《Journal of Humanities East/West》
Vol. 18, December 1998, pp. 137-165
College of Liberal Arts, National Central University

Scriptures and Their Popularization: The Case of the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao-ching* in the Han Dynasty

*Yen-zen Tsai**

* Associate Professor, Department of History, National Chengchi University

Abstract

The *Lun-yü (Analects of Confucius)* and *Hsiao-ching (Book on Filial Piety)* , two texts of *chuan* or commentary type, and the *Wu ching*, the recondite and voluminous Five Classics, formed an inseparable Confucian scriptural corpus in the Han Dynasty. Because of textual shortness and simplicity, the former two texts were widely distributed and learned. Also because people in Han China believed that Confucius was their author, they were highly respected. Han rulers then used these two small scriptures as ideological foundation to build up their empire. They even employed them for such practical purposes as promulgation of Confucian ethics, recruitment of officials, and selection of imperial consorts. The *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao-ching* were inferior in scriptural status in comparison with the Five Classics, but their sacredness and authority were by no means lower. There were at least two important reasons for this. First, each of these two small scriptures contained the *tao* by itself, hence its own independent status. Second, their succinct outline form was supposed to be summary of the profound Five Classics, hence serving to integrate the latter. On account of these two scriptural characteristics, the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao-ching* became more popularized. From the perspective of functionality and practicality, the article argues, these two *chuan* should exceed the Five Classics in importance and influence. And to popularize the profound Five Classics via simpler texts for functional considerations has exactly been one of the salient scriptural phenomena in Confucian tradition.

Key words: *Lun-yü, Hsiao-ching,* Five Classics, Confucianism, Hermenutics

I

As a sacred text, scripture designates a special class of words, either in oral or written form, that claim special meanings among believers of a faith community. It exercises great authority and exerts enormous influence on those who read and study it with reverence. It provides its believers with a rich depository from which a belief system is formed and to which one's deeds and conducts are referred. It is never a neutral object, but rather a "relational concept" the significance of which can be perceived only through the reciprocal relationships between the believers and this text in the changing religio-historical circumstances.[1]

Different scriptures enjoy different sacred status, and how each of them comes to being, evolves in history, and becomes canonized also varies in different cultural or religious traditions. Similar to a literary canon whose process of formation is "a narrative of some intricacy, depending on places and times and opportunities,"[2] the sacrality, power, authority, and function of a scripture is intimately linked to the socio-historical contexts in which it arises. More complex is the situation where one finds not only a scripture or a collection of sacred books but different groups of scriptures interacting, complementing, or even competing with one another. The division between the primary texts versus the secondary texts, as found in many religions or cultural traditions, by some scholars is thus a response to this intricate scriptural phenomenon.[3] However, some intriguing questions ensue as a result of the classification between different scriptural groups.

When we make distinction between the primary sacred texts versus the secondary sacred texts, do we presuppose discrepancies of value attributed to each of these two groups? On what basis do we ground our value judgment? Is it necessary the case that the primary scriptures possess higher degree of sacrality, power, and authority than that contained in the secondary scriptures? How do we tell? It often happens that some scriptures, because of their archaic and abstruse nature, need interpretations or expositions, hence the productions of commentaries, primers, or introductory writings. Scholars of religion tend to regard these original texts as primary and their interpretations as secondary, as far as the

classification of the overall scriptures is concerned. In actuality, the commentaries or primers, due to their easier accessibility and wider circulation, may reach more people and henceforth exert greater influence. Should we, then, based upon this consideration of functionality or practicality, reassess the relationships between the primary scriptures and the secondary scriptures?[4] For example, the Mishnah is considered to be divinely revealed in Rabbinic Judaism, and as the oral Torah, it explains and continues the majestic written Torah. The Hadith, a collection of the Prophet Muhammad's words and deeds, has been so revered by Muslims that its sacred status almost matches that of the Qur'an, and as such it has been used as authoritative references in matters of diverse areas. In Indian tradition, the Puranas, compendia of Hindu myths and rituals created during the medieval period, often function scripturally as the most sacrosanct Vedas and hold wide devotion from among the masses. Whereas in Buddhism, there is no easy way to categorize the primary texts in contrast to the secondary texts due to innumerable amount of sutras, except the fact that many Buddhist communities, predicated upon their respective religious convictions, would single out a particular scripture or scriptures for their special reverence.[5] Indeed the demarcation between the primary scriptures and the secondary scriptures is hard to draw, as each religious or cultural tradition has its own unique definition of the sacred, concept of scripture, process of canonization, way of scriptural application, etc.. I believe, nonetheless, that it is heuristic to explore this scriptural phenomenon because it will lead us into understanding not only scriptures in general but the very nature of a religious or cultural tradition. As we will see in the following pages, ancient China also exhibited its own scriptural features which involved intricate relationships between the primary *ching* texts and the secondary *chuan* writings. From a comparative perspective, an investigation of the Chinese case will help us, on the one hand, clarify the issues mentioned above and, on the other hand, bring Confucianism into meaningful dialogue with other religious traditions.

For these purposes, I will take the scriptural phenomena in Han China (206 BCE - 220 CE) for illustration. In particular, my paper will focus upon the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching*, long thought to be two minor or secondary Confucian scriptures, and examine how they were popularized in the society. It will further discuss their

relationships with the *Wu ching*, traditionally treated as the primary scriptures in ancient China, and see how these different types of scriptures fared in the Chinese context.

II

The *Wu ching (Five Scriptures* or *Five Classics)* as a collection of the five most sacred texts refer to the *Shih (Book of Odes)*, *Shu (Book of Documents)*, *Li (Rites)*, *I (Book of Changes)*, and *Ch'un-ch'iu (Spring and Autumn Annals)*. Their provenance is ambiguous, and their authorship has remained pseudonymous. Ancient Chinese, however, regarded them as the embodiment of the *tao*, the ultimate truth. They believed these scriptures to be composed by former sages, which in turn were redacted and transmitted by Confucius. The educated took them as the norm, searching in them guidelines which would orient their life in both the private and public arenas. As a integral corpus, the *Wu ching* were thus treasured, carefully studied, and highly venerated in ancient China. The reverent feeling toward these *Five Scriptures* reached its apogee in the Han Dynasty when the imperial household began to promote the Confucian school, with which these Scriptures were associated, and excluded other competing schools from public learning. The *Wu ching* hence enjoyed an incontestable status never seen before and tremendously shaped the intellectual and religious outlook in the subsequent generations.

There are two other very important texts, in addition to the recondite *Wu ching*, that commanded wide respect and exerted immeasurable influence in Han China: the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching*. In the bibliographical list of the "I-wen chih" (Treatise on Literature) of the *Han shu (History of Former Han)*, the *Liu i (Six Arts or Six Scriptures*, later *Wu Ching* or *Five Scriptures*[6]*)* are followed by the *Lun-yü Hsiao ching*, and *Hsiao hsüeh*. While the last *Hsiao hsüeh* are a corpus of philological writings that serve as fundamental primers to the profound *Liu i* texts,[7] the fact that the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching* are juxtaposed with the orthodox Scriptures is highly significant. The "I-wen chih" asserts that there should be nine

groups of writings included as far as the *Liu i* are concerned.[8] It thus implies that these two classical texts are part and parcel of the Confucian Scriptures and should be placed on an equal footing with the other major six (or five) texts.

