
SINO-PLATONIC PAPERS

Number 72

May, 1996

The Life and Mentorship of Confucius

by
E. Bruce Brooks

Victor H. Mair, Editor
Sino-Platonic Papers
Department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6305 USA
vmair@sas.upenn.edu
www.sino-platonic.org

SINO-PLATONIC PAPERS is an occasional series edited by Victor H. Mair. The purpose of the series is to make available to specialists and the interested public the results of research that, because of its unconventional or controversial nature, might otherwise go unpublished. The editor actively encourages younger, not yet well established, scholars and independent authors to submit manuscripts for consideration. Contributions in any of the major scholarly languages of the world, including Romanized Modern Standard Mandarin (MSM) and Japanese, are acceptable. In special circumstances, papers written in one of the Sinitic topolects (*fangyan*) may be considered for publication.

Although the chief focus of *Sino-Platonic Papers* is on the intercultural relations of China with other peoples, challenging and creative studies on a wide variety of philological subjects will be entertained. This series is **not** the place for safe, sober, and stodgy presentations. *Sino-Platonic Papers* prefers lively work that, while taking reasonable risks to advance the field, capitalizes on brilliant new insights into the development of civilization.

The only style-sheet we honor is that of consistency. Where possible, we prefer the usages of the *Journal of Asian Studies*. Sinographs (*hanzi*, also called tetragraphs [*fangkuaizi*]) and other unusual symbols should be kept to an absolute minimum. *Sino-Platonic Papers* emphasizes substance over form.

Submissions are regularly sent out to be refereed and extensive editorial suggestions for revision may be offered. Manuscripts should be double-spaced with wide margins and submitted in duplicate. A set of "Instructions for Authors" may be obtained by contacting the editor.

Ideally, the final draft should be a neat, clear camera-ready copy with high black-and-white contrast.

Sino-Platonic Papers is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 2.5 License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, 543 Howard Street, 5th Floor, San Francisco, California, 94105, USA.

Please note: When the editor goes on an expedition or research trip, all operations (including filling orders) may temporarily cease for up to two or three months at a time. In such circumstances, those who wish to purchase various issues of *SPP* are requested to wait patiently until he returns. If issues are urgently needed while the editor is away, they may be requested through Interlibrary Loan.

N.B.: Beginning with issue no. 171, *Sino-Platonic Papers* has been published electronically on the Web. Issues from no. 1 to no. 170, however, will continue to be sold as paper copies until our stock runs out, after which they too will be made available on the Web at www.sino-platonic.org.

The Life and Mentorship of Confucius

E Bruce Brooks

University of Massachusetts at Amherst

It is obvious that the account of Confucius in Shǐ Jì 史記 (SJ) 47 is in part mythological; the placement of the Confucius chapter in the series of SJ ruler lineages rather than individuals suggests as much. It is less clear how one should proceed to work backward to a more credible account. So harmless a detail as the number of his disciples turns out to be surprisingly difficult to state. An official figure would seem to be given by the statues in the Temple of Confucius, but this inventory too has its variant forms. Early text sources give conflicting information, with the numbers 70 and 72 both mentioned. This problem may be connected with the question of Confucius's age at his death, where again accounts vary, over the range 70, 72, and 73. A seasoned investigator may suspect that one of these categories (number of disciples, age at death) is emblematic for the other, but which for which? The number 72, which turns up in both problems, is numerologically attractive (for one thing, $2^3 \times 3^2 = 8 \times 9 = 72$), suggesting that there may be a drift toward certain numbers. But 70 also has claims. It is in fact hard to find a number wholly without numerological interest, as witness the famous story – famous among mathematicians! – of Ramanujan and 1729. In this uncertain situation, how can we detect the direction of an evolution from a possibly real number toward a probably symbolic number? The age of Confucius is in turn connected with the birthdate of Confucius, in which problem eclipses of the sun, both real and imaginary, seem to be involved. From a calendrological perspective, a possible connection with the five 72-day periods into which the Chinese solar year is divided ($5 \times 72 = 360$) suggests itself. These multiple contacts with astral symbolism might well lead a rational investigator to abandon the problem altogether.

There is nevertheless a reason to continue. If anything definite about Confucius can after all be extracted from the meager evidence, it would add to our knowledge of a major figure, and perhaps indicate the pressures that were brought to bear on the historical Confucius image to create from it the emblematic Confucius image of Hàn and afterward. The present study will make this attempt, taking as a first focus the question of the disciples. In the course of pursuing this goal, it will also become necessary to consider such matters as Confucius's ancestors, the number and longevity of his successors (beginning with Dǐ-sǐ 子思), and the evidential value of some of the text sources, notably the Kǔngdǐ Jyā-yǔ 孔子家語. For the dates of other texts, I will here assume the suggestions in *Sino-Platonic Papers #46* (1994), some of them as refined in *The Original Analects* (for these and other citations, see the final list of Works Cited).

I am grateful to my colleague A Taeko Brooks for her contribution to the long program of joint research on whose results I have freely drawn in the present study. For segmentation and dating of the Analects and other texts here cited, see Brooks *Prospects* and Brooks *Original* (short citations of these and other works, in the form Author Surname Title Keyword, are expanded in the list of Works Cited). These conclusions are the starting point for the present paper.

Spellings of Chinese words are in the Common Alphabetic system (consonants as in English, vowels in Italian, plus æ as in “cat,” v as in “cut,” r as in “bird,” z as in “adz,” and yw (after n- or l-, simply w) for the “umlaut u” vowel sound. This convention, which is compatible with the unproblematic one long in use for Japanese, and which is capable of extension to other modern and premodern forms of Chinese, is recommended herewith to the consideration of both scholars and teachers.

Years BC are given with a zero prefix, as “0320,” years AD simply as the number. This culturally neutral form is recommended, over the alternates BC and BCE (and their even more overt equivalents in French and other modern languages), in the interest of a more inclusive international dialogue.

1: The Analects Disciples

It will be useful to begin with the Analects, by general agreement the most authentic source for the historical Confucius. It contains no early, that is, no 05c, statement about the size of the group around Confucius. Waley (*Analects* 19) notes that “in the Analects some twenty people figure, who might possibly be regarded as disciples, in so far as they are represented as addressing questions to Confucius.” From the Analects material as a whole, we should deduct those questioners who are rulers or members of the other great clans of Lǚ, since these may well reflect an aggrandizing tendency in the myth of Confucius’s official importance in his lifetime. If in addition we limit ourselves to those portions of the Analects which, on the accretional view of the text here adopted, were composed within living memory of Confucius, namely LY 4-6, we get a modest but suggestive initial count of probably genuine disciples:

LY 4 (c0479). Assuming that the accretional account of this text is correct, the sixteen noninterpolated sayings in this chapter (LY 4:1-14, 16-17) are the only material which closely reflects the historical Confucius. It is noteworthy that in these possibly genuine sayings no disciples are named, and no contact between disciples is implied. The sayings are remarks such as might have been made, on separate occasions, to a single hearer, and the sayings themselves give no clue to the identity of that hearer or hearers. They thus do not collectively imply the existence of a Confucian “school” in the sense of an organized learning experience for more than one person. Such a “school” is implied in the early posthumous chapters LY 5-6, but it is doubtful if we are justified in assuming a similar organization during the lifetime of Confucius. What the LY 4 sayings *do* imply is an intense concern for principled, even honorable, conduct both in and out of office, not for virtue in any abstract sense, or with personal morality as such. The sayings might easily have been addressed by a senior mentor to a young aspirant to office, and some of them, notably the first group, 4:1-7, only make sense on such an assumption. On this evidence, we should substitute, at least for the LY 4 material, a mentor/protege picture for the master/disciple one with which readers typically approach the Analects.

LY 5 (c0473). Here for the first time we find a group of persons engaged in conversation, and even rivalry, *with each other*. Of the four thematic sections into which the chapter seems to have been divided, the second (LY 5:4-12) appears to be systematically devoted to disciples (or proteges, as they still appear to be despite the new “school” setting). This is an invaluable aid in separating Confucius’s family (5:1-2), and contemporaries such as Dǔ-jyèn (5:3), here praised by Confucius as the admirable product of someone *else*’s training, from what the text seems to consider the disciples proper. The names certified by their appearance in 5:4-12 are:

1. Dǔ-gùng (5:4, using the Harvard concordance numbering; 5:9, 5:12)
2. Rǎn Yūng (5:5)
3. Chīdyāu Kāi (5:6)
4. Dǔ-lù (5:8)
5. Rǎn Chyóu (also 5:8)
6. Gūngsyī Hwá (also 5:8)
7. Yén Hwéi (5:9)
8. Dzǎi Yǔ (5:10a/b)
9. Shǔn Chǔng (5:11)

The only tempting possibility outside this section is:

Dǔ-jāng (5:19a/b, where he asks questions about ancient personages)

The obscure Shǔn Chǔng of 5:9, who is never again mentioned in the text (and who but for the pattern in LY 5 might be overlooked as a disciple), and the disqualification of Dǔ-jyèn (5:3) and Dǔ-jāng, both later of whom were regarded as disciples, are the first surprises we experience in reading the Analects text on the new, accretion-theory basis.

LY 6 (c0460). Noticing only names not encountered above, and relying on the general situation implied in the passage, since there does not seem to be a dedicated disciple section in this or any later Analects chapter, we can add the following from LY 6:

10. Džsāng Bwóđž (6:2, paralleling Rǎn Yūng in 6:1)
11. Ywǎn Sž (6:3)
12. Mǐn Dž-chyēn (6:9)
13. Rǎn Gvng (6:10)
14. Dž-syà (6:13)
15. Dž-yóu (6:14)
16. Fán Chř (6:22)

The fact that this total (to which no new names are added in the next two chapters) is the same number as the sixteen sayings of Confucius in LY 4 gives us our first suspicious conjunction: is there a connection between these two numbers? Since it is LY 6 which would be making that gesture toward the earlier LY 4, we need only assess the matter from that end. (1) Were there exactly 16 disciples, both emblemized in LY 4 and named in the above list? No, since the author of LY 6 will at this early date probably have been himself from the original Confucius circle, and since by the convention of the age he will not have mentioned his own name in his text, he constitutes a 17th authentic protege; I have conjectured that he was Yǒu Rwò. (2) Was it instead an inner circle of proteges who are emblemized in the structure of LY 4? If so, the same objection applies; the Analects school heads were probably drawn from the inner circle as long as any of its members remained, and Yǒu Rwò would thus make a 17th member of the inner circle. In addition, the extreme obscurity of some names on the LY 5-6 list argues against their having been favored members of an inner circle. (3) Were those emblemized by LY 4 a compiler group rather than an elite group? If it is thought that each contributed one saying, this is at variance with the orderliness of the LY 4 arrangement into thematic groups and paired sayings within groups: artistic selection from a larger fund of sayings is implied. Early tradition (the earliest instances is MC 3A4, c0255), which makes Dž-gùng the chief figure among the mourners for Confucius, suggests him as the compiler of LY 4 also. Whether he consulted the memories of his fellow mourners in making his selection would seem to be beyond conjecture. His personality as it is reflected (and criticized) in LY 5 implies a non-consultative stance.

In my view, the least unlikely possibility is that the sixteen sayings of LY 4 *had* some sort of special meaning, but evidently an ephemeral one, since it was not taken up by later addenda (subsequent Analects chapters tend to have 24 sayings, or twice the calendrical number 12). One possibility is that it reflected the number of mourners who observed the full requirements, whatever they may have been at that date, perhaps as a reproach to those who were absent or left early (this implied reproach is also present in the MC 3A4 story). Given that sixteen, it is quite possible that the compiler of LY 6 may have limited disciple anecdotes so as not to exceed that total number of disciples, but it is less likely that we have in the LY 5-6 inventory a precise list of the LY 4 mourners, if only because Yǒu Rwò, absent from LY 5-6, was said in MC 3A4 to have been among them; if such a precise intention was in the mind of the compiler of LY 5, he could easily have worked all sixteen names into his chapter. The LY 6 compiler, finding less than sixteen names mentioned in the text up til then, may well have chosen to add no more names than would allude to, or replicate, the LY 4 situation, but he probably chose particular names as associated with, or giving a suitable foundation for, the anecdotes he wished to relate.

LY 7 (c0450). No new disciples, and few old ones, are mentioned in LY 7 (the entire list consists of Dž-lù in 7:19 and 7:35, and Gūngsyī Hwá in 7:34). It is to be presumed that the compiler of LY 7 felt ill at ease composing disciple stories, most likely because his knowledge of the original circle was limited, this in turn most plausibly because he *was not of* that circle. LY 7 thus seems to be outside what might be called the zone of living memory of Confucius.

LY 8 (c0436). The core chapter consists of four sayings, 8:3, 5-7, of which the first records the last words of Dv̄ngdž. The four sayings are thus obviously a memorial to him, and were probably recorded by his elder son Dz̄v̄ng Yw̄æn 曾元, who would logically have been his ranking mourner. Peculiarities of usage unknown in earlier chapters, notably the occasional use of the quasi-sacral first person pronoun yǔ 予 for the standard Lǚ-dialect wú/wǒ 吾 / 我, imply identity of authorship between LY 7 and the Dz̄v̄ngdž sayings in 8:3-7. This difference supports the above inference that Dz̄v̄ngdž was not himself of the original protege circle, but rather a late comer to the posthumous school. Of his four sayings, 8:5 almost certainly alludes to Yén Hwéi. Taking this and LY 7 together, Dz̄v̄ngdž's demonstrable acquaintanceship will have been limited to Yén Hwéi, Dž-lù, and Gūngsyī Hwá, the last two of whom he treats more amiably than the LY 5-6 authors had done. This is interesting from the point of view of school history, but it tells us nothing new about the composition of the disciple group in its own time.

LY 9 (c0405). Dz̄v̄ng Yw̄æn is the logical person to have succeeded his father in the school headship as of LY 9. Still less than Dz̄v̄ngdž can he have had any first-hand knowledge of the original Confucius circle. That some were still living who did have such knowledge is implied by the explicit variant of a story given in 9:7 in the words "Láu 牟 says that the Master said . . ." A survivor of the original circle would have had to be nearly 100 by the year c0405 which for other reasons seems likely as the *final* date of LY 9, but this saying might have been written down earlier, as part of the accumulating chapter. It is customary to identify "Láu" with Chín Jāng 琴張, who appears in the Dzwǒ Jwàn (sv Jāu 20, c0522; see Legge **Ch'un** 682b) but not, under that name, in the Analects proper. He cannot be equated with any of the sixteen disciples so far named in the book, or with the yet unnamed Yǒu Rwò (#17). Had Dz̄v̄ng Yw̄æn regarded him as one of the original circle, his version would presumably have superseded 9:7. It seems safest to regard him as a later figure.

LY 10 (c0380) marks a complete departure from earlier chapters, and apart from later interplations it contains no mentions of disciples at all. It is, in its entirety, a guide to court and household ritual conduct, and may have been compiled as a guide to those entering the court circle but not previously familiar with it. It will be argued below that this chapter also marks the beginning of the hereditary Kūng family headship of the Analects school.

LY 11 (c0360). The text here returns with a vengeance to the subject of the disciples. This chapter consists of almost nothing else but disciple stories, including a long series of laments for the early death of Yén Hwéi (11:7-10). Its centerpiece is undoubtedly 11:3, which is a list of ten disciples grouped under the category in which they supposedly excel. This has the look of an intentional pantheon of approved disciples, and the LY 11:3 Ten in fact figure at the head of virtually every subsequent roster of Confucius's disciples, including the Kūngdž Jyā-yǔ and Shǐ Jì lists and the Confucian Temple inventory (Legge **Analects** Prolegomena 112f). From the fact that other disciples figure elsewhere in LY 11, it cannot be construed as an exhaustive list; it is rather a first attempt to delineate a more prominent or more approved subgroup. It includes:

Virtuous Conduct:	Yén Yw̄æn, Mín Dž-chyēn, Rǎn Bwó-nyóu, Jùng-gūng
Language:	Dzǎi Wǒ, Dž-gùng
Government Affairs:	Rǎn Chyóu, Jì-lù
Cultural Achievement:	Dž-yóu, Dž-syà

This list is outrageous to the consecutive Analects reader, since it reverses or ignores many of the LY 5-6 anecdotes. The worst shock is the presence of Dzǎi Wǒ, who in 6:26 ridicules the "rǎn person" with a cynical pun, but in 11:3 is rehabilitated as "skilled in language." Others previously criticized are also here honored: Dž-gùng (disabused of his literary pretensions in 5:4, 5:9, and 5:12, but sharing the 11:3 spotlight with Dzǎi Wǒ for literary skill), Rǎn Chyóu (corrupt in office in 6:4; exemplary in office in 11:3), and Dž-syà (scolded in 6:13 for his preoccupation with lowbrow tradition; praised in 11:3 for his expertise in highbrow tradition).

