

Dorothee Schaab-Hanke

# Der Geschichtsschreiber als Exeget

## Facetten der frühen chinesischen Historiographie



Dorothee Schaab-Hanke

**Der Geschichtsschreiber als Exeget  
Facetten der frühen chinesischen Historiographie**

Deutsche Ostasienstudien 10

OSTASIEN Verlag

Umschlagbild: Steinabklatsch eines hanzeitlichen Bildziegels aus Pengzhou 彭州, Sichuan, wiedergegeben in Gong Tingwan (1999), Abb. 188.

Bibliographische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek  
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der  
Deutschen Nationalbibliographie; detaillierte bibliographische Daten  
sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

ISSN: 1868-3665  
ISBN: 978-3-940527-36-3

© 2010. OSTASIEN Verlag, Gossenberg ([www.ostasien-verlag.de](http://www.ostasien-verlag.de))  
1. Auflage. Alle Rechte vorbehalten  
Redaktion, Satz und Umschlaggestaltung: Martin Hanke und Dorothee Schaab-Hanke  
Druck und Bindung: Rosch-Buch Druckerei GmbH, Scheßlitz  
Printed in Germany

# Inhalt

Einführung	9
Der Geschichtsschreiber als moralische Autorität The Historiographer as a Moral Authority	
Sima Qians <i>Huo</i> -Zweifel in Kapitel 61 des <i>Shiji</i>	23
Schreiber ( <i>shi</i> 史) als Autoritäten in der Rezeption des <i>Shiji</i>	51
The <i>Junzi</i> in the <i>Shiji</i> and the Quest for Moral Authorities	105
Der Geschichtsschreiber als Exeget The Historiographer as an Exegete	
Der Herrscher und sein Richter: Zur Bedeutung von <i>biao</i> 表 und <i>li</i> 裏 in Kapitel 28 des <i>Shiji</i>	141
Die vielen Stimmen aus der Vergangenheit: Sima Qians Eintreten für Meinungsvielfalt	179
Crisis and Reform of the Calendar as Reflected in <i>Shiji</i> 26	195
Sima Tans Anteil an Kapitel 27 des <i>Shiji</i>	211
Der Geschichtsschreiber und seine Exegeten The Historiographer and His Exegetes	
Did Chu Shaosun Contribute to a Tradition of the Grand Scribe?	225
Der Fall Ziyng: Ein Beispiel für Ban Gus Kritik am <i>Shiji</i> und ihr ideologischer Hintergrund	243
Why Did Sima Zhen Want to Correct the <i>Shiji</i> 's Account of High Antiquity?	265
Die zwei Körper des Geschichtsschreibers The Historiographer's Two Bodies	
The Power of an Alleged Tradition: A Prophecy Flattering Han Emperor Wu and its Relation to the Sima Clan	293
In eigner Sache: Die Autobiographie Sima Qians und deren (Aus-) Nutzung durch Ban Gu	347
Anfechtungen eines Ehrenmannes: Argumente für die Authentizität des Briefes an Ren An	369
Dolchstecher, Bluträcher: Warum hat das <i>Shiji</i> ein „Attentäterkapitel?“	387
Subjectivity as a Form of Authority: The “I” Voice in the <i>Taishigong yue</i> Sections of the <i>Shiji</i>	405
Bibliographie	429

# The Junzi in the *Shiji* and the Quest for Moral Authorities\*

## Introduction

In this article, the historiographer's role as a moral authority will be approached from the angle of references to a *junzi* (a morally outstanding person, a superior man)<sup>1</sup> in the *Shiji*.

A separate analysis of the *junzi* entries in the *Shiji* has to my knowledge not been made so far. The probable reason is that in the *Shiji* the ultimate authorial judgment finds its expression not, as in texts of the earlier exegetical tradition such as the *Zuo zhuan*, in the formulaic statement of a superior man (*junzi yue*), but rather by the likewise formulaic *taishigong yue* (His Honor the Grand Scribe said).<sup>2</sup>

Even if the *junzi* may not have the status of an ultimate authority in the *Shiji*, anyone who conducts a closer study of the historiographer's search for orientation as a moral authority must search for the references to a *junzi* in this text. The *junzi* occurs not only in almost all of the early philosophical texts, but also in the texts that belong to the exegetical corpus related to the so-called *Chunqiu* (Spring and Autumn) annals,

