

Confucius Beyond the Analects. By Michael Hunter. Leiden: Brill, 2017. Pp. 347. €132.00/\$158.00.

Michael Hunter's book is an interesting study of the early literary sources—stretching from the Warring States period through the Eastern Han dynasty and a bit later—that relate to Kongzi 孔子 (Confucius; 551–479 B.C.E.).¹ Hunter surveys, and occasionally reads closely, such diverse transmitted sources as the *Zuozhuan* 左傳, *Shuoyuan* 說苑,² *Lunheng* 論衡, and *Kongzi jiayu* 孔子家語, to name but a few, many of which have languished in the neglected margins of Kongzi studies, and he takes into account as well the recently excavated manuscripts that supplement the corpus of Kongzi materials.³

Confucius Beyond the Analects has many well-constructed arguments that call attention to the significance of these early works for understanding not only the historical Kongzi but also, more importantly in the author's view, what he calls “the quotable Kongzi,” a historical phenomenon that, bounded by neither time nor place, enjoyed a sort of immortality and universality denied to the historical Kongzi. This quotable Kongzi, in Hunter's account of him, grew in vitality and scope as Kongzi came to be regarded as *the* authority on matters of ethics, government service, and perhaps a few other areas overlooked in the book. (Hunter distinguishes the quotable Kongzi from the historical Kongzi by putting the name in quotation marks, i.e., “Kongzi.”) This is a key distinction meant to validate the book's exploration of

¹ Figures on pp. 13 and 46 show the largest of these sources that date through to the end of the Western Han (plus the *Kongzi jiayu* 孔子家語 and the *Kong congzi* 孔叢子) and a complete list appears on pp. 39–45. I will refer to some of these works by title below when discussing the details of Hunter's analysis of them. In addition to retrieving these neglected sources, thanks in large measure to various electronic databases, also to be counted as virtues of *Confucius Beyond the Analects* are that it provides an overview of recent scholarship on Kongzi and the *Analects* and is amply supplemented with numerous and informative tables and graphs. The book is nicely printed with only a small handful of typos. Some sections, however, would have benefitted from a heavy-handed editor and it is regrettable that access to its contents is limited by a too abbreviated three-page “Subject Index” whose entries are almost exclusively proper names while the many subjects covered in the book are not represented.

² Hunter transcribes this title *Shuiyuan* but I prefer *Shuoyuan*.

³ *Confucius Beyond the Analects*, p. 47: “The corpus of Kongzi material is perhaps even more impressive when described in relative terms. At approximately 230,000 characters, the material depicted in figures 0.1 and 0.2 (which [include texts through the Western Han plus the *Kongzi jiayu* and *Kong congzi* but] exclude Eastern Han texts) is roughly equivalent to four of the Five Classics combined. . . . Kongzi is not only the most widely quoted master figure in the early literature (see [Hunter's] figure 3) . . . but also the most widely quoted individual. If the material in figure 1 constituted a single text, it would be the largest text through the end of the Western Han period save for the *Shiji* [史記].”

the many works that interest the author even though it is highly doubtful that the compilers of these works recognized a distinction between “Kongzi the man” and “Kongzi the quotable authority.”⁴

Before turning to a summary and analysis of Hunter’s treatment of the sources, a few initial observations are in order. First, contrary to his book’s catchy title, Hunter’s work is only partly concerned with Confucius or Kongzi *beyond* the *Analects*. Aside from its first two chapters and parts of its introduction, the remainder of Hunter’s study—roughly half the book—consists of a discussion, largely conjectural, of the date and circumstances of the composition of the *Lunyu* 論語 as well as analyses, some quite detailed, of what the text has to say about both Kongzi and “Kongzi.” And though he seems intent on undermining the foundational role the text has appeared, to many, to have played in the history of Chinese thought—at the very start of the book he says of the text that it is a “hodgepodge of sayings, dialogues, anecdotes, and other miscellanea” (p. 2) and a bit further on rejects the proposition that “enough evidence can be found to justify continuing to read the *Lunyu* as the most authoritative Kongzi text from the Warring States era and, thus, as a foundational work of pre-imperial Chinese thought” (p. 11)—Hunter himself seems unable to escape the allure of the *Analects*. Indeed so much so that it is possible to read parts of Hunter’s study as an unintended contribution to a “*Lunyu*-centric approach” to Kongzi that he otherwise frequently bemoans.⁵

Confucius Beyond the Analects argues in favour of the view that the *Lunyu* that we now possess is a work of the Western Han (202 B.C.E.–2 C.E.) and should be read as a representative part of the intellectual and cultural milieu of that period. But the author admits (on p. 314, for example) that there is insufficient evidence to counter successfully those who have assumed or maintained that the *Lunyu* is wholly or at least in part the work of Kongzi’s disciples and followers accomplished sometime during the Warring States period (453–221 B.C.E.).⁶ Hunter’s acknowledgement of the absence of solid evidence for some of his claims about the *Lunyu* buys him some latitude—but only to a certain degree. Thus, in my reading of the book, I find more satisfying and convincing what he says about Confucius *beyond* the *Analects*. In the book’s conclusion, the author says much the same thing about his survey of the non-*Lunyu* sources for Kongzi: “Consequently, it is my hope that this study’s greatest

⁴ That such works contain neither death narratives for Kongzi nor the details of his birth—facts noted at *Confucius Beyond the Analects* (p. 38)—in no way assuages such doubts.

⁵ Hunter is not unaware of this and attempts to justify devoting so much of his attention to the *Lunyu* on p. 165.

