



**E-ASIA**  
university of oregon libraries

<http://e-asia.uoregon.edu>

# HISTORY AND THE OLD TEXT-NEW TEXT CONTROVERSY IN THE HAN

by

Jack L. Dull

University of Washington

June, 1966

The Han dynasty was a period of great experimentation and important beginnings. To the rulers and scholar-officials of the four centuries of the Han fell the task of providing solutions to problems that had been little more than raised by the short-lived Ch'in. Among these problems was the nature of the imperial state and the related problem of how to staff the state structure. No definitive answer to these problems emerged but the direction of future development was clearly adumbrated. Han social structure also began to follow the mold created by Confucianism, but Han society was not Confucian in the same sense that the Ch'ing society was – the process of Confucianization had only begun in the Han. The very obvious reason that Han society did not conform to Confucianism (meaning 'imperial' or Old Text Confucianism) was that the Later Han dynasty may be termed the inchoative stage in the formulation of this kind of Confucianism; in other words, that which we generally conceive of as traditional Chinese society, and particularly the Chinese family as the touchstone of that society, was dependent upon the refinement of Old Text Confucianism – a process that scarcely existed before the Eastern Han dynasty. This paper is not concerned directly with the Confucianization of Chinese society or any of the other issues raised here; my main aim is to pursue a more fundamental approach, viz., to say something about a few of the basic tenets of Old and New Text Confucianism, and particularly those tenets having to do with historical figures and therefore views of history.

## A BRIEF SURVEY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE OLD AND NEW TEXT SCHOOLS

At the onset it might be helpful to trace very sketchily the evolution of these two Schools of Han Confucianism. Tung Chung-shu is generally recognized as the founder of *yin-yang* Confucianism, which was to become New Text Confucianism. However, it is important to keep in mind that most of Tung's ideas were allegedly derived from only the *Kung-yang* version of the *Spring and Autumn Annals*; that is, Tung did not make his ideas specifically relevant to an understanding or an interpretation of all the Classics. Nor did the application of *yin-yang* ideas to the other Classics take place immediately. It was not, for example, until relatively late in Former Han that Ching Fang and I Feng were to interpret the *Book of Changes* and the *Book of Songs*, respectively, in this manner.<sup>1</sup>

I Feng is significant as a contributor to New Text Confucianism and also because he redirected New Text Confucianism, whereas Tung Chung-shu had strived to elaborate a world view which could be manipulated by the scholar-officials against the emperor in order to control the emperor.<sup>2</sup> I Feng attempted to show that this world view could be made to serve the imperial cause. For example, in 46 B.C., I Feng asserted that the period granted by Heaven to the Han dynasty to rule was nearing its end. (His argument was based upon correlations of the cyclical signs with some of the pieces in the *Book of Songs*, but we need not delve into that now). However, this end could be forestalled by moving the capital, one of the steps taken by the founding emperor of a new dynasty, which would produce a symbolic change of the mandate which would allow the Han to continue to rule.<sup>3</sup> I Feng continued to apply *yin-yang* Confucianism in a critical way, but instead of chiding the emperor he was attempting to defend the throne by attacking those around it who were seizing power for themselves.<sup>4</sup> It is difficult to overemphasize this shift in thinking by such men as I Feng: a doctrine originally designed to restrain the power of the throne was now being offered it so that it could strengthen its position.

Another important development in the Han Confucianism was the "discovery" of cyclical laws of history according to which all previous dynasties were made to correlate with one of the five cosmic forces. Liu Hsin probably gave this view of history its final formulation.<sup>5</sup> The fact that this view of history was applied by Wang Mang when he founded his own dynasty is well known, but not an essential part of this story.

New Text Confucianism, with its emphasis on cosmic forces not only in history but in all aspects of life and with its attention to Heaven as a consciously acting power watchful of human affairs, reached its apogee in the apocryphal (*ch'an-wei*) texts. The latter corpus of literature was a distinctly Later Han phenomenon: the apocrypha grew out of the struggles for the throne among the future emperor Kuang-wu and some of his competitors.<sup>6</sup> Emperor Kuang-wu tolerated no opposition to the apocrypha; indeed, Kuang-wu had the texts promulgated throughout the empire so that no scholar-official could ever say that he was unfamiliar with their contents.<sup>7</sup> When Huan T'an, an Old Text scholar, argued against the apocryphal texts, Kuang-wu at first sentenced him to death and then relented and demoted him to a low position distant from the capital. Huan died on the way to his new office.<sup>8</sup> Emperor Kuang-wu attempted to enforce belief in the apocrypha because they provided the ideological basis for Later Han rule – some of the *ch'an-wei* material will be introduced shortly which will demonstrate this.

The rise of the Old Text school can be dated from Liu Hsin's petition to have chairs established for the Old Text Classics. Liu's activities, in the reign of Emperor Ai, were to no avail except that his suggestions so irked many Confucianists that, in order to save his life, Liu had to petition for a position outside of the capital.<sup>9</sup> It is noteworthy that Liu Hsin did not develop a well-argued case for the Old Text version of the Classics; the potential of the Old Text position was not fully appreciated. Liu did say that Tso Ch'iu-ming's ideas of good and evil were the same as Confucius whereas Kung-yang and Ku-liang were both later men and therefore could not directly have known the views of the Sage.<sup>10</sup> It is important that the one quality attributed to Tso was in the realm of morality, i.e., what the *Tso-chuan* had to offer

was essentially concerned with man, not with the gods. This presupposes a historical, as opposed to cosmic or religious, view of the past.

The first attempt in the Eastern Han period at the establishment of chairs of the Old Text School took place in A.D. 28, shortly after Emperor Kuang-wu ascended the throne and before he had attained full control of the empire. In that year, Han Hsin submitted a memorial in which he petitioned for imperial recognition of the Tso commentary to the *Spring and Autumn Annals* as well as for an Old Text version of the *Book of Changes*. This petition led to a major conference of scholars who debated the advisability of recognizing Old Text classics.

The opposition was led by Fan Sheng, an Erudite for the Liang-ch'iu (New Text) version of the *Changes*. The spokesman for the Old Text scholars was Ch'en Yüan. Apparently neither side argued very much on the merits of the texts themselves. Fan Sheng warned the Emperor that since previous emperors had never established Erudites for these classics neither should Emperor Kuang-wu. He also asserted that if these two versions of the classics were recognized, then others would also clamor for the same treatment and in the end there would be no orthodoxy – only confusion. According to Fan, Tso Ch'iu-ming was not a direct disciple of Confucius and therefore could not really have represented the views of the master himself, at least not from first-hand knowledge. The *Tso-chuan* was attacked for supposedly containing errors and when Fan's opponents tried to defend their position by reference to quotations of the *Tso-chuan* in Ssu-ma Ch'ien's *Shih-chi*, Fan submitted another memorial accusing Ssu-ma Ch'ien of perverting the Classics.<sup>11</sup>

The Old Text position was defended by Chen Yüan, whose father had taught the *Tso-chuan* to Mang Mang. Chen argued that the *Tso* deserved official sanction because its author had personally received instruction from Confucius. He also said that Fan's argument that former emperors had not recognized the *Tso-chuan* and therefore that Kuang-wu should not do so was pointless since the Ku-liang commentary had not been recognized until after the Kung-yang commentary. If a later emperor could establish an Erudite for the Ku-liang text after an earlier ruler had recognized the Kung-yang version then there was no reason why a still later emperor could not also include instruction in the *Tso-chuan* as a part of the curriculum of the Imperial University.<sup>12</sup>

There is nothing to indicate that either side debated the establishment of the *Tso* on the basis of the contents of the text, in spite of the fact that the interchange of arguments was a lengthy one, involving over ten memorials by these two principle protagonists. We also know that the arguments were highly emotional, not based upon a reasonable assessment of the problem and that the apocrypha were frequently cited.<sup>13</sup> But, unfortunately, we do not have the details of the debate.

