

## Appendix 4 Confucius and His Circle

We here attempt<sup>1</sup> to derive, from the earliest Analects and compatible sources, a picture of Confucius, his ancestors, his disciples, and his Kǔng-family successors.

### Confucius's Dates

**Death.** The earliest statement of the date of Confucius's death (a jǐ/chǒu 己丑 day, #26 in the 60-day calendrical cycle, in the 4th month of Aī-gūng's 16th year of reign, 0479) is found in the part of the Dzwǒ Jwàn (DJ) which extends beyond the cutoff date of 0481 observed by the Gūngyáng (GYJ) and Gūlyáng (GLJ) texts.<sup>2</sup> It has been challenged by Maspero, but his proposed date of a generation later, or c0454, raises new problems,<sup>3</sup> and the old ones it addresses can be solved in other ways. Thus, the reference to Aī-gūng (d 0469) by his posthumous title in LY 6 does not mean that *Confucius* lived past 0469, merely that *this chapter* was written after 0469. Again, the SJ 47 list of Confucius's descendants is too short (at 25 years per birth generation) to reach from a datable Chín figure<sup>4</sup> back to Confucius, but this is unproblematic if, as LY 8 implies, there had been a preceding period of disciple headship. There is no competing tradition, early or late, and the death date in DJ is compatible with all indications in the earliest Analects. We thus accept it.

**Birth.**<sup>5</sup> The version of CC associated with DJ (no *independent* CC text exists) has no entry for the birth of Confucius, or for anyone not a son of the Lǔ Prince. Birth entries exist under 0552 (21st year of Syāng-gūng) in the CC associated with the GYJ and GLJ commentaries. The former runs: 十有一月、庚子、孔子生 “in the 11th month, on the day gǔng/dǐ (#37 of the 60-day cycle), Master Kǔng was born.” The GLJ entry is identical except that it omits the month, thus implicitly dating the birth to the 10th month, the last mentioned in earlier CC entries. The first day of the 9th month in both texts (recorded in connection with a solar eclipse) is gǔng/syè 庚戌 (cycle #47); that of the 10th month, another solar eclipse, is gǔng/chǔn 庚辰 (#17), 30 days later. Then a gǔng/dǐ day (cycle #37) *could have occurred* 20 days after the second eclipse, in the 10th month, or 60 days after that, in the 12th month, but a gǔng/dǐ day in the 11th month is *arithmetically impossible*. It would seem that, with Dubs,<sup>6</sup> we should simply ignore GYJ, and adopt GLJ.

<sup>1</sup>This summary is abridged from the fuller treatment in Brooks **Life**.

<sup>2</sup>It is repeated at SJ 15 (2/680; year only) and SJ 47 (4/1945; Yang **Records** 26).

<sup>3</sup>Maspero **Antique** 376n1 / **Antiquity** 449n1, Waley **Analects** 16n2, 79, and Riegel **Review** 791. There is no evidence that Confucius lived, let alone spent his last 14 years, under Lǔ Dàu-gūng (r 0468–0432). See further Creel **Confucius** 296–297.

<sup>4</sup>Confucius's son Bwó-yǔ predeceased him (LY 11:8); his presumptive successor is Dǐ-sǐ, next on the SJ 47 list. But six generations after *him* is Kūng Fù. Fù died in 0208, the end of the reign of the rebel Chǔn Shǔ, at the stated age of 57. This implies a c0265 birthdate. If Dǐ-sǐ was born 150 years earlier (6 birth generations, at 25 years), or c0415, then he *cannot have been* the son of Bwó-yǔ, who had died at least 65 years earlier.

<sup>5</sup>Readers not caring to follow the detailed birthdate argument may skip to page 267.

<sup>6</sup>Dubs **Date** 146.

But there are difficulties. (1) By scholarly consensus GYJ is earlier than GLY,<sup>7</sup> thus GYJ is not garbling an earlier *correct* entry; instead, GLJ is rationalizing an earlier *absurd* entry. (2) The absurdity in GYJ is its specification of “11th month,” despite the resulting inconsistency. It is not a slip of the brush, but intentional. What was the intent? (3) The 10th-month eclipse entry is itself spurious: no eclipse occurred on or near that date<sup>8</sup> (in general, successive-month eclipses *are not visible* from a single location).<sup>9</sup> This suggests that the second eclipse entry was an addition, made to honor the month of Confucius’s birth. Such supernatural conjunctions are intrinsically suspect. (4) The *Shǐ Jì* follows the *historiography* of GYJ,<sup>10</sup> yet SJ 47, the chapter on Confucius, *does not give* the GYJ birthdate; just the year Syāng 22 (0551). Since no month or day is given, this cannot be based on a ritual record. GLJ did not yet exist. Both SJ compilers were court astronomers, and would have recognized the absurdity of GYJ. In this dilemma, the material used for SJ 47, some of it at least probably assembled by Sǒmǎ Tán, a student of the Yì, may have abandoned GYJ and substituted the birthdate 0551, which allows a numerologically significant age of 72 at death, a datum which, as we shall see below, is associated with the entry of the originally heterodox Yì tradition into Confucianism.

**The CC Eclipses.** It would then seem that when Sǒmǎ Chyēn in c0107 wrote up the SJ 47 chapter on Confucius,<sup>11</sup> he had before him only the GYJ birth record (0552), flawed because of its calendrical absurdity, and Tán’s 0551, which he adopted, though calculating Confucius’s age at death as 73 rather than 72. No other pre-SJ source for Confucius’s birthdate is known to exist. If there *is* a birth record, it then presumably lies behind GYJ, distorted by its association with a false eclipse. To determine the nature of the distortion, we here consider CC eclipses in general. They are reliable,<sup>12</sup> recording eclipses on days when modern astronomy says they occurred. Not all visible eclipses are recorded,<sup>13</sup> but those recorded were visible.

The exceptions are four entries for which no plausible eclipses exist, and which therefore can only be invented.<sup>14</sup> These are:

CC Year	Intl Yr	Mo	Cyclical Day	Notable Coincidence
Syī 15	0645	05	[none given]	nothing
Sywān 17	0592	06	癸卯 (#40)	nothing
Syāng 21	0552	10	庚辰 (#17)	month before Confucius’s birth
Syāng 24	0549	08	癸巳 (#30)	nothing

<sup>7</sup>Pokora **Pre-Han** 26. GYJ was the text of the 02c Hàn Modernizers, while GLJ was the text of the 01c Reformists, who were dominant from c070 on (Loewe **Crisis** 11–13).

<sup>8</sup>Stephenson **Atlas** xv, noting, in all, *four* impossible CC eclipses (see further below).

<sup>9</sup>Dubs **Date** 142.

<sup>10</sup>Watson **Ssu-ma** 78f; note the connection with Dǔng Jùng-shū (84).

<sup>11</sup>Brooks **Shǐ Jì** 10. For Tán’s pro-Dàuist tract of c0138, see Watson **Ssu-ma** 43–48.

<sup>12</sup>The recent Stephenson **Atlas** shows closer agreement than Chalmers **Appendix**.

<sup>13</sup>Some of the omissions may have political implications; see further in Brooks **Life**.

<sup>14</sup>Stephenson and Chalmers, despite small differences in their calculations, agree that these are problematic. Dubs **Date** 142 explains one as due to a good-faith copying error; Stephenson **Atlas** xv attributes all four to “false sightings or possibly abortive predictions.” Given the general accuracy of the CC, these courteous conjectures fail to convince.

It is likely that these are not *four separate and independent plans* to tamper with the CC eclipses, but have a single agenda. The agenda with which the third is clearly involved is the highlighting of Confucius's birth. Thus the others probably relate to other members of his lineage. The second is 40 years (a long generation?) before the third; the first is 53 years (two normal generations) before the second. A plausible hypothesis for these three eclipses is then that they were added to the CC to highlight the births of Confucius's great-grandfather, his father, and himself.

**Plausibility.** Apart from omitting Confucius's grandfather, it may be objected that this theory claims that false eclipses *celebrate* the births of Confucius and his forebears, whereas eclipses are *bad omens* in the CC and in Hàn portentology.<sup>15</sup> This may make it unlikely that the false entries were made by court astronomers. But the calendrical absurdity of GYJ already implies the hand of an amateur. When did amateurs have access to the CC? The CC had been in non-court hands since at least the compilation of the DJ in Chí, in c0312, and the DJ-associated CC indeed contains all four false eclipses. However, presumably in line with its general Chí strategy of downplaying the Lǚ sage Confucius, there is nothing in the DJ about his birth. That is, the false eclipses are *in* the CC, but they are *symbolically inactive* – no narrative use is made of them. This suggests that they were present in the version of CC that was brought to Chí from Lǚ, and were made earlier by Lǚ Confucians. The obvious candidate among Lǚ Confucians is the Analects school. As will be argued in detail below, it had since c0400 been led by a hereditary series of Kǔng descendants of Confucius. As LY 11:3 shows, in c0360 the Kǔngs were actively concerned to revise and re-establish the tradition of the disciples. It would be consistent for the calendrically inexpert Kǔngs to have added entries to their CC, to honor the births of Confucius and his Lǚ ancestors.

The DJ compilers presumably knew the Kǔng lore of Confucius's birth, and toned it down as part of a policy not to emphasize Lǚ connections in addressing a Chí royal audience. But knowledge of that lore may easily have persisted in Chí, and it is to Chí that the GYJ in particular traced its tradition of interpretation.<sup>16</sup> There is thus a possible link between the Kǔng Analects school, the false eclipses in the DJ text of CC, and the GYJ school of CC interpretation in Hàn. The false CC *birth entry* for Confucius may have been present in the Chí text of CC used by the DJ compilers (and excised by them for diplomatic reasons), or it may have been added by those who possessed that copy after c0312. Either possibility will serve.

**The Kǔng Interpolation Theory.** It is then to the Kǔng family that we would look for a tradition glorifying Confucius and his Lǚ ancestors. According to family tradition as preserved in KZJY, it was Confucius's great-grandfather, a refugee from Sùng, who established the Kǔng line in Lǚ. Our theory is then that the CC false eclipses were added to the CC by the Kǔngs of Lǚ, in their copy of the CC, sometime around the middle of the 04c.

<sup>15</sup>For traditional versions of this objection, see Legge **Ch'un** 492.

<sup>16</sup>SJ 121, written in c060 after Szmǎ Chyēn's death, mentions a Master Húwú 胡毋 of Chí as a CC expert in the time of Hàn Jǐng-dì (r 0156–0141). The GYJ tradition as stated by Hú Syōu 何休 (123–182) is that Húwú was a pupil of one Gūngyáng; still later tradition gives a *whole line* of Gūngyáng transmitters, reaching back to Dž-syà. The evidence suggests that *what later became* the GYJ tradition was in Jǐng-dì's time an undifferentiated CC tradition, which had been handed down in Chí rather than in Lǚ.

We may note, with Dubs, the fact that the CC birth entry for Confucius is in the month *after* an eclipse, even though insistence on this fact is what produces the famous GYJ absurdity. This must have been how the relation of birth to eclipse was remembered in the family. Though the *onset* of an eclipse was baleful (the one in the 6th month of 0612 was met, according to the CC, with drums and sacrifices),<sup>17</sup> an individual might well take pride in being born just *after* one.<sup>18</sup> If Confucius's grandfather lacks such a record, the likely reason is that he was *actually born* in the month after an eclipse, so that no interpolated eclipse was necessary. This model<sup>19</sup> was then generalized to other Lǔ Kǔngs, Confucius's birth being further honored by having a *second* eclipse added in the *same* month. For the grandfather's eclipse, there are two options, the likelier being the one in 0612: it was conspicuous in Lǔ, and suggests a later age at marriage (the 33rd rather than 18th year) for Confucius's great-grandfather, consistent with typical military-family career patterns.<sup>20</sup>

The fourth false eclipse in 0549, three years after the third, cannot be a later generation. It is more likely a shadow entry for Confucius himself: an original location from which the present birth entry has been moved, leaving the spurious eclipse entry in place. It is generally assumed by students of this problem that Confucius's age at death is mythically linked with the claimed number of his disciples. A slight increase *in the number of claimed disciples* could then have led to a backward adjustment in his birthdate. It will be argued below that the relevant change is from a claimed 70 disciples (the old tradition, known to Mencius when he left Lǔ in c0321 and retained in the writings of his school, MC 2A3 and 4B31) to 72 (the new one, claimed in the title of the Kǔng family disciple list in KZJY 38). The adjustment is imperfect: Confucius was 70 at his death, agreeing with the Mencian tradition, if born in the year of the fourth false eclipse, but 73 (not 72) if born in the year of the third. Presumably the real 0552 eclipse was the best available (there was no eclipse in 0551) as a peg on which to hang the false eclipse.

**Conclusion.** Moving the birth entry to the month after *two* eclipses in 0549 still leaves a problem: the genuine 0549 eclipse was on the 1st day of the 7th month (jyǎ/dǔ 甲子, cycle #01) and the spurious one on the 1st day of the 8th month (gwěi/sǔ 癸巳, cycle #30). The interpolated birth entry would then have specified a gǔng/dǔ 庚子 day, cycle #37, *in the 9th month*; again an impossibility. The real month must have been the 2nd, 4th, 6th, 8th, 10th, or 12th. Surviving tradition seems to favor the 8th month.<sup>21</sup> If so, Confucius, like his grandfather, really *was* born in the month after an eclipse, a coincidence that invited mythic elaboration. We conclude that Confucius was born on a gǔng/dǔ day in the 8th month of 0549.

<sup>17</sup>Legge **Ch'un** 270.

<sup>18</sup>Old men in Ohio have been known to brag that they were born in the year of an especially hard winter. Compare also 19:21n, above; the operative point may be that the period *after* an eclipse or other disaster can function as a rebirth or revitalization symbol.

<sup>19</sup>Possibly reinforced, it will presently appear, by a similar pattern at Confucius's birth.

<sup>20</sup>The other eclipse is 0626 (Wǔn 1). The average age at marriage of 18 of Churchill's WW2 generals was 36 years (data from Keegan **Generals**). War is a jealous mistress.

<sup>21</sup>Sacrifices at the Confucian temple in Lǔ were in the 2nd and 8th months (Legge **Analects** Prolegomena 91); the rationale is that by the Syà calendar (recommended in LY \*15:11<sup>15a</sup>), the equivalent to the CC date is the 8th month, 27th day. The Republic proclaimed the 27th of the 8th *Western* month (August) as the birth month of Confucius.

