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Abstract. Jí 及 in the Chūn/Chyōu 春秋 (CC) can be a verb “overtake, go as far as” or a coverb linking one noun with another noun. The Güngyáng Jwàn 公羊傳 (GYJ) and Gülyáng Jwàn 故梁傳 (GLJ) commentaries ascribe to coverb jí the meaning “and” or a nuance of secondary involvement (lè 觐). 2 Legge (Ch'un 5) calls the latter meaning “recondite;” Dobson, Schuessler, and Wáng Lì do not mention it. I find that jí is a secondary, specifically a distancing, “and.” 3 I ascribe that nuance, when present, not to any retrospective Confucian “praise and blame” coding in the CC, a theory still widely accepted, but to the protocol sensibilities of the Lǔ court itself. There are implications for the authorship, and indeed the nature, of the CC text.

Options. What words for “and” were available to a CC scribe? GYJ at Yín 1:2 says “會及爾皆與也: “hwën, jí, and jí are all ‘and’ (yw 懷与).” YW and jí are rare in the CC; hwën and jí are common (jí 及 occurs 95 times, 94 times as a coverb). 4 But it is also possible, in the CC, to list things with no connecting coverb whatever. Since jí is not grammatically required to be present, we may properly ask: when it does occur, what meaning does it convey?

1 Several Dzwô Jwàn 左傳 (DJ) suggestions will be taken up below.
2 Legge Ch'un 895a “and also;” Dobson Studies 250 “accompanying agent.”
3 I am grateful to Christoph Harbsmeier for comments on this paper at WSWG 17, including suggestions that I avoid calling this nuance “disjunctive,” my original choice.
4 Apart from a proper-name use, yw 懷与 occurs twice in CC. (1) Hwán 18:1 (公與夫人姜氏 會如齊 燕 the [Lǔ] Prince and his lady Jyàng-shǐ then went to Chí”) is rejected by Dobson (Studies 224, following Dwàn Yw-tsâi) as an interpolation. I find no ground other than rarity for doubting it. Dobson construes Jâu 13:5 公不與盟 as a verb “take part in.” I concur, since coverbal “with [them]” would require a preposed Jw, contracted with 不 to give 弁, as in the parallel Wûn 16:1 公弗及盟 “the Prince [of Chí] did not covenant with him [the Lǔ envoy].” This attests verbal yw “associate with” in the CC language. Suitably to that meaning, coverbal yw seems to be a conjunction of equal status. I attribute its rarity in CC usage to the rarity of social equality itself in the situations reported by the CC.

5 Jj 及 occurs in Jâu 7:1 (會齊平 “made peace with Chí”) and Ding 10:12 (宋公之弟辰, 喜便便, 石彊 “The Prince of Süng’s brother Chínn, together with Jâng Twô and Shî Kôu”). Legge remarks, of the former case, that 及 = 縣. The parallel extends to the counterpart verb jí 及 “go as far as” (not attested in CC). Dobson Studies 230 plausibly makes jí 及 a holdover from an earlier phase of the language. Its rarity in CC is then not due to any social factors, but rather to its status as an almost obsolete word.

6 The verb instance is Syì 26:2 (公遂齊師, 會鄭, 弁及 “pursued the Chí host to Syì, but did not overtake it”). The 94 coverb instances occur in 91 different CC passages. (Here and below, I follow Yâng Bwô-jwûn’s numbering for CC and DJ passages.)
Lists

There are three content categories in which coverb jí appears. I will form my hypothesis of its meaning on examples from the first category, which includes lists of objects, towns, or persons involved in civil disorders in other states. The first point to establish is that jí is not mandatory in these lists:

盜竊寶玉，大弓 “a thief stole the Precious Jade [and] Great Bow” (Dìng 8:16)

These were items of the Lǔ regalia, presumably of equally great symbolic value. They are simply juxtaposed, without any linking “and” word. By contrast:

雉門及兩顯災 “...the Pheasant Gate 及 the two towers were destroyed by fire” (Dìng 2:2)

In line with the verbal meaning of jí, “go as far as,” we might construe this as “the fire in the gate later spread to the side towers also.” But since coverb jí recurs in the Dìng 2:4 entry, when the gate and towers were rebuilt, surely at the same time, jí must here convey, not a time sequence, but more generally a priority difference. We have also:

郯廪其以漆，呂丘來奔 “Shù-chí of Jū came as a refugee, bringing with him Chī [and] Lù-chyōu” (Sya-ng 21:2)

where “and” is implied simply by the juxtaposition of the town names, and is not separately signaled by any word in the sentence. Compare:

莒牟爽以牟爽及防守，莒來奔 “...Mōu-yí of Jyü came as a refugee, bringing with him Mōu-lōu 及 Fang [and] Dž” (Jāu 5:4)

where jí occurs in the list of towns the refugee brought with him. The names suggest that the town Mōu-lōu was closely associated with the person Mōu-yí, leaving his association with the others to be less close. Again, jí seems to divide the list into two parts, of which the second is less primary than the first. This function, not exactly the GLJ le function, but an indicator of secondarity, is my hypothesis.

