

11

c0360

LY 10 only gradually became a portrait of Confucius, but LY 11 was from the first intended as a definitive, and balancing, repository of disciple lore; the key passage is 11:3. Some lore preserved in KZJY 38, including 11:3 itself, goes back to this period. Džvngdž, whose line the Kūngs had replaced in c0400, fares badly, but many disciples criticized in LY 5–6 are rehabilitated. As noted in 11:7, the 05c danger of usurpation by the Jì clan must have receded; from here on, political philosophy develops not as a legitimacy question, but as a set of function and policy questions, and Lǚ state policy begins to come into focus.

LY 11 seems to have been written sometime in the headship of Dž-shàng, of whom we firmly know from SJ 47 only that he died at the age of 47.

Reference numbers to Legge are given at the end of each passage.

[A. The Disciple Pantheon]

┌ 11:1. The Master said, Those who first advanced were rustics in ritual and music; those who later advanced were gentlemen in ritual and music. If I were employing anyone, I would go with the “first advanced.” [11:1]

In terms of the later, ritualized Confucianism, this seeming preference for the yě-rǚn 野人 (“rustics”) over ritual experts is astonishing; a nice conundrum for the commentators. Waley takes the first sentence as a quote, “Only common people wait till they are advanced in ritual and music [before taking office],” of which the last line disapproves, giving a consistently ritualistic Confucius. Legge takes the contrast as historical: the ancients knew less ritual than the moderns. This requires punctuating after jìn 進 “came forward” (which is awkward; the concordance punctuates after lǚ/ywè 禮樂 “ritual and music”). Lau accepts the awkwardness, but takes 11:1 as about early and late disciples. What to do?

└ 11:2. The Master said, Of those who followed me in Chǔn and Tsài, none now approach my gate. [11:2a]

This too worries commentators: exactly what are these followers accused of? They are clearly being singled out from others, and a time lapse is involved. Thus there is a contrast of earlier and later disciples, supporting Lau in 11:1.

11:2 marks a further growth (see 9:15) of the myth of the international Confucius, who travels to foreign states. The Chǔn/Tsài story is one of the central features of this myth. In 15:2 we find Dž-lù hard-pressed in Chǔn; other late traditions include Yén Hwéi as well. Why, in 11:2, do they not come to Confucius’s gate? In 6:3 it is claimed that Yén Hwéi predeceased Confucius; this chapter (11:13b) for the first time says the same of Dž-lù. Perhaps, then, they do not come *because they are viewed by the narrator as having died?*

These two sayings then tell us, of the early disciples, that though worthy of office they were not expert in ritual (11:1), that they shared hardships with Confucius in Chǔn, and died early (11:2). By implication, the later disciples were “gentlemen” skilled in ritual, who survived the Master and were thus the ones who founded the posthumous school. We are now ready for 11:3.

⌊ 11:3. Virtuous conduct: Yén Ywān, Mǐn Dž-chyēn, Rǎn Bwó-nyóu, Jùng-gūng. Language: Dzǎi Wǒ, Dž-gūng. Administration: Rǎn Yǒu, Ji-lù. Culture: Dž-yóu, Dž-syā. [11:2b]

This important passage, not offered as a quotation from Confucius but asserted as a statement, lists disciples by area of distinction. It is often at variance with the opinion of earlier chapters; for example, it is odd not to find Dž-yóu, Steward of Wǔ-chýng, under Administration. Even where the *area* of expertise is familiar, its *value* may not be: the lowbrow Dž-syā of 6:13 (see further 3:8), appears under Culture; the punster Dzǎi Wǒ of 6:26 is in Language. These figures have been either mythologized or deeply reconsidered. The tendency is to accept disciples disapproved of in LY 5–6, while eliminating Dzvngdž, whose territory is LY 7–8. The 11:1/2 praise of early rather than late disciples could in this light be interpreted as chiefly aimed at Dzvngdž.