The *Po-hu t'ung*, an ideological thesaurus crystallized at the imperial Po-hu Council (79 CE), devotes a section to the discussion of the "Wu ching" as a scriptural category. This section conclusively states that Confucius fixed the Five Scriptures in order to manifest the *tao* in the chaotic world. In a significant way, it continues its discourse in such a rhetorical question-and-answer form:

> "Since the *Ch'un-ch'iu* had already been composed, why was, in addition, the *Hsiao ching* produced? [That was because Confucius] wished especially [by this book] to establish the correct [norms.].... Why did his disciples note down, in addition, the *Lun-yü*? [That was] to show how the precepts issued by the Master, while encountering difficulties and extraordinary events, became the correct standards."[9]

Han Confucians in this way regarded the *Hsiao ching* and *Lun-yü* as Confucius' intentional compositions and as norms created to reinforce the implementation of the *tao* embedded in the *Wu ching*. They brought these two texts together with the other Confucian Scriptures, suggesting that they be treated with special attention.[10]

In contrast to the *Wu ching* which are either voluminous in length or recondite in meaning, the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching* are textually short and simple. Consisting of terse sayings and anecdotal accounts about Confucius and his disciples, the *Lun-yü* conveys such crucial ethicoreligious insights as *jen* (humanity, humaneness) and *i* (righteousness, rightness) which the Master industriously promulgated in his lifetime. The *Hsiao Ching*, on the other hand, is an aphorism-like text that contains less than two thousand Chinese characters. Composed of sayings about filial piety and cast in a highly programmatic and structured manner, it gives instructions to people of various classes as to what kind of duty they are supposed to observe in order to be recognized as people of filial piety. It was the simple and straightforward features of these two texts, along with Confucius' authorship, that often bound them together in the Han Dynasty. This explains that when K'uang Heng, a learned Confucian official, submitted his memorial to Emperor Ch'eng (r. 33-7 BCE), he made it unequivocal that the *Liu i* were the norm the ancient sages

established to guide human activities. "As to the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching*," he claimed, "they are the summary of the words and deeds of the sage [Confucius;] their meanings should be investigated with due sensitivity."[11]

However, to say that the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching* were highly revered and often juxtaposed with the *Wu ching* does not mean that they were actually *ching* texts, i.e. scripture of the highest category. The bamboo strips used to record these two texts, one-foot two-inches for the *Hsiao ching* and eight-inches for the *Lun-yü*, were always shorter than those of two-foot four-inch length applied to the *Wu ching*;[12] this concrete physical aspect tells of the former's lower scriptural status. In addition, many historical accounts indicate that people of Han China alluded to the *Lun-yü* with a beginning of "*Chuan yüeh*" ("The *Commentary* says.....").[13] They reveal that although a Confucian scripture, this text was still a type of commentary. As to the *Hsiao ching*, because its title contains the word *ching*, it might create the impression that it was a *ching* scripture. Many scholars, however, have pointed out that the *ching* in the title of this text refers to the meanings of "norm" and "universal standard" that should be observed in the society rather than to its own scriptural genre.[14] People of the Han Dynasty might quote this text by its title,[15] they unmistakably regarded it as a *chuan* writing.[16]

The most impressive evidence which shows the common *chuan* status of the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching* is that in the Han Dynasty, no *po-shih* (literally erudites, referring to Academicians appointed by the state) office was permanently assigned to either of these two texts.[17] After Emperor Wu (r. 141-87 BCE) had exclusively promoted Confucian scholarship and selected national *po-shih* for the *Wu ching*, neither the *Lun-yü* nor the *Hsiao ching* received its own *po-shih* appointment. This is an obvious sign that with regard to scriptural status, the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching* were inferior to the *Wu ching* in Han China. Furthermore, in the ongoing debates between the *ku-hsüeh* (old learning) and the *chin-hsüeh* (modern learning) scholars, these two small texts never emerged in the foreground of controversy. One might attribute this fact to their characteristics of simplicity and clarity, but it might be more likely that because of their *chuan* status, they attracted less attention than the majestic *ching* Scriptures.[18]

The *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching*, however, were not ordinary *chuan* scriptures. In the first place, people in the Han Dynasty were convinced that Confucius was the original author of these two texts, although his disciples were the scribes, and their further disciples the final compilers.[19] The recognition of this authorship qualitatively distinguished them from other *chuan* writings. It is important to emphasize again that the *Wu ching* were regarded as *ching* primarily because they were creations of the ancient sages. Confucius, as Lu Chia (ca. 240-170 BCE) expressed on behalf of the Han Confucians, was the *hou-sheng* (later sage) who resumed the responsibility to continue the transmission of the *tao*, a process inaugurated by those *hsien-sheng* (former sages) and passed down by the *chung-sheng* (middle sages).[20] He and those sages before him were thus in the same *tao* tradition. Analogically, since he authored the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching*, these two texts should be treated in relation to and on a par with the *Wu ching*. That was also why they differed from other works created by *chu-tzu* (philosophers) in the pre-Ch'in period and were grouped with the *Liu i* in the Han Dynasty.[21]

Of equal significance is that the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching* generated their respective and diversified commentarial traditions. According to the "I-wen chih," the *Lun-yü* had two different versions in the early Han, the *Ch'i Lun* (*Lun-yü of Ch'i*) and the *Lu Lun* (*Lun-yü of Lu*), each with its own master-transmitters and commentaries.[22] Likewise, there were at least five different commentarial schools stemming from the *Hsiao ching* when the Han Dynasty was newly established, with each school creating its main commentary.[23] The attributes normally associated with the *ching* scriptures were now connected to the *chuan* texts. This feature bespeaks the respectful status of these two scriptures, to which Han Confucians paid their homage in the same way they did to the *Wu ching*.

The scriptural genre of the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching* was indeed ambiguous. There was no consensus as to whether one should assign these texts to the *ching* or to the *chuan* category. Some traditional Chinese scholars designated them as *fu-ching chih chuan* (*chuan* texts attached to the *ching* Scriptures) because they, of *chuan* kind, are annexed to the *Liu i* in the *Han shu*.[24] Others rather called them *ching chih er* (secondary *ching* texts or *ching* of lower kind) also for the same reason.[25] These two terms, however, were derived from consideration of the

bibliographical order set up for these two texts and the *Wu ching* in the "I-wen chih." They tend to give us the impression that the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching* were dependent upon and, as such, less important than the Five Scriptures upheld in the national academy. This impression in fact contradicts the historical reality that the former were two independent texts and that they, in a sense, excelled the latter in functional importance.

