

Distancing Jí 及 in the Chūn/Chyōu

A Taeko Brooks 白妙子

University of Massachusetts at Amherst

17th WSWG Conference (Leiden, 17 Sept 2003)

Abstract. Jí 及 in the Chūn/Chyōu 春秋 (CC) can be a verb “overtake, go as far as” or a coverb linking one noun with another noun. The Gūngyáng Jwàn 公羊傳 (GYJ) and Gǔlyáng Jwàn 穀梁傳 (GLJ)¹ commentaries ascribe to coverb jí the meaning “and” or a nuance of secondary involvement (lèi 累).² Legge (**Ch’un** 5) calls the latter meaning “recondite;” Dobson, Schuessler, and Wáng Lì do not mention it. I find that jí is a secondary, specifically a distancing, “and.”³ I ascribe that nuance, when present, not to any retrospective Confucian “praise and blame” coding in the CC, a theory still widely accepted, but to the protocol sensibilities of the Lǚ court itself. There are implications for the authorship, and indeed the nature, of the CC text.

Options. What words for “and” were available to a CC scribe? GYJ at Yǐn 1:2 says 會及暨皆與也: “hwèi, jí, and jì are all ‘and’ (yǔ 與).” Yǔ⁴ and jì⁵ are rare in the CC; hwèi and jí are common (jí 及 occurs 95 times, 94 times as a coverb).⁶ But it is also possible, in the CC, to list things with no connecting coverb whatever. Since jí is not grammatically *required* to be present, we may properly ask: when it *does* occur, what meaning does it convey?

¹Several Dzwǒ Jwàn 左傳 (DJ) suggestions will be taken up below.

²Legge **Ch’un** 895a “and also;” Dobson **Studies** 250 “accompanying agent.”

³I am grateful to Christoph Harbsmeier for comments on this paper at WSWG 17, including a suggestion that I avoid calling this nuance “disjunctive,” my original choice.

⁴Apart from a proper-name use, yǔ 與 occurs twice in CC. (1) Hwán 18:1 (公與夫人姜氏遂如齊 “the [Lǚ] Prince and his lady Jyàng-shǐ then went to Chí”) is rejected by Dobson (**Studies** 224, following Dwàn Yǔ-tsái) as an interpolation. I find no ground other than rarity for doubting it. Dobson construes Jāu 13:5 公不與盟 as a verb “take part in.” I concur, since coverbal “with [them]” would require a preposed 之, contracted with 不 to give 弗, as in the parallel Wǎn 16:1 公弗及盟 “the Prince [of Chí] did not covenant *with him* [the Lǚ envoy].” This attests verbal yǔ “associate with” in the CC language. Suitably to that meaning, coverb yǔ seems to be a conjunction of equal status. I attribute its rarity in CC usage to the rarity of social equality itself in the situations reported by the CC.

⁵Jì 暨 occurs in Jāu 7:1 (暨齊平 “made peace with Chí”) and Dìng 10:12 (宋公之弟辰，暨仲佗，石彊 “The Prince of Sùng’s brother Chǎn, together with Jūng Twō and Shǐ Kōu”). Legge remarks, of the former case, that 暨 = 及. The parallel extends to the counterpart verb jì 暨 “go as far as” (not attested in CC). Dobson **Studies** 230 plausibly makes jì 暨 a holdover from an earlier phase of the language. Its rarity in CC is then not due to any social factors, but rather to its status as an almost obsolete word.

⁶The verb instance is Syī 26:2 (公追齊師，至鄆，弗及 “pursued the Chí host to Syī, but did not overtake it”). The 94 coverb instances occur in 91 different CC passages. (Here and below, I follow Yáng Bwó-jyǔn’s numbering for CC and DJ passages).

Lists

There are three content categories in which coverb *jí* appears. I will form my hypothesis of its meaning on examples from the first category, which includes lists of objects, towns, or persons involved in civil disorders in other states. The first point to establish is that *jí* is not mandatory in these lists:

盜竊寶玉，大弓 “a thief stole the Precious Jade [and] Great Bow.” (Dìng 8:16)

These were items of the Lǚ regalia, presumably of equally great symbolic value. They are simply juxtaposed, without any linking “and” word. By contrast:

雉門及兩觀災 “. . . the Pheasant Gate 及 the two towers were destroyed by fire.” (Dìng 2:2)⁷

In line with the verbal meaning of *jí*, “go as far as,” we might construe this as “the fire in the gate later spread to the side towers also.” But since coverb *jí* recurs in the Dìng 2:4 entry, when the gate and towers were rebuilt, surely at the same time, *jí* must here convey, not a time sequence, but more generally a priority difference. We have also:

邾庶其以漆，呂丘來奔 “Shù-chí of Jū came as a refugee, bringing with him Chī [and] Lǚ-chyōu.” (Syāng 21:2)

where “and” is implied simply by the juxtaposition of the town names, and is not separately signaled by any word in the sentence. Compare:

莒牟夷以牟婁及防，茲來奔 “. . . Mǒu-yí of Jyǔ came as a refugee, bringing with him Mǒu-lóu 及 Fáng [and] Dž.” (Jāu 5:4)

where *jí* occurs in the list of towns the refugee brought with him. The names suggest that the town Mǒu-lóu was closely associated with the person Mǒu-yí, leaving his association with the others to be less close. Again, *jí* seems to divide the list into two parts, of which the second is less primary than the first. This function, not exactly the GLJ *lèi* 累 function, but an indicator of secondarity, is my hypothesis.

