

ISSN 0917-6578

中 國 史 學

第 七 卷

中 國 史 學 會

1997年12月

# **STUDIES IN CHINESE HISTORY**

No. 7 (December 1997)

The Society for the Study of Chinese History

**中國史學 第七卷**

1997年12月15日印刷 1997年12月20日發行

定價五千圓（個人會員會費三千圓）

編集兼發行者 中國史學會

〒192-0364 東京都八王子市南大澤1-1

東京都立大學人文學部史學研究室

振替口座 東京 00160-557995

銀行口座 住友銀行多摩支店 普通 331631

代表者 佐竹靖彦

印刷所 (株)外爲印刷

〒111-0032 東京都臺東區淺草2-29-6 天野ビル 2F

## 執筆者紹介

葛 荃	南開大學政治系教授
姜 廣 輝	社會科學院歷史研究所研究員
金 文 京	京都大學人文科學研究所副教授
近藤 一成	早稻田大學文學部教授
ライオネル ジャンセン	コロラド・デンバー大學副教授
薛 化 元	交通大學副教授
潘 光 哲	中央研究院歷史語言研究所助手
東 晉 次	三重大學人文學部教授
妙子 ブルックス	マサチューセッツ・アムハースト大學協力研究員
ブルース ブルックス	マサチューセッツ・アムハースト大學教授
劉 志 琴	社會科學院近代史研究所研究員

## Contributors

E. Bruce BROOKS	Research Professor of Chinese at University of Massachusetts at Amherst
A. Taeko BROOKS	Research Associate with the Warring States Project at University of Massachusetts at Amherst
GE Quan	Professor at the Department of Politics, Nan-kai University
HIGASHI Shinji	Professor of History at the Department of Humanities, Mie University
HSUEH Hua-yuan	Associate Professor at Traffic University at Xin-zhu
Lionel M. JENSEN	Associate Professor at the Department of History University of Colorado at Denver
JIANG Guang-hui	Professor at the Institute of History Academy of Social Sciences
KIN Bunkyo	Associate Professor at the Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University
KONDO Kazunari	Professor of History at the Department of Literature at Waseda University
LIU Zhi-qin	Professor at the Institute of Modern History Academy of Social Sciences
PAN Kwang-che	Assistant Professor at the Institute of History and Philology Academia Sinica

# 目 次

Intellectual Dynamics of the Warring States Period	E. Bruce Brooks A. Taeko Brooks	1
Among Fallen Idols and Noble Dreams Notes from the Field of Chinese Intellectual History	Lionel M. Jensen	33
孟子在中國經學發生史上的地位	姜 廣 輝	69
晚明思想研究述評——以陽明學的發展爲線索——	葛 荃	83
文化熱與中國文化史研究	劉 志 琴	103
晚清的「議院論」——與傳統思惟相關爲中心的討論——	薛 化 元 潘 光 哲	117
中國古代の社會的結合——任俠的習俗論の現在——	東 晉 次	151
王安石撰墓誌を讀む——地域、人脈、黨爭——	近藤 一成	171
中國近世における知識人の性格 ——明代の山人を手がかりとして——	金 文 京	193

STUDIES IN CHINESE HISTORY  
No. 7 (December 1997)

**Contents**

Intellectual Dynamics of the Warring States Period	E. Bruce BROOKS A. Taeko BROOKS	1
Among Fallen Idols and Noble Dreams Notes from the Field of Chinese Intellectual History	Lionel M. JENSEN	33
The Role of Mencius in the Development of Chinese Classical Learning	JIANG Guang-hui	69
Review of Research in Late Ming Thought Focussing on the Development of Yangming Thought	GE Quan	83
Heightening Interest in the Culture and Research in Chinese Culture History	LIU Zhi-qin	103
A Discussion of the Traditional Chinese Argument in the "Theory of Parliament" in Late Qing China(1861-1900)	HSUEH Hua-yuan PAN Kwang-che	117
Personal Relationship in Ancient China	HIGASHI Shinji	151
On the Inscription Stones by Wang An-shi	KONDO Kazunari	171
The Characteristics of the Intellectual in Early Modern China	KIN Bunkyo	193

