

To emend or not to emend? : on determining the integrity of some ancient Chinese texts

Autor(en): **Gassmann, Robert H.**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen
Asiengesellschaft = Études asiatiques : revue de la Société
Suisse-Asie**

Band (Jahr): **56 (2002)**

Heft 3: **Textual scholarship in Chinese studies : papers from the Munich
conference 2000**

PDF erstellt am: **04.07.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-147577>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern. Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

TO EMEND OR NOT TO EMEND? ON DETERMINING THE INTEGRITY OF SOME ANCIENT CHINESE TEXTS.

Robert H. Gassmann, University of Zurich

1. Introductory Remarks

Recent discoveries of texts belonging to the Lao-Zi-tradition have been forcing scholars to reassess some of the basic notions in textual scholarship.¹ What did 'authorship' mean, when can we speak of an 'original text,' when does material from one text change into material of a different text, when can we reasonably speak of a 'tradition,' when of a line of development from earlier to later versions of one and the same text? What do we mean when we state that a text is a 'compilation' of old material? Is editorship simply compilatory or does it also bear on questions of content or originality? Intimately related to most of these questions is one of the main occupations of textual scholarship: determining the *integrity* of a text, i.e. determining when a text should be emended, and for which reasons. I therefore propose to present in my paper two exemplary texts that can serve to bring some of the questions raised above into focus.

2. Counting clans and tribes: *Guo Yu* 10.9

The following account of the posterity of the Yellow Emperor (*huang Di*) can be found in the *Guo Yu* 國語:

1 黃帝之子二十五人。其同姓者二人而已。唯青陽與夷鼓皆爲己姓。青陽方雷氏之甥也。夷鼓，彤魚氏之甥也。其同生而異姓者，四母之子別爲十二姓。凡黃帝之子二十五宗。其得姓者十四人爲十二姓。姬、酉、祁、己、滕、箴、任、荀、僖、姁、僂、依是也。唯青陽與蒼林氏同于黃帝，故皆爲姬姓。

1 Cf. *Guodian Chu mu zhujian* 郭店楚墓竹簡 [=Bamboo strips from the Chu-grave of Guodian]. Ed. Museum of the City of Jingmen 荆門市博物館. Beijing: Wenwu Publishers, 1998.

The sons of huang Di amounted to twenty-five ren². Of these twenty-five there were only two ren who had the same clan name. They were Qing Yang and Yi Gu, and together they formed the Qi-clan. Qing Yang was the son-in-law of the Lord of Fanglei; Yi Gu was the son-in-law of the Lord of Tongyu. Those of the twenty-five who were of the same father but differed as to their clan names, these sons of four mothers separated and formed twelve clans. All in all the sons of huang Di formed twenty-five tribes. Of these, fourteen ren received clan names, forming twelve clans. The names were Ji, You, Qi, Qi, Teng, Zhen, Ren, Xun, Xi, Ji, Xuan, and Yi. Only Qing Yang and the Lord of Cang Lin were equal to huang Di; they therefore were both members of the Ji-clan.³

This passage from the *Guo Yu* poses grammatical questions and a number of arithmetical riddles.⁴ The grammatical question concentrates on the interpretation of *ji* 己 in *wei Qing Yang yu Yi Gu jie wei ji xing* 唯青陽與夷鼓皆爲己姓, and on the expression *tong yu huang Di* 同于黃帝; as for the arithmetical riddles, the quantity of sons termed as *tong xing zhe* 同姓者 strikes one at first sight as rather strange. It seems that the decoding of the entire passage calls for a few rounds of arithmetics.

- 2 The terms *ren* and *min* in the translations are simply transcribed. The reasons for not rendering them in the traditional way, and a new interpretation of the structure of ancient Chinese society, are offered in Robert H. Gassmann, "Understanding Ancient Chinese Society: Approaches to *Ren* and *Min*." In: *JAOS* 120.3 (2000), 348–59. With some titles, e.g. daifu, I deal in a similar way.
- 3 *Guo Yu* 10.9. The references follow the text of the ICS Concordance Series (Chinese University of Hong Kong), *A Concordance to the Guoyu* (1999). Cf. Imber, Alan, *Kuo Yü: An Early Chinese Text and its Relationship with the Tso Chuan* (Dissertation, Stockholm University, 1975), I, 85, translates the passage as follows: "In the case of the twenty-five sons of the Yellow Emperor there were only two who were of the same clan name: these two were Ch'ing Yang and I Ku, and were called I. Ch'ing Yang was a son-in-law of the Fang Lei family while I Ku was a son-in-law of a family of T'ung Yü. Of the rest of them, those who were born of the same father but yet had different clan names, they were the children of four different mothers and they split up to take twelve different names. All in all the sons of the Yellow Emperor started twenty-five family branches, but only fourteen took clan names, and these names were twelve; they were Chi, Yu, Ch'i, I, T'eng, Chen, Jen, Hsün, Hsi, Chi, Hsüan, and I. It was only the Ch'ing Yang and Ts'ang Lin families who could equal the Yellow Emperor in virtue, and consequently they alone took his family name Chi." (Notes on various names in Imber II, 215.)
- 4 Yang Ximei 楊希牧 has dealt with this passage in two articles, mainly under the anthropological perspective of marriage patterns; in the first article he offers a different, in my opinion unconvincing, solution to some of the riddles. Cf. 國語黃帝二十五子得姓傳說的分析上篇 (A study of the legend of Huang-di's descendants in the *Guo Yu*). *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology* (Academia Sinica) 34.2 (1963), 627–48; and 論晉語黃帝傳說與秦晉聯姻的故事 (On the legend of Huang-di in the 'Jin yu' and stories of marriages of alliance between Qin and Jin). *Dalu Zazhi* 26.6 (1963), 1–6.