I will now test that hypothesis on other material from this content category, which includes killings of important persons, revolts, and flights from a state.

Killings. The killing of a ruler by a subject has its own verb in CC (*shè* 弑); the killing of an officer or other non-ruler is rather *shā* 殺. Rulers and non-rulers regularly appear together in CC lists of covenant participants, but in cases of inflicted death, the mind of the time seems to have recognized a major difference. When a CC entry includes both types of killing, the higher-status verb proper to the ruler is used, the ruler is mentioned first, and a *jí* always separates the two names, thus:

宋督弑其君與夷及其大夫孔父 “Dū of Sùng put to death his ruler Yǔ-yí 及 his great officer Kǔng-fǔ.” (Hwán 2:1)⁸

The effect is to restore the missing ruler/non-ruler distinction (missing because only the higher-status verb is used) by subordinating the second object as the “less primary” of the two.

⁷In this and all CC quotations, introductory time expressions have been omitted.

⁸The parallel cases are Jwāng 12:3 and Syī 10:3.

When two persons said to be killed in one CC entry are both are non-rulers, the previous rule does not obtain. Normally, no jí occurs.⁹ Here is an exception:

晉人殺其大夫士穀及箕鄭父 “A man of Jìn killed the great officer Shì Hú 及 Jī Jǐng-fū.” (Wǎn 9:6)

The rank difference may imply a responsibility difference. GLJ indeed asserts that Shì Hú was the chief agent, and Jī Jǐng-fū was merely involved (累). There is no reason to suppose that the GLJ statement is anything but an inference from the CC entry, but the entry does invite that inference.

陳殺其大夫慶虎及慶寅 “Chén killed its great officer Chìng Hǔ 及 Chìng Yín.” (Syāng 23:5)

Dù Yǜ 杜預 sees this as refuting the GLJ idea that jí signals lesser involvement of the second figure.¹⁰ But the CC tells us that Chìng Hǔ was of higher rank than Chìng Yín. As above, it is natural to suppose that he was the leading figure in any joint enterprise, and thus logically the chief target of any reprisal.

衛殺其大夫元咺及公子瑕 “. . . Wèi killed its great officer Ywǎn Sywǎn 及 Prince Syá.” (Syī 30:3)

The status of the second figure here is higher; this rules out the possibility that jí is a high/low status separator.¹¹ Two years earlier, the Wèi ruler had fled to Chǔ and later returned. On his return, Ywǎn Sywǎn had fled to Jìn and later returned. All this suggests that Ywǎn was trying to put Prince Syá on the throne of Wèi. The Prince would have been the *beneficiary* of the plot, but Ywǎn may have been its *leader*.¹² The hypothesis of jí as a secondarity marker thus seems to hold here.

Revolts (pàn 叛) may be led by several people. When this is the case, the CC usually lists them without connectives.¹³ An exception is the following:

宋公之弟辰及仲佗，石彊，公子地自陳入于蕭，以叛 “The Sùng Prince’s younger brother Chén [及] Jùng Twō, Shí Kōu, and Prince Dì entered Syāu from Chén and held it in revolt.” (Dìng 11:1)

The violation of rank order is obvious, and the implication (see again note 11) is that the Prince’s younger brother, who is listed before the jí, is the ringleader.

⁹Sywǎn 15:5, Chǐng 8:6 and 17:13, Syāng 10:8, Aī 4:5.

¹⁰DJ 23:3 speaks collectively of “the Two Chìng” and so perhaps invites Dù’s comment. DJ tells a story of a popular revolt against the usurping Two Chìng. Nothing in CC suggests this. DJ regularly, but incorrectly, takes the term X 人, which in CC means “an [unnamed] officer of X,” to mean “the people of X.”

¹¹Compare Dìng 10:12, where the younger brother of the Prince of Sùng and [暨] several named persons flee to Chén. In Dìng 11:1, the same group plus [及] Prince Dì 公子地, who is listed last, enters Syāu and holds it in rebellion. As in Syī 30:3, it seems that a conspiracy, headed by the Sùng ruler’s younger brother, had picked up a plausible ruler in Chén and then activated their plot. Despite his high status, Prince Dì is still listed last. He is not in all likelihood the leader of the plot; rather, a necessary accessory.

¹²DJ claims (though some commentators deny) that Ywǎn Sywǎn had earlier made Syá ruler of Wèi. I here intentionally avoid DJ stories, and infer from CC evidence alone.

¹³Instances are Jāu 21:3 and Dìng 13:6.

Here and above, it may seem that the CC is concerned to identify the person chiefly responsible for a revolt, or the chief target among several victims. This easily leads to the thought that these distinctions are guilt judgements, and this in turn can lead to the “praise and blame” theory of the CC. The following examples implicitly argue against that inference.

