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Introduction

Until recently, the cultural history of early China was universally pictured on the model of lineal descent, with the Xia and Shang Dynasties, if not the sage emperors who predated them, seen as the high ancestry of a distinctive culture and state, which gradually expanded to dominate the subcontinent. This model, which was an established narrative by the Han era, has been challenged over the past several decades by scholars interpreting the numerous new archaeological discoveries and by a trend to question relatively monolithic histories of “national” origins. These recent discoveries and interpretive strategies, without denying the significance of political and, perhaps, linguistic lineages represented by the traditional account, invite us to picture Chinese culture developing and coalescing from a varied mix of sophisticated Neolithic and Bronze Age cultures. On either account, however, there has tended to be agreement that whatever meaning the term “Chinese” may have in this regard, aspects of early culture appropriately labeled “Confucian,” or “Ruist,” are central to it, and representative of the elements associated with the lineal evolution of Xia/Shang society, as developed by the successor Zhou state.

In the argument that follows, I will question the relationship between the earliest forms of Ruism and contemporary Zhou culture by reexamining the family background of Confucius, whom I will refer to throughout by his family and personal names: Kong Qiu 孔丘. I will attempt to show that what made Kong Qiu’s teachings distinctive in his time may well have involved a tension between them and cultural norms associated with the Xia/Shang/Zhou tradition, or a critical stance taken towards those norms by Kong Qiu, whom I will picture as an outsider to that tradition by virtue of his family history. Specifically, I hope to demonstrate three major claims. The first is that there is significant evidence to indicate that we possess valid reports about the family background of Kong Qiu, a claim rejected in much recent Western scholarship. The second is that this background suggests a hybrid ethnic profile for Kong Qiu that, in contrast
to the traditional notion that Kong Qiu’s ancestry traced back to the Shang royal house, reveals filiations with a culture outside the Xia/Shang/ Zhou tradition. The third is that Kong Qiu’s unusual background probably contributed to the shape of Ruism. The key elements that make these arguments interesting concern evidence that links Kong Qiu’s family with the small state of Zhu 鄒, also known as Zhulou 鄒魯, a state which during Kong Qiu’s lifetime was approaching absorption by the state of Lu 魯, and which is consistently identified in early sources as an Yi 夷, or non-“Chinese,” state.¹

**Kong Qiu’s Family Background**

**Shuliang He and the Question of Kong Qiu’s Father**

The earliest account of Kong Qiu’s family history appears in the Shi ji 史記, which provides Kong Qiu with a chapter of genealogical history comparable to that devoted to major ruling houses. The chapter begins:

Kongzi was born in Zou 鄒 City, in the Changping 昌平 district of the state of Lu. His forebear was a man of the state of Song 宋 named Kong Fangshu 孔防叔. Fangshu gave birth to Boxia 伯夏; Boxia gave birth to Shuliang He 叔梁乾. He, together with a woman of the Yan 顏, conjoined in the wilds (yehe 野合) and gave birth to Kong Qiu.²

The tenuousness of the connection between Kong Qiu and the ancestors listed here has been noted by many, beginning with Cui Shu 崔述 in the eighteenth century, and most recently discussed in detail by Lionel Jensen.³ Most notably, although the man here described as Kong Qiu’s father, Shuliang He, is mentioned several times in the Zuo zhuan 左傳, that text, which is at many points clearly interested in the figure

---

¹ Two previous authors of whom I am aware have noted the possibility that Ruism’s origins were connected to the Yi state of Zhulou: Zhang Zhihan 張致寒 (“Lue lun Zhulou wenhua yu Ru-Mo 略論邾魯文化與魯墨,” Wenxian 文獻 1989.3, 243–48), and E.G. Pulleyblank, (“Zou 鄒 and Lu 魯 and the Sinification of Shandong,” in *Chinese Language, Thought, and Culture*, ed. Philip J. Ivanhoe [Chicago & La Salle: Open Court, 1996]).

² Shi ji 史記 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1959), 47.1905. I am postponing discussion of earlier generations of ancestors reported in other sources and linking Kong Qiu to the state of Song and the royal lineage of the Shang Dynasty.

of Kong Qiu, never identifies Shuliang He as Kong Qiu’s father. Given the four-century gap between Kong Qiu’s lifetime and the Shi ji, Jensen suggests that this genealogy was fabricated in the interim. To account for the choice of Shuliang He as Kong Qiu’s father, Jensen notes that He is referred to in the Zuo zhuan as Zouren He 郑人纥, or “He, a man from Zou,” and that in the Lun yu 論語, the only information providing a clue to Kong Qiu’s background is a reference to him as a “son of a man from Zou 郑.” Jensen argues that this connection inspired the choice of Shuliang He as Confucius’s father.

Closer examination of the information we possess concerning Shuliang He, however, suggests that there may be other points of connection between this obscure figure and Kong Qiu—too many to be coincidental, and of a nature too oblique to suggest intentional fabrication.

Shuliang He appears at two points in the Zuo zhuan. The earlier instance is very well known: he is portrayed exhibiting a critical feat of strength in the midst of a military siege.

Because the people of the state of Qi 齊 had not yet got what they wanted from us, in the fall the Marquis of Qi attacked our northern territories and surrounded Tao. Gao Hou surrounded Zang He 郑纥 in Fang防. An army of Lu soldiers marched from Yangguan to reach Zangsun 郑孙 [He], encamping at Lüsung. From that point, Shu He of Zou 郑叔纥, Zang Chou 郑池, and Zang Jia 郑家 led three hundred armored soldiers and ambushed the soldiers of Qi in a night attack. They escorted [Zang He] and returned, whereupon the Qi army departed.

This account concerns a prominent family of Lu, the Zang clan, whose

---

4. Lun yu (Lun yu yinde 論語引得 Harvard-Yenching Institute Sinological Index Series [Taipei reprint edition, 1966] Supplement #16), 3.15. For Shuliang He, see Zuo zhuan (Chunqiu jingzhuan yinde 春秋經傳引得 Harvard-Yenching Institute Sinological Index Series [Taipei reprint edition, 1966] Supplement #11) Xiang 10/1 (269); at 17/5 (285) he is referred to as Zou Shu He, “Uncle He of Zou.” The characters 郑, 郑 and 郑 were pronounced identically, and are usually taken to be alternative forms for a single word (see, e.g., Pulleyblank, “Zou and Lu,” 43). We will look at this more closely later in this discussion.


7. Zuo zhuan, Xiang 17/5 (285). The appellation Zou Shu He used here is equated with Shuliang He in Du Yu’s 杜預 commentary. Where Shuliang He might be rendered, “He, known as Uncle Liang,” comprised of a name (He) and a cognomen (Shuliang), Zou Shu He might be rendered, “He, an uncle of Zou,” comprised of a name, and the generic component of the cognomen modified by a place of origin. For an analysis of Shuliang He’s name, see Zhou Faqiao 周法高 ed., Zhou Qin mingzi jiegu huishi 周秦名字解詁彙釋 (original author, Wang Yinzhi 王引之) (Taipei: Taiwan shudian, 1958), 58.
members were also referred to by the clan designation Zangsun (Zang-descendants). At the time of this account, Zangsun He was a high officer of the state of Lu, occupying the position of Sikou, or Minister of Crime. He was a leading military figure as well. Here, we see Zangsun He trapped in his family estate lands, which the Zangs ruled from the walled city of Fang. He is rescued by other members of the clan, his brothers, but listed before them is Shuliang He, an elevation of role for Shuliang He, as compared to the incident recorded seven years earlier, and one that seems to place him in a network associated with the Zang clan.

There are, in fact, four further connections between Zang He and the Zang clan on the one hand, and Kong Qiu and his reputed father on the other.

The first of these further connections relates to Zang He’s role in the historical account of Kong Qiu. In a Zuo zhuan passage that bears signs of having been designed as part of a hagiography for Kong Qiu, Meng Xizi, a grandee of the Mengsun clan, one of the three major warlord clans of Lu, issues a deathbed command, entrusting his sons to the tutelage of the young Kong Qiu. He cites as his reason wise phrases inscribed by a supposed distant ancestor of Kong Qiu, and then says:

Zangsun He has a saying, “When a sage possesses brilliant virtue, should he fail to encounter a generation that recognizes him, there will surely be among his descendants a man who will be recognized.” Surely, now this shall befall Kong Qiu!9

This gratuitous invocation of the authority of Zang He by the story’s author to ratify the identification of Kong Qiu as a man with a sage lineage and promising destiny reinforces the connection between He and the Kong family—Zang He is not a figure prominent in texts or frequently cited in this way. Moreover, Zang He’s exile from Lu in 550 had been entirely the product of a plot conceived by Meng Xiaobo, his enemy and Meng Xizi’s father (all dates are B.C. unless specified). The authors of the account of Meng Xizi’s endorsement of Kong Qiu had willfully to overlook the improbability of this bow to the wisdom of Zang He.10

8. The most prominent members of the clan are most often referred to with the clan name Zang when their posthumous honorifics are used, and as Zangsun when their names (ming) are used. I will generally refer to them with the clan designation Zang, but will preserve text formulations in translations.

9. Zuo zhuan, Zhao 7/6 (366); the passage is dated to 534, but describes Meng Xizi’s death in 517. Because a saying (yan) is normally a general statement, the final sentence is taken to be the words of Meng Xizi; the possibility that the quote extends through the sentence cannot, however, be ruled out.

10. On the relations of Meng Xiaobo and Zang He, see Zuo zhuan, Xiang 23/11 (300).
A second further point relates to an unusual pattern of personal names. An obvious resonance between Zang He and the man identified as Kong Qiu’s father is that they share the personal name (ming 姓), He. There are, in pre-Qin literature, records of only three men with this personal name. In addition to Zang He and Shuliang He, the third is the son of Ji Wuzi 季武子, the head of the most powerful of the Lu warlord clans during the generation of Zang He. The Zuo zhuan records in the year 550 the following event, prefatory to the exile of Zang He:

Ji Wuzi had no set heir (that is, no son by his principal wife). Gongmi (Gong Chu) was the eldest son, but Wuzi loved Daozi (Jisun He) and wished to designate him as heir . . . He asked Zang He about this, and Zang He said, “Have me join a ceremony of toasts and I will designate him for you.” When Ji Wuzi next toasted his grandees with wine, Zang He was indeed a guest. After the initial toasting was done, Zangsun ordered that two mats be laid in the position facing north. He took a fresh goblet and rinsed it. Then he summoned Daozi and descended the steps of the dais to meet him; all the grandees rose. At the point when host and guests toast one another, he called for Gong Chu, and then had him seated next to his brother according to age. Seeing this, Ji Wuzi turned white.11

This passage appears in a series of episodes illustrating the flamboyant and unpredictable character of Zang He, leading towards his exile. To understand fully the connection between Zang He and the son of Ji Wuzi who shares with him a personal name, it is necessary to know that Zang He enjoyed great intimacy with Ji Wuzi, and played the role of consigliere to the warlord Ji family; later in the tale, Zang He is described contrasting Ji Wuzi’s “love” (ai 愛) towards him and the hatred borne towards him by the Meng family leader. In light of this intimate connection, and in view of the role that Zang He is portrayed as undertaking to manage the accession to power of Jisun He, the evidence suggests that their coincidence of names would not likely be accidental.

12. I have pursued research on this through Barry Blakeley’s useful Annotated Genealogies of Spring and Autumn Period Clans (Taipei: Chinese Materials Center, 1983). A survey of naming patterns yields examples of names that, sometimes with little generational spacing, seem to recur within lineage lines, and some instances of identically named men of the same generation or of one removed in different branches of the same lineage (particularly in the state of Zheng), ruling out strong intra-family taboo rules, and also examples in the state of Qi of ducal sons sharing a name with members of key ministerial families a generation earlier, but I cannot see that any clear rules concerning shared names can be inferred or rejected from the evidence. It should be borne in mind that the database for this research is relatively small.
Although we have certain types of information about ancient Chinese names, we lack any guidelines that would help us assess the situation we encounter here. We noted earlier that Shuliang He was portrayed, along with two of Zang He’s brothers, as rescuing Zang He. The proxy brother role played there by Shuliang He resonates with the godfather role played towards Jisun He by Zang He. Although there are in the roster of Chunqiu era figures whose personal names are known many examples of multiple men bearing identical ming, there is no situation remotely comparable to the isolated cluster represented by these three men. Moreover, although there exists in the Zuo zhuan and elsewhere a small group of statements concerning methods for naming children, none of these bears on the issue of shared names.