The result of the conference was that an Erudite was appointed for the *Tso-chuan*. Because Ch'en Yüan had just been involved in a heated discussion over the *Tso* and in spite of the fact that his name headed the list of four nominees for the new position, Emperor Kuang-wu appointed Li Feng, the scholar whose name was second on the list, as Erudite for the *Tso-chuan*.<sup>14</sup> Even after the position was created, some scholars "obstinately" continued the argument. When Li Feng died, a successor could not have been appointed without reopening the whole issue, which would have entailed another conference of scholars; Kuang-wu avoided this discussion by not filling the position.<sup>15</sup> Li Feng's brief occupancy of the position of Erudite for the *Tso* was the only time during the Han dynasty that an Old Text version of a

classic was officially recognized by the appointment of an Erudite.

Although the Old Text School suffered several defeats, when no successor was appointed to replace Li Feng and when emperor Kuang-wu decreed the promulgation of the apocryphal texts throughout the empire, the Old Text cause continued to grow. Chia K'uei stands out as one of the most important scholars of the Eastern Han period, for his espousal of the Old Text cause corresponded in large measure with the reign of Emperor Chang who was favorably inclined toward the Old Text School.

Chia K'uei was born in A.D. 29, about the same time that Fan Sheng and Ch'en Yüan were arguing over the merits of the *Tso-chuan* and other texts.<sup>16</sup> Chia K'uei could trace his ancestry back to Chia I, one of the best-known scholars of the early years of Western Han. Chia K'uei's father had been instructed in the *Tso-chuan* by Liu Hsin, and he had gone beyond that single classic and developed an excellence in the other Classics of the Old Text School. Chia K'uei himself continued his father's studies, but he was also a teacher of the Greater Hsia-hou (New Text) version of the *Book of Documents*. This apparent paradox should not occasion too much surprise. In the first place Chia probably found it expedient to teach one of the canonical versions of a classic in order to make a living.<sup>17</sup> In the second place the lines between the Old and New Text Schools were not always sharply drawn. And in the third place, Chia was something of a synthesizer who was interested in drawing the two Schools together, or at least in availing himself of New Text writings in order to further the Old Text cause.<sup>18</sup>

The first fruits of Chia's scholarship were explanations of the *Tso-chuan* and *Kuo-yü*, which he presented to emperor Ming sometime before A.D. 75. These explanations no longer exist and we know no details of their contents; however, on a later occasion Chia referred to the first of these writings as an attempt to set forth the compatibility of the *Tso* and the apocrypha.<sup>19</sup>

Emperor Chang ascended the throne in A.D. 76. He was much inclined towards Confucian studies and he was particularly fond of the Old Text version of the *Book of Documents* and the *Tso-chuan*. In his first year on the throne, Emperor Chang ordered Chia K'uei to write a piece on the *Tso* commentary. Chia apparently presented a rather cautious argument: while admitting differences between the two Schools, he said that the *Tso* commentary agreed with the Kung-yang commentary "seven or eight parts in ten."<sup>20</sup>

Emperor Chang was delighted with Chia's writings; he ordered Chia to select twenty outstandingly talented students of the Kung-yang version of the *Annals* for instruction by Chia in the *Tso* version of the classic. The Emperor himself presented the students with slips of wood, paper, and copies of the classic and the commentary to it. Emperor Chang was obviously interested in giving as much support as possible to the *Tso* commentary and its adherents. Under imperial orders Chia also wrote pieces in which he compared the New and Old Text versions of the *Book of Documents*, the *Book of Songs*, and another piece on the *Chou-kuan*.<sup>21</sup>

Chia K'uei and Huan T'an were both Old Text scholars, but their viewpoints differed markedly with regard to the apocryphal texts. Huan T'an refused to have anything to do with them but fifty years later Chia K'uei manifested a willingness to reach some kind of an accommodation with this New Text body of literature. He suggested, for example, that the reason that no successor was appointed to the position of Erudite for the *Tso-chuan* after the death of Li Feng was that none of the *Tso* teachers of the time "understood" the apocrypha.<sup>22</sup>

Thus Chia is indicative of a fundamental change in outlook of the Old Text men – a change that recognizes the existence of the apocrypha and at the same time one in which the compatibility of the *Tso-chuan* and the apocrypha is asserted.

However, the writings of Chia K'uei did not bring to an end the uncertainty about official dogma or the tensions within the scholarly world. The rift between the two Schools led to another imperially sponsored conference of scholars similar to the Shih-ch'ü Pavilion discussions of the Former Han period. The demand for such a conference as first voiced in A.D. 58 by Fan Shu when he urged Emperor Ming to convene a meeting of Confucianists to determine the meaning of the five Classics because, according to Fan, the "great; undertakings of the former emperors should be carried out according to the [exigencies of the] times."<sup>23</sup> Such a formal conference was not called at that time; instead, Fan and some of the highest ministers determined the procedures to be followed in certain sacrificial rites and "according to the prognostication records [another name for the apocrypha], rectified the divergent theories of the five Classics."<sup>24</sup> On the basis of those remarks we are probably safe in assuming that Fan Shu wanted to convene a scholarly conference in order to increase the role the apocrypha were to play in interpreting the Classics.

It was not until A.D. 79 that such a conference was finally convened. The precise motives for holding the conference may never be known, but several reasons for holding the White Tiger Hall discussions may be suggested. Foremost among them could be the rising star of the Old Text scholars, as seen, for example, in the case of Chia K'uei. Of scarcely less importance would be the personal favor shown by Emperor Chang to this School.<sup>25</sup> That is, the aim of the conference was to secure a position for the Old Text versions of the Classics. Yang Chung, the man who actually suggested the conference at this time, offered still another, but related, reason, namely that the "followers of the sections and sentences (*chang-chü*) are ruining the general principles of the Classics."<sup>26</sup> This too would indicate that the aim of the conference was to bring pressure against the New Text School, here referred to as the "followers of the sections and sentences."

Probably both schools, but particularly the followers of the Old Text School, looked upon such a conference as an opportunity to increase the fortunes of its own Classics. We know that during the course of the conference Chia K'uei debated with Li Yü over the Tso commentary.<sup>27</sup> Li Yü was a student of the Kung-yang commentary of the *Spring and Autumn Annals*, but he had also browsed through the Old Text versions of the Classics. He enjoyed the Tso commentary because of its literary qualities but felt that it "did not get at the profound ideas of the Sage."<sup>28</sup> On the other hand, when he read the texts of the memorials written by Fan Sheng and Ch'en Yüan, he objected to their irrational arguments and to their use of the apocrypha. He was moved to write a piece in forty-one sections in which he argued against the acceptance of the Tso commentary.<sup>29</sup> Thus Li Yü emerges as a scholar who was at least sufficiently inclined towards the Old Text School that he had read its works and appreciated the *Tso chuan* as a literary work, and it is also significant that he was first recommended for office by Pan Ku, an Old Text scholar.<sup>30</sup> While defending the Kung-yang commentary Li was also opposed to the use of the apocrypha, at least as they had been applied or quoted in earlier debates between scholars of the two Schools. On the basis of the scant amount of evidence in this biography we can see that some of the New Text scholars were moving away from the apocryphal texts (with which the extreme New Text position was identified) at the same time that some Old Text scholars were bringing themselves to recognize such materials.