Flight. Fleeing from State A to State B is common in Spring and Autumn. We know of no punishments in B for crimes committed in A. On the contrary, refugees often did well in their new setting. The Tyén family, who became the ruling house of Chí, had been refugees from Chǔn; the Kǔngs of Lǔ were refugees from Sùng. In most CC instances where more than one person flees from one state to another, no jí appears.¹⁴ An exception is:

齊國夏及高張來奔 “Gwó Syà 及 Gāu Jāng fled to us.” (Aī 6:4)

There is no rank difference. Both men are of important Chí families. But we can infer from the CC evidence that Gwó Syà is the more important figure of the two: he is mentioned in four previous CC passages;¹⁵ Gāu Jāng in only two.¹⁶

It will be useful to repeat here an earlier example:

莒牟夷以牟婁及防，茲來奔 “. . . Mǒu-yí of Jyǔ came as a refugee, bringing with him Mǒu-lóu 及 Fáng [and] Dž.” (Jāu 5:4)

It is likely that Lǔ, which was not a large state, welcomed both men in the previous example, and all three towns here. In effect, they increased the strength of Lǔ by deserting to it as they did. No disparagement of items listed after jí seems intended. We see rather an interest in priority: who is the big fish; which are the ancillary towns. It is hard to imagine a later moralist focusing on such matters.¹⁷ But the Lǔ officers in charge of new arrivals would have found it convenient to know.

Wallings. Most entries record the walling of only one town. When two towns are involved, the form is always 城 A 及 B; simple juxtaposition (城 A B) never occurs. No CC evidence suggests a special situation in any of these cases, and we may assume that the towns are here listed in order of priority, the sense of jí being “A and then B.” Those in charge of the walling expedition would have known to attend to “A” first. The idea of a secondarity marker seems to apply here unproblematically.¹⁸

¹⁴Instances are Jāu 20:4, 22:2, and 26:7.

¹⁵Dìng 4:2, 7:7, and 8:6; Aī 3:1. On three occasions, he leads the Chí army; two of them (Dìng 7:7 and 8:6) against Lǔ.

¹⁶Jāu 29:1 and 32:4.

¹⁷GYJ says that the 及 in Jāu 5:4 distinguishes the refugee’s “own” city from others. GLJ sees the distinction as one of size, the later named cities being smaller. I doubt that there is independent evidence of this, but both suggestions are along the lines here proposed.

¹⁸Wallings of two towns with jí occur at Jwāng 29:5, Wǔn 12:8, and Dìng 14:15. The case of two captured cities or land areas is analogous; see Aī 2:1, 8:3, and 8:7. Aī 8:7 records the restoration of two Lǔ towns whose loss was recorded in Aī 8:3. Their loss was undoubtedly regretted, and their restoration was undoubtedly welcome, but both entries have 及. The secondarity rule here proposed seems to apply in both cases.

Diplomacy

In the first or Lists category above, *jí* marked secondary involvement or lesser prominence. In the diplomatic area, *jí* also separates. But instead of separating items in a list, it seems to distance Lǚ politically from the action described, for such reasons as protocol irregularity, conflicting alliance obligations, or external compulsion.

Meetings. Formal meetings of rulers or their delegates are called *hwèi* 會. With meetings of states which do not include Lǚ, we have the following patterns:

蔡侯，鄭伯會于鄧 “N [Name] / N met in P [Place].” (Hwán 2:6)

單伯會齊侯，宋公，衛侯，鄭伯于鄧 “N met with N / N in P.” (Jwāng 14:4)

The first form is normal for non-Lǚ meetings; *hwèi* (at the end) is intransitive. The second, with *hwèi* following the first name and thus transitive, is unique in non-Lǚ reports. Earlier, Chí, Chǔn, and Tsáu had attacked Sùng; Shàn-bwó (acting for Jōu) later joined in the attack. Between that event and this, a drastic redirection of policy had occurred. The new line was to drop local enmities and unite the northern states (including Jǔng, which had not attacked Sùng) against the Chǔ threat. It is reasonable to think that this policy initiative came from Jōu, and that Shàn-bwó’s “transitive” grammatical position reflects that initiative.¹⁹

When Lǚ is involved, it is regularly mentioned first, and the form of the entry is the second one given above, thus:

公會齊侯，鄭伯于中丘 “[Lǚ] met with N / N in P.” (Yǐn 10:1)

The form 魯公 never appears, being always reduced to 公. The exceptions to Lǚ-first order are cases where the Lǚ prince is outside his territory, and where the local ruler is thus naturally the host or initiator:

衛侯會公子沓 “N met with [Lǚ] in P.” (Wǔn 13:6)

Coverbs occur with main verb *hwèi* in three odd situations. One of them is:

公會晉侯，宋公。 。 。 會吳于柤 “[Lǚ] with the Lord of Jīn, the Prince of Sùng, [and others] met with Wú at Jā.” (Syāng 10:1)

The second *hwèi* must be the main verb, so the first can only be a coverb.²⁰ Wú was a new and non-Sinitic member of the Spring and Autumn community of states. As such, it may not have been wholly welcome; it is thus notable that the state name alone appears here, with no ruler title. One gets a sense of solidarity among the first group, but the overall situation still seems sufficiently amicable.²¹

¹⁹The DJ claims that at this meeting Jōu conferred the *bà* mandate on the Lord of Chí. I believe that this overreads and politically reinterprets the situation; see Brooks **Hegemon**.