That these three men, connected closely in various ways, share a single name seems beyond coincidence, but the significance of the fact cannot be determined with any certainty. The most interesting interpretation, given the contextual information, would infer pseudo-affinal ties among the three men. Lacking independent confirmation of this possibility, a more cautious speculation might attribute the overlapping names to confusion on the part of the Zuo authors. Even were we to assert the weaker claim, the potential for Shuliang He and Zang Wuzhong to be conflated in this way would still reflect an unanticipated connection between the two figures, reinforcing the general argument I am building here.

A third further connection between the Zangs and Kong Qiu exists, related to official rank within the state of Lu. The Shi ji reports that Kong Qiu rose to the office of Sikou, or Minister of Crime, in the state of Lu, dating his appointment to approximately 500. I do not want to debate here whether this report reflects historical fact; whether Kong Qiu’s appointment was factually true or later hagiographical invention, what is significant is that the office of Sikou itself, one of the chief offices of state in Lu, was the hereditary preserve of the Zang family. After the exile of Zang He, the fortunes of the Zang family rapidly diminished, and it is very possible that the office of Sikou did fall out of Zang control. Whether it fell so far as to reach within a generation a man of Kong Qiu’s modest family background is questionable, but whether in fact or by hagiographer’s choice, Kong Qiu’s supposed accession to the office of Sikou provides yet another link between the Zangs and the Kongs.

Finally, a fourth further connection concerns a very unusual textual association between Zang He and a term closely tied to the later school

13. For an overview of customs concerning personal names, see Xiao Yaotian, Zhongguo renming de yanjiu (Beijing: Xinhua, 1987), 23–27.
14. Shi ji, 47.1915.
of Kong Qiu: ru 亅. Zang He first appears in Zuo zhuan accounts for the year 571. He is pictured as a military leader, a source of knowledge about li (禮; ritual), and he possesses a reputation for wisdom. Nevertheless, in an account dated to 568, Zang He’s military excellence is dimmed by a misadventure concerning the state of Zhulou, Lu’s immediate neighbor to the south.

Winter, tenth month. Men from Zhu 鄫 and Ju 蘀 attacked Zeng 胄. Zang He went to the rescue of Zeng by invading Zhu, but was defeated at Hutai 狐骀. The occupants of Lu city all emerged to meet the returning corpses wearing zhua 鬢 hair styles. It was at this time that the people of Lu began to wear the zhua. The occupants of the city chanted:

Zang’s foxskin jacket brought us down at Hutai.
Our lord a little child, a zhuru 朱儒 dwarf his envoy.
Zhuru! Zhuru! You brought us down in Zhu!\(^{16}\)

What I want to note here is the use of the term zhuru.\(^{17}\) The term is used in early texts to refer either to a type of dwarf dancer or to a type of jester (perhaps the two roles overlapped).\(^{18}\) Here, of course, there is a pun intended: zhuru not only pictures Zangsun He in unflattering terms, it creates a pun with the name of the state that defeated him in battle, Zhu. The force of the pun, however, is somewhat elusive. Since the commentary of Du Yu, the explanation offered has been that Zangsun He was of short stature, but there is no confirmation of this elsewhere. The pun would be cogent and the jingle witty only if the term ru were being used as an independent term, Zang being referred to as a (traitorous) “Ru of Zhu.”

I have argued at length elsewhere that the term ru is not applied in the sense of a ceremonial master or teacher until after the time of Kong Qiu.\(^{19}\) In the entire Zuo zhuan, the character ru (in independent usage or in the combination zhuru) is never employed in a tale concerning events before the time of Kong Qiu—nor is there any use of the term in a pre-Confucian context in any other early text—except in this one instance.\(^{20}\)

---

17. The common orthography for the term is 侏儒.
18. The sense of dancer is quite common; for usage in the sense of jester, see Shi ji, 126.3202.
20. This statement must be qualified by noting that the Zhou li 周禮 refers to Ru in its description of the Duke of Zhou’s model administration. I take this to be an ahistorical generic projection into the distant past, in a late Warring States or Qin-Han text.
The logic of the phrasing begs us to read this as a retrospective characterization of Zang He as a Ru. Apart from this case, the silence regarding pre-Confucian Ru in the textual corpus suggests that it was understood in the centuries after Kong Qiu’s death that projection of Ru into the time before his maturity would be inappropriate. But if this passage is read as a pun in the way I propose, the author would not have felt it inappropriate to portray people referring to Zang He as a Ru.

It seems to me that in light of this welter of connections that link Zang He to the man said to be Kong Qiu’s father, to Kong Qiu, and to at least the name of Kong Qiu’s school, it would no longer be appropriate to accept as the strongest hypothesis based on the evidence the claim asserted by Creel and Jensen that the designation of Shuliang He as Kong Qiu’s father was arrived at solely because Shuliang He is referred to as “Zou ren He” (He, a man from Zou) and Kong Qiu is referred to as “Zou ren zhi zi” (the son of a man from Zou). Too much evidence with too little direct reference to Kong Qiu exists.

I will develop later a model of clan-based and cultural tensions important to the formation of the Ru movement, consistent with general features of the Shi ji account of Kong Qiu’s background. Those tensions may conceivably have generated a broader design of textual fabrications concerning Kong Qiu, into which the phenomena we see here, including the Shi ji account, may fit. However, we do not seem to possess the sort of textual support that would clarify a specific scheme and function of any such fabrication. It is very difficult to suggest any such model that has the theoretical elegance and explanatory force of accepting the Shi ji’s assertion that Shuliang He was, indeed, Kong Qiu’s father. The most conservative approach to the textual evidence we do have is to adopt the hypothesis that Shuliang He was Kong Qiu’s father unless counter-evidence emerges.

Yan Zhengzai and the Question of Kong Qiu’s Mother

To the degree that the Shi ji’s identification of Shuliang He as Kong Qiu’s father appears promising, we might expect that the basic identification of Kong Qiu’s mother may also provide us with useful information that we can probe further.

We have seen that the Shi ji identifies Kong Qiu’s mother as a woman of the Yan clan, with whom Kong Qiu’s father “conjoined in the wilds.” The description of this union has given rise to considerable comment. The term yehe 野合 very naturally suggests illegitimate sexual relations (its literal sense may also be rendered “rudely conjoined”). Uneasy commentators have argued that the term refers only to the advanced age of
Kong Qiu’s father. The Kongzi jiayu, which dates from the third century A.D., but which includes material presumed to be earlier, gives a far more detailed account. It includes the personal name of Kong Qiu’s mother, Yan Zhengzai, and agrees with the Shi ji commentaries in portraying Shuliang He as advanced in years. It does not use the term yehe.

Less attention has been paid to Kong Qiu’s mother than to his father. Shirakawa Shizuka, seizing on this gap with his customary inventiveness, makes her identity central to Kong Qiu’s unusual commitment to rituals, concluding that she was a shamaness (wu). Shirakawa speculated that secret liaisons between men and shamanesses were not unusual, and that Kong Qiu was the offspring of such a match.

The Shi ji and Kongzi jiayu accounts, as well as accounts in other early texts, uniformly state that Shuliang He died when Kong Qiu was an infant, his mother living on until Kong Qiu was a young man, or at least old enough to direct his mother’s funeral arrangements. Some sources state that prior to Kong Qiu’s birth, Shuliang He had produced nine daughters by a principal wife from the Shi clan of Lu, and, by a concubine, a son named Mengpi. The Lunyu refers to Kong Qiu marrying off his elder brother’s daughter. However, in the brief portraits we have of Kong Qiu’s early life, there is no indication of a Kong family presence. At the time of his mother’s death, the Shi ji tells us that Kong Qiu was unaware of the site of his father’s grave and was thus unable to bury his mother in a permanent grave until strangers provided the information. Whatever the facts, the tale of Kong Qiu’s early life pictures him without family support other than his mother.

As is often noted, an unusually high number of the people listed as disciples of Kong Qiu bear the surname Yan, and if we grant that the Shi ji identification of Kong Qiu’s maternal clan may be reliable, the natural

---

21. See the Suoyin and Zhengyi commentaries to the Shi ji account, 47.1906.
24. Kongzi jiayu, “Ben xing”, 39.1/72/23; Shi ji (Suoyin commentary), 47.1906.
25. Lunyu, 5.2.
26. Shi ji, 47.1906–7; Li ji, “Tan gong” I, 3.10.
supposition is that this reflects a family interest on Kong Qiu’s mother’s side.\(^\text{27}\) If this were the case, the nature of the Yan clan would be of some importance in understanding both Kong Qiu’s background and the nature of his career and connections.

We noted earlier that Kong Qiu’s father was referred to as a man from Zou. Commentary and tradition tell us that this refers to the fact that Shuliang He held an official appointment, presumably from the Lu court, giving him authority over the town of Zou.\(^\text{28}\) However, the fact that both Shuliang He and Kong Qiu are specifically referred to as Zou ren, or “men from Zou,” in Kong Qiu’s case with an overtone of implicit disrespect, suggests that the link between Shuliang He and Zou ran deeper.

The city of Zou is generally identified as a city in the state neighboring Lu to the south, Zhulou; in fact, the city served for a time as the latter state’s capital, and its name, most often rendered 騃, is generally taken to be identical with the state’s name, rendered with the graph 騃. However, there is, in fact, dispute over the issue of whether Zou 騃 and Zou 騃 are identical places.\(^\text{29}\) The problem is made more difficult by the fact that not long after Kong Qiu’s lifetime, the state of Zhu and its capital Zou were absorbed by Lu. I do not think the issue can be adjudicated on the basis of sources of historical geography alone. But associations connected with the Yan clan may help.

There are, to my knowledge, no early sources that include discussion of the Yan clan name.\(^\text{30}\) The earliest extant text with a reference to the origins of the Yan clan of which I am aware is the famous family instructions of Yan Zhitui 頭之推, dating from the sixth century A.D. There it is stated, “The forebears of the Yan family were originally from Zou and Lu; some parted and went to Qi. For generations, they took the cultivation of Ruism as their task.”\(^\text{31}\) Now, the state of Zou, that is, the state of Zhu,

\(^{27}\) The point has recently been made by the Brooks’ (Original Analects, 282). In addition to disciples themselves, note that the Shi ji identifies the brother-in-law of the senior disciple Zilu 子路 as a member of the Yan clan (47.1919, 1932). It is, of course, possible that at some point in the development of the Ru school Yan-family disciples invented for Kong Qiu a Yan-clan mother.


\(^{29}\) Takezoe is the strongest opponent of the identification (Saden kaisen, 15.3). Traditional commentary favors the identification (see Cheng Faren 程斐航, Chunqiu Zuo shi zhu zuding tukao 春秋左氏傳地名圖考 [Taipei: Guangwen, 1967], 200). We will explore this issue further later on.

\(^{30}\) The surname Yan is not discussed in the Bohu tongyi 白虎通義 sections on xing 性 or in the Shi ben 世本, where the earliest descriptions of surnames appear.

or Zhulou, was a state outside the cultural sphere of the Zhou people—it was referred to as an Yi or “barbarian” state. It is unlikely that the Yan clan would have made a conscious choice to fabricate an association with Zhulou. Moreover, the tradition reported by Yan Zhitui is persistent. The Tang period work Yuanhe xingzuan 元和姓纂 specifies that the first ancestor of the clan was Wu Gong Yan 武公頞, a ruler of Zhulou, referred to in early texts as Zhu Gong Yan 鄒公頞, or Yifu Yan 夷甫頞 (r. ca. 800 B.C.); the Yuanhe xingzuan quotes two prior sources for this information, the earliest being by the fourth century A.D. writer Ge Hong 葛洪.32

The conclusion suggested by this evidence is that the clan of Kong Qiu’s mother was native to the state of Zhulou, which would reinforce the argument that Kong Qiu’s father was, equally, a man of Zou/Zhulou. Were this the case, it would offer a new option in the interpretation of the phrase yehe, which might indeed denote a union conjoined in “the wilds”—that is, outside the borders of the Zhou cultural community. Were this the case—and I will adduce additional evidence that this is so later in this discussion—it could open an avenue for new insight into Kong Qiu’s unique contributions to Chinese culture.

