

Chapter Five

經學中衰時代

The Period of Decline of Classical Scholarship

[5/1 SVA Introductory Comments: In the opening section of this chapter in which he examines the period of the decline of Classical Scholarship, Pi Xirui touches upon the manifestations of decline, and at the same time introduces Zheng Xuan and his scholarship. He uses quotes to illustrate that the reasons for Classical Scholarship's decline resided in abandoning serious study and the importance placed on the quality of one's character, and that this was replaced by the motive of personal gain. Members of the bureaucracy who possessed the refined learning and the skills that once were the standard for all, were now few and far between. He then shifts his attention to Zheng Xuan, describing how he drew from both the Modern and Old Script schools when writing his commentaries to the Classics. He lists his major works and briefly touches on some of the materials Zheng Xuan used when putting together his commentaries.]

5/1¹ The study of the Classics flourished during the Han. The Han came

¹[SVA: Section 5/1 corresponds to pp.141-8 of the Zhonghua ed. and to pp.145-153 of the Yiwén ed.]

to an end and the study of the Classics went into decline. The reigns of Huan 桓 and Ling 靈² twice saw the misfortunes associated with factionalism.³ Many scholars of integrity and men of humanity filled the

²(5/1, n.1) Zhou Yutong comments: Huan and Ling refer to Emperor Huan 桓帝 and Emperor Ling 靈帝 of the Later Han. Emperor Huan was on the throne for twenty-one years, beginning with the first year of the Jianhe 建和 period and continuing to the first year of the Yongkang 永康 period. This was from 147 to 167 by the Western calendar. Emperor Ling was on the throne for twenty-one years, beginning with the first year of the Jianning 建寧 period and continuing to the sixth year of the Zhongping 中平 period. This was from 168 to 189 by the Western calendar.

³(5/1, n.2) Zhou Yutong comments: In the ninth year of the Yanxi 延熹 period (166 A.D.), "The Metropolitan Commandant (sili xiaowei 司隸校尉 --Hucker 5697) Li Ying 李膺 and over two hundred others were falsely accused of being members of a partisan faction, were all imprisoned, and the names were recorded in the imperial archives. (See: Hou Han shu 7.318) In the first year of the Yongkang 永康 period (167) "...there was a general amnesty granted throughout the empire, and the great proscription was done away with." (See: Hou Han shu 7.319) The restriction banning partisan factions was relaxed for the first time. This was the first episode of the misfortunes arising out of the rivalries between partisan factions.

In the second year of the Jianning period of the reign of Emperor Ling (169), "The Palace Attendant-in-Ordinary (zhong changshi 中常侍--Hucker 1532), Hou Lan 侯覽, started the rumor that there was an official who had memorialized that the former Minister of Works (sikong 司空--Hucker 5687)

Yu Fang 虞放, the Royal Coachman (taipu 太僕--Hucker 6201) Du Mi 杜密, the Steward of the Empress Dowager (changle shaofu 長樂少府--Hucker 251) Li Ying 李膺, the Metropolitan Commandant (sili xiaowei 司隸小尉 --Hucker 5697) Zhu Yu 朱瑀, the Governor of Yingchuan 潁川 Ba Su 巴肅, the Administrator of Pei 沛 Xun Yi 荀翬, the Governor of Henei 河內 Wei Lang 魏朗, and the Governor of Shanyang 山陽 Zhai Chao 翟超 were all members of a partisan faction, and they were imprisoned. Those who died numbered over one hundred. Their spouses and children were relocated to the border regions. The prohibition against holding office extended to those who had a great-great-grandfather in common with the persons implicated. An imperial decree was issued throughout the provinces and commanderies, which was a general call to search out and catch (鉤) partisans, and the result was that throughout the Empire, men of character along with those who carried out the principles of Confucian learning were all tied together as members of partisan factions." (Hou Han shu 8.330-1) In the fourth year of the Jianning period (171), "There was a general amnesty granted throughout the empire, but this amnesty did not extend to members of partisan factions." (See: Hou Han shu 8.332) In the fifth year of the Xiping 熹平 period (176), "The Governor of Yongchang 永昌, Cao Luan 曹鸞, was found guilty of being a member of a partisan faction and was executed in the public square. An imperial decree was issued which ordered the disciples and clerks of the members of the partisan factions, along with their fathers, brothers, and sons who held official positions, to resign their offices and barred them from government service." (See: Hou Han shu 8.338) In the first year of the Zhongping 中平 period (184), " There was a general amnesty granted throughout the empire which extended to the

prisons. Educated men along with learned scholars were also caught in this net [of laws and regulations].⁴ It was indeed already the case that the morale of the educated was low and the state of mind of the Confucian scholar was one of loneliness and isolation. Zheng Kangcheng (Zheng Xuan; 127-200), owing to his wide learning and powerful memory, together with his high integrity and unexcelled behavior, wrote books enough to fill a

members of the partisan factions, and those who were banished to the outlying regions were allowed to return." [SVA: Reading HHs 徒 for Jxls 徒] (Hou Han shu 8.348) With this, the misfortune which went along with the proscription against being involved with a partisan faction began to subside. This was the second episode of the misfortunes arising out of the rivalries between partisan factions. For a more detailed account, see chapters seven and eight of the Hou Han shu, "The Annals of Emperor Huan" 孝桓帝紀 and "The Annals of Emperor Ling" 孝靈帝紀, along with chapter sixty-seven, "The Biographies of Members of the Partisan Factions" 黨錮列傳.

⁴(5/1, n.3) Zhou Yutong comments: The "Biographies of Wandering Knights" 游俠列傳 chapter of the Shi ji states, "Although at times they violated the laws and regulations of the times..." The Suoyin commentary to the passage reads, "Han 扞 is none other than han 捍 ('to go against'). Breaking the 'web' of laws and statutes of the times, was referred to as violating the laws and restrictions." (See: Shi ji 124.3183 and n.3) Han 扞 is none other than gan 干, which means "to offend against." The characters gang 岡 and wang 網 are interchangeable.

house, and had followers by the thousands. At the time there was no one who didn't seek him out, and it was said that from the Yi 伊 and the Luo 雒⁵ eastward, and from the Huai 淮 and Han 漢⁶ northward, there was only one

⁵(5/1, n.4) Zhou Yutong comments: The Yi 伊 is the Yi River 伊水 which flows from its source in Mendunling 悶頓嶺 located in the southeast of Lushi County 廬氏縣 in Henan. It flows to the northeast and courses through Song County 嵩縣, Yiyang 伊陽, Luoyang 洛陽, Yanshi 偃師, and then empties into the Luo 洛. The Luo is the Luo River 洛水 which flows from its source at Mt. Zhongling 冢嶺山 which is located in the northwest of Luonan County 雒南縣 in Shaanxi 陝西 Province. It flows eastward into Henan, and passes through Lushi 廬氏 and Yongning 永寧. It then flows to the northeast, coursing through Yiyang 宜陽, Luoyang, Yanshi and Gong County 鞏縣 and the Fa 灋 and Yi Rivers empty into it. It empties into the Yellow River at Luokou 洛口. Luo 雒 is sometimes used interchangeably with luo 洛.

⁶(5/1, n.5) Zhou Yutong comments: The Huai 淮 is the Huai River which has its source at Mt. Tongbo 桐柏山 in Henan. It flows to the east, entering Anhuijing 安徽境 and ends its flow where it empties into Lake Hongze 洪澤湖, between Anhui and Jiangsu. The lower stretch of the river has changed its course several times, and at present it goes from Huaiyin County 淮陰縣 and joins the Grand Canal 運河. The Han is the Han River 漢水 which has its source at Mt. Bozhong 嶓冢山, located in the north of Ningqiang County 寧羌縣 in Shaanxi. It flows through the territory of six former prefectures, Hanzhong 漢中, Xing'an 興安, Yunyang 鄖陽, Xiangyang 襄陽, Anlu 安陸 and Hanyang 漢陽. It then empties into the Yangtze River.

man: Kangcheng, and that was all. They all said that scholars of the past were deficient in many ways, but that Zheng Xuan's way was complete. As for masters of the Classics, in the past there was no one whose scholarly output matched Master Zheng's [when it came to the Classics]. However, like a wooden clapper he carried out his teachings, but in the end [he could only] go to the rivers and seas to escape.⁷ Lanling 蘭陵 transmitted the

⁷(5/1, n.6) Zhou Yutong comments: The "Bayi" 八佾 chapter of the Analects states, "The world has been without the Way for a long time. Heaven is about to use the master as a wooden clapper." (See: Analects 3/24; Lau, trans., Analects, p.71) He Yan's Jijie commentary to this passage reads, "A wooden clapper is that which is struck when teaching the proper administration of government. This is to say that Heaven was about to give Confucius the mandate to create models and standards, and use them as orders issued throughout the world." (See: Lunyu zhushu, Ssjzs, 3.14a) In addition, the "Gongye Zhang" 公冶長 chapter of the Analects reads, "...the Way is not carried out and I board a raft and float about the seas..." (See: Analects 5/7; Lau, trans., Analects, p.76) Xing Bing's Zhengyi commentary reads, "[He is] saying that his Way, which he holds in high regard, was not to be put into actual practice by the central states, he wanted to climb onto a raft, float upon the seas and dwell among the Nine Tribes who perhaps will be able to put his Way into practice." (See: Lunyu zhushu, 5.3a-b) This passage borrows the lament that although Confucius possesses a kind of power akin to that of a wooden clapper, nevertheless he will drift around the seas which is analogous to Zheng Xuan's having the reputation of a master of the Classics, but being unable to save Classics Studies from decline.

Classics, but he could not avert the tragedy of the Qin's burning [of books] and burying [of scholars].⁸ And although Zheng Xuan's scholarship flourished, the quality of Han scholarship in the end deteriorated. The Sanguo zhi 三國志⁹ contains a memorial by Dong Zhao 董昭 which lays forth

⁸(5/1, n.7) Zhou Yutong comments: Lanling 蘭陵 refers to Xunzi. Xunzi served as the Prefect of Lanling. According to Wang Zhong's 汪中 Shuxue Xun Qingzi tonglun 述學荀卿子通論, in the early years of the Han dynasty Classical Scholarship for the most part was transmitted from Xunzi, and thus the words, "Lanling transmitted the Classics." See: 2/4, n.4 above. "Burning and burying" refers to the First Qin Emperor's burning of the books and burying alive the Confucian scholars. The proposal for burning the books and burying the Confucian scholars came from Li Si and moreover, Li Si was a disciple of Xunzi. This line borrows the notion that although Xunzi transmitted the Classics, he was not able to save the books and the Confucian scholars from being burned and buried by the First Qin Emperor and this is similar to the circumstances of Master Zheng Xuan who transmitted the Classics, but was not able to avert the decline and demise of Han scholarship.

⁹(5/1, n.8) Zhou Yutong comments: The Sanguo zhi, in sixty-five juan, was compiled by Chen Shou 陳壽 (233-297) of the Jin Dynasty. Chen Shou (zi Chengzuo 承祚) was a native of Anhan 安漢 in Baxi 巴西. He served Shu 蜀 and later went to Jin 晉, where he eventually attained the rank of Secretarial Censor (zhishu yushi 治書御史--Hucker 1065, 1067). For his biography, see Jin shu 82.2137-38. His compilation, the Sanguo zhi, contains the "Wei zhi" 魏志 ("Memoirs of Wei") in thirty juan, the "Shu zhi"

the severe decline of the later years, "Looking at the young people of today, they haven't returned to taking education and learning as their foundation, but consider making connections and contacts their sole occupation. Those of the scholars-of-state class do not consider being a good son and a good brother or integrity and principled conduct to be primary, but place following power and influence and personal gain first."¹⁰ Du Shu 杜恕 submitted a memorial in which he wrote,¹¹ "Scholars of the present take

蜀志 ("Memoirs of Shu") in fifteen juan, and the "Wu zhi" 吳志 ("Memoirs of Wu") in twenty juan, and considers Wei to have legitimate sovereignty.

¹⁰(5/1, n.9) Zhou Yutong comments: For the original source of this passage, see the biography of Dong Zhao 董昭 in the "Wei zhi" section of the Sanguo zhi. (Sanguo zhi 14.442) Dong Zhao (zi Gongren 公仁) was a native of Dingtao 定陶 in Jiyin 濟陰. In the sixth year of the Taihe 太和 period (232 A.D.) of the reign of Emperor Ming of the Wei 魏明帝 (reg. 227-239) he was appointed to the position of Minister Over the Masses (situ 司徒--HB; cf. Hucker 5801) and subsequently submitted a memorial in which he discussed the problems relating to the decline of the quality of scholarship.

¹¹(5/1, n.10) Zhou Yutong comments: Du Shu 杜恕 (zi Wubo 務伯) was a native of Duling 杜陵 in Wei who lived during the Three Kingdoms period. He was the son of Du Ji 杜畿 and the father of Du Yu 杜預. He held the position of Regional Inspector (cishi 刺史--Hucker 7567) in Youzhou 幽州. His biography is appended to the biography of Du Ji in the "Wei zhi" section of the Sanguo zhi. (See: Sanguo zhi 16.498-508) For the quote from his memorial, see Sanguo zhi 16.502.

Shang 商 and Han 韓¹² as their masters and hold Legalist methods in high regard, contend with the Confucian schools, considering their doctrines to be impractical and not suited¹³ for use in the real world. These then are the failures and shortcomings of the fashion of the times." In Yu Huan's 魚豢 Weilüe 魏略,¹⁴ he ranks seven individuals, Dong Yu 董遇, Jia Hong 賈洪, Handan Chun 邯鄲淳, Xue Xia 薛夏, Wei Xi 隗禧, Su Lin 蘇林, and Yue Xiang 樂祥¹⁵ as highly venerated Confucian scholars. His "Preface" states,

¹²(5/1, n.11) Zhou Yutong comments: Shang 商 refers to Shang Yang 商鞅 who served Duke Xiao of Qin and amended the legal code. For his biography, see: Shi ji 68.2227-39. Han 韓 refers to Han Fei 韓非 who authored the Han Feizi in fifty-five pian. For his biography, see: Shi ji 63.2146-56. The two men were both Legalists.

¹³(5/1, n.12) Zhou Yutong comments: In the Chinese, zhou 周 is glossed as he 合, "to be suited for, to accord with, to be compatible with." See Chuci buzhu 1.11a (p.25).

¹⁴(5/1, n.13) Zhou Yutong comments: Yu Huan 魚豢 was a native of Jingzhao 京兆 (the Capital District) in Wei who lived during the Three Kingdoms period. He compiled the Weilüe 魏略 in fifty juan, which ended with the reign of Emperor Ming 明帝 (reg. 227-239). His work has been lost, but Pei Songzhi 裴松之 quotes from it in numerous instances in his Sanguo zhi zhu 三國志注.

¹⁵(5/1, n.14) Zhou Yutong comments: Dong Yu's 董遇 name appears at the end of the biography of Wang Su which is contained in juan 13 of the "Wei

zhi" section of the Sanguo zhi. The passage reads, "It was said that during the reign of Emperor Ming, the Chamberlain for the National Treasury (da sinong 大司農--Hucker 6042) Dong Yu of Hongnong 弘農 and others, also wrote notes to the Classics and Commentaries, and these were passed around and circulated throughout the land." Pei Songzhi's notes to this line read, "The Weilüe says that Dong Yu's zi was Jizhi 季直. He was of simple character and he was slow of speech, but he loved to study....during the reign of Emperor Ming he was appointed to the position of Chamberlain for the National Treasury with Palace Attendant status (shizhong da sinong 侍中大司農--Hucker 5229)...he had a fine understanding of the Zuo Commentary and wrote on the differences in red and in black." (See: Sanguo zhi 134.420 and n.3)

Jia Hong 賈洪, Xue Xia 薛夏 and Wei Xi 隗禧 also appear in Pei Songzhi's notes to the biography of Wang Su. Pei's notes read, "Jia Hong (zi Shuye 叔業) was a native of Xinfeng 新豐 in Jingzhao 京兆 (the Capital District). He possessed talent and ability, was fond of study, had an especially precise understanding of the Chunqiu Zuozhuan." "Xue Xia (zi Xuansheng 宣聲) was a native of Tianshui 天水. He was a man of talent, ability, and broad learning." "Wei Xi (zi Ziya 子牙) was a native of Jingzhao...Wei Xi had a clear understanding of the Classics and possessed good knowledge of the heavens....he wrote explanations to several of the Classics which numbered in the tens of thousands of words, but he did not have time to write out a clean copy and he became deaf. Several years later, he became ill and died."

Handan Chun's name appears in the biography of Wang Can 王粲 which is contained in juan 21 of the "Wei zhi" section of the Sanguo zhi. He

was a native of Yingchuan 潁川. Pei's note reads, "The Weilüe says that Handan Chun (zi Zishu 子叔) had an alternate name (ming) which was Zhu 竺. He was a person of wide learning and intellectual gifts, and in addition was highly skilled with respect to seal script (chongzhuan 蟲篆) in the Cangya 蒼雅 and the meaning of the words in Xu Shen's [dictionary]....Early in the Huangchu 黃初 period (220-226), he became an Erudite Serving Within the Palace (boshi jishizhong 博士給事中--cf. Hucker 587, HB)."

Su Lin's name appears in the biography of Liu Shao 劉劭 which is contained in juan 21 of the "Wei zhi" section of the Sanguo zhi. He was a native of Chenliu 陳留 and he attained the rank of Cavalier Attendant-in-Ordinary (sanqi changshi 散騎常侍--Hucker 4834). Pei's note reads, "The Weilüe says: Su Lin's zi was Xiaoyou 孝友. He was a person of broad learning and was widely versed in both the ancient and current meanings of words. Doubtful and questionable places in the text of the books and commentaries were all explained by Su Lin....during the Huangchu period (220-226), he became an Erudite Serving Within the Palace."

Yue Xiang appears in the biography of Du Ji 杜畿 which is contained in juan 16 in the "Wei zhi" section of the Sanguo zhi. It states, "In the second year of the Ganlu 甘露 period (257) Yue Xiang of Hedong 河東 who was over ninety years of age, submitted a memorial praising Du Ji's legacy." Pei's note reads, "The Weilüe says: Yue Xiang's zi was Wenzai 文載. When he was young, he was fond of learning....the Zuoshi Yueshi wen 左氏樂氏問 with its seventy-two items was compiled by Yue Xiang....during the Huangchu period he was summoned and appointed to the position of Erudite....His

"During the Zhengshi 正始¹⁶ period (240-246 A.D.) there was an imperial edict issued inviting discussion on the Round Altar to Heaven¹⁷ and it invited the educated elite from all over [to participate]. At the time, the number of Court Gentleman¹⁸ and Clerks¹⁹ under the leadership of the Minister over the Masses²⁰ numbered in excess of 20,000, ...however those who responded and participated in the discussions amounted to only a handful of people. In addition, at the time the number of officials in the court from the Dukes and Ministers on down exceeded four hundred, but

students numbered several thousand."

¹⁶(5/1, n.15) Zhou Yutong comments: Zhengshi 正始 is the name of the first reign period of the deposed emperor of Wei which lasted for seven years, from 240 to 246.

¹⁷(5/1, n.16) Zhou Yutong comments: The "Round Altar" (Yuanqiu 圜丘) is none other than the modern day Altar to Heaven (Tiantan 天壇) and it is the location where the ancient emperors and kings performed rites to Heaven on the winter solstice. The "subcommentary" in the "Musician-in-Chief" (Dasiyue 大司樂) subsection in the "Spring Offices" ("Chunguan" 春官) section of the Zhouli states, "Where the earth is elevated is called a hillock. One which is round resembles the roundness of Heaven. Thus it is high in order to serve Heaven, and as a result it is above ground level." (See: Zhouli zhushu, Ssjsz, 22.19a) Yuan 圜 is none other than the word 字 yuan 圓.

