

On the Dates when the *Li-chi* and the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* were Edited

By

Sokichi TSUDA

The view usually taken by scholars is that the *Li-chi* 禮記 of 49 volumes was edited by TAI SHĒNG 戴聖 (Hsiao Tai or Tai, the Junior), a Chinese scholar of the era of Hsüan-ti (73-49 B.C.) of the Former Han Period; and the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* 大戴禮記 by TAI TÊ 戴德 (Ta Tai or Tai, the Senior) of the same era. This view seems to admit of criticism, and it is the object of the present treatise to controvert its authenticity.

The above view was adopted apparently by most scholars of the Sui and T'ang Periods (589-906 A.D.), as can be seen from the reference in the *Ching-chi-chih* 經籍志 (Bibliographical Chapter) of the *Sui-shu* 隋書 to the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* as being edited by TAI TÊ and the *Li-chi* as being edited by TAI SHĒNG; from the reference by the *Ching-chi-chih* of the *Chiu T'ang-shu* 舊唐書 to the former as being edited by TAI TÊ and to the latter which it believes was edited by TAI SHĒNG as the *Hsiao-Tai Li-chi* 小戴禮記; and from the reference by the *I-wên-chih* 藝文志 of the *Hsin T'ang-shu* 新唐書 to the two books respectively as the *Ta-Tai-Tê Li-chi* and the *Hsiao-Tai-Shêng Li-chi*. The practice of referring to the two books in the above manner did not originate in the Sui or T'ang Period, but we find in the general introduction to the *Ching-tien shih-wên* 經典釋文 of LIU TÊ-MING 陸德明 that already in the preface to the *Chou-li-lun* 周禮論 by CHĒN SHAO 陳邵, mention was made of the name of the *Hsiao-Tai Li* in the sense of the *Hsiao-Tai Li-chi*. If we trace it further back, we find that the view already existed in the latter part of the Later Han Period, as the *Li-chi-chêng-i* 禮記正義 quoting the *Liu-i-lun* 六藝論 of CHENG HSÜAN 鄭玄 says: "TAI TÊ edited and gave to the world the eighty-five volumes of *Chi*, which are known as the

Ta-Tai Li-chi, while TAI SHÊNG edited and gave to the world the forty-nine volumes of *Li*¹⁾ which form the present *Li-chi* referred to here." Reference may be made also to the *Hou-Han-shu* 後漢書, the *Ju-lin-chuan* 儒林傳 (or the Biographies of Confucian Scholars), section of Tung Chün 董均, which remarks, CHÊNG HSÜAN 鄭玄 "annotated the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes which had been edited and transmitted by HSIAO TAI." It might be questioned in this connection why the *Liu-i-lun* refers to the volumes edited by TAI SHÊNG merely as the '*Li-chi*' instead of the '*Hsiao-Tai Li-chi*,' while it calls those volumes edited by TAI TÊ the '*Ta-Tai Li*' (which properly ought to be called the '*Ta-Tai Li-chi*'). However, it is evident from these remarks that in the days of CHÊNG HSÜAN the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes used to be referred to as 'being edited by HSIAO TAI.' The question is, was this view inherited from the preceding period? For no mention is made of the two books in the *Han-shu* 漢書, the *I-wên-chih*, nor in the section of the two TAI in the *Ju-lin-chuan*. The section regarding the *Li* in the *I-wên-chih* mentions the one hundred and thirty-one volumes of *Chi*, but there is not found any reference to the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* in eighty-five volumes, nor to the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes. The *I-wên-chih* does not suggest, also, any relation existing between the one hundred and thirty-one volumes of *Chi* and the two TAI. As to the two TAI, in a note in the *Ching* 經 (or the text of *I-li* 儀禮) in seventeen volumes, is mentioned the name of Tai-shih 戴氏 along with that of Hou-shih 后氏; and also in another passage in it is written "When it came to the Han Period, KAO-t'ANG SHÊNG 高堂生 gave to the world the *Shih-li* 士禮 (or the *I-li*) in seventeen volumes. In the era of Emperor Hsiao Hsüan 孝宣, among his disciples Hou Ts'ang 后倉 was the most erudite, TAI TÊ, TAI SHÊNG, and Ch'ing P'u 慶普 being all disciples of Hou Ts'ang." It is added that the two TAI, after having studied under Hou Ts'ang, established each a school of his own, but nothing more is told about them. The *Ju-lin-chuan*, speaking of the same schools of learning, says: "Thus with regard to *li* there arose three schools, of *Ta-Tai*, *Hsiao-Tai*, and *Ch'ing-shih*." The *li* mentioned here clearly refers to the *Shih-li* or the *I-li* in seventeen volumes,

1) The present writer is inclined to believe that '*Li*' is a misnomer of '*Chi*'.

judging from the remark in the *I-wên-chih* as well as from the situation of the day that the studies of Confucianism had been classified according to the principles of *Ching* 經 or the texts of the Six Classics. The remark in the *Ju-lin-chuan* of the *Hou-Han-shu*: "Tai Tê founded the *Ta-Tai-li* school, Tai Shêng the *Hsiao-Tai-li* school and C'hing P'ü the *Ch'ing-shih-li* school," no doubt corresponds to the remark in the *Han-shu*: "Regarding the studies of *li* there are the schools of Ta-Tai, Hsiao-Tai, and Ch'ing-shih." These statements refer to the situation of the Former Han Period, and it is remarkable that in them there is not found any such view as in the *Liu-i-lun*. In the Later Han Period also clearly there existed, according to the *Hou-Han-shu*, *Ju-lin-chuan*, the two schools of study of the two TAI regarding the *I-li*. The Biography of Tung Chün 董均 above referred to, speaking of CHÊNG HSÜAN, says that "CHÊNG HSÜAN first studied the *Hsiao-Tai-li*," meaning thereby the text of the *I-li* that was adopted by the Hsiao Tai school. To sum up, the two TAI were known from the Former Han Period as the scholars versed in the *I-li*, and those who followed them in their respective teachings continued to exist down to the Later Han Period, their respective teachings and texts having been called by the names of *Ta-Tai Li* and *Hsiao-Tai Li*. The contributions of the two TAI to the studies of *li* consisted, therefore, in their having inherited the Text of *I-li* from preceding scholars and left them behind together with their own interpretations added, thereby establishing their own respective school. However, the *Ta-Tai Li* referred to by the *Liu-i-lun* does not correspond to the *Ta-Tai Li* above mentioned, but is a general appellation for the eighty-five volumes of *Chi* or miscellany of *Li*. The exact appellation of those volumes therefore should be *Ta-Tai Li-chi* instead of *Ta-Tai Li*, in contrast to the *Li-chi* or the so-called *Hsiao-Tai Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes which is believed to have been left behind by HSIAO TAI, although apparently it used to be called in those days also by the simpler name of *Ta-Tai Li*. If such is the case, we find that in the days of CHÊNG HSÜAN (127-200, A.D.) the name *Ta-Tai Li* used to have two entirely different meanings, for the teachings of the two TAI and their texts of the *I-li* are entirely different things from the two *Li-chi*

which are believed by many to have been inherited from the two TAI. It is difficult to believe that the above view expounded in the *Liu-i-lun* had already existed in, and was transmitted, from the Former Han Period, seeing no mention was made of the *Li-chi* of the two TAI in the *I-wên-chih* or in the *Ju-lin-chuan*, while the existence of the schools of the two TAI and their texts of the *I-li* in the same period could be clearly established. If it is a fair inference that the reason why the *Liu-i-lun* does not refer to the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes as the *Hsiao-Tai Li* was probably because the name of *Hsiao-Tai Li-chi* had not yet come into existence, and hence its abridged form of *Hsiao-Tai Li* had not yet made its appearance, then it is reasonable to infer that the name of *Ta-Tai Li-chi* or its abridged form *Ta-Tai Li* could hardly have existed in the Former Han Period.

It is clear that in the days of CHÊNG HSÜAN, the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes, was in existence under the name of *Li-chi*, if we take into account the remark of the *Liu-i-lun* and the fact that the book annotated by CHÊNG HSÜAN is still existent under the title of *Li-chi*, and that according to the *Hou-Han-shu*, *Lu-Chih-chuan* 盧植傳, LU CHIH, of the same school as CHÊNG HSÜAN, also wrote notes on the *Li-chi*, which from the accounts in the *Ching-chi-chih* of the *Sui-shu* and the *T'ang-shu*, can be established to have been composed of forty-nine volumes. The *Ta-Tai Li-chi*, though it has an additional name of Ta Tai, was also called by the title of *Li-chi*, in spite of its being an entirely different edition from the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes. The existence of a book by the title of *Li-chi* in the latter part of the Former Han Period is testified to by the appearance of the name in the chapters of *Chiao-ssü-chih* 郊祀志, *Mei-Fu-chuan* 梅福傳, and *Wei-Hsüan-chêng-chuan* 韋玄成傳, and *Wang-Mang-chuan* 王莽傳 of the *Han-shu*. The book was, it can then be inferred, apparently a collection of many independent smaller books, and the title of *Li-chi* was, so to speak, a general title for the series of books thus edited; for the *Chiao-ssü-chih* and the *Wei-Hsüan-chêng-chuan* mention the name of the *Li-chi Ssü-tien* 禮記祀典 and the *Wei-Hsüan-chêng-chuan* the *Li-chi Wang-chih* 禮記王制; and the *Wang-Mang-chuan* speaks of the *Li Ming-t'ang-chi*

