BRILL

T'oung Pao 96 (2011) 299-369

通報
T'OUNG PAO
www.brill.nl/tpao

Were there "Inner Chapters" in the Warring States?

A New Examination of Evidence about the *Zhuangzi*

Esther Klein*
(University of Illinois at Chicago)

Abstract

This article questions the traditional beliefs that the seven "inner chapters" constitute the earliest stratum of the *Zhuangzi*, that they already formed a coherent unit in the Warring States, and that they came from a single hand. After reviewing what is known about the early history of the *Zhuangzi* text, various arguments that have been made in support of early, coherent inner chapters, are examined. Taking the *Shiji* portrait of the *Zhuangzi* as the starting point, it is shown that Sima Qian's description and use of the *Zhuangzi* already gives us reason to question the importance, or even existence, of the inner chapters in the Western Han. It is then shown that pre-Han and Han references to Zhuang Zhou, and parallels with the *Zhuangzi* text, do not necessarily even require (or support) the existence of most inner chapters, and certainly give no evidence that they were coherent and had any kind of canonical status. Though this does not constitute proof, it does give us reason to rethink the traditional beliefs about the authorship and structure of the early *Zhuangzi* text. In closing, the possibility of a Huainan *Zhuangzi*, and the role Liu An and his court might have played in the compilation of the inner chapters, is considered.

Résumé

Cet article met en question les conceptions traditionnelles suivant lesquelles les sept "chapitres intérieurs" constituent la strate la plus ancienne du *Zhuangzi*, formaient déjà un ensemble cohérent à l'époque des Royaumes Combattants, et étaient de la

* I would like to thank the participants in the Midwest Conference on East Asian Thought (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, April 2009) and in the China Before Print Workshop (University of Chicago, May 2009) for their helpful comments on early drafts of this study. I would also like to thank Jean François Billeter, Chris Fraser, and an anonymous reviewer for their thoughtful comments and suggestions.

DOI: 10.1163/156853210X546509

même main. Ce qu'on connaît de l'histoire ancienne du texte du *Zhuangzi* est passé en revue, puis sont examinés les divers arguments qui ont été avancés en faveur de l'ancienneté et de la cohérence des chapitres intérieurs. Partant du portrait du *Zhuangzi* dans le *Shiji*, il est démontré que déjà la description et l'usage du texte par Sima Qian nous invitent à nous poser des questions sur l'importance, voire l'existence, des chapitres intérieurs à l'époque des Han occidentaux. Puis il est constaté que les références à Zhuang Zhou sous les Han et avant, ainsi que les parallèles avec le texte du *Zhuangzi*, ne supposent pas nécessairement (ni ne confortent) l'existence de la plupart des chapitres intérieurs, et ne suggèrent certainement pas que ceux-ci formaient un ensemble cohérent et avaient un quelconque statut canonique. Si ces faits n'ont pas valeur de preuve, ils invitent à s'interroger sur les conceptions traditionnelles concernant l'auteur et la structure du texte primitif du *Zhuangzi*. En conclusion sont considérés la possibilité d'un *Zhuangzi* originaire de Huainan ainsi que le rôle qu'auraient pu jouer Liu An et sa cour dans la compilation des chapitres intérieurs.

Keywords

Zhuangzi, Sima Qian, *Shiji*, Warring States, *Huainanzi*

Introduction

Scholars view the *Zhuangzi* 莊子 as being essentially a Warring States (476-221 BCE) period text, though there is debate over whether it might have been formally compiled only in the Western Han dynasty (202 BCE-9 CE). The prevailing view is that the first seven "inner chapters" (*neipian* 內篇) of the *Zhuangzi* were all written by a person named Zhuang Zhou 莊周, who lived during the Warring States period.[1] These seven chapters are seen as the "core *Zhuangzi*," the earliest and most representative of Master Zhuang's (Zhuangzi) own thought and an important cornerstone of Warring States philosophical Daoism. The other parts of the *Zhuangzi*, the "outer chapters" (*waipian* 外篇) and "miscellaneous chapters" (*zapian* 雜篇), are now considered to have been written by followers of the "school of Zhuangzi," or to represent incursions by other schools of thought. Efforts have been

[1] Zhuang Zhou is conventionally dated to the 4th century BCE based on the *Shiji* 史記 (hereafter *SJ*), the only extant text which even attempts a biographical account of him; *Shiji* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1962) 63.2143. There, he is said to have been a contemporary of King Hui of Liang 梁惠王 (r. 369-319 BCE) and King Xuan of Qi 齊宣王 (r. 320-301 BCE).

made to classify or categorize these chapters philosophically,[2] but such projects are hindered by the lack of information about the late Warring States philosophical milieu.

I argue against this entire picture of the pre-Han *Zhuangzi* text. First I review the textual history of the *Zhuangzi*, insofar as it is known. I will examine some of the strategies scholars have employed in arguing that the inner chapters were either written by the historical Zhuang Zhou, or at least were the earliest stratum of the text; I suggest some potential methodological problems with these arguments. In the remainder of the paper, I reanalyze the available evidence by using a different set of starting assumptions. I will draw on various sources, including Sima Qian's 司馬遷 (b. 145 BCE) Western Han dynasty portrait of Zhuang Zhou and the text associated with him, as well as pre-Han and early Han *Zhuangzi* parallels and citations.

Ultimately, I will make three main points. First, the "core *Zhuangzi*" in Sima Qian's time and before did not include the seven inner chapters: either they were not a significant unit distinct from other proto-*Zhuangzi* materials, or they did not exist in their received form.

Second, there may be a "core *Zhuangzi*," suggested (albeit tentatively) by citation patterns and excavated texts. Regardless of who actually composed this set of texts, the *impression* they give of their author as a person and a thinker dovetails far more closely with Sima Qian's characterization of Zhuang Zhou than with the Zhuang Zhou of the "inner chapters" that philosophers know and love.

Third, I will close with a few suggestions about the implications of my argument for our picture of the *Zhuangzi* text's compilation and early textual history.

The Received Zhuangzi

The *Zhuangzi* text we have today is already very different from the text that existed (or took shape) in the Han. The received *Zhuangzi* contains

---

2) See, for example, A.C. Graham, "How Much of the *Chuang Tzu* did Chuang Tzu Write?" in Graham, *Studies in Chinese Philosophy and Philosophical Literature* (Singapore: Institute of East Asian Philosophies, National Univ. of Singapore, 1986), 283-321; and Harold D. Roth, "Who Compiled the Chuang Tzu?" in *Chinese Texts and Philosophical Contexts: Essays Dedicated to A.C. Graham*, ed. Henry J. Rosement, Jr. (La Salle: Open Court, 1991), 79-128.

thirty-three chapters and, as noted above, is divided into three parts: seven inner chapters, fifteen outer chapters, and eleven miscellaneous chapters. These chapters vary widely in length, content, and style.

It is generally accepted that this version of the *Zhuangzi* descends from a version edited and annotated by Guo Xiang 郭象 (252-312).[3] The "Introduction" (*Xulu* 序錄) of the *Jingdian shiwen* 經典釋文 preserves valuable information about the *Zhuangzi* as Lu Deming 陸德明 (556-627) knew it. Lu lists there the various commentary editions of the *Zhuangzi* that he was aware of.

Table 1: Zhuangzi Commentaries Listed in the Jingdian shiwen[4]

Text	**Commentator**	***Juan*** 卷	***Pian*** 篇	**Inner**	**Outer**	**Misc.**
Commentary 注	Cui Zhuan 崔譔	10	27	7	20	0
Commentary 注	Xiang Xiu 向秀	20	26	-	-	0
Commentary 注	Sima Biao 司馬彪	21	52	7	28	14
Commentary 注	Guo Xiang 郭象	33	33	7	15	11
Collected explanations 集解	Li Yi 李頤	30	30	-	-	-
Commentary 注	Master Meng 孟氏	18	52	-	-	-

3) For a colorful though probably apocryphal account of the origins of Guo Xiang's commentary, see *Shishuo xinyu* 世說新語 (hereafter *SSXY*) (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1982), "Wenxue" 文學, 4.206-7, and the translation in Richard B. Mather, *Shih-shuo Hsin-yu: A New Account of Tales of the World*, 2nd ed. (Ann Arbor: Center for Chinese Studies, Univ. of Michigan, 2002), 105-7. Livia Knaul [Köhn] has discussed Guo Xiang's work on the *Zhuangzi* in "Lost Chuang-tzu Passages," *Journal of Chinese Religions* 10 (1982): 53-79; and "Kuo Hsiang and the Chuang Tzu," *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 12 (1985): 429-47. For recent work on Guo Xiang, see Brook Ziporyn, *The Penumbra Unbound* (Albany: State Univ. of New York Press, 2003). Wang Shumin 王叔岷 has argued that the received text differs considerably even from Guo Xiang's version; see the preface to his *Zhuangzi jiaoshi* 莊子校釋 (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1947), 1, and my discussion below. See also Liao Mingchun 廖名春, "*Zhuangzi* 'Dao Zhi' pian tanyuan" 《莊子·盜跖》篇探源 in *Wenshi* 文史 45 (1998): 49-59, regarding structural corruption in what is now *Zhuangzi* chapter 29 ("Robber Zhi" 盜跖).

4) Based on *Jingdian shiwen* (hereafter *JDSW*) (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1985), "Xulu," 67. If the number of chapters in a section is unspecified, I have used a hyphen. If it seems clear from Lu Deming's description that the commentator did not have that section, I have used a zero instead. The distinction strikes me as potentially significant, or at least worth preserving. Cf. a similar table in Knaul "Lost Chuang-tzu Passages," 54. That chart assumes the identity of potentially distinct versions, however, so I have produced my own.

Both Sima Biao and Master Meng were said to be commenting on a 52-*pian* base-text. Regarding these, Lu Deming wrote that "the *Hanshu* 'Bibliographic Treatise' [has a] *Zhuangzi* in 52 *pian*, and it is this upon which Sima Biao and Master Meng made commentaries" (漢書藝文志莊子五十二篇, 即司馬彪、孟氏所注是也).[5] The *Hanshu* does indeed cite a 52-chapter *Zhuangzi* text, attributed to Zhuang Zhou of Song, though without giving further details about the text's internal structure.[6]

Lu Deming himself expressed a preference for Guo Xiang's abridgement. Though scholars often credit Su Shi 蘇軾 (1036-1101) with being first to notice that parts of the *Zhuangzi* did not appear to be the work of Zhuang Zhou,[7] Lu Deming too should probably be understood as expressing a similar suspicion:

> Master Zhuang was universally renowned for his magnificent talent; his words were flowery and his meaning profound. The words he meant as true seemed to say the opposite, and thus no one was able to convey their great import. Later people added superfluous appendages, gradually losing the true [nature of the original text].
> 莊生宏才命世, 辭趣華深, 正言若反, 故莫能暢其弘致, 後人增足, 漸失其真。[8]

This description is part of what has led later scholars to form the currently accepted picture of the *Zhuangzi* text: a pure central 'true' (*zhen* 真) part, weighed down by superfluous and even damaging accretions from later people.

Lu Deming then goes on to quote from Guo Xiang's own preface,[9] where Guo described Zhuangzi as "an eccentric genius who rushed crazily into peculiar theories" (一曲之才, 妄竄奇說). Lu complained

---

5) *JDSW* "Xulu," 66.
6) *Hanshu* 漢書 (hereafter *HS*) (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1962) 30.1730.
7) See "Zhuangzi citang ji" 莊子祠堂記, in *Su Shi wenji* 蘇軾文集 (hereafter *SSWJ*) (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2004) 11.347.
8) *JDSW* "Xulu," 66.
9) This text was otherwise lost until a version of it surfaced in Japan, at Kōzanji temple in Kyoto. For debate regarding the authenticity of this passage, see, for example, Wang Liqi 王利器, "Zhuangzi Guo Xiang xu de zhenwei wenti" 莊子郭象序的真偽問題, *Zhexue yanjiu* 1979.9: 53-56; and Yu Dunkang 余敦康, "Guanyu Zhuangzi Guo Xiang xu de zhenwei wenti yu Wang Liqi xiansheng shangque" 關於莊子郭象序的真偽問題與王利器先生商榷, *Zhexue yanjiu* 1979.1: 73-76.

of the *Zhuangzi* that "in total, the various sophistic and hybrid [passages] make up three parts in ten" (凡諸巧雜, 十分有三).[10] There is a clear difference between Lu Deming's and Guo Xiang's respective explanations of the "unacceptable" passages: Lu considered them to be additions by unspecified "later people," while Guo seemed to assign full responsibility to Zhuangzi's eccentric genius.

A further comment[11] describes the offending passages: "Many of the words are distorted and fantastic, some resembling the *Classic of Mountains and Seas*, while others are like the texts of dream-diviners" (言多詭誕, 或似山海經, 或類占夢書). The Japanese edition of Guo Xiang's preface continues, "Some come from Liu An's court, others debate forms and names" (或出淮南, 或辯形名).[12] Lu Deming then sums up Guo Xiang's abridgement strategy: "Thus the commentator included or excluded [things] based on the underlying meaning" (故注者以意去取). This last statement is important: when juxtaposed with the statement above, that the "true" nature of the text had been lost, it implies that the abridgement made by Guo Xiang reflects interpretive and philosophical judgements—but *not* an accepted tradition regarding the authenticity of the different parts of the text.

Lu Deming thought that Guo Xiang was using the criterion of "meaning" to strip away later accretions from the true *Zhuangzi* text, but it is not wholly clear what Guo Xiang himself thought he was doing. On the one hand, he seemed to see his role as "taming" and simplifying Zhuang Zhou's thought.[13] But on the other hand, depending on how we understand the statement that "some [passages] *come from* Liu An's court" [emphasis added], perhaps he too was trying to strip away what appeared to be later accretions.

---

10) *JDSW* "Xulu," 66.

11) *JDSW* editions often punctuate the following passage as being by Lu Deming, but in the Japanese edition it actually appears as part of Guo's preface.

12) Cited in Wang Liqi, "Zhuangzi Guo Xiang," 55; for a full translation, see Knaul, "Lost Chuang-tzu Passages," 54-55. *Contra* Wang and Knaul, I do not consider the mention of Huainan 淮南 in the above passage to be a reference to the *Huainanzi* text, but rather to the lost Liu An chapters cited by Li Shan 李善 (see discussion below). I have taken the liberty of translating Huainan as "Liu An's court" because this is obviously the intended referent—not simply the geographical area. For a discussion of the difficult term *xingming*, which probably referred to the comparison of names and actualities, see Herlee Glessner Creel, "The Meaning of 刑名 Hsing-ming," in Creel, *What is Taoism? And Other Studies in Chinese Cultural History* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1982), 79-91.

13) Again, based on the Kōzanji version of the lost preface.

Given the heterogeneity of even the received *Zhuangzi*, it is interesting to imagine the text before Guo Xiang's abridgement. Lu Deming, who seems to have had access to both the full and abridged versions, not only expressed a clear preference for Guo Xiang's version but also implied that his contemporaries shared that evaluation: "Only that [text] which has the commentary of Zixuan [=Guo Xiang] especially accords with Master Zhuang's aims; thus it is highly valued by everyone" (唯子玄所注特會莊生之旨, 故為世所貴).[14]

Clearly, the 52-*pian Zhuangzi* was a big, difficult, heterogeneous text in dire need of abridgement. The abridgement, carried out by Guo Xiang and probably inherited by almost all subsequent readers, was based on a particular vision of "Zhuangzi's aim." But where did this vision, this *idea* of Zhuangzi, come from? There would seem to be no source other than that same big, difficult, heterogeneous *Zhuangzi* text itself, together with such traditional interpretations as had accreted by the time of Guo Xiang. The circularity should be obvious: what the text tells us about "Zhuangzi's thought" is already heavily influenced—even determined—by the thought of Guo Xiang and the readers who preceded him.

Defending the Inner Chapters

Against the gloom that accompanies the everpresent awareness of textual loss, there is, in the story of the *Zhuangzi* text told heretofore, a single beacon of hope: the inner chapters. No matter how mixed and mutilated the rest of the text, scholars can console themselves by thinking that at least the precious inner chapters survived intact. For example, A.C. Graham's understanding of the text was that it "is a collection of writings of the fourth, third, and second centuries B.C., in which only the inner chapters can be confidently ascribed to Chuang-tzu himself."[15] Before arguing against this conventionally accepted belief, I will briefly review the methods by which scholars have attempted to defend it.

---

14) *JDSW* "Xulu," 66-67.

15) Graham, "How Much of the *Chuang Tzu* did Chuang Tzu Write?," 281.

Persistence of Internal Divisions

The very first piece of evidence unambiguously in favor of "intact" inner chapters also comes from Lu Deming. In Table 1 above, whenever Lu notes internal divisions at all (i.e., for the commentaries of Cui Zhuan, Sima Biao, and Guo Xiang), the number of inner chapters is always seven. Furthermore, Lu commented that "the inner chapters of numerous commentators are all the same; from what remains, some have the outer but not the miscellaneous" (其内篇衆家並同, 自餘或有外而無雜).[16] Lu also assured his readers that the Sima Biao/Master Meng version of the text was the same one as mentioned in the *Hanshu*. Lu Deming's identification of the Sima Biao commentary edition (which had seven inner chapters) with the *Hanshu* text would allow us to push the hypothesis of intact inner chapters all the way back to the early Eastern Han.[17]

To bridge the shorter but far more perilous gap between the Eastern Han and the fourth century BCE, a wide variety of evidence has been brought forth, as discussed below. However, I should first make a methodological observation regarding scholarship that defends Zhuang Zhou's authorship of the inner chapters: nearly every scholar who has worked on this problem begins with an underlying goal of proving that the inner chapters are the earliest part of the text. This is understandable, since received wisdom considers those chapters the best and most interesting part. For anyone working on ancient texts, it is a habit of mind to equate "older" with "better." Thus, the two come apart only rarely and with difficulty. But a work of genius can arise in almost any time, almost any social context. Though as part of their development, early Chinese texts often became attached to authors' names, they did not necessarily become attached to the correct names.[18]

---

16) *JDSW* "Xulu," 66.

17) Not everyone remains on board with the inner chapters even this far: Wang Shumin provides a slew of examples to support his hypothesis that Guo Xiang meddled severely with the inner chapters. See Wang's "Author's Preface" 自序 to his *Zhuangzi jiaoshi*, 1-4. His arguments are well worthy of consideration, but since I am concerned with an earlier period, I will not discuss them in detail.

18) The text often called the *Laozi* 老子 seems a good example. Several versions of the *Daodejing* have been excavated, but assigning that text's authorship to the shadowy figure of Lao Dan is clearly a later, retrospective development. For an introductory discussion, see William G. Boltz, "Lao-tzu Tao te ching," in *Early Chinese Texts: A Bibliographical*

Author and Author-Function

I now mention an early argument for Zhuang Zhou's authorship of the inner chapters, one that may seem silly to the modern eye. In Jiao Hong's 焦竑 (1540-1620) formulation: "Certainly no one but Master Zhuang could have created the inner chapters" (內篇斷非莊生不能作).[19] On its surface, the argument is completely circular. As observed above, almost everything we know about Master Zhuang comes from the *Zhuangzi* text,[20] nor is our current knowledge of early China detailed enough to rule out the existence of some other writer talented enough to produce such a text.

In another sense, however, Jiao Hong's remark can be read more profoundly and sympathetically as a definition of identity. Apart from the *Zhuangzi* text, and especially its inner chapters, Master Zhuang has almost no existence as an independent historical figure. He is *defined* by his authorship of the *Zhuangzi* text (or at least its perceived core, the inner chapters). To use the terminology of literary criticism, he is purely an author-function. In making the distinction between author and author-function, Michel Foucault wrote:

> This 'author-function' … is not formed spontaneously through the simple attribution of a discourse to an individual. It results from a complex operation whose purpose is to construct the rational entity we call an author …We speak of an individual's 'profundity' or 'creative' power, his intentions or the original inspiration manifested in writing. Nevertheless, these aspects of an individual, whom we designate as an author (or which comprise an individual as an author), are projections, in terms always more or less psychological, of our way of handling texts.[21]

Guide, ed. Michael Loewe (Berkeley: Society for the Study of Early China and Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 1993), 269-70.

19) *Jiaoshi bisheng* 焦氏筆乘 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2008) 2.56. Cited in Ren Jiyu 任繼愈, "Zhuangzi tanyuan—cong weiwu zhuyi de Zhuang Zhou dao weixin zhuyi de houqi Zhuang xue" 莊子探源——從唯物主義的莊周到唯心主義的後期莊學, *Zhexue yanjiu* 1961.2: 57.

20) The two exceptions are brief characterizations found in the *Xunzi* (Li Disheng 李滌生, *Xunzi jishi* 荀子集釋 [Taipei: Xuesheng shuju, 1981]) 21.478 and *SJ* 63.2143, discussed in detail below. Still, there is no evidence that either of these had any other source than some version of the *Zhuangzi* text.

21) "What is An Author?" in *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1977), 124.

In the perception of the vast majority of readers, whoever authored the core *Zhuangzi* text *was* Master Zhuang. His authorship is the single most important aspect of his biography; almost any other single fact about him could be proven false without damaging our fundamental sense of who he was.

