Early China (2024), **47**, 3–52
doi:10.1017/eac.2024.5

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Consulting the Elder: Intertextuality in the "Lord Ai Asked" Confucian Dialogues

Scott Cook

Department of Chinese Studies and Yale-NUS College, National University of Singapore
Email: scott.cook@yale-nus.edu.sg

Abstract

This article focuses on passages in which Confucius is portrayed in dialogue with Lord Ai of Lu (r. 494–468 BCE), found scattered throughout a range of early texts, most centrally in the *Li ji*, the *Da Dai Li ji*, and the *Xunzi*. Examining intertextual connections among these dialogues and related texts, both received and excavated, it seeks to adduce evidence to determine whether their particular shared narrative frame might be original and integral to the content of these texts, as well as to reveal their close links with other early Confucian texts that hold important implications for the dating of all these interrelated texts.

Keywords: Kongzi (Confucius); Ai Gong wen; *Li ji* (*Book of Ritual*); *Da Dai Li ji* (*Elder Dai Book of Ritual*); *Xunzi*; Zhongyong (Doctrine of the Mean); Kongzi xianju; Zhongni yanju; Min zhi fumu; Ziyi; Biao ji; Fang ji; Warring States intellectual history

As perhaps the leading authority on ritual matters of his time and the man who, possessing the knowledge, wisdom, and charisma necessary to attract large numbers of disciples to his gates, effectively established the dominant tone for all discourse on ritual from his time forward, the figure of Confucius (Kong Zi 孔子, 551–479 BCE)[1]—not to mention his disciples—naturally looms large in both the *Li ji* 禮記 (*Book of Ritual*) and *Da Dai Li ji* 大戴禮記 (*Elder Dai Book of Ritual*). Outside of the *Lunyu* 論語

An earlier version of this article was first presented at the International Academic Conference on Intertextual Dialogue in Early Chinese Texts, held at Yale-NUS College, Singapore, on May 5–7, 2022; this conference was hosted by the Chinese Studies Council of Yale-NUS College and generously supported by the Tan Chin Tuan Foundation. I would like to thank the scholars who participated in that conference for their invaluable feedback, and also the two anonymous reviewers for *Early China* for their many useful suggestions for improving this article.

[1]Given that early texts refer to Confucius variously as "Master Kong" 孔子 and Zhongni 仲尼, I will reserve the use of those Chinese appellations mainly to refer to the figure of Kong Zi as he appears specifically in those texts, and use the Latinization of "Confucius" when referring to him as a literary and historical figure more generally—even though he is referred to consistently as "Kong Zi" in the texts that are the focus of this particular article.

© The Author(s), 2025. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Society for the Study of Early China. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution and reproduction, provided the original article is properly cited.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(*Analects of Confucius*), which is devoted exclusively to utterances and conversations of Confucius and his disciples, these two works are among our most valuable sources for understanding the thought of both Confucius himself and those who, in the subsequent few centuries, laid claim to his mantle.[2] Needless to say, the Confucius of all these works is at once both an historical and literary figure. As an historical figure, he was that man of Lu 魯 who at times likely achieved administrative and advisory positions of some prominence but at others remained largely beyond the political fray and devoted most of his time to the instruction of his disciples; as a literary figure, he was the subject of countless imaginative recreations that, consciously or not, served ends or philosophical positions that occasionally departed in subtle ways from those of the historical Confucius—texts produced by way of a literary license that was nonetheless bound, I would stress, by the limits of credulity established by historical memory of the living Confucius (itself, to be sure, constantly evolving over time).[3]

This present article focuses on passages in which Confucius is portrayed in dialogue with Lord Ai of Lu 魯哀公 (r. 494–468 BCE, b. 508 BCE). Such dialogues are found scattered throughout a range of early texts, but a central core of them is concentrated in the *Li ji*, the *Da Dai Li ji*, and the *Xunzi* 荀子—not to mention the *Kongzi jiayu* 孔子家語, which likely excerpted directly from these texts—with a fair amount of overlap among them.[4] It is these texts in particular that form the subject

[2]Both the *Li ji* and *Da Dai Li Ji* were compiled in the Western Han—and may not have achieved their final forms until the Eastern Han—but, with a few exceptions, they comprise largely texts transmitted from the mid-to-late Warring States.

[3]For some intriguing recent scholarship on Confucius as a literary figure and the examination of compositional features and editorial strategies that marked or informed the texts centered on that figure, see Oliver Weingarten, "Textual Representations of a Sage: Studies of Pre-Qin and Western Han Sources on Confucius (551–479 BCE)," Ph.D. dissertation (University of Cambridge, 2009), and Michael Hunter, *Confucius Beyond the Analects* (Leiden: Brill, 2017), or, preceding this, his "Sayings of Confucius, Deselected," Ph.D. dissertation (Princeton University, 2012). For my own discussion on how such recreations nevertheless remained bound by the limits of historical believability, see my "Confucius as Seen through the Lenses of the *Zuo zhuan* and *Lunyu*," *T'oung Pao* 101.4/5 (2015), 298–334. For an interesting look at how the figure of Confucius continually evolved in iconography over the past two millennia, see Julia K. Murray, "Varied Views of the Sage: Illustrative Narratives of the Life of Confucius," in *On Sacred Grounds: Culture, Society, Politics, and the Formation of the Cult of Confucius*, ed. Thomas A. Wilson (Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2002), 222–64; for a much more speculative yet thought-provoking examination of the evolving constellation of mythology surrounding Confucius's origins, see Lionel Jensen, "The Genesis of Kongzi in Ancient Narrative: The Figurative as Historical," in *On Sacred Grounds*, 175–221; and for a particularly intriguing exploration of how early Confucian hagiography may have intersected with Confucius's family origins, see Robert Eno, "The Background of the Kong Family of Lu and the Origins of Ruism," *Early China* 28 (2003), 1–41. Of particular relevance to the current article, Mark Csikszentmihalyi examines in conjunction with formal consistencies seen in parts of the *Lunyu* whether there was a process whereby "interlocutor texts"—texts or sets of passages featuring a single interlocutor, such as a specific disciple or, in the present case, a ruler such as Lord Ai—were "combined and incorporated into a single text"; see his "Interlocutory Collections, the *Lunyu*, and Proto-*Lunyu* Texts," in *Confucius and the Analects Revisited*, ed. Michael Hunter and Martin Kern (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 218–40.

[4]Elsewhere, two mini-dialogues between Lord Ai and Kong Zi appear in the *Lunyu*: "Lord Ai asked: 'What must I do so that the people will submit?' Kong Zi replied: 'If you promote the upright and place them above the crooked, the people will submit; if you promote the crooked and place them above the upright, they will not'" (哀公問曰：「何為則民服？」孔子對曰：「舉直錯諸枉，則民服；舉枉錯諸直，則民不服」) ("Weizheng" 為政 passage 19 [2.19]); and "Lord Ai asked: 'Which of your disciples is [most] fond of learning?' Kong Zi replied: 'There was Yan Hui, who was fond of learning, did not transfer his anger

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

matter of this study, though, due to space constraints, the current article will examine in depth only the two dialogues that appear in the "Lord Ai Asked" chapter (or, more accurately, text)[5] of the *Li ji* itself (or, equivalently, the "Lord Ai Asked Kong Zi" chapter of the *Da Dai Li ji*). Translations of the other five dialogues are included here in an appendix; while their mutual affinities and connections with other relevant texts cannot be substantiated in this article to the same degree as those pertaining to the two treated in depth here, we will still have occasion to point to a few telling and significant instances of overlap along the way—though, as we shall see by the conclusion of this article, the two dialogues that form "Lord Ai Asked" may have constituted a particularly central text of the early Confucian proto-canon. In order to maintain distinction among the separate dialogues rather than concentrating unduly on the "chapters" in which they appear, the present study will label each dialogue with a letter, as per Table 1.[6]

This study begins with the conjecture that there was likely an explicit purpose behind this particular narrative frame. Against the potential argument that this frame was, at least in some cases, added only later to provide plausible context for pre-existing material, we seek here to adduce evidence to determine whether the frame

upon others, and never repeated his mistakes. But unfortunately he died too young! Now, there are none, to my knowledge, who are [truly] fond of learning'" (哀公問：「弟子孰為好學？」孔子對曰：「有顏回者好學，不遷怒，不貳過。不幸短命死矣！今也則亡，未聞好學者也」) ("Yongye" 雍也, passage 2[/3] [6.2(/3)]). "Ai Gong Asked" dialogues of various lengths also appear in the "Zhongyong" 中庸 and "Rufu" 儒服 chapters of the *Li ji*; the "Zidao" 子道 chapter of the *Xunzi* (though focusing more on a subsequent conversation with Zigong 子貢); the "Jundao" 君道, "Zhengli" 政理, "Zunxian" 尊賢, "Jingshen" 敬慎, "Zhiwu" 指武, and "Zayan" 雜言 chapters of the *Shuoyuan* 說苑; the "Zashi, disi" 雜事第四 and "Zashi, diwu" 雜事第五 chapters of the *Xinxu* 新序; *juan* 1 and 4 of the *Hanshi waizhuan* 韓詩外傳; and various chapters of the *Kongzi jiayu* and *Kongcongzi* 孔叢子. In decidedly more non-Confucian sources, such dialogues also appear in the "Nei chushuo shang" 內儲說上, "Wai chushuo zuoxia" 外儲說左下, and "Nansan" 難三 chapters of the *Han Feizi* 韓非子; the "Cha chuan" 察傳 chapter of the *Lüshi chunqiu* 呂氏春秋; and, most imaginatively, the "Dechongfu" 德充符 chapter of the *Zhuangzi* 莊子 (in some of these appearing as "Zhongni"). Finally, if we include texts in which Lord Ai (assumedly) appears in the form of an unspecified "the Lord," we might add to this list the "Qiansheng" 千乘, "Sidai" 四代, "Yu daide" 虞戴德, "Gaozhi" 誥志, "Xiaobian" 小辨, "Yongbing" 用兵, and "Shaoxian" 少閒 chapters of the *Da Dai li ji*—which, taking the consistent form of "the Lord said" 公曰 followed by "the Master said" 子曰, would seem to form a separate group of their own. These last seven texts have long been identified as equivalent to the seven-*pian* 篇 *Kongzi sanchao ji* 孔子三朝記 listed under the "Lunyu" 論語 category in the "Treatise on Arts and Letters" 藝文志 of the *Han shu* 漢書; this is based partly on a quote from Liu Xiang's 劉向 (77–6 BCE) *Bielu* 別錄 cited in Pei Songzhi's 裴松之 (372–451 CE) annotations to Qin Mi's 秦宓 (d. 226 CE) biography in the "Shu shu" 蜀書 section of the *Sanguo zhi* 三國志, which states that "Kong Zi had audience with Lord Ai three times and created the *Sanchao ji* in seven *pian*, which are now in the *Da Dai Li*" (孔子三見哀公，作《三朝記》七篇，在今《大戴禮》). See Wang Pinzhen 王聘珍 (fl. eighteenth century), *Da Dai Liji jiegu* 大戴禮記解詁, ed. Wang Wenjin 王文錦 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983), 6–7. Most of all these various texts, however, remain outside the scope of the present study; the "Zhongyong" case will be touched on below.

[5]Like most compilations in early China, the *Li ji* was certainly not a book in the usual sense of that word, but rather a collection of common yet somewhat dissimilar texts, and we use the term "chapter" here only for convenience to point to a particular text within that larger compilation. The same holds true for all references to "chapters" of other compilations as well.

[6]Versions of Dialogue G also appear in the "Zunxian" chapter of the *Shuoyuan* and *juan* 4 of the *Hanshi waizhuan*; segments from Dialogue C are also excerpted in *juan* 1 and 4 of the *Hanshi waizhuan*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1. Dialogue letter assignments

Dialogue	*Li ji*	*Da Dai Li ji*	*Xunzi*
A	"Lord Ai Asked" 哀公問	"Lord Ai Asked Kong Zi" 哀公問於孔子	
B	"Lord Ai Asked" 哀公問	"Lord Ai Asked Kong Zi" 哀公問於孔子	
C		"Lord Ai Asked about the Five Proprieties" 哀公問五義	"Lord Ai" 哀公
D			"Lord Ai" 哀公
E			"Lord Ai" 哀公
F			"Lord Ai" 哀公
G			"Lord Ai" 哀公

might instead be original and integral to the content itself.[7] To that end, we first observe that Lord Ai is clearly not the only ruler with whom Confucius could have been imagined in dialogue. According to *Zuo zhuan* 左傳 accounts, Confucius held relatively high positions under the reign of Lord Ding of Lu 魯定公 (r. 509–495 BCE, b. 556 BCE), who did not die until Confucius was already fifty-six years of age.[8] Yet, outside of two very brief excerpts in the *Lunyu* and a couple of questionable short passages in the *Kongzi jiayu* and *Kongcongzi*,[9] virtually no dialogues between Lord Ding and Confucius are to be found among extant texts. The chief reason for this probably has much to do with the fact that Lord Ding was, on top of being the ruler, also five years Confucius's senior and thus one to whom Confucius would have been expected to be relatively deferential, whereas Lord Ai was forty-three years his junior—still only twenty-nine years old when the Master died—and thus Confucius would have appeared before him as a sagely elder statesman, welcomed back to his home state after years of travel abroad and thus now due special deference in his own right.[10] As we shall see below, certain features of the dialogues in question serve to highlight just such a reversal in deferential status, such as Lord Ai's repeated use of the

[7]I have elsewhere offered a similar argument concerning the "Confucius at leisure" texts from the ritual compendia; see Scott Cook, "Confucius After Hours: An Analysis of the 'Master at Leisure' Dialogues in the *Li ji*," in *Autour du Traité des rites: De la canonisation du rituel à la ritualisation de la société*, ed. Joseph Ciaudo (under the direction of Anne Cheng and Stéphane Feuillas) (Paris: Hémisphères Editions, 2021), 127–65. As will be noted further below, those texts also bear an interesting relationship to some of the "Lord Ai Asked" dialogues.

[8]See especially the entries in Lord Ding, years 1, 10, and 12; Yang Bojun 楊伯峻, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu (xiudingben)* 春秋左傳注（修訂本) (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1990), 1527, 1577–78, and 1587.

[9]The *Lunyu* passages are (by Zhu Xi's 朱熹 [1130–1200 CE] numbering) "Bayi" 八佾 passage 19 (3.19) and "Zilu" 子路 passage 15 (13.15). The *Kongzi jiayu* passages are found in its "Jiaowen" 郊問 and "Zhenglunjie" 正論解 chapters; the *Kongcongzi* passages, both particularly brief, occur in that work's "Lunshu" 論書 chapter.

[10]According to the *Zuo zhuan* timeline, Confucius returned to Lu during the eleventh year of Lord Ai (484 BCE), and thus any dialogue between them could only have been imagined to have taken place during the six years from 484–479 BCE, when Confucius would have been between around sixty-seven to seventy-two years of age.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

formula "Dare I ask" (*gan wen* 敢問) in making his inquiries, a locution ordinarily reserved for disciples.

Our search for intertextual commonalities among these texts of similar narrative frame will also reveal fascinating connections with other early Confucian texts—connections of the sort that include those not easily attributed to a more general shared vocabulary and commonly utilized narrative devices, but which are rather indicative of more idiosyncratic stylistic tendencies and thought processes. Following an initial examination of the texts in question and an exploration of their shared phraseology, we will attempt to draw out the possible implications of such connections. In brief, these will include the speculation that, while shared usage of some of the more prominent unique terms could well be a mark of conscious imitation, overlap among less immediately noticeable idiosyncratic phrases is more likely a sign of common authorship, whether by a single individual or different members of a cohesive intellectual lineage. For reasons that will become clear below, moreover, indications of such likely common authorship, viewed in conjunction with recently excavated manuscripts, allow us to propose dates of composition for such influential texts as "Zhongni yanju" 仲尼燕居 (Zhongni Rested at Ease) and the "Zhongyong" 中庸 (Centrality and Commonality)—or at least portions thereof—with a much greater degree of certainty than hitherto possible. With these implications in mind, let us start our examination with the two dialogues that together comprise a single text found in both the *Li ji* and *Da Dai Li ji*.

"Lord Ai Asked"

The "Ai Gong wen" chapter of the *Li ji*—or "Ai Gong wen yu Kong Zi" chapter of the *Da Dai Li ji*—is a combination of two entirely separate dialogues (Dialogues A and B).[11] The first and shorter of the two lacks any sort of extra narrative frame, beginning straight off with Lord Ai's question. Much like other Confucius dialogue texts in the *Li ji*—such as "Zhongni yanju" 仲尼燕居—the topic of inquiry is, not surprisingly, ritual.

[11]The text of this chapter as given here is cited from Sun Xidan 孫希旦 (1736–1784), *Liji jijie* 禮記集解, ed. Shen Xiaohuan 沈嘯寰 and Wang Xingxian 王星賢 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1989), 1258–66, with reference also to Zhu Bin 朱彬 (1753–1834), *Liji xunzuan* 禮記訓纂, ed. Rao Qinnong 饒欽農 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1996), 740–44. This chapter is equivalent to the "Ai Gong wen yu Kong Zi" 哀公問於孔子 chapter of the *Da Dai Li ji*, for which see Wang Pinzhen, *Da Dai Liji jiegu*, 12–17; and Kong Guangsen 孔廣森 (1751–1786), *Da Dai Liji buzhu (fu Jiaozheng Kongshi Da Dai Liji buzhu)* 大戴禮記補注（附校正孔氏大戴禮記補注), ed. Wang Fengxian 王豐先 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2013), 26–30. The first of the two dialogues also occurs as the first passage in the "Wenli" 問禮 chapter of the *Kongzi jiayu*, whereas the second dialogue constitutes the entirety of the "Dahun jie" 大婚解 chapter of that work; for these, see, respectively, the *Qinding Siku quanshu* 欽定四庫全書 edition, *juan* 1, 17a–18a, and *juan* 1, 10a–13a. In the textual footnotes below, the *Da Dai Li ji* version and *Kongzi jiayu* version of the text will simply be referenced by DDLJ and KZJY, respectively; LJ will refer to the *Li ji* edition. As Wang E notes, the period in which this and the other "Ai Gong wen" dialogues would have taken place was somewhere between 484–479 BCE; Wang, however, believes this chapter to be an authentic record of Kong Zi's actual words, which, given especially the highly stylized literary touches, does not seem realistic. See Wang E 王鍔, "'Ai Gong wen' he 'Zhongni yanju' chengpian niandai kao"《哀公問》和《仲尼燕居》成篇年代考, *Journal of Ancient Books Collation and Studies* 古籍整理研究學刊 2006.2, 5–8.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Dialogue A

哀公問於孔子曰：	「大禮何如?君子[12]之言禮，何其尊也！」
孔子曰：	「丘也小人，不足以知禮。」[13]
君曰：	「否，吾子言之也。」[14]
Lord Ai asked Kong Zi:	"What is great ritual like? Why do [you] noblemen, when discussing ritual, hold it in such high esteem?"
Kong Zi replied:	"I am a man of no consequence and lack the means to understand ritual."
Lord [Ai] said:	"That is not so. Do speak of it."

While the question of "Ritual, what is it good for?" may well have been on Lord Ai's mind, it is hard to imagine any real conversation would have opened in such a manner, and Lord Ai's inquiry in this fictitious dialogue is clearly just a convenient set-up question designed to impart a discourse on the greatness of ritual directly into Kong Zi's mouth. The question implies that the value of ritual, and by extension ritual experts, has been subject to question, and the task of the written dialogue would seem to be to put such a question to rest.

The Kong Zi of this dialogue at once both declines any true knowledge of ritual and yet demonstrates that very knowledge precisely through his ritual show of humility—in a formula of self-declared "insufficiency" that we see repeated elsewhere.[15] Pressed by Lord Ai, Kong Zi then goes right ahead to discuss "what he has heard."

孔子曰： 「丘聞之，民之所由生[16]，禮為大。非禮無以節事天地之神也[17]，非禮無以辨君臣、上下、長幼之位也，非禮無以別男女、父子、兄弟之親，昏姻、疏數之交也[18]。君子以此之為尊敬然。[19]

[12]KZJY has just 子 here. In the textual notes that follow for this and subsequent dialogues, I attempt to identify all variations of any potential significance among the various versions of the text, but in order to streamline them somewhat I omit recording most of the more insignificant lexical variants (such as 如是 for 若此) and the absence, addition, or substitution of inconsequential words or particles (such as the absence or addition of 也, the addition of 對 before 曰, the substitution of 焉 for 之也, etc.).