Let us begin with assuming that the total of sons is correct, i.e. huang Di really had twenty-five sons. These twenty-five sons formed twenty-five tribes *er shi wu zong* 二十五宗.

- 1a 黃帝之子二十五人。〔...〕凡黃帝之子二十五宗。
The sons of huang Di amounted to twenty-five ren. [...] All in all the sons of huang Di formed twenty-five tribes.

Let us further assume that the text is correct in informing us of the total number of clans, i.e. twelve. These twelve are explicitly listed, but only eleven of them are in fact *new*. The clan named 姬 Ji, i.e. huang Di's clan, is the parent clan of the other eleven and should therefore not figure in the list.

- 1b 〔/〕、酉、祁、己、滕、箴、任、荀、僖、姁、依是也。
The names were Ø You, Qi, Qi, Teng, Zhen, Ren, Xun, Xi, Ji, Xuan, and Yi.

This clearly leads to the following emendation:

- 1c 其同生而異姓者，四母之子別爲十〔一〕姓。
Those of the twenty-five who were of the same father but differed as to their clan names, these sons of four mothers separated and formed *eleven* clans.

Let us finally assume that the text is correct in informing us of the formation of *one* new clan with *two* new tribes having related geminal ancestors. Dividing up the fourteen ren mentioned in the text into twelve clans, we have either the option of forming one clan with three new tribes having related ancestors and eleven with one ancestor each heading a new tribe, or of forming two clans with two new tribes each having related ancestors and ten clans with one ancestor each heading a new tribe. Either calculation is not supported by the text, which only mentions one single clan with two ancestors. As there are only *eleven* new clans, the problems are multiplied: ten clans with one head and one with four; nine clans with one head, one with two heads, and one with three; etc. All these combinations are of course even less probable. This leads to the following emendation with the only reasonable combination, namely ten clans with one head and one clan with two heads, i.e. a total of eleven clans and twelve heads:

- 1d 凡黃帝之子二十五宗。其得姓者十〔二〕人爲十〔一〕姓。
All in all the sons of huang Di formed twenty-five tribes. Of these, *twelve* ren received clan names, forming *eleven* clans.

The new clans thus account for *twelve sons*, ten as solitary heads, two as geminal heads. Subtracting twelve from the total number of twenty-five leaves us with thirteen sons remaining in the Ji-clan. This slight majority in favour of the Ji-clan stresses the importance of this clan and shows that the clan was not reduced to a size of little consequence. It also accounts for the fact that Huang Di had *twenty-five* sons (some as important as Hou Ji or Xuan Xiao not being mentioned here), and that the text informs us prominently and in *two places* of this number. I therefore suggest the following emendation:

- 1e 黃帝之子二十五人。其同姓者〔十三〕人而已。
The sons of Huang Di amounted to twenty-five ren. Of these there were only *thirteen* ren who had the same clan name as he.

Who were the geminal heads of one of the new tribes? The only sons singled out are Qing Yang and Yi Gu. This suggests that we understand the next statement as follows:

- 1f 唯青陽與夷鼓皆爲己姓。
And it was Qing Yang and Yi Gu, who together formed *their own* clan.

Which clan did they form? Obviously the 己 Qi-clan, which necessitates a change in the final sentence: *ji* 姬 ‘Ji-clan’ (EMC reading: ki) must be changed to *qi* 己 ‘Qi-clan’ (EMC reading: k^{hi}). But is this not excluded by the preceding sentence, which is explicitly marked as a reason by the following *gu* 故? If we retain the traditional active interpretation, yes, but not if we take it as a passive construction (mark the *yu* 于):

- 1g 唯青陽與蒼林氏同于黃帝，故皆爲〔己〕姓。
Only Qing Yang and the Lord of Cang Lin *were regarded as equal* by Huang Di; they therefore were both members of the *Qi-clan*.