11:3 was authoritative for the later body of disciple lore; it formed the nucleus of the KZJY 38 disciple list. With the establishment of Confucianism by Hàn Wǔ-dì in 0136, every officeholder had to present himself as a votary of Confucius. In this context, the emblematic influence of LY 11:3 became enormous. Its rubrics were used as titles for the first four chapters of the SSSY collection (Mather **Yü** 3, 25, 81, 92), typifying Six Dynasties elite qualities. They also figured in the Táng official evaluation system (Bol **Culture** 15–16).

[B. Praise of Disciples: Yén Hwéi]

┐ 11:4. The Master said, Hwéi: he was not one who helped me. In all that I said, there was nothing he did not take pleasure in. [11:3]

The underlying idea here is that the teacher only learns from his mistakes, such as when a remark addressed to a protégé fails to produce the desired effect. Hwéi is so quick that he sees at once the point of even an imperfect maxim. This wry but extravagant praise is a development of 9:20; compare 9:11.

⌊ 11:5. The Master said, Filial indeed was Mǐn Dž-chyēn! Others did not disagree with the comments of his father and mother, his elder and younger brothers. [11:4]

Their praise might be biased, but is confirmed by the judgements of others (note the subtle parallel 11:4/5 based on “disagreeing”). The public virtue of Dž-chyēn in 6:9 (retained in 11:14) is here domesticated, a trend we shall find several times exemplified in LY 11. 11:4/5 gloss the first two names in 11:3.

┐ 11:6. Nán Rúng thrice repeated the White Scepter. Confucius gave him his elder brother’s daughter to wife. [11:5]

The White Scepter refers to Shī 256E. The image is polishing away a scratch on a piece of white jade, whereas an indiscreet word can never be retrieved. This elegant characterization upgrades the grudging view of Nán Rúng in 5:2. Later tradition seems to be sensitive to slurs on the Kǔng bloodline.

⌊ 11:7. Jì Kāngdž asked, Of the disciples, who loves learning? Confucius replied, There was Yén Hwéi who loved learning. Unfortunately, his allotted span was short, and he has died. Now there are none. [11:6]

This cut-down version of 6:3 has Jì Kāngdž as questioner, perhaps reflecting a lessening of 05c political tensions with the Jì; see 10:2n and compare 11:23.

⌋ 11:8. When Yén Ywān died, Yén Lù asked for the Master's carriage in order to make him an enclosure. The Master said, Talented or not talented, let us each speak of his son. When Lǐ died, he had a coffin but no enclosure. I did not go on foot in order to make him an enclosure. Because I follow the Great Dignitaries, I cannot go on foot. [11:7]

Hwéi's father Yén Lù figures on the KZJY 38 list as himself a disciple, a mythical extension. Chariots in Warring States graves are usually intact, with horses slaughtered between the shafts, and proclaim the power and wealth of the deceased; chariot axle caps (see page 68) also occur as a symbolic variant. The chariot here seems intended as an outer coffin. Confucius's ceremonial duties are part of the myth of his official importance. Waley suggests that he was shì-shī 士師 "Leader of the Officers" (see *18:2¹⁸ and 19:19). In CC times, the Prince of Lǔ or a relative had led the warriors himself; the delegation of military leadership is a sign of evolution from a feudal to a functional state.

This is the first we hear of Confucius's son Lǐ "Carp" (or Bwó-yw "Elder Brother Fish"). According to KZJY 39, Lǐ was born in his father's 20th year, and died in his own 50th year, giving the span c0530–c0481/0480. Yén Hwéi's death *after* Bwó-yw would barely fit into Confucius's lifespan (0549–0479). The point of these traditions is their concern with the *succession* of Confucius; they are in a sense the authority myth of the Kǔng family school heads.

⌋ 11:9. When Yén Ywān died, the Master said, Ah! Heaven is destroying me! Heaven is destroying me! [11:8]

The reiteration conveys intense sincerity; the use of yw 予 for "me" reflects the presence of death and the reference to Heaven (see 9:12n). The basis of the pairing with 11:8 is the loss of physical and intellectual heirs (compare 11:2).

