When the Reader Became the Book: Eleventh Century Voices on the *Shiji*

Yangruxin Liu

劉陽汝鑫

Thesis submitted for the degree of PhD
in Chinese and Inner Asian Studies

2019

Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures

SOAS, University of London

Declaration for SOAS PhD thesis

I have read and understood Regulation 21 of the General and Admissions Regulations for students of the SOAS, University of London concerning plagiarism. I undertake that all the material presented for examination is my own work and has not been written for me, in whole or in part, by any other person. I also undertake that any quotation or paraphrase from the published or unpublished work of another person has been duly acknowledged in the work which I present for examination.

Signed: _____ Date: _____

Abstract

With a focus on eleventh century material pertaining to the *Shiji* 史記 (Scribes' Records), this dissertation investigates the synchronic and diachronic diversity of approaches to this text. Whereas research on the reception of the *Shiji* often regards criticism formulated by Song (960–1279) intellectuals as "misreadings" of the presumed "true" intentions of Sima Qian 司馬遷 (c. 145–c. 85 BC), this study proposes an alternative perspective and reads eleventh century responses to the *Shiji* in light of contemporary (i.e. eleventh century) textual, intellectual, and socio-political environments, regarding them as appropriations of the *Shiji* situated in contemporary discourses.

This dissertation is divided into four main chapters. The first two chapters position the *Shiji* in a wider context. Chapter one focuses on the question of "Did the *Shiji* matter?" by discussing the *Shiji* in relation to other important texts and alternative sources of historical knowledge. Chapter two answers the question of "What was the problem?" with an emphasis on how the criticism of the *Shiji* was integrated in contemporary discourses and served specific aims. The last two chapters, each presenting a case study on the reception of one particular chapter of the *Shiji,* combine textual analysis and historical enquiries in emphasising the contexts of historical recipients of the *Shiji*. Chapter three discusses synchronic diversity of the appropriation of Jia Yi's 賈誼 (c. 200–169 BC) legacy transmitted in the *Shiji* and *Hanshu* 漢書 (Book of the Han). Chapter four investigates Su Zhe's 蘇轍 (1039–1112) protest to the portrayal of Confucius in the *Shiji.*

Through the dynamic picture explored in the abovementioned four chapters, this dissertation argues that the value of historical readings of the *Shiji* goes far beyond the question of whether they are up to modern standards. The abundance of historical readings represents valuable testimony to the ways readers read themselves into their texts, hence shedding light on various modes of interactions between the human and textual world.

Acknowledgements

Looking back at my academic journey over the past years at SOAS, I see many teachers, friends and colleagues who helped me along.

From the very beginning of this project, my main supervisor Professor Bernhard Fuehrer provided most generous support and was a great source of advice and inspiration. He tirelessly encouraged me to venture out of the traditional realm of Sinology and to think about how to relate my study to a wider intellectual landscape. Without his patient determination, I would not have been able to enjoy as much pleasure of seeing intellectual paths of different cultures cross in the vast span of human history.

My supervisors Professor Andrew Lo and Professor Tian Yuan Tan have also generously lent their expertise to me and widened my horizons. I also owe much to my supervisor Dr Andrea Janku, who kindly read through my immature drafts with great patience and challenged me with her thoughtful comments. I also benefited enormously from highly productive discussions with Professor Joachim Gentz and Professor Hans van Ess. They both provided tremendously helpful and detailed suggestions for the final draft of this dissertation.

I extend my thanks to the participants of our Pre-modern Chinese Reading Group at SOAS, where I received much appreciated help with my translations and had truly enjoyable excursions into texts on which my fellow colleagues worked. Particular thanks go to Connor Judge and Eleanor Lipsey, both of whom read my various drafts over the years and never failed to spot weaknesses in my writing.

Finally, it is beyond words to express my gratitude to my parents. This dissertation would not have been possible without their support.

Table of Contents

Introduction

> [E]very word, when once it is written, is bandied about, alike among those who understand and those who have no interest in it, and it know not to whom to speak or not to speak; when ill-treated or unjustly reviled it always needs its father to help it; for it has no power to protect or help itself.
>
> ── Plato (428/7–348/7 BC)[1]

Among all the paths to the history of ancient China, the *Shiji* 史記 (Scribes' Records) is one of the most indispensable texts. It can be acclaimed as the first Chinese world history (as the authors might well have perceived it). It became the first of the so-called "standard histories" (*zhengshi* 正史) and a celebrated exemplar of literary style. Above all, it tells good stories. For these reasons, the *Shiji* is treated in innumerable publications, which offer a wide range of suggestions on how to read it, how to appreciate it and how to interpret it. Yet, the reading suggestions are sometimes divergent or even contradictory. More intriguingly, the divergence between reading suggestions does not necessarily mean that one is better than others. They may all have reasonable grounds and make good sense within the discourses in which each of them is located. Overviewing the readings accumulated throughout the two millennia after the compilation of the *Shiji,* we are confronted with an even more diverse reservoir that consists of readings that were once informed by and catered for discourses with which we are now unfamiliar. The coexistence of divergent yet justifiable readings prompts a scrutiny of the context that produces these readings, and it is the aim of the current study to show how the reading of the *Shiji* was circumscribed by and integrated into a wider discourse in a particular historical period. Meanwhile, my enquiries into the reception of this particular text constitute

[1] From Plato's *Phaedrus* 275E, see Plato and Fowler (transl.), *Phaedrus,* 565–67.

an exploration of reading as a sociocultural phenomenon that plays a crucial role in the transmission, production and renewal of knowledge in the course of human history.

Towards a Reception History

Wallace Stevens' (1879–1955) poem "The House was Quiet and the World Was Calm," to which my thesis title alludes,[2] depicts the moment when a reader was completely immersed in the written world and captures the psychological phenomenon that takes place when one reads and tries to engage with the book. I would underline that this encounter between a book and its reader is not a process in which the former informs the latter (of a fact, of a story, of a belief, etc.). It is more like a dialogue between the two, where the book offers something and the reader decides whether to accept it. Bearing that in mind, we may then ask: Did the reader really become the book? Or, is the book that the reader takes away after reading the same as the book that was originally read? In the end, it is not the book itself, but the reader's understanding of it that constitutes his/her beliefs and worldview that serve as guidance of his/her practice in life. This is one of the reasons why reception studies are beneficial to our understanding of history.

Since the expression "reception" was raised to a central term in the 1960s, reception theory has brought attention to the significant role of the reader and stimulated investigations into the gaps between the situations of a source and its recipient. Viewing a source as a stimulus that is subjected to reproduction, adoption, renewal, modification as well as rejection, the perspective of reception provides insights to the process of how recipients appropriate a source of various forms, scales and degree of complexity, ranging from a text to a culture.[3] Reception studies came to be a growing field in academia, illuminating what might have been perceived as

[2] See Stevens, *Collected Poems of Wallace Stevens*, 358–359.

[3] For a survey of the concept and different modes of reception, see Cancik and Mohr, "Reception, Modes of."

"misunderstandings" and recognising the rejection of and deviation from a given stimulus as an integral part of communication.

Regarding the prevailing historicist approaches in classical studies, Charles Martindale advocates the perspective of reception:

> A poem is, from one point of view, a social event in history, as is any public response to it. But we also need to avoid privileging history over the other element in Jauss's model, the present moment in which the text is experienced, received, partly aesthetically (though that moment too is always potentially subject to historicisation). If we respect both elements, our interpretations can become "critical," self-aware, recognising our self-implication, but they will not thereby (necessarily) stand forever. History, as Duncan Kennedy well puts it, "is as much about eventuation as it is about original context;" and he continues "that is what 'Reception Studies' seeks to capture, and what the model of historicism prevalent in classical studies, with its recuperation of the notion of 'reception' for an original audience, seeks to eschew."[4]

This passage elucidates the value and limitation of reception studies, and we may extend the statement to reception studies of any text other than a poem. To study the reception of a text is to bring to consciousness that the interpretation of it is inevitably circumscribed by the situations of the interpreter. There is controversy on whether reception studies can ever help us to strip away cultural accretions that inform our interpretations of ancient texts, but it is undeniable that they provide an intellectual device that can calibrate our verdicts on a given interpretation, be it by a historical or contemporary interpreter. In essence, the focus of reception studies is not about evaluating whether a recipient understands a stimulus "correctly" but about reconstructing the eventuation of meaning and the reasons why the stimulus is received in a particular way.

In Sinological scholarship, text-based studies also witness the predominance of historicist approaches. When it comes to the *Shiji,* material pertaining to its early receptions during the Han times (221 BC–206 AD) attracts much more scholarly attention than later receptions, for it sustains reconstruction and historicisation of the formative stage of the *Shiji* (e.g. its

[4] Martindale, "Thinking Through Reception," 5.

compilation, sources, early transmission and interpolations, etc.) and the life of its putative author Sima Qian 司馬遷 (c. 145–c. 85 BC).[5] In his magisterial introduction to his translations from the *Shiji,* Édouard Chavannes (1865–1918) devoted an entire chapter, entitled "Fortune des Mémoires historiques," to a historical outline of the editorial history of the text, including early interpolations, major commentaries, and critiques.[6] A similar effort was made by William Nienhauser in the short section "The Reception of the *Shiji*" in his introduction to the first volume of *The Grand Scribe's Records.*[7] Building on Chavannes, Timoteus Pokora (1928–1985) and modern Chinese scholarship, Nienhauser discusses key events in the editorial history of the text and provides an overview of translations from the *Shiji*.[8]

Yet, what can be (re)examined in light of reception studies would go far beyond these outlines and include all types of writings pertaining to the *Shiji,* ranging from commentaries (which have attracted more attention than others), notes, essays, memorials, creative adaptions into various literary genres, etc. Though we observe a keen interest in Han period reception of the *Shiji*, one might hope for a wider and more in-depth scholarly engagement with later layers of the history of *Shiji* receptions.[9] If one looks at the entire massive body of material awaiting

[5] Scholars publishing extensively on such topic areas include Édouard Chavannes, Burton Watson, Stephen Durrant, Grant Hardy, Wai-Yee Li, Michael Nylan and Hans van Ess, just to name a few. Though not positioned in the framework of reception studies, their works are pertinent to the early reception of the *Shiji* and certainly deserve more attention than I can give them here. However, given the chosen focus on reception studies, I concentrate here on studies that are methodologically most relevant to my project and shall refer to works by abovementioned scholars where I touch upon more specific matters later on in this dissertation.

[6] See Chavannes, *Mémoires Historiques*, vol. 1, CXCVII–CCXXI.

[7] Nienhauser, *Scribe's Records*, vol. I, xii-xv. See also the section "Commentaries on the *Shih chi*" in the general bibliography in Nienhauser, *Scribe's Records,* vol. I, 215–217.

[8] See Pokora, "Present State of the Translations from the Shih chi," 154–173 and its later version "Bibliographies des Traductions du *Che ki*" in the posthumously published volume of Chavannes' *Mémoires Historiques,* vol. 6, 113–146.

[9] For studies that include later layers of reception, see, for example, Nienhauser, "Reexamination," 210–233 and L'Haridon, "Merchants in *Shiji*," esp. 179 and 181. The authors of both articles draw on historical readings to build their interpretations of specific chapters of the *Shiji,* and the context of the historical readings referred to is not their major concern.

exploration,[10] it is clear that studies in this field have only scratched the surface of the reception of the *Shiji.*

Esther Klein's PhD project "The History of a Historian: Perspectives on the Authorial Roles of Sima Qian" in 2010 is the first substantial engagement with historical reception of the *Shiji* in the West. She presents a trans-dynastic study from the Han to the Song dynasties, focusing on how readers of these periods thought about Sima Qian and his relation to the *Shiji*.[11] By highlighting the distance between the *Shiji* itself and later interpretations of it, she shows how later interpretations of the *Shiji* "are informed by their own historical circumstances and should not be treated as privileged, authoritative statements on the *Shiji*'s 'true nature.'"[12] With a focus on historical interpretations of Sima Qian's authorial role*,* Klein holds that Sima Qian, as all the characters depicted in the *Shiji*, had a dual existence: the historical person and the author that is manifested in the text he himself purportedly wrote.[13] For later interpreters, the former is practically inaccessible, and the latter has been taking different shapes in different minds and periods. Due to her focus on Sima Qian's authorial role, Klein's research leaves aside aspects of the reception of the *Shiji* as a text, and some of her conclusions in case studies remain debatable.[14] Nevertheless, she presents a fruitful exploration of the rich sources regarding historical reception of the *Shiji* and demonstrates a way forward in *Shiji* studies.

More efforts on the exploration of historical reception of the *Shiji* are made in Chinese academia. The study of the reception of the *Shiji* constitutes a branch of the wider scholarship on the *Shiji* and benefits in particular from research on the history of *Shiji* scholarship, i.e. *Shiji*

[10] See the next section on sources.

[11] Klein uses the term "author-function," which is inspired by Michel Foucault (1926-1984) and refers to Sima Qian as "a concept" that "depends as much on the contingent circumstances of its most influential interpreters as it does on facts about a single man who lived 2100 years ago;" see Klein, "History of a Historian," 2–3.

[12] Ibid., 2.

[13] Ibid., 483–484.

[14] See chapter two in this dissertation.

yanjiu shi 史記研究史. A milestone of the study of historical scholarship is the publication of *Shiji yanjiu shi lüe* 史記研究史略 (An Overview of the History of *Shiji* Studies) by Zhang Xinke 張新科 and Yu Zhanghua 俞樟華 in 1990.[15] Since then, they have published widely on historical scholarship on the *Shiji* and thus brought it to the attention of more scholars. Almost at the same time, Western hermeneutics and theories on reception aesthetics were introduced into Chinese academia and attracted the attention of scholars on both sides of the Taiwan straits. The term *jieshou* 接受 soon gained popularity as the Chinese take on "reception."[16] Consequently, scholars started to apply concepts and methodologies associated with this key term to the study of pre-modern texts, and the first projects on the reception of the *Shiji* came to fruition under the supervision of Yu Zhanghua and Zhang Xinke. So far, studies on *Shiji* receptions in all dynasties have come out as theses or monographs.[17]

The first output was *Tang Song Shiji jieshou shi* 唐宋《史記》接受史 (A Reception History of the *Shiji* during the Tang and Song), which combines two master theses, by Ying Chaohua 應朝華 and Yu Liming 虞黎明, both under Yu Zhanghua's supervision.[18] This book opens up avenues to the study of the reception of the *Shiji*, but its problematic aspects also leave their marks in reception studies that follow its publication. The first problem relates to

[15] It was reprinted in 2005 under the title *Shiji yanjiu shi* 史記研究史 (A History of *Shiji* Studies) in the series *Shiji yanjiu jicheng* 史記研究集成 (Collection of *Shiji* Studies).

[16] In the West, discussion of reception theory and its application kept on evolving after Hans Robert Jauss (1921-1997) first outlined his theory on *Rezeptionsästhetik* in the 1960s. The first Chinese publication on reception theory, *Jieshou meixue yu jieshou lilun* 接受美學與接受理論 (Reception Aesthetics and Reception Theory, published in 1987), provides a Chinese translation of a 1982 English translation of collected essays by Jauss under the title *Towards an Aesthetic of Reception* (translated from German by Timothy Bahti). Since then, translations of Jauss' works remain the most cited references in Chinese publications inspired by reception theory.

[17] All of these theses and monographs are finished under the supervision of Yu Zhanghua and Zhang Xinke with two exceptions, which are Wang Qi's 王齊 "*Shiji* zai Mingdai de chuanbo yu jieshou" 《史記》在明代的傳播與接受 (under the supervision of Guo Yingde 郭英德 at Beijing Normal University) and Cai Dan's 蔡丹 "Gudai shiren jieshou Shiji lungao" 古代詩人接受《史記》論稿 (under the supervision of Zhang Xinke's colleague Zhao Wangqin 趙望秦 at Shaanxi Normal University).

[18] The main body of the book remains largely the same as the original master theses with a bit of revision and embellishment, probably by Yu Zhanghua.

inadvertent terminological and conceptual fusion. The usage of the term *xiaoguo shi* 效果史 (history of effect) is one example at hand. As many other publications of reception studies, the discussion of the theoretical framework of the *Tang Song Shiji jieshou shi* starts from an introduction of reception aesthetics of Hans Robert Jauss (1921–1997) and Wolfgang Iser (1926–2007). It also cites Hans-Georg Gadamer (1900–2002), whose hermeneutics have provided one of the most important theoretical foundations for reception aesthetics. In this context, the expression *xiaoguo shi* promptly recalls Gadamer's conception of *Wirkungsgeschichte* (effective history/history of effect), which emphasises that all interpretations are inevitably affected by the hermeneutical situation of the interpreter and that an objective understanding of the past does not exist.[19] The "effect" here refers to the epistemological limitations and prejudices of the interpreter posed by his historical conditions. However, in the *Tang Song Shiji jieshou shi,* the word "effect," or *xiaoguo* 效果, in the term *xiaoguo shi* refers to the tangible effects in the transmission of the *Shiji*, such as printing, selections into anthologies, adaptions into performing arts, etc.[20] This usage of "effect" seems to be derived from the concept of "effect" (especially of the mass media) in communication studies, which is also a source of theoretical inspiration for the *Tang Song Shiji jieshou shi*.[21] Yet, the authors do not draw any explicit connection of their usage of "effect" with communication studies. Instead, in their explanation of what they mean by "history of effect," they cite a statement on yet another "effect," that is "aesthetic effect" (*shenmei xiaoying* 審美

[19] See Gadamer, *Wahrheit und Methode,* 305–312, its English translation in Weinsheimer and Marshall, *Truth and Method*, 299–307; see also Steinmann et al., "Effective History/Reception History." In the Chinese discourse of hermeneutics, *xiaoguo lishi* 效果歷史 (history of effect) is used as translation term for *Wirkungsgeschichte,* see Hong Handing (transl.), *Zhenli yu fangfa,* 385–394. From the perspective of word formation, *xiaoguo lishi* and *xianguo shi* yield no fundamental or transparent difference in modern Mandarin.

[20] See Yu Zhanghua, Ying Chaohua and Yu Liming, *Tang Song Shiji,* 152–166.

[21] See Yu Zhanghua, Ying Chaohua and Yu Liming, *Tang Song Shiji*, 11. They refer specifically to the communication model developed by Harold D. Lasswell (1902–1978). For Lasswell's explanation of his model, see Lasswell, "Structure and Function of Communication in Society," 37–51.

效應), which recalls Iser's *wirkungsästhetische Theorie* (theory of aesthetic effect/theory of aesthetic response).[22] That is to say, there are at least three distinct concepts of *xiaoguo* at play in the fields which the *Tang Song Shiji jieshou shi* refers to, but the authors use the word *xiaoguo* indiscriminatorily and without explanation, as if the word was self-evident and denoted one single concept consistently in all the references upon which they draw.

The differentiation of different interpretations of *xiaoguo* does not mean that one concept is necessarily more important than the others. Yet, the inadvertent fusion of concepts based on lexical convergence in terminology is indicative of a lack of scrutiny regarding the conceptual level in the *Tang Song Shiji jieshou shi* and studies that apply similar approaches.[23] To some extent, this perhaps also explains the reason why Chinese reception studies are riddled with evaluative remarks on whether historical readers understood Sima Qian "correctly" and whether they managed to recognise the significance of the *Shiji,* which are precisely the remarks that reception studies are trying to avoid.

An even more influential aspect of the *Tang Song Shiji jieshou shi* is the all-inclusive approach of the identification of primary sources. This means that any (alleged) resemblance to the *Shiji* in style and/or content is to be automatically regarded as evidence of reading the *Shiji* and as responses to the *Shiji*.[24] For instance, a later piece of *ci*-poetry on the conflict between Xiang Yu 項羽 (232–202 BC) and Liu Bang 劉邦 (256–195 BC, r. 202–195 BC) is taken to be an echo of the *Shiji,*[25] despite the story being widely accessible in multiple sources

[22] The authors of the *Tang Song Shiji jieshou shi* do not refer to Iser's work but cite Chen Wenzhong's 陳文忠 work on reception studies of classical Chinese poetry. Chen Wenzhong does not ostensibly fuse aesthetic effect and the effect of transmission. He regardes aesthetics as a driving force behind canonisation processes and suggests *xuanben* 選本 (anthologies) as an important parameter of the realisation of aesthetic effect; see Chen Wenzhong, *Gudian shige jieshou shi,* 14–17. For Iser's theory of aesthetic effect, see his *Akt des Lesens,* 37–86.

[23] It should be noted that the *Tang Song Shiji jieshou ji* is not the first one that fuses concepts in this way. Instead, it follows paradigms widely observed in Chinese studies of literary reception.

[24] This problematic reasoning does not merely prevail in the study of the reception of the *Shiji.*

[25] See Yu Zhanghua, *Tang Song Shiji jieshou shi*, 250–251.

and forms. It is also argued that Ouyang Xiu 歐陽修 (1007–1072) was emulating the *Shiji* in depicting a character by recording anecdotes and the character's speech,[26] yet what he applied are basic methods of biographical writing that are by no means constrained to or initiated by the *Shiji*. A substantial amount of subsequent studies have tended to follow a similar logic and identify the *Shiji* as the source of inspiration whenever some topical or stylistic resemblance is observed.[27] Some writers might have indeed been consciously imitating the *Shiji* or responding specifically to the *Shiji*, but there needs to be more than an impressionistic resemblance to establish this relationship. The problem here is that such intuitive lines of reasoning omnipresent in studies of the reception of the *Shiji* fail to establish standards for a more solid evaluation of the relationship between two given texts. They are inclined to underestimate the intricacy of the textual relationship and confuse resemblances perceived by the observant and conscious imitation intended by the writer.

To a certain degree, everything is connected. We may suspect that the *Shiji* has played a part in shaping the writing style or perception of history of every reader of it. But where does this approach lead? In Chinese studies of the reception of the *Shiji*, it leads to a celebration of Sima Qian and his *magnum opus,* because one may assume its direct or indirect influences in writings of virtually all genres. However, the significance of the *Shiji* can be and has been approached from various angles, and it does not take reception studies to understand its seminal historiography and exemplary literary style. So, from what point exactly does the perspective

[26] See Yu Zhanghua, *Tang Song Shiji jieshou shi*, 290–94.

[27] Articles that follow this approach are innumerable. For examples of more substantial studies, see Fan Jing, "Shiji zai Yuandai," esp. chapter two to six and Cai Dan, "Gudai shiren jieshou Shiji." It is noteworthy that Fan Jing differentiates *Shiji* poetry in a narrow sense and a broad sense. The former refers to poetry that alludes explicitly to the *Shiji* or something for which the *Shiji* is the earliest and only textual witness. The latter refers to poetry that is generally on historical events which are not exclusively recorded in the *Shiji.* She reports that most titles identified as *Shiji* poetry are actually not necessarily responses to the *Shiji,* see her "Shiji zai Yuandai," 50-51; see also chapter one and three of the current study.

of reception start to make sense? If not based on perceived resemblance, how exactly should we evaluate a reader's reception of the *Shiji*? What are the parameters?

To answer these questions, we can draw inspiration from reception studies of the *Histories* by Herodotus (c. 484 – c. 425 BC), who is conferred the title of "father of history" and considered the Western counterpart of Sima Qian.[28] Despite Herodotus having been active more than three centuries before Sima Qian was born, the two figures are highly comparable in view of their similar reputation and pivotal status in historiography and literature in the cultures with which they are associated. Following the introduction of reception theories into classical studies in the West, the afterlife of Herodotus came to be examined in a new light.[29] As in the case of the *Shiji,* the all-inclusive approach based on impressionistic resemblance is also attested in reception studies of Herodotus.[30] Scholars who have recently challenged and/or modified this approach present serious attempts to lift reception studies out of the realm of generalised observations.

For example, in his analysis of Duris of Samos' (c. 350 BC–after 281 BC) reception of Herodotus, Christopher A. Baron proposes five specifics (arrangement, subject matter, engagement with other authors, use of evidence, and pleasurable reading) for establishing the Herodotean model and argues that it is the cumulative effect of a combination of these five aspects that may be used to mark a historian as "Herodotean."[31] This should prompt us to refine

[28] For comparative studies of these two figures, see Stuurman, "Herodotus and Sima Qian," 1–40 and the introduction to Martin, *Herodotus and Sima Qian,* 1–28. See also the comparative study between Thucydides and Sima Qian in Shankman and Durrant, *Siren and Sage,* 79–156.

[29] For a general discussion of classical receptions regarding the theoretical bases, intellectual scope and relationship with existing specialisms, see the introductions to Martindale and Thomas, *Classics and the Uses of Reception* and Hardwick and Stray, *Companion to Classical Receptions*. Both volumes showcase a variety of methodologies applied in classical receptions. For a brief summary of important studies on the reception of Herodotus, see the introduction to Priestley and Zali, *Reception of Herodotus,* 1–16. Published in 2016, this volume presents important recent studies on the reception of Herodotus across geographical boundaries from the fifth century BC down to the twentieth century AD.

[30] See Gray, "Herodotus (and Ctesias) Re-enacted," 301–305.

[31] See Baron, "Duris of Samos and a Herodotean Model," 59–62.

our understanding of what exactly it means to write like Sima Qian (either in terms of literature or historiography) and avoid simplistic statements about the relationship between a recipient and the *Shiji*.

Another paradigm is proposed by Vivienne Gray in her investigation into Xenophon's (c. 430–354 BC) reception of Herodotus. Her view on the necessity of establishing the recipient's engagement with, not just knowledge of, Herodotus provides food for thought:

> [T]hough Xenophon undoubtedly knew his Herodotus, he need not have him in mind at every turn. In establishing whether he does have him in mind, we should be wary of the commonplace resemblance; in my view, Xenophon must demonstrate an involvement with Herodotus in the detail, if not through verbal echoes, then through some startling and uncommon motif, or other kinds of marking. In my view too, there must also be some specific purpose in the adaptation to secure a specific effect.[32]

When studying historical readers of a text, what sustains our reconstruction of their receptions is primarily their writings. Yet, do writings that refer to or are suspected of referring to the *Shiji* all have the same analytical value in view of reception studies? Previous studies of historical reception of the *Shiji* often regard the reference to the *Shiji* (e.g. its title, author, or events recorded in it) as evidence of reading the *Shiji* and testimony to its importance. In doing so, they simplify the process and modes of reception and reduce it to a question of whether or not a reader has experience with a text. Gray's statement is illuminating because she suggests that "knowledge of Herodotus" alone cannot be generalised into conscious engagement with Herodotus on every occasion of Xenophon's writing. Moreover, she identifies several kinds of marks that can be traced in writings and established as parameters of conscious engagement. Her approach entails a narrower focus and thus smaller repertoire with which to work, but it also singles out moments of reception that can sustain in-depth analyses. The point I am trying to make here is not so much about where reception starts but rather where reception studies start. For some readers, we only have evidence of them having read the *Shiji*; other readers

[32] Gray, "Herodotus (and Ctesias) Re-enacted," 305.

alluded to the *Shiji* in their creative writing; others still left writings that explain their reading experience, strategies, and evaluative criteria. When dealing with this diverse material, we need to identify different types and levels of engagement with the *Shiji*, establish criteria of verifiable engagement with it in written sources, and treat them with due attention in order to achieve a more nuanced understanding of the historical receptions of the *Shiji*.

As for general observations of "commonplace resemblance," one way to avoid them is by expanding our own interpretive horizons. In his discussion of the study of *Ovide moralisé,* a fourteenth century French translation of Ovid's (43 BC–17/18 AD) *Metamorphoses,* Ralph Hexter addresses the necessity of engaging with the whole Ovidian canon as well as non-Ovidian material. As he so aptly puts it:

> What we have seems very much like a large room where the voices of these texts echo and re-echo. The risk of cacophony cannot put us off from realising that the music we make ourselves hear is a simplification. Can we achieve at least polyphony?[33]

In the case of *Shiji* receptions, we also encounter such multiple echoes, materialised in the writings of historical readers of the *Shiji*. When examining these writings, one can easily privilege the *Shiji* as the source of inspiration and ignore other sources and traditions that might also have been incorporated into them. An important reason why reception studies of the *Shiji* remain on a general level is that they are hardly calibrated with the reception of other important texts and traditions such as the classics, *Hanshu* 漢書 (Book of the Han), *Zhanguo ce* 戰國策 (Stratagems of the Warring States), and *belles-lettres* by recognised master writers apart from Sima Qian. We should take into consideration the part these texts and traditions might have played, because it is quite unperceivable that the *Shiji* functioned as the only source of inspiration for the readers/writers on whose works we are depending in our enquiries into *Shiji* receptions. Moreover, it is inevitable and sometimes even necessary to make generalisations when we try to build up a coherent narrative out of individual cases found in our material. A

[33] Hexter, "Literary History as a Provocation to Reception Studies," 28.

fair understanding of the reception of other important texts and traditions helps to detect how far we can push our generalisation, for it shows phenomena that tend to be predominately observed in the reception of the *Shiji* and phenomena common in the reception of similar texts.

In order to reconstruct the wider picture, I draw on studies in the history of reading, which operate under the same basic premises with reception studies. In the introduction to *A History of Reading in the West*, Guglielmo Cavallo and Roger Chartier explain the two essential ideas in their edited volume:

> The first is that reading is not already inscribed in the text; that it is not true that there is no imaginable gap between the meaning assigned to it (by the author of the text or its editor, by criticism, by tradition, etc.) and the use or interpretation that readers may make of it. The second recognises that a text exists only because a reader gives it meaning.[34]

By and large, these two ideas are shared by reception studies. In the introduction to *Classics and the Uses of Reception*, Charles Martindale states that:

> A "text" […] is never just "itself," appeals to that reified entity being mere rhetorical flag-waving; rather it is something that a reader reads, differently.[35]

Earlier on in his *Redeeming the Text*, Martindale stated that "[m]eaning, could we say, is always realised at the point of reception."[36] The differentiation between a text and the reading of it is not new. As shown in the epigraph, Plato put in the mouth of Socrates (c. 470–399 BC) that written words can be laid out indiscriminately to all kinds of readers and are subject to interpretation and misinterpretation. Yet, it is a relatively recent thing that the significance of this gap between a text and the reading of it came to be the main concern of a growing group of scholars. Despite the shared premises, it would appear that studies in the history of reading occasionally relate to reception studies, whereas receptions studies hardly contain cross-references to studies on the history of reading. The divergent discourses of these two fields are

[34] Cavallo and Chartier, "Introduction," 1.

[35] Martindale, "Thinking Through Reception," 3.

[36] Martindale, *Redeeming the Text,* 3.

made transparent by their preferred points of reference in wider intellectual history. For example, Chartier refers to French philosophers such as Michel de Certeau (1925–1986) and Paul Ricœur (1913–2005) in the discussion of the interplay between *espaces lisibles* and *effectuation* of a text (in de Certeau's terms) or between "the world of the text" and "the world of the reader" (in Ricœur's terms).[37] On the other hand, Martindale emphasises the debts reception studies owe to German thinkers, especially Gadamer and Jauss, in the elucidation of the "fusion of horizons" that occurs when a reader reads a text.[38]

Apart from the self-perception of intellectual genealogy, focus and scope of study define the second major divergence between reception studies and history of reading. Following the model of Jauss in literary studies, research in reception studies tends to evolve from the *result* of the reception of a stimulus. A typical pattern of research is to trace a stimulus in material of a certain type left by the recipient. Essentially, the research engages with sources that represent the outcomes of reception (e.g. canonisation, translations, theatre adaptions, etc.). Studies on the history of reading, on the other hand, look at reading as an *activity* and investigate modes of reading and what conditions them. Though individual works might be in focus in case studies, studies on the history of reading look at them as samples for demonstrating the implications of reading as one of many activities that constitute human society. They draw extensively on the history of books, history of printing, history of literacy and sociology of texts.

With a focus on the *Shiji,* the current study traces the *Shiji* in writings produced during a defined period and thus quite comfortably sits in the framework of reception studies. Yet, reception studies usually investigate a work as an abstract text, not as a written object, the physical specifics of which (writing material, typographic forms, etc.) are not without significance.[39] Also, modes of reading (silently or aloud, in private or public settings, etc.)

[37] See Chartier, *Order of Books,* 1-5 and Cavallo and Chartier, "Introduction," 1–5.

[38] See Martindale, "Thinking Throught Reception," 3–4.

[39] See Chartier, *Order of Books,* 10 and his "Reading Matter and 'Popular' Reading," 274–275.

pertaining to a work are not as frequently discussed in reception studies as in the history of reading. In the case of the *Shiji,* bringing in perspectives of the history of reading can help to position the *Shiji* in the wider reading environment and define the boundary of reception studies by answering questions such as how accessible the *Shiji* was as a book, in what forms the text was presented if not in a book entitled *Shiji*, how much competitive force it had in the market as well as intellectual mindset, and how far we can go in assuming something reminiscent of the *Shiji* was actually inspired by or responded to the *Shiji*.

In sum, the study of the reception of the *Shiji* has just started, and there are still problems regarding the boundaries and meaning of reception studies. The aim of my current study is two-fold. On one hand, it explores the abundance of materials that are pertinent to the *Shiji* but that do not necessarily revolve around it. By doing so, we move from "what the *Shiji* means" towards an understanding of what the *Shiji* meant to specific readers and how it was used. On the other hand, my study attempts to avoid the overly inclusive approach in source selection that might, at a certain point, defeat the purpose of reception studies. In particular, it looks into material that sheds light on the interplays between the *Shiji* and its readers/recipients, which is, to return to the line in Stevens' poem, the moment of "becoming" in reading.

Sources

When setting out to contribute towards writing a history of the reception of the *Shiji,* the first problem one encounters is how to identify primary sources. In nearly two millennia since the *Shiji* was written, analyses and interpretations of different aspects of the *Shiji* have been accumulating over time, and it is an arduous task to locate them in the vastness of received texts. Writings that reflect the reception of the *Shiji* range from poems, essays, letters, prefaces, postscripts and jottings to memorials. They often reflect personal reflections on the *Shiji*, sometimes written in an informal setting, and are thus invaluable paths to layers of a more

personalised engagement with the *Shiji*. They are scattered in the corpora of individual writers, and so far substantial efforts have been put into the identification and compilation of material pertinent to the *Shiji*.

The earliest attempt to compile such material was made during the late sixteenth century by Ling Zhilong 淩稚隆 (fl. 1576–1587), who collected numerous comments on the *Shiji* up to the sixteenth century under the title *Shiji pinglin* 史記評林 (Scribes' Records: A Forest of Comments). As it reproduces the *Shiji* with the interlinear glosses from the *sanjia zhu* on its main printing area, some read the *Shiji pinglin* just as an alternative *Shiji sanjia zhu* redaction. However, as indicated in the title, the *Shiji pinglin* offers much more. It presents us with an additional commentarial layer in the upper margins, and with general and conclusive remarks appended to each chapter. These highly valuable comments, mostly dating from the period from the Song up to the compilation of the *Shiji pinglin*, were harvested by Ling Zhilong from a wide range of intellectuals' writings. As reflections of literary and intellectual appreciation of the text, these comments are far more interpretative and entertaining than the more explanatory interlinear *sanjia zhu* glosses. They offer insights into individual reading experiences and, in some cases, aim at guiding the readership in its appreciation of the *Shiji*.

Cheng Yuqing's 程餘慶 (fl. 1822) *Lidai mingjia pingzhu Shiji jishuo* 歷代名家評注史記集說 (Collective Explanations of Famous Scholar's Comments and Annotations on the *Shiji* Throughout the Ages) represents an attempt similar to the *Shiji pinglin* and draws extensively on Qing material. It was first published in 1927 by Qian Rong 錢鎔 (1851–1927), yet it was left to oblivion due to political and military upheavals. Only two imprints of this first edition are known to us, preserved in the libraries of Minzu University of China and Shaanxi Normal

University, respectively.[40] A new edition, edited in simplified script, was issued in 2011 and will hopefully draw more attention to Qing receptions of the *Shiji*.[41]

Further to these two collections, two modern collections are noteworthy. In 1985, Yang Yanqi 楊燕起 and his collaborators compiled the *Lidai mingjia ping Shiji* 歷代名家評《史記》 (A Collection of Famous Scholars' Comments on the *Shiji* Throughout the Ages), which consists of two parts. Part one arranges general comments in topical order, and part two lists comments on specific chapters of the *Shiji*. Another useful reference is found in the fourteen-volume series *Shiji yanjiu jicheng*《史記》研究集成 (Collection of *Shiji* Studies) published in 2005, edited by Zhang Dake 張大可, An Pingqiu 安平秋 and Yu Zhanghua. The section "Lidai wenji yu biji zhong de Shiji sanlun" 歷代文集與筆記中的《史記》散論 (Scattered Discussions of the *Shiji* in Literary Corpora and Brush Notes Throughout the Ages) provides an index to short comments and/or essays scattered in the works of individual writers, including famous scholars and minor writers, and thereby fills some of the lacunae in Yang Yanqi's collection.[42] Based on a wide and loose understanding of intertextuality, this index aims at a comprehensive documentation of texts that are deemed to be related in the widest possible sense to the *Shiji.*

As mentioned in my methodological discussion, existing studies on the reception of the *Shiji* now cover all historical dynasties. Notwithstanding the methodological problems, the authors of these studies have meticulously ploughed through a plethora of available sources. Their works provide invaluable collections of material focusing on *Shiji* receptions during specific periods and greatly supplement the four reference works listed above.

---

[40] See "Qianyan" 前言 (foreword) in Cheng Yuqing, *Shiji jishuo,* 1–5.

[41] The new edition contains substantial typographical changes catering for modern readers, including aspects such as direction of the text, arrangement of interlinear commentaries, and interpolated explanations of historical toponyms; see "Zhengli bianzuan shuoming" 整理編撰說明 (Editorial Notes) in Cheng Yuqing, *Shiji jishuo,* 6.

[42] See Yu Zhanghua and Deng Ruiquan, *Shiji lunzhu tiyao yu lunwen suoyin,* 214–290.

Temporal Parameters and the Choice of Focus

The current study focuses on the Northern Song (960–1179) with emphasis on material from the eleventh century. Speaking of *Shiji* receptions during the Northern Song, one of the potential dimensions of discussion that comes to mind relates to its significance as a literary model of the ancient-style writing (*guwen* 古文). Yet, responses to the *Shiji* analysed in this study primarily address the *Shiji* as a historical account, and this is a choice made for two reasons.

The first reason concerns limitations of extant responses pertaining to the literary aspects of the *Shiji* during the Northern Song. There is certainly evidence of the *Shiji* being appreciated as an enjoyable read, or as a piece of *wen* 文 (writings) or *wenzhang* 文章 (writings, especially literary writings).[43] Zeng Gong 曾鞏 (1019–1083) allegedly instructed the young Chen Shidao 陳師道 (1053–1101) to disregard all books except the *Shiji* for two or three years so as to improve his writing style.[44] Ouyang Xiu reported that he, among many other intellectuals, enjoyed reading the *zhuan* 傳 (traditions) of the *Shiji* in particular.[45] Zhang Lei 張耒 (1054–1114), a distinguished pupil of Su Shi 蘇軾 (1037–1101), named Sima Qian as one of his favourite writers.[46] Such notes clearly attest to these readers' recognition and appreciation of the literary style and effects of the *Shiji,* but they do not provide formulated or sufficiently

[43] The word *wen* 文 denotes a number of concepts, including (1) pattern(ed), ornament(ed); (2) civilisation, culture; (3) a graph; (4) words; (5) writings in general, as in the compound *wenzhang*; (6) prose writings as distinguished from *shi* 詩 (poetry). In the discourse on the *Shiji* as a literary model during the Northern Song, the last two of these six concepts come into play, and the *Shiji* was perceived either as a model of non-poetic writing (see point 6 above) or as a model of all literary compositions (see point 5 above). This is to say, some readers perceived the *Shiji* as distinguished from poetry (e.g. Tang Geng, *Tang Zixi wenlu,* 1a-1b), whereas others praised it in the context of a wider concept of literature, including prose and poetry (e.g. Su Xun, *Jiaoyou ji,* 11.318 and Zhang Lei, *Zhang Lei ji,* 56.844). For a discussion of *wen* and the dichotomy between prose and poetry, see Bol, *This Culture of Ours,* 22-27.

[44] See Wang Zhengde, *Yushi lu,* 1.10b.

[45] See Ouyang Xiu, *Ouyang Xiu quanji*, 66.971.

[46] See Zhang Lei, *Zhang Lei ji,* 56.844.

developed arguments that can sustain a more in-depth analysis. Compliments invariably focus on the vigour and unconventionality of Sima Qian's writing and often take a gnomic form, with comments such as *xionggang* 雄剛 (heroic and rigid), *shudang po you qiqi* 疏蕩頗有奇氣 (clear and unbridled, somewhat showing marvellous spirit), and *gan luan dao* 敢亂道 (dare to speak without constraint).[47] Yet, these comments only give general impressions of the *Shiji* without going further to explain their grounds.

Moreover, a large proportion of comments are not really on the *Shiji* itself but compliments on someone's writing that is reportedly reminiscent of the *Shiji.* Ouyang Xiu, Su Xun 蘇洵 (1009–1066) and Su Shi all received such accolades from their contemporaries.[48] These sketchy notes on the impressionistic resemblance between someone's writings and the *Shiji* are frequently taken as testimony to the imitation of the *Shiji* in literary practices.[49]

Such analogies are certainly indicative of the status of the *Shiji* as a literary model. Their significance lies in the fact that the *Shiji* was chosen as the touchstone in the assessment of other works in a classicising environment, yet these analogies alone cannot prove the existence of imitation. Clearly, the more a work is recognised, the more likely it is to be used as a reference value in the assessment of other works. When praising someone's writing, drawing a connection between the writer and Sima Qian as an esteemed classicist model works in the same way as locating a place by reference to a famous landmark. Analogies to Sima Qian thus suggest that the person who drew such a connection regarded the *Shiji* as a model to which

[47] See Su Xun, *Jiayou ji*, 11.319, Su Zhe, *Luancheng ji,* 22.381, Tang Geng, *Tang Zixi wenlu,* 1b, respectively. It is perhaps worth noting that the laudatory formula *shudang poyou qiqi* in this context is attributed to Chao Buzhi 晁補之 (1053-1110) by Wang Zhengde in his *Yushi lu,* 1.16a.

[48] Su Shi noted that Ouyang Xiu's narratives resembled those by Sima Qian, see Su Shi, *Su Shi Wenji,* 10.316; see also Ouyang Xiu's statement that he wanted to imitate Sima Qian in his own biographical writings in his *Ouyang Xiu Quanji,* 66.971. On Su Xun's writings, see Zhang Fangping's 張方平 (1007-1091) comment in Su Xun, *Jiayou ji,* 12.334 and 12.348; see also Lei Jianfu's 雷簡夫 (1001-1067) comment in Shao Bo, *Wenjian houlu,* 15.97. For Wang Anshi's 王安石 (1021-1086) comment on Su Shi's writings, see Dong Fen, *Xianyan changtan,* 332.

[49] See, for example, Yu Zhanghua, "Tang Song ba dajia," 135-37.

writers should aspire. However, remarks on the resemblance between someone's writings and the *Shiji* during the Northern Song are very succinct, and there is no elaboration of where and how exactly the writings evaluated resembled the *Shiji.* Subsequently, analyses of such comments would be based on a substantial amount of conjectures, not to mention guesswork.

What can be said about the reception of the *Shiji* as a literary work during the Northern Song is that there was a consensus on its literary merits and that it has played a part in shaping the ancient-style writing. Yet, it is not until the Southern Song that we start to see more first-hand reports, mostly found in the *biji* 筆記 (brush notes) writings, that detail the understanding of lexicon, syntax, rhetorical devices, and narratological arrangements of the *Shiji.*[50] Together with the prevalence of *pingdian* 評點 (appreciative dotting) practice, commentaries on literary devices of the *Shiji* proliferated since the Ming dynasty (1368–1644), yielding analyses of the literary devices of the *Shiji* on a much more technical level than achieved in preceding periods.[51]

The second reason this study does not spill more ink on the reception of the *Shiji* as a literary work is the unbalanced treatment of extant material. As shown in the examples mentioned above, quite a few Northern Song readers showed a shared understanding of the literary merits of the *Shiji*. Despite their laconic nature, these laudatory comments are often highlighted as evidence of historical recognition of the supreme status of the *Shiji*. Yet, the prevalent discourse on the *Shiji* as a flawed historical account, often more elaborate than the praise of its literary style, is rarely mentioned, let alone scrutinised on an academic basis.

[50] Prior to the Song, Liu Zhiji 劉知幾 (661–721) is perhaps the only scholar who wrote extensively on the style of the *Shiji*. For a list of his revision of excerpts of perceived redundancies in ten chapters of the *Shiji,* see chapter "Dianfan" 點煩 (Pointing out Redundancy) in Liu Zhiji, *Shitong tongshi,* 15.406–417. Wang Ruoxu 王若虛 (1174–1243) followed Liu Zhiji's path and listed more stylistically problematic passages in the *Shiji,* see Wang Ruoxu, *Hunan yilao ji,* scroll 13, 15 and 18. For a summary of Southern Song comments that engage with literary aspects of the *Shiji*, see Zhang Ziran, "Song Ming biji zhong de Shiji," chapter 4.

[51] Examples can be found in marginal comments in the *Shiji pinglin*. For a discussion of some of these comments, see Wang Qi, "*Shiji* zai Mingdai," chapters 4 and 5.

This unbalanced treatment of relevant material can probably be understood from two perspectives. As this study shows, outside the realm of literature, responses to the *Shiji* during the Northern Song are primarily critical. Overviewing the two millennia after the completion of the *Shiji,* its reception history is by and large dominated by the canonisation processes that come to play a more significant function during the later imperial periods. In this context, readers of later imperial periods up to modern times tend to eschew earlier criticism or seem to feel obliged to speak out in defence of the *Shiji.* Critical comments are thus often construed as misunderstandings of Sima Qian's "true intentions" and attributed to epistemological limitations posed by historical conditions.[52]

Another factor that contributes towards the lack of interest in Northern Song readers' reservations on the *Shiji* is that their criticism is riddled with political implications and tightly bound to specific historical situations. Applications of the *Shiji*, responses to the *Shiji* and management of *Shiji*-related issues were initiated and conditioned by multiple factors that were subject to constant changes, and they went far beyond subject matters with which *Shiji* scholarship is concerned. Therefore, statements or observations by Northern Song readers were proven invalid when circumstances changed and could no longer attract the interest of later readers who would naturally be occupied with concerns relevant for them. Within such ever-changing frameworks of intellectual concerns, comments on the *Shiji* during the Northern Song need to be allocated in a framework much wider than the context in which *Shiji* scholarship since the Ming dynasty is located.

Historically speaking, the aim of engagement with the *Shiji* has undergone fundamental changes. The more recent discourse on the *Shiji* aims at an improved understanding of the text, not at its application. Modern scholars have been working on translations and various text-

[52] See, for example, Yang Haizheng's refutation of historical criticism of the *Shiji* in *Han Tang Shiji*, 56–58, 83–87 and 185–190; see also the discussion of Song and Qing criticism of the *Shiji* in Zhang Xinke and Yu Zhanghua, *Shiji yanjiu shi,* 118–22, 184–85 and 190–91.

focused matters, such as the construction of the *Shiji*, its transmission, ideological underpinnings, literary devices, authorship, authenticity, historical accuracy, etc.[53] Despite the diverse approaches and divergent outcomes, the overarching common goal is to improve our understanding of the *Shiji.* For this purpose, commentaries and scholarly notes on the *Shiji* are particularly useful. However, Northern Song readers have rather little to offer in terms of guidance towards a better textual understanding of the *Shiji.* As mentioned above, they have not provided discussions on literary merits of the *Shiji* on a technical level comparable to Ming and Qing scholarship. They have not continued the commentarial traditions that were initiated by the *sanjia zhu*. As for elaborations on the historiographical value of the *Shiji* and scrutiny of textual divergences, Northern Song readers stand no chance when compared to Qing scholars.

Consequently, voices from the Northern Song are rarely brought to attention in modern *Shiji* scholarship. For exactly the same reasons, these voices constitute invaluable material for reception studies, for they represent specimens of ephemeral interfaces between the text and its readers prior to the canonisation of the *Shiji*. As the *Shiji* was treated as a privileged subject to a much lesser degree than in later periods, engagement with the *Shiji* during the Northern Song did not orbit the *Shiji*. This is to say, enquiries into the *Shiji* during that period primarily provided avenues of reflection on and arguments pertaining to contemporary issues well beyond the textual world. This phenomenon is certainly to be observed in various periods, but it was particularly explicit during the Northern Song. Subsequently, the exploration of *Shiji*

[53] During the last few decades, a significant number of modern Mandarin translations of and commentaries on the *Shiji* have been published, clearly attesting to this tendency. As for more substantial *Shiji* translation projects in the West, the following three stand out. Édouard Chavannes (1865–1918) translated the first 52 chapters of the *Shiji* under the title *Les Mémoires Historiques de Se-ma Ts'ien*. The first 47 of them were published in five volumes (1895–1905), with the remaining five chapters published posthumously. His translations were republished in 2015 with additional chapters translated by Max Kaltenmark and Jacques Pimpaneau. Burton Watson (1925–2017) rendered 80 out of 130 chapters of the *Shiji* into English. William H. Nienhauser Jr. leads a team working on translating the entire *Shiji* into English with scholarly annotations. So far, seven volumes of the series entitled *The Grand Scribe's Records* have come out. With regard to the other text-focused studies, significant contributions are simply innumerable.

receptions during the Northern Song provides a fertile path to delineate the diverse and intricate appropriation of a text and how a text and its reader are constitutive of each other in the process of reading.

A Note on the Title of the *Shiji*

Debates in *Shiji* studies tend to start from the reading of its title, especially the problematic term *shi* 史. In light of the alternative and earlier title of the *Shiji* as *Taishigong shu* 太史公書, scholars have offered a considerable range of renderings of *shi*, including "historian," "scribe," "star-clerk," "clerk," "astrologer," "archivist," and "chronologist."[54] Due to Burton Watson's translations under the title *Records of the Grand Historian* and the *Grand Scribe's Records* project led by William Nienhauser, the first two renderings on this lst are perhaps more widely known to English readers. More recent scholarship suggests that "while Sima Qian was a great historian, he was no Grand Historian."[55] The translation term "scribe" has been called into question because it tends to be widely perceived in the sense of "copyist." Yet, I am inclined to use "scribe" in the broader sense as a person that keeps and generates records. This leaves sufficient space for the scribe's role in the generation of records, which fits the Northern Song perception of the *Shiji* as largely made up by Sima Qian's decisions in source selection.

Another question relates to whether *shi* is to be understood as in singular or plural form. Nowadays, it is widely accepted that the *Shiji* was a family enterprise, started by Sima Tan 司馬談 (d. 110 BC) and finished by his son Sima Qian. Within the *Shiji,* the appellation

[54] For recent discussions of *shi* in the title *Shiji*, see Durrant et al., *Letter to Ren An,* 18–21, van Ess, *Politik und Geschichtsschreibung,* 9–13 and Klein, "History of a Historian," 30-34. For an early and influential discussion of the etymology of *shi,* see Wang Guowei's "Shi shi" 釋史 (On *shi*) in his *Guantang jilin*, 6.1a–6b (263–274). For recent discussions of the duties of *shi* in early China, see Schaberg's "Functionary Speech," 19–41 and Vogelsang, *Geschichte als Problem*, 17–91. For a phonological approach on *shi,* see Behr, "Idea of a 'Constant' Way," 15–20.

[55] Durrant et al., *Letter to Ren An,* 20.

taishigong 太史公 (His Honour the Grand Scribe) refers to Sima Qian and occasionally to Sima Tan.[56] Therefore, a plausible argument can be established for understanding *shi* in the title *Shiji* as plural and for reading the title as *Scribes' Records.*[57] Attempts have been made to differentiate Sima Qian's contribution from that of his father (as well as from later interpolations), yet it has been proven an intricate problem, and the possibility and necessity of such a differentiation have been called into question.[58]

During the Northern Song, however, readers did not seem to be concerned so much about the authorial responsibility of Sima Qian and appeared to have understood *shi* as singular. Though they did not elaborate on this issue, they would have read the title *Shiji* in the sense of *Scribe's Records.* As I show in chapter two, in their evaluations of the *Shiji*, eleventh century readers almost invariably stressed Sima Qian's role as a decision-maker, which indicates that his authorship was not seen as a problem. It would appear that Su Xun is the only one who addressed the dual designation of *taishigong* in the *Shiji*. He doubted whether the evaluative remarks introduced by the phrase *taishigong yue* 太史公曰 (His Honour the Grand Scribe said) refer to Sima Tan or Sima Qian. Yet, he unambiguously blamed Sima Qian for using the term *taishigong* in such an underspecified manner.[59] In other words, the essence of Su Xun's comment is not to propose that some parts of the *Shiji* were written by Sima Tan, but to complain about Sima Qian's terminological sloppiness. In accordance with the Northern Song perception of Sima Qian's authorial responsibility for the *Shiji,* I address Sima Qian as the

[56] Liang Yusheng 梁玉繩 (1744–1819) identified eight occasions where he believes *taishigong* to refer to Sima Tan, see his *Shiji zhiyi,* 1.27.

[57] Notwithstanding the translation title *The Grand Scribe's Records,* Nienhauser recently suggested it "could have been changed into *The Grand Scribes' Records*;" see Nienhauser, *Scribe's Records,* vol. X, "Acknowledgements," ix.

[58] See van Ess, "Friends of Sima Tan and Sima Qian," 67 (footnote 4), and Nienhauser, *Scribe's Records*, vol. V.1, "Introduction," xviii–xix.

[59] See Su Xun's "Shilun xia" 史論下 (On Histories, III) in his *Jiayou ji*, 9.238; see also Klein's translation and discussion of Su Xun's comments, along with earlier and later debates on Sima Tan's authorship, in her "History of a Historian," 393–403.

single author of the *Shiji* in this dissertation and use *Scribe's Records* in my translations of Northern Song material.

Structure of this Study

This dissertation is divided into four main chapters. Following an introduction of conceptual premises and research focus, the first two chapters look at the *Shiji* in a wider context and answer the questions of "Did the *Shiji* matter?" and "What was the problem?" The subsequent two chapters, each presenting a case study on the reception of one particular chapter of the *Shiji,* combine textual analysis and historical enquiry, emphasising the contexts of historical recipients of the *Shiji*.

As over-privileging *Shiji*-related material tends to result in assigning insufficient significance to the historical factors that constituted the intellectual landscape and conditioned interpretations of the *Shiji*, chapter one discusses the *Shiji* in relation to other important texts (especially classical texts), alternative forms of historical knowledge (including textual sources and vernacular traditions) and the position of the *Shiji* in pedagogical schemes. It seeks to depict what it might have meant to own a copy of the *Shiji* and whether that was necessary at all. The examination of the *Shiji* against a background that is full of rivals aims at revealing what makes the *Shiji* distinct from similar or relevant sources and where exactly reception studies of the *Shiji* should start.

Following the analysis of *Shiji*'s competitive force compared to other reading options in chapter one, chapter two moves to look at the *Shiji*'s place in the battles in the brains of individual readers. It identifies several distinct perceptions of Sima Qian and analyses convergences and divergences among diverse verdicts of the *Shiji,* including comments that reflect the widespread critical attitudes towards the *Shiji* and the ones that came to be known as romantic or autobiographical readings. Instead of judging the validity of eleventh century

readers' verdicts against modern standards, this chapter underlines how their understandings of the *Shiji* were integrated in contemporary discourses and how they served different aims.

Chapter three looks into the legacy of Jia Yi 賈誼 (c. 200–169 BC), for which the *Shiji* and *Hanshu* provide partly overlapping but overall distinct accounts. In view of general methodological considerations on the reception study of the *Shiji,* this case tests the extent to which one can detect the influence of the *Shiji* through textual analysis. This chapter starts with an analysis of the subtle differences between the *Shiji* and *Hanshu* versions of Jia Yi's legacy that lead to strikingly different directions of later narratives. Following that, I investigate how three eleventh century readers appropriated this legacy to address different audiences and taught different lessons despite speaking for the same class.

Chapter four turns to the *Shiji* account on Confucius and the way Su Zhe 蘇轍 (1039–1112) reworked this narrative. It analyses the subtle changes in wording and narrative architecture, delineating how Su Zhe replaced the frustrated Master who meets rejection everywhere in the *Shiji* with a proactive Master who persistently looks for a ruler worthy of his service. Su Zhe's reading of the *Shiji,* consisting of emulation, rejection, purported rectification and improvement, is discussed in light of contemporary depictions of the Master and the practice of rewriting history.

Departing from the abovementioned series of case studies, the conclusion takes my arguments further and contends that the value of historical readings of the *Shiji* and indeed any other text goes far beyond the question of whether their reading choices are up to modern standards. The abundance of historical readings represents precious testimony to the ways in which readers read themselves into their texts, hence investigations into historical readings illustrate modes of interaction between the textual world and perceived realities of the human world.

Chapter One

Did the *Shiji* matter?

一葉蔽目，不見太山；兩豆塞耳，不聞雷霆。
When a leaf covers the eyes, one sees no Mount Tai;
When two peas block the ears, one hears no peal of thunder.
—*Heguanzi* 鶡冠子 [1]

The first half of the epigraph has come to be known as a Chinese proverb. But how many Chinese speakers and/or readers can tell what comes after it (if they happen to know it is followed by something)? How many of them would be able to identify the *Heguanzi* as the point of reference? How many of them have read, or even heard of the *Heguanzi*? This is a straightforward example of how one can be familiar with something without being aware of its source. However, when it comes to sources of more privileged status, it might be less straightforward. With their perceived significance, these privileged sources can easily attract (and thus divert) the attention of the observer, acting as the leaf that covers the eyes and the peas that block the ears. The *Shiji* is one such example.

As it is widely perceived as a celebrated historiographical work and literature achievement nowadays, people might readily identify the *Shiji* as the source for anything reminiscent of an aspect of it and neglect the fact that the perception of the *Shiji* has its own history. A historical reader might well have come across the *Shiji* in a different way from how we encounter it. The differences may lie in many aspects, starting from the very possibility of getting one's hands on the *Shiji* and the reasons why one should or should not read it, to what parts of it were read. In an effort to address eleventh century perceptions of the *Shiji,* this chapter aims to reconstruct

[1] *Heguanzi,* 1.12b.

this context of reading and places the *Shiji* in a wider landscape during the Northern Song (970-1127).

My enquiries into the reading of the *Shiji* start from how to get a copy. After tracing the physical accessibility of it, I move on to discuss how much the *Shiji* mattered by evaluating its competitive strength against alternative forms of historical knowledge and the position of history in an educational and examination context. As the imperial examinations underwent significant changes during the Northern Song, which brought about devastating effects on historical scholarship, my discussion is divided in two, before and after the reforms during the 1070s.

Getting a Copy of the *Shiji*

The development of printing technology during the Song is a well-known story. It is undeniable that printing technology aided the distribution of knowledge throughout the whole span of the three hundred years of the Song dynasty, but it is taken for granted so often that people tend to neglect that our knowledge of the flourishing printing activities is largely based on records about the Southern Song (1127–1279).[2] The accessibility of prints and the right to print were largely restricted during the Northern Song,[3] and it is thus important to scrutinise how exactly the *Shiji* was transmitted.

[2] Ye Dehui's 葉德輝 (1864–1927) list of commercial and private publishing entities during the Song is a favourite point of reference. Only a tenth of the seventy-odd entities on his list are from the Northern Song, see Ye Dehui, *Shulin qinghua*, 3.77–88. See also Inoue, "Zōsho to dokusho," 409–445 and McDemott, "Ascendance of the Imprint in China," 55–104.

[3] On the imperial court's monopoly, the printing of the classics, and the high book prices during the eleventh century, see Cherniack, "Book Culture," 40–44 and Tian Jianping, *Songdai chuban shi,* chapter 14. There were also prohibitions on printing other types of material, see Yang Weisheng, *Liang Song wenhuashi*, 429–435; on imperial prohibitions, especially on publishing texts related to regulations, border affairs and state security, see de Weerdt, "What Did Su Che See," 471–487.

The first difficulty is posed by the scarcity of material. Although imperial printing activities are well documented, extant material suggests that the major concern was the printing and dissemination of the classical texts. The Five Dynasties (907–960) witnessed the first state-sponsored prints of the classics. Following that, Taizong of Song 宋太宗 (939–997, r. 976–997) launched a collation and printing project of the five classics in 988.[4] Since then, the right to print the classics was kept under imperial control until the 1070s, and activities including collation, printing and dissemination can largely be traced via imperial decrees.[5]

However, it is much more difficult to reconstruct the picture for historical texts.[6] There are records of imperial collations and printing projects, but they are of much lesser quantity and level of detail compared to those pertaining to the classical texts. For example, among various accounts on the dissemination of imperial imprints to local academies (*shuyuan* 書院), there are only three occasions where historical texts are mentioned (with one occasion specifying that the *Shiji* was requested), and the majority of such material specifies the classical texts (*jiujing* 九經, *jingshu* 經書, or *zhujing* 諸經) were to be sent over.[7] This contrast itself is a warning against the assumption that one isolated record is sufficient to evaluate the importance of the *Shiji*.

Despite the lack of material, there are still a few records that shed light on different aspects of the physical existence of the *Shiji* during the Northern Song. To start with, Su Shi 蘇軾

---

[4] See Cheng Ju, *Lintai gushi*, 2.70 and Wang Yinglin, *Yuhai*, 167.38a.

[5] For example, the 998 edict demands, "regarding the books of the classics by the Directorate of Education, counties outside [the capital] are not allowed to carve woodblocks without permission," *SHYJG*, "Zhiguan" 職官, 28.1b: 國子監經書, 外州不得私造印版. For the abolition of this prohibition, see Luo Bi, *Zhiyi,* 1.432. On various ways of dissemination of imperial imprints, see Cherniack, "Book Culture," 42–32.

[6] It should be noted that the historical texts discussed in this section mainly concern historical accounts of pre-Song history and exclude texts on contemporary concerns such as *huiyao* 會要 (digests of essentials), *shilu* 實錄 (veritable records) and *guoshi* 國史 (imperial histories). These records contain sensitive information and were thus strictly controlled; see, for example, a 1090 prohibition of the transmission of such texts in *SHYJG,* "Xingfa" 刑法, 2.38a.

[7] See Wang Yinglin, *Yuhai,* 167.35a–b and 36b, *SHYJG,* "Chongru," 2.2a–3b, and Tuotuo, *Songshi,* 7.128, 131, 134 and 8.154.

(1037–1101) provided an account about the difficulty of getting a copy of the *Shiji* in the early Song:

> 余猶及見老儒先生，自言其少時，欲求《史記》、《漢書》而不可得。幸而得之，皆手自書，日夜誦讀，惟恐不及。[8]
>
> I have still seen elder classicists, who said that in their youth they wanted to find the *Scribe's Records* and *Book of the Han* yet could not get [them]. [When they] got them by chance, [they] all copied them by hand, reciting and reading [them] day and night, only fearing not making enough [effort].

This passage can be read in tandem with a comment by Xing Bing 刑昺 (932–1010), who was seriously involved in compiling explanatory material to the classics. In 1005, Xing Bing recalled that it used to be extremely difficult to possess a copy of classical commentaries when he was a student.[9] Cherniack aptly points out that Xing Bing, then the seventy-three-year-old head of the Directorate of Education, was probably speaking diplomatically by drawing a contrast between past and present so as to assure the emperor of the achievements.[10] By the same token, Su Shi's testimony perhaps also constitutes a rhetorical device. In his account, he reported the difficulty of getting hold of a text in order to draw a contrast between devoted learners in the old days and those who had easy access to books but did not care to read in his own days.[11] Nevertheless, it is probably fair to believe that there is some truth in their reports, and this accessibility of texts was presumably to be changed by the prevalence of printing that started with imperial-sponsored projects.

---

[8] See Su Shi's "Lishi shanfang cangshu ji" 李氏山房藏書記 (Record of the Book Collection in Mr Li's Mountain House), in his *Su Shi wenji*, 11.359.

[9] See *XZZTJCB* 60.1a; see also parallels in *SHYJG*, "Zhiguan" 職官, 28.1b, Tuotuo, *Songshi*, 431.12798, and Wang Yingling, *Yuhai*, 43.21a–b.

[10] See Cherniack, "Book Culture," 43.

[11] This contrast recurs in Zhu Xi's 朱熹 (1130–1200) writing too, where he, like Su Shi, complained that his contemporaries did not read despite the easy accessibility of books. In Zhu Xi estimation, books were not so easy to access in Su Shi's days; see Zhu Xi's "Dushufa shang" 讀書法上 (Guidance on Reading Books I) in Li Jingde, *Zhuzi yulei,* 171.

Following the publishing of the printed five classics, the first imperial-sponsored project of the collation and printing of the first three *zhengshi* 正史 (standard histories),[12] namely the *Shiji, Hanshu* 漢書 (Book of the Han) and *Hou Hanshu* 後漢書 (Book of the Later Han), started in 994. The prints were distributed to nobles and ministers in 998,[13] probably also available to be borrowed from the imperial libraries,[14] or purchased from the Directorate of Education (*Guozi jian* 國子監).[15] Yet, the advent of printed versions also brought about new problems:

> 景祐二年九月，詔翰林學士張觀等刊定《前漢書》、《孟子》，下國子監頒行。議者以為前代經史皆以紙素傳寫，雖有舛誤，然尚可參讎。至五代，官始用墨版摹六經，誠欲一其文字，使學者不惑。至太宗朝，又摹印司馬遷、班固、范曄諸史，與六經皆傳，于是世之寫本悉不用。
>
> In the ninth month of the second year of *jingyou* [1035], [Zhenzong] decreed that Hanlin scholar Zhang Guan [fl. mid-eleventh century], among others, was to rectify the *Book of the Former Han* and *Mencius* and to send [the rectified editions] to the Directorate of Education to be published. Discussants [of this issue] held the opinion that in previous dynasties the classics and histories were all transmitted as paper or silk manuscripts. Although there may have been mistakes, [they] can still be compared [with each other] and collated. It was not until the Five Dynasties that the authority started to use inked blocks to reproduce the six classics, sincerely hoping to standardise the texts so that learners would not be confused. When it came to Taizong's reign [976–997], [the authority] continued to reproduce and print the histories by Sima Qian, Ban Gu [32–92] and Fan Ye [298–445] to be transmitted with the six classics. Upon this, manuscript copies in our age all ceased to be used.

---

[12] The earliest textual witness of the term *zhengshi* is in Xiao Yi, *Jinlouzi,* 2.33. Then it is used in the *Suishu* 隋書 (Book of the Sui, finished in 636) to annotate a group of historical accounts, but it was not yet exclusively used for what later became known as standard histories; see Wei Zheng, *Suishu*, 33.957. Liu Zhiji's 劉知幾 (661–721), the eminent historian of the Tang, listed a series of historical texts in "Gujin zhengshi" 古今正史; see Liu Zhiji, *Shitong tongshi*, 12.305–349. Apart from classical texts such as the *Shangshu, Chunqiu* and *Zuozhuan,* other historical texts he listed are by and large the same as the standard histories printed during the Song.

[13] See *SHYJG,* "Chongru," 4.1a and Wang Yinglin, *Yuhai*, 43.20a.

[14] In 999, Zhenzong of Song 宋真宗 (968–1022, r. 997–1022) made an enquiry about the loss of books in the imperial libraries. A report came that 460 scrolls of books of the four categories (*sibu shu* 四部書) borrowed by court officials were missing; see *SHYJG*, "Zhiguan," 18.51b. The four categories consisted of *jing* 經 (classics), *shi* 史(histories), *zi* 子 (masters), and *ji* 集 (collections). Although this fourfold classification scheme has its root in pre-Tang periods, it was only institutionalised as the four palace depositories (*siku* 四庫) during the Tang, which served as a point of reference when Zhenzong established his four depositories; see Cheng Ju, *Lintai gushi*, 1.43.

[15] See Ye Dehui, *Shulin qinghua,* 6.143–145.

然墨版訛駁，初不是正，而後學者更無他本可以刊驗。會祕書丞余靖建言《前漢書》官本差舛，請行刊正。因詔靖及王洙盡取祕閣古本校對。踰年，乃上《漢書刊誤》三十卷。至是改舊摹版，以從新校，然猶有未盡者。而司馬遷、范曄史尤多脫略，惜其後不復有古本可正其舛謬云。[16]

However, inked blocks contain errors and stains. [If they are] not corrected at the beginning, later learners would no longer have other versions to rectify or verify [them]. It happened that Yu Jing [1000–1064], the Assistant Director of the Palace Libraries, suggested that the official edition of the *Book of the Former Han* contained mistakes and requested to make corrections. Thereupon, [Zhenzong] decreed that [Yu] Jing and Wang Zhu [997–1057] were to take all the old versions in the Imperial Archives for collation. It was only after a year that [they] presented thirty scrolls of *Rectification of the Book of the Han*. Upon this, changes were made to the old blocks so as to follow the new collation. However, there were still places where [corrections] were not completed. Moreover, the histories of Sima Qian and Fan Ye are particularly riddled with omissions. It is a shame that later on there would no longer be old versions that could correct their mistakes.

This *Lintai gushi* account touches upon two out of the three times of collation of the three histories during the Northern Song.[17] Due to the concerns for numerous omissions in the 994 edition of the *Shiji*, another collation project was carried out in 1035 and produced the so-called "Jingyou edition," which is the earliest extant printed edition of the *Shiji.*[18] Although no account of this project mentions the presence of commentaries, extant editions derived from the Jingyou edition testify that it was accompanied by Pei Yin's commentary. In fact, this was the most common form of the *Shiji* during the Northern Song because Pei Yin's *Shiji jijie* 史記集解 (Scribe's Records: Collected explanations) was the only commentary recognised in the examinations. It was not until the Southern Song that the text of the *Shiji* came to be

[16] Cheng Ju, *Lintai gushi*, 2.70. Part of this account is translated in Cherniack, "Book Culture," 34, but I disagree with her reading of some passages. For example, she has "they were never correct to begin with" for *chu bu shizheng* 初不是正), whereas I read *shizheng* as a synonym compound, "to put right." For the translation of official titles, I generally follow Hucker's *A Dictionary of Official Titles in Imperial China.*

[17] The three collating projects are dated to 994, 1004, and 1035, respectively; see *SHYJG*, "Chongru," 4.1a–b and Cheng Ju, *Lintai*, 2.70–71; see also Ozaki, *Seishi*, 9–12. Wang Yinglin recorded a fourth collation of the *Hanshu* and *Hou Hanshu* in 1069, see Wang Yinlin, *Yuhai*, 43.20a. Zhang Yuchun argues that it is a convention to collate all the three histories at the same time throughout the Song, so the 1069 project must have involved the *Shiji*; see Zhang Yuchun, *Shiji banben*, 84–87.

[18] There are six extant copies (some incomplete) of editions that are derived from the Jingyou edition, preserved in the Academia Sinica, National Taiwan Library, National Library of China (four copies), respectively. The copy at the Academia Sinica is believed to be the original Jingyou edition and reprinted in *Renshou ershiwu shi* 仁壽二十五史 in 1955; see Zhang Yuchun, *Shiji banben*, 88.

accompanied by the commentaries of Zhang Shoujie 張守節 (fl. 725–735) and Sima Zhen 司馬貞 (fl. 745) or by commentaries of all three commentators.[19]

The *Lintai gushi* account also addresses another point of interest, that is the challenge printed books posed to manuscripts. Although printing technology posed a threat to manuscript culture, it is unlikely that it could put a stop to the production of manuscripts. The passage "*shi zhi xieben xi buyong* 世之寫本悉不用" (manuscript copies in the world all ceased to be used) can be understood from an operative point of view. For example, a 1038 edict states that the exam questions were only to be drawn from classical texts published by the Directorate of Education.[20] That is to say, the imperial control of texts was promptly reflected in imperial examinations, which would ideally reinforce the status of the central government as the sole authority on textual transmission as well as wider Chinese traditions in return.