III

In Han times, the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching* were far more popular and, functionally speaking, far more influential than the *Wu ching*. Thanks to their characteristics of simplicity and comprehensiveness, they were promulgated and spread to the farthest corner of the Han empire. Those who specialized in any one of the *Wu ching* were also conversant with these two texts as a precondition of their specialization.[26] No educated person could have possibly ignored the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching* if he or she aimed at Confucian scholarship. Even the commoners were instructed to study them from early ages;[27] these two *chuan* scriptures served as the universal intellectual foundation for the people of Han China.[28]

Anyone in the Han Dynasty who aspired to scriptural learning was instructed to read the *Lun-yü* first as a basic, indispensable text. Historical records demonstrate that many Han scholars were particularly conversant with this *chuan* scripture in their early years. Abundant examples show its wide circulation and people's devotion to it. Wei Hsüan-ch'eng (?- 36 BCE), Chancellor of Emperor Yuan (r. 49-33 BCE), was enthusiastic about scriptural learning in his childhood. He was knowledgeable on the *Lun-yü* and *Odes*, and because of this, he was appointed as the Grand Tutor of the heir apparent before he finally became the Chancellor.[29] Fan Sheng, a *po-shih* in the reign of Emperor Kuang-wu (r. 25-57 CE), was an expert in the *Spring and Autumn Annals*. His biography tells that he mastered the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching* when he was only nine years old. Although he was also learned in the *Lao Tzu*, he was a stout defender of Confucian learning, a stance that might have been shaped by his early education in the above two *chuan*

scriptures.[30] In the biography of Ma Hsü, a scholar-general in the time of Emperor Shun (r. 125-144 CE), one reads that, "at seven, he was well-versed in the *Lun-yü*; at thirteen, he was proficient in the *Documents*; at sixteen, he was engaged in the study of the *Odes*."[31] This description of Ma Hsü's programmatic and progressive development indicates the importance of the *Lun-yü* in the formation of Han scholars' educational background. It is in this context that when Hsün Shuang (128-190 CE) demonstrated his impressive knowledge on the *Lun-yü* and *Spring and Autumn Annals* at the age of twelve, the experienced scholar, Tu Ch'iao praised him highly and predicted that he would be a great master; Hsün indeed became what had been expected of him.[32]

The popularity of the *Lun-yü* demanded that many qualified Confucian scholars teach this text. As a result, scholars learned in the *Wu ching* and naturally proficient in the *Lun-yü* as well, assumed this task. The biography of Wang Chi (fl. 85-48 BCE) emphasizes that although he was originally trained in the Five Scriptures, he instructed the *Odes* and *Lun-yü* to whomever came to study with him.[33] The great master Chang Yü (?-5 BCE), whose commentary on the *Lun-yü* had far-reaching influence in subsequent generations, was summoned to lecture on the *Lun- yü* to the heir apparent of Emperor Yüan (r. 49-33 BCE), although he was also a seasoned scholar of the *Changes*.[34] Another imperial tutor Pao Hsien was invited to teach the *Lun-yü*, although he was actually expert in the *Odes*, too.[35]

Along with the demand for more masters to teach the *Lun-yü* came the appearance of more commentaries on this scripture. In addition to a few commentaries listed in the "I-wen chih," many more Han scholars wrote commentaries of their own, most likely out of the need to teach this text to their followers. Unlike the institutionalized *Wu ching* which had long and distinctive commentarial traditions, the *Lun-yü* had its own commentaries produced on an individual and situational basis. The *Han shu* reports that Hsia-hou Sheng, when serving as the imperial Grand Tutor, was ordered by Emperor Hsüan (r. 74-49 BCE) to write the *Lun-yü shuo* (*Exposition of the Lun-yü*), evidently for the sake of the heir apparent's learning.[36] Henceforth learned scholars such as Wang Chi, Hsiao Wang-chih, and Wei Hsüan-ch'eng all created their own exegetical notes on the *Lun-yü* based on different textual versions. This phenomenon of multiplication

occasioned some confusions among the learners as to which one they should adopt. Finally Chang Yü, consulting various opinions, wrote his *Lun-yü chang-chü* (*Detailed Exegesis of the Lun-yü*) and submitted it to Emperor Yüan (r. 49-33 CE). Since his commentary was regarded by the scholar-cominunity as most comprehensive and well-balanced, it was immediately accepted and spread afar.[37] This, however, did not put an end to the generation of new commentaries. The popularity of the *Lun-yü* still compelled many scholars to try their hand at interpreting this scripture. In the Later Han Dynasty, efforts of this kind became more obvious and concentrated. The erudite Ho Hsiu (129-182 CE) wrote a commentary on it.[38] Both Ma Jung (79-166 CE) and his disciple, Cheng Hsüan (127-200 CE), two of the most learned scholars in their generations, also created their respective commentaries.[39]

Functionally speaking, the mastery of the *Lun-yü* was directly connected to one's ascendance to officialdom. In the Han Dynasty, the most popular channel through which one was able to enter government service was the recommendation system. In particular, the selection of people to the office of *hsiao-lien* (Filially Pious and Incorrupt) in the local areas was fundamental to the operation of the bureaucracy of the empire.[40] It is true that knowledge of the *Hsiao ching* and demonstrated filial reverence, as we will see momentarily, were most crucial, but one's learning in the *Lun-yü* was also indispensable. The following three examples gleaned from historical records will be sufficient to prove this point.

In the reign of Emperor Hsüan (r. 74-49 BCE), Wang Chün was recommended to be an official. His biography specifies that he had actually received instructions from his father, the famous Wang Chi, in the *Lun-yü* and other Scriptures. It was this early scriptural knowledge that contributed to his later promotion.[41] Pao Hsien, an imperial tutor, had also mastered the *Lun-yü* and *Odes* before his intellectual competence was recognized and recommended to the post of *hsiao-lien*.[42] Chou Hsieh (fl. 100-150 CE) was conversant with the *Odes* and *Lun-yü* when he was ten years old; some years later he also became an expert in the *Rites* and *Changes*. Thanks to this scriptural knowledge, he was recommended to be a *hsiao-lien*.[43]

The *Lun-yü* was thus fundamental to one's qualification for government office. There are many other cases of recommendations of intellectually talented people to the *hsiao-lien* office that do not specifically mention this *chuan* scripture. We are, however, confident that it should be included because of its status as a common, fundamental text to the deeper scriptural learning. This is why when Hsü Fang, the unyielding advocate of *chang-chü* (literally "chapter and verse," designating hermeneutical methods and activities) learning and *shih-fa* (literally "master-rule," indicating authority of one's teacher's commentary) tradition, suggested to Emperor Ho (r. 88-106 CE) that selection of the Confucian scholars to advanced government offices be based upon the *Wu ching*. As to the *Lun-yü*, he proposed, it should not be included. The reason for this exclusion was that the *Lun-yü* was so universal and fundamental that it should be regarded as the basis of Confucian scholarship; to include it in the examination would have been superfluous and redundant.[44]

Parallel to the *Lun-yü*, the *Hsiao ching* was used as a basic text in the pedagogical agenda of the Han society. Han rulers such as Emperor Chao (r. 87-74 BCE), Emperor Hsüan (r. 74-49 BCE), and Emperor Yüan (r. 49-33 BCE) were well-versed in the *Lun-yü* in their childhood. Because it was customary to learn the *Hsiao ching* along with or even before the *Lun-yü*, to be knowledgeable in the latter always presupposed proficiency in the former.[45] According to the historical records, these emperors indeed mastered the *Hsiao ching*.[46] Furthermore, like the *Lun-yü*, the *Hsiao ching* was promoted and promulgated among the households of the imperial consorts and the meritorious ministers for educating their young clan members. This effort was most conspicuous in the reign of Emperor Ming (r. 57-75 CE).[47]