[13]For 不足以, the DDLJ has the interrogative 何足以, to equivalent effect. KZJY has 鄙人 for 小人, and repeats 大禮 here for 禮.

[14]KZJY has 公 for 君—which is actually more consistent with the rest of the text.

[15]See, for instance, Kong Zi's initial response to Lord Ai's opening question in Dialogue E (from *Xunzi* "Ai Gong"; see the appendix below): "What my lord asks is the question of a sage-ruler. I am but a small man—how could I understand such things?" (君之所問，聖君之問也。丘，小人也，何足以知之).

[16]For 所由生, KZJY has 所以生者.

[17]For 神, DDLJ has 神明.

[18]KZJY lacks the 之親 after 兄弟 and instead adds 親族 in between 婚姻 and 疎數 (as it writes those latter pairs).

[19]As Kong Guangsen notes, some DDLJ editions lack this final 然, and some also have an added 夫 before the 然 of the next sentence. I suspect this 然 may have been accidentally duplicated from below. KZJY has this line as 是故君子此為之尊敬, with only the one 然 that begins the next phrase.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Kong Zi said: "I have heard that ritual is the greatest thing by which the people live their lives. Without ritual, there would be no means by which to serve the spirits of Heaven and Earth with rhythmic regularity; without ritual, there would be means by which to distinguish the positions between ruler and ministers, superiors and subordinates, or old and young; and without ritual, there would be no means by which to differentiate the affinities of man and woman, father and son, and elder and younger brother, or the relationships among relatives by marriage, those who are distant and those who are close. It is for these reasons that the noble man holds it in such high esteem and reverence."

Here, Kong Zi gets right to the heart of the manner by flatly stating that ritual is, in fact, indispensable for all of human social life, which is naturally marked by various forms of vertical and horizontal difference among living family members, deceased yet ever-present ancestors, and the entire political order under which we live, all of which require the regulating norms of ritual in order for those differences to be properly observed. Such is the essence of ritual, which both precedes and pervades all of its particular occasions, forms, vessels, and accoutrements, which, as the following "only then" 然後 serves to emphasize, are only subsidiary to this greater function:

「然後以其所能教百姓[20]，不廢其會節。有成事，然後治其雕鏤、文章、黼黻以嗣。[21]其順之，然後言其喪笄[22]，備其鼎、俎[23]，設其豕、腊，脩其宗廟[24]，歲時以敬祭祀，以序宗族[25]。即安其居節[26]，醜其衣服，卑其宮室，[27]車不雕幾[28]，器不刻鏤，食不貳味[29]，以與民同利。昔之君子之行禮者如此。[30]」

[20]KZJY adds 順 after 教 and has an extra 所能 at the end of this phrase.

[21]KZJY adds 既 before 有, has 而後 for 然後, omits 雕鏤, and in place of 以嗣 has 以別尊卑、上下之等.

[22]As Kong Guangsen notes, some DDLJ editions have 葬 for 笄. Here and elsewhere, we should keep in mind, as Kong also reminds us, that certain DDLJ editions may have been altered so as to conform to LJ, so it is relatively likely that these variants reflect an earlier state of the DDLJ text. KZJY has a markedly different version of the first part of this line: "其順之也，而後言其喪祭之紀、宗廟之序 . . . ".

[23]In place of this phrase, KZJY has 品其犧牲.

[24]KZJY lacks the 宗廟 here (though adds it above), effectively making 其歲時 the object of its 修.

[25]In place of the phrase 以序宗族, KZJY has an entirely new set of lines: 別其親疎，序其昭穆，而後宗族會醮.

[26]DDLJ writes this phrase as 則安其居處. The modern LJ editions punctuate the two phrases as "即安其居，節醜其衣服," but in comparison with DDLJ it appears more likely that 節 was intended to be read with the previous phrase, which would yield strict parallelism for the first three phrases (after the initial 即). With this parsing in mind, I do not follow Zheng Xuan 鄭玄 (127–200 CE) here in taking 即 verbally, as "take to," but read it simply as a conjunction. KZJY has an added phrase here, writing: 即安其居，以綴恩義, whereas the 節 appears as the verb in the corresponding line about clothing below.

[27]KZJY reverses these two phrases, and for 醜其衣服 (or 節醜其衣服) writes 節其服御.

[28]For 幾, KZJY writes 璣.

[29]After this phrase, KZJY adds an additional one: 心不淫志.

[30]KZJY writes this line as 古之明王行禮也如此.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> "Only then does [the noble man] instruct the men of a hundred surnames[31] [in ritual] to the extent of his abilities,[32] [so as] not to abandon their communal observances. Only once [their] tasks are accomplished [are they to] follow [these] through with the ordering of their carvings and engravings, emblems and patterns, and embroidered insignia. Only once all is in accord [are they to] discuss their degrees of mourning observance, make provisions for their tripod cauldrons and serving platters, set forth their sacrificial boars and dried meat, and renovate their ancestral temples, so that they may sacrifice with reverence at the seasonal occasions and bring order to their ancestral clans. At this, they are made secure in their [various] abodes and routines, have their clothing categorized [according to rank],[33] and have their residences and chambers diminished, their carriages devoid of carvings and reliefs, their vessels devoid of etchings and engravings, and their meals devoid of manifold flavors, so as to share their benefits in common with the people."

Kong Zi makes clear that all of these specific forms, patterns, and accoutrements are for the purposes of allowing the men of the hundred surnames to "sacrifice with reverence at the seasonal occasions and bring order to their ancestral clans"—they should never be misunderstood as being simply for their own sake. And as if to drive this point home, Kong Zi further proclaims that all embellishment or extravagance that does not go directly toward the service of such ends is to be expressly curtailed, so that the benefits of those higher up in the otherwise-indispensable hierarchy may be shared "in common with the people."

公曰：	「今之君子，胡莫行之也？」
孔子曰：	「今之君子，好實[34]無厭，淫德[35]不倦，荒怠敖慢[36]，固民是盡，午其眾以伐有道[37]，求得當欲，不以其所。[38]昔[39]之用民者由前，今之用民者由後。今之君子莫為禮也。[40]」
Lord [Ai] said:	"Why do none of today's noblemen put it into practice?"

[31]In this text, *baixing* 百姓, "men of a hundred surnames," appears to function in its older sense of referring to prominent landed office holders, in distinction to the ordinary people, *min* 民, mentioned at the end of this paragraph.

[32]It is tempting to take this first 其 to refer to 百姓 instead of the 君子, but this would be an unusual usage of the phrase 以其所能 and I here follow the traditional commentaries instead. The referents of the various 其 throughout the remainder of this paragraph are similarly ambiguous.

[33]This is according to the commentarial reading of 醜. In context, however, it may make sense to take 醜 more literally here in the sense of something like "un-beautify" or "degrade."

[34]For 好實, "fond of material bounty," DDLJ reads 好色, "fond of sensual beauty." KZJY has 好利, "fond of profit."

[35]For 淫德, KZJY has 淫行.

[36]For 荒怠, *Liji jijie* reads 怠荒; I here follow *Liji xunzuan*. For 敖慢, KZJY has 慢遊.

[37]For 午, DDLJ writes 忤. For 午(/忤)其眾以伐有道, KZJY has four phrases: "以遂其心，以怨其政，以忤其眾，以伐有道."

[38]KZJY adds two additional phrases to the end of this line: "虐殺刑誅，不以其治."

[39]For 昔, DDLJ reads 古.

[40]KZJY adds 是即 to the head of this final line and adds 能 after 莫.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Kong Zi replied: "The noblemen of today are incessantly fond of material bounty, tirelessly transgress the bounds of virtue, and are indolent, dissolute, and arrogant, thus invariably exhausting [their] people.[41] Contravening the masses, they attack those with the proper way, seeking [only] to fulfill [their own] desires and taking no stock of their [people's] places. Those who employed the people in the past took the former route; those who employ the people today take the latter. None of today's noblemen practice ritual."

The emphasis on moderation in ritual is finally put into the starkest of terms by posing an enemy of the people in the guise of the sham "noblemen" of today.[42] Or, to put the matter another way, ritual is not the problem, but rather that those who are employing it in this day and age are simply abusing it toward selfish ends.

There are a few defining terms and idiomatic phrases worth taking note of in this dialogue, a point which we will return to later. Before moving on to the second dialogue, however, let us first briefly examine the aforementioned "noblemen of today" (今之君子). While the contrast between an ancient golden age and a fallen present is certainly nothing out of the ordinary, the use of this particular term in expressing that contrast is in fact highly limited. Aside from its three occurrences in this dialogue of text, elsewhere within the *Li ji* and *Da Dai Li ji* corpuses (hereafter referred to as the "ritual compendia") it occurs only once in the "Tan Gong, xia" 彈弓下 chapter of the *Li ji*, in the mouth of Zisi; and, most significantly, once in the "Zhuyan" 主言 chapter of the *Da Dai Li ji*, in the mouth of Kong Zi.[43] Among all other pre-imperial and early Han texts (including unearthed manuscripts), it also occurs twice within a single passage in the "Gongsun Chou, xia" 公孫丑下 chapter of the *Mengzi* 孟子 (2B.9), in Meng Zi's mouth; three times in a passage from the Shanghai Museum manuscript "Zhonggong" 仲弓, in a brief series of questions from Zhonggong about the difficulties of remonstration; once in the "Zashi, disi" 雜事第四 (Miscellaneous Matters 4) chapter of the *Xinxu* 新序 (*New Arrangement*), in the mouth of the Chunqiu (Spring and Autumn)-period great officer Zhao Cui 趙衰 (d. 622 BCE); once in the *Lienü zhuan* 列女傳 (*Biographies of Exemplary Women*); and once in the "Fanzhi" 反質 (Return to Substance) chapter (*juan* 20) of the *Shuoyuan* 說苑 (*Garden of Persuasions*).[44] The latter, bearing ideological similarity to Dialogue A, is especially worth taking a look at:

衛叔孫文子問於王孫夏曰：　「吾先君之廟小，吾欲更之，可乎？」

[41]Zheng Xuan takes 固 here in the sense of 故. Kong Guangsen would read 錮, "hamper," "prohibit." I attempt a reading of 固 more or less as is, in the sense of "certainly," "invariably."

[42]I translate this as one word, "noblemen," in this sense in order to distinguish such men from the virtuous "noble men" who are ordinarily referred to by the term 君子 in Confucian discourse.

[43]The latter is duplicated in the equivalent "Wangyan" 王言 chapter of the *Kongzi jiayu*. "Zhuyan" is one of the three "Confucius at leisure" texts in the ritual compendia, the significance of which will be discussed later.

[44]These last three works were all compiled by Liu Xiang.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

對曰：	「古之君子，以儉為禮；今之君子，以汰易之。夫衛國雖貧，豈無文履一奇，以易十稷之繡哉？以為非禮也。」
文子乃止。[45]	
Shu-Sun Wenzi of Wey asked Wangsun Xia:	"The temple of our former lords is small, and I wish to renovate it—would that be alright?"
[Wangsun Xia] replied:	"The noble men of antiquity performed ritual with frugality, whereas the noblemen of today have substituted extravagance for this. For though the state of Wey be poor, did it not still have its marvel of the 'decorated shoes,' whose embroidery was traded for ten [units] of fine millet? I do not believe this to be in accord with ritual."
At this, Wenzi desisted.	

Though these Chunqiu-era figures technically predated Kong Zi, Wangsun Xia's ostensible words here sound almost as if they could have been taken straight out of Kong Zi's mouth from our "Ai Gong Wen" text, with its equivalent emphasis on the curtailment of extravagance.[46]

Dialogue B

The second and longer of the two dialogues runs as follows:

孔子侍坐於哀公，哀公曰：	「敢問人道誰為大？」
孔子愀然作色而對曰：	「君之及此言也，百姓之德[47]也。固臣敢無辭而對：人道政為大。」
Kong Zi was sitting in attendance of Lord Ai, and Lord Ai said:	"Might I dare ask what is the greatest [aspect] of the human way?"
Kong Zi apprehensively changed his facial expression and replied:	"The subject that you, my lord, are broaching concerns the virtue of the people of the hundred surnames, and so I would certainly not dare to decline to give you my reply: governance is the greatest [aspect] of the human way."

While preceded in this case by at least a minimal contextual tag, Lord Ai's initial question here comes out of the blue and is such a fundamental one that it is hard to imagine it ever having come up in the course of any genuine conversation. It is striking

[45]Liu Xiang, *Shuoyuan jiaozheng* 說苑校證, ed. and annot. Xiang Zonglu 向宗魯 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1987), 526. This edition mistakenly writes 文履 as 十履, which I have corrected here.

[46]As for the phrases 今之用民者 and 昔之用民者 that occur near the end of the dialogue, it is also worth noting that the term 用民者 appears nowhere outside this dialogue other than in the "Fafa" 法法 chapter of the *Guanzi* 管子 (though simply 用民 alone is somewhat more prevalent).

[47]For 德, KZJY has 惠.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

even to the no-doubt fictionalized Kong Zi of this narrative dialogue, who is portrayed as being visibly taken aback by it, having "apprehensively changed his facial expression" upon hearing the question. He replies by first stating why he even dares to reply, given that the standard ritual in such situations where the ruler asks a question of grave importance is for the minister to first decline the competence to answer it—just as we saw in the previous dialogue. In this case, the question is dramatized to be of such fundamental import that it is simply too big to risk the chance of passing it up through such ritual niceties, and so Kong Zi sums up the matter right away with a concisely straightforward five-word response.[48] This of course elicits Lord Ai's obligatory follow-up question:

公曰：	「敢問何謂為政？」[49]
孔子對曰：	「政者，正也。君為正，則百姓從[50]政矣。君之所為，百姓之所從也。君所不為[51]，百姓何從？」
公曰：	「敢問為政如之何？」
孔子對曰：	「夫婦別，父子親[52]，君臣嚴[53]，三者正，則庶物[54]從之矣。」
Lord Ai asked:	"Might I dare ask what is meant by 'practicing governance'?"
Kong Zi replied:	"'Governance' is 'rectification.' If the ruler acts with rectitude, the people of the hundred surnames will in accordance become rectified. Whatever the ruler practices, it is this that the people of the hundred surnames follow. If the ruler does not practice something, how would they follow it?"
Lord Ai asked:	"Might I dare ask how one is to go about practicing governance?"
Kong Zi replied:	"Husband and wife are to be distinguished from one another, father and son are to hold affinity toward each other, and ruler and minister are to be strict toward one another. When these three [relationships] are rectified, all things will follow in accord."

Lord Ai's first two follow-up questions here are asked with particular humility—reflecting not only consciousness of his own youth but also the solemn import of the topic—and as he has finally begun to slowly get more detail as to the basic principles of charismatic governance, he continues to press forward with further humility:

[48]Compare the use of the opposite means to achieve the same dramatic ends in the "Zhuyan" chapter of the *Da Dai Li ji*—albeit there in a dialogue with Zeng Zi. See Cook, "Confucius After Hours: An Analysis of the 'Master at Leisure' Dialogues in the *Li ji*," 151–52.

[49]KZJY omits this follow-up question and the "孔子對曰" that follows it, having Kong Zi's ensuing discourse instead follow directly on the heels of his short answer to the initial question.

[50]For 從, KZJY has 從而.

[51]For 君所不為, KZJY writes 君不為正.

[52]For 父子親, KZJY writes 男女親.

[53]As Kong Guangsen notes, some editions of the DDLJ have 義 for 嚴. KZJY has 信 instead.

[54]For 庶物, DDLJ has 庶民.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

公曰： 「寡人雖無似[55]也，願聞[56]所以行三言之道，可得聞乎？」

孔子對曰： 「古之為政，愛人為大。所以治愛人，禮為大。所以治禮，敬為大。敬之至矣，大昏為大，大昏至矣。大昏既至，冕而親迎，親之也。親之也者，親之也。[57]是故君子興敬為親，舍[58]敬，是遺親也。弗愛不親，弗敬不正。[59]愛與敬，其政之本與？」

Lord Ai said: "Although I am unworthy, I wish to learn the means by which to put these three precepts into practice—might I hear of them?"

Kong Zi replied: "In ancient times, the greatest [aspect] of practicing governance was caring for (/loving) people. The greatest means by which to bring order to the care of people is ritual, and the greatest means by which to bring order to ritual is reverence. The greatest [occasion] for the ultimate extension of reverence is the [ritual of] the Great Wedding.[60] Having achieved this ultimate extension, the Great Wedding [dictates that the lord] personally receive [the bride] in his ceremonial crown, by which to show his personal intimacy with her. To show intimacy with her is to take her as kin.[61] Thus the noble man expresses intimacy through the elevation of reverence; to forsake reverence is to leave one's kin behind. Without care (/love), there will be no intimacy; without reverence, there will be no rectitude. Caring and reverence—are they not the foundations of governance?"

It may well be the case, as Sun Xidan suggests, that Kong Zi chooses to emphasize the Great Wedding above all due to the fact that Lord Ai had, to widespread disapproval, promoted one of his concubines—the favored mother of Noble Scion Jing 公子荊—to become his chief consort.[62] Be that as it may, there is much deeper import here: a statement of nothing less than the dialectical relationship of "love" and "reverence" (or "caring" and "respect"), *ai* 愛 and *jing* 敬, or, in other terms, that of "affinity" (/"intimacy") (*qin* 親) and "rectitude" (*zheng* 正).[63] The proper balance of these apparent

[55]For 無似, KZJY has 無能.

[56]For 聞, KZJY has 知.

[57]KZJY lacks this entire sentence.

[58]KZJY writes 捨 for 舍.

[59]Lu Deming's 陸德明 (556–627) *Jingdian shiwen* 經典釋文 notes that some early LJ editions also precede the 親 and 正 of this line with 弗 instead of 不. KZJY has instead the somewhat different sentence of 弗愛弗敬弗尊也.

[60]The "Great Wedding" 大昏 refers to the marriage ceremony conducted for either the Son of Heaven or a regional lord.

[61]In the sentence 親之也者，親之也, a perhaps possible if unlikely alternative reading for one of the 親之 might be: "To go [to her] personally"; we might also potentially read it as "To do it (i.e., this act) personally." More likely, however, the 之 in both halves of this sentence both refer to the bride. As noted above, the KZJY version lacks this entire sentence.

[62]Sun Xidan, *Liji jijie*, 1261. For the incident in question, see the *Zuo zhuan*, Lord Ai year 24; Yang Bojun, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu (xiudingben)*, 1723.

[63]There are a few other texts in which *ai* and *jing* are paired together in similar fashion, albeit not so essentially as here. Among the more notable is the "Yue ji" 樂記: "Great Music shares the same harmony with Heaven and Earth, and great Ritual shares the same rhythm with Heaven and Earth. Because of harmony, none of the many things is neglected, and because of rhythm, Heaven and Earth each receive their respective

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

opposites and their reconciliation into a singular attitude is the key to success, contentment, and longevity in all personal, social, and political endeavors, and its foundation in the marriage is naturally the basis for its extension to the ultimate realm of governance—mediated, as always, through the guiding norms of ritual. In the ritual of the Great Wedding, the lord embodies these two primary aspects at once by not only personally going to receive the bride, and thus showing his love and affinity, but also doing so clad in his finest royal garb, and thus expressing reverence for all that the marriage to his bride signifies in harmonizing relations and carrying forth the noble lineage. The youthful Lord Ai has not yet quite grasped this point, and thus deigns to express his doubts:

公曰：	「寡人願有言然[64]。冕而親迎，不已重乎？」
孔子愀然作色而對曰：	「合二姓之好，以繼先聖之後，以為天地、宗廟、社稷之主，[65]君何謂已重乎？」
Lord Ai said:	"There is something I would like to say in this regard.[66] To personally receive [the bride] donning the ceremonial crown, is this not excessive?"[67]
Kong Zi apprehensively changed his facial expression and replied:	"Joining together the affections of two clans, so as to carry forward the lineage with a descendant of the former sage[68] so as to serve as the lord of Heaven and Earth, the ancestral temples, and the altars of soil and grain—why does my lord say that this is excessive?[69]

Kong Zi's reply, accompanied by the narratively requisite sudden change in demeanor upon his hearing such an audacious question, prompts Lord Ai to a recognition of his own obtuseness and an entreaty for further elucidation:

sacrifices. Among the living, there is Ritual and Music; among the deceased, there are the ghosts and spirits. When things are thus, all within the four seas are united in common in reverence and care. *Ritual is that which unites in reverence through differentiated matters, and Music is that which unites in caring through diverse patterns.* The natures of Ritual and Music are the same, and thus the enlightened kings succeeded each other through them, such that their affairs stood together with their times, and their reputations accompanied their merits" (大樂與天地同和，大禮與天地同節。和，故百物不失；節，故祀天祭地。明則有禮樂，幽則有鬼神。如此，則四海之內合敬同愛矣。禮者，殊事合敬者也；樂者，異文合愛者也。禮樂之情同，故明王以相沿也。故事與時並，名與功偕). See Sun Xidan, *Liji jijie*, 988–89.

