# 19
c0253

In the winter of 0255/0254, Chŭ armies occupied the southern part of Lŭ. To oversee the newly conquered territory, they set up a Directorship in Lán-líng (34°42′ N, 117°49′ E), and as Director they picked Syŵn Chīng. For three years (0257–0255) he had been the oldest member and ex officio libationer at the revived Jì-syà establishment in Chí, but his position there had become difficult, perhaps due to friction with colleagues representing earlier Chí thought (SJ 74, Nienhauser **Records** 7/184). He thus moved to Lán-líng, and established a school that would last until his Chŭ patron died in 0238, and would exert a profound influence on Confucianism well into the Hàn dynasty.

Northern Lŭ was not occupied, but its affairs were effectively controlled from Lán-líng. The Analects, with Dž-shvèn continuing as head, responds to Syŵndž with defiance (the main chapter) but also interest (the interpolations made at that time in other chapters). LY 19 has a subtly satirical dimension, and, like all underground literature, can be hard to decode in later ages. It is made up of sayings by five disciples, three of them criticized by the others. Those three disapprove errors that may be emphases of the Syŵndzian school, and their squabbling may be a caricature of Syŵndž's own contentiousness: attacks on other viewpoints fill substantial stretches of the Syŵndzian writings.

The numbering of passages is identical in the Legge text.

## [A. Dž-jāng]

┌ 19:1. Dž-jāng said, If an officer when faced with danger carries out his orders, if when faced with profit he thinks of right, if when sacrificing he thinks of humility, and if when in mourning he thinks of his grief, I expect that he will do.

This is the first appearance of Dž-jāng as a primary speaker. He shows courage, useful for a threatened country. All his points have earlier Analects precedents; for profit versus right, see 16:10.

└ 19:2. Dž-jāng said, If his hold on virtue is not wide, if his trust in the Way is not sincere, how can one say he is there? And how can one say he is *not* there?

Ardor has always been demanded (4:9, 5:10a, 6:12); for wideness, see *15:29[15a]. This may deplore Syŵndzian adaptability (SZ 3:5, Knoblock **Xunzi** 1/175f): "These semi-Confucians are neither quite with us nor wholly against us."

╘ 19:3. Dž-syà's disciples asked Dž-jāng about personal relationships. Dž-jāng said, What does Dž-syà say? They replied, Dž-syà says, Those whom you can, you associate with; those whom you can't, you rebuff. Dž-jāng said, That is different from what I have heard. The gentleman respects the worthy but countenances the many. He esteems the good but pities the incapable. Am *I* a great worthy? Then among others, whom should I not countenance? Am *I* unworthy? Then the others will rebuff *me;* what need have I to rebuff the others?

This plea for inclusiveness and against arrogance wryly notes the superfluityof hauteur: it labels you as an uncomprehensive and thus unworthy person, who (like the contentious Syŵndž) is unlikely to receive attentions requiring rebuff.

## [B. Dž-syà]

┌ 19:4. Dž-syà said, Though they may be little Ways, there will surely be something in them worth seeing, yet if carried too far, there is the danger of being distracted. For this reason the gentleman does not do them.

This may be aimed at the Syẃndzian emphasis on text study. "Distracted" is literally ní 泥 "mud," in the present context perhaps "bogged down."

└ 19:5. Dž-syà said, If day by day he is aware of what he lacks, and if month by month he does not forget what he can do, one can call him fond of learning.

A favorite passage of teachers; more than one book title has borrowed from it. Note the emphasis on skill over information: what one has learned *to do*.

┌ 19:6. Dž-syà said, To be of wide learning and sincere intent, to question incisively and reflect on what is close at hand – rv́n will be found in this.

For jìn 近 "at hand, nearby," compare *6:30[18]. Notice that learning is by questioning followed by personal reflection (the classic method), rather than by memorization of texts (more recent), and that its practice is, or leads to, rv́n. Another passage that has generated its share of book titles in later ages.