⁶ *Confucius Beyond the Analects*, p. 207: “[N]othing in this book disproves the existence of a pre-Han *Lunyu*, because the existence of a pre-Han *Lunyu* cannot be disproven on the basis of the evidence available to us.”

contribution is its survey of early Kongzi material in chapters 1 and 2” (p. 315). Complementing this are Hunter’s own qualms about reading the *Lunyu* as a product of the Western Han: “Admittedly, such an approach is fraught with uncertainty, as seen in the many ‘ifs,’ ‘maybes,’ and ‘mights’ that pepper my discussion” (p. 248). In light of these features of *Confucius Beyond the Analects*, the present review will focus on the book’s first two chapters and for the most part leave it to others more game to deal in hypotheticals to assess what it has to say about the origins of the *Lunyu*.

Part of what inspired Hunter to look beyond the *Analects* was the *Kongzi jiyu* 孔子集語 of Sun Xingyan 孫星衍 (1753–1818), an extensive compendium of the sayings, conversations, and anecdotes associated with Kongzi drawn from sources outside of the *Lunyu* and other ancient canonical works.⁷ Sun, who can be regarded as a participant in the *gouchen* 鈎沈 movement of the early and middle Qing, was a remarkably thorough and careful scholar and it is easy to understand why his collection motivated Hunter to pursue an interest in the obscure and too often neglected material it contains.⁸

In the comparatively lengthy introduction that precedes the five chapters and conclusion that form the two parts of his study, Hunter covers several topics. First he presents an extremely abbreviated account of how Kongzi is portrayed in the *Lunyu*. Following this are “three basic approaches to the question of the *Lunyu*’s origins” (p. 4): the text was compiled by Kongzi’s disciples, a traditional explanation that elicits extreme scepticism on Hunter’s part; the *Lunyu* reflects a diachronic process of textual accretion as demonstrated in the studies done by such scholars as Cui Shu 崔述 (1740–1816) and Takeuchi Yoshio 武內義雄 (1886–1966), an approach that Hunter commends but also criticizes because it has “generally reaffirmed the *Lunyu*’s privileged status without subjecting the traditional view to more thoroughgoing scrutiny” (p. 8); the formation of the *Lunyu* happened centuries after the death of

⁷ A modern collated edition of Sun’s work was published in 1989 by the Shandong youyi shushe 山東友誼書社 in Ji’nan 濟南. Sun’s seventeen-juan corpus of Kongzi materials followed upon, though greatly surpassed in the quality and quantity of its contents, the earlier two-juan eponymous effort of Xue Ju 薛據 (fl. thirteenth century). The latter was included in the *Siku quanshu* 四庫全書 and reprinted by the Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan in 1983.

⁸ For those interested in Sun Xingyan, see Arthur W. Hummel, ed., *Eminent Chinese of the Ch’ing Period (1644–1912)* (Washington, DC: Library of Congress, 1943), pp. 675–77. I first encountered Sun’s collection when, as an MA student attempting to follow in the footsteps of Gustav Haloun, I worked on the fragments of otherwise lost “Confucian” texts listed in the *Hanshu* 漢書 bibliography and found the *Kongzi jiyu* to be a valuable source of ancillary textual material. More recently I became reacquainted with Sun’s scholarship through his commentary on the *Mozi* 墨子 included in the *Mozi xiangu* 墨子閒詁 of Sun Yirang 孫詒讓 (1848–1908).

Kongzi, perhaps by the end of the Warring States period or as late as the first century B.C.E., the view that Hunter favours for reasons he gives in the introduction as well as later in his book.

Hunter then argues for the importance of drawing a distinction between Kongzi and “Kongzi”—though I very much question the degree to which an emphasis upon the latter narrows or diminishes into mere parochialism the traditional importance attached to the *Lunyu*⁹—and offers the interesting observation, elaborated upon in Chapter 2, that “representations of Kongzi as a man can often be understood as biographical projections of the function of *Kongzi yue* [孔子曰, ‘Confucius says, . . .’] within early Chinese textual culture” (p. 19). Recognizing Kongzi as the literary embodiment of a voice or voices that articulated fundamental values in early Chinese society is not original to *Confucius Beyond the Analects* but it is nevertheless an extremely important insight that is an integral part of the overall argument found in the book.¹⁰

⁹ Hunter makes the argument on p. 12 that the traditional view of the text—the first of the three approaches he describes earlier in the introduction—might have been motivated to invest the *Lunyu* with prestigious origins that would distinguish its contents from what is found in the numerous other sources of Kongzi material. There is no evidence that the compilers of the *Lunyu* were motivated by such concerns and it is possible to view the other sources of Kongzi material as having borrowed from or emulated the *Lunyu* because they prized it for its privileged origins and uniqueness but regarded its contents as recondite, elliptical, and incomplete. In relation to this, cf. *Confucius Beyond the Analects*, p. 52: “In the cases of Qu Yuan and Laozi at least, the primacy of certain genres suggests that the popular imagination of these figures was tied to specific textual traditions. But the mélange of genres in the corpus of Kongzi material precludes such a conclusion (unless, of course, one is prepared to argue that an irreducibly heterogeneous text like the *Lunyu* inspired subsequent representations of Kongzi).” It is certainly worth considering such a possibility more seriously than Hunter chooses to do.

¹⁰ Hunter insightfully links the view that Kongzi was an historicized voice to other figures in the literary tradition of early China. *Confucius Beyond the Analects*, p. 317: “‘Laozi’ 老子, or the ‘Old Master,’ became the author for the otherwise authorless *Laozi* tradition, and . . . the persona of the *Li sao* 離騷 (*Encountering Sorrow*) was historicized as Qu Yuan 屈原 or Qu Ping of Chu 楚屈平. . . .” Kristofer Schipper, *The Taoist Body*, trans. Karen C. Duval (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993), p. 121, suggests a similar analysis of the historicization of Laozi. Cf. my note 16 below. With regard to Qu Yuan, Hunter adds in a note: “Crucially, the names Qu Yuan and Qu Ping do not appear within the *Li sao* itself, nor is there good reason to suppose that the persona of the *Li sao* was anything other than a literary invention” (p. 317, n. 4). One could extend the analysis further. My reading of the *Mozi* suggests to me that the anecdotes about Mo Di 墨翟 found in that text and other early sources could very well be fabricated embodiments of the values associated with the Mohists. See John Knoblock and Jeffrey Riegel, trans., *Mozi: A Study and Translation of the Ethical and Political Writings* (Berkeley, CA: Institute of East Asian Studies, 2013), pp. 1–6.