The attitude revealed in Jiao Hong's remark, and tacitly shared by most *Zhuangzi* scholars, makes it difficult if not impossible to argue that Master Zhuang did not write the inner chapters of the *Zhuangzi*. In a moment of unwitting psychological revelation, A.C. Graham mentioned Fu Sinian's 傅斯年 (1896-1950) suggestion that the second chapter of the *Zhuangzi* ("Discussion on Making Things Equal" 齊物論) might have been written by Shen Dao 慎到 (ca. 390-315 BCE). Graham called this "a proposal as unsettling as it would be to credit Bacon with *Hamlet* while leaving the rest of the plays to Shakespeare."[22] There is no denying that the inner chapters have taken on a canonical status. They represent what is perceived as best in the *Zhuangzi*, just as, say, *Hamlet*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *King Lear*, and *Othello* represent what is best about Shakespeare's tragedies. To propose that Shakespeare did not write these but did write *Titus Andronicus* and *Timon of Athens* would profoundly destabilize what we even mean by "Shakespeare." The inner chapters (far less controversially than any arbitrary selection of Shakespeare plays) are seen as the essence and epitome of the *Zhuangzi*, considered to lack the obvious flaws and incoherencies that mar many of the other chapters. If Master Zhuang by definition wrote at least some part of the *Zhuangzi*, then, the argument goes, it would surely have to be the inner chapters.

Of course, the creation of an author-function is a nearly inevitable consequence of "our way of handling texts" (where "our" may be expanded to include traditional Chinese readers as well as modern Western ones). This is not necessarily problematic, especially if we acknowledge what we are doing, and accept that author-function and writer (a historical person) may well be non-identical. It does become problematic, however, in the case of the *Zhuangzi* because of the central importance that text has for our understanding of Warring States philosophy. Above, I wrote that there was *almost* no other aspect of

22) "How Much of the *Chuang Tzu* did Chuang Tzu Write?," 283.

Zhuang Zhou's biography as important to us as his authorship of the *Zhuangzi*. But what if the author of the "core *Zhuangzi*" was not a man of the Warring States? Or to put it more carefully, what if no single Warring States figure corresponds to the author-function produced by a reading of the core *Zhuangzi*? The consequences for Warring States intellectual history could be considerable.

In short, I argue that we should strive to separate three different things we might mean by "Zhuang Zhou," meanings that have often been conflated: the historical figure from the Warring States period, the character in the *Zhuangzi*, and the author/originator of the philosophy found in the *Zhuangzi* inner chapters. The existence of a historical Zhuang Zhou is tenuous. The nature of the character Zhuang Zhou is whimsical and clearly leavened with a good deal of fiction. As for the third, Zhuang Zhou the author and philosopher (if a single person answering that description ever existed), solid evidence to connect him to either of the others is hard to come by.

Coherent and Representative

One common argument for the hypothesis that the inner chapters at least represent the earliest or original stratum of the *Zhuangzi* text (and that the non-inner chapters postdate them) rests on their purported coherence. A.C. Graham wrote, "This series [i.e., the first seven chapters] is homogeneous in thought and style and generally recognized as substantially the work of Chuang-tzu himself."[23] Roth adds that the inner chapters "contain all the major themes for which the *Chuang Tzu* has been renowned."[24] Liu Xiaogan attempts a systematic argument based on the interrelatedness of the inner chapters, identifying pairs of passages with similar wording or content. He concludes that, for the inner chapters, "there are 26 pairs (or groups), average[ing]

---

[23] A.C. Graham, *Chuang-tzu: The Inner Chapters* (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2001), 27. Obviously, this is not actually an argument. Liu Xiaogan complained, with justification, that "the question of whether we should take the Inner chapters as Zhuangzi's own work never bothered Graham at all; he simply adopted the traditional view through Guan Feng's work without any further discussion" (*Classifying the Zhuangzi Chapters*, trans. William E. Savage [Ann Arbor: Center for Chinese Studies, Univ. of Michigan, 1994], "Afterword," 160).

[24] "Who Compiled the Chuang Tzu?," 80.

approximately 3.7 pairs per chapter [while] among the Outer and Miscellaneous chapters, the most mutual relations only average 2.3 pairs per chapter."[25]

Even if we agree that the inner chapters are stylistically and philosophically coherent and representative of the work as a whole,[26] it does not follow that Zhuang Zhou wrote them. It is true that part of a compilation can become coherent and representative because it was first written by a single person, and then served as the inspiration for the rest of the text. Yet it is equally possible that the most coherent and representative part of a compilation can be produced by an editor who had access to the entire work and selected from it (and/or was inspired by it to create) a coherent and representative subset. If, as I argue, the proto-*Zhuangzi* materials were an incoherent mélange of multiply-authored texts, a hypothetical editor could have chosen strands of thought he wished to emphasize, while still preserving the rest due to a conservative (or syncretic) instinct.

Furthermore, the argument that the inner chapters are the *most* coherent (or representative) subset of the *Zhuangzi* may well result from a status quo bias. Suppose a skillful reader unfamiliar with the received *Zhuangzi* were presented with an undifferentiated mass of *Zhuangzi* materials in random order and asked to construct a coherent (or representative) subset roughly the size of the inner chapters. It is likely that this person would come up with a selection of texts that differed strikingly from the present inner chapters.

---

25) Liu Xiaogan, *Classifying the Zhuangzi Chapters*, 25-38.

26) It should be noted that a number of scholars disagree with these characterizations. See, e.g., Wang Shumin, *Zhuangzi jiaoshi*, "Zixu," and Lee H. Yearley, "The Perfected Person in the Radical Chuang-tzu" (*Experimental Essays on Chuang-tzu*, ed. Victor H. Mair, Honolulu: Univ. of Hawaii Press, 1983), 125-39. The latter sidesteps questions of authorship by preferring to "talk of tendencies or motifs or strands in the *Chuang-tzu*," 125. Another interesting argument against stylistic coherence has been put forth by Wang Baoxuan 王葆玹 (*Lao Zhuang xue xintan* 老莊學新探 [Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2002]) and expanded by François Billeter, namely, that the dialogue form precedes the essay in the development of philosophical writing, and that therefore the dialogic parts of the *Zhuangzi* should be seen as the earlier ones. While I have some reservations about the premise, the conclusion at which Billeter arrives with regard to how one should view the inner chapters is quite compatible with my own, namely, "le premier *Tchouang-tseu* est l'œuvre de Tchouang-tseu *et d'autres auteurs anonymes* dont le génie était proche du sien, qui partageaient sa vision des choses et se sont exprimés dans la même veine que lui," in his *Études sur Tchouang-tseu* (Paris: Éditions Allia, 2008), 260-61.

Terminological Differences

A tool frequently employed to analyze *Zhuangzi* authorship is "linguistic evidence": the differential use, in various groups of chapters, of terms ranging from single-character grammatical particles to more meaningful philosophical concepts.[27] A seemingly clear example is Liu Xiaogan's discussion of the three compound terms *daode* 道德, *xingming* 性命, and *jingshen* 精神. These terms never appear in the inner chapters, but appear with varying frequency in half of the other chapters. Liu Xiaogan notes that they are rarely or never found before the supposed lifetime of Zhuang Zhou, but become common by the time of Xunzi 荀子 (ca. 335-ca. 238 BCE) and increase in frequency as time goes on.[28]

This style of reasoning initially seems justified because it depends only on the text itself. Yet given what is known about ancient Chinese editorial practices, it is difficult to accept these kinds of arguments as conclusive.[29] Beneath painstakingly collected usage data lurks the uncomfortable awareness that an ancient text like the *Zhuangzi* went through many hands between its compilation and our reading of it. Excavated texts with transmitted counterparts now show that there was considerable variation among versions of the same text. In dealing with changes on the level of word-choice, then, it is impossible to guarantee that today's *Zhuangzi* provides an accurate reflection of early manuscript versions.

To make matters worse, the process by which textual variation was introduced could easily have differentially affected inner and non-inner chapters: if after their compilation the inner chapters enjoyed canonical status in the eyes of commentators, their texts might have remained more stable than those of the other chapters. This could have been true

---

27) See, for example, Graham's "How Much of the *Chuang Tzu* did Chuang Tzu Write?," 284-96, 315-19; Roth's "Who Compiled the Chuang Tzu?," 96-98.

28) Liu Xiaogan, *Classifying the Zhuangzi*, 4-16.

29) Erik W. Maeder, based on observations about excavated texts, has usefully likened early Chinese texts to "the looseleaf ring binder into which miscellaneous material, including both class notes by different hands and documentary handouts, can be entered" ("Some Observations on the Composition of the 'Core Chapters' of the *Mozi*," *Early China* 17 [1992]: 28). For background on the materiality of early texts, see Tsuen-hsuin Tsien, *Written on Bamboo and Silk: The Beginnings of Chinese Books and Inscriptions*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2004), esp. 96-125.

no matter when the first *Zhuangzi* text to contain a differentiated inner chapters section was compiled, whether in Warring States, Qin, or even Han times. Furthermore, if we envision the inner chapters as a Han compilation employing pre-existing material, we cannot entirely rule out deliberate archaisms or attempts to select apparently archaic parts of the corpus for placement in the inner chapters. This still does not guarantee that *all* and *only* the inner chapters material represents the oldest stratum of the text.[30] Finally, even if some parts of the *Zhuangzi* (whether inner chapters or not) can be shown to be earliest in linguistic terms, this still does not guarantee that Zhuang Zhou wrote them.

It must also be noted that the interpretation of linguistic evidence is dramatically influenced by one's starting assumptions. In the case of the argument about specific terms, Liu Xiaogan has made at least two: first, that the author of the core *Zhuangzi* lived during the mid- (rather than late) Warring States;[31] and second, that the correct unit of analysis is sequences of chapters (rather than individual chapters or passages).[32] The first assumption arises from the authorial construction process I described above; the second assumption I discuss below and ultimately question. Without these assumptions, and in light of what we know about the materiality of ancient texts, the case does not seem nearly as clear-cut.

In conclusion, usage comparisons should not be ignored completely, but the evidence they provide is inconclusive and can only be used as auxiliary to other sets of data.

Zhuang Zhou as a Character

Liu Xiaogan has proposed a curious argument regarding the inner chapters. He has collected all the instances where Zhuang Zhou personally appears in the *Zhuangzi* text and found that when these

---

30) This same line of reasoning can also be used to call into question Liu Xiaogan's arguments about "burning and drowning" (Liu, *Classifying the Zhuangzi Chapters*, 16-18), namely, that in passages about burning and drowning, the inner chapters contain less explanation and are thus the *lectio brevior*, and perhaps even the *lectio difficilior*, and therefore earlier. While this may be suggestive, it too is not conclusive.

31) Liu, *Classifying the Zhuangzi Chapters*, 14.

32) Ibid., 15.

stories appear in the inner chapters (four times in three different chapters), they appear only at the end of a chapter. Meanwhile, when Zhuang Zhou stories appear in the outer or miscellaneous chapters, they may appear anywhere. Liu argues that the placement of these anecdotes within chapters is significant: "Generally speaking," he argues, "a student can only append records of a teacher's activities at the end of the teacher's essays. Only in the student's own work can he place them at the front or middle of the chapter."[33] Liu goes on to conclude:

> In the entire *Zhuangzi*, there are a total of 29 sections that are records directly mentioning Zhuangzi's activities. Excluding those few sections from the Inner chapters, such as Zhuangzi's dream of the butterfly, which are possibly Zhuangzi's own stories, generally they can all be seen as records of Zhuangzi's activities by his followers.[34]

This argument is interesting, but careful consideration quickly reveals a flaw: if the inner chapters anecdotes that feature Zhuang Zhou were tacked on later by his students, Zhuang Zhou cannot be the sole author of those chapters. Liu attempts to get out of this by suggesting that the butterfly-dream story and possibly others actually are Zhuang Zhou's own work after all. But to make this concession badly undermines the significance of the data, especially since the sample set is very small to begin with. If inner chapters stories about Zhuang Zhou could have been written by Zhuang Zhou himself, he could place them anywhere in the chapter he wanted. Furthermore, if Zhuang Zhou "possibly" wrote the third person Zhuang Zhou stories in the inner chapters, he could have written such stories in the other chapters as well.

Another possible explanation for the differential placement of Zhuang Zhou anecdotes in the inner chapters versus non-inner chapters could be related to editorial criteria. Texts such as the *Zuozhuan* and *Shiji* include explicit evaluations, often moralizing in nature, at the end of an anecdote. The *Zhuangzi* compilers and transmitters, who perhaps took more care with the inner chapters than with the others,

33) Ibid., 18.
34) Ibid.

could easily have tried to adapt their material to this style in certain instances. They might have used a story about Zhuang Zhou to stand in for an explicit evaluation, but the purpose—drawing some kind of lesson from the chapter as a whole—might well have been the same. Alternatively, given the small sample set, the distribution could be coincidental, or a product of later rearrangements like Guo Xiang's. In this context, it is important to consider the probable nature of textual production in the Warring States. As Mark Edward Lewis has written, current evidence suggests that "the notion of authorship was weak or absent" in Warring States philosophical texts.[35] The figure of the master, around whom an intellectual tradition would coalesce, was not an author figure. Instead, "the master was invented, or written as a character, in the text dedicated to him."[36] Although Lewis is here discussing texts like the *Lunyu* and *Mengzi*, the *Zhuangzi* too could very well have been produced in a similar way.

I do not claim to have conclusively refuted all the arguments above. For these arguments to be effective, however, they must give us compelling reasons to believe either that the inner chapters were written by the historical Zhuang Zhou or at least that these chapters as a distinct unit are the earliest stratum of the text. The above arguments do neither. Their apparent aggregate conclusiveness results from a systematic bias; as Chris Fraser has also pointed out, many defenses of the inner chapters rely on hidden premises that only seem likely if one assumes what one is trying to prove.[37] The approach I pursue below strips away these assumptions and replaces them with hypotheses that accord more closely with what we now know about early Chinese texts.

---

35) *Writing and Authority in Early China* (Albany: State Univ. of New York Press, 1999), 55. Erik W. Maeder makes a similar argument: noticing the relative freedom of *ce* 冊 ("bound sets of bamboo slips") to be rearranged, added, or subtracted within the longer *pian* 篇 ("bound roll of bamboo slips"), he writes, "As one pays more attention to the material condition of a text, some familiar devices for approaching it come to be seen as ill-adapted, if not plainly irrelevant to the task. One such device is the notion of authorship, which presupposes a form of continuity over time and a sense of closure as well" ("Some Observations," 28).

36) *Writing and Authority*, 58.

37) See Fraser's "Review of *Classifying the Zhuangzi Chapters*," *Asian Philosophy* 7.2 (1997): 155–59.

Two Premises

My methodology rests on two major premises. First, I do not consider the "chapter" (*pian* 篇) to be the most significant basic unit (at least for the *Zhuangzi*)—much less larger divisions such as "inner," "outer," and "miscellaneous." This is not to deny that some of the *Zhuangzi* existed in chapter form from early on. But there is good reason to believe that the chapter divisions of the early *Zhuangzi* text were not as strongly demarcated as is commonly assumed.

Consider Sima Qian's description of the *Lüshi chunqiu* 呂氏春秋: "Lü Buwei had his retainers all write down what they knew, and their collected discourses made up eight examinations, six discourses, and twelve almanacs: more than two hundred thousand words" (呂不韋乃使其客人人著所聞,集論以為八覽、六論、十二紀,二十餘萬言).[38] The *Shiji* self-description too is quite detailed: after giving a description of each chapter, and an overall explanation of each section,[39] Sima Qian's last summary description of the *Shiji* is that it contains "a total of 130 chapters, 526,500 characters" (凡百三十篇, 五十二萬六千五百字).[40] Compare these to the very brief description of the *Zhuangzi* text found in the *Shiji*: "[Zhuangzi] composed a text of more than 100,000 words, mostly in the category of 'imputed words'" (其著書十餘萬言, 大抵率寓言也).[41] Sima Qian goes on to mention a few chapters by name, but he gives no indication either of the total number of chapters or of larger internal divisions.

It is true that the *Zhuangzi* may have been a fundamentally different type of text from the *Lüshi chunqiu* and the *Shiji*. The latter two texts clearly had internal divisions from the outset, and these divisions were important to the larger project of both works. This, then, may be the reason Sima Qian chose to be specific in describing the internal structure of those works, but not of the *Zhuangzi*. Yet even so, the difference tells us something potentially significant: that, in contrast to the *Lüshi chunqiu* and the *Shiji*, the *Zhuangzi* belonged to a text-type in which

38) *SJ* 85.2510.
39) I.e., the five major internal divisions of the *Shiji*: the basic annals (*benji* 本紀), tables (*biao* 表), treatises (*shu* 書), hereditary households (*shijia* 世家), and arrayed traditions (*liezhuan* 列傳).
40) *SJ* 130.3319.
41) *SJ* 63.2143.

clear persistent internal divisions (countable chapters or larger subsections like inner and outer chapters) were probably *not* important to the text's project—and thus might well have been either absent or quite fluid.

Compare the way the *Zhuangzi* is described to descriptions of other Masters texts in the *Shiji*. Laozi 老子 is said to have "composed and written down an upper and a lower chapter discussing the ideas of *dao* and *de* in more than 5,000 characters" (著書上下篇, 言道德之意五千餘言).[42] Mengzi 孟子 "retired and with the disciples of Wan Zhang arranged the *Odes* and *Documents*, transmitted the ideas of Zhongni [=Confucius], and made the *Mengzi* in seven chapters" (退而與萬章之徒序詩書, 述仲尼之意, 作孟子七篇).[43] Shen Buhai 申不害 "composed and wrote down two chapters, which are known as the *Shenzi*" (著書二篇, 號曰申子).[44] Xunzi, who purportedly being a contemporary of Zhuang Zhou is a particularly interesting case, was merely said to have "ordered, arranged, and composed several tens of thousands of words, and then died" (序列著數萬言而卒).[45] The description of Han Fei's 韓非 production is actually the one closest in form to the description of the *Zhuangzi*: "[Han Fei] made 'Solitary Anger,' 'Five Vermin,' 'Inner and Outer Collections,' 'The Forest of Persuasions,' and the 'Difficulties of Persuasion,' more than a hundred thousand words" (故作孤憤、五蠹、內外儲、說林、說難十餘萬言).[46]

To summarize, we can tentatively conclude that Sima Qian portrayed the *Laozi*, *Mengzi*, and *Shenzi* 申子 texts as being fixed in size and chapter divisions. On the opposite extreme, he portrayed the *Xunzi* as being a large mass of undifferentiated text. The *Zhuangzi* and *Hanfeizi* 韓非子 fall somewhere in between. An approximate size is given, and a few chapters are singled out for particular mention, but the total number of chapters is not specified. There are many possible explanations for this pattern of evidence, but the simplest one is that Sima Qian gave what information he had. In the case of the *Zhuangzi*, this might mean that he only had access to the chapters he named (or that

42) *SJ* 63.2141.
43) *SJ* 74.2343.
44) *SJ* 63.2146.
45) *SJ* 74.2348.
46) *SJ* 63.2147.

those were the only named chapters), and perhaps that some of the material he had was not neatly divided into chapters. Certainly there is no evidence that his *Zhuangzi* had the kind of elaborate divisions and subdivisions that the *Lüshi chunqiu* and the *Shiji* are specified as having.

I propose therefore that the most appropriate textual unit to use in analyzing the *Zhuangzi* is not "inner/outer" or even whole chapters, but rather some subset of a chapter.[47] Of course, such divisions are not always easy to determine. For convenience, I employ the sub-chapter divisions (*jie* 節) used by Chen Guying 陳鼓應 in his modern commentary, *Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 莊子今注今譯.[48] In some cases, I would prefer even smaller divisions, but Chen's framework is nonetheless fine-grained enough to illustrate my point.

My second premise is that the most robust type of evidence is to be found in citations or textual parallels. Accordingly I will focus on a careful analysis of parallels between the *Zhuangzi* and other pre-Han and early Han texts, as well as on the evidence in excavated fragments of the *Zhuangzi*.

There are certain difficulties with this approach. One is, in the case of unattributed parallels, to determine whether a given passage is actually a citation from the proto-*Zhuangzi*, or whether both texts are citing a third. This problem can be slightly mitigated, but never wholly solved, by careful attention to context. Another complication is that, except in the case of excavated texts, the transmitted versions of the texts I consider (the *Xunzi*, *Hanfeizi*, *Lüshi chunqiu* etc.) also went through the hands of Han dynasty editors. Thus, they too might contain relatively late material. This question is of less concern to me, however, because such "later contamination" would be more likely to weigh unfairly *against* my hypothesis than to yield falsely positive results. At some point, the inner chapters did attain a somewhat canonical status, potentially tempting editors to project citations from them

47) Note that this is in complete contrast to Liu Xiaogan's methodological statement that because there is very little solid evidence regarding the compilation of the *Zhuangzi*, "we are only able to take the Inner chapters as one large block distinguished from the Outer and Miscellaneous chapters as another block and proceed with our study" (Liu, *Classifying the Zhuangzi Chapters*, 47).

48) (Hong Kong: Zhonghua shuju, 1994.) In the following, I use this edition ("*Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi*") as my base text.

into other texts. But there is almost no evidence even for this type of process.