禮明堂記,¹⁾ thus giving the name of an individual book or volume in the *Li-chi*. The *Chiao-ssü-chih* and the *Mei-Fu-chuan* sometimes mention simply the title *Li-chi*, without giving the name of the volumes from which the quotations are derived,—a fact to be explained by the situation that the title of the *Li-chi* was a general appellation for the whole series of books on *Li*. It can also be inferred from it that the *Li-chi* was not a vague appellation for those kinds of books of *Li*, but one for a series of books with definite contents. Again, if the *Li-chi* existed in the Former Han Period, the *Li-chi* often referred to in the *Po-hu-t'ung* 白虎通, which was written in the early part of the Later Han Period, must be the same book. In its references to the *Li-chi*, the *Po-hu-t'ung* sometimes gives merely the general title of *Li-chi*, and sometimes in addition to the general title, gives the names of the volumes from which the references were derived, such as the *Li-chi Shih-fa* 禮記諡法, the *Li-chi Chi-i* 禮記祭義, the *Li-chi San-chêng* 禮記三正 (or the *Li San-chêng-chi* 禮三正記), the *Li Chung-yung-chi* 禮中庸記, the *Li Pieh-ming-chi* 禮別名記, the *Li Pao-fu-chi* 禮保傳記, the *Li Wu-ti-chi* 禮五帝記, the *Li Wang-tu-chi* 禮王度記, the *Li Ch'in-shu-chi* 禮親屬記, the *Li Tsêng-tzū-chi* 禮曾子記, the *Li Pên-sang-chi* 禮奔喪記, etc. The *Li Pieh-ming-chi* and the *Li Pao-fu-chi* are alternative names respectively of the *Li-chi Pieh-ming* and the *Li-chi Pao-fu*, in the same manner the *Li-chi San-chêng* is sometimes called *Li San-chêng-chi*. There are also found other shorter forms, such as the *Li Pao-fu*, the *Li Chi-i*, and the *Li Chung-yung*, being equivalents respectively for the *Li Pao-fu-chi*, the *Li-chi Chi-i*, and the *Li Chung-yung-chi*, whence it can be deduced, we believe, that the other shorter titles, as the *Li Chi-t'ung* 禮祭統, the *Li Chi-fa* 禮祭法, the *Li Yü-tsao* 禮玉藻, the *Li Chiao-tê-shêng* 禮郊特牲, the *Li T'an-kung* 禮檀弓, the *Li Fang-chi* 禮坊記, the *Li Hsiao-chi* 禮學記, the *Li Nei-tsê* 禮內則, and the *Li Ching-chieh* 禮經解, which are all without 'chi' at the end, also ought to be regarded as the names of volumes of the *Li-chi*. Among those volumes that are claimed to have been included in the *Li-chi* there are some volumes to be found

1) The *Li Ming-t'ang-chi* is probably the same thing as the *Li-chi Ming-t'ang* later to be mentioned, if the example of the *Po-hu-t'ung* 白虎通 is to be followed.

in the existent *Li-chi*—that is, the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes,—such as the volumes of the *Wang-chih* 王制, and the *Ming-t'ang* 明堂 (or the *Ming-t'ang-wei* 明堂位) referred to in the *Han-shu*, both of which are included in the existent *Li-chi*. The *Ssü-tien* quoted in the *Han-shu*, recalls, judging from the quotation, the volume *Chi-fa* in the existent *Li-chi*. There are also some other passages in the *Han-shu*, which recall respectively the volumes *Ch'ü-li* 曲禮, the *Chi-i*, and the *T'an-kung*, in spite of lack of any explicit references to the sources. The same is true with the *Po-hu-t'ung*: the names of the volumes quoted in it, as are given above, show that they were derived from what is contained in the (existent) *Li-chi*. The *Po-hu-t'ung* also has some passages, though not many, which, without reference to the definite source of derivation, simply begin with 'The *Li-chi* says' and yet clearly show that they were taken from among the volumes contained in the existent *Li-chi*. For example, a passage regarding marriage 嫁娶, quoted in the *Po-hu-t'ung*, beginning with 'The *Li-chi* says,' is one of those passages in point, and must be regarded as having been taken from the volume *Nei-tsê*. On the other hand, the names of the volumes above mentioned show that there are some among them, including the volumes *Shih-fa*, *San-chêng*,¹⁾ *Pieh-ming*, *Pao-fu*, *Wu-ti*, *Wang-tu*, and *Ch'in-shu*, which do not have any corresponding volumes in the existent *Li-chi*. Among those passages beginning with 'The *Li-chi* says' and unaccompanied by any reference to the definite source of derivation, are some, for instance, a passage quoted in the section of the *Li-yo* 禮樂, that do not have any corresponding passages in the existent *Li-chi*. Of those volumes that are not represented in the existent *Li-chi*, the volume of the *Pao-fu* is still found in the existent portion of the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*, and the volume of the *Shih-fa* 諡法 apparently once used to be included in

1) That the *Li-chi San-chêng* quoted in the chapter of the *Shê-shi* contains an identical passage with the *Chi-fa* in the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes does not mean that the *San-chêng* is another name for the former. For some passages quoted in the *Ch'i-kuei* 著龜 and *San-chêng*, for instance, are not found in the *Chi-fa*, while the *Wang-chih* and the *Nei-tsê* of the existent *Li-chi* contain some identical passages in each. The passage quoted in the *Ch'i-kuei*, *San-chêng* is, as CHEN LIU has proved, identical with a passage in the *Li-wei*, 禮緯 which again is believed to have been derived from the *Li-chi San-chêng*.

the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*, seeing that the *Shih-fa* is quoted, in the chapter of the *Shih* (or posthumous title) of the *Pei-t'ang-shu-ch'ao* 北堂書鈔, from the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*, volume of the *Shih-li* 謚禮. I am inclined to think that the *Li Hao-shih-chi* 禮號謚記 quoted in the chapters of the *San-huang* 三皇 and the *San-wang* 三王 of the *Fêng-su-t'ung* 風俗通 corresponds to the above *Shih-li*. As to the passages beginning with 'The *Li-chi* says,' those appearing in the section of *Hsing-ming* 姓名 were apparently derived from the volume *Yü Tai Té* 虞戴德 in the existent *Ta-Tai Li-chi*. Considering that we have no means to ascertain the names of the eighty-five volumes of the so-called *Ta-Tai Li-chi*, there may be some volumes that are missing in the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* in existence or in the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes, but might have been included in the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* in eighty-five volumes. Again among those passages beginning with 'the *Li* says,' there are some to be traced back to the volumes found in the existent *Li-chi* and some traceable to the extinct portion of the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*. A few examples of the former case are found in the section of *Chüeh* 爵 (quoted from the *Chü-li* 曲禮), of *Wu-ssü* 五祀 (quoted from the *Wang-chih*), and of *Chia-ch'ü* 嫁娶 (quoted from the *Tsêng-tzū-wên* 曾子問). An example of the latter is found in the section of *Chien-chêng* 諫諍, as CH'ÊN LI 陳立 proved it in its notes. The section of *Hao* 號 may also be referred to, where a passage the same as the one in the above-mentioned *Li Hao-shih-chi* is found beginning with 'the *Li* says.'¹⁾

The above remark applies to the *Po-hu-t'ung*, but with the *Han-shu* all the quotations from the *Li-chi* are apparently to be regarded to have been taken from what is contained in the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes. If we take into consideration the scarcity in the *Han-shu* of such

1) According to these examples, the 'Li' in the 'Li says' may sometimes be regarded as the abridged form of the *Li-chi*. Therefore among those passages of unknown derivation, there may be some that were taken from what was then called the *Li-chi*, including the now-missing volumes of the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*. However, the 'Li' in the 'Li says' cannot always be interpreted as the abridged form of the longer title of the *Li-chi*, as there are, for example, in the sections of *Tsung-tsu* 宗族 and *Chia-ch'ü* some passages beginning with the 'Li says,' but actually being quoted from the *I-li*, and some in the section of *Pêng-hung* with the same beginning but quoted from the *Chou-kuan* 周官. In these latter cases, the 'Li' in the 'Li says' ought to be regarded as the abridged appellation of the *Li-ching* 禮經.

quotations from the *Li-chi*, however, it may be regarded as rather accidental, and the *Li-chi*, from which the *Po-hu-t'ung* and the *Han-shu* drew their quotations, should be regarded as one and the same series of books. It is nearly inconceivable that there should have been two different *Li-chi* with the same title, and apparently the same contents, making their appearance without much separation in time from each other. It can be conceived from the above consideration that the series of books which was called by the name of the *Li-chi* in the period from the close of the Former Han Dynasty to the beginning of the Later Han Dynasty, contained much of what is now in the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes as well as in the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*. Is it not natural to conclude that since each of the books constituting the series that was called *Li-chi*, was called without any distinction by the name of *Li-chi*, *Li-chi* being the general name for the series, there could most likely not exist two different series of the *Li-chi*, that is, of the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes and of the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*? As the *Po-hu-t'ung* is known to be a collection of the opinions or theories held by the majority of the scholars of the Confucian school of the day, there is reason to believe that the way the *Li-chi* is called in the *Po-hu-t'ung*, must have been the way the book of *Li* was treated by those scholars. Then it can be inferred that in the days when those scholars of the Confucian school met in the Po-hu-kuan Hall to discuss the doctrines of Confucianism, there was only one kind of *Li-chi* in existence.

From such considerations, it is only natural to conclude that the one hundred and thirty-one volumes of *Chi* or miscellaneous writings on *li* mentioned in the *Han-shu*, *I-wên-chih*, refers to the same *Li-chi* as the above. Although the *I-wên-chih* does not enumerate the names of each of the one hundred and thirty-one volumes, the *Chi* mentioned in the *I-wên-chih* must be regarded as the same *Li-chi* that the *Po-hu-t'ung* refers to, because there was in those days no other book that was called by the name of the *Li-chi*. This inference is again corroborated by the fact that in its quotations from the *Yo-chi* 樂記 in the sections on *Shê-chi* 社稷, *Li-yo* 禮樂, and *Iêng-kung-hou* 封公侯, the *Po-hu-t'ung* never refers to the source of their quotations as from the