Kong Family Forebears in the State of Song

Although the Shi ji account of Kong Qiu’s family background goes back only three generations, there exist much more extensive descriptions of Kong Qiu’s ancestry. The most complete appears in the Kongzi jiayu. It traces the Kong line back to the famous Weizi Qi 微子啟, sagely brother and long-suffering victim of the evil last ruler of the Shang Dynasty, whose son, after the Zhou conquest, ultimately became duke of the new state of Song. The great-grandfather with whom the Shi ji account begins is described only as the first member of the family to have arrived in the state of Lu, prior generations having lived in the state of Song, ruled by

32. Lin Bao 林寶, Yuanhe xingzuan (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1994), 519. Lin actually bases his report on three prior sources, all now substantially lost. The third traces the Yan clan to the son of the Duke of Zhou, but Lin questions the reliability of this claim. Lin claims that Yan was the zi 子 of Zhu Gong Yan, which is very unlikely, Yifu being in the form of a zi, thus bringing into conformity with Zhou naming pattern the adoption of his name as a surname (the Song period Tong zhi 通志, by Zheng Qiao 鄭樵 also adopts this position [Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1936], 461), and a similar claim is described in a Tang inscriptional source by Cen Zhongmian 岑仲勉 [see Yuanhe xingzuan, 519 (B)]. We will encounter Zhu Gong Yan again further on.
the descendants of the Shang line. After following Weizi Qi with four early dukes of Song, Kong Qiu’s ancestral line prior to the earliest member mentioned in the Shi ji, Kong Fangshu, is described as follows:

Fufu He 弗父何
Songfu Zhou 宋父周
Sheng 僑
Zheng Kaofu 正考父
Kongfu Jia 孔父嘉
Zimu Jinfu 子木金父
Gaoyi 翟夷

Two members of this line appear in the Zuo zhuan passage in which the Lu grandee Meng Xizi predicts Kong Qiu’s greatness and cites Zang He in support. In that passage, he claims that Fufu He was the rightful successor to the Song throne, but ceded it to his brother, and he goes on to cite with admiration a tripod inscription ascribed to Zheng Kaofu, who lived during the eighth century B.C.:

My first appointment bent my back, my second appointment hunched me over, my third appointment bowed me double. Clinging to the walls as I walk, who would dare bully one such as me? Herein my congee, herein my gruel, to fill my mouth.

The type of admonitory inscription represented here became common during the late Warring States period and after; such formulae were inscribed on objects of various types, and there are many instances where

33. All relevant information is contained in the “Ben xing” chapter of the Kongzi jiayu, 39.1.
34. Zimu Jinfu is called Qifu 祀父 in the Shi ben (see, e.g., Shi ben sizhong zhu zui suoyin 世本四種逐字索引, Institute for Chinese Studies Concordance [Hong Kong: Commercial Press, 1997], 1.7/15.15).
35. The name for this supposed forebear closely resembles graphs that would point towards the capital city of Zhulou in Kong Qiu’s time, located at Yishan 翳山, followed by the designation “non-Zhou person” (that is, Yi Yi 翳夷). The ming Yi 夷 is common among people of this period, but it is nevertheless an odd coincidence that the predecessor of Kong Qiu’s earliest Shi ji ancestor should bear a name that could so easily be taken to mean “an Yi person of the Zou region.” With this point in mind, it may also be noted that there seems to be, within Kong Qiu’s ancestral list, a tendency towards names based on mountains (others may include Fangshu, Shuliang [Liang 梁 being the name of several peaks in the Lu region], and Qiu).
36. Zuo zhuan, Zhao 7/6 (366).
they are cited in texts and ascribed to ancient sages, such as Huangdi 黃帝.\textsuperscript{37} There exist to my knowledge, however, no such inscriptions among the corpus of Western Zhou bronzes, and the Zheng Kaofu citation seems to me best interpreted as an invention of hagiographers some generations after Kong Qiu’s death, projecting into Kong Qiu’s ancestry ideas of humility and prudence favored by Ru-school adherents emphasizing the doctrine of timeliness. Zheng Kaofu is also mentioned in the \textit{Guo yu} 國語, where he is pictured transmitting to the Zhou music master the poems of the“Shang song” 商頌 section of the \textit{Shi jing}, and this seems a similar projection of Ruism into the early Kong family line.\textsuperscript{38}

The member of Kong Qiu’s Song lineage most prominent in the texts is Kongfu Jia, from whom, if he were, in fact, Kong Qiu’s ancestor, the Kong clan name would derive.\textsuperscript{39} Kongfu Jia is recorded in \textit{Zuo zhuan} accounts as the Minister of War in Song, and his death by assassination in 709 is recorded in the \textit{Chunqiu} itself.\textsuperscript{40} Although Kongfu Jia is mentioned multiple times in the \textit{Zuo zhuan}, \textit{Gongyang zhuan} 公羊傳, and \textit{Guliang zhuan} 桓梁傳, and he is treated as a valorous man who died with honor in all three, none of these texts connect him with Kong Qiu, directly or indirectly.

Kongfu Jia was assassinated, along with the ruler of the state, whom the former ruler had entrusted to Kongfu Jia’s protection, by a powerful Song patrician named Hua Du 華督, whose family succeeded to the inherited office of Minister of War. The \textit{Kongzi jiayu} accounts for the removal of Kong Qiu’s clan to Lu by claiming that it was the persecution of the Kong’s by the Hua clan that necessitated the flight of Gaoyi’s

\begin{footnotes}
\item 37. I have learned of this phenomenon through Mark Csikszentmihalyi’s unpublished manuscript, “The Myth of Practice and the Yellow Emperor Inscriptions” (Nov. 2000).
\item 39. The name Kongfu Jia consists of a \textit{zi} 字 cognomen followed by a \textit{ming}. There is a regular relation in Zhou naming patterns between \textit{zi} which include the element Kong and the personal name Jia (see Zhou Fagao, \textit{Zhou-Qin mingzi}, 8–9; also, \textit{Shuowen jiezi gulin} 說文解字詮林 [Ding Fubao 丁福保, ed. (Shanghai: Yixue, 1931–32), 590]. One manner in which clan names were assigned was by selecting the main character of the \textit{zi} of the deceased grandfather of the clan head initiating a new lineage branch (see \textit{Zuo zhuan}, Yin 8/10 [18]). Hence, in the lineages of the state of Zheng we find a ducal son named Gongzi Jia 公子嘉 bearing the \textit{zi} Zikong 子孔, and his grandson bearing the family name Kong (Blakeley, \textit{Annotated Genealogies}, 191–92). The regularity of these relationships, and their instance in the state of Zheng, tends to work against applying to early accounts Jensen’s interesting notion, that the association of Kong Qiu’s surname, with its nominal sense of “a swallow,” linked Kong Qiu to bird-myth material associated with the Shang people, the progenitors of the Song state (“Wise Man of the Wilds,” 425–27).
\item 40. \textit{Zuo zhuan}, Huan 2/5 (25).
\end{footnotes}
son Kong Fangshu from Song. As Cui Shu noted centuries ago, while the flight of Kongfu Jia’s son might be expected, it is difficult to account for the flight of the great-grandson on the same grounds. No stronger evidence supports the connection between the Lu-region ancestry listed in the Shi ji with the Song-region ancestry described in the Zuo zhuan and listed in the Kongzi jiayu, although the tradition of Kong Qiu’s Song antecedents is strong in the literature—texts outside the Zuo zhuan as early as the Li ji assert this, and it is, of course, noted in passing in the Shi ji account.

The linkage of the clan of Kong Qiu with the Kongs of Song appears, in this light, to be a construction designed in the first instance to link Kong Qiu’s ancestry to a man who exhibits exceptional courage in the historical record, and whose name could place him prominently in the recreated temple configuration of Kong family tablets. The ascription, in the clearly hagiographical Meng Xizi passage, of a wise admonition to Kongfu Jia’s father, Zheng Kaofu, provides proto-Ruist credentials to the ancestral clan in Song. The reference to a story of Fufu He ceding the throne of Song to his brother suggests that an effort had been made to provide Kong Qiu with a lineage that would make him the legitimate heir to the throne that had once been occupied by the Shang kings.

It seems most cogent to argue, with Jensen, Creel, and others, that the legend of Kong Qiu’s Song forebears is a hagiographical construct.

To sum up what we seem to be able to learn about Kong Qiu’s family background: 1) His father was Shuliang He, a “man of Zou,” which phrase most likely identifies him not with the state of Lu, but with the state of Zhulou (or perhaps, more precisely, with the culture of Zhulou, as the Zou city area may already by the sixth century have come under the control of Lu, the Zhulou capital having been removed south to Mt. Yi in the seventh century). 2) Shuliang He was very likely linked in a significant way with the Zang clan of Lu, and although he is explicitly identified by connection with Zhulou, all references to him in the historical record concern military actions under Lu command. 3) To the degree that we can be confident that Shuliang He was Kong Qiu’s father, we can probably assert that Kong Qiu’s mother was a member of the Yan clan. The Yan clan also has connections with the state of Lu, but is more fundamentally linked by the sources to the state of Zhulou. 4) Although Kong Qiu’s supposed ancestry in the state of Song is strongly asserted, because the tradition cannot be confirmed as early and also performs

42. Cui, Zhu-Si kaoxin lu, 3.
43. Li ji, “Tan gong” I, 3.44/15/17.
44. See Creel, Confucius, 296.
the sort of direct hagiographic function that the ties to Shuliang He and Yan Zhengzai do not, we must assess it less likely to have a historical basis.

The Connection with the Zang Family of Lu

The Zang clan, with which Kong Qiu’s reputed father is linked, was one of the most prominent in Lu history. In this section, I am going to embark on an extended digression, focusing on textual presentations concerning the Zang clan, rather than on Kong Qiu himself. I argue that analysis of these presentations shows that the Zang’s occupied a uniquely problematic position for early Ru authors, and that the varied patterns of approval and disapproval of the Zang’s in these texts can tell us much about the relationship between the clan, Kong Qiu’s family and personal stature in Lu, and early Ruisim.

The Zang’s traced their ancestry to Duke Xiao of Lu (r. 795–769), and generations of their forebears had been prominent statesmen. In the Zuo zhuan, at least four generations of clan leaders are depicted delivering major speeches of admonishment to dukes of Lu, the earliest dated to 718. The most prominent of these men, Zangsun Chen (d. 617), who is chiefly known in texts by his posthumous title, Zang Wenzhong, was, judging from the Zuo zhuan accounts, the most revered figure in Lu history between the Duke of Zhou and Kong Qiu. However, the prominence of the clan comes to an end in 550 with the exile to Qi of Wenzhong’s grandson Zangsun He, whose escape from siege six years earlier we have already encountered.

Zang Wenzhong in Ru Texts

I want to begin this exploration of a family that may have borne a pseudo-familial relationship to Kong Qiu’s father by observing the manner in which texts respectful of Kong Qiu treat its most prominent member, Zangsun Chen, whom I will refer to by the honorific Zang Wenzhong. (Table 1, below, indicates the genealogical lines of Lu patrician houses relevant to this discussion.)

Zang Wenzhong is treated roughly in the Lun yu, and given the connections that we have established between his grandson and Kong Qiu’s

45. The Zangs first appear in the Zuo zhuan at Yin 5, when Xibo (Gongsun Kou), whose cognomen, Zizang, became the source of the Zang family surname, remonstrates with Duke Yin; when Xibo dies later that year, the duke is portrayed as uneasy over having ignored Xibo’s advice. Xibo’s son is also portrayed in wise remonstrance (Zuo zhuan Huan 2/6 [25]).
father, this is surprising. The principal complaint concerning Zang Wenzhong relates to another Lu grandee:

The Master said: Did not Zang Wenzhong occupy his position illicitly? He knew the worthiness of Liuxia Hui 柳下惠 and would not let him stand alongside in rank. 46

Liuxia Hui is the honorific title of Zhan Qin 展禽. Later sources sometimes identify Zhan Qin as a talented commoner, beneath the natural notice of the court elite. 47 The Lun yu passage makes sense in this context, as it suggests that Zang maintained his own burnished reputation by failing to recommend at court a talented man unknown to his lord. However, in the Chunqiu commentaries, we find Zhan Qin as the senior generational representative of a clan descended, like Zang Wenzhong’s own, from Duke Xiao of Lu. 48

47. For example, Shuo yuan 説苑 (Shuo yuan zhuzi yinde 説苑逐字索引, Institute for Chinese Studies Concordance [Hong Kong: Commercial Press, 1992]), 12.8.
48. The founding Zhan ancestor was, according to the Zuo zhu, Gongsun Wuhai.

