

BERNHARD FUEHRER

ORALITY AND THE TRANSMISSION OF INTERPRETATIONS IN TWO VERSIONS OF HUANG KAN'S *LUNYU YISHU*: TEACHING *LUNYU* FROM THE NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF THE LIANG TO THE PERIPHERY OF THE TANG EMPIRE¹

ABSTRACT

This article explores the received version of Huang Kan's (488–545) *Lunyu Yishu* and a Tang manuscript fragment that stems from it, with a view to investigating residues of the oral transmission of glosses and interpretations of the *Lunyu* (the *Analects*). The discussion is based on close readings of passages that display remnants of the oral transmission of interpretations and attest to pedagogical techniques applied by Huang Kan during the Liang Dynasty (502–557) and by an unknown tutor in Dunhuang toward the end of the Tang Dynasty (618–907). The two versions of the *Lunyu Yishu* are read as texts of oral utterances that bear evidence of two distinct layers of recognizable oral vestiges.

I. THE CONTEXT

Historically not always classified as a classic (*jing* 經) in the technical sense, the utterances of Kong Zi as transmitted in the *Lunyu* 《論語》 (the *Analects*) have undoubtedly served as one of the most prominent teaching materials in Chinese educational history. The transmitted documents suggest that since the mid-Han Period the wording and meaning of the utterances of Kong Zi were no longer directly accessible to learners, a development that prompted the need for explanations of the main text (*jingwen* 經文) to bridge linguistic divergences and gaps of knowledge of antiquity.

Early expositions of the *Lunyu* are associated with the names of Senior Tutors to Heir Apparents and with some of the most revered

BERNHARD FUEHRER, Professor, Department of the Languages and Cultures of China and Inner Asia, School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), University of London. Specialties: traditional Chinese exegesis, classical Chinese philosophy, early Chinese literary criticism. E-mail: bf3@soas.ac.uk

scholars of those times.² This teaching material addressed problems encountered by particular individuals and, given the prominent status of these learners, was soon elevated from its specific teaching context to a much broader hermeneutic significance. Be it within or beyond the context of palace education, the task of laying out the presumed intended meaning of texts became imminent, and the increase of commentarial literature indicates a distinct gap between Han learners and the main text. The exegetical procedures transmitted in the early commentarial traditions attest not only to linguistic shifts but also to specific reconstructions of a past that was at some distance from the Han learner. Though a sizable portion of exegetical material compiled during the Han stems from teaching material, the concise style in which these glosses are presented provides little reflection of actual teaching situations.

Some of the early teaching material on the *Lunyu* has been transmitted, often in fragmentary form, and often integrated into compilations of explanatory material such as the *Lunyu Jije* 《論語集解》,³ a summary of primarily Han glosses on the *Lunyu* compiled under the general editorship of He Yan 何晏 (190–249).⁴ Unfortunately, the earliest textual witness of the *Lunyu*, the bamboo strip manuscript fragment that dates from 55 BCE and was found in Dingzhou 定州 in 1973, the extant manuscript copies of Zheng Xuan's 鄭玄 (127–200) glosses on the *Lunyu*, and other fragments on the early *Lunyu* exegesis offer few clues for an investigation of how this text was taught during the Han periods.

Nevertheless, with regard to the transmission of the main text and explanatory glosses, these documents are highly significant, because they attest to the coexistence of a number of textual strata, a fascinating synchronic and diachronic diversity of interpretations, and to a continuous chain of reinterpretations of textual and philosophical content matter. Further to this, the early manuscript copies bear witness to a residually oral transmission with strong awareness of the mnemonic base of learning that testifies to the function of copying as a means of studying and internalizing given material.

II. THE *LUNYU YISHU*: RECEIVED VERSION AND MANUSCRIPT FRAGMENT

Whereas the early material reflects the transmission of reading traditions as addressed to the upper echelons of society, Huang Kan's 皇侃 (488–545) *Lunyu Yishu* 《論語義疏》 provides us with insights into a classroom during the Liang Period (502–557). This sub-commentary stems from lecture notes on the *Lunyu* in which the main text and the

glosses transmitted in the *Lunyu Jijie* are examined and critically discussed, and alternate readings established. It preserves recognizable oral patterning in that it shows features of classroom dynamics and exhibits a number of pedagogical features, such as the tutor dealing with the age-old problem of his audience's attention span and providing references to explanations given on a previous occasion; and it shows evidence of Huang Kan positioning himself vis-à-vis given exegetical traditions. The *Lunyu Yishu* also illustrates how students were instructed in rendering the main text accessible to themselves through cross-referencing within the *Lunyu* and other core readings. Although the transmitted sub-commentary is not to be read as a straightforward transcript of Huang Kan's lectures, but rather as an edited form of lecture notes, it is in this sense that with its notable residue of orality, the *Lunyu Yishu* offers ample material regarding the oral transmission of glosses and interpretations, and the way in which the *Lunyu* was made accessible and explored as teaching material at the National University of the Liang.⁵

But our glimpses into medieval practices of teaching the *Lunyu* do not end here. While the *Lunyu Yishu* reveals Huang Kan's oral transmission of reading traditions, a Tang manuscript fragment of the *Lunyu Yishu* provides us with a second layer of orality in the form of a transcript of the teaching by an unknown tutor who based his lectures on Huang Kan's explorations. The Tang manuscript fragment thereby represents a textual snapshot record of a teaching tradition which is otherwise only scarcely documented.