¹⁸[SVA: Court Gentleman = langguan 郎官--Hucker 3573, 3563]

¹⁹[SVA: Clerks = li 吏--cf. Hucker 3586]

those who knew how to hold a writing brush numbered less than ten, and for the most part they would only eat their fill, follow each other around, and then retire. Alas! The enterprise of scholarship has sunk so low that it has come to this. Therefore I humble myself, constantly thinking of and holding in the highest regard these several scholars who each lived during difficult times and yet were still able to be upright individuals who preserved their integrity and held fast to their resolve."²¹ Yu Huan's "Preface" appears in the notes to the Sanguo zhi, and it causes one to read it and tremble in fear. The study of the Classics flourished during the Former and Later Han, but not one hundred years had passed and it had declined to this degree. In this way then, how could culture and civilization be maintained! Fan Weizong (Fan Ye) discussed Master Zheng (Xuan) as follows, "He tied up the great canons in a sack,²² sought out and collected

²⁰[SVA: Minister over the Masses = situ 司徒--HB; cf. Hucker 5801]

²¹(5/1, n.17) Zhou Yutong comments: For the original text of the quoted passage, see the note to the line in the biography of Wang Su which is contained in juan 13 of the "Wei zhi" section of the Sanguo zhi (13.420-1 and n.3). The phrase "eat their fill, follow each other around" (飽食相從) is written "follow each other around and eat their fill" (相從飽食) in the original text. I suspect this is an error on Pi Xirui's part.

²²(5/1, n.18) Zhou Yutong comments: A note to the Hou Han shu reads as follows, "Kuo (gua) 括 means jie 結, "to tie together, group together, tie into

[explanations of] the various schools, edited out what was unnecessary, filled in that which had been lost, and because of this, scholars all knew where to turn."²³ Because during the Han each Classic had several schools and each school in turn had several different explanations, scholars did not know what to follow. Zheng Xuan being versed in both Modern Script and Old Script, combined them into one. Thus students of the Classics could all follow Master Zheng and did not need to search into each individual school. The strength of Zheng Xuan's scholarship lies in this, but the reasons for the deterioration of Han scholarship also lie in this. Zheng Xuan's biography reads as follows, "Zheng Xuan wrote commentary to the Changes, the Documents, the Mao Version of the Songs, the Ceremonials and Rites, the Record of Rites, the Analects, the Classic of Filial Piety, the Shangshu dazhuan, the Zhonghou 中侯, and the Qianxiangli 乾象曆. He also composed the Qizheng lun 七政論, the Luli dixiayi 魯禘袷義, the Liuyi lun 六藝論, the

a bundle." [A line (6/4)] of the "Kun" 坤 hexagram (#2) of the Changes reads, 'A tied up sack. No Blame.'" (See: Wilhelm/Baynes, Book of Changes, p.14) To tie up the Great Canons in a sack is like saying one has covered and internalized the Classics. This is used as a metaphor for Zheng Xuan's broad learning. (See: Hou Han shu 35.1213, n.3)

²³(5/1, n.19) Zhou Yutong comments: For the original text of the quoted passage see Fan Ye's (Fan Weizong) "Lun" 論 at the end of the biography of Zheng Xuan which is in chapter 35 of the Hou Han shu (35.1213).

Mao Shi pu 毛詩譜, the Bo Xu Shen Wujing yiyi 駁許慎五經異義, and the Da Lin Xiaocun Zhouli nan 答臨孝存周禮難, the words of which numbered more than one million in all."²⁴ Zheng Xuan, in writing his commentary to the various Classics, in every case drew from both Modern Script and Old

²⁴(5/1, n.20) Zhou Yutong comments: For the original text of the quoted passage, see the biography of Zheng Xuan in chapter 35 of the Hou Han shu (35.1212). Zheng Xuan's works which survive are the Mao Shi qian 毛詩淺, the Yili zhu 議禮注, the Liji zhu 禮記注, and the Zhouli zhu 周禮注.

Fragments of his Zhouyi zhu 周易注 have been compiled and edited by Wang Yinglin of the Song dynasty and by Hui Dong and Yuan Jun 袁鈞 of the Qing dynasty and are contained in the Zhengshi yishu 鄭氏遺書.

Fragments of the Lunyu zhu 論語注, the Zhonghou 中候, the Luli dixia yi 魯禮禘禘義 and the Liuyi lun 六藝論 have been compiled and edited by Ma Guohan in his Yuhan shanfang jiyishu and by Yuan Jun in the Zhengshi yishu. Fragments of the Xiaojing zhu 孝經注 have been compiled and edited by Yan Kejun and Yuan Jun in the Zhengshi yishu. Fragments of the Bo Xu Shen Wujing yiyi 駁許慎五經異義 have been compiled by Wang Yinglin and by Yuan Jun and are in the Zhengshi yishu. Fragments of the Shangshu zhu 尚書注, the Shangshu dazhuan zhu 尚書大傳注, the Mao Shi pu 毛詩譜 and the Da Lin Xiaocun Zhouli nan 答臨孝存周禮難 have been compiled and edited by Yuan Jun and are in the Zhengshi yishu. There are only two of Zheng Xuan's works about which we completely lack any reliable estimation [as to their content] and these are the Qian xiangli 乾象曆 and the Qizhenglun 七政論.

Script. In writing commentary to the Changes, he utilized Master Fei's 費氏 Old Script interpretation. His pairing of the hexagram lines with the twelve "Earthly Branches" (chen 辰)²⁵ came out of Master Fei's "Astral Fields"

²⁵(5/1, n.21) Zhou Yutong comments: The "lines" (yao 爻) are the six lines of the hexagrams and chen 辰 refers to the twelve Earthly Branches. Zheng Xuan matched and combined the six lines with the twelve Earthly Branches and used this system to explain the Changes, and thus it is referred to as the yao chen [system]. These explanations are long lost, but we can catch a glimpse of them in Li Dingzuo's 李鼎祚 Zhouyi jijie 周易集解 and in Kong Yingda's Zhouyi zhengyi. Hui Dong of the Qing dynasty compiled [the fragments of] Zheng Xuan's Zhouyi zhu and at the end he appended a chart of twelve months, the lines, and the twelve Earthly Branches along with a chart of the interrelationship between the lines, the duodecimal units, and the [corresponding members of] the twenty-eight lunar mansions. In addition, he wrote the Yi Hanxue 易漢學 which contains the "Zhengshi Zhouyi yaochen tu" 鄭氏周易爻辰圖 and the "Zhengshi Yi" 鄭氏易 in section six. Both are extremely detailed and the result of careful scholarship, and are worth consulting. The following example will serve as an illustration. "Tai 泰 (hexagram 11), six in the fifth place, 'Sovereign Yi gave the maiden in marriage. The results are blessings and good fortune.'" Zheng Xuan's note reads, "Five, the line and its corresponding Earthly Branch are located with mao 卯. Spring is in the middle of the Yang phase and the Ten Thousand Things are born. To give birth and nurture, this is the most precious aspect of marriage. In the second month of Spring, marriages take place, and the ceremony between man and woman, is one of blessings and

(fenye 分野).²⁶ However, it has already been lost and moreover, the

great good fortune." The above passage appears in the subcommentary to the "Meishi" 媒氏 subsection of the "Diguan" 地官 section of the Rites of Zhou where it is quoted. (See: Zhouli zhushu, Ssjzs, 14.15b) Zheng Xuan is referring to the line "sixth in the fifth place" in the "Tai" hexagram, and as for the Earthly Branch, it is mao and the month being the second month of Spring, this is what is referred to as the interrelationship between the lines (爻) and the twelve Earthly Branches (辰).

²⁶(5/1, n.22) Zhou Yutong comments: Fenye 分野 ("astral fields") originally referred to the feudal kingdoms of those who ruled as kings, and above, this was reflected in the position of the constellations. Fei Zhi in explaining the Changes, matched the eight trigrams with the constellations, the Heavenly Stems and Earthly Branches, etc., and as a result, this too was referred to as "fenye." His explanation has been lost, but the Qing scholar Ma Guohan in his Yuhan shanfang jiyishu compiled the Feishi Yilin 費氏易林 and the Feishi fenye 費氏分野, which although are very brief outlines, are still worth consulting. The following example will serve as an illustration. In the "Yueling" chapter of the Liji zhengyi there is a quote from the Yilin 易林 which reads, "[The trigram] Zhen 震 commands geng 庚, zi 子 and wu 午, [the trigram] Xun 巽 commands xin 辛, chou 丑 and wei 未, [the trigram] Kan 坎 commands wu 戊, yin 寅 and shen 申, [the trigram] Li 離 commands ji 己, mao 卯 and you 酉, [the trigram] Gen 艮 commands bing 丙, chen 辰 and xu 戌, and [the trigram] Dui 兌 commands ding 丁, si 巳 and hai 亥." (See: Liji zhushu, Ssjzs, 16.12b) The matching and combining of the eight trigrams with the Heavenly Stems and Earthly Branches is similar to

interpretation of the Changes of Master Shi 施, of Master Meng 孟, and of Master Liangqiu 梁邱 have also been lost, and thus there is nothing that we can examine to compare their similarities and differences. In writing commentary to the Documents he used Old Script interpretations, and for the most part differed from Ma Rong. There are times when Ma Rong follows the Modern Script interpretation while Zheng Xuan follows the Old Script interpretation, but there are times when Ma Rong follows the Old Script interpretation while Zheng Xuan follows the Modern Script interpretation.²⁷ This was due to Zheng Xuan drawing from both the

Zheng Xuan's explanation which paired the hexagram lines with the twelve Earthly Branches, and thus Pi Xirui says that the matching of the hexagram lines with the twelve Earthly Branches came out of Master Fei's feyue ("astral fields") system.

²⁷(5/1, n.23) Zhou Yutong comments: In his commentary to the Documents, Zheng Xuan differs from Ma Rong on every point. For example, in the line 欽明文思安安 ("[He was] reverent, possessed clarity of mind, was accomplished, thoughtful and a person of tranquility") from the "Canon of Yao" 堯典 chapter of the Documents, the character si 思 is si 思 in the Old Script version and sai 慙 in the Modern Script version. Ma Rong's commentary reads, "When the Way and its power are pure and complete, we refer to it as si 思," here he is reading si 思 as sai 慙, consulting and using the Modern Script explanation. Zheng Xuan's commentary reads, "to contemplate deeply and have a quick but thorough understanding, this is

Modern and Old Script schools when writing commentary to the Documents. In writing his notes to the Songs, he took the Mao version as his principal source, but in the process changed Mao's words.²⁸ He himself said

referred to as si 思," and here si 思 is read as itself, and this is the Old Script explanation. This is one example of Ma Rong following the Modern Script [explanation] and Zheng Xuan following the Old Script [explanation].

An additional example is the line from the "Canon of Yao" chapter, 曰若稽古帝堯曰放勳 ("Examining antiquity, the emperor Yao was called Fangxun.") Ma Rong explains the word ji 稽 as kao 考 ("to examine"), saying that Yao followed and examined the Way of antiquity and carried it out, and this is the Old Script explanation. Zheng Xuan explained ji 稽 as tong 同 and explained gu 古 as tian 天. With jigu 稽古 explained as tongtian 同天, he is saying that Yao "united with" ("became like") Heaven, and this is the New Script explanation. This is one example of Ma Rong following the Old Script interpretation and Zheng Xuan following the Modern Script interpretation. For more details, consult Chen Qiacong's 陳喬縱 Jinwen Shangshu jingshuo kao 今文尚書經說考. (Huang Qing jingjie xubian 皇清經解續編 1079.1A.5a-9a, 1079.1A.13a-14b)

²⁸(5/1, n.24) Zhou Yutong comments: In Zheng Xuan's Shi jian 詩箋, he alters characters in the Mao version in every piece. For example, in the poem "Hengmen" 衡門 ("The City Gate," #138) which is in the "Airs of Chen" 陳風, in the line 可以樂飢 ("One can satisfy one's hunger"), he changes le 樂 to liao 療, "to cure [one's thirst]." (See: Mao Shi zhengyi, Ssjzs, 7之1.7a) In the poem "Shiyue zhijiao" 十月之交 ("The Alignment of the Tenth Month,"

that, "If there is something that I am at variance with, then below it I give my own opinion."²⁹ That which he refers to as his "own opinion" in actuality has its roots in three separate schools.³⁰ This is due to Zheng Xuan drawing

#193) which is in the "Lesser Elegantiae" 小雅 section, in the line 抑此皇父 ("But perhaps, this Huangfu"), he reads yi 抑 as yi 噫 ("Alas"). (See: 12之 2.7b) In the poem "Siqi" 思齊 ("Great Dignity," #240) which is in the "Greater Elegantiae" 大雅 section, in the line 古之人無斁 ("The ancients were untiring"), he changes yi 斁 to ze 擇 ("to select; to differentiate"). (See: 16之 3.16a) In the poem "Panshui" 泮水 ("The Waves of the Pan," #299) which is in the "Hymns of Lu" 魯頌 section, in the line 狄彼東南 ("The tribes are kept to the southeast"), he changes bi 彼 to ti 剔 ("to pare away"). (See: 20之1.17b) These are all clear examples.

²⁹(5/1, n.25) Zhou Yutong comments: For the original text of this passage, see Zheng Xuan's Liu yi lun 六藝論. (Csic, p.4)

³⁰(5/1, n.26) Zhou Yutong comments: The "three schools" refers to the Qi 齊, Lu 魯, and Han 韓 Modern Script schools of the Songs. Zheng Xuan made use of explanations from the three schools. For example, in the poem "Xuanniao" 玄鳥 ("The Dark Colored Bird," #303) there is the line, "Heaven commanded the dark colored bird to descend and bear Shang." The Mao commentary states, "The dark colored bird is a swallow (yi 鷓). At the vernal equinox, the dark colored bird descended. Jiandi 簡狄, a daughter of the Yousong 有娥 [SVA: reading song 娥 for e 娥] family who were the great ancestors of Tang, was wedded to the lord of the Gaoxin 高辛 family." The lord went with her and together they performed a sacrifice at the suburban

from both the Modern and Old Script schools when writing his notes to the Songs. In writing his commentary to the Ceremonials and Rites (Yili 儀禮) he preserved both Modern Script and Old Script interpretations. When he follows the Modern Script school in his commentary, there constantly appears material from the Old Script school, and when he follows the Old Script school, there constantly appears material from the Modern Script school. This is due to Zheng Xuan drawing from both the Modern Script and Old Script schools when writing his commentary to the Ceremonials and Rites.³¹ The Rites of Zhou is an Old Script text with no Modern Script

area, prayed for progeny and she gave birth to Xie 契. Therefore, originally it was that which was commanded by Heaven, and thus the dark colored bird came and [she] gave birth to him." (See: Maoshi zhushu, Ssjzs, 20-3.14b) This is the explanation of the Old Script school which holds that when the swallows arrived at the vernal equinox, Jiandi together with the lord performed the sacrifices and prayed for progeny at the suburbs, and because of this, she gave birth to Xie. Zheng Xuan's commentary reads, "Jiang 降 means to come down (xia 下). As for Heaven sending the swallows down and Shang being born, it refers to a swallow leaving an egg behind, Jiandi, who was a daughter of the Yousong family, swallowed it and bore Xie." (See: Maoshi zhushu, Ssjzs, 20-3.14b) This is the explanation of the Modern Script school which holds that Jiandi ate a swallow's egg and gave birth to Xie. In this case Zheng Xuan held to the latter explanation, and these are [examples of] Zheng Xuan following the three schools.

³¹(5/1, n.27) Zhou Yutong comments: In the "Shiguan li" 士冠禮 chapter of

version. The Record of Rites for its part does not differentiate between Modern and Old Script, and thus its not necessary to discuss its commentary at all. In writing his commentary to the Analects, he follows the Lu Version of the Analects (Lulun 魯論), but also refers to the Qi Version of the Analects (Qilun 齊論) and Old Version of the Analects (Gulun 古論),³²

the Yili, there is the line "The mat is spread at the center of the doorway, the wooden peg to the west, the threshold to the outside, facing west." Zheng Xuan's notes to this line reads, "In the Old Script version, nie 闌 is written nie 櫛 ('a short wooden peg') and yu 闕 ('threshold') is written cu 蹙." (See: Yili zhushu, Ssjzs, 1.7a) This is one example where he follows the Modern Script interpretation, but in his commentary there constantly appears material from the Old Script school. In addition, there is the line from the "Shiguan li" chapter, 禮於阼 ("perform rites at the eastern stairway"). Zheng Xuan's commentary to this line reads, "In the Modern Script version, li 禮 is written li 醴." (See: Yili zhushu, Ssjzs, 3.6a) This is an example where he follows the Old Script version, but in his commentary there constantly appears material from the Modern Script school. Jia Gongyan's Yili shu 儀禮疏 subcommentary which appears under the line 布席於門中 in the "Shiguan li" chapter reads, "When Zheng Xuan comments on the Rites,...sometimes he follows the Modern Script and sometimes he follows the Old Script, and in all cases he seeks out the one which is the better meaning and follows it. If it was the case that there were two words which both had meanings that fit, he then cross-references them.

³²(5/1, n.28) Zhou Yutong comments: During the Western Han, there were

three schools each with their own version of the Analects, and these were the Qi Version of the Analects (Qi lun 齊論), the Lu Version of the Analects (Lu lun 魯論) and Old Script Version of the Analects (Guwen Lunyu 古文論語). Huang Kan 皇侃 in the preface to his subcommentary to the Analects (論語疏) quotes from Liu Xiang's Bielu 別錄, "That which is studied by the people of Lu is referred to as the Lu Version of the Analects, that which is studied by the people of Qi is referred to as the Qi Version of the Analects. And that which was discovered in the walls of Confucius' residence is referred to as the Old Script Version of the Analects." (See: Huang Kan, Lunyu jijie yishu 論語集解義疏, Csjc, "敘," p.4)

In the "Lunyu" subsection of the "Classics" 經 section of the "Jingji zhi" chapter of the Sui shu it states, "In the early years of the Han, there were the explanations of the Qi and Lu schools. The version which was passed on by the people of Qi consisted of twenty-two pian. The version passed on by the people of Lu had twenty pian. Zhang Yu 張禹 originally taught the Lu Version of the Analects and in his later years lectured on the Qi Version of the Analects. He subsequently brought them together and studied them closely, removing that which was confusing and misleading. He removed the "Wenwang" 問王 and "Zhidao" 知道 chapters (pian) from the Qi version, put it in final form following the twenty chapter Lu version, and its title was the Zhanghou lun 張侯論....In addition, there was the Old Script Version of the Analects, which had appeared together with the Old Script Documents (Guwen Shangshu 古文尚書). In the details of the commentary there was no difference between it and the Lu version, it was only that the "Zizhang" 子張 chapter was divided into two pian, and as a result the number of pian totaled twenty-one....Zheng Xuan took the Zhanghou lun as

and in writing his commentary, he states, "The Lu Version reads X as Y, the Modern Script interpretation follows the Old Script." This is owing to Zheng Xuan drawing from both Modern Script and the Old Script schools in annotating the Analects. His commentary to the Classic of Filial Piety is for the most part [derived from] Modern Script school explanations. Yan Kejun 嚴可均 has made a compilation of these.³³

[5/2 SVA Introductory Comments: In this section, Pi Xirui describes the relationship between the "rise" of Zheng Xuan's scholarship and the

his base text, and consulted and referred to the Qi Version of the Analects and the Old Script Version of the Analects, while writing commentary to it." (See: Sui shu 32.939)

³³(5/1, n.29) Zhou Yutong comments: Yan Kejun 嚴可均 (zi Yingwen 景文; hao Tiejiao 鐵橋; 1762-1843) was a native of Wucheng 烏程 who lived during the Qing dynasty. During the Jiaqing 嘉慶 period (1796-1820) he became a Provincial Graduate (juren 舉人--Hucker 1682). He was keenly interested in etymology (文字學), and his works include the Shuowen shenglei 說文聲類 and the Tiejiao mangao 鐵橋漫稿. For biographical information, one can consult section two of the "Ruxue" 儒學 chapter in juan seventy-two of Miao Quansun's 繆荃孫 Xu Beizhuanji 續碑傳集. The Xiaojing Zheng zhu 孝經鄭注 which he compiled is currently reprinted in Yao Jinyuan's 姚覲元 Zhijinzhai congshu 咫進齋叢書. [SVA: For his biography, see: ECCP pp.910-12]

"decline" of Han scholarship, or more specifically, the teachings of the early Han masters which up until this time had remained distinct and in circulation. He begins by describing a situation in which the so-called Modern Script and Old Script schools (i.e. their members) were mutually distinct, at odds with one another, and in the cases Pi cites, never made use of the opposing camp's scholarly efforts. It was only Xu Shen in his Wujing yiyi who brought the scholarship of both the Modern and Old Script schools together in one work, but within it preserved the distinction between the explanations of the two schools. He goes on to point out that Zheng Xuan in his efforts to be comprehensive, drew from both schools, but did not preserve distinctions. The popularity of his scholarship eclipsed that of the former masters whose texts were gradually lost, and with them a clear knowledge and understanding of their scholarship. As a result, in spite of Zheng Xuan's achievements as a scholar and as a synthesizer, the traditions of the early Han masters suffered in an irreversible way, which for a champion of Han Learning could only be viewed as the "decline" of Han scholarship.]