Table 1: Genealogies for Selected Individuals

Source: Blakely, Annotated Genealogies of Spring and Autumn Period Clans, genealogical charts of Lu, following page 108.

Note: It seems likely that a generation is missing from the earliest parts of this table.
There is a curious division among early texts in the manner in which these two men are viewed. The *Zuo zhuan*, in the body of its historical narrative, devotes a great deal of space to discussion of Zang Wenzhong, and his role in Lu is roughly comparable to that of other great heroes of the *Zuo zhuan*, such as Zichan 子産 in Zheng 郑. His speeches are celebrated in the *Zuo zhuan* and other sources as “utterances that shall never decay” (*bu xiu zhi yan* 不朽之言).\(^4^9\) If these reports have a basis in fact, then during Kong Qiu’s lifetime, Zang’s name would likely have been one of the most respected in Lu. On the other hand, Zhan Qin is mentioned only once in the body of *Zuo* narratives, and that single instance bears the marks of later editorial insertion within the narrative context in which it appears.\(^5^0\)

There is, however, another instance where the two men’s names are linked. In a description of a major ceremonial irregularity that occurred in Lu, with which Zang Wenzhong is nowhere else directly associated, there appears a passage from a commentarial layer embedded at intervals in the *Zuo zhuan* text that includes comments by “Zhongni 仲尼,” that is, Kong Qiu. In this instance, the Zhongni voice introduces a gratuitous critique of Zang Wenzhong:

Zhongni says: There were three unbenevolent things and three unwise things that characterize Zang Wenzhong. Keeping Zhan Qin low, discarding the six tax stations, making his concubines weave mats: these are the three unbenevolent things; constructing vain vessels, allowing contrary sacrifice, sacrificing to the *yuanju* 爰居: these are the three unwise things.\(^5^1\)

---

\(^4^9\) *Zuo zhuan*, Xiang 24/1 (301–2).

\(^5^0\) The instance appears at Xi 26/4 (the narrative has been displaced by one entry relative to the annals). It may be compared with a parallel passage in *Guo yu*, “Lu yu” 1 (2.6) in which Zhan Qin plays a key role. In the *Zuo* account, a different actor fulfills the function Zhan Qin performs in the *Guo yu*, and Zhan Qin’s name seems inserted in a tangential phrase.

\(^5^1\) Wen 2/6. No early texts attest to the matters of the six tax stations or mat weaving, though commentators offer explanations. The episode of the *yuanju* bird is discussed below. Commentators link the “vain vessel” to a family turtle that will also be discussed later on, but I believe it is more cogent to link the term to an anecdote concerning forged vessels in which Zhan Qin appears, morally protesting bad behavior by the duke of Lu (*Lü shi chunqiu* 呂氏春秋 [Lü shi chunqiu zhuzi suoyin 呂氏春秋逐字索引, Institute for Chinese Studies Concordance (Hong Kong: Commercial Press, 1994)], 9.4). Zang Wenzhong is absent from that tale as we have it, but I would argue that the Zhongni voice gratuitously ascribes to Zang responsibility for the bad behavior of the state there.
Here, the breach of sacrificial ritual is placed on Zang’s head, and the *Lun yu* charge against Zang Wenzhong concerning Zhan Qin is reiterated. In sharp contrast to the implicit assessment of Zang Wenzhong in the body of the *Zuo zhuan* narratives, his character and career are stridently denigrated. In this way, the Zhongni voice and the *Lun yu* are aligned in disparaging the grandfather of Shuliang He’s ally, while the *Zuo zhuan* text, apart from the Zhongni voice, clearly admires Zang Wenzhong, and takes no notice of Zhan Qin.

There exists in “Lu yu” I in the *Guo yu* a considerable number of passages detailing the relationship between Zang Wenzhong and Zhan Qin. These accounts are balanced, favorable to both men, but clearly picturing Zang as a man with power and moderate virtue, while Zhan is a man without power possessing exceptional virtue. A discussion of a tale concerning the “yuanchu” mentioned by the Zhongni voice will illustrate this.

We know the story of the *yuanchu* from the “Lu yu” I. There we learn that the *yuanchu* was a seabird that alighted for three days atop the eastern gate of the city wall of Lu. Zang Wenzhong deputed a man of the city to offer it sacrifices. The “Lu yu” records the protests of Zhan Qin, recorded in an elegant persuasion, embedding, as such persuasions will, intricate details of historical precedent from the era of Huangdi on, and addressed to nobody in particular. The passage concludes, however:

> Wenzhong heard the speech of Liuxia Ji and said, “Truly, this is my error. One cannot but take Jizi’s speech as a model (fa).” He had it inscribed on three bamboo-strip copies.

Here we find, woven together, elements of two of the Zhongni commentator’s criticisms of Wenzhong, the illicit sacrifice and his relationship to Zhan Qin. On the basis of the “Lu yu” passage, however, there is little reason to attack Wenzhong. It is a normal pattern of commentarial interpretation in stories of this form to view the author’s judgment of both characters as positive—Zhan Qin for obvious reasons, Zang Wenzhong because his initial error is redeemed by recognition and acknowledgment of his fault, here further stressed by his praise for Zhan Qin and inscription of his words as a model saying. Clearly, the “Lu yu” author is not

in the same way it injects him into the case of “contrary sacrifices.” This entire *Zuo zhuan* passage is discussed in some detail in Eric Henry’s recent study of the *Zuo zhuan* Zhongni voice, but with a different focus, and with different conclusions about the relation of the Zhongni judgment of Zang to judgments in other texts (“‘Junzi yue’ versus ‘Zhongni yue’ in *Zuo zhuan*” [Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies 59.1 (1999)], 138–39).

52. Zhan Qin is also known as Liuxia Ji, or Jizi.

principally motivated by disapproval of Zang’s character, as seems to be the case in both *Lunyu* 15.14 and the Zhongni commentator’s attack.

The “Lu yu” I, on the contrary, generally portrays Zang Wenzhong quite positively—and it portrays him often. He is featured in six of the sixteen passages in that text.\(^{54}\) Interestingly, the focus of one tale concerns Zang’s encounter with an unnamed commoner who provides Zang with sage advice, allowing Zang to secure for Lu a large gift of land from Jin. When Duke Xi of Lu commends Zang for this, he replies:

“The size of the territory is due to the efforts of an innkeeper in Zhong. I have heard it said, ‘When merit gleams, though in a lowly man, reward it. Where evil shows, though in a noble man, punish it.’ In this instance, through a single speech our borders were enlarged — this is bright gleaming indeed! I ask that you reward him.” Accordingly, the man was raised from among the commoners and given rank.\(^{55}\)

This anecdote turns us in a direction quite different from the *Lunyu* 15.14 author and Zhongni commentator, who create a headline item of Zang’s unwillingness to share credit or recommend a worthy, Zhan Qin, for court recognition.

We have encountered three different authorial camps with regard to Zang Wenzhong and his relation to Zhan Qin. The *Zuo zhuan* narratives valorize Zang and ignore Zhan; the “Lu yu” I links the two men, but does not disparage Zang, though it portrays Zhan as his superior; the *Lunyu* and the Zhongni voice link the two men, disparaging Zang and valorizing Zhan. In later accounts of Zang Wenzhong, the *Zuo zhuan* appreciation recedes, and only denigration of his character and conduct remain.\(^{56}\) On the other hand, Zhan Qin, now referred to only by honorific, rises in stature to near-sacred proportions, his name linked to sages such as Bo Yi and Yi Yin 伊尹.\(^{57}\)

---

56. For example, in the *Yantie lun* 燕翼論, Zang Wenzhong is moved up to Kong Qui’s generation, and he is upbraided by the disciple Zigong for his oppressive rule in Lu (*Yantie lun zhuzi suoyin* 燕翼論渾字索引, Institute for Chinese Studies Concordance [Hong Kong: Commercial Press, 1994]), 10.3 [#57]; a passage from the *Xin xu* 新序, preserved in the *Qunshuzihao* 群書治要, presents a different version of the tale (*Xin xu zhuzi suoyin* 新渾字索引, Institute for Chinese Studies Concordance [Hong Kong: Commercial Press, 1993], 11.40). In the *Lienü zhuan* 列女傳, Wenzhong’s own mother upbraids him for his arrogance of character (*Gu Lienü zhuan zhuzi suoyin* 古列女傳渾字索引, Institute for Chinese Studies Concordance [Hong Kong: Commercial Press, 1993], 3.9).
57. The apotheosis of Zhan Qin is signaled in the *Lunyu* (18.8), the *Mengzi* 孟子...
I interpret this textual pattern as reflective of a perceived need within the growing Ru cult to displace Zang Wenzhong from his position as the preeminent thinker of the state of Lu, in order to allow Kong Qiu to occupy that position. The logic of this position takes the Zuo zhuan Lu narratives as expressive of early consensus admiration of Zang Wenzhong among the elite of Lu. The “Lu yu” introduction of the obscure Zhan Qin would thus reflect an emerging Ru teaching that qualifies admiration for Zang by contrasting him unfavorably with a figure of his own generation whose features were largely invented by Kong Qiu’s followers. Ultimately, the Zhongni voice and later textual accounts which transform Zang into a villain mirror the full conquest of Kong Qiu’s admirers over the intellectual history of Lu, Kong Qiu sharing the stage only with a vague, fictionalized precursor, now known as Liuxia Hui. The portrait I am drawing here parallels this textual displacement of Zang Wenzhong with a broader displacement of the Zangs in Lu society and history by the lineal and spiritual descendants of the Zang family ally, Shuliang He.

Zang He in Ru Texts

The textual treatment of Zang He, Zang Wenzhong’s grandson and ally of Shuliang He, is quite different. He is neither valorized nor denigrated, but as the Ru tradition grows, the tendency is to acknowledge his faults but excuse them.

Zang He, whom late texts always refer to as Zang Wuzhong, using a posthumous title complementary to his grandfather’s, is portrayed in the Zuo zhuan as a complex, charismatic, and flawed man. It is clear from the Zuo narratives that Zang Wuzhong had a well established reputation as a “sage” (sheng 聖). The wisdom of Zang Wuzhong appears as a standard phrase in the Lun yu as well, echoing an assessment found in the Zhongni commentary to the Zuo.58

58. This is reflected in the following anecdote: “Zang Wuzhong was traveling to Jin and as his route was passing the district presided over by Yushu, it began to rain. Within his walled stronghold, Yushu was just sitting down with some wine. ‘What use have I for a sage?’ he said. ‘I’m not planning to do anything but drink! Besides, what good is it to be a sage if you don’t know to stay out of the rain?’” (Zuo zhuan, Xiang 22/fu 1 [295]).

59. Lun yu, 14.12; Zuo zhuan, Xiang 23/fu (301).
The *Zuo zhuan* narratives do not pass judgment on Zang Wuzhong, but his portrait evolves over the textual stretch of his career from that of a military leader particularly concerned with issues of *li* to the likeness of a man repeatedly risking personal ruin by flamboyantly provoking men more powerful than he.\(^{60}\)

The *Lun yu* and the Zhongni voice, paired in their attacks against Zang Wenzhong, are both much easier on Zang Wuzhong. The *Lun yu* is critical of his attempt to retain for his clan control of his fief at the time of his exile,\(^{61}\) but is mild in phrasing, and un-ironic in the reference to his wisdom.\(^{62}\) The Zhongni voice regrets that though wise, Zang Wuzhong failed to exemplify compliance and “reciprocity” (*shu* 思), here not used to suggest lack of a cardinal virtue, as *shu* becomes in later Ruist tradition, but in the narrower sense of “mindful of the limits of others,” employed by texts such as the *Xunzi* and *Daxue*—the charge in full amounts to being self-indulgently undiplomatic.