In the long term, the impact of printing did reshape the textual history of the *Shiji.* In light of a few *guben* 古本 (old versions/old manuscripts) still available now,[21] it would appear that the collation and printing projects during the Song indeed standardised the text (*yi qi wenzi* 一其文字) to a great extent. The textual variants between extant editions of the *Shiji* seem to remain within the limited systems stabilised during the Song, whereas pre-Song manuscripts sometimes display (allegedly better) textual divergences that are nowhere to be found in received editions.[22] In other words, Cheng Ju's worries have been realised, and we now can

[19] See Ozaki, *Seishi*, 206–231 and Zhang Yuchun, *Shiji banben*, 169–174 and 195–198.

[20] See *XZZTJCB* 122.3a.

[21] A recent survey counts seventeen extant manuscript fragments copied by the end of the Song, see Zhang Zongpin, "Shiji xieben yanjiu," 98–99. The more substantial ones include a Dunhuang manuscript (preserved at the Bibliothèque Nationale de France and reproduced in Kanda Kiichirō, *Liuzhen xinbian*/*Rushin shinpen,* 366–380; digitalisation available at the website of the International Dunhuang Project under one catalogue entry "Pelliot chinois 2627"), a received pre-Tang manuscript (preserved at the Ishiyama-dera 石山寺, Kyoto; digitalisation available at the website of National Diet Library Digital Collections, Japan) and six received manuscripts presumably of the Tang (all in Japan, see Zhang Yuchun, *Shiji banben,* 50).

[22] See Zhang Yuchun, *Shiji banben,* 41–60.

only peep through fragmentary manuscripts at the textual diversity prior to this textual unification.

In the short term, however, it is very likely that hand-copying remained the easiest way to get a copy. The collation and printing of standard histories of pre-Song periods was not finished until the 1110s,[23] which indicates that these texts were more likely to have been circulated as manuscripts during the Northern Song. There are even cases where the imperial projects relied on the manuscripts in circulation outside the imperial collections.[24] Besides, there is the problem of book prices. Although printing technology presumably entailed a decrease in book prices, it remains obscure to what extent books were affordable goods due to the scanty material that is available, especially regarding the Northern Song.[25] Therefore, the only extant material pertaining to the price of a standard history is worth careful scrutiny. There is an anecdote about the prominent intellectual, Su Song 蘇頌 (1021–1101),[26] recorded by his grandson Su Xiangxian 蘇象先 (granted *jinshi* in 1091):

[23] Among them are two tricky cases regarding what are now known as the *Jiu Tangshu* 舊唐書 (Old Book of the Tang) and *Jiu Wudaishi* 舊五代史 (Old History of the Five Dynasties). It is unclear whether they were printed during the Northern Song. As an official standard history of the Tang, the *Jiu Tangshu* was replaced by Ouyang Xiu's *Xin Tangshu* 新唐書 (New Book of the Tang), commissioned by Emperor Renzong (1010–1063, r. 1022–1063) and finished in 1060. However, Ozaki suspects that the *Jiu Tangshu* was printed before 1060; see Ozaki, *Seishi*, 13. Ouyang Xiu also rewrote the history of the Five Dynasties as a private project, which was posthumously printed by the Directorate of Education and established as a standard history. Thereafter, the previous standard history of the Five Dynasties, namely the *Jiu Wudaishi*, was lost and only reconstructed during the Qing. For a survey of Ouyang Xiu and his new histories, see Ng, *Mirroring the Past*, 136–147. Regarding other standard histories, the collation of the *Sanguo zhi* 三國志 (Records of the Three Kingdoms) and *Jinshu* 晉書 (Book of the Jin) started in 998, then the *Suishu*, *Nanshi* 南史 (Histories of the Southern Dynasties) and *Beishi* 北史 (Histories of the Northern Dynasties) in 1024, and finally the seven histories of the South and North dynasties (420–589) in 1061; see Ozaki, *Seishi*, 7–8 for a handy list of all the major printing activities during the Northern Song and pages 9-19 for a more detailed discussion extended to the entire Song periods.

[24] In 1061, the collators of the histories of the Northern and Southern dynasties once complained about the quality of versions in the Imperial Archives and requested manuscripts preserved in private collections to be collected for collation; see Chao Gongwu, *Junzhai*, 5.184.

[25] See Cherniack, "Book Culture," 40 (footnote. 80) and 44 (footnote 92).

[26] For his biography, see Tuotuo, *Songshi*, 340.10859–10868 and Franke, *Sung Biographies,* vol. 3, 969–70. He was an extremely knowledgeable man and a renowned engineer and scientist. His contributions to the clock mechanism, for example, is discussed in Needham, *Science and Civilisation in China,* vol. 4.2, 446–465.

> 祖父應舉之年元日游相國寺，時浙本中字《前漢書》方出，祖父戲撲之，為錢五千，十三淳一擲皆紅。鬻書者曰：“未常領所下金。”祖父遂行，不取。衆亦皆不平，然以謂必有大喜慶。踰月，南廟試第一，遂登科。[27]
>
> My grandfather had an outing in the Xiangguo Temple[28] on New Year's Day of the year [he] went for the imperial examinations. At that time, the Zhe prefectural edition, with medium-sized characters, of the *Book of the Former Han* had just come out. My grandfather bid for it in jest, offering five thousand cash, and got exactly thirteen tails in one toss. The book seller said, "You haven't taken back your stake." My grandfather just walked away without taking it. The crowd was completely stirred up, yet thereby it was said a great festive event would definitely befall [him]. After a month, [my grandfather] scored the first in the departmental examination[29] and thereupon became a degree holder.

This anecdote is intriguing in many aspects, but I hereby only address a few points that shed light on the question of what it meant to buy a standard history in those days. Whereas the five thousand cash for a whole set (a hundred scrolls) of the *Hanshu* has been used as evidence of the cheap book price,[30] the context of this anecdote calls for further investigation. Su Song did not get this set of *Hanshu* by ordinary commercial exchange, but by gambling.[31] The verb *pu* 撲 (lit. to beat, knock) and the passage *shisan chun yi zhi jie hong* 十三純一擲皆紅 (got exactly thirteen tails in one go) points to a popular gambling game often combined with commercial promotion during Song and Yuan periods.[32] The game typically used coins as the gambling

[27] Su Xiangxian, *Chengxiang Weigong Tan xun*, 8.1a.

[28] The temple was a major Buddhist temple located in the capital of the Northern Song (modern Kaifeng, Henan).

[29] *Nanmiao* 南廟 (lit. southern temple) refers to the *Shangshu sheng* 尚書省 (Department of State Affairs). As this department was located to the south of the other two departments (*Zhongshu sheng* 中書省, or Secretariat, and *Menxia sheng* 門下省, or Chancellery) of the administrative core of the central government, it is alternatively named *Nangong* 南宮, *Nansheng* 南省, or *Nanmiao* 南廟. The departmental examination, or *shengshi* 省試, was the standard term during the Song, and it corresponded to the *huishi* 會試 (metropolitan examination) in the Ming-Qing examination systems; for the procedures of examinations in late imperial China, see Miyazaki, *China's Examination Hell*, esp. chapter 5–7. For an overview of Song practices of the imperial examinations, see Chaffee, *Thorny Gates,* chapter 2.

[30] See Cheng Minsheng, *Songdai wujia,* 372.

[31] Tian Jianping lists this anecdote in his table of sources concerning book prices and notes the gambling setting, but he does not discuss it further; see Tian Jianping, *Songdai chuban,* 575 and 582.

[32] Apart from the single verb *pu,* this gambling game can be denoted by various words, such as *guanpu* 關撲, *maipu* 賣撲, and pumai 撲賣; see Zhou Mi, *Wulin jiushi,* 3.1a and his *Guixin zazhi*, "Xuji" 續集, 1.41b, Hong Mai, *Yijian zhi*, "Sanzhi jijuan" 三志己卷, 9.1371, Zhuang Jiyu, *Jilei bian,* 3.94, and Meng Yuanlao, *Dongjing menghua lu*, 6.1a, 6.9b, 7.2b, and 10.1a; see also discussions of this game in Qi Ruixia, "Songdai biji suyuci," 62–65 and Wei Huaxian, "Songdai xiaofei jingji," 26–28.

device, and the outcome was determined by the number of the reverse side, or tails (*chun* 純, lit. pure, untainted) shown on the group of coins tossed onto the ground or into a pot. Also, the festive colour *hong* 紅 (red) was used as the term when one gets tails, whereas the colour *hei* 黑 (black) referred to heads (*zi* 字, lit. character).[33] This game was often played in holiday markets, such as the one where Su Song had his outing, and was usually instrumental in commercial exchanges.[34] The buyer would offer a price as the stake for the desired commodity, which is typically lower than its normal price, and then agree with the seller on the number of tails. If the toss gets the agreed number of tails, the player wins and can take back the stake together with the commodity. If not, the seller gets the money at stake. The more tails are required, the slimmer the chances are and the more it is a bargain for the buyer. That is to say, in Su Song's case, to get thirteen tails in one toss would have required an astonishing amount of luck (which then was attested by his performance in the examination), and the price at which he got the *Hanshu* would be much lower than its normal price, otherwise there would have been no point in gambling.

Another important question is of course the value of "five thousand cash" (*wu qian qian* 五千錢). This incident is dateable to 1042, the year when Su Song became a *jinshi*. According to near-contemporary records, the monthly salary of local officials at that time ranged from four/five thousand cash to eight/nine thousand cash.[35] In 1038, one could buy a sacrificial calf for imperial rituals with five thousand cash.[36] That should give us an idea about how much the *Hanshu* cost and why the crowd was so astonished when Su Song did not take back the stake

[33] See Lu Yinglong, *Xianchuang kuoyi zhi*, 9a–b.

[34] It was sometimes illegal to play this game on non-festive occasions. See, for example, Su Shi's complaint about local officials setting up this game to cheat farmers in his *Su Shi wenji,* 27.784,

[35] See Wang Anshi's 1059 memorial in his *Linchuan xiansheng weanji,* 39.9a and Shen Kuo, *Mengxi bitan,* 23.230; see also He Zhongli's discussion of the general state of official salaries during the Song, in "Songdai guanli de Fenglu," 102–115.

[36] See *SHYJG,* "Li" 禮, 26.9b; see also Cheng Minsheng, *Songdai wujia,* 600–604 for what one can buy with one thousand cash and ten thousand cash.

he could have. It also draws our attention to Su Song's family background. He came from a gentry family which immigrated to Fujian towards the end of the ninth century. The family produced several *jinshi* in every generation, and Su Song's father served as high minister in the central government. This background perhaps explains how Su Song, then a twenty-year-old exam candidate, could bring with him the cash equivalent of a petty local officials monthly salary and spend it in jest in a gambling game.

As the *Shiji* is of the similar size to the *Hanshu,* it seems reasonable to assume that a printed edition of the *Shiji* would not have been any cheaper than five thousand cash. Speaking of size, it should also be noted that the main texts (*jingwen* 經文) of all the classical texts[37] consist of some 635 thousand characters. The *Shiji* alone consists of some 526 thousand characters, *Hanshu* some 742 thousand, and *Hou Hanshu* some 377 thousand. With classical commentaries added, the study of the classics certainly involves much more than the main texts and can easily exceed the study of the three histories in terms of the minimum workload required. However, these figures do pose some questions for our conjecture about the reading of historical texts. From the anecdote about Su Song, we can infer that the benefit of printing technology perhaps was not yet manifest during the eleventh century. It is very likely that a printed copy of the standard histories was beyond the purchase power of average students. They might have read them by borrowing a copy from others and perhaps produced a manuscript copy for

[37] Given that the notion of what passes as one of the Confucian classics was not stable, it seems worth noting that Northern Song scholars perceived "the classics" as the five major classics (*Yi* 易, *Shu* 書, *Shi* 詩, *Li* 禮, and *Chunqiu* 春秋) or its extended corpus, "nine classics," i.e. *Yi*, *Shu*, *Shi*, *Yili* 儀禮, *Liji* 禮記, *Zhouli* 周禮, *Chunqiu Zuoshi zhuan* 春秋左氏傳, *Chunqiu Gongyang zhuan* 春秋公羊傳, and *Chunqiu Guliang zhuan* 春秋穀梁傳. The four texts that later became part of "the thirteen classics" (*shisan jing* 十三經), namely the *Lunyu* 論語, *Mengzi* 孟子, *Xiaojing* 孝經, and *Erya* 爾雅, were integral parts of the imperial examinations during the Northern Song and reached quasi-classical status. However, they were generally treated separately from *jing* 經 (classic) in examination modules; see Tuotuo, *Songshi,* 155.3604–06. It is during the Northern Song when the status of the *Mengzi* underwent significant changes, in which Wang Anshi's New Policies played a key role; see Zhang Yuhan, "Bei Song Xinxue," chapter 6. In my discussion, the word "classics" denotes the classics proper, whereas "classical corpus" and "classical texts" is a generic term for pan-classical texts, including the *Lunyu*, *Mengzi*, *Xiaojing* and *Erya.*

themselves.[38] But then, these histories are so voluminous, and the time and energy required to read and copy them is another type of cost they would have needed to consider. Would they really bother to read them? What were the alternative ways to learn about history?

Alternative Forms of Historical Knowledge

Apart from reading the book entitled *Shiji*, there were various ways one could acquire historical knowledge transmitted in the *Shiji*. It was an important source of historical knowledge but by no means the only source. One could hear about history from teachers, family, friends, or storytellers in the street. Information about the past can be passed over in different settings and forms, and one does not even need to be literate to be able to access it. In the written world where educated men immersed themselves, there were different types of texts that offered historical knowledge. From within the orthodox textual world, the *Shiji* would meet with challenges from at least two rivals, the classics and *Hanshu,* the narratives of which partly overlap with those of the *Shiji.*[39] From outside the orthodox textual world, there would have been more challenges. In a world where diverse forms of historical knowledge were floating around, one simply could not avoid being informed of past events in ways other than reading standard histories. Moreover, these alternative ways of learning were often much less expensive and more attractive. Therefore, this section looks at the potential rivals of the book *Shiji* and how they were related to orthodox historical accounts. The aims are to avoid

[38] For example, Zhang Fangping 張方平 (1007–1091) borrowed the *Shiji*, *Hanshu*, and *Hou Hanshu* for reading and reportedly "grasped details of them all" (*yi de qi xiang* 已得其詳) within ten days; see Tuotuo, *Songshi,* 318.10353–59 and the obituary written by Su Shi in his *Su Shi wenji,* 14.445. Zhang Fangping did not seem to have produced any copy of the books he borrowed, but this anecdote is recorded because Zhang Fangping was known as a reader of extraordinary memory and comprehensive abilities, hence it is more likely that his behaviour stands in contrast to common practice. See also Li Jingde, *Zhuzi yulei*, 171, where Zhu Xi reported that Chao Yuezhi 晁說之 (1059–1129) hand-copied the traditions of Gongyang and Guliang that he borrowed.

[39] See further discussion in chapters two and three.

oversimplifying the environments where the *Shiji* was located and, on the other hand, reveal what was perceived as the core of historical knowledge via investigation into its various forms.

(1) Storytelling

As in previous periods, vernacular traditions played an important role in the transmission of historical knowledge during the Northern Song. In the capital city, there were lively activities of storytelling, and history was a popular topic. In his reminiscence of a visit to the capital in 1103, Meng Yuanlao 孟元老 (fl. twelfth century) named fourteen professional storytellers, out of which seven were specialised in history. Among all historical periods, storytelling of events during the Han, Three Kingdoms (184/220–280) and Five Dynasties were most popular.[40]

There is no extant script or promptbook that we can attribute to the Northern Song with confidence,[41] but we can be certain that a major feature of storytelling was the elaborative narratives that aimed at maximising the entertaining effects of the performance. In his comment on *xiaoshuo* 小說 (minor talks), a category of storytelling, Zheng Qiao 鄭樵 (1104–1162) observed:

> […]如稗官之流，其理只在唇舌間，而其事亦有記載。虞舜之父，杞梁之妻，於經傳所言者，不過數十言耳，彼則演成千萬言。東方朔三山之求，諸葛亮九曲之勢，於史籍無其事，彼則肆為出入。[42]
>
> As for petty officials[43] and the like, their arguments just come out between the lips, yet the matters they [talk about] are actually on record. [On] the father of Shun of Yu and the wife of Qi Liang [fl. sixth century BC], what classical commentaries say is no more

[40] See Meng Yuanlao, *Dongjing*, 5.92; see also Luo Xiaoyu, "Song Yuan jiangshi huaben," 25–30.

[41] The Chinese terms closely associated with storytellers' promptbooks, especially from the Song until Yuan, are *pinghua* 平話 and *huaben* 話本; see Idema and Haft, *Traditional Chinese Literature,* 163–64 and chapter 21; see also Wivell, "The Term 'Hua-pen,'" 295–306. Extant texts related to Song-Yuan storytelling of historical matters are riddled with later editorial traces, so it is disputable to what extent they represent the actual practices of storytelling in earlier periods; see Luo Xiaoyu, "Song Yuan Jiangshi huaben," 52–104.

[42] Zheng Qiao, *Tongzhi*, 49.33a.

[43] The term *baiguan* 稗官 (petty officials) refers to officials in charge of reporting street gossip to the rulers; see Yan Shigu's gloss on *HS* 30.1745.

> than some tens of words, while they elaborate [the two stories] into thousands of words. Dongfang Shuo's [c. 160–c. 93 BC] pursuit of the three mountains[44] and Zhuge Liang's [181–234] circumstance along the nine bends[45] do not exist in historical accounts, while they make adaptations as [they] wish.

The first two examples can be found in the *Zuozhuan* 左傳 (Zuo's tradition [of the Spring and Autumn]). No detail about Shun's father Gusou 瞽瞍 (lit. blind old man) is provided apart from that he was one of Shun's forebears that "did not go against [the heavenly] order" (*wuwei ming* 無違命).[46] For Qi Liang's wife, we only find some terse accounts of how she reacted to her husband's death.[47] The other two stories are presumably related to Dongfang Shuo's association with immortality and Zhuge Liang's persona of a celebrated strategist. It should be noted that, despite his observation on the elaborative nature of this genre, Zheng Qiao did not explicitly object to the elaboration or accuse it of potential distortion or fabrication of history. Instead, he expressed his sympathies and even justified this approach. By analogy with musical compositions, he regarded exaggeration as a necessary artistic device for full expression of the narrator's thoughts.[48]

In modern scholarship regarding storytelling, activities focusing on historical matters are referred to as *jiangshi* 講史 (explanations of history). Yet, it is noteworthy that in Song sources, the alternative term is *jiang shishu* 講史書 (explanation of historical books).[49] The word *shi* 史 in modern Chinese, as the English word "history," denotes at least two concepts, namely the series of past events and written records of this series. However, as Christoph Harbsmeier

[44] The three mythical mountains were believed to be the dwellings of immortals.

[45] A metaphor for the Yangzi River.

[46] See *Zuozhuan* (Zhao 8), 44.26b (770). For a more well-known and elaborate version of the story about Shun's father attempting to murder Shun, see *SJ* 1.31–34.

[47] See *Zuozhuan* (Xiang 23), 35.20a–20b (607), *Liji*, 9.6a (165) and 10.12a(191), *Mengzi,* 12A.10b (213). On Qi Liang's wife as the prototype of the tale of Lady Mengjiang 孟姜女, whose weeping caused the collapse of part of the Great Wall, see essays in Gu Jiegang and Zhong Jingwen eds., *Mengjiang nü lunwenji*.

[48] Zheng Qiao, *Tongzhi*, 49.33a: 正為彼之意向如此, 不得不如此, 不說無以暢其胸中也.

[49] See Wu Zimu, *Mengliang lu,* 20.15a and 17a, and Nai Deweng, *Ducheng jisheng,* 13b–14a.

points out, the term *shi* in pre-modern context rarely denotes "historical events." It refers to "historical accounts/records" instead of the reality described in them.[50] In Song sources, the concept of historical events is denoted by *gushi* 故事 (past events), 古話 *guhua* (ancient tales) or *shi* 事 (events, matters) of a specified period, whereas *shi* 史 is reserved for historical records, especially the orthodox ones, and those who compile such records. The term *jiangshi* is thus not exactly explanation of the past but explanation of written records of the past. Examples of *jiangshi* often specify a historical account to be at focus,[51] which also testifies that *shi* in this term refers to historical accounts. For our purposes here, it is important to clarify the meaning of *shi* and highlight the less ambiguous term *jiang shishu*, because in doing so, it becomes explicit that an important appeal of storytelling of historical matters is that it bridged the textual world and widest possible audience. Because of its elaborative narratives and entertaining effects, storytelling served to transmit historical knowledge in an accessible and absorbing way. Wang Peng 王彭 (fl. 1065–1087) once recalled storytellers as a solution for parents who wanted to get rid of their naughty kids:

> 途巷中小兒薄劣，其家所厭苦，輒與錢，令聚坐聽說古話。至說三國事，聞劉玄德敗，顰蹙有出涕者，聞曹操敗，即喜唱快。[52]
>
> The alley kids are nasty and a pain for their families. [Their families] always give [them] money and ask [them] to sit together and listen to the [story]telling of ancient tales. When it comes to the [story]telling of the matters of Three Kingdoms, upon hearing of the defeat of Liu Xuande [namely Liu Bei 劉備, 161–223], [the audience] furrow their brows, some [even] shedding tears; upon hearing the defeat of Cao Cao [155–220], [the audience] immediately cry out their approval with joy.

[50] See Harbsmeier, "Notions of the Time and of History," 60–66.

[51] For an example of the storytelling of *Hanshu,* see Hong Mai, *Yijian zhi,* "Dingji," 3.11b. Other records of storytelling of the events during the Han are more ambiguous in terms of the storytellers' textual sources, see Mei Yaochen, *Wanling ji*, 53.9a, Xie Zhaozhi, *Wu zazu*, 16.328 and Liu Kezhuan, *Houcun ji,* 10.16b.

[52] Su Shi, *Dongpo zhilin*, 1.7.

This is just one example of how storytelling engaged the audience, even naughty little kids, emotionally with historical matters.[53] In such entertainment consumption, the audience paid to have historical accounts explained to them. Depending on different educational backgrounds and understanding of the relation between storytelling and historical accounts, people in the audience would have had different takes on the historicity of the storyteller's narratives. Nevertheless, storytelling certainly had a larger and more diverse audience than historical accounts on which it was based would have and, to a certain degree, made the reading of historical accounts possible for not just educated men but also illiterate people.

(2) Primers

Since the Tang dynasty, primers such as the *Tuyuan cefu* 兔園策府 (Repository of Policies of the Rabbit Garden) have been widely used in elementary education.[54] The *Tuyuan cefu*, alternatively known as *Tuyuan ce* 兔園策/兔園冊 (Policies/Documents of the Rabbit Garden), was lost during the Yuan, but the word *tuyuan* survived as a general term for all the primers meant to aid children's memorisation of allusions. Designed for children, theses primers were characterised by their simplicity, which was subsequently extended to denote shallow and unsophisticated books. For this reason, the word *tuyuan ce* often goes in tandem with a pejorative connotation in scholarly writings.[55]

Nevertheless, it is undeniable that these primers played an important role in the transmission of knowledge in elementary education. Quite often, the compilers of these primers

[53] For a similar example, see Lu You's recollection of enjoying storytelling in his childhood in his *Laoxuean biji,* 6.75.

[54] *Tuyuan* is the name of a garden formerly owned by Li Yun 李惲 (c. 620–674), a son of Taizong of Tang 唐太宗 (598–649, r. 626–649). *Ce* 策 and *ce* 冊 are homophones in middle Chinese. The four Dunhuang manuscripts attest to the use of *ce* 策 and seem to support Wang Yinglin's interpretation of the title, which suggests that the content of the book takes the form of question and responses in imitation of the *ce* 策 (policy question) module in the examinations; see Wang Yinglin, *Kunxue jiwen,* 14.14b and Guo Li, "*Tuyuan cefu* kaolun," 94.

[55] See, for example, Ouyang Xiu, *Xin Wudaishi*, 55.632 and Zheng Qiao, *Tongzhi*, 49.33a–b.

were experienced tutors and/or recognised literati. The *Shiqi shi mengqiu* 十七史蒙求 (Quests of the Ignoramus for the Seventeen Histories) is one such example. It is named after the *Mengqiu* 蒙求 (Quests of the Ignoramus), a popular primer since the Tang. The title alludes to the explanation of the hexagram *meng* 蒙 in the *Yi* 易 (Changes), which reads "the juvenile ignoramus quests for me" (*tongmeng qiu wo* 童蒙求我).[56] Composed in tetrasyllabic verse, the *Mengqiu* introduces about six hundred historical figures in total. The Song witnessed the production of quite a few primers in the *Mengqiu* style, and the subject matters extended to the classics and Daoist texts.[57]

According to the preface (dated 1101), the *Shiqi shi mengqiu* is attributed to Wang Ling 王令 (1032–1059).[58] He did not seem to have made any attempt to take the imperial examinations but supported himself by tutoring in the Jiangsu area. Nevertheless, he came to make the acquaintance of Wang Anshi, who spoke highly of him and eventually married his wife's sister to him.[59] Wang Ling reportedly drew on his expertise in history to compile the *Shiqi shi mengqiu,* presumably a project originated from his own teaching.

The main text of the *Shiqi shi mengqiu* is only one scroll. Some editions include a commentary by an unknown hand and thus expand to sixteen scrolls.[60] The main text consists

[56] See Chao Gongwu's note on the *Mengqiu*, *Junzhai dushuzhi*, 14.672. On the hexagram *meng*, see *Zhouyi zhengyi,* 1.13b (23); see also Lynn, *Classic of Changes*, 158. On controversy of the authorship of the *Mengqiu*, see Tang Wen, "Mengqiu zuozhe," 18ff. On the three extant Dunhuang manuscripts of the *Mengqiu*, see Cheng A-cai, "Dunhuangben Mengqiu," 177–198. The whole book is available in an English translation by Burton Watson, but he only translated the main text without the commentary by Xu Ziguan 徐子光, a Song scholar that is only known as the commentator of the *Mengqiu*.

[57] See for example, Tuotuo, *Songshi*, 202.5059, 202.5061, 207.5293, 5297, 5299–5302, Chao Gongwu, *Junzhai dushuzhi*, 14.673, and Chen Zhensun, *Zhizhai shulu jieti*, 14.424, 426–28.

[58] Chen Zhensun, *Zhizhai shulu jieti*, 14.427 notes that the book was compiled by a scholar with the surname Wang and that some people attributed it to Wang Ling.

[59] See the poems and epitaph in Wang Anshi, *Linchuan xiansheng wenji,* 7.8a–b, 9b, 20.2b–3a and 30.6b.

[60] The earliest extant edition seems to be a Qing print of the sixteen scrolls edition dated 1709, now in Tōyō Bunkō 東洋文庫. There are two manuscripts in Japan, both consisting of ten scrolls and dated to the Edo period (1603–1867). The relationship between the manuscripts and the annotated Qing editions is unclear. Also, a sixteen-scroll edition (preface dated 1827) was reprinted in Japan and accompanied by reading marks by Okazaki Motonori 岡崎元軌 (1767–1832); see Okazaki's preface in Wang Ling, *Shiqi shi mengqiu,* 2a.

mostly of high-frequency characters, but it delivers highly-compressed information. For instance:

梁感石英，	Liang moved quartz;
阮致人蔘。	Ruan brought about ginseng.
仁裕剖腸，	Renyu split intestines;
知章破心。[61]	Zhizhang broke the heart.

The messages and points of reference of this excerpt can be laid out in the following table:

Table 1 Messages and Points of Reference of the *Shiqi shi mengqiu* Excerpt

Main text	Protagonist	Anecdote	Point of reference given in the commentary
梁感石英	Liang Yanguang 梁彥光 (541-601)	When Liang Yanguang was seven years old, his father was seriously ill and needed quartz. After searching for some time without success, he suddenly saw a transformed being in his garden, which turned out to be a piece of quartz. People said that his filial piety had moved even the quartz.	*Suishu*[62]
阮致人蔘	Ruan Xiaoxu 阮孝緒 (479-536)	Ruan Xiaoxu's mother was ill and needed ginseng. After searching in the mountains for days without success, he suddenly saw a deer, which then led him to a place of ginseng and disappeared.	*Nanshi*[63]
仁裕剖腸	Wang Renyu 王仁裕 (880-956)	Wang Renyu once dreamed that he split his intestines and washed them in the West River, where he saw all the sands in the water become words. He then made great progress in poetry and named his corpus *Collection of the West River*.	*Xin Wudaishi* [64]
知章破心	Yin Zhizhang 尹知章 (660-718)	Yin Zhizhang once dreamed that someone hit his heart with a huge chisel. When he woke up, he felt greatly inspired and started to excel in the classics.	*Xin Tangshu* [65]

This excerpt shows that it is quite impossible that a child would be able to understand the main text without sufficient guidance. Moreover, the anecdotes, each introduced by a

[61] Wang Ling, *Shiqi shi mengqiu,* 2.7b–8a.

[62] See Wei Zheng, *Suishu*, 73.1674.

[63] See Li Yanshou, *Nanshi*, 76.1894.

[64] See Ouyang Xiu, *Xin Wudaishi*, 57.662. It should be noted that the *Xin Wudaishi* was published after Wang Ling's death. The anonymous commentator only specifies the dynasty, not his textual source, but the wording of the commentary is clearly based on the *Xin Tangshu;* see Wang Ling, *Shiqi shi mengqiu,* 2.8a. The anecdote is also recorded in Xue Juzheng, *Jiu Wudaishi,* 128.1689–90.

[65] See Ouyang Xiu, *Xin Tangshu*, 199.5671. Again, the commentator aligned with the wording of *Xin Tangshu,* which was published after Wang Ling's death; see Wang Ling, *Shiqi shi mengqiu,* 2.81. The anecdote is also recorded in Liu Xu, *Jiu Tangshu*, 189b.4974

tetrasyllabic line, do not follow the chronological order. This is perhaps for the sake of more liberty in paring anecdotes that have the same implications (e.g. filial piety, honesty, diligence, etc.) and in selecting suitable phrases from the sources in order to craft perfectly parallel couplets. That is to say, priority is given to parallel style instead of chronology.

In terms of the relation between the main text of *Shiqi shi mengqiu* and its source references, the expressions used in each line of the translated excerpt can be traced in historical accounts. That is to say, in this *Mengqiu* style, historical knowledge was compressed into a series of rhymed prompters and detached from their textual sources. Through education with such a primer, what the pupil processed and internalised as historical knowledge was the abstract "past" extracted from historical records.

(3) Commonplace Books

The last form of historical knowledge we look at in this section is the books that categorise pre-existing texts, which come close to the so-called *leishu* 類書 (category books). In fact, many primers are also regarded as a form of *leishu* as they introduce general knowledge by category. The *Tuyuan ce* mentioned above is one example at hand.[66] Scholars have pointed out that this type of books are similar to commonplace books that were mainly for personal reference and popularised since the Renaissance, yet Chinese *leishu* were often imperially commissioned and distinctively of an encyclopaedic nature.[67] It is true that most known examples of *leishu* are large-scale projects, but it is rather inconceivable that copying useful extracts by category has ever been a practice confined to the limited group of imperial elites and prominent scholars. The *leishu* or *leishu*-like manuscript fragments found in Dunhuang

[66] See Wang San-ching, *Dunhuang leishu,* 117–18. For another example, see a dozen Dunhuang manuscripts of the text entitled *Zachao* 雜抄 (Miscellaneous Epitomes), regarded as *mengshu* 蒙書 (primers) in Cheng A-cai and Chu Feng-yu, *Dunhuang mengshu,* 165-193 and as *leishu* in Wang San-ching, *Dunhuang leishu,* 123–126. For the overlaps between *mengshu* and *leishu,* see Cheng A-cai and Chu Feng-yu, *Dunhuang mengshu,* 4.

[67] See Tian Xiaofei, "Literary Learning: Encyclopedias and Eptomes," esp. 140–143.

attest to the prevalence of this kind of compilation and expand our understanding of *leishu*. More than two thirds of these manuscript fragments are of unknown titles, and only four out of fifteen titles attested in these fragments are transmitted in received catalogues.[68] This should give us an idea of how the perception of *leishu* might have been tuned by extant material. Here I choose to use the term "commonplace book" to refer to the compilations of quotes. They can be intimate and personalised as well as commercialised. More importantly, they clearly converge with European commonplace books in the strategy of knowledge management, copying verbatim or nearly verbatim excepts from pre-existing texts and arranging them by topic. In other words, the form of historical knowledge found in these compilations, compared to storytelling and primers, bears a higher degree of textual affinity with its sources.

For the Northern Song, we do not have any extant commonplace books apart from the famous large-scale compilations such the *Taiping yulan* 太平御覽 (Taiping [Era's compilation] for the Emperor's Reading) and *Cefu yuangui* 冊府元龜 (Outstanding Models from the Storehouse of Literature), which are unlikely to have been (easily) available to the wider public. However, there are reports on the prevalence of commonplace books among exam candidates. Su Shi, for example, once reported:

> 近世士人纂類經史，綴緝時務，謂之策括，待問條目，搜抉略盡，臨時剽竊，竄易首尾，以眩有司， 有司莫能辨也。[69]
>
> Intellectuals nowadays categorise the classics and histories and collect [records of] contemporary affairs, calling them summaries for policy questions. [As for] topics that can be asked about, [they] have hunted down nearly everything. [They] plagiarise [such compilations] offhand, replacing beginning or ending in order to cheat the officers. Officers cannot distinguish [their tricks].

The aim of such books was to organise resources in a way that could sustain faster responses to potential questions (*daiwen tiaomu* 待問條目). The passage *linshi piaoqie* 臨時剽竊

[68] See Wang San-ching, *Dunhuang leishu,* 127–131. His calculation is based on 112 scrolls of forty-three titles (including known and unknown titles).

[69] Su Shi, *Su Shi wenji,* 25.723–724.

(plagiarise [such compilations] offhand) might indicate that these commonplace books were often used as examination cribs. Even if not, they would have served as shortcuts in the preparation of imperial examinations, because some exam candidates committed themselves to memorisation of useful quotes and writings by previously successful candidates instead of studying authoritative texts.[70]

Extant examination references from the Southern Song, such as the *Lidai zhidu xiangshuo* 歷代制度詳說 (Detailed Explanations of Institutions Throughout the Ages) and *Qunshu huiyuan jiejiang wang* 群書會元截江網 (River-Cutting Net that Summarises Various Books),[71] can perhaps shed light on how *cekuo* 策括 (summaries for policy questions) might have worked in Su Shi's days. The two books both deal with one subject matter in each scroll, starting with verbatim or nearly-verbatim quotes from various sources. Also, the points of reference are detailed in annotations. The *Qunshu huiyuan jiejiang wang* makes it clear that the first sections of each scroll concern *shishi* 事實 (facts). That is to say, historical accounts are not to be understood as historiographical works that address concerns of a specialised discipline. Together with classical texts and writings of pre-Qin masters, historical accounts (including standard histories, digests of government institutions, miscellaneous histories, etc.) are equally treated as textual embodiments of historical facts. We certainly find the *Shiji* as one of the sources, but it is segmented, dispersed and mixed with quotes from other sources that address the same issue. A reader of these commonplace books have come across historical accounts in their original wording, but he would have only processed them on the level of historical events and not engaged with historiographical aspects.

[70] See Yue Ke, *Kuitan lu,* 9.14a–15a and *SHYJG,* "Xuanju," 8.36b.

[71] The former is attributed to the prominent thinker Lü Zuqian 呂祖謙 (1137–1181) and the latter was compiled by anonymous compiler(s) sponsored by commercial establishments; see Yong Rong, *Tiyao,* 135.41b; see also de Weerdt's discussion of examination references including these two works, with a focus on their implications for ideological reconciliation, in her *Competition over Content,* 272–297.

In sum, the three forms of historical knowledge discussed in this section all have their roots in historical accounts, including the *Shiji*. They adapt and edit historical accounts in different ways (to expand, compress, and disperse respectively). The first two (vernacular traditions and primers) are perhaps more often associated with popular history and perceived as less serious, whereas commonplace books exhibit textual loyalty to authoritative sources. As some commonplace books were designed specifically for the preparation of imperial examinations, they seemingly served historical study as an intellectual undertaking. Yet, the management of historical accounts in commonplace books shares one thing in common with the other two forms of historical knowledge, that is to separate *shi* 事 (historical events) from *shi* 史 (historical accounts), or one might say, to deprive histories of their historiographical identity. For general acquisition of historical knowledge, it does not really matter whether it comes from the *Shiji, Hanshu,* primers, storytellers or commonplace books. But there is one occasion where sources might have mattered—imperial examinations, the field on which the next two sections focus.

Teaching and Assessing Historical Knowledge before the New Policies

Since the Sui dynasty (581–618), imperial examinations played an increasingly important role in recruiting officials to serve the empire. At the same time, the examination has been used as a pedagogical device to enforce what the authority wanted people to learn. Imperial promotion of historical studies in the examinations is well documented, and these documents have been singled out as evidence of the importance of history.[72] This would perhaps leave the impression that historical learning was highly valued during the Song and thus led to the flourishing of historiography. Yet, it should also be noted that memorials about promoting

[72] See Hartwell, "Historical Analogism," 704–709.

history often start precisely with a description of a general *lack* of historical knowledge.[73] Moreover, discussions going on high up in the court could only demonstrate an intention to promote historical studies. Although the ideal result is often described as approachable, when it comes to the materialisation of the theory, there can be a wide gap between what is intended and what is achieved. This section focuses on material that illuminates this gap and discusses the status of historical education in pedagogical schemes prior to Wang Anshi's New Policies.

Among all degrees one could obtain in the imperial examinations, our investigation focuses on the examinations for the *jinshi* 進士 (presented scholar) degree, which was the most prestigious degree and attracted the most exam candidates.[74] Before the 1070s, there were six modules in the examination of candidates, including composition of a poem (*shi* 詩), a rhapsody (*fu* 賦), an essay (*lun* 論), five policy questions (*ce* 策), ten fill-in-the-blank tests on the *Lunyu* (*tie Lunyu* 貼論語) and ten memorisation exercises concerning the *Chunqiu* or *Liji* (*dui Chunqiu huo Liji moyi* 對春秋或禮記墨義).[75] History could be incorporated into any one of the first four modules. According to extant material,[76] most exam questions before Renzong's reign (1022–1063) were based on contemporary events, the classics, *Laozi* 老子 (Master Lao) and *Zhuangzi* 莊子 (Master Zhuang). From the 1030s onwards, there was a clear

[73] See, for example, a 1185 memorial about expanding history topics in the examination to all periods of Chinese history starts with the observation that in those days students did not pay attention to history. *SHYJG*, "Xuanju," 5.7b.

[74] It is perhaps worth mentioning that imperial examinations during the Norther Song, following the practice of the Tang, offered a *sanshi* 三史 (Three Histories) degree. There is not much documentation of the examinations for this degree. The method of assessment is basically a test of memorisation. The examination consisted of three hundred memorisation questions, which attracted very few candidates; see Tuotuo, *Songshi,* 155.3604–05; see also Kracke, *Civil Service in Early Sung China,* 63–68.

[75] See Tuotuo, *Songshi*, 155.3604 and Ma Duanlin, *Wenxian tongkao,* 30.21a–b. For an overview of the imperial examinations during the Northern Song, see Chaffee, *Thorny Gates,* chapters 3–4 and Elman, *A Cultural History of Civil Examinations in Late Imperial China,* 12–19.

[76] Exam questions for the last round of examinations, the palace examination (*dianshi* 殿試), are best documented, see *SHYJG*, "Xuanju," 7.1a–18b. For a table of all topics in palace examinations from 973 to 1067, see Zhou Xinglu, *Keju shici*, 57–61. On exam questions of poems in prefectural examinations (*jieshi* 解試, lit. dispatching exmaination) and department examinations (*shengshi*), see Zhou Xinglu, *Keju shici,* 15–25.

increase in exam questions based on histories, and they could be integrated into the exam questions in three ways:

1) The exam question could be a verbatim quotation from a standard history, asking candidates to compose, for example, a poem on "Seeking for lost books in the world" (*qiu yishu yu tianxia* 求遺書於天下),[77] a rhapsody on "Responding to Heaven with substance instead of ornamentation" (*ying tian yi shi bu yi wen* 應天以實不以文),[78] or an essay on "An incorruptible officer being a standard for the people" (*lianli min zhi biao* 廉吏民之表),[79] etc.
2) The exam question could be an abridged or rephrased passage from the histories, asking for an essay on "Classicists can be companions in maintaining achievements" (*ruzhe ke yu shoucheng* 儒者可與守成), [80] a poem on "Clouds cover the bush of alpine yarrow" (*yun fu cong shi* 雲覆叢蓍), [81] or a rhapsody on "Wendi on the edge of [his] mat asked about ghosts and spirits" (*Wendi qianxi wen guishen* 文帝前席問鬼神),[82] etc.
3) Occasionally the exam question could be an essay on a more general topic, e.g. "Obedient officers of the two Han periods" (*liang Han xunli* 兩漢循吏).[83]

These examples may give us an idea about what it meant to make an exam question out of history. If one were to identify the point of reference, he would need a rather sound and detailed knowledge of standard histories, especially the Three Histories, on which most topics on history during the Northern Song were based. But did this really make candidates study standard histories harder?

In fact, many candidates, even the presumably most promising ones who succeeded in departmental examination, might have failed to make sense of the exam questions in the palace

[77] See *SHYJG*, "Xuanju," 7.18a and *HS* 10.310 and 30.1701.

[78] See *SHYJG*, "Xuanju," 7.16b and *HS* 45.2184.

[79] See *SHYJG*, "Xuanju," 7.16a and *HS* 4.124.

[80] See *SHYJG*, "Xuanju," 7.15a, *SJ* 99.2722 and *HS* 43.2126.

[81] See *SHYJG*, "Xuanju," 7.18a and *SJ* 128.3226

[82] See Wu Jingxu, *Lidai shihua,* 20.2a–b, *SJ* 84.2502–03 and *HS* 48.2230.

[83] See *SHYJG*, "Xuanju," 7.16b. *Xun* 循 denotes "following reason" (*xunli* 循理) in the *Shiji*, see *SJ* 119.3099 and 130.3317; cf. Nienhauser, *Scribe's Records*, vol. X, 227, n. 1. But Yan Shigu glosses *xun* as "following" (*shun* 順) regulations as well as humane feelings, see *HS* 89.3623.

examination. They were, however, allowed to ask for further explanation. Even the celebrated Ouyang Xiu once asked for clarification on the points of reference in the 1030 palace examination.[84] It is unclear for which one(s) he needed further explanations, but it is noteworthy that the three questions of that examination were either verbatim quotes (from the *Zhuangzi*)[85] or nearly verbatim quote (probably from the *Hanshu*).[86] Unlike questions that gave a topic (e.g. "Obedient officers of the two Han dynasties"), questions based on verbatim quotes clearly have higher requirements for precise knowledge of textual details, and a grasp of the general meaning of a passage or the ability to recall historical facts might not have done the trick.

Ouyang Xiu was not the only one who had problems with exam questions in that examination. It was a common problem. As a result, complaint came that too many candidates ran back and forth to make such enquiries, which hindered the order and solemnity of the examination hall. However, the inconvenience caused did not lead to the urge of pushing the educational level to a higher standard. Instead, it ended up with a compromise by the examiners. In 1034, an edict was issued that exam questions would all be printed along with explanations of the points of reference.[87]

Up to this point, it is clear that the textual knowledge required to understand exam questions could not stand for the actual level of textual knowledge of examiners. Yet, we cannot establish a comparison of exam candidates' performance in the identification of points of reference from different kinds of texts from extant material alone. It remains unclear whether

[84] See *SHYJG*, "Xuanju," 7.15a–b. However, the record does not indicate in which one he made the enquiry.

[85] The exam question was to compose a "Cangzhu yu yuan fu" 藏珠於淵賦, which refers to the chapter "Tiandi" 天地 in *Nanhua zhenjing*, 5.3a: 藏珠於淵. Note that the *Zhuangzi*, alternatively known as *Nanhua zhenjing,* was accompanied by glosses of Guo Xiang 郭象 (c. 252–312) and Lu Deming 陸德明 (556–627) in this period; see *SHYJG,* "Chongru," 4.3a-b and Cheng Ju, *Lintai gushi,* 2.60.

[86] The exam question was to compose a "Puai wusi shi" 溥愛無私詩, which is a nearly verbatim quote from *HS* 56.251, and a "Ruzhe keyu shoucheng lun" 儒者可與守成論, for which *SJ* 99.2722 and *HS* 43.2126 have the same wording: 夫儒者難與進取,可與守成.

[87] Ye Mengde, *Shilin yanyu*, 8.3a–b, Wang Yong, *Yanyi yimou lu*, 5.39 and Hong Mai, *Rongzhai suibi*, 3.31-32.

examiners struggled with historical reference more than, for example, classical reference. To understand various modes and potential effects of learning of different texts, we need to turn to pedagogy.

Again, the documentation of educational activities concerning the classics is much better than those concerning history. It seems quite common that lecturers orally expounded on the classics in official as well as unofficial schools, including the National Academy (*taixue* 太學)[88] and private classrooms run by individual tutors,[89] but little evidence indicates that history was taught in the same way during the Northern Song. The most detailed account of the status of historical education in a wider curriculum is perhaps the stele inscription of school regulations, set by the Elementary School of Jingzhao 京兆 prefecture (near modern Xi'an) in 1054.[90] The inscription contains the curriculum of the school and has been discussed in the context of elementary education and school regulations.[91] But here, I would like to highlight the pedagogical hierarchy demonstrated in the following extract:

一　教授每日講說經書三兩帋，授諸生所誦經書文句音義，題所學書字樣，出所課詩賦題目，撰所對屬詩句，擇所記故事。

Item Every day, teachers expound on two or three sheets of paper from the classical books, deliver to students the pronunciation and meaning of the passages from the classical books to be recited, inscribe the characters to be learned,[92] provide the topics of poetry and rhapsodies to be tested, write out the couplets to be completed and choose the past events to be remembered.

一　諸生學課分為三等

Item The study and assessment of students are divided into three classes:

---

[88] For example, Sun Jue 孫覺 (1028–1090) gave lectures on the *Mengzi* and *Yi* in the 1050s; see Ma Duanlin, *Wenxian tongkao*, 42.4b; see also the teaching scheme proposed by Su Song in his 1068 memorial in Yang Shiqi, *Mingchen zouyi*, 114.26a–27b.

[89] See Ye Mengde, *Bishu luhua*, 2.81–82.

[90] A translation of the whole inscription can be found in Wu Pei-yi, "Education of Children," 311–312. The new translation presented here provides alternative readings of some technical terms that are highly relevant to the current discussion.

[91] See Wu Pei-yi, "Education of Children," 307–324 and Lee, *Education in Traditional China,* 594–598.

[92] In this stele, *shu* 書 is used in two distinct senses: books and the writing (of characters). The translations of the two senses *shu* in the curricula of the following three classes are informed by the context. In general, the first *shu* occurring in each curriculum refers to classical books, and the second *shu* refers to the writing of characters.

第一等
每日抽籤問所聽經義三道，念書一二百字，學書十行，吟五七言古律詩一首。三日試賦一首或四韻，看賦一道，看史傳三五帋內記故事三條。

The first class
Every day, random [student(s)] are asked three questions about the meaning of the classics that they have heard [from the teacher]. [Each student needs to] memorise[93] one to two hundred characters from [classical] books, learn to write [characters] for ten lines, and compose one pentasyllabic or heptasyllabic poem in ancient or regulated style. Every three days, [students need to] be tested on [the composition of] a rhapsody or [verses of] four rhymes,[94] scan one rhapsody and three or four sheets of paper of historical traditions in which three past events are recorded.

第二等
每日念書約一百字，學書十行，吟詩一絕，對屬一聯，念賦二韻，記故事一件。

The second class
Every day, [students need to] memorise a hundred or so characters from [classical] books; learn to write [characters] for ten lines; compose one quatrain poem; complete one couplet; memorise [verses of] two rhymes of rhapsodies; remember one past event.

第三等
每日念書五七十字，學書十行，念詩一首。[95]

The third class
Everyday [students need to] memorise fifty to seventy characters from [classical] books; learn to write [characters] for ten lines; memorise one poem.

According to this curriculum, the memorisation of the classics, calligraphy practice and poetic composition are compulsory for students of all levels. As the level goes higher, there is more intensive training concerning poetry and rhapsodies. This design clearly caters for future challenges in imperial examinations, for the composition of *shi* and *fu* was part of the more important modules prior to the 1070s.[96]

[93] On *nian* as reciting from memory, see Wang Xianqian, *Buzhu*, 81.4892. For an analysis of different types of reading (*du* 讀, *song* 誦, *zhou* 籀, *nian* 念, *yue* 閱, and *yong* 詠), see Behr and Führer, "Einführende Notizen zum Lesen," 13–26.

[94] The rhyming formula of exam rhapsodies was established during the Tang and followed by the Northern Song. The exam rhapsody topic was typically given with eight required rhymes, so "verses of four rhymes" means half an exam rhapsody. On rhyming requirements of exam rhapsodies established during the Tang, see Dong Jiuxiong, "Tangdai bayun shifu," 239–275.

[95] Wang Chang, *Jinshi cuibian,* 134.23b–24b.

[96] During the first century of the Song, *shifu* (poetry and rhapsody) generally played a more decisive role than other modules, such as *celun* (policy and essay), but there were constant debates on assessment criteria. Fan Zhongyan's reforms in the 1040s elevated the status of *celun*, and Wang Anshi's reforms in the 1070s

Although history is incorporated in the curriculum, it takes a rather marginal position. It can even be abandoned at a certain point, as in the curriculum for the third class. Compared to other modes of training concerning the classics and poetic composition, the acquisition of historical knowledge requires much less intellectual commitment, which can be illustrated by the verbs associated with different areas of study (see Table 1.2).

Table 1.2 Students' Activities in Different Areas of Learning

	Jing 經 Classical texts	*Shi* 詩 Poems	*Fu* 賦 Rhapsodies	*Shu* 書 Writings	*Shi* 史 Histories
Nian 念 (read aloud in order to commit to memory)	√	√	√		
Yin 吟 (compose)		√			
Dui 對 (match, complete a couplet)		√			
Shi 試 (test)			√		
Xue 學 (learn)				√	
Kan 看 (look)			√		√
Ji 記 (remember)					√

In this pedagogical scheme, teachers only orally expounded on (*jiangshuo* 講說) classical texts. In actual teaching, teachers must have also expounded on their teaching material on other occasions, but the fact that only explanations of classical texts were written in the pedagogical scheme is indicative of the pivotal status of classical learning. On the students' side, the verb *nian* 念 (read, typically aloud, so as to commit to memory) suggests that students needed to engage with and internalise not just the philosophical messages but also textual details of the

completely abolished *shifu* from imperial examinations. For a summary of the flux of *shifu* in examinations throughout Song times, see Zhu Shangshu, *Songdai keju yu wenxue*, 190–209.

books. In other words, the pedagogical approach of classical texts asks for absolute submission of the student to the learning material.

Poetic training (including *shi* 詩 and *fu* 賦) also required memorisation, as reflected in the verb *nian*. Apart from that, it also called for creative output (*yin* 吟 and *dui* 對). Yet, it should be noted that the point of this training was not to encourage "creativity" in a modern sense, but to practise established rules (rhymes, different forms, parallelism, etc.) that had been internalised. Similarly, character writing practice focuses on imitation of given models. It is most likely that the most important thing at this level is not (yet) to cultivate an individual artistic style of calligraphy, but to conform with writing conventions and to progress in literacy.

It should be noted that the three activities associated with classical and poetic training, namely, *nian, yin* and *dui*, all entailed oral connotations. When it came to historical accounts, *kan* 看 (to look at) was unambiguously silent and less intensive reading. Students also "looked at" example rhapsodies, but in that case, silent reading was combined with other activities such as *nian* and *shi* 試 (test), constituting a more complex pedagogical approach. Also, the whole meaning of historical education seemed to be familiarising the students with *gushi* 故事 (past events), which was reminiscent of the terminological discussion in the previous section. The only occurrence of *shi* 史 (historical accounts) in the pedagogical scheme we are looking at is in the combination *shizhuan* 史傳 (historical traditions, or historical biographies). *Kan* and *ji* 記 (remember) represent the process of detaching *gushi* (historical events) from *shi* (historical accounts). During this process, the student had the cognitive freedom to extract information from the texts and rework it into a preferable form that was more digestible for his brain. That is to say, historical teaching in this pedagogical scheme was fundamentally different from that of other fields in the sense that it did not require total submission to the learning material.

It is certainly disputable to what extent this 1054 inscription at Jingzhao prefecture can represent practices in other regions of the empire and during other periods of the Northern Song. Nevertheless, it offers us an opportunity to catch a glimpse of the hierarchy of knowledge at that time and a perspective to reconstruct the strategies people applied to distribute their limited energy and time to different areas of learning. The inscription also testifies that, to a considerable degree, the aim of education was to prepare students for future imperial examinations. When the assessment criteria changed, educational practices were also adjusted accordingly. During the Northern Song, Wang Anshi's 王安石 (1021–1086) New Policies exerted the most serious impact on historical learning.

After Wang Anshi's New Polices

When Wang Anshi came into power in 1069, he initiated radical reforms in various fields, including education and the examinations. Some of his policies were not his creation and can actually be traced back to debates in earlier periods, but it was his reforms that gave significant institutional expression to the results of these debates and thus exerted significant influences on subsequent periods. In 1071, he established the *sanshe fa* 三舍法 (Three Hall System) in the *taixue* 太學 (Imperial University) as an integral part of bureaucratic recruitment mechanisms. This system was later extended to prefectural schools and even resulted in a hierarchical school system that replaced imperial examinations for the sake of ideological uniformity during the first two decades of the twelfth century.[97] Moreover, Wang Anshi prioritised the study of "classical meaning" (*jingyi* 經義) to "poetry and rhapsodies" (*shifu* 詩賦) in the recruitment procedure. He started to abolish "poetry and rhapsodies" in the imperial

[97] See *XZZTJCB* 301.12a–13a; see also Chaffee, *Thorny Gates,* 77–80 and Levine, "Reigns of Hui-tsung and Ch'in-tsung," 585–589.

examinations in 1070 and issued the so-called *Sanjing xinyi* 三經新義 (Three Classics: New Meaning) as the sole textbooks in 1075.[98] The examination of poetry and rhapsodies resumed in 1085, almost immediately after the death of Wang Anshi's sponsor, Emperor Shenzong 神宗 (1048–1085, r. 1067–1085). However, the weighing of classical learning and poetic composition remained in flux until the mid-twelfth century, when the imperial examinations finally settled on a system where *jingyi* and *shifu* co-existed as two options available to all examinees.[99]

At first glance, the debate on proper criteria of imperial examinations was focused on the competition between classical learning and literary composition. Historical learning was not directly involved. Yet, Wang Anshi's new policies are deemed to have exerted fatal influence on historical scholarship towards the end of the Northern Song. This discourse reoccurs in various brush notes (*biji* 筆記), especially during the early Southern Song. For instance, Zhu Bian 朱弁 (d. 1144) recalled:

> 科舉自罷詩賦以後，士趁時好，專以《三經義》為捷徑，非徒不觀史，而于所習經外，他經及諸子無復有讀之者。故于古今人物，及時世之治亂興衰之迹，亦漫不省。元祐初韓察院以論科舉改更事嘗言：“臣於元豐初差對讀舉人試卷，其程文中或有云‘古有董仲舒，不知何代人’。當時傳者莫不以為笑。”此與定陵時省試舉子於簾前上請云“堯舜是一事是兩事”絕相類，亦可怪也。[100]
>
> Since the imperial examinations abolished poetry and rhapsodies, intellectuals inclined towards the contemporary trend and took specifically *The Three Classics: [New] Commentaries* as a shortcut. It is not just histories that they disregarded. Apart from the classics they studied [as a speciality], they no longer read other classics or various masters. Therefore, they grew completely ignorant of historical and contemporary figures as well as the legacies of the vicissitudes of times. In the early Yuanyou era

[98] See *XZZTJCB* 243.9b–10a and 265.36a. It should be noted that *Sanjing xinyi* is not a book title. Wang Anshi led the exegetic project and produced commentaries of the *Shi, Shu* and *Zhouli*. Alhough this is a colaborative project, it is widely accepted that these commentaries represent Wang Anshi's classical scholarship; see Cheng Yuan-Min, *Sanjing xinyi jikao huiping,* vol. 2, 416. In the *Songshi*, these commentaries are recorded under titles of *Xinjing Shu yi* 新經書義 (New Meaning of the Classic of *Documents*), *Xinjing Maoshi yi* 新經毛詩義 (New Meaning of the Classic of *Mao's Songs*) and *Xinjing Zhouli yi* 新經周禮義 (New Meaning of the Classic of *Zhou Rites*); see Tuotuo, *Songshi*, 202.5042, 5046, 5049 and 327.10550. They are collectively dubbed *Sanjing yi* 三經義 (Meaning of the Three Classics) or *Sanjing xinyi* 三經新義 (Three Classics: New Meaning).

[99] See Li Xinchuan, *Jianyan yilai chaoye zaji*, "Jiaji" 甲集, 13.261.

[100] Zhu Bian, *Quyou jiuwen*, 3.116.

> [1086–1094], the Investigation Bureau[101] Han [Chuan 韓川 (fl. eleventh century)], in a discussion about changes in the imperial examinations, once said, "In the early Yuanfeng era [1078–1085], I was sent to read the exam answer sheets of recommended men.[102] In their formula writing,[103] there was someone saying, 'In the past there was a Dong Zhongshu [179–104 BC], a man of an unknowable period.' Spreaders [of this anecdote] unanimously regarded it as laughable." This sounds extremely like [what happened] during the years of Dingling [Zhenzong, r. 997–1022],[104] when a recommended man in the departmental examination presented an enquiry in front of the curtain,[105] saying, "Is Yao and Shun one thing or two things?" This is indeed astonishing.

The passage *fei tu bu guan shi* 非徒不觀史 (not just disregard histories) in Zhu Bian's account points to a major drawback of an assessment system that depended exclusively on the study of the classics. Those who regarded *shifu* as the preferable touchstone believed that exam questions of poetic composition drew on sources including the classics, histories, pre-Qin masters and many more. Therefore, an emphasis on poetic composition in the assessment would force students to read more extensively in order to expand their repository of allusions, lexicons and rhetorical devices. In contrast, an emphasis on a limited selection of the classics would lead to serious partiality of learning.[106]

Further to that, Zhu Bian listed two examples of examinees that were ignorant of history. In the first example, an examinee did not know the historical context in which the famous Han scholar, Dong Zhongshu, lived. This example is singled out as evidence of the undesirable consequence of Wang Anshi's reforms in the imperial examinations, and there are other

---

[101] *Chayuan* 察院 is a unit of supervisory agency *yushitai* 御史臺 (Censorate) in the central government. Also, it can denote the six major officials that fill this unit, namely *jiancha yushi* 監察御史 (Investigating Censor); see Gong Yanming, *Songdai guanzhi,* 382. Han Chuan was appointed Investigating Censor in 1086 (first year of Yuanyou era); see *XZZTJCB* 373.2a.

[102] Those who passed the prefectural examination and were eligible for the department examination.

[103] Exam writing was alternatively known as *chengwen* 程文 (formula writing) because it needed to follow some specific formulae.

[104] *Dingling* 定陵 (Pacification Mausoleum) refers to the mausoleum of Zhenzong. The official name is *Yongding ling* 永定陵 (Long-lasting Pacification Mausoleum), but Zhu Bian consistently used *Dingling* to refer to Emperor Zhenzong, see other examples in his *Quyou jiuwen,* 1.88 and 7.182–183.

[105] *Liangqian* 簾前 (in front of the curtain) refers to examiners sitting in front of a curtain in the examination hall.

[106] See Liu Zhi, *Zhongsu ji,* 4.21a; see also Zhu Shangshu, *Songdai keju yu wenxue,* 194-96.

accounts that draw the same connection between the reform and ignorance of history. Zhu Bian's contemporary Ye Mengde 葉夢得 (1077–1148), for instance, provided another. In a departmental examination in the early Xining 熙寧 era (1068–77), a presumably outstanding student from the Superior Hall (*shangshe* 上舍), the highest grade in the Three Halls System, was found having no idea about what happened in Jiaozhi 交趾 (modern Vietnam). Even when someone reminded him that the exam question was based on the biography of the famous Han general, Ma Yuan 馬援 (14 BC–49 AD),[107] the student wrote the name with the wrong character, *yuan* 愿.[108]

The second example Zhu Bian listed is a bit problematic. In this example, a recommended man did not even know the legendary sages Yao and Shun, which is perhaps more unthinkable than not knowing the historical period in which Dong Zhongshu lived. However, this incident is dated to Zhenzong's reign, which is long before Wang Anshi's reforms. The juxtaposition of the two incidents seems to suggest Zhu Bian's ambivalence about the relationship between Wang Anshi's New Policies and the decline of historical learning. In the first incident, the ignorance of Dong Zhongshu's historical context is presented as a consequence of Wang Anshi's New Policies. On the other hand, the second incident is something for which Wang Anshi's reforms are obviously not responsible. At this juncture, it would appear that Zhu Bian directed his attention away from criticism of the New Policies by pointing out the fact that those who are ignorant of history exist in all times.

What really makes the *biji* accounts valuable is not (just) its documentation of examples of extreme ignorance of history, but the documentation of how the reforms were carried on towards an extreme and incited intellectuals to reject histories. Ye Mengde reported:

---

[107] See *Hou Hanshu*, 28.836–846.

[108] See Ye Mengde, *Bishu luhua*, 2.68. For similar accounts that relate the decline of historical scholarship and Wang Anshi's reforms, see Li Xinchuan, *Jianyan yilai xinian yaolu,* 27.544 and 34.670.

> 方新學初，何嘗禁人讀史，而學者自爾。[…]崇甯立三舍法，雖崇經術，亦未嘗廢史，而學校為之師長者本自其間出，自知非所學，亦幸時好，以倡其徒，故凡言史，皆力詆之。尹天民為南京教授，至之日，悉取《史記》而下至《歐陽文忠集》，焚講堂下，物論喧然。未幾，天民以言章罷。[109]
>
> When the New Learning[110] just started, who has ever forbidden people from reading histories? Yet, learners did so themselves. […] The Chongning era [1102–1106] established the Three Halls System. Despite its reverence for classical expertise, it never abolished history. But in schools, those who acted as teachers came out from it. [They,] for their part, knew that [histories] were not what they studied, [so they] also favoured the contemporary trend and promoted it among their disciples, hence forcefully reprimanding whoever talked about histories. Yin Tianmin [fl. 1045–1119][111] was an instructor in Nanjing.[112] On the day of arrival, [he] took all [the books ranging] from the *Scribe's Records* to *Collection of Ouyang Wenzhong* [i.e. Ouyang Xiu] and burned them in the lecture hall, raising a clamour among the public. Before long he was dismissed because of a remonstration.

This passage delineates how intellectuals, in order to maintain their current status, took the opportunity of the reforms and pushed things to an extreme. In Ye Mengde's perspective, historical learning was not a target of prohibition when Wang Anshi started his reforms. Instead, Ye Mengde understood the hostility towards historical learning as a result of the re-implementation of the New Policies during the Chongning era, when Cai Jing 蔡京 (1047–1126) came to power and incorporated Wang Anshi's policies into his political manipulations, initiating the annihilation of specific fields of learning.[113] To secure his authority, Cai Jing restricted the transmission of works of the "Yuanyou [1086–1094] faction" (*Yuanyou dangren* 元祐黨人), who once disapproved Wang Anshi's New Policies.[114] As many officials listed in the "Yuanyou faction" engaged with the study of poetry and history, the enmity was transferred to these two fields of learning. Ma Duanlin 馬端臨 (1254–1323) already noted that historical

[109] Ye Mengde, *Bishu luhua*, 2.68.

[110] *Xinxue* 新學 (New Learning) in the Song context refers to the classical learning Wang Anshi promoted.

[111] There is little documentation of Yin Tianmin's life. For a short account, see Qian Shisheng, *Nan Song shu,* 65.5b; see also Tuotuo, *Songshi,* 356.11211.

[112] This Nanjing was located near modern Shangqiu 商丘, Henan and unrelated to modern Nanjing in Jiangsu.

[113] See Li Xinchuan, *Jianyan yilai xinian yaolu,* 34.670; see also. Hartwell, "Historical Analogism," 712.

[114] See Smith, "Introduction: The Sung Dynasty and Its Precursors," 24–28, Levine, "Reigns of Hui-tsung and Ch'in-tsung," 572–578, and Chaffee, "Huizong, Cai Jing, and the Politics of Reform," 42–44.

learning was prohibited mainly because of Sima Guang, who was a historian and a major opponent of Wang Anshi. By the same token, poetry was abandoned because of Su Shi and his circle, who were also not in favour of Wang Anshi's policies.[115]

In essence, Cai Jing was merely using new policies as a pretext for gaining more power for himself, and the promotion of the classics at the expense of the study of history and poetry had nothing to do with serious intellectual concerns. Yet, the competition in the political sphere exercised strong influences on intellectual activities. Yin Tianmin, who burned the *Shiji* and the works of Ouyang Xiu (who was perceived as a historian and poet), is not an isolated example of an intellectual who readily complied with government policies. What Yin Tianmin did is comparable to an anecdote of Xue Ang 薛昂 (d. 1146), who climbed up to the position of high minister under the New Policies. As an Erudite of the Imperial University (*taixue boshi* 太學博士), Xue Ang failed any student who referred to the *Shiji* and repeatedly proposed to abolish historical learning completely.[116] It is these people who created the environment that eventually prompted the radical elimination of historical learning.

Ye Mengde's account ends with the presumably well-deserved punishment of the "bad guy" who committed to the elimination of historical leaning, an arrangement reflecting Ye Mengde's own disapproval of this elimination. Yet, other sources suggest that in reality things went in a much more depressing direction. Historical learning was labelled "the learning of the vulgar" (*liusu zhi xue* 流俗之學), as opposed to "the learning of previous kings" (*xianwang zhi xue* 先王之學) transmitted in the classics.[117] Huizong 徽宗 (1082–1135, r. 1100–1125) officially

[115] See Ma Duanlin, *Wenxian tongkao,* 31.41a.

[116] Yet, his advice was dismissed by Zhezong 哲宗 (1077–1100, r. 1085–1100); see Tuotuo, *Songshi,* 352.11122.

[117] See Wu Zeng, *Nenggaizhai manlu,* 12.323.

banned intellectuals from learning history in 1112, constituting a fatal attack on historical learning towards the end of the Northern Song.[118]

Concluding Remarks

By stepping back and looking at the *Shiji* within its surroundings, this chapter endeavours to reveal the "Mount Tai" and "roar of thunder" that a narrower focus on the *Shiji* could have hidden from our perception. The exploration of areas that are closely related to but not necessarily addressing the *Shiji* enables us to get a better understanding of the decisions an eleventh century reader would have made.

First of all, printing technology has just begun to be used by the authority to distribute orthodox texts during the Northern Song. The *Shiji*, the first one on the list of standard histories, was among the first texts printed during this period. Yet, it would appear that an imprint of it was not widely accessible because of its price.[119]

One could always read and reproduce manuscripts, but was that really necessary? In the last few decades of the Northern Song, historical learning was practically prohibited, and the *Shiji* became a text to be eschewed. Apart from this dark period, people might have read the *Shiji* for two reasons: to learn the ancient style of writing and to learn history. For the former purpose, reading the *Shiji* was perhaps essential, but we should also bear in mind that the *Shiji* is not the only model of ancient-style writing that was promoted during the Song. For reasons explained in the introduction, extant material from the Northern Song does not allow us to draw any conclusion about the extent to which the *Shiji* has exerted its influence as a literary model.

[118] See Wu Zeng, *Nenggaizhai manlu,* 12.323 and *XZZTJCBSB* 31.5a–5b.

[119] For a more general survey of the availability and publication of books throughout the eleventh to eighteenth centuries, see McDermott, *Social History of the Chinese Book,* 55–66.

As for the purpose of learning history, the book entitled *Shiji* could have lost its appeal when compared to other sources that allowed people to learn about the past in cheaper, and possibly faster and more entertaining ways. This chapter discussed three alternative forms of historical knowledge. Storytelling and primers for children were often perceived as less serious sources of historical knowledge. Commonplace books organised historical knowledge in a way that closely reflects authoritative historical accounts and, on the other hand, were reprimanded for serving as shortcuts in the preparation for the imperial examinations. However, in essence, all of the three forms of historical knowledge feature a separation between historical events (*gushi* 故事) and historical accounts (*shi* 史), indicating that the main purpose of historical learning meant familiarising oneself with historical events. Storytelling exaggerated historical events and was associated with an entertaining setting; children's primers focussed on telling stories of the past in a morally and stylistically illustrative way; commonplace books managed historical knowledge in order to help their users to make syntheses and inferential statements on a given topic. None of them concerned the historiographical aspects of historical accounts. The *Shiji* certainly contributed to all these three forms of historical knowledge. However, presented in these forms, the text from the *Shiji* would have been perceived as an authoritative textual embodiment of the past, not an artificial representation of the past.

This chapter also argues that what mattered in the acquisition of historical knowledge was nothing more than the historical events themselves. Prior to the 1070s, the seemingly high demand for precise knowledge of textual details in imperial examinations turns out to be the examiners' expectation that examinees could hardly meet. When the examinees failed to recognise verbatim quotes from received texts, the inconveniences caused led to the examiners' compromise instead of more intensive training of the examinees. Such compromises testify that knowledge of the textual details of historical accounts were not required in the imperial examinations and justifies the arrangements in pedagogical schemes. Unlike the commitment

required in the study of classical texts and literary techniques, the study of history was left to a peripheral status in the pedagogical scheme. Study of history required a minimal level of commitment, and the textual details of histories were subject to a higher degree of alternation when processed by individual learners.

For the study of *Shiji* receptions, the differentiation between the two notions of historical events and historical accounts is important because it identifies different purposes of and cognitive processes in the reading of the *Shiji*. It raises questions previously unanswered, such as to what extent the reader consciously looked at the *Shiji* as an artefact and to what extent the *Shiji* was only read for the sake of historical events. As an agent that informs its readers of historical events, the *Shiji* did not just have other authoritative texts as its competitors, but also alternative forms of historical knowledge. When it comes to a specific comment on historical events or figures, especially the important ones that have been retold on many occasions, it is sometimes impossible to identify the source(s) of knowledge. All we can say is that the *Shiji* has certainly played a part in the general transmission of historical knowledge, but we need more than topical convergence to establish its contribution.

Moreover, the differentiation between the notions of historical events and historical accounts prompts us to consider what makes the *Shiji Shiji* and what it means to study its receptions. When read as a collection of historical events, the *Shiji* is hardly distinct from other sources that perform the same task. Especially with regard to the history of the Western Han, the *Hanshu* played at least an equally important role as the *Shiji,* hence it is essential to check against both texts when dealing with reference to events of the Western Han. The identity of the *Shiji* is only realised when it is read as a historiographical work and/or work of literature and when the reader is conscious of its style, structure, historiographical approaches, evaluative standards and motivations. Therefore, instead of applying an all-inclusive approach to writings reminiscent of the *Shiji,* the following chapters will focus on material that engages with the

Shiji by either 1) showing the awareness of the function of the historiographer and/or 2) echoing the text of the *Shiji* (including quoting and reworking) for specific purposes.

By positioning the *Shiji* in the wider context, this chapter has also shown the limited importance attached to historical learning and identified factors that exerted major impacts on historical learning, including classical learning and political environment. These factors should certainly be taken into consideration in the study of *Shiji* receptions. The following chapters will concentrate on a selection of cases that can sustain in-depth analyses of how exactly the reading of the *Shiji* was conditioned by factors beyond concerns with the *Shiji* itself.

