Early China (2024), **47**, 253–261
doi:10.1017/eac.2024.11

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Confucius and the Yi Di, *Analects* 3.5

William H. Nienhauser Jr.

University of Wisconsin, USA
Email: whnienha@wisc.edu

Abstract
This article explores the commentaries on *Analects* 3.5 and related texts in light of Confucius' other discussions of the Yi Di. It also speculates on the ways readings of these texts have been shaped by the historical-cultural contexts of the scholars who have interpreted them over the years. Finally, it questions whether there might be a relationship between *Analects* 3.5 and the pericopes that make up the rest of chapter 3.

Keywords: Confucius; *Analects*; Yi Di; life settings; commentaries

This note on *Lun yu* 3.5 is part of what will be a longer study, which will include miscellaneous notes for much of the *Lun yu*. It involves primarily presenting or reconstructing context, not unlike one form of biblical criticism, based on life settings of various people and the use of parallel passages in other early texts, especially the *Zuo zhuan* (Zuo Tradition). It attempts to suggest that breathing room is needed to explore the ambiguities of some of Confucius' utterings. It also assumes that the text of the *Lun yu* was read differently by different scholars in different ages *because* those readings suited their goals beyond the text. As Shakespeare has Cicero say, "Indeed it is a strange-disposèd time;/But men may construe things after their fashion,/Clean from the purpose of the things themselves" (*Julius Caesar*, I.3:33–35).

But first our text—*Lun yu* 3.5—reads: 子曰：「夷狄之有君，不如諸夏之亡也。」 In his discussion of *Lun yu* 3.5, Li Ling 李零 echoes the claim about the evolution of interpretations when he writes in his *Sangjia gou, Wo du Lun yu* 喪家狗, 我讀論語:

> When we look into historical writings, the ancients often took from this sentence what each of them needed, arguing whatever they wanted to argue.
>
> 我們看史書，古人對這句話，經常是各取所需，想怎麼講就怎麼講.[1]

[1]Li Ling 李零, *Sangjia gou, Wo du Lun yu* 喪家狗, 我讀論語 (Taiyuan: Shanxi Renmin, 2011), 80.

© The Author(s), 2025. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Society for the Study of Early China. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution and reproduction, provided the original article is properly cited.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.11 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lun yu 3.5 intrigued Li, who called it the "most interesting" (最有意思) section of chapter 3, "Ba yi" 八佾 (The Eight Rows),[2] and many scholars agree with this assessment. *Lun yu* 3.5 is also a passage that benefits from the "life-setting" mentioned just above. Edward Slingerland, for example, translates: "The Master said, 'The Yi and Di barbarians, even with their rulers, are still inferior to the Chinese states without their rulers.'"[3] Slingerland then comments:

> The Yi and Di are tribes living to the east and north, respectively, of China proper in Confucius' time. They had some sort of political organization but did not follow the rituals of the Zhou. Huang Kan and others are probably correct in seeing this as another jibe at the Three Families of Lu. They wield political power as do the barbarian rulers, but their breaches of ritual propriety make them no better than the Yi or Di, and it would be preferable for Lu to remain ritually correct (and thus "Chinese" in the proper sense) even if this meant going without any ruler at all.[4]

Another western scholar, Pierre Ryckmans, translates: "Barbarians who have rulers are inferior to the various nations of China who are without."[5] Then, in perhaps the lengthiest note to his rendition, he comments:

> This important passage raises fascinating problems of interpretation. There are two ways of reading it—with opposite meanings. It says either "Barbarians who are fortunate enough to have rulers are still inferior to Chinese who do not have such luck," or even "Barbarians have rulers—in this respect they are unlike (i.e., better than) the Chinese who do not have any." Through the ages commentators have inclined now to the first reading, now to the second, in a way that often reflected their own historical circumstances. During the Six Dynasties, for instance, as China was tragically disunited and half of its territory had fallen to foreign invaders, a majority of commentators followed the first reading; they derived some comfort from the notion that, even in the middle of political chaos, defeated Chinese were still superior to victorious Barbarians. It was only by affirming the superiority of their civilization that they managed to define and maintain a cultural identity that was being threatened under foreign occupation. In the Song, On the contrary, several commentators came to prefer the second interpretation. After the traumatic disorders that had marked the end of the Tang and the Five Dynasties, and confronting the permanent threat from northern barbarians which challenged the very survival of the unified empire, the most pressing priority was to maintain a strong central authority that could prevent political disintegration. Therefore scholars were eager to draw one lesson from the enemy, and for them it became salutary—and urgent—to ponder this paradox: even barbarians can appreciate the advantages of centralized power; are we going to lag behind them in this respect?

[2]Li Ling, *Sangjia gou*, 87.

[3]Edward Slingerland, *Confucius, Analects* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2004), 18). James Legge, *The Confucian Analects* (Taipei: SMC, 1991), 156, translates this as (slightly revised) "Kongzi said, 'The rude tribes of the east and north have their princes and are not like the States of our great land which are without them'".

[4]Slingerland, *Confucius, Analects*, 18.

[5]Pierre Ryckmans, *The Analects, Confucius*, ed. Michael Nylan (New York: Norton, 2014), 7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.11 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> The second reading—which allowed us superiority to the Barbarians—was naturally bound to please scholars who were not Chinese. Thus Arthur Waley translated without hesitation: "the Barbarians ... have retained their princes. They are not in such a state of decay as we in China" (*The Analects of Confucius* [London: Allen and Unwin, 1938, pp. 94–95]). Before him Fr. Séraphim Couvreur [1895] had already shown the way: "Les barbares qui ont des princes sont mois misérables que les nombreaux peuples de la Chine ne reconnaissant plus de princes." [Barbarians who have princes are less miserable than the many states of China who no longer recognize princes.][6]
>
> It may be tempting to think that Confucius was able to transcend the limitations of his own cultural world and that he could find some merit in Barbarians yet if such a reading be justified it would certainly fit with Confucius's view of the extraordinary importance of the royal authority. The dynastic institutions of Zhou were to him the very cornerstone of civilized order, the only rampart against the ferocious rivalries of the lords of the various states. He believed that only a restoration of the king's power could prevent social disintegration. From this point of view, Barbarians who kept their kings could quite naturally be extolled as a model for the Chinese to follow. Yet one could equally develop an opposite reasoning: Confucius did not worship monarchy for its own sake. The king's power was not important in itself—it was valuable only as an instrument and as a condition of civilization; it was *civilization* that constituted the absolute value; civilization alone distinguished the Chinese from the Barbarians, and the superiority of the Chinese rested on it: even with their kings, Barbarians could not equal civilized nations, though the latter might unfortunately be sometimes deprived of a sovereign.
>
> Still, the final word should belong to philology and not to philosophy. In the end, it all depends on the meaning of *buru*—literally "to be unlike." It seems that in the pre-Qin (and especially in the *Analects*: see, for instance 5.9 and 6.20), this expression meant nearly always "not to equal," "to be inferior," "not to be as worth." If this is the case here, we should conclude that Confucius believed that barbarians were inferior to the Chinese. This conclusion is not surprising.[7]

Indeed, in all cases in the *Lun yu buru* seems to mean "not as good as" or "not equal to" (比不善), rather than "not like" (不像).[8] *Lun yu* 1.8, for example: "Have no friends not equal to yourself" (無友不如己者).

Li Ling has the most extensive discussion of *Lun yu* 3.5 in his *Sangjia gou*. He speaks of three interpretations.[9] The first emphasizes the lack of a ruler, showing Confucius' disappointment with the Zhou states. The second emphasizes the fact that

[6]Séraphin Courveur gives a slightly different translation in *Les entretiens de et de ses disciples* (Paris: FV Editions, 2017), 53.

[7]Ryckmans, *The Analects, Confucius*, 72–73.

