

## THE FORMATION OF *LUNYU* AS A BOOK

JOHN MAKEHAM

### Contents

Introduction .....	1
Authorship .....	2
Composition .....	6
The Name <i>Lunyu</i> .....	10
The Number of <i>pian</i> .....	13
<i>Qilun</i> and <i>Lulun</i> .....	17
<i>Zhang Hou Lun</i> in twenty <i>pian</i> .....	22
Conclusion .....	24

### Introduction

For the last two thousand years the twenty *pian* 篇 *Lunyu* 論語, or *Analects*, has served as the principal source of Confucius' (trad. 551–479) teachings. This essay presents an hypothesis of how and when this book was formed. Although my primary purpose has been to lay the groundwork for a much larger study of the exegetical tradition that has grown around *Lunyu*, more immediately this essay fills another long-standing lacuna, being the first detailed English language study on the formation of what has arguably been the single most influential text in pre-modern East Asian civilisation. In developing my hypothesis that *Lunyu* did not exist as a book prior to about 150–140 B.C., I examine a number of Chinese and Japanese interpretations about the authorship and composition of the text and submit them to critical evaluation. I have also drawn upon the evidence provided by archaeological texts unearthed over the last twenty or so years to propose that writings other than the received editions of *Lunyu* should be re-evaluated for their value as records of Confucius' thought, and also to identify possible influences that shaped the formation of the twenty-*pian Lunyu* in the Western Han (206 B.C. – A.D. 9).

---

I wish to extend a note of gratitude to Gary Arbuckle for some constructive critical feedback on an earlier draft of this paper.

Monumenta Serica 44

### Authorship

The assumption that *Lunyu* has existed as a book since the pre-Qin period (with the overwhelming consensus among contemporary Chinese scholars being that it had been in existence since the early to middle Warring States period [475–221 B.C.]) invites a number of problems regarding the “text’s” early history. The longest standing problem is that of authorship. Traditional accounts identify the writers-cum-compilers<sup>2</sup> of *Lunyu* as either Confucius’ immediate disciples or second generation disciples.<sup>3</sup> The *locus classicus* for the view that *Lunyu* was compiled by Confucius’ disciples<sup>4</sup> is found in Ban Gu’s 班固 (32–92) account in the *Hanshu* 漢書 “Treatise on Bibliography.”<sup>5</sup> If one were to accept this account then the compilation could not have been made before 429 B.C. We are able to deduce this because *Lunyu* 8.3,<sup>6</sup> describes Zeng Zi 曾子, the youngest of Confucius’ disciples,<sup>7</sup> on his deathbed instructing his own students. This could not have

<sup>1</sup> This is evident in any survey of the relevant literature and has been confirmed in individual discussions I had early in 1994 with Li Xueqin 李學勤, Zhang Dainian 張岱年, Zhu Bokun 朱伯崑, Fang Keli 方克立, and Xin Guanjie 辛冠潔, all of whom, incidentally, share this opinion.

<sup>2</sup> The idea of a proto-text or texts which later evolved to form *Lunyu* seems not to have been entertained.

<sup>3</sup> Huang Kan 黃侃 (485–545), *Lunyu yishu* 論語義疏, Kaitokudō redaction, 1.1a, in *Wu qiu bei zhai Lunyu jicheng* 無求齋論語集成, compiled by Yan Lingfeng 嚴靈峰 (Taipei: Yiwen yinshuguan, 1966), modifies this view by maintaining that while Confucius was still alive he already authorised what should be included in *Lunyu*, even though the actual compilation and editing did not occur until after his death.

<sup>4</sup> Zhu Yizun 朱彝尊 (1629–1709), *Jing yi kao* 經義考, *Sibu beiyao* 四部備要, 282.5a–5b, and also *Baoshu ting ji* 曝書亭集, *Sibu congkan* 四部叢刊 (first series, reduced format), 57.445, argues that in *Lunyu*, at least, *dizi* 弟子 refers to Confucius’ immediate disciples while *menren* 門人 refers to the students of those disciples. Fujitsuka Chikashi 藤塚謙, *Rongo zōsetsu* 論語總說 (Tokyo: Kokusho kankōkai, 1988; reprint of 1949 ed.), pp. 36–39, however, disagrees with this view. On the basis of one piece of textual evidence, he argues that in Han times *menren* referred specifically to one’s immediate students, not second and third generation students. He further argues and concludes that based on internal evidence found in *Lunyu*, *dizi* referred to a disciple only in those contexts where a student-teacher relation was concerned; *menren*, by contrast, referred to disciples generally. Fujitsuka cites too few examples to support his thesis and as it stands it remains unconvincing. Nevertheless, as there is some ambiguity as to whom the term *menren* refers in several passages, Zhu’s thesis should not be accepted too readily.

<sup>5</sup> 30.1717 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983).

<sup>6</sup> References to the *Lunyu pian* 論語篇 (“book”) and *zhang* 章 (“section”) divisions follow those used in the Harvard-Yenching Institute Sinological Series, Supplement 16 (Peking: Harvard-Yenching Institute, 1940).

<sup>7</sup> *Shiji* 史記, 47.1945 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983), records that Confucius died in 479 B.C.

been written earlier than fifty years after Confucius’ death because the following and related passage refers to a minister of Lu 魯, Meng Jingzi 孟敬子. In the “Tan Gong” 檀弓 *pian* of *Liji* 禮記,<sup>8</sup> Meng Jingzi is recorded as still being alive when Duke Dao 悼 of Lu died in 429 B.C.<sup>9</sup> At most, however, this evidence might be used as a guide to the dating of this *pian*,<sup>10</sup> not *Lunyu* as a whole.

Other accounts even identify individual disciples as the writers-cum-compilers. For example, Zheng Xuan 鄭玄 (127–200) lists “Zhong Gong 仲弓, Zi You 子游, Zi Xia 子夏, and others”<sup>11</sup> and the Han apocryphal work, *Lunyu chong jue chen* 論語崇爵識 gives “Zi Xia and sixty-four others.”<sup>12</sup> In neither case do we have any evidence to corroborate these accounts. This same weakness exists in Huang Kan’s account which identifies the students of the disciples generally as the authors<sup>13</sup> and Fu Xuan’s 傅玄 (217–278) account which attributes authorship to Zhong Gong’s students.<sup>14</sup>

at the age of 73. At 67.2205, Sima Qian 司馬遷 (ca. 145–86) further relates that Zeng Zi was forty-six years younger than Confucius, thus when Confucius died Zeng Zi would have been twenty-six years old.

<sup>8</sup> *Shisan jing zhushu* 十三經注疏 edition (Taipei: Yiwen-yinshuguan, 1985), 9.22a.

<sup>9</sup> Dating based on *Shiji*, 15.702.

<sup>10</sup> The more cautious would perhaps only agree to its reliability in dating this *zhang*.

<sup>11</sup> Cited by Lu Deming 陸德明 (556–627) in “*Lunyu yin yi*” 論語音義, *Jingdian shiwen* 經典釋文 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1985), 24.1a, and by Xing Bing 邢昺 (932–1010) in his preface to *Lunyu zhushu* 論語注疏 (Song edition), 1a, in *Wu qiu bei zhai Lunyu jicheng*. As a variation on this list, the Qing commentator Zhai Hao 翟灝 (d. 1788), *Sishu kaoyi* 四書考異, “Zong kao” 總考 (1769 edition), 9.4b, substitutes Zi Zhang 子張 for Zhong Gong.

<sup>12</sup> See Li Shan’s 李善 (ca. 630–689) commentary to Liu Xin 劉歆 (A.D. 46–23), “Yishu rang taichang boshi” 移書讓太常博士, *Wenxuan* 文選, 43.22a (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1977). In citing the same source in his commentary to Cao Zhi 曹植 (192–232), “Wang Zhongxuan lei” 王仲宣誄, *Wenxuan*, 56.23a, however, Li Shan writes “sixty men,” not sixty-four. Ma Guohan 馬國翰 (1794–1857), *Yuhan shanfang jiyishu* 玉函山房集佚書 (Taipei: Wenhai chubanshe, 1974), 2:2185 (*Lunyu chen*, 8.8.1a), identifies the full title of this apocryphal writing as *Lunyu chong jue chen*. It is unclear what is the basis for his ascription. Possibly it is Li Shan’s commentary to Cao Yanyuan’s 曹顏遠 poem, “Si you ren” 思友人, *Wenxuan*, 29.20a. In that passage, however, which is almost certainly corrupt, there is no mention of any disciple other than Zi Xia.

<sup>13</sup> *Lunyu yishu*, Preface, 1a. Liu Xie 劉勰 (ca. 465–522), “Lun shuo” 論說, *Wenxin diaolong* 文心雕龍, *Wenxin diaolong zhu* 注 (revised edition), Fan Wenlan 范文瀾 (annotator) (Taipei: Cuiwentang shuju, n.d.), *juan* 4, p. 326, also attributes the authorship and compilation of *Lunyu* to the *menren*. It is not clear, however, how specifically he is using the term.