I will now test that hypothesis on other material from this content category, which includes killings of important persons, revolts, and flights from a state.

Killings. The killing of a ruler by a subject has its own verb in CC (shř 說); the killing of an officer or other non-ruler is rather shã 說. Rulers and non-rulers regularly appear together in CC lists of covenant participants, but in cases of inflicted death, the mind of the time seems to have recognized a major difference. When a CC entry includes both types of killing, the higher-status verb proper to the ruler is used, the ruler is mentioned first, and a jí always separates the two names, thus:

宋畜其君與夷及其大夫孔父 “Dū of Sùng put to death his ruler Yw-yí 及 his great officer Kung-fu” (Hwan 2:1)

The effect is to restore the missing ruler/non-ruler distinction (missing because only the higher-status verb is used) by subordinating the second object as the “less primary” of the two.

7 In this and all CC quotations, introductory time expressions have been omitted.
8 The parallel cases are Jwāng 12:3 and Syī 10:3.
When two persons said to be killed in one CC entry are both are non-rulers, the previous rule does not obtain. Normally, no jǐ occurs. Here is an exception:

晋人殺其大夫士獻及ære師父 “A man of Jìn killed the great officer Shì Hú 及 Jí Jīng-fū” (Wén 9:6)
The rank difference may imply a responsibility difference. GLJ indeed asserts that Shì Hú was the chief agent, and Jí Jīng-fū was merely involved (黑). There is no reason to suppose that the GLJ statement is anything but an inference from the CC entry, but the entry does invite that inference.

陳殺其大夫屠虎及慶賔 “Chén killed its great officer Chèng Hú 及 Chèng Yín” (Syāng 23:5)
Dù Yw 社頰 sees this as refuting the GLJ idea that jǐ signals lesser involvement of the second figure. But the CC tells us that Chèng Hú was of higher rank than Chèng Yín. As above, it is natural to suppose that he was the leading figure in any joint enterprise, and thus logically the chief target of any reprisal.

衛殺其大夫元咺及公子疆 “...Wēi killed its great officer Yuán Sywān 及 Prince Syā” (Syā 30:3)
The status of the second figure here is higher; this rules out the possibility that jǐ is a high/low status separator. Two years earlier, the Wēi ruler had fled to Chū and later returned. On his return, Yuán Sywān had fled to Jìn and later returned. All this suggests that Yuán was trying to put Prince Syā on the throne of Wēi. The Prince would have been the beneficary of the plot, but Yuán may have been its leader. The hypothesis of jǐ as a secondary marker thus seems to hold here.

Revolts (pàn 叛) may be led by several people. When this is the case, the CC usually lists them without connectives. An exception is the following:

宋公之弟咺及仲咺，石疆，公子地自陳入于齊，以叛 “The Sūng Prince’s younger brother Chén [及] Jūng Two, Shí Kōu, and Prince Dī entered Syāu from Chén and held it in revolt” (Dīng 11:1)
The violation of rank order is obvious, and the implication (see again note 11) is that the Prince’s younger brother, who is listed before the jǐ, is the ringleader.

9Sywān 15:5, Chén 8:6 and 17:13, Syāng 10:8, Aī 4:5.
10 DJ 23:3 speaks collectively of “the Two Chūng” and so perhaps invites Dù’s comment. DJ tells a story of a popular revolt against the usurping Two Ching. Nothing in CC suggests this. DJ regularly, but incorrectly, takes the term X人, which in CC means “an [unnamed] officer of X,” to mean “the people of X.”
11Compare Dīng 10:12, where the younger brother of the Prince of Sūng [及び] several named persons flee to Chén. In Dīng 11:1, the same group plus [及び] Prince Dī 公子地, who is listed last, enters Syāu and holds it in rebellion. As in Syā 30:3, it seems that a conspiracy, headed by the Sūng ruler’s younger brother, had picked up a plausible ruler in Chén and then activated their plot. Despite his high status, Prince Dī is still listed last. He is not in all likelihood the leader of the plot; rather, a necessary accessory.
12DJ claims (though some commentators deny) that Yuán Sywān had earlier made Syā ruler of Wēi. I here intentionally avoid DJ stories, and infer from CC evidence alone.
13Instances are Jāu 21:3 and Dīng 13:6.
Here and above, it may seem that the CC is concerned to identify the person chiefly responsible for a revolt, or the chief target among several victims. This easily leads to the thought that these distinctions are guilt judgements, and this in turn can lead to the “praise and blame” theory of the CC. The following examples implicitly argue against that inference.