## Confucius's Ancestors

KZJY 39 gives a series of notable ancestors in Sùng, and a series of less eminent Lǚ-connected ones. The former, intrinsically suspect as a mythic elaboration, are already referred to (under the year 0535)<sup>22</sup> in the DJ of 0312. We may here consider the more plausible traditions concerning the later, or Lǚ, ancestors. The KZJY 39 account seems to be the earliest; some of its details are also present, if undeveloped, in the DJ, and it is embroidered, not always in a friendly sense, in SJ 47.<sup>23</sup>

**Great-Grandfather.** By the eclipse hypothesis, Kǔng Fáng-shú 防叔 of Sùng was born in the 6th month of 0645 (Syī 15), married not later than the middle of 0613, and produced a son in the 7th month of 0612. We may now test this guess by comparing it with the sound parts of the remaining evidence.<sup>24</sup> KZJY 39 says that Fáng-shú “fled to Lǚ to avoid the Hwà 華 disaster.” From the CC we may identify Hwà as Hwà Ywǎn 華元, who figured in Sùng affairs in the late 07c and early 06c. Several crises stand out in his career, but given Fáng-shú’s name (fáng 防 means “defend”), and the military exploits of his grandson, Confucius’s father, the relevant one is a battle with Jvng in the 2nd month of 0607, in which Hwà Ywǎn, the leader, was captured and later ransomed; blame for this defeat is in the DJ ascribed to a resentful charioteer, a typical DJ narrative topos, but may in fact have rested on his subordinate commanders, giving them a motive to seek refuge in Lǚ.<sup>25</sup> Fáng-shú would have been in his 38th year at the time of the battle; a plausible age for responsible command. No deeds are recorded for Fáng-shú in Lǚ, and it is possible that he was denied a position to avoid offending Hwà Ywǎn,<sup>26</sup> who was prominent in Sùng down to 0576<sup>27</sup> and made diplomatic visits to Lǚ in 0587 and 0583.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>22</sup>Legge **Ch’un** 618bf. If born in the 8th month of 0549, Confucius would in 0535 have just begun his 15th year, the point at which (by LY 2:4) he had “determined upon study.” It is just possible that the placement of this DJ story confirms the 0549 birthdate.

<sup>23</sup>Ariel **K’ung** 65–69 considers KZJY a forgery, but it and the forged Kǔng Tsungdž (KTZ) relate differently to Wáng Sù (195–256). KZJY is annotated by Wáng (which would tend to exculpate him; Graham **Reflections** 283); KTZ is not. KTZ reinterprets Gǔngsūn Lǔng; KZJY does not. Ariel’s data (and Kramers **K’ung**, and the fact that the life spans of Kǔng successors are less plausible in KTZ) make sense if Wáng *annotated* KZJY, but he or his daughter later *wrote* KTZ; see Kramers **Chia Yü**. In any case, KZJY (present text 44 chapters) has expanded beyond its HS 30 (27 chapter) form; it needs to be evaluated chapter by chapter, not as an integral work. On KZJY 38, see further below.

<sup>24</sup>“Guess” and “plausible” are standard heuristic in mathematics (Polya **Induction** v), physics (Feynman **Law** 143), and biology (Beveridge **Art** 46; PB 63).

<sup>25</sup>CC sv Sywǎn 2 and the associated DJ expansion; Legge **Ch’un** 289, which notes that the supposed architect of defeat, Hwà Ywǎn’s resentful charioteer Yang Jvñ 羊斟, fled to Lǚ after confronting the ransomed and returned Hwà Ywǎn.

<sup>26</sup>The protocol is that the state of refuge may harbor the individual, but cannot show him conspicuous favor in the presence of ranking representatives of the state of origin.

<sup>27</sup>CC sv Chvng 15 (Legge **Ch’un** 387–389). Hwà Ywǎn’s insistence (in the DJ story) that he would return from Jin to Sùng only if given the right to punish the leaders of the other side bespeaks a vindictive nature, and sheds further light on this supposition.

<sup>28</sup>CC sv Chvng 4 (Legge **Ch’un** 354) and Chvng 8 (Legge **Ch’un** 366, 367a). The purpose of the former visit is not stated; the latter was to arrange a marriage between the son of the Prince of Sùng and the eldest daughter of the Prince of Lǚ. The Lǚ court would have gone out of its way to avoid offending the Sùng envoy on the latter occasion.

**Grandfather.** By hypothesis, Kǔng Bwó-syà 伯夏 was born in Sùng in the 7th month of 0612. His name alludes to the dynasty supposed to have preceded the Shāng, whose traditions were kept in Sùng; compare the personal (Shāng 商) and formal (Dž-syà 子夏) names of Confucius’s disciple. He would have been in his 5th year when the family fled to Lǔ in 0607. Nothing is recorded for him in Lǔ, due perhaps to the enmity of Hwà Ywǎn, whose prominence in Sùng extended to 0576, when Bwó-syà would have been already 36, too late to be launching a career.

**Father.** By hypothesis, he was born in the 6th month of 0592, and was thus 16 in 0576, when Hwà Ywǎn’s continuing prominence in Sùng still boded ill for his career prospects as a scion of the Lǔ Kǔngs. It has been too little noted<sup>29</sup> that Confucius’s father, Shú or Shúlyáng Hỳ 叔梁紇, *did not bear* the Kǔng surname. Also, by LY 3:15, Confucius was the “son of a man from Dzōu 鄒,” south of the Lǔ capital, whereas his Kǔng ancestors had settled in Fāng-shān 防山, eastward of it.<sup>30</sup> This looks like an intentional renunciation of the family surname and a seeking of new fortunes in Dzōu. According to the DJ, in the 5th month of 0563, Dzōu Hỳ (“Hỳ from Dzōu”) held up the portcullis at the small southern fortress of Bì-yáng while his Lǔ comrades escaped.<sup>31</sup> By our hypothesis, Hỳ was then in his 29th year. This seems late for an exploit of sheer strength, but is consistent with career profiles of modern weight lifters.<sup>32</sup> In the autumn of 0556, Chí besieged Táu, northwest of the Lǔ capital, while a second Chí force attacked Dzàng Hỳ in Fáng, to the east; Dzōu Shú Hỳ (“Shú Hỳ of Dzōu”) and two others led a party of 300 in an attack to extricate Dzàng Hỳ from Fáng.<sup>33</sup> Autumn means the 7th month or later, so Hỳ was now 37, being just *past* his birthday in that year. This is a plausible age at which to have advanced in a career to the point of commanding a task force on a mission within a campaign.<sup>34</sup> The new surname Shú may imply patronage by the Shú clan, one of whom was the chief minister in Lǔ at this period, following the first exploit.

<sup>29</sup>An exception is Kennedy **Butterfly** 318. Creel’s claim (**Confucius** 297–298n3–4) that Shúlyáng Hỳ has nothing to do with Confucius is unconvincing. The fact that in his appearances in the DJ he is not identified as Confucius’s father is not decisive: Yǒu Rwò, on his one DJ appearance, is not identified as a future disciple of Confucius either, though DJ often makes, for civilians as well as rulers, predictions of future achievements.

<sup>30</sup>Implicit in KZJY 39; more overt in SJ 47 (4/1906, Yang **Records** 1) as the place where Shúlyáng Hỳ was buried; the SJ commentary locates it 25 leagues (8 miles) east of the capital Chyw-fù, not unreachable from, but not adjacent to, Dzōu, which is some 45 leagues (15 miles) *south* of the capital, a total journey of perhaps 35 actual road miles.

<sup>31</sup>CC sv Syāng 10 (Legge **Ch’un** 445–446). The allied attack was led by Jīn; the Lǔ party was commanded by a member of the Mǔng clan. Entry to the gate of Bì-yáng was gained by a ruse involving a cart, which, once admitted, was followed by concealed shock troops. It is this raiding party which Hỳ’s feat of strength saved from capture.

<sup>32</sup>Body mass is required for these feats. Best performances of weight lifters come late, eg John Davis, career 1938–1952, best lift 1951, aged 30. Averaging four careers (Davis, Tommy Kono, Vasily Alexeyev, David Rigert, but excluding the exceptional Norbert Schemansky, 1948–1964, best 1961 at 37 years 10 months) gives an average peak age of 30 years 3 months. Hỳ was 28 years 11 months by Western count at the time of his lift.

<sup>33</sup>CC sv Syāng 17 (Legge **Ch’un** 474). The two co-commanders were named Dzàng.

<sup>34</sup>Orde Wingate was, by Chinese reckoning, in his 38th year when he led the guerrilla force that for four months assisted regular British army units in the Ethiopian campaign, ending in their entry into Addis Ababa on 5 May 1941 (Keegan **Generals** 284–285).

**Mother.** KZJY 39 tells how H̀v got a wife from the Yén family. Some details are exaggerated but early, such as the claim that the no-longer-young suitor came of S̀ng royal stock (a motif already present in DJ). Others are folkloric and late, such as the availability of *three* Yén daughters, and H̀v's *nine* daughters by a former wife. We may assume an unmarried, mature H̀v. The bride's name was J̀vng-dzà 徽在 or "summoned to be present," an unusual name for a female, implying as it does an order to attend the court. This way of enshrining the summons attests its rarity, hence the Yéns were not in court service, but to be summoned at all they must have been *court-connected*, and hence may have been artisans, traders, or other suppliers to the palace. The likely occasion for receiving such persons is the first year of a reign; the only possible candidate for J̀vng-dzà's birth is Syāng 1, 0572. H̀v did not enter that social range until he moved to the capital, evidently after his 0556 victory, or at earliest 0555; he may have come courting in c0554. In that year, H̀v was 38, twice the average age of marriage for males, not prime material despite future prospects based on his Shú connections; J̀vng-dzà was 18, half his age, and near the standard marriage age for females. To make this mismatch socially intelligible, we may conjecture (with support from the tradition of Yén Hwéi's poverty) that the Yén family were then down on their luck. The marriage<sup>35</sup> may be assigned to c0553.

**Brother.** By LY 5:2, Confucius had an older brother who could not himself arrange his daughter's marriage. By the above inferences, he would have been born in c0552. KZJY 39 gives his name as M̀vng-pí, perhaps implying a skin condition (pí 皮 means "skin"), and says that he was a cripple, which would explain LY 5:2. Such a condition would also disqualify him from inheriting in a military family, and the family thus urgently required a second son.

**Summary.** The above conjectures are here recapitulated in a table:

CC Year	Intl Yr	Mo	Cycl Day	Event
Syī 15	0645	05		[spurious CC eclipse]
Syī 15	0645	06		K̀ng Fáng-shú born in S̀ng
Ẁvn 15	0612	07	#38	genuine CC eclipse; 93% totality
Ẁvn 15	0612	08		K̀ng Bwó-syà born in S̀ng
Sywān 2	0607	02		S̀ng army of Hwà Ywān defeated
	0607?			K̀ng Fáng-shú flees to Lǔ
Sywān 17	0592	06	#17	[spurious CC eclipse]
Sywān 17	0592	05		H̀v born to K̀ng family in Lǔ
Sywān 31	0576			Hwà Ywān still influential in S̀ng
	0575?			H̀v relocates to Dzōu
Syāng 1	0572			Yén J̀vng-dzà born in Lǔ capital
Syāng 10	0563	05	#31	H̀v "of Dzōu" lifts portcullis
	0562?			H̀v is patronized by Shú clan?
Syāng 17	0556	07		"Shú" H̀v of Dzōu leads mission
Syāng 18	0555?			H̀v relocates to Lǔ capital
Syāng 20	0553?			H̀v marries bride from Yén family
Syāng 21	0552			H̀v's first son M̀vng-pí born

<sup>35</sup>KZJY 39 emphasizes that the bride had to be persuaded to accept the groom; the present hypothesis is consistent with KZJY 39, where age disparity is the chief crux; the marriage was irregular in that sense. SJ 47 cattily calls it an "illicit union" (yě h́ 野合), thus setting off centuries of steamy speculation and heated defense.

## Confucius's Life

**Youth.** KZJY 39 says that the couple prayed at Ní-shān 尼山, southeast of the capital,<sup>36</sup> and that Confucius was born afterward, by the above hypothesis perhaps in the 8th month of 0549, three years after his brother, his given name Chyōu 丘 “Hill” and style -ní 尼 both deriving from the prayer for his birth at Ní-shān.<sup>37</sup> When he was in his third year, c0546, his father, now called Shú-lyáng 叔梁 纘, died, by our hypothesis at age c46. Hù will have had, to support his chariot, a landholding near the capital; if this fact is reflected in the new element -lyáng “weir” in his surname, it may have been distinctive in including a pond for irrigation and for fish cultivation. Its management will in any case have been beyond the powers of a child of three and his crippled brother of six, and Confucius's youth must thus have been spent in eking out a living by means not customary for the son and heir of a warrior. This implication is supported by 05c *Analects* references to his early hardship and makeshift livelihood (see LY 9:6; this element is played down in the later *Analects*). At 19 he married a daughter of the Jyēn-gwān 卞 官 family of Sùng. This may seem a suspiciously exalted match (-gwān means “office”), but no other holder of this surname seems to have been identified,<sup>38</sup> and we may plausibly assume that the bride, like Confucius himself, was from a family of exiles from Sùng living in Lǚ. This does not necessarily imply a reconciliation between Confucius and the Kǔngs of Fāng-shān; it will be argued below that Confucius had inherited from his father a circle of acquaintance based in part on such exile families in Lǚ, and one of these may have helped to arrange the marriage.<sup>39</sup>

**Son.** The next year (at 20, c0530), a son was born, and Jāu-gūng sent a present of carp, the baby being named Lǐ 鯉 “Carp” or Bwó-yw 伯魚 “Fish” in response. This is plausible enough: as heir to a military landholding, Confucius was liable for military service, and a gift of fish (by LY 10:12a, live ones would have been bred, not eaten) would reflect concern for his livelihood and that of his heir. By LY 11:8, Bwó-yw predeceased his father; KZJY 39 says that he died in his 50th year, or c0481. Confucius did not long survive this disappointment, himself dying in early 0479.

**Service.** A DJ story<sup>40</sup> has Confucius known at 17 to the Mvng clan as learned in ritual; SJ 47 tops this with tales of foreign travel in his twenties. This is out of the question for an impoverished youth. More likely, delayed by hardship, he took up his military duties as a member of Jāu-gūng's guard only in his c30th year, c0520, and even then (LY 9:2) was none too expert in the use of bow and chariot.

<sup>36</sup>For the fertility rite that may have been involved, see Jensen *Wise* 421f.

<sup>37</sup>SJ 47 repeats the KZJY 39 data that lead to this inference, and superadds a claim that “hill” referred to the shape of his head. This second explanation reflects Hàn physiognomy, and would appear to be a typical mythical elaboration.