<sup>14</sup> Quoted by Li Shan in his commentary to Liu Xiaobiao’s 劉孝標 (462–521) “Bian ming lun” 辯命論, 54.13b. Where this same passage is reproduced in Yan Kejun 嚴可均 (1762–1843), (ed.), *Quan shanggu Sandai Qin Han Sanguo Liuchao wen* 全上古三代秦漢三國六朝文 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1985), 49.7b, “Zhong Gong” 仲弓 has been changed to “Zhongni” 仲

Not all such accounts, however, have been so readily dismissed. For example, the use of the honorific “Zi” 子 to refer to Zeng Zi and You Zi 有子<sup>15</sup> has been taken by many commentators as evidence<sup>16</sup> that *Lunyu* was compiled by their followers. This is surprising as this thesis is undermined by the simple observation that other disciples were also referred to by the honorific “Zi,” for example, Ran Zi 冉子 and Min Zi 閔子. Furthermore, You Zi is not consistently referred to by the honorific “Zi”; sometimes he is referred to by his surname and name, You Ruo 有若 (12.9). Finally, it may be noted that the use of “Zi” to refer to Zeng Zi and You Zi is not limited to *Lunyu*: this same practice was followed in a number of pre-Qin works.<sup>17</sup>

It is, nevertheless, still possible to argue that the disciples of Zeng Zi had a larger hand to play in the compilation of *Lunyu* based on the fact that the name Zeng Zi occurs fifteen times, You Zi and Ran Zi thrice each and Min Zi twice. Furthermore, on the two other occasions that Zeng Zi is mentioned, Confucius refers to him by his personal name (*ming* 名), Shen 參 (4.15, 11.18).<sup>18</sup> As Confucius was his teacher this would have been entirely appropriate and consistent with his general practice when addressing his disciples.

Variations on this forms of address argument have also been used to identify others as the rightful compilers. The Song commentator Song Yongheng 宋永亨 points out that the only disciple in *Lunyu* whom Confucius addresses by his cognomen (*zi* 字) is Min Ziqian 閔子騫 (personal name Sun 損, cognomen Ziqian);<sup>19</sup> all other disciples he addresses by their personal names. Song cites this as evidence that *Lunyu* was compiled by Min Ziqian. While the argument is weakened by the passage at 11.13 where he is referred to as Min Zi, it could be argued that the inclusion of this particular passage was the work of Min’s own students.

尼. While this might appear a plausible amendment, it is not so because the next sentence refers to Confucius as “Fu Zi” 夫子.

<sup>15</sup> Liu Zongyuan 劉宗元 (773–819), “*Lunyu bian*” 論語辯, *Liu Hedong ji* 柳河東集 (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 1974), 68–69, proposes that You Ruo 有若 was given the honorific because after Confucius died he best bore a physical resemblance to the Master. *Mencius* 3A.4 also records that You Ruo resembled Confucius.

<sup>16</sup> Including Liu Zongyuan, “*Lunyu bian*,” p. 68, and Cheng Hao 程顥 (1032–1085), cited by Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130–1200) in his preface to *Lunyu jizhu* 論語集注, *Sishu zhangju jizhu* 四書章句集注 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1986), p. 43. Liu Zongyuan (p. 69) goes so far as to identify two students of Zeng Zi as being responsible for compiling *Lunyu*: Yuezheng Zichun 樂正子春 and Zi Si 子思. No evidence is advanced in support of this claim.

<sup>17</sup> For example, *Xun Zi*, *Mencius*, *Zhuang Zi*, and the “Tan gong” *pian* of *Liji*.

<sup>18</sup> In the case of 11.18 this may be inferred from the context.

<sup>19</sup> *Jing yi kao*, 211.2a.

Nor have forms of address arguments been the monopoly of Chinese commentators. Ogyū Sorai’s 荻生徂徠 (1666–1728) disciple Dazai Jun 大宰純 (1680–1747)<sup>20</sup> proposed that because (i) *Lunyu* 9.7, in the first half of *Lunyu*, refers to Qin Lao 琴牢 by his personal name, Lao, not his cognomen, Zikai 子開,<sup>21</sup> and (ii) *Lunyu* 14.1, in the second half of *Lunyu*, refers to Yuan Xian 原憲 by his personal name, Xian, not his cognomen, Zisi 子思, this is indicative of first person speech hence the first half of *Lunyu* was compiled by Qin Lao while the second half was compiled by Yuan Xian. This is a very long bow to draw and is considerably weakened by the fact that other disciples also refer to themselves using their personal names, for example, Ran Qiu 冉求 refers to himself as Qiu at 11.24.

A weakness common to all of the foregoing accounts is the assumption that *Lunyu* was the product of Confucius’ disciples and/or the students of those disciples. While it is reasonable to accept that much if not most of the received *Lunyu* is ultimately derived from records of Confucius’ speech and dialogue with his students (while acknowledging, of course, the impossibility of being able to ascertain the extent to which these putative records underwent modification in their long transmission), we do not know how long Confucius’ teachings were passed on orally after his death, the extent to which his disciples made notes of his teachings,<sup>22</sup> nor how many different sets of students’ notes were compiled and transmitted.<sup>23</sup> Even if we accept that the records transmitted by the students of Zeng Zi (or a Zeng Zi “school”) are better represented in the received text than the records of any of the other disciples, this cannot be generalised into the claim that the book, *Lunyu*, was the product of their editing. That the records of several different disciples are in evidence, brings us no closer to answering the question of when this material was first brought together to be regarded as a book in its own right.

<sup>20</sup> In his *Rongo kokun* 論語古訓, 5.3a, 7.8b, in *Wu qiu bei zhai Lunyu jicheng*, and also his *Rongo kokun gaiten furoku* 論語古訓外傳附錄 (Sōzanbo edition, Edo, 1745), 1b.

<sup>21</sup> Little is known of this disciple and there are conflicting accounts as to his name. The only extant source which lists both his personal name and his cognomen is the suspect *Kong Zi jiyu* 孔子家語, Chen Shike 陳士珂 (ed.), *Kong Zi jiyu shuzheng* 疏證, juan 9, 227, *Guoxue jiben congshu* 國學基本叢書, and even in this source two cognomens are given.

<sup>22</sup> *Hanshu*, 30.1717 does, however, record that each of his students made notes of Confucius’ speech and *Lunyu* 15.6 records one occasion where Zi Zhang wrote down the Master’s words on his sash.

<sup>23</sup> According to *Han Fei Zi* 韓非子, *Sibu beiyao*, 19.9a, his disciples split into eight “schools” after Confucius’ death. For details, see Chen Qitian 陳啓天, *Zengding Han Fei Zi jiaoshi* 增訂韓非子校釋, pp. 2–3 (Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1985); Chen Qiyou 陳奇猷, *Han Fei Zi jishi* 韓非子集釋, pp. 1081–1083 (Shanghai: Renmin chubanshe, 1974).

### Composition

In attempting to gain a clearer understanding of when *Lunyu* came into existence, the question of composition cannot be ignored. The single broadest division identified within the received *Lunyu* text is that between the first half, “Shang Lun” 上論, and the second half, “Xia Lun” 下論.<sup>24</sup> Arguments based on differing patterns of “forms of address” have been popular with those who have sought to prove that the “Xia Lun” was compiled later than the “Shang Lun.” The modern Taiwanese scholar, Hu Zhikui 胡志奎, develops the “forms of address” argument in the greatest detail. His most important points are as follows:<sup>25</sup>

- (I) The term “Fu Zi” 夫子 is used twelve times in the “Shang Lun” as a third person form of address; in the “Xia Lun” it is used twenty-seven times as a mixture of second and third person terms of address. In support of a late dating for the “Xia Lun,” Hu cites Cui Shu’s 崔述 (1740–1816) argument that “Fu Zi” was always used as a third person form of address before Mencius but beginning in Mencius’ time “Fu Zi” was also used as a second person form of address.<sup>26</sup>
- (II) Hu also cites Cui’s argument that in the “Shang Lun” the word “Zi (Master)” is used when referring to Confucius. The only exception to this is when Confucius is answering a ruler in which case “Kong Zi” 孔子 is used (to show respect for the ruler). In the “Xia Lun,” however, *pian* 11 to 15 all include examples of “Kong Zi” being used when Confucius is answering senior ministers (*daifu* 大夫), thus evidencing a departure from

<sup>24</sup> Perhaps the earliest extant reference to this division is in the preface to *Lunyu fenzhan* 論語分篇 by the Ming commentator Luo Yuyi 羅喻義. See Zhu Yizun, *Jing yi kao*, 221.5b. *Lunyu fenzhan* appears to be no longer extant. Luo maintains that the “Shang Lun” is concerned with matters relating to “sages and worthies” with its main focus being on learning, while the “Xia Lun” is concerned with matters relating to “emperors and kings” with its main focus being on the application of learning. While the soundness of this particular analysis need not concern us here, the view that the *Lunyu* text is composed of two distinct parts has been an influential one, both in China and Japan. Particularly influential have been variations on the view originally proposed by Itō Jinsai 伊藤仁齋 (1627–1705), namely that the two parts effectively represent the principal work and its later supplement. His argument is that “Xiang dang” 鄉黨 (*pian* 10) clearly marks the end of a book and the fact that it appears in the middle of the received text is indication that the following ten *pian* belong to a different book – the supplement. This, he argues, is confirmed by the range of subjects which are absent in the “Shang Lun,” the exceptionally lengthy passages such as 11.24, 13.3 and 16.1, and the listing of numbered sets composed of three, six, and nine, such as at 16.7, 16.10, 17.7. See *Rongo kogi* 論語古義, Preface, p. 2, in *Wu qiu bei zhai Lunyu jicheng*.

<sup>25</sup> *Lunyu bianzheng* 論語辯證, pp. 17–22 (Taipei: Lianjing chuban shiye gongsi, 1978).

<sup>26</sup> “Zhu Si kaixin lu” 洙泗考信錄. Gu Jiegang 顧頡剛 (ed.), *Cui Dongbi yishu* 崔東壁遺書 (Shanghai: Yadong tushuguan, 1936), *juan* 2, pp. 38–39.

the original usage.<sup>27</sup> Furthermore in *pian* 16, “Kong Zi,” not “Zi,” is used throughout to refer to Confucius.<sup>28</sup> Hu comments that the use of “Kong Zi” must have occurred at a time considerably after Confucius’ lifetime, as “Zi” would have been sufficient to know who was being referred to in Confucius’ own time or close to it.