**Flight.** Fleeing from State A to State B is common in Spring and Autumn. We know of no punishments in B for crimes committed in A. On the contrary, refugees often did well in their new setting. The Tyên family, who became the ruling house of Chî, had been refugees from Chvîn; the Kûngs of Lû were refugees from Sung. In most CC instances where more than one person flees from one state to another, no ji appears. An exception is:

齊國夏及高張來奔 “Gwô Syâ 及 Gâu Jâng fled to us.” (Ai 6:4)

There is no rank difference. Both men are of important Chî families. But we can infer from the CC evidence that Gwô Syâ is the more important figure of the two: he is mentioned in four previous CC passages; Gâu Jâng in only two.

It will be useful to repeat here an earlier example:

莒牟奭以牟婁及防，茲來奔 “…Môu-yî of Jyû came as a refugee, bringing with him Môu-lou 及 Fang [and] Dz.” (Jâu 5:4)

It is likely that Lû, which was not a large state, welcomed both men in the previous example, and all three towns here. In effect, they increased the strength of Lû by deserting to it as they did. No disparagement of items listed after jî seems intended. We see rather an interest in priority: who is the big fish; which are the ancillary towns. It is hard to imagine a later moralist focusing on such matters. But the Lû officers in charge of new arrivals would have found it convenient to know.

**Wallings.** Most entries record the walling of only one town. When two towns are involved, the form is always 城 A 及 B; simple juxtaposition (城 A B) never occurs. No CC evidence suggests a special situation in any of these cases, and we may assume that the towns are here listed in order of priority, the sense of jî being “A and then B.” Those in charge of the walling expedition would have known to attend to “A” first. The idea of a secondarity marker seems to apply here unproblematically.

---

14 Instances are Jâu 20:4, 22:2, and 26:7.
15 Ding 4:2, 7:7, and 8:6; Ai 3:1. On three occasions, he leads the Chî army; two of them (Ding 7:7 and 8:6) against Lû.
17 GYJ says that the 及 in Jâu 5:4 distinguishes the refugee’s “own” city from others. GLJ sees the distinction as one of size, the later named cities being smaller. I doubt that there is independent evidence of this, but both suggestions are along the lines here proposed.
18 Wallings of two towns with jî occur at Jwâng 29:5, Wûn 12:8, and Ding 14:15. The case of two captured cities or land areas is analogous; see Ai 2:1, 8:3, and 8:7. Ai 8:7 records the restoration of two Lû towns whose loss was recorded in Ai 8:3. Their loss was undoubtedly regretted, and their restoration was undoubtedly welcome, but both entries have 及. The secondarity rule here proposed seems to apply in both cases.
Diplomacy

In the first or Lists category above, ji marked secondary involvement or lesser prominence. In the diplomatic area, ji also separates. But instead of separating items in a list, it seems to distance Lü politically from the action described, for such reasons as protocol irregularity, conflicting alliance obligations, or external compulsion.

Meetings. Formal meetings of rulers or their delegates are called hwèi 会. With meetings of states which do not include Lü, we have the following patterns:

蔡侯，鄭伯會于飡 “N [Name] / N met in P [Place]” (Hwán 2:6)

單伯會齊侯，宋公，衛侯，鄭伯于郾 “N met with N / N in P” (Jwān 14:4)
The first form is normal for non-Lü meetings; hwèi (at the end) is intransitive. The second, with hwèi following the first name and thus transitive, is unique in non-Lü reports. Earlier, Chí, Chvn, and Tsáu had attacked Sùng; Shàn-bwó (acting for Jóu) later joined in the attack. Between that event and this, a drastic redirection of policy had occurred. The new line was to drop local enmities and unite the northern states (including Jvng, which had not attacked Sùng) against the Chí threat. It is reasonable to think that this policy initiative came from Jóu, and that Shàn-bwó’s “transitive” grammatical position reflects that initiative.19