- 
- \* This article is a revised and enlarged version of a paper I had presented at the seventeenth conference of the Warring States Group, held in Leiden, September 2003. The title of that paper was “The *junzi* prior to Confucius in the *Shiji*”. It focused on the observation that Confucius is depicted in the *Shiji* as someone who himself owed much to the moral judgments passed by earlier authorities, most importantly, by scribes of old. Both he and his disciple, Zuo Qiuming (who was a scribe himself), are thus strongly emphasized as having benefited from and belonging to a long inherited tradition of scribes.
  - 1 Probably the best way to illustrate the meaning of the term *junzi* 父子 – literally: “son of a ruler” – is by considering the words transmitted from the mouth of Confucius in *Lunyu* 12.11: 君君，臣臣，父父，子子。“Let the ruler be a ruler, the subject a subject, the father a father, the son a son!”. The idea expressed there is that a person should adhere to the moral standards required by this social position. Many proposals have been made as to how to render the term *junzi* most fittingly. James Legge used, in his translation of the *Zuo zhuan*, the term “superior man” (cf. Legge V); John Knoblock in his translation of the *Xunzi* prefers “Gentleman”; Stephen W. Durrant (1995) chose the term “True Gentleman”; Eric Henry (1999) proposed to render the term by “superior man” or “man of quality”. In this article I will leave the term *junzi* mostly untranslated, except in translated passages, where I will render it by the term “superior man”.
  - 2 Studies of the *taishigong yue* as the ultimate authority in the *Shiji*, both in Chinese and Western language, are quite numerous. To name only a few: Watson (1958); Li Changzhi (1984), Zhang Dake (1985); Zhou Hulin (1991); Li Wai-ye (1994); Stephen W. Durrant (1995); Michael Nylan (1998–1999); Mark Edward Lewis (1999), esp. Chap. 7 (“Sima Qian and Universal History”).

named after the annals of the Chunqiu period (722–481 B.C.). These are a record of events comprising the reigns of altogether twelve dukes of the state of Lu during the first part of the Eastern Zhou dynasty.<sup>3</sup>

Among the references to a *junzi* found in the *Shiji* text, two major types may be distinguished. *Junzi* references of the first type describe how a man of high moral standards, a paragon of virtue, would behave in a given situation. They are thus mainly prescriptive, serving as role-models, and are mostly presented without giving any historical context, since it is of no importance who the person representing these values actually is or was.

References to a *junzi* of the second type concentrate on the judgments which a critically reflecting authority passed on an historical event or an historical person. Here again, the basic interest is essentially of a moral nature, saying that this or that person acted in accordance with or contrary to the rites. But, in contrast to references to the *junzi* of the first type, the reader in instances of this type is always provided with an historical context, i.e., he learns about the past events or the behavior of a specific person which the *junzi* then comes to evaluate. *Junzi* references of this type are typically found in texts belonging to the tradition of *Chunqiu* exegesis, such as the *Zuozhuan*, the *Gongyang zhuan*, and the *Guliang zhuan*, since it is precisely here that a morally superior authority – whether early scribes, Master Confucius, or the authors or compilers themselves incorporated into these texts who claim to preserve what Confucius had orally transmitted to his disciples – passes moral judgments on past events and thus serves as a guide for authorities of the present and the future.

As a first step in searching for the meaning of the *junzi* for the historiographer in the *Shiji*, examples of both types of references to a *junzi* as characterized above will be given. Apart from looking for parallels to the *Shiji* passages in earlier sources, I will try to determine in each case to what degree the historiographer simply copied the earlier source and whether or not he added something new to the earlier account.

As a second step, the role of the *Shiji* author, and primarily his role as a *Chunqiu* exegete, is examined more closely by looking at some of the passages discussed before in terms of his exegetical preferences. It will be argued that the historiographer, while claiming to include all kinds of earlier texts and to present a synopsis of the past, as it is formulated in the last chapter of the *Shiji*, clearly had personal priorities and inclinations. This becomes especially clear in the case of *Chunqiu* exegesis, which certainly lay at the core of the historiographer's interest.

In a third and last step, an attempt will be made to interpret the different exegetical inclinations discernible in the *Shiji* text as displayed by the apparent preferences of two authors who both contributed to the

---

3 For a study on Confucius as the ultimate authority of the *Gongyang* and *Guliang* traditions, see Arbuckle (1997); for a study on the *junzi* in the *Zuozhuan*, see Eric Henry (1999).

compilation of this text: Sima Tan and Sima Qian. Criteria such as the different eras in which father and son Sima lived, their different educational background and the canonization tendencies at the time of Emperor Wu will be adduced to support the to support the theory of what I will call the approaches of two exegetes visible in the *Shiji*.