⌋ 11:10. When Yén Ywān died, the Master wailed for him movedly. His followers said, The Master is moved. He said, Am I moved? If for such a man I am not moved, then for whom? [11:9]

Ritual lamentation ("wailing," see 7:10¹⁰) was a duty, but heartfelt emotion (tùng 慟 "be moved," requiring a neologism in the translation for its adverb use) was apparently reserved for one's own kin. Yén Hwéi may have been a cousin; he is here almost a son, worthy of Confucius as his own son and other followers were not (compare the dismissive treatment of Dzṽngdž in 11:18a).

Later tradition (SJ 47, 4/1946–1947) would deny that there had been any disciple heads at all, by representing the first Kǔng head, Dž-sž, as Lǐ's son. We have not yet reached that stage. The more modest aim of LY 11 is to discredit what was still acknowledged to have been the century of disciple headship.

⌋ 11:11. When Yén Ywān died, the school wanted to bury him lavishly. The Master said, It cannot be done. The school buried him lavishly. The Master said, Hwéi looked on me as a father, but I have not been able to look on him as a son. It is not me; it is you disciples. [11:10]

For the son's burial, see 11:8; for the use of yw 予 AI[®] see 11:9. False splendor (as in 9:12) spoils the validity of a modest burial. The disciples ignoring Confucius's wishes, and the "sonship" of Yén Hwéi, may be a Kǔng family claim to have restored the true tradition after a century of disciple headship.

Note the litany effect of the recurring initial phrase in sayings 11:8–11.

[C. Praise and Blame of Disciples: Dž-lù]

┌ 11:13a. Mǐn Dž-chyēn, attending by his side, was formal; Dž-lù was energetic; Rǎn Yǒu and Dž-gùng were unassuming. The Master was pleased. [11:12a]

The first and third of these reduplicative predicates occur in 10:1b, where they characterize behavior toward upper and lower dignitaries, respectively. For the Mǐndž “Master Mǐn” of the present text, we adopt the variant given, as agreeing with the form of the other disciple names. We have here a formal, even courtly, situation (see 11:15), with Confucius portrayed almost as a ruler, and his disciples flanking him as virtual ministers. It seems (compare 10:1b) that Mǐn Dž-chyēn’s stance to those approaching Confucius was less lofty than that of Rǎn Yǒu and calmer than that of Dž-lù. All are clearly acceptable. For Dž-lù’s swashbuckling and early death, see next.

└ 11:13b. As for Yóu, he will not reach his death. [11:12b]

The informal name marks this passage off from the preceding (with which it is now combined: a “Master said” phrase presumably dropped out of the text at some point in its history), but where the narrator’s “Dž-lù” is used instead. 11:13b also contrasts with 11:13a in being hostile to Dž-lù, who, because of his martial forwardness, will not die his fated, natural death (this common phrase occurs in the later DDJ 42), but end violently. This expands the subtle 11:13a characterization of Dž-lù, making it explicit that Confucius thinks him rash. DJ (sv Aī 15 = 0480; Legge **Ch’un** 843b) narrates the violent end of Dž-lù, where he dies sword in hand, defending the Wèi Prince, and Confucius on hearing of it makes a remark similar to 11:13b. That does not mean that the story existed at this time; 11:13b is a step *leading to* the story. The truth of the matter (implied by Dzṽngdž’s apparently having known him) is that Dž-lù died after Confucius (SJ, amusingly, preserves *both* versions in different chapters). Such romanticizing of the past (as in the DJ) shows that a psychological watershed has been reached. As of LY 11, the feudal past *is in fact the past*.

┌ 11:14. The men of Lǚ were going to undertake work on the Long Treasury. Mǐn Dž-chyēn said, How would it be to keep to the old lines? What need is there to build it anew? The Master said, That man does not talk, but when he *does* talk, he is sure to hit the mark. [11:14]

Note the contrastive “*does*” (“He does not talk much, but when exceptionally he talks . . .”), with its disapproval of glibness. The issue is whether to repair the building on its old foundation, retaining its feudal function, or enlarge it, recognizing the need of a salary-based bureaucracy for more grain storage. Confucius does not want the new *social* basis *architecturally* acknowledged.