[64]KZJY adds 也 after 言, suggesting that it interprets the 然 as heading up the next sentence instead.

[65]In DDLJ, the order of 宗廟 and 社稷 is reversed.

[66]Alternately, we can take the 然 as heading up the next sentence in the sense of "however."

[67]According to Zheng Xuan, Lord Ai considers the wearing of sacrificial attire (i.e. the ceremonial crown) on this occasion to be the excessive aspect.

[68]Zheng Xuan suggests that the "former sage" here refers specifically to the Duke of Zhou 周公旦.

[69]A nearly identical question and (slightly shortened) answer appears in the *Guliang zhuan* 穀梁傳, Lord Huan 桓 year 2 (684 BCE), but there the interlocutor is the disciple Zigong 子貢 rather than Lord Ai. See Liao Ping 廖平 (1852–1932), *Guliang guyishu* 穀梁古義疏 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2012), 83–84.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

公曰：	「寡人固[70]。不固，焉得聞此言也？寡人欲問，不得其辭。請少進！」
孔子曰：	「天地不合，萬物不生。大昏，萬世之嗣也。君何謂已重焉？」
孔子遂言曰：	「內以治宗廟之禮，足以配天地之神明[71]；出以治直言之禮，足以立上下之敬。物恥足以振之，國恥足以興之。為政先禮[72]，禮其政之本與？」
Lord Ai said:	"I am ignorant. But were I not ignorant, how would I have come to hear these words? I should like to inquire further, but I am unable to express myself properly. Please advance me a little further!"
Kong Zi said:	"If Heaven and Earth did not join together, the myriad things would not be born. The Great Wedding is the continuation of a lineage of myriad generations—why does my lord say that it is excessive?"
Kong Zi then continued:	"Internally, the rituals of the ancestral temple are ordered through it, in a way sufficient to match the divine luminosity of Heaven and Earth.[73] Externally, the rituals of straightforward speech are ordered through it, in a way sufficient to establish the respect of superiors and subordinates.[74] When affairs are brought to shame, [such rituals] are sufficient to revive them, and when the state is brought to shame, they are [likewise] sufficient to revitalize it.[75] In practicing governance, ritual comes first—is ritual not the foundation of governance?"

It is not that Kong Zi has forgotten that he had already just labeled "love and reverence" as the foundation of governance, but rather that it is precisely through ritual—specifically here that of the Great Wedding—that those two fundamental attitudes of

[70]KZJY precedes this first 固 with 實.

[71]For 神明, DDLJ simply has 神.

[72]KZJY writes this phrase as 故為政先乎禮.

[73]Zheng Xuan points to a passage from the "Liqi" 禮器 chapter of the *Li ji* referring specifically to the ritual positions within the ancestral temple of the ruler to the east and the consort to the west, representing the sources of movement of the sun and moon, respectively.

[74]Zheng Xuan states that "straightforward speech" refers to "the proclamation of governmental instructions" 謂出政教也. As Sun Xidan, paraphrasing the *Lunyu*, puts it, once the proper division between husband and wife is established, "names will be rectified and speech will go smoothly" 名正言順, which will in turn ensure that all governmental orders and instructions accord with ritual and no one in society dare not show respect; see *Liji Zhengyi*, 1262. Zheng Xuan points to lines from the "Hunyi" 昏義 chapter in which external and internal governance are similarly linked to the pairing of king and queen: "The Son of Heaven sees to the ordering of the external, his consort sees to the duties of the internal, and [thus] instruction smoothly turns into social mores, all is in harmonious accord without and within, and all the states and households are brought to order—this is what we refer to as 'prosperous virtue'" (天子聽外治，后聽內職，教順成俗，外內和順，國家理治，此之謂盛德). For the text of this "Hunyi" passage, see Sun Xidan, *Liji jijie*, 1422.

[75]Zheng Xuan ascribes the "shame of affairs" to the ministers and the "shame of state" to the ruler.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sincere affection are brought into harmonious accord. Yet perhaps because it is the attitude of reverence that is the most easily neglected, Kong Zi then turns to elaborate on the three basic forms of reverence, all of which in turn constitute expressions of filial piety toward one's parents and the ultimate origins of one's lineage:

孔子遂言曰：「昔三代明王之政[76]，必敬其妻子也，有道[77]。妻也者，親之主也，敢不敬與？子也者，親之後也，敢不敬與？君子無不敬也，[78]敬身為大。身也者，親之枝也，敢不敬與？不能敬其身，是傷其親；傷其親，是傷其本；傷其本，枝從而亡。三者，百姓之象也。身以及身，子以及子，妃以及妃[79]，君行[80]此三者，則[81]愾乎天下矣，[82]大王之道也。如此，則國家順矣。」

Kong Zi then continued: "In former times, in the governance of the enlightened kings of the three dynasties, reverence was invariably paid to consorts and sons, and [for this] there was a [proper] way. The consort is the host of one's parents—dare one not be reverent?[83] The son is the descendant of one's parents—dare one not be reverent? There is no one toward whom the noble man is not reverent, but his reverence towards his own self (/body) is the greatest. One's self (/body) is a branch of one's parents—dare one not be reverent? To be unable to be reverent towards one's self is to harm one's parents, to harm one's parents is to harm one's roots, and when one harms one's roots, the branches perish along with them. These three [forms of reverence] form the models for the people of the hundred surnames [to follow]. [Reverence for] one's own self leads to [others' reverence for] their selves; [reverence for] one's own son leads to [others' reverence for] their sons; and [reverence for] one's own wife leads to [others' reverence for] their wives. If the ruler[84] practices these three [forms of reverence], his [reverential] spirit will infuse the entire world.[85] This is the way of the

[76]KZJY lacks 之政.

[77]For 有道, KZJY has 盖有道焉.

[78]KZJY precedes this phrase with 是故, and in place of 也 has 敬也者.

[79]DDLJ writes these 妃 as 配.

[80]For 君行, DDLJ has 君子行. KZJY has 君以修.

[81]KZJY precedes 愾 with the subject of 大化, "great transformation."

[82]KZJY precedes 大王 with 昔.

[83]Kong Yingda 孔穎達 (574–648) suggests this refers to her role in providing sacrificial grains 粢盛 for the worship of one's parents and other ancestors.

[84]Or "noble man," if we follow the DDLJ version.

[85]In other usages, *kai* (or *xi*) 愾 has the sense of either "to give a long sigh" or "to be angered," but here Zheng Xuan glosses it as roughly equivalent to *zhi* 至, to "reach." In his annotations to the *Shuowen jiezi* 說文解字, Duan Yucai 段玉裁 (1735–1815) suggests that this latter sense is arrived at as a phonetic loan for *qi* 訖. Wang Su's 王肅 (195–258) annotation of the equivalent KZJY passage glosses it as 滿. Given the role ascribed to *qi* 氣 in achieving such a widespread charismatic influence throughout the world in such arguably related texts as "Kong Zi xianju" (more on this below), I suspect that the 愾 here is in fact closely cognate with 氣, and my translation along the lines of "spiritually infuse" follows accordingly.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

great kings,[86] and if things are thus, all the states and households will be in compliant accord.

Kong Zi ascribes these three forms of reverence to no lesser authority than the "great" and "enlightened" former kings of the three dynasties, whose practice of them adhered to a definite course of principles—they "had [their] way" (*you dao* 有道)—and thus allowed their reverential spirit to infuse the entire world and bring all levels of society into order. The stakes and pedigree of such practice could not be any higher, which leads Lord Ai to want to inquire further about each form of reverence one by one—or at least the initial form:

公曰： 「敢問何謂敬身？」

孔子對曰： 「君子過言則民作辭，過動則民作則。君子言不過辭，動不過則，百姓不命而敬恭[87]。如是，則[88]能敬其身；能敬其身，則能成其親矣。」

Lord Ai said: "Might I dare ask what is meant by being 'reverent towards one's self'?"

Kong Zi replied: "When the noble man goes too far with his statements, the people will follow in acting upon his words; when he goes too far with his actions, the people will follow in acting upon his model. [But] when the noble man's statements do not go too far in their words, and his actions do not exceed the proper model, the people of the hundred surnames will become reverent and humble without having even been commanded to do so. If things are thus, it follows that [the noble man] is able to be reverent towards his own self, and if he is able to be reverent towards his self, he will be able to bring completion to his parents."

While reverence toward one's self is here put into the familiar context of the invariably charismatic political effect of one's words and actions, this is ultimately brought back

[86]Zheng Xuan and Lu Deming both read 大王 as 太王, i.e. Zhou King Wen's grandfather Gugong Danfu 古公亶父, who served as leader of the Zhou during the Shang dynasty. The *Kongzi jiayu* version also suggests such a reading by preceding 大王 with 昔, "in former times," and Wang Su's annotation also specifies 太王 as the referent. Ye Mengde 葉夢得 (1077–1148) (cited in *Liji jijie*) further supports this reading by oblique reference to the "Liang Hui Wang, xia" 梁惠王下 chapter of the *Mengzi* (1B.5): 〔孟子〕對曰：「昔者大王好色，愛厥妃。詩云：『古公亶甫，來朝走馬，率西水滸，至于岐下。爰及姜女，聿來胥宇。』當是時也，內無怨女，外無曠夫。王如好色，與百姓同之，於王何有？」([Meng Zi] replied: "In former times, King Tai was fond of sensual pleasures and loved his wives and concubines. The ode says: 'Gugong Danfu, come morning raced on horseback; following the bank of the river west, he arrived beneath Mt. Qi. Bringing Lady Jiang with him, they together inspected the dwellings.' At this time, there were no husbandless women or wifeless men to be found. If your highness is fond of sensual pleasures and [yet] can share them in common with the people of the hundred surnames, what harm is this to you ruling as a king?"). There are arguments to be made, however, for simply reading 大王 as "great kings," particularly when compared against the common juxtaposition of 大王 with 三代之王 (kings of the three dynasties) found in both this text and "Kong Zi xianju," to be discussed further below. And Kong Guangsen notes that the *Yongle dadian* citation of this line in fact reads 先王, "former kings," rather than 大王.

[87]KZJY has this phrase as 百姓恭敬以從命.

[88]KZJY adds 可謂 following this 則.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to land once again on the positives it accords to one's parents. This prompts a follow-up question:

公曰： 「敢問何謂成親？」

孔子對曰： 「君子也者，人之成名也。百姓歸之[89]名，謂之君｛子｝之子[90]，是使其親為君｛子｝也[91]，是為成其親之名也已。」

Lord Ai asked: "Might I dare ask what is meant by 'bringing completion to [one's] parents'?"

Kong Zi replied: "The 'noble man' is the name given to a man who achieves completion. The people of a hundred surnames attach a name to him, calling him the 'son of a noble ~~man~~,' and this [effectively] makes his parents 'noble[s] ~~men~~';[92] this is how he brings about the completion of a good name for his parents."

Kong Zi's answer involves something of a play on words: nobility of character confers noble pedigree upon one's entire lineage, as *junzi* 君子, "noble man," is quite literally the "son of a lord (ruler/noble)." For someone like Lord Ai, whose lineage was of course already noble in fact, such a practice would demonstrate that it was actually still deserving of that term, Lord Ai having fulfilled the conditions of character and action that make one worthy to serve as ruler. On the heels of this point, Kong Zi then returns to the importance to governance of the other cardinal attitude/practice emphasized in this text, "caring" (/"love") for others, and doing so by first emphatically repeating verbatim a statement he had made earlier:[93]

孔子遂言曰： 「古之為政，愛人為大。不能愛人，不能有其身；[94]不能有其身，不能安土；不能安土，不能樂天；不能樂天，不能成其身。」

[89]For 歸之, KZJY simply has 與.

[90]For 君子之子, KZJY has just 君子, which in fact makes more sense here.

[91]KZJY writes this phrase as 則是成其親為君而為其子也 (this is to turn his parents into "rulers" and serve as their "son"), which again makes somewhat more sense; it also has Kong Zi's reply ending at this point, without any equivalent to the next phrase.

[92]I strongly suspect that the two instances of 君子 in this sentence are corruptions of 君 (and that either the KZJY preserves the uncorrupted text or else its compiler/editor effectively rewrote this sentence having recognized the problem). Thus, instead of "son of a noble man" and "noble men," we should have "son of a ruler (/lord)" and "rulers (/lords)," respectively. In this translation, I split the difference by replacing the assumed "ruler(/s)" with "noble(/s)."

[93]The statement "In ancient times, the greatest [aspect] of practicing governance was caring for (/loving) people" already appears at the head of Kong Zi's answer to Lord Ai's question about the means by which the three precepts concerning the three cardinal relationships may be put into practice. The reader will have recognized by now that the phrase "In/for (etc.) . . . , the greatest [aspect] was . . . " (. . . . . , ... 為大) has already appeared several times in this text, and it also links this dialogue stylistically to Dialogue A above, where Kong Zi's initial full reply begins with "I have heard that ritual is the greatest thing by which the people live their lives" (丘聞之，民之所由生，禮為大). We will have more to say about this phrase below.

[94]KZJY has an entirely different set of lines here: 愛政而不能愛人，則不能成其身. It also has 成 for 有 again in the next phrase and continues to add 則 at the head of the result clauses for each of the three subsequent conditional sequences. The phrase 不能成其身 thus appears as the result both here and in the final sequence, yielding an inexplicable tautology.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Kong Zi then continued: "In ancient times, the greatest [aspect] of practicing governance was caring for (/loving) people. If you are unable to care for other people, you will be unable to take possession of your own self;[95] if you are unable to take possession of your own self, you will be unable to be secure in your own territory; if you are unable to be secure in your own territory, you will be unable to find contentment with Heaven['s mandate]; and if you are unable to find contentment with Heaven['s mandate], you will be unable to bring completion to your self."

Living with stability in the world inherently requires the support of others, and this is all the more true for someone in a position of political authority. Caring for others is naturally indispensable for this cause, and when applied fully, it can lead one beyond mere survival to a state of self-completion and ultimate security and contentment in one's Heavenly-mandated position. Having been told of this, Lord Ai asks for elaboration on these final notions of "self-completion" and contentment with "Heaven's Way":

公曰： 「敢問何謂[96]成身？」

孔子對曰： 「不過乎物。」[97]

公曰： 「敢問君子[98]何貴乎天道也？」

孔子對曰： 「貴其不已。如日月東西相從而不已也，是天道也。不閉其久[99]，是天道也。無為而物成，是天道也。已成而明，是天道也。」

Lord Ai asked: "Might I dare ask what is meant by 'bringing completion to [one's] self'?"

Kong Zi replied: "[It lies in] not going beyond [the proper scope of] things. 〔To not go beyond [the proper scope of things] is to accord with Heaven's Way.〕"[100]

Lord Ai asked: "Might I dare ask what aspect of Heaven's Way it is that the noble man[101] values most?"

[95]Zheng Xuan glosses 有 as 保, "protect"; with Zhu Xi and others, I suspect a broader meaning is intended here.

[96]For 何謂, KZJY has 何能, "How can one [bring completion to one's self]?" It also has a 其 before 身.

[97]In place of this terse response, KZJY has a much fuller reply: 夫其行己不過乎物，謂之成身。不過乎〔物〕，合天道也 (For to not go beyond [the proper scope of] things in one's conduct we refer to as "bringing completion to the self." To not go beyond [the proper scope of] things is to accord with Heaven's way). As Zhu Xi and Sun Xidan both suggest, this makes for a much more sensible reply within the overall context, given that the last sentence seems necessary in order to elicit the next follow-up question. It thus appears probable that there is some textual corruption at play here. And whether the KZJY preserves the uncorrupted text or instead reflects its compiler/editor's attempt to clean it up is an open question.

[98]For 君子, DDLJ has simply 君. KZJY has 君子 here, but lacks the preceding 敢問.

[99]For 不閉其久, KZJY writes 不閉而能久, "not shutting down and able to endure."

[100]I am tentatively supplying this sentence, absent from both LJ and DDLJ, on the basis of KZJY (see note 97 above).

[101]Or "ruler," if we follow the DDLJ version instead.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Kong Zi replied: "He values the fact that it is unrelenting. Such as the sun and moon following each other from east to west without relent—this is Heaven's Way. To lastingly endure without ever shutting down—this is Heaven's Way. For things to find completion while it acts to no purpose—this is Heaven's Way. To shine brilliantly after achieving [such] completion—this is Heaven's Way."

Kong Zi concludes his sagely advice here on a metaphysical note, implicitly comparing the way of a fully accomplished ruler—and the entire lineage of noble rulers that precede him—to the ceaseless operations of the cosmos itself: self-perpetuating, ever-enduring, and a source of sustenance for all he oversees.

The final exchange then reiterates the point that filial piety lay at the root of such achievement, and reverence for one's parents is ultimately the same as reverence toward Heaven itself:

公曰：	「寡人惷愚、冥煩，子志之心也。[102]」
孔子蹴然辟席[103]而對曰：	「仁人不過乎物，孝子不過乎物[104]。是故仁人之事親也如事天，事天如事親。是故[105]孝子成身。」
公曰：	「寡人既聞此言也，無如後罪何！」
孔子對曰：	「君之及此言也，是臣之福也。」
Lord Ai said:	"I am foolish, ignorant, and befuddled, as you, sir, know all too well in your heart."
Kong Zi apprehensively arose from his mat and replied:	"The man of humanity does not go beyond [the proper scope of] things, and the filial son [likewise] does not go beyond [the proper scope of] things. For this reason, the man of humanity serves his parents just as he serves Heaven, and he serves Heaven just as he serves his parents. For this reason, the filial son brings his self to completion."[106]
Lord Ai said:	"Having now heard these words, I [still fear] I cannot avoid falling short of them in the future!"
Kong Zi replied:	"That you should [aspire to] live up to these words is, itself, my good fortune."

[102]For 志, DDLJ writes 識. In KZJY, Lord Ai's statement here reads somewhat differently: 寡人且愚冥，幸煩子之於心 (I am foolish and ignorant, and would be fortunate to trouble you, sir, [to conduct an assessment] in regard to my mind['s capabilities]).

[103]DDLJ and KZJY both write this as 避席.

[104]In place of this second 物, KZJY has 親, "parents."

[105]For this second 是故, KZJY has 此謂, "this is what is meant by."

[106]Cf. the opening lines of the sixteenth passage of the *Xiao jing* 孝經: "The Master said: 'The enlightened kings of former times served their fathers with filial piety, and were thus manifest in their service of Heaven; they served their mothers with filial piety, and were thus evident in their service of Earth" (子曰：「昔者明王，事父孝，故事天明；事母孝，故事地察」).

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Not only does Lord Ai end up convinced by Kong Zi's words, he also expresses the fear that he might fail to live up to them—a trope not uncommonly seen in exchanges with disciples.[107] Given that Lord Ai is far from a disciple in any ordinary sense, Kong Zi not surprisingly follows this with some encouragement couched in an expression of humility.

Analysis and textual connections

The narrative form of Dialogue B displays some contours already familiar from the previous dialogue. Lord Ai once again initiates the main question, and it is a big one unprompted by any particular context. This time, Kong Zi does not demur, but he still offers an explanation as to why he will not demure. He first gives the minimal answer—that "governance" is the greatest aspect of the human way—which necessarily invites Lord Ai's request for elaboration. This is all more or less identical to the opening of Dialogue A, save for the lack of actual demurral—which only serves to highlight the particular importance of the lesson that is to follow. After Lord Ai presses for more details, Kong Zi finally lets loose with his more sustained lesson, framed in terms of the successful traditions of the past, the rituals of the former kings. Throughout the dialogue, while Lord Ai grows ever-humbler, Kong Zi naturally remains respectful, though taken aback enough by a couple of Lord Ai's questions to have it visually appear on his face, as duly noted for dramatic effect by the author of this clearly fictional dialogue.

