

Political Debates over Rulership through the *Lunyu* in the Western Han

by

Joonpyo Lee

A thesis accepted and approved in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in East Asian Languages and Literatures

Thesis Committee:

Luke Habberstad, Chair

Yugen Wang, Member

University of Oregon

December 2025

© 2025 Joonpyo Lee
To my beloved parents.

ABSTRACT

Joonpyo Lee

Master of Arts in Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures

Title: Political Debate over Rulership through the *Lunyu* in the Western Han

This thesis contends that in Western Han court politics, *Lunyu* passages functioned as political rhetoric that could either strengthen or undermine imperial rulership, thereby diversifying rather than fixating the image of Kongzi 孔子 (551–479 BCE). Examining passages concerning the rites, the rites of Zhou and the Rectification of names, it analyzes how emperors and ministers applied these passages in concrete political debates. Although a quantitative approach using digital database searches has identified a marked rise in references to *Lunyu* passages since the Western Han, such method remains speculative in explaining the political circumstances of their employment. Through qualitative analysis, this study demonstrates that the flexible and ambiguous nature of these passages engendered political ambivalence regarding rulership. It thus reconsiders the political function of the *Lunyu* as a multifaceted resource rather than a stabilized foundation of imperial authority.

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME OF AUTHOR: Joonpyo Lee

GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

University of Oregon, Eugene
Sungkyunkwan University, Seoul, South Korea
UCLA, Los Angeles
Shoreline Community College, Shoreline

DEGREES AWARDED:

Master of Arts, East Asian Languages and Literatures, 2025, University of Oregon
Master of Arts, Confucian Studies, 2020, Sungkyunkwan University
Bachelor of Arts, History, 2017, UCLA
Associate in Arts, History, 2015, Shoreline Community College

AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST:

Early Chinese Thought
Lunyu
Early Chinese Historical Writing
Shiji, Hanshu

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Graduate Teaching Fellow, Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures,
2022–2024, 2025, University of Oregon
Teaching Assistant, Department of Confucian Studies, 2018– 2020,
Sungkyunkwan University
Research Assistant, Institute for Confucian Philosophy and Cultural Contents, 2018,
Sungkyunkwan University

GRANTS, AWARDS, AND HONRS:

Ministry of Education Hanyu Enrichment Scholarship Program, the Ministry of
Education of the Republic of China, 2024
Yanghyeonjae Scholarship, Sungkyunkwan University, 2018

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I express my gratitude to my academic advisor, Professor Luke Habberstad. Thanks to his unwavering support throughout my MA program at the University of Oregon, I was able to complete the thesis. He respected my research interests, methodology, and cultivated my intellectual curiosity through thoughtful discussions and close mentorship. In the winter of 2023, his assignment to read the “Liu Jing Shusun Tong Liezhuan 劉敬叔孫通列傳” inspired what later developed into Chapter 4 of this thesis. I also remember a moment in class when we were reading the *Hanshu*: he pointed to a phrase and said, “Joonpyo, this phrase comes from the *Lunyu*.” It was a simple gesture, yet it demonstrated his sincere support for my learning. He also cared deeply about my long-term academic growth and suggested that I study Chinese in Taiwan for a year, writing a recommendation letter that made this opportunity possible for me to improve my Chinese skills. In the spring of 2024, he mentored me in analyzing the “Kongzi Shijia” through Durkheimian and Freudian perspectives, which enabled me to distinguish Kongzi’s political ideas from his ethical thought through close reading of the text. Through individual studies with him, I translated the entire “Kongzi Shijia,” enabling a close reading and ultimately shaping the foundation of Chapter 3. Throughout the advising process, he encouraged me to move beyond Michael Hunter’s argument by clarifying the core contribution of my thesis. Furthermore, he urged me to explore the broader intellectual landscape of early China. His advising led me to extend my academic interest from how the Classics were employed as political rhetoric during the Han dynasty to their incorporation into later commentaries. As my advisor, he not only guided this thesis—rather than directing it—but also expanded my academic vision. For this, I am truly grateful.

In addition to Professor Habberstad, I would also like to thank my committee member, Professor Yugen Wang, as well as Professor Alison Groppe and Ina Asim, whose teaching made it possible for me to write this thesis. Through independent studies with Professor Wang, I learned how to analyze the classical texts without relying on commentaries. This approach led me to consider the possibility that Duke Jing of Qi was satisfied with Kongzi's response, which informed part of my analysis in Chapter 3. Professor Alison Groppe's film course taught me how editorial decisions shape nuanced meaning in movies. This insight inspired my analysis of how early Chinese texts edited the conference at Jia Gu in the "Kongzi Shijia" and *Yantielun*, and how such editorial choices allow the same anecdote to both strengthen and weaken rulership. Professor Ina Asim reminded me that my research should not be confined to my personal curiosity but should also contribute to contemporary understanding. Her discipline awakened in me a commitment to producing scholarship that serves society. She also meticulously edited my thesis, which improved the clarity and quality of my writing.

My sincere thanks also go to the four Chinese instructors—Jean Wu, Chen Weijun, Mao Fengjun, and Denise Huang—who helped me improve my Chinese at UO. When I struggled to speak, Professor Wu helped me keep up with the class. Professor Chen introduced me to her friend's niece in China, which allowed me to practice Chinese conversation every week for 30 minutes. When I caught the flu, Professor Mao was very understanding and flexible with my situation, ensuring that I could continue my Chinese learning without falling behind. Professor Huang often engaged me in small talk and invited me to audit First-year Chinese at UO to strengthen my grammar.

Finally, I express my deepest gratitude to my parents. Their continued support enabled me to complete the first draft of this thesis during the summer break in Korea.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	9
The Purpose and Methodology of the Thesis	9
Literature Review and Thesis Statement	12
II. DEBATING THE POLITICAL FLEXIBILITY OF <i>LUNYU</i> PASSAGES.....	17
Political Flexibility of <i>Lunyu</i> 7.1	17
Conclusion	31
III. DEBATING THE POLITICAL AMBIGUITY OF <i>LUNYU</i> PASSAGES IN “KONGZI SHIJIA”	32
Political Ambiguity of the Rites in the “Kongzi Shijia”	34
Political Ambiguity of the Rectification of names in “Kongzi Shijia”	46
Conclusions.....	53
IV. DEBATING RULERSHIP THROUGH THE POLITICAL AMBIVALENCE OF <i>LUNYU</i> PASSAGES.....	55
Political Ambivalence of the Rites in the Western Han	57
Political Ambivalence of “Rectification of names” in the Western Han	64
Conclusions.....	69
V. CONCLUSION	71
VI. EPILOGUE.....	75
APPENDICES	95
A. English Translation of the “Kongzi Shijia”.....	95

Chapter	Page
B. Statistics on the Passages Found in the <i>Lunyu</i> in the “Kongzi Shijia”	142
REFERENCES CITED.....	158

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION

The Purpose and Methodology of the Thesis

This study investigates the political application of *Lunyu* 論語 passages during the Western Han dynasty¹ by analyzing how ministers and emperors employed the passages in rhetorical efforts to strengthen or constrain rulership at the court. In other words, ‘political’ in this thesis, denotes the effect of attempts to influence the balance between emperors and ministers. The flexible and ambiguous nature of the *Lunyu* passages, derived from their concise length and omitted contexts, opens space for ambivalent applications. Substantive examples of *Lunyu* citations demonstrate elites’ use of these passages to reinforce or undermine rulership. The study, thus, argues that the *Lunyu* still presented an unfixed image of Kongzi through its ambivalent applications for political purposes, in contrast to the fixed image of Kongzi that could be achieved when an electronic database search on the *Lunyu* is conducted.² The electronic database search helps collect quantitative data tracing the changing number of *Lunyu* citations conducted in early Chinese texts from the Warring States period to the Western Han dynasty. While this kind intellectual has contributed to understanding the Western Han as the period when early Chinese first engaged in the widespread citation of the *Lunyu* passages, the quantitative methodology has not

¹ Although this thesis analyzes Wang Mang’s 王莽 (r. 9–23) citation of a *Lunyu* passage to change the crown prince during the Xin dynasty, the primary analysis deals with the Western Han figures such as Shusun Tong 叔孫通, Dong Zhongshu 董仲舒, Zhi 直 who might serve Emperor Cheng 成帝 (r. 33–7 BCE) and Emperor Ai 哀帝 (r. 7–1 BCE), and Emperor Ai during the Western Han dynasty.

² Michael Hunter, *Confucius Beyond the Analects*, (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 314.

substantiated the purpose behind these citations. Although such methodology provides quantitative data on citation frequency in texts written during the Han dynasty, it does not reveal the qualitative context behind these citations. Without incorporating qualitative analysis, the political applications of the *Lunyu* in the Western Han such as character evaluation remain conjectural. This thesis, therefore, explores how the Han elites cited passages, found in *Lunyu* 2.23, 3.14, 13.3, as recorded in the *Hanshu* 漢書, to advance their political agendas.

Building on this goal, the described political ambivalence stems from innate flexibility and external ambiguity, which makes the passages susceptible to opposing political applications. To research how such ambivalence arose from the textual openness of the *Lunyu* passages, this thesis adopts the methodology of Classical Learning 經學. Classical Learning, in this thesis, indicates attempts to articulate recondite passages in Classics 經 and Traditions 傳, but these accumulated attempts uncover the subtle nuances embedded in these passages rather than yield a definitive articulation. The thesis does not resolve ethical issues through Classical Learning but rather uses it as a hermeneutic framework for analyzing the textual openness of the *Lunyu* passages. This methodology enables a nuanced understanding of the passages by integrating three dimensions: flexibility, which allows multiple interpretations; ambiguity, which arises from the absence of context; and ambivalence, which manifests the capacity of the same passages to both advocate and curb rulership. The thesis proceeds in three stages. First, it examines the variegated philosophical possibilities that derive from the flexibility of the brief passages through traditional commentaries. Second, it reconstructs the political ambiguity of the passages found in the *Lunyu* by supplementing them with other passages from the “Kongzi Shijia” or with relevant accounts from the

Zuozhuan 左傳 and *Gongyangzhuan* 公羊傳 in a philological and historical manner through contextualization. Third, it concretizes the political connotations of the *Lunyu* passages that engender political ambivalence in the *Hanshu* by analyzing the speakers' purposes and the contexts of their citations. The three *Lunyu* passages concerning the chronological changes of the rites *li* 禮³ (Xia 夏, Shang 商 Zhou 周), the rites of Zhou and Rectification of names *zheng ming* 正名,⁴ all cited in the "Kongzi Shijia," possess political ambivalence. The Han elites' citation of these passages also exhibit the political ambivalence in rationalizing their political agendas to support or constrain rulership, such as the establishment of a new ritual system by Shusun Tong, the proper governance of the empire proposed by Dong Zhongshu, the enforcement of the law by Zhi, the construction of Empress dowager's tomb by Emperor Ai, and the rewarding of those who suppressed rebellions as well as the re-appointment of the crown prince by Wang Mang in the *Hanshu*. By situating these citations within historical context, this thesis proposes a model for

³ This thesis does not deny the ethical function of the rites as social etiquette, especially as stressed by philosophers such as Philip Ivanhoe and Bryan Van Norden in the *Lunyu*. Philip J. Ivanhoe, *Confucian Moral Self Cultivation*, (New York: Peter Lang, 1993), 11. Bryan Van Norden, "Introduction," in *Kongzi and the Analects: New Essays*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 30. Instead, it traces its application to reform or follow the ritual system as a means of ruling the empire by Shu Suntong and Dong Zhongshu during the Western Han dynasty in the *Shiji* and *Hanshu*.

⁴ This thesis does not seek to demonstrate the ethical significance and meaning of *zheng ming* in early China, but rather focuses on its application by Zhi and Wang Mang in the *Hanshu*. As Carine Defoort points out, "they (two consecutive *Lushi Chunqiu* 呂氏春秋 chapters, two *Shizi* 尸子 chapters, five *Guanzi* 管子 chapters, two *Chunqiu fanlu* 春秋繁露 chapters, and some fragments from the *Liji* 禮記, *Heguanzi* 鶡冠子, *Xinshu* 新書, and *Guliang zhuan* 穀梁傳) actually attest to an increasing interest in naming toward the Han dynasty, when the earliest explicit reference was also made to the dialogue between Kongzi and Zilu 子路 (542–480 BCE) in *Lunyu* 13.3. Another reason might be their lack of philosophical stress on and consistency in *zheng ming* statements. Many sources do not express either agreement or disagreement on the meaning of *zheng ming*." Defoort, Carine, "How to Name or not to Name: That is the Question in Early Chinese Philosophy," in *That is Question in Early Chinese Philosophy*, ed. Li Wai-ye and Yuri Pines, (Hong Kong: Chinese University of Hong Kong, 2020), 17. This study highlights two cases in which Zhi and Wang Mang cited Rectification of names for political purposes.

understanding the textual fluidity of the *Lunyu* passages—caused by both the passages themselves and their interpreters together—which enabled the Han figures to either uphold or check rulership in Western Han court politics.

Literature Review and Thesis Statement

Situating this thesis within the *Lunyu* studies of early China necessitates a review of current scholarship. Sinologists have focused on the compilation of the *Lunyu* and the motivation behind it. The first English language study on the compilation date of the *Lunyu* concludes that a text titled *Lunyu* circulated around 140 BCE.⁵ John Makeham differentiates the first titled *Lunyu* from the transmitted text which Zhang Yu 張禹 (? – 5 BCE) fixed in the late Western Han.⁶ He explains that ideological motivation during the Western Han to consolidate the persona of Kongzi led to the compilation of the twenty-one *pian Lunyu* as a text “to signal this status and homogeneity,”⁷ drawing on proto-*Lunyu* passages dating to the Warring States period, as well as the *Guwen* 古文 version, discovered in the wall of Kongzi’s house by King Gong of Lu 魯共王 (? – 129 BCE). The capturing of when the people used the *Lunyu* contributes to clarifying the emergence of the *Lunyu* passages from the text, but his explanation “to signal this status and homogeneity” does not address the ambivalent nature of the *Lunyu*. Two contradictory passages in which Kongzi champions⁸

⁵ John Makeham, “The Formation of Lunyu As a Book,” *Monumenta Serica* 44, (1996): 13.

⁶ John Makeham, “The Formation of Lunyu As a Book,” 10.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 15.

⁸ *Lunyu* 3.22. Yang Bojun, *Lunyu Yizhu* 論語譯註, (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1958), 31.

and censures Guan Zhong 管仲 (725–645 BCE)⁹ in the *Lunyu* undermine the homogeneity of the text. Since Kongzi does not maintain coherence in his evaluation of Guan Zhong, these two examples reveal the heterogeneity within the *Lunyu* itself. In addition, Makeham does not offer historical evidence for how the *Lunyu* functioned “to signal this status and homogeneity” during the Western Han dynasty.

To supplement the existing discourse with concrete evidence, an archaeological excavation as well as a historical record in the *Hanshu* hint at the political function of the *Lunyu* during the Han dynasty. The excavation of bamboo slips from the Ding County 定州 tomb of Liu Xiu 劉修, who died in 55 BCE, revealed content overlapping with the transmitted *Lunyu*. The discovery coincided with efforts to standardize the text of the *Lunyu* during the mid-Western Han.¹⁰ During this period, not only the imperial clan but also the crown prince read the *Lunyu*. Beginning in the reign of Emperor Xuan 宣帝 (r. 74 – 48 BCE) in 74 BCE, the *Lunyu* served the politico-pedagogical purpose that the crown prince and ritual officials should absorb Zhou ideals.¹¹ After Emperor Xuan’s reign, Emperor Yuan 元帝 (r. 48– 33 BCE) emulated Zhou ideals while distancing his court from Qin models of governance. Mark Csikszentmihalyi argues that the use of the *Lunyu* by tutors in the late Western Han reflected this ideological shift.¹² Considering the circumstance, the *Lunyu* had come close to the standardized text transmitted since then 55 BCE, even though its contents

⁹ *Lunyu* 14.16, 14.17. Yang Bojun, *Lunyu Yizhu* 論語譯註, 149.

¹⁰ Mark Csikszentmihalyi, “Kongzi and the *Analects* in the Han,” in *Kongzi and the Analects*, 146–147.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 148–149.

¹² *Ibid.*, 146.

may have originated in the Warring States period.¹³ Csikszentmihalyi concludes, “the ascendancy of the *Analects* during the first half of the century BCE may therefore be seen as the result of the advocacy of the text by court officials with a specific agenda.”¹⁴ Although Csikszentmihalyi sheds light on the compilation of the *Lunyu* by highlighting an ideological agenda of court officials, his analysis does not present solid evidence to corroborate such institutional usage during the Western Han dynasty.

The electronic database searching methodology, adopted by Hunter for quantitative research on *Lunyu* citations in early Chinese texts,¹⁵ yields statistical evidence supporting the view that the compilation date of the *Lunyu* occurred during Emperor Wu’s 武帝 (r. 141–87 BCE) reign. He calculates that 25 percent of Kongzi attributions in Western Han sources exhibit parallels with the *Lunyu*,¹⁶ whereas this figure drops to just 9 percent in pre-Han texts.¹⁷ Based on these data, Hunter proposes that “[t]he story of the rise of the *Lunyu* is, at its core, the story of the Han imperium’s appropriation of ‘Kongzi’ as a symbol of cosmopolitan cultural mastery and its subsequent transformation into a tool of imperial legitimacy.”¹⁸ The lack of textual evidence, which becomes evident through analyzing the second results of available sources, cannot confirm an accreted formation of the *Lunyu* from

¹³ Ibid., 144.

¹⁴ Ibid., 149.

¹⁵ Michael Hunter, *Confucius Beyond the Analects*, 57.

¹⁶ According to Hunter’s estimate, 70 percent of Kongzi attributions in Eastern Han sources exhibit parallels with the *Lunyu*. Ibid., 87.

¹⁷ Michael Hunter, “The *Lunyu* As A Western Han Text” in *Confucius and the Analects Revisited: New Perspectives on Composition, Dating, and Authorship* ed. Micheal Hunter and Martin Kern (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 73

¹⁸ Michael Hunter, *Confucius Beyond the Analects*, 166.

the Warring States period to the Han dynasty.¹⁹ Furthermore, Hunter argues that “the theme of character evaluation, whose presentation in the *Lunyu* reflects the influence of Western Han political rhetoric surrounding the appointment of talented and virtuous individuals to the imperial bureaucracy, a finding consistent with the *Lunyu*’s role in imperial appointments from Emperor Wu’s reign onward.”²⁰ However, his argument, which relies on quantitative analysis does not ascertain the actual frequency of how many times the emperors used the *Lunyu* to assess officials in court by scrutinizing its occurrences in the *Shiji* and *Hanshu*. This insufficient evidence leads to a reserved judgement regarding the validity of the argument, as Hunter himself acknowledges, “we do not know with certainty that the *Lunyu* originated in the Western Han period. We simply do not have enough evidence to suppose otherwise.”²¹ This study responds to Hunter’s speculation not by refuting the purpose of “character evaluation,” but by analyzing specific citations of the *Lunyu* passages related to the rites, the rites of Zhou and Rectification of names to unpack their rhetorical roles in the Western Han court politics.

This thesis contends that the *Lunyu* passages on the rites and Rectification of names, due to their flexible and ambiguous nature, did not stabilize into fixing a singular image of Kongzi but rather operated as rhetoric to either bolster or regulate rulership in ongoing Western Han political debates. To support this contention, it proceeds in the three chapters.

¹⁹ Ibid., 232.

²⁰ Ibid., 249. In “The *Lunyu* As A Western Han Text,” Hunter maintains the same argument: “The *Lunyu*’s perceived value for the imperial Liu clan may have even been as a manual of character evaluation, a skill that emperors and kings were expected to exercise once in office. On the flip side, aspiring officials might have read such sayings as advice on becoming, or at least presenting themselves as, ‘accomplished’ and ‘talented’ candidates.” Michael Hunter, “The *Lunyu* As A Western Han Text” in *Confucius and the Analects Revisited: New Perspectives on Composition, Dating, and Authorship*, 19.

²¹ Michael Hunter, *Kongzi Confucius the Analects*, 245.

Chapter 2, via an analysis of the multiple meanings found in the expression *shu er bu zuo* 述而不作, disentangles how the flexible trait of the *Lunyu* passages, stemming from their terse length, produces various political connotations. Second, Chapter 3, by a close reading of Sima Qian's 司馬遷 (145–86 BCE) record echoing the *Lunyu* passages in the “Kongzi Shijia” 孔子世家, explores how the ambiguity of those passages regarding the rites and Rectification of names allows readers to interpret Kongzi's political stance as either advocating or limiting the ducal authority during the Chunqiu period. Third, Chapter 4, through an investigation of the historical cases involving the flexible and ambiguous *Lunyu* 2.23 as used by Shusun Tong, Dong Zhongshu, *Lunyu* 3.14 cited by Emperor Ai, Wang Mang, and *Lunyu* 13.3 employed by Zhi and, Wang Mang, delineates the political ambivalence of the *Lunyu* passages as either empowering or restraining rulership during the Western Han dynasty.

CHAPTER II.

DEBATING THE POLITICAL FLEXIBILITY OF *LUNYU* PASSAGES

The flexibility of the *Lunyu* passages arises from their intertextual terseness, which transforms concise statements into arguments through work by commentators as well as translators of Classical texts. Interpreting the passages not only entails the reader's own ideas but also engages in an ongoing dialogue with Kongzi. For this reason, the *Lunyu* passages have engendered diverse commentaries which to this day have produced a variety of philosophical premises and foundations. This varied connotations represent a general trait that explains the enduring universality of the *Lunyu*. This chapter exemplifies how this flexibility manifests in *Lunyu* 7.1 within broader politico-philosophical developments by contrasting Han dynasty examples with later commentaries.

Political Flexibility of *Lunyu* 7.1

Political flexibility of *Lunyu* 7.1 begets an abstruse problem concerning Kongzi's relation to the *Chunqiu*, whether Kongzi composed the *Chunqiu* or not. To resolve this problem, some scholars have propounded theories to address the paradox between the statements "[I] transmit but did not compose. 述而不作"²² in the *Lunyu* 7.1 and "Kongzi was apprehensive and composed the *Chunqiu*. 孔子懼作春秋"²³ in the *Mengzi* 3B 9. The

²² *Lunyu* 7.1 Yang Bojun, *Lunyu Yizhu* 論語譯註, 65.

²³ *Mencius: A Bilingual Edition*, trans. D. C. Lau, (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2003), 141.

prevalent reading of *Lunyu* 7.1 tends to follow predominant commentaries such as He Yan 何晏 (195–249), Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130–1200), Yang Bojun 楊伯峻 (1902–1992). Another commentary on *Lunyu* 7.1 by Liu Baonan 劉寶楠 (1791–1855) can give a clue to resolving the paradox in Kongzi’s relation to the *Chunqiu* by allowing interpretive space for reconstructing Kongzi as the uncrowned king 素王 as he was seen by the Han elites, though Liu Baonan himself does not elevate Kongzi in this way. If Kongzi did not transmit but followed the ancient rites, this reading does not contradict the belief that Kongzi composed the *Chunqiu*. Although the conventional readings of *Lunyu* 7.1 do not support the enhancement of Kongzi’s status to that of the uncrowned king, Liu Baonan’s commentary facilitates a reading that makes such an elevation possible.

The mainstream commentary of *Lunyu* 7.1, “[I] transmit but did not compose,” tends to diminish the status of Kongzi to a great commoner rather than an uncrowned king. He Yan annotates 述 *shu* to mean “transmit,”²⁴ and the later scholars such as Zhu Xi²⁵ and Yang Bojun²⁶ have followed He Yan’s commentary. Although *shu* in *shu er bu zuo* did not mean “to transmit” in the Han dynasty, these mainstream commentaries would bolster their philological validity by appealing to Han texts where *shu*, when considered apart from *shu er bu zuo*, carries the meaning of “to transmit.” In the *Shiji*, Sima Qian writes:

²⁴ Zhu Xi, *Sishu Zhangjuiizhu* 四書章句集註, (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1933), 93. To be specific, He Yan comments: “I (Kongzi) transmitted it, just like Lao Peng 老彭, and that’s all. 我若老彭但述之耳. Xing Bing, *Lunyu Zhushu* 論語注疏 ed. Ma Xinmin, (Beijing: Beijing University Press, 2000), 93.

²⁵ Zhu Xi comments: “*Shu* 述 is to transmit old things and that’s all. 述, 傳舊而已.” Zhu Xi, *Sishu Zhangjuiizhu* 四書章句集註, 93.

²⁶ *Lunyu Yizhu*. Yang Bojun translates *shu er bu zuo* into Modern Chinese: “Kongzi said, ‘[I] expound but does not create [it].’ 孔子說: ‘闡述而不創作.’”

The part which is called as I transmit the old stories to organize and complete the transmitted anecdotes in the world, it is not the thing, which is called to compose something else, so it is an error that you compared my work with the Chunqiu.

余所謂述故事，整齊其世傳，非所謂作也，而君比之於春秋，謬矣。²⁷

While transmitting historical events from the mythological age to his own time, Sima Qian invented the perception of Chinese history through the framework of dynastic units, unlike earlier accounts, which did not organize history of the Central States 中國 by dynastic units.²⁸ Notwithstanding his self-evaluation, Sima Qian's transmission of history engendered the composition of a new concept through the writing of the *Shiji*. This tension between self-assessment and historical innovation is not a logical contradiction but an instance of productive paradox. Analogous to Stephen Durrant's textual analysis of Sima Qian's work, Feng Youlan 馮友蘭 (1894–1990) also seeks to dissolve the apparent contradiction in *Lunyu*

7.1. Feng insists:

Kongzi was interested in the meaning contained in its phrases [expounding the *Yijing* 易經] rather than in the mere use of the book for divination. This is no longer to be simply 'a transmitter and not a creator 述而不作.' It is in fact to be a creator through being a transmitter... Thus the *Yijing* had existed long before Kongzi, and was handed down by the 'Confucian' school; but it is primarily its Appendices, written by 'Confucians,' which make it important in the history of thought. The *Chunqiu* existed early, and was transmitted by the 'Confucians;' but it is the *Gongyangzhuan*, a commentary written on it by the 'Confucian' school (together with other commentaries), which make it important.²⁹

He seems to take the phrase 'a transmitter and not a creator' in a literal sense while

²⁷ *Shiji* 130, 3299–3300.

²⁸ Stephen Durrant, Truth Claims in *Shiji* in *Historical Truth, Historical Criticism, and Ideology: Chinese Historiography and Historical Culture from a New Comparative Perspective*, ed. Helwig Schmidt-Giltner, Achim Mittag and Jörn Rüsen, (Brill: Leiden, 2004), 109.

²⁹ Feng Youlan, *A History of Chinese Philosophy*, trans. Derk Bodde, (London: George Allen & Unwin LTD, 1952) 65.

construing ‘transmission’ not as mere narration but as an act of creative reinterpretation in relation to tradition, thereby reconfiguring Kongzi’s transmission as a creative endeavor rather than the straightforward conveyance of factual content. This dual gesture indicates Feng’s attempt to turn the tension between transmission and creation into a hermeneutic resource. Moreover, Feng believes that “though Kongzi could not have composed the ‘Six Disciplines 六藝’ himself, however, he did use them to teach his disciples.”³⁰ He chooses to support the authority of *Lunyu* 7.1 through his own interpretation while implying that he sets aside the passage in *Mengzi* 3B9. Feng considers Kongzi one person, holding in high regard the fact that “Sima Qian, the author of the *Shiji*, still regarded Kongzi as a human person at a time when many men were already coming to look upon him as a divine being.”³¹ Another way to deal with the contradiction differentiates Kongzi’s self-evaluation from what Kongzi did by trusting in Mengzi’s words. On the one hand, *Lunyu* 7.1 narrates that Kongzi presents himself as a humble figure, for only sages can create something else.³² On the other hand, *Mengzi* 3B9 conveys Mengzi’s belief that Kongzi was a sage and therefore able to compose

³⁰ Feng Youlan, *A History of Chinese Philosophy*, 46.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 46.

³² Michael Puett, *The Ambivalence of Creation*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001), 40–41. Puett’s textual analysis of *Lunyu* 7.1 resembles Zhu Xi’s commentary, as both scholars read the passage to indicate Kongzi’s humility. Zhu Xi, however, would believe Kongzi did not compose the *Chunqiu*. In *Lunyu Jizhu* 論語集註, Zhu Xi said, “Kongzi expurgated the *Shi* and the *Shu*, established the *Rites* and the *Music*, added the *Zhouyi*, edited the *Chunqiu*; everything was to transmit the old things of the Former Kings, and there was once not a thing which he composed of. Thereupon, he said it by himself like it. He did not become to not dare to occupy a sage who composed of but also did not dare to reveal himself to be close to worthy people in ancient times; his virtue was even more thriving, and his heart and mind was even more humble, but he did not know humility of his words by himself. 孔子刪詩書，定禮樂，贊周易，修春秋，皆傳先王之舊，而未嘗有所作也，故其自言如此。蓋不惟不敢當作者之聖，而亦不敢顯然自附於古之賢人，蓋其德愈盛而心愈下，不自知其辭之謙也。” Zhu Xi, *Sishu Zhangjuiizhu* 四書章句集註, 93.

the *Chunqiu*.³³ The widespread reading of *Lunyu* 7.1 positions Kongzi's status as a great commoner, for the passage cannot support the belief that Kongzi composed the *Chunqiu* to ennoble him as the uncrowned king.

The other commentary of *Lunyu* 7.1, "[I] follow and compose," furnishes a philological foundation to establish Kongzi's status as the uncrowned king rather than a common person and invalidates the inherent contradiction that Kongzi composed the *Chunqiu* since the verb 'follow' evinces the impossibility of writing the text, the *Chunqiu*, in the passage. In the *Lunyu Zhengyi* 論語正義, Liu Baonan verifies his commentary by citing the *Shuowen Jiezi* 說文解字, "The *Shuowen* says, 'shu 述 means to follow, zuo 作 means to begin.' *Shu* is to follow old things, *zuo* is to begin for the first time. 說文云, '述, 循也。作, 起也。' 述是循舊, 作是創始."³⁴ Based on Xu Shen 許慎's (58–148) definition of *shu* 述, Liu Baonan's commentary of *Lunyu* 7.1 accords with the one passage in the *Mozi* 墨子:

The Classicists say: "A gentleman must use ancient modes of speech and dress and afterwards he is benevolent."

I say in reply: "What is called ancient in speech and dress was all once upon a time new so, if the men of old spoke this way and dressed this way, they were not gentlemen. This being so, must we clothe ourselves in the garb of those who were not gentlemen and speak the speech of those who were not gentlemen before being benevolent?"

³³ Michael Puett, *The Ambivalence of Creation*, 56–57.

³⁴ Liu Baonan, *Lunyu Zhengyi* 論語正義. (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1990), 251. Liu Baonan annotates *shu* 述 in *shu er bu zuo* as *xun*, 'to follow,' but he made clear that he did not support the concept of the 'uncrowned king.' He stated his position as follows: "If it were so, Mengzi said, 'Kongzi composed the *Chunqiu*.' The *Chunqiu* is something to follow; it is also a general designation to speak a thing which is called to 'compose' in a prose. 若然孟子云'孔子作春秋,' 春秋是述, 亦言作者, 散文通稱." The thesis does not adopt Liu Baonan's commentary in its entirety, but seeks to demonstrate the possibility of an alternative interpretation, taking into account the contexts of the phrase during the Han dynasty, and grounding the analysis in the same premise as Liu Baonan by appropriating one part of his commentary.

[The Classicists] also say: “The gentleman follows but does not compose.”

I say in reply: “Among the ancients, Yi created the bow, Yu created armour, Xi Zhong created the cart and Craftsman Chui created the boat. In this case, then, are the tanners, armourers, cart-makers and carpenters of the present time all gentlemen, and Yi, Yu, Xi Zhong and Craftsman Chui all petty men? Moreover, someone must have created what the follower follows. This being so, then, is to follow in all cases the way of the petty man?”

儒者曰，“君子必服古言然後仁。”應之曰，“所謂古之言服者，皆嘗新矣。而古人言之，服之，則非君子也。然則必服，非君子之服。言非君子之言，而後仁乎？”又曰，“君子循而不作。”應之曰，“古者羿作弓，伋作甲，奚仲作車，巧垂作舟，然則今之鮑函車匠皆君子也，而羿伋奚仲巧垂皆小人邪？且其所循人必或作之，然則其所循皆小人道也？”³⁵

In the passage, the Classicist’s attitude toward antiquity in uniforms and words favors, since following the ancient styles leads one to become humane. The Classicist, thus, respects antiquity rather than composing new things here; this respect entails trust in and liking of antiquity. Considering the context, the Classicist’s statement that “A gentleman must use ancient modes of speech and dress” indicates “trust in and like the ancients 信而好古” from the immediate following passage of *shu er bu zuo* in *Lunyu* 7.1.³⁶ The close reading raises a

³⁵ *The Mozi: A Complete Translation*, trans. Ian Johnston, (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010), 354–357.

³⁶ In the *Mozi*, the Classicist’s advocacy of antiquity resembles Xunzi’s attitude toward Zhou culture. Xunzi said, “The rule of a true king is such that his ways do not deviate from the later kings. If a person’s way goes back beyond the Three Dynasties, he calls it reckless. If a person’s models do not deviates from the later kings, he calls it unrefined. His clothing and garments are properly regulated. His palaces and homes have their proper measure. His followers have their proper order. In funerals and sacrifices, the implements all accord with rank and proper position. As for music, everything that is refined music is discarded. As for sights, everything that is not the patterns of old is discounted. As for implements, everything that is not the equipment of old is destroyed. This is called recovering the ancient ways. Such is the rule of a true king. 王者之制，道不過三代，法不貳後王，道過三代謂之蕩，法貳後王謂之不雅。衣服有制，宮室有度，人徒有數，喪祭械用皆有等宜。聲則凡非雅聲者舉廢，色則凡非舊文者舉息，械用則凡非舊器者舉毀，夫是之謂復古，是王者之制也” *Xunzi: The Complete Text*, trans. Eric L. Hutton, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014). 73. The Classicist’s attitude, thus, reveals a zeitgeist among Classicists during the Warring States period. The attitude of advocating Zhou culture, which had already become an old-fashioned tradition during the Warring States period, did not belong to a specific Classicist, but was a universal phenomenon in

question based on the quantitative research by Hunter, “telling is the fact that *xin er hao gu* (trust in and love the ancient) does not appear in any prior to the Eastern Han period, when it appears only in conjunction with *shu er bu zuo* – a sign that the second half of *Lunyu* 7/1 was original to the *Lunyu*.”³⁷ Hunter’s methodology which relies on a literal reading to search for the “intertextual profile,” may limit its capacity to capture the contextual meaning of the four characters through the potential for paraphrasing in the *Mozi*. Questioning the validity of “following but not composing” something else such as the old customs by exemplifying technologies that ordinary people used but those extraordinary figures had invented long before the Mohists’ critique, the Mohists criticized the Classicists’ obsession with antiquity rather than whether Kongzi composed the *Chunqiu* or not. This reading prevents the contradiction between *Lunyu* 7.1 and *Mengzi* 3B9, for Kongzi’s following without composing does not relate to the belief about Kongzi’s composition of the *Chunqiu*. Reading *Lunyu* 7.1 following the approach of the Classicist in the *Mozi* during the Han dynasty, they maintained the Kongzi myth as the “uncrowned king” by composing the *Chunqiu* to foretell the rise of the Han dynasty³⁸ in order to validate the Liu clan’s 劉氏 sovereignty without encountering the contradiction that later readers faced, who depended on the mainstream commentaries.

Classics. In addition, because of the term ‘reconstructing,’ one might also suspect whether pre-Qin thinkers could have used “return to the rites” in the phrase of *Lunyu* 12.1. However, in the *Xunzi*, *fu* does not imply to recover one’s ritual disposition. Rather, in the *Xunzi*, Xunzi claims to learn the way in the Zhou dynasty: “If you wish to understand ten thousand or one-hundred thousand, then examine one and two. If you wish to understand the ancient ages, then examine the way of the Zhou. If you wish to understand the way of Zhou, then examine the gentleman whom their people valued. 欲知億萬，則審一二，欲知上世，則審周道，欲知周道，則審其人，所貴君子。” *Xunzi: The Complete Text*, 36. As a result, “recovering the ancient ways” does not intend to recover one’s innate ability, but the phrase promotes to emulate ideal cultures in the Zhou dynasty.

³⁷ Michael Hunter, *Confucius Beyond the Analects*, 26.

³⁸ Micheal Nylan, “Kongzi, the Uncrowned King” in *Lives of Confucius*, ed. Michael Nylan and Thomas Wilson, (New York: Doubleday, 2010), 75.

To investigate the Han people's reading of *Lunyu* 7.1, probing examples of *shu er bu zuo* in Han texts provides insight into their understanding of the phrase within its context.

Hunter gathers resources and translates the phrase in a literal manner; while the translations make sense, they overlook its precise meaning within the context. In the “Rizhe Liezhuan 日者列傳,” Sima Jizhu 司馬季主 said:

[Sima Jizhu said], “It is the business of the gentleman to ‘follow but do not compose.’ Now the diviner invariably takes heaven and earth as his pattern and the four seasons as his model. Conforming to humaneness and righteousness, he divides the milfoil stalks and determines the hexagram, resolves the divining instrument and calculates the correct formula. Only then does he venture to discuss what is profitable and unprofitable in heaven and earth or to predict the success or failure of undertakings. In ancient times, when the former kings managed the affairs of the state, they invariably consulted the tortoise or the milfoil stalks and observed the sun and moon before undertaking the charge of Heaven. Only after determining the correct hour and day did they come and go. When a child is born to a family, the father divines to see whether its future will be lucky or unlucky before deciding whether to rear it. Even since Fu Xi 伏羲 deserved the eight trigrams and King Wen of the Zhou 周文王 (r. 1106–1056 BCE) expanded them with the three hundred and eighty-four explanations of the lines, the world has been well ordered. King Yue of Gou Jian 句踐 (r. 496–464 BCE), by imitating the eight trigrams of King Wen, was able to defeat his enemies and become one of the dictators of Central States. In view of all this, what fault can you find with the arts of divination?”

述而不作，君子義也。今夫卜者，必法天地，象四時，順於仁義，分策定卦，旋式正棋，然後言天地之利害，事之成敗。昔先王之定國家，必先龜策日月，而後乃敢代，正時日乃后入，家產子必先占吉凶，后乃有之。自伏羲作八卦，周文王演三百八十四爻而天下治。越王句踐放文王八卦以破敵國，霸天下。由是言之，卜筮有何負哉？³⁹

Hunter renders only the first eight characters of *shu er bu zuo jun zi zhi ye* 述而不作，君子

³⁹ *Shiji* 127, 2318. *Records of the Grand Historian of China: Translated from the Shih chi of Ssu-Ma Ch'ien*, trans. Burton Watson, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961), 472. The translator translated *shu er bu zuo* into “a transmitter and not a maker,” following a popular translation of *Lunyu* 7.1. However, this translation does not take the context of the phrase into account. Thus, I modify it to reflect the context, while preserving its basic sense. In addition, I change Wade-Jile system to pinyin.

義也 as “... Transmitting without originating is the principle of the noble man,”⁴⁰ omitting the succeeding parts. Meanwhile, in the context of the “Rizhe Liezhuan,” the phrase *shu er bu zuo* means “follow but do not compose,” for the subsequent passages after *shu er bu zuo jun zi zhi ye* 述而不作，君子義也 elucidates its meaning. According to the passage, fortunetellers divine the future by using hexagrams that Fu Xi invented long ago. Furthermore, fortune-telling aims to portend the future; the fortune-tellers do not need to transmit the legacy of Fu Xi and King Wen. Sima Jizhu also added King Yue of Gou Jian’s imitation; this imitation aligns with *shu*, as King Yue did not compose new things but followed the traditional divination practice to achieve his aim. To put it another way, transmission is not germane to the work of fortune tellers. In this context, *shu er bu zuo* corresponds to *xun er bu zuo* in the *Mozi* rather than translating the phrase in a literal way. This evidence shows a possibility that the Han elites might not face the contradiction between *shu er bu zuo* and *zuo chunqiu* passages.

The philological evidence between *xun er bu zuo* and *shu er bu zuo* in the *Yantielun* 鹽鐵論 corroborates the equation of the two phrases as synonyms by the men of learning *wenxue* 文學 during the mid-Western Han period, for both mean, “follow but not compose,” not “transmit but not compose.” The two cases dealt with respect for the ancient standards, while the man of learning did not connect *xun er bu zuo* and *shu er bu zuo* with the question of whether Kongzi composed the *Chunqiu* or not. In the *Yantielun*, the man of learning did not raise doubts about the historical authenticity of Kongzi’s authorship through *Lunyu* 7.1. Later commentators, however, positioned Kongzi not as the “uncrowned king,” but as a

⁴⁰ Michael Hunter, *Confucius Beyond the Analects*, 26.

single figure elevated to the status of a sage on the ethical and intellectual level. First, the man of learning championed their position of following the old customs while disagreeing with Shang Hongyang's critique of the Classicists' incompetence in resolving imperial problems. In the *Yantielun* "Cifu" 刺復 chapter, the man of learning refuted a court-aristocrat's question that Ni Kuan 兒寬 (?–103 BCE) promoted to nine minister by learning the *Shangshu* 尚書; however, his administrative ability was not conducive to the amelioration of problems in the empire during Wudi's reign:

The man of learning said, "When Gong Shuzi 公輸子 fashioned timber, he rectified the compass, square and then its mortise, tenon were attuned. When Shi Guang 師曠 conformed to five notes, he rectified the six pitch pipes and then Gong 宮 and Shang 商 (Gong and Shang are one of five notes) were attuned. If today artisans cannot attune to their mortise, tenon, then they modify their compass and square; if [today musicians] cannot concord their sounds, then they change the conventional notes. Thereupon, the mortise, tenon are poled and unmanageable, and then they were not accorded; the sounds are unsettled even more and then they are not harmonious. It is to raise the compass, square, and then to know suitable ones. This is the best. In accordance with following but not composing in order to wait for the proper person is the second."