- (III) When Confucius refers to himself in the “Shang Lun” he uses “Qiu” 丘 (seven times). In the “Xia Lun,” however, others use this term to refer to him (once) as well as “Kong Qiu” (three times). Hu cites Cui Shu who claims that this use of Confucius’ personal name, Qiu, has a derogatory sense thus indicating that the provenance of these passages is apocryphal in a similar way to those passages in *Zhuang Zi* 莊子 which quote and discuss Confucius.<sup>29</sup> As to the use of “Zhongni” 仲尼 (six times) in *pian* 19, Hu argues that this matches the practice in *Mencius* thus indicating a similar dating for the “Xia Lun.”

The problem with the thrust of these arguments as evidence of a “Shang Lun”/“Xia Lun” distinction is that while individual *zhang* (and possibly individual *pian*) might be singled out as evidencing a date of composition no earlier than the time of *Mencius*, the claim nevertheless is really a question-begging one for it has not been established either that the “Shang Lun” and “Xia Lun” are each homogeneous, integral compositions, or, if the “Shang Lun” were largely homogeneous and integral, when it was written.

Hu does not limit his arguments in support of the “Shang Lun”/“Xia Lun” distinction to the above; drawing on and developing the arguments of earlier commentators he also presents evidence based on *pian* titles. His main points<sup>30</sup> are as follows:

- (I) “*Pian* titles in the ‘Shang Lun’ mostly ignore the first two or three words and base the title on the following two words while in the ‘Xia Lun’ most are named using the first two words that appear.”<sup>31</sup> While this is so, nev-

<sup>27</sup> D.C. Lau, *The Analects* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1983), p. 223, however, proposes that “Kong Zi” could be used when Confucius was “conversing with someone superior in station or senior in age” which would leave only 11.6 in the “Xia Lun” as problematical because Nan Rong 南容 was younger than Confucius. 14.5 is also possibly problematical in that it is not certain who Nangong Kuo 南宮适 was. Citing a tradition that Nangong Kuo and Nan Rong are one and the same person, Lau concludes: “Judging by his clan name of Nan-kung, Nankung K’uo must have been descended from the ruling house in Lu,” thus accounting for the use at 11.6 and 14.5.

<sup>28</sup> “*Lunyu yushuo*” 論語餘說, pp. 20–22, *Cui Dongbi yishu*.

<sup>29</sup> “Zhu Si kaixin lu,” *juan* 4, p. 28.

<sup>30</sup> *Lunyu bianzheng*, pp. 46–49.

<sup>31</sup> These same observations had already been made by Dazai Jun in his list of differences between the “Shang Lun” and the “Xia Lun.” See his *Rongo kokun gaiten furoku*, p. 2a.

ertheless, we do not know what connection exists between the *pian* titles and the person or persons who compiled *Lunyu*.

- (II) "There is a clear homogeneity in the content in each of the first four *pian* of the 'Shang Lun' which matches their titles, while in the 'Xia Lun' there are no *pian* where this is the case." Hu makes much of this argument but in none of these *pian* does a significant proportion of the content match their respective titles. Further, Hu makes the unwarranted assumption that in the "Shang Lun" *pian* titles were chosen to represent the theme of a *pian*. It is neither established that such themes exist nor that the *pian* titles were created at the same time that the *pian* were written/compiled.
- (III) "The words and deeds of Confucius play a minor role particularly in the last five *pian*." This is a significant point and will be examined further in connection with Cui Shu.
- (IV) Hu claims that the *persona* of Confucius is quite different in a number of "Shang Lun" *pian* ("Shu er" 述而, "Zi han" 子罕) when compared with a number of "Xia Lun" *pian* ("Wei Ling gong" 魏靈公, "Ji shi" 季氏, "Yang Huo" 陽貨, and "Wei Zi" 微子), particularly his concern with office and politics. This is a questionable point as one could choose a number of *pian* from the "Shang Lun" and argue that Confucius' treatment of a particular issue was different in each *pian*; indeed, one can find such differences even within the same *pian*. Or again, one might argue that the differences represent different periods in Confucius' life rather than different periods of compilation. It is not too much to expect Confucius to have a complex *persona*; certainly from certain statements in *Lunyu*<sup>32</sup> we would also expect his thinking to change over time.

Hu concludes from this group of arguments that unlike the "Xia Lun," the "Shang Lun" evidences a definite relationship between *pian* titles and content. This is clearly not proven. He further hypothesises that the "Shang Lun" was the product of the first editing of *Lunyu*, while "Xia Lun" was the result of the second editing. It is hard to see how the arguments assembled under (II) support this.

The third type of argument refined by Hu<sup>33</sup> is based on a tally of the number of words in the *zhang* divisions in the "Shang Lun" and "Xia Lun." Hu found that in the "Xia Lun" there are seven *zhang* which are in excess of 120 words whereas there are none in the "Shang Lun" as long as this. Yet seven out of the

<sup>32</sup> For example, 2.4

<sup>33</sup> *Lunyu bianzheng*, pp. 49-54. Hu also develops a fourth type of argument (pp. 26-30) which attempts to show that certain "Xia Lun" passages were written at or after the time of Mencius. Yet of the seven examples cited, only one or two admit serious consideration on *prima facie* grounds. To generalise from these one or two examples about the composition of the entire "Xia Lun" is clearly untenable.

total of two hundred and forty-six *zhang* which comprise the "Xia Lun" is not a significant proportion. More importantly, we do not know how the *zhang* were originally divided. His findings for word counts of sentences is more telling, showing that (I) the range for the number of words per *zhang* to be more stable in the "Shang Lun," (II) the average number of words per *zhang* is higher and the range less stable in the "Xia Lun," (III) the average number of words per long *zhang* is higher and the range less stable in the "Xia Lun," and (IV) the average number of words per short *zhang* is higher and the range less stable in the "Xia Lun." If we accept that the *zhang* divisions in a hypothetical "original" or "proto" *Lunyu* were not significantly different from those found in He Yan's *Lunyu jijie* then these figures might indicate an important difference between the "Shang Lun" and the "Xia Lun." Yet in so far as the argument hinges on averages and means and that an important factor bearing on the averages and means obtained for the last ten *pian* is the inclusion of a number of disproportionately long *zhang*, then again the possibility that materials from different lineages of transmission were incorporated into parts of the last ten *pian* presents itself as a possibility.

Despite the criticisms I have raised to Hu's arguments, it is evident that there are a number of striking differences between the first ten *pian* and the second ten *pian*. It is, however, quite a different matter to generalise from this to argue that both the "Shang Lun" and "Xia Lun" each form a homogeneous and integral "book." From Hu's evidence, at most one could argue that at some point seven of the first ten *pian* had been edited such that each *pian* begins with "Zi yue" 子曰 or "Zi wei" 子謂 while only one *pian* in the "Xia Lun" ("Xian jin" 先進) begins with "Zi yue." Save perhaps this last point, it is difficult to see evidence of any characteristic common to all or even most *pian* in the "Xia Lun." In view of this, one might then advance a modified version of Hu's argument along the lines that while a case for the whole of the last ten *pian* cannot be made, nevertheless, there are blocks or groups of *pian* in the last ten *pian* that can be grouped together on the grounds that they are so different from any other parts of the text. This, in fact, was Cui Shu's position. Focussing his critical eye on the last five *pian*, 16-20, his arguments<sup>34</sup> may be summarised as follows:

- (I) Much of the "Ji shi" *pian* is in matching couplets which is not the case with any other *pian*.
- (II) 18.5, 18.6, and 18.7, which concern stories about hermits and madmen, are reminiscent of stories in the later *Zhuang Zi*.
- (III) "Kong Zi" is used to refer to Confucius throughout "Ji shi" and in much of "Wei Zi."

<sup>34</sup> "Zhu Si kaixin lu," *juan* 4, pp. 28-29.

- (IV) “Yang huo” 陽貨 is a eclectic mix of material. Its use of numbered sets is also shared with “Ji shi.”<sup>35</sup> In two *zhang* in this *pian* “Fu Zi” is used to refer to Confucius, which Cui identifies to be a Warring States usage.
- (V) “Zizhang” 子張 consists entirely of the sayings of Confucius’ disciples and followers and the use of “Zhongni” to refer to Confucius is unusual.
- (VI) The disparate contents of “Yao yue” 堯曰 identify it as being the result of materials being appended to the end of the *Lunyu* text.

Cui argues that these five *pian* comprise a later supplement that was appended to the first fifteen *pian*. D.C. Lau endorses this conclusion and expands upon Cui’s individual arguments.<sup>36</sup> Yet when did this occur? We simply do not know to what extent changes were made to the order of the *pian* in their transmission. We do know, however, that in the Western Han there was some variety both in the number and in the order of the *pian* (discussed below) as transmitted by different scholars. As the order of the *pian* in the received text was fixed by Zhang Yu 張禹 in the late Western Han (discussed below), we have no way of confirming to what extent that order faithfully followed the order of the *pian* in any hypothetical proto-*Lunyu*. Is not the very disparate nature of the contents of the received text more likely to be evidence of a body or bodies of writings that was edited over an extended period of time, perhaps only having stability imposed upon it relatively late, perhaps even as late as the Han dynasty? A clue to this question may lie in its name because until a body of writings had achieved a certain degree of stability it is unlikely to have been identified by a stable name.