I therefore finally suggest the following reading of the emended passage (emendations in the Chinese text in brackets, changes in the translation in italics):

- 1h 黃帝之子二十五人。其同姓者〔十三〕人而已。唯青陽與夷鼓皆爲己姓。青陽方雷氏之甥也。夷鼓，彤魚氏之甥也。其同生而異姓者，四母之子別爲十〔一〕姓。凡黃帝之子二十五宗。其得姓者十〔二〕人爲十〔一〕姓。〔/〕、酉、祁、己、滕、箴、任、荀、僖、姁、僂、依是也。唯青陽與蒼林氏同于黃帝，故皆爲〔己〕姓。
The sons of Huang Di amounted to twenty-five ren. Of these there were only *thirteen* ren who had the same clan name as he. And it was Qing Yang and Yi Gu, who together formed *their own* clan. Qing Yang was the son-in-law of the Lord of Fanglei; Yi Gu was the son-in-

law of the Lord of Tongyu. Those of the twenty-five who were of the same father but differed as to their clan names, these sons of four mothers separated and formed *eleven* clans. All in all the sons of huang Di formed twenty-five tribes. Of these, *twelve* ren received clan names, forming *eleven* clans, namely Ø, You, Qi, Qi, Teng, Zhen, Ren, Xun, Xi, Ji, Xuan, and Yi. Only Qing Yang and the Lord of Cang Lin were regarded as equal by huang Di; they therefore were both members of the *Qi-clan*.

Despite the extensive emendations, I should like to stress the *authenticity* of the text and the passage discussed. The fact that the emendations result in satisfactory and verifiable calculations can be taken as a fairly safe sign for this. But the kind of emendations also makes it equally clear that the received text is an edited, a *mis-edited* version of the reconstructed *original*, i.e. the *textus receptus* cannot be said to be the original text. During editing it lost its original integrity and coherence, and, in my opinion, the main reason for this was that the editor (presumably a Han-dynasty scholar) had misinterpreted the central terms *xing* 姓 ‘clan’ and *zong* 宗 ‘tribe.’ These terms denote basic social entities which radically changed between pre-Han and Han-times (*xing* changes from ‘clan’ to ‘surname,’ *zong* denotes the extended family as defined by ritual mourning regulations). These statements concerning authorship and editorship, and a definition of the terms ‘authentic’ and ‘original’ shall be taken up again after the discussion of the next text.

3. Counting temples and ancestors: *Li Ji* 24.5

It is a well-known fact that ancient Chinese society is structured along kinship lines. A very prominent aspect of the kinship structure is ancestor worship, as illustrated by the following passage from the *Zuo Zhuan*:

- 2 凡諸侯之喪〔...〕同姓〔臨〕於宗廟，同宗於祖廟〔...〕。是故魯爲諸姬臨於周廟，爲邢、凡、蔣、茅、胙、祭臨於周公之廟。

On occasion of the decease of any prince, [...] if he was of the same clan, the wailing took place in the shrine of the (senior) tribal ancestor; if he was from the same tribe, in the shrine of the (junior tribal) ancestor [...]. Thus the princes of Lu wailed for all [princes] of the Ji-clan in the shrine of the Zhou, but for [the princes of] Xing, Fan, Jiang, Mao, Zuo und Zhai in the shrine of the Duke of Zhou, [these being from the same tribe].⁵

- 5 *Zuo Zhuan*, Xiang 12.4. Cf. James Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, vol. 5, *The Ch'un Ts'ew with the Tso Chuen*, Hong Kong, ²1960, 455: “On occasion of the decease of any prince, [...] [i]f he were of the same surname, the wailing took place in the ancestral (*i.e.*, the Chow) temple; if he were descended from the same individual who bore that surname, in

If we look for basic information about the various shrines, we must generally refer to parts of the Book of Rites, the *Li Ji* 禮記. The following passage is a primary source for the number of shrines and for their supposed arrangement:


- 3 天子七廟。三昭，三穆。與大祖之廟而七。諸侯五廟。二昭，二穆。與大祖之廟而五。大夫三廟。一昭，一穆。與大祖之廟而三。士一廟。庶人祭于寢。
The son of Heaven had seven ancestral shrines. He had three *zhao*-shrines (on the left) and three *mu*-shrines (on the right). Adding the three *zhao*-shrines and the three *mu*-shrines to the shrine of the grand-ancestor, there were seven. A prince had five ancestral shrines. He had two *zhao*-shrines and two *mu*-shrines. Adding the two *zhao*-shrines and the two *mu*-shrines to the shrine of the grand-ancestor, there were five. A daifu had three ancestral shrines. He had one *zhao*-shrine and one *mu*-shrine. Adding the *zhao*-shrine and the *mu*-shrine to the shrine of the grand-ancestor, there were three. A shi had one ancestral shrine. The shu-ren presented their offerings in the sleeping apartment.⁶

For reasons I will not enter into here, this passage clearly refers to temples of the type *zu miao* ‘temple of the (junior tribal) ancestor’, i.e. it served the purposes of the members of the same tribe (*zong*). Such temple facilities comprised a number of shrines, according to the social rank of the tribe. Based on this passage it is generally assumed that the three major tribal structures conformed to the following arrangements:⁷

the temple of that [common] ancestor [...]. Thus the princes of Loo mourned for the Kes generally in the Chow temple; but for the lords of Hing, Fan, Tsëang, Maou, Tsoo, and Chae, in the temple of the duke of Chow.”