└ 19:7. Dž-syà said, The hundred artisans dwell in their shops to perfect their specialty, and the gentleman studies to realize his Way.

The apprenticeship motif is socially suggestive. The end of the gentleman's effort of skill development is the Way, not here political but personal. Skill cultivation is a major motif in the Jwāngdž (JZ 19:9–10, Watson **Chuang** 204f), often as a symbol for meditational expertise.

┌ 19:8. Dž-syà said, The mistakes of the little people will always be in the direction of culture.

Or, as an interpretative translation would say, of superficial elaboration.

└ 19:9. Dž-syà said, The gentleman has three aspects. When you view him from afar, he is awe-inspiring. When you get close to him, he is warm. When you listen to his words, he is severe.

Formal in demeanor, affable in personal contact, incisive in counsel.

┌ 19:10. Dž-syà said, The gentleman is faithful, and only then exacts toil from his people. If there were not trust, then they would think he was oppressing them. He is faithful, and only then remonstrates. If there were not trust, he would think he was slandering him.

Establishing trust is vital, in directing the populace ("they" in the first clause) or in chiding the sovereign ("he" in the second). Here is a more complete blueprint for the postfeudal state than before, with the sovereign limited to an advice-taking role and the minister ("gentleman") operationally in charge.

└ 19:11. Dž-syà said, With greater virtue, one does not cross the lines. With lesser virtue, it is all right to come and go.

This ethical latitude offends Legge ("very questionable"); Waley takes "greater virtue" as "undertakings of greater moral import." If so, then "virtue" becomes "internalized *sense* of virtue," or what the Mencians mean by conscience.

┗ 19:12. Dž-yóu said, Dž-syà's disciples: if it is sprinkling and sweeping, responding and replying, or advancing and retreating, they are satisfactory. They look to the details. But if you get them onto the basics, they have nothing. What is to be done? Dž-syà heard this, and said, No, Yén Yóu is wrong. The Way of the Gentleman is:

He to whom 'tis early told
Will weary of it ere he's old

I would compare it to grass and trees; each one is different from the rest. The Way of the Gentleman: how can it be criticized? The one who has a beginning, and who has an end, will he not be a Sagely Man?

This defends a teaching sequence beginning with details: theory encountered too early can be overwhelming or unintelligible. This is pedagogically sound (too much of education is answers to questions the student has not yet asked), and perhaps also a criticism of a theory-first trend in the Syẃndzian school.

The last piece in each section so far *criticizes another disciple*: Dž-jāng reproved Dž-syà in 19:3, and Dž-syà here refutes Dž-yóu. Who will be next?

## [C. Dž-yóu]

┏ 19:14. Dž-yóu said, In mourning, go to the point of grief and stop.

The form should not outrun the feeling (compare *7:9[10] and 3:4). Is it not the Syẃndzians who are championing excessively elaborate mourning customs?

┗ 19:15. Dž-yóu said, My friend Jāng: when it comes to doing what is difficult, he is capable. But he is not yet rv́n.

"What is difficult" seems to be the demeanor and not the mere duty (see 2:8). What is granted to Dž-jāng was recommended by Dž-yóu in the paired saying.

This criticism eliminates Dž-jāng as a possible winner. All persons quoted so far have also been criticized. We are at a formal crux.

┗ 19:16. Dzv̄ngdž said, Pompous indeed is Jāng. It is hard to be rv́n alongside him.

To finish off Dž-jāng, we have Dzv̄ngdž chiming in; it is *in rv́n* that Dž-jāng falls short. Dzv̄ngdž himself is now in the running as the undefeated candidate.

## [D. Dzv̄ngdž]

┏ 19:17. Dzv̄ngdž said, I have heard from our Respected Master, A man who has not had occasion to exert himself to the full will surely do so in mourning his parents.