<sup>38</sup>Some texts of KZJY 39 emend the surname to the well-known Shànggwān 上官, but the more obscure form is clearly the source of all variants in this family of texts.

<sup>39</sup>Confucius's mother may have died earlier. KZJY 39 does not mention her death; in SJ 47 it precedes a story in which he is said to be 17. She may have died when he was c15, or in c0535, she being c37; Legge *Analects* Prolegomena 61 gives “0527” [0528]. LJ (Tán-gūng A10; Legge *Li* 124f) claims he did not know the site of his father's grave; this may preserve a memory that he was not at this time in touch with the Kǔngs.

<sup>40</sup>DJ Jāu 7 (0535) 9th month, Legge *Ch'un* 618bf, assuming the 0551 birthdate.



**Jāu-gūng's Exile** occurred in 0517, following his botched coup against the Jì. Confucius's natural course (consistent with the steadfastness which, from LY 4:5, was his *self-perceived* central quality) would have been to continue as a member of his personal guard. SJ 47, ignoring Confucius's political legitimism as expressed in LY 4:7, and the animus of LY 5–6 against those who served the Jì, has him taking service under the Jì clan, and traveling on his own account to Chí, where he is interviewed by Chí Jǐng-gūng. The two possibilities are not wholly antithetical, but the likeliest relation between them is that the second is a mythic exaggeration of the first. Jāu-gūng in exile was supported by the Prince of Chí, who twice in 0515 received him in the Chí capital. On those occasions, Confucius, as a member of Jāu-gūng's escort, would have been in Jǐng-gūng's presence, might have exchanged words with him, and would have witnessed the musical performance which inspired LY 7:14, the earliest and most plausible Analects claim of Confucius's travels.

The CC tells us that Chí conquered the border town of Ỳwn 郟 and in 0516 gave it to Jāu-gūng as a residence; the Chí visits followed in 0515. In 0514 Jāu-gūng visited Gān-hóu 乾侯 on the Lǔ/Jìn border, went back to Ỳwn, and returned to Gān-hóu. In 0513 the residents of Ỳwn, doubtless weary of the burden of the exile court, simply abandoned the town, and Jāu-gūng stayed in Gān-hóu until his death in 0510. Military challenges were few, and service at the exile establishment may have exposed Confucius to the civil side of court life for which his military background had not trained him; the late LY 19:22 emphasizes that he had no regular teacher in cultural matters, and picked up his knowledge as he could; the theme of learning from all and sundry is constant throughout the early LY 5–9.

**Dìng-gūng.** The Jì clan let Jāu-gūng's younger brother, known as Dìng-gūng, succeed in 0509; Jāu-gūng loyalists like Confucius were probably at first excluded from positions at court. For his daughter, perhaps born c0527 (three years after Bwó-ỳw) and by now a marriageable 19, Confucius could find no better husband than the jailbird Gūngyě Cháng (LY 5:1). Presumably he simply occupied his landholding in the early years of Dìng-gūng's reign, 0509–0495 (SJ 47 describes that period as one of retirement and teaching). A new note appears with the CC record of the razing of Jì and Shú clan-stronghold walls in 0498, a centrist policy which might have given Confucius more scope (though surely not at the ministerial level claimed by DJ and SJ 47). The 05c Analects (7:23 and 9:5) hints at a trip to Sùng and possibly the states south of it, which might have been a semiofficial effort to win support for the centrist initiative (later myth dates this trip or its beginning to 0496 and makes it part of Confucius's principled exit from his mythical Lǔ ministership). The date itself is plausible; in that year Lǔ walled some cities for defense against Jìn.

**Aī-gūng** succeeded in 0494, and showed energy in continuing centrist policies, culminating in an apparent direct land tax imposed in 0483, which converted the previous endowed military elite into a salaried civilian elite; he also displayed enterprise in rallying foreign support for the legitimate line against the other clans. He might well have offered a post to the loyalist Confucius from c0494. It will then have been between c0494 and his withdrawal from court in 0481, after his son's death, that Confucius, who doubtless had friends and associates under Dìng-gūng, probably first attracted a significant number of official court protégés.

In all of the above, we find that the most frugal inferences from outside tradition best fit the implications of the early Analects, and indicate a core of probable fact from which the mighty Confucius persona of the DJ, the late Analects, and SJ 47 might rationally have evolved in response to school needs and family pressures.

### The Analects Disciples

We now come to the part of Confucius's life for which the Analects gives direct, though still tantalizingly scanty, evidence.

**Roster.** Statements of the number of Confucius's disciples cluster in the 70s: the 70 of MC 2A3 and 4B31 (early to mid 03c; retained in SJ 121), the perhaps original 70 but nominal 72 (actually 77) of KZJY 38, the claimed inner circle of 72 in SJ 47 (c0107, but based on earlier notes), and the 77 of SJ 67 (also c0107). These look like an expanding, but generally stable, tradition.<sup>41</sup> As Waley (**Analects** 19) notes, the plausible Analects names number about 20;<sup>42</sup> those mentioned *as disciples* in the *early* Analects, before direct memory seems to fade out with Dz̄vngd̄z in LY 7, are even fewer. If to those who figure in the second section of LY 5, and those employed or rated as employable in LY 6, we add Yōud̄z̄ (“Master Yōu”) on the probability that he was a pre-Dz̄vngd̄z head of the school, we get just 16, namely:

*Dž-gùng (5:4, 9, 12, 6:8)	Sh̄vn Ch̄ng (5:11)
*Rǎn Yūng (5:5, 6:1, 6:6)	Dž-sāng Bwódz̄ (6:2)
Chīdyāu Kāi (5:6)	Ywǎn S̄z (6:5)
*Dž-lù (5:8, 6:8)	*Mǐn Dž-chyēn (6:9)
*[Rǎn] Chyóu (5:8, 6:4, 6:8, 6:12)	*Rǎn Ḡng (6:10)
[Gūngsyī] Ch̄r (5:8, 6:4)	*Dž-syà (6:13)
*[Yén] Hwéi (5:9, 6:3, 6:7, 6:11)	*Dž-yóu (6:14)
*Dzǎi Yw (5:10ab)	[Yōud̄z̄]

On the Analects evidence, these are the certain members of the original circle of official protégés. Among near misses are the mere questioners Dž-jāng in 5:19a/b and Fán Ch̄r in 6:22, and the later school head Dz̄vngd̄z in 8:3–7. The enigmatic Láu of LY 9:7 (identified by commentators with Chín Jāng) seems to claim memory of Confucius, but at that late date (c0405) it can only be an indirect memory.

The ten asterisked names on this list are those comprising the later LY 11:3 disciple pantheon (c0360).<sup>43</sup> Of the other six, four (Chīdyāu Kāi, Gūngsyī Ch̄r, Sh̄vn Ch̄ng, and Dž-sāng Bwódz̄) vanish altogether in the later Analects, Ywǎn S̄z recurs just once, in 14:1a, and the problematic Yōud̄z̄ is *first* mentioned in 12:9.

**Disciple Names.** In the KZJY and SJ disciple inventories, all these people have a personal name (míng 名) and an often semantically related social or formal name (d̄z 字), the formal name being usually preceded by the honorific Dž- 子 prefix. In the Analects itself a different pattern obtains, in which the use of the Dž- prefix is restricted to a small and definite group. The Dž- group are often known by just their Dž- name (as Dž-gùng, whose surname is never given), whereas the non-Dž- group are usually known by surname plus personal or formal name (most conspicuously Yén Hwéi, who is sometimes Yén Hwéi, sometimes Yén Ywǎn, but *never* Dž-ywǎn). This pattern of name usage seems to preserve a distinction later lost or normalized. What was it?

<sup>41</sup>The SJ 47 (4/1938) claim of an outer circle of 3,000 beyond the inner circle of 72 may be dismissed as a bit of numerical fantasizing, akin to the claim that Confucius chose the 305 Sh̄r poems from an original corpus of 3,000 (SJ 47, 4/1936).

<sup>42</sup>Morohashi **Jimbutsu** gets 30, but by including relatives and other doubtful persons.

<sup>43</sup>For the place of this grouping in the history of the disciples, see page 290 below.

**Money.** One factor is wealth, sometimes symbolized by possession of a chariot:

Dž-	Non-Dž-
Dž-lù (chariot, *5:26 <sup>1</sup> )	Yén Hwéi (poor, 6:11; no chariot, 11:8)
Dž-hwá (chariot, rich, 6:4)	
Dž-gùng (rich, 11:18b)	

But not all who are rich (such as Ywǎn Sž, who in 6:5 can afford to return his salary to the court) has the Dž- prefix, and some Dž- protégés appear more as cultured than as specifically rich: Dž-gùng is described as a ritual vessel in 5:4, and Dž-syà is chided in 6:13 for failing to uphold the higher culture as against the lower.

**Social Origins.** Another factor which correlates with Dž- status is social origin, as reflected in palace-lineage or occupational surnames. The one disciple clearly of ruling-group origin is Dž-lù, whose surname Jùn 仲 (18:6, short for Shújùn) links him with the Shú clan. Dž-syà's surname Bǔ 卜 “omen” suggests divination specialists, and thus a tradition of palace association, and Dž-yóu's surname Yén 言 “words” might indicate palace ritual invocators. At the other end of the scale is the surname Rǎn (冉 = 染 “Dyer”), providing three of the sixteen undoubted protégés, none of whom ever evinces a Dž- usage, though Rǎn Chyóu appears in 6:8 as equally employable with Dž-lù, and in 16:1 as his actual colleague. In this list of possible occupational surnames, those that may have been purveyors to the palace, as distinct from merchants to a wider commercial public, are given in **bold**:

<b>Dž-gùng</b>	Dwānmù 端木 “Stump”	Timber purveyor? <sup>44</sup>
<b>Dž-hwá</b>	Gūngsyī 宮西 “West of Palace”	Potter? <sup>45</sup>
Rǎn Chyóu	Rǎn 冉 = 染 “Dye”	Dyer
Rǎn Gǔng	“	“
Rǎn Yūng	“	“
Chīdyāu Kāi	Chīdyāu 漆雕 “Lacquer Carver”	Lacquer carver
Dzǎi Yw	Dzǎi 宰 “Sty-ward = Steward”	Butcher
Dž-sāng Bwóđž	Dž-sāng 子桑 “Master of Mulberry”	Grover
Yén Hwéi	Yén 顏 “Face”	Cosmetics maker? <sup>46</sup>
Ywǎn Sž	Ywǎn 原 “Plain, Meadow?”	Shepherd?

Shǔn Chǔng's surname is apparently not occupational but geographical (see 5:11n). The correlation of Dž- with the presumption of close palace connection is evident.

This makes sense if we posit three statuses (ruler-related, palace-connected, and outside), a real but ignored factor (wealth), and an acknowledged factor (culture): (1) the ruler-related (Dž-lù) use Dž- regardless of wealth, (2) the palace-connected (Dž-gùng) use Dž- if wealthy, but (3) the outside do not automatically acquire Dž- along with wealth (Ywǎn Sž), lack of culture (Yén Hwéi) being one factor, just as betrayal of culture by its possessors (Dž-syà) is a major lapse for the Dž- group.

<sup>44</sup>The court would be the major buyer of architectural-quality timber; see LY 5:18.

<sup>45</sup>The potters were located west of the Lǔ palace; see Needham v5 pt6 p297. Smelly occupations (dyeing, lacquer, meatcutting) seem not to have been sited near the palace.

<sup>46</sup>See discussion of this possibility above and at 10n23. The hypothesis would be that Confucius's mother came from palace-connected official purveyors, whereas Yén Hwéi's branch (note his father's name, Lù 路 “journey,” and his own, Hwéi 回 “return”) were engaged in outside trading in cosmetics, and would thus have been a step lower socially. Note Hwéi's gratitude for being taught “culture” by the Master in 9:11.

**Lǚ Society.** This picture gives us a hint of the forces shaping 05c Lǚ society. The overall impression is of a palace-centered culture which is becoming accessible not only to its associated artisan providers, but also to more distant entrepreneurs. Money from these non-court (and apparently also not *court-controlled*) enterprises was convertible into access, but social acceptance (symbolized by the Dž- prefix) was withheld until that access was confirmed by acquisition of the higher culture. The implication is that not only can wealth and social status be acquired (LY 4:5), but the higher culture can also be acquired (9:11). It will therefore not be wrong to characterize this as an open society. Such a newly open palace society, with its sometimes vulgar new members retaining their original profit ethos, and not yet having absorbed the traditional others-first ethos, is compatible with what we sense behind the LY 4–5 complaints about the “little people.”

### The KZJY Disciples

**The Longer Lists.** For further evidence on the social placement and nature of the Confucius circle, we must turn to the “disciple” lists. There are two of these, which are similar in length and organization. Both begin with a group of names for which more detail is given, and to which more or less anecdotal material is attached, and both continue with a second group of names for which only surname, personal name, and formal name are given. This division is implicit in KZJY 38, and explicitly noted in SJ 67. A few difficulties notwithstanding, the 77 names of the KZJY 38 list (“Explanation of the 72 Disciples,” 七十二弟子解) can be matched one for one with the 77 names of the SJ 67 list (“Notice of the Disciples of Jùng-ní,” 仲尼弟子列傳). Unexpectedly, most of the names on the lists are not high-profile Analects personalities such as the clan heir M̀vng Yìdž of LY 2:5, who we might expect would be claimed as a disciple, but who does not appear. Instead, many of them are totally unknown, could serve no readily imaginable aggrandizing agenda, and, since no other hypothesis suggests itself, may be an actual inventory of the larger Confucius circle, of which we only see the employable tip in the Analects. Before proceeding, however, we must ascertain whether KZJY 38 or SJ 67 is earlier, and how reliable the earlier list itself may be.<sup>47</sup>

<sup>47</sup>This preliminary demonstration is called a lemma in mathematics; humanistic scholars might well borrow this useful term. Readers who are prepared to take on faith the relative validity of the KZJY 38 disciple list may skip directly to page 282.