The manuscript fragment which represents by far the earliest textual witness of the *Lunyu Yishu*, a text otherwise lost in China and reintroduced to China during the reign of Emperor Qianlong 乾隆 (1735–1796), was brought to Europe from Dunhuang 敦煌 by Paul Pelliot (1878–1945) and is now held at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris.⁶ Together with photographs of other Dunhuang fragments in the Pelliot collection this manuscript was first made more widely available by Kanda Kiichirō (1897–1984) in his *Dunhuang Miji Liuzhen Xinbian*, an album-form reproduction of photographs taken at the Bibliothèque Nationale.⁷ The manuscript P 3573 shows two dates (923 and 921–923), though neither of these is believed to relate to the *Lunyu Yishu* or the manuscript copy.⁸ As it exhibits the typical Tang taboo avoidances the manuscript fragment is believed to originate from the Tang Period (618–907).⁹

The fragment P 3573 carries a total of thirty-eight sections from the first four chapters of the *Lunyu Yishu* up to the *Lunyu*, 4: 18. These include sequences of the main text of the *Lunyu*, excerpts from the *Lunyu Jijie* commentary and from Huang Kan's sub-commentary, as well as additional explanatory material provided by the tutor in

Dunhuang. A comparison with the wording of the first commentarial level (*zhu*) of the *Lunyu Jijie* as transmitted in Xing Bing's 邢昺 (931–1010) *Lunyu Zhushu* 《論語注疏》 (999) or in the Japanese text traditions of the *Lunyu Yishu* reveals that the manuscript fragment carries a substantially abridged *Jijie*-commentary.¹⁰ As far as the graphic layout is concerned, the short excerpts from the commentary are written in small half-size graphs. They are introduced by “*zhu yun* 注云 (the commentary states)” or a simple “*zhu* 注 (commentary)” and end with “*yunyun* 云云 (and so on),” a formula indicating the omission of the rest of the commentary and widely attested in Tang manuscripts. Usually only consisting of the first few words, these excerpts served as aide-mémoire, prompting the wording of the *Jijie*-commentary which the learner was expected to be able to quote from memory.

Textual sequences and even whole sections of the main text are missing, the sub-commentary is often shortened significantly, and the introductory remarks in the sub-commentaries at the beginning of each chapter are omitted entirely.¹¹ The manuscript shows corrections in black and red ink, the latter believed to represent corrections by the tutor.

Based on a comparison of P 3573 with the *Zhibuzuzhai Congshu* version of the *Lunyu Yishu*, Wang Zhongmin 王重民 (1903–1975) believed textual discrepancies in these two text traditions to be caused by alterations made by Japanese scholars before the text was reintroduced to China, and suggested the Tang manuscript was a fairly truthful representation of the original condition of the *Lunyu Yishu*.¹² He also surmised that text portions that appear in the Japanese text tradition (and the redactions that derive from it), but do not appear in the Tang manuscript, should be identified as interpolations made in Japan. However, apart from the obvious consequences of P 3573 presenting substantially shortened versions of all textual layers, some of these discrepancies relate to glosses by earlier scholars that appear as quotes in the Japanese text tradition of the *Lunyu Yishu*.¹³ Such omissions are found in the sub-commentaries on about twenty of the thirty-eight sections that survived in the manuscript fragment and include citations from Li Chong (the mid-fourth century), Sun Chuo (c. 314–c. 371), Wang Bi (226–249), Fan Ning (339–401), and others.¹⁴ However, it is, as Li Fang asserts, unlikely that these passages are interpolations in the Japanese text tradition.¹⁵ Jiang Xi's 江熙 (fourth century) *Jijie Lunyu* 《集解論語》 which may have included some of these quotes and Li Chong's *Lunyu Zhu* 《論語注》 were both lost at the time of the Northern Song (960–1127) and given that there is no record of their being transmitted to Japan, the suggestion that quotes from these commentaries were inserted by Japanese scholars seems

rather implausible.¹⁶ It seems evident that the text tradition preserved in Japan and manuscript P 3573 show considerable differences in the textual arrangement as well as in the segmentation and wording of the main text and the sub-commentary. Like the other relevant portions of the *Lunyu Yishu* that are absent from the Tang fragment, we shall regard these citations simply as deliberate omissions in the manuscript that reflect the development of the intellectual discourse in which explanations on the Confucian canon that are associated with Daoist or Buddhist thought became increasingly unpopular.¹⁷

In contrast to the practice attested in the sub-commentary of the *Lunyu Yishu* received via Japan, the sub-commentary in P 3573 tends to mark the end of direct quotes and to indicate a change of topic or speaker by leaving an empty space, a technique that makes the text more accessible by reflecting the short pause that the tutor would make at this point of his oral presentation of the sub-commentary. Further to this, emphasis on specific text segments in the sub-commentary (and in the additions by the tutor) is indicated by red circles which are, presumably, added by the tutor in order to guide the learner toward particularly noteworthy explanations.¹⁸ A close reading of the manuscript fragment brings to light further features supporting the view that P 3573 reflects residually oral transmission and reveals teaching practices and pedagogical purposes. For instance, the manuscript frequently shows a more colloquial wording than the Japanese text tradition. It recurrently omits the sentence final *ye* 也 and emphasizes the focus of attention by inserting the function word *zhe* 者, and it tends to clarify the subject by techniques such as indicating subject change or naming what appeared as so-called silent subjects in the sub-commentary.

These features are shared among a wide range of manuscript copies and strengthen the argument for this copy originally serving practical purposes. It thus appears that, rather than regarding P 3573 as a fair representation of the original version of the *Lunyu Yishu*, the idiosyncrasies of this manuscript fragment suggest that it derives from an outline of lectures on Huang Kan's *Lunyu Yishu* and should thus be perceived as a text genetically related to but by no means slavishly adhering to the *Lunyu Yishu*.

III. REMNANTS OF ORAL TRANSMISSION IN P 3573

With regard to the textual arrangement in the manuscript fragment, the sub-commentary is generally preceded by a short reference to the *Jijie*-commentary which is, however, dropped entirely on a few occasions. The excerpts from the sub-commentary are introduced by the

formula “*ci ming* 此明” (this explains/makes plain) with *ci* written in the same size as the main text and *ming* in half-size. Expressions such as “*ci ming*” and “*ci zhang ming* 此章明” (this section explains/makes plain) are already used by Huang Kan where he introduces the synopses of sections.¹⁹ However, as Wang Zhongmin has noted, there are seventeen cases in which P 3573 carries the formula *ci ming* and where this does not appear in the other textual witnesses.²⁰