Chapter Two

What was the Problem?

> 史論者，治史者皆認為無關史學，而且有害者也。
>
> Speaking of historical criticism, scholars of history invariably think that it has nothing to do with historical scholarship but rather causes harm.
>
> ── Chen Yinke 陳寅恪 (1890–1969)[1]

As mentioned in the introduction, the majority of intellectual engagement of the *Shiji* during the Song takes the form of historical criticism. However, these writings are negatively received in modern scholarship as they often criticise Sima Qian and his work. Moreover, the genre *shiping* 史評 (historical criticism) is notorious for coming more often from armchair critics who puff up their ill-informed arguments with literary ornamentation rather than from scholars who are truly learned in histories.[2] But is that all we can say about historical criticism? When these writings cannot contribute to modern interpretations of the *Shiji* or fail to address modern historical or historiographical concerns, do we simply disregard them? If we seriously consider the fact that the eleventh century readers of the *Shiji* might have never meant to speak to posterity, then what exactly did they respond to? What caused them to look at the *Shiji* in an unfavourable light? What kind of role(s) did the *Shiji* play in the wider intellectual landscape? What does that tell us about reading activities on a more general level?

In order to answer these questions, this chapter focuses on the eleventh century criticism of the *Shiji* that modern scholars rarely analyse. All the writers to be discussed explicitly engaged with the *Shiji* and were concerned particularly with the role Sima Qian played in shaping his work. This chapter starts with an investigation into a piece of historical criticism

[1] Chen Yinke, *Jinming guan conggao er bian,* 248.

[2] See, for example, Yong Rong, *Tiyao,* 88.1a-b and Liu, *China Turning Inwards*, 34.

that involves the evaluation of the *Shiji* as well as the received classical learning. Following a discussion of the consensus in the perception of the *Shiji*, we have another case study that demonstrates the divergence on the evaluation of the *Shiji* in historical criticism. Finally, with reference to recent discussions of "autobiographical readings" of the *Shiji*, I discuss the prevalence of historical analogism and its impact on the approach to the *Shiji*.

A Case in Focus: A Treacherous Sage-King

In the spring of 1005, two promising young men unexpectedly failed the departmental examination (*shengshi* 省試), which would determine whether or not one could become a *jinshi* 進士 (advanced scholar) candidate.[3] The examiners decided to review their scripts: one of them made a mistake in a rhyme of his composition, and the other one proposed an interpretation of a *Lunyu* passage that contradicted the received commentarial traditions. In the end, the examiner regarded the technical mistake of the former candidate as more tolerable, while the latter was dismissed as his unconventional interpretation might encourage wider disregard of tradition amongst students. This anecdote is retold in various Song sources as an illustration of the strict adherence to the commentarial traditions during the early Northern Song.[4]

However, this conservatism soon changed. From the 1040s onwards, the reform led by Fan Zhongyan 范仲淹 (989–1052) brought about a new approach to the classics that promoted a sceptical view on the orthodox Han and Tang commentaries to the classics and aimed at drawing on classical learning to resolve social and political problems of the contemporary

[3] See chapter one, footnote 29.

[4] See Fan Zhen, *Dongzhai jishi*, 1.2, Zhang Lei, *Mingdao zazhi,* 16, Lin Zhiqi, *Zhuozhai wenji*, 2.10a, Zhu Xi, *Yanxing lu,* 2.16a-16b, Hong Mai, *Rongzhai suibi,* "Sanbi" 三筆, 14.592, and *XZZTJCB* 59.20b.

world.[5] As intellectuals started to re-evaluate the classical corpus and associated commentarial traditions, non-classical texts pertaining to antiquity also came to be re-examined with fresh eyes. Among them was the *Shiji*.

The narrative of the *Shiji* spans from legendary antiquity down to the early Han, and it was compiled before the official canonisation of the five classics, a highly heterogeneous textual corpus mainly concerned with affairs and personae associated with early stages of Chinese civilization up to the Zhou period. Regarding the overlaps between the classics and the *Shiji*, it is widely accepted that the *Shiji* largely updates the archaic language used in the classics, but Sima Qian did much more than translating passages that had become obscure even in the eyes of Han readers. In many cases, he provided complementary or alternative accounts of antiquity. Most importantly, he assigned to himself the liberty to promote values and judgements that disagree with and even contradict those extracted from the classics.

Bearing the academic context of the eleventh century in mind, we now look into a case in which Sun Fu 孫復 (992–1057) established a particular perception of an ancient sage-king by evaluating pertinent passages from the classics, classical commentaries and the *Shiji* account.

Sun Fu is one of the prominent precursors of sceptical classicists of the eleventh century.[6] With expertise in the study of the *Chunqiu*, he is renowned and respected for never getting confused by the commentarial traditions and is thus described as successfully grasping "the original meanings" (*benyi* 本義) of the classics.[7] His exegetical approach comes close to the Gongyang and Guliang traditions of the *Chunqiu* with a focus on scrutinising the hidden

[5] On the official canonisation of the five classics under Emperor Wu of Han 漢武帝 (157–87 BC, r. 140–87 BC), see Nylan, *Five Classics*, 41–51. On the concept of *jing* during the Song, see chapter one, footnote 37.

[6] See his biography in Tuotuo, *Songshi,* 432.12832–33 and Franke, *Sung biographies*, 970–973. For substantial discussions of his scholarship, especially on the *Chunqiu,* see Wood, "Politics and Morality in Nothern Sung China," 140–185 and Chiang Yi-Tai, "Bei Song *Chunqiu* xue," 109–154.

[7] See the obituary for Sun Fu written by Ouyang Xiu, "Sun Mingfu xiansheng muzhiming" 孫明復先生墓誌銘 (Epitaph for Mr. Sun Mingfu [Sun Fu]), *Ouyang Xiu quanji,* 30.458.

meanings behind the carefully worded narratives. Yet in dealing with the *Chunqiu*, he is inevitably confronted with challenges posed by those engaged with the *Zuozhuan* and other non-classical sources pertaining to the same historical periods, such as the *Shiji.* His essay "Wenwang lun" 文王論 (On King Wen [of Zhou]) is an illustrative example of his handling of various textual sources. It begins with a discussion of an excerpt from the *Zuozhuan*:

> 《春秋左氏傳》：“吳公子季札來聘，請觀於周樂，見舞《象箾》、《南籥》者，曰：‘美哉！猶有憾。’”[8] 說者曰：“憾，恨也。‘文王恨不及已致太平’，[9] 意以為文王不能夷商紂於當時，取天下於已手，有遺憾焉。”[10]
>
> The *Zuo Tradition of the Spring and Autumn* [says]: Jizha, son of Lord of Wu, came on a diplomatic mission and requested to watch [performances of] Zhou music. Seeing the dances of "Representations with Poles" and "Flute of the South,"[11] [he] said, "How marvellous! Still, there is regret." [Some] speaker says, "*han* means 'resentment.' 'King Wen resented that it was not himself that brought about great peace.' I take it as indicating King Wen was not able to wipe out [King] Zhòu[12] of Shang at the time and acquired all under heaven by his own hands, and felt regret about this."

The *Zuozhuan* excerpt under discussion is a commentary on the passage "*Wuzi shi Zha lai pin*" 吳子使札來聘 (Viscount of Wu sent [Ji]zha to come on a diplomatic mission) in the *Chunqiu*.[13] Both Gongyang and Guliang traditions to this passage revolve around the implications of addressing the ruler of Wu by the title "Viscount" and Jizha by his personal

[8] This is a combination of three short extracts from a much longer commentary, see *Zuozhuan* (Xiang 29), 39.8b (667) and 39.16b-17b (6716–72).

[9] See *Zuozhuan* (Xiang 29), 39.17b (672).

[10] Sun Fu, *Sun Mingfu xiaoji*, 1.5a.

[11] Whereas commentators seem to agree that *shuo* 箾 and *yue* 籥 are dance props, there is controversy regarding the interpretation of *xiang* 象. Durrant et al., *Zuo Tradition*, 1247, translate the names of these two dances as "Elephant Steps to Flute Music" and "Southern Tunes on the Pipes" without explanation. Couvreur, *Tch'ouen Ts'iou,* Tome II, 279, has "des pantomimes avec des flageolets d'ivoire et des flutes du midi." However, it would appear that classical commentators do not consider anything pertinent to "elephant" as a reading option. Following Zheng Xuan, Kong Yingda glosses *xiang* as "represent." It is believed that this type of dance represents military events or activities; see *Zuozhuan* (Xiang 29), 39.17b (672) and *Maoshi,* 19A.13b–15a (709–710).

[12] I use Zhòu for the character 紂 to differentiate it from Zhou 周.

[13] See *Zuozhuan* (Xiang 29), 39.2a (664). The character *shi* 使 could be a noun or a verb. Kong Yingda reads it as a verb, see *Zuozhuan* (Xiang 29), 39.2a (664); Couvreur reads it as a noun, "envoyé [du prince de Ou]," see his *Tchouen Ts'iou,* Tome II, 277. Legge and Durrant both read it as a verb "to send;" see Legge, *Classic*, vol. 5, pt. 2, 547 and Durrant et al., *Zuo Tradition*, vol.2, 1231.

name,[14] whereas the *Zuozhuan* applies a different exegetic approach and gives a lengthy account of Jizha's comments on a series of musical pieces of Zhou made during his sojourn in Lu and his subsequent visits to Qi, Zheng, Wei, and Jin.[15] Sun Fu's own take on this *Chunqiu* passage can be found in his *Chunqiu zunwang fawei* 春秋尊王發微 (Elaboration on the Hidden [meaning of] Honouring Kings in the *Spring and Autumn*), but there he did not engage with the *Zuozhuan* commentary on this passage at all.[16] Therefore, his "Wenwang lun" we are now looking at provides important clues to his disregard of the *Zuozhuan* commentary.

In his interpretation of the *Zuozhuan* passage, the unspecified exegete (*shuozhe* 說者) referred to Du Yu's 杜預 (222–285) commentary on the *Zuozhuan*, which reads, "King Wen resented that it was not himself that brought about great peace" (*Wenwang hen bu ji ji zhi taiping* 文王恨不及己致太平).[17] It is most likely that this *shuozhe* represents not one but a group of people who hold this view. In Sun Fu's days, conservatism in classical learning still held sway. This "Wenwang lun" might well have been intended as a comment on the mainstream readers who clung to nothing but received commentaries, the *Zuozhuan* among them.

In the long passage that follows the one translated above, Sun Fu expressed his doubts on the interpretation in the received commentary, arguing on the grounds of his imagination of King Wen of Zhou as a moral paragon. Jizha was reportedly a worthy man of antiquity. In Sun Fu's view, if Jiazha indeed had such a reflection on the music and read regrets into King Wen of Zhou, this would mean that Jizha knew nothing about music and that he had "severely

[14] See *Gongyang zhuan* (Xiang 29)*,* 21.10a (266) and *Guliang zhuan,* 16.12a12–b (161).

[15] See *Zuozhuan* (Xiang 29), 39.8b–20b (667–673).

[16] Sun Fu shares the concern about addressing the ruler of Wu as "viscount" within the Guliang tradition, but he proposed a different explanation. Also, he deals with an issue untouched by the three traditions: The *Chunqiu* narrative seems to suggest that the viscount commissioned Jizha after being killed; see Sun Fu, *Chunqiu zunwang fawei,* 9.25a–25b.

[17] See *Zuozhuan* (Xiang 29), 39.17b (672).

defamed the sage" (*hou wu shengren* 厚誣聖人).[18] Sun Fu rejected the *Zuozhuan* account of Jizha's comment, "still there is regret" (*you you han* 猶有憾), because it can be read, as spelled out by Du Yu, as a remark on King Wen of Zhou's unfulfilled ambition to realise a peaceful world by himself. Although Du Yu did not explicitly equate this ambition to overthrowing the Shang, his reading opens an avenue to read into King Wen of Zhou's treacherous intentions against his then ruler. This interpretation of the sage-king that was totally inconceivable to Sun Fu, so he passionately reiterated the persona of King Wen of Zhou as a diligent subject, serving his sovereign, who granted him the status of aristocracy, with all his gratitude and loyalty.

Further to that, Sun Fu fused two references associated with the highest authority, namely Confucius, to advance his point:

> 觀乎紂既失德，毒流四海，諸侯咸叛，而文王事之獨無二心，故孔子曰："三分天下有其二，以服事商，周之德其可謂至德也已矣！"[19] 又曰："下之事上也，雖有庇民之大德，不敢有君民之心，仁之厚也。有庇民之大德，有事君之小心，其舜、禹、文王、周公之謂歟"？[20] 若文王猶有憾也，則夫子何以謂之至德與仁厚者乎？[21]
>
> [I] observe that when Zhòu had lost [his] virtue, venom flooded [all between the] four seas [i.e. all over the world], titled lords unanimously revolted, yet King Wen alone served him without a treacherous heart. Thus Confucius said, "To hold two thirds of all under heaven to serve Shang as a subject, the virtue of Zhou can only be called supreme virtue!" [He] also said, "As for those below serving those above, even though [those below] have the great virtue of protecting people, [they] do not dare to have the heart to rule over people: [this is] the deepest humanity." To have the great virtue of protecting the people and to have the humble heart of serving the ruler, "is [this] not talking about Shun, Yu, King Wen and Duke Zhou?" If King Wen still had regrets, then how could the Master regard him as someone of supreme virtue and deepest humanity?

The first utterance of Confucius is almost a verbatim quote of *Lunyu* 8.20. The only textual variant is *Shang* 商, where the received *Lunyu* has *Yin* 殷, an alternative term for the Shang

[18] Sun Fu, *Sun Mingfu xiaoji*, 1.5a.

[19] Cf. *Lunyu* 8.20, 8.6b–7a (72–73). For segmentation of the main text (*jingwen* 經文) of the *Lunyu* and *Mengzi*, I follow the Harvard-Yenching Index Series.

[20] Cf. *Liji*, 54.12a–12b (913).

[21] Sun Fu, *Sun Mingfu xiaoji,* 1.5b–6a.

dynasty.[22] The second utterance of Confucius, however, is more problematic. It seems to correspond to a *Liji* passage, but Sun Fu abridged the original text by dropping two references to the *Shijing* and made a significant change in wording on one occasion.

In the *Liji*, the underlined passage is immediately followed by a quote from the *Shijing* that presumably provides a context for understanding the "humble heart" (*xiaoxin* 小心). In light of this *Shijing* quote, the *jun* 君 (ruler, sovereign) in the passage *shi jun zhi xiaoxin* 事君之小心 refers to the humble heart one has when serving *shangdi* 上帝 (Lord on High), an agent of the overarching power beyond human control and comprehension.[23] Yet, in juxtaposing the two utterances, Sun Fu seemed to read *shi jun* 事君 in the *Liji* passage as an equivalent of *shi Shang* 事商/*shi Yin* 事殷 in *Lunyu* 8.20. In other words, the *Liji* passage praises King Wen of Zhou in a theological context, whereas Sun Fu disregarded this context and read *shi jun* in a purely secular or, more precisely, political context.

Moreover, the *Liji* parallel of the underlined passage in Sun Fu's essay reads:

> 有君民之大德，有事君之小心。[24]
> [Shun, Yu, King Wen and Duke Zhou] have the great virtue of ruling over people and the humble heart of serving the ruler.

It is intriguing that Sun Fu replaced *jun min zhi dade* 君民之大德 (the great virtue of ruling over the people) with *bi min zhi dade* 庇民之大德 (the great virtue of protecting the people). There are at least three possible reasons to account for this. First, the wording *jun min* can potentially serve as point of reference for the interpretation of King Wen as a subject with treacherous intentions. Therefore, Sun Fu deliberately altered the wording in order to avoid

[22] See *Lunyu* 8.20, 8.6b–7a (72–73).

[23] See *Liji,* 54.12b (913):《詩》云: 惟此文王, 小心翼翼, 昭事上帝, 聿懷多福, 厥德不回, 以受方國 ("Now this Wen Wang, he was careful and reverent; brightly he served God on High, and so he could aspire to much happiness; his virtue did not deflect, and so he received the states of the (four) quarters;" see Karlgren, *Book of Odes,* 188). The received *Shijing* has *wei* 維 instead of *wei* 惟; see *Shijing,* 16.3a-3b (541). .

[24] *Liji,* 54.12b (913).

associating "ruling over people" with the sage-king. Second, Sun Fu simply misremembered the passage and thus used the wording *bi min* that appears in a preceding sentence (*sui you bi min zhi dade, bu gan you jun min zhi xin* 雖有庇民之大德，不敢有君民之心). Third, he studied an unknown *Liji* edition that has the wording *bi min*. In any case, the result is that Sun Fu's presentation does not explicitly associate any potential, let alone intentions, of "ruling over the people" with the sage-king. It is also noteworthy that Sun Fu did not explicitly refer to any textual sources. Instead, he presented the verdicts as coming directly from Confucius and thereby gave more authority to the persona of the sage-king as a loyal subject.

Up to this point of his essay, Sun Fu dealt solely with texts within the classical corpus, drawing on selected passages from the *Lunyu* and *Liji* to reject a *Zuozhuan* account and its commentary. Then comes another challenge posed by, again, unspecified speaker(s). This time the point of reference is the *Shiji,* a text outside the classical corpus:

> 或曰："《史記．齊世家》叙太公之迹，其後亦言西伯昌之脱羑里，與吕尚陰謀脩德以傾商政，其事多兵權與奇計。若文王果無憾也，則何得與太公陰謀脩德以傾商政，其事多兵權奇計之如是哉？由是觀之，季子之言，又何誣也？"
> 曰："此蓋秦火之後，簡編錯亂，司馬子長脩《史記》，叙太公之迹也，不能實録善事，乃散取雜亂不經之説以廣其異聞爾，斯固不足疑於聖人也。"[25]
>
> Some say, "'The Hereditary House of Qi' in the *Shiji* puts in order the legacies of the Grand Duke [i.e. Lü Shang, fl. eleventh century BC]. Then it also says, 'Upon escaping from Youli, Chang, Baron of the West [i.e. King Wen of Zhou][26] secretly plotted with Lü Shang to cultivate [his own] virtue to overthrow the governance of Shang, which displays plenty of military tactics and surprising strategies.' If King Wen had indeed no regret, how could he secretly plot with the Grand Duke to cultivate virtue to overthrow the governance of Shang with plenty of military tactics and surprising strategies like this? Viewing it [i.e. the case of King Wen of Zhou] in light of this, what is defamatory about Jizi's words?"
>
> [I] say, "This is possibly [because] the bamboo slips were misplaced after the fire under the Qin. [When] Sima Zichang [i.e. Sima Qian] compiled the *Scribe's Records* to put in order the legacies of the Grand Duke, he could not faithfully record the good things but rather randomly took the miscellaneous unorthodox words to expand on divergent

[25] Sun Fu, *Sun Mingfu xiaoji*, 1.6a–6b.

[26] Chang 昌 is King Wen's *ming* 名 (personal name), and Xibo 西伯 (Baron of the West) is his title prior to the overthrow of the Shang.

information; that is all. Such [records] are certainly not sufficient for raising doubts about the sage."

In Sun Fu's refutation, the *Shiji* account is invalidated on grounds that it was compiled from inferior sources. The significance of the notorious burning of the books under the Qin is not news to anyone.[27] Presented as a milestone in the transmission of textual traditions in countless discourses, it is such an omnipresent motif that it can raise very little excitement now, which is perhaps why comments such as the one by Sun Fu have never born close scrutiny in the study of *Shiji* receptions. However, Sun Fu's perception of the *Shiji* project sheds light on the strategies he applied in adjusting the interpretation and evaluation of given texts to cater for ideological needs.

Sun Fu's classical scholarship reveals that his contextualisation of the compilation of the *Shiji* is actually transplanted from his reconstruction of the transmission of classical learning. He depicted the same picture in a letter to Fan Zhongyan, elaborating how the burning of the books interrupted the transmission of classical learning:

> 噫！孔子既歿，七十子之徒繼往，六經之旨鬱而不章也久矣！加以秦火之後，破碎殘缺，多所亡散。漢魏而下，諸儒紛然四出，爭為註解，俾我六經之旨益亂，而學者莫得其門而入。[28]
>
> Alas! After Confucius perished, the seventy disciples followed [him] to leave. It has been a long time since the meaning of the six classics[29] faded into oblivion! In addition, after the fire under the Qin, [the six classics] become fragmentary and incomplete, with many being lost. From the Han and Wei onwards, classicists thronged out from everywhere, vying for providing exegeses. [It] leads the meaning of our six classics to further chaos, and learners have no way to approach it.

As mentioned above, Sun Fu was not the only one to accuse the Qin of interrupting the transmission of classical learning. This view can be traced back to Ban Gu and, closer to Sun Fu's days, Han Yu 韓愈 (768–824). Yet, these three scholars took it to completely different

[27] For a discussion of this event, see Nylan, *Five Classics,* 29–30.

[28] Sun Fu's "Ji Fan Tianzhang shu er" 寄范天章書二 (Letter II to [Edict Attendant at] Tianzhang [Pavillion] Fan [Zhongyan]), *Sun Mingfu xiaoji,* 1.26a–26b.

[29] The five classics plus the allegedly lost *Yue* 樂 (Music).

ends. Ban Gu spoke of this calamity with inclinations to praise the reconstructive efforts made by Han scholars.[30] Han Yu spoke of it in order to emphasise the necessity of safeguarding Confucian tradition and supressing Buddhism.[31] Sun Fu spoke of it to legitimatise his doubts on any text produced or made orthodox after the Qin. His criticism of the *Shiji* is only part of a larger scheme. The *Zuozhuan,* which Sun Fu refuted in the "Wenwang lun," was only brought into imperial attention during the Han. Also, it was called into question during the Tang and came to be understood as a patchwork of heterogeneous sources by editorial hands from various historical periods.[32] The commentaries by people like Du Yu that gained authoritative status via the *Zuozhuan* tradition were consequently found at fault too. Towards the end of his "Wenwang lun," Sun Fu proclaimed that these people lacked clever reading suggestions and that their interpretations were "utterly wrong" (*guaimiu zhi shen* 乖謬之甚).[33]

Freed from post-Qin scholarship (including commentarial traditions to the classics and alternative narratives of antiquity), Sun Fu assigned himself considerable liberty to bring out what he wanted to bring out directly from the classics. In the "Wenwang lun," he defended King Wen of Zhou and depicted him as a subject with absolute loyalty to his ruler. In fact, this promotion of proper ruler-subject relations also characterises his overall classical scholarship. It might thus be tempting to conclude that he, despite the exegetic freedom endowed by scepticism towards received traditions, was simply another conservative that preached the cliché of Confucian socio-political hierarchy. However, it would appear that Sun Fu was not

[30] See *HS* 30.1701.

[31] See Han Yu's "Yu Meng shangshu shu" 與孟尚書書 (Letter to Minister Meng [Jian 簡, d. 824]), in his *Changli xiansheng wenji,* 18.7a–7b.

[32] Dan Zhu 啖助 (fl. 750), Zhao Kuang 趙匡 (early eighth century) and Lu Chun 陸淳 (d.806) doubted the received view that the *Zuozhuan* was compiled by Confucius' contemporary. They argued for a continuous textual expansion and alteration of the transmission of indeed all the three major commentarial traditions of the *Chunqiu*; see Chiang Yi-Tai, "Bei Song *Chuqiu* xue," 65–72. Their doubts were mostly accepted by Northern Song scholars, see, for example, Zheng Xie, "Zuozhi lun" 左氏論 (On Mr Zuo), *Yunxi ji*, 16.1a–3a.

[33] Sun Fu, *Sun Mingfu xiaoji,* 1.6b.

just a reclusive theorist that expounded on empty values in the mountains. His disciple Shi Jie 石介 (1005-1045),[34] who was also an influential scholar, refused to associate Sun Fu with reclusion, arguing that he only resided in the mountains as a temporary compromise.[35] As a scholar with a keen interest in contemporary affairs, Sun Fu's strong disapproval of treason was rooted in his reflections on recent turmoil. Mou Runsun 牟潤孫 (1909–1988) suggests that Sun Fu's approach to the *Chunqiu* is closely related to the weak monarchy and powerful regional warlords in the late Tang and the subsequent Five Dynasties.[36] It was not until some two decades after the founding of the Song dynasty that the empire was unified under the ruling house. Also, the founder of the Song dynasty, as with founders of many other dynasties, started his own rule by overthrowing his then ruler. With the recent coup d'état and warfare in mind, Sun Fu's insistence on proper ruler-subject relations can be understood as an attempt to prevent the recurrence of political and military chaos. The ultimate goal of his classical scholarship is to provide theoretical support for maintaining the stability of the empire.

In sum, Sun Fu's "Wenwang lun" demonstrates how the perception of the *Shiji* is closely related to his overall scholarship. Furthermore, he arrived at this particular perception of the textual world because he needed to find his niche to develop his own arguments as responses to contemporary affairs. Intellectual concerns shift as socio-political circumstances change, but as we shall see in following section, Sun Fu's view on the *Shiji* became a widely shared opinion and constituted one of the most important approaches to the *Shiji* during the eleventh century.

[34] His biography can be found in Tuotuo, *Songshi,* 432.12833-36.

[35] See Shi Jie, *Culai ji*, 9.1a-3b; see also Ouyang Xiu, *Ouyang Xiu quanji,* 30.457.

[36] See Mou Runsun, *Zhushizhai conggao,* 70.

The *Shiji* as Part of Imperfect Reconstructions of Antiquity

When Fan Zhongyan recommended Sun Fu to be a lecturer of the imperial seminar in the 1040s, complaints came that Sun Fu's teachings often contradicted those by previous classicists. Sun Fu was consequently dismissed.[37] Despite recognition and recommendation from a few leading intellectuals, Sun Fu spent most of his lifetime teaching at Mount Tai and constantly struggled to support himself. This is indicative of the power of the conservatives then at court. Yet, within a decade of Sun Fu's death (1057), the mainstream attitudes towards classical learning completely changed, and scepticism became the new norm.[38] In a memorial presented in 1069, Sima Guang complained about the popular practices (*fengsu* 風俗) that attacked the received traditions even before reading them properly.[39] This intellectual shift, which started in the eleventh century and continued to influence intellectual history of subsequent centuries, has been documented and discussed in detail by many scholars. Hence in this section I only highlight a particular venue, imperial examinations, where such opinions are presented, and how they are connected to the perception of the *Shiji*.

Among all modules of the imperial examinations, this section focuses on *ce* 策 (policy questions), which are essay questions pertaining to contemporary socio-political issues and/or classical and historical studies.[40] The examiner's presentation of the essay question (*wen* 問) could at times be very lengthy and elaborative, sometimes even consisting of well over six

[37] Accounts of this event disagree on years, *XZZTJCB* 149.166 says 1044, whereas Ouyang Xiu, *Ouyang Xiu quanji,* 30.457-8 gives 1042.

[38] See, for example, Qu Wanli's "Songren yijing de fengqi," and Yeh Kuo-liang's *Songren yijing gaijing kao*. Cherniack, "Book Culture," 22-24 provides a summary of Song criticisms of each of the thirteen classics.

[39] See Sima Guang, *Sima gong wenji*, 45.9b–10a.

[40] For discussion of policy questions during the Song, see Hartwell, "Historical Analogism," 703-708, and De Weerdt, *Competition over Content,* chapter 2.

hundred characters. According to extant examples of responses (*dui* 對), the length ranges from three hundred to a thousand characters.[41]

By design, policy questions are meant to test exam candidates' familiarity with the textual tradition. In chapter one, we have seen that exam questions alone could not directly attest to examinees' knowledge. But from another perspective, exam questions did represent examiners' opinions, and they were prompt in reflecting the change of intellectual trends.[42] In many cases, if we disregard the last few formulaic sentences asking for a solution from the exam candidate, the lengthy presentation of the question itself can be regarded as an essay that explains the examiner's view in an elaborative manner that cannot be found in other exam modules. Moreover, the venue of expression is not without significance. The targeting venue of policy questions determined that they were to be read by numerous exam sitters, and the arguments put forward in these questions represented a particular set of values that were expected to be shared at the time. Exam candidates understood very well that it would be unwise to challenge the examiner's presumptions, and it was a common practise to "follow the exam question" (*shunti* 順題) in drafting responses.[43] In other words, the purpose of this module was not (just) about testing exam candidates' dialectical thinking and problem-solving abilities, but disseminating doctrines that the examiner expected exam candidates to follow.

The first policy question we look at was written by Ouyang Xiu for *jinshi* 進士 (presented scholar) candidates. This question requested exam candidates to discuss the pitfalls of the

[41] Hartwell, "Historical Analogism," 705 (n. 85), provides a long list of policy questions between mid-Tang and the end of the Song. For examples of the eleventh century, another twenty-two examples transmitted in Chen Shidao, *Houshan ji*, scroll 14, can be added to his list, making 144 examples in total of this century. Compared to that, we have much fewer examples of responses during this period. Eight responses by Ouyang Xiu are transmitted in his *Quanji,* 71.1030–1041. Three of them are dated 1029 and the other five 1030, in which year Ouyang Xiu got his *jinshi* degree. They possibly represent his responses in actual examinations.

[42] Working primarily with twelfth century material, De Weerdt also observes that "[p]olicy questions on the textual tradition bore the traces of intellectual debate in more explicit ways," *Competition over Content,* 77.

[43] See Yang Jian, *Cihu yishu,* 14.18b.

Zhouli. But before he posed the main questions, Ouyang Xiu spent some six hundred characters to elaborate his doubts on the *Zhouli.* He introduced his doubts by depicting a chaotic scene of the general transmission of classical learning:

> 自秦之焚書，六經盡矣，至漢而出，皆其殘脫顛倒，或傳之老師昏耄之說，或取之冢墓屋壁之間，是以學者不明，異說紛起。[44]
> Since the Qin burnt the books, the six classics have disappeared. What emerged by the Han were all fragmentary and misplaced passages of them [i.e. the six classics]. Some are transmitted by the explanations of aged instructors and muddle-headed elders; some are taken from amongst tombs and house walls. Therefore, learners are not clear [about them], and divergent explanations arise one after the other.

As mentioned in the previous section, the devastating consequences of the burning of the books was common knowledge. The significance of arguments of subsequence periods lies in the way in which this information is used. As in Sun Fu's "Wenwang lun," Ouyang Xiu used this event to justify his doubts and called the reliability of post-Qin classical scholarship into question. He first set a wider context that featured an utter destruction of the classical tradition (*liujing jin yi* 六經盡矣, "the six classics disappeared"), implying that the commentarial traditions appearing after the Qin were nothing more than reconstructions. He then alluded to three important episodes in the transmission of the classical tradition after the Qin, all adding to its problematic state. First, the passage *laoshi hunmao* 老師昏耄 (aged instructors and muddle-headed elders) hints at Fu Sheng 伏生 (fl. second century BC), a Qin erudite with expertise in the *Shangshu*. When Emperor Wen of Han (202–157 BC, r. 180–157 BC) sought for someone who could read the *Shangshu*, Fu Sheng was in his 90s. As he was so old and could not serve at court anymore, the emperor had to send Chao Cuo 晁錯 (200–154 BC) to study with him.[45] Secondly, texts taken from *zhongmu* 冢墓 (tombs) refer to the bamboo slips discovered in a tomb in County Ji 汲郡[46] around 280. It was believed that the bamboo slips were buried before

[44] Ouyang Xiu, *Ouyang Xiu quanji,* 48.673.

[45] See *SJ* 101.2745.

[46] Near modern Weihui 衛輝, Henan.

the Qin and preserved the earlier and alternative versions of textual traditions. Since their discovery in late third century, these bamboo slips have been regarded as valuable sources for the study of early textual traditions, the classics among them.[47] Thirdly, texts found between *wubi* 屋壁 (house walls) could refer to at least two events. Fu Sheng reportedly hid his copy of the *Shangshu* in a wall. After that, some classical texts (including the *Shangshu, Liji, Lunyu* and *Xiaojing*) were discovered during the first century BC from the walls of Confucius' old house.[48] These texts are written in allegedly ancient (pre-Qin) scripts and include a copy of the *Shangshu* that contains extra chapters not transmitted at the time, thus greatly impacting the study of the *Shangshu.*[49]

Once Ouyang Xiu's points of reference are identified, we note that these events only relate to a small part of the classical corpus, and none of them involved the *Zhouli,* which Ouyang Xiu called into question in this policy question. Also, the two syntactically parallel passages (*huo chuan zhi laoshi hunmao zhi shuo* 或傳之老師昏耄之説 and *huo qu zhi zhongmu biwu zhi jian* 或取之冢墓屋壁之間) seem unbalanced in allusions. The expression *laoshi hunmao* points to one person, whereas its counterpart *zhongmu wubi* indicates two places and at least three events. This imbalance can be understood as a minor compromise for the sake of style, but we should also consider the possibility that it is part of the design. There might well be a twofold strategy. On one hand, by obscuring the details, this passage could test whether exam candidates are familiar with these important events. On the other hand, by obscuring the details and generalising the statement, Ouyang Xiu presented a stronger assertion, casting doubt on not just the specific texts involved in these events but the whole received tradition. Only those who know exactly what Ouyang Xiu was talking about can see the tricks. To reflect this

[47] For a survey of this discovery and its influence on scholarship, see Shaughnessy, *Rewriting Early Chinese Texts,* chapter 3.

[48] For both recoveries of texts from walls, see *HS* 30.1706.

[49] See Loewe, *Early Chinese Texts*, 381–82; see also Nylan, *Five Classics,* 130.

incompleteness of information that possibly served two purposes (as a test for exam candidates and as a rhetorical device), my translation uses plural forms for the passages *laoshi hunmao* and *zhongmu* despite that they essentially refer to one person and one tomb, respectively.

The same year as Sun Fu's death, Ouyang Xiu acted as the Examination Administrator (*zhi gongju* 知貢舉) and granted *jinshi* degrees to Zhang Zai 張載 (1020–1077), Su Shi 蘇軾 (1037–1101) and Su Zhe 蘇轍 (1039–1112), who later became leading intellectuals of their times and all made contributions to criticism of the received classical corpus. This year has been regarded as a milestone in the history of literature, especially regarding the revival of *guwen* 古文 (ancient-style writing). Invested with the power of the chief examiner, Ouyang Xiu steered, though not without meeting with protest, the writing style practiced among exam candidates, leading to the flourishing of ancient-style writing. However, the classical learning he promoted in the context of examinations is less often discussed. The excerpt of policy analysed above gives a good example of his contribution to the prevalence of scepticism in classical learning. Exam candidates, in front of Ouyang Xiu's eloquent presentation of his doubts on the received classical traditions, would have to agree on his point if they wanted to pass the exam. As Ouyang Xiu acted as examiner on several occasions, there were plenty of opportunities for him to promote this new approach to classical learning in the context of examinations.[50]

Ouyang Xiu's view on the transmission of classical learning is reminiscent of that of Sun Fu, although Ouyang Xiu seems even more radical. Moreover, as Sun Fu did in his "Wenwang lun," Ouyang Xiu also transplanted his views on classical learning to his interpretation of the *Shiji.* An excerpt from his "Diwang shici tu xu" 帝王世次圖序 (Preface to Illustrations of the Genealogy of Sovereigns) reads:

[50] See more examples in Ouyang Xiu, *Ouyang Xiu quanji,* 48.672, 675-678 and 680.

孔子既歿，異端之說復興，周室亦益衰亂，接乎戰國，秦遂焚書，先王之道中絕。漢興久之，《詩》、《書》稍出而不完。當王道中絕之際，奇書異說方充斥而盛行，其言往往反自托於孔子之徒，以取信於時。學者既不備見《詩》《書》之詳，而習傳盛行之異說，世無聖人以為質，而不自知其取捨真偽。至有博學好奇之士，務多聞以為勝者，於是盡集諸說，而論次初無所擇，而惟恐遺之也，如司馬遷之《史記》是矣。[51]

After Confucius died, unorthodox teachings came back to life. The Zhou ruling house went further into decline and chaos, which was followed by the Warring States. The Qin eventually burnt the books, [resulting in] the extinction of the Way of ancient kings. Long after the Han thrived, the *Songs* and *Documents* gradually came out, yet not in their entirety. At a time of the extinction of the kingly Way, unconventional books and unorthodox teachings were flooding and vogue. Yet, they attributed their words to Confucius and his fellows to convince [their] contemporaries. Learners had not scrutinised details of *Songs* and *Documents.* Instead, [they] practised and transmitted popular unorthodox teachings. There was no sage at the time to be enquired, and [the learners], for their part, did not know how to differentiate the true from the false. There were even gentlemen who were extensive in learning, fond of the marvellous and strove to compete in the multiplicity of information. Thereupon, [such gentlemen] exhaustively collected various teachings. In discussing and arranging [their sources], [they] had no criteria in the first place and only feared that [they might] miss something. Sima Qian's *Scribe's Records* is one such example.

In this passage, Ouyang Xiu retrofitted a few statements made by his predecessors to make his point. Apart from the burning of books under the Qin, another two statements on the *Shiji* by previous readers were embedded in Ouyang Xiu's argument. The expression *haoqi* 好奇 (fond of the marvellous) is most likely to be an allusion to Yang Xiong's 揚雄 (53 BC–18 AD) comment:

子長多愛，愛奇也。[52]

Zichang [Sima Qian] has a deep affection, which is for the marvellous.[53]

Yang Xiong's laconic comment is one of the most often cited point of reference in subsequent discourse on the *Shiji,* yet this affection for the marvellous has been used with opposite

[51] Ouyang Xiu, *Ouyang Xiu quanji*, 41.591–592.

[52] Yang Xiong, *Fayan,* 12.2a.

[53] Cf. Michael Nylan's rendering: "Sima Qian had many enthusiasms, but what he loved best were oddities and curiosities;" see Nylan, *Exemplary Figures,* 213. Durrant reads "Zizhang (Sima Qian) loved much – he loved the curious," see his *Cloudy Mirror,* 71. L'Haridon reads "[L]'attention passionnée de Sima Qian est diverse en étant une attention à l'extraordinaire," see her *Maîtres mots,* 133. Zach reads "Ssu-ma Ch'ien bringt auch gerne viele Anekdoten, aber über ungewöhnliche Dinge," see his *Yang Hsiung's Fa-yen,* 64.

connotations. Scholars who defend the *Shjii* for its literary value take it as a virtue that adds to its readability, whereas those who approach the *Shiji* as a historical account take it as a drawback that undermines its reliability.[54] Yang Xiong spoke of this affection in a context that is inclined to regard Sima Qian as overly eclectic.[55] Ouyang Xiu followed the same path and regarded Sima Qian's fondness of the marvellous as a shortcoming.

The extensiveness of Sima Qian's sources is another point that is often made in discourses on the *Shiji* prior to the Song. Despite the negative views on Sima Qian's fondness of the marvellous, his achievements of working through sources outside the classical corpus was generally received with critical acclaim prior to the Song. Starting from Ban Gu,[56] those who engaged with the *Shiji* invariably agreed that it is difficult to bring coherence to heterogeneous sources. They all had reservations of different degrees when it came to the evaluation of the outcome of Sima Qian's project, but none of them addressed the extensiveness of Sima Qian's sources without admiration.[57] However, Ouyang Xiu spoke of this very same matter with a clear negative connation (*wu duowen yiwei sheng* 務多聞以為勝, strive to compete in the multiplicity of information) to build up his argument against Sima Qian's lack of criteria in source criticism (*lunci chu wu suo ze* 論次初無所擇, have no criteria in the first place in discussing and arranging [the sources]).

---

[54] It is noteworthy that Herodotus is also renowned for his interest in *ϑωμαστά* / *thōmasta* (the marvellous). Just as in the case of Sima Qian, this interest brings Herodotus criticism as well as acclaim. For studies focusing on historical reception of Herodotus' interest in marvels, see, for example, Priestley's discussion of the idea of *ϑωμα* / *thōma* (wonders) in Herodotus and in Hellenistic writers in her *Herodotus and Hellenistic Culture,* chapter 2, Looney's analysis of the treatment of Herodotus' wonders in Matteo Maria Boiardo's (1441–1494) vernacular translation in his "Herodotus and Narrative Art in Renaissance Ferrara," 247-49, and Schwab's analysis of Vivant Denon's (1747–1825) reception of Herodotus in his "The 'Rediscovery' of Egypt," 263–267.

[55] See Yang Xiong, *Fayan,* 5.3a-3b. For a discussion of Yang Xiong's attitudes towards the *Shiji,* see Durrant, "Creating Tradition," 284 and Klein, "History of a Historian," 62-66.

[56] See *HS* 62.2738 and my translation and discussion below.

[57] For Ban Gu's comment, see *HS* 62.2738 and my discussion below. For pre-Song expression of admiration on Sima Qian's work, see the prefaces to the commentaries by Pei Yin's 裴駰 (fl. 438), Zhang Shoujie 張守節 (fl. 725–735), Sima Zhen 司馬貞 (fl. 745) to their own commentaries, *SJ* appendixes (esp. pages 1, 7 and 9); see also Liu Zhiji's 劉知幾 (661–721) praise in his *Shitong tongshi,* 5.106.

In her discussion of this passage, Klein regards Ouyang Xiu's criticism as a result of earlier complaints by scholars (e.g. Yang Xiong) and suggests Ouyang Xiu "had no choice but to affirm the version found in the Classics."[58] However, our analysis here shows that Ouyang Xiu was much more proactive on this matter. He was not obliged to admit the drawbacks of the *Shiji* under the pressure posed by previous accusations or the dictate of the classics. On the contrary, he let the material say he wanted it to say. As with his predecessor Sun Fu, Ouyang Xiu depicted a serious interruption of the transmission of textual traditions after the Qin to legitimise his doubts on the classical corpus and get rid of some impractical doctrines (e.g. the overly complicated and redundant administrative system laid out in the *Zhouli*). As part of the perceived imperfect reconstructions of antiquity under the Han, the *Shiji* suffers, so to speak, collateral damage. Ouyang Xiu was not just informed by preceding comments on the *Shiji.* They were resources at his disposal, waiting to be selected to build up arguments that met his needs.

Ouyang Xiu's perception of the *Shiji* was echoed in another policy question by Wang Gui 王珪 (1019–1085). As it happens, Wang Gui was also granted a *jinshi* degree (1042) in an exam supervised by Ouyang Xiu.[59] In this policy question, he also presented the *Shiji* as an imperfect history:

> 司馬遷之為學博矣，然班固譏之，以為上下數十年間，多所牴牾，是非頗謬於聖人。方遷之時，《尚書》孔氏、《詩》毛氏，傳者猶未盛。戰國之史，又為秦所焚滅。而諸子說客，各自著書。其言古事，往往增損以就一時之說。遷博觀而兼採之，宜其有不合也。今夫學者，上觀堯舜三代，下及秦漢，以考聖賢之遺迹。固知遷之書有不合，將索其所以異於《詩》、《書》、《春秋》與戰國之載，著其得失，使《史記》得為完書，以信班氏之譏。然則可概舉之乎？[60]

[58] Klein, "History of a Historian," 110.

[59] Sixteen years after this exam, Ouyang Xiu and Wang Gui became colleagues as academicians (*xueshi* 學士), for which they exchanged poems; see Ouyang Xiu, *Ouyang Xiu quanji,* 12.207. This became a popular anecdote among literati of subsequent periods; see Ye Mengde, *Shilin yanyu,* 8.8a–8b.

[60] Wang Gui, *Huayang ji*, 45.17b–18a.

> Sima Qian's conduct of learning is indeed extensive. Yet, Ban Gu criticises him, holding that [in Sima Qian's records] spanning several decades,[61] there are a lot of inconsistencies, [and that his] judgements somewhat stray from [those of] the sages. In [Sima] Qian's days, there was not yet a wide circulation of Kong [Anguo's] *Documents*, Mao [Heng's] *Songs*. Furthermore, the histories of the Warring States were completely burned by the Qin. Yet, masters and spokesmen all wrote their own books. Their presentations of ancient events often exaggerated or abridged [the matter] so as to cater for arguments of the day. [As Sima] Qian extensively looked into [his sources] and took widely from them, it is fitting that there are discrepancies. Learners nowadays observe [from antiquity] up to Yao, Shun and the Three Dynasties and down to the Qin and Han in order to investigate the legacies of the sages. Knowing for sure about the discrepancies in [Sima] Qian's records,[62] [we] shall search for where it differs from the *Songs*, *Documents*, *Spring and Autumn* and the records from the Warring States, make its merits and demerits evident, and raise the *Scribe's Records* up to [the status of] a flawless book to lend credibility to Mr. Ban's criticism. As such, could [you] outline them [i.e. the discrepancies]?

This policy question features a clear adherence to Ban Gu's verdict of the *Shiji,* which is another oft-cited point of reference in the discussion of the *Shiji*.[63] It initiates the so-called *shigong san shi* 史公三失 (three faults of the honourable scribe), a topic in the study of the *Shiji* that has been treated by numerous scholars of the past and present. As an exam question, Wang Gui's discussion represents a public attitude towards the *Shiji.* However, it is rarely (if ever) mentioned even in the *Shiji* studies focusing on the Song, let alone being scrutinised. In order to understand his perception and significance, it is necessary to quote Ban Gu's original comment at length:

---

[61] It appears that the *shu shi zai* 數十載 (several decades) is a scribal mistake for *shu qian zai* 數千載 (several millennia). Cf. Ban Gu's comment translated below.

[62] It is noteworthy that *gu* 固 can also be read as Ban Gu's given name, thus making this clause "[Ban] Gu knew about the discrepancies in [Sima] Qian's records." This seems grammatically possible, but I read *gu* as an adverb, "certainly, definitely," for logical reasons. If one reads *gu* in reference to Ban Gu and the subject of this clause, the next clause tends to carry on with this subject and thus reads "[Ban Gu] shall search for where it [the *Shiji*] differs from *Songs*, *Documents*, *Spring and Autumn* and the records from the Warring States, make its merits and demerits evident and raise the *Scribe's Records* up to a flawless book to lend credibility to Mr Ban's criticism." However, there is no historical evidence for this. Ban Gu's *Hanshu* is a dynastic history of the Han and there would not have been many occasions where he needed to check the *Shiji* against pre-Qin sources. Also, if the subject is "Ban Gu," the "Mr. Ban" towards the end of the sentence would appear a bit awkward.

[63] As has been pointed out by many scholars, this passage is a reiteration of a comment by Ban Gu's father, Ban Biao 班彪 (3–53); see *HHS* 40.1325–1327. For discussion of their comments, see Yang Haizheng, *Han Tang Shiji,* 49-71, and Klein, "History of a Historian," 202–203 and 214–221.

至於采經摭傳，分散數家之事，甚多疏略，或有抵牾。亦其涉獵者廣博，貫穿經傳，馳騁古今上下數千載間，斯以勤矣。又其是非頗繆於聖人，論大道則先黃老而後六經，序遊俠則退處士而進姦雄，述貨殖則崇勢利而羞賤貧，此其所蔽也。[64]

As for [Sima Qian's] selection from the classics and traditions and dispersion of the matters of several schools, there are numerous mistakes and sometimes inconsistencies. Certainly, he makes extensive references and threads together the classics and traditions, galloping all the way through several millennia, with such diligence! Yet, his judgements somewhat stray from [those of] the sages. When discussing the Great Way, [he] puts Huang-Lao first and leaves the Six Classics behind. When giving order to wandering knights,[65] [he] belittles reclusive gentlemen and praises treacherous heroes. When giving accounts of money makers, [he] regards power and profit as honourable and humbleness and poverty as shameful. These are his drawbacks.

This passage, given in the final remark of the biography of Sima Qian in the *Hanshu,* has stirred scholarly debates since the Han, and Song intellectuals were also keen on it.[66] Ban Gu pointed out two problematic aspects of the *Shiji*, the inconsistencies within the *Shiji* and the values it promotes. When it comes to Wang Gui, these two major problems collapse into the expression *buhe* 不合 (do not fit, come together, or accord with).

However, there is more to Wang Gui's discussion. With a praising tone (*si yi qin yi* 斯以勤矣), Ban Gu addressed the extensive amount of sources Sima Qian worked through. Wang Gui shared Ban Gu's compliment on Sima Qian's extensive learning (*Sima Qain zhi wei xue bo yi* 司馬遷之為學博矣), for which his criticism of the *Shiji* sounds milder than those of Sun Fu and Ouyang Xiu, but at the same time, he spilt more ink on the inferior quality of Sima Qian's sources. He depicted a scenario where the transmission of the classics and histories

[64] *HS* 62.2738.

[65] Cf. Durrant's translation of part of this passage in his "Creating Tradition," 285. Klein reads *xu* 序 as "introduction," see her "History of a Historian," 216. The chapter "Youxia liezhuan" 遊俠列傳 (Arrayed Traditions of Wandering Knights) indeed starts with a lengthy introduction elaborating the praiseworthiness of these people, which seemingly supports Klein's reading. However, *xu* is much more often used as "sequence, order/put in order" in the *Hanshu*. Even when it refers to an additional remark on a text, *xu* refers to "postscript" and is interchangeable with *xu* 敘. It is only after the Han that *xu* 序 gradually came to be a term for "foreword" or "preface." Therefore, I sympathise more with Durrant's reading "giving a place to."

[66] For a review of Tang scholars' reception of Ban Gu's comment, see Yang Haizheng, *Han Tang Shiji,* 55–63. For its reception from Song until Ming, see Yu Zhanghua, Yu Liming and Ying Chaohua, *Tang Song Shiji,* 212–217, and Zhang Ziran, "Song Ming biji," 75–81.

during the early Han is in utter chaos. In his portrayal, ancient classical traditions remain in oblivion, old historical accounts are burned, and to make it worse, the sources widely available are later compilations that constantly give inaccurate information.

In the policy question by Ouyang Xiu, Kong Anguo's *Shangshu* is one of the targets of ridicule as a text coming from walls. Compared to that, Wang Gui seemed to have a higher opinion on Kong Anguo's *Shangshu* and indicated that a reason why Sima Qian did not transmit reliable accounts was that Kong Anguo's *Shangshu* was not in wide circulation (*chuanzhe you wei sheng* 傳者猶未盛) in Sima Qian's days.[67] Also, Ouyang Xiu's attitude comes closer to Sun Fu, who unambiguously blamed Sima Qian for his eclecticism, whereas Wang Gui seemed to have more sympathies with Sima Qian and thus used the depiction of a chaotic situation to exculpate him. As the various sources at the time were confusing and difficult to handle, so Wang Gui thought, it was "fitting" (*yi* 宜) that Sima Qian's work displayed plenty of discrepancies.

Despite the different points of references and subtly different attitudes, it is still fair to say that Sun Fu, Ouyang Xiu, and Wang Gui were on the same path. They unanimously addressed the extensiveness of Sima Qian's accounts, a point that Ban Gu clearly deemed as a merit, but such extensiveness came to be considered as detrimental to the quality of the *Shiji* as a historical account by eleventh century critics. Their perception of the *Shiji* was part of a larger scheme that aimed to shake the authority of received classical traditions. Given the public venue of its expression, Wang Gui's perception of the *Shiji* probably represents a view shared by many intellectuals. The reoccurrences of this perception in scholarly writing, sometimes even in

[67] It should be noted that the *Kong's Documents* was reportedly recovered from Confucius' old house and deciphered by Kong Anguo 孔安國 (c. 165–c. 74 BC). However, the *Kong's Documents* of the Han was eventually lost and replaced by some later forgeries by the fifth century. The later forgeries are now known as pseudo-Kong chapters, or in Chinese terms, *wei Kong zhuan* 偽孔傳 or *wei guwen Shangshu* 偽古文尚書; see Nylan, *Five Classics*, 131. Therefore, what eleventh century scholars worked with as *Kong's Documents* would have been these pseudo-Kong chapters.

strikingly similar formulations, attest to its prevalence.[68] Yet, the general agreement on the overall perception of Sima Qian's project did not ensure consensus on all the details. When it comes to more concrete examples from the *Shiji*, readers' opinions diverged. In the next section, we will see a case in which two readers of the same chapter of the *Shiji* arrived at opposite verdicts on Sima Qian's decision.

Too Little or Too Much?

In the first section of this chapter, we have analysed how Sun Fu rejected the *Shiji* account in order to emphasise the absolute loyalty of a subject to his sovereign. This section starts with another piece of historical criticism written by him and investigates his take on a case concerning the line of succession, another aspect of the socio-political hierarchy promoted in the classics. Theoretically speaking, the sons of the principal wife enjoyed priority and thus were deemed superior to their brothers borne by concubines. Historically speaking, however, there are plenty of examples of violations of this rule. The case under investigation involves four elder hermits from Mount Shang, known as *Shangshan si hao* 商山四皓 (the four hoary [men] from Mount Shang) in the early Han, whose stories can be found in the "Liuhou shijia" 留侯世家 (Hereditary House of Lord Liu [i.e. Zhang Liang 張良, d. 186 BC]) of the *Shiji* and the "Zhang Chen Wang Zhou zhuan" 張陳王周傳 ("Traditions of Zhang [Liang], Chen [Ping 陳平, d. 178 BC], Wang [Ling 王陵, d. 180 BC] and Zhou [Bo 周勃, d. 169 BC]) in the *Hanshu*. The four elders are said to be worthy men who retreated to live in the mountains because they were unwilling to serve Liu Bang 劉邦 (247–195 BC), the founding emperor of the Han. When Liu Bang wanted to replace the heir apparent, then the empress' son, with the son of his

[68] See, for example, Zeng Gong, *Zeng Gong ji,* 188, and Su Zhe, *Gushi,* vol. 3, 351/2a-b. Su Zhe's comment is worded in a way that is highly similar to that of Wang Gui, see chapter 4.

favourite concubine, the empress sought the help of Zhang Liang, who advised her to invite the four famous elders from Mount Shang. Some time after this was arranged, Liu Bang realised that the four elders who refused to serve him now acted as advisors of the empress' son, he explained to his favourite concubine that the heir apparent was already well established and could not be replaced anymore.[69]

Although the *Shiji* and *Hanshu* both record this episode, the four elders are not subject matter in either of them. In both accounts, this episode is only one of many other episodes that build up the persona of Zhang Liang as a resourceful advisor. In his "Bian si hao" 辨四皓 (Clarifying [the Significance of] the Four Hoary [Men]), Sun Fu expressed his discontent with both the *Shiji* and *Hanshu*:

> 昔伯夷、叔齊諫武王，不食而死，非孔子稱之，則西山之餓夫也，後世孰稱之哉？司馬遷、班固不能博采厥善，發舒其光，為四先生立傳，垂於無窮，斯其過矣。噫！萬世之下，使臣不敢戕其君者，夷、齊是也；萬世之下，使庶不敢亂其嫡者，四先生是也。[70]
>
> In the past, Boyi [fl. eleventh century BC] and Shuqi [fl. eleventh century BC] admonished King Wu [of Zhou, fl. eleventh century BC], refused to eat and died. If Confucius had not extolled them, they would have merely been starving men of western mountains. Who of posterity would extol them? Sima Qian and Ban Gu failed to extensively collect the good [records], manifest their light and establish a tradition for the four respectable men to be passed down to infinity – such is their fault. Alas! In the following ten thousand generations, it is for [Bo]yi and [Shu]qi that subjects do not dare to murder their rulers, and it is for the four respectable men that sons borne by concubines do not dare to displace sons born by the principal wife.

Boyi and Shuqi are mentioned on various occasions in the *Lunyu*,[71] to which Sun Fu probably alluded here. As they remained loyal to the Shang dynasty and starved themselves to death in protest against Zhou's usurpation, Sun Fu regarded them as martyrs of propriety.[72] In the *Shiji,*

[69] See *SJ* 55.2044–2047, and *HS* 40.2033–2036; see also Loewe, *Biographical Dictionary*, 483 and 685.

[70] Sun Fu, *Sun Mingfu xiaoji,* 1.7b–8a.

[71] See *Lunyu* 5.23, 7.15, 16.12, and 18.8 in *Lunyu zhushu*, 5.10b (45), 7.5a (62), 16.9a (150), and 18.6a (166); see also *SJ* 61.2122, where Sima Qian referred to the two utterances transmitted as *Lunyu* 5.23 and 7.15.

[72] His disciple Shi Jie made exactly the same point with the case of Boyi and Shuqi in his "Jizha lun" 季札論 (On Jizha); see Shi Jie, *Culai ji,* 11.1a–2b.

the legacy of Boyi and Shuqi is treated as subject matter in chapter 61, which leads the entire *liezhuan* 列傳 (arrayed traditions) section.[73] In Sun Fu's view, the significance of the four elders was no less than that of Boyi and Shuqi, yet they were not given due attention in the *Shiji* or *Hanshu*. Again, Sun Fu's view reflects how his reading of historical accounts was affected by his concerns about establishing order in his contemporary world.[74]

Regarding the same case, Sima Guang 司馬光 (1019-1086) gave a strikingly different interpretation and formulated quite the contrary opinion on Sima Qian's management of the story. When compiling his *Zizhi tongjian* 資治通鑑 (Comprehensive Mirror to Aid in Government), Sima Guang disregarded the whole legacy of the four hoary men and explained his grounds in the *Zizhi tongjian kaoyi* 資治通鑑考異 (Examination of Alternative Records to the Comprehensive Mirror to Aid in Government):

> 高祖罡猛伉厲，非畏搢紳譏議者也。但以大臣皆不肯從，恐身後趙王不能獨立，故不為耳，若決意欲廢太子，立如意，不顧義理，以留侯之久故親信，猶云非口舌所能爭，豈山林四叟片言遽能梶其事哉！借使四叟實能梶其事，不過汚高祖數寸之刃耳，何至悲歌云“羽翮已成，矰繳安施”乎？若四叟實能制高祖，使不敢廢太子，是留侯為子立黨以制其父也。留侯豈為此哉？此特辯士欲夸大四叟之事，故云。然亦猶蘇秦約六國從，秦兵不敢闚函谷關十五年，魯仲連折新垣衍，秦將聞之却軍五十里耳。凡此之類，皆非事實，司馬遷好事，多愛而采之，今皆不取。[75]
>
> Gaozu [Liu Bang] was vigorous and stern, not a person that would fear the criticism from those with tablets thrust in the belt [i.e. court ministers]. [It was] just because ministers were all unwilling to agree [on the displacement]. [Gaozu] was afraid that, after his death, the King of Zhao [i.e. Liu Ruyi 劉如意, 208-195/4 BC] would not be able to stand on his own. Therefore [he] did not do it. If [Gaozu] was determined to dismiss the heir apparent and to establish [Liu] Ruyi regardless of morality, even an old confidant like Lord Liu [i.e. Zhang Liang] said it was not a matter to be disputed on lips.[76] How could a few words of four old mountain men possibly impede his plan!

[73] The structure of this chapter is strikingly different from other arrayed traditions in the *Shiji.* Also, it is believed that the first chapters of each section in the *Shiji* bear great significance in illuminating the overall design of the *Shiji* and Sima Qian's compositional intentions; see, for example, Ge Hong, *Xijing zaji,* 4.3a, He Qiaoxin, *He Wensu gong wenji,* 1.76, Huang Zuo, *Yongyan,* 9.21a, and Zeng Guofan, *Qiuquezhai dushu lu,* 3.7a.

[74] See the first section of this chapter.

[75] Sima Guang, *Zizhi tongjian kaoyi,* 1.4a.

[76] This refers to the *Shiji* account of Zhang Liang's words; see *SJ* 55.2045: 此難以口舌爭也.

> Even if the four old men were really able to impede his plan, [they] could not but stain a bit of Gaozu's blade. How could it go so far [as to make Gaozu] sing with grief that "feathers are already fully grown, where to shoot the arrows?"[77] If the four old men were really able to constrain Gaozu, making him not dare to dismiss the heir apparent, this [means] Lord Liu initiated a faction for the heir apparent to constrain his father. How could Lord Liu do this? This is just because some disputers wanted to exaggerate the story of the four old men. Yet, [it] is comparable to [another two accounts]: Su Qin [d. 284 BC] set up a vertical alliance of the six states, [for which] Qin troops did not dare to peep out from Hangu Pass for fifteen years;[78] Lu Zhonglian [fl. third century BC] subdued Xinyuan Yan [fl. third century BC], and the Qin commander, upon hearing it, retreated fifty miles.[79] All such [accounts] are not factual. Sima Qian is fond of anecdotes,[80] [so he] recorded them for his deep affection.[81] Now [I] dismiss [them] all.

Compared to Sun Fu's reading guided by ethical considerations, Sima Guang was more concerned about the *realpolitik*. In Sima Guang's view, Liu Bang did not care about propriety, at least not to the extent that people like Sun Fu would imagine. Instead of perceiving the whole thing as a moral lesson, Liu Bang would have (so Sima Guang believed) regarded the support of the four elders for the heir apparent as indicative of the actual political powers he gathered. Even if he had insisted on dismissing the heir apparent, Liu Ruyi's later defeat would have been foreseeable.

The passage *wei zi li dang yi zhi qi fu* 為子立黨以制其父 (establish a faction for the heir apparent to constrain his father) reveals the main reason of Sima Guang's objection to the

---

[77] This is an abridged version of the lyrics Liu Bang reportedly sang, see *SJ* 55.2047.

[78] This refers to the event of Su Qin persuading the six states to the east of the Qin to form an alliance in order to withstand Qin; see *SJ* 69.2262 and a full translation of this chapter in Nienhauser, *Scribe's Records,* vol. VII, 97–122. Hangu Pass (around modern Lingbao 靈寶, Henan) marked the eastern border of the state of Qin, and "peeping out from Hangu Pass" is an analogy for coveting lands of other states.

[79] Xinyuan Yan was commissioned by the king of Wei to persuade the state of Zhao to recognise Qin as an emperor. Lu Zhonglian, who was reportedly an independent man of integrity, convinced Xinyuan Yan that the submission to the power of Qin would eventually bring misfortune to the state of Wei and Xinyuan Yan himself. In the end, Xinyuan Yan gave up on his mission; see SJ 83.2464–2465 and a full translation of this chapter in Nienhauser, *Scribe's Records*, vol. VII, 281–292.

[80] *Hao shi* 好事 occurs on several occasions within the context of the *Shiji*. Except for *SJ* 27.1325, where *hao shi* reads "good thing," *hao shi* as a verbal phrase, reading "to be fond of things," entails different connotations, including being fond of anecdotes (see Chu Shaosun's remarks in *SJ* 20.1059, 58.2089, 126.3203, 128.3229), of political and military activities (see *SJ* 40.1325), and of working (see *SJ* 129.3269).

[81] This reading considers the possibility that *duo ai* 多愛 alludes to Yang Xiong's verdict on Sima Qian (see previous section). A more innocent reading of the passage *duo ai er cai zhi* 多愛而采之 would be "[Sima Qian] in many cases loved and recorded them."

historicity of the account of the four elders. He could not accept that an advisor as wise as Zhang Liang would possibly care to employ such a despicable tactic. Speaking of factions, or *pengdang* 朋黨, we have several theoretical essays from the Northern Song on the interpretation of this term, among which we might first recall Ouyang Xiu's eloquent "Pengdang lun" 朋黨論 (On Factions) that justifies the healthy gathering of gentlemen.[82] Despite that this essay is widely appreciated for its style, it did not materially change the negative connotations of the word *dang* or *pengdang.* During the eleventh century, factionalism was a highly sensitive issue and seemed to predominate Sima Guang's concerns, so he was quick in reading into the account of the four elders an implication of factionalism.

As his concerns about factionalism outweighed those about proper hierarchical order, Sima Guang arrived at an evaluation of the *Shiji* that stands opposite to Sun Fu's view. Whereas Sun Fu held that Sima Qian should have treated the account of the four elders more seriously, Sima Guang thought it should never have been recorded as history, stating that it is no more than an exaggerated presentation of historical events. The two similar examples he listed, the accounts of Su Qin and Lu Zhonglian, both highlight a dramatic contrast between the mighty military force of Qin and a single man who withstood that force by deploying his intellectual resources. By the same token, there is a contrast between the four old mountain men and the formidable emperor who started the legacy of the Han dynasty. It is the seeming unbalance in power that makes the result unexpected and brings the entire narrative into the realm of memorable stories. However, for Sima Guang, a good story could not make reliable history, and the account of the four elders was perhaps conceived as too dramatic to be true.

[82] See Ouyang Xiu, *Ouyang Xiu quanji*, 17.297; for a partial translation with analysis, see Liu, *Ou-yang Hsiu,* 53–58. For a rounded analysis of the term *pengdang* and the discourse on it during the Northern Song, see Levine, *Divided by a Common Language,* 25–27 and chapter 3.

Despite that the *Hanshu* also records the legacy of the four elders, Sima Guang made it clear toward the end of his note that his criticism was focused on the *Shiji*. Also, he presented his explanation of the presence of these perceived false accounts. If we recall Sima Guang's predecessors who commented on Sima Qian's source criticism, Sun Fu, Ouyang Xiu and Wang Gui invariably addressed Sima Qian's eclectic strategy *and* the multiplicity of sources available to him. When it comes to Sima Guang, the quality of sources was not an issue of concern, and the blame was put solely on Sima Qian. The reason for this could simply be that Sima Guang did not want to expound on the *Shiji* in a note supplementary to the *Zizhi tongjian*. However, we should also consider the tendency during the eleventh century that Sima Qian as the person within and behind his text was brought to centre stage.[83] This tendency might also have contributed to Sima Guang's perception that Sima Qian's source criticism was marred by his personal preferences (*hao shi* 好事, be fond of anecdotes) instead of constrained by the complexity of his task.

In modern scholarship, the readings that approach the *Shiji* via Sima Qian's life experience are dubbed "lyric/romantic" or "autobiographical" readings.[84] Readers of the eleventh century provided rich discourse on the relationship between Sima Qian and his work, addressing aspects including

1) Sima Qian's preferences for the marvellous;[85]
2) Sima Qian's extensive travel in his youth; [86]

[83] See my discussion of the awareness of the relationship between the historian and his histories in the next section.

[84] See Nylan, "True Historian," 203–215 and Klein, "History of a Historian," chapter 5, respectively.

[85] See Ouyang Xiu's "Diwang shici tu xu" and Sima Guang's note discussed above; see also Zhang Lei's "Sima Qian lun xia" 司馬遷論下 (On Sima Qian II) his *Zhang Lei ji*, 56.664–665.

[86] See Chao Buzhi's 晁補之 (1053–1110) comment in Wang Zhengde, *Yushi lu,* 1.16a, Ma Cun's 馬存 (d. 1096) comment in Ling Zhilong, *Shiji pinglin*, 65a–65b, Wang Anshi's 王安石 (1021–1086) poem on Sima Qian in Wang Anshi, *Linchuan xiansheng wenji,* 4.6b, Qin Guan's 秦觀 (1049–1110) poem on Sima Qian in Qin Guan, *Huaihai ji,* 2.48, Zhang Lei's 張耒 (1054–1114) "Shang Zeng Zigu Longtu shu" 上曾子固龍圖書 (Letter to Longtu [academician] Zeng Zigu [i.e. Zeng Gong]) in his *Zhang Lei ji*, 56.844–845, and Su Zhe's "Shang Shumi

3) Sima Qian's defence for defence for Li Ling 李陵 (d. 74 BC) and consequent castration;[87]

4) Sima Qian's philosophical thoughts; [88]

and 5) Sima Qian's reflections on contemporary (early Western Han) society.[89]

Regardless of whether these aspects were discussed in a favourable light, they significantly enriched the dimensions of interpretation of the *Shiji.* As Sima Guang did in his note we just discussed, readers engaging with the aspects listed above pay little heed to the multiplicity of Sima Qian's sources and how difficult it might have been to work through them. Instead, they focused primarily, if not solely, on the role that Sima Qian played in shaping his work.

In her extensive discussion of autobiographical readings of the *Shiji* during the Song dynasty, Klein translates and analyses most examples mentioned above. She observes a shift in how many readers read the *Shiji* in light of Sima Qian's biography and argues that this shift was initiated by the intellectual circle surrounding Su Shi as a response in particular to the factionalism which arose around Wang Anshi's New Policies. She identifies the *Wutai shian* 烏臺詩案 (Crow Terrace Poetry Trial) of 1079 as a key event. Klein suggests the persecution of Su Shi was perceived by his circle as analogous to Sima Qian's personal misfortune. Their sympathy for Su Shi then transferred into their defence of Sima Qian. Further to that, Klein suggests that the seemingly contradictory evaluations of the *Shiji* made by the same reader can be accounted for by the difference between private and public venues of expression. She focuses on the writings of Zhang Lei, a disciple and close friend of Su Shi, He seemed more brave in expressing his fondness of and sympathy for Sima Qian in a private setting, whereas

---

Han taiwei shu" 上樞密韓太尉書 (Letter to Han [Qi 韓琦, 1008–1075], Defender-in-Chief of the Bureau of Military Affairs) in Su Zhe, *Luancheng ji,* 22.381.

[87] See Wang Anshi, *Linchuan xiansheng wenji,* 4.6b, Qin Guan's poem and essay on Sima Qian in his *Huaihai ji*, 2.48 and 20.700–701, and Zhang Lei's "Sima Qian lun shang" 司馬遷論上 (On Sima Qian I) in his *Zhang Lei ji,* 41.664–665.

[88] See Qin Guan's essay on Sima Qian in his *Huaihai ji,* 20.700.

[89] See Qin Guan's essay on Sima Qian in his *Huaihai ji,* 20.700–701 and Shen Kuo, *Mengxi bitan,* "Bu bitan" 補筆談, 1.289.

in a more public setting, he criticised Sima Qian for giving vent to personal grudge in historical writing. Thereby, Klein suggests, Zhang Lei, then involved in official historiography himself, clarified his own stance as a historian that would not vent his personal grudge and indirectly criticise authority in historical writing.[90]

The prosecution of Su Shi might have served to give rise to a sympathetic interpretation of Sima Qian and his work, but there are three aspects of Klein's arguments that are not fully convincing.

First, most of the Northern Song material pertaining to Sima Qian and his work are not dated, and there is no evidence of Northern Song intellectuals becoming more sympathetic with Sima Qian after the prosecution of Su Shi. The shift Klein proposes is not a conclusion drawn from factual evidence but a precursory concept that assigns hypothetical dates to her sources.

Second, the different venues of expression are also hypothetical. A large amount of writings pertaining to evaluations of the *Shiji* are *lun* 論 (essays) on historical matters, and there is usually no obvious reason to believe one essay is intended for a more public setting than another. In her discussion of Zhang Lei's alleged change of attitudes towards Sima Qian, Klein assigns different venues of expression to two essays without explanation.

Third, the "seeming contradiction" in the evaluations of Sima Qian and his work is not just attested in the writings of Su Shi's circle but also in writings that predate the prosecution of Su Shi. Ouyang Xiu and Zeng Gong 曾鞏 (1019–1083), for example, both expressed admiration for and doubts on the *Shiji.*[91] It would appear that the compliments emphasise the *Shiji* as good

[90] See Klein, "History of a Historian," 255–287.

[91] See discussion of Ouyang Xiu's verdict on the *Shiji* in this chapter. Elsewhere, Ouyang Xiu expressed that he was deeply fond of Sima Qian's "arrayed traditions" yet not sure whether there was any exaggeration; see his "Sang Yi zhuan" 桑懌傳 (A Biography of Sang Yi) in his *Ouyang Xiu quanji,* 66.969–972. Zeng Gong stated that one should devote to the reading of the *Shiji* for two or three years before embarking on literary writing; see Wang Zhengde, *Yushi lu* 1.10b. Also, he stated that, despite his exemplary writing style, Sima Qian failed to transmit thoughts of the sages, see Zeng Gong, *Zeng Gong ji,* 11.188.

literature that provides an enjoyable read, whereas criticism focuses on its drawbacks when judged by moral and historiographical standards. It is not uncommon during the Northern Song that the two attitudes coexist in one reader. Klein discusses these comments in her own work too, but she does not read a shift of opinion from private to public setting into them.[92] As Zhang Lei's ambivalence (regarding the *Shiji* as good literature but a flawed history) does not ostensibly differ from the attitudes of Ouyang Xiu and Zeng Gong, it remains disputable whether it is necessary to impose a series of hypothetical dates to bring out the proposed contrast between opinions expressed in the presumed different venues.