└ 11:15. The Master said, Yóu’s psaltery: what is it doing at Chyōu’s gate? The school then ceased to respect Dž-lù. The Master said, Yóu has ascended to the hall, but not yet entered into the chamber. [11:14]

A severe remark is mitigated by a milder one. The narrative transition “The school then . . .” links what would otherwise be two separate sayings. We may note the grand house of Confucius, with its public hall (táng 堂) and private chamber (shì 室). The many-string plastery (sè 瑟) with its long horizontal sounding board, is held on the lap of the seated player. The musical prowess here attributed to the disciples implies greatly increased leisure in 04c culture.

┌ 11:16. Dž-gùng asked, Of Shī and Shāng, which is worthier? The Master said, Shī goes too far, Shāng does not go far enough. He said, If so, then Shī is better, is he not? The Master said, To go too far is as bad as not to go far enough. [11:15]

We here take up Shī (Dž-jāng) and Shāng (Dž-syà). The latter, praised in 11:3, is here censured (notice *yóu* 猶 “as bad as,” versus *rú* 如 “as good as”). 11:16 rests on a new idea: deeds are mapped on a line between too much and too little, with *the right amount in the middle*. This is puzzling to those with the 6:12 idea of a line running from not enough to enough, where *more is better*. The contrast is between perfection in meeting an ideal, and an equilibrium between imperfect extremes. The former suits the feudal obligation culture (can one ever be brave or faithful enough?); the latter better fits the postfeudal compromise culture, with its more diverse society. The idea of an ethical mean was developed in the 03c text Jūng Yūng. This and 11:21 are the first Analects instances of *rán dzú* 然則 “if so, then,” signaling a stage in the development of propositional logic. The earliest Mician cases are in MZ 8 (Mei **Ethical** 30 “therefore,” 31–32 “hence”), contemporary with LY 11. Near approaches to a *two-step* argument are 16:1 (c0285, “if all is thus”) and 17:13 (c0270); for the Sywǎndzian multi-step or chain argument, see the interpolated *13:3¹⁹ (c0253).

└ 11:17. The Jì were wealthier than Jōu-gūng, but Chyóu collected and gathered for them, and still further enriched them. The Master said, He is not my follower. Little ones, you may sound the drum and denounce him. [11:16].

The dislike of acquired wealth (compare the contempt of the British clergy for trade; Maugham **Cakes** 103) is a feudal survival; the act of public dissociation implies the existence of *a public*, and thus more directly attests the new society (for the tradition implied by the drum, see Arbuckle **Metaphor**); the almost contemporary MZ 18 (Mei **Ethical** 106) quotes proverbial sayings as ethical authorities. For Rǎn Chyóu’s association with the Jì, see 6:8. 11:17, which Mencius would have known as a student in Lǔ, is expanded in MC 4A15.

┌ 11:18a. Chái is stupid, Shǔm is dull, Shī is vulgar, Yóu is commonplace. [11:17]

Those here disparaged are Gāu Chái, Dzǔngdž, Dž-jāng, and Dž-lù. Chái’s only other Analects appearance is in 11:23; he is probably not invented (see page 294), but he is unreported in earlier chapters. Dzǔngdž is the great figure of 05c Confucianism; to ridicule him is to reject the whole drift of the 05c school. Dž-jāng is positively treated in the 05c but, like Dzǔngdž, is criticized here and excluded from 11:3. Dž-lù is currently undergoing image evolution.

└ 11:18b. The Master said, Hwéi is almost there, is he not? He is often empty. Sž does not accept his fate, and has traded to advantage. If we reckon up his results, then he is often on the mark. [11:18]

Hwéi’s “empty” (*kūng* 空) rhymes with Dž-gùng’s “on the mark” (*jūng* 中; the verbal “hit the mark” is read *jūng*). For “empty” as a metaphor of meditation, see 8:5n. From about this date, a meditation group seems to have existed in Lǔ. The group’s text was the Dàu/Dǔ Jīng (DDJ), whose oldest chapter, DDJ 14 (LaFargue **Tao** 422–423), expresses the mysteriousness of the meditative vision. Dž-gùng’s wealth through trade is a sign of the newly commercial times.