The gist of the lesson is that governance is all about leading through example, which begins with modeling the correct cardinal relationships between husband and wife, father and son, and ruler and minister—in that order. Whereas governance is said to be the greatest aspect of the human way, the greatest aspect of governance is "caring for people," for which "ritual" and "reverence" are in turn the key prerequisite means. This is all encapsulated in the ritual of the Great Wedding, which best exemplifies the quasi-paradoxical ideal of the identity between "caring (/love)" and "reverence," or of that between "affinity" and "rectitude." As the Great Wedding lies at the nexus of harmony between clans and the continuity of the royal lineage, getting that relationship correct sets the tone for all of society to follow. In more cosmological terms, moreover, the relationship established by the Great Wedding, if properly achieved, is inherently natural insofar as it parallels that between Heaven and Earth. In all these respects, it is the prime exemplar of "ritual" more generally, which is itself described as the ordering principle of society and "foundation" of all governance—in this sense essentially equivalent to the identity of "caring" and "reverence."

Reverence for those toward whom one holds affection and affinity likely seems paradoxical to Lord Ai because the primary object of such affection, the wife, was in

[107]A similar trope expressing the fear of an inability to live up to the Master's words, followed by words of encouragement from the Master, also occurs at the end of the Shanghai Museum manuscript text "Shi Liu wen yu fuzi" 史蓄問於夫子, where the dialogue is instead between the Master and an official of Qi (though it is not entirely certain that the "Master" there is in fact Confucius). For a transcription of the text in question, see Gu Shikao 顧史考 [Scott Cook], "Shangbo jiu 'Shi Liu wen yu fuzi' zaitan" 上博九《史蓄問於夫子》再探, in his *Shangbo zhushu Kongzi yulu wenxian yanjiu* 上博竹書孔子語錄文獻研究 (Shanghai: Zhongxi shuju, 2021), 375–76 and 377.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

some sense always considered subordinate to the husband. Kong Zi takes this further by demanding that such reverence be applied to one's son and one's self as well—both of whom occupy a position subordinate to one's parents. Such reverence is justified, however, precisely because the wife, the son, and the parents' son are indispensable to the well-being and legacy of the parents themselves, and so reverence towards them is inextricably bound together with reverence towards one's parents and lineage as a whole—to thus show reverential "affinity" (*qin*) is, quite literally, to serve one's "parents" (*qin*). All of this is ultimately an expression of filial piety towards one's own legacy and the means to have it partake in the unrelenting, ever-lasting, and glorious splendor of Heaven's Way itself.

This dialogue is a fascinating one, mainly because it is in fact a relatively unique expression of a particular confluence of ideas with thought-provoking resonances. At the same time, though, it does sound certain undeniable echoes with other texts in the early Confucian tradition—beyond all the various "Ai Gong asked" dialogues—that are worth our further exploration. The textual similarities discussed below come in several varieties, and their implications vary in accordance with such factors as whether they involve common terminology or idiosyncratic phrases, and, for the latter, whether they are prominent enough to be ripe for imitation or inconspicuous enough to suggest other reasons for their shared usage across the texts in question—points we shall address more fully in the final section of this article.

Parallels With The "Zhongyong"

Several tell-tale turns of phrase would appear to link this dialogue closely with a core section of the "Zhongyong," especially when considered in the aggregate. First, the expression that, to achieve something, "there is a [proper] way" to go about it (*you dao* 有道) appears above in the statement: "In former times, in the governance of the enlightened kings of the three dynasties, reverence was invariably paid to consorts and sons, and [for this] there was a [proper] way" (昔三代明王之政，必敬其妻子也，有道). There is an entire paragraph of the "Zhongyong"—also found attributed to Meng Zi in his eponymous work—that is built upon this construction:

> 在下位不獲乎上，民不可得而治矣。獲乎上有道：不信乎朋友，不獲乎上矣。信乎朋友有道：不順乎親，不信乎朋友矣。順乎親有道：反諸身不誠，不順乎親矣。誠身有道：不明乎善，不誠乎身矣。[108]
>
> If those in subordinate positions do not capture [the trust] of their superiors, the [allegiance of] the people cannot be gained and they cannot be governed. There is a [proper] way to capture [the trust] of superiors: if one is not trusted by one's friends, he will not capture [the trust] of his superiors. There is a [proper] way to become trusted by one's friends: if one does not gain accordance with his parents, he will not be trusted by his friends. There is a [proper] way to gain accordance with one's parents: if one, in reflecting back upon himself, is not sincere, he will

[108]"Zhongyong" passage nineteen; Zhu Xi, *Zhongyong zhangju* 中庸章句, in Zhu Xi, *Sishu zhangju jizhu* 四書章句集注 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983), 31.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> not gain accordance with his parents. There is a [proper] way of making oneself sincere: if one lacks a clear understanding of the good, he will be unable to make himself sincere.[109]

Here, what follows this "there is a [proper] way" is in each instance framed in the negative—what to not fail to do—and while our text here phrases it somewhat differently, it also lands on the idea of not daring *not* to be reverent (*gan bu jing yu* 敢不敬與). It is worth noting that the "Zhongyong" lines appear within what some consider to be part of an extended dialogue between Lord Ai and Kong Zi—the only one in the text—which begins with the phrase "Lord Ai asked about governance" (哀公問政);[110] this would thus also put them in the mouth of Kong Zi, though it remains possible the dialogue was meant to end prior to these lines. No less notable is the fact that this expression appears but only a few times among other early Confucian texts. The only comparable example among the ritual compendia can be found in the "Zeng

[109]The twelfth passage of "Li Lou, pt. 1" 離婁上 in the *Mengzi* reads: "Master Meng said: 'If those in subordinate positions do not capture [the trust] of their superiors, the [allegiance of] the people cannot be gained and they cannot be governed. There is a [proper] way to capture [the trust] of superiors: if one is not trusted by one's friends, he will not capture [the trust] of his superiors. There is a [proper] way to become trusted by one's friends: if one's service to his parents is not gratifying, he will not be trusted by his friends. There is a [proper] way to gratify one's parents: if one is not sincere in the cultivation of his self, he will be unable to serve his parents. There is a [proper] way of making oneself sincere: if one lacks a clear understanding of the good, he will be unable to make himself sincere. Thus sincerity is the Way of Heaven, and contemplating sincerity is the way of mankind. There has never been one with sincerity who failed to motivate, and never one without sincerity who was capable of motivating'" (孟子曰：「居下位而不獲於上，民不可得而治也。獲於上有道：不信於友，弗獲於上矣；信於友有道：事親弗悅，弗信於友矣；悅親有道：反身不誠，不悅於親矣；誠身有道：不明乎善，不誠其身矣。是故誠者，天之道也；思誠者，人之道也。至誠而不動者，未之有也；不誠，未有能動者也). See Zhu Xi, *Mengzi jizhu* 孟子集注, in *Sishu zhangju jizhu*, 282. A version of the final lines here, beginning with "Thus sincerity," also directly follows the parallel passage in the "Zhongyong": "Sincerity is the Way of Heaven, and bringing about sincerity is the way of mankind. One with sincerity hits the mark without striving, attains without contemplating, and effortlessly accords with the Way—this is the sage" (誠者，天之道也；誠之者，人之道也。誠者，不勉而中，不思而得，從容中道，聖人也). The final section of the "Zhushu" 主術 chapter of the *Huainanzi* 淮南子 also has a closely parallel passage that would seem to have been adapted directly from one of these texts: "When the man of service dwelling in lowly seclusion wishes to achieve high prominence, he must first reflect upon himself. There is a [proper] way to achieve high prominence: one cannot achieve high prominence unless one's reputation arises. There is a [proper] way to gain a reputation: if one is not trusted by his friends, he cannot gain a reputation. There is a [proper] way to become trusted by one's friends: if one's service to his parents is not gratifying, he will not be trusted by his friends. There is a [proper] way to gratify one's parents: if one is not sincere in the cultivation of his self, he will be unable to serve his parents. There is a [proper] way to cultivate oneself: if one's mind is not focused and unified, he will be unable to focus on sincerity. The Way resides in what is easy yet one seeks it in the difficult; its demonstration is near at hand yet one seeks it from afar—thus one fails to attain it" (士處卑隱，欲上達，必先反諸己。上達有道：名譽不起，而不能上達矣。取譽有道：不信於友，不能得譽。信於友有道：事親不說，不信於友。說親有道：修身不誠，不能事親矣。誠身有道：心不專一，不能專誠。道在易而求之難，驗在近而求之遠，故弗得也). See Liu Wendian 劉文典, *Huainan Honglie jijie* 淮南鴻烈集解, ed. Feng Yi 馮逸 and Qiao Hua 喬華 (Beijing Zhonghua shuju, 1989), 317. This most likely was adapted from the *Mengzi* passage, not only because of the closer similarity to a couple of its lines, but also because a version of the last few lines also appears in the preceding *Mengzi* passage ("Li Lou, pt. 1," passage eleven): "The Way resides nearby and yet is sought far way; affairs reside in what is easy yet are sought in the difficult" (道在爾而求諸遠，事在易而求之難) (*Mengzi jizhu*, 281).

[110]Zhu Xi, at least, sections the text in this way. More on this matter will be said below.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Zi shi fumu" 曾子事父母 (Zeng Zi's service to his parents) chapter of the *Da Dai Li ji*, a short text wherein a disciple asks Zeng Zi a series of three questions: "Is there a [proper][111] way to serve one's parents"? (事父母有道乎), "Is there a [proper] way to serve one's elder brother"? (事兄有道乎), and "Is there a [proper] way to serve one's younger brother?" (事弟有道乎). Interestingly, the kernel answer to the first question, which in detail refers to the subtle art of remonstrating with one's parents when they are in the wrong, is precisely to "be loving, yet reverent" (*ai er jing* 愛而敬). The phrase "*you dao*" also appears in a few other passages of the *Mengzi*, most notably in a chain within the passage wherein Meng Zi describes how Jie 桀 and Zhou 紂 both lost the world by losing the people's hearts:

> 得天下有道：得其民，斯得天下矣；得其民有道：得其心，斯得民矣；得其心有道：所欲與之聚之，所惡勿施爾也.[112]
>
> There is a [proper] way to attain the world: attain the people, and you will have attained the world. There is a [proper] way to attain the people: attain their hearts, and you will have attained the people. There is a [proper] way to attain their hearts: simply to give them and stockpile what they desire, and do not bestow upon them what they detest

Elsewhere, we find only a couple of comparable examples in the *Xunzi*[113] and, among more eclectic or non-Confucian texts, in a few scattered dialogues and passages found in such works as the *Guanzi* 管子, the *Lüshi chunqiu* 呂氏春秋, or the Han compendium *Shuoyuan*.[114]

[111]When I refer to "early texts" in this article, I am broadly referring to texts from both the pre-imperial and Western Han periods, unless otherwise specified.

[112]"Li Lou, pt. 1," passage nine; *Mengzi jizhu*, 280. Elsewhere, in passage three of "Liang Hui Wang, pt. 2" 梁惠王下, King Xuan of Qi 齊宣王 asks: "Is there a [proper] way to interact with neighboring states?" (交鄰國有道乎). In passage five of "Teng Wen Gong, pt. 1" 滕文公上, Meng Zi states that "If it is indeed correct to bury one's parents, then the filial son and person of humanity, in so doing, must certainly have their [proper] way/principle" (掩之誠是也，則孝子仁人之掩其親，亦必有道矣). The final somewhat comparable example comes in passage two of "Gongsun Chou, pt. 1" 公孫丑上, wherein the disciple Gongsun Chou asks Meng Zi: "Is there a [proper] way to attain an unagitated mind?" (不動心有道乎). See *Mengzi jizhu*, 215, 263, and 229.

[113]The closest *Xunzi* parallels come from the opening passage of "Youzuo" 宥坐, wherein Zilu asks Kong Zi: "Dare I ask, is there a way to maintain what is full?" (敢問持滿有道乎; parallel passages occur in both the *Shuoyuan* and *Hanshi waizhuan*); and from "Chendao" 臣道: "Thus the humane are necessarily respectful towards others. There is a [proper] way to respect others: the worthy are to be respected with honor, the unworthy with fear; the worthy are to be respected with affinity, the unworthy with distance. The respect is the same, but the [underlying] sentiment is different" (故仁者必敬人。敬人有道，賢者則貴而敬之，不肖者則畏而敬之；賢者則親而敬之，不肖者則疏而敬之。其敬一也，其情二也)—note again the attention to the proper relationship between "respect" and "affinity." One other, less comparable example appears in the "Jundao" chapter, where we are told of the ancients that "they had a [proper] way of selecting people, and a [proper] method of employing people" (其取人有道，其用人有法). See Wang Xianqian 王先謙 (1842–1917), *Xunzi jijie* 荀子集解, ed. Shen Xiaohuan 沈嘯寰 and Wang Xingxian 王星賢 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1988), 520, 256, and 240–41.

[114]Almost all of these examples are framed in the form of a question: 有道乎. We should also include here the well-known example from the "Quqie" 胠篋 chapter of the *Zhuangzi*, where Robber Zhi 盜跖 is asked by his disciple: "Is there also a [proper] way to thievery?" (盜亦有道乎).

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A second, relatively uncommon phrase of note is one that occurs no less than eight times in Dialogue B, and notably once in Dialogue A as well: that such-and-such "is the greatest [aspect]" (*wei da* 為大) of something, as we see already in Lord Ai's initial question: "Might I dare ask what is the greatest [aspect] of the human way?" (敢問人道誰為大). Here again, the most comparable example among other texts appears in the "Zhongyong," and this time almost certainly as part of its dialogue between Lord Ai and Kong Zi:

> 哀公問政。子曰：「文武之政，布在方策。其人存，則其政舉；其人亡，則其政息。 … … 故為政在人，取人以身，脩身以道，脩道以仁。仁者，人也，親親為大；義者，宜也，尊賢為大。親親之殺，尊賢之等，禮所生也。在下位不獲乎上，民不可得而治矣。故君子不可以不脩身；思脩身，不可以不事親；思事親，不可以不知人；思知人，不可以不知天。」[115]
>
> Lord Ai asked about governance. The Master replied: "The governance of Kings Wen and Wu has been displayed on wooden tablets and bamboo strips. So long as the men existed, their governance was implemented; when the men perished, their governance ceased …. Thus the execution of governance lies in its men, the men are selected on the basis of one's self, one's self is cultivated on the basis of the [proper] way, and the [proper] way is cultivated on the basis of humanity (*ren*). 'Humanity' is [a matter of] the 'human,' and in this, intimacy (/affinity) towards kin (*qin qin*) is the greatest [aspect]. 'Propriety' (*yi*) is [a matter of] the appropriate, and in this, the honoring of worthies is the greatest [aspect]. The graded diminutions in intimacy towards kin and graded ranks in the honoring of worthies are things to which ritual gives rise. If those in subordinate positions do not capture [the trust] of their superiors, the [allegiance of] the people cannot be gained and they cannot be governed. Thus the noble man may not fail to cultivate his self. If he wishes to cultivate his self, he may not fail to serve his parents; if he wishes to serve his parents, he may not fail to appreciate others; and if he wishes to appreciate others, he may not fail to appreciate Heaven."

Whether the words were intended to have been spoken by Kong Zi end at this point is difficult to determine, but if the line reading "If those in subordinate positions do not capture [the trust] of their superiors" is indeed part of the Master's response here, that suggests that it may indeed be correct (as Zhu Xi happened to arrange it) to include the previously cited passage—in which the same line reappears verbatim—as a later part of the same dialogue. Immediately following the present citation, the text (and perhaps its "Kong Zi") goes on to mention how there are five "prominent ways" (*da dao* 達道) and three "prominent virtues" (*da de* 達德) in the world, the former consisting of the relationships between ruler and minister, father and son, husband and wife, elder and younger brothers, and colleagues and friends—which, notably, is an expanded and reordered version of the three cardinal relationships whose proper handling Kong Zi emphasizes as the key to the successful practice of governance in his

[115]Zhu Xi, *Zhongyong zhangju*, 28.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

initial answer to Lord Ai in our current dialogue ("Ai Gong" Dialogue B). Most telling, however, may be the shared emphasis between these two dialogues on the importance of "intimacy towards kin" in balance with an attitude of "reverence" or "honor," though in this case more specifically the honoring of worthies and in terms of a dialectical relationship between the cardinal virtues of "humanity" (*ren*) and "propriety" (*yi*). All these points of commonality naturally serve to link these two texts together in fascinating ways that are not to be easily dismissed.[116]

Moving from turns of phrase to specific terms, we might first take note of "Heaven's way" (*tian dao* 天道), which appears as a focal point of one of Lord Ai's questions here and its consequent response. While this term (including in the variant forms of *tian zhi dao* 天之道 and *tiandi zhi dao* 天地之道) comes up frequently in a whole range of early texts—from the *Laozi* 老子 and *Zhuangzi* 莊子 to the *Guanzi* and *Guoyu* 國語, to name just a few—the term is not particularly favored in texts that are clearly associated with the Confucian tradition. Its only appearance in the *Lunyu* is where it is specifically eschewed: "Zigong said: 'Of the Master's refined cultural patterns we are able to hear, but we are unable to hear him speak of [human] nature or Heaven's Way'" (子貢曰：「夫子之文章，可得而聞也；夫子之言性與天道，不可得而聞也」).[117] One of its only two appearances in the *Mengzi* is likewise placed in the context of human nature and one's personal mandate as a human. Our common sensual desires are, Meng Zi tells us, a matter of human nature, though for the noble man a mandate is involved therein; such things as "the sage's relationship to Heaven's Way," on the other hand, "[are] matters of mandate, [but] as [human] nature is involved therein, the sage does not refer to [them] as mandate[s]" (聖人之於天道也，命也，有性焉，君子不謂命也).[118] The other example, tellingly, occurs in the aforementioned passage that duplicates the wording of a "Zhongyong" passage, and which states: "Thus sincerity is the Way of Heaven, and contemplating sincerity is the way of mankind" (是故誠者，天之道也；思誠者，人之道也).[119] Even in the *Xunzi* the term appears only twice, once in the relatively inconsequential line "The significance of dance commingles with Heaven's Way" (舞意天道兼), and the other in a statement that specifically eschews the term's relevance to humanity: "The 'way' is not the way of Heaven, and not the way of Earth, but rather the way by which mankind is led, the way that is taken (/guided/discussed) by the noble man" (道者，非天之道，非地之道，人之所以道也，君子之所道也).[120] This relative lack of favorability makes its appearances within the ritual compendia all the more

[116]In the "Yue ji" 樂記 chapter of the *Li ji*, we are told: "Thus it is said: 'In the way of living (/nurturing) people, music is the greatest [aspect]'" 故曰：「生民之道，樂為大焉」. The "Liqi" 禮器 chapter states that "In ritual, timeliness is the greatest aspect, followed by accordance, followed by embodiment, followed by appropriateness, followed by correspondence" (禮，時為大，順次之，體次之，宜次之，稱次之). And in the "Jiyi" 祭義 chapter of that work, it is recounted how Zeng Zi once heard from the Master—using a perhaps slightly altered form of the phrase—that: "Among all to which Heaven gives birth and Earth rears, there is nothing greater than mankind. One's parents give birth to one whole, and when the son returns [his body] whole, he can be said to have been filial" (天之所生，地之所養，無人為大。父母全而生之，子全而歸之。可謂孝矣). See Sun Xidan, *Liji jijie*, 1007, 627, and 1228.

[117]"Gongye Chang" 公冶長, passage 12 (5.12); see Zhu Xi, *Lunyu jizhu*, in *Sishu zhangju jizhu*, 79.

[118]*Mengzi* "Jin xin, pt. 2" 盡心下, passage 24 (7B.24); Zhu Xi, *Mengzi jizhu*, in *Sishu zhangju jizhu*, 369.

[119]See the twelfth passage of "Li Lou, pt. 1" cited in footnote 109 above.

[120]From "Yue lun" 樂論 and "Ruxiao" 儒效, respectively; see Wang Xianqian, *Xunzi jijie*, 383 and 122.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

significant. And while it does appear in several chapters of both ritual compendia, "Ai Gong wen" is the only one, aside from the "Zhongyong," in which it appears more than once, there the focus of an entire paragraph of conversation.[121]

More noteworthy, though, is the use of the term *wuwei* 無為, "acting to no purpose," which also appears within that same paragraph and is likewise a term that is generally not utilized in Confucian texts, save for a few well-known exceptions.[122] Within the ritual compendia, aside from a possible instance of limited relevance in "Liyun" 禮運,[123] this dialogue and the "Zhongyong" are the only two places in which this term occurs, and both in a remarkably similar context:

"Ai Gong wen":

孔子對曰：「貴其不已。如日月東西相從而不已也，是天道也。不閉其久，是天道也。無為而物成，是天道也。已成而明，是天道也。」

Kong Zi replied: "He values the fact that [Heaven's Way] is unrelenting. Such as the sun and moon following each other from east to west without relent—this is Heaven's Way. To lastingly endure without ever shutting down—this is Heaven's Way. For things to *find completion while it acts to no purpose*—this is Heaven's Way. To shine brilliantly after achieving [such] completion—this is Heaven's Way."