That being said, it is true that extant material suggests the prevalence of readings that explain the *Shiji* in light of Sima Qian's life experience and personality. We can find the roots of this type of readings, as well as other alternative readings, in comments by earlier readers. As early as the Han, Ban Gu has already pointed out that Sima Qian was subtly criticising the emperor and contemporary politics to vent his personal frustration.[93] In other words, this autobiographical approach is certainly not an invention of the Northern Song. Readers of the *Shiji* prior to the Northern Song have already provided a selection of approaches (e.g. socio-political, autobiographical, philological, etc.). Yet, there were aspects and strategies in the reading of the *Shiji* that were available to the Northern Song readers yet did not interest them as much as the autobiographical approach. For example, despite the models established by pre-Song commentators, Song readers did not follow up with any notable achievement in textual criticism. Elucidation on historiographical principles of the *Shiji* was also rare. Su Xun 蘇洵's (1009–1066) discussion of the so-called *hujian fa* 互見法 (the technique of mutual illumination) is often singled out as an important essay on Sima Qian's historiography, but we should note that Su Xun's discussion is the only example on that analytical level during the eleventh

[92] See Klein, "History of a Historian," 107–111.

[93] See *HS* 62.2738 and Ban Gu, "Dianyin" 典引 (Extending the Canon) in Xiao Tong, *Wenxuan*, 48.13b.

century.[94] As for interpretations that drew on Sima Qian's personality and experience, there are about a dozen examples addressing different aspects and written in several genres. Given this, it seems plausible to surmise that something in those days provided the soil for the flourishing of this particular reading approach. The next section will thus move on to discuss why eleventh century readers found this approach particularly appealing.

The Person and the History He Tells

Among all factors that might account for the popularity of autobiographical readings, I focus on the common practice of historical analogism during the Northern Song and its impact on the interpretation of historical accounts.

Historical analogism, together with classical hermeneutics, constituted a shared inventory of linguistic and intellectual foundations of political rhetoric during the Northern Song.[95] Robert Hartwell (1932–1996) provided an abundance of references for the significance of historical analogism. Everybody involved in governance – current or future emperors, royalty, ministers, and exam candidates – were expected to familiarise themselves with important historical figures, policies, and events, especially those of the Three Dynasties, Han and Tang periods.[96] Chapter one has questioned whether exam questions alone can reflect the actual level of historical knowledge of exam candidates. There is evidence indicating that they were often not as familiar with historical accounts as they were supposed to be. However, exam questions did reflect examiners' engagement with history and the imperial will to emphasise historical knowledge. Hartwell convincingly showed that historical analogism was then an indispensable

[94] See Su Xun, *Jiayou ji,* 9.232. Hardy reads it as "technique of complementary viewpoints," see his *World of Bronze and Bamboo,* 82; see also Li Wai-Yee's discussion in her "Idea of Authenticity," 395-400.

[95] See Devine, *Divided by a Common Language,* chapter 2–3.

[96] See Hartwell, "Historical Analogism," 690–711.

rhetorical device in political discourse and constituted the pivotal technique of social analysis. Once an exam candidate managed to enter the administrative system (a process in which his level of historical knowledge did not play an arguably decisive role), he would have had plenty of opportunities and occasions to practise this essential skill. Ministers were to draw on historical examples to advance their political views in direct or indirect ways; memorials were to be packed with an abundance of historical precedents; policies were to be made according to the operative principles deduced from the repository of the empirical dataset provided by histories.

The presumption of the practice of historical analogism is that history allows its interpreters to extract some timeless principles that can serve as guidance for resolving problems at present. However, history is so multifaceted that it can provide precedents for whatever one is looking for. In the end, it does not seem to manifest constant truths but only constitutes a rhetorical device. As the eleventh century context witnessed the prevalence of historical analogism in political context, it also provided numerous examples of how history was appropriated for meeting different ends. As one of the most important historical accounts, the *Shiji* certainly provided plenty of resources for historical analogies, but at the same time, it was sometimes blamed for transmitting unwelcome accounts. Su Shi's criticism of Sima Qian's accounts of Shang Yang 商鞅 (390–338 BC) and Sang Hongyang 桑弘羊 (152–80 BC)[97] is a good example at hand.

Shang Yang was one of the most important statesmen during the Warring States period. He is best known as a reformer in the state of Qin and a representative figure of legalism (*fajia* 法家). Chapter 68 of the *Shiji,* "Shangjun liezhuan" 商君列傳 (Arrayed Traditions of Lord

[97] This essay appears under the title "Lun Shang Yang" 論商鞅 (On Shang Yang) in Su Shi, *Su Shi wenji,* 5.155–157, and "Lun Sima Qian er da zui" 論司馬遷二大罪 (On Sima Qian's Two Serious Faults) in the *Dongpo zhilin*, 5.107–108.

Shang), has long been the primary source of biographical information about Shang Yang.[98] The final remark of this chapter suggests that Shang Yang was a harsh person and that his notoriety was well-deserved.[99] On the other hand, in the narratives of chapter 68 there are various remarks on how effective his policies were. Moreover, chapter 130 of the *Shiji* leaves a positive comment on him, which reads "[he] was able to clarify his methods and made Duke Xiao [of Qin 秦孝公, 381–338 BC, r. 361–338 BC] powerful. Later generations followed his way" (*neng ming qi shu qiangba Xiaogong houshi zun qi fa* 能明其術, 彊霸孝公, 後世遵其法).[100] Su Shi found this ambivalent presentation of Shang Yang's deeds highly disputable:

> 商鞅用於秦，變法定令。"行之十年，秦民大悅，道不拾遺，山無盜賊，家給人足，民勇於公戰，怯於私鬬。"[101] "秦人富彊，天子致胙於孝公，諸侯畢賀。"[102] 蘇子曰：此皆戰國之遊士邪說詭論，而司馬遷闇於大道，取以為史。吾嘗以為遷有大罪二，其"先黃老後《六經》，退處士進姦雄"，[103] 蓋其小小者耳。所謂大罪二，則論商鞅、桑弘羊之功也。自漢以來，學者恥言商鞅、桑弘羊，而世主獨甘心焉，皆陽諱其名，而陰用其實，甚者則名實皆宗之，庶幾其成功，此則司馬遷之罪也。[104]
>
> Shang Yang was put to use in Qin; [he] changed laws and determined orders. "After putting them to practice for ten years, commoners of Qin were greatly delighted. On the road [people] did not pick up lost items; in the mountains, there was no bandits or thieves. Households were well-supplied and people were well off. Commoners were brave in communal battles and fearful of private fighting." "The people of Qin were wealthy and powerful. The Son of Heaven presented sacrificial meat to Lord Xiao [of Qin]. Titled lords all sent their congratulations." Master Su says: These are all heterodox talk and deceitful arguments, yet Sima Qian was ignorant of the great Way and took them to write historical accounts. I once thought [Sima] Qian had two serious faults. His "putting Huang-Lao [teachings] first and leaving the Six Classics behind, belittling reclusive gentlemen and praising treacherous heroes" are just the most trivial

[98] The *Zhanguo ce* 戰國策 (Stratagems of the Warring States) also includes some passages about Shang Yang, but they are far less informative than the *Shiji* account; see Liu Xiang, *Zhanguo ce*, 75–77. Another relevant text is the *Shangjun shu* 商君書 (Book of Lord Shang), which is attributed to Shang Yang and his followers. However, this book is a collection of legalistic theories and does not provide any information about Shang Yang's life. For discussions of textual sources of Shang Yang's life, see Duyvendak, *Lord Shang*, 33-40, and Pines, *Book of Lord Shang,* 7–24.

[99] See *SJ* 68.2237.

[100] *SJ* 130.3313.

[101] See *SJ* 68.2231.

[102] See *SJ* 68.2232.

[103] See *HS* 62.2738 and my discussion in previous sections of this chapter.

[104] Su Shi, *Su Shi wenji,* 5.156–157.

> [faults]. What [I] mean by two serious faults is [his] discussion of the achievements of Shang Yang and Sang Hongyang. Since the Han, learners have been ashamed for speaking of Shang Yang and Sang Hongyang. Yet rulers of the world alone are content with them. [They] all eschew their names overtly and practise their substance covertly; some even go so far as to venerate them for name as well as substance in the hope for their success. These are Sima Qian's faults.

At first glance, Su Shi's criticism is precise in identifying his targets, which are two specific passages of the chapter 68 of the *Shiji.* He openly challenged Ban Gu's famous verdict on Sima Qian's lack of proper morality. However, his criticism, when read in light of the political context of Su Shi's days, is much more than a criticism of the *Shiji*. Although Su Shi did not enunciate it, various aspects of his criticism hint at his political opponent Wang Anshi. As a reformer himself, Wang Anshi sympathised with Shang Yang and once expressed his admiration for Shang Yang's determination and trustworthiness in a poem.[105] Wang Anshi's political thoughts were mostly based in Confucian tradition, and he sometimes argued against legalist governance, for which Shang Yang is a spokesman. Yet, Shang Yang and Wang Anshi shared the role of radical reformer of their own times. Just as Shang Yang, Wang Anshi was a man of resolute principles and a politician that had many of his ideas put into actual practice.[106] When he read about Shang Yang, he perhaps saw a reformer's unyielding resolution and deeply appreciated it. From Su Shi's point of view, however, Sima Qian was to be blamed for attributing the wealth and power of Qin to Shang Yang's reforms. Sima Qian's account potentially serves as a point of reference to support radical reforms, which in Su Shi's days refer to Wang Anshi's New Policies.

The other historical figure that Su Shi criticised is Sang Hongyang, a Han statesman known for his economic expertise.[107] Again, Su Shi singled out a passage from the *Shiji*:

---

[105] Wang Anshi, *Linchuan xiansheng wenji*, 32.7b.

[106] See Williamson, *Wang An-shih*, 99-147 and Liu, *Wang An-Shih*, 52–58.

[107] For a biographical note on Sang Hongyang, see Loewe, *Biographical Dictionary*, 462–264.

> 至於桑弘羊，斗筲之才，穿窬之智，無足言者，而遷稱之，曰：“不加賦而上用足。”[108] 善乎，司馬光之言也！曰：“天下安有此理！天地所生財貨百物，止有此數，不在民則在官，譬如雨澤，夏澇則秋旱。不加賦而上用足，不過設法陰奪民利，其害甚於加賦也。”[109]
>
> As for Sang Hongyang, a man of meagre talents and burglar's wisdom, he was not worthy of mention. Yet, [Sima] Qian praised him, saying, "Without increasing taxes, the sovereign was sufficiently supplied." Sima Guang's words are fine indeed! [He] said, "Where to find such nonsense in the world! Things like recourses produced by heaven and earth are limited to such an amount. If they are not with the people, then they are with the officials. It is analogous to rainfall: If there are floods in summer, there will be drought in autumn. [As for making] the sovereign sufficiently supplied without increasing taxes, it is no more than finding a way to deprive the people of their profit, which is even more harmful than increasing taxes."

Again, Su Shi did not mention Wang Anshi, but Sima Guang's words which Su Shi quoted at length were a comment Sima Guang made in a court debate with Wang Anshi, who alluded to Sima Qian's praise of Sang Hongyang and claimed that a good fiscal manager would be able to realise *bu jia fu er guoyong zu* 不加賦而國用足 (without increasing taxes, the state was sufficiently supplied).[110] Compared to the wording in the *Shiji, min bu yi fu er tianxia yong rao* 民不益賦而天下用饒 (People did not pay more taxes, yet all under heaven was sufficiently supplied), Su Shi's quote stands closer to Wang Anshi's wording in the court debate.

In the court debate, Sima Guang refuted Wang Anshi by reading a subtext into the *Shiji* account of Sang Hongyang's achievement. Instead of a literal reading, Sima Guang proposed that Sima Qian recorded Sang Hongyang's policy not to praise it but to indicate that the emperor was unwise (*buming* 不明) enough to be cheated by Sang Hongyang.[111] However,

---

[108] See *SJ* 30.1441. Klein also discusses this court debate about Sang Hongyang's economic policy, but she focuses on the divergent interpretations by Sima Guang and Wang Anshi and refers to Su Shi's essay in a footnote as evidence of his support of Sima Guang; see Klein, "History of a Historian," 281–282.

[109] Su Shi, *Su Shi wenji,* 5.156.

[110] See parallel passages of the debate in Tuotuo, *Songshi,* 336.10763–64, Xu Qianxue, *Zizhi tongjian houbian* 76.15a–16a, and Lü Zuqian, *Dashiji jieti,* 12.109b; see also Klein's translation and discussion of the parallel passage in the *Zizhi tongjian houbian* in her "History of a Historian," 282.

[111] Klein provides an alternative interpretation of Sima Guang's words and regards *buming* as referring to Sang Hongyang's policy being "uninsightful," see her "History of a Historian," 282. My reading of Sima Guang's comment in this debate is informed by his general criticism on Emperor Wu of Han and Su Shi's reading of his comment; see *ZZTJ* 16.19b–20b and Su Shi, *Su Shi wenji*, 16.484.

Sima Guang's opposition was not effective. Wang Anshi's economic policies, inspired by Sang Hongyang, were eventually implemented, and those who opposed them were punished. Su Shi's brother Su Zhe, for example, was dismissed in 1069 for his criticism, again, with reference to the *Shiji* passage on Sang Hongyang's achievement.[112]

To sum up, Wang Anshi expressed his determination as a reformer by praising Shang Yang and alluded to the *Shiji* to promote his policies inspired by Sang Hongyang's policy, so Su Shi indirectly criticised Wang Anshi by condemning Shang Yang and Sang Hongyang. Su Shi's criticism of Sima Qian was a disguised proclamation of his political stance, and the charges of "serious faults" pinned on Sima Qian actually pointed to Wang Anshi. Readers unfamiliar with the eleventh century context may easily take Su Shi's criticism as referring to historical figures and historiography, but to Su Shi's contemporary intellectuals, the subtext of his criticism would have been more obvious. This is not just because they were more familiar with the contemporary context to which Su Shi responded, but also because they were accustomed to historical analogism in political rhetoric and fully aware of how one can express one's opinions directly or indirectly in the language of history.

When reading the *Shiji,* the eleventh century readers would think about what Sima Qian saw in his days as much as they would think about what their eleventh century peers saw when they talked about history. In his "Sima Qian lun" 司馬遷論 (On Sima Qian), Qin Guan suggested that "he [Sima Qian] actually expressed [himself] for he had a view and spoke for he was provoked [to do so]" (*bi shi you jian er fa, you ji er yan* 彼實有見而發, 有激而言).[113] In Qin Guan's view, Sima Qian's motivations did not just concern his encounters that brought

[112] See Tuotuo, *Songshi,* 186.4556–4558.

[113] Qin Guan, *Huaihai ji,* 22.700. Cf. Klein's reading: "In truth, he put forth [his words] according to what he had experienced, and spoke as he did just because he was provoked to do so." Again, her interpretation of Qin Guan's comment is conditioned by her assumption that it was written after the prosecution of Su Shi; see Klein, "History of a Historian," 284–285.

about his personal tragedy but also his views on philosophical genealogy and his observations on contemporary society.[114] Therefore, it is questionable to what extent the reading strategy popularised during the eleventh century was about the sympathy for Sima Qian's personal encounters. It is perhaps more accurate to say that what interested eleventh century readers the most was the close relation between the presentation of the past and the person who told it. When reading the *Shiji,* some expressed more sympathies with Sima Qian's encounters, while some did not. Li Zhi 李廌 (1059–1109) and Shen Kuo 沈括 (1031–1095), for example, both suggested a subtext of Sima Qian's accounts without expressing sympathy towards his tragedy.[115] Eleventh century readers were particularly wary of the possible existence of a subtext because they often embedded overtones in their own writings on history. Qin Guan's comment on Sima Qian can apply perfectly to Su Shi (and indeed many others who engaged with history in those days), who "expressed himself as he had a view and spoke as he was provoked to do so."

Concluding Remarks

The epigraph of this chapter might be accused of being a misquote by those familiar with Chen Yinke's scholarship, because he continued the quoted passage with an encouragement to make use of historical criticism in the enquiries into the historical context that produced such criticism. In fact, this whole chapter is taking the path exactly as he suggested. Yet, after all his encouragement, Chen Yinke dubbed this exercise "waste recycling" (*feiwu liyong* 廢物利

[114] Qin Guan explicitly associated *you jian* 有見 with Sima Qian's thought on the relationship between Confucian thought and Huang-Lao teachings; see Qin Guan, *Huaihai ji,* 22.700. In her lengthy discussion of Qin Guan's essay, Klein does not mention the passage that defines *you jian*. This perhaps explains her reading of *you jian* ("what he experienced"), which tends to refer to Sima Qian's personal tragedy.

[115] See Li Zhi's 李廌 (1059–1109) comment in Ma Duanlin, *Wenxian tongkao,* 191.12a and Shen Kuo, *Mengxi bitan*, "Bu bitan," 1.289.

用),[116] which seems to affirm his approval of the view that historical criticism takes only a peripheral position in historical scholarship. However, this "waste" constitutes positive evidence of the complexity of reading and would interest people who work on the history of reading. It does not just tell us what sources one has read but also provides rich information about what he liked and disliked, how much weighing he gave to each source and which part of what source contributed to his own views.

In our case, historical criticism and similar writings have helped us to delineate how the *Shiji* was incorporated into the eleventh century discourse. This chapter touches upon three Sima Qians. The first Sima Qian had to work through the chaotic textual world after the calamity of the burning of the books and thereby compiled a flawed history (depicted by Sun Fu, Ouyang Xiu, and Wang Gui); the second (and the most well-known) Sima Qian wrote himself (e.g. his fondness of the marvellous, his philosophical thoughts, his spirit as an extensive traveller, his social observations, his personal grudge towards the emperor, etc.) into the *Shiji* (depicted by Sima Guang, Qin Guan, Zhang Lei, among many others); and the third Sima Qian was actually a scapegoat for Wang Anshi (depicted by Su Shi).

If we consider the nuances of each writing, these three Sima Qians entail more than three perceptions and evaluations of the *Shiji.* What conditioned these diverse interplays between the *Shiji* and its readers concerns multiple factors, including the requirements coming from the more privileged field of knowledge (e.g. the classical learning), the weighing assigned to the textual world and the real world, the political stance and the habit in reasoning developed from the prevalent historical analogism. There are certainly more factors (e.g. literary tastes, philosophical inclinations, social relations, etc.) that might have been at play. The aim of this

[116] See Chen Yinke, *Jinmingguan Conggao er bian,* 248; see also Sun Lirao's discussion of the general negative perception of historical criticism in his *Songdai shilun yanjiu*, 12–22.

chapter is not to exhaust all these possibilities, but to draw attention to the complexity in the formation and formulation of the verdicts on Sima Qian and his work.

If the eleventh century admiration for Sima Qian's writing style joins in the celebration of the romance about how a book shapes its reader, the ample examples of criticism, sometimes made by the very same readers who expressed admiration, constitute a powerful challenge to this romance. Compared to sympathy and respect, the doubts and rejection of the *Shiji* tell us more about the power of readers over written words.

Chapter Three

A Contest Between Two Accounts

> Les lecteurs sont des voyageurs; ils circulent sur les terres d'autrui, nomades braconnant à travers les champs qu'ils n'ont pas écrits, ravissant les biens d'Egypte pour en jouir.
>
> ——Michel de Certeau (1925–1986)[1]

In chapter one, we have discussed the difficulty of attributing historical knowledge to a single, identifiable source. History can be told as stories, and those who listen to these stories do not necessarily take note of the textual source. Some historical figures and events are so important that they become common currency and are treated in various genres of writings as well as oral traditions. In such cases, it can be extremely difficult to evaluate the extent to which a particular source has played a part in the acquisition of the information about these figures and events.

However, the legacy of Jia Yi 賈誼 (c. 200–169 BC), a prominent figure during the Han (206 BC–220 AD),[2] is perhaps an exception. The *Shiji* 史記 (Scribes' Records) and *Hanshu* 漢書 (Book of the Han) provide two essential accounts of his life story and works. These two accounts overlap in narratives, but they interpret Jia Yi's legacy in such contrasting manners that a large portion of writings regarding Jia Yi during subsequent periods can be traced back to one of these two sources with a considerable degree of certainty.

Due to the increased accessibility and textual standardisation of the *Shiji* and *Hanshu* during the Song periods, the discrepancies as well as similarities between the overlapping accounts of the two histories (i.e. chapters regarding early Western Han) came into focus more

[1] De Certeau, *Arts de faire*, 251.

[2] For a summary of Jia Yi's life and significance, see Loewe, *Biographical Dictionary*, 187–189.

often than during preceding periods. The earliest work on the textual comparison between the *Shiji* and *Hanshu* on record is the *Ban Ma yitong* 班馬異同 (Similarities and differences between [the histories of] Ban [Gu] 班固 (32–92) and [Si]ma [Qian]), attributed to the Southern Song scholar Ni Si 倪思 (1174–1220).[3] As one comes to expect, debates tend to be more heated where the discrepancies are more substantial, and it is relatively easier to tell the reader's inclinations towards a particular source. Therefore, the two accounts of Jia Yi provide an excellent case for us to evaluate the extent to which we can surmise and establish the influence of one particular source via textual analysis.[4] This chapter first analyses the different personae of Jia Yi as presented in the *Shiji* and *Hanshu*. Further to that, I discuss how the two disparate narratives and personae were received and taken on to different ends during the eleventh century. Also, I contextualise these receptions in light of the continuous implementation of imperial lectures, which emboldened intellectuals to claim a certain degree of authority over the imperial ruler and conditioned their understanding of Jia Yi as an imperial advisor and an instructor.

Setting the Tone: A Mistreated Man of Talents

There is little doubt that the combined biography of Qu Yuan 屈原 (c. 340–c. 278 BC) and Jia Yi in the *Shiji* coins the perception of the two protagonists as talented men who suffered from defamations by jealous colleagues. In *Shiji* chapter 84, Qu Yuan and Jia Yi are juxtaposed not just because the latter composed a lament for the former, but also because the life

[3] In some catalogues, the *Ban Ma yitong* is attributed to another Southern Song scholar, Liu Chenweng 劉辰翁 (1232–1297). Yet, it has been established that Liu Chenwen only added his annotations on the basis of Ni Si's work; see Yong Rong, *Tiyao,* 45.22a–22b and Wang Xiaojuan, "*Ban Ma yitong ping* yanjiu san ti," 66–68. The practice of comparing the *Shiji* and *Hanshu* certainly predated the *Ban Ma yitong*. For a brief survey of the history of such comparisons, see Zhang Dake, "Lüe lun Ma Ban yitong," 1–9.

[4] It is perhaps noteworthy that the *Ban Ma yitong* does not cover a comparison between the two accounts of Jia Yi in the *Shiji* and *Hanshu*.

experiences of these two figures are highly comparable, or, to be more precise, presented as highly comparable. As admirable poets and competent officials, they were slandered (Qu Yuan) and belittled (Jia Yi) at court and, as a result, distanced by the rulers they served. A reader of this chapter in the *Shiji* might find the parallel fairly convincing, but a comparison with its counterpart in the *Hanshu* discloses strikingly different choices made by historians who have different perceptions in their minds.

As in many other cases, passages about Jia Yi in *Hanshu* chapter 48 ("Jia Yi zhuan" 賈誼傳, Traditions of Jia Yi)[5] overlaps with *Shiji* chapter 84.[6] However, the *Hanshu* presents a much longer version of Jia Yi's biography, adding substantial passages such as Jia Yi's memorials, together with a contextualising narrative. A closer textual comparison reveals that the accounts presented in *Shiji* and *Hanshu* are fairly similar up to the point, near the end of the *Shiji* version, where Jia Yi was summoned back to the court and meets Emperor Wen, probably in 175 BC. From this point onwards, the *Hanshu* version inserts narratives and memorials elaborating on Jia Yi's advice regarding various contemporary issues, whereas the *Shiji* brings its story of Jia Yi's life to a close. In other words, the *Shiji* and *Hanshu* accounts embark on different paths after the narratives about the meeting in 175 BC. This meeting is presented in the following passage in the *Shiji*:

> 後歲餘，賈生徵見。孝文帝方受釐，坐宣室。上因感鬼神事，而問鬼神之本。賈生因具道所以然之狀。至夜半，文帝前席。既罷，曰："吾久不見賈生，自以為過之，今不及也。"居頃之，拜賈生為梁懷王太傅。梁懷王，文帝之少子，愛，而好書，故令賈生傅之。[7]

[5] The noun *zhuan* 傳 in the current context has been rendered as "biography" (e.g. Burton Watson, Michael Nylan), "memoir" (e.g. William Nienhauser), and "tradition" (e.g. Stephen Durrant). I use "tradition" throughout to highlight that the compilation of received information about a historical figure's life shares the same term with the compilation of received glosses of a particular reading tradition (as suggested, typically, by the *Zuozhuan* 左傳, *Zuo's Tradition [of the Spring and Autumn Annals]*). Also, "tradition" reflects the meaning of the same character in verbal function, i.e. *chuan* 傳 (to pass over, pass down).

[6] For a convenient list of major divergences between the *Shiji* and its parallels in the *Hanshu*, see Park Jae-woo, *Shiji Hanshu bijiao yanjiu*, 77–163.

[7] *SJ* 84.2502–2503. Relevant textual divergences in this and the following passages are underlined.

> Over a year later, Scholar Jia was summoned to an audience. Emperor Xiao Wen [Emperor Wen, 202–157 BC, r. 180–157 BC] had just received sacrificial meat[8] and was seated in the Xuan Chamber. On this occasion, with matters of ghosts and spirits on his mind, the sovereign asked about their basis. Scholar Jia thence spoke exhaustively about the circumstances by which they were as they were. Up to midnight, Emperor Wen was on the edge of his mat [i.e. listened attentively]. [When Scholar Jia] had finished, [the emperor] said, "I had not seen Scholar Jia for a long time and thought I had surpassed him. Now [I see I am] not up to him." After a short time, [he] appointed Scholar Jia Grand Tutor to King Huai of Liang [d. 169 BC]. King Huai of Liang was Emperor Wen's youngest son who was beloved and fond of books, thus [the emperor] ordered Scholar Jia to tutor him.[9]

This passage is immediately followed by a somewhat cursory narrative about Jia Yi "several times presenting admonishments" (*shu shangjian* 數上諫) regarding the threats posed by the increasing power of members of the nobility, to which "Emperor Wen did not listen" (*Wendi bu ting* 文帝不聽).[10] After a period of unspecified length (*ju shu nian* 居數年, "several years passed"), King Huai died of equestrian injuries, and Jia Yi died reportedly due to his grief about his failure as a tutor of King Huai. After the meeting in 175 BC, *Shiji*'s narrative concludes Jia Yi's life story with about a hundred characters stressing that his advice was not adopted and his pupil died young. As a result, the reader is left with the impression that Jia Yi's life ended in depression, just as that of Qu Yuan in the first half of the same chapter.

In the *Hanshu*, the parallel passage on the meeting between Jia Yi and Emperor Wen reads:

> 後歲餘，文帝思誼，徵之。至，入見，上方受釐，坐宣室。上因感鬼神事，而問鬼神之本。誼具道所以然之故。至夜半，文帝前席。既罷，曰："吾久不見賈生，自以為過之，今不及也。"乃拜誼為梁懷王太傅。懷王，上少子，愛，而好書，故令誼傅之，數問以得失。[11]
>
> Over a year later, Emperor Wen thought of [Jia] Yi and summoned him. [When Jia Yi] arrived and entered for the audience, the sovereign had just received sacrificial meat

[8] In his commentary on *shouxi* 受釐, Pei Yin refers to Xu Guang 徐廣 (352–425) and Ru Chun 如淳 (fl. third century). The former glosses *xi* as blessed sacrificial meat (*jisi fuzuo* 祭祀福胙), whereas the latter elaborates on procedural issues, indicating that the Han emperors would not attend such sacrifices personally but have the "blessing" (*fu* 福) presented to them after completion of the ritual; see *SJ* 84.2503. In his commentary on the *Hanshu* parallel, Yan Shigu 顏師古 (581–645) reads *xi* 釐 as a phonetic loan of *xi* 禧 (happiness); see *HS* 48.2230.

[9] Nienhauser, *Scribe's Records*, vol. VII, 307, with modifications. My underlining, same below.

[10] *SJ* 84.2503.

[11] *HS* 48.2230.

> and was seated in the Xuan Chamber. On this occasion, with matters of ghosts and spirits on his mind, the sovereign asked about their basis. [Jia] Yi spoke exhaustively about the reasons for which they were as they were. Up to midnight, Emperor Wen was on the edge of his mat. [When Jia Yi] had finished, [the emperor] said, "I have not seen Scholar Jia for a long time and thought I surpassed him. Now [I see I am] not up to him." Only then [he] appointed [Jia] Yi as Grand Tutor to King Huai of Liang. King Huai was the sovereign's youngest son who was beloved and fond of books, thus [the emperor] ordered [Jia] Yi to tutor him and enquired several times about [his] merits and demerits.

In the two underlined divergences indicating the relationship between the emperor and Jia Yi, we can already observe a subtle change in tone in the *Hanshu* narrative of the meeting. In the *Shiji* narrative, it is unclear why Jia Yi was summoned back, whereas in the *Hanshu* narrative, Emperor Wen is the subject of the sentence, and Jia Yi's return is presented as the immediate result of the emperor's need for him. With the verb "*si* 思" (think of, miss, long for), the *Hanshu* narrative brings in a psychological dimension that is absent in the *Shiji.* This change of perspective comes with a clear implication that the emperor actually valued Jia Yi, which challenges presentation of the relationship between Jia Yi and the emperor in the *Shiji*. This amendment seems subtle, but it proves to be rather effective. For instance, *si* was some poets' choice of keyword for describing the relationship between Jia Yi and Emperor Wen.[12] Moreover, the additional clause *shu wen yi deshi* 數問以得失 (enquired several times about merits and demerits) at the end of this passage makes it ever clearer that Emperor Wen did care about Jia Yi's opinion.

[12] See, for example, Li Bai's 李白 (701–762) "Songbie de shu zi" 送別得書字 (Acquiring Calligraphy upon Farewell), Zhang Bayuan's 章八元 (b. 795) "Chou Liu yuanwai yuexia jian ji" 酬劉員外月下見寄 (Reply to the Poem Sent by Supernumerary Liu under the Moon) and Guan Xiu's 貫休 (832–912), "Song Yu Rong yuanwai fuque" 送吳融員外赴闕 (Seeing off Supernumerary Wu Rong, Who Leaves for the Capital); see Peng Dingqiu et al., *Quan Tang shi,* 177.1805, 281.3192, and 831.9376. It is noteworthy that *si* is also used in an ironic way, see, for example, Wu Yun 吳筠 (754–778), "Langu" 覽古 (Observing the Past), in Peng Dingqiu et al., *Quan Tang shi,* 853.9645.

From this point onward, the narrative in the *Hanshu* opens up new perspectives that are in clear contrast to the *Shiji* (Table 3.1). The information provided in the *Hanshu,* much of which is absent in the *Shiji,* can be structured as follows:

1) After Zhou Bo 周勃 (d. 169 BC)[13] was falsely accused of rebellion, Jia Yi submitted a lengthy memorial on the instability of the newly founded Han empire. Emperor Wen "deeply took in his words" (*shen na qi yan* 深納其言), i.e. genuinely accepted his proposal, and fostered an improved moral foundation of the empire's administrative bodies accordingly.
2) After the death of Liu Sheng 劉勝 (d. 113 BC),[14] King of Liang 梁王, Jia Yi submitted a memorial on safeguarding the empire against threats from members of the nobility by taking better control of the strategically crucial regions of Liang[15] and Huaiyang 淮陽.[16] Emperor Wen "followed [Jia] Yi's advice" (*cong Yi ji* 從誼計).
3) Emperor Wen planned to restore the rank of nobility of the four sons of King Li of Huainan 淮南厲王 (199–174 BC), who was guilty of rebellion and died of starvation in a prison cart.[17] Jia Yi submitted an admonishment, warning that this would enable them to plot revenge against their father. Whereas the *Hanshu* states in no unclear terms that the emperor followed Jia Yi's advice on the earlier two occasions, it gives no direct indication in chapter 48 whether the emperor accepted Jia Yi's view on the restoration of ranks of nobility for sons of treacherous subjects. Nevertheless, elsewhere the *Hanshu* confirms that these four individuals were reinstated as members of the nobility.[18]

[13] See Loewe, *Biographical Dictionary*, 729–732.

[14] The fourth and youngest son of Emperor Wen and alternatively recorded as Liu Yi 劉揖; see Loewe, *Biographical Dictionary*, 189.

[15] The capital of Liang was modern Shangqiu, Henan.

[16] Huaiyang was adjacent to the southwestern border of Liang.

[17] The kingdom of Huainan spanned over a vast area south of the River Huai, roughly including modern Jiangxi, part of Henan, Anhui, and Hubei. On King Li of Huainan and his plot, see *SJ* 118.3076–3080 and Loewe, *Biographical Dictionary,* 271–273.

[18] Emperor Wen restored the four sons as *hou* 侯 (marquis) in 173/2 BC and then *wang* 王 (king) in 165/4 BC, except for the one who died before that. The territory of the previous kingdom of Huinan was distributed to the remaining three sons; see *HS* 44.2144 and *SJ* 118.3080–3081.

Jia Yi died in about 168 BC. Yet, the *Hanshu* narrative continues to expound on the posthumous impact of Jia Yi as an imperial adviser, thereby emphasising the legacy of his advice. Within 128 characters, the stark contrast with the *Shiji* is further exemplified in the following three events that parallel the three memorials mentioned above:

1) Four years after Jia Yi's death, Emperor Wen thought of (*si* 思) Jia Yi's advice on land and power distribution amongst nobles and made arrangements accordingly. This echoes Jia Yi's earlier memorial (see point 1 above) and indicates that the emperor continued to follow his advice on these matters, especially aspects of his earlier advice that had not yet been acted upon.
2) Following Jia Yi's recommendation to keep strategically important regions within the control of the imperial family (see point 2 above), in 154, the King of Liang played a pivotal role in the suppression of the rebellion of seven states (*qi guo zhi luan* 七國之亂) during the reign of Emperor Wen's successor, Emperor Jing 景帝 (188–141 BC, r. 157–141 BC). The *Hanshu* narrative confirms Jia Yi's strategy and foresight.
3) Nearly fifty years after Jia Yi's death, in 122, two of the four sons of King Li of Huainan (see point 3 above) were executed for rebellion under Emperor Wu 武帝 (156–87 BC, r. 141–87 BC). The sentence in *Hanshu* chapter 48 on these individuals' rebellion brings forward the consequences of Emperor Wen not listening to his capable adviser.[19] Though the *Hanshu* does not indicate any immediate effects of Emperor Wen's decision, the long-term effect is laid out in no uncertain terms.

As Michael Loewe pointed out, the *Hanshu* statement on Jia Yi's advice regarding various kingdoms during the early Han might "derive from anachronistic hindsight."[20] Yet, within the narrative of *Hanshu* chapter 48, the overall architecture displays a double-layered account,

[19] See *HS*, 48.2264: 淮南厲王子為王者兩國亦反誅.

[20] Loewe, *Biographical Dictionary*, 189.

which serve as evidence of Jia Yi's political foresight and his bearing on Emperor Wen's decision-making. One might even argue Ban Gu presented his counsel as greatly contributing to the survival of the Han dynasty, the saviour of the ruling house contrasting with the unappreciated official encountered in the *Shiji*. It is also noteworthy that references to the first two examples (points 1 and 2 in both layers) only appear in the *Hanshu*; the *Shiji* is silent on both accounts. The *Shiji* only touches upon the third point and the emperor's unwillingness to take notice of Jia Yi's advice culminates in a simple statement, *Wendi bu ting* 文帝不聽 (Emperor Wen did not listen).[21] This statement, lying at the core of the presentation of Jia Yi's distressful situation in the *Shiji*, is omitted in the *Hanshu.* All in all, the narrative structure of the two accounts can be demonstrated as follows:

Table 3.1 Comparison of the narrative structure of the two accounts in the *Shiji* and *Hanshu*

		Shiji	*Hanshu*
Episode 1	Jia Yi's advice	x	√
	Response of the emperor	x	Acceptance
	Consequence	x	Positive
Episode 2	Jia Yi's advice	x	√
	Response of the emperor	x	Acceptance
	Consequence	x	Positive
Episode 3	Jia Yi's advice	√	√
	Response of the emperor	Refusal	x
	Consequence	x	Negative
x: record absent √: record present			

This suggests the *Shiji* presents nothing but the occasion where the emperor responded negatively to Jia Yi, whereas the *Hanshu* brings forward two occasions where the emperor followed Jia Yi's advice and steers clear of the emperor's rejection on a third occasion. Moreover, by adding one more aspect (consequences of the emperor's responses) to the narrative, the *Hanshu* builds his case for a re-evaluation of Jia Yi's position and his contribution

[21] *SJ* 84.2503.

to the ruling dynasty. Notwithstanding some of Ban Gu's caveats,[22] in the *Hanshu* narrative, the persona of the capable and loyal adviser takes centre stage, and the wisdom of good rulership lies in following his recommendations. Standing in sharp contrast to the final remarks in the *Shiji,* the *Hanshu* version of Jia Yi's life concludes:

> 誼亦天年早終，雖不至公卿，未為不遇也。[23]
> [Jia] Yi just died early a natural death. Though [he] did not reach [the position] of highest-ranked ministers, [he] is not to be considered as having not met [with the right time].

In Ban Gu's days, it was not uncommon to consider lifespan as something closely bound to Heaven. In the *Baihu tongde lun,* edited by Ban Gu, *ming* 命 is glossed as "human lifespan" (*ren zhi shou* 人之壽) and "the time Heaven lets one live" (*tian ming ji shi sheng zhe* 天命已使生者).[24] Ban Gu's contemporary Wang Chong 王充 (27–97?) also expounded on cases where people died early due to the lack of *qi* 氣 (Vital Breath) they were able to receive from Heaven.[25] The expression *tiannian* 天年 (Heaven-endowed years) thus reflects the non-interrupted aspect of Jia Yi's death, i.e. he died a natural death as opposed to being put to death (e.g. killed or executed).

However, a textual variant indicates that historical readers had problems with *tiannian*. The alternative wording of the *Hanshu* remark reads "[Jia] Yi died early before [his] time" (*Yi yi yaonian zaozhong* 誼以夭年早終).[26] The word *yao* 夭 (to die young, die an untimely death) indicates a completely different interpretation of Jia Yi's death. Moreover, the intensifier *yi* 亦

[22] See the passage *qishu gu yi shu yi* 其術固已疏矣 (his strategies are indeed crude) in *HS* 48.2265, which indicates that Jia Yi was, in Ban Gu's judgement, not all that clever.

[23] *HS* 48.2265.

[24] Ban Gu, *Baihu tongde lun*, 8.4b–5a.

[25] See Wang Chong, *Lun heng*, 28–35.

[26] See, for example, Wang Xianqian, *Hanshu buzhu*, 48.36a.

(indeed, simply, just) is replaced by the coverb *yi* 以 (by means of, with),[27] which remarkably diminishes Ban Gu's affirmative tone in the statement that Jia Yi's death is a natural one, i.e. it is not really something to wonder about. The complexities of the editorial history of a text as important as the *Hanshu* would not allow us to rush to any conclusion about which one of the two versions has the "original" wording, but there is indeed something interesting to be noted on Song intellectuals' take on Ban Gu's evaluation of Jia Yi.

The official edition of the *Hanshu* dated 1030s, i.e. the Jingyou 景祐 edition, exhibits the wording *yi tiannian zaozhong* 亦天年早終.[28] Also, there is no known textual witness of *yi yaonian zaozhong* 以夭年早終 dating from the Northern Song. Ouyang Xiu's 歐陽修 (1007–1072) essay "Jia Yi buzhi gongqing lun" 賈誼不至公卿論 (On Jia Yi's Failure to Become a High-Ranked Minister) seems to indicate that *yi tiannian zaozhong* 亦天年早終 was the only wording of this phrase known to him. Chances are his reading was based on the Jingyou edition. Even if not, it still stands to conjecture that the *Hanshu* edition(s) with this wording predominated in his days. In this essay, Ouyang Xiu questioned the given wording without indication that he was aware of any alternative version. He extravagantly praised Jia Yi's talents and cast doubt upon Ban Gu's evaluation:

[27] Phonetic reconstructions suggest that 亦 and 以 share the same initial but have different vowels and tones throughout pre-modern periods, see Schuessler, *Minimal Old Chinese and later Han Chinese*, 71 and 98. The Baxter-Sagart reconstructions of Middle Chinese suggest *yek* for 亦 and *yiX* for 以. We might thus want to be prudent about the speculation that these two textual variants resulted from phonetic similarity. On the other hand, an alternative methodology of phonetic reconstruction suggests otherwise. The Middle Chinese reconstructions widely used now are based on comparisons between rhyme books and modern Chinese dialects and Sinoxenic dialects. In attempts to refine the understanding of phonetic changes of a given period, an alternative approach is to compare rhyme books and usage of rhymes in the practice of contemporary poetic writing; see, for example, Lu Guoyao, "Lun Song ciyun ji qi yu Jin Yuan ciyun de bijiao," 131–176. According to rhyming practices in Song poetry, there are examples of using *-ek* and *-i* in the *Guangyun* system as the same rhyme; see Qian Yi's discussion of diminishing distinction of entering tones in the practice of poetic writing in his "Songdai Jiang Zhe shiyun," 47–57. In light of this, the textual variants of the *Hanshu* passage might actually have resulted from phonetic similarity.

[28] Jingyou refers to the period from 1034 to 1038. See also my discussion of the printing of the standard histories during the Northern Song in chapter one. *Yi tiannian zaozhong* is also the wording of the palace edition (*dianben* 殿本) of the *Hanshu* in the Qing dynasty, see the collation notes in *HS* 48.2265.

> […]誼過長沙，作賦以吊汨羅，而太史公傳於屈原之後，明其若屈原之忠而遭棄逐也。而班固不譏文帝之遠賢，痛賈生之不用，但謂其"夭年早終"。且誼以失志憂傷而橫夭，豈曰"天年"乎！則固之善志，逮與《春秋》褒貶萬一矣！[29]
>
> [Jia] Yi passed by Changsha and composed a rhapsody to lament over [River] Miluo. His Honourable Grand Scribe attached his traditions after [those of] Qu Yuan, making it clear that he was as loyal as Qu Yuan but met with abandonment. However, Ban Gu did not reprimand Emperor Wen for distancing the worthies or grieve [over] Jia Yi for not being put to use; [he] simply said he "died early a natural death." Moreover, [Jia] Yi died an untimely death due to distress and unfulfilled ambitions. How can one say it was "a natural death!" Given this, [Ban] Gu's competence in recording catches up with [the subtle] praises and blames in the *Spring and Autumn* [merely] in the least!

If Ouyang Xiu had seen the alternative wording *yi yaonian zaozhong* 以夭年早終, one might expect him to direct his argument, at least partly, to editorial interference rather than Ban Gu's incompetence. Yet, his criticism of Ban Gu's verdict perhaps represents an understanding of Jia Yi's life that is shared by a considerable number of readers. Throughout pre-modern China, there was an abundance of literature written by or on behalf of demoted or exiled officials with unfulfilled ambitions, and Jia Yi has always been a favourite choice for making analogies. With very few exceptions, literary compositions referring to Jia Yi feature tears, regrets, depression, resentment, and so on.[30] This is perhaps the reason why Sun Fu 孫復 (992–1057) states:

> 讀《漢書》者，靡不尤文帝、偉賈生也。[31]
>
> There is no one who reads the *Hanshu* without blaming Emperor Wen and glorifying Scholar Jia.

This kind of sweeping assertion frequently occurs at the beginning of Song writings, and it is therefore best understood as a rhetorical strategy rather than a faithful report on the real situation.[32] Still, this assertion reflects the popularity of Jia Yi's persona as a mistreated talent

[29] Ouyang Xiu, *Ouyang Xiu quanji,* 75.3b–4a.

[30] For instance, Han Zhaoqin et al., *Shiji tiping yu yong Shiji renwu shi*, 566–571 provides sixty-two examples of Tang poems referring to Jia Yi. Only a dozen of them do not allude to Jia Yi as a tragic figure.

[31] Sun Fu, "Shu Jia Yi zhuan hou" 書賈誼傳後 (Writing after the "Traditions of Jia Yi"), *Sun Mingfu* xiaoji*,* 15a.

[32] In the current case, Sun Fu's essay starts with this assertion to form a contrast with his criticism of Jia Yi: despite his profound political insights, he made a fatal mistake in talking about ghosts and spirits, of which even sages would not speak. In Sun Fu's opinion, Jia Yi was ingratiating himself to Emperor Wen as he was just summoned back from exile, and he should have taken responsibility for the superfluous ritual activities in the Han; see Sun Fu, *Sun Mingfu xiaoji,* 15a–15b.

prior to the Song and reiterates the Jia Yi legacy constructed in the *Shiji*, which Ban Gu failed to challenge.

Going back to Ouyang Xiu's passage, we can see that he played with the quasi-homographs *yao* 夭 (early, untimely) and *tian* 天 (heaven, here: natural). What he said about Ban Gu's verdict might well be an opinion shared by the numerous readers who were inclined to Sima Qian's depiction of Jia Yi. We might even take a step further to surmise that this also represented the reasoning of the editorial hand that changed *yi tiannian zaozhong* 亦天年早終 to *yi yaonian zaozhong* 以夭年早終. The *Hanshu* edition(s) with the wording *yao*, or "die an untimely death," would certainly "make more sense" to those who shared Ouyang Xiu's sympathy with Jia Yi and consequently gained its popularity in circulation.

That being said, conjecture remains conjecture. The extant evidence seems to support it, but the possibility still remains that the change happened the other way round, namely. the original wording has "untimely death," and a certain editor altered it to "natural death" because the latter provides a better fit for Ban Gu's overall evaluation of Jia Yi. In either case, readers with the two versions at hand have ever since pondered these two wordings, proposing their preferences based on their own perception of the persona of Jia Yi.

At this point, we have seen how *Shiji* chapter 84 and *Hanshu* chapter 48 vividly demonstrate that the writing of history is a craft operated under clear compositional intentions. In terms of the presentation of Jia Yi's persona, we might conclude that the *Shiji* has been more successful in developing Jia Yi's legacy into a motif that became well-received in *belle-lettres*. However, "subject matter" is not the entire sum of a composition, still less so for the most influential works recognised as masterpieces.

Disappearance of the Mistreated Talent

Good paintings should all be successful in depicting their subject, but a refined work may simultaneously reveal an enormous amount of historical information about a given period's architecture, fashion, home interior designs, and so forth. These details may appeal to different people of diverse interests. Similarly, a good text tends to be multi-faceted. Regarding the evaluation of Jia Yi, the *Shiji* and *Hanshu* both give their answers via their different arrangements of the traditions associated with Jia Yi. Apart from the main messages delivered in these two carefully constructed accounts, there are other layers and aspects of the narratives. Such layers and aspects might interest those who approach these texts with an eye on particular details and provide resources to build up different discourses. The *Shiji* account might be more successful in delivering its main message, but it does not mean that it surpasses the *Hanshu* account in every aspect under all circumstances. This section discusses two readers who preferred the *Hanshu* account. They were eminent eleventh century historians, Sima Guang 司馬光 (1019–1086) and Fan Zuyu 范祖禹 (1041–1098), who both drew on Jia Yi's legacy to teach different lessons to their intended audience.

In his voluminous chronicle *Zizhi tongjian* 資治通鑑 (Comprehensive Mirror to Aid in Government),[33] Sima Guang seems rather indifferent to Jia Yi's suffering. Considering the scope of this work, whose narratives span across well over a millennium, Jia Yi is hardly more than a small drop of water in the flow of history. Using his major technique in the handling of sources, i.e. "scissors and paste,"[34] Sima Guang simply rearranged accounts from the *Shiji* and

[33] For a survey of the *Zizhi tongjian*, see Pulleyblank, "Chinese Historical Criticism," 151–166 and Chan, "The Historiography of *the Tzu-chih t'ung-chien*," 1–38.

[34] Note that this means cutting and pasting in a physical sense. As part of the compiling procedure, Sima Guang asked a scribe to copy specific events on a piece of paper with some space left between two events so that he could cut the paper and attach each event to the year it took place; see Sima Guang's "Yu Fan Neihan lun xiushu tie" 與范內翰論修書帖 (To Discuss the Compilation Project with Palace Writer Fan [Zuyu]), *Zizhi*

Hanshu and ordered them chronologically. Unlike on many other occasions, he did not insert his own evaluation, typically introduced by *chen Guang yue* 臣光曰 ([Your] subject [Sima] Guang says), so his views on Jia Yi remain subject to speculation. Nevertheless, his management of the source material provides some insights into his interpretation and reception of this imperial adviser.

A significant aspect of Sima Guang's editing is that he expunged almost all the records on Jia Yi's exile in Changsha and on his meeting with Emperor Wen when he was summoned back to the capital. Sima Guang only kept one sentence suggesting that Jia Yi lost favour in the court and was appointed as Grand Tutor of the King of Changsha.[35] There is no record of him crossing the River Xiang and composing the famous lament for Qu Yuan. There is no mention of the owl that popped into Jia Yi's room and inspired him to muse on cosmology. There is no account of midnight meeting in which the emperor was absorbed in Jia Yi's elaboration on spirits and ghosts. The three most beloved episodes of Jia Yi's legacy are virtually non-existent in the *Zizhi tongjian.* Sima Guang's silence on these events can be partially explained by the purpose of compilation of the *Zizhi tongjian.* After all, it focuses on what would be instructive for governance and leaves little space for sentimental moments and literary compositions. At the same time, silence on these events allowed Sima Guang to avoid questions to which the *Shiji* and *Hanshu* provide different answers: Did Jia Yi suffer from a depressing life? Was he summoned back because of the emperor's sincere hope? Did he get the recognition he deserved after returning from exile in Changsha? As Sima Guang omitted nearly all of the records about Jia Yi's exile, the *Zizhi tongjian* leaves an impression that these thorny issues do not exist in the first place.

tongjian shili, 5a; see also Pulleyblank's annotated translation and discussion in "Chinese Historical Criticism," 160–166.

[35] Sima Guang, *ZZTJ* 14.4b: 於是天子後亦疏之, 不用其議, 以為長沙王太傅; cf. *SJ* 84.2492 and *HS* 48.2222.

It is clear that Sima Guang was more interested in what Jia Yi had to offer in terms of insights into statecraft rather than in his experience as an unhappy individual. Sima Guang quoted substantial portions from Jia Yi's memorials, all of which are extracted from those transmitted in the *Hanshu*.[36] As *Shiji* chapter 84 contains only a selection of Jia Yi's literary compositions, but no memorial, it played a much less significant role in Sima Guang's sources. However, there are clear indications that Sima Guang did consult both accounts with great care. For example, he aligned with the *Shiji* as he quoted the memorial about threats posed by powerful kingdoms (see the two point 3s in the previous section), where Ban Gu left out the emperor's rejection of Jia Yi's advice. Following an abridged version of Jia Yi's advice transmitted in the *Hanshu,* Sima Guang inserted the sentence *shang fu ting* 上弗聽 (the sovereign did not listen),[37] which is clearly inspired by the *Shiji* parallel *wendi buting* 文帝不聽 (Emperor Wen did not listen).

Amongst Jia Yi's memorials recorded in the *Zizhi tongjian*, there is a most lengthy one (the one mentioned in point 1 in the previous section) in which Jia Yi passionately elaborated his concerns about the empire as "one thing to weep bitterly for, two things to shed tears for, and six things to sigh deeply for" (*ke wei tongku zhe yi, ke wei liuti zhe er, ke wei chang tiaxi zhe liu* 可為痛哭者一，可為流涕者二，可為長太息者六).[38] Even the "gist" (*dalüe* 大略) of this memorial transmitted in *Hanshu* chapter 48 totals well over six thousand characters.[39]

[36] These include memorials in points 1 to 3 summarised in the previous section, plus one memorial on coinage transmitted in *Hanshu* chapter 24 ("Shihuo zhi" 食貨志, "Treatise on Food and Goods"). The *Zizhi tongjian* arranges them in a chronological order and thus differs from the order in the *Hanshu*; see *HS* 24.1128–1130 and 48.2230–2262, and *ZZTJ* 14.5a–6a, 8a–15b, and 15.1a–2a.

[37] *ZZTJ* 14.15b.

[38] *HS* 48.2230.

[39] There are sentences at the end of each section corresponding to the outline Jia Yi lays out at the beginning of the memorial, i.e. "to weep bitterly," "to shed tears" and "to sigh deeply." However, the sentence *gu yue ke wei chang taixi zhe ci ye* 故曰可為長太息者此也 (this is the reason why I said [there are things] to be deeply sighed for) only appears three times, indicating that Ban Gu might have dropped three sections; see *HS* 48.2242–2258. Yan Shigu associates the missing three sections to Ban Gu's statement that he only records the most closely relevant to contemporary affairs, see *HS* 48.2265.

When it comes to the *Zizhi tongjian*, Sima Guang pruned the *dalüe* further down to half. He rarely engaged in any rephrasing but simply chopped off what seemed less significant for the point he intended to bring to light. For example, when handling passages about maintaining a good educational environment for the heir apparent, Sima Guang cut off most of the administrative and ritual details. He only presented passages about the importance of ensuring that the heir apparent is surrounded by *zhengren* 正人 (upright men).[40] This noticeably resonates with a comment Sima Guang made on another occasion. There he argued for appointing the right people to take positions in the present system as opposed to radically changing the system,[41] indicating his disapproval of the ongoing reform led by his political opponent Wang Anshi 王安石 (1021–1086).

Interestingly, what Sima Guang chose to leave out in his handling of *Hanshu* chapter 48 is picked up by his younger colleague Fan Zuyu, who once acted as one of his three major assistants in the compilation of the *Zizhi tongjian*.[42] Fan Zuyu is renowned for his expertise on the history of Tang and the "mirror" of his own, the *Tangjian* 唐鑑 (Mirrors of the Tang). However, another lesser-known work entitled *Dixue* 帝學 (The Learning of Emperors) is more relevant to the discussion here as it provides an excellent illustration of Fan Zuyu's different interest and how it is reflected in his textual management.

Fan Zuyu presented the *Dixue* when he was Lecturer-in-Waiting (*shijiang* 侍講) for Emperor Zhezong of Song 宋哲宗 (1077–1110, r. 1085–1110), but it does not seem to have received much attention until the Qing dynasty.[43] The book, totalling eight scrolls, collects

[40] See *ZZTJ* 14.12a–12b; see also Appendix A.

[41] See *XZZTJCJSB* 6.6b.

[42] See Pulleyblank, "Chinese Historical Criticism," 154–159.

[43] For a survey of the content and reception history of the *Dixue*, see Guarino, "Mat lectures," chapter IV, esp. 90-117. The *Siku Quanshu* compilers highly praised the *Dixue*, see Yong Rong, *Tiyao*, 91.30b–31b.

records about how rulers from antiquity down to the recent past devoted themselves to learning. It should be noted that Fan Zuyu seemed to have paid more attention to how much efforts these rulers have put into learning than what they learned. In other words, his compilation is more about the fact that "a ruler should learn," instead of "what a ruler should learn." It is thus more plausible to understand the *xue* 學 (learning) in the book title in the sense of the action of acquiring knowledge through study or being taught rather than the knowledge acquired. With this book, Fan Zuyu intended to convince the royalty of the importance of learning and to persuade them to foster a proper attitude towards learning and learned men. His presentation of the interaction between Emperor Wen of Han and Jia Yi provides a good example.

In the *Dixue,* we find a slightly altered account of Jia Yi's meeting after his exile in Changsha:

> 大中大夫賈誼為長沙王太傅，歲餘，帝思誼，徵之入見。[44]
> Jia Yi, the Superior Grand Master of the Palace, was the tutor of the King of Changsha. Over a year [later], the emperor thought about [Jia] Yi and summoned him to enter [the court] for an audience.

First of all, the presence of the verb *si* 思 immediately recalls the parallel in the *Hanshu.* Secondly, Fan Zuyu presented the change of Jia Yi's official position in a neutral statement that does not spell out the relegation. Moreover, there is an interesting change hidden in the timeline. Both *Shiji* chapter 84 and *Hanshu* chapter 48 clearly state that Jia Yi composed the "Funiao fu" 服鳥賦 (Rhapsody on the Owl)[45] three years after he went to Changsha (around 179 BC) and that he was summoned back to the court more than one year after this composition.[46] This would lead to the conclusion that Jia Yi was in Changsha for more than

[44] Fan Zuyu, *Dixue*, 2.2b.

[45] This piece is also known as *Funiao fu* 鵩鳥賦 (e.g. Xiao Tong, *Wenxuan*, 13.16a–20a). However, *fu* 服 is an earlier orthographic variant as attested in the *Shiji* and *Hanshu.*

[46] *SJ* 84.2496 and 2502; *HS* 48.2226 and 2230. For a handy chronology of Jia Yi's lifetime, see Wang Zhong, "Jia Yi Nianbiao" 賈誼年表 (Chronology of Jia Yi) in his *Shuxue,* "Neipian" 內篇, 3.7a.

four years. In the *Dixue*, however, the period of Jia Yi's exile is curiously shortened (see Table 3.2). As Fan Zuyu deleted the whole passage about Jia Yi's encounter with the owl and attached the passage about the midnight meeting directly after Jia Yi's position change, it amounts to a false report of historical fact. Jia Yi's return to the capital took place four years after he went to Changsha, whereas Fan Zuyu presented it as a little over a year.

Table 3.2 Comparison of Timelines and Texts Based on the *Hanshu* and *Dixue*[47]

Hanshu

year	180 BC	179 BC	176 BC	175 BC
event	Jia Yi became Superior Grand Master of the Palace	Jia Yi became Grand Tutor of King of Changsha	**Being Grand Tutor of King of Changsha for three years**, Jia Yi encountered the owl	**Over a year later**, Jia Yi returned to the capital and had a meeting with the emperor
text	[…]歲中至太中大夫 […]	為長沙王太傅 […]	**為長沙傅三年**，有服飛入誼舍 […]	**後歲餘**，文帝思誼，徵之，至，入見 […]

Dixue

year		179 BC	178 BC
event		Jia Yi became Grand Tutor of King of Changsha	**Over a year later**, Jia Yi returned to the capital and had a meeting with the emperor
text	大中大夫賈誼	為長沙王太傅	**歲餘**，帝思誼，徵之入見

In the *Dixue,* Fan Zuyu did not always copy his sources in a verbatim manner. As he rephrased his sources on other occasions, he could have also summarised that Jia Yi returned to the capital after four years in Changsha. It is difficult to say whether Fan Zuyu disregarded the three years on purpose, or if his false report is simply the result of an editorial slip. Yet, even if it was an editorial slip, he may have made the mistake as he scanned through the text quickly and stopped only when he spotted something fitting his purpose. As mentioned above, he wanted to emphasise examples of rulers devoting themselves to learning in his *Dixue*. For

[47] Given that the *Dixue* narrative is based on the *Hanshu,* this table only compares the two accounts. The parallels in the *Shiji* have a slightly different wording, but apart from the absence of *si* 思, the other divergences seem to be of minor significance; see *SJ* 84.2502–2503.

that purpose, the *Hanshu* wording is certainly more supportive than the *Shiji* wording. Fan Zuyu might well have perceived the verb *si* 思 as "long for," which helps to depict Emperor Wen as a ruler that was eager to call back his learned adviser.

Following the passage about the midnight meeting in 175 BC, Fan Zuyu provided an excerpt from, again, the lengthy memorial about things that made Jia Yi weep and sigh. Fan Zuyu chose the passage in which Jia Yi expounded on the education of the heir apparent and referred to the *Xueli* 學禮 (School Ritual).[48] The *Xueli* excerpt elucidates the implications of a sovereign's visit to five venues for study and states that the sovereign should study with his Grand Tutor, who is assigned the duty and right to rectify the sovereign's mistakes.[49]

Moreover, when quoting Jia Yi's memorial, Fan Zuyu disregarded the original context in *Hanshu* chapter 48 and presented the *Xueli* passage as coming from Jia Yi's memorial on "the way rulers of the Three Dynasties educated the heir apparent" (*sandai zhi jun jiao taizi zhi fa* 三代之君教太子之法).[50] In the *Hanshu,* the whole memorial is contextualised in an era that features foreign invasions along the border, inadequate administrative regulations, threats posed by titled lords, frequent rebellions against the newly-founded Han empire, etc.[51] Jia Yi introduced the *Xueli* passage not as a topic of his memorial but as an integral part of his grander vision, which involves establishing morality and proper rituals so as to strengthen the state power. However, Fan Zuyu obscured this context, changed the focus and magnified what used to be rather peripheral in the original picture.

[48] The text *Xueli* is otherwise unknown. The passage quoted by Jia Yi is also transmitted in "Baofu" 保傅 chapter in Dai De, *Da Dai Liji*, 3.1a–5b. According to the context and Yan Shigu's commentary, Jia Yi read *xue* 學 as the official venues for study, see *HS* 48.2248–2251. It is perhaps also noteworthy that Fan Zuyu copies all of Yan Shigu's glosses on the *Hanshu* account; see Fan Zuyu, *Dixue,* 2.2b

[49] See Fan Zuyu, *Dixue,* 2.2b–3a.

[50] Fan Zuyu, *Dixue*, 2.2b.

[51] See *HS* 48.2230.

In sum, the picture Fan Zuyu presented in the *Dixue* is strikingly different from what we find in the *Hanshu.* First of all, the protagonist is not Jia Yi but Emperor Wen. Emperor Wen missed Jia Yi, summoned him back for a meeting and listened to his lecture attentively with whole-hearted admiration. Furthermore, Jia Yi presented a memorial about the importance of learning during legendary antiquity, confirming that sovereigns should indeed consult their learned ministers.

As suggested in the book title, Fan Zuyu's intended audience is the emperor, who in this case would be Emperor Zhezong. The *Siku quanshu* compilers aptly contextualised the *Dixue* in light of the fact that Fan Zuyu was an advocate of royal devotion to learning.[52] Soon after Fan Zuyu became Lecturer-in-Waiting, he protested against the summer and winter breaks of imperial seminars and insisted that the emperor should make continuous efforts in learning, which was viewed as decisive for future prosperity.[53] As a collection of exemplary deeds of imperial predecessors, the *Dixue* was intended as an instrument to convince Emperor Zhezong of Fan Zuyu' argument. In his eyes, the most important message in Jia Yi's legacy was that Emperor Wen was an earnest learner and therefore an exemplary model for Emperor Zhezong.

Similar to Sima Guang, whose most important envisaged audience was also the emperor, Fan Zuyu doctored the textual details of *Hanshu* chapter 48 in a way that shows little interest in Jia Yi's life experience as an individual. In his account of Jia Yi's meeting with Emperor Wen, Fan Zuyu aligned with the *Hanshu* narrative in emphasising the emperor's psychological attachment to his wise advisor. Fan Zuyu emphasised this aspect even at the expense of historical accuracy. Also, he quoted part of Jia Yi's memorial because Jia Yi just happened to

[52] See Yong Rong, *Tiyao*, 91.31a.

[53] See Fan Zuyu, "Quanxue zhazi" 勸學劄子 (Memorial on Promoting Learning), *Fan taishi ji,* 14.12b. Emperor Renzong 仁宗 (1010–1063, r, 1022–1063) initiated the annual curriculum with two breaks due to health issues in his later years; see Sima Guang's "Jiangyan zhazi" 講筵劄子 (Memorial on Mat Lectures) in his *Sima gong wenji*, 31.1b. The two breaks every year were then regularised during Emperor Shenzong's 神宗 (1048–1085, r. 1067–1085) reign; see Jiang Peng, *Bei Song jingyan yu Songxue de xingqi*, 61–62.

be the articulator of something in support of Fan Zuyu's argument. When read on its own, the *Dixue* might appear to be a collection of records of exemplary rulers characterised by their respect and passion for learning.[54] However, our analysis above has shown that the persona of Emperor Wen in the *Dixue* is more of an intentional design that Fan Zuyu skilfully packed together. Also, the editorial choices made by Sima Guang and Fan Zuyu suggest an alternative perspective to look at the divergences between the *Shiji* and *Hanshu.* Although the representation of a mistreated talent in the *Shiji* proved literarily effective and predominated the perception of Jia Yi's legacy, the *Hanshu* account, with its additional layers and different perspective, seems to have opened up more possibilities for reworking the legacy to suit different needs.

An Alternative Approach to Textual Management

Having discussed two accounts that display substantial textual resemblance to *Hanshu* chapter 48, we now turn our attention to Su Shi's 蘇軾 (1037–1101) "Jia Yi Lun" 賈誼論 (On Jia Yi).

Su Shi's "Jia Yi lun" is different from the two examples above firstly in terms of genre. The accounts provided by Sima Guang and Fan Zuyu more or less announce themselves as historical accounts and demonstrate ostensible loyalty to their textual sources. Su Shi's "Jia Yi lun" is an essay (*lun* 論, lit. discussion), whose major task is not to provide historical information but to advance the author's personal insight on a specific matter. That is to say, the title already suggests that it is to be understood as a synthesis of Jia Yi's legacy and, more importantly, Su Shi's own take on it. Su Shi did not retell Jia Yi's story in his essay. Instead,

[54] For example, Guarino, "Mat Lectures," 93 states that "the emperors showcased here [in scroll 2 on emperors from Han to Tang] are notable for their personal commitment to learning the civil arts."

he assumed the reader's familiarity with the story and laid out a fresh perspective to interpret it. Secondly, Sima Guang and Fan Zuyu both talked to the sovereign via their accounts, whereas Su Shi's "Jia Yi lun" was designed for a different audience. In the conclusive passage, Su Shi gave a brief caveat to rulers who came across subjects like Jia Yi, but the main body of the essay suggests that his intended audience was mainly those who were of Jia Yi's character (*wei Jiasheng zhe* 為賈生者).[55]

In the first half of this essay, Su Shi elucidated his interpretation of Jia Yi's failure:

> 非才之難，所以自用者實難。惜乎！賈生，王者之佐，而不能自用其才也。夫君子之所取者遠，則必有所待；所就者大，則必有所忍。古之賢人，皆有可致之才，而卒不能行其萬一者，未必皆其時君之罪，或者其自取也。愚觀賈生之論，如其所言，雖三代何以遠過？得君如漢文，猶且以不用死，然則是天下無堯舜終不可以有所為耶？！ […]若賈生者，非漢文之不能用生，生之不能用漢文也。[56]
>
> It is not the case that being talented is difficult, but it is indeed difficult to find a way to put oneself to use. What a shame! Scholar Jia [could have been] an assistant to the king, but he was unable to put his talents to use. If a gentleman chooses something far-reaching, then there is definitely something he would await. If he approaches something great, then there is definitely something he would endure. Worthies of the past all bore talents that might bring about [prosperity]. However, in cases that they could not put the slightest of them [i.e. the talents] into practice, it is not necessarily the faults of the ruler at that time; some people brought about [the unrecognition] themselves. I humbly observe the discussion of Scholar Jia. If [things go] as he says, even the Three Dynasties would not be able to surpass [the Han]! Encountering a sovereign like Emperor Wen, [he] still died for not being put to use. If it is how things are, does this [mean that if] there is no Yao and Shun in the world, one would not possibly be able to achieve anything?! […] As for Scholar Jia, it is not the case that Emperor Wen of Han was unable to put Scholar [Jia] to use, but Scholar [Jia] was unable to put Emperor Wen of Han to use.

It is clear enough that Su Shi's sympathy did not fully lie with Jia Yi. On the one hand, he spoke highly of Jia Yi's capabilities as an imperial advisor. In this regard, he was in the camp that would sympathise with the presentation in the *Shiji* and argue against Ban Gu, who did not find Jia Yi's views on statecraft all that impressive.[57] On the other hand, he put the blame

[55] Su Shi, *Su Shi wenji*, 4.106.

[56] Ibid.

[57] See *HS* 48.2265.

entirely on Jia Yi and thus stood in sharp contrast with previous interpretations of Jia Yi's tragedy. We mentioned above that previous perceptions of Jia Yi were dominated by sympathies and regrets for a talented young man being discarded. The blame was, explicitly or not, put on the emperor that reportedly failed to recognise Jia Yi the way he deserved. Jia Yi's story was more often approached from the perspective that emphasises what he confronted. However, Su Shi provided a new perspective to look at what Jia Yi could have done to change the situation. Regarding the emperor's alienation from Jia Yi, previous interpretations operated under the assumption that Jia Yi had no choice but to accept it, whereas Su Shi did not interpret Jia Yi as taking such a passive position. Su Shi clearly regarded Emperor Wen as a decent ruler, so Jia Yi should also have taken at least part of the responsibility when problems occurred. According to Su Shi, Jia Yi could have chosen to take an active role, just like Confucius and Mencius, who were persistent in promoting the Way and never got discouraged because of rejection.[58] As Jia Yi failed to do the same, it is nobody but himself that led his life to a mournful end.

Up to this point, Su Shi made it clear that what he expected for an intellectual like Jia Yi was not to be restricted by his surroundings, but to be persistent in exerting his influence. Moreover, so Su Shi continued, this needed to be done skilfully. In the next passage, Su Shi did not specify his points of reference, but his wording indicates that he was not commenting on Jia Yi without specific textual sources in mind. I mark the verbal echoes with quotation marks and underline the passage to be read against its parallels.

> 賈生，洛陽之少年。欲使其一朝之間，盡棄其舊而謀其新，亦已難矣。爲賈生者，上得其君，下得其大臣，如絳、灌之屬，優遊浸漬而深交之，使天子不疑，大臣不忌，然後舉天下而唯吾之所欲爲，不過十年，可以得志。安有立談之間，而遽爲人“痛哭”哉！觀其過湘，爲賦以吊屈原，紓鬱憤悶，趯然有遠舉之志。其後卒以“自傷”“哭泣”，至於夭絕。是亦不善處窮者也。夫謀之一不見用，

[58] See Su Shi, *Su Shi wenji,* 4.107; see also my discussion of the eleventh century perception of Confucius in chapter four. Here I only present a summary of the passage in which Su Shi gave Confucius and Mencius as examples. I translate this passage in chapter 4 so as to juxtapose it with other similar discourses.

則安知終不復用也？不知默默以待其變，而自殘至此。嗚呼！賈生志大而量小，才有餘而識不足也。[59]

Scholar Jia was a young man from Luoyang. It is difficult indeed to hope for completely abandoning the old and planning for the new within a day. [If] Scholar Jia for his part had gained the support from the ruler above and from ministers below such as Marquis Jiang [Zhou Bo 周勃 (d. 169 BC)], Guan [Fu 灌夫 (d. 131 BC)] and the like, with whom he could have drifted along, mingled and developed a deep friendship; [if he had] left the Son of Heaven without doubt and ministers without aversion, thereafter he could have done whatever he wanted with the entire world and had his ambitions fulfilled within ten years. How could [he have] casually and abruptly "wept bitterly" for others! [I] observe that he passed by the River Xiang and composed a rhapsody to lament Qu Yuan, [which suggests that he was] gloomy and frustrated, clearly having an intent to embark on a journey afar. Then, in the end, [he] "grieved for himself" and "wept," leading to [his] untimely perishing. This is indeed someone who is not good at dwelling in straits. If a plan is not put to use for once, how can [he] know it will not be put into use in the end? [Scholar Jia] did not know how to wait in silence for changes but [instead] destroyed himself like this. Alas! Scholar Jia was great in ambition yet small in capacity, well off in talents yet short of insights.