Fan Yeh provides the reader with a disappointingly meager amount of material concerning the debate between Chia K'uei and Li Yü at the discussion in White Tiger Hall. Indeed, Chia's biography does not even mention the fact that he participated in the conference. Li Yü's biography notes only that Li opposed Chia K'uei and that the arguments that flew back and forth between them were "logical and evidential (*li-cheng*)."<sup>31</sup> At the risk of overinterpreting this remark, we can say that it shows an intellectual atmosphere markedly different from that of the Kuang-wu period. Whereas the earlier discussions had taken place in a highly charged atmosphere, when Chia and Li debated the issue of recognizing the Tso commentary, both were moving towards a middle ground in which each was willing to take note of the other's materials and arguments. We may account for these great changes which were underway in the intellectual world of the time by suggesting that the Old Text scholars realized that New Text Confucianism still had much vitality in it and that some kind of an accommodation was essential either in order to live with it, or, for more ulterior motives, to benefit the Old Text School itself as Chia K'uei had done. To some New Text scholars the apocrypha were perhaps beginning to lose their appeal and also, as a result of intellectual curiosity, such scholars began to feel that the Old Text School did have some-thing to offer.

The discussions held in White Tiger Hall did not settle anything between the Old and New Text Schools.<sup>32</sup> If the Old Text scholars had felt that the discussions would lead to official recognition for their texts they must have been disappointed by the conference.

But neither Emperor Chang nor the Old Text scholars admitted defeat or ceased trying. In A.D. 83, in large part because of the contributions of Chia K'uei,<sup>33</sup> Emperor Chang issued a decree which in part read:

The five Classics have been created [but we are now] very distant from the Sage. The sections and sentences and the bequeathed statements [of commentators of the past] are strange and dubious as well as difficult to rectify. We fear that the subtle teachings of former teachers will in the future be abandoned end cut off; this would not be the way to emphasize searching into antiquity or [the way] to seek to set forth the truth.<sup>34</sup>

Emperor Chang then ordered that talented students be selected to study the Tso and Ku-liang versions of the *Spring and Autumn Annals*, the Old Text *Book of Documents* and the Mao version of the *Book of Songs*. From this time on these four Classics enjoyed great prestige in the Han intellectual world, and Chia K'uei's students came to occupy high positions.<sup>35</sup>

Apparently the New Text scholars were still sufficiently strong and so well entrenched in the bureaucracy that, even though the Old Text supporters had imperial power on their side, the New Text forces could prevent the establishment of chairs for the Old Text classics. Emperor Chang found that he could not augment the Erudites in the Imperial University but by ordering special selections of students (and he tried to make sure that they were the better students) he sought to circumvent the traditional institutions. He encouraged men to study the *Tso-chuan* and similar Classics even though he could not give full imperial support to the Old Text cause by founding chairs for its texts in the Imperial University. From this time forward, "the nets were neglected and there existed on a broad scale many schools."<sup>36</sup>

Subsequent Later Han emperors could do no better than Emperor Chang had done in furthering Old Text studies. In A.D. 123, under Emperor An, there was a decree issued which

ordered the selection of those who understood the Old Text *Book of Documents*, Mao's *Songs*, and the Ku-liang commentary to the *Annals*.<sup>37</sup> The absence of the *Tso-chuan* in this list perhaps indicates that it was so well established by this time that it did not need special mention. It is equally possible that there has been an omission in the *Hou Han-shu* or its source. Thus Emperor An, perhaps because he was not really concerned with Confucianism,<sup>38</sup> was made to continue Emperor Chang's policy of encouraging the pursuit of Old Text scholarship.

About half a century after Emperor An's decree, Lu Chih was appointed an Erudite (the exact date is unknown but it was between 168 and 172, "during the Chien-ning reign period"<sup>39</sup>). Lu Chih was competent in both Schools of thought, but, significantly enough, he was a student of Ma Jung, one of the leading members of the Old Text School at the time, and Lu was disinclined to follow rigidly the New Text School's teachings;<sup>40</sup> he was apparently an Erudite of one of the New Text Classics. Later, between 175 and 178, Lu Chih requested that Erudites be established in order to give full imperial recognition to the Old Text Classics.<sup>41</sup> No action was taken on this petition. However, in A.D. 180 Emperor Ling decreed that the highest officials were each to select one man who comprehended various Old Text Classics for positions in the bureaucracy.<sup>42</sup> The petition by Lu Chih, the first such action in almost a century, so far as we know, probably indicates a growing confidence on the part of the Old Text scholars. But the throne's failure to act on it shows also that the other School was still a force to be reckoned with. Indeed, the New Text School was apparently still so firmly entrenched that Emperor Ling could only bring Old Text scholars into the government by special decree; he could not grant them the recognition that they desired.

It was Cheng Hsüan, another student of Ma Jung, who contributed most to closing the gap between the two contending Schools of Confucianism; in effect, he argued that there were no differences between the Old and New Text Schools. There had already been minor attempts in the direction of a synthesis of the two Schools, but it was Cheng who took the most significant steps in that direction.<sup>43</sup> Cheng's contributions to classical studies were so great that a late Ch'ing scholar, Yeh Te-hui, has said that there were essentially four schools of Confucianism in Chinese history: the Old and New Text Schools, and the studies by Cheng Hsüan and Chu Hsi.<sup>44</sup> Since Cheng's philosophical principles are far from clear and since, for purposes of this paper, it is not necessary to go into them, we would be wise to withhold any such comparison until more work has been done on this man. It is clear, however, that Cheng was the most important contributor to Confucianism in the Eastern Han period.

Cheng was a man of immense breadth of learning. In classical studies he began by mastering Ching Fang's interpretation of the *Changes* and the Kung-yang commentary to the *Annals*; thus his introduction to Confucianism was well within the New Text tradition. Later he studied the *Chou-kuan*, the *Li chi*, Tso's commentary to the *Annals*, the Han version of the *Songs* and the Old Text *Book of Documents* – a predominantly Old Text curriculum. Cheng then went to the capital where he studied under Ma Jung who was a student of Chia K'uei.<sup>45</sup> Cheng's impressive background makes him one of the best-educated men of the time.