### The Name *Lunyu*

This suspicion that it may have only been in early Han times that a relatively stable form of the collection of writings became known as *Lunyu*<sup>37</sup> is strengthened by the lack of any reliable reference to the name *Lunyu* in pre-Han sources (despite the fact that many passages and paraphrases of passages which occur in the received *Lunyu* text are found in a variety pre-Qin writings). While some scholars regard the earliest explicit reference to the name *Lunyu* to be a passage in the “Fangji” 坊記 *pian* of *Liji*,<sup>38</sup> others make a stronger case for the view that

<sup>35</sup> See also Lau’s detailed discussion of the numbered sets in *pian* 16, 17, and 20, in *Confucius: The Analects*, pp. 224-225.

<sup>36</sup> *Confucius: The Analects*, pp. 222-227, 233.

<sup>37</sup> This same observation applies to a variety of other pre-Han writings.

<sup>38</sup> *Shisan jing zhushu* edition, 51.16a-b, ed. by Kong Yingda 孔穎達 (574-648) (Taipei: Yiwen yinshuguan, 1985). “Fangji” is thought to have originally been part of *Zi Si Zi* 子思子, a work ascribed to Zi Si 子思 (ca. 492 - ca. 431). See Shen Yue 沈約 (441-513), *Suishu* 隋書 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1973), 13.288; Takeuchi Yoshio 武內義雄, *Eki to Chūyō no kenkyū* 易と中庸の研究 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1943), pp. 11-17, 32-34. Jeffrey Riegel has chal-

“Fangji” is a Han writing.<sup>39</sup> In the absence of any other pre-Han references to *Lunyu*, in conjunction with the fact that *Liji* was compiled in the Han, there is a reasonable likelihood that this example is not pre-Han. Similarly, the explicit reference to *Lunyu* in *Kong Zi jiaju* 孔子家語<sup>40</sup> is unreliable because the received text, which purports to be a pre-Qin work, is most likely a forgery by Wang Su 王肅 (195-256),<sup>41</sup> as is the postface to this work, attributed to Kong Anguo 孔安國 (fl. ca. 120 B.C.) and which also refers to *Lunyu*.

In the “Zhengshuo” 正說 *pian* of his *Lunheng*,<sup>42</sup> Wang Chong 王充 (27 - ca. 97) claims that Fu Qing of Lu 魯扶卿<sup>42</sup> was the first to use the name *Lunyu*.<sup>43</sup>

lenged this view in his “The Four ‘Tzu Ssu’ Chapters of ‘Li Chi’: An Analysis and Translation of the ‘Fang Chi’, ‘Chung yung’, ‘Piao chi’, and ‘Tzu I’” (Ph.D. diss., Stanford University, 1978), pp. 68-73, in particular.

<sup>39</sup> Riegel dates it approximately to the mid-first century B.C., see his “The Four ‘Tzu Ssu’ Chapters of ‘Li Chi,’” pp. 112-115, and notes, in particular. Tsuda Sōkichi 津田左右吉, *Rongo to Kōshi no shisō* 論語と孔子の思想 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1946), pp. 50-56, also dates this *pian* and the quotations of Confucius as Western Han. Another study which questions the pre-Qin status of the “Fangji” *pian* is Itō Tomoatsū 伊東倫厚, “Raiki ‘Bōki’, ‘Hyōki’, ‘Shie’ hen ni suite” 禮記坊記表記、繹衣篇について, *Tōkyō Shinagakuho* 東京支那學報 15 (1969), pp. 30-35. Alternatively, one might argue that in the many other passages which quote Confucius, both in “Fangji” and other *pian* in *Liji*, formulas such as “Zi yun” 子云 or “Kong Zi yue” 孔子曰 are used; “*Lunyu* yue” 論語曰 is used nowhere else. This supports Takeuchi Yoshio’s view, *Eki to Chūyō no kenkyū*, p. 127, that the “Fangji” reference to *Lunyu* is a case of a marginal annotation being copied into the text. If this were so, then even if the “Fangji” should not be a Han work, the marginal annotation in all probability would be.

<sup>40</sup> “Qi shi er dizi jie” 七十二弟子解. *Kong Zi jiaju shuzheng*, p. 225.

<sup>41</sup> For a recent discussion of this old question, see Section 3 of the Introduction to Yoav Ariel, *K’ung-Ts’ung-Tzu: The K’ung Family Masters’ Anthology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989). Ariel (p. 65) challenges Robert Paul Kramers’ view that “Wang Su did not forge *K’ung-tzu chia-yu* but rather overhauled a collection of Confucian lore that already existed before his time.” Kramers’ conclusions are outlined on pp. 193-198 of his detailed study, *K’ung Tzu Chia Yu: The School Sayings of Confucius* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1949). See also his recent “*K’ung-tzu chia yü*,” in *Early Chinese Texts: A Bibliographical Guide*, ed. by Michael Loewe, (Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, and the Society for the Study of Early China, 1993), pp. 258-262. Kramers’ thesis is vindicated in part by the *Kong men dizi wen* 孔門弟子問 fragments discovered at Ding xian 定縣, Hebei, in 1973, which include a number of passages that are also found in the received *Kong Zi jiaju* (curiously Kramers [1993] does not make reference to this material). Questions still remain, however, as to what extent Wang Su collected materials from pre-Han sources (disparate or otherwise) and also to what extent he supplemented this material with his own writings.

<sup>42</sup> In his commentary cited at *Jingdian shiwen*, Preface, 31a, Zheng Xuan notes that Fu was also called Fu Xian 扶先 or Fu xian sheng 扶先生. “Qing” 卿 is possibly an honorific term (as in Xun Qing 荀卿), as is “xian sheng.”

<sup>43</sup> See *Lunheng jiaoshi* 論衡校釋, 2 vols., annot. by Huang Hui 黃暉 (Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1983), 2:113.

This same source relates that the name *Lunyu* only first began to be used after Fu Qing had studied *Lunyu* under Kong Anguo. As the only dates we have for Kong Anguo are an approximation, Fu Qing's dates cannot be given with any more precision. There is, however, another reference to the name *Lunyu* that also dates from the period of Emperor Wu: a memorial in Dong Zhongshu's 董仲舒 (ca. 179 – ca. 104) biography in *Hanshu* (56.2514). Most recently, this memorial has been dated 130 B.C.<sup>44</sup> This would almost certainly predate Fu Qing's reference to *Lunyu* and so place Wang Chong's claim in jeopardy. Nevertheless, in this same biography, fifteen other passages which occur in the received *Lunyu* are also quoted in this biography and are all prefaced with the formula, "Kong Zi yue" 孔子曰.<sup>45</sup> One might infer either that the single reference to "*Lunyu*" was a later interpolation or that *Lunyu* was not in its final form; that is, many passages beginning with the formula "Kong Zi yue" were only later included in a more or less stable *Lunyu*.<sup>46</sup> Be that as it may, however, there is another book which refers specifically to "*Lunyu*" that may be dated to approximately the same time as

<sup>44</sup> See Gary Arbuckle, "When Did Tang Meng Reach Yelang?," *B.C. Asian Review*, III-IV (1990), pp. 341-348. In a personal communication, Arbuckle notes that the dating of the memorial is somewhat of an academic exercise given his conviction that Ban Gu edited Dong Zhongshu's memorials for style, thus the *Lunyu* reference may not have been made by Dong Zhongshu. Zhao Zhenxin 趙真信, "*Lunyu* yiming zhi laili yu qi jieshi" 論語一名之來歷與其解釋, *Shixue jikan* 史學集刊, 2 (1936), p. 18, dates this memorial between 140-134. Tsūda Sōkichi, *Rongo to Kōshi no shisō*, p. 35, dates it 134. For a discussion of the problems in dating Dong's memorials, see Tain Tzey-yueh, "Tung Chung-shu's System of Thought, its Sources and Influence on Han Scholars" (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 1974), pp. 46-54.

<sup>45</sup> Tsūda, *Rongo to Kōshi no shisō*, pp. 34-37, argues that when Confucius is quoted in Dong's memorials or the slightly earlier *Hanshi waizhuan* 韓詩外傳, the "Kong Zi yue" formula is used, but when it is not Confucius who is being quoted, "*Lunyu* yue" is used. His thesis is undetermined by the fact that in *Hanshi waizhuan*, of the three passages prefaced by "*Lunyu* yue" two are attributed to Confucius in the received *Lunyu*. See *Hanshi waizhuan jishi* 集釋, ed. by Xu Weiyu 許維通 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980), *juan 5, zhang 34* (p. 201), and *juan 6, zhang 6* (p. 209). Tsūda failed to identify the second of these, claiming that there was only one exception and that this may have been a copyist's mistake.

<sup>46</sup> This hypothesis might seem to be supported by the fact that in the "Ren yi fa" 仁義法 *pian* and the "Bi ren qie zhi" 必仁且智 *pian* of *Chunqiu fanlu* 春秋繁露 – considered to be amongst those *pian* closest to Dong Zhongshu's pen – two *Lunyu* passages are quoted yet only the word *Lun* 論 is used, not *Lunyu*. Nevertheless, even in considerably later sources (by which time *Lunyu* was well established) such as the "Zhengshuo" 正說 *pian* of *Lunheng*, 2:1131, and *Hanshu*, 81.3352, "*Lun*" is also used. (To complicate the picture, in the "Zhengshuo" *pian*, both "*Lun*" and "*Lunyu*" are used.) What this might indicate is that *Lunyu* was first named *Lun* (ca. 150-140 B.C.) – hence the names *Gulun* 古論, *Qilun* 齊論, and *Lulun* 魯論 (these versions of *Lunyu* to be discussed below) – and subsequently was still sometimes referred to by its original name.