"Zhongyong":

如此者，不見而章，不動而變，無為而成。天地之道，可壹言而盡也：其為物不貳，則其生物不測。天地之道，博也，厚也，高也，明也，悠也，久也。[124]

Someone like this is manifest without even presenting himself, causes change without even taking action, and *brings completion while acting to no purpose*. The

[121]The "Zhongyong" lines include the aforementioned "Sincerity is the Way of Heaven, and bringing about sincerity is the way of mankind" 誠者，天之道也；誠之者，人之道也 and another instance to be cited shortly. Perhaps the most noteworthy example among other "chapters" comes from "Liyun" 禮運: "Kong Zi said: 'As for ritual, it is the means by which the former kings inherited Heaven's Way and by which they brought order to human affections. Thus those who lose it die, and those who gain it live" (孔子曰：「夫禮，先王以承天之道，以治人之情，故失之者死，得之者生」).

[122]These include passage four of the "Wei Ling Gong" 衛靈公 chapter of the *Lunyu* (15.4): "He who could rule by acting to no purpose, was it not Shun!" (無為而治者，其舜也與); the "Jiebi" 解蔽 chapter of the *Xunzi*: "Thus in carrying out their way, the humane act to no purpose, and the sages do nothing forcibly" (故仁者之行道也，無為也；聖人之行道也，無彊也); and the words of "Kong Zi" as portrayed in the "Youzuo" 宥坐 chapter of the *Xunzi*: "For water universally benefits all living things while acting to no purpose, [thereby] resembling virtue" (夫水遍與諸生而無為也，似德). See Zhu Xi, *Lunyu jizhu*, in *Sishu zhangju jizhu*, 162; and Wang Xianqian, *Xunzi jijie*, 404 and 524.

[123]"[With the various sacrifices and their attendants all in order,] the king acts to no purpose in his inner heart, and thereby holds on to ultimate correctness" (王中心無為也，以守至正). "Wu wei" also occurs together once in the "Wen Wang shizi" 文王世子 chapter, but there in the totally unrelated sense of simply "have no [ability] to act." See Sun Xidan, *Liji jijie*, 615 and 565.

[124]Zhu Xi, *Zhongyong zhangju*, 34.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> Way of Heaven and Earth can be exhausted in a single word: as it is never duplicitous on behalf of things, its production of things cannot be fathomed. The Way of Heaven and Earth is vast, abundant, lofty, bright, long, and enduring.

Parallels with "Kong Zi xianju" 孔子閒居

In addition to the "Zhongyong," another text with which Dialogue B reveals suggestively close connections is the "Kong Zi xianju" chapter of the *Li ji*—the first half of which also appears as a text among the Shanghai Museum manuscripts given the title of "Min zhi fumu" 民之父母.[125] Of particular note are the underlined terms and phrases from the opening and closing lines of the following paragraph of Dialogue B:

> 孔子遂言曰：「昔三代明王之政，必敬其妻子也，有道。 … …身以及身，子以及子，妃以及妃，君行此三者，則愾乎天下矣，大王之道也。如此，則國家順矣。」

> Kong Zi then continued: "In former times, in the governance of the enlightened kings of the three dynasties, reverence was invariably paid to consorts and sons, and [for this] there was a [proper] way …. [Reverence for] one's own self leads to [others' reverence for] their selves; [reverence for] one's own son leads to [others' reverence for] their sons; and [reverence for] one's own wife leads to [others' reverence for] their wives. If the ruler practices these three [forms of reverence], his [reverential] spirit will infuse the entire world. This is the way of the great kings, and if things are thus, all the states and households will be in compliant accord.

First, on a general level, the phrase "his [reverential] spirit will infuse the entire world" (愾乎天下矣) reminds one most immediately of Kong Zi's opening lines from "Kong Zi xianju" ("Min zhi fumu"): "A father-and-mother of the people! He must comprehend the source(s) of ritual and music, so as to achieve the five attainments and practice the three absences, and thereby transfuse the world" (夫民之父母乎！必達於禮樂之原，以致五至而行三無，以橫於天下).[126] While the exact sense of *kai hu tianxia* 愾乎天下 is a little ambiguous, that it may involve a transfusing *qi* 氣 is suggested by the "Kong Zi xianju" rephrasing of its similar notion later in that text as *zhiqi sai hu tiandi* 志氣塞乎天地 ([The virtuous] energy of intentions fills [the

[125]See Ma Chengyuan 馬承源 et al., eds., *Shanghai bowuguan cang Zhanguo Chu zhushu*, v. 2 上海博物館藏戰國楚竹書（二） (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 2002), 3 and 15–30 (photographic reproductions) and 149–80 (Pu Maozuo's 濮茅左 transcription). More on the relationship between this manuscript and "Kong Zi xianju" will be noted below.

[126]Sun Xidan, *Liji jijie*, 1274. For 致, "Min zhi fumu" has 至; for 橫 (transfuse), "Min zhi fumu" writes 皇, which, if not simply a phonetic loan for 橫, could alternatively be understood along the lines of "shine brightly." A similarly worded notion of "filling" the world is found in a passage that occurs in both the "Jiyi" 祭義 chapter of the *Li ji* and the "Zeng Zi daxiao" 曾子大孝 chapter of the *Da Dai Li ji*, the former version of which reads: "Zeng Zi said: 'For filial piety, once erected, fills the expanse of Heaven and Earth; once disseminated, transfuses [the land within] the four seas; and once conferred upon later generations, effaces all distinctions of time and space" (曾子曰：「夫孝，置之而塞乎天地，溥之而橫乎四海，施諸後世而無朝夕」). See *Liji jijie*, 1227.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

expanse between] Heaven and Earth) and its recurring focus on "energized intent" (*qizhi* 氣志).[127] In "Kong Zi xianju," the main conduit of this "energy of intentions" or "energized intent" is the practice of the "three absences,"[128] and it may be no coincidence that the "[reverential] spirit infusing the entire world" in our dialogue here is similarly the result of "one who practices these three" (行此三者)—albeit here "these three" constitute manifestly different forms of reverence from the "three absences."

More striking, though, are the other two underlined terms in this passage. Notably, while references to the "three [founding] kings" (*san wang* 三王) of the Xia, Shang, and Zhou are of course rife in early literature, the phrase *san dai ming wang* 三代明王 (the enlightened kings of the three dynasties) appears only in this dialogue and the "Biao ji" 表記 (Record of example) chapter of the *Li ji*, the latter of which reads: "The Master spoke thus: 'In former times, the enlightened kings of the three dynasties all served the spirits of Heaven and Earth, in which service they never failed to employ tortoiseshell and milfoil divination—not daring to employ their own private [judgments] and [thereby] serve the Lord-on-High with disrespect'" (子言之：「昔三代明王皆事天地之神明，無非卜筮之用，不敢以其私，褻事上帝」).[129] If we extend this phrase to include the variant form of simply *san dai zhi wang* 三代之王 (the kings of the three dynasties), however, we find yet one further reference, which occurs in the second half of "Kong Zi xianju," at the very end of Kong Zi's mini-lecture:[130]

> 「三代之王也，必先其令聞。詩云『明明天子，令聞不已』，三代之德也。『弛其文德，協此四國』，大王之德也。」[131]

> In coming to rule the kingdom, the [sage] kings of the Three Dynasties invariably first [accomplished] a fine reputation. As the ode has it, "Brilliant, oh brilliant, is the Son of Heaven, his glorious reputation never ceasing"—[such] were the virtues of the Three Dynasties; and "He promulgates his refined virtue, and harmonizes the four regions"—[such] were the virtues of the great kings.[132]

[127]The "Min zhi fumu" version of this line is slightly different and perhaps somewhat corrupted, but otherwise more or less equivalent; for details see Chen Jian 陳劍, "Shangbo jian 'Min zhi fumu' 'er de ji sai yu sihai yi' ju jieshi" 上博簡《民之父母》「而得既塞於四海矣」句解釋, in *Shangboguan cang Zhanguo Chu zhushu yanjiu xubian* 上博館藏戰國楚竹書研究續編, ed. Shanghai daxue gudai wenming yanjiu zhongxin 上海大學古代文明研究中心 and Qinghua daxue sixiang wenhua yanjiusuo 清華大學思想文化研究所 (Shanghai: Shanghai shudian chubanshe, 2004), 251–55.

[128]That is, the "music of no sounds" (無聲之樂), the "ritual of no bodily deportment" (無體之禮), and the "mourning of no apparel" (無服之喪).

[129]Sun Xidan, *Liji jijie*, 1318.

[130]Versions of this passage also occur in the "Wenyu" 問玉 chapter of the *Kongzi jiayu* and *juan* 5 of the *Hanshi waizhuan*. We should note that another variant, 三代之興王, appears once in the *Lüshi chunqiu*, and the phrase 三代(之)聖王 occurs quite a number of times in the *Mozi*. No such further variations of 三代X王, however, are found in any texts of clearly Confucian orientation, or anywhere else, for that matter.

[131]Sun Xidan, *Liji jijie*, 1279.

[132]The cited lines come from consecutive couplets forming the final stanza of the ode "Jiang Han" 江漢 (The Jiang and Han Rivers) of the "Da Ya" section of the *Shi jing*, an ode written in praise of King Xuan (and his minister Shao Bohu 召伯虎), used here toward other purposes.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In the passage from Dialogue B above, Kong Zi is made to bookend his initial reference to "the governance of the enlightened kings of the three dynasties" (三代明王之政) with "the way of the great kings" (大王之道也) at his statement's conclusion, whereas here, remarkably, the same thing happens with "the kings of the three dynasties" (三代之王也) and "the virtue of the great kings" (大王之德也). And as it turns out, the phrases "way of the great kings" (大王之道) and "virtue of the great kings" (大王之德) occur *nowhere* else in early literature—the phrase being so unusual that commentators have insisted on reading the "great kings" (*da wang* 大王) of these passages as specific references to the historical King Tai (*Tai wang* 太王).[133]

Connections with "Ziyi" , "Fang ji" , and "Biao ji"

Specific terminology and phraseology aside, there are, finally, areas of general philosophical overlap for which we can also observe close points of correspondence among these texts. In particular, we might also note the similarity of such statements as "the people of the hundred surnames will become reverent and humble without having even been commanded to do so" (百姓不命而敬恭) in Dialogue B of "Ai Gong wen" with such lines as "Thus the noble man is revered without even taking action, and trusted without even speaking" (故君子不動而敬，不言而信) from the final passage of the "Zhongyong."[134] To be sure, similar lines are found in any number of early texts, ranging from the *Zhuangzi* to the *Lüshi chunqiu* to the *Huainanzi*, and, most notably among Confucian texts, in the opening lines of the "Biao ji": "The Master spoke thus: 'Let us return! The noble man is prominent while in seclusion, solemn without making any display of it, awesome without being stern, and trusted without even speaking'" (子言之：「歸乎！君子隱而顯，不矜而莊，不厲而威，不言而信」).[135] However, within the same paragraph of "Dialogue B" text, it is also interesting to note that the 君子X則民Y pattern seen in the statement 君子過言則民作辭，過動則民作則 (When the noble man goes too far with his statements, the people will follow in acting upon his words; when he goes too far with his actions, the people will follow in acting upon his model) is in fact seldom seen in early texts. Aside from one instance in the *Lunyu* and a couple of cases in the *Hanshi waizhuan* and *Shuoyuan*, the other four examples all come from the three closely related *Li ji* "chapters" traditionally associated—in addition to the "Zhongyong"—with Zisi 子思: the "Fang ji" (Record of Boundaries): "The Master said: 'If the noble man honors others and lowers himself, prioritizes others and deprioritizes himself, the people will be made to be yielding'" (子云：「君子貴人而賤己，先人而後己，則民作讓」), and "Thus if the noble man oversees with trust and yielding, the people will be generous in their

[133]As discussed earlier in note 86 above, 大王, "great kings," could be read 太王, "King Tai" (Zhou King Wen's grandfather), as commentators since Zheng Xuan have indeed read it and as it appears in "Wen yu" in some editions of the *Kongzi jiayu*—probably in order to signal that the editor in fact read it that way (the *Hanshi waizhuan* version of the passage, however, still writes it as 大; the two graphs are, in any case, cognate). However, reading 大王 as a general descriptor of "great kings" here would—just as in "Dialogue B"—again make better sense as a concluding line than to single out King Tai uniquely from the already-mentioned "kings of the three dynasties"; it reads more naturally to simply take "great kings" as an alternate expression for the aforementioned "[enlightened] kings of the three dynasties" and their ilk.

[134]Zhu Xi, *Zhongyong zhangju*, in *Sishu zhangju jizhu*, 39.

[135]Sun Xidan, *Liji jijie*, 1297.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ritual requitals" (故君子信讓以蒞，則民之報禮重); the "Biao ji": "The Master said: 'If the noble man does not praise people with [mere] words, the people will be made to be loyal" (子曰：「君子不以口譽人，則民作忠」); and the "Ziyi" (Black Robes): "Thus if the noble man looks back upon his words before acting, so as to fulfill his trustworthiness, then the people will [likewise] be unable to exaggerate their [own] beauty or minimize their [own] failings" (故君子寡（顧）言而行以成其信，則民不得大其美而小其惡).[136] Notably, two of these examples also duplicate the specific pattern of 民作X seen in the 民作辭 and 民作則 of the Dialogue B statement.

Where do we find other examples of this idiosyncratic phrase? Once again, four of them occur in these same texts; in the "Fang ji": "The Master said: 'If [the minister] praises the ruler when good is accomplished and faults himself when things err, the people will be made to be loyal'" (子云：「善則稱君，過則稱己，則民作忠」), "The Master said: 'If he [as a son] praises his parents when good is accomplished and faults himself when things err, the people will be made to be filial'" (子云：「善則稱親，過則稱己，則民作孝」), and "The Master said: 'If the leader of the people shows respect to the elders in court, the people will be made to be filial'" (子云：「長民者，朝廷敬老則民作孝」); and the "Ziyi": "The Master said: 'If one is as fond of beauty as [one is of] black [courtly] robes (as in the ode "Ziyi"), and as despising of the wicked as [one is of] slanderers (as in the ode "Xiangbo"), then noble ranks will not be transgressed, and the people will act with honesty; implements of punishment will not be utilized, and yet the people will all submit'" (子曰：「好賢如緇衣，惡惡如巷伯，則爵不瀆而民作愿，刑不試而民咸服」)[137]; the only two other examples are likewise found in the ritual compendia.[138]

[136]Sun Xidan, *Liji jijie*, 1285, 1286, 1317, and 1332 (in the Guodian version of the "Ziyi" lines, 寡, "few," is written 䫜, which might instead be read 顧, "look back upon," as Zheng Xuan in fact reads it); there are also many more examples of … 則民 … in these texts where the preceding leadership-by-example model is not explicitly stated as the actions of the "noble man" (君子). The *Lunyu* instance occurs in the second passage of the "Tai Bo" chapter (8.2), wherein the Master is given to remark: "If the noble man is earnest toward his parents, the people will be inspired toward humaneness; if he does not neglect his former acquaintances, the people will not grow indifferent" (君子篤於親，則民興於仁；故舊不遺，則民不偷). In *juan* 1 of the *Hanshi waizhuan*, we have the lines "Thus if the noble man is moderate in his clothing and appropriate in his demeanor, the people's eyes will be gratified; if his speech is modest and his responses forthcoming, the people's ears will be gratified; and if he seeks out the humane and shuns the inhumane, the people's hearts will be gratified" (故君子衣服中，容貌得，則民之目悅矣；言語遜，應對給，則民之耳悅矣；就仁去不仁，則民之心悅矣); a close parallel is also found in the "Xiushen" 脩身 chapter of the *Shuoyuan*. And in *juan* 5 of the *Hanshi waizhuan* we find: "Thus if the noble man cultivates himself and practices filial piety, the people will not turn against him; if his reverence and filial piety reaches below, the people will know to be compassionate and caring" (故君子脩身及孝，則民不倍矣。敬孝達乎下，則民知慈愛矣). Even if we substitute "ruler" (君) for "noble man" (君子), this small list does not expand much, with only a few additional examples from the *Guanzi* to note.

[137]Sun Xidan, *Liji jijie*, 1287, 1289, and 1322. The Guodian and Shanghai Museum versions of the "Ziyi" lines have some substantial variations, including lacking the line about the "transgression of noble ranks" altogether; for details, see Scott Cook, *The Bamboo Texts of Guodian: A Study and Complete Translation*, vol. 1 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012), 375–78.

[138]In the "Xiang yinjiu yi" 鄉飲酒義 chapter of the *Li ji*, we find the statement: "If you prioritize ritual over material resources, the people will be made to be reverent and yielding and not contend" (先禮而後財，則民作敬讓而不爭矣); and in both the "Pinyi" 聘義 chapter of the *Li ji* and "Chaoshi" 朝事 chapter of the *Da Dai Li ji*, we find: "If the regional lords encourage each other to value ritual over material resources, the people will be made to be yielding" (諸侯相厲（勵）以輕財重禮，則民作讓矣). Sun

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Some Tentative Conclusions

What does this all tell us? The answer naturally depends on which particular forms of evidence we are considering. The use of common terminology, for instance, while highly suggestive, might show only that the texts in question derived from similar impulses or within the same intellectual milieu. That a couple of Confucian texts would borrow common terminology such as *tian dao* or *wuwei* that likely originally derived from sources beyond the confines of Confucian lineages may thus in that regard not be entirely remarkable, though the confluence of both terms within closely related contexts is certainly at least suggestive of more direct ties between the texts in question. The same limitations apply even more to the case of the common appearance of shared notions—however particular those notions may be—where they do not involve especially close repetitions of wording. When it comes to more idiosyncratic phrases, however, these are far more suggestive of direct connections, especially where such phrases are subtle enough to not otherwise scream for attention.

Broadly speaking, such connections are of two possible varieties. Most directly, subtle echoes of unique language usage could reveal traces of common authorship, as everyone naturally has one's own idiosyncrasies in phraseology just as every individual has a unique signature. Indirectly, however, the connections could take the form of conscious imitation, where one may have occasion to attempt to replicate a prior dialogue model down to the smallest detail of verbal interactions between characters. And we can also imagine something in between these two possibilities: common authorship could, for instance, be understood more broadly to include authorship by different individuals within the same teacher–disciple lineage, wherein a disciple or set of disciples either consciously or subconsciously imitated the model of a master under whom they had studied so closely. Each of these scenarios is significant in its own way.

For conscious imitation of a Confucian dialogue beyond the confines of a lineage or common ideology, we have the fascinating examples of the many parodies (or, in some cases, quasi-tributes) of such dialogues in the *Zhuangzi*. In some cases, the level of attention to detail is in fact quite striking and reveals an author who is quite a master of the literary craft of parody.

For instance, in dialogues in both the "Dasheng" 達生 and "Zhi beiyou" 知北遊 chapters, confused disciples are given to ask Confucius (there referred to as "Zhongni") the question 敢問何謂 (May I dare ask what [this] refers to?), which is the stock form of questions to the Master in "Ai Gong wen" (/"Ai Gong wen yu Kong Zi"). Remarkably, within the ritual compendia, the only other places we see the phrase are in two of the three "Confucius at leisure" texts: "Kong Zi xianju" (notably in both "halves" of the dialogue) and the "Zhuyan" 主言 chapter of the *Da Dai Li ji*.[139] The

Xidan, *Liji jijie*, 1428 and 1462; Wang Pinzhen, *Da Dai Liji jiegu*, 235. To be sure, the "Ai Gong wen" phrases both differ slightly in having 作 followed by a noun ("words" 辭, "model" 則) rather than one of the adjectival virtues ("loyal" 忠, "filial" 孝, "reverent" 敬, etc.) seen in all these other examples, but the effect is much the same.