Because the *Hsiao ching* conveys the message of *hsiao*, deciding whether one has mastered this scripture was based upon whether one was a child of filial piety. In other words, what was emphatically stressed about this scripture was its practical dimension. It is in this sense that the *Hsiao ching* or the practice of *hsiao* was often taken as the criterion by which the Han rulers were evaluated. Emperor Ch'eng (r. 33-7 BCE), for example, in one of his edicts highly praises King Hsiao of Ch'u, his half brother, who was then bedridden. He first quotes a sentence from the "Sheng chih" (The Government of the Sages) of the *Hsiao ching*: "Of all

(creatures with their different) natures produced by Heaven and Earth, human being is the noblest. Of all the actions of a human being there is none greater than filial piety." He then praises King Hsiao of Ch'u for having acted as a man of benevolence and filial reverence; this ethical virtue qualifies him to gain the emperor's sympathy and reward.[48] In a similar manner, when Ma Yen, a high ranking official in the reign of Emperor Kuang-wu (r. 25-57 CE), recommends his cousins as candidates for the heir apparent's consorts. In addition to portraying their fair appearances, he describes them as "filially pious, cautious, and gentle and quiet with good knowledge of propriety."[49] This stress on the virtue of filial piety was applied to the choice of imperial consorts and even to the decision of the successor to the throne. One of the reasons why the Marquis of Ch'ang-an, also the future Emperor An (r. 106-125 CE), could be chosen to succeed Emperor Shang (r. 106-106 CE) was his distinction in this virtue.[50]

What is of more significance are the Han emperors' conscious and systematic attempts to popularize the *Hsiao ching* among the commoners. Their efforts enabled this Confucian scripture to be spread eventually throughout the whole Han empire. Primarily thanks to Wang Mang as mastermind, Emperor Ping (r. 1 BCE-6 CE) in 3 CE inaugurated a grand-scale educational program. He first appointed supervisors for scriptural learning. In the larger political units like marquisates and counties, he assigned a master of the *Wu ching* to each of them; this master would also have been proficient in the *Hsiao ching*. In the minor units such as the districts and villages, he stationed a *hsiao ching shih* (master of the *Hsiao ching*) at every one of them.[51] This unprecedented project tremendously facilitated the on-going promulgation of this Confucian scripture. Because of this project, the demand for qualified *Hsiao ching* masters greatly increased. In 5 CE, Emperor P'ing summoned experienced scholars of the ancient scriptures, including the *Wu ching*, *Lun-yü*, and *Hsiao ching*, to the capital in the name of "broadening the *tao*-and-its art."[52] One of his practical intentions was evidently to recruit more qualified masters of the *Hsiao ching* to execute the aforementioned nation-wide program.

Emperor P'ing's ambition to "broaden the *tao*-and-its-art" might have been temporarily interrupted immediately after the fall of Wang Mang, but the

popularization project of the *Hsiao ching* was not seriously affected. Emperor Kuang-wu (r. 25-57 CE), himself a scholar, consciously promoted scriptural learning, expanding the *po-shih* posts to fourteen. His academic renovation implied encouraging the learning of the *Hsiao ching* as the preparatory work.[53] The next ruler, Emperor Ming (r. 57-75 CE), continued the agenda of scriptural learning and pushed the *Hsiao ching* to the acme of its popularity. The *Hou Han shu* reports that he not only demanded that the imperial relatives and powerful aristocrats study this book but also obliged the palace guards to learn it by heart.[54] His continued effort of promotion created an unprecedented zeal for mastering this scripture. Even the nomadic *Hsiung-nu*, who were considered by Han Chinese as extremely uncultured, admired the *Hsiao ching* and sent their young men to Han China to learn it![55] Positions for those who taught this scripture or the *Hsiao ching shih* were even instituted. Later the responsibilities of these masters, in addition to teaching, even extended to supervising the examination of scriptural learning in general.[56]

IV

The textual transmissions of the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching* in the pre-Ch'in period are not clear to us, but at least from the beginning of the Han Dynasty, they already enjoyed wide respect and popularity. Similar to the major Confucian Scriptures such as the *Spring and Autumn Annals*, *Documents*, and *Odes*, these two *chuan* texts had their respective *ku-wen* (old text) and *chin-wen* (modern text) versions.[57] This means that textual disagreements might have caused scholarly debates. In the on-going controversies over the problem of official recognition of certain commentarial schools, however, these two small texts were never implicated. The reason behind this historical fact could be attributed to their simplicity and clarity; perhaps this was the reason why there was no controversy over their slight textual variations. It could also be due to the fact that no *po-shih* office was established for either of them because of their *chuan* status, making it pointless to argue over setting up commentarial schools for them.

Reasons like those mentioned are still insufficient to account for the lofty scriptural status and continuous popularity of the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching* in the Han Dynasty. They are not able to answer the critical question that among many *chuan* texts, why were these two but not others like the *Mencius* and *Lao Tzu* venerated and popularized? One may answer that it was because of the incontestable, sacred name of Confucius that the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching*, believed to be authentic words of the Master, enjoyed such a privilege. There can be little doubt that this was a major factor. A more convincing answer, however, comes from consideration of the pragmatic policy of the state with which the Han ruling class associated these two texts.

Functionality, we should repeat and underscore, is the key behind the Han government's motivation to promote these two small scriptures. The *Lun-yü* expressly contains the sayings of the Master. To allude to this text definitely increased the credibility and persuasiveness of the user. Because of the fact that these short, concise sayings originated in specific real-life situations and that they were collected and compiled without indicating these contexts, their applications were subject to multiple possibilities. Han emperors and intellectuals alike resorted to the *Lun-yü* very frequently on different occasions, citing it as source of authority to support their arguments. Thus rich and comprehensive contents plus a wide range of possible applications enabled the *Lun-yü* to become a highly convenient reference for many who were proficient in it.

The *Hsiao ching*, on the other hand, also a collection of the Master's words, is even shorter and simpler. The whole text is actually a programmatic blueprint, prescribing the respective duties for people of different classes. Centering upon filial piety, the foundational virtue, it provided an overarching framework within which each person in Han China oriented his behavior properly in the society. The Han rulers thus emphasized and expanded the concept of filial piety and utilized the *Hsiao ching* for religious, political, and social purposes. That is to say, this small text was used fundamentally out of practical considerations; it served as the ideological foundation for the Han empire, as well as the guideline of action for the Han people.

Because of the important functions these two texts practically assumed, both the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching* were consciously promoted by the Han government. They were first employed as elementary textbooks in the pedagogical program thanks to the short, easy, and clear nature of their contents. Consequently, the educated, whether from the ruling lass or the populace, had to master them before they proceeded to learn the *Wu ching*. Aided by the need of the recommendation system by which the government selected the competent candidates to serve in officialdom, these two scriptures were furthermore popularized. We can safely conclude that the personality of the Han people and the ideological foundation of the Han empire were shaped by these two texts to an immeasurable degree.

If the preceding observations are an appropriate description and evaluation of the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching*, scriptures of the *chuan* type, in the Han Dynasty, we then proceed to explore their relationship to the *Wu ching*, scriptures of the most respected *ching* category.

The *Wu ching* were too voluminous and profound as texts, therefore their accessibility was limited only to some learned scholars. The promotion of and emphasis on the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching*, by contrast, provided the general public with easily accessible texts that were also part and parcel of the Confucian Scriptures. People of Han China believed that these two scriptures contained sacred words bequeathed by the "later sage," Confucius; therefore, like the *Wu ching*, they were embodiments of the invariable *tao*. If this were the case, to approach this *tao* by the easy *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching* would be just as valid as by the difficult *Wu ching*. The former were in this sense the simplification of the latter.

