

Divisions in Early Mohism Reflected in the Core Chapters of Mo-tzu

A. C. GRAHAM

Published by
**The Institute of East Asian
Philosophies
1985**

Occasional Paper and Monograph
Series No. 1

The Institute of East Asian Philosophies (IEAP)

The Institute of East Asian Philosophies was set up in June 1983 as a resource and research centre, to promote the study of oriental philosophies in Singapore. Initially focusing on Confucianism, the Institute's basic aim is to examine the relevance and applicability of these ancient philosophies to modern East Asian societies.

The Institute is governed by a ten-member Board of Governors comprising nominees from the Singapore Government, the National University of Singapore, and professional and civic organisations, as well as distinguished scholars. A nine-member Board of Management, chaired by the Institute's Director, oversees its day-to-day operations.

The responsibility for facts and opinions expressed in this publication rests exclusively with the author and his views do not necessarily reflect those of the Institute or its supporters.

The Author

Professor A. C. Graham is a Senior Research Fellow of the Institute of East Asian Philosophies. Formerly Professor of Classical Chinese at the School of Oriental and African Studies, London University, Professor Graham has worked for many years on both the thought and the textual and linguistic problems of Chinese philosophical literature.

A. C. Graham is not only the best English translator of the **Chuang-tzu** (London, 1981) to date; his **Later Mohist Logic, Ethics and Science** (Hong Kong and London, 1979) also represents the principal Western study on the rationalising side of the tradition, against which Chuang-tzu revolted. He is an experienced translator of Chinese poetry (**Poems of the Late T'ang**, London 1965) and is interested in research into the philosophical and philological problems of the Chinese Classics.

CONTENTS

	Page
1. Introduction	1
2. Criteria for Identifying the Three Series of Core Chapters	3
2.1 Usages with the Name of Mo-tzu	3
2.1.1 The Digest Chapters not Ascribed to Mo-tzu	3
2.1.2 "Master Mo-tzu Says" (子墨子曰)	4
2.1.3 "Master Mo-tzu Pronounces" (子墨子言曰)	5
2.1.4 Other Usages	6
2.2 The Quotation Formulae	8
2.2.1 Formula 1	8
2.2.2 Formula 2	9
2.2.3 Other Usages	9
2.3 Introductory and Concluding Formulae	10
2.3.1 The "Rich/Poor" "Order/Disorder" Formulae	10
2.3.2 The "Benefit/Harm" Formulae	11
2.3.3 The "Benevolence/Duty" Formulae	12
2.4 The Transpositions in the Anti-fatalist Triad	12
2.5 Why the Han Editors Misplaced the Chapters	16
3. The Three Sects and the Audiences of the Three Series	18
4. The Issues which Divided the Mohists	20

1. Introduction

The core of the Book *Mo-tzu* consists of ten triads of chapters, with the chapters of each triad distinguished by *shang* 上 *chung* 中, and *hsia* 下 after the shared title. Of the total of thirty chapters seven are lost.

			上	中	下
<i>Shang hsien</i>	尚賢	Promoting worth	8	9	10
<i>Shang t'ung</i>	尚同	Conforming upwards	11	12	13
<i>Chien ai</i>	兼愛	Loving everyone	14	15	16
<i>Fei kung</i>	非攻	Rejecting aggression	17	18	19
<i>Chieh yung</i>	節用	Thrift in expenditure	20	21	
<i>Chieh tsang</i>	節葬	Thrift in funerals			25
<i>T'ien chih</i>	天志	The will of Heaven	26	27	28
<i>Ming kwei</i>	明鬼	Elucidating the spirits			31
<i>Fei yüeh</i>	非樂	Rejecting music	32		
<i>Fei ming</i>	非命	Rejecting destiny	35	36	37

The titles correspond, with only minor variations, to the names of the ten doctrines which Mo-tzu enumerates in one of the dialogues in the *Lu wen* 魯問 chapter (ch. 49/61-64). The chapters of a triad are separate expositions of its doctrine, sometimes sharing little but the theme, sometimes running parallel almost sentence by sentence, but never with the identity of wording of many parallel passages in other pre-Han texts. It seems that we have three written versions of a common oral teaching, very probably, as Yü Yüeh was the first to suggest, those of the three sects into which the Mohist school is said in *Han Fei tzu* to have divided.¹ In more than one case a chapter parallels the whole of another chapter (ch. 11 = 12/1-41; ch. 36 = 37/1-29) but then continues with entirely new material introduced by a new "Mo-tzu said" (ch. 12/41-76; 37/29-46), suggesting that the oral tradition expanded and diverged within the Mohist sects. If so, we might expect that the three series would throw light on the disputes over doctrine which, according to the *T'ien-hsia* 天下 chapter of *Chuang-tzu*, led the different sects to denounce each other as *pie Mo* 別墨 "heretical Mohists".²

Such differences of doctrine are not immediately obvious, and the general agreement in thought led Ch'en Chu and Fang Shou-ch'u to doubt

1. Yü Yüeh 俞樾, preface to Sun. The *Han Fei tzu* passage is quoted in para. 3 below.

2. *Chuang-tzu* 33/29-31, quoted in para. 3 below.

whether the three series can after all derive from the three sects.³ They preferred to take them as the transcripts of Mo-tzu's discourse by disciples. However, before deciding whether there are significant differences it is necessary to establish which chapters belong to which series, since the *shang*, *chung*, *hsia* of the titles may indicate no more than the order in which the final editor chose to arrange them. Watanabe Takashi, who seeks evidence for the relative dating of chapters in their literary and logical organisation, claims that in ch. 14-16, 17-19 and 35-37 the chapters were written in the order *shang*, *chung*, *hsia*, but that in ch. 8-10, 11-13 and 26-28 the *chung* chapter was written last.⁴ A new contribution to the problem is the observation of Stephen Durrant that one particle, the non-final *hu* 乎, is clustered in certain chapters which are not consistently *shang*, *chung* or *hsia*.⁵ A slip in overlooking cases of the particle in ch. 16 prevented him from recognising that *hu* always clusters in a single chapter of a triad.

<i>Chung</i>	<i>Chung</i>	<i>Hsia</i>	<i>Hsia</i>	<i>Chung</i>	<i>Hsia</i>	<i>Shang</i>	<i>Hsia</i>	<i>Hsia</i>
ch. 9	12	16	19	25	27	31	32	37

Occurrences
of *hu*

15	21	8	6	21	13	15	13	21
----	----	---	---	----	----	----	----	----

Others

ch. 8/7	(three times in parallel clauses)
ch. 11/5	(the single case with the graph 摩)

When this is pointed out, one quickly notices other words or word-combinations confined or almost confined to the same chapters, for example:

3. Ch'en Chu 陳柱 *Mo-tzu shih lun* 墨子十論 preface dated 1926, (MTCC v. 33), p. 24. Fang Shou-ch'u 方授楚, *Mo hsieh yüan liu* 墨學源流 Taipei 1957 (MTCC v. 39), p. 41.
4. Watanabe Takashi 渡邊卓, *Kodai Chūgoku shisō no kenkyū* 古代中國思想の研究 Tokyo 1973, pp. 473-524.
5. Stephen W. Durrant, *A consideration of differences in the grammar of the MO TZU "Essays" and "Dialogues"*, *Monumenta Serica*, v. 33 (1977/8), pp. 248-267. I made the same observation about the distribution of the particle a little later, in *A post-verbal aspectual particle in Classical Chinese: the supposed preposition HU 乎* *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*. v. 41/2 (1978).

	ch.9	12	16	19	25	27	31	32	37	Others
即		2	42	1	4			17		
當若	1	2	1	2	1	2	1		1	
萬民	11	14	7	4	1	5	4	6	3	ch. 35/20, 27
官府	2			1				3	2	4 ch. 35/29, 32
天鬼	4	6		1		4	1	1	2	ch. 35/22, 25, 36/4

These tests provide us with a series complete except for the *Chieh yung* triad, the missing chapter of which (ch. 22) may be presumed to have belonged to the same sequence. The exceptions cluster in a passage of ch. 35 which we shall reconsider in para. 2.4. We shall call these chapters the *Hu* 乎 series (H).

The random choice of words as criteria has however its dangers; once a pattern emerges one is tempted to overlook examples which would suggest a different pattern. We shall proceed with three tests which can be applied systematically, the variations on the formula "Mo-tzu said", the quotation formulae, and the introductory and concluding formulae. Afterwards we shall consider whether there are differences in the thought of the three series.