Dong Zhongshu's memorial: *Hanshi waizhuan*.<sup>47</sup> It is thus evident that a book called "*Lunyu*" existed in some form by circa 140 B.C.<sup>48</sup>

### The Number of *pian*

This then brings us back to the earlier question of how many *pian Lunyu* was comprised in the Han dynasty. Central to this question is the purported discovery of a *guwen* 古文 version of *Lunyu* in twenty-one *pian* in the wall of Confucius' house during the reign of Emperor Wu.<sup>49</sup> The date of this discovery has been much disputed – as indeed has the discovery itself – in part because of conflicting evidence in the Han sources. Ban Gu maintains that it was towards the end of Emperor Wu's reign (141-87) that a *guwen* version of *Lunyu* was found in the walls of Confucius' house by King Gong 共 of Lu 魯.<sup>50</sup> Liu Xin 劉歆 (d. A.D. 23) partly corroborates this account (although not the date),<sup>51</sup> but from Liu's reference to "after the *tian Han* 天漢 reign period (100-97)" in his account, we know that the find must have occurred before 100 B.C. Wang Chong records that although the *guwen Lunyu* was not unearthed until the time of Emperor Wu, the discovery of a cache of *guwen* manuscripts by King Gong of Lu had actually occurred during the reign of Emperor Jing (157-141).<sup>52</sup> Yet elsewhere Wang Chong writes that it was in the reign of Emperor Wu that Gong was invested as King of Lu and subsequently discovered the cache of *guwen* manuscripts.<sup>53</sup> This account of his investiture, however, is surely a mistake as both *Shiji* (59.2095) and *Hanshu* (53.2413) record this event as having taken place in 155 B.C. in the reign of Emperor Jing. As King Gong of Lu died in 130,<sup>54</sup> then if he did indeed

<sup>47</sup> Three occurrences: *Hanshi waizhuan jishi*, *juan 2, zhang 21* (p. 57); *juan 5, zhang 34* (p. 201); and *juan 6, zhang 6* (p. 209). Although Han Ying 韓嬰 (ca. 200-120) served in office under both Emperors Wen 文 (180-157) and Jing 景 (157-141), it is quite possible that *Hanshi waizhuan* was not completed until early in the reign of Emperor Wu (141-87).

<sup>48</sup> One might push the date back another twenty-odd years if one were to accept Zhao Qi's 趙岐 (ca. 108-201) account that chairs for *Lunyu* academicians (*boshi* 博士) were already established in the reign of Emperor Wen. See his preface to *Meng Zi zhangju* 孟子章句, in Jiao Xun 焦循 (1763-1820), *Meng Zi zhengyi* 孟子正義, in *Zhuzi jicheng* 朱子集成, vol. 1 (Shanghai: Shanghai shuju, 1986), 8. Zhao's account might be seen to be supported by similar comments made by Liu Xin, *Hanshu* 36.1969, although, significantly, Liu does not specifically mention *Lunyu*.

<sup>49</sup> *Lunheng*, 28.1132.

<sup>50</sup> *Hanshu*, 30.1706.

<sup>51</sup> *Hanshu*, 36.1969.

<sup>52</sup> "Zhengshuo," *Lunheng*, 28.1121.

<sup>53</sup> "Yiwen" 佚文, *Lunheng*, 21.858.

<sup>54</sup> *Shiji*, 59.2095; or 128 B.C., according to *Hanshu*, 53.2413.

discover a *guwen* version of *Lunyu* after his investiture in 154, then this would have had to have occurred some time between 154 and 130, a period which just happens to coincide with the dating of those sources in which the earliest extant references to *Lunyu* are to be found. One implication of this would be that already in the Warring States period the twenty-one *pian* that were to be named "*Lunyu*" were in existence.

Much debate has centred on the question of the authenticity of the *guwen* manuscripts purportedly discovered in the wall of Confucius' house.<sup>55</sup> In the absence of any new evidence weakening the claim to authenticity, there is a broad consensus in modern scholarship that the *Gulun* was an authentic pre-Qin body of writing. The most probable explanation for its being thus concealed was to escape the fate of being burnt with the other proscribed writings during the Qin dynasty. Importantly, however, we do not know when it was originally compiled, if it originally had the status of a book, or even if it was privileged as a single collection.

My own view is that its status as a book was a product of being singled out for special attention in the Western Han precisely because it had been found in the wall of Confucius' house and the ascendancy of Confucianism at this time required that an orthodox and standard version of Confucius' recorded sayings be established. And once these twenty-one *pian* were regarded as forming a book in their own right and conferred a name to signal this status and homogeneity, the process of textual closure was imminent. Subsequently, the assumption became that these twenty-one *pian* had existed as a book ever since they were first recorded, when actually it was a Western Han invention. Yet this is by no means to imply that the contents of these twenty-one *pian* were a Western Han fabrication. There is no reason to suspect that much if not most of the material contained in these twenty-one *pian* did not ultimately derive from the early Warring States period. Indeed, Ōta Tatsuo 太田辰夫 has identified the grammar of the received text – which, as I argue below, derives from the twenty-one *pian* *Gulun* edition – as being an early example of the Lu dialect.<sup>56</sup> By the same token, however, equally there is no reason to assume that the material had always existed as a 'fixed' or closed collection or that in the Qin or pre-Qin periods it had a special

<sup>55</sup> See, for example, Bernhard Karlgren, *On the Authenticity and Nature of the Tso Chuan*, (Taipei: Ch'eng-wen Publishing Co., 1968), pp. 18-19. Paul Pelliot's charge that the account of the discovery of these books is a legend from the first century B.C. has found few supporters. See his "Le Chou-king en caractères anciens et le *Chang chou wen*," *Mémoires concernant l'Asie Orientale*, II (1916), pp. 123-177.

<sup>56</sup> *Koten Chūgokugo bunpō* 古典中國漢語文法 (rev. ed., Kyoto: Kyūkosho, 1984), pp. 192-193. On grammatical grounds, he dates it earlier than the received *Mencius*, although his claim that *Lunyu* is two hundred years older than *Mencius* is unsubstantiated and would appear to accept uncritically the traditional dating of *Lunyu*.

status or even that originally the twenty-one *pian* of which it is composed were regarded as forming a distinctive unit, a book, as opposed to a collection of *pian* or even several collections of *pian*. Indeed, as John B. Henderson has written with reference to "the inchoate collections of ancient writings from which Confucian scholars eventually extracted their canon":

Throughout most of the Chou era, the "texts" of these collections were in quite a fluid state and existed in diverse forms. According to the renowned scholar Fu Ssu-nien, even the concept of the book did not exist in the Chou era, only *p'ien* (roughly "chapters"),<sup>57</sup> most of which were written on silk rolls or bamboo strips. These *p'ien* were combined in diverse ways for various reasons to form collections but not books in the modern sense.<sup>58</sup>

When one considers (i) the overall lack of systematic arrangement of the various *pian* as well as the disparate nature of the last ten *pian* in particular, and (ii) the large number of passages that are repeated in the received text,<sup>59</sup> this increases the likelihood that the twenty-one *pian* discovered circa 150-140 B.C. were originally several collections of *pian* recording Confucius' and his disciples' speech and actions, and that only subsequent to their discovery were these collections regarded as a single book. Nor is there any reason to believe that these twenty-one *pian* represented the entire corpus of such early collections of the Masters' sayings, or that in pre-Qin times they had been privileged as a single collection or as a group of collections over any other early collection or collections of the Master's sayings. These suspicions are supported by the fact that in other pre-Han writings which record Confucius' sayings, some of which are also found in the received text of *Lunyu* and a great many more which are not, there is no attempt to lend greater authority to those which are found in the received text than those which are not.

Let us consider, for example, the case of *Mencius*, the work one would expect to be most likely to privilege the twenty-one *pian* *Lunyu*, should the latter have already attained the status of a book or a unique collection of records before *Mencius* was compiled. If *Lunyu* were already a book or a unique collection of records when *Mencius* was compiled, one would expect it to be quoted extensively, yet of the twenty-eight passages in *Mencius* which begin with "Kong Zi yue" or "Zhongni yue," a mere eight are found in the received *Lunyu*. Of these eight only one is identical with the received text; of the other seven, one is

<sup>57</sup> I would take issue with Henderson on this point, as "chapters" implies a subdivision of a whole, while a *pian* does not.

<sup>58</sup> *Scripture, Canon and Commentary: A Comparison of Confucian and Western Exegesis* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), p. 35.

<sup>59</sup> Yang Bojun 楊伯峻 (trans.), *Lunyu* (Taizhong: Landeng wenhua shiye gongsi, 1987), pp. 2-3.



slightly different while of the other six, the wording is so different that even if it were granted that they were quotations from a proto-*Lunyu* corpus that was then in existence, clearly between then and the end of the Western Han the contents of this corpus underwent significant editing. Yet rather than postulating a proto-*Lunyu* corpus that underwent significant editing, it is more reasonable to attribute all twenty-eight passages<sup>60</sup> to a collection or, more probably, a number of collections of Confucius' sayings that were already in existence when *Mencius* was written.<sup>61</sup> These collections would have included some (and possibly all) of the material that was also contained in the twenty-one *pian* that were discovered in the wall of Confucius' house and which were collectively named *Gulun*. That passages common to two or more collections were not necessarily identical<sup>62</sup> further supports the hypothesis that the Master's sayings were transmitted in a variety of collections. Given the large number of passages quoting Confucius in such early works as *Zuozhuan*, *Guoyu* 國語, and *Mencius*, for which no matching examples can be found in the received *Lunyu*, one suspects that the disparate collections of "recorded sayings" from which these quotations were derived would, collectively, have been many *pian* larger than the twenty-one *pian* of the *Gulun*.