From the Editor: We will devote next issue of this journal mainly to an examination of the Economic History of traditional China. Manuscripts are welcome (deadline: May 30, 1998)

# Intellectual Dynamics of the Warring States Period

E. Bruce Brooks 白牧之 and A. Taeko Brooks 白妙子

## 1. The Textual Basis

We here explore some implications of our earlier work on the chronology of the Warring States texts.<sup>1</sup> In general, we find that many of these texts have an accretional structure, being neither authentic nor forged in the traditional sense of those terms, but having accumulated over time, under the aegis of whatever advocacy groups had physical custody of them. The chief motive for extending a text seems to have been a need to represent the group or its founder as having something to say about new issues; that is, to keep the group current with social and intellectual changes. The classic example is the *Analects*, which in our view began as a memorial compilation of sixteen sayings of Confucius, written down shortly after his death in 0479,<sup>2</sup> but which in its later layers discusses, or makes a point of refusing to discuss, such 03c<sup>3</sup> issues as human nature, a question debated between the schools of Sywǎndž<sup>4</sup> 荀子 and Mencius 孟子, and referred to in LY 17:2a/b and in the interpolated \*5:13, both of which we date to c0270.<sup>5</sup>

---

E Bruce Brooks is Research Professor of Chinese, and A Taeko Brooks is Research Associate with the Warring States Project, at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

<sup>1</sup>For an outline of methods, see Brooks *Prospects*; for a brief history, Brooks *Original* 339f. The latter work is a full reconstruction of the *Analects*, the keystone of the new chronology.

<sup>2</sup>We use a prefixed "0" (zero) as typographically less obtrusive, and culturally more neutral, than the abbreviations BC and BCE.

<sup>3</sup>That is, 03rd ["oh-third"] or 3rd century BC. A "c" prefixed to dates means "circa."

<sup>4</sup>In response to the plea of Boodberg *Comments* 23 for a system accessible to generalists, and of Kennedy *Biographies* 499f for one less hampering to scholars, we here spell Chinese terms so as to respect the alphabetic reflexes of international readers. The rule of thumb "consonants as in English, vowels as in Italian" applies, with some special vowel conventions: æ as in "cat," r as in "fur," v as in "cup," z as in "adz," and yw (after l- or n-, simply w), for "umlaut u." Tones are indicated by contour marks: hīgh, rīsing, lōw, fālling. This Common Alphabetic convention is compatible with the Hepburn spelling of Japanese, and can be easily extended to dialectal Chinese.

<sup>5</sup>*Analects* references are to the text of the 1929 Harvard-Yenching concordance; a prefixed asterisk identifies a passage we find to be an interpolation. For human nature, see further §8 below.

The Analects, then, has a time span of 230 years, from the death of Confucius in 0479 to the end of Lǔ in 0249. Other accretional texts are the Gwǎndǔ 管子, whose earliest portions we agree with Rickett<sup>6</sup> in dating to the 04c and the latest to Hàn; the Mwòdǔ 墨子, also 04c to Hàn; the Dào/Dé Jīng 道德經, mid 04c to mid 03c, the statecraft (in Creel's term "purposive") part being relatively late; the Mencius, with core transcripts of his interviews with rulers (found, with several *imagined* ones, in MC 1) and two parallel 03c continuations (MC 2-3 and MC 4-7); and the Jwāngdǔ 莊子, 03c with Hàn addenda. The Dzwǒ Jwàn 左傳 is a special case: its final compilation date was c0312, in Chí, with a core going back to the mid 04c, in Lǔ; despite the plausibility of its historical picture (unsurprising if its compilers had contact with the lore traditions of other states), it cannot, in our view, be a Spring and Autumn work: (1) With a *written* Chūn/Chyōu 春秋, there was no need for a parallel *oral* tradition handing down a fuller account of the same material. (2) The DJ picture, however plausible, disagrees with the CC, as does (3) its linguistic usage, which cannot derive from that period. (4) It has anachronisms, such as a too-early appearance of popular literacy and of iron, but (5) it *does* fit smoothly into the picture implied by admitted Warring States texts.<sup>7</sup>

