suggest a method of examining terminology that starts from terms with a rather simple, concrete meaning, terms which are clearly used in a specialized way. The advantage of this approach is that such words most probably do not occur in many texts, and if those texts in which they do occur share some more common features (for example in structure, content or

---

usually based on the respective parallel text and thus blur the differences of the two texts and tend to mingle them into one fictitious text that never existed. All Chinese primary sources apart from DL and YZ will, if not otherwise indicated, be cited from the *ICS Ancient Chinese Texts Concordance Series* 先秦兩漢古籍逐字索引叢刊, ed. D. C. Lau 劉殿爵 and Chen Fong Ching 陳方正, Hong Kong 1992 ff.

2 I will hereafter refer to the explication of points 1 to 6 of this catalog as "paragraphs 1 to 6". The relation of the paragraphs to the catalog of "six criteria" (*liu zheng*) is explicitly marked by the respective number at the beginning of each paragraph, and at the end it is stated even more clearly by the formula "此之謂 ..." preceding the criterion which the paragraph refers to (e.g. "一曰 [...] 此之謂 觀誠").

presumptive place of origin) they may be seen as what I should like to call "cognate texts," i.e. texts which derive from a common source or tradition. I would like to stress that the word "text" here does not designate whole books but rather single chapters or independent units within a chapter.

Once a number of cognate texts have been established, it may be assumed that they also use more complex terms in a similar way. Thus these texts can be mutually referred to in order to determine the meaning of their complex terms or so-called philosophical concepts.

In the following the application of the above described method will be demonstrated—at least in its first step—by means of only one of many more words in *Guan ren* which could be examined in this way as possible technical terms:

The character 故 commonly representing the word *gu* meaning "old, ancient; cause, reason; therefore" in some cases has to be interpreted as writing a word synonymous with *zha* 詐, "deceit, deceitful," a meaning not mentioned in smaller dictionaries such as *Gu Hanyu changyong zi zidian* or even *Ci yuan*.[3] It is mentioned, however, in the *Hanyu da cidian* and *Zhongwen da cidian*, but only in cases where this meaning is explicitly stated by early commentaries.[4]

It should not be taken for granted from the outset that any word written by the character 故 is identical or at least homonymous with the familiar word *gu* commonly written by the same character. However, as a few rhymes in the examples cited below will show, it obviously has a similar or the same final as *gu* [*kâg][5] and perhaps also the same initial. Therefore, it will in the following be treated as a homophone of the familiar *gu* and will for the purpose of differentiating the two be written *"GU"*.

As *GU* often occurs coupled with *zha* 詐 or *qiao* 巧, it seems possible that it reflects the development of a rhyming binome like 詐故 [*tsăg-kâg] or 巧故 [*k'og-kâg] into two separate words. In this case it may be a word entirely different from the familiar *gu*. This possibility should, even if not very probable, at least be taken into consideration. It is far more likely, however, that *GU* is

3 Cf. *Gu Hanyu changyong zi zidian* 古漢語常用字字典, Beijing 1979, 88; *Ci yuan* (*Xiuding ben*) 辭源 (修訂本), 2 vols., Beijing 1990 [[1]1983], 1340.

4 Cf. *Hanyu da cidian* 漢語大詞典, ed. Luo Zhufeng 羅竹風 et al., 13 vols., Shanghai 1990–94, vol. 5, 428; *Zhongwen da cidian* 中文大辭典, 10 vols., Taibei [8]1990 [[1]1962–68], vol. 4, 891.

5 Reconstructions of Old Chinese pronunciations are given according to Dong Tonghe 董同龢 (20th c.) and cited from Chou Fa-kao 周法高 (ed.), *A Pronouncing Dictionary of Chinese Characters in Archaic & Ancient Chinese, Mandarin & Cantonese* 漢字古今音彙, Hong Kong 1974.

just a further specialization of the meaning "deliberately, on purpose" of *gu*.[6] An exact determination of the semantics of *GU* would require a detailed and thorough analysis of all contexts in which the term can be traced. This will not be attempted here. The objective of the present paper is to establish *GU* as a term clearly distinct from the familiar *gu* ("thus, therefore"), thus preparing the ground for the correction of a considerable number of misinterpretations caused by the term *GU* not being recognized as such.

The following argumentation will proceed in three steps: Firstly, it will be demonstrated by a number of examples from various texts that *GU* is not a singular phenomenon but typical of certain texts of a common tradition. Secondly, an examination of the use of 故 in DL and YZ will show that in most cases it should be interpreted as writing the term *GU*, thereby, thirdly, arriving at the conclusion that the distribution of this term corroborates the above stated hypothesis about different sources of the ancestral text *Guan ren*.

1. The term *gu* in texts apart from *Guan ren*

The term *gu* appears at least twice in *Lüshi chunqiu* 呂氏春秋. The chapter "The assessment of men" (*Lun ren* 論人) has the following:

何謂反諸己也	{*kj̥əg}[7]	What does one call "introspection"?
適耳目	[*mj̥ok]	Adjust your senses,
節嗜欲	[*gj̥uk]	restrain your desires,
釋智謀	[*mj̥wə̆g]	free yourself from wisdom and schemes,
去巧故	[*kâg]	discard artfulness and deceit
而游意乎無窮之次	[*ts'j̥ed]	to let your mind roam in the range of the limitless
事心乎自然之塗	[*dag]	and employ your heart on the path of the spontaneous.[8]

6 Cf. the modern Chinese *guyi* 故意 ("deliberately, purposefully, wilfully"), which carries a markedly negative connotation, as happens also to be true of the respective words in English. In some cases it is difficult to determine if 故 really should be interpreted as "deceitful" or just "wilful". I am grateful to Prof. Glen Dudbridge for his suggestion that the translation "contrive, contrived, contrivance" be considered, which seems appropriate in many cases, esp. those in which 故 is not closely related to 詐 but rather to 巧 or (esp. in *Huainanzi* 淮南子) to 智.

7 Reconstructed pronunciations in square brackets [ ] refer to the last word of the line. If the line ends with a particle irrelevant for the rhyme, the pronunciation of the preceding word is given in braces { }.

Richard Wilhelm (1873–1930) translates "去巧故" somewhat loosely as "vermeide perverse Neigungen [avoid perverse inclinations]" and Knoblock/Riegel as "abjure the 'clever' and 'established'."[9] The parallel structure, which this sentence shares with the preceding three, shows that "故" must denote a concept of the same category as "巧," just as both respective words of the pairs "耳目," "嗜欲" and "智謀" belong to one category.

The chapter "Subjugate the worthies" (*Xia xian* 下賢)[10] describes the man "who has found the way" (*de dao zhi ren* 得道之人) as "one who is empty [i.e. free of prejudice or ambitions] and is not artful and deceitful [不爲巧故]".[11] The fact that Gao You 高誘 (c. 168–212) in both cases considered it necessary to gloss "巧故" as "僞詐"[12] seems to reflect that around A.D. 200 *GU* was no longer a familiar expression.