輸子之制材木也，正其規矩而鑿柄調。師曠之諧五音也，正其六律而宮商調。當世之工匠，不能調其鑿柄，則改規矩，不能協聲音，則變舊律。是以鑿柄刺戾而不合，聲音泛越而不和。夫舉規矩而知宜，吹律而知變，上也。因循而不作，以俟其人，次也。⁴¹

The man of learning said "to follow but not compose" to vindicate Ni Kuan's official career. He argued that the fundamental problem stemmed from a faulty appointment, not the selection system. He identified Gong Shuzi, Shi Gaung's perfection with classical discipline, criticizing those who mismanaged the system to induce the current problem. His examples of Gong Shuzi and Shi Guang whom Mengzi mentioned in *Mengzi* 4A1, represent criteria that

⁴¹ *Yantielun Jiaozhu* 鹽鐵論校注, ed. Wang Liqi, (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1992), 130.

people ought to emulate rather than the transmission of their techniques. Second, the man of learning said *shu er bu zuo* 述而不作, meaning “to follow but not compose,” not “to transmit but not compose” to emphasize the preservation of the way *dao* 道 as a means of denouncing a clerk of the Chancellor’s 丞相史 panegyric to Shang Yang 商鞅 (390–338 BCE) in “Zundao” 尊道 chapter. In this chapter, the man of learning first reiterated the anecdote of Shi Guang to underscore the fundamental significance of the Classical way:

The man of learning said, “Shi Guang attuned five notes, does not lose Gong and Shang. The sage kings ruled the world; they did not dispose of humaneness and righteousness. Thereupon, there is a legitimacy to revise the system, but there does not have substantiality to change the Way. From the Yellow Emperor to the Three Kings, no one did not bright virtuous education, established country schools, revered humaneness and righteousness, set up edification. This is the unchangeable way permanently. Thereupon, Yin 殷 dynasty and Zhou dynasty followed and then flourished; the King of Qin changed the standard, and then [the Qin dynasty] perished...” [a clerk of the Chancellor said,]... “One who desires millet works hard on time, one who desires to rule adapts to proper time. Thereupon, the reason why Shang Yang clearly alone looked at thrive or decay but could not take part with popular together was they obstructed achievements and then many people traced short-term gains. The commoners were comfortable for their precedents in use, and then those who were untaught were firm to things which they heard before. Therefore, boats and chariots which were invented made the commoners used three years later and then they regarded them as comfortable things...” The man of learning said, “the gentleman heard many things but terminated doubtful things among many things, followed but did not compose; the sage accomplished and then planned great works, his wisdom was sagacious, and his project was detailed. Thereupon, the achievement was accomplished but was not overthrown; his name was established but was not worn out.”

文學曰，“師曠之調五音，不失宮商。聖王之治世，不離仁義。故有改制之名，無變道之實。上自黃帝，下及三王，莫不明德教，謹庠序，崇仁義，立教化。此百世不易之道也。殷、周因循而昌，秦王變法而亡...” 丞相史曰，“...夫欲粟者務時，欲治者因世，故商君昭然獨見存亡不可與世俗同者，爲其沮功而多近也。庸人安其故，而愚者果所聞。故舟車之治，使民三年而後安之...” 文學曰，“君子多聞闕疑，述而不作，聖達而謀大，叡智而事寡。是以功成而不驕，名立而不頓。”⁴²

⁴² *Yantielun Jiaozhu* 鹽鐵論校注, 291.

Since the man of learning mentioned that “the gentleman heard many things but terminated doubtful things among the many things” before saying *shu er bu zuo*, the phrase seems to read as “to transmit but does not compose.” However, the reason the man of learning invoked *shu er bu zuo* to counter the eulogy compared by the clerk of the Chancellor for Shang Yang, who responded well to the change and achieved success. *Shu* of *shu er bu zuo*, thus, means to “follow.” The man of learning cited Shi Guang, who attuned the five notes, as well as the two glorious dynasties, and the fall of Qin brought by changing the standard to underscore adherence to the fundamental way. In this context, *shu er bu zuo* functions to accentuate the maintenance of the fundamental way rather than transmitting the way. Such evidence calls into question Hunter’s assumption that “Only when Han authors began relying primarily on the *Lunyu* for their Kongzi quotations did the circulation of previously anonymous phrases like *shu er bu zuo* become chained to the *Lunyu*, as a result of which any non-*Lunyu* variants were largely cast aside.”⁴³ The two phrases substantiate the conflation of *shu* and *xun*, as used by the man of learning in the *Yantielun* who did not differentiate *xun er bu zuo* from *shu er bu zuo*; this philological evidence suggests an interpretive space in which some Han Classicists regarded the two phrases as identical.

The *Liji* 禮記 *Zhongyong* 中庸 chapter compilers’ equation of *shu* with *xun* in their word choice provides a clear instance in which the two terms were synonymously used during the Han dynasty. Later commentators such as Zheng Xuan 鄭玄 (127–200) further endorsed this equation, whereas Hunter’s reading does not take into account the contextual meaning of *shu* in “*Zhongyong*” chapter. In isolation from its context, Hunter translates, “The

⁴³ Michael Hunter, *Confucius Beyond the Analects*, 267.

Master said, ‘... A father originates, a son transmits.’ 子曰, ... 父作之, 子述之。”⁴⁴

However, in context, *zhi* 之 refers to the enterprise initiated by King Wen’s father and inherited by King Wu 武王 (r. 1046–1043 BCE); thus *shu* implies not transmitting, but succession or following:

Kongzi said, “The person who had no worries was only King Wen! He took Wang Ji 王季 as his father, King Wu as his son. The father originated it; the son followed it. King Wu continued an enterprise of Da Wang, Wang Ji, and King Wen. He once fought Yin and then obtained All under the Heaven. He did not lose honorable name by himself, became the son of Heaven in a venerable manner, had everything else within the Four Sea in a wealthy manner. They reverently handed up in an ancestral shrine, his descendants preserved them.

子曰, “無憂者其惟文王乎! 以王季爲父, 以武王爲子, 父作之, 子述之. 武王繼大王、王季、文王之緒, 壹戎衣而有天下, 身不失天下之顯名, 尊爲天子, 富有四海之內. 宗廟饗之, 子孫保之.”⁴⁵

After Kongzi referred to the phrase, “the son followed it,” he narrated the anecdote of King Wu who inherited the enterprise of his forebears; King Wu defeated the Shang dynasty and then secured the realm. As a result, the descendants of King Wu venerated Da Wang, Wang Ji, King Wen, and King Wu in the ancestral shrine to preserve their legacy. Considering that King Wu did not transmit some documents of Wang Ji and King Wen, but inherited and completed their undertakings, the term *shu* in this context means “to follow,” not “to transmit.” The Han commentator Zheng Xuan also annotated: “the sage regarded to take the system as the great enterprise, the son can follow and accomplish it, then how did he worry? 聖人以入法度爲大事, 子能述成之, 則何憂乎?”⁴⁶ Zheng Xuan’s commentary offers

⁴⁴ Ibid., 29.

⁴⁵ *Liji Zhengyi* 禮記正義, ed. Ma Xinmin, (Beijing: Beijing University Press, 2000), 1677–1678.

⁴⁶ *Liji Zhengyi* 禮記正義, 1677.

evidence that some Han people conflated *shu* with *xun*. The philological evidence based on classical learning suggests a tendency among some Han people to use *shu* and *xun* in an equivalent way, including Classical scholars. For this reason, the Han people did not need to discern the contradiction between *Lunyu* 7.1 and their myth of Kongzi as the “uncrowned king.”

The Han people’s reading of the first phrase in *Lunyu* 7.1, “to follow but not compose” did not hinder them from stressing political significance of the *Chunqiu*, one of the pivotal Classics, as a means of ruling the Han empire, for their reading did not occasion the contradiction concerning whether Kongzi composed the *Chunqiu* or not. Post-Han commentators such as He Yan, Zhu Xi, Yang Bojun advanced an alternative reading of *Lunyu* 7.1, which produced the contradiction while recalibrating Kongzi’s position from that of the “uncrowned king” to a sage divorced from kingship. In the “Taishigong Zixu 太史公自序,” Sima Qian even suggests philological evidence to support the post-Han commentaries on *Lunyu* 7.1. The two distinctive commentaries thus convey Kongzi’s ideas in a sound manner: commentators and philosophers elucidate his message, and at the same time, Kongzi offers them his thought (that is, Kongzi’s thought in the *Lunyu*, not Kongzi’s thought as a historical figure). This dual combination of Kongzi’s and reader’s opinions rests upon the flexible traits of *Lunyu* passages which derive from its brevity. The classical, philological, and philosophical analysis of *Lunyu* 7.1 reconsiders Hunter’s textual evaluation that “the *Lunyu*, whose striking lack of argumentation only fuels the impression that Kongzi’s ideas are authoritative by virtue of being Kongzi’s.”⁴⁷ Owing to its flexibility, Kongzi’s terse words in the *Lunyu* possess inherent classical, philological, and philosophical potential, which later

⁴⁷ Ibid., 144.

scholars have elaborated upon in their works.

Conclusion

The *Lunyu* 7.1 passage can precipitate a distinctive political debate that arises from innate flexibility due to its brevity. On the one hand, reading *shu* in *shu er bu zuo* as ‘to transmit’ entails regarding Kongzi as the intellectual and ethical sage among commoners. Kongzi’s authority remains in intellectual and ethical dimension but does not extend to political legitimization. On the other hand, reading *shu* in *shu er bu zuo* as ‘to follow’ sanctions political legitimization by Kongzi. Since this commentary accommodates the interpretation that justifies the belief that Kongzi composed the *Chunqiu* and portended the rise of Han, Kongzi held absolute authority in politics. Reading this passage in this way reconciles the myth that composed the *Chunqiu* without contradiction. The philological evidence undermines Hunter’s assumption that “in *Lunyu* 7, they [the compilers] might have prioritized the notions of ‘transmitting without originating’ and ‘trusting in and loving antiquity’ as convenient mottoes for the collection as a whole”⁴⁸ *Lunyu* passages, for the concrete evidence suggests that Han readers understood *shu* in *shu er bu zuo* as ‘to follow,’ whereas the reading that supports Hunter’s view emerges only in later commentaries. However, the *Lunyu* contains no passage to support the myth that Kongzi composed the *Chunqiu*. Furthermore, *Lunyu* 7.1 by itself does not provide sufficient evidence to conclude that the compilation of the *Lunyu* intended to strengthen the emperor’s rulership during the Western Han dynasty.

⁴⁸ Michael Hunter, *Confucius Beyond the Analects*, 26.

CHAPTER III.

DEBATING THE POLITICAL AMBIGUITY OF *LUNYU* PASSAGES IN THE “KONGZI SHIJIA”

Lunyu 7.1 also exemplifies how textual flexibility can engender political ambiguity in the “Kongzi Shijia,” for the terse phrase *shu er bu zuo* admits of distinctive emphases. On the one hand, reading *shu* as “to transmit” leads to the analysis that Sima Qian narrated Kongzi’s life under the premise that “Kongzi composed the *Chunqiu*,” and thus excluded *Lunyu* 7.1⁴⁹ or as Martin Kern argues, that the *Lunyu* never mentions the *Chunqiu* but attributes certain characteristics to Kongzi, which the *Shiji* then reapplies to him as its author.⁵⁰ On the other hand, reading *shu* as “to follow” allows readers to focus on how much Kongzi emphasizes the rites throughout his entire life; Sima Qian epitomizes this sense of the rites, though he does not cite *Lunyu* 7.1.

Sima Qian highlights Kongzi’s consistent and significant value, the rites and Rectification of names, as pivotal mottos for Kongzi. He records that Kongzi wrote the *Chunqiu* to convey his ideals to later generations and summarizes the lesson of “Kongzi Shijia 孔子世家” through Zigong’s 子貢 (520–456 BCE) mouth at Kongzi’s funeral, saying, “If the rites are lost, then it will be in turmoil; if the names lose its proper definition,

⁴⁹ Chen Tongsheng, Not As the Six Arts Yet Superior to Them—About the Academic Relationship Between *Records of the Historian* and *Analects* 不是六艺 胜似六艺—谈 《史记》与 《论语》的学术关系, Kongzi Yanjiu, Vol.1 (2004): 42.

⁵⁰ Martin Kern, “Kongzi as Author in the Han” in *Confucius and the Analects Revisited New Perspectives on Composition, Dating, and Authorship*. ed. Micheal Hunter and Martin Kern (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 297.

then transgressions will happen. Losing intention lets the turmoil evolve; losing the proper place becomes a transgression. 禮失則昏，名失則愆。失志爲昏，失所爲愆。”⁵¹ Michael Nylan underscores Kongzi’s slow and improbable development into ongoing progress as opposed to his being a sage by birth.⁵² This chapter, expanding Nylan’s contribution, investigates Kongzi’s enduring mottos as narrated in the “Kongzi Shijia” by Sima Qian. Regardless of the fixed mottos, they need not conflict with personal development, for they can coexist in the process of Kongzi’s growth. The chapter thus aims to illuminate a dimension that has remained unexplored, analyzing the ambiguous record of certain the “Kongzi Shijia” passages, found in the *Lunyu*.

In the “Kongzi Shijia” the political ambiguity of certain passages found in the *Lunyu* generates opposing interpretations of Kongzi’s political stance. The passages obscure whether Kongzi supports or regulates ducal authority, as he does both through rites. In addition, the other passages do not clarify whether he advocates or restrains ducal authority through the Rectification of names. These passages, enabling dynamic interpretations, maintain the ambiguity of his political motivation, triggered by the fragmented plot of the “Kongzi Shijia.” This contrasts with Hunter’s observation of “the *Lunyu*’s staid presentation of Kongzi dicta.”⁵³ In sum, the passages in the “Kongzi Shijia” preserve the ambiguity of the decontextualized *Lunyu* passages.

⁵¹ *Shiji* 47, 1926.

⁵² Michael Nylan, “Kongzi, in Sima Qian’s *Shiji* and the *Analects*” in *Lives of Confucius*. 16.

⁵³ Michael Hunter, “The *Lunyu* As A Western Han Text” in *Confucius and the Analects Revisited: New Perspectives on Composition, Dating, and Authorship* ed. Micheal Hunter and Martin Kern (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 79.

Political Ambiguity of the Rites in the “Kongzi Shijia”

Sima Qian’s narrative strategy of deploying the rites, as articulated or practiced by Kongzi, either to disagree with a duke’s political decision or to uphold another duke’s authority, reveals the political ambiguity of the rites in the *Lunyu*, regardless of the contexts offered in the “Kongzi Shijia.” He depicts Kongzi’s maintenance of the rites from a political perspective but does not use passages related to ethics found in the *Lunyu*. His narrative strategy of omitting Kongzi’s ethical idea on the rites anchors the “Kongzi Shijia” not as an account of Kongzi’s philosophy but as a biography of Kongzi. Sima Qian does not analyze the political philosophy of the rites but instead narrates when Kongzi practiced or spoke of them. Even if Sima Qian provides specific timelines for Kongzi’s words, not present in the *Lunyu*, he does not integrate them to depict a concrete and perspicuous image of Kongzi. Sima Qian, thus, preserves the ambiguity of the *Lunyu* passages in the “Kongzi Shijia.”

Sima Qian expresses one facet of the rites as curbing the duke’s political affairs by portraying Kongzi’s invocation of the rites to disagree with Duke Ling of Wei’s 衛靈公 (r. 534–493 BCE) war plan. In the “Kongzi Shijia,” an episode between Kongzi and Duke Ling of Wei found in *Lunyu* 15.1, exemplifies a political function of the rites to check ducal authority:

On another day, Duke Ling asked how to deploy armies. Kongzi said, “If it is an affair of Zudou 俎豆, I heard it in the past. If it is an affair of 12,500 soldiers, I haven’t learned it yet.” On the next day, he talked to Kongzi. He saw a flying wild goose, looked up at it; his face was not directed to Kongzi. Thereupon, Kongzi left and went to Chen 陳 again.

他日，靈公問兵陳，孔子曰，“俎豆之事則嘗聞之，軍旅之事未之學也。”明日，與孔子語，見蜚鴈，仰視之，色不在孔子。孔子遂行，復如陳。⁵⁴

⁵⁴ *Shiji* 47, 1945.

On the surface, this episode seems like Kongzi answered that he specializes in the rites, instead of military affairs. Kongzi did not respond to Duke Ling of Wei's question, as he might not be conversant with the war. Sima Qian, however, leaves the latter passage—in which Ran You 冉有 (522–489 BCE) fought against Qi in Lang and defeated Qi armies—to induce doubt about the veracity of Kongzi's answer after the defeat of Qi in 484 BCE, “Ji Kangzi 季康子 (?–468 BCE) said, ‘Did you learn to deploy armies or is it your nature?’ Ran You said, ‘I learned it from Kongzi.’ 季康子曰, ‘子之於軍旅, 學之乎? 性之乎?’ 冉有曰, ‘學之於孔子.’”⁵⁵ Ran You's answer implies Kongzi's knowledge of war, unlike Kongzi's response to the duke. Kongzi's response to Duke Ling of Wei, thus, provides a counterexample to Hunter's assumption on the motivation of textual formation in the case of the *Lunyu*:

“Presumably, a Kongzi who deliberately disobeyed his superiors or who compromised his integrity would have been an imperfected model for impressionable scions of the ruling Liu clan, not to mention their officials.”⁵⁶ In fact, Kongzi even suppressed rebellions in BCE 495 when he served Duke Ding of Lu 魯定公 (r. 509–495 BCE): “The Duke and the three linages entered into a palace of the Ji clan 季氏, ascended terrace of Wuzi 季武子 (?–535 BCE). Bi people 費人 attacked them but could not defeat them; they advanced very near to the duke. Kongzi ordered Shen Quxu 申句須 and Yue Qi 樂頎 to go under the terrace and attack them. 公與三子入于季氏之宮, 登武子之臺. 費人攻之, 弗克, 入及公側. 孔子命申句須、樂頎下伐之, 費人北.”⁵⁷ Considering the context of the “Kongzi Shijia,” Kongzi

⁵⁵ *Shiji* 47, 1943.

⁵⁶ Michael Hunter, *Confucius Beyond the Analects*, 291.

⁵⁷ *Shiji* 47, 1916.

objected to Duke Ling of Wei's plan, not because he lacked specialization in war. In addition, Kongzi had once already replied to the difficulty of attacking Pu 蒲 to Duke Ling of Wei before he referred to Zudou to disagree with the military affairs of Wei, so the Duke abandoned the plan to attack Pu. By alluding to the rites, Kongzi sought to stop the duke's political plan for war here and thus restrained ducal authority.⁵⁸

Sima Qian frames the rites as the central theme of the "Kongzi Shijia," weaving them through Kongzi's childhood, adulthood and later years, and concluding the biography with his comments upon visiting the shrine in his hometown. Sima Qian reinforces Kongzi's interest in the rites, symbolizing that Kongzi's childhood by showing he played with Zudou which Kongzi used as a metaphor to dissuade Duke Ling of Wei from war later: "Kongzi as a child, delighted often playing to put Zudou in order, accorded with ritual appearance every time. 孔子爲兒嬉戲，常陳俎豆，設禮容。"⁵⁹ Sima Qian records that Kongzi studied abroad

⁵⁸ In the "Kongzi Shijia," Sima Qian presents anecdotes in which Kongzi opposes dukes' activities that disregard or violate the rites. Kongzi's stance reflects his effort to curb the dukes' arbitrary political decisions. In other words, Kongzi seeks to restrict the dukes' actions so that they conform to the rites rather than personal desires or ideas. Thus, Kongzi places the duke's authority beneath the authority of the rites. In the end, he binds the duke to the rites. For example, when Kongzi left Lu, he criticized the Duke Ding of Lu not following the rites and for indulging in a licentious life with women. These anecdotes also show Kongzi's disagreement, and meanwhile indicates his attempt to regulate the duke's action under the rites rather than the dukes' own desires or ideas: Thereupon, they chose beautiful women, every woman wore patterned clothes and danced *Kangle* 康樂 within the Qi realm, and 120 embellished horses; they sent them to the lord of Lu, displayed the beautiful women and embellished horses outside of the Gao gate in the southern wall. Ji Huanzi wore common people's clothes to go, watch several times and was about to take them, then spoke to the lord of Lu to encircle on a pleasure outing; they went to watch for a whole day, were indolent to governing affairs. Zilu said, "You can leave." Kongzi said, "Today, Lu has also the Jiao rite. If they gave ritual meats to court aristocrats, then I can still stay here." Eventually, Huanzi took female performers from Qi, did not take care of governing for three days, and also did not give ritual meats to the court aristocracies in the Jiao rites. Thereupon, Kongzi left. 於是選齊國中女子好者八十人，皆衣文衣而舞康樂，文馬三十駟，遺魯君，陳女樂文馬於魯城南高門外。季桓子微服往觀再三將受，乃語魯君爲周道游，往觀終日，怠於政事。子路曰，“夫子可以行矣。”孔子曰，“魯今且郊，如致饔乎大夫，則吾猶可以止。”桓子卒受齊女樂，三日不聽政，郊又不致饔俎於大夫。孔子遂行。 *Shiji* 47, 1918.

⁵⁹ *Shiji* 47, 1906.

in Zhou to learn the rites during his youth.⁶⁰ He explains Kongzi's resignation due to Duke Ding of Lu's disregard for the rites in favor of sexual indulgence when he became the senior supervisor of corrections at the age of 56.⁶¹ Sima Qian describes Kongzi's disappointment at the duke for violating political procedure in accordance with the rites, but he does not address the matter on an ethical level. He even represents Kongzi's last moments as instructing Zigong on the procedure for his funeral rites.⁶² Having completed his narration of Kongzi's life and the circumstances following his death, Sima Qian concludes the "Kongzi Shijia" with his personal impressions of the rites he observed at Kongzi's shrine: "I passed by Lu, and observed his chariot, clothes, and ritual vessels in Zhongni's shrine, and that several students practiced the rites in his house on time. 適魯，觀仲尼廟堂車服禮器，諸生以時習禮其家."⁶³ On the basis of the Sima Qian's comment, Miyazaki Ichisada 宮崎市定 (1901–1995) argues that "zhi 之" in *Lunyu* 1.1, "To learn and to practice it on time 學而時習之," points to the rites.⁶⁴ Sima Qian constructs the life of Kongzi through the lens of the rites.

By presenting Kongzi and his followers' practice of the rites, Sima Qian illuminates another facet of their political efficacy in bolstering ducal authority. Since Kongzi distinguished improper rites from proper ones in specific situations, he employed his knowledge of the rites to lead the conference at Jia Gu 夾谷 between Qi and Lu in Lu's favor in BCE 500:

⁶⁰ Ibid., 1909.

⁶¹ Ibid., 1918.

⁶² Ibid., 1944.

⁶³ Ibid., 1947.

⁶⁴ Miyazaki Ichidada, *New Research of the Lunyu 論語inの新研究*, (Tokyo: Iwanami, 1947), 16.

A Qi functionary approached hastily, saying “Please perform barbarian music.” Duke Jing 齊景公 (r. 548–490 BCE) said, “I approve the request.” Thereupon, performers arrived raising cow-tailed flags, feathered flags, spears, halberds, and swords, beating the drums, and then arrived there. Kongzi approached hastily, ran up the stairs, and stopped before the last step. He rolled up his sleeve and said, “Our two lords are having a meeting for peace; how can barbarian music be performed here! I ask to call for order in his functionary.” The functionary made the musicians retreat; they did not leave, then courtiers looked at Yan Ying 晏嬰 (578–500 BCE) and Duke Jing. Duke Jing was ashamed heart, commanded them to leave... Duke Jing was afraid but touched that his knowledge and righteousness are not at the same level as those of the others. He returned and greatly feared and announced to his ministers, “In Lu realm, Kongzi assists his lord by means of the way of a gentleman, but you merely teach me by means of the way of the barbarians; you make me sin to the lord of Lu. What can I do to remedy him?” ... Thereupon, the lord of Qi returned the land of Yun, Wen Yang, and Gui Hui in Lu in order to apologize for the error.

齊有司趨而進曰，“請奏四方之樂。”景公曰，“諾。”於是旂旄羽被矛戟劍撥鼓噪而至。孔子趨而進，歷階而登，不盡一等，舉袂而言曰，“吾兩君爲好會，夷狄之樂何爲於此！請命有司。”有司卻之，不去，則左右視晏子與景公。景公心忤，麾而去之... 景公懼而動，知義不若。歸而大恐，告其群臣曰，“魯以君子之道輔其君，而子獨以夷狄之道教寡人，使得罪於魯君，爲之奈何？”... 於是齊侯乃歸所侵魯之鄆、汶陽、龜陰之田以謝過。⁶⁵

Sima Qian draws the scene in which Kongzi practiced the proper rites, by “approaching hastily,” as recorded in *Lunyu* 10.3, contrasting this with Duke Jing of Qi’s approval of barbaric music performed at the conference. In this episode, Sima Qian’s juxtaposition results in the dramatization of Duke Jing’s humiliation through the proper rites identified by Kongzi. His mastery of the rites led Qi, the dominant power in Kongzi’s age,⁶⁶ to return territories it had earlier seized from Lu. Indeed, before Duke Jing met Duke Ding, Qi assumed that Kongzi would not respond to its tactics since Li Chu 犁鉏 thought, “Kong Qiu knows the

⁶⁵ *Shiji* 47, 1915–1916.

⁶⁶ Qian Mu, *The Biography of Kongzi* 孔子傳, (Taipei: Dongda, 1974), 39.

rites but is cowardly. 孔丘知禮而怯.”⁶⁷ Instead, Duke Ding of Lu strengthened his authority over Duke Jing of Qi at the conference. In addition to the rites at the conference, Sima Qian adds Yan Ying at the conference, hinting that Yan Ying did not end the conference in a manner favorable to Qi since Qi decided to return the territories later. Before Sima Qian introduces the anecdote at Jia Gu, he presents Yan Ying’s critique of Kongzi. Yan Ying disparaged Kongzi’s support of the old-fashioned Zhou rites, arguing that they dissipated resources in Qi, could induce instability in society:

Now Classicists craftily deliberate something else and can’t follow the rules; they are arrogant, haughty, submissive to their own habits, can’t be modest; they exalt mourning and to fulfill the mourning, destroy resources for ostentatious burials, can’t follow modest customs; they wander around to beg for loans, can’t serve a realm. Since the passing of the great worthies, the house of Zhou has already declined, the rites and music were interrupted. Now Kongzi adorns his face and wears ornaments, proliferates rites of ascending and descending, moves around, according to correct detailed etiquette that generations can’t master its learning, no one can practice rites for one’s whole life. What you desire to employ him to change Qi’s custom is not the means to lead common people.

夫儒者滑稽而不可軌法，倨傲自順，不可以爲下，崇喪遂哀，破產厚葬，不可以爲俗，游說乞貸，不可以爲國。自大賢之息，周室既衰，禮樂缺有間。今孔子盛容飾，繁登降之禮，趨詳之節，累世不能殫其學，當年不能究其禮。君欲用之以移齊俗，非所以先細民也。⁶⁸

In contrast to Yan Ying’s warning, Kongzi contributed to strengthening the power of Lu by returning the territories seized by Qi and upholding ducal authority through the rites, according to the record of the “Kongzi Shijia.”⁶⁹

⁶⁷ *Shiji* 32

⁶⁸ *Shiji* 47, 1911.

⁶⁹ David Schaberg analyzes how the details of anecdotes shifted over time, but early Chinese writers and speakers paid little attention to such changes. David Schaberg, *Chinese History and Philosophy in The Oxford History of Historical Writing Volume 1: Beginnings to AD 600*, ed. Andrew Feldherr and

As Sima Qian chronicles the conference at Jia Gu, he first records anecdotes that show Kongzi's life around the rites, and then he introduces detailed descriptions of Kongzi's ritual practices before narrating his demise.⁷⁰ These detailed descriptions intensify the ambiguity of the *Lunyu* passages in the "Kongzi Shijia," because they mirror the haphazard arrangement of the *Lunyu*. On the one hand, Esther Sungkyung Klein insists that "I do not think it is reasonable to say that this section [near the end of 'Kongzi Shijia,' after having discussed Kongzi's work on each of the Six Classics, the *Shiji* narrative devolves into a series of miscellaneous sayings, all with *Lunyu* parallels] is an interpolation just because it is not smoothly integrated into the narrative flow."⁷¹ On the other hand, Yoshimoto Michimasa 吉

Grant Hardy, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 398. Men of learning's quotation of the anecdote at Jia Gu represents a typical example of Schaberg's analysis. In the *Yantielun*, Men of Intelligence challenged governmental authority and the emperor's political decision, citing the conference anecdote at Jia Gu to disagree with the governmental policy to subdue the Xiongnu 匈奴: Men of learning said, 'In ancient, a gentleman established humaneness and cultivate righteousness in order to placate his people. Thereupon, people who live near the gentleman practice goodness; other people who live far away followed him. Thereupon, Kongzi held a position in Lu; he first served in office, three months later reached a peace treaty with Qi... Big realms revered his righteousness and wanted to maintain a good relationship with Lu; Qi people returned the lands of Yun, Huan 讎, and Wen Yang. Therefore, governing by means of virtue is not only to get rid of harms, retreat an enemies' chariots but also is something to desire not seeking but obtaining by himself. 賢良曰, '古者, 君子立仁修義, 以綏其民, 故邇者習善, 遠者順之. 是以孔子仕於魯, 前仕三月及齊平... 大國畏義而合好, 齊人來歸鄆、讎、龜陰之田. 故爲政而以德, 非獨辟害折衝也, 所欲不求而自得.'" *Yantielun Jiaozhu* 鹽鐵論校注, 445. By contrast, in the "Kongzi Shijia," Kongzi's service resulted in upholding ducal authority. Such divergent appropriations of the same anecdote demonstrate the political malleability of an anecdotal tradition and substantiate Schaberg's analysis that early Chinese authors did not mind shifting details. The two cases reveal an ambiguous message of an identical anecdote; users apply its ambiguity for their own purpose rather than determine which one is closest to the truth.

⁷⁰ Since Kongzi's childhood toys in the "Kongzi Shijia" symbolize his lifelong pursuit, the opening of the narrative accords with Wai-Yee Li's textual analysis that "One common device in the *Records* is to relate a symbolic incident or anecdote at the beginning of a narrative." Wai-Yee Li, "The Idea of Authority in the Shih Chi (Records of the Historian)," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 54, no. 2 (1994): 383-384.

⁷¹ Esther Sunkyung Klein, "Sima Qian's Kongzi and the Western Han Lunyu" in *Confucius and the Analects Revisited: New Perspectives on Composition, Dating, and Authorship* ed. Micheal Hunter and Martin Kern (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 255.

本道雅 reads *Lunyu* 10.3, which occurs in the interpolated section of the “Kongzi Shijia,” as illustrating Kongzi’s conduct as a host and envoy, citing Gong Yuanjie’s 龔元玠 interpretation to situate this depiction in the diplomatic context of the Jia Gu conference.⁷² Sima Qian conveys Kongzi’s movement at the conference in Jia Gu; his manner of moving corresponds to the phrase, “His hastily approaching was like a bird with flying wings. 趨進翼如也,”⁷³ among the descriptions. Although the textual analyses of Klein and Yoshimoto oppose each other, both are of ultimate validity. Rather, these divergent interpretations accentuate that Sima Qian, like the *Lunyu* itself, presents the rites in the “Kongzi Shijia” with ambiguity. Thus, the narrative ambiguity of the “Kongzi Shijia” resembles the ambiguous nature of the *Lunyu*.

While sustaining ambiguity in the “Kongzi Shijia,” Sima Qian’s deployment of the passages, found in the *Lunyu* constructs a persona of Kongzi distinct from the popular image derived from the *Lunyu*. Elaborating the rites, Sima Qian elevates the way, whereas he downplays humaneness, recording the identical passage to *Lunyu* 9.1 in the “interpolation” part: “The master seldom talked about profits and fate and humaneness. 子罕言利與命與仁.”⁷⁴ This passage is consistent with Sima Qian’s record on Kongzi’s life, since Kongzi

⁷² Yoshimoto Michimasa, *Philological Evidence to the “Kongzi Shijia”* 孔子世家疏證, (Kyoto: Memoirs of the Faculty of Letters, Kyoto University, 2021), 60, 55. In the *Lunyu Kenan* 論語客難, Gong Yuanjie annotates *Lunyu* 10.3: “This happened during the tenth reign year of Duke Ding of Lu, Qi sent a diplomatic mission to Lu. The Duke of Lu ordered Kongzi to conduct the special mission. 此定公十年，齊聘魯，魯使孔子報聘。” Gong Yuanjie, *Lunyu Kenan* 論語客難, accessed September 22, 2025, <https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=en&chapter=2482563#p31>

⁷³ *Shiji* 47, 1915.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 1938.

only mentions humaneness twice in the five recorded instances.⁷⁵ Kongzi even adduced to the insufficiency of humaneness to achieve his ideals, refuting Zilu's answer as to why they endured the dire situation between Chen 陳 and Cai 蔡:

Kongzi knew that the disciples had angry emotions, then summoned Zilu and asked, saying, "The *Shi* saying, 'Something else which isn't a rhinoceros and isn't a tiger wanders the wilderness!' My way isn't followed! Why I am here!" Zilu said, "I conjecture that we aren't humane yet; people don't trust our words. I conjecture that we aren't wise yet; people don't follow us." Kongzi said, "Here it is! You 由, I draw an analogy making everyone become humane and then people trust in him, how else could Bo Yi 伯夷 and Shu Qi 叔齊 exist? I draw an analogy making everyone become wise will make people trust in him, how else could Prince Bi Gan 比干 exist?"

孔子知弟子有慍心，乃召子路而問曰，“『詩』云，‘匪兕匪虎，率彼曠野！’吾道非邪！吾何爲於此！”子路曰，“意者吾未仁邪？人之不我信也。意者吾未知邪？人之不我行也。”孔子曰，“有是乎！由，譬使仁者而必信，安有伯夷、叔齊？使知者而必行，安有王子比干？”⁷⁶

Sima Qian renders Kongzi's rebuttal of Zilu's emphasis of humaneness and then records that perfected humaneness does not suffice to resolve the hardship that Kongzi and his disciples faced between Chen and Cai. Sima Qian instead prioritizes the way over humaneness, for Kongzi asked the reason that his way seemed wrong for other people. Moreover, he composes narratives in which Kongzi regarded the rites as a practice of the way. He notes that Kongzi retreated and edited the *Rites* when many people in Lu overstepped and strayed from the right way 正道 in Kongzi's youth.⁷⁷ He also documents that Duke Jing of Qi praised Kongzi in the aftermath of the conference at Jia Gu: "In Lu realm, Kongzi assists his lord by means of the way of a gentleman, but you merely teach me by means of the way of the barbarians; you make me sin to the lord of Lu. 魯以君子之道輔其君，而子獨以夷狄之

⁷⁵ Laozi 老子 refers to humaneness twice, and Zilu mentions it once in the "Kongzi Shijia."

⁷⁶ *Shiji* 47, 1931.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 1914.

道教寡人，使得罪於魯君。”⁷⁸ The narrative structure of the “Kongzi Shijia” leads to reconsider Ogyū Sorai’s 荻生徂徠 (1666–1728) interpretation of *Lunyu* 9.1: “Kongzi seldom talked about profits but did talk about fate and humaneness.”⁷⁹ In the *Lunyu*, Kongzi often refers to humaneness, hence Ogyū’s reading of *Lunyu* 9.1 accords with Kongzi’s words. However, the conventional reading of *Lunyu* 9.1, “Kongzi seldom talked about profits, fate and humaneness,” better matches the context of the “Kongzi Shijia.” By inserting *Lunyu* 9.1, Sima Qian buttresses the credibility of his own narrative, which marginalizes Kongzi’s association with humaneness. Sima Qian’s marginalization of humaneness impugns Hunter’s idea that “we might infer that *Huainanzi/Shiji* period marks a shift in the influence of the *Lunyu* as a source of Kongzi material, with post-*Shiji* texts drawing heavily from the *Lunyu* for their Kongzi quotations and pre-*Huainanzi* texts drawing their Kongzi material from elsewhere.”⁸⁰ Even though Sima Qian cites references to Kongzi’s humaneness seven times in *Shiji* 67 found in the *Lunyu*, these quotations reflect Kongzi’s instruction of his disciples rather than constituting his persona.

Even granted that Kongzi respected the rites of Zhou as seen in Yan Ying’s evaluation, he did not regard it as the absolute norm that everyone always must follow. The rites of Zhou can embody the way, but whether the way represents the rites of Zhou remains ambiguous. Sima Qian invokes four passages found in the *Lunyu*; these passages articulate the significance the rites of Zhou hold for Kongzi in the “Kongzi Shijia.” First, Kongzi

⁷⁸ Ibid., 1915.

⁷⁹ Ogyū Sorai, *Longocho* 2 論語徵 2, ed. Ogawa Tamaki, (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1994) 7. Ogyū Sorai, *Longocho* 2 論語徵 2, trans. Kidong Lee, Okgyun Lim, Taehong Lim, and Hyunchan Hahm, (Seoul: Somyung, 2010), 225–226.

⁸⁰ Michael Hunter, “The *Lunyu* As A Western Han Text” in *Confucius and the Analects Revisited: New Perspectives on Composition, Dating, and Authorship*, 73.

claimed that he had succeeded to King Wen's legacy when the Kuang 匡 people once detained him and his disciples.⁸¹ Second, he believed that Huan Tui 桓魋 could not kill him when he was practicing the rites with his disciples, since he said, "Heaven gave virtue to me; how is Huan Tui about to do something else to me! 天生德於予, 桓魋其如予何!"⁸² Third, Sima Qian inserted the identical passage to *Lunyu* 2.23 in the "interpolation:" "Observing what Yin and Xia relinquished and added, Kongzi said, "Although there will be a hundred generation later, I can know it. 觀殷夏所損益, 曰, 後雖百世可知也." Soon after this, Sima Qian adds another saying of Kongzi found in the *Lunyu* 3.14: Kongzi said, "Zhou observed the two dynasties. How much it was embellished! I am following Zhou. 周監二代, 郁郁乎文哉! 吾從周."⁸³ The repetitive emphasis on Kongzi's respect for the rites of Zhou by Sima Qian consists in the narrative that Kongzi wished to practice the rites of Zhou in politics. Kongzi, however, did not end up obtaining an opportunity to practice his vision, so he returned to Lu. Sima Qian incorporates the passage identical to *Lunyu* 15.20 and lionizes Kongzi's status as the "uncrowned king,"⁸⁴ writing that he composed the *Chunqiu* to convey his way while crystallizing the fact that he was not a king:

A gentleman is concerned that he dies but his fame isn't eulogized among people. My way hasn't been performed. How will I be perceived later? Thereupon, he used historians' records to write the *Chunqiu* from Duke Yin 魯隱公 (r. 722–712 BCE) to the 14th reign year of Duke Ai 魯哀公 (r. 494–468 BCE); there are twelve dukes. Based on Lu, he personally succeeded Zhou. Therefore, he continued Yin; he followed the three dynasties. Its writings are precise, but the indications are broad. 君子病沒世而名不稱焉。吾道不行矣, 吾何以自見於後世哉?" 乃因史記作

⁸¹ Ibid., 1919.

⁸² Ibid., 1921.

⁸³ Ibid., 1936.

⁸⁴ Michael Nylan, "Kongzi, the Uncrowned king" in *Lives of Confucius*. 76.

『春秋』，上至隱公，下訖哀公十四年，十二公。據魯，親周，故殷，運之三代。約其文辭而指博。⁸⁵

Since Sima Qian delineated the continuity from Xia and Yin to Zhou, and Kongzi applied it in the *Chunqiu*, the rites of Zhou seemed to culminate in their quintessence. Sima Qian's last scene of Kongzi's life contrasts with the continuity from Yin to Zhou, as Kongzi revealed to Zigong that he hoped to have his funeral conducted according to the style of his ancestors from Yin, not the style of Zhou.⁸⁶ This scene resonates with the beginning of the "Kongzi Shijia" that his ancestor came from Song 宋 a realm established by the descendants of Yin, and Kongzi's ancestor abdicated from the position of duke in the past.⁸⁷ By the way, Kongzi here weakens the absolute authority of the Zhou rites what he wishes that his funeral follows the Yin style, instead of the Zhou style. In other words, Sima Qian's narrative intimates that the rites of Zhou may not have been an absolute criterion in Kongzi's thought in the "Kongzi Shijia." In this way, Sima Qian sustains the political ambiguity of the Zhou rites by framing Kongzi as both supporting and denying the rites of Zhou.