The agenda behind this list becomes clearer when we observe that Dz̄vngd̄z̄, the exemplar of the strenuous moral life in 8:3, and clearly the leading figure in the Confucian school in the latter half of the 05c, is cavalierly dismissed in 11:18a as “dull.” A further clue can be found in the series of laments on the early death of Yén Hwéi (11:7-11), who by his surname was presumably a relative of Confucius on his mother’s side. His death is compared to that of Confucius’s own son in 11:8, it is said to have left Confucius no worthwhile disciples in 11:7, it is lamented “unrestrainedly” in 11:9, and characterized as “Heaven destroying me” in 11:8. It is clear to the greenest reader that Confucius was deprived of a worthy *potential* successor by Hwéi’s death, and LY 11 openly denigrates Dz̄vngd̄z̄, one of Confucius’s *actual* successors. All told, these passages read like an attempt to discredit the immediately preceding Dz̄vng line, and (in the person of the indirectly related Yén Hwéi) to argue instead for the credentials of their own (Kǔng) line. In other words, the sudden interest in disciples in LY 11 does not represent contact with a new and plausible *source* for the past. It is rather a systematic attempt to *remold* the past; to validate the recent Kǔng family takeover of the leadership of the school.

Another sign of family bias is in the admission, to what is evidently a list of disciples, of the two marginally reputable sons-in-law of LY 5:1-2, both of whom had historically been in real or potential trouble with the law, and who had figured in a *non-disciple* section of LY 5. One of them, the Nán Rúng of 5:2 is in 11:6 made to be a cultured and aspirational reciter of the better Shī poems; he will in a later chapter be further upgraded by being identified with an apparently much more exalted personage, Nángūng Kwò. There is no plausible reason to take Nán Rúng’s highmindedness in 11:6 (or Dz̄vngd̄z̄’s stupidity in 11:18a) as based on new or more authentic information about the past; they are more likely to be *manipulations* of the past.

This is not to deny that the school at this date, about a century after the death of Confucius, may not still have possessed authentic information about him and his circle. The test case is the disciple who, after about 90 years of no new names in the Analects chapters, is mentioned for the first time in LY 11. We may list him here with other “post-sixteen” figure noticed above:

17. [Yǒu Rwò (not so far mentioned in the text, but by inference the author of LY 6)]
18. Gāu Chái (11:18a, 11:23)

Gāu Chái in 11:23 is no more than incidental; in 11:18a he is dismissed (as “stupid”) along with Dz̄vngd̄z̄ (“dull”), D̄z̄-jāng (“vulgar”) and D̄z̄-lù (“commonplace”). The latter mention almost requires that he would have been recognized by LY 11 readers as a known early disciple (note that D̄z̄-jāng, not in the disciple section of LY 5, has here been retrospectively promoted to disciple status), whose place in Analects school history it was worthwhile for LY 11 to dispute. Recognizing him as a member of the circle brings us closer to Waley’s number of 20 for the true proteges (adding [Chín] Láu and D̄z̄-jāng would *give* 20, though not exactly Waley’s 20). It is reasonable to suspect, however, that any “disciples” first introduced *after* this point will have less plausibility as historical figures. The probable exception is Yǒu Rwò, who first appears in LY 12:9 (c0326) and figures in the Dzwǒ Jwàn 左傳 (DJ; completed c0312). His being questioned by the ruler of Lǔ in 12:9, and his being elsewhere (1:2, 1:13) called Yǒud̄z̄ (“Master Yǒu”), implies a tradition that he had at one point been head of the Analects school. Apart from him, this variant of Waley’s conclusions seems to be as far as the Analects evidence can safely take us, in framing a first hypothesis of the original circle.

2. Outside Evidence for Disciples: Early 03c

There is no statement of the *size* of the Confucius group in any late 04c text. The Mencius, in both the northern (MC 4B31) and southern (MC 2A3) strands of its later layers (early 03c), mentions “70 disciples.” If its presence in both schools implies that it derived from Mencius himself, then this tradition goes back to c0320, the year Mencius left the Analects school and began his own public career. At latest, these passages attest a 70-disciple tradition by c0275.

The Sywǎndž 荀子 (SZ), most of which seems to date from the lifetime of Sywǎn Chīng, and which thus falls in the early and middle 03c, overlapping with the Mencian writings, makes no statement about the number of Confucius's disciples. It does dispute the virtue and credentials of individual disciples or later school heads, the most notorious example being his denunciation of "Dž-sž and Mencius" in SZ 6. This is unsurprising, since whereas Mencius, via the Analects school, could claim the doctrinal authority of disciple transmission, Sywǎndž could not (he, or the tradition he founded, emphasizes instead his place in the transmission of the classic *texts*). The 70-disciple tradition attested in Mencius thus seems to be uncontradicted within the first half of the 03c. We note in passing that the famous ethical-progress passage, LY 2:4 (c0317), ends with Confucius describing himself at the age of 70. At that date, then, the *minimum* Analects assertion as to Confucius's age at his death was 70. For almost a century thereafter, the understood age of Confucius and the asserted number of his disciples were the same.

It is often asserted that these numbers must be taken as rounded off, thus permitting the later tradition that the actual figure in one or both cases is 72 rather than 70. To the extent that 72 may have been a culturally resonant number, it is that much less likely to have been rounded off in practice, since any magic would presumably have abided in the specific 72. Beyond this, we may consider the claims for 72 later, when they first become visible in the literary record. For the present, with only 70 available for discussion, the question is whether it is (1) accurate, (2) rounded off from a *nonresonant* number, or (3) influenced by some outside consideration.

Comparative Considerations. The number 70, as mentioned earlier, is common enough in the Bible to be considered a recurring motif of that set of texts. We seem to have, for example, 70 as an age or other duration, and as a number of sons or elders:

Gen 5:12 When Kenan had lived **70 years** he became the father of Mahalalel

Gen 11:26 When Terah had lived **70 years** he became the father of Abram, Nahor, and Haran

but adjacent passages give, as ages at procreation, such mundane numbers as 29, 34, and 187. If there is magic in 70 for this purpose, it is at best intermittent. For 70 as a duration:

Gen 50:3 And the Egyptians wept for him [Jacob] **70 days**

Isa 23:15 Tyre will be forgotten for **70 years**, like the days of one king

The former has no notable parallels. The latter gives itself away by its comparison to the length of the life of a king; it may refer to the revival of Tyrian prosperity under the Seleucid kings, following its destruction by Alexander in 332 (Scott *Isaiah* 296).

Ex 1:5 The offspring of Jacob were **70 persons**

Ju 8:30 Gideon had **70 sons**

Commentators tend to dismiss these instances as merely "symbolic" use of numbers, without pointing to a specific symbolism. Other groups of 70 men would include:

Num 11:16 Gather for me **70 men** of the elders of Israel

Deu 10:22 Your fathers went down to Egypt **70 persons**

Ezra 8:7 Jeshaiiah the son of of Athalia, and with him **70 men**

The last amounts to little: other sentences in the same context have other numbers (for the "genealogies of those who went up with me from Babylonia") such as 30, 50, 80, and 218. The first two examples seem to symbolize Israel (the second refers to the same Egyptian sojourn as the Exodus passage above). An alternate and far more popular symbolism for Israel is 12, based on the 12 tribes, and in later times 70 seems at least sometimes to have been regarded as the number of the Gentile nations. Thus:

Luke 10:1 After [sending the 12 to Israel] the Lord appointed **70 others** [to the Gentiles]

Historical allusions aside, we can say little more than that 70 (and 700, and 7000) probably gain emblematic strength from being round numbers, and multiples of the 7 (one of whose primary embodiments is the 7-day week) tend to symbolize perfection or completion in this culture.

There is little in these Biblical examples that might be expected to be culturally universal. On the Chinese side, we have evidences for two types of 70-symbolism. These are 70 as an age, specifically as the beginning of old age, and 70 as the number of men in a military company.

Age 70. In Mencius, this defines those sufficiently aged to deserve support, and special care, from the rest of society. The basic Mencian economy is one which provides sufficient surplus for those of 70 and over to have meat to eat and silk to wear (MC 1A3:4). The higher caloric value of meat food, and the higher thermal value of silk clothing, both seem to reflect the diminished metabolic efficiency of the aged (compare MC 7A22). Though the number 70 may be rounded for convenience, it would seem to be more reportorial rather than symbolic. A wry use of 70 as the threshold of age (the point by which one has learned all one is going to) is in MC 5A9. Confucius at 70 in LY 2:4 (c0317), though approvingly rather than sarcastically, might also be said to have learned all he or anyone is ever going to. The tone is different, but the idea of a major threshold at 70 is the same. The Mencian economics passage MC 1A3:4, though appended to a genuine Mencian speech, is itself an interpolation and thus from after its putative date of c0320; the wry MC 5A9 is definitely from the first half of the 03c. For what it may be worth, the definition of 70 as the onset of old age is reflected in several texts in the *Lǐ Jì* anthology; among them LJ 1A8 (曲禮上; Legge Li 1/66). This perception thus seems to obtain from at least the late 04c onward into Hān. The reference to Tàì-gūng 太公 in SZ 12:9 (mid 03c; Knoblock *Xunzi* 2/188) as having been 72 when appointed to a ministership by Jōu Wǎn-wáng seems to lack cosmic resonance; it is instead an occasion of decrepitude – his teeth were so worn that he seemed to have none at all, hence it was not for his appearance that he was chosen for office. 72 here seems to imply “past age into decrepitude,” validating the idea of 70 as the cultural threshold of old age rather than establishing 72 itself as a different threshold.

Company of 70. The Dzwǒ Jwàn (c0312) three times mentions a body of 70 footsoldiers (tú 徒 “followers”) accompanying no (Ding 10; Legge 777b), or 7 (Ding 4; Legge 754b), or 15 (Jāu 21; Legge 689b), chariots. The military function of this company is less clear than its size. In the Jāu 21 (0521) case, it seems to be the infantry component of a 15-chariot attack force which pierces the enemy line. None of the classic military manuals (Sūndǒ 孫子, Wúdǒ 吳子, Sǒmǎ Fǎ 司馬法, or Wèi [or Ywè] Lyáudǒ 尉繚子) mention such a group, but there is other textual and archaeological evidence for the existence of a combat group of approximately this size, operating with, and in support of, a single war chariot. Gwǎndǒ 管子 (GZ) 5, from the early 03c, describes a chariot complement totaling 78 men: 28 armored soldiers (jyǎ 甲), 20 guards (bì 蔽), and 30 untrained conscripts (bái tú 白徒) to assist with the supplies. Of the 78, then, 48, or 62% are combat troops. This is not a very efficient ratio, consistent with the reference to “untrained” support troops. In Pit #2 of the First Emperor’s mausoleum (c0208) we have a seeming western version of this same group. With a chariot (whose driver and archer are absent) are terra cotta statues representing 68 soldiers. All are armored, showing a more advanced state of training and equipment than the GZ 5 group. There were 4 behind the chariot, apparently a rear guard, and 8 in two ranks at its right, suggesting a double skirmish line extending to the right of the chariot and capable of linking up to the next chariot in a battle line. Behind this line in a double file were 34 soldiers, as it were a column ready to move through the skirmishers to exploit a breakthrough. On the left and to the rear were 22 more, noted by Dien (*Armor* 47) as “certainly not a combat group” and presumably the support group. Not only has there been a reduction from 78 to 68 in the infantry complement, but that reduction has largely taken place in the support troops, which have shrunk from 30 to 22. The Chín version then has a ratio of 46 to 68, or 68% in fighting troops, compared to 62% in the GZ 5 version. No such unit is mentioned in the military texts, but this evidence implies that there was, in practice, an infantry company of between 68 and 78 men which operated in support of a chariot. The Dzwǒ Jwàn references are probably to an early version of this chariot-support company.

For the age of Confucius as stated in LY 2:4, namely 70, and for the size of Confucius's dedicated band of followers, namely 70, there thus seem to be, not numerological constraints, but real-life cultural and military precedents, during the period when they have their currency. The "company of 70" allusion might invite us to picture the mature Confucius riding in his chariot at the head of a band of 70 followers; it envisions him as engaged against opposition.

3. Outside Evidence for Disciples: Late 03c and 02c

We may here consider statements in later texts about the number of Confucius's disciples, keeping watch also for appearances of the number 72 in other contexts.

The *Lǚ-shì Chūn/Chyōu* 呂氏春秋 (LSCC; first series dated to c239) takes a step beyond the Mencian 70 disciples by referring (but in the second-series chapter LSCC 14:7; after 0220) to 70 disciples who were said in turn to have been selected from a larger group of 3,000. The 3,000 here are undoubtedly a mythic elaboration, and apparently a transfer from military lore: it is supposedly the size of the army of King Wǔ when he conquered Shāng and established Jōu. This Wǔ-wàng tradition already appears in MC 7B4 (c0255), later than the 70-disciple mentions in that text, and in any case not mixing with them motivically. The Wǔ-wàng 3,000-warrior strand occurs also in LSCC 8:3 (0239) and in LSCC 15:7 (after 0220), in the same layer as the addition of the 3,000 motif to the Confucian disciple tradition. This "selected from 3,000" motif continues to spread within the body of Confucian myth, and appears later as a claim that the "300 Poems" of the *Shī* 詩 corpus were selected by Confucius from a larger repertoire of 3,000.

The *Jwāngdǔ* 莊子 (JZ), a Dàuist collection whose earliest portions seem to go back to the first half of the 03c, makes no direct statement about the number of Confucius's disciples. It does, however, portray him (in JZ 14:7, a belittling story in which Confucius confesses failure and seeks guidance from Lǎudǔ) as having attempted to convince 72 rulers of the value of his teachings. The 72 motif also appears in the story of the magic tortoise (JZ 26:6), whose shell yielded 72 correct divinations – unfortunately, the tortoise had to be killed before its shell could be used in this way; a metaphor of wisdom being the ruin of its possessor. The knowledge of Confucius, displayed in vain before 72 rulers, and the potency of the tortoise, validated ruinously in 72 divinations, are rhetorically analogous. In both cases, it seems valid to take 72 as in some sense symbolizing completeness: *all* the kingdoms of the earth rejected Confucius (no one reading the JZ story will expect to hear a narrative of a 73rd attempt; on the contrary, the implication is that Confucius has abandoned such attempts), or *all* the divinations that were undertaken with the tortoise's shell. It is possible that the association between 72 and the political world is via the Five Element theory ($5 \times 72 = 360$), or that 72, as the product of the two largest linguistically primary integers 8 and 9, is in a sense the "largest possible" number. The latter has the advantage that it may also explain the migration of 70 to 72 in Mediterranean as well as Chinese contexts (the translators of the Septuagint are given as 70 in early, and as 72 in later, sources; the Lukan "70 apostles" have a late variant "72 apostles"). The tortoise story hints at some sort of numerological/cosmological potency in the number 72; the Lǎudǔ story documents an infection of the Confucius myth (if not yet its disciple portion) with the "72" element. Neither of these *Jwāngdǔ* stories is quoted in a datable pre-Chín text. A different portion of JZ 26 is quoted in LSCC 14, which is in the Chín portion of that work. It would be rash at present to date either of these JZ passages too closely. They are almost certainly from the late 03c, but whether before or after the Chín Unification is not so clear.

The Hān dynasty work *Hwái-nándǔ* 淮南子 (0160-0139; Brooks **Prospects** 12f) gives the number of Confucius's disciples as 70 (HNZ 20), continuing the pattern set in the 03c evidence, and notes also a larger group of 3,000 followers (the same passage goes on to mention the 180 militant men of *Mwòdǔ*, which is evidently responding to different symbolic sources). HNZ 11 refers to "more than 70 sages" who have recommended solutions to the problems of the age.