For the widespread scholarly impression that the KZJY is a forgery by Wáng Sù, see the brief counter-argument in n23, above, which argues among other things that our KZJY has grown between the 27-chapter version recorded in the HS 30 palace library catalogue and the 44-chapter version which we possess today. It is easy to demonstrate that KZJY 38, the disciple list, is among the chapters added to the work after Hàn, and the demonstration at the same time proves that the list is not itself a post-Hàn forgery, but was known *as an independent document* in Hàn times. It is obvious that KZJY 38 or its precursor has a close relation to the structurally identical SJ 67, and SJ 67 explicitly states that it has used (and improved on) an earlier text, which it calls a Register of Disciples (弟子籍) and describes as “an old [pre-Chín] writing of the Kùng family.” A text which is clearly close to our KZJY 38 is cited by J̀vng Sywæn (127–200) in his commentary to SJ 67 #2, not as the Jyā Yǚ or Kùngdž Jyā-yǚ (as do all later commentators) but as the List of Confucius’s Disciples (孔子弟子目錄). It is only after Wáng Sù’s time that this second tradition is cited by commentators *as the KZJY*. The inference must be that the list in question circulated separately throughout Hàn and most of Latter Hàn, and was only combined with the Kùngdž Jyā-yǚ at the time of, and most likely by, Wáng Sù.

**KZJY vs SJ.** Several points suggest that the KZJY 38 list is anterior to SJ 67, though in its present form it has suffered some scribal corruption. Among them are:

- SJ 67 in effect says so: it mentions using, and improving upon, an old (pre-Chín script) text of the Kǔng clan called Disciple Register 弟子籍.
- SJ 67 claims to have improved on this work by supplementing it from the Analects. KZJY 38 in general avoids citing Analects stories in its first, or anecdote-containing, half of the list. SJ 67 also claims to have improved on this work by getting rid of doubtful data. Stories attached in KZJY 38 to four persons not mentioned in the Analects are in SJ 67 eliminated, and the four persons are demoted to the non-anecdote-containing half of the list.
- KZJY 38 mentions 72 disciples in its title, but actually has 77. SJ 67 has, and claims, 77 disciples. It would seem that the KZJY list grew after its first compilation, and that SJ took that expanded list as a starting point.
- Both lists begin with the ten LY 11:3 disciples, but whereas KZJY 38 keeps the Analects order, SJ 67 switches two pairs, #5–6 and #7–8. The Analects order is authoritative, hence KZJY 38 is earlier, and the SJ variant, whose effect is to list the three Rǎns in succession, is a revision.
- Both lists give ages (in number of years younger than Confucius) for disciples in the first section (though in the present KZJY 38 those for the first ten disciples are missing). The disciple ages vary between the two lists. Boodberg **Zoographic** 445–447 suggests that some disciple names derive from the animal associated with the cyclical year of their birth. His best example is Lyáng Jān, whose personal (鱸) and formal (魚) names both involve fish; by SJ 67 #30, Jān was 29 years younger than Confucius, and hence was born in a dragon (symbolically, fish) year. But the cycle of sixty was not applied to years earlier than the 03c, so this theory is untenable for the 06c, and any agreement of disciple ages with that theory is suspect. KZJY 38 #32 gives Lyáng Jān as 39 years younger than Confucius. It would seem that SJ has altered this to agree with a theory of the Boodberg type. KZJY is then primary.
- The two lists have largely the same names, but in different order, some KZJY names in the first section being placed later in the SJ list, as though an SJ copyist had omitted a KZJY entry, and then, on realizing the error, added it *at the point he had then reached*. The opposite scenario, with a KZJY copyist repeatedly *anticipating* SJ, is a less typical scribal error.
- Divergences in the second section are more drastic, but on collating the lists, we find that KZJY 38 #51 Sywē Bāng 薛邦 matches SJ 67 #63 Jvng Gwó 鄭國. The latter appears to respect the Hàn taboo on the name Bāng 邦 of the first Hàn emperor; the usual Hàn substitution was gwó 國. The pre-Chín KZJY (see above), would not have come under this taboo.

We may thus take the sequence KZJY 38 > SJ 67 as established. But KZJY 38 has undergone scribal corruption since its prototype served as the source for SJ 67:

- As comparison with SJ 67 shows, the present KZJY 38 represents a later stage in the spread of the honorific Dž- prefix, and
- The present KZJY 38 displays an Analectizing tendency, so that the original entry Chín Rǎn 秦冉, an unknown figure preserved only in SJ 67, is in the present KZJY 38 replaced by the known Chín Láu 琴牢 (LY 9:7)

so that it cannot be simply substituted for the SJ 67 list, or taken uncritically as the source for that list. Instead, the proto-KZJY 38 must be reconstructed from the combined testimony of that list and SJ 67 in their present form.

**Reconstruction Guidelines.** In reconstructing the source text which SJ 67 calls the Register of Disciples 弟子籍 from the derived texts SJ 67 and KZJY 38, the woodblock Bwó-nà 百納 edition of SJ has been used to avoid later typesetting errors, and KZJY citations in early SJ commentaries have been substituted, where different, for the reading of the SBTK Sùng woodblock or other extant editions of KZJY. Basic principles are that elements found in both derived texts are attributed to the source, and where readings differ, the “more difficult” (such as SJ tú 徒 for the graphically and semantically similar, but less learned, KZJY tsúng 從) are to be preferred. There are also some visible traits and preferences of the respective texts and their copyists, which have been used as further guidelines:

- The stated SJ Analectizing tendency is seen in its substituting, for the unknown KZJY Shv̄n Lyáu 申繚 (a commentary reading), the known Gūngbwó Lyáu 公伯僚 (LY 14:36), an enemy of Dž-lù who cannot have been a disciple. In general, non-Analectizing readings are followed.
- SJ variations from the KZJY order seem sometimes inadvertent (see above) but also sometimes purposive; one tendency is to group similar surnames, such as KZJY #46 and 48, both Gūngsyī 公西 > SJ 67 #76–77. In all cases, explainable or not, the KZJY order is followed.
- Having grouped the two Gūngsyī, SJ assimilates the second formal name (KZJY 子尚) to the homophonous first (子上, both Dž-shàng). In such phonetic substitutions (as KZJY #64 守 ~ SJ #49 首), KZJY is followed.
- The KZJY #52 surname Shí 石 appears in SJ #47 as Hòu 后, where the difference amounts to adding a stroke in SJ. This seems to be a misreading of the extra dot often added to 石. KZJY is followed.
- For KZJY #45 Jyé 潔, SJ #70 has Syé 絜. The source text undoubtedly lacked the reformed-script “water” determinative, and *calligraphically*, SJ better reflects it, but the *word* is more adequately conveyed to modern readers by the form with determinative. Where SJ and KZJY have *different* determinatives, SJ, as the earlier transcription, is followed.
- Where either text provides a formal name without the Dž- prefix, , or where one text has prefix 子 and the other the apparently elegant suffix 之 (as in KZJY #52 里之 ~ SJ #47 子里), the unaffixed form is followed.
- KZJY #49 has surname Rángsz̄ 穰嗣; SJ #42 has Rángsz̄ 壤嗣. The KZJY form 穰 “stalk of grain” may be a semantic amelioration of the cruder 壤 “loam.” For the KZJY #55 name Jí 哲 “wise” SJ #73 has Jí 皙 “bright,” better balancing the personal name Hēi 黑 “black.” For KZJY #34 Rú 儒 “Confucian,” SJ #32 has rú 孺 “child.” Both the latter look like instances of intellectual aggrandization. In all cases, the humbler form is followed.
- In the same entry with KZJY #40 (corresponding to SJ #71) is #41, Kūng Sywǎn 孔璇, one of two Kūngs in KZJY and the only anecdotally elaborated one. His presence is probably a Kūng aggrandizement. SJ #72, Yén Hý, which corresponds with it by default, has been substituted.
- The KZJY 38 #42 surname Syī 奚 is given as Syīrúng 奚容 in SJ 67 #50, similarly KZJY 38 #54 Dzwǒ 左 ~ SJ 67 #61 Dzwǒv̄n 左人. In these and other cases, a character appears to have dropped out of the KZJY list, and the fuller SJ readings are followed.

In the outline of the reconstruction at right, it has not been possible to indicate which readings rely on SJ, an SJ commentary, or a variant text of KZJY. In addition to surname, personal name, and formal name, we also give the age (number of years younger than Confucius), when that datum is supplied in the better sources.

01	Yén Hwéi	顏回	子淵		40	Shújùng Hwèi	叔仲會	子期	54
02	Mǐn Sǔn	閔損	子騫	29	41	Yén Hú	顏何	稱	
03	Rǎn Gǔng	冉耕	伯牛		42	Chín Dzǔ	秦祖	子南	
04	Rǎn Yǔng	冉雍	仲弓		43	Syīrúng Jǔn	奚容箴	子皙	
05	Dzǎi Yw	宰予	子我		44	Gǔngdzǔ Gōudz	邕邕	子之	
06	Dwānmù Sǔ	端木賜	子貢		45	Lyén Jyé	廉潔	曹	
07	Rǎn Chyóu	冉求	子有		46	Gǔngsyī Yw-rú	西園	子上	
08	Jǔng Yóu	仲由	子路		47	Hǎnfǔ Hēi	罕父黑	索	
09	Yén Yǎn	言偃	子游	35	48	Gǔngsyī Jǔn	公西箴	子尚	
10	Bǔ Shāng	卜商	子夏		49	Rǎngsz Chǐ	壤駟赤	子徒	
11	Jwānsūn Shǐ	顓孫師	子張	48	50	Rǎn Jì	冉季	子產	
12	Dzǔng Shǔm	曾參	子輿	46	51	Sywē Bāng	薛邦	子徒	
13	Tántái Myè-míng	譚台	子羽	49	52	Shǐ Chǔ	石處	里	
14	Gāu Chái	高柴	子羔	40	53	Chyāu Shàn	鄒單	子家	
15	Mì Bù-chí	密不齊	子賤	49	54	Dzwǒrvn Yǐng	左人郢	行	
16	Fán Syw	樊須	子遲	46	55	Dí Hēi	狄黑	皙	
17	Yóu Rwò	有若	有	36	56	Shāng Dzǔ	商澤	子秀	
18	Gǔngsyī Chǐ	公西赤	子華	42	57	Rǔn Bù-chí	任不齊	選	
19	Ywǎn Syèn	原憲	子思	36	58	Rúng Chí	榮祈	子祺	
20	Gǔngyě Cháng	公冶長	子長		59	Yén Kwài	顏噲	子聲	
21	Nángūng Tāu	南宮縉	子容		60	Ywǎn Táu	原桃	籍	
22	Gǔngsyī Kǐ	公析克	季沉		61	Gǔngjyēn Dìng	公肩定	中	
23	Dzǔng Dyēn	曾點	子皙		62	Chín Fēi	秦非	子之	
24	Yén Yóu	顏由	路	6	63	Chīdyāu Tú	漆雕徒	文	
25	Shāng Jyw	商瞿	子木	29	64	Yēn Jí	燕紱	思	
26	Chīdyāu Kāi	漆雕開	子若	11	65	Gǔngsyà Shǒu	公夏守	乘	
27	Gǔnglyáng Rú	公良孺	子正		66	Gōujǐng Jyāng	句井疆	子界	
28	Chín Shāng	秦商	丕茲	4	67	Bùshú Chǔng	步叔乘	子車	
29	Yén Gāu	顏高	子驕	50	68	Shǐ Dzwò-shǔ	石作蜀	子明	
30	Szmǎ Lí-gǔng	司馬犁	子牛		69	Gwēi Sywǎn	邾選	子斂	
31	Wūmǎ Shǐ	巫馬施	子旗	30	70	Shǐ Jǐ-cháng	施之常	子恒	
32	Lyáng Jān	梁鱣	叔魚	39	71	Shǔn Lyáu	申繚	子周	
33	Chín Rǎn	秦冉	開		72	Ywè Kài	樂歆	子聲	
34	Rǎn Rú	冉孺	子魚	50	73	Yén Jǐ-pú	顏之僕	子叔	
35	Yén Syīn	顏辛	子柳	46	74	Kǔng Fú	孔弗	子蔑	
36	Bwó Chyén	伯虔	楷	50	75	Chīdyāu Chǐ	漆雕哆	子斂	
37	Gǔngsūn Chǔng	公孫寵	子石	53	76	Sywǎn Chǔng	懸成	子橫	
38	Tsáu Syw	曹卣	子循	50	77	Yén Dzǔ	顏祖	襄	
39	Shǔn Chǔng	申櫟	周						

## 弟子籍

## The Disciple Register (DZJ)

The Prototype of KZJY 38 as a Source for SJ 67, c0107

**Refinements.** The resulting document, which we may call Disciple Register (Dìdǔ Jì, or DZJ) to distinguish it from its later KZJY 38 form, still needs to be purged of one or two layers of accretions: a probable two names raising it from a conjectured initial 70 (the tradition reported by the Mencius) to the 72 of the title, and an undoubted increment of five names raising that nominal 72 to an actual, and unacknowledged, 77. We have seen that both the SJ 67 and KZJY 38 later versions are subject to Analectizing tendencies, so that we may not assume that congruity with the Analects is a touchstone for this list, which seems to have been made and/or maintained at a certain distance from the Analects. But there are a few suggestions that may be made toward identifying incremental strata.

One concerns #25 (Shāng Jywè), who seems to be present in the text simply as an expert in the Yì. The SJ 67 version supplies an entire transmission-genealogy of the Yì; since this goes down to Yáng Hú 楊何, and notes that he was given a post under Hàn Wǔ-dì due to his Yì expertise in c0125,<sup>48</sup> not long before SJ 67 itself was written, this SJ genealogy is a Hàn product, and cannot be attributed to the source document DZJ (KZJY 38 simply states that Jywè received the Yì from Confucius). He recurs at greater length in #32 (Lyáng Jān), where he successfully predicts that the childless Jān (who is about to put away his wife) will shortly have an heir. There is nothing in #32 but this story. Neither figure is known to the Analects, the Lǐ Jì, or para-Confucian writings in general (Shāng Jywè does figure in the Yì apocrypha, a set of writings handed down not in Confucian but in a separate Yì tradition). It would seem that Lyáng Jān is present in this list merely to validate Shāng Jywè, and that Shāng Jywè is present merely to validate the Yì in the Confucian tradition. Here, then, are two spurious names with a clear agenda, as a candidate for the conjectured two-name increment. When might they have been added? LY \*13:22b<sup>2</sup> (c0317) has Confucius approving of the Yì as a wisdom book and not a divination manual, hence the probability is before c0317. The acceptance of the Yì as a discussable text,<sup>49</sup> and the induced raising of the disciple number to 72, must have followed Mencius's departure in c0321, since neither development was known to Mencius, whose school ignores the Yì and always mentions 70 disciples. The range is thus c0320/c0318. These changes also presumably produced the shift of Confucius's official birthdate from 0549 to 0552 in the Kǔng-controlled copy of the CC, hence this copy must have been transmitted to Chí after the period c0320/c0318. This agrees with our date of c0312 for the final Chí DJ, and leaves open the possibility that the Lǔ DJ was taken to Chí by a member of the retinue of Mencius himself, who in c0317 visited Lǔ for his mother's funeral, subsequently returning to Chí.