In the much later *Kongzi jiayu*, we find fully articulated apologetics for Zang Wuzhong. When the disciple Zilu 子路 criticizes Wuzhong’s failure at the battle of Hutai, mentioned above, Kong Qiu notes that it was the ruler who should have borne responsibility.\(^{63}\) When Yan Hui 頷回 asks Kong Qiu to compare the two famous Zangs, Kong Qiu astonishes him by naming Wuzhong, repeating the hedged criticisms of the *Zuo* Zhongni voice, to which he appends praise of Wuzhong’s actions in Qi.\(^{64}\)

Contrasting the portraits of Zang Wenzhong and Zang Wuzhong, we see an intensifying trend in the Ruist tradition to demonize the former, and an unstressed but consistent attempt to salvage the reputation of the man who was the friend of Kong Qiu’s father, and whose damaged reputation in Lu would represent no challenge to Kong Qiu.

---

60. The key passages for Zang Wuzhong’s early career are at Cheng 18/14, Xiang 4/1, and Xiang 13/4. His increasingly caustic taunts of authority figures appear at Xiang 19/fu 2, Xiang 21/2, and particularly in the portrait of the erratic behavior that led to his exile, at Xiang 23/11. In a remarkable episode closing Wuzhong’s career in the *Zuo*, he is depicted as a recent refugee in Qi, where he learns that the duke intends to present him a gift of land. Wuzhong immediately visits the duke, who has just returned from a surprise attack on Jin during that state’s period of mourning for its late ruler, and utterly alienates him by repeatedly comparing his attack on Jin to the behavior of rats. Naturally, the offer of land is never made (Xiang 23/fu).


63. *Kongzi jiayu*, 42.8/82/1–3.

64. *Kongzi jiayu*, 18.4. It should be noted that in the *Shuo yuan* (13.38), Wenzhong seems to be given superior valuation, though on grounds different from those discussed here.
Kong Qiu and the Zangs

The Zangs and the Yans

There is in the literature an exceptionally puzzling passage, which seems to pit the Zang clan and the Yan clan against one another. The text appears in the Gongyang zhuan commentary to a Chunqiu entry which reads: "Winter. Heigong 黑弓 came in flight bringing Lan 班." Heigong was a grandee of the state of Zhulou, and the Chunqiu entry here reports his defection to Lu, submitting his estate of Lan to the Duke of Lu’s authority. The Gongyang comment, in explaining the background of this event, tells the following tale (the account seems to me an interlacing of story and comment, and I have italicized those phrases I take to be comment, providing the Chinese text for clarity):

When Yan was the ruler of Zhulou, a princess of Zhulou was the principal wife of the ruler of Lu. And it is not known whether this ruler was Duke Wu or Duke Yi. At the time, [the future] Duke Xiao was young. Yan behaved wantonly with the princesses of the inner palace—accordingly, he admitted into the palace an assassin. And it is not known whether he was a prince of Lu or a prince of Zhulou. A maternal ancestor of the Zang clan (Zang shi zhi mu 臧氏之母) was wet-nurse to Duke Xiao. When rulers are young, it is appropriate that they have as a wet-nurse a grandee’s concubine or a knight’s wife; and it is not known which of these the maternal ancestor of the Zang clan was. Whenever she entered to nurse the duke, she would bring her own son along. When the maternal ancestor of the Zang clan heard there was an assassin, she substituted her own boy for the duke, and fled with the duke in her arms. When the assassin arrived, he broke into the duke’s bedroom and killed the boy. Two ministers, Bao Guangfu and Liang Maizi, heard that there was an assassin and rushed to the palace. The maternal ancestor of the Zangs said, “The duke is not dead—he is here! I substituted my own son for the duke. Thereupon, she tied

65. Zhao 31/6 (433).
Duke Xiao on her back and traveled to Zhou to appeal to the Son of Heaven. On her behalf, the Son of Heaven had Yan executed, set Shushu up in his place, and returned Duke Xiao to Lu . . .

The tale is, I think, not coherent as history, but clearly recalls events that are well documented in the historical record. Duke Xiao was the son of Duke Wu (r. 824–815), and after Duke Wu’s death, the future Duke Xiao’s older brother, Duke Yi, had ruled (815–806). Duke Yi’s ascension had been irregular—the Zhou king reportedly ordered Duke Wu to alter the succession because he became infatuated with the future Duke Yi—and in 806, Boyu, a son of the original heir, assassinated Duke Yi in a coup. Boyu reigned for eleven years (he is not recognized as a legitimate duke, and so has no posthumous title in historical texts), until the Zhou king dispatched an army to topple him in 795, an event which led to the ascension of Duke Xiao.

Since the Zang clan traced its ancestry to Duke Xiao, it is not conceivable that the wet-nurse of the story was meant to be seen as a member of that Zang clan per se. The account only makes sense as a tale either if this woman were conceived as belonging to a different Zang clan, in which case, her designation would simply be “a mother of the Zang clan” and the tale would bear no significant relevance to this discussion, or if she were conceived as the mother of a woman who ultimately bore a son by Duke Xiao, that is, the grandmother of the Zang lineage founder, which is the interpretation I adopt here. As the story seems clearly ahistorical and so invented to serve a particular purpose, I think it is legitimate to begin on the presumption that the selection of the Zang clan name was intended to refer to this prominent Lu family, and that the tale was constructed to reflect on that clan.

As we have seen, Yan, the ruler of Zhulou, is identified in a variety of texts as the founding ancestor of the Yan clan to which Kong Qiu’s mother seems to have belonged. In picturing the progenitor of the Yan clan invading the Lu harem and plotting to assassinate the future duke and Zang clan progenitor, the tale valorizes the Zangs at the expense of the Yans, underscored by the heroic sacrifice made by the Zang woman.

If, however, there are, as I have suggested, two voices speaking in this passage, then the commentarial voice may play a very different role. The three comments raise the following issues: first, it is uncertain which generation of princesses was debauched, the consorts of Duke Xiao’s father

---

66. The Gongyang discussion of the tale is tangential to the larger context of the passage, which I will not consider here.
or those of his elder brother; second, it is uncertain whether someone was a prince of Lu or Zhulou; third, it is uncertain whether the Zang woman was a moderately high or low aristocrat. On the second point, it makes little sense to see the issue of doubt as the identity of the assassin, who is specifically noted as Boyu in other sources; it makes better sense to see the issue as related to the first point—if the women to whom Yan had access were consorts of Duke Xiao’s father, then we could not know whether Duke Xiao himself were a prince of Lu or of Zhulou.68

The effect of the three points is to undercut the apparent intent of the main voice to valorize the Zang clan at the expense of the non-Lu clan of Yan. By suggesting that the Zang’s progenitor may, in fact, have been a man of Zhulou pedigree whose mother’s background was humble, the modifications of the second voice counter the idea that the Zangs can be associated with the protection of the purity of Lu from the pollution of Zhulou. On this interpretation, the root story is a Zang clan tale, expressing a need to denigrate the Yans, but the text in which it is embedded appears to have come under the control of editors so friendly to the Yan’s that the observations of an anti-Zang commentator came to be incorporated in the text itself.

I read the text, then, as inscribing the opposing intentions of partisans of the Zang and Yan clans. As I hope is becoming clear, I wish to suggest that in early Ruism, the struggle between such partisans, one side associated with Zang Wenzhong’s tradition and with Lu, the other with Kong Qiu’s tradition and with Zhulou, was a significant factor in the shaping of the early Ruist school.

Kong Qiu’s Youth

A legend concerning events of Kong Qiu’s youth may strengthen our understanding of tension between the Zang and Yan clans seen in later accounts. The tale appears in the Shi ji:

After Qiu was born, Shuliang He died and was buried on Mt. Fang, to the east of Lu. Consequently, Kongzi was in doubt about the location of his father’s grave; his mother forbore to speak of it . . . When Kongzi’s mother died, he merely had her coffin temporarily interred at the Crossroads of Wufu; likely, this was an expression of caution. A woman relative of the funeral cart drawers of Zou instructed Kongzi

68. This is the direction taken by the anonymous early shu-commentary to the text, which explains the second point with the phrase: “Because [Yan] had coupled with the princesses of the inner palace” (Chen Li 陳立, Gongyue yishu 公羊義疏 [Taipei: Dingwen, 1973], 67.12b [680]).
where his father’s grave was located, and he subsequently interred his mother together with his father in Fang.69

Later in this paper, I will take up the issue of the location of Mt. Fang. Here I want to focus on the point that Kong Qiu was believed not to know the location of his father’s grave. Qian Mu maintains that it would be unsurprising that Kong Qiu did not know where his father was buried, but the Shi ji narrative itself suggests that, in fact, this was an unusual situation.70 Indeed, it would have been, because Kong Qiu’s mother was a secondary wife, and Shuliang He had a son and several daughters by other wives. For the tale to be cogent, we must picture Kong Qiu living alone with his mother, out of touch with his elder brother and the remainder of the Kong family. This picture seems consistent with the Shi ji portrait of the union of Kong Qiu’s parents “in the wilds” as a departure from norms. Either as a reflection of historical memory or devised hagiography, Kong Qiu is presented in this tale as detached from his paternal lineage, which evidence indicates was aligned in some way with the Zang clan, and growing up instead under the care of his Yan-family mother.

*   *   *

The implications of the material we have been looking at, as I view them, are that the Zang and Yan clans had significant and competing roles in early Ruism. Table 2 represents schematically the model I am proposing:

I do not want to suggest that the actual situation was so clear; the existence of the Guo yu text, where Zang Wenzhong is regarded positively, and both Zhan Qin and Kong Qiu are celebrated, suggests the existence of an intermediate position, and, as I will note later, this is certainly not all that was going on in the factional shaping of early Ruism. However, I believe it is a split that has not been identified before, and one that relates most personally to the family and biography of Kong Qiu.

69. Shi ji, 47.1906–7.
70. Qian bases his view on the fact that sacrifices were not made at graves and graves were not mounded (Qian Mu 錢穆, Kongzi zhuan 孔子傳 [Taipei: Dongda, 1987], 7–8).
To make this model persuasive, however, we need to explore further the relation between Zhulou, the Zangs, and Kong Qiu.

The Connection with Zhulou

Kong Qiu’s father, Shuliang He, is referred to as a man from Zhulou’s capital; Kong Qiu’s mother came from the Yan clan, whose later members traced their ancestry to a Zhulou ruler; Shuliang He’s associate Zang He is mocked by association with Zhulou. These encounters with Zhulou in a pursuit of Kong Qiu’s family context require that we address more directly the nature of Zhulou and its possible role in the origin of the Ruist movement.

The state of Zhulou was located just a few miles south of the Lu capital (modern Qufu). The state is referred to in most sources by the single syllable *zhu*, which is also the name used in recorded inscribed vessels of the state.71 The *Gongyang* text of the *Chunqiu*, however, refers to the state as Zhulou, as does the “Tan gong” chapter of the *Li ji*. The anonymous early *shu*-commentary to the *Gongyang* explains that the people of Zhu, when speaking, appended a second syllable to the name of their state.72 Pulleyblank has noted the likelihood that the variability between monosyllabic and disyllabic forms suggests the transcription of a non-Chinese word.73

Zhulou is referred to in a number of early sources as an Yi state.74 It was, of course, quite common in Chunqiu and Warring States China for Yi peoples to live in close proximity to centers of Zhou hegemony in the East, and Zhulou was one of a cluster of Yi states that are identified in the neighborhood of Lu.75

---

72. Chen Li, *Gongyang yishu*, 2.1a (16).
73. Pulleyblank, “Zou and Lu,” 43.
74. E.g., *Zuo zhuan* Zhao 23/3 (409). Pulleyblank accepts the identification of Zhulou as an Yi state, and suggests that the Yi spoke an Austroasiatic language distinct from that of the core Zhou population (“Zou and Lu,” 45). We have seen some evidence that Zhulou princesses were marriage partners of Lu princes, but this is not inconsistent with their being viewed as Yi; it is not uncommon for consorts of Zhou rulers, including Ji surname rulers, to take “barbarian” consorts. Inscribed bronze dowry vessels also indicate that marriage relations between the elites of Lu and Zhulou were not unusual (Li Xueqin, *Eastern Zhou and Qin Civilizations* [New Haven, Yale University Press, 1985], 143–44).
75. Among these were the “twelve lords of the River Si,” discussed by Li Xueqin (*Eastern Zhou and Qin Civilizations*, 143–53). In the 1930s, Wang Xianzang 王獻唐 developed an extensive theory of the influence of Zhulou. In studies recently published as *Yan-Huang shizu wenhua kao* 炎黃氏族文化考 [ed. Jiang Yixue 蔣逸雪 (Jinan: Qi-Lu,
According to several sources, the capital city of Zhulou was moved a number of times. Before the period of Kong Qiu’s life, it appears to have been located in Zou (陬, or variants), very near the capital of Lu. In 613, Duke Wen of Zhulou moved the capital south to Mt. Yi, which may also have been known as Mt. Zou 呶, still close to Lu. Later, after Zhulou was subsumed within Lu during the reign of Duke Mu (r. 407–377), the territory itself became known as Zou, rather than Zhulou.