Waley believes that the magicality of 72 stems from “the quintuple division of the year of 360 days;” the 5×72 formula mentioned above. This division (and the 360-day year) are never mentioned in the Mician writings, the earliest of which date from the early 04c. They are absent from Dzwǒ Jwàn (completion date c0312). Instead, an value of approximately 365 days per year is implied by a DJ anecdote under Syāng 30 (Legge 556a), in which an elapsed age of 73 years is said to equal 26,660 days, this resting on an analysis of the cyclic sign *hài* 亥, graphically made up of a two (二) and two sixes (六). The 72-day year division is in Gwǎndž (GZ) 41 (in the sentence 七十二日而畢), but only in the relatively late chapter GZ 41, dated by Rickett to Hân. Waley’s reading of LY 11:24 as implying $5 \times 6 = 30$ plus $6 \times 7 = 42$ (total 72) young men is probably inferior to a reading which takes the consecutive numbers as alternates (“five or six”) and not factors (“five times six”). On this reading, the young men in the envisioned excursion would be, in effect, “about a dozen.” In any case, LY 11:24, which decries official ambition, is an interpolation in that chapter, and is probably to be grouped chronologically with the retreat-from-office chapter LY 1, which we date to c0294; that is, to the early 03c.

The Number 71. This is mildly celebrated as the supposed number of states (fiefs) created by the Jōu dynasty after the conquest of Shāng. This figure is unknown to the Dzwǒ Jwàn, which at several points states the number of fiefs given to members of the Jōu ruling house, but does not give a total including the nonlinear fiefs. It is given for the first time, as far as I know, in several genuine chapters of the Sywǎndž (SZ 8:1, 8:8, and 12:9; Knoblock 2/68, 77, 188), all these being repetitions of the same sentence. There is in LSCC 15:8, of shortly after 0239, a reference to the “the 71 sages of the world” (天下七十一聖) who give it conflicting advice; this seems to be the number that is given less exactly as “more than 70 sages” in HNZ 11. Whether this is meant as an analogue of the Jōu 71 states (in the sense of “the sages of the several states”) is difficult to say. It seems in any case not to be cosmically resonant, but simply impatient – its implication is that there are too many conflicting theories at large in the world. It would conceivably be justifiable to translate it as “umpty-eleven.” In Hân Shǐ Wàì-jwàn (HSWJ) 4:15 (c0141), in a sentence otherwise quoted exactly from Sywǎndž, the number of Jōu fiefs is given as 72. That change might represent pressure from a symbolically meaningful number 72. It might also be simply textual interference: that reference comes directly after mention of the employment of Tàì-gūng at age 72, only a few lines earlier in HSWJ 4:15 (as in SZ 12:9, which is the source of this HSWJ section). It was Tàì-gūng’s assistance, according to this story, that made it possible for Wǎn-wáng to govern the realm and apportion the fiefs. The age/fiefs number sequence, which is 72/71 in the Sywǎndž source, becomes 72/72 in HSWJ. Nothing unambiguously symbolic seems necessarily to be at work here.

For information as to the number 72 in connection with Confucian lore, one must sooner or later turn to the Kǔngdž Jyā-yǎ 孔子家語 (KZJY), a text of uncertain date and disputed value. Of the present work’s 44 chapters, we may as a preliminary step distinguish between the first 27, which may correspond to the entry in HS 30 (4/1717), and the last 17, which might be addenda. The distinction turns out to be suggestive. The only reference in KZJY 1-27 to Confucius’s age or number of disciples is in KZJY 12, where the latter number is given as “more than 70” 七十有餘人; the number 72 occurs only in a passage of Yì 易-related nature lore in KZJY 25. On the other hand, in the chapters beyond KZJY 27, we find “72 disciples” in the title of the disciple list, KZJY 38, and the statement that Confucius was 72 at the time of his death in the story of his death, which is contained at length in KZJY 40:1. By the time of this material, whatever its own age turns out to be, both the age and the disciples of Confucius, which were identical at 70 in the early 03c, have become once again identical, but at 72.

The Shǐ Jì too, along with the older tradition of 70 for both, also contains statements of 72 for Confucius’s age and for the number of his disciples. It will be fruitful to embark here on an extended comparison and analysis of these two works, focusing first on the disciples.

The Kǔngdǔ Jyā-yǔ Disciple List

The Text. KZJY and SJ both contain lists of Confucius's disciples. Before comparing the two, we need to rebut the impression, widespread among scholars, that the Kǔngdǔ Jyā-yǔ is a forgery by Wáng Sù (195-256). Ariel K'ung 65-69, in a book on the Kǔng Tsungdǔ (KTZ), a work of partly similar character, considers that KZJY is a forgery, but notes, in effect, that it and KTZ have a different relation to Wáng Sù. KZJY is annotated by Wáng, which tends to exculpate him from having forged it (see the remark by Graham, in a different connection, in *Reflections* 238), whereas KTZ is not. KTZ reinterprets Gūngsūn Lúng; KZJY does not. Ariel's data (and the remarks in Kramers K'ung, and the fact that the life spans of the Kǔng successors are less plausible in KTZ) seem to make sense if it is assumed that Wáng annotated a pre-existing KZJY, but that he or his daughter later wrote KTZ (see also Kramers Chia Yü). As to whether it was Wáng who expanded the 27-chapter KZJY to 44 chapters, see below.

KZJY38 and SJ 67. These two lists have much in common. They begin with names for which more detail, and sometimes anecdotal color, is given, and continue with entries having only surname, personal name, and formal name. The division is tacit in KZJY 38, and explicitly labeled in SJ 67. Most of the KZJY names can be readily matched with their SJ counterparts, but there are also some unobvious cases:

KZJY 38

- 33. Chín Láu 琴牢 / 子開
- 39. Chín Kàng 陳亢 / 子亢, 子禽
- 40. Shújùng Hwèi 叔仲會 / 子期
- 41. Kǔng Sywǎn 孔璇
- 51. Sywē Bāng 薛邦 / 子從
- 53. Sywǎn Dǎn 懸璽 / 子象
- 71. Shǔn Jí 申績 / 子周

SJ 67

- 24. Gūngbwó Lyáu 公伯僚 / 子周
- 48. Chín Rǎn 秦冉 / 開
- 57. Shǔn Chǔng 申黨 / 周
- 71. Shújùng Hwèi 叔仲會 / 子期
- 72. Yén Hí 顏何 / 冉
- 63. Jǔng Gwó 鄭國 / 子徒
- 53. Chyáu Dān 鄒單 / 子家

KZJY #33 and SJ #48 are probably to be equated from the identity of formal names; of them, Chín [ancient Gyvm] Láu (who appears in LY 9:2) is likely to be an Analectizing development of Chín [Dzvyv] Rǎn rather than the reverse. In the KZJY #40-41 anecdote, Kǔng Sywǎn has no formal name, contrary to the practice in the KZJY anecdotal section, of which it marks the end. SJ demotes Shújùng Hwèi to almost the end of the list; next to him is Yén Hí, unknown to KZJY but also a presumptive relation of Confucius (on his mother's, not his father's, side). Yén Hí is probably original, and Kǔng Sywǎn a later Kǔng exaggeration.

Most of the names are not high-profile Analects personalities like the clan heir Mǔng Yidǔ (LY 2:5) who we might expect would have been claimed as a disciple, but who does not appear. Instead, many are totally unknown and could serve no readily imaginable aggrandizing agenda. No other hypothesis suggests itself than that they are an actual listing of the Confucius circle, of which we only see the employable tip in the Analects. Before proceeding, however, we must ascertain which version of the list is earlier, and how reliable the earlier version itself may be.

Fortunately, the relation between the two lists is readily determined. KZJY 38 is titled "Explanation of The 72 Disciples" (七十二弟子解), but actually contains 76 names (77, if we count those in #40 separately, as has been done here). The SJ 67 list speaks of, and contains, 77 names. The names are in largely the same order at the beginning, and diverge increasingly toward the end, but as noted they are recognizably the same names, and one list has presumably been rearranged from the other. It is likely that KZJY 38, an original 72-disciple list, was later expanded by interpolation to 77 names, but without updating the title. SJ 67, which has no such discrepancy, was presumably a 77-name list from the beginning. That SJ 67 makes explicit the KZJY 38 division between elaborate and minimal entries also implies that SJ 67 is later.

This probability becomes a virtual certainty in light of the following points:

- SJ 67 in effect says so: it mentions using, and improving upon, an old (that is, a pre-Chín script) text of the Kǔng family called the Disciple Register 弟子籍.

- Jǐng Sywǎn 鄭玄 (127-200) in his commentary to SJ 67 #2, cites a text which he calls not the Jyā-yǔ, or the Kǔngdǔ Jwā-yǔ, but the List of Confucius's Disciples 孔子弟子目錄. The inference is that his text, which generally agrees with KZJY 38, was that list in its still separate form. Wáng Sù, whose commentary to KZJY includes critical notes on some of the less probable KZJY 38 anecdotes, either found the list already added to KZJY or added it himself. Commentators after his time all cite the list as from KZJY. This guarantees the separate existence of the list long after the Shǐ Jì was compiled, and before Wáng Sù can have had anything to do with it.

- SJ 67 claims to improve on its source by supplementing it from the Analects. KZJY 38 largely avoids citing Analects stories in its anecdotal first half. SJ 67 also claims to have gotted rid of doubtful data in its source.. 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 second, non-anecdotal half of the list.

- Both lists begin with the ten LY 11:3 disciples, but whereas KZJY 38 keeps the Analects order, SJ 67 switches two pairs of names (#5-6 and #7-8). The Analects order may be presumed to be authoritative, hence KZJY 38 is earlier, and the SJ variant, whose effect is to list the three Rǎn in succession, is then a revision of it.

- 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 strongest example is Lyáng Jān 梁鱧, whose personal (鱧) 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 reordering of names on the two lists is such that some KZJY names in the first section are 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 Jǐng 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. A pre-Chín KZJY (see above), would not have come under this taboo, and we may infer that at least this detail of the KZJY list is of pre-Hàn date.

We may thus take the sequence KZJY 38 > SJ 67 as established. But KZJY 38 has also apparently 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 Dǔ- prefix, and

- The present KZJY 38 displays an Analectizing tendency, so that the apparently 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 KZJY 38 cannot simply be 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 Shǎn Lyáu 申繚 (a commentary reading), the known Gūngbwó Lyáu 公伯僚 (LY 14:36), an enemy of Dž-lù who thus cannot have been a disciple or even an adherent. 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 the character 石. KZJY is followed.

- For KZJY #45 Jyé 潔, SJ #70 has Syé 黎. 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 the determinative. Where SJ and KZJY have *different* determinatives, SJ, as the earlier and thus more informed expansion, 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 Rángszè 穰駟; SJ #42 has Rángszè 壤駟. The KZJY form 穰 “stalk of grain” may be a semantic amelioration of the cruder 壤 “loam.” For the KZJY #55 name Jv 哲 “wise,” SJ #73 has Jv 哲 “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 Sywán 孔璇, one of two Kūngs in KZJY and the only anecdotally elaborated one. His presence is probably a Kūng aggrandizement. SJ #72, Yén Hǎ, which corresponds with it by default, has been substituted.

- KZJY #53 (懸壺) and SJ #53 (鄴單) have only vague calligraphic similarities; they are equated by default and by position. The KZJY form has been preferred.

- 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 Dzwǒrǎn 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, I also give the age (number of years younger than Confucius), when that datum is supplied in the better sources.

01	Yén Hwèi	顏回	子淵	40	Shújùng Hwèi	叔仲會	子期	54
02	Mǐn Sùn	閔損	子騫	29	Yén Hú	顏何	稱	
03	Rǎn Gōng	冉耕	伯牛	42	Chín Dzǔ	秦祖	子南	
04	Rǎn Yōng	冉雍	仲弓	43	Syírung Jǎn	奚容箴	子皙	
05	Dzái Yǔ	宰予	子我	44	Gūngdzú Gōudz	公祖句茲	子之	
06	Dwānmù Sè	端木賜	子貢	45	Lyén Jyé	廉潔	曹	
07	Rǎn Chyóu	冉求	子有	46	Gūngsyī Yw-rú	公西輿如	子上	
08	Jùng Yóu	仲由	子路	47	Hǎnfǔ Hēi	罕父黑	索	
09	Yén Yǎn	言偃	子游	35	Gūngsyī Jǎn	公西箴	子尚	
10	Bǔ Shāng	卜商	子夏	49	Rǎngsz Chì	壤駟赤	子徒	
11	Jwānsūn Shī	顓孫師	子張	48	Rǎn Jì	冉季	子產	
12	Dzǎng Shǔm	曾參	子輿	46	Sywē Bāng	薛邦	子徒	
13	Tántái Myè-míng	澹臺滅明	子羽	49	Shí Chǔ	石處	里	
14	Gāu Chái	高柴	子羔	40	Chyāu Shàn	鄒單	子家	
15	Mì Bù-chí	密不齊	子賤	49	Dzwórvn Yǐng	左人郢	行	
16	Fán Syw	樊須	子遲	46	Dí Hēi	狄黑	皙	
17	Yòu Rwò	有若	有	36	Shāng Dzǔ	商澤	子秀	
18	Gūngsyī Chǐ	公西赤	子華	42	Rǎn Bù-chí	任不齊	選	
19	Ywǎn Syèn	原憲	子思	36	Rúng Chí	榮祈	子祺	
20	Gūngyě Cháng	公冶長	子長	59	Yén Kwài	顏嚮	子聲	
21	Nāngūng Tāu	南宮綽	子容	60	Ywǎn Tāu	原桃	籍	
22	Gūngsyī Kǐ	公析克	季沉	61	Gūngjyēn Dìng	公肩定	中	
23	Dzǎng Dyèn	曾點	子皙	62	Chín Fēi	秦非	子之	
24	Yén Yóu	顏由	路	6	Chīdyāu Tú	漆雕徒	文	
25	Shāng Jyw	商瞿	子木	29	Yēn Jí	燕級	思	
26	Chīdyāu Kāi	漆雕開	子若	11	Gūngsyā 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	Bùshú Chǎng	步叔乘	子車	
29	Yén Gāu	顏高	子驕	50	Shí Dzwò-shú	石作蜀	子明	
30	Szmǎ Lí-gǎng	司馬黎耕	子牛	69	Gwēi Sywǎn	邾選	子斂	
31	Wūmǎ Shī	巫馬施	子旗	30	Shī Jī-cháng	施之常	子恒	
32	Lyáng Jān	梁鱸	叔魚	39	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	Yén Jī-pú	顏之僕	子叔	
35	Yén Syīn	顏辛	子柳	46	Kǔng Fú	孔弗	子蔑	
36	Bwó Chyén	伯虔	楷	50	Chīdyāu Chǐ	漆雕哆	子斂	
37	Gūngsūn Chǔng	公孫寵	子石	53	Sywǎn Chǎng	懸成	子橫	
38	Tsáu Syw	曹卣	子循	50	Yén Dzǔ	顏祖	襄	
39	Shǔn Chǎng	申櫟	周					

弟子籍

The Disciple Register

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

Refinements. The resulting document, which we may follow the Shǐ Jì in calling the Disciple Register (Dìdǎ Jì, or DZJ) to distinguish it from the later KZJY 38, still needs to be purged of two layers of accretions. The first of these is a possible two names raising the list from a conjectured original 70 (the 04c tradition reported by the Mencius) to the 72 of the KZJY 38 title. The second is an undoubted addition of five names raising that nominal 72 to an actual 77. Since SJ 67 and KZJY 38 have been subjected to Analectizing tendencies, we may not assume that congruity with the Analects is a touchstone for this list, which seems, on the contrary, to have been first made and later maintained at a certain distance from the Analects. The following, however, suggest themselves:

Shāng Jyù (#25) is present in the text simply as an expert on the Yì. The SJ 67 version gives an entire transmission-genealogy of the Yì. Since that goes down to Yáng Hú 楊何, and notes that he was employed by Hàn Wū-dì for his Yì expertise in c0125,¹ not long before SJ 67 itself was written, it must itself be a Hàn product, and cannot be attributed to the DZJ source (KZJY 38 says only that Jyù received the Yì from Confucius). Shāng Jyù reappears in #32 (Lyáng Jān), where he predicts that the childless Jān (who is about to put away his wife) will soon have an heir. #32 consists only of this story. Neither figure is known to the Analects, the Lǐ Jì, or other paraConfucian writings (Shāng Jyù does figure in the Yì apocrypha). It would seem that Lyáng Jān is present in this list merely to validate Shāng Jyù, and that Shāng Jyù is present merely to validate the Yì in the Confucian tradition. Here, then, are two spurious names with a clear agenda, as candidates for the conjectured two-name increment.