As for omissions and insertions, it has been noted that, compared with the versions transmitted via Japan, P 3573 lacks about 60 percent of the sub-commentary and is thus far from providing a complete copy of Huang Kan’s elaborations. On the other hand, the manuscript fragment carries revealing text sequences that are absent from all other text traditions of the *Lunyu Yishu*. Some of these additions to the sub-commentaries are marked by “*Yang jie* . . . *zhe* 仰解 . . . 者,” “*Yang shi* . . . *zhe* 仰釋 . . . 者,” “*Yang ming* . . . *zhe* 仰明 . . . 者 ([Kindly] note the explanation . . .),” and so forth. Introduced via formulaic expressions such as *yang* 仰, a form of imperative used in transmitting orders or advice to inferiors, these supplementary explorations tend to introduce summaries that reproduce and record the teaching delivered by one individual in Dunhuang.²¹ Other similar expressions used to mark the tutor’s summaries and pointers, which are written in single column graphs but smaller than the main text, are “*Yan* . . . *zhe* 言 . . . 者” or “*Suoyi* . . . *zhe* 所以 . . . 者.” These additional explanations represent more than just deviations from Huang Kan’s sub-commentary: they represent new elements introduced by the tutor to the transmitted stock of glosses. With regard to the interaction between learner and tutor they echo problems which students may have encountered in their study of the *Lunyu* and which the tutor felt compelled to address. The sub-commentary on the *Lunyu*, 1: 5 in P 3575, where the explanation of the key passage is marked in the manuscript by the formula “*Yang jie* . . . *zhe*,” provides a case in point. Otherwise, the explanatory wording in the manuscript and in the received versions of the *Lunyu Yishu* is nearly identical:

[Kindly] note the explanation of “being frugal in expenditure and loving of people”: Although a country may be affluent, it is not permissible to be wasteful and extravagant; thus the expression “being frugal in expenditure” [in the *Analects*]. Although the residents may be noble and lofty, it is not permissible to be arrogant and slow; thus the expression “loving of people” [in the *Analects*].²²

Similarly, in his explorations of the key term *peng* 朋 in the *Lunyu*, 1: 1, the tutor’s “*Yang jie peng you zhe* 仰解朋友者 ([Kindly] note the explanations of *peng* [and] *you*)” draws the learner’s attention to the semantic differences between *peng* and *you* as explained at some length by Huang Kan. After the emphatic formula “*yang jie* . . . *zhe*,”

P 3573 records a direct quotation from the sub-commentary.²³ Other examples include the passage “*Yang shi Zhongsun mingzi zhe: Zhongsun shi qi shi* ([Kindly] note the explanation of the name Zhongsun: Zhongsun is his clan name)” in the explanations on the *Lunyu*, 2: 5.²⁴ However, the use of this formula in the *Lunyu*, 1: 9 presents us with a slightly different case. Here P 3573 omits the sub-commentary on the concern for the deceased and on maintaining the sacrifices to distant ancestors, and instead opts for what Huang Kan describes as “alternate interpretation (*yi yun* — 云).”²⁵ Whereas the *Lunyu Yishu* redactions received via Japan offer a sequence of four-syllable phrases with no further source reference, the tutor in Dunhuang names the *Shijing* 《詩經》 as the source of these lines, thereby providing his students with a point of reference in the classics.²⁶

An example of the manuscript fragment providing interpolated explanations by the tutor is found in the sub-commentary on the *Lunyu*, 3: 6 where the famous Mount Tai (Taishan) is simply introduced as “Mount Tai of Lu” in the Japanese text tradition.²⁷ P 3573 records the following excursions:

How do we know Mount Tai is in Lu? Regarding Mount Tai, the *Songs* state: “Mount Tai is so very lofty, [it is] looked up to by the state of Lu.” How do we know Lin Fang is from Lu? As Mount Tai is a mountain in Lu, so Lin Fang is a person from Lu.”²⁸

This explanation prompts a number of interesting points. First, these interpolations are deemed to be of essence and thus marked by red circles. Second, by complementing the received stock with a reference to the “Odes of Lu” in the *Shijing* the tutor provides new elements that are absent from the received versions of the *Lunyu Yishu*.²⁹ Third, P 3573 exhibits a question–answer technique, a teaching strategy also attested elsewhere in Huang Kan’s sub-commentary and an indication that both versions of the *Lunyu Yishu* preserve recognizable oral patterning. Finally, the manuscript introduces Lin Fang who, in the Japanese text tradition of the *Lunyu Yishu*, is first introduced in Zheng Xuan’s gloss on the *Lunyu*, 3: 4, a text portion omitted in P 3573.³⁰ Given that Huang Kan’s sub-commentary on the *Lunyu*, 3: 4 does not provide further details on Lin Fang or establish any relation between Mount Tai and Lin Fang, but focuses on the “roots of ritual [practices] (*li zhi ben* 禮之本),” the tutor behind the manuscript fragment provides students with instructions on how to deduce information from the material provided in the commentarial traditions. A reading of the received sub-commentary against the manuscript on the *Lunyu*, 3: 4 shows that P 3573 eclipses the first part of Zheng Xuan’s commentary, omits substantial portions of the

sub-commentary including the quote from Wang Bi, and preserves, in essence, the pseudo dialogue format that appears toward the end of the sub-commentary. The tutor perceives the common theme of ritual practices in the *Lunyu*, 3: 4 and the *Lunyu*, 3: 6 as an opportunity to create a parallelism between the “Lu mountain (*Lu shan*)” and the “Lu person (*Lu ren*)” which aims at improving the learner’s ability to extract background knowledge from source material. The reference to the *Shijing* in his supplementary explanations on the *Lunyu*, 3: 6 illustrates how the tutor seizes the opportunity to use elaboration and clarification to guide students through a course of deductive reasoning and intertextual comparison so as to gain a clearer understanding of the text and enhance their analytical skills.³¹

On other occasions the tutor summarizes previous or ongoing debates on matters of context and interpretation, providing focused guidance to keep his students on track.³² P 3573, which reads 3: 10 and 3: 11 as one section, has the following additional remark which serves to clarify the lesson and to import a more fixed structure to the lecture.³³ The insertion, which is marked by an emphasizing red circle in the manuscript, is then followed by a direct quotation from the *Lunyu Yishu* which details the numerous different theories on the pouring of libations. P 3573 records the following note by the tutor in Dunhuang:

Earlier scholars proposed different explanations [of the meaning] of the pouring out of the libation. From the sub-commentary [these differences] become very clear.³⁴