[8]Cf. *Lun yu*, 1.8, 3.6, 5.28, 6.20, 9.23/25, 13.4/24, 15.31, 19.20, 20.1.

[9]Li Ling, *Sangjia gou*, 89–91. See also Li Xicheng 李細成, "Yi Di zhi you jun, bu ru Zhu Xia zhi wang ye': Sizhong zhijie bianzheng" 夷狄之有君，不如諸夏之亡也: 四種岐解辨正, *Kongzi xuekan* 孔子學刊, 2019.10, 29–45.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.11 Published online by Cambridge University Press

though the other non-Han peoples have rulers, they don't have *li*, ritual, so important to Confucius, and thus don't measure up to the States of the Central Region (Zhongguo 中國). This second interpretation has a corollary: if the barbarian peoples have a ruler, and he ventures to give orders to us, that is not as good as having no ruler at all. That this reading was also popular in the Song dynasty again reflects the historical circumstances of the time.

Yang Bojun's 楊伯峻 translation is 孔子曰: 文化落后国家, 虽然有个君主, 还不如中国没有君主哩 ("Confucius said, 'Although a culturally backward country has a ruler, it is not as good as China without a ruler'").[10] This echoes many traditional scholars, such as Xing Bing 邢昺 (932–1010), who argued,

> even though the Yi and Di tribes have their rulers, their conduct is not guided by the rites and they have no sense of what is right; even though the Chinese states at times are without their rulers, as in [the reign of] King Shao of the Zhou and the Gonghe era (841–828 BCE), they did not abandon the practice of the rites and they had a sense of ritual and right.
>
> 夷狄雖有君長而無禮儀, 中國雖偶無君，若周召共和之年，而禮儀不廢.[11]

This was especially true of those who lived during eras that China was under pressure from foreign states. Some of those traditional readings identified the particular Yi Di who threatened the Hua Chinese at the time. For example, the commentary attributed to Bao Xian 包咸 (6–65 CE) asserts this passage is related to the struggles between Jin 晉 (the Central State) and Wu 吳 (the Barbarian) in 482 BCE, as chronicled in the *Zuo zhuan*,[12] during which the parties met at Huang Chi 黃池; and in the negotiations, because Wu was lacking in knowledge of ritual, Jin was given precedence in the meeting.[13] But the *Zuo zhuan* does not mention anything about *li*, ritual, in that passage. In fact, in the *Guoyu* 國語 ("Wu yu" 吳語, 19.615) and *Shiji* (39.1685 and 43.1792), Wu was given precedence in this meeting. Others, such as Yang Shuda 楊樹達, argued that "Yi Di" referred to King Zhuang of Chu 楚莊王 (r. 613–591 BCE) and Helü, King of Wu 闔閭吳王 (r. 515–496 BCE).[14]

On the other hand, those scholars who saw *buru* 不如 as meaning something like "not the same as" include Cheng Yi 程頤 (1033–1107), who interpreted the passage as "even though the Yi and Di people have their elders and rulers, which is unlike the Chinese, who, in a state of disorder, are no longer making distinctions between above and below, superior and inferior" (夷狄且有君長，不如諸夏之僭亂，反無上下之分也).[15] My reading of Cheng Yi may not be shared by all since I'm unsure of the subject of

[10]Yang Bojun's 楊伯峻, *Lun yu yizhu* (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1980), 24. Yang Chaoming's 楊朝明 *Lun yu quanjie* 論語詮解 is similar to Yang Bojun, *Lun yu quanjie*, pp. 37–38.

[11]Cited in Huang Huaixin 黃懷信, *Lun yu huijiao jishi* 論語彙校勘集釋 (Shanghai: Shanghai Guji, 2008), 208.

[12]Ai 13.3–4, translated by Stephen Durrant et al. in *The Zuo Tradition* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2016), 1915.

[13]Cited in Cheng Shude 程樹德, *Lun yu jishi* 論語集釋 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1990), 147–48.

[14]Yang Shuda 楊樹達, *Lun yu shuzheng* 論語疏證 (Shanghai: Guji, 1986), 65–67.