Continuing the sequence (begun in 19:14) on mourning, and displaying Dzv̄ngdž in the filial piety phase for which he is mythically renowned in Hàn.

┗ 19:18. Dzv̄ngdž said, I have heard from our Respected Master, As for the filiality of Mv̀ng Jwāngdž, the rest one might manage, but his not changing his father's ministers and his father's government – *this* is difficult to manage.

This is still firmly within the filiality vein, but it extends the reach of the interpolated *4:20[2], which first enjoined restraint in making changes even after a parent's death, to the "government" sphere (one gathers, the policy sphere).

┗ 19:19. The head of the Mv̀ng made Yáng Fū the Leader of the Officers. He asked Dzv̄ngdž about it. Dzv̄ngdž said, That those on high have lost the Way, and that the people have scattered, is of long standing. If you find evidences of it, then feel grief and pity; do not rejoice over it.

It is Yáng Fū, not the head of the Mv̀ng, who inquires. Shr̀ Shī 士師 "Leader of the Officers" is the post Confucius might have held (Waley **Analects** 15). The legal term chíng 情 "circumstances, evidences" appears in 13:4 as "facts." Dzv̄ngdž feels that the culture of Lǔ (*postconquest* Lǔ?) is not what it was.

## [E. Dž-gùng]

Now it is Dž-gùng's turn. Will he attack Dzv̄ngdž? Or do something else, now that the circle of criticisms has been closed (19:15–16) and not reopened?

┏ 19:20. Dž-gùng said, The evils of Jòu cannot have been as extreme as that. For this reason, the gentleman hates to dwell in the lower reaches, since all the world's evils tend to accumulate there.

Jòu 紂 (not the dynasty, which is Jōu 周 in the level tone) was the bad last ruler of the Shāng dynasty, conquered by King Wǔ of Jōu. The atrocities told of him are typical of the "bad last ruler" historical paradigm, used to justify an end or transfer of sovereignty. For "lower reaches," see DDJ 66 (compare the reaction in 17:22 to DDJ 61). Like MC 7B3 (Legge **Mencius** 479), 19:20 is a major Warring States expression of distrust in other people's forged ancient texts.

┗ 19:21. Dž-gùng said, The gentleman's mistakes are like eclipses of sun or moon. If he makes a mistake, everyone sees him; if he changes, everyone looks up to him.

Just as rulers get extra blame (19:20), they also get extra credit for reforming. The use of eclipses as a not wholly baneful symbol, here, bears on the question of whether several *spurious* eclipses might have been interpolated into the CC to honor the birthdates of Confucius and his forbears (see page 266).

┏ 19:22. Gūngsūn Cháu of Wèı asked Dž-gùng, From whom did Jùng-ní learn? Dž-gùng said, The culture of Wv́n and Wǔ has not fallen to the ground: it exists among men. The worthy know its larger aspects; the unworthy know its smaller aspects – no one *does not* possess the Way of Wv́n and Wǔ. From whom did our Respected Master *not* learn? But equally, what *regular* preceptor did he have?

Dž-gùng here returns to the question he muffed in 9:6, and handles it nicely, making a virtue rather than an embarrassment of Confucius's eclectic youth, and in the process implicitly damning Syv́ndž's "regular" type of school.

The social implications are important: even the unworthy (bù-syén 不賢) are part of society, with a unique role in embodying and preserving its values.

┗ 19:23. Shúsūn Wǔ-shú, talking with the great officers at court, said, Dž-gùng is worthier than Jùng-ní. Džfú Jǐng-bwó reported this to Dž-gùng. Dž-gùng said, I would compare it to the wall of a mansion. Sž's wall comes up to your shoulder, and you can see how attractive the house is. Our Respected Master's wall is several rods high, and if you cannot find a gate to go in by, you do not see the elegance of the ancestral shrine, or the splendor of the hundred officials, and those who find that gate are few indeed. So then, is not the Respected Master's remark appropriate?