Sima Qian's Zhuangzi

An awkward circumstance for defenders of the *Zhuangzi* inner chapters is that Sima Qian (who, as mentioned above, knew, or knew about, a *Zhuangzi* text in 100,000 characters) betrays no knowledge of them. Is this absence of evidence, or evidence of absence? To evaluate this question, I consider Sima Qian's portrait of the *Zhuangzi* from a broad perspective, examining the specific passages that discuss or employ the *Zhuangzi* text in light of what is known about the *Shiji* as a whole.

The Zhuang Zhou Biography

The *Shiji* biography of Zhuang Zhou is, as mentioned above, the only independent information we have about his life. After giving biographical details,[49] Sima Qian turns to Zhuang Zhou's thought:

> There was nothing that his learning did not probe into. However in its essentials and roots, it is traceable to the words of Laozi. The text [Zhuangzi] composed, in more than one hundred thousand words, is mostly in the category of 'imputed words.' He created the "Old Fisherman,"[50] "Robber Zhi,"[51] and "Rifling Trunks"[52] in order to defame and refute the disciples of Confucius, and to elucidate the arts of Laozi. Things like "Gengsangzi of Weilei Xu"[53] are all empty words, without

---

49) These seem to include the only evidence outside the *Zhuangzi* text that Zhuang Zhou was a contemporary of Mencius.

50) Chapter 31 in today's *Zhuangzi*.

51) Chapter 29. Liao Mingchun has argued, based on Guo Xiang's commentary, that Guo Xiang's version of "Robber Zhi" contained only the first section (*zhang* 章)—the confrontation between Robber Zhi and Confucius—and that the other two *zhang* of today's "Robber Zhi" chapter formed an independent chapter. Liao suggests that the chapters got merged either through material vicissitudes (loss of the title strip or section) or through sloppy editing. His argument is especially interesting given the problematic nature of the following chapter, the "Sword Persuasion" (ch. 30). See the discussion in Guan Feng 關鋒, "Zhuangzi waiza pian chutan" 莊子外雜篇初探, in *Zhuangzi zhexue taolun ji* 莊子哲學討論集, ed. Zhexue yanjiu bianjibu 哲學研究編輯部 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1962), 96-7.

52) Chapter 10.

53) This line is sometimes punctuated as 畏累虛、亢桑子: "'Weilei Xu' and 'Gengsangzi' (i.e., two different chapters). "Gengsangzi" probably corresponds to chapter 23 in the

> any matters of substance. However, he was skillful at composition and at crafting phrases. He could point to the category and disposition of matters. He used these [skills] to attack the Ru and Mo. Even the most erudite scholars of his time were unable to extricate themselves or escape [his critiques].
> 其學無所不闚，然其要本歸於老子之言。其著書十餘萬言，大抵率寓言也。作漁父、盜跖、胠篋，以詆訾孔子之徒，以明老子之術。畏累虛亢桑子之屬，皆空語無事實。然善屬書離辭，指事類情，用剽剝儒、墨，雖當世宿學不能自解免也。[54]

If we take *yan* 言 (words) to mean *zi* 字 (characters), then Sima Qian's *Zhuangzi* seems to have been larger than the one we have today (which is between 60,000 and 70,000 characters).[55] This is not surprising, given the fifty-two-chapter *Zhuangzi* that Ban Gu and Sima Biao had, subsequently cut down to thirty-three chapters by Guo Xiang. It is important to remember, though, that just because Sima Qian's text of "more than one hundred thousand words" seems about the right size to be Ban Gu's *Zhuangzi*, this does not guarantee that it was identical to the latter. In particular, there is no certainty that Sima Qian's hundred thousand words contained all of today's *Zhuangzi*—let alone all of Ban Gu's.

This passage suggests, as Liu Xiaogan has pointed out, that Sima Qian believed Zhuang Zhou to be responsible for *all* of the rather large *Zhuangzi* text he saw.[56] Of course, Sima Qian believed Confucius was responsible for all of the Classics[57] and had a fairly romanticized view of authorship in general.[58] Thus we need not accept his judgment on this point. It is worth noting however, for two reasons: first, because

---

Zhuangzi, now known as "Gengsang Chu" 亢桑楚. "Weilei Xu," however, is not a chapter name in today's *Zhuangzi*. The word *weilei*, written differently, appears in chapter 23 as the name of a region to which Laozi's disciple Gengsang Chu retired, so I think it best to understand the phrase as "Master Gengsang of Weilei" rather than as two distinct chapters.

54) *SJ* 63.2143.

55) Admittedly, round numbers of this sort cannot always be taken literally. Nonetheless, the accuracy of Sima Qian's estimates for the size of the *Lüshi chunqiu* (*SJ* 85.2510) and his own *Shiji* (*SJ* 130.3319) may give us at least some reason to believe that his estimate for the *Zhuangzi* was similarly careful.

56) *Classifying the Zhuangzi Chapters*, 25.

57) See Stephen W. Durrant, "Sima Qian, the Six Arts, and the *Spring and Autumn Annals*" in his *The Cloudy Mirror* (Albany: State Univ. of New York Press, 1995), 47-69.

58) Ibid, 1-27. By writing "traditions" (*zhuan* 傳) for the Warring States masters and foregrounding their authorial roles as well as his self-conscious description of his own

of the role Sima Qian's ascription surely played in shaping the traditional belief that Zhuang Zhou wrote (all of) the *Zhuangzi*; second, because of how this belief led Sima Qian to portray the Zhuangzi "author-function."

Sima Qian's overall pronouncement on Zhuang Zhou is that "there was nothing that his learning did not probe into." That is to say, Sima Qian's main characterization of the *Zhuangzi*'s thought is that it is exceedingly eclectic. This actually fits well with the plethora of improbable "schools" that modern scholarship has credited with the authorship of the non-inner chapters.[59] Sima Qian's reading of *Zhuangzi*, like our reading of the outer and miscellaneous chapters today, did not produce any overall impression of coherence.[60]

Though it is hard to make any definite statement regarding what Sima Qian's *Zhuangzi* did *not* contain, we can be reasonably confident that it *did* contain something like the four chapters he cites by name. A point of deep contention among scholars, then, is whether or not Sima Qian listed these chapters because he considered them representative of the *Zhuangzi* as a whole. Were these Sima Qian's 'core *Zhuangzi*'?

Ren Jiyu 任繼愈, one of the few scholars ever to have explicitly questioned Zhuang Zhou's authorship of the inner chapters,[61] believed that the chapters Sima Qian mentioned were, in fact, his core *Zhuangzi*. Ren wrote: "None of these several chapters, which Sima Qian listed as representative of Zhuang Zhou's work, are among the inner chapters, but rather belong to the outer chapters" (司馬遷列舉的這幾篇莊周的代表作都不屬於《莊子》內篇, 而屬於外篇).[62]

---

writing, Sima Qian certainly played a role in the development of a stronger notion of authorship than had existed in the Warring States.

59) For a discussion of this point, see Paul R. Goldin, "Review of *Chuang-tzŭ: The Inner Chapters*, translated by A.C. Graham, and *A Companion to Angus C. Graham's* Chuang-tzŭ: The Inner Chapters, edited by Harold D. Roth," *Early China* 28 (2003): 201-14, esp. 204-05.

60) Contrast this with Lu Deming, who characterizes the *Zhuangzi* as being "nothing more than free roaming, spontaneity, non-action, and making things equal" [逍遙自然無為齊物而已] (*JDSW*, "Xulu," 66), a description clearly based primarily on an inner chapters *Zhuangzi*.

61) One should perhaps also include Wang Baoxuan and Billeter: see n. 26 above.

62) Ren Jiyu, "Zhuangzi tanyuan," 57.

Zhang Dejun 張德鈞 objected that, given the context, Sima Qian was not trying to cite representative chapters, but rather those most critical of the disciples of Confucius,[63] "consciously reflecting the connections and conflicts among various schools of thought in his own time" (有意識地反映當時各種學派之間的聯結與鬥爭).[64] This interpretation has a certain appeal, especially since the three chapters in question are indeed to varying degrees critical of Confucian ideas.[65] However, it still leaves open the question of why Sima Qian would choose to emphasize this particular theme in the *Zhuangzi* text unless he considered it to be a representative one.

Guan Feng argued that "Sima Qian lived in a time when the Han Emperor Wu 'honored only Ru teachings, demoting and dismissing the hundred schools' and [Sima Qian] was greatly dissatisfied with the governance of the Han ruling house" (司馬遷生活在漢武帝獨尊儒述, 罷黜百家的時代, 他對漢室統治很不滿). This personal rancor, in Guan Feng's view, is what caused Sima Qian to draw special attention to any texts in which Confucius is made to look foolish or wrong.[66] Yet many parts of the *Shiji* reveal profound admiration for Confucius himself, though figures described as Ru 儒[67] receive a somewhat more ambivalent treatment.[68] Furthermore, despite the existence of Dong Zhongshu's 董仲舒 (ca. 179-ca. 104 BCE) famous memorial (which inspired Guan Feng's argument), there is reason to question whether the Ru were already "victorious" at the time Sima Qian was writing, or that Sima considered their role the most objectionable aspect of Emperor Wu's governance.[69] The issue of philosophical *dramatis personae*

---

63) Zhang Dejun, "Zhuangzi neipian shi Xi Han chu ren de zhuzuo ma?" 《莊子》內篇是西漢初人的著作嗎 in *Zhuangzi zhexue taolun ji*, 270.
64) Ibid., 272.
65) Chapter 29 ("Robber Zhi") and chapter 31 ("The Old Fisherman") both feature Confucius being lectured or criticized. Chapter 10 ("Rifling Trunks") does not directly criticize Confucius but develops the thesis that the great sage is a great thief, an idea certainly not sympathetic to anything we know about Confucian principles.
66) Guan Feng, "Zhuangzi waiza pian," 71.
67) Traditionally understood as "Confucians," though recent scholarship has questioned the appropriateness of this translation. See, for example, Michael Nylan, *The Five 'Confucian' Classics* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 2001), 3-5.
68) See Durrant, *The Cloudy Mirror*, chapters 1-3; Lewis, *Writing and Authority*, 218-40.
69) *HS* 56.2518-2524. For work questioning the "victory of Han Confucianism," see Nylan, "A Problematic Model: The Han Orthodox Synthesis Then and Now," in *Imagining Boundaries: Changing Confucian Doctrines, Texts, and Hermeneutics*, ed. Kai-wing Chow,

of the Western Han is too complex to treat here, but in short, nothing in Sima Qian's portrait of Zhuang Zhou suggests that the latter was his chosen champion in opposing followers of Confucius.

Guan Feng also noted that "the *Shiji* account of Zhuangzi's character does not fit the philosophy of the inner chapters" (史記…所敘莊子人格跟內篇不符).[70] Guan's main concern is a short anecdote about Zhuangzi which comes after the passage quoted above in the *Shiji* biography. However, the claim should also be evaluated in light of the *Shiji*'s initial characterization. The Zhuang Zhou who "attacked the Ru and Mo" appears as an analytical and aggressive disputer, quite the way one imagines the author of the more polemical outer and miscellaneous chapters to have been. The inner chapters, by contrast, seem more conciliatory toward Confucius;[71] insofar as this Zhuang Zhou has an opponent, it is Master Hui—and even there the tone is more friendly than ruthless or implacable.

Another place where Zhuang Zhou appears in a conciliatory guise is what is now the final chapter of the *Zhuangzi*, "The Realm" 天下 (ch. 33):

> [Zhuang Zhou] came and went alone with the pure spirit of Heaven and earth, yet he did not view the ten thousand things with arrogant eyes. He did not scold

---

On-cho Ng, and John B. Henderson (Albany: State Univ. of New York Press, 1999), 17-56. Sima Qian's views on the political and ideological complexity of relations among Emperor Wu's advisers can be guessed at from the "Treatise on the *Feng* and *Shan* Sacrifices" (*Shiji* ch. 28). The simplistic view that Sima Qian opposed the Ru has certainly been reinforced (and perhaps was even created) by Ban Gu's well-known assertion that Sima Qian "venerated the teachings of the Yellow Emperor and Laozi and slighted the Five Classics" [崇黃老而薄五經] (*HS* 62.2738). There is no reason to blindly accept Ban Gu's judgment on this point, however; see Klein, "History of a Historian: Perspectives on the Authorial Roles of Sima Qian" (Ph.D. diss. Princeton Univ., 2010), especially chapter 4.

70) Guan Feng, "Zhuangzi waiza pian," 71.

71) Graham, too, registers this intuition, writing that "the bitter mockery of Confucius in … 'Robber Chih' and 'The old fisherman', and the elaborate condescension with which Old Tan instructs him in the *Outer Chapters*, are quite foreign to [the inner chapters] Chuang-tzů, who never allows any of his characters to treat the Master disrespectfully to his face" (*Inner Chapters*, 17). John Makeham too states that "In the outer and mixed *pian*… Confucius is portrayed far less sympathetically" than in the inner chapters ("Between Chen and Cai: *Zhuangzi* and *Analects*," in *Wandering at Ease in the Zhuangzi*, ed. Roger T. Ames [Albany: State Univ. of New York Press, 1998], 75). From my own reading, I tentatively conclude that the Confucius of the inner chapters is for the most part either a figure of partial wisdom or a beneficiary of relatively gentle correction and remonstration.

> over 'right' and 'wrong,' but lived with the age and its vulgarity. Though his writings are a string of queer beads and baubles, they roll and rattle and do no one any harm.
> 獨與天地精神往來而不敖倪於萬物，不譴是非，以與世俗處。其書雖饒瑋而連狁无傷也。[72]

Chapter 33 of the *Zhuangzi* is almost universally accepted as one of the latest parts of the text, probably dating from the early Western Han. In it we find a relatively harmless, *tamed* Zhuangzi—in fact, one who has more in common with the dreamer of the "butterfly dream" than with the author of "Robber Zhi." The similarity between the description of Zhuang Zhou in chapter 33 and the sense of him we get from the inner chapters could be taken as evidence that only the inner chapters are a reliable record of the "real" Zhuang Zhou. Yet this would amount to employing a double standard. Readers troubled by the *Shiji*'s portrait of Zhuang Zhou suggested that Sima Qian emphasized a certain aspect of Zhuang's character because he was motivated by circumstances in his own life. Yet why accept this, while taking the author of "The Realm" at face value, simply because of the latter's anonymity? Whoever wrote "The Realm" was surely also biased by his own interests. Most of these are difficult to recover, but one is clear enough: the author of "The Realm" wanted to create a place for Zhuang Zhou in an intellectual genealogy, which in its somewhat mystical profundity serves as a corrective both to classicists and "logicians" of Hui Shi's type; it certainly reads like an attempt to market the *Zhuangzi* to a wider audience.[73]

I should note that A.C. Graham's characterization of the Zhuangzian voice in the inner chapters (versus that of the non-inner chapters) is completely opposite to mine. Graham argued:

---

72) *Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 33.884, trans. Burton Watson, *The Complete Works of Chuang Tzu* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1968), 373.

73) As Wiebke Denecke writes, "The last chapter of the *Zhuangzi* not only grants amnesty to the masters, but tries to integrate them into a catholic vision of the cosmos" ("'Mastering' Chinese Philosophy: A History of the Genre of 'Masters Literature' [*zhuzi baijia*] from the Analects to the Han Feizi.," [Ph.D. diss. Harvard Univ., 2004], 127). She adds that "the text goes beyond sectarian debate precisely by integrating its own master, the Zhuangzi, into the ranks of the other masters" (135).

> Something has changed—moderated—when one passes from the *Inner* to the *Outer chapters* … The bolder, more outrageous side of Chuang-tzu has disappeared—the cripples, freaks and mutilated criminals, the ravings of Chieh Yü the madman of Ch'u, the extravagant praise of uselessness, the identification of waking and dream … So has the intellectual dimension of Chuang-tzu, the side of him which delights in playing with and challenging reason.[74]

It is difficult to see why "cripples" and "freaks" would constitute a more outrageous type of subject matter in the world of early China. Might it not be equally possible that such characters were a way of defusing or disguising the potency of the arguments, making the words appear more like "a string of queer baubles"? Similarly, the philosophical sophistication of the inner chapters *Zhuangzi* seems no guarantee of an early date, and might even militate against one. Perhaps a person would even have to 'think through' the rest of the *Zhuangzi* before arriving at the intellectual territory of certain of the inner chapters.

Another important aspect of Sima Qian's Zhuang Zhou is that he is explicitly connected with Laozi. The short biography of Zhuang Zhou is found in a *Shiji* chapter whose title does not even mention him. The "Arrayed Traditions of Laozi and Han Fei" (老子韓非列傳 [*SJ* 63]) includes Laozi, Zhuang Zhou, Shen Buhai, and Han Fei. The categorization has troubled scholars for centuries, and I will not reproduce the debate here, but merely emphasize the degree to which the elusive figure of Laozi completely overshadows Zhuangzi in Sima Qian's treatment. In the chapter 63 evaluation, Sima Qian wrote of its subjects: "They all trace their origins to the ideas of the *dao* and *de*,[75] but Laozi is the most profound and far-reaching" (皆原於道德之意, 而老子深遠矣).[76] The view of Zhuang Zhou suggested by an overall reading of the chapter is that Sima Qian did not see him as a singular literary and philosophical genius, but as just one of several intellectual successors to Laozi, none of whom measure up well. Again, though it is not a conclusive argument, this "minor" Zhuangzi does not seem like the innovative and marvelously subtle thinker of the inner chapters.

The third aspect of Zhuang Zhou upon which Sima Qian places particular emphasis is his refusal to take office. The *Shiji* account

---

74) Graham, *Inner Chapters*, 116.
75) "The Way" and "virtue/power"—or, alternately, the *Daode[jing]* 道德[經] text.
76) *SJ* 63.2156.

characterizes Zhuangzi as someone whose "words knew no bounds; he let loose just so as to suit himself. Thus no king, duke, or great man could ever make use of him" (其言洸洋, 自恣以適己, 故自王公大人不能器之). There follows a short anecdote, a conflation of two stories that now appear in *Zhuangzi* chapters 17 and 32.

> King Wei of Chu heard that Zhuang Zhou was a worthy. He sent an emissary with generous emolument to meet him and promise to make him prime minister.[77] Zhuang Zhou smiled and said to the Chu emissary: "...Have you not seen the ox for the suburban sacrifice? He is nourished and fed for several years, decked out in embroidery and trimmings, and brought into the great temple. By that point, though he might want to go back to being the lonely creature he had been, how could he do so?[78] ...I insist that you depart, sir, and cease polluting me. I would rather wander and play in a muddy pond and enjoy myself. I will not be bridled by those who possess states. I will fulfill my intention, never to serve in any office until the end of my days."[79]
>
> 楚威王聞莊周賢，使使厚幣迎之，許以為相。莊周笑謂楚使者曰：子獨不見郊祭之犧牛乎？養食之數歲，衣以文繡，以入大廟。當是之時，雖欲為孤豚，豈可得乎？…子亟去，無污我。我寧游戲污瀆之中自快，無為有國者所羈，終身不仕，以快吾志焉。[80]

---

77) Cf. *Zhuangzi*, "Autumn Floods" 秋水 (ch. 17): "Once, when Zhuangzi was fishing in the Pu River, *the king of Chu* sent two officials to go and announce to him: "I would like to trouble you with the administration of my realm!" (莊子釣於濮水, 楚王使大夫二人往先焉, 曰：願以境內累矣！); *Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 17.441, trans. Watson, *Complete Chuang Tzu*, 187-88.

78) This is very closely parallel to a different anecdote of the same type, this one in the *Zhuangzi*, "Lie Yukou" 列禦寇 (ch. 32): "Zhuangzi replied to the messenger in these words: 'Have you ever seen a sacrificial ox? They deck him out in embroidery and trimmings, gorge him on grass and beanstalks. But when at last they lead him off into the great ancestral temple, then, although he might wish he could become a lonely calf once more, is it possible?'" (莊子應其使曰：子見夫犧牛乎？衣以文繡, 食以芻叔, 及其牽而入於大廟, 雖欲為孤犢, 其可得乎！); *Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 32.850, trans. Watson, *Complete Chuang Tzu*, 360-61.

79) Cf. *Zhuangzi*, "Autumn Floods": "...Would this tortoise rather be dead and have its bones left behind and honored? Or would it rather be alive and dragging its tail in the mud? ... Go away! I'll drag my tail in the mud" (此龜者, 寧其死為留骨而貴乎？寧其生而曳尾於塗中乎？ ...往矣！吾將曳尾於塗中); *Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 17.441, trans. Watson, *Complete Chuang Tzu*, 188. The parallel is much looser, but the "muddy pond" in the *Shiji* passage above fits far more closely with the tortoise metaphor of chapter 17 than with the sacrificial ox of chapter 32, especially since in both Zhuangzi portrays himself as playing in the mud.

80) *SJ* 63.2143.