When Lü is involved, it is regularly mentioned first, and the form of the entry is the second one given above, thus:

公會齊侯，鄭伯于中丘 “[Lü] met with N / N in P” (Yǐn 10:1)
The form 魯公 never appears, being always reduced to 公. The exceptions to Lü-first order are cases where the Lü prince is outside his territory, and where the local ruler is thus naturally the host or initiator:

衛侯會公于昔 “N met with [Lü] in P” (Wvn 13:6)

Coverbs occur with main verb hwèi in three odd situations. One of them is:

[Lu] with the Lord of Jín, the Prince of Sùng, [and others] met with Wú at Jā” (Syān 10:1)
The second hwèi must be the main verb, so the first can only be a coverb.20 Wú was a new and non-Sinitic member of the Spring and Autumn community of states. As such, it may not have been wholly welcome; it is thus notable that the state name alone appears here, with no ruler title. One gets a sense of solidarity among the first group, but the overall situation still seems sufficiently amicable.21

19 The DJ claims that at this meeting Jóu conferred the bà mandate on the Lord of Chí. I believe that this overreads and politically reinterprets the situation; see Brooks Hegemon.

20 This example establishes the existence of a coverb hwèi. It cannot mean “met with” since the meeting proper is the one with Wú, denoted by the final hwèi. The meaning of coverb hwèi, in contrast to ji, is apparently conjunctive: “with, together with.” It was noted above that coverb ji occurs 94 times in the CC. The figure for coverb hwèi is 87 times.

21 Wú at this time was apparently not organized along Sinitic lines. Other cases of coverb hwèi in the same entry as verbal hwèi also involve Wú: Chvng 15:12, Syān 14:1. I infer that the Sinitic states as a group were culturally uncomfortable with this situation.
Sentences with 公 “the Prince [of Lù]” as first in a list of names need a following coverb. That coverb may be hwèt 會, which seems to preserve the amicable sense of verbal hwè; or jí 及, which overrides that implication by suggesting reluctance on Lù’s part. Hwèt (85 times) is the more common usage; jí (2 times) is very rare. One of the two instances of jí is:

公及齊侯，宋公・・・會王世子于會稽 止 “[Lù] 及 the Lord of Chí, the Prince of Sung, [and others] met with the King’s Heir in P” (Syī 5:4)

Presumably a Jōu succession dispute is involved. The parties covenant in the next CC entry. The entry after that notes that the Jyīng ruler had left without joining the covenant; his reluctance is overt. Lù, with its special relation to Jōu, probably disliked meddling in Jōu politics, however urgent the situation. Hence, I suggest, its joining the other states, but with reservations. The other instance is:

公及夫人義氏會齊侯于陽駟 “The [Lù] Prince 及 his Lady Jyāng-shē met with the Lord of Chí in P” (Syī 11:2)

We know nothing about this meeting. It may have been ordered by the Lady’s father, the Lord of Chí in question; Yáng-gū is in Chí. In the absence of other information, a nuance of reluctance, carried by jí, seems at least not implausible.

A case of jí separating an object series is relevant to this point:

公會齊侯及吳子于黃池 “The [Lù] Prince met with the Lord of Jīn 及 the Master of Wū in P” (Aī 13:3)

Jí in this entry seems to be more than a secondarity marker. This occasion is the first time that the CC gives to the ruler of Wū a title on the model of those used by rulers of the older Sinitic states. In previous meetings it was called simply “Wū,” a usage normally reserved for unorganized tribes like the Rǔŋg 戎. The implication is that Wū had now, in some sense, been taken into the Jōu system and its leader recognized as a ruler by the Jōu King; perhaps it was at this time that Wū was also granted the royal surname Jī 齊, the surname to which Lù itself had a genuine hereditary right. A Lù objection to meeting with Wū on this new basis of fictive kinship may provide the best explanation for the use of coverb jí here.