In his presentation, Su Shi went back and forth between two scenarios: What could have happened and what had happened. The contrast between the imagined triumph and the real frustration further confirms the conventional perception that Jia Yi's case is indeed a pitiable one. Also, it should be noted that in the imaginary scenario Su Shi was consistent in looking at the situation from Jia Yi's perspective. What he proposed is all about what Jia Yi could have done rather than what Emperor Wen could have done. Putting Jia Yi at the centre of the discourse, Su Shi presented him as the agent (ideally) in control of his surroundings, not constrained by them, and thus no one but Jia Yi could have been blamed when he lost control.

Now, let us look into some details on the textual level. The expression *litan zhi jian* 立談之間 (during the time of a standing conversation) is often used for things that can be done very quickly and/or in a casual manner. It is probably derived from the fact that people usually do not talk for hours if they hold a conversation while standing, and serious discussions usually are not carried out under such circumstances. To grasp what exactly is implied here, we need to look at the context for further clues. Firstly, the preceding passage is all about managing

[59] Su Shi, *Su Shi wenji,* 4.107.

social relations, including getting on good terms with senior colleagues and securing the trust of the emperor. The following passage contains a seemingly straightforward expression *tongku* 痛哭 (to weep bitterly). Yet, there is no historical account suggesting that Jia Yi literally "wept bitterly" when he served at court. I put this expression in quotation marks because I identify it as one of the keywords Jia Yi used to structure his lengthy memorial transmitted in *Hanshu* chapter 48. In other words, the expression "weep bitterly" calls for something beyond its literal meaning. Su Shi's passage is not about Jia Yi suddenly weeping during a conversation, but about him presenting the lengthy memorial that elaborates on something to be wept for (*ke wei tongku zhe* 可為痛哭者). A failure to identify this allusion would not immediately undermine the understanding of Su Shi's argument, but it may lead to a reading that contradicts history.

We might also need to note that *tongku* actually alludes to a written piece of work.[60] Su Shi held that Jia Yi could have done something, especially in the social circles at court, to lay the foundation for a smooth implementation of his proposals. Instead, he laid out his concerns and ambitions with passion in written form, addressing only the emperor. It would appear that, in Su Shi's perspective, Jia Yi's problem was that he only engaged with the theoretical aspect of politics. He failed to see or handle the complex social relations that could (and did) easily impact his political career and counted entirely on the emperor's wisdom and the trust he would put on a young genius. In the end, defamation from his senior colleagues led to his exile. Therefore, it seems plausible to highlight the connotation of *litan zhi jian* as "lightly" or "casually," referring to Jia Yi's underestimation of the complexity of political games and his mistaken assumption that his plans could be implemented without him making a major effort other than just expounding on them. From a reader's point of view, the understanding of what is folded in the expression "*tongku*/weep bitterly" is crucial. The reader has to recall the

[60] *HS* 48.2230 makes it clear that Jia Yi "several times presented memorials" (*shu shangshu* 數上疏).

eloquence of Jia Yi's memorial to fully grasp the overtone in Su Shi's rhetorical question and the ironic contrast between how much Jia Yi talked about his plans and how little he did in paving the way for their implementation.

Following that, Su Shi continued in the underlined passage with something seemingly have picked up from the *Shiji*. Although there is no similarity in terms of wording, the underlined passage from Su Shi's essay is comparable to the following passage in the final remark of *Shiji* chapter 84:

> 及見賈生弔之，又怪屈原以彼其材，游諸侯，何國不容，而自令若是。[61]
> When I saw how Scholar Jia lamented for him [i.e. Qu Yuan], I also wondered: With his talents, Qu Yuan could not have failed to find a place in any of the states if he had travelled to titled lords, yet [he] brought himself to such an end.

This passage starts with a clause indicating that Sima Qian read Jia Yi's lament for Qu Yuan, and then moves on to the specific point that drew Sima Qian's attention. His point of reference, according to He Dao 何焯 (1661–1722), is the following two lines in the last section, i.e. coda (*xun* 訊), of Jia Yi's lament for Qu Yuan:[62]

瞝九州而相君兮，	Browse through nine counties and appraise the rulers,
何必懷此都也？[63]	Why is it necessary to feel an attachment to this city?

The reading of the character *xiang* 相 is controversial. As a verb, it could also be read as "to assist" or even "to [act as] the prime minister." In that case, the line will read "Browse through nine counties, assist the rulers."[64] However, these two lines are immediately followed by the

---

[61] *SJ* 84.2503.

[62] He Dao, *Yimen dushuji,* 14.7b.

[63] *SJ* 84.2492. *HS* 48.2224 has a slightly different wording: 歷九州而相其君兮, 何必懷此都也 (Pass through nine counties and appraise their rulers,/Why do you need to feel an attachment to this city). In this context, *du* 都 can also be read as the capital, referring to the capital city of Chu, i.e. Ying 郢 (in the west of modern Hubei).

[64] Cf. Nienhauser, *Scribe's Records,* vol. VII, 304: "You could have looked around the nine lands and served as prime minister,/Why did you have to long for your home capital?" Commentators of this line suggest different readings. Li Shan 李善 (630–689) was inclined to read "appraise/assess," whereas Lü Xiang 呂向 (fl. eighth century) seemed to read "assist;" see Xiao Tong, *Wenxuan*, 60.15b and *Liuchen zhu Wenxuan*, 60.21b; see also

metaphor that a phoenix only descends on the land where it finds the radiance of virtue and would leave the land as soon as it finds virtue in decline.[65] In other words, a phoenix would choose the place to land. In light of this context, it seems more plausible to interpret *xiangjun* 相君 as "assessing the quality of rulers" so as to choose one to serve, not "assisting rulers."

He Dao's identification of Sima Qian's point of reference is instructive, but perhaps too narrow. In fact, the whole coda revolves around the idea that truly worthy beings (e.g. fine steeds, phoenixes, dragons, and sages) would not and should not be subdued by an unfavourable environment. They have the right to choose a way to keep their spirit and pride intact and to make their virtues manifest. Given this, we might regard Sima Qian's supposition about Qu Yuan as inspired from the whole coda of Jia Yi's lament. As Qu Yuan is comparable to the worthy beings, Sima Qian assumed that he could have claimed his right to abandon the place that disappointed him and offered his service to another ruler that valued him. However, so Sima Qian stated unequivocally, Qu Yuan did not choose this path and eventually brought himself to a wretched end.

Now let us return to the underlined passage in Su Shi's essay. He started by indicating that he had read Jia Yi's lament for Qu Yuan. Then, it would appear that the coda that drew Sima Qian's attention also caught Su Shi's eye, though the latter worded it differently stating "gloomy and frustrated, clearly having an intent to embark on a journey afar" (*yuyu fenmen, yueran you yuanju zhi zhi* 紆鬱憤悶，趯然有遠舉之志). To Su Shi, this perhaps represented the right solution to Jia Yi's situation. Instead of feeling distressed about being forced to leave the court, why not perceive it as just an occasional disappointment, retreat from the unsupportive environment and "embark on a journey afar" without burden? However, so Su

Han Zhaoqi, *Shiji jianzheng,* 4544 (note 40: 選擇, 觀察) and Zhang Dake, *Shiji xinzhu,* 1564 (note 15: 天下之大哪裡不能找到君主).

[65] See *SJ* 84.2492 and *HS* 48.2224-25.

Shi continued, the reality was that Jia Yi never recovered from the distress that resulted from his exile and let to his tragic end.

The difference between Sima Qian's passage and Su Shi's passage is obvious. The subject matter of Sima Qian's passage is Qu Yuan, whereas, for Su Shi's passage, it is Jia Yi. The whole final remark of *Shiji* chapter 84 runs as a contemplation on how one should deal with the adversity Qu Yuan suffered. Sima Qian drew on Jia Yi's lament for Qu Yuan so as to find a new perspective by which to view Qu Yuan's case.[66] Su Shi, on the other hand, drew on Jia Yi's lament for Qu Yuan to comment on Jia Yi himself. Yet, the difference in subject matter is not all that different. By putting Qu Yuan and Jia Yi in the same chapter, it is clear that the two are highly comparable from Sima Qian's perspective. Ban Gu also stated that Jia Yi wrote the lament to draw an analogy to himself (*ziyu* 自諭).[67] Moreover, as shown in Table 3.3, Su Shi's passage is highly comparable to the passage in Sima Qian's final remark in terms of points of reference and discursive logic.

Table 3.3 Discursive Logic of the Passages from *Shiji* chapter 84 and Su Shi's "Jia Yi lun"

Stage	Final Remark of *Shiji* chapter 84	"Jia Yi lun"
1. Jia Yi's lament for Qu Yuan as stimulus	及見賈生弔之, When I saw how Scholar Jia lamented for him [i.e. Qu Yuan]	觀其過湘，爲賦以吊屈原， I observe that he passed by River Xiang and composed a rhapsody to lament Qu Yuan.
2. Ideal solution suggested by the point of reference (Jia Yi's lament)	又怪屈原以彼其材，游諸侯，何國不容, [I] also wonder: With his talents, Qu Yuan could not have failed to find a place in any of the states if he had travelled to titled lords.	紓鬱憤悶，趯然有遠舉之志。 [The rhapsody suggests that he was] gloomy and frustrated, clearly having an intent to embark on a journey afar.
3. Actual result	而自令若是。 Yet [he] brought himself to such an end.	其後卒以"自傷""哭泣"，至於夭絕。 Then in the end he "grieved for himself" and "wept," leading to [his] untimely perishing.

[66] Though *Shiji* chapter 84 features Qu Yuan and Jia Yi, the final remark focuses on Qu Yuan and does not comment directly to Jia Yi's life. In his final remark, the Grand Scribe (assumed to be the voice of Sima Qian) 1) starts out admiring Qu Yuan's conduct and work; 2) is perplexed by Qu Yuan's suicide (as a consequence of reading Jia Yi's lament); and 3) suggests a solution to his dilemma through reference to the Daoist egalitarianism alluded to in Jia Yi's "Rhapsody on the Owl;" see *SJ* 84.2503.

[67] *HS* 48.2222.

Notwithstanding the resemblance, it cannot lead to the conclusion that Su Shi consciously took inspirations from the *Shiji*. On many occasions, Su Shi sent clear signals of his engagement with the *Shiji*, and this habit makes his engagement with the *Shiji* questionable when such signals are absent.[68] We may speculate that he wrote the underlined passage under the influence of the final remark in *Shiji* chapter 84, but there is no way to establish that he did so as part of his design.

Regarding the underlined passage from Su Shi's essay, I would also add a remark on *zishang kuqi* 自傷哭泣 (grieve for himself and weep). Again, this seemingly straightforward expression is an implicit verbal echo to his textual source(s) that records Jia Yi's last days after his pupil, King Huai of Liang, died as a result of equestrian injuries. In this case, it is difficult to tell whether Su Shi was thinking of the *Shiji* or *Hanshu*, or perhaps both. The *Shiji* version reads:

> 賈生自傷為傅無狀，哭泣歲餘，亦死。[69]
> Scholar Jia grieved for himself as a tutor not up to form. [He] wept for over a year and died too.[70]

The parallel in *Hanshu* chapter 48 reads:

> 誼自傷為傅無狀，**常**哭泣。**後**歲餘，亦死。[71]
> [Jia] Yi grieved for himself as a tutor not up to form and often wept. Over a year later, [he] died too.

Apart from the different ways of addressing Jia Yi, the *Hanshu* version only adds two characters, *chang* 常 (often) and *hou* 後 (after), but the effect is intriguing: Jia Yi appears sadder in the *Shiji* version. By adding the *hou* (after), the *Hanshu* wording detached *sui yu* 歲

[68] There are at least twenty examples in Su Shi's corpus where he explicitly referred to the *Shiji*; see, for example, Su Shi, *Su Shi wenji*, 2.54, 3.86, 4.104, 10.316, 11.347, 13.429, and 65.1998.

[69] *SJ* 84.2503.

[70] Nienhauser, *Scribe's Records,* vol. VII, 307, slightly modified.

[71] *HS* 48.2264, emphasis marks added.

餘 (over a year) that modifies the main verb *kuqi* 哭泣 (weep) as an adverbial in the *Shii* version. As a result, *sui yu* (over a year) appears as a neutral statement of the passing of time without any modifying function. The effect of adding *chang* 常 (often) is also subtle, but it does have a literary effect on the whole sentence. The difference between the *Shiji* version and the *Hanshu* version is a question of intensity of grief. "He wept for more than a year and died" just sounds like more weeping than "he often wept, and after a year he died." The *Shiji* wording presents Jia Yi's grief as the direct cause of his death. What the *Hanshu* version has done is to slightly distance the two so that there is some space for the possibility that Jia Yi was not occupied by weeping throughout the whole year.

Having said that, we still cannot tell for sure which one of the two sources Su Shi was thinking about when he wrote the essay on Jia Yi. What we can see is that his use of *zishang kuqi* 自傷哭泣 contains a slightly sarcastic tone that is absent from the *Shiji* or *Hanshu*. Together with the preceding clause on "the intent to embark on a journey afar," Su Shi drew another contrast between what Jia Yi suggested in his writing and what he actually did in reality. In Su Shi's presentation, Jia Yi's words about leaving afar turn out to be nothing more than a temporary self-consolation of someone who was "not good at handling hardship" (*bu shan chuqiong* 不善處窮) of real life.

On the note of Jia Yi's failure to practise what he suggested in his writing, we have another passage from Zheng Xie's 鄭獬 (1022–1072) "Shu Jia Yi zhuan" 書賈誼傳 (Writing [on] "Traditions of Jia Yi"). The title seems to suggests that the note is a reflection on *Hanshu* chapter 48, but it closely engages with Qu Yuan's story and refers to, again, the coda of Jia Yi's lament for Qu Yuan:

> 屈平竄而死，誼詆之曰何必懷此都也”，又著《鵩賦》以自開。揚子雲亦曰：“何必湛身哉？！”及誼傅梁懷王，王墮馬死，誼“哭泣亦死”。子雲迫於莽，投之閣，此又何也？士君子介窮屈憂急之際，果難自置與？[72]
>
> Qu Ping [i.e. Qu Yuan] was driven out and died, and Jia Yi deprecated it, saying “Why is it necessary to feel an attachment to this city?” Furthermore, he composed “Rhapsody on the Owl” to console himself. Yang Ziyun [Yang Xiong, 53 BC–18 AD] also said, “Why was it necessary to sink himself?!” When it came to the point that Jia Yi tutored King Huai of Liang and the king fell from the horse and died, [Jia] Yi “wept and died too;” [Yang] Ziyun was cornered by [Wang] Mang [46 BC–23 AD] and threw him[self] off a tower: Why is this? Does it mean that gentlemen at the moment of straits and desperation would indeed find it difficult to position themselves?

In this passage, Zheng Xie used the same sources as we analysed above (the line “Why is it necessary to feel an attachment to this city”) in Jia Yi’s lament for Qu Yuan and narratives about Jia Yi’s death (“he wept and died too”). At the same time, he introduced another comparable figure: Yang Xiong. According to the *Hanshu,* Yang Xiong greatly admired Qu Yuan’s literary works and deeply regretted that he ended his life such a way. Yang Xiong’s appreciation of Qu Yuan’s works and disapproval of his choice of life are combined and culminate in his “Fan Lisao” 反離騷 (Counter-“Encountering Sorrows”) and “Guang Sao” 廣騷 (Expanding “[Encountering] Sorrows”). Similar to Jia Yi, Yang Xiong upheld a philosophy of flexibility, arguing that a gentleman would proceed leisurely when times favoured him and would hibernate when they do not favour him. Therefore, so Yang Xiong stated, Qu Yuan did not have to sink himself.[73] Also similar to Jia Yi, Yang Xiong was confronted with a desperate situation in real life. When he thought he was going to be arrested and executed by Wang Mang, he also chose the same path as Qu Yuan.[74] Yang Xiong’s attempt at suicide was unsuccessful, but this indicates that he also failed to practise his own theory about handling a desperate situation.

[72] Zheng Xie, *Yunxi ji,* 18.8a-8b.

[73] See *HS* 87A.3515.

[74] Ibid.; see also Loewe, *Biographical Dictionary,* 638–639.

Compared to Su Shi's verdict on Jia Yi's death, Zheng Xie appeared to be more lenient and sympathetic. More important to my discussion here is that Zheng Xie and Su Shi drew inspiration from the same sources, even the same lines. We have evidence of them making use of their sources on a textual level (e.g. *zishang kuqi* 自傷哭泣 and *kuqi yisi* 哭泣亦死). Sometimes the *Hanshu* plays a more important part (e.g. *tongku* 痛哭 in Su Shi's essay), yet sometimes the influence of the *Shiji* seems to have crept in (e.g. Su Shi and Zheng Xie both single out the coda of Jia Yi's lament for Qu Yuan). As the *Shiji* and *Hanshu* overlap on the textual level, it remains difficult to distinguish their influences as well as to what extent the authors wanted to make a clear distinction. One might argue that an innocent reading without identification of these points of reference would not hinder the understanding of Su Shi's argument, but the verbal and programmatic echoes of the *Shiji* and *Hanshu* are highly unlikely to be a mere coincidence. Above all, this is perhaps one feature of good writing. It speaks to an audience informed to different degrees. What we see in Su Shi's essay is that, compared to Sima Guang and Fan Zuyu, he applied different techniques in the way he played with his textual sources. Yet, they all managed to take their sources to their preferred ends and made different points. Or are they so different? In the next section, I discuss convergences of their presentations and bring in one aspect of their socio-political environment to explain their perceptions.

Different Voices on the Same Ground

In previous sections, we have seen that the presentations of Jia Yi's legacy by Sima Guang, Fan Zuyu and Su Shi differ in terms of genre, intended audiences and the style of managing textual sources. The choices in these respects are largely subject to different personal preferences and situational requirements. This section looks into what the three intellectuals

had in common. In particular, I discuss their takes on Jia Yi with reference to the regularisation of imperial seminars during the eleventh century, arguing that these three prominent intellectuals are essentially on the same page in terms of upholding status of intellectuals.

A juxtaposition of Fan Zuyu's account and Su Shi's essay immediately sheds light on their common ground. Fan Zuyu provided an exemplary emperor who was an earnest pupil and admired his learned minister. With this example, Fan Zuyu aimed at persuading the emperor to learn from intellectuals just as Emperor Wen of Han learned from Jia Yi. On the other hand, Su Shi criticised Jia Yi for his failure to put the ruler to use and warned intellectuals against making the same mistakes. The power relationship implied by Su Shi's essay is noteworthy. He was working on the assumption that intellectuals can and should put the ruler to use. All he suggested in his essay is to persuade the intellectuals to think strategically and realistically about how to exert their influence on the ruler and ultimately on the world, or in his words, *ju tianxia er wei wu zhi suo yuwei* 舉天下而唯吾之所欲為 (do whatever I want with the entire world). In essence, Fan Zuyu and Su Shi had the same scenario in mind. They both suggested the ruler's dependence on intellectuals in governance, but they addressed two different parties involved in this scenario.

Compared to the works of Fan Zuyu and Su Shi, Sima Guang's account of Jia Yi seems less engaging with the co-ruling of a ruler and intellectuals. However, if we compare his account against his sources, we observe that he omitted a ritual detail, *shi shi fu zhi* 使士負之 ([ancient kings] would make a *shi* carry him [the heir apparent] on his back), from Jia Yi's memorial.[75] Scholars have discussed extensively about historical changes of the idea of *shi* and the social stratum it designated, ranging from low-ranked servicemen to literati or

[75] See *ZZTJ* 14.11b, cf. *HS* 48.2248; see also appendix A.

intellectuals.[76] The *shi* in *shi shi fu zhi,* which Jia Yi presented in the historical context of high antiquity, would not have been perceived in early China in the same way Sima Guang would have perceived it in the eleventh century. However, an innocent reader of the eleventh century might well read *shi shi fu zhu* as "[ancient kings] would make an intellectual carry him [the heir apparent] on his back," which implies a subordinate status of intellectuals to the heir apparent. We do not know how Sima Guang perceived the historical changes of *shi.* He might have paid no heed to the history of this word and read it consistently in its eleventh century sense. Another possibility is that he was well aware of the history of this word, but he would not take the risk of exposing to his audience (the emperor) a point of reference that can potentially be interpreted as signifying intellectuals' subordination to the throne. At this juncture, we may speculate that both Fan Zuyu and Su Shi would have appreciated Sima Guang's editorial decision of disregarding references that lower the status of intellectuals.

An interesting aspect of the common ground shared by Sima Guang, Fan Zuyu and Su Shi relates to their experience of serving as lecturers in imperial seminars, or *jingyan* 經筵 (Mat [Lectures] on classical texts),[77] where discussions on classical texts and their contemporary implications took place. Sima Guang was one generation before Fan Zuyu and Su Shi, the two

[76] For a discussion of the origin and the social stratum of *shi* in early China, see Yu Ying-shih, *Shi yu Zhongguo wenhua*, chapter 1, esp. 3–26; for a more recent discussion, see the introduction of Pines, "Ideology and Power in Early China," 1–6. For the concept of *shi* during the Tang and Song periods, see Bol, *This Culture of Ours*, chapter 2, and Smith and Ebrey, "Introduction," 9–12.

[77] The "classics" here does not just include the six classics and their commentarial traditions, but also histories and instructions by preceding rulers. For a more detailed record of the period each of the three scholars served in imperial seminars, see Jiang Peng, *Bei Song jingyan yu Songxue de xingqi*, 85–86, 96–97, and 99–104. Some official titles might lead to confusion, especially before 1080. For example, Hanlin Reader-in-waiting Academician (*Hanlin shidu xueshi* 翰林侍讀學士) and Hanlin Lecturer-in-Waiting Academician (*Hanlin shijiang xueshi* 翰林侍講學士) were nominal titles. Post holders of these titles were not involved in delivering lectures at imperial seminars. Only Readers-in-Waiting (*shidu* 侍讀) and Lecturers-in-Waiting (*shijiang* 侍講) had the duty to deliver lectures. For a note on this, see Ma Duanlin, *Wenxian tongkao*, 54.12b–18a and Hartwell, "Historical Analogism," 696–670 (note 33). The three scholars discussed here all served at posts that were actually involved in lecture delivering.

of whom were colleagues in imperial seminars from 1087 to 1093. Su Shi regarded his slightly younger colleague, Fan Zuyu, as the best lecturer of the time.[78]

Imperial seminars was initiated by Emperor Taizong's 太宗 (939–997, r. 979–997) reading activities and regularised during Emperor Renzong's reign (1022–1063). These seminars started as part of a strategy to gain support from intellectuals at the beginning of the dynasty. Later on, they became highly regularised and provided an institutional foundation for a transformation of the lecturers' role. Prominent intellectuals, who filled the position of the lecturer, started as the emperors' subordinate consultants, but as time went on, they became venerated instructors of indispensable learning.[79]

The turning point was during Emperor Renzong's reign. Unlike his predecessors, who came to the throne as fully-fledged adults, Emperor Renzong came to the throne (1022) at the age of thirteen as a boy who had not even finished the curriculum for the heir apparent. Following the policy of venerating classical learning, which was agreed and maintained by his forebears, Emperor Renzong had to continue his studies under the instructions of senior lecturers. A record about the interaction between the young emperor and his then tutor Sun Shi 孫奭 (962–1033) is particularly intriguing:

> 上在經筵，或左右瞻矚，或足敲踏床，則奭拱立不講，體貌必莊，上亦為竦然改聽。[80]
>
> At the Mat [Lectures] on the classical texts, the sovereign sometimes looked around; sometimes [he] kicked or stepped on the bench. Then [Sun] Shi stood still with hands folded and no longer spoke. [His] deportment was absolutely solemn. The sovereign for his part changed [his behaviour] to listen in awe.

This is a telling account of the encounter between the thirteen-year-old new emperor and the sixty-year-old learned classicist. It conveys a clear message: Even the sovereign has no

[78] See Jiang Peng, *Bei Song jingyan yu Songxue de xingqi*, 101–103 and Su Shi, *Su Shi wenji,* 4.106.

[79] For an in-depth discussion of these changes, see Jiang Peng, *Bei Song jingyan yu Songxue de xingqi,* chapter 1–3.

[80] *XZZTJCB* 99.18a. This anecdote is also recorded in Kong Pingzhong, *Kongshi tanyuan,* 2.637.

absolute superiority to a learned man. Also, it is noteworthy that this encounter took place more than two decades before Sima Guang came to the political stage, let alone Su Shi and Fan Zuyu. The three men might well have been accustomed to the fact that an intellectual has the potential to be highly respected by a ruler and to give instructions to him.

The change of lecturers' status became so remarkable that it triggered debates on various issues, including ritual details. In 1068, there was a heated debate about whether lecturers should be standing or sitting during the imperial seminars. Some ministers suggested that the person who expounds on the Way should be treated with extra respect and thus be seated. They listed precedents of granting lecturers seats and advised Emperor Shenzong to do the same as a gesture of respecting the Way. On the other hand, opponents insisted that it would be more practical to have the lecture standing so that they can clearly point out which passage they are talking about. More importantly, the lecturer was there merely to explain traditional commentaries and thus should not have assumed the role of a true instructor of the Way.[81] This debate ended up with no change implemented. However, as Jiang Peng points out, no one questioned the presumption that the person who transmits the Way embedded in classical texts should be venerated. Instead, the controversy lied in whether lecturers in imperial seminars were indeed transmitting the Way rather than mere glosses and readings of the classical texts.[82] There seems to be a well-established consensus amongst officials that the emperor should respect and attend to the guidance of his instructor, as long as he is a true instructor of the Way.

In the meanwhile, the function of the seminars was also expanding. At the early stage, it used to focus on textual learning, but later on it became a venue used by ministers-cum-lecturers to advance their political proposals through the language of classical texts. When Sima Guang served as lecturer in 1068, he purposely chose to read passages in his *Zizhi*

[81] See *XZZTJCBSB* 3a.8a–9a.

[82] See Jiang Peng, *Bei Song jingyan yu Songxue de xingqi,* 207–208.

tongjian about not making radical changes to a given system.[83] Two days later, his colleague Lü Huiqin 吕惠卿 (1032–1111) took the same occasion to expound on a passage in the *Shangshu* to indicate the necessity and precedents of taking reforms.[84] In other words, in the 1060s the role of an instructor and that of a political advisor were collapsed into one, and it remained this way until the end of the Northern Song.

This context provides a new angle to understand the perceptions of Jia Yi's legacy we analysed in this chapter, especially the two by Su Shi and Fan Zuyu. From their perspectives, Jia Yi is not just a motif of a mistreated genius but also an early example of an intellectual, an imperial advisor and an instructor. Fan Zuyu presented Jia Yi as a respected lecturer, giving wise advice about establishing proper proprieties of learning, whereas Su Shi blamed Jia Yi for not fully exploring what an intellectual could potentially do in this position. They gave different lessons to two parties, but both perceptions reflect the contemporary consensus on the relationship between the emperor and his intellectual advisors.

Concluding Remarks

During the eleventh century, *Shiji* chapter 84 and *Hanshu* chapter 48 remained the most influential textual sources of Jia Yi's legacy. In terms of the amount and coverage of information, *Hanshu* chapter 48 fills the gaps that have been (possibly intentionally) left blank in *Shiji* chapter 84 and thus provides a more comprehensive account.[85] However, it would appear that readers in succeeding centuries were much less attracted by the more complete or

[83] See *XZZTJCBSB* 6.6a–6b.

[84] See *XZZTJCBSB* 6.7a–7b.

[85] Zhong Xing 鍾惺 (1581–1624), for example, suggests that Sima Qian did not include any of Jia Yi's memorial because he intended to highlight the comparability of Qu Yuan and Jia Yi; see Yang Haizheng, *Lidai mingjia ping Shiji,* 615, quoted from a 1625 (fifth year of Tianqi 天啟 era) edition of the *Shiji,* edited by Ge Ding 葛鼎 (fl. seventeenth century).

even fairer version in *Hanshu* chapter 48 than by the distressful man of talent depicted in *Shiji* chapter 84. The *Shiji* account, which lent a romanticised analogy to those who were perceived as unrecognised talents, was so powerful that it even impacted the editing of the parallel account in the *Hanshu.*

When Jia Yi's image as a talented yet unfortunate man is popularised mostly in the realm of *belles-lettres*, those who are more widely known for their expertise in history seem much less concerned with Jia Yi's personal encounters. Sima Guang and Fan Zuyu, both of whom were prominent historians, provided good examples. They applied similar techniques of textual management and relied primarily on the *Hanshu* account, whose rich layers enabled them to find raw materials for teaching different lessons. With an eye on contemporary issues, Sima Guang and Fan Zuyu carefully trimmed the received texts and drew on carefully chosen aspects of Jia Yi's advice regarding state affairs.

In contrast, Su Shi picked up the old story about Jia Yi's tragedy. With the reprimand of Jia Yi's inflexibility and unwise attitudes towards temporary adversity, Su Shi distinguished himself from those who approached Jia Yi's legacy with sentimentalism. In terms of his handling of textual sources, he took more liberties than Sima Guang and Fan Zuyu, who applied a relatively rigid "scissors-and-paste" method. Su Shi's essay is reminiscent of both the *Shiji* and *Hanshu* in different ways (verbally and discursively), and traces are skilfully embedded in and mingled with his own words. The reader's familiarity with different versions of Jia Yi's legacy presented in the *Shiji* and *Hanshu* is not required for understanding Su Shi's position. Yet, full recognition of Su Shi's allusions to his sources enriches the reader's appreciation of the subtle design through which he advanced his disapproval of Jia Yi's choice.

Generally speaking, the readers discussed in this chapter were seemingly inclined to favour the *Hanshu* and disregard the *Shiji.* How does that relate to the study of the reception of the *Shiji*?

On the methodological level, these examples illustrate two points. The first is the importance of scrutinising thematic convergence with and verbal resemblance to the *Shiji.* On the other hand, there is a limit to the identification of the source of inspiration by textual analysis. As an oft-cited point of reference, Jia Yi's legacy is a telling example of common currency in Chinese textual traditions. Some echoes (e.g. Sima Guang and Fan Zuyu's accounts) of Jia Yi's legacy actually resonate with the *Hanshu* account. Therefore, thematic convergence alone cannot be regarded as an indicator of *Shiji*'s influence. Though Su Shi's "Jia Yi lun" bears discursive resemblance to Sima Qian's final remark, it does not constitute adequate proof of Su Shi's engagement of the *Shiji* account at this point. Sometimes, even if there is clear evidence of verbal echoes (such as *zishang kuqi* 自傷哭泣), it is still impossible to assess the source of inspiration when these echoes respond to the overlapping narratives in the *Shiji* and *Hanshu*. Researchers of reception studies should be fully aware of these limits and scrutinise the resemblance observed before venturing to claim influence of any one of them.

Further to that, analyses in this chapter enrich our understanding of eleventh century readers by approaching their compilations as a series of choices they made when engaging with the textual traditions. Their representations of Jia Yi can be understood and appreciated on their own terms. However, the recognition of their acceptance and rejection of divergent accounts gives their discourses deeper resonance as this recognition reconstructed their dialogues with the past.

Despite the differences in intended audience, genre, and techniques of textual management, there is clearly something that Sima Guang, Fan Zuyu and Su Shi shared. Their perceptions of the relation between a ruler and intellectuals unequivocally called for the former's respect for the latter. Sima Guang cleansed his source of information that could potentially undermine intellectuals' status. Fan Zuyu brought out – even at the expense of factual accuracy – an image of Emperor Wen of Han as a keen learner who willingly took instructions from Jia Yi. Su Shi

was bold enough to claim that a man in Jia Yi's position has the right to evaluate and make use of the emperor.

Moreover, this chapter analyses the common ground shared by Sima Guang, Fan Zuyu and Su Shi in light of their court life. I argue that their shared experience as lecturers in the imperial seminars constituted their expectations of Jia Yi, who represented an early example of an imperial advisor and an instructor. Meanwhile, their expectations of Jia Yi also fostered their attitudes towards textual traditions associated with him. Sima Guang, Fan Zuyu and Su Shi certainly knew their *Shiji*, but they would only make use of it on the condition that it was supportive of their discourses. They disregarded the melancholic and relatively monophonic representation of Jia Yi's legacy in the *Shiji* because of their need to establish Jia Yi's persona as an imperial instructor and political advisor, not (just) a mistreated talent. For this purpose, the richer polyphonic account provided in the *Hanshu* proved more useful. That being said, there is no conclusion on which account is better; nor will there be one. As the needs of readers vary in different circumstances and periods, they will always make different choices.

Chapter Four

A Forgotten Protest

> The Greek and Latin historians we consider great and exemplary were already considered great and exemplary by ancient readers. They owe their preservation to their reputation; though, of course, not all the historians who were reputable were preserved.
>
> ── Arnaldo Momigliano (1908–1987)[1]

In chapter two, we discussed the exam question set by Wang Gui 王珪 (1019–1085), who regarded it as the task of himself and his contemporaries to revise the *Shiji* and make it a "flawless book" (*wanshu* 完書). Despite his proposal, Wang Gui did not seem to have embarked on any revision project or left behind any form of substantial historiographical writing. Yet, another eleventh century intellectual performed the precise revision Wang Gui proposed. This was Su Zhe 蘇轍 (1039–1112), who reworked narratives concerning pre-Han periods in the *Shiji* and compiled the *Gushi* 古史 (Ancient History).[2]

Generally speaking, the *Gushi* betrays no knowledge of additional primary material other than what was accessible for the compilation of the *Shiji*, nor does it apply any innovative historiographical approach. Consequently, it has drawn very little attention among modern scholars. Even when it is taken into account, scholars are clearly more interested in Su Zhe's

[1] Momigliano, "Tradition and the Classical Historian," 279.

[2] In my research I consult two editions of the *Gushi*, the *Siku quanshu* edition and a critical edition in *San Su quanshu* 三蘇全書 (Yuwen Chubanshe, 2001). The *San Su quanshu* edition uses the *Siku quanshu* edition as base text and compares it against an edition that is believed to have originated from the 1095 (second year of the Shaosheng 紹聖 era) edition and was subsequently collated and reprinted during the Yuan and Ming periods; see Su Zhe, *Gushi*, vol. 3, "Gushi xulu" 古史敘錄 (Foreword to *Ancient History*), 348–350. As the *San Su quanshu* edition uses simplified characters, I will give priority to the Siku edition in terms of orthography. But I will refer to both editions in my examples, with the scroll and page numbers in the *San Su quanshu* edition, and those in *Siku quanshu* edition after a slash.

final evaluative remarks.[3] Despite that narratives prior to his evaluative remarks constitute the main body of each chapter, they attract very little academic attention as they mainly derive from the *Shiji* narratives. In other words, modern scholars rarely read the *Gushi* as a full-fledged history, and instead as a collection of Su Zhe's historical criticism.

For the purposes of this dissertation however, the *Gushi* provides invaluable materials. There is controversy surrounding Su Zhe's amendments of the *Shiji*, and the *Gushi* does not stand for a more authoritative account of antiquity. However, it represents an unusual and detailed record of the interface between Su Zhe and the *Shiji*, laying out precisely what he accepted, what he rejected and why. In the hope of expanding our understanding of Su Zhe's reception of the *Shiji*, this chapter starts with a general discussion of the *Gushi* project and then focuses on a specific case, Su Zhe's presentation of the life of Confucius, to investigate the underexplored narratives in the *Gushi*. To establish the significance of the *Gushi,* I relate Su Zhe's perception of Confucius' persona to his contemporary intellectual context and discuss the *Gushi* project in light of the practice of compiling new historical accounts by recalling, *mutatis mutandis*, the old ones.

Some General Facts about the *Gushi* Project

As a member of a most prominent Su family, Su Zhe is somewhat eclipsed by his versatile elder brother Su Shi 蘇軾 (1037–1101). Yet, with the compilation of the *Gushi*, Su Zhe distinguished himself in historiography, a field where Su Shi produced very few words.[4]

[3] See, for example, the discussions of Su Zhe's historical scholarship in Gu Jian, *Su Zhe xueshu yanjiu,* 149–173 and Wu Shu-Hua, "Su Zhe xueshu sixiang," 170–209. So far Sung Chia-fu's "Between Tortoise and Mirror," esp. 240–264, seems to be the only example of substantial discussion of the *Gushi* in Western languages.

[4] An anecdote recorded by Xu Du 徐度 (fl. twelfth century) suggests that Su Shi deliberately avoided engaging with historiography; see Xu Du, *Quesao bian*, 2.11b; see also Sung Chia-fu, *Between Tortoise and Mirror*, 216–217.

The sixty scrolls of the *Gushi* were drafted during two politically frustrating periods when Su Zhe was in Yunzhou 筠州 (1080s and 1090s).[5] The narratives cover the periods from the legendary times up to the end of the Qin Dynasty (221–206 BC). In his preface, Su Zhe explained that the compilation of the *Gushi* arose from his respect for and, more importantly, discontent with the *Shiji*. In his view, the Way of sage-rulers underwent a serious decline after the Three Dynasties of antiquity. When it came to the Qin and Han times, people vied to offer interpretations of the Way based on their limited knowledge and thereby hindered the transmission of the fundamental truth.[6] This was the case up to the advent of Sima Qian's seminal work:

> 太史公始易編年之法，為本紀、世家、列傳，記五帝三王以來，後世莫能易之。然其為人淺近而不學，疎略而輕信。漢景武之間，《尚書》、古文《詩毛氏》、《春秋左氏》皆不列於學官，世能讀之者少，故其記堯舜三代之事，皆不得聖人之意。戰國之際，諸子辯士各自著書，或增損古事以自信一時之說，遷一切信之，甚者或采世俗相傳之語，以易古文舊說。及秦焚書，戰國之史不傳於民間，秦惡其議已也，焚之略盡。幸而野史一二存者，遷亦未暇詳也，故其記戰國有數年不書一事者。 余竊悲之，故因遷之舊，上觀《詩》、《書》，下考《春秋》及秦漢襍錄，記伏犧、神農，訖秦始皇帝，為七本紀，十六世家，三十七列傳，謂之《古史》。[7]
>
> Since His Honour the Grand Scribe changed the method of chronicles and compiled "Basic Annals," "Hereditary Houses" and "Arrayed Traditions" to record the Five Sovereigns and Three Kings, no one in later generations has been able to change it. However, as a person, he was shallow and did not commit to learning; [he was] careless and credulous. During [the reigns of] Emperors Jing [188–141 BC; r. 157–141 BC] and Wu [156–87 BC; r. 141–87 BC] of Han, none of the Documents, the old scripts of Mao's Songs and Zuo's Spring and Autumn were established as schools of learning, and only a few people in the world were able to read them. Therefore, his account of the matters of Yao, Shun and the Three Dynasties invariably fail to grasp the intentions of the sages. At the time of the Warring States, the various masters and disputers all wrote their own books. Sometimes they exaggerated or abridged [their presentations of] ancient events so as to personally make credible [their] arguments of the day. [Sima] Qian believed them all. In some extreme cases, [he] even took sayings circulated amongst the vulgar [people] to change previous teachings of ancient texts. When the Qin burnt the books, histories from the Warring States were no longer transmitted

[5] Yunzhou corresponds to modern Gao'an 高安, Jiangxi. For discussions of the compilation of the *Guzhi* with reference to Su Zhe's biography, see Su Zhe, *Gushi,* vol. 3, "*Gushi* xulu," 343–348 and Sung Chia-fu, "Between Tortoise and Mirror," 220–235.

[6] See Su Zhe, *Gushi*, "Yuanxu" 原敘 (Original Preface), vol. 3, 351/1b–2a.

[7] Ibid., 2a–2b.

> among common people. The Qin hated the criticism from them [i.e. histories from the Warring States] and burned nearly all of them. As for one or two of the unofficial histories that fortunately survived, [Sima] Qian found no time to scrutinise [them]. Therefore, in recording [the history of] the Warring States, there are [circumstances where he] recorded nothing during several years. I, for myself, feel sad about it. Therefore, following [Sima] Qian's old [account], [I] observe the Songs and Documents for high [antiquity], investigate miscellaneous records from the Qin and Han for late [antiquity], record from Fuxi and Shennong up to the First August Emperor of the Qin, and compile seven "Basic Annals," sixteen "Hereditary Houses" and thirty-seven "Arrayed Traditions," calling them *Ancient History*.

This passage encapsulates two perspectives prevailing during the eleventh century, both of which are discussed in chapter two. On one hand, Su Zhe indicated that compiling a history out of chaotic and incomplete records was not an easy task. At this point, Su Zhe joined his contemporaries to establish a serious interruption of classical traditions and prevalence of alternative teachings/records during Qin and Han times.[8] In his contribution to this ongoing discourse, Su Zhe used wording that is reminiscent of Wang Gui's passage that we have seen in chapter two. Where Wang Gui stated "in talking about ancient events, [masters and disputers] often exaggerate or abridge [ancient events] so as to cater for their arguments of the day" (*qiyan gushi wangwang zengsun yi jiu yishi zhi shuo* 其言古事，往往增損以就一時之說),[9] Su Zhe had "sometimes [masters and disputers] exaggerated or abridged [presentations of] ancient events so as to personally make credible [their] arguments of the day" (*huo zengsun gushi yi zixin yishi zhi shuo* 或增損古事以自信一時之說). On the other hand, Su Zhe related the quality of the *Shiji* to Sima Qian's personal specifics (*wei ren* 為人). In his view, Sima Qian transmitted alternative teachings and records regardless of their disagreement with the classics and thus should be blamed for his lack of insight and neglect of scrutiny. At this point, Su Zhe's view recalls the criticism of the *Shiji* from Sima Guang and Zhang Lei, both of whom held the

[8] For discussion of this prevalent perception of the *Shiji*, see the first two sections of chapter two.

[9] Wang Gui, *Huayang ji*, 45.17b. For my translation of the entire exam question, see the second section of chapter two.

Shiji to have been marred by Sima Qian's inclination towards recording dramatic events.[10] In short, Su Zhe attributed the problems of the *Shiji* to Sima Qian's unwise choices in a situation that was far from straightforward. At the same time, he made it clear that he was unsatisfied with the *Shiji* (*yu qie bei zhi* 余竊悲之) and that his compilation of the *Gushi* was initiated by an intention to improve Sima Qian's accounts of the remote past.

Apart from his motivations, Su Zhe also outlined his methodology of his revision project and listed a few sources against which he would check the *Shiji.* His touchstone was, above all, the classics, especially the *Shi, Shu,* and *Chunqiu*, in which he specialised. These choices are hardly surprising. Despite the sceptical tendency in classical learning during the Northern Song, intellectuals did not go as far as to challenge the overall authoritative status of the classics. They wrote about various aspects of the textual body of the classics, including inconsistencies, anachronisms, authorship, etc. However, they all agreed that the universal truths are manifested by classical texts. The debates in classical scholarship were related to whether the classics had been faithfully represented by their received textual body rather than whether the classics constituted a venerable canon. By questioning this textual body, intellectuals freed themselves from parts of the received traditions (especially commentarial traditions) and asserted their own rights to interpret the truths the classics might embody. Yet, in the end they did not try to find their truths outside classical texts.

Further to the classical texts, Su Zhe also consulted "miscellaneous records from the Qin and Han" (*Qin Han zalu* 秦漢襍錄). This probably includes the "histories from the Warring States" (*Zhanguo zhi shi* 戰國之史) that Sima Qian "found no time to scrutinise" (*wei xia xiang* 未暇詳). In the afterword of the *Gushi*, Su Zhe narrowed it down and named the *Zhanguo ce* 戰國策 (Stratagems of the Warring States) as one of his main sources against which he

[10] See Sima Guang, *Zizhi tongjian kaoyi,* 1.4a and Zhang Lei's "Sima Qian lun xia" in his *Zhang Lei ji*, 56.664–665; see also my discussion in the third section of chapter two.

compared the *Shiji*.[11] Yet, the suitability of the *Zhanguo ce* for reconstructing pre-Qin history is open to debate. The *Zhanguo ce* only came into its current form after Sima Qian's days, but it is clear that Sima Qian made substantial use of the textual sources that were later compiled into the *Zhangguo ce*.[12] Despite the literary brilliance of the *Zhangguo ce*, the nature and evaluation of the narratives transmitted in it have been subject to dispute due to the abundance of crafty political plots and its unfavourable moral implications. Even Liu Xiang 劉向 (79-8 BC), who compiled and coined the title *Zhanguo ce,* warned the reader against the moral implications of these records.[13] It would appear that Su Zhe was fully aware of these problems. In the *Gushi,* there are examples where he drew on the *Zhanguo ce* to correct or complement the *Shiji* narratives.[14] However, where the *Zhanguo ce* is in line with the *Shiji* in contradicting the classics, they are both dismissed.[15] That is to say, in terms of the priority within his textual sources, Su Zhe regarded the classics as the ultimate touchstone of his *Gushi*.

The passage *yin Qian zhi jiu* 因遷之舊 (following [Sima] Qian's old [account]) in Su Zhe's preface indicates that he used most of the *Shiji* narratives and adopted the annal-tradition style (*jizhuanti* 紀傳體) of historical writing. However, there are at least three aspects where the *Gushi* is distinct from the *Shiji.* First, the *Gushi* is only in partial conformity with the *Shiji* in terms of overall structure. Despite his appreciation of Sima Qian's contribution as a

[11] See Su Zhe, *Gushi*, vol. 4, 443/60.9a.

[12] For the relationship between the *Shiji* and *Zhangguo ce*, see Durrant, *Cloudy Mirror*, 100–116 and Hardy, *Worlds of Bronze and Bamboo*, 150–153.

[13] See Liu Xiang, *Zhanguo ce,* "Shulu" 書錄 (Note on the Book), 1196–1198.

[14] See, for example, Su Zhe, *Gushi,* vol. 3, 419/6.20a–20b, cf. *SJ* 5.207 and Liu Xiang, *Zhanguo ce,* "Qin si" 秦四, 6.227; see also Su Zhe, *Gushi,* vol. 4, 266/40.3a–3b, cf. *SJ* 69.2245 and Liu Xiang, *Zhanguo ce,* "Yan yi" 燕一, 29.1041–1043.

[15] For example, *Shiji* chapter 86 starts with a narrative about Cao Mo 曹沫 (fl. seventh century BC), a general of Lu. He threatened Duke Huan of Qi 齊桓公 (d. 643 BC) with a dagger at the oath altar and made him return the territories gained in battles to the state of Lu; see *SJ* 86. 2515–2516. This event is attested in various passages in the *Zhanguo ce*, see Liu Xiang, *Zhanguo ce,* "Qi san" 齊三, 10.384, "Qi liu" 齊六 12.456–457, and "Yan san" 燕三, 31.1132. However, Su Zhe denied the historicity of this event on the grounds that the *Chunqin* does not state that this is a "coerced oath" (*yaomeng* 要盟); see Su Zhe, *Gushi*, vol. 4, 436/59.16b–17a.

historiographer, Su Zhe silently dropped the sections of "Tables" (*biao* 表) and "Treaties" (*shu* 書) in *Shiji*'s model and only kept "Basic Annals" (*benji* 本紀), "Hereditary Houses" (*shijia* 世家), and "Arrayed Traditions" (*liezhuan* 列傳) in the *Gushi*. Second, the temporal coverage of the *Gushi* differ from that of the *Shiji*. Intended as a comprehensive history of civilisation, the *Shiji* narratives start from the "Basic Annals of the Five Sovereigns" ("Wudi benji" 五帝本紀) and end with Sima Qian's days. The later boundary of Su Zhe's perception of *gu* 古 (ancient, antiquity) is the Qin period, and he enlarged the scope of antiquity by pushing the beginning of civilisation to even further remote early stages, that is the times of the Three August Ones (*sanhuang* 三皇).[16] Third, Su Zhe compiled accounts for seven individuals that do not take the role of a protagonist in any chapter of the *Shiji*.[17]

In terms of the structure of each chapter, Su Zhe modelled on the *Shiji* and consistently attached his evaluative remarks, introduced by *Suzi yue* 蘇子曰 (Master Su says), at the end of the narratives. These remarks are much more elaborative than the final remarks in the *Shiji* and closely related to Su Zhe's various essays on historical matters and commentaries to the classics, especially the *Shijing* and *Chunqiu.*[18]

Despite Su Zhe's enunciation of the intimate relationship between his work and the *Shiji,* little has been done to investigate what exactly Su Zhe altered, and more importantly, why he revised it the way he did. For those presently interested in the history of early China, the *Shiji* and *Hanshu* are certainly the most significant and valuable received texts. There are overlaps between the narratives of these two accounts, but they both came to be regarded as

[16] For discussion of Su Zhe's reconstruction of genealogy of early legendary sage-rulers, see Sung Chia-fu, "Between Tortoise and Mirror," 243–246.

[17] For a structural comparison of the *Gushi* and *Shiji*, see the table in Sung Chia-fu, "Between Tortoise and Mirror," 237.

[18] For a discussion of the relation between the "Suzi yue" in the *Gushi* and Su Zhe's other writings, see Sung Chia-fu, "Between Tortoise and Mirror," 261–263.

indispensable sources. An important aspect of Ban Gu's challenge of the *Shiji* is that he provided substantial amounts of information that do not appear in the *Shiji* account, as we have seen in chapter three. In the case of the *Gushi,* Su Zhe did not come up with new primary sources that were arguably unknown to Sima Qian, and therefore the *Gushi* might be rated as a second-hand history of antiquity. Nevertheless, I would like to stress that the *Gushi* was intended as a fully-structured history, not as a repetition of the *Shiji* narratives complemented by Su Zhe's evaluative remarks.[19] As the next section shows, in Su Zhe's system, his remarks are all about how history should be understood, whereas his narratives are about how history should be told.

Two Different Masters in the *Shiji* and the *Gushi*

In this section, I focus on one example in the *Gushi,* namely Su Zhe's reconstruction of the life story of Confucius, to illustrate how his narratives are interwoven with his evaluative remarks and how he made up the perceived deficiencies of the *Shiji* account without providing supplementary material.

The *Shiji* account of Confucius' life, which can be found in chapter 47 "Kongzi shijia" 孔子世家 (Hereditary House of Confucius), is largely built upon utterances of the Master that transmitted in the classical corpus, especially in the *Lunyu*. This account represents a significant attempt to contextualise and historicise the otherwise isolated utterances of Confucius.[20] Given the cultural significance of Confucius, it is a particularly daring attempt to rewrite the account of his life, undoubtedly one of the most well-known stories among the

[19] Sung Chia-fu also points out that the *Gushi* is not just copy-and-paste historiography, and he presents a comparison of the narrative parts of the *Gushi* chapter about Guan Zhong 管仲 (d. 645 BC) and Yan Ying 晏嬰 (d. 500 BC) with the *Shiji* counterpart. However, this comparison remains rather sketchy; see Sung Chia-fu, "Between Tortoise and Mirror," 240–243.

[20] See Fuehrer, "Sima Qian as a Reader," 17–19.

populace. To Su Zhe himself, Confucius was the paragon of a man who reached a comprehensive understanding of the Way.[21] How would he rewrite the story of such an important figure? And if he was discontent with the *Shiji* account, what exactly was he unhappy about? What did he see as a more "accurate" or "suitable" representation of the great master?

Su Zhe's departure from the *Shiji* can be promptly observed from the chapter title "Kongzi liezhuan" 孔子列傳 (Arrayed Traditions of Confucius). In *Shiji* scholarship, the interpretation of the term *shijia* 世家 (hereditary houses) is open to debate, hence the presence of the account of Confucius in the *shijia* section has been interpreted differently.[22] Some scholars point out that the account of Confucius should not be placed in the *shijia* section because he never held any noble title or hereditary fief. Yet others argue for the flexibility of Sima Qian's historiographical framework and regard his arrangement as a way to honour the Master.[23] Both lines of thought have their roots in historical scholarship. The theory of honouring Confucius by treating him in the *shijia* section reached a wide audience through the commentaries of Sima Zhen 司馬貞 (fl. 745) and Zhang Shoujie 張守節 (fl. 725–735).[24] As for its counterargument, Wang Anshi's 王安石 (1021–1086) discussion of "Kongzi shijia" is a famous point of reference. Wang Anshi suggested that the account of Confucius only fits in the *liezhuan* 列傳 (arrayed traditions) section from a historiographical point of view. If one were indeed to honour

[21] See Su Zhe, "Yuanxu," in *Gushi*, vol. 3, 351/1b.

[22] For a selection of interpretations of the concept *shijia* in the *Shiji*, see Yang Yanqi et al., *Lidai mingjia ping Shiji,* 152–157; see also Hardy, *Worlds of Bronze and Bamboo,* 36–38 and Nienhauser, *Scribe's Records,* vol. V.1, xi-xviii. For the controversy surrounding the placement of "Kongzi shijia," see Yang Yanqi et al., *Lidai mingjia ping Shiji,* 488–500; see also Watson, *Ssu-ma Ch'ien,* 118–120 and Durrant, *Cloudy Mirror,* 29–31.

[23] It should be noted that controversy surrounding "Kongzi shijia" goes far beyond the placement of this chapter in the *Shiji.* Cui Shu 崔述 (1740–1816), for example, wrote extensively in his *Zhu Si kaoxin lu* 洙泗考信錄 about inconsistencies and fallacies in "Kongzi shijia." More recently, Creel expressed his highly critical view on the "Kongzi shijia," arguing that Sima Qian actually criticised Confucius in this chapter; see Creel, *Confucius,* 244–248. On the basis of a comparison between "Kongzi shijia" in the *Shiji* and *Kongzi jiayu* 孔子家語, van Ess also concludes that Sima Qian might well have made selective use of his sources in a way that Confucius is depicted as a man with many weaknesses; see van Ess, "Einige Anmerkungen zur Biographie des Konfuzius im *Shih-chi* und vergleichbaren Stellen im *K'ung-tzu chia-yü*, Teil II," 257–259.

[24] See *SJ* 47.1905.

Confucius by making a historiographical exception, one could have treated Confucius as a sovereign, not just as a titled lord of a hereditary house. Placing the account of Confucius in the *shijia* section, Wang Anshi stated, did not just contradict the historiographical principles of the *Shiji* but also amounted to insufficient respect for Confucius. Therefore, Wang Anshi regarded Sima Qian's arrangement as an unwise solution.[25] This view was subject to serious criticism in subsequent periods,[26] but Su Zhe, Wang Anshi's contemporary, was clearly in line with Wang Anshi. In the *Gushi,* the *shijia* section only deals with hereditary houses, and the account of Confucius comes as the eighth chapter of the *liezhuan* section.

Moreover, a close analysis suggests that the narrative of Su Zhe's "Kongzi liezhuan" differs considerably from that of Sima Qian's "Kongzi shijia."[27] Readers of the *Shiji* version may be struck by how frustrating Confucius' life must have been. In this chapter, Confucius is depicted as a person of poverty and ineffectiveness, wandering among various states in search for employment.[28] On his journey, he was framed, arrested, nearly killed and once even described as a stray dog (*sangjia zhi gou* 喪家之狗) by a passer-by.[29] Shortly after the beginning of the chapter and before a more detailed narrative, we find a summary of Confucius' career:

[25] See Wang Anshi, *Linchuan xiansheng wenji,* 71.12a.

[26] See, for example, He Liangjun, *Siyouzhai congshuo,* 5.6a–6b, Yuan Mei, *Suiyuan suibi,* 2.7a–7b, and Wang Mingsheng, *Shiqi shi shangque,* 4.2b. More examples can be found in Yang Yanqi et al., *Lidai mingjia ping Shiji,* 490–500.

[27] My discussion here focuses on selected aspects of Su Zhe's revisions, for a comparison of the entire narratives of the two accounts of Confucius, see appendix B.

[28] For textual analyses and interpretations of Sima Qian's design of chapter 47, see Durrant, *Cloudy Mirror,* chapter 2 and Hardy, *Worlds of Bronze and Bamboo,* 153–168. In other chapters of the *Shiji*, Sima Qian depicted more frustrated figures, such as Qu Yuan 屈原 (c. 340–c. 278 BC), Sun Bin 孫臏 (d. 316 BC), Han Fei 韓非 (d. 233), etc. Sima Qian's depiction of these suffering writers constituted his self-portrayal, see *SJ* 130.3300 and *HS* 62.2733; see also Durrant, *Cloudy Mirror*, 14-27, Fuehrer, "Court Scribe's *Eikon Psyches*," 171–179, and Li Wai-Yee, "Letter to Ren An and Authorship in the Chinese Tradition," 97–100.

[29] *SJ* 47.1921.

> 孔子貧且賤。及長，嘗為季氏史，料量平；嘗為司職吏而畜蕃息，由是為司空。已而去魯，斥乎齊，逐乎宋、衛，困於陳、蔡之間，於是反魯。孔子長九尺有六寸，人皆謂之“長人”而異之。魯復善待，由是反魯。[30]
>
> Confucius was poor and humble. When [he] grew older, [he] once served as a scribe for the Ji clan, [and his] measurements were fair. [He] once served as pasturage manager, and the herds multiplied. Because of this, [he] became Minister of Works. Soon after, [he] left Lu, was rejected in Qi, driven out from Song and Wei, trapped between Chen and Cai, and upon this [he] returned to Lu. Confucius' height was nine *chi* and six *cun*. People invariably called him a "tall man" and regarded him as extraordinary.[31] Lu treated [him] kindly again, therefore [he] returned to Lu.

In the *Gushi*, this passage is completely rearranged. Su Zhe first moved the sentence about Confucius' height to the beginning of this passage, presumably because it looked somewhat out of place in the *Shiji* account. Also, he aligned with the wording of a parallel passage in *Mengzi* 5B.14 and replaced *jishi shi* 季氏史 (scribe for the Ji clan) with *weili* 委吏 (granary clerk).[32] This move is indicative of Su Zhe's adherence to received classical texts, but I will get back to this point later and show that his adherence is not without reservation. For the time being, let us first look at the most significant alteration of Sima Qian's summary. In the *Gushi,* the outline of a series of frustrations in Confucius' career was entirely omitted and substituted by an alternative summary that created a rather different image of these journeys:

> 夫孔子去魯凡十三年，適衛者五，適陳、適蔡者再，適曹、適宋、適鄭、適葉、適楚各一，諸侯皆莫能用，卒自衛反魯。[33]
>
> Confucius had left Lu for thirteen years in total. [He] went to Wei five times, to Chen and Cai twice, to Cao, Song, Zheng, She and Chu once respectively. Of all titled lords, none was able to put [him] to use. In the end [he] returned from Wei to Lu.

Su Zhe's summary of Confucius' career is worth further discussion because it is significantly different from the *Shiji* version in four aspects:

---

[30] *SJ* 47.1909.

[31] There is controversy as to whether this measurement should be interpreted according to the standards of the Western Han or those of the state of Lu during the Zhou. Nine *chi* and six *cun* corresponded to about 2.22 m in the Western Han. Weights and measures varied in different areas prior to the standardisation under the Qin. So far there is no sufficient evidence of the length of a *chi* in the state of Lu; see Qiu Guangming et al., *Duliangheng juan,* 68–70 and 116–172.

[32] See *Mengzi*, 10B.5b (185). The wording *weili* is also transmitted in the *Suoyin* commentary on the *Shiji,* see *SJ* 47.1909; see also Wang Shumin, *Shiji jiaozheng,* 47.1729–1730.

[33] Su Zhe, *Gushi*, vol. 4, 183/31.7b.

1) Its location in the whole chapter;

2) Its summarising strategy;

3) Its interpretation of Confucius' return to Lu; and

4) Its main verbs, changing from passive to active mode.

As mentioned above, in the *Shiji* version the summary is placed at the beginning of the account of Confucius' political career, when he served as a minor official in his home state. Presented at this juncture, this summary guides the reader on what to expect from the rest of Confucius' lifetime. It gives a preview of the remaining narrative, suggesting that what awaited Confucius is nothing but a series of disappointments and dangers.[34] In fact, what immediately follows this summary does not seem all that depressing. Confucius spent most of his early career in his home state, Lu, and achieved considerable success in his 50s. He served as Minister of Zhongdu (*Zhongdu zai* 中都宰), followed by appointments as Minister of Works (*sikong* 司空) and Grand Minister of Justice (*dasikou* 大司寇). However, the summary leaves out all these achievements. Instead, it presents Confucius' political career as starting in minor positions and finishing after a series of disappointments in various states. No matter how successful Confucius was in Lu for some time, the reader would have born in mind that his good days were coming to an end. In other words, through the content of this summary and its location in the whole narrative, Sima Qian managed the reader's expectations, guided the way in which the entire narrative was to be perceived and set the tone for a specific interpretation of the legacy of Confucius. The final remark of the *Shiji* chapter suggests that, despite his humble birth status, Confucius gained tremendous posthumous success that could not be achieved even by a sovereign.[35] In light of this, we may surmise that the summarising passage positioned in an early stage of the entire narrative serves to draw the contrast between Confucius' frustrations during his lifetime and his prodigious posthumous reputation.

[34] See Hardy, *Worlds of Bronze and Bamboo*, 156–157.

[35] See Sima Qian, *SJ* 47.1947.

Su Zhe was clearly up to something different. In the *Gushi* narrative, the passage that is comparable to the *Shiji* summary appears much later. Placed after the account on Confucius' most successful period in Lu, Su Zhe's summary only appears after about one third of the entire narrative. It is not presented as a summary of the whole political career of Confucius (as the *Shiji* summary does) but only as a summary of what happened after he left Lu. Su Zhe's summary gives a pause to the narrative and sends out a different message to the reader. The previous phase (serving in Lu) had finished and, from this point onwards, Confucius' life entered a new phrase (journeys to various states).

As for the reason behind such a design, the final remark of this chapter provides a hint. Su Zhe indicated that Confucius' departure from Lu marked the start of his journeys to "select a ruler" (*ze jun* 擇君).[36] This interpretation of Confucius' journeys is distinct from Sima Qian's interpretation and leads Su Zhe to adopt a different summarising strategy. The *Shiji* summary highlights the most frustrating experiences and lists them roughly according to the order in which they took place. In the *Gushi* version, however, Su Zhe discarded the chronological order and turned to present the frequency of Confucius' journeys to each of those states. Yet, he did not just provide what he considered to be a factual report about the count of how many times Confucius went to a certain place. Amongst the eight destinations mentioned, the state of Wei stands out in the statistics. In the *Shiji* summary, it is just one of the several places where Confucius once had a hard time, but Su Zhe expounded on the significance of Confucius' journey to Wei in his final remark:

> 當是時，諸侯無可言者。衛靈公雖無道，而善用人，"仲叔圉治賓客，祝鮀治宗廟，王孫賈治軍旅"，以無失其國。孔子疑可輔焉，是以去魯，三年而往反於衛者四。及知其不用，然後適陳、適蔡皆再。孔子之於陳、蔡，無取焉耳。陳、蔡近於楚，而楚昭王、葉公諸梁，一時賢君臣也。磐桓以竢焉，前後六年。見葉公不合，卒見昭王。將用之矣，而子西間之，昭王亦死。知諸侯無復

[36] Su Zhe, *Gushi*, vol.4, 194/31.21a.

> 可與共事者，然後浩然有歸老之意。然猶反於衛，五年以須魯人之招也。蓋“翔而後集”故歟？[37]
>
> At that time, there was no titled lord with whom [he] could talk. Although Duke Ling of Wei [540–493 BC, r. 534–493 BC] did not follow the Way, [he] was good at putting people to use. “Zhongshu Yu [d. 480 BC] ministered diplomatic guests; Priest Tuo [fl. sixth–fifth century BC] ministered ancestral temples and Wangsun Jia [fl. sixth century BC] ministered military troops”[38] – thereby [Duke Ling of Wei] did not lose his state. Confucius suspected that [he] could serve there, thus left Lu, and within three years went back to Wei four times. After [he] realised he would not be put to use, [he] went to Chen and Cai twice. In Chen and Cai, Confucius simply found nothing to value there. Chen and Cai were close to Chu, and King Zhao of Chu [d. 489 BC] and Zhuliang, Duke of She [fl. sixth–fifth century BC] were worthy rulers and subjects of that time. [Confucius] lingered and waited there for altogether six years. Seeing that Duke of She did not accord [with him], [Confucius] finally visited King Zhao of Chu. [King Zhao of Chu] was about to put him to use, but Zixi [d. 479 BC] alienated him, and also King Zhao died. [Confucius] knew there was no longer anybody among titled lords with whom [he] could work. Thereafter, [he] irrevocably had the intention to return and grow old. Nevertheless, [he] returned to Wei, staying for five years to await the beckoning of the people of Lu. Perhaps it was because [he wanted to] “circle around and then alight?”[39]

In this passage, Su Zhe introduced two utterances, transmitted as *Lunyu* 10.21 and 14.19, that Sima Qian did not use in his reconstruction of Confucius' life. Also, Su Zhe made it clear that Confucius' wandering among various states was a conscious decision, or even a strategy. The Confucius in Su Zhe's presentation is not a poor man who was rejected wherever he went, as presented in the *Shiji* version. Confucius himself decided to "circle around" (*xiang* 翔), and the purpose of these journeys was, for Su Zhe, to find a right timing and place to "alight" (*ji* 集). An important piece of evidence for this, so Su Zhe argued, is that Confucius paid considerable

[37] Su Zhe, *Gushi*, vol.4, 193–194/31.21a.

[38] This is a direct quote from *Lunyu* 14.19, see *Lunyu zhushu,* 14.10b (127). Note that the punctuation in the *San Su quanshu* edition does not provide indication of direct quote in Su Zhe's text.

[39] This is a verbatim quote from *Lunyu* 10.20, see *Lunyu zhushu,* 10.12a (91): 色斯舉矣, 翔而後集. There is controversy surrounding this excerpt, including whether it is to be read with *Lunyu* 10.21 and what exactly is the implication. The passage Su Zhe quoted, *xiang er hou ji*, is not at the centre of these debates. Nevertheless, it is perhaps worth noting that by Su Zhe's days, at least three influential commentaries on the *Lunyu* were available, including commentaries by He Yan 何晏 (189?–249), Huang Kan 皇侃 (488–545), and Xing Bing 邢昺 (931–1010). These three commentaries do not exhibit an obvious disagreement regarding *Lunyu* 10.20 and 10.21; see *Lunyu jijie yishu*, 5.143 and *Lunyu zhushu*, 10.12a–12b (91). For altenative readings, see Yang Bojun, *Lunyu yizhu*, 108, Lau, *Analects,* 105, and Slingerland, *Confucius Analects*, 109–110.

attention to Wei, whose ruler was described by Confucius himself as a person who was good at recognising and appointing worthy men.

Moving towards the end of Confucius' journey to various states, the *Shiji* and *Gushi* both mention that Confucius returned to Lu. The summary in the *Shiji* version gives the impression that Confucius had no choice but to return to Lu, which turned out to be the only state that was friendly to him (*Lu fu shandai, you shi fan Lu* 魯復善待，由是反魯). Yet, Su Zhe provided a new interpretation of Confucius' return and put the blame entirely on the inability of the rulers (*zhuhou jie mo neng yong* 諸侯皆莫能用). Corresponding to this interpretation, he added a sentence towards the end of his narrative of Confucius' journeys:

> 孔子既歷聘諸國，其君無足與成事者，將歸老於魯。[40]
> Confucius had visited various states one by one, [but] none of the rulers was [capable] enough to achieve things with [him]. [He] was going to return and grow old in Lu.

This passage echoes statements that "there was no titled lord with whom he could talk" (*zhuhou wu ke yan zhe* 諸侯無可言者) and that Confucius "knew there was no longer anybody among titled lords with whom [he] could work" (*zhi zhuhou wu fu ke yu gongshi zhe* 知諸侯無復可與共事者) in Su Zhe's final remark. We can observe that in the *Gushi* version, Confucius' problem is not so much about getting a position, but getting a position to work with the right person. In this version, Confucius has the initiative in his life and, instead of being driven away in various states, he makes the decision to leave because none of their rulers were worthy of his service. In other words, Confucius is depicted as a person who is making choices instead of being chosen.

To reinforce this reading of Confucius as a proactive figure, Su Zhe changed the wording here and there. In the summary of the *Shiji* chapter, the particles *hu* 乎 can be read as passive markers or markers of locative relation, but in the given context, the main verbs (*chi* 斥/reject,

[40] Su Zhe, *Gushi*, vol. 4, 188/31.15a.

zhu 逐/drive out and *kun* 困/trap) unambiguously convey a passive voice, giving the impression that Confucius is a recipient of the action imposed on him. All these verbs are replaced by *shi* 適 (to go) in the *Gushi* version, and the action agent is nobody but Confucius himself. This changes the whole picture remarkably. The man who was repeatedly rejected, as depicted in the *Shiji*, completely disappears, and a new Confucius emerges as a man whose life is made up by a series of conscious decisions made by himself.

It would appear that Su Zhe was rather consistent in applying the technique of changing the passive voice into an active one. Another example can be found in his account of one of the most dangerous and distressful moments in Confucius' life. On his way to Chen, he passed by Kuang, where a Lu official, Yang Hu 陽虎 (fl. sixth–fifth century BC), once used violence against local people.[41] Confucius was mistakenly thought to be Yang Hu and thus, according to the *Shiji*, harshly treated:

> 拘焉五日，顏淵後，子曰："吾以汝為死矣。"顏淵曰："子在，回何敢死！"匡人拘孔子益急，弟子懼。[42]
>
> [Confucius] was restrained there [in Kuang] for five days. Yan Yuan came later. The Master said: "I thought you were dead." Yan Yuan said: "You Master are still alive, how would I dare to die!" The people of Kuang restrained Confucius even more anxiously, [and his] disciples were frightened**.**

We have mentioned above that Su Zhe followed *Mengzi* 5B.14 and replaced "scribe for the Ji clan" in the *Shiji* with "granary clerk." Here again we find a passage in classical texts parallel to the *Shiji* account of the episode in Kuang. The dialogue between Confucius and Yan Yuan is transmitted as *Lunyu* 11.21, but the underlined passages are not present.[43] Su Zhe dropped the second underlined passage that described the increasing danger of the situation (*Kuang ren*

[41] See *SJ* 47.1923.

[42] *SJ* 47.1923, my underlining.

[43] See *Lunyu zhushu*, 11.8b (99).

ju Kongzi yi ji, dizi ju 匡人拘孔子益急，弟子懼).[44] His handling of the first underlined passage is more intriguing. The *Shiji* account provides the only extant testimony to the duration of Confucius' detention. Su Zhe kept the duration, but he had *ju wu ri* 居五日 ("stayed for five days" or just "five days passed") instead.[45] That is to say, the *Gushi* narrative presents a Confucius *staying,* not restrained, in Kuang due to a mistaken identification. With the keyword *ju* 拘 (hold, restrain) and the presence of terrified disciples wiped out from the picture, Su Zhe's narrative substantially decreases the tension, and hardly any trace of danger can be detected from his account of this episode.

One may say that the *Shiji* version of this episode is more expressive and presents a more dramatic scene, whereas the *Gushi* version clearly tunes it down and thus appears rather descriptive or even dull. However, suggestive and expressive narratives usually require a higher degree of interpretation by the narrator. We do not know how Sima Qian came to know, for instance, that the men holding Confucius and his disciples were gradually more "anxious" and that the disciples were "frightened." They certainly add to the tension of the dramatic scene, but there is no (extant) evidence supporting them as historical facts. Sima Qian might have had access to additional sources that provided him with this kind of information,[46] but the possibility remains that it was all up to Sima Qian's assumption of what must have happened in such a situation. Psychological depictions of historical figures always require a certain

[44] Su Zhe made the same decision on another similar occasion. When Confucius was again surrounded by armed forces later in Pu 蒲, his disciple Gongliang Ru 公良孺 (fl. fifth century BC) sighed about the frequent danger he and his teacher had encountered. Su Zhe deleted this comment from "Kongzi liezhuan" and put it in "Kongzi dizi liezhuan" 孔子弟子列傳 (Arrayed Traditions of Confucius' Disciples), see *SJ* 47.1923, Su Zhe, *Gushi*, vol.4, 185/31.9b and vol. 4, 220/32.33b–34a; see also appendix B.