## A Closer Look at the *Junzi* Passages Found in the *Shiji*

Searching the *Shiji* systematically, one finds altogether 152 occurrences of the term *junzī*.<sup>4</sup> If one examines the overall distribution of these references among the 130 chapters of the book more closely, one finds that they are quite unevenly distributed among the chapters. While there are quite a few chapters that have no *junzī* entry at all, in others there are frequent *junzī* references. For example, the five references to a *junzī* in chapter 23 (Monograph on Rites), the twenty references in chapter 24 (Monograph on Music) and the fourteen references in chapter 47 (Hereditary House of Master Kong) all serve to describe the moral qualities or behavior of a *junzī*.<sup>5</sup> Very much in contrast, the ten references to a *junzī* in chapter 14 (Table by Years of the Twelve Feudal Lords) point to ancient moral authorities who judged a person's behavior or action of someone else or who commented on events such as presages or anomalous heavenly constellations with respect to their possible impact on the fate of a state (see table 1).

Below, examples of *junzī* references falling under the two types that have been described in the introduction will be given in separate sections. A list of all the *junzī* references in the *Shiji* text together with all the parallel references in earlier texts I have been able to find so far is attached to the end of this article (see table 2).

### References to a *Junzi* as a Paragon of Virtue

To begin with persons from the remote past, Laozi is called the “hidden superior man” (*yin junzī* 隱君子) in *Shiji* 63, the chapter devoted to Laozi

4 This number includes both the parallel text passages of *Shiji* 28.1404 and 12.486, two chapters of the *Shiji* which are almost identical in content, and the *junzī* passages in those parts of the *Shiji* which are introduced by the formula Chu *xiansheng yue* and are thus discernible as parts for which Chu Shaosun (ca. 104 – ca. 30 v. Chr.) can be made responsible: *Shiji* 20.1059; 58.2091; 60.2114–15, 2116, 2119; 126.3208, 3211, 127.3221. If one excludes the eight occurrences that were certainly not part of the original book as it was compiled by Sima Tan and Sima Qian, the total would be 144 *junzī* occurrences.

5 All five references to a *junzī* in *Shiji* 23 have parallels in *Xunzī* 19; of the twenty references to a *junzī* in *Shiji* 24, almost all have parallels in *Da Dai liji* 19; and the twenty references to a *junzī* in *Shiji* 47 have their parallels partly in the *Lunyu* and partly in the *Kongzījiayu*. For precise localizations, see Table 2.

and Han Feizi.<sup>6</sup> In the introductory remarks to the “Table By Years of the Twelve Feudal Lords” chapter, Zuo Qiuming is praised by the *taishigong* as the “superior man from (the state of) Lu” (*Lu junzi* 魯君子).<sup>7</sup> In the “Hereditary House of Wu” chapter, Jizha, the famous prince and diplomat of Wu, is praised by the *taishigong* at the end of the chapter as a “superior man of vast insight and broad knowledge” (*honglan bonu junzi* 閑覽博物君子).<sup>8</sup> There is a similar statement in the “Hereditary House of Zheng” chapter, said to have been uttered by Duke Ping of Jin and Shuxiang, in which Zichan is called a “superior man of broad knowledge” (*bonu junzi* 博物君子),<sup>9</sup> and this has a perfect parallel in the *Zuo zhuan*.<sup>10</sup> In this case the author’s praise for Jizha may have been inspired by the praise addressed to Zichan, as evidenced in the *Zuo zhuan*.

In the chapter devoted to the Prince of Wei and Kang, *Shiji* 37, the author refers to the Duke of Zhou who in his “Cicai” (Timber of the *Ci* Tree)<sup>11</sup> intended to show what a *junzi* would take as his model.<sup>12</sup>

In the “Officer of Heaven” chapter, the author refers to a superior man who would be alarmed if the Four Planets had a conjunction, whereas petty men would scatter. The “superior man” (*junzi*) versus “petty man” (*xiaoren* 小人) dichotomy appears to have been applied here to the realm of astrologers.<sup>13</sup>

As for persons of a less remote past, the historiographer, in the *taishigong yue* section of the chapter devoted to Huoli Ziji and Gan Mou, *Shiji* 71, describes both men as “even though they were no superior men of sincere conduct” (*fei duxing zhi junzi* 非篤行之君子), they could be reckoned among the strategic heroes (*ceshi* 策士) of the Warring States period.<sup>14</sup>

6 *Shiji* 63.2142:11.

7 *Shiji* 14.509:15. The fact that there is no explicit designation of Confucius as *junzi* should certainly not be given too much weight in this context. For example, at the end of the Hereditary House of the Kong family, chap. 47, Confucius is described as the “Master whom all those who in the civilized realm teach the Six Arts took as their common standard” (自天子王侯，中國言六藝者折中於夫子), as “the ancestor of all scholarship” (*xuezhi zong zhi* 學者宗之) and as “the one who may be called the most accomplished of all wise men” (*ke wei zhisheng yi* 可謂至聖矣), which of course includes the notion that he was considered by the *Shiji* author as a *junzi*. See *Shiji* 47.1945:9,10.