Li-chi Yo-chi or the *Li Yo-chi*, but always simply as the *Yo-chi*.¹⁾ The treatment of the *Yo-chi* as found in the *Po-hu-t'ung* must have been due to the circumstances that in the beginning of the Later Han Period the *Yo-chi* and the *Li-chi* were two distinct books, and agrees with the manner of the treatment of the two series of books in the *I-wên-chih*, which under the section of the *Yo* includes twenty-three volumes of the *Yo-chi* 樂記 and twenty-four volumes of the *Wang Yü-chi* 王禹記 (which probably means the *Yo-chi* of WANG YÜ),—a fact that justifies the belief that the *Yo-chi* and the *Wang Yü-chi* must be regarded as being distinct from the one hundred and thirty-one volumes of *Chi*, referred to in the section of *Li* in the *I-wên-chih* if we take into account the manner of the classification of the Six Arts, and also the manner in which the names of the *Li-chi* and the *Yo-chi* are contrasted. The treatment of the *Po-hu-t'ung* agrees, as has been noted above, with that in the *I-wên-chih*, and induces us to believe that the so-called *Li-chi* and the *Yo-chi* mentioned in the *Po-hu-t'ung* refer to the *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes and the *Yo-chi* in twenty three volumes mentioned by the *I-wên-chih*. These two books must have been in existence in their original form as was first edited, at the time when the *Po-hu-t'ung* was written. If we take into account the fact that the *I-wên-chih* does not mention any other *Li-chi* besides the above, and the circumstances which make it hard for us to believe that there existed two or three *Li-chi* of the same nature and same title, is there not reason to conceive that at the end of the Former Han Period the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes and the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* in eighty-five volumes were not in existence? There may be some who suspect that the *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes mentioned in the *I-wên-chih* might be a combination of what were two series of books before, and although the *I-wên-chih* does refer to the combined volumes only, there might have been two kinds of *Li-chi* in existence and in use in those days. However, the doubt can be readily settled by pointing out the fact that

1) It must be noted, however, that not all the quotations on *Yo* beginning with 'the *Li-chi* says' in the chapter of the *Li-yo* can be taken to have been derived from the *Yo-chi*, because *Yo* or music was also treated in some volume or other contained in the *Li-chi*.

the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes contains a portion of the *Yo-chi*. According to *Chêng's Catalogue* 鄭目錄 quoted in the *Li-chi chêng-i*, the portion of the *Yo-chi* that is contained in the existent *Li-chi* includes eleven volumes derived from the *Yo-chi* in twenty-three volumes. These twenty-three volumes are not included, as has been pointed out above, in the *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-three volumes. Moreover if we follow the view of the *I-wên-chih*, which says: "Wang Yü . . . presented the Emperor (Emperor Ch'êng-ti) with the *Chi* in twenty-four volumes. It was different from the *Yo-chi* in twenty-three volumes that was discovered by LIU HSIANG 劉向, when he was collating books," the *Yo-chi* in twenty-three volumes was newly discovered by LIU HSIANG when he was collating books, and even if it might have been edited before the time of LIU HSIANG, it could not have been in wide use in his days. Further, seeing that the *Yo-chi* in twenty-three volumes was found left as a complete single book by LIU HSIANG, it is quite improbable that only a portion of the book could have been in wide use before the days of LIU HSIANG. Therefore, our conclusion is that the volume of the *Yo-chi* as found in the existent *Li-chi* must have been derived from the *Yo-chi* in twenty-three volumes, out of which eleven volumes were selected and made into one volume to be included as such in the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes.¹⁾ It seems noteworthy in this connection that while the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* contains some chapters the same as the *K'ung-tzŭ-san-chao-chi* 孔子三朝記, the *I-wên-chih* treats the *K'ung-tzŭ-san-chao-chi* under the section of the *Lun-yü* 論語 separate from the *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes. The case is different, however, from that in the classification of the Six Arts, in which the *Li* and the *Yo* are distinguished from each other in separate departments, or are usually held to stand in contrast to each other.

1) Of the passages of the *Yo-chi* that are quoted by the *Po-hu-t'ung*, there are some found in the *Yo-chi* included in the existent *Li-chi*, such as the Chapters of the *Shê-chi*, and the *Fêng-kung-hou*, and some that are not, as the *Li-yo*. Those passages that are not found in the existent *Li-chi*, were probably derived from some volume or other among the twelve volumes of the *Yo-chi* that were not included in the existent *Li-chi*, when it was edited. Seen in this light, it is clear that the *Yo-chi* as referred to by the *Po-hu-t'ung* is the *Yo-chi* in twenty-three volumes, and does not exactly correspond to the volume of the *Yo-chi* in the existent *Li-chi*.

It is possible on the contrary to infer that some volumes of the *K'ung-tzū-san-chao-chi* were taken into the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*, while the *K'ung-tzū-san-chao-chi* was kept intact in its original form and continued to exist as an independent book. If so, the case of the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* and the *K'ung-tzū-san-chao-chi* cannot much affect our above consideration.

There are some statements met with, however, that stand in the way of our acceptance of the hitherto inference. The *Hou-Han-shu*, *Ch'iao Hsüan-chuan* 橋玄傳 says: "Ch'iao Jên 橋仁, the forefather of the seventh generation of Ch'iao Hsüan . . . followed the teachings of Tai Tê, and wrote the *Li-chi chang-chü* 禮記章句 in forty-nine volumes. Jên's teachings were called by the name of Mr. Chiao's doctrines." There is much likelihood that the *Li-chi* here mentioned refers to the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes.

The *Li-chi chêng-i*, section on the *Yo-chi*: "The *Pieh-lu* 別錄 says, the *Li-chi* has forty-nine volumes, and the *Yo-chi* constitutes the nineteenth volume."

The *Ching-tien shih-wên*: "LIU HSIANG'S *Pieh-lu* lists forty-nine volumes, the arrangement of which is the same as in the existent *Li-chi*."

In the PEI SUNG-CHIH'S 裴松之 note on the *Ch'in-Mi-chuan* 秦宓傳 of the *Shu-chih* 蜀志: "LIU HSIANG'S *Ch'i-liao* 七略" says, 'Confucius had audience of Prince Ai 哀公 three times, and wrote the *San-chao-chi* in seven volumes, which are contained in the present *Ta-Tai Li*'."

The *Shih-chi so-yin* 史記索隱, *Wu-ti pên-chi* 五帝本紀: "The *Pieh-lu* says, 'Confucius had audience of Prince Ai of Lu 魯哀公, three times at which he was asked his opinions about politics. After withdrawing from the presence of the Prince, he wrote this book, which hence was called the *San-chao-chi* or Record of Three Audiences. It consists of seven volumes, all of which were later included in the *Ta-Tai Li*'." From these statements, it seems necessary to conclude that the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes and the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* must have already existed in the days respectively of Ch'iao Jên, follower of Tai Tê,

1) Seeing that the *Ch'i-liao* is entitled the LIU HSIANG'S *Ch'i-liao*, it probably refers to the *Pieh-lu*. The difference that is found in the use of words between the note of the *Shu-chih* and that of the *Shih-chi so-yin*, is due to the carelessness on the part of those who copied from the original texts.

and of LIU HSIANG in the declining days of the Former Han Dynasty.¹⁾ There are, however, some difficulties met in taking this view. Firstly, the name of Ch'iao Jên appears in the *Ju-lin-chuan*, as "Hsiao-Tai taught Ch'iao Jên of Liang 梁. . . Hence Ch'iao-shih's division in the school of Hsiao-Tai." The teachings of Ch'iao-shih represent the teachings on the *I-li* by a sub-division of the Hsiao-Tai school, but no mention is made in the *Ju-lin-chuan* of Ch'iao-shih having written the *Li-chi chang-chü* in forty-nine volumes. That no mention is made of it in the *Ju-lin-chuan* does not necessarily prove that Ch'iao-shih did not write the book, but taken into account with the fact that no reference to the *Li-chi chang-chü* is given in the *I-wên-chih*, the circumstances make it susceptible of the belief that such book did not exist at the close of the Former Han Period. It cannot be known now from what source the writer of the *Hou-Han-shu* obtained the information, but supposing the statement was derived from the family of Ch'iao Hsüan, then it must be born in mind that Ch'iao Hsüan was a contemporary of Lu Chih and Chêng Hsüan, commentators on the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes, and that the same *Li-chi* had in those days already been known as the work of Hsiao-Tai. Secondly, in connection with the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes the above consideration of ours on the *Yo-chi* must be recalled here. That is, if the volume of the *Yo-chi* in the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes was a part of the *Yo-chi* in twenty-three volumes that was believed to have been newly discovered by Liu Hsiang, it cannot be that the *Yo-chi* had already been included as a part of the *Li-chi* in those days. It is inconceivable therefore that Liu Hsiang, referring to the *Yo-chi*, could observe that it formed the nineteenth volume of the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes. Further, if the above is inconceivable, it is also inconceivable that Liu Hsiang knew of the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes. The *Li-chi chêng-i*, in referring to each of the forty-nine volumes, indicates to which section in the classification of the *Pieh-lu* each volume belongs, quoting, in connection with the volume *Sang-fu-ssü-chih* 喪服四制,

1) It is remarkable that the notes of the *Shu-chih* and of the *Shih-chi so-yin* do not mention the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* but the *Ta-Tai Li*. However, the *Ta-Tai Li* in this case means, as will be made clear, the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*.

the *Chêng mu-lu* or the *Chêng's Catalogue*, which says: "This volume (the *Sang-fu ssü-chih*), according to what is called the *Chiu-shuo* or the older theory in the *Pieh-lu*, belongs to the *Sang-fu*." 1) However, if there existed in the days of *Chêng Hsüan* any such thing as the 'Chiu-shuo' in the *Pieh-lu*, is there not some room for suspecting the truth of the view that the statement in what was called the *Pieh-lu* was written by *LIU HSIANG*? For it can not be that the (original) *Pieh-lu* contained what is called the *Chiu-shuo*; hence the *Pieh-lu* containing the *Chiu-shuo* could not properly be the original *Pieh-lu*. It is difficult to believe therefore the validity of the statement that those passages of the *Pieh-lu* given above were written by *Liu Hsiang*. If such is the case with the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes, the same observations can, I believe, be properly applied to the case of the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*. The only difficulty with this assumption is that no positive proof can be obtained from what was called the text of the *Pieh-lu* itself for refuting the theory attributing this remark in the *Pieh-lu* to *Liu Hsiang*.