Both sections of *Lüshi chunqiu* which use the term *GU* meaning "deceit" share some common features with the text *Guan ren*: Both deal with the question of how to recognize able men and they use a pattern which also occurs in paragraph 1 of *Guan ren* and in other related texts. *Lun ren* shows an even closer relation to *Guan ren* as it has a catalog of examinations resembling those in paragraph one of the latter.

Xunzi 荀子 also uses the term *GU*: a short paragraph of chapter 13 ("The Way of the Minister," *Chen dao* 臣道) says:

[...] 是事暴君之義也	{*ngja}	[...] This is the right way to serve a cruel lord:
若馭其樸馬	[*mwăg]	It is like taming one's wild horse,
若養赤子	[*tsjəg]	like nourishing an infant,
若食餒人	[*nj̥en]	like feeding someone who is starving.

8 *Lüshi chunqiu* 3.4, 15/1–2.

9 Richard Wilhelm (transl.), *Frühling und Herbst des Lü Bu We*, Düsseldorf; Köln 1979 [[1]1928], 35. John Knoblock/Jeffrey Riegel (transl.), *The Annals of Lü Buwei*, Stanford 2000.

10 Judging from its title, this chapter (*Lüshi chunqiu* 15.3) seems to promote a policy expressed by Shen Dao 慎到 (4th to 3rd c. B.C.) as "*fu xian* 服賢" or "*qu xian* 屈賢" (cf. P. M. Thompson, *The* Shen Tzu *Fragments*, Oxford 1979, 235–36). Nevertheless, the text, on the contrary, explicitly counsels the ruler to humble himself before the worthies in order to gain their support. Therefore, the title should probably be understood as a pun alluding to the maxim "to exalt the worthies" (*shang xian* 尚賢) and at the same time rejecting Shen Dao's concept of subjugating the worthies.

11 Cf. *Lüshi chunqiu* 15.3/82/30. Wilhelm translates: "Er ist unvoreingenommen und frei von Trug und Hinterlist." Knoblock/Riegel: "How guileless! his not doing anything artful." Cf. Wilhelm (fn. 9), 214 and Knoblock/Riegel (fn. 9), 348.

12 Cf. *Lüshi chunqiu jiaoshi* 呂氏春秋校釋, ed. Chen Qiyou 陳奇猷, Shanghai [2]1990 [[1]1984], 162 and 883.

故因其懼也	{*g'i̯wag}	Therefore: Act in accordance with his fears
而改其過	[*kwâ]	to corrects his mistakes;
因其憂也	{*·i̯ŏg}	act in accordance with his grievances
而辨其故	[*kâg]	to discern his deceitfulness;
因其喜也	{*xi̯əg}	act in accordance with his pleasures
而入其道	[*d'ôg]	to join in his ways;
因其怒也	{*nâg}	act in accordance with his animosities
而除其怨	[*·i̯wǎn]	to avoid his wrath.[13]

Köster erroneously understands "故" in the sense of "old" and translates: "geht auf seinen Kummer ein, damit der Herrscher vom Altgewohnten abzulassen lerne [considers the ruler's distress to make him change his habits]".[14] Knoblock's interpretation of "故" as "cause, reason" is not much more convincing: "use his distress to acquaint him with its causation".[15] Chapter 11 of *Xunzi* ("Kings and Lords-Protector,"[16] *Wang ba* 王霸) describes an incapable ruler who seeks his own profit, loves sensual pleasures, luxury and amusement and trusts the wrong people. The text goes on:

> If the ruler of a large state does not exalt the original norms of conduct, does not respect the old laws but favors falsehood and deceit (詐故), then his court and ministers will follow his example and make it their habit not to exalt propriety and righteousness but they will tend to overthrow [the government].[17]

Köster again mistakes "故" for "old" and translates "而好詐故" as "ja sogar gern altbekannte (Familien oder Freunde) betrügen [even tend to deceive long-known families and friends]", whereas Knoblock translates: "but is fond of schemes and plots".[18]

13 *Xunzi* 13, 64/24–65/1.

14 Köster apparently follows the interpretation of Wang Niansun 王念孫 (1744–1832): "辨讀爲變變其故謂去故而就新也". Cf. Hermann Köster (transl.), *Hsün-tzu*. Kaldenkirchen 1967, 174; *Xunzi jijie* 荀子集解, ed. Wang Xianqian 王先謙, Beijing [2]1992 ([1]1988], 253. Admittedly, it might be argued that this sentence could as well be read as "... to discern the reasons [for his actions]". The context of this passage, especially the preceding passage dealing with the same subject, however, supports the reading "deceitfulness".

15 John Knoblock, *Xunzi: A Translation and Study of the Complete Works*, 3 vols., Stanford 1988ff., vol. 2, 201.

16 The translation of the title follows Knoblock (fn. 15), vol. 2, 139ff.

17 "大國之主也不隆本行不敬舊法而好詐故若是則夫朝廷群臣亦從而成俗於不隆禮義而好傾覆也" (*Xunzi* 11, 56/10–11).

18 Cf. Köster (fn. 14), 148; Knoblock (fn. 15), vol 2, 168.

Even more obvious is the meaning of "故" in a similar description of a deplorable government, to be found in a rhyming verse in chapter 9 of *Huainanzi* 淮南子 ("The art of rulership," *Zhu shu* 主術):

是以		Therefore:
上多故	[*kâg]	The more deceitful those above
則下多詐	[*tsăg]	the more false are those below;
上多事	[*dz'əg]	the more assiduous those above
則下多能	[*nə̂g]	the more able are those below;
上煩擾	[*nio̯ŏg]	disturbance above
則下不定	[*d'ieng]	means insecurity below;
上多求	[*g'io̯ô̯g]	the greedier those above
則下交爭	[*tseng]	the more those below will quarrel.[19]

Another passage in chapter 2 of *Huainanzi* ("The beginning of the genuine," *Chu zhen* 俶眞) laments that in the progress of history the originally pure, childlike heart of men is incessantly corrupted by the material world. From the Zhou on, it is said, "artfulness and deceit sprouted [巧故萌生]".[20]

Last but not least *GU* occurs in a rhyming passage of chapter 36 of *Guanzi* 管子 ("Techniques of the Heart," *Xin shu shang* 心術上), a text said to have its origin in the Jixia 稷下 academy[21] and to have been finally compiled at the King of Huainan's court:[22]

人之可殺	[*sät]	The reason why men can be killed
以其惡死也	{*sio̯ed}	is because they fear death.
其可不利	[*lied]	The reason why men can be deprived of profit
以其好利也	{*lied}	is because they like profit.

19 *Huainanzi* 9, 68/6–7.