[45] Su Zhe, *Gushi*, vol. 4, 184/31.8a. The two words *ju* 拘 and *ju* 居 were near homophones, read *kjo* and *kju,* respectively, in Middle Chinese reconstructions. It is perhaps also noteworthy that in the *Guangyun, ju* 居 is listed under the *yu* 魚 rhyme and *ju* 拘 under the *yu* 虞 rhyme. Su Zhe was a native of Meishan 眉山 (belonging to Yizhou 益州 during the Northern Song; in modern Sichuan) that typically did not different these two rhymes in the local dialect, see *Guangyun,* "Yun shang ping" 韻上平, 2b–3a: 梁、益則平聲似去，又支脂、魚虞共為一韻; see also Lu Guoyao, "Lun Song ciyun ji qi yu Jin Yuan ciyun de bijiao," 139.

[46] One of such sources is the oral tradition, see Durrant, *Cloudy Mirror,* 34.

degree of conjecture, and here is precisely what different interpreters can manoeuvre. Su Zhe clearly saw this niche and played with the narrative, giving an account that remained faithful to the *Lunyu* and, at the same time, amplifies Confucius' dignity.

Su Zhe's reconstruction of Confucius' departure from Lu provides a more complex example of how he contextualised classical sources used in the *Shiji* in a different manner.

Before going to Su Zhe's account of this episode, we first look at the *Shiji* version with which he worked. According to *Shiji* chapter 47, Confucius acted as Prime Minister (*shexiangshi* 攝相事) at the age of fifty-six in his home state, Lu.[47] Thanks to his work, Lu was so well-governed that the neighbouring state of Qi felt threatened. As Qi started to consider giving some land to Lu in exchange for peace, an advisor came up with the idea of trying to corrupt (*ju* 沮) their rival first. Thereupon, some beautiful dancing girls and fine horses from Qi were sent as a gift to Lu, performing outside a city of Lu.[48] The *Shiji* version of this event follows:

> 季桓子微服往觀再三，將受，乃語魯君為周道游，往觀終日，怠於政事。子路曰："夫子可以行矣。"孔子曰："魯今且郊，如致膰乎大夫，則吾猶可以止。"桓子卒受齊女樂，三日不聽政；郊，又不致膰俎於大夫。孔子遂行。[49]
>
> Ji Huanzi wore plain-clothes and went to watch [the girls and music] several times. When [he] was about to accept [them], [he] asked Duke [Ding of] Lu to roam all over the streets. [They] went to watch [the girls and music] the whole day and neglected governmental affairs. Zilu said: "Master, you can leave." Confucius said: "Now Lu is about to perform a ritual in the suburbs. If [they] send roasted [sacrificial] meat to the grand ministers, then I can still stay." Ji Huanzi finally accepted the girls and music from Qi and did not attend to governmental [affairs] for three days. [After] the ritual in the suburbs, no plate of roasted [sacrificial] meat was sent to the grand ministers. Confucius then left.

In this passage, the *Shiji* narrative makes an attempt (that is indeed the earliest one known to us) to merge two accounts that are separately (and arguably later) transmitted in the *Lunyu* and the *Mengzi* so as to reconstruct the event that triggered the departure of Confucius from Lu.

[47] *SJ* 47.1917 and Su Zhe, *Gushi*, vol. 4, 183/31.6b.

[48] *SJ* 47.1918 and Su Zhe, *Gushi*, vol.4, 183/31.6b.

[49] *SJ* 47.1918.

Recent scholarship has questioned the extent to which received editions of the *Lunyu* and *Mengzi* can represent these textual sources available in Sima Qian's days, but it is clear that Sima Qian had access to textual sources that transmitted utterances of Confucius and Mencius.[50] The *Shiji* passage translated above contains an account parallel to *Lunyu* 18.4:

> 齊人歸女樂，季桓子受之，三日不朝，孔子行。[51]
> The people of Qi gave girls and music as presents. Ji Huanzi accepted them and did not attend the court for three days. Confucius left.

This incident is also recorded in the *Hanfeizi*.[52] However, there are significant differences in orthography and narrative details between the *Hanfeizi* account and *Lunyu* 18.4. It is most likely that they represent different textual traditions recording the same incident, and the *Shiji* account displays more similarities with *Lunyu* 18.4. First, *Lunyu* 18.4 and the *Shiji* account both have Ji Huanzi as the receiver of the gift from Qi, whereas the *Hanfeizi* account has Duke Ai of Lu 魯哀公 (d. 468 BC; r. 494–468 BC) instead. Second, the passage *san ri bu ting zheng* 三日不聽政 (did not attend to governmental [affairs] for three days) in the *Shiji* account is parallel to *san ri bu chao* 三日不朝 (did not attend the court for three days) in *Lunyu* 18.4. Yet, this detail is absent from the *Hanfeizi* account.

The other incident compiled into the *Shiji* finds its parallel in *Mengzi* 6B.6:

> 孔子為魯司寇，不用，從而祭，燔肉不至，不稅冕而行。不知者以為為肉也，其知者以為為無禮也。乃孔子則欲以微罪行，不欲為苟去。君子之所為，眾人固不識也。[53]
> Confucius served as Minister of Justice in Lu and was not put to use. [He] attended the sacrifice as an accompanier. The roasted [sacrificial] meat did not arrive, [and he] left without taking off the [ritual] cap. Those who do not understand [him] think that [he

[50] On discrepancies between Confucius' utterances transmitted in *Shiji* chapter 47 and those transmitted in the *Lunyu,* see Kaneto, "Shiki 'Rongo' kō," 19–26, Hunter, "Sayings of Confucius, Deselected," 181–187, and Fuehrer, "Sima Qian as a Reader," 1-19. On the commentarial traditions and editing of *Mengzi* during the Han, see Fuehrer, "*Mencius* for Han Readers," 506–510.

[51] *Lunyu*, 18.2b (164).

[52] The incident recorded in the following passage is also recorded in the *Han Fei zi,* see *Han Fei zi,* 10.8a. However, there are significant differences in orthography and narrative details between the *Han Fei zi* account and the *Shiji* account, making it likely that they represent different textual traditions representing the same incident.

[53] *Mengzi*, 12a.11a (214).

left] because of the meat, [whereas] those who understand him think that [he left] because there was no [proper] ritual. [The truth] is that Confucius would leave at a minor fault rather than simply leave. The behaviour of a gentleman is certainly not comprehensible to the mass of commoners."

The two accounts are seemingly contradictory: *Lunyu* 18.4 attributes Confucius' departure to Ji Huanzi accepting the gifts, while *Mengzi* 6B.6 connects it with the failure to deliver the sacrificial meat to the grand ministers after the ritual. However, the *Shiji* accepts both accounts and put them together in a presumably imaginary sequence, with the event recorded in *Lunyu* 18.4 put before that from *Mengzi* 6B.6. In the *Shiji,* there is even a witness and participant at this event, namely Confucius' disciple Zilu 子路 (542–480 BC), who reportedly found the situation unbearable and suggested Confucius should leave. It is noteworthy that in the *Shiji,* Zilu frequently appeared unhappy about the Master. As a person associated with courage and uprightness, he rarely concealed his discontentment and sometimes challenged Confucius in a blunt way.[54] Given this, it seems understandable that Zilu was the first to complain about the corruption of the ruler. Compared to him, Confucius, though conceivably disappointed, seemed reluctant to leave right away. In hopes of mitigating the problem, he decided to give another opportunity to the ruler of Lu, which ended up with another disappointment and led to his departure. In the *Shiji,* the seemingly contradictory records of *Lunyu* 18.4 and *Mengzi* 6B.6 become compatible and are woven into one storyline. They are not regarded as two versions of one story, but as two partial accounts of the same story that emphasise different episodes that essentially took place in succession.

Su Zhe followed the sequence proposed by the *Shiji*, but again with some amendments:

季桓子微服往觀，語魯君為周道游，觀終日，卒受之，三日不朝。孔子將行，而惡彰君之惡也。於是魯方郊，不致膰肉於大夫，孔子遂行。[55]

[54] For Zilu's character, see *SJ* 67.2191. Zilu is described as "unhappy" (*buyue* 不悅) and "irritated" (*yun* 慍) three times, see *SJ* 47.1914, 47.1920, and 47.1930. On another two occasions, Zilu explicitly challenged Confucius, see *SJ* 47.1924 and 47.1933.

[55] Su Zhe, *Gushi*, vol.4, 183/31.7a.

> Ji Huanzi wore plain-clothes and went to watch [the girls and music]. [He] asked Duke [Ding of] Lu to roam all over the streets. [They] watched [the girls and music] the whole day, finally accepted them, and did not attend the court for three days. Confucius was about to leave, but [he] hated to shed light on the ruler's misconduct. At that time, it happened that Lu performed a ritual in the suburbs and did not send roasted [sacrificial] meat to the grand ministers. Confucius then left.

In this version, the presence of Zilu is edited out. The narrative now conveys to the reader that it was Confucius himself who wanted to leave at a very early point. What made him hesitate was that his departure might bring people's attention to Ji Huanzi's misconduct. Therefore, he took advantage of another occasion, on which the ruler failed to comply with the ritual demands and distribute sacrificial meat to the grand ministers, and chose this to be a better time for leaving. Table 4.1 lays out the convergences and divergences of the four accounts regarding Confucius' departure from Lu.

Table 4.1. Different accounts of Confucius' Departure from Lu

	Lunyu 18.4	*Mengzi* 6B.6	*Shiji*	*Gushi*
Incident 1	Ji Huanzi indulged in the gifts from Qi and neglected state affairs.	N/A	Ji Huanzi indulged in the gifts from Qi and neglected state affairs.	Ji Huanzi indulged in the gifts from Qi and neglected state affairs.
Consequence 1	N/A	N/A	**Zilu was unhappy and advised Confucius to leave, but Confucius wanted to stay for further observation.**	**Confucius wanted to leave, but he hesitated because his departure might draw people's attention to the ruler's misconduct.**
Incident 2	N/A	The sacrificial meat was not distributed to grand ministers as it should have been.	The sacrificial meat was not distributed to grand ministers as it should have been.	The sacrificial meat was not distributed to grand ministers as it should have been.
Consequence 2	N/A	**Confucius detected the collapse of ritual.**	**Confucius was disappointed (again).**	**Confucius considered it a good time for leaving.**
Final result	Confucius left Lu.	Confucius left Lu.	Confucius left Lu.	Confucius left Lu.

When read separately in their own contexts, *Lunyu* 18.4 and *Mengzi* 6B.6 are both fairly clear in giving a cause for Confucius' departure, but the juxtaposition of the two incidents creates space for interpretation of how they are related to each other as well as to Confucius' final decision. Here is precisely where Su Zhe's interpretation set in. He disagreed with Sima

Qian on the conjecture of Confucius' thoughts and intentions. In the commentary inserted after the *Gushi* account of Confucius' departure, Su Xun 蘇遜 (fl. early twelfth century), Su Zhe's third son and assistant for the compilation of the *Gushi*, stated that Confucius was using the failure to deliver the sacrificial meat as a pretext (*tui fanrou* 託膰肉) to cover up the true reason for his departure, namely the ruler's indulgence in entertainment.[56] In other words, Su Zhe accepted the sequence of the two incidents recorded in *Lunyu* 18.4 and *Mengzi* 6B.6 as proposed in the *Shiji*, but he seemed uncomfortable with the weight given to these two incidents. The *Shiji* version only suggests a temporal relation between the two incidents, and Confucius' departure can be seen as a result of accumulative disappointments. However, Su Zhe was concerned with the question of which one played the decisive role in Confucius departure.

It is particularly intriguing that Su Zhe somewhat challenged *Mengzi* 6B.6 in downgrading the incident of the sacrificial meat to a peripheral status in Confucius' decision-making. Su Zhe discussed *Mengzi* 6B.6 on several occasions. To him, it was a typical example of the accounts in which Confucius' behaviour seems to contradict what one would expect of him. In an exam question asking for solutions to perplexing records in classical texts, Su Zhe explained the problem he had with *Mengzi* 6B.6:

> […] 仕而至於司冦，君臣之義不為淺矣。膰肉不至而行，何其輕君臣之義而重區區之微禮哉！此明於輕重者之所不為也。或曰：“膰肉不至，仲尼以為禮将從此而大壞，此所謂知幾者。”夫為大臣，知禮之将亡，不救而去，則又安用夫大臣者？故此将有微眇難見之意，而世或未之思。[57]
>
> […] [As the Master] took an official position as high as Minister of Justice, the duties between ruler and subject are not insignificant. [Records have it that he] left as the roasted [sacrificial] meat did not arrive. Why would [he] have made light of the duties of ruler and subject and weighted trivial ritual details?! This is [something] one would not do [if he] was clear about what to make light of and what to weigh. Some say: "[As] the roasted [sacrificial] meat did not arrive, Zhongni [i.e. the Master] thought that the ritual would collapse from then on. This is what is called 'a person who understands the incipient.'" As a grand minister, upon knowing that the ritual is about to perish, [he] left without rescuing [it]. Then what is the use of such a grand minister? Therefore,

[56] See Su Zhe, *Gushi*, vol.4, 183/31.7a.

[57] Su Zhe, *Luancheng ji,* 20.358.

there must be obscure hidden implication in this, but people of this world do not seem to have thought it out.

This excerpt reveals the root of Su Zhe's dissatisfaction with *Mengzi* 6B.6. From his perspective, a man in office should take it seriously to perform "duties between ruler and subject" (*junchen zhi yi* 君臣之義). The sense of duty and responsibility took a predominate position in Su Zhe's philosophical guidelines in his reading. Yet, *Mengzi* 6B.6 indicates that Confucius did not take up his responsibility to solve problems for the state but abandoned the state when problems occurred. Su Zhe found such a decision highly unlikely to have come from Confucius, who was the most venerated model of intellectuals and would not perform in a way that contradicted one's expectations of an educated man. That is to say, the problem Su Zhe had with *Mengzi* 6B.6 is in essence a conflict between his values and the classical text.

The first step Su Zhe took to reconcile this conflict was to believe in an "obscure hidden implication" (*you weimiao nanjian zhi yi* 有微眇難見之意) in *Mengzi* 6B.6. In contrast to those who "had not thought it out" (*wei zhi si* 未之思), Su Zhe mused over *Mengzi* 6B.6 and found his solution, which he explained further in his *Mengzi jie* 孟子解 (Explanations of the *Mencius*). Though he did not spell it out in the *Mengzi jie,* it is most likely that he took inspirations from the *Shiji.* Regarding the perceived perplexing account in the *Mengzi,* the *Shiji* account that fuses *Lunyu* 18.4 and *Mengzi* 6B.6 shows a way forward without explicitly challenging the authoritative status of the two classical texts. In the *Mengzi jie*, Su Zhe drew on the sequence laid out by the *Shiji* and expounded on his interpretation of Confucius' departure from Lu:

孔子之去魯，為女樂之故也。去於膰肉之不至，為君也。於其君之有大惡也，孔子有不忍行焉。於其君之無罪也，孔子有不安行焉。曰：“上以求免吾君，下以免我。”是以去於膰肉之不至。曰：“是可以辭於天下也。”[58]

Confucius' departure from Lu was because of the girls and music. Leaving at the time when the roasted [sacrificial] meat did not arrive was for the sake of the ruler. As for

[58] Su Zhe, *Luancheng houji*, 6.955.

> [showing that] his ruler had a gross misconduct, Confucius could not bear to act upon it. As for [pretending that] his ruler had no fault, Confucius was not comfortable to act upon it. [He would] say: "Above, [I] seek to free my ruler [from blame]. Below, [I] free myself [from being conscience-stricken]." Therefore [he] left at the time when the roasted [sacrificial] meat did not arrive. [He would] say: "In this way [I] can make [my] excuse to all under heaven."

This note was boiled down to "hated to shed light on the ruler's misconduct" (*wu zhang jun zhi e ye* 惡彰君之惡也) in the *Gushi* account of Confucius' departure from Lu. What we have seen from this example is how Su Zhe processed what he read. Due to his belief in the duties between ruler and subject and in the exemplariness of Confucius, he detected a problem when *Mengzi* 6B.6 contradicted what he would expect of Confucius. Yet, the authoritative status of *Mengzi* as a classical text posed a constraint. Su Zhe then drew on the *Shiji* to introduce *Lunyu* 18.4 into the reconstruction of the reason for Confucius' departure from Lu. He interpreted *Lunyu* 18.4 as the true reason and *Mengzi* 6B.6 as a pretext, which is not implied in any of his sources, thereby resolving the initial conflict without explicitly denying any classical text. At the same time, the exemplariness of Confucius remained intact. In the *Gushi* account, Confucius is presented as a person fully aware of the duties between ruler and subject. He avoided drawing attention to the ruler's misconduct, yet he would not blindly cover for his ruler and harm his own integrity as an intellectual. In choosing an appropriate moment to end this relationship, Confucius was also rightly performing his duties.

Going back to the *Shiji* version of Confucius' departure from Lu, the Confucius there seems more attached to his home state. Through the dialogue between him and Zilu, it can be discerned that he wanted to stay despite his disappointment, but later the ruler failed him again and again, leaving him no choice but to leave. In the *Gushi* version, however, we see a more decisive Confucius, who took actions by himself from beginning to end. He had the intention to leave as early as when the ruler accepted the gift, and his delay was no more than a strategic one. Given the structural design of the chapter, it seems that Su Zhe perceived Confucius' departure from Lu as a watershed. It was a result of Confucius' disappointment in the ruler of

his home state and opened a new chapter of his life in which he was persistently in search of a new ruler to serve (*ze jun* 擇君).

To sum up, in the *Gushi* Su Zhe presented a coherent account of a Confucius who made decisions. This Confucius decided to leave Lu, chose the appropriate time to leave, and evaluated whether rulers in other states deserved his service. When his persistent search did not prove fruitful, he chose to grow old in his hometown. By making subtle changes to the *Shiji* narrative, Su Zhe replaced the frustrated Confucius that constantly met with adversity with a Confucius who persistently sought someone worthy of his talents. It is impossible to determine whether this perception of Confucius is a more faithful representation of the historical Confucius, but it would appear that the Confucius in the *Gushi* was not Su Zhe's idiosyncratic perception. In the next section, I bring in the viewpoints of Su Zhe's contemporaries in order to reveal where Su Zhe stood in his days regarding the understanding of Confucius' persona.

Family Style or Contemporary Spirit?

In chapter three, we have discussed parts of Su Shi's essay on Jia Yi, in which he argued that Jia Yi's encounters should be understood as Jia Yi's failure to make use of Emperor Wen of Han, not the other way around.[59] After the analysis of the *Gushi* account of Confucius' life, it seems plausible to argue that these two Su brothers shared the view that an intellectual has the initiative in hand when it comes to the relationship between ruler and subject. This shared understanding becomes particularly clear when Su Shi listed two exemplars that intellectuals should look up to, namely Confucius and Mencius. The way he presented the conduct of these two masters is highly comparable to his brother's perception:

> 仲尼聖人，歷試於天下，苟非大無道之國，皆欲勉强扶持，庶幾一日得行其道。"將之荆，先之以子夏，申之以冉有。"[60] 君子之欲得其君，如此其勤

[59] See Su Shi, *Su Shi wenji,* 4.106; see also chapter three.

[60] See *Liji zhushu*, "Tangong shang" 檀弓上, 8.7b (145).

也！孟子去齊，三宿而後出晝，猶曰：“王其庶幾召我！”[61] 君子之不忍棄其君，如此其厚也！公孫丑問曰：“夫子何為不豫？”孟子曰：“方今天下，捨我其誰哉？而吾何為不豫？”[62] 君子之愛其身，如此其至也！夫如此而不用，然後知天下之果不足與有為，而可以無憾矣。[63]

Zhongni [i.e. Confucius], the sage, tried out, one by one, all under heaven. As long as it was not a state with absolutely no trace of the Way, [he] always wanted to make an effort to support it, hoping that his Way could be put into practice one day. “[When he] was about to go to Jing [i.e. Chu], [he] sent Zixia [fl. fifth century BC] first and continued with Ranyou [fl. sixth century BC].” A gentleman would want to win over his ruler, such is his diligence! [When] Mencius left Qi, [he only] went out of Zhou after staying three nights,[64] still saying, “Perhaps the king would summon me!” A gentleman would not bear to abandon his ruler. Such is his sincerity! Gongsun Chou [fl. fourth–third century BC] asked, saying, “Why are you, master, unhappy?” Mencius said, “In this world of today, who can possibly [bring about peace and order] if not me? Why would I be unhappy?” A gentleman would treasure himself, such is his extreme! Being such [a gentleman] yet not put to use, [he] thence knows that all under heaven is indeed not worth having achievements with and that [he] can have no regret.

This passage brings together a *Liji* passage, *Mengzi* 2B.12 and *Mengzi* 2B.13, forming a parallel presentation of three cases. In short, Su Shi argued that a gentleman should try everything he can to realise his ambitions and not give up hope easily. But this is only the obvious part. The more interesting thing is the presumption underlined by the way Su Shi put this argument. In his presentation, Su Shi placed the *junzi* 君子 (gentleman) at centre stage. The passage “knowing that all under heaven is indeed not worth having achievements with” (*zhi tianxia zhi guo bu zu yu youwei* 知天下之果不足與有為) immediately recalls Su Zhe’s passage “knowing there was no longer anybody among titled lords with whom [he] could work” (*zhi zhuhou wu fu ke yu gongshi zhe* 知諸侯無復可與共事者). Such wording suggests an envisaged power relationship between a ruler and a gentleman that featured the superiority of the gentleman. As Su Zhe did in the *Gushi*, Su Shi dictated his imagination of an ideal persona of Confucius and of Mencius in his reading of classical texts. He presented the two venerated masters as fully

[61] See *Mengzi* 2B.12 in *Mengzi zhushu,* 4B.9b–10a (84).

[62] See *Mengzi* 2B.13 in *Mengzi zhushu*, 4B.11a–11b (85).

[63] Su Shi, *Su Shi wenji,* 4.105–106.

[64] Zhao Qi 趙岐 (108–201) glosses Zhou 晝 as a place in the southwest of Qi. It was a town on Mencius’s way back to his home state, Zou; see *Mengzi zhushu,* 4B.8a–8b (83).

aware of their intellectual privileges and sparing no effort to realise their ambitions, and Jia Yi was found at fault as he gave up faith in himself too easily after being rejected just once.

It is not surprising to find the two Su brothers sharing the same perception of Confucius as a proactive figure. However, Wang Anshi, who stood politically on the opposite side to the Su brothers, expressed strikingly similar views and applied same narrative techniques in his presentation of Confucius' life. Wang Anshi's "Xingshu" 行述 (Account of Conduct) starts out with a reproach of those who imitated Confucius by aiming at the realisation of their Ways. Following that is a brief account of Confucius' life that stresses:

1) Confucius felt obliged to leave Lu as the ruler neglected state affairs due to the gifts from Qi;
2) He went to Wei because Duke Ling of Wei, though not practising the Way, seemed capable of appointing worthy men;
3) He returned to his home state Lu as he grew old.[65]

In this brief account, which is packed in slightly more than a hundred characters, Wang Anshi agreed with Su Zhe on every departure from the *Shiji* version. Further to that, Wang Anshi used a selection of verbs in his presentation of Confucius journeys among the various states: *shi* 食 (serve, receive an official salary), *shi* 適 (go), *zhi* 之 (go), *qu* 去 (leave) and *gui* 歸 (return). Just as in Su Zhe's narrative, there is no passive voice throughout Wang Anshi's account. As for what he made out of Confucius' life, he also stressed that the persistent pursuit, not the result of the search, defined the Master:

> 孔子之行如此，烏在其求行道也？夫天子諸侯不以身先於賢人，其不足與有為明也。孔子而不知，其何以為孔子也？曰："沽之哉！沽之哉！我待價者也。"[66] 僕僕然勞其身以求行道於世，是沽也。子路曰："君子之仕也，行其義

[65] See Wang Anshi, *Linchuan xiansheng wenji*, 67.11a–11b.

[66] Cf. *Lunyu* 9.13 in *Lunyu zhushu* 9.6a (79). The character 價 is written as 賈 in the transmitted *Lunyu.* However, the character 價 is attested in various sources, and Ruan Yuan notes that 價 is a non-standard graph (*suzi* 俗字) for 賈; see Ruan Yuan's collation notes (*jiaokan ji* 校勘記) in *Lunyu zhushu,* 9.4b (83).

> 也，道之不行，已知之矣。”[67] 蓋孔子之心云耳。然則孔子無意於世之人乎？曰：“道之將興歟？命也。道之將廢歟？命也。”[68] 苟命矣，則如世之人何？[69]
>
> With such conduct, how could Confucius have aimed at implementing his Way? As the Son of Heaven and various lords did not put themselves ahead of worthy men, it was clear enough that they were not worth working with. If Confucius did not know this, how could [he] be Confucius? [He] said, “Oh, I would sell it! I would sell it! I am just waiting for the right offer.” [70] Restlessly exhausting himself to seek the implementation of his Way in the world: this is to sell. Zilu said, “The gentleman takes office in order to do what is right. As for the Way not being realised [in the end], [he] already knew it.”[71] This is probably Confucius’ thought, and that is all. If so, does it mean that Confucius did not care about people in the world? [He] said, “Whether or not the Way is to flourish is a matter of fate. Whether or not the Way is to be discarded is also a matter of fate.”[72] If it is a matter of fate, how can people of the world be relevant?

From the beginning of this passage, Wang Anshi made it clear that “implementation of the Way” (*xingdao* 行道) was never the aim of Confucius, for he would have known that none of the contemporary lords was supportable and that the Way was bound to fall into disuse. Considering Wang Anshi himself as an extremely active politician during the eleventh century, one might even argue that he had known all along that his own Way could not be implemented in the end. But what defines a gentleman, for whom Confucius is the ultimate model, is the ability and willpower to stick to what he thinks he should do regardless of the actual result of his attempts. Towards the end of this passage, Wang Anshi even presented an almost eccentric persona of Confucius by suggesting that the Master was merely performing a gentleman’s duty and that people of the world might not have been his main concern.

Given all the similarities between the accounts presented by Wang Anshi and Su Zhe, one may even say that Su Zhe’s “Kongzi liezhuan” represents an expanded version of Wang Anshi’s “Xingshu,” which means that the perception of a proactive Confucius was not just a

[67] See *Lunyu* 18.7 in *Lunyu zhushu,* 18.5b (166).

[68] Cf. *Lunyu* 14.36 in *Lunyu zhushu,* 14.14a (129). The character *xing* 興 (rise, flourish) is *xing* 行 (practice) in the transmitted *Lunyu.*

[69] Wang Anshi, *Linchuan xiansheng wenji*, 67.11a–11b.

[70] Slingerland’s translation in his *Confucius Analects*, 91.

[71] Ibid., 218, with modifications.

[72] Ibid., 168, with modifications.

consensus between the Su brothers but also something shared by intellectuals beyond their circle. This perception constituted a shared horizon of Wang Anshi, Su Shi and Su Zhe and governed their reading of texts. The isolated utterances of Confucius and records of his conduct are transmitted in various texts that might well have been situated in different context, recorded by different hands for different purposes, or reflecting different stages of Confucius' teaching. Su Zhe, Su Shi and Wang Anshi were all well versed in these texts and each made an attempt to build up a coherent narrative out of them. Their presentations analysed above have singled out different selections of passages from the repertoire of received textual traditions, but the final products, namely the persona of Confucius they presented, are strikingly similar. It is difficult to tell how exactly the three pieces of writing are related to each other, partly because none of them can be dated precisely. Nevertheless, there is still something that can be said about what might have accounted for the convergences.

As discussed in chapter three, the Northern Song witnessed a significant change in the self-perception of intellectuals. When it came to the eleventh century, it is not uncommon to find scholars taking pride in their intellectual superiority and being well aware of their social duties as well as rights. Among their perceived rights was the authority to judge the ruler, and the emphasis on this right called for revision of all historical discourse on ruler-subject relations. Su Shi put forward that Jia Yi should have spared no effort in putting the emperor to use, and Cheng Yi 程頤 (1033–1107), who wrote an essay on a prominent advisor in the early Han, Zhang Liang 張良 (d. 186 BC), made exactly the same point. As opposed to the prevalent interpretation that regards Zhang Liang's success as a result of the ruler putting him to use, Cheng Yi stated that it was Zhang Liang who was able to put the emperor to use.[73] Another eleventh century scholar, Liu Ban 劉攽 (1022-1088), made an even stronger case. He held that

[73] See Zhu Xi, *Er Cheng yishu,* 19.25b: 人道高祖能用張良, 却不知是張良能用高祖; see also Wang Mai, "Gaodi lun er" 高帝論二 (On Emperor Gao II) in his *Yuxuan ji,* 3.6a.

men are by nature different in capacity, which also applies to any ruler. Therefore, a ruler with a small capacity would not be able to recognise, appreciate, and fully support a subject with a bigger capacity even when such a subject is around.[74] In other words, a real gentleman need not be disappointed if he does not have the appreciation of his ruler, for the reason might well be that the ruler cannot match up with him in capacity.

To claim authority of evaluating the ruler's capacity would appear rather daring in some other periods, but it seems to be a norm that can be openly discussed even directly to the sovereign during the eleventh century. Sun Jue 孫覺 (1028-1090) once presented substantial memorials to Emperor Renzong, giving advice regarding ruler-subject relations. In one of these memorials, he expounded on two types of people, the worthy (*xian* 賢) and the able (*neng* 能), that might come to offer their service to the authority:

> 謂之賢也，則仁且有智，德脩而才全，不以富貴貧賤動其心，不以用舍得喪違其操。人主不與之同量合德，則不可得而屈立其朝，而道不行則去。故道德之士，常擇君而後起，豈以人主之取舍輕重移其心哉！故人主之得此士也，大則師之，其次友之，則天下治矣。
> 謂之能也，則奔走役使之人耳。可貴可賤，可榮可辱，予奪而進退之，惟上所令，猶恐恐然，惟懼其君之厭己也。然而世無是人，則誰為君役，誰為君使者？故明主謹視其臣之賢能，而馭之各以其道。[75]
>
> [Those who are] regarded as worthy are humane and wise, accomplished in virtue and comprehensive in talent. [They] do not change their mind because of wealth or poverty, nobility or humbleness, and do not go against their integrity because of use or disuse, recognition or loss [of it]. If the master does not match up with them in terms of capacity and virtue, then he cannot obtain and yield [them] to serve at court. Yet when the Way is not implemented, they leave. Therefore, it is common that gentlemen of virtue only emerge after selecting a ruler. How is it possible that they change their mind because of a master's use or disuse, devaluing or valuing! Therefore, if the master encounters such gentlemen, the best thing to do is to treat them as instructors, and the second best is to treat them as equals, then all under heaven is well-governed. [Those who are] regarded as able are the people who just do the legwork and trifles. [They] can be made noble or humble, honoured or humiliated. It lies entirely at the sovereign's hands to make them gain or lose, move forward or backward, yet [they] still appear frightened, only fearing that the ruler dislikes them. However, if there are no such people in the world, then who would run errands for the ruler? Who would be

[74] Liu Ban, *Pengcheng ji*, 33.9b–10a.

[75] Yang Shiqi and Huang Huai, *Lidai mingchen zouyi*, 135.48b–49a.

> ordered about by the ruler? Therefore, a wise master would carefully examine the worthy or the able amongst his subjects and drive each of them in the appropriate way.

This passage provides a vivid illustration of how intellectuals negotiated with the monarchy. Sun Jue rose to high ranks at court and represented an intellectual that was well connected to prominent thinkers as well as politicians.[76] In the excerpt of the memorial quoted above, Sun Jue played a dual role. On one hand, he spoke for the social class of scholar-officials, with which he himself was identified, and explicitly requested the emperor to fully respect the pride and integrity of the most accomplished intellectuals, namely the truly worthy men (*xian* 賢). On the other hand, he also performed the duty of a subject and spoke for the emperor as he laid out the benefits and necessity of securing the service of mediocre men.

It would appear that these negotiations were rather effective. The very nature of Sun Jue's writing, a court memorial (*zou* 奏),[77] indicates that such request of respect for intellectuals was deemed acceptable in the communication with the sovereign. Intellectuals were much more self-confident than in the past, and those who took official positions felt free to admonish, remonstrate with and challenge their rulers.[78] Going back to the perception of Confucius, we can see that it is very much a projection of the self-perception of Su Zhe, Su Shi, Wang Anshi, Liu Ban as well as other leading intellectuals. This is a group of people who perceived themselves as intellectually superior to people around them, even including the ruler. In their perspective, Confucius, who eagerly engaged with politics and reportedly compiled the classics, was the paragon of intellectuals, the earliest and greatest exemplar of the group of scholar-officials. As the socio-political environment during the eleventh century allowed, if not

[76] For accounts of Sun Jue's intellectual background, family associations and political career, see Tuotuo, *Songshi* 344.10925–28.

[77] See Yang Shiqi and Huang Huai, *Lidai mingchen zouyi*, 135.47a.

[78] It has been well established that the Song times witnessed the summit of social and political status of intellectuals. For the transition from the Five Dynasties to early Northern Song, see Deng Xiaonan, *Zuzong zhi fa,* chapter 2; for a discussion of political status of *shi* 士 and the power negotiation between the monarchy and the prime minister, see Yu Ying-Shih, *Zhuxi de lishi shijie,* chapter 2–4.

encouraged, intellectuals to take great pride in their identity, Confucius could not have been a miserable person who was kicked out wherever he went as depicted in the *Shiji*. Instead, it should be that Confucius was voluntarily leaving in search for a good ruler that would match up with his virtues. Going back to Su Zhe's "Kongzi liezhuan," we can now conclude that he actually spelled out the Confucius which the eleventh century intellectuals had seen within textual traditions. Bearing this finding in mind, we move to discuss the significance of the *Gushi* from another perspective, namely the motivations of rewriting ancient history.

A Text to be Revered or Replaced?

In the analysis of the *Gushi*, we have seen how Su Zhe aligned historical narratives with classical texts. His engagement with historiography and adherence to classical texts resonated with his father's view on the reciprocal relationship between classical and historical scholarship. Su Xun famously stated, "Without histories, there is no way to manifest the evaluations in the classics; without the classics, there is no way to estimate the value in histories."[79] On the other hand, we have also seen how Su Zhe found the lacunae in his textual sources and read eleventh century values into them. His narratives in the *Gushi* are not mere repetitions of old narratives, but a product resulting from the urge to reconcile the conflict between textual traditions and contemporary values.

In his discussion of the *Gushi,* Sung Chia-fu points out another option of engaging with the *Shiji* that was available to Su Zhe, suggesting that he could have written a commentary on the *Shiji.* Writing commentaries is a traditional way of reflecting upon and elucidating a text, and to some extent this activity secures the transmission of scholarship that might be otherwise

[79] See Su Xun, *Jiayou ji*, "Shi lun shang" 史論上 (On History I), 9.1b-3b (229–230): 經不得史, 無以證其褒貶; 史不得經, 無以酌其輕重.

forgotten. In the case of the *Shiji,* nowadays we celebrate the commentaries of the three schools (*san jia zhu* 三家注). Yet, apart from their commentaries, we hardly know anything about these three scholars whose works are so much relied on in *Shiji* studies and beyond. In other words, if they had not annotated the *Shiji,* nobody would have remembered their names and works. Writing commentaries is thus a way to get one's name attached to a textual tradition, of which transmission is secured, and many readers aspired to have their works passed on to posterity along with recognised masterpieces.[80] As Su Zhe did not choose this path, Sung Chia-fu suggests that the *Gushi* is the product of Su Zhe's "unconventional and even idiosyncratic" way to "honour Sima and his *Shiji*."[81]

Sung Chia-fu's interpretation, however, seems to presume that the *Shiji* was a reputable text as it is nowadays. Su Zhe did praise Sima Qian for his contribution to historiography, but Su Zhe stated unambiguously that he compiled the *Gushi* because he found the *Shiji* unsatisfactory and in need of improvement. One might even argue that Su Zhe found the *Shiji* so fallacious in the presentation of antiquity that a revision would go beyond the capacity of a commentary. Generally speaking, revisions aim at furnishing the reader with an updated and, in the eyes of the author or editor, corrected version. The updated version is designed to stand alone and replace any older versions. In our case, Su Zhe provided an updated version of ancient history, cleared of perceived mistakes and errors made by Sima Qian. The title *Gushi* can even be regarded as an announced inclination to detach itself from the *Shiji* tradition, and Su Zhe might well have hoped to replace the delusive representation of antiquity in the *Shiji* with his new history.

[80] See Sung Chia-fu's discussion of Gao Wenhu's work on the *Shiji*, "Between Tortoise and Mirror," 269–270. His discussion focuses on the hope of being "transmitted along with the *Grand Scribe's Records*" (*yu taishigong shu bing chuan* 與太史公書並傳). This statement can actually be applied to any commentarial attempt regarding important texts. Of course, whether these commentarial works can indeed be transmitted along with the masterworks as planned is another issue.

[81] Sung Chia-fu, "Between Tortoise and Mirror," 268.

Su Zhe's attempt to rewrite history was not the only example in his days. In fact, a significant portion of recognised achievements of Song historiography consist of compilations based on pre-existing historical accounts. Such compilations include Sima Guang's *magnum opus*, *Zizhi tongjian*, part of which is touched upon in chapter three.[82] An important motivation of Sima Guang was his anxiety about the multiplication of historical accounts. As the overabundant written sources could take more than a lifetime to finish, he edited out the superfluous, singled out what he deemed important, and thereby produced a new representation of the past in a manageable size.[83]

There are more examples of rewritten histories during the Song, but their fate varies. Ouyang Xiu revised histories of the Tang and Five Dynasties, and it did not take long for them to be established as authoritative texts after their completion. Controversy arose as Ouyang Xiu strove for readability and literary elegance at the expense of veracious and detailed information.[84] Nevertheless, the advent of his new histories did pose significant threats to the old ones. The *Jiu Wudai shi* 新五代史 (Old History of the Five Dynasties) was forced out of circulation for a long time, and it was not until the Qing times that scholars endeavoured to reconstruct it.

Zheng Qiao's 鄭樵 (1104–1162) *Tongzhi* 通志 (Universal Treatise) represents a serious attempt to rewrite the history of all ages. This attempt famously produced the twenty *lüe* 略 (summarising treatises) on a wide range of topics, which are recognised as the best part of *Tongzhi*. Yet, it should be noted that the *Tongzhi* was designed to be a work aligning with the tradition of "universal history" (*tongshi* 通史) as established by the *Shiji.* Apart from the twenty treatises, Zheng Qiao presented a revised history of periods spanning from the beginning of

[82] For a study of Sima Guang's subtle changes of historical accounts, see Tillman, "Textual Liberties and Restraints in Rewriting China's Histories," 61–106.

[83] See Egan, "To Count Grains of Sand on the Ocean Floor," 45–50.

[84] See Ng and Wang, *Mirroing the Past*, 137.

Chinese civilisation until the dynasty prior to his own time. It is particularly intriguing that Zheng Qiao denounced Ban Gu for copying substantially from the *Shiji* and described him as a person who "had absolutely no scholarship and specialised only in plagiarism" (*quan wu xueshu zhuan shi piaoqie* 全無學術, 專事剽竊).[85] In his preface to the *Tongzhi*, Zheng Qiao took great pride in his twenty treatises, stating that they were based on his original research and not lifted from any previous history. But immediately after that, he excused himself for copying from previous annals and arrayed traditions and regarded them as records of facts that "do not increase because of wisdom or decrease because of ignorance" (*bu wei zhi er zeng bu wei yu er jian* 不為智而增，不為愚而減).[86] One might accuse Zheng Qiao of applying double standards here.[87] Or perhaps his eagerness to produce a comprehensive history surpassed his distaste for copying others' work. In any case, it would appear that his reproduction of history is far less acknowledged than the *Hanshu*, which he perceived as stemming from Ban Gu's "plagiarism." Zheng Qiao's twenty treatises, accounting for fifty-two out of the total two hundred scrolls of the *Tongzhi,* are sometimes reprinted separately, and the remaining three quarters of *Tongzhi* are subject to criticism and left to fall into disuse.[88]

When it comes to the *Gushi*, it is now an obsolete account. Unlike those who worked on contemporary or near contemporary periods, Su Zhe's subject matter is the history of antiquity that he never witnessed. He was dependent on the narratives that were readily available in the well-established textual traditions. Furthermore, Su Zhe's original discussions on various historical figures and events are well-documented in his other writings, so the *Gushi* is not

[85] Zheng Qiao, *Tongzhi,* "Zongxu" 總序 (Preface), 8b–9a.

[86] Zheng Qiao, *Tongzhi,* "Zongxu," 21a.

[87] See, for example, Ma Duanlin's criticism in his *Wenxian tongkao*, 201.34b–35a. Ma Duanlin also accuses Zheng Qiao of shamelessly copying Du You's 杜佑 (735–812) *Tongdian* 通典 (Comprehensive Compendium) in five of his treatises.

[88] For evaluations of Zheng Qiao's twenty *lüe* and his reproduction of history, see Ma Duanlin, *Wenxian tongkao*, 201.32b–35b and Yong Rong, *Tiyao*, 50.13b–6a.

necessary for those who are interested in Su Zhe's views on these matters. For these reasons, the nature of the *Gushi* became a matter of dispute among its readers. Bibliographers disagreed on the category under which it falls. Some disregarded the narratives and categorised it as "historical criticism" (*shiping* 史評), while others allocated it to the category of "miscellaneous histories" (*zashi* 雜史) or "alternative histories" (*bieshi* 別史).[89] Zheng Qiao, who himself endeavoured to produce a universal history (without being recognised so), regarded the *Gushi* as a "universal history."[90]

In fact, the *Gushi* did make its way to the reading lists of intellectuals during the periods that follow its completion. It was immediately published after its completion in 1095 and reprinted during subsequent dynasties.[91] Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130–1200) wrote substantial comments on it and regarded it as a more rewarding reading than the more popular *Shiji.* In his view, the *Gushi* was marred by Su Zhe's inclinations towards Daoism, yet it still far surpassed the works by Zhu Xi's contemporaries.[92] During the Song periods, we can also find Hu Zi 胡仔 (1095–1170), Hu Hong 胡宏 (1105–1161), Chao Gongwu 晁公武 (1105–1108), Chen Zhensun 陳振孫 (1179–1262), Luo Mi 羅泌 (1131–1189), and Huang Zhen 黃震 (1213–1281) extensively engaging with the *Gushi.*[93] Among these readers, Huang Zhen was a particularly

[89] For a discussion focusing on the differences between the *Gushi* and other works that are categorised as "historical criticism," see Sung Chia-fu, "Between Tortoise and Mirror," 271–76.

[90] Zheng Qiao, *Tongzhi,* 65.8a.

[91] See Su Zhe, *Gushi,* "*Gushi* Xulu," vol. 3, 348–350.

[92] See Zhu Xi, *Huian xiansheng Zhu wengong ji*, "Da Zhao Jidao" 答趙幾道 (Reply to Zhao Jidao), 54.31a–31b. For more of his comments on the *Gushi,* see Zhu Xi, *Huian xiansheng Zhu wengong ji*, "Da Cheng Yunfu" 答程允夫 (Reply to Cheng Yunfu), 41.8a–10a, "Da Lü Ziyue" 答呂子約 (Reply to Lü Ziyue), 48.19a–20a, "Du Sushi jinian" 讀蘇氏紀年 (Reading Mr Su's Chronology), 70.14a–17b, "Gushi yulun" 古史餘論 (More Remarks on Ancient History), 72.50a, and Li Jingde, *Zhuzi yulei,* 130.38b–39b, 135.15a, and 137.35b–36a. These comments are attached to the *San Su quanshu* edition of the *Gushi,* together with abundant entries found in annotated catalogues. The writing of this section has greatly benefited from materials collected there.

[93] See Hu Zi, *Kongzi biannian,* "Yuanxu" 原序 (Original Preface), 3b, Hu Hong, *Huangwang daji,* 34.6a, 37.4a, 51.4b, 52.11a, and 66.3b, Chao Gongwu, *Junzhai dushuzhi,* 7.302, Chen Zhensun, *Zhizhai shulu jieti,* 4.109, Luo Mi, *Lushi,* "Tiyao" 提要 (Summary), 2a, Huang Zhen, *Huangshi richao,* 51.1a–33b.

keen reader. He commented on each chapter based on a close comparison between the narratives and evaluative remarks in the *Shiji* and in the *Gushi.*

Yet, from Southern Song readers' comments on the *Gushi,* we can already see that eleventh century values embedded in Su Zhe's work had lost their appeal. Huang Zhen's note on "Kongzi liezhuan" is an excellent example at hand. After reading the *Gusih* account of Confucius' persistent pursuit, Huang Zhen regarded Su Zhe's interpretation as utterly wrong and enthusiastically restored the authority of the *Shiji* account. The only fault of the *Shiji* account, so Huang Zhen claimed, was that Confucius was depicted as coming from an "improper union" (*yehe* 野合).[94] In his view, Su Zhe failed to provide a more respectable account of Confucius' birth based on alternative records and only altered the passages where the *Shiji* rightly extols Confucius' virtues.[95]

It would appear that Huang Zhen's times called for yet another Confucius. The perception of Confucius as a dignified and persistent intellectual, which used to prevail during the eleventh century, came to be regarded as a misinterpretation by Southern Song scholars, among others in later periods.[96] This is, again, related to a shift of perspective. Along with the fall of the capital of the Northern Song arose new ideological inclinations that diverted intellectual concerns towards a stronger emphasis on moral authorities and an innate realisation of sagehood.[97] As more intellectuals chose to retire from active political life from the twelfth century onwards, the eleventh century perception of Confucius perhaps seemed too secular,

[94] *SJ* 47.1905. Cf. Hardy's reading "rustic union" in his *Worlds of Bronze and Bamboo,* 156.

[95] See Huang Zhen, *Huangshi richao,* 51.21b. For the accounts of Confucius' birth, see *SJ* 47.1905 and *Kongzi jiayu*, "Benxing jie" 本姓解, 9.10b; see also van Ess, "Einige Anmerkungen zur Biographie des Konfuzius im *Shih-chi* und vergleichbaren Stellen im *K'ung-tzu chia-yü*, Teil I," 159–163.

[96] For an example of later receptions of Su Zhe's account of Confucius, Chen Renxi 陳仁錫 (1581–1636) suggested that Su Zhe's account revealed nothing of the sagehood of Confucius, presumably because the Way of the sage was not yet fully understood in Su Zhe's times; see Su Zhe, *Gushi,* vol. 4, 195.

[97] See Liu, *China Turning Inward*, chapter 7 and Bol, *Neo-Confucianism in History*, 128–138.

and it had to give way to a new Confucius as an iconic moralist who was flawless in every aspect from birth to death.

Concluding Remarks

For readers of history nowadays, those interested in early China hardly pay any heed to the *Gushi* or take it as an important reference, but our analysis in this chapter has demonstrated its value as testimony to the interface between eleventh century intellectuals and their textual traditions. Considering the diverse and dynamic interactions between a text and its readers, the significance of reading activities is not just about what is read but also what is taken out from the read. From this perspective, Su Zhe's *Gushi* is a valuable documentation of the encounter between Su Zhe and the *Shiji,* detailing the points at which the horizons of the text and those of its reader stopped being fused and how the reader reacted when his values were in conflict with those proposed by the text. With a focused discussion of the "Kongzi liezhuan" in the *Gushi,* this chapter shows how Su Zhe read between constraint and invention.

Su Zhe's constraint was mainly posed by his textual sources, especially classical texts. As with many of his contemporaries, Su Zhe was concerned with the discrepancies between the *Shiji* and received classical texts and the conflicts within the classical texts. His efforts put into giving coherence to classical texts culminated in his writing on ancient history. Su Zhe's approach to the revision of the *Shiji* narratives of Confucius' life suggests a clear adherence to textual details of the received classical texts. The passages analysed in this chapter mainly concern Su Zhe's adherence to the *Lunyu* and the *Mengzi*, and they can be supplemented by other examples of him rejecting the *Shiji* narratives where they contradict other classical texts, especially the *Chunqiu.*[98]

[98] See, for example, Su Zhe, *Gushi*, vol. 3, 450/8.4a, 456/8.10a–10b, 499–500/11.12b–13b, and vol. 4, 203/32.10a–10b.

Notwithstanding his commitment to aligning the *Shiji* narratives with classical texts, Su Zhe still found his niche to exert the creative force of a reader. His revision of the *Shiji* narrative of Confucius' life demonstrates to what extent history can be rewritten within a semantic range of received textual traditions. By and large, Su Zhe's narrative was derived from the *Shiji,* but the subtle changes he made should not be overlooked. Taking advantage of the gaps within classical corpus and between classical texts and the *Shiji*, Su Zhe integrated his own conjectures and shifted the emphasis of the narrative. He changed the image of Confucius as a receiver of rejection, as depicted in the *Shiji,* into a Confucius who had his life firmly under control.

Su Zhe's depiction of a proactive Confucius would have seemed convincing to his contemporaries, regardless of social affiliations and political standpoints. In other eleventh century writings, Confucius was also interpreted in the same light. Here the Master was not perceived as a frustrated man who struggled to find a place within the political entity. He has become a dignified man who performed a gentleman's duties to the utmost. This perception of Confucius does not necessarily reveal the truth about the historical man, but it is the Confucius that eleventh century intellectuals wanted to see and aspired to emulate. This Confucius embodied eleventh century beliefs in the power of superior intelligence and a strong sense of responsibility for creating a better world. Given this, we can conclude that Su Zhe was writing a contemporary spirit into Confucius' life, and an important motivation of his revision of the *Shiji* was to manifest, via ancient history, values that the *Shiji* did not share or fully illustrated.

Eleventh century intellectuals are renowned for their inclinations to challenge previous verdicts on history. They might have found pleasure in developing dialectical discourses, but as we have seen in this chapter, their revisions of histories also represent the contemporary need to reconcile the conflicts between new values with old traditions. Because of the overabundance of textual sources and the increasing accessibility of them, it became a pressing issue to produce a more "appropriate" account of history. Various projects, state-sponsored or

private, aimed at reworking transmitted accounts and bringing new life to them, resulting in an unprecedented number of revisions of historical accounts. In this process, the received textual traditions proved to be rather flexible and remained instrumental in promoting new values. In the reconstruction of Confucius' life, the traditions that intellectuals engaged with were derived from hands to which the eleventh century level of self-confidence and privileges of intellectuals might have been rather alien. Yet, the revised account of Confucius' life in the *Gushi*, as well as in other eleventh century presentations, stemmed from the venerated classical texts in the same way as the pre-revision *Shiji* account. That is to say, they renewed the traditions by formulating their arguments based on resources available in those traditions.

However, the renewed traditions were subject to further revision in subsequent periods. Su Zhe's "Kongzi liezhuan" constituted an eleventh century protest against the depressing representation of the Master in the *Shiji*, yet this protest was itself protested as the readers of late twelfth and thirteenth centuries preferred a new Confucius that called for definite reverence. The *Gushi* never enjoyed the privileges given to the *Shiji*, but it preserved the perspective of its times and eventually managed to survive through the ages. It enables us to see a historical moment of lively interactions between the *Shiji* and its readers. Meanwhile, it also reminds us to consider how many such moments have contributed to and been forgotten in the constant regeneration of traditions.

Conclusion

> Dies ist die Antinomie der Philologie: man hat das *Alterthum* thatsächlich immer nur *aus der Gegenwart* verstanden - und soll nun *die Gegenwart aus dem Alterthum* verstehen?
>
> —Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche (1844–1900)[1]

Books try to install order, yet they await the reader to make them relevant to reality. Books aim to persuade the reader to follow a story, to believe in a conviction and/or to perceive things in certain ways. Yet, whether a reader is persuaded is a completely different issue. The reader's reception of a book can be entirely deduced from the linguistic devices of the text in the book, because reading is a process of negotiation between the book and its reader, in whose intellectual sphere different information and/or values are juxtaposed, accepted and confirmed, as well as neglected or rejected. In the end, it is not the book itself, but the readers' understanding of it that constitutes their beliefs and worldview that in turn serve as guidance for practice in life. Going back to Wallace Stevens line, "the reader became the book," we might want to add a note that the "becoming" would have been selective. In this study, I endeavoured to show the creative force of readers of a particular text in a particular historical period, that is eleventh century readers of the *Shiji.*

Encountering the *Shiji* in the Eleventh Century

In the wider context of the history of *Shiji* scholarship, the Northern Song is certainly not the most celebrated period. The production of commentaries on the entire *Shiji* reached a plateau. There was little in-depth historiographical or stylistic discussion, and a critical attitude seemed to prevail. Even on those rare occasions where such critical comments are discussed

[1] Nietzsche, *Wir Philologen,* 10.

(primarily in Chinese scholarship), they are often interpreted by modern scholars as misunderstandings of Sima Qian's intensions and attributed to epistemological limitations posed by the historical period that, being the standard argument, featured moral conservativism.[2] This method of interpretation constitutes a wider perception of the *Shiji* as a national cultural legacy and operates under the assumptions that Sima Qian's true intentions can be reconstructed from the text he purportedly wrote, and that modern readers are somehow better-equipped to grasp the authorial intentions than historical readers. As a result, eleventh century criticism of the *Shiji* tends to be judged as irrelevant to *Shiji* scholarship and to bear little scrutiny. Drawing on reception studies that emphasise the interface between text and reader, this study steers away from the question of whether eleventh century readers understood the *Shiji* "correctly." Instead, it focuses on why they understood it in their particular ways.

This study looks at the *Shiji* as a written object, the meaning of which is not merely determined by linguistic and discursive devices. Readers do not encounter a text directly as an abstract entity; they read books that bear the text. In his discussion of the sociology of text, McKenzie stresses the impacts that the form of a text has on its meaning.[3] In the case of the *Shiji*, the reason why we need to consider the alternative forms of it is first of all the market price of standard histories during the Northern Song. Those who could not afford an imprint of the *Shiji* could always copy it by hand or have someone do it for them. But they also had the option of accessing its content in forms other than in a book entitled *Shiji.* As one of the authoritative historical accounts, the *Shiji,* among other texts, was conceivably represented in various forms of historical knowledge, including vernacular traditions, primers and commonplace books on historical matters. All three of these forms of historical knowledge

[2] See Zhang Xinke and Yu Zhanghua, *Shiji yanjiu shi,* 118–122 and Yu Zhanghua et al., *Tang Song Shiji jieshou shi,* 212–218.

[3] McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts,* 10–76; see also Chartier's discussion of McKenzie's work in Chartier, *On the Edge of the Cliff*, 81–89.

were derived from textual sources, but they all detached historical events from their textual sources through exaggeration, extraction or dispersion (see chapter one). We can infer that the *Shiji,* even when presented in these forms, would not have been perceived as a historiographical work. It functioned as a brand that lent authority to storytellers, as a hidden reference that pupils of primers did not need to memorise and as a constituent of resources listed in commonplace books that assisted their users in synthesising and composing inferential statements on a given topic.

In order to counter the universality of reading implied by phenomenological and hermeneutic approaches, Chartier underlines that "reading is a practice with multiple differentiations varying with time and milieu, and that the signification of a text also depends on the way it is read."[4] With this in mind, I considered the reading modes associated with different types of texts in pedagogical schemes and surmise that the reading of historical accounts required much less intellectual engagement than classical or literary texts. Moreover, the methods of assessment of historical knowledge in imperial examinations justified this specific pedagogical approach to historical accounts (see chapter one). The *Shiji* in this context was mainly read for the sake of information about past events.

Findings in chapter one bear instructive implications to the discussion of *Shiji* receptions on a hermeneutic level, for they help to draw a line for the analysis of *Shiji* receptions with specifics of the text taken into consideration. As a text that provides information about past events, the significance of the *Shiji* in shaping eleventh century readers' perceptions of early China is conceivable yet not measurable. There were many alternative sources that provided the same information, and it is often impossible to identify and evaluate the significance of one specific source. Even when the *Shiji* can be identified as the source, if the reader did not engage with aspects distinct to the *Shiji* and merely referred to it as a record of past events, we may

[4] Chartier, "Reading Matter and 'Popular' Reading," 276.

conclude that it would not have made any difference if the reader had read the same information in another source. Therefore, in the study of *Shiji* receptions, we need to distinguish responses to past events in general from responses to the *Shiji* as a distinct text. For operative purposes, I used two main parameters to establish conscious engagement with the *Shiji*: awareness of the function of Sima Qian as a historiographer (see chapter two) and textual echoes (including linguistic and discursive echoes, see chapter three; and reworking of narratives, see chapter four) with a specific purpose. In doing so, I avoid generalised conclusions that risk overstating the influence of the *Shiji* and flattening the diversity of depths of reading. On the other hand, these parameters help to single out material of more significant analytical value from the perspective of reception studies. Some such materials are treated in studies of historical *Shiji* scholarship (especially autobiographical readings discussed in chapter two), whereas other materials are rarely scrutinised either because they do not revolve around the *Shiji* (e.g. appropriations of Jia Yi's legacy in chapter three) or because their once shared values were forgotten (e.g. Su Zhe's narratives of Confucius' life in chapter four).

Texts and Beyond

Although the reception of the *Shiji* is the subject matter of this study, I work on the understanding that the *Shiji* is not and never was at the centre of the world's concerns. In historical reception societies, the *Shiji* did not always enjoy the privilege assigned to it in specialised *Shiji* scholarship. If we put the spotlight exclusively on the *Shiji* and thereby blacken out the complexity of its reception, we effectively obscure its surroundings in a picture in which it did, originally, not take such a pivotal position. This is to say, we risk overlooking elements and conditions in the intellectual landscape of historical readers that circumscribed their verdicts on the *Shiji*. Therefore, I submit that an analysis of the wider textual world is indispensable to the study of the reception of the *Shiji*. Only when we see what options the

readers had at their disposal, and what matters concerned them, can we begin to work our way towards a contextualised understanding of their decisions.

Considering that "reception becomes decisive when traditions intersect or are in conflict,"[5] the case studies of chapters three and four aim at calibrating selected readers' *Shiji* receptions against their receptions of the *Hanshu* and other classical texts, with which the *Shiji* has overlapping narratives. This perhaps becomes most apparent in the different selections recipients made when the two distinct accounts of Jia Yi's legacy were at their disposal (see chapter three). Sima Guang and Fan Zuyu both leaned towards the *Hanshu* instead of the *Shiji,* for the *Hanshu* provided them with richer resources for their political lessons. Su Shi's essay on Jia Yi echoes both the *Shiji* and *Hanshu,* yet he did not ostensibly follow the evaluations proposed by either. We also see how Su Zhe aligned the *Shiji* narratives with classical texts and rewrote Confucius' life within the constraints posed by his textual sources (see chapter four). These examples represent moments where parts of the *Shiji* were adjusted or rejected and where other sources were favoured. These cases do not help us to arrive at a better understanding of the *Shiji.* But by investigating how these individuals appropriated their sources, we are looking at how historical readers effectuated the interpretative possibilities of ancient texts and how their understanding of the written world constructed reality.

Furthermore, I enquire into the historical context beyond the written world. In chapter two, I showed that some interpretations and changes of interpretations of the *Shiji* can be explained by events and trends in the socio-political sphere. In evaluating accounts of King Wen of Zhou and the four elders from Mount Shang, Sun Fu blamed Sima Qian for inappropriate source selection and reiterated the importance of hierarchical order, a stance rooted in his concerns for the disorder of the late Tang period. In contrast, Sima Guang did not accept what he perceived as an overly dramatic account of the four elders in the *Shiji* because of his distaste for

[5] Hardwick and Stray, "Introduction: Making Connections," 5.

factionalism in his immediate environment. Su Shi openly criticised Sima Qian for his praise of Shang Yang and Sang Hongyang, because these two figures were perceived as historical projections of Wang Anshi, the politics of whom Su Shi opposed.

The significance of historical analogism in political rhetoric is another factor that stimulated new readings of the *Shiji.* Eleventh century readers approached the *Shiji* with a keen interest on the relationship between Sima Qian and the stories he told. As the readers themselves were accustomed to referencing the historical repertoire in order to hint at contemporary phenomena and debates, they readily assumed that Sima Qian's writing can also largely be explained with reference to his life experience and individual persuasions (see chapter two).

In chapters three and four, the images of Jia Yi and Confucius are closely related to the self-perceptions of eleventh century intellectuals. Fan Zuyu and Su Shi promoted the same scenario to different audiences. Using the interaction between Jia Yi and Emperor Wen of Han as an illustration, Fan Zuyu tried to convince his audience, Emperor Zhezong of Song, that a ruler should take instructions from his learned subjects. Su Shi applied the same example to stress the directive power Jia Yi could have had over the emperor, suggesting that intellectuals should aspire to instruct the ruler in order to realise their own ambitions (see chapter three). In his narrative of Confucius' life, Su Zhe replaced the succession of dangers and rejections in the *Shiji* narratives with the paragon's persistent striving for a wise ruler that was worth working with. We do not know if this representation of Confucius can be considered more faithful to the historical man, but it certainly is a reflection of how eleventh century readers would have pictured the Master, an intellectual with initiative and pride, just like themselves (see chapter four).

So, what we are seeing through the window of *Shiji* receptions is a series of choices eleventh century readers made with consideration of varying factors, including obedience to or

doubts about classical texts, moral principles, historiographical thoughts, political stances, intellectual self-perceptions, and so forth. We might add literary tastes, social connections and so on to this list. As readers' opinions varied on these points and they assigned different weighting to them, they clearly arrived at different receptions of the *Shiji.*

Limited in space and scope, this study does not exhaust all the documented *Shiji* receptions of the eleventh century and how exactly they were circumscribed by historical conditions of readers. Yet, the focused discussion of the selected examples suggests directions and dimensions that future studies of *Shiji* receptions might wish to explore further. In the collective dimension, we see how a shared horizon of expectations directed the reception of the *Shiji.* For instance, due to the need to expand interpretative liberty in classical learning and to install new order in society, the *Shiji* was widely perceived as a flawed history and an example of imperfect reconstructions of antiquity by Han scholars (see chapter two). In the individual dimension, we delineate the dynamic interaction between Su Zhe and the *Shiji.* The *Shiji* proposed sequences and contexts of Confucius' utterances, Su Zhe accepted them, but at the same time injected his classical scholarship and identified niches between and lacunae within his textual sources that allowed him to read an eleventh century spirit into his chosen texts (see chapter four). With its focus on the eleventh century, this study mainly outlines synchronic diversity in the reception of the *Shiji*, but it also touched upon the diachronic dimension. Even within the relatively short span of one century, reading of the *Shiji* cannot be assumed to have been a stable activity, the text having suffered collateral damage due to annihilation of historical scholarship from the 1090s onwards (see chapter one). Another example is Su Zhe's revision of the narrative on Confucius, which was criticised by thirteenth century readers for secularising the master and insufficiently celebrating his sagehood (see chapter four).

Tradition and Reception

The general purposes of this study are two-fold. As summarised above, I draw on intellectual devices provided by reception studies, shed light on rarely examined writings and propose avenues to expand our enquiry into the richness of relevant material. On the other hand, I hope to make a contribution to the discourse on the reciprocal relationship between tradition and reception based on selected case studies from eleventh century China. As Lorna Hardwick and Christopher Stray aptly claimed:

> [T]here was sometimes a misleading conflation between the values represented in the ancient context and those of the societies that appropriated them. One of the achievements of reception studies has been to examine this interface and to bring about a partial liberation from this confusion for both ancient and modern. Sensitivity to the possibility of a more dialogic relation between ancient and modern has also focused attention on the interface between tradition and reception. If it is accepted that tradition is not something merely inherited but is constantly made and remade, then reception and tradition may be seen as related parts of an extended process.[6]

When reading ancient texts, we do of course rely on previous scholarship. Reception studies tell us that we need to be wary of the conflation between what these ancient texts may mean and what they meant to specific historical individuals. Once we realise that under certain conditions any reading may be justified, we then need to re-evaluate the benefits of considering some readings as more correct than others and think in terms of why some readings are deemed more useful for our purposes than others.

Apart from the implications on the way we deal with historical receptions of traditions, reception studies also instigate self-examination to "uncover ideas that were already ours but of which we were ignorant."[7] By looking at how eleventh century readers appropriated the *Shiji,* we come to understand to what extent our own interpretations are indebted to and diverge from theirs. By looking at how their interpretations were informed by and catered for eleventh

[6] Hardwick and Stray, "Introduction: Making Connections," 5.

[7] Batstone, "The Point of Reception Theory," 17.

century discourses, we create an opportunity to become aware of the conditions that shape our own interpretations and certain discourses that we serve. As much as – if not more than – eleventh century intellectuals, we are by no means direct inheritors of the language, culture and values of antiquity. We look at ancient texts through contemporary lenses, and it is important to keep in mind that our interpretations are conditioned by our times.

That being said, I do not indicate that we should and can get rid of such lenses and thereby uncover the "true meaning" of ancient texts as intended for its original audience. In his introduction to *Classics and the Uses of Receptions,* Charles Martindale writes:

> My own view is that reception, on a Jaussian model, provides one intellectually coherent way of avoiding both crude presentism ("the reading that too peremptorily assimilates a text to contemporary concerns") and crude historicism. Antiquity and modernity, present and past, are always implicated in each other, always in dialogue – to understand either one, you need to think in terms of the other.[8]

In this dissertation, I have investigated how eleventh century readers read themselves into ancient texts through the language of those texts. They skilfully repacked passages and ideas found in ancient texts to advance similar as well as contradictory arguments, displaying remarkable creative force in the transmission of traditions. In this process, they made their choices to develop some of the traditions passed down to them and abandon others. The traditions eleventh century intellectuals passed on to posterity were no longer the same as those passed down to them. These traditions were again subject to numerous reviews and renewal in subsequent periods, extending to the present and future. This has always been and will remain an ongoing project. Thinking through receptions is as much about understanding the past as it is about being self-aware in making our own decisions and understanding our position in the transmission of traditions. It remains my hope that this dissertation becomes a small contribution to this discourse.

[8] Martindale, "Thinking through Reception," 5–6.

Appendix A

Editing of Jia Yi's Memorial by Sima Guang and Fan Zuyu

The following passage, based on the Zhonghua shuju 1962 edition of the *Hanshu*, is an excerpt from the lengthy memorial in which Jia Yi formulated his concerns and advice in "one thing to weep bitterly for, two things to shed tears for, and six things to sigh deeply for" (*ke wei tongku zhe yi, ke wei liuti zhe er, ke wei chang tiaxi zhe liu* 可為痛哭者一，可為流涕者二，可為長太息者六). This excerpt is located in the last point of the things to "sigh deeply for." Sima Guang and Fan Zuyu both made use of this excerpt. Their editorial decisions are marked in the following ways:

Unmarked: Passages Sima Guang selected for the *Zizhi tongjian*

_____: Passages Sima Guang abridged

~~strikethrough~~: Passages Sima Guang edited out

_____: Passages Fan Zuyu selected for the *Dixue*

夏為天子，十有餘世，而殷受之。殷為天子，二十餘世，而周受之。周為天子，三十餘世，而秦受之。秦為天子，二世而亡。人性不甚相遠也，何三代之君有道之長，而秦無道之暴也？其故可知也。古之王者，太子乃生，固舉以禮，~~使士負之~~，有司齊肅端冕，見之南郊，~~見于天也。~~過闕則下，過廟則趨，~~孝子之道也~~。故自為赤子而教固已行矣。~~昔者成王幼在繈抱之中，召公為太保，周公為太傅，太公為太師。保，保其身體；傅，傅之德意；師，道之教訓：此三公之職也。於是為置三少，皆上大夫也，曰少保、少傅、少師，是與太子宴者也。故乃~~孩提有識，三公、三少固明孝仁禮義以道習之，逐去邪人，不使見惡行。於是皆選天下之端士孝悌博聞有道術者以衛翼之，使與太子居處出入。故太子乃生而見正事，聞正言，行正道，左右前後皆正人也。夫習與正人居之，不能毋正，猶生長於齊不能不齊言也；習與不正人居之，不能毋不正，猶生長於楚之地不能不楚言也。~~故擇其所耆，必先受業，乃得嘗之；擇其所樂，必先有習，乃得為之。~~孔子曰："少成若天性，習貫如自然。"~~及太子少長，知妃色，則入于學。學者，所學之宮也。《學禮》曰：「帝入東學，上親而貴仁，則親疏有序而恩相及矣；帝入南學，上齒而貴信，則長幼有差而民不誣矣；帝入西學，上賢而貴德，則聖智在位而功不遺矣；帝入北學，上貴而尊爵，則貴賤有等而下不踰矣；~~

帝入太學，承師問道，退習而考於太傅，太傅罰其不則而匡其不及，則德智長而治道得矣。此五學者既成於上，則百姓黎民化輯於下矣。」及太子既冠成人，免於保傅之嚴，則有記過之史，徹膳之宰，進善之旌，誹謗之木，敢諫之鼓。瞽史誦詩，工誦箴諫，大夫進謀，士傳民語。習與智長，故切而不媿；化與心成，故中道若性。三代之禮：春朝朝日，秋暮夕月，所以明有敬也；春秋入學，坐國老，執醬而親饋之，所以明有孝也；行以鸞和，步中采齊，趣中肆夏，所以明有度也；其於禽獸，見其生不食其死，聞其聲不食其肉，故遠庖廚，所以長恩，且明有仁也。夫三代之所以長久者，以其輔翼太子有此具也。及秦而不然。其俗固非貴辭讓也，所上者告訐也；固非貴禮義也，所上者刑罰也。使趙高傅胡亥而教之獄，所習者非斬劓人，則夷人之三族也。故胡亥今日即位而明日射人，忠諫者謂之誹謗，深計者謂之妖言，其視殺人若艾草菅然。豈惟胡亥之性惡哉？彼其所以道之者非其理故也。鄙諺曰：“不習為吏，視已成事。”又曰：“前車覆，後車誡。”夫三代之所以長久者，其已事可知也；然而不能從者，是不法聖智也。秦世之所以亟絕者，其轍跡可見也；然而不避，是後車又將覆也。夫存亡之變，治亂之機，其要在是矣。天下之命，縣於太子；太子之善，在於早諭教與選左右。夫心未濫而先諭教，則化易成也；開於道術智誼之指，則教之力也。若其服習積貫，則左右而已。夫胡、粵之人，生而同聲，耆欲不異，及其長而成俗，累數譯而不能相通，行者雖死而不相為者，則教習然也。臣故曰選左右早諭教最急。夫教得而左右正，則太子正矣，太子正而天下定矣。書曰：“一人有慶，兆民賴之。”此時務也。

Appendix B

"Kongzi shijia" in the *Shiji* VS "Kongzi liezhuan" in the *Gushi*

The following pages present a textual comparison between the two narratives of Confucius' life as found in *Shiji*'s "Kongzi shijia" and *Gushi*'s "Kongzi liezhuan." The original commentary on the *Gushi* is shown in smaller characters. My brief annotations mainly identify textual parallels (mostly in the classical texts) and summarise Su Zhe's amendments. Note that minor rephrasing and changes in wording and/or orthography are NOT marked.