Indirect evidence that there were a number of pre-Qin collections recording Confucius' sayings and his conversations with his disciples is forthcoming from a number of sources. Several collections which come to mind straight away are the *Kong Zi jiayu* in twenty-seven *pian* listed in the *Hanshu* "Treatise on Literature" (30.1716), and the "Tan gong" 檀弓, "Zhongni yan ju" 仲尼燕居, and "Kong Zi xian ju" 孔子閒居 *pian* of *Liji*.<sup>63</sup> More recently are the twenty-seven *zhang* recording Confucius' conversations with his disciples that were unearthed in Ding xian 定縣 in 1973 and named *Rujia zhe yan* 儒家者言 by modern Chinese scholars.<sup>64</sup> The tomb from which the bamboo strips were unearthed has been

<sup>60</sup> This same observation applies to another four passages from *Mencius*, which are not attributed to Confucius, for which approximate matches can be found in *Lunyu*.

<sup>61</sup> The same observation applies to the case of *Xun Zi* 荀子, where *Lunyu* is not cited once and of those many passages which quote Confucius, not one is found in the received *Lunyu*.

<sup>62</sup> Such as we find in *Mencius* and the received text of *Lunyu*.

<sup>63</sup> Ōta Tatsuo, *Koten Chūgokugo bunpō*, p. 193, reports that like the grammar of the received *Lunyu* and *Mencius*, the grammar of the "Tan gong" *pian* is characteristic of the Lu dialect. He concludes that it should either be dated somewhere between these two writings or else regarded as a very convincing attempt to fake an early Lu writing. Given the grammatical difficulties involved, this latter possibility would seem to credit a Han forger with rather too much ingenuity and initiative. Karlgren, *On the Authenticity and Nature of the Tso chuan*, p. 56, also notes that the Lu dialect is in evidence in "Kong Zi xian ju."

<sup>64</sup> See He Zhigang 何直剛, "Rujia zhe yan lüeshuo" 儒家者言略說, *Wenwu*, 1981.8, pp. 20-22. An annotated transcription, "Rujia zhe yan shiwen" 儒家者言釋文, appears in the same issue, pp. 13-19.

dated at 55 B.C.<sup>65</sup> As the latest historical person to be quoted in the material is Zeng Zi's disciple, Yuezheng Zichun 樂正子春, it has been suggested that it may be the work of the latter's own followers.<sup>66</sup> Of particular interest, however, is that not only would nearly all of the material contained in *Rujia zhe yan* be quite at home in *Lunyu*, moreover, three of the *zhang* have been identified as having matches in *Lunyu*.<sup>67</sup> This is a prime example of what I believe to be one of a number of pre-Qin collections of writings that record Confucius' sayings and his conversations with his disciples and which survived the Qin burning of the books. That some of the material transmitted by one Confucian lineage or group in the pre-Qin period should also have been transmitted by other Confucian lineages or groups is, of course, quite expected. Another recently excavated Confucian writing is the "Er san zi wen" 二三子問 manuscript, appended to the *Yizhuan* 易傳 which was discovered at Mawangdui in 1973.<sup>68</sup> The manuscript follows a question and answer format between Confucius and his disciples (*er san zi*) on the subject of the *Book of Changes*. While there is evidence of later thinking in parts of the writing, it has been argued that it is a record of Confucius' teachings on the *Book of Changes* as transmitted by his later followers.<sup>69</sup>

#### *Qilun and Lulun*

Besides the *Gulun* in twenty-one *pian*, Ban Gu also recorded the existence of two other editions of *Lunyu* said to have been in existence in the early Western Han:<sup>70</sup>

<sup>65</sup> "Hebei Ding xian 40 hao Han mu fajue jianbao" 河北定縣 40 號漢墓發掘簡報, *Wenwu*, 1981.8, p. 10.

<sup>66</sup> He Zhigang, "Rujia zhe yan lüeshuo," p. 22.

<sup>67</sup> "Rujia zhe yan shiwen," p. 19.

<sup>68</sup> The discovery of the Mawangdui *Yizhuan* manuscript puts pay once and for all to the claim that *Yizhuan* was a Han writing. For a transcription of "Er san zi wen," see Chen Songchang 陳松長 and Liao Mingchun 廖明春, "Boshu *Er san zi wen*, *Yi zhi yi*, *Yao shiwen*" 帛書《二三子問》、《易之義》、《要》釋文, ed. by Chen Guying 陳鼓應, *Daojia wenhua yanjiu* 道家文化研究, no. 3 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1993), pp. 424-428.

<sup>69</sup> See Liao Mingchun, "Er san zi wen jieshuo" 二三子問解說, *Daojia wenhua yanjiu*, no. 3, pp. 190-195.

<sup>70</sup> Wang Chong also refers to other versions of "*Lunyu*" in various *pian* combinations ("Zhengshuo," *Lunheng*, 28.1134): "The twenty *pian Lunyu* referred to nowadays is missing the Qi-Lu 齊魯 and Hejian 河間 [versions] in nine *pian*. Originally there were thirty *pian*." The twenty *pian Lunyu* Wang refers to is the *Zhang Hou Lun* 張侯論 recension of the *Lulun* (to be discussed below) which for most of the Eastern Han was the standard edition of *Lunyu*. As for the Qi-Lu and Hejian versions, elsewhere in the "Zhengshuo" *pian* (28.1132) Wang lists them amongst those that King Gong of Lu recovered from Confucius' house: "Coming to Emperor Wu, he excavated a number of *guwen* manuscripts from the wall of Confucius' house including a *guwen* version of *Lunyu*, twenty-one *pian*; a Qi-Lu version and a Hejian version, nine *pian*. Together they comprised thirty *pian*." (While commentators have suggested a variety of

the *Qilun* in twenty-two *pian* and the *Lulun* in twenty *pian*. Ban Gu's account, which is recorded in his "Treatise on Bibliography" in *Hanshu*, is based on the bibliography, "Qi lue" 七略, compiled by Liu Xin, which in turn is based on Liu Xiang's 劉向 (79–8 B.C.) "Bie lu" 別錄. In the preface to *Lunyu jijie* 論語集解, Liu Xiang is also cited as the source for this information about the three different editions of *Lunyu*.

Of the twenty *pian* that the *Qilun* had in common with the *Lulun*, Liu Xiang comments that "the *zhang* 章 and *ju* 句 considerably exceed those in the *Lulun*."<sup>71</sup> This could mean either that there were more *zhang* and *ju* in the *Qilun* or that individual *zhang* and *ju* in the *Qilun* were lengthier. Furthermore, the *Qilun* had two extra *pian* unique to it. Ban Gu lists these as "Wen wang" 問王 and "Zhi dao" 知道.<sup>72</sup> The *Lulun* is considered to be the principal basis for the received text. It has the same number of *pian* and, if we accept Lu Deming's account, their order also matches that of the received text. As to textual differences between these two editions and the *Gulun*, Huan Tan 桓譚 (43 B.C. – A.D. 28) notes discrepancies in the readings of over four hundred words (presumably this refers only to the twenty *pian* in common).<sup>73</sup>

amendments to this passage, if we apply the principle of Occam's Razor the simplest solution is to regard the word 二 as a marginal note that has been incorporated into the text. This suspicion is strengthened by the fact that when the passage is substantially repeated on p. 1314, the 二 is not included.) Nevertheless, it is questionable how much credence can be placed in Wang's account, particularly as the Qi-Lu and Hejian versions are confirmed in no other early sources. His most "creative" defender has been Takeuchi Yoshio, *Rongo no kenkyū* (originally published in 1939), in *Takeuchi Yoshio zenshū* 武内義雄全集 (Tokyo: Kadokawa shoten, 1979), vol. 1, pp. 77-143, *passim*. Takeuchi's arguments are unconvincing, however, for a number of reasons. First, while speculating that the Qi-Lu version (which he accepts was in two *pian*) was written when Mencius went to Qi and convened a gathering of Qi and Lu scholars, he fails to establish what connection the purported Lu portion of the Qi-Lu text has with Lu scholarship. Second, his claim that seven of the last ten *pian* form a homogenous body of writing – an argument which in places is advanced on the strength of tendentious argument and questionable textual changes – remains unconvincing because for a composite text such as *Lunyu*, as a methodological principle it is inappropriate to generalise from what may be the case with one *zhang* to make claims about a whole *pian*, much less seven *pian*. Finally, his account fails to explain why the "Zihan" *pian* was included in the "Shang Lun."

<sup>71</sup> *Lunyu jijie*, Yuan edition, in *Wu qiu bei zhai Lunyu jicheng*, 1a.

<sup>72</sup> *Hanshu*, 30.1716. Traditional commentators have long suspected that the first of these should be "Wen yu" 問玉. *Taiping yulan* 太平御覽 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1985), 804, pp. 6a-b, includes a passage that is identified as having been left out of, or lost from *Lunyu* ("yi *Lunyu*" 佚論語). Part of the same passage is cited in *Shuowen jiezi* 說文解字 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1979), 1B.7b, where it is attributed to Confucius. As its contents have to do with jade it may originally have been part of the *Qilun*.

<sup>73</sup> *Jingdian shiwen*, Preface, p. 31a.