20 Cf. *Huainanzi* 2, 15/10–15. This reading of "故" is corroborated by analogous passages in other chapters of the *Huainanzi*: "智詐萌興" (9, 68/2), "毀譽萌生" (9, 77/2), "詐僞萌生誹譽相紛" (11, 93/30–94/1), "誹譽萌於朝" (11, 97/26).

21 A place in the vicinity of the capital of Qi 齊, Linzi 臨淄, where the Qi-kings in the fourth century B.C. professedly gathered intellectuals of different persuasions to discuss and teach their political and philosophical ideas.

22 Cf. W. Allyn Rickett, *Guanzi: Political, Economic, and Philosophical Essays from Early China*, vol. 2, Princeton 1998, 67–70; Harold D. Roth, *Original Tao: Inward Training* (Nei-yeh) *and the Foundations of Taoist Mysticism*, New York 1999, 18–23.

是以君子		Therefore the gentleman
不怵乎好	[*xôg]	shall not let himself be enticed by what he likes,
不迫乎惡	[*·âg]	shall not let himself be oppressed by what he fears,
恬愉無爲	[*ɣi̯wa]	he shall be calm and contented without acting,
去智與**故**	[*kâg]	he shall discard wisdom and deceit.[23]

Not only is the expression "去智與故"[24] reminiscent of "釋智謀去巧故" in the *Lun ren* chapter of *Lüshi chunqiu*—the above cited examples of the use of *GU* all have some features in common: *Lüshi chunqiu* recommends restraint of one's senses and uses a pattern similar to paragraph 1 of *Guan ren*. The advice for the "gentleman" (*junzi* 君子) given in *Guanzi* 36 resembles *Lüshi chunqiu*'s concept of introspection. *Xunzi* and *Huainanzi* mention "deceit" as a typical feature of a bad ruler and describe this defect as a result of indulgence in sensual pleasures, i.e. lacking restraint of one's senses. All of these texts more or less pointedly stress the relation of a person's physical state and their mental condition and qualities of character. Some of the texts, like *Guanzi* and *Xunzi* may be seen in traditions of the Jixia academy; for others, like *Lüshi chunqiu* and *Huainanzi* it cannot, at least, be ruled out that they incorporated Jixia traditions. But of course the occurrence alone of the term *GU* in different texts does not necessarily indicate a common tradition.

GU also occurs in texts of different persuasions which are essentially different from the above-mentioned ones. Among the "Rules of deportment of minor officials" (*Shao yi* 少儀) in *Liji* 禮記 17, for example, there is a rhyming[25] set of instructions:

23 *Guanzi* 36 (ed. *Sibu beiyao* 四部備要, Shanghai 1936), 13, 2ab. Rickett, following Xu Weiyu's 許維遹 (1905–51) reading of "故" as "詐," translates "故" as "pretense". Cf. Rickett (fn. 22), 74.

24 The same expression is used in *Zhuangzi* 15, where it is said of the sage (聖人) that he "discards wisdom and deceit and complies with the pattern of heaven [去知與故循天之理]." (*Zhuangzi yinde* 莊子引得, ed. Qi Sihe 齊思和, Harvard-Yenching Institute Sinological Index Series Suppl. 20, Peiping 1947, 40/15/10–12.) Both this expression and the one in *Lüshi chunqiu* 3.4 (cf. above, p. 553) are reminiscent of *Laozi* 19 (Wang Bi version, cf. *Boshu Laozi jiaozhu* 帛書老子校注, ed. Gao Ming 高明, Beijing 1996, 312) where similar expressions serve a different but still related rhetorical purpose: "Break with sagacity, discard wisdom and the benefit to the people will be manifold. Break with benevolence, discard righteousness and the people will return to filial piety and loving kindness. Break with artfulness, discard profit and there will be no robbers and thieves. [絕聖棄智民利百倍絕仁棄義民復孝慈絕巧棄利盜賊無有]".

25 "密"[* mi̯wət] does not, of course, rhyme with "狎" [*ɣap] in the strict sense of the *Shijing* rhyme groups. However, assonance was obviously very often consciously used in ancient

不窺密	[*mi̯wət]	Do not pry into secrets!
不旁狎	[*ɣap]	Do not take liberties [with your superior]!
不道(舊)故	[*kâg]	Do not tell lies!
不戲色	[*sək]	Do not be licentious![26]

It is not very probable that the third verse was meant to say: "do not talk about past affairs" or "do not talk about old friends" as the transmitted text "不道舊故" has it. The trisyllabic structure suggests that "舊" has been added to support the interpretation of "故" as "old" and should therefore be omitted. Another example is the second section of the *Jinyu* 晉語 in *Guoyu* 國語 where Pei Zheng 丕鄭 wants to persuade Li Ke 里克 to give up his neutral position towards Duke Xian's 獻公 plan to kill the heir apparent and install somebody else in his position. Pei Zheng says: "Try all sorts of tricks to make him change his plans [多爲之故以變其志]." Wei Zhao 韋昭 (204–273) explains the sentence as "多作計術以變易其志," whereas Imber's translation "if many did this it would change their purpose," which is obviously based on a misunderstanding of "故" as "therefore / thus," seems off the mark.[27]

2. The term *gu* in *Guan ren*

As regards the parallel texts DL and YZ, it is peculiar that "故" appears eleven times in the former, but only in three instances does it have a counterpart in the latter. There is no case in which YZ uses "故" without a counterpart in DL. A general assessment of the structure of both texts shows that DL in its structure (not necessarily in wording) is closer to the ancestral text. Thus the shortening of the text can be seen as a main feature of the redaction of YZ in contrast to DL. Following the principle of *lectio difficilior potior*, it appears that in some cases "故" has been either eliminated or exchanged for another character.

Chinese literature to create a rhyme-like effect. This apparently applies to the rhetorics of many didactic political and philosophical texts which did not so much aspire to poetic brilliance as they aimed to facilitate memorization. Most likely, *ru*-tone 入聲 words (i.e. words with the finals -p, -t or -k in Middle Chinese) created just this effect and should thus always be considered as possible quasi-rhymes.

26 *Liji* 17.13, 94/6.

27 Cf. *Guoyu* (ed. *Sibu beiyao* [fn. 23]) 8, 57b, and Alan Imber, *Kuo Yü: an early Chinese text and its relationship with the Tso Chuan*, Stockholm 1975, 44.

In the following I will show that DL really uses "故" in the above described specialized meaning, whereas YZ does not. I will further demonstrate how the distribution of this term in DL corroborates the hypothesis about its different sources. As all of the passages in which "故" occurs seem to be more or less corrupt and a presentation of all philological considerations, on which the translation is based, would lead too far from the point, I will only mention a few textual problems directly pertaining to the usage of "故".

