

18

c0262

LY 18 continues under the same head, Dž-shv̀n, and in the same context of philosophical disputation, as LY 17. It is a short chapter, and was probably compiled more as a controversial position than as a calm, inner-determined repertoire of sayings. The controversy in question is the classic one: whether to serve an illegitimate ruler (which at this juncture would likely have been the Chũ-dominated Prince of Lǔ), to which the classic answer (see 4:5) was “No.” On that question, LY 18 takes a brilliantly nonclassical position (see 18:6), consistent with the more recent line of political theory: now that the state can be conceived separately from the ruler, as something with its own needs and loyalty focus, the ruler’s credentials, still decisive in 17:4/6, no longer count. The larger needs of human society are the determining concern.

This chapter, and associated interpolations in other chapters, was written before the partial Chũ conquest of Lǔ brought Syẁndž directly on the scene as the military governor of occupied Lǔ, and the intellectual nemesis of Lǔ. Though much of interest can be detected in the covert sayings of LY 19–20, it has to be read between the lines. LY 18 is the last free Analects chapter.

The numbering of passages is identical in the Legge text.

┌ 18:3. Chí Jǐng-gūng was awaiting a visit from Confucius. He said, To treat him like the head of the Jì clan – *that* I cannot do. I shall treat him as between the Jì and the Mǔng. He said, I am old, and cannot use you. Confucius went on his way.

The two “he said” both refer to Jǐng-gūng, before and during Confucius’s visit; the repetition here signals a narrative lapse of time. This is a redo of the 15:1 story of a visit to Wèi (with the same concluding verb sýng 行 “went his way”), upgraded to the more powerful Chí. The major new detail is the implication that Confucius should have been treated with the ceremonies due the head of the Jì; in other words, as a virtual head of state. The highest position previously claimed for him was that of prime minister to the Prince of Lǔ, in 14:21.

For a Mician expansion of this story, see MZ 47:3 (Mei **Ethical** 223).

└ 18:4. Chí presented female musicians. Jì Hwándž accepted them, and for three days did not hold court. Confucius went on his way.

Evidently Dž-shv̀n is also thinking of Confucius’s days in Lǔ, since he here adds an anecdote explaining the rupture *between* Confucius and Lǔ. There is absolutely no warrant for accepting this as historical. It is in the pattern of ruler encounters established by the historical Mencius, and here grafted onto the evolving myth of Confucius. It must not be forgotten by analysts of the Analects that the Mencians were a rival school, and the prominence of their founder set a standard *for Confucians* that the Lǔ group could not afford to ignore. The departure of Confucius in 18:4 (compare 15:1/2) may be seen as imitating that of Mencius from Chí following the Yēn incident, the propriety of which is debated endlessly throughout the Mencius text (for example MC 2B11–12; Legge **Mencius** 228f). This defense had apparently confirmed departure as the seemly response. In any case, Confucius here does it too.

┌ 18:5. Jyē-yw̄, the Madman of Chǔ, passed by Confucius singing,
 Phoenix, ho! Phoenix, ho!
 How is your virtue now brought low!
 You cannot now reprove a past mistake;
 You still can overtake a future woe.
 Have done, oh! Have done, oh!
 Those who now serve, at their own risk do so!

Confucius descended, and wanted to talk with him, but he quickened his steps and evaded him, and he was not able to talk with him.

This is a rebuttal to the almost identical scene in the Jwāngdǔ (JZ 4:7; Watson **Chuang** 66), which cryptically censures Confucius for persisting in office in difficult times. It changes a detail at the end of the otherwise identically quoted anecdote. The new detail is Confucius's attempt *to refute the criticism*, and the unwillingness of the critic to stand his ground; its implied meaning is the Madman's lack of courage. Those who are only looking to save their own skins are of no use to others, or to the state. What Confucius probably wanted to say was what Frederick the Great *did* say to his troops at Cologne on 18 June 1757: "You wretches, do you want to live forever?"

> 18:6. Tall-in-the-Mud and Bold-in-the-Mire were plowing as a team. Confucius passed by, and sent Dǔ-lù to ask them about the ford. Tall-in-the-Mud said, Who is that driving? Dǔ-lù said, It is Kǔng Chyōu. He said, Would that be Kǔng Chyōu of Lǔ? He said, It would. He said, Oh, *he* knows the ford.