- 6 *Li Ji* 5.30. The references follow the text of the ICS Concordance Series (Chinese University of Hong Kong), *A Concordance to the Li Ji* (1992). Cf. James Legge, *Li Chi, Book of Rites*, New York, 1967², I, 223: “(The ancestral temple of) the son of Heaven embraced seven fanes (or smaller temples); three on the left and three on the right, and that of his great ancestor (fronting the south):—in all, seven. (The temple of) the prince of a state embraced five such fanes: [*delete*: those of, R.H.G.] two on the left, and two on the right, and that of his great ancestor:—in all, five. Great officers had three fanes:—one on the left, one on the right, and that of his great ancestor:—in all, three. Other officers had (only) one. The common people presented their offerings in their (principal) apartment.” The total number of shrines is also mentioned in *Li Ji* 10.9.
- 7 The so-called *zhao-mu*-system has been dealt with by some well-known scholars. A fair impression of some of the problems surrounding this system can be derived from an article by Marcel Granet, “Catégories matrimoniales et relations de proximité dans la Chine ancienne” (*Annales Sociologiques*, Série B, Sociologie Religieuse, Paris, 1939) and from the criticism voiced by Francis Lang-Kwang Hsu (*T'ien Hsia Monthly*, Vol. XI, No.3 [1940–41], 242–269, and No. 4 [1941], 353–362).

The arrangement of shrines in the temple grounds of the various zong-tribes



According to example 2, the only shrine that was always dedicated to the same ancestor was that of the *tai zu* 大祖 ‘grand-ancestor.’ It was situated in the north, facing south. To its left, in the east, were the ancestors of the *zhao*-order 昭 (‘the bright ones’), to its right, in the west, were the ancestors of the *mu*-order 穆 (‘the splendid ones’). How were the shrines in these two rows assigned? Here we normally consult the following passage from the *Li Ji*:

- 4 王立七廟，一壇一墀。曰考廟，曰王考廟，曰皇考廟，曰顯考廟，曰祖考廟；皆月祭之。遠廟爲祧，有二祧，享嘗乃止。去祧爲壇，去壇爲墀。壇墀，有禱焉祭之；無禱，乃止。去墀曰鬼。

The king established seven shrines, a *tan*-shrine and a *shan*-shrine.⁸ The (first five) shrines were called: shrine of the completed, of the grand-completed, of the great-grand-completed, of the great-great-grand-completed, and of the great-great-great-grand-completed. To all of these a monthly sacrifice was offered. The remote shrine was a shrine for the *tiao*-ancestor. There were two shrines for *tiao*-ancestors. To this ancestor the king offered the autumn-

- 8 James Legge, *Li Chi*, II, 204 translates as follows: “Thus the king made for himself seven ancestral temples, with a raised altar and the surrounding areas for each.” I do not agree. The equivalents ‘altar’ and ‘area’ might be convincing in other contexts, but here the verb *li* 立 ‘establish’ dominates the objects 七廟 ‘seven shrines’, 一壇 ‘one *tan*-shrine’ and 一墀 ‘one *shan*-shrine.’ As a consequence it is most likely that the latter expressions also refer to architectural structures. As becomes clear in the following context, the expressions *tan* 壇 and *shan* 墀 are not names of buildings but of categories of ancestors (similar to the expression 鬼 ‘*gui*-ancestor’ at the end of the passage, which is clearly a categorial name). The expressions 壇 and 墀 are presumably truncated forms of *tan miao* 壇廟 und *shan miao* 墀廟.

sacrifice, other sacrifices were discontinued. An ancestor who left the shrine of the *tiao*-ancestor became a *tan*-ancestor, one who left the shrine of the *tan*-ancestor became a *shan*-ancestor. As for the *tan*- and the *shan*-ancestors, if there were prayers to them, then sacrifices were offered. If prayers had been stopped, the sacrifices were discontinued. An ancestor who left the shrine of the *shan*-ancestor became a *gui*-ancestor-ghost.⁹

In this context I do not wish to enter into the many questions probably raised by my translation. I shall directly continue with the passage about the shrines on the level of the princes:

- 5 諸侯立五廟，一壇一墀。曰考廟，曰王考廟，曰皇考廟，皆月祭之；顯考廟，祖考廟，享嘗乃止。去祖爲壇，去壇爲墀。壇墀，有禱焉祭之，無禱，乃止。去墀爲鬼。

A prince established five shrines, a *tan*-shrine and a *shan*-shrine. The (first three) shrines were called: shrine of the completed, of the grand-completed, and of the great-grand-completed. To all of these a monthly sacrifice was offered. As for the great-great-grand-completed and the great-great-great-grand-completed, to these the prince offered the autumn-sacrifice, other sacrifices were discontinued. An ancestor who left the shrine of the great-great-great-grand-completed became a *tan*-ancestor, one who left the shrine of the *tan*-ancestor became a *shan*-ancestor. As for the *tan*- and the *shan*-ancestors, if there were prayers to them, then sacrifices were offered. If prayers had been stopped, the sacrifices were discontinued. An ancestor who left the shrine of the *shan*-ancestor became a *gui*-ancestor-ghost.¹⁰

