

## 9. Enfiefment

The Jōu dynasty came to an end in 0771, when its northwestern homeland was overrun by rude tribes of the area. In 0770, under King Píng 平, a remnant of Jōu moved, or was moved, to the old Jōu eastern capital on the Lwò River. Jōu power had gone, Jōu hegemony had gone, and a new age had begun.

It would be convenient if the Chūn/Chyōu 春秋 (“Spring and Autumn”), the chronicle of Lǚ, began at the year 0770 and carried us all the way. This it does not do.<sup>1</sup> Despite this documentation gap, it is nevertheless of interest to ask: Now that the Jōu hegemony, with landed warriors pledged to military service, has ended, what formalities of that period, if any, survive into the new age?

In the old system, as we know from some inscriptions,<sup>2</sup> it was the custom, when a landholder died, for his son to be confirmed in possession by a renewal of the grant to his father: a re-enfiefment. Did this custom survive, as between Lǚ and Jōu? Apparently it did: successive Lǚ rulers *were* re-enfiefed (given a mandate 命 to rule their territory) – but only if the succession was legitimate; that is, if the rulership had passed to the oldest son of the ruler’s wife.

The occasions when this standard was met in Lǚ number exactly three. Here are the posthumous titles of the twelve CC rulers, their reign dates, and whether they received a formal renewal of mandate 命 from Jōu, along with factors that might have disqualified a new ruler from formal recognition by Jōu:

1. Yǐn	0722-0712	son of concubine (lower-ranking wife)	
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. Wún	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 <sup>3</sup>	
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	

<sup>1</sup>For what it *does* do, see **Beginning**.

<sup>2</sup>Personal communication, Gilbert L Mattos, 2003.

<sup>3</sup>Syāng-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.

The usual view of Aī-gūng (Dzwo Jwàn, Gūngyáng, Lù Dv-míng, Legge) is that he was the son of Dìng-gūng's wife. But she is not styled fū-rv́n 夫人 in the entry for her death (11/15:9, where she is instead Lady S̄ 姒氏), and is not styled syǎu-jywn 小君 at her burial (Dìng 15:14, where she is Dìng S̄ 定姒). On this CC evidence, we therefore conclude that she was a concubine.

As to Aī-gūng's age, six years pass before he does anything that gets recorded in the CC, though at that point he is vigorous enough: meeting with Wú (12/7:3), attacking Jū 郟, and capturing its ruler (12/7:4). It may also have been in this year that, as we have elsewhere suggested, Aī-gūng resumed the practice of Dìng-gūng in using Confucius as a source of civil personnel.<sup>4</sup>

The inference is that Aī-gūng did indeed come to the throne at an early age. But in the above list, it seems that youth is never the sole possible reason for nonrecognition by Jōu, and we accordingly hesitate to assume that it was relevant here either.



The wording of the first re-enfeignment entry (3/1:6) shows that no new mandate is being issued; rather, the previous mandate is being renewed:

- 0693 3/1:6 錫桓公命 bestowed [the previous ruler] Hwán-gūng's mandate<sup>5</sup>  
 0626 6/1:5 錫公命 bestowed the princely mandate"  
 0583 8/8:7 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. The difference in wording may be nothing more than a change in scribal convention. Presumably the old mandate was being renewed. The tokenism of the renewal procedure will be apparent to any modern reader. But it was evidently meaningful to those involved.

<sup>4</sup> Brooks **Analects** 284. But no ruler is disqualified solely by youth; see above.

<sup>5</sup> It is the characters 桓公命 "Hwán-gūng's mandate" that appear in the rather battered fragment of the Hàn stone classics, above.

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?

- 0693 3/1:6 王 sent 榮叔 [a third son of the Rúng clan; no formal rank]  
 0626 6/1:5 天王 sent 毛伯 “The Elder of Máu” [a Jōu fiefholder]  
 0583 8/8:7 天王 sent 召伯 “The Elder of Shàu” [a Jōu fiefholder]

These differences of term (王 in 3/1:6 is less grand), status (only the last two envoys have 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 two envoys are titled. The sending of a low level envoy may have caused offense in Lǚ, thus prompting an answering snub.<sup>6</sup> As for the reason for 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 (2/15:1).

The reason for the late embassy to Chǔng-gūng (in his 8th year) is a puzzle, on which it may be best not to speculate. What does seem to come through more generally, in the details here considered, is that Jōu Kings and Lǚ Princes had a precise 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.<sup>7</sup> However that may come out, the data here examined seem to prove a continuing reality in the feudal relationship between Jōu and Lǚ, a relationship which we might have expected would end after 0771, but evidently did not.

It should be noted that though the form of re-enfiefment was gone through, between Lǚ and Jōu, the substance had vanished. If we are correct in finding that military age was not, in Jōu eyes, a requirement for the renewal of the mandate, it can only mean that Jōu did not in fact look to the new ruler for military service. We may be all the more strongly reminded that for all its concern with realities, the Spring and Autumn world attached great importance to question of form, and in these examples in particular, displays an exquisite sense of gradations of proper form.

<sup>6</sup>A different Rúng Shú appears in 6/5:1 (0622) bringing funeral gifts; again, the donor is listed as 王, not 天王. A Jōu snub may have been intended, since the deceased on that occasion was a concubine, not a wife. When burial gifts were brought by Steward Sywǎn 宰囑, a person of rank, in 1/1:4 (0722), the donor appears as 天王.

<sup>7</sup>For the Lǚ court’s extreme sensitivity to protocol slights, see **Nuances**.

Jìn, when after 0632 it asserted the right to act for the Jōu King, did request military service from Lǚ. But throughout the entire Spring and Autumn period, Jōu itself never made such a request. The Jōu military service system had thus passed away; only the ritual shell remained.<sup>8</sup> The fact that an underage ruler could easily be manipulated by factions near the throne, and thus that a child ruler imperiled the continuity of policy, was seemingly not a concern of Jōu when deciding whether to extend, or withhold, formal mandate renewal. It was reduced to considerations of form and legitimacy.

Jōu's options in the case of an illegitimate heir were limited to withholding formal approval: it lacked the power to reassign the fief to another tenant. This is to say that "fief" is no longer the right term for Lǚ and its post-Jōu rivals. Possibly before 0771, but assuredly after that year, they had become "states" – in charge of their own affairs and responsible for their own defense.

---

*The Spring and Autumn states are thus a potentially valuable example for comparative history – an example of what can happen to a hegemonic system when it is cut loose from its hegemonic moorings, and develops on its own. The answer here is that it takes some hegemonic reflexes and sensibilities with it. It was in all probability those reflexes and those sensibilities, the model of overlordship rather than equality among states, which shaped later thinking, and drove the policies of the several states toward reinstating a hegemony, rather than evolving toward mutual recognition and co-existence.*

*It is good to be reminded that not all Spring and Autumn customs were new. On the contrary, some went back to the not entirely superseded days of Jōu.*

<sup>8</sup>We have seen that within its own modest domain, Jōu did have fiefholders. Two of them we have met: the "Elder of Máu" and the "Elder of Shàu" who served as envoys to Lǚ in 0626 and 0583. But these fiefs are only within the small Royal domain on the Lwò River. The system of powerful fiefs extending over the entire Sinitic world, of which Lù was one member, had passed away.