By noting points where one text is aware of another (the LY 17:19 defense of the three-year mourning, itself a response to MZ 48:8, is ridiculed in MZ 48:12), the text sequences can be joined into a single structure, which in turn can be linked to events (LY 3:1 reads like a protest against the usurpation of the title King by the Chí ruler in 0342; Lau has shown<sup>8</sup> that Mencius's career began in 0320), yielding a consistent *text* chronology anchored to the *political* chronology.

That construct, which is assumed in what follows, looks in part like this:

---

<sup>6</sup>Rickett **Guanzi** and Rickett **Dates**.

<sup>7</sup>We here acknowledge the assistance of the Warring States Working Group, an interuniversity collaboration of scholars which since 1993 has exchanged views and held semiannual conferences at the University of Massachusetts, and among whom the DJ has been vigorously discussed. Our present view of it, though gaining ground in some circles (Sivin **Naturalists** 3), is resisted in others.

<sup>8</sup>Lau **Mencius** Appendix 1. See also Brooks **Original** Appendix 1.

0479	<i>Death of Confucius</i>							
0479					LY 4			
0470					LY 5			
0460					LY 6			
0450	<i>Dzōngdž headship of Analects</i>				LY 7			
0436	<i>Death of Dzōngdž</i>							
0436					LY 8			
0405					LY 9			
0403	<i>Tripartition of Jìn</i>							
0400	<i>Kǐng Family headship of Analects, under Dž-sž</i>							
0390				MZ 17				
0380				MZ 20	LY 10			
0360	GZ 1	GZ 3	MZ 8	?	LY 11			
0345	"	"				DDJ 14		
0342	"	<i>Chí ruler usurps Jōu title of King</i>						
0342	"	"	MZ 46	?	LY 3			
0326	"	"	MZ 19	"	?	LY 12		
0324	"	"	MZ 32	"				
0322	"	"		"	?	LY 13		
0320	"	"	MZ 9	"	?			MC 1
0317	"	"	"	"	?	LY 2		
0316	<i>Yēn King abdicates in favor of minister Dž-jř</i>							
0315	<i>Civil disorder in Yēn; with Mencius's approval, Chí invades Yēn</i>							
0314	<i>Chí puts Dž-jř to death</i>							
0313	<i>Jâu and allies enter Yēn, expel Chí, and restore monarchy; Mencius leaves Chí in disgrace</i>							
0312	"	"	"	DJ		DDJ 30		
0310			MZ 47		LY 14			
0306			"	GY				
0305			"		LY 15			
0294	GZ 5?		"		LY 1			
0286	<i>Chí invades and extinguishes Sùng</i>							
0285	<i>Coalition of states expels Chí from Sùng and drives Chí King into exile</i>							
0285			MZ 48		LY 16			
0284	<i>Chi Mǐn-wáng dies in exile</i>							
0282			"				MC 4	
0280			"	JZ 4			"	MC 2
0272			"	"	JZ 8		MC 5	SZ 8
0270			"	LY 17	"	"	MC 6	
0265			"	"	"	"	"	SZ 23
0262			MZ 49		LY 18	"	"	"
0256	<i>Chín annexes part of Jōu domain</i>						"	
0255	<i>Chǔ invades and annexes southern Lü; Sywōndž is Director at Lán-líng</i>							SZ 16
0254			MZ 50	LY 19	DDJ 80	"	"	MC 7
0252					"	"	"	MC 3
0250				LY 20	DDJ 81			SZ 15
0249	<i>Chín annexes remaining part of Jōu domain; Chǔ annexes northern Lü</i>							
0239							LSCC 1-12	
0221	<i>Chín completes unification of other Warring States; beginning of Chín Dynasty</i>							