The passage in which it is most obvious that "故" means "deceit" is to be found in paragraph 6.[28]

	DL	YZ
6.59	心色辭氣	志色亂氣
6.60	其入人甚俞	其人甚偷
6.61	進退工**故**	進退多巧
6.62	其與人甚巧	
6.63	其就人甚速	就人甚數
6.64	其叛人甚易	
6.65	曰位志者也	
6.66	飲食以親	
6.67	貨賄以交	
6.68	接利以合	
6.69	**故**得望譽征利而依隱於物	
6.70	曰貪鄙者也	
6.71	質不斷	
6.72	辭不至	辭不至
6.73	少其所不足	少其所不足
6.74	謀而不(已)[已][29]	謀而不已
6.75	曰僞詐者也	曰僞詐者也[30]

28 In the following, the text of DL will always be placed on the left and the matching text of YZ on the right. The line numbers count the individual cola in the respective part of the text. Identical numbers are given to the matching cola of DL and YZ to facilitate reference only. This does not imply that cola without a counterpart in the other text existed in the ancestral text and were omitted later. The number of a colon is, whenever referred to in the text, preceded by "#," e.g. "#6.59" stands for colon 59 of paragraph 6.

29 Emendations are marked as follows: characters in round brackets ( ) are omitted, those in square brackets [ ] inserted. Lacunae are marked by a square □ for each missing character. In the translation, corrupt or otherwise obscure parts of the text which cannot even be tentatively reconstructed are marked < … >.

DL: [6.59] Someone whose "color of mind" and *qi* of speech [6.60] pleases others, [6.61] whose diplomacy is crafty and deceitful,[31] [6.62] who is very artful in his connections with others, [6.63] who very quickly approaches others, [6.64] who very lightly renounces others [6.65] is a person who only thinks of his position.
[6.66] Someone who is close to those who feed him, [6.67] who associates with those who bribe him, [6.68] who allies with those who suit his profit, [6.69] who by deceiving gains reputation and fame, seizes his profit and relies on "outward things" [6.70] is a greedy and mean person.
[6.71] Someone who is of an indecisive nature, [6.72] who in his speech does not come to the point, [6.73] who makes his inadequacies appear smaller, [6.74] who is endlessly scheming [6.75] is a person who is false and deceitful.
YZ: [6.59] Someone who is intent upon lust and whose *qi* is in disorder, [6.60] whose personality is frivolous, [6.61] whose diplomacy is very artful, [6.63] who very quickly approaches others, [6.72] who in his speech does not come to the point, [6.73] who makes his inadequacies appear smaller, [6.74] who is endlessly scheming [6.75] is a person who is false and deceitful.

YZ here is considerably shorter than DL. Whereas DL describes three types of character—one who thinks only of his position (#6.65: "位志者"), one who is greedy and mean (#6.70: "貪鄙者") and one who is false and deceitful (#6.75: "僞詐者")—the matching sentences in YZ all describe the latter type. The inner logic of both the sections #59–65 and #71–75 suggests that text has been lost in YZ. "工故" ("clever and deceitful"), makes good sense in DL and has a counterpart in "甚巧" ("very artful") of the following sentence, just as "速" ("quickly") and "易" ("lightly") in the following lines match. In paragraph 2 there is a passage in which "故" again occurs in a parallel position to "巧": "以故自說" ("to resort to deceit to excuse one's own faults").

2.15	其貌直而不(傷)[傸][32] [*dịeg]	其貌直(□□□)[而不止][33] [*t̂ịəg]
2.16	其言正而不私	其言正而不私
2.17	不飾其美	不飾其美
2.18	不隱其惡	不隱其惡
2.19	不防其過	不防其過
2.20	曰有質者也	曰有質者也

30 *Da Dai Liji* 72: 10, 54a ; *Yi Zhoushu* 58: 7, 42a.

31 More literally: "who is clever and deceitful in promoting and degrading others".

32 The emendation follows Wang Niansun. Cf. *Jingyi shuwen* 經義述聞 (1832 [1797]), comp. Wang Yinzhi 王引之 (1766–1834), *Sibu beiyao* (fn. 23), 13, 1b–2a.

33 The *lacunae* derive from the Yuan 元 edition; all other editions have "而不止". For details cf. *Yi Zhoushu huijiao jizhu* 逸周書彙校集注, ed. Huang Huaixin 黃懷信 / Zhang Maorong 張懋鎔 / Tian Xudong 田旭東, Shanghai 1995, 820.

2.21	其貌固嘔	其貌曲媚
2.22	其言工巧	其言工巧
2.23	飾其見物	飾其見物
2.24	務其小微	務其小證
2.25	以故自說	以故自說
2.26	曰無質者也	曰無質者也[34]

DL: [2.15] Someone whose manner is straightforward and not light-minded, [2.16] whose words are correct and not selfish, [2.17] who does not exhibit his merits, [2.18] who does not hide his faults, [2.19] who does not cover up his mistakes, [2.20] is a person who has substance.
[2.21] Someone who is self-complacent, [2.22] whose words are clever and artful, [2.23] who exhibits his 'visible things' [appearance/wealth?], [2.24] who devotes his attention to sophistry [2.25] and resorts to deceit to excuse his own faults [2.26] is a person who lacks substance.
YZ: [2.15] Someone whose manner is straightforward [and not reticent], [2.16] whose words are correct and not selfish, [2.17] who does not exhibit his merits, [2.18] who does not hide his faults, [2.19] who does not cover up his mistakes, [2.20] is a person who has substance.
[2.21] Someone who is submissive and fawning, [2.22] whose words are clever and artful, [2.23] who exhibits his 'visible things' [appearance/wealth?], [2.24] who strives for testimonies [of his goodness?] [2.25] and resorts to deceit to excuse his own faults [2.26] is a person who lacks substance.

At first sight "以故" seems to mean no more than "and thus." But keeping in mind that "故" appears in connection with "巧" and "工" just like in paragraph 6, and considering the fact that paragraphs 2 and 6 use many similar or even identical terms and phrases, the picture changes. Furthermore, the meaning "and thus" is not likely because in both texts the individual sentences defining a certain type of personality are usually merely listed and not joined by conjunctions or other means of explicitly stating a relation between them.

The parallel structure in paragraph 2 corroborates the assumption that "故" must here be interpreted as "deceit" as well: Paragraph 6 first lists a number of positive types of character, followed by a number of negative ones. In paragraph 2 not only do positive and negative types alternate regularly but also each of the individual sentences describing a positive character has a counterpart in the following description of the matching negative type. Thus in the cited example the first sentences (#2.15/21) contrast a straightforward manner with a self-complacent (DL) or a submissive (YZ) one, the next

34 *Da Dai Liji* 72: 10. 51b; *Yi Zhoushu* 58: 7, 40b.