2. Criteria for Identifying the Three Series of Core Chapters

2.1 Usages with the Name of Mo-tzu

2.1.1 The Digest Chapters not Ascribed to Mo-tzu

All core chapters except three of the very shortest ch. 14, 17 and 20 (three successive *shang* chapters) are identified in the opening sentences as the words of Mo-tzu. The formula is 子墨子言曰 "Master Mo-tzu pronounces", except in ch. 12, where the character 言 is missing in all but the *Cheng te* 正德 edition. The word *yen* 言 "saying" is used regularly in the core chapters of a statement of doctrine or thesis in debate: "The apologists for aggressive war pronounce" (ch. 18/15 飾攻戰者言曰), "The pronouncement of the fatalists declares" (ch. 35/3, 30 執有命者之言曰). Outside the core chapters we find the introductory attribution to Mo-tzu only in ch. 4-6, in the form 子墨子曰 "Master Mo-tzu says". It seems therefore that the formula with *yen* declares the canonical status of the chapters as statements of Mohist doctrine.

Why is the formula missing in three of the *shang* chapters? In the case of ch. 17 (the only one which does not mention Mo-tzu at all) there is a simple explanation. Although it carries the title *Fei kung* it is plainly, as D.C. Lau has pointed out to me, a fragment parallel with ch. 28/56-69 in the *T'ien-chih* triad. The theme of the passages is that people condemn private robbery but admire aggression by states, which is like calling a black thing

black when there is a little of it but white when there is a lot. Of the other *T'ien chih* chapters, ch. 27 also has the comparison with black and white (ch. 27/73 cf. 17/11, 28/66). But ch. 26, which runs much more closely parallel with ch. 28, breaks off at a comparison with the carpenter's L-square and compasses corresponding to ch. 28/44, 45, without any conclusion rounding off the chapter. We may infer that ch. 17 is a fragment from the lost ending of ch. 26, which we shall henceforward indicate as "ch. 26 (+ 17)".

Ch. 14 (*Chien ai shang*) and 20 (*Chieh yung shang*) do not seem to be fragments. They read like short but complete summaries of the Mohist doctrines of universal love and thrift in expenditure, without illustrative quotations or answers to objections, and almost without close parallelism with chapters in the same triads. Both mention Mo-tzu only at the conclusion, as declaring the doctrine to be indispensable or to be the way of the former kings and beneficial to the world. The central importance of universal love in Mohism makes it incredible that ch. 14 (19 lines in the HY edition, against 42 for the companion ch. 15 and 86 for ch. 16) can be one of the authoritative statements of the doctrine. If we exclude the *Fei kung shang* fragment, it is with ch. 21 (also 21 lines) one of the two shortest chapters in the whole set.

It is reasonable to suppose that the Mohist school would have a use for short digests of their doctrines, without the introductory "Master Mo-tzu pronounces" which stamps with canonical authority. There is in fact a clear case in the *Fa yi* 法儀 (ch. 4), a 22-line digest of the doctrine of the *T'ien chih* triad, introduced by a simple "Master Mo-tzu says". In cases where the editor could find only two members of a triad and an uncanonical summary, he would be very likely to take the latter for the missing member. That ch. 14 and 20 are such digests will be confirmed when we come to examine the total organisation of the core chapters in para. 2.5.

2.1.2 "Master Mo-tzu Says" (子墨子曰)

The canonical core chapters all begin "Master Mo-tzu pronounces". After the opening sentence, one member of each triad generally continues with the same formula, another member generally replaces it by "Master Mo-tzu says". We start with the latter. The following are the chapters in which 子墨子曰 alone or with 是故 "Therefore", outnumber all other usages.

	ch. 12	16	19	25	27	31	32
子墨子曰	2	5	3	2	3	4	
是故子墨子曰	1	3	1	1	4	4	9
<hr/>							
子墨子言曰							1
是故子墨子言曰							1
故子墨子言曰			2				

All these belong to the H series. Of the remaining H chapters, ch. 9 does not mention Mo-tzu after the opening sentence, ch. 37 does have a case of 是故子墨子曰 but also one of 是故子墨子言曰. With the inclusion of ch. 37, there are 5 cases of "Master Mo-tzu pronounces" after the opening sentence. There is however a principle behind this apparent irregularity; the H series uses "Master Mo-tzu pronounces" only to contrast with the pronouncements of other schools.

Ch. 25/18 故子墨子言曰。然則姑嘗稽之。今雖毋法執厚葬久喪者言……

"Therefore Master Mo-tzu pronounces: 'If so, then let's try testing it. Now if we take as standard the pronouncement of those who uphold rich burial and long mourning. . . .'"

This chapter, which has introduced the rival doctrines about mourning as "the pronouncements of the two schools" (ch. 25/10 二子者言), concludes with a further "Therefore Master Mo-tzu pronounces" in line 86.

Ch. 31/13, 14 今執無鬼者言曰...子墨子言曰...

"Now the disbelievers in spirits pronounce . . . Master Mo-tzu pronounces . . ."

This introduces a series of tales of spirits being seen by men, concluding with another "Therefore Master Mo-tzu pronounces" at line 42.

Ch. 37/44 是故子墨子言曰，今天下之士君子，中實將欲求興天下之利，除天下之害，當若有命者之言，不可不强非也。

"Therefore Master Mo-tzu pronounces: 'If now the gentlemen of the world genuinely wish to raise up benefit to the world and get rid of harm to it, it is indispensable that the pronouncement of the fatalists be firmly rejected.'"

Before "Master Mo-tzu pronounces" the *shih ku* 是故, otherwise invariable in the H series examples, is twice in ch. 25 reduced to *ku* (ch. 25/18, 86).

2.1.3 "Master Mo-tzu Pronounces" (子墨子言曰)

The following are the chapters in which 子墨子言曰 alone or with 是故 "Therefore", outnumber all other usages. We exclude from counting the introductory sentence.

	ch.8	11	15	18	21	26	35
子墨子言曰	2		3	3	1	5	3
是故子墨子言曰	1	1	2	2			2
是故子墨子言			3				
<hr/>							
子墨子曰							1
是故子墨子曰				1			

In each triad the cluster is again limited to a single chapter. In the three triads in which we do not find it, *Chieh tsang* (ch. 20–22), *Ming kuei* (ch. 29–31) and *Fei yueh* (ch. 32–34), there is only one extant chapter, which in each case has already been identified as H. We have then all that remains of a second sequence, which we shall call the “*Yen* 言 series” (Y). In para. 2.1.1 we identified ch. 17 (which does not mention Mo-tzu) as a fragment from the end of ch. 26, the *T'ien chih* chapter we now identify as Y. The chapters which should by a process of elimination belong to the third series (ch. 10, 13, 28, 36) we shall, until we find positive criteria, refer to as the “Residue”.

Except for the mutilated ch. 26, all members of the Y series end with the formula “Therefore Master Mo-tzu pronounces. . .”, which elsewhere concludes only ch. 37(H). Inside a chapter the saying of Mo-tzu is frequently the answer to a question, one form of which is unique to the Y series:

Ch. 8/5, 15/11, 21/17, 26/36, 35/6 (2/1B/2, 4/4B/1, 6/5A/6, 7/5A/4, 9/1B/6).

然則!.....將奈何哉。子墨子言曰.....

Note 1. Ch. 26 omits 則.

The nearest parallels in other chapters are:

Ch. 31/9H 然則!.....將奈何而可。子墨子曰.....

13/7 (Residue) 然!.....將奈何可。故子墨子曰.....

13/22 (Residue) 然則!.....將奈何可。故子墨子言曰.....

A striking characteristic of the Y series is that it almost completely lacks the linguistic peculiarities which give the core chapters their appearance of being written in a non-standard dialect. Stephen Durrant calls attention to the frequent occurrence of the compound particles *wei-wu* (variously written as 唯, 唯, 雖 and 無, 無, 勿) and *jo-kou* 若苟 as a “characteristic which distinguishes the language of the *Mo-tzu* Essays from all other pre-Han texts”.⁶ Of these, *wei-wu* (27 occurrences) appears in the Y series only in two suspect passages.

(1) Ch. 18/3, 4, immediately following the single example of 是故子墨子曰 (ch. 18/2). This saying of Mo-tzu is recognised by Wu Yü-chiang⁷ as out of place, and may well have strayed in from another chapter.

6. Durrant, p. 261.

7. Wu Yü-chiang ch. 5, 2B/4.

(2) Ch. 35/17, in a passage (ch. 35/10–18) which we shall in para. 2/4 identify as transposed from ch. 36 (Residue). The single case of 子墨子曰 (ch. 35/20) occurs a few lines later, in a passage (ch. 35/18–35) which we transpose to ch. 37 (H).

When these passages are removed, the use of 子墨子言 (曰) (with or without 是故) turns out to be invariable in the Y series. The three cases without 曰 in ch. 15 however remain puzzling.