## 2. The Texts as Sources

Arranging the material in chronological order is an advantage, but it does not solve some problems which are inherent in the nature of the texts. As a cautionary preface to what follows, we note the following: (1) The texts are few; compared to its better-studied contemporary, classic Greece, the Warring States period is severely underdocumented. (2) Most of them come from the world of the court (later, the bureaucratic) elite, and apart from some suggestions in the *Mwòdž* and the *Jwāngdž*, tell us little about the rest of society. Arguments from silence about non-elite matters are thus weak. (3) They are advocational rather than descriptive; they do not exist to *document* the period, but to recommend or resist changes in the status quo. (4) Many are (or, as with the *Gwāndž*, become) identified with a philosophical founder, and are cast as sayings of that person. The heads of successor schools who extended any core of founder sayings will have tried to preserve the milieu of the founder and avoid anachronisms, hence there will be little mention of contemporary matters as such, and that either oblique or inadvertent, and (5) most early texts are eastern, and may not attest other areas, obliquely or otherwise. On the other hand, (6) the retrospective texts are also not intrinsically reliable for the earlier period they *purport* to describe.<sup>9</sup> In this situation one does best to accept the limitations of the material, and adopt the conservative view that, despite its possible obliquity, a text is only a *primary* source for the time *at which it was written*, not for some earlier time. This guideline seems to lead in practice to historical inferences which are internally consistent, and agree generally with the archaeological evidence for the period.

One must also note that the texts are part of the foundation on which the imperial ideology rested, and that much pressure has been exerted on them to conform to that function, a fact which has deeply affected the scholarly tradition.

---

<sup>9</sup>A frequent claim is that, though *written down* late, such texts contain material transmitted orally from earlier periods. On the unlikelihood of *exact* oral transmission, see Ong *Orality* 53-67; the author (in a letter of 20 June 1996) has specifically endorsed this interpretation of his findings.

### 3. The Nature and Mutual Contact of the Texts

The aspects of the period<sup>10</sup> which the Warring States texts most directly attest are text-related matters: the spread of literacy, the shift from an oral to a written medium of statement and propagation, the organization of viewpoints around a closely-held text, and the nature of the contact between these viewpoint groups.

Our results confirm the common statement that the Analects was the first private book in China. It is useful to consider its immediate precedents, which were of two types: the memorial bronze inscription, in its nature permanent once the metal had cooled, and meant to be preserved in a family to perpetuate the fame of the ancestor in whose honor it was cast and whose exploits it recorded, and the state chronicle, of which the only secure example is the Chūn/Chyōu of Lǚ, not a closed but an open text, compiled sequentially and preserved in the ruler's palace. Neither was presumably secret: the fame of a family ancestor was doubtless paraded on occasion before others,<sup>11</sup> and the state chronicle's function as a repository of precedent and diplomatic protocol would not be served unless its contents were available to the members of the court circle. We note in passing that both types require the assumption of at least a limited degree of elite-level literacy in the Spring and Autumn period. The Analects is an important advance beyond this position: as far as we know, it was the first text not compiled on the initiative of the ruler, but on that of those who (or whose successors) would also constitute the intended readership of the text. It seems that elite *literacy* is here for the first time turned to purposes not wholly defined by elite *court position*.

---

<sup>10</sup>We date the Warring States from the death of Confucius in 0479 (also the year of the conquest of Chín 陳 by Chǔ) to the 0221 Chín unification. It is hardly controversial that the effective (though not the ritual) end of Jōu came with their defeat in 0771; we here follow the Warring States Working Group rule (which in turn follows the Analects characterization of the Jōu as a past, not a present, historical fact) which forbids the use of the term Jōu after that date. For the intervening period, 0770-0480, we adopt the term Spring and Autumn, from the text of that name which, in its DJ-associated version, more precisely covers the period 0721-0464.

<sup>11</sup>Mwòdž, in the one speech that can apparently be attributed directly to him, joins the issue by complaining of this flaunting of ancient military prowess by the "gentlemen of the world" to "bequeath it to posterity" (MZ 17; see Mei *Ethical* 99).