When might they have been added? LY *13:22b (c0317) has Confucius approving of the Yì as a wisdom book. Such acceptance was unknown to the Lǚ Confucianism of the earlier Analects, or to Mencius, who left Lǚ in c0320, and whose later school cites the Shī and Shū, but never the Yì. We may recall that the Mencian school knows nothing of 72 disciples, and refers only to 70 disciples. The simplest inference from this is (1) that there was in 0320 a Lǚ tradition of 70 disciples, embodied in a list, and no recognition of the Yì; and (2) that soon after that date, at latest by c0317, the Yì was acknowledged by the Lǚ Confucians (though never by the later Mencians) and two fictitious names were added to the list to give the Yì a pedigree in the school, thus raising the number of names to 72; finally (3) the title of the list was altered at this time to reflect the new count of 72. That 72 had emblematic value is suggested by the fact that *two* names were added, whereas one would have been enough to establish the idea that Confucius had known and valued the Yì.

The Second Increment. The remaining five names can only have been added after the title of the list had become fixed, or at any rate familiar, as containing 72 names. There will have been no value in adding names to the nonanecdotal half of the list, hence the final five additions are probably to be found in the anecdotal first half. One possibility is Gūnglyáng Rú (#27), a brave man who is said to have escorted Confucius on his travels; another is 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, which increasingly abhors personal violence. They seem to be opposed to the general trend of the Confucius myth, and thus unlikely to be closely connected with it. They might more plausibly be construed as lingering, and possibly genuine, family traditions.

¹SJ 67 specifies only the period Ywǎn-shwò 元朔, or 0128/0124, which is here interpreted 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 Yǔn (see Brooks *Shǐ Jì*), and which disagrees at many points with SJ 67, gives an earlier date: the first year of Ywǎn-gwāng 元光 or 0134. This has the effect of emphasizing the early official status of the Yì in the Hàn Confucian canon. The parallel genealogy in HS 88 7/3597 has a number of changes from that in SJ 67, whose effect is to emphasize the Lǚ connections of the Yì, and minimize the southern ones. It seems, however, from LY *13:22a, that the Yì as first known to the Analects had southern associations.

More promising is the idea of Analectizing updates: keeping the list current with highlights of, or themes visible in, the later Analects. Those persons on the list mentioned in the Analects, or associated with Analects events, and whose first occurrence in that text is after LY 11, are:

30 Szmǎ Lí-gvng	(notably problematic)	12:1-5	(c0326)
17 Yǒu Rwò		1:2	(c0317)
22 Gūngsyī Kṽ	(a hermit figure; see next)	cf *11:24	(c0294)
23 Dzṽng Dyĕn	(a hermit apologist)	*11:24	(c0294)
29 Yĕn Gāu	(driver in Wèi; story of Nándž)	cf *6:28	(c0270)

It seems possible that the above five are the second level of additions to the text. Four keep up with Analects innovations,² and one, the anti-official Gūngsyī Kṽ, whom Confucius is said to have singled out for special praise and admiration, expands on a theme in the later Analects: Confucius's surprising (and temporary) advocacy of a nonservice position in LY 1 and *11:24; it is perhaps significant that Gūngsyī Kṽ stands in DZJ next to Dzēng Dyĕn, who embodies this position in *11:24 itself. As with the Yì addenda discussed above, the implied relation between the list and the Analects is not that the list closely mirrors the Analects, but that it records in detail doctrinal or mythical movements that are sometimes barely visible in the Analects itself.

If this inference is correct, the original DZJ list of 70 names would have been as shown in the revised reconstruction on page 17. For convenience of visualization and of later reference, the numbering and arrangement of the previous table (page 13) have been retained.

Date of the List of 70. The original DZJ uses the ten names of LY 11:3 as its starting point, and therefore cannot itself be earlier than c0360. It follows LY 11 in other ways also. The first disciple mentioned after LY 11:3 who is *not* on the 11:3 list is Dž-jāng (11:16); next are Dzṽngdž and Gāu Chái (11:18a). These (with the enigmatic Tántá Myè-míng) are also the next names on the DZJ list, comprising its #11-14. One might plausibly argue that the DZJ list or an earlier state of it was either the source of, or was itself based on, the identical 11:3. But its relation to the *following* sections tends to suggest that DZJ is later; that is, post-0360. That DZJ defined the disciple tradition as it was apparently known to Mencius in 0320 establishes a latest possible date (*terminus ad quem*) in that vicinity; say c0325. We will later return to the question of whether that range of possible dates can be plausibly reduced.

It is probably a point in favor of the general validity of the list that it contains figures validated as probable disciples by their LY 5-6 occurrences, but completely undeveloped in the tradition of revision and extension that is already visible in LY 11 itself. The notable examples would be the obscure Shṽn Chvng of 5:11³ and Dž-sāng Bwódž of 6:2.⁴ At the same time, we must notice that the myth of Confucius's importance has already begun to affect the list, since it also contains names which, in LY 5-6, were clearly not those of disciples. The examples here are the two sons-in-law of 5:1-2 and the exemplary contemporary Dž-jyĕn of 5:3, both of whom appear in DZJ. The sons-in-law might be explained as members of an extended family group, but Dž-jyĕn can only be intrusive. For that matter, we must remember that the LY 11:3 list itself is a drastic revision of the LY 5-6 position of most of the disciples which it includes.

²But not all. Among the later Analects figures who were *not* added to this list are Bwó-yw's classmate Chvń Kāng (16:13, c0285) and the sprawling Ywān Rāng (*14:43, c0270).

³Already detected by the Táng SJ commentator Szmǎ Jvń, who simply equated the LY name Chvng 根 with the SJ name Táng 堂 (the present SJ text has Dāng 黨) as phonetically compatible. The actual process of corruption may have been: (1) the LY form Chvng 根 "prop," (2) the phonetically similar Chvng 榑, also "prop," which we reconstruct for the DZJ, (3a) the graphically similar SJ Dāng 黨, and separately (3b) whatever KZJY form was displaced by the Analectizing substitution of Chvń Kāng at #39.

⁴If we take the odd Dž-sāng as an epithet rather than a surname, and analyze the atypical name Bwódž 伯子 normally as "Master Bwó," Bwó becoming then the surname, we may equate him with the Bwó Chyĕn 伯度 of #36.

Further Purifications. The Kǔng family in c0360, as their dismissive treatment of the important figure Dzǔngdǔ 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. In doing so, we need to modify our first presumption that what we have here is a disciple roster. It is more likely a list of those who looked to Confucius for broader support, leadership, and social advancement; in short, an inventory of his client circle.

We are probably best advised to eliminate Confucius's and his brother's sons-in-law (5:1-2), since the respective daughters married to them will have thenceforth been part of their circles (such as they may have been) and no longer part of Confucius's. Again, Dǔ-jyèn (5:3) is mentioned not as a member of the circle, but precisely as a worthy member of someone else's circle. His presence on the list is appropriate; an implicit claim that Confucius was virtually the only teacher in the 05c. Wūmǎ Shī (*7:31), though in our view interpolated in LY 7 in c0380 and thus before the date of the list, is certainly part of the myth of Confucius visiting exalted personages on his travels, and should probably be excised; his KZJY 38 entry is devoted to a tale of Confucius's supernatural knowledge, which is also a late motif. Yén Hwèi's father Yén Lù (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). In that sense, he probably belongs on the list.

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 through Dǔ-yóu, said in 6:14 to have been Steward of Wǔ-chǔng. Tántái Myè-míng, the supposed protégé mentioned in 6:14, may be a kenning for Dzǔngdǔ himself: 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 (centering on ζ Orionis), and the atypical disyllabic personal name Myè-míng 滅明 "dim and brighten" might refer to the flickering of stars. In the pun-infested early Analects, this 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 Ywǎn, and thus reaching to the end of the 05c, had a strongly southern focus, and that the Kǔng takeover in the 04c can be seen in part as a northern recapture of a tradition which in its early evolution had taken a distinctly southern turn. Dzǔngdǔ and company are thus an undeniably important part of the history of the Confucian school, but they do not represent persons actually in the original Confucius circle, and they need to be eliminated from the list in order to reveal that circle, which is the object of our present interest.

Disciples first mentioned in LY 11 (Gāu Cháu, Fán Syw) may be allowed to stand; the former in particular is not exemplary enough to be suspicious as a desirable interpolation. Of the names which are unknown to the Analects but are provided with stories in the KZJY list, Shújùng Hwèi stands out as dubious; he is seemingly mentioned (#40) only for his extreme youth. He is, as already noted, the peg on which a perhaps equally extravagant invention, the youthful Kǔng Sywǎn, is later hung. His surname would make him a kinsman of Dǔ-lù, the only one of the genuine Analects disciples who derives from one of the three collateral clans of Lǔ. It will be safer to eliminate him.

At right is the reconstructed 70-name list to which the KZJY 38 title presumably applied, which was argued for on pages 14-15 above. The further modifications proposed in the remarks immediately preceding will be found carried out in the final version of the table on page 19.

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	42	Chín Dzǔ	秦祖	子南
04	Rǎn Yǔng	冉雍	仲弓	43	43	Syírúng Jǔn	奚容箴	子皙
05	Dzái Yǔ	宰予	子我	44	44	Gūngdzǔ Gōudz	公祖句茲	子之
06	Dwānmù Sǔ	端木賜	子貢	45	45	Lyén Jyé	廉潔	曹
07	Rǎn Chyóu	冉求	子有	46	46	Gūngsyī Yw-rú	公西輿如	子上
08	Jùng Yóu	仲由	子路	47	47	Hǎnfǔ Hēi	罕父黑	索
09	Yén Yǎn	言偃	子游	35	48	Gūngsyī Jǔn	公西箴	子尚
10	Bǔ Shāng	卜商	子夏	49	49	Rǎngszè Chì	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	澹臺滅明	子羽	49	52	Shí Chǔ	石處	里
14	Gāu Cháu	高柴	子羔	40	53	Chyāu Shàn	鄭單	子家
15	Mì Bù-chí	密不齊	子賤	49	54	Dzwōrvn Yíng	左人郢	行
16	Fán Syw	樊須	子遲	46	55	Dí Hēi	狄黑	皙
17					56	Shāng Dzǔ	商澤	子秀
18	Gūngsyī Chì	公西赤	子華	42	57	Rv̀n Bù-chí	任不齊	選
19	Ywǎn Syèn	原憲	子思	36	58	Rúng Chí	榮祈	子祺
20	Gūngyě Cháng	公冶長	子長		59	Yén Kwà	顏喲	子聲
21	Nángūng Táu	南宮縉	子容		60	Ywǎn Táu	原桃	籍
22					61	Gūngjyēn Dìng	公肩定	中
23					62	Chín Fēi	秦非	子之
24	Yén Yóu	顏由	路	6	63	Chīdyāu Tú	漆雕徒	文
25					64	Yēn Jí	燕紱	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 Chǔng	步叔乘	子車
29					68	Shí Dzwō-shǔ	石作蜀	子明
30					69	Gwēi Sywǎn	邽選	子斂
31	Wūmǎ Shǐ	巫馬施	子旗	30	70	Shǐ Jǐ-cháng	施之常	子恒
32					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 70-Member Register

As Probably Originally Compiled By the Kūng Family after c0360 (7 names eliminated)

The Client Circle. If we make the changes argued for above, and further restore Yǒu Rwò, probably an early head of the school but still apparently under a ban as of c0360,⁵ and thus artificially excluded from the original list, 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) Dž-sāng Bwòdž. 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 compiled in the Hàn dynasty. As it is, its divergence from the Analects forms of some names separates the list from the Analects, and gives it an independent evidentiary value.

Our first impression of the list is that its surnames tend to recur, and that known protégés such as the three Rǎns tend to bring in their wake others of that surname; in this case another two Rǎns. Similarly, behind the known protégés of that surname, we have another seven Yéns, two Gǔngsyīs, two Chīdyāus, one Ywǎn, and one Shǔn. Surname clusters *without* a known protégé and which, like most of the above, seem to imply an artisan origin, are two Shí 石 (“stone,” maker of grindstones; jadeworker?) and one Ywè 樂 “musician”). These artisan origin persons probably hoped to obtain, or benefit from the affluence attached to, a court connection (LY 4:5, 6:5). The clustering of surnames suggests that a place in the protégé circle represented not only the perhaps official aspiration of an individual, but the livelihood hope of a group.

Another class of entries represents relationship. The eight Yéns are probably a connection of Confucius’s mother; the KZJY 38 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.⁶ In at least some of these cases it may have been relevant that Confucius, once past his early struggles, was the proprietor of a landholding, and, besides the court contact which that implies, was able to feed people from his own resources. A starving man can greatly prolong the process by weekly visits to the table of a gentleman farmer.

The third category, overlapping the other two, is surnames of seeming geographical origin: the four Chín and two Shǔn abovementioned, plus one each of Tsáu 曹, Sywē 薛, Chyāu 鄒, Shāng 商 (that is, Sùng), Yēn 燕, and Gwēi 邾. These comprise twelve persons; 19% of the list. They may represent a community of exiles, not necessarily recent, in which Confucius’s father, himself said in KZJY 39 to be descended from an exile from Sùng, may have moved.

Conclusion. The disciple inquiry here suggests something unexpected but of interest: that Confucius was not simply a teacher with two dozen disciples around him, but a landed courtier with the livelihood hopes of three score people centered on him. Those visible in LY 5-6 may thus be simply the more viable candidates for office. Might Confucius have had an interest in their success? The tale of Master Rǎn in LY 6:3 can be read that way. So can the story of Mwòdž and his disciple-in-office Gǔng Jùdž in MC 46:5 (c0326), which centers on a disciple who is employed in Chǔ, and is sending money back to his master Mwòdž, in another state.

⁵We may note in passing that, with Dž-jāng and Dzǔngdž, he seems to be part of the southern group whose center was Dž-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 Dž-yóu, who could have recommended him to Confucius (then still alive and with a mentor function in Lǔ). That this same passage also mentions Tántái Myè-míng reminds us that the DJ is not a history, but, in this respect at least, a record of a stage in the evolution of a myth.

⁶For what it may be worth in a list which has passed through Kǔng hands, the use of this surname tends to suggest that, though Confucius’s father Shǔ-lyáng Hǔ (as he is styled both in the DJ and in KZJY 39) had evidently not used the Kǔng family surname, Confucius and his brother had resumed it in their lifetimes, most likely not later than the beginning of Ding-gǔng’s reign.

01	Yén Hwéi	顏回	子淵	40			
02	Mǐn Sùn	閔損	子騫	29	41	Yén Hú	顏何 稱
03	Rǎn Gōng	冉耕	伯牛		42	Chín Dzù	秦祖 子南
04	Rǎn Yūng	冉雍	仲弓		43	Syīrúng Jǐn	奚容箴 子皙
05	Dzài Yǔ	宰予	子我		44	Gūngdzù Gōudz	公祖句茲 子之
06	Dwānmù Sè	端木賜	子貢		45	Lyén Jyé	廉潔 曹
07	Rǎn Chyóu	冉求	子有		46	Gūngsyī Yw-rú	公西輿如 子上
08	Jùng Yóu	仲由	子路		47	Hǎnfū Hēi	罕父黑 子索
09	Yén Yǎn	言偃	子游	35	48	Gūngsyī Jǐn	公西箴 子尚
10	Bǔ Shāng	卜商	子夏		49	Rǎngszè Chì	壤駟赤 子徒
11					50	Rǎn Jì	冉季 子產
12					51	Sywē Bāng	薛邦 子徒
13					52	Shí Chǔ	石處 里
14	Gāu Chái	高柴	子羔	40	53	Chyāu Shàn	鄭單 子家
15					54	Dzwōrvn Yǐng	左人郢 行
16	Fán Syw	樊須	子遲	46	55	Dí Hēi	狄黑 哲
17	Yóu Rwò	有若	有	36	56	Shāng Dzú	商澤 子秀
18	Gūngsyī Chì	公西赤	子華	42	57	Rv̀n Bù-chí	任不齊 選
19	Ywǎn Syèn	原憲	子思	36	58	Rúng Chí	榮祈 子祺
20					59	Yén Kwài	顏喲 子聲
21					60	Ywǎn Táu	原桃 籍
22					61	Gūngjyèn Dìng	公肩定 中
23					62	Chín Fēi	秦非 子之
24	Yén Yóu	顏由	路	6	63	Chīdyāu Tú	漆雕徒 文
25					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
29					68	Shí Dzwo-shù	石作蜀 子明
30					69	Gwēi Sywǎn	邾選 子斂
31					70	Shī Jī-cháng	施之常 子恒
32					71	Shv̀n 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	Kūng Fú	孔弗 子蔑
36	Bwó Chyén	伯虔	楷	50	75	Chīdyāu Chǐ	漆雕哆 子斂
37	Gūngsūn Chǐng	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	Shv̀n Chǐng	申櫟	周				

The Confucius Client Circle

As Derived From the Kǔng Family "Disciple" List of c0360 (Total: 63 Names)

Confucius's Age

Before investigating the sociology of the client group around Confucius, we may consider another aspect of the numerological interference problem with which we began: the *age* of Confucius. With the disciple number, the best inference is that there was a well-delimited group of 63 people with whom Confucius had something like client relations, and that this number was emblematically increased; first, sometime after c0360, to the 70 of a military company, the symbolic infantry escort of a chariot warrior; then, as part of an expansion to legitimate the Yì in c0319/0318, to 72, probably with influence from a conception of 72 as a “complete” number; and then expanded once more in c0270 to a less obviously symbolic 77. In late but pre-Chín form the list ceased to grow, and in the course of time (c0107) was used as a source for SJ 67. This implies the development $63 > 70 > 72 > 77$, the second and third stages being influenced by numerological symbolism.