- 9 *Li Ji* 24.5. James Legge, *Li Chi*, II, 204–5: “Thus the king made for himself seven ancestral temples, with a raised altar and the surrounding area for each. The temples were—his father’s; his grandfather’s; his great-grandfather’s; his great-great-grandfather’s; and the temple of his (high) ancestor. At all of these a sacrifice was offered every month. The temples of the more remote ancestors formed the receptacles for the tablets as they were displaced; they were two, and at these only the seasonal sacrifices were offered. For the removed tablet of one more remote, an altar was raised and its corresponding area; and on occasions of prayer at this altar and area, a sacrifice was offered, but if there was no prayer, there was no sacrifice. In the case of one still more remote, (there was no sacrifice); — he was left in his ghostly state.”
- 10 *Li Ji* 24.5. James Legge, *Li Chi*, II, 205: “A feudal prince made for himself five ancestral temples, with an altar and a cleared area about it for each. The temples were—his father’s; his grandfather’s; and his great-grandfather’s; in all of which a sacrifice was offered every month. In the temples of the great-great-grandfather, and that of the (high) ancestor only, the seasonal sacrifices were offered. For one beyond the high ancestor a special altar was raised, and for one still more remote, an area was prepared. If there were prayer at these, a sacrifice was offered; but if there was no prayer, there was no sacrifice. In the case of one still more remote, (there was no service);—he was left in his ghostly state.”

If we arrange the passages dealing with the royal and princely tribes side by side, various problems arising from a critical comparison immediately become apparent. And these problems go well beyond the level of simple words, as was the case with the passage from the *Guo Yu*. We are now definitely touching upon questions of the *integrity* of the text at a deeper and more decisive structural level.

Example 4

- 1 王立七廟，一壇一墀
- 2 曰考廟
- 3 曰王考廟
- 4 曰皇考廟
- 5 曰顯考廟
- 6 曰祖考廟
- 7 皆月祭之
- 8 遠廟爲祧，有二祧
- 9
- 10 享嘗乃止
- 11 去祧爲壇
- 12 去壇爲墀
- 13 壇墀，有禱焉祭之；無禱，乃止。去墀曰鬼。

Example 5

- 1 諸侯立五廟，一壇一墀
- 2 曰考廟
- 3 曰王考廟
- 4 曰皇考廟
- 5
- 6
- 7 皆月祭之
- 8
- 9 顯考廟，祖考廟
- 10 享嘗乃止
- 11 去祖爲壇
- 12 去壇爲墀
- 13 壇墀，有禱焉祭之，無禱，乃止。去墀爲鬼。

Following the structure of the passage in example 4 and the information gathered from example 3, we can state that the two temple grounds differ in one main quantitative respect: the royal tribe has seven shrines, the princely tribe has five. In each, one shrine is occupied by the grand-ancestor, i.e. respectively six and four shrines are arranged in the two rows of the *zhao-mu*-system. In the royal tribe five shrines are occupied by ancestors who receive monthly offerings; the last shrine is occupied by the *tiao*-ancestor, who receives a seasonal offering. In a princely tribe, the number of shrines occupied by ancestors who receive monthly offerings is reduced to three. The difference between five and three reflects the overall difference between seven and five. So far, the structural analogy between the two tribal levels is proportionally retained. The lines 1 to 7 conform to our expectations.

With lines 8 and 9 we run into our first difficulties. Line 8 (example 4) states that 'the remote shrine was a shrine for the *tiao*-ancestor. There were two shrines for *tiao*-ancestors.' In example 5 the word *tiao* has completely dis-

appeared; instead, the two supernumerary ancestors put in an unexpected appearance. Taking a closer look at example 4, the concept of *tiao*-ancestors seems to need clarification. According to example 3, one shrine was exclusively for the use of the *tai zu* 大祖 ‘grand-ancestor’ of the tribe. This shrine was never vacated. In example 4, we are therefore left with only one shrine for a *tiao*-ancestor. Why should the text then mention two shrines for the *tiao*-ancestor?

The answer requires knowledge of the working of the *zhao-mu*-system: deceased kings (princes, daifus) were alternatively allotted to either the *zhao*-row or the *mu*-row. If the ruling king was next-in-line, for example, for the *zhao*-row (because his predecessor had entered the *mu*-row), the topmost *zhao*-shrine became the *tiao*-shrine. The remote ancestor in this shrine would be removed on the occasion of his death (just as the remote ancestor in the topmost shrine in the *mu*-row had been removed on the occasion of his predecessor’s death). In other words: the *tiao*-shrine alternated between the two rows. Functionally speaking, there were two *tiao*-shrines (one in each row), but they never were active at the same time.