Hunter elaborates on the richness and the complexities of the material that can be compiled through the use of digital databases when we turn to the non-canonical sources that testify to the “Kongzi” phenomenon.” Partly to illustrate this point he provides the intriguing example of how a properly constructed digital search can yield an unexpectedly broad range of textual parallels for *Lunyu* 7.1 (子曰：述而不作，信而好古。)，though he overreaches when he concludes that these parallels demonstrate that “Kongzi’s ownership of the saying was not fixed until the latter part of the Western Han period at the earliest” (p. 30).

Chapter 1, entitled “The Big Picture” to distinguish its contents from what Hunter characterizes as close readings of the non-*Lunyu* sources found in Chapter 2, offers what the author calls a “distant reading” of the Kongzi material that is meant as a “roadmap to the ‘Kongzi’ phenomenon” and thus “explores those features which lent coherence to ‘Kongzi’ across time and space, and which differentiated it from other quotable authorities in the period” (p. 37). (I touch upon only a few of these “features” in the discussion that follows.) Hunter introduces Chapter 1 by first noting how fundamentally the features of the “Kongzi” phenomenon differ from the portrayal of the “flesh-and-blood Kongzi” found in the “Kongzi shijia” 孔子世家 (Hereditary House of Kongzi), the *Shiji* 史記 biography compiled by Sima Qian 司馬遷 (c. 145–86 B.C.E.),¹¹ and then providing (on pp. 39–45) an exhaustive list of the extant sources of “Kongzi” material and (on p. 46) a table that singles out the major sources of Kongzi through the end of the Western Han plus the *Kongzi jiyu* and the *Kong congzi* (because, he argues, they contain earlier material).¹²

In a brief overview of the great variety of early sources that attest to the importance of “Kongzi” as a quotable authority, Hunter observes that even Mozi, “arguably Kongzi’s most vociferous critic” (p. 48), cited Kongzi in an anecdote included in the *Mozi*—though it is likely that Hunter is misinterpreting the rhetorical intent of the anecdote when he concludes that “Mozi is forced to acknowledge

¹¹ *Confucius Beyond the Analects*, pp. 37–38. Hunter observes here that accounts of “Kongzi” contain no death notices and that the majority of passages do not associate “Kongzi” with Lu 魯 because “the quotable Master” did not require a birthplace or home state. Cf. my note 4 above.

¹² Hunter is by no means advocating the wholesale indiscriminate use of these sources. On p. 83, note 139, he points out that “these anthologies likely postdate the Han period even if they include a large amount of ‘early’ material.” Thus he excludes their use in a discussion of the role played by the *Lunyu* in providing early Kongzi material. This is a wise move on Hunter’s part and is anticipated by generations of scholars who have disparaged the reliability of the *Kongzi jiyu* and been even more disdainful of the contents of the *Kong congzi*. For example, Liang Yusheng 梁玉繩 (1745–1819), *Shiji zhiyi* 史記志疑 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1981), p. 2 *sub* 皇帝者, explicitly rejects the use of the *Kongzi jiyu* in considering the contents of

(Continued on next page)

Kongzi's value as a quotable authority, as if 'Kongzi' transcended the intellectual factionalism of the period" (p. 49).¹³

The first of the features of "Kongzi" that Hunter discusses is the variety of Kongzi's names: Kongzi's supposed surname Kong 孔, his given name Qiu 丘, and his courtesy name Zhongni 仲尼. He notes that, in the "Kongzi shijia," Sima Qian explains the derivation of Qiu and Ni by referring to the legend that Kongzi was conceived after his father prayed for a child at a hill called Niqu 尼丘 and that Kongzi was born with an oddly shaped skull that resembled a dent in the hill. Hunter claims that "there is little evidence that Sima Qian's view was shared by anyone else in the period" (p. 50), though it seems unlikely that the court historian simply fabricated the tale underlying the derivation of the names. Nor is Hunter at all interested in pursuing the spiritual resonances of the tale and he concludes that there is no significance in Kongzi's surname, noting, though not with any serious intent, that the range of its meanings did not extend beyond "hole, penetrating, great, extremely."¹⁴

(Note 12—*Continued*)

the *Shiji* as well as other Han and pre-Han sources. And on p. 13 of his text, *sub* 堯使舜 . . . , Liang labels the *Kong congzi* a "forgery" (weishu 偽書) that dates to the Eastern Han. Liang's dismissal of the *Kong congzi* follows the lead of Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130–1200) who criticized the text in several comments recorded by his students and preserved in the *Zhuzi yulei* 朱子語類. See Li Jingde 黎靖德, ed., *Zhuzi yulei* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1986), pp. 1985, 2187, 2989, and 3252. Such critiques of the two texts should not keep Hunter from referring to them in his attempts to outline the features of "Kongzi." But it is an error in judgement for Hunter to quote them alongside some unquestionably pre-Han and Western Han sources as if there were no chronological issue in such juxtaposition. See, for example, the references to the *Kong congzi* at *Confucius Beyond the Analects*, pp. 17–18, p. 49 n. 27, p. 54, and p. 134. Only in the discussion on p. 60—a comparison of the wording in the *Kong congzi* and a manuscript now in the collection of the Shanghai Museum—is it explicitly, if parenthetically, noted that the former (along with the *Kongzi jiyu*) is "much later."