(#2.16/22) a correct and unselfish way of speaking with a clever and artful one. The third sentences (#2.17/23) contrast modesty and boastfulness, the fourth sentences (#2.18/24) contrast admitting faults with sophistical excuses (DL) or stressing one's own achievements (YZ), and the fifth sentences (#2.19/25) contrast not concealing errors with trying to excuse them. Even if it should be argued that "故" here means "reasons" and the respective person excuses himself "with reasons," the negative implication cannot be denied and the "reasons" must be false, which again means nothing else but "deceit".

As a rule, YZ does not use the term *GU*. As I will show in the following, YZ seems to have eliminated this unfamiliar term. In this singular instance "故" may have been retained in YZ because it could easily be understood in its usual, unspecialized sense as "and thus".

In the above cited passage of paragraph 6 there is another instance of *GU* which has not yet been discussed:[35] "故得望譽征利而依隱於物" (#6.69). At first sight, "故" here seems to mean "therefore" or to mark a caesura, possibly preceding an interpolation. However, a closer look at the sentence or rather sentences shows that their words are arranged in pairs: "望譽," "征利" ("to seize profit") and "依隱" ("to rely on") obviously belong together. "依隱" may already be the result of redactional work, but "征 利" is doubtless a verb-object construction. The interpretation of "故得" depends on the reading of "望譽". To read it like "征利" as a verb-object construction in the sense of "to look out for fame, to hope for fame," would make "故得" difficult to explain. Thus it is more plausible to read "望" in the well-attested meaning "prestige/reputation" or, following Kong Guangsen, as the homophonous *wang* 妄 ("unfounded/unjustified").[36] "望譽" is then the object of "得" and "故得" may be understood as adverb plus verb: "deceitfully gain" or "obtain something by deceit"[37] (a structure identical with the much more familiar "難得"). The passage should therefore be read: "someone who by deceiving gains reputation and fame, who seizes his profit and relies on 'outward things'".

"故得" is also used in paragraph 5 and may, as it occurs in a similar context, be interpreted in the same way:

35 Cf. p. 558.

36 Cf. *Da Dai Liji buzhu* 大戴禮記補注 (preface of 1794), comp. Kong Guangsen 孔廣森 (1752–1786), comm. Lu Bian 盧辯 (*fl.* 519–557), *Baibu congshu jicheng* 百部叢書集成, Taibei 1965, 10, 8a.

37 Although in the case of "故得" the translation "obtain by contrivance" would seem even more appropriate, I will, for the sake of terminological unity, adhere to the translation "deceit" for *GU*.

5.49	以詐臨人	以詐臨人
	[...]	[...]
5.55	飾其見物	飾其見物
5.56	故得其名	
5.57	名揚於外	
5.58	不誠於內	不誠於內
5.59	伐名以事其親戚	發名以事親
5.60	以故取利	
5.61	分白其名以私其身	自以名私其身
5.62	如此者隱於忠孝者也	如此隱於忠孝者也[38]

DL: [5.49] Someone who approaches others with deception, [...] [5.55] who exhibits his 'visible things' [appearance? / wealth?], [5.56] who by deceiving gains reputation, [5.57] who spreads his reputation outside [5.58] but is not adequate to it within, [5.59] who boasts a reputation for serving his relations, [5.60] who by deceiving gains profit, [5.61] who distinguishes himself only for his own good—[5.62] a person like this is someone who hides behind loyalty and filial piety.

YZ: [5.49] Someone who approaches others with deception, [...] [5.55] who exhibits his 'visible things' [appearance? / wealth?], [5.58] but is inadequate within, [5.59] who boasts a reputation for serving his relations, [5.61] but uses his reputation only for his own good—[5.62] a person like this is someone who hides behind loyalty and filial piety.

The sentence preceding "故得其名" already occurred in connection with the above cited passage from paragraph 2 (cf. 2.23–25 "飾其見物務其小微以故自說" vs. 5.55–56: "飾其見物故得其名"). This is one of many examples of recurring patterns in *Guan ren* that suggest a standardized formulaic language of the source material.[39] Some lines later "故" again occurs in connection with a word meaning "to gain," this time in the phrase "by deceiving gain profit [以故取利]". "以故" may appear unfamiliar in this pattern, but the interpretation *GU* is supported by a comparison with the expression "to approach others with falsehood [以詐臨人]" in the same paragraph (#5.49).

Another occurrence of *GU* in paragraph 5 is again connected with the idea of gaining reputation; it says: "someone who is deceitful in one's actions and thereby strives for reputation [故其行以攻其名]".

38 *Da Dai Liji* 72: 10, 53b; *Yi Zhoushu* 58: 7, 41b.

39 Cf. below, pp. 564 and 566.

5.15	言願以爲質	言願以爲質
5.16	僞愛以爲忠	□愛以爲忠
5.17	面寬而貌慈	
5.18	假節以示之	
5.19	故其行	尊其得
5.20	以攻其名	以改其名
5.21	如此者隱於仁質也	如此隱於仁賢者也[40]

DL: [5.15] Someone who passes sincere talk off as his nature, [5.16] who passes feigned love off as his loyalty, [5.17] who looks generous and compassionate, [5.18] who demonstrates pretended restraint, [5.19] who is deceitful in his actions [5.20] and thereby strives for reputation—[5.61] a person like this is someone who hides behind feigned humanity and genuineness.

YZ: [5.15] Someone who passes sincere talk off as his nature, [5.16] who passes <…> love off as his loyalty, [5.19] who prizes his own attainments [5.20] to change [improve?] his reputation[41]—[5.61] a person like this is someone who hides behind feigned humanity and genuineness.

This time the line in which *GU* occurs in DL has a counterpart in YZ, but again YZ has no 故. Even if this does not necessarily imply that the ancestral text *Guan ren* was in this passage identical with DL and has been altered in YZ, it should be noted that YZ not only "lacks" text in places where DL uses *GU*, but also that YZ does not use *GU* where it has a counterpart to the respective passage in DL. The version of DL is in this case supported by a passage at the beginning of the same paragraph in which both texts have "以攻其名":

5.0	五曰	五曰
5.1	生民有(靈)[霧]陽	民生則有陰有陽
5.2	人有多隱其情	人多隱其情
5.3	飾其僞	飾其僞
5.4	以賴於物	
5.5	以攻其名也	以攻其名[42]

DL: [5.0] [Criterion number] five: [5.1] Man has by nature a dark side and a bright one. [5.2] There are many who hide their actual condition, [5.3] who exhibit their pretensions

40 *Da Dai Liji* 72: 10, 53a; *Yi Zhoushu* 58: 7, 41b.

41 "改" is probably a graphic error for "攻". Earlier in the same paragraph both texts have "攻" (cf. below, YZ#5.3–5 "飾其僞/以攻其名也"). The variant is not emended in order to point out the difference between the received texts. Cf. below, fn. 57.