<sup>48</sup>SJ 67 specifies the period Ywǎn-shwò 元朔, or 0128/0124, which we transcribe as c0125. The later SJ 121 6/3127 (Watson **Records** 2/409), a chapter begun by Szmǎ Chyēn but finished only in c060 by his nephew Yáng Yǎn, and which disagrees at many points with SJ 67, gives an earlier date: the first year of Ywǎn-gwāng 元光 or 0134. The parallel genealogy in HS 88 7/3597 has a number of changes from that in SJ 67, the effect of which is to emphasize the Lǔ connections of the Yì, and minimize the southern ones; it is obvious from LY \*13:22a<sup>2</sup> that when it first came into the orbit of the Analects, the Yì had southern associations.

<sup>49</sup>Never a canonical one as far as the Analects is concerned; the Yì is never mentioned or alluded to later in the text, nor does it figure in the Sywǎndzian canon; it gradually gained official status during Hàn. For a document which may represent an early, internal Confucian apologia for the Yì, structured as a dialogue between Confucius and Dž-gǔng, see the Mǎwáng Dwēi text called Yàu or Essentials, Shaughnessy I 235–243.



**The Second Increment.** Since there will have been no emblematic value in adding names to the nonanecdotal half of the list, the unacknowledged five entries made after the “72 Disciple” title was attached to it<sup>50</sup> are probably to be found in the anecdotal entries of the first half. One possibility is Gūnglyáng Rú (#27), a brave man who is said to have escorted Confucius on his travels, or Chín Shāng (#28), whose father is said to have been renowned with Confucius’s father Shúlyáng Hù as a strong man. But the bravery of the former, and the strength of the latter, are both qualities played down in the later Analects. They thus seem to be in the opposite direction to the main trend of the Confucius myth, and for that reason less likely to be part of it. They seem more plausibly construed as family memories. More promising are possible Analectizing updates, keeping the list current with highlights of the later Analects. Persons mentioned in the Analects, or associated with Analects tendencies, whose first occurrence in that text is after LY 11, are:

31	Wūmǎ Shī	(companion in Chǔn)	*7:31 <sup>3</sup>	(c0342)
30	Sǐmǎ Lí-gǔng	(notably problematic)	12:3–5	(c0326)
22	Gūngsyī Kǔ	(a hermit figure; see next)	*11:24 <sup>1</sup>	(c0294)
23	Dzǔng Dyěn	(a hermit apologist)	*11:24 <sup>1</sup>	(c0294)
29	Yén Gāu	(driver in Wèi; story of Nándǔ)	*6:28 <sup>18</sup>	(c0270)

Yǒudǔ, who first appears in 12:9, was on previous inferences remembered as a disciple, though taboo in LY 11. We suggest, then, that the above five are the second level of additions to the text. Four keep up with later-Analects innovations.<sup>51</sup> One, the recluse Gūngsyī Kǔ, whom Confucius is said to have singled out for special praise, expands on a late Analects theme: the advocacy of a nonservice position in LY 1 and \*11:24<sup>1</sup>. Here, as with the Yǐ addenda above, the relation between the list and the Analects is not that the list mirrors the Analects, but that it records in detail some movements that are barely visible in the Analects itself.

**Date of the List of 70.** The list is based on LY 11:3 and cannot be earlier than c0360. The first disciple mentioned after LY 11:3 in LY 11 who is not included in 11:3 itself is Dǔ-jāng (11:16); next are Dzǔngdǔ and Gāu Cháu (11:18a). These (with the enigmatic Tántái Myè-míng) are also the next names in the list, comprising its #11–14. This close relation between chapter and list suggests that the list is also a product of c0360. As to its validity, we note that it contains the obscure Shǔn Chǔng of 5:11<sup>52</sup> and Dǔ-sāng Bwódǔ of 6:2;<sup>53</sup> and (assuming the presence of Yǒudǔ) is thus complete for the sixteen 05c disciples, even those not developed in 04c tradition.

<sup>50</sup>Sǐmǎ Chyēn’s reference to it as the Dídǔ Jǐ may be merely a tactical convenience; quoting the number 72 would cast doubt on the validity of his own 77-name list.

<sup>51</sup>Not all: among later Analects figures who were *not* added to this list are Bwó-yǔ’s classmate Chǔn Kāng (16:13, c0285) and the sprawling Ywǎn Rǎng (\*14:43, c0270).

<sup>52</sup>Already detected by the Táng SJ commentator Sǐmǎ Jǔn, who simply equated the LY name Chǔng 楨 with the SJ name Táng 堂 (the present SJ text has Dǎng 黨) as phonetically compatible. The actual process of corruption may have been: (1) the LY form Chǔng 楨 “prop,” (2) the phonetically similar Chǔng 櫟, also “prop,” which we reconstruct for the DZJ, (3a) the graphically similar SJ Dǎng 黨, and separately (3b) whatever KZJY form was displaced by the Analectizing substitution of Chǔn Kāng at #39.

<sup>53</sup>If we take the odd Dǔ-sāng as an epithet rather than a surname, and analyze the atypical name Bwódǔ 伯子 normally as “Master Bwó,” Bwó becoming then the surname, we may equate him with the Bwó Chyēn 伯虔 of #36.

**The Original List.** On that basis, the actual list put together by the Kǔng family in c0360 would have been that shown at right (the seven names argued above as having been later Kǔng additions are eliminated from the previous reconstruction, but, for reader convenience, without changing the numbering of the list).

**Further Purifications.** But the Kǔngs in c0360, as their dismissive treatment of the important figure Dzǔngdǔ in LY 11 makes clear, were obviously concerned to standardize and reshape the disciple tradition, not simply to record it, and the list of 70 must itself be scrutinized for problematic data: names which cannot in fact have been part of Confucius's circle, however that circle may be defined.

We should eliminate Dǔ-jyèn (#15, LY 5:3) who figures in the 05c Analects, but is mentioned there not as a member of Confucius's circle, but as a worthy member of someone *else's*. His presence on the list is in all probability appropriate; an implicit claim that Confucius was virtually the only teacher in the 05c. Again, Confucius's and his brother's sons-in-law (#20–21; LY 5:1–2) are doubtful, since the daughters married to them will have thenceforth become part of *their* circles, and no longer part of Confucius's circle. On the other hand, Yén Hwéi's father Yén Lù (#24, LY 11:8) cannot have been a *doctrinal disciple*, but as the head of a poor family with a link to Confucius through his son, he may have been a *dependent* (11:8 shows him relying on Confucius for help with his son's funeral).

Entries #11–13 are a special case. It is clear in LY 5 that Dǔ-jāng, though a questioner, is not himself a protégé; he is reputed to be from Chǔn. Dzǔng Shǔm, said to be from Wǔ-chǔng and pictured as living there in MC 4B31, cannot have passed his years of protégéship under Confucius; the lack of protégé acquaintance in his LY 7–8 also argues against his having been a member of the original circle; he is rather a latecomer, whose connection to the Confucian school was probably Dǔ-yóu, said in 6:14 to have been Steward of Wǔ-chǔng. Tántá Myè-míng, the supposed protégé mentioned in 6:14, may be a kenning for Dzǔngdǔ: Dzǔng 曾 is cognate with dzǔng 增 “layer,” while -tái 臺 means “raised platform.” Similarly the personal name Shǔm 參 is the name of a constellation (not identical with the Western constellation Orion, but centering on the star astronomers call ζ Orionis); the disyllabic personal name Myè-míng 滅明 “dim and brighten” might refer to the flickering of stars. In the pun-infested early Analects, this name may be a way of *mentioning* Dzǔngdǔ (perhaps the golden hopeful of the school at that point) without actually *naming* him. These entries suggest that the early school, including its LY 9 phase under Dzǔng Ywán, had a strongly southern focus, and that the Kǔng takeover in the 04c was in part a northern recapture. They are thus part of the history of the *school*, but do not represent persons actually in the Confucius *circle*, and need to be eliminated from the list to reveal that circle.

Disciples first mentioned in LY 11, such as Gāu Cháu, may be allowed to stand; he is not sufficiently exemplary to be suspicious. Of names unknown to the Analects but having stories in the KZJY 38 list, Shújùng Hwèi (apparently of the same clan as Dǔ-lù) is dubious; he is seemingly mentioned (#40) only for his extreme youth. He is, as has been noted above, the peg on which an equally extravagant invention, the youthful Kǔng Sywán, is later hung. It will be safer to eliminate him.

What is left? Yén Lù in the upper half of the list, and all the unknowns on the lower half, are not plausible as future officials. They are more likely to be people who looked to Confucius for support, leadership, and perhaps social advancement. In short, we seem to have here an inventory of Confucius's *client circle*.

01 Yén Hwéi	顏回	子淵		40 Shújùng Hwèi	叔仲會	子期	54
02 Mǐn Sǔn	閔損	子騫	29	41 Yén Hǔ	顏何	稱	
03 Rǎn Gōng	冉耕	伯牛		42 Chín Dzǔ	秦祖	子南	
04 Rǎn Yǒng	冉雍	仲弓		43 Syīrúng Jǐn	奚容箴	子皙	
05 Dzǎi Yǔ	宰予	子我		44 Gūngdzǔ Gōudǔ	公祖固	子之	
06 Dwānmù Sǔ	端木賜	子貢		45 Lyén Jyè	廉潔	曹	
07 Rǎn Chyóu	冉求	子有		46 Gūngsyī Yw-rú	公西圖	子上	
08 Jùng Yóu	仲由	子路		47 Hǎnfǔ Hēi	罕父黑	索	
09 Yén Yǎn	言偃	子游	35	48 Gūngsyī Jǐn	公西箴	子尚	
10 Bǔ Shāng	卜商	子夏		49 Rǎngsǔ Chǐ	壤駟赤	子徒	
11 Jwānsūn Shǐ	顓孫師	子張	48	50 Rǎn Jì	冉季	子產	
12 Dzǔng Shǔm	曾參	子輿	46	51 Sywē Bāng	薛邦	子徒	
13 Tántái Myè-míng	檀台	子羽	49	52 Shí Chǔ	石處	里	
14 Gāo Chái	高柴	子羔	40	53 Chyāu Shàn	鄭單	子家	
15 Mì Bù-chí	密不齊	子賤	49	54 Dzwǒrvn Yǐng	左人郢	行	
16 Fán Syw	樊須	子遲	46	55 Dí Hēi	狄黑	子皙	
17 Yǒu Rwò	有若	有	36	56 Shāng Dzǔ	商澤	子秀	
18 Gūngsyī Chǐ	公西赤	子華	42	57 Rǎn Bù-chí	任不齊	選	
19 Ywǎn Syèn	原憲	子思	36	58 Rǔng Chí	榮祈	子祺	
20 Gūngyě Cháng	公冶長	子長		59 Yén Kwài	顏噲	子聲	
21 Námgūng Tāu	南宮縉	子容		60 Ywǎn Tāu	原桃	籍	
				61 Gūngjyēn Dìng	公肩定	中	
24 Yén Yóu	顏由	路	6	62 Chín Fēi	秦非	子之	
				63 Chīdyāu Tú	漆雕徒	文	
26 Chīdyāu Kāi	漆雕開	子若	11	64 Yēn Jí	燕級	思	
27 Gūnglyáng Rú	公良孺	子正		65 Gūngsyà Shǒu	公夏守	乘	
28 Chín Shāng	秦商	丕茲	4	66 Gōujǐng Jyāng	句井疆	子界	
				67 Bùshú Chǔng	步叔乘	子車	
				68 Shí Dzwò-shǔ	石作蜀	子明	
				69 Gwēi Sywǎn	邾選	子斂	
				70 Shǐ Jǐ-cháng	施之常	子恒	
				71 Shǔn Lyáu	申繚	子周	
33 Chín Rǎn	秦冉	開		72 Ywè Kài	樂歆	子聲	
34 Rǎn Rú	冉孺	子魚	50	73 Yén Jǐ-pú	顏之僕	子叔	
35 Yén Syīn	顏辛	子柳	46	74 Kǔng Fú	孔弗	子蔑	
36 Bwó Chyén	伯虔	楷	50	75 Chīdyāu Chǐ	漆雕哆	子斂	
37 Gūngsūn Chǔng	公孫寵	子石	53	76 Sywǎn Chǔng	懸成	子橫	
38 Tsáu Syw	曹卣	子循	50	77 Yén Dzǔ	顏祖	襄	
39 Shǔn Chǔng	申櫟	周					

## 弟子元籍

## The Original 70-Member Register

As Compiled by the Kǔng Family in c0360 (7 names eliminated from DZJ)

**The Client Circle.** If we make the changes argued for above, and continue to retain Yóu Rǔ, very probably an early head of the school but still apparently under a ban as of c0360,<sup>54</sup> we arrive at the list of 63 shown opposite, as all that we are entitled to rely on for early information about the actual circle of Confucius. It carries more than conjectural conviction due to the presence on it of all sixteen Analects-documented original protégés, including (very probably) Shǔn Chǔng and (less surely but still plausibly) Dǔ-sāng Bwódǔ. If these names were in exactly their Analects form, or were arranged in an Analects-based order (as are the 11:3 names), they could be simply an Analects extract, which could easily have been done in Hàn. As it is, the divergence from Analects form separates the list from the Analects, and gives it independent evidentiary value.

Our first impression of the list is that its surnames tend to repeat, and that the known protégés such as the three Rǎns tend to bring in their wake other bearers of that surname; in this case another two Rǎns. Similarly, behind the known protégés of that surname, we have another seven Yéns, two Gūngsyī, two Chīdyāu, one Ywǎn, and one Shǔn. Surname clusters without a known protégé and which, like most of the above, are clearly of artisan origin, are two Shí 石 (“stone,” grindstone maker? jeweler?) and one Ywè 樂 “musician”). These artisan-origin persons and groups doubtless hoped for a court career, with its associated affluence (LY 4:5, 6:5), or at the very least for help with a contract to supply the court. The conclusion that suggests itself from the clustering of surnames is that a place in the protégé circle seems to have represented in many cases not the official aspiration of an individual, but the livelihood hope of a group.

Another class of entries represent relationship. The eight Yéns are probably a connection of Confucius’s mother, the KZJY version of the list tells us that Chín Shāng (#28), one of four Chíns, was the son of an associate of Confucius’s father, and the single Kǔng on the list (#74) is said in a late but plausible commentary to have been the son of Confucius’s crippled elder brother.<sup>55</sup> It may be relevant that Confucius, once past his early struggles, was the proprietor of a landholding, and thus, besides the court contact which a landholding implies, able to feed people from his own resources. A poor man undergoing starvation can prolong the process by weekly visits to the table of a gentleman farmer.