5/2³⁴ With respect to the statement that while Zheng Xuan's scholarship

³⁴[SVA: Section 5/2 corresponds to pp.148-150 of the Zhonghua ed. and to pp.153-6 of the Yiwén ed.]

flourished, [on the whole] Han scholarship deteriorated: The Classical Scholarship of the Han was close to antiquity and reliable, the Modern Script interpretations of the Fourteen Erudites had been passed from master to disciple over a long period of time; Liu Xin initiated [the practice of] being versed in Old Script [texts], and Wei Hong 衛宏, Jia Kui 賈逵, Ma Rong 馬融, Xu Shen 許慎,³⁵ and others developed and elaborated on his explanations, to where it had become a separate school standing in opposition to the Modern Script school. In this way, [scholars of] Modern Script learning held fast to the positions of Modern Script learning and scholars of Old Script learning strictly maintained the positions of Old Script learning. Members of the Modern Script school were of the opinion that the Old Script school had corrupted and perverted the master teachers' way of teaching the texts, while members of the Old Script school thought that the scholars of the Modern Script school were "forming a faction of like-minded men and being jealous of the true or genuine"³⁶ and they

³⁵(5/2, n.1) Zhou Yutong comments: On Wei Hong 衛宏, see: 3/7, n.7. On Jia Kui 賈逵, see: 3/7, n.8. On Ma Rong 馬融, 1/3, n.16. On Xu Shen 許慎, see: 3/7, n.11.

³⁶(5/2, n.2) Zhou Yutong comments: The "Biography of Wang Mang" 王莽傳 in juan ninety-nine of the Han shu states, "Therefore the General of the Left (zuo jiangjun 左將軍) Gongsun Lu 公孫祿...said...the Preceptor of State

attacked one another like enemies, never intermixing. Du 杜, the Zhengs 鄭, Jia 賈, and Ma 馬³⁷ in annotating the Rites of Zhou and the Zuo

(guoshi 國師--Hucker 3530) Jiaxin Gong 嘉信公 (Liu Xin) has turned the Five Classics upside down, ruined the master teachers' way of teaching the texts, and caused scholars to harbor doubts and be confused." (See: Han shu 99B.4170) This is one example of a scholar of the Modern Script school criticizing a scholar of the Old Script school for corrupting and perverting the master teachers' way of teaching the texts. In addition, the "Biography of Liu Xin" in juan thirty-six of the Han shu states, "...Liu Xin, because of this, sent a letter reprimanding the Erudites of the Chamberlain of Ceremonials and in it he berated them saying: '...If they must confine themselves to their own [interests] and hold fast to defective texts (referring to the Erudites of the Modern Script school), band together with those of the same faction, be jealous of a different path which is genuine, go against wise edicts, lose the meaning of the sages, they will then because of this sink to the level of the [petty] discussions of lower level functionaries. I hold the strong conviction that you two or three gentlemen should not adopt this course.'" (See: Han shu 36.1967, 36.1971; Eva Chung, A Study of the Shu (Letters), p.488) This is the source of the four character phrase 黨同妒真 ("forming a faction of like-minded men and being jealous of the true or genuine").

³⁷(5/2, n.3) Zhou Yutong comments: Du 杜 refers to Du Zichun 杜子春; the Zhengs 鄭 refers to Zheng Xing 鄭興 and his son, Zheng Zong 鄭眾; Jia 賈 refers to Jia Kui 賈逵; Ma 馬 refers to Ma Rong 馬融. Du Zuchun transmitted the Rites of Zhou. In Jia Gongyan's Zhouli zhengyi, the

prefatory section "Xu Zhouli feixing" 序周禮廢興 [SVA: JXLS reads 興廢 (sic)] quotes from the biography of Ma Rong and it states, "Du Zichun was a native of Goushi County 緱氏縣 in Henan and he was still alive during the early years of the Yongping 永平 period (58-75 A.D.) when he was over ninety years old. His home was in Nanshan 南山, he was able to thoroughly master what he studied (referring to the Rites of Zhou), everyone knew of his explanations, and Zheng Zong and Jia Kui went and received instruction from him." (See: Zhouli zhushu, Ssjzs, 10b-11a) In Ma Guohan's Yuhan shanfang jiyishu, he has compiled a Zhouli Dushi zhu 周禮杜氏注 in two juan.

Zheng Xing (zi Shaogan 少贛) was a native of Kaifeng 開封 who lived during the Latter Han. He was fond of the [texts and] teachings of the Old Script school. He had an especially clear understanding of the Zuo Commentary and the Zhouguan. His son Zheng Zong (zi Zhongshi 仲師) received instruction from his father in the Zuo Commentary to the Spring and Autumn Annals, and from Du Zichun in the Zhouguan. For their biographies, see Hou Han shu 36.1124-26. Compilations in the Yuhan shanfang jiyishu include the Zhouli Zheng Dafu (Xing) jiegū 周禮鄭大夫解詁 in one juan, the Zhouli Zheng Sinong (Zong) jiegū 周禮鄭司農解詁 in six juan, and Zheng Zong's Chunqiu dieli zhangju 春秋牒例章句 in one juan.

On Jia Kui, see 3/7, n.8. Compilations in the Yuhan shanfang yishishu include the Zhouli Jiashi jiegū 周禮賈氏解詁 in one juan, the Chunqiu Zuoshizhuan jiegū 春秋左氏傳解詁 in two juan, and the Chunqiu Zuoshi changjing 春秋左氏長經 in one juan. The "Jingji zhi" chapter of the Sui shu records a Chunqiu shixun 春秋釋訓 in one juan and a Chunqiu

Commentary did not make use of Modern Script school explanations, and He Xiu 何休 for his part did not cite a single word from the Rites of Zhou in annotating the Gongyang Commentary.³⁸ Xu Shen's Wujing yiyi 五經異義 differentiates the explanations of the Modern Script school from those of the Old Script school with extreme clarity."³⁹ If they were always separate and

sanjia jingben xungu 春秋三家經本訓詁 in twelve juan, both which are no longer extant. (See: Sui shu 32.928, 32.932)

On Ma Rong, see 1/3, n.16. Compilations in the Yuhan shanfang jiyishu include the Zhouguan zhuan 周官傳 in one juan and the Chunqiu sanzhuang yitongshuo 春秋三傳異同說 in one juan.

³⁸(5/2, n.4) Zhou Yutong comments: On He Xiu 何休, see 2/4, n.7. He Xiu wrote the Chunqiu Gongyang jiegou 春秋公羊解詁 in eleven juan, which is extant and is included in the Shisan jing zhushu edition. He Xiu was a scholar of the Modern Script school and therefore did not quote from the Rites of Zhou which is a text of the Old Script school.

³⁹(5/2, n.5) Zhou Yutong comments: On Xu Shen, see 3/7, n.11. Xu Shen wrote the Wujing yiyi 五經異義 in ten juan. See the "Jingji zhi" chapter of the Sui shu (32.937). It had been lost by the Song dynasty, but during the Qing dynasty with the increase in compiling and recording [of fragments] over one hundred items were obtained. Chen Shouqi's 陳壽祺 Wujing yiyi shuzheng 五經異義疏證 is a text which is relatively complete. An example of its contents is as follows, "The fifth, field tax: the Modern [Script school] Chunqiu Gongyang explanation is that the tax is one part out of ten. Exceeding one part in ten is, to a greater or lesser degree, a tyranny like

distinct like this, then when they were transmitted to later ages, the Modern Script and Ancient Script explanations would not have been mixed and confused, and when one opened a text it would have been easy to see [the difference]. Master Zheng first mastered the Modern Script texts and later became versed in the Old Script texts. His biography says, "He went to the Imperial Academy to receive instruction and he studied with Diwu Yuanxian 第五元先 of Jingzhao 京兆 (the Capital District). He first mastered Jing Fang's 京房 interpretation of the Changes, the Gongyang Commentary to the Spring and Autumn Annals, the Santongli 三統曆 and the Jiuzhang suanshu 九章算術. In addition, he received instruction from

that of Jie 桀. Less than one part in ten, to a greater or lesser degree [carries the shame] of being like the Mo 貉 tribe. [SVA: Cf. Mencius 6B.10] A tax of one part in ten is just and fair [throughout] the Empire. When a tax of one part in ten is implemented, the sounds of praise arise. The Old [Script school] Rites of Zhou explanation is that the tax on land under cultivation and shops located in the center of the state, is one part out of the yield of twenty; in nearby suburban areas, it is one part out of a yield of ten; in outlying suburban areas this is three parts out of a yield of twenty...." (See: Chen Shouqi, Wujing yiyi shuzheng, HQjj, 1248.1a; Chunqiu Gongyang zhuan zhushu, Ssjzs, 16.15a; Goran Malmqvist, "Studies on the Gongyang and Guliang Commentaries I," rpt. from BMFEA, 43, 1971, p.186, 189)

The Wujing yiyi separates the explanations of the Modern Script school from that of the Old Script school, and for the most part is like this.

Zhang Gongzu 張恭祖 of Dongjun 東郡 in the Zhouguan 周官 (Zhouli), Record of Rites 禮記, Zuo's Spring and Autumn Annals 左氏春秋 (Zuozhuan), the Han Version of the Songs (Hanshi 韓詩) and the Old Script Documents (Guwen Shangshu 古文尚書). Because there was no one qualified to answer his questions east of the mountains, he traveled westward through the pass, and with the assistance of Lu Zhi 盧植 of Zhuo commandery 涿郡 studied with Ma Rong of Fufeng 扶風.⁴⁰ Jing Fang's interpretation of the Changes and the Gongyang Commentary to the Spring and Autumn Annals were Modern Script texts while the Zhouguan, Zuo's Spring and Autumn Annals, and the Old Script Documents were Old Script texts. Master Zheng studied widely, with many teachers, and he became thoroughly versed in the way of the Modern Script school and in that of the Old Script school, making them one. He saw that at the time the two schools were attacking one another and it was his intent and desire to bring the learning of both schools into accord, personally synthesizing them so that they spoke with the voice of a single school. Although he considered the scholarship of the Old Script school to be principal, he also drew from the scholarship of the Modern Script school to add to his commentary. Scholars

⁴⁰(5/2, n.6) Zhou Yutong comments: For the quoted passage, see the biography of Zheng Xuan in the Hou Han shu 35.1207.

found it difficult [to gain command of] the numerous and diverse interpretations of the [various] schools which existed at this time, and seeing the vast scope and wide range of Master Zheng's learning which omitted virtually nothing, and that he had in a harmonious manner assembled the numerous explanations, opinions and arguments in one place, they never again had to abandon one thing in favor of another. Hence, Zheng Xuan's Commentary to the Changes 易注 [became the version] in circulation, while the Shi Chou 施雠, Meng Xi 孟喜, Liangqiu He 梁丘賀, and Jing Fang 京房 versions of the Changes [disappeared from] circulation.

Zheng Xuan's Commentary to the Documents 書注 became the version in circulation while the Ouyang 歐陽 and Elder and Younger Xiahou 大小夏侯 versions of the Documents disappeared from circulation. Zheng Xuan's Annotations to the Songs 詩箋 became the version in circulation while the Lu 魯, Qi 齊, and Han 韓 versions of the Songs disappeared from circulation.

Zheng Xuan's Commentary to the Rites 禮注 became the version in circulation while the Elder and Younger Dai 大小戴 versions disappeared from circulation. Zheng Xuan's Commentary to the Analects 論語注 became the version in circulation while the Qi 齊 and Lu 魯 versions of the Analects disappeared from circulation. Furthermore, because the Empire was divided like the legs of a tripod with the three states at war with one

another, the Way of the Classics waned.⁴¹ The decline and abandonment of Han scholarship cannot be completely blamed on Master Zheng. However, Zheng Xuan drew from the Modern Script and Old Script schools, not keeping them separate by distinguishing between them, and this caused the individual schools' way of teaching the text of the Former and Later Han dynasties to be lost and thus inaccessible for study. Thus it is also the case that he cannot be considered to be completely without fault. Therefore when Classical Scholarship met Master Zheng, it changed [in a significant way].

[5/3 SVA Introductory Comments: Pi Xirui continues his discussion of Zheng Xuan in this section. He draws parallels between the utility of the Mao Version of the Songs and the Zuozhuan when trying to understand the Songs and Spring and Autumn Annals in the absence of other commentaries which were unavailable, and the utility of Zheng Xuan's commentaries in providing an insight into the nature of the earlier commentaries that they displaced. He goes on to point out that although Zheng Xuan was a major figure, there were also contemporaries along with

⁴¹(5/2, n.7) Zhou Yutong comments: In the Chinese 鼎足分爭 "divided like the legs of a tripod [with the three states] at war with one another" refers to the states Wu 吳, Shu 蜀, and Wei 魏 having the pattern of the legs of a tripod.

those men of a slightly later era who wrote on the Classics and differed from Zheng's positions.]

5/3⁴² There are things about which one cannot make blanket statements. If one does not thoroughly examine the Old Script and Modern Script texts, then one will be unable to arrive at an [accurate] determination. The Mao Version of the Songs and the Zuo Commentary were texts which were not officially established learning during the Han, but in later times they became indispensable. Master Zheng brought to an end the way of teaching the texts of the individual schools for the Han Confucians (originally the explanation of Li Zhaoluo 李兆洛),⁴³ but in later times [Zheng Xuan's

⁴²[SVA: Section 5/3 corresponds to pp.151-5 of the Zhonghua ed. and to pp.156-161 of the Yiwen ed.]

⁴³(5/3, n.1) Zhou Yutong comments: Li Zhaoluo 李兆洛 (zi Shenqi 申耆; 1769-1841) was a native of Wujin 武進 in Changzhou 常州 who lived during the Qing dynasty. During the Jiaqing 嘉慶 period (1796-1820) he became a jinshi, and served as the District Magistrate (zhixian 知縣--Hucker 993) of Fengtai 鳳臺. He had a detailed understanding of evidential scholarship (kaozhengxue 考證學), and was accomplished in the study of geography. His written works are contained in the Lishi wuzhong 李氏五種 and the Yangyi zhai wenji 養一齋文集. For his biography one can consult part three of the "Ruxue" 儒學 section of juan 73 in Miao Quansun's 繆荃孫 Xu Beizhuanji 續

synthesis] could not be done without. During the Han there were three schools of the Songs, the Lu, the Qi, and the Han schools, and for the Spring and Autumn Annals, there were the two commentaries, the Gongyang and the Guliang. There was no harm in not having the teachings of the Mao Version of the Songs and the Zuo Commentary officially established, and moreover as their teachings were not officially established, it did not come to where they were mixed and intermingled with the other three schools [of the Songs], and the two commentaries [to the Spring and Autumn Annals]. After the Han, the three schools [of the Songs] were completely lost and the two commentaries [to the Spring and Autumn Annals] almost ceased to

碑傳集. The center of the revival of Modern Script school scholarship during the Qing dynasty was in Changzhou, and Shenqi (Li Zhaoluo) was influenced by it, the result in his case being that he held to the theories and explanations of the Modern Script school. He wrote the "Preface" ("Xu" 敘) to Zhang Jinwu's 張金吳 Liang Han wujing boshi kao 兩漢五經博士考 where he states, "Those of the modern era who speak of 'Han Learning,' only offer up [that of] one Master Kangcheng (Zheng Xuan). However they do not understand that Master Kangcheng was the great traitor of Han Learning...How Pitiful! Han Learning was lost and what remained was only one Kangcheng, who did not hold to the accepted rules for teaching the texts." (See: Zhang Jinwu, Liang Han wujing boshi kao, Csje, "序," p.1) In Pi Xirui's own annotations he says that his source is Li Zhaoluo's explanations. He is probably referring to this passage. [SVA: See ECCP 448-50 for Li

exist, and if there was no Mao Version of the Songs or Zuo Commentary then scholars studying the Songs and the Spring and Autumn Annals would have nothing to rely on for consultation. Master Zheng, by combining the Modern Script and Old Script explanations caused the learning of the individual and specialized schools to come to a complete end, and in this way after the learning of the individual and specialized schools was lost, [scholars] then relied on Zheng Xuan's commentaries in order to obtain a rough outline to examine. With respect to the scholarship of the Modern Script and Old Script schools, without Zheng's commentaries, scholars who wanted to study Han scholarship would have been at a total loss! The achievements and faults along with the strongpoints and shortcomings all appear together, but are not things about which one can make blanket statements. As Master Zheng's followers spread throughout the Empire, speaking in terms of Classical Scholarship, it can be said that this was a period of minor unification. His biography states, "In Qi and in Lu they held him in the highest regard."⁴⁴ It was not only the case that he was held in high regard in Qi and in Lu, as his biography lists five individuals including Chi Lü 郟慮,⁴⁵ and the Zheng zhi 鄭志 and Zheng ji 鄭記 name sixteen

Zhaoluo's biography.]

⁴⁴[SVA: See: Hou Han shu 35.1212.]

⁴⁵(5/3, n.2) Zhou Yutong comments: The biography of Zheng Xuan in chapter

35 of the Hou Han shu states, "As for his disciples, Chi Lü 郗慮 who was a native of Shanyang 山陽 attained the position of Censor-in-Chief (yushi dafu 御史大夫--Hucker 8181). Wang Ji 王基 of Donglai 東萊 and Cui Yan 崔琰 of Qinghe 清河 were both well known throughout the Empire. In addition, Guo Yuan 國淵 and Ren Jia 任嘏, both of Le'an 樂安, were in their youth at the time and Zheng Xuan praised them saying that Guo Yuan was a state treasure and that Ren Jia possessed the virtue of the Way." The note to this passage reads, "[Chi] Lü's zi was Hongyu 鴻豫. [Wang] Qi's zi was Boyu 伯輿, he served Wei in the capacity of General of the Southern Defense Command (zhennan jiangjun 鎮南將軍; cf. Hucker 372) and was enfeoffed as the Township Marquis of Anle (Anle xianghou 安樂鄉侯--Hucker 2316). [Cui] Yan's zi was Jigui 季珪, he served Wei in the capacity of Administrator of the Eastern Section (dongcao yuan 東曹掾-- Hucker 7458, 8219) and was later transferred to the position of Commandant-in-Ordinary (zhongwei 中尉--Hucker 1638). [Guo] Yuan's zi was Zini 子尼, he served Wei in the capacity of Administrator of the Central Prison (sikong yuan 司空掾 --Hucker 5687, 8219) and was transferred to the position of Chamberlain for the Imperial Stud (taipu 太僕--Hucker 6201). [Ren] Jia's zi was Zhaoguang 照光 and he served Wei in the capacity of Gentleman Attendant at the Palace Gate (huangmen shilang 黃門侍郎--Hucker 2847)." (See: Hou Han shu 35.1212 and n.1) For biographical information on Wang Ji, see juan 27.750-56 in the "Wei zhi" section of the Sanguo zhi. For biographical information on Cui Yan, see juan 12.367-74 in the "Wei zhi" section of the Sanguo zhi. For biographical information on Guo Yuan, see juan 11.339-40 in the "Wei zhi" section of the Sanguo zhi. There is nothing to consult in the

individuals including Zhao Shang 趙商.⁴⁶ The biography of Jiang Wei 姜維

standard histories regarding the remaining two individuals.