It was a common phenomenon for scholars in the Han Dynasty to concentrate upon one Confucian Scripture, such as the *Spring and Autumn Annals* or the *Changes*, in order to grasp the *Wu Ching* as a whole. This might be done out of frustration with textual difficulty, but it was also out of the genuine belief that one particular Scripture could represent all the rest of the *Wu ching*.[58] In this connection, the popularity of the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao Ching* could be explained as following this epistemological outlook. Many Han people intended to employ

either of these two texts to represent the entire corpus of Confucian Scriptures. These two scriptures hence served to summarize as well as to unify the *Wu ching*. To master the former, as people of Han China were convinced, was not merely the precondition of understanding the latter but was itself an independent and self-sufficient act.

The actualization of the *tao* embodied in the Confucian Scriptures had been the most crucial ideal and unceasing pursuit in Confucianism. Applying the sages' teachings to the concrete human world was the ultimate concern for the true followers of Confucian tradition. The realization of those teachings written in the *Wu ching*, however, was an extremely difficult, if not impossible, task. (That was why the sages left the world with their noble agenda unfulfilled and so, recording it in the Scriptures, hoped that the later comers would reassume and actualize it.) The *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching* as foundational texts of the Han empire were utilized by the rulers to deal with practical issues in many aspects. As simplified versions of the *Wu Ching*, they were more practical, functional, and popular than the Wu ching; this pragmatic dimension was what the *Wu ching* inherently aimed at but did not successfully achieve.

Unlike those *chuan* commentaries that derived their scriptural significance from the *ching* texts upon which they commented, the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching* had their own texts and advocated their independent messages. Confucius did not intend to replace the *Wu ching*, the utmost respected literary corpus for ancient Chinese intellectuals, including Confucius himself, with these two *chuan* texts.[59] What he rather wanted, as the *Lun-yü* tells us, was to transmit and expound these *ching* scriptures (7:1). The unintended consequence was that later followers of the Confucian tradition, the Han rulers included, elevated and utilized the Master's words to such an extent that their functional importance surpassed that of the *Wu ching*.

Thus in the Han Dynasty, the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching* were not simply *chuan*, in the sense that they explicated the *Wu ching* and thereby obtained their scriptural value. In actuality, they summarized the *Wu ching*, and as such they were thought to convey the holistic vision embodied in these sacred Scriptures. This feature

qualitatively distinguished these two texts from other *chuan* commentaries, which branched off from rather than reintegrated the *Wu ching*. Now by way of the simple access which the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching* provided, one was able to reach the ultimate *tao* not only theoretically but also practically. These two scriptures became *ching* (norm, principle, constancy) to which the people of Han China resorted faithfully. To study and master them was itself sufficient to realize the ideal bequeathed by the ancient sages. In the context of Han China, the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching* were no longer *fu-ching chih chuan (chuan* texts attached to *ching* scriptures) but themselves scriptures in their own right.

V

Liu Hsieh (c. 466/7-538/9 CE), the first literary critic in Chinese history who systematically theorized about ancient texts, asserted that "the *tao* [had to] rely upon the sages to transmit its writings, whereas the sages [had to] rest upon the writings to manifest the *tao*." [60] Here he perspicaciously brought forth the *tao*, the sages, and the ancient texts into the foreground when dealing with the scriptural phenomena and highlighted their organic relationships. These three, in a word, stood independently, but they claimed their respective significance only through the auxiliary role of the others. This trinary theory summarizes well what we have been discussing about the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching* in the Han Dynasty. A deeper reflection, however, makes it clear that the *tao*, among the three, should occupy the leading position. It is the *tao* that the ancient texts intended to carry, and it is also the *tao* that the sages strove to realize. Whatever this *tao* might be construed and understood, it undoubtedly remained the ultimate concern in the minds of ancient Chinese.

This *tao*, furthermore, was invariable, but it could be transmitted and expressed in various forms. What a scripture appeared to be seemed less important than what it actually was. As long as this scripture was deemed to contain the *tao*, it enjoyed a lofty position. That was why the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching* were treated as effectively as the *Wu ching*. As Confucian scriptures, their

popularization did not diminish their sacrality and authority. Even political involvement from the ruling class did not reduce their scriptural status. Rather, owing to their popularity and practical function, they assumed more important role than the dignified *Wu ching* in Han China.

The exposition above leads us to the understanding that to distinguish scriptures between the primary and the secondary and regard the former more highly than the later is subject to reevaluation. Our case study shows that the *chuan* texts, traditionally treated as commentaries or simpler texts and hence secondary, may exceed the *ching* texts, commonly understood as original scriptures and hence primary, in popularity and importance. The classification of scriptures into different groups might be a convenient device by which one can better approach the complex scriptural corpora. Without looking into specific scriptural features manifested in a particular religion or cultural context, however, one easily fails to do justice to the role or function a scripture actually assumes.[61]

Related to this prejudice toward scriptural grouping is the common assumption of the concept of the sacred versus the secular. This, too, requires our rethinking. As we saw, the popularization of the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching* moved along the trajectory from the recondite *ching* genre to the more accessible *chuan* texts. Sociologically it proceeded from the elite to the less educated commoners. The tendency of reaching out to more people and taking deeper root in the society, however, did not discredit the sacred status of the Confucian scriptures as a whole. On the contrary, one rather sees the extension of the sacred texts into the wider sectors of the society. As the popularity of these two small *chuan* scriptures grew, the reverent feelings toward the *tao*, Confucius, and his writings increased accordingly. Popularization of scriptures thus does not necessarily entail secularization. It may rather see the effect of sacralizing the secular. The sacred and the secular, at least in the Chinese case, do not appear contradictory but form a continuum that well covers the entire society.[62]

The popularization of the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching* also has deep implications in our modern context. If the *tao* was the ultimate concern which the scriptures were thought to embody and if diverse and simpler forms could be adopted for

carrying this *tao*, there exist many possible literary expressions which one can use for scriptural education. Particularly in a world like ours that is characterized by instantaneousness and speediness, further simplification of scriptures for educational purposes seems necessary and inevitable. It is legitimate, of course, to ask to what extent can or should this scriptural simplification be allowed so that the major scriptural features such as sacrality, authority, and power would not be sacrificed. Answers will undoubtedly vary or even cause ceaseless controversies, yet in our modern, "de-scripturalized" world, this is a challenge that we cannot and should not avoid if we still take our religious or cultural heritage seriously.[63]

Notes

1. A group of scholars of religious studies have recently proposed to reevaluate the rich meanings of "scripture" as a generic concept as well as a comparative category. Their reinterpretation of this important religious theme or "human activity" deserves our serious attention. See Wilfred C. Smith, "The True Meaning of Scripture: An Empirical Historian's Nonreductionist Interpretation of the Qur'an," *International Journal of Middle East Studies II* (1980), pp. 487-505; *What Is Scripture? A Comparative Approach* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993); Miriam Levering, ed., *Rethinking Scripture: Essays from Comparative Perspective* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1989); Frederick M. Denny and Rodney Taylor, eds., *The Holy Book in Comparative Perspective* (Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1985). I basically subscribe to their proposal and, as the reader can detect from the following pages, join their conversations from the Confucian approach.