¹³ The anecdote, found in Chapter 48 "Gongmeng" 公孟 of the *Mozi*, is translated by Hunter on p. 49. In it one of Mozi's followers named Master Cheng 程子 catches Mozi out for citing Kongzi as an authority when otherwise he condemns the Ru 儒, that is, Kongzi and his disciples. Hunter thinks that Mozi's reply to his follower—"Although birds and fish can be called foolish, even Yu [禹] and Tang [湯] would follow them at times"—is in effect Mozi's forced acknowledgement of "Kongzi's value as a quotable authority." Not noted by Hunter, the immediately preceding anecdote in the *Mozi* has Mozi reply to Master Cheng's charge that he has been "excessive" in reviling the Ru that in conversation one need not mount a formal argument but only be "clever and quick." That is the tactic he uses in the anecdote that Hunter quotes. See Knoblock and Riegel, *Mozi*, pp. 350 and 360–62, for more on these two *Mozi* passages.

¹⁴ In a footnote (p. 50, n. 30) Hunter gives some textual examples of these meanings.

There are large questions about Kongzi's lineage and surname that, though ultimately unanswerable, deserve more attention than Hunter gives them. Sima Qian names as Kongzi's forebear his great-grandfather, the Song 宋 nobleman Fang Shu 防叔.¹⁵ But he fails to mention the even earlier Kongfu Jia 孔父嘉 who was murdered in 710 B.C.E. along with his ruler Duke Shang of Song 宋殤公 by Huaifu Shu 華父叔, the grandson of Duke Dai of Song 宋戴公.¹⁶ The *Zuozhuan* authority Du Yu 杜預 identifies Kongfu Jia as Kongzi's "sixth generation ancestor" and the "Ben xing" 本姓 chapter of the *Kongzi jiayu* credits him with having founded the Kong lineage and either Kongfu Jia or his immediate descendants with having established the lineage name (*shi* 氏) "Kong" based on his courtesy name.¹⁷ Should we interpret Sima Qian's silence with respect to Kongfu Jia as an indication that the historian had doubts about the longer lineage as well as Kongfu Jia's role in establishing it and the origins of the lineage name?¹⁸

As for the meaning of *kong* 孔, the early dictionary *Shuowen jiezi* 說文解字 of Xu Shen 許慎 (25–189) defines the word with the synonym gloss *tong* 通 (penetrating), but goes on to explain the graph for *kong* as made up of two elements, *yi* 乙 (swallow) and *zi* 子 (child). The text elaborates:

The swallow is a migratory bird to which one prays for the gift of children. When the swallow arrives one obtains the child and finds it fine and beautiful.

¹⁵ *Shiji* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1959), p. 1905.

¹⁶ *Zuozhuan, Zhongguo shixue yaoji congkan* 中國史學要籍叢刊 ed. (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2015), Huan 桓 2, pp. 43–46. Huaifu Shu killed Kongfu Jia because he coveted Kongfu Jia's wife and he murdered Duke Shang because the duke was angered by Huaifu Shu's behaviour. The *Zuozhuan* account goes on, however, to blame Duke Shang for having waged too many wars during his reign. Du Yu interprets the *Zuozhuan* text as an implied condemnation of Kongfu Jia for not controlling his harem and for having incited resentment among the general population.

¹⁷ *Zuozhuan*, p. 44, n. 1. *Kongzi jiayu* (Taipei: Shijie shuju, 1991), p. 93: 孔父嘉，五世親盡，別為公族，故後以孔為氏焉。一曰孔父者，生時所賜號也，是以子孫遂以氏族。In his *Zuozhuan* commentary, Du Yu says that "Kongfu" was Kongfu Jia's given name and that "Jia" was his courtesy name. See *Zuozhuan*, p. 44, n. 1, and p. 46, n. 4. Jiao Xun 焦循 (1763–1820), *Chunqiu Zuoshi zhuan buzhu* 春秋左氏傳補注 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2016), p. 109, rejects this and argues that the "Kong" lineage name would not have been based upon a tabooed given name.

¹⁸ Liang Yusheng, *Shiji zhiyi*, p. 1111 (*sub* 其先宋人也，曰孔防叔), suggests that Sima Qian is simply mistaken in not identifying Kongfu Jia as Kongzi's ancestor. He asks rhetorically whether Sima Qian names Fang Shu because he was the first in the lineage to have fled from Song to Lu? But Liang rejects that possibility noting parenthetically that the Du Yu commentary to the *Zuozhuan* says that it was Kongfu Jia's son Mujinfu 木金父 who fled to Lu after his father's murder. See *Zuozhuan*, Zhao 昭 7, p. 759, n. 7.

Among the ancients those with the given name Jia 嘉 (Fine) had as a courtesy name Zikong 子孔.¹⁹

Xu Shen is claiming that reflected in the way the graph for *kong* is written are the old lore of the swallow—called variously *yan* 燕, *yi* 鳧, and *xuanniao* 玄鳥 in early sources²⁰—as a magical bird that fulfils a supplicant’s wish for children²¹ and the spring equinox prayers for children made to the swallow that had perhaps become commonplace by Warring States times.²² Given the similarity between the lore of the swallow and Sima Qian’s account of Confucius’s father praying to Niqui for a child, can we therefore see in the way Kongzi’s surname is written traces of a belief in Kongzi’s miraculous birth?