[15]Cheng Yi 程頤, *Lun yu huijiao jishi*, 208.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.11 Published online by Cambridge University Press

反無上下之分也. I read it as referring to the *zhuxia* 諸夏, but it could also refer to the Yi Di. Cheng Shude cites Chen Tianxiang 陳天祥 (1230–1316) *Sishu bianyi* 四書辨疑, who reads Cheng Yi's comments as follows: "It must have been that among the Yi and Di who respectfully accepted their rulers' commands, there was a division between superior and inferior, and this could be called 'having a ruler.'[16] Those of the Chinese states which violated their ruler's commands, and had no division between superior and inferior, could be in this way said to have despised and abandoned their ruler. This was simply a lament that the Master made during a time when he was suffering from the chaos of his time" (蓋謂夷狄尊奉君命，而有上下之分，是謂有君矣. 諸夏蔑棄君命, 而無上下之分，是謂亡其君矣。是夫子傷時亂而歎之也).

Gu Yanwu 顧炎武 (1613–1682) agrees: "As for the customs and mores throughout the Nine Regions, if you examine the historical writings of the previous eras, there are instances of China not being as good as foreign states" (歷九州之風俗，考前代之史書，中國之不如外國者有之矣).[17] Arthur Waley, perhaps because of his skeptical attitude towards modern China, offers: "The Master said, The barbarians of the East and North have retained their princes. They are not in such as state of decay as we in China."[18] As with the first understanding of the passage that assumes that Chinese states are superior and identifying specific references for the Yi and Di, there are also those who read the Yi and Di as superior with firm identifications of whom the Yi and Di were. For example, in his *Lun yu fawei* 論語發微, Song Xiangfeng 宋翔風 (1779–1860) argues that it was not the neighboring states of Lu that Confucius was criticizing, but rather the rulers of Lu: "It must have been that this indicates the chaos resulting from [the Three Families] overstepping [the duke's] authority in Lu so that there no proper relations between ruler and vassal, father and son, causing [Lu] to be similar to the Yi Di so it would be better to destroy [Lu] in order to heal it" (此蓋指魯之僭亂無君臣父子之義，同乎夷狄，不如滅亡之為愈).[19] The Yi and Di would then most likely refer to some of the Jiu Yi 九夷 with whom Confucius had interactions, most remarkably during the meeting between Duke Ding of Lu 魯定公 (r. 509–495 BCE) and Duke Jing of Qi 齊景公 (r. 548–490 BCE) at Jiagu 夾谷 in 505 BCE.

In his *Lun yu quanjie* 論語詮解, Yang Chaoming 楊朝明 argues that *you jun* 有君 means *you xian jun* 有賢君 and that Confucius judges people not by race, ethnicity, or place of origin, but by their behavior.[20] He thus translates the final clause as "not like central domains who on the contrary do not have [rulers]" 不像諸夏卻沒有.[21] Moreover, there is Kang Youwei's 康有為 (1858–1927) interpretation that is more complex but clearly reflective of his point of view that democracy should be discussed and the Dowager Empress Zixi be removed from power to allow this:

[16]Cheng Shude, *Lun yu*, 149.

[17]Gu Yanwu 顧炎武, *Ri zhi lu* 日知錄, cited in Li Ling, *Sangjia gou*, 90n2).

[18]Arthur Waley, *The Analects of Confucius* (New York: Vintage, 1938), 94–95. Waley's note 1 reads: "Where in several States the ruling families had been ousted by usurpers."

[19]Cheng Shude, *Lun yu*, 149.

[20]Yang Chaoming 楊朝明, *Lun yu quanjie* 論語詮解 (Jinan: Shandong Youyi, 2013), 37–38.

[21]While *wang* 亡 is usually glossed as *wu* 無, this clause could also be read as "the Hua Xia who have lost them [their rulers."