By conveying the life of Kongzi in the "Kongzi Shijia," Sima Qian not only specifies Kongzi's life but also propounds an ambiguous character of Kongzi, which could either uphold or curb a ruler's authority, especially by utilizing the passages found in the *Lunyu*. Sima Qian's specification of when and where Kongzi said the words does not help unravel the ambiguous functions of the rites from the political point of view, rather maintains or even intensifies their characteristics. Sima Qian seems to describe Kongzi's rites as the rites of

⁸⁵ *Shiji* 47, 1943.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 1944.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 1905.

Zhou first, but in the later part, he interjects the passage found in the *Liji* 禮記, where Kongzi stated he would like to follow the style of the Yin rites after he died. Notwithstanding changes in Kongzi's preference there, Kongzi insisted on following the rites from his youth to his death; even Sima Qian recorded his impression of Kongzi, observing that the students still practiced the rites in his shrine in the aftermath of Kongzi's death around 500 years later. Sima Qian's description of Kongzi reflects the contents of the *Lunyu* 7.1 passage under the Han people's linguistic sense that Kongzi "followed but did not compose" the new rites, eschewing the contradiction that "Kongzi composed the *Chunqiu*." Meanwhile, Sima Qian does not associate Kongzi's rites with ethical issues while undermining the status of the humaneness in the life and thought of Kongzi. The "Kongzi Shijia" manifests the idea that the increased number of the *Lunyu* citation does not always mean that the persona of Kongzi converges to fixed on the persona of Kongzi in the *Lunyu*. Instead, he combines the rites with the way, creating the distinctive image of Kongzi that contrasts with the conventional image, constructed by commentators and philosophers to highlight humaneness of Kongzi in the *Lunyu*.

Political Ambiguity of the Rectification of Names in the "Kongzi Shijia"

Sima Qian fashions a bookended plot in the "Kongzi Shijia" by constructing the pivot of Kongzi's political ideal on persistent arguments from the 'Rectification of names' group (*Lunyu* 12.11 and 13.3)⁸⁸ from his thirties until his return to Lu. The "Kongzi Shijia"

⁸⁸ Since Sima Qian does not record the passage, found in *Lunyu* 12.17 in the "Kongzi Shijia," the thesis does not address it.

impugns Defoort's analysis that "none of these three additional passages⁸⁹ mention anything about 'names,'" as Sima Qian inserts Rectification of names as a pivotal idea throughout Kongzi's life. He interpolates an episode in which, upon returning from studying abroad in Zhou and seeking his official appointment, Kongzi urges Duke Jing of Qi to enact a ruler. Later, when he wandered the Central States in search of an appointment, Sima Qian records *Lunyu* 13.3 once. Grounded in the narrative structure, Sima Qian underscores the Rectification of names; at the same time, the fragmented plot of the "Kongzi Shijia" allows expansive space to read Kongzi's intention to either limit or reinforce ducal authority. The omitted contexts preserve the political ambiguity of the "Rectification of names" group in the "Kongzi Shijia."

The fragmented arrangement of the plot around the Rectification of names compels readers to question whether Kongzi encouraged or reproached Duke Jing of Qi, engendering

⁸⁹ When Defoort questions Hu Shi 胡適 (1891-1962)'s emphasis on "Rectification of names," she notes that Hu provides three pieces of evidence to support *Lunyu* 13.3. Carine Defoort, "Confucius and the 'Rectification of Names': Hu Shi and the Modern Discourse on Zhengming," *Dao: a Journal of Comparative Philosophy*, 20, no. 4 (2021): 620. Among the four commentaries (*Lunyu* 6.23, 12.11, 12.17, 13.3), one commentary, *Lunyu* 6.23, does not pertain to the main idea of *Lunyu* 13.3 based on archaeological evidence. In general, the shape of a *gu* [觚] vessel is rounded; it has no corners. A few *gu* vessels, for example, those produced by the Yachou clan 亞醜 during the late Shang period, have corners with a square shape. "Square *gu* wine breaker with inscription 'Ya Chou' 亞醜方觚," *National Palace Museum* 國立故宮博物院, accessed September 22, 2025, https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/chicago_manual_17th_edition/cmos_formatting_and_style_guide/web_sources.html However, Zhu Xi's commentary ("*gu* is a square edged." 觚, 稜也.) supports the view that these exceptional *gu* vessels are authentic and orthodox, in contrast to the current archaeological data. Her English citation follows the ahistorical commentary: "Kongzi said: 'The *gu* [觚] (a vessel with corners used for sacrificial purposes) no longer has corners (*gu*). What a *gu*! What a *gu*!'" Zhu Xi, *Sishu Zhangjuzhu* 四書章句集註, 90. This translation does not capture the accurate shape of *gu* vessels. This passage does not align with the concept of "Rectification of names." For this reason, the thesis excludes *Lunyu* 6.23 when investigating rectification of names in the "Kongzi Shijia."

⁹⁰ Carine Defoort, "Confucius and the 'Rectification of Names': Hu Shi and the Modern Discourse on Zhengming," 621.

political ambiguity in the “Kongzi Shijia” as found in *Lunyu* 12.11: “A lord enacts the lord, a minister enacts the minister, a father enacts the father, a son enacts the son 君君，臣臣，父父，子子。”⁹¹ Sima Qian arranges this dialogue during Kongzi’s second attempt to obtain a political position in his thirties when Duke Zhao of Lu 魯昭公 (r. 541–510 BCE) fled to Qi. Duke Jing of Qi asked about Governing, so Kongzi replied, and then the duke was delighted with his answer, “Duke Jing said, ‘Excellent! Indeed, if a lord doesn’t enact the lord, a minister doesn’t enact the minister, a father doesn’t enact the father, a son doesn’t enact the

⁹¹ *Shiji* 47, 1911. Defoort says that “the current discourse on *zhengming* has had a relatively short history—one that can be traced to one of China’s most influential modern scholars, Hu Shi... This combination of influence and neglect has solidified Hu’s discourse into a supposed fact rather than a historically situated interpretation... We should acknowledge Hu Shi’s central role in the invention of this specific view and, more importantly, also follow his advice to doubt where people no longer express doubts.” Carine Defoort, “Confucius and the ‘Rectification of Names’: Hu Shi and the Modern Discourse on Zhengming,” 631. However, this conclusion overlooks a traditional commentary by Xing Bing, who had already connected *Lunyu* 12.11 with Rectification of names: “Kongzi replied to saying, a thing which ‘a lord enacts the lord, a minister enacts the minister; a father enacts the father, a son enacts the son’ is to speak of governing is rectifying. If a lord does not lose the way of the lord, then it reaches that a son does not lose the way of son; each superior and inferior has order, high class and low class does not lose their order, and then later states and households are rectified. ‘孔子對曰 君君臣臣父父子子’者，言政者正也。若君不失君道，乃至子不失子道，尊卑有序，上下不失，而後國家正也。” Xing Bing, *Lunyu Zhushu* 論語注疏, 184. Xing Bing’s commentary on *Lunyu* 12.11 annotates its main point of the *Lunyu* 12.11 through the lens of Rectification of names, and combining *Lunyu* 12.11 with *Lunyu* 12.17. In addition to Xing Bing, Jeong Yak-yong 丁若鏞 (1762–1836) glossed *Lunyu* 13.1 as follow: “Name is called fixed names of between a father and son, and a subject and objects... Kongzi replied Duke Jing of Qi, saying, ‘A lord enacts the lord, a minister enacts the minister, a father enacts the father, a son enacts the son.’ It is exactly known as rectification of names. 名，曰父子，君臣之定名... 孔子對齊景公曰，‘君君臣臣父父子子，’即所謂正名也。” in the *Noneo Kokeumju* 論語古今註. Jeong Yak-yong, *Noneo Kokeumju* 論語古今註, *Tasan Cultural Foundation*, accessed September 22, 2025,

[https://db.itkc.or.kr/dir/item?itemId=GO#/dir/node?dataId=ITKC_MP_0597A_0360_050_0010&solrQ=query%E2%80%A0%E5%90%9B%E8%87%A3%E4%B9%8B%E5%AE%9A%E5%90%8D\\$sortField%E2%80%A0%EA%B7%B8%EB%A3%B9%EC%A0%95%EB%A0%AC s%20%EC%9E%90%EB%A3%8CID s\\$sortOrder%E2%80%A0\\$secId%E2%80%A0GO AA\\$toal Count%E2%80%A0\\$curPos%E2%80%A0\\$solr solId%E2%80%A0BD_ITKC_MP_0597A_0360_050_0010](https://db.itkc.or.kr/dir/item?itemId=GO#/dir/node?dataId=ITKC_MP_0597A_0360_050_0010&solrQ=query%E2%80%A0%E5%90%9B%E8%87%A3%E4%B9%8B%E5%AE%9A%E5%90%8D$sortField%E2%80%A0%EA%B7%B8%EB%A3%B9%EC%A0%95%EB%A0%AC s%20%EC%9E%90%EB%A3%8CID s$sortOrder%E2%80%A0$secId%E2%80%A0GO AA$toal Count%E2%80%A0$curPos%E2%80%A0$solr solId%E2%80%A0BD_ITKC_MP_0597A_0360_050_0010)

These two commentaries call for a reconsideration of Defoort’s conclusion that the discourse on rectification of names originated only with Hu Shi after the 20th century, just as Defoort cites Hu Shi’s words that ‘also follow his advice to doubt where people no longer express doubts.’

son, although there are grains, how can I obtain and eat them!’ 景公曰, ‘善哉! 信如君不君, 臣不臣, 父不父, 子不子, 雖有粟, 吾豈得而食諸!’”⁹² On one side, when concentrating on the dialogue, Kongzi’s words could aim to consolidate the authority of a ruler and father over ministers and sons, so Duke Jing’s answer shows his agreement and acceptance. On the other side, Yoshikawa Kōjirō’s 吉川幸次郎 (1904–1980) contextualization of the passage in the “Kongzi Shijia” yields an opposite interpretation of Kongzi’s intention. He proposes that Kongzi reprimanded Duke Jing; by saying “A lord enacts the lord, a minister enacts the minister,” Kongzi alluded to the Qi minister Cui Zhu’s 崔杼 assassination of Duke Zhuang 齊莊公 (r. 553–548 BCE) and his immediate installation of Duke Jing as the new duke of Qi. He further argues that Kongzi’s assessment of the chaotic situation in Qi referred to the fact that Cui Zhu’s first son killed Cui Zhu, since Cui Zhu wished to pass his position to the son of his cherished concubine, who had inappropriate relations with Duke Zhuang, expressed through the saying, “a father enacts the father, a son enacts the son.”⁹³ As a final point, he adds that Duke Jing did not understand Kongzi’s intention because he was obtuse.⁹⁴ Kōjirō’s analysis, that Kongzi rebuked Duke Jing establishes its validity, as the records of the “Qitaigong Shijia 齊太公世家” and the *Zuozhuan* corroborate each other in support of his argument. Embedding the anecdote, whose ambiguous messages leave political ambiguity in Kongzi’s stance on ducal authority, Sima Qian establishes the significance of coherence between names and its role in Kongzi’s thought, without attempting to expound the concept.

⁹² *Shiji* 47, 1911.

⁹³ Yoshikawa Kōjirō, *Yoshikawa Kōjirō zenshū* Vol. 5 吉川幸次郎全集 第5卷, (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1974), 170–174.

⁹⁴ Yoshikawa Kōjirō, *Yoshikawa Kōjirō zenshū* Vol. 5 吉川幸次郎全集 第5卷, 160.

Sima Qian portrays Kongzi's consistent ideal by presenting "Rectification of names" when he returned to Wei with Zilu in his sixties. Yet at the same time, Sima Qian still preserves its political ambiguity by not delineating how Kongzi envisioned the establishment of social hierarchy. A lack of details enables one to interpret Kongzi's "Rectification of names" in an opposite manner, either to advocate or to condemn Duke Chu of Wei 衛出公 (r. 492–481 BCE, r. 476–470 BCE) for succeeding his grandfather, Duke Ling of Wei, while, ignoring his father, Kuai Kui 蒯瞶, who later became Duke Zhuang of Wei 衛莊公 (r. 480–278 BCE):

This time, the father of the lord of Wei whose name was Zhe 輒 did not take position. Out of the realms, several lords frequently criticized him, and a lot of Kongzi's disciples held office positions in Wei. The lord of Wei desired to obtain Kongzi to practice governing. Zilu said, "The lord of Wei will treat you and practice governing. What are you about to do first?" Kongzi said, "I definitely rectify names!" Zilu said, "Here it is! You're irrational! How do you rectify names?" Kongzi said, "You aren't insightful! You! In any particular cases, if a name isn't rectified, then language isn't compliant. If the language isn't compliant, then things aren't perfected. If the things aren't perfected, then punishment doesn't attain its goal. If the punishment doesn't attain its goal, then common people don't have a thing to put their hands and feet on. In any case, if a gentleman names it, then people definitely can name it; if the gentleman says it, then the people definitely practice it. The gentleman doesn't have a thing to do frivolously to the language and that's all.

是時，衛君輒父不得立，在外，諸侯數以爲讓，而孔子弟子多仕於衛，衛君欲得孔子爲政。子路曰，“衛君待子而爲政，子將奚先？”孔子曰，“必也正名乎！”子路曰，“有是哉，子之迂也！何其正也？”孔子曰，“野哉！由也！夫名不正則言不順，言不順則事不成。事不成則禮樂不興，禮樂不興則刑罰不中。刑罰不中則民無所錯手足矣。夫君子爲之必可名，言之必可行。君子於其言，無所苟而已矣。”⁹⁵

When Kongzi claimed to rectify names first in Wei, Zilu chided him as being unrealistic.

Kongzi, however, reproached Zilu and asserted the significance of the Rectification of names

⁹⁵ *Shiji* 47, 1933–1934.

in forging social stability in Wei. The anecdote conveys Kongzi's political ambition, but its limitation lies in that it does not explicate for whom, and by what means Kongzi intended to practice the Rectification of names. Qian Mu 錢穆 (1895–1990) thus puts forward a plausible argument that Kongzi decried Duke Chu of Wei. Since Kongzi prioritized the relationship between father and son over that between ruler and minister, he denounced Duke Chu of Wei for neglecting his father by inheriting the throne from his grandfather.⁹⁶ If Kongzi aimed to rectify names because of this reason, Zilu's complaint to Kongzi sounds reasonable; many Kongzi's disciples served under Duke Chu of Wei in official posts. As opposed to Qian Mu, a context of the *Gongyangzhuan* points to Kongzi's Rectification of names as advocating Duke Chu of Wei, for the text legitimates the accession to the throne of Duke Chu of Wei, instead of Kuai Kui.⁹⁷ As Sima Qian affords the possibility of reading the passage found in *Lunyu* 13.3 as a means of faulting Kuai Kui, he also furnishes another hint for an argument supporting the idea of the *Gongyangzhuan* in the "Kongzi Shijia." Kongzi may not have absolutized father-to-son succession in matters of inheritance. He served Duke Ding of Lu in the aftermath of Duke Zhao of Lu's death in Qi. In fact, Duke Ding was Duke Zhao's brother, not his son. Jisun Chengzi 季孫成子 in Lu expelled Duke Zhao's sons and

⁹⁶ Qian Mu, *The Biography of Kongzi* 孔子傳, 83–84.

⁹⁷ According to the *Gongyangzhuan*, a son must obey a father's words, so the father must obey his father's words. Therefore, Duke Chu of Wei's succession to the dukedom from Duke Ling of Wei is legitimate: "Kuai Kui had no way; Duke Ling expelled him and installed Zhe as the duke. Then is it permissible that Zhe was installed as the duke in righteousness? Said, "It is permissible." How is it permissible? One cannot reject a mandate of grandfather by means of a mandate of father; one can reject a mandate of father by means of a mandate of grandfather. This is a father's command being directed to a son. One cannot reject a king's affair by means of an affair of house; one can reject the affair of house by means of the king's affair. This is a king's command being directed to an object. 蒯瞶爲無道，靈公逐蒯瞶而立輒。然則輒之義可以立乎？曰，“可。”其可奈何？不以父命辭王父命，以王父命辭父命，是父之行乎子也。不以家事辭王事，以王事辭家事，是上之行乎下也。” Xu Yan, *Chunqiu Gongyangzhuan Zhushu* 春秋公羊傳注疏, ed. Ma Xinmin (Beijing: Beijing University Press, 2000), 682–683.

then made Duke Zhao's brother the new duke.⁹⁸ Kongzi, however, accompanied Duke Ding to the conference at Jia Gu later. Relying on two pieces of supporting evidence in the "Kongzi Shijia," Sima Qian draws Kongzi's Rectification of names into an ambiguous domain of whether Kongzi prioritized the relationship of the father-son relationship over the ruler-minister relationship, representing Kongzi's consistency from his thirties to his sixties.

Sima Qian brings into focus Rectification of names as Kongzi's crucial idea by reinforcing the structural coherence of Kongzi's ideas to correlate his idea at thirty with his idea at sixty in the "Kongzi Shijia," while he structures the scenes in an ambiguous manner, withholding sufficient detail to illuminate his political orientation. In spite of the few references to the Rectification of names, Sima Qian situates them at two symbolic moments: when Kongzi sought office in his thirties and when he concluded his political wandering in his sixties. Moreover, Sima Qian writes that Zigong summarized his master's life by mentioning rites and names together in Kongzi's funeral scene. Through this narrative deployment, Sima Qian makes the Rectification of names permeate Kongzi's entire life. This narrative interrogates Defoort's argument that "in general, references to Kongzi along with *zhengming* in the *Shiji* tend to be short and unrelated to the content of the *zhengming* dialogue, concerned rather with either reputation or the practice of checking a minister's achievements against his title or job description."⁹⁹ While frequency serves an important measure for gauging the significance of a concept, even limited occurrences can acquire considerable

⁹⁸"Shusun sent someone to inform him [Zijia Yibo], "It was Gongyan and Gongwei who prevented many subjects from serving the ruler. That Gongzi Song should be appointed master of the altars of the domain is the desire of the many subjects. 叔孫使告之曰，‘公衍公爲實使群臣不得事君，若公子宋主社稷，則群臣之願也。’" 1766. *Zuo Tradition*, 1735.

⁹⁹ Carine Defoort, "Confucius and the "Rectification of Names": Hu Shi and the Modern Discourse on Zhengming," 627.

importance through narrative function in the structure of the “Kongzi Shijia.”

Conclusion

The equivalent passages to those in the *Lunyu* within the “Kongzi Shijia” do not yield a consistent stance on whether Kongzi supported or constrained ducal authority. In fact, they reveal ambiguity of the *Lunyu* through Sima Qian’s fragmented plots, despite sixty-one instances of textual concordance with the *Lunyu* passages.¹⁰⁰ This narrative strategy complicates any attempt to construct a fixed image of Kongzi within the “Kongzi Shijia.” Although Hunter insists that “the *Lunyu*-centric approach distracts us from the amazing breadth, diversity, and interest of early Kongzi material, and thus of the significance of “Kongzi” itself,”¹⁰¹ the ambiguity of *Lunyu*, arising from its lack of context in many passages, still enables the creation of a broad and diverse Kongzi comparable to the images from the Warring States period. As a result, the political ambiguity of these passages qualifies Hunter’s claim that “the received *Lunyu* is best read as a text compiled in response to this earlier, more dynamic ‘Kongzi,’ the goal of which was to establish a fixed, independently quotable version of Kongzi for elites of the Han dynasty.”¹⁰² In contrast to the defining of Kongzi’s image, quantitative data on the increased frequency of the passages, found in the *Lunyu* within the “Kongzi Shijia,” compared to the Warring States texts, typify a varied Kongzi image, whether sustaining or regulating the authority of rulers, depending on

¹⁰⁰ The thesis appends 61 identical or similar passages from the “Kongzi Shijia” that are found in the *Lunyu* in Appendix B.

¹⁰¹ Michael Hunter, *Confucius Beyond the Analects*, 315.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 314.

interpretive aims: these passages either legitimate or constrain ducal authority. Therefore, the passages found in the “Kongzi Shijia” constitute a paradigmatic model, grounded in political ambivalence, for political debates that aimed either to strengthen or to regulate rulership.

CHAPTER IV.

DEBATING RULERSHIP THROUGH THE POLITICAL AMBIVALENCE OF *LUNYU* PASSAGES

In the *Hanshu*, Ban Gu 班固 (32–92) documented political applications of the *Lunyu* passages by the Han figures in an ambivalent manner. The same passages found in the *Lunyu*, employed as political rhetoric to support or regulate rulership, reinforce the persuasiveness of arguments voiced by each figure whom Ban Gu recorded. While Hunter proposes that “the best candidate for such an idea is the theme of character evaluation, whose presentation in the *Lunyu* reflects the influence of Western Han political rhetoric surrounding the appointment of talented and virtuous individuals to the imperial bureaucracy,”¹⁰³ his analysis remains thematic and speculative.¹⁰⁴ In contrast to Hunter’s assumption, at a minimum, historical

¹⁰³ Ibid., 255.

¹⁰⁴ Hunter’s thematic linkage of the *Lunyu* with the Han dynasty character evaluation overlooks the flexible and ambiguous nature of the *Lunyu* passages. Hunter writes, “In 11/3, too, certain echoes with Western Han recruitment edicts suggest that the *dizi* of the *Lunyu* were meant to be understood as exemplary candidates for office,” citing ‘See Loewe 2004, chap. 4, for a useful summary.’ However, Michael Loewe, in *The Men Who Governed Han China: Companion to a Biographical Dictionary of the Qin, Former Han and Xin Periods*, does not write that the Western Han recruitment edicts resonate with the *Lunyu* 11.3, but explains the recruitment system. Michael Loewe, “The First Steps to Office,” in *The Men Who Governed Han China: Companion to a Biographical Dictionary of the Qin, Former Han and Xin Periods*, (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 109–154. In the immediate next sentence, Hunter writes, “The earliest extant edict to reference Men of Letters and Learning in the context of ‘selecting’ 選 officials dates to 128 BCE, thirteen years into the reign of Emperor Wu... Also note the mention of ‘government affairs’ 政事 in Emperor Wu’s edict, a term which reappears in a later recruitment edict. The labels virtuous conduct 德行 and speech from 11/3 do not appear in any Han edicts. However, calls for men of integrity who were capable of offering frank advice pervade these documents, including an Emperor Wen 文帝 (r. 180–157 BCE) edict dated to 178 BCE which called for ‘the appointment of Men of Excellence and Integrity, Men of Probity and Uprightness, and Men Capable of Frank Words and Unflinching Remonstrance’ 舉賢良方正能直言極諫者.” Michael Hunter, *Kongzi Beyond the Analects*, 292–294. According to Hunter’s analysis, the four traits (or relevant qualities) from the *Lunyu* 11.3 should indicate one of the pivotal traits to serve the emperor

record demonstrates that the political ambivalence of the *Lunyu* passages, deriving from their flexible and ambiguous nature, enabled them to buttress an expansive range of political affairs, such as the establishment of a new ritual system,¹⁰⁵ the governance of the empire, the enforcement of the law, and the re-appointment of the crown prince, recorded in the *Hanshu*. In doing so, they both strengthened and limited rulership as a means of governing the Han empire, while conferring legitimacy upon the political aims of individual figures.

(or superiors such as a king or duke) in early China. The textual evidence from the *Zuozhuan* refutes Hunter's analysis. In the *Zuozhuan*, Beigong Wenzi 北宮文子 predicted the chief minister Wei 圍 (King Ling of Chu 楚靈王, r. 540-529 BCE) would rebel against his King because he had 'majesty 威儀' which King Wen had before. Beigong Wenzi said, "King Wen had the majesty of bearing. That is why the noble man in his position inspires awe, and in his act of giving he inspires love. His steps forward and back can serve as a standard, his every turn can be initiated as an example, his demeanor is well worth observing, his conduct of affairs can be set up as rules, his virtues and actions can be realized as a model, his voice and aura can bring joy, his gestures have refinement, and his speeches are elegant. With all these attributes he oversees those below him. This is called having the majesty of bearing. 有威儀也。故君子在位可畏，施舍可愛，進退可度，周旋可則，容止可觀，作事可法，德行可象，聲氣可樂，動作有文，言語有章，以臨其下，謂之有威儀也。" *Zuo Traditions*, trans. Stephen Durrant, Wai-yee Li, and David Schaberg, (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2016), 1292 – 1293. Virtues and speeches in the *Zuozhuan* do not belong to subjects' merits; rather, the subjects could take the position of their objects based on the two merits. Linking *Lunyu* 11.3, the passage from the *Zuozhuan* offers a disparate interpretation and application from what Hunter suggests. In addition, the two terms, virtues and speeches in the *Zuozhuan*, do not have any conclusive link to their usage in *Lunyu* 11.3. As mentioned above, no one claims that some of Kongzi's disciples who have the traits should become rulers in *Lunyu* 11.3. Following Hunter's interpretation, the passage explains two pivotal traits as a guideline for rulership; he likewise treats the remaining two traits as tools for character evaluation. As Hunter says, if *Lunyu* 11.3 influenced Emperor Wu's edict because of the two identical terms ('Men of Letters and Learning' and 'government affairs'), the compilers of the *Lunyu* might consult the *Zuozhuan* (if Hunter's textual classification is valid that the *Zuozhuan* was the Pre-Han texts) Michael Hunter, *Kongzi Beyond the Analects*, 84. Regardless of its plausibility, there is no solid evidence to substantiate this statement. The use of identical terms from Emperor Wu's edict, thus, does not prove direct influence from the *Lunyu*. Hunter also acknowledges his speculative analysis. For example, he writes, "The *Lunyu*'s perceived value for the young Emperor Zhao and other scions of the Liu clan may have even been as a kind of manual of character evaluation, a skill they would have been expected to demonstrate as adult rulers." *Ibid.*, 255. Rather than providing concrete evidence, he uses the phrase 'may have even been.' He also suggests, "Armed with a collection of Kongzi sayings on the topic of character evaluation, Liu De might have even sought to persuade Emperor Wu that he could be trusted with the authority to staff his own bureaucracy. Or perhaps Liu De had caught wind of a proposal to establish a semiformal recruitment system for filling the ever-expanding bureaucracy in Chang'an and at the regional courts, in which case Emperor Wu might benefit from a manual of character." *Ibid.*, 307–308. Here, he adopts a speculative tone such as 'could be trusted' and 'might benefit from.'

¹⁰⁵ The account of Shusun Tong in the *Hanshu* resembles the one in the *Shiji*.

Political Ambivalence of the Rites in the Western Han

The two identical *Lunyu* passages on the rites, especially the Zhou rites (*Lunyu* 2.23 and 3.14), express Kongzi's preference for the Zhou rites, yet the Han figures appropriated them to rationalize their political motivations. Shusun Tong turned to *Lunyu* 2.23 and Emperor Ai to *Lunyu* 3.14 to strengthen rulership, whereas Dong Zhongshu appealed to *Lunyu* 2.23 and Wang Mang to *Lunyu* 3.14 in order to regulate it. Their textual usage did not aim to interpret the authentic meaning of these passages. Instead, these four figures leveraged the terse passages to legitimize contrasting agendas within the Han court to advance their intentions.

After defeating Xiang Yu 項羽 (232–202 BCE) and becoming the first emperor of the Western Han dynasty at Dingtao 定陶, Liu Bang 劉邦 (r. 202–195 BCE) confronted the problem that he and his generals had—all of commoner origins—they were unfamiliar with court etiquette. To resolve this problem, Shusun Tong used the content which resembles *Lunyu* 2.23 not to restore the authentic rites but to reform them in order to gratify Liu Bang's immediate needs, by his contribution to strengthening rulership. When Liu Bang asked whether it was challenging or not, Shusun Tong said:

Music was different in the age of Five Di 五帝, rites were not the same in the age of Three Kings 三王, the rites went through detailed embellishments of the pattern, depending on each time and situation of people in each time. Therefore, Xia, Yin, and Zhou rites went through a reduction and augmentation can be known. It is called not repeating each other. I ask for fairly collecting ancient rites and Qin ceremonials to reference and attain them.

通曰, “五帝異樂, 三王不同禮。禮者, 因時世人情爲之節文者也。故夏、殷、周禮所因損益可知者, 謂不相復也。” 臣願頗采古禮與秦儀雜就之。”¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁶ *Hanshu* 43, 2126. Citing Shusun Tong's ideas on the rites, Jeong Yak-yong explicates Kongzi's sanction of the changing rites over time in *Lunyu* 2.23. Jeong Yak-yong, *Noneokokeumju* 論語古今註,

Shusun Tong explicated *Lunyu* 2.23 by framing the rites as subject to change, a fact that Kongzi never articulated in the passage. He insisted on the continuous change of the rites in response to the circumstances of each age. The new dynasty should establish its own rites suited to the present age, even by incorporating elements from Qin ceremonials. In contrast to general classicists who respected the Zhou rites while disagreeing with the Qin style rites, Shusun Tong embraced Qin ceremonials to accommodate Liu Bang's preference. To reform the rites for Liu Bang, he returned to Lu to recruit classicists. Although several Classicists disparaged his project on the grounds that it distorted the authenticity of the Classical rites, he eventually enlisted 30 classicists, proceeded to Chang'an 長安 and, together with his 100 disciples, revised the rites with relative ease.¹⁰⁷ Shusun Tong's ritual reform, endorsed by Liu Bang, retained its standing as a new ritual standard in the Western Han. In the *Shiji*, the Grand Historian recognized him as the Founding Classicist *ruzong* 儒宗 in the Han dynasty. In addition, his legacy continued to receive measured praise even in late Western Han memorials.¹⁰⁸ As a result of the reform, Shusun Tong played a role in legitimizing rulership with his specialized knowledge of the rites as the Classicist.

Shusun Tong's ritual reform represents Liu Bang's political choice of a Classicist who could serve his immediate needs in establishing the imperial system, as opposed to embodying the Classical ideology to influence imperial policy. Liu Bang did not promote him

Tasan Cultural Foundation, accessed September 22, 2025,

https://db.itkc.or.kr/dir/item?itemId=GO#dir/node?grpId=&itemId=GO&gubun=book&depth=5&cate1=Z&cate2=&dataGubun=%EC%B5%9C%EC%A2%85%EC%A0%95%EB%B3%B4&dataId=ITKC_MP_0597A_0350_040_0080

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 2125.

¹⁰⁸ Luke Habberstad, *Forming the Early Chinese Court*, (Seattle: University of Washington, 2017), 79.

to practice the Classical ideal, but instead, gave him an opportunity to invent new rites for rulership. When Shusun Tong first met Liu Bang, he noticed that Liu Bang disliked his Classical apparel. The next time they met, he changed his clothes into Chu style to ingratiate himself with Liu Bang.¹⁰⁹ He accommodated Liu Bang by echoing what he wanted to hear and by conforming to the prevailing trends. He also reformed the rites to meet Liu Bang's demands, instead of pursuing a revival of the Classical rites which Classicists regarded as exemplary forms. He altered the rites to serve the emperor by reinforcing his rulership.

In contrast to Shusun Tong, Dong Zhongshu cited *Lunyu* 2.23 in his third response to limit rulership by cautioning against imperial policy. After stabilizing the empire and rulership through the reign of Emperor Wen and Jing 景帝 (r. 157–141 BCE), Emperor Wu exercised stronger power in military affairs to expand the territories of the empire and levied heavy taxes on peasants to support them. Imperial policies of uncontrolled taxation and wealth imbalance made the lives of common people harsher.¹¹⁰ In the third responses, Dong Zhongshu regarded way as a universal principle, but its application depended on time. He suggested the practical application of the way by pursuing the loyalty *zhong* 忠 of Xia while suppressing the pattern *wen* 文 of Zhou, since the Han succeeded the Zhou dynasty. To support his argument, he used the identical passage of *Lunyu* 2.23, saying “Kongzi said, that ‘Yin succeeded to the rites of Xia; what Yin relinquished and added can be known. Zhou succeeded to the rites of Yin; what Zhou relinquished and added can be known.’ 孔子曰, ‘殷

¹⁰⁹ *Hanshu* 43, 2127.

¹¹⁰ Michael Loewe, *Dong Zhongshu a ‘Confucian’ Heritage and the Chunqiu fanlu*, (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 101.

因於夏禮，所損益可知也。周因於殷禮，所損益可知也。”¹¹¹ Dong Zhongshu deployed Kongzi’s authority to supplement the ambiguous meaning of *Lunyu* 2.23 with his idea about the reforms of institution 改制, which aimed to maintain the way while adjusting its application to the times. Here, he articulated the way:

Therefore, households which receive official salaries maintained their lives to spend the salaries and that’s all. These people had not competed with the enterprise with common people, and then later profits could have been equally distributed, and then the common people’s households could be affluent. This is the principle of Heaven and then it is also the way since high antiquity.

故受祿之家，食祿而已，不與民爭業，然後利可均布，而民可家足。此上天之理，而亦太古之道。¹¹²

Dong Zhongshu’s economic thoughts warned against the extraordinary wealth gap that plunged the common people into misery. He asserted strong and substantive regulations by the emperor to protect the lives of the common people.¹¹³ However, his idea would oppose the imperial policy of economics which emperor Wu promoted to continue waging war against the Xiongnu 匈奴 later.¹¹⁴ Under this socio-economic situation, Dong Zhongshu mentioned *Lunyu* 2.23 to admonish Emperor Wu that he should govern the empire in accordance with the established way Dong Zhongshu should believe in and not to his own arbitrariness. *Lunyu* 2.23 offered Dong Zhongshu a means to check rulership through

¹¹¹ *Hanshu* 56, 2518.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 2521.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 2521.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 2521. In the *Yantielun*, the counsellor advocated the balance-delivery law 均輸法 to allow the governmental dominance of wealth. However, Men of learning disagreed with the counsellor’s proposal. They were concerned that the new law could worsen the wealth gap, saying, “If barren lands are not cultivated, 草萊不闢, agrarian lands are not managed, although [the court] monopolizes every property, have access to every profit, it rather cannot supply as to meet all needs. 田疇不治，雖擅山海之財，通百末之利，猶不能贍也。” *Yantielun Jiaozhu* 鹽鐵論校注, 28.

Kongzi's words.

However, if the responses were not written during the Western Han dynasty, Dong Zhongshu's *Lunyu* quotation could not have conveyed a political response to the Western Han court circumstances. Hunter denies Loewe's conclusion that the three responses reflect Dong Zhongshu's ideas and suspects them to be Eastern Han compositions; nevertheless a close reading of the responses in textual cross-examination with other chapters in the *Hanshu* suggests that, at least with regard to the passages he questions and casts doubt that, Dong Zhongshu authored the responses in his own time. To support his opinion, Hunter suggests that one quotation marker is an exception: "For the *Lunyu* citation, see *Hanshu* 56.2514. Not only does this particular citation break the pattern of *Kongzi yue* 孔子曰 quotations across the memorials, but its quotation marker—"Your subject has heard that the *Lunyu* says" 臣聞論語曰—has no parallel in the extant literature that I am aware of."¹¹⁵ His first evidence, 'the pattern of *Kongzi yue*' cannot validate his claim, since Kongzi never says this phrase in the *Lunyu*, instead, Zi Xia 子夏 (507–407 BCE) says it in *Lunyu* 19.12: "A person who has a beginning and an ending; only he a sage! 有始有卒者, 其惟聖人乎!"¹¹⁶ His second evidence, "Your subject has heard that the *Lunyu* says," has no parallel textual evidence mentioning the *Lunyu*; however, Wei Xiang 魏相 (?–59 BCE) said, "Your subject has heard that the *Yi* says 臣聞易曰,"¹¹⁷ in *Hanshu* 74. Although such an instance is absent in the *Lunyu*, broadening the range of examples to other Classics, such as the *Yi*, does not make the

¹¹⁵ Michael Hunter, "The *Lunyu* As A Western Han Text" in *Confucius and the Analects Revisited: New Perspectives on Composition, Dating, and Authorship*, 68.

¹¹⁶ *Lunyu* 19.12, Yang Bojun, *Lunyu Yizhu* 論語譯註, 199.

¹¹⁷ *Hanshu* 74, 3139.

phrase an exceptional case and thus undermines Hunter's claim. For these reasons, Hunter's challenge is insufficient to refute the authored timeline of Dong Zhongshu in the Western Han dynasty. Furthermore, Michael Loewe analyzes whether the three responses of Dong Zhongshu's fundamental ideas, in spite of later edits¹¹⁸ such as inserting Kangju 康居 to not be a province of the Han dynasty until Yuandi's 元帝 (r. 48–33 BCE) reign¹¹⁹ in the second response, not the third response where Dong Zhongshu cited *Lunyu* 2.23.

The three responses of Dong Zhongshu did not catalyze the promotion of Classics since the reign of Emperor Wu. The heyday of Classics began during the reign of Emperor Yuan, which was a period that became a watershed in which Qin customs diminished at court and a shift toward Zhou models took hold.¹²⁰ In this trend, emperors and ministers used the rites of Zhou to either augment or curtail rulership, and, for example, *Lunyu* 3.14 functioned as political rhetoric to vindicate their intentions. Since Emperor Cheng had no sons, the throne passed to his adopted son, Emperor Ai. Emperor Ai first elevated Miss Ding 定氏 to Empress Gong 恭皇后, who never held the title of empress during her lifetime, died, Emperor Ai quoted *Lunyu* 3.14 to sanction the interment of his mother alongside her husband, King Dingtaogong 定陶恭王:

In the sixth months the day of Gengshen 庚申, Empress dowager Ding died. Emperor Ai said, "I heard a husband and wife are together. *Shi* says, 'When a husband and wife are alive then they stay in different rooms; when they die, then they are buried in the same tomb.' In the ancient time, Ji Wuzi established a tomb; miss Du's funeral site set up at western stairs. He asked for burying together and

¹¹⁸ Michael Loewe, *Dong Zhongshu a 'Confucian' Heritage and the Chunqiu fanlu*, 117.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 78.

¹²⁰ Michael Loewe, The Former Han dynasty in *The Cambridge History of China: Volume 1 The Ch'in and Han Empires 221 B.C.–A.D. 220*, ed. Denis Twitchett and John K. Fairbank (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 198.

sanctioned it. The rites of joint burial had arisen since the Zhou dynasty. ‘How much it was embellished! I am following Zhou.’ A filial son served dead people like serving living people. Empress dowager’s tomb ought to be established in the burial ground of Emperor Gong 恭皇.” Thereupon, Emperor Ai buried her at Dingtao.

六月庚申，帝太后丁氏崩。上曰，“朕聞夫婦一體。詩云，‘穀則異室，死則同穴。’昔季武子成寢，杜氏之殯在西階下，請合葬而許之。附葬之禮，自周興焉。‘郁郁乎文哉！吾從周。’孝子事亡如事存，帝太后宜起陵恭皇之園。”遂葬定陶。¹²¹

Emperor Ai fortified his rulership while respecting the Zhou legacy by treating his mother’s funeral as that of the Empress dowager. The emperor emulated Zhou culture, whereas Kongzi did not adhere to the Zhou burial system because his ancestor was from Yin according to the “Kongzi Shijia,” written by Sima Qian during the reign of Emperor Wu. Even in the “Kongzi Shijia,” the meaning of the phrase, “How much it was embellished! I am following Zhou” is obscure. Since this obscurity engenders interpretive variety, Emperor Ai applied *Lunyu* 3.14 in a way that supported his political aims. In contrast to the age of Emperor Wu, Emperor Ai used the Zhou culture as a means of framing his political motivations as plausible in the later period of the Western Han dynasty.

Wang Mang disagreed with the elevation of Miss Ding to the position of Empress dowager when he was a minister;¹²² meanwhile, he referenced *Lunyu* 3.14 to cement his authority as a regent for Emperor Ping 平帝 (r. 1 BCE–6 AD) who did not hold tangible power in 7 AD. In other words, Wang Mang’s quotation served to enhance his own authority while eroding the rulership. His *Lunyu* 3.14 citation offered legitimacy to bestow upon generals who subdued Zhai Yi 翟義 (?–7 AD) and Huo Hong 霍鴻 (?–7 AD) the rank of

¹²¹ *Hanshu* 11, 339.

¹²² *Hanshu* 99, 4041.

nobility and lands. Wang Mang co-opted the Zhou dynasty institutions for the consolidation of his authority. Since Wang Mang abused his power and sought to challenge the emperor's authority, Zhai Yi invoked this as his justification for staging an insurrection against Wang Mang.¹²³ By quelling the military rebellion led by Zhai Yi and granting to the generals the five ranks of nobility and lands, Wang Mang paraded his entrenched power and authority as the regent. Unlike Emperor Ai, who quoted *Lunyu* 3.14 to uphold rulership, Wang Mang applied the same passage to devise a broader scheme to diminish Emperor Ping's authority.

The Han figures instrumentalized the rites, as explicated by Kongzi's words in the *Lunyu* to enable their political agendas at court. Shusun Tong and Dong Zhongshu utilized the flexibility of *Lunyu* 2.23: Shusun Tong developed a discourse of change to strengthen rulership, whereas Dong Zhongshu emphasized cyclical continuity to limit it. Their philosophical articulation revealed the potential for politicized philosophizing of *Lunyu* 2.23. Emperor Ai and Wang Mang, on the other hand, read reverence for the rites of Zhou and specified its application in their political circumstances for themselves by manipulating the ambiguous nature of *Lunyu* 3.14, deriving their political aims from its brevity. These dynamic cases reveal that textual flexibility and ambiguity underpinned the political ambivalence of the *Lunyu*, enabling its appropriation for contrasting strategies of power.