The second "Respected Master" refers to Shúsūn Wǔ-shú. This again deals with those who would disparage Confucius; here, their tactic is not to attack Confucius, but to praise Dž-gùng (Sż), who, as we have seen in 11:18b, was reputed to be rich. The reply is that Dž-gùng's virtues are obvious to all, but the higher virtues of Confucius are visible only to those who "find the gate" by understanding his teachings. That only his intimates appreciate Confucius's virtues implies that those virtues are not public, and the sacrificial touches in the comparison further support the implication that they are rather mystical.

Syẃndž did not possess the lineal *tradition* of Confucius, but specialized instead in the learned explication of texts which had come to be *associated* with Confucius. He rarely quotes Confucius, but regularly quotes the Shr̄ and Shū. The gibe at Confucius in 19:22 may be Syẃndzian ridicule of the Lǔ lack of a transmitted *text* "tradition." The Lǔ response is that the culture, as preserved by its own people, is their tradition. This is followed in 19:23 by the crusher "Few indeed are those who find that gate." So much for Syẃndž.

┌ 19:24. Shúsūn Wǔ-shú had tried to disparage Jùng-ní. Dž-gùng said, It cannot be done; Jùng-ní cannot be disparaged. The worthiness of others is a hill or mound; one can walk up them. Jùng-ní is the sun and moon; there is no way one could walk up them. Though a man should want to cut himself off, what harm would that do to the sun and moon? It would merely show that he lacked a sense of proportion.

The word "disparage" at the beginning of this saying is incipient rather than indicative in aspect ("made as though to disparage," not "did disparage"). Incipient aspect is covert rather than overt, linguistically speaking: there is no inflection or auxiliary word to signal it. The sense of the sentence is the only guide. As to the designation "Jùng-ní," it is new in this chapter, though met with in the 03c works of other schools. Conventions vary somewhat from text to text, but often "Jùng-ní" is relation-neutral, unlike "Confucius" ("Master Kǔng"), which acknowledges his status as an authority figure. This may imply that we have here a debate *among* schools, not a question *within* one school.

A final pair refuting a disparagement of Confucius which may represent the criticism of the Syẃndž school. Their "dropping out" of the doctrinal lineage is compared to a man's seceding from the sun and moon: merely ridiculous.

└ 19:25. Chvn Dž-chín said to Dž-gùng, You are being polite; how could Jùng-ní be worthier than you? Dž-gùng said, A gentleman for one word is seen to be wise, or for one word is seen to be unwise: of words one cannot but take care. Jùng-ní's being unsurpassable is like Heaven's being unclimbable by stairs. When our Respected Master got control of a state or a family, it was what one calls "If he caused them to stand, they stood; if he showed them the Way, they went; if he invited them, they came; if he moved them, they were harmonious." In life, honored; in death, lamented – how could it be that anyone should surpass him?

Claiming for Confucius not merely capacity, but actual achievement, in both the state and the family; a late stage of Confucian myth. His "achievements" figure among those attributed in LY 12–13 to the ideal ruler. The phrase "climbing to Heaven" occurs in MC 7A41 (Legge **Mencius** 474).

The ambition of LY 17, to have some ministership, *any* ministership, is here calmly taken as a long-accomplished fact. The myth is growing rapidly.

## Interpolations

These Syẃndzian interpolations are too few to be plausible as appeasement, and may represent genuine borrowings. They include an addition to LY 19 itself, and may be slightly later than the chapter date; we put them all at c0252.

For a complete finding list of interpolated passages, see page 329.