[139]The phrase also occurs in the "Gongsun Chou, pt. 1" 公孫丑上 (2A.2) chapter of the *Mengzi*, and, in somewhat different contexts among other Warring States texts, once in the *Guanzi* 管子 and thrice in the *Zuo zhuan*. The related phrase 敢問何如 (May I dare ask what kind of . . .), which also appears in the "Ai Gong wen wuyi" (Dialogue C) text (but not in the *Zhuangzi*), is also notably found in both "Kong Zi xianju" and "Zhongni yanju" (the third "Confucius at leisure" text) (it also appears once in the *Mengzi* and once in

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

somewhat more common yet still idiosyncratic phrase 吾語汝 (/吾語女/吾語若) (I will tell you) is found uttered by Confucius to disciples in the "Renjianshi" 人間世, "Qiushui" 秋水, and "Yufu" 漁父 chapters of the *Zhuangzi*—though this particular term is also adopted in other dialogues in that work between imaginary interlocutors wherein a certain figure assumes a similar role as a kind of enlightened master.[140] Finally, and even more interestingly in terms of narrative detail, we have the term *qiaoran* 愀然 (apprehensivel, taken aback) and its variants (蹴然、愀焉、憯然、憯焉、蹙然)—often in conjunction with *zuo se* 作色 (changed facial expressions)—as descriptors of participants' reactions in dialogue contexts. This expression occurs three times in Dialogue B, and once in Dialogue F (from the *Xunzi*), in all cases descriptive of Kong Zi's reaction to one of Lord Ai's comments or questions.[141] Elsewhere in the ritual compendia, it also occurs in the "Confucius at leisure" text "Zhuyan"—as Kong Zi's reaction to a dumb question from his disciple Zeng Zi; and thrice in the "Sidai" 四代 and "Shaoxian" 少閒 texts (two of the so-called "Kongzi sanchao ji" dialogues mentioned in note 4 above)—though in two of these cases it portrays the Lord's reaction rather than Kong Zi's. Elsewhere, the term appears occasionally in a few other dialogue or purely narrative contexts scattered amongst a variety of Warring States and early Han works, but on balance it is decidedly associated with dialogues involving Kong Zi.[142] Not surprisingly, roughly half of the instances in the *Zhuangzi* describe Kong Zi in just such imagined dialogues: in response to his disciple Yan Hui in both "Dazongshi" 大宗師 and "Rangwang" 讓王, in response to Lao Laizi 老萊子 in "Waiwu" 外物, and twice in response to the fisherman guest in "Yufu" 漁父.[143]

the "Yue ji" 樂記)—yet another turn of phrase suggestive of a close connection between the "Ai Gong wen" dialogues and the "Confucius at leisure" texts. Within the "Ai Gong wen" dialogues, specifically, the use of the "Dare I ask" phrases appears designed to suggest a "disciple-like" status on Lord Ai's part.

[140]Instances may be found in "Zaiyou" 在宥, "Tianyun" 天運, "Dasheng," and "Gengsang Chu" 庚桑楚. Most notably, within the ritual compendia, this phrase also occurs in both the "Zhongni yanju" and "Zhuyan" dialogues; it is also found within dialogues in the "Zeng Zi tianyuan" 曾子天圓 and "Wey jiangjun Wenzi" 衛將軍文子 chapters of the *Da Dai Li ji*. Elsewhere among Warring States texts, there is one instance in the *Lunyu* and quite a few in dialogues involving Confucius in different chapters of the *Xunzi*. Especially remarkable is its occurrence in one feigned Confucian dialogue portrayed in the "Feiru, xia" 非儒下 chapter of the *Mozi* 墨子.

[141]In the third of the three instances in the former, and the one in the latter, the term is written 蹴然 rather than 愀然.

[142]Other examples involving Kong Zi are seen in the "Shenren" 慎人 chapter of the *Lüshi chunqiu*, where the term describes Kong Zi in response to remarks reported by Yan Hui. An instance from the "Jingshen" 敬慎 chapter of the *Shuoyuan* is another case where the term occurs in a dialogue between Kong Zi and Lord Ai, but it is Lord Ai that changes his facial expression. The first of two examples in the *Han Shi waizhuan* describes Yan Hui's response to a statement by Kong Zi, and in the "Zhongni" 仲尼 chapter of the *Liezi* 列子, the term describes Kong Zi in response to a remark by Yan Hui—embedded there within the familiar context of "Confucius at leisure" 仲尼閒居. While strongly associated with Confucius, however, the term does appear in other dialogue contexts as well, including several times between Yan Zi 晏子 and Lord Jing of Qi 齊景公 in the *Yanzi chunqiu* 晏子春秋, among others.

[143]The first of these is written 蹴然, and the "Waiwu" instance is written 蹙然. The instances not involving Confucius, all written 蹴然, respectively describe the famous minister Zichan 子產 in dialogue with a crippled criminal (Dechongfu 德充符), Yang Ziju 陽子居 (possibly Yang Zhu 楊朱) in dialogue with Lao Dan 老聃 (in both "Yingdiwang" 應帝王 and "Yuyan" 寓言), Zigong 子貢 in dialogue with Lao Dan

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The recurring use of all such tell-tale terms in these parodies shows obvious signs of conscious imitation, which in turn suggests a source of well-known, pre-existing model texts upon which to draw, ones whose narrative quirks would have already been familiar to the audience for whom these newly imagined dialogues were intended.

In some ways, we might suppose that such forms of direct imitation would actually be less likely to occur in texts written by followers of a master within the same ideological lineage, where the emphasis was no doubt more on the transmission of ideas and philosophical positions rather than achieving a convincing mimic of a prior textual dialogue. But to the extent that such imitation may have in fact occurred within a single lineage, the very act of such a form of common lineage authorship would itself certainly be significant for our understanding of intellectual-historical developments in the period.

Perhaps more interesting, however, are the idiosyncratic terms that we do *not* find in texts that clearly involve conscious imitation. Such dialogue-advancing and narratively descriptive phrases as "May I dare ask what this refers to?" "I'll tell you," and "[He] apprehensively changed facial expression" are both prominent and colorful enough to have been readily noticed and adopted by those eager to imitate the form and tone of a particular text. By contrast, less intriguing yet still idiosyncratic locutions such as "is the greatest [aspect]" or "there is a [proper] way [for something]," or even the close juxtaposition of the "kings of the three dynasties" with "great kings," were perhaps subtle or unremarkable enough to have escaped the attention of any conscious mimicker and appear far more likely to evidence common authorship—either derivation from the work of the same individual author, or, if not that, then from followers of texts that would have been so frequently consulted or even memorized by members of a common lineage as to have pervaded their subconscious writing habits (or perhaps patterns of speech more generally). While any such evidence remains tenuous at best where it occurs in isolation, a confluence of such evidence within a particular constellation of texts, especially when some of the terms in question are almost entirely absent elsewhere, points us more firmly in the direction of common authorship of one sort or another.

In this study, we have observed how the dialogues in "Ai Gong wen"—particularly Dialogue B—reveal remarkable parallels on multiple levels with both the "Zhongyong" and the entire text of "Kong Zi xianju," not to mention with such closely associated texts as "Biao ji," "Fang ji," "Ziyi," and even portions of the *Mengzi*. What might this tell us about dating and authorship? To take the "Kong Zi xianju" example first, the fact that the "Ai Gong wen" parallels with that text clearly cut across both halves of it would only serve to corroborate my findings elsewhere, based mostly on entirely separate evidence, that the two halves of "Kong Zi xianju" did indeed belong together and that the excavated manuscript "Min zhi fumu" was simply an excerpt from that larger, originally integrated text.[144] If this holds true, it is clear that "Kong Zi xianju" as a whole was written by no later than around the end of the fourth

("Tianyun" 天運), great officers in response to King Wen 文王 ("Tian Zifang" 田子方), and one fictional figure in response to another ("Gengsang Chu" 庚桑楚).

[144]For details of the argument, which involves comparison with the way the text is erroneously divided up in the *Kongzi jiayu*, see Cook, "Confucius After Hours: An Analysis of the 'Master at Leisure' Dialogues in the *Li ji*," especially 146–50; or, somewhat more comprehensively, Gu Shikao [Scott Cook], "Cong 'xian ju' lei wenxian kan Shangbo jian 'Min zhi fumu' ji *Li ji*, *Kongzi jiayu* xiangguan pianzhang de xingzhi" 從「閒

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

century BCE—assuming a probable dating of around 300 BCE for the Shanghai Museum manuscripts—and if "Ai Gong wen" indeed derived from a common author, the same would hold true for "Ai Gong wen" as well (or certainly at least Dialogue B). This is further corroborated by the close connections "Ai Gong wen" also betrays with "Ziyi" and its likely cohort texts "Fang ji" and "Biao ji," as we know for certain that at least "Ziyi" also predates the roughly-300 BCE interment of both the Guodian tomb and whatever tomb the Shanghai Museum manuscripts were stolen from.

The other text that shares the greatest formal similarity with "Ziyi," "Fang ji," and "Biao ji" is, of course, the "Zhongyong," but the "Zhongyong" is also clearly the most problematic of these texts to date, given especially the long-observed anomaly of the passage wherein, perhaps anachronistically, it is stated that:

> 今天下車同軌，書同文，行同倫，雖有其位，苟無其德，不敢作禮樂焉；雖有其德，苟無其位，亦不敢作禮樂焉。
>
> Now all the carriages of the world drive the same tracks, documents share the same forms of writing, and practices share the same order. Though one may have the position, if he does not possess the virtue, he dare not create ritual and music therefrom; and though he possess the virtue, if he does not have the position, he also dare not create ritual and music therefrom.

This statement has led to a view—now something of a scholarly consensus—that the composition of either the "Zhongyong" as a whole or at least substantial portions of it must post-date the Qin 秦 unification.[145] Whether the statement is indeed an anachronism, however, is open to question, for so long as one does not neglect to read the "now" phrases together with the "though" phrases that follow them, we should in fact be inclined to read the whole utterance as a hypothetical, in other words: "Now suppose that all the carriages of the world were to drive the same tracks … [even then], though one may have the position [of Son of Heaven], if he did not possess the virtue, he [should] not dare to create [new] ritual and music therefrom."[146] This reading is supported by other co-occurrences of *jin* 今 and *sui* 雖 in early texts, as in the "Quli, shang" 曲禮上 chapter of the *Li ji*, for instance, where we are told "Now if someone were to be lacking in ritual, then though he may be well versed in speech, would he not still have the mind of a bird or beast!" (今人而無禮，雖能言，不亦禽獸之心乎); and, in the words of "Kong Zi" as quoted in the "Youzuo" 宥坐 chapter of

居」類文獻看上博簡〈民之父母〉及《禮記》、《孔子家語》相關篇章的性質, in his *Shangbo zhushu Kongzi yulu wenxian yanjiu*, 225–69, especially 251–65.

[145]For the argument that it must be a post-unification statement, see Feng Youlan 馮友蘭, *Zhongguo zhexueshi (zengdingben)* 中國哲學史（增訂本）(1944; expanded edition Taipei: Taiwan Shangwu yinshuguan, 1983), 446–48. Feng himself suspected that what he sees as the "middle portion" of the text—passage 2 to a few lines into passage 20 (up through "親親之殺，尊賢之等，禮所生也"), by Zhu Xi's numbering—is at least generally the product of Zisi's authorship, whereas the first passage and last several passages derive from later elaborations going all the way into the Han; Feng's views on this are very close to ones separately offered by Takeuchi Yoshio 武内義雄 (1886–1966). For the "anachronistic" lines in question, see passage 28 of Zhu Xi, *Zhongyong zhangju*, in *Sishu zhangju jizhu*, 36.

[146]I am not the first to propose such a reading. Li Xueqin 李學勤 has previously offered a similar take, though I am unable to track down the precise reference.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the *Xunzi*: "Now suppose there were the right man, but he did not encounter the right time, then though he may be worthy, would he be able to put anything into practice? [But] were he to encounter the right time, what difficulties would he have!" (今有其人，不遇其時，雖賢，其能行乎？苟遇其時，何難之有). If this sort of reading holds, then what the passage does tell us is only that it was written at a time when unification of the realm had already begun to be imagined, which was in fact the case by the latter years of the fourth century BCE.[147]

Yet even if we choose to view that passage as an expression of a post-unification worldview, that certainly would not entail that the whole of the "Zhongyong" is a product of the Han dynasty, given especially all the close resonances it shares, both ideologically and formally, with other Warring States texts. We could well suppose that the "Zhongyong" was constructed in several layers upon the foundation of a text having the Kong Zi-Lord Ai dialogue (its current passage 20, in Zhu Xi's numbering) at (or even as) its original core, which makes a good deal of sense when we consider that the dialogue is both anomalous in form from the rest of the "Zhongyong" and yet contains within it many of the core terms and ideas expressed throughout the rest of the text. Much work on this issue remains to be done, but given the undeniably close resonances this dialogue has with Dialogue B of "Ai Gong wen," and the latter's likely fourth century BCE provenance, we have much cause to further rethink the dating of what remains one of the most important texts in the long and far-reaching Confucian tradition.

Finally, it should be clear from the foregoing that "Ai Gong wen" not only betrays an especially close connection with "Kong Zi xianju," but with the other two "Confucius at leisure" texts from the ritual compendia as well: "Zhongni yanju" and "Zhuyan," which in turn, as I have attempted to demonstrate elsewhere, all reveal close resonances with one another. Of the three, "Zhuyan" is likely derivative—concerned as it is with the types of concrete administrative issues that would seem to be more reflective of late-Warring States texts—and may well be a candidate for what we have spoken of here as conscious imitation within a common lineage.[148] "Kong Zi xianju" and "Zhongni yanju," however, would appear to be constructed of the same cloth, and in this regard it is interesting to observe that not only do they both share relatively unique phraseology in common with "Dialogue C,"[149] the latter also shares a pattern in common with "Dialogue B" which, as far as I can ascertain, appears nowhere else

[147]It should further be noted that we need not await the concrete proposals of Li Si 李斯 to imagine a world connected by common carriage tracks, as the term *tong gui* 同軌 already appears in other pre-Qin texts as a stock metaphor for a group of either states or actors united in their words or principles. See, for instance, the "Bajian" 八姦 and "Nei chushuo, shang" 內儲說上 chapters of the *Han Feizi* 韓非子, where the term "with a single voice and common track" 一辭同軌 is employed to such ends; Wang Xianshen 王先慎, *Han Feizi jijie* 韓非子集解, ed. Zhong Zhe 鍾哲 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1998), 54 and 217. See also the "Jun chen, shang" 君臣上 chapter of the *Guanzi* 管子, where "documents united in names, and carriages united in tracks" 書同名，車同軌 are presented as the "ideals of rectified [governance]" (*zhi zheng* 至正) within a Zhou "feudal" structure; see Li Xiangfeng 黎翔鳳, *Guanzi jiaozhu* 管子校注, ed. Liang Yunhua 梁運華 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2004), 559. Most crucially, the *Zuo zhuan* already uses the term *tong gui* to indicate the most inclusive area possible of all regional lords loyal to the Zhou king: "[When] the Son of Heaven [passes away, he] is buried after seven months, and all those of common carriage tracks arrive [to mourn him]" 天子七月而葬，同軌畢至. See Yang Bojun, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu (zengdingben)*, 16.

[148]See Cook, "Confucius After Hours," 155.

[149]See note 139 above.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

among the ritual compendia—one which takes the form of "A之所B，C之所D也," as follows:[150]

"Ai Gong" Dialogue B:

君之所為，百姓之所從也。

Whatever the ruler practices, it is this that the people of the hundred surnames follow.

"Zhongni yanju":

禮之所興，眾之所治也。禮之所廢，眾之所亂也。

"Wherever ritual prospers is where the masses are well-ordered. Wherever ritual is abandoned is where the masses are in chaos."

Again, while such an instance of relatively unique overlap may be less than convincing on its own, when the entire constellation of such close resonances among "Ai Gong wen," "Kong Zi xianju," and "Zhongni yanju" are considered in tandem, common authorship of one sort or another presents itself as a distinct possibility.

To that end, we might propose a working hypothesis that these three texts formed part of a small core of writings formulated by either a single individual or group of individuals within a common Confucian lineage who had a particular interest in presenting their philosophy in a set of closely related, yet somewhat-distinct narrative contexts designed to highlight that philosophy with convincing rhetorical effect, whether that be to impart the sense that Confucius saved his most profound philosophy for unusual "moments of leisure" with his disciples, or that he proffered his most important views on governance as an elder statesman responding to the eager queries of a young ruler of Lu. These texts, then, would have been disseminated widely enough to become well known to even the followers of philosophical rivals, who felt free to construct parodies of Confucian dialogues by extracting bits and pieces of narrative phrases therefrom, and to not only make their way into the Han ritual compendia after being rediscovered perhaps in ancient-script form, but even, in the case of "Min zhi fumu," to resurface from looted pre-imperial tombs in more recent years. Other texts, such as the "Ziyi," "Biao ji," "Fang ji," and "Zhongyong," would also appear to have been closely related to this group in one way or another, as

[150]This refers to sentences in which the first phrase is the subject of the second; it excludes, in other words, instances where the two 之所 phrases both form the predicate to a prior subject or demonstrative equivalent, such as in the "Sannian wen" 三年問 chapter of the *Li ji*: "This is something the hundred kings held in common and something that has remained constant from past to present" (是百王之所同，古今之所壹也). Outside the ritual compendia, we do see a few scattered examples of the former pattern, such as in the "Chendao" chapter of the *Xunzi*: "Thus those whom the enlightened ruler rewards are those whom the befuddled ruler punishes; those whom the befuddled ruler rewards are those whom the enlightened ruler kills" (故明君之所賞，闇君之所罰也；闇君之所賞，明君之所殺也); or the "Dishu" 地數 chapter of the *Guanzi*: "Where weapons issue forth is where coinage arises" (戈矛之所發，刀幣之所起也), to name a couple.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

were other early "Ai Gong wen" dialogues such as "Ai Gong wen wuyi." The exact nature of these various relationships, if it can ever be determined with any precision, necessarily awaits further research and, ideally, further archaeological discoveries, but the evidence we have so far demands that we continue to closely examine this group of texts as writings of potentially seminal import in the development of Confucian thought in the mid-to-late Warring States.

顧史考

拜問耆老：論〈哀公問〉諸篇的互文關係

摘要

本文以孔子與魯哀公（前494—468年在位)的假設對話為主要對象，亦即散見於《禮記》、《大戴禮記》及《荀子》的「哀公問」諸篇，探討其間及其與其他相關傳世文本與出土文本之間的互文性關係。目的在於判定這幾篇所共見的敘述框架是否與其所論內容息息相關而本來即有的，同時也揭示其與若干其他先秦儒家文本間的密切關聯，進而推論諸種相關文本的著作年代。

孔子、哀公問、禮記、大戴禮記、荀子、中庸、孔子閒居、仲尼燕居、民之父母、緇衣、表記、坊記、戰國思想史

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Appendix: Translations of Dialogues C through F

"Lord Ai Asked about the Five Proprieties" 哀公問五義[151]

Dialogue C

魯哀公[152]問於孔子曰：	「吾欲論吾國之士[153]，與之為政[154]，何如者取之？[155]」
孔子對曰：	「生乎今之世，志古之道；居今之俗，服古之服；舍此而為非者，不亦鮮乎！」
哀公曰：	「然則今夫章甫、句屨、紳帶而搢笏者，此皆賢乎？[156]」
孔子曰：	「否，不必然。[157]今夫端衣、玄裳、冕而乘路者，志不在於食葷；[158]斬衰、菅屨、杖而歠粥者，志不在於飲食。[159]故生乎今之世，志古之道；居今之俗，服古之服；舍此而為非者，雖有，不亦鮮乎？[160]」
Lord Ai of Lu asked Kong Zi:	"I wish to assess my state's men of service and engage in governance with them—how should I go about choosing them?"
Kong Zi replied:	"To be born in today's age [yet] have one's mind set on the ancient ways, and to live among the customs of today [yet] don the clothes of the ancients—are not those who dwell in such things yet do wrong rare indeed?!"[161]

[151]The text as given here is cited from Wang Pinzhen, *Da Dai Liji jiegu*, 8–12, with reference also to Kong Guangsen, *Da Dai Liji buzhu*, 23–25. This chapter is equivalent to the first half of the "Ai Gong" 哀公 chapter of the *Xunzi*, for which see Wang Xianqian, *Xunzi jijie*, 537–42; and the first half of the "Wuyi jie" 五儀解 chapter of the *Kongzi jiayu*, for which see the *Qinding Siku quanshu* edition, *juan* 1, 20b–22b. In the textual footnotes below, the *Xunzi* and *Kongzi jiayu* versions of the text will be referenced by XZ and KZJY, respectively; DDLJ will refer to the *Da Dai Li ji* edition, utilized here as the base text.

[152]KZJY omits the 魯 here.

[153]For 吾, KZJY has 寡人, and for 吾國 it has 魯國.

[154]For 為政, XZ has 治國, and KZJY has 為治.