Political Ambivalence of Rectification of names in the Western Han

"Rectification of names" in *Lunyu* 13.3, as a political principle aimed at establishing social justice, exhibited its political ambivalence by functioning as a rationale to both

¹²³ *Hanshu* 99, 4089–4099.

authorize and constrain rulership. In court politics, “Rectification of names” subordinated an emperor to the law or enabled another emperor to transcend normal policy-making process. To prevent the emperor from carrying out an execution, a Superintendent of Trials *tingwei* 廷尉 whose name was Zhi during the reign of Emperor Ai persuaded the emperor to comply with the law when enforcing it. By contrast, during the reign of Wang Mang, “Rectification of names” served as political rhetoric to justify the arbitrary alteration of the crown prince. “Rectification of names,” as mentioned by these two figures constitutes a political application of the concept. Assessing the extent to which their invocations embodied Kongzi’s authentic intent is fraught with difficulty. It is also challenging to ascertain how they represented Kongzi’s thought in political practice. Yet, this elusiveness reveals a salient aspect of political rhetoric: under the assumption that the concept originated from Kongzi himself, they mobilized Kongzi’s authority to advance their own political aims in the Western Han period.

Zhi’s reference to “Rectification of names” constrained rulership by impressing upon Emperor Ai that his governance must accord with Classics, for “Rectification of names” imposed limits on rulership by providing a criterion to restrain the emperor’s arbitrariness. Zhi’s appeal to “Rectification of names” symbolized the transformed political atmosphere to respect for Classics in court politics, compared to the early Western Han milieu when Liu Bang considered the Classical rites cumbersome on account of their complexity. While Liu Bang refused to govern the empire according to the discipline of Classics, ministers later demanded Emperor Ai to adhere to Classics in the first reign year of Emperor Ai:

A Superintendent of Trials whose name was Zhi regarded that the laws say, “someone hurts a person by means of a sword in fighting should make him construct a walled city for four years without physical punishment; if one who hurts the other seriously punishes one more arduous punishment with one who plans together to be punished in the same manner...” A murderer should be executed, a

person who hurts other people should be punished. It is the comprehensive way from ancient times to today, and unchangeable since the Three Dynasties. Kongzi said, ‘I definitely rectify names..., if names aren’t rectified, then language isn’t compliant. If the language isn’t compliant, then things aren’t perfected. If the things aren’t perfected, then punishment doesn’t attain its goal. If the punishment doesn’t attain its goal, then common people don’t have a thing to put their hands and feet on...’ A sage king does not add punishment by means of his resentment. Yang Ming 楊明 was definitely a dishonest person who hurt the other by means of hurting, and every person who planned with Kuang should be deprived of their ranks and make them construct a walled city for four years without physical punishment.”

廷尉直以爲, “律曰, ‘鬪以刃傷人, 完爲城旦, 其賊加罪一等, 與謀者同罪...’ 殺人者死, 傷人者刑, 古今之通道, 三代所不易也. 孔子曰, ‘必也正名... 名不正, 則至於刑罰不中, 刑罰不中, 而民無所錯手足...’ 聖王不以怒增刑. 明當以賊傷人不直, 況與謀者皆爵減完爲城旦.”¹²⁴

Zhi urged enforcing the law in accordance by the law rather than arbitrariness to Emperor Ai who adopted Zhi’s argument and thus banished Xue Kuang 薛況 to Dunhuang 敦煌, instead of executing him.¹²⁵ This historical scene symbolizes the subordination of the emperor’s governance to Classics, especially through the “Rectification of names,” unlike the governance of the early Western Han emperors such as Liu Bang and Emperor Wu. In this way, ministers drew upon passages found in the *Lunyu* to constrain imperial authority.¹²⁶

While Wang Mang harnessed *Lunyu* 3.14 to restrain rulership, strengthening his authority as the regent before establishing the Xin 新 dynasty, he objectified the “Rectification of names” as political rhetoric to maintain his rulership and gloss over his

¹²⁴ *Hanshu* 83, 3395.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 3396.

¹²⁶ *Ding County Han Tomb Bamboo Strips: Heibei Provincial Institute of Cultural Relics Ding County Han Tomb Bamboo Strips Arrangement Group* 定州漢墓竹簡論語 河北省文物研究所定州漢墓竹簡整理小組, ed. Cai Min, (Beijing: Wenwu, 1997), 1, 60. There is no concrete evidence to substantiate that Zhi read the *Lunyu* and cited *Lunyu* 13.3 to validate his argument on imposing the law. However, the excavation of Ding County *Lunyu* suggests the possibility that Zhi might have read the *Lunyu*, since its archaeological data show that fragmentary *Lunyu* 13.3 passage had already been inserted into the *Lunyu* at least before 55 BCE when Liu Xiu was buried at Dingzhou.

political mistakes. Instead of acknowledging his own mistakes and addressing the problems he had caused, Wang Mang invoked the “Rectification of names” to preserve his rulership by blaming the succession problem for the crisis he faced:

Lin 臨 has an elder brother but is called as the crown prince. Name is not rectified. Kongzi said, “If names aren’t rectified, then language isn’t compliant. If the language isn’t compliant. If the punishment doesn’t attain its goal, then common people don’t have a thing which put their hands and feet on.” I think that since I ascend the throne, then Yin and Yang are not harmonious yet; winds and rains do not arrive at the perfect moment; encountering a lot of droughts, locusts and brown planthoppers become disasters. People eat grains little, they are starving severely. Man 蠻 and Yi 夷 invade, pillage, kill, and sow disorder both inside and outside Central States. The people undertake their work by rectification, but there are no things to put their hands and feet on. I think its faults deeply and find out problem that the name is not rectified on the current situations.

臨有兄而稱太子，名不正。宣尼公曰，“名不正，則言不順。至於刑罰不中，民無錯手足。”惟即位以來，陰陽未和，風雨不時，數遇枯旱蝗螟爲災，穀稼鮮耗，百姓苦飢，蠻夷猾夏，寇賊姦宄，人民正營，無所錯手足。深惟厥咎，在名不正焉。¹²⁷

Wang Mang cited the “Rectification of names” to attribute his political mistakes to his son. His currency reform induced the collapse of the economy, and triggered officials’ misrule.¹²⁸ In addition, his arrogant diplomatic policy alienated the sentiments of the foreign states, as he referred a foreign state name with a derogatory label such as Haguryeo 下句麗, instead of saying its original name, Goguryeo 高句麗.¹²⁹ Considering this circumstance, Wang Mang

¹²⁷ *Hanshu* 99, 4160.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 4112.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 4130. As a result of Wang Mang’s arrogant treatment, Gogureyo seized Goguryeo County, which belonged to the Han dynasty in AD 14. “In the reign of thirty three years... the eight month of fall, King Yuri 瑠璃王 (r. 19 BCE–18 AD) ordered Oh Yi 烏伊 (?–?) and Ma Ri 摩離 (?–?) to lead 20,000 armies to attack Yangmaek 梁貊 where it was located in the west and overthrew the state; and then the generals advanced the troops to attack and seize Gaoguli County in Han. 三十三年... 秋八月，王命烏伊，摩離，領兵二萬，西伐梁貊，滅其國，進兵襲取漢高句麗縣。” Kim Pusik,

said the “Rectification of names” to safeguard his rulership while he was seeking to overcome the unfavorable political situation. However, Wang Mang himself designated Wang Lin (9 BCE–AD 21) as crown prince, since his elder brother, Wang An 王安 (?–AD 21), suffered from mental illness.¹³⁰ For him, the “Rectification of names” was political rhetoric that helped protect his rulership in the context of the “Wang Mang Zhuan 王莽傳.” Furthermore, this example represents the political application of a Classical term in late Western Han court politics. The political ambivalence of the *Lunyu* passages manifested itself in either strengthening or weakening rulership, depending on Wang Mang’s political status in the “Wang Mang Zhuan.” The two cases of Wang Mang’s citation qualify Hunter’s idea that “Wang Mang was simply following the example established by his Western Han predecessors when he used the *Lunyu* (and other classics) to legitimize his rule,”¹³¹ for his citation of the

Shinju Samguk sagi 1 신주 삼국사기 1, ed. Jeong Gubok, Roh Joongguk, Shin Dongha, Kim Taesik and Kwon Deokyoung, (Seoul: The Academy of Korean Studies Press, 1996), 152.

¹³⁰ *Hanshu* 99, 4160.

¹³¹ Michael Hunter, *Confucius Beyond the Analects*, 193. The *Lunyu*, though a collected and selected saying of Kongzi, its citation does not always serve as a projection of one’s image onto Kongzi when cited. This observation casts doubt on Hunter’s assertion that Wang Mang, presented himself as Kongzi by quoting the *Lunyu*. Wang Mang quoted the *Lunyu* passages, but he emulated Shun 舜 during his reign. In the aftermath of establishing the Xin dynasty, he identified himself with a descendant of Shun, saying “My ancestor Shun received throne to Yao, Liu clans’ ancestor was Yao. There have been forms to receive states of each age. I again receive the golden response to Liu clan’s spirit. 予之皇始祖考虞帝受嬪于唐，漢氏初祖唐帝，世有傳國之象，予復親受金策於漢高皇帝之靈。”¹³¹ *Hanshu* 99, 4190. Wang Mang made use of the Shun’s legend to justify the so-called abdication system under Emperor Ping. He likened himself to Shun and fashioned his image as a follower of his ancestor. However, Hunter insists that “In Wang Mang’s hands, the *Lunyu* was not simply a test or qualification for an aspiring ruler. It was also a guide to presenting oneself as a latter-day sage à la Kongzi.”¹³¹ Hunter suggests Wang Mang’s last words that he cited *Lunyu* 7.23 in the *Hanshu*: “Heaven gave virtue to me, how the Han armies do to me! 天生德於予，漢兵其如予何!” Michael Hunter, *Confucius Beyond the Analects*, 192. Wang Mang’s citation indicates that he was in a dangerous situation, similar to the one Kongzi faced when threatened by Huan Tui, as the Han armies attacked him at a court. Even if Wang Mang, at his final moment, said *Lunyu* 7.23 to claim that he would not die there but survive, he does not sustain a consistent portrayal of himself as Kongzi in the “Wang Mang Zhuan.” Rather, he relied on Shun to consolidate his political standing. Quoting the *Lunyu* passage does not by itself guarantee emulation of Kongzi, the context reveals whether he aligns

Lunyu prior to becoming the emperor in fact served to diminish rulership through *Lunyu* 3.14.

The “Rectification of names” in the *Lunyu*, as cited by the Han figures at court, did not aim to practice Kongzi’s ideal. The figures framed the “Rectification of names” as rationalizing and carrying out their political motivations. Thus, they deployed the “Rectification of names” and authority of Kongzi to strengthen or weaken rulership, depending on their political circumstances. These people selected the “Rectification of names” that was compatible with their needs to consolidate validity of their political ideas, among various possibilities opened up by its ambiguous connotations. Zhi taught Emperor Ai through the “Rectification of names” to regulate the emperor’s governance under the discipline of Classics, while Wang Mang cited the “Rectification of names” to deflect blame for his political mistakes without undermining his rulership. These political figures regarded *Lunyu* 13.3 as political rhetoric to support their political agendas.

Conclusion

The *Lunyu* passages conferred rationales in ongoing court debates to justify political intentions concerning rulership, even in the early Western Han, a period in which Classics occupied a marginal position. Their flexibility and ambiguity provided a pliability that could either fortify or undermine the rulership in an ambivalent manner. This rhetorical strategy conveyed the Han figure’s political application of the *Lunyu* passages rather than their attempt to investigate the authentic meaning of Kongzi’s words from a philosophical perspective. Shusun Tong, Emperor Ai, and Wang Mang accomplished the aim of

himself with Kongzi or other figures, such as Shun.

strengthening rulership with *Lunyu* 2.23, 3.14, 13.3 as political rhetoric to support their arguments. Conversely, Dong Zhongshu, Zhi, and Wang Mang employed these same passages to weaken rulership, using them as political rhetoric to intensify their arguments. These citations indicate contextual dependence of the *Lunyu* passages. These instances call into question Hunter's analysis that "the *Lunyu* essentialized 'Kongzi' was by positioning him as a charismatic figure who existed independently of his quotable teachings,"¹³² as the example of the *Lunyu* passages in the Western Han dynasty rely on the political usages by Han figures. Furthermore, no intact *Lunyu* commentary written prior to He Yan's *Lunyu Jijie* in the Three Kingdom period has survived. For this reason, it is impossible to determine whether the *Lunyu* essentialized Kongzi as an independent charismatic figure without investigating usage of the *Lunyu* passages in the Han texts. The six cases discussed above reveal political appropriation of the *Lunyu* in court politics during the Western Han dynasty, thus offering an early precedent for the application of Classics for political purposes.

¹³² Ibid., 301. Hunter continues the sentence by adding, "a shift which paved the way for the 'Kongzi Shijia' biography of Sima Qian and the increasing numbers of Kongzi encomia found in the Western Han sources." Since this thesis already addresses the relation between the "Kongzi Shijia" and the passages found in the *Lunyu* from the "Kongzi Shijia" in Chapter 3, this part has not been included in the direct citation.

V. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the *Lunyu* passages facilitated the legitimization of the Han elites' political claims regarding rulership in court debate during the Western Han dynasty. Although the passages, as a semi-Classic, did not determine policy outcomes, they contributed to solidifying policies at significant moments, such as the establishment of new ritual system, the proper governance of the empire, the construction of the Empress dowager's tomb, the enforcement of the law, the rewarding of those who suppressed rebellions, and the re-appointment of the crown prince. These figures applied the *Lunyu* passages to conduct political affairs when managing the empire. For them, the *Lunyu* functioned less as a manual of direct instruction than as a rhetorical device which they used to justify and advance their political aims at court. Therefore, their application illustrates one mechanism by which the Classical text shaped court politics during the Western Han dynasty.

The flexibility of *Lunyu* passages engenders multiple interpretations of a single passage, due to their brevity. This inherent flexibility of *Lunyu* 7.1 suggests different political designations for Kongzi, contingent upon which commentary they follow. The predominant Han usages of *Lunyu* 7.1 do reconcile the apparent contradiction between the myth that Kongzi wrote the *Chunqiu* and the view that he followed the tradition. Yet, the predominant commentaries of *Lunyu* 7.1 leave room for an alternative interpretation of Kongzi's transmission, as supported by Sima Qian's account. This interpretive openness of *Lunyu* 7.1 exemplifies how the flexibility of this passage has supplied the basis for justifications in political debates.

Along with its flexibility, the ambiguity of the *Lunyu* passages, deriving from its

terseness, fashions diverse images of Kongzi. This external ambiguity, arising from the lack of context, enables readers to fill the textual gaps and construct different portraits of Kongzi. By maintaining this ambiguous nature of *Lunyu* passages, Sima Qian, in the “Kongzi Shijia,” portrayed Kongzi as serving either to uphold or curb ducal authority. His description of Kongzi as a ritual-centric character, using some passages found in the *Lunyu* imparts the impression that the rites held salience for Kongzi, while it refrains from clarifying whether Kongzi pursued strengthening the ruler’s authority or not. Sima Qian’s deployment of the “Rectification of names” highlights its significance, although he quotes it only twice in the “Kongzi Shijia.” He leaves open the interpretive potential as to whether Kongzi’s Rectification of names bolsters ducal authority or not. The insufficient contextual framing of the passages empowers Sima Qian to leverage their political ambiguity to open multiple interpretive possibilities concerning the persona of Kongzi.

The political ambivalence of the *Lunyu* passages, grounded in their flexible and ambiguous nature, positioned the text as a rhetorical device through which the Han figures justified and advanced their political aims to either strengthen or limit rulership at court. During the establishment of the Western Han dynasty, a phrase found in the *Lunyu* provided justification for rationalizing ritual reform while adopting Qin ceremonial practices. In the middle of the Western Han dynasty, the same passage aimed to limit rulership. Later, several figures appropriated the *Lunyu* passages to implement their own agendas, exemplifying its continued adaptability to diverse political circumstances. In this way, the *Lunyu* operated as a versatile resource in response to political circumstances rather than fixating a singular persona of Kongzi at court during the Western Han dynasty.

This thesis elucidates the political role of the *Lunyu* through a qualitative approach

based on classical-learning methodology. This methodology complements and corrects the limitations of electronic database searches, which tends to neglect close readings because of its excessive emphasis on quantitative data. While the previous research argues that “the *Lunyu*’s perceived value for the imperial Liu clan may have even been as a manual of character evaluation, a skill that emperors and kings were expected to exercise once in office,”¹³³ it has done so only in broad terms and without meticulous case studies. By contrast, the thesis substantiates its argument through close readings of specific cases and demonstrates ambivalent applications of the *Lunyu* in court politics. Hence, the thesis contributes to broadening our understanding of the *Lunyu*’s political functions by providing concrete evidence.

However, the small amount of evidence limits this thesis from offering an expansive account of the role of the *Lunyu* in early China. The six cases represent empirical usage of the *Lunyu*, whereas the number of cases is insufficient to establish a general pattern of the Han figures’ *Lunyu* readings and applications. Thus, the current research does not deny the possibility of the *Lunyu* as a means of ‘character evaluation,’ but, for the same reason, there is no solid evidence to support this broad narrative. The other fundamental limitation of this thesis arises from the indeterminate compilation date of the *Lunyu* during the Western Han dynasty. Nevertheless, it has illuminated one facet of the political application of the *Lunyu* in the Western Han dynasty through an empirical approach.

Considering these limitations, research on the political role of the *Lunyu* in the Western Han dynasty remains unstable and narrow. Extending this line of inquiry to the

¹³³ Michael Hunter, “The Lunyu As A Western Han Text” in *Confucius and the Analects Revisited: New Perspectives on Composition, Dating, and Authorship*, 87.

Eastern Han and Three Kingdoms period—through sources such as the *Hanshu*, *Baihutongyi* 白虎通義, *Houhanshu*, *Sanguozhi* 三國志, *Jinshu* 晉書 as well as Wang Bi's 王弼 (226–249) commentary on *Laozi* and *Zhouyi* 周易, He Yan's *Lunyu Jijie* and Han Kangbo's 韓康伯 *Zhouyi* commentary—promises to further clarify how the three texts would shape political discourse across dynasties. In particular, the synthesized Han readings of the three scholars in the Wei-Jin period would inherit certain examples that elites had applied at court from the Eastern Han to the Three Kingdoms period, while transforming others through mystery learning *Xuanxue* 玄學. Future research in this direction will contribute to illuminating how early commentarial traditions absorbed and reshaped political rhetoric within the commentaries of the early Chinese texts.

VI. EPILOGUE

The commentarial history of the *Lunyu* problematizes any attempt to anchor the image of Kongzi, revealing a persistent political potential to echo debates over the rulership, as the terse length of its passages conditions the reproduction of the multifaceted politico-philosophical discourse. The concise length of the passages in general engenders a conundrum in the *Lunyu*. To be specific, the dearth of sufficient explanations for crucial meanings in the *Lunyu* points to a lack of philosophical systematicity. While Bryan Van Norden defines this systematic issue in terms of the virtue of Kongzi by highlighting its ethical idea,¹³⁴ the enigmatic contents of numerous passages, through their flexibility, can also shape the *Lunyu* into politico-philosophical discourse that may serve various political ends. This epilogue examines how the flexibility of *Lunyu* 12.1. generates a plurality of Kongzi's political stance through a politico-philosophical lens.

Lunyu 12.1 exemplifies the political flexibility of the *Lunyu* passages, with its brevity inviting diverse interpretations, in turn producing multifaceted political arguments to either uphold or curb the ruler's authority. Classical traditions aimed at elucidating the meaning of the Classics and Traditions have amplified the philosophical potential by using the interpretive openness of *Lunyu* 12.1, owing to its pithiness. To demonstrate the political flexibility of *Lunyu* 12.1, this thesis extends Philip J. Ivanhoe's ethical framework comprising Zhu Xi's recovery model,¹³⁵ Xunzi's 荀子 reformation model,¹³⁶ and Mengzi's 孟子

¹³⁴ Bryan Van Norden, "Unweaving the 'One Thread' of *Analects* 4:15," in *Kongzi and the Analects*, 230–231.

¹³⁵ Philip J. Ivanhoe, *Confucian Moral Self Cultivation*, 11.

(372–289 BCE) development model to political philosophy. These models introduce disparate facets of self-cultivation and have the potential to facilitate the analysis of the political emphases in distinctive commentaries on *Lunyu* 12.1. When applied to *Lunyu* 12.1, they generate distinct political interpretations. Since the discipline of self-cultivation serves as preparation for governing others in Classical and Neo-Confucian thought, these models bridge the ethical domain and political authority, clarifying how ideas of self-cultivation structure politico-philosophical discourse on rulership. Among a plethora of *Lunyu* 12.1 commentaries, this thesis compares three: those of Zhu Xi, the Han–studies *hanxue* 漢學 commentaries, developed by Mao Qiling 毛奇齡 (1623–1716), Itō Jinsai 伊藤仁齋 (1627–1705) and Ogyū Sorai, and Yu Yue 俞樾 (1821–1907) as these commentaries reflect philosophical development of *Lunyu* 12.1 into the ‘Neo-Confucian’ model (influenced by Buddhist-Daoist thought), the Xunzi model, and the Mengzi model. By examining this hermeneutic diversity of *Lunyu* 12.1, which has absorbed a variety of philosophies and enabled ongoing evolution, this epilogue shows how the image and philosophy of Kongzi derived from the *Lunyu* have remained fluid and adaptable since at least the Western Han dynasty.

The prevalent *Lunyu* 12.1 translation following Zhu Xi’s commentary, “conquer oneself and return to the rites 克己復禮,” can empower anyone to inspire other people who have not yet conquered themselves and returned to the rites, if that person recovers one’s humaneness 仁 by conquering oneself and returning to the rites. Under this logic, Zhu Xi’s recovery model through recovering humaneness guarantees, in this case, influencing other people

¹³⁶ Ibid., 54.

rather than ensuring political legitimation. A tyrant, who wields power without official process, can still govern others if he meets the condition mentioned above. In theory, this commentary allows a humane minister to guide an emperor, and people may defer to the minister's guidance rather than the emperor's own decision, since everyone under the Heaven attributes to him humane 天下歸仁,¹³⁷ according to Zhu Xi's commentary, "return is the same as attributing. 歸, 猶與也."¹³⁸ The predominant interpretation of *Lunyu* 12.1 pertains to the authority to influence political decisions under the emperor's authority.

Although many scholars adopt Zhu Xi's commentary to research the authentic meaning of the idea in *Lunyu* 12.1, spoken by Kongzi, who lived in the late Chunqiu period, the popular translation may not reflect the philosophical milieu of early China. First, the verb, "to conquer *ke* 克" entails subduing an object. Early Chinese employed this nuance in its linguistic usage to describe conquering one's foes, not oneself. The authors (or compilers) of the *Zuozhuan* utilized *ke* to conquer, "Even when King Wu conquered Shang and moved the nine cauldrons to the settlement at Luo 雒, there were nonetheless some men of lofty principles who criticized him. 武王克商, 遷九鼎于雒邑, 義士猶或非之."¹³⁹ The authors (or compilers) of the *Shu* likewise used *ke* to mean in the same way: "When the king returned from vanquishing Xia and came to Po 亳, he made a grand announcement to the myriad regions. 王歸自克夏, 至于亳. 誕告萬邦."¹⁴⁰ In addition to the *Zuozhuan* and the

¹³⁷ *Lunyu* 12.1. Yang Bojun, *Lunyu Yizhu* 論語譯註, 121.

¹³⁸ Zhu Xi, *Sishu Zhangjuzhu* 四書章句集註, 131.

¹³⁹ *Zuo Tradition*, 78–79.

¹⁴⁰ Kong Yingda, *Shangshu Zhengyi* 尚書正義, ed. Ma Xinmin, (Beijing: Beijing University Press, 2000), 237. "The Shu King," in *Sacred Books of China: The Texts of Confucianism*, translated by

Shu, Sima Qian also followed the same usage in the *Shiji*: “King Wu of Zhou defeated Zhou 紂. 周武王克紂.”¹⁴¹ These representative examples do not use *ke* to conquer oneself.

Since “conquer oneself” regards oneself as the object that one should defeat, “conquer” indicates the necessity of antagonizing oneself; thus, one imagines a divided set. Zhu Xi equated oneself with selfishness saying, “one is one’s selfish desires 己, 謂身之私欲也.”¹⁴² The concept of conquering oneself epitomizes a Sinicized Buddhist legacy to pursue complete purity, free from any dust, in human nature.¹⁴³ Zhu Xi even acknowledged the similarity of his commentary on “conquer oneself” to Buddhism, saying, “If this Buddhism exhausts that which has the capacity to conquer oneself, although it is permissible to say to not have conquered one’s selfishness, but Buddhism cannot return to the rites. 若是佛家, 儘有能克己者, 雖謂之無己私可也, 然卻不曾復得禮也.”¹⁴⁴ These words indicate the limitation of Buddhism in sharing the idea “to conquer oneself,” as Buddhism does not advance to the next stage, “to return to the rites.”

The verb, “return,” underscores Zhu Xi’s belief that one can recover one’s perfect human nature, while implying that one has moved away from one’s original place. It also denotes the

James Legge, (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1879), 89.

¹⁴¹ Sima Qian, *Shiji* 42. (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1959), 1758.

¹⁴² Zhu Xi, *Sishu Zhangjuzhu* 四書章句集註, 131. In contrast to Zhu Xi, Yang Xiong 揚雄 (53 BCE–AD 18) and Xing Bing 邢昺 (932–1100) did not conflate the self with selfishness. Yang Xiong urged conquering one’s selfish desires within the unified self; he said, “defeating one’s selfishness is called conquest 勝己之私之謂克” in *Fanyan* 法言. Xing Bing also urged to conquer one’s desire, not oneself; he said, “Ji means oneself. When a person experiences preferences and desires, he must control them in accordance with the rites and righteousness. 己謂身也. 身有嗜慾, 當以禮義齊之” in the *Lunyu Zhushu* 論語注疏. Xing Bing, *Lunyu Zhushu* 論語注疏 177–178.

¹⁴³ Philip J. Ivanhoe, *Confucian Moral Self Cultivation*, 55.

¹⁴⁴ Zhu Xi, *Zhuzi Sishu Yulei* 朱子四書語類, (Shanghai: Shanghai Guji, 1992), 630.

rites as an intrinsic characteristic of human beings. This idea assumes that Kongzi argues the rites constitute something natural for people. In early Chinese texts, *fu* means return; this return designates a physical relocation rather than a mental restoration in Classics. In *Lunyu* 10.4, “[Kongzi] returned to his place.”¹⁴⁵ In the *Yili* 儀禮, “return” also signifies the physical relocation, “Court aristocrats walked down [the stairs] and returned to their places 大夫降復位.”¹⁴⁶ By contrast, “return,” indicates a mental restoration in early Chinese texts, such as in the *Laozi* 老子: “The teeming creatures. All return to their separate roots. Returning to one’s roots is known as stillness. This is what is meant by returning to one’s destiny. Returning to one’s destiny is known as the constant. Knowledge of the constant is known as discernment. 夫物芸芸，各復歸其根。歸根曰靜，是謂復命。復命曰常，知常曰明。”¹⁴⁷ The concept of “return” shifts from a concrete act of moving to one’s original place to an abstract process of recovering one’s fundamental nature, aligning with metaphysical notions of stillness. This phrase forms the basis for Ogyū Sorai’s critique to Zhu Xi in *Longocho* 論語徵: “*fu* is ‘to return’ in Zhu Xi’s commentary. It originates from Kong Anguo’s 孔安國 commentary. However, it reaches to say it by means of ‘returning to origin.’ It is indeed Laozi’s idea. I cannot follow it. 朱註反復也，本諸孔安國。然至於以復初爲說，亦老氏之意。”¹⁴⁸ Zhu Xi’s commentary results from the expansion of “neo-Confucian” philosophical properties to embrace Daoism.

¹⁴⁵ *Lunyu* 10.4. Yang Bojun, *Lunyu Yizhu* 論語譯註, 97.

¹⁴⁶ Jia Gongyan, *Yili Zhushu* 儀禮註疏, ed. Ma Xinmin (Beijing: Beijing University Press, 2000), 403.

¹⁴⁷ *Tao Te Ching*, trans. D.C. Lau (New York: Penguin Books, 1963), 20.

¹⁴⁸ Ogyū Sorai, *Longocho* 2 論語徵 2, 126–127. Ogyū Sorai, *Longocho* 3 論語徵 3, 9–10.

Considering *Lunyu* 12.1 alone, Zhu Xi downplays the rites of their particularities to reframe them as manifestations of universal principle. Zhu Xi sought to draw the Classics and Classical terminology into a source of everlasting principles, elevating them beyond practical contingencies, in contrast to their pragmatic application in Han dynasty politics.¹⁴⁹ Zhu Xi commented, “the rites are the detailed embellishments of the pattern-principle of Heaven. 禮者，天理之節文也。”¹⁵⁰ In Zhu Xi’s broader philosophy, the rites relegate their primary function of consolidating hierarchy between subject and object, the father and the son, the teacher and students to a secondary significance, as the rites embody the definitive and ultimate principle *li* 理 that everyone must recover. However, Kongzi never relates the rites with principle in the *Lunyu*.

Another *Lunyu* 12.1 translation, developed by Han commentary, “control oneself and repeat the rites,” can promote a person to regulate oneself within the boundaries of the rites, as one continues to exercise self-control while repeating them. Following this logic, one who “controls oneself” repeats the prescribed rites to become habituated to them, and at the same time the repetition of the rites amounts to self-control through the repetitive practice. If ministers repeat the rites to control themselves, they will treat their rulers in accordance with the rites; if the rulers likewise accustom themselves to the rites as a means of self-control, they will treat their ministers in accordance with the rites. This politico-philosophical reading of *Lunyu* 12.1 parallels Xunzi’s re-formation model in human beings’ pursuit of physical desires urged the need to re-form them through mastering the sages’ legacy to curb bad human nature. The idea of practicing the rites the sages created for the people could suppress

¹⁴⁹ Michael Nylan, *The Five “Confucian Classics*, (New Heaven: Yale University Press, 2001), 56.

¹⁵⁰ Zhu Xi, *Sishu Zhangjuzhu* 四書章句集註, 131.

any challenge to the sage kings' authority.¹⁵¹ Within this framework, continual practice of the rites warrants the authority established by the sage kings and ensures that the rulers' authority exceeds the authority held by ministers, who cannot override it so long as they control themselves through the rites.

This reading of *Lunyu* 12.1 "to control oneself" alludes to growth through persistent self-control, since the verb "control" implies maintaining an exemplary state rather than indulging one's instincts, and the object "oneself" connotes a person with the potential for refinement rather than eliminating a negative entity such as selfishness. Attested in the Han commentary, this philosophical interpretation develops Ma Rong's 馬融 (79–166) definition that "*keji* is to control oneself 克己, 約身",¹⁵² as recorded in He Yan's *Lunyu Jijie* 論語集解. Later scholars such as Mao Qiling and Ogyū Sorai, working in the same period, drew upon Ma Rong's commentary to criticize Zhu Xi's commentary of 'to conquer oneself,' and Yang Bojun incorporated Mao Qiling's commentary in the *Lunyu Yizhu* 論語譯註.¹⁵³

Scholars who advocate Han-studies on *Lunyu* 12.1 build their analysis on evidence to validate their commentaries. Whereas "to conquer" in "to conquer oneself (selfishness)" has a lack of philological evidence in early Chinese texts, "to control" in "to control oneself" appears in them. In the *Lunyu Jijiupian* 論語稽求篇, Mao Qiling cites the *Houhanshu* 後漢書 to buttress the Han commentary that "Ma Rong regards 'to control oneself' as *keji*; the

¹⁵¹ Philip J. Ivanhoe, *Confucian Moral Self Cultivation*, 40–41.

¹⁵² Xing Bing, *Lunyu Zhushu* 論語註疏, 177.

¹⁵³ Zhu Xi, *Sishu Zhangjuzhu* 四書章句集註, 131–132. Yang Bojun, *Lunyu Yizhu* 論語譯註, 121.

following theory is like it. 馬融以約身爲克己，從來說如此。”¹⁵⁴ To be specific, he quotes:

[The Empress Dowager] wears clothes modestly and eats food meagerly. You lead people, reducing the number of meats, the number of chariot-horses in order to well provide for the common people. [Your] mercy of compassion is like observing toddlers. [You] control yourself and draw back faults by yourself, and brighten your fame among the lower classes.

菲薄衣食，躬率群下，損膳解驂，以贍黎苗。惻隱之恩，猶視赤子。克己引愆，顯揚仄陋。¹⁵⁵

Keji means “control oneself” here, not “conquer oneself.” One might argue that “conquer oneself” could also apply to this context since the Empress Dowager maintained a frugal lifestyle for the sake of providing for the common people, so she seems to have conquered her selfish desires. Yet if her good governance results from her innate talents, there would have been no need for her to conquer selfish desires. In the first part of the edict *shu* 書, Marquis of Pingwang 平望侯 Liu Yi 劉毅, however, eulogizes, “I think the Empress Dowager receives the talent of great sages. 伏惟皇太后膺大聖之姿.” Considering this context, *keji* is “to control oneself” rather than “conquer oneself.” In conjunction with Mao Qiling’s example, Wang Zhengjun’s 王政君 (71 BCE –AD 13) edict to Gongsun Hong 公孫弘 (199–121 BCE) also bolsters *ke* as meaning “to control,” instead of “to conquer.” In the *Shiji*, Wang Zhengjun said:

The Empress Dowager issued an edict to Grand Minister over the Masses 大司徒 and Grand Minister of Works 大司空. “... Since Han rose, there has not been like prime minister Marquis of Pinjin 平津侯 Gongsun Hong who practices a frugal

¹⁵⁴ Mao Qiling, *Lunyu Jijiupian* 論語稽求篇, accessed September 22, 2025, <https://www.kanripo.org/text/KR1h0060/005#1a>

¹⁵⁵ Fan Ye, *Houhanshu* 後漢書, (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1965), 426.

lifestyle, considers properties scant importance but put weight on righteousness among important prime ministers. While serving as the prime minister, he wore linen clothes, he ate unpolished rice, did not have more than one kind of meat. Thereupon, he is a person who was good at distributing all of his salaries to guests in order to give them, had nothing that was left. He truly controlled himself inside and followed imperial announcements outside.”

太皇太后詔大司徒大司空...維漢興以來，股肱宰臣身行儉約，輕財重義，較然著明，未有若故丞相平津侯公孫弘者也。位在丞相而為布被，脫粟之飯，不過一肉。故人所善賓客皆分奉祿以給之，無有所餘。誠內自克約而外從制。¹⁵⁶

Wang Zhengjun’s *ke* usage reveals Gongsun Hong’s self-control rather than conquering selfishness. This usage also underpins Mao Qiling’s citation, consolidating the philological foundation of the Han commentary to interpret *keji* as “to control oneself.”

As Ma Rong regards *ji* as oneself, *ji* has the capacity to develop oneself through self-control or cultivation in the context of the *Lunyu*. Mao Qiling impugns Zhu Xi’s commentary since Zhu Xi’s commentary causes a paradox between *ji* of *keji* as selfishness and *ji* of *youji* 由己 “deriving from oneself” in the latter part of *Lunyu* 12.1. Mao Qiling disputes Zhu Xi’s commentary:

This is originally Ziyun’s 子雲 (Yang Xiong’s polite name) words, ‘defeating one’s selfishness’ he calls *ke*, but what he means to defeat one’s selfishness he definitely adds ‘*zhisi* 之私’ the two characters; it is not once called selfishness. *Jizhu* regards one as one’s selfishness, but does not genuinely annotate self as selfishness, but succeeds in its fault. People turbidly say one equals selfishness; it reaches to gloss one to mean selfishness in a classical Chinese dictionary, citing *keji* in the *Lunyu* as evidence, then fraud is too serious. Without discussing the meaning of character like it, it is just to say that a person does not have two selves by means of the *Lunyu*. Now, there has ‘humaneness comes from the self.’ With the character *ji* here, if one gloss takes it as self, and another takes it as selfishness, how can it be communicated?

此本子雲勝己之私之謂克語，然亦謂勝己之私必于己字下添之私二字，未嘗謂己即私也。集註以己為身之私欲，亦不純以己註私，而承其弊者，濶曰己

¹⁵⁶ *Shji* 112, 2963.

私。致字書註己作私，引論語克己爲證，則誣甚矣。毋論字義無此，即以論語言人無二己。現有爲仁由己。己字在下，而一作身解，一作私解，其可通乎？¹⁵⁷

As Mao Qiling notes above, in the *Lunyu*, the character *ji* does not carry the connotation of selfishness. *Ji* pursues persistent growth and functions in an agentive manner through self-cultivation and self-control by oneself rather than being eliminated. In addition to *keji* and *weiji*, “cultivate oneself *xiuji* 修己” stands as a representative expression in the *Lunyu* 14.42. “To cultivate oneself in order to take care of the common people. 修己以安百姓” does not allow an interpretive space to construe oneself as selfish, rather oneself underscores an altruistic aim to cultivate oneself for the people. Despite the haphazard characteristics of the *Lunyu* passages, no instances of *ji* entail a passive meaning and eliminative necessity; rather, in *Lunyu* 12.1, *ji* also conveys oneself.

Complementing the analysis of each character in *keji*, *keji* itself means “to control oneself” in the Han text. Thus, Ma Rong’s commentary reflects a Han person’s usage of *keji*. This commentary matches the Han dynasty usage, recorded by Ban Gu in the *Hanshu*:

[Wang] Mang just stood out above his fellows, succeeded his four uncles and supported governing. He desired to propagate his fame to surpass his uncles. Thereupon he has controlled himself and has not been weary; invited several Men of intelligence and fine qualities in order to employ them as aides and clerks. He spent all his prizes, bestowed towns, and money in order to host classical scholars; he became ever more frugal.

莽既拔出同列，繼四父而輔政，欲令名譽過前人，遂克己不倦，聘諸賢良以爲掾史，賞賜邑錢悉以享士，愈爲儉約。¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁷ Mao Qiling, *Lunyu Jijiupian* 論語稽求篇, accessed September 22, 2025, <https://www.kanripo.org/text/KR1h0060/005#1a>

¹⁵⁸ Ban Gu, *Hanshu* 99, (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1962), 4041.

In this passage, *keji* cannot mean to “conquer oneself” since Wang Mang later became an extravagant figure. Moreover, Ban Gu underscores Wang Mang’s performance to seize power for the future when Wang Mang was young. Wang Mang controlled his expenditures to propagate his fame. Considering Wang Mang’s entire life course, as followed by Ban Gu’s record, Wang Mang controlled his desires only until he attained power.

Like Kong Anguo, Zhu Xi explains that *fu* is *fan* 反;¹⁵⁹ for Zhu Xi, *fan* means “to return.” By contrast, Ogyū Sorai expounds *fan* as “to reflect.”¹⁶⁰ One may reflect upon the rites on a single occasion, but they should reflect upon the rites whenever confronted with situations that demand them to recall the rites. In one’s entire life, this act of “reflection” does not only occur once; rather it happens numerous times. For this reason, this reflection implicates “repeat,” as Itō Jinsai comments it as “repeat” in the *Longgokogi* 論語古義.¹⁶¹ Even in the *Lunyu*, *fu* signifies “repeat”¹⁶² or “again,”¹⁶³ which carries the sense of repetition. Of course, *fu* also denotes to “return” in *Lunyu* 10.4; however, this returning means a physical relocation.¹⁶⁴ In the *Hanshu*, Ban Gu also expresses “to return” through using *fu*:

“In the Three King’s discipline, among things which have begun but are not identical, but all have been lost; or there are those of long duration but have not

¹⁵⁹ Zhu Xi, *Sishu Zhangjuzhu* 四書章句集註, 131.

¹⁶⁰ Ogyū Sorai, *Longocho* 2 論語徵 2, 127. Ogyū Sorai, *Longocho* 3 論語徵 3, 10.

¹⁶¹ Koyasu Nobukuni, *Itō Jinsai: Modern Translation and Commentary of Longokogi Vol. 2* 仁齋論語: 「論語古義」現代語譯と評釋下, (Tokyo: Perikansha, 2017), 48. Itō Jinsai, *Longokogi* 論語古義, trans. Kyungyeol Choi, (Seoul: Greenbee, 2016), 774.

¹⁶² *Lunyu* 11.4 Yang Bojun, *Lunyu Yizhu* 論語譯註, 109.

¹⁶³ *Lunyu* 6.9, 7.5, 7.8, 10.3 Yang Bojun, *Lunyu Yizhu* 論語譯註, 57, 66, 67, 96.

¹⁶⁴ Shin Jeonggeun, *Discovery of Humanness* 사람다움의 발견, (Seoul: Ihaksa, 2004), 416.

changed and yet are called the way. How is the meaning different?” I heard that what is joyful but not chaotic, as repeated without becoming disliked is called the Way.

“夫三王之教所祖不同，而皆有失，或謂久而不易者道也，意豈異哉？”臣聞夫樂而不亂復而不厭者謂之道。¹⁶⁵

Dong Zhongshu employs *fu* to express the repetitive characteristics of the way here; one may translate it as “repeat” and “repeat” even implies multiple repetition. The philological evidence substantiates the validity of Itō Jinsai’s commentary that *fu* in *kejifuli* could mean “to repeat.” Because of the semantic value of *fu* which embodies the sense of “to reflect,” *fu* in *kejifuli* can broaden its meaning to embrace the connotation of “repetition” even though its primordial meaning is “to reflect.”