8 *Shiji* 31.1475:15.

9 *Shiji* 42.1772:14.

10 *Zuo zhuan*, Zhao 1.12/319/17.

11 “Cicai” 桀材 is the title of chapter 29 of the transmitted *Shangshu*.

12 *Shiji* 37.1590:4.

13 *Shiji* 27.1321:1.

14 *Shiji* 71.2321:4. For the requirement that a *Ru* scholar should have an all-encompassing educational background (*boxue* 博學), and he should display a sincere conduct (*duxing* 篤行), see *Xiao Dai liji* 42.6/163/27. For the Master’s response to Zizhang’s question about

In the *taishigong yue* section concluding chapter 98, the composite biographies of Fu Kuan, Qin Xi and Zhou Xie, the historiographer praises Zhou Xie as someone who can justly be called a “sincere and magnanimous superior man” (*ke wei dubou junzi* 可謂篤厚君子).<sup>15</sup>

In the “Pitch Pipes” chapter, the *Shiji* author praises Han Emperor Wen as someone whom Confucius would call a “superior man displaying virtue” (*you de junzi* 有德君子).<sup>16</sup>

In the collective biography devoted to Shi Fen, Wei Wan, Zhi Buyi, Zhou Ren and Zhang Shu, chapter 103, two kinds of judgments as regards Shi Fen, Wei Wan and Zhang Shu are expressed in the *taishigong yue* section.<sup>17</sup> The first judgment says, “a superior man would criticize them, due to their being close to servile flatterers” (*junzi ji zhi, wei qi jin yu wei ye* 君子譏之，為其近於佞也). Immediately following this, the authorial “I” turns to a more modified judgment, saying that these men could (nevertheless) be called “superior men of sincere conduct” (*du-xing junzi* 篤行君子). – It is remarkable that in the rhymed preface related to this very chapter, a very positive judgment is passed on these four persons, saying that they could even be regarded as belonging to the most elevated among the superior men (*junzi changzhe* 君子長者).<sup>18</sup>

The chapter on Han Changru (= Han Anguo) contains an almost enthusiastic praise of Hu Sui, describing him as a „respectful and devoted superior man“ (*jugong junzi* 鞠躬君子).<sup>19</sup> This positive judgment is all the more surprising, as there is in fact not a single word of praise in the *taishigong yue* section devoted to Han Anguo himself. The only bridge between Han Anguo and Hu Sui is the remark that Han Anguo had recommended Hu Sui for service in Liang.<sup>20</sup>

In the collective biography devoted to the “wandering knights” (*youxia* 游俠), the author refers, probably ironically alluding to the above mentioned *duxing junzi* 篤行君子 (*junzi* of sincere conduct), to people who “when reading books long for the virtue of an independently acting superior man (*du shu huai duxing junzi zhi de* 讀書懷獨行君子之德).<sup>21</sup> And later in the same chapter, shortly before the beginning of the *taishigong yue* section, the author states that “although these people were among the knights, they still breathe the air of superior men who, when retiring

correct conduct, namely, that in his conduct one should always be “sincere and respectful” (*xing dujing* 行篤敬), see *Lunyu* 15.6/42/11.

15 *Shiji* 98.2713:2.

16 *Shiji* 25.1243:5.

17 *Shiji* 103.2774:1.

18 *Shiji* 130.3316:7.

19 *Shiji* 108.2865:5.

20 For the term *jugong* 鞠躬 (respectful and devoted) as a rule of conduct as prescribed for a guest who enters the door, see *Yili* 8/54/14 (“Binli”).

21 *Shiji* 124.3181:8.

themselves, advance others” (*sui wei xia er lingling you tuirang junzi zhibi feng* 雖為俠而逡逡有退讓君子之風).<sup>22</sup> If one tries to imagine how Confucius would have judged on people such as the “wandering knights”, one gets the impression that the judgment expressed here is intentionally mild.

In the “Hemerologists” chapter, Sima Jizhu, an astrologer working in the market place of Chang'an, is recorded to have met with the court officials Jia Yi and Song Zhong and to have instructed them that “transmitting and not inventing is the righteousness of the superior man” (*shu er bu zuo, junzi yi ye* 述而不作, 君子義也), concerning in this case the realm of observing and interpreting the motions of the heavenly bodies.<sup>23</sup>

Next there is a group of references which, albeit easily recognizable as belonging together, are not as easily attributable to one or the other of the two categories. These are the passages in which the historiographer – always as part of the *taishigong yue* section – addresses his readers as “superior men of the future” (*bou junzi* 後君子). Since the examples of this group, only four in number, are quite interesting, they will all be listed here.