Cheng was basically concerned with the divisions within the Confucian world and specifically with presenting the Classics in such a way as to eliminate the distinctions between the Old and New Text Schools. His bias, however, was towards the Old Text School. For example, he once began to annotate the Tso commentary to the *Annals* of

Confucius, but when he overheard another Old Text scholar, named Fu Ch'ien, talking of a commentary that he was writing for the *Tso-chuan*, Cheng presented his drafts to Fu.<sup>46</sup> Likewise, his commentary to the *Book of Changes* was based upon the Old Text interpretation by Fei Chih, and he composed exegeses for the Old Text *Book of Documents* and Mao's *Songs*.<sup>47</sup>

But while Cheng based himself on the Old Text versions of the Classics, his interpretations were not so restricted. Where his most famous teacher, Ma Jung, had followed an Old Text interpretation, Cheng might follow a New Text idea and sometimes, vice versa. In his work on the *Songs* according to Mao, Cheng did not feel compelled to follow the traditions of his School and said that he would make changes according to his own ideas. But "his own ideas" were often based upon New Text readings of the text.<sup>48</sup>

Cheng's overriding desire was to bring the two main Schools of Confucianism back together again. This accounts for the fact that in his commentaries to the Classics he drew upon the ideas of both Schools. He also tried to minimize the differences between the Schools in other ways. He said, for example, that the differences between the Lu (Old Text) and Ch'i (New Text) interpretations of the *Songs* were originally due to no more than differences in pronunciation.<sup>49</sup> And he accounted for discrepancies in the different versions of the *Documents* on the basis of differences in pronunciation, on the basis of differences due to former and later interpreters (which he left vague and unexplained), and on the basis of differences in the script in which the texts were written.<sup>50</sup> Cheng never mentions any philosophical or political differences between the two Schools.

In order to show that a middle way was needed between the two Schools, Cheng Hsüan attacked members of both groups. For example, Ho Hsiu was a contemporary of Cheng Hsüan who attempted to preserve the New Text tradition by writing a commentary to the *Kung-yang chuan* which was a modest compromise of the New Text position.<sup>51</sup> In addition, he wrote a trilogy defending the *Kung-yang* commentary and attacking the other two commentaries on the *Spring and Autumn Annals*.<sup>52</sup> Cheng Hsüan immediately composed counterattacks to each of these three pieces.<sup>53</sup> Similarly, Cheng composed another work entitled *Controverting [Hsü Shen's] Different Interpretations of the Five Classics (Po Wu-ching i-i)*. In this work, Cheng took issue with Old Texter Hsü Shen on many specific points, e.g., Cheng argues that the Son of Heaven did not go in person to welcome his bride<sup>54</sup> (and therefore the Son of Heaven was expected to follow the same social customs as anyone else instead of being completely above and consequently different from other men.). But at the same time, Cheng often agreed with Hsü.<sup>55</sup>

Instead of suggesting that any one interpretation was superior to the others, Cheng asserted that each had its good points. This attitude may be summed up in the following quotation from Cheng's *Discussion of the Six Arts* (i.e., Six Classics), *Liu-I lun*: "The *Tso-shih* excels in rites, the *Kung-yang* excels in the apocrypha, and the *Ku-liang* excels in the Classics."<sup>56</sup> He adopted the same position with regard to the books of rites.<sup>57</sup> Thus, Cheng was a thorough-going eclectic who tried to select whatever he thought was superior within each tradition.

Cheng was eminently successful. Even before his death he was widely recognized as one of the greatest scholars of all times. Few men of the Han period, for example, had a locality named in their honor. But most important, according to Fan Yeh's evaluation of Cheng, is that Cheng brought order where there had been chaos. Before Cheng's writings

became known, the Eastern Han intellectual world was one in which most followers of the various Schools doggedly protected their texts and dogmatically adhered to that in which they had been instructed. Each of "the Classics had numerous Schools and the Schools had numerous theories." Previous scholars had had their doubts about the condition of scholarly studies but none had been able to remedy the situation. "Cheng Hsüan closed the bag on the great canons and cast a net over the many Schools. He cut out the superfluous and deleted and reformed what was in error.. From this, scholars generally knew where to turn."<sup>58</sup> The latter sentence is perhaps the most important. It shows that Cheng Hsüan set Confucianism off on a completely new course. Yeh Te-hui's evaluation of Cheng is that "he collected the great achievements of the New and Old Texts and smashed the bigoted vulgarity of classical studies."<sup>59</sup> P'i Hsi-jui, who, like Yeh, lived at the end of the Ch'ing period, blames Cheng for the fact that in P'i's own time it was so difficult to study the Old and New Text Schools of thought. Although the fault is not all Cheng's, said P'i, after Cheng joined together the Old and New Text, the distinction between the two ended and the various interpretations of the Classics passed out of existence as scholars then devoted their attention to Cheng's annotations of the Classics. P'i concluded: "Classical studies upon reaching Cheng all changed,"<sup>60</sup>

In spite of the synthesis of Cheng Hsüan, officially, at the end of the Han dynasty, the status of the Old Text School was exactly as Emperor Ling had left it in A.D. 180. Later Han emperors, beginning with Emperor Chang, issued special summonses for Old Text scholars, but throughout the dynasty, with the exception of the appointment of an Erudite for the *Tso-chuan* by Emperor Kuang-wu, no Erudites were established for the Old Text classics. Then, immediately after the Han, when there was great disorder and more occasion for innovation and change, the chairs for the New Text Classics were replaced with those for the Old Text canons. New Text orthodoxy fell with the Han and did not seriously challenge the Old Text tradition until seventeen centuries later.<sup>61</sup>

## OF MEN AND GODS

Only a few scholar officials of the Later Han period became directly involved in the dispute between the Old and New Text Schools and committed their views to writing. Most scholar-officials were apparently content to accept unquestioningly the officially sponsored New Text position; such men were officials more than scholars. They were primarily concerned with positions in the bureaucracy, not with philosophical principles. Furthermore, it was not unusual for a person to study both Old and New Text versions of the Classics; Chia K'uei, who was of singular importance in gaining imperial support for the Old Texters was a teacher of New Text versions of the Classics.<sup>62</sup> Thus the differences between the two Schools did not necessarily divide the scholars of the period into irreconcilable camps, although individual scholars occasionally took strongly defended positions, as in the case of Huan T'an and some of his contemporaries. In the following discussion, I have tried to emphasize the differences between the two Schools. The differences were not simply those of which Classics, or commentaries to them, were to be authoritative; profound philosophical and political views separated the two Schools.

As we have seen, the earliest exponent of the Old Text position was Liu Hsin whose basic argument was that Tso Ch'iu-ming held the same moral views as Confucius. Liu saw another disadvantage in the New Text version of the classics, *viz.*, that they were generally

deficient. In great matters of state for example the rites to be performed by the emperor, the New Text scholars had nothing to offer, nor did they know the origins of these rituals.<sup>63</sup> The Old Text scholars, because of their greater emphasis on history, were aware of the practices of the past and could assist in devising ceremonies for the throne. This is the only Western Han argument in favor of the Old Text School. Its most striking feature is the extent to which it does not sharply delineate the differences between the two Schools. And yet, even in Liu's case there is already beginning to develop the idea that the Old Text School is essentially historically minded. As opposed to the cosmic view of the world by the New Texters the scholars of the Old Text School were primarily concerned with the activities of man in the past.