22 Perhaps for metrical reasons; monosyllabic 公 is somewhat awkward in a list which otherwise consists of polysyllabic names.
23 And DJ, for once, does not invent a story about it.
24 Du Yū sees impropriety in the lady traveling, but Spring and Autumn wives often visited their parents in other states. The irregularity is not for the wife to travel, but for the husband to accompany her. Something more than a parental visit is probably involved.
25 Compare n19, above. Wū was not of Jōu lineage; it did not even speak a Sinitic language. Von Falkenhausen Waning 538f notes “gradual convergence” of lower Yánggǔgǔ practices with Sinitic ones; political assimilation was “not yet complete at the end of the Spring and Autumn period.” A Chvůn officer in LY *7:31 is made to accuse Lù Jāu-gūng of marrying a wife from consanguineous Wū. It may be that in Jāu-gūng’s time (two reigns before this CC passage) Wū was not yet even nominally consanguineous. This fact might easily have been forgotten by the time LY *7:31 was written (c0342; see Brooks Analects 86).
Informal Meetings. In contrast to the formal hwèi会, there are less formal, even casual, encounters: yw遇见. The CC attests awkward circumstances for some of them, but the informality itself seems to have been objectionable, and such meetings vanish altogether from the latter part of the CC. An example:

公及宋公通于淮 ‘The [Lû] Prince 及 the Prince of Sûng met informally in P’
(Yîn 4:3)

Chîng 淮 was in Wèi, and the previous CC entry notes the murder of the Wèi ruler. The next CC entry records a joint attack on Jîng in which Sûng, but not Lû, took part; later, a Lû army did join in the attack. Haste and/or reluctance are implied.

Covenants, 明盟, are the core of CC diplomacy; its most formal feature. Juxtaposition of members in a list is possible in certain sentence forms, but when a list begins with 公, a coverb, either hwèi or jí, must follow. Of 105 covenants, 32 use the jí option. Here is a normal example, with hwèi rather than jí:

公會鄭伯盟于武父 ‘The [Lû] Prince covenanted with the Elder of Jîng in P’
(Hwán 12:7)

This followed fruitless meetings (no final covenant) with Sûng. Next month, Lû and Jîng together attacked Sûng. Of the two neighbors, Lû had sided with Jîng. The covenant with Jîng is thus amicable, hence coverb hwèi. When jí appears, the CC often suggests a context of difficult or strained relations. Two examples:

公及齊侯盟于數 ‘The [Lû] Prince 及 the Lord of Chî covenanted in P’ (Wîn 17:3)

This directly follows a Chî attack “on our northern border.” The covenant was presumably forced on Lû by Chî. Jí here could well be called an enmity marker.

叔孫州仇，仲孫何忌及鄭子盟于句譜 ‘Shùsûn Jîu-chyôu and Jûngsûn Hî-jî [of Lû] 及 the Master of Jî covenanted in P’ (Ai 2:1)

Here, jí is an enmity marker in the other direction. These two Lû officers had led an attack on Jû and taken land from it; the covenant was to ratify this seizure. Lû at this time was in a state of expansionist hostility toward its smaller neighbor.

Suppressed Subject. Parallel with the hwèi/jí option, and overlapping with it, is this separate device: an initial 公 is sometimes omitted and left implicit. The effect of this verbal gesture is something like abstention: the Lû Prince is present, and thus accepts the covenant, but he does not acknowledge his presence, and thus puts on record a degree of personal discomfort with the proceedings.

26Legge (at Yîn 4:2) argues that yw遇见 are as formal as hwèi会. I cannot agree.
27There are in all 8 such meetings; the last is at Syì 14:2 (from the year 0646). Syì-gûng’s reign was a time of profound change for Lû, and for all the northern states, which were brought together under the leadership of Jîn to resist the territorial incursions of Chû.
28The other yw meetings, all with coverb jí, are Jwàng 23:6 and 30:6, and Syì 14:2. In Hwán 10:3 yw seems to contrast with hwèi as “in person” or “privately.”
29Thus also Jû Kwàng 敦属 (contra GYJ, which believes that an officer is sometimes implied when no subject is given), quoted with approval at Legge 104.
Of 9 covenants in which the subject 公 is suppressed, 5 follow a visit pin 聘 by an officer sent to Lū. Pin are ostensibly good-will missions, and doing other business in connection with them may have been against protocol, and thus a ground for Lū discomfort, even if the covenant itself was acceptable to Lū.

Covenants were usually made at locations between the respective capitals. Lū had joined in many such multilateral covenants which included Jin. But a group of bilateral covenants with Jin, made in the Jin capital, imply irregularities. In the first (Wvn 2:3), the Jin ruler is a minor, and Chū-fù represents Jin. The Lū ruler’s trip to Jin is not recorded, and 公 is suppressed in the covenant entry. These denials of presence may be seen as implying resentment of protocol irregularity.