The third systematic category, overlapping with the other two, is surnames of geographical origin: the four Chíns and two Shǔns mentioned above plus one each of Tsáu 曹, Sywē 薛, Chyāu 鄒, Shāng 商 (that is, Sùng), Yēn 燕, and Gwēi 邾. These together comprise twelve persons, or 19% of the entire list. They probably represent what has been called the exile community in which Confucius’s father is conjectured, above, to have moved.

<sup>54</sup>We may note in passing that, with Dǔ-jāng and Dzǔngdǔ, he seems to be part of the southern group whose center was Dǔ-yóu. In the DJ under 0487 (Legge **Ch’un** 816a) he is represented as one of 300 footsoldiers picked for an assault on the camp of an invading Wú force. His service on the southern frontier might have brought him to the attention of Dǔ-yóu, who could have recommended him to Confucius (then still alive and with a mentor function in Lǔ). That this same passage also mentions Tántá Myè-míng reminds us that DJ is not a history, but the record of a stage in the evolution of a myth.

<sup>55</sup>For what it may be worth in a list which has passed through Kǔng hands, the use of this surname tends to suggest that Confucius and his brother had resumed the Kǔng surname in their lifetimes, most likely not later than the beginning of Dǔng-gūng’s reign.

01	Yén Hwéi	顏回	子淵				
02	Mǐn Sǔn	閔損	子騫	29	41	Yén Hú	顏何 稱
03	Rǎn Gōng	冉耕	伯牛		42	Chín Dzǔ	秦祖 子南
04	Rǎn Yǒng	冉雍	仲弓		43	Syīrúng Jǐn	奚容箴 子皙
05	Dzǎi Yú	宰予	子我		44	Gūngdzǔ Gōudǔ	公祖固 子之
06	Dwānmù Sǔ	端木賜	子貢		45	Lyén Jyé	廉潔 曹
07	Rǎn Chyóu	冉求	子有		46	Gūngsyī Yw-rú	公西圖 子上
08	Jùng Yóu	仲由	子路		47	Hǎnfǔ Hēi	罕父黑 索
09	Yén Yǎn	言偃	子游	35	48	Gūngsyī Jǐn	公西箴 子尚
10	Bǔ Shāng	卜商	子夏		49	Rǎngsǔ Chǐ	壤駟赤 子徒
					50	Rǎn Jì	冉季 子產
					51	Sywē Bāng	薛邦 子徒
14	Gāu Chái	高柴	子羔	40	52	Shí Chǔ	石處 里
					53	Chyāu Shàn	鄭單 子家
16	Fán Syw	樊須	子遲	46	54	Dzwǒrvn Yǐng	左人郢 行
17	Yóu Rwò	有若	有	36	55	Dí Hēi	狄黑 子皙
18	Gūngsyī Chǐ	公西赤	子華	42	56	Shāng Dzǔ	商澤 子秀
19	Ywǎn Syèn	原憲	子思	36	57	Rǎn Bù-chí	任不齊 選
					58	Rúng Chí	榮祈 子祺
					59	Yén Kwài	顏噲 子聲
					60	Ywǎn Táu	原桃 籍
					61	Gūngjyēn Dìng	公肩定 中
					62	Chín Fēi	秦非 子之
24	Yén Yóu	顏由	路	6	63	Chīdyāu Tú	漆雕徒 文
					64	Yēn Jí	燕級 思
26	Chīdyāu Kāi	漆雕開	子若	11	65	Gūngsyà Shǒu	公夏守 乘
27	Gūnglyáng Rú	公良孺	子正		66	Gōujǐng Jyāng	句井疆 子界
28	Chín Shāng	秦商	丕茲	4	67	Bùshú Chǐng	步叔乘 子車
					68	Shí Dzwò-shǔ	石作蜀 子明
					69	Gwēi Sywǎn	邾選 子斂
					70	Shī Jī-cháng	施之常 子恒
					71	Shǐn Lyáu	申繚 子周
33	Chín Rǎn	秦冉	開		72	Ywè Kài	樂歆 子聲
34	Rǎn Rú	冉孺	子魚	50	73	Yén Jī-pú	顏之僕 子叔
35	Yén Syīn	顏辛	子柳	46	74	Kǔng Fú	孔弗 子蔑
36	Bwó Chyén	伯虔	楷	50	75	Chīdyāu Chǐ	漆雕哆 子斂
37	Gūngsūn Chǔng	公孫寵	子石	53	76	Sywǎn Chǐng	懸成 子橫
38	Tsáu Syw	曹卣	子循	50	77	Yén Dzǔ	顏祖 襄
39	Shǐn Chǐng	申櫟	周				

## The Confucius Client Circle

As Derived from the Kūng Family "Disciple" List of c0360 (Total: 63 Names)

**Mentorship.** We may now consider the age data on this list. If Confucius was born in the 8th month of 0549, he would have reached his 20th year, the transition to adulthood and eligibility to become a protégé, in the 8th month of 0530. But the list is presumably skewed by the Kǔng family's relocation of Confucius's birth year to 0552, which would put his year of matriculation back to 0533. Then to find the calendar year in which a protégé was seen *by the Kǔng list* as reaching the age of protégéship, we subtract the age from 0533. We excise Yén Lù and Chín Shāng, Confucius's same-generation contemporaries, and also eliminate Chīdyāu Kāi.<sup>56</sup> We then get the following distribution, by year, of 12 protégéship inceptions:

							x		
			x			x	x		
x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
0504	0501	0498	0495	0492	0489	0486	0483	0480	

In other words, a third of these protégéships begin under Dìng-gūng, most of them in the last four years of his reign (beginning precisely in 0498, the year of the Lǔ walling initiative which was earlier suggested as a probable index that Confucius might have been acceptable at court), another third in the early years of Aī-gūng, and a final third stacked up in the years 0483 and after, most of them precisely in that year (that of the new tax policy, which probably increased the importance of office relative to landholding, and thus put new pressure on the protégé system). We may note that there is no support in these figures<sup>57</sup> for the idea that Confucius increased his teaching after withdrawing from court; on the contrary, his teaching, or rather mentorship, seems to be coordinated with his holding a position at court. On the other hand, there is much support in them for the general career trajectory which was conjectured above: obscurity in the early part of Dìng-gūng's reign, access in the last part of that reign, full visibility in the early years of Aī-gūng, and a special impetus given to the protégé system as a whole in 0483.

Confucius's function as a mentor was then a by-product of his court career, and we cannot validly envision him as a teacher in his early years, or after his retirement in 0481. His function as a leader in the circle which the client list reveals to us will have been earlier, and must have played its role in his Dìng-gūng period.

It remains to say, of Confucius as a teacher, that the respectful Chinese term Kǔng Fūdǔ 孔夫子, which supposedly lies behind the missionary Latinization "Confucius," is not a native term, but itself an invention of Western missionaries.<sup>58</sup>

<sup>56</sup>Whose given age differential is the unlikely 11. SJ 67 does not give an age for Chīdyāu Kāi, so influence from this text is eliminated as a factor. The content of the KZJY 38 entry tells us that Kāi declined office not, as in LY 5:6 because he was not yet perfected in good faith, but because he was absorbed in the study of the Shàng-shū (the Shū Jīng). This can only be a post-04c story, and we must assume that the curious age also reflects some late notion of the life history of Confucius. We ignore it here.

<sup>57</sup>Such as they are; the key first ten are missing from KZJY. Of the SJ figures, which Wáng Sù apparently copied into his edition of KZJY, Wáng himself notes that they are self-contradictory, that for Yén Hwéi being inconsistent with the LY 11:8 claim that he postdeceased Bwó-yw. The reason for their excision may be precisely that they could not be reconciled with the internally inconsistent later myth of Confucius and his disciples.

<sup>58</sup>Jensen **Invention**.

## The Kǔng Family Successors

**Presumption.** The list of Kǔng descendants at the end of SJ 47 begins with Confucius's son Bwó-yw, who predeceased him. Next is Dž-sž, said to be Bwó-yw's son and the author of the Jǔng Yǔng: both a lineal and a doctrinal successor. When Sywǎndž attacks "Dž-sž and Mencius," he presumably means the school of Lǔ, with Dž-sž its chief posthumous leader and Mencius its most prominent later product.<sup>59</sup> The Mencius text contains vignettes of Dž-sž,<sup>60</sup> presumably reflecting Mencius's own impressions,<sup>61</sup> which depict Dž-sž as on familiar terms with the Lǔ Prince.

This implied direct-succession picture collapses upon examination. If Dž-sž had directly succeeded Confucius, the Prince who showed him such favor would have been Aī-gǔng (r 0494–0469), but the Mencian material shows him as minister to Mù-gǔng (r 0410–0378), a gap of at least sixty years, or about two generations.

The same discrepancy is latent in the SJ list itself. The names, formal names, and ages at death (here listed as "aet") of these Kǔngs, counting Confucius as generation 1 and Bwó-yw as generation 2, appear in SJ 47 as follows:

3. Kǔng Jí 伋	Dž-sž 子思	aet 62
4. Kǔng Bwó 白	Dž-shàng 子上	aet 47
5. Kǔng Chyóu 求	Dž-jiā 子家	aet 45
6. Kǔng Jī 箕	Dž-jīng 子京	aet 46
7. Kǔng Chwān 穿	Dž-gāu 子高	aet 51
8. [no personal name]	Dž-shèn 子慎	minister in Ngwèi aet 57
9. Kǔng Fù 鮒		erudite of Chǔn Shǔ aet 57

Later generations are in Hàn, and do not concern us here. #9, Fù, is said to have died with Chǔn Shǔ, whose reign of less than a year ended in 0208. Assuming that Fù had not yet reached his birthday in that year, his lifespan is then c0265–0208. Fù could not have succeeded as school head before his 20th year, 0246. By then, Lǔ was extinct and his father, the previous school head, had emigrated to Ngwèi.

At 25 years per birth generation, Dž-sž's birthdate will be 6 generations or 150 years before Fù's birthdate c0265, or c0415. Then Dž-sž reached adulthood in 0396, and could have served Mù-gǔng as Mencius implies, but never Aī-gǔng. Therefore, Dž-sž was neither the grandson of Confucius nor his direct successor. But he could have succeeded Dzǔng Ywǎn, whose LY 9 we have dated to c0405, and with slight adjustments in the dates, this is what we assume actually happened.

<sup>59</sup>SZ 6:7, Knoblock *Xunzi* 1/224. This attack has been a problem for later Confucians (see Knoblock 1/214f and 1/245f), but it rings true as a piece of Warring States polemic. Sywǎndž deplored the influence of the Lǔ school, and on the evidence of LY 17 and 19, the feeling was mutual. The Mencians and the Sywǎndž school had a separate debate on human nature (MC 6A1–8 versus SZ 23); the Analects weighs in with LY 17:2, supporting the Mencian side of that debate. The Jǔng Yǔng, credited to Dž-sž, has echoes in LY \*6:28 (citing the name Jǔng Yǔng) and in the Mencius, again emphasizing their closeness. It is this polarity between the Analects and Mencius on the one hand, and Sywǎndž on the other, to which the irascible SZ 6:7 remark evidently refers.

<sup>60</sup>Dž-sž in his role as a person of consequence in Lǔ is mentioned in MC 2B11, 5B6, 5B7, and 6B6 (he appears in other connections in MC 4B31 and 5B3).

<sup>61</sup>Mencius himself (c0387–c0303) can hardly have known Dž-sž directly, but he was probably a student in the Lǔ school at a time when memories of him were still current.

It is notable that all Kǔngs in the SJ list who may be presumed to have served as Lǚ school heads have the Dž- prefix on their formal names, whereas Fù, who could not have done so, lacks that prefix. The distinction is not one of office, since Fù held office under a ruler. The prefix thus confirms the implication of the dates.

**Wáng Sù** repeats the SJ list in his postface to KZJY, with some variants:

3. Kǔng Jí 伋	Dž-sz̄ 子思	aet 62
4. Kǔng Bwó 白	Dž-shàng 子上	aet 47
5. Kǔng Àu 傲	Dž-jiā 子家	aet 45
	later named Chyóu 求	
6. Kǔng Kù 榘	Dž-jí 子直	aet 46
7. Kǔng Chwān 穿	Dž-gāu 子高	aet 57
8. Kǔng Wǔ 武	Dž-shùn 子順	minister in Ngwèi aet 57
	named Wēi 微, later named Bīn 斌	
9. Kǔng Fù 鮒	Dž-yú 子魚	erudite of Chǔn Shǜ –
	later named Jyǎ 甲	

Besides the changes, and the addition of a personal name in generation 8, this list moves the two “aet 57” up a generation, leaving generation 9 blank. It extends the Dž- prefix to Fù. In SJ 47, Fù dies without issue, and the line continues through his younger brother; the KZJY preface assigns Fù a son, and a grandson who served Hàn Gāu-dzǔ and was present at the battle of Gāi-syà (0202). If we conveniently forget the date of Chǔn Shǜ’s (and Fù’s) death, this effectively adds two additional generations to the pre-Hàn Kǔng succession, thus implicitly filling the Dž-sz̄ gap.

**The Kǔng Tsúngdž (KTZ)** fills it a different way, by attributing to Dž-sz̄ himself an age at death of 78, and assigning the following lifespans,<sup>62</sup>

2. Kǔng Lǐ 鯉	Bwó-yú 伯魚	–0483	
3. Kǔng Jí 伋	Dž-sz̄ 子思	0479–0402	[aet 78]
4. Kǔng Bwó 白	Dž-shàng 子上	0429–0383	[aet 47]
5. Kǔng Chyóu 求	Dž-jiā 子家	0390–0346	[aet 45]
6. Kǔng Kù 榘	Dž-jí 子直	0351–0306	[aet 46]
7. Kǔng Chwān 穿	Dž-gāu 子高	0312–0262	[aet 51]
8. Kǔng Wǔ 武	Dž-shùn 子順	0293–0237	[aet 57]
9. Kǔng Fù 鮒	Dž-yú 子魚	0264–0208	[aet 57]

still leaving four years between Bwó-yú’s death and the birth of his supposed son Dž-sz̄.<sup>63</sup> These KTZ and KZJY preface variants are labored rather than convincing, and in the present book we have followed SJ 47 as the earliest evidence.