Kong Qiu as a Cultural Outsider

The proximity of Lu and Zhulou created a rich history of interaction between the two states, and Zhulou is quite prominent throughout the Chunqiu annals and commentaries. For our purposes here, the most salient fact is that the city that is identified as Kong Qiu’s ancestral place in the Lun yu, Zou, is likely the former capital of Zhulou, located, during Kong Qiu’s lifetime, about midway between the Lu capital and the later Zhulou capital at Mt. Yi. We have seen that Shuliang He is referred to

1985)], Wang takes the name of Zhulou as the root generic term for the Yi peoples as a whole (even claiming the etymological identity of the words zhulou and yi [29]). For Wang, the Zhulou peoples were descendants of the adversaries of the Yellow Emperor, an alternative ethnic branch of the larger racial group (see esp. 85). Much of his research on this topic consists of geographical philology, arguing that a variety of place names in Shandong and elsewhere are different graphic renderings of the spoken word underlying the term zhulou. Wang’s research is certainly relevant to issues raised here, and would magnify their importance to cultural history. In my view, however, his arguments are speculative and imprecise.

76. Several sources stress the proximity of Lu to Zou; see Chen Pan 陳槃, Chunqiu dashibiáo lieguo juexing ji cunmie zhuanyi 春秋大事表列國疆界存滅譜異 (Taipei: Zhongyang Yanjiuyuan, Lishi Yuyan Yanjiusuo monograph #52, 1969), 2.135b. The interchangeability of the name Zhulou with various graph forms attributed to Kong Qiu’s home, discussed further below, indicates that this was the earlier capital that Duke Wen chose to flee, presumably as a result of pressure from Lu, which was in tension with Zhulou throughout the Chunqiu period. On the capital at Mt. Yi, see Cheng Faren, Chunqiu Zuoshi zhuanzhu ming tu kaò, 103. This site, known now as Jiwang cheng 禹王城 (located about 10 km. south of modern Zouxian), has been excavated (Li Xueqin, Eastern Zhou and Qin Civilizations, 144–46).

77. Texts variously report Zou as being extinguished by Lu and by Chu 楚 (see Chen Pan, Chunqiu dashibiáo, 2.135). It seems likely that the northern regions of Zhulou were in the process of absorption by Lu from the seventh century, and that Chu merely absorbed the remaining portions in the process of its third-century expansion to the northeast. Note, however, that the “defection” of Lan reported in the Gongyang zhuan entry for Zhao 31 (discussed earlier) suggests that parts of southern Zhulou were aligning with Lu during the late sixth century. As Zhulou was in a long-term alliance with Qi, Lu’s powerful northern neighbor, such defections may have been unstable.

78. Although it is generally agreed that Zou is loan for Zhu, or for the binomial Zhulou, there is dispute over the identity between Zou and the one hand, and the Zou represented by the graphs 周, 周 and 隰 in the Lun yu, Zuo zhuan, and Shi ji respectively.
as “He, a man of Zou,” that Kong Qiu is called disparagingly “the son of a man of Zou,” and that Kong Qiu’s mother’s family, the Yan clan, probably traced its ancestry back to an early Zhulou ruler. What are the biographical and cultural implications of the possibility that Kong Qiu was a native son of a non-Zhou state?79

The *Lun yu* reference to Kong Qiu’s Zou origins conveys a sense that Kong Qiu was, in that context, being viewed as a cultural outsider in Lu.

The Master entered the Grand Temple and asked about each ceremonial step. Someone remarked, “Who has said that this son of a man of Zou knows *li*? When he entered the grand Temple he asked about each ceremonial step!” Hearing of this the Master said, “That is *li*.\(^\text{80}\)

Whether Kong Qiu knew *li* or not is not at issue for us; the point is that the *Lun yu* editor regarded it as cogent to construct the passage in such a way as to suggest that Kong Qiu’s place of birth was in tension with his claim to be master of Zhou *li*. The issue would be more strongly joined if we were to adopt the reading of the late-Qing commentator Yu Yue 俞樾 and others, which treats the final line as an ironic question, implicitly criticizing the ceremonies of Lu, rather than the understanding of the anonymous critic, as incorrect.\(^\text{81}\)

There are other points where the issue of tension between Kong Qiu

Pulleyblank assumes the identity of these places (“Zou and Lu,” 55n4), and most sources make the same claim (see Cheng Faren, *Chunqiu Zuoshi zhuang diming tukao*, 200; numerous claims and arguments for loan equivalence among these various graphs can be found in the entries for the characters in *Shuowen jiezi gulin* 2842, 2857–58). For counter-arguments, which claim that there were two “Zous,” extremely close to one another, and that Kong Qiu’s home was not a former capital of Zhulou, see Takezoe Shin’ichirō, *Saden kaisen*, 15.3. I do not think the distinction between the two positions is essential with regard to my arguments. In Li Daoyuan’s 郭英 註 to the *Shui jing*, Mt. Yi, rather than the earlier capital of Zhulou, is identified as the home city of Kong Qiu and his father (Wang Guowei 王國維, *Shui jingzhuzhao* 水經注校 [Shanghai: Renmin, 1984], 809).

79. Perhaps in order to avoid this question, some traditional texts dealt with the association of Kong Qiu’s father to Zou by claiming that he was, in fact, merely an appointed governor of Zou, rather than a native. (See the early pseudo-Kong commentary in *Lun yu jijie* 論語集解 [3.15] and Pei Yin’s 裴骃 Song period *Jijie*-commentary to the *Shi ji*, 47.1905. In Du Yu’s Jin-period commentary to the *Zuo zhuan*, Shuliang He is described as a grandee of Zou, and Zou is described as a city in Lu.) However, I know of no other instance where a non-hereditary appointee is given as a surname-like identifier the location of his service in this way, although Takezoe, following Tang commentary, claims it as a rule in his comments to Xiang 10/1.


and Lu ritual arises, which may relate to the connection between Kong Qiu and Zhulou. One concerns the tale of the burial of Kong Qiu’s mother, discussed above, where Kong Qiu’s ignorance of his father’s grave site is an issue. The account of this episode that appears in the “Tan gong” chapter of the Li ji conveys a new set of issues.

Once Kongzi had been able to bury his parents jointly in Fang, he said, “I have heard that ancient practice is that graves should not be mounded. Now I am a man from all directions; it will not do for me not to mark it. Thereupon, he mounded the grave to a height of four chi-lengths. Kongzi returned first, his attendants following after. A hard rain fell, and when they arrived, Kongzi asked them, “Why have you been so slow?” “The grave in Fang collapsed,” they replied. Kong Qiu did not answer for a long time, then, tears flowing down, he said, “I have heard that ancient practice was not to build up the grave!”

There is considerable evidence that the practice of marking graves with mounds originated among peoples of eastern China with no links to Shang and Zhou cultural regions, while burials in cultures of the North China Plain left no mark in the terrain, the people of that region only gradually adopting the eastern practices during the Chunqiu and Warring States periods. The “Tan gong” tale is unusual because it portrays Kong Qiu rejecting “ancient” practice because of his special needs as a “man from all directions”—more literally, “an east-south-west-north man.” This phrase may be taken to anticipate Kong Qiu’s later career as a wanderer, but in the context of a tale supposedly about his youth, the sense seems more cogently taken as “a man of no fixed country.”

---

82. Li ji, “Tan gong” I, 3.6.
83. Chia-li Luo, “Coastal Culture and the Religion of Early China” (Indiana University Ph.D. dissertation, 1999), 262–66. Luo’s thesis elaborates contrasts in religious practices between the Yi peoples, whom she describes very broadly in terms of a family of coastal cultures, and those of people of the “Zhongyuan,” or central plains regions. The Lu/Zhulou contrast I am drawing would represent the interface of these two cultural spheres. Luo’s religious model correlates well with the linguistic model suggested in Pulleyblank, “Zou and Lu.”

84. Were the tale factual, as it clearly is not, tradition would place it in Kong Qiu’s twenty-fourth year, well before the date at which he is said to have first received disciples, much less the period of his exile (see Xu Tonglai 許同萊, Kongzi nianpu 孔子年譜 [Taipei: Zhonghua wenhua chuban shiye weiyuanhui, 1955], 34–35). Shirakawa takes this phrase to reflect Kong Qiu’s awareness of his outsider status as a shamaness’s son (Kôshi den, 23). Kimura Eiichi 木村英一 suggests that the place where Kong Qiu initially interred his mother, the Crossroads of Wufu, was a travelers’ service point in Lu, frequented by outsiders, which would resonate with this theme (Kôshi to Rongo 孔子と論語 [Tokyo: Sôbunsha, 1971], 24).
the theme here concerns Kong Qiu’s sense that he has a free choice of li, Zhou or Yi, the phrase detaches Kong Qiu from both Lu and Zhulou. The lesson of the tale, however, is that the Zhou ritual practice prevails, as Kong Qiu seems to realize.

Another tale from “Tan gong” suggests an affinity for Yi customs on Kong Qiu’s part, this time specifically tied to Zhulou. In this tale, the text first refers to the great defeat of Lu at the hands of Zhulou at the battle of Hutai (Yitai in “Tan gong”), noted earlier in the discussion of Zang He, who was the vanquished Lu general. “Tan gong”, like the Zuo zhuan, says that it was this defeat that prompted the women of Lu to begin the custom of wearing the zhua 鬟 mourning hairstyle. The text then goes on to recount the manner in which Kong Qiu instructed his sister-in-law in the zhua hairstyle at the time of her aunt’s death. The portrait of Kong Qiu’s concern about precision in a li that was not Zhou-sanctioned practice, but rather a memorial of an encounter with Zhulou is an unusual one, and suggests again affinities towards two types of li which were in tension.

These and other passages point towards a theme underlying a range of passages in Ruist texts that seem best decoded through an awareness that Kong Qiu may have been understood at some stage to have been, in some degree, a man of non-Zhou origins aligned with his native traditions as well as with those of his adoptive culture.

This tension may reflect different geographical and cultural origins among the Ruist disciples who constructed the early corpus, reflecting or projecting a similar split in the original disciples. This would be particularly evident if we were to interpret the union between Kong Qiu’s parents, described as yehe (conjoined in the wilds) as referring to its having been reached in a non-Zhou state between non-Zhou people (in contrast to Shuliang He’s earlier marriage ties). If the term ye refers to the Zhulou/Yi nature of the Yan clan or the city of Zou, then the fact that Kong Qiu’s early disciples, including Yan Lu 路 and Yan Hui, father and son, may have been Zhulou men, may be reflected in the famously obscure Lun yu passage:

Those who first advanced in ritual and music were men of the wilds (yeren 野人), while those who advanced later were cultivated men (junzi 君子). Were I to employ one or the other, I would go with the men of the wilds.87

85. Li ji, “Tan gong” I, 3.20–21. The tale appears in Kongzi jiayu, 42.18.
86. The term zhua may be yet another rendering of Zou/Zhulou. Du Yu gives as an alternative name for Shuliang He’s home city as Cuo 塼, which shares with zhua both graphemic and phonetic elements (Takezoe, Saden kaisen, 15.3).
87. Lun yu, 11.1.
The passage could equally well be a general endorsement of the cultural priority of the Yi over the Zhou culture. Whichever way it is taken, if the reference does, indeed, reflect a fundamental tension in the cultural commitments of the historical Kong Qiu and, consequently, of the early teachings of his school, it would be consistent with other such materials we are collecting here.  