CC protects the honor of its ruler. This is part of a larger practice: defeats of armies led by the ruler of any state are not attributed to the ruler of that state. A Lū example:

我師敗績 “Our host was disgracefully defeated” (Jwāng 9:5)
The entry for the battle itself, immediately preceding, also omits the ruler’s title:

及齊師敗于乾時 “[The Prince] fought with the Chī host at P” (Jwāng 9:5)

These omitted 公 are subsumed in that convention. It may help to separate the omission of 公 from the occurrence of 及. The chronologically first instance is:

會齊侯，宋公，衛侯，魯伯，許男，晉伯，鄭子，同盟于幽 “[The Lū Prince] together with the Lord of Chī . . . and the Master of Tʻung made a covenant of common cause in You” (Jwāng 16:4)
The purpose was to unite against Chū, which had invaded border state Tsā and attacked northern Jvāng. The danger was obvious, and the lack of ji implies policy agreement. But the Chī ruler was Hwān-gūng, and Lū had earlier supported a rival for the Chī throne. Some personal embarrassment might thus have lingered.

The sense of suppressed 公 in these examples, I would suggest, is not a dissent about power politics; that was the world into which the Sinitic states were moving, but one at which they had not arrived. It is rather a scruple arising from an older code, including the ideal of keeping faith, of being reliable whether as friend or as foe.

That code was undoubtedly fading, but it could still exert pressure. Here are two examples of its presence, both from the reign of Syī-gūng:

Syī 19:6 (no 公) is the first covenant to include Lū’s old enemy Chū; this might have been personally awkward for a ruler not yet accustomed to shifting alliances.

30 GYJ and/or GLJ supply 公 in some of them. I reject these as normalizing variants.
31 Chvng 3:14, 3:15, and 11.2; Syāng 7:7 and 15:1.
32 I partly coincide with the DJ view (Legge 233), that the Lū ruler’s treatment in Jin was humiliating. In the other bilateral covenants with Jin (Wvn 3:6 and 13:8; Syāng 3:3), the trip to Jin is recorded, the subject 公 is mentioned, and the other party is the Jin ruler. All four of these entries use coverb ji, presumably to indicate discontent with Jin policy.
33 For this cluster of conventions in the CC, see Brooks Defeat.
34 There is a check on this interpretation. Eleven years later, after Chī and Lū had gotten on more normal terms, the same major participants make a covenant of common cause in the same place; this time the subject 公 appears in the CC entry (Jwāng 27:2).
Distancing Jí in the Chūn/Chyōu

Syī 29:3 (no 亜) largely duplicates the roster of a previous covenant (Syī 28:8), but here the Jōu King is also represented and Jvng is absent; the other parties are officers, not rulers as before. A diminution of ceremony is manifest.35 The Lū ruler may also have felt awkward about a pact which excluded previous member Jvng, Lū’s sometime ally, and which seems indeed to have been aimed at Jvng.36

War and Peace

In this third category, we reach the strongest version of the jí nuance: outright antagonism. Here, jí does not link members of a team, but divides allies from enemies. 

Battles. The sentence verb is the intransitive jàn 職. Battles are rare in the CC, accounting for only 4% of all military actions. In battle reports, jí normally separates the allied combatants from their enemies, and in effect means “against;” thus:

季孫行父、臧孫許粉丝 使師會晉郤克，衛孫良父hazi 及齊侯戰于鞌
“Jisūn Hángfǔ, Dzângsūn Syī... led the host and with [會] Syī K'v of Jìn, Sūn Lyâng-fú of Wèi... fought against [及] the Lord of Chí at An” (Chûng 2:3)

Here the Lū leaders are plural, and their allies (marked by coverb hwe安) are also plural; only the opponent (separated from the preceding by coverb jí) is singular. Other examples, such as Hwán 13:1, show that the enemy list may be plural also.

Entries for battles fought between non-Lū parties also normally37 mark the enemy side with jí. Here, Wèi takes on a Chí army which had invaded it:

衞人及齊人戰 "A Wèi officer fought against [及] a Chí officer” (Jwâng 28:1)

It may well be that the sympathies of Lū were with Wèi.38

Joint Expeditions. It is not until halfway through the CC text that the DJ proposes a rule about the use of coverbs jí and hwe安. This is in connection with:

公會齊侯伐萊 "The [Lű] Prince together with the Lord of Chí attacked Lâu” (Sywēn 7:2)

---

35Legge 214 stigmatizes as “ridiculous” Hú A-nil-gwó’s suggestion that the Lū ruler “is omitted in the text to conceal the disgrace of [his] meeting with his inferiors.” It is not ridiculous; it is a rather tempting hypothesis. In the end, it fails because it cannot be extended to all cases where the other co-covenanting parties are officers (亜).