2. Hugh Kerner, "The Making of the Modernist Canon," in *Canons*, ed. Robert von Hallberg (Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1984), p. 373.

3. William A. Graham, "Scripture" in *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, ed. Mricea Eliade (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1987), vol. 13, p. 134; *Beyond the Written Word: Oral Aspects of Scripture in the History of Religion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 3-4.

4. The translation of a scripture from its original language to another or many other

foreign languages is also a form of scriptural popularization, as one can witness in the histories of Buddhist and Christian missionary activities. This phenomenon of scriptural translation also serves as a good example by which we may engage in a comparative study of the original scripture and its translated work(s) with respect to sacrality, power, authority, and function.

5. William A. Graham, *Beyond the Written Word*, pp. 3-4, chs. 6-9.

6. The most popular term for the *Wu ching* before the Han Dynasty and in the early part of the Former Han as well was *Liu i*, which included, in addition to the five named ancient texts, the *yüeh* (*Music*). This term appeared towards the end of the Warring States Period (403 - 222 BCE) and grew into popularity in the early Han time; see Lu Chia (ca. 240-170 BCE), *Hsin yü*, in *Chung-kuo ssu-hsiang ming-chu*, Yang Chia-luo, ed. 12 vols. (Taipei: Shih-chieh shu-chü, 1959), "Tao chi," p. 2. The *yüeh* text, however, got lost during the process of its transmission before the Han time. Although only five kinds of scriptural texts existed, the general appellation, *Liu i*, was still customarily retained.

7. This corpus collects various lexicons such as *Hsün-ts'uan* and *Ts'ang-chieh* which deal with the six writing styles in ancient China. Since the Confucian Scriptures have the "Old Text" and "New Text" versions, besides containing many abstruse, archaic words, these lexicons are indispensable tools for Han scholars. It was a usual practice for children of Han China to learn these philological writings in their early school days; see Wang Hsien-ch'ien, *Han shu pu-chu* (*Complementary Annotations on the History of Former Han*) (Taipei: I-wen yin-shu-kuan, 1956; rpt. of Hsü-shou-t'ang edition, 1900), 30, pp. 22b-26b (hereafter abbreviated as *HSPC*); Pan Ku, *Han shu* (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1962), 30, pp. 1719-1721 (hereafter abbreviated as *HS*).

8. *HSPC*, 30, pp. 27 a-b, *HS*, 30, p. 1723.

9. Chen Li, *Po-hu t'ung shu cheng*, in *Chung-kuo tzu-hsüeh ming-chu* chi-ch'eng, ed. Hsiao T'ien-chih, vol. 086 (Taipei: Chung-kuo tzu-hsüeh ming-chu chi-ch'eng pien-yin chi-chin-hui, 1980), 9 ("Wu ching"), pp. 26b-27a; I use Tjoe Som Tjan's translation with some stylistic modifications; see his *Po Hu T'ung: The Comprehensive Discussions in the White Tiger Hall*, 2 vols. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1949-52), vol. 2, p. 607.

10. The juxtaposition of the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao Ching* with the *Wu Ching* was henceforth followed by subsequent Confucian scholars. For example, the "Ching-chi chih" (Treatise on Scriptures) of the *Sui shu* (*History of the Sui Dynasty*) produced in the seventh century, the most comprehensive piece of literature dealing with classical texts after the "I-wen chih," adopts the "nine-scriptural scheme" set up in the *Han shu*, besides including one more category of *wei shu* (apocryphal texts); see Wei Cheng, *Sui shu* (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1973), 32, pp. 903-951. The *Ching-tien shih-wen* by Lu Te-ming (556-627 CE), an influential work of philological exegesis of the classical texts, also lists the *Hsiao Ching* and *Lun-yü* immediately after the *Wu Ching*, a clear sign that they are together treated as belonging to the same Confucian literary body; see "Hsü lu" of this book (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1983), pp. 6a-7b.

11. *HSPC*, 81, p. 8b; *HS*, 81, p. 3343.

12. Wang Hsien-ch'ien, *Hou-Han shu chi-chieh* (*Collected Annotations on the History of Later Han*) (Taipei: I-wen yin-shu-kuan, 1956; rpt. of 1915 ed., Changsha), 35, p. 8b (hereafter abbreviated as *HHSCC*). Fan Yeh, *Hou Han shu* (*History of Later Han*) (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1965), 35, p. 1203 (hereafter abbreviated as *HHS*). Huang Hui, *Lun-heng chiao-shih* (Taipei: Shang-wu yin-shu-kuan, 1983; rpt. of Shang-wu edition, Changsha, 1938), 28 ("Cheng shuo"), pp. 1131-32; 12 ("Hsien tuan"), p. 560 (hereafter abbreviated as *LHCS*). For a description of the written communications in the Han time, one may refer to Michael Loewe, *Records of han Administration*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), vol. 1, pp. 25-47.

13. For instance, Liu Hsin in his accusatory letter to the national Academicians quotes the *Lun-yü* (19:22) by saying, "The *Chuan* says ...;" *HSPC*, 36, pp. 34b-35a; *HS*, 36, p. 1971. Empress dowager Teng, consort of Emperor Ho (r. 88-106 CE), in her remarks about her intention to have the youngsters of imperial family instructed in Confucian Scriptures, also refers to the *Lun-yü* (17:22) by using "The *Chuan* says..." formula; *HHSCC*, 10A, p. 2la; *HHS*, 10A, p. 428.

14. Such Ch'ing scholars as Juan Yüan and Liu Kuang-fen are good examples; see Chen Tieh-fan, *Hsiao-ching hsüeh yüan-liu k'ao* (Taipei: Kuo-li pien-i kuan, 1986), pp.

25-26; also Hiraoka Takeo, *Keisho no seiritsu*, (Tokyo: Sobunsha, 1983), pp. 21-23.

15. In most cases, when they alluded to this book, they simply said "*Hsiao ching yüeh*" ("The *Hsiao ching* says"). But on some rare occasions, they also used "*Chuan yüeh*" ("The *Chuan* says"). For example, in his edict to his Chancellor Chai Feng-chin, Emperor Cheng (r. 33-7 BCE) quotes a passage from the chapter "Chu-hou" (Vassal) by saying "*Chuan yüeh*;" *HSPC*, 84, p. 9b; *HS*, 84, p. 3423.

16. The eminent scholar Liang Ch'i-ch'ao (1873-1929) has a short but incisive argument about this point; see his *Ku-shu chen-wei chi-ch'i nien-tai*, ed. Chou Chuan-ju et al (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü), 1962.

17. Chao Ch'i (ca. 110-201 CE) in his *Meng Tzu chu-shu* reports that Emperor Wen (r. 180-157 BCE) once established the *po-shih* posts for the *Lun-yü*, *Hsiao ching*, *Mencius*, and *Er Ya*, all texts of the *chuan* type. No other historical documentations can verify this piece of information. But if his report is credible, these official positions might have existed only ephemerally. See his book, in *Shih-san-ching chu-shu*, ed. Juan Yüan, 8 vols. (Taipei: I-wen yin-shu-kuan, 1985; rpt. of Nan-ch'ang fu-hsüeh edition, 1815), p. 8a.