The crucial point of the question in general, however, is why the *I-wên-chih* does not contain the same statement as in the *Pieh-lu*. It should rather be decided from the examination of this question whether those statements in the *Pieh-lu* were written by *LIU HSIANG* or not. The *I-wên-chih* was written as the summary of the *Ch'i-liao* which

1) The remark in the *Sang-fu-ssü-chih-p'ien* of the *Ching-tien shih-wên*, "The *Pieh-lu* belongs to the *Sang-li*," was also probably taken from *CHÊNG HSÜAN's Mu Lu*, the two words *Chiu-shuo* having apparently been omitted from the title. There are very few cases when *LU TÊ-MING* 陸德明 follows the classification by the *Pieh-lu* of the contents of the *Li-chi*, and there are, besides the above *Sang-fu-ssü-chih-p'ien*, only three volumes, including the *T'ou-hu* 投壺, the *Hsiang yin-chiu-i* 鄉飲酒義, and the *Shê-i* 射義, in which he adopts such classification. Seeing that the classification of the volume of the *T'ou-hu* was evidently derived from *CHÊNG HSÜAN*, there is reason enough to believe that he follows the same author in the classification of the other three volumes. As to the *Chêng-i*, which records the classification of all the volumes of the *Li-chi*, it is hard to decide whether the classification was taken from *CHÊNG HSÜAN* or directly from the *Pieh-lu*, but in view of the circumstances that the editor of the *Chêng-i* adopts always the explanatory notes that are found in the *Chêng mu-lu*, and then proceeds to the classification, and that particularly in the case of the *Ch'ü-li*, the *T'an-kung*, and the *Wang-chih*, the classification precedes the remarks of the editor of the *Chêng-i*, it is most probable that the nomenclature of the volumes in the *Chêng-i* was not directly derived from the *Pieh-lu*. It cannot be decided now whether the *Pieh-lu* as found in the Tang Period contained these records or not.

LIU HSIEN 劉歆 addressed to Emperor Ai-ti 哀帝 (whose regime lasted during 6-1 B.C.) and which was the consummation of the work first started by LIU HSIANG at the command of Emperor Chêng-ti 成帝 (whose regime was 32-7 B.C.). It is no source of surprise, therefore, that the *Ch'i-liao* might contain some differences from the work of LIU HSIANG. But the differences should reasonably exist, we are inclined to believe, in additions, improvements, or corrections to make up for the defects in the explanatory notes or regarding the manner of classification, and not in erasing the names of the volumes which LIU HSIANG himself had recorded as existent in his days, and which continued to exist down to the days of the reviser. Therefore it is possible that what is not recorded in the work of LIU HSIANG, may be found in the *I-wên-chih*, but the reverse is an impossibility. Suppose that the *Pieh-lu*, as it is, was just what was written and left behind by LIU HSIANG, it is difficult to understand why the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes and the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*, both of which are recorded in the *Pieh-lu*, are not referred to in the *I-wên-chih*. Seeing that the *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes and the *Yo-chi* in twenty-three volumes, that are mentioned in the *I-wên-chih*, are respectively the names of the series of books, as was pointed out above, and the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes and the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* in eighty-five volumes also should be regarded in the same light, and the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes contains a part of the *Yo-chi* of the *I-wên-chih*, the first two series of books should be regarded as different from the second two series of books. From this standpoint, I do not hesitate to declare that the statements quoted from the *Pieh-lu* are additions by later writers. It should be borne in mind that especially the remarks regarding the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*, such as 'It is now included in the *Ta-Tai Li*' or 'It is all included in the *Ta-Tai Li*' are of the nature of marginal notes, and the use of the simpler form 'the *Ta-Tai Li*' instead of 'the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*,' also seems in favour of such an interpretation by us. For, as the expression 'the *Ta-Tai Li*' meant originally the teachings or interpretations on the *I-li* of the Ta-Tai school or their texts of the *I-li*, it is more likely that if the expression was used in the days of LIU HSIANG, it would have been used in this sense. It seems likely that those remarks

were added, in the days when the *K'ung-tzũ san-chao-chi* was still in existence, to the section on the *San-chao-chi* in the *Pieh-lu*, by some writer who had noticed the existence of a similar chapter in the so-called *Ta-Tai Li-chi*, and later came to be blended with the text itself. As to the remarks of the kind about the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes, which are rather complicated, they might have been added on purpose by some one. The date cannot be ascertained when these additions were made, but they may possibly belong to some considerably later period. As to the classification of the forty-nine volumes, if the classification attempted had been confined to the forty-nine volumes only, it should have been regarded as having been done before the time of CHENG HSÜAN, but in this case it is possible to suppose that the classification was done not in connection with the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes, but the *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes, CHENG HSÜAN singling forty-nine volumes out of them to be classified. The passage in the *Pieh-lu* on the *Wang-tu-chi*, which is quoted, in the *Li-chi chêng-i*, the *Tsa-chi*, can be established to have been a portion of the *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes, because the *Wang-tu-chi* is, as was pointed out above, referred to as the *Li Wang-tu-chi* in the *Po-hu-t'ung*,—evidence that the *Pieh-lu* contains a record on something that is not found among the forty-nine volumes. According to the LIU HSIANG'S *Ch'i-lu* 七錄 (which was probably the *Pieh-lu* 別錄) quoted in the *Shih-chi so-yin*, the *Fêng-ch'an-shu* 封禪書, “among the works that were written at command of Emperor Wên-ti 文帝, were the volumes of the *Pên-chih* 本制, *Ping-chih* 兵制, and the *Fu-chih* 服制,” and the two volumes of the *Ping-chih* and the *Fu-chih* at least are not identical with the volume of the *Wang-chih* among the forty-nine volumes, being apparently written contemporaneously with the latter. These volumes also might have been included among the one hundred and thirty-one volumes. Again according to the *Chêng-i*, the *Pieh-lu* must have contained the names of the volumes of the *Yō-chi* in twenty-three volumes, which surely do not correspond, it is clear, to the volume of the *Yō-chi* in the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes. From these circumstances, is it not reasonable to infer that the *Pieh-lu* did contain the names of the volumes of the

Li-chi in one hundred and thirty-one volumes? Seen in this light, the above inference of ours is not impossible, except for the only difficulty with this interpretation to be met in understanding the existence of the 'Chiu-shuo.' Therefore, we could not push the above interpretation of ours too far, but nevertheless the remarks we noticed above in the *Pieh-lu* are not a proof at any rate that the *Pieh-lu* as originally left by LIU HSIANG, contained the record of the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes.

Let me produce here, by way of strengthening my argument, some more instances in the *Pieh-lu*, wherein that which was added by later writers can be clearly pointed out. The *Pieh-lu* quoted in the *Tso-chuan chêng-i* 左傳正義 in connection with T'U YÜ's 杜預 preface, contains the historical account of the teachings of the *Tso-chuan* as inherited from TSO CH'IU-MING 左丘明 to CHANG TS'ANG 張蒼, contradicting the view of the *I-wên-chih*, which says of TSO CH'IU-MING that afraid of persecution by the authorities, he kept his writings concealed from the public, without trying to transmit his teachings to posterity. The theory expounded in the *I-wên-chih* is based upon the remark on the *Tso-shih ch'un-ch'iu* 左氏春秋 in the preface to the *Shih-êrh-chu-hou nien-piao* 十二諸侯年表 or the Chronological Table of the Twelve Princes in the *Shih-chi*, which being applied to the *Tso-chuan*, was developed, it can be seen, into the present form of the theory. If we take into account the remark in the *I-wên-chih* as if TSO CH'IU-MING himself took part in the writing of the *Ch'un-ch'iu*, and the fact that, as his writings were unknown to scholars, the Commentaries by KUNG-YANG 公羊 and KU-LIANG 穀梁 and others came to appear, although TSO CH'IU-MING was the only one that grasped the real spirit of the Confucian teachings,—a view conforming to that of LIU HSIEN in the *Liu-Hsin-chuan* of the *Han-shu* in trying to exalt the dignity of the *Tso-shih-chuan* 左氏傳, the above view of the *I-wên-chih* must be a later fabrication added by LIU HSIEN, author of the *Ch'i-liao*. The theory also that the writings of TSO CH'IU-MING were kept concealed from the public, is likely to have been copied from the view in the *Liu-Hsin-chuan* that the so-called *Tso-shih-chuan* in old characters, which is said to have been recovered from the old home of Confucius, was kept concealed from the public in the Pi-fu 秘府

or the library in the Imperial Palace. The statement of the *I-wên-chih* corresponds to the above theory of the recovery of the *Tso-shih-chuan* in old characters in the *Liu-Hsin-chuan*. Then we have reason to assume that the view of the *I-wên-chih* preceded the appearance of the view of the *Pieh-lu*. For in the first place, the remark that Tso-CH'IU-MING kept his writings secret, corresponds to the statement that his writings were recovered after having been long kept concealed from the world. If any theory had been current that there was some school continuously in existence since, and following, Tso CH'IU-MING, regarding his '*Tso-chuan*,' no such opinion as the above would have made its appearance. Further if we take into consideration that it would have had the best advertising effect to label the newly-written *Tso-shih-chuan* as a book that had been written in old characters, and had been kept concealed from the public, we ought to see that the view of the *I-wên-chih* preceded the so-called view of the *Pieh-lu*. The view of the *Pieh-lu* might not have been directly derived from LIU HsIN, because the *I-wên-chih*, which was based upon the view of LIU HsIN, is found to contain a view different from that in the *Pieh-lu*. However, if not LIU HsIN himself, some scholar of his school might have had something to do with the view in the *Pieh-lu*, as can be inferred in the following way. The appearance in the *Pieh-lu* of the names of To SHU 鐸椒 and Yü CH'ING 虞卿 as belonging to the school of the *Tso-shih-chuan* may be regarded as far-fetched derivation from the appearance of their names, in connection with the *Ch'un-ch'iu*, in the preface to the Chronological Table of the Twelve Princes, where the names of HsÜN CH'ING 荀卿, and CHANG T'SANG 張蒼, too, are found,—a situation wherein the view of the *Pieh-lu* (where mention is made of Chang T'sang, a noted astrologist) is shown to be related to the astrological interpretation of the *Ch'un-ch'iu* by LIU HsIN found in the *Han-shu*, *Lü-li-chih* 律歷志.