In the introduction to „Table by Years of the Six Feudal States”, the historiographer emphasizes that this table was conceived by him for the *junzi* of a later generation who would be capable to use it as a basis for gaining insight into what he calls the germs of flourishing and decay (*xing huai zhibi duan* 興壞之端).<sup>24</sup>

In a very similar vein, and again found in the introductory remarks to a chapter of the “tables” genre, namely the chapter on meritorious generals of the time of Gaozu, the historiographer tells the *junzi* of a future generation to draw their own conclusions from the data he had recorded in this table.<sup>25</sup> There is an interesting addition there, namely, that he omitted what is questionable, thus alluding to a principle laid down earlier by Confucius.

At the end of the “Sacrifices” chapter, the *taishigong* authority first reports of his many travels in the entourage of the emperor accompanying him to the various places of sacrifice and specifically to the Feng and Shan sacrifices, and then addresses future *junzi*, instructing them to draw their own conclusions from a comparison of Emperor Wu's outward behavior and his personal attitude.<sup>26</sup>

The historiographer's comment at the end of the last chapter of the *Shiji* is slightly different from the other examples, as it is not directly

22 *Shiji* 124.3188:15.

23 *Shiji* 127.3219:5.

24 *Shiji* 15.687:4.

25 *Shiji* 18.878:10.

26 *Shiji* 28.1404:5, and identically in the doublet, *Shiji* 12.486:4.

addressed to future *junzī*, but formulated in the hope that this work would await the wise and the *junzī* of a future generation. This section at the same time is part of the rhymed preface summarizing the overall idea of the last chapter of the *Shiji*.<sup>27</sup>

### References to a Junzi as a Critically Reflecting Authority

As mentioned in the introduction to this article, *junzī* references of this type are characterized by recording the judgment which a critically reflecting authority passed on an historical event or an historical person. They frequently perform this function in texts belonging to the *Chunqiu* exegetical tradition, such as the *Zuo zhuan*, the *Gongyang zhuan* and the *Guliang zhuan*. As I have also mentioned before, in some *Shiji* chapters *junzī* references are grouped together, as, for example, the ten references occurring in chapter 14, “Table by Years of the Twelve Feudal Lords”. Since, with only two exceptions,<sup>28</sup> all the references occurring in this table are of the critically reflecting *junzī* type, I will start this section by looking at these references as a group.

For the tenth year of Earl Mu of Jin (802), the table in the *Shiji* records that the Earl had decided to confer upon his two sons names which predestined them to become rebels, an act which a *junzī* criticized. As the *Shiji* table also records, disorder did indeed arise in Jin later on.<sup>29</sup> In the *Chunqiu* exegetical sources, only the *Zuo zhuan* seems to have commented on this event. There, a Master Fu (Shi Fu 師服) is quoted as saying that the names the Earl had conferred on his two sons were rather strange, since names would normally be given in order to establish some kind of morality. Jiang Shi's first son, who was designed to be the crown prince, was named Chou (“enemy”), and the second son (born during a fight), was given the name Chengshi 成師 (“accomplished leader”). Master Fu's comment ends with the presage that disobeying the rules concerning the proper conferring of names is a bad omen for the fate of the state of Jin.<sup>30</sup> The *Shiji* author in his record thus appears to have adopted both the historical account and the moral message given in the *Zuo zhuan*, turning the words that the *Zuo zhuan* quoted from the mouth of Master Fu into those of an anonymously criticizing *junzī*. – It is noteworthy that

27 *Shiji* 130.3320:1: *si houshi shengren junzī* 俟後世聖人君子。Cf. the almost identical remark in the *Gongyang zhuan*, according to which the morality of *Chunqiu* making is done in awaiting the *junzī* of a future age. See *Gongyang zhuan*, Ai 14.1/158/15.

28 The two exceptions are: *Shiji* 14.509:15, mentioned already in section 1.1 (“References to a *junzī* as a paragon of virtue”), and *Shiji* 14.581: Jin660, in which a *junzī* is said to have known of the impending death of Master Shen, the crownprince of Lu.

29 *Shiji* 14.525: Jin802: 生仇弟成師。二子名反，君子譏之。後亂。See also the more elaborate account in *Shiji* 39.1637:8ff.

30 *Zuo zhuan*, Huan 2.8/21/1-3.

the rhymed preface relating to chapter 39 of the *Shiji*, the “Hereditary house of Jin”, also mentions that a “superior man criticized the conferring of names” (*junzǐ jí míng* 君子譏名) by the Earl of Jin.<sup>31</sup>

For the first year of the Earl Zhao of Jin (745), the table records that after Chengshi had been enfeoffed with Quwo, a *junzǐ* warned that the uprising of the people of Jin would take its origin in Quwo.<sup>32</sup> Searching the three *Chunqiu* exegetical texts for this event, we again find it in the *Zuo zhuan*, close to the previous reference, that of Master Fu reflecting on Chengshi’s being enfeoffed with Quwo and the possible dangers evolving from the decision taken by the Earl of Jin.<sup>33</sup> Again, the *Shiji* author appears to have modified the *Zuo zhuan*’s account and absorbed it into his own historical record.