18. This however, does not mean that these two *chuan* texts were not mentioned in the scholarly debates. The "I-wen chih" actually lists a *Lun-yü i-tsou (Discussions and Proposals about the Lun-yü)*, a product of the Shih-ch'ü Council in 51 BCE; *HSPC* 30, p. 20a; *HS*, 30, p. 1716.

19. P'i Hsi-jui, *Ching-hsüeh li-shih*, annotated by Chou Yü-t'ung (Taipei: I-wen yin-shu-kuan, 1974), pp. 27, 58-59.

20. Wang Li-ch'i, *Hsin yü chiao-chu* (Taipei: Ming-wen shu-chü, 1987), A ("Tao chi"), p. 18. Similarly, K'uang Heng's remark that the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching* summarize Confucius the sage's words and deeds and should be treated with respect is also another good evidence to support my point.

21. See Ch'ien Mu, "K'ung Tzu yü Ch'un-ch'iu," and "Liang Han po-shih chia-fa k'ao," all in his *Liang Han ching-hsüeh chin-ku-wen p'ing-i* (Taipei: Tung-ta t'u-shu, 1971), pp. 182, 249; Liu Shih-p'ei, *Kuo-hsüeh fa-wei*, in *Liu Shen-shu hsien-sheng i-shu, ed.*

Cheng Yü-fu (Ningwu: Nan-shih, 1934-36), vol. 13, pp. 3a-b.

22. *HSPC*, 30, pp. 19b-21a; *HS*, 30, pp. 1716-17.

23. *HSPC* , 30, pp. 21a-22b; *HS*, 30, pp. 1718-19.

24. Chang Hsüeh-ch'eng (1738-1801) is a typical advocate of this view; see *Wen-shih t'ung-i chiao-chu*, 2 vols., (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1985), p. 94.

25. Kung Tzu-chen (1792-1841), for example, agrees to this opinion; see *Kung Tzu-chen chüan-chi*, 2 vols., collated by Wang P'ei-cheng (Shanghai: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1959), p. 37.

26. According to Li Hsien the commentator of the *Hou Han shu*, the *Han kuan-i*, a book describing Han government offices and attributed to Ying Shao (fl. 165-ca. 204 CE), stipulates that the Superintendent of Ceremonial was responsible for selecting from among the *po-shih* a dean to lead the imperial academy. The qualifications of this dean, among others, included comprehensive knowledge of the *Changes, Documents,. Lun-yü,* and *Hsiao ching; HHSCC*, 33, pp. 5b-6a; *HHS*, 33, p. 1145. The same requirements seemed to have been applied to all the *po-shih* in the end of the Han Dynasty; see Tu Yü (734-812 CE), *T'ung Tien*, 13 ("Hsüan-chü"), pp. 13a-b (Shanghai: Ch'ien-ch'in t'ung shu-chü, rpt. of Che-chiang shu-chü, 1896 edition).

27. *The Ssu-min yüeh-ling* (*Monthly Instructions for the Populace*) by Ts'ui Shih (fl. 141-170 CE), a collection of records about the monthly activities of the ordinary Han people, lists a curriculum schedule for scriptural learning. It reads that children (at the age of nine to fourteen) were supposed to enter the elementary school to learn basic characters or words in the first month; while in the eleventh month, they should study the *Lun-yü* and *Hsiao ching*. Only the young adults (fifteen to twenty years of age) were taught the *Wu ching* at the high school. It is thus evident that the *Lun-yü* and the *Hsiao ching* as fundamental core courses were extremely popular in the Han Dynasty; see this book edited and annotated by T'ang Hung-hsüeh, in *Sui-shih hsi-su tzu-liao hui-pien*, 29 vols. (Taipei: I-wen yin-shu kuan, 1970, rpt. of I-lan-t'ang ts'ung-shu edition, Chengtu, 1922), vol. 1, pp. 2a, 14a, 15a.

28. For an insightful discussion of this subject see Wang Kuo-wei, "Han Wei po-shih

k'ao," pp. 156-164; Chien Ch'ao-liang, *Lun-yü chi-chu pu-cheng shu-shu*, in *Chung-kuo hsüeh-shu ming-chü*, ed. Yang Chia-luo, 14th annotation, no. 3, vol. 2 (Taipei: Shih-chieh shu-chü, 1961, rpt. of tu-shu t'ang ed.), p. 36b; also Hsü Fu-kuan, *Chung-kuo ching-hsüeh-shih te chi-ch'u* (Taipei: hsüeh-sheng shu-chü, 1982), p. 188.

29. Ssu-ma Ch'ien, *Shih chi (History of the Grand Historian)* (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1982), 96, p. 2688; *HSPC*, 73, pp. 5a, 8a; *HS*, pp. 2108, 2113.

30. *HHSCC*, 36, pp. 6b-9a; *HHS*, 36, pp. 1226-27.

31. *HHSCC*, 24, p. 23b; *HHS*, 24, p. 862.

32. *HHSCC*, 62, pp. la-8a; *HHS*, 62, pp. 2050-58.

33. *HSPC*, 72, p. 8a; *HS*, 72, p. 3066.

34. *HSPC*, 81, pp. 11a-b; *HS*, 81, pp. 3347-48.

35. *HHSCC*, 79B, p. 2a; *HHS*, 79B, p. 2570.

36. *HSPC*, 75, pp. 4b-5a; *HS*, 75, P. 3159.

37. *HSPC*, 81, p. 14a; *HS*, 81, p. 3352.

38. *HHSCC*, 79B, p. 12a; *HHS*, 79B, pp. 2582-83.

39. *HHSCC*, 60A, p. 14a; 35, p. 14b; *HHS*, 60A, p. 1972; 35, p. 1212.

40. Huang Liu-chu, *Ch'in Han shih-chin chih-tu,* (Hsian: Hsi-pel ta-hsüeh ch'u-pan-she, 1985), pp. 148-151.

41. *HSPC*, 72, p. 8a; *HS*, 72, p. 3066.

42. *HHSCC*, 79B, p. 2a; *HHS*, 79B, p. 2570.

43. *HHSCC*, 53, p. 3a; *HHS*, 53, p. 1742.

44. *HHSCC*, 44, p. 5b; *HHS*, 44, pp. 1501-02.

45. Wang Kuo-wei, *Han Wei po-shih k'ao,* pp. 160-162.

46. *HSPC*, 71, p. 4b; 8, p. 3a; 71, p. 4a; 78, p. 8b; *HS*, 7, p. 223; 8, p. 23 8; 71, p. 3039; 78, p. 3282.

47. *HHSCC*, 79A, pp. 1b-2a; *HHS*, p. 2546.

48. *HSPC*, 80, pp. 5a-b; *HS*, 80, p. 3319. For the translation, I use Legge's with my modification; see his *The Hsiao King*, in *The Sacred Books of the East*, ed. F. Max Müller (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1879), p. 476.

49. *HHSCC*, 10A, pp. 7b-8a; *HHS*, 10A, p. 408.

50. *HHSCC*, 5, p. 1b; *HHS*, 5, p. 203.

51. *HSPC*, 12, pp. 6b-7a; *HS*, 12, p. 355.

52. *HSPC*, 12, p. 9b; *HS*, 12, p. 359.