Jo-kou (16 occurrences) appears only once in the Y series, in a repeated sentence which at its first occurrence lacked the *jo*:

Ch. 15/17, 26–27 Y (4/5A/4, 6A/5)

此天下百姓之所皆難也。若¹苟君說之, 則士²衆能爲之

Notes 1. Line 17 omits 若.

2. Line 27 omits 士.

The *jo* is probably to be rejected, since in every other example of *jo-kou* it is immediately followed by a repetition of the preceding phrase, for example:

Ch. 12/54, 56, 58 H 是故上下不同義。若苟上下不同義.....
若苟上下不同義.....若苟上下不同義。

2.1.4 Other Usages

In the digest and residue chapters, the ones outside H and Y, Mo-tzu is introduced as follows after the introductory sentence.

	Digest	Residue	H, Y
	ch.14	20 10 13 28 36	
是故子墨子曰		1	Passim (H) 18/2 (Y)
是故子墨子言曰		1	Passim (Y) 31/42, 37/44 (H)
故子墨子曰	1	1	
是以子墨子曰		1	
故子墨子言曰		1	25/18, 86 (H)

(The transposition hypothesis we shall propose in para. 2/4 will add another 是故子墨子言曰 by transferring ch. 35/16 from ch. 35 Y to ch. 36).

It will be seen that references to Mo-tzu in the residue are much less frequent than in H and Y, and are not formalised at all; indeed he is never mentioned twice in a chapter in the same form of sentence. The sentence is always introduced by a “Therefore”, which may be 是故, 是以 or 故 (the last shared with the digest chapters). This is the case even with the two sayings of Mo-tzu which are answers to questions, both quoted in para.

2.1.3 above. So far however we still lack positive criteria for recognising the residue as a single sequence.

Para. 2.2 The Quotation Formulae

2.2.1 Formula 1

Four chapters are distinguished from all others by a quotation formula with three unique features.

(1) Book titles are preceded by 於先王之書 'Among the books of the former kings'. This phrase is never elsewhere introduced by the preposition *yü* 於 (in these chapters missing only once).

(2) The title is followed (with only one exception) by 然曰 or simply 然. *Jan* 然 is never elsewhere used in quotation.

(3) In 4 out of the 6 cases the title is of two words and presented in the form XX 之言/書 "the words/book of XX". Of the other two cases, one is in the form XX 之道之 (also found ch. 12/70, 27/60, 31/95H), in the other the title itself approximates to the form (仲虺之告).

A further feature, not unique, is that the quotation is followed (again with only one exception) by 此言/語 "this says that. . ." without an intervening particle.

Ch. 10/29 (2/16A/4, 5) 於先王之書，呂刑之書然 (.....)

31 (2/16A/8-16B/1) 於先王之書，暨年之言然曰 (....) 此言.....

13/46 (3/18A/7-18B/1) 於先王之書也，大誓之言然曰 (....) 此言.....

28/69 (7/22B/5-8) 於先王之書，大夏之道之然 (....) 此 (語) * 語.....¹

36/24-28 (9/9B/2-10A/3) 於先王之書，仲虺之告曰 (.....)

此語.....先王之書，大誓之言然曰 (.....)

Note 1. Pi Yüan's emendation.

The only remaining quotations in these four chapters are from documents which, as far as one can tell from their corrupt and unidentified titles, did not claim kings for authors. They directly follow the two from ch. 36. 有 (= 又) 於三代不國有之曰 (....)。於召公之執令於然 (....)

Of these the corruption of the text permits us to say only that in the absence of "among the books of the former kings" the preposition *yü* 於 directly preceded the title.

These are the four canonical chapters (ch. 10, 13, 28, 36) which we have so far been calling the "residue". We can now positively identify them as a homogeneous sequence, which we shall name from the second of its distinguishing features the "*Jan* 然 series" (J).

Para. 2.2.2 Formula 2

Two more chapters resemble the J series in having 此言 "This says that . . ." after quotations without an intervening particle. These likewise precede book titles by the preposition *yü* 於, but present quotations without any reference to the books of the former kings and directly followed by *yüeh* 曰.

Ch. 15/39 (4/7B/4-6)Y 傳曰 (.....) 此言.....

35/39 (9/5B/4-6A/1) Y 於仲虺之告曰 (.....) 此言.....

於太誓曰 (.....) 此言.....

Both chapters belong to the Y series. The seven chapters of the Y series have no other quotations, except for one from the *Songs* by a speaker in a story (ch. 18/37Y 詩曰). The Y series therefore stands out from the rest for the extreme rarity of quotations and the absence of appeals to the authority of the former kings.

Para. 2.2.3 Other Usages

Throughout a number of chapters a quotation followed by 此言/語 "This says . . ." is always separated off by an intervening particle, *tse* 則 or *chi* 即. The latter particle, as noted in para. 1, is used only by H.

ch. 9/17 (2/6A/4) H 詩曰 (.....), 則此語.....

9/45 (2/9A/7)H 湯誓曰 (.....), 則此言.....

9/62-65 (2/12B/1-5) H 先王之書，呂刑道之，曰 (.....) 曰 (.....) 則此言.....

9/68 (2/12A/2) H 周頌道之曰，(.....)，則此言.....

12/44, 45 (3/9A/4-5) H 是以先王之書，(以)* 呂刑之道曰，(.....)，則此言.....

12/46 (3/9A/8-9B/1) H 是以先王之書，衛命之道曰，(.....)，則此言.....

12/49, 50 (3/9B/5-8) H 是以先王之書，相年之道曰，(.....)，則此語.....

12/69, 70 (3/12A/4-5) H 是以先王之書，周頌之道之曰，(.....)，則此語.....

12/72, 73 (3/12A/8-12B) H 詩曰 (.....) 又曰 (.....) 即此語[也].....

16/50, 51 (4/13B/7-8) H 泰誓曰，(……)，即此言……
16/56-58 (4/14B/1-6) H 雖湯說即亦猶是也。湯曰(……)，即此言……

16/69-71 (4/16A/3-5) H 姑嘗本原之先王之所書。大雅之所道曰，(……)，即此言……

31/95 (8/12A/3-4) H 且禽艾之道之曰(……)，則此言……

These passages all belong to H, and illustrate also a further peculiarity, that H does not use the preposition *yii* before either 先王之書 or an isolated title. In the only exceptions the reference is apparently to a part of an already named book.

Ch. 32/44-46 (8/18B/7-19A/4) H 先王之書，湯之官刑有之，曰(……)……於武觀曰，(……)

Ch. 37/22-25 (9/13A/1-7) H 禹之總德有之，曰(……)仲虺之告曰(……)……太誓之言也於去發曰，(……)

Para. 2.3 Introductory and Concluding Formulae

Para. 2.3.1 The “Rich/Poor” “Order/Disorder” Formulae

Similar introductions or conclusions are usable for our purposes only when there is verbal identity. Different members of a triad sometimes have similar introductions, but with the variations of phrasing which run throughout the common material. We take an example from the *Fei ming* triad.

Ch. 36/1 (9/6B/5) J 凡出言談由文學之爲道也，則不可而不先立義法。
Ch. 37/1 (9/10B/1) H 凡出言談，則必可而不先立儀而言。

Verbal identity is found only between introductions or conclusions of chapters in different triads, which confirms that they are evidence of belonging to the same series. Thus ch. 8 and 35 have the same introduction, about the rulers of the past wishing their states to be rich, well populated and orderly.

Ch. 8/1 = 35/1 (2/1A/3, 9/1A/5) Y 古¹者王公大人爲政於²國家者，皆欲國家之富，人民之衆，刑政之治。然而不得富而得貧，不得衆而得寡，不得治而得亂，則是本失其所欲，得其所惡。是其³故何也。

Note 1. In ch. 8 Sun unnecessarily emends 古 to 今。

2, 3. ch. 35 omits 於，其。

That in the *Shang hsien* triad ch. 10 starts off like ch. 8 is irrelevant, since the phrasing is different.

Ch. 10/1 (2/12B/8) J

天下之王公大人皆欲其國家之富也，人民之衆也，刑法之治也。

Of the two chapters sharing the formula, ch. 35 concludes with a corresponding appeal to gentlemen of the present who wish the world to be rich and orderly to attend to the teaching of the chapter. We find the same formula at the end of ch. 15.

Ch. 15/41-42 = 35/46-47 (4/7B/7-8A/2, 9/6B/1-3) Y

今天下之士¹君子忠實欲天下之富。而惡其貧，欲天下之治而惡其亂……

Note 1. Ch. 15 places 士 8 characters later, before 富。

The three chapters sharing the formulae (ch. 8, 15 and 35) all belong to the Y series.

Para. 2.3.2 The “Benefit/Harm” Formulae

Ch. 16 and 32 share an introduction about the benevolent seeking to raise up benefit and get rid of harm.