Of perhaps greater relevance to the question of the genesis of the *Qilun* and the *Lulun* is what concerns their transmission. *Hanshu* and *Lunyu jijie* each list transmitters for both editions.<sup>74</sup> For the *Qilun*, a total of six men are listed: Censor-in-Chief Wang Qing 王卿 of Langye 瑯琊 (fl. 100 B.C.),<sup>75</sup> Yong Sheng 庸生 of Jiaodong 膠東 (fl. ca. 74–53),<sup>76</sup> Commandant-in-ordinary of the Nobles Wang Ji 王吉 of Langye (fl. ca. 80–47),<sup>77</sup> Chamberlain for the Palace Revenues Song Ji 宋畸 of Donghai 東海 (fl. 72–67 B.C.),<sup>78</sup> Censor-in-chief Gong Yu 貢禹 of Langye (d. 44 B.C.),<sup>79</sup> and Chamberlain for the Palace Revenues Wulu Chongzong 五鹿充宗 (fl. 38 B.C.).<sup>80</sup> The period covered by the seven *Lulun* transmitters is similar: Defender Gong Fen 龔奮 of Changshan 常山 (n.d.), Fu Qing of Lu (fl. ca. 110–87),<sup>81</sup> Counsellor-in-chief Wei Xian 韋賢 (148–67)<sup>82</sup> and his son Wei Xuancheng 韋玄成 (d. 36 B.C.),<sup>83</sup> Chamberlain for the Palace Revenues Xiahou Sheng 夏侯勝 of Changxin 長信 (fl. ca. 74–49),<sup>84</sup> Front General Xiao Wangzhi 蕭望之 (fl. ca. 74–46)<sup>85</sup> and Zhang Yu 張禹, Marquis of Anchang 安昌侯 (d. 5 B.C.).<sup>86</sup>

Of both groups, Gong Fen is the only person whose *floruit* (fl.) is unknown. Given the dates of the others, however, the middle period of Emperor Wu's reign would be a good possibility. If we accept this, then the most striking feature of both lists is that no transmitters are listed from any period earlier than the reign of Emperor Wu, indicating that Ban Gu's statement, "when the Han dynasty

<sup>74</sup> *Hanshu*, 30.1717 and *Lunyu jijie*, Preface, 1a (latter citing Liu Xiang).

<sup>75</sup> See *Hanshu*, 19B.785, and Xing Bing's sub-commentary, *Lunyu zhushu*, Preface, 2b, for this date.

<sup>76</sup> Based on the information in Zhang Yu's biography in *Hanshu*, 81.3347, that Yong Sheng studied *Lunyu* under Zhang Yu prior to the *ganlu* 甘露 reign period (53–50) of Emperor Xuan 宣 (r. 74–49).

<sup>77</sup> Approximate dates based on events in his biography, *Hanshu*, 72.3058-3066.

<sup>78</sup> Dates based on references to him at *Hanshu*, 19B.800 and 78.3273.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, 19B.816.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, 19B.820.

<sup>81</sup> The only guide we have for these dates is that, according to Wang Chong, he studied under Kong Anguo. The most likely approximation for Fu Qing's *floruit* would be some time in the latter half of Emperor Wu's reign.

<sup>82</sup> *Hanshu*, 73.3107.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, 73.3115.

<sup>84</sup> Approximate *floruit* based on his biography, *Hanshu*, 75.3155-3159. *Jingdian shiwen*, Preface, 31a, also lists his cousin, Xiahou Jian 夏侯建, as another transmitter.

<sup>85</sup> Approximate *floruit* based on his biography, *Hanshu*, *juan* 78.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, 81.3352.

arose there were the interpretations of Qi and Lu,<sup>87</sup> should not necessarily be taken strictly to mean “at the outset” of the Han dynasty. This suspicion is lent further credibility when one considers the dates of the seven *Lulun* transmitters. Finally, when we also consider the likelihood that the name “*Lunyu*” only began to appear some time slightly before or after the beginning of Emperor Wu’s reign, it looks increasingly possible that the *Qilun* and *Lulun* editions of *Lunyu* did not exist before this period.<sup>88</sup> If so, this raises the question of their relationship with the *Gulun* for it is surely more than a coincidence that all three “editions” should appear at about the same time.

Takeuchi Yoshio has proposed that the *Qilun* and *Lulun* were none other than copies of the *Gulun* that differed from one another in their *jinwen* 今文 (“cleric”) transcriptions of the *Gulun* text.<sup>89</sup> There are two apparent difficulties with this interpretation; both, however, can be countered. (i) The question of the *Qilun* having two more *pian* than the *Lulun*. This difficulty may be countered if one accepts that the Qi tradition simply divided one of the *Gulun pian* in two,<sup>90</sup> while the Lu tradition conflated two.<sup>91</sup> (ii) Liu Xiang comments that “the *zhang* and *ju* [in the *Qilun*] considerably exceeded those in the *Lulun*.” Understanding this passage to mean “more *zhang* and *ju*,” the difficulty may be countered if one accepts that not only did the *Qilun* have two more *pian*, but also that the internal *zhang* and *ju* divisions within all twenty-two *pian* were generally shorter and

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, 30.1717. This, of course, is a charitable interpretation. It is more probable that he did believe (mistakenly) that the *Qilun* and *Lulun* had their origins in the early years of the Han.

<sup>88</sup> It is also worth noting that the biography of the famous bibliophile, Liu De 劉德, King of Hejian 河間王 (fl. 155–129), records that he obtained books such as *Zhou guan* 周官, *Liji*, *Mencius*, *Lao Zi*, and established academicians for the Mao 毛 recension of *Poetry* and the *Zuo* 左 commentary on *Chunqiu*, yet no mention is made of *Lunyu* – Qi, Lu, or otherwise. See *Hanshu*, 53.2410.

<sup>89</sup> *Rongo no kenkyū*, p. 69.

<sup>90</sup> Consider the case of *pian* 21 of the *Gulun*. According to Huang Kan, *Lunyu yishu*, Preface, 3b, *pian* 21 was called “Zizhang wen” 子張問 and was originally taken from “Yao yue” 堯曰. According to He Yan 何晏 (190–249), *Lunyu jiyie*, Preface, 1b, it was called “Zizhang,” and was a duplication of 20.2. According to the Three Kingdoms *Hanshu* commentator Ru Chun 女淳, *Hanshu*, 30.1717, n. 1, *pian* 21 was called “Cong zheng” 從政 and made by breaking “Yao yue” at the line *heru keyi cong zheng* 何如可以從政. (N.B. the received text, 20.2, reads *heru si keyi cong zheng yi* 何如斯可以從政矣.) There is also evidence to suggest that the break was made elsewhere. According to *Jingdian shiwen*, 24.22a (3:1391), in a comment that was possibly based on Zheng Xuan’s original commentary to *Lunyu*, the *Lulun* did not have the passage beginning *Kong Zi yue bu zhi ming* 孔子曰不知命 (i.e., the received 20.3), while the *Gulun* did. If this is so, then this would imply that it was from *Kong Zi yue bu zhi ming* that the break was made.

<sup>91</sup> Alternatively we might consider the possibility that one *pian* was removed. Cf. the *Saishu*, 32.939, account that Zhang Yu removed the two *pian*, “Wen wang” and “Zhi dao.”

hence more numerous. Alternatively, understanding the passage to mean “longer *zhang* and *ju*,” one might suggest that in addition to the two extra *pian*, certain *zhang* and *ju* may have been moved to different parts of the text to suit the particular arrangement of individual transmitters. This is quite conceivable given that the order of the *pian* in the versions of *Qilun* transmitted by Fu Qing of Lu, Xiahou Sheng, Xiao Wangzhi and Wei Xuancheng was not consistent,<sup>92</sup> thus admitting the possibility that in some *pian* at least, related *zhang* and related *ju* were grouped together to produce longer *zhang* and/or *ju* than in the *Lulun*. In connection with this possibility it is germane to note two points concerning the bamboo-strip manuscript of *Lunyu* unearthed at Ding xian, Hebei.<sup>93</sup> (i) The word totals for individual *pian* recorded at the end of ten *pian* (although none of these totals from the “Shang Lun” is decipherable) frequently exceed the word totals of the longest *pian* in the received text.<sup>94</sup> (ii) The *zhang* divisions are also different from those in the received text (which derives substantially from the *Lulun*). Both points would be consistent with a *Qilun* that had “longer *zhang* and *ju*” than the *Lulun*. As the tomb has been dated 55 B.C.,<sup>95</sup> the Ding xian *Lunyu* may yet prove to be an example of a variant *Qilun*.<sup>96</sup>

<sup>92</sup> *Hanshu*, 81.3352.

<sup>93</sup> The strips contain about fifty percent of the received text. Along with a number of other manuscripts, the *Lunyu* manuscript was unearthed in 1973 and was worked on until 1981, when the first and only public report on the strips was published. The report, by the Ding xian Han Tomb Bamboo Strip Reconstruction Group, “Ding xian 40 hao Han mu chutu zhujian jianjie” 定縣 40 號漢墓出土竹簡簡介. *Wenwu*, 1981.8, 11, is two paragraphs long. The strips are now stored in Hebei Provincial Museum in Shijiazhuang. In January, 1994, I was a visiting researcher in the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences in Beijing. The Academy tried to arrange for me to visit the team at the Hebei Provincial Museum responsible for the strips but after an initial acceptance my visit was declined on the grounds that no one was working on the material any longer and of those who had, one had died, one was ill and others had been relocated to different work units! It would seem that we are unlikely to learn anything further about these strips in the near future, unless Roger Ames and D.C. Lau’s recent negotiations with the relevant Chinese authorities to allow them access to the strips do actually bear fruit.

<sup>94</sup> Ding xian Han Tomb Bamboo Strip Reconstruction Group, “Ding xian 40 hao Han mu chutu zhujian jianjie,” p. 11, and personal communication from Li Xueqin. Because of the broken and jumbled nature of the unearthed manuscript, identification of which *pian* the word totals refer to has been limited.

<sup>95</sup> Hebei Province Cultural Relics Research Institute, “Hebei Ding xian 40 hao Han mu fajue jianbao,” p. 10.