## Added to LY 13

*13:3. Dž-lù said, If the Ruler of Wèı were waiting for the Master to run his government, what would the Master do first? The Master said, It would certainly be to rectify names, would it not? Dž-lù said, Is there such a thing? The Master is off the track. What is this about rectifying? The Master said, Boorish indeed is Yóu! The gentleman, with respect to what he does not understand, should maintain an abashed silence. If names are not rectified, speech will not be representative. If speech is not representative, things will not get done. If things do not get done, rites and music will not flourish. If rites and music do not flourish, punishments and penalties will not be just. And if punishments and penalties are not just, the people will have nowhere to put hand or foot. Therefore, as to the gentleman: if he names something, it must be sayable, and if he says something, it must be doable. The gentleman's relation to words is to leave nothing whatever to chance. [13:3]

This "chain argument" was noticed by Waley (**Analects** 22) as Syẃndzian, and the doctrine of "rectifying names" forms a whole chapter in that text (SZ 22; Knoblock **Xunzi** 3/113f). Waley notes the astonishment of Dž-lù as betraying the novelty of the idea, an insight which we have applied to similar passages.

This Syẃndzian idea has precedents in 12:11 ("let the father be a father") and elsewhere (Makeham **Name** 39f), but whereas 12:11 can be read as social role fulfilment, *13:3 is about the chain of command. These interpolations, then, do not satirize, but *adapt from*, Syẃndž. Given Syẃndž's Legalist leaning, the question asked in 18r perhaps begins to be answered.

Waley mentions a historical "language crisis," which he dates to the late 04c or early 03c (**Way** 59). The precision of naming here enjoined does relate to a general interest, much developed in the Mician school (Graham **Later**; compare Graham **Three**), in the logic of precise statement and valid inference.

## Added to LY 15

*15:36. The Master said, With rv́n, one need not defer to one's teacher. [15:35]

However it was originally meant, the Syẃndzian or post-Syẃndzian saying "Blue [dye] comes from indigo [plants], but it is bluer than indigo" (SZ 1:1; Knoblock **Xunzi** 1/135) is later taken to refer to students surpassing teachers. Deference to *teachers* limits the success of *students*, not to mention the *school*.

*15:39. The Master said, There is teaching, but there are no kinds. [15:38]

Lèı 類, logical or social class, otherwise unknown in the Analects, is common in Syẃndž (Knoblock **Xunzi** 1/252). *15:39 agrees with Mencius (MC 2B2, 3A1, 4B32): the sages and ourselves are of one kind; any difference is in degree of cultivation. Thus, "There are *teaching* differences, but no *class* differences."

## Added to LY 1

*1:12. Yǒudž said, In the practice of ritual, harmony is to be esteemed. The Way of the Former Kings was beautiful in this: in small things and great they followed it. If there is something that does not go right, one should recognize the principle of harmony, and then it will become harmonious. But if it is not moderated by ritual itself, it still won't go right. [1:12]

"Way of the Former Kings" is Syẃndzian (SZ4:10, Knoblock **Xunzi** 1/192f). SZ 2:2 (**Xunzi** 1/152f) unites harmony and ritual. *1:12 accepts the "harmony" insight as showing the end which a given observance is "trying to reach to" (we do not follow Mao **Suggestions** 283, who punctuates differently, requiring an elucidation of the square-bracket type). But it also insists (compare 19:12) that ritual precedent itself exerts a necessary limiting effect on its application.

## Added to LY 17

*17:7. The Master said, Yóu, Have you heard the Six Maxims and the Six Distortions? He replied, I have not. [He said], Be at ease; I will tell you. To love rə́n but not to love study; its distortion is stupidity. To love wisdom but not to love study; its distortion is diffuseness. To love fidelity but not to love study; its distortion is banditry. To love uprightness but not to love study; its distortion is censoriousness. To love courage but not to love study; its distortion is riotousness. To love firmness but not to love study; its distortion is wildness. [17:8]

"Be at ease" suggests an invitation to assume a less formal posture, to facilitate relaxed and thus effective listening (for a Japanese parallel, see *14:43[17]n).