The age of Confucius at the time of his death is an even more celebrated problem than that of the number of his disciples. We may begin by considering the absolute date of his death, and only then take up the complicated question of the date of his birth.

Death. The earliest statement 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 Dzwō Jwàn that extends beyond the cutoff date of 0481 observed by the Gūngyáng (GYJ) and Gūlyáng (GLJ) texts.⁷ It has been dismissed by Maspero as uncertain, but his proposed date of c0454 raises new problems,⁸ and the old ones which it addresses can be solved in other ways. Thus, the LY 6 reference to Aī-gūng (his posthumous title) need not mean that *Confucius* lived past Aī-gūng's death in 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 figure⁹ back to Confucius, but is the right length if, as the Dzvngdž deathbed scene in LY 8:3 implies, there was a preceding period of disciple headship. There is no competing tradition, and the DJ death date is compatible with the earliest Analects. We may accept it.

Birth. The CC as associated with the DJ has no entry for the birth of Confucius, or of anyone not a son of the Lǔ Prince. Birth entries exist under 0552 (21st year of Syāng-gūng) in the CC as preserved with GYJ and GLJ. The former runs: 十有一月、庚子、孔子生 “in the 11th month, on the day gǔng/dž (#37 of the 60-day cycle; see at right), Master Kūng was born.” The GLJ entry is identical except that it omits the month. Since the last month mentioned in earlier CC entries is the 10th, this event too would be, by default, in the 10th month.

The first day of the 9th month in both texts (recorded in connection with a solar eclipse on that day) is gǔng/syw 庚戌 (cycle #47); that of the 10th month, another solar eclipse, is gǔng/chvn 庚辰 (#17). The second eclipse is 30 days after the first, consistently for the beginnings of successive lunar months (solar eclipses necessarily coincide with a new moon). Then a gǔng/dž day (cycle #37) *could have occurred* 20 days after the second eclipse, in the 10th month, or 60 days later, in the 12th month, but a gǔng/dž day in the 11th month is *arithmetically impossible*. It would seem that, with Dubs (Date 146), we should ignore GYJ, and adopt the seemingly unproblematic GLJ.

⁷It is repeated at SJ 15 (2/680) and SJ 47 (4/1945; Yang Records 26).

⁸Maspero *Antique* 376n1 / *Antiquity* 449n1, Waley *Analects* 16n2, 79, Riegel *Review* 791. There is no evidence that Confucius spent his last 14 years under Lǔ Dāu-gūng (r 0468–0432). See Creel *Confucius* 296–297.

⁹Briefly: by LY 11:8, Confucius's son Bwó-yw died before him; his presumptive successor is Dž-sž, who is next on the SJ 47 list. Sixth after *him* is Kūng Fù. Fù died in the service of Chvn Shv, whose reign ended in 0208; his age at death, 57, gives a c0265 birthdate. If Dž-sž was born 150 years (6 birth generations) earlier, or c0415, he cannot have been the son of Bwó-yw, who had died some 65 years previously.

甲子 01. jyǎ/dǔ	甲戌 11. jyǎ/syǔ	甲申 21. jyǎ/shǔn	甲午 31. jyǎ/wǔ	甲辰 41. jyǎ/chǔn	甲寅 51. jyǎ/yín
乙丑 02. yǐ/chǒu	乙亥 12. yǐ/hài	乙酉 22. yǐ/yǒu	乙未 32. yǐ/wèi	乙巳 42. yǐ/sì	乙卯 52. yǐ/mǎo
丙寅 03. bǐng/yín	丙子 13. bǐng/dǔ	丙戌 23. bǐng/syǔ	丙申 33. bǐng/shǔn	丙午 43. bǐng/wǔ	丙辰 53. bǐng/chǔn
丁卯 04. dīng/mǎo	丁丑 14. dīng/chǒu	丁亥 24. dīng/hài	丁酉 34. dīng/yǒu	丁未 44. dīng/wèi	丁巳 54. dīng/sì
戊辰 05. wù/chǔn	戊寅 15. wù/yín	戊子 25. wù/dǔ	戊戌 35. wù/syǔ	戊申 45. wù/shǔn	戊午 55. wù/wǔ
己巳 06. jǐ/sì	己卯 16. jǐ/mǎo	己丑 26. jǐ/chǒu	己亥 36. jǐ/hài	己酉 46. jǐ/yǒu	己未 56. jǐ/wèi
庚午 07. gāng/wǔ	庚辰 17. gāng/chǔn	庚寅 27. gāng/yín	庚子 37. gāng/dǔ	庚戌 47. gāng/syǔ	庚申 57. gāng/shǔn
辛未 08. xīn/wèi	辛巳 18. xīn/sì	辛卯 28. xīn/mǎo	辛丑 38. xīn/chǒu	辛亥 48. xīn/hài	辛酉 58. xīn/yǒu
壬申 09. rǎn/shǔn	壬午 19. rǎn/wǔ	壬辰 29. rǎn/chǔn	壬寅 39. rǎn/yín	壬子 49. rǎn/dǔ	壬戌 59. rǎn/syǔ
癸酉 10. guǐ/yǒu	癸未 20. guǐ/wèi	癸巳 30. guǐ/sì	癸卯 40. guǐ/mǎo	癸丑 50. guǐ/chǒu	癸亥 60. guǐ/hài

The Cycle of 60 Day Signs

(Formed from combinations of 10 bases and 12 suffixes; repeats indefinitely)

But there are difficulties. (1) By scholarly consensus GYJ is earlier than GLY,¹⁰ 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 can only be intentional. What was the intent? (3) The preceding 10th month eclipse entry is itself spurious: no eclipse occurred on or near that date;¹¹ in general, successive-month eclipses *are not visible* from the same location.¹² This suggests that the second eclipse entry was a mythographic addition made to honor the month of Confucius’s birth. (4) Shǐ Jì follows the *historiography* of the GYJ,¹³ yet SJ 47 *does not give* the GYJ birthdate, just the year Syāng 20 (0551). Since no month or day is given, this cannot be based on a genuine ritual record. GLJ did not yet exist. There was thus no alternative to GYJ, but the SJ compilers were astronomers, and would have seen the absurdity of the GYJ entry. In this dilemma, SJ 47, whose materials were probably assembled by Szmǎ Tán, a student of the Yì, may have abandoned the GYJ date and substituted 0551, which at least allows the numerologically attractive age of 72 at death.

The CC Eclipses. It would seem that when Szmǎ Chyēn in c0107, working from the notes of his father Tán (a Dàuist, with no great enthusiasm for Confucius), wrote up the SJ 47 chapter on Confucius,¹⁴ he had before him only the GYJ birth record, which he viewed as flawed because of its calendrical absurdity. No other pre-SJ source for Confucius’s birthdate is known. If there is a birth record, it presumably lies behind GYJ, distorted by association with a false eclipse. To determine the nature of the distortion, we may here consider CC eclipses in general.

The first thing to notice about the eclipses recorded in the CC is that they are reliable.¹⁵ Not all the eclipses which modern computational astronomy finds were visible in Lǔ are recorded,¹⁶ but all the recorded eclipses were indeed visible. The exceptions are four entries for which no plausible eclipses exist, and which therefore can only be invented.¹⁷ 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

¹⁰Pokora *Pre-Han* 26. GYJ was the text of the 02c Hàn Modernizers, while GLJ was the text of the 01c Reformists, who were dominant at the Hàn court from c070 on (Loewe *Crisis* 11–13).

¹¹Stephenson *Atlas* xv, noting, in all, *four* impossible CC eclipses (see further below).

¹²Dubs *Date* 142.

¹³Watson *Ssu-ma* 78f; note the connection with Dǔng Jǔng-shū (p84).

¹⁴Brooks *Shǐ Jì* p10. For Tán’s pro-Dàuist tract of c0138, see Watson *Ssu-ma* 43–48.

¹⁵The recent Stephenson *Atlas* shows closer agreement than Chalmers *Appendix*.

¹⁶Some of the omissions may have political implications. Stretches where the text is *consistently* defective in eclipse reporting may imply a change of interest at the court, or a gap in the succession of court astronomers. Also, eclipses were seen as harbingers of disaster, and an eclipse *not* followed by a disaster may have been felt to be a dud, and thus not recorded. In support of this possibility, there does seem to have been a two-stage process in the making of the CC. Thus, the entry “from the 12th month [of the last year] it had not rained until autumn [of this year] 7th month” (Wǔn 2 [0624]; Legge *Ch’un* 232) implies that the no-rain records were saved up (there are none in the CC under any of the preceding seven months) until a rain occurred, when the final, summary entry could be made. Again, DJ entries that give events missing in CC are not of sufficiently dramatic character to have been handed down over the centuries by any imaginable “oral transmission,” nor do they serve the historiographical agenda of the DJ, to provide a political-domination theory for contemporary (04c) rulers. They may have come from a preliminary record, which must itself have survived in the Lǔ palace until the 04c, when it could have been used by the first DJ compiler.

¹⁷Stephenson and Chalmers, despite small differences in their calculations (note that both use “astronomical” years which are 1 later than historical ones, thus “astronomical” -0775 equals “historical” 0776, Legge *Ch’un* Prolegomena 88n1), agree that these four are problematic. Dubs *Date* 142 explains one as due to a good-faith copying error; Stephenson *Atlas* xv attributes all four of them to “false sightings or possibly abortive predictions.” The accuracy of the other CC eclipse records refutes these courteous conjectures.

It is a priori unlikely that these represent *four separate and independent plans* to tamper with the CC eclipses; they probably have a single agenda. The agenda with which the third is clearly involved is a highlighting of Confucius's birth. Therefore, the remainder probably relate to other members of his lineage. The second is 40 years (a long generation) earlier than the third; the first is 53 years (two normal generations) before the second. Putting aside the fourth for a moment, a plausible hypothesis for the first three is that they were interpolated into the CC to highlight the births of Confucius's great-grandfather, his father, and himself.

Plausibility. Apart from its omission of Confucius's grandfather, it may be objected that this theory claims that false eclipses *celebrate* the births of Confucius and some of his forbears, whereas eclipses are *bad* omens in the CC and in Hàn portentology.¹⁸ This forbids a conjecture that the false entries were made by Hàn or other court astronomers. But the calendrical absurdity of GYJ already implied this: the false entry *can only have been made by amateurs*. When did amateurs have this kind of access to the CC? The CC had been in non-court hands since at least the compilation of the DJ in Chí, in c0312. The DJ-associated CC indeed contains all four false eclipse records. However, notwithstanding its obvious Confucian political agenda, and in line with a seeming intent to play down its Lǚ connections, there is nothing in the DJ itself about the birth of Confucius. That is, the false eclipses are in the CC as of that time, but they are *symbolically latent* – no narrative use is made of them. This can only mean that they were already present in the version of CC that was brought to Chí from Lǚ, and that the false entries had been made by Confucians in Lǚ. The obvious candidate among Lǚ Confucians, and the only group known to have had contact with the Lǚ court (which had custody of the original CC), is the Analects school. As will be argued in detail below, that school had since c0400 been led by a hereditary series of Kǔng descendants of Confucius. As LY 11 shows, as early as c0360 (half a century before the DJ) the Kǔng leadership had been actively concerned to revise and re-establish the tradition of the disciples (11:3, 1–2, 4–11). It would be consistent with this concern if the calendrically unsophisticated Kǔngs had also tampered with their copy of CC, to fix and celebrate the birth of Confucius and some of 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 the Lǚ connections of their text 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.¹⁹ There is thus a possible link, not in conflict with the Analects evidence, 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 continued in possession of 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 not simply Confucius but his ancestors in Lǚ. According to family tradition as preserved in KZJY (parts of which will be shown below to go back to the period of the Kǔng ascendancy in the Analects school), 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.

¹⁸For traditional versions of this objection, see Legge Ch'un 492.

¹⁹SJ 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 Hǚ Syōu 何休 (123–182) is that Húwú was a pupil of one Gūngyáng; still later tradition gives a whole line of Gūngyáng transmitters, going 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 the birth to an eclipse was remembered in the family. Though eclipses were *dynastically* baleful (the one in the 6th month of 0612 was met, according to the CC, with drums and sacrifices),²⁰ an *individual* might well take pride in being born just after one.²¹ Given the apparent Kǔng family aggrandizing agenda for these false eclipse entries, 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 for him no interpolated eclipse was necessary. This model²² was then generalized to all the other Lǔ Kǔngs, Confucius's birth being further honored by being placed in the month following not one but *two* eclipses. For the grandfather's eclipse, there are two options, the likelier being the above-cited one in 0612. This eclipse was visually conspicuous in Lǔ, and that date suggests a later age at marriage (33rd rather than 18th year) for Confucius's great-grandfather, consistent with typical military-family career patterns.²³

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: a 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 balancing 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; the Shǐ Jì actually gives the age 73, although if Confucius had died before the month of his birth, he would have been 72 according to the applicable conventions. Presumably the genuine eclipse of 0552 was the best available (there was no eclipse at all 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/dž 甲子, cycle #01) and the spurious one on the 1st day of the 8th month (gwěi/sz 癸巳, cycle #30). The interpolated birth entry would then have specified a gǔng/dž 庚子 day, cycle #37, *in the 9th month*; again an impossibility (the possibilities can be more easily visualized by reference to the table of cyclical combinations on page 21). The real month must have been the 2nd, 4th, 6th, 8th, 10th, or 12th. Surviving tradition seems to favor the 8th month.²⁴ If so, then Confucius, like his grandfather, really *was* born in the month after an eclipse, a coincidence that invited mythic elaboration. We may conclude that Confucius was born on a gǔng/dž day in the 8th month of 0549, in the month after a genuine 7th month eclipse, that a spurious second eclipse was added to the CC record for the 8th month by way of symbolic decoration, and that the false eclipse record remained when, again for symbolic reasons, Confucius's birth year was relocated to 0552.

²⁰Legge Ch'un 270.

²¹Old men in Ohio have been known to brag that they were born in the year of an especially hard winter. None have ever similarly flaunted the year of a bumper harvest.

²²Possibly reinforced, it will presently appear, by a similar pattern at Confucius's birth.

²³The other eclipse is 0626 (Wǔn 1). The average age at marriage of eighteen of Churchill's WW2 generals was 36 years (data from Keegan *Generals*). War is a jealous mistress.

²⁴Sacrifices at the Lǔ Confucian temple were in the 2nd and 8th months (Legge *Analects Prolegomena* 91); the rationalization is that by the Syà calendar (recommended in LY *15:11), 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 Kǔng family 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)²⁵ in the DJ of 0312. We may here consider the more plausible traditions concerning the latter, 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 as a whole, not always in a friendly sense, in SJ 47.²⁶

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.²⁷ 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.²⁸ 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 while in Lǚ. It is possible that he was denied a position by the Lǚ court to avoid offending Hwà Ywǎn,²⁹ who continued to be prominent in Sùng affairs down to 0576³⁰ and made diplomatic visits to Lǚ in 0587 and 0583.³¹

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 secondary (Dž-syà 子夏) names of Confucius's disciple. He would have been in his 5th year when the family fled to Lǚ in 0607. Nothing is recorded for him in Lǚ, due perhaps to the enmity of Hwà Ywǎn, whose influence continued until 0576. Bwó-syà would then have been 36, too late to launch a career.

²⁵Legge Ch'un 618f. 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.

²⁶Ariel K'ung 65–69 considers KZJY a forgery, but it and the forged Kǔng Tsúngdž (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 Lúng; 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 42 chapters) has expanded beyond its HS 30 (30 chapter) form; it needs to be evaluated chapter by chapter, not as an integral work. On KZJY 38, see further below.

²⁷“Guess” and “plausible” are standard heuristic in mathematics (Polya Induction v), physics (Feynman Law 143), and biology (Beveridge Art 46; PB 63).