Xu Shen does not refer to Kongzi or to *kong* as a surname but rather concludes his gloss by noting that delight in the children believed to be the divine answer to prayers made to the swallow led to the ancient nomenclature of a single individual having Jia 嘉 (Fine) as a given name and Zi Kong 子孔 (Master Swallow-Child) as a courtesy name. It is possible that Xu Shen is alluding to Kongfu Jia 孔父嘉 and thus fashioning a distant link to Kongzi; but it is more likely that he is referring to other historical figures called Jia and Zi Kong.²³ In the midst of pondering these

¹⁹ Duan Yucai 段玉裁 (1735–1815), *Shuowen jiezi zhu* 說文解字注 (reprint, Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1981), *juan* 12A, pp. 1a–1b: 孔，通也。嘉美之也。从乞子。乞，請子之候鳥也。乞至而得子，嘉美之也。故古人名嘉，字子孔。

²⁰ *Yi* 乙 and *yi* 鳧 are variant writings of the same word. For the different Chinese names for the bird, see the Guo Pu 郭璞 (276–324) commentary, *Erya zhushu* 爾雅注疏, *Shisanjing zhushu* 十三經注疏 ed. (Nanchang, 1815), *juan* 10, p. 4b, *sub* “Yanyan” 燕燕。

²¹ It is attested quite early in the *Shijing* 詩經 song *Xuanniao* (Mao #303) in which it is said that the childless Jian Di 簡狄 swallowed an egg dropped by a *xuanniao* and miraculously conceived Xie 契, the legendary founder of the Shang house. (*Shiji* [Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1959], *juan* 3, p. 91, preserves a full account of Xie’s miraculous birth.) The lore of the swallow also figures in *Yanyan* (Mao #28). See Jeffrey Riegel, “Eros, Introversion, and the Beginnings of *Shijing* Commentary,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 57, no. 1 (June 1997), pp. 161–62.

²² According to a late Zhou ritual almanac found in the *Lüshi chunqiu* 呂氏春秋 and the *Liji* 禮記, barren women were to pray for children on the spring equinox, the day when the *xuanniao* returned to the north. See Chen Qiyong 陳奇猷, *Lüshi chunqiu jiaoshi* 呂氏春秋校釋 (Shanghai: Xuelin chubanshe, 1984), *juan* 2, p. 63; *Liji zhushu* 禮記注疏, *Shisanjing zhushu* ed., *juan* 15, p. 4a; and also Derk Bodde, *Festivals in Classical China: New Year and Other Annual Observances during the Han Dynasty, 206 B.C.–A.D. 220* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press; Hong Kong: Chinese University of Hong Kong, 1975), pp. 244–47.

²³ As cited by Jiao Xun, *Chunqiu Zuoshi zhuan buzhu*, p. 109, Gu Yanwu 顧炎武 (1613–1682), in his *Rizhi lu* 日知錄, noted in connection with the *Shuowen* definition the two figures Cheng Jia of Chu 楚成嘉 and Gongzi Jia of Zheng 鄭公子嘉, both of whom had Zi Kong as a courtesy

(Continued on next page)

uncertainties one should keep in mind the odd lineages and surnames possessed by some other early masters. Laozi having the surname Li 李 was unprecedented—since he gave birth to himself—and it may have served to identify him with a cult of the plum tree.²⁴ And, as is well known, it is doubtful that Mozi's surname was Mo 墨 though it is not known how and why he and his followers came to be labelled with a word that ranged in meaning from “black-branded” to the “blackened skin of common laborers.”²⁵ No mention of these comparisons is found in *Confucius Beyond the Analects*.

Hunter identifies as another distinctive feature of “Kongzi” the many interlocutors who questioned and conversed with the Master. He finds that, among the interlocutors, a large number are *dizi* 弟子 (a term that may be variously rendered as “disciple,” “follower,” or “student”) and he regards it as evidence of Kongzi's singularity that he had so many of them. There can be little question that Kongzi's sizable number of followers and the fact that many gained important reputations in their own right not only distinguished “Kongzi” from other early masters but were also a hallmark of the “Kongzi” tradition.²⁶ It is nevertheless odd that Hunter seems so resistant to viewing the early accounts of Kongzi's followers in light of those of

(Note 23—Continued)

name. For Cheng Jia, see *Zuozhuan*, Wen 文 12, p. 298 and note 1 on that page; for Gongzi Jia, see *Zuozhuan*, Xiang 襄 9, p. 516 and p. 517, n. 24. In his *Shuowen* commentary *apud* Xu Shen's gloss on *kong*, Duan Yucai repeats the two examples.

²⁴ Schipper, *The Taoist Body*, p. 121: “Take, for example, the biography of Lao Tzu in the *Historical Records (Shih-chi)* of Ssu-ma Ch'ien (145–86 B.C.). This first great historiographer of China attempted to rewrite the sacred story of the Mold Master and reduce it to a historical source so as to make Lao Tzu appear as an ordinary philosopher. His ‘biography’ reveals nonetheless that Lao Tzu's family name was Li, ‘plum tree,’ a detail that comes straight from mythology. Indeed, no clan of this name ever existed in ancient China and the very appearance of the family name Li late in antiquity is apparently linked to the story of Lao Tzu and early Taoism, as the Old Master was the first to have borne this name. It would be possible to see traces here to a cult of the plum tree, and indications of such a religious custom do exist.”

²⁵ Knoblock and Riegel, *Mozi*, p. 4: “Starting in the early twentieth century, scholars began to argue that *mo* was not a surname but was rather meant to associate Mozi with laborers or convicts who had undergone branding, one of the five punishments. How this description came to be associated with and adopted by Mozi and his followers is not evident.”

²⁶ It is, however, noteworthy that both early sources as well as Hunter himself question the large numbers used to describe the size of Kongzi's following. See *Confucius Beyond the Analects*, p. 60. And it is possible to name more first-generation disciples of Mozi than Hunter seems willing to allow. See Knoblock and Riegel, *Mozi*, pp. 9–10. But, as Hunter maintains, extant evidence indeed suggests that the long-term impact of Kongzi's *dizi* was far greater than Mozi's or any other early figure for that matter.