However, the *I-wên-chih* does not contain the name of the *Ku-wên Tso-shih-chuan* 古文左氏傳, but the *Ch'un-ch'iu-ku-ching* 春秋古經 in distinction from the two texts of Kung-yang and Ku-liang, apparently treating Tso CH'IU-MING's *Ching* or text as being written in old characters. It might possibly be meant that together with the *Ching* in old characters

the *Chuan* in old characters was discovered, but inferring from the situation that there is no reference to the *Chuan* or Commentary found, it is likely that the theory of the existence of the *Chuan* in old characters came to assume the form of the existence of the *Ching* in old characters. In view of the fact, however, that such a view presents itself in the *I-wên-chih* which is believed to have been based upon LIU HSIEN'S *Ch'i-liao*, it is possible that LIU HSIEN himself might not have strictly held to the view of regarding the *Tso-shih-chuan* as being written in old characters. The existence of so many divergent opinions and theories, all arbitrarily presented regarding the matter, indicate that all those views were not based upon actual facts but simply fabrications. Further, if the view presented in the *Pieh-lu* made its appearance later than that of the *I-wên-chih*, as was pointed out above, it is clear that the view quoted, in the *Tso-chuan chêng-i*, as the view of the *Pieh-lu*, does not represent the view of the real *Pieh-lu*. That the appearance of the above view of the *Pieh-lu* most likely preceded the appearance of the *Han-shu*, can be inferred from the fact that CHANG T'SANG of the Han period is referred to, first of all the scholars of the school, in the *Han-shu*, *Ju-lin-chuan*, where it traces the development of the teachings of the *Tso-shih-chuan*,—a passage which reminds us of its having been most probably copied from the passage immediately succeeding the one that was quoted, in the *Chêng-i*, as the view of the *Pieh-lu*. The remark in the *Ho-chien-hsien-wang-chuan* 河間獻王傳 regarding the *Tso-shih-chuan* was probably written conformably to the statement in the *Ju-lin-chuan*. Judging from the general tone of the *Hsien-wang-chuan*, the *Tso-shih-chuan* referred to there may possibly be regarded as having been written in old characters, but we believe it had better be treated as above, because the name of the *Tso-shih-chuan* is not found among Hsien-wang's collection of classical texts and commentaries in old characters. It will be discussed more in detail how the *Tso-shih-chuan* came to assume the present form at the close of the Former Han Period, and let it suffice here to conclude that the above statements in the *Pieh-lu*, together with the remarks regarding the chronological description of the teachings of the school of the *Tso-shih-chuan*, are pure fabrications, and could never have

been written by LIU HSIANG, being additions by some later writers. The remarks in the *Pieh-lu* concerning the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes must also be regarded in the same light.

If it is granted that, in the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes and the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*, there are many volumes corresponding to some volume or other in the *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes, to find even roughly the time when the latter came to be widely known, will furnish important material for deciding if the two TAI had anything to do with the editing of the former two series of books. In referring to the occasion when Prince Kung-Wang 恭王 of Lu 魯 destroyed the old house of Confucius, the *I-wên-chih*, in its section on the *Shang-shu* 尚書, remarks: "They obtained the *Shang-shu*, the *Li-chi*, the *Lun-yü* 論語, the *Hsiao-ching* 孝經, scores of volumes in all, that were all written in old characters." It is not evident which *Li-chi* is referred to in this remark, but it will be proper to assume it to be the *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes, seeing that no two kinds of the *Li-chi* are mentioned in the *I-wên-chih*. Now let it be granted that the *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes was thus recovered and found written in old characters. The *Han-shu*, *Ho-ch'ien-hsien-wang-chuan* says, however: "The books that Hsien-wang obtained are all written in old characters," and include such volumes as the old books of the Pre-Ch'in Period, the *Chou-kuan* 周官, the *Shang-shu*, the *Li*, the *Li-chi*, the *Mencius* 孟子, the *Lao-tze* 老子 and others. They are all classical texts, commentaries and similar miscellany, and comprise the views of the seventy Confucian disciples." According to this statement, the collection Ho-chien-hsien-wang obtained included the *Chou-kuan*, the *I-li*, and the *Li-chi*, written in the old form of characters. The remark in the *Han-shu*, *Ho-chien-hsien-wang-chuan* is not detailed enough to make clear the contents of the *Li-chi*, but it must be noticed that the book was anyhow called by the name

1) The term *Kü-wên* '古文' was sometimes apparently used in the sense of *Kü-shu* '古書' or ancient writings, as in the case of the eulogy in the *Shih-chi*, *Wu-ti-pên-chi*, or in the *Han-shu*, *Mei-fu-chuan*. The expression here, however, is believed to have been used in the ordinary sense of 'the old form of characters,' since it is immediately followed by the words, '(they include) the old writings of the Pre-Ch'in Period,' indicating thereby that the term in question here should be understood in a sense different from that of old writings.

of the *Li-chi*, and written in the old form of characters. No reference is given, however, to Ho-chien-hsien-wang, in the *I-wên-chih* in the section of *Li-chi*; nor is there any remark found that the *Li-chi* was written in the old form of characters. The *I-wên-chih* simply says that the *I-li* in old characters was obtained from *yen-chung* 淹中 of Lu and the old home of Confucius. The *Liu-Hsin-chuan* also simply remarks that the *I-li* written in the old form of characters was discovered in the old house of Confucius, without mentioning Ho-chien-hsien-wang or the name of the *Ku-wên Li-chi* 古文禮記' or the *Li-chi* in old characters. The preface to the *Ching-tien shih-wên* says in referring to the *Li*: "The LIU HSIANG'S *Pieh-lu* says that there are 204 volumes of *Chi* in old characters." If this remark was written by LIU HSIANG, it is hard to understand which volumes were meant here, or how they were related to the one hundred and thirty-one volumes mentioned by the *I-wên-chih*, but it being hardly conceivable that there were, besides the one hundred and thirty-one volumes, so many volumes without their being mentioned by the *I-wên-chih*, it would be proper to regard the one hundred and thirty-one volumes to have been included among the two hundred and four volumes. If so, it would be tantamount to admitting that here is another statement in existence to the effect that the one hundred and thirty-one volumes in question were written in the old form of characters. It must be noticed, however, that the *I-wên-chih* does not have any such statement, nor does it contain any record of volumes other than the one hundred and thirty-one volumes. Thus there are divergent versions about the manner of the appearance of the *Li-chi*. But it is clearly inconceivable that there existed several *Li-chi* with different contents, since the *Li-chi* must be regarded, in the period from the end of the Former Han Period to the beginning of the Later Han Period, as the general name for a definite series of volumes. If the individual volumes of the series had been discovered separately, and treated as separate, independent volumes, then they would not have been called equally by the name of the *Li-chi*. What was called '*Chi*' was often appended to the *I-li*, as in the volume of the *Shih-kuan-li* 士冠禮, which contains some entirely identical passages as the volume of the *Chiao-tê-shêng* 郊特牲 (which

volume is found included in the existent *Li-chi*), and in the *Wên-wang-shih-tzū* 文王世子 and the *Chi-t'ung* 祭統 (both of which also are found in the existent *Li-chi*) containing quotations from the *Chi*. There is reason to believe that it was something of micellaneous nature, different from the texts of the *I-li* and its commentaries, but still treating of *Li*. The *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes must have contained some such books as might be called 'chi' in this sense, but that the whole thing could not have been of such nature, can be inferred from the contents of the existent *Li-chi* and the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*. The *Li-chi* as a proper name is meant to be the general name for a series of volumes.¹⁾ Therefore, the remarks in the section of the *Shang-shu* in the *I-wên-chih* and in the *Ho-chien-hsien-wang-chuan*, must be regarded as two different attempts to explain the appearance of one and the same *Li-chi*. (Cf. the example of the *Tso-chuan*, above.)

The important thing to note, however, is that there attaches much doubt to the truth of these stories. To conclude that they are only unworthy stories or fabrications, it is necessary only to take into account the following facts: that the legend of the discovery and collection of the writings in old characters at the old house of Confucius is not found in the *Shih-chi*, in its chapters of *Kung-wang-chuan* 恭王傳 and of *Hsien-wang-chuan*, but makes its appearance for the first time in the *Han-shu*; that the *Han-shu*, *Kung-wang-chuan*, contains the story that music was heard on the occasion when they destroyed the the old house of Confucius, — a clear fabrication; that in its *Kung-wang-chuan*, the *Han-shu* contains some entirely identical passages as the *Kung-wang chuan* of the *Shih-chi*, but in the former the passage—"He loved to build palaces," makes its appearance twice, once in the section apparently copied from the *Shih-chi*, and repeatedly another section,—evidence that the account was derived from some other source than the *Shih-chi* of some later date than the latter; that Kung-wang, who according to the *Shih-chi* ought to have died in the sixth year of *Yüan-kuang* 元光 (129 B.C.) in the

1) The individual volumes of the series,—once the series is edited as such,—might be called by the name of the series, i.e. the *Li-chi*. But it is a case different from the above.

early part of Wu-ti's 武帝 regime, destroyed, according to the *I-wên-chih*, the old house of Confucius in the latter part of the reign of the same Emperor; that the *Shih-chi* contains a remark that only the *Shang-shu* in old characters was found in the house of the family of Confucius, no other old books being discovered, but does not contain any story of Kung-wang in connection with the book; that the *Chou-kuan*, which was, according to the *Han-shu*, *Ho-chien-hsien-wang-chuan*, discovered and collected along with the *Li-chi*, is clearly a work written in the latter part of the Former Han Period; and that the story that the *Tso-shih-chuan* had already been in existence has proved a fabrication. It is evidence of their not being based upon facts, that two different versions to explain the appearance of one and the same *Li-chi* were produced, one being woven around the story of Kung-wang's discovery of the writings in old characters, and the other around the story of Hsien-wang's collection of the writings in the old form of characters. The books that were, in the closing period of the Former Han Period, most widely known as the classics written in old characters, were the *Shang-shu* and the *I-li*, and it was around these two books that the above mentioned legends of Princes Kung-wang of Lu and Ho-chien-hsien-wang were produced. Of the two legends, that of Hsien-wang apparently was not so widely spread as the other, and also appeared later than the other, seeing that LIU HSIEN said of the two books simply that they were discovered in the old house of Confucius, and that the *I-wên-chih*'s description was almost the same as in the *Liu-Hsin-chuan* except the slight addition of the two ideographs 'yen-chung' regarding the *I-li*. We are able to infer from the remarks in the *Shih-chi* that the legend of Kung-wang was apparently first produced around the *Shang-shu*, and then the story regarding the *I-li* came to be added to it. Further if it is taken into consideration that neither the *Han-shu*, *Ju-lin-chuan*, nor the *I-wên-chih* contains any account about the manner in which the *I-li* in old characters was transmitted, we can see that even the story of the discovery of the *I-li* in old characters itself came into existence towards the end of the Former Han Period; and the biographies of the scholars in the *Ju-lin-chuan* were apparently based on the material that had