²⁸CC 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 Yáng Jvñ 羊斟, fled to Lǚ after confronting the ransomed and returned Hwà Ywǎn.

²⁹The 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.

³⁰CC sv Chvng 15 (Legge Ch'un 387–389). Hwà Ywǎn's insistence 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 psychological light on this supposition.

³¹CC sv Chvng 4 (Legge Ch'un 354) and Chvng 8 (Legge Ch'un 366–367). 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.

Father. By the above 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 the prospects of a scion of the Lǚ Kǔngs. It has been too little noted³² that Confucius's father Shú or Shúlyáng Hù 叔梁紇 *did not bear* the Kǔng surname. By LY 3:15, Confucius was the son of a man from Dzōu 鄒, south of the Lǚ capital, whereas his Kǔng ancestors had settled in Fáng-shān 防山, east of it.³³ This looks like a renunciation of the family surname and a seeking of new fortunes in Dzōu. According to DJ, in the 5th month of 0563, Dzōu Hù ("Hù from Dzōu") held up the portcullis of the small southern fortress of Bì-yáng while his Lǚ comrades escaped.³⁴ By our hypothesis, Hù was then in his 29th year. This seems a late age for an exploit of sheer strength, but it is consistent with the career profiles of modern weight lifters.³⁵ In the autumn of 0556, Chí besieged Táu, northwest of the Lǚ capital, while a second Chí force attacked Dzàng Hù in Fáng, to the east; Dzōu Shú Hù ("Shú Hù of Dzōu") and two others led a party of 300 to extricate Dzàng Hù from Fáng.³⁶ Autumn means the 7th month or later, so Hù was now 37, being just *past* his birthday. This is a plausible age at which to have advanced in a military career to the point of commanding a task force on a mission within a campaign.³⁷ The name Shú may imply patronage by the Shú clan, one of whom was the chief minister in Lǚ at this time, following Hù's earlier exploit.

Mother. KZJY 39 tells how Hù married into the Yén family. Some details are exaggerated but early, such as the claim that the no longer young suitor came of Sùng royal stock (already present in DJ). Others are folkloric and probably late, such as the *three* Yén daughters or Hù's *nine* daughters by a former wife. We may assume an unmarried, mature Hù. The bride's name was Jǚng-dzài 徵在, "Summoned to be Present," an unusual name for a female, implying as it does an order to attend 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*; they may have been artisans, traders, or other palace suppliers. The likely occasion for receiving such persons is the first year of a reign; the only possible candidate for Jǚng-dzài's birth is Syāng 1, 0572. Hù probably moved to the capital after his 0556 victory, or at earliest 0555; he may have come courting in c0554. Hù was then 38, twice the average age of marriage for males, not prime material despite his Shú connections. Jǚng-dzài was 18, half his age, and near the standard marriage age for females. To make this mismatch intelligible, we may conjecture (with support from the tradition of Yén Hwéi's poverty) that the Yéns were then down on their luck. The marriage³⁸ may be assigned to c0553.

³²An exception is Kennedy **Butterfly** 318. Creel's claim (*Confucius* 297–298n3–4) that Shúlyáng Hù 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: Yōu Rǚ, on his one DJ appearance, is not identified as a future disciple.

³³Implicit in KZJY 39; more overt in SJ 47 (4/1906, *Yang Records* 1) as the place where Shúlyáng Hù was buried. The SJ commentary locates it 25 leagues (8 miles) east of the capital Chyǚ-fù, not very near to Dzōu, which is 45 leagues (15 miles) *south* of the capital, a journey of perhaps 35 actual road miles.

³⁴CC sv Syāng 10 (Legge **Ch'un** 445–446). The attack was led by Jin; the Lǚ party was commanded by a member of the Mǚng clan. Entry to the gate of Bì-yáng was gained by a ruse involving a cart, followed by concealed shock troops. It is this raiding party which Hù's feat of strength saved from capture.

³⁵Body 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 Norbert Schemansky, 1948–1964, best 1961 at 37 years 10 months) gives an average peak age of 30 years 3 months. Hù was 28 years 11 months by Western count at the time of his lift.

³⁶CC sv Syāng 17 (Legge **Ch'un** 474). The two co-commanders were named Dzàng.

³⁷Orde 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).

³⁸KZJY 39 emphasizes that the bride had to be convinced to accept the groom. The present hypothesis accepts the tradition that age disparity is the chief crux; the marriage was irregular in that sense. SJ 47 cattily calls it an "illicit union" (yě hǚ 野合), thus setting off centuries of steamy speculation and heated defense.

Brother. By LY 5:2, Confucius had an older brother who could not arrange his daughter's marriage. By the above, he was born in c0552. KZJY 39 gives his name as M̀ng-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			Kūng Fáng-shú is born in S̀ng
Ẃn 15	0612	07	#38		genuine CC eclipse ; 93% totality
Ẃn 15	0612	08			Kūng Bwó-syà is born in S̀ng
Sywān 2	0607	02			S̀ng army of Hwà Ywān is defeated
	0607?				Kūng Fáng-shú flees to Lǚ
Sywān 17	0592	06	#17		[spurious CC eclipse]
Sywān 17	0592	05			H̀ is born to Kūng family in Lǚ
Sywān 31	0576				Hwà Ywān is still influential in S̀ng
	0575?				H̀ relocates to Dzōu
Syāng 1	0572				Yén J̀ng-dzài is born in Lǚ capital
Syāng 10	0563	05	#31		H̀ "of Dzōu" lifts portcullis
	0562?				H̀ acquires a patron in the Shú clan?
Syāng 17	0556	07			"Shú" H̀ of Dzōu leads an attack
Syāng 18	0555?				H̀ relocates to Lǚ capital
Syāng 20	0553?				"Shúyáng" H̀ marries a bride from Yén family
Syāng 21	0552				H̀' s first son M̀ng-pí born

Confucius's Life

Youth. KZJY 39 says that the couple prayed at Ní-shān 尼山, southeast of the capital,³⁹ and that Confucius was born afterward, by the above hypothesis in the 8th month of 0549. His names Chyōu 丘 "Hill" and -ní 尼 both derived from the prayer at Ní-shān.⁴⁰ In his third year, c0546, his father, now called Shú-lyáng 叔梁 H̀, died at age c46. H̀ will have had a landholding near the capital; if this is reflected in the element -lyáng "weir" in his surname, it may have included a pond for irrigation and fish cultivation. Its management will have been beyond the powers of a child of three and his crippled brother of six, and Confucius must in his youth have eked out a living by means atypical for the heir of a warrior. This inference is supported by 05c Analects references to his early hardship and makeshift livelihood (LY 9:6). At 19 he married into the S̀ng family Jyēn-gwān 卞官. This seems a suspiciously exalted match (-gwān means "office"), but no other holder of the surname has been identified,⁴¹ and the bride, like Confucius, may merely have been from a family of S̀ng *exiles*. This need not imply reconciliation between Confucius and the Fáng-shān Kūngs: Confucius had inherited from his father a circle partly based on exile families, and one of these may have arranged the marriage.⁴²

³⁹For the fertility rite that may have been involved, see Jensen Wise 421f.

⁴⁰SJ 47 repeats the KZJY 39 data that lead to this inference, and adds that "hill" referred to the shape of his head. This explanation reflects Hàn physiognomy, and would appear to be a typical mythical elaboration.

⁴¹Some 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.

⁴²Confucius'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* 91 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 Kūngs.

Son. The next year (at 20, c0530), a son was born. The Lǚ Prince Jāu-gūng sent a present of carp, the baby being named Lǐ 鯉 “Carp” or Bwó-yw 伯魚 “Fish” in its honor. 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 valid concern for his livelihood. By LY 11:8, Bwó-yw predeceased his father; KZJY 39 says that he died in his own 50th year, or c0481. Confucius himself died shortly afterward, in early 0479.

Service. The DJ⁴³ has Confucius known at 17 to the M̀ng 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 orphaned and impoverished youth. More likely, delayed by hardship, he took up his military duties as a member of Jāu-gūng’s palace guard sometime before his 30th year, that is, by c0520.

Jāu-gūng’s Exile in 0517 followed a 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 (LY 4:7) and his animus (LY 5–6) against those who served the Jì, has him taking service under the Jì, and traveling on his own account to Chí, where he is interviewed by Chí Jǐng-gūng. These 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. Confucius, as a member of Jāu-gūng’s escort, would have been in Jǐng-gūng’s presence at those times, 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.

CC tells us that Chí took the border town Ỳn 鄆 and in 0516 gave it to Jāu-gūng as a residence; the two Chí visits followed in 0515. In 0514 Jāu-gūng visited Gān-hóu 乾侯 on the Jìn border, went back to Ỳn, and then returned to Gān-hóu. In 0513 the residents of Ỳn, doubtless weary of the burden of the exile court, abandoned the town; Jāu-gūng remained in Gān-hóu until his death in 0510. Military challenges seem to have been few, and service at the exile establishment may have exposed Confucius to the civilian aspects of court life; LY 9:6 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 LY 5-9.

Dìng-gūng. The Jì 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, born c0527 (three years after Bwó-yw) and by now a marriageable 19, Confucius could find no better husband than the jailbird Gūngyě Cháng (LY 5:1). Probably he occupied his landholding in the early years of Dìng-gūng, 0509-0495 (SJ 47 describes that period as one of retirement and teaching). A new note appears with the razing of Jì and Shú stronghold walls in 0498, a centrist policy which might have given Confucius more scope (though not at the policy level claimed by DJ and SJ 47). The 05c Analects (7:23 and 9:5) hints at a trip to S̀ng or further south, which might have been a semi-official effort to win support for Dìng-gūng (later myth puts this trip at 0496 and makes it part of Confucius’s exit from a Lǚ ministership). The date itself is plausible; in that year Lǚ walled some cities for defense against Jìn.

Aī-gūng succeeded in 0494, and energetically continued these centrist policies, culminating in a direct land tax imposed in 0483, which converted the endowed military elite into a salaried civilian elite; he also worked to rally outside support for the legitimate line against the clans. He might have offered a court post to Confucius from c0494. It will then have been between c0494 and his withdrawal from court in 0481 after his son’s death, that Confucius probably first attracted, besides his personal client group, a significant number of official court protégés.

⁴³DJ Jāu 7 (0535) 9th month, Legge Ch’un 618f, assuming the 0551 birthdate.

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 modest fact from which the mighty Confucius persona of the DJ, the late Analects, and finally SJ 67, might rationally have evolved in response to later Lǚ school needs and escalating Kǔng family pressures.

The Mentorship of Confucius

Mentorship. We may now return to the client-circle data which was extracted, above, from the reconstructed KZJY 38 list. To evaluate the age-differential figures on that list, and assign birth years to those individuals, requires that we know the year of Confucius's birth, determined above as the 8th month of 0549. He would then have reached his 20th year, the transition to adulthood, in the 8th month of 0530. But the list is presumably skewed by the relocation of Confucius's birth year to 0552, which would put his maturity in 0533. To find the year in which someone was seen *by the list* as reaching the age of protégéship, we then subtract that person's age differential from 0533. We must excise Confucius's contemporaries, Yén Lù and Chín Shāng, and probably also Chīdyāu Kāi.⁴⁴ We then get these years of protégéship for 12 persons:

							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 Lǚ walling initiative which was earlier suggested as a probable index that Confucius might have been acceptable at court), another third in the early Aī-gūng years, 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 figures⁴⁵ 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 possession of a position of influence at court. On the other hand, there is a great deal of support in them for the general career path 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 for the protégé system in 0483.

The implication of these figures is that Confucius's function as a mentor was a byproduct of his court career, and not a consequence of the end of that career. We thus cannot validly envision him as a teacher either in his early years, before he had some civil connection with the court, or after his retirement in 0481. Apart from mentorship in the strict sense, Confucius's function as a leader in the wider circle which the client list reveals to us will have been earlier, and must have played its role in his life already during the Dìng-gūng period. We should thus not envision him, even in his younger days, as being without obligations of a livelihood sort, some of them inherited from his father's generation, to a sizeable group of people.

⁴⁴Chīdyāu Kāi's given age differential is the unlikely 11; SJ 67 does not give a figure. 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 Shū. The Shū are not cited in the Analects until the end of the 04c, and this story must thus be a post-04c variant of LY 5:6. Kāi is said in HFZ 50 to have left a school of his own. It is possible that the proponents of that school were concerned to increase Kāi's standing among the disciples by claiming him to have been a near contemporary, rather than a member of the next generation. Whether for this reason or another, the age differential as given is intrinsically implausible, and is ignored in these calculations.

⁴⁵Such 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. They may have been excised precisely because they could not be reconciled with the internally inconsistent later myth of Confucius and his disciples.

Sociology of the Inner Protege Circle

Viability. We may turn from the named but still somewhat imponderable many in the lower half of the list to the better-known few in its upper half; the ones who figure in the Analects. It is not to be imagined that all the 63 were future courtiers, but some clearly did have that expectation, and it will be appropriate to explore the social situation of this more hopeful group.

Roster. For present purposes, this must be the subset of disciples mentioned in the Analects through LY 11, or (as with Yǒu Rǔ) *not* mentioned for plausible reasons; for safety I omit the arguable case of Chín Jāng, the “Láu” of LY 9:7). This rule gives the following names, with some corrections from the reconstructed list, but including secondary names (字 *dz*) *only* in the form attested in the Analects itself:

Dwānmù Sè 端木賜	Dǔ-gùng 子貢	
Rǎn Yūng 冉雍	Jùng-gūng 仲弓	
Chīdyāu Kāi 漆雕開		
Jùng Yóu 仲由	Dǔ-lù 子路	
Rǎn Chyóu 冉求	Yǒu 有	
Gūngsyī Chì 公西赤	Dǔ-hwá 子華	
Yén Hwéi 顏回	Ywān 淵	
Dzǎi Yǔ 宰予	Wǒ 我	
Shǔn Chǔng 申櫟		
Bwó Chyén 伯虔		LY: Dǔ-sāng Bwódz 子桑伯子
Ywān Syèn 原憲	Sī 思	
Mǐn Sūn 閔損	Dǔ-chyēn 子騫	
Rǎn Gǔng 冉更	Bwó-nyóu 伯牛	
Bǔ Shāng 卜商	Dǔ-syà 子夏	
Yén Yēn 言偃	Dǔ-yóu 子游	
Yǒu Rǔ 有若		LY: Yǒudz 有子
Gāu Chái 高柴	Dǔ-gāu 子羔	
Fán Syū 樊須	Chí 遲	

The reason for caution with the secondary names is that the Analects usage, which is quite definite, has been largely obliterated in the DZJ and its extant KZJY and SJ derivatives.

Social Status. In the usage of the Analects, though not in that of the extant lists, there is a clear difference between those who do and do not possess the Dǔ- 子 prefix in their formal names. Grammatically, this Dǔ- element is in complementation with the order-of-birth element (Bwó- 伯 for the eldest son; Jùng- 仲 for the second son, and so on) which some names display. Socially, there seems to be a coordination with the degree of wealth which is attributed to that person in the Analects, of which the most obvious instance is the skill of chariot-driving, which needed means and leisure during youth to acquire to a meaningful extent (compare Confucius’s sarcastic but suggestive remark in LY 9:2 that he needed to work on his chariotry and archery skills, and his allusion to his early poverty in 9:6). If we correlate the possession of a Dǔ- prefix with Analects references to either wealth or poverty, we get the following consistent picture:

Dǔ-	No Dǔ-
Dǔ-lù (chariot, *5:26 ¹)	Yén Hwéi (poor, 6:11; no chariot, 11:8)
Dǔ-hwá (chariot, rich, 6:4)	
Dǔ-gùng (rich, 11:18b)	

But not all who are rich (such as Ywān Sī, who in 6:5 can afford to return his salary to the court) have the Dǔ- prefix, and some Dǔ- protégés appear more as cultured than specifically rich: Dǔ-gùng is described as a ritual vessel in 5:4, and Dǔ-syà is chided in 6:13 for failing to uphold the higher culture as against the lower. There might still be a correlation between wealth and expertise in the higher culture, but it is the latter on which the Analects seemingly focuses.