⁴⁶(5/3, n.3) Zhou Yutong comments: The Zheng zhi 鄭志 in eleven juan was composed by Zheng Xiaotong 鄭小同 who lived during the Wei dynasty and held the position of Palace Attendant (shizhong 侍中--Hucker 5229). The Zheng ji 鄭記 in six juan was composed by Zheng Xuan's disciples. See the "Jingji zhi" chapter of the Sui shu (32.938). The Siku quanshu zongmu tiyao says: The Zheng zhi is entirely made up of questions and answers between Zheng Xuan and his students. The Zheng ji is completely composed of questions and answers between his students. The difference between the Zhi and the Ji lies in this. The two texts were completely lost during the Northern Song. Later, someone compiled the Zheng zhi in three juan, with a supplement of missing material in one juan, which the Siku quanshu zongmu tiyao lists in the "Wujing zongyi" 五經總義 category of the "Jing" section. (See: Siku quanshu zongmu tiyao, Vol. 1, pp.662-3)

Basing himself on Yuan Jun's 袁鈞 Zheng zhi yishu 鄭志遺書, Pi Xirui wrote the Zheng zhi shuzheng 鄭志疏證 in eight juan, and appended his Zheng ji kaozheng 鄭記考證 in one juan to it. It is worth consulting.

Zhao Shang 趙商 was a native of Henei 河內 and was a student of Zheng Xuan. His name appears in the Hou Han shu biography of Zheng Xuan. (Hou Han shu 35.1208) In addition to Zhao Shang, the others who appear in the Zheng zhi and Zheng ji are Leng Gang 冷剛, Zhang Yi 張逸, Sun Hao 孫皓 (also appears as Sun Hao 孫顥), Liu Shan (Yan?) 劉掞 (also appears as Liu Yan 劉炎), Gui Mo 晁模 (also appears as Ling Mo 靈模), Tian Qiong 田瓊, Wang Zan 王瓚, Jiao 焦氏 (also appears as Jiao Qiao 焦喬),

in the San guo zhi states, "[He] liked the learning of Master Zheng,"⁴⁷ but it is not known who he received instruction from. Emperor Zhaolie 照烈帝 (reg. 221-223) [of Shu] had personally said that he had interacted with Zheng Kangcheng.⁴⁸ This was most probably when Master Zheng had fled and was residing in Xuzhou 徐州 and at the time Zhaolie was serving as the Regional Governor⁴⁹ of Xuzhou, and studied with him using the decorum one shows to one's teacher. In this way then, the ruler and ministers of

Chong Jing 崇精, Wang Quan 王權, Bao Yi 鮑遺, Ren Jue 任厥, Fan Ge 汜閣, Chong Ao 崇翽, Liu De 劉德, Chen Shuo 陳鑠 (also appears as Chen Keng 陳鏗) and Huan Ao 桓翽, seventeen individuals in all. I suspect that Pi Xirui's statement that there were sixteen individuals was not the full number.

⁴⁷(5/3, n.4) Zhou Yutong comments: Jiang Wei 姜維 (zi Boyue 伯約) was a native of Tianshui 天水 in Shu 蜀, one of the Three Kingdoms. He was a well known general in the service of Shu. For his biography, see San guo zhi 44.1062- 69. The quoted passage appears on 44.1062.

⁴⁸(5/3, n.5) Zhou Yutong comments: Emperor Zhaolie 照烈帝 is none other than the ruler of Shu-Han, Liu Bei 劉備. For his biography, see juan 32.871-92 in the "Shu zhi" section of the Sanguo zhi. For the quoted passage, see the annotation to the biography of Liu Shan 劉禪 (Liu Bei's son, "Liu the Later Ruler" 劉後主). (See: Sanguo zhi 33.903, n.1) In addition, see the "Liu Houzhu zhi" 劉候主志 in juan seven of the Huayangguo zhi 華陽國志. (Csjc, 7.87-100)

⁴⁹[SVA: Regional Governor = mu 牧--Hucker 4041]

Shu-Han were also the progeny in the line of Zheng Xuan's teachings. As for those who were contemporaries of Master Zheng, but whose scholarship was not completely identical with his, there was Xun Shuang 荀爽 (128-190) and Yu Fan 虞翻 (164-232) who wrote commentaries to the Changes.⁵⁰ Xun

⁵⁰(5/3, n.6) Zhou Yutong comments: On Xun Shuang 荀爽, see 1/3, n.23. He wrote the Lizhuan 禮傳, the Yizhuan 易傳, the Shizhuan 詩傳, the Shangshu zhengjing 尚書正經, the Chunqiu tiaoli 春秋條例, the Gongyang wen 公羊問, the Bianchen 辨讖, the Hanyu 漢語, and the Xinshu 新書 which have a combined total of over one hundred chapters. His study of the Changes was based on the Old Script scholarship of Master Fei, and he wrote annotations to the Zhouyi in eleven juan, but it is no longer extant. In his Yuhan shanfang jiyishu, Ma Guohan has compiled the Zhouyi Xunshuang zhu 周易荀爽注 in three juan. In addition, Hui Dong 惠棟 has compiled the Yi Hanxue 易漢學, and Zhang Huiyan 張惠言 has compiled the Zhouyi Xunshi jiujiayiyi 周易荀氏九家義. Both of these works can be consulted for a general outline [of Xun Shuang's original text].

On Yu Fan 虞翻, see 1/3, n.23. The Changes of Master Meng 孟氏 had been transmitted for generations and [drawing from this] he composed the Yizhu 易注 in nine juan. In addition, he wrote philological annotations to the Laozi, the Analects, and the Guoyu. His Yizhu is no longer extant. The works of Qing scholars, such as Hui Dong's Yi Hanxue, Zhang Huiyan's Zhouyi Yushi yi 周易虞氏義, Zhouyi Yushi xiaoxi 周易虞氏消息, Yushi Yili 虞氏易禮, Yushi Yishi 虞氏易事, Yushi Yiyan 虞氏易言, Yushi Yihou 虞氏易候, and Zeng Zhao's 曾釗 Zhouyi Yushi yijian 周易虞氏義箋 can all be consulted

Shuang used the Changes of Fei, while Yu used the Changes of Meng, and a rough outline of their works is contained in Li Dingzuo's Zhouyi jijie.⁵¹

Previously, Yu Fan had refuted [the positions taken by] Zheng in his (Zheng's) Shangshu zhu 尚書注, and in addition considered Zheng's Yi zhu

for a general outline [of Yu Fan's original text].

⁵¹(5/3, n.7) Zhou Yutong comments: Li Dingzuo 李鼎祚 was a native of Zizhou 資州 who lived during the Tang dynasty. He has no biography in the Tang shu, so the details of his life cannot be investigated. He wrote the Zhouyi jijie 周易集解 in ten juan. He appended a Lüeli 略例 in one juan, and a Suoyin 索隱 in six juan, for a total of seventeen juan. People of a later age, because the Lüeli and Suoyin had become scattered and lost, divided the Zhouyi jijie into seventeen juan. This text is extant, and one can refer to the [notice in the] first part of the "Yi" subsection of the "Classics" section (經部易類一) in the Siku quanshu zongmu tiyao. (See Vol. 1, pp.7-8) The text selects from the explanations of thirty-five scholars including Zixia 子夏, Meng Xi 孟喜, Jiao Gan 焦贛, Jing Fang 京房, Ma Rong 馬融, Xun Shuang 荀爽, Zheng Xuan 鄭玄, Liu Biao 劉表, He Yan 何晏, Song Zhong 宋衷, Yu Fan 虞翻, Lu Ji 陸績, Gan Bao 干寶, Wang Su 王肅, Wang Bi 王弼, Yao Xin 姚信, Wang Yi 王廙, Zhang Fan 張璠, Xiang Xiu 向秀, Wang Kaichong 王凱冲, Hou Guo 侯果, Shu Cai 蜀才, Zhai Yuan 翟元, Han Kangbo 韓康伯, Liu Yan 劉巖, He Tuo 何妥, Cui Jing 崔憬, Shen Linshi 沈麟士, Mr. Lu 盧氏, Cui Jin 崔覲, Fu Manrong 伏曼容, Kong Yingda 孔穎達, Yao Gui 姚規, Zhu Yangzhi 朱仰之 and Cai Yingjun 蔡景君. It is an essential text for the investigation and compilation of explanations of the Changes from ancient times.

易注 to be unacceptable.⁵² Wang Can 王粲 (177-217) also criticized Zheng,

⁵²(5/3, n.8) Zhou Yutong comments: Yu Fan submitted a memorial titled, "The Errors in Zheng Xuan's Explanation of the Documents" ("Zheng Xuan jie Shangshu weishi shi" 鄭玄解尚書違失事) in which he states, "Thus in the Documents annotated by Recruit for Office (zhengshi 徵士--Hucker 435) Zheng Xuan of Beihai 北海, in the 'Gu ming' chapter where King Kang is holding a piece of ceremonial jade, the old character for yue 月 resembled tong 同, and from this he makes a mistake by writing it as tong 同, and later being uncertain, he explains it as bei 杯, referring to a wine goblet. In the text where King Cheng is ill and is leaning on a table, and the words taohui 洮頹 [SVA: meaning to wash one's hands and face] is taken to be zhuo 濯 ['to wash away dirt'], and he thinks this means to be finished washing clothing. The character tao 洮 is changed to zhuo 濯 without basis, which follows from his [previous] error.

In addition, the old large seal script character 𠄎 should be read liu 柳, the old forms 柳 and 𠄎 are the same word, but he takes it to be mei 昧. As for the line 分北三苗, 北 is the ancient form of the character 別, and furthermore in explaining 北, he says that 北 is like 別....With respect to these several items, they are mistakes of which there are no greater. It is appropriate that you order the officials in charge of education to rectify these three matters." (See: Sanguo zhi 57.1322-23, n.2) In addition, he submitted a memorial on [Zheng Xuan's] Yi zhu 易注 in which he stated, "In the case of Zheng Xuan of Beihai and Song Zhong 宋忠 of Nanyang 南陽, although each has established a commentary [to the Changes] and while that of Song Chong is somewhat inferior to that of Zheng Xuan, neither has

but his arguments have not come down to us.⁵³ There are those of an era

been able to obtain a following, and [each] has had difficulty being manifest in the world." (See: Sanguo zhi 57.1322, n.2) The text of both memorials appears in the notes to the biography of Yu Fan in juan fifty-seven of the Sanguo zhi.

⁵³(5/3, n.9) Zhou Yutong comments: Wang Can 王粲 (zi Zhongxuan 仲宣 (177-217) was a native of Shanyang 山陽 in Wei 魏 who lived during the Sanguo period. He held successive official positions, reaching the rank of Palace Attendant (shizhong 侍中--Hucker 5229). He had a wide knowledge of all manner of things and was especially talented in literary pursuits, the literary works he left include shi 詩 (lyric poetry), fu 賦 (rhapsody), lun 論 (treatise) and yi 議 (discussion or proposal) and comprise sixteen chapters. He was one of the Seven Masters of the Jian'an period. For his biography, see juan twenty-one in the "Wei zhi" section of the Sanguo zhi. His criticisms of Zheng Xuan have not come down to us and can only be seen in a sketchy outline form in chapter eight, "Mianxue" 勉學, of Yan Zhitui's 顏之推 Yanshi jiaxun 顏氏家訓. The Yanshi jiaxun reads, "When I first came to Ye 鄴, I became friends with Cui Wenyan 崔文彥 of Boling 博陵. He had said that in Wang Can's collected writings he criticized Zheng Xuan's [annotations on the] Documents and he spoke of this to several scholars. Just as he opened his mouth, he was rebutted with the following: In his literary collection there are shi 詩, fu 賦, ming 銘 (inscription) and lei 誄 (dirge), so how would it be appropriate that there would be discussions of matters pertaining to the Classics? Moreover, among the Confucian scholars of the past, we have never heard Wang Can's name mentioned. Cui laughed and retired, and in the end he never took out Wang Can's collected

somewhat later than Zheng whose scholarship is not completely the same. Wang Bi's 王弼 (226-249) Yi zhu 易注 swept away images and numerology, and although he also utilized Fei's Changes, his explanations are not the same.⁵⁴ Therefore, Li Dingzuo wrote, "I did away with the wild [Taoist] writings of Fusi 輔嗣 (Wang Bi) and filled in Kangcheng's missing

writings and showed them to them." (See: Yanshi jiaxun, Sbck, 上.19a)

Based on this passage, at the time Wang Can's collected writings still contained his criticisms of Zheng Xuan.

⁵⁴(5/3, n.10) Zhou Yutong comments: Wang Bi 王弼 (zi Fusi 輔嗣; 226-249) was a native of Shanyang 山陽 in Wei who lived during the Three Kingdoms period. He was fond of Laozi and was a master at discerning differences and was quite capable in discourse. He wrote commentary to the Changes and to the Laozi which are both extant. For biographical information, see the biography of Zhong Hui 鐘會 and Pei Songzhi's 裴松之 notes in juan twenty-eight in the "Wei zhi" section of the Sanguo zhi (28.795-6 and n.1). Studies on the Changes can be separated into two groups, one being focused on the study of images and numerology and the other focused on the study of meaning and underlying principles. Wang Bi's Yi zhu 易注 had its origins with Master Fei 費氏, completely did away with images and numerology, and in addition brought in ideas associated with the Laozi and Zhuangzi texts. It was different with regard to its interest from that of Zheng Xuan, whose work discussed the interrelationships between yao 爻 (the lines) and the chen 辰 (the Earthly Branches) and did not discard numerology.

images."⁵⁵ Although He Yan 何晏 (190-249) in his Lunyu jijie 論語集解, drew from Zheng Xuan's commentary, he did not take Zheng as his sole and principal source.⁵⁶ In the case of Wang Su 王肅 it is especially clear that he

⁵⁵(5/3, n.11) Zhou Yutong comments: The quote is taken from the "Preface" ("Zixu" 自序) written by Li Dingzuo 李鼎祚 to his Zhouyi jijie 周易集解. (See: Li Dingzuo, Zhouyi jijie. Rpt. Taipei: Xuesheng shuju, 1976, p.2) Fusi is Wang Bi's zi. Wang Bi in writing his commentary to the Changes mixed in ideas from the Laozi and as a result it was criticized as being "untamed or undisciplined writings." In the Chinese, kan 刊 should be understood as kanluo 刊落 ("to delete," "to drop"). Kangcheng is Zheng Xuan's zi. Zheng Xuan in annotating the Changes, did not discard images and numerology. In his text, Li Dingzuo selected and collected the words of others who discoursed on images and numerology, and therefore the statement that he "filled in its missing images."

⁵⁶(5/3, n.12) Zhou Yutong comments: He Yan 何晏 (zi Pingshu 平叔) was a native of Wan 宛 in Nanyang 南陽 which was located in the kingdom of Wei, who lived during the Three Kingdoms period. He was well known owing to his talent and refinement. He was fond of the words of Laozi and Zhuangzi, wrote the Daode lun 道德論, and his fu and other writings number in the tens of pian. Biographical information about him is appended to the biography of Cao Shuang 曹爽 and Pei Songzhi's notes in juan nine in the "Wei zhi" section of the Sanguo zhi (9.285-93, esp. 9.292 and n.1). The commentary (zhu 注) to the Analects contained in the Shisan jing zhushu edition of the Thirteen Classics is none other than He Yan's Lunyu jijie 論語集解. This text originally combined the annotations of He Yan and four

was diametrically opposed [to Zheng].⁵⁷

[5/4 SVA Introductory Comments: Pi Xirui shifts his focus to Wang Su in this section, and in a spirited attack, takes him to task. He begins with a brief sketch of Wang Su's and Zheng Xuan's common scholastic

other individuals, Sun Yong 孫邕, Zheng Chong 鄭冲, Cao Xi 曹羲 and Xun Yi 荀顛, however He Yan's annotations were taken to be primary. In the "Preface" ("Xulu" 敘錄) to Lu Deming's Jingdian shiwen it states, "He Yan collected together the explanations of Kong Anguo 孔安國, Bao Xian 包咸, Master Zhou 周氏, Ma Rong 馬融, Zheng Xuan 鄭玄, Chen Qun 陳群, Wang Su 王肅, and Zhou Shenglie 周生烈, added his own ideas below theirs in the text, and this became the Lunyu jijie." (See: Jingdian shiwen, 1.31a) Based on this, although He Yan's text drew from Zheng Xuan's annotations, in reality it did not completely take Zheng Xuan's commentary as its sole and principal source.

⁵⁷(5/3, n.13) Zhou Yutong comments: On Wang Su 王肅, see 2/1, n.14. Wang Su had a favorable opinion with respect to Jia Kui and Ma Rong, but he did not like Zheng Xuan. He selected and brought together similarities and differences, and wrote commentary on the Documents, Songs, Analects, the three Rites and the Zuo Commentary. He also edited and put in final form the Commentary to the Changes (Yizhuan 易傳) which was composed by his father, Wang Lang 王朗 and all of these works had positions established for them in the Imperial Academy. In addition, he forged the Kongzi jiaayu 孔子家語 and the Kongcongzi 孔叢子, and composed the Shengzheng lun 聖證論

filiations. He then turns to Wang Su's intentions in his criticism of Zheng Xuan, and shows while his criticisms may have had merit, Wang was inconsistent and even hypocritical in his use of evidence in his critique of Zheng Xuan's scholarship. He accuses Wang of forging texts⁵⁸ in order to provide supporting evidence for his arguments and for the purpose of attacking Zheng Xuan. Pi points out that Wang's positions were inconsistent with historical sources, and that his "evidence" was recognized as self-manufactured.]

5/4⁵⁹ Zheng Xuan's scholarship appeared and Han scholarship declined. Wang Su came forth and the scholarship of Zheng Xuan, for its part, declined. Wang Su held the scholarship of Jia and Ma⁶⁰ in high regard, but did not like Master Zheng. Jia Kui and Ma Rong were both scholars aligned with Old Script scholarship and were the source of Zheng Xuan's

in order to ridicule and belittle Zheng Xuan.

⁵⁸[SVA: Most modern scholars do not hold this view. Cf. Robert Kramers, K'ung Tzu Chia Yü (Leiden: Brill, 1949) and Yoav Ariel, trans. K'ung-ts'ung-tzu (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989).]

⁵⁹[SVA: Section 5/4 corresponds to pp.155-9 of the Zhonghua ed. and to pp.161-6 of the Yiwen ed.]

⁶⁰(5/4, n.1) Zhou Yutong comments: Jia 賈 and Ma 馬 are Jia Kui 賈逵 and Ma Rong 馬融 who have already appeared several times in previous notes.

scholarship. With regard to Wang Su holding Jia and Ma in high regard, but not liking Zheng, was it perhaps because Jia and Ma solely focused on scholarship of the Old Script school while Zheng also added [scholarship] of the Modern Script school? In my opinion, Wang Su's scholarship also contained a thorough knowledge of both Modern Script and Old Script texts and scholarship. Wang Su's father, Wang Lang 王朗, had Yang Si 楊賜 as his teacher and for generations the Yang family had transmitted the Ouyang interpretation of the Documents.⁶¹ In his Chuanjing biao 傳經表,

⁶¹(5/4, n.2) Zhou Yutong comments: Wang Su's father, Wang Lang 王朗 (zi Yingxing 景興), was a native of Donghai 東海. He had as his teacher Yang Si 楊賜, who held the official position of Defender-in-Chief (taiwei 太尉 --Hucker 6260). Early on, he served as the Governor (taishou 太守-- Hucker 6221) of Kuaiji 會稽 in Han. Later, he returned to Wei where he was enfeoffed as the Marquis of Lanling 蘭陵. He wrote commentary to the Changes, The Spring and Autumn Annals, The Classic of Filial Piety and the Zhouguan (Rites of Zhou), along with memorials to the throne (zou 奏), disquisitions (yi 議), discourses (lun 論) and notes (ji 記) all of which were in circulation during his lifetime. For his biography, see juan thirteen in the "Wei zhi" section of the Sanguo zhi (13.406-14).

Yang Si (zi Boxian 伯獻) was a native of Huayin 華陰 who lived during the Later Han. He was the grandson of Yang Zhen 楊震. His family had transmitted the Ouyang version of the Documents for generations. During the reign of Emperor Ling 靈帝 (reg. 168-189) he served in the

Hong Liangji 洪亮吉⁶² took Wang Su to be seventeenth in the line of transmission from teacher to student which started with Fu Sheng,⁶³ and

capacity of Defender-in-Chief. For his biography, see Hou Han shu 54.1759-95.