Mozi, and vice versa,²⁷ especially since the two groups were frequently juxtaposed and compared in early sources²⁸ and the contact and competition between them has been the subject of significant recent studies by Christoph Harbsmeier and Michael Nylan.²⁹ In this regard it is perhaps also worth noting that, in his discussion of the “Kongzi” feature he calls “place,” Hunter notes tensions between what he identifies as the “local Kongzi” and the “universal Kongzi” as well as the contradictions among accounts that associate Kongzi with both the state of Lu 魯 and the state of Song but he fails to note that such tensions and ambiguities are also found in anecdotes about Mozi. Mozi’s travels compare in breadth with those of Kongzi and we cannot say with certainty whether Mozi was a native of Lu or Song.³⁰ It is unlikely that the parallels between the two masters are merely coincidental.

Chapter 1 also provides a look into what Hunter calls the “anatomy” of one of the most famous legends surrounding Kongzi: the trials and hardships he and his followers are said to have endured while travelling between the states of Chen 陳 and Cai 蔡. He notes that the *Mozi* found in the apparent popularity of such tales an opportunity for accusing Kongzi of hypocrisy when, because of the circumstances but contrary to his principles, he accepted from a follower food he knew to have been stolen.³¹ In attempting to answer the question of how the “between Chen and

²⁷ Later in his study, Hunter quotes and discusses (on pp. 158–59) an anecdote from the “Kongzi shijia” that relates how, after Kongzi’s death, a follower named You Ruo 有若 was made by the other disciples to impersonate Kongzi because he bore a physical resemblance to their late master. Hunter dismisses the tale as “a comically pathetic attempt to resurrect their master” and so overlooks the important parallel with Mozi’s followers who regularly employed the practice—presumably borrowed from the rites of royal ancestor worship—of selecting “impersonators” (*shi* 尸) as a means of identifying who should succeed to the leadership of the Mohist school upon the death of the incumbent. See Knoblock and Riegel, *Mozi*, pp. 9–10.

²⁸ I have in mind the “Tianxia” 天下 chapter of the *Zhuangzi* 莊子, the “Xianxue” 顯學 chapter of the *Hanfeizi* 韓非子, and the “Dangran” 當染 chapter of the *Lüshi chunqiu*. For more details see Knoblock and Riegel, *Mozi*, pp. 7–11.

²⁹ Christoph Harbsmeier, “The Birth of Confucianism from Competition with Organized Mohism,” *Journal of Chinese Studies* 56 (January 2013), pp. 1–19; Michael Nylan, “Kongzi and Mozi, the Classicists (Ru 儒) and the Mohists (Mo 墨) in Classical-Era Thinking,” *Oriens Extremus* 48 (2009), pp. 1–20. Both works are included in Michael Hunter’s bibliography.

³⁰ Knoblock and Riegel, *Mozi*, pp. 1–2, especially n. 3.

³¹ For a translation of the passage see Knoblock and Riegel, *Mozi*, p. 323. In his summary of the passage, Hunter (p. 80) renders Kong Mou 孔某 as Kong So-and-So (apparently understanding this as a denigrating way to refer to Kongzi) but he notes (p. 80, n. 131) that Harbsmeier, “The Birth of Confucianism from Competition with Organized Mohism,” p. 15, suggests that *mou* is a replacement for the tabooed *Qiu* inserted into the text during the Song dynasty. Harbsmeier’s suggestion is buttressed by the study of the passage found in Wu Yujiang 吳毓江 (1898–1977), *Mozi jiaozhu* 墨子校注 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2006).

Cai” tales came to be, Hunter refers to the 1986 study by the author of the present review in which it is proposed that some are reworked prose narratives based on a few *Shijing* 詩經 songs that appear to be about the sufferings and troubles of an anonymous wanderer and his followers.³² Hunter (quite wisely) does not fully embrace this proposal; but nor does he dismiss it as implausible.³³

The chapter closes with a discussion of “Kongzi and the *Lunyu*” in which it is proposed that 100 B.C.E.—roughly the date of the completion of Sima Qian’s *Shiji*—marked a turning point in the history of the *Lunyu*. In Hunter’s telling of the chronology, from that date forward, the authority of the text enjoyed unprecedented growth. And Hunter notes what he takes to be no coincidence: the earliest mentions of the *Lunyu* occur in the two or three decades preceding this crucial date. These observations are elements in the larger argument offered by *Confucius Beyond the Analects* that the *Lunyu* is a product of anonymous compilers working late in the first half of the Western Han. As with other parts of his book where he advocates for this position, Hunter is quick to point out some problems with it: there is significant uncertainty surrounding the dating of the sources that form part of the basis for claiming that 100 B.C.E. was the watershed he believes it to have been. He points out as an example that the *Liji* 禮記 cannot be regarded as a unified text with a single date of compilation but is better thought of as “twenty-four distinct texts,” each of which may have had its own circumstances and date of composition.³⁴

The second chapter of Hunter’s study is entitled, “A Dozen Perspectives on ‘Confucius’ beyond the *Analects*.” He analyses twelve non-*Lunyu* sources about Kongzi with the aim of refining the topographical map of the features of “Kongzi” that his Chapter 1 “distant reading” produced. The materials discussed in this chapter are well chosen and Hunter’s treatment of them produces for the most part the nuanced perspective that he aims for. One can disagree with some of the translations and interpretations but these disagreements are comparatively slight when compared to the scope and scale of what Hunter has undertaken and accomplished in the chapter’s sixty-seven pages. There are nevertheless instances where it seems that the analyses presented in these pages do not go deep enough and are hindered by some preconceived notions of what should or should not be identified as a feature of “Kongzi.”

³² Jeffrey Riegel, “Poetry and the Legend of Confucius’s Exile,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 106, no. 1 (January–March 1986), pp. 13–22.

³³ Hunter (p. 82) proposes some helpful corrections and emendations to two of the *Shijing* translations found in the original article.

³⁴ *Confucius Beyond the Analects*, p. 89. There is a quote of the *Lunyu* by title in the “Fangji” 坊記 chapter of the *Liji* but Hunter (p. 88, n. 143) joins the small chorus of those who think it an interpolation. It would be difficult for him to do otherwise given his views on the *Lunyu* chronology.