**The Kǔng Lineage of the Analects** is reconstructed at right from SJ 47, from the arithmetical fact that at least one of the Kǔng heads must have succeeded as a minor, and from the observed fact that LY 12–13 seem to reflect such a situation, LY 12 being strikingly Mencian, and LY 13 less so. The known date of Mencius’s departure from Lú (c0321) establishes a historically fixed point for these inferences. These limits taken together do not uniquely determine a chronology, but rather a family of generally similar chronologies; our suggestion represents one of these.

<sup>62</sup>As extracted from KTZ by Ariel K’ung 8.

<sup>63</sup>Which, with divergences as to whether Fù or his brother hid the wall texts and other matters, Ariel K’ung 13f tries to reconcile. He does *not* try to rationalize the KTZ 5 dialogues between Confucius (KTZ deathdate 0479) and Dž-sz̄ (KTZ birthdate 0479).



0439	[Kǔng Dǔ-sz̄ born]	
<b>0436</b>	<b>Death of Dz̄vngdǔ</b>	LY 8
0435	Dz̄vng Ywǎn succeeds as school head	
0408	<b>[Last of several Chí attacks on Lǔ border]</b>	
0405	Dz̄vng Ywǎn aet 68?	LY 9
0404	Dz̄vng Ywǎn dies (aet c69?); succession possibly uncertain	
<b>Kǔng Succession Begins</b>		
0402	Dǔ-sz̄ becomes school head, aet 38	
0399	[Kǔng Dǔ-shàng born]	
0387	[Mencius born]	
0380	Dǔ-sz̄ aet 60	LY 10
0378	<b>Dǔ-sz̄ dies, aet 62</b>	
0377	Dǔ-shàng succeeds, aet 24	
0372	[Kǔng Dǔ-jyā born]	
0360	Dǔ-shàng aet 40	LY 11
0354	<b>Dǔ-shàng dies, aet 46</b>	
0353	Dǔ-jyā succeeds, aet 20	
<b>0342</b>	<b>[Chí Kingship proclaimed]</b>	
0342	Dǔ-jyā aet 31	LY 3
0340	[Kǔng Dǔ-jīng born]	
0328	<b>Dǔ-jyā dies, aet 45</b>	
0327	Dǔ-jīng aet 14; Mencius among interim supervisors	
0326	Dǔ-jīng aet 15, relatively compliant; much Mencian input	LY 12
0322	Dǔ-jīng aet 19, more assertive; less Mencian input	LY 13
0321	Dǔ-jīng succeeds, aet 20; Mencius leaves Lǔ	
0321	[Kǔng Dǔ-gāu born]	
<b>0320</b>	<b>[Mencius begins public career, aet c66]</b>	
<b>0317</b>	<b>Dǔ-jīng aet 24, Lǔ Píng-gūng 1st year</b>	LY 2
0310	Dǔ-jīng aet 31	LY 14
0305	Dǔ-jīng aet 36	LY 15
0295	<b>Dǔ-jīng dies, aet 46</b>	
0294	Dǔ-gāu succeeds, aet 28	LY 1
0293	[Kǔng Dǔ-shv̄n born]	
<b>0285</b>	<b>[Chí conquest of Sūng]</b>	
0285	Dǔ-gāu aet 37	LY 16
0271	<b>Dǔ-gāu dies, aet 51</b>	
0270	Dǔ-shv̄n succeeds, aet 24	LY 17
0265	[Kǔng Fù born]	
0262	Dǔ-shv̄n aet 32	LY 18
<b>0255</b>	<b>[Chǔ conquest of southern Lǔ]</b>	
0254	[Syw̄ndǔ becomes Director in Lán-líng]	
0253	Dǔ-shv̄n aet 41	LY 19
0251	Dǔ-shv̄n aet 43	LY 20:1
0250	Dǔ-shv̄n aet 44	LY 20:2–3
0249	<b>[Chǔ extinguishes Lǔ]</b>	
0249	Dǔ-shv̄n aet 45; goes to Ngw̄i	
0243	[Ngw̄i minister Syin-líng Jyw̄n dies]	
0242	Dǔ-shv̄n <b>becomes minister in Ngw̄i</b>	
0237	Dǔ-shv̄n <b>dies in Ngw̄i, aet 57</b>	
<b>0209</b>	<b>Fù takes office as erudite under Chv̄n Shv̄</b>	
<b>0208</b>	<b>Fù dies in the fall of Chv̄n, aet 57</b>	

### Chronology of the Kǔng Succession

*Data known from SJ 67 or other sources in bold*

### The Fate of the Major Disciples

It will be obvious that there is tension between the 05c protégés and the Kǔng lineage, with the Kǔngs first attempting (LY 11) to discredit the disciples, and then (with Wáng Sù and the KTZ) to deny their existence altogether. It is against this background of rival legitimacies that the evolution of the disciples must be seen. One milestone in this evolution is LY 5–6 (c0460). From a century later, we have:

**The LY 11:3 Ten** (c0360), whose members are often valued for other qualities than they were praised for, or for just the qualities they *lacked*, in the earlier LY 5–6:

Name	LY 5–6 (c0470–0460)	LY 11:3 (c0360)
Yén Hwéi	intent on virtue	virtuous conduct
Mǐn Dž-chyēn	politically scrupulous	virtuous conduct
Rǎn Gvng	vaguely esteemed	virtuous conduct
Rǎn Yūng	rǎn, not glib; able to govern	virtuous conduct
Džǎi Wǒ	lazy, uncommitted, punning	skill in language
Dž-gùng	elegant but overrates himself	skill in language
Rǎn Chyóu	corrupt in office	administration
Dž-lù	adequate for recruiting	administration
Dž-yóu	good administrator	culture
Dž-syà	betrays the higher culture	culture

Except for Dž-yóu, the last six were largely dispraised in LY 5–6, but are here given an honorable place; the reversal of 05c opinion is fairly comprehensive. It is simplest to take 11:3 as a revision, rather than a summary, of the earlier Analects. The almost obsessive emphasis on Yén Hwéi in LY 11, like his top listing here, is probably the nearest the Kǔngs could come to insisting on a family connection, or at any rate to blaming the school's problems on the *lack* of a family connection.<sup>64</sup>

**The LY 19 Five** (c0253, from a century later) shows a drastic realignment from the 11:3 pantheon. The first five of the 11:3 ten do not appear at all. Two of the last five do appear, but are merely sacrificed to a controversialist tactic, being used to emblemize Sywǎndzian school heresies (as such, all three are disavowed in SZ 6). Of the two positive spokesmen for the chapter, one was not listed at all in 11:3:

Name	Place in LY 11:3	Role in LY 19
Dž-jāng	not listed	negative emblem
Dž-syà	#10, praised for culture	negative emblem
Dž-yóu	#9, praised for culture	negative emblem
Džvngdž	not listed	chapter spokesman
Dž-gùng	#6, praised for eloquence	chapter spokesman

Whereas the first three (Dž-syà and Dž-yóu probably because of their identification with the Shī, the chief Sywǎndzian text) *represent* excesses of the Sywǎndzian school, the last two more directly *condemn* the Sywǎndzian age, with its fixed curriculum, its emphasis on depraved later cultural traditions, and its lack of reliance on the personal authority of Confucius. Here too, it seems to be only contemporary need, and not any documentary interest in historical truth as such, that drives the chapter.

<sup>64</sup>Note the power of accretion to affect the text's message. No Analects reader but has wondered what would have happened had insightful Yén Hwéi outlived stuffy Džvngdž and so "influenced the subsequent development of the school" (Waley **Analects** 20).

We now attempt to summarize, from the viewpoint of the above argument, the origins, character, and later histories of the sixteen certain protégés, the two major posthumous disciples Dz̄vngdž and Dž-jāng, and the more shadowy Fān Chr̄.

**Mīn Dž-chyēn.** By DZJ (assuming that it is using the relocated Confucius birthdate), he is the oldest protégé, born c0523. His Analects mentions are civilian, and he may have begun a protégéship at the civilian age of adulthood, in c0503 (Dīng-gūng 7). His surname suggests no occupation; his Dž- prefix implies social acceptance. His scrupulousness is noted in 6:9 and elaborated in 11:3 and 11:13. He is said to deserve his family's good opinion in 11:5, an early instance of the filiality motif, but he does not continue as emblematic of filiality, being replaced in that role by Dz̄vngdž. He vanishes from the text after his LY 11 appearances.

**Dž-yóu** appears in 6:14 as a judicious administrator. As we read the DJ evidence, he was Steward of Wǔ-chǐng by the 0487 (Aī-gūng 8) campaign in which Yǒu Rwò took part. Since this may not have been his first year in that post, and since the post itself cannot have been a first assignment, his protégéship under Confucius would seem to go back to Dīng-gūng, possibly c0497, after the walling initiative and near the time of Confucius's trip to Sūng. He must have had military credentials to be assigned to Wǔ-chǐng, and so might have been among Confucius's escort in Sūng. By other evidence, he may have been the author of LY 5, and thus the leader of what can for the first time be called a school rather than a circle, though a less organized one than it became under Yǒudž. After his 6:14 mention he is enshrined in 11:3 (for culture, not administration; not wholly irrelevant given the artistic expertise implied by the form of LY 5), and recast as an apprentice of filiality in 2:7. His political stature is not forgotten: he gives a warning on remonstrance in \*4:26<sup>1</sup> (c0294) and reappears as Wǔ-chǐng Steward in a potshot at Sywǎndž in 17:3; he is also a negative emblem in LY 19. Though thus expended in symbolic controversy in the 03c Analects, he appears frequently and positively in the ritual collections such as the Lǐ Jì, thus completing the evolution begun in LY 2:7. He would appear to have been notable in both the early military and late civilian stages of the typical 05c career, and thus an ideal choice to head the first Confucian school in c0470, but to have been developed in later centuries only in the latter aspect.

**Yǒudž.** By DZJ, he was born c0516. As a military man, his apprenticeship may have been relatively late, and by the Wú campaign of 0487, when he was 28, he may not yet have had contact with Confucius, hence the suggestion that he owed his introduction to the senior protégé Dž-yóu, whom he may have met in 0487 at Wǔ-chǐng. His surname suggests no occupation, but his lack of the Dž- prefix implies a modest background, as does the homely character of LY 6, which we assign to his authorship. His -dž suffix labels him as a head of the school, and if, as we infer, he was Dž-yóu's successor, his contact with Dž-yóu in 0487 may have paved the way; he praises Dž-yóu in 6:14. Despite being head in c0460, he is never mentioned in the early Analects (though Dz̄vngdž at least must have known him) or the 11:3 pantheon, and does not appear at all until LY 12 (c0326). In 12:9 he is shown as advising Aī-gūng, implying the ministerial role that (according to the Mencius) Dž-sz̄ later had, and suggesting a considerable status for the school under his headship. He seems to have been the first to bear the -dž suffix, and thus the first to be head of an organized school; perhaps tensions associated with that change left a hostile legacy. In \*1:12<sup>19</sup> (c0253) he appears as a ritual specialist, reflecting the nature of the 03c school and displaying the same evolution that we see with Dž-yóu, but not necessarily providing evidence for the historical Yǒu Rwò.

**Dž-gùng.** From his surname, he was from a palace-supplier background, and from his Dž- prefix, he was accepted in his time as having mastered the high culture. His role in later legend as the most devoted of Confucius's mourners suggests that he was the chief figure among whatever group of followers thought of themselves as constituting the immediate posthumous circle, and thus the most likely compiler of the LY 4 core sayings. The attempt of the next chapter, LY 5, to disabuse him of his impression of his own competence, may easily be a senior figure (Dž-yóu) putting in his place a younger whippersnapper who has temporarily and by default lucked into a role of influence. He fades out of view in the last half of the 05c, is enshrined for eloquence in the 11:3 pantheon, and then regains prominence as Dž-lù loses it; one or the other of the two functions narratively, at any given point, as the companion of Confucius and the counterfoil to Yén Hwéi. By LY 19, partly by the attrition of some rival figures, he has become the chief spokesman for the movement, and specifically for its stance of centering on the person of Confucius; his Analects trajectory attests the durability of the supporting role. 11:18a hints at wealth gained through trade, and SJ 67 (in which list his is by far the longest entry) recounts in the style of the Jàn-gwó Tsù his diplomatic triumph on behalf of Chí, and notes that he died in Chí. He seems to have been ahead of his time in the 05c, but to have perfectly suited the mercantile culture of the 04c and 03c, thus enabling him to become an icon in Chí without at the same time being abandoned by Lǚ. He is also a frequent figure in the later Confucian ritual texts.

**Dž-syà** by his surname came by inherited palace connection to the same cultural expertise that Dž-gùng probably won through contact. From his first (and disapproving) appearance in 6:13 he is frequently associated with the Shī, thus doubtless explaining his place in the transmission genealogy of that text; in LY 19 he is the negative emblem of a fussy sort of ritualism associated (as the Shī itself had by then become associated) with the Sywǎndž school. He may be said to symbolize both the pro and the con sides of the curricularizing tendency within the Analects. He figures occasionally in the later ritual compilations.

**Chīdyāu Kāi** is the visible member of three Chīdyāus in DZJ, all of artisan origin, and in the Analects lacking the accolade of the Dž- prefix. He appears only once (in 5:6, owning himself not ready for office), a fact which will astonish many Analects readers, since that appearance is an indelible one. An outside tradition also exists. HFZ 50 (c0150) mentions a Chīdyāu branch of Confucianism, emphasizing integrity in the face of danger; such a view is criticized in SZ 4:4 as the courage of the "little man," perhaps a gibe at its artisan origins, and MZ 39 (also 03c) notes Chīdyāu's "menacing" (tsán 殘) appearance as a sign of potential rebelliousness. Courage in the fractious sense is disapproved in the late Analects, and the eclipse of Kāi may be due to his becoming identified with it (Analects disapproval is aimed instead at Dž-lù, who also tends to vanish). HS 30 lists a Chīdyāudž in 13 chapters, which it attributes to a descendant (Chīdyāu Chī 啓) of the disciple.<sup>65</sup> Kāi's low age differential (11) in DZJ may be an attempt to bring both disciple and descendant within the client circle, as was done with the fathers of Yén Hwéi and Dzǎngdž; if so, the text (we cannot tell if it advised bellicosity) may have been of 03c date.

<sup>65</sup>Chī 啓 was the personal name of the pre-SJ Hàn Emperor Jǐng, and one would thus expect this name to be converted in HS 30 to the usual substitution Kāi 關, and in that form to court confusion with the disciple Kāi.