If this constellation is proportionally adapted to the shrine arrangement in a princely tribe, then the fourth shrine would be a *tiao*-shrine, alternating between the two rows. Now, the editor/author of these lines seems to have taken the statement ‘there were two shrines for *tiao*-ancestors’ not in a *functional* but in a very *literal* sense, i.e. as two physical shrines. As two shrines are necessary to house the supernumerary ancestors, the two *tiao*-shrines come in very handy. But this simple solution immediately leads to another problem: which shrine is left for the grand-ancestor? If all five shrines are occupied with the five ancestors mentioned in the lines 2 to 4 and 9, then the remotest one is either identical with the grand-ancestor, or that shrine must have been occupied by two ancestors, one permanent, the other transitory, or else the grand ancestor has completely disappeared.

This last possibility seems to be borne out by the received text. Line 11 reveals this: in example 4 we read that ‘an ancestor who left the shrine of the *tiao*-ancestor became a *tan*-ancestor,’ in example 5 this changes to ‘when an ancestor left the shrine of a great-great-great-grand-completed, he became a *tan*-ancestor.’ The *tiao*-ancestors have disappeared, and the grand-ancestor has also bowed out—the *zu* 祖 in the utterance from example 5 must be taken as the reduced form of *zu kao* 祖考, and not of *tai zu* 大祖, because the latter is according to example 3 a *permanent* occupant of the topmost shrine (but the

coincidence of *zu* 祖 seems telling). And, finally, we have evidence that the princes did in fact have *tiao*-ancestors.¹¹

The final part of the two passages under comparison, the lines 12 and 13, is identical. This leads us to suggest the following emendation of example 5, i.e. replacement of line 9 by line 8 from example 4 and replacement of *zu* 祖 by *tiao* 祧. The emendations are in square brackets, explanatory additions in round brackets:

- 5a 諸侯立五廟，一壇一墀。曰考廟，曰王考廟，曰皇考廟，皆月祭之；〔遠廟爲祧，有二祧〕，享嘗乃止。去〔祧〕爲壇，去壇爲墀。壇墀，有禱焉祭之，無禱，乃止。去墀爲鬼。

A prince established five shrines, a *tan*-shrine and a *shan*-shrine. The (first three) shrines were called: shrine of the completed, of the grand-completed, and of the great-grand-completed. To all of these a monthly sacrifice was offered. [The remote shrine was a shrine for the *tiao*-ancestor. There were two shrines for *tiao*-ancestors.] To the *tiao*-ancestor the prince offered the autumn-sacrifice, other sacrifices were discontinued. An ancestor who left the shrine of the [*tiao*-ancestor] became a *tan*-ancestor, one who left the shrine of the *tan*-ancestor became a *shan*-ancestor. As for the *tan*- and the *shan*-ancestors, if there were prayers to them, then sacrifices were offered. If prayers had been stopped, the sacrifices were discontinued. An ancestor who left the shrine of the *shan*-ancestor became a *gui*-ancestor-ghost.

But is it correct to suggest an emendation of the text? Let us first have a look at the passage following the ones already discussed in examples 4 and 5. This passage refers to the shrines of a daifu:

- 6 大夫立三廟，二壇。曰考廟，曰王考廟，曰皇考廟，享嘗乃止。顯考祖考無廟，有禱焉，爲壇祭之。去壇爲鬼。

A daifu established three shrines and two *tan*-shrines. The (three) shrines were called: shrine of the completed, of the grand-completed, and of the great-grand-completed. To these the daifu offered the autumn-sacrifice, other sacrifices were discontinued. The great-great-grand-completed and the great-great-great-grand-completed ancestors had no shrines. If there were prayers to these and if they had become *tan*-ancestors, then sacrifices were offered. An ancestor who left the shrine of the *tan*-ancestor became a *gui*-ancestor-ghost.¹²

11 Cf. *Zuo Zhuan*, Xiang 9 fu 2.

12 *Li Ji* 24.5. James Legge, *Li Chi*, II, 205: "A Great officer made for himself three ancestral temples and two altars. The temples were—his father's; his grandfather's; and his great-grandfather's. In this only the seasonal sacrifices were offered. To the great-great-grandfather and the (high) ancestor there were no temples. If there were occasion for prayer to them, altars were raised, and sacrifices offered on them. An ancestor still more remote was left in his ghostly state."

If we arrange this passage and the one dealing with the princely tribe side by side, further problems become immediately apparent:

Example 5	Example 6
1 諸侯立五廟，一壇一墀	1 大夫立三廟，二壇
2 曰考廟	2 曰考廟
3 曰王考廟	3 曰王考廟
4 曰皇考廟	4 曰皇考廟
5 皆月祭之	5
6 顯考廟，祖考廟	7 享嘗乃止
7 享嘗乃止	(6) 顯考，祖考無廟
8 去祖爲壇，去壇爲墀	8
9 壇墀，有禱焉祭之。無禱，乃止	9 有禱焉，爲壇祭之
10 去墀爲鬼	10 去壇爲鬼