²⁰This example establishes the existence of a coverb *hwèi*. It cannot mean “met with” since the meeting proper is the one with Wú, denoted by the final *hwèi*. The meaning of coverb *hwèi*, in contrast to *jí*, is apparently conjunctive: “with, together with.” It was noted above that coverb *jí* occurs 94 times in the CC. The figure for coverb *hwèi* is 87 times.

²¹Wú at this time was apparently not organized along Sinitic lines. Other cases of coverb *hwèi* in the same entry as verbal *hwèi* also involve Wú: Chǔng 15:12, Syāng 14:1. I infer that the Sinitic states as a group were *culturally* uncomfortable with this situation.

Sentences with 公 “the Prince [of Lǔ]” as first in a list of names need a following coverb.²² That coverb may be hwèi 會, which seems to preserve the amicable sense of *verbal* hwèi; or jí 及, which overrides that implication by suggesting reluctance on Lǔ’s part. Hwèi (85 times) is the more common usage; jí (2 times) is very rare. One of the two instances of jí is:

公及齊侯，宋公。會王世子于首止 “[Lǔ] 及 the Lord of Chí, the Prince of Sung, [and others] met with the King’s Heir in P.” (Syī 5:4)

Presumably a Jōu succession dispute is involved. The parties covenant in the next CC entry. The entry after that notes that the Jèng ruler had left without joining the covenant; his reluctance is overt. Lǔ, with its special relation to Jōu, probably disliked meddling in Jōu politics, however urgent the situation. Hence, I suggest, its joining the other states, but with reservations. The other instance is:

公及夫人姜氏會齊侯于陽穀 “The [Lǔ] Prince 及 his Lady Jyàng-shè met with the Lord of Chí in P.” (Syī 11:2)

We know nothing about this meeting.²³ It may have been ordered by the Lady’s father, the Lord of Chí in question; Yáng-gǔ is in Chí.²⁴ In the absence of other information, a nuance of reluctance, carried by jí, seems at least not implausible.

A case of jí separating an object series is relevant to this point:

公會晉侯及吳子于黃池 “The [Lǔ] Prince met with the Lord of Jīn 及 the Master of Wú in P.” (Aī 13:3)

Jí in this entry seems to be more than a secondarity marker. This occasion is the first time that the CC gives to the ruler of Wú a title on the model of those used by rulers of the older Sinitic states. In previous meetings it was called simply “Wú,” a usage normally reserved for unorganized tribes like the Rúng 戎. The implication is that Wú had now, in some sense, been taken into the Jōu system and its leader recognized as a ruler by the Jōu King; perhaps it was at this time that Wú was also granted the royal surname Jì 姬, the surname to which Lǔ itself had a genuine hereditary right. A Lǔ objection to meeting with Wú on this new basis of fictive kinship may provide the best explanation for the use of coverb jí here.²⁵

²²Perhaps for metrical reasons; monosyllabic 公 is somewhat awkward in a list which otherwise consists of polysyllabic names.

²³And DJ, for once, does not invent a story about it.

²⁴Dù Ywè sees impropriety in the lady traveling, but Spring and Autumn wives often visited their parents in other states. The irregularity is not for the wife to travel, but for the husband to accompany her. Something more than a parental visit is probably involved.

²⁵Compare n19, above. Wú was not of Jōu lineage; it did not even speak a Sinitic language. Von Falkenhausen **Waning** 538f notes “gradual convergence” of lower Yángdǔ practices with Sinitic ones; political assimilation was “not yet complete at the end of the Spring and Autumn period.” A Chýn officer in LY *7:31 is made to accuse Lǔ Jāu-gūng of marrying a wife from consanguineous Wú. It may be that in Jāu-gūng’s time (two reigns before this CC passage) Wú was not yet even *nominally* consanguineous. This fact might easily have been forgotten by the time LY *7:31 was written (c0342; see Brooks **Analects** 86).

Informal Meetings. In contrast to the formal *hwèi* 會, there are less formal, even casual, encounters: *yw* 遇.²⁶ The CC attests awkward circumstances for some of them, but the informality itself seems to have been objectionable, and such meetings vanish altogether from the latter part of the CC.²⁷ An example:

公及宋公遇于清 “The [Lǔ] Prince 及 the Prince of Sùng met informally in P.”
(Yǐn 4:3)

Chīng 清 was in Wèi, and the previous CC entry notes the murder of the Wèi ruler. The next CC entry records a joint attack on Jvng in which Sùng, but not Lǔ, took part; later, a Lǔ army did join in the attack. Haste and/or reluctance are implied.²⁸

Covenants, *mǐng* 盟, are the core of CC diplomacy; its most formal feature. Juxtaposition of members in a list is possible in certain sentence forms, but when a list begins with 公, a coverb, either *hwèi* or *jí*, must follow. Of 105 covenants, 32 use the *jí* option. Here is a normal example, with *hwèi* rather than *jí*:

公會鄭伯盟于武父 “The [Lǔ] Prince covenanted with the Elder of Jvng in P.”
(Hwán 12:7).