existed prior to the existence of any such story about the *I-li* in old characters, while the account at the end of the chapter regarding the newly discovered *I-li*, and also the remark in the section of the *Li* in the *I-wên-chih*, were most probably written after the appearance of such legends. Judging from the fact that the *I-wên-chih* mentions the name of the *Li-chi*, but not that of the *I-li* in old characters, in the section on the *Shang-shu*, the probability is that the story of Kung-wang had originally been told about the discovery of the *Shang-shu*, and later it came to be expanded to include the *Li-chi* or the *I-li*, hence the appearance of the name of the *Li-chi* in connection with the legend of its discovery, in the *I-wên-chih*, in the section of the *Shang-shu*, and of the name of the *I-li*, in the section of the *Li* as well as in the *Liu-Hsin-chuan*. The legends of Hsien-wang in connection with the *Shih* or the Book of Poetry and the *Yo-chi* in the *I-wên-chih*, the *Shih* in the *Ju-lin-chuan*, and music in the *Li-yo-shih*, are probably fabrications based on the legend that the prince loved to study Confucianism, to which later the legend of his collection of the classical text and commentaries in old characters, came to be attached. The story that Prince Kung-wang of Lu discovered the *Tso-shih-chuan* written in old characters, also is probably a later addition to the legend on the *Shang-shu* and the *I-li*.

That the legends on Kung-wang and Hsien-wang regarding the *Li-chi* in old characters are not found in the section of the *Li* of the *I-wên-chih* or in the *Liu-Hsin-chuan*, suggests that the legends had not yet been widely enough spread to be an accepted theory among literary circles at large, and were the product of some one's casual idea. The latter part of the Former Han Period saw many books written and falsely attributed to some ancient writers, and stories were fabricated so as to make the newly written books seem to be really old ones,—a phenomenon that resulted from the factitious competition among the scholars for the recognition by the public of the authenticity of their views, as well as the desire of some scholars to outdo others by announcing some new theory. It is quite possible that some old books were actually discovered and collected, and the legends of the discovery and collection of the *Shang-shu* and the *I-li* in old characters might have been based upon

some such facts. In the case of the *Li-chi*, however, there is no evidence found, nor is there reason enough, to believe that it was discovered in any such manner. Consequently, the theory of the *Pieh-lu* quoted in the *Ching-tien shih-wên* describing the *Li-chi* in two hundred and four volumes as being written in the old form of characters, is unfounded, and it is even doubtful whether the quotation itself was really derived from the *Pieh-lu*. There is reason enough to believe that even in the days of LIU HSIANG there was only one kind of *Li-chi* in existence, and it was the one referred to by the *I-wên-chih*. If the *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes written in old characters had existed, it would have been mentioned by the *I-wên-chih*, as was always its method, and further if there had been any other *Li-chi* than the one in one hundred and thirty-one volumes, it should have been mentioned there too, but it was not. Seeing that the *I-wên-chih* was based upon the *Ch'i-liao* of LIU HSIN, who had been an ardent supporter of the classics in old characters, it is inconceivable that LIU HSIANG, father of LIU HSIN could have known of any such *Li-chi* written in old characters, in view of the want of reference to it in the *I-wên-chih*. The inference then is that this account, too, may properly be regarded as an addition by some later writer. Probably there was not in existence any such thing as the *Li-chi* in old characters, in distinction from the case of the *Shang-shu*, and what had been simply known as the *Li-chi*, came to be included, from somebody's casual idea, among the classical writings in old characters.

The *Shih-wên* contains the following remark, just following a quotation from the *Pieh-lu*, as quoted from the *Liu-i-lun* 六藝論 by CHÉNG HSÜAN: 後得孔氏壁中, 河間獻王, 古文禮五十六篇, 記百三十一篇, 周禮六篇, 其十七篇與高堂生所傳同, 而字多異. The *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes is not explicitly described here as being written in the old form of characters, but from the general tone, it was probably implied, although the passage is too confused to admit of any definite interpretation. However, the *Liu-i-lun*, as quoted at the beginning of the *Li-chi chêng-i* 禮記正義 and also in the section of *Pên-sang* 奔喪 in the *Li-chi chêng-i* does not contain any such words as 'Ho-

chien-hsien-wang,' 'the *Chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes' and 'the *Chou-li* in six volumes.' The remark in the *Shih-wên*, as quoted from the *Liu-i-lun*, must have been, therefore, an arbitrary addition, by some later writer, based upon the legend of Prince Hó-chien-hsien-wang. Viewed from such an angle as that, the account in the *Pieh-lu* of the *Li-chi* in two hundred and four volumes in old characters may have something to do with the following words of CHÊN SHAO's in his preface to the *Chou-li-lun* as quoted by the *Shih-wên* :

"TAI TÊ, collating the *Ku-li* 古禮 in two hundred and four volumes, edited eighty-five volumes, which are called the *Ta-Tai Li*. TAI SHÊNG, collating the *Ta-Tai Li*, edited forty-nine volumes, which form the *Hsiao-Tai Li*,"¹⁾

and is believed to be a later addition of the Six Dynasties Period. This view on the two TAI and their *Li-chi* is different from that in the *Liu-i-lun*, but being probably based on the latter, came into existence after the *Ta-Tai Li* had ceased to exist in its original, complete form. To regard the *Li-chi* as having been written in the old form of characters is not consistent with the statement that the two TAI left the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* and the *Hsiao-Tai Li-chi* behind, because the former has an underlying idea that the *Li-chi* in old characters had not been widely spread, while the latter view means that the two *Li-chi* were spread by the two TAI. Although it was not conformable to the fact, the mention of the *Li-chi* in old characters toward the close of the Former Han Period may be taken as evidence that the names of the two TAI had not yet made their appearance in connection with the two TAI's editions of the *Li-chi*. CHÊN SHAO's position, however, combines these two views, so that the appearance of his view was probably after the so-called *Li-chi* in old characters (which as a matter of fact did not actually exist at all), had come to be understood only as a name. It is not clear, however, why CHÊN SHAO enumerated two hundred and four volumes instead of one hundred and thirty-one volumes, and again whether his view preceded that of the later revision of the *Pieh-lu*. The view of the *Sui-shu*,

1) The *Ku-li*, the *Ta-Tai Li*, and the *Hsiao-Tai Li* here referred to mean respectively the *Ku-wên Li-chi* or the *Li-chi* in old characters, the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* and the *Hsiao-Tai Li-chi*.

Ching-chi-chih may be regarded as the combination and elaboration of the view of CHÊN SHAO and that of the *Liu-i-lun* with, as was pointed out above, later additions, and enumerates two hundred and fourteen volumes instead of two hundred and four. The *Sui-shu*, *Ching-chi-chih* enumerates two hundred and fourteen volumes, which includes one hundred and thirty volumes said to have been presented to the Emperor by Ho-chien-hsien-wang, thirty-three volumes of the *Ming-t'ang yin-yang-chi* 明堂陰陽記, seven volumes of the *Kung-tzū-san-chao-chi*, twenty-one volumes of the *Wang-shih Shih-chi* 王氏史記, and twenty-three volumes of the *Yo-chi*. The enumeration is probably the result of picking up from the contents of the *I-wên-chih* those volumes dealing with *li* that were likely to have been related to some volume or other in the *Li-chi* or the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*; adding the number to the one hundred and thirty-one volumes; and then after failing to secure the number of two hundred and four, taking one out of the one hundred and thirty-one volumes, thereby obtaining the number of two hundred and fourteen volumes. As the result of having lifted one out of the one hundred and thirty-one volumes, the writer of the *Sui-shu*, *Ching-chi-shih* invented the theory that although Prince Ho-chien-hsien-wang presented the Emperor with one hundred and thirty-one volumes, one out of the one hundred and thirty-one volumes was missing at the time when LIU HSIANG collated them. It is also conceivable that the number of the forty-six volumes of the *Hsiao-Tai Li-chi*, the original number of volumes enumerated by the *Sui-shu*, might have been obtained by taking thirty-nine volumes, which was equivalent to the number of the volumes of the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* as it existed then, out of eighty-five volumes, which was equivalent to the total number of the volumes of the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* as given in the *Liu-i-lun*, conformably to the theory that the *Hsiao-Tai Li-chi* was edited by expunging some portion of the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*. That is, this explanation tries to regard the number of the volumes of the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* as were then existent, as the number of the volumes that had been expunged out of the larger series of the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* to secure the shorter series of the *Hsiao-Tai Li-chi*.¹⁾

1) The remark that the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* probably contained thirty-nine volumes is only

It has been made clear, we believe, by the foregoing discussion that the *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes was not found written in the old form of characters, and that Princes Kung-wang and Hochen-hsien-wang had nothing to do with it, but the date when it began to be widely known must be decided by inferring the dates when each of the individual volumes composing the series of the *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes was written, and not otherwise. Before we proceed, let it be taken for granted, as has been pointed out above, that the best portion of the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes and the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* were first included among the *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes. Then if we take into account the volumes of the *San-nien-wên* 三年問, the *Li-san-pên* 禮三本, and the *Ch'üan-hsüeh* 勸學, that were all clearly derived from the *Hsün-tzū* 荀子; the volume of the *Yüeh-ling* 月令, which is nothing but the Book of the *Shih-êrh-yüeh-chi* 十二月紀, in the *Lü-shih Ch'un-ch'iu* 呂氏春秋 with slight modifications added; the volume of the *Wang-chih*, which from the remark in the *Fêng-ch'an-shu* 封禪書 can be inferred to have been written in the reign of Emperor Wên-ti; the volumes of the *Pao-fu* 保傳 and the *Li-ch'a* 禮祭, which were partly derived from the work of CHIA I 賈誼, there can be no doubt that some volumes of the *Li-chi* were written in the latter part of the Chan-kuo Period or in the beginning of the Han Period, while there are some volumes that may properly be believed to have been written after the era of Emperor Wu-ti, as we can see from the examples of the volumes of the *Tsêng-tzū T'ien-yüan* 曾子天圓, of which a portion was taken from the *Huai-nan-tzū* 淮南子, *T'ien-wên-hsün* 天文訓, and is attributed to Confucius; of the *I-pên-ming* 易本命, a portion of which was derived from the *Huai-nan-tzū*, *Chui-hsing-hsün* an inference on my part following an attempt to explain the import and the source of derivation of the number of forty-six volumes. I believe, however, that the inference probably is not very wide of the mark and is strengthened by the remark in the *Shih-chi* *So-yin*, *Chung-ni-ti-tzū Lieh-chuan* 仲尼弟子列傳, Biographies of the Disciples of Confucius, "Forty-seven volumes (out of eighty-five volumes) were lost to the world, and there are now thirty-eight volumes left of the book." There is the difference of one volume between this remark and my enumeration, but I believe it does not much matter, because in view of the method of the arrangement and the number of volumes in the existent *Ta-Tai Li-chi*, the book was very susceptible of some rearrangement or combination of volumes.