He asked of Bold-in-the-Mire. Bold-in-the-Mire said, Who are *you*? He said, Jùnng Yóu. He said, Would that be the follower of Kǔng Chyōu of Lǔ? He replied, Yes. He said, A thing overflowing – All Under Heaven is such, and who is going to change it? Besides, than follow one who only withdraws from *men*, why not rather follow one who withdraws from the *age*? He went on plowing without further pause.

Dǔ-lù went and reported it. Our Respected Master said consolingly, Birds and beasts cannot be flocked together with. Were I not a follower of other men, with whom should I take part? If the world possessed the Way, Chyōu would not be doing his part to change it.

For the symbol >, see 18:7n below. This counter-anecdote uses phrases from JZ 9:1, 12:5 and 12:9b (Watson **Chuang** 105, 131 "proceeded with work," 134f) and inspires a rejoinder in JZ 20:4, where Confucius is depicted as giving up his principles and living happily with birds and beasts (Watson 213f). The names of the primitivist hermits (compare MC 3A4 and Graham **Tillers**) exaggerate those given to Jwāngdǔ characters. The point of 18:6 is that it is precisely the danger that creates the obligation. Humankind, such as it is, is all that human beings can validly labor for. That this eloquent appeal was not lost on the JZ 4 people is shown by the fact that later parts of that chapter advocate *rejoining* the dangerous world (Brooks **Jwāngdǔ** 4; see also page 258 below).

The covert meaning of "ask about the ford" is "seek for a way out of the chaos of the times." The literary hermit Táu Chyén (372–427) ended his famous "Peachblossom Fountain Preface" allegory with the line, "Since then, there has been no one to ask about the ford." This is a twinge of conscience; a sense that his own hermit life in evil times fell short of this imperative.

┌ 18:7. Dǔ-lù was following, but fell behind. He met an old man who was carrying a basket on a staff. Dǔ-lù asked, Have you seen my Respected Master? The old man said, His four limbs he does not bestir, the five grains he cannot distinguish – who is your “Respected Master?” He planted his stick in the earth and began weeding. Dǔ-lù joined his hands respectfully, and stood there, waiting. He gave Dǔ-lù shelter for the night, killed a chicken and made a soup to feed him, and presented his two sons to him. Next day, Dǔ-lù went and reported it. The Master said, He is a hermit, and had Dǔ-lù go back and see him, but when he got there, he had gone. Dǔ-lù said, Not to serve is to have no sense of duty. Distinctions of age and youth may not be set aside; how can duties of ruler and subject be set aside? He wants to keep his person pure, and in the process disorders higher relations. The gentleman’s serving is merely doing his duty. That the Way does not obtain: *this* he knows already.

Unlike the invented 18:6, which ridicules the hermits from the beginning, 18:7 reads at first as favorable to the hermit, from whom Dǔ-lù respectfully seeks enlightenment. Only at the end, when the hermit is found to have run away, do our sympathies turn. The parallel with 18:5 suggests an outside source, which (or an analogue of which; not all the Jwāngdǔ has come down to us) may be JZ 25:6 (Watson **Chuang** 285f). The peroration, and thus the moral, is a more spelled-out version of the one in 18:6.

The 18:5–7 series consists of what we may call a split pair, with 18:5 and 18:7 parallel stories based on Jwāngdǔ originals, separated (split) by a freely invented story on the same theme, but not as close to either of the flanking stories as they are to each other. This would suggest that the middle piece is an interpolation, and in previous chapters such a situation has been so interpreted. We note, however, that once the ABA interpolated triplet (examples include 3:4–6, with *3:5¹⁴ splitting a Lín Fàng pair 3:4/6, or the very recent 17:4/6, on improper offers, which are to be split by the self-interpolated *17:5¹⁸ passage grouped with this chapter) has become familiar through memorization and repetition, it is only a question of time before the ABA structure, like the AA structure of the basic pairing pattern, comes to be seen as valid in its own right. We assume that this stage has been reached with this triplet, directly inspired by Dǔ-shùn’s own prior interpolation of the ministerial *17:5¹⁸ between the anti-ministerial 17:4/6. It seems to us that the ABA framing structure here gives, and was meant to give, an architectural prominence to the central 18:6.