This followed fruitless meetings (no final covenant) with Sùng. Next month, Lǔ and Jvng together attacked Sùng. Of the two neighbors, Lǔ had sided with Jvng. The covenant with Jvng is thus amicable, hence coverb *hwèi*. When *jí* appears, the CC often suggests a context of difficult or strained relations. Two examples:

公及齊侯盟于穀 “The [Lǔ] Prince 及 the Lord of Chí covenanted in P.” (Wón 17:3)

This directly follows a Chí attack “on our northern border.” The covenant was presumably forced on Lǔ by Chí. *Jí* here could well be called an enmity marker.

叔孫州仇，仲孫何忌及郟子盟于句繹 “Shúsūn Jōu-chyóu and Jūngsūn Hý-jì [of Lǔ] 及 the Master of Jū covenanted in P.” (Aī 2:1)

Here, *jí* is an enmity marker in the other direction. These two Lǔ officers had led an attack on Jū and taken land from it; the covenant was to ratify this seizure. Lǔ at this time was in a state of expansionist hostility toward its smaller neighbor.

Suppressed Subject. Parallel with the *hwèi/jí* option, and overlapping with it, is this separate device: an initial *gūng* 公 is sometimes omitted and left implicit.²⁹ The effect of this verbal gesture is something like abstention: the Lǔ Prince is present, and thus accepts the covenant, but he does not *acknowledge* his presence, and thus puts on record a degree of personal discomfort with the proceedings.

²⁶Legge (at Yǐn 4:2) argues that *yw* 遇 are as formal as *hwèi* 會. I cannot agree.

²⁷There are in all 8 such meetings; the last is at Syī 14:2 (from the year 0646). Syī-gūng’s reign was a time of profound change for Lǔ, and for all the northern states, which were brought together under the leadership of Jīn to resist the territorial incursions of Chū.

²⁸The other *yw* meetings, all with coverb *jí*, are Jwāng 23:6 and 30:6, and Syī 14:2. In Hwán 10:3 *yw* seems to contrast with *hwèi* as “in person” or “privately.”

²⁹Thus also Jāu Kwáng 趙匡 (contra GYJ, which believes that an *officer* is sometimes implied when no subject is given), quoted with approval at Legge 104.

Of 9 covenants in which the subject 公 is suppressed,³⁰ 5 follow a visit pìn 聘 by an officer sent to Lǚ.³¹ Pìn are ostensibly good-will missions, and doing other business in connection with them may have been against protocol, and thus a ground for Lǚ discomfort, even if the covenant itself was acceptable to Lǚ.

Covenants were usually made at locations between the respective capitals. Lǚ had joined in many such multilateral covenants which included Jìn. But a group of *bilateral* covenants with Jìn, made in the Jìn capital, imply irregularities. In the first (Wǔn 2:3), the Jìn ruler is a minor, and Chǔ-fǔ represents Jìn. The Lǚ ruler's trip to Jìn is not recorded, and 公 is suppressed in the covenant entry. These denials of presence may be seen as implying resentment of protocol irregularity.³²

CC protects the honor of its ruler. This is part of a larger practice: defeats of armies led by the ruler of *any* state are not attributed to the ruler of that state. A Lǚ example:

我師敗績 “Our host was disgracefully defeated.” (Jwāng 9:5)

The entry for the battle itself, immediately preceding, also omits the ruler's title:

及齊師戰于乾時 “[The Prince] fought with the Chí host at P.” (Jwāng 9:5)³³

These omitted 公 are subsumed in that convention. It may help to separate the omission of 公 from the occurrence of 及. The chronologically first instance is:

會齊侯，宋公，陳侯，衛侯，鄭伯，許男，滑伯，滕子，同盟于幽 “[The Lǚ Prince] together with the Lord of Chí . . . and the Master of Tǔng made a covenant of common cause in Yōu.” (Jwāng 16:4)

The purpose was to unite against Chǔ, which had invaded border state Tsà and attacked northern Jǔng. The danger was obvious, and the lack of jí implies *policy* agreement. But the Chí ruler was Hwán-gūng, and Lǚ had earlier supported a rival for the Chí throne. Some *personal* embarrassment might thus have lingered.³⁴

The sense of suppressed 公 in these examples, I would suggest, is not a dissent about power politics; that was the world into which the Sinitic states were moving, but one at which they had not arrived. It is rather a scruple arising from an older code, including the ideal of keeping faith, of being reliable whether as friend or as foe.

That code was undoubtedly fading, but it could still exert pressure. Here are two examples of its presence, both from the reign of Syī-gūng:

Syī 19:6 (no 公) is the first covenant to include Lǚ's old enemy Chǔ; this might have been personally awkward for a ruler not yet accustomed to shifting alliances.

³⁰GYJ and/or GLJ supply 公 in some of them. I reject these as normalizing variants.

³¹Chǔng 3:14, 3:15, and 11:2; Syāng 7:7 and 15:1.