Although the sub-commentary by Huang Kan, a renowned specialist on rites and ceremonies, goes into considerable detail on this matter, the tutor provides complementary references on ancient perceptions of the pouring of libations.³⁵ However, the tutor’s remark implies that students at the outpost in Dunhuang had access to a full copy of the *Lunyu Yishu* where details of Huang Kan’s elaborations on this issue could be obtained. From a compositional point of view it is noteworthy that the tutor’s reference to the sub-commentary echoes a similar short-cut taken by Huang Kan in his explanation of *di* 禘, a sacrifice made once every five years. The relevant part of the sub-commentary on the *Lunyu*, 3: 10 in the *Lunyu Yishu* reads:

However, earlier scholars provided divergent discussions of it [the *di* sacrifice]. [I] shall not go into [further] detail now but talk about it following the outline given in the commentary.³⁶

When reading the manuscript fragment as a close representation of orally delivered lectures, one might also expect the tutor at Dunhuang to elaborate on—or at least repeat—the synopses of individual chap-

ters. Instead, the manuscript omits Huang Kan's introductory notes to chapters. This is the case at the beginning of the second chapter and the *Lunyu*, 2: 1 where none of the opening remarks on the significance of the chapter and its main content appear in the manuscript.³⁷ The omission of these opening remarks in P 3573 is particularly noteworthy because it hints at the manuscript fragment initially having served as a meaningful selection from the *Lunyu Yishu*.

Of the thirty-eight sections copied in manuscript P 3573 there are twelve in which the main text of the *Lunyu* is incomplete. Some are missing the beginning, some omit the end, and others show both beginning and end but do not contain central segments.³⁸ Most importantly, there seems to be little regularity in these omissions unless the manuscript is perceived as a digest of passages that appeared particularly relevant to the tutor, and on which he thought he had significant comments to make. P 3573 also shows that the tutor did not strictly adhere to the textual sequence of the sub-commentary but felt somewhat free to move explanatory passages around. At the beginning of Chapter 3 we see that explanations that relate to the *Lunyu*, 3: 1 in the received versions of the *Lunyu Yishu* are moved into the running commentary on the subsequent the *Lunyu*, 3: 2 in P 3573.³⁹ In addition to cross-references between explanatory notes on topically related but traditionally separate chapters of the main text, this text sample shows a number of other interesting characteristics.⁴⁰ Formulae such as “*Huo wen yue* 或問曰” (Some ask) and “*Da yue* 答曰” (The answer is) in the sub-commentary on the *Lunyu*, 3: 2 are transcriptions of Huang Kan's oral presentation in his classroom where the pseudo-dialogue format aims to engage the learner with the subject matter.⁴¹ In the sentence pattern “*Wen . . . ye* 問 . . . 耶 (Is it the case that . . . ?)” followed by “*Da* 答 (The answer is),” P 3573 carries the very same feature in a slightly more colloquial style. Supplementary question-answer sections in the manuscript guide the student to engage with and better understand the message. As the question is of a rhetorical nature, the answer is provided by the tutor who, again, complements Huang Kan's elaborations with an additional point of reference from within the wider corpus of the classics:

How do we know about the demeanor of a majestic Son of Heaven? [The] *Record of Rites* [states]: “The Son of Heaven [appears] majestic, titled lords [show] gravity, grandees [show] composure, officers [show] easy alertness, and ordinary people [show] simplicity and humility.” This is why [the *Analects*] speak of the demeanor of a “majestic Son of Heaven.”⁴²

As a vestige of oral teaching performance, we also find plentiful evidence of Huang Kan employing the rhetorical question-answer

format in his sub-commentaries as transmitted in the Japanese text tradition.⁴³ The question–answer format is indeed a recurring technique in the pedagogical repertoire that gives the lecture structure, divides the material up more cleanly and serves as a method of retaining students’ attention. To illustrate this with just one example, we may refer to the *Lunyu*, 7: 14, a passage discussing the influence of music upon people and vice versa, on which Huang Kan notes:

Someone asked: “If music changes in compliance with the lord, and if the lord’s heart is good, then the music becomes good; if the heart is lewd, then the music becomes lewd. Now, the lord of Qi was not with the Way, but the music did not change and still flourished, how can this be so? Moreover, if the music kept flourishing, then the people of Qi ought to change with the music, but the people of Qi remained fierce and did not change in compliance with the music, how can that be so?” I [Huang Kan] answer: “The music that follows the lord and thus changes is only the music in the time of a [real] king, that’s it.”⁴⁴

This fairly lengthy example shows a clearly constructed dialogue that elaborates on the core point. There are, however, many less developed rhetorical interjections, often consisting of no more than as simple “*He zhe* 何者 (why is this?),” a short insertion that seems to offer nothing more than to ensure students stay focused, thereby providing us with a fascinating residual trace of oral classroom performances. Clearly, the rhetorical question–answer format is far from exclusive to the *Lunyu Yishu* or to Huang Kan’s teaching practice, and there are numerous examples of rhetorical questions in the manuscript fragment. These include the *Lunyu*, 1: 10 where Zigong 子貢 (520–446 BCE) discusses the master’s methods of acquiring information. While the sub-commentary in the *Lunyu Yishu* transmitted via Japan builds up a rather standard topic-comment with a wording almost identical to that found in the manuscript, P 3573 shows the residual formula of oral transmission and thought processes in the form of “*He zhi yu ren zhi qiu yi ye* 何知與人之求異也 (How [do we] know [Confucius] is different to others in his seeking [of information]).”⁴⁵

The two versions of the *Lunyu Yishu* also include examples of both texts using rhetorical questions in the same context, but for different purposes. In the *Lunyu*, 2: 22, for example, the Master equates a man’s trustworthiness to the crossbar of a chariot. Both versions of Huang Kan’s sub-commentary make reference to Jiang Xi.⁴⁶ But whereas P 3573 introduces this quotation in a manner in which the topic is laid out by giving a clear direction of the discourse, the versions transmitted via Japan use parallel rhetorical questions as a means for textual emphasis:

If a carriage does not have clamps or a crossbar, what can it then use to move? If someone does not have trustworthiness, what can he then use to stand [firm]? Thus Jiang Xi . . . said: "A carriage's dependence on clamps and crossbar to move is similar to a man's reliance on trustworthiness to stand [firm]." ⁴⁷

The manuscript fragment reads:

How do we know that a man's reliance on trustworthiness is similar to a carriage's dependence on clamps and crossbar? Thus Jiang Xi . . . said: "Carriages depend on clamps and crossbar to move. Men rely on trustworthiness and uprightness to stand [firm]." ⁴⁸

This is to say that whereas the rhetorical question serves as an emphatic element in the versions received via Japan, the manuscript appears to use the very same technique to add structure and direction to the discourse, presumably to assist the students in learning to access the material.