Chia K'uei, one of the key figures in the rise of the Old Text School composed a work dealing with thirty items in the *Tso-chuan*, and in the memorial which introduced that study to the throne, he also elaborated on the Old Text position as none of his predecessors had done (I pass over the debates between Fan Sheng and Ch'en Yüan during the reign of Emperor Kuang-wu because we have none of the material from their memorials which would throw light on the differences between the two Schools as seen by those men at that time). The memorial exists today (but the work on the *Tso-chuan* itself is lost) and in it we read:

Those things that I have especially made clear are the correct principles concerning the ruler and his ministers and the bonds (紀綱) between father and son.<sup>64</sup>

In a subsequent passage he developed the significance of this relationship:

Of all of those things that still exist from the Way of the former kings, the essentials lie in that which gives repose to the Superior One and which regulates the people. Now, the *Tso-shih* esteems the sovereign and the father and slights the ministers and sons. It strengthens the trunk and weakens the branches. It encourages good and warns against evil....<sup>65</sup>

In other words, Chia K'uei saw the Old Text philosophy as a highly authoritarian one and one which was dependent overwhelmingly on precedents that could be found in the Classics or their commentaries. This aspect of the differences between the Old and New Text Schools may be seen in one of the several examples that Li Hsien offers in his commentary to a part of this memorial.

The essential facts to be considered in this example come from the *Spring and Autumn Annals*. In 700 B.C. the Duke of Cheng died and was succeeded by his elder son, Duke Chao with the given name of Hu. Shortly thereafter Chi Chung, a high minister of Cheng, was seized by the men of the state of Sung. The next entry in the *Annals* is that Tu, identified in the commentaries as a younger brother of Duke Chao, returned to Cheng. This series of events concludes with the statement that Duke Chao fled to another state.<sup>66</sup> Such elliptical entries in the chronological history attributed to Confucius are typical of that work and they provided almost endless opportunities for interpretation.

The Kung-yang interpretation of this dethronement of Duke Chao makes Chi Chung, the minister, a hero because he "knew circumstances. By acting contrary to what was right, the minister saved the life of the ruler; had he not deposed Duke Chao, the state of Sung

would have attacked the state of Cheng and the Duke would have lost his life and the state itself would have perished. By acting according to circumstances, the minister preserved both the state and Duke Chao.<sup>67</sup>

The *Tso-chuan* view of this chain of events is entirely different. The minister was enticed into going to Sung where his life was threatened. He then set aside the elder son and established the younger son as Duke of Cheng. He is mentioned in order to reprehend him for the wrong he had committed.<sup>68</sup>

Chia K'uei, in referring to this case and others like it, summarized this authoritarian aspect of the differences between the two Schools when he said: "The significance of the *Tso-shih* is its profundity regarding the sovereign and the father [whereas] the *Kung-yang* is frequently burdened with changes according to circumstances."<sup>69</sup> The point that Chia K'uei repeatedly made is the authoritarian position occupied by the ruler. Man's highest duty as a political animal was to the ruler. Beyond this there was apparently nothing. Likewise, as a social animal, man had to see himself in relation to his father. The relationships, subject to ruler and son to father, were essentially the same. Together they would have provided the basis for a society in which, according to the Old Text ideal, everyone would have been held in his place because of his subordinate position to someone else. Everyone, that is, except the ruler.

Chia does not say what the role of the ruler was to have been. Presumably, just as the father had certain obligations to his son, so too the ruler would have been under some restraint with regard to his subjects, but this argument does not emerge in Chia's writings. In fact, restraint of the ruler presupposes a truth higher than any that the ruler himself might promulgate – a truth to which the officials, for example, might appeal in order to circumscribe the possible actions of the sovereign. When Chia K'uei criticized the New Text beliefs, it was precisely this point that he rejected.

"Adjustment to circumstances" was one of the keystones in the New Text philosophy. It meant an act which was contrary to the normal standards of conduct or to the constants of life (*ching* 經) but an act that ultimately was for the good. Such acts were not lightly to be performed; one was justified in contravening the constants only in order to preserve a life or to prevent destruction. In "adjusting to circumstances" one might have to demean or belittle oneself but such action was never permitted for the benefit of the actor himself. "Killing others so that one's self may live or causing others to perish so that one's self is preserved are things the Superior Man does not do."<sup>70</sup>

On the basis of this New Text philosophy, an official might well commit a disloyal act, as Chi Chung did in the foregoing example, because although this was contrary to the proper behavior expected of an official, it was for the good of the state, and for the ruling family of the state and even for the ruler himself in that it saved his life. By denying the acceptability of this line of reasoning, Chia K'uei and the Old Text scholars were arguing that there was only one good in the state – the ruler's immediate good. The New Text scholar official had a certain amount of freedom of action in any given situation, but the Old Text philosophy taught that in all circumstances the official had only one route to follow: loyalty and subordination to the ruler.<sup>71</sup>

Hsü Shen is most famous as the author of the *Shuo-wen chieh-tzu* but he was also the author of another important work called the *Wu-ching i-i*, *Different Interpretations of the Five Classics*. In this work Hsü pointed out differences between the Old and New Text versions of

the Classics and several of his examples are useful in pointing out the extent to which the Old Text scholars availed themselves of a historical text, the *Tso-chuan*, in order to exalt the position of the emperor. For example, when a couple were married it was customary for the groom to go personally to welcome his bride. According to the New Text School, everyone from the emperor down to the commoners followed the same procedure. Hsü Shen cited the *Tso-chuan* to prove that since the Son of Heaven occupied a peerless and extremely exalted position, there was no ceremony by which he personally welcomed his bride.<sup>72</sup>

Again, the New Text position on a related question was that men should marry at age 30 and women at age 20; 30 plus 20 gives 50 which was the number of the "grand extension" (大衍), a number of mystical significance. This rule was to apply to all people from the emperor down to the commoners. Hsü Shen was able to counter this with a statement from the *Tso-chuan* according to which a youthful ruler of 15 years was to produce a son and heir. In Hsü's opinion, the figures 30 and 20 applied only to commoners.<sup>73</sup> Although seemingly inconsequential, these examples show how the New Text scholars were determined to make the ruler behave socially as any other human; their opponents were just as concerned with developing the uniqueness of the position of the emperor – the rules that he followed were not those of the ordinary man.

In place of the emperor to whom the official owed complete loyalty, the New Text scholar—officials felt that they were ultimately answerable to God on High or to Heaven. One expression of this view occurred early in the reign of Emperor Ming when the King of Kuang-ling, a younger brother of the Emperor committed a crime. Because the King was such a close relative, the Emperor was reluctant to see the case pushed to its conclusion. Fan Shu, one of the New Text scholars who wrote commentaries to the Classics to make them accord with the apocryphal texts, was ordered to conduct an investigation. When the investigation was complete, Fan and the others working with him recommended that the King be executed. The Emperor, angered at the suggestion, summoned them to an audience. In defending his position, Fan Shu informed the Emperor that "The empire is the empire of God on High; it is not Your Majesty's empire."<sup>74</sup>

A similar case involves Ts'ao Pao; Ts'ao and his father were both experts in rites and music and both of them relied heavily on the apocrypha in setting forth their ideas on rites and music. Between 76 and 78, Ts'ao Pao was a Prefect when some bandits fled to the area under his jurisdiction. Ts'ao was ordered to have them executed, but he refused to carry out the orders. His refusal was based upon the view that only Heaven could take the life of a man. Rather than do so, he resigned from office.<sup>75</sup>

The fullest expression of this New Text esteem of Heaven as opposed to the emperor comes from the biography of Fan Ying. Fan was a widely recognized expert in the apocryphal texts and one of the few men credited with teaching them. Because of his fame, Emperor An summoned him to become an Erudite, the highest academic honor that could be bestowed upon anyone, but Fan Ying declined the position and refused to go to the capital. In A.D. 217, Emperor Shun, who was much more concerned with the scholarly world than was his predecessor, prepared an elaborate ritual by which to invite Fan to the court and again Fan refused. After the Emperor rebuked the local officials for not conveying Fan to the capital, Fan had no alternative. However, upon arriving in Lo-yang, he pleaded illness and declined to appear in court. Finally when he was bodily carried into the court, he refused to bow according to ritual to the Emperor.