³²I partly coincide with the DJ view (Legge 233), that the Lǚ ruler's treatment in Jìn was humiliating. In the other bilateral covenants with Jìn (Wǔn 3:6 and 13:8; Syāng 3:3), the trip to Jìn is recorded, the subject 公 is mentioned, and the other party is the Jìn ruler. All four of these entries use coverb jí, presumably to indicate discontent with Jìn policy.

³³For this cluster of conventions in the CC, see Brooks **Defeat**.

³⁴There is a check on this interpretation. Eleven years later, after Chí and Lǚ had gotten on more normal terms, the same major participants make a covenant of common cause in the same place; this time the subject 公 appears in the CC entry (Jwāng 27:2).

Syī 29:3 (no 公) largely duplicates the roster of a previous covenant (Syī 28:8), but here the Jōu King is also represented and J̀ng is absent; the other parties are officers, not rulers as before. A diminution of ceremony is manifest.³⁵ The Lǚ ruler may also have felt awkward about a pact which excluded previous member J̀ng, Lǚ's sometime ally, and which seems indeed to have been aimed at J̀ng.³⁶

War and Peace

In this third category, we reach the strongest version of the jí nuance: outright antagonism. Here, jí does not link members of a team, but divides allies from enemies.

Battles. The sentence verb is the intransitive 戰. Battles are rare in the CC, accounting for only 4% of all military actions. In battle reports, jí normally separates the allied combatants from their enemies, and in effect means “against;” thus:

季孫行父，臧孫許。 。 。 帥師會晉郤克，衛孫良父。 。 。 及齊侯戰于鞍
 “Jìsūn Hángfǔ, Dzàngsūn Syǔ . . . led the host and with [會] Syì K̀ of Jìn, Sūn
 Lyáng-fǔ of Wèi . . . fought against [及] the Lord of Chí at Añ.” (Ch̀ng 2:3)

Here the Lǚ leaders are plural, and their allies (marked by coverb hwèi) are also plural; only the opponent (separated from the preceding by coverb jí) is singular. Other examples, such as Hwán 13:1, show that the enemy list may be plural also.

Entries for battles fought between non-Lǚ parties also normally³⁷ mark the enemy side with jí. Here, Wèi takes on a Chí army which had invaded it:

衛人及齊人戰 “A Wèi officer fought against [及] a Chí officer.” (Jwāng 28:1)

It may well be that the sympathies of Lǚ were with Wèi.³⁸

Joint Expeditions. It is not until halfway through the CC text that the DJ proposes a rule about the use of coverbs jí and hwèi. This is in connection with:

公會齊侯伐萊 “The [Lǚ] Prince together with the Lord of Chí attacked Láí.”
 (Sywān 7:2)

³⁵Legge 214 stigmatizes as “ridiculous” Hú Añ-gwó's suggestion that the Lǚ ruler “is omitted in the text to conceal the disgrace of [his] meeting with his inferiors.” It is not ridiculous; it is a rather tempting hypothesis. In the end, it fails because it cannot be extended to all cases where the other covenanting parties are officers (人).

³⁶Of the northern states, J̀ng was the most friendly to Chǔ. In Syī 30:4, it is attacked by Jìn and Chín. Lǚ may not have denied the need, but will have regretted the duplicity.

³⁷The sole exception is 晉人，秦人戰于河曲 (Ẃn 12:7). In a slightly earlier entry (Ẃn 7:6) the same adversaries fight, this time with jí. Legge reports the Kāng-syī editors as finding “the simple 人 condemnatory of both the hostile states, especially as there is no 及 between the parties.” This is to read the presence of 及 in precisely the opposite sense to the one I here propose. I do not think that the CC evidence will bear this reading. The 人 indicates armies not led by their rulers. I can only suggest that in this particular case, Lǚ found itself indifferent about the outcome of an admittedly distant battle.

³⁸Notwithstanding the DJ theory that Chí was acting under orders from the Jōu King, and that Lǚ naturally supported that mandate. This is part of the DJ idea of a bà system, which, as I have shown elsewhere (Brooks **Hegemon**), is largely an invention of the DJ.

The DJ claims that the term “hwèi” implies that Lǚ had not been a party in planning the expedition. In its view, the marker for planning is 及, and for its absence, 會. Legge says the Kāng-syī editors “accept this canon with minor reservations.” But the tendency *early* in the CC is for enterprises to be planned at a separate meeting (hwèi) before the actual excursion. In later times, as here, that meeting is often waived, and the parties simply gather for the attack. Second, as noted above, in sentences beginning with 公, *some* coverb is required, and 及 and 會 are the only options. The DJ rule makes 會 the “marked” member of this pair. CC evidence suggests the opposite: that 會 is the default option, whereas 及, when used, has a special nuance.

Peace. Peacemaking (píng 平) is sometimes a transaction imposed on previously hostile parties, and it is not surprising to find that these cases also use jí:

宋人及楚人平 “An officer of Sùng made peace with an officer of Chǔ.” (Sywān 15:2)³⁹

These jí too seem to be enmity markers, a usage which we have encountered in the diplomatic category, but which is also common in entries reporting war or peace.