The overall impression is that the editor/author was deeply disturbed by the consequences of the continuous reduction of the number of shrines. In contrast to the situation in the princely tribe, where the supernumerary ancestors could be conveniently housed in the *tiao*-shrines, the total number of three shrines for the *daifu* definitely excluded two generations of ancestors—and in line (6) in example 6 the editor/author, in genuine despair, is forced to take note of this fact. Not only were two ancestors no longer provided for, but the type of offerings had changed for the remaining ones. The monthly offerings completely disappear (line 5, example 6); mention is only made of seasonal offerings (line 7, example 6). That the monthly offerings must have been present in one way or another shows itself in the otherwise illogical statement that ‘other sacrifices were discontinued.’ Furthermore, the treatment of the more remote ancestors has become completely disconnected from that of the royal or princely tribes; even the *shan*-shrine has lost its identity and has been replaced by two *tan*-shrines (line 1, example 6).

I think we are now in the position to attempt an answer to the question raised above: Is it correct to suggest an emendation of the text? I think the answer is both yes and no. But what are we doing when we emend the text, and what are we presupposing when we refrain from emending it? The latter question is easier to answer: If we abstain from emending the text, we are presup-

posing that we are dealing with an *original* text. The text we have been dealing with must have been written by a scholar in the Han-dynasty (I am not entering into the reasons for this judgment here¹³). It is definitely not a simple compilation of old material; it seems to me to be a *study* of historical matter, serious in intent, but clearly unsuccessful. Evidence of this authorial intention is, for example, the remark about the lack of shrines for certain ancestors, but also the evident departures from the pattern set by the royal tribe, thus destroying analogies and similarities.

We are therefore clearly dealing with an *author* (unknown, I admit), and not with an editor (equally unknown). Emendation of such a text would destroy an original document of thinking of Han-times and be a gross misunderstanding of its worth as evidence of what a (certain) Han-scholar knew about the organisation of Zhou-dynasty tribal ancestor-temples. But what about the evident mistakes in the text? Our knowledge of the Zhou-dynasty-system have made it possible to identify and to *authenticate* them, and therefore it also enables us to suggest, not an emendation of the text, but the *reconstruction* of an *authentic* early text dealing with the respective temple-systems in Zhou-times, maybe the text our unknown Han-dynasty scholar was contemplating. I consciously avoid using the word 'original' here, because we cannot safely decide whether there was such a text. But we can, I think, safely assume that authentic material on such questions did exist at that time (compiled parts of the *Li Ji*, such as the obviously unchanged passage example 3, are themselves evidence for this fact).

I therefore suggest the following tentative *reconstruction* of an early, i.e. pre-Han, ritual text (examples 4 to 6):

- 13 If pressed I would mention three reasons: The text reveals that the Han-scholar cannot understand why certain ancestors are excluded. His preoccupation with five generations of ancestors shows that he has the family-system of Han-times in mind. The concept of the grand-ancestor has changed, and the *Bai Hu Tong* shows this clearly. Furthermore, the designation of the ancestors (*kao*) is understood in a biological sense, not in the sense of succession (which could have constellations differing from the usual father-son sequence). Finally, the *Li Ji* is clearly a Han-dynasty compilation, so that a later authorship seems unlikely.

- 7 王立七廟，一壇一墀。曰考廟，曰王考廟，曰皇考廟，曰顯考廟，曰祖考廟；皆月祭之。遠廟爲祧，有二祧，享嘗乃止。去祧爲壇，去壇爲墀。壇墀，有禱焉祭之；無禱，乃止。去墀曰鬼。
- 諸侯立五廟，一壇一墀。曰考廟，曰王考廟，曰皇考廟，皆月祭之；遠廟爲祧，有二祧，享嘗乃止。去祧爲壇，去壇爲墀。壇墀，有禱焉祭之，無禱，乃止。去墀爲鬼。
- 大夫立三廟，一壇一墀。曰考廟，月祭之；遠廟爲祧，有二祧，享嘗乃止。去祧爲壇，去壇爲墀。壇墀，有禱焉祭之；無禱，乃止。去墀曰鬼。
- The king established seven shrines, a *tan*-shrine and a *shan*-shrine. The (first five) shrines were called: shrine of the completed, of the grand-completed, of the great-grand-completed, of the great-great-grand-completed, and of the great-great-great-grand-completed. To all of these a monthly sacrifice was offered. The remote shrine was a shrine for the *tiao*-ancestor. There were two shrines for *tiao*-ancestors. To this ancestor the king offered the autumn-sacrifice, other sacrifices were discontinued. An ancestor who left the shrine of the *tiao*-ancestor became a *tan*-ancestor, one who left the shrine of the *tan*-ancestor became a *shan*-ancestor. As for the *tan*- and the *shan*-ancestors, if there were prayers to them, then sacrifices were offered. If prayers had been stopped, the sacrifices were discontinued. An ancestor who left the shrine of the *shan*-ancestor became a *gui*-ancestor-ghost.
- A prince established five shrines, a *tan*-shrine and a *shan*-shrine. The (first three) shrines were called: shrine of the completed, of the grand-completed, and of the great-grand-completed. To all of these a monthly sacrifice was offered. The remote shrine was a shrine for the *tiao*-ancestor. There were two shrines for *tiao*-ancestors. To the *tiao*-ancestor the prince offered the autumn-sacrifice, other sacrifices were discontinued. An ancestor who left the shrine of the *tiao*-ancestor became a *tan*-ancestor, one who left the shrine of the *tan*-ancestor became a *shan*-ancestor. As for the *tan*- and the *shan*-ancestors, if there were prayers to them, then sacrifices were offered. If prayers had been stopped, the sacrifices were discontinued. An ancestor who left the shrine of the *shan*-ancestor became a *gui*-ancestor-ghost.
- A daifu established three shrines, a *tan*-shrine and a *shan*-shrine. The (first) shrine was called: shrine of the completed. To this a monthly sacrifice was offered. The remote shrine was a shrine for the *tiao*-ancestor. There were two shrines for *tiao*-ancestors. To the *tiao*-ancestor the daifu offered the autumn-sacrifice, other sacrifices were discontinued. An ancestor who left the shrine of the *tiao*-ancestor became a *tan*-ancestor, one who left the shrine of the *tan*-ancestor became a *shan*-ancestor. As for the *tan*- and the *shan*-ancestors, if there were prayers to them, then sacrifices were offered. If prayers had been stopped, the sacrifices were discontinued. An ancestor who left the shrine of the *shan*-ancestor became a *gui*-ancestor-ghost.