As a transcript of lectures based on the *Lunyu Yishu* P 3573 is highly selective in what it carries and what it omits. Its excerpts from the *Lunyu*, 1: 7, for example, record parts of the beginning of the main text and the sub-commentary, while the second part is entirely omitted.⁴⁹ As in the case of the *Lunyu*, 1: 8, where the manuscript omits the entire beginning, the overall textual arrangement and omissions seem to derive from intentional amendments rather than errors during the transcription process.⁵⁰ This suggests that P 3573 was never intended as a complete copy of the *Lunyu Yishu* but as a selection of passages that deserve particular attention, a digest focused on passages significant in the context of a particular teaching situation.

IV. CODA

The omissions, interpolations, and amendments in the sub-commentary from Dunhuang do not result from alterations made in Japan but are primarily related to amendments made by the tutor delivering lectures on the *Lunyu* based on Huang Kan's readings.⁵¹ It thus follows that manuscript fragment P 3573 is the earliest extant textual witness of the *Lunyu Yishu* and invaluable source material for our understanding of its transmission. It represents what might be described as a working manuscript either taken from or used for lectures based on the *Lunyu Yishu* at the periphery of the empire. It offers valuable insights into teaching practices and manuscript culture, but it does not qualify as a faithful and trustworthy representation of the original textual condition of the *Lunyu Yishu*. The manuscript from Dunhuang transmits selected passages from the *Lunyu*

and from Huang Kan's sub-commentary that were deemed relevant by either the tutor or the copyist, and it was received and studied with the commentaries assembled in the *Lunyu Jijie* in mind, and with reference to a full copy of the *Lunyu Yishu*.

The *Lunyu Yishu* allows for meaningful insights into one man's teaching at the National University of the Liang, where his lectures attracted considerable numbers of students.⁵² It represents what may be described as edited lecture notes that take the *Lunyu Jijie* as their exegetical starting point and develop an intellectual environment in which the openness of the main text is emphasized by Huang Kan who discusses the exegetical corpus and is open to divergent, sometimes even contradictory, interpretations of the Master's utterances. The transmitted text shows considerable residual oral influences and remnants of oral teaching practices, and it offers telling insights into traditional pedagogy.

The manuscript fragment P 3573 builds on Huang Kan's elaborations and attests to a second layer of oral teaching performance. The additional elucidations by the tutor in Dunhuang provide us with windows into what was expected of students of the *Lunyu* in a specific environment toward the end of the Tang Period, and into how students were led to advance their skills and knowledge. The tutor not only provides pointers and focused summaries but also additional references wherever he finds these necessary in view of the students' perceived lack of familiarity with relevant readings. On the other hand, the manuscript clearly indicates that familiarity with the *Lunyu Jijie* was a prerequisite and that the main text of the *Lunyu* was approached with reference to the glosses established by preceding exegetes. By focusing on what the tutor considered the core explanatory material, the manuscript P 3573 reflects historical changes of exegetical parameters, a development that found its culmination in Xing Bing's *Lunyu Zhushu*. In this sense P 3573 can be described as a precursor of the *Lunyu Zhushu*.

Although the appearance of text-cum-commentary editions is widely associated with developments during the Song, the main text of the *Lunyu*, the pointers toward the *Lunyu Jijie*, the elaborations, discussions of and addenda to it in the *Lunyu Yishu*, as well as the tutor's treatment of these materials are all written up in a comprehensive manuscript format that reflects substantial components of the oral transmission of knowledge in a particular environment. As an outline of teaching sessions, most likely recorded by a student, manuscript fragment P 3573 was never intended for later generations. It does, nevertheless, provide pictures frozen in time that allow us to gauge the interaction between a tutor and his students at this outpost

of the Tang empire, and how readings of the *Lunyu* were passed on from generation to generation.

SCHOOL OF ORIENTAL AND AFRICAN STUDIES (SOAS)
London, United Kingdom

ENDNOTES

A first draft of this article was presented at the international forum on “Re-reading *The Analects of Confucius*,” October 22–23, 2010, at King’s College London; a revised version was discussed at the International Conference of “The Study of the Classics and Literature (*Jingxue yu Wenxue* 《經學與文學》),” March 16–18, 2012, at National Taiwan University in Taipei. I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to the participants at these two conferences for providing me with feedback on these earlier versions. This article would not have been possible without their inspiring comments.