Change Over Time

The conclusions reached above may be summarized thus: coverb jí is a secondarity marker intensified by context, acquiring a nuance of reluctance verging on enmity in diplomatic contexts, and of open enmity in military and peace-making contexts.

There is a certain development over the course of the CC, not in the *behavior* of jí, but in the relative frequency of the categories *displaying* it. In the last two CC reigns, diplomacy largely breaks down, war is more common, the personal honor ethos reflected in the CC treatment of the Lǚ ruler weakens, and the CC entries give more non-personal detail. These changes lead to a higher proportion of instances in the basic first category, where jí has its mildest nuance, and in the military third, where its nuance is strongest, but where the presence of jí is virtually mandatory, so that the nuance can be attributed to the sentence rather than the word. If we had data only from those last two reigns, it would be very difficult to reach the above conclusions about coverb jí. It would seem in that case rather to be at most a mild secondarity marker, which added little to the implications of the order of listing.

Further evolution of usage along these lines will bring us eventually to a point where coverb jí does not contrast strongly with the other “and” words. From that point, the GYJ statement listing jí as a synonym for “and” becomes increasingly reasonable, and differences of opinion about the *nuances* of jí become increasingly intelligible. The world of CC protocol sensibilities has been lost.

³⁹Other cases are Dìng 10:1 and 11:4, Aī 15:7. A special case is the abortive peace effort in Sywān 4:1 (公及齊侯平莒及郟，莒人不肯), where we must interpret “Lǚ together with Chí [reluctantly, since three years earlier Chí had taken land from Lǚ, hence the first 及] attempted to make peace between Jyǔ and Tán [these being at odds, hence the second 及], but Jyǔ was unwilling.” The refusal was punished by Lǚ, which attacked Jyǔ and took Syāng. Lǚ sided with Tán since a Lǚ daughter had married into Tán.

Envoi

I conclude that jí 及 in the CC does carry a distinctive nuance of distancing, a nuance which has sometimes been sensed by commentaries, and which in many cases can be supported from information in the CC itself.⁴⁰ If this solution holds, it may supplement the events recorded in the CC by giving some hints as to the Lǚ court's feelings *about* those events, and thus Lǚ's policy preferences, even if those preferences could not be implemented at the time. It may also clarify the nature of the personalistic state, and suggest how far, in CC times, it had been replaced by the more complex and powerful state which was to fight the battles leading to the Empire.

Appendix: Data Set

All 95 instances of coverbal and verbal jí 及 and the 2 instances of coverbal jì 暨 are here divided by context (joint military actions, implying agreed effort, are in Diplomatic). Asterisked* items do not involve Lǚ. The Comment column gives the nuance I ascribe to jí 及 (S = secondarity, R = reluctance, E = enmity), and a brief description of the situation. Items in **bold** are discussed in the paper.

Year	Basic	Diplomatic	War/Peace	Comment
0722		Yǐn 1:2		[no information]
0722		Yǐn 1:5		[no information]
0721		Yǐn 2:4		R covenant w/ Rúng 戎
0719		Yǐn 4:3		R protocol irregularity
0715		Yǐn 8:7		R covenant w/ non-Sinitic Jyǎ 莒
0712		Yǐn 11:3		R at initiative of allies
0711		Hwán 1:3		R at initiative of allies
0710	Hwán 2:1*			S murder of ruler <i>and officer</i>
0710		Hwán 2:8		R covenant w/ Rúng 戎
0700		Hwán 12:9		R failed diplomacy
0699			Hwán 13:1	E opponents in battle 戰
0695			Hwán 17:3	E opponent in battle 戰
0695		Hwán 17:7		R breaking an earlier covenant
0690		Jwāng 4:7		R after father was killed in Chí
0686		Jwāng 8:3		R at initiative of ally
0685		Jwāng 9:2		R Chí succession problem
0685			Jwāng 9:5	E opponent in battle 戰
0682	Jwāng 12:3*			S murder of ruler <i>and officer</i>
0675		Jwāng 19:3		R protocol irregularity
0672		Jwāng 22:5		R grudging reconciliation
0671		Jwāng 23:6		R protocol irregularity
0666			Jwāng 28:1*	E opponent in battle 戰
0665	Jwāng 29:5			S walling <i>a second town</i>
0664		Jwāng 30:6		R protocol irregularity

⁴⁰As Carine Defoort has pointed out, the information in the CC is limited. But what information the CC *does* contain consistently supports the inference, not incompatible with her conclusion, that valuational words do exist in the CC, but that the values in question are those of the Lǚ court of the time, not those of Confucius or any other later moralist.