⁶²(5/4, n.3) Zhou Yutong comments: Hong Liangji 洪亮吉 (zi Junzhi 君直; alt. zi Zhicun 稚存; hao Beijiang 北江; 1746-1809) was a native of Yanghu 陽湖 who lived during the Qing dynasty. Because he submitted a confidential memorial, the words of which were cutting and direct, he was exiled to Yili 伊犁, but he received a pardon and returned home. He was learned in the field of geography and was also a talented poet and a man of letters. His writings are contained in the Hong Beijiang quanji 洪北江全集. For his biography, see juan four of Jiang Fan's Guochao Hanxue shi chengji. The Chuanjing biao 傳經表 which he authored appears in the Hong Beijiang quanji. The Huayu lou xuchao 花雨樓續鈔 and the Jiaojing shanfang congshu 校經山房叢書 also contain the Chuanjing biao, but Bi Yuan 畢沅 is given as the author. Perhaps the reason was that at the time, Hong Liangji was working in Bi Yuan's office and thus Bi Yuan's name was signed [to this work]. [SVA: See: ECCP 373-5 for Hong Liangji's biography.]

⁶³(5/4, n.4) Zhou Yutong comments: The "Preface" ("Xu" 序) of the Chuanjing biao 傳經表 states, "The Modern Script Documents 今文尚書 passed through seventeen steps in the process of transmission from Fu Sheng 伏勝 to Wang Su." (See: Chuan jing biao, Csjc, "序," p.1) According to this text, the chart gives it as follows: (1) Fu Sheng-->(2) Ouyang Sheng 歐陽生-->(3) Ni Kuan 兒寬-->(4) Ouyang Shi 歐陽世-->(5) transmitted from father to son in the Ouyang family-->(6) transmitted from father to son in the Ouyang

this is an instance of Wang Su having studied a text of the Modern Script school; but he also studied the Old Script teachings of Jia and Ma. As a result, in his refutation of Zheng, at times he makes use of Modern Script school explanations in order to refute Zheng's Old Script school positions, and at other times he utilizes the explanations of the Modern Script school in refuting Zheng's Old Script school positions.⁶⁴ [Wang Su] did not

family-->(7) Ouyang Gao 歐陽高-->(8) Lin Zun 林尊-->(9) Ping Dang 平當-->(10) Zhu Pu 朱普-->(11) Huan Rong 桓榮-->(12) Huan Yu 桓郁-->(13) Yang Zhen 楊震-->(14) Yang Bing 楊秉--> (15) Yang Si 楊賜-->(16) Wang Lang 王朗-->(17) Wang Su 王肅.

⁶⁴(5/4, n.5) Zhou Yutong comments: Wang Su used the explanations of the Modern Script school to refute Zheng Xuan's Old Script school explanations. For example, in the case of the poem "Ju xia" 車牽 ("Carriage's Axle Pin," #218) in the "Lesser Elegantiae" section of the Songs there is the line, "Thereby comforts our hearts" 以慰我心. The Mao commentary glosses "wei 慰 as an 安 ('to comfort')." Zheng Xuan's commentary repeats the Old Script explanation from the Mao version of the Songs. He writes, "When I see the newly married young lady, I am comforted and sadness leaves my heart." However, Wang Su, following the Modern Script school explanation of the Han Version of the Songs changed wei 慰 to yun 愠 ('anger') and wrote, "The Han Version of the Songs reads, 'Thereby angers my heart' 以愠我心; yun 愠 means hui 恚 ('to anger')." This is one example.

Wang Su also made use of the explanations of the Old Script school in order to refute Zheng Xuan's Modern Script school explanations. For

example, the poem "Sheng min" 生民 ("Birth of the People" #245) in the "Greater Elegantae" section of the Songs reads, "She who in the beginning gave birth to the people, this was Jiang Yuan. How did she give birth to the people, she offered sacrifices and she offered prayers, so that she would not be childless. She trod on the big toe of God's footprint, And she was moved to elation, She was enriched and she was blessed, She became pregnant and was serene. She bore him and she nurtured him, And this was Hou Ji." In his "Notes" (Jian 箋), Zheng Xuan draws from the Modern Script explanations of the Three Schools of the Songs (Sanjia Shi 三家詩) as he considers Hou Ji as not having a father in the literal sense and his birth to be [the result of his mother] being "touched" or "moved" by Heaven. He writes, "When she prayed and performed sacrifices for progeny, there was the footprint of a great spirit, and Jiang Yuan trod upon it, but her foot was not able to fill it. She stepped on the location of the big toe, her heart was elated, to her left and to her right that which fell still, and it seemed as if someone moved her. Thereupon she became pregnant, and she was reserved and cautious and did not again ride in a carriage. Later she gave birth to a son and nurtured him, and she named him Qi 棄 ('the Abandoned')."

However, Wang Su following the Old Script school explanation of the Mao Songs, considered Hou Ji to be the son of Emperor Ku 帝嚳 and opposed the "miraculous conception and birth" explanation. He writes, "Emperor Ku had four wives, his highest ranking wife was Jiang Yuan who gave birth to Hou Ji....After Emperor Ku died, ten months passed and then Hou Ji was born, and he was a posthumous son. Although she had the protection of Heaven, she dwelt alone and gave birth to her son. This is something about which many are suspect and cannot explain. Jiang Yuan understood Hou Ji's

understand that Han scholarship placed importance on strict adherence to a single school; Master Zheng mixed Modern together with the Old, and recent scholars have discussed how he brought to ruin the separate and distinct interpretations [i.e. way of teaching the texts] of the individual schools; Wang Su wanted to attack Zheng Xuan, correctly and properly separate and differentiate the interpretations of the individual schools so that each returned to its original form, and moreover point out Zheng's mistakes. Then Han scholarship would be restored to a state of clarity and [as a result] Zheng's scholarship would naturally be abandoned. However, not only did Wang Su not know how to separate out and differentiate [the interpretations of individual schools], on the contrary he imitated Master Zheng and made things worse than [Zheng Xuan] ever had. He forged a Kong Anguo Commentary to the Documents, commentaries to the Analects and Classic of Filial Piety, the Kongzi jiaoyu 孔子家語 and the Kong Congzi 孔叢子, five texts in all,⁶⁵ which were employed as cross referencing

divine nature and that no harm could come to him, and thus she abandoned him in order to make manifest his divinity which thereby became self evident." This is one example.

⁶⁵(5/4, n.6) Zhou Yutong comments: The Kongzi jiaoyu 孔子家語 in ten juan and the Kong Congzi 孔叢子 in three juan are both extant. Traditionally it has been believed that they were forged by Wang Su and for a detailed evaluation, see the notices in the Siku quanshu congmu tiyao (pp.1874-5

and pp.1876-7 respectively).

Kong Anguo's Shangshu zhuan 尚書傳 is none other than the Shangshu zhu 尚書注 which is contained in the Shisanjing zhushu and is extant. This text has been critically examined by the Qing scholars Yan Ruoqu 閻若璩 in his Guwen Shangshu shuzheng 古文尚書疏證, and Hui Dong 惠棟 in his Guwen Shangshu kao 古文尚書考, their researches indicating that it was a forgery by Mei Ze 梅賾. Later, Ding Yan 丁晏 (1794- 1875) in writing his Shangshu yulun 尚書餘論, was the first to trace it back to Wang Su. Ding Yan's work is printed in juan 844 of the Xu Qing jingjie 續清經解.

Kong Anguo's Lunyu zhu 論語注 has been lost, but He Yan 何晏 occasionally draws from it in his Lunyu jijie 論語集解. Shen Tao 沈濤 in writing his Lunyu Kongzhu bianwei 論語孔注辨偽 in two juan and Ding Yan 丁晏 in his four juan work Lunyu Kongzhu zhengwei 論語孔注證偽 both indicate that this text was forged by Wang Su. Shen Tao's work has been reprinted in juan 627-8 of the Xu Qing jingjie.

Kong Anguo's Xiaojing zhu 孝經注 appears in the "Jingji zhi" chapter of the Sui shu and at the time it was thought that it was forged by Liu Xuan 劉炫. This text was originally lost, but during the Qing dynasty Wang Yicang 汪翼滄 obtained the Guwen Xiaojing Kongzhuan 古文孝經孔傳 from Japan. Ding Yan in his Xiaojing zhengwen 孝經徵文 points out that it was forged by Wang Su. Ding Yan's work has been reprinted in juan 847 of the Xu Qing jingjie.

As for considering the Kongzi jiayu and the Kong Congzi to be forged by Wang Su, classicists of earlier eras already harbored these suspicions.

supporting evidence for one another. He ascribed them to Confucius and to Confucius' descendants,⁶⁶ and had his student Kong Yan 孔衍 provide evidence for their authenticity.⁶⁷ He did not consider that the Shi ji and the

When it comes to considering Kong Anguo's commentaries to the Documents, Analects and Classic of Filial Piety to be forged by Wang Su, this in fact began with Qing scholars.

⁶⁶(5/4, n.7) Zhou Yutong comments: The authorship of the Kongzi jiyu was attributed to Kong Anguo and the authorship of the Kong Congzi to Kong Fu 孔鮒. Kong Anguo and Kong Fu were both descendants of Confucius.

⁶⁷(5/4, n.8) Zhou Yutong comments: The ["Postface" (後序) to the] Kongzi jiyu records a memorial submitted by Kong Yan 孔衍 which states, "When King Gong of Lu 魯恭王 demolished Confucius' former residence, he recovered texts of the Documents, the Classic of Filial Piety and the Analects written in the Old Script tadpole style. At the time there was no one who was able to read it. Kong Anguo wrote it into Modern Script and studied it, and moreover explained and transmitted its meaning. In addition, he compiled the Kongzi jiyu. It had already been completed when he encountered problems stemming from the witchcraft affair which had arisen, and consequently each work was abandoned and not circulated. The Grand Master of Splendid Happiness (guanglu dafu 光祿大夫--Hucker 3349) Liu Xiang 劉向, because the texts were not in circulation at the time, did not record the Documents in the "Bielu" 別錄 and the Analects was not assigned to a known author." (See: Kongzi jiyu, rpt. of the Ming dynasty Mao Jin 毛晉 edition, Shanghai: Wenruilou 文瑞樓, n.d., 10.18a)

Kong Yan 孔衍 (zi Shuyuan 舒元) was a native of the state of Lu 魯國

Han shu both state that Kong Anguo died an early death,⁶⁸ and neither states that he composed any writings. The [authorship] of the three forged texts is inconsistent with [the information] already given in the Shi ji and Han shu. Moreover, in the remaining two texts, the Kongzi jiayu and the Kong Congzi, he selected matters pertaining to the grand ceremonies at the temple(s) for Heaven about which the scholars of the Modern Script school and the Old Script school debated back and forth without final resolution during the Former and Later Han dynasties, and claimed they were all the words of Confucius, so that they would be taken as the last word [on these matters].⁶⁹ He did not take into account the fact that the Han dynasty

who lived during the Jin dynasty. He was a twenty-second generation descendant of Confucius and he studied under Wang Su. For his biography, see the "Rulin zhuan" chapter of the Jin shu (91.2359).

⁶⁸(5/4, n.9) Zhou Yutong comments: The "Hereditary House of Confucius" (孔子世家) chapter of the Shi ji states, "Kong Anguo served the present emperor (Emperor Wu) in the capacity of Erudite, and attained the position of Governor (taishou 太守--Hucker 6221) of Linhuai 臨淮. He died an early death. (See: Shi ji 47.1947) Although the "Yiwen zhi" chapter (30.1706), the biography of Ni Kuan 兒寬 (58.2628) and the "Rulin zhuan" chapter (88.3603, 88.3607-8) in the Han shu all mention Kong Anguo, nowhere does it state that 'He died and early death.' (早卒) In the Chinese, zao 蚤 is a phonetic loan for zao 早 ("early").

⁶⁹(5/4, n.10) Zhou Yutong comments: Chapter thirty-four, "The Temple

Ruists in discussing ritual matters debated back and forth, for the precise

System" ("Miaozhi" 廟制) in juan eight of the Kongzi jiayu and the second part "Discussion of the Book of Documents" ("Lun Shu" 論書) of juan A (上) of the Kong Congzi both discuss the grand ceremonies at the suburban temples, but these passages are attributed to Confucius. As the text is long, it is not cited in its entirety and [in each case] I have restricted the quoted passage to a section so we can see a segment of the whole. For example, the Kongzi jiayu states, "There are seven temples erected for the Son of Heaven, three Zhao 昭 temples, three Mu 穆 temples, and a temple for the founder for a total of seven....There are five temples erected for the feudal lords, two Zhao temples, two Mu temples, and a temple for the founder for a total of five...Three temples are erected for the grandees, one Zhao temple, one Mu temple and a temple for the founder for a total of three...For the elite (shi 士) there is one temple erected and it is called the Kao 考 temple...There is no temple for the common people." (See: Kongzi jiayu, Sbck 8.4a-b) The Kong Congzi states, "Burying a small animal at the temple of Grand Radiance was how the seasons were sacrificed to. Offering prayers of welcome at the pit and at the altar was how the Cold of Winter and the Heat of Summer were sacrificed to. Performing sacrifice at the Palace for Offerings to Heaven and Earth was how the Sun was sacrificed to. Offering sacrifices at the Altar of Nighttime Radiance was how the Moon was sacrificed to. Sacrificing at the Altar Honoring the Hidden was how the Stars were sacrificed to. Making offerings at the Altar Honoring Rain was how Flood and Drought were sacrificed to. Offering sacrifice to the Six Venerated Ones refers to this." (See: Kong Congzi, Sbck A.13a-b; following Yoav Ariel, trans. K'ung-ts'ung-tzu (Princeton: Princeton University Press,

reason that they were far removed in time from the sages, and had nothing on which to base themselves. Therefore, at the discussions held at the Shiqu Pavilion and at the White Tiger Hall,⁷⁰ the Son of Heaven exercised imperial authority in presiding over the decision making process. If there were clear writings available from Confucius' own hand which could have served as evidence, then why were there so many words spoken in such a confused rebuttal of the sages, and how could it be that there were so many [opinions]? Wang Su composed the Shengzheng lun 聖證論⁷¹ in order to

1989), p.82)

⁷⁰(5/4, n.11) Zhou Yutong comments: During the Former Han, Emperor Xuan 宣帝 convened a meeting of Confucian Scholars at the Stone Canal Pavilion where he exercised imperial authority, overseeing the process by which decisions were arrived at. In the Later Han, Emperor Zhang, modelling on the precedent of the Stone Canal Pavilion, assembled the Confucian scholars at the White Tiger Hall. See 4/6, n.4 and n.5.

⁷¹(5/4, n.12) Zhou Yutong comments: The Shengzheng lun 聖證論 in twelve juan was written by Wang Su and appears in the "Jingji zhi" chapter of the Sui shu (32.938). The "Yiwen zhi" chapter of the Tang shu states that it was in eleven juan. (See: Liu Xu 劉昫, comp. Jiu Tang shu, Beijing zhonghua shuju, 1975, 46.1983; Ouyang Xiu, comp., Jin Tang shu, Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1975, 57.1444) It is no longer extant. Ma Guohan in his Yuhan shanfang jiyishu has compiled fragments in one juan. Pi Xirui has written the Shengzheng lun buping 聖證論補評 in two juan which one should consult.

humiliate and belittle Master Zheng. He himself said that the proof was obtained from the words of the sages, and a single work, the Kongzi jiayu, was its basis.⁷² His annotations to the Kongzi jiayu, [especially] those on the Five Emperors (Wudi 五帝), the Seven Temples (Qimiao 七廟) and the

⁷²(5/4, n.13) Zhou Yutong comments: The Shengzheng lun at times bases itself on the forged Kongzi jiayu in order to dispute Zheng Xuan's explanations. For example, in the "Yao dian" chapter of the Documents there is the line, "Sacrifice to the Six Venerable Ones." (禮於六宗; see: Ssjzs, 3.5a) Zheng Xuan takes the Six Venerable Ones to be the xing 星 (the five planets--Jupiter, Mars, Venus, Mercury and Saturn), chen 辰 (the twelve conjunctions of the positions of the sun and the moon that occur during the year--the moon being opposite the sun when there is a full moon and the relationships to the star groups), sizhong 司中 (identified as either the fifth star in the Wenchang 文昌 star group or the middle star--zhongtai 中台--in the Santai 三台 star group), siming 司命 (identified as either the fourth star in the Wenchang 文昌 star group or the upper star--shangtai 上台--in the Santai 三台 star group), fengshi 風師 (identified as the "Master" or "God" of Wind, the Ji 箕 star group) and yushi 雨師 (identified as the "Master" or "God" of Rain, the Bi 畢 star group). (See: Zhouli zhengyi, Ssjzs, 18.2a-3b; Sun Xiaochun and Jacob Kistemaker, The Chinese Sky During the Han, Leiden: Brill, 1997) Wang Su, basing himself on the forged Kongzi jiayu stated, "[According to] the jiayu these are the four seasons, winter cold and summer heat, the sun, the moon, flood and drought. These are the Six Venerable Ones." (See: Ma Guohan, Yuhan shanfang jiyishu, 52.35a) [SVA:

Round Altar to Heaven (Jiaoqiu 郊丘) were all dragged in to attack the words of Zheng Xuan,⁷³ and in doing so it was fitting that he exposed his own forgeries. At the time, the adherents of Zheng Xuan's scholarship all

Xing 星 (stars) omitted from the list of six.] This is one example.

⁷³(5/4, n.14) Zhou Yutong comments: Chapter twenty-four, "The Five Emperors" ("Wudi" 五帝) in juan six of the Kongzi jiayu focuses on discussing the Five Emperors. In his Jiayu shuzheng 家語疏證 Sun Zhizu 孫志祖 (1737-1801) states, "This chapter, which was written by Wang Su, selects from and intermixes the Record of Rites and Zuo Commentary, passing it off in a question and answer format with Ji Kangzi 季康子 in order to rebut Zheng Kangcheng's theory of the 'Six Heavens' 六天." (See: Jiayu shuzheng, Jiaojing shanfang congshu 校經山房叢書 edition, Shanghai: 1904, 3.14a)

In addition, chapter thirty-four, "The System of Temples" ("Miao zhi" 廟制), in juan eight discusses the seven temples of the Son of Heaven. Sun states, "This chapter, was written by Wang Su, in order to refute Zheng Kangcheng's writings on the system of temples." (See: 4.9b)

Furthermore, chapter twenty-nine, "Questions on Sacrifice" ("Jiaowen" 郊問) discusses the ceremonies of sacrifices and offerings. Sun states, "This chapter, which was written by Wang Su, selects from and intermixes various passages from the Record of Rites so as to rebut Zheng Kangcheng, passing it off as a dialogue in the form of questions and answers between Duke Ding 定公 and Confucius." (See: 4.2a) The text is lengthy and thus I do not reproduce it here. For a detailed examination one should consult Sun's original work.

said that, "the Kongzi jiayu was added to by Wang Su,"⁷⁴ and some even said that Wang Su wrote it himself.⁷⁵ This, what Wang Su said was "proof from the sages," was known by everyone not to have come from the sages. In his Kongzi jiayu shuzheng 孔子家語疏證,⁷⁶ Sun Zhizu 孫志祖 has already clearly exposed his forgery.

[5/5 SVA Introductory Comments: Pi Xirui continues his attack on

⁷⁴(5/4, n.15) Zhou Yutong comments: The "Yueji" 樂記 chapter of Kong Yingda's Liji zhengyi quotes Ma Zhao 馬昭. It states, "The Jiayu was that which was added to by Wang Su." (See: Liji zhushu, Ssjsz, 36.1b) Ma Zhao took Zheng Xuan's scholarship as primary.

⁷⁵(5/4, n.16) Zhou Yutong comments: Juan ninety-one of the Tongzhi 通志 quotes from Ma Zhao. It states, "The words of the Jiayu are certainly something we cannot put our faith in." [SVA: I was unable to locate this line in juan ninety-one of the Tongzhi.] However, he does not clearly criticize it as being written by Wang Su.