Since “repeating the rites” manifests a specific mode of “controlling oneself,” “repeating the rites” entails “to control oneself” rather than understanding it as the later stage “returning to the rites” that results from “conquering oneself.” This logic, however, does not clarify the specific characteristics of the rites in *Lunyu* 12.1, as Kongzi does not account for them. Using its expansive interpretive space, Ogyū Sorai suggests, “‘In general, it is to say that all rites are the former kings.’ 凡言禮者皆先王之禮也.”¹⁶⁶ Even if Kongzi does not define the rites as the former kings’ rites here, he relates the rites to the Three Dynasties in the *Lunyu*.¹⁶⁷ This evidence, of course, cannot prove the definition of the rites, but it may reconstruct the traits of the rites based on Kongzi’s words in the *Lunyu*, rather than considering the rites as “the detailed embellishment of the pattern-principle of Heaven.” In

¹⁶⁵ *Hanshu* 56, 2514.

¹⁶⁶ Ogyū Sorai, *Longocho* 2 論語徵 2, 127. Ogyū Sorai, *Longocho* 3 論語徵 3, 9.

¹⁶⁷ *Lunyu* 2.23, *Lunyu* 3.9 Yang Bojun, *Lunyu Yizhu* 論語譯註, 21, 26.

the *Lunyu*, Kongzi never talks about the principle *li* 理; so Zhu Xi's commentary adds an anachronistic concept to apply the *Lunyu* 12.1 to rationalize validity of his philosophical ideas later. (However, he contributes to amplifying the philosophical discourse of *Lunyu* 12.1 through substituting principle for the rites). On the other hand, at least, Kongzi respects the rites of the Three Dynasties in the *Lunyu*; thus, there remains a potential to regard the rites as the former King's productions in the *Lunyu*. One may still question to maintain the validity of translation of "defeating oneself" to originate from Xing Bing's commentary. However, this commentary also posits a concept, heart and mind *xin* 心, which Kongzi does not deal with in the *Lunyu*. The translation often traces to Xing Bing's commentary that states, "A person has preferences and desires. 身有嗜慾," borrowing from Liu Xuan's 劉炫 (546–613) commentary of the *Zuozhuan* in the Sui 隋 dynasty.¹⁶⁸ One's preferences and desires arise in response to the external stimuli or to the internal feelings by heart and mind, but there is no concrete philological evidence that Kongzi talks about the heart and mind from this perspective. Instead, Kongzi introduces how to practice "to control oneself and repeat the rites" to Yan Hui 顏回 (521–489 BCE): he said, "If it is not the rites, do not look at it; if it is not the rites, do not listen to it; if it is not the rites, do not speak of it; if it is not the rites, do not move accordingly. 非禮勿視, 非禮勿聽, 非禮勿言, 非禮勿動."¹⁶⁹ This discipline, at least, justifies construing the rites as an external criterion such as a social norm that we must follow, irrespective of any potential one may have; it does not, however, deny the possibility of such potential.

¹⁶⁸ Kong Yingda, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan Zhengyi* 春秋左傳正義, 1507.

¹⁶⁹ *Lunyu* 12.1 Yang Bojun, *Lunyu Yizhu* 論語譯註, 121.

The Han-based commentary reads to control oneself while repeating the rites, taking *keji* and *fuli* not as a sequence but as concurrent practices. This idea supports the claim that a ruler can achieve a praiseworthy rule while retaining the throne. In other words, imperial legitimacy follows from practice rather than prior vindication. In the *Caizhonglang Ji* 蔡中郎集, Cai Yong's 蔡邕 (133–192) eulogy exemplifies this reading:

Having a meal, she [Cui's 崔氏 wife] did not add side dishes; wearing clothes, she did not wear diaphanous silks. She regarded frugality as honor but considered extravagance as humiliation. Her children are confident, indeed become good talented people all around the world; they received this righteous method from a great mother. She disciplined them by means of gentleness, managed them by means of strictness; expressing her anger, she did not hurt love, when delighted, she did not disorder dignity. She introduced them to proper bounds, eventually her children truly stored this model behavior up! Thereby, they were employed and promoted, were gratified by his [emperor's] favor... As a titled lady of the Imperial House, she was persistently diligent, repeating the rites and controlling herself. That is why people also have saying that a humane person will have longevity.

食不兼膳，服不纖縠，以儉爲榮，以奢爲辱。堂堂其胤，惟世之良，于其令母，受茲義方，訓以柔和，董以嚴剛，怒不傷愛，喜不亂莊。納之軌度，終然允藏！是用登臚，享其寵光... 帝室命婦，猶日孜孜，復禮克己，人亦有言，仁者壽長。¹⁷⁰

The textual record offers no solid evidence for interpreting *keji* as a “conquering oneself,” as Cai Yong does not describe Cui's wife as a figure who turns over a new leaf. Rather, he believes that she educates her children in accordance with the rites, so her children have successful careers later. Furthermore, he does not arrange *fuli* to be a prerequisite to *keji*; the contents of Cai Yong's eulogy present the relation between *keji* and *fuli* as concurrent rather than sequential. Since Cai Yong praised her to nurture great subjects in her household, his expression on *fulikeji* 復禮克己 coheres with the idea that household governance parallels

¹⁷⁰ Cai Yong, *Caizhonglangji* 蔡中郎集, accessed September 22, 2025, <https://www.kanripo.org/text/KR4b0002/006#1a>

governing affairs in the *Lunyu*.¹⁷¹ This example shows that, at least, Cai Yong, a Han figure, regards *keji* and *fuli* as simultaneous practices, underscoring the persistent practice of the rites.

One may challenge *fuli* in the Han dynasty to mean “returning to the rites,” this translation, however, translates the passage in a literal manner without considering its literary trait under the context of the *Lienü zhuan* 列女傳. Liu Xiang 劉向 (77–6 BCE) praised Master Da’s 荅 wife, who “returned to the rites” after leaving her husband before he was punished to serve her mother-in-law: “

The wife of Dazi of Tao said, “...Now, while my husband governs Tao, our family prospers but the city is poor. The ruler is not respected and the people are not sustained—all clear omens of destruction. I wish to take leave with my child.” The mother-in-law was furious and expelled them. After a period of a few years, Dazi’s family was indeed put to death for grant and only his elderly mother was spared. Dazi’s wife and young child thus returned the rites to care for her, so that she lived out her Heaven-appointed days. A man of discernment would say, “The wife of Dazi was able to use her sense of what was right to scorn profit. Although she violated the rites by asking to leave her husband, ultimately, she embraced to return to the rites wholeheartedly. This can be called far-reaching wisdom.”

婦曰，“... 今夫子治陶，家富國貧，君不敬，民不戴，敗亡之徵見矣。願與少子俱脫。”姑怒，遂棄之。處期年，荅子之家果以盜誅。唯其母老以免，婦乃與少子歸養姑，終卒天年。君子謂荅子妻能以義易利，雖違禮求去，終以全身復禮，可謂遠識矣。¹⁷²

The wife’s physical force to her husband’s household to serve her mother-in-law again is labeled as returning to the rites. Here, the rite stands for the in-law’s household; Liu Xiang uses the rites as a normative label to stress virtue of the wife. Regardless of the wife’s virtue, this “return to the rites”

¹⁷¹ *Lunyu* 2.21 Yang Bojun, *Lunyu Yizhu* 論語譯註, 20.

¹⁷² Liu Xiang, *Lienü zhuan Buzhu* 列女傳補注, ed. Wang Zhaoyuan (Taipei: Taiwan Commercial Press, 1976), 32. Liu Xiang, *Exemplary Women of Early China: the Lienü zhuan of Liu Xiang*, trans. Anne Behnke Kinney, (New York: Columbia University Press, 2014), 92. Anne Behnke Kinney translates 復禮 into “returned home,” considering the context. However, this thesis translates literally as “return to the rites” to highlight its literary function.

differs from *fuli* of *kejifuli*. The *fuli* of *kejifuli* does not specify its meaning into in-law's house, and return + X constructions, X still means physical relocating places rather than an abstract concept. This instance, which expresses the return to the in-law's house as "return to the rites," represents a metaphor, not a sequel to conquering oneself.

The other *Lunyu* 12.1 translation based on Yu Yue's commentary, "I can submit to the rites,"¹⁷³ can develop a politico-philosophical discourse according to validity anyone can practice the rites and executes them to a reliable standard attains qualification to lead others who have not yet practiced the rites. Here, the "can" which affirms the capacity of "I" to practice the rites bespeaks an expectation of further development. The "can" sustaining the ritual practice indicates a determination of "I" to carry that practice toward continued improvement. In principle, everyone has the potential to develop their nature, as the rites lie within human reach; however, in practice, only a few actualize this capacity to a sufficient degree for reliable practice of the rites. If a minister can submit to the rites, the people may follow him rather than a ruler whose capacity is inferior to the minister. This reading of *Lunyu* 12.1, based on Yu Yue's commentary, echoes Mengzi's development model, as articulated by Philip Ivanhoe's analysis of Mengzi's ethics. This thesis extends Mengzi's philosophy into the political domain. On this reading, ritual competence functions as a

¹⁷³ Yu Yue cites, "Kong Anguo said, '*fu* 復 is *fan* 反. 孔曰, 復反也.'" Yu Yue, Yu Yue's *Lunyu Pingyi*: How Does an Evidential Scholars Read the *Lunyu* 俞樾의 論語平議: 고증학자는 논어를 어떻게 읽었나, trans. Gangje Lee and Hyoshin Kim, (Seoul: Hakgobang, 2006), 179. Although *fu* is *fan*, this *fan* does not mean "return," unlike in Zhu Xi's commentary. In *Longocho*, Ogyū Sorai explains Kong Anguo's *fan*: "The intention of Kong Anguo was 'to reflect himself;' 'it is the retrospection of King Tang and King Wu reflect it.' 孔安國之意, 如'反身,' '湯武之反'之反." Ogyū Sorai, *Longocho* 2 論語徵 2, 126–127. Ogyū Sorai, *Longocho* 3 論語徵 3, 10. Considering the philological evidence, I translate Yu Yue's commentary by adopting Arthur Wayley's translation, since Wayley's *kejifuli* seems to rest on the same philological basis as those of Yu Yue and Ogyū Sorai. Wayley translates *kejifuli* as "He who can himself submit to ritual." *The Analects of Confucius*, trans. Arthur Wayley, (New York: Vintage Books, 1938), 162. However, I do not replicate his wording; instead, I modify it into a more literal form in translating Yu Yue's commentary.

criterion of political authority and legitimacy. Those who have completed their nature can inspire others who continue to develop their own nature.¹⁷⁴ Following this logic, a minister with proven superiority in ritual practice over the ruler's may possess the standing to guide and inspire those still developing.

This philosophical idea grounds on Yu Yue's philological claim that *ke* 克 means "can," rather than "conquer" 勝. In the *Lunyu Pingyi*, he said, "Kong Anguo's commentary elucidates *ke* is 'can.' He is right. 孔註訓克爲能，是也。”¹⁷⁵ Building on this sense, Jin Jingfang 金景芳 and Lu Shaogang 呂紹綱 argue that taking *ke* in the sense of "can" requires parsing *jifuli* as a single constituent.¹⁷⁶ The transmitted texts corroborate this idea: in the *Shu*, Kong Anguo also glosses *ke* as "can." In the *Shangshu Dazhuan*, he explains, "*kemingde* 克明德 to mean 'can reveal and use eminent virtue. 能顯用俊德.'" The *Zuozhuan* likewise exhibits the same usage. For example, "In the twentieth year, in spring, the Liege of Zheng 鄭伯 tried to bring harmony to the king's household but was unable to do it. 二十年，春，鄭伯和王室，不克。”¹⁷⁷ Du Yu 杜預 (222–285) annotates, "*ke* 克 is 'can' 克，能也。” In addition to the transmitted texts, an excavated text also indicates

¹⁷⁴ Philip J. Ivanhoe, *Confucian Moral Self Cultivation*, 26–27.

¹⁷⁵ Yu Yue, Yu Yue's *Lunyu Pingyi*: How Does an Evidential Scholars Read the *Lunyu* 俞樾의 論語平議: 고증학자는 논어를 어떻게 읽었나, 179–180.

¹⁷⁶ Jin Jingfang 金景芳, and Lu Shaogang 呂紹綱, "Annotation of 'Kejifuli to become Humane' 釋'克己復禮爲仁,'" *Zhongguo Zhhexueshi*, no. 1 (1997): 17.

¹⁷⁷ Kong Yingda, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan Zhengyi* 春秋左傳正義, ed. Ma Xinmin, (Beijing: Beijing University Press, 2000), 301. *Zuo Tradition*, 188–189. In ancient Chinese, the character 克 connotes a sense of ability or capacity to accomplish something, encompassing the meanings of "to succeed" or "to be able to." While the translators have focused on the result and rendered it as "to succeed," this study emphasizes the aspect of ability, and therefore adopts the nuance of "can" here.

philological evidence that *ke* means “can.” In *Dabaogui* 大保簋, for example, “At that time, the king descended punitive attack order to Dabao 大保. Dabao could reverently practice the order so did not have any faults. 王降征令弔大保 大保克弔亡 .”¹⁷⁸ Taken together, these transmitted and excavated texts confirming *ke* as meaning “can” in early Chinese usage lend strong support to Yu Yue’s *Lunyu* 12.1 commentary as “I can submit to the rites” and to reading *jifuli* as a unified expression.

Taken together, the Han-based commentary that equates “controlling oneself” with “repeating the rites” fits the Han political context for 魯 the Han people gravitated to read that “controlling oneself” necessitates the repeated practice of the rites, and “repeating the rites” aims at controlling oneself. However, the other two plausible commentaries substantiate the flexibility of the *Lunyu*. Regardless of the anachronistic concept in Zhu Xi’s commentary such as adopting Buddhism which Kongzi and the compilers of the *Lunyu* did not know or the grammatical problem in Yu Yue’s commentary, which places the auxiliary verb before the subject and verb, these commentaries exemplify how later scholars employed the flexibility of *Lunyu* 12.1 to offer new philosophical insights by advancing a recovery model drawing on neo-Confucian thought¹⁷⁹ and a development model grounded in Mengzi’s thought, and

¹⁷⁸ Kim Sungki 김성기, *Dongyi and Origin of East Asian Civilization: Western Zhou Edition* 동이족과 동아시아 문명의 기원: 서주편, (Seoul: Sungkyunkwan University, 2021), 75. Won Yongjun 원용준, “The Duke of Zhou’s Eastern Expedition: A Study Based on Bronze Inscriptions and the Tsinghua Bamboo Manuscripts 周公의 동이정벌에 대하여 - 金文 및 清華簡을 중심으로 -,” in *Institute of Confucian Philosophy and Culture*, No. 20, (2012): 60.

¹⁷⁹ Zhu Xi’s commentary has influenced many later scholars. Kwong-loi Shun characterizes the relation between humaneness and the rites as a reciprocal relationship. For example, Shun writes that, “[T]he ideal of *jen* is shaped by the actually existing *li* practices in that it is not intelligible and cannot be shown to have a validity independent of *li*. However, it is not totally determined by *li* since advocacy of the ideal allows room for departing from or revising an existing rule of *li*.” However, his structure between humaneness and the rites of this problem converges with Zhu Xi on the principle as

further politico-philosophical discourses, all developed on a foundation of Classical ethics. In contrast to the Han-studies commentary, which aligns with Xunzi's re-formation model, these two commentaries imply a politico-philosophical logic that empowers subjects in proportion to their ritual competence. While the two commentaries attest to the flexibility of the passage, the Han-based commentary accords with Han usage. The commentaries of *Lunyu* 12.1 based on the Han commentary present self-control as a means to consolidate rulership. Considering the textual evidence from the Han dynasty, the emperor's self-control can justify his imperial title.

In addition to these three commentaries, Hunter's *kejifuli* translation, which draws in part on Ulrich Unger, "to conquer oneself and abide by ritual,"¹⁸⁰ can contribute to constructing an alternative image of Kongzi by suggesting the possibility of a new politico-philosophical discourse. Translating *ke* as "to conquer" accords with Zhu Xi's commentary, while *fu*, "to follow," resembles the Han-based commentary. Although Hunter's new translation moves beyond a conventional philological basis, leaning instead toward Classical Learning, it may offer an alternative image of Kongzi. For this reason, his translation provides a concrete case

the medium for realizing humaneness, without adopting his full metaphysics. Zhu Xi claims that "the rites are the detailed embellishments of the pattern-principle of Heaven." While Shun does not adopt Zhu Xi's full metaphysics, his structure converges with Zhu Xi in taking principle as the medium for realizing humaneness, as in Zhu Xi's claim that "Humaneness is the complete and perfect virtue of the original heart and mind. [A]ll affairs will be in accordance with the pattern-principle of Heaven and the virtue of my original heart and mind will return to its complete state with me. 仁者，本心之全德... 復於禮，則事皆天理，而本心之德。" Despite differences, such as Shun's reluctance to invoke Zhu Xi's full metaphysics, their route from the rites to humaneness presupposes principle as the mediating ground. This structural convergence constitutes a substantive limitation in their approach insofar as both presuppose a prior normative order that mediates humanness through the ritual practice; at the same time, it testifies to outsized influence of Zhu Xi in shaping contemporary research on "Chinese philosophy." Zhu Xi, *Sishu Zhangjuzhu* 四書章句集註, 131. Kwong-loi Shun, Jen and Li in the "*Analects*," *Philosophy East and West*, 43, no. 3, (1993): 472.

¹⁸⁰ Hunter states in footnote 17 on p. 103, "For the understanding of *fu* 復 as something like 'abide by' or 'follow,' see Unger 2009." Michael Hunter, *Confucius Beyond the Analects*, 103, 215, 221, 271.

through which to reconsider his own argument that the *Lunyu* determined the image of Kongzi.

The political flexibility of the *Lunyu* passages in *Lunyu* 12.1 affords a compelling paradigm for the conventional history of Chinese thought, whose origins trace back to Kongzi in the *Lunyu*, as its terse passages have enabled the creation and development of multifaceted intellectual discourses elaborating on its ideas, regardless of its compilation during the Han dynasty. The political flexibility of *Lunyu* 12.1 epitomizes the capacity for extension of classical and Neo-Confucian discourse into Mengzi, Xunzi, Daoist thought and even in collaboration with Buddhism. Hunter asks, “if the Kongzi of the *Lunyu* does not belong at the head of the standard timeline of early Chinese thought—in other words, if he is not the grand marshals in the parade of Warring States masters—then where does he belong, and what should take his place?”¹⁸¹ By differentiating the developmental stage of Chinese thoughts, which denotes the progression and refinement of philosophical ideas, from the historical fact on the textual compilation date, scholars need not reconsider the conventional practice of placing the *Lunyu* at the forefront of pre-Qin intellectual history. The flexibility of the *Lunyu*, due to its semantic openness, still enables the “Kongzi of the *Lunyu*” to function as the foundational point of departure for Chinese thought.

¹⁸¹ Ibid., 318.

APPENDICES

A. English Translation of the “Kongzi Shijia”

551 BCE

孔子生魯昌平鄉陬邑。其先宋人也，曰孔防叔。防叔生伯夏，伯夏生叔梁紇。紇與顏氏女野合而生孔子，禱於尼丘得孔子。魯襄公二十二年而孔子生，生而首上圩頂，故因名曰丘云。字仲尼，姓孔氏。

Kongzi was born in the Zou 陬 settlement of Changping 昌平 village in Lu realm. His ancestor was a man from Song 宋, called Kong Fangshu 孔防叔. Fang Shu bore Bo Xia 伯夏; Bo Xia bore Shulianghe 叔梁紇 (622 –549 BCE). Shu and a daughter from Yan clan 顏氏 joined in the wild and gave birth to Kongzi. They prayed at Mt. Niqu 尼丘 to obtain Kongzi. It was the 22nd reign year of Duke Xiang of Lu 魯襄公 (r. 572– 542 BCE), and Kongzi was born. He was born, and the top of his head was shaped concavely. Therefore, they gave him the name called Qiu 丘 with the polite name Zhongni 仲尼, and the surname is Kong clan 孔氏.

丘生而叔梁紇死，葬於防山。防山在魯東，由是孔子疑其父墓處，母諱之也。孔子爲兒嬉戲，常陳俎豆，設禮容。孔子母死，乃殯五父之衢，蓋其慎也。邠人輓父之母誨孔子父墓，然後往合葬於防焉。

孔子要經，季氏饗士。孔子與往，陽虎絀曰，“季氏饗士，非敢饗子也。”孔子由是退。

Qiu was born but Shulianghe died, buried at Mt. Fang 防山. Mt. Fang was in the eastern part of Lu; because of this reason, Kongzi was doubtful for the tomb location of his father; his mother concealed it. As a child, Kongzi delighted in playing to put Zudou in

order, in accordance to the ritual appearance every time. When Kongzi's mother died, he placed her coffin at a crossroads of Wufu 五父, practicing his circumspection. A Zou person, an elder cart-puller's mother, told the tomb location of Kongzi's father, then later he went to bury them together at Mt. Fang.

While Kongzi wore mourning clothes, the Ji clan banqueted men of service. Kongzi prepared to go there, Yang Hu 陽虎 dismissed, saying, "The Ji clan is banqueting the men of service, but they would not dare to banquet you." Because of this reason, Kongzi withdrew.

535 BCE

孔子年十七，魯大夫孟釐子病且死，誡其嗣懿子曰，“孔丘，聖人之後，滅於宋。其祖弗父何始有宋而嗣讓厲公。及正考父佐戴，武，宣公，三命茲益恭。故鼎銘云，‘一命而僂，再命而傴，三命而俯，循牆而走，亦莫敢余侮。饁於是，粥於是，以餬余口。’其恭如是。吾聞聖人之後，雖不當世，必有達者。今孔丘年少好禮，其達者歟？吾即沒，若必師之。”及釐子卒，懿子與魯人南宮敬叔往學禮焉。是歲，季武子卒，平子代立。

Kongzi's age was 17. The court aristocrat Meng Xizi 孟釐子 at Lu realm was sick and about to die; he admonished his successor Yizi 懿子, saying, "Kong Qiu is a descendant of a sage; his ancestor was extinguished at Song realm. His ancestor, Fufuhe, at first had Song realm and yielded heirs to the Duke of Li 宋厲公 (r. ?–859 BCE); then came to Zhengkaofu 正考父, and served the duke of Dai 宋戴公 (r. 799–766 BCE), Wu 宋武公 (r. 765–748 BCE) and Xuan 宋宣公 (r. 747–729 BCE). In the three times of service, his order became increasingly reverent. Therefore, the tripod inscription says, 'At the first order, I bent my head; at the second order, I stooped my waist; at the third order, I bowed down; I followed a wall and walk; indeed no one dared to insult me. I cooked thick gruel from this; I made thin gruel from that and gave them my mouth.' His reverence is like this. I heard the

descendant of the sage; even if he does not meet the time, there will definitely be insight.

Today, Kongzi's age is still young and he already likes the rites; isn't this his insightfulness? I soon die, you definitely take him as your master." Then Xizi died; Yizi and a Lu person whose name is Nangong Jingshu 南宮敬叔 went to learn the rites from Kongzi. This year, Jiwuzi died, Pingzi 平子 (?–505 BCE) took his position.

孔子貧且賤。及長，嘗爲季氏史，料量平，嘗爲司職吏而畜蕃息。由是爲司空，已而去魯。斥乎齊，逐乎宋，衛，困於陳蔡之間，於是反魯。孔子長九尺有六寸，人皆謂之‘長人’而異之。魯復善待，由是反魯。

Kongzi was poor and base. He reached up to adulthood. He once became Ji clan's storekeeper; his calculating quantity of crops was equivalent; he once became an official to manage pastures and livestock were thriving. Because of these reasons, he became Commissioner of Public Works 司空; he ceased and left Lu realm. He was dismissed from Qi realm, was expelled from Song and Wei realm, constrained between Chen and Cai 蔡 realm. Thereupon, he returned to Lu realm. Kongzi's height was nine *chi* 尺 and six *cun* 寸. Everyone called him 'a tall person' and considered him special. Lu realm again treated him well. Because of this reason, he returned to Lu realm.

魯南宮敬叔言魯君曰，“請與孔子適周。”魯君與之一乘車，兩馬，一豎子俱。適周問禮，蓋見老子云，辭去，而老子送之曰，“吾聞富貴者送人以財，仁人者送人以言。吾不能富貴，竊仁人之號，送子以言，曰，‘聰明深察而近於死者，好議人者也。博辯廣大危其身者，發人之惡者也。爲人子者毋以有己，爲人臣者毋以有己。’”孔子自周反于魯，弟子稍益進焉。

Nangong Jingshu at Lu realm told the lord of Lu, saying, "Please allow Kongzi to go to Zhou." The lord of Lu gave him one carriage, two horses, and one minor servant altogether.

He went to Zhou, asked about the rites; probably he saw Lao Zi 老子 when taking his leave to go, and Lao Zi saw him off, saying, “I heard that wealthy individuals see a person off with goods, humane person sees the person off with a word. I am unable to be wealthy; I have effrontery to the title of the humane person to see you off to talk about something, saying, ‘Those who are highly perceptive and deeply thoughtful are taking to the point of death enjoy judging other people. Those who have erudite disputation and are so broad and great endangered to their body are the sort of people who bring hatred from other people. Those who are a person’s child have no means to hold oneself; Those who are the person’s minister have no means to hold oneself.’” Kongzi returned to Lu realm from Zhou, disciples gradually increased and came forward to him.

是時也，晉平公淫，六卿擅權，東伐諸侯。楚靈王兵彊，陵轢中國。齊大而近於魯，魯小弱，附於楚則晉怒，附於晉則楚來伐，不備於齊，齊師侵魯。

At this time, Duke Ping of Jin 晉平公 (r. 557–532 BCE) was seditious, Six Ministers 六卿 of the realm arrogated power, and attacked several lords in east. King Ling of Chu’s troops were strong; he bullied and towered over the Central States. Qi was large and near to Lu; Lu was small and weak. If Lu was close to Chu, then Jin would be angry. If Lu was close to Jin, then Chu would come and attack. If they did not take precautions to Qi, Qi armies would invade Lu.

522 BCE

魯昭公之二十年，而孔子蓋年三十矣。齊景公與晏嬰來適魯，景公問孔子曰，“昔秦穆公國小處辟，其霸何也？”對曰，“秦國雖小，其志大，處雖辟，行中正。身舉五穀，爵之大夫。起纍繼之

中，與語三日。授之以政，以此取之。雖王可也，其霸小矣。”景公說。

In the 22nd year of Duke Zhao of Lu, Kongzi's age was 30. Duke Jing of Qi and Yan Ying came and visited Lu; Duke Jing asked Kongzi, saying, “In the past, Duke Mu of Qin's 秦穆公 (r. 659–621 BCE) realm was small, and its location was remote; how did he enact his hegemon?” Kongzi responded to it, saying, “Although Qin realm was small, his intention was grand; although the location was remote, his behavior was right in the center what was correct. He promoted Baili Xi 百里奚, granting him a court aristocrat. He lifted him up from among prisoners; he discussed governing with him for three days. Baili Xi taught him by means of governing; he acquired hegemon by means of it. Even if he enacted as a true king, this is permissible. His hegemon status was in fact a small thing.” Duke Jing became pleased.

517 BCE

孔子年三十五，而季平子與郈昭伯以鬪雞故得罪魯昭公。昭公率師擊平子，平子與孟氏，叔孫氏三家共攻昭公。昭公師敗，奔於齊，齊處昭公乾侯。其後頃之，魯亂。孔子適齊，為高昭子家臣，欲以通乎景公。與齊太師語樂，聞韶音，學之，三月不知肉味，齊人稱之。

Kongzi's age was 35 and then Ji Pingzi and Earl Hou Zhao 郈昭伯 (?–517 BCE) due to cockfight offended Duke Zhao of Lu. Duke Zhao led armies to beat Pingzi; Pingzi and Meng clan 孟氏, Shusun clan 叔孫氏—the Three Houses—together attacked Duke Zhao. Duke Zhao's armies were defeated, he fled to Qi; Qi dwelt Duke Zhao in Qianhou 乾侯. After a while, there was a rebellion in Lu. Kongzi went to Qi, became a Gao Zhaozi's 高昭子 household retainer; he wished to have access to Duke Jing. He discussed music with a grad preceptor in Qi. He listened to Shao 韶 tunes and learned it; he lost savor of meat for

three months.¹⁸² Qi people praised him.

景公問政孔子，孔子曰，“君君，臣臣，父父，子子。”景公曰，“善哉！信如君不君，臣不臣，父不父，子不子，雖有粟，吾豈得而食諸！”他日又復問政於孔子，孔子曰，“政在節財。”景公說，將欲以尼谿田封孔子。晏嬰進曰，“夫儒者滑稽而不可軌法，倨傲自順，不可以爲下，崇喪遂哀，破產厚葬，不可以爲俗，游說乞貸，不可以爲國。自大賢之息，周室既衰，禮樂缺有間。今孔子盛容飾，繁登降之禮，趨詳之節，累世不能殫其學，當年不能究其禮。君欲用之以移齊俗，非所以先細民也。”後景公敬見孔子，不問其禮。異日，景公止孔子曰，“奉子以季氏，吾不能。”以季孟之間待之，齊大夫欲害孔子，孔子聞之。景公曰，“吾老矣，弗能用也。”孔子遂行，反乎魯。

Duke Jing asked governing to Kongzi; Kongzi said, “A lord enacts the lord, a minister enacts the minister, a father enacts the father, a son enacts the son.” Duke Jing said, ‘Excellent! Indeed, if a lord doesn’t enact the lord, a minister doesn’t enact the minister, a father doesn’t enact the father, a son doesn’t enact the son, although there are grains, how can I obtain and eat them!’¹⁸³ Another day, he again asked governing to Kongzi; Kongzi said, “Governing depends on conserving goods.” Duke Jing became pleased; he was about to desire to grant a fief to Kongzi by means of fields in Nixi 尼谿. Yan Ying moved forward, saying, “Now Classicists craftily deliberate something else and can’t follow the rules; they are arrogant, haughty, submissive to their own habits, can’t be modest; they exalt mourning and to fulfill the mourning, destroy resources for ostentatious burials, can’t follow modest customs; they wander around to beg for loans, can’t serve a realm. Since the passing of the great worthies, the house of Zhou has already declined, the rites and music were interrupted. Now Kongzi adorns his face and wears ornaments, proliferates rites of ascending and

¹⁸² *Lunyu* 7.14. All citations of the *Lunyu* in the appendices are given by passage number, following the numbering of the *Lunyu Yizhu*.

¹⁸³ *Lunyu* 12.11

descending, moves around, according to correct detailed etiquette that generations can't master its learning, no one can practice rites for one's whole life. What you desire to employ him to change Qi's custom is not the means to lead common people." Later Duke Jing reverently saw Kongzi but did not ask his rites. Other day, Duke Jing stopped Kongzi, saying, "I can't hold a superior to you by means of Ji clan." He treated him between Ji and Meng clan, court aristocrats in Qi realm desired to murder Kongzi; Kongzi heard it. Duke Jing said, "I'm old, so I can't employ you." Thereupon, Kongzi left¹⁸⁴ and returned to Lu.

510 BCE

孔子年四十二，魯昭公卒於乾侯，定公立。

Kongzi' age was 42. Duke Zhao of Lu died in Qianhou. Duke Ding took Duke Zhao's position.

505 BCE

定公立五年，夏，季平子卒，桓子嗣立。季桓子穿井得土缶，中若羊，問仲尼云‘得狗。’仲尼曰，“以丘所聞，羊也。丘聞之，木石之怪夔、罔闔，水之怪龍、罔象，土之怪墳羊。”

In the fifth summer of Duke Ding's reign, Ji Pingzi died, Ji Huanzi 季桓子 (?-492 BCE) succeeded his position. Ji Huangzi dug a well and obtained a Fou 缶 vessel made of earth. Inside the vessel, there was something like a sheep. He asked Zhongni, saying, 'I obtained a dog.' Zhongni said, "Based on what I heard, it's a sheep. I heard it; there are

¹⁸⁴ *Lunyu* 18.3

mountain monsters named Kui 夔 and Wang Liang 罔閭, water monsters named a dragon and Wang Xiang 罔象, an earth monster, named Fen Yang 墳羊.

吳伐越，墮會稽，得骨節專車。吳使使問仲尼，“骨何者最大？”仲尼曰，“禹致群神於會稽山，防風氏後至，禹殺而戮之，其節專車，此爲大矣。”吳客曰，“誰爲神？”仲尼曰，“山川之神足以綱紀天下，其守爲神，社稷爲公侯，皆屬於王者。”客曰，“防風何守？”仲尼曰，“汪罔氏之君守封、禺之山，爲釐姓。在虞、夏、商爲汪罔，於周爲長翟，今謂之大人。”客曰，“人長幾何？”仲尼曰，“焦僂氏三尺，短之至也。長者不過十之，數之極也。”於是吳客曰，“善哉聖人！”

Wu 吳 attacked Yue 越, destroyed Kuaiji 會稽, and obtained bone joints filled up a chariot. A king of Wu made an ambassador ask Zhongni, “Which bone is the largest?”

Zhongni said, “Yu 禹 summoned several gods to Mt. Kuaiji 會稽山. One god from the Fangfeng clan 防風氏 arrived late; Yu killed and disposed him in order. His joint was used to complete a carriage. This is the biggest.” The visitor from Wu said, “Who is acting for gods?” Zhongni said, “Gods of mountain are sufficient to manage all under the Heaven, its protection jobs are various marquis’ jobs, the altars of domains are jobs of dukes and marquises. Everything belongs to a king.” The visitor said, “What did Fangfeng protect?” Zhongni said, “The lord of a clan whose name is Wangwang 汪罔氏 protected Mt. Feng and Yu, then became Xi lineage 釐姓. The name was Wangwang in the Yu 虞, Xia, Shang period, it was Zhangdi 長翟 in the Zhou period, today it is called as Daren 大人.” The visitor said, “How much was their heights?” Zhongni said, “The height of Jiaoyao clan 焦僂氏, which was three *chi*, represented the extreme of the shortness; the tallest person who was not over three *zhang*, represented the extreme of the height number.” Thereupon, the visitor from Wu said, “You’re an excellent sage!”

桓子嬖臣曰仲梁懷，與陽虎有隙，陽虎欲逐懷，公山不狃止之。其秋，懷益驕，陽虎執懷，桓子怒。陽虎因囚桓子，與盟而驛之。陽虎由此益輕季氏，季氏亦僭於公室，陪臣執國政。是以魯自大夫以下皆僭離於正道，故孔子不仕，退而修詩書禮樂，弟子彌衆，至自遠方，莫不受業焉。

Huanzi's favorite minister, Zhongliang Hui 仲梁懷, had a quarrel with Liang Hu.

Liang Hu desired to expel Hui; Gongshan Buniu 公山不狃 restrained him. In this autumn, Hui became more and more arrogant; Liang Hu arrested Hui; Huanzi became angry.

Thereupon, Liang Hu arrested Huanzi, swore the covenant with him and then released him.

From this event, Liang Hu gradually belittled Ji clan; Ji clan also overstepped to the lord's house, personal subjects held power to govern the state. Thereupon, everyone from court aristocrats to inferiors in Lu realm overstepped and separated from the right way. Therefore, Kongzi did not serve in office, retreated and then edited the *Shi*, the *Shu*, the *Rites*, and the *Music*; his disciples gradually increased, came to Lu from far areas, no one did not receive instruction from him.

502 BCE

定公八年，公山不狃不得意於季氏，因陽虎爲亂。欲廢三桓之適，更立其庶孽陽虎素所善者，遂執季桓子，桓子詐之，得脫。

In the eighth year of Duke Ding, Gongshan Buniu did not obtain his will from Ji clan; he made Yanghu to enact rebellion. He desired to abolish principal sons of three Huan lineages and establish one whom Liang Hu usually liked among their concubines' sons. Thereupon he arrested Ji Huanzi, Huanzi deceived him and was able to escape from him.

501 BCE

定公九年，陽虎不勝，奔于齊，是時孔子年五十。

In the ninth year of Duke Ding, Liang Hu did not defeat them, fled to Qi. At this time, Kongzi' age was 50.

公山不狃以費畔季氏，使人召孔子。孔子循道彌久，溫溫無所試，莫能己用，曰，“蓋周文武起豐鎬而王，今費雖小，儻庶幾乎？”欲往。子路不說。止孔子。孔子曰，“夫召我者豈徒哉！如用我，其爲東周乎！”然亦卒不行。其後定公以孔子爲中都宰。

Gongshan Buniu betrayed Ji clan by means of Bi; made people to summon Kongzi.

Kongzi followed the Way for a long time, there was nothing to try the things he practiced hard. No one was able to employ him, he said, “King Wu of Zhou and King Wen of Zhou launched their dynasty at Feng 豐 and Hao 鎬 and enacted the kingly way. Although Bi is small now, is it perhaps similar with Feng and Hao probably?” He desired to go there. Zilu was not pleased; he stopped Kongzi. Kongzi said, “How he summons me uselessly! If he employs me, I will make Zhou in the East!”¹⁸⁵ However, he did not indeed go to Gongshan Buniu in the end. After this happening, the Duke Ding made Kongzi appoint the Steward 宰 in Zhongdu 中都.

500 BCE

一年，四方皆則之，由中都宰爲司空，由司空爲大司寇。

One year later, everyone followed him everywhere. Kongzi promoted from the Steward in Zhongdu to the Supervisor of Works 司空; promoted from the supervisor of works to the Senior Supervisor of Corrections 大司寇.

¹⁸⁵ *Lunyu* 17.5.

定公十年春，及齊平。夏，齊大夫黎鉏言於景公曰，“魯用孔丘，其勢危齊。”乃使使告魯爲好會，會於夾谷。魯定公且以乘車好往。孔子攝相事曰，“臣聞有文事者必有武備，有武事者必有文備。古者諸侯出疆，必具官以從，請具左右司馬。”定公曰，“諾。”具左右司馬。會齊侯夾谷，爲壇位土階三等，以會遇之禮，相見揖讓而登，獻酬之禮畢。齊有司趨而進曰，“請奏四方之樂。”景公曰，“諾。”於是旂旄羽被矛戟劍撥鼓噪而至。孔子趨而進，歷階而登，不盡一等，舉袂而言曰，“吾兩君爲好會，夷狄之樂何爲於此！請命有司。”有司卻之，不去，則左右視晏子與景公。景公心忤，麾而去之。有頃，齊有司趨而進曰，“請奏宮中之樂。”景公曰，“諾。”優倡侏儒爲戲而前，孔子趨而進，歷階而登，不盡一等曰，“匹夫而營惑諸侯者罪當誅！請命有司。”有司加法焉，手足異處。景公懼而動，知義不若。歸而大恐，告其群臣曰，“魯以君子之道輔其君，而子獨以夷狄之道教寡人，使得罪於魯君，爲之奈何？”有司進對曰，“君子有過則謝以質，小人有過則謝以文。君若悼之，則謝以質。”於是齊侯乃歸所侵魯之鄆、汶陽、龜陰之田以謝過。

In the tenth-year spring of Duke Ding, Lu and Qi made a peace agreement. In the summer, Lichu spoke to Duke Jing, saying, “Lu is employing Kongzi, his power will endanger Qi.” Then the Duke of Qi made an ambassador request Lu to make a meeting for peace; the meeting was held in Jiagu. Duke Lu of Ding was going to go to the meeting for peace without armies by means of riding a carriage. Kongzi acted as a substitute of minister’s task, saying, “I heard that there has one who conducts cultivating tasks must have preparation for warlike people and another who conducts martial tasks must have preparation for cultivated people. In ancient time, several lords who went outside territory must equip officials in order to take part in affairs. Please to equip the supervisor of left army and right army.” Duke Ding said, “I approve it.” He equipped the supervisor of left army and right army. He made agreement with the Duke of Qi in Jiagu; climbed an alter made of earth and the three stairs. They saw each other, saluting and yielding by means of unsophisticated rites; they finished practicing the rite which offers alcohols to each other. A Qi functionary approached hastily, saying “Please perform barbarian music.” Duke Jing said, “I approve the request.” Thereupon, performers arrived raising cow-tailed flags, feathered flags, spears, halberds, and swords, beating the drums, and then arrived there. Kongzi approached hastily, ran up the stairs, and stopped before the last step. He rolled up his sleeve and said, “Our two

lords are having a meeting for peace; how can barbarian music be performed here! I ask to call for order in his functionary.” The functionary made the musicians retreat; they did not leave, then courtiers looked at Yan Ying and Duke Jing. Duke Jing was ashamed heart, commanded them to leave. Shortly thereafter, the functionary in Qi ran and moved toward hastily, saying “Please to perform a court music.” Duke Jing said, “I approve it.” Players, singers, and dwarfs practiced performance and moved forward; Kongzi ran and moved toward hastily passed through each stair and raised there, but did not raise the last one stair, saying, “The thing which they enact commonplace people’s way and plan to deceive the several lords should be executed! I ask the order to the functionary.” The functionary enforced the law to them; their hands and feet were located separately. Duke Ding was afraid but touched that his knowledge and righteousness are not at the same level as those of the others. He returned and greatly feared and announced to his ministers, “In Lu realm, Kongzi assists his lord by means of the way of a gentleman, but you merely teach me by means of the way of the barbarians; you make me obtain a sin to the lord of Lu. What can I do to remedy him?” The functionary moved toward, responded to it, saying, “If a gentleman has an error, then, the gentleman apologizes one by means of substance; if petty people have an error then, the petty people apologize one by means of embellishment. If you tremble to him, then you apologize the lord of Lu by means of substance.” Thereupon, the lord of Qi returned the land of Yun, Wen Yang, and Gui Hui in Lu in order to apologize for the error.