Hwéi accepts poverty, turning inward to emptiness; Dž-gùng rebels, turning outward to commerce. Hwéi meditates; Sž calculates. Both succeed.

[D. Self-Cultivation]

┌ 11:19a. Dž-jāng asked about the Way of the Good. The Master said, If you don't tread in the tracks, you cannot enter into the chamber. [11:19]

The "Way of the Good" (shàn-rǎn 善人; compare the harbinger 7:26b) is here almost certainly the Mician Way, which in the populist and meritocratic 04c was gaining ground as a public philosophy. Its rejection here (compare the tolerance of 9:24) implies that it was now successful enough to count as a rival.

└ 11:19b. The Master said, If his talk is sound, he is all right, is he not? But is he a gentleman, or is he one of impressive appearance? [11:20]

Just as there are two roads to virtue in 11:19a, one of them leading wrong, so there are two kinds of impressive talkers, one of them false. There may again be an allusion to the Micians, with their interest in rhetoric and argument.

└ 11:21. The Master was alarmed in Kwáng. Yén Ywān fell behind. The Master said, I thought you were dead. He said, While the Master is alive, how dare Hwéi die? [11:22]

Invented (after 9:5) or not, this is very sweet. It may be here to conclude the section with positive advice: the proper course is following Confucius all one's life, and thus having a duty to prolong one's life so as to continue learning. What this adds to the devotion of 9:11, keeping it vivid after 2,400 years, is the personal affection (typical of emerging 04c individualism) which it implies.

[E. Envoi: Final Denunciations]

┌ 11:22. Jì Dž-rán asked, Can Jùng-yóu and Rǎn Chyóu be called great ministers? The Master said, I thought you were going to put some unusual question, but it is only a question about Yóu and Chyóu. Those whom one calls great ministers serve their ruler according to the Way, and when they can do so no longer, they stop. Now, as for Yóu and Chyóu, they are utility ministers. He said, If so, then they would just go along with him? The Master said, If it came to killing father or ruler, even they would not go along. [11:23]

Greatness lies not in obedience, but in integrity, having things *you will not do*. Yóu and Chyóu have their limits, but limits located far north of where a principled minister would draw them. For the idiom "if so" see 11:16n.

└ 11:23. Dž-lù got Dž-gāu employed as Steward of Bì. The Master said, You are making a thief out of another man's son. Dž-lù said, The people are involved, the altars of grain and the soil are involved; why must one qualify as learned only after reading books? The Master said, It is for just this reason that I hate glibness. [11:24]

Bì was the stronghold of the Jì family, once the villains of Lǚ politics. Some of that emblematic value lingers here (and in 11:7, where Confucius does not recommend any *living* disciple to Jì Kāngdž). The other issue is the readiness of Dž-gāu (Gāu Cháu) for office, without which he is a thief of office. Dž-lù relies on the principle of 6:8 and 6:22, that low-level ability is enough to hold office; Confucius, irked, reiterates his disapproval of glibness from 5:5 and 5:8. It is a sign of the times that the *higher* qualification for office, which in 6:22 was rǎn (imitation leading to self-improvement), is now literal book learning.

Interpolations

The school's hostile attitude toward its 05c disciple century (see 11:8–11) is manifest in this chapter, and to its period we also date some doctrinal revisions interpolated in earlier chapters, notably the notorious crux *9:1. The LY 11 concentration on disciples makes it plausible that disciple-anecdote passages added to LY 10 (and possibly also the Confucius-anecdote ones in LY 10) are of about this date. All are appended below.

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

Added to LY 5

*5:7. The Master said, The Way does not progress; I shall board a raft and drift out to sea. The one who would follow me would be Yóu, would it not? Dž-lù heard of this, and was delighted. The Master said, Yóu loves daring more than I do. I don't have any material that I can use. [5:6]

This is on a par with the LY 11 use of narrative transition (11:15) and its image of rash Dž-lù (11:13a; compare *7:11¹⁴, from c0310). Dž-lù's love of daring disqualifies him as "material" for what the Master is trying to build, namely his movement (Leys **Analects** 138f proposes, and Huang **Analects** 73 rejects, the idea that the "material" is for the raft; this literary non sequitur ignores the affinity of *5:7 with other Analects criticisms of Dž-lù, and its sarcastic tone).