Interpolations

The LY 18 breakthrough from the old rigid concept of the state was echoed in interpolations placed in other Analects chapters; Dǔ-shùn seems indeed to have concentrated on these rather than on completing the 24-saying plan for LY 18. These political passages are probably of the same date as LY 18 itself, or c0262.

Some other interpolations (and all those added to LY 8) are not Confucian sayings, but bits of historic lore, imitating the Shū documents in constructing a new heritage to replace the obsolete feudal one. The idea that one can make direct contact with the past and future by mental effort, first stated in 2:23, is here adopted as a method. These lore passages are probably slightly later than the chapter proper and its associated political interpolations, or c0260.

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

Added to LY 6

⌈ *6:29. The Master said, The efficacy of the Middle Method, is it not the ultimate? But among the people it has long indeed been rare! [6:27]

The Jūng Yūng (“Middle Method”) must refer to the text of that name, known in English since Legge as the “Doctrine of the Mean,” which as Waley notes (**Analects** 241) has early 03c affinities but refers also to the Chín unification. It is thus an accretional text, whose early segments existed by LY 18, and whose late ones fall after 0221. JY 4 (Legge **Analects** 387) seems to be the core; a line in it is identical to one in LY 18:7. JY 5 is a variant (the Way is not practiced). JY 6 brings in Shùn, who figures in the present set of interpolations. There are several phrases in common with earlier **Analects** passages, and also links with various parts of the Mencius. With JY 3, probably added to the core at the same time as JY 7, we encounter the phrase here duplicated as LY *6:29. This shows a strong affinity between the nascent JY text and the **Analects**, though the fact that the JY apparently continued to be compiled into the Chín dynasty, while the **Analects** did not, suggests that they were sponsored by different groups. *6:29 thus gives a tantalizing hint of the activities of the Jūng Yūng group.

⌋ *6:30. Dž-gùng said, If there were one who bestowed benefits widely among the people, and could relieve the condition of the multitude, how would that be? Could he be called rǎn? The Master said, Why need one bother with “rǎn” – he would surely be a sage; could even Yáu and Shùn find fault with him? As for rǎn: You yourself want position, so you give position to others; you yourself want to advance, so you advance others. To be able to *take one’s example from near at hand* – that can be said to be the method of rǎn. [6:28]

The classic Golden Rule in its positive form as a basis for ethical extrapolation (the “near at hand” is one’s own directly experienced character) here balances the novel technique of the middle course in *6:29. Note that the sage ruler is a *populist* ruler, who benefits the people in good times and saves them from disaster in bad. Disasters as a test of government derive from the 04c Micians (see MZ 16, Mei **Ethical** 87) and are also typical of the 03c (notice the image of the times as engulfed by calamity, like a flood, in 18:6). Yáu and Shùn, unknown in the early **Analects**, figure also in the LY 8 interpolations, below.

Added to LY 8

These LY 8 additions, many of them containing ancient-ruler lore, enclose that chapter as previously augmented, with *8:1 at the head, and *8:18–21 at the tail. Like the LY 18 interpolations, below, they expand doctrine by constructing a validating antiquity; we date both to c0260, slightly later than LY 18 proper.

*8:1. The Master said, Tàì-bwó is one who may be called perfectly virtuous. Thrice he renounced the dominion of All Under Heaven, and the people had no chance to praise him for it. [8:1]

Tàì-bwó relinquished the succession in favor of his nephew, the Jōu “cultural” founder Wǎn-wáng (see Nivison **Paradox** 35; the theory of sacrificing lineage to merit continues to develop). The people could not praise him because it was long before they directly benefited (compare *6:30 above) from his selflessness.

┌ *8:18. The Master said, Impressive indeed was the way in which Shùn and Yǎo possessed All Under Heaven, yet did not take part in it. [8:18]

The last predicate means “were not involved in it, kept aloof from it,” as the counterpart virtue to giving it away altogether (*8:1); Shùn and Yǎo came to power by merit, not inheritance. Compare the earlier DDJ 10: the Way gives birth but does not possess (yǒu 有, as here). The DDJ image is maternal: the mother bears the child, but does not own the child; the child is its own person. Both the mother and the sage stand somewhat aside from their creations.