Hunter identifies as a key feature of the “Kongzi” tradition the Master’s “powers of *wen* [聞 ‘hearing’]” that he attributes to the fact that “‘Kongzi’ was plugged into a vast network of information in the form of stories, gossip, and texts from all over the Central States (Zhongguo 中國) and every period of history” (p. 120). The use of such anachronistic imagery aside, there are problems with Hunter’s understanding of *wen* as the term applies to Kongzi’s perspicacity. As illustrations of his interpretation that Kongzi’s unusual power of hearing was due simply to his being broadly learned, Hunter quotes two anecdotes from the *Shuoyuan*. In the first, from the text’s “Bianwu” 辨物 chapter, the Lu nobleman Ji Huanzi 季桓子, having found a sheep in an earthen jar while excavating a well, claimed to Kongzi (presumably in an effort to test him) that he had found a dog in the jar. But Kongzi knew better and pointed out to Ji Huanzi that the “odd” or “weird” (*guai* 怪) creature associated with earth, as opposed to the other materials from which a jar might be fashioned or the contents of a jar, is the sheep and not the dog. In addition to mentioning the sheep, Kongzi names the *kui* 夔 and *wangliang* 罔兩 (or 魍魎) as the weird creatures associated with wood and rock and the *long* 龍 and *wangxiang* 罔象 as those associated with water.³⁵ (It is disconcerting that Hunter attempts to understand these binoms without referring to the groundbreaking scholarship of Donald Harper.³⁶) Knowledge of these “oddities” can hardly be characterized as mundane and should, along with the parallels to the *Shuoyuan* passage, be regarded as a “demonological teaching put in the mouth of Confucius.”³⁷ It in effect identifies Kongzi as someone familiar with the sorts of *guai* that the *Lunyu* would have him say are not the proper topics of discussion.³⁸ Hunter chooses to ignore this part of the intent of the *Shuoyuan* anecdote and not only doubts that Kongzi possesses “preternatural perspicacity” but favours tracing what the Master knows to mundane sources.

Hunter attempts to do this by referring to another *Shuoyuan* tale from the same chapter that in fact illustrates the opposite of his interpretation. When the boat of King Zhao of Chu 楚昭王 was struck by a large object he could not identify, the king sent a messenger to Kongzi who replied by identifying the name of the object as *pingshi*

³⁵ *Shuoyuan, Sibü congkan* 四部叢刊 ed. (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1922), *juan* 18, p. 7b. For Hunter’s translation of the anecdote, see *Confucius Beyond the Analects*, p. 120.

³⁶ See note 37 below.

³⁷ Donald Harper, “A Chinese Demonography of the Third Century B.C.,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 45, no. 2 (December 1985), p. 481, n. 63. Harper’s article contains a lengthy discussion of the *wangliang*, *wangxiang*, and the names of other demons. A linguistic perspective on the names can be found in William G. Boltz, “Philological Footnotes to the Han New Year Rites,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 99, no. 3 (July–September 1979), pp. 432–33. These works are not included in Hunter’s bibliography.

³⁸ Cf. *Lunyu* 7.21.

萍實 and declaring it a “good omen” (*jixiang* 吉祥). Sometime later Kongzi identified a one-legged bird that had perched before the palace in the capital of the state of Qi 齊 as the *shangyang* 商羊 and explained its appearance as a warning to the people of Qi to repair their irrigation ditches in preparation for a great deluge.³⁹ In both instances Kongzi is revealed to be a skilled diviner capable of not only naming omens and signs but also interpreting their significance. When questioned by his disciples how he knew such things Kongzi refers to the songs and dances of children. But far from being the simple “children’s folk songs” as in Hunter’s reading of the anecdote, the *xiao’er yao* 小兒謠 should be understood as synonymous with the divinatory *tongyao* 童謠 of the ancient mantic tradition quoted in the *Zuozhuan* and the omen chapters of the *Hanshu* 漢書 and explained in the *Lunheng* of Wang Chong 王充 (27–97).⁴⁰ The dance that the children do, accompanied by more prophetic lyrics, is no doubt part of the same mantic tradition. Its description as “hopping on one leg” (*qu yizu er tiao* 屈一足而跳) reminds one of the *Yu bu* 禹步 (Pace of Yu), which scholars such as Marcel Granet (1884–1940) have argued should be connected to shamanistic traditions in early Chinese religion.⁴¹ The attempt on the part of the compilers of the *Shuoyuan* and the texts that parallel it to portray Kongzi in a more spiritual mode should not be thought surprising in light of the Han-dynasty divinization of Laozi and the transformation of Mozi from ancient master to Daoist divinity.⁴² For Hunter

³⁹ The text of the anecdote is found at *Shuoyuan*, *juan* 18, p. 17b. For Hunter’s translation see *Confucius Beyond the Analects*, p. 121. Hunter’s translation of *pingshi* as “duckweed fruit” and *shangyang* as “the Shang sheep” are both questionable.

⁴⁰ See, for example, *Zuozhuan*, *Xi* 僖 5, p. 307, for a Spring and Autumn example, and *Hanshu* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1962), pp. 1395–97, for exemplars from the reign of Han Emperor Yuan 漢元帝 (r. 48–33 B.C.E.). For Wang Chong’s comments see Huang Hui 黃暉, ed., *Lunheng jiaoshi* 論衡校釋 (Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1964), pp. 213, 921, 929, and 938.

⁴¹ For a fuller discussion of *Yu bu*, see Donald Harper, “A Chinese Demonography of the Third Century B.C.,” pp. 469–70; idem, *Early Chinese Medical Literature: The Mawangdui Medical Manuscripts* (London: Kegan Paul, 1998), pp. 167–69; and Mu-chou Poo, “Ritual and Ritual Texts in Early China,” in John Lagerwey and Marc Kalinowski, eds., *Early Chinese Religion, Part One: Shang through Han (1250 BC–220 AD)* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), vol. 1, pp. 301–3, 309. Harper was the first scholar to recognize that the occurrence of *Yu bu* in the Mawangdui medical manuscripts should be read in light of Granet’s scholarship on religious Daoism and its shamanistic roots.