For the fifth year of the reign of Duke Yin of Lu (718), the table records that a *junzǐ* criticized the duke for his desire to observe the fishing in Tang.<sup>34</sup> A slightly more detailed account of this is contained in the “Hereditary House of Lu” chapter, where also the formula “a superior man criticized it” (*junzǐ jí zhī* 君子譏之) is also used.<sup>35</sup> Under the entry “Fifth year of Duke Yin of Lu”, the *Chunqiu* records that in spring (of that year) the Duke went to observe the fishing. To this entry the *Zuo zhuan* adds a long speech of Zang Xibo 臧僖伯 remonstrating with the duke. The duke, we learn, did not listen to Zang’s advice but went to see the fishing, after which either Zang himself or someone who took order from him, recorded the event, together with the judgment that this was contrary to the rites.<sup>36</sup>

Among the comments concerning the *Chunqiu* record mentioning the Duke’s observing of the fishing in Tang, we find the following made by the author of the *Gongyang zhuan*:

五年。春。公觀魚于棠。何以書。譏。何譏爾。遠也。公曷為遠而觀魚。登來之也。

In his fifth year, in spring, the Duke went to observe the fishing in Tang. Why has this been recorded? – In order to criticize (it). – Why was it criticized? – (because he would have had to go) too far! - Why would the Duke have had to go too far in order to observe the fishing? – Because he would have had to climb in order to get there.<sup>37</sup>

Very much in the same vein, the *Guliang zhuan* comments:

31 *Shiji* 130.3309:3.

32 *Shiji* 14.540: Jin745: 晉昭侯元年封季父成師于曲沃，曲沃大於國，君子譏曰：晉人亂自曲沃始矣。See also the more elaborate account in *Shiji* 39.1638:4.

33 *Zuo zhuan*, Huan 2.8/21/5.

34 *Shiji* 14.551: Lu718 (公觀魚于棠，君子譏之。).

35 *Shiji* 33.1529:8 (隱公五年，觀漁於棠).

36 *Zuo zhuan*, Yin 5.1/8/23-30.

37 *Gongyang zhuan*, Yin 5.1/5/7.

五年。春。公觀魚于棠。[...] 公觀之非正也。

In his fifth year, in spring, the Duke went to observe the fishing in Tang. [...] The Duke's observing this was contrary to the rites.<sup>38</sup>

For this account, then, we have comments in the texts of all three major *Chunqiu* exegetical traditions. While the critical judgment is in the *Zuo zhuan* account quotes Zang Xibo, who remonstrated with the duke, the *Gongyang zhuan* simply states that the event was recorded (by scribes?) in order to criticize the duke's behavior. In the *Guliang zhuan*, the author or compiler himself criticizes the duke's going to observe the fishing in Tang. In any case, the judgments given by the moral authorities are identical, and it is difficult to say after whom the anonymous criticizing *junzi* recorded in the *Shiji* table was modeled.

For the eighth year of Duke Yin of Lu (715 B.C.), it is recorded in the *Shiji* table that the states of Lu and Zheng exchanged territories and that a “superior man criticized it” (*junzi ji zhi* 君子譏之).<sup>39</sup> A slightly more elaborate version is found in chapter 33, the “Hereditary house of Lu”, where we find the exact names of the respective territories the two states exchanged.<sup>40</sup>

The author or compiler of the *Zuo zhuan* also refers to this event, but does not seem to make a comment on it.<sup>41</sup> However, from an account referring to it in the *Guliang zhuan*, we learn that the background of this exchange action was that the state of Zheng intended to give up sacrifices on Mount Tai and instead sacrifice to the Duke of Zhou; therefore they wanted to exchange the territory of Pang near Mount Tai for the fields of Xu. In the third month, the Earl of Zheng sent Yuan to give Pang to Lu and ceased from then on to use the Mount Tai sacrifice.<sup>42</sup> Since the *Guliang zhuan* seems in this case to be the only text from which an implicit criticism can be deduced, one might conclude that the *Shiji* author, by recording that a *junzi* criticized the exchange, was primarily following the *Guliang zhuan* here.<sup>43</sup>

For the 2nd year of Duke Huan of Lu (710 B.C.), an entry in the *Shiji* table records that the duke received a tripod from the state of Song, and that he gave an order to bring it to his ancestral temple, an act which a “superior man criticized”.<sup>44</sup> Turning to the three *Chunqiu* “commentar-

38 *Guliang zhuan*, Yin 5.1/4/17.