1. Technical note: References to the *Lunyu Yishu* 《論語義疏》 are to the reproduction of the Genji 元治 redaction in Yan Lingfeng 嚴靈峰, ed., *Wuqiubeizhai Lunyu Jicheng* 《無求備齋論語集成》 (Taipei: Yiwen Publisher, 1966). The Genji redaction (1864) is a reproduction of Nemoto Sonshi’s 根本遜志 (1699–1764) collation work based on the so-called Ashikaga manuscript which dates from between 1521 and 1554. Further reference is given to the Taitokudō 懷德堂 redaction, a collation of a 1477 manuscript copy with old textual witnesses preserved in Japan, established by Takeuchi Yoshio 武内義雄 (1886–1966) and first published in 1923/1924. Takeuchi Yoshio’s redaction is accompanied by his collation notes, the *Lunyu Yishu Jiaokanji* or *Rongo Giso Kōkan Ki* 《論語義疏校勘記》; both are reproduced in Yan, *Wuqiubeizhai Lunyu Jicheng*. For the Thirteen Classics I refer to Ruan Yuan 阮元, ed., *Shisan Jing Zhushu* [Fu Jiaokanji] 《十三經注疏 [附校勘記]》 (Taipei: Yiwen Publisher, 1985). References to sections (*zhang* 章) of the *Lunyu* follow the textual arrangement and segmentation in the Harvard-Yenching Index Series; see *Lunyu Yinde* 《論語引得》, in *Shisan Jing Yinde* 《十三經引得》, reprint (Taipei: Yanjing Publisher, n.d.), Vol. 8.
2. In his preface to the *Lunyu Jijie* He Yan provides a list of early commentators on the *Lunyu*; see *Lunyu Jijie* 《論語集解》 (photolithographic reproduction of a Yuan edition; Yan, *Wuqiubeizhai Lunyu Jicheng*) “Xu 序,” 1a–1b.
3. Preface in *ibid.*, 242.
4. For a summary on relevant issues regarding this commentary, see John Makeham, “He Yan, *Xuanxue* and the Editorship of the *Lunyu Jijie*,” *Early Medieval China* 5 (1999): 1–35.
5. For a more comprehensive discussion of these issues, see Bernhard Fuehrer, “Exegetical Strategies and Commentarial Features of Huang Kan’s *Lunyu Yishu*: A Preliminary Overview,” in *Dongya Lunyuxue: Zhongguo Pian* 東亞論語學：中國篇, ed. Huang Chun-chieh 黃俊傑 (Taipei: Guoli Taiwan Daxue Publisher, 2009), 273–96.
6. See Pelliot chinois Touen-houang 3573 (P3573). On the return of the *Lunyu Yishu* to China during the *Siku Quanshu* preparation 《四庫全書》 Period, see Bernhard Fuehrer, “‘The Text of the Classic and the Commentaries Deviates Greatly from Current Editions.’ A Case Study of the *Siku Quanshu* Version of Huang Kan’s *Lunyu Yishu*,” in *Zensur. Text und Autorität in China in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. Bernhard Führer (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003), 19–38. The beginning of the manuscript and of the *Lunyu*, 1: 1 is damaged; the fragment ends with the *Lunyu*, 4: 18. At the beginning of the second scroll the fragment indicates the title as *Lunyu Shu* 《論語疏》, a title version well attested in the dynastic histories.
7. See Kanda Kiichirō 神田薰一郎, *Dunhuang Miji Liuzhen Xinbian* 《敦煌祕籍留真新編》 Preface, Vol. 1, 59–96. For more recent reproductions, see Huang Yongwu 黃永武, ed., *Dunhuang Congkan Chuji* 《敦煌叢刊初集》 (Taipei: Xinwenfeng Publisher, 1985) or *Zhongguo Xibei Wenxian Congshu*

- 《中國西北文獻叢書》 (Lanzhou: Lanzhou Guji Publisher, 1990). P 3573 is reproduced in Yan, *Wuqiubeizhai Lunyu Jicheng* under the title *Tang Xieben Lunyu Yishu* 《唐寫本論語義疏》. As part of the International Dunhuang Project led by the British Library, an excellent digitized reproduction is available at the website of the Bibliothèque Nationale; see the link at www://idp.bl.uk. My references to this manuscript are to the thirty slightly overlapping slides made available by the Bibliothèque Nationale.
8. The dates are year nine of the reign-period Zhenming 貞明 (923) and the reign-period Longde 龍德 (921–923) of the Later Liang Period (907–923). According to the official calendar, the reign-period Zhenming lasted for only six years (915–921) and was changed to Longde which lasted up to the takeover by the Later Tang in 923. An alternative explanation for the conflict in dates could be that the copyist continued to use taboo graphs even after the fall of the Tang, be that either out of habit or as expression of loyalty.
 9. P 3573 exhibits the typical taboo graph avoidance such as the use of *ren* 人 as a synonym substitute for *min* 民 in the *Lunyu*, 1: 5, 1: 9, 2: 1, 2: 3, 3: 21, 3: 24, and 3: 25.
 10. See *Lunyu Zhushu* 《論語注疏》 (Ruan Yuan, *Shisan Jing Zhushu*) Whereas the *Lunyu Yishu* tends to give the full names of commentators, most copies of the *Lunyu Jijie* and the *Lunyu Zhushu* refer to them by surname only. The names of commentators cited in the *Jijie*-commentary are entirely omitted in P 3573, another indication of the memory-based nature of references to the first commentarial layer.
 11. Out of a total of eighty-four sections from the *Lunyu*, 1: 1 up to the *Lunyu*, 4: 18 covered in P 3573, the manuscript omits forty-six and only carries thirty-eight sections, twelve of which carry incomplete versions of the main text.
 12. See Wang Zhongmin 王重民, “Bali Lundun Suo Cang Dunhuang Canjuan Xulu 巴黎倫敦所藏敦煌殘卷敘錄,” *Tushu Jikan* 《圖書季刊》 New Series 1, no. 1 (1939): 4–14, esp. 4, and Wang Zhongmin, *Dunhuang Guji Xulu* 《敦煌古籍敘錄》 (Taipei: Muduo Publisher, 1981), 73. For the *Lunyu Yishu* Wang Zhongmin used a copy of the original version of Bao Tingbo 鮑廷博, ed., *Zhibuzuzhai Congshu* 《知不足齋叢書》 ([facsimile of the 1776–1823 ed.] 12 volumes; Taipei: Xingzhong Publisher, 1964). The reproduction of the *Lunyu Yishu* in Chen Li 陳澧, comp., *Gujingjie Huihan* 《古經解彙函》 (1873) (Tokyo: Chūbun Publisher, 1998), which was widely used among Qing scholars, also derived from the copy in the 1776–1823 version of the *Zhibuzuzhai Congshu*.
 13. As for omissions in the exegetical apparatus, two examples may suffice: Compared with the versions transmitted in Japan the sub-commentary on the *Lunyu*, 3: 7 in P 3573 is reduced from over 830 to around 370 graphs (approximately 45 percent), and the notes on the *Lunyu*, 3: 4 come down from about 220 to about 90 graphs (approximately 41 percent).
 14. See, for example, the omission in P 3573 of statements by Li Chong 李充 in the sub-commentaries on the *Lunyu*, 3: 7 and the *Lunyu*, 3: 20; by Sun Chuo 孫綽 on the *Lunyu*, 2: 4, the *Lunyu*, 3: 22, and the *Lunyu*, 3: 24; by Wang Bi 王弼 on the *Lunyu*, 2: 4 and the *Lunyu*, 3: 4; and by Fan Ning 范寧 on the *Lunyu*, 1: 15 and the *Lunyu*, 3: 7.
 15. See Li Fang 李方, “*Tang Xieben Lunyu Huang Shu de Xingzhi ji qi Xiangguan Wenti* 〈唐寫本論語皇疏的性质及其相关问题〉,” *Wenwu* 《文物》 2 (1988): 49–55, esp. 51; cf. also Tang Minggui 唐明貴, “*Dunhuang ji Tulufan Chutu Tang Xieben Lunyu Zhuben Yanjiu Gaishu* 〈敦煌及吐魯番出土唐寫本論語注本研究概述〉,” *Guji Zhengli Yanjiu Xuekan* 《古籍整理研究學刊》 1 (2006): 32–41, esp. 33.
 16. The titles of both works vary slightly in the bibliographic chapters of the dynastic histories from Sui to Tang. For the *Jijie Lunyu* and the *Lunyu Zhu*, see Wei Zheng 魏徵 et al., *Sui Shu* 《隋書》 (Beijing: Zhonghua Publisher, 1987), 32: 936, where the commentary records also a *Lunyu Shi* 《論語釋》 by Li Chong which was, however, lost at the time of the compilation of the bibliographical chapter. Neither Jiang Xi’s nor Li Chong’s work on the *Lunyu* appears in Fujiwara Sukeyo 藤原佐世, *Nihonkoku Genzaisho Mokuroku* 《日本國現在書目錄》, in *Guyi Congshu* 《古逸叢書》, comp. Li Shuchang 黎庶昌 (Tokyo: Li Shuchang, 1882–1884).
 17. This development which led to Xing Bing’s *Lunyu Zhushu*, a reader that derives from the *Lunyu Yishu* but reduced the explanations transmitted by Huang Kan to what