Emperor Shun's wrath was aroused at seeing his authority flouted by Fan Ying and he warned the obstinate scholar of the nature of imperial power:

I can allow you to live or I can kill you. I can make you noble or I can make you base. I can make you wealthy or I can make you poor. How is it that you treat with contempt my commands?

Fan's answer was a blunt rebuttal of every point made by the Emperor:

Your servant received his allotted span from Heaven. If one lives and completes his allotted span, it is Heaven [that decides this]. If one dies and does not receive a full span it is Heaven's [doing]. How can your majesty allow me to live? How can you kill me?

Your servant views a cruel ruler like he views an enemy. If I resolve not to stand in his court, can he make me noble? Even if I were among the ranks of the commoners and lived in poverty, I would be fully content with my lot. I shall not exchange my place for that of a ruler of a great state. Then can Your Majesty still make me base? Can your Majesty make your servant noble? Can you make your servant base?

If it were an improper remuneration then even though it were 10,000 bushels, your servant would not accept it. If something furthered my principles, then even though it was but a single-dish meal, I would not spurn it. How can Your Majesty enrich your servant? How can you impoverish your servant?

The Emperor was unable to make Fan Ying submit and ended by giving him special treatment.<sup>76</sup> Although not a contemporary, the historian favored the Old Text School and gives what might well have been a contemporary Old Text characterization of Fan Ying in saying that Fan's "fame was the most exalted and his slander the most extreme."<sup>77</sup> Chia Ku'ei and Fan Ying stand as representatives of the two major Han schools. To Chia and other Old Text scholars there was nothing above the emperor, but Fan Ying and his School did not see the emperor as the primary force in the world. Their world was one in which the ultimate source of power was not the throne but Heaven; they lived in a divine world whereas the Old Text scholars lived in one that was eminently human and governed by man's history.

The differences between the two Schools with regard to the human and the divine may also be seen in the writings of Hsü Shen. The New Text School argued that sage men did not have fathers. A sage was a demigod whose birth was the result of a woman being "influenced" by Heaven. Heaven might act as a dragon which descended and hovered over the sage's mother or the woman might have conceived after eating the egg of a mysterious bird which Heaven had apparently caused to appear. Hsü Shen again defended the Old Text position by reference to the *Tso-chuan*, where it is said that the sage Emperor Yao was intimate with his nine clans. Hsü also referred to an unidentified apocrypha to the *Book of Rites* which spoke of ancestral temples of Yao. These references to clans and ancestral temples indicate that Emperor Yao knew who his forefathers were and Hsü therefore concluded that emperor Yao was not born as a result of his mother having been "influenced" by Heaven.<sup>78</sup>

The Old Text attitude with regard to deities is revealed in still another way. The *she* 社 sacrifice was made to the earth god, which controlled the *yin* aura, but to Hsü Shen the

earth god was not really a deity. He said that this ritual was a corruption of an early sacrifice to a human figure, Chü-lung, the son of Kung-kung shih, one of the earliest emperors of highest antiquity.<sup>79</sup> Hsü provided a similar interpretation for the God of Grain (*chi* 稷) and the Spirit of the Kitchen (*ts'ao-shen* 竈神).<sup>80</sup> Essentially the same type of argument is involved in the question of the descent of the Han House from Emperor Yao. Some of the Old Text scholars held that Emperor Yao should not be specially honored by the Han dynasty because there was no cosmic connection between the Liu family and Yao. The Liu family ruled because of its own merits.<sup>81</sup>

This brief survey of some of the differences between the two major schools of Han Confucianism shows that they disagreed on such a fundamental issue as the relative roles of man and God in the world. The New Text School adhered to a belief in god to whom man could appeal for his own benefit, e.g., the God of earth. The New Text scholars also believed that basic ideas on morality were determined by Heaven and that man was ultimately accountable to Heaven for his actions. In the political sphere of man's life this was particularly clear, for Heaven first sent warnings and then punishments if the emperors or his officials misbehaved. Politically, the foremost implication of this idea was that there was something higher than the emperor to whom man was accountable. It was not obligatory that the emperor be obeyed in all situations.

The Old Text position was quite different. In their view, man's primary problem was a political and social one, which he answered by reference to political and social forms. In their view of the political order as an extrapolation of the social and particularly the familial order, the Old Texters were not unlike Chia I at the very beginning of the Former Han dynasty. Implicit in their belief was the idea that man in history, not the gods, provided the final solutions to man's problems.

The conflict between the New and Old Text Schools is particularly clear with regard to the question of the appropriate commentary to the *Spring and Autumn Annals*. The New Text scholars saw Confucius' history as a book that contained arcane truths; every word and every date (or the omission of a date) had to have a significance that transcended the historical fact itself. The men who sought official recognition of the Tso commentary, however, viewed the book as a compilation of precedents. In their emphasis on man, they naturally turned to historical texts in order to find norms for human existence. The same parallel exists with regard to the *Book of Songs*. The New Text scholars, as seen in the case of I Feng, interpreted this classic as one that contained verities concerning the operation of the cosmos. The Mao version of the *Book of Songs*, the Old Text interpretation, is heavily oriented toward historical examples.<sup>82</sup> The emphasis on history by the Old Text School demonstrates very well the extent to which this School was oriented towards man, as opposed to the New Text orientation towards the divine.

---

### Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> Both of these men were active in the reign of Emperor Yüan, who ascended the throne in 48 B.C. Most of what we know about them comes from their biographies in *Han shu* 75. The

---

*Han shu* (hereafter *Hs*) and the *Hou Han shu* (hereafter *HHs*) cited in this paper are the Taipei: I-wen yin-shu-kuan's photoreproductions of Wang Hsien-ch'ien's *Han-shu pu-chu* and *Hou Han-shu chi-chieh*. Since Pan Ku usually treats his biographies in chronological order, it is somewhat unusual that he presents Ching Fang's biography before I Feng's. One reason for this might be that the first part of Ching's biography outlines information about his teacher Chiao Yan-shou; hence this is to a certain extent a double biography going back in time to a period before Emperor Yüan's reign. It is also quite possible, and quite likely, that Pan Ku presents I Feng after Ching Fang because I Feng's ideas show a more advanced development in terms of these ideas being applied for the benefit of the ruler, as opposed to criticism of the ruler.

<sup>2</sup> Tung Chung-shu, *Ch'un-ch'iu fan-lu* (Taipei: Shih-chieh shu-chü, 1963, reprint from the *Huang-ch'ing ching-chieh hsü-pien*), 18. See also, for example, Hsiao Kung-ch'üan, *Chung-kuo cheng-chih ssu-hsiang shih* (Taipei: Chung-hua wen-hua ch'u-pan shih-yeh wei-yüan-hui, 1954, 6 vols.) III, 294. I have developed this aspect of Tung's ideas in my dissertation; see Jack L Dull, "A Historical Introduction to the Apocryphal (*ch'an-wei*) Texts of the Han Dynasty" (University of Washington, 1966).