53. *HHSCC*, 69A, pp. la-b; *HHS*, 69A, p. 2545.

54. *HHSCC*, 69A, p. 2a; *HHS*, 69A, p. 2546.

55. *Ibid.* This remarkable enthusiasm for the Confucian Scriptures in general and the *Hsiao ching* in particular in Emperor Ming's time had great impact on subsequent Han scholars. For example, when the zeal for Confucian scholarship declined in the reign of Emperor Ho (r. 88-106 CE), Fan Chun, a Gentleman of the Secretariat, in his memorial to the emperor recounts this particular, past glory in order to revitalize the old interest; see *HHSCC*, 32, pp. 5b-7b; *HHS*, pp. 1125-27; Martin J. Powers aptly calls the reign of Emperor Ming, particularly because of the emperor's stress on the *Hsiao ching*, a period of "classical revival;" see his *Art and Political Expression in Early China* (New Haven and London; Yale University Press, 1991), pp. 160-161.

56. *HHSCC*, "Chih," 27, p. 9a ; *HHS*, "Chih," 27, p. 3614.

57. *HSPC*, 30, pp. 7a, 19b-22b; *HS*, 30, pp. 1706, 1716-19.

58. Many Han Confucians explicitly expressed this conviction in their writings. For instances, Han Ying, a *po-shih* in the reign of Emperor Wen (r. 180-157 BCE), affirmed that the "kuan chü" chapter of the *Odes* was " [the point] to which myriads of things were tied and upon which all the living depended for their lives;" *Han-shih wai-chuan*, annotated by Chou Yen-tsai (Shanghai: Shang-wu yin-shu-kuan, 1917), 5, p. la. Tung Chung-shu (c. 179-c. 104 BCE), a *po-shih* of Emperor Ching (r. 157-141 BCE) and the foremost scholar in Han China, singled out the *Ch'un-ch'iu* as the root

of the "grand rightness" by which every human affair should be judged; Su Yü, *Ch'un-ch'iu fan-lu i-cheng* (Peking: publisher unknown, 1910), 5 ("Cheng kuan"), pp. 7b-9a. Ssu-ma Ch'ien the grand historian subscribed to Tung's opinion and asserted that "the foundation of existence of myriads of things lay in the *Ch'un-ch'iu*;" *SC*, 130, p. 3297. Pan Ku, author of the *Han shu*, however, in his "I-wen chih" made the *Changes* precede the other Four Scriptures and conclusively remarked that the former was the later's source; *HSPC*, 30, p. 26b; *HS*, 30, p. 1723. The *Li chi* (*Commentary on the Rites*), a collection of expository writings on rituals and proprieties by anonymous pre-Han and Han scholars, rather regarded the *Rites* as the testament of the most important Confucian teachings in which all other sacred texts should converge; *Li chi chu-shu*, in *Shih-san-ching chu-shu*, ed. Juan Yüan (Taipei: I-wen yin-shu-kuan, 1985), 50 ("Ching chieh"), pp. la-6a.

59. Liu Shih-p'ei (1884-1919) makes an interesting distinction between these two literary corpora that deserve our attention. He calls the *Liu i* or *Wu ching* "ju-chih-yeh" (occupation of the scholars), meaning that they are texts requiring all the scholars or intellectuals to read and practice. And for the *Lun-yü* and the *Hsiao ching*, he names them "shih-chih-yeh" (occupation of the Master), indicating that they are the Master's notes which explicate the recondite *Wu ching*; see his *Kuo-hsüeh fa-wei*, p. 3a.

60. Liu Hsieh, *Wen-hisn tiao-lung*, 1 (*"Yüan Tao"*).

61. Besides the case we are now investigating, another parallel example that can substantiate our present observation happened in the Sung Dynasty (960-1279 CE). Primarily owing to the effort of Chu Hsi, (1 130-1200), the *Ssu shu* (Four Books), i.e. the *Lun-yü*, *Mencius*, *Great Learning*, and *Doctrine of the Mean*, formerly considered to be *chuan* texts or merely some chapters of a ching scripture, were elevated to the canonical status. They eventually replaced the *Wu ching* and became the standard texts by which all candidates for government offices had to learn by heart. For a detailed introduction to this intellectual and scriptural history, see Daniel K. Gardner, "Principle and Pedagogy: Chu Hsi and the Four Books," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 44:1 (June 1984), pp. 57-8 1; *Chu Hsi and the Ta-hsüeh.: Neo-Confucian Reflection on the Confucian Canon* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986).

62. That the western scholarly tradition tends to use "scripture" to refer to the Christian Bible and "classic" to designate the Graeco-Roman literary collection may not be applicable in the Chinese case. As the Chinese do not hold the binary concept of the sacred versus the secular, this distinction between classics and scripture fails to reflect the true nature of Confucian ancient texts. Wilfred C. Smith's observation that "the Confucian Classics have for many Chinese at many periods been received scripturally" confirms my argument and deserves our attention; see his *What Is Scripture?*, p. 179. See also William E. Paden, *Religious Worlds: The Comparative Study of religion* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1988), p. 82.

63. There are two modern examples which suitably tell of the ongoing of scriptural simplification. One is that some religious communities have adapted Confucian scriptures for their particular religious purposes. The *I-kuan tao* sect (The Way of Pervading Unity), for instance, has done its commentary on the *Great Learning* and *Doctrine of the Mean* and turned the two *chuan* texts into an easier and more readable form for their followers. Leaving aside the question of whether its exegetical operation is divinely inspired, as this religious group has positively claimed, one clearly finds that its work is a further simplification of part of the *Ssu shu*; see *Hsüeh Yung ch'ien-yen hsin-chu*, annotated by Lü Tsu (Taipei: Cheng-i shan-shu ch'u-pan-she, n. d.). The other example is the cartoonist Chih-chung Tsai who popularized the *Chuang Tzu* by making it into a comic. Its effect is yet to be evaluated, but the fact that such a dignified institute as Princetion University was willing to publish this comic book bespeaks the gradual recognition, on the part of traditional scholars, of the necessity of scriptural popularization; see Chih-chung Tsai, *Zhuangzi Speaks: the Music of Nature*, tr. Brian Bruya (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992).

經典及其普及化：以漢代的論語與孝經為例

蔡 彥 仁*

摘 要

論語與孝經在漢代佔有極其重要的地位，其與五經的關係更是密不可分，是研究儒家經典現象所不能忽略者。本文指出，論語與孝經文簡意賅，漢人又認爲孔子即其作者，故地位崇高，學之者眾。漢之統治者以此兩本小經建立其帝國之意識形態，並以此作爲達成其他宗教、政治社會目的之重要工具，故積極推廣，教民學習，不餘遺力。比之於五經，此二經雖如附經之傳，但是因爲漢人以其存道，直通五經，以傳御經，學習簡易，事半功倍。本文在此認知下，以宗教詮釋學之觀點強調，論語與孝經的普及與影響力，較之五經可謂有過之而無不及，其神聖性與權威性也未因普及而降低或淡化。因此如從功能論的角度考量，此兩小經的重要性當超過五經，而此普及化、由簡御繁以達道的趨勢與做法，正是儒家經典傳統的重要特徵之一。

關鍵詞：論語、孝經、五經、儒家、詮釋學

*國立政治大學歷史系副教授