These six are partly derived from the four of *8:2a[14]. The chief difference is that study, not ritual, is the moderating force which directs impulses into proper channels. The idea of distortion (bì 蔽 "abuse") is developed in SZ 21 ("Explaining Distortions," Knoblock **Xunzi** 3/88 has "Dispelling Blindness"). Syẃndž is the great advocate of an intellectually tidy universe.

## Added to LY 19

*19:13. Dž-syà said, If he is underoccupied in service, he may study. If he is underoccupied in study, he may serve. [19:13]

"Underoccupied" (yōu 優; in 14:11 "overqualified") is having more capacity than the task at hand calls for. The interplay of study and office fits Syẃndž, who was a producer of talent for all the states. One pupil came from Tsài, earlier absorbed by Chǔ (Lǐ Sz̄), and another from Hán (Hán Fēı); both went to the highest bidder (Chín). His school was free of the one-state connection that limited the Lǔ Confucians. Not being committed to an aphoristic style let Syẃndž produce the extended essays that are the hallmark of his school. His career (born in Jàu, studied in Ngwèı, honored in Chí, employed in Chǔ) had a multinational character, in higher posts than proto-multinational Mencius. He thought and discoursed to a later generation, on a wider scale.

The service/exit equilibrium (*18:8a/b[18]) is here resolved in a practical way, or at least without reference to any awkward questions of personal principle. Syẃndž tends to get on with the job; the Lǔ Confucians agonize a little more.

## Added as LY 20

The following piece was a chapter by itself (LY 20) in the copy of the Analects concealed in the schoolroom wall in 0249, and rediscovered in c0154; in the present text it is combined with 20:2–3, which were originally a fragmentary 21st chapter. It owes nothing to previous Analects chapter form, but is instead in the style of the Shū; its archaic diction, lapsing from the purported words of sage rulers into historical summary, ornaments and gives sonority to a plan for the state, whose ruler is accountable to Heaven for his administration of justice, encouragement of trade, and solicitude for the people. What seems a jumble is actually a landmark document. Its date of composition might be c0251.

*20:1. Yáu said, Oh, you Shùn! Heaven's order of succession, upon your person comes to rest / Unto the Mean do you hold fast! / And within the Four Seas vast / Heaven's favor long will last.

Shùn also in this way commanded Yŭ.

[Tāng] said, I, the little child Lŭ, venture to sacrifice a black bull, and to announce openly to the most eminent Lord God: The guilty I will not venture to pardon, God's servitors I will not mislead; the determination lies with the heart of God. If I in my own person incur guilt, do not visit it upon the myriad places; if the myriad places should incur guilt, let that guilt lie upon my own person.

Jōu had great beneficence; the good men, these it enriched. "Though there be relatives of Jōu, they shall not equal the rźn men. If the Hundred Families should incur a fault, let it lie upon me, the One Man."

He attended to weights and measures, examined rules and standards, restored disused offices, and a government of the Four Quarters put them in practice withal. He revived extinguished states, continued interrupted successions, promoted subjects in seclusion, and the people Under Heaven gave their hearts to him. What he emphasized was the people, food, mourning, and sacrifice. He was generous, and thus won over the multitude. He was faithful, and thus the people trusted him. He was diligent, and thus had success. He was fair, and thus made others happy.

The archaic pronoun yŭ 予 "I" (see 7:23) here resumes its original context.

The Yáu charge to Shùn (and from Shùn to Yŭ) implies a meritocratic, not a lineal successor. It invokes the Jūng Yūng ("Mean") as a balancing principle, and as a condition of retaining the mandate to rule.

Next is Tāng ("He"), founder of Shāng. Behind the sacrifices, invoked from old inscriptions, is a bureaucratic concern for due process: the guilty will not be protected nor law officers deceived; any guilt the people incur will be considered the ruler's fault. This is the corollary of the magic-efficacy theory of rule: the people, even if nominally guilty, are what the ruler has made them.