└ *8:19. The Master said, Great indeed was Yáo’s acting as a ruler. Impressive! It was Heaven that was great; it was Yáo that patterned on it. Pervasive was he, and the people were unable to give it a name. Impressive was his bringing things to completion; dazzling was his possession of cultural splendor. [8:19]

The phrase wén-jāng (here “cultural splendor”) occurs also in *5:13¹⁷, where it is equally hard to define; we must infer that the perfection of social order under Yáo had its appropriate cultural perfection. The motif of not receiving praise from the people whom one benefits is common in these interpolations, and also in the Dàoism of the DDJ, by which (while it resists the nihilistic Dàoism of the Jwāngdǔ) the Analects of the period is evidently much affected. Another motif is modeling society on a cosmic order, implied in LY 2 (c0317). There is an 03c tussle between Heaven and man as the type of human virtue.

┌ *8:20a. Shùn had five servitors, and all under Heaven was governed. [8:20a]

└ *8:20b. King Wǔ said, I have ten ordering servitors. [8:20b]

These bits of lore are like those added to LY 16 and 18 (see below); Legge (and Tswēi Shù before him) had already noted their strangeness. King Wǔ uses the pronoun yǐ 予 “I” in its historically accurate sense as a ruler’s self-reference. The word translated “ordering” (lǜ 亂) normally means “disordering,” as when the rhythmic pulse dissolves in the coda of a piece of Warring States music (see 3:23n), but these passages involve antique or supposedly antique usages, and whatever will confer an archaic tone is admissible. By context the word must here mean “able, order-producing,” and so we assume that it does.

Five (Parkinson **Law** 34f) or perhaps six (Beveridge **Art** 63, PB 86) are the maximum viable executive committee for a small project, or a large state.

┌ *8:20c. Confucius said, “Talent is difficult,” is it not so? The age of Táng and Yǎo, in just this point was successful. [In King Wǔ’s ten] there was a woman; they were only nine men. Of three parts of All Under Heaven they held two, and with them submissively served Yǐn – the virtue of Jōu can be said to be perfect virtue! [8:20c]

A phrase seems to have dropped out of this two-part comment on *8:20a/b, and is here supplied in brackets. The first comment (Táng and Yǎo are the dynastic names for Yáo and Shùn, respectively) approves Parkinson’s view that it is impossible to find more than five able people at one time. In the second part, the usually inclusive term rén 人 “man” is taken in its exclusive sense “male,” a footnote on 17:23. Whether the woman of the ten was the wife or mother of Wén-wáng is much debated; this particular myth was obviously still evolving. Opinions differed as to whether the coming unification would be by force. Some traditions emphasize the violence of the Shāng/Jōu transition (Yǐn is the dynastic name of late Shāng); this passage, optimistically, takes a pacific view.

⌒ *8:21. The Master said, In Yǔ, I have no fault to find. He had simple drink and food, but used the utmost devotion toward the ghosts and spirits. He had bad clothes and robes, but displayed the utmost beauty in his headdress and surplice. He had a lowly hall and chamber, but put forth all his strength on ditching and draining. In Yǔ, I have no fault to find. [8:21]

Yǔ was first associated with farming (Brooks **Myth**; see 14:5). Later he became a hero who drained the waters of a great flood, thus fixing the watercourses. This myth is attested as early as the late 04c; the *Analects* is slow to assimilate this and other aspects of the new antiquity. The selflessness of Yǔ in laboring for the common good is given ritual expression: ignoring his personal comfort, he puts his effort into ritual observances. Compare the “beautiful” of *13:8¹⁴.

Added to LY 9

*9:4. The Master avoided four things: no wish, no will, no set, no self. [9:4]

This cryptic line is explained by Lyóu **Jǐng-yì** in the light of the political fluidity of *18:8b¹⁸ (“no may, no may not”), which we refer to this same period. Its third predicate, the adverb 必 “invariably,” is with difficulty nominalized in English. All invite intellectual interpretation: no fixed opinions, no foregone conclusions, no stubbornness, no self-absorption. This can equally well evoke the supple art of the 03c courtier or the intellectual ethos of modern research (Beveridge **Art** 115, PB 160). It would have shocked Confucius, who sacrificed office for principle (see 4:10), but it suits the 03c. Only Ware and Lau render the prohibitive force of the repeated verb 毋 “do not.” *9:4 may have been originally a self-cultivation rule, here imperfectly adapted to a political context.