For intimations of wealth and trade, and foreign contacts, see 11:17–18b (Dž-gùng in 11:18b is traditionally associated with Chí). The wealth of Chí in this period rested in part on its seacoast salt monopoly. It seems that Lǚ, in CC times cut off from it by various warlike peoples, had now also reached the sea. Coastal sailing rafts would have allowed a heavier trade with the Yángdž delta than the old route by skiff, drifting down, and rowing back up, the Sž River.

*5:14. When Dž-lù heard something, and had not yet been able to put it into practice, his only fear was that he might hear something else. [5:13]

This comically highlights Dž-lù's intense energy and narrowness of focus: the acceptance of one task shuts him off from awareness of any other. This explains the *5:7¹¹ criticism that he is "not the right material" for the 04c Confucius. His bravery is too risky, and his intellectual grasp is too linear, for the new age.

*5:22. The Master was in Ch'vń, and said, Should we go back? Should we go back? The little ones of our group are running wild; they are producing all that elegance, but don't know what to cut out of it. [5:21]

The image is of fine figured silk being woven without knowledge of what clothes it is to be tailored into. It apparently refers to the ritual expertise of the younger disciples (11:1), which, with the Master himself away (compare 11:2), they are unable to apply to the proper purpose.

Trade with the steppe was important at this time, such objects as bronzes in the hunting style being produced specifically for export (So **Traders** 58, 69; for the currency used in the Lǚ trading bloc, see Li **Eastern** 387–393). The steppe peoples hunted on horseback, and the astride position required tailored clothes, rather than Chinese-style robes. The implication of the metaphor is that Lǚ, like Chí and Yēn, was engaged in this export industry.

Added to LY 6

*6:15. The Master said, M̀ng Jī-fǎn did not brag. When they fled, he served as the rear guard. When they were about to enter the gate, he whipped up his horses, and said, It is not that I dared to remain behind; my horses would not go forward. [6:13]

This battle was fought with an invading Chí force outside the Lǚ capital in 0484. According to the later and more consecutive narrative in the DJ (Aī 11, Legge **Ch'un** 824–825), another squad in the same retreating army lost their lives in this sort of rearguard duty. The immediate ethical point is the chivalric code of modesty, a somewhat romanticized view of Spring and Autumn times which is also developed in the DJ. The old code required selfless courage, which in a ritually modest form (approaching self-denial) is here approved of. Compare the disapproval of conspicuous courage in *5:7, above.

*6:17. The Master said, Who can go out but by the door? Why is it that no one follows this Way? [6:15]

Analogous to *5:7, above, in despairing that none follow the Master's Way. In the original 6:12, Rǎn Chyóu (who also figures in the battle of 0484; see above) gives an excuse for not following the Master's Way, but this failure is wider. It may relate to an LY 11 claim that Confucius's Way was lost in his own time, and only revived in the Kǔng century.

Added to LY 9

*9:1. The Master seldom spoke of profit and fate and r̀n. [9:1]

A large exegetic literature has grown up around this problematic saying (see Bodde **Perplexing**, Laufer **Lun Yü**, Chan **Jen** 296–297, Chan **Source** 34–35, Malmqvist **What**, Bodde **Introduction** 27–29, and Boltz **Word**) which seeks to neutralize its outrageous claim by giving the “and” (yǔ 與) a meaning that will separate the often-mentioned virtue r̀n from one or both of the others. The accretional theory of the text obviates such ingenuity by noting that r̀n is common in the 05c layers but *vanishes from LY 10–11*. *9:1 thus says what it *seems* to say (as most translators have held from Legge 1892 through Soothill 1911, Wilhelm 1921, Waley 1938, Lau 1983, Dawson 1993, and Leys 1997, along with commentators from Lyóu 1866 to Nán 1990), and is an attempt by the LY 11 people (for whom r̀n was obsolete) to protect their lǐ-based theory of Confucianism by denying the r̀n basis of the original school.