⁴² For Laozi, see Anna K. Seidel, *La divinisation de Lao tseu dans le taoisme des Han* (Paris: École française d’Extrême-Orient, 1969). On Mozi, see Stephen W. Durrant, “The Taoist Apotheosis of Mo Ti,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 97, no. 4 (October–December 1977), pp. 540–46; and Robert Ford Campany, *To Live as Long as Heaven and Earth: A Translation and Study of Ge Hong’s Traditions of Divine Transcendents* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2002), pp. 329–30 and 508–10. None of these works is included in Hunter’s bibliography.

not to note that this *Shuoyuan* passage closely aligns Confucius with divination and other specialized mantic traditions and otherwise to disregard evidence of the spiritual dimensions of Confucius's persona must be considered a large oversight in his discussion of the features of "Kongzi."

A more general disappointment with the treatment of non-*Lunyu* sources for Kongzi is that, while Hunter makes a point of including in his corpus a large number of recently excavated manuscripts that contribute to our understanding of the pre-Han and Han contours of the Kongzi tradition,⁴³ one finds in *Confucius Beyond the Analects* only passing reference to their contents. None is analysed in depth in the way that the transmitted sources are in Chapter 2 or *Analects* passages are in Chapter 5. For example, "Lubang dahan" 魯邦大旱, a Warring States manuscript now in the collection of the Shanghai Museum, attributes to Kongzi opinions about offerings made to the spirits of mountains and rivers to alleviate drought that can only be properly understood and contextualized by comparing the narrative with other examples of drought tales known from other excavated manuscripts as well as transmitted sources.⁴⁴ Hunter attributes (on p. 54) what he takes to be the manuscript's "strict economy of description [that] keeps narrative details to a minimum" to the "didacticism of 'Kongzi'" that tends to omit details "not directly relevant to the lesson at hand." Others might not find that "Lubang dahan" exhibits such a "strict economy of description" and, in any case, it can be argued that, whatever the text's features, they have more to do with the genre of drought tales attested in the early literature than with the "didacticism of 'Kongzi.'" ⁴⁵

As mentioned earlier in this review, the balance of *Confucius Beyond the Analects* is for the most part devoted to an examination of the origins and chronology

⁴³ *Confucius Beyond the Analects*, pp. 43–45.

⁴⁴ For the text of the manuscript, see Ma Chengyuan 馬承源, ed., *Shanghai bowuguan cang Zhanguo Chu zhushu* 上海博物館藏戰國楚竹書, vol. 2 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2002). Li Xueqin 李學勤, "Shangbo Chu jian 'Lubang dahan' jieyi" 上博楚簡〈魯邦大旱〉解義, *Kongzi yanjiu* 孔子研究, 2004, no. 1, p. 3, compares the contents of the manuscript with a drought tale from the *Yanzi chunqiu* 晏子春秋. (This article is included in Hunter's bibliography.) For other examples of stories in which a sage-like figure advises a rulers on the steps to take to alleviate a drought, see Jeffrey Riegel, "Curing the Incurable," *Early China* 35–36 (2012–2013), pp. 228–33.

⁴⁵ Similarly, on p. 74 of *Confucius Beyond the Analects*, Hunter claims that the appearance of Duke Ai of Lu 魯哀公 in the manuscript's story is merely as one of the "prompts for the discussion of topics of general interest, for example, the appropriateness of propitiating mountain or river spirits." Had Hunter considered the other examples of drought stories he might have concluded that the duke's role in the narrative is not that of a mere prompt; nor is the subject of propitiating spirits simply a topic of general interest.

of the *Analects* and the consequences of reading it as a product of the Western Han times rather than a Warring States text. The methods employed by the author in discussing these subjects have mostly to do with literary and textual comparisons especially focusing on the “intertextuality” between *Lunyu* passages and numerous other sources. Though the analyses appear sound and the conclusions evidence-based, the pall of uncertainty and ambiguity hangs over these efforts. One senses that greater clarity, if not greater certainty, could have been brought to this enterprise had the author expanded somewhat the repertoire of methodologies that he employs in his study of the sources. Particularly absent from Michael Hunter’s observations on the chronology of the *Lunyu* and the relationship between its passages and parallels in other sources—and it is a large lacuna in the opinion of this reviewer—is the evidence offered by the tools and techniques of historical linguistics. At one—and only one—point at the end of his study the author explains why he has chosen not to take into account the language of the *Analects*: the difficulties involved in taking the necessary first steps of thoroughly re-evaluating the place of the text in “the history of thought, culture, languages, etc.,” without falling “into the trap of applying implicitly *Lunyu*-centric models to the assessment of *Lunyu*-centrism itself.” Though the arguments of historical linguistics might be circular and inconclusive, Hunter’s reasons for ignoring them seem to have been arrived at far too easily.⁴⁶

JEFFREY RIEGEL

The University of Sydney
University of California, Berkeley

⁴⁶ *Confucius Beyond the Analects*, p. 315. In note 1 on that page Hunter refers to the existence of Yuri Pines, “Lexical Changes in Zhanguo Texts,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 122, no. 4 (October–December 2002), pp. 691–705, but does not say why he has apparently chosen to disregard its contents. He says, without elaborating, that an unpublished paper Wolfgang Behr delivered at a Princeton University conference in 2011 has influenced his thinking. Finally, Hunter also cites a three-page “critique of the use of linguistic criteria to sort the *Lunyu*’s layers” in Oliver Weingarten’s 2010 Ph.D. dissertation—which I have been unable to see—but surely this cannot be considered definitive.