

## 8

c0436

Dz̄v̄ngdž's death, portrayed in LY 8:3 (and in the more elaborate and thus probably later \*8:4<sup>16</sup>) is traditionally assigned to 0436. This becomes our date for what appears to be a memorial compilation of four Dz̄v̄ngdž sayings (perhaps a gesture of respect to the four *sections* of the Confucius memorial). They are the only subset which can be firmly attributed to a known figure.

The LY 8 core sayings have the distinctive pronoun and other usages which were noted in LY 7. One of them, the sacral pronoun yw̄ 予, seems rather subject-related than dialectically conditioned (Dz̄v̄ngdž was from Wŭ-chŭng in southern Lŭ), but the continuity of theme is still striking. They occur also in LY 9, at points clearly a reworking of LY 7. The simplest assumption is that Dz̄v̄ngdž's elder son Dz̄v̄ng Yw̄án, his chief mourner and thus the likeliest compiler of LY 8, also succeeded him as school head, in which role he would be the presumptive compiler of LY 9 as well.

The numbering of passages is identical in the Legge text.

┌ 8:3. When Dz̄v̄ngdž fell ill, he summoned the disciples at his gate, and said,  
Uncover my feet; uncover my hands. The poem says:

Tremblingly and full of fear,  
As though I verged the deep abyss,  
As though I trod the thinnest ice –

but now and hereafter, I know I have come through safely, my little ones.

Disciples “at the gate” imply a gate and thus a residential center, whereas the “Confucius” of LY 5–7 is never observed at home, but always elsewhere.

Dz̄v̄ngdž (who in the presence of death uses the sacral “I,” see 7:23) need not worry about assuming a ritually improper posture in his dying moments: he has safely negotiated the perils of life. Confucius in LY 4 spoke of a constant need for improvement; here is a strenuous anxiety to avoid wrongdoing. The eloquence of Dz̄v̄ngdž's negative claim echoes Paul's farewell (2 Timothy 4:7), “I have fought a good fight, I have finished the race, I have kept the faith.”

Dz̄v̄ngdž here sounds the note he ascribed to “Confucius” in 7:35. It is not the ritual (the prayer of 7:35, or the posture of the corpse in 8:3) that counts: the dying man's previous life has been one long prayer, one continuous effort.

The lines quoted here are identical with lines in Sh̄r 195 (a political lament that the ruler follows bad advice). The *force* of the quote is however closer to Sh̄r 196 (containing three *near*-identical lines), on measuring up to an exacting standard of conduct; the lines are thus a likely ancestor of *both* poems. LY 6:13 implied the F̄v̄ng section of the Sh̄r early in its compilation process; 8:3 may show the Yǎ or courtly section of the Sh̄r (presumably the highbrow alternative that was commended to Dž-syà in 6:13) in a similarly fluid state.

The different functions of the texts quoted at these deaths is noteworthy: “Confucius” in 7:35 had rejected the model and instead instanced his life; Dz̄v̄ngdž accepts the model and fulfils it with his life. Life and art converge.

⌊ 8:5. Dzṽngdž said, Able, yet inquiring of the less able; versatile, yet inquiring of the limited; having, yet seeming to lack; full, yet seeming empty; wronged, yet not retaliating – long ago, a friend of mine used to devote himself to these.

One can only agree with the commentators that the friend was Yén Hwéi, here described in terms taken from earlier passages. One strand is courtly modesty; the willingness to learn from inferiors, praised by or attributed to Confucius (4:17, 5:15, 5:28, nothing in LY 6, 7:22, 7:28). Another is the speciousness faulted in 7:26b, transformed into paradoxical praise of the meditation adept (for “empty” as a codeword see LaFargue **Tao** 210–211). A third is humility, the suppression of anger or resentment, implied by the Golden Rule of 5:12 and associated with Yén Hwéi in 6:3 and 6:11. It is notable that Confucius is never mentioned in LY 8; his virtues are here blended with Hwéi’s. This agrees with our inferences that Hwéi survived Confucius and that Dzṽngdž was a latecomer to the circle. His feeling for Hwéi is then more than friendship: Hwéi was Dzṽngdž’s point of contact with Confucius.

⌋ 8:6. Dzṽngdž said, He can be entrusted with a six-span orphan, he can be sent on a hundred-league mission, having charge in a crisis he cannot be overwhelmed – is he a gentleman? He is a gentleman.

A span (chǐ 尺) was 23 cm or 9 in (Dubs **Han** 1/279; Reifler **Span**); a six-span orphan stood 138 cm or 54 in: below adult size and needing custodianship. “Gentleman” (usually jyṽndž) has an added rṽn “man” (jyṽndž-rṽn), as in modern colloquial. The first two clauses are parallel, based on the measures span and league (lǐ 里, about 0.5 km); the third is cadential. In the family, civil, or military spheres, a gentleman is one who can take responsibility, not one of a certain social status (compare 6:6). Unlike Confucius in 4:11 and 4:16 (or Yödž in 6:13), Dzṽngdž never defines the jyṽndž (“gentleman”) in opposition to the syäu-rṽn (“little man”), or uses the latter term at all. The inclusion of family leadership in this functional definition makes it applicable also to those of modest status. Here, then, may be a Confucian movement in the direction of making cultural common cause with the lower-status group.