Emphasis mark: Passages added by Su Zhe

Wavy underline: Passages added by Su Zhe based on other textual sources

Underlining: Contradictory accounts

Italic: Passages relocated

~~Strikethrough~~: Deleted by Su Zhe from "Kongzi liezhuan"

"Kongzi shijia" of the *Shiji*	"Kongzi liezhuan" of the *Gushi*	Annotation	Points of reference/Parallels
	孔子之先，宋湣公之長子，曰弗父何。湣公之亡也，公弟煬公熙立。弗父何之弟鮒祀弒煬公，而以國授何，何弗受。鮒祀立，是為厲公，而何世為宋大夫。其曾孫曰正考父，考父之子曰孔父嘉。嘉為華父督所殺，其子奔魯，始為邾人。	The additional narrative in the *Gushi* seems to be based on the *Zuozhuan* (Zhao 7), *Shiji* chapter 38, and	《左傳•昭公七年》："吾聞將有達者，曰孔丘，聖人之後也，而滅於宋，其祖弗父何，以有宋而授厲公。"

		Kongzi jiayu (“Benxing jie”). The underlined passage follows the *Zuozhuan* and contradicts *Shiji* chapter 38.	《史記•宋微子世家》：“湣公共卒，弟煬公熙立。煬公即位，湣公子鮒祀弒煬公而自立，曰‘我當立’，是為厲公。” 《孔子家語•本姓解》：“宋公生丁公申。申公生緡公共及襄公熙。熙生弗父何及厲公方祀。方祀以下，世為宋卿。[…]一曰：孔父者，生時所賜號也，是以子孫遂以氏族。孔父生子木金父。金父生睪夷。睪夷生防叔，避華氏之禍而犇魯。”
孔子生魯昌平鄉陬邑。其先宋人也，曰孔防叔。防叔生伯夏，伯夏生叔梁紇。紇與顏氏女野合而生孔子，禱於尼丘得孔子。魯襄公二十二年而孔子生。~~生而首上圩頂，故因名曰丘云。~~字仲尼，姓孔氏。丘生而叔梁紇死，葬於防山。防山在魯東，由是孔子疑其父墓處，母諱之也。孔子為兒嬉戲，常陳俎豆，設禮容。孔子母死，乃殯五父之衢，~~蓋其慎也。~~聊人輓父之母誨孔子父墓，然後往合葬於防焉。	孔子之曾太父曰孔防叔，生伯夏。伯夏生叔梁紇，以勇力聞於諸侯。與顏氏女野合而生孔子。禱於尼丘，故名之曰丘，字仲尼。孔子之生，魯襄公之二十二年也。孔子為兒嬉戲，常陳俎豆，設禮容。幼而喪父，葬於防山。母諱之，不以告。及母死，不知其墓，乃殯於五父之衢。有過而疑者，因問之，得於聊曼父之母，然後合葬於防。	The *Gushi* adds the passage in bold based on the *Zuozhuan* (Xiang 10).	《左傳•襄公十年》：“孟氏之臣秦堇父，輦重如役，偪陽人啟門。諸侯之士門焉。縣門發，聊人紇抉之，以出門者。狄虒彌建大車之輪，而蒙之以甲，以為櫓，左執之，右拔戟，以成一隊。孟獻子曰：‘《詩》所謂“有力如虎”者也。’”

孔子要絰，季氏饗士，孔子與往。陽虎絀曰：“季氏饗士，非敢饗子也。”孔子由是退。		See the *Gushi* parallel below.	
	孔子長九尺六寸，人皆謂之長人，蓋未有知之者。嘗為委吏，會計當；嘗為乘田，畜蕃息。	See the *Shiji* parallel below; see also my discussion in chapter four. The *Gushi* aligns with *Mengzi* 5B.14.	《孟子•萬章下》：“孔子嘗為委吏矣，曰：‘會計當而已矣。’嘗為乘田矣，曰：‘牛羊茁壯，長而已矣。’”
孔子年十七，魯大夫孟釐子病且死，誡其嗣懿子曰：“孔丘，聖人之後，滅於宋。其祖弗父何始有宋而嗣讓厲公。及正考父佐戴、武、宣公，三命茲益恭，故鼎銘云：‘一命而僂，再命而傴，三命而俯，循牆而走，亦莫敢余侮。饘於是，粥於是，以餬余口。’其恭如是。吾聞聖人之後，雖不當世，必有達者。今孔丘年少好禮，其達者歟？吾即沒，若必師之。”及釐子卒，懿子與魯人南宮敬叔往學禮焉。~~是歲，季武子卒，平子代立。~~	年三十有四，魯大夫孟僖子病，且死，召其大夫而屬之曰：“禮，人之幹也，無禮無以立。吾聞將有達者，曰孔丘，聖人之後也，而滅於宋。其祖弗父何，以有宋而授厲公。及正考父，佐戴、武、宣，三命茲益恭。故其鼎銘云：‘一命而僂，再命而傴，三命而俯，循牆而走，亦莫予敢侮。饘於是，粥於是，以糊予口。’其恭如是。臧孫紇有言曰：‘聖人之有明德者，若不當世，其後必有達人。’今其將在孔丘乎？我死，必屬說與何忌於夫子，使事之而學禮焉，以定其位。”故孟懿子與南宮敬叔皆師事孔子。	The *Gushi* revises the *Shiji* according to the parallel in the *Zuozhuan* (Zhao 7). On the age of Confucius, see the *Gushi* commentary below.	《左傳•昭公七年》：“孟僖子病，不能相禮，乃講學之，苟能禮者從之。及其將死也，召其大夫曰：‘禮，人之幹也，無禮無以立。吾聞將有達者，曰孔丘，聖人之後也，而滅於宋，其祖弗父何，以有宋而授厲公，及正考父佐戴、武、宣，三命茲益共，故其鼎銘云：“一命而僂，再命而傴，三命而俯，循牆而走，亦莫余敢侮，饘於是，鬻於是，以餬余口。”其共也如是。臧孫紇有言曰：“聖人有明德者，若

			不當世，其後必有達人。”今其將在孔丘乎？我若獲沒，必屬說與何忌於夫子，使事之而學禮焉，以定其位。’故孟懿子，與南宮敬叔，師事仲尼。”
~~孔子貧且賤。~~*及長，嘗為季氏史，料量平；嘗為司職吏而畜蕃息。*~~由是為司空。已而去魯，斥乎齊，逐乎宋、衛，困於陳蔡之閒，於是反魯。~~*孔子長九尺有六寸，人皆謂之長人而異之。*~~魯復善待，由是反魯。~~		See the *Gushi* parallel above; see also my discussion in chapter four.	
魯南宮敬叔言魯君曰：“請與孔子適周。”魯君與之一乘車，兩馬，一豎子俱，適周問禮，蓋見老子云。辭去，而老子送之曰：“吾聞富貴者送人以財，仁人者送人以言。吾不能富貴，竊仁人之號，送子以言，曰：‘聰明深察而近於死者，好議人者也。博辯廣大危其身者，發人之惡者也。為人子者毋以有己，為人臣者毋以有己。’” 孔子自周反于魯，弟子稍益進焉。	孔子將觀禮於周，敬叔言於魯君，予之一乘車、兩馬、一豎子。孔子得以適周，問禮於柱下史老聃。將辭去，聃送之曰：“富貴者送人以財，仁人送人以言。吾不能富貴，竊仁人之號。夫聰明深察而近於死者，好議人者也；博辯廣大危其身者，發人惡者也。為人子者無以有己，為人臣者無以有己。” 孔子自周反於魯，弟子稍益進焉。		
	明年，魯昭公孫於齊，季平子專國。*季氏饗士，孔子要經而往，陽虎絀曰：“季氏饗士，非敢饗子也。”孔子由是退。*《史記》稱孔子年十七而孟僖子死；書季氏饗士、孔子要經而往在孟僖子死前。案《左傳》孔子年十七當魯昭公七年。是歲孟僖子相昭公如楚，病不克相禮耳。僖子之死，實昭公二十四年，則孔子年三十四矣。		

	又昭公二十五年，陽虎始見，然則孔子要經，亦當在此後。故皆改正之。		
~~是時也，晉平公淫，六卿擅權，東伐諸侯；楚靈王兵彊，陵轢中國；齊大而近於魯。魯小弱，附於楚則晉怒；附於晉則楚來伐；不備於齊，齊師侵魯。~~			
魯昭公之二十年，而孔子蓋年三十矣。齊景公與晏嬰來適魯，景公問孔子曰：“昔秦穆公國小處辟，其霸何也？”對曰：“秦，國雖小，其志大；處雖辟，行中正。身舉五羖，爵之大夫，起縲紲之中，與語三日，授之以政。以此取之，雖王可也，其霸小矣。”景公說。		See the *Gushi* parallel below.	
~~孔子年三十五，而季平子與郈昭伯以鬬雞故得罪魯昭公，昭公率師擊平子，平子與孟氏、叔孫氏三家共攻昭公，昭公師敗，奔於齊，齊處昭公乾侯。~~			
~~其後頃之~~，魯亂。孔子適齊，為高昭子家臣，欲以通乎景公。~~與齊太師語樂~~，聞《韶》音，學之，三月不知肉味，齊人稱之。	魯方亂，孔子適齊，為高昭子家臣，欲以通乎景公。在齊聞《韶》，學之，三月不知肉味。	See *Lunyu* 7.14.	《論語•述而》：“子在齊聞韶，三月不知肉味。曰：‘不圖為樂之至於斯也！’”
景公問政孔子，孔子曰：“君君，臣臣，父父，子子。”景公曰：“善哉！信如君不君，臣不臣，父不父，子不子，雖有粟，吾豈得而食諸！”	景公問政。孔子曰：“君君，臣臣，父父，子子。”景公曰：“善哉！信如君不君，臣不臣，父不父，子不子。雖有粟，吾得而食諸？”是時景公失政，其大夫田氏厚施以奪其民，而公不悟，故孔子及之。	See *Lunyu* 12.11. Cf. *Zuozhuan* (Zhao 26) and *Yanzi chunqiu* (“Waipian shang”).	《論語•顏淵》：“齊景公問政於孔子。孔子對曰：‘君君，臣臣，父父，子子。’公曰：‘善哉！信如君不君，臣不臣，父不父，子不

			子，雖有粟，吾得而食諸？’” 《左傳•昭公二十六年》：“齊侯與晏子坐于路寢[…]‘公厚斂焉，陳氏厚施焉，民歸之矣。’” 《晏子春秋•外篇上》：“景公坐于路寢[…]‘今公家驕汰，而田氏慈惠，國澤是將焉歸？田氏雖無德而施于民。公厚斂而田氏厚施焉。’”
	它日，復問：“昔秦穆公國小處辟，其伯何也？”對曰：“秦國雖小，其志大；處雖辟，行中正。身舉五羖爵之大夫，起纍紲中，與語三日，授之以政。以此取之，雖王可也，其伯小矣！”景公說。《史記》言孔子年三十，齊景公與晏嬰適魯，問孔子以秦穆公事。又於《齊世家》言景公獵魯郊，因入魯，與晏嬰俱問魯禮。《左傳》皆不載。恐出於戰國雜說，故正之於此。	See the *Shiji* parallel above.	
~~他日又復問政於孔子，孔子曰：“政在節財。”景公說，~~將欲以尼谿田封孔子。晏嬰進曰：“夫儒者滑稽，而不可軌法；倨傲自順，不可以為下；崇喪遂哀，破產厚葬，不可以為俗；游說乞貸，不可以為國。自大賢之息，周室既衰，禮樂缺有閒。今孔子盛容飾，繁登降之禮，趨詳之節，累世不能殫其學，當年不能究其禮。君欲用之以移齊俗，非所以先細民也。”	將以尼谿田封孔子。晏嬰進曰：“夫儒者滑稽，而不可軌法；倨傲自順，不可以為下；崇喪遂哀，破產厚葬，不可以為俗；游說乞貸，不可以為國。自大賢之息，周室既衰，禮樂缺弛，今孔子盛容餝，繁登降之禮，趨詳之節，累世不能殫其學，當年不能究其禮。君欲用之，以移齊俗，非所以先細民也。”		

後景公敬見孔子，不問其禮。~~異日，景公止孔子~~曰：“奉子以季氏，吾不能。”以季孟之間待之。齊大夫欲害孔子，孔子聞之。景公曰：“吾老矣，弗能用也。”孔子遂行，反乎魯。	後景公敬見孔子，不問其禮，曰：“待子以季氏，吾不能。”以季孟之間待之。齊大夫猶欲害孔子，孔子聞之，欲去。景公亦曰：“吾老矣，不能用也。”孔子遂行。反乎魯。	See *Lunyu* 18.3.	《論語•微子》：“齊景公待孔子，曰：‘若季氏則吾不能，以季、孟之閒待之。’曰：‘吾老矣，不能用也。’孔子行。”
孔子年四十二，魯昭公卒於乾侯，~~定公立~~。定公立五年，~~夏，~~季平子卒，桓子嗣立。季桓子穿井得土缶，中若羊，問仲尼云“得狗”。仲尼曰：“以丘所聞，羊也。丘聞之，木石之怪夔、罔閬，水之怪龍、罔象，土之怪墳羊。”	孔子年四十二，魯昭公卒於乾侯。定公五年，季平子死，桓子嗣立。桓子穿井得土缶，中若羊，以問孔子。曰：“得狗。”孔子曰：“以丘所聞，羊也。丘聞之，木石之怪夔、罔閬，水之怪龍、罔象，土之怪墳羊。”		
吳伐越，墮會稽，得骨節專車。吳使使問仲尼：“骨何者最大？”仲尼曰：“禹致羣神於會稽山，防風氏後至，禹殺而戮之，其節專車，此為大矣。”吳客曰：“誰為神？”仲尼曰：“山川之神足以綱紀天下，其守為神，社稷為公侯，皆屬於王者。”客曰：“防風何守？”仲尼曰：“汪罔氏之君守封、禺之山，為釐姓。在虞、夏、商為汪罔，於周為長翟，今謂之大人。”客曰：“人長幾何？”仲尼曰：“僬僥氏三尺，短之至也。長者不過十之，數之極也。”於是吳客曰：“善哉聖人！”		See the *Gushi* parallel below.	
~~桓子嬖臣曰仲梁懷，與陽虎有隙。陽虎欲逐懷，公山不狃止之。其秋，懷益驕，陽虎執懷。桓子怒，~~陽虎因囚桓子，與盟而醳之。~~陽虎由此益輕季氏。季氏亦僭於公室，陪臣執國政。~~	是時陽虎專季氏，嘗囚季桓子盟而釋之。		

	虎欲見孔子，而惡無禮。大夫有賜於士，不得受之其家，則往拜其門。陽虎時孔子之亡也，而饋孔子烝豚。孔子亦時其亡也，而往拜之，遇諸塗。謂孔子曰：“来，予與爾言。”曰：“懷其寶而迷其邦，可謂仁乎？”曰：“不可。”“好從事而亟失時，可謂知乎？”曰：“不可。”“日月逝矣，歲不我與。”孔子曰：“諾。吾將仕矣。”	The *Gushi* bring together *Lunyu* 17.1 and *Mengzi* 3B.7.	《論語•陽貨》：“陽貨欲見孔子，孔子不見，歸孔子豚。孔子時其亡也，而往拜之，遇諸塗。謂孔子曰：‘來！予與爾言。’曰：‘懷其寶而迷其邦，可謂仁乎？’曰：‘不可。’‘好從事而亟失時，可謂知乎？’曰：‘不可。’‘日月逝矣，歲不我與。’孔子曰：‘諾。吾將仕矣。’” 《孟子•滕文公下》：“陽貨欲見孔子而惡無禮，大夫有賜於士，不得受於其家，則往拜其門。陽貨矙孔子之亡也，而饋孔子蒸豚；孔子亦矙其亡也，而往拜之。”
是以魯自大夫以下皆僭離於正道。故孔子不仕，退而脩《詩》、《書》、《禮》、《樂》，弟子彌衆，至自遠方，莫不受業焉。	魯君臣上下皆失其正，故孔子不仕。退而脩《詩》、《書》、《禮》、《樂》。弟子至自遠方，受業者益衆。		
定公八年，公山不狃不得意於季氏，因陽虎為亂，欲廢三桓之適，更立其庶孽陽虎素所善者，遂執季桓子。桓子詐之，得脫。定公九年，陽虎	定公八年，陽虎將殺三桓，不克，出奔齊。公山不狃為費宰，不得志於季氏，與虎同惡，以費叛，召孔子。孔子欲往，子路不說。孔子曰：	The *Gushi* abridges the *Shiji* and aligns with *Lunyu* 17.4.	《論語•陽貨》：“公山弗擾以費畔，召，子欲往。子路不

不勝，奔于齊。是時孔子年五十。公山不狃以費畔季氏，使人召孔子。~~孔子循道彌久，溫溫無所試，莫能己用，曰：“蓋周文武起豐鎬而王，今費雖小，儻庶幾乎！”~~欲往。子路不說，~~止孔子~~。孔子曰：“夫召我者豈徒哉？如用我，其為東周乎！”然亦卒不行。	“夫召我者，而豈徒哉？如有用我者，吾其為東周乎？”然卒不行。時孔子年五十。		說，曰：‘末之也已，何必公山氏之之也。’子曰：‘夫召我者而豈徒哉？如有用我者，吾其為東周乎？’”
其後定公以孔子為中都宰，一年，四方皆則之。由中都宰為司空，由司空為大司寇。	自陽虎出，而魯小安。定公以孔子為中都宰，一年，四方皆則之。由中都宰為司空，由司空為大司冦。		
定公十年春，~~及齊平。夏，齊大夫黎鉏言於景公曰：“魯用孔丘，其勢危齊。”乃使使告魯為好會，~~會於夾谷。魯定公且以乘車好往。孔子攝相事，曰：“臣聞有文事者必有武備，有武事者必有文備。古者諸侯出疆，必具官以從。請具左右司馬。”定公曰：“諾。”具左右司馬。	十年，齊、魯會於夾谷，孔子相。定公將以乘車好徃，孔子曰：“臣聞有文事者必有武脩，有武事者必有文備。古者諸侯出疆，必具官以從。請具左右司馬。”定公許之。		
	犁彌言於齊侯曰：“孔丘好禮而無勇，若使萊人以兵劫魯侯，必得志焉。”齊侯從之。孔子以公退，曰：“士兵之。兩君合好，而裔夷之俘以兵亂之，非齊君所以命諸侯也。裔不謀夏，夷不亂華，俘不干盟，兵不偪好。於神為不祥，於德為愆義，於人為失禮。君必不然。”齊侯聞之，遽避之。將盟，齊人加於載書曰：“齊師出竟，而不以兵車三百乘從我者，有如此盟！”孔子使茲無還揖對曰：“而不反我汶陽之田，吾以共命者，亦如之。”齊侯將享公，孔子謂梁丘據曰：“齊、魯之故，吾子何不聞焉？事既成矣，而又享之，是勤執事也。且犧象不出門，嘉樂不野合。饗而既具，是棄禮也。若其不具，用秕稗	The *Gushi* is based on *Zuozhuan* (Ding 10).	《左傳•定公十年》：“夏，公會齊侯于祝其，實夾谷，孔丘相，犁彌言於齊侯曰：‘孔丘知禮而無勇，若使萊人以兵劫魯侯，必得志焉。’齊侯從之。孔丘以公退，曰：‘士兵之，兩君合好，而裔夷之俘，以兵亂之，非齊君所以命諸侯也，裔不謀夏，夷不亂華，俘不干盟，

	也。用秕稗，君辱。棄禮名惡，子盍圖之？夫享所以昭德也，不昭，不如其已。”乃不果享。		兵不偪好，於神為不祥，於德為愆義，於人為失禮，君必不然。’齊侯聞之，遽辟之。將盟，齊人加於載書曰：‘齊師出竟，而不以甲車三百乘從我者，有如此盟？’孔丘使茲無還揖對曰：‘而不反我汶陽之田，吾以共命者，亦如之。’齊侯將享公，孔丘謂梁丘據曰：‘齊魯之故，吾子何不聞焉，事既成矣，而又享之，是勤執事也，且犧象不出門，嘉樂不野合，饗而既具，是棄禮也，若其不具，用秕稗也，用秕稗君辱，棄禮名惡，子盍圖之？夫享所以昭德也，不昭不如其已也。’乃不果享。齊人來歸鄆讙龜陰之田。”
~~會齊侯夾谷，為壇位，土階三等，以會遇之禮相見，揖讓而登。獻酬之禮畢，齊有司趨而進曰：“請奏四方之樂。”景公曰：“諾。”於是旄旄羽祓矛戟劍撥鼓噪而至。孔子趨而進，歷階而登，不盡一等，舉袂而言曰：“吾兩君為好會，~~			

~~夷狄之樂何為於此！請命有司！”有司卻之，不去，則左右視晏子與景公。景公心怍，麾而去之。有頃，齊有司趨而進曰：“請奏宮中之樂。”景公曰：“諾。”優倡侏儒為戲而前。孔子趨而進，歷階而登，不盡一等，曰：“匹夫而營惑諸侯者罪當誅！請命有司！”有司加法焉，手足異處。景公懼而動，知義不若，歸而大恐，告其羣臣曰：“魯以君子之道輔其君，而子獨以夷狄之道教寡人，使得罪於魯君，為之柰何？”有司進對曰：“君子有過則謝以質，小人有過則謝以文。君若悼之，則謝以質。”~~			
於是齊侯乃歸所侵魯之鄆、汶陽、龜陰之田以謝過。	卒事，齊人不能加魯，齊侯愧焉，乃歸魯鄆、讙、龜陰之田。	Cf. *Shiji* chapter 32 and 33.	《史記•齊太公世家》：“方會，進萊樂。孔子歷階上，使有司執萊人斬之，以禮讓景公。景公慚，乃歸魯侵地以謝，而罷去。” 《史記•魯周公世家》：“十年，定公與齊景公會於夾谷，孔子行相事。齊欲襲魯君，孔子以禮歷階，誅齊淫樂，齊侯懼，乃止，歸魯侵地而謝過。”
定公十三年夏，孔子言於定公曰：“臣無藏甲，大夫毋百雉之城。”使仲由為季氏宰，將墮三都。於是叔孫氏先墮郈。季氏~~將墮費，公山不狃、叔孫輒率費人襲魯。公與三子入于季氏之~~	十二年夏，孔子言於定公曰：“臣無藏甲，大夫無百雉之城。”使仲由為季氏宰，將墮三都。於是叔孫氏墮郈， 季氏墮費。將墮成，公歛處父謂孟孫：“墮成，	The *Gushi* revises the *Shiji* according to the *Zuozhuan* (Ding 12).	《左傳•定公十二年》：“仲由為季氏宰。將墮三都，於是叔孫氏墮郈，季氏將墮費。公山不狃、叔

~~宮，登武子之臺。費人攻之，弗克，入及公側。孔子命申句須、樂頎下伐之，費人北。國人追之，敗諸姑蔑。二子奔齊，遂墮費。~~將墮成，公斂處父謂孟孫曰：“墮成，齊人必至于北門。且成，孟氏之保鄣，無成是無孟氏也。我將弗墮。”十二月，公圍成，弗克。	齊人必至於北門。且成，孟氏之保障也。無成，是無孟氏也。子偽不知，我將不墮。”十二月，公圍成，弗克。		孫輒帥費人以襲魯。公與三子入于季氏之宮，登武子之臺，費人攻之，弗克。入及公側。仲尼命申句須、樂頎下伐之。費人北，國人追之，敗諸姑蔑。二子奔齊，遂墮費。將墮成，公斂處父謂孟孫：‘墮成，齊人必至于北門，且成，孟氏之保障也，無成是無孟氏也，子偽不知，我將不墜。’冬，十二月，公圍成弗克。”
定公十四年，孔子年五十六，由大司寇行攝相事，有喜色。門人曰：“聞君子禍至不懼，福至不喜。”孔子曰：“有是言也。不曰‘樂其以貴下人’乎？”於是誅魯大夫亂政者少正卯。與聞國政三月，粥羔豚者弗飾賈；男女行者別於塗；塗不拾遺；四方之客至乎邑者不求有司，皆予之以歸。	十四年，孔子年五十六。由司寇攝相事，有喜色。門人曰：“聞君子禍至不懼，福至不喜。”孔子曰：“有是言也。不曰‘樂以其貴下人’乎？”於是誅魯大夫亂政者少正卯。與聞國政三月，粥豚羔者弗飾賈；男女行者別於塗，塗不拾遺，四方之客至乎邑者，不求有司，皆予之以歸。	Cf. *Kongzi jiayu* (“Shizhu”).	《孔子家語•始誅》：“孔子為魯司寇，攝行相事，有喜色。仲由問曰：‘由聞君子禍至不懼，福至不喜。今夫子得位而喜，何也？’孔子曰：‘然！有是言也。不曰樂以貴下人乎？’於是朝政七日而誅亂政大夫少正卯，戮之於兩觀之下，尸於朝三日。”
齊人聞而懼，曰：“孔子為政必霸，霸則吾地近焉，我之為先并矣。盍致地焉？”黎鉏曰：“請先嘗沮之；沮之而不可則致地，庸遲乎？”於是	齊人聞而懼，曰：“孔子為政必伯，伯則吾地近焉。我為之先并矣。盍致地焉？”犂鉏曰：“請先嘗沮之。沮之而不可，則致地，庸遲乎？”於	See *Lunyu* 18.4 and *Mengzi* 6B.6; see	《論語•微子》：“齊人歸女樂，季桓

選齊國中女子好者八十人，皆衣文衣而舞康樂，文馬三十駟，遺魯君。陳女樂文馬於魯城南高門外，季桓子微服往觀再三，將受，乃語魯君為周道游，往觀終日，~~怠於政事。子路曰：“夫子可以行矣。”孔子曰：“魯今且郊，如致膰乎夫夫，則吾猶可以止。”~~桓子卒受齊女樂，三日不聽政；郊，又不致膰俎於大夫。孔子遂行。	是選國中女子八十人，皆衣文衣而舞康樂，文馬三十駟，以遺魯君。陳於魯城南高門外，季桓子微服往觀，語魯君為周道游。觀終日，卒受之，三日不朝。孔子將行，而惡彰君之惡也。於是魯方郊，不致膰肉於大夫，孔子遂行。《孟子》曰：“孔子從而祭，膰肉不至，不稅冕而行。不知者以為為肉也，其知之者以為為無禮也。乃孔子則欲以微罪行，不欲為苟去。君子之所為，衆人固不識也。”然則孔子之去，實以女樂，而託膰肉耳。	also my discussion in chapter four.	子受之。三日不朝，孔子行。” 《孟子•告子下》：“孔子為魯司寇，不用，從而祭，燔肉不至，不稅冕而行。”
宿乎屯。而師己送，曰：“夫子則非罪。”孔子曰：“吾歌可夫？”歌曰：“彼婦之口，可以出走；彼婦之謁，可以死敗。蓋優哉游哉，維以卒歲！”師己反，桓子曰：“孔子亦何言？”師己以實告。桓子喟然歎曰：“夫子罪我以羣婢故也夫！”	宿乎屯，師己送之曰：“夫子則非罪。”孔子曰：“吾歌可夫？”歌曰：“彼婦之口，可以出走。彼婦之謁，可以死敗。蓋優哉游哉，聊以卒歲。”師己反，桓子曰：“孔子亦何言？”師己以實告。桓子喟然歎曰：“夫子罪我以羣婢故也。”		
	夫孔子去魯凡<u>十三年</u>，適衛者五，適陳、適蔡者再，適曹、適宋、適鄭、適葉、適楚各一。諸侯皆莫能用，卒自衛反魯。	Later on, the *Shiji* narrative has “fourteen years.” See chapter four.	
孔子遂適衛，主於子路妻兄顏濁鄒家。衛靈公問孔子：“居魯得祿幾何？”對曰：“奉粟六萬。”衛人亦致粟六萬。居頃之，或譖孔子於衛靈公。靈公使公孫余假一出一入。孔子恐獲罪焉，居十月，去衛。	孔子之初適衛也，主於顏讎。由衛靈公問孔子：“居魯得祿幾何？”對曰：“奉粟六萬。”衛人亦致粟六萬。居頃之，或譖孔子於靈公，靈公使公孫余假一出一入。孔子恐獲罪，居十月，去衛。	Confucius’ first trip to Wei.	
將適陳，過匡，顏刻為僕，以其策指之曰：“昔吾入此，由彼缺也。”匡人聞之，以為魯之陽虎。陽虎嘗暴匡人，匡人於是遂止孔子。孔子狀類陽虎，拘焉五日，顏淵後，子曰：“吾以汝為	將適陳，過匡。孔子貌類陽虎，陽虎嘗暴匡人，匡人以為虎而止之。孔子曰：“文王既沒，文不在茲乎？天之將喪斯文也，後死者不得與於斯文	Confucius’ first trip to Chen.	《論語•子罕》：“子畏於匡。曰：‘文王既沒，文不在茲乎？天之將喪斯文

死矣。”顏淵曰：“子在，回何敢死！”匡人拘孔子益急，弟子懼。孔子曰：“文王既沒，文不在茲乎？天之將喪斯文也，後死者不得與于斯文也。天之未喪斯文也，匡人其如予何！”孔子使從者為甯武子臣於衛，然後得去。~~去即過蒲。~~	也。天之未喪斯文也，匡人其如予何？”居五日，顏淵後。子曰：“吾以汝為死矣！”顏淵曰：“子在，回何敢死？”孔子使從者為甯武子臣，然後得去。	See *Lunyu* 9.5 and 11.21; see also my discussion in chapter four.	也，後死者不得與於斯文也；天之未喪斯文也，匡人其如予何？’” 《論語•先進》：“子畏於匡，顏淵後。子曰：‘吾以女為死矣。’曰：‘子在，回何敢死？’”
月餘，反乎衛，主蘧伯玉家。靈公夫人有南子者，使人謂孔子曰：“四方之君子不辱欲與寡君為兄弟者，必見寡小君。寡小君願見。”孔子辭謝，不得已而見之。夫人在絺帷中。孔子入門，北面稽首。夫人自帷中再拜，環珮玉聲璆然。孔子曰：“吾鄉為弗見，見之禮答焉。”子路不說。孔子矢之曰：“予所不者，天厭之！天厭之！”	月餘，復反乎衛，主蘧伯玉。靈公夫人南子使人謂孔子曰：“四方之君子不辱與寡君為兄弟者，必見寡小君。寡小君願見。”孔子辭謝，不得已而見之。夫人在絺帷中，孔子入門，北面稽首，夫人自帷中再拜，環佩玉聲璆然。孔子曰：“吾鄉為弗見，見之禮答焉。” 子路不說。孔子矢之，曰：“予所否者，天厭之，天厭之！”	Confucius’ second trip to Wei. See *Lunyu* 6.28.	《論語•雍也》：“子見南子，子路不說。夫子矢之曰：‘予所否者，天厭之！天厭之！’”
居衛月餘，靈公與夫人同車，宦者雍渠參乘，出，使孔子為次乘，招搖市過之。孔子曰：“吾未見好德如好色者也。”於是醜之，去衛。	居月餘，靈公與夫人同車，宦者雍渠參乘，使孔子為次乘，招搖過市。孔子曰：“吾未見好德如好色者也！”於是醜之，去衛。	See *Lunyu* 9.18 and 15.13.	《論語•子罕》：“子曰：‘吾未見好德如好色者也。’” 《論語•衛靈公》：“子曰：‘已矣乎！吾未見好德如好色者也。’”
過曹。是歲，魯定公卒。	過曹。是歲，魯定公卒。	Confucius’ only trip to Cao.	
孔子去曹適宋，與弟子習禮大樹下。宋司馬桓魋欲殺孔子，拔其樹。孔子去。弟子曰：“可以速	孔子去曹適宋，與弟子習禮大樹下。宋司馬桓魋欲害孔子，扳去其樹。孔子曰：“天生德於予，桓魋其如予何？”	Conficius’ only trip to Song. See *Lunyu* 7.23.	《論語•述而》：“子曰：‘天生德於

矣。”孔子曰：“天生德於予，桓魋其如予何！”			予，桓魋其如予何？’”
孔子適鄭，與弟子相失，孔子獨立郭東門。鄭人或謂子貢曰：“東門有人，其顙似堯，其項類皋陶，其肩類子產，然自要以下不及禹三寸。纍纍若喪家之狗。”子貢以實告孔子。孔子欣然笑曰：“形狀，末也。而謂似喪家之狗，然哉！然哉！”	孔子適鄭，與弟子相失，獨立鄭東門外。鄭人或謂子貢曰：“東門有人，其顙似堯，其項類皐陶，其肩類子產，然自腰以下不及禹三寸，纍纍若喪家之狗。”子貢以告，孔子欣然笑曰：“形狀，末也。而似喪家之狗，然哉，然哉！”	Confucius’ only trip to Zheng.	
孔子遂至陳，主於司城貞子家。~~歲餘，吳王夫差伐陳，取三邑而去。趙鞅伐朝歌。楚圍蔡，蔡遷于吳。吳敗越王句踐會稽。~~有隼集于陳廷而死，楛矢貫之，石砮，矢長尺有咫。陳湣公使使問仲尼。仲尼曰：“隼來遠矣，此肅慎之矢也。昔武王克商，通道九夷百蠻，使各以其方賄來貢，使無忘職業。於是肅慎貢楛矢石砮，長尺有咫。先王欲昭其令德，以肅慎矢分大姬，配虞胡公而封諸陳。分同姓以珍玉，展親；分異姓以遠職，使無忘服。故分陳以肅慎矢。”試求之故府，果得之。	孔子遂至陳，主司城貞子。 有隼集於陳庭而死，楛矢貫之，石砮長尺有咫。陳湣公使問孔子，孔子曰：“隼来遠矣。此肅慎氏之矢也。昔武王克商，通道九夷八蠻，使各以其方賄来貢，以無忘職業。於是肅慎貢楛矢石砮，長尺有咫。先王欲昭其令德，以肅慎矢分太姬，配胡公而封諸陳。分同姓以寶玉，展親也；分異姓以遠方之職貢，無忘服也。”陳人求之故府，得之。	Confucius’ second trip to Chen. Minor changes in wording.	
孔子居陳三歲，會晉楚爭彊，~~更伐陳，及吳侵陳~~，陳常被寇。~~孔子曰：“歸與歸與！吾黨之小子狂簡，進取不忘其初。”~~於是孔子去陳。	居陳三年，吳、楚争陳，陳常被寇。孔子去陳。	Cf. *Lunyu* 5.22.	《論語•公冶長》：“子在陳曰：‘歸與！歸與！吾黨之小子狂簡，斐然成章，不知所以裁之。’”
過蒲，會公叔氏以蒲畔，蒲人止孔子。弟子有公良孺者，以私車五乘從孔子。~~*其為人長賢，有勇力，謂曰：“吾昔從夫子遇難於匡，今又遇難於此，命也已。吾與夫子再罹難，寧鬬而死。”*~~鬬	將復適衛，過蒲。會公叔氏以蒲叛衛，止孔子。弟子公良孺以其私車與蒲人鬬，蒲人懼，與孔子盟曰：“無適衛。”孔子既出，適衛。子貢曰：“盟可負耶？”孔子曰：“要盟，神弗聽也。”	Confucius’ third trip to Wei. Deleted passage is relocated to	

甚疾。蒲人懼，謂孔子曰：“苟毋適衛，吾出子。”與之盟，出孔子東門。孔子遂適衛。子貢曰：“盟可負邪？”孔子曰：“要盟也，神不聽。”		“Kongzi dizi liezhuan” in the *Gushi*; see chapter four, footnote 42.	
衛靈公聞孔子來，喜，郊迎。問曰：“蒲可伐乎？”對曰：“可。”靈公曰：“吾大夫以為不可。今蒲，衛之所以待晉、楚也，以衛伐之，無乃不可乎？”孔子曰：“其男子有死之志，婦人有保西河之志。吾所伐者不過四五人。”靈公曰：“善。”然不伐蒲。	衛靈公聞孔子来，喜，郊迎。問曰：“蒲可伐乎？”對曰：“可。”靈公曰：“蒲，衛之所以待晉、楚也，而伐之，可乎？”孔子曰：“其男子有死之志。婦人有保西河之志、吾所伐者。不過四五人。”公曰：“善。”然不伐蒲。		
靈公老，怠於政，不用孔子。孔子喟然歎曰：“苟有用我者，朞月而已，三年有成。”~~孔子行。~~	靈公老，怠於政，不用孔子。孔子歎曰：“苟有用我者，期月而已可也。三年有成。”	See *Lunyu* 13.10.	《論語•子路》：“子曰：‘苟有用我者。期月而已可也，三年有成。’”
佛肸為中牟宰。趙簡子攻范、中行，伐中牟。佛肸畔，使人召孔子。孔子欲往。子路曰：“由聞諸夫子，‘其身親為不善者，君子不入也’。今佛肸親以中牟畔，子欲往，如之何？”孔子曰：“有是言也。不曰堅乎，磨而不磷；不曰白乎，涅而不淄。我豈匏瓜也哉，焉能繫而不食？”		See its *Gushi* parallel below. Cf. *Lunyu* 17.6.	《論語•陽貨》：“佛肸召，子欲往。子路曰：‘昔者由也聞諸夫子曰：“親於其身為不善者，君子不入也。”佛肸以中牟畔，子之往也，如之何！’子曰：‘然。有是言也。不曰堅乎，磨而不磷；不曰白乎，涅而不緇。吾豈匏瓜也哉？焉能繫而不食？’”

孔子擊磬。有荷蕢而過門者，曰：“有心哉，擊磬乎！硜硜乎，莫己知也夫而已矣！”	*擊磬於衛。有荷蕢而過門者，曰：“有心哉，擊磬乎！”既而曰：“鄙哉，硜硜乎！莫己知也夫，已而已矣。”孔子聞之曰：“果哉，末之難矣。”*	See *Lunyu* 14.39.	《論語•憲問》：“子擊磬於衛。有荷蕢而過孔氏之門者，曰：‘有心哉！擊磬乎！’既而曰：‘鄙哉！硜硜乎！莫己知也，斯已而已矣。深則厲，淺則揭。’子曰：‘果哉！末之難矣。’”
	孔子自衛將適晉。趙簡子攻范、中行，伐中牟。佛肸以中牟叛，召孔子，孔子欲往。子路曰：“由聞諸夫子，親於其身為不善者，君子不入也。佛肸以中牟叛，子之往也，如之何？”孔子曰：“有是言也。不曰堅乎，磨而不磷；不曰白乎，涅而不淄。吾豈匏瓜也哉？焉能繫而不食？”	See *Lunyu* 17.6 and its *Shiji* parallel above.	《論語•陽貨》：“佛肹召，子欲往。子路曰：‘昔者由也聞諸夫子曰：“親於其身為不善者，君子不入也。”佛肹以中牟畔，子之往也，如之何！’子曰：‘然。有是言也。不曰堅乎，磨而不磷；不曰白乎，涅而不緇。吾豈匏瓜也哉？焉能繫而不食？’”
孔子學鼓琴師襄子，十日不進。師襄子曰：“可以益矣。”孔子曰：“丘已習其曲矣，未得其數也。”有間，曰：“已習其數，可以益矣。”孔子曰：“丘未得其志也。”有間，曰：“已習其志，可以益矣。”孔子曰：“丘未得其為人也。”有間，（曰）有所穆然深思焉，有所怡然高望而遠志焉。曰：“丘得其為人，黯然而黑，幾然而長，眼如望羊，如王四國，非文王其誰能		See its *Gushi* parallel below.	

為此也！”師襄子辟席再拜，曰：“師蓋云《文王操》也。”			
孔子既不得用於衛，將西見趙簡子。至於河而聞竇鳴犢、舜華之死也，臨河而歎曰：“美哉水，洋洋乎！丘之不濟此，命也夫！”子貢趨而進曰：“敢問何謂也？”孔子曰：“竇鳴犢、舜華，晉國之賢大夫也。趙簡子未得志之時，須此兩人而后從政；及其已得志，殺之乃從政。丘聞之也，刳胎殺夭則麒麟不至郊，竭澤涸漁則蛟龍不合陰陽，覆巢毀卵則鳳皇不翔。何則？君子諱傷其類也。夫鳥獸之於不義也尚知辟之，而況乎丘哉！”乃還息乎陬鄉，作為《陬操》以哀之。	孔子至河，聞趙簡子殺竇鳴犢、舜華，臨河而歎曰：“美哉水！洋洋乎，丘之不濟此。命也夫！”子貢趨而進曰：“敢問何謂也？”孔子曰：“竇鳴犢、舜華，晉之賢大夫也。趙氏未得志之時，湏此兩人而後從政；及其得志，殺之乃從政。丘聞之也，刳胎殺夭，則騏驎不至郊；竭澤涸漁，則蛟龍不合陰陽；覆巢毀卵，則鳳凰不翔。何則？諱傷其類也。夫鳥獸之於不義也，尚知辟之，而况丘哉！”乃還息於陬鄉，作《陬操》以哀之。		
而反乎衛，入主蘧伯玉家。他日，靈公問兵陳。孔子曰：“俎豆之事則嘗聞之，軍旅之事未之學也。”明日，~~與孔子語，見蜚鴈，仰視之，色不在孔子。孔子~~遂行。	反乎衛，復主蘧伯玉。靈公問陳於孔子，孔子對曰：“俎豆之事則嘗聞之，軍旅之事未之學也。”明日遂行。	Confucius’ fourth trip to Wei. See *Lunyu* 15.1.	《論語•衛靈公》：“衛靈公問陳於孔子。孔子對曰：‘俎豆之事，則嘗聞之矣；軍旅之事，未之學也。’明日遂行。”
復如陳。	復適陳。	Confucius’ third trip to Chen.	
夏，衛靈公卒，~~立孫輒，是為衛出公。六月，趙鞅內太子蒯聵于戚。陽虎使太子絻，八人衰絰，偽自衛迎者，哭而入，遂居焉。冬，蔡遷于州來。~~是歲魯哀公三年，而孔子年六十矣。~~齊助衛圍戚，以衛太子蒯聵在故也~~。	是歲，靈公死。 明年，魯哀公三年，孔子年六十矣。		
夏，魯桓釐廟燔，南宮敬叔救火。孔子在陳，聞之，曰：“災必於桓釐廟乎？”已而果然。	魯桓宮、釐宮災。孔子聞之，曰：“災必於桓釐之宮。”已而果然。		

秋，季桓子病，輦而見魯城，喟然歎曰：“昔此國幾興矣，以吾獲罪於孔子，故不興也。”顧謂其嗣康子曰：“我即死，若必相魯；相魯，必召仲尼。”後數日，桓子卒，康子代立。已葬，欲召仲尼。公之魚曰：“昔吾先君用之不終，終為諸侯笑。今又用之，不能終，是再為諸侯笑。”康子曰：“則誰召而可？”曰：“必召冉求。”於是使使召冉求。冉求將行，孔子曰：“魯人召求，非小用之，將大用之也。”是日，孔子曰：“歸乎歸乎！吾黨之小子狂簡，斐然成章，吾不知所以裁之。”子贛知孔子思歸，送冉求，因誡曰“即用，以孔子為招”云。	秋，季桓子卒，其弟康子嗣。桓子病且死，遺言於康子，恨不終用孔子，屬使召之，故康子欲召孔子。公之魚曰：“昔吾先君用之不終，為諸侯笑。今又用之，不能終，是再為諸侯笑也。”康子曰：“然則誰召而可？”曰：“必召冉求。”於是使使召冉求。冉求將行，孔子曰：“魯人召求，非小用之，將大用之也。”是日，孔子曰：“歸歟，歸歟！吾黨之小子狂簡，斐然成章，不知所以裁之。”子貢知孔子思歸，送冉求，因誡曰“即用，以孔子為招”云。	See *Lunyu* 5.22.	《論語•公冶長》：“子在陳曰：‘歸與！歸與！吾黨之小子狂簡，斐然成章，不知所以裁之。’”
冉求既去，明年，孔子自陳遷于蔡。~~蔡昭公將如吳，吳召之也。前昭公欺其臣遷州來，後將往，大夫懼復遷，~~公孫翩射殺昭公。~~楚侵蔡。秋，齊景公卒。~~	冉求既去，明年，孔子自陳遷於蔡。蔡公孫翩弒昭公。	Confucius’ first trip to Cai.	
明年，孔子自蔡如葉。葉公問政，孔子曰：“政在來遠附邇。”他日，葉公問孔子於子路，子路不對。孔子聞之，曰：“由，爾何不對曰‘其為人也，學道不倦，誨人不厭，發憤忘食，樂以忘憂，不知老之將至’云爾。”	明年，孔子自蔡如葉。葉公問政，孔子曰：“近者說，遠者来。”他日，葉公問孔子於子路，子路不對。孔子聞之，曰：“爾奚不曰‘其為人也，發憤忘食，樂以忘憂，不知老之將至’云爾。”	Confucius’ only trip to She. See *Lunyu* 13.16 and 7.19.	《論語•子路》：“葉公問政。子曰：‘近者說，遠者來。’” 《論語•述而》：“葉公問孔子於子路，子路不對。子曰：‘女奚不曰，其為人也，發憤忘食，樂以忘憂，不知老之將至云爾。’”

去葉，反于蔡。長沮、桀溺耦而耕，孔子以為隱者，使子路問津焉。長沮曰：“彼執輿者為誰？”子路曰：“為孔丘。”曰：“是魯孔丘與？”曰：“然。”曰：“是知津矣。”桀溺謂子路曰：“子為誰？”曰：“為仲由。”曰：“子，孔丘之徒與？”曰：“然。”桀溺曰：“悠悠者天下皆是也，而誰以易之？且與其從辟人之士，豈若從辟世之士哉！”耰而不輟。子路以告孔子，孔子憮然曰：“鳥獸不可與同羣。天下有道，丘不與易也。”	去葉，反於蔡。長沮、桀溺耦而耕。孔子過之，使子路問津焉。長沮曰：“夫執輿者為誰？”曰：“為孔丘。”曰：“是魯孔丘歟？”曰：“然。”曰：“是知津矣。”桀溺曰：“子為誰？”曰：“為仲由。”曰：“是魯孔丘之徒歟？”曰：“然。”曰：“滔滔者，天下皆是也，而誰以易之？且而與其從辟人之士也，豈若從辟世之士哉！”耰而不輟。子路行，以告，孔子憮然曰：“鳥獸不可與同羣！吾非斯人之徒與而誰與？天下有道，丘不與易也。”	Confucius’ second trip to Cai. The *Gushi* aligns with the wording of *Lunyu* 18.6.	《論語•微子》：“長沮、桀溺耦而耕，孔子過之，使子路問津焉。長沮曰：‘夫執輿者為誰？’子路曰：‘為孔丘。’曰：‘是魯孔丘與？’曰：‘是也。’曰：‘是知津矣。’問於桀溺，桀溺曰：‘子為誰？’曰：‘為仲由。’曰：‘是魯孔丘之徒與？’對曰：‘然。’曰：‘滔滔者天下皆是也，而誰以易之？且而與其從辟人之士也，豈若從辟世之士哉？’耰而不輟。子路行以告。夫子憮然曰：‘鳥獸不可與同群，吾非斯人之徒與而誰與？天下有道，丘不與易也。’”
他日，子路行，遇荷蓧丈人，曰：“子見夫子乎？”丈人曰：“四體不勤，五穀不分，孰為夫子！”植其杖而芸。子路以告，孔子曰：“隱者也。”復往，則亡。	他日，子路遇荷蓧丈人，曰：“子見夫子乎？”丈人曰：“四體不勤，五穀不分，孰為夫子？”止子路宿，殺雞為黍而食之。見其二子焉。明日，子路以告孔子，孔子曰：“隱者也。”使子路反見之，至則行矣。子路曰：“不仕無義，長幼之節，不可廢也；君臣之義，如之何其廢之？	The *Gushi* aligns with the wording of *Lunyu* 18.7.	《論語•微子》：“子路從而後，遇丈人，以杖荷蓧。子路問曰：‘子見夫子乎？’丈人曰：‘四體不勤，五穀不分。孰為夫子？’植其杖而芸。子路拱而立。

	欲絜其身， 而亂大倫！君子之仕也，行其義也，道之不行，已知之矣。”		止子路宿，殺雞為黍而食之，見其二子焉。明日，子路行以告。子曰：‘隱者也。’使子路反見之。至則行矣。子路曰：‘不仕無義。長幼之節，不可廢也；君臣之義，如之何其廢之？欲潔其身，而亂大倫。君子之仕也，行其義也。道之不行，已知之矣。’”
孔子遷于蔡三歲，吳伐陳。楚救陳，軍于城父。聞孔子在陳蔡之間，楚使人聘孔子。孔子將往拜禮，陳蔡大夫謀曰：“孔子賢者，所刺譏皆中諸侯之疾。今者久留陳蔡之間，諸大夫所設行皆非仲尼之意。今楚，大國也，來聘孔子。孔子用於楚，則陳蔡用事大夫危矣。”於是乃相與發徒役圍孔子於野。不得行，絕糧。從者病，莫能興。孔子講誦弦歌不衰。	孔子反於蔡。三歲，吳伐陳。楚昭王救陳，師於城父。聞孔子在陳、蔡之間，使人聘孔子。孔子將往從之，陳、蔡大夫謀曰：“孔子賢者，所譏刺皆中諸侯之病。今者从留陳、蔡之間，諸大夫所行非仲尼意，若用於楚，則陳、蔡用事大夫危矣！”於是相與發徒役圍孔子於野，不得行。絶糧，從者病，莫能興。孔子講誦弦歌不衰。	Cf. *Kongzi jiayu* (“Zai e”).	《孔子家語•在厄》：“楚昭王聘孔子，孔子往拜禮焉，路出于陳、蔡。陳、蔡大夫相與謀曰：‘孔子聖賢，其所刺譏，皆中諸侯之病。若用於楚，則陳、蔡危矣。’遂使徒兵距孔子。孔子不得行，絕糧七日，外無所通，黎羹不充，從者皆病，孔子愈慷慨講誦絃歌不衰。”
子路慍見曰：“君子亦有窮乎？”孔子曰：“君子固窮，小人窮斯濫矣。”	子路愠見，曰：“君子亦有窮與？”孔子曰：“君子固窮，小人窮斯濫矣。”	See *Lunyu* 15.2.	《論語•衛靈公》：“在陳絕糧，從者病，莫能興。子路慍見曰：‘君子亦有窮

			乎？’子曰：‘君子固窮，小人窮斯濫矣。’”
子貢色作。孔子曰：“賜，爾以予為多學而識之者與？”曰：“然。非與？”孔子曰：“非也。予一以貫之。”		See *Lunyu* 15.3.	《論語•衛靈公》：“子曰：‘賜也，女以予為多學而識之者與？’對曰：‘然，非與？’曰：‘非也，予一以貫之。’”
孔子知弟子有慍心，乃召子路而問曰：“《詩》云：‘匪兕匪虎，率彼曠野。’吾道非邪？吾何為於此？”子路曰：“意者吾未仁邪？人之不我信也。意者吾未知邪？人之不我行也。”孔子曰：“有是乎！由，譬使仁者而必信，安有伯夷、叔齊？使知者而必行，安有王子比干？” 子路出，子貢入見。孔子曰：“賜，《詩》云：‘匪兕匪虎，率彼曠野。’吾道非邪？吾何為於此？”子貢曰：“夫子之道至大也，故天下莫能容夫子。夫子蓋少貶焉？”孔子曰：“賜，良農能稼而不能為穡，良工能巧而不能為順。君子能脩其道，綱而紀之，統而理之，而不能為容。今爾不脩爾道而求為容。賜，而志不遠矣！” 子貢出，顏回入見。孔子曰：“回，《詩》云：‘匪兕匪虎，率彼曠野。’吾道非邪？吾何為於此？”顏回曰：“夫子之道至大，故天下莫能容。雖然，夫子推而行之，不容何病，不容然後見君子！夫道之不脩也，是吾醜也。夫道既已大脩而不用，是有國者之醜也。不容何病，不容然後見君子！”孔子欣然而笑曰：“有是哉顏氏之子！使爾多財，吾為爾宰。”	孔子知弟子有愠心，乃召子路而問曰：“《詩》云：‘匪兕匪虎，率彼曠野。’吾道非耶？吾何為於此？”子路曰：“意者吾未仁耶？人之不我信也。意者吾未知耶？人之不我行也。”孔子曰：“由，有是乎？使仁者而必信，安有伯夷、叔齊？使知者而必行，安有王子比干？” 子路出。子貢入見，孔子曰：“《詩》云：‘匪兕匪虎，率彼曠野。’吾道非耶？吾何為於此？”子貢曰：“夫子之道至大也，故天下莫能容夫子。夫子盍少貶焉？”孔子曰：“賜，良農能稼而不能為穡，良工能巧而不能為順，君子能修其道綱而紀之統而理之，而不能為容。今爾不修爾道，而求為容，而志不遠矣！” 子貢出，顏回入見，孔子曰：“《詩》云：‘匪兕匪虎，率彼曠野。’吾道非耶？吾何為於此？”顏回曰：“夫子之道至大，故天下莫能容。雖然夫子推而行，不容何病？不容然後見君子！夫道之不修，是吾醜也。道既已大修而不用，是有國者之醜也。不容何病？不容然後見君子！”孔子欣然而笑曰：“有是哉！顏氏之子，使爾多財，吾為爾宰。”	Cf. Parallel in the *Kongzi jiayu* (“Zai e”).	《孔子家語•在厄》：“乃召子路而問焉，曰：‘《詩》云：“匪兕匪虎，率彼曠野。”吾道非乎？奚為至於此？’子路慍，作色而對曰：‘君子無所困。意者夫子未仁與？人之弗吾信也；意者夫子未智與？人之弗吾行也。且由也，昔者聞諸夫子：“為善者，天報之以福；為不善者，天報之以禍。”今夫子積德懷義，行之久矣，奚居之窮也？’子曰：‘由未之識也！吾語汝。汝以仁者為必信也，則伯夷、叔齊不餓死首陽；汝以智者

			為必用也，則王子比干不見剖心；汝以忠者為必報也，則關龍逢不見刑；汝以諫者為必聽也，則伍子胥不見殺。夫遇不遇者，時也；賢不肖者，才也。君子博學深謀，而不遇時者，眾矣。何獨丘哉！且芝蘭生於深林，不以無人而不芳；君子修道立德，不為窮困而敗節，為之者人也，生死者命也。是以晉重耳之有霸心，生於曹、衛；越王句踐之有霸心，生於會稽。故居下而無憂者，則思不遠；處身而常逸者，則志不廣。庸知其終始乎？’子路出。召子貢，告如子路。子貢曰：‘夫子之道至大，故天下莫能容夫子，夫子盍少貶焉？’子曰：‘賜！良農能稼，不必能穡；良工能巧，不能為順；君子能修其道，綱而紀之，不必其能容。今不修其道，而求其容，賜，

			爾志不廣矣！思不遠矣！’子貢出。顏回入，問亦如之。顏回曰：‘夫子之道至大，天下莫能容。雖然，夫子推而行之，世不我用，有國者之醜也。夫子何病焉！不容然後見君子。’孔子欣然歎曰：‘有是哉，顏氏之子！吾亦使爾多財，吾為爾宰。’”
昭王將以書社地七百里封孔子。楚令尹子西曰：“王之使使諸侯有如子貢者乎？”曰：“無有。”“王之輔相有如顏回者乎？”曰：“無有。”“王之將率有如子路者乎？”曰：“無有。”“王之官尹有如宰予者乎？”曰：“無有。”“且楚之祖封於周，號為子男五十里。今孔丘述三五之法，明周召之業，王若用之，則楚安得世世堂堂方數千里乎？夫文王在豐，武王在鎬，百里之君卒王天下。今孔丘得據土壤，賢弟子為佐，非楚之福也。”昭王乃止。其秋，楚昭王卒于城父。	於是使子貢見楚昭王，昭王以師迎孔子，然後得免。昭王將以書社地七百里封孔子，楚令尹子西曰：“王之使諸侯有如子貢者乎？”曰：“無有。”“王之輔相有如顏回者乎？”曰：“無有。”“王之將帥有如子路者乎？”曰：“無有。”“王之官尹有如宰予者乎？”曰：“無有。”“且楚之祖封於周，號為子男五十里。今孔丘述三五之法，明周、召之業，王若用之，則楚安得世世堂堂方數千里乎？文王在豐，武王在鎬，百里之君，卒王天下。今孔丘得據土壤，賢弟子為佐，非楚之福也。”昭王乃止。其秋，楚昭王卒於城父。	Confucius’ only trip to Chu.	
楚狂接輿歌而過孔子，曰：“鳳兮鳳兮，何德之衰！往者不可諫兮，來者猶可追也！已而已而，今之從政者殆而！”孔子下，欲與之言。趨而去，弗得與之言。	楚狂接輿歌而過孔子曰：“鳳兮鳳兮，何德之衰！往者不可諫，来者猶可追。已而已而，今之從政者殆而。”孔子下，欲與之言，趨而辟之，不得與之言。	The *Gushi* aligns with the wording of *Lunyu* 18.5.	《論語•微子》：“楚狂接輿歌而過孔子曰：‘鳳兮！鳳兮！何德之衰？往者不可諫，來者猶可追。已而，已而！今

			之從政者殆而！’孔子下，欲與之言。趨而辟之，不得與之言。”
於是孔子自楚反乎衛。是歲也，孔子年六十三，而魯哀公六年也。 ~~其明年，吳與魯會繒，徵百牢。太宰嚭召季康子。康子使子貢往，然後得已。~~ 孔子曰：“魯衛之政，兄弟也。”是時，衛君輒父不得立，在外，諸侯數以為讓。而孔子弟子多仕於衛，衛君欲得孔子為政。子路曰：“衛君待子而為政，子將奚先？”孔子曰：“必也正名乎！”子路曰：“有是哉，子之迂也！何其正也？”孔子曰：“野哉由也！夫名不正則言不順，言不順則事不成，事不成則禮樂不興，禮樂不興則刑罰不中，刑罰不中則民無所錯手足矣。夫君子為之必可名，言之必可行。君子於其言，無所苟而已矣。”	於是孔子自楚反乎衛。是歲，孔子年六十三，而魯哀公六年也。衛靈公死，而世子蒯聵入於戚。蒯聵之子出公輒立，父子爭國。孔子既至，而弟子疑所予，冉有、子貢以伯夷、叔齊之事質之，然後知孔子之不予輒也。子路問孔子治衛所先，孔子答之以“正名”，而子路不達。前此三年，季康子嗣立，而召冉有矣。後此五年，冉有為魯帥，師敗齊師于清。今冉有在衛，豈自魯来見孔子歟？哀公七年，子貢在魯，為季氏說吳太宰嚭，豈今歲自衛反魯歟？子路與冉有同為季氏家臣，既而仕衛，孔氏以死。豈與孔子皆歸於魯，復自魯仕衛歟？傳記脫畧，無所考證矣。	Confucius’ fifth trip to Wei. Cf. *Lunyu* 7.15 and 13.3.	《論語•述而》： “冉有曰：‘夫子為衛君乎？’子貢曰：‘諾。吾將問之。’入，曰：‘伯夷、叔齊何人也？’曰：‘古之賢人也。’曰：‘怨乎？’曰：‘求仁而得仁，又何怨。’出，曰：‘夫子不為也。’” 《論語•子路》： “子路曰：‘衛君待子而為政，子將奚先？’子曰：‘必也正名乎！’子路曰：‘有是哉，子之迂也！奚其正？’子曰：‘野哉由也！君子於其所不知，蓋闕如也。名不正，則言不順；言不順，則事不成；事不成，則禮樂不興；禮樂不興，則刑罰不中；刑罰不中，則民無所措手足。故君子名之必可言也，言之必可行

			也。君子於其言，無所苟而已矣。’”
	孔子既歷聘諸國，其君無足與成事者，將歸老於魯。弟子冉有、子貢方為魯臣，故孔子磐桓於衛者累歲。		
其明年，冉有為季氏將師，與齊戰於郎，克之。季康子曰：“子之於軍旅，學之乎？性之乎？”冉有曰：“學之於孔子。”季康子曰：“孔子何如人哉？”對曰：“用之有名；播之百姓，質諸鬼神而無憾。求之至於此道，雖累千社，夫子不利也。”康子曰：“我欲召之，可乎？”對曰：“欲召之，則毋以小人固之，則可矣。”而衛孔文子將攻太叔，問策於仲尼。仲尼辭不知，退而命載而行，曰：“鳥能擇木，木豈能擇鳥乎！”文子固止。會季康子逐公華、公賓、公林，以幣迎孔子，孔子歸魯。	魯哀公十一年，冉有帥師敗齊師於清，季康子嘉，欲召孔子，問冉有曰：“孔子何如人哉？”對曰：“用之有名，播之百姓，質之鬼神而無憾。然求之不以道，雖累千社，夫子不利也。”康子曰：“我欲召之，可乎？”對曰：“無以小人固之，則可矣。”衛大夫孔圉將攻太叔疾，訪於孔子。孔子辭之，退而命駕，曰：“鳥則擇木，木豈能擇鳥哉？”圉遽謝焉。將止，魯人以幣召孔子，乃歸。	Cf. *Zuozhuan* (Ai 11).	《左傳•哀公十一年》：“孔文子之將攻大叔也，訪於仲尼。仲尼曰：‘胡簋之事，則嘗學之矣，甲兵之事，未之聞也。’退命駕而行，曰：‘鳥則擇木，木豈能擇鳥？’文子遽止之，曰：‘圉豈敢度其私，訪衛國之難也。’將止，魯人以幣召之，乃歸，”
~~孔子之去魯凡十四歲而反乎魯。~~			
	季氏欲以田賦，使冉有訪諸孔子，孔子曰：“丘不識也。”冉有曰：“子為國老，待子而行，若之何子之不言也。”孔子不對。而私於冉有曰：“君子之行也度於禮。施取其厚，事舉其中，斂從其薄。如是，則丘亦足矣。若不度於禮，而貪冒無厭，雖以田賦，將又不足。且季孫若欲行而法，則周公之典在。若欲苟而行，又何訪焉？”弗聽。	See *Zuozhuan* (Ai 11).	《左傳•哀公十一年》：“季孫欲以田賦，使冉有訪諸仲尼。仲尼曰：‘丘不識也。’三發，卒曰：‘子為國老，待子而行，若之何子之不言也。’仲尼不對。而私於冉有曰：‘君子之行也度於

			禮。施取其厚，事舉其中，斂從其薄。如是則以丘亦足矣。若不度於禮，而貪冒無厭，則雖以田賦，將又不足，且子季孫若欲行而法，則周公之典在，若欲苟而行，又何訪焉？’弗聽。”
	十二年，昭夫人孟子卒。孔子吊，適季氏，季氏不絻，放絰而拜。	See *Zuozhuan* (Ai 12).	《左傳•哀公十二年》：“夏，五月，昭夫人孟子卒，昭公娶于吳，故不書姓，死不赴，故不稱夫人，不反哭，故言不葬小君，孔子與弔，適季氏，季氏不絻，放絰而拜。”
	十四年，齊田恒弒其君，孔子齋三日，而請伐齊。哀公曰：“魯為齊弱久矣，子之伐之，將如之何？”對曰：“田恒弒其君，民之不予者半，以魯之衆加齊之半，可克也。”公曰：“告夫三子。”之三子，告，不可。孔子退而告人曰：“以吾從大夫之後，不敢不告也。”	See *Zuozhuan* (Ai 14) and *Lunyu* 14.21.	《左傳•哀公十四年》：“甲午，齊陳恆弒其君壬于舒州，孔丘三日齊，而請伐齊三。公曰：‘魯為齊弱久矣，子之伐之，將若之何，？’對曰：‘陳恆弒其君，民之不與者半，以魯之眾，加齊之半，可克也。’公曰：‘子告季孫。’孔子辭，退而告人

			曰：‘吾以從大夫之後也，故不敢不言。’” 《論語•憲問》：“陳成子弒簡公。孔子沐浴而朝，告於哀公曰：‘陳恆弒其君，請討之。’公曰：‘告夫三子！’孔子曰：‘以吾從大夫之後，不敢不告也。君曰“告夫三子”者。’之三子告，不可。孔子曰：‘以吾從大夫之後，不敢不告也。’”
~~魯哀公問政，對曰：“政在選臣。”~~季康子問政，曰：“舉直錯諸枉，則枉者直。”	哀公問：“何為則民服？”孔子對曰：“舉直錯諸枉，則民服；舉枉錯諸直，則民不服。”	Cf. *Lunyu* 2.19.	《論語•為政》：“哀公問曰：‘何為則民服？’孔子對曰：‘舉直錯諸枉，則民服；舉枉錯諸直，則民不服。’”
	季康子問：“使民敬忠以勸。”對曰：“臨之以莊則敬，孝慈則忠，舉善而教，不能則勸。”	See *Lunyu* 2.20.	《論語•為政》：“季康子問：‘使民敬、忠以勸，如之何？’子曰：‘臨之以莊則敬，孝慈則忠，舉善而教不能，則勸。’”
	康子問政，對曰：“政者，正也。子帥以正，孰敢不正？”	See *Lunyu* 12.17.	《論語•顏淵》：“季康子問政於孔子。孔子對曰：‘政

			者，正也。子帥以正，孰敢不正？’”
康子患盜，孔子曰：“苟子之不欲，雖賞之不竊。”	康子患盜，對曰：“苟子之不欲，雖賞之不竊？”	See *Lunyu* 12.18.	《論語•顏淵》：“季康子患盜，問於孔子。孔子對曰：‘苟子之不欲，雖賞之不竊。’”
	又問：“如殺無道以就有道，何如？”對曰：“子為政，焉用殺？子欲善而民善矣。君子之德風，小人之德草。草上之風必偃。”	See *Lunyu* 12.19.	《論語•顏淵》：“季康子問政於孔子曰：‘如殺無道，以就有道，何如？’孔子對曰：‘子為政，焉用殺？子欲善，而民善矣。君子之德風，小人之德草。草上之風，必偃。’”
	*吳之伐越也，墮會稽，得骨節專車。吳子使聘魯，且問之孔子，曰：“無以吾命也。”賓既將命，發幣於大夫，及孔子，孔子爵之。既徹俎而燕，客執骨而問曰：“骨何者為大？”孔子曰：“丘聞之，昔禹致羣神於會稽之山，防風氏後至，禹殺而戮之，其骨專車，此為大矣。”客曰：“誰為神？”孔子曰：“山川之神。足以紀綱天下，其守為神，社稷為公侯，皆屬於王者。”客曰：“防風何守？”孔子曰：“汪罔氏之君，守封禺之山，為漆姓。在虞、夏、商為汪罔氏，於周為長狄，今謂之大人。”客曰：“人長幾何？”孔子曰：“僬僥氏三尺，短之至也；長者不過十之，數之極也。”*吳伐越，墮會稽，前此十一年。然其通魯，則五六年耳。《史記》載此事在定公之世，則為失之矣。	See the *Shiji* parallel above.	

然魯終不能用孔子，孔子亦不求仕。	孔子之歸魯，非求仕也，以為父母之邦，蓋將老焉。而魯之君臣亦莫能用。	See my discussion in chapter four.	
孔子之時，周室微而《禮》、《樂》廢，《詩》、《書》缺。追迹三代之禮，序《書傳》，上紀唐虞之際，下至秦繆，編次其事。	自周室微，而《禮》、《樂》、《詩》、《書》缺。孔子憂後世之無述也，於是叙《書》，上紀唐、虞，下至秦穆，為百篇。		
	刪《詩》，上采契、稷，中述商、周之盛，至幽、厲之缺，為三百五篇。皆弦歌之，以求合《韶》、《武》、《雅》、《頌》之音。	See the *Shiji* counterpart below.	
	故曰：“吾自衛反魯，然後樂正，《雅》、《頌》各得其所。”	See *Lunyu* 9.15.	《論語•子罕》：“子曰：‘吾自衛反魯，然後樂正，《雅》《頌》各得其所。’”
曰：“夏禮吾能言之，杞不足徵也。殷禮吾能言之，宋不足徵也。足，則吾能徵之矣。”	至於《禮》、《樂》之說，遭秦焚書之變，世不復見。孔子曰：“夏禮吾能言之，杞不足徵也。殷禮吾能言之，宋不足徵也。文獻不足故也。足，則吾能徵之矣。”	See *Lunyu* 3.9.	《論語•八佾》：“子曰：‘夏禮，吾能言之，杞不足徵也；殷禮，吾能言之，宋不足徵也。文獻不足故也，足則吾能徵之矣。’”
觀殷夏所損益，曰：“後雖百世可知也，以一文一質。周監二代，郁郁乎文哉。吾從周。”故《書傳》、《禮記》自孔氏。	孔子觀三代所損益，曰：“後雖百世可知也。周監乎二代，郁郁乎文哉！吾從周。”	See *Lunyu* 2.23 and 3.14.	《論語•為政》：“子張問：‘十世可知也？’子曰：‘殷因於夏禮，所損益可知也；周因於殷禮，所損益可知也；其或

			繼周者，雖百世可知也。’” 《論語•八佾》：“子曰：‘周監於二代，郁郁乎文哉！吾從周。’”
孔子語魯大師：“樂其可知也。始作翕如，縱之純如，皦如，繹如也，以成。”“吾自衛反魯，然後樂正，雅頌各得其所。”	與魯太師論樂，曰：“樂其可知也，始作翕如也，縱之純如也，皦如也，繹如也，以成。”至其詳，不可得而聞矣。	See *Lunyu* 3.23.	《論語•八佾》：“子語魯大師樂。曰：‘樂其可知也：始作，翕如也；從之，純如也，皦如也，繹如也，以成。’”
古者《詩》三千餘篇，及至孔子，去其重，取可施於禮義，上采契后稷，中述殷周之盛，至幽厲之缺，始於衽席，故曰：“《關雎》之亂以為《風》始，《鹿鳴》為《小雅》始，《文王》為《大雅》始，《清廟》為《頌》始。”三百五篇孔子皆弦歌之，以求合《韶》、《武》、《雅》、《頌》之音。~~禮樂自此可得而述，以備王道，成六藝。~~		See the *Gushi* counterpart above.	
孔子晚而喜《易》，序《彖》、《繫》、《象》、《說卦》、《文言》。讀《易》，韋編三絕。曰：“假我數年，若是，我於《易》則彬彬矣。”	蓋晚而學《易》，讀之，韋編三絶。為之《彖》、《象》、《文言》、《繫辭》，以發其秘。	Cf. *Lunyu* 7.17.	《論語•述而》：“子曰：‘加我數年，五十以學易，可以無大過矣。’”
	*復因魯史記作《春秋》，取東周之後、戰國之前，當魯十二公。*以為前此者，周之典刑行於諸侯，無所事《春秋》；後此者，禮法大壞，中夏幾於夷狄，雖有《春秋》無所復施。	See the *Shiji* parallel below.	