⁷⁶(5/4, n.17) Zhou Yutong comments: Sun Zhizu (zi Yigu 頤谷; 1737-1801) was a native of Renhe 仁和 who lived during the Qing dynasty. He served in public office, attaining the position of Investigating Censor (jiancha yushi 監察御史--Hucker 795). He wrote the Jiayu shuzheng in six juan in which he gave evidence that the Kongzi jiayu was forged by Wang Su. This work has been reprinted in the Jiaojing shanfang congshu 校經山房叢書. Sun Zhizu's biography appears in juan B of Ruan Yuan's Guoshi Rulin zhuan 國史儒林傳.

Wang Su in this section. He begins by drawing parallels between Liu Xin and Wang Su, showing that they both were unfilial as well as disloyal to the ruling house, and stating that therefore neither was capable of understanding the Classics. He goes on to point out that in both cases, their scholarship did not stand on its own merits, but was patronized by the Wang Mang in the case of Liu Xin, and in the case of Wang Su, was popular owing to family ties. He then recounts the factional fighting that occurred between the supporters of Wang Su and those of Zheng Xuan, and how civil unrest and chaos led to the scholarship of the early Han classicists being lost. After the founding of the Eastern Jin, Erudite positions were set up for the Classics, but none represented the way the texts were taught by the early Han masters.]

5/5⁷⁷ Classical Scholarship flourished to its highest degree during the two Han dynasties, but at the end of the Former Han there emerged one Liu Xin and at the end of the Later Han there came forth one Wang Su, and they were the great destructive vermin of Classical Scholarship. Liu Xin was the descendant of King Yuan of Chu 楚元王.⁷⁸ His father Liu Xiang did his

⁷⁷[SVA: Section 5/5 corresponds to pp.159-163 of the Zhonghua ed. and to pp.166-170 of the Yiwen ed.]

⁷⁸(5/5, n.1) Zhou Yutong comments: King Yuan of Chu 楚元王, whose given

utmost in speaking on behalf of the Liu clan and in stating that the Wang clan (the imperial in-laws) were not heirs to the throne.⁷⁹ Liu Xin was a member of the Wang Mang clique that usurped the Han⁸⁰ and thus was disloyal to the Han and not filial towards his father. Wang Su's father was Wang Lang who served as the governor of Kuaiji 會稽 during the Han and became the captive of Sun Ce 孫策. He returned to Cao Cao 曹操, becoming

name (ming 名) was Jiao 交 (zi You 游) was the younger paternal half-brother of Han Gaozu 漢高祖 (Liu Bang). In the sixth year of Gaozu's reign (201 B.C.) he was enfeoffed as the King of Chu. For his biography, see Han shu 36.1921-74. Liu Xin was a descendant of King Yuan of Chu and his biography is appended to and follows that of King Yuan. (see: Han shu 36.1967-74)

⁷⁹(5/5, n.2) Zhou Yutong comments: On Liu Xiang, see 2/1, n.14. During the reign of Emperor Cheng (reg. 32-7 B.C.) the Wang consort clan monopolized control of the government, and consequently Liu Xiang submitted a confidential memorial of extreme admonishment. It read, "There are never two major trends in the course of events and it is also the case that the Wang clan and the Liu clan cannot both reign side by side." (See: Han shu 36.1961)

⁸⁰(5/5, n.3) Zhou Yutong comments: Liu Xin was the youngest son of Liu Xiang. When Wang Mang usurped the throne, Liu Xin became Master Teacher of the State (guoshi 國師, cf. Hucker 3530). He turned against Wang Mang and because he was involved in a traitorous plot against him which failed, he committed suicide. For a detailed account, see the

one of the three venerable ministers of Wei 魏.⁸¹ Wang Su married his daughter to Sima Zhao 司馬昭, joined with the Sima clan in their usurpation of Wei, but he died early and did not see the usurpation [completed].⁸² The two individuals became members of cliques and

biography of Wang Mang in the Han shu (99C.4184-5).

⁸¹(5/5, n.4) Zhou Yutong comments: On Wang Lang, see 5/4, n.2. During the later years of the Han dynasty, because he served the royal house, he was promoted to the position of Governor of Kuaiji. Sun Ce crossed the Yangtze River in an invasion. Wang Lang raised an army and fought the invaders, but suffered defeat, and was captured. He soon proceeded against this setback to defend against Wei. After Emperor Wen (Cao Pi 曹丕) took the throne, he was transferred to the position of Censor-in-Chief (yushi dafu 御史大夫, cf. Hucker 8181) and enfeoffed as the Neighborhood Marquis of Anling 安陵亭侯 (tinghou 亭侯, see Hucker 6752). He was soon made Minister of Works (sikong 司空, see Hucker 5687) and enfeoffed as the Township Marquis of Leping 樂平鄉侯 (xianghou 鄉侯, see Hucker 2316). During the reign of Emperor Ming 明帝 (reg. 227-239) he was transferred to the position of Minister over the Masses (situ 司徒, HB, p.14; cf. Hucker 5801) and enfeoffed as the Marquis of Lanling 蘭陵侯.

⁸²(5/5, n.5) Zhou Yutong comments: Wang Su's daughter married Sima Zhao 司馬昭 and she is none other than the person the Jin shu refers to as Wenming Huanghou 文明皇后. She was the mother of Sima Yan 司馬炎 who was Emperor Wu of the Jin 晉武帝 (reg. 265-290). According to Wang Su's biography, Wang Su rebuked Cao Shuang 曹爽, and joined into a clique with

participated in rebellious activities designed to usurp the throne. How could they have understood the Classics of the sages! In addition, Liu Xin established the Old Script Classics which wreaked havoc on the Modern Script school's master teachers' rules for teaching the text. Wang Su forged various texts attributed to the Kong clan, which also threw the scholarship of Zheng Xuan into chaos. Liu Xin's scholarship was promoted through his association with Wang Mang,⁸³ and because Emperor Wu of the Jin 晉武帝

Sima Yi 司馬懿. Sima Shi 司馬師 deposed the Emperor, installed Gaogui xiangong 高貴鄉公 (Cao Mao), and gave Wang Su an imperial carriage to greet him with. In addition, Sima Shi at times would ask Wang Su about governing techniques derived from the Classics, and it was probably the case that they got along well. However, Wang Su died in the first year of the Ganlu 甘露 period, which was 256 A.D., and this event is separated from Sima Yan's usurpation of Wei which took place in 265 A.D., by ten years. For a detailed account, consult Wang Su's biography.

⁸³(5/5, n.6) Zhou Yutong comments: During the reign of Emperor Ai 哀帝 (reg. 7-1 B.C.), Wang Mang recommended Liu Xin for promotion. Liu Xin wanted to establish Erudite positions for the Old Script Documents, the Mao Version of the Songs, the Lost Rites 逸禮, and the Zuo Commentary to the Spring and Autumn Annals in the Imperial Academy, but this was opposed by the Erudites and he was not successful. In the fifth year of the Yuanshi 元始 reign period of Emperor Ping 平帝 (5 A.D.), Wang Mang submitted a memorial requesting the construction of the Luminous Hall (Mingtang 明堂) and the Circular Moat (Biyong 辟雍), and sent Liu Xin and

(reg. 265-269) was the son of Wang Su's daughter, Wang Su's scholarship was popular during the early years of the Eastern Jin dynasty (265-317). His explanations of the Documents, the Songs, the Analects, the three Rites and the Zuoshi, along with his father Wang Lang's Yizhuan 易傳 which he revised and edited, all had positions established for them in the Imperial Academy.⁸⁴ During the early years of the Jin, the ceremonies at the temple for the sacrifice to Heaven and Earth were all performed in accordance with Wang Su's explanations, and Zheng Xuan's interpretations were not used.⁸⁵

others to supervise it. In addition, he sought out those in the empire who thoroughly understood the Old Script Documents, the Mao Version of the Songs, the Lost Rites, the Zhouguan (Zhouli), and the Erya 爾雅 and had them report to the Offices in Control of the Palace Gates (gongju sima men 公車司馬門; cf. Hucker 3394). This was probably Liu Xin's idea. When Wang Mang usurped the Han, Liu Xin became Preceptor of State (guoshi 國師, Hucker 3530) and the various Old Script texts were all established and given official recognition. For the details, see the "Annals of Emperor Ping" 平帝紀 in juan twelve of the Han shu, along with the biography of Liu Xin in juan thirty-six, the "Rulin zhuan" in juan eighty-eight and the "Biography of Wang Mang" in juan ninety-nine.

⁸⁴(5/5, n.7) Zhou Yutong comments: See Wang Su's biography in the "Wei zhi" section of the Sui shu (13.419).

⁸⁵(5/5, n.8) Zhou Yutong comments: Early in the Taikang 太康 period (280-289) of the Jin dynasty, Zhi Yu 摯虞 submitted a memorial on the regulations regarding mourning, [which stated] that Zheng Xuan and Wang

At the time Kong Chao 孔晁, Sun Yu 孫毓 and others expounded upon Wang Su in order to criticize Zheng Xuan,⁸⁶ while Sun Yan 孫炎, Ma Zhao 馬昭

Su each had their similarities and differences, and that they could adopt as standard and act according to the [regulations in] the Sangfu bianchu 喪服變除 which was written by Wang Jinghou 王景侯 (Wang Su's posthumous title). [SVA: Following Jin shu 19.582.] An imperial edict was issued allowing his proposal. In the second year of the Taishi 泰始 period (266), there was a memorial submitted by an official on establishing the seven temples, and for the rites involved they also based themselves on Wang Su's explanations. For the details, consult the "Monograph on Rites" ("Lizhi" 禮志) in juan nineteen of the Jin shu (19.581-2).

⁸⁶(5/5, n.9) Zhou Yutong comments: There is no biography for Kong Chao 孔晁 in the official histories. The biography of Yuan Xingchong 元行冲 in juan 102 of the Jiu Tang shu states, "Ziyong 子雍 (Wang Su) criticized Zheng Xuan on several tens or a hundred items. Of those who held to Zheng's learning, at the time there was the Palace Attendant Ma Zhao (zhonglang 中郎, Hucker 1580), who submitted a memorial in which he considered Wang Su to be wrong. An imperial decree was issued stating that the group of adherents to Wang's learning should prepare a report containing their responses." (See: Jiu Tang shu, 102.3180) One person who at the time responded to Ma Zhao's refutations and questioning of [Wang Su's positions] and whose name is known is Kong Chao. The Qing scholar Ma Guohan in writing his "Preface" (序) to the [recovered] Shengzheng lun stated, "Kong Chao spoke for the group on behalf of Wang Su and thus Kong Chao was certainly the chosen head of the group of adherents to Wang Su's

and others promoted Zheng Xuan and attacked Wang Su.⁸⁷ They argued⁸⁸

learning." (See: the "Preface" to the Shengzheng lun in his Yuhan shanfang jiyishu, 1a) Kong Chao's works are no longer extant, [but his comments] appear interspersed in the Zhengyi editions of the Songs and Rites texts as well as in the Tongdian 通典. The material collected in Ma Guohan's compilation of the Shengzheng lun is fairly complete and worth consulting.

In addition, the "Preface" (敘錄) to Lu Deming's Jingdian shiwen states, "During the Jin dynasty, the Regional Inspector (cishi 刺史, see Hucker 7567) in Yuzhou 豫州, Sun Yu 孫毓, composed the Shiping 詩評 in which he evaluated the similarities and differences of the Mao school, Zheng Xuan and Wang Su. He favored Wang Su." He own notes read, "Sun Yu (zi Xiulang 休朗) was a native of Pingchang 平昌 in Beihai 北海. He served as Governor of Changsha." (See: Jingdian shiwen, 1.20a)

The "Jingji zhi" chapter of the Sui shu states, "The Maoshi tongyi ping 毛詩同異評 in ten juan was written by Sun Yu who served as the Governor of Changsha during the Jin dynasty." (See: Sui shu 32.916) Sun Yu also sided with Wang Su, but his writings have been lost. Ma Guohan in his Yuhan shanfang jiyishu has compiled three juan of his writings which is worth consulting.

⁸⁷(5/5, n.10) Zhou Yutong comments: Sun Yan 孫炎 (zi Shuran 叔然) was a native of Le'an 樂安 in Wei who lived during the Three Kingdoms period and was a second generation disciple of Zheng Xuan. Wang Su wrote the Shengzheng lun in order to criticize Zheng Xuan, and Sun Yan refuted it, explaining it away. In addition, he wrote commentaries to the Changes, Chunqiu li 春秋例, the Mao Version of the Songs, the Record of Rites, the Three Commentaries to the Spring and Autumn Annals 春秋三傳, the

about Wang and Zheng, about who was right and who was wrong, while having no interest in the individual schools of the Former and Later Han. On top of this, because of the chaos of the Yongjia 永嘉 period (311),⁸⁹ the interpretations of Master Liangqiu, Master Shi and Master Gao were lost for the Changes, the interpretations of Master Ouyang and of the Elder and Younger Xiahou were lost for the Documents. The Qi Version of the Songs had already been lost during the Wei, the Lu version of the Songs never made it east of the River (i.e. south of the Yangtze), and although the Han version of the Songs was extant, there was no one to teach it. Neither was

Guoyu and the Erya. Biographical information about him is contained in the biography of Wang Su which is in juan thirteen of the "Wei zhi" section of the Sanguo zhi. (See: Sanguo zhi 13.519-20) The text of Sun Yan's refutation of the Shengzheng lun has not come down to us. On Ma Zhao, see: 5/5, n.9. For the text of Ma Zhao's refutations of the Shengzheng lun, see Ma Guohan's compilation of the Shengzheng lun in his Yuhan shanfang jiyishu.⁸⁸(5/5, n.11) Zhou Yutong comments: In the Chinese yinyin 斷斷 means to "argue or dispute." See the note to the "Appraisal" (贊) to juan sixty-six of the Han shu (66.2904, n.8).

⁸⁹(5/5, n.12) Zhou Yutong comments: Yongjia 永嘉 is a reign period of Emperor Huai 晉懷帝 of the Jin dynasty. It covered six years, from 307 through 312. The disorder of the Yongjia period refers to the events of the fifth year of the Yongjia period (311) when the army of Liu Cong 劉聰 captured Luoyang and took Emperor Huai prisoner.

there anyone to teach the interpretations of Master Meng, Master Jing or Master Fei of the Changes. And although the Gongyang and Guliang [commentaries to the Spring and Autumn Annals] were extant, it was as if they had been lost.⁹⁰ Emperor Yuan of the Eastern Jin 晉元帝 (reg. 317-322)

⁹⁰(5/5, n.13) Zhou Yutong comments: The "Preface" to Lu Deming's Jingdian shiwen states, "During the disorder of the Yongjia period, Master Shi's 施 and Master Liangqiu's 梁丘 versions of the Changes were lost. There was no one to teach and pass on the interpretations of the Changes of Master Meng 孟, Master Jing 京, and Master Fei 費." (See: Jingdian shiwen 1.11a) The "Jingji zhi" section of the Sui shu states, "[The interpretations of] Master Liangqiu, Master Shi, and Master Gao were lost during the Western Jin. With respect to [the interpretations of] Master Meng and Master Jing, there were texts, but no one to teach them." (Sui shu 32.913) In addition, the "Preface" to the Jingdian shiwen states, "During the chaotic devastation of the Yongjia period, the Documents of numerous schools were all destroyed and lost." (Jingdian shiwen 1.16b) The "Jingji zhi" section of the Sui shu states, "During the chaos of the Yongjia period, the Ouyang, Elder Xiahou and Younger Xiahou versions of the Documents were all lost." (Sui shu 32.919) The "Preface" to the Jingdian shiwen goes on to state, "The Qi Version of the Songs was lost long ago, the Lu Version of the Songs never made it east of the Yangtze, and although the Han Version of the Songs was extant, there was no one to teach it and pass it on." (Jingdian shiwen 1.20a) The "Jingji zhi" of the Sui shu states, "The Qi Version of the Songs was already lost at the time of the Wei dynasty. The Lu Version of the Songs was lost during the Western Jin, and although the Han Version of the Songs was

restored the schools and reduced the number of Erudite positions. Individual Erudite positions were established for Master Wang's interpretation of the Changes, Master Zheng's interpretation of the Documents, Master Kong's Old Script Documents, Master Zheng's interpretation of the Mao Version of the Songs, Master Zheng's interpretation of the Zhouguan and for his interpretation of the Record of Rites, Master Du's and Master Fu's interpretations of the Zuo Commentary to the Spring and Autumn Annals, and Master Zheng's interpretation of the Analects as well as his interpretation of the Classic of Filial Piety.⁹¹ Xun

extant, there was no one to teach it and pass it on." (Sui shu 32.918) Furthermore, the "Jingji zhi" of the Sui shu states, "The Gongyang and Guliang commentaries gradually fell into decline and at present it is probably the case that there are no teachers to explain them." (Sui shu 32.933) The "Preface" to the Jingdian shiwen states, "As for the two commentaries, in recent times there has been no one to lecture on them." (Jingdian shiwen 1.11a) Pi Xirui's passage most probably combines the lines from the above two texts.

⁹¹(5/5, n.14) Zhou Yutong comments: For this passage see the biography of Xun Song 荀崧 in the Jin shu 75.1976-7. Master Wang is Wang Bi 王弼; see 5/3, n.10. Master Zheng is Zheng Xuan; see 1/3, n.23. Master Kong refers to Kong Anguo and the forged [Kong Anguo] commentary to the Documents (Shangshu zhuan 尚書傳); see 5/4, n.6. Master Du is Du Yu 杜預; see 1/1, n.24. Master Fu is Fu Qian 服虔 (zi Zishen 子慎; original ming Zhong 重, alt. ming Qi 祗), a native of Yingyang 熒陽, who lived during the Later Han.

Song 荀崧, who held the position of Chamberlain for Ceremonials submitted a memorial requesting that additional Erudite positions be established for Zheng Xuan's interpretations of the Changes, the Ceremonials and Rites, and the Gongyang and the Guliang Commentaries to the Spring and Autumn Annals. At the time the Guliang Commentary was considered to be shallow and did not merit a position being established for it. [However], owing to the problems brought on by Wang Dun's 王敦 criticisms, his proposals were never carried out.⁹² Of the Erudite positions established

During the reign of Emperor Ling 靈帝 (reg. 168-189) he served as the Governor of Jiujiang 九江. He wrote the Chunqiu Zuoshizhuan jie 春秋左氏傳解, and in addition, he used the Zuozhuan to refute He Xiu's criticism of events during the Han, which numbered in excess of sixty items. For his biography, see the "Rulin zhuan" chapter of the Hou Han shu (79B.2583).
⁹²(5/5, n.15) Zhou Yutong comments: On Xun Song 荀崧, see 3/9, n.29.

During the reign of Emperor Wen of the Jin dynasty 晉文帝, Xun Song was appointed to the position of Grand Master of Ceremonies (taichang 太常; cf. Hucker 6137), and he submitted a memorial in which he said that it was appropriate that Erudite positions be established for Zheng Xuan's interpretation of the Changes, Zheng Xuan's interpretation of the Ceremonial and Rites, The Gongyang Commentary to the Spring and Autumn Annals and the Guliang Commentary to the Spring and Autumn Annals, with one person appointed for each text. An edict was handed down which called for a discussion of this proposal, and the participants in the

during the Jin dynasty, not one was for an interpretation passed down from the [original] fourteen Erudites of the Han, and consequently the way of teaching the texts of the master teachers of the Modern Script school met its end.