42 *Da Dai Liji* 72: 10, 53a; *Yi Zhoushu* 58: 7, 41a.

[5.4] and thereby rely on [outward? / material?] things [5.5] and thereby strive for reputation.
YZ: [5.0] [Criterion number] five: [5.1] Man has from his birth a dark side and a bright one. [5.2] Many hide their actual condition, [5.3] they exhibit their pretensions [5.5] and thereby strive for reputation.

"To exhibit a pretended [good personality] ... and thereby strive for reputation [飾其僞…以攻其名]" is essentially the same as "to be deceitful in one's actions". Moreover, the above cited line DL#6.69[43] says roughly the same: "故得望譽征利而依隱於物," DL in both cases adds the aspect of relying on "things" (cf. DL#5.4 "賴於物" vs. #6.69 "依隱於物")—another example of recurring formulas.

GU occurs again in a passage of paragraph 6, which describes a loyal and dutiful person:

6.48	忠愛以事其親	忠愛以事親
6.49	歡欣以敬之	
6.50	盡力而不面	驩以盡力而不回
6.51	敬以安人	敬以盡力而不□
6.52	以(名故)[故名]不生焉	
6.53	曰忠孝者也	曰忠孝者也[44]

DL: [6.48] Someone who serves his parents with faithful love, [6.49] who rejoices in revering them, [6.50–51] who exhausts his strength [in their service] and does not only superficially rever them to satisfy others, [6.52] so that he does not gain a false reputation [6.53] is a loyal and a dutiful child.
YZ: [6.48] Someone who serves his parents with faithful love, [6.50] who rejoices in exhausting his strength [in their service] without erring, [6.51] who reverently exhausts his strength [in their service] without < … >, [6.53] is a loyal and a dutiful child.

This passage is extremely corrupt and allows only a tentative and approximate translation. As a lengthy discussion of textual problems not directly pertaining to the question of *GU* would lead too far from the point, suffice it to note that a certain type of person is described by his praiseworthy actions. If one reads "故" in DL#6.52 as "solid; certain" (written "固" in standard orthography) for which it is a frequent orthographic variant, "以名故不生焉" may be interpreted as "so that he certainly does not make himself a good name," which does not yield a very satisfactory reading. Dai Zhen 戴震 (1724–1777), however,

43 Cf. above, p. 561.
44 *Da Dai Liji* 72: 10, 54a; *Yi Zhoushu* 58: 7, 42a.

emends the sentence to "以故名不生焉".[45] If Dai Zhen's emendation is correct, "故" can very well be understood as "false, deceptive, contrived".—The idea of false reputation (here: "故名") is also expressed in another line later in paragraph 6, which in DL describes a person as "somebody who gains reputation by trickery/artfulness" and in YZ as "somebody who usurps a name (reputation/title?)" (#6.88, DL: "曰巧名者也," YZ: "曰竊名者也").[46]

There is another instance of 故 in *Guan ren*, which cannot be easily explained. In a passage of paragraph 5 a type of character is described as a person who feigns intelligence:

5.25	少其所不足	
5.26	慮誠不及	慮誠弗及
5.27	佯爲不言	佯爲不言
5.28	内誠不足	内誠不足
5.29	色示有餘	色示有餘
5.30	**故**知以動人	
5.31	自順而不讓	自順而不讓
5.32	錯辭而不遂	措辭而弗遂
5.33	莫知其情	
5.34	如是者隱於知理者也	此隱於智理者也[47]

DL: [5.25] Someone who plays down his deficiencies, [5.26] who does not get to a result in his considerations [5.27] but acts as if he simply would not tell it, [5.28] who is deficient inside [5.29] but takes on airs of abundance, [5.30] who fakes wisdom to impress (< move) others, [5.31] who only follows his own line of argumentation and does not accept arguments of others, [5.32] who hints at something but does not finish his statement,[48] [5.33] so that nobody knows what he is really up to—[5.34] a person like this is someone who hides behind feigned intelligence.[49]

YZ: [5.26] Someone who does not get to a result in his considerations [5.27] but acts as if he simply would not tell it, [5.28] who is deficient inside [5.29] but takes on airs of abundance, [5.31] who only follows his own line of argumentation and does not accept arguments of others, [5.32] who hints at something but does not finish his statement—[5.34] this is someone who hides behind feigned intelligence.

45 Cf. Kong Guangsen's gloss in his *Da Dai Liji buzhu* (fn. 36), 10, 7b–8a.

46 Cf. below, p. 569.

47 *Da Dai Liji* 72: 10, 53a; *Yi Zhoushu* 58: 7, 41b.

48 Maybe also: "who puts forward an argument but cannot carry it through".

49 More literally: "who feigns comprehending the pattern of things".

Line DL#5.30: "故知以動人" is difficult to understand. The Qing scholar Wang Pinzhen (18th/19th c.) and, later, Gao Ming (20th c.) both interpret "故知" as "to demonstrate knowledge by using classical quotations,"[50] which seems highly implausible to me. If the above cited emendation of Dai Zhen in line #6.52 is correct and "故名" is to be understood as "false reputation," "故知" should be read "fake wisdom" which fits perfectly in this context. But it is also possible that this sentence is the result of a combination of errors. If it once went "以故動人" like "以故自說" and "以故取利" in the examples discussed above (#2.25 and #5.60) and if "故" was at some point in the process of transmission mistaken as "therefore" and thus shifted to the front position, someone might later have wanted to add an appropriate verb to the seemingly defective "故… 以動人" and changed it to the form found in the received text. But of course such speculations can neither justify an emendation nor substantiate a reliable translation.

It is quite certain, however, that "故知" does not, as Wang Pinzhen and Gao Ming would have it, mean real knowledge of ancient texts which the person described would cite to impress others. (Besides, this seems more likely from the perspective of a later Chinese scholar than from a Han perspective. *Guan ren* neither praises the ancients nor does it exalt learning as such.) The point of the entire description is, on the contrary, that somebody creates an impression of a wisdom which he does not really possess. Notwithstanding the question, if the correct reading is "故知以動人" or "故以動人," "故" must mean something like "deceptive, contrived, fake". This interpretation is further corroborated by other passages of the text that use a similar formulaic language. For example, the formula "少其所不足" (DL#5.25) is repeated in line #6.73 of DL and YZ as part of the description of a person "who is false and deceitful".[51] There are several instances in *Guan ren* in which a stupid person or one who feigns intelligence is described in similar terms as in #5.25–34, among them "自順" ("to only follow one's own line of argumentation") and "不讓" ("to reject argument's of others"). These expressions apparently belong to a number of technical terms describing a candidate's performance in disputations, which were held to examine his quick-wittedness and rhetorical abilities. These technical terms must have become obsolete and consequently been misinterpreted quite early. This in turn must in the process of transmission have led to

50 Cf. *Da Dai Liji jiegu* 大戴禮記解詁 (preface of 1807), comp. Wang Pinzhen 王聘珍, *Zhongguo xueshu mingzhu* 中國學術名著, Taibei 1962ff., 10, 5, and *Da Dai Liji jin zhu jin yi* 大戴禮記今註今譯, ed. Gao Ming 高明, Taibei [3]1993 [[1]1975], 395.