36Of the northern states, Jvng was the most friendly to Chū. In Syī 30:4, it is attacked by Jìn and Chí. Lū may not have denied the need, but will have regretted the duplicity.

37The sole exception is 晉人、楚人戰于河曲 (Wén 12:7). In a slightly earlier entry (Wén 7:6) the same adversaries fight, this time with jí. Legge reports the Kâng-syī editors as finding “the simple 亜 condemnatory of both the hostile states, especially as there is no 及 between the parties.” This is to read the presence of 及 in precisely the opposite sense to the one I here propose. I do not think that the CC evidence will bear this reading. The 亜 indicates armies not led by their rulers. I can only suggest that in this particular case, Lű found itself indifferent about the outcome of an admittedly distant battle.

38Notwithstanding the DJ theory that Chí was acting under orders from the Jōu King, and that Lű naturally supported that mandate. This is part of the DJ idea of a bà system, which, as I have shown elsewhere (Brooks Hegemon), is largely an invention of the DJ.
The DJ claims that the term “hwêi” implies that Lû had not been a party in planning the expedition. In its view, the marker for planning is 及, and for its absence, 併. Legge says the Kâng-syî editors “accept this canon with minor reservations.” But the tendency early in the CC is for enterprises to be planned at a separate meeting (hwêi) before the actual excursion. In later times, as here, that meeting is often waived, and the parties simply gather for the attack. Second, as noted above, in sentences beginning with 公, some coverb is required, and 及 and 併 are the only options. The DJ rule makes 併 the “marked” member of this pair. CC evidence suggests the opposite: that 及 is the default option, whereas 及, when used, has a special nuance. 

Peace. Peacemaking (平平) is sometimes a transaction imposed on previously hostile parties, and it is not surprising to find that these cases also use jì:

併人及併人平 “An officer of Sûng made peace with an officer of Chû” (Sywên 15:2)  

These jì too seem to be enmity markers, a usage which we have encountered in the diplomatic category, but which is also common in entries reporting war or peace.

Change Over Time

The conclusions reached above may be summarized thus: coverb jì is a secondarity marker intensified by context, acquiring a nuance of reluctance verging on enmity in diplomatic contexts, and of open enmity in military and peace-making contexts.

There is a certain development over the course of the CC, not in the behavior of jì, but in the relative frequency of the categories displaying it. In the last two CC reigns, diplomacy largely breaks down, war is more common, the personal honor ethos reflected in the CC treatment of the Lû ruler weakens, and the CC entries give more non-personal detail. These changes lead to a higher proportion of instances in the basic first category, where jì has its mildest nuance, and in the military third, where its nuance is strongest, but where the presence of jì is virtually mandatory, so that the nuance can be attributed to the sentence rather than the word. If we had data only from those last two reigns, it would be very difficult to reach the above conclusions about coverb jì. It would seem in that case rather to be at most a mild secondarity marker, which added little to the implications of the order of listing.

Further evolution of usage along these lines will bring us eventually to a point where coverb jì does not contrast strongly with the other “and” words. From that point, the GYJ statement listing jì as a synonym for “and” becomes increasingly reasonable, and differences of opinion about the nuances of jì become increasingly intelligible. The world of CC protocol sensibilities has been lost.