⌋ 8:7. Dzṽngdž said, An officer cannot but be broad and resolute, for his burden is heavy and his road is far. Rṽn makes up his burden; is that not indeed heavy? Only with death is he done; is that not indeed far?

Here again is the onerousness seen in 8:3. It is a favorite quotation of teachers, and is alluded to at the beginning of the primer Hán Shī Wàt-jwàn (HSWJ 1:1, Hightower **Wai** 11; compare Brooks **Prospects** 3f) to motivate a young king.

The personal motif in 8:3 and 8:7 give these sayings an ABBA double pairing format, like 7:1–5 and 7:12–17. The compiler may thus have preserved not only Dzṽngdž’s words, but his proclivities of form. In his use of secondary pairing, Dzṽngdž resembles Dž-yòu (LY 5) and not Yödž (LY 6). The same *resumed* affinity, with Dž-yòu and Dzṽngdž sharing a trait that Yödž lacks, appears in the theme of learning from inferiors (see 8:5n) and in the avoidance of the derogatory term syäu-rṽn (see 8:6n).

## Interpolations

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

## Reflections

Quite apart from the striking similarity in their final utterances (8:3n), it seems that Dz̄vngdž has, in Confucianism, very much the position occupied by Paul in the history of Christianity – that of a latecomer, who had never known the founder, but becomes a strong and indeed constitutive leader of the movement. They are intense, making up in energy for lack of authenticity; original, taking the movement into new areas; and, most importantly, political, imposing new discipline and reconciling old enmities.

Like zeal and originality, which are almost required of a latecomer by his lack of continuity with the founder, harmonizing may also be inherent in such situations. One who had known Confucius can claim to be speaking for him in disputes among the followers, as Dž-yóu (LY 5) and Yóudž (LY 6), with their praise and blame of disciples, repeatedly do. Dz̄vngdž's LY 7 is by contrast a zone of reconciliation. It praises Yén Hwéi, but it also lets Gūngsyī Hwá (corrupt in 6:4) make a supportive remark in 7:34, and gives Dž-lù (associated with Gūngsyī Hwá in the negative 5:8) a role as a spokesman at the hour of Confucius's death in 7:35. It is noteworthy that the text's earlier disapproval of Dž-lù is made up only in the final period of Confucius's life (assuming LY 7 to be chronologically arranged), but the point is that it *is* made up. In venturing into the new sociological and ideological directions implied by LY 7–8, Dz̄vngdž seems to have chosen to redefine the past as a heritage of peace.

Dz̄vngdž's distinctive traits include his mystical propensity, centering on Yén Hwéi, the cognate qualities of meekness and interest in the lower orders, and his own mixture of austerity and aesthetic sensitivity. He shows a keen interest in stewardship (8:6; compare 7:5), as befits his headship, and a strong sense of effort (8:7; not courage) and indeed of wayfaring, implying nonmilitary origin (compare MC 4B31). All the early Analects chapters are quotable, but each has its own flavor. The “stupid” Níng Wūdž of 5:21 will later appeal to the bold Lyóu Dz̄ng-ywán (773–819); the humble Yén Hwéi of 6:11 will be evoked by the reticent Wáng Wéi (699–759). If there is such a salient passage in LY 7, it is perhaps the equally striking but less strained “three men” image of 7:22. Its simple interactive humanity, its random but sufficient conjunction, have a different charm. If there is a moment in the Analects when three moral agents can safely take a ten-minute break, this is surely it. Here the sometimes cosmic Dz̄vngdž of LY 7 approaches the direct laterality of the Golden Rule, which was only *quoted*, from afar and perhaps disapprovingly, in 5:12.

Differences between works ascribed to a single author, such as Homer, are often explained as reflecting the difference between youth and age. If our inferences above are sound, we have in LY 7–8 a real case of early and late statements by one person. It is a complication that the LY 7 sayings purport to represent Confucius, whereas the LY 8 ones are openly attributed to Dz̄vngdž and may represent him more directly. With that qualification, it is still useful to analyze the LY 8 sayings down to the last detail, and then see how much of LY 7 reflects the same personality. This is parallel to, but independent of, the investigation of linguistic similarities and differences between the two chapters. A more advanced exercise of this sort is to get an impression of Dž-gùng from LY 5, and then try to remove that component from LY 4. The result should be Confucius without the Dž-gùng filter, or as near as we can get to it.

**Jade Carving (see LY 9:13)**

*Width 9 cm (3.5 in). 04c/03c. Courtesy Freer Gallery of Art (39-30)*