*9:9. The Master said, The phoenix does not come; the River puts forth no diagram. I am finished! [9:8]

This despair is symbolized by late images: the phoenix omen (for this motif, surprisingly rare in Warring States art, see page 172), and the River Diagram (the reference is to the Yellow River). The latter is not interpreted as the magic square of order three until Hàn times (we are grateful to Nathan Sivin for this clarification); in the late 04c it may have been a 3 × 3 array representing the nine parts of China in Dzōu Yǎn’s geography; a symbol of universal dominion. The meaning is then, I shall not live to see the achievement of the new order.

Yoshikawa **Zakki**, an essay by a specialist for the (Japanese) general reader, contains a meditation on this passage.

Added to LY 3

*3:24. The borderman of Yí asked to be presented; he said, Whenever a gentleman comes to this place, I have never failed to be presented to him. The followers presented him. When he came out, he said, You disciples, why do you worry about failure? That All Under Heaven has not had the Way has long indeed been true. Heaven is going to make of your Respected Master a wooden gong. [3:24]

The frontier guard as spokesman is a Dàuist device; see JZ 12:4 (Watson **Chuang** 130), where Yáu is chastened by one. The prediction here is benign: the Master will sound the public note of a new and better age.

Added to LY 14

⌈ *14:37a. The Master said, The worthy withdraw from the age, the next withdraw from a place, the next withdraw at a look, the next withdraw at a word. [14:39]

The “withdraw” (bì 辟) is exactly the term used by the hermit of 18:6, above, and expresses the same prickly scrupulosity as that shown by Mencius in his departure from Chí. This may seem to contradict 18:6, but see next.

⌋ *14:37b. The Master said, Those who rose up were seven. [14:40]

But for the paired comment, this would look like a bit of ancient lore randomly added to the text. Waley interprets dzwò 作 “arose” as “invented,” implying culture heroes; Lyóu Jǐng-yì 324) takes it instead as “rose and departed,” and lists seven or so political recluses, among them those of 18:5–7 above, and, more plausibly, Bwó-yí and Shú-chí from 5:23 (compare *18:8a, below).

This sentiment might better fit the period of withdrawal, LY 1 and 16. We note however the similarity of wording in *14:37a and 18:6, and the similarity of manner in *14:37b and the various lore interpolations, in dating them here. We take these passages as an assertion of ancient principle which balances, and does not refute, the LY 18 assertion of relative freedom within that principle. Compare the following pair.

⌈ *14:38. Dž-lù passed the night at Stone Gate. The gate watchman said, Where are you from? Dž-lù said, I am from Mr. Kǔng. He said, Isn’t that the one who knows it can’t be done, but goes on doing it? [14:41]

Perhaps an echo of JZ 25:6 (Watson **Chuang** 285), where Confucius himself stays overnight on a journey and is gawked at disapprovingly by the locals. The question, which the gatekeeper intends as derisory (“he does not see the futility of his efforts”), will be taken by Analects readers as adulatory, in just the sense of 18:6 (“he is not deterred by the hopelessness of his task from pursuing it”). In its miniature way, it achieves the same reversal of expectation as 18:6.

⌋ *14:39. The Master was playing the chimes in Wèi. Someone with a basket on his back passed by Mr. Kǔng’s gate, and said, Has he not something in mind, he who plays the chimes? After a time, he said, Vulgar! If nobody recognizes you, there is an end of it: “If it is deep, plunge in: if shallow, lift your skirt.” The Master said, How consistent! From that point of view, there is indeed no difficulty. [14:42]

The quote is from Shī 34 (Waley **Songs** #54), and recommends adapting to circumstances. The only difficulty in reading such anecdotes is the layers of irony they contain. The “consistency” of the rustic recluse, which he demands that Confucius should adopt, is in fact expediency: a *lack* of fixed principle that equally tolerates good and bad situations. Confucius, as his playing shows (the chimes are an orchestral and not a private instrument, as witness *18:9 below; his house in Wèi must have been lavishly furnished), has instead a principle. He is not feudally bound to lineal loyalty, or even to a code of personal purity. That is what the basketman keeps, and LY 18 sacrifices. What LY 18 retains, as reaffirmed in 14:37a/b and upheld here, is a commitment to good order (see *6:30). This more difficult kind of consistency lies beyond prudence, or even rigid principle: a resolute intention that is responsive to the particular situation. It may be such a conflictive consistency that *9:4 above is defining.