	哀公十四年春，西狩獲麟，魯人以為不祥。孔子傷之，故《春秋》終焉。其實由恒、三晉自是起也。	See *Zuozhuan* (Ai 14).	《左傳•哀公十四年》：“十四年，春，西狩于大野，叔孫氏之車子鉏商獲麟，以為不祥，以賜虞人，仲尼觀之，曰：“麟也。”然後取之。”
	孔子之於當世，其志見於《春秋》，故曰：“後世知我者以《春秋》，罪我者以《春秋》。”	Cf. *Mengzi* 3B.9.	《孟子•滕文公下》：“世衰道微，邪說暴行有作，臣弒其君者有之，子弒其父者有之。孔子懼，作《春秋》。《春秋》，天子之事也。是故孔子曰：‘知我者其惟春秋乎！罪我者其惟春秋乎！’”
孔子以詩書禮樂教，弟子蓋三千焉，身通六藝者七十有二人。~~如顏濁鄒之徒，頗受業者甚衆~~。	弟子受業，高弟七十七人，其下者三千，其於六藝不盡通也。		
~~孔子以四教：文，行，忠，信。~~		See *Lunyu* 7.25.	《論語•述而》：“子以四教：文，行，忠，信。”
~~絕四：毋意，毋必，毋固，毋我。~~		See *Lunyu* 9.4.	《論語•子罕》：“子絕四：毋意，毋必，毋固，毋我。”
~~所慎：齊，戰，疾。~~		See *Lunyu* 7.13.	《論語•述而》：“子之所慎：齊，戰，疾。”

~~子罕言利與命與仁。~~		See *Lunyu* 9.1.	《論語•子罕》：“子罕言利，與命，與仁。”
~~不憤不啟，舉一隅不以三隅反，則弗復也。~~		Cf. *Lunyu* 7.8.	《論語•述而》：“子曰：‘不憤不啟，不悱不發，舉一隅不以三隅反，則不復也。’”
~~其於鄉黨，恂恂似不能言者。其於宗廟朝廷，辯辯言，唯謹爾。朝，與上大夫夫言，闇闇如也；與下大夫夫言，侃侃如也。~~		See *Lunyu* 10.1.	《論語•鄉黨》：“孔子於鄉黨，恂恂如也，似不能言者。其在宗廟朝廷，便便言，唯謹爾。”
~~入公門，鞠躬如也；趨進，翼如也。君召使儐，色勃如也。君命召，不俟駕行矣。~~		Cf. *Lunyu* 10.2, 10.3 and 10.14.	《論語•鄉黨》：“朝，與下大夫言，侃侃如也；與上大夫言，闇闇如也。君在，踧踖如也。與與如也。” 《論語•鄉黨》：“君召使擯，色勃如也，足躩如也。揖所與立，左右手。衣前後，襜如也。趨進，翼如也。賓退，必復命曰：‘賓不顧矣。’” 《論語•鄉黨》：“君命召，不俟駕行矣。”

~~魚餒，肉敗，割不正，不食。席不正，不坐。~~		Cf. *Lunyu* 10.6 and 10.7.	《論語•鄉黨》：“齊必變食，居必遷坐。食不厭精，膾不厭細。食饐而餲，魚餒而肉敗不食。色惡不食。臭惡不食。失飪不食。不時不食。割不正不食。不得其醬不食。肉雖多，不使勝食氣。惟酒無量，不及亂。沽酒市脯不食。不撤薑食。不多食。祭於公、不宿肉。祭肉不出三日，出三日不食之矣。食不語，寢不言。雖疏食菜羹瓜，祭必齊如也。” 《論語•鄉黨》：“席不正，不坐。鄉人飲酒，杖者出，斯出矣。”
~~食於有喪者之側，未嘗飽也。~~		See *Lunyu* 7.9.	《論語•述而》：“子食於有喪者之側，未嘗飽也。”
~~是日哭，則不歌。~~ ~~見齊衰、瞽者，雖童子必變。~~		See *Lunyu* 7.10. Cf. *Lunyu* 9.10 and 10.18.	《論語•述而》：“子於是日哭，則不歌。” 《論語•子罕》：“子見齊衰者、冕衣裳者與瞽者，見之，

			雖少必作；過之，必趨。” 《論語•
~~“三人行，必得我師。”~~ ~~“德之不脩，學之不講，聞義不能徙，不善不能改，是吾憂也。”~~ ~~使人歌，善，則使復之，然后和之。~~		See *Lunyu* 7.22. See *Lunyu* 7.3. See *Lunyu* 7.32.	《論語•述而》：“子曰：‘三人行，必有我師焉。擇其善者而從之，其不善者而改之。’” 《論語•述而》：“子曰：‘德之不脩，學之不講，聞義不能徙，不善不能改，是吾憂也。’” 《論語•述而》：“子與人歌而善，必使反之，而後和之。”
~~子不語：怪，力，亂，神。~~		See *Lunyu* 7.21.	《論語•述而》：“子不語怪、力、亂、神。”
~~子貢曰：“夫子之文章，可得聞也。夫子言天道與性命，弗可得聞也已。”~~		Cf. *Lunyu* 5.13.	《論語•公冶長》：“子貢曰：‘夫子之文章，可得而聞也；夫子之言性與天道，不可得而聞也。’”
~~顏淵喟然歎曰：“仰之彌高，鑽之彌堅。瞻之在前，忽焉在後。夫子循循然善誘人，博我以文，約我以禮，欲罷不能。既竭我才，如有所立，卓爾。雖欲從之，蔑由也已。”~~		Cf. *Lunyu* 9.11.	《論語•子罕》：“顏淵喟然歎曰：‘仰之彌高，鑽之彌堅；瞻之在前，忽焉在後。夫子循循然善誘人，博我以文，約

			我以禮。欲罷不能，既竭吾才，如有所立卓爾。雖欲從之，末由也已。’”
達巷黨人（童子）曰：“大哉孔子，博學而無所成名。”~~子聞之曰：“我何執？執御乎？執射乎？我執御矣。”~~		Cf. *Lunyu* 9.2.	《論語•子罕》：“達巷黨人曰：‘大哉孔子！博學而無所成名。’子聞之，謂門弟子曰：‘吾何執？執御乎？執射乎？吾執御矣。’”
~~牢曰：“子云‘不試，故藝’。”~~		Cf. *Lunyu* 9.7.	《論語•子罕》：“牢曰：‘子云：“吾不試，故藝。”’”
~~魯哀公十四年春，狩大野。叔孫氏車子鉏商獲獸，以為不祥。仲尼視之，曰：“麟也。”取之。~~		See *Zuozhuan* (Ai 14).	《左傳•哀公十四年》：“十四年，春，西狩于大野，叔孫氏之車子鉏商獲麟，以為不祥，以賜虞人，仲尼觀之，曰：“麟也。”然後取之。”
曰：“河不出圖，雒不出書，吾已矣夫！”		Cf. *Lunyu* 9.9.	《論語•子罕》：“子曰：‘鳳鳥不至，河不出圖，吾已矣夫！’”
~~顏淵死，孔子曰：“天喪予！”~~		Cf. *Lunyu* 11.9.	《論語•先進》：“顏淵死。子曰：‘噫！天喪予！天喪予！’”

~~及西狩見麟，曰：“吾道窮矣！”~~		See *Zuozhuan* (Ai 14).	《左傳•哀公十四年》：“十四年，春，西狩于大野，叔孫氏之車子鉏商獲麟，以為不祥，以賜虞人，仲尼觀之，曰：“麟也。”然後取之。”
~~喟然歎曰：“莫知我夫！”子貢曰：“何為莫知子？”子曰：“不怨天，不尤人，下學而上達，知我者其天乎！”~~		See *Lunyu* 14.35.	《論語•憲問》：“子曰：‘莫我知也夫！’子貢曰：‘何為其莫知子也？’子曰：‘不怨天，不尤人。下學而上達。知我者，其天乎！’
	獲麟之三年，哀公十六年，孔子年七十有三。		
	蚤作，曳杖而歌於門曰：“泰山其頹乎，梁木其壞乎，哲人其萎乎？”子貢聞之曰：“泰山其頹，則吾將安仰？梁木其壞，哲人其萎，則吾將安放？夫子殆將病也。”趨而入。孔子曰：“夏后氏殯於東階之上，則猶在阼也。殷人殯於兩楹之間，則賓主夾之也。周人殯於西階之上，則猶賓之也。丘，殷人也。予夢坐奠於兩楹之間。夫明王不興，天下其孰能宗予？予殆將死也。”寢疾，七日而没。實四月己丑。	The *Gushi* revises the *Shiji* according to the *Liji* (“Tangong A”).	《禮記•檀弓上》：“孔子蚤作，負手曳杖，消搖於門，歌曰：‘泰山其頹乎？梁木其壞乎？哲人其萎乎？’既歌而入，當戶而坐。子貢聞之曰：‘泰山其頹，則吾將安仰？梁木其壞、哲人其萎，則吾將安放？夫子殆將病也。’遂趨而入。夫子曰：‘賜！爾來何遲也？夏后氏殯於東階之上，則猶在阼

			也；殷人殯於兩楹之間，則與賓主夾之也；周人殯於西階之上，則猶賓之也。而丘也殷人也。予疇昔之夜，夢坐奠於兩楹之間。夫明王不興，而天下其孰能宗予？予殆將死也。’蓋寢疾七日而沒。”
	哀公誄之。弟子葬之魯城北泗上，皆心喪三年。喪畢乃去，獨子貢築室於墓，復三年而去。弟子及魯人從而居者百餘室，命曰孔里。世世相傳，春秋奉祠不絕，雖帝王亦以弟子禮事之。	See the *Shiji* counterpart below.	
	孔子少好學而無常師。	Cf. *Lunyu* 5.28 and 19.22.	《論語•公冶長》：“子曰：‘十室之邑，必有忠信如丘者焉，不如丘之好學也。’” 《論語•子張》：“衛公孫朝問於子貢曰：‘仲尼焉學？’子貢曰：‘文武之道，未墜於地，在人。賢者識其大者，不賢者識其小者，莫不有文武之道焉。夫子焉不學？而亦何常師之有？’”

	嘗從老聃問禮，後與弟子言禮，猶以聃之言為斷。郯子朝於魯，道黃帝以来名官，孔子從而問焉，歎曰：“吾聞天子失官，學在四夷，猶信。”	Cf. *Zuozhuan* (Zhao 17).	《左傳•昭公十七年》：“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[…]。’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。’”
	嘗學鼓琴於師襄，十日不進，師襄曰：“可以益矣。”曰：“丘習其曲矣，未得其數也。”有間，曰：“已習其數，可以益矣。”曰：“丘未得其志也。”有間，曰：“已習其志，可以益矣。”曰：“丘未得其為人也。”有間，曰：“有所穆然深思，有所怡然高望而遠志焉。”曰：“丘得其為人矣。黯然而黑，頎然而長，眼如望羊，如王四國。非文王，其孰能為此也？”師襄辟席再拜曰：“師蓋云《文王操》也。”	See the *Shiji* parallel above.	
	故世之知之者曰：*“大哉，孔子！博學而無所成名。”*	See *Lunyu* 9.2.	《論語•子罕》：“達巷黨人曰：‘大哉孔子！博學而無所

			成名。’子聞之，謂門弟子曰：‘吾何執？執御乎？執射乎？吾執御矣。’”
	而孔子亦自謂“少賤，故多能鄙事”。然非其所以為孔子也。	See *Lunyu* 9.6.	《論語•子罕》：“大宰問於子貢曰：‘夫子聖者與？何其多能也？’子貢曰：‘固天縱之將聖，又多能也。’子聞之，曰：‘大宰知我乎！吾少也賤，故多能鄙事。君子多乎哉？不多也。’”
	所以為孔子者，人不盡知，而孔子盍略言焉。曰：“*我非多學而志之者，予一以貫之。*”	Cf. *Lunyu* 15.3 and 4.15.	《論語•衛靈公》：“子曰：‘賜也，女以予為多學而識之者與？’對曰：‘然，非與？’曰：‘非也，予一以貫之。’” 《論語•里仁》：“子曰：‘參乎！吾道一以貫之。’曾子曰：‘唯。’子出。門人問曰：‘何謂也？’曾子曰：‘夫子之道，忠恕而已矣。’”
	又曰：“吾十有五而志于學，三十而立，四十而不惑，五十而知天命，六十而耳順，七十而從心所欲不踰矩。”	See *Lunyu* 2.4.	《論語•為政》：“子曰：‘吾十有五而志于學，三十而

			立，四十而不惑，五十而知天命，六十而耳順，七十而從心所欲，不踰矩。’”
“不降其志，不辱其身，伯夷、叔齊乎！”謂柳下惠、少連降志辱身矣。謂虞仲、夷逸隱居放言，行中清，廢中權。“我則異於是，無可無不可。”	謂伯夷、叔齊，不降其志，不辱其身。謂柳下惠、少連降志而辱身矣，言中倫，行中慮，其斯而已矣。謂虞仲、夷逸隱居放言，身中清，廢中權。“我則異於是，無可無不可。”	Cf. *Lunyu* 18.8.	《論語•微子》：“逸民：伯夷、叔齊、虞仲、夷逸、朱張、柳下惠、少連。子曰：‘不降其志，不辱其身，伯夷、叔齊與！’謂柳下惠、少連，降志辱身矣。言中倫，行中慮，其斯而已矣。’謂虞仲、夷逸，隱居放言，身中清，廢中權。我則異於是，無可無不可。”
~~子曰：“弗乎弗乎，君子病沒世而名不稱焉。吾道不行矣，吾何以自見於後世哉？”~~		Cf. *Lunyu* 15.20.	《論語•憲問》：“子曰：‘君子疾沒世而名不稱焉。’”
乃因史記作《春秋》，上至隱公，下訖哀公十四年，十二公。~~據魯，親周，故殷，運之三代。約其文辭而指博。故吳楚之君自稱王，而春秋貶之曰“子”；踐土之會實召周天子，而《春秋》諱之曰“天王狩於河陽”：推此類以繩當世。貶損之義，後有王者舉而開之。春秋之義行，則天下亂臣賊子懼焉。~~		See the *Gushi* parallel below.	
~~孔子在位聽訟，文辭有可與人共者，弗獨有也。至於為春秋，筆則筆，削則削，子夏之徒不能贊~~		See the *Gushi* parallel above.	

~~一辭。弟子受春秋，~~*孔子曰：“後世知丘者以《春秋》，而罪丘者亦以《春秋》。”*			
明歲，子路死於衛。孔子病，子貢請見。孔子方負杖逍遙於門，曰：“賜，汝來何其晚也？”孔子因歎，歌曰：“太山壞乎！梁柱摧乎！哲人萎乎！”因以涕下。謂子貢曰：“天下無道久矣，莫能宗予。夏人殯於東階，周人於西階，殷人兩柱間。昨暮予夢坐奠兩柱之間，予始殷人也。”後七日卒。		See the *Gushi* parallel above.	
~~孔子年七十三，以魯哀公十六年四月己丑卒。~~			
哀公誄之曰：~~“旻天不弔，不慭遺一老，俾屏余一人以在位，煢煢余在疚。嗚呼哀哉！尼父，毋自律！”子貢曰：“君其不沒於魯乎！夫子之言曰：‘禮失則昏，名失則愆。失志為昏，失所為愆。’生不能用，死而誄之，非禮也。稱‘余一人’，非名也。”~~*孔子葬魯城北泗上，弟子皆服三年。三年心喪畢，相訣而去，則哭，各復盡哀；或復留。唯子贛廬於冢上，凡六年，然後去。弟子及魯人往從冢而家者百有餘室，因命曰孔里。魯世世相傳以歲時奉祠孔子冢，而諸儒亦講禮鄉飲大射於孔子冢。*~~孔子冢大一頃。故所居堂弟子內，後世因廟藏孔子衣冠琴車書，至于漢二百餘年不絕。高皇帝過魯，以太牢祠焉。諸侯卿相至，常先謁然後從政。~~		See the *Gushi* counterpart above.	
	至語其極也，曰：“予欲無言。天何言哉！四時行焉，百物生焉。”	See *Lunyu* 17.17.	《論語•陽貨》：“子曰：‘予欲無

			言。’子貢曰：‘子如不言，則小子何述焉？’子曰：‘天何言哉？四時行焉，百物生焉，天何言哉？’”
	然夫卞莫之知，則歎曰：“鳳鳥不至，河不出圖。吾已矣夫！”	See *Lunyu* 9.9.	《論語•子罕》：“子曰：‘鳳鳥不至，河不出圖，吾已矣夫！’”
	至其甚也，則“欲居九夷”，“乘桴以浮于海”，以示中國莫與立者，而非其誠言也。	See *Lunyu* 9.14 and 5.7.	《論語•子罕》：“子欲居九夷。或曰：‘陋如之何！’子曰：‘君子居之，何陋之有？’” 《論語•公冶長》：“子曰：‘道不行，乘桴浮于海。從我者其由與？’子路聞之喜。子曰：‘由也好勇過我，無所取材。’”
孔子生鯉，字伯魚。伯魚年五十，先孔子死。 伯魚生伋，字子思，年六十二。嘗困於宋。子思作中庸。 子思生白，字子上，年四十七。 子上生求，字子家，年四十五。 子家生箕，字子京，年四十六。 子京生穿，字子高，年五十一。 子高生子慎，年五十七，嘗為魏相。	孔子生鯉伯魚，年五十，先孔子死。 伯魚生伋子思，年六十二，作《中庸》。 子思生白子上，年四十七。 子上生求子家，年四十五。 子家生箕子京，年四十六。 子京生穿子高，年五十一。 子高生子慎，年五十七，嘗為魏相。 子慎生鮒，年五十七，為陳王涉博士，死於陳。		

子慎生鮒，年五十七，為陳王涉博士，死於陳下。 鮒弟子襄，年五十七。嘗為孝惠皇帝博士，遷為長沙太守。長九尺六寸。 子襄生忠，年五十七。 忠生武。 武生延年及安國。安國為今皇帝博士，至臨淮太守，蚤卒。 安國生卬。 卬生驩。	鮒弟子襄，年五十七，為漢惠帝博士，遷為長沙守，長九尺六寸。 子襄生忠，年五十七。 忠生武。 武生延年及安國。安國為漢武帝博士，至臨淮守，蚤卒。 安國生卬。 卬生驩。		

Abbreviations

CSJCCB	*Congshu jicheng chubian* 叢書集成初編
CSJCSB	*Congshu jicheng sanbian* 叢書集成三編
CSJCXB	*Congshu jicheng xinbian* 叢書集成新編
HS	*Hanshu* 漢書
SBCK	*Sibu congkan chubian* 四部叢刊初編
SBCKXB	*Sibu congkan xubian* 四部叢刊續編
SBCKSB	*Sibu congkan sanbian* 四部叢刊三編
SJ	*Shiji* 史記
SKQS	*Yingyin Wenyuange Siku quanshu* 景印文淵閣四庫全書
SHYJG	*Song huiyao jigao* 宋會要輯稿
SSJZS	*Shisanjing zhushu* 十三經注疏
XXSKQS	*Xuxiu Siku quanshu* 續修四庫全書
XZZTJCB	*Xu Zizhi tongjian changbian* 續資治通鑑長編
XZZTJCBSB	*Xu Zizhi tongjian changbian shibu* 續資治通鑑長編拾補
ZZTJ	*Zizhi tongjian* 資治通鑑

Bibliography

Ban Gu 班固 (32–92). *Baihu tongde lun* 白虎通德論. *SBCK* vol. 432–432.

———. *Hanshu* 漢書. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1962.

Baron, Christopher A. "Duris of Samos and a Herodotean Model for Writing History." In *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Herodotus in Antiquity and Beyond*, edited by Jessica Priestley and Vasiliki Zali, 59–82. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Batstone, William W. "Provocation: The Point of Reception Theory." In *Classics and the Uses of Reception,* edited by Charles Martindale and Richard F. Thomas, 14–20. Malden, Mass. and Oxford: Blackwell, 2006.

Beasley, W. G., and E. G. Pulleyblank, eds. *Historians of China and Japan*. London: Oxford University Press for the School of Oriental and African Studies, 1961.

Behr, Wolfgang. "Language Change in Premodern China — Notes on Its Perception and Its Impact on the Idea of a 'Constant' Way." In *Historical Truth, Historical criticism and Ideology,* edited by Axel Schneider and Susanne Weigelin-Schwiedrzik, 13–52. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2005.

———, and Bernhard Führer. "Einführende Notizen zum Lesen in China mit besondrer Berücksichtigung der Frühzeit." In *Aspekte des Lesens in China in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart*, edite by Bernhard Führer. 1–42. Bochum: Projekt Verlag, 2005.

Bol, Peter K. *Neo-Confucianism in History*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, distributed by Harvard University Press, 2008.

———. *"This Culture of Ours": Intellectual Transitions in T'ang and Sung China*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1992.

Brokaw, Cynthia J., and Kai-wing Chow, eds. *Printing and Book Culture in Late Imperial China*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California, 2005.

Buxbaum, D. C., and Frederick W. Mote. *Transition and Permanence: Chinese History and Culture*. Hong Kong: Cathy Press, 1972.

Cai Dan 蔡丹. "Gudai shiren jieshou Shiji lungao" 古代詩人接受《史記》論稿. PhD diss., Shaanxi Normal University, 2012.

Cancik, Hubert and Hubert Mohr. "Reception, Modes of." In *Brill's New Pauly*, Antiquity volumes, edited by Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider, English edition by Christine F. Salazar, Classical Tradition volumes edited by Manfred Landfester, English edition

by Francis G. Gentry. Accessed January 27, 2018. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e15206450.

Cavallo, Guglielmo, and Roger Chartier. “Introduction.” In *A History of Reading in the West,* edited by Guglielmo Cavallo and Roger Chartier, translated by Lydia G. Cochrane, 1–36. Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers, 1999.

———, eds. *A History of Reading in the West.* Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers, 1999.

Certeau, Michel de (1925–1986). *L’invention du quotidien 1. Arte de faire.* Paris: Gallimard, 1980.

Chaffee, John W. “Huizong, Cai Jing, and the Politics of Reform.” In *Emperor Huizong and Late Northern Song China: The Politics of Culture and the Culture of Politics*, edited by Patricia Buckley Ebrey and Maggie Bickford, 31–77. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, distributed by Harvard University Press, 2006.

———. *The Thorny Gates of Learning in Sung China: A Social History of Examinations.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995.

Chan, Ming K. “The Historiography of the *Tzu-chih t’ung-chien*: A Survey.” In *Monumenta Serica* 31 (1974/5): 1–38.

Chartier, Roger. *On the Edge of the Cliff: History, Language, and Practices*. Translated by Lydia G. Cochrane. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.

———. “Reading Matter and ‘Popular’ Reading: From the Renaissance to the Seventeenth Century.” In *A History of Reading in the West,* edited by Guglielmo Cavallo and Roger Chartier, translated by Lydia G. Cochrane, 269–283. Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers, 1999.

———. *The Order of Books: Readers, Authors, and Libraries in Europe between the Fourteenth and Eighteenth Centuries.* Translated by Lydia G. Cochrane. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1994.

Chao Gongwu 晁公武 (1105–1180). *Junzhai dushuzhi jiaozheng* 郡齋讀書志校證. Annotated by Sun Meng 孫猛. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1990.

Chavannes, Édouard (1865–1918), Max Kaltenmark, and Jacques Pimpaneau, trans. *Les Mémoires Historiques de Se-ma Ts’ien*. Paris: Éditions You Feng, 2015.

Chen Shidao 陳師道 (1053–1101). *Houshan ji* 後山集. *SKQS* vol. 1114.

Chen Wenzhong 陳文忠. *Zhongguo gudian shige jieshou shi yanjiu* 中國古典詩歌接受史研究. Hefei: Anhui Daxue chubanshe, 1998.

Chen Ying 陳瑩. “Tang qian Shiji jieshoushi lun” 唐前《史記》接受史論. PhD diss., Shaanxi Normal University, 2009.

Chen Yinke 陳寅恪 (1890–1969). “Feng Youlan Zhongguo zhexueshi shencha baogao” 馮友蘭中國哲學史上冊審查報告. In *Jinmingguan conggao erbian* 金明館叢稿二編, 279–281. Beijing: Sanlian shudian, 2001.

Chen Zhensun 陳振孫 (1179–1262). *Zhizhai shulu jieti* 直齋書錄解題. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1987.

Cheng Ju 程俱 (1078–1144). *Lintai gushi jiaozheng* 麟臺故事校證. Annotated by Zhang Fuxiang 張富祥. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2000.

Cheng Minsheng 程民生. *Songdai wujia yanjiu* 宋代物價研究. Beijing: Renmin chubanshe, 2008.

Cheng Yuan-Min 程元敏. *San jing xinyi jikao huiping* 三經新義輯考彙評. Taipei: Guoli bianyiguan, 1986.

Cheng Yuqing 程餘慶 (fl. 1822). *Lidai mingjia pingzhu Shiji jishuo* 歷代名家評注《史記》集說. Xi’an: San Qin chubanshe, 2011.

Cherniack, Susan. “Book Culture and Textual Transmission in Sung China.” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 54, no. 1 (1994): 5–125.

Chiang Yi-Tai 姜義泰. “Bei Song *Chunqiu* xue de quanshi jinlu 北宋《春秋》學的詮釋進路.” PhD diss., National Taiwan University, 2013.

Chunqiu Gongyangzhuan zhushu 春秋公羊傳注疏. Commentaries by He Xiu 何休 and Xu Yan 徐彥. *SSJZS* vol. 7.

Chunqiu Guliangzhuan zhushu 春秋穀梁傳注疏. Commentaries by Fan Ning 范甯 and Yang Shixun 楊士勳. *SSJZS* vol. 7.

Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhengyi 春秋左傳正義. Commentaries by Du Yu 杜預 and Kong Yingda 孔穎達. *SSJZS* vol. 6.

Couvreur, Séraphin (1835–1919), trans. *Tch’ouen Ts’iou et Tso Tchouan: La Chronique de la Principauté de Lòu*. Paris: Cathasia, 1951.

Creel, H. G. *Confucius: The Man and the Myth*. New York: John Day, 1949.

Cui Shu 崔述 (1740–1816). *Zhu Si kaoxin lu* 洙泗考信錄. *CSJCCB* vol. 143.

Dai De 戴德 (fl. first century BC). *Da Dai Liji* 大戴禮記. *SBCK* vols. 48–49.

De Weerdt, Hilde. *Competition Over Content: Negotiating Standards for the Civil Service Examinations in Imperial China (1127–1279)*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, distributed by Harvard University Press, 2007.

——— . "What Did Su Che See in the North? Publishing Regulations, State Security, and Political Culture in Song China." *T'oung Pao* 92, no. 4/5 (2006): 466–94.

Deng Xiaonan 鄧小南. *Zuzong zhi fa* 祖宗之法. Beijing: Sanlian shudian, 2006.

Dong Fen 董弅 (fl. twelfth century). *Xianyan changtan* 閒燕常談. *CSJCXB* vol. 84, 332–333.

Dong Jiuxiong 董就雄. "Shilun Tangdai bayun shifu de yongyun" 試論唐代八韻試賦的用韻. *Rao Zongyi Guoxueyuan yuankan* 饒宗頤國學院院刊 2 (2015), 239–275.

Durrant, Stephen W. "Creating Tradition: Sima Qian Agonistes?" In *Early China/Ancient Greece: Thinking through Comparisons,* edited by Steven Shankman and Stephen Durrant, 283–298. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002.

———. *The Cloudy Mirror: Tension and Conflict in the Writings of Sima Qian*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995.

———, Wai-Yee Li, Michael Nylan, and Hans van Ess. *The Letter to Ren An & Sima Qian's Legacy.* Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 2016.

———, Wai-Yee Li, and David Schaberg. *Zuo Tradition/Zuozhuan: Commentary on the "Spring and Autumn Annals."* Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2016.

Duyvendak, J. J. L. *The Book of Lord Shang: A Classic of the Chinese School of Law*. London: Arthur Probsthain, 1963.

Ebrey, Patricia Buckley, and Maggie Bickford, eds. *Emperor Huizong and Late Northern Song China: The Politics of Culture and the Culture of Politics*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, distributed by Harvard University Press, 2006.

———, and Paul Jakov Smith. *State Power in China, 900–1325*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 2016.

Egan, Ronald C. "To Count Grains of Sand on the Ocean Floor: Changing Perceptions of Books and Learning in the Song Dynasty." In *Knowledge and Text Production in an Age of Print: China, 900-1400*, edited by Lucille Chia and Hilde De Weerdt, 33–62. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2011.

Elman, Benjamin A. *A Cultural History of Civil Examinations in Late Imperial China*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

Fan Jing 樊婧. "*Shiji* zai Yuandai de chuanbo jieshou yanjiu" 《史記》在元代的傳播接受研究. PhD diss., Shaanxi Normal University, 2014.

Fan Ye 范曄 (398–445). *Hou Hanshu* 後漢書. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1965.

———. *Hou Hanshu. SKQS* vol. 253.

Fan Zhen 范鎮 (1007–1088). *Dongzhai jishi* 東齋記事. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980.

Fan Zuyu 范祖禹 (1041–1098). *Dixue* 帝學. *SKQS* vol. 696, 725–779.

———. *Fan taishi ji* 范太史集. *SKQS* vol. 1100, 84–571.

Franke, Herbert. "Some Aspects of Chinese Private Historiography in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries." In *Historians of China and Japan*, 115–34. London: Oxford University Press for the School of Oriental and African Studies, 1961.

———. *Sung Biographies.* Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1976.

Fuehrer, Bernhard. "Sima Qian as a Reader of Master Kong's Utterances." In *Views from Within, Views from Beyond: Approaches to the Shiji as an Early Work of Historiography*, edited by Hans van Ess, Olga Lomová, and Dorothee Schaab-Hanke, 9–30. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2015.

———. "The Court Scribe's *Eikon Psyches:* A Note on Sima Qian and His Letter to Ren An." *Asian and African Studies* 6, no. 2 (1997): 170–183.

———. "Mencius for Han Readers: Commentarial Features and Hermeneutical Strategies in Zhao Qi's work on the Mencius." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 164.2 (2014): 501–526.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg (1900–2002). *Truth and Method*. Second, revised edition. Translation revised by Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall. London: Sheed & Ward, 1975.

———. *Wahrheit und Methode: Grundzüge einer philosophische Hermeneutik.* Tübingen: Mohr, 1960.

———. *Zhenli yu fangfa* 真理與方法. Translated by Hong Handing 洪漢鼎. Shanghai: Shanghai yiwen chubanshe, 1999.

Gao Cheng 高承 (fl. 1100). *Shiwu jiyuan* 事物紀原. *CSJCXB* vol. 39.

Gardner, Charles S. *Chinese Traditional Historiography*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Ge Hong 葛洪 (283–343). *Xijing zaji* 西京雜記. *SBCK* vol. 461.

Gong Yanming 龔延明. *Songdai guanzhi cidian* 宋代官制辭典. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1997.

Gray, Vivienne. "Herodotus (and Ctesias) Re-enacted: Leadership in Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*." In *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Herodotus in Antiquity and Beyond*, edited by Jessica Priestley and Vasiliki Zali, 301–321. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Gu Jian 谷建. *Su Zhe xueshu yanjiu* 蘇轍學術研究. Beijing: Guangming ribao chubanshe, 2009.

Gu Jiegang 顧頡剛 (1893–1980). "Mengjiang nü gushi yanjiu" 孟姜女故事研究. In *Mengjiang nü gushi lunwenji* 孟姜女故事論文集, edited by Gu Jiegang and Zhong Jingwen 鐘敬文, 55–96. Beijing: Zhongguo minjian wenyi chubanshe, 1984.

Guarino, Marie. "Learning and Imperial Authority in Northern Sung China (960–1126): The Classics Mat Lectures". PhD diss., Columbia University, 1994.

Guo Li 郭麗. "*Tuyuan cefu* kaolun jian lun Tangdai tongmeng jiaoyu de yingshi qinxiang" 《兔園策府》考論——兼論唐代童蒙教育的應試傾向. *Dunhuang yanjiu* 敦煌研究, no. 4 (2013): 93–100.

Han Fei zi 韓非子. *SBCK* vols. 350–352.

Han Yu 韓愈 (768–824). *Zhu Wengong jiao Changli xiansheng wenji* 朱文公校昌黎先生文集. *SBCK* vols. 677–684.

Han Zhaoqi 韓兆琦. *Shiji jianzheng* 史記箋證. Nanchang: Jiangxi renmin chubanshe, 2004.

———, Zhang Dake 張大可, and Song Silian 宋嗣廉. *Shiji tiping yu yong Shiji renwu shi* 史記題評與詠史記人物詩. In *Shiji yanjiu jicheng* 史記研究集成, edited by Zhang Dake, An Pingqiu 安平秋 and Yu Zhanghua 俞樟華, vol. 3. Beijing: Huawen chubanshe, 2005.

Harbsmeier, Christoph. "Some Notions of Time and of History in China and in the West: With a Digression on the Anthropology of Writing." In *Time and Space in Chinese Culture,* edited by Chun-chieh Huang and Erik Zürcher, 49–71. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Hardwick, Lorna, and Christopher Stray. "Introduction: Making Connections." In *A Companion to Classical Receptions*, edited by Lorna Hardwick and Christopher Stray, 1–9. Malden, Mass. and Oxford: Blackwell, 2008.

Hardy, Grant. *Worlds of Bronze and Bamboo: Sima Qian's Conquest of History*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

Hartwell, Robert. "Historical Alanogism, Public Policy, and Social Science in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century China." *The American Historical Review* 76*,* no. 3 (1971): 690–727.

He Dao 何焯 (1661–1722). *Yimen dushuji* 義門讀書記. *SKQS* vol. 860.

He Liangjun 何良俊 (1506–1573). *Siyouzhai congshuo* 四友齋叢說. *XXSKQS* vol. 1125, 509–787.

He Qiaoxin 何喬新 (1427–1502). *Jiaoqiu wenji* 椒邱文集. *SKQS* vol. 1249.

———. *He wensu gong wenji* 何文肅公文集. In *Siku quanshu cunmu congshu* 四庫全書存目叢書, vol. 174, 474–580. Jinan: Qi Lu shushe, 1995.

He Zhongli 何忠禮. "Songdai guanli de fenglu" 宋代官吏的俸祿. *Lishi yanjiu* 歷史研究, no. 3 (1994): 102–115.

Heguanzi 鶡冠子. *SBCK* vol. 418.

Hexter, Ralph. "Literay History as a Provocation to Reception Studies." In *Classics and the Uses of Reception,* edited by Charles Martindale and Richard F. Thomas, 23–31. Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell, 2006.

Hong Mai 洪邁 (112–1202). *Rongzhai suibi* 容齋隨筆. Annotated by Kong Fanli 孔凡禮. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2005.

———. *Yijian zhi* 夷堅志. Annotated by He Zhuo 何卓. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1981.

Hu Hong 胡宏 (1105–1161). *Huangwang daji* 皇王大紀. *SKQS* vol. 313.

Hu Su 胡宿 (995–1067). *Wengong ji* 文恭集. *SKQS* vol. 1088.

Hu Zi 胡仔 (1095–1170). *Kongzi biannian* 孔子編年. *SKQS* vol. 446.

Huang Zuo 黃佐 (1490–1566). *Yongyan* 庸言. *XXSKQS* vol. 939, 221–398.

Huang Yizhou 黃以周 (1828–1899). *Xu Zizhi tongjian changbian shibu* 續資治通鑒長編拾補. *XXSKQS* vol. 11.

Huang Zhen 黃震 (1213–1281). *Huangshi richao* 黃氏日抄. *SKQS* vols. 707–708.

Hucker, Charles O. *A Dictionary of Official Titles in Imperial China.* Reprint, Taipei: Southern Materials Center, 1985.

Hunter, Michael. "Saying of Confucius, Deselected." PhD diss., Princeton University, 2012.

Inoue Susumu 井上進. "Zōsho to dokusho" 藏書と讀書. *Tōhō gakuhō* 東方學報 62 (1990): 409–45.

Iser, Wolfgang (1926–2007). *Der Akt des Lesens: Theorie ästhetischer Wirkung.* München: Wilhelm Fink, 1976.

Jauss, Hans Robert (1921–1997). *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Translated by Timothy Bahti. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982.

———. "The Identity of the Poetic Text in the Changing Horizon of Understanding." In *Reception Study: From Literary Theory to Cultural Studies,* edited by James L. Machor and Philip Goldstein*,* 1–28. New York and London: Routledge, 2001.

———, and Robert C. Holub. *Jieshou meixue yu jieshou lilun* 接受美學與接受理論. Translated by Zhou Ning 周寧 and Jin Yuanpu 金元浦. Shenyang: Liaoning renmin chubanshe, 1987.

Ji, Xiao-bin. *Politics and Conservatism in Northern Song China: The Career and Thought of Sima Guang (A.D.1019–1086)*. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 2005.

Jiang Peng 姜鵬. *Bei Song jingyan yu Songxue de xingqi* 北宋經筵與宋學的興起. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2013.

Kanda Kiichirō 神田喜一郎 (1897–1984). *Dunhuang miji liuzhen xinbian* 敦煌秘籍留真新編. In *Dunhuang congkan chuji* 敦煌叢刊初集, vol. 13, edited by Huang Yongwu 黃永武, 243–546. Taipei: Xinwenfeng, 1985.

Kaneto Mamoru 金戶守. "Shiki "Rongo" kō, sono roku: Sōketsu no seiritsu ni tsuite 史記「論語」考、その六: 總結の成立について." Shitennōji Joshi Daigaku Kiyō 11 (1979): 19–26.

Karlgren, Bernhard (1889–1978), trans. *The Book of Odes.* Stockholm: Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities, 1950.

Klein, Esther Sunkyung. "The History of a Historian: Perspectives on the Authorial Roles of Sima Qian." PhD diss., Princeton University, 2010.

Kong Pingzhong 孔平仲 (1044–1102). *Kongshi tanyuan* 孔氏談苑. *CSJCXB* vol. 86, 633–648.

Kongzi jiayu 孔子家語. *SBCK* vols. 309–311.

Kracke, E. A. *Civil Service in Early Sung China, 960–1067: With Particular Emphasis on the Development of Controlled Sponsorship to Foster Administrative Responsibility.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953.

Kuhn, Dieter. *The Age of Confucian Rule: The Song Transformation of China*. History of Imperial China. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2009.

Lasswell, Harold D. (1902–1978). "The Structure and Function of Communication in Society." In *The Communication of Ideas: A Series of Addresses*, edited by Lyman Bryson, 37–52. New York and London: Institute for Religious and Social Studies: Distributed by Harper & Brothers, 1948.

Lau, D. C. (1921–2010), trans. *Confucius: The Analects*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1979.

Lee, Thomas H. C. *Education in Traditional China: A History*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2000.

———, ed. *The New and the Multiple: Sung Senses of the Past*. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 2004.

Legge, James (1815–1897), trans. *The Chinese Classics*. Reprint, Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1960.

Levine, Ari Daniel. *Divided by a Common Language: Factional Conflict in Late Northern Song China*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2008.

———. "The Reigns of Hui-tsung (1100–1126) and Ch'in-tsung (1126–1127) and the Fall of the Northern Sung." In *The Cambridge History of China,* vol. 5.1, edited by Denis Twitchett and Paul Jakov Smith, 556–643. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

L'Haridon, Béatrice. "The Merchants in *Shiji*: An Interpretation in the Light of Later Debates." In *Views from Within, Views from Beyond: Approaches to the Shiji as an Early Work of Historiography*, edited by Hans van Ess, Olga Lomová, and Dorothee Schaab-Hanke, 171–191.Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2015.

———, trans. *Yang Xiong: Maîtres mots.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2010.

Li Dao 李燾 (1115–1184). *Xu Zizhi tongjian changbian* 續資治通鑒長編. *SKQS* vols. 314–322.

Li Jingde 黎靖德 (fl. thirteenth century), ed. *Zhuzi yulei* 朱子語類. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1986.

Li Wai-Yee. "The Idea of Authority in the Shih Chi (Records of the Historian)." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 54, no. 2 (1994): 345–405.

———. "The Letter to Ren An and Authorship in the Chinese Tradition." In *The Letter to Ren An & Sima Qian's Legacy*, edited by Stephen Durrant, Wai-Yee Li, Michael Nylan, and Hans van Ess, 96–123. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 2016.

Li Xinchuan 李心傳 (1167–1244). *Jianyan yilai xinian yaolu* 建炎以來繫年要錄. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1988.

———. *Jianyan yilai chaoye zaji* 建炎以來朝野雜記. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2000.

Li Yanshou 李延壽 (fl. seventh century). *Nanshi* 南史. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1975.

Liang Yusheng 梁玉繩 (1744–1819). *Shiji zhiyi* 史記志疑. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1981.

Liji zhushu 禮記注疏. Commentaries by Zheng Xuan 鄭玄 and Kong Yingda 孔穎達. *SSJZS* vol. 5.

Lin Xiyi 林希逸 (1193–1274). *Zhuxiyanzhai shiyigao xuji* 竹溪鬳齋十一藁續集. *SKQS* vol. 1185.

Lin Zhiqi 林之奇 (1112–1176). *Zhuozhai wenji* 拙齋文集. *SKQS* vol. 1140, 369–538.

Ling Zhilong 凌稚隆 (fl. sixteenth century) and Li Guangjin 李光縉 (1549–1623). *Shiji pinglin* 史記評林. Tianjin: Tianjin guji chubanshe, 1998.

Liu, James T. C. *China Turning Inward: Intellectual-Political Changes in the Early Twelfth Century*. Cambridge, Mass.: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University Press, 1988.

———. *Ou-yang Hsiu: An Eleventh-Century Neo-Confucian.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1967.

———. *Reform in Sung China: Wang An-shih (1021–1086) and His New Policies*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959.

Liu Ban 劉邠 (1022–1088). *Pengcheng ji* 彭城集. *SKQS* vol. 1096.

Liu Kezhuang 劉克莊 (1187–1269). *Houcun ji* 後村集. *SKQS* vol. 1180.

Liu Xiang 劉向 (77–6 BC), ed. *Zhanguo ce* 戰國策. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1985.

Liu Xu 劉昫 (888–947). *Jiu Tangshu* 舊唐書. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1975.

Liu Zhi 劉摯 (1031–1098). *Zhongsu ji* 忠肅集. *SKQS* vol. 1099.

Liu Zhiji 劉知幾 (661–721). *Shitong tongshi* 史通通釋. Annotated by Pu Qilong 浦起龍. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2009.

Loewe, Michael. *A Biographical Dictionary of the Qin, Former Han and Xin periods (221 BC–AD 24)*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2000.

———. *Early Chinese Texts: A Bibliographical Guide.* Berkeley, California: Society for the Study of Early China; Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 1993.

Looney, Dennis. "Herodotus and Narrative Art in Renaissance Ferrara: The Translation of Matteo Maria Boiardo." In *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Herodotus in Antiquity and Beyond*, edited by Jessica Priestley and Vasiliki Zali, 232–253. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Lu Guoyao 魯國堯. "Lun Song ciyun ji qi yu Jin Yuan ciyun de bijiao" 論宋詞韻及其與金元詞韻的比較. In *Lu Guoyao zixuanji* 魯國堯自選集. Zhengzhou: Daxiang chubanshe, 1993.

Lu Yinglong 魯應龍 (fl. thirteenth century). *Xianchuang kuoyizhi* 閒窗括異志. *XXSKQS* vol. 1264, 633–646.

Lu You 陸游 (1125–1210). *Laoxuean biji* 老學庵筆記. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1979.

Lü Zuqian 呂祖謙 (1137–1181). *Dashiji jieti* 大事記解題. *SKQS* vol. 324.

———. *Lidai zhidu xiangshuo* 歷代制度詳說. *SKQS* vol. 923.

Lunyu jijie yishu 論語集解義疏. Annotated by He Yan 何晏 and Huang Kan 皇侃. *CSJCCB* vols. 481–484.

Lunyu zhushu 論語注疏. Annotated by He Yan and Xing Bing 邢昺. *SSJZS* vol. 8.

Luo Bi 羅璧 (fl. late thirteenth century). *Zhiyi* 識遺. *CSJCXB* vol. 12, 431–476.

Luo Mi 羅泌 (1131–1189). *Lushi* 路史. *SKQS* vol. 383.

Luo Xiaoyu 羅筱玉. "Song Yuan jiangshi huaben yanjiu" 宋元講史話本研究. PhD diss., Fudan University, 2005.

Lynn, Richard John, trans. *The Classic of Changes: A New Translation of the I Ching Interpreted by Wang Bi*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

Ma Duanlin 馬端臨 (1254–1323). *Wenxian tongkao* 文獻通考. *SKQS* vols. 610–616.

Maoshi zhengyi 毛詩正義. Commentaries by Zheng Xuan 鄭玄 and Kong Yingda 孔穎達. *SSJZS* vol. 2.

Martin, Thomas R. *Herodotus and Sima Qian: The First Great Historians of Greece and China : A Brief History With Documents*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2010.

Martindale, Charles. "Introduction: Thinking Through Reception." In *Classics and the Uses of Reception,* edited by Charles Martindale and Richard F. Thomas, 1–14. Malden, Mass. and Oxford: Blackwell, 2006.

———. *Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

———, and Richard F. Thomas, eds. *Classics and the Uses of Reception.* Malden, Mass. and Oxford: Blackwell, 2006.

McDermott, Joseph. *A Social History of the Chinese Book: Books and Literati Culture in Later Imperial China.* Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2006.

———. "The Ascendance of the Imprint in China." In *Printing and Book Culture in Late Imperial China,* edited by Cynthia J. Brokaw and Kai-wing Chow, 55–104. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 2005.

McKenzie, D. F. *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Mei Yaochen 梅堯臣 (1002–1060). *Wanling ji* 宛陵集. *SKQS* vol. 1099.

Meng Yuanlao 孟元老 (fl. twelfth century). *Dongjing menghua lu* 東京夢華錄. *SKQS* vol. 589, 125–174.

Mengzi zhushu 孟子注疏. Commentaries by Zhao Qi 趙岐 and Sun Shi 孫奭. *SSJZS* vol. 8.

Momigliano, Arnaldo (1908–1987). "Tradition and the Classical Historian." *History and Theory* 11, no. 3 (1972): 279–293.

Williamson, H. R. *Wang An-shih, a Chinese Statesman and Educationalist of the Sung Dynasty*. London: Probsthain, 1935.

Miyazaki Ichisada 宮崎市定 (1901–1995). *China's Examination Hell: The Civil Service Examinations of Imperial China*. Translated by Conrad Schirokauer. New York: Weatherhill, 1976.

Mou Jun-sun 牟潤孫 (1909–1988). *Zhushizhai conggao* 注史齋叢稿. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2009.

Nai Deweng 耐得翁 (fl. late twelfth century). *Ducheng jisheng* 都城紀勝. *SKQS* vol. 590.

Nanhua zhenjing 南華真經. Annotated by Guo Xiang 郭象 and Lu Deming 陸德明. *SBCK* vols. 534–538.

Needham, Joseph and Wang Ling. *Science and Civilisation in China,* vol. 4.2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.

Ng, On-cho and Q. Edward Wang. *Mirroring the Past: The Writing and Use of History in Imperial China*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2005.

Nienhauser, William H. Jr. "A Century (1895–1995) of Shih Chi Studies in the West." *Asian Culture Quarterly* 24, no. 1 (1996): 1–51.

———. "A Reexamination of 'The Biographies of the Reasonable Officials' in the Records of the Grand Historian." *Early China* 16 (1991): 209–34.

———, ed. *The Grand Scribe's Records.* Vols. I, II, V.1, VII, VIII, IX, and X. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994, 1994, 2002, 2006, 2008, 2010, and 2016.

Nietzsche, Friedrich Wilhelm (1844–1900). *Wir Philologen: Gedanken und Entwürfe zu der Unzeitgemäßen Betrachtung.* Hamburg: Tredition, 2013.

Nylan, Michael. *Exemplary Figures: Fayan.* Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 2013.

———. "Sima Qian: A True Historian?" *Early China* 23–24 (1998–1999): 203–46.

———. *The Five "Confucius" Classics.* New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2001.

Ouyang Xiu 歐陽修 (1007–1072). *Ouyang Xiu quanji* 歐陽修全集. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2001.

———. *Xin Tangshu* 新唐書. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1975.

———. *Xin Wudaishi* 新五代史. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974.

Ozaki Yasushi 尾崎康. *Seishi Sōgen-ban no kenkyū* 正史宋元版の研究. Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 1989.

Qi Ruixia 齊瑞霞. "Songdai biji suyuci yanjiu" 宋代筆記俗語詞研究. PhD diss., Shangdong University, 2016.

Qiu Guangming 丘光明, Qiu Long 邱隆, and Yang Ping 楊平. *Duliangheng juan* 度量衡卷. In *Zhongguo kexue jishu shi* 中國科學技術史, edited by Lu Jiaxi 盧嘉錫. Beijing: Kexue chubanshe, 2001.

Qunshu huiyuan jie jiang wang 群書會元截江網. *SKQS* vol. 934.

Park Jae-woo 朴宰雨. *Shiji Hanshu bijiao yanjiu* 史記漢書比較研究. Beijing: Zhongguo wenxue chubanshe, 1994.

Peng Dingqiu 彭定求 (1645–1719) et al., eds. *Quan Tang shi* 全唐詩. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1960.

Pines, Yuri. "Introduction: Ideology and Power in Early China." In *Ideology of Power and Power of Ideology in Early China,* edited by Yuri Pines, Paul Rakita Goldin, and Martin Kern, 1–29. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

———. *The Book of Lord Shang: Apologetics of State Power in Early China*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2017.

———, Paul Rakita Goldin, and Martin Kern, eds. *Ideology of Power and Power of Ideology in Early China*. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Plato (428/7–348/7 BC). *Euthyphro. Apology. Crito. Phaedo. Phaedrus.* Translated by Harold North Fowler. Loeb Classical Library 36. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1914.

Pokora, Timoteus. "Bibliographies des Traductions du *Che ki.*" In *Les Mémoires Historiques de Se-ma Ts'ien*, translated by Édouard Chavannes, Max Kaltenmark, and Jacques Pimpaneau, vol. 6, 113–146. Paris: Éditions You Feng, 2015.

———. "The Present State of the Translations from the Shih chi." *Oriens Extremus* 9, no. 2 (1962): 154–173.

Priestley, Jessica. *Herodotus and Hellenistic Culture.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

———, and Vasiliki Zali, eds. *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Herodotus in Antiquity and Beyond*. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Pulleyblank, E. G. "Chinese Historical Criticism: Liu Chih-Chi and Ssu-Ma Kuang." In *Historians of China and Japan*, edited by Beasley, W. G. and Edwin G. Pulleyblank, 135–66. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.

———. “The Tzyjyh Tongjiann Kaoyih and the Sources for the History of the Period 730-763.” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 13, no. 2 (1950): 448–73.

Qian Yi 錢毅. “Songdai Jiang Zhe shiyun yanjiu” 宋代江浙詩韻研究. PhD diss., Yangzhou University, 2008.

Qin Guan 秦觀 (1049–1100). *Huaihai ji jianzhu* 淮海集箋注. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1994.

Qu Wanli 屈萬里 (1907–1979). “Songren yi jing de fengqi” 宋人疑經的風氣. *Dalu zazhi* 大陸雜志 29, no. 3 (1964): 23–25.

Schmidt-Glintzer, Helwig, Achim Mittag, and Jörn Rüsen, eds. *Historical Truth, Historical Criticism, and Ideology: Chinese Historiography and Historical Culture From a New Comparative Perspective*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2005.

Schneider, Axel, and Susanne Weigelin-Schwiedrzik, eds. *Historical Truth, Historical criticism and Ideology*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2005.

Schuessler, Axel. *Minimal Old Chinese and later Han Chinese: A Companion to Grammata Serica Recensa*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2009.

Schwab, Andreas. “The ‘Rediscovery’ of Egypt: Herodotus and His Account of Egypt in the *Voyage dans la Basse et la Haute-Égypte* (1802) by Vivant Denon.” In *Brill’s Companion to the Reception of Herodotus in Antiquity and Beyond*, edited by Jessica Priestley, and Vasiliki Zali, 254–277. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Shankman, Steven, and Stephen Durrant. *The Siren and the Sage: Knowledge and Wisdom in Ancient Greece and China.* London and New York: Cassell, 2000.

Shao Bo 邵博 (d. 1158). *Shaoshi wenjian hou lu* 邵氏聞見後錄. *CSJCXB* vol. 83, 617–667.

Shaughnessy, Edward L. *Rewriting Early Chinese Texts*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006.

Shen Kuo 沈括 (1031–1095). *Xin jiaozheng Mengxi bitan* 新校正夢溪筆談. Annotated by Hu Daojing 胡道靜. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1957.

Shi Jie 石介 (1005–1045). *Culai ji* 徂徠集. *SKQS* vol. 1090.

Shisanjing zhushu 十三經注疏. Edited by Ruan Yuan 阮元 (1764–1849). Taipei: Yiwen yinshuguan, 2001.

Sima Guang 司馬光 (1019–1086). *Wenguo Wenzheng Sima gong wenji* 溫國文正司馬公文集. *SBCK* vols. 828–843.

———. *Zizhi tongjian* 資治通鑑 (Comprehensive Mirror to Aid in Government). *SBCK* vols. 99–178.

———. *Zizhi tongjian shili* 資治通鑑釋例. *SKQS* vol. 311.

———. *Zizhi tongjian kaoyi* 資治通鑑考異. *SBCK* vols. 179–184.

Sima Qian 司馬遷 (c. 145 BC–c. 85 BC). *Shiji* 史記. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1959.

Slingerland, Edward, trans. *Confucius Analects: With Selection from Traditional Commentaries*. Indianapolis/Cambridge: Hackett, 2003.

Smith, Paul Jakov. "Introduction: The Sung Dynasty and Its Presursors, 907–1279." In *The Cambridge History of China,* vol. 5, pt. 1, edited by Denis Twitchett and Paul Jakov Smith, 1–37. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

———, and Patricia Buckley Ebrey. "Introduction." In *State Power in China, 900–1325*, edited by Patricia Buckley Ebrey and Paul Jakov Smith, 1–26. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 2016.

Stevens, Wallace (1879–1955). *The Collected Poems of Wallace Stevens*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1971.

Stuurman, Siep. "Herodotus and Sima Qian: History and the Anthropological Turn in Ancient Greece and Han China." *Journal of World History* 19, no. 1 (2008): 1–40.

Su Shi 蘇軾 (1037–1101). *Dongpo zhilin* 東坡志林. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1981.

———. *Su Shi wenji* 蘇軾文集. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1986.

Su Xiangxian 蘇象先 (fl. twelfth century). *Chengxiang Weigong Tan xun* 丞相魏公譚訓. *SBCKSB* vol. 371.

Su Xun 蘇洵 (1009–1066). *Jiayou ji jianzhu* 嘉祐集箋注. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1993.

Su Zhe 蘇轍 (1039–1112). *Sushi Chunqiu jijie* 蘇氏春秋集解. *SKQS* vol. 148.

———. *Gushi* 古史. In *San Su quanshu* 三蘇全書, vols. 3 and 4, edited by Zeng Zaozhuan 曾棗莊 and Shu Dagang 舒大剛. Beijing: Yuwen chubanshe, 2001.

———. *Gushi* 古史. *SKQS* vol. 371, 205–632.

———. *Luancheng ji* 欒城集. In *Su Zhe ji* 蘇轍集, punctuated and collated by Cheng Hongtian 陳宏天 and Gao Xiufang 高秀芳, 1–872. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1990.

———. *Luancheng houji* 欒城後集. In *Su Zhe ji*, punctuated and collated by Cheng Hongtian and Gao Xiufang, 873–1148. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1990.

Sun Fu 孫復 (992–1057). *Chunqiu zunwnag fawei* 春秋尊王發微. *SKQS* vol. 147.

———. *Sun Mingfu xiaoji* 孫明復小集. *SKQS* vol. 1090.

Sun Liyao 孫立堯. *Songdai shilun yanjiu* 宋代史論研究. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2009.

Sung, Chia-fu. "Between Tortoise and Mirror: Historians and Historiography in Eleventh-Century China." PhD diss., Harvard University, 2010.

Takigawa Ryotaro 滝川龜太郎 (1865–1946) and Mizusawa Toshitada 水沢利忠. *Shiji huizhu kaozheng fu jiaobu* 史記會注考證附校補. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1986.

Tan Qixiang 譚其驤, ed. *Zhongguo lishi dituji* 中國歷史地圖集. Beijing: Zhongguo ditu chubanshe, 1982.

Tang Geng 唐庚 (1071–1121). *Tang Zixi wenlu* 唐子西文錄. *XXSKQS* vol. 1713, 402–406.

Tang Wen 唐雯. "Mengqiu zuozhe xinkao" 蒙求作者新考. *Zhongguo dianji yu wenhua* 中國典籍与文化 3 (2008), 18–22.

Tian Jianping 田建平. *Songdai chuban shi* 宋代出版史. Beijing: Renmin chubanshe, 2017.

Tian, Xiaofei. "Literary Learning: Encyclopedias and Epitomes." In *The Oxford Handbook of Classical Chinese Literature,* edited by Wiebke Denecke, Wai-Yee Li, and Xiaofei Tian, 132–146. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Tillman, Hoyt Cleveland. "Textual Liberties and Restraints in Rewriting China's Histories: The Case of Ssu-ma Kuang's Re-construction of Chu-ko Liang's Story." In *The New and the Multiple: Sung Senses of the Past*, edited by Thomas H. C. Lee, 61–106. Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong, 2004.

Tuotuo 脱脱 (1314–1355). *Songshi* 宋史. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1977.

Twitchett, Denis Crispin, and John King Fairbank, eds. *The Cambridge History of China* vol.5.1. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

van Ess, Hans. "Einige Anmerkungen zur Biographie des Konfuzius im *Shih-chi* und vergleichbaren Stellen im *K'ung-tzu chia-yü*, Teil I." *Oriens Extremus* 50 (2011): 157-180.

———. "Einige Anmerkungen zur Biographie des Konfuzius im *Shih-chi* und vergleichbaren Stellen im *K'ung-tzu chia-yü*, Teil II: Vom Dienst in Lu über die Wanderungen zurück nach Lu", *Oriens Extremus* 52 (2013): 215-262.

———. *Politik und Geschichtsschreibung im alten China: Pan-ma i-t'ung*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2014.

———. “The Friends of Sima Tan and Sima Qian.” In *Views from Within, Views from Beyond: Approaches to the Shiji as an Early Work of Historiography*, edited by Hans van Ess, Olga Lomová, and Dorothee Schaab-Hanke, 67–78. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2015.

———, Olga Lomová, and Dorothee Schaab-Hanke, eds. *Views from Within, Views from Beyond: Approaches to the Shiji as an Early Work of Historiography*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2015.

von Zach, Erwin. *Yang Hsiung's Fa-yên = Worte Strenger Ermahnung: Ein philosophischer Traktat aus dem Beginn der Christlichen Zeitrechnung*. Reprint, San Francisco: Chinese Materials Center, 1976.

Wang Anshi 王安石 (1021–1086). *Linchuan xiansheng wenji* 臨川先生文集. *SBCK* vols. 924–943.

Wang Bi 王弼 (226–249). *Wang Bi ji jiaoshi* 王弼集校釋. Annotated by Lou Yulie 樓宇烈 Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980.

Wang Chang 王昶 (1725–1806), ed. *Jinshi cuibian* 金石萃編. *XXSKQS* vols. 886–891.

Wang Chong 王充 (27–c. 97). *Lunheng jiaoshi* 論衡校釋. Annotated by Liu Pansui 劉盼遂 and Huang Hui 黃暉. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1990.

Wang Gui 王珪 (1019–1085). *Huayang ji* 華陽集. *SKQS* vol. 1093.

Wang Guowei 王國維 (1877–1927). *Guantang jilin* 觀堂集林. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1961.

Wang Ling 王令 (1032–1059). *Shiqi shi mengqiu* 十七史蒙求. Osaka: Gyokushiken, 1825. Accessed July 27, 2018: http://repository.lib.cuhk.edu.hk/en/item/cuhk-683310#page/1/mode/2up.

Wang Mingsheng 王鳴盛 (1722–1797). *Shiqi shi shangque* 十七史商榷. *XXSKQS* vol. 452, 137–678.

Wang Mai 王邁 (1104–1228). *Yuxuan ji* 臞軒集. *SKQS* vol. 1178.

Wang Ruoxu 王若虛 (1174–1243). *Hunan yilao ji* 滹南遺老集. *SBCK* vols. 1353–1358.

Wang San-ching 王三慶. *Dunhuang leishu* 敦煌類書. Kaohsiung: Liwen, 1993.

Wang Shumin 王叔岷 (1914–2008). *Shiji jiaozheng* 史記斠證. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2007.

Wang Xianqian 王先謙 (1842–1917). *Hanshu buzhu* 漢書補注. *XXSKQS* vols. 268–270.

Wang Xiaojuan 王曉鵑. “*Ban Ma yitong ping* yanjiu san ti” 班馬異同評研究三題. *Shaanxi Shifa Daxue xuebao (Zhexue shehui kexueban)* 陝西師範大學學報 (哲學社會科學版) 45, no.1 (2016): 66–75.

Wang Xiaoling 王曉玲. “Qingdai *Shiji* wenxue chanshi lungao” 清代史記文學闡釋論稿. PhD diss., Shaanxi Normal University, 2012.

Wang Yinglin 王應麟 (1223–1296). *Kunxue jiwen* 困學紀聞. *SBCKSB* vols. 225–230.

———. *Yuhai* 玉海. *SKQS* vols. 943–948.

Wang Yong 王栐 (fl. thirteenth century). *Yanyi yimou lu* 燕翼詒謀錄. *CSJCXB* vol. 84, 401–415.

Wang Zhengde 王正德 (fl. late twelfth century). *Yushi lu* 餘師錄. *SKQS* vol. 1480, 747–808.

Wang Zhong 汪中 (1945–1794). *Shuxue neiwai pian* 述學內外篇. *SBCK* vols. 1854–1855.

Watson, Burton, trans. *Meng Ch’iu: Famous Episodes from Chinese History and Legend*. Tokyo and New York: Kodansha International, 1979.

———, trans. *Records of the Grand Historian of China*. Hong Kong and New York: Renditions-Columbia University Press, 1993.

———. “Some Remarks on Early Chinese Historical Works.” In *The Translation of Things Past: Chinese History and Historiography*, edited by George Kao, 34–47. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 1982.

———. *Ssu-Ma Ch’ien, Grand Historian of China*. New York & London: Columbia University Press, 1958.

Wei Huaxian 魏華仙.“Songdai xiaofei jingji ruogan wenti yanjiu” 宋代消費經濟若干問題研究. PhD diss., Hebei University, 2005.

Wei Zheng 魏徵 (580–643). *Suishu* 隋書. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1973.

Wilkinson, Endymion. *Chinese History: A New Manual (Fourth Edition)*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Published by the Harvard University Asia Center for the Harvard-Yenching Institute, distributed by Harvard University Press, 2015.

Wivell, Charles. “The Term ‘Hua-pen.’” In *Transition and Permanence: Chinese History and Culture,* edited by David C. Buxbaum and Frederick W. Mote, 295–306. Hong Kong: Cathay Press, 1972.

Wood, Alan Thomas. “Politics and Morality in Northern Sung China: Early Neo-Confucian Views on Obedience to Authority.” PhD diss., University of Washington, 1981.

Wu Guiling 吳桂翎. *Songdai lishi jiaoyu yanjiu* 宋代歷史教育研究. Beijing: Renmin chubanshe, 2016.

Wu Pei-yi. “Education of Children in the Sung.” In *Neo-Confucian Education: The Formative Stage,* edited by Wm. Theodore de Bary and John W. Chaffee, 307–324. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press.

Wu Jingxu 吳景旭 (1611–1670?). *Lidai shihua* 歷代詩話. *SKQS* vol. 1483.

Wu Shu-hua 吳叔樺. “Su Zhe xueshu sixiang yanjiu” 蘇轍學術思想研究. PhD diss., National Kaohsiung Normal University, 2006.

Wu Zeng 吳曾 (d. 1131). *Nenggaizhai manlu* 能改齋漫錄. *CSJCXB* vol. 11, 418–536.

Wu Zimu 吳自牧 (fl. thirteenth century). *Mengliang lu* 夢粱錄. *SKQS* vol. 590.

Xi Shichen 席世臣 (fl. eighteenth century), ed. *Nan Song shu* 南宋書. *CSJCSB* vol. 97, 477–853.

Xiao Tong 蕭統 (501–531), ed. *Wenxuan* 文選. Annotated by Li Shan 李善. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1977.

———, ed. *Liuchen zhu Wenxuan* 六臣注文選. Annotated by Li Shan, Lü Yanji 呂延濟, Liu Liang 劉良, Zhang Xian 張銑, Li Zhouhan 李周翰, and Lü Xiang 呂向. *SBCK* vols. 1894–1923.

Xiao Yi 蕭繹 (508–555). *Jinlouzi* 金樓子. *CSJCXB* vol. 21, 22–60.

Xie Zhaozhe 謝肇淛 (1567–1624). *Wu zazu* 五雜俎. In *Guoxue zhenben wenku* 國學珍本文庫 vol. 13. Shanghai: Zhongyang shudian, 1935.

Xu Du 徐度 (fl. twelfth century). *Quesao bian* 卻掃編. *SKQS* vol. 863, 747–800.

Xu Qianxue 徐乾學 (1631–1694), ed. *Zizhi tongjian houbian* 資治通鑑後編. *SKQS* vols. 342–345.

Xu Renfu 徐仁甫 (1901–1988). *Shiji zhujian bianzheng* 史記注解辨正. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2014.

Xu Song 徐松 (1784–1848) ed. *Song huiyao jigao* 宋會要輯稿. Taipei: Xinwenfeng, 1976.

Xue Juzheng 薛居正 (912–981). *Jiu Wudaishi* 舊五代史. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1976.

Yang Bojun 楊伯峻 (1909–1992), trans. *Lunyu yizhu* 論語譯注. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980.

Yang Haizheng 楊海崢. *Han Tang Shiji yanjiu lungao* 漢唐史記研究論稿. Jinan: Qi Lu shushe, 2003.

Yang Jian 楊簡 (1141–1226). *Cihu yishu* 慈湖遺書. *SKQS* vol. 1156.

Yang Shiqi 楊士奇 (1364–1444) and Huang Huai 黃淮 (1366–1449), eds. *Lidai mingchen zouyi* 歷代名臣奏議. *SKQS* vol. 433–442.

Yang Weisheng 楊渭生. *Liang Song wenhua shi* 两宋文化史. Hangzhou: Zhejiang Daxue chubanshe, 2008.

Yang Xiong 揚雄 (53 BC–18 AD). *Yangzi fayan* 揚子法言. *SBCK* vol. 333.

Yang Yanqi 楊燕起, Chen Keqing 陳可青, and Lai Changyang 賴長揚, eds. *Lidai mingjia ping Shiji* 歷代名家評史記. Beijing: Beijing Shifan Daxue chubanshe, 1986.

Ye Dehui 葉德輝 (1864–1927). *Shulin qinghua* 書林清話. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1959.

Ye Mengde 葉夢得 (1077–1148). *Bishu luhua* 避暑錄話. *CSJCXB* vol. 84, 618–644.

———. *Shilin yanyu* 石林燕語. *SKQS* vol. 863.

Yeh Kuo-liang 葉國良. *Songren yijing gaijing kao* 宋人疑經改經考. Taipei: Guoli Taiwan Daxue chuban weiyuanhui, 1980.

Ying Zhaohua 應朝華. "*Shiji* zai Tangdai de jieshou" 史記在唐代的接受. Master's thesis, Hangzhou: Zhejiang Normal University, 2003.

Yong Rong 永瑢 (1744–1790), ed. *Siku quanshu zongmu tiyao* 四庫全書總目提要. *SKQS* vols. 1–6.

Yu Liming 虞黎明. "*Shiji* zai Songdai de jieshou" 史記在宋代的接受. Master's thesis, Hangzhou: Zhejiang Normal University, 2003.

Yu Ying-shih 余英時. *Shi yu Zhongguo wenhua* 士與中國文化. Shanghai: Renmin chubanshe, 1987.

———. *Zhu Xi de lishi shijie: Songdai shidafu zhengzhi wenhua de yanjiu* 朱熹的歷史世界：宋代士大夫政治文化的研究. Beijing: Sanlian shudian, 2004.

Yu Zhanghua 俞樟華. "Tang Song ba dajia yu *Shiji*" 唐宋八大家與史記. *Jiangsu shehui kexue* 江蘇社會科學, 4 (1996): 134–137.

———, and Deng Ruiquan 鄧瑞全, eds. *Shiji lunzhu tiyao yu lunwen suoyin* 史記論著提要與論文索引. In *Shiji yanjiu jicheng*, edited by Zhang Dake, An Pingqiu and Yu Zhanghua, vol. 14. Beijing: Huawen chubanshe, 2005.

Yu Zhanghua, Ying Zhaohua 應朝華 and Yu Liming 虞黎明. *Tang Song Shiji jieshou shi* 唐宋史記接受史. Changchun: Jilin renmin chubanshe, 2004.

Yuan Mei 袁枚 (1716–1797). *Suiyuan suibi* 隨園隨筆. *XXSKQS* vol. 1148, 165–402.

Yue Ke 岳珂 (1183–1243). *Kui Tan lu* 愧郯錄. *SBCKXB* vols. 345–348.

Zeng Gong 曾鞏 (1019–1083). *Zeng Gong ji* 曾鞏集. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1984.

Zeng Guofan 曾國藩 (1811–1872). *Qiuquezhai dushulu* 求闕齋讀書錄. *XXSKQS* vol. 1161, 123–270.

Zhang Lei 張耒 (1054–1114). *Mingdao zazhi* 明道雜誌. *CSJCXB* vol. 86, 626–632.

———. *Zhang Lei ji* 張耒集. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1990.

Zhang Dake 張大可. "Lüe lun Ma Ban yitong de neirong yu fazhan lishi" 略論馬班異同的內容與發展歷史. *Weinan shizhuan xuebao (shehui kexue ban)* 渭南師專學報(社會科學版) 23, no. 1 (1994): 1–9.

———. *Shiji xinzhu* 史記新注. Beijing Huawen chubanshe, 2000.

Zhang Xinke 張新科 and Yu Zhanghua. *Shiji yanjiu shi* 史記研究史. In *Shiji yanjiu jicheng,* vol. 13, edited by Zhang Dake, An Pingqiu and Yu Zhanghua. Beijing: Huawen chubanshe, 2005.

Zhang Yuchun 張玉春 and Ying Sanyu 應三玉. *Shiji banben ji sanjiazhu yanjiu* 史记版本及三家注研究. In *Shiji yanjiu jicheng,* vol. 12, edited by Zhang Dake, An Pingqiu and Yu Zhanghua. Beijing: Huawen chubanshe, 2005.

Zhang Ziran 張自然. "Song Ming shiqi biji zhong de *Shiji* kaoping shulun" 宋明時期筆記中的史記考評述論. PhD diss., Henan University, 2008.

Zheng A-cai 鄭阿財. "Dunhuang ben *Mengqiu* ji zhuwen zhi kaoding yu yanjiu" 敦煌本蒙求及注文之考訂與研究.In *Dunhuang xue* 敦煌學, vol. 24 (2003): 177–198.

———, and Chu Feng-yu 朱鳳玉. *Dunhuang mengshu yanjiu* 敦煌蒙書研究. Lanzhou: Gansu jiaoyu chubanshe, 2002.

Zheng Qiao 鄭樵 (1104–1162). *Tongzhi* 通志. *SKQS* vols. 372–381.

———. *Song mingchen yanxing lu qianji* 宋名臣言行錄前集. *SKQS* vol. 449.

Zheng Xie 鄭獬 (1022–1072). *Yunxi ji* 鄖溪集. *SKQS* vol. 1097.

Zhou Mi 周密 (1232–1298). *Guixin zazhi* 癸辛雜識. *SKQS* vol. 1040.

———. *Wulin jiushi* 武林舊事. *SKQS* vol. 590.

Zhou Xinglu 周興祿. *Songdai keju shici yanjiu* 宋代科舉詩詞研究. Jinan: Qi Lu shushe, 2002.

Zhou Zumo 周祖謨 (1914–1995), ed. *Guangyun jiaoben* 廣韻校本. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1960.

Zhouyi zhengyi 周易正義. Commentaries by Wang Bi 王弼, Han Kangbo 韓康伯, and Kong Yingda 孔穎達. *SSJZS* vol. 3.

Zhu Bian 朱弁 (d. 1144). *Quyou jiuwen* 曲洧舊聞. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2002.

Zhu Shangshu 祝尚書. *Songdai keju yu wenxue kaolun* 宋代科舉與文學考論. Zhengzhou: Daxiang chubanshe, 2006.

Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130–1200), ed. *Er Cheng yishu* 二程遺書. *SKQS* vol. 698.

———. *Huian xiansheng Zhu wengong ji* 晦菴先生朱文公集. *SBCK* vols. 1158–1107.

———. *Sishu zhangju jizhu* 四書章句集注. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983.

Zhuang Jiyu 莊季裕 (fl. twelfth century). *Jilei bian* 雞肋編. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983.

Congshu 叢書 (Collectanea)

Congshu jicheng chubian 叢書集成初編. Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1935–1937.

Congshu jicheng san bian 叢書集成三編. Taipei: Xinwenfeng, 1997.

Congshu jicheng xinbian 叢書集成新編. Taipei: Xinwenfeng, 1985.

Sibu congkan chubian 四部叢刊初編. Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1919–1922.

Sibu congkan san bian 四部叢刊三編. Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1936.

Sibu congkan xubian 四部叢刊續編. Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1934.

Xuxiu Siku quanshu 續修四庫全書. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2002.

Yingyin Wenyuange Siku quanshu 景印文淵閣四庫全書. Taipei: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1986.