墜形訓; and of the *Chung-yung* 中庸, which is believed to be a work later than the *Huai-nan-tzū*. Further we can see that the views regarding *Li* expounded in the *Li-chi* 禮器 and the *Shêng-tê* 盛德, have some elements to be regarded as ideas of the latter part of the Former Han Period, and the idea of the *Liu-kuan* 六官 theory in the volume of the *Shêng-tê* belongs to the same period, in its being related to the ideas of the *Chou-kuan*. It is probably toward the end of the Former Han Period, about the time when LIU HSIANG collated classical books, that the volumes, containing the above mentioned ones, came to be edited into a series containing one hundred and thirty-one volumes, and were named *Li-chi*.¹⁾

The inclusion in the *Li-chi* of the volumes of the *Yüeh-ling*, the *Hsia-hsiao-chêng* 夏小正, the *Wu-ti-tê* 五帝德, the *Ti-hsi-hsing* 帝繫姓, which cannot be regarded as having anything to do with *li*, and of the *Chung-yung*, the *Ta-hsiaih* 大學, and the volumes containing what is called the words of *Tsêng-tzū* regarding filial duty,—all of which are, properly speaking, not mainly concerned with *li*, although there are some passages dealing with the subject,—has probably something to do with the ideas prevalent in the latter part of the Former Han Period when, together with the rise of the ideas demanding the restoration of the old practice of *li* and *yo* as taught by Confucian scholars, the idea of *yüeh-ling*, or the Imperial administration and institution according to the seasons, came to be in favour at the court, and the view that in *li* lie all the virtues, became influential with the result that as in the *Tso-shih-chuan* (the sections of the 2nd year of Prince Chao-kung 昭公 and the 1st and 2nd years of Prince Wên-kung 文公), even the *I* or the Book of Divination, the *Ch'un-ch'iu* or the Book of Annals and the Calender, came to be taught as belonging in the category of *li*, the practice of filial duty being regarded as the first and most important step of *li*. The story regarding Confucius in the volume of the *Li-yün*

1) The inadequacy of the theory treating of the *Li-chi* as being written in the old form of characters can be pointed out from this angle by thus clarifying the dates when the individual volumes of the *Li-chi* were edited. It is also suggested, of what value are the legends of the discovery and collection of the classics written in the old form of characters.

禮運 that when he was asked about the ways of *li*, he tried to show what *li* is by referring to the Calender of the Hsia 夏 Dynasty and the *K'un-ch'ien* 坤乾 or Earth and Heaven according to the *I* 易, represents the situation that suggests the volume was a work of the latter part of the Former Han Period. The manner in which K'uan Hêng 匡衡 treats of *li* in his address to the emperor as quoted in the *Han-shu*, *K'uang-Hêng-chuan* 匡衡傳, as well as Tzù-ch'an of Chêng's 鄭子產 remark in the *Tso-shih-chuan*, Chapter of Prince Chao-kung, Section of the 25th Year of his Reign in deriving quotations from the *Hsiao-ching* 孝經 or the Book of Filial Duty, and applying them to the subject of *li*, or replacing the word 'hsiao' or filial duty with 'li,' reflect the similarity of the trends of thought of that period. It cannot always be regarded as an attempt on the part of those writers to interpret 'hsiao' as an attribute identical with 'li,' but it shows that they were apt to be associated with each other in their minds. It becomes intelligible only when we regard those volumes, as the work edited toward the close of the Former Han Period, which are included in the *Li-chi* but actually have little to do with *li*.

If such volumes are included in the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes or the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*, it will be clear that the two TAI had nothing to do with the editing of the two *Li-chi*. Even from the single fact that the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes does contain a volume of the *Yo-chi*, it can be easily inferred that the *Li-chi* could not have been edited by HSIAO TAI.

The next question is, when were the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes and the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* edited? Since the two *Li-chi* had been already in existence, as has been pointed out above, in the days of CHÊNG HSÜAN, they must have appeared during the period from the time when the *Po-hu-t'ung* was written to the days of CHÊNG HSÜAN.¹⁾ The *Hou-Han-shu*,

1) We read in the *Hou-Han-shu*, *Ma-Yung-chuan* 馬融傳, that MA YUNG annotated the three *Li*, and also find the view of MA YUNG quoted in the *Chêng-i*. Consequently there is much probability that MA YUNG had something to do with the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes, and it would be more proper to regard the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes as having been existent prior to the time of MA YUNG. In view of the lack of any positive evidence, however, to that effect regarding the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*, we let the matter stand as it is.

Ts'ao-Pao-chuan 曹褒傳, says: "The *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes was transmitted to posterity through Ts'ao Pao." He belongs to the reign of Emperor Chang-ti 章帝 and Emperor Ho-ti 和帝, and having died in the 14th year of *Yung-yüan* 永元 (102 A.D.), was probably a contemporary of PAN KU 班固, author of the *Po-hu-t'ung*, or of a little later date. Therefore, the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes must have already been existent in the declining years of Ts'ao Pao at the latest, and in view of the fact that the *Po-hu-t'ung* was written in the 4th year of *Chien-ch'u* 建初 (79 A.D.), the *Li-chi* in question was apparently edited during the next twenty years. The use of the word '*chuan*' 傳 or 'transmitted' regarding the book, indicates that Ts'ao Pao was connected with the *Li-chi* in some particular manner, or Ts'ao Pao had something to do with the spread of the book, because if the book had already been in wide use in his day, there would have been no reason for the writer of the *Hou-Han-shu* to use that particular expression in connection with Ts'ao Pao, who was not an annotator of the volume. Therefore, the passage probably means that Ts'ao Pao was in some way or other influential in bringing about the popularity of the book, or responsible for making the book in the present form widely known to the public. The word '*chuan*' is sometimes used to express the line of descent of a school of learning, but it is hardly conceivable that with regard to the *Li-chi*, the expression was used, as in the case of the *I-li*, in the sense just mentioned, in view of the inconceivable enough situation that there could have been in those days some traditions or school of learning on the *Li-chi*. Hence the word here cannot be interpreted otherwise than in the sense of 'making the book in the present form known to the public,' in the same way it was used in the *Liu-i-lun* regarding the two *Tai* in connection with respectively the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* and the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes. Further, I am inclined to believe that the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes was edited by Ts'ao Pao, who used it as a kind of text-book in his lectures for his numerous students,—so numerous that it was said of him, "He taught more than a thousand pupils." Pao was a scholar belonging to Ch'ing-shih's 慶氏 school of the *I-li*, having followed his father in accepting the teachings of the school.

Having some definite opinion on the institutions of *li* and *yo*, he often presented to the emperor his opinion for the crystallisation of the institutions, or was consulted by the emperor, submitting once to the throne a memorial for the establishment of the definite practices of *li* from the emperor and princes down to the common people. His opinions were apparently different from those of PAN KU and of many other scholars. He also wrote a great many of books; it was said of him, "He wrote the *T'ung-i* 通義 in twelve volumes and one hundred and twenty volumes of miscellaneous writings on the classics." In view of these facts, it is not altogether inconceivable. I believe that he selected some important portion out of the *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes, and together with one volume of the *Yo-chi*, which had also been picked out of the complete *Yo-chi*, edited the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes. It is probably due to such circumstances that the passage: "He caused the book to be known in the present form," immediately follows the passage quoted above. If the *Li-chi* in question had already been well known in Ts'ao Pao's days, these passages would have been unintelligible. If the passage had been significant only in its assertion that Ts'ao Pao gave lectures to his numerous students, the *I-li* in seventeen volumes should have more naturally been mentioned there, because Ts'ao Pao was a follower of the teachings of Ch'ing-shih's school of the *I-li*. Therefore the particular reference to the *Li-chi* as the subject of his lectures implies probably that Ts'ao Pao not only gave lectures to his students, but also was in some special way connected with the *Li-chi*. Ts'ao Pao's new series of volumes on *li* was probably named after the *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes, from which the new shorter series was selected; and although there was included in the new series a volume of the *Yo-chi*, it probably did not form a portion big enough to make the name unsuitable for the new series. Then my inference is that the new *Li-chi* came to be spread in gradually wider circles at the hands of his followers, until whenever the *Li-chi* was referred to, it always meant this one unless otherwise noted.