Ch. 16/1 = 32/1 (4/8A/4-5, 8/13B/7-8) H

仁人¹之事者，必務求興天下之利，除天下之害。

Note 1. Ch. 32 omits 人，Wu restores from the parallel.

That in the *Chien ai* triad ch. 15 starts off like ch. 16 is irrelevant, the phrasing being different.

Ch. 15/1 (4/3A/6-7) Y 仁人之所以爲事者，必興天下之利，除去天下之害，以此爲事者。

Ch. 32 ends with a corresponding formula shared with ch. 19, 31 and 37, appealing to the leaders of the present to study the doctrine of the chapter.

Ch. 19/62, 31/107, 32/48, 37/44 (5/14B/4, 8/13B/2, 19A/7, 9/15B/1) H 今¹天下之²王公大人³士君子，中實⁴將欲求興天下之利，除天下之害，當若⁵……

Notes 1. Ch. 19 今且。 2. Ch. 32 omits 之。 3. Ch. 32, 37 omit 王公大人。 4. For 實 ch. 19 reads 情，ch. 3/2 請。

5. Ch. 32 在 for 若。

All the five chapters sharing these formulae (ch. 16, 19, 31, 32, 37) belong to the H series, to which, as noticed in para. 1, the particle combination 當若 is peculiar. The phrases 興天下之利 (“raise up benefit to the world”) and 除天下之害 (“get rid of harm from the world”) are also characteristic of H, which always uses them in combination.

	ch.9	12	16	19	25	27	31	32	37	Others
興天下之利	—	1	3	1	1	1	2	3	1	ch. 15/1 Y
除天下之害	—	1	3	1	1	1	2	3	1	—

The example outside the H series (ch. 15/1Y) has already been quoted in full in this section. It is differentiated from the others by the inexact parallel 除去天下之害, which shows that it is not formulaic.

Para. 2.3.3 The “Benevolence/Duty” Formulae

Five chapters share a concluding formula appealing to those who wish to be benevolent and dutiful. Of these, ch. 19 combines it with the “benefit/harm” formula, by not repeating the words 天下之士君子中實將 common to both.

Ch. 10/46J, 13/58J, 19/62H, 25/86H, 28/71J (2/18A/1, 3/19B/4, 5/14B/6, 6/15B/8, 7/23A/1) 今¹天下之王公大人²士君子中實³將欲為仁義, 求為上⁴士, 上欲⁵中聖王⁶之道, 下欲中國家百姓之利……

Notes 1. Ch. 10, 28 且今. 2. Ch. 25, 28 omit 王公大人.

3. For 實 ch. 10 reads 情, ch. 25 謂.

4. Ch. 10, 13 omit 上. 5. Ch. 20 尚 for 上.

6. Ch. 13 omits 王.

These chapters fall into two groups:

(1) Ch. 19 and 25, both H, continue with the words 故當若 …… We noticed in para. 1 that the combination 當若 is peculiar to the H series.

(2) Ch. 10, 13 and 28, which continue without this combination, are three of the four chapters we ascribe to J. The fourth is the anti-fatalist ch. 36, which has a unique conclusion: 且今天下之士君子將欲辨是非利害之故..

A partially corresponding introductory formula is found only in ch. 27 (H): 今天下之君子之欲為仁義者……

Para. 2.4 The Transpositions in the Anti-Fatalist Triad

There is evidence of serious dislocation in the anti-fatalist triad. All three chapters start by laying down three tests for argument, called the Three Gnomons (三表) in ch. 35 (Y) and the Three Standards (三法) in ch. 36 (J) and 37 (H). There is one striking difference between the three versions; the second test in ch. 35 and 37 is the evidence of the people’s ears and eyes, in ch. 36 it is the books of the former kings. Both ch. 35 and 36 proceed to apply the first two tests to the existence of destiny, but it is plain that something has gone wrong with the text; ch. 35/10–18 applies the tests of ch. 36, ch. 36/5–13 of ch. 35. That ch. 35/10–18 does not belong in ch. 35

(Y) is further suggested by an example of the compound particle *wei-wu* (here written 雖毋) in line 17; we noticed in para. 2.1.3 that Y seems not to use it. We underline the crucial phrases in the quoted text.

Ch. 35/8–10 (9/2A/2–6) 於何本之。上本之於古者聖王之事。於何原之。下原察百姓耳目之實。於何用之。廢以為刑政, 觀其中國家百姓人民之利。此所謂言有三表也。然而今天下之士君子或以命為有。

35/10–12 (9/2A/7–2B/2) [益]¹ 蓋嘗尚觀於聖王之事。……豈可謂有命哉。

35/12–18 (9/2B/2–3A/5) 然而天下之士君子或以命為有。[益]² 蓋嘗尚觀於先王之書……今雖毋求執有命者之言不必得, 不亦可錯乎。

Notes 1, 2 益 is a corruption of 蓋 (= 盍); in the first case it was corrected by a scribe but not dislodged from the text (Sun).

Ch. 36/3–5 (9/7A/2–4) 於其本之也。考之天鬼之志, 聖王之事。於其原之也。徵以先王之書。用之奈何。發而為刑。此言之三法也。今天下之士君子。

Ch. 36/5–9 (9/7A/4–7B/5) 或以命為亡¹。我所以知命之有與亡者。以眾人耳目之情知有與亡……然胡<不>² 嘗考之百姓之情。……然胡不嘗考之。

Ch. 36/9–13 (9/7B/5–8A/4) 聖王之事。……豈可謂有命哉。

Notes 1. Wu’s emendation of 亡 to 有 is an attempt to make sense of the text as it stands. 2. Restored from the parallel which follows it (Sun).

We can now recognise where the dislocation occurred. Ch. 36/5 follows on to ch. 35/10, making a continuous sentence in which Wu’s emendation is unnecessary.

“Now of the officer gentlemen of the world, some think that destiny exists, some that it does not. As for how we know whether destiny exists or not, we know it by the evidence of the common people’s ears and eyes”.

But how is it that in placing ch. 35/10–12 after ch. 35/8–10 the rearranger joined up a sentence about the sage kings’ practice which is perfectly parallel with the coming sentence in ch. 35/12–18 about the former kings’ books? One may guess that he found in the disordered strips only what he took to be the beginning and the end of the sentence, and restored what he inferred from the parallel to be the missing characters. The intermediate characters, approximately 蓋嘗尚觀於, have therefore to be treated as suspect. The problem of restoring the text would seem to allow both a simple and a complicated solution:

(1) The simple solution. We can follow the rearranger’s presumed example and restore from the parallel, making ch. 35/10–12 follow on to ch. 36/3–5:

Ch. 36/5 今天下之士君子 35/10<或以命為有>。蓋嘗尚 (= 上) 觀於聖王之事。

“Now some of the officer gentlemen of the world think that destiny exists. Why not try inspecting the practice of the sage kings in the past?”

We have then merely to exchange the 240 characters of ch. 35/10–18 and the 264 of ch. 36/5–13.

(2) The complicated solution. We place only ch. 36/5–9 after 35/8–10, where with the elimination of the suspect characters ch. 35/10–12 will follow on:

Ch. 36/9 然胡不嘗考之 35/10 [蓋嘗尚觀於]聖王之事。

“But why not try investigating it in the practice of the former kings?”

Instead of a direct exchange, we then have to place ch. 35/12–18 after ch. 36/9–13.

The only difference between the two solutions is that the complicated one leaves the sections on the sages’ practice (ch. 35/10–12, 36/9–13) in the same chapters as before. This is an advantage, because ch. 36 runs closely parallel with the remaining *Fei ming* chapter, ch. 37, a parallelism which is clearly visible in the sections on the sage kings’ practice (ch. 37/5–10 is much closer to ch. 36/9–13 than to ch. 35/10–12). However, the relations between members of a triad are so variable that this consideration is hardly decisive. We shall leave the question open but use the simpler solution, as the more convenient.

Ch. 35 (Y) presents a further problem. The rest of the chapter consists of two blocks, of which only the second shows the characteristic features of Y.

(1) Lines 18–33. Within this block, lines 19–27 and 27–33 are homogeneous episodes.

(2) Lines 33–47. Of these lines 33–46 are a homogeneous episode, in which the conclusion of lines 33–36 (此特凶言之所自生而暴人之道也) leads on to the argument of lines 36–42 and is repeated at the end of lines 42–46. The episode is established as Y by the quotation formula examined in para. 2.2.2. There remains only the conclusion of the chapter, which resumes the introduction by a formula identified as Y in para. 2.3.1.