The Jōu are the ideal: meritocracy (see *18:10[18]), responsibility alike for the people's livelihood (see 12:9) and misdeeds, and for a rational bureaucracy (contrast 13:20), reconciling the secluded (*18:8a[18]), generosity (see *6:30[18]), faith (12:7, *17:5[18]), and above all fairness. This word, gūng 公, originally "Prince," in 6:14 already "public" (see the early DDJ 16), is now "fair" – having the equitable character on which alone a public culture can rest.

## Reflections

We may begin our examination of *20:1 by asking,, where does it fit into the context of its time? Like Mencius, it envisions a universal ("Four Quarters") sovereignty, but looks to the continuance rather than the extirpation of local ruler lineages. This is not a revived feudalism, but rather a unified federalism (compare 13:18, which had sheltered families from the law). Along with these concessions to Legalism, we find a strong distaste for punishment, particularly punishment of the people, for whose errors the ruler is ultimately responsible. The Lŭ Confucians may have wanted the extirpation of Sùng to be reversed, but they did not want virtue itself to be locally confined.

Our search for LY 19 Legalisms (see 18r) found only *13:3, *19:13, and *20:1. The first is merely bureaucratic, the second unclear, the third benign. The hostility to Legalistic punishments is very like that of DDJ 72–75, which implies that both may be reacting to a third, Legalist presence at the Lŭ court. We thus infer the existence of a court Legalist faction in Lŭ, prior to 0255. After 0254, direct Syŵndzian influence on the LY 19 theories becomes the likeliest hypothesis. Evidence for the Confucian/Legalist convergence noted by Hsiao for Hàn is thus best sought in the school of Syŵndž, but the LY 19–20 lean toward universalism may constitute a footnote to that tendency.

Syŵndž too must be seen in context. Warring States thought from c0320 on was collectively engaged in designing the universal political state which the Warring States technologies of war and peace were making inevitable. One item in the technology of peace, the technology of governing, is the know-how involved in controlling more than a local area. It was apparently gained from experience in administering conquered territory (see Creel **Beginnings**). The experience being acquired by Chŭ, in the LY 19 year c0253, in administering its annexed but not yet absorbed territory of southern Lŭ, must itself have been part of that process of refining a new technology of rule.

The Dàuists, who were seemingly high enough at the Lŭ court to be held accountable for the 0254 loss of half its territory and population, justified it as a desirable outcome in DDJ 80 ("Make the state small, make the people few," Henricks **Te** 36, 156). This apologia anticipates the "inactivity" of a 4c Dàuist minister (Waley **Lo-yang** 48–53). As for the defensive-war Micians, MZ 50 (c0254; Mei **Ethical** 257), which relocates Mwòdž from Lŭ to Chí, suggests that an ungrateful Lŭ government had dismissed them.

All the LY 19 disciples can be seen as in some way criticizing Syŵndž, but only the three whose mutual wrangling *caricatured* him drew a response from Lán-líng: an addendum to the earlier diatribe SZ 6 (Knoblock **Xunzi** 1/229) vilifies precisely Dž-jāng, Dž-syà, and Dž-yóu. As for Yén Hwéı, whom we have not seen in any uninterpolated passage since 12:1, he has found a new home among the Dàuists (JZ 6:7, 20:7, 22:11, Watson **Chuang** 90f, 217f, 246f), toward whom he had from the first shown a certain predilection (see 6:23n), and with whom he is living happily ever after.

On the long-term viability of the LY 19–20 political proposals, de Bary (**Trouble** 2; compare Wakeman **Remarks** 21) notes that their sanctions, based on paradigms of antiquity, later proved "susceptible of appropriation" by rulers. The Lŭ Confucians, to borrow a metaphor from JZ 4:3 (Watson **Chuang** 62), are here philosophizing to a steamroller.

Gold Inlaid Crossbow Fittings (see p195)
*Length 25·6 cm (10·4 in). 04c/03c. Courtesy Freer Gallery of Art (32·15–16)*