Our next inference is that the remaining portion of the *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes, from which the *Li-chi* in forty-nine

volumes had been selected, was taken up, and together with a portion of the *Kung-tzŭ san-chao-chi* and others was edited to form a series of books on *li* in eighty-five volumes.¹⁾ It might also properly be called by the name of '*Li-chi*,' but to distinguish it from the already existent *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes, the latter series might probably have been named 'the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*' after the *Ta-Tai* school, simply for the sake of propagandistic effect, although as a matter of fact it belonged to none of the *Ta-Tai* school. There might have been some latent motive to make the newly edited *Li-chi* look superior to the older *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes. Or the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* might possibly have been edited by some one belonging to the *Ta-Tai* school. Those who tried to ascribe the

1) If there was a volume of the *Shih-fa* in the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*, it might possibly have been almost the same as the one that is taken up in the *I-chou-shu* 逸周書. The close relationship that seems to exist between the *Wên-wang Kuan-jên* 文王官人 of the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* and the *I-chou-shu*, *Kuan-jên-chieh* 官人解, may be referred to. But the case is probably that the editor of the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* did not take the two volumes from the *I-chou-shu*, but the two volumes had already been included in the *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes. It may be added that the '*Li-yo-chi*' or the '*Li-chi*' is quoted in the *Fêng-su-t'ung* 風俗通 in its section where the *Yo-chi* 樂器 or the musical instrument is discussed. Since these quotations are not found in the volume of the *Yo-chi* in forty-nine volumes, they are believed to have been derived from the portions of the *Yo-chi* in twenty-three volumes which were not taken up in the *Li-chi*, that is from the volumes of the *Yo-chi* (musical instrument) referred to in the *Pieh-lu*. It is unintelligible, therefore, why the *Li-yo-chi* or the *Li-chi* was referred to as the source of those quotations. In view of the fact that in some passages the writer simply says the '*Yo-chi*' instead of the *Li-yo-chi* or the *Li-chi*, and in the passages on the *chêng* 箏, a musical instrument, the *Li-yo-chi* is quoted in the same manner as in the quotation in the *I-wên-lei-ch'ung* 文藝類聚, while the *T'ai-p'ing-yün-lan* 太平御覽 again simply says the '*Yo-chi*,' the confusion in the references of the names might have been due to some error in copying, so that it is doubtful how YING-SHAO 應劭 originally wrote. It might be conjectured, therefore, that under the force of circumstances in which, when the *Yo-chi* was mentioned, the volume of the *Yo-chi* of the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes was apt to be associated with it, those who copied the book might have written by mistake *Li-yo-chi* or *Li-chi* instead of *Yo-chi* as originally worded, without taking the trouble of examining the still earlier sources. In case, however, the original wording was '*Li-yo-chi*' or '*Li-chi*,' I wonder if the *Yo-chi* in question might not have been included in the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*, on the supposition that the portions of the *Yo-chi* in twenty-three volumes that were left out of the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes when the latter was edited, came probably later to be included in the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*. It may not be valid to believe that the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* was referred to as the '*Li*' or the '*Li-chi*,' but there are cases where the volume of the *Shih-fa* in the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* is referred to simply as the '*Li Hao-shih-chi*,' 禮號詮記. At any rate, however, it will be difficult to infer from the above treatment in the *Fêng-su-t'ung* that the *Yo-chi* in twenty-three volumes was originally included in the *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes.

Li-chi in forty-nine volumes to HSIAO TAI, must have forgotten or overlooked the fact that it was the work of Ts'ao Pao of Ching-shih's school, apparently without paying any attention to who the editor was, or such matters, since the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes had already been in wide circulation. For it ought to be regarded as the abridgement of the longer series of the *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes, which did not belong to any particular school. However, the shorter *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes, which had already been known simply as the *Li-chi*, never came to be called the *Hsiao-Tai Li-chi*, even after the appearance of the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*, and it is due to this circumstance that the *Liu-i-lun* calls one 'the *Ta-Tai Li*' (or properly the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*) and the other simply 'the *Li-chi*' instead of the *Hsiao-Tai Li* or properly the *Hsiao-Tai Li-chi*. Interpreted in any other way, the remark of the *Liu-i-lun* would be hardly intelligible.¹⁾ It seems strange that such a state of affairs should have occurred in the Later Han Period when of course it should have been known there were two schools of *li* regarding the *I-li* by the names of Ta-Tai and Hsiao-Tai, but this very situation and the comparative unpopularity of the two schools—it was said of them, "Their teachings were transmitted from follower to follower without any interruption, but the schools were yet without any distinguished scholars"—possibly made it rather convenient for some of the scholars to ascribe them to the two schools of *li*.

Such being the case, in the days of CHENG HSÜAN, the two *Li-chi* came generally to be believed to be the work of TA TAI and HSIAO TAI. There is no wonder, then, that the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes was regarded as the work of HSIAO TAI, by CHENG HSÜAN, a follower of the Hsiao-tai school who was uncritical enough to believe even the *Wei-shu* 緯書 as the teachings of Confucius. If the classification of the volumes of the *Li-chi* as was believed to be found in the *Pieh-lu*, had to deal with the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes, it must have been inserted in

1) The appearance of the name of the *Hsiao-Tai Li-chi* attached to the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes, resulted from the ignorance or disregard of the actual circumstance, under which the two kinds of the *Li-chi* were edited, they merely paying attention to the contrast in the appellations, and calling one 'the *Hsiao-Tai Li-chi*' against the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*, after the fashion of the two schools of the *I-li*.

the *Pieh-lu* prior to the days of CHÊNG HSÜAN. Even in that case there is every probability that CHÊNG HSÜAN would have believed such insertion to have been the work of LIU HSIANG. It reflects the lack of critical spirit in the age that the fashion of writing counterfeit books and ascribing them to some classic writers; prevailed in the Han Periods. Such was also the case with LIU HSIANG, who collated classical books, as the fragments of the *Pieh-lu* and also some remarks in the *I-wên-chih* show. The statement in the *I-wên-chih* that the *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes comprised the writings of the disciples of Confucius, was a sheer fabrication, although it is not clear whether the remark can be ascribed to LIU HSIANG or not. In view of such a state of things prevailing among the Confucian scholars, there is no wonder that CHÊNG HSÜAN should have taken the above view. The remark in the *Hou-Han-shu*, *Ch'iao-Hsüan-chuan* 橋玄傳, alluded to above, was probably written in such an atmosphere, and it is quite conceivable that in the latter part of the Later Han Period, even the Hsiao-Tai scholars came to regard the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes as the work of HSIAO TAI. As to the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*, apparently it never came into much popularity, probably because it consisted of the rather insignificant—or inappropriate in the strict sense of the term *li*,—portion of the *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes which had been left of the one hundred and thirty-one volumes after the more important section had been picked out and made into the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes by its editor,—a fact which can be inferred from the character of the still existent portion of the *Ta-Tai-Li-chi*, although we cannot know of the whole contents of the book today. It was probably due to the same situation that in the Periods of Wei 魏 and Chin 晉, and after, rather few scholars ever tried to study the book, and a portion of the book was neglected to be lost to the world.

Such is my view regarding the circumstances in which the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes and the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* were edited, and the dates of their appearance. To sum up, what was called the *Li-chi* in the period from the latter part of the Former Han Period to the beginning of the Later Han Period, was the *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one

volumes referred to in the *I-wên-chih*. Then in the middle of the Later Han Period, the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes was edited by selecting an important section out of the *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes, and was followed by the appearance of the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*, which was edited from the remaining portion of the *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes that had been left out of the one hundred and thirty-one volumes by the editor of the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes, with the exception of the volume of the *Yo-chi* in the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes and a portion of the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*, which were both collected from somewhere outside the *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes. The two volumes of the *Ai-kung-wên* 哀公問 and the *T'ou-hu* 投壺 are, however, found in both of the *Li-chi*, but seeing that the forty-nine volumes probably edited and made widely known to the world by T'sao Pao, are all found included in the *Li-chi* annotated by CHÊNG HSÜAN, the probability is that the two volumes had been included among the forty-nine volumes from the beginning, and later came to be inserted in the *Ta-Tai Li-chi*. A portion of the *Tsêng-tzŭ ta-hsiao* 曾子大孝 in the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* is identical with a portion of the *Chi-i* 祭義 in the *Li-chi*, and the *Pên-ming* 本命 of the former is largely identical with the *Sang-fu ssŭ-chih* 喪服四制 of the latter. However, apparently it was not a mixture that took place after the appearance of the two *Li-chi*, but originally the *Tsêng-tzŭ ta-hsiao* and the best part of the *Sang-fu ssŭ-chih* had been contained respectively in the *Chi-i* and the *Pên-ming*.¹⁾ It is also remarkable that the *Chi-i* contains some passages exactly identical with some in the *Yo-chi*, while the *Tsêng-tzŭ ta-hsiao* itself is largely derived from the *Lü-shih-Ch'un-ch'iu*, *Hsiao-hsing-lan* 孝行覽. This state of things often happened with works of the Han Period; similar examples are found in the relations between the *Tsêng-tzŭ-t'ien-yüan* and the *Huai-nan-tzŭ*, the *Li-ch'a* 禮祭 and the *Ching-chieh* 經解, and the *Wang-chih* and the *Nei-tsé*, both of the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes. In view of the circumstances, that the original eleven volumes of the *Yo-chi* were compressed into only one volume, the arrangement of the volumes being altered from that in the original *Yo-chi* in twenty-three volumes, we can infer that when the *Li-chi* in

forty-nine volumes and the *Ta-Tai Li-chi* were edited out of the *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes, some new arrangements might probably have been adopted, so that it would not be quite adequate to expect correspondence in the number or arrangement of the volumes between the original *Li-chi* in one hundred and thirty-one volumes and the two new *Li-chi*. Further, when we notice that the passages of the *Chi-i* and the *Tsêng-tzū-wên* quoted in the chapter of the *Kêng-sang* 耕桑, in the *Po-hu-t'ung* as well as the remark from the *Wang-chi* as quoted in the chapter of the *Pêng-hung* 崩薨, are not found in the corresponding section of the existent *Li-chi*, we might well conjecture that some changes in the form of abridgement or omission might have been effected, when the two *Li-chi* were edited. The difference in the arrangement of the volumes, therefore, does not, we believe, stand in the way of accepting our foregoing standpoint.

1) The *Han-shu*, *Wei-Hsüan-chêng-chuan*, contains in Wei Hsüan-chêng's memorial to the emperor, a passage quoted with the remark 'the *Chi-i* says,' that is now found, not in the volume of the *Chi-i*, but in that of the *Sang-fu-hsiao-chi*. In view of the fact that the matter discussed in Wei Hsüan-chêng's memorial to the throne had nothing to do with mourning costume, but with religious ceremonials, it is more reasonable to suppose that the remark was originally found in the volume of the *Chi-i*, and not in the *Sang-fu-hsiao-chi*. This kind of confusion or mixture took place probably prior to the appearance of the *Li-chi* in forty-nine volumes.