The refusal to be useful is an underlying theme running throughout the received *Zhuangzi*. It often takes the form of refusal to rule (as in "Yielding Kingship") or appears in more general parables. Specific refusal to serve as an official seems to be a concern only of the non-inner chapters; furthermore, in the two *Zhuangzi* chapters where the above material is found, such refusal is so important as to constitute a major theme.[81]

Why did Sima Qian choose to emphasize this particular aspect of the *Zhuangzi* text? Guan Feng suggested that

> Circumstances alter cases. Sima Qian, who lived in the Han, was a victim of castration. Thus, he was greatly dissatisfied with the governance of the Han ruling house. From the materials that had been passed down, he gave prominence to the particular aspect of Zhuangzi's refusal to cooperate with the government of his time, describing it most vividly.
> 事過境遷, 生活在漢代遭了宮刑的司馬遷, 對漢室統治者非常不滿, 他從傳說材料中, 把莊子和當權者不合作這个側面突出出來, 加以渲染。[82]

As an autobiographical reading of the *Shiji*, this is both facile and vague. Refusal to serve is nowhere especially valorized in the *Shiji* and is even undermined in the "Arrayed Traditions of the Roving Warriors" 遊俠列傳 (ch.124).[83] In Huangfu Mi's 皇甫謐 (215-282) *Gaoshi zhuan* 高士傳, Sima Qian appears as a representative of engagement, in opposition to reclusion.[84] Though the account may not be historical, it does underscore the general sense that Sima Qian would be more likely to valorize engagement than withdrawal.[85]

---

81) See, for example, the parable of the *yuanqu* and the owl (*Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 17.442) and all of "Lie Yukou," perhaps most strikingly the anecdote of the King of Qin's hemorrhoids (*Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 32.839).

82) Guan Feng, "Zhuangzi waiza pian," 71.

83) See *SJ* 124.3181-2.

84) *Gaoshi zhuan* (in *Han Wei biji xiaoshuo* 漢魏筆記小說, ed. Zhou Guangpei 周光培, vol.1 [Shijiazhuang: Hebei jiaoyu chubanshe], 1994), 2.621-22. See the discussion in Vervoorn, *Men of the Cliffs and Caves: The Development of the Chinese Eremitic Tradition to the End of the Han Dynasty* (Hong Kong: Chinese Univ. Press, 1990), 114; Alan J. Berkowitz, *Patterns of Disengagement: The Practice and Portrayal of Reclusion in Early Medieval China* (Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 2000), 9, 81 n. 73; Burton Watson, *Ssu-ma Chien, Grand Historian of China* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1958), 200 n. 2; Klein, "History of a Historian," chapter 4.

85) Yielding kingship, as described in *Shiji* 61, is of course a major exception. But that is a very different case from an official refusing to take office.

I would argue that Sima Qian's use of the above anecdote to characterize Zhuang Zhou is not readily interpretable as autobiographically or politically motivated. It makes far more sense that these stories seemed particularly representative to Sima Qian as he went about constructing the Zhuang Zhou author-function. Whatever the case, it is worth emphasizing that Sima Qian, in narrating Zhuang Zhou's refusal to serve, again demonstrates familiarity with non-inner chapters but fails to use or allude to any inner chapters material.

The final evaluation in this chapter of the *Shiji* begins with a characterization of Laozi and discusses the other figures in relation to this. Regarding Zhuang Zhou, the judgment is: "Zhuangzi extended and developed *dao* and *de*, and discussed them at length; essentially [his thought] also goes back to *ziran* (the self-so/natural)" (莊子散道德放論, 要亦歸之自然).[86] The term *ziran* gives us no particular clues, as it appears both as a term and as a concept throughout the *Zhuangzi*, in both inner and non-inner chapters. The mention of *dao* and *de*[87] again may be intended to foreground the connection between the *Zhuangzi* and the *Laozi*, but at the same time suggests that the *Zhuangzi* is more eclectic than the *Laozi*.[88]

Shiji-Zhuangzi Parallels

I turn now to other *Zhuangzi* parallels found in the *Shiji*. Some are quite brief and questionable, for example the saying "He who steals a fish-hook is put to death, but he who steals a kingdom becomes a feudal lord; benevolence and righteousness are always to be found at the gate of a feudal lord" (竊鉤者誅, 竊國者侯, 侯之門仁義存).[89] Versions of this saying appear at least twice in the *Zhuangzi*, in "Rifling Trunks" (ch.10) and again in "Robber Zhi" (ch. 29).[90] However, it was clearly a well-known saying; it is also found in the "Yucong" 語叢

86) *SJ* 63.2156.
87) Which I understand to refer to the philosophical viewpoint(s) of what is now the *Daodejing* 道德經, though the locution is ambiguous.
88) For a helpful discussion of this line in the *Shiji*, see Wang Shumin, *Zhuangxue guankui* 莊學管闚 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2007), 85-103.
89) *SJ* 124.2182.
90) *Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 10.256, 29.790-91.

manuscript excavated at Guodian, which probably predates any recognizable version of the *Zhuangzi qua* compilation.[91]

Similarly, when Sima Qian discussed the yielding of the sage kings, he emphasized the caution with which they purportedly approached this process, concluding, "This shows that the realm is a vessel of great weight" (示天下重器).[92] The Tang dynasty *Shiji* commentator Sima Zhen 司馬貞 (early eighth cent.) draws a parallel between this and the statement in the *Zhuangzi* that "the realm is a great vessel" (天下大器也)."[93] On the other hand, this seems like an obvious metaphor for discussing the idea of yielding kingship, and does not necessarily mean that Sima Qian had the *Zhuangzi* in mind when he employed it.

A far more meaningful parallel appears in the same section, however. Still discussing the idea of yielding (*rang* 讓), Sima Qian writes:

> Persuaders say, "Yao yielded the realm to Xu You. Xu You would not accept it but fled in shame and went into seclusion." When it comes to the time of the Xia, there were Bian Sui and Wu Guang. But how can these be recounted? …. According to what I have heard, [Xu] You and [Wu] Guang had an exquisitely lofty sense of rightness. Yet writings about them are not a little vague and incomplete. How is that?
> 說者曰堯讓天下於許由, 許由不受, 恥之逃隱。及夏之時, 有卞隨、務光者。此何以稱焉？…余以所聞由、光義至高, 其文辭不少概見, 何哉？[94]

The "Yielding Kingship" chapter of the *Zhuangzi* discusses the same figures in the same kind of context (as well as the same order).[95] Furthermore the style of these passages in the *Zhuangzi* is closer to that of the parable than it is to a historical account: it lacks dates or details other than those that add to the message. This dovetails well with Sima Qian's complaint about lack of detail: Sima Qian was known as a "good

---

91) For a dissenting opinion, see Wang Baoxuan, "Shilun Guodian chujian de chaoxie shijian yu Zhuangzi de zhuanzuo shidai" 試論郭店楚簡的抄寫時間與莊子的撰作時代, *Zhexue yanjiu* 哲學研究 1999.4: 18-29.

92) *SJ* 61.2121.

93) *Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 28.744.

94) *SJ* 61.2121.

95) For Yao and Xu You, see *Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 28.744. Bian Sui and Wu Guang appear on 28.769-770. Note that the *Lüshi chunqiu* (Chen Qiyou 陳奇猷, *Lüshi chunqiu jiaoshi* 呂氏春秋校釋 [Taipei: Huazheng shuju, 1988]), while containing parallels with both stories, places them in entirely separate chapters (22/5 and 19/1, respectively), thus seeming less likely than the *Zhuangzi* to be the inspiration for this *Shiji* chapter.

historian" (良史) in part because of the substantiality of his scholarship, his attempts to verify his sources, and his refusal to accept vague or dubious accounts.[96] The saying at the beginning of the above passage, ascribed to a persuader or persuaders (*shuizhe* 說者), is a verbatim quotation of the first words of "Yielding Kingship," though the *Zhuangzi* does not have Xu You fleeing in shame. It seems likely that the text Sima Qian had in mind when writing the beginning of the "Arrayed Traditions of Bo Yi" bore some relation to the *Zhuangzi* "Yielding Kingship" chapter.[97]

This raises questions, however. Why attribute the quotation to an anonymous persuader instead of to Zhuang Zhou or the *Zhuangzi*? In Sima Zhen's interpretation, the whole passage shows "the Honorable Senior Archivist suspects that some of the persuaders' words are not factual" (是太史公疑說者之言或非實也).[98] To cite someone by name may have conferred an additional degree of approval or agreement that Sima Qian did not wish to imply. Alternately, perhaps the *Zhuangzi* as a source lacked sufficient stature to be cited by name.[99] Certainly the *Shiji* never does so, and very few other early texts do either. A final possibility is that the "Yielding Kingship" materials were not yet part of the *Zhuangzi* corpus.

Another *Shiji-Zhuangzi* parallel involves the meeting between Confucius and Laozi. This meeting is recounted twice in the *Shiji*.[100] Multiple versions can also be found in "The Turning of Heaven" 天運 (*Zhuangzi* ch.14).[101] The only real parallel, however, occurs in Confucius' description of Laozi:

---

96) See the discussion of this aspect of the *Shiji* in Watson, *Ssu-ma Ch'ien*, 85-100; Klein, "History of a Historian," ch. 6.

97) Further connections between *SJ* 61 and the *Zhuangzi* are: Bo Yi's own story (found in "Yielding Kingship") and the juxtaposition of Bo Yi and Robber Zhi (found in "Webbed Toes" [*Zhuangzi* ch. 8] and in "Robber Zhi" [*Zhuangzi* ch. 29]).

98) *SJ* 61.2122.

99) Charles LeBlanc has suggested that this was the case with the *Huainanzi* use of the *Zhuangzi*. See his *Huai-Nan Tzu: Philosophical Synthesis in Early Han Thought* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong Univ. Press, 1985), 85, and discussion below.

100) *SJ* 47.1909, 63.2940.

101) *Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 14.377-92. The *Zhuangzi* accounts of the meeting seem disjointed and slightly redundant, as if the compiler had collected accounts from different traditions and stuck them together with little or no effort to reconcile them or provide transitions.

> *Shiji* ch.63: As for dragons, I am not able to know their riding the wind and clouds, their mounting up to heaven. Today I saw Laozi, and how like a dragon he is!
> 至於龍, 吾不能知其乘風雲而上天。吾今日見老子, 其猶龍邪！[102]

> *Zhuangzi* ch.14: It is only now, in him, that I have seen a dragon! A dragon who when coiled becomes a body and when spread out becomes a pattern, who rides the clouds and vapors, who is nourished on *yin* and *yang*…
> 吾乃今於是乎見龍！龍, 合而成體, 散而成章, 乘雲氣而養乎陰陽。[103]

Both texts have Confucius likening Laozi to a dragon. One could argue that such a comparison, associated with traditions about the meeting between Confucius and Laozi, might be merely conventional. After all the parallel is not a particularly close one. The important point, however, is that *if* there is a *Zhuangzi* parallel here, it is drawn from an outer, not an inner, chapter.

Another *Zhuangzi* parallel, this one quite extensive, can be found in the *Shiji* "Traditions of the Tortoise and Milfoil" 龜策列傳.[104] The parallel in question, which I will discuss below, is the anecdote about King Yuan of Song's dream, also found in *Zhuangzi* chapter 26, "External Things" 外物.[105]

The last *Shiji-Zhuangzi* parallel I will consider involves Robber Zhi. This parallel is more difficult to tie down textually, but we know that Sima Qian associated the "Robber Zhi" chapter with Zhuangzi since he mentioned it by name as part of the *Zhuangzi* text. He also refers to Robber Zhi in the "Arrayed Traditions of Bo Yi." There he laments:

> Of all the seventy disciples of the master, it was only Yan Yuan whom Zhongni commended as being fond of learning. Yet Hui [=Yan Yuan] was constantly impoverished and ate only the coarsest food, never eating his fill either. In the end, he even died young. Is this how heaven rewards a good person?
> 且七十子之徒, 仲尼獨薦顏淵為好學。然回也屢空, 糟糠不厭, 而卒蚤夭。天之報施善人, 其何如哉？
> Robber Zhi killed innocent people every day, and ate human liver meat. He was violent and uncontrollable, gathering a mob of several thousand people and ram-

102) *SJ* 63.2139.
103) *Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 14.382 (translation mine).
104) *SJ* 128.3229-37.
105) *Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 26.614-15.

paging throughout the realm. In the end, though, he died of old age. In accord with what virtue [of his] was this [state of affairs]?!
盜蹠日殺不辜, 肝人之肉, 暴戾恣睢, 聚黨數千人橫行天下, 竟以壽終。是遵何德哉？[106]

Sima Qian's reaction to this conundrum has been described as "tortured."[107] It is a Chinese version of the problem of evil: though Heaven is supposed to reward the good and punish the evil, it patently fails to do so, and for the most part no earthly power fulfills this role either. Thus, it seems that exemplars of purity and goodness inevitably fail, while awful greedy monstrous people succeed far better than they deserve. In this, Sima Qian seems to agree with the *Zhuangzi*'s Robber Zhi, who mocks Bo Yi and Shu Qi (together with other men who died for virtue) as being "no different from a flayed dog, a pig sacrificed to the flood, a beggar with his alms-gourd in his hand" (無異於磔犬流豕、操瓢而乞者).[108] This is to say, virtuous sacrifices are powerless to bring about any beneficial effect. The two texts differ completely in tone, of course, but this should not obscure the closeness of their material.

To conclude: when Sima Qian writes about the *Zhuangzi* in the *Shiji*, the inner chapters do not figure at all. Nor are there any textual parallels between the *Shiji* and those inner chapters. In contrast, there do seem to be a few parallels between the *Shiji* and various non-inner chapters of the *Zhuangzi*, even though these parallels are potentially debatable.

There is some evidence, albeit not particularly strong, that Sima Qian may have recognized a subset of chapters as a "core *Zhuangzi*." The best candidates for this subset would seem to include parts of chapters 28, 29, and 31 (corresponding to the category that Feng Youlan and A.C. Graham[109] have identified with the hedonist Yang

106) *SJ* 61.2125.
107) Durrrant, *Cloudy Mirror*, 20.
108) *Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 29.779, trans. Watson, *Complete Chuang Tzu*, 330.
109) See, for example, Graham's "How Much of the *Chuang Tzu* did Chuang Tzu Write?," 307-15, and "The Right to Selfishness," in *Individualism and Holism: Studies in Confucian and Taoist Values*, ed. Donald J. Munro (Ann Arbor: Center for Chinese Studies, Univ. of Michigan, 1985), 73-84.

Zhu, while Liu Xiaogan assigns them to "Anarchists"[110]). Parts of chapters 10, 14, 17, and 23 might also be included.

Whatever the *Shiji*'s core *Zhuangzi* might have been, it did not include any inner chapters. Given how fascinating and important the inner chapters are, it is hard to believe that Sima Qian would not have taken note of them—even if only to criticize them, as he did with "Gengsang Chu." This would be especially true if they formed a fixed subsection of the text, marked off in any way as recognizably the work of Zhuang Zhou himself.

The chart below summarizes all the *Zhuangzi* parallels I have been able to locate in the *Shiji*.[111]

Table 2: *Shiji* Parallels with the *Zhuangzi*

Zhuangzi Chapters	*Shiji* Parallel
Ch. 10: Rifling Trunks 胠篋 (外)	*SJ* 63.2143*: Chapter title Stealing a fish-hook (*SJ* 124.3182):「竊鉤者誅, 竊國者侯, 侯之門仁義存」, 非虛言也。
Ch. 14: The Turning of Heaven 天運(外)	Laozi as a dragon (*SJ* 63.2139): 龍, 吾不能知其乘風雲而上天。吾今日見老子, 其猶龍邪！
Ch. 17: Autumn Floods 秋水(外)	Sacrificial ox (*SJ* 63.2143): 子獨不見郊祭之犧牛乎？養食之數歲, 衣以文繡, 以入大廟。當是之時, 雖欲為孤豚, 豈可得乎？
Ch. 23: Gengsang Chu 庚桑楚 (雜)	*SJ* 63.2143*: Chapter title
Ch. 26: External Things 外物 (雜)	Much longer version of Lord Yuan of Song's tortoise dream (*SJ* 128.3229-37)
Ch. 28: Yielding Kingship 讓王 (雜)	Realm as a great vessel (*SJ* 61.2121): 示天下重器 Yielding/refusing kingship (*SJ* 61.2121): 說者曰堯讓天下於許由, 許由不受, 恥之逃隱。及夏之時, 有卞隨、務光者。此何以稱焉？
Ch. 29: Robber Zhi 盜跖(雜)	*SJ* 63.2143*: Chapter title Description of Robber Zhi (*SJ* 61.2125): 盜蹠日殺不辜, 肝人之肉, 暴戾恣睢, 聚黨數千人橫行天下, 竟以壽終。

[110] Or, in Liu's original, "The School of No Sovereign" 無君派. See Liu, *Classifying the Zhuangzi Chapters*, 88, 141-47, and Munro's "Foreword" in *Individualism and Holism*, xi.

[111] Specialists will notice that I am leaving out one category of parallels, namely, those found in the rhapsodies of Jia Yi as anthologized in the *Shiji*. I consider it appropriate to treat these under a separate heading.

Ch. 31: The Old Fisherman 漁父(雜)	*SJ* 63.2143*: Chapter title
Ch. 32: Lie Yukou 列禦寇(雜)	Playing in the mud (*SJ* 63.2143): 楚威王聞莊周賢, 使使厚幣迎之, 許以為相…子亟去, 無污我。我寧游戲污瀆之中自快, 無為有國者所羈, 終身不仕, 以快吾志焉。

* Explicitly associated with the *Zhuangzi* text

Although Sima Qian was considered to be one of the best-read men of his time,[112] it would be imprudent to rely solely on his testimony. Archaeology has shown us whole textual constellations of which Sima Qian demonstrated no awareness. Therefore, I now consider other sources of evidence, dating from both pre-Han and Han periods.

Pre-Han Citations and Parallels

Liu Xiaogan and other scholars have noted parallels between the *Zhuangzi* and various pre-Han texts, as well as occasional mentions of Zhuang Zhou the person. However, their analyses tend to begin with the assumption that the inner chapters formed an authentic early, core *Zhuangzi* text. I instead investigate what these textual parallels might tell us in the absence of that assumption.

The Xunzi

The first reference I will discuss—the earliest mention of Zhuang Zhou outside the *Zhuangzi*—appears in the *Xunzi*.[113] There, Master Zhuang is discussed in only a single remark, a comment contrasting various thinkers. (There is no mention of, nor quotation from, a *Zhuangzi* text.) Because the mention is so brief, it is important to consider fully the context in which it appears. We find it in the chapter entitled

---

112) See, for example, Wang Chong 王充 (27-ca. 97): "People like the Honorable Senior Archivist [=Sima Qian] and Liu Zizheng [=Liu Xiang] were officially in charge of all the texts and records, and thus have become famous for their great learning and vast erudition" (若太史公及劉子政之徒, 有主領書記之職, 則有博覽通達之名矣); Huang Hui 黃暉, *Lunheng jiaoshi* 論衡校釋 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1995) 80.1115.

113) I am assuming that this part of the received *Xunzi* is authentic Warring States material. If it were a later interpolation, then the only pre-Han mention of Zhuang Zhou (outside the *Zhuangzi* text) would be two brief anecdotes in the *Lüshi chunqiu*. See discussion below.

"Jiebi" 解蔽, which John Knoblock has translated as "Dispelling Blindness," though in his commentary he adds that "*Bi* means 'to keep in ignorance' by 'covering, concealing, beclouding' as well as what 'blinds' or 'obsesses' us…. We think we understand the truth, but in fact the aspect of the truth that we know keeps us in the dark and prevents our grasping the whole truth."[114]

For each thinker it discusses, the *Xunzi* "Jiebi" passage mentions first that aspect of the truth which that thinker has grasped (and is obsessed or blinkered by), then what might be considered its opposite: the aspect of the whole truth which that thinker is most likely to have overlooked. The second section then describes, for each thinker, the excesses to which his limitations have led him:

> In the past, there was the blindness of guest-retainers, of which the disordered thinkers are examples. Mozi was blinded by utility and was insensible to the value of cultural accomplishment. Songzi [=Song Xing] was blinded by desire and was insensible to attainment. Shenzi [=Shen Dao] was blinded by law and was insensible to worth. Shen Buhai was blinded by technique and was insensible to knowledge. Huizi was blinded by propositions and was insensible to realities. Zhuangzi was blinded by *tian*[115] and was insensible to humanity.
> 昔賓孟之蔽者, 亂家是也。墨子蔽於用而不知文。宋子蔽於欲而不知得。慎子蔽於法而不知賢。申子蔽於埶而不知知。惠子蔽於辭而不知實。 莊子蔽於天而不知人。
> Thus if one defines it in terms of utility, the Way will be all about profit. If one defines it in terms of desire, the Way will be all about satisfaction. If one defines it in terms of law, the Way will be all about calculation. If one defines it in terms of technique, the Way will be all about adaptation. If one defines it in terms of propositions, the Way will be all about argumentation. If one defines it in terms of *tian*, the Way will be all about [passive] reliance.
> 故由用謂之, 道盡利矣。由欲謂之, 道盡嗛矣。由法謂之, 道盡數矣。由埶謂之, 道盡便矣。由辭謂之, 道盡論矣。由天謂之, 道盡因矣。[116]

---

114) Knoblock, *Xunzi: A Translation and Study of the Complete Works*, vol. 3: *Books 17-32* (Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 1994), 88.