It is clear that we cannot give this reconstruction the label *Li Ji*. But I also must stress that I am not claiming that the whole of the *Li Ji* can be dealt with in the same way. What I would certainly be suggesting is that we have to be extremely cautious and to use our critical senses when the *Li Ji* is talking about pre-Han institutions. And we should definitely not place more trust in the opinion of a

Han-dynasty scholar than in the semantic reconstruction of terms contained in texts of pre-Han origin, e.g. such as the *Zuo Zhuan*.

4. On the terms ‘original’ and ‘authentic’

Let me conclude with offering some comments on the use of the terms ‘authentic’ and ‘original.’ With the term ‘authentic’ I am referring to the integrity of a text *in terms of content* (the *Zuo Zhuan* is basically authentic, as Bernhard Karlgren has convincingly shown). An ‘authentic’ text is a true mirror of its times and its contents can—at least theoretically—be independently authenticated. This does not mean that the time of the contents dealt with necessarily coincides with the date of composition of the text. A modern (Chinese or Western) scholar dealing with an ancient Chinese phenomenon in a basically correct and state-of-the-art way would thus be the author of an authentic text. Depending on the intention of the author, a non-authentic text would either be a fake (intended to deceive) or more or less worthless trash (due to deficiencies of the author, or the eye of a later beholder). It is clear that the authenticity of non-fictional texts is easier to assess than that of, in the broadest sense, fictional or philosophical texts.

With the term ‘original’ I am referring to the *formal* integrity of a text. An ‘original’ text is, or was, written by an author in basically just this form and with just these words. If such a text is edited (more often: mis-edited), it is no longer original. This is true for the *Guo Yu* passage dealt with. A text or parts of it may appear in compilations, either in their original form (like verbal quotes) or in a more or less edited form.

The two terms can be combined to define certain aspects of the integrity of texts:

- (a) A text can be both original and authentic (e.g. example 2 from the *Zuo Zhuan* or example 3 from the *Li Ji*; I think this also holds true for the Guodian- and Mawangdui-texts in the Lao-Zi-tradition). These cases are pure wonders, and this also comprises *verbatim* copies of earlier texts.
- (b) A text can be original, but, historically speaking, not authentic (e.g. the *Li Ji*-passages in examples 4 to 6 discussed above). Discussing these passages as Han-dynasty documents, they however also bear marks of authenticity. The same applies to many studies on Early China published earlier in this century. In such cases we should refrain from emendation, but we might be

able to *reconstruct* earlier authentic underlying texts or parts of such (e.g. example 7). It is clear that the tag 'authentic' mirrors our current state of knowledge.

- (c) A text can be authentic, but not original (e.g. the *Guo Yu*-text in example 1 discussed above). Such cases clearly call for *emendation*. Successful emendation eventually results in a type-(a) wonder, i.e. an authentic and original text.
- (d) Finally, a text can be neither original nor authentic. This category, to my mind, is of pathological interest, because it means that somebody has plagiarized somebody else's text without noticing that it might be, or even is, rubbish.

I believe that close reading of the texts and strict attention to formal and semantic details can not only help us to determine the (relative) age of a text and to discover tell-tale signs of editing, but also to develop a feeling for the signal words as well as certain routines or tests enabling decisions concerning the emendation of passages in it. I hope that my comments on the relationship between form ('original') and content ('authentic') and their respective rôles and merits in textual scholarship turn out to be helpful, and that they can especially lead to decisions whether a text needs emendation or reconstruction.