Added to LY 16

*16:9. Confucius said, Those who know it from birth are the highest, those who know it from study are next, those who despite difficulties study it are next after that. Those who in difficulties do *not* study: these are the lowest. [16:9]

Confucius disclaims innate knowledge in 7:20, but now the Mencians are claiming that anyone can be a Yáu or a Shùn (MC 6B2). This saying is echoed in JY 20 (Legge **Analects** 407), but there the fourth category is dropped, and the other three are grades of intelligence, all of which eventually reach the goal. In LY *16:9, kùn 困 “difficulties” must refer to outward circumstances; the last two types are then those in difficult circumstances who have, or lack, the will to learn. It is in the middle levels that progress due to effort is possible, as in 17:2b. The Analects group, while widening the range within which they used to posit educability, are not prepared to go *all* the way with the Mencians.

This saying, like *17:5 below, splits a previous pair. Once in place, it is a model of the ABA form which we have assumed (see 18:7n above) is used intentionally and originally in 18:5–7.

*16:14. The wife of the sovereign of a state: when the sovereign refers to her, he says “The Distinguished One,” when the Distinguished One refers to herself, she says “This small youth,” when the people of the same state refer to her, they say “The Sovereign’s Distinguished One,” when he refers to her in another state, he says “The Orphaned One’s Little Sovereign,” and when the people of the other state refer to her, they also say “The Sovereign’s Distinguished One.” [16:14]

This (compare *8:20b above) gives reference conventions for women of rank. One suspects that their prominence outside the palace circle is new, and that this protocol was invented to meet the new need. As Waley notes, none of the terms is specifically female, though fū-rǔn 夫人 “Distinguished One” is always translated, and is now probably felt, as feminine. It is a twin of dàfū 大夫, which in Spring and Autumn meant court dignitaries, including husbands of the Prince’s daughters. The “youth” (túng 童) is the “lad” of the song quoted at *15:11¹⁵, and seems also to be a term of normally masculine reference.

Added to LY 17

*17:5. Dž-jāng asked Confucius about rǔn. Confucius said, One who can practice the Five everywhere under Heaven would be rǔn. He begged to ask about them. He said, Respect, magnanimity, fidelity, diligence, kindness. If he is respectful, he will not be snubbed. If he is magnanimous, he will win the multitude. If he is faithful, others will do their duty for him. If he is diligent, he will have success. If he is kindly, he will be able to employ others. [17:6]

The rǔn person is here seen as a ruler or a high minister deputizing for a ruler. Only the first and fourth are personal; the rest are recipes for getting and using power: attracting a popular following, motivating subordinates, and inducing major talents to work for him. Note the presence of the “kindliness” scorned as a virtue in 14:9, but in the present kindly century accepted in the list of Five. *17:5 may be an afterthought definition of the ideal ruler envisioned in the original chapter’s 17:4/6; compare 13:10/11.

Added to LY 18

These lore passages encapsulate LY 18 as the concentric additions to LY 8, above, surrounded *that* chapter. They are probably close in date to the LY 8 lore passages; at the least, all must follow rather than precede the LY 18 core. Such equations might be used to divide these interpolations into multiple strata (compare the interpolations in LY 15). As a beginning in this direction we have tentatively dated the LY 18 and other lore passages to c0260 rather than c0262.

┌ *18:1a. The Master of Wēi left him, the Master of Jī became his slave, Bǐ-gān remonstrated and died. [18:1a]

For the lore/comment pair, see 14:37a/b, above. The “him” is the bad last ruler of the Shāng or Yīn period. This approval of suicidal remonstrance against a depraved ruler had an enormous effect in inspiring individuals to feats of personal courage in later, despotic centuries.

└ *18:1b. Confucius said, The Yīn in them had three rǐn men. [18:1b]

The “in them” refers to the paired *18:1a. Here is another case where rǐn can be said to mean “dedicated to principle in the discharge of official duties.”

└ *18:2. When Lyǒusyà Hwèi was Leader of the Officers, he was thrice dismissed. People said, Can you not bring yourself to go elsewhere? He said, If I should serve others with an upright Way, where can I go that I would not be thrice dismissed? And if I am going to serve others with a crooked Way, why need I leave the country of my father and mother? [18:2]

The criticism of Hwèi is that he lacks dignity; he retorts that he has principle, or (wryly), if not principle, at least a proper sentiment toward his native place. Wryness tends to get lost over the millennia, but this passage holds up nicely; it remains one of the retorts most beloved of latter-day Analects followers.