The Location of Fang and the Zang Connection

The burial place of Kong Qiu’s parents was Mt. Fang (防山), also referred to simply as Fang. Cheng Faren locates this place slightly north of Zou, Kong Qiu’s home city, and to the southeast of the capital city of Lu (modern Qufu). Kong Qiu’s great-grandfather was known as Fangshu 防叔; commentary records that Fangshu’s name was derived from the region where he was a grandee (“Uncle of Fang”), and so, at least in legend, the Kong clan was portrayed with an ancestral attachment to the region dating back several generations. Fang was also the name of the clan estate or fief of the Zang clan, with which Kong Qiu’s father, at least, was connected.

The Zuo zhuan records the walling of Fang in 664, one year after Zang Wenzhong’s first political achievement, a request for grain supplies from Qi during a famine, and we may, perhaps, conclude that this represented a reward, either in the form of a new estate, or of the walling of an existing estate stronghold. There is, however, a second notice of walling Fang, recorded in 559, at the height of the power of Zang Wenzhong’s grandson, Zang He, Shuliang He’s associate. There are two possible reasons why a second walling of a scale worthy of entry in the Chunqiu might have occurred: major repairs or strengthened fortifications may have been deemed necessary, or the two entries may refer to different cities named Fang. In the latter case, we may ask whether this would concern one city unrelated to the Zangs, or a movement of the Zang estate to a new location, preserving the name.

---

88. The association of the yeren of this passage with Zhulou has been made by Zhang Zhihan in “Lue lun Zhulou wenhua yu Ru-Mo” (246). In his brief article, Zhang builds on the theories of Wang Xiantang to argue that Zhulou culture was the origin of the philosophies of both the Ruists and the Mohists. Zhang’s argumentation is more enthusiastic than analytic, but his conclusions anticipate aspects of what I argue here.

89. Cheng Faren, Chunqiu Zuoshi zhuan diming tukao, appended maps, sector map 4.

90. The Shi ben states that Fangshu was a grandee of Fang, and his name signified this (e.g., 1.7/15.15–16). An explanation for Fangshu’s name, linked specifically to the mountain, appears in the Shandong tongzhi 山東通志 ([Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1934], 1129), citing the Da-Qing yilong zhi 大清一通志.

91. Zuo zhuan, Zhuang 29/5 (76); on the famine, see Zhuang 28/7 (75).

It is acknowledged by all that there were multiple places called Fang in the region of Lu (see Map 1). The city generally identified as the estate of the Zang family was located well east of Lu (that is, of the capital, at present day Qufu), on the eastern slope of the Jun River valley, across from the Ji family stronghold of Bi. It was clearly this estate that was walled in 559, as the Zuo zhuan specifies Zang He’s involvement.

93. Cheng Faren, however, locates it well north of Qufu, and posits four different locations called Fang within the state of Lu (including Mt. Fang); others assume three. The disagreement is material to issues concerning the Zang family, but not, I think, to this discussion. For Cheng’s arguments, see Chunqiu Zuoshi zhuan diming tukao, 60–66. Some historical maps suggest that the location of Fang was east of the Jun River valley, perhaps near the Eastern Wen River.
Commentary takes the place walled in 664 to be the same one, and the proximity in time to Zang Wenzhong’s first achievements makes this an obvious assumption, but the conclusion that both wallings were connected with the Zangs does not necessarily imply that they were of the same city.

There were two famous battles fought between Lu and Zhulou, in which Lu suffered humiliating defeats. The first was the battle of Shengxing 升隴, fought in 637. At that battle, Duke Xi led the armies of Lu. The duke grossly underestimated the power of the Zhulou forces, despite the admonitions of his advisor, none other than Zang Wenzhong. The second battle was fought at Hutai in 568. The Lu armies in that instance were led by Zang He. These coincidences of the connection of the Zang family in military engagements against Zhulou suggest a geographical connection, easily explained by the notion that at the time of these encounters, the Zang clan estate was located not in the place of the 559 walling, but at Mt. Fang, on the Lu-Zhulou border. On this view, the walling of 559 would have signaled a removal of the Zang clan from the military role of guarding against Zhulou, and a shift to a position better aligned to mobilize resistance to Qi (which was at the time an ally of Zhulou). Unsurprisingly, we find the Zang’s battling Qi at their estate garrison in Fang just four years later. Six years after that, when Zang He runs afoul of the Ji clan and must flee Lu, he departs from a point near the southeast gate of the capital city, and flees south to Zhulou. Only at an unspecified later time does he proceed east to Fang (or north, if we follow Cheng Faren), prior to going into exile in Qi. Zang He’s detour to Zhulou suggests that he could find there a quick safe haven, which we would explain in terms of his family’s long connection with that region.

If we adopt the notion that, at least from 664 to 559, the Zang estate was at Mt. Fang, next to Zou on the Lu-Zhulou border, the connection

94. Zuo zhuan, Xi 22/3 (118–19).
95. Zuo zhuan, Xiang 4/fu 2 (259).
96. Zuo zhuan, Xiang 17/5 (285).
98. The force of this argument should not be overstated—Zhulou was a haven for Lu refugees in a number of recorded instances, and if Zang’s estate was to the east, he would have needed, in his flight, to cross from the Si River valley to the Jun River valley by a northern route. However, Zang did ultimately flee to his estate, and then to Qi, and his intermediate stop in Zhulou would not have been a logical step without a good reason, such as an attempt to gather a supporting guard to protect him as he reentered Lu. The mountains east of the region of Zhulou do not feature passes that could have made a transit from Zhulou to Fang the escape route of choice.
between the Zangs and Kong Qiu’s family can be projected back to the generation of Kong Qiu’s great-grandfather, Fangshu (“Uncle of Fang”), who would have been a man of Zang Wenzhong’s generation. Moreover, the sarcastic reference to Zang He as “a dwarf of Zhu (Zhulou)” noted earlier, would make better sense.

If there was indeed a removal of the Zang clan from the region of Zou about 560, it could explain much in connection with the unusual family arrangement depicted for Kong Qiu in the texts. We have earlier seen strong evidence that Kong Qiu’s father, Shuliang He, was closely associated with the Zang clan as a military ally or retainer, and also, as indicated by the overlap of personal names, through a possible pseudo-familial tie. It would be natural to assume that a man with such links to the Zang’s would relocate as they had, and so leave the city of Zou, taking with him his existing family. We would accordingly read the story of Kong Qiu’s birth preserved in the Shi ji as suggesting that six or seven years after that removal, still in search of a concubine who would bear him a viable son, Shuliang He returned to his home region and established a second family there, his principal establishment remaining in Fang, the new estate land of the Zang’s.

A practice of maintaining multiple family households in this way is indicated by the example of Meng Xizi, the Lu noble who entrusted his two sons to Kong Qiu’s tutelage upon his death in 517, thus initiating Kong Qiu’s role as a master. The Zuo zhuan provides us with a highly unusual tale of the conception of these two sons, which seems designed principally to provide them with a connection to Zhulou.

Meng Xizi met with Duke Zhuang of Zhu, and swore a covenant at Jinxiang. This was to promote good relations and was in accord with li. A woman of Quanqiu dreamt that she had draped the ancestral temple of the Meng family with curtains, and so she stole away to Xizi, together with her servant . . . Xizi installed them in the kitchen quarters of the establishment of the Wei family. On the way back from Jinxiang, he stopped there, and with the Quanqiu woman, he conceived Yizi and Nangong Jingshu. The relation between Kong Qiu’s mother and father may have been one of this nature.

99. Zuo zhuan, Zhao 11/7; fu1 (374–75). Commentary tells us that “Wei family” should be read as “Lady Wei,” a concubine whom Meng Xizi had provided with a separate residence. By either interpretation, the practice of providing a remote establishment for a concubine with children is indicated.
Reshaping the Portrait of the Ru

The Zang Clan, Zhulou, and the Origins of the Ru

As noted early in this paper, one point of possible connection between the Zang family and the Kong’s is the sarcastic characterization of Zang He as a zhuru, a pun which embraces the meaning of the term as “dwarf dancer” with the sense “a Ru of Zhulou.” In pre-Qin texts, broadly considered, this is the only ascription of the term “Ru” to an individual prior to the time of Kong Qiu, at least of which I am aware, and while it seems unlikely that the tale in which this pun is included is historically accurate, and that in 568, the people of Lu composed satirical verse of this nature, the fact that the composer of the text found this scenario plausible is itself a significant indication that readers would encounter no sense of anachronism in conceiving Zang He as a Ru. Although this passage is part of my evidence linking the Zang and Kong clans, there is enough evidence of other kinds to support the inference that the ascription of Ru title to Zang He is not accidental, and is a function of that linkage.

If there existed a tradition of proto-Ruist thought in Lu, the Zang clan would be the place we would most likely search for it. The Shi ji lists as Kong Qiu’s principal influences Zang Wenzhong and the figure who becomes Wenzhong’s adversary in Ru tradition, Liuxia Hui.100 Zuo zhuan presentations of the Zang’s, from the initial appearance of the Zang branch lineage founder Gongsun Kou in the record for 718 through the career of Zang He, who is known as both wise and devoted to ritual correctness, lay stress upon the importance of li to the clan.101

There exists in the tradition of Zang family lore a unique feature related, perhaps, to distinctive ritual practice. The Zang’s are said, in multiple sources, to have nurtured a turtle of great size and value, passed down for generations, beginning as early as Zang Wenzhong.102 So impressive was this animal that two generations later, Zang He employed it to barter with the duke of Lu for the survival of his clan estate beyond his own exile.103

I do not understand this turtle, its nature, its value, or its clan function. The point I wish to make is that as the Zang’s were marked off from other clans in Lu by virtue of their traditions of knowledge and ritual

100. Shi ji 67.2186. In his history of Lu, Guo Keyu devotes a chapter to the early Ru traditions of Lu, consisting entirely of an account of these two men (Lu guo shi, 299–324).
101. Gongsun Kou’s appearance is a remonstrance against breaches of ritual (Yin 5/1 [11–12]); Zang He’s initial appearances in the Zuo zhuan focus on his critiques of li violations (Cheng 18/14 [252]; Xiang 4/1 [257]).
102. Lun yu, 5.18.
103. Zuo zhuan, Xiang 23/11 (300); he is criticized for this in the Lun yu 14.14.
commitment; they were also marked off by a peculiar clan devotion to this turtle, or to some practice or set of practices that the turtle represents in the literary record. Different from the other prominent families of Lu, the Zang’s did not rely solely on power; they possessed a distinctive clan tradition. While I remain unable to point to other specific elements of ritual or other practices that may have marked the distinctive elements of that tradition—and additional data may no longer exist—we do possess enough evidence to support a general claim of the Zang’s cultural idiosyncrasy.

In light of the connection with the Kong family and the Zuo zhuan pun concerning Zang He, it seems reasonable to see that clan tradition as the earliest form of Ruism. The name Ru itself may reflect the geographical location of the Zang estate, if I am correct in suggesting it was, for an extended time, at the interface of Lu and Zhulou. To better establish this claim, it will be helpful to consider the way in which the binomial terms “Zhulou” and “zhuru” may represent related linguistic phenomena that will better pin down the meaning of the term Ru.

We know from many textual sources that the graphic forms 齐 (tiugliu) and 齐 (tiu) were interchangeable as representations of the name of the Zhulou state. This suggests that the name of the Zhulou state, which belonged to a cultural and linguistic group distinct from that of the Zhou people, was a monosyllabic word with an initial consonant cluster including elements of the initials of both zhu and lou, and sharing their common final. By convention, the term could be denoted either by two graphs that, quickly read, produced an approximation of the initial cluster, as suggested by Duan Yucai’s 段玉裁 analysis concerning the alternative name for the state, Zou 都 (ts’iu): “During the Zhou, some said Zou and some said Zhulou; the difference is between fast and slow speech.” The two graphs/syllables of Zhulou are elsewhere treated as loans, in the name of the legendary figure Li Lou 離娄, whose name ap-

104. The turtle is generally referred to in the texts as a “cai 寵,” which some commentators explain by identifying the southern state Cai as the locale where such turtles were found. The Zuo zhuan also refers to it as the Zang’s “precious turtle lougou” (bao gui lougou 寶龜樓句; Zhao 25/fu3 [419]), employing as the name of their turtle a binome similar in structure to possible Austroasiatic linguistic evidence associated with Zhulou (see n. 74 above and the discussion below). This may suggest the turtle’s connection with the cultural region of which Zhulou was a part. (I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer who brought this evidence to my attention.)