497 BCE

定公十三年夏，孔子言於定公曰，“臣無藏甲，大夫毋百雉之城。”使仲由爲季氏宰，將墮三都。於是叔孫氏先墮郕，季氏將墮費，公山不狃、叔孫輒率費人襲魯。公與三子入于季氏之宮，登武子之臺。費人攻之，弗克，入及公側。孔子命申句須、樂頎下伐之，費人北。國人追之，敗諸姑蔑，二子奔齊，遂墮費。將墮成，公斂處父謂孟孫曰，“墮成，齊

人必至于北門，且成，孟氏之保鄣。無成是無孟氏也，我將弗墮。”十二月，公圍成，弗克。

In the thirteenth-year summer of Duke Ding, Kongzi spoke to Duke Ding, saying, “Ministers don’t hide armors, court ministers don’t have walls around a hundred *zhi*.” Duke ordered Zhong You 仲由 to become a Steward of Ji clan, was about to destroy the three main cities. Thereupon, Shusun clan first destroyed Hou, Ji clan was about to destroy Bi. Gongshan Buniu and Shusun Zhe led people from Bi attacked surprisingly Duke of Lu. The Duke and the three linages entered into a palace of the Ji clan, ascended terrace of Wuzi. Bi people attacked them but could not defeat them; they advanced very near to the duke. Kongzi ordered Shen Quxu and Yue Qi to go under the terrace and attack them. Bi people fled; people in the realm chased them, the Bi people were defeated in Gumie, the two noblemen fled to Qi, then Kongzi destroyed the wall in Bi. He was about to destroy Cheng; Gonglian Chufu talked to Mengsun, saying, “If you destroy Cheng, Qi people definitely arrive at Lu’s northern gate. Furthermore, Cheng is a protective barrier of Meng clan. If there isn’t the wall in Cheng, Meng can’t exist. I’m not about to destroy it.” In the twelve month, the duke besieged Cheng, but could not destroy it.

496 BCE

定公十四年，孔子年五十六，由大司寇行攝相事，有喜色。門人曰，“聞君子禍至不懼，福至不喜。”孔子曰，“有是言也。不曰，‘樂其以貴下人’乎？”於是誅魯大夫亂政者少正卯，與聞國政三月，粥羔豚者弗飾賈，男女行者別於塗，塗不拾遺，四方之客至乎邑者不求有司，皆予之以歸。

In the fourteenth year of Duke Ding, Kongzi’ age was 56; as the senior supervisor of corrections, he acted as a substitute of a minister’s work. He had delightful facial expressions. His disciples said, “We heard that a gentleman doesn’t fear when disaster comes to him; he isn’t delightful when a prosperity comes to him.” Kongzi said, “There has a word, don’t you

say, ‘I take in pleasure in it in order to cherish inferior people?’ Thereupon, Kongzi executed a Lu court aristocrat, Shaozheng Mao, who disordered governing. He participated in listening governing the realm for three months; congee, lambs, and pork merchants did not deceive its price, men and women walked on roads separately, did not pick up lost things on the road, every visitor who came to the county did not ask help to functionaries, and they returned.

齊人聞而懼曰，“孔子爲政必霸。霸則吾地近焉，我之爲先并矣。盍致地焉？”黎鉏曰，“請先嘗沮之，沮之而不可則致地，庸遲乎！”於是選齊國中女子好者八十人，皆衣文衣而舞康樂，文馬三十駟，遺魯君，陳女樂文馬於魯城南高門外。季桓子微服往觀再三將受，乃語魯君爲周道游，往觀終日，怠於政事。子路曰，“夫子可以行矣。”孔子曰，“魯今且郊，如致膳乎大夫，則吾猶可以止。”桓子卒受齊女樂，三日不聽政，郊又不致膳俎於大夫。孔子遂行，宿乎屯，而師己送曰，“夫子則非罪。”子曰，“吾歌可夫？”歌曰，“彼婦之口，可以出走，彼婦之謁，可以死敗。蓋優哉游哉，維以卒歲！”師己反，桓子曰，“孔子亦何言？”師己以實告，桓子喟然嘆曰，“夫子罪我以群婢故也夫！”

The lord of Qi heard and was afraid of it, saying, “Kongzi is governing, accomplishes hegemon. If he accomplishes hegemon, then my realm is closed to Lu, my realm will be annexed first. How don’t¹⁸⁶ I give¹⁸⁷ the land to Lu?” Lichu said, “Please try to prevent him first. If you prevent him but can’t do it, then give the land. How it is late!” Thereupon, they chose 88 beautiful¹⁸⁸ women, every woman wore patterned clothes¹⁸⁹ and danced *Kangle* within Qi realm, and 120 embellished horses; they sent them to the lord of Lu, displayed the beautiful women and embellished horses outside of the *Gao* gate in the

¹⁸⁶ Li Jiemin 李解民, “Kongzi Shijia 孔子世家” in *Shiji Quanzhu Quanyi* 史记全注全译, ed. Qiu Xigui, (Beijing: Tianjin Guji, 1997), 1795.

¹⁸⁷ Li Jiemin 李解民, “Kongzi Shijia 孔子世家” in *Shiji Quanzhu Quanyi* 史记全注全译, 1795.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., 1795.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., 1795.

southern wall. Ji Huanzi wore common people's clothes¹⁹⁰ to go, watch several times and was about to take them, then spoke to the lord of Lu to encircle on a pleasure outing to a way; they went to watch for a whole day, were indolent to governing affairs. Zilu said, "You can leave." Kongzi said, "Today, Lu has also the *Jiao* 郊 rite. If they gave ritual meats¹⁹¹ to court aristocrats, then I can still stay here." Eventually, Huanzi took female performers from Qi, did not take care of governing for three days, and also did not gave the ritual meats to the court aristocrats in the *Jiao* rites. Thereupon, Kongzi left,¹⁹² spent the night in Tun 屯, and Shiji 師己 saw him off, saying, "Then it isn't you to commit a sin." Kongzi said, "Can I sing a song?" The sing says, "That married woman's mouth can go out and flee; that married woman's asking for a meeting¹⁹³ can kill and defeat. Leisurely,¹⁹⁴ I just finish my life!" Shiji returned, Huanzi said, "What does Kongzi indeed say?" Shiji announced it based on the fact. Huanzi sighed deeply, saying, "Master admonishes me by means of the reason I took a large number of the women!"

孔子遂適衛，主於子路妻兄顏濁鄒家，衛靈公問孔子，“居魯得祿幾何？”對曰，“奉粟六萬。”衛人亦致粟六萬。居頃之，或譖孔子於衛靈公。靈公使公孫余假一出一入。孔子恐獲罪焉，居十月，去衛。

Thereupon, Kongzi went to Wei realm; he stayed a house of Zilu wife's brother, Yan Zouzou 顏濁鄒 (?–472 BCE). Duke Ling of Wei asked Kongzi, "How much salary did you earn when living in Lu?" Kongzi responded to it, saying, "My salary is grain 60,000 *dou*."

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., 1796.

¹⁹¹ Ibid., 1796.

¹⁹² *Lunyu* 18.4.

¹⁹³ Li Jiemin 李解民, "Kongzi Shijia 孔子世家" in *Shiji Quanzhu Quanyi* 史记全注全译, 1796.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid., 1796.

Duke of Wei indeed gave him the grain 60,000 *dou*. He lived there for a while; someone maligned Kongzi to Duke Ling of Wei. Duke Ling made Gongsun Yujia 公孫余假 go out and enter to threaten Kongzi. Kongzi got feared to obtain a sin from the duke; he lived there for the months, left Wei.

將適陳，過匡，顏刻爲僕，以其策指之曰，“昔吾入此，由彼缺也。”匡人聞之，以爲魯之陽虎。陽虎嘗暴匡人，匡人於是遂止孔子。孔子狀類陽虎，拘焉五日，顏淵後，子曰，“吾以汝爲死矣。”顏淵曰，“子在，回何敢死！”匡人拘孔子，益急，弟子懼。孔子曰，“文王既沒，文不在茲乎！天之將喪斯文也，後死者不得與于斯文也。天之未喪斯文也，匡人其如予何！”孔子使從者爲甯武子臣於衛，然後得去。

Kongzi was about to go to Chen realm, passed by Kuang. Yan Ke 顏刻 was a lackey, indicated there by means of his riding-whip, saying, “In the past, I entered here from there where was smashed.” Kuang people heard it; they regarded him as Yang Hu from Lu. Liang Hu once harassed Kuang people; thereupon, Kuang people halted Kongzi because of it. Kongzi’s appearance was analogous to Liang Hu. They detained him and his disciples there for five days. Yan Yuan arrived late, Kongzi said, “I thought you died.” Yan Yuan said, “You’re alive. How I dare die!”¹⁹⁵ Kuang people detained Kongzi and even more oppressed them; the disciples were afraid of it. Kongzi said, “King Wen already died. Embellishment isn’t it here! Heaven is about to abandon this embellishment¹⁹⁶, I can’t participate in this embellishment. Heaven isn’t about to abandon this embellishment yet, how Kuang people are about to do something else to me!”¹⁹⁷ Kongzi ordered a follower¹⁹⁸ to become Ning Wuzi’s

¹⁹⁵ *Lunyu* 11.23

¹⁹⁶ Li Jiemin 李解民, “Kongzi Shijia 孔子世家” in *Shiji Quanzhu Quanyi* 史记全注全译, 1797.

¹⁹⁷ *Lunyu* 9.5

¹⁹⁸ Since Kongzi ordered him to become a minister of Ning Wuzi to receive Ning Wuzi’s support, it would be strange for him to order his servant to serve Ning Wuzi. For this reason, I translate 從者 as “follower” here.

甯武子 minister in Wei realm, and only then they were able to leave there.

495 BCE

去即過蒲，月餘，反乎衛，主蘧伯玉家。靈公夫人有南子者，使人謂孔子曰，“四方之君子不辱欲與寡君爲兄弟者，必見寡小君。寡小君願見。”孔子辭謝，不得已而見之。夫人在絺帷中，孔子入門，北面稽首。夫人自帷中再拜，環珮玉聲璆然。孔子曰，“吾鄉爲弗見，見之禮答焉。”子路不說，孔子矢之曰，“予所不者，天厭之！天厭之！”衛月餘，靈公與夫人同車，宦者雍渠參乘，出，使孔子爲次乘，招搖市過之。孔子曰，“吾未見好德如好色者也。”於是醜之，去衛，過曹。是歲，魯定公卒。

Kongzi left then passed by Pu, staying there for a month; he returned to Wei, staying in Qu Baiyu's 蘧伯玉 house. There had Nanzi 南子 among Duke Ling's wives; Nanzi ordered a person to address Kongzi, saying, "Gentlemen all around the world don't humiliate to desire a thing which makes brotherhood with my lord; one must see my lord's wife. She hopes for seeing you." Kongzi expressed refusal; he had no choice and saw her. The wife was in a pavilion made of hems. Kongzi entered a door, faced north and lowered his head. The wife bowed to Kongzi twice by herself in the pavilion; a jade sound of her jade rings and pedants hitting each other was heard. Kongzi said, "Before I do to not see her; I see her, I respond to her by means of the rites." Zilu was not pleased; Kongzi swore to Zilu, saying, "If I don't practice the rites, Heaven loathes me! Heaven loathes me!"¹⁹⁹ He stayed in Wei for one month. Duke Ling and the wife got in a carriage together, a eunuch Yong Ju 雍渠 got in the same carriage; they went out. They ordered Kongzi to get in the next carriage. They moved on with unconcern through a market and passed by. Kongzi said, "I haven't yet seen a person who likes virtue as much as one likes a woman."²⁰⁰ Thereupon, he loathed the duke,

¹⁹⁹ *Lunyu* 6.28

²⁰⁰ *Lunyu* 9.18

left Wei, passed by Cao 曹. This year, Duke Ding of Lu died.

孔子去曹適宋，與弟子習禮大樹下，宋司馬桓魋欲殺孔子，拔其樹，孔子去。弟子曰，“可以速矣。”孔子曰，“天生德於予，桓魋其如予何!”²⁰¹

Kongzi left Cao and went to Song; he practiced the rites under a huge tree with his disciples. The Supervisor of Army 司馬 in Song, Huan Tui, desired to kill Kongzi; he pulled up the tree. Kongzi left; the disciples said, “We can hasten to run away.” Kongzi said, “Heaven gave virtue to me; how is Huan Tui about to do something else to me!”

孔子適鄭，與弟子相失。孔子獨立郭東門，鄭人或謂子貢曰，“東門有人，其顙似堯，其項類皋陶，其肩類子產，然自要以下不及禹三寸，累累若喪家之狗。”子貢以實告孔子，孔子欣然笑曰，“形狀，末也，而謂似喪家之狗，然哉！然哉！”孔子遂至陳，主於司城貞子家。

Kongzi went to Zheng 鄭 with disciples but lost each other. Kongzi only stood up Guodong gate. Someone among Zheng people addressed to Zigong, saying, “There is a person in the east gate; his forehead is like Yao 堯; his neck is akin to Gao Yao 皋陶; his shoulders are akin to Zi Chan 子產 (?–522 BCE), but he doesn’t reach Yu’s three *cun* from his waist down, his dejected appearance is like a dog which loses its house.” Zigong announced it based on the fact to Kongzi; Kongzi delightfully smiled and said, “The appearance is secondary, but saying to be like the dog which loses its house is right! It is right!” Thereupon, Kongzi arrived at Chen, staying at a house of Supervisor of Fortification 司城 whose name was Gongsun Zhenzi 公孫貞子 (?–480 BCE).

²⁰¹ *Lunyu* 7.23

494 BCE

歲餘，吳王夫差伐陳，取三邑而去。趙鞅伐朝歌。楚圍蔡，蔡遷于吳。吳敗越王句踐會稽。

One year later, King of Wu Fu Chai 夫差 (r. 495–473 BCE) attacked Chen,

acquired three settlements and left. Zhao Yang 趙鞅 attacked Chaoge 朝歌. Chu besieged

Cai; Cai moved to Wu. Wu defeated King of Yue Gou Jian in Kuai Ji.

有隼集于陳廷而死，楛矢貫之，石砮，矢長尺有咫。陳湣公使使問仲尼，仲尼曰，“隼來遠矣。此肅慎之矢也。昔武王克商，通道九夷百蠻，使各以其方賄來貢，使無忘職業。於是肅慎貢楛矢石砮，長尺有咫。先王欲昭其令德，以肅慎矢分大姬，配虞胡公而封諸陳。分同姓以珍玉，展親，分異姓以遠職，使無忘服。故分陳以肅慎矢。”試求之故府，果得之。

An osprey lived a tree in Chen court but died; an arrow made by a shrub bush-clover tree penetrated it; length of arrowhead made by a stone and the arrow is 1 *chi* 8 *cun*. Duke Min of Chen 陳湣公 (r. 501–478 BCE) made an ambassador ask Zhongni; Zhongni said, “The osprey came from a far away. This is the arrow of Sushen 肅慎. In the past, King Wu defeated Shang. He made an access way to nine Yi and hundred groups of Man tribes; he ordered each tribe by its present goods in its region come to offer as tribute and made not forget their obligations and occupations. Thereupon, Sushen offered as tribute the arrow made by the shrub bush-clover tree with its arrowhead made by the stone that the total length is 1 *chi* 8 *cun*. The former king desired to illuminate his good virtue. He gave out his first daughter something by means of Sushen’s arrow; he made her marry Duke Hu of Yu 虞胡公 (r. 1045–986 BCE) and put in power at Chen. He gave out same lineages by means of precious jades and considered the relatives important; he gave out different lineages by means of obligations from distant places and made them not forget their obedience. Therefore, he gave out Chen by means of Sushen’s arrow.” He attempted to look for it in an old storehouse;

as he expected, he obtained it there.

孔子居陳三歲。會晉楚爭彊，更伐陳。及吳侵陳，陳常被寇。孔子曰，“歸與！歸與！吾黨之小子狂簡，進取不忘其初。”於是孔子去陳。

Kongzi lived in Chen for three years; apropos Jin and Chu contested power, successively attacked Chen, and Wu successively attacked Chen. Chen was always invaded. Kongzi said, “I return to hometown! I return to hometown! A goal of young students in my villages is high,²⁰² show initiative and don’t forget their roots.” Thereupon, Kongzi left Chen.

過蒲，會公叔氏以蒲畔，蒲人止孔子。弟子有公良孺者，以私車五乘從孔子。其為人長賢，有勇力，謂曰，“吾昔從夫子遇難於匡，今又遇難於此，命也已。吾與夫子再罹難，寧鬪而死！”鬪甚疾，蒲人懼，謂孔子曰，“苟毋適衛，吾出子。”與之盟，出孔子東門。孔子遂適衛，子貢曰，“盟可負耶？”孔子曰，“要盟也，神不聽。”

Kongzi passed by Pu; apropos a clan member from Gongshu 公叔氏 betrayed someone by means of Pu, Pu people stopped Kongzi. There was Gongliang Ru 公良孺 among disciples; he followed Kongzi by means of his five *sheng* 乘 of chariots. That person was tall, worthy and had valor and power, said to Kongzi, “In the past, I followed Kongzi, we suddenly faced difficulty in Kuang; today we also suddenly faced difficulty here; it is mandate. I and master encounter unfortunately difficulty again. I rather fight and die!” Fighting was more and more fierce, Pu people were afraid of it; they addressed to Kongzi saying, “If you don’t go to Wei, we let you go.” They swore the covenant with him, let Kongzi go to the east gate. Thereupon, Kongzi went to Wei. Zigong said, “Is it permissible to disregard the swear?” Kongzi said, “If swear is compelled by someone, a god doesn’t accept it.”

²⁰² *Lunyu* 5.22

衛靈公聞孔子來喜。郊迎，問曰，“蒲可伐乎？”對曰，“可。”靈公曰，“吾大夫以爲不可。今蒲，衛之所以待晉楚也，以衛伐之，無乃不可乎？”孔子曰，“其男子有死之志，婦人有保西河之志。吾所伐者不過四五人。”靈公曰，“善。”然不伐蒲。

Duke Ling of Wei heard Kongzi visited, was delightful; he welcomed Kongzi at suburbs, asked him saying, “Is it permissible to attack Pu?” Kongzi responded to it, saying, “It’s permissible.” Duke Ling said, “My court aristocrats regard it as impermissible. Now, Pu is located where Wei face off Jin and Chu by means of Pu. Isn’t it then impermissible to attack there by means of Wei?” Kongzi said, “That men in Pu have an intention to die; womenfolk have an intention to protect Xihe 西河. People who we attack aren’t over four or five people.” Duke Ling said, “Excellent.” To be thus, he did not attack Pu.

靈公老，怠於政，不用孔子。孔子喟然歎曰，“苟有用我者，朞月而已。三年有成！”孔子行。

Duke Ling became old, indolent to governing; he did not employ Kongzi. Kongzi sighed deeply, saying, “If there is someone who employs me, he uses me for one year and he already achieves something to some extent. If he employs me for three years, there will be a full achievement!”²⁰³ Kongzi left Wei realm.

493 BCE

佛肸爲中牟宰。趙簡子攻范、中行，伐中牟。佛肸畔，使人召孔子。孔子欲往，子路曰，“由聞諸夫子，‘其身親爲不善者，君子不入也。’今佛肸親以中牟畔，子欲往，如之何？”孔子曰，“有是言也。不曰，‘堅乎！磨而不磷！’不曰，‘白乎！涅而不淄！’我豈匏瓜也哉？焉能系而不食？”

Bi Xi 佛肸 became a Steward in Zhongmou 中牟. Zhao Yang attacked Fan 范, Zhonghang 中行, attacked Zhongmou. Bi Xi betrayed Zhao Yang; he made people to

²⁰³ *Lunyu* 13.10

summon Kongzi. Kongzi desired to go there. Zilu said, “I heard it from you, ‘A gentleman doesn’t go to a person who practices non-good things by himself.’ Now, Bi Xi betrays Zhao Yang by means of Zhongmou by himself. What do you desire to go there?” Kongzi said, “There has this word. Isn’t it, saying, ‘The most solid thing is abraded but it can’t become thin!’ Isn’t it saying, ‘The whitest thing is tanned by alum but can’t become black! How do I become a gourd? Is it possible to hang on a tree and not be used?’”²⁰⁴

孔子擊磬，有荷蕢而過門者，曰，“有心哉！擊磬乎，硜硜乎！莫己知也夫而已矣！”
Kongzi beat a stone chime; there was one person who carried utensils made by grass and passed by a door, saying, “He has a profound heart! There is sound of the stone chime; *keng keng*! Nobody knows him and that’s all!”²⁰⁵

孔子學鼓琴師襄子，十日不進。師襄子曰，“可以益矣。”孔子曰，“丘已習其曲矣，未得其數也。”有間，曰，“已習其數，可以益矣。”孔子曰，“丘未得其志也。”有間，曰，“已習其志，可以益矣。”孔子曰，“丘未得其爲人也。”有間，有所穆然深思焉，有所怡然高望而遠志焉。曰，“丘得其爲人，黯然而黑，幾然而長，眼如望羊，如王四國，非文王其誰能爲此也！”師襄子辟席再拜，曰，“師蓋云文王操也。”

Kongzi learned to play a zither from Shixiangzi 師襄子 but did not improve his playing for ten days as Kongzi thought. Shixiangzi said, “It’s permissible to add a new musical tune.” Kongzi said, “I completely practice its tune, but don’t obtain its way to play.” There is for a moment later, Shixiangzi said, “You completely practice its way, it’s permissible to add a new tune.” Kongzi said, “I don’t obtain its intention yet.” There is for a moment later, Shixiangzi said, “You completely practice its intention, it’s permissible to add a new tune.” Kongzi said, “I don’t obtain its tune to become a man.” There is for a moment

²⁰⁴ *Lunyu* 17.7

²⁰⁵ *Lunyu* 14.39

later, Kongzi had a thing which a composure thinks tranquilly and deeply, and which the composer looks up something happily and has a grand intention from the tone. Kongzi said, “I obtain its tune to become the man. He is dark, tall; his eyes are like gazing at a far distance. Who else can compose it without the King Wen!” Shixiangzi turned away straw mat and bowed to Kongzi twice, saying, “My master said that it’s *Wenwangcao* 文王操.”

孔子既不得用於衛，將西見趙簡子。至於河而聞竇鳴犢、舜華之死也。臨河而嘆曰，“美哉水！洋洋乎！丘之不濟此，命也夫！”子貢趨而進曰，“敢問何謂也。”孔子曰，“竇鳴犢、舜華，晉國之賢大夫也。趙簡子未得志之時，須此兩人而后從政。及其已得志，殺之乃從政。丘聞之也，刳胎殺夭，則麒麟不至郊，竭澤涸漁，則蛟龍不合陰陽，覆巢毀卵，則鳳皇不翔，何則？君子諱傷其類也。夫鳥獸之於不義也尚知辟之，而況乎丘哉！”乃還息乎陬鄉，作為陬操以哀之，而反乎衛，入主蘧伯玉家。

Kongzi then was not employed in Wei; he was about to go to the West to see Zhao Yang. He arrived at Yellow River 黃河 and heard the death of Dou Mingdu 竇鳴犢 and Shun Hua 舜華. He looked downward Yellow River and sighed, saying, “Here is such a beautiful Yellow River! The river is magnificent! I don’t cross here; it is the mandate!” Zigong ran and moved toward hastily, saying, “I dare to ask what you think.” Kongzi said, “Du Mingdu and Shun Hua were worthy court aristocrats in Jin realm. When Zhao Yang didn’t obtain his ambition yet, he employed these two people and then later was in charge of government with them. When he already obtained his ambition, he killed them and then was in charge of government by himself. I heard it; if you cut open fetus and kill a baby, then a unicorn does not come to a suburb; if you dry up a marsh and desiccate to fish, then a dragon which has a horn does not unify Yin and Yang; if you overturn a nest and damage eggs, then phoenix does not hover. How is it? The gentleman shuns to injury his type. Birds merely know to avoid going to unrighteous place, and then how I do it!” Then, Kongzi returned and took a rest in Zou village. He composed, played *Zoucao* 陬操 in order to mourn them and

then returned to Wei; he entered and stayed in Qu Baiyu's house.

他日，靈公問兵陳，孔子曰，“俎豆之事則嘗聞之，軍旅之事未之學也。”明日，與孔子語，見蜚鴈，仰視之，色不在孔子。孔子遂行，復如陳。

On another day, Duke Ling asked how to deploy armies. Kongzi said, “If it is an affair of Zudou, I heard it in the past. If it is an affair of 12,500 soldiers, I haven't learned it yet.” On the next day, he talked to Kongzi. He saw a flying wild goose, looked up at it; his face was not directed to Kongzi. Thereupon, Kongzi left and went to Chen again.²⁰⁶

夏，衛靈公卒，立孫輒，是爲衛出公。六月，趙鞅內太子蒯聵于戚。陽虎使太子絏，八人衰經，僞自衛迎者，哭而入，遂居焉。冬，蔡遷于州來。

In summer, Duke Ling of Wei died. His grandson Zhe was taken to the position; this person was Duke Chu of Wei. In the sixth month, Zhao Yang invited the crown prince, Kuaikui, at Qi. Yang Hu made the crown prince wear a mourning cowl, and eight people dressed *Cuidie* 衰經. Counterfeitly welcoming from Wei, they cried and entered. Thereupon, Kuaikui lived in there. In the winter, Cai relocated to Zhoulai 州來。

492 BCE

是歲魯哀公三年，而孔子年六十矣。齊助衛圍戚，以衛太子蒯聵在故也。

Next year was the third reign year of Duke Ai of Lu, and Kongzi's age was 60.²⁰⁷ Qi helped Wei to besiege Qi because the crown prince of Wei, Kuaikui, was there.

²⁰⁶ *Lunyu* 15.1

²⁰⁷ “Liang Yusheng 梁玉繩 (1744–1792) said, ‘When Duke of Cai moved to Zhoulai, Kongzi was 59 years old, and it was the second year of the reign of Duke Ai. [Thus], this is an error. 梁玉繩曰，蔡遷州來之歲，孔子年五十九，哀公二年也，此誤。’ Based on Liang Yusheng's textual critique, Han Zhaoqi 韩兆琦 revised this year 是歲 into the next year 明歲. Han Zhaoqi 韩兆琦, *Shiji Jianzheng* 史记笺证, (Nanchang: Jiangsu Renmin, 2004), 3240. Considering the timeline of the “Kongzi Shijia,” I agree with the revision of Liang Yusheng and Han Zhaoqi.

夏，魯桓釐廟燬，南宮敬叔救火。孔子在陳，聞之，曰，“災必於桓釐廟乎！”已而果然。

In summer, the temples of Duke Huan of Lu 魯桓公 (r. 711–694 BCE) and Duke Xi of Lu 魯釐公 (r. 659–627 BCE) were burnt. Nangong Jingshu extinguished fire. Kongzi was in Chen; he heard it, saying, “The disaster definitely happened in the temples of Duke Huan of Lu and Duke Xi of Lu!” Soon,²⁰⁸ it turned out to be true.

秋，季桓子病，輦而見魯城，喟然嘆曰，“昔此國幾興矣，以吾獲罪於孔子故不興也。”顧謂其嗣康子曰，“我即死，若必相魯，相魯，必召仲尼。”後數日，桓子卒，康子代立。已葬，欲召仲尼。公之魚曰，“昔吾先君用之不終，終爲諸侯笑。今又用之，不能終，是再爲諸侯笑。”康子曰，“則誰召而可？”曰，“必召冉求。”於是使使召冉求。冉求將行，孔子曰，“魯人召求，非小用之，將大用之也。”是日，孔子曰，“歸乎！歸乎！吾黨之小子狂簡，斐然成章，吾不知所以裁之。”子贛知孔子思歸，送冉求，因誡曰，“即用，以孔子爲招。”云。冉求既去。

In autumn, Ji Huanzi got sick. He got in carriages for court officials pulled by men and saw the walled city in Lu; he sighed deeply, saying “In the past, a sign of this realm was prospering. Since I obtained the sin to Kongzi, it isn’t prospering anymore.” He turned the head to see and to see and talked to his successor Kangzi, saying, “I soon die. If you definitely continued to rule Lu, continuing to rule Lu, you must summon Zhongni.” Several days later, Huanzi died, Kangzi took his position. Kangzi finished burying and desired to summon Kongzi. Gongzhi Yu 公之魚 said, “In the past, our previous lord employed him but didn’t maintain his employment in the end. Finally, it became several lords’ derision. Now, you also employ him. If you can’t maintain his employment, this becomes several lords’ derision again.” Kangzi said, “Then, who do I summon, and is it permissible?” Gongzhi Yu said, “You must summon Ran Qiu 冉求.” Thereupon, he made an ambassador summon to Ran Qiu. Ran Qiu was about to leave; Kongzi said, “Kangzi summons you; it isn’t to employ

²⁰⁸ Li Jiemin 李解民, “Kongzi Shijia 孔子世家” in *Shiji Quanzhu Quanyi* 史记全注全译, 1797.

you as a small position, but it's about to employ you in a grand position.” This day, Kongzi said, “I return to hometown! I return to hometown! A goal of young students in my village is high. Silk patterns were woven with the silk patterns; I don't know that by which tailors them.”²⁰⁹ Zigong knew Kongzi thought to return to the hometown; he saw off Ran Qiu. Thereupon, he requested Ran You, saying, “If you are employed, you summon the master” in this way. Ran Qiu soon left.

491 BCE

明年，孔子自陳遷于蔡。蔡昭公將如吳，吳召之也。前昭公欺其臣遷州來，後將往，大夫懼復遷，公孫翩射殺昭公。楚侵蔡。

In the next year, Kongzi moved to Cai from Chen. Duke Zhao of Cai 蔡昭公 (r.

518–491 BCE) was about to go to Wu since Fu Chai summoned him. Before Duke Zhao cheated his ministers to move Zhoulai; later he was about to go there again. Court ministers were afraid of relocation again. Gongsun Pian 公孫翩 shot an arrow to kill Duke Zhao. Chu invaded Cai.

490 BCE

秋，齊景公卒。

In autumn, Duke Jing of Qi died.

489 BCE

明年，孔子自蔡如葉。葉公問政，孔子曰，“政在來遠附邇。”他日，葉公問孔子於子路，子路不對。孔子聞之，曰，“由，爾何不對曰，‘其爲人也，學道不倦，誨人不厭，發憤忘食，樂以忘憂，不知老之將至。’云爾。”

²⁰⁹ *Lunyu* 5.22

Next year, Kongzi went to She 葉 from Cai. Duke She 葉公 asked governing; Kongzi said, “The governing depends on coming people who live a far distance and submitting people who live nearby.”²¹⁰ Another day, Duke She asked Kongzi to Zilu; he did not respond to it. Kongzi heard it, saying, “You, why don’t you respond to it, saying, ‘That person isn’t tired of learning the way, displeased to teach people.’”²¹¹ If he emits excitement to do something else, he forgets to eat something, enjoys it so forgets his worries, and doesn’t know that aging is about to reaching to him in this way and that’s all.”²¹²

去葉，反于蔡。長沮、桀溺耦而耕，孔子以爲隱者。使子路問津焉。長沮曰，“彼執輿者爲誰？”子路曰，“爲孔丘。”曰，“是魯孔丘與？”曰，“然。”曰，“是知津矣。”桀溺謂子路曰，“子爲誰？”曰，“爲仲由。”曰，“子，孔丘之徒與？”曰，“然。”桀溺曰，“悠悠者天下皆是也，而誰以易之？且與其從辟人之士，豈若從辟世之士哉！”耰而不輟。子路以告孔子，孔子憮然曰，“鳥獸不可與同群。天下有道，丘不與易也！”

Kongzi left She and returned to Cai. Chang Zu 長沮 and Jie Ni 桀溺 plowed a field together; Kongzi regarded them as recluses. He made Zilu ask a dock to them. Chang Zu said, “Who is that person who hold a whip.” Zilu said, “That person is Kongzi.” He said, “Is this person Kongzi from Lu?” He said, “Yes.” He said, “This person knows where the dock is.” Jie Ni talked to Zilu, saying, “Who are you?” He said, “I’m Zhong You.” He said, “Are you a Kongzi’s disciple?” He said, “Yes.” Jie Ni said, “Steadily flowing everything all under the Heaven is like this, and with whom would you change all under the Heaven?”

Furthermore, comparing him to follow men of service who avoid people; how he is like one to follow men of service who avoid the world! They planted seeds without stopping. Zilu announced Kongzi by means of what he talked to them; Kongzi despondently said, “I can’t

²¹⁰ *Lunyu* 13.16

²¹¹ *Lunyu* 7.2

²¹² *Lunyu* 7.19

make the same community with us. If all under the Heaven has the way, I wouldn't participating in changing all under the Heaven!"²¹³

他日，子路行，遇荷蓀丈人，曰，“子見夫子乎？”丈人曰，“四體不勤，五穀不分，孰爲夫子！”植其杖而芸。子路以告，孔子曰，“隱者也。”復往，則亡。

Another day, Zilu was leaving and suddenly meeting an old man who carried utensils made by bamboos, saying, “Do you see a master?” The old man said, “He doesn't labor hard by two arms and legs, distinguish five grains, who is the master!” He embedded his cane on earth and weeded. Zilu announced Kongzi by means of what he talked to the old man. Kongzi said, “He is a recluse.” Zilu went again, but then he was not there.²¹⁴

孔子遷于蔡。三歲，吳伐陳。楚救陳，軍于城父，聞孔子在陳蔡之間。楚使人聘孔子。孔子將往拜禮，陳蔡大夫謀曰，“孔子賢者，所刺譏皆中諸侯之疾。今者久留陳蔡之間，諸大夫所設行皆非仲尼之意。今楚大國也，來聘孔子。孔子用於楚，則陳蔡用事大夫危矣。”

Kongzi moved to Cai. Three years later, Wu attacked Chen. Chu came to rescue Chen and encamped at Chengfu 城父. Chu heard that Kongzi was between Chen and Cai. Chu sent a person to request Kongzi's presence and service. Kongzi was about to pay his respects, then court aristocrats in Chen and Cai discussed and said, “Kongzi was a worthy person. What he criticizes and derides all strikes right at the heart of every lord's faults. Now, he has been staying between Chen and Cai for a long time, what the court aristocrats implement and do aren't all of what Kongzi wants to aim for. Now, Chu is a big realm, and comes to ask for service to Kongzi. If Kongzi is employed in Chu, then we who are employed and served in Chen and Cai will be endangered.”

²¹³ *Lunyu* 18.6

²¹⁴ *Lunyu* 18.7

於是乃相與發徒役圍孔子於野。不得行，絕糧。從者病，莫能興。孔子講誦弦歌不衰。子路慍見曰，“君子亦有窮乎？”孔子曰，“君子固窮，小人窮，斯濫矣。”子貢色作，孔子曰，“賜，爾以予爲多學而識之者與？”曰，“然，非與？”孔子曰，“非也。予一以貫之。”

At this moment, the grandees then mobilized their people and corvee labors

altogether to besiege Kongzi in the fields. Kongzi was not able to move, and his food ran out.

His followers got sick, no one was able to stand up. Kongzi did lecture, reciting, playing,

singing without an end. Zilu who had an angry facial expression said, “Does a gentleman also have a mired situation?” Kongzi said, “The gentleman is definitely in the mired situation. If a petty person is in the mired situation, the person is overwhelmed in the mired situation.”²¹⁵

Zigong’s facial color changed, so Kongzi said, “Ci 賜, do you regard me as a person who have learned a lot and has great judgement?” He said, “Yes, isn’t it?” Kongzi said, “It is not. I penetrate it by means of one.”²¹⁶

孔子知弟子有慍心，乃召子路而問曰，“『詩』云，‘匪兕匪虎，率彼曠野！’吾道非邪！吾何爲於此！”子路曰，“意者吾未仁邪？人之不我信也。意者吾未知邪？人之不我行也。”孔子曰，“有是乎！由，譬使仁者而必信，安有伯夷、叔齊？使知者而必行，安有王子比干？”

Kongzi knew that that the disciples had angry emotions, then summoned Zilu and asked, saying, “The *Shi* saying, “Something else which isn’t a rhinoceros and isn’t a tiger wanders the wilderness!’ My way isn’t followed! Why I am here!” Zilu said, “I conjecture that we aren’t humane yet; people don’t trust our words. I conjecture that we aren’t wise yet; people don’t follow us.” Kongzi said, “Here it is! You, I draw an analogy making everyone become humane and then people trust in him, how else could Bo Yi and Shu Qi exist? I draw an analogy making everyone become

²¹⁵ Lunyu 15.2

²¹⁶ Lunyu 15.3

wise will make people trust in him, how else could Prince Bi Gan exist?"

子路出，子貢入見，孔子曰，“賜，『詩』云，‘匪兕匪虎，率彼曠野！’吾道非邪！吾何爲於此！”子貢曰，“夫子之道至大也，故天下莫能容夫子。夫子蓋少貶焉？”孔子曰，“賜，良農能稼而不能爲穡，良工能巧而不能爲順。君子能修其道，綱而紀之，統而理之，而不能爲容。今爾不修爾道而求爲容。賜，而志不遠矣！”

Zilu went outside; Zigong entered and saw Kongzi. Kongzi said, “The *Shi* says, “‘Something else which isn’t a rhinoceros and isn’t a tiger wanders that wilderness!’ My way isn’t wrong! Why I am here! Zigong said, “Your way is extremely grand. Therefore, no one all under the Heaven can accept you. Can you probably slightly reduce in your way to people?” Kongzi said, “Ci, a good farmer can sow seeds but can’t harvest grains; a good mechanics can produce something skillfully but can’t satisfy people. The gentleman cultivates his way, makes order to people, integrate and manage them, but can’t embrace them. Now, you don’t cultivate your way but seek to embrace them. Ci, your intention isn’t grand!”

子貢出，顏回入見，孔子曰，“回，『詩』云，‘匪兕匪虎，率彼曠野！’吾道非邪！吾何爲於此！”顏回曰，“夫子之道至大，故天下莫能容。雖然，夫子推而行之，不容何病？不容然後見君子。夫道之不修也，是吾醜也。夫道既已大修而不用，是有國者之醜也。不容何病？不容然後見君子。”孔子欣然而笑曰，“有是哉！顏氏之子！使爾多財，吾爲爾宰。”

Zigong went outside; Yan Hui entered and saw Kongzi. Kongzi said, “The *Shi* says, “‘Something else which isn’t a rhinoceros and isn’t a tiger wanders that wilderness!’ My way isn’t wrong! Why I am here! Yan Hui said, “Your way is extremely grand. Therefore, no one all under the Heaven can accept it. Although it is thus so, you carry it out. Why is to not embrace it a failing? People don’t accept it; only then it shows the gentleman. In any particular case, the way isn’t cultivated; this is our shame. In any particular case, the way is already cultivated greatly but can’t be used; this is that realms have shame. Why is to not embrace it a failing? People don’t accept it; only then it shows the gentleman. Kongzi

delightfully smiled and said, “Here it is! A child of Yan clan! If you had a plethora of materials, I would become your Steward.”

於是使子貢至楚，楚昭王興師迎孔子，然後得免。

Thereupon, Kongzi ordered Zigong to reach Chu; King Zhao of Chu 楚昭王 (r. 515–489 BCE) raised armies to welcome Kongzi, only then he could get away from the dire situation.

昭王將以書社地七百里封孔子，楚令尹子西曰，“王之使使諸侯有如子貢者乎？”曰，“無有。”“王之輔相有如顏回者乎？”曰，“無有。”“王之將率有如子路者乎？”曰，“無有。”“王之官尹有如宰予者乎？”曰，“無有。”“且楚之祖封於周，號爲子男五十里。今孔丘述三五之，明周召之業。王若用之，則楚安得世世堂堂方數千里乎！”夫文王在豐，武王在鎬，百里之君卒王天下。今孔丘得據土壤，賢弟子爲佐，非楚之福也。”昭王乃止。其秋，楚昭王卒于城父。

King Zhao was about to bestow Kongzi by means of registered hamlets within 700 *li* in all.²¹⁷ The Chief Minister 令尹, Zi Xi 子西, in Chu said, “Do you have one like Zigong among your ambassadors to send several lords?” The King said, “I don’t have one.” He said, “Do you have one like Yan Hui among your ministers to assist you?” The King said, “I don’t have one.” He said, “Do you have one like Zilu among your general to lead armies?” The King said, “I don’t have one.” He said, “Furthermore, the ancestor of Chu was bestowed from the Zhou king; its name became viscount or baron who manage fifty *li*. Now, Kong Qiu followed model of three kings and five emperors; he illuminates heritage of Duke Zhou 周公 and Duke Zhao 召公. If you employ him, then how Chu loftily manages several thousand *li* square from one generation to another!”²¹⁸ King wen lived in Feng, and King Wu lived in

²¹⁷ Han Zhaoqi 韩兆琦, *Shiji Jianzheng* 史记笺证, 3284.

²¹⁸ Li Jiemin 李解民, “Kongzi Shijia 孔子世家” in *Shiji Quanzhu Quanyi* 史记全注全译,

Hao; the lord of a hundred *li* accomplished to become a king all under the Heaven. Now, if Kong Qiu can seize the bestow lands,²¹⁹ and worthy disciples support him, it isn't a good fortune of Chu." King Zhao then abandoned his plan. This autumn, King Zhao of Chu died in Chengfu.