Added to LY 10

*10:9. When he is sending someone to make inquiries in another country, he bows twice in sending them on their way. [10:11a]

A bit of diplomatic courtesy is here appropriated to Confucius, implying private contacts between Confucians in, say, Lǚ and Chí (which did exist; see LY 12).

*10:10. When Kāngdǔ bestowed a gift of medicine, he bowed in receiving it. He said, Chyóu is not versed in these matters, and does not dare to take it. [10:11b]

He does not decline the Jī-clan gift, which would be disrespectful, but he also does not take (“taste,” cháng 嘗) the medicine, which might be imprudent.

*10:11. The stables burned down. When the Master returned from court, he said, Did it injure anyone? He did not ask about the horses. [10:12]

The stables of Lǚ (see Shī 297; Waley **Songs** #252) bred horses for the state's military expansion program. The refusal to ask about the horses is always taken as showing Confucius's human focus; in SSSY 24:11 (Mather **Yü** 396), the phrase has simply entered the language, and is used to excuse the ignorance of a cavalry officer. *10:11 in its own time was probably antimilitary, typical of Kǔng Confucianism but at odds with the code of warrior comradeship (rǔn). The negative image of Dž-lù is probably a Kǔng satire on the military virtues.

*10:20. At an expression, it rose up; it soared and then flocked. [10:18a]

Apparently describing a bird, and probably associated with the next.

*10:21. He said, Pheasant on the mountain ridge / Timely indeed, timely indeed. Dž-lù clasped his hands to it. It sniffed thrice and arose. [10:18b]

Bamboo slips at the ends of rolls are liable to breaking, and these two passages seem to be fragments of an anecdote about Dž-lù and a bird, perhaps, with Waley **Analects** 152n1, an allegory of the Jì clan's offer of reconciliation with Confucius (see *10:10 above). Clasp one's own hands and bowing is a gesture of respectful recognition, analogous to Western handshaking.

Reflections

LY 11 and its interpolations give us an idea of early Kǔng Confucianism. It continued to exaggerate Confucius's rank and influence in the state. Though concerned with ritual, it did not equate ritual propriety with political virtue; the relation between them is discussed in the chapter. It had distanced itself from the military tone of original Confucianism (Dž-lù is the chief symbol of the old values), including the obsolete rǔn, which it sought, by inserting *9:1, to negate in the 05c part of the text. It was not concerned with Lǚ legitimacy, but had a theory of school legitimacy, in which the 05c disciple heads were an aberration within a clan succession. They were especially hostile to Dzǔngdž, the most important disciple head. The revisionist 11:3–4 pantheon of disciples and their accomplishments deeply influenced all later Confucian tradition.

LY 11 deprecates economic progress (the 11:18b praise of Dž-gùng's enterprise is surely not the equal of its praise of Yén Hwér's inner success), from the export silk trade to the leisure craft of medicine (*10:10). Markets, first mentioned in 10:6c, imply not merely urbanization but urban consumerism. Readers may list the items that LY 10–11 show were available in such markets, and ponder the degree of social specialization which they imply.

Even more than trade, LY 11 opposes the military revolution which had abandoned the limited warfare of the old elite chariot host for the inclusive war of mass armies. A parallel protest against the disruptions of the new warfare was made by the Micians, whose first preserved tract (MZ 17, probably by the movement founder Mwò Dí) is the first of three against war. It is thus quite on schedule that this new movement is reflected, and opposed as a rival, in 11:19a.

The observation in 11:13bn is more widely applicable: in mediaeval sacred paintings, the members of the Holy Family are depicted wearing contemporary (mediaeval) clothing; Renaissance treatments aim instead at historic authenticity. There comes a moment when the past is suddenly recognized *as being the past*.

Jade Figure of a Dancer (see LY 3:1)
Height 9.7 cm (3.82 in). 03c. Courtesy Freer Gallery of Art (30.43)