39 *Shiji* 14.552: Lu715: 易許田, 君子譏之。

40 *Shiji* 33.1529:8. To this, the *Jjie* author adds the comment from the *Guliang zhuan*.

41 *Zuo zhuan*, Yin 8.1/12/23.

42 *Guliang zhuan*, Yin 8.2/6/11.

43 Chen Tongsheng (1995), 93, also came to the conclusion that there is an implicit criticism of Lu here on the part of the author or compiler of the *Guliang zhuan*.

44 *Shiji* 14.556: Lu710: 宋賂以鼎, 入於太廟, 君子譏之。The event is also mentioned in *Shiji* 33.1530, together with the formula “A superior man criticized” it, and the *Jjie* author adds references to the *Guliang zhuan* and *Gongyang zhuan* here.

ies”, one finds a critical comment concerning this event in all three texts. Under the *Chunqiu* entry “Huan, Second Year”, the author of the *Zuozhuan* not only explicitly says that the Duke of Lu’s decision to bring the tripod into the ancestral temple was contrary to the rites, but also mentions Zang Aibo 殢哀伯 as the criticizing authority commenting on the event.<sup>45</sup> Besides, the Inner Scribe of Zhou 周內史 is mentioned as having heard of Zang Aibo’s criticism, adding his own comment to it.<sup>46</sup> Under the same *Chunqiu* entry, both the authors or compilers of the *Gongyang zhuan* and of the *Guliang zhuan* unanimously declare that in this instance the Duke of Zhou acted contrary to the rites.<sup>47</sup>

Again, it is difficult to decide which of the three comments is the one that the *Shiji* author might follow in this case. Since the duke’s decision to bring the tripod from Song to the ancestral temple of Lu is severely criticized in all three texts, one might say that, by simply noting that “a superior man criticized this”, the essential message of all three commentaries was recorded by the historiographer. For the 3rd year of Duke Huan of Lu (709), the *Shiji* table records that (Gongzi) Hui, the Earl of Qi, had sent a woman to the Duke of Lu.<sup>48</sup> All three exegetical texts give us essentially the same account, namely, that the name of the woman the Earl of Qi had sent to Lu was Jiang Shi and that she was a rebellious woman. Besides, all three texts accord in that by doing so, the Earl of Qi acted contrary to the rites.<sup>49</sup> Here again, the *Shiji* author, in referring simply to a *junzi* who criticized the act, highlights after a fashion the position of all three “commentaries”.

Concerning the thirty-ninth year of the reign of Duke Mu of Qin (621 B.C.), the table in the *Shiji* records that, when the Duke died, 170 persons had to follow him into his tomb, an action which a superior man criticized.<sup>50</sup> The event is also mentioned in the “Qin Annals”; this account quotes the judgment of a superior man who criticized the duke severely for his deciding to destroy the lives of other people simply because he himself had to die and came to the conclusion that because of such a “brain drain” of excellent officials to the grave, the state of Qin would never again be able to make a military expedition to the East.<sup>51</sup> While neither the *Gongyang zhuan* nor the *Guliang zhuan* comment on this episode, the *Zuozhuan* quotes the words from the mouth of

45 *Zuozhuan*, Huan 2.2/20/1-10.

46 *Zuozhuan*, Huan 2.2/20/12.

47 *Guliang zhuan*, Huan 2.4/10/10; *Gongyang zhuan*, Huan 2.4/9/24.

48 *Shiji* 14.557: Lu709: 姜迎女, 齊侯送女, 君子譏之。

49 See *Zuozhuan*, Huan 3.5/22/18, *Gongyang zhuan*, Huan 3.6/11/4, and *Guliang zhuan*, Huan 3.5/10/19.

50 *Shiji* 14.603: Qin621: 繆公薨。葬殉以人, 從死者百七十人, 君子譏之, 故不言卒。

51 *Shiji* 5.194:2.

a *junzi* who criticizes the decision taken by the Duke of Qin almost exactly as it is rendered in the account given in the *Shiji*.<sup>52</sup>

Summarizing the results gathered from closer examination of the *junzi* references contained in the table of chapter 14 of the *Shiji*, we can say that the *Shiji* author, in his search for orientation among worthy authorities passing judgment on the time of the *Chunqiu* period (the time frame of the table that chapter 14 comprises), appears to have included the comments of all three major *Chunqiu* exegetical texts, the *Zuo zhuan*, the *Gongyang zhuan* and the *Guliang zhuan*. But as far as the references in this table are concerned, there was no example in which the *Shiji* author decided against a judgment passed in one of these texts in favor of one passed in another exegetical source.