115) Often translated as "Heaven," *tian* is here understood by Knoblock as "Nature." Both translations are problematic. Here, and in the discussion below, the meaning of the term must come near to "nature" insofar as it refers to that which is inborn and/or not a result of human agency. But to straightforwardly translate the term as "nature" risks also importing a number of unconscious assumptions: "nature" may not seem as mysterious to us as it ought to when we find it in the early Chinese context. Here I will leave *tian* untranslated.

116) *Xunzi jishi*, "Jiebi" 21.478. Trans. based on Knoblock, *Xunzi* 3: 102, but considerably modified.

It is hard to see that this passage tells us anything new about Zhuang Zhou, except that (if the passage is authentic) he was a figure known to Xunzi and considered comparable to the other thinkers mentioned.[117]

As for the content of Xunzi's critique, the inner chapters of the *Zhuangzi* do place considerable emphasis on *tian* 天—whether we understand this to mean "heaven", "nature", or both—but then so do almost all the other *Zhuangzi* chapters. Ren Jiyu advanced the argument that "the *Zhuangzi* text that Xunzi saw could not have been the inner chapters of today's *Zhuangzi* text" (荀子所看到的《莊子》書, 不會是現在《莊子》書中的內篇) because the inner chapters contain so much "that Xunzi would have been unable to condone" (是荀子所不能容忍的).[118] In other words, had Xunzi read the inner chapters, he would have found more to criticize Zhuang Zhou for than just an obsession with *tian*. This idea is clever, though the specifics of Ren Jiyu's version are too dogmatically Marxist to convince most readers today.

In "Hsun Tzu and Chuang Tzu," David S. Nivison suggests curious similarities between the two thinkers, especially on the issue of detachment from the world. I will not attempt to summarize all his points, but instead will address a problematic feature of his dialectic. Nivison assumes that the inner chapters are "the 'basic' *Chuang Tzu*" and "the earliest strata" of the text.[119] This forces him to confront the problem that "the more characteristic idea in the earliest strata of the *Chuang Tzu* [i.e., the inner chapters] is precisely the idea we have suggested was Hsun Tzu's 'esoteric' improvement on Chuang Tzu—that detachment is desirable, but that it does not require disengagement."[120] This leads Nivison to the conclusion that "there is a distinct Taoist echo" in Xunzi, and that "we can see Hsun Tzu's thought taking forms that

---

117) As mentioned above, this is significant in itself, given that Zhuang Zhou's historical existence is so slenderly attested.

118) Ren Jiyu, "Zhuangzi tanyuan," 57.

119) "Hsun Tzu and Chuang Tzu," in *Chinese Texts and Philosophical Contexts*, 132. Note that Nivison is cautious about the issue of authorship, describing the current *Zhuangzi* text as containing "a mad variety of ideas" which are "obviously not by a single author." While he subscribes to the view that the inner chapters are early, he remains agnostic about whether Zhuang Zhou—or any single person—actually wrote them.

120) "Hsun Tzu and Chuang Tzu," 132.

we can understand only if we think of him as having first thought his way through Chuang Tzu."[121]

Nivison's conclusions would seem to support the idea of early inner chapters. But how would the picture change under the hypothesis of late inner chapters? Does Xunzi have a distinct Daoist echo, or does the Daoism of the inner chapters Zhuangzi have a distinct Xunzian echo? Or both? It is unlikely that the historical Zhuang Zhou was in mutually influential dialogue with the historical Xun Qing. It is, however, possible that the texts associated with these two thinkers could bear traces of each other's influence: we would only have to admit that neither text assumed its final form before the inception of the other. This is certainly true of the *Xunzi*,[122] and the above-mentioned discussion of Guo Xiang's editing of the *Zhuangzi* suggests that it is true of that text as well.

Nivison's essay argues that the Xunzi comment is thought-provoking and can lead to insights into surprising commonalities between the two thinkers. But a historian of texts seeks concrete examples. Though there is no sure way of identifying what specifically Xunzi was thinking of in critiquing Zhuangzi, one particularly striking possibility occurs in "Autumn Floods" (*Zhuangzi* ch. 17). There, the Lord of the River has a dialogue with Ruo of the North Sea. Ruo argues:

> *Tian* is on the inside, the human is on the outside. Virtue resides in *tian*. To understand the actions of *tian* and man, base yourself upon *tian*, take position in virtue, and then, although you hasten or hold back, bend or stretch, you may return to the essential and speak of the ultimate.
> 天在內, 人在外, 德在乎天。知天人之行 , 本乎天, 位乎得[德]; 蹢躅而屈伸, 反要而語極。[123]

Though it is not easy to understand what this means, there is a sense that placing *tian* "inside" and human "outside" leads to a privileging of *tian*. Furthermore, *de* 德 (whether understood as "virtue" or "power") is situated in *tian*, not in humans. *Tian* is privileged because, whatever

---

121) Ibid., 137.
122) See Michael Loewe's discussion of Liu Xiang's editorial work on the *Xunzi* in *Early Chinese Texts*, 178-79.
123) *Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 17.427, trans. Watson, *Complete Chuang Tzu*, 182-83 (slightly modified).

it means to "base oneself upon *tian*"[124] or to "take position in virtue," there is a clear sense that *tian*-based insight gives perspective on both *tian* and human, while a mere focus on the human gives no insight at all.

When asked what he means by "*tian*" and "human", Ruo of the North Sea adds by way of explanation:

> Horses and oxen have four feet—this is what I mean by *tian*. Putting a halter on the horse's head, piercing the ox's nose—this is what I mean by the human. So I say: do not let what is human wipe out what is *tian*; do not let what is purposeful wipe out what is fated; do not let [the desire for] gain [convince you] to die for fame. Be cautious, guard it, and do not lose it—this is what I mean by returning to the True.
> 牛馬四足, 是謂天; 落馬首, 穿牛鼻, 是謂人。故曰, 無以人滅天, 無以故滅命, 無以得殉名。謹守而勿失, 是謂反其真。[125]

This passage seems a highly plausible target for Xunzi's criticism: it could appropriately be described as being "blinded by *tian*," and potentially suffering from a tendency toward passivity. In effect, Ruo of the North Sea argues that people are blinded by the human and do not understand *tian*, suggestively opposite of Xunzi's critique.

Again there is no way to be certain, from such a brief comment, what the *Xunzi* "Jiebi" notion of the *Zhuangzi* text might have been. But, I argue, it *could* easily have been formed without knowledge of anything in the inner chapters.[126]

The Hanfeizi

Liu Xiaogan has identified only four reasonably secure parallels between the *Hanfeizi* and the *Zhuangzi*. Only one of these has anything like an attribution:

---

124) Perhaps intentionally paradoxically, since Heaven seems to be "above" by definition, while *ben* 本 "base" or "root" seems by definition to be "downward."
125) *Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 17.428-29.
126) Another passage that seems to place greater value on understanding *tian* than on the human is found in "Gengsang Chu," *Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 23.619 (a miscellaneous chapter). This is also striking because it immediately precedes the *Hanfeizi-Zhuangzi* parallel concerning Archer Yi, discussed below, and is one of the chapters Sima Qian lists, thus a known part of his *Zhuangzi*.

> *Hanfeizi* ch. 38: Thus the words of a man of Song are as follows: "If regarding every single sparrow that passed by Archer Yi, he insisted he could bring it down—Yi would be a liar[127] indeed. But if you make the whole world into a net, then you never fail to get the sparrow."
> 故宋人語曰：「一雀過羿，羿必得之，則羿誣矣。以天下為之羅，則雀不失矣。」[128]
>
> *Zhuangzi* ch. 23: If a single sparrow went by Archer Yi, he was sure to bring it down—it was in his range. But if you make the whole world into a cage, then the sparrow has no place to flee to.
> 一雀適羿, 羿必得之, 或也。以天下為之籠, 則雀無所逃。[129]

Liu Xiaogan assumes that the *Hanfeizi*'s "a man of Song" amounts to an attribution of this anecdote to Zhuang Zhou.[130] Perhaps this assumption should give us pause, however.

It is worth noting that the anecdote fits the *Hanfeizi* very well, but is put to very different use there than in the *Zhuangzi*. In the *Hanfeizi* context, Zichan of Zheng is shown to have amazing powers of perception: he hears a woman crying and is able to know that she murdered her husband. The *Hanfeizi* objects to this as a method of government, comparing Zichan to the Archer Yi. However skillful Yi is in bringing down individual sparrows, making the world into a net[131] would still be a more reliable method of making sure every sparrow gets caught.

The *Zhuangzi* context for the Archer Yi story is far more convoluted and difficult. There, the anecdote relates to the passage which precedes it through the figure of the Archer Yi, but not by any clear line of reasoning. The earlier passage criticizes Archer Yi because, although he is good at shooting sparrows, he is unable to keep people from praising him for this. It then goes on to state that "the sage is skillful at [things related to] *tian* but clumsy with [things related to] the

---

127) There is some difficulty in interpreting *wu* 誣, which does not appear in the *Zhuangzi* version. My translation follows Wang Xianshen's 王先慎 gloss (Wang Xianshen, *Han Feizi jijie* 韓非子集解 [Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2006], 38.377-8), but Liu Xiaogan's interpretation "Yi was a wizard" (*Classifying the Zhuangzi Chapters*, 52) is also not impossible. Though Liu does not mention it, the latter involves emending *wu* 誣 to *wu* 巫.

128) "Nan san" 難三: *Han Feizi jijie* 38.377-8.

129) "Gengsang Chu": *Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 23.621.

130) *Classifying the Zhuangzi Chapters*, 52.

131) Nets are common metaphors for laws; see *SJ* 123.3131, where the character used is *wang* 網, but the image is similar. Note that *luo* 羅 is a type of net specifically for birds.

human" (聖人工乎天而拙乎人).[132] The above-quoted passage occurs next, but seems so disconnected that Chen Guying has made it into a separate section (*jie* 節).[133] The metaphor used there is that of a cage (*long* 籠), rather than a net, and the discussion which follows expands on the anecdote by focusing on how individuals can be caged by what they are fond of. Tentatively, we could relate this passage to the preceding one by suggesting that what Archer Yi was fond of was praise. Still, the *Zhuangzi* context is both more fragmentary and more abstract than that in the *Hanfeizi*.

One might suppose that the *Hanfeizi* made better use of the material than its supposed source, the *Zhuangzi*, was able to. It is also possible that the *Hanfeizi* anecdote—attributed merely to "a man of Song"—was incorporated into the "Gengsang Chu" chapter because the compiler of that chapter also assumed that the "man of Song" referred to Zhuang Zhou, and took the quotation to be a lost saying of his. This then inspired the (somewhat forced) commentary-like discussion which follows the anecdote in the *Zhuangzi*, perhaps an attempt to fit the story into a slowly developing framework of 'Zhuangzian' thought.

Two other parallels, both corresponding to passages in "The Mountain Tree" (*Zhuangzi* ch. 20) are similarly anecdotal in nature. One is an extremely loose parallel regarding a fox and a leopard. In *Zhuangzi*, as part of a sermon on preserving life, "the Master from South of the Market" (市南子) mentions that although these two animals are cautious, "their skin causes disaster for them" (其皮為之災也) by being desirable enough to make humans set traps for them.[134] In the *Hanfeizi*, a person of Di presents fox and leopard skins to Duke Wen of Jin, who sighs and comments that "These [creatures] brought suffering upon themselves because of the beauty of their skins" (此以皮之美自為罪). The narrator goes on to draw the analogy that "the ruler of a state suffers for his fame and title" (治國者以名號為罪).[135] The *Hanfeizi*

---

132) *Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 23.619. Note that this also fits well with Xunzi's criticism of Zhuangzi, mentioned above.

133) Ibid., 23.621.

134) *Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 20.502.

135) *Han Feizi jijie* 21.156. Duke Wen of Jin 晉文公 (697-628 BCE), also known as Chong'er 重耳, experienced a succession struggle of epic proportions, narrated discontinuously in *Zuozhuan* 左傳 "Duke Zhuang" 28, "Duke Xi" 4-5, 10, and especially "Duke

context has a more historical "flavor," but again it is difficult to determine priority; as with the fish-hook proverb mentioned above, it seems likely that the saying about fox and leopard skins was a common rhetorical topos.

The third parallel is almost verbatim and comprises an entire anecdote:[136] a Master Yang[137] is passing through Song and stops at an inn for the night. There he is startled to find that of the two serving girls, the beautiful one is despised while the ugly one is favored. He inquires about it and is told[138] that the beautiful one is unattractive in her vanity, while the ugly one is attractively modest. In the *Hanfeizi*, this anecdote appears near the end of the "Forest of Persuasions" 說林 chapter in a series of stories not obviously connected to one another. In the *Zhuangzi*, it appears at the very end of "The Mountain Tree" chapter, directly after a story that A.C. Graham has identified as being in dialogue with Yangist ideas.[139] It is difficult to determine priority, and again it seems possible or even likely that both were drawing from a third source.

The fourth and final parallel demands closer consideration, as it is the first appearance of material corresponding to any *Zhuangzi* inner chapter.

> *Hanfeizi* ch. 20: The Way is that by which the ten thousand things are as they are … Heaven got it and is lofty thereby. Earth got it and contains [things] thereby. *It happened that the Big Dipper got it* and completed its majesty thereby. *The sun and moon got it* and extended their brilliance thereby. The five constants got it and made constant their places thereby. The various stars got it and leveled their progressions thereby. The four seasons got it and drive the transformations of their *qi* thereby. Xuanyuan [=the Yellow Emperor] got it and gained power over the [peoples of the] four directions thereby. Red Pine got it and united with heaven and earth.[140] The sages got it and completed their accomplishments thereby.

Xi" 23 and 28. Though there is no reason to insist on the historicity of the *Hanfeizi* anecdote, Chong'er is a very historically appropriate character to feature in it.

136) *Han Feizi jijie* 22.181-182; *Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 20.526.

137) Written 楊 in the *Hanfeizi* and 陽 in the *Zhuangzi*; identified by commentators as Yang Zhu 楊朱.

138) By the innkeeper in the *Hanfeizi*, and by a young boy in the *Zhuangzi*.

139) Graham, "The Right to Selfishness," 79.

140) Red Pine is an elusive figure mentioned in *Chuci* 楚辭, "Journeying Afar" 遠遊: "I heard how once Red Pine had washed the world's dust off:/I would model myself after the pattern he had left me" (Hong Xingzu 洪興祖, *Chuci buzhu* 楚辭補注 [Taipei: Tiangong shuju, 1989], 5.164; trans. David Hawkes, *The Songs of the South: An Ancient*

道者, 萬物之所然也 … 天得之以高, 地得之以藏, 維斗得之以成其威, 日月得之以恆其光, 五常得之以常其位, 列星得之以端其行, 四時得之以御其變氣, 軒轅得之以擅四方, 赤松得之與天地統, 聖人得之以成文章。[141]

Zhuangzi ch. 6: The Way has its reality and its signs but is without action or form. You can hand it down but you cannot receive it; you can get it but you cannot see it.... Xiwei got it and held up heaven and earth. Fu Xi got it and entered into the mother of breath. *It happened that the Big Dipper got it* and from ancient times has never wavered. *The sun and moon got it* and from ancient times have never rested. Kan Pi got it and entered Kunlun. Ping Yi got it and wandered in the great river.[142] Jian Wu got it and lived in the great mountain.[143] The Yellow Emperor got it and ascended to the cloudy heavens. Zhuan Xu got it and dwelt in the Dark Palace.[144] You Qiang got it and stood at the limit of the north. The Queen Mother of the West got it and took her seat on Shaoguang—nobody knows her beginning, nobody knows her end. Pengzu got it and lived from the age of Shun to the age of the Five Hegemons. Fu Yue got it and became minister to Wu Ding, who extended his rule over the whole world.

夫道, 有情有信, 無為無形; 可傳而不可受, 可得而不可見…狶韋氏得之, 以挈天地; 伏戲氏得之, 以襲氣母; 維斗得之, 終古不忒; 日月得之, 終古不息; 勘坏得之, 以襲崑崙; 馮夷得之, 以游大川; 肩吾得之, 以處大山; 黃帝得之, 以登雲天; 顓頊得之, 以處玄宮; 禺強得之, 立乎北極; 西王母得之, 坐乎少廣, 莫知其始, 莫知其終; 彭 祖得之, 上及有虞, 下及及五伯; 傅說得之, 以相武丁, 奄有天下。[145]

As regards "getting" the Dao, both texts share the same syntactic structure and have a few elements in common ("the Big Dipper got it ... the sun and moon got it..."). However, the significance of this "getting it," as well as the progression and most of the content, are wholly

---

Chinese Anthology of Poems by Qu Yuan and Other Poets [New York: Penguin Books, 1985], 194). See also Hawkes' discussion in *The Songs of the South*, 199. As Hawkes mentions, Zhang Liang 張良, the illustrious minister of Han Gaozu 漢高祖, once announced his "desire to follow the journey of Red Pine" (欲從赤松子游; *SJ* 55.2048).

141) "Explaining Laozi" 解老: *Han Feizi jijie* 20.146-47. Emphasis added.

142) A mythical figure who also appears as Bing Yi 冰夷 in the *Shanhai jing* 山海經. There he is said to have "a human face" (冰夷人面) and to "ride upon two dragons" (乘兩龍); see Yuan Ke 袁珂, *Shanhai jing jiaozhu* 山海經校注 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1980) 7.316. It is Guo Pu's 郭璞 (276-324) commentary that identifies "Bing Yi" with the "Ping Yi" mentioned here and in the *Huainanzi*; for the latter (馮夷得道, 以潛大川), see Liu Wendian 劉文典, *Huainan honglie jijie* 淮南鴻烈集解 (Taipei: Taiwan Zhonghua shuju, 1981), 11.362. Guo Pu also traces a connection between this figure and "The Lord of the River" 河伯, who features prominently in *Zhuangzi* ch. 17, "Autumn Floods."

143) See *Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 1.21.

144) See *SJ* 1.10-13.

145) "The Great Ancestral Teacher" 大宗師: *Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 6.181; trans. Watson, *Complete Chuang Tzu*, 83-4. Emphasis added.

different in the two texts. The *Hanfeizi* makes a very logical progression, from heaven and earth to the other celestial bodies, then on to the most exalted of humans. What they receive from "the Way" is "that by which they are so" (*suo ran* 所然). The *Zhuangzi* text is focused less on the things that are "so" and more on the mythical figures and marvelous stories, exalting magical aspects of the Way instead of practical accomplishments (such as gaining power over other tribes).

As regards the potential correspondence between the two, then, it is also important to notice that the *Hanfeizi* chapter in which the textual parallel is found is the "Jie Lao" 解老 (Explaining Laozi). Since many parts of the *Zhuangzi* are closely connected with the *Laozi* as well, it is especially easy to imagine both texts using as a starting point some third passage about "getting" the Way, a passage which might have been found in a shared corpus of *Laozi*-related lore. Thus, it is hard to see even the *Hanfeizi* parallel as solid evidence of the pre-Han existence of the inner chapters as a distinct unit. In fact, all the *Hanfeizi* parallels could have come from a source ancestral to both texts: none mentions the *Zhuangzi* nor is there anything specifically Zhuangzian in the way the parallel content is used in the *Hanfeizi*. At best, the *Hanfeizi* could be providing evidence for the pre-Han existence of one passage from one inner chapter, "The Great Ancestral Teacher" (大宗師, ch. 6).

The Lüshi Chunqiu

The "Almanac" (*ji* 紀) section of the *Lüshi chunqiu* is dated to 239 BCE, though the "Examinations" (*lan* 覽) and "Discourses" (*lun* 論) are likely to have been composed later.[146] As the *Shiji* narrates, the *Lüshi chunqiu*

> was considered to include everything about heaven and earth and the ten thousand things, from antiquity to the present … It was displayed at the city gate of Xianyang with a thousand gold hanging above it … which was to be given to anyone who could add or subtract a single character.

---

146) See discussion by Michael Carson and Michael Loewe in *Early Chinese Texts*, 324; John Knoblock and Jeffrey K. Riegel, *The Annals of Lü Buwei: A Complete Translation and Study* (Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 2000), 19-20, 27-32.