The last item of the first block (lines 30–33) is a duplicate of the first item of the second (lines 33–35), with only the variations one expects when different members of a triad run parallel. This suggests that the first block may come from another chapter. On closer inspection it turns out to be full of evidence that it belongs to H, and therefore to ch. 37 (although it is not clear where it is to be located). The duplicate itself answers a fatalist thesis in words repeated almost unchanged from an H chapter (ch. 35/31–33 = 9/28–30H). We noticed in para. 1 several usages almost limited to H, but with exceptions clustered in this block.

H chapters

子墨子曰	Passim
萬民	Passim
官府	Passim
天鬼	Passim

Other chapters

ch. 35/20
35/20, 27
35/29, 32
35/22, 27. 36/4J

We also find Mo-tzu quoting himself, a usage limited to the H chapters:

Lines 26–27 鄉者言曰 “According to the pronouncement earlier” quotes line 20.

Ch. 12/60H 鄉吾本言 “According to my original pronouncement earlier” quotes ch. 12/1.

Ch. 16/15–16H 鄉吾本言曰 quotes 16/1

Ch. 25/67–70H 鄉者吾本言曰 quotes 25/12–15

The transposition also accounts for an anomaly in the lengths of the *Fei ming* chapters: ch. 35 (Y, 47 lines in the HY edition), ch. 36 (J, 31 lines), ch. 37 (H, 46 lines). With the identification of the three different series it turns out to be an otherwise invariable rule that Y is the shortest and H the longest. There is one other case of an H chapter being approximately equalled by another, the *T’ien chih* triad, in which ch. 27 (H) and 28 (J) both have 73 lines, but in all other triads the H member is very much the longest. The anomaly disappears when 15 lines are transferred from Y to H and Y loses a further 24 characters to J.

The rearrangement of ch. 35 (Y) leaves a coherently organised essay:

Ch. 35/1–10	Introduction of the three tests.
36/5–9	The second test (people’s ears and eyes)
36/9–13	The first test (sage kings’ practice)
35/33–47	The third test (practical results)

That Y finds it convenient to apply the second test first need not surprise us, since we find the same in the only other chapter which applies it, the single surviving *Ming kuei* chapter (ch. 31H).

Apart from its single transposition ch. 36 (J) is not suspect, and its quotation formula is that established as J in para. 2.2.1. Like ch. 35 (Y) it can now be seen to be coherently organised:

Ch. 36/1–5	Introduction of the three tests.
35/10–12	The first test (sage kings’ practice)

35/12-18 The second test (books of former kings)

36/13-31 The third test (practical results)

Neither Y nor J makes a formulaic appeal to the third test, but the same is true of ch. 31 (H).

In ch. 37 (H) we may suspect further dislocation, which we shall not attempt to repair. The introduction of the three tests (ch. 37/1-4) is followed by a passage which, judging by a section paralleled in the other chapters, is the application of the first test (ch. 37/5-10 cf. 35/10-12, 36/9-13). But there has been no formal appeal to the first test, and the second is ignored altogether. One may guess that there is a lacuna after the introduction, in which H appealed to the two tests in the same order as does Y.

Para. 2.5 Why the Han Editors Misplaced the Chapters

We noticed in para. 2/4 an emerging regularity: in all triads Y is the shortest chapter and H the longest, although in a few cases they approach equality. There is another and quite unexpected regularity. In spite of all our rearrangements the chapter numbers still run continuously except in the disordered final triad (for which we assume the simpler of the proposed reconstructions).

	Y	H	J
<i>Shang hsien</i> (ch 8-10)	8	9	10
<i>Shang t'ung</i> (11-13)	11	12	13
<i>Chien ai</i> (14-16)	15	16	
<i>Fei kung</i> (17-19)	18	19	
<i>Chieh yung</i> (20-22)	21		
<i>Chieh tsang</i> (23-25)		25	
<i>T'ien chih</i> (26-28)	26 (+17)	27	28
<i>Ming kuei</i> (29-31)		31	
<i>Fei yüeh</i> (32-34)		32	
<i>Fei ming</i> (35-37)	35/1-10	37	36/1-5
	+36/5-13	+35/18-33	+35/10-18
	+35/33-47		+36/13-31

The significance of the continuity is revealed if we put back the chapters we have excluded as fragments or digests, and fill in the 7 missing chapters (ch. 22, 24, 29, 30, 33, 34). The result is like a crossword puzzle one cannot quite finish.

	Digests and fragments	Y	H	J
<i>Shang hsien</i> (8-10)		8	9	10
<i>Shang t'ung</i> (11-13)		11	12	13
<i>Chien ai</i> (14-16)	14	15	16	
<i>Fei kung</i> (17-19)	17	18	19	
<i>Chieh yung</i> (20-22)	20	21	(22)	
<i>Chieh tsang</i> (23-25)	(23)	(24)	25	
<i>T'ien chih</i> (26-28)		26	27	28
<i>Ming kuei</i> (29-31)	(29)	(30)	31	
<i>Fei yüeh</i> (32-34)	?	?	32	?
<i>Fei ming</i> (35-37)		35/1-10	37	36/1-5
		+36/5-13	+35/18-33	+35/10-18
		+35/33-47		+36/13-31

We can now see how the confusion arose. The Han editors of *Mo-tzu*, presumably Liu Hsiang 劉向 or his team, sorted out the versions in the order YHJ. In this arrangement, the shortest version (Y) stood first. But at least 5 of the J chapters were already missing. In the further sorting of Mohist materials, at least 5 digests or fragments were found which could be mistaken for the lost chapters. Most of these were even shorter than the Y chapters (only the digest ch. 20, of 20 lines, approximately equals ch. 21 Y, 19 lines). In the final arranging of the book the replacements, perhaps because of their shortness, were given the first instead of the last place in each triad.

For the *Fei yüeh* triad there is no clear solution. If in this case the editors found no Y chapter and no replacements, they would number H as ch. 32 and J if extant as ch. 33, but would have to leave ch. 34 vacant. But other explanations are possible. The disorder which dislocated the *Fei ming* triad may have started in *Fei yüeh*, or a later scribe, coming on the title *Fei yüeh* for the first time, may have automatically written *shang* in place of *chung* or *hsia*. It may be noticed that the marking of chapter titles as *shang*, *chung* and *hsia* allowed the restoration of the titles of missing chapters, followed by the word *ch'üeh* 闕 "missing", and that this could have been done at any period. (Outside the core chapters so marked a missing chapter is recognised only by a break in the number sequence). There is nothing to forbid the assumption that a chapter title with *ch'üeh* goes back to Liu Hsiang himself, or alternatively that all were filled in after the title of ch. 32 was corrupted.

3. The Three Sects and the Audiences of the Three Series

Our information about the Mohist sects comes entirely from two passages.

Chuang-tzu 33/29-31 相里勤之弟子，五侯之徒，南方之墨者，苦獲己齒鄧陵子之屬，俱誦墨經，而倍誦不同，相謂別墨，以堅白同異之辯相訾，以符偶不侔之辭相應，以巨子為聖人，皆願為之戶，冀得為其後世，至今不決。

“The disciples of Hsiang-li Ch'ín, the followers of Wu Hou, and the Mohists of the South, K'u Huo, Chi Ch'ih, Teng-ling-tzu and the like, all recited the Mohist canons but diverged and disagreed, they called each other “heretical Mohists”, abused each other in disputation about “the hard and the white” and “the same and the different”, answered each other with propositions at odds and evens which do not match. They regarded their Grand Masters as sages, and all wished to become the acknowledged head, aspiring to lay down the line for later generations of the school; even today the issue is undecided”.

Han Fei tzu (*Han Fei tzu so-yin* 韓非子索引 Peking 1982) 50/1/16-25 自墨子之死也，有相里氏之墨，有相夫氏之墨，有鄧陵氏之墨。故孔，墨之後，儒分為八，墨離為三，取舍相反不同，而皆自謂真孔，墨。

(After distinguishing eight Confucian schools) “From Mo-tzu's death there were the Mohists of Hsiang-li, of Hsiang-fu, of Teng-ling. So after Confucius and Mo-tzu the Confucians divided into eight, the Mohists split into three, what they were for and against was opposed and dissimilar, yet they all called themselves the true Confucians or Mohists”.

The “canons” (*ching* 經) over which the sects fought were presumably, as Hu Shih pointed out,⁸ the ten doctrines of the school; the logic, geometry and science of the dialectical chapters of *Mo-tzu* entitled *Ching* “Canons” would surely not have occasioned accusations of heresy. Although the information in these passages is almost confined to the names of otherwise untraceable Mohist masters, there is one usable item. *Chuang-tzu* distinguishes three teachers from the rest as “Mohists of the South”. Since Mohism originated in the politically and economically advanced states of the North, it is likely that it would have to take new directions in the relatively backward states of the South. Is there evidence for connecting any of the three series with Southern Mohism?