<sup>96</sup> Li Xueqin (personal communication) is of the opinion that there is a strong possibility that the Ding xian manuscript is a version of the *Qilun*, an interpretation which he believes is strengthened by the fact that the *Zhang Hou Lun* was not yet then completed. It might also be noted that textual variants within the one line or transmission, or “tradition,” also existed. See, for example, those from the Lu tradition quoted in Takeuchi, *Rongo no kenkyū*, pp. 70–71. And just as there was also more than one version of the *Qilun*, Takeuchi argues that there also existed more than one version of the *Gulun*. Citing three instances where Zheng Xuan quotes a *gawen*

In support of his interpretation Takeuchi might also have noted that according to Wang Chong, by the reign of Emperor Xuan (74–49), the *Gulun* had become transcribed into *jinwen* to aid its study and transmission.<sup>97</sup> Takeuchi may have been reluctant to cite this as supporting evidence given that the earliest *Qilun* and *Lulun* transmitters were already active in the reign of Emperor Wu. It would, however, seem a reasonable possibility that the Qi and Lu traditions of interpretation were initially concerned with points of exegesis and that *jinwen* transcription was a secondary and subsequent development. It might be further noted in support of Takeuchi's interpretation that Fu Qing of Lu, who transmitted the *Lulun*, had studied *Gulun* under Kong Anguo.<sup>98</sup>

I find Takeuchi's hypothesis that the *Qilun* and *Lulun* were none other than different *jinwen* recensions of the *Gulun* an attractive one. It would also explain why in the last hundred years of the Western Han these recensions gradually displaced the *Gulun*. With greater attention being focused on the *Qilun* and *Lulun* it was only natural that some scholars should have been trained in both recensions and so it is not surprising that eventually some attempt should have been made to reconcile the two recensions to form a new edition. It was Zhang Yu who took up this task.

張禹

#### Zhang Hou Lun in twenty pian

While Zhang Yu (d. 5 B.C.) was serving as the official *Lunyu* tutor for the son of Emperor Yuan 元 (49–33 B.C.), the future Emperor Cheng 成 (33–7 B.C.), on several occasions the young Heir Apparent raised questions about the meaning of the text, so as a learning aid Zhang compiled a *Lunyu zhangju* 論語章句 (81.3352). *Hanshu* also records Zhang as having written a *Lu Anchang Hou shuo* 魯安昌侯說 in twenty-one *pian* (30.1716). Given that the book that became known in the Eastern Han as *Zhang Hou Lun* 張侯論 was in twenty *pian* it might seem that his commentary in twenty-one *pian* was not based on the *Lulun* text of which he was a transmitter. *Hanshu*, however, also lists a *Lu Xiahou shuo* 魯夏

reading that differs from the *guwen* graph as given by Xu Shen (ca. 55 – ca. 149), in *Shuowen jiezi*, Takeuchi concludes that while Xu Shen used the original *Gulun* manuscript, Zheng Xuan used a *jinwen* copy which included a number of loan graphs and that this accounts for the difference between Xu's and Zheng's readings. The problem with this hypothesis, however, is that there is no indication in *Shuowen jiezi* that the *guwen* readings Xu Shen gives are based on the *Gulun*. And even if they were, it is incorrect to assume, as Takeuchi does, that for a given word only one *guwen* graph could possibly represent it: *guwen* writing was certainly not immune from variants and loan graphs. (Ironically, in the first of the three examples cited by Takeuchi, Xu Shen identifies one such example of variant *guwen* graphs.)

<sup>97</sup> "Zhengshuo," *Lunheng*, 28.1133.

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*, 28.1133.

侯說 in twenty-one *pian*.<sup>99</sup> As Xiahou Sheng was also a Lu transmitter the most probable explanation for the "commentary" being in twenty-one *pian* is that one *pian* was commentary while the remainder was the twenty *pian* of the *Lulun* text. In the case of Zhang Yu, however, the real question is whether the *Lunyu zhangju* compiled for the future emperor Cheng and the *Lu Anchang Hou shuo* were the same. Given that Zhang's purpose in compiling the *Lunyu zhangju* was expository it is probable that they were. As for the *Zhang Hou lun*, which was in twenty *pian*, it would have included the text only, without Zhang's commentary.

Assuming that the *Lunyu zhangju* and the *Lu Anchang Hou shuo* were the same, how were they arranged? Immediately after recording that Zhang compiled *Lunyu zhangju*, his biography reads: "Before this, among the versions of *Lunyu* transmitted by Fu Qing of Lu, Xiahou Sheng, Wang Yang (i.e., Wang Ji), Xiao Wangzhi, and Wei Xuancheng, there was some variation in the order of the *pian*. Zhang Yu first studied under Wang Yang and later under Yong Sheng, selecting what he felt to be appropriate." In other words, the order of the *pian* that Zhang settled upon took into account the order of the *pian* in the versions of *Qilun* scholars Wang Yang and Yong Sheng. Given that elsewhere in *Hanshu* Zhang Yu is listed as a *Lulun* transmitter,<sup>100</sup> then the *Suishu* account<sup>101</sup> that he removed the two *pian*, "Wen wang" and "Zhi dao," after collating the *Qilun* against the *Lulun* is plausible. *Lunyu jiyie* further notes that although he had been trained in the *Lulun*, he was also conversant with the commentary tradition associated with the *Qilun*. Thus on the basis of his familiarity with both the *Qilun* and *Lulun*, he "selected whichever interpretation was better"<sup>102</sup> and emended the *Lulun* text accordingly. Combining these two accounts, it would appear that having collated the *Lulun* against the *Qilun*, he not only created a new recension of *Lulun*, but also a new edition of *Lunyu* which (i) included all twenty *pian* of the *Lulun* but in some cases re-arranged their order to conform with the order of the *pian* in the Wang Yang and/or Yong Sheng versions of the *Qilun*; and (ii) incorporated *Qilun* readings into the *Lulun* text. If this is so then the so-called *Lulun* as transmitted by Zhang Yu – the *Zhang Hou lun* – was actually a *Qilun-Lulun* hybrid.

<sup>99</sup> 30.1716. There is a consensus among commentators identifying the author as Xiahou Sheng 夏侯勝; his biography, *Hanshu*, 75.3159, also records him as having written a *Lunyu shuo* 論語說.

<sup>100</sup> *Yiwen zhi*, 30.1717. *Jingdian shiwen*, Preface, 31a, records that Zhang had studied *Lulun* under Xiahou Sheng.

<sup>101</sup> *Suishu*, 32.939.

<sup>102</sup> Preface, 1b. This would imply that there were commentaries written for both the *Qilun* and *Lulun* at this time.

His *Hanshu* biography records, "Scholars made up a saying about Zhang Yu's book: 'If you want to study *Lunyu*, study Zhang's writing'. From then on, most scholars followed Zhang and the other schools gradually fell into obscurity" (81.3352). This development represents the textual closure of the twenty *pian Lunyu*, for even though it continued to undergo minor textual changes through the Eastern Han,<sup>103</sup> attaining a more or less final stability in the *Lunyu jijie* edition, it underwent no significant structural or content changes after Zhang Yu.

### Conclusion

In this study I have not attempted a content analysis of *Lunyu*, leaving that to those better qualified than myself,<sup>104</sup> as my purpose has not been to construct an hypothesis about which parts of the text were written by whom and when. Rather, I have developed an hypothesis about the text as a whole, arguing that it was not until around 150–140 B.C. that *Lunyu* came into existence as a book and that this book was based on a number of early "collected sayings" of the Master. As to the claim that the received text faithfully represents the teachings of the historical Confucius, until more work is done on grammatical and content analyses it is perhaps best not to be too dogmatic, either in the affirmative or the negative. Nevertheless, if my argument is sound, then clearly there is a need to reconsider the status of other early records of Confucius' sayings and conversations with his disciples, in particular writings such as the "Tan gong" *pian* of *Liji*. Hitherto the aura surrounding the scriptural status afforded *Lunyu* has tended to blind commentators to the potential value of such writings as records of Confucius' speech and actions.

<sup>103</sup> Discussed in my forthcoming paper, to be published in *T'oung Pao*, "The earliest extant commentary on *Lunyu* 論語: *Lunyu Zheng shi zhu* 論語鄭氏注."

<sup>104</sup> See, for example, Kimura Eiichi 木村英一, *Kōshi to Rongo* 孔子と論語 (Tokyo: Sobunsha, 1971).

## CONFUCIUS AND POLITICAL LOYALISM: THE DILEMMA

CHARLES WING-HOI CHAN

"I have no preconceptions about  
the permissible and the impermissible."<sup>1</sup>

### Contents

Introduction .....	25
I. Value-Orientations of the <i>shih</i> in the "Brave New World" .....	31
II. Confucius' Motivation to Learn and his Preparation for a Political Career .....	39
III. Confucius' Eagerness and Caution in Accepting an Offer of Office .....	49
IV. Situations in Which a Gentleman Should Withdraw from a Position .....	59
V. The Internal World of Confucius in the Face of Disillusionment in His Political Career .....	70
VI. Confucius Remaining Committed to His Chosen Vocation .....	79
Conclusion .....	91

### Introduction

Much has been said about Confucius, his life, his thought and his profound influence on the shaping of Chinese culture. Whether considered to be a valuable source of inspiration or a scapegoat for all cultural evils, Confucius and his thought have, for generations, remained a point of reference to which people consistently return to seek resolutions or for the causes of problems they regard as crucial, either to themselves, or to the culture as a whole.

<sup>1</sup> D.C. Lau (trans.), *Confucius: The Analects* (Lun yü), (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1983; Penguin ed., 1979), XVIII:8. In order to avoid inconsistency in style, I have used this translation. All quotations by permission of Penguin Books Ltd. Only on very few occasions I preferred translations by others. However, unless otherwise stated, all translations of the *Analects* quoted in this paper are by D.C. Lau 劉殿爵. The Chinese text I have been using is *Ssu-shu chi-chu* 四書集注, ed. by Chu Hsi 朱熹 (Taipei: Shih-chieh, 1978).