[5/6 SVA Introductory Comments: In the final section of this chapter, Pi Xirui discusses the commentaries to the Thirteen Classics. He points out that about half of the commentaries were written by men who lived during the Han and the other half by men who lived during the Wei and Jin dynasties. In his view, the commentaries by the Han scholars are superior to those of the Wei and Jin periods. He supports his view by quoting other scholars and by illustrating weaknesses in the Wei and Jin period

discussions for the most part requested that Xun Song's memorial be followed. An edict was issued which said that because the Guliang Commentary was shallow, it did not merit an Erudite position being established for it, but the remaining positions would be established according to the memorial. However, because of the problems encountered due to Wang Dun's criticism, the proposal was not carried out. For a detailed account, see the biography of Xun Song in the Jin shu (75.1975-80). [SVA: Emperor Wen of the Jin (Jin Wendi) was the posthumous designation of Sima Zhao 司馬昭 (211-265) who was the second son of Sima Yi 司馬懿 (179-251) who was posthumously designated Emperor Xuan of the Jin (Jin Xuandi 晉宣帝).]

commentaries, as well as by stating that in many instances the authors based themselves on the work of earlier scholars, but failed to give them proper credit. As might be expected, Pi closes by saying that by the Wei and Jin dynasties, the influence of the master teachers of the early Han had all but disappeared from Classical Scholarship. The possibility of any new innovation, understanding, or insight into the Classics on the part of later scholars is never entertained or addressed.]

5/6⁹³ As for the commentaries to the Thirteen Classics⁹⁴ which have been transmitted for generations, with the exception of the imperial commentary to the Classic of Filial Piety by Tang Ming Huang 唐明皇⁹⁵ (Emperor

⁹³[SVA: Section 5/6 corresponds to pp.163-9 of the Zhonghua ed. and to pp.170-8 of the Yiwen ed.]

⁹⁴(5/6, n.1) Zhou Yutong comments: The Thirteen Classics are: 1) Zhouyi (Changes), 2) Shangshu (Documents), 3) Mao shi (Songs), 4) Zhouli (Rites of Zhou), 5) Yili (Ceremonial and Rites), 6) Liji (Record of Rites), 7) Zuozhuan (Zuo Commentary), 8) Gongyang zhuan (Gongyang Commentary), 9) Guliang zhuan (Guliang Commentary), 10) Lunyu (Analects), 11) Xiao jing (Classic of Filial Piety), 12) Erya, and 13) Mengzi (Mencius).

⁹⁵(5/6, n.2) Zhou Yutong comments: The "Jingji zhi" chapter of the Jiu Tang shu states, "The Classic of Filial Piety in one juan, commentary by Xuanzong 玄宗." (See: Jiu Tang shu 46.1980) The Tang huiyao 唐會要 states, "In the sixth month of the tenth year of the Kaiyuan 開元 period

Xuanzong 玄宗, reg. 712-755), men of the Han dynasty and men of the Wei and Jin dynasties each wrote about half. Master Zheng annotated the Mao Version of the Songs, and wrote commentaries to the Rites of Zhou, the Ceremonials and Rites, and the Record of Rites. He Xiu composed a commentary to the Gongyang Commentary. Zhao Qi 趙岐 wrote a commentary to the Mencius. The [above mentioned] six Classics all had commentaries written by Han dynasty personages. Kong Anguo's Shangshu zhuan 尚書傳 (Commentary to the Documents) which was forged by Wang Su, Wang Bi's Commentary to the Changes 易注 as well as He Yan's 何晏 Lunyu jijie 論語集解 (Collected Commentaries to the Analects), were commentaries to three Classics which were all composed by men of the Wei dynasty. Du Yu's Zuozhuan jijie 左傳集解 (Collected Commentaries to the Zuozhuan), Fan Ning's 范寧 (339-401) Guliang jijie 穀梁集解 (Collected Commentaries to the Guliang zhuan)⁹⁶ along with Guo Pu's 郭璞 (276-324)

(722), the sovereign wrote a commentary to the Classic of Filial Piety, and it was distributed throughout the Empire as well as to the Academy for the Sons of State. In the fifth month of the second year of the Tianbao 天寶 period (743), the sovereign again wrote commentary, and this was also distributed throughout the Empire." (See: Wang Fu 王溥 comp. [961 A.D.], Tang huiyao, Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1957, p.658)

⁹⁶(5/6, n.3) Zhou Yutong comments: Fan Ning 范寧 (zi Wuzi 武子; 339-401)

Erya zhu 爾雅注 (Commentary to the Erya)⁹⁷ were commentaries to three Classics which were all composed by men of the Jin dynasty. Speaking in terms of commentaries, the [men of] the Wei and the Jin seemingly did not yield anything to the men of the Han dynasty. But the commentaries written by the men of the Wei and Jin dynasties in the final analysis do not measure up to those of the Han. Kong Anguo's Commentary [to the Documents] is in many instances the same as [that of] Wang Su. Kong Yingda's Subcommentary [to the Documents] already contains these suspicions.⁹⁸ During the Song dynasty Wu Yu 吳棫 (ob. 1154) and Master

was a native of Shunyang 順陽 who lived during the Jin dynasty. He attained the official position of Governor of Yuzhang 豫章. He wrote the Chunqiu Guliang zhuan jijie 春秋穀梁傳集解 in twelve juan. For his biography, see: Jin shu 75.1984-9.

⁹⁷(5/6, n.4) Zhou Yutong comments: Guo Pu 郭璞 (zi Jingchun 景純; 276-324) was a native of Wenxi 聞喜 who lived during the Jin dynasty. He attained the official position of Governor of Hongnong 弘農. He wrote the Erya zhu 爾雅注 in five juan. For his biography, see: Jin shu 72.1899-1910.

⁹⁸(5/6, n.5) Zhou Yutong comments: Under the two characters "三帛" ("three silks") in the "Canon of Yao" 堯典chapter of the Documents, Kong Yingda's Zhengyi commentary reads, "The language of Wang Su's commentary to the Documents is in many instances the same as Kong Anguo's Commentary [to the Documents]." (See: Shangshu zhushu, Ssjzs, 3.12a) In addition, under the line "禮於六宗" ("performed yin sacrifices to the six venerable ones"), the

Zhu (Zhu Xi) along with the recent scholars Yan Ruoqu and Hui Dong in turn criticized its faults, and held that it was forged.⁹⁹ Ding Yan 丁晏

Zhengyi states, "During the Han, those who explained the 'six venerable ones' were many...only Wang Su bases himself on the Kongzi jiayu in explaining the 'six venerable ones,' and [his explanation] is the same as Kong Anguo's." (Shangshu zhushu, Ssjzs, 3.7b-8a) Furthermore, the Zuozhuan in Duke Ai / Sixth Year quotes from one of the chapters in the "Xia shu" 夏書 section of the Documents, "There was the prince of Tao and Tang, Who possessed this region of Ji." (惟彼陶唐, 有此冀方) (Trans. following Legge, The Shoo King, p.159) Kong Yingda's Zhengyi commentary reads, "The language of Wang Su's commentary to the Documents is in many instances that of Kong Anguo's Commentary to the Documents. I suspect that Wang Su saw the Old Text version, concealed it and did not mention this." (See: Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhushu, Ssjzs, 58.4a-b) Based on the above quoted passages, Kong Anguo's Commentary is in many cases identical to Wang Su's commentary and Kong Yingda in his Shu 疏 subcommentary expressed suspicions about it. For a detailed study, one can consult Ding Yan's 丁晏 Shangshu yulun 尚書餘論 under the section heading, 王肅注書, 多同孔傳, 再見於唐孔氏正義 ("Wang Su in writing commentary to the Documents is in many cases identical to Kong Anguo's Commentary, and this observation also appears in Kong Anguo's Zhengyi commentary.") (See: Huang Qing jingjie xubian, 844.13b-15a)

⁹⁹(5/6, n.6) Zhou Yutong comments: Wu Yu 吳棫 (zi Cailao 才老; ob. 1154) lived during the Southern Song. The official histories do not contain his biography. Wu Yu first suspected that the edition of the Old Script Documents (Guwen Shangshu 古文尚書) presented during the Eastern Jin

(1794-1875), in his Shangshu yulun 尚書餘論, [after] examining the text

dynasty was a forgery, and he wrote the Shubai zhuan 書稗傳 in thirteen juan which is no longer extant. For a detailed account, see juan eight in Yan Ruoqu's Guwen Shangshu shuzheng 古文尚書疏證, under the heading "疑古文自吳才老始" ("Suspicious About the Old Script Documents Began with Wu Cailao").

"Master Zhu" 朱子 is Zhu Xi 朱熹; see 1/4, n.4. Zhu Xi also had his suspicions about the Old Script Documents. For a detailed treatment, one can consult Yan Ruoqu's Guwen Shangshu shuzheng under the section heading "朱子於古文猶爲調停之說" ("Master Zhu, with Respect to the Old Script, Seems to Have Come Up with a Reconciliatory Theory") Yan Ruoqu and Hui Dong were both famous scholars of the Qing dynasty and thus they are referred to as "recent scholars."

Yan Ruoqu (zi Baishi 百詩; hao Qianqiu 潛邱) was a native of Taiyuan 太原. During the Kangxi period (1678), he was recommended for the special Boxue hongci 博學鴻詞 exam, but he failed. He served as an assistant to Xu Qianxue 徐乾學 and edited the Da Qing yitong zhi 大清一統志. His writings include the Guwen Shangshu shuzheng, the Sishu shidi 四書釋地, the Mengzi shengzu nianyue kao 孟子生卒年月考 and the Qianqiu zhaji 潛邱札記, along with other works. For his biography, see juan B (卷下) of Ruan Yuan's Guoshi Rulin zhuan and juan one of Jiang Fan's Guochao Hanxue shi chengji. On Hui Dong, see 4/4, n.25. Yan Ruoqu in writing the Guwen Shangshu shuzheng and Hui Dong in writing the Guwen Shangshu kao 古文尚書考 were the first to definitively prove that the Guwen Shangshu was forged by Mei Yi 梅賾. Mei Yi 梅賾 is sometimes written as Mei Ze 梅蹟.

[concluded] that it actually came from the hand of Wang Su.¹⁰⁰ Based on the biography of Xun Song 荀崧 in the Jin shu, which contains a memorial by Xun Song in which he states that during the reign of Emperor Wu 晉武帝 (reg. 265-290) Erudite positions had been established, and that there already was one for Master Kong's [Commentary], [we know] that early in the Jin dynasty [this school of learning] had already been officially recognized. During the chaos of the Yongjia 永嘉 period (307-313) [the text]

¹⁰⁰(5/6, n.7) Zhou Yutong comments: Ding Yan 丁晏 (zi Jianqing 儉卿, alt. zi Zhetang 柘唐; 1794-1875) was a native of Shanyang 山陽 in Huai'an 淮安 who lived during the Qing dynasty. In his early years he studied the Classics and was very fond of Zheng Xuan's scholarship. In the early years of the Daoguang 道光 period (1821-1850) he became a juren 舉人. During the Xianfeng 咸豐 period (1851-1861) because of meritorious service, he was appointed to the position of Secretary of the Grand Secretariat (neike zhongshu 內閣中書; see Hucker 4194). Twenty-two of his works are contained in the Yizhitang congshu 頤志堂叢書. For his biography, see the fourth part in the "Ruxue" section (儒學四) in juan seventy-four of Miao Quansun's 繆荃孫 Xu Beizhuan ji 續碑傳集. Four of his works which are printed in the Xu Qing jingjie are the Shangshu yulun 尚書餘論, the Xiaojing zhengwen 孝經徵文, the Shipu kaozheng 詩譜考證 and the Yugong zhuizhi zhengyi 禹貢錐指正義. In his Shangshu yulun in one juan, he puts forth the opinion that the Kong Anguo Shangshu zhuan was forged by Wang Su. See juan 844 in the Xu Qing jingjie.

was lost, and in the Eastern Jin dynasty a copy was again presented to the court by Mei Yi 梅頤, but it was not that it was forged by Mei Yi.¹⁰¹ Wang Bi and He Yan virtually deified and held in the highest regard the Mysterious

¹⁰¹(5/6, n.8) Zhou Yutong comments: Xun Song's 荀崧 biography which is in juan seventy-five of the Jin shu contains a memorial submitted by Xun Song which states, "Our founder, Emperor Wu, in response to the needs of the times took over the government and ascended the throne, he held Confucianism in high regard and caused learning to thrive....he put first the explanations of the canonical texts by the Confucian scholars. The disciples of Jia 賈, Ma 馬, Zheng 鄭, Du 杜, Fu 服, Kong 孔, Wang 王, He 何, Yan 顏 and Yin 尹, the scholarship of many experts in the form of exegesis, commentary and annotations, [was represented by] the nineteen men who filled the Erudite positions which were established." (See: Jin shu 75.1977) Kong refers to Kong Anguo's Old Script Documents. Based on this then, the Old Script Documents already had a position established for it in the Imperial Academy during the Western Jin, and it was not forged by Mei Yi. For a detailed treatment, consult Ding Yan's Shangshu yulun under the section heading, "古文尚書, 西晉已立博士, 非東晉梅氏偽作" ("The Old Script Documents already had an Erudite position established for it during the Western Jin, and was not forged during the Eastern Jin by Mei Yi"). (See: Huang Qing jingjie xubian, 844.4a-5a) [SVA: The above mentioned scholars are probably Jia Kui, Ma Rong, Zheng Xuan, Du Yu, Fu Qian, Kong Anguo, Wang Su, and He Xiu. Yan and Yin are a little more difficult to precisely identify. Perhaps Yan is Yan Anle 顏安樂 of the Han who was a specialist in the Gongyang. (See: Han shu 88.3616-7) Perhaps Yin is Yin Gengshi 尹更始

Void, and Fan Ning often said that their crimes were greater than those of Jie 桀 and Zhou 紂.¹⁰² Wang Bi's Commentary to the Changes 周易注 talks in abstract terms about names and principles, but it is nothing like the simple and sound explanations of the Classics by the Confucian scholars of the Han dynasty. For this reason, the Song dynasty scholar Zhao Shixiu 趙師秀 (fl. 1190) remarked, "When Fusi's 輔嗣 Changes flourished, learning of the Han was no more."¹⁰³ In his Lunyu jijie, He Yan combined the

of the Han who was a specialist in the Guliang. (See: Han shu 88.3618-20)]
¹⁰²(5/6, n.9) Zhou Yutong comments: Fan Ning's 范寧 biography which is in juan seventy-five of the Jin shu states, "At the time the superficial and ornate, and the abstract served to incite one another, and day by day Confucian orthodoxy was supplanted by it. Fan Ning thought that the reason for this had its origins with Wang Bi and He Yan and he considered the transgressions of these two individuals worse than those of the tyrants Jie 桀 and Zhou 紂." (See: Jin shu 75.1984) On Wang Bi, see 5/3, n.10. On He Yan, see 5/3, n.12.

¹⁰³(5/6, n.10) Zhou Yutong comments: Zhao Shixiu 趙師秀 (zi Zizhi 紫芝; hao Lingxiu 靈秀) was a native of Yongjia 永嘉 who lived during the Southern Song dynasty. Some time in the Shaoxi 紹熙 reign period (1190-1194) he became a jinsshi 進士, and ended his official career in the position of Judge (tuiguan 推官, see Hucker 7399) of Gao'an 高安. He was a skilled poet and his writings are contained in the Qingyuanzhai ji 清苑齋集 and the Zhongmiao ji 眾妙集. He does not have a biography in the Song shi. The

commentaries of Bao Xian 包咸 (6 B.C.-65 A.D.) and of Master Zhou 周氏 to the Lu Version of the Analects, and those of Kong Anguo and Ma Rong to the Old Version of the Analects, and they are intermixed and not differentiated [from one another].¹⁰⁴ The Kong Anguo commentary which is

quoted line is from the poem "Qiuye oucheng" 秋夜偶成 which is in the Qingyuanzhai ji buyi 清苑齋集補遺 (Skqs edition, 30a). In the original, wu 無 is written as fei 非, which is the occasional error on Pi Xirui's part. [SVA: The Skqs edition notes that fei 非 is written as wu 無 in at least one other edition.]

¹⁰⁴(5/6, n.11) Zhou Yutong comments: Bao 包 refers to Bao Xian 包咸, Zhou 周 refers to Master Zhou 周氏, Kong 孔 refers to Kong Anguo 孔安國, and Ma 馬 refers to Ma Rong 馬融. The "Preface" (序) to He Yan's Lunyu jijie states, "The Marquis of Anchang 安昌, Zhang Yu 張禹, originally received instruction in the Lu Version of the Analects (魯論), and when he lectured, he used it together with the Qi Version of the Analects (齊論), following what was best [from the two versions]. The title given to [the resulting text] was the Analects of Marquis Zhang (Zhanghou Lun 張侯論) and it was something which was very highly valued. The exegesis of Master Bao and that of Master Zhou were both derived from it. As for the Old Version of the Analects (Gulun 古論), there was only the Erudite Kong Anguo who provided commentary and explanation for it, but it was not passed on. Coming to the reign of Emperor Shun 順帝 (126-144 A.D.), Ma Rong, who served as the Governor of Nanjun 南郡, also provided commentary and explanation for it." Xing Bing's Subcommentary (疏) states, "The 'Rulin

quoted is also a forgery. For example, to the line "Who said that the son of the man from Zou understood the Rites?"¹⁰⁵ the Kong commentary states, "Zou is the city which was governed by Confucius' father, Shu Lianghe 叔梁紇."¹⁰⁶ He personally does not say how many generations separate his ancestor (Shu Lianghe) from himself, and this is something which arouses great suspicion.¹⁰⁷ Ding Yan says that the Kong commentary was also

zhuan' chapter of the Hou Han shu states, 'Bao Xian (zi Ziliang 子良) was a native of Qu'e 曲阿 in Kuaiji....During the Jianwu 建武 period (25-55 A.D.) he instructed the Heir Apparent in the Analects and in addition composed exegesis to it....We are not clear as to exactly who Master Zhou was." (See: Lunyu zhushu, Ssjzs, 序.3b-4a) The "Preface" to Lu Deming's Jingdian shiwen states, "He Yan collected the commentaries of Kong Anguo, Bao Xian, Master Zhou, Ma Rong, Zheng Xuan, Chen Qun 陳群, Wang Su and Zhou Shenglie 周生烈, and below he wrote his own ideas." (Jingdian shiwen 1.31a) Based on this then, He Yan's Jijie in fact intermixes the Qi, Lu and Old versions of the Analects.

¹⁰⁵[SVA: See Lunyu 3/15, Lau, trans., p.69.]

¹⁰⁶[SVA: For the quoted passages, see Lunyu zhushu, Ssjzs, 3.8a.]

¹⁰⁷(5/6, n.12) Zhou Yutong comments: For the quoted passage, see the "Baiyi" 八佾 chapter in He Yan's Lunyu jijie. (Ssjzs, 3.8a) Pi Xirui's observation that this is "highly suspicious" has its origins with Chen Zhan's 陳鱣 Lunyu guxun 論語古訓 and Sun Zhizu's 孫志祖 (1737-1801) Dushu cuolu 讀書臆錄. Under the section heading "Kong Anguo Lunyu zhu," Sun Zhizu's text reads, "At present, as I read the Lunyu guxun which was compiled by Chen

forged by Wang Su.¹⁰⁸ Du Yu's Zuozhuan jijie in many instances bases itself on the interpretations and explanations of scholars who lived previously, but because their names are not given, people of later times suspected that [these attributions were in fact] written by Du Yu.¹⁰⁹ [His statements

Zhongyu Zhan 陳仲魚鱧 of Haining 海寧...it says that Kong Anguo was the eleventh generation descendant of Confucius, but that the commentary reads 'Confucius' father, Shu Lianghe,' and this is something which gives rise to great suspicions. I thus heave a sigh and wonder what limits there were with respect to the forgery of texts in ancient times, and lament that it exposed those who were easily fooled." (See: Huang Qing jingjie, 492.11a-b)
¹⁰⁸(5/6, n.13) Zhou Yutong comments: Ding Yan wrote the Lunyu Kongzhu zhengwei 論語孔注證偽 in four juan which I have not seen. In his Shangshu yulun 尚書餘論, in the section under the heading 王肅私造古文以難鄭君; 并論語孔注 皆肅一手偽書 ("Wang Su personally wrote Old Script texts in order to criticize Master Zheng; together with the Kong Commentary to the Analects they were both forged texts from the hand of Wang Su"), it states, "Kong's commentary to the Analects is also a forged text, in reality coming from the hand of Wang Su, and it was written at the same time as the Documents Commentary." (See: Shangshu yulun, Huang Qing jingjie xubian, 844.19b)

¹⁰⁹(5/6, n.14) Zhou Yutong comments: Pi Xirui's explanation probably has its roots in the works of Hui Dong and Chen Shouqi. The "Preface" to Hui Dong's Chunqiu Zuozhuan buzhu 春秋左傳補注 states, "Du Yuankai 杜元凱 wrote the Chunqiu jijie, and although he based himself on the studies of previous scholars, he did not properly cite their explanations." (See: HQJJ,

regarding] bereavement and that the imperial mourning period be shortened, were the promotion of heterodox doctrine.¹¹⁰ With respect to the

353.1a)

Chen Shouqi in a letter written in response to Attendant Gao Yunong 高雨農 which is contained in his Zuohai wenji 左海文集 wrote, "Du Yu in writing commentary to the Zuoshi zhuan,...most of its best features came from Jia and Fu, but he concealed the original sources. Every one of his mistakes is a result of not being willing to listen to advice and perverts the meaning of the Classics....as for his explanation of the passage 長轂一乘 (a single military vehicle) ...I don't know what Classic or canon it comes from and it is something which I honestly have never heard of." (See: HQJJ, 1254.26a-27b) When Pi Xirui writes that scholars of a later age had suspicions about Du Yu's writings, he was most probably referring to these men.