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.11 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> When the Yi and Di have virtuous power, then they become the Central States (i.e., Han Chinese states), when the Central States do not have virtuous power, then they become the Yi and Di .... It seems to be that Confucius's speaking of the Yi and Di and the Central States could then be considered as the Crude Barbarians (Manchu rulers) and the civilized (Western governments). Should the Crude Barbarians' organization fall apart too greatly, then they should enthrone a ruler to monopolize power in order to gather it back together, this is that which should be obtained in a world of chaos. The power of the people in civilized (states)[22] shines brilliantly, they together accept governing under public law, yet they have (the right to) discuss public affairs and democracy without having a ruler .... As for the Crude Barbarians in their world of chaos having rule by a ruler, it is not as good as the civilized states' method to rule without a ruler in their time of peace.

> 夷狄而有德，則中國也。 中國而不德，則夷狄也 ... 蓋孔子之言夷狄，中國，即今野蠻文明之謂。野蠻團體太散，當立君主專制以聚之，據亂世所宜有也。文明世人權昌明，同受治于公法之下，但有公議民主，而無君主 ... 若亂世野蠻有君主之治法，不如平時文明無君主之治法。[23]

It might even be argued that this goes on today given the different ways the *Lun yu* is read according to contemporary circumstances both outside China and in the "Neidi." But that is certainly a topic outside the scope of this article.

Whichever of the readings you choose to follow, *Lun yu* 3.5 has implications for how the entire "Ba yi" 八佾 chapter is read. One thing seems obvious: that this passage ties in well with the idea that this chapter is about ritual, music, and how they are intricately related to ruling a state. Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130–1200) himself said the twenty-six passages in "Ba yi" "discuss matters of ritual and music" (論禮樂之事).[24] Recent scholars in both the West and China have also emphasized the possible coherence of the passages in *Lun yu* chapters (Li Ling, etc.). Huang Kan points out that this chapter, "Ba yi" (Eight Lines of Dancers) begins by criticizing the Ji Clan 季氏 and that it follows naturally because "governing" or "administrating" (*zheng* 政) originates from "study" or "learning" (*xue* 學)—and I assume he means "studying ritual and music"—and that failure to study them leads to the evilness of the Ji-sun; he further suggests that this chapter, beginning with criticism of this evilness, is a natural result of that failure to study and an ideal sequel to the second chapter, "Wei zheng" 為政 (On Governing).[25] Hans van Ess in his recent German translation of the *Lun yu*, in turn emphasizes the idea that this chapter is about usurpation of ritual and therefore of governing.[26] Van Ess also believes that there is a consistency to all the twenty-six passages in "Ba yi" and that this chapter fits into the logic of how the chapters were arranged (his idea is that the first ten chapters provide a chronological parallel with the events of Confucius' life). He also notes that previous scholarship has argued that

[22]Or perhaps "civilized times."
[23]Kang Youwei 康有為, *Lun yu zhu* 論語注 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1984), 32–33.
[24]Huang Huaixin, *Lun yu huijiao jishi*, 191.
[25]Huang Huaixin, *Lun yu huijiao jishi*, 191.
[26]Hans van Ess, *Confuzius, Gespräche* (Munich: Beck, 2022), 145 and 176.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.11 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lun yu 3.5 and 3.6—3.6 is about the Ji Clan usurping the imperial privilege of worshipping Mt. Tai 泰山— should be part of the same passage, an interpretation which reinforces the idea that *Lun yu* 3.5 is actually a criticism of Lu politics. Charles Le Blanc in a preface to his French translation of this chapter has similar comments:

> The entire chapter deals with rites (23 paragraphs) and music (3 paragraphs). The essential affinities between government, on the one hand, and rites and music, on the other, justify the logical continuation of Chapters II and III. However, Confucius' approach here is rather casuistic, focusing on the modalities and legitimacy of the performance of certain rites by well-known figures, such as the heads of the Three Families (3.1, 3.2, 3.6 and 3.10).[27]

To conclude, let us examine three more passages that may suggest Confucius' attitude towards the Yi Di. In the *Li ji,* "Zaji, xia" 雜記, 下 (James Legge's translation revised slightly):