**Shv̄n Chv̄ng**, whose instant of fame is in LY 5:11, is represented, though in a scribally garbled form, in the DZJ list, where he serves as one guarantor of the reality of that list. His forebears were apparently from the extinct state of Shv̄n, and he shows traits perhaps intelligible in a member of the Lǔ exile community: a firm determination to make good which, as “Confucius” makes clear in 5:11, is different from the poised equanimity required of the successful and ponderable gentleman.

**Dž-sāng Bwódž** has a much more positive instant of fame in LY 6:2 and a much more garbled survival as (perhaps) the Bwó Chyén of the DZJ list. As a grove proprietor, he will have had an economic fallback option, and his “laxity” in 6:2 agrees with the situation of someone who can afford to fail in the search for office.

**Ywān Sž**. His surname is not unequivocally informative; from 6:5 we know that he was in easy financial circumstances (able to decline an official salary, which it was the goal of many of the client group to obtain) but not socially certified by the Dž- prefix; socially, he seems to be a more successful version of Dž-sāng Bwódž. Confucius in 6:5 criticizes him for a lack of social imagination, a lesson more appropriate for the thoughtless rich (who regard money in symbolic rather than subsistence terms) than for the poor. His recurrence in 14:1a, where the issue is the propriety of service, including receipt of salary, is wholly in character. What Legge calls his “carelessness of worldly advantages” is literarily exaggerated as extreme poverty in JZ 28:11, where his principled answer abashes his rich and arrogant caller, none other than Dž-gùng. Ywān Sž belongs with those Analects characters, of whom the best-known example is Yén Hwéi, who vanish from that text in the 03c and are absorbed instead into the literary repertoire of the Jwāngdž.

**Džāi Yw** has a possibly artisanal surname (it could also be derived from the “steward” or official sense of the word) and lacks the Dž- prefix; as with the three preceding figures, it is his shortcomings, chiefly energy and dedication, that dominate his 05c Analects appearances (in 5:10a/b and 6:26, the latter being a satire on the concept of r̄vn). He is embraced by the Kūngs and enshrined for his eloquence (6:26 involves a pun) in 11:3. In keeping with this new dignity he appears in 3:21 as a ritual expounder to Aī-gūng, but faithful to his 05c persona he is again criticized by “Confucius” for an inappropriate pun. In 17:19 he is brought back to symbolize the wrong (in this case, the Mician) side of a ritual question: the validity of the three-year mourning practice. He is thus literarily stable in the Analects, and does not migrate to the Jwāngdž. His pairing with Dž-gùng in 11:3 as “eloquent” may reflect an outside tradition of a career in diplomacy that existed already at that time (c0360); SJ 67 suggests such a development by claiming that he held office in Chí, was involved in a rebellion, and was executed with his family; even in myth he seems to have been an embarrassment to the school.

**Rān Gv̄ng**, like his two Analects kinsman seemingly of artisan stock, and without a Dž- prefix, dies regretted by Confucius in 6:10, is enshrined in the 11:3 pantheon (in the “virtue” category, perhaps implying the poverty which is suggested in 6:10), and is never heard from again, in the Analects or elsewhere.

**Rān Yūng** is defended by Confucius in 5:5 for lack of eloquence, and praised by him as having rulership capacity in 6:1, qualified by a 6:6 remark suggesting that his parentage rendered him socially ineligible for such a position. The Kūngs in 11:3 pair him with Rān Gv̄ng as virtuous. He is a questioner in 12:2 (in close parallel with Yén Hwéi in 12:1), and breaks into office in 12:2 (under the Jī, but in the 04c that no longer carried an imputation of treachery). He vanishes thereafter.

**Rǎn Chyóu**, who *does* achieve office, is the success story of the Rǎn clan, but he is disapproved of (faintly in 5:8 and the parallel 6:8; openly in 6:4 and 6:12) for his conduct in office; even more than the lazy Dzǎi Yw or the presumptuous Dž-gùng, he is the villain of the 05c school. Apart from his enshrinement (for executive ability, in parallel with Dž-lù) in 11:3, he keeps this character even in the same chapter's 11:17 (compare the similar, and nearby, disapproval of Dž-lù in 11:15) and 11:22 (Dž-lù is faulted in the same passage), and through 3:6 and 13:14 to the last failure, and the last co-denunciation with Dž-lù, in the eloquent 16:1. Like some of his erring colleagues, Chyóu exits from the Analects only to reappear in the Jwāngdž (JZ 22:10), where he questions a Dāuized Confucius on “the time before Heaven and Earth existed,” such cosmic speculations being only hinted at (17:17, c0270) or altogether interdicted (\*5:13, also c0270) in the contemporary Analects.

**Dž-lù** is of ruler-connected stock, specifically the Shú clan who may have been the patrons of Confucius's father; his presence in the circle may thus be hereditary rather than meritocratic. In the 05c Analects he is faintly praised (5:8, 6:8) or chided (for his impostures at Confucius's death, 7:35; reworked in 9:12) but never shown in office; he once (7:19) intermediates between Confucius and a petty ruler. His parallelism with Rǎn Chyóu (from 11:3 and 11:15 to its climax in 16:1) may thus be a literary fiction. His literary symbiosis with Yén Hwéi, with his wrong answer the perfect counterfoil to Hwéi's right one, is another literary fiction, played out in just two interpolated passages (\*5:26, c0294, and \*7:11, c0310), a fact which will surprise many readers, for whom these anecdotes loom large. For the 05c, one gets the impression of a weak candidate whom the text, very understandably, is reluctant to criticize. In LY 11 he acquires a rash, even swashbuckling, persona (11:13b, reinforced by the interpolated \*5:7 and \*7:11), perhaps as a way of criticizing the Chīdyāu movement, which retained or exaggerated the military aspect of early Confucianism which the ritualistic Kǔngs were trying to replace. By the DJ (c0312), this has become a full-blown story of Dž-lù's death in a duel, defending his Wèi patron (Legge **Ch'un** 843). In real life (and in the scholarly rather than romantic tradition preserved in SJ 121) Dž-lù survived the Master; by LY 7–8 he was one of three disciples whom the posthumous Dzǎngdž may have known. He switches roles with the Confucius of 7:19 in 17:4 and 6, disapproving of unsavory offices which Confucius is tempted to take, and alternates with Dž-gùng in the later Analects as the escort of Confucius; his last primary Analects appearance is in that role (18:6). Shortly thereafter, he is appropriated by the Jwāngdž in his basic late role as Confucius's companion, but once (JZ 28:15) as a swordsman, doing a sword dance.

**Yén Hwéi**, of probable artisan origin and without a Dž- prefix, was related to Confucius on his mother's side, and enjoys an unassailable narrative position in the early Analects (5:9, 6:3, 6:7, 6:11). Alone of the early circle, he is praised for his skill in mental concentration, and for his love of “study” (which in this precurricular age means mental self-cultivation); by 9:11 that study takes on a clearly transcendent character, and in 11:18b he is described as often “empty,” a frequent codeword for meditative practices. Beginning in 12:1 he is treated with unwonted roughness and appears stupid rather than clever; in this same period the text first admits meditation as a second way of knowledge (2:15; in the nearby 2:9, Hwéi is defended against the imputation of stupidity) and later rejects it altogether (\*15:31<sup>15a</sup>, c0301; compare Hwéi's question about government in \*15:11<sup>15a</sup>). Thereafter Hwéi vanishes from the Analects, but reappears in the Jwāngdž, in one case (JZ 6:7) as a meditative adept. He is the prime example of narrative obsolescence in the Analects.

**Myths of Early Death.** As with Dž-lù, but beginning earlier, there attaches to Yén Hwéi a myth that he predeceased Confucius. With Dž-lù, there is a double tradition (both parts of which figure in Hàn tradition, the romantic one in SJ 67 and the more plausible scholarly one in SJ 121). Yén Hwéi is treated as alive in 5:9 (c0470) and first treated as deceased in the probably retrospective 6:11 (c0460); the natural inference is that he died in c0465. Since Dzṽngdž alludes to him as dead but also as a friend in 8:5 (a recollected saying from before c0436), and since Dzṽngdž himself, on any reading of the evidence, came late to the school, the probability from this direct testimony also is that Yén Hwéi survived Confucius. The motif of his early death continues to be developed in the Analects as a great loss to the school, and reaches a peak of lamentation in LY 11, which would perfectly suit the agenda of the Kǔng linealists as against the Dzṽngdž meritocrats, but the utility of the myth merely explains the myth. In its final form it seems likely to be a thematic transfer from the fact of the early death of Confucius's son Bwō-yw̄. Conceivably the appearance of a parallel myth of Dž-lù is affected by the fact that he had in the meantime become narratively involved with Yén Hwéi.

**Gūngsyī Hwá,** possibly of artisan background, and (in 6:4) with an honorific Dž- prefix. He is mentioned with Dž-lù and Rǎn Chyóu as employable in 5:8, and shown on an official mission to Chí in 6:4; the dispute over the allowance granted his family by his colleague Rǎn Chyóu turns on the fact that Dž-hwá is wealthy. He is thus an upwardly mobile success story, but also an example of what Confucius in LY 4 dislikes about the culture of upward mobility. His DZJ age differential would give him a birthdate of c0510, reaching adulthood in c0490. Consistently with this, his 7:34 mention by Dzṽngdž (which does *not* use his Dž- prefix; the only Analects instance of variation in this usage) suggests he may have been known to Dzṽngdž. Interpolations apart, he vanishes from the text after LY 11, along with the vital 05c issues of legitimacy and corruption in office which he symbolized.

**Dzṽngdž.** His surname (there was a state of Dzṽng) suggests a member of the exile community in Lù; by tradition he was a resident not of the capital but of the southern fortress town of Wǔ-chǔng. His dying credo in 8:3 suggests the energy of the outsider (compare Shǔn Chǔng). If, as suggested above (page 282), the odd name Tántái Myè-míng in 6:14 is a kenning rubric for Dzṽngdž, under which he can be referred to, and praised, without violating contemporary literary convention, his scrupulousness in office may also be a trait of the meritocratic social newcomer. With Dž-yóu and Dž-jāng, he represents the southern focus which is conspicuous in the 05c school. Unless we are prepared to accept the possibility of random or hostile interpolations in the text, we must take LY 8:3–7 as proving that at the time of his death (0436) Dzṽngdž was the head of the Lǔ school. Given the thematic features common to those sayings and LY 7, he was the author of LY 7 and thus the architect of a major change in the perception of Confucius. As the chief figure in 05c Confucianism, he is damned by omission and innuendo in LY 11:3 and 11:18a, respectively, but is later rehabilitated in a domestic (12:24, 1:4) and increasingly ritualized (1:9, c0294) mode, more compatible with the Kǔng agenda. He is a ritual spokesman, apparently in a positive sense, in his last bow in 19:16–18. At some point after his death he acquired, if not his own school, at any rate his own text. This is recorded in the HS 30 Palace library catalogue as having 18 chapters, and seems to have been included, perhaps entire, in Dà Dài Lǐ 49–58; it was still extant in early Táng. Dzṽngdž is also frequently quoted in the Hàn ritual compilations. This late, “outside” (non-Analectal) Dzṽngdž tradition still awaits systematic study.

**Dž-jāng**, said to be from Ch'vn, is unlikely as a protégé of Confucius in Lǚ. His DZJ-implied birth year is 0503 (two years younger than Dzvngdž), so that he came of age in 0485. He is a bystander in LY 5–6 and does not make the 11:3 pantheon. We infer that like Dzvngdž he is one of Dž-yóu's coterie of southern-connected people. His literary role in the early text is the neutral questioner, who exists to elicit a wise comment from Confucius. His role expands in the late chapters; at the end, he is the sole survivor: the only disciple who appears in LY 20.

**Fán Ch'í** is also a questioner rather than a candidate on his earliest appearance (6:22), but, unlike Dž-jāng, he does not develop into a major figure; he is still a questioner (not a notably perceptive one) in the late 04c, and vanishes thereafter.

**The Dubious Disciples**, those who appear first in the Kǔng period, are suspect as literary inventions. It is notable, for instance, that the plausible Lín Fāng, who appears only in LY 3:4 and 3:6, is not claimed as a disciple on any of the later lists. We assume, however, that those first mentioned in LY 11 are probably sound, since it was evidently the intention of that chapter not to create a new disciple tradition but to revise a known one. For Gāu Chái, the decisive passage is not his patronage by Dž-lù (11:23), since this might be a case of second-order clientship, but 11:18a, where he is plonked with the chapter enemy Dzvngdž, and where it would serve no literary purpose to introduce an unfamiliar personage. In general, no later tradition or text ascription attaches to later-mentioned people, while Dž-jyèn, manifestly not a disciple in 5:3 but nevertheless *appearing* in 5:3, has a Mídž 宓子 attributed to him in the HS 30 catalogue, along with an associated work, the Jǐngdž 景子, which is said to comment on the Mídž sayings and to be (seemingly) by a Dž-jyèn disciple. It would seem that, whether genuine protégés or not, the 05c names had a market value denied to those of later appearance, and thus lesser pedigree. It follows that the later centuries *still knew* what in the Analects went back to the earlier centuries. This awareness may affect the placing of interpolations, only the early school heads, for example, being honored with sayings interpolated into the LY 4 core.

**The Nobodies.** DZJ #34–38 are persons who, except for Bwó Chyén (#36, if he is rightly identified with Dž-sāng Bwódž), are unknown to the Analects but also not obvious myths. They have age differentials of 46 (Yén Syīn), 50 (Rǎn Rú, Tsáu Syw), and 53 (Gūngsūn Chūng). Yén Syīn would have come of age in 0487, and Bwó Chyén, Rǎn Rú and Tsáu Syw in 0483, Confucius being still active at court; Gūngsūn Chūng would have come of age in 0480, the year after his retirement. It seems that even these late arrivals expected, and in Bwódž's case actually got, counsel pursuant to a career, but also that the people Confucius attracted in those last years were not of the same quality or status as his earliest protégés, and that his degree of real or anticipated court influence, not his reputation as a philosopher, was the key factor in his attraction of protégés. The youngest, Gūngsūn Chūng, would appear to be an aspirant to office who gambled on Confucius's continued longevity, and lost. For him, the LY 4 maxims as remembered by older colleagues would have had a real-life function as a surrogate mentor.

**Summing Up.** We note in conclusion that nowhere in the above discussion does post-05c data plausibly augment 05c data; in many cases it clearly reflects a later agenda. The inference is that a picture based solely on early data, even though (as with Yén Hwér's death) sometimes shocking to readers schooled in the integral Analects, is truer than one contaminated by late data. The line between the two is probably to be located after LY 6, with LY 7–9 still containing usable impressions, and the Kǔng period from LY 10 on being increasingly revisionist and mythological.