楚狂接輿歌而過孔子曰，“鳳兮！鳳兮！何德之衰？往者不可諫兮，來者猶可追也！已而！已而！今之從政者殆而！”孔子下，欲與之言，趨而去，弗得與之言。

The madman of Chu, Guang Jie 接輿, sang a song and passed by Kongzi, saying,

“Phoenix! Phoenix! How the virtue is declined! People who are about to be gone can't be remonstrated! People who are about to come rather can be pursued! The world is in turmoil! It is too severe! Now, people who are in charge of governing are endangered, and that's all!” Kongzi got out of a carriage, desired to talk to him but he moved toward hastily and left; Kongzi was not able to talk to him.²²⁰

於是孔子自楚反乎衛。是歲也，孔子年六十三，而魯哀公六年也。

Thereupon, Kongzi returned to Wei from Chu. In this year, Kongzi's age was 63 and it was the 16th reign year of Duke Ai of Lu.

488 BCE

其明年，吳與魯會繒，徵百牢。太宰嚭召季康子，康子使子貢往，然後得已。

In the next year, Wu and Lu made an agreement in Zeng 繒; Wu demanded a hundred cows, lambs, and pigs.²²¹ The Grand Steward, Bai Pi 伯嚭, summoned Ji Kangzi.

1806.

²¹⁹ Ibid., 1806.

²²⁰ *Lunyu* 18.5

²²¹ Li Jiemin 李解民, “Kongzi Shijia 孔子世家” in *Shiji Quanzhu Quanyi* 史记全注全译,

Kangzi ordered Zigong to go to Wu, only then he obtained the aim.

孔子曰，“魯衛之政，兄弟也。”是時，衛君輒父不得立，在外，諸侯數以爲讓，而孔子弟子多仕於衛，衛君欲得孔子爲政。子路曰，“衛君待子而爲政，子將奚先？”孔子曰，“必也正名乎！”子路曰，“有是哉，子之迂也！何其正也？”孔子曰，“野哉！由也！夫名不正則言不順，言不順則事不成。事不成則禮樂不興，禮樂不興則刑罰不中。刑罰不中則民無所錯手足矣。夫君子爲之必可名，言之必可行。君子於其言，無所苟而已矣。”

Kongzi said, “The governing of Lu and Wei is brother.”²²² This time, the father of the lord of Wei whose name was Zhe did not take position. Out of the realms, several lords frequently criticized him, and a lot of Kongzi’s disciples held office positions in Wei. The lord of Wei desired to obtain Kongzi to practice governing. Zilu said, “The lord of Wei will treat you and practice governing. What are you about to do first?” Kongzi said, “I definitely rectify names!” Zilu said, “Here it is! You’re irrational! How do you rectify names?” Kongzi said, “You aren’t insightful! You! In any particular cases, if a name isn’t rectified, then language isn’t compliant. If the language isn’t compliant, then things aren’t perfected. If the things aren’t perfected, then punishment doesn’t attain its goal. If the punishment doesn’t attain its goal, then common people don’t have a thing to put their hands and feet on. In any case, if a gentleman names it, then people definitely can name it; if the gentleman says it, then the people definitely practice it. The gentleman doesn’t have a thing to do frivolously to the language and that’s all.”²²³

484 BCE

其明年，冉有爲季氏將師，與齊戰於郎，克之。季康子曰，“子之於軍旅，學之乎？性之乎？”冉有曰，“學之於孔子。”季康子曰，“孔子何如人哉？”對曰，“用之有名，播之百姓，

1807.

²²² *Lunyu* 13.7

²²³ *Lunyu* 13.3

質諸鬼神而無憾。求之至於此道，雖累千社，夫子不利也。”康子曰，“我欲召之，可乎？”對曰，“欲召之，則毋以小人固之，則可矣。”而衛孔文子將攻太叔，問策於仲尼。仲尼辭不知，退而命載而行，曰，“鳥能擇木，木豈能擇鳥乎！”文子固止，會季康子逐公華、公賓、公林，以幣迎孔子。孔子歸魯。

Four years later, Ran You became Ji clan's general. He fought against Qi in Lang and defeated Qi. Ji Kangzi said, "Did you learn to deploy armies or is it your nature?" Ran You said, "I learned it from Kongzi." Ji Kangzi said, "What kind of person is Kongzi?" He responded to it, saying, "If you employ him, you obtain fame. You spread it to common people and pledge it to ghost, but there isn't unsatisfaction.²²⁴ I reach to this way even if I accumulate²²⁵ 25,000 households;²²⁶ the master does not regard it as profit." Kangzi said, "I desire to summon him, is it permissible?" He responded to it, saying, "If you desire to summon him, you don't fetter²²⁷ him by means of petty people, then it's permissible." However, Kong Wenzi in Wei 孔文子 was about to attack Taishu 太叔. He asked a stratagem to Kongzi. Kongzi said refusal that he did not know it. He went back and ordered to prepare for a carriage²²⁸ and left, saying, "A bird can choose a tree. How the tree can choose the bird!" Wenzi firmly stopped Kongzi. At that moment, Ji Kangzi expelled Gonghua 公華, Gongbin 公賓 and Gonglin 公林 in order to welcome Kongzi by means of silk.²²⁹ Kongzi returned to Lu.

²²⁴ Li Jiemin 李解民, "Kongzi Shijia 孔子世家" in Shiji Quanzhu Quanyi 史记全注全译, 1808.

²²⁵ Ibid., 1808.

²²⁶ Ibid., 1808.

²²⁷ Ibid., 1808.

²²⁸ Ibid., 1808.

²²⁹ Ibid., 1808.

482 BCE

孔子之去魯凡十四歲而反乎魯.

Kongzi left Lu for 14 years and returned to Lu.

魯哀公問政，對曰，“政在選臣。”季康子問政，曰，“舉直錯諸枉，則枉者直。”康子患盜，孔子曰，“苟子之不欲，雖賞之，不竊。”然魯終不能用孔子，孔子亦不求仕。

Duke Ai of Lu asked governing; Kongzi responded to it, saying, “The governing depends on selecting ministers.” Ji Kangzi asked governing; Kongzi said, “If you recommend an honest person and discard a dishonest person, then the dishonest person will become honest.”²³⁰ Kangzi worried about thieves; Kongzi said, “If you sincerely aren’t greedy, although you prize them, nobody steals anything else.” However, Lu did not possibly employ Kongzi in the end; Kongzi also did not want to serve in the office.

孔子之時，周室微而禮樂廢，詩書缺。追跡三代之禮，序書傳，上紀唐虞之際，下至秦繆，編次其事。曰，“夏禮吾能言之，杞不足徵也，殷禮吾能言之，宋不足徵也。足，則吾能徵之矣。”觀殷夏所損益，曰，“後雖百世可知也，以一文一質。周監二代，郁郁乎文哉！吾從周。”故『書傳』、『禮記』自孔氏。

In the time of Kongzi, the Zhou house became tenuous, and the rites and music were abolished, the *Shi* and the *Shu* were splintered. Kongzi traced the rites of the Three Dynasties, arranged the *Shu Zhuan* 書傳 in sequence, chronicled the period of Tang 唐 and Yu first in sequence, reached to Duke Mu of Qin last in a series of the *Shu Zhuan*, and edited its events in an order. He said, “About the rites of Xia, I can speak to it; but Ji 杞 isn’t sufficient to perfect it. About the rites of Yin, I can speak to it; but Song isn’t sufficient to perfect it. If it’s sufficient, then I can perfect it.”²³¹ Observing what Yin and Xia relinquished and added,

²³⁰ *Lunyu* 2.19

²³¹ *Lunyu* 3.9

Kongzi said, “Although there will be a hundred generation later, I can know it.”²³² Each generation used embellishment once, and substance another time.²³³ Zhou observed the two dynasties. How much it was embellished! I am following Zhou.”²³⁴ Therefore, the *Shu Zhuan*, the *Liji* 禮記 came from Kongzi.

孔子語魯大師, “樂其可知也, 始作翕如, 縱之純如, 皦如, 繹如也, 以成.”

Kongzi discussed music with a Grand Preceptor 大師 in Lu, “Music, it can be known. The beginning should be exuberant, following after the beginning should be harmonious, making the syllable clear in order to perfect it.”²³⁵

“吾自衛反魯, 然後樂正, 雅頌各得其所.”

“I returned to Lu from Wei, only then music became rectified; Ya 雅 and Song 頌 obtain its place to each other.”²³⁶

古者詩三千餘篇, 及至孔子, 去其重, 取可施於禮義. 上采契后稷, 中述殷周之盛, 至幽厲之缺. 始於衽席, 故曰, “關雎之亂以爲風始, 鹿鳴爲小雅始, 文王爲大雅始, 清廟爲頌始.” 三百五篇孔子皆弦歌之, 以求合韶武雅頌之音. 禮樂自此可得而述, 以備王道, 成六藝.

In the past, the *Shi* were around 3,000 poems. Reaching Kongzi’s time, he eliminated its overlap, picked the *Shi* which can carry out to the rites and appropriateness. He collected Xie 契 and Hou Ji 后稷 first in sequence, recorded flourishment of Yin and Zhou middle in sequence, reached to deficiency of King You 周幽王 (r. 781–771 BCE) and Li 周厲王 (r.

²³² *Lunyu* 2.23

²³³ Han Zhaoqi 韩兆琦, *Shiji Jianzheng* 史记笺证, 3293.

²³⁴ *Lunyu* 3.14

²³⁵ *Lunyu* 3.23

²³⁶ *Lunyu* 9.15

871–841 BCE). The *Shi* begins from love story between a man and woman. Thereupon, Kongzi said, “The managing of Guan Ju 關雎 considers the beginning of Feng 風; Lu Ming 鹿鳴 is the beginning of Xiao Ya 小雅; Wen Wang 文王 is the beginning of Da Ya 大雅; Qing Miao 清廟 is the beginning of Song 頌.” Kongzi played and sang all of 305 poems in order to seek and meet the sound of Shao, Wu 武, Ya 雅 and Song 頌. The rites and music can be obtained and recorded from it in order to prepare for Kingly Way 王道 and perfect Six Arts 六藝.

孔子晚而喜易，序彖、繫、象、說卦、文言。讀易，韋編三絕。曰，“假我數年，若是，我於易則彬彬矣。”

Kongzi became old and delighted in the *Yi* 易; he arranged Tuan 彖, Ji 繫, Xiang 象, Shuogua 說卦, and Wenyan 文言. He read the *Yi*; a bundle of leather strips was broken off three times. Kongzi said, “Supposing that I have several years, I’m then balanced to the *Yi* like it.”²³⁷

孔子以詩書禮樂教，弟子蓋三千焉，身通六藝者七十有二人。如顏濁鄒之徒，頗受業者甚衆。

Kongzi taught disciples by means of the *Shi*, the *Shu*, the rites and music; the disciples probably were around 3,000. Like Yan Zouzou’s groups, there were a plethora of people who received instruction a little bit.²³⁸

孔子以四教，文，行，忠，信。絕四，毋意，毋必，毋固，毋我。所慎，齊，戰，疾。子罕言利與命與仁。不憤不啟，舉一隅不以三隅反，則弗復也。

²³⁷ *Lunyu* 6.18

²³⁸ Li Jiemin 李解民, “Kongzi Shijia 孔子世家” in *Shiji Quanzhu Quanyi* 史记全注全译, 1811.

Kongzi taught students by means of four things; embellishment, practice, sincerity, trustworthiness.²³⁹ He did not have four characteristics; he did not an indulgent intention, he was not certain to do anything else, he did not have firm intention, he did not have his own idea.²⁴⁰ The things which he was heedful were ritual purification by fasting, war, and disease.²⁴¹ The master seldom talked about profits and fate and humaneness.²⁴² If one is not impassioned, Kongzi does not open. If he raises one side, but one does not think of the other three sides, then he does not teach him again.²⁴³

其於鄉黨，恂恂，似不能言者，其於宗廟朝廷，辯辯言，唯謹爾。朝，與上大夫言，誾誾如也，與下大夫言，侃侃如也。

He was in a town which consisted of 12,500 household; he was with care and respect like one who is not capable of speaking well. He was in an Ancestral Temple 宗廟 and a court; he spoke well but was only prudent and that is all.²⁴⁴ In a court, his conversation with superior court aristocrats was like was right in the center what was correct, and his conversation with inferior court aristocrats was like affable.²⁴⁵

入公門，鞠躬如也。趨進翼如也。君召使儼，色勃如也。君命召，不俟駕行矣。

When he entered a gate of Duke, his bending body was like it.²⁴⁶ His hastily

²³⁹ *Lunyu* 7.25

²⁴⁰ *Lunyu* 9.4

²⁴¹ *Lunyu* 7.13

²⁴² *Lunyu* 9.1

²⁴³ *Lunyu* 7.8

²⁴⁴ *Lunyu* 10.1

²⁴⁵ *Lunyu* 10.2

²⁴⁶ *Lunyu* 10.4

approaching was like a bird with flying wings. When a lord summoned to order to welcome a guest, his changing facial expression was definitely like it.²⁴⁷ When the lord commanded him to summon, he did not wait for yoking a carriage and went.²⁴⁸

魚餒肉敗。割不正，不食。席不正，不坐。食於有喪者之側，未嘗飽也。

If fish and meat were decayed, cut improperly, then he did not eat them. If a mat was located improperly,²⁴⁹ he did not sit down there.²⁵⁰ When he had a meal next to one who has a mourning, he never ate the meal fully in the past.²⁵¹

是日哭，則不歌。見齊衰、瞽者，雖童子必變。

If he cried on this day, then he did not sing a song.²⁵² If he looked at a person wearing mourning clothes with sewn edges, a blind person, he definitely changed his facial expression even if the person is a child.²⁵³

“三人行，必得我師。”“德之不修，學之不講，聞義不能徙，不善不能改，是吾憂也。”使人歌，善，則使復之，然後和之。

“When three people go somewhere, I definitely obtain my master.”²⁵⁴ “Not cultivating virtue, not practicing what I learned, I can’t follow after listening to righteousness,

²⁴⁷ *Lunyu* 10.3

²⁴⁸ *Lunyu* 10.20

²⁴⁹ *Lunyu* 10.8

²⁵⁰ *Lunyu* 10.9

²⁵¹ *Lunyu* 7.8

²⁵² *Lunyu* 7.10

²⁵³ *Lunyu* 9.10

²⁵⁴ *Lunyu* 7.22

I can't correct not good; they are my worries.”²⁵⁵ He made a person sing a song; if the person sang well, then he ordered to sing a song again, only then he accompanied in song together.²⁵⁶

子不語，怪力，亂神。

Kongzi never spoke to power not derived from pattern and incorrect gods.²⁵⁷

子貢曰，“夫子之文章，可得聞也。夫子言天道與性命，弗可得聞也已。”顏淵喟然嘆曰，“仰之彌高，鑽之彌堅，瞻之在前，忽焉在後。夫子循循然善誘人，博我以文，約我以禮，欲罷，不能，既竭我才，如有所立，卓爾，雖欲從之，蔑由也已。”達巷黨人曰，“大哉孔子，博學而無所成名。”子聞之曰，“我何執？執御乎？執射乎？我執御矣。”牢曰，“子云，‘不試，故藝。’”

Zigong said, “Master’s works can be obtained and heard; Master’s words about the way of Heaven and mandate of nature can’t be obtained and heard.”²⁵⁸ Yan Yuan sighed deeply, saying, “I look up him, but he is even higher than where I look up, I drill him, but he is even harder than my expectation to be able to drill. I gaze forward him when he is near at me; he is suddenly far from me. Master sequentially promotes people well, broads me by means of embellishment, controls me by means of the rites. I desire to stop but can’t do it. I completely exhaust my talent; but it seems as if there is a place where he stands towering

²⁵⁵ *Lunyu* 7.3

²⁵⁶ *Lunyu* 7.32

²⁵⁷ *Lunyu* 7.21. Since Kongzi spoke about “several gods” with an ambassador from Wu in the “Kongzi Shijia,” it does not make sense to understand him as having never spoken about gods as mainstream commentaries suggest. Therefore, I follow Li Chong’s 李充 commentary, for his annotation is more suitable to the context of the “Kongzi Shijia”: “Li Chong said, ‘Power does not derive from pattern; this is *guaili* 怪力. A god does not derive from correctness; this is *luanshen* 亂神. *Guaili* and *luanshen* have promoted perniciousness; they have never augmented edification. Therefore, the master never spoke of them.’ 李充曰 ‘力不由理，斯怪力也。神不由正，斯亂神也。怪力·亂神，有與於邪，無益於教，故不言也。’” Xing Bing, *Lunyu Zhushu* 論語註疏, 102.

²⁵⁸ *Lunyu* 5.13

above. Although I desire to follow him, I don't reach him yet.²⁵⁹ A man of 500 households from Da Xiang said, "Kongzi is great. He broadly learns but doesn't have a fame which he perfects." Kongzi heard it, saying, "What do I take charge of? Do I take charge of driving a chariot? Do I take charge of shooting an arrow? I take charge of driving the chariot."²⁶⁰ Lao 牢 said, "Kongzi said, 'I am not employed. Thereupon, I learned various arts.'²⁶¹

BCE 481

魯哀公十四年春，狩大野。叔孫氏車子鉏商獲獸，以爲不祥。仲尼視之，曰，“麟也。”取之。曰，“河不出圖，雒不出書，吾已矣夫！”顏淵死，孔子曰，“天喪予！”及西狩見麟，曰，“吾道窮矣！”喟然嘆曰，“莫知我夫！”子貢曰，“何爲莫知子？”子曰，“不怨天，不尤人，下學而上達，知我者其天乎！”

In the 14th reign year of Duke Ai of Le, the duke hunted in Da Ye 大野. Shusun clan's driver whose name was Chu Shang 鉏商 captured a beast, regarded it as inauspicious. Zhongni looked at it, saying, "It's a unicorn." He took it. Kongzi said, "The *Tu* 圖 hasn't been emerged from Yellow River, The *Shu* 書 hasn't been emerged from Ruò 雒 River. I'm done!" Yan Yuan died, Kongzi said, "Heaven abandons me!" He reached Xishou 西狩 and looked at the unicorn, saying, "My way is stopped!"²⁶² He sighed deeply, saying, "Nobody knows me!" Zigong said, "Why does nobody know you?" Kongzi said, "I don't remonstrate Heaven, blame people. I learn today and understand the past. The thing which knows me is Heaven!"²⁶³

²⁵⁹ *Lunyu* 9.11

²⁶⁰ *Lunyu* 9.2

²⁶¹ *Lunyu* 9.7

²⁶² *Lunyu* 11.9

²⁶³ *Lunyu* 14.35

“不降其志，不辱其身，伯夷、叔齊乎。”謂，“柳下惠、少連降志辱身矣。”謂，“虞仲、夷逸隱居放言，行中清，廢中權。”“我則異於是，無可無不可。”

“Not giving up his intention, not humiliating his body was Bo Yi and Shu Qi.”

Kongzi said, “Liu Xiahui 柳下惠, Shao Lian 少連 gave up their intentions, humiliated their bodies.” He said, “Yu Zhong 虞仲, Yi Yi 夷逸 lived in seclusion while disposing to say what happened in the world. Their behaviors accord with cleanness, their abolishment accord with scale.” “I’m then different from them. I have nothing to do permissibly and nothing to do impermissibly.”²⁶⁴

子曰，“弗乎，弗乎。君子病沒世而名不稱焉。吾道不行矣，吾何以自見於後世哉？”乃因史記作『春秋』，上至隱公，下訖哀公十四年，十二公。據魯，親周，故殷，運之三代。約其文辭而指博。故吳楚之君自稱王，而春秋貶之曰‘子’；踐土之會實召周天子，而春秋諱之曰‘天王狩於河陽’。推此類以繩當世，貶損之義，後有王者舉而開之。春秋之義行，則天下亂臣賊子懼焉。

Kongzi said, “I can’t perfect it. I can’t perfect it.”²⁶⁵ A gentleman is concerned that he dies but his fame isn’t eulogized among people.²⁶⁶ My way hasn’t been performed. How will I be perceived later? Thereupon, he used historians’ records to write the *Chunqiu* from Duke Yin to the 14th reign year of Duke Ai; there are twelve dukes. Based on Lu, he personally succeeded Zhou. Therefore, he continued Yin; he followed the Three Dynasties. Its writings are precise, but the indications are broad. Thereupon, the lord of Wu and Chu claimed a king by himself, but Kongzi degraded them, saying ‘viscounts’ in the *Chunqiu*. In fact, the meeting of Jiantu 踐土 summoned the Zhou son of Heaven, but referred to it by saying, “The Zhou king hunted in Heyang 河陽.” He extrapolated this case in order to take precautions to the

²⁶⁴ Lunyu 18.8

²⁶⁵ Li Jiemin 李解民, “Kongzi Shijia 孔子世家” in Shiji Quanzhu Quanyi 史记全注全译, 1813.

²⁶⁶ Lunyu 15.20

time. Later, there will be one who practices Kingly Way raise up and open the meaning of degradation and relinquishment. If the meaning of *Chunqiu* is performed, then rebellious ministers and maltreating sons all around the world are afraid of it.

孔子在位聽訟，文辭有可與人共者，弗獨有也。至於爲『春秋』，筆則筆，削則削，子夏之徒不能贊一辭。弟子受『春秋』，孔子曰，“後世知丘者以『春秋』，而罪丘者亦以『春秋』！”

Kongzi was in a position to listen to accusations; he had people who can be associated with the documents. He did not have the case to do it by alone. He reached to editing the *Chunqiu*. He recorded what needed to be recorded and deleted what needed to be deleted. Zi Xia's group could not take part in one word. Disciples learned the *Chunqiu*; Kongzi said, “Later people will know me by means of the *Chunqiu*, and a thing which will blame me will be used by the *Chunqiu*!”

480 BCE

明歲，子路死於衛。

Next year, Zilu died in Wei.

479 BCE

孔子病，子貢請見。孔子方負杖逍遙於門，曰，“賜，汝來何其晚也？”孔子因歎，歌曰，“太山壞乎！梁柱摧乎！哲人萎乎！”因以涕下。謂子貢曰，“天下無道久矣，莫能宗予。夏人殯於東階，周人於西階，殷人兩柱間。昨暮予夢坐奠兩柱之間，予始殷人也。”後七日卒。

Kongzi got sick; Zigong requested him to see. Kongzi was carrying his hands on back, dragging a cane, and wandering carefreely beside a door, saying, “Ci, why do you come late?” Thereupon, Kongzi sighed, sang a song, saying, “Mt. Tai 太山 is being collapsed! The beam and pillar are broken apart! The wise man is being weakened!” Thereupon, he

dropped tears; he talked to Zigong, saying, “There isn’t the way all under the Heaven for a long time; no one can revere me. Xia people set up a funeral at eastern stairs, Zhou people set up the funeral at western stairs, Yin people set up it between two pillars. Last night, I dreamed of sitting down between two pillars and receiving *zun* 奠 rites. My ancestors were Yin people.” Seven days later, Kongzi died.

孔子年七十三，以魯哀公十六年四月己丑卒。哀公誄之曰，“旻天不弔，不憖遺一老，俾屏余一人以在位，嘽嘽余在疚！嗚呼哀哉！尼父，毋自律！”子貢曰，“君其不沒於魯乎！夫子之言曰，‘禮失則昏，名失則愆。失志爲昏，失所爲愆。’生不能用，死而誄之，非禮也。稱‘余一人，’非名也。”

Kongzi’ age was 73, his death date was the fourth month Jichou 己丑 day in the 16th reign year of Duke Ai of Lu. Duke Ai eulogized it, saying, “Heaven doesn’t practice goodness for me. It won’t bequeath Kongzi. It orders blocks me as one person in order to maintain the position. I’m lonely and sick. Alas and Woe! Nifu, I don’t have self-regulation!” Zigong said, “You won’t die in Lu! There’s the Master’s word, saying, ‘If the rites are lost, then it will be in turmoil; if the names lose its proper definition, then transgressions will happen. Losing intention lets the turmoil evolve; losing the proper place becomes a transgression.’ When he was alive, you didn’t possibly employ him. He died but eulogized him; it isn’t the rite. Claiming ‘me as one person’ isn’t proper naming.”

孔子葬魯城北泗上。弟子皆服三年，三年心喪畢，相訣而去，則哭，各復盡哀，或復留。唯子貢廬於冢上，凡六年，然後去。弟子及魯人往從冢而家者百有餘室，因命曰孔里。魯世世相傳以歲時奉祠孔子冢，而諸儒亦講禮鄉飲大射於孔子冢。孔子冢大一頃。故所居堂弟子內，後世因廟藏孔子衣冠琴車書，至于漢二百餘年不絕。高皇帝過魯，以太牢祠焉。諸侯卿相至，常先謁然後從政。

Kongzi was buried by Si river to the north of Lu’s capital. Every disciple wore mourning clothes for three years. During the three years, they finished the mourning sincerely,

spoke final farewell to each other and left. Then they cried, each one again exhausted sorrow or stayed there again. Only Zigong built a mourning hut by the tomb for a total of six years, only then he left. The disciples and Lu people went to the tomb and then a number of people who built houses there reached to around 100 households. Thereupon, it was called as Kong town. In Lu, people have offered sacrifice at Kongzi' tomb by each season annually from one generation to another and several classicists have also discussed the rites, practiced drinking and shot ritual at Kongzi' tomb. The size of Kongzi' tomb is around one *qing* 頃. Thereupon, the places where he lived in a house and disciples lived in inner houses later became the shrine to store Kongzi' clothes, hat, zither, chariot, and texts; its preservation reached to around 200 years until Han without cutting off. Liu Bang passed by Lu, offered the ritual by means of the sacrifice of the three domestic animals to Kongzi. Several lords, ministers reached there; they always first presented themselves to Kongzi only then were in charge of governing.

孔子生鯉，字伯魚，伯魚年五十，先孔子死。伯魚生伋，字子思，年六十二，嘗困於宋，子思作中庸。子思生白，字子上，年四十七。子上生求，字子家，年四十五。子家生箕，字子京，年四十六。子京生穿，字子高，年五十一。子高生子慎，年五十七，嘗爲魏相。子慎生鮒，年五十七，爲陳王涉博士，死於陳下。鮒弟子襄，年五十七，嘗爲孝惠皇帝博士，遷爲長沙太守，長九尺六寸。子襄生忠，年五十七。忠生武。武生延年及安國，安國爲今皇帝博士，至臨淮太守，蚤卒。安國生卬，卬生驩。

Kongzi bore Li 孔鯉 (532–483 BCE) with polite name Boyu 伯魚. When Boyu's age was 50, he died earlier than Kongzi. Boyu bore Ji 孔伋 (483–402 BCE) with polite name Zisi 子思; he died when Zisi's age was 62. He once experienced hardship in Song. He wrote the *Zhongyong* 中庸. Zisi bore Bai 孔白 with polite name Zishang 子上; Zishang died when his age was 47. Zishang bore Qiu 孔求 with polite name Zijia 子家; Zijia died

when his age was 45. Zijia bore Qi 孔箕 with polite name Zijing 子京; Zijing died when his age was 46. Zijing bore Chuan 孔穿 with polite name Zigao 子高; Zigao died when his age was 51. Zigao bore Zishen 孔謙; Zishen died when his age was 57. He was once a minister in Wei. Zishen bore Fu 子鮒; Fu died when his age was 57. He became an erudite of King Chen 陳王 whose name was She 涉 and died in Changxia 長沙. Fu's little brother whose polite name was Zixiang 孔騰 died when his age was 57. He was once an erudite of Emperor Hui 惠帝 (r. 195–188 BCE) and moved to become a Changsha governor. His height was nine *chi* six *cun*. Zixiang bore Zhong 忠; Zhong died when his age was 57. Zhong bore Wu 武, Wu bore Yannian 孔延年 and Anguo. Anguo was once current emperor's erudite and reached to a Linhuai 臨淮 governor; he died in Zao 蚤. Anguo bore Yang 孔印, Yang bore Huan 孔驩.

太史公曰，“詩有之，‘高山仰止，景行行止。’雖不能至，然心鄉往之。余讀孔氏書，想見其爲人。適魯，觀仲尼廟堂車服禮器，諸生以時習禮其家。余祇回留之，不能去云。天下君王至於賢人衆矣，當時則榮，沒則已焉。孔子布衣，傳十餘世，學者宗之。自天子王侯，中國言六藝者折中於夫子，可謂至聖矣！”

The Grand Historian said, “In the *Shi*, there is a verse, “Looking up a high mountain, practicing the great way.” Although I can’t reach him, my heart and mind move toward him. I read Kongzi’ texts and imagined that person. I passed by Lu, and observed his chariot, clothes, and ritual vessels in Zhongni’s shrine, and that several students practiced the rites in his house on time.²⁶⁷ I reverently and hesitantly stayed, couldn’t leave there. Many people from kings to worthy people all under the Heaven were alive then were flourishing at that moment; they

²⁶⁷ *Lunyu* 1.1

die then had disappeared. Kongzi wore linen clothes²⁶⁸ but has been transmitted for ten generations; learners are revering him. From a son of Heaven, kings and marquises to people who talk about the Six Arts in Central States conform to their decision with the master; he's feasible to be called as perfect paragon.

²⁶⁸ Li Jiemin 李解民, “Kongzi Shijia 孔子世家” in *Shiji Quanzhu Quanyi* 史记全注全译, 1817.

B. Statistics on the Passages Found in the *Lunyu* in the “Kongzi Shijia”

	孔子世家	論語
551 BCE	孔子生魯昌平鄉陬邑，其先宋人也，曰孔防叔。防叔生伯夏，伯夏生叔梁紇。紇與顏氏女野合而生孔子，禱於尼丘得孔子。魯襄公二十二年而孔子生。生而首上圩頂，故因名曰丘云，字仲尼。姓孔氏。	
	丘生而叔梁紇死，葬於防山。防山在魯東，由是孔子疑其父墓處，母諱之也。孔子爲兒嬉戲，常陳俎豆，設禮容。孔子母死，乃殯五父之衢，蓋其慎也。邾人輓父之母誨孔子父墓，然後往合葬於防焉。 孔子要經，季氏饗士。孔子與往。陽虎絀曰，“季氏饗士，非敢饗子也。”孔子由是退。	
535 BCE	孔子年十七，魯大夫孟釐子病且死，誡其嗣懿子曰，“孔丘，聖人之後，滅於宋。其祖弗父何始有宋而嗣讓厲公。及正考父佐戴，武，宣公，三命茲益恭。故鼎銘云，‘一命而偻，再命而傴，三命而俯。循牆而走，亦莫敢余侮。饘於是，粥於是，以餬余口。’其恭如是。吾聞聖人之後，雖不當世，必有達者。今孔丘年少好禮，其達者歟？吾即沒若必師之。”及釐子卒，懿子與魯人南宮敬叔往學禮焉。是歲，季武子卒，平子代立。	
	孔子貧且賤。及長，嘗爲季氏史，料量平，嘗爲司職吏而畜蕃息。由是爲司空。已而去魯。斥乎齊，逐乎宋，衛，困於陳蔡之間，於是反魯。孔子長九尺有六寸，人皆謂之“長人”而異之。魯復善待，由是反魯。 魯南宮敬叔言魯君曰，“請與孔子適周。”魯君與之一乘車，兩馬，一豎子俱，適周問禮。蓋見老子云。辭去，而	

	老子送之曰，“吾聞富貴者送人以財，仁人者送人以言。吾不能富貴，竊仁人之號，送子以言，曰，‘聰明深察而近於死者，好議人者也，博辯廣大危其身者，發人之惡者也。爲人子者毋以有己，爲人臣者毋以有己。’”孔子自周反于魯，弟子稍益進焉。 是時也，晉平公淫，六卿擅權，東伐諸侯。楚靈王兵彊，陵轢中國。齊大而近於魯。魯小弱，附於楚則晉怒，附於晉則楚來伐，不備於齊，齊師侵魯。	
522 BCE	魯昭公之二十年，而孔子蓋年三十矣。齊景公與晏嬰來適魯，景公問孔子曰，“昔秦穆公國小處辟，其霸何也？”對曰，“秦國雖小，其志大，處雖辟，行中正。身舉五穀，爵之大夫，起纍繼之中，與語三日，授之以政。以此取之，雖王可也，其霸小矣。”景公說。	
517 BCE	孔子年三十五，而季平子與郈昭伯以鬪雞故得罪魯昭公，昭公率師擊平子，平子與孟氏，叔孫氏三家共攻昭公。昭公師敗，奔於齊，齊處昭公乾侯。其後頃之，魯亂。孔子適齊，爲高昭子家臣，欲以通乎景公。與齊太師語樂，聞韶音，學之，三月，不知肉味，齊人稱之。	1. 子在齊聞韶，三月，不知肉味。曰，“不圖爲樂之至於斯也！” (<i>Lunyu</i> 7.14)
	景公問政孔子，孔子曰。“君君，臣臣，父父，子子。”景公曰。“善哉！信如君不君，臣不臣，父不父，子不子，雖有粟，吾豈得而食諸！”他日又復問政於孔子，孔子曰，“政在節財。”景公說，將欲以尼谿田封孔子。晏嬰進曰，“夫儒者滑稽而不可軌法，倨傲自順，不可以爲下，崇喪遂哀，破產厚葬，不可以爲俗，游說乞貸，不可以爲國。自大賢之息，周室旣衰，禮樂缺有間。今孔子盛容飾，繁登降之禮，趨詳之節，累世不能殫其學，當年不能究其禮。君欲用之以移齊俗，非所以先細民也。”後景公敬見孔子，不問其禮。	2. 齊景公問政於孔子，孔子對曰，“君君，臣臣，父父，子子。”公曰，“善哉！信如君不君，臣不臣，父不父，子不子，雖有粟，吾得而食諸！”(<i>Lunyu</i> 12.11) 3. 齊景公待孔子，曰，“若季氏則吾不能，以季，孟之閒待之。”曰，“吾老矣，不能用也。”孔子行。 (<i>Lunyu</i> 18.3)

	異日，景公止孔子曰，“奉子以季氏，吾不能。”以季，孟之間待之。齊大夫欲害孔子，孔子聞之。景公曰，“吾老矣，弗能用也。”孔子遂行，反乎魯。	
510 BCE	孔子年四十二，魯昭公卒於乾侯，定公立。	
505 BCE	定公立五年，夏，季平子卒，桓子嗣立。季桓子穿井得土缶。中若羊，問仲尼云“得狗。”仲尼曰，“以丘所聞，羊也。丘聞之，木石之怪夔，罔閭，水之怪龍，罔象，土之怪墳羊。”	
	吳伐越，墮會稽，得骨節專車。吳使使問仲尼，“骨何者最大？”仲尼曰，“禹致群神於會稽山，防風氏後至，禹殺而戮之，其節專車，此爲大矣。”吳客曰，“誰爲神？”仲尼曰，“山川之神足以綱紀天下，其守爲神，社稷爲公侯，皆屬於王者。”客曰，“防風何守？”仲尼曰，“汪罔氏之君守封，禹之山，爲釐姓。在虞，夏，商爲汪罔，於周爲長翟，今謂之大人。”客曰，“人長幾何？”仲尼曰，“焦僂氏三尺，短之至也，長者不過十之，數之極也。”於是吳客曰，“善哉聖人！” 桓子嬖臣曰仲梁懷，與陽虎有隙。陽虎欲逐懷，公山不狃止之。其秋，懷益驕，陽虎執懷。桓子怒，陽虎因囚桓子，與盟而醴之。陽虎由此益輕季氏。季氏亦僭於公室，陪臣執國政。是以魯自大夫以下皆僭離於正道。故孔子不仕，退而修『詩』，『書』，『禮』，『樂』。弟子彌衆，至自遠方，莫不受業焉。	
502 BCE	定公八年，公山不狃不得，意於季氏，因陽虎爲亂，欲廢三桓之適，更立其庶孽陽虎素所善者，遂執季桓子。桓子詐之，得脫。	
501 BCE	定公九年，陽虎不勝，奔于齊。是時孔子年五十。	
	公山不狃以費畔季氏，使人召孔子。孔子循道彌久。溫溫無所試，莫能己	4. 公山弗擾以費畔，召，子欲往。子路不說，曰，“末之也已，何必

	用，曰，“蓋周文武起豐鎬而王。今費雖小，儻庶幾乎！”欲往。子路不說，止孔子。孔子曰，“夫召我者豈徒哉？如用我，其爲東周乎！”然亦卒不行。其後定公以孔子爲中都宰，	公山氏之之也。”子曰，“夫召我者而豈徒哉？如有用我者，吾其爲東周乎！” (<i>Lunyu</i> 17.5)
500 BCE	一年，四方皆則之。由中都宰爲司空，由司空爲大司寇。 定公十年春，及齊平。夏，齊大夫黎鉏言於景公曰，“魯用孔丘，其勢危齊。”乃使使告魯爲好會，會於夾谷。魯定公且以乘車好往。孔子攝相事曰，“臣聞有文事者必有武備，有武事者必有文備。古者諸侯出疆，必具官以從。請具左右司馬。”定公曰，“諾。”具左右司馬。會齊侯夾谷，爲壇位，土階三等，以會遇之禮相見。揖讓而登。獻酬之禮畢，齊有司趨而進曰，“請奏四方之樂。”景公曰，“諾。”於是旂旄羽被矛戟劍撥鼓噪而至。孔子趨而進，歷階而登，不盡一等，舉袂而言曰，“吾兩君爲好會，夷狄之樂何爲於此！請命有司！”有司卻之，不去，則左右視晏子與景公。景公心忤，麾而去之。有頃，齊有司趨而進曰，“請奏宮中之樂。”景公曰，“諾。”優倡侏儒爲戲而前。孔子趨而進，歷階而登，不盡一等曰，“匹夫而營惑諸侯者罪當誅！請命有司！”有司加法焉，手足異處。景公懼而動，知義不若，歸而大恐，告其群臣曰，“魯以君子之道輔其君，而子獨以夷狄之道教寡人，使得罪於魯君，爲之柰何？”有司進對曰，“君子有過則謝以質，小人有過則謝以文。君若悼之，則謝以質。”於是齊侯乃歸所侵魯之鄆，汶陽，龜陰之田以謝過。	
497 BCE	定公十三年夏，孔子言於定公曰，“臣無藏甲，大夫毋百雉之城。”使仲由爲季氏宰，將墮三都。於是叔孫氏先墮郕。季氏將墮費，公山不狃，叔孫輒率費人襲魯。公與三子入于季氏	

	之宮，登武子之臺。費人攻之，弗克，入及公側。孔子命申句須，樂頎下伐之，費人北。國人追之，敗諸姑蔑。二子奔齊，遂墮費。將墮成，公斂處父謂孟孫曰，“墮成，齊人必至于北門。且成，孟氏之保鄆，無成是無孟氏也。我將弗墮。”十二月，公圍成，弗克。	
496 BCE	定公十四年，孔子年五十六，由大司寇行攝相事，有喜色。門人曰，“聞君子禍至不懼，福至不喜。”孔子曰，“有是言也。不曰‘樂其以貴下人’乎？”於是誅魯大夫亂政者少正卯。與聞國政三月，粥羔豚者弗飾賈。男女行者別於塗，塗不拾遺。四方之客至乎邑者不求有司，皆予之以歸。 齊人聞而懼曰，“孔子為政必霸。霸則吾地近焉，我之為先并矣。盍致地焉？”黎鉏曰，“請先嘗沮之。沮之而不可則致地，庸遲乎！”於是選齊國中女子好者八十人，皆衣文衣而舞康樂，文馬三十駟，遺魯君。 陳女樂文馬於魯城南高門外。季桓子微服往觀再三，將受，乃語魯君為周道游，往觀終日，怠於政事。子路曰，“夫子可以行矣。”孔子曰，“魯今且郊，如致饗乎大夫，則吾猶可以止。”桓子卒受齊女樂，三日不聽政，郊又不致饗俎於大夫。孔子遂行，宿乎屯。而師已送，曰，“夫子則非罪。”孔子曰，“吾歌可夫？”歌曰，“彼婦之口，可以出走，彼婦之謁，可以死敗。蓋優哉游哉，維以卒歲！”師已反，桓子曰，“孔子亦何言？”師已以實告。桓子喟然歎曰，“夫子罪我以群婢故也夫！”	5. 齊人歸女樂，季桓子受之，三日不朝，孔子行. (<i>Lunyu</i> 18.4)
	孔子遂適衛，主於子路妻兄顏濁鄒家。衛靈公問孔子，“居魯得祿幾何？”對曰，“奉粟六萬。”衛人亦致粟六萬。居頃之，或譖孔子於衛靈公。靈公使公孫余假一出一入。孔子恐獲罪焉，居十月，去衛。 將適陳，過匡。顏刻為僕，以其策	6. 子畏於匡，顏淵後，子曰，“吾以女為死矣。”曰，“子在，回何敢死？” (<i>Lunyu</i> 11.23) 7. 子畏於匡。曰，“文王既沒，文不在茲乎？天之將喪斯文也，後死者不得與於斯文也，天之未喪斯文也，匡人其如予何！”