> Confucius said, "Shaolian and Dalian demeaned themselves skillfully during their mourning (for their parents). During the (first) three days they were alert; for the (first) three months they manifested no weariness; for the (first) year they were full of grief; for the (whole) three years they were sorrowful. (And yet) they belonged to one of the rude tribes on the East."
>
> 孔子曰：「少連、大連善居喪，三日不怠，三月不解，期悲哀，三年憂。東夷之子也。」

Some skepticism is evident here, to be sure, but nevertheless Confucius shows an admiration for two men of Yi descent.

There is also the famous passage in *Lunyu* 9.14:

> Confucius expressed a desire to go and live among the Nine Yi Barbarian tribes. Someone asked him, "How could you bear their uncouthness?" Confucius replied, "If a superior man were to dwell among them, what uncouthness would there be?"[28]
> 子欲居九夷。或曰：「陋，如之何！」子曰：「君子居之，何陋之有？」

Of course, this passage offers a double-edged sword in any argument about Confucius and the Yi Di since, on the one hand, it shows Confucius was ready to go live among the Yi, whereas, on the other, it implicitly suggests he agrees that there is "uncouthness" or that they are "uncultured" (*lou* 陋). Moreover, in the modern commentaries to this passage Li Ling begins his assessment by reaffirming the nature of interpretation to

[27]Le Blanc, *Les entretiens de Confucius (Lunyu)* (Paris: Gallimard, 2009), 41: "Le chapitre entier porte sur les rites (23 paragraphes) et al musique (3 paragraphes). Les affinities essentielles entre le government, d'une part, et les rites et la musique, d'autre part, justifient la suite logique des chapitres II and III. Cependent, l'approche de Confucius est ici plutot casuistique, portant sur les modalites et la legitimite de l'accomplissment de certains rites part des personnages bien connus, comme les chefs des Trois Familles (3.1, 3.2, 3.6 and 3.10)."

[28]Slightly revised from Slingerland, *Confucius, Analects*, 91.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.11 Published online by Cambridge University Press

follow the political situation in which they are written. He writes: 現在，政治上不得意，或貪污發現，都是上歐美國家，但孔子不得意，卻上落後地區.[29] My translation would be something like: "Nowadays, people who are unfulfilled in their political positions, or who are found to be corrupt, go to European and American countries, whereas Confucius, who was unfulfilled in his position, went to a backward region."

Finally, the following passage from the *Zuo zhuan* (Zhao 17) in which Confucius is so impressed by the Master of Tan 郯, a small statelet and dependency of Lu located about 40 miles south of modern Linyi 臨沂 in Shandong,[30] that he sought out the Master to learn some of these things from him (reflecting those events and objects such as the huge bone that was found in Wu 吳, that Confucius was later asked to explain).[31]

> In autumn, the Master of Tan came to visit our court. The Lord held a feast for him. Shusun Chuo (the Shusun lineage head, d. 517 BCE) asked him, "The lineage of Shaohao named its offices for birds. Why is that?" The Master of Tan said, "He was my ancestor; I know about this. Long ago, the lineage of the Yellow Emperor took clouds as its guide in regulating affairs and therefore established cloud masters who were named for clouds. The lineage of the Flaming Emperor took fire as its guide and therefore established fire masters who were named for fires. The lineage of Gonggong took water as its guide and therefore established water masters who were named for waters. The lineage of Taihao had dragons as its guide and therefore established dragon masters who were named for dragons. Just at the moment when my distant ancestor Shaohao Zhi was established as ruler, a phoenix appeared, so he took birds as his guide and established bird masters who were named for birds. The Phoenixes were regulators of the calendar. The Swallows were supervisors of the equinoxes. The Shrikes were supervisors of the solstices. The Orioles were supervisors of the opening of seasons. The Pheasants were supervisors of the close of seasons. The Snipes were supervisors of conscripts. The Ospreys were supervisors of the military. The Cuckoos were supervisors of works. The Falcons were supervisors of Corrections. The turtle doves were supervisors of affairs. These last five birds, all of the *jiu* variety, were for gathering (*jiu*) the people. Five types of pheasants were leaders for the five types of artisans; making objects useful and establishing measures, they created common standards for the people. Nine birds, all of the *hu* variety were leaders of the nine agricultural activities, and they stopped (*hu*) people from committing any excesses. Since the time of Zhuanxu, no one has been able to take distant things as guides, so they have taken things near at hand. Being unable to follow the earlier practice, they have established masters for the people and named them for the affairs of the people." Hearing of this, Confucius had an audience with the Master of Tan and studied these things. Afterwards he told others, "I have heard that when the Son of Heaven has lost his officials,