> 以為備天地萬物古今之事…布咸陽市門, 懸千金其上…有能增損一字者予千金。[147]

It should not perhaps be surprising that there is considerable textual overlap between the *Zhuangzi* and the *Lüshi chunqiu*. Drawing on the work of Liu Xiaogan,[148] and Knoblock and Riegel,[149] as well as my own reading of the text, I have been able to identify twenty-seven parallels.[150]

Curiously, the amount of material *explicitly* tied to the *Zhuangzi* text is very slight. It includes exactly one anecdote about Zhuang Zhou and exactly one saying attributed to him, both of which appear in the "Examinations" section. The anecdote features a big and useless tree.[151] There are two different "big and useless tree" stories collected in "The World of Men" (*Zhuangzi* ch. 4), but the one found in the *Lüshi chunqiu* resembles neither of these. Instead, it is closely parallel to the story in "The Mountain Tree" (*Zhuangzi* ch. 20), where Zhuang Zhou pronounces the big tree to have been saved by its uselessness, even while admitting that the uselessness of the non-honking goose proves to be its downfall.[152] A.C. Graham, who also points out that this story about Zhuang Zhou "is the earliest attested by another source" suggests:

> We can imagine even admirers having reservations… about the unqualified praise of uselessness in the inner chapters. They would be reassured by the story of the mountain tree, where Zhuangzi makes a judicious compromise between the claims of uselessness and usefulness.[153]

Graham does not extend his argument to include a discussion of the *Lüshi chunqiu*'s use of this passage. If we follow his line of reasoning,

---

147) *SJ* 85.2510.
148) *Classifying the Zhuangzi Chapters*, 50-61. Note that Liu dismisses the possibility that the *Zhuangzi* could have copied from the *Lüshi chunqiu* based on his assumptions about the *Zhuangzi* authors' composition practices. I disagree with some of these assumptions, as discussed at the beginning of the present article. Liu does not seriously address the very real possibility that both texts might have copied from a third.
149) Knoblock and Riegel, *Annals of Lü Buwei*, 705-9.
150) Of these, ten appear in the "Almanacs," twelve in the "Examinations," and five in the "Discourses."
151) *Lüshi chunqiu jiaoshi* 14/8.828-29, Knoblock and Riegel, *Annals of Lü Buwei*, 331-32.
152) *Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 20.500-1.
153) *Inner Chapters*, 117.

however, we might suppose that the *Lüshi chunqiu* editors would have had access to all the "useless tree" stories (since two appeared in the supposedly early inner chapters) but chose this one because it was more "judicious."

Without an inner-chapters bias, it is just as easy to see "The Mountain Tree" version of the story coming first, perhaps just a Zhuang Zhou legend preserved in the *Lüshi chunqiu*, which then inspired admirers to concoct similar stories. These later stories, because their message is so much sharper and clearer, might have been selected for inclusion in the inner chapters, while the less satisfying "Mountain Tree" version was relegated to the outer chapters. Neither possibility can be proven, but without an inner chapters bias, both seem equally likely. The saying attributed to Master Zhuang—the only other mention of him in the entire *Lüshi chunqiu*—is also found today in the outer chapters:

> Master Zhuang said, "Play for tiles and you soar; play for belt-hooks and you become combative; play for gold and you are flustered. Although your luck is the same in each of the games, the reason you become flustered must be the value you place on external things. Valuing external things makes one become clumsy within."
> 莊子曰：「以瓦投者翔, 以鉤投者戰, 以黃金投者殆。其祥一也, 而有所殆者, 必外有所重者也。外有所重者, 泄蓋內掘。」[154]

This passage is clearly parallel to the *Zhuangzi* version, but with a large number of character variants. These probably reflect the different editorial hands through which the two texts passed. It may be worth noting that in the received *Zhuangzi*, these words are spoken by Zhongni (i.e., Confucius), not by Zhuang Zhou. This could mean that the *Lüshi chunqiu* editors had something like the "Mastering Life" chapter (*Zhuangzi* ch.19)—or some part of it—and understood it to be authored by (or at least associated with) Master Zhuang. On the other hand, it is not impossible that they had an alternate version where the same anecdote features Zhuangzi instead of Confucius.

---

154) *Lüshi chunqiu jiaoshi* 13/3.689, Knoblock and Riegel, *Annals of Lü Buwei*, 288. Compare with *Zhuangzi*, "Mastering Life": 以瓦注者巧, 以鉤注者憚, 以黃金注者殉。其巧一也, 而有所矜, 則重外也 。凡外重者內拙。(*Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 19.473-74.)

Of the remaining *Zhuangzi*/*Lüshi chunqiu* parallels, the majority are found in today's non-inner chapters.[155] Only two parallels appear in what are now the *Zhuangzi* inner chapters, and both of these are potentially questionable.

The first is the well-known story of Butcher Ding. Unlike many of the other parallels (which are quite close), this one is a relatively brief allusion in the *Lüshi chunqiu* but a fully dramatized narrative in the *Zhuangzi*. The details are specific enough, however, to make the connection unmistakable. In the *Lüshi chunqiu*, it states:

> Butcher Ding of Song was so devoted to butchering oxen that he looked at nothing except dead oxen. For three years he did not even see a live ox. He had used his knife for nineteen years, and the blade was as if it had been just sharpened. This happened because he was in accord with its natural principles and was intent on the oxen.
> 宋之庖丁好解牛, 所見無非死牛者; 三年而不見生牛; 用刀十九年, 刃若新磨硎, 順其理, 誠乎牛也。[156]

This might well be a genuine citation from the inner chapters—or at least from material that would eventually become the inner chapters.

Curiously, however, the corresponding *Zhuangzi* passage is one of several pieces of evidence cited by Wang Shumin to support his hypothesis that inner and outer chapter materials were hopelessly scrambled and mixed together by Guo Xiang, or even later editors. Wang wrote:

> The first part of the first *juan* of the *Bailun Shu* by the Sui Dynasty Buddhist Ji Zang (548-623) says, "In the Outer chapters of the *Zhuangzi*, [there is] a Butcher Ding, who did not see a whole ox for twelve years."
> 隨釋吉藏《百論疏》卷上之上云：莊子外篇庖丁十二年不見全牛。[157]

Liu Xiaogan has dismissed Wang's point because the sentence quoted (but perhaps only paraphrased?) by Ji Zang does not appear in the

---

155) For discussion of these parallels, see Xu Fei 徐飛, "*Lüshi chunqiu* yuanyin *Zhuangzi* yanjiu" 呂氏春秋援引莊子研究, *Sichuan wenli xueyuan xuebao* 18.1 (2008): 62-65; Liu Xiaogan, *Classifying the Zhuangzi Chapters*, 50-61; Harold D. Roth, "Appraisal of Angus Graham's Textual Scholarship on the *Chuang Tzu*," in *A Companion to Angus C. Graham's Chuang Tzu: The Inner Chapters*, ed. Harold D. Roth (Honolulu: Univ. of Hawaii Press, 2003), 181-219.

156) *Lüshi chunqiu jiaoshi* 9/5.507, Knoblock and Riegel, *Annals of Lü Buwei*, 220. Compare with *Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 3.95-96.

157) Wang Shumin, *Zhuangzi jiaoshi*, "Zixu," 1.

present edition of the *Zhuangzi*. He argues that it probably derived from a second, redundant outer chapter version of the Butcher Ding story that was eventually excised. Still, there is enough detail in Ji Zang's citation to strongly suggest a connection to what is now *Zhuangzi* chapter 3. If the *Zhuangzi* text that Ji Zang saw contained one Butcher Ding story in the inner chapters and one in the outer chapters, why would Ji Zang cite only the outer chapter version? Finally, the *Lüshi chunqiu* citation and that of Ji Zang are closely comparable. If there were at some point two versions of the story, and Ji Zang's reference is to the outer chapter version, the *Lüshi chunqiu*'s citation could easily have come from that outer chapter version as well.

A.C. Graham has described *Zhuangzi* chapter 3 as "short and scrappy, surely because of textual mutilation."[158] One might disagree about whether it can or should be "restored" to its original state by a method like Graham's (i.e., bringing in related material from non-inner chapters). However, the impulse behind Graham's project allows us to envision an editor with a similar impulse—for example, in the period between Ji Zang's comment and the fixing of today's *Zhuangzi*—who sought to restore a mutilated or lost *Zhuangzi* chapter 3 by importing material from outer chapters. This idea is speculative but sufficient, I think, to raise some doubt about the solidity of this passage in the *Lüshi chunqiu* as a true inner-chapter citation.

The second *Lüshi chunqiu* parallel that appears today in the *Zhuangzi* inner chapters is a more complicated case:

> Long ago, when Yao paid court to Xu You in the middle of a fertile prairie, he said, "When ten suns have appeared, if the blazing torches are not extinguished, aren't we taking needless trouble to light the world? Were you, master, to become the Son of Heaven, the world would certainly be well governed. I beg to give the world to you, master."
> 昔者堯朝許由於沛澤之中，曰：「十日出而焦火不息，不亦勞乎？夫子為天子，而天下已治矣，請屬天下於夫子。」
>
> Xu You declined, saying, "Would I do it because the world is in disorder? But the world is already in good order. Would I do it for my own sake? When the tailorbird builds its nest in the woods, it uses only a single branch. When the mole drinks from the river, it takes only enough to fill its belly. Go away, my lord! What use have I for the world?" He then proceeded on to the foot of Mount Ji, on the

158) *Inner Chapters*, 62.

north side of the Ying River, and there he made his living by farming. For the rest of his life he gave no sign of how to govern the world.
許由辭曰：「為天下之不治 與？而既已治矣。自為與？啁焦巢於林, 不過一枝; 偃鼠飲於河, 不過滿腹。歸已君乎！惡用天下？」遂之箕山之下, 潁水之陽, 耕而食, 終身無經天下之色。[159]

A reasonably close parallel can be found in the first chapter of the *Zhuangzi*, "Free and Easy Wandering" 消遙遊. Yet as evidence for the existence of the inner chapters, this passage too is potentially problematic.

In order to understand what might have happened here, it is first necessary to consider the special relationship between the *Lüshi chunqiu* and *Zhuangzi* chapter 28, "Yielding Kingship": namely, almost every part of "Yielding Kingship" has a *Lüshi chunqiu* parallel. These parallels are scattered throughout the text of the *Lüshi chunqiu*, but the overlap is impossible not to notice.[160] The *Zhuangzi* "Yielding Kingship" chapter consists of a long series of anecdotes about people who were offered the position of ruler and declined it. The first in the series, as the chapter stands today, is actually just a stub: "Yao wanted to cede the empire to Xu You, but Xu You refused to accept it. Then he tried to give it to Zizhou Zhifu. Zizhou Zhifu said …" (堯以天下讓許由, 許由不受。又讓於子州支父, 子州之父曰…).[161] Compare this, then, to the anecdote in *Zhuangzi* chapter 1:

Yao [wanted to] cede the empire to Xu You. "When the sun and moon have already come out," he said, "it's a waste of light to go on burning the torches, isn't it? When the seasonal rains are falling, it's a waste of water to go on irrigating the fields. If you were established as ruler, the world would be well ordered. I go on [occupying it] like an impersonator, but all I can see are my failings. I beg to turn over the world to you."
堯讓天下於許由, 曰：「日月出矣而爝火不息, 其於光也, 不亦難乎！時雨降矣而猶浸灌, 其於澤也, 不亦勞乎！夫子立而天下治, 而我猶尸之, 吾自視缺然。請致 天下。」

Xu You said, "You govern the world and the world is already well governed. Now if I take your place, will I be doing it for a name? But name is only the guest of

159) *Lüshi chunqiu jiaoshi,* 22/5.1515, Knoblock and Riegel, *Annals of Lü Buwei*, 580.
160) The exact nature of this relationship has been the subject of much debate. See Roth "Appraisal," 207-210; D.C. Lau "On the Expression *Zai You*," in *Chinese Texts and Philosophical Contexts*, 9-13; Liu Xiaogan *Classifying the Zhuangzi Chapters*, 57-61, etc.
161) *Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 28.744; trans. Watson, *Complete Chuang Tzu*, 309.

> reality—will I be doing it so I can play the part of a guest? When the tailorbird builds her nest in the deep wood, she uses no more than one branch. When the mole drinks at the river, he takes no more than a bellyful. Go home and forget the matter, my lord. I have no use for the rulership of the world! Though the cook may not run his kitchen properly, the priest and the impersonator of the dead at the sacrifice do not leap over the wine casks and sacrificial stands and go take his place."
> 許由曰：「子治天下, 天下既已治也。而我猶代子, 吾將為名乎？名者, 實 之賓也, 吾將為賓乎？鷦鷯巢於深林, 不過一枝; 偃鼠飲河, 不過滿腹。歸休乎君, 予無所用天下為！庖人雖不治庖, 尸祝不越樽俎而代之矣。」[162]

This anecdote would have fit very neatly at the beginning of "Yielding Kingship," where there even appears to be a sort of 'scar' or trace of its excision—that is, the statement (without further elaboration) that Yao first offered the realm to Xu You before offering it to Zizhou Zhifu.

If we begin with an inner-chapters bias, we would conclude that the anecdote in *Zhuangzi* chapter 1 was written first by Zhuang Zhou, while the bulk of "Yielding Kingship" was written by Zhuang Zhou's putative followers, inspired by this first anecdote. Yet if we lay aside the inner chapters bias, it seems just as likely that the above-cited anecdote was removed from "Yielding Kingship", where it fit very well thematically, and placed in "Free and Easy Wandering" because of the content of Xu You's speech. Further evidence for this might be found in the minor differences between this passage and the *Lüshi chunqiu* parallel: many of the *Lüshi chunqiu* parallels with "Yielding Kingship" passages are exceedingly close, even word for word. This one, however, has clearly been reworked in one of the texts.

It has not been possible to settle definitively the question of priority regarding the *Lüshi chunqiu* and the *Zhuangzi*. It is possible, too, that both drew on a lost source or body of sources. Whatever the case may be, the fact is that both times Master Zhuang is mentioned in the *Lüshi chunqiu*, he is associated with a non-inner chapter passage. Furthermore, textual parallels between the *Lüshi chunqiu* and *Zhuangzi* inner chapter material are scantier and more problematic than we would expect if the inner chapters had already been a coherent body of text in Lü Buwei's 呂不韋 (d. 235 BCE) time. Though not conclusive in itself, this does seem to add to a growing body of evidence.

---

162) Ibid., 1.18; trans. Watson, *Complete Chuang Tzu*, 32-33.

Early Han Citations and Parallels

From the early Han, there are two different sources of evidence regarding the *Zhuangzi* text. The first is archaeological: strips discovered in tombs at Fuyang 阜陽 (ca.165 BCE) and Zhangjiashan 張家山 (ca.179-157 BCE). The second comes from the received tradition in form of numerous allusions in two rhapsodies (*fu* 賦) by Jia Yi 賈誼 (201-169 BCE) that are anthologized in the *Shiji*. Conveniently, these two sources would seem to be quite close in time though entirely different in nature.

Excavated Zhuangzi

Regarding the *Zhuangzi* strips found at Fuyang, Han Zhiqiang 韓志強 has published an extremely helpful summary.[163] Of the eight (badly-damaged) *Zhuangzi*-related strips found at Fuyang, one appears to contain material from "Zeyang"則陽 (*Zhuangzi* ch. 25), one from "Yielding Kingship" (*Zhuangzi* ch. 28), and six[164] from "External Things" (*Zhuangzi* ch. 26). The material from "Zeyang" and "Yielding Kingship" is extremely slight and fragmentary (five and six characters respectively). The six strips corresponding to "External Things," however, are striking. Enough has survived from these to reveal that the text was a version of the anecdote about Lord Yuan of Song's tortoise dream. This is the same anecdote that also has an extensive *Shiji* parallel, mentioned above. Though there is a fair amount of variation between the *Zhuangzi* and excavated versions, they are much closer to each other than either is to the *Shiji* version. It might be worth noting in this context that the *Shiji* chapter in question is one of the ten most questionable chapters, generally thought to have been lost and added subsequently by a later hand.[165]

As for the Zhangjiashan materials, the 1992 report published in *Wenwu* 文物 describes it as forty-four strips in a messy and difficult

---

163) "Fuyang chutu de *Zhuangzi* 'Zapian' Han jian" 阜陽出土的《莊子·雜篇》漢簡, *Daojia wenhua yanjiu* 道家文化研究 18 (2000): 10-14. The tomb, excavated in 1977, belonged to the Lord of Ruyin 汝陰 and his wife. For further details, see the report by Wang Xiangtian王襄天 and Han Ziqiang 韩自强, "Fuyang Shuanggudui Xi Han Ruyin hou mu fajue jianbao" 阜陽雙古堆西漢汝陰侯墓發掘簡報, *Wenwu* 1978.8: 12-31, 98-99.

164) Some of these six are almost surely pieces of the same strip—see Table 3 below.

165) See Yu Jiaxi 余嘉錫, *Taishi gong shu wangpian kao* 太史公書亡篇考, in *Yu Jiaxi lunxue ji* 余嘉錫論學集 (Taipei: Wenhai chubanshe, 1979), vol. 1, 1-108.

(*liaocao* 潦草) script, bearing the title "Robber Zhi" (though the character for "Zhi" is an unusual variant). The report goes on to state:

> The content is Confucius having an audience with Robber Zhi; this chapter is thus the 'Robber Zhi' from the *Zhuangzi* outer chapters [sic]. The content is complete, and the wording is basically identical to that of the existing edition.
> 内容為孔子見盜跖, 此篇即為《莊子·外篇·盜跖》。内容完整, 與現存版本内容基本一致。[166]

These strips have not been published in full, though Liao Mingchun has done a preliminary analysis based on two strips, photographs of which were published in the *Wenwu* article.[167]

Table 3 summarizes the distribution of the archaeological findings discussed above.

Table 3: Excavated *Zhuangzi* Compared to Received *Zhuangzi*

Site	Pieces (characters)	Content	*Zhuangzi* Parallel	*Zhuangzi* Chapter
Fuyang 阜陽	1 (5)	有乎生莫見	萬物有乎生而莫見其根。 The ten thousand things have their life, yet no one sees its root.	25 "Zeyang" (*Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 25.688; Watson, *Complete Chuang Tzu*, 288)
	1 (6)	樂與正為正樂	樂與政為政, 樂與治為治。 He delighted in ruling for the sake of ruling, he delighted in bringing order for the sake of order.	28 "Yielding Kingship" (*Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 25.771; Watson, *Complete Chuang Tzu*, 322)
	6 (48)	宋元君夜夢丈夫被=髮窺	宋元君夜半而夢人被髮闚阿門 Lord Yuan of Sung one night dreamed he saw a man with disheveled hair who peered in at the side door of his chamber…	26 "External Things" (*Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 26.714-15; Watson, *Complete Chuang Tzu*, 298-99)

166) "Jiangling Zhangjiashan liangzuo Han mu chutu dapi zhujian" 江陵張家山兩座漢墓出土大批竹簡, 1992.9: 2.
167) "Zhuangzi 'Dao Zhi' pian tanyuan," 49-59.

Table 3: Continued

Site	Pieces (characters)	Content	*Zhuangzi* Parallel	*Zhuangzi* Chapter
		之曰是龜	使人占之, 曰：此神龜也。(?) He ordered his men to divine the meaning, and they replied, "This is a sacred turtle."	
		何得曰得龜往視	君曰：漁何得？對曰：且之網得白龜焉, 箕圓五尺。君曰：獻若之龜。龜至 The ruler said, "What kind of fish have you caught?" [He] replied, "I caught a white turtle in my net. It's five feet around." "Present your turtle!" ordered the ruler. When the turtle was brought…	
		事七十兆而無遺筴故不能	知能七十二鑽而無遺筴, 不能 It knew enough to give correct answers to seventy-two queries but it couldn't	
		剖腸之患	避剖腸之患 escape the disaster of having its belly ripped open	
		有所不知而神有	如是, 則知有所困, 神有所不及也。 So it is that knowledge has its limitations, and spirituality has that which it can do nothing about.	
Zhangjiashan 張家山	44	[Robber Zhi story]	[Robber Zhi story]	29 "Robber Zhi" (*Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 29.776-80)

Those who work with archaeological materials will always be plagued with unanswerable questions about how representative their findings might be. Though two different finds with parallels in today's miscellaneous chapters certainly do no harm to my argument, neither can they be taken as conclusive.

A feature of the Fuyang materials that does seem to provide interesting and relevant evidence, however, is the juxtaposition of material from what are now three different chapters. This suggests that by the time of the burial, a body of proto-*Zhuangzi* materials was in the process of coming together. Whether or not it bore the name of *Zhuangzi* is, of course, another matter.

Jia Yi's Rhapsodies

Jia Yi's two rhapsodies, the "Lament for Qu Yuan" 吊屈原 and the "Rhapsody on the Owl" 鵩鳥賦, contain numerous allusions to what are now *Zhuangzi* passages.

Liu Xiaogan has used this fact as an argument against the hypothesis that the *Zhuangzi* was compiled in the Han. Noting the many unattributed but close Jia Yi/*Zhuangzi* parallels, Liu writes, "On the one hand, this indicates that Jia Yi was deeply influenced by *Zhuangzi*. On the other, [it] also shows that the *Zhuangzi* had a set form at that time and had a relatively wide influence."[168] The second claim requires considerable support, which Liu Xiaogan attempts to provide. He argues first that Jia Yi was said to have been "rather well versed in the books of the hundred schools of philosophers" (頗通諸子百家之書) by the age of eighteen (i.e., in the 180s BCE);[169] this would presumably have included the *Zhuangzi*. Liu then goes on to argue that

> If the *Zhuangzi* that was circulating at that time was only partial, then after the other had been completed there would be two versions of the *Zhuangzi* in circulation. If this were the case, then Sima Qian, who lived during this time, and Liu Xiang, Liu Xin, and Ban Gu, who lived somewhat later, would certainly have written about it. Hence, the text of the *Zhuangzi* that Jia Yi read must have been the completed volume.

This argument contains several problematic assumptions.