**Ambience.** The Warring States texts differ in their situation, or ambience.<sup>12</sup> Nothing in the Analects core (LY 4:1-14 and 4:16-17) implies an organized school; these remarks were seemingly spoken to one particular person, on one particular occasion, and were meant solely to benefit that person. MZ 17, the core of the *Mwòdž*, is a diatribe of the founder *Mwò Dí* 墨翟 (who represents the extension of writing to the sub-elite), seemingly addressed to a *group* of his followers, and giving an anti-war argument which could be used by them in a later persuasional situation; a template for future argument, delivered to a group of like-minded adherents. The immediate *audience* is thus the group of followers, but the ultimate *recipient* of the implied persuasion is the circle of those in power. Later strata of that text, including revised versions of the core anti-war argument, indicate that the former outsiders have reached positions of some governmental influence, and have altered their views on war and other issues accordingly. A yet more public initial stance seems to be taken by the earliest parts of the *Gwǎndž*, which read like memoranda of positions which in the first instance were argued at the court of the *Chí* ruler, and then preserved for the guidance of the persuaders or their colleagues. DDJ 14, in our view the core of that text, is a celebration of the mystical experience and not in any sense a public document; that text drifts into statecraft prescriptions only in its later (“purposive”) layers. The DJ, in its final c0312 form, is a blueprint for empire, a warning about the mistakes of Spring and Autumn rulers, and an omen of *Chí*’s success in the unification wars. Whatever their origins, then, it is worthy of note that the major texts whose beginning falls within the 05c/04c part of the Warring States either have, or eventually acquire, a functional interrelationship with the state.

---

<sup>12</sup>We intend this as a technical term, including not only the audience envisioned by a text, but also the text’s expectations *about* that audience, including their presumed acquaintance with other texts. We are generally indebted, at this point, to comments by C J Fraser, Paul Goldin, Michael LaFargue, Victor Mair, Nathan Sivin, Chad Hansen, and Dan Robins in a lively and ongoing discussion of school/text/audience topics on the Warring States Working Group’s E-mail network, though our present remarks reflect our own opinion and do not summarize that discussion.

**Literacy.** The previous examples can be seen to document an increasing encroachment of writing into speech and hearing. The direct advice of Confucius to his separate protégés, samples of which are preserved in LY 4 (05c), have a sonorous and courtly parallelism, and like the Biblical Proverbs, were probably meant to be arresting:<sup>13</sup> oral remarks designed to be held in memory without a mediating text process. In none of these sayings does Confucius quote, mention, or otherwise suggest the existence of, written texts. The first MZ and GZ documents (early 04c) can be construed as oral presentations immediately committed to writing by their authors for their preservation. The mystical paean in DDJ 14 (mid 04c) may well have been meant to be memorized; that is to say, it was *in the first instance* a written text, not a memorandum of an oral effusion, and any oral or mnemonic aspect would be secondary to that written form. Finally, the DJ (late 04c), simply because of its length, cannot have been presented orally at the Chí court, and can only have been a primary written text *also transmitted to its intended audience* in written form. That is, as far as the major extant texts go, the 05c/04c saw a progressive erosion of the primacy of oral statement, and a concurrent expansion of written statement.

That process can be witnessed in detail by a chronologically consecutive reading of the Analects. The constant assumption in the 05c part of that text is that teaching is something “heard.” Apart from the Shīr poems, to which we shall return below, the first hint of written texts is the “Model Maxims” (Fǎ Yǔ 法語) and “Select Advices” (Sywǎn Jyǔ 選舉) of 9:24 (c0405);<sup>14</sup> whether oral or written, these are fixed inventories with titles, not a disorganized body of apothegm lore. And with LY 10 (c0380), which systematically covers court and private etiquette, and reads like a reference manual, not a set of disconnected remarks arranged in transcription, we seem to be clearly in the presence of a primary written text.

---

<sup>13</sup>Grafflin Form, handout.

<sup>14</sup>We follow Waley’s interpretation of this passage.