Year	Basic	Diplomatic	War/Peace	Comment
0661		Mín 1:4		R succession turmoil
0656		Syī 4:5		R initiative of allies
0655		Syī 5:4		R succession problem
0650	Syī 10:3*			S murder of ruler <i>and officer</i>
0649		Syī 11:2		R protocol irregularity
0646		Syī 14:2		R protocol irregularity
0645		Syī 15:3		R initiative of allies
0645			Syī 15:12*	E opponent in battle 戰
0642			Syī 18:3*	E opponent in battle 戰
0638			Syī 22:3	E opponent in battle 戰
0638			Syī 22:4*	E opponent in battle 戰
0634		[Syī 26:2 – sole instance of verbal 及]		
0632			Syī 28:5*	E opponent in battle 戰
0630	Syī 30:3*			S execution of <i>second officer</i>
0628		Syī 32:3*		R covenant after attack
0627		Syī 33:3*		R military alliance w/ Rúng 戎
0625			Wǎn 2:1*	E opponent in battle 戰
0625		Wǎn 2:3		R protocol irregularity
0624		Wǎn 3:6		R protocol irregularity
0620			Wǎn 7:6*	E opponent in battle 戰
0618	Wǎn 9:6*			S execution of <i>second officer</i>
0617		Wǎn 10:5		[information uncertain]
0615	Wǎn 12:8			S walling <i>a second town</i>
0614		Wǎn 13:8		R protocol irregularity
0611		Wǎn 16:1		R protocol: refusal to covenant
0611		Wǎn 16:1		R protocol: earlier refused
0610		Wǎn 17:3		E previously attacked
0607			Sywān 2:1*	E opponent in battle 戰
0605		Sywān 4:1		R previously attacked
0605			Sywān 4:1*	E refusal of peace
0604		Sywān 5:5		R protocol irregularity
0597			Sywān 12:3*	E opponent in battle 戰
0594			Sywān 15:2*	E enforced peace
0593	Sywān 16:1*			S extinguished <i>a second tribe</i>
0590		Chǐng 1:5		R forthcoming attack?
0589			Chǐng 2:2*	E opponent in battle 戰
0589			Chǐng 2:3	E opponent in battle 戰
0589		Chǐng 2:4		R covenant with defeated
0589		Chǐng 2:10		R covenant with former enemy
0588		Chǐng 3:14		R protocol irregularity
0588		Chǐng 3:15		R protocol irregularity
0580		Chǐng 11:2		R protocol irregularity
0575			Chǐng 16:6*	E opponent in battle 戰
0575		Chǐng 16:4		R after seizure of officer
0570		Syāng 3:3		R protocol irregularity
0570		Syāng 3:7		R initiative of allies
0570		Syāng 3:7		R covenant with turncoat
0566		Syāng 7:7		R protocol irregularity
0558		Syāng 15:1		R protocol irregularity

Year	Basic	Diplomatic	War/Peace	Comment
0550	Syāng 23:5*			S execution of <i>second officer</i>
0546		Syāng 27:5		R initiative of allies
0537	Jāu 5:4			S flees with <i>additional towns</i>
0535			Jāu 7:1*	E [暨] peace after attack
0525			Jāu 17:6*	E opponent in battle 戰
0508	Dìng 2:2			S fire in gate <i>and towers</i>
0508	Dìng 2:4			S rebuild gate <i>and towers</i>
0507		Dìng 3:5		R father just buried (3:4)
0506		Dìng 4:4		R policy disagreement
0506			Dìng 4:14*	E opponent in battle 戰
0500			Dìng 10:1	E enforced peace
0500	Dìng 10:12*			S [暨] flight with <i>other officers</i>
0499	Dìng 11:1*			S revolt with <i>other officers</i>
0499			Dìng 11:4	E enforced peace
0496	Dìng 14:15			S walling of <i>second city</i>
0493	Aī 2:1a			S <i>another</i> tract of land
0493		Aī 2:1b		E enforced covenant
0493			Aī 2:5*	E opponent in battle 戰
0489	Aī 6:4*			S flight of <i>second officer</i>
0487	Aī 8:3			S taking of <i>second town</i>
0487	Aī 8:7			S return of <i>second town</i>
0484			Aī 11:3*	E opponent in battle 戰
0482		Aī 13:3		R non-Sinitic state
0480			Aī 15:7	E enforced peace
Totals by Category				
Tot 及	18 (19%)	51 (54%)	25 (27%)	= 94 (100%)
Tot 暨	1	0	1	= 2
Both	19	51	26	= 96

Works Cited

- A Taeko Brooks. Evolution of the Bà 霸 “Hegemon” Theory. WSP v1 (2010) 220-226
- A Taeko Brooks and E Bruce Brooks. Defeat in the Chūn/Chyōu. WSP v1 2010) 189-198
- E Bruce Brooks and A Taeko Brooks. The Original Analects. Columbia 1998
- Carine Defoort: Can Words Produce Order? Cultural Dynamics v12 #1 (March 2000) 85-109
- W A C H Dobson. A Dictionary of the Chinese Particles. Toronto 1974
- W A C H Dobson. Studies in Middle Archaic Chinese: The Spring and Autumn Annals. TP v50 (1963) 221-238
- W A C H Dobson. Towards a Historical Treatment of the Grammar of Archaic Chinese: (1) Early Archaic Yüeh 越 > Late Archaic Chi 及. HJAS v23 (1960-61) 5-18
- Lothar von Falkenhausen. The Waning of the Bronze Age; in CHAC (1999) 450-544
- Yáng Bwó-jywn 楊伯峻. 春秋左傳注. 1981; 2ed 中華 1990