

Enfiefment Renewal in Lǚ 魯

A Taeko Brooks 白妙子

University of Massachusetts at Amherst

WSWG Note 134 (16 Apr 1997)

Abstract. Three times in the Chūn/Chyōu chronicle, the Jōu King confers a mandate (mìng 命) on a Lǚ ruler. The details of these incidents shed light on the nature of Jōu enfiefment, as it persisted after the loss of Jōu military power in 0771.

Data. The twelve CC rulers with their reign dates and mandate 命 conferrals, and some factors that might disqualify a new ruler from recognition by Jōu, are:

1. Yǐn	0722-0712	son of concubine	
2. Hwán	0711-0694	previous ruler killed	
3. Jwāng	0693-0662	legitimate heir	命
4. Mǐn	0661-0660	underage ruler; legitimate heir killed	
5. Syī	0659-0627	son of concubine; previous ruler killed	
6. Wǎn	0626-0609	legitimate heir	命
7. Sywān	0608-0591	son of concubine; legitimate heir killed	
8. Chýng	0590-0573	legitimate heir	命
9. Syāng	0572-0542	underage ruler; son of concubine ¹	
10. Jāu	0541-0510	son of concubine; legitimate heir dies	
11. Dìng	0509-0495	brother of previous ruler; a son is bypassed	
12. Aī	0494-	underage ruler; son of concubine	

The usual understanding of Aī-gūng (Dzwǒ Jwàn, Gūngyáng, Lù Dv-míng, Legge) is that he was the son of Dìng-gūng's wife. But she is not styled fū-rǎn 夫人 in the entry for her death (Dìng 15:9, where she is instead called Lady Sǜ 姒氏), and is not styled syǎu-jyǎn 小君 at her burial (Dìng 15:14, where she figures as Dìng Sǜ 定姒). The Dzwǒ Jwàn explains these irregularities as due to notification protocol or the closeness of her funeral to that of Dìng-gūng, but the likelier view is that of Gǔ-lyáng, which is that she was a concubine 妾.

As to Aī-gūng's age, six years pass before he appears in the CC: meeting with Wú (12/7/3), attacking Jū 邾, and capturing its ruler (12/7/4); it may be also in this year that Aī-gūng resumes Dìng-gūng's use of Confucius as a source of personnel.² But in the above list, youth is never the sole reason for nonrecognition, and so was probably not a relevant consideration. Then Jōu expected a ruler's legitimate son to succeed him at his natural death, and would recognize such a successor, even if underage.

¹Syāng-gūng's mother's death is recorded at CC 9/4:3 and her burial at 9/4:5, in both cases with the titles proper for a wife, but DJ seems to recall a tradition that she was a concubine. The death of the regular wife of Syāng-gūng's father is recorded at 9/2:3 and her burial at 9/2:7. The honors paid to Syāng-gūng's real mother may thus have been, as DJ intimates, improper.

²See Brooks *Analects* 284. But no ruler is disqualified solely by youth; see preceding note.

The wording of the first entry shows that no new mandate is being issued; rather, the previous mandate is being renewed:

- 3/1:6 (0693) 錫桓公命 “bestowed [the previous ruler] Hwán-gūng’s mandate”
 6/1:5 (0626) 錫公命 “bestowed the princely mandate”
 8/8:7 (0583) 賜公命 “bestowed the princely mandate”

Lack of the previous ruler’s sacrificial name in 6/1:5 (on the model of 桓公 in 3/1:6) cannot be due to Jōu ignorance of the name, since a Jōu representative was present at the interment, 6/1:3; so also 8/8:7, where the visit is in the 8th year of the Lǚ reign. This may be nothing more than a change in Lǚ scribal convention.

There are some further finesses affecting these mandate renewals, which emerge on close study of the CC wording. For instance, we may ask, who sent the envoy on these occasions, and who was the envoy?

- 3/1:6 (0693) 王 sent 榮叔 [a third son of the Rúng clan]
 6/1:5 (0626) 天王 sent 毛伯 “The Elder of Máu”
 8/8:7 (0583) 天王 sent 召伯 “The Elder of Shàu”

These differences of term (王 in 3/1:6 is less grand), status (only the last two envoys have feudal titles, and thus high Jōu rank), and timing, invite explanation.

The CC uses wáng 王 for the King’s and his daughters’ marriages, his children’s deaths, and his military actions. Tyēn-wáng 天王 “Heavenly King” is used of actions reflecting his ritual status: diplomatic visits, disturbances in the royal house, or his own death. We should thus have expected 天王 in 3/1:6. Why does it not appear? It may be relevant that the 0693 envoy is a private person, while the other envoys are titled. The sending of a low-level envoy may have caused offense in Lǚ, thus prompting an answering snub in the record kept by the Lǚ scribe.³ As for the reason for the King’s slight, in sending a low-ranking envoy, it may have been a response to Lǚ’s failure to send a requested funeral gift a few years earlier, in 0697 (CC 2/15:1).

The reason for the late embassy to Chvng-gūng (in his 8th year) is a puzzle, on which it may be best not to speculate. What does seem to come through, in the details here considered, is that Jōu Kings and Lǚ Princes had an idea of what was due them, in ceremonial gestures and in terms of respect, and that both sides were liable to be prickly when their expectations in this area were not met. Business somehow got done, but the feelings of the parties involved also managed to get themselves expressed.

All this suggests a continuing reality in the feudal relationship between Jōu and Lǚ, a relationship which we might have expected would cease after 0771, but did not.

Works Cited

A Taeko Brooks. *Distancing* 及 in the Chūn/Chyōu. WSP v1 (2010) 27-39

³A Rúng Shú appears in 6/5:1 (0622, hence a different person) bringing funeral gifts; again, the donor is listed as 王, not 天王, despite the solemn occasion. A Jōu snub may have been intended, since the deceased was a Lǚ concubine promoted to wife. When burial gifts were brought by Steward Sywǎn 宰囑, a person of rank, in 1/1:4 (0722), the donor was duly entered as 天王. For the Lǚ court’s extreme sensitivity to protocol slights, see Brooks **Distancing**.