[155]XZ has this phrase as 敢問何如之邪, with the 取 perhaps inadvertently omitted; KZJY has 敢問如何取之. Interestingly, 敢問 appears in only two of Lord Ai's questions in DDLJ's "Ai gong wen wuyi," whereas it is seen often in its "Ai Gong wen yu Kong Zi" (i.e., *Li ji*'s "Ai Gong wen").

[156]For 句屨, XZ writes 絇屨, and KZJY has 絇履; for 紳帶, XZ has just 紳. XZ also lacks the 皆 in the final phrase, having just 此賢乎; Yu Yue 俞樾 (1821–1906) suspects its 此 is actually an error for 比, understood in the sense of "all," but this seems unnecessary. For 賢, KZJY has 賢人.

[157]XZ lacks the 否 here, as well as the 今 that follows. KZJY also lacks the 否, and it follows this phrase with an additional one—丘之所言非此之謂也 (What I am speaking of here does not refer to this)—before resuming the next phase also with just 夫, rather than 今夫, at its head.

[158]XZ writes 冕 as 絻. For 路, KZJY has 軒, and it writes 葷 with the variant form of 焄; it also precedes the last phrase, as well as the parallel one below, with 則.

[159]For 菅屨, XZ writes 菅屨 (cogon-grass sandals), whereas KZJY has 菅菲; XZ also writes 歠 with the variant form of 啜. For 飲食, both XZ and KZJY have 酒肉 (alcohol and meat). Both XZ and KZJY also lack the following 故.

[160]In place of this 舍此而為非者，雖有，不亦鮮乎, KZJY instead has simply 謂此類也 ([I am] referring to these types of things), a rejoinder to its additional 丘之所言非此之謂也 above.

[161]Or taking 舍 in the sense of 捨, another way of reading this line might possibly be: "[Should you do such things,] would not those [below] who reject this [model] and do wrong be rare indeed?" The reading given in the translation tentatively follows that suggested by Wang Pinzhen, which, given what follows, would appear to be the correct interpretation.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lord Ai asked: "In that case, are those who don the *zhangfu* cap,[162] tasseled sandals, and a sash belt inserted with a ritual tablet all worthies?"

Kong Zi said: "No, not necessarily. [But] now those who don the ceremonial un-tapered upper garment, jet-black lower garment, and ritual crown while riding in their carriage do not have minds that are set on eating pungent flavors,[163] and those who don the mourning garment of extreme grief and grass sandals while walking with a cane and while sipping [only] rice gruel do not have minds that are set on food and drink.[164] Thus to be born in today's age [yet] have one's mind set on the ancient ways, and to live among the customs of today [yet] don the clothes of the ancients—though there may be those who dwell in such things yet do wrong, are they not rare indeed?!"

The pronounced emphasis on clothing here in the assessment of worthiness is somewhat remarkable. While it is obviously the "intent" 志 of the men of service in question that is paramount, intent itself is difficult to gauge, whereas apparel is immediately visible and, moreover, can often be representative or reflective of that intent. There can, of course, be a disconnect, where men simply wear the clothing of the part they wish to play while possessing none of the intent such clothing was meant to signify, and this is granted frankly at the outset with Kong Zi's admission that it is by no means necessarily the case that those who don the garb of worthy scholars possess the inherent worthiness their apparel serves to boast. Yet in certain cases, Kong Zi argues, particularly when it comes to participation in the age-old, solemn, and heartfelt rituals of sacrificing and mourning, the donning of the ancient apparel itself serves to generate, or rather reinforce, a certain authentic mindset in the wearer almost automatically. Here, the distinction between the clothing of men of service and that of rulers and upper nobility is blurred somewhat, as the apparel discussed in the final paragraph of translation above refers to that of the latter, but our Kong Zi here no doubt assumed that the practice of donning such apparel would radiate downward and, in any case, had corresponding grades of practice for the men of service at the lower levels. What follows in fact discusses various classes of people in turn, starting with the common man (due to space considerations, I will now present the translations below largely devoid of further commentary):

哀公曰：「善！何如則可謂庸人矣？」[165]

[162]The *zhangfu* was a kind of black, ceremonial cap, worn by scholars, that was said to originally date from the Shang dynasty.

[163]The clothing here describes the apparel of both rulers and upper nobility worn during the occasions of fasting, sacrifice, and solemn court occasions, while the term *lu* usually refers to the carriage of a ruler. *Hun* 葷 more literally refers to alliums, i.e., onions, garlic, scallions, etc.

[164]*Zhancui* 斬衰 refers to the most austere type of mourning garment, one worn, among other instances, during the three-year morning period for one's deceased parent. It is made of the coarsest hempen fabric and has unstitched edges.

[165]In XZ, Lord Ai's response here is broken up into two, with Kong Zi giving a summarizing prefatory comment to what follows in between, as follows: 哀公曰：「善！」孔子曰：「人有五儀：有庸人，有士，有君子，有賢人，有大聖。」哀公曰：「敢問何如斯可謂庸人矣？」(Lord Ai said: "Excellent!" Kong Zi said: "There are five standards of men: the common man, the man of service, the noble man, the worthy man, and the great sage." Lord Ai said: "Might I dare ask what kind of man may be called a 'common man?'"). Note that here again Lord Ai's question begins with 敢問. KZJY has an even more expanded text here: the initial question reads 公曰：「善哉！盡此而已乎？」(Lord [Ai] said: "Excellent! Is that all there is to it?"), after which Kong Zi's initial reply follows as per the XZ text (with 聖人 for 大聖), but with the additional concluding line of 審此五者，則治道畢矣 (If one examines these five [standards of men], the way of governance will be complete), after which Lord Ai gives his follow-up question (公曰：「敢問何如斯可謂之庸人」 [Lord (Ai) said: "Dare I ask what kind of man may be called a 'common man'?"]).

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

孔子對曰：「所謂庸人者，口不能道善言，而志不邑邑[166]；不能選賢人善士而託身焉，以為己憂。[167]動行不知所務，止立不知所定；[168]日選於物，不知所貴；從物而流，不知所歸；五鑿為政[169]，心從而壞。若此，則可謂庸人矣。」[170]

Lord Ai said: "Excellent! What kind of man may be called a 'common man'?"

Kong Zi replied: "A 'common man' refers to one whose mouth is unable to utter words of excellence and who has no reserve in his ambitions. He is unable to take the selection of worthies and men of excellence with whom to entrust himself as his source of personal concern.[171] He knows not what to prioritize in his movements and actions, nor where to settle when he comes to rest or take his stance. In his daily choice of things, he knows not what to value: he flows astray in his pursuit of things, not knowing to where he should return. He allows his five orifices [of perception] to govern him,[172] such that his mind is brought to ruin in their wake. Such a man may be called a 'common man.'"

哀公曰：「善！何如則可謂士矣？[173]」

[166]XZ has this phrase as 心不知色色 (*Xunzi jijie* writes 必 for 心, perhaps a typo). As Hao Yixing 郝懿行 (1757–1825) argues, 色 is most likely a graph error for 邑 (read 悒), as DDLJ has it.

[167]For 能, XZ has 知, which implies that this sentence should be understood in the sense of "He knows not to take the selection of worthies and men of excellence with whom to entrust himself as his source of personal concern."

[168]XZ has 勤 for 動, and 交 for 立; as both Hao Yixing and Wang Yinzhi 王引之 (1766–1834) contend, the XZ characters are again most likely both graphic errors. There is a closely similar description of the "common man" in the penultimate passage of *juan* 4 of the *Hanshi waizhuan*, where the text here accords with the DDLJ version.

[169]XZ writes 正 for 政. For 鑿, the *Hanshi waizhuan* passage has 藏, perhaps to be read as 臟, "internal organs"; this version also has 政 for the last character of the phrase.

[170]In KZJY, this entire response is somewhat different: 孔子曰：「所謂庸人者，心不存慎終之規，口不吐訓格之言；不擇賢以託其身，不力行以自定；見小闇大，而不知所務，從物如流，不知其所執；此則庸人也」(Kong Zi replied: "A 'common man' refers to one whose heart harbors no cautious design over how things might end, whose mouth utters no instructive words worthy of emulation, who selects no worthies with whom to entrust himself, who exerts no efforts to establish himself, who perceives the small but is ignorant of the great and knows not what to prioritize, and who flows astray in his pursuit of things and knows not to what he should adhere—such is the 'common man'.").

[171]As written, these lines could also be interpreted to mean: "His source of personal concern is his inability to choose worthies and men of excellence with whom to entrust himself." Given that "worthies and men of excellence" should in fact be positive models here, my reading here follows along the lines of the XZ wording of the text. A third way these lines have been interpreted is to take the 以為己憂 separately as "and this becomes a cause for his own concern."

[172]This follows Yang Liang's 楊倞 (fl. ca. 800 CE) interpretation of 五鑿 (though he also gives an alternate interpretation as the "five affections" 五情). Wang Pinzhen reads 五 as 忤, thus interpreting the phrase along the lines of "he governs in violation of the laws," and the subsequent phrase along the lines of "as a result of his [selfish] mind, [governance] is brought to ruin." Yang's reading is much more straightforward and natural.

[173]In XZ, this question is again preceded by 敢問. KZJY has simply 公曰：「何謂士人」, and its parallel questions below follow equivalent forms.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

孔子對曰：「所謂士者，[174]雖不能盡道術，必有所由焉[175]；雖不能盡善盡美，必有所處焉。[176]是故知不務多，而務審其所知；行不務多，而務審其所由；言不務多，而務審其所謂。[177]知既知之，行既由之，言既順之，[178]若夫[179]性命肌膚之不可易也。[180]富貴不足以益，貧賤不足以損。[181]若此，則可謂士矣。[182]」

Lord Ai said: "Excellent! What kind of man may be called a 'man of service'?"

Kong Zi replied: "A 'man of service' refers to one who, though he may be unable to exhaust the methods of the proper way, certainly abides by things therein; and who though he may be unable to exhaust both excellence and splendor, certainly dwells amidst such things. For this reason, his priorities lie not in knowing a great deal, but rather in examining thoroughly what he does know; they lie not in putting a great deal into practice, but rather in examining thoroughly that from which his practices derive; and they lie not in speaking a great deal, but rather in examining thoroughly that of which he speaks. Once he knows what he knows, follows what he puts into practice, and accords with what he speaks, then it becomes as if it were an unalterable part of his flesh-and-blood endowment: wealth and high status are insufficient to augment him, and poverty and low status are unable to diminish him. Such a man may be called a 'man of service.'"

哀公曰：「善！何如則可謂君子矣？[183]」

[174]In KZJY, the opening of Kong Zi's response here has a couple of additional phrases: 所謂士人者，心有所定，計有所守。雖 ... ... 」(A "man of service" is one whose mind has that upon which it is settled and whose plans have that to which they adhere. Although ...).

[175]For 所由焉, both XZ and KZJY have 率也; for 道術, KZJY has 道術之本.

[176]For 盡善盡美, XZ has 偏美善, and for 所處焉, it has simply 處也. KZJY has 備百善之美 for the former and parallels XZ for the latter. There is a closely similar, though relatively truncated, description of the "man of service" in *juan* 1 of the *Hanshi waizhuan*, prefaced by "a transmitted text states" (*zhuan yue* 傳曰); its text here reads 盡其美者, just one of several relatively inconsequential wording variations that I will not otherwise detail here. Note that this comes from an entirely different *juan* than that work's description of the "common man" mentioned above.

[177]In XZ, the order of the last of these three parallel statements (on 行 and 言) is the reverse of what we see here; it also lacks the coordinative 而 between each half of the three statements. The KZJY text here is the same as XZ, except that it substitutes 必 for 務 in the second half of each statement.

[178]Here again, the order of the last two phrases is the reverse in XZ; XZ also precedes these three with 故 and has a couple of additional particles in each phrase: "知既已知之矣," etc.; it also has 謂 for 順 in what here is the final phrase. The KZJY order of phrases parallels XZ, and for 順/謂 it has 道 (essentially a lexical variant of 謂).

[179]For 若夫, XZ and KZJY both have 則若. For 性命肌膚之不可易也, KZJY has 性命之於形骸不可易也 (Then it becomes as unalterable as the relationship of his endowment to his body).

[180]In XZ, the subsequent lines are preceded by 故, suggesting a full stop at this point.

[181]XZ has 卑賤 for 貧賤.

[182]KZJY has simply 此則士人也.

[183]XZ again precedes this phrase with 敢問.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

孔子對曰：「所謂君子者，躬行忠信，其心不買[184]；仁義在己，而不害不志[185]；聞志廣博，而色不伐[186]；思慮明達，而辭不爭。[187]君子[188]猶然如將可及也，而不可及也。[189]如此，可謂君子矣。」

Lord Ai said: "Excellent! What kind of man may be called a 'noble man'?"

Kong Zi replied: "A 'noble man' refers to one who personally practices loyalty and trust and whose heart cannot be bought; one in whom benevolence and righteousness reside and yet who is not hurt by [others'] failure to take note of this; one whose learning and recognition is vast and erudite and yet whose countenance makes no display of this; and one whose thoughts and deliberations are enlightened and perceptive and yet who is not contentious in his words. The noble man appears so at ease that it seems one might be able to measure up to him even [when] one cannot. Such a man may be called a 'noble man.'"

哀公曰：「善！敢問何如可謂賢人矣？[190]」

[184]Kong Guangsen's base edition has 置 for 買, in which case we could read either "and he does not set them aside" or perhaps "yet he has no inclination to display them." XZ writes these two phrases as 言忠信而心不德 ([whose] words are loyal and trustworthy and yet [whose] heart is not self-righteous), perhaps suggesting the latter of the aforementioned two interpretations for the alternate DDLJ text. KZJY writes 言必忠信而心不怨 ([whose] words are invariably loyal and trustworthy and yet [who] bears no resentment in his heart).

[185]For 不志, Kong Guangsen's base edition reads 不知; accordingly, I read 志 here along the lines of 識. I also suspect, however, that 不志 may be an error for 其志, thus perhaps yielding "and yet this does not harm (i.e., overinflate) his ambitions." XZ writes these two phrases as 仁義在身而色不伐 (in [whose] person benevolence and righteousness reside and yet [whose] countenance makes no display of this). Save for having 無 for 不, KZJY parallels XZ.

[186]XZ lacks the first phrase of this statement, whereas the second phrase appears as the second half of the previous statement (same for KZJY). It is possible the XZ text here accidentally collapsed these two statements together, thus eclipsing the nine graphs 而不害不志聞志廣博 (or their equivalent) altogether.

[187]KZJY has this last statement as 思慮通明而辭不專 ([whose] thoughts and deliberations are penetrating and enlightened and yet [who] is not monopolizing in his words), after which it adds two additional phrases: 篤行信道，自强不息 ([and who] earnestly practices the way of trust and unrelentingly strengthens himself).

[188]In place of this 君子, XZ has 故. KZJY lacks both and writes the subsequent 猶然 as 油然.

[189]XZ lacks this last phrase, and simply combines the previous one with the following conclusion as a single statement: 故猶然如將可及者，君子也. KZJY has 油然若將可越而終不可及者，君子也 (The 'noble man' is one who appears so at ease that it seems one might be able to surpass him even [when], in the end, one cannot even measure up).

[190]Somewhat anomalously, this is the first of only two times Lord Ai precedes his question with 敢問 in the DDLJ text, whereas this locution precedes every question in XZ. The XZ text here is the same save for having a 斯 before 可謂.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

孔子對曰：「所謂賢人者，好惡與民同情，取舍與民同統[191]；行中矩繩[192]而不傷於本，言足法於天下而不害[193]於其身[194]；躬為匹夫而〔不〕[195]願富，貴為諸侯而無財。[196]如此，則可謂賢人矣。[197]」

Lord Ai said: "Excellent! Might I dare ask what kind of man may be called a 'worthy man'?"

Kong Zi replied: "A 'worthy man' refers to one whose likes and dislikes find commonality with the affections of the people, and whose choices and rejections find commonality with the principles of the people; one whose actions measure up with the carpenter's square and plumb line without injuring his fundamental [nature], and whose words are worthy of emulation throughout the world without bringing any harm to himself; and one who though he may be poor[198] as a common man he does〔not〕desire wealth, and though he may have the nobility of a regional lord he yet [amasses] no material resources. Such a man may be called a 'worthy man.'"

哀公曰：「善！敢問何如可謂聖人矣？」[199]

孔子對曰：「所謂聖人者，知通乎大道，應變而不窮，能測[200]萬物之情性者也。大道者，所以變化而凝成萬物者也。[201]情性也者，所以理然不然取舍者也。故其事大，配乎天地，參乎日月，雜於雲蜺，總要萬物。[202]穆穆純純，其莫之能循；[203]若天之司，莫之能職，[204]百姓淡然不知其善。[205]若此，則可謂聖人矣。」

[191]These last two phrases (beginning with 好惡) do not appear in XZ. KZJY also lacks them but has an additional phrase in their place: 德不踰閑 ([is one whose] virtue does not transgress the proper boundaries).

[192]XZ and KZJY both have 規繩 (compass and plumb line) for 矩繩 (carpenter's square and plumb line).

[193]For 害, XZ repeats 傷 here.

[194]In KZJY, these two parallel statements are elaborated into a couple of not-so-parallel ones: 行中規繩、言足以法於天下而不傷於身，道足化於百姓而不傷於本 (his actions measure up to the compass and plumb line and his words are worthy of emulation throughout the world without bringing injury to his self, and his way is worthy of transforming the people of the hundred surnames without injuring his fundamental [nature]).

[195]Kong Guangsen notes that the "Song edition" of DDLJ lacks this 不, and he supplies it on the basis of a citation in an annotation to the *Wenxuan* 文選.

[196]In XZ, these two statements read somewhat differently, and in reverse order: 富有天下而無怨（苑）財，布施天下而不病貧 (with all the wealth in the world, he does not amass any material resources; bestowing [his resources] throughout the world, he is not troubled by poverty). Based on this parallel, I suspect that a 苑 or equivalent verb has dropped out of the DDLJ text here as well. In KZJY, the statements read: 富則天下無宛財，施則天下不病貧 (when he is wealthy, there are no amassed material resources in the world, and when he bestows, the world is not troubled by poverty).

[197]KZJY here again has shortened conclusion, simply: 此賢者也.

[198]With Kong Guangsen, I read 躬 here as 窮.

[199]XZ has 大聖 for 聖人, here and throughout this passage, and has a 斯 before 可謂.

[200]For 能測, XZ has 辨乎.

[201]XZ has 遂 for 凝.

[202]These few phrases appear much differently in XZ: 是故其事大辨乎天地，明察乎日月，總要萬物於風雨 (For this reason, his task involves the great discernment of Heaven and Earth, the clear examination of the sun and moon, and gathering together the essentials of the myriad things in [the manner of] the wind and rain); for alternate readings of these lines as quasi-conditional phrases, see the remarks of Wang Niansun 王念孫 (1744–1832) and Yu Yue in *Xunzi jijie*.

[203]XZ writes this as 繆繆肫肫，其事不可循.

[204]XZ writes this as 若天之嗣，其事不可識. Wang Niansun follows the DDLJ reading of 司 in the former phrase and the XZ reading of 識 in the latter. Kong Guangsen reads 若天之司 in the sense of "he follows along with Heaven's affairs" (reading 司 as 事).

[205]XZ writes this as 百姓淺然不識其鄰 (Shallowly, the people of a hundred surnames do not [even] recognize what lies adjacent [/his adjacency]). KZJY has the same last four characters as XZ, but otherwise writes this entire description much differently from both DDLJ and XZ, as follows: 所謂聖者，德合於天地，變通無方，窮萬事之終始，協庶品之自然，敷其大道而遂成情性，明並日月，化行若神，下

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lord Ai said: "Excellent! Might I dare ask what kind of man may be called a 'sage?'"

Kong Zi replied: "A 'sage' is one whose knowledge penetrates to the Great Way, who can respond to changes inexhaustibly, and who is able to fathom the dispositional natures of all the myriad things. The 'Great Way' is that by which change and transformation take place and congeal to form the myriad things, and the 'dispositional natures' are that by which affirmations and denials, choices and rejections are brought to order. Thus his tasks are great, forming a match for Heaven and Earth and a triad with the sun and the moon; they are interspersed with the clouds and rainbows, and gather together the essentials of the myriad things. Solemn and genuine, no one can follow him; like the overseeing of Heaven, no one can take charge of him.[206] Obliviously, the people of a hundred surnames are unaware of his excellence. Such a man may be called a 'sage.'"