<sup>3</sup> *Hs* 75, 19a-20a, quoted in Hsiao, *op. cit.*, II, 302.

<sup>4</sup> *Hs* 75, 16a.

<sup>5</sup> Ku Chieh-kang, "Wu-te chung-shih shuo-hsia ti cheng chih ho li-shih," in Ku Chieh-kang, ed., *Ku-shih-pien*, V, 404-417. (Hong Kong: T'ai-p'ing shu-chü, 1963, reprint of the P'u-she 1935 edition), 450-596; Wm Theodore DeBary, Wing-tsit Chan, Burton Watson (comps. and trans.), *Sources of Chinese Tradition*. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1960), 216-217. At one point Pan Ku attributes this system to both Liu Hsiang and Liu Hsin; see *Hs* 25B, 23b-24a, quoted in Ku, *op. cit.*, 491.

<sup>6</sup> I have dealt in the dissertation referred to in note 2 with the origins of the apocrypha; see especially Chapter V of that work. For this paper, suffice it to say that the first apocryphal texts appear in the ideological warfare waged by Liu Hsiu (the future Emperor Kuang-wu) and Kung-sun Shu. Furthermore, it is impossible to conceive of the apocrypha before the contributions of Ching Fang, I Feng, and Liu Hsin to Han New Text Confucianism.

<sup>7</sup> *HHs* 1B, 22b.

<sup>8</sup> *HHs* 28A, 4a-5a. See also Timoteous Pokora, "The Life of Huan T'an," *Archiv Orientální*, 31:1 (1963), 31-33, and Tjan Tjoe Som, *Po Hu T'ung, The Comprehensive Discussions in the White Tiger Hall*, 2 vols. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1949, 1952), I, 152.

<sup>9</sup> *Hs* 36, 31b-35a.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 31b.

<sup>11</sup> *HHs* 36, 6b-9a.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 9a-10b; this argument is summarized in Tjan, *op. cit.*, I, 150-151.

<sup>13</sup> *HHs* 79B, 11a.

<sup>14</sup> *HHs* 36, 10b. Cf. Tjan, *op. cit.*, I, 151 who misinterprets Kuang-wu's bypassing of Ch'en Yüan.

<sup>15</sup> *HHs* 79B, 15a and 56, 10b.

---

<sup>16</sup> *HHs* 36, 16b.

<sup>17</sup> See Shen Ch'in-han's explanation of this in the commentary to *HHs* 36, 12a-b.

<sup>18</sup> For example, according to the cyclical pattern of history the Han House was the progeny of Emperor Yao of antiquity and both of them ruled by virtue of the cosmic force of fire. This idea was of crucial importance in the Restoration of the Han and is frequently found in the apocrypha. Former Old Text scholars had objected to this cosmic interpretation of history, saying that the Han ruled by its own right and not because of any connection with Emperor Yao (*HHs* 27, 6a-b). Because of this objection from the Old Texters, no special sacrifices for Emperor Yao as a distant founder of the Han line were ever established. Nevertheless, the idea was widely held and even Pan Ku, an Old Text historian, includes it in his ancestry of the Liu family; see Homer H. Dubs, *History of the Former Han Dynasty*, (Baltimore: Waverly Press, 1938-55, 3 vols.), I, 146 ff. One of Chia K'uei's arguments in favor of the *Tso* was that, of all the classics and commentaries, it alone contained information proving that the Han House descended from Emperor Yao (*HHs* 36, 14b-15a). Hence, he used the New Text position as seen in the apocrypha in order to strengthen the Old Text position.

<sup>19</sup> *HHs* 36, 13b-14a.

<sup>20</sup> *HHs* 36, 13a-b. There is a problem, apparently minor in the dating of this memorial. The biography reads as if the memorial were presented shortly after Chia was summoned by Emperor Chang in A.D. 76. In the biography, after presenting the memorial, Fan Yeh informs the reader that Chia also composed treatises on the other Old Text classics, that he received a promotion, and the historian records under the date of A.D. 83 the summoning of students to study other Old Text classics. However, the memorial contains a laudatory account of the accomplishments of Emperor Chang (*HHs* 36, 15a), which includes the calendar reform of A.D. 85. It appears that Fan Yeh (or his source) has rewritten several memorials submitted by Chia, anachronistically fusing them as though they were a single memorial. It seems likely that the Emperor summoned students for several Old Text classics only after he had first summoned some for a single Old Text classic, the *Tso-chuan*. If we assume, as Fan Yeh did, that students were selected to study the *Tso* commentary because of this memorial, then much of it must have been written in or shortly after A.D. 76.

<sup>21</sup> *HHs* 36, 15a-b.

<sup>22</sup> *HHs* 36, 14a.

<sup>23</sup> *HHs* 3.6a; also in Tjan, *op. cit.* I, 154-155 and note 555.

<sup>24</sup> *HHs* 32, 3b.

<sup>25</sup> Tjan has attempted to account for the Po Hu Kuan discussions but his argument is somewhat ambiguous. He suggests (*op. cit.*, I, 154-155) that on the basis of the earlier Shih-ch'ü Pavillion discussion, which was concerned with the controversy between the Kung-yang and Ku-liang schools of the *Spring and Autumn Annals*, the motives for the Po Hu discussions "may also be found in some analogous controversy between the schools." He also suggests (*ibid.*, 157) that Emperor Chang's "dangerous deviation from the paths of orthodoxy seems to have caused such confusion that it was deemed necessary to bring the whole question of the authority of the Classics into question." There is no indication that anyone was questioning "the authority of the Classics." There probably was a question as to which classics to honor.

---

Still later (p. 171) Tjan states that the discussion was “held to discuss that of new chairs for Old Text Schools.” I agree with the latter statement, although the evidence for this view is not as sound or as abundant as I would like it to be.

<sup>26</sup> *HHs* 48, 2b; also in Tjan, *op. cit.*, 157.

<sup>27</sup> *HHs* 79B, 11b. However, according to Tjan’s list of works quoted in the Po Hu Kuan discussion, no one quoted from the *Tso-chuan* (see his Appendix A, pp. 179 ff.).

<sup>28</sup> *HHs* 79B, 11b.

<sup>29</sup> *HHs* 79B, 11b.

<sup>30</sup> *HHs* 79B, 11b.

<sup>31</sup> *HHs* 79B, 11b.

<sup>32</sup> Tjan, *op. cit.*, 163.

<sup>33</sup> *HHs* 36, 16a.

<sup>34</sup> *HHs* 3, 10a. Tjan, *op. cit.*, 163 gives a rather poor summary of this decree. Ch’ien Mu, *Liang-Han ching-hsueh -chin-ku-wen p’ing-i* (Kowloon: Hsin-ya yen-jiu so, 1958), 216 gives a slightly different version as found in Yüan Hung’s *Hou Han chi*. Ch’ien adds that “former teachers” refers to those of the period before Emperor Wu, i.e., before the rise of *yin-yang* Confucianism.

<sup>35</sup> *HHs* 3, 10a; 36, 13a.