Let us now take a look at some more references to the *junzi* that are not contained in *Shiji* chap. 14. Here are two quotes from the mouth of the famous diplomat Jizha from the state of Wu, who in 544 B.C. went on a diplomatic trip through the state of Wei. One refers to the following episode: After having met there several important personalities, among them the scribe Qu Boyu, the scribe Qiu and the scribe Gou, he said in a conversation with Zichan that since there were many men of high moral standard (*junzi*), no calamity had to be feared so far.<sup>53</sup> The same account can be found in the *Zuo zhuan*.<sup>54</sup>

The second quote is mentioned in the “Hereditary House of Wu”<sup>55</sup> chapter, in which Jizha is reported to praise Zizang of Zheng for his decision to decline the throne offered to him after the death of Duke Xuan of Cao, saying that a *junzi* designated Zizang as “someone who upheld the rites”.<sup>56</sup> Again, a parallel passage of Jizha’s speech including his reference to the judgment of a *junzi* is contained in the *Zuo zhuan*.<sup>57</sup> Interestingly, whereas Jizha in the latter cases refers back to someone who called someone a *junzi*, in the first case he himself is the authority that calls someone a *junzi*.

In the following instance the *Shiji* author, although a different judgment would have been offered by another *Chunqiu* exegetical source, the *Gongyang zhuan*, seems to have appealed to the version found in the *Zuo zhuan*. In the “Hereditary House of Song” chapter of the *Shiji*, we learn that after Duke Mu of Song had died, Duke Xuan, his elder

52 *Zuo zhuan*, Wen 6.3/131/14.

53 *Shiji* 31.1458:3: 衛多君子，未有患也。There is a parallel account in *Shiji* 37.1597:16. See also Schaab-Hanke (2007a), page 52.

54 *Zuo zhuan*, Xiang 29.13/304/3.

55 Hereafter, the titles of *Shiji* chapters will be rendered in a slightly abbreviated, but easily recognizable form.

56 *Shiji* 31.1450:6: 君子曰：能守節矣。

57 *Zuo zhuan*, Xiang 14.2/254/12.

brother, decided to offer the throne to the duke's son Yuli. Then, the account continues,

君子聞之，曰：宋宣公可謂知人矣，立其弟以成義，然卒其子復享之。  
A superior man who had heard about that said, “The Duke can be called someone who knew men. He put his younger brother on the throne, and, upon (the duke's) death, his son again followed him!”<sup>58</sup>

In the *Zuozhuan*, we find the same judgment as the statement of a *junzi*.<sup>59</sup> However, the *Gongyang zhuan* comments under the same *Chunqiu* entry (Duke Yin of Lu, third year) that the calamity of Song was brought about by Duke Xuan of Song.<sup>60</sup>

Faced with the existence of different and at times even contradictory traditions, the *Shiji* author seems in some cases to have made an exegetical choice. A good example is the account of the defeat of Duke Xiang of Song at Hong. In the “Hereditary House of Song” chapter, the author demonstrates how wrong decisions of rulers lead to the decay and finally the death of the state of Song. In the course of the chapter the author makes clear yet one further step was taken towards the decay and final demise of the state of Song because of the duke's staunch adherence to a rule he had learned to obey and because he did not listen to the advice of Ziyu, that he attack the army of Chu before the soldiers, having crossed the river, had returned to correct formation.<sup>61</sup> Yet, in the *taishigong yue* section at the end of the chapter, the *Shiji* author states that the duke's decision not to follow Ziyu's advice but to stick to his rules was something that “some (or one) among the superior men who judged to be something one should estimate highly” (*junzi huo yinwei duo* 君子或以為多).<sup>62</sup> Although the historiographer does not make clear whether he shared this opinion or not, he at least made clear that he knew that the exegetical traditions interpreted the duke's decision in more than one way.

If one turns to the *Chunqiu* exegetical texts, one finds that not only *Zuozhuan* but also *Gongyang zhuan* and *Guliang zhuan* comment on this episode. From the account given in the *Zuozhuan* it can be concluded that, in the author's eyes, Ziyu's advice given to the duke to attack the army of Chu as soon as possible should be looked upon as superior to the duke's decision to wait, following rites he had learned to obey.<sup>63</sup> The author of the *Guliang zhuan* interprets the duke's defeat in Hong as the

58 *Shiji* 38.1623:3.

59 *Zuozhuan*, Yin 3.5/6/7.

60 *Gongyang zhuan*, Yin 3.7/4/7.

61 *Shiji* 38.1626:10.

62 *Shiji* 38.1633:3.

63 *Zuozhuan*, Xi 22.8/99/1. For the interpretation of this episode see also David Schaberg, *A Patterned Past: Form and Thought in Early Chinese Historiography* (Cambridge, Mass, and London: Harvard, 2