	指之曰,“昔吾入此,由彼缺也。”匡人聞之,以爲魯之陽虎。陽虎嘗暴匡人。匡人於是遂止孔子。孔子狀類陽虎,拘焉五日。顏淵後,子曰,“吾以汝爲死矣。”顏淵曰,“子在,回何敢死!”匡人拘孔子益急,弟子懼。孔子曰,“文王既沒,文不在茲乎?天之將喪斯文也,後死者不得與于斯文也。天之未喪斯文也,匡人其如予何!”孔子使從者爲甯武子臣於衛,然後得去。	(Lunyu 9.5)
495 BCE	去卽過蒲。月餘,反乎衛,主蘧伯玉家。靈公夫人有南子者,使人謂孔子曰,“四方之君子不辱欲與寡君爲兄弟者,必見寡小君。寡小君願見。”孔子辭謝,不得已而見之。夫人在絺帷中。孔子入門,北面稽首,夫人自帷中再拜,環珮玉聲璆然。孔子曰,“吾鄉爲弗見,見之禮答焉。”子路不說。孔子矢之曰,“予所不者,天厭之!天厭之!”居衛月餘,靈公與夫人同車,宦者雍渠參乘出,使孔子爲次乘,招搖市過之。孔子曰,“吾未見好德,如好色者也。”於是醜之,去衛,過曹。是歲,魯定公卒。 孔子去曹適宋。與弟子習禮大樹下。宋司馬桓魋欲殺孔子,拔其樹。孔子去。弟子曰,“可以速矣。”孔子曰,“天生德於予,桓魋其如予何!” 孔子適鄭,與弟子相失,孔子獨立郭東門。鄭人或謂子貢曰,“東門有人,其類似堯,其項類皋陶,其肩類子產,然自要以下不及禹三寸,纍纍若喪家之狗。”子貢以實告孔子。孔子欣然笑曰,“形狀,末也。而謂似‘喪家之狗’,然哉!然哉!” 孔子遂至陳,主於司城貞子家。	8. 子見南子,子路不說,夫子矢之曰,“予所否者,天厭之!天厭之!” (Lunyu 6.28) 9. 子曰,“吾未見好德如好色者也。” (Lunyu 9.18) 10. 子曰,“天生德於予,桓魋其如予何!” (Lunyu 7.23)
494 BCE	歲餘,吳王夫差伐陳,取三邑而去。趙鞅伐朝歌。楚圍蔡,蔡遷于吳。吳敗越王句踐會稽。 有隼集于陳廷而死,楛矢貫之,石砮,矢長尺有咫。陳湣公使使問仲尼。仲	

	尼曰，“隼來遠矣。此肅慎之矢也。昔武王克商，通道九夷百蠻，使各以其方賄來貢，使無忘職業。於是肅慎貢楛矢石砮，長尺有咫。先王欲昭其令德，以肅慎矢分大姬。配虞胡公而封諸陳。分同姓以珍玉展親，分異姓以遠方職使無忘服。故分陳以肅慎矢。”試求之故府，果得之。	
	孔子居陳三歲，會晉楚爭彊，更伐陳，及吳侵陳，陳常被寇。孔子曰，“歸與歸與！吾黨之小子狂簡，進取不忘其初。”於是孔子去陳。 過蒲，會公叔氏以蒲畔。蒲人止孔子。弟子有公良孺者，以私車五乘從孔子。其為人長賢，有勇力，謂曰，“吾昔從夫子遇難於匡，今又遇難於此，命也已。吾與夫子再罹難，寧鬪而死。”鬪甚疾。蒲人懼，謂孔子曰，“苟毋適衛，吾出子。”與之盟，出孔子東門。孔子遂適衛。子貢曰，“盟可負邪？”孔子曰，“要盟也，神不聽。” 衛靈公聞孔子來喜郊迎。問曰，“蒲可伐乎？”對曰，“可。”靈公曰，“吾大夫以爲不可。今蒲，衛之所以待晉楚也，以衛伐之，無乃不可乎？”孔子曰，“其男子有死之志，婦人有保西河之志。吾所伐者不過四五人。”靈公曰，“善。”然不伐蒲。 靈公老，怠於政，不用孔子。孔子喟然歎曰，“苟有用我者，朞月而已，三年有成。”孔子行。	11. 子在陳曰，“歸與！歸與！吾黨之小子狂簡，斐然成章，不知所以裁之。” (<i>Lunyu</i> 5.22) 12. 子曰，“苟有用我者，期月而已，可也，三年有成。” (<i>Lunyu</i> 13.10)
493 BCE	佛肸爲中牟宰。趙簡子攻范，中行，伐中牟。佛肸畔。使人召孔子。孔子欲往。子路曰，“由聞諸夫子，‘其身親爲不善者，君子不入也。’今佛肸親以中牟畔，子欲往，如之何？”孔子曰，“有是言也。‘不曰堅乎，磨而不磷。不曰白乎，涅而不淄。’我豈匏瓜也哉，焉能繫而不食！” 孔子擊磬。有荷蕢而過門者曰，“有心哉！擊磬乎！硜硜乎！莫己知也，	13. 佛肸召，子欲往。子路曰，“昔者由也聞諸夫子曰，‘親於其身爲不善者，君子不入也。’佛肸以中牟畔，子之往也，如之何？”子曰，“然。有是言也。‘不曰堅乎，磨而不磷。不曰白乎，涅而不緇。’吾豈匏瓜也哉，焉能繫而不食！” (<i>Lunyu</i> 17.7) 14. 子擊磬於衛，有荷蕢而過孔氏之門者曰，“有心哉！擊磬

	夫而已矣!” 孔子學鼓琴師襄子，十日不進。師襄子曰，“可以益矣。”孔子曰，“丘已習其曲矣，未得其數也。”有間曰，“已習其數，可以益矣。”孔子曰，“丘未得其志也。”有間曰，“已習其志，可以益矣。”孔子曰，“丘未得其爲人也。”有間，有所穆然深思焉，有所怡然高望而遠志焉。曰，“丘得其爲人，黯然而黑，幾然而長，眼如望羊，如王四國，非文王其誰能爲此也!”師襄子席再拜曰，“師蓋云，‘文王操也。’” 孔子既不得用於衛，將西見趙簡子。至於河而聞竇鳴犢、舜華之死也，臨河而歎曰，“美哉水，洋洋乎!丘之不濟此，命也夫!”子貢趨而進曰，“敢問何謂也?”孔子曰，“竇鳴犢，舜華，晉國之賢大夫也。趙簡子未得志之時，須此兩人而從政。及其已得志，殺之乃從政。丘聞之也，刳胎殺夭則麒麟不至郊，竭澤涸漁則蛟龍不合陰陽，覆巢毀卵則鳳皇不翔。何則，君子諱傷其類也。夫鳥獸之於不義也尚知辟之，而況乎丘哉!”乃還息乎陬鄉，作爲陬操以哀之。而反乎衛，入主蘧伯玉家。 他日，靈公問兵陳。孔子曰，“俎豆之事，則嘗聞之，軍旅之事，未之學也。”明日，與孔子語，見蜚鴈，仰視之，色不在孔子。孔子遂行，復如陳。 夏，衛靈公卒，立孫輒，是爲衛出公。六月，趙鞅內太子蒯聩于戚。陽虎使太子絃，八人衰經，僞自衛迎者，哭而入，遂居焉。冬，蔡遷于州來。	乎!”既而曰，“鄙哉，硜硜乎!莫己知也，斯已而已矣，深則厲，淺則揭。”子曰，“果哉!末之難矣。”(Lunyu 14.39) 15. 衛靈公問陳於孔子。孔子對曰，“俎豆之事，則嘗聞之矣，軍旅之事，未之學也。”明日遂行。(Lunyu 15.1)
492 BCE	是歲魯哀公三年，而孔子年六十矣。齊助衛圍戚，以衛太子蒯聩在故也。 夏，魯桓釐廟燔。南宮敬叔救火。孔子在陳，聞之曰，“災必於桓釐廟乎。”已而果然。 秋，季桓子病，輦而見魯城，喟然歎曰，“昔此國幾興矣，以吾獲罪於孔子，故不興也。”顧謂其嗣康子曰，“我	16. 子在陳曰，“歸與!歸與!吾黨之小子狂簡，斐然成章，不知所以裁之。”(Lunyu 5.22)

	即死，若必相魯。相魯，必召仲尼。” 後數日，桓子卒，康子代立。已葬，欲召仲尼。公之魚曰，“昔吾先君用之不終，終爲諸侯笑。今又用之，不能終，是再爲諸侯笑。”康子曰，“則誰召而可？”曰，“必召冉求。”於是使使召冉求。冉求將行，孔子曰，“魯人召求，非小用之，將大用之也。”是日，孔子曰：“歸乎！歸乎！吾黨之小子狂簡，斐然成章，吾不知所以裁之。”子貢知孔子思歸，送冉求，因誡曰，“即用，以孔子爲招”云。 冉求既去。	
491 BCE	明年，孔子自陳遷于蔡。蔡昭公將如吳，吳召之也。前昭公欺其臣遷州來，後將往，大夫懼復遷，公孫翩射殺昭公。楚侵蔡。	
490 BCE	秋，齊景公卒。	
489 BCE	明年，孔子自蔡如葉。葉公問政，孔子曰，“政在來，遠附邇。”他日，葉公問孔子於子路，子路不對。孔子聞之曰，“由，爾何不對曰‘其爲人也，學道不倦，誨人不厭，發憤忘食，樂以忘憂，不知老之將至’云爾。” 去葉，反于蔡。長沮，桀溺耦而耕。孔子以爲隱者，使子路問津焉。長沮曰，“彼執輿者爲誰？”子路曰，“爲孔丘。”曰，“是魯孔丘與？”曰，“然。”曰，“是知津矣。”桀溺謂子路曰，“子爲誰？”曰，“爲仲由。”曰，“子，孔丘之徒與？”曰，“然。”桀溺曰，“悠悠者天下皆是也，而誰以易之？且與其從辟人之士，豈若從世之士哉！”耷而不輟。子路以告孔子，孔子憮然曰，“鳥獸不可與同群。天下有道，丘不與易也。” 他日，子路行，遇荷蓀丈人，曰，“子見夫子乎？”丈人曰，“四體不勤，五穀不分，孰爲夫子！”植其杖而芸。子路以告，孔子曰，“隱者也。”復往，則亡。 孔子遷于蔡三歲，吳伐陳。楚救陳，軍于城父。聞孔子在陳蔡之間，楚使	17. 葉公問政，子曰，“近者說，遠者來。” (Lunyu 13.16) 18. 子曰，“默而識之，學而不，誨人不倦，何有於我哉？” (Lunyu 7.2) 19. 葉公問孔子於子路，子路不對。子曰，“女奚不曰，‘其爲人也，發憤忘食，樂以忘憂，不知老之將至’云爾。” (Lunyu 7.19) 20. 長沮，桀溺耦而耕。孔子過之，使子路問津焉。長沮曰，“夫執輿者爲誰？”子路曰，“爲孔丘。”曰，“是魯孔丘與？”曰，“是也。”曰，“是知津矣。”問於桀溺，桀溺曰，“子爲誰？”曰，“爲仲由。”曰，“是魯孔丘之徒與？”對曰，“然。”曰，“滔滔者天下皆是也，而誰以易之？且而與其從辟人之士也，豈若從辟世之士哉！”耷而不輟。子路行以告。夫子憮然曰，“鳥獸不可與同群，吾非斯人之徒與而誰與？天下有道，丘不與易也。” (Lunyu 18.6) 21. 子路從而後，遇丈人以杖荷

	人聘孔子。孔子將往拜禮，陳蔡大夫謀曰，“孔子賢者，所刺譏皆中諸侯之疾。今者久留陳蔡之間，諸大夫所設行皆非仲尼之意。今楚，大國也，來聘孔子。孔子用於楚，則陳蔡用事大夫危矣。” 於是乃相與發徒役圍孔子於野。不得行，絕糧。從者病，莫能興。孔子講誦弦歌不衰。子路慍見曰，“君子亦有窮乎？”孔子曰，“君子固窮，小人窮斯濫矣。”子貢色作。孔子曰，“賜，爾以予爲多學而識之者與？”曰，“然。非與？”孔子曰，“非也。予一以貫之。” 孔子知弟子有慍心，乃召子路而問曰，“詩云‘匪兕匪虎，率彼曠野’，吾道非邪？吾何爲於此？”子路曰，“意者吾未仁邪？人之不我信也。意者吾未知邪？人之不我行也。”孔子曰，“有是乎！由，譬使仁者而必信，安有伯夷，叔齊？使知者而必行，安有王子比干？” 子路出，子貢入見。孔子曰，“賜，詩云‘匪兕匪虎，率彼曠野’，吾道非邪？吾何爲於此？”子貢曰，“夫子之道至大也，故天下莫能容夫子。夫子蓋少貶焉？”孔子曰，“賜，良農能稼而不能爲穡，良工能巧而不能爲順。君子能修其道，綱而紀之，統而理之，而不能爲容。今爾不修爾道而求爲容。賜，而志不遠矣！” 子貢出，顏回入見。孔子曰，“回，詩云‘匪兕匪虎，率彼曠野’，吾道非邪？吾何爲於此？”顏回曰，“夫子之道至大，故天下莫能容。雖然，夫子推而行之，不容何病，不容然後見君子！夫道之不修也，是吾醜也。夫道既已大修而不用，是有國者之也。不容何病，不容然後見君子！”孔子欣然而笑曰，“有是哉顏氏之子！使爾多財，吾爲爾宰。” 於是使子貢至楚，楚昭王興師迎孔	蓀，子路問曰，“子見夫子乎？”丈人曰，“四體不勤，五穀不分，孰爲夫子？”植其杖而芸。子路拱而立，止子路宿，殺雞為黍而食之，見其二子焉。明日，子路行以告，子曰，“隱者也。”使子路反見之，至則行矣。子路曰，“不仕無義，長幼之節，不可廢也，君臣之義，如之何其廢之！欲潔其身，而亂大倫。君子之仕也，行其義也，道之不行，已知之矣。” (Lunyu 18.7) 22. 在陳絕糧，從者病，莫能興。子路慍見曰，“君子亦有窮乎？”子曰，“君子固窮，小人窮斯濫矣。” (Lunyu 15.2) 23. 子曰，“賜，爾以予爲多學而識之者與？”曰，“然。非與？”孔子曰，“非也。予一以貫之。” (Lunyu 15.3) 24. 楚狂接輿歌而過孔子曰，“鳳兮，鳳兮！何德之衰！往者不可諫兮，來者猶可追也，已而已而！今之從政者殆而。”孔子下，欲與之言，趨而去，不得與之言。 (Lunyu 18.5)
--	---	---

	子，然後得免。昭王將以書社地七百里封孔子。楚令尹子西曰，“王之使使諸侯有如子貢者乎？”曰，“無有。”“王之輔相有如顏回者乎？”曰，“無有。”“王之將率有如子路者乎？”曰，“無有。”“王之官尹有如宰予者乎？”曰，“無有。”“且楚之祖封於周，號爲子男，五十里。今孔丘述三五之法，明周召之業，王若用之，則楚安得世世堂堂方數千里乎？夫文王在豐，武王在鎬，百里之君卒王天下。今孔丘得據土壤，賢弟子爲佐，非楚之福也。”昭王乃止。其秋，楚昭王卒于城父。 楚狂接輿歌而過孔子曰，“鳳兮，鳳兮！何德之衰！往者不可諫兮，來者猶可追也，已而已而！今之從政者殆而。”孔子下，欲與之言，趨而去，弗得與之言。 於是孔子自楚反乎衛。是歲也，孔子年六十三，而魯哀公六年也。	
488 BCE	其明年，吳與魯會繒，徵百牢。太宰嚭召季康子。康子使子貢往，然後得已。	
	孔子曰，“魯衛之政，兄弟也。”是時，衛君輒父不得立，在外，諸侯數以爲讓。而孔子弟子多仕於衛，衛君欲得孔子爲政。子路曰，“衛君待子而爲政，子將奚先？”孔子曰，“必也正名乎！”子路曰，“有是哉，子之迂也！何其正也？”孔子曰，“野哉，由！夫名不正，則言不順，言不順，則事不成，事不成，則禮樂不興。禮樂不興，則刑罰不中，刑罰不中，則民無所措手足矣。夫君子爲之，必可名，言之，必可行。君子於其言，無所苟而已矣。”	25. 子曰，“魯衛之政，兄弟也。” (Lunyu 13.7) 26. 子路曰，“衛君待子而爲政，子將奚先？”子曰，“必也正名乎！”子路曰，“有是哉，子之迂也！奚其正？”子曰，“野哉，由也！君子於其所不知，蓋闕如也。名不正，則言不順，言不順，則事不成，事不成，則禮樂不興，禮樂不興，則刑罰不中，刑罰不中，則民無所措手足。故君子名之，必可言也，言之，必可行也。君子於其言，無所苟而已矣。” (Lunyu 13.3)
484 BCE	其明年，冉有爲季氏將師，與齊戰於郎克之。季康子曰，“子之於軍旅學之乎？性之乎？”冉有曰，“學之於孔子。”季康子曰，“孔子何如人哉？”對曰，“用之有名，播之百姓，質諸鬼神	

	而無憾。求之至於此道，雖累千社，夫子不利也。”康子曰，“我欲召之，可乎？”對曰，“欲召之，則毋以小人固之，則可矣。”而衛孔文子將攻太叔，問策於仲尼。仲尼辭不知，退而命載而行曰，“鳥能擇木，木豈能擇鳥乎！”文子固止，會季康子逐公華，公賓，公林，以幣迎孔子，孔子歸魯。	
482 BCE	孔子之去魯凡十四歲而反乎魯。 魯哀公問政，對曰，“政在選臣。”季康子問政，曰，“舉直錯諸枉，則枉者直。”康子患盜，孔子曰，“苟子之不欲，雖賞之不竊。”然魯終不能用孔子，孔子亦不求仕。	27. 季康子問政於孔子。孔子對曰，“政者，正也。子帥以正，孰敢不正。” (Lunyu 2.19)
	孔子之時，周室微而禮樂廢，『詩』，『書』缺。追迹三代之禮，序『書傳』，上紀唐虞之際，下至秦繆，編次其事。曰，“夏禮，吾能言之，杞不足徵也。殷禮，吾能言之，宋不足徵也。足則吾能徵之矣。”觀殷夏所損益，曰，“後雖百世可知也，以一文一質。周監二代，郁郁乎文哉！吾從周。”故『書傳』，『禮記』自孔氏。 孔子語魯大師，“樂其可知也。始作翕如，縱之純如，皦如，繹如也，以成。”“吾自衛反魯，然後樂正，雅頌各得其所。” 古者『詩』三千餘篇，及至孔子，去其重，取可施於禮義。上采契后稷，中述殷周之盛，至幽厲之缺。始於衽席。故曰，“「關雎」之亂以爲「風」始，「鹿鳴」爲「小雅」始，「文王」爲「大雅」始，「清廟」爲「頌」始。”三百五篇孔子皆弦歌之，以求合韶，「武」，「雅」，「頌」之音。禮樂自此可得而述，以備王道，成六藝。 孔子晚而喜『易』，序「彖」，「繫」，	28. 子曰，“夏禮，吾能言之，杞不足徵也。殷禮，吾能言之，宋不足徵也。文獻不足故也。足則吾能徵之矣。” (Lunyu 3.9) 29. 子張問，“十世可知也？”子曰，“殷因於夏禮，所損益，可知也。周因於殷禮，所損益，可知也。其或繼周者，雖百世可知也。” (Lunyu 2.23) 30. 子曰，“周監於二代，郁郁乎文哉！吾從周。” (Lunyu 3.14) 31. 孔子語魯大師，曰，“樂其可知也。始作翕如，縱之純如，皦如，繹如也，以成。” (Lunyu 3.23) 32. 子曰，“吾自衛反魯，然後樂正，雅頌各得其所。” (Lunyu 9.15) 33. 子曰，“質勝文則野，文勝質則史。文質彬彬，然後君子。” (Lunyu 6.18) 34. 子以四教。文，行，忠，信。 (Lunyu 7.25) 35. 子絕四。毋意，毋必，毋固，毋我。 (Lunyu 9.4) 36. 子之所慎。齊，戰，疾。 (Lunyu 7.13) 37. 子罕言利，與命，與仁。 (Lunyu 9.1) 38. 子曰，“不憤不啟，不悱不發，

	「象」，「說卦」，「文言」．讀『易』，韋編三絕．曰，“假我數年，若是我於『易』，則彬彬矣．” 孔子以『詩』，『書』，『禮』，『樂』教，弟子蓋三千焉，身通六藝者七十有二人．如顏濁鄒之徒，頗受業者甚衆． 孔子以四教．文，行，忠，信．絕四，毋意，毋必，毋固，毋我．所慎，齊，戰，疾．子罕言利．與命，與仁．不憤不啓，舉一隅不以三隅反，則弗復也．其於鄉黨，恂恂，似不能言者，其於宗廟朝廷，辯辯言，唯謹爾．朝，與上大夫言，誾誾如也，與下大夫言，侃侃如也．入公門，鞠躬如也，趨進，翼如也．君召使賁，色勃如也，君命召，不俟駕行矣．魚餒，肉敗，割不正，不食．席不正，不坐，食於有喪者之側，未嘗飽也．是日哭，則不歌．見齊衰，瞽者，雖童子必變．“三人行，必得我師．”“德之不修，學之不講，聞義不能徙，不善不能改，是吾憂也．”使人歌，善，則使復之，然後和之．子不語，“怪，力，亂，神．” 子貢曰，“夫子之文章，可得聞也，夫子言天道與性命，弗可得聞也已．”顏淵喟然歎曰，“仰之彌高，鑽之彌堅．瞻之在前，忽焉在後．夫子循循然善誘人，博我以文，約我以禮，欲罷不能．既竭我才，如有所立，卓爾．雖欲從之，蔑由也已．”達巷黨人曰，“大哉，孔子，博學而無所成名!”子聞之曰，“我何執? 執御乎? 執射乎? 我執御矣．”牢曰，“子云，‘不試，故藝．’”	舉一隅不以三隅反，則不復也．” (Lunyu 7.8) 39. 孔子於鄉黨，恂恂如也，似不能言者．其在宗廟朝廷，便便言，唯謹爾．(Lunyu 10.1) 40. 朝，與下大夫言，侃侃如也，與上大夫言，誾誾如也．君在，蹏蹏如也，與與如也． (Lunyu 10.2) 41. 入公門，鞠躬如也，如不容．立不中門，行不履闕．過位，色勃如也，足躩如也，其言似不足者．攝齊升堂，鞠躬如也，屏氣似不息者．出降一等，逞顏色，怡怡如也，沒階趨進，翼如也，復其位，蹏蹏如也．(Lunyu 10.4) 42. 君召使賁，色勃如也，足躩如也．揖所與立，左右手，衣前後，襜如也．趨進，翼如也．賓退，必復命曰，“賓不顧矣．” (Lunyu 10.3) 43. 君賜食，必正席先嘗之，君賜腥，必熟而薦之，君賜生，必畜之．侍食於君，君祭，先飯．疾，君視之，東首，加朝服拖紳．君命召，不俟駕行矣． (Lunyu 10.20) 44. 食不厭精，膾不厭細．食饁而餽，魚餒而肉敗，不食，色惡不食，臭惡不食，失飪不食，不時不食．割不正，不食，不得其醬，不食．肉雖多，不使勝食氣，惟酒無量，不及亂．沽酒市脯不食，不撤薑食，不多食．祭於公，不宿肉．祭肉不出三日，出三日，不食之矣．食不語，寢不言．雖蔬食菜羹，瓜祭，必齊如也． (Lunyu 10.8) 45. 席不正，不坐，(Lunyu 10.9) 46. 子食於有喪者之側，未嘗飽也．(Lunyu 7.8) 47. 子於是日哭，則不歌．
--	--	---

		(Lunyu 7.10) 48. 子見齊衰者，冕衣裳者與瞽者，見之，雖少必作，過之，必趨。(Lunyu 9.10) 49. 子曰，“三人行，必有我師焉，擇其善者而從之，其不善者而改之。”(Lunyu 7.22) 50. 子曰，“德之不修，學之不講，聞義不能徙，不善不能改，是吾憂也。”(Lunyu 7.3) 51. 子與人歌而善，必使反之，而後和之。(Lunyu 7.32) 52. 子不語，“怪，力，亂，神。”(Lunyu 7.21) 53. 子貢曰，“夫子之文章，可得而聞也，夫子之言性與天道，不可得而聞也。”(Lunyu 5.13) 54. 顏淵喟然歎曰，“仰之彌高，鑽之彌堅，瞻之在前，忽焉在後。夫子循循然善誘人，博我以文，約我以禮。欲罷不能，既竭吾才，如有所立卓爾。雖欲從之，末由也已。”(Lunyu 9.11) 55. 達巷黨人曰，“大哉，孔子，博學而無所成名!” 子聞之，謂門弟子曰，“吾何執? 執御乎? 執射乎? 吾執御矣。”(Lunyu 9.2) 56. 牢曰，“子云，‘吾不試，故藝。’”(Lunyu 9.7)
481 BCE	魯哀公十四年春，狩大野。叔孫氏車子鉏商獲獸，以爲不祥。仲尼視之曰，“麟也。”取之。曰，“河不出圖，雒不出書，吾已矣夫!” 顏淵死，孔子曰，“天喪予!” 及西狩見麟，曰，“吾道窮矣!” 喟然歎曰，“莫知我夫!” 子貢曰，“何爲莫知子?” 子曰，“不怨天，不尤人，下學而上達，知我者其天乎!” “不降其志，不辱其身，伯夷，叔齊乎!” 謂柳下惠，少連，“降志辱身矣。” 謂虞仲，夷逸，“隱居放言，行中清，廢中權。” “我則異於是，無可無不可。” 子曰，“弗乎，弗乎，君子病沒世而	57. 顏淵死，子曰，“噫! 天喪予! 天喪予!”(Lunyu 11.9) 58. 子曰，“莫我知也夫!” 子貢曰，“何爲其莫知子也?” 子曰，“不怨天，不尤人，下學而上達，知我者，其天乎!”(Lunyu 14.35) 59. 逸民，伯夷，叔齊，虞仲，夷逸，朱張，柳下惠，少連。子曰，“不降其志，不辱其身，伯夷，叔齊與!” 謂柳下惠，少連，“降志辱身矣，言中倫，行中慮，其斯而已矣。” 謂虞仲，夷逸，“隱居放言，身中清，廢中權。” “我則異於是，

	名不稱焉。吾道不行矣，吾何以自見於後世哉？”乃因史記作『春秋』，上至隱公，下訖哀公十四年，十二公。據魯，親周，故殷，運之三代。約其文辭而指博。故吳楚之君自稱王，而『春秋』貶之曰“子。”踐土之會實召周天子，而『春秋』諱之曰，“天王狩於河陽。”推此類以繩當世。貶損之義，後有王者舉而開之。『春秋』之義行，則天下亂臣賊子懼焉。 孔子在位聽訟，文辭有可與人共者，弗獨有也。至於爲『春秋』，筆則筆，削則削，子夏之徒不能贊一辭。弟子受『春秋』，孔子曰，“後世知丘者以『春秋』，而罪丘者亦以『春秋』。”	無可無不可。”(Lunyu 18.8) 60. 子曰，“君子疾沒世而名不稱焉。”(Lunyu 15.20)
480 BCE	明歲，子路死於衛。	
479 BCE	明歲，子路死於衛。孔子病，子貢請見。孔子方負杖逍遙於門曰，“賜，汝來何其晚也？”孔子因歎歌曰，“太山壞乎！梁柱摧乎！哲人萎乎！”因以涕下。謂子貢曰，“天下無道久矣！莫能宗予。夏人殯於東階，周人於西階，殷人兩柱間。昨暮予夢坐奠兩柱之間，予始殷人也。” 後七日卒。孔子年七十三，以魯哀公十六年四月己丑卒。 哀公誄之曰，“旻天不弔，不慙遺一老，俾屏余一人以在位，瑩瑩余在疚！嗚呼，哀哉！尼父，毋自律！”子貢曰，“君其不沒於魯乎！夫子之言曰，‘禮失則昏，名失則愆。失志爲昏，失所爲愆。’生不能用，死而誄之，非禮也。稱‘余一人，’非名也。”	
	孔子葬魯城北泗上。弟子皆服三年。三年心喪畢，相訣而去，則哭，各復盡哀，或復留。唯子貢廬於冢上，凡六年，然後去。弟子及魯人往從冢而家者百有餘室，因命曰‘孔里。’魯世世相傳以歲時奉祠孔子冢，而諸儒亦講	

	禮鄉飲大射於孔子冢。孔子冢大一頃。故所居堂，弟子內，後世因廟，藏孔子衣冠琴車書，至于漢二百餘年不絕。高皇帝過魯，以太牢祠焉。諸侯卿相至，常先謁然後從政。	
	孔子生鯉，字伯魚。伯魚年五十，先孔子死。伯魚生伋，字子思，年六十二。嘗困於宋。子思作「中庸」。子思生白，字子上，年四十七。子上生求，字子家，年四十五。子家生箕，字子京，年四十六。子京生穿，字子高，年五十一。子高生子慎，年五十七，嘗爲魏相。子慎生鮒，年五十七，爲陳王涉博士，死於陳下。鮒弟子襄，年五十七。嘗爲孝惠皇帝博士，遷爲長沙太守。長九尺六寸。子襄生忠，年五十七。忠生武，武生延年及安國。安國爲今皇帝博士，至臨淮太守，蚤卒。安國生卬，卬生驩。	
	太史公曰，“詩有之，‘高山仰止，景行行止。’雖不能至，然心鄉往之。余讀孔氏書，想見其爲人。適魯，觀仲尼廟堂車服禮器，諸生以時習禮其家。余祇迴留之不能去云。天下君王至于賢人衆矣，當時則榮，沒則已焉。孔子布衣，傳十餘世，學者宗之。自天子，王侯，中國言六藝者折中於夫子，可謂至聖矣!”	61. 子曰,“學而時習之, 不亦說乎! 有朋自遠方來, 不亦樂乎! 人不知而不慍, 不亦君子乎!” (<i>Lunyu</i> 1.1)

CITED REFERENCES

- Ban Gu. *Hanshu* 漢書. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju. 1962.
- Cai Yong 蔡邕. *Caizhonglang Ji* 蔡中郎集. Accessed September 22, 2025.
<https://www.kanripo.org/text/KR4b0002/006#1a>
- Chen Tongsheng 陈桐生, Not As the Six Arts Yet Superior to Them—About the Academic Relationship Between Records of the Historian and Analects 不是六艺 胜似六艺——谈《史记》与《论语》的学术关系, *Kongzi Yanjiu*, Vol.1, (2004): 41–52.
- Csikszentmihalyi, Mark. “Confucius and the *Analects* in the Han,” in *Confucius and the Analects: New Essays*, 132–162. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2002.
- Defoort, Carine. “How to Name or not to Name: That is the Question in Early Chinese Philosophy.” In *Keywords in Chinese Culture*, edited by Li Wai-ye and Yuri Pines, 3–36. Hong Kong: Chinese University of Hong Kong, 2020.
- Defoort, Carine. “Confucius and the ‘Rectification of names’: Hu Shi and the Modern Discourse on Zhengming,” *Dao: a Journal of Comparative Philosophy*, 20, no. 4 (2021): 613–633.
- Durrant, Stephen. “Truth Claims in Shiji,” in *Historical Truth, Historical Criticism, and Ideology: Chinese Historiography and Historical Culture from a New Comparative Perspective*, edited by Helwig Schmidt-Giltner, Achim Mittag and Jörn Rüsen, 93–113. Brill: Leiden. 2004.
- Ding County Han Tomb Bamboo Strips: Hebei Provincial Institute of Cultural Relics Ding County Han Tomb Bamboo Strips Arrangement Group* 定州漢墓竹簡論語 河北省文物研究所定州漢墓竹簡整理小組, edited by Cai Min. Beijing: Wenwu. 1997.
- Fan Ye 范曄. *Houhanshu* 後漢書. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju. 1965.
- Feng Youlan 馮友蘭. *A History of Chinese Philosophy*, translated by Derk Bodde. London: Gorge Allen & Unwin LTD. 1952.
- Gong Yuanjie 龔元玠. *Lunyu Kenan* 論語客難. Accessed September 22, 2025.
<https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=en&chapter=2482563#p31>
- Habberstad, Luke. *Forming the Early Chinese Court*. Seattle: University of Washington. 2017.
- Hunter, Michael. *Confucius Beyond the Analects*. Leiden: Brill. 2017.

- Hunter, Michael. "The *Lunyu* As A Western Han Text" in *Confucius and the Analects Revisited: New Perspectives on Composition, Dating, and Authorship*, edited by Micheal Hunter and Martin Kern, 92–115. Leiden: Brill. 2018.
- Han Zhaoqi 韩兆琦. *Shiji Jianzheng* 史记笺证. Nanchang: Jiangsu Renmin. 2004.
- Itō Jinsai 伊藤仁齋, *Longokogi* 論語古義, translated by Choi Kyungyeol. Seoul: Greenbee. 2016.
- Ivanhoe, Philip J. *Confucian Moral Self Cultivation*. New York: Peter Lang. 1993.
- Jeong Yak-yong 정약용 丁若鏞. *Noneokokeumju* 논어고금주 論語古今註. *Tasan Cultural Foundation*. Accessed September 22, 2025.
https://db.itkc.or.kr/dir/item?itemId=GO#dir/node?grpId=&itemId=GO&gubun=book&depth=2&cate1=Z&cate2=&dataGubun=%EC%84%9C%EC%A7%80&dataId=ITKC_MP_0597A
- Jia Gongyan 賈公彥. *Yili Zhushu* 儀禮註疏, edited by Ma Xinmin. Beijing: Beijing University Press. 2000.
- Jin Jingfang 金景芳, and Lu Shaogang 吕绍纲. "Annotation of 'Kejifuli to become Humane' 释'克己复礼为仁.'" *Zhongguo Zhexueshi*, no. 1 (1997): 17.
- Kern, Martin. "Kongzi as Author in the Han." In *Confucius and the Analects Revisited New Perspectives on Composition, Dating, and Authorship*, edited by Hunter, Micheal and Kern 268–307, Martin. Leiden: Brill. 2018.
- Kim Pusik 김부식 金富軾. *Shinju Samguk sagi 1* 신주 삼국사기 1 新註 三國史記1, edited by Jeong Gubok, Roh Joongguk, Shin Dongha, Kim Taesik and Kwon Deokyoung. Seoul: The Academy of Korean Studies Press. 1996.
- Kim Sungki 김성기. *Dongyi and Origin of East Asian Civilization: Western Zhou Edition* 동이족과 동아시아 문명의 기원: 서주편. Seoul: Sungkyunkwan University. 2021.
- Klein, Esther Sunkyung. "Sima Qian's Kongzi and the Western Han Lunyu." In *Confucius and the Analects Revisited: New Perspectives on Composition, Dating, and Authorship* edited by Hunter, Micheal and Kern, Martin 241–267. Leiden: Brill. 2018.
- Koyasu Nobukuni 子安宣邦. *Itō Jinsai: Modern Translation and Commentary of Longokogi Vol. 2* 仁齋論語: 「論語古義」現代語譯と評釋下. Tokyo: Perikansha. 2017.

- Kong Yingda 孔穎達. *Chunqiu Zuozhuan Zhengyi* 春秋左傳正義, edited by Ma Xinmin, Beijing: Beijing University Press. 2000.
- Kong Yingda 孔穎達. *Liji Zhengyi* 禮記正義, edited by Ma Xinmin. Beijing: Beijing University Press. 2000.
- Kong Yingda 孔穎達. *Shangshu Zhengyi* 尚書正義, edited by Ma Xinmin. Beijing: Beijing University Press. 2000.
- Li Jiemin 李解民, “Kongzi Shijia 孔子世家.” In *Shiji Quanzhuquanyi* 史記全注全譯, edited by Qiu Xigui, 1786–1832. Beijing: Tianjin Guji. 1997.
- Li, Wai-Yee. “The Idea of Authority in the Shih Chi (Records of the Historian).” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 54, no. 2 (1994): 345-405.
- Liu Baonan 劉寶楠. *Lunyu Zhengyi* 論語正義. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju. 1990.
- Liu Xiang 劉向, *Lienü zhuan Buzhu* 列女傳補注, edited by Wang Zhaoyuan. Taipei: Taiwan Commercial Press. 1976.
- Liu Xiang 劉向. *Exemplary Women of Early China: the Lienü zhuan of Liu Xiang*, Translated by Anne Behnke Kinney. New York: Columbia University Press. 2014.
- Loewe, Michael. “The Former Han dynasty.” In *The Cambridge History of China: Volume I The Ch'in and Han Empires 221 B.C.–A.D. 220*, edited by Twitchett, Denis and Fairbank, John K. 103–222. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1986.
- Loewe, Michael. *The Men Who Governed Han China: Companion to a Biographical Dictionary of the Qin, Former Han and Xin Periods*. Leiden: Brill. 2004.
- Loewe, Michael. *Dong Zhongshu a 'Confucian' Heritage and the Chunqiu fanlu*. Leiden: Brill. 2011.
- Makeham, John. “The Formation of Lunyu As A Book.” *Monumenta Serica* 44, (1996): 1–24.
- Mao Qiling 毛奇齡. *Lunyu Jijiupian* 論語稽求篇. Accessed September 22, 2025.
<https://www.kanripo.org/text/KR1h0060/005#1a>
- Mencius: A Bilingual Edition*. Translated by Lau, D. C. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press. 2003.
- Miyazaki Ichidada 宮崎市定. *New Research of the Lunyu* 論語の新研究. Tokyo: Iwanami. 1947.

- The Mozi: A Complete Translation*, translated by Johnston, Ian. New York: Columbia University Press. 2010.
- “Square gu wine breaker with inscription ‘Ya Chou’ 亞醜方觚,” *National Palace Museum* 國立故宮博物院. Accessed September 22, 2025, https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/chicago_manual_17th_edition/cmos_formatting_and_style_guide/web_sources.html
- Tao Te Ching*, translated by D.C. Lau. New York: Penguin Books. 1963.
- Ogyū Sorai 荻生徂徠. *Longocho* 2 論語徵 2, edited by Ogawa Tamaki. Tokyo: Heibonsha. 1994.
- Ogyū Sorai 荻生徂徠, *Longocho* 論語徵. translated by Lee Kidong, Lim Okgyun, Lim Taehong and Hahm Hyunchan. Seoul: Somyung. 2010.
- Nylan, Michael. *The Five “Confucian Classics*. New Heaven: Yale University Press. 2001.
- Nylan, Micheal. *Lives of Confucius*, edited by Michael Nylan and Thomas Wilson. New York: Doubleday. 2010.
- Puett, Michael. *The Ambivalence of Creation*. Stanford: Stanford University Press. 2001.
- Qian Mu 錢穆, *The Biography of Kongzi* 孔子傳. Taipei: Dongda. 1974.
- Records of the Grand Historian of China: Translated from the Shih chi of Ssu-Ma Ch’ien*, translated by Burton Watson. New York: Columbia University Press. 1961.
- Schaberg, David. “Chinese History and Philosophy.” In *The Oxford History of Historical Writing Volume 1: Beginnings to AD 600*, edited by Feldherr, Andrew and Hardy, Grant, 394–414. New York: Oxford University Press. 2011.
- Shin Jeonggeun 신정근. *Discovery of Humaneness* 사람다움의 발견. Seoul: Ihaksa. 2004.
- Shun, Kwong-loi. Jen and Li in the “Analects.” *Philosophy East and West*, 43, no. 3. (1993): 457–479.
- Sima Qian 司馬遷. *Shiji* 史記. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju. 1959.
- Van Nordon, Bryan. “Introduction.” In *Confucius and the Analects: New Essays*, 3–36. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2002.
- Van Nordon, Bryan. “Unweaving the ‘One Thread.’” In *Confucius and the Analects: New Essays*, 216–236. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2002.
- The Analects of Confucius*. Translated by Wayley, Arthur. New York: Vintage Books. 1938.

- Won Yongjun 원용준, “The Duke of Zhou’s Eastern Expedition: A Study Based on Bronze Inscriptions and the Tsinghua Bamboo Manuscripts 주공의 동이정벌에 대하여 - 金文 및 清華簡을 중심으로 -,” in *Institute of Confucian Philosophy and Culture*, No. 20, (2012): 50–79.
- Xing Bing 邢昺, *Lunyu Zhushu 論語注疏*, edited by Ma Xinmin. Beijing: Beijing University Press. 2000.
- Xu Yan 徐彥. *Chunqiu Gongyangzhuan Zhushu 春秋公羊傳注疏*, edited by Ma Xinmin. Beijing: Beijing University Press. 2000.
- Xunzi: The Complete Text*, translated by Hutton, Eric L. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 2014.
- Yantielun Jiaozhu 鹽鐵論校注*, edited by Wang Liqi. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju. 1992.
- Yang Bojun 楊伯峻. *Lunyu Yizhu 論語譯註*. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju. 1958.
- Yoshimoto Michimasa 吉本道雅. “Philological Evidence to the ‘Kongzi Shijia’ 孔子世家 疏證.” *Memoirs of the Faculty of Letters, Kyoto University* 60, (2021): 1–131.
- Yoshikawa Kōjirō 吉川幸次郎, *Yoshikawa Kōjirō zenshū Vol. 5 吉川幸次郎全集 第5卷*. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō. 1974.
- Yu Yue 俞樾. Yu Yue’s *Lunyu Pingyi: How Does an Evidential Scholars Read the Lunyu* 俞樾의 論語平議: 고증학자는 논어를 어떻게 읽었나, translated by Lee Gangje and Kim Hyoshin. Seoul: Hakgobang. 2006.
- Zhu Xi 朱熹. *Sishu Zhangjuzhu 四書章句集註*. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju. 1933.
- Zhu Xi 朱熹. *Zhuzi Sishu Yulei 朱子四書語類*. Shanghai: Shanghai Guji. 1992.
- Zuo Tradition*, edited by Durrant, Stephen, Li, Wai-Li and Schaberg, David. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2016.