The four strongest states of the time are named in ch. 25/45 (H): “In the South there are the kings of Ch'u and Yüeh, in the North the lords of Ch'ï and Chin” (南有楚越之王而北有齊晉之君 cf. also ch. 19/50H, as well as

ch. 18/15 Y, where Sun recognises Wu 吳 as a mistake for Yüeh). Ch. 16/31 (H) has an imaginary example of a man sent on a far mission to Pa or Yüeh, Ch'ï or Ching (Ch'u) (遠使於巴越齊荆), which places H definitely in the North (and not the North East). But in ch. 28/21-23 (J) there is an argument that Heaven loves the people who support him by sacrifices just as a ruler loves his own people because he depends on them for revenue. The examples chosen are the rulers of Ch'u and Yüeh. We may infer provisionally that the 4 J chapters come from the Mohists of the South. This would attach them to the sect of Teng-ling, the only one of *Chuang-tzu*'s Southern Mohists who has a *tzu* 子 after his name, and the only one named in *Han Fei tzu* as head of a sect. We shall decide later whether this proposal contributes to the understanding of the J chapters.

As for the H and Y series, which presumably come from the North, the most obvious difference between them is in the assumed audience: H is addressed to princes and men of state, Y to fellow thinkers. We have no information as to whether one of the Northern sects was more interested than the other in winning political influence, so that the information from *Chuang-tzu* and *Han Fei Tzu* is of no further use to us. The difference in audience shows up most clearly in the concluding formulae examined in para. 2.3. In H the appeals are to “kings, dukes, great men and officer gentlemen” (王公大人君子), or, in the case of the more private issues, mourning, music, fatalism, simply to the “officer gentlemen”. The officer gentlemen are described in ch. 32/34-40 H as those who hold offices and collect taxes, in contrast with the kings, dukes and great men who attend court. Thinkers who oppose Mohism on the issues of universal love, the will of Heaven or destiny are never called officer gentlemen, although it is once said of the latter that on music “they disagree with my pronouncement” (ch. 32/34 H 以吾言不然). Although, as in the Y and J series, the appeal is generally to those who wish to benefit the world or to behave righteously, there are striking exceptions in the case of the two directly political chapters.

Ch. 9/73 H 今大人欲王天下，正諸侯，將欲使意得乎天下，名成乎後世，故 (= 胡) 不察尚賢為政之本也。

“Now if a great man wishes to reign over the world and rule the lords of the states, and intends to realise his ambitions in the world and become famous in future generations, why not inquire into ‘promotion of worth’ as the basis of government?”

Ch. 12/75 H 今天下之王公大人君子，請 (= 情) 將欲富其國家，衆其人民，治其刑政。定其社稷，當若尚同之不可不察。此〈為政〉之本也。

“Now if the world's kings, dukes, great men and officer gentlemen sincerely wish to enrich *their own* states, multiply their own people, put their

8. Hu Shih 胡適, *Chung-kuo che-hsiieh shih ta-kang* 中國哲學史大綱 Commercial Press 1947 (first published 1919), p. 185.

punishments and administration in order, secure their own altars, the indispensability of inquiring into 'upward conforming' is because this is the basis of government."

Although the *Fei kung* chapter ends with a purely moral appeal, the concluding argument is that if a ruler helps the smaller states against aggression by the larger "the submission of the whole world may be expected without delay". (ch. 19/55H 天下之服可立而待也).

In Y on the other hand the concluding appeals are solely to the officer gentlemen, and these are identified, not as holders of office, but as the rival thinkers who question the doctrine of universal love (ch. 15/15, 29Y), fail to recognise that the Son of Heaven is himself subject to Heaven (ch. 26/1, 8, 18, 42Y) and have conflicting opinions about fatalism (ch. 35/10Y). Whereas H refers no less than 19 times to "the kings, dukes and great men of today" (今王公大人), Y mentions only "the kings, dukes and great men of old" (ch. 8/1 cf. 3. 18/1, 25. 35/1 cf. 5Y 古者王公大人). Y is defending his positions against rival thinkers, not trying to convert rulers of states.

J, whom we claim provisionally as a Southern Mohist, addresses both audiences. The concluding formulae of his *T'ien chih* and *Fei ming* chapters appeal only to the officer gentlemen, whom like Y he identifies with his opponents on the issues of the will of Heaven and fatalism (ch. 28/1, 13, 45, 46, 35/12 [transposed] J). In the two political chapters on the other hand the appeal is to "kings, dukes and great men", whom like H he repeatedly specifies as the "kings, dukes and great men of today". His appeals however are exclusively moral, never to the prospect of reigning over the empire.

The different audiences of the three series, men of state (H), thinkers (Y) and — on the evidence so far only of a single passage — Southerners (J), might well lead the Mohists in divergent directions, and we shall bear this in mind in comparing the thought of the three series.

4. The Issues which Divided the Mohists

The core chapters begin with two triads on the organisation of the state, *Shang hsien* "promoting worth" and *Shang t'ung* "conforming upwards". In the *Shang hsien* triad all chapters recommend the promotion of talented people, but Y alone teaches a pure meritocracy in which talent is the *only* consideration in appointment to office.

Ch. 8/8Y. 言曰，不義不富，不義不貴，不義不親，不義不近。是以國之富貴人聞之，皆退而謀曰，始我所恃者富貴也。今上舉義，不辟貧賤，然則我不可不為義。

"They announced: 'Unless righteous, not rich: unless righteous, not noble: unless righteous, not kin to the ruler: unless righteous, not near the throne.' Therefore when the rich and noble men in the state heard it, they all

withdrew and took counsel saying: 'Before, we depended on being rich and noble; now if our ruler appoints the righteous and does not shun the poor and base, we have no choice but to be righteous'. . . ."

Ch. 8/17 Y 雖在農與工肆之人，有能則舉之，高予之爵，重予之祿，任之以事，斷予之令。

"Even among peasants, craftsmen and traders, if they had ability he appointed them, gave them high titles, ample salary, full responsibility for the work, and full powers to command."

Ch. 8/20Y 故官無常貴，而民無終賤。有能則舉之，無能則下之。

"Therefore no one in office was irreversibly noble, no one among the people was irrevocably base; if they had ability he appointed them, if they lacked ability he degraded them."

Neither H nor J mentions peasants, craftsmen and traders, or is specific that appointment is to be based on nothing else but merit. H comes nearest to this uncompromising position in a general recommendation to promote the worthy and degrade the incapable:

Ch. 9/4H 不黨父兄，不偏貴富，不嬖顏色。賢者舉而上之，富而貴之，以為官長。不肖者抑而廢之。貧而賤之，以為徒役。

"They did not gang up with father or elder brother, did not side with the rich and noble, did not favour handsome looks. The worthy they appointed and promoted, enriched and ennobled and made officials; the unworthy they suppressed and dismissed, impoverished and debased and reduced to servants."

The radicalism of Y, which is toned down in H, is abandoned altogether in J:

Ch. 10/20 J 是故古之聖王之治天下也，其所富，其所貴，未必王公大人骨肉之親，無故富貴，而面目美好者也。

"Therefore when the sage kings of old governed the world, those whom they enriched and ennobled were *not necessarily* blood relations of kings, dukes and great men, enriched and ennobled without reason, or handsome of face."

Although J recommends promotion of talent, he says nothing of demoting the talentless. His only reference to demotion is in the case of "disloyal and untrustworthy officers" (ch. 10/6 J 不忠信之士)。

We find the same spectrum of radical and conservative Mohism in the *Shang t'ung* triad. In all versions the solution to the problem of conflicting moralities is to establish a hierarchy in which at each level everyone takes his moral code from above, from the lords of the states, the Son of Heaven, and ultimately from Heaven itself. In Y this is accompanied by a system of

checks to eliminate the danger that the superiors to whom one conforms may not themselves be conforming to Heaven. The hierarchy in Y consists of Son of Heaven, lords of states, (國君), district heads (鄉長) and village heads (里長), each appointed from above, and implicitly bypassing the family. The checks are

(1) Each is rewarded by superiors and praised by inferiors for criticising the faults of his superiors and recommending good people among his inferiors, and correspondingly punished and reviled if he fails to do so.

(2) Villagers conform not to the village but to the district head, people of the district to the lord of the state, people of the state to the Son of Heaven.

(3) Villagers report good or bad conduct, not to the village but to the district head, and so on up the hierarchy.

(4) "If the people throughout the world all upwardly conform to the Son of Heaven but do not upwardly conform to Heaven" (ch. 11/22 Y 天下之百姓，皆上同於天子，而不上同於天), Heaven will punish them with natural disasters. The implication is not spelled out, but can only be that Heaven has appointed someone like T'ang or King Wu to replace the present Emperor, and it is to him that the people should now conform.