Later Analects chapters clearly attest the existence of such written manuals. The disciple pantheon in LY 11:3 (c0360) is a direct statement, not a Confucius saying, and 11:23 makes “Confucius” deplore Dǔ-lù’s dismissal of book learning as unimportant for the administrator, indicating the contemporary existence of texts relevant to administration. LY 3 (c0342), though reverting to the saying form, is a systematic treatment of ritual, and its 3:9 laments the lack of written documentation of Syà and Shāng ritual practice, implying the existence of written guidelines for more *contemporary* ritual practice. Mention of ancient written documents, *even though they are said not to exist*, anticipates the later 04c, when ancient documents will not only be claimed to exist, but exhibited in extenso.

There is much late 04c evidence for a detailed concern with the way in which written texts come into being, all examples being of the reduction to writing of originally oral expressions. LY 14:8 (c0310) is concerned with the transcription, verification, and embellishment in written form of a ruler’s proclamation, and in LY 15:6 (c0305), Dǔ-jāng is shown writing a maxim *which he has just heard* on the sash of his robe, the first Analects reference to writing on silk.<sup>15</sup> The process of *immediately* recording the Master’s saying leaves no role for memory; as in the former example, transcription is direct rather than from later recollection. The same point is made in the remarkable passage MC 1A6, Mencius’s first interview with Ngwèi<sup>16</sup> Syāng-wáng in 0319, presumably while he was still in mourning and no retinue was allowed to visitors. Mencius is recorded as coming out of the audience and recounting the interview to a follower, presumably his amanuensis, who under more normal court conditions would presumably have been present at the interview itself. Again, the effect of these narrative asides is apparently to guarantee the authenticity of the transcript to its readers.

---

<sup>15</sup>Earlier is MZ 16 (c0315); Mei *Ethical* 92. This passage, one of several similar ones in MZ chapters of the same period, is intended to inspire confidence in the written record handed down from antiquity; it is noteworthy that no claim of reliable *oral* transmission is made in 04c texts.

<sup>16</sup>The initial ng-, phonetically long lost in Mandarin, is here restored to distinguish the states of Ngwèi 魏 and Wèi 衛.

**The Hundred Schools.** We now turn from written texts as such to the question of interplay *among* those texts. It is generally accepted that there occurred in the Warring States a period of intergroup or interschool debate, customarily called the Hundred Schools period, and the onset of just such a period of direct mutual awareness among the respective school texts can be clearly seen in the Analects. Following upon some fainter indications in LY 11 and LY 3, we find in LY 12-13 a sudden explosion of similarities to, quotes from, or refutations of, such texts as the Mwòdž and particularly the Gwǎndž. Many of the sayings in these two chapters (from c0326 and c0322), and a good number of those in LY 2 (c0317) as well, have some sort of counterpart or verbal similarity in the Gwǎndž,<sup>17</sup> and the striking definition of the old Confucian virtue rǎn 仁 as the Mician term ài 愛 “love” [for others] in LY 12:22 shows influence from that school as well. We have elsewhere documented an extended interplay between the Analects and the Dàu/Dǔ Jīng,<sup>18</sup> and also between the Analects and the parallel chapter series MZ 46-50, which amount to a Mician counter-Analects.<sup>19</sup> We will revert below to the *substance* of these interschool debates; the point for the history of textual dynamics is that the level of mutual awareness and mutual influence among the school texts makes a quantum leap at about the year 0330.

The existence of this lateral intertext debate is an important departure from the predominantly court-centered or centrifugal character of most 05c and 04c texts or their audiences. It may from this point on be assumed that one of the possible audiences for a piece of writing is the group associated with *another* piece of writing. This diffusion of text focus will be seen, below, to be only an aspect of a more general diffusion of significant membership in the new-type bureaucratic state, and also in the new-type mass army, both of which were evolving steadily in parallel with these strictly textual developments.

---

<sup>17</sup>See Brooks **Original** 226-231, and the corresponding portion of the main translation.

<sup>18</sup>See Brooks **Prospects** 63-68.

<sup>19</sup>See Brooks **Original** 259-262.