¹¹⁰(5/6, n.15) Zhou Yutong comments: In the Zuo Commentary, Duke Yin / First Year, following the line, "condoling the living took place before their intense grieving [began]," (弔生不及哀) Du Yu's Jijie commentary states, "For those of the rank of feudal lord and above, after the burial, the hemp mourning garments are taken off, there is no specified place for intense grieving, and they are in bereavement until the end of the mourning period." Kong Yingda's Zhengyi commentary quotes from the biography of Du Yu in the Jin shu which states, "In the tenth year of the Taishi 泰始 period (274) Empress Dowager Yuan (Yuan Huanghou 元皇后) died, according to the old regulations of the Han and Wei dynasties, after the burial, the emperor and the various ministers all remove their mourning garb, and the count wondered whether the heir apparent should remove his

mourning garb as well.... Du Yu thought that in ancient times when the Son of Heaven... was in mourning, according to the regulations concerning unhemmed mourning garb, with sandals, a staff, hemp mourning clothing and a sash, one completes the mourning period." After the burial and the mourning garb is taken off, one dwells silently in the mourning hut to end the mourning rite. For three years no changes are made to the way of one's father, therefore it was said that all members of officialdom follow the minister of state. [SVA: Cf. Lun yu 4/20, 14/40] After the mourning garb is taken off, they change the titles and do not speak to praise it and it is clear that he does not again sleep on a grass mat with an earthen clod for a pillow thereby abandoning major government affairs...the proposal was discussed, and the heir apparent consequently took off his hemp mourning garments and was in bereavement until the end of the mourning period. When the ranking officials finally heard about Du Yu's proposal, most of them considered it to be odd and misleading and said that he had gone against the rites in order to suit the times." (See: Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhushu, Ssjzs, 2.23b-24b)

Also, in the Zuozhuan Duke Yin / First Year, following the line, "Yielding in a humble way is the foundation of virtue," (卑讓德之基也) Du Yu's Jijie commentary states, "[When] the feudal lords are in bereavement, auspicious sacrificial rites were used in all state affairs." (See: Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhushu, Ssjzs, 18.7a) According to the ancient rites, in mourning the loss of one's mother or father, the mourning garb was worn for three years, and there was no discussion about "before burial" or "after burial." However, in Du Yu's proposal regarding shortening the mourning period, he considered that after the internment of the deceased, mourning attire would then be taken off, only bereavement in the form of remaining silent would

line, "In all instances when a ruler is killed and the ruler is referred to by his name, it is because the ruler lacked the Way," [Du Yu's] Chunqiu shili 春秋釋例 repeatedly causes problems.¹¹¹ In cases such as Zheng Bo 鄭伯

continue until the end of the mourning period and moreover, in affairs of state, auspicious sacrificial rites would be used. Therefore, at the time his proposals were considered to go against the rites and Pi Xirui considered them to be heterodox doctrine.

The "Zuoshi zhuan" section in juan six in Wang Yinglin's Kunxue jiwen states, "Du Yu's explanation to the Zuoshi zhuan reads, 'The feudal lords, during the period of bereavement, in all state affairs employ auspicious sacrificial rites.' His proposal concerning the mourning garb of the heir apparent states, '[The] Gaozong 高宗 [passage] does not contain any writings on the mourning garb and only mentions not speaking.' This obscures the Classics and plays tricks (manipulates) with the rites, and cannot be used for moral instruction." (See: Kunxue jiwen, Sbck 三編, 6.17b) The origins of Pi Xirui's words probably lie in this. Liang'an 諒闇 is the name of mourning of the Son of Heaven in ancient times, and in the Analects it is written as liangyin 亮陰 which is identical. [SVA: See: Lunyu 14/40; cf. Lau, trans., Analects, pp.130-1] According to the forged Kong Anguo commentary, 諒 is glossed as 信 ("to place confidence in") and 闇 is glossed as 默 ("silence"). This refers to placing confidence in the minister of state, remaining silent and not speaking.

¹¹¹(5/6, n.16) Zhou Yutong comments: The Spring and Autumn Annals under Duke Xuan / Fourth Year reads, "The son of the Duke of Zheng 鄭, Guisheng 歸生, murdered his ruler Yi 夷." The Zuo Commentary reads, "In

cases where a ruler is killed and the name of the ruler is given, it is because the ruler lacked the Way. When the name of the minister is given, it is because of the guilt of the minister." Du Yu's Chunqiu shili 春秋釋例 states, "Heaven gave birth to the people and established rulers for them, caused the rulers to be in charge and to watch over them and the other collective things, and this is what binds them to the mandate. Therefore, they support him like Heaven, feel close to him like one does one's parents; ...however, originally there is not the natural love which exists between a father and his children, and there is not the affection which exists between family members. The separation between those above and those below is very great, and the ways in which the obstructions restrict access are innumerable. For this reason, those who reside above submit themselves in order to observe and examine those below, manifest sincerity in order to move them, and afterward a closer relationship between them will be possible. If those above act without restraint, all those below have their hopes dashed, feelings of loyalty and honor become obstructed and distant, and the relationship becomes that of strangers, not that of ruler and minister. If men's hearts become estranged and alienated, then although position and title still exist, they lack an intrinsic and solid foundation. Therefore the commentary states, 'In cases where a ruler is killed and the name of the ruler is given, it is because the ruler lacked the Way. When the name of the minister is given, it is because of the guilt of the minister.'..." (See: Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhushu, Ssjzs, 21.18b-20a; Legge, Ch'un Ts'ew, p.296) In his Chunqiu Zuozhuan bushu 春秋左傳補疏, the Qing scholar Jiao Xun 焦循 (1763-1820) says that Du Yu's Jijie and Shili commentaries both went against the [true meaning] of the Classics of the sages in order to mislead and deceive the world. Pi Xirui's view probably has its origin in

shooting the king right in the shoulder, [Du Yu] bends the facts so as to absolve him [of any wrongdoing].¹¹² Jiao Xun 焦循 (1763-1820) discussed Du

these words. One can consult [Jiao Xun's original].

¹¹²(5/6, n.17) Zhou Yutong comments: Zuo Commentary, Duke Huan / Fifth Year, "In autumn, the king led the feudal lords in an invasion of Zheng 鄭 and the Earl of Zheng 鄭伯 resisted them....in the end, the king suffered a great defeat. Zhu Dan 祝聃 shot the king in the shoulder with an arrow. The king for his part was still able to do battle. Zhu Dan requested that he be allowed to pursue him, but the duke (Duke Zhuang of Zheng 鄭莊公) said to him, 'The superior man does not want to be excessively dominant over others, so how dare he humiliate the Son of Heaven? If we are able to save ourselves and the altar to the spirits of the grains (the integrity of our state) does not topple, [then this in itself] is much.' At night, the Earl of Zheng sent Ji Zu 祭足 to console the king and inquire as to his assistants." Du Yu's Jijie commentary reads, "Consoling the king and inquiring about his assistants, speaks to the fact that Zheng's intent lie only in avoiding the consequences. The king's invasion was wrong." (See: Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhushu, Ssjzs, 6.9b, 6.10b-11a) Du Yu's purpose seems to be to vindicate the Earl of Zheng of the crime of shooting the king. In his Chunqiu Zuozhuan bushu Jiao Xun says, "Shooting the king right in the shoulder was a case where Zheng did not act like a minister. Consoling the king and inquiring about his assistants was the act of a traitor. Moreover, Du Yu's opinion that the king's attack was wrong is clearly drawn from Gaogui's 高貴 (Cao Mao 曹髦) plot and attack against Sima Zhao 司馬昭....The explanation about saving ourselves originally were words which presented a pleasant

Yu's crimes of turning on his father, participating in factionalism and taking part in usurpation, and he said that he covered up for the Sima clan, and thus his commentaries for the most part do harm to instruction in what is right, and cannot serve as moral teachings.¹¹³ As for Fan Ning's Guliang

appearance and that the Zuoshi recounts them was not due to the Zuoshi considering that Zheng's intent lie in avoiding the consequences. Du Yu cited Wu Sheng's 寤生 (Duke Zhuang) reply to Zhu Dan to explain away Sima Zhao's actions and was already wrong. Moreover, as for directly criticizing the king's invasion as wrong, how could he be as absurd as this?" (See: Chunqiu Zuozhuan bushu, in HQjj, 1159.10b) Pi Xirui's words most probably have their basis in the above.

¹¹³(5/6, n.18) Zhou Yutong comments: Jiao Xun 焦循 (zi Litang 理堂; 1783-1820) was a native of Ganxuan 甘泉 in Jiangsu 江蘇 who lived during the Qing dynasty. In 1801, during the Qianlong period, he became a juren, but he failed the metropolitan exam, [returned home], closed his door behind him and devoted himself to studying and writing. He made a name for himself owing to his command of the Classics and at the same time possessed a talent for mathematics as well as for literature. His writings are contained in the Jiaoshi congshu 焦氏叢書 in 122 juan and in the Diaogulou ji 調菰樓集 in twenty-four juan. For his biography, one can consult juan 135 in Qian Yiji's 錢儀吉 Beizhuan ji 碑傳集. Twelve of his works explaining the Classics are printed in the Zhengxu Qing jingjie 正續清經解. Among them is his Chunqiu Zuozhuan bushu in five juan which is printed in juan 1159 through 1163 in the Qing Jingjie. In it he states in his "Preface," "The biography of Du Yu in the Jin shu reads, 'His grandfather,

Du Ji 杜畿, served Wei in the capacity of Supervisor of the Secretariat (shangshu puye 尚書僕射; cf. Hucker 5052). His father, Du Shu 杜恕, served as the Regional Inspector (cishi 刺史; cf. Hucker 7567) of Youzhou 幽州. His father and Emperor Xuan 宣帝 (Sima Yi 司馬懿) did not get along and consequently he died in prison, and because of this Du Yu was not able to be promoted for a long time. Emperor Wen 文帝 (Sima Zhao 司馬昭) succeeded to the throne, Du Yu married the emperor's younger sister, Princess Gaolu 高陸公主, which increased his stature and he was promoted to the position of Gentleman of the Masters of Writing (shangshu lang; cf. Hucker 5047). After four years, he was transferred to the position of Adjutant under the Counselor-in-Chief. [SVA: JXLS reads "參府軍府" while the Jin shu reads, "參相府軍事." (Adjutant = canjunshi 參軍事-- Hucker 6876; Counselor-in-Chief = xiangguo 相國--Hucker 2337.) There is no official position that exactly matches the wording found in either the JXLS or the Jin shu texts. Jiao Xun may have been referring to service under the Jin dynasty equivalent to the canfu 參府 (Assistant Regional Commander-- Hucker 6879) which was an unofficial reference to the position of canjiang 參將 (Hucker 6870) during the Qing dynasty. However, Du Yu did serve as canjun to the xiangguo, who was Sima Zhao 司馬昭.] Because Du Yu's father offended Sima Yi, he was discarded and not employed, Du Yu probably harbored anger and resentment for a long time. Sima Zhao had the intention of usurping the throne, so he recruited talented officials, and because Du Yu had married his younger sister, he sent him to take part in regional government affairs. [SVA: "使參府事"--I was unable to determine the exact position Du Yu held. See above.] For Du Yu this was unexpected and he thereupon forgot about the resentment over what had happened to

jijie, although it preserves old explanations of the Guliang zhuan, it does not solely focus on a single school. The "Preface" adds remarks which are critical of and deprecate the three commentaries to the Spring and Autumn Annals,¹¹⁴ and a Song dynasty scholar has referred to it as the most

his father and gave his complete loyalty to the Sima clan. After he had witnessed Cheng Ji's 成濟 actions with his own eyes (Cheng Ji drew his sword and stabbed Gaogui xiang gong 高貴鄉公 [Cao Mao 曹髦] to death), he then used [his interpretation of the Zuo zhuan] to cover up for Sima Zhao, to also cover up for Sima Yi and Sima Shi 司馬師, and in addition to cover up for himself. This was the reason he wrote the Zuoshi Chunqiu jijie....I think that it is very, very unusual that Du Yu just forgot the anger he felt over his father's treatment and then served those who were his enemies, that he went against the meaning of the Classic of the Sage and used it to deceive the world. I have picked out the major errors of his explanations and let a few be known... so that later generations in the empire will all understand that Du Yu was a relative and confidant of the Sima clan, that he was the unfilial wicked son of Du Shu, and that with respect to our Spring and Autumn Annals which was written by Confucius, he was nothing but destructive vermin." (See: Chunqiu Zuozhuan buzhu, HQJJ, 1159.1a-2b) Pi Xirui in his assessment is most probably referring to this text.

¹¹⁴(5/6, n.19) Zhou Yutong comments: In the "Preface" to his Guliang jijie 穀梁集解 Fan Ning states, "There are three commentaries to the Spring and Autumn Annals, but as for their approach to the meaning of the Classic, their strengths and weaknesses are not the same and their judgments differ. It was probably the case that the nine schools of thought divided and

the subtle words were hidden, heterodox teachings arose and the greater meaning was perverted. The Zuoshi considers Yu Quan's 鬻拳 admonition of his ruler and his threatening him with a weapon to be the love of his ruler (Zhuang 19) and it considers Duke Wen's presentation of silk as a marriage gift [during the mourning period] to be the using proper etiquette in accord with the rites (Wen 2). The Guliang considers Zhe of Wei's 衛輒 opposition to his father to be a case of respecting one's forebears (Ai 2) and considers not instating Zi Jiu 子糾 to be wrongdoing at the court (Zhuang 9). The Gongyang considers that Jizhong 祭仲, in deposing his ruler, [properly] exercised his authority (Huan 11) and considers referring to a concubine who is a mother as an official wife to be fitting and correct (Yin 2). Considering admonishing and threatening one's ruler with a weapon to be due to one loving one's ruler is the same as saying that it is permissible to intimidate one's ruler. Considering the presentation of a marriage gift during the mourning period to be proper etiquette in accord with the rites is the same as saying that it is permissible to marry during the mourning period. To consider that opposing one's father is a case of respecting one's forebears is the same as saying that it is permissible for a son to rebel. To consider that not instating Zi Jiu was wrongdoing at court is the same as saying that it is permissible to tolerate one's enemies. Considering deposing one's ruler to be the [proper] exercise of one's authority is the same as saying that it is permissible to spy on the sacred vessels (the symbols of imperial power). And to consider that a concubine who is a mother can enjoy the status of an official wife is the same as saying that it is permissible to treat as equals one's legal wife and one's concubine [as well as their offspring]. It is cases such as these which do harm to moral teachings and destroy the true meaning and implications [of the Classic] and we cannot

evenhanded of the writings [on the three commentaries to the Spring and Autumn Annals].¹¹⁵ [The reason for this was] simply that this work conformed to way Song scholars approached the subject. In the case of Han times, [scholars of] the three commentaries each strictly adhered to their individual area of specialization, and there was no one who would concurrently pick and choose from all three commentaries. Guo Pu's Erya zhu is another work which does not give the names of the studies of

insist that they be forced to fit ...the Zuoshi is resplendent and it contains a wealth of material, but its shortcomings are demonic in nature. The Guliang is clearly defined but tactful, but its defects lie in at times being terse and less than complete. The Gongyang is eloquent in its argumentation and decisive, but its shortcoming is that it at times is coarse and vulgar." (See: Chunqiu Guliang zhushu, Ssjzs, 序 7a-8b) Fan Ning in the above passage has said that the three commentaries all contain things which he considers unsatisfactory.

¹¹⁵(5/6, n.20) Zhou Yutong comments: The entry under the heading "漢人注經" ("Han Scholars' Commentary to the Classics") in juan twenty-seven of Gu Yanwu's Rizhilu reads, "Huang Zhen 黃震 of the Song dynasty said that Du Yu in annotating the Zuoshi solely focused on the Zuoshi, He Xiu in annotating the Gongyang solely focused on the Gongyang, and that only Fan Ning was not partial to the Guliang and that he spoke of the shortcomings of the three commentators in an impartial manner." (See: Rizhilu, Vol.5, 5A.3) Pi Xirui's mention of a "Song dynasty scholar" is most probably a reference to Huang Zhen.

individuals of previous times, and Yu Xiaoke 余蕭客 (1729-1777) made the comment that Guo Pu shamelessly appropriated credit that was rightfully due others.¹¹⁶ These are all Classics, the commentaries to which were written by scholars of the Wei and Jin dynasties. And taking the form and style of the written works of the Han scholars as the standard, we see that they are entirely different, and [that the differences] are not merely [those

¹¹⁶(5/6, n.21) Zhou Yutong comments: Yu Xiaoke 余蕭客 (zi Zhonglin 仲林; hao Gunong 古農; 1729-1777) was a native of Wu County 吳縣 who lived during the Qing dynasty. He was a student of Hui Dong. He wrote the Gujing jie gouchen 古經解鉤沉 in thirty juan in which he compiled explanations on the Classics done prior to the Tang dynasty, and its studies, as well as what it records, are relatively complete. For his biography, see juan B (下) of Ruan Yuan's Guoshi Rulin zhuan and the second juan of Jiang Fan's Guochao Hanxue shicheng ji. Jiang Fan wrote, "[Yu Xiaoke] thought that when Guo Pu annotated the Erya he made use of older commentaries, but concealed their titles and he said that he shamelessly appropriated the credit that was rightfully due others. Thus, he (Yu) collected [evidence] from the commentaries and subcommentaries along with that taken from the older annotations of the Attendant of Qianwei 捷爲, Sun Yan 孫炎, and Li Xun 李巡 [whose writings] are located in the various works compiled in the Taiping yulan, and used them to explain [and support his position]. However, his book was not completed." (See: Jiang Fan, notes by Zhou Yutong, Hanxueshi chengji, Taipei: Zhonghua shuju, 1982, p.160) Pi Xirui's statement is most probably based on this. [SVA: For Yu Xiaoke's biography,

between dynasties,] like the differences between the Shang and the Zhou. Perhaps one setback [to Classical Scholarship] occurred during the fragmentation of the Three Kingdoms period, and another disaster took place as a result of the chaos resulting from the Five Hu Tribes' aggression toward China.¹¹⁷ Although fragments of their writings were passed along, the influence of the original masters had already fallen into oblivion.

see [ECCP 941-2](#).]

¹¹⁷(5/6, n.22) Zhou Yutong comments: The Five Hu Tribes refers to the Xiongnu 匈奴, Xianbei 鮮卑, Jie 羯, Di 氐, and Qiang 羌 peoples. From the time of the Eastern Han dynasty, the Five Hu Tribes successively changed their places of residence inside the northern frontier, and their power gradually increased. At the end of the Western Jin dynasty, China found itself in chaos, with Liu Yuan 劉淵 of the Xiongnu, the Murong 慕容 clan of the Xianbei, the Shi 石 clan of the Jie, the Fu 苻 clan of the Di and the Yao 姚 clan of the Qiang one after the other proclaiming themselves ruler, and dividing up and occupying the central plain. This began in the first year of the Yongxing 永興 period (304) and continued until the sixteenth year of the Yuanjia 元嘉 period (439), for a time span covering more than 130 years. The histories refer to it as the "chaos of the Five Tribes."