51 Cf. above, pp. 558 and 565.

diverse alterations of the passages in which these technical terms occurred, with the result that they are mostly corrupt in the received texts.

The most obvious example of the description of a personality similar to that in #5.25–34 is the one immediately following the passage discussed above:

5.35	素動人以言	動人以言
5.36	涉物而不終	竭而弗終
5.37	問則不對	問則不對
5.38	(詳)[佯]爲不窮[52]	佯爲不窮
5.39	色示有餘	□貌而有餘
5.40	有道而自順	假道而自順
5.41	用之物	因之□初
5.42	窮則爲深	窮則託深
5.43	如此者隱於文藝者也	如此者隱於文藝者也[53]

DL: [5.35] Someone who simply impresses others with words, [5.36] who approaches a subject but does not carry it through, [5.37] who cannot adequately answer questions, [5.38] who [then] feigns not being out of his wits [5.39] but [instead] takes on airs of abundance [with regard to his wisdom], [5.40] who has a way [of arguing] and follows only his own line of argumentation [5.41] which he applies to the problem, [5.42] who, if at a loss what to say, pretends profundity—[5.43] a person like this is someone who hides behind refinement and skills.

YZ: [5.35] Someone who [wants to] impress others with words [5.36] but is soon at his wit's end and cannot carry [his argumentation] to the end, [5.37] who cannot adequately answer questions, [5.38] who [then] feigns not being out of his wits [5.39] but [instead] takes on <...> appearance of abundance [with regard to his wisdom], [5.40] who has a fake way [of arguing] and follows only his own line of argumentation, [5.41] following this <...> beginning, [5.42] who, if at a loss what to say, pretends profundity—[5.43] a person like this is someone who hides behind refinement and skills.

The persons described in both passages (#5.25–34 and #5.35–43) try to impress others with pretended intellectual and rhetorical abilities and at the same time camouflage their deficiencies (#5.30/35 "故知以動人 / 素動人以言," #5.25 "少其所不足"). When they are unable to penetrate and solve a problem, they feign reluctance to display their wisdom (cf. DL#5.26–29 "慮誠不及 / 佯爲不言 / 内誠不足 / 色示有餘" vs. DL#5.36–39 "涉物而不終 / 問則不對 / 佯爲不窮 / 色示有餘," which are very similar in wording and mainly differ in

52 Kong Guangsen points out that the Ming edition of Zhu Yangchun 朱養純 has "佯" instead of "詳," cf. also "佯" in DL#5.27 above. Cf. *Da Dai Liji buzhu* (fn. 36), 10, 6a.

53 *Da Dai Liji* 72: 10, 53a; *Yi Zhoushu* 58: 7, 41b.

the arrangement of the arguments: ABAB vs. AABB). Another common feature of both passages lies in the observation that the persons described force their line of argumentation upon others (cf. #5.31 "自順而不讓" vs. #5.40 "有道而自順" [DL] / "假道而自順" [YZ]).[54]

There are only three more instances in which "故" occurs in DL. In all these cases this character clearly does not represent the word *GU*. The first example appears in paragraph 4, which deals with the "scrutiny of facial expression". After presenting two catalogs which describe different facial expressions as indicators of certain qualities of men, the paragraph concludes:

4.32 質色皓然固以安	質浩然固以安
4.33 僞色縵然亂以煩	僞蔓然亂以煩
4.34 雖欲故之中	雖欲改之中
4.35 色不聽也	色弗聽[55]
4.36 雖變可知	

DL: [4.32] A genuine mien is radiantly firm and calm; [4.33] a feigned mien is contradictorily confused and disturbed. [4.34] Even if one tried to withhold it [i.e. keep one's facial expression from changing], [4.35] one's mien does not obey; [4.36] even though changeable, it can be recognized.
YZ: [4.32] Genuineness is radiantly firm and calm; [4.33] falsehood is contradictorily confused and disturbed. [4.34] Even if one tried to change it inside, [4.35] one's mien does not obey.

As a genuine mien is described as firm and clear and a false one consequently as changeable and confused, "故" has here quite certainly to be understood as an orthographic variant of "固" (solid).[56] The YZ variant "改" is also plausible, but I still prefer to assume "故" as the *lectio difficilior* for the ancestral text.[57]

54 A passage in paragraph 2 describing an "envier and liar" (妬誣者) again uses similar formulas: DL#2.61–65 "辨言而不固行 / 有道而先困 / 自慎而不讓 / 當如強之 / 曰(始) 妬誣者也" (*Da Dai Liji* 72: 10, 52a); YZ#2.61–65 "屏言弗顧 / 自順而弗護 / 非是而彊之 / 曰(始) 妬誣者也" (*Yi Zhoushu* 58: 7, 40b). ("妬" has apparently been erroneously written "始" [*lectio facilior*, graphic similarity]. This may be a feature of the ancestral text or a result of lateral contamination as it appears in both DL and YZ. "始妬" in DL must be a mistake as it does not fit in the regularly used pattern "曰 X X 者也". Presumably "妬" was introduced into DL as a gloss correcting "始" and later retained as part of the main text without deleting "始".) In this passage the aspect of forcing an incorrect argument is explicitly stated: DL "當如強之," YZ "非是而彊之".

55 *Da Dai Liji* 72: 10, 52b–53a; *Yi Zhoushu* 58: 7, 41a.

56 Cf. the gloss of Yu Yue (1821–1907) in his *Da Dai Liji pingyi* 大戴禮記平議 (1867); *Qunjing pingyi* 群經平議, comp. Yu Yue 俞樾, *Huang Qing jingjie xubian* 皇清經解續

In the remaining two cases "故" obviously stands for the familiar word *gu*, usually rendered "thus" or "therefore". It marks a caesura and introduces a new textual unit, probably drawn from a different source. In both cases it precedes a catalog of metrically regular sentences and thus cannot be interpreted as part of the following sentence:

	[...]	[...]
6.88	曰巧名者也	曰竊名者也
	故	**故**曰
6.89	事阻者不夷	事阻者不夷
6.90	(畸)[倚]鬼者不仁[58]	時□者不回
6.91	面譽者不忠	果敢者也
6.92	飾貌者不情	飾貌者不(靜)[情][59]
6.93	隱節者不平	假節者不平
6.94	多私者不義	多私者不義
6.95	揚言者寡信	揚言者寡信
6.96	此之謂揆德	此之謂揆德[60]

DL: [6.88] [...] is someone who obtains his name (reputation? / title?) by artfulness. Therefore: [6.89] Those who take risks are not balanced. [6.90] Those who rely on spirits are not benevolent. [6.91] Those who look out for fame are not loyal. [6.92] Those who adorn their appearance are not genuine. [6.93] Those who feign restraint are not poised. [6.94] Those who are selfish are not dutiful. [6.95] Those whose speech is boastful are scarcely reliable. [6.96] This is called "the assessment of virtue".
YZ: [6.88] is someone who usurps a name (reputation? / title?).
Therefore: [6.89] Those who take risks are not balanced. [6.90] Those who timely < ... > do not stray, [6.91] they are resolute. [6.92] Those who adorn their appearance are not genuine. [6.93] Those who feign restraint are not poised. [6.94] Those who are selfish are not dutiful.