105. Reconstructions are according to Bernhard Karlgren, Grammata Serica Recensa (Stockholm: 1957), which I use, rather than more recent phonetic reconstructions, only because it is more complete than most published lists available to me, and because its forms are widely understood. I wish to hang nothing on Karlgren’s specific analyses.

pears as Li Zhu 朱 in other texts. Presumably, represented by a single graph, the name of the Zhulou state could have equally well been zhu or lou, though Zhu or Zou became the convention.

The term zhuru (*tiun ´iu) is similar in structure, and likely also to render an Yi word involving a complex initial consonant, equally well represented by either character, and meaning “dwarf.” This word could have been represented as a monosyllable by either of its constituent characters. It has long been argued that, in fact, the term Ru was attached to the Ruists by those who wished to stigmatize the cult. If so, we could argue that in this case, the original satiric motive of tying the cult to supposed Yi origins would have dictated that the latter of the binome graphs be employed, in order that the group could be denoted as “Zhu dwarfs” ("[zhu]ru of Zhu"), in just the manner that Zang He is mocked in the Zuo zhuan jingle.

Thus at the point of Kong Qiu’s arrival upon the scene, there may well have been a tradition known as Ru in the state of Lu, consisting of the practices and members of the Zang clan circle, into which Kong Qiu’s father fell, and associated with the region of Zhulou, in which Kong Qiu grew up. But initially, Kong Qiu’s relationship to this group would have been uncertain: the family had left Zhulou shortly before Kong Qiu’s birth; Shuliang He’s associate, Zang He, had fled into exile a few years after, the profile of the Zang family in Lu never recovering; and Kong Qiu may himself have lost touch with his Kong family relatives. On this view Kong Qiu was, in a sense, the Ru left behind.

Shedding Connections to the Zang’s

If the portrait we have constructed is accurate in substance, then we need to ask about the manner in which Kong Qiu ultimately established himself in Lu, to the degree that he was accepted there. I do not at this point know how to answer those questions—after all, we have never,
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107. For Li Lou, see Mengzi 4A.1. For Li Zhu, see Paul Thompson, The Shen Tzu Fragments (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 274, and Wang Xiantang, Yan-Huang shizu, 69, where instances are noted in the Zhuangzi and Liezi. I am treating the difference between 朱 and 笮 as inconsequential; they are exact homophones for Karlgren.

108. I am, in this discussion, indebted to the work of William Boltz, who, in an unpublished paper, has analyzed similar binomes in this way. However, I lack the training to assess specific cases critically, as Boltz does, and so the speculative analysis I make in this section should be understood as a suggestion, rather than as a strong claim.


110. The pun, to speculate beyond my skills, would have been on the two vocalizations zhuru/*tiun ´iu and Zhu-zhuru/*tiu-tn ´iu, imagining the words could be rendered in either “Lu” binome form or “Zhu” consonant cluster form.
on any account, understood very well how Kong Qiu first began to turn into Confucius. The vacuum evidently left in the Zang family after the departure of Zang He might have created opportunities for the son of Shuliang He to displace from leadership the lineage successors of the Zang clan, but a more detailed model requires further analysis of evidence concerning factional components of Ruism not directly germane to this paper.\footnote{Preliminary analysis suggests that Kong Qiu’s prospects may have benefited from tensions between the powerful Mengsun and Jisun clans in Lu, which a generation earlier brought down Zang He. The Lun yu seems much more favorably disposed towards members of the Mengsun clan, and the marriage alliances it records Kong Qiu arranging for his own family appear to be with a branch of that clan and a family that the Zuo seems to portray as explicitly alienated from the Ji. (Recall also that Kong Qiu’s career as a teacher is said to have been inaugurated by a Mengsun clan patriarch with Zhulou connections [see page 00, above].) The evidence is not straightforward, however, and more detailed consideration of the data will be required to determine if this line of analysis can yield a fully coherent scenario.}

If we grant the model I have been proposing here, there do seem to be some evident strategies that the Ru followers of Kong Qiu adopted to underscore the unique position of their master, and the originality of his dao. We have already noted in some detail the effort to separate Kong Qiu from his Zang family predecessors, through critiques of Zang Wenzhong and Zang He in the Lun yu, and the insertion of particularly strident attacks on Zang Wenzhong by the Zhongni voice in the Zuo zhuan and in later texts.

The other side of this coin would be the sanctification of Yan Hui, whose clan membership would link him with the non-Zang, Zhulou-based membership of Kong Qiu’s association of disciples. I should note at this point that it is not clear to me whether the model I am proposing should envision Kong Qiu’s group as composed of Ru drawn from the Zang lineage or not, but given the former close relationship between the Ji clan and the Zang’s, and the service of the disciples Zilu and Ran Qiu to the Ji, a conscious exclusion of all those linked to the Zang’s does not seem in order. On the other hand, no members of the Zang clan appear in the long disciple lists found in the Shi ji and Kongzi jiayu.\footnote{See Brooks and Brooks, The Original Analects, 281, 283.} This celebration of a man who represented the antithesis of the successful, aristocratic Zang’s was paralleled in the tradition of Mengzi by the sanctification of Liuxia Hui, Zang Wenzhong’s nemesis. Moreover, Mengzi, a Ru from Zou, is pictured at the close of his career being blocked from a meeting with the duke of Lu by a member of the Zang clan, Zang Cang, about whom nothing further is known.\footnote{Mengzi, 1B.16. Blakely locates Zang Cang within the Zang clan, but his sources are not clear.}
as “a son of the Zang clan,” in parallel with the dismissal of Kong Qiu as a “son of a man from Zou” in the Lun yu.

The fact that Kong Qiu was not indebted to the Zang family Ru is made clear in the Lun yu by a speech of the disciple Zigong, who states that Kong Qiu had no teachers. The Shi ji, as we have seen, names Zang Wenzhong and Liuxia Hui as his indirect teachers, but by the time of Sima Qian, it may be that little awareness remained of what was at stake in excluding the Zang’s. In the Zuo zhuan tale of the establishment of Kong Qiu’s teaching career, which we viewed earlier, his qualifications are not based on a teaching lineage, but on his ancestry—most likely a constructed ancestry linking him to the Shang royal house. His original patron is there a member of the Mengsun warlord clan of Lu, who, by citing a saying by Zang He, provides the imprimatur of the Zang clan without implying any debt owed by Kong Qiu to that family.

Cutting off Zhulou: a Myth of Closure

The central elements of the model I am arguing concern the hybrid cultural identification of Kong Qiu, the possible earlier existence within the aristocratic Zang clan of Lu of a tradition known as Ru, and the competition between factions, exemplified by the Zang and Yan clans, as an influence on the way that the Ru movement came to be configured. However, even if the bifurcation in early Ruism that this model suggests proves on further examination to be valid, it is by no means the whole story. The larger body of material in the early texts does not seem engaged with this issue. Any account of textual elements viewed in terms of this type of dichotomy is apt to project onto many passages an issue not germane to their original intent, and I do not propose this model as a “key” to understanding the teachings of early Ruism.

Other writers have pointed to different important implicit divisions within the Ru school: the Brooks have highlighted a tension between the Zeng and Kong families in their analysis of the growth of the Lun yu text, and Kimura Eiichi threw important light on possible tensions in the Lun yu with reference to competing influences of Ru groups based in the states of Lu and Qi. I believe both those approaches to be at least as important as the one I have offered here. The complex of personal and cultural contestations among the early Ru was surely more particular
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114. Lun yu, 19.22.
and complex than the few documents we now possess will ever permit us to understand.

But on a larger scale, the model I am proposing does represent a potential further argument against essentialist claims about “Chinese” culture. As I noted at the outset, these traditional claims have been much weakened by contemporary discoveries, which increasingly draw us towards a view of pre-Imperial and early Imperial culture as significantly hybrid, and evolving over time in contexts of diverse cultural exchange. “Confucianism,” however, has continued to be viewed as a distillation of cultural elements expressive of and lineally developed through a narrow Xia/Shang/Zhou tradition. If the theories offered here hold up, and we come to agree that the momentum of the Ruist tradition dates from a shift in its leadership from the head of an aristocratic Lu family, representing the Zhou traditions of the royal Ji lineage, to a leader whose lineal and cultural origins were more closely tied to the Yi peoples whom the Zhou saw as outside its cultural sphere, it will be hard to maintain that Confucianism—whatever that vague term may be taken to mean—was simply the legacy of China’s earliest dynasties.

Nevertheless, I do not want to overstate my claim. I am unable to identify significant elements of Kong Qiu’s ritualism, politics, or ethics that can be identifiably associated with Zhulou or Yi cultures, and I do not think it likely that further research will shed too much light on this (although I do believe the Lu/Zhulou split may have more to tell us about the politics of the early Ru tradition). Moreover, nothing I have encountered thus far indicates that the teachings of Kong Qiu did not include the prominent Ruist theme of Zhou loyalism and reverence for the prototypical Zhou sage, the Duke of Zhou. It is entirely possible that the non-Zhou origins of Kong Qiu and his Yan family followers led them or their school to adopt an ultra-orthodox Zhou vantage point specifically to cover the traces of the school’s outsider origins. Along these lines, I would like to close with a brief analysis of a famous tale about Kong Qiu that seems best understood with reference to the problematic nature, for a cult recruiting among a Warring States era Zhou population, of Kong Qiu’s possible non-Zhou origins.

The story in question concerns events of the famous meeting in 499 at Jiagu, between Duke Ding of Lu and the ruler of Qi, at which Kong Qiu supposedly served as his lord’s chief ceremonial advisor. In this tale, Kong Qiu demonstrates an attitude towards actual zhuru that seems in its gratuitous brutality far removed from the Kong Qiu of the Lun yu.

At the meeting of Jiagu, the lord of Qi, wishing to seize Duke Ding, ordered zhuru music. Kongzi said, “Commoners who delude a
member of the assembly of lords must be executed!” The zhuru were thereupon executed, their heads and feet departing separately.\textsuperscript{116}

In other versions of this tale, the fact that the zhuru, or other variously named figures, are Yi people is at the center of the story.

The tale, the most dramatic legend of Kong Qiu’s political career in Lu, is stridently violent in its scorn of zhuru and Yi, well outstripping the brutality of the few other legends of Kong Qiu’s harshness (as in his supposed execution of a corrupt merchant when appointed to the office of Sikou). The story reads best as a mythical moment of cultural identification by Kong Qiu, when, at the most critical moment in his public career, he establishes his Zhou cultural credentials by destroying symbolic representatives of Yi culture, most likely the problematic sources of the name by which his own cult was to become known, in the protection of his lord, the lineal descendant of the Duke of Zhou. This interpretation suggests that Kong Qiu’s cultural origins may have inspired his followers to be “more Zhou than the Zhou,” and to the degree that the Ru school became influential, to have made that school, because of the culturally unorthodox background of the man it came to view as its intellectual founder, a major source of the doctrines of Chinese cultural essentialism which this study seeks to challenge.

\textsuperscript{116} There are many versions of this tale. I have translated that in He Xiu’s 賀休 \textit{Gongyang} commentary (Ding 10). Among other early texts, the \textit{Shi ji} account refers to “actors and zhuru”; the \textit{Guliang zhuans} account refers to “Yi-Di” 夷狄 people. The \textit{Zuo zhuans} account is most likely the earliest and differs slightly; it stigmatizes Yi, but they are specifically from a place other than Zhu, and the action is without violence. The most interesting account appears in the early Han text \textit{Xin yu} 新語, which is one of several accounts that breaks the action into two scenes. In the \textit{Xin yu} account, it is in a post-ceremonial encounter that the zhuru (actually, a man identified as a zhuru in the \textit{Shi ji}) is dismembered. What makes the account of particular interest, however, is that at the initial conflict during the ceremonial encounter of the two lords, Kong Qiu’s speech includes the statement, “When two rulers meet . . . they do not rudely conjoin (yehe),” an unusual use of the phrase so problematic in the \textit{Shi ji} biography of Kong Qiu. (A survey of accounts of the Jiagu incident appears in Chen Li, \textit{Gongyang yishu}, 71.3–4 [716].)