[29]Li Ling, *Sangjia gou*, 183.

[30]See Yang Bojun, *Chunqiu Zuo zhuan zhu* 春秋左傳注 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1980). Tan lasted into the Warring States era; see p. 676.

[31]See "Kongzi shijia" 孔子世家, *Shiji*, 47.1912–13.

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.11 Published online by Cambridge University Press

knowledge about the officials remains among the aliens of the four quarters." This is still credible.[32]

秋，郯子來朝，公與之宴，昭子問焉，曰，少皞氏鳥名官，何故也，郯子曰，吾祖也，我知之，昔者黃帝氏以雲紀，故為雲師而雲名，炎帝氏以火紀，故為火師而火名，共工氏以水紀，故為水師而水名，大皞氏以龍紀，故為龍師而龍名，我高祖少皞，摯之立也，鳳鳥適至，故紀於鳥，為鳥師而鳥名，鳳鳥氏歷正也，玄鳥氏司分者也，伯趙氏司至者也，青鳥氏司啟者也，丹鳥氏司閉者也，祝鳩氏司徒也，鴡鳩氏司馬也，鳲鳩氏司空也，爽鳩氏司寇也，鶻鳩氏司事也，五鳩，鳩民者也，五雉為五工正，利器用，正度量，夷民者也，九扈為九農正，扈民無淫者也，自顓頊以來，不能紀遠，乃紀於近，為民師而命以民事，則不能故也，仲尼聞之，見於郯子而學之，既而告人曰，吾聞之，天子失官，學在四夷，猶信。

It seems obvious that in light of the *Zuo zhuan* passage about Confucius studying with the Master of Tan, and especially considering Confucius' final comment: "I have heard that when the Son of Heaven has lost his officials, knowledge about the officials remains among the aliens of the four quarters," that the Master did not have such a negative view of the Yi and Di as some commentators, especially those living under the pressure of later Yi and Di tribes in the Six Dynasties and Song dynasty, have argued. Moreover, the texts and arguments above suggest that the closer examination of traditional commentaries on the *Lun yu* will help us to better understand not only the *Lun yu*, but the life and times of the commentators themselves.

It goes without saying that the possibility to read *Lun yu* 3.5 as Confucius' acceptance of other cultures resonates loudly today as it become apparent that some of what Kang Youwei called "civilized states" in the West are unable to reach an equal level of acceptance of the Other.

孔子和夷狄——讀論語 3. 5

倪豪士

摘要

本文結合孔子對夷狄民族的其他討論，探討了《論語》3.5的註釋和有關夷狄的相關文本。它還推測了那些多年來解釋這些材料的學者的歷史文化背景如何影響他們對這些文本的閱讀。最後，它質疑《論語》3.5和構成第三章其餘部分的 pericopes 之間是否存在關係。

孔子、論語、夷狄人、人生設定、註解

[32]Durrant et al. in *The Zuo Tradition*, 1545, Zhao 17.3.

Cite this article: William H. Nienhauser, Jr., "Confucius and the Yi Di, *Analects* 3.5," *Early China* (2024), **47**, 253–261. doi:10.1017/eac.2024.11

https://doi.org/10.1017/eac.2024.11 Published online by Cambridge University Press