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) identifies him as connected with the Shú clan. Dž-syà's surname Bǔ 卜 "omen" suggests divination expertise 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 "Dye"), 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 (of course, by that date, c0287, he had long since acquired a Dž- prefix in the official pre-KZJY list, and might all the more readily appear on a par with the undoubtedly elite Dž-lù). In this list of possible occupational surnames, those that may have been purveyors to the palace (the main user of commodities like timber), as distinct from merchants to a wider commercial public, are given in **bold**:

Dž-gùng	Dwānmù 端木 "Stump"	Timber purveyor? ⁴⁶
Dž-hwá	Gūngsyī 宮西 "West of Palace"	Potter? ⁴⁷
Rǎn Chyóu	Rǎn 冉 = 染 "Dye"	Dyer
Rǎn Gǔng	ditto	
Rǎn Yūng	ditto	
Chīdyāu Kāi	Chīdyāu 漆雕 "Lacquer Carver"	Lacquer carver
Dzǎi Yǔ	Dzǎi 宰 "Sty-ward = Steward"	Butcher
Dž-sāng Bwódz	Dž-sāng 子桑 "Master of Mulberry"	Grover
Yén Hwéi	Yén 顏 "Face"	Cosmetic maker? ⁴⁸
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). With those distinctions we can then state the following usage rules: (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.

Lǔ Society. This usage picture may quite possibly give us a hint of the forces shaping 05c Lǔ 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 court access, but social acceptance (symbolized by the Dž- prefix) was withheld until that access was confirmed by acquisition, and suitable display, of the higher culture. The implication is that not only can wealth and social status be acquired (LY 4:5), 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." It is also compatible with the whole implied dynamic of Confucius's role as a purveyor of the higher culture.

⁴⁶For the court as the major buyer of architectural-quality timber; see LY 5:18.

⁴⁷The potters were located west of the Lǔ palace; see map in Needham *Science* v5 pt6. The smellier occupations (dyeing, lacquer work, meatcutting) seem not to have been sited near the palace.

⁴⁸See discussion of this possibility above. 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 (whether or not in cosmetics), and would have been a step lower socially. Note Hwéi's gratitude for being taught "culture" by the Master in 9:11.

The Analects Fate of the Major Analects Disciples

It is 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's 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
Džǎ Wō	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 dispraised in LY 5-6, but here have an honorable place. The reversal of 05c opinion is striking. 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.⁴⁹

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 used to emblemize Sywǎndzian 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

The first three *represent* excesses of the Sywǎndzian school, the last two more directly *condemn* the Sywǎndzian age, with its fixed curriculum, its emphasis on later cultural traditions, and its lack of reliance on the personal authority of Confucius.

We may here summarize, from the viewpoint of the above argument, the origins, character, and later histories of the sixteen certain protégés, plus several other important figures.

Mǐn Dž-chyēn. By DZJ, he is the oldest protégé, born c0523. His Analects mentions are civilian, and he may have become a protégé in c0503 (Ding-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 Džvngdž. He vanishes from the text after his LY 11 appearances.

⁴⁹Note 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).

Dž-yóu appears in 6:14 as a judicious administrator. From the DJ evidence, he was Steward of Wŭ-chŭng by the 0487 (Aī-gŭng 8) campaign in which Yōu Rwò took part. Since this may not have been his first year in that post, and since that post cannot have been a first assignment, his protégéship would seem to go back to Dìng-gŭng, possibly c0497, after the walling initiative and near the time of Confucius's trip to Sŭng. He must have had military credentials to be assigned to Wŭ-chŭng, and so might have been among Confucius's escort in Sŭng. 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 Yōudž. 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 (c0296) and reappears as Wŭ-chŭng Steward in a potshot at Sywŭndž 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.

Youđž. By DZJ, he was born c0516. As a military man, even if only a footsoldier, his apprenticeship may have been 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 Wŭ-chŭng. 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 Dzŭngdž at least must have known him) or the 11:3 pantheon, and does not appear at all until LY 1, when Dzŭngdž himself returns repersonified. He seems to have been the first to bear the -dž suffix, and thus the first to be head of a fully organized school; perhaps tensions associated with that change left a hostile legacy. In 12:9 he advises Aī-gŭng, implying the ministerial role that (according to the Mencius) Dž-sž later had, and perhaps casting light on the status of the school under his headship. In *1:12 (c0253) he appears as a ritual specialist, reflecting the preoccupation of the 03c and displaying the same evolution that we also see with Dž-yóu, but providing no evidence for the historical Yōu Rwò.

Dž-gŭng. From his surname, he is from a palace-supplier background; from his Dž- prefix, he was accepted as having mastered the high culture. His legendary role as the most devoted of Confucius's mourners suggests that he was the chief figure in the early posthumous circle, and thus the compiler of the LY 4 sayings. The LY 5 attempt to disabuse him of his impression of his own competence may easily be a senior figure (Dž-yóu) putting in his place a younger one who has by default acquired a role of influence. He fades from view in the 05c, is enshrined for eloquence in LY 11:3, and then regains prominence as Dž-lù loses it; one or the other functions narratively, at any given point, as Confucius's companion and Yén Hwéi's counterfoil. By LY 19, partly by the attrition of rival figures, he is the chief spokesman for the movement, and specifically for its stance of centering on the person of Confucius. 11:18a hints at wealth gained through trade, and SJ 67 (in which list his is the longest entry) recounts his diplomatic triumph on behalf of Chí, and notes that he died in Chí. If this anecdotal development rests on a core of fact, he seems to have been ahead of his time as an entrepreneurial figure in the 05c, but to have perfectly suited the more openly mercantile culture of the 04c and 03c, enabling him to become an icon in Chí without at the same time being abandoned by Lǔ (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 LY 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 **Sywndž** 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 jibe 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, attributed to a descendant (**Chīdyāu Chī 啓**) of the disciple.⁵⁰ **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 **Dzvingdž**; if so, the text (we cannot tell if it advised bellicosity) may have been of 03c date.

Shvn Chvng, whose instant of fame is in LY 5:11, is represented, though in a phonetically garbled form, in the **DZJ** list, where he serves as one guarantor of the reality of that list. His forbears were apparently from the extinct state of **Shvn** 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 Bwóđž 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 mulberry grove proprietor, he would have had an economic fallback option; for the high output of silk-making in the 05c, which already had displaced older plant-fiber cloth even for ritual garments, see LY 9:3. The “laxity” attributed to him in 6:2 perhaps agrees with the situation of someone who can afford to fail in the search for office.

Ywāen 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 Bwóđž**. **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 **Dž-gùng**. Technically, **Ywāen Sž** belongs to the group of **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**.

⁵⁰**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 開**, and in that form to court confusion with the disciple **Kāi**.

Dzǎ Yŵ 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 in 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 *rŷn*). He is embraced by the Kŷngs 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-gŷng*, but faithful to his 05c persona he is again criticized by “Confucius” for an inappropriate pun. In 17:19 he symbolizes 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-gŷng* 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; in this mythic option also he seems to have been an embarrassment to the school.

Rǎn Gŷng, like his Analects kinsman seemingly of artisan stock, and without the Dž- prefix, dies regretted by Confucius in 6:10, is enshrined by the Kŷngs (in the “virtue” category, perhaps implying the poverty which is suggested in 6:10), and is never heard from again.

Rǎn Yŷng 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 Kŷngs in 11:3 pair him with *Rǎn Gŷng* 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 *Jì*, 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 *Dzǎ Yŵ* or the presumptuous *Dž-gŷng*, 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 *Dàui*zed 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 from the *Shú* clan who may have been the patrons of Confucius’s father; his presence in the circle may thus be hereditary. 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 fiction. His literary symbiosis with *Yén Hwéi*, with his wrong answer the perfect counterfoil to *Hwéi*’s right one, is another fiction, played out in two interpolated passages (*5:26, c0294, and *7:11, c0310). His 05c image is of a weak candidate whom the text is reluctant to criticize. In LY 11 he acquires a rash, even swashbuckling, persona (11:13b, plus the interpolated *5:7 and *7:11), perhaps as a criticism of the militaristic *Chīdyāu* movement. In the DJ (c0312), this becomes a full-blown story of *Dž-lù*’s death in a duel, defending his *Wèi* patron (Legge **Ch’un** 843). In fact (and in the tradition preserved in SJ 121) *Dž-lù* survived the Master; by LY 7–8 he was one of three disciples whom *Dzŷngdž* may have known. He switches roles with the Confucius of 7:19 in 17:4 and 6, disapproving of the unsavory offers of office which Confucius is tempted to take, and alternates with *Dž-gŷng* in the later Analects as Confucius’s escort (18:6). He appears in the *Jwāngdž* as Confucius’s companion, 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 his love of "study" (which in this precurricular age means mental self-cultivation); in 9:11 that study has a clearly transcendent character; in 11:18b he is said to be often "empty," a codeword for meditative practices. In 12:1 he is treated roughly and appears stupid rather than clever; in this same period the text first admits meditation as a second way of knowledge (2:15; in 2:9 Hwéi is defended against the imputation of stupidity) and later rejects it altogether (*15:31, c0301). Hwéi then vanishes from the Analects, but reappears in the *Jwāngdž*, once (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 earlier, there attaches to Yén Hwéi a myth that he predeceased Confucius. With Dž-lù, there is a double tradition (a romantic one preserved in SJ 67 and a realistic one preserved 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 had died in the meantime, perhaps c0465. Since *Džvngdž* alludes to him as dead but also as a friend in 8:5, and since *Džvngdž* himself, on the Analects evidence, came late to the school, the probability from this evidence is that Yén Hwéi survived Confucius. The motif of his early death is developed in the Analects as a disaster for the school; it reaches a peak of intensity in LY 11, perhaps expressing the agenda of the Kǔng linealists against the *Džvngdž* meritocrats. In its final form it is likely to be a thematic transfer of the fate of the early death of Confucius's son Bwó-yw. Conceivably the later appearance of a parallel early-death myth for Dž-lù is affected by the fact that he had in the meantime become narratively involved with Yén Hwéi.

Gūngsyī Hwá is possibly of artisan background; by 6:4) with had the 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 Rǎn Chyóu turns on the fact that Dž-hwá is wealthy. His 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 *Džvngdž* suggests that he may have been known to *Džvngdž*. 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.

Džvngdž. His surname suggests a member of the exile community in Lǔ; by tradition he was a resident not of the capital but of the southern fortress town of Wǔ-chǔng. His 8:3 dying credo suggests the energy of the outsider (compare Shǔn Chǔng). If, as suggested above, the odd name Tántái Myè-míng in 6:14 is a kenning rubric for *Džvngdž*, under which he can be referred to without violating literary convention, his scrupulousness in office may reflect the meritocratic social newcomer. With Dž-yóu and Dž-jāng, he represents the southern focus which is conspicuous in the 05c school. Unless we 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) *Džvngdž* was the head of the Lǔ school. Given the pronoun usage 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, but 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 given in the HS 30 catalogue as having 18 chapters, seems to have been incorporated, perhaps entire, in *Dà Dài Lǐ* 49–58, and was still extant in early Táng. *Džvngdž* is frequently quoted in the Hǎn ritual compilations. This late, "outside" (non-Analectal) *Džvngdž* tradition still awaits systematic study.

Dž-jāng is said to have been from Chǔn; this makes him unlikely as a protégé of Confucius in Lǔ. His DZJ-implied birth year is 0503 (two years younger than Dzǔngdž), so that he came of age in 0485. He is a bystander rather than a disciple in LY 5-6, and is not in the 11:3 list. We infer that like Dzǔngdž he is one of Dž-yóu's coterie of southern-connected people. His literary role in the early text and much of the later text is the neutral questioner, who exists to elicit a wise comment from Confucius. His role expands in the late chapters as the infallibility of Confucius increases. At the end, he is the sole survivor: the only disciple to appear in LY 20.

The Dubious Disciples, those who appear first in the Kǔng period, are suspect by position as literary inventions. It is notable, for instance, that the plausible Lín Fàng, who appears only in LY 3:4 and 3:6 (c0342), is not claimed on later lists as a disciple. We assume, however, that those first mentioned in LY 11 (c0360) are probably sound, since it was evidently the intention of that chapter not to create a new disciple tradition but to restructure a previously known one. For Gāu Cháu, 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 along with the chapter enemy Dzǔngdž, and where it would serve no literary purpose to introduce a recognizably unfamiliar personage. In general, no later tradition or text ascription attaches to later-mentioned people, whereas Dž-jièn, manifestly not a disciple in 5:3, but nevertheless *appearing* in 5:3, has a Mídž attributed to him in the HS 30 catalogue, along with an associated work, the Jǐngdž, which is said to comment on the Mídž and to be by a Dž-jièn 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 knew what in the Analects went back to the earlier centuries. This awareness may affect the placing of interpolations; the disciples with sayings in the LY 4 core, for example, being limited to the early heads of the school.

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 Chǔng). 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 Chǔng 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 Chǔng, 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.

The Southern Connection. It was earlier noted that Dž-jāng figures in LY 5:19a, outside the section devoted to disciples. He is mentioned nowhere else in the early Analects chapters. If we trust the structure of LY 5, we must conclude that though Dž-jāng is treated as a *school insider*, he is not grouped with those who seem to have in common the fact that they were of the *disciple circle*. He would then seem to be, as of LY 5, an apprentice rather than a member: a posthumous disciple. Tradition holds that Dž-jāng was a southerner, a native of Chǔn. It also holds that Dzǔngdž was a southerner: a native of the Lǔ southern border city of Wǔ-chǔng; there are anecdotes in the Mencius of his conduct during an attack on Wǔ-chǔng, and since by LY 8 he finished his career as head of the Analects school in the Lǔ capital, this incident can only be from his young manhood. These traditions of origin, paralleled by the implications of the early Analects, allow the inference that both Dž-jāng and Dzǔngdž were southerners, and represent an influx of southerners to the Confucian school in the years just after the Master's death. There is even a possible scenario, in the fact that Dž-yóu appears in LY 6:14 as the administrator of Wǔ-chǔng, and might have recruited this local talent during his term of office.

LY 6:14 indeed seems to show Dž-yóu in the process of recognizing talent in Wǔ-chǐng, since the whole point of the passage is his praise of a subordinate for his procedural propriety. The name of the subordinate, Tántái Myè-míng 澹臺滅明, is odd but suggestive. LY 6:14 seems designed as an occasion to commend him, yet no commentator will admit to having information about him. Have we here an indirect reference? The -tái of the surname, meaning “terrace,” is cognate with Dzǎngdž’s dzǎng 曾 (cf tsǎng 層) “layer.” And the curious personal name Myè-míng “fade and brighten,” which among other things could describe the twinkling of a star, might be an oblique reference to Dzǎngdž’s personal name Shǔm 參, the name of a constellation. It is then conjectural, but on the Analects evidence perhaps not fantastic, to read LY 6:14 as pseudonymous praise of Dzǎngdž, who would then have been not Confucius’s own protege, but rather Dž-yóu’s, and by the evidence of 6:14 perhaps already designated as destined for the future headship of the school.

Retrospect on the Disciple Period of the Analects. The evidence so far considered gives us a two-phase picture of the Confucian school of Lǔ. In the early phase, the survivors of Confucius’s protégé circle formed a successor school, and gradually established themselves as suppliers of talent to the court. Dzǎng Ywǎn, or whoever was school head as of LY 9 (c0405), is clearly in touch with, and presumably interacting with, such court politics matters as the reproachment with “Wèi” (in fact, presumably the Jìn successor states which were at that period in the process of detaching themselves from the Jìn rubric) which is repeatedly implied in the chapter. That is, by the end of the 05c, the Confucian school head was very probably also a de facto official at the court of Lǔ, and was in close contact with, and perhaps itself engaged in, such enterprises as the development of the official ritual culture (see LY 9:15 on the Shǐ). It is wise not to exaggerate the importance of Confucius in his lifetime, but at minimum, as we have seen, he had a landholding and a considerable circle of people who were in some sense his personal dependents, as well as membership in the elite stratum who alone, in the late 06c, had automatic access to court-connected careers. Similarly with the school of Lǔ: it is well not to imagine it as the only enterprise of its kind, or to picture it as influential from the beginning, but by the end of the 05c, some 80 years after Confucius’s death, the headship of that school had become in all probability a very powerful position, and therefore, one worth taking over. It is in that context of unexpected success that we should perhaps view the onset of the second phase, which is a takeover of the Lǔ school by the Kǔng family. All legends, including those preserved by Kǔng family tradition itself, emphasize, or at minimum do not contradict, the estrangement of Confucius’s father from his Kǔng forbears (the Kǔng-added false eclipses in the CC were doubtless meant to *offset* that image, but the image itself remained in the record). No story of Confucius’s death has him attended in his last days, or mourned after his death, by anyone except his most important disciples. No Kǔng family presence is visible anywhere in these traditions. The disciples constituted Confucius’s immediate posterity, and they were for almost a century also in charge of his personal legacy.