<sup>36</sup> *HHs* 79A, 2a.

<sup>37</sup> *HHs* 5, 17a.

<sup>38</sup> According to Fan Yeh (*HHs* 79A, 2a-b) the situation in the scholarly world fell to low depths during the reign of Emperor An. The Erudites who were supposed to teach the recognized versions of the classics to future officials merely occupied mats without lecturing. The grounds of the Imperial University were turned into vegetable gardens and grazing lands; even woodcutters were found there.

<sup>39</sup> *HHs* 64, 11a.

<sup>40</sup> *HHs* 64, 10a.

<sup>41</sup> *HHs* 64, 11a-12b.

<sup>42</sup> *HHs* 8, 9a.

<sup>43</sup> T’ao Hsi-sheng, *Chung-kuo cheng-chih ssu-hsiang shih* (Taipei: Ch’üan-min ch’u-pan-she, 1954, 3 vols.), III, 23.

<sup>44</sup> See Yeh’s “Preface,” p. 1a, to P’i Hsi-jui’s compiled and annotated fragments of Cehng Hsüan’s *Liu-I lun*. P’i’s compilation bears the title *Liu-i-lun su-cheng* and may be found in P’i’s collected works: *P’i Lu-men so chu-shu*, unnumbered *ts’e* 14 (Ch’ang-sha ssu-hsien shu-chü, 1896-1908).

<sup>45</sup> *HHs* 35, 10a-b. The *HHs* biography of Cheng and other materials about his life have been translated; see Mieczyslaw Jerzy Künstler, “Deux biographies de Tcheng Hiuan,” *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 26.1 (1962), 23-64.

---

<sup>46</sup> *HHs* 79B, 12b and note. Fu went on to write his text, which circulated for several centuries. Fu Ch'ien also used the Tso commentary to refute arguments that the New Text scholar Ho Hsiu had composed.

<sup>47</sup> P'i Hsi-jui, *Ching-hsüeh li-shih* (Hong Kong: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1961), 142. *HHs* 35, 14b-15b lists Cheng's works.

<sup>48</sup> P'i Hsi-jui, *Ching-hsüeh li-shih*, 142.

<sup>49</sup> Tjan, *Po Hu T'ung*, I, 87.

<sup>50</sup> See his preface to his *Shang-shu ta-chuan*, quoted on p. 2a of *Cheng K'ang-ch'eng chi*, a collection of pieces by Cheng put together by Ting Fu-pao and contained in the latter's *Han Wei Liu-ch'ao ming-chia chi* (Shanghai: Wen-ming shu-chü, 1910).

<sup>51</sup> See Ho's preface, pp. 1a-4b, in the *Kung-yang chuan chu-su* (in the *Shih-san ching chu-su* edition); quoted in part in Ch'ien, *op. cit.*, 218.

<sup>52</sup> *HHs* 79B, 12a. These works by Ho and the rebuttals to them by Cheng Hsüan have all been lost. Fragments from the works of both authors have been reassembled and are available in Pao T'ing-chüeh, comp., *Hou Chih-pu-tsu chai ts'ung-shu* (Chung-ch'iu ch'ang-shu Pao-shih k'an-hsing, 1884).

<sup>53</sup> *HHs* 35, 11a.

<sup>54</sup> Ch'en Shou-ch'i has compiled and copiously annotated fragments from the work by Hsü Shen and included Cheng's opinions on Hsü's statements. Ch'en's work, called *Wu-ching i-i su-cheng* may be found in chuan 1248-1250 of Juan Yüan, ed., *Huang-ch'ing ching-chieh*. This example is from *chuan* 1249, 62b-73a.

<sup>55</sup> See, for example, *ibid.*, 1248, 51b, 53b, and 1250, 47a.

<sup>56</sup> P'i, *Liu-i-lun su-cheng*, 34a.

<sup>57</sup> Lü Ssu-mien, *Ch'in Han-shih* (Hong-kong: T'ai-p'ing shu-chü, 1962), II, 752, and *I-li chu-su* (*Shih-san-ching chu-su* ed.), ch. 1, p. 3a.

<sup>58</sup> *HHs* 35, 16b-17a.

<sup>59</sup> See p. 1a of Yeh's "Preface" to P'i's *Liu-i-lun su-cheng*.

<sup>60</sup> P'i, *Ching-hsüeh li-shih*, 149.

<sup>61</sup> Tjan, *op. cit.*, I, 165.

<sup>62</sup> See also *HHs* 78, 18a-b for Chung K'ai who studied the Yan-shih, i.e., New Text, version of the *Ch'un-ch'iu* and the Old Text *Documents*; *HHs* 38, 8a for Tu Shang who studied Ching Fang's *Changes* and the Old Text *Documents* and *HHs* 79A, 7a for Sun Ch'i who studied the same texts.

<sup>63</sup> *Hs* 36, 34a.

<sup>64</sup> *Hs* 36, 13a.

<sup>65</sup> *Hs* 36, 14a.

<sup>66</sup> James Legge (trans.), *The Ch'un Ts'ew with the Tso Chuan* (Vol. V in *The Chinese Classics*, Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1960, 5 vols.), 56.

---

<sup>67</sup> Li Hsien's commentary to *HHs* 36, 13b in which he summarizes *Kung-yang chuan* 5, 7b-9a. On "knowing circumstances" or "adjusting to circumstances" see Tung Chung-shu, *Ch'un-ch'iu fan-lu*, 52-53 and 56, and Fung Yu-lan, *A History of Chinese Philosophy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952 and 1953, 2 vols.), II, 77-79.

<sup>68</sup> Li Hsien's commentary to *HHs* 36, 13b in which he summarizes *Tso-chuan* 7, 5a-11a. See also Legge, *op. cit.*, 56-57.

<sup>69</sup> *Hs* 36, 13b.

<sup>70</sup> *Kung-yang chuan* 5, 9a.

<sup>71</sup> For another formulation of these differences, see Hellmut Wilhelm, "The Scholar's Frustration: Notes on a Type of Fu," in *Chinese Thought and Institutions*, edited by John K. Fairbank, pp. 310-319, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 318.

<sup>72</sup> Chen, *Wu-ching i-i su-cheng*, 1249, 62b-63a.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, 1249, 64a ff.

<sup>74</sup> *HHs* 32, 4a.

<sup>75</sup> *HHs* 35, 7a.

<sup>76</sup> *HHs* 82A, 13a-14a.

<sup>77</sup> *HHs* 82A, 15a.

<sup>78</sup> Chen, *Wu-ching i-i su-cheng*, 1250, 12a. Wang Ch'ung (Alfred Forke, trans., *Lun-heng, Philosophical Essays of Wang Ch'ung*, 2 vols., second edition, New York: Paragon Book Gallery, 1962, II, 114) said that sages "know spontaneously, without learning, and understand of themselves, without inquiring, where fore the term Sage is equivalent with supernatural." Thus Wang also held the view that sages were not entirely human.

<sup>79</sup> Chen, *Wu-ching i-i su-cheng*, 1248, 28a.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, 1248, 29a-b, 76a.

<sup>81</sup> *HHs* 27, 6a-b.

<sup>82</sup> Liu Ju-lin, *Han Chin hsüeh-shu pien-nien* (Shanghai: Commercial Press, second edition, 1935, 4 vols.), *chüan* 3, 166.