First, the fact of Jia Yi's having access to the *Zhuangzi* does not necessarily imply that the *Zhuangzi* had, as Liu Xiaogan suggests, either a set form or a wide influence. It does not even imply that the text was "in circulation." According to the *Shiji*, Jia Yi wrote both rhapsodies in question during his time as tutor to the King of Changsha. There, locally, he might well have had access to rare texts, including some version of the *Zhuangzi* not in general circulation.[170]

---

168) Liu Xiaogan, *Classifying the Zhuangzi Chapters*, 65.
169) *SJ* 84.2491.
170) In particular, it is interesting to speculate on the possibility of a southern *Zhuangzi* textual tradition. Changsha belonged to a more southern cultural sphere, as did Fuyang and also Huainan, discussed below.

The second problematic assumption in the above-quoted argument is that the four bibliophiles mentioned by Liu would necessarily have known about and/or mentioned the existence of two versions of the *Zhuangzi*. Sima Qian was relatively unspecific about the *Zhuangzi* text that he knew. If there was another version, perhaps edited at the Huainan court, it is plausible that he might *not* have had access to it, due to political circumstances discussed below. As for the imperial librarian Liu Xiang 劉向 (ca. 77 BCE-6 BCE), he could well have mentioned two or more versions of the *Zhuangzi* in his original catalogue of the imperial library "Separate Listings" 別錄 that was abbreviated by his son Liu Xin 劉歆 (46 BCE-23 CE) into the "Seven Summaries" 七略. Ban Gu's "Bibliographical Treatise," itself an abridgement of Liu Xin's work, could then easily have omitted such a discussion. Alternatively, the "second" version of the *Zhuangzi* could have become fixed sometime after Sima Qian but before Ban Gu, and might have quickly replaced its predecessor.

The third problematic assumption, which also underlies some of Liu Xiaogan's other arguments against a Western Han compilation date for the *Zhuangzi*, is that if the outer and miscellaneous chapters can be dated to the late Warring States then the completed compilation can be as well. This in turn is based on a potentially erroneous assumption about the stability of the internal structure of the proto-*Zhuangzi*.

Finally, it is important to note that though there appear to be many *Zhuangzi* allusions in Jia Yi's "Rhapsody on the Owl," only three have parallels is the inner chapters, and relatively loose parallels at that.[171] In fact, all three are found in the same inner chapter, the "Great and Venerable Teacher" (*Zhuangzi* ch. 6), also the chapter that contained the *Hanfeizi* parallel cited above.

In addition to these, I have identified sixteen fairly solid textual parallels with non-inner *Zhuangzi* chapters.[172]

As with the other sources, this is not the type of pattern one would expect if the seven inner chapters had formed a coherent or canonical unit in the text that Jia Yi saw.

---

171) Liu suggests a few more, but these are even more tenuous and would not see to require Jia Yi to have actually seen the *Zhuangzi* chapters he was purportedly alluding to. See *Classifying the Zhuangzi Chapters*, 61-67.

172) Based on Liu Xiaogan's work as well as my own reading of *Shiji* commentaries.

Table 4: Parallels Between Jia Yi's "Rhapsody on the Owl" and the *Zhuangzi*'s "Great and Venerable Teacher"

Jia Yi "Rhapsody on the Owl"	*Zhuangzi* "Great and Venerable Teacher"
千變萬化兮, 未始有極。忽然為人兮, 何足控摶；化為異物兮, 又何足患！(*SJ* 84.2499) A thousand, ten thousand mutations,/ Lacking an end's beginning./Suddenly they form a man!/How is this worth taking thought of?/ They are transformed again in death./But this too is not worthy of concern. (Watson, *Han I*, 449)[173]	亡, 予何惡！浸假而化予之左臂以為雞, 予因以求時夜；浸假而化予 之右臂以為彈, 予因以求鴞炙。(*Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 6.189) Why no, what would I resent? If the process continues, perhaps in time he'll transform my left arm into a rooster. In that case I'll keep watch on the night. Or perhaps in time he'll transform my right arm into a crossbow pellet and I'll shoot down an owl for roasting. (Watson, *Complete Chuang Tzu*, 84)
且夫天地為鑪兮, 造化為工 (*SJ* 84.2500) Heaven and earth are the furnace,/The workman, the Creator. (Watson, *Han I*, 449)	今一以天地為大爐, 以造化為大冶 (*Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 6.190) Now I think of Heaven and earth as a great furnace, and the Creator as a skilled smith. (Watson, *Complete Chuang Tzu*, 85)
釋知遺形兮 (*SJ* 84.2500) Discarding wisdom, forgetful of form… (Watson, *Han I*, 450)	離形去知 (*Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 6.205) Cast off form, do away with understanding… (Watson, *Complete Chuang Tzu*, 90)

Evidence and Absence

Textual parallels and explicit references in pre-Han and early Han texts have thus far failed to provide solid evidence for the existence, influence, or canonical status of *Zhuangzi* inner chapters. It might be objected that "the absence of evidence does not equal the evidence of absence." This is not a methodological truism, however. In fact, it is a simplified response to a highly complex problem, namely: how to evaluate a given hypothesis when the evidence available is not sufficient to *prove* anything either way.

To consider this issue in a more nuanced way, I would first note that in the case of *Zhuangzi* parallels, we do not actually have an absence of evidence—or at least we could imagine an absence far more gaping. If no one in the Warring States had ever heard of someone called Zhuang Zhou, if there were no references or parallels, if the *Shiji* did

[173] Burton Watson, trans., *Records of the Grand Historian: Han Dynasty*, 2nd ed. (New York: Renditions-Columbia Univ. Press, 1993), 2 volumes.

not contain any mention of the *Zhuangzi* text—in such a case there would really be nothing to work with. But the pattern of evidence does not look like this at all.

Instead there is a respectable number of textual parallels connected with what I cautiously describe as proto-*Zhuangzi* materials. The vast majority of these are from non-inner chapters, with only a few questionable examples from inner chapters. Consider a hypothetical situation in which the findings were reversed: suppose we found numerous pre-Han and early Han citations from the inner chapters with only a tiny and doubtful minority from the non-inner chapters. Would we be wrong to conclude that the inner chapters were most likely early while non-inner chapters were late? Certainly not, and indeed we would do so without hesitation. Intellectual integrity, therefore, should compel us to take seriously the opposite possibility, that the traditional beliefs regarding Zhuang Zhou's personal authorship of the inner chapters—and even regarding their early date—may well be unfounded.[174]

"Who Compiled the *Zhuangzi*?" Revisited

Who compiled the fifty-two chapter *Zhuangzi* text recorded by Ban Gu? The answer is intimately related to any conjecture about the nature and early history of the *Zhuangzi* text. Furthermore, in suggesting a Han dynasty compilation date for the bulk of the inner chapters, it would be helpful also to have a story about where they might first have appeared. That could lead to at least some conjecture about who created them and how they came to be included in the *Hanshu* "Bibliographical Treatise" version of the *Zhuangzi*.

Guan Feng states (without evidence or justification) that the *Zhuangzi* "was compiled and fixed by the retainers of the King of Huainan" (由淮南王的門下客編定的).[175] Harold D. Roth argued for the same

---

174) For more on how "absence of evidence" situations are dealt with in other fields, such as philosophy of science, see Elliott Sober, "Absence of Evidence and Evidence of Absence," *Philosophical Studies* 143.1 (2009): 63-90, which gives a nice discussion of cases that are in some ways comparable. For a more general introduction to the Bayesian framework from which these ideas are drawn, see Richard Jeffrey's *Subjective Probability* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2004).

175) Guan Feng, "Zhuangzi waiza pian," 62.

conclusion in "Who Compiled the *Zhuangzi*?" His strongest piece of evidence is from quotations in Li Shan's 李善 (d. 689) *Wenxuan* 文選 commentary that mentions two essays by Liu An: an "Explanatory Colophon to the *Zhuangzi*" 莊子後解 and a "Summary of the Essentials of the *Zhuangzi*" 莊子要略. Though these two essays are nowhere else attested, Roth points out that the "three-chapter explanatory section," which according to Lu Deming was contained in Sima Biao's commentary edition of the *Zhuangzi*, may well have included them.[176]

Liu An's purported authorship of a "Summary of the Essentials of the *Zhuangzi*" is particularly interesting. Based on the content of the "Summary of Essentials" 要略 chapter in the *Huainanzi* 淮南子,[177] the *Zhuangzi* "Summary of Essentials" might well have been a table of contents with a summary of each chapter.[178] Other evidence includes the extensive overlap between the *Huainanzi* and the *Zhuangzi*—Roth, following Charles LeBlanc, counts "about three hundred locations in the [*Huainanzi*] which contain ideas, phrases, or entire paragraphs borrowed from the [*Zhuangzi*]"—and also points out that two entire chapters of the *Huainanzi* are closely linked to two of the *Zhuangzi* inner chapters: *Huainanzi* chapter 11, "Placing Customs on a Par" 齊俗 is heavily influenced by *Zhuangzi*'s chapter 2, "Discussion on Making Things Equal" 齊物論; *Huainanzi* chapter 18, "Human Affairs" 人間 has much in common with *Zhuangzi*'s chapter 4, "The World of Human Affairs" 人間世. As Roth concludes, "there can be no doubt that a version of the material contained in the extant *Chuang Tzu* was at the court of Liu An."[179]

Despite the amount of textual overlap, however, there is only one attributed *Zhuangzi* quotation in the *Huainanzi*:

---

176) Roth, "Who Compiled the Chuang Tzu?," 118-21; LeBlanc, *Philosophical Synthesis*, 83. See also *Wenxuan* (Taipei: Wenjin chubanshe, 1987) 26.1250, 31.1469-70, 35.1614, 60.2583. According to Roth, the fact that "these essays are not listed in any of the biographical or bibliographical sources should not be seen as an indication that they are not genuine. They very well may have been transmitted, not as independent works, but as part of early redactions of the *Chuang Tzu*" (Roth, *The Textual History of the Huai-nan Tzu.* [Ann Arbor: Association for Asian Studies, 1992], 25-26).

177) See *Huainan honglie jijie* 21.700-12.

178) For recent studies on the interesting and innovative form of this chapter, see Judson Murray, "A Study of 'Yaolüe,'" *Early China* 29 (2004): 45-109, and Martin Kern, "The 'Yaolue' of the *Huainanzi* as a Western Han *Fu*," in *Text in Context: New Perspectives on the Huainanzi*, ed. Michael Puett and Sarah A. Queen (forthcoming).

179) Roth "Who Compiled the Chuang Tzu?," 118.

> …Thus Zhuangzi said, "The short-lived cannot come up to the long-lived; little understanding cannot come up to great understanding. The morning mushroom knows nothing of twilight and dawn; the summer cicada knows nothing of spring and autumn."
> 故莊子曰：「小年不及大年，小知不及大知，朝菌不知晦朔，蟪蛄不知春秋。」[180]

This quotation has a parallel in what is now *Zhuangzi* chapter 1. In addition, Zhuang Zhou appears twice as a character.[181] The first of these has no parallel in the extant *Zhuangzi*. The second is loosely parallel to an anecdote in "Xu Wugui" (*Zhuangzi* ch. 24).[182] In any case, as LeBlanc has observed, "*Chuang Tzu* is never treated as an authority" in the *Huainanzi*. LeBlanc concluded that this "reflects faithfully the intellectual mood of the cultured society of Former Han."[183] Roth also observed that the evidence "suggests a much less hallowed status for the *Chuang Tzu*: it is beloved, but it is not canonical."[184] This is exactly the kind of attitude we would expect if some of the Huainan scholars had a hand in editing or compiling the *Zhuangzi*. But does this fit the historical circumstances insofar as we know them?

Liu An, generally accepted to have been the patron behind the compilation of the *Huainanzi*, was an older contemporary of Sima Qian. He visited the court of Emperor Wu when Sima Qian was about six years old (in 139 BCE), and at that time presented a set of "inner chapters" (*neipian* 內篇), which are now understood to be the *Huainanzi* text. The *Hanshu* account of this presentation (it does not appear in the *Shiji*) records a curiously ambiguous reaction on the part of Emperor Wu: he "*ai mi zhi*" 愛秘之.[185] Roth translates this as "[was] delighted with the work and stored it in his personal collection."[186] Some Chinese scholars, however, have understood it to mean something more like "he acted pleased but hid it away."[187] In any case, during this

---

180) *Huainan honglie jijie* 12.410. See *Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 1.10, which is a close parallel with some variants.
181) *Huainan honglie jijie* 11.373, 19.654.
182) *Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi* 24.641.
183) LeBlanc, *Philosophical Synthesis*, 85.
184) Roth, "Who Compiled the Chuang Tzu?," 95.
185) *HS* 44.2145.
186) Roth, *Textual History*, 16.
187) See, for example, Qi Ziyang 漆子楊, "*Shiji* wei zhu lu *Huainanzi* yuanyin ji zuozhe wenti kaolun" 史記未著錄淮南子原因及作者問題考論, *Lanzhou daxue xuebao* 36.1 (2008): 98-101.

same visit, Emperor Wu also asked Liu An to write a composition on the *Li Sao* 離騷 (Encountering sorrow). The work that Liu produced is referred to as the "Li Sao zhuan" 離騷傳. Though eventually lost, it was quoted (and attributed to Liu An) by both Ban Gu and Liu Xie.[188]

Seventeen years after the visit described above, in 122 BCE, Liu An was accused of fomenting rebellion and committed suicide. The *Shiji* contains a detailed account of the build-up to this tragedy, including long dialogues between Liu An and his minister.[189] Yet the closest Sima Qian comes to mentioning the Huainan textual production—which, judging by records in the *Hanshu* "Bibliographic Treatise" must have been prodigious[190]—is to say that

> Various disputatious scholars and schemers madly composed beguiling words, flattering the king. The king was pleased, and rewarded them with much gold and money. Meanwhile, his rebellious plotting continually increased.
> 諸辨士為方略者, 妄作妖言, 諂諛王, 王喜, 多賜金錢, 而謀反滋甚。[191]

Clearly Sima Qian had no very high opinion of the scintillating intellectual milieu at Liu An's court. Jin Dejian 金德建 and others have debated whether or not Sima Qian even saw the *Huainanzi*.[192]

As LeBlanc observed, the passage from Liu An's "Li Sao zhuan" quoted by Ban Gu also appears in the *Shiji* biography of Qu Yuan, but without attribution.[193] This suggests that Sima Qian was at least cognizant of Liu An as an author. Did he have access to the early draft of the *Huainanzi* but chose not to use it, whether from disapproval or some other reason? Or did the political sensitivity of the whole Huainan issue militate against *anyone* having access to the text?

---

188) See the discussion in LeBlanc, *Philosophical Synthesis*, 48-50.

189) The problematic historicity of this chapter in the *Shiji* has been discussed sensitively by Griet Vankeerberghen in *The Huainanzi and Liu An's Claim to Moral Authority* (Albany: State Univ. of New York Press, 2001).

190) See *HS* 30.1741, 1747, 1754, etc.

191) *SJ* 118.4677.

192) See, for example, Jin Dejian 金德建, *Sima Qian suo jian shu kao*司馬遷所見書考 (Shanghai: Renmin chubanshe, 1963), 349-355, where he concludes that in Sima Qian's time, what would eventually become the *Huainanzi* text was merely a rough draft.

193) *SJ* 84.2482. See the discussion in Hawkes, *Songs of the South*, 52, and his translation of the passage concerned, 55-56.

It is difficult, perhaps impossible, to decide these questions. We do know that as early as Yang Xiong's 揚雄 (53 BCE-18 CE) *Fayan* 法言, the two texts (i.e., the *Huainanzi* and the *Shiji*) were already being juxtaposed and considered in some sense comparable:

> Someone asked, "Is it not so that [the King of] Huainan and the Honorable Senior Archivist possessed great knowledge? But how eclectic they were!" [I] said, "Eclectic, *how* eclectic! When people go astray from having too many [kinds of] knowing, then their works are eclectic. Only the works of the Sage are not eclectic."
> 或曰：「淮南、太史公者, 其多知與？曷其雜也！」曰：「雜乎雜！ 病以多知為雜, 惟聖人為不雜。」[194]

Perhaps future study will provide a more thorough understanding of Liu An and why Sima Qian portrayed him as he did. But the outlines I have so far been able to trace do suggest one thing: if there was, as Roth and Guan Feng believe, a Huainan *Zhuangzi*, it is possible that Sima Qian simply did not see it. How then would Liu Xiang have had access to it not very much later?

As mentioned above, Liu An's abortive (or perhaps fabricated) rebellion resulted in his suicide in 122 BCE. A comment elsewhere in the *Hanshu* mentions that the imperial bibliographer Liu Xiang's father Liu De 劉德 came into possession of at least some of the Huainan books:

> The emperor [Xuan, r. 73-49 BCE] revived the business of occult techniques for apotheosis and immortality. Huainan had *Great Treasure* and *Secrets of the Enclosure* "pillow book" texts. These texts discussed techniques for apotheosis and immortality, the summoning of spirit-beings, and the making of gold. There was also Zou Yan's method, *The Profound Way of Prolonging Life*.[195] No one of that generation had seen [these works], but in the time of Emperor Wu, Gengsheng's [=Liu Xiang's] father [Liu] De had been involved in the management of the Huainan case, and had obtained [these] texts. When [Liu Xiang] was young, he chanted [these works] and, in light of their rarity, presented them at court.

---

194) Wang Rongbao 汪榮寶, *Fayan yishu* 法言義疏 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1987) 5.163.
195) It seems possible that these eight characters are an interpolation, as they fit very awkwardly in the flow of the text and are not mentioned in the other account of Liu Xiang presenting these occult texts to the imperial court in *HS* 25B.1250. There the Huainan texts appear with slightly variant characters: 洪寶苑祕 instead of 鴻寶苑秘.

> 上復興神僊方術之事, 而淮南有枕中鴻寶苑秘書。書言神僊使鬼物為金之術, 及鄒衍重道延命方, 世人莫見, 而更生父德武帝時治淮南獄得其書。 更生幼而讀誦, 以為奇, 獻之 。[196]

Although the *Hanshu* does not mention a Huainan *Zhuangzi* text, this at least suggests a route whereby such a text could have ended up traveling from the court at Huainan to the imperial library: acquired by Liu De, passed down to his son Liu Xiang, presented at court (along with the occult texts named in this passage) and thence stored in the imperial library where it could have been catalogued, successively, by Liu Xiang, Liu Xin, and Ban Gu.

Regardless of its relation to the *Shiji*, the *Huainanzi* is well-known to stand in very close relationship to the *Zhuangzi*, as discussed above. LeBlanc has counted nearly three hundred citations in which the inner chapters are well represented. It seems safe to conclude that, whoever compiled the *Zhuangzi* and put the inner chapters in something like their current form, the Huainan authors had access to that version.

Conclusion

Suppose the inner chapters were the work of a master, and call him Zhuang Zhou. Suppose further that he also had devoted followers—the putative authors of at least some of the other chapters. If this were the case, then we would expect Zhuang Zhou's chapters to be cited *more* often than those of his followers, not less. Yet citation evidence gives us exactly the opposite data.

I am not arguing—as Ren Jiyu does [197]—that the inner chapters are garbage and should be abandoned completely, or even that all the material in them is late. I *am* arguing that it is time to let go of the notion that the historical Zhuang Zhou was their author, and of the

---

196) *HS* 36.1928-29. Roth understands this passage to mean that "works from the library of Liu An were added to the Imperial Archives when Liu Te settled his estate" (Roth, *Textual History*, 23). Whether or not "settled the Huainan estate" is the best translation for *zhi Huainan yu* 治淮南獄, clearly Liu De did somehow end up with the texts. Whether *qi* 其 here refers to the Huainan court or to the above-mentioned occult texts is ambiguous. It is clear, however, that the texts were presented to the imperial court *not* by Liu De during the reign of Emperor Wu, but by Liu Xiang in the reign of Emperor Xuan.

197) "Zhuangzi tanyuan," 56.

problematic assumption that they are the earliest stratum of the text. Instead we should consider the proto- or pre-Han *Zhuangzi* as a substantial body of textual material. It was perhaps loosely centered around the character Zhuang Zhou, but was also extremely heterogeneous and dealt with a large number of different figures. These ranged from fully historical to downright fantastical, Zhuang Zhou being such a figure (somewhere in the middle of the range) and Confucius another.

As for the inner chapters, they represent someone's judgement about what was best in that body of material. In other words, material for the inner chapters was carefully selected, probably by Han dynasty editors. These editors did not necessarily select material on the basis of its perceived authenticity but rather for quality and probably philosophical content. Whoever the editors were—Liu An's scholars or someone else—I conclude that they produced a version that was known at Huainan but unattested in the *Shiji*. Jia Yi's allusions suggest that he may have had a *Zhuangzi* (or a few proto-*Zhuangzi* chapters) but do not necessarily prove that it was the same *Zhuangzi* that was later read at Huainan. His *Zhuangzi* too seems more slanted toward outer and miscellaneous chapters material than inner chapters material.

In short, from the point of view of *compilation*, I argue that we should see the inner chapters as last, rather than first, to take fixed shape. This does not at all prevent them from preserving some authentically early ideas, nor should it detract from our enjoyment or admiration of them. Given the objections I have raised above, I would suggest that it is time to reconsider and revise certain long-held assumptions about the *Zhuangzi*. Chief among these is that the *Zhuangzi* inner chapters should be seen as the primary representatives of Zhuang Zhou's—or any fourth-century BCE thinker's—philosophical views.