編 (1888), comp. Wang Xianqian 王先謙 (1842–1918), 32 vols., Shanghai 1889, 192B, 10a.

57 That 故 and 改 belong to the words which in both texts have not been transmitted reliably can also be observed in other cases: #5.19–20 DL "**故**其行以**攻**其名" vs. YZ "尊其得以**改**其名" and #6.61–62 DL "進退工**故**其與人甚**巧**" vs. YZ "進退多**巧**". Graphic similarity of the characters and—apart from 攻—also phonetic similarity of the words written by them may have contributed to these variants (故 [*kâg], 攻 [*kûng], 改 [*kə̂g], 巧 [*k'og]).

58 The emendation follows a gloss of Kong Guangsen. Cf. *Da Dai Liji buzhu* (fn. 36), 10.8b.

59 The emendation is based on the citation "周書曰飾貌者不情" in Li Shan's commentary to the *Wenxuan*. Cf. *Wenxuan* 文選, comp. Xiao Tong 蕭統 (501–531), comm. Li Shan 李善 (ca. 630–689), Beijing [3]1990 [[1]1977], 43.5, 602b.

60 *Da Dai Liji* 72: 10, 54a–b; *Yi Zhoushu* 58: 7, 42a.

[6.95] Those whose speech is boastful are scarcely reliable. [6.96] This is called "the assessment of virtue".

	DL	
	[...]	[...]
7.5	觀其陽以考其陰	scrutinize his bright sides to examine his dark sides,
7.6	察其内以揆其外	examine his interior to assess his exterior.
	是故	Therefore:
7.7	隱節者可知	Those who feign restraint can be found out,
7.8	僞飾無情者可辨	those who are meretricious and false can be discerned,
7.9	質誠居善者可得	those who are genuine and impeccable can be procured,
7.10	忠惠守義者可見也	those who are loyal, kind-hearted and adhere to their duty can be beheld.[61]

Conclusion

The character 故 occurs eleven times in DL. In eight cases it writes the word *GU* ("deceitful, fake").[62] Of these eight cases YZ retains 故 only once—in line #2.25, where it can easily be interpreted as the familiar "and thus". In two of the remaining seven cases it has apparently been replaced by another character: 尊 and 巧 in #5.19 and #6.61 respectively, and in five cases the respective sentence of DL has no counterpart in YZ.

1	*GU* / *gu*	2.25	以**故**自說	以**故**自說
2	*gu* 固	4.34	雖欲**故**之中	雖欲改之中
3	*GU*	5.19	**故**其行	尊其得
4	*GU*	5.30	**故**知以動人	
5	*GU*	5.56	**故**得其名	

61 *Da Dai Liji* 72: 10, 54b.

62 Of these eight cases, Wang Niansun glosses "故" as "詐" in four instances (DL#2.25 "以故自說," #5.19 "故其行," #5.30 "故知以動人" and #5.60 "以故取利") and in one instance as synonymous with "巧" (DL#6.61 "進退工故"). Cf. *Jingyi shuwen* (fn. 32), 13, 187b and 189a. With the single exception of a citation of Wang Niansun's gloss in the case of #5.19 by Wang Shunan, I could not find 故 in DL being recognized as writing the term *GU* in any commentary or translation. Cf. *Jiaozheng Kong shi Da Dai Liji buzhu* 校正孔氏大戴禮記補注, ed. Wang Shunan 王樹枏 (1851–1936), *Baibu congshu jicheng* (fn. 36), 10, 5b.

6	*GU*	5.60	以**故**取利	
7	*GU*	6.52	以名**故**不生焉	
8	*GU*	6.61	進退工**故**	進退多巧
9	*GU*	6.69	**故**得望譽征利而依隱於物	
10	caesura	6.89	**故**事阻者不夷	**故**曰事阻者不夷
11	caesura	7.7	是**故**隱節者可知	

The character 故 in the sense of "deceitful" (*GU*) obviously does not belong to the vocabulary of YZ. This reading may be considered as the *lectio difficilior* and thus assumed to have existed in *Guan ren*. Furthermore, a number of other features show that DL is closer to the ancestral text than YZ. Therefore, the term *GU* must be considered as a special feature of the ancestral text, which has been eliminated in the redaction of YZ.

With regard to the different sources of the ancestral text *Guan ren*, it should also be noted that the term *GU* only occurs in paragraphs 2, 5 and 6. It is exactly for these portions of the text that an examination of the macrostructure of the whole text has assumed a common source which is different from the sources of paragraphs 1, 3 and 4 and of the narrative frame. The distribution of this single term is only one of several features that corroborate this hypothesis about different sources. The introduction of more of these features (such as their internal structure, recurring patterns of formulaic language and terminological details) would require a lengthy discussion. The example of *GU* shall therefore suffice to illustrate the method of determining "cognate texts" with the help of technical terms.

The examples from other texts cited at the beginning showed that the term *GU* occurs predominantly in texts which probably have their origin in the region of Qi 齊. Thus it may be assumed that this term was typical either of the language of this region or of an ideological tradition flourishing in Qi. As regards *Guan ren*, *GU* is only one of several features[63] which indicate that the state Qi played a decisive role in the early development of meritocratic methods for the recruitment of officials as propagated in *Guan ren* and a number of related texts.

As to the method demonstrated above, I am aware that assuming a not yet well attested, specialized meaning for some words implies the risk, that once having left the firm ground of the familiar usage of words anything seems

63 Among these: further technical terms, special rhymes, the number six as a predominant structural element, parallels in other texts and the association of the text with Taigong 太公, the founder of Qi.

possible. But if one shuns this risk one has to pay the price of remaining at the mercy of much too often corrupt, unintelligible texts that have been altered over and over again under the influence of different commentarial traditions. The only too common method of choosing among the various—and often contradictory—readings of texts and commentaries to them in order to make sense of the otherwise inexplicable, appears no less arbitrary than assuming unusual readings for some terms, even if this means reading a text contrary to tradition. Any possible arbitrariness of interpretation has to be counterbalanced by a careful application of textual criticism.