Ch. 11/1-41 H very closely parallels ch. 10 (Y), so closely that the omission of the crucial point 3 immediately strikes the eye. A general announcement by the Emperor about reporting good or bad conduct appears in both chapters:

Ch. 11/9 Y 聞善而不善，皆以告其上。

If you hear of anything good or bad, in all cases report to your superiors.

Ch. 12/12 H 凡聞見善者，必以告其上。聞見不善者，亦必以告其上。

Whoever hears or sees something good, be sure to report it to your superiors; whoever hears or sees something bad, likewise be sure to report it to your superiors.

But there is nothing corresponding to ch. 11/14, 17, 20 Y 里長 (鄉長 / 國君) …… 言曰，聞善而不善必以告其鄉長 (國君 / 天子)

"The village head (/district head/lord of state) . . . announces: If you hear of anything good or bad, be sure to report it to the district head (/lord of state/Son of Heaven)" — which requires everyone to report the virtues and faults of his own superiors to the level above.

On Point 4 H expands at length, but in a way which avoids any hint of rebellion. In Y Heaven punishes "the people" (ch. 11/23, 24 Y, 百姓) for conforming to the wrong person and failing to conform to Heaven, in H he

punishes "men below" (ch. 12/33 H 下人) including the Emperor as long as they "do not yet conform upwards to Heaven" (ch. 12/31 H 未上同乎天). Y implies that the people should respond to the calamity by conforming to someone called by Heaven to replace the Emperor; H asserts that the Emperor should respond to the calamity by recovering the support of Heaven, the spirits and the people through regular sacrifices and just government.

The conception of *shang t'ung*, which in H is slightly compromised, is in J completely emasculated. In J the bottom place in the hierarchy is occupied, not by appointed village heads, but by the "lords of families" (家君). Instead of an administrative system bypassing the family we have the traditional levels of family, state and empire as in Confucianism, and we are even told that 'ordering the states of the world is like ordering one family' (ch. 13/45 J 治天下之國若治一家). A further crucial difference from both Y and H is that the lords of family, state and empire call on their subjects to conform, not to the power above them, but to themselves. J is advocating a feudal rather than a bureaucratic hierarchy. As for the possibility of the Emperor failing to conform to Heaven, it is not mentioned at all.

This spectrum of political attitudes corresponds neatly to the differences between the audiences addressed in the three series. Y can afford to be radical, because he is not trying to persuade princes but debating with fellow thinkers. H is more conservative, because he hopes to convert "kings, dukes and great men". As for J, we can now commit ourselves with some confidence to our provisional conclusion that he is a Mohist of the South. There is a story in the *Kuei yi* 貴義 chapter (ch. 47/6-16) of Mo-tzu being refused an interview with the King of Ch'u on the grounds that he is a commoner. He defends himself with the example of T'ang 湯 acknowledging the worth of the commoner Yi Yin 伊尹, a story used in all the *Shang hsien* chapters (ch. 8/22, 9/48, 10/23). In advanced states of the North, where talent was increasingly recruited from below, a Mohist could push for a pure meritocracy; in the more exclusively aristocratic society of Ch'u he might find it useless to propose more than the promotion of talented people who are 'not necessarily blood relations of kings, dukes or great men'. The little we know of Mohism in Ch'u suggests that its patrons were small fiefholders, Lord Wen of Lu-yang (魯陽文君), who converses with Mo-tzu in stories in the *Keng-chu* 耕柱 and *Lu wen* 魯問 chapters, and the Lord of Yang-ch'eng (陽城君), patron of the Mohist Grand Master Meng Sheng 孟勝 who died fighting for him in 381 B.C.⁹ A proposal to turn Ch'u into a fully bureaucratized state of the type emerging in the North, with an administrative hierarchy down to village level which bypasses the

9. *Lü-shih ch'un-ch'ü* 呂氏春秋 ch. 19/5 *Shang te* 上德 .

clans, would be no way to win the ear of the Lords of Lu-yang or Yang-ch'eng.

We can now understand why the Mohist sects, as *Chuang-tzu* tells us, fought so bitterly over the interpretation of doctrine and reviled each other as “heretical Mohists”. The issue was the perennial one of theoretical purity or accommodation to political realities. One can well see that for Y the pure doctrine of Mo-tzu has been watered down by H and utterly betrayed by J. We can also find a significance in the different usages with the name of Mo-tzu analysed in para. 2.1. All chapters start with the “Master Mo-tzu pronounces” which identifies them as authoritative statements of doctrine. But both H and J frequently mention Mo-tzu in the 3rd person, without indicating where his words broke off, and H generally resumes them with a simple “Master Mo-tzu says”. In the Y chapters however it may be observed throughout that the words of Mo-tzu are interrupted only by a question or by an anti-Mohist thesis to be answered, and are immediately resumed by a “Master Mo-tzu pronounces”. Y, the purist, wants it clearly understood that in every line he is laying down the true doctrine of the Master.

In the next triad, *Chien ai*, there is no evidence of compromise on the central Mohist doctrine of universal love. The J chapter is missing, but Y and H, as well as the digest ch. 14, all say explicitly that each should regard the family of another as though it were his own (ch. 15/11–12Y, 16/9–12H, cf. 14/12–16). But differences reappear in the *Fei kung* triad (where the J chapter is again missing). As before, it is Y who takes the uncompromising position, a straightforward rejection of aggression without recommending attack on tyrannical rulers or even defense. Throughout Y there are no references to “defending” (守),¹⁰ “punishing” (誅) or to how T'ang and Wu came to win their thrones, other than the general reference, common to all members of the *T'ien chih* triad, to Heaven rewarding them and punishing the tyrants they replaced. The invention of weapons by the sages was for use against wild beasts (ch. 21/9–11Y. J says against bandits, ch. 20/5–7 J). It is unlikely that Y was a pure pacifist, but there is nothing in the seven chapters of the series which would forbid such an interpretation.

The *Fei kung* chapter in the H series culminates and concludes with an argument that a ruler who defends the small states against aggression by the great will by gaining their support win the submission of the whole world (ch. 19/53–62 H). He judges Yu's attack on the San-miao 三苗, T'ang's

10. The word *shou* 守 “defend” is exclusive to H, and may be added to the evidence on p. 15 above that ch. 35/18–33 is an H fragment.

Ch. 9H	12H	25H	37H	Others
3	1	1	1	ch. 35/29, 32

on Chieh 桀 and Wu's on Chow 紂 to be not “aggression” (*kung* 攻) but “punishing” (ch. 19/30–48 H). He mentions the wars of Yu and Wu also in ch. 16/53–56 H and 31/46, 88–92 H, and even slips into using *kung* of King Wu (ch. 19/40, 46, 31/47 H). That there is a real compromise here is shown by a formula unique to H, that the well governed state is strong enough to “defend itself at home” and “go punishing abroad” (入守……出誅 ch. 9/13, 31, 12/40, 37/43 H). It amounts to a full license to aggressive war if the Mohist judges one's cause to be righteous, and must have been very reassuring to the kings, dukes, and great men whom H is addressing. As for J, the surviving four chapters do not touch on the issue of aggression.

Among the other doctrines for which we have more than one document, there is no compromise over thrift in expenditure or the will of Heaven. The *T'ien-chih* chapters raise only the minor question of whether the word *chih* 志 in the title is common to all the sects. Because of the title one is accustomed to think of the Will of Heaven as a characteristic Mohist concept, but outside this triad we find only a single reference to “the will of Heaven and the spirits” (ch. 36/3 J, 天鬼之志), and elsewhere in *Mo-tzu* a single story mentioning “accord with the will of Heaven” (ch. 49/17, 19 順於天之志). The listing of the ten doctrines in the *Lu wen* has “honouring Heaven” (ch. 49/63 尊天), the summary in the *Fa yi* refers to “taking Heaven as standard” (ch. 4/9 法天). Inside the triad all chapters speak throughout of according with or defying “the *yi* of Heaven” (ch. 26 天意 27, 28 天之意). That this *yi* has a wider meaning than *chih* 志 “will, intent”, more like “thoughts”, is plain when we are informed of the thoughts of Heaven when elevating the sage kings and dismissing the tyrants, introduced by “Therefore the *yi* of Heaven said” (ch. 26/26, 29 故天意曰). It is only at the ends of ch. 26 (Y) and 28 (J), where Mo-tzu takes Heaven as the standard for righteousness like compass and L-square for circle and square, that the standard is identified as the will of Heaven (ch. 26/41 天志 28/44–73 天之 (= 志), 天志, 天之志). But ch. 27 (H) continues to use “*yi* of Heaven” even for the standard (ch. 27/63–73). In the two apparent cases of *t'ien chih* 天之 in this chapter it would seem that a *yi* has dropped out:

Ch. 27/14 H (7/7B6, 7) 然則天之〈意¹〉將何欲何憎。子墨子曰，天之意不欲……

Note 1. Pi restores 意 .