39Other cases are Ding 10:1 and 11:4, Aî 15:7. A special case is the abortive peace effort in Sywên 4:1 (公及齊侯平及斬，斬人不聞)， where we must interpret “Lû together with Chî [reluctantly, since three years earlier Chî had taken land from Lû, hence the first 及] attempted to make peace between Jywê and Tán [these being at odds, hence the second 及], but Jywê was unwilling.” The refusal was punished by Lû, which attacked Jywê and took Syâng. Lû sided with Tán since a Lû daughter had married into Tán.
As Carine Defoort has pointed out, the information in the CC is limited. But what information the CC does contain consistently supports the inference, not incompatible with her conclusion, that valuational words do exist in the CC, but that the values in question are those of the Lû court of the time, not those of Confucius or any other later moralist.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Diplomatic</th>
<th>War/Peace</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0661</td>
<td>Mín 1:4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>succession turmoil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0661</td>
<td>Syǐ 4:5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>initiative of allies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0656</td>
<td>Syǐ 5:4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>succession problem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0650</td>
<td>Syǐ 10:3*</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>murder of ruler and officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0649</td>
<td>Syǐ 11:2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>protocol irregularity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0646</td>
<td>Syǐ 14:2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>protocol irregularity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0645</td>
<td>Syǐ 15:3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>initiative of allies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0645</td>
<td>Syǐ 15:12*</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>opponent in battle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0642</td>
<td>Syǐ 18:3*</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>opponent in battle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0638</td>
<td>Syǐ 22:3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>opponent in battle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0638</td>
<td>Syǐ 22:4*</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>opponent in battle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0634</td>
<td>[Syǐ 26:2 – sole instance of verbal]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0632</td>
<td>Syǐ 28:5*</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>opponent in battle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0630</td>
<td>Syǐ 30:3*</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>execution of second officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0628</td>
<td>Syǐ 32:3*</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>covenant after attack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0627</td>
<td>Syǐ 33:3*</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>military alliance w/ Rúng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0625</td>
<td>Wún 2:1*</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>opponent in battle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0625</td>
<td>Wún 2:3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>protocol irregularity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0624</td>
<td>Wún 3:6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>protocol irregularity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0620</td>
<td>Wún 7:6*</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>opponent in battle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0618</td>
<td>Wún 9:6*</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>execution of second officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0617</td>
<td>Wún 10:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0615</td>
<td>Wún 12:8</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>walling a second town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0614</td>
<td>Wún 13:8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>protocol irregularity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0611</td>
<td>Wún 16:1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>protocol: refusal to covenant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0611</td>
<td>Wún 16:1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>protocol: earlier refused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0610</td>
<td>Wún 17:3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>previously attacked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0607</td>
<td>Sywen 2:1*</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>opponent in battle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0605</td>
<td>Sywen 4:1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>previously attacked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0605</td>
<td>Sywen 4:1*</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>refusal of peace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0604</td>
<td>Sywen 5:5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>protocol irregularity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0597</td>
<td>Sywen 12:3*</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>opponent in battle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0594</td>
<td>Sywen 15:2*</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>enforced peace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0593</td>
<td>Sywen 16:1*</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>extinguished a second tribe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0590</td>
<td>Chưng 1:5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>forthcoming attack?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0589</td>
<td>Chưng 2:2*</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>opponent in battle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0589</td>
<td>Chưng 2:3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>opponent in battle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0589</td>
<td>Chưng 2:4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>covenant with defeated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0589</td>
<td>Chưng 2:10</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>covenant with former enemy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0588</td>
<td>Chưng 3:14</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>protocol irregularity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0588</td>
<td>Chưng 3:15</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>protocol irregularity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0580</td>
<td>Chưng 11:2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>protocol irregularity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0575</td>
<td>Chưng 16:6*</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>opponent in battle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0575</td>
<td>Chưng 16:4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>after seizure of officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0570</td>
<td>Syăng 3:3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>protocol irregularity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0570</td>
<td>Syăng 3:7</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>initiative of allies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0570</td>
<td>Syăng 3:7</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>covenant with turncoat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0566</td>
<td>Syăng 7:7</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>protocol irregularity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0558</td>
<td>Syăng 15:1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>protocol irregularity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Year** | **Basic** | **Diplomatic** | **War/Peace** | **Comment**
---|---|---|---|---
0550 | **Syăng 23:** | | | S execution of second officer
0546 | Syăng 27:5 | | | R initiative of allies
0537 | **Jâu 5:** | | | S flees with additional towns
0535 | | **Jâu 7:** | | E peace after attack
0525 | | | **Jâu 17:** | E opponent in battle
0508 | **Ding 2:** | | | S fire in gate and towers
0508 | **Ding 2:** | | | S rebuild gate and towers
0506 | Ding 3:5 | | | R father just buried (3:4)
0506 | Ding 4:4 | | | R policy disagreement
0500 | Ding 4:14 | | | E opponent in battle
0499 | Ding 10:1 | | | E enforced peace
0499 | Ding 11:1 | | | S flight with other officers
0496 | Ding 11:4 | | | E enforced peace
0493 | **AÎ 2:** | | | S walling of second city
0493 | **AÎ 2:** | | | S another tract of land
0493 | | | **AÎ 2:** | E enforced covenant
0489 | **AÎ 6:** | | | E opponent in battle
0487 | **AÎ 8:** | | | S flight of second officer
0487 | | | **AÎ 8:** | S taking of second town
0482 | | | **AÎ 11:** | E opponent in battle
0480 | | | | R non-Sinitic state
| **Tot** | **18** (19%) | **51** (54%) | **25** (27%) | **= 94** (100%)
| **Tot** | **1** | | **1** | **= 2**
| **Both** | **19** | | **51** | **26** | **= 96**
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