┌ *18:8a. Subjects who went into seclusion were Bwó-yí, Shú-chí, Yw Jùng, Yí Yì, Jū Jāng, Lyǒusyà Hwèi, Shàu-lyén. [18:8a]

There is some difficulty about one of the names (see below), but otherwise these might be the mysterious “seven” of *14:37b, above.

└ *18:8b. The Master said, They did not bend their wills, they did not disgrace their persons: these were Bwó-yí and Shú-chí, were they not? One might say of Lyǒusyà Hwèi and Shàu-lyén that they bent their wills and disgraced their persons; their words matched their station and their deeds matched their concerns; this and no more. One might say of Yw Jùng and Yí Yì that they dwelt in seclusion and were unrestrained in speech; in their persons they showed purity, and in their retirement they showed flexibility. As for me, I am different from these: I have no “may” and no “may not.” [18:8b]

Only six of the *18:8a names appear here. The Táng scholiast Lù Dv-míng suspects that the seventh, Jū Jāng, is a corruption in *18:8a. This makes it agree with *18:8b, but at the cost of any light *18:18a might have shed on *14:37b.

The Master’s concluding remark rejects all these models in favor of a more flexible standard; compare *9:4 above (and the simplified version in MC 5B1, Legge **Mencius** 369). The recurring problem of service versus exit from service has remained vexatious for Confucians down to the present time.

└ *18:9. Grand Preceptor Jí went to Chí, second course Gān went to Chǔ, third course Lyáu went to Tsài, fourth course Chywē went to Chín, drummer Fāng-shú went to the River, taborer Wǔ went to the Hàn, and Lesser Preceptor Yáng and chime-player Syāng went to the sea. [18:9]

Master Jí we met in *8:15¹⁴; the next few were leaders (lead wind-players?) at different courses of banquets (or different meals?). The dispersal of the court musicians implies a disaster; Waley suggests the exile of Jāu-gūng in 0517. The River is the Yellow River, the Hàn is a tributary of the Yángdǔ, the sea is the Eastern Sea (compare *5:7¹¹). The scattering extends over the entire map.

This probably exaggerates Lǔ music in Confucius's time (in 7:14, c0450, it was outclassed by Chí). Lǔ court music *is* however implicit in the interview with a Lǔ Grand Preceptor, 3:23 (c0342); these two passages attest musical growth in Lǔ over the period c0450–c0342. But a pious school head, referring both *to the time of Confucius*, might have thought to reconcile 3:23 (implying court music in Lǔ) and 7:14 (attesting it in Chí) by creating a link in *18:9 (where a Lǔ musician goes to Chí, establishing Chí music *from a Lǔ source*).

> *18:10. The Prince of Jōu said to the Prince of Lǔ, The gentleman does not favor relatives; he does not make great ministers resent not being used. Old associates he does not without reason cast off; he does not look for everything in one man. [18:10]

For the symbol >, see *18:11n, below. The Jōu regent Jōu-gūng (see 7:5) speaks to his heir, the first Prince of Lǔ. No statecraft rule (in Lǔ, at any rate: Chí theorists used Gwǎn Jùng) could have higher authority. It recommends a rational bureaucracy, where nepotism is resisted and officers are given proper scope. Claims of acquaintance are admitted, but dismissal for cause is retained. In assigning men to tasks, the ruler will use them according to their skills, as in 13:25 (without making the 2:12 exception for gentlemen). The new issue (depending on the meaning of shī 施 “put forward,” which some authorities, citing JY, define as “replace”) is that of nepotism. It was perhaps raised by the increased prominence of the ruler's wife in this period (see *16:14n above).

└ *18:11. Jōu had eight officers: Bwó-dát and Bwó-gwāt, Jùng-tūt and Jùng-hūt, Shú-yà and Shú-syà, and Jì-swéi and Jì-gwéi. [18:11]

The point of this list seems to be its rhyming pairs of names, here phonetically antiqued to give an idea of the impression they may have conveyed at the time. The prefixes are the standard sequential ones for sons in the same family: Bwó “elder,” Shú “younger,” Jùng “next,” and Jì “least.” Nothing useful is known of these people, who are thus as obscure to us as those in *18:9.