**Wider Audience.** The contact of texts *with each other*, and not exclusively with the members of their own supporting group or of a central court, amounts to a first expansion of the audience for texts. A second such expansion, which seems to occur by the early or mid 03c, is the appearance of an *outside* audience: a readership which is not itself part of an advocacy group. This in turn implies an expansion of literacy itself outside the limits of the court or those who are concerned to influence the court, to include a much wider circle whose major concern is with the conduct of their own lives. They constitute something like a general public. In the present state of our knowledge it is not possible to give an accurate profile of Warring States social structure, but it can be shown that reading for pleasure or profit, and not exclusively for policy-making, ranged very widely. In the late 04c or very early 03c we have, from the tomb of King Syāng of Ngwèi, abovementioned (who died in 0296), not only a copy of the Gwó Yǔ and a study of the divinations in the Dzwǒ Jwàn, which might be categorized as relevant to administration, but also a copy of the fantastical Journey of King Mù (Mù Tyēndǔ Jwàn 穆天子傳) and an unnamed and openly romantic sequel.<sup>20</sup> And from later in the century, we have the socially suggestive JZ 8:1b (c0260), which tells how a slave lad let his sheep stray because he was absorbed in reading a book. The fact that this anecdote condemns book-reading *as leading to error* is merely an indication of the Jwāngdǔ's position (or one of its positions; this is a very diverse text) in the contemporary culture wars. That books *were* at this time read by at least some low-status persons is a necessary literary assumption for this Jwāngdǔ passage, and thus a valid historical inference. By the mid 03c, then, what may be called secular reading not only existed, but was rather widespread. The Jwāngdǔ itself, in recommending personal priorities, seems to have in view such a general rather than governmental or specialist-philosophical audience.

---

<sup>20</sup>For an account of the texts recovered in c279 from this tomb, which seems to have been based on the original archaeological report, see Jīn Shū 3 (1/70) and Jīn Shū 51 (3/1434).

**Court Forms.** These show a similar expansion. The genuine interviews of Mencius (0320-c0310) are consistent in having occupied no more than 5 minutes, and in being initiated by a question from the ruler. There is no question of the persuader stating a topic, or talking at random, or for an extended period, with the sovereign.<sup>21</sup> The same limit recurs in the early 03c interviews of Sywǎndž with rulers (maximum 5·5 minutes), though it is extended in preliminary interviews with screening functionaries (to 11·3 minutes). In c0250, however, the King of Jàu holds not an interview *but a debate* on military policy, preserved in SZ 15:1, and lasting some 28·4 minutes, far beyond the previous court limit.<sup>22</sup> Not only do the principals *speak in turn*, they *question each other*. Since, as noted above, lateral debate goes back to the mid 04c, this represents court adoption of a form already known at the advocacy level. This openness to sub-court fashion suggests in turn that the 03c courts were no longer the sole source of public culture.

**Texts and Memorization.** The presumption that fixed texts such as the DJ existed and were handed down orally before being committed to writing receives scant support from the text evidence. Single Shī poems are quoted, evidently from memory, in earlier passages, but it is only in LY 13:5 (c0322) that an ability to recite the whole corpus from memory is clearly referred to, and only in 1:1 and 1:4 (c0294) that the technique of repetition to fix memory (syí 習) is mentioned. And the primacy of writing to such memorization efforts in the 03c is strikingly confirmed in the Gǔ or old-script Analects text, supposedly recovered from the wall of the Confucian school in c0154, and the Lǔ text, supposedly retranscribed from memory after 0191. It is well known that only the Gǔ text included the final saying, 20:3, at the end of a chapter whose composition was probably interrupted by the Chǔ conquest of 0249. This saying had then been *written in the school text*, but had not yet been *given out for memorization*, when the conquest intervened.

---

<sup>21</sup>See Brooks **Interviews**. The genuine MC 1 interviews, distinguished on formal and linguistic grounds, are MC 1A1, 1A3a, 1A5-6, 1B1, 1B9-10, and 1B12-16, a total of twelve passages.

<sup>22</sup>See Brooks **Sywǎndž**. The early interviews are in SZ 8:2 and 16:6 (rulers) and 16:4 (minister).