哀公曰： 「善！」

孔子出， 哀公送之。[207]

Lord Ai said: "Excellent!"

Kong Zi then took his leave, Lord Ai escorting him out.

Xunzi "Lord Ai" 哀公 Part 2[208]

Dialogue D

魯哀公問舜冠於孔子[209]，孔子不對。三問，不對。[210]

民不知其德，覩者不識其鄰 (A "sage" is one whose virtue accords with Heaven and Earth, who penetrates through changes in no set manner, who exhausts the beginnings and ends of the myriad affairs, and who harmonizes with what is natural to the countless variety of things, promulgating the great Way and bringing completion to their dispositional natures, with a luminosity that combines with the sun and moon and a transformative influence that moves like the spirits. The people below are unaware of his virtue, and those who look upon him do not recognize his adjacency).

[206]Or, reading 職 as 識, "no one can recognize him."

[207]XZ lacks these last seven characters, possibly removing this coda intentionally in order to lead more naturally to the subsequent dialogue between the two figures with which it follows this passage. In KZJY, Lord Ai gives a much lengthier reply beginning with 善哉，非子之賢，則寡人不得聞此言也。雖然，... ... (Excellent! If it were not for your worthiness, I would not have been able to hear of such words. That being said . . .). This is then directly followed by the question which begins its version of the dialogue after the next one in XZ (i.e., beginning with 寡人生於深宮之中, and skipping altogether here the short dialogue on Shun's cap).

[208]The text as given here is cited from Wang Xianqian, *Xunzi jijie*, 542–47. This half of the *Xunzi* chapter is largely equivalent to the second half of the "Wuyi jie" chapter of the *Kongzi jiayu*, except that the first and third dialogues (Dialogues D and F) appear instead at separate points of the "Haosheng" 好生 chapter of that work (which takes its title from a key phrase of Dialogue D, which comes at its head); see the *Qinding Siku quanshu* edition, *juan* 1, 22b–24b, and *juan* 2, 14a–14b and 17a, respectively. In the textual footnotes below, the *Xunzi* and *Kongzi jiayu* versions of the text will again be referenced by XZ and KZJY.

[209]In KZJY, this line reads: 魯哀公問於孔子曰：「昔者舜冠何冠乎？」(Lord Ai of Lu asked Kong Zi: "In ancient times, what kind of cap did Shun don?").

[210]This sentence on the repeated asking does not appear in KZJY, which also omits the 哀 before 公 just below.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

哀公曰：　「寡人問舜冠於子，何以不言也？」[211]

孔子對曰：　「古之王者，有務而拘領者矣，其政好生而惡殺焉。是以鳳在列樹，麟在郊野，烏鵲之巢可附而窺也。君不此問而問舜冠，所以不對也。」[212]

Lord Ai of Lu asked Kong Zi about Shun's [style of] cap. Kong Zi did not respond. He asked several times, with still no response.

Lord Ai said: "I have asked you, sir, about Shun's cap—why do you not speak?"

Kong Zi replied: "The kings of old were ones who focused on their central tasks and held firm to the essentials,[213] and in their governance they delighted in life and detested killing. Thus phoenixes came to alight along the rows of trees, *qilin*-unicorns came to dwell in suburban fields, and the nests of crows and magpies could be approached and observed.[214] It is because my lord did not ask of this but rather of Shun's cap that I failed to respond."

The fact that this dialogue (and the subsequent ones) begins with "Lord Ai of Lu asked" rather than simply "Lord Ai asked" makes it clear that it was at least conceived as having occurred on a separate occasion, if not, perhaps, deriving from a separate source altogether.

[211]KZJY writes this question as simply 寡人有問於子而子無言，何也？(Why is it that you have nothing to say in response to my question?).

[212]In KZJY, Kong Zi's entire response here is preceded by a further short answer and question, and the subsequent response is itself greatly elaborated, as follows: 對曰「以君之問不先其大者，故方思所以為對。」公曰：「其大何乎？」孔子曰：「舜之為君也，其政好生而惡殺，其任授賢而替不肖。德若天地而靜虛，化若四時而變物。是以四海承風，暢於異類，鳳翔麟至，鳥獸馴德，無他也，好生故也。君舍此道而冠冕是問，是以緩對。」([Kong Zi] replied: "It is because my lord's question did not prioritize what is important that I was in the midst of considering how to respond." Lord Ai said: "What is it that is important?" Kong Zi said: "Shun was a ruler such that his governance delighted in life and detested killing, and in his appointments he invested the worthy and divested the unworthy. His virtue was as tranquil and capacious as Heaven and Earth, and his influence as transforming of creatures as the four seasons. Thus all within the four seas followed the sway of his influence, which penetrated even to other species: phoenixes soared, *qilin*-unicorns arrived, and all birds and beasts were tamed by his virtue. For this there was no other reason than that he delighted in life. My lord set aside this topic but rather asked about caps, and this is why I was slow to respond").

[213]Yang Liang and subsequent commentators would instead read this phrase as phonetically equivalent to 有冒而句領者矣, or "those who donned hats and curved collars," but this makes little sense in a context where Kong Zi feels no need to discuss clothing. While commentators see the line as parallel to the 古之人，衣上有冒而句領者, seen in the *Shangshu dazhuan* 尚書大傳, it nonetheless makes much better sense in the context here read as is.

[214]Similar imagery and wording can be found in the final paragraph of the "Liyun" chapter of the *Li ji*. The intent of the imagery here might be better gleaned from the more elaborate version of KZJY, cited two notes above.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Dialogue E

魯哀公問於孔子曰：[215] 「寡人生於深宮之中，長於婦人之手，寡人未嘗知哀也，未嘗知憂也，未嘗知勞也，未嘗知懼也，未嘗知危也。[216]」

孔子曰： 「君之所問，聖君之問也。丘，小人也，何足以知之？」[217]

曰： 「非吾子無所聞之也。」[218]

孔子曰： 「君[219]入廟門而右，登自胜階，仰視榱棟，俯見几筵，其器存，其人亡；[220]君以此思哀，則哀將焉而不至矣？[221]君昧爽而櫛冠，平明而聽朝，一物不應，亂之端也；[222]君以此思憂，則憂將焉而不至矣?君平明而聽朝，日昃而退，諸侯之子孫必有在君之末庭者；[223]君以思勞，則勞將焉而不至矣?[224]君出魯之四門，以望魯四郊，亡國之虛則必有數蓋焉；[225]君以此思懼，則懼將焉而不至矣？且丘聞之：[226]『君者，舟也；庶人者，水也。水則載舟，水則覆舟』[227]；君以此思危，則危將焉而不至矣?」[228]

---

[215]As detailed above, in KZJY this dialogue takes the form of a further follow-up question (preceded by 雖然, "Though this be the case") directly following the chapter-opening dialogue (Dialogue C), and thus lacks this opening line seen in XZ—where it appears after an intervening dialogue (Dialogue D) and takes the form of a new conversation. A version of this dialogue also appears in the "Zashi, disi" chapter of the *Xinxu*. See Liu Xiang, *Xinxu jiaoshi* 新序校釋, ed. Shi Guangying 石光瑛 and Chen Xin 陳新 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2001), 581–91. I will not attempt to include all the variations from that version in the present notes.

[216]In KZJY, Lord Ai's "question" here is suffixed with the phrase 恐不足以行五儀之教，若何 (I fear I am insufficient to implement the instruction of the five categories of etiquette—what can I do?).

[217]In KZJY, Kong Zi's initial response here reads somewhat differently: 孔子對曰：「如君之言，已知之矣，則丘亦無所聞焉」 (Kong Zi replied: "Judging by your words, [you] already know the answer—in which case I really have no knowledge [I can add] to it").

[218]The wording of Lord Ai's response here is also somewhat different in KZJY, though the gist is the same: 公曰：「非吾子，寡人無以啟其心。吾子言也」(Lord Ai said: "If not for you, sir, there would be no one who could open up my mind. Do speak, sir").

[219]KZJY has 君子 (noble man) for this first 君 (lord/ruler); its four succeeding parallel sentences lack an explicitly stated subject altogether.

[220]KZJY has 如 for 而, 阼 for 胜, 桷 for 棟, 察 for 見, adds 皆 after 器, and writes 而不覩其人 for 其人亡.

[221]KZJY writes this last phrase as simply a non-rhetorical 則哀可知矣 (then sorrow can be comprehended); the same variation applies to the four parallel phrases that conclude the remaining sentences.

[222]KZJY adds 夙興 after 昧爽, writes 正其衣冠 for 而櫛冠, has 平旦視朝 for 平明而聽朝, has 失理 for 不應, and writes 亂亡之端 for 亂之端也; preceding its 一物失理, it also has an additional phrase: 慮其危難 (Taking consideration of the perils and troubles).

[223]KZJY writes 日出聽政 for 平明而聽朝, has 至于中宴 for 日昃而退, and writes the last phrase here as 諸侯子孫往來為賓，行禮揖讓，慎其威儀 (the descendants of regional lords come and go as guests, paying ritual respects and obeisances, cautious over their demeanor).

[224]The KZJY version of this phrase has an additional 亦 (too), here, i.e., 則勞亦可知矣.

[225]KZJY begins this sentence with 緬然長思 (pondering with thoughts afar), writes 出於四門 for 出魯之四門, has 周章遠望 for 以望魯四郊, and adds 覩 before 亡國之虛 but omits both the 則 and 蓋 of the final phrase here.

[226]For 且丘聞之, KZJY has simply 夫.

[227]This same quotation is attributed to a "transmitted text" (傳) in the "Wangzhi" 王制 chapter of the *Xunzi*, there cited directly by the authorial voice of that chapter rather than Kong Zi. It is of course possible that Xun Zi could have had the "Ai gong" reference in mind as his source. KZJY writes the last two phrases here as 水所以載舟，亦所以覆舟.

[228]KZJY adds some concluding lines here: 君既明此五者，又少留意於五儀之事，則於政治何有失矣？ (Once my lord understands these five things, and further pays some attention to the matter of the five categories of etiquette, then how could you go wrong in governance?).

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lord Ai of Lu asked Kong Zi: "I was born within the inner recesses of the palace and grew up at the hands of waiting-women; I have never known sorrow, never known apprehension, never known toil, never known fear, and never known peril."[229]

Kong Zi replied: "What my lord asks is the question of a sage-ruler. I am but a small man—how could I understand such things?"

[Lord Ai] said: "If not from you, sir, there is no one else from whom I might hear of it."[230]

Kong Zi replied: "The lord keeps to the right as he enters the temple, ascends via the eastern staircase, looks upward to observe the ridgepole and rafters, and looks downward to see the tables and mats. The ancestors are gone, yet their vessels remain behind—if my lord reflects in this way upon his sorrows, how could sorrow fail to arrive? The lord combs his hair and dons his cap in the dim glow of the predawn hour, and attends to his court at the first clear light of day. Failure to respond [appropriately] to a single thing [could] be the start of disorder—if my lord reflects in this way upon his apprehensions, how could apprehension fail to arrive? The lord attends to his court at the first light of dawn and retires [only] as the sun sets on the horizon. Invariably, descendants of regional lords will be among those [serving] in the back recesses of the lord's court—if my lord reflects in this way upon his toils, how could [an understanding of] toil fail to arrive?[231] The lord exits from the four gates of Lu to gaze upon the suburban outskirts of the four directions. Invariably, he will come across the covered ruins of several fallen states there—if my lord reflects in this way upon his fears, how could fear fail to arrive? Moreover, I have heard it said that: 'The ruler is a boat, and the masses are the water. A water can support the boat, but it can also overturn it'—if my lord reflects in this way upon his perils, how could [a sense of] peril fail to arrive?"

Dialogue F

魯哀公問於孔子曰：[232] 「紳、委、章甫，有益於仁乎？」

[229]This is not really a question, as phrased, but apparently Kong Zi gets the point of inquiry suggested by Lord Ai's statement.

[230]This pairing of a demurral and, following it, an exhortation to continue, should by now be familiar; cf. the opening lines of Dialogue A above.

[231]According to Yang Liang, this refers to the descendants of lords of other states who have been forced to flee to Lu and serve humbly as ministers at Lu's court, with the implication that Lord Ai, himself a descendant of lords, could encounter similar circumstances and end up toiling abroad himself should he not take care to properly cultivate his virtue.

[232]KZJY ("Haosheng") begins this dialogue with simply 哀公問曰.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

孔子蹴然[233]曰：	「君號然也？[234]資衰苴杖者不聽樂，[235]非耳不能聞也，[236]服使然也。黼衣、黻裳者不茹葷，[237]非口不能味也，[238]服使然也。且丘聞之[239]，好肆不守折，長者不為市。竊其有益與其無益，君其知之矣。[240]」
Lord Ai of Lu asked Kong Zi:	"Do the wide belt-sash, the black-silk *wei* cap, and black-linen *zhangfu* cap enhance the virtue of humanity?"[241]
Kong Zi replied, apprehensively:	"Why does my lord [ask] in this manner? One who dons coarse hempen clothing and supports himself with bamboo cane [in mourning] does not listen to music; it is not that his ears cannot hear it, but rather the apparel that makes him so. One who wears the black-and-white embroidered upper garment and black-and-turquoise embroidered lower garment [in sacrifice] does not ingest pungent alliums; it is not that his mouth cannot taste them, but rather the clothing that makes him so. Moreover, I have heard it said that: 'One who is fond of the marketplace does not countenance any loss, [whereas] one of superior qualities does not engage in the market.' I would hazard to assume[242] that you, my lord, already know the answer to whether [the apparel] is beneficial or not."

Dialogue G

魯哀公問於孔子曰：[243]	「請問取人[244]。」

[233]For 蹴然, KZJY has 作色而對.

[234]KZJY writes this phrase as 君胡然焉.

[235]KZJY has 衰麻 for 資衰, and writes 志不存乎樂 (his intent does not lie in music) for 不聽樂.

[236]KZJY has simply 非耳弗聞 here.

[237]KZJY instead reads 黼紱衮冕者容不褻慢 (One clad in embroidered ceremonial dress and cap bears no disrespect in his countenance).

[238]KZJY here instead has 非性矜莊 (it is not that he is solemn by nature). It then adds a further parallel sentence: 介胄執戈者，無退懦之氣，非體純猛，服使然也 (One who dons armor and helmet and holds a halberd has no airs of weakness or backing down; it is not that he is utterly fierce in embodiment, but rather the clothing that makes him so).

[239]Note the repetition of this phrase from the previous dialogue. KZJY substitutes 臣 for 丘.

[240]KZJY writes this last phrase as 君子所以知 (it is this by which the noble man knows it).

[241]These three were all accoutrements of the scholar-gentleman; the *wei* and *zhangfu* caps were said to have been caps of the Zhou and Shang, respectively.

[242]I take 竊 here in the sense of 竊謂. Wang Su, commenting on KZJY, instead reads 竊 as 察 ([If you] examine . . .).

[243]In KZJY, where this dialogue directly follows Dialogue E, the 魯 is again omitted before 哀公. Versions of the dialogue—excluding the seemingly extraneous tag beginning with "a saying has it" 語曰 below—also appear in the *Hanshi waizhuan*, *juan* 4, where it is followed by quotations from a "Zhou document" 周書 and the ode "Qiaoyan" 巧言; and the "Zunxian" 尊賢 chapter of the *Shuoyuan*, where it is followed by further elaborative comments by Kong Zi and a one-word reply of "Excellent!" from Lord Ai. Only certain variants from these two versions will be noted below. For the full text of each, see Liu Xiang, *Shuoyuan jiaozheng*, 186–87; and Han Ying 韓嬰 (fl. late second century BCE), *Hanshi waizhuan jishi* 韓詩外傳集釋, ed. and annot. Xu Weiyu 許維遹 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980), 131–33.

[244]KZJY adds 之法 here.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

孔子對曰：

「無取健，無取詘，無取口哼。[245]健，貪也；詘，亂也；口哼，誕也。[246]故弓調而後求勁焉，馬服而後求良焉，士信慤而後求知能焉。[247]士不信慤而有多知能，[248]譬之其豺狼也，不可以身尒也。[249]

Lord Ai of Lu asked Kong Zi:

"May I inquire about selecting men [for service]?"

Kong Zi replied:

"Do not select the vigorously ambitious, do not select the disputatious, and do not select the verbose.[250] The vigorously ambitious are greedy, the disputatious are chaotic, and the verbose are preposterous. Thus the bows must be well adjusted before one seeks a strong one among them; the horses must be tamed before one seeks a fine steed among them, and men of service must be trustworthy and honest before one seeks the knowledgeable and capable among them. A man of service who is not trustworthy and honest and yet excels in knowledge and capability may be compared to a jackal or wolf—one cannot but keep a distance from him.

語曰：『桓公用其賊，文公用其盜。』故明主任計不信怒，闇主信怒不任計。計勝怒則彊，怒勝計則亡。」[251]

"A saying has it that 'Lord Huan employed his assailant, and Lord Wen employed his thief.' Thus the enlightened sovereign entrusts [his selections] to [sober] calculation rather than to [blind] anger, whereas the befuddled sovereign entrusts them to anger rather than calculation. When calculation overcomes anger, one is strong; when anger overcomes calculation, one perishes."[252]

[245]KZJY writes 健 as 捷捷, 詘 as 鉗鉗, and 口哼 as 哼哼, here and below. The *Hanshi waizhuan* equivalents are 健, 佞, and 口讒, whereas the *Shuoyuan* equivalents are 健, 拑, and 口銳.

[246]The *Hanshi waizhuan* equivalents for 貪, 亂, and 誕 are 驕, 諂, and 誕, whereas their *Shuoyuan* equivalents are, more elaborately, 必欲兼人，不可以為法 (invariably desire to excel over others and may not serve as a model), 大給利不可盡用 (are greatly clever [but] cannot be exhaustively employed), and 多誕而寡信，後恐不驗 (are often preposterous and seldom credible, [such that] their words are likely to turn out false), respectively.

[247]KZJY has 必慤 for 信慤. The *Hanshi waizhuan* version has simply 知 for 知能; the phrases of the *Shuoyuan* version are more elaborate altogether, and for 勁, 良, and 知能 have 中, 良材, and 知能, respectively.

[248]KZJY writes this phrase as simply 不慤而多能.

[249]KZJY writes the final phrase as simply 不可邇 and concludes the dialogue at this point (after which it contains further dialogues not found in the XZ).

[250]The exact sense of these terms is somewhat in dispute; 詘, here rendered "disputatious," may be cognate with 拑 (as the *Shuoyuan* version has it), which carries the sense of "threatening," or "clamping down."

[251]As with the *Shuoyuan* and *Hanshi waizhuan* versions, KZJY also lacks these final lines altogether.

[252]This final short paragraph takes the philosophy of selecting ministers in an entirely new direction, and has the makings of having been simply tacked onto the end of a preexisting dialogue. The lines appear in an entirely different context in the "Zashi, diwu" chapter of the *Xinxu*, where they instead follow a pair of stories that make clear the "saying" here refers to Lord Huan of Qi's employment of Guan Zhong 管仲 (d. 645 BCE)—who had once shot an arrow at him and struck him in the belt buckle when in the service of the future Lord Huan's then-rival to the throne; and Lord Wen of Jin's employment of Li Fuxu 里鳧須 (seventh century BCE), who had once pilfered the future Lord Wen's treasury back when the latter had been forced to flee the state. As noted above, the lines are also absent from not only KZJY, but both the *Shuoyuan* and *Hanshi waizhuan* versions of the dialogue as well.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press

As detailed in the footnotes, this short final paragraph is found only in the *Xunzi* "Ai Gong" version of the dialogue. Following it, the chapter then concludes with a dialogue between Lord Ding 定公 and the disciple Yan Yuan 顏淵 that employs the example of horse-driving to drive home the point that an enlightened ruler will not overwork his people—a dialogue that naturally also seems somewhat out of place in the chapter.[253]

[253]Versions of that dialogue also appear at the head of the "Yan Yuan" chapter of the *Kongzi jiayu*, as well as in *juan* 2 of the *Hanshi waizhuan*, and in the "Zashi, diwu" chapter of the *Xinxu*. A version also appears in the "Shiwei" 適威 chapter of the *Lüshi chunqiu* 呂氏春秋, but there it is instead set as a dialogue between Lord Zhuang 莊公 (r. 693–662 BCE) and the figure of Yan He 顏闔.

Cite this article: Scott Cook, "Consulting the Elder: Intertextuality in the "Lord Ai Asked" Confucian Dialogues," *Early China* (2024), 3–52. doi:10.1017/eac.2024.5

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.5 Published online by Cambridge University Press