Here, as in 18:5–7, with its middle member marked by >, is an original split pair, or triplet: *18:9/11 resonate, while *18:10 introduces a policy statement. It may be that this bit of structure is a stylistic trademark of Dž-shv̄n.

Reflections

None of the core LY 18 passages are sayings; all of them are anecdotes. This form was introduced in the DJ, developed in the Mencius (note the virtual short story in MC 4B33), and became the medium of choice for the mob of Jwāngdǔ writers. By thus keeping up with the latest literary techniques, the Analects people showed themselves worthy of a continued part in the fray.

There was a tactical dilemma facing the Analects writers at this period. Direct rebuttals to Jwāngdǔ (as in 18:5–7) violated the historical convention of the Analects, and like any rebuttal gave the attacker more visibility. A safer tactic was to avoid contemporary polemic and put the argument beyond debate by basing it on ancient history, as is done in the bits of lore attached to LY 18 and other 03c chapters (noticed by Tswēi Shù as one trait of these chapters). But rival schools could make up lore too, leading to the taunt of the Micians to the Confucians, in the race to forge speeches of ever more ancient kings, “*Your antiquity isn’t old enough*” (MZ 48:4, from c0285; Mei **Ethical** 233).

Schneider (**Madman** 17f and 42f) observes that the emblematic figures of Bwó-yí and Shú-chí figure in an aristocratic framework, whereas the Madman of Chū in 18:5 is from the world of the minister. The transition in the Analects is from 16:7, where Bwó-yí and Shú-chí are still revered, via the agonizing reappraisal of LY 17, to *18:8b, where Confucius distances himself from them. But the principled recluses of *18:8a continued as a type; see the early Hàn Four Ancients of SJ 55 (4/2044–2047; Watson **Records** 1/146–149). For an overview of the tension between service and reclusion, see Mote **Eremitism**.

There is another side to Confucius’s undaunted resolve in 18:6, and that is the truly daunting conditions from which the recluses were retreating. One gets in a number of contemporary texts a picture of a society which had virtually dissolved. Slavery had become widespread, and is often mentioned (Brooks **Slavery**): the convict laborers swarm in JZ 11:3 (Watson **Chuang** 118) and MC 7A2 (Legge **Mencius** 450). Besides the brigands already noticed above, there were the wandering armed men who gravitated to the estates of the rich as private retainers (JGT 154, Crump **Ts’e** 189; for further examples compare Liu **Knight** 13f). The sale of wife and children into slavery was a recourse for at least one noble in debt (JGT #153, Crump **Ts’e** 188), and Kinney **Infant** 117 notes the abandonment of children by starving commoners (MC 1A7, Legge **Mencius** 148, and MZ 5, Mei **Ethical** 21). Even apart from the endemic warfare, times were hard.

Waley (**Analects** 21) sees 18:5–7 as from “a world hostile to Confucius.” We can follow him, up to a point. We can see the Dàuists sneaking up to Confucian headquarters in the dead of night. We can see them jimmying open a window. We can see them taking the Analects manuscript out of its drawer in the office desk. We can see them writing anti-Confucian anecdotes into it. We can hear them chortling as they vanish into the night. What we *can’t* see is the scene next morning, where Dž-shv̄n comes in, opens the book, finds the Dàuist stories, scratches his head, mumbles, Well, yeah; I guess I *must* have, and calls the students in to memorize them. We envision an earthier reaction.

If Waley’s theory does not hold, then these stories are *not* intrusive, but reflect a creative engagement of the Analects partisans with the Jwāngdǔ partisans. *This part of the text* must then be post-Jwāngdzian, and the Analects as a whole must cover a long time period. In this way (see also Appendix 1), one arrives at something like the present theory of the text.

What did the Confucians do, once back in office? DDJ 70–75, from this period, complain of Legalistic policies, and it may then be that the Analects Confucians were already adopting this outlook, a convergence anticipating the one that Hsiao **Political** 456f notes for Confucians in general during the Hàn. We may thus wish to be alert for hints of Legalism in the next layer, LY 19.

Ornate Bronze Belt Hook (see LY 19:7)
Length 22 cm (8.7 in). 03c. Courtesy Freer Gallery of Art (54.121)