Xing Bing considered the Confucian core material. In addition, just like the *Lunyu Zhushu*, which aimed at offering students a handy reader on the *Lunyu* for examination purposes, P 3573 can be regarded as stemming from lectures on the *Lunyu* in which students were prepared for examinations. This is to say that the omission of explanatory material associated with Daoist and Buddhist thought in P 3573 not only reflects practical considerations such as the relevance of certain readings for examination purposes. Perhaps even more importantly, the omissions reflect a general trend in Confucian exegesis from Huang Kan's *Lunyu yishu* to Xing Bing's *Lunyu Zhushu*.

18. The emphasizing red circles in the manuscript are represented by ○ in my excerpts. Another frequently encountered means of adding emphasis is the addition of red marks in P 3573.
19. For the use of *ci ming* in the sub-commentary of *Lunyu Yishu* versions transmitted in Japan, see, for example, the *Lunyu*, 1: 5, 1: 9, 2: 1, 4: 2, 6: 6, 7: 7, 7: 11, 7: 16, 7: 22, 7: 32, 8: 5, 8: 9, 9: 11, 9: 26, 11: 22, 14: 11, 15: 35, 16: 1, 16: 5, and 20: 1. For *ci zhang ming*, see, for example, the *Lunyu*, 5: 2, 4: 2, 10: 2, 11: 2, 12: 2, 14: 2, 22: 3, 7: 3, 9: 3, 10: 7, 6: 8, 8: 2, 8: 8, 9: 30, and 16: 1. There are, however, minor textual divergences. For example, the sub-commentary on the *Lunyu*, 1: 5 reads *ci ming* in the *Lunyu Yishu* (Taitokudō), 1: 5b whereas *Lunyu Yishu* (Genji), 1: 6b has *ci zhang ming*, and the sub-commentary on the *Lunyu*, 1: 9 has *ming* in the *Lunyu Yishu* (Taitokudō), 1: 10a where *Lunyu Yishu* (Genji), 1: 11a reads *ci ming*.
20. See Wang Zhongmin, "Bali Lundun Suo Cang Dunhuang Canjuan Xulu," 5.
21. See, for example, the tutor's supplementary explanations to the sub-commentary on the *Lunyu*, 1: 1 and 1: 5 (*yang jie . . . zhe*), the *Lunyu*, 1: 9 and 2: 5 (*yang shi . . . zhe*), the *Lunyu*, 3: 2 and 3: 16 (*yang ming . . . zhe*) in the manuscript.
22. P 3573 (slide 3): 仰解節用愛人者：雖富有一國，而不可奢侈，故云節用。雖貴居人上，不可驕慢，故云愛人也。Compare *Lunyu Yishu* (Genji), 1: 6b and *Lunyu Yishu* (Taitokudō), 1: 7b and note that P 3573 adheres to the Tang taboo (民) and drops 之財.
23. See P 3573 (slide 1) and compare the corresponding passages in *Lunyu Yishu* (Genji), 1: 2b and *Lunyu Yishu* (Taitokudō), 1: 2b.
24. P 3573 (slide 11): 仰釋仲孫名字者：仲孫是其氏，何忌是其名也。Compare the corresponding part in *Lunyu Yishu* (Genji), 1: 21a and *Lunyu Yishu* (Taitokudō), 1: 19a.
25. See P 3573 (slide 5): 仰釋慎終追遠二事者。Compare *Lunyu Yishu* (Genji), 1: 11a and *Lunyu Yishu* (Taitokudō), 1: 10a.
26. See P 3573 (slide 5), *Lunyu Yishu* (Genji), 1: 11a and *Lunyu Yishu* (Taitokudō), 1: 10a. The first two verses of this quote are attested in *Mao Shi Zhushu* 毛詩注疏 (Ruan Yuan, *Shisan Jing Zhushu*), 18A: 1b [p. 641], and also appear in *Zuo Zhuan Zhushu* 《左傳注疏》 (Ruan Yuan, *Shisan Jing Zhushu*), 14: 22b [p. 689] with reference to the *Shijing* 《詩經》.
27. See *Lunyu Yishu* (Genji), 2: 5a and the slightly different orthography in *Lunyu Yishu* (Taitokudō), 2: 4b.
28. P 3573 (slide 18): ○ 何知泰山在魯家？泰山者，詩云：泰山巖巖，魯邦所詹。○ 何知林放魯人者？泰山既魯山，則林放是魯人。
29. See *Mao Shi Zhushu*, 20B: 13a [p. 782]. The *Lunyu Yishu* as transmitted via Japan does not contain this reference.
30. Zheng Xuan's gloss is recorded in the *jijie*-commentary on the *Lunyu*, 3: 4 in *Lunyu Yishu* (Genji), 2: 4a and *Lunyu Yishu* (Taitokudō), 2: 3b: 鄭玄曰：林放魯人也。
31. Another example of the tutor clarifying matters in complementary commentaries is found in the *Lunyu*, 3: 9; compare *Lunyu Yishu* (Genji), 2: 8b–9b and *Lunyu Yishu* (Taitokudō), 2: 8a–8b with P 3573 (slides 19–20).
32. See, for example, the explanatory texts on the *Lunyu*, 3: 10 and the *Lunyu*, 3: 11.
33. See P 3573 (slides 20–21). *Lunyu Yishu* (Genji), 2: 9b–11b and *Lunyu Yishu* (Taitokudō), 2: 8b–10b, as well as the later tradition, read 3.10 and 3.11 as separate sections.
34. P 3573 (slide 20): ○ 先儒說灌法不同，依疏明顯者也。
35. See P 3573 (slide 20–21). *Lunyu Yishu* (Genji), 2: 10a–10b and *Lunyu Yishu* (Taitokudō), 2: 9a–9b.