“If so, what does the *yi* of Heaven desire and dislike? Master Mo-tzu says: the *yi* of Heaven does not desire. . . .”

Ch. 27/63, 67H (7/13A/8–13B/1, 14A/1)是¹故子墨子之有天之意²也……

Note 1. Line 67 omits 是 2. Line 63 omits 意也

“Therefore Master Mo-tzu's having the *yi* of Heaven. . . .”

The point is hardly material, since H certainly conceives Heaven as desiring and disliking, but it is of some interest that the fullest of the three series does not include “Will of Heaven” in its terminology.

Coming finally to the *Fei ming* triad, there are no differences on the issue of fatalism, but important differences in formulating the three tests of doctrine, greatly clarified by the transpositions proposed in para. 2.4. Here we find the same spread as before from radical Y to conservative J. It is convenient to start from H, and note first the resemblances to the other two and then the differences. H agrees with Y in formulating the three tests as the practice of the sage kings, the evidence of the people’s ears and eyes, and practical results in benefiting the people. The second is relevant only to questions of existence, of the spirits (ch. 31/10–42 H) and of destiny (ch. 36/5–9, Y transposed), but when relevant is applied first. The full three tests are applied both in the only surviving *Ming kuei* chapter (ch. 31 H) and in at least the Y version of *Fei ming*, where the silence of the H version is probably, as noticed in para. 2.4, to be explained by a lacuna in the text. The argumentation of the other chapters is conducted in terms of the sage kings’ practice and of beneficial effects, although these tests are specifically mentioned only once; H rejects music because ‘investigated above, it does not coincide with the practice of the sage kings; estimated below, it does not coincide with the benefit of the myriads of the people’ (ch. 32/6 H 然上考之不中聖王之事，下度之不中萬民之利). The sage kings, for Y, H and J alike, are Yao 堯, Shun 舜, and the founders of the Three Dynasties.

H agrees with J in supporting its appeals to the sage king’s practice by copious documentation from “the books of the former kings” (先王之書). The quotations are generally from the *Documents* attributed to the founders of the Three Dynasties, sometimes to the *Songs* of the early Chou. We are repeatedly told that the sages ascribed such importance to a doctrine that they wrote it on silk and bamboo, inscribed it on metal and stone, in order to pass it down to future generations (ch. 16/50, 27/51, 59, 31/57, 37/22 H, 10/28, 36/24 J). It is here that Y distinguishes itself from the others. The impression that the Mohists are constantly appealing to scriptural authority is so strong that it comes as a surprise to discover that in the seven chapters of the Y series there are hardly any quotations from titled documents. Y quotes popular sayings (ch. 18/2, 37, 39Y 古者有語, the first doubtful, cf. para 2.1.3. 26/6Y 語言有之曰), and an untitled document (ch. 15/39Y 傳曰), and has a story in which someone quotes the *Songs* (ch. 18/37Y). On the single occasion when he cites titled documents in the manner of H and J (ch. 35/39–42) there is nothing about the sages inscribing them on metal and stone to give them scriptural authority. The word *shu* 書 itself, which appears 50 times in the core chapters in the sense of “book” or “write”, is used only once by Y, in a remark that in spite of their innumerable books the officer gentlemen of the world are far from benevolence and duty

(ch. 26/42Y). Y is further distinguished by the feature that, whereas the other series use *hsien wang* 先王 “former kings” indistinguishably from *sheng wang* 聖王 “sage kings”, even when not appealing to their writings (ch. 9/24, 67, 12/65, 19/10, 17H, 10/32, 13/45 J), Y does not use *hsien wang* at all. He does mention the “kings, dukes and great men of old” (古者王公大人), but as not knowing how to rule until instructed by the sage kings (ch. 18/1, 35/1 Y). This is so unexpected if one takes the core chapters as a whole that Sun Yi-jang emended 古 to 今 in the first although not the second passage.

It is plain that while for H and J, “the practice of the sage kings” has the double authority of wisdom and of antiquity, for Y it has only the authority of wisdom, and antiquity as such carries no weight. Y does assume like the others that the problems of government are unchanging (an assumption not questioned until the 3rd century B.C., in *Chuang-tzu*, *Han Fei tzu* and the Mohist *Canons*), and therefore that solutions if correct will already have been known to the wisest men of the past. But for Y the sages’ guidance is to be sought only as one seeks the advice of wiser or more experienced contemporaries. The books which record their teaching are worth only as much as the wisdom they convey; like Mencius,¹¹ Y would no doubt reject a book which credits a sage with improper behaviour. Conversely, if one solves the problem independently there is no need of documents to prove that a sage would have advised the same. H, on the other hand, takes quite seriously the objection “How do you know that the former sage Six Kings personally did it?” (何知先聖六王之親行之也), and makes Mo-tzu answer that although he never met them himself it can be proved from three of the *Documents* and one of the *Songs* (ch. 16/49–63H).

J diverges from H in the opposite direction from Y, actually adopting the books of the former kings as the second of the three tests, in place of the evidence of common observation. He adds to the first test “the will of Heaven and the spirits” (天鬼之志). This implies access to the will of Heaven independent of the other tests, presumably through those “shamans and diviners” (巫卜) whom, as we learn from the military chapters (ch. 68/9, 70/99), the Mohist defence forces consulted when the enemy attacked a city. The inclusion of the witness of shamans among the recognised tests of knowledge would be intelligible as another of J’s accommodations to the shamanistic culture of Ch’u. As for the second test, when Y and H appeal to the common man’s observations, both are careful to reassure despisers of the common man by a further demonstration that kings and feudal lords have observed the same (ch. 31/43 H, 36/7–8 Y transposed). In the aristocratic and traditionalist society of the South the test appealing to the common

11. Mencius, 7B/3.

man might well prove to be a liability, making it advisable to replace it by the authority of ancient books.

The core chapters taken as a whole give the impression of a quite slavish dependence on antiquity. When the three strands are separated, the picture alters. Y, the most distinctively Mohist, does not appeal to antiquity at all. H, who is trying to win the ear of men of state who will not listen to newfangled ideas, proves by quotations that the ancient kings agreed with him, but perhaps only as a matter of expediency: he does not include appeal to their books among his three tests of knowledge. It is only J, spokesman for the deviant, not to say degenerate, Mohism of the South, who elevates the ancient books to scriptural authority.

This paper has ignored all questions of dating. To judge by the absence of verbal identity even in the closest parallels, the 3 documents did not borrow from each other. Of the branches of a common oral tradition which underlie them, the Southern written down as J is later than and deviant from the Northern stock the branches of which were written down as Y and H. But since the Mohists were in the South almost from the beginning, J as a document is not necessarily the latest. The Mohism of Y may be the pure doctrine diluted by H out of political expediency, but it may just as well be a pushing of Mohist principles to their logical conclusion by later extremists who have lost hope of winning political influence. As for tracing the lines of development and divergence in the oral tradition itself, that is beyond the scope of the present inquiry.

POSTSCRIPT

A very striking linguistic peculiarity of the J chapters was noticed only at proof stage, the use of *k'o erh* for *k'o yi*.

ch. 10	13	28	36/1-5 +35/10-18 +36/13-31	Others
可而 5	3		1	37/1
可以	1			Passim

Ch. 37/1 is plainly corrupt, probably contaminated from ch. 36/1; the two are quoted together on p. 10 above. In ch. 13/43 the clause with *k'o erh* has two subsequent parallels with *k'o erh*; no doubt a *k'o erh* has been corrected to the regular *k'o yi*, as has happened also in the other two cases in the *Cheng te* 正德 edition.

REFERENCES

References to pre-Han texts are to chapter and line in the editions of the *Harvard Yenching sinological index series* (abbreviation HY). For *Mo-tzu* this edition follows the text as emended by Sun Yi-jang 孫詒讓, *Mo-tzu chien-ku* 墨子閒詁 (*Mo-tzu chi-ch'eng* 墨子集成, edited Yen Ling-feng 嚴靈峯 Taipei 1975, abbreviation MTCC, v. 12-15); the variants in its footnotes are often the original readings. When quoting the unemended text I use the Tang Yao-ch'en 唐堯臣 edition of 1553, reproduced in the *Ssu-pu ts'ung-k'an* 四部叢刊 and in MTCC v. 2, and add a reference to chapter, page and line in brackets after the HY reference. Variants and emendations are quoted from Sun, from Pi Yüan 畢沅, *Mo-tzu* 墨子 (*Ssu-pu pei-yao* 四部備要 MTCC, v. 7, 8), and from Wu Yü-chiang 吳毓江, *Mo-tzu chiao-chu* 墨子校注 (MTCC, v. 43, 44), the last of which includes a full collation of variants.