This phase of disciple control must at some point have ended, and been followed by a period of Kǔng family dominance which continued into the Hàn dynasty. Again, all traditions point to Dž-sǐ 子思 as the first figure in the Kǔng succession, and all traditions about Dž-sǐ’s court career show it to have taken place under Lǔ Mù-gǔng, which puts it, at earliest, toward the end of the 05c. It was thus either then, or in the early years of the 04c, that the Kǔng period of the Analects school of Lǔ begins. The great dilemma of the Kǔng proprietors was to emphasize their own position, and to downplay or even deny the preceding period of disciple conservation and management of the Confucius tradition, while at the same time maintaining textual and ideological continuity with that tradition.

We may now consider the Kǔng phase itself, and see how they solved the problem, and consolidated the opportunities, with which control of the Analects tradition presented them.

The Kǔng Family Succession

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-sz, said to be Bwó-yw's son and the author of the Jǔng Yǔng: a lineal and doctrinal successor. When Sywǎndž attacks "Dž-sz and Mencius," he presumably means the school of Lǔ, with Dž-sz its chief posthumous leader and Mencius its most eminent later product.⁵¹ The Mencius text contains vignettes of Dž-sz,⁵² presumably reflecting Mencius's own impressions,⁵³ which show Dž-sz as an advisor to the Lǔ Prince.

This implied direct-succession picture collapses upon examination. If Dž-sz had directly succeeded Confucius, the Prince in his period would have been Aī-gǔng (r 0494–0469), but in the Mencian material it is Mù-gǔng (r 0410–0378), a gap of sixty years or 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-sz 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-jǐng 子京		aet 46
7. Kǔng Chwān 穿	Dž-gāu 子高		aet 51
8. [no personal name]	Dž-shǔn 子慎	minister in Ngwèi	aet 57
9. Kǔng Fù 鮒		erudite of Chǔn Shǔ	aet 57

The later (Hàn) generations do not concern us here. #9, Fù, is said to have died with Chǔn Shǔ, whose brief reign of less than a year ended in 0208; this gives an absolutely certain year of death for Fù, which in turn anchors the chronology of the entire Shǔ Jì list of Kǔng successors. Assuming that Fù had not yet reached his birthday in that year, his lifespan is then c0265–0208. Fù could not have succeeded to the position of 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-sz's birthdate will be 6 generations or 150 years before Fù's birthdate c0265, or c0415. Then Dž-sz reached adulthood in 0396, and could have served Mù-gǔng as Mencius implies, but not Aī-gǔng. Then Dž-sz was neither the grandson nor the direct successor of Confucius. He *could* have succeeded Dzǔng Ywǎn, whose LY 9 wedate to c0405, and with slight adjustments in the dates, this is what we assume actually happened.

It is notable that all Kǔngs in the SJ list who may be presumed to have served as Lǔ school heads have the Dž- prefix on their formal names, whereas Fù, who could not have done so, lacks that prefix. The intended distinction cannot be one of official position, since Fù is said by the list itself to have held office under a ruler. The prefix must then refer to the position of head of the school of Lǔ, and Fù's lack of that prefix confirms the implication of the dates themselves: that he was the first of the line *not* to have held that position.

⁵¹SZ 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-sz, 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.

⁵²Dž-sz 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).

⁵³Mencius himself (c0387-c0303) can hardly have known Dž-sz directly, but he was probably a student in the Lǔ school at a time when memories of him were still current.

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

3. Kǔng Jí 伋	Dǔ-sǐ 子思		aet 62
4. Kǔng Bwó 白	Dǔ-shàng 子上		aet 47
5. Kǔng Àu 傲	Dǔ-jyā 子家		aet 45
	later named Chyóu 求		
6. Kǔng Kḗ 榘	Dǔ-jr 子直		aet 46
7. Kǔng Chwān 穿	Dǔ-gāu 子高		aet 57
8. Kǔng Wǔ 武	Dǔ-shùn 子順	minister in Ngwèi	aet 57
	named Wēi 微, later named Bīn 斌		
9. Kǔng Fù 鮒	Dǔ-yw 子魚	erudite of Chvn Shv	—
	later named Jyā 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 Dǔ- prefix usage 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 Chvn Shv’s (and therefore Fù’s) death, this effectively adds two extra generations to the pre-Hàn Kǔng succession. If these generations are counted backward (from 0208, which we are here allowed to remember), they will be found to fill the Dǔ-sǐ gap, and permit Dǔ-sǐ to have learned directly from Confucius.

The Kǔng Tsungdǔ (KTZ) fills it a different way, by attributing to Dǔ-sǐ himself an age at death of 78, and assigning the following lifespans,⁵⁴

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

still leaving four years between Bwó-yw’s death and the birth of his supposed son Dǔ-sǐ.⁵⁵ 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 the SJ 47 data. It also makes use of 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, with LY 12 seemingly very close to Mencius’s known ideas (as reflected in the genuine portions of MC 1) and LY 13 somewhat less so, as though a minor were approaching closer to the age of adulthood and were accordingly more disposed to anticipate the authority of adulthood; there are also no interpolations which invite association with LY 12, suggesting a moratorium on retrospective additions to the canon which might reflect the conditions of an intellectual regency. The known date of Mencius’s departure from Lǔ (c0321) establishes a fixed point for all calculations in this vicinity, just as Fù’s deathdate (0208) fixes an endpoint for the Kǔng list itself. These limitations do not uniquely determine a single chronology, but rather loosely demarcate a family of generally similar chronologies; this suggestion represents one of these.

⁵⁴As extracted from KTZ by Ariel K’ung 8.

⁵⁵Which, with together with divergences as to whether Fù or his brother is supposed to have hidden the wall texts and other matters, Ariel K’ung 13f tries to reconcile. He does *not* try to rationalize the incompatible KTZ 5 dialogues between Confucius (KTZ deathdate 0479) and Dǔ-sǐ (KTZ birthdate 0479).

0439	[Kǔng Dž-sz born]	
0436	Death of Dzṽngdž	LY 8
0435	Dzṽng Ywæn succeeds as school head	
0408	[Last of several Chí attacks on Lǔ border]	
0405	Dzṽng Ywæn aet 68?	LY 9
0404	Dzṽng Ywæn dies (aet c69?)	
0402	Dž-sz becomes first Kǔng head of the Lǔ school, aet 38	
0399	[Kǔng Dž-shàng born]	
0387	[Mencius born]	
0380	Dž-sz aet 60	LY 10
0378	Dž-sz dies, aet 62	
0377	Dž-shàng succeeds, aet 24	
0372	[Kǔng Dž-ŷā born]	
0360	Dž-shàng aet 40	LY 11
0354	Dž-shàng dies, aet 46	
0353	Dž-ŷā succeeds, aet 20	
0342	[Chí Kingship proclaimed]	
0342	Dž-ŷā aet 31	LY 3
0340	[Kǔng Dž-jīng born]	
0328	Dž-ŷā dies, aet 45	
0327	Dž-jīng aet 14; Mencius among interim supervisors	
0326	Dž-jīng aet 15, relatively compliant; much Mencian input	LY 12
0322	Dž-jīng aet 19, more assertive; less Mencian input	LY 13
0321	Dž-jīng succeeds, aet 20; Mencius leaves Lǔ	
0321	[Kǔng Dž-gāu born]	
0320	[Mencius begins public career, aet c66]	
0317	Dž-jīng aet 24, Lǔ Píng-gūng 1st year	LY 2
0310	Dž-jīng aet 31	LY 14
0305	Dž-jīng aet 36	LY 15
0295	Dž-jīng dies, aet 46	
0294	Dž-gāu succeeds, aet 28	LY 1
0293	[Kǔng Dž-shṽn born]	
0285	[Chí conquest of Sùng]	
0285	Dž-gāu aet 37	LY 16
0271	Dž-gāu dies, aet 51	
0270	Dž-shṽn succeeds, aet 24	LY 17
0265	[Kǔng Fù born]	
0262	Dž-shṽn aet 32	LY 18
0255	[Chǔ conquest of southern Lǔ]	
0254	[Sywǹdž becomes Director in Lán-líng]	
0253	Dž-shṽn aet 41	LY 19
0251	Dž-shṽn aet 43	LY 20:1
0250	Dž-shṽn aet 44	LY 20:2-3
0249	[Chǔ extinguishes Lǔ]	
0249	Dž-shṽn aet 45; goes to Ngwèi	
0243	[Ngwèi minister Syìn-líng Jyǹn dies]	
0242	Dž-shṽn becomes minister in Ngwèi	
0237	Dž-shṽn dies in Ngwèi, aet 57	
0209	Fù takes office as erudite under Chǹn Shṽ	
0208	Fù dies in the fall of Chǹn, aet 57	

Chronology of the Kǔng Succession

Data firmly known from SJ 67 or other sources is shown in bold

Conclusions

Numerology. We began by suspecting that numerological factors played a role in the appearance of “72” in statements concerning the age and disciples of Confucius. We found that this is so, and that the figure of 70 disciples is also numerologically influenced, although the symbolism was military rather than divinatory or cosmological. The only firm figure in the traditional accounts turned out to be Confucius’s age at death, which was 70. It was then this number which by its resonance with the standard size of an infantry company in c0350, invited an expansion of the original disciple list to that size at about that time.

Eclipses. It has long been seen that the problem of Confucius’s birthdate is somehow involved with CC eclipse records, which turn out to be partly spurious. All the spurious eclipses in the CC can be solved at one stroke by the resolution of the problem of Confucius’s birthdate: they were inserted in the text to enhance the birthdates of Confucius and his Lǚ ancestors.

Disciples. The SJ 67 disciple list was based on a prototype of the KZJY 38 disciple list, which had a 70-disciple version as its earliest state, but even this represented mythic expansion; in all, 63 names remain after analysis as the probable size of Confucius’s circle. These are best seen as a client group, whose relation to Confucius is partly hereditary rather than intellectual. It is the *upper layer* of this group, who were attracted to Confucius after he gained a position at the Lǚ court, who are the court-position hopefuls familiar from the early Analects chapters.

Sociology. The Analects usage of the honorific Dǔ- prefix, and the distribution of the names in the Dǔ Jì, yield a partial but surprisingly suggestive picture of the nature of the circle around the historical Confucius, and suggest redefining his role as that of patron and proprietor, and perhaps acculturator, rather than more narrowly as exclusively a philosopher.

Disciple Headship. Many puzzles concerning the Kǔng succession list in SJ 47 and the contrary indications in the early Analects are solved if it is seen that the SJ 46 Kǔng list is essentially correct, but that it ignores an 05c period of disciple headship in the school of Lǚ.

Outside Disciple Traditions. Dzvngdǔ, Chīdyāu Kāi, and also Dǔ-sǔ, have traditions of composed or associated texts or advocacy positions quite apart from their role in the Analects. These may be either splitoffs from the Analects tradition proper, as seems to be the case with the career of Mencius, or emblematic appropriations of Analects-certified figures by rival groups. Their systematic investigation is a matter of some urgency. The possibility of texts composed by the Analects group itself, but conceived and maintained apart from the Analects, is raised by the account of the Dǔ Jì here given, and by the scenario for the Dzwō Jwàn which is here assumed. The early Jūng Yūng, associated with Dǔ-sǔ and acknowledged in its early compositional stages by both the Analects and the Mencius, is another possible case.

Validity of the Sources. The general picture which we find concerning the standard sources which have been available to scholarship for the last several thousand years is that they indeed invite skepticism as they stand, but that such skepticism has, within the available material, enough evidence to work on to produce reasonably sound inferences as to textually prior, and historically more plausible, states of that material. In making such inferences, the value of earlier rather than later evidence continues to be affirmed. That is to say, the Warring States situation is difficult but not hopeless. It would seem to merit, and permit, further investigation.

Nature of Mythic Pressure. As far as the evidence here examined suggests, myth as such does not exist as a shaping force in the evolution of traditions. There is in every case a more primary and immediate motive (such as the interest of the Kǔng family in legitimizing and glorifying their control of the school of Lǚ) for the detectable changes in the traditions about Confucius. In the working out of that immediate human agenda, numerology and cosmology provide useful materials and points of gravitation, but are not initiating factors.

Works Cited

The following entries expand the short citations given in the text and notes. Names are given in Chinese order (surname first, without comma). Joint authors are omitted, as is place of publication; X University Press is normally abbreviated to X. An edition not seen is given in [brackets]; an asterisk after a year of publication indicates that later reprints, not here specified, also exist.

Text, Series, and Journal Abbreviations

AM: Asia Major
 CC: Chinese Classics (Legge, 1861-1872*)
 DJ: Dzwō Jwàn (see Legge **Ch'un**)
 EC: Early China
 IB: The Interpreter's Bible
 MZ: Mwòdž 墨子 (see Mei **Ethical**)
 SBE: Sacred Books of the East
 SPP: Sino-Platonic Papers
 WSWG: Warring States Working Group (University of Massachusetts), 1993-

Bibliography

Ariel Yoav, **K'ung Ts'ung-tzu**, Princeton 1989
 Beveridge W I B, **The Art of Scientific Investigation**, Norton 1950*
 Brooks E Bruce, **The Original Analects**, Columbia 1998
 Brooks E Bruce, **The Present State and Future Prospects of Pre-Hàn Text Studies**, SPP #46 (1994) 1-74.
 Brooks E Bruce, **Shř Jì Chronology**, WSWG Note 85 (1995)
 Chalmers John, **Appendix on the Astronomy of the Ancient Chinese**, in: Legge **Shoo Creel** Herrlee Glessner, **Confucius**, John Day 1949*
 Dien Albert E, **Warring States Armor and Pit Three at Qin Shihuangdi's Tomb**, EC v5 (1979-80) 46-47
 Dubs Homer H, **The Date of Confucius' Birth**, AM v1 (1949-50)
 Feynman Richard P, **The Character of Physical Law**, [1964]; Modern Library 1994
 Graham A C, **Reflections and Replies**, in: Rosemont **Contexts**
 Jensen Lionel M, **Wise Man of the Wilds**, EC v20 (1995)
 Keegan John, **Churchill's Generals**, Grove Weidenfeld 1991
 Kennedy George A, **The Butterfly Case**, in: Li **Selected**
 Knoblock John, **Xunzi**, Princeton 3v (1988-1994)
 Kramers Robert Paul, **K'ung Tzu Chia Yü**, in: Loewe **Texts**
 Kramers Robert Paul, **K'ung Tzu Chia Yü**, Brill 1949
 Legge James, **The Analects of Confucius**, as: CC v1
 Legge James, **The Ch'un Ts'ew**, as: CC v5
 Legge James, **The Li Ki**, as: SBE (1885*)
 Legge James, **The Shoo King**, as: CC v3
 Leslie Donald D, **Essays on the Sources for Chinese History**, South Carolina 1973
 Li T'ien-yi, **Selected Works of George A Kennedy**, Far Eastern 1964
 Loewe Michael, **Crisis and Conflict in Han China**, Allen & Unwin 1974
 Loewe Michael, **Early Chinese Texts**, Society for the Study of Early China 1993
 Maspero Henri, **La Chine Antique**, [1927]; 2ed, Presses Universitaires 1965
 Maspero Henri, **China in Antiquity**, Massachusetts 1971
 Mei Y P, **Ethical and Political Works of Motse**, Probsthain 1929*
 Needham Joseph, **Science and Civilisation in China**, Cambridge 1961-

Pokora Timoteus, Pre-Han Literature, in: Leslie Sources

Polya George, Induction and Analogy in Mathematics, Princeton 1954

Rickett W Allyn, Guanzi v1, Princeton 1985

Riegel Jeffrey K, [Review of Maspero *Antiquity*], JAS v39 (1980)

Rosemont Henry Jr, Chinese Texts and Philosophical Contexts, Open Court 1991

Scott R B Y, The Book of *Isaiah*, as: IB v5

Stephenson F R, Atlas of Historical Eclipse Maps 1500 BC - AC 1900, Cambridge 1986

Waley Arthur, The *Analects of Confucius*, Allen & Unwin 1938*

Watson Burton, *Records of the Grand Historian of China*, Columbia 2v 1961*

Watson Burton, *Ssu-ma Ch'ien*, Columbia 1958

Yang Hsien-yi, *Records of the Historian*, Commercial 1974

Since June 2006, all new issues of *Sino-Platonic Papers* have been published electronically on the Web and are accessible to readers at no charge. Back issues are also being released periodically in e-editions, also free. For a complete catalog of *Sino-Platonic Papers*, with links to free issues, visit the *SPP* Web site.

www.sino-platonic.org