36. *Lunyu Yishu* (Genji), 2: 9b and *Lunyu Yishu* (Taitokudō), 2: 8b: 而先儒論之不同，今不具說，且依注梗概而談也。For a slightly different wording of this passage, see P 3573 (slide 20).
37. See *Lunyu Yishu* (Genji), 1: 17a–17b, *Lunyu Yishu* (Taitokudō), 1: 16a–16b; P 3573 (slide 9).
38. See, for example, the *Lunyu*, 2: 3 and compare the main text in *Lunyu Yishu* (Genji), 1: 18a and *Lunyu Yishu* (Taitokudō), 1: 17a with P 3573 (slide 10).
39. See *Lunyu Yishu* (Genji), 2: 1a–3b, *Lunyu Yishu* (Taitokudō), 2: 1a–3a; P 3573 (slides 16–17) and note Huang Kan's synopsis of this chapter is again omitted.
40. The textual tradition of the *Lunyu Yishu* seems uniform in separating the *Lunyu*, 3: 1 and the *Lunyu*, 3: 2, the textual arrangement in P 3573 is peculiar.
41. The *Lunyu Yishu* shows ample evidence of Huang Kan using this strategy.
42. P 3573 (slide 17): ○ 何知穆穆天子之容者。 礼記。天子穆穆。諸侯皇皇。大夫濟濟。士鏘鏘。庶人僬僬。故言穆穆天子之容者。This passage is absent from the sub-commentary on the *Lunyu*, 3: 2 in *Lunyu Yishu* (Genji), 2: 2b–2b and *Lunyu Yishu* (Taitokudō), 2: 2a–3a. For the point of reference provided in P 3573, see *Liji Zhushu* 《禮記注疏》 (Ruan Yuan, *Shisan Jing Zhushu*), 5: 11a.
43. For examples in the *Lunyu Yishu* where Huang Kan explicitly refers to himself as the person who provides answers and insights, see the *Lunyu*, 1: 2, 1: 8, 1: 11, 1: 13, 3: 17, 5: 2, 5: 9, 5: 14, 7: 14, 7: 27, 7: 35, 8: 4, 8: 8, 8: 15, 8: 20, 9: 16, 10: 5, 10: 8, 11: 3, 11: 7, 11: 15, 12: 9, 15: 15, 18: 11, and 20: 1.
44. *Lunyu Yishu* (Genji), 4: 8a and *Lunyu Yishu* (Taitokudō), 4: 7a: 或問曰。樂隨人君而變。若人君心善則樂善。心淫則樂淫。今齊君無道。而韶音那獨不變而猶盛耶。且若其音猶盛。則齊民宜從樂化。而齊民猶惡不隨樂化何也。侃答曰。夫樂隨人君而變者。唯在時王之樂耳。
45. See *Lunyu Yishu* (Genji), 1: 11b–12b, *Lunyu Yishu* (Taitokudō), 1: 10a–11b and P 3573 (slides 6–7) where the insertion is marked by a red circle (slide 6).
46. For the *Lunyu*, 3: 2.22, see *Lunyu Yishu* (Genji), 1: 30a–31a, *Lunyu Yishu* (Taitokudō), 1: 28b–29a and P 3573 (slides 13–14).
47. *Lunyu Yishu* (Genji), 1: 30b and *Lunyu Yishu* (Taitokudō), 1: 28b: 若車無輓輒。則車何以得行哉。如人而無信。則何以得立哉。故江熙[...]曰。車待輓輒而行。猶人須信以立也。
48. P 3573 (slide 14): 何知人須信猶車待輓輒者。 故江熙[...]曰。車待輓輒而行。人須信義以立也。
49. Compare *Lunyu Yishu* (Genji), 1: 9a–10a and *Lunyu Yishu* (Taitokudō), 1: 8b–9a with P 3573 (slide 4) where the explanations and commentaries in the manuscript only refer to a short excerpt (seven graphs) of this section. The rest of this otherwise thirty-eight graph-long main text and the exegetical notes on the missing parts are omitted from the manuscript copy.
50. Compare *Lunyu Yishu* (Genji), 1: 10a–11a and *Lunyu Yishu* (Taitokudō), 1: 9a–10a with P 3573 (slides 4–5) where we observe that the omission of the first part of the main text turns the remaining text (主忠信，無友不如己者，過則勿憚改) into a riddle that can hardly be resolved without reference to the omitted part.
51. Due to the lack of further textual witnesses it remains unclear to what extent these amendments are to be associated with one specific tutor or whether they can be taken as indications of a wider trend in teaching material related to the *Lunyu* and the *Lunyu Yishu* at the time.
52. See Yao Cha 姚察 and Yao Silian 姚思廉, *Liang Shu* 《梁書》 (Beijing: Zhonghua Publisher, 1987), 48: 672 and Li Yanshou 李延壽, *Nan Shi* 《南史》 (Beijing: Zhonghua Publisher, 1987), 62: 1508.