Zhuangzi Chapters and Parallels (section numbers from Chen Guying, *Zhuangzi jinzhu jinyi*)

1 逍遙遊	1	2 *LSCQ*	3												
2 齊物論	1	2	3	4	5	6	7								
3 養生主	1	2 *LSCQ*	3												
4 人間世	1	2	3	4	5	6	7								
5 德充符	1	2	3	4	5	6									
6 大宗師	1	2	3 *HF*	4	5 JY	6	7	8	9 JY	10					
7 應帝王	1	2	3	4	5	6									
8 駢拇	1	2 JY													
9 馬蹄	1	2													
10 胠篋 SJ	1 LSCQ;	SJ	2												
11 在宥	1	2	3	4	5 JY										
12 天地	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 LSCQ	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
13 天道	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8							
14 天運	1	2	3	4	5 SJ	6	7								
15 刻意	1	2 JY	3												
16 繕性	1	2 JY	3												
17 秋水	1 JY	2	3	4	5 SJ	6	7								
18 至樂	1	2	3	4	5	6	7								
19 達生	1	2	3	4 LSCQ	5 LSCQ	6	7	8	9	10	11	LSCQ	12	13	
20 山木	1 LSCQ	2 HF	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 HF						

Key

LSCQ	*Lüshi chunqiu*
HF	*Han Feizi*
FY	Fuyang (excavation)
ZJS	Zhangjiashan (excavation)
JY	Jia Yi
SJ	*Shiji*
italics	Potentially doubtful

21 田子方	1	2 LSCQ	3	4 JY	5	6	7	8	9	10	11					
22 知北遊	1 JY	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	LSCQ				

23 庚桑楚 SJ	1 JY	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11 HF	12				
24 徐无鬼	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 LSCQ	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
25 則陽	1	2	3	4	5 JY	6	7	8 FY	9	10	11					
26 外物	1 LSCQ	2	3	4	5	6 FY;	SJ	7	8	9	10	11	12	13		
27 寓言	1	2	3	4	5	6	7									
28 讓王	1 LSCQ;	SJ	2	-	6	LSCQ		7	8	9	10	11	-	14	LSCQ	15 LSCQ, FY
29 盜跖 SJ	1 LSCQ;	SJ; ZJS	2 SJ	3												
30 說劍	1	2														
31 漁父 SJ	1	2														
32 列禦寇	1 JY	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 JY	11 SJ	12				
33 天下	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8								

莊子內篇	Parallel Text
1. 逍遙遊	LSCQ 22/5.3: 昔者堯朝許由於沛澤之中, 曰：『十日出而焦火不息, 不亦勞乎？夫子為天子, 而天下已治矣, 請屬天下於夫子。』許由辭曰：『為天下之不治 與？而既已治矣。自為與？啁焦巢於林, 不過一枝；偃鼠飲於河, 不過滿腹。歸已君乎！惡用天下？』遂之箕山之下, 潁水之陽, 耕而食, 終身無經天下之色。故賢 主之於賢者也, 物莫之妨；戚愛習故, 不以害之；故賢者聚焉。賢者所聚, 天地不壞, 鬼神不害, 人事不謀, 此五常之本事也。
2. 齊物論	
3. 養生主	LSCQ 9/5.4: 宋之庖丁好解牛, 所見無非死牛者；三年而不見生牛；用刀十九 年, 刃若新磨硎, 順其理, 誠乎牛也。
4. 人間世	
5. 德充符	
6. 大宗師	HF 20: 維斗得之…日月得之… Jia Yi (SJ 84.2500): 千變萬化兮, 未始有極・忽然為人兮, 何足控摶；化為異物兮, 又何足患！ Jia Yi (SJ 84.2499): 且夫天地為鑪兮, 造化為工 Jia Yi (SJ 84.2500): 釋知遺形兮
7. 應帝王	

莊子外篇	Parallel Text
8. 駢拇	Jia Yi (SJ 84.2500): 貪夫徇財兮, 烈士徇名 Jia Yi (SJ 84.2493): 世謂伯夷貪兮, 謂盜跖廉
9. 馬蹄	
10. 胠篋	SJ 63.2143*: [Chapter title] LSCQ 11/4.2: 跖之徒問於跖曰：『盜有道乎？』跖曰：『奚啻其有道也？夫妄意關內, 中藏, 聖也；入先, 勇也；出後, 義也；知時, 智也；分均, 仁也。不通此 五者, 而能成大盜者, 天下無有。』 SJ 124.3182:「竊鉤者誅, 竊國者侯, 侯之門仁義存」, 非虛言也。
11. 在宥	Jia Yi (SJ 84.2500): 德人無累兮, 知命不憂。
12. 天地	LSCQ 20/2.2: 堯治天下, 伯成子高立為諸侯。堯授舜, 舜授禹, 伯成子高辭諸侯而耕。禹往見之, 則耕在野。禹趨就下風而問曰：『堯理天下, 吾子立為諸侯, 今 至於我而辭之, 故何也？』伯成子高曰：『當堯之時, 未賞而民勸, 未罰而民畏, 民不知怨, 不知說, 愉愉其如赤子。今賞罰甚數, 而民爭利且不服, 德自此衰, 利自此作, 後世之亂自此始。夫子盍行乎, 無慮吾農事。』協而耨, 遂不顧。
13. 天道	

14. 天運	SJ 63.2139: 龍, 吾不能知其乘風雲而上天・吾今日見老子, 其猶龍邪！
15. 刻意	Jia Yi (SJ 84.2500): 其生若浮兮, 其死若休。
16. 繕性	Jia Yi (SJ 84.2500): 真人淡漠兮, 獨與道息。
17. 秋水	Jia Yi (SJ 84.2500): 小知自私兮, 賤彼貴我通。人大觀兮, 物無不可。 SJ 63.2143: 子獨不見郊祭之犧牛乎？養食之數歲, 衣以文繡, 以入大廟・當是之時, 雖欲為孤豚, 豈可得乎？
18. 至樂	
19. 達生	LSCQ 13/3: 莊子曰：『以瓦投者翔, 以鉤投者戰, 以黃金投者殆。其祥一也, 而有所殆者, 必外有所重者也。外有所重者, 泄蓋內掘。』 LSCQ 14/8.4: 張毅好恭, 門閭帷薄聚居眾無不趨, 輿隸棁(木改女)婦小童無不敬, 以定其身, 不終其壽, 內熱而死。單豹好術, 離俗棄塵, 不食穀實, 不衣芮 溫, 身處山林巖堀, 以全其生, 不盡其年, 而虎食之。 LSCQ 19/5.3: 東野稷以御見莊公, 進退中繩, 左右旋中規。莊公曰：『善』, 以為造父不過也, 使之鉤百而少及焉。顏闔入見。莊公曰：『子遇東野稷乎？』對曰：『然。臣遇之。其馬必敗。』莊公曰：『將何敗？』少頃, 東野之馬敗而至。莊公召顏闔而問之曰：『子何以知其敗也？』顏闔對曰：『夫進退中繩, 左右旋中規, 造父之御, 無以過焉。鄉臣遇之, 猶求其馬, 臣是以知其敗也。』
20. 山木	LSCQ 14/8.2: 莊子行於山中, 見木甚美, 長大, 枝葉盛茂, 伐木者止其旁而弗取, 問其故, 曰：『無所可用。』莊子曰：『此以不材得終其天年矣。』出於山, 及 邑, 舍故人之家。故人喜, 具酒肉, 令豎子為殺鴈饗之。豎子請曰：『其一鴈能鳴, 一鴈不能鳴, 請奚殺？』主人之公曰：『殺其不能鳴者。』明日, 弟子問於莊子 曰：『昔者山中之木以不材得終天年, 主人之鴈以不材死, 先生將何以處？』莊子笑曰：『周將處於材、不材之間。材、不材之間, 似之而非也, 故未免乎累。若夫 道德則不然：無訝無訾, 一龍一蛇, 與時俱化, 而無肯專為；一上一下, 以禾為量, 而浮游乎萬物之祖, 物物而不物於物, 則胡可得而累？此神農、黃帝之所法。若 夫萬物之情、人倫之傳則不然：成則毀, 大則衰, 廉則剉, 尊則虧, 直則骫, 合則離, 愛則隳, 多智則謀, 不肖則欺, 胡可得而必？』 HF 21.156: 此以皮之美自為罪。 Jia Yi (SJ 84.2500): 獨與道俱 HF 22.181-82: 楊子過於宋東之逆旅, 有妾二人, 其惡者貴, 美者賤。楊子問其故, 逆旅之父答曰：『美者自美, 吾不知其美也, 惡者自惡, 吾不知其惡也。』楊子謂弟子曰：『行賢而去自賢之心, 焉往而不美。』
21. 田子方	LSCQ 18/3.3: 孔子見溫伯雪子, 不言而出。子貢曰：『夫子之欲見溫伯雪子好矣, 今也見之而不言, 其故何也？』孔子曰：『若夫人者, 目擊而道存矣, 不可以容聲矣。』故未見其人而知其志, 見其人而心與志皆見, 天符同也。聖人之相知, 豈待言哉？ Jia Yi (SJ 84.2500): 至人遺物兮
22. 知北遊	Jia Yi (SJ 84.2499-2500): 合散消息兮, 安有常則 LSCQ 18/3.4: 故至言去言, 至為無為。淺智者之所爭則末矣。

莊子雜篇	Parallel Text
23. 庚桑楚	SJ 63.2143*: [Chapter title] Jia Yi (SJ 84.2495): 彼尋常之汙瀆兮, 豈能容吞舟之魚！橫江湖之鯷鰿兮, 固將制於螻螘。 HF 28*: 故宋人語曰：『一雀過羿, 羿必得之, 則羿誣矣。以天下為之羅, 則雀不失矣。』
24. 徐無鬼	LSCQ 1/4.3: 管仲有病, 桓公往問之, 曰：『仲父之病矣, 漬甚, 國人弗諱, 寡人將誰屬國？』管仲對曰：『昔者臣盡力竭智, 猶未足以知之也, 今病在於朝夕 之中, 臣奚能言？』桓公曰：『此大事也, 願仲父之教寡人也。』管仲敬諾, 曰：『公誰欲相？』公曰：『鮑叔牙可乎？』管仲對曰：『不可。夷吾善鮑叔牙, 鮑叔 牙之為人也：清廉潔直, 視不己若者, 不比於人；一聞人之過, 終身不忘。』『勿已, 則隰朋其可乎？』『隰朋之為人也：上志而下求, 醜不若黃帝, 而哀不己若 者；其於國也, 有不聞也；其於物也, 有不知也；其於人也, 有不見也。勿已乎, 則隰朋可也。』夫相, 大官也。處大官者, 不欲小察, 不欲小智, 故曰：大匠不 斲, 大庖不豆, 大勇不鬥, 大兵不寇。桓公行公去私惡, 用管子而為五伯長；行私阿所愛, 用豎刁而蟲出於戶。
25. 則陽	Jia Yi (SJ 84.2494): 所貴聖人之神德兮, 遠濁世而自藏。 FY (1): …有乎生莫見…
26. 外物	LSCQ 14/8.1: 外物不可必, 故龍逢誅, 比干戮, 箕子狂, 惡來死, 桀、紂亡。人主莫不欲其臣之忠, 而忠未必信, 故伍員流乎江, 萇弘死、藏其血三年而為碧。親莫不欲其子之孝, 而孝未必愛, 故孝己疑, 曾子悲。 FY (6): Lord Yuan of Song's dream (see Table 3)
27. 寓言	
28. 讓王	LSCQ 2/2.2: 堯以天下讓於子州支父。子州支父對曰：『以我為天子猶可也。雖然, 我適有幽憂之病, 方將治之, 未暇在天下也。』天下，重物也，而不以害其生，又況於它物乎？惟不以天下害其生者也，可以託天下。 SJ 61.2121: 示天下重器 SJ 61.2121: 說者曰堯讓天下於許由，許由不受，恥之逃隱。及夏之時，有卞隨、務光者。此何以稱焉？ LSCQ 21/4.2: 太王亶父居邠，狄人攻之，事以皮帛而不受，事以珠玉而不肯，狄人之所求者地也。太王亶父曰：『與人之兄居而殺其弟，與人之父處而殺其子，吾 不忍為也。皆勉處矣，為吾臣與狄人臣奚以異？且吾聞之：不以所以養害所養。』杖策而去，民相連而從之，遂成國於岐山之下。太王亶父可謂能尊生矣。能尊生， 雖富貴不以養傷身，雖貧賤不以利累形。今受其先人之爵祿，則必重失之。生之所自來者久矣，而輕失之，豈不惑哉？ LSCQ 19/1.2: 舜讓其友石戶之農。石戶之農曰：『棬棬乎后之為人也，葆力之士也。』以舜之德為未至也，於是乎夫負妻妻攜子以入於海，去之終身不反。

LSCQ 2/2.3: 越人三世殺其君，王子搜患之，逃乎丹穴。越國無君，求王子搜而不得，從之丹穴。王子搜不肯出，越人薰之以艾，乘之以王輿。王子搜援綏登車， 仰天而呼曰：『君乎，獨不可以舍我乎！』王子搜非惡為君也，惡為君之患也。若王子搜者，可謂不以國傷其生矣，此固越人之所欲得而為君也。

LSCQ 21/4.3: 韓、魏相與爭侵地。子華子見昭釐侯，昭釐侯有憂色。子華子曰：『今使天下書銘於君之前，書之曰：「左手攫之則右手廢，右手攫之則左手廢， 然而攫之必有天下。」君將攫之乎？亡其不與？』昭釐侯曰：『寡人不攫也。』子華子曰：『甚善。自是觀之，兩臂重於天下也，身又重於兩臂。韓之輕於天下遠， 今之所爭者，其輕於韓又遠，君固愁身傷生以憂之臧不得也？』昭釐侯曰：『善。教寡人者眾矣，未嘗得聞此言也。』子華子可謂知輕重矣。知輕重，故論不過。

LSCQ 2/2.4: 魯君聞顏闔得道之人也，使人以幣先焉。顏闔守閭，鹿布之衣，而自飯牛。魯君之使者至，顏闔自對之。使者曰：『此顏闔之家邪？』顏闔對曰：『此闔之家也。』使者致幣，顏闔對曰：『恐聽繆而遺使者罪，不若審之。』使者還反審之，復來求之，則不得已。故若顏闔者，非惡富貴也，由重生惡之也。世之 人主，多以富貴驕得道之人，其不相知，豈不悲哉！

LSCQ 16/2.3: 子列子窮，容貌有飢色。客有言之於鄭子陽者，曰：「列御寇，蓋有道之士也， 居君之國而窮，君無乃為不好士乎？」鄭子陽即令官遺之粟。子列子見使者，再拜而辭。使者去，子列子入，其妻望之而拊心曰：「妾聞為有道者之妻子，皆得佚 樂，今 有飢色。君過而遺先生食，先生不受，豈不命邪。」子列子笑，謂之曰：「君非自知 我也。以人之言而遺我粟，至其罪我也，又且以人之言，此吾所以不受也。」其卒， 民果作難而殺子陽。

LSCQ 21/4.4: 中山公子牟謂詹子曰：『身在江海之上，心居乎魏闕之下，奈何？』詹子曰：『重生。重生則輕利。』中山公子牟曰：『雖知之，猶不能自勝也。』詹子曰：『不能自勝則縱之，神無惡乎。不能自勝而強不縱者，此之謂重傷。重傷之人無壽類矣。』

LSCQ 14/6.4: 孔子窮於陳、蔡之間，七日不嘗食，藜羹不糝。宰予備矣，孔子弦歌於室，顏回擇菜於外。子路與子貢相與而言曰：『夫子逐於魯，削紇於紏，伐樹於宋，窮於陳、蔡，殺夫子者無罪，藉夫子者不禁，夫子弦歌鼓舞，未嘗絕音，蓋君子之無所醜也若此乎？』顏回無以對，入以告孔子。孔子憱然推琴，喟然而歎曰：『由與賜，小人也。召，吾語之。』子路與子貢入。子貢曰：『如此者可謂窮矣。』孔子曰：『是何言也？君子達於道之謂達，窮於道之謂窮。今丘也拘仁義之道，以遭亂世之患，其所也，何窮之謂？故內省而不疚於道，臨難而不失其德。大寒既至，霜雪既降，吾是以知松柏之茂也。昔桓公得之莒，文公得之曹，越王得之會稽。陳、蔡之彌，於丘其幸乎！』孔子烈然返瑟而弦，子路抗然執干而舞。子貢曰：『吾不知天之高也，不知地之下也。』古之得道者，窮亦樂，達亦樂。所樂非窮達也，道得於此，則窮達一也，為寒暑風雨之序矣。故許由虞乎潁陽，而共伯得乎共首。

LSCQ 19/1.2: 舜又讓 其友北人無擇。北人無擇曰：『異哉后之為人也，居於畎畝之中，而游入於堯之門。不若是而已，又欲以其辱行漫我，我羞之。』而自投於蒼領之淵。

	LSCQ 19/1.2: 湯將伐桀，因卞隨而謀，卞隨曰：「非吾事也。」湯曰：「孰可？」曰：「吾不 知也。」湯又因瞀光而謀，瞀光曰：「非吾事也。」湯曰：「孰可？」曰：「吾不知也。」湯曰：「伊尹何如？」曰：「強力忍垢，吾不知其他也。」湯遂與伊尹謀 伐桀 ，克之，以讓卞隨。卞隨辭曰：「后之伐桀也謀乎我，必以我為賊也；勝桀而讓我， 必以我為貪也。吾生乎亂世，而無道之人再來漫我以其辱行，吾不忍數聞也！」乃自投稠水而死。湯又讓瞀光，曰：「知者謀之，武者遂之，仁者居之，古之道也。 吾子 胡不立乎？」瞀光辭曰：「廢上，非義也；殺民，非仁也；人犯其難，我享其利，非 廉也。吾聞之曰：『非其義者，不受其祿；無道之世，不踐其土。』況尊我乎！吾不 忍久見也。」乃負石而自沈於廬水。 LSCQ 12/4.2: 昔周之將興也，有士二人，處於孤竹，曰伯夷、叔齊。二人相謂曰：『吾聞西方有偏伯焉，似將有道者，今吾奚為處乎此哉？』二子西行如周，至於 岐陽，則文王已歿矣。武王即位，觀周德，則王使叔旦就膠鬲於次四內，而與之盟曰：『加富三等，就官一列。』為三書同辭，血之以牲，埋一於四內，皆以一歸。 又使保召公就微子開於共頭之下，而與之盟曰：『世為長侯，守殷常祀，相奉桑林，宜私孟諸。』為三書同辭，血之以牲，埋一於共頭之下，皆以一歸。伯夷、叔齊 聞之，相視而笑曰：『譆，異乎哉！此非吾所謂道也。昔者神農氏之有天下也，時祀盡敬而不祈福也。其於人也，忠信盡治而無求焉。樂正與為正，樂治與為治，不 以人之壞自成也，不以人之庳自高也。今周見殷之僻亂也，而遽為之正與治，上謀而行貨，阻丘而保威也。割牲而盟以為信，因四內與共頭以明行，揚夢以說眾，殺伐以要利，以此紹殷，是以亂易暴也。吾聞古之士，遭乎治世，不避其任，遭乎亂世，不為苟在。今天下闇，周德衰矣。與其並乎周以漫吾身也，不若避之以潔吾 行。』二子北行，至首陽之下而餓焉。人之情莫不有重，莫不有輕。有所重則欲全之，有所輕則以養所重。伯夷、叔齊，此二士者，皆出身棄生以立其意，輕重先定 也。 FY (1): …樂與正為正樂…
29. 盜跖	SJ 63.2143*: [Chapter title] SJ 61.2125: 盜蹠日殺不辜，肝人之肉，暴戾恣睢，聚黨數千人橫行天下，竟以壽終。 ZJS (44): Entire Confucius/Robber Zhi story LSCQ 11/4.2: 備說非六王、五伯，以為『堯有不慈之名，舜有不孝之行，禹有淫湎之意，湯、武有放殺之事，五伯有暴亂之謀。世皆譽之，人 皆諱之，惑也』。故死而操金椎以葬，曰『下見六王、五伯，將穀其頭』矣。辨若此不如無辨。 LSCQ 10/3.1: 人之壽，久之不過百，中壽不過六十。以百與六十為無窮者之慮，其情必不相當矣。以無窮為死者之慮則得之矣。
30. 說劍	

31. 漁父	SJ 63.2143*: [Chapter title] LSCQ 2/5.2: 彊令之笑不樂，彊令之哭不悲。彊令之為道也，可以成小，而不可以成大。
32. 列禦寇	Jia Yi (SJ 84.2500): 澹乎若深淵之靜，氾乎若不繫之舟 Jia Yi (SJ 84.2494): 襲九淵之神龍兮，汔深潛以自珍 SJ 63.2143: 楚威王聞莊周賢，使使厚幣迎之，許以為相…子亟去，無污我．我寧游戲污瀆之中自快，無為有國者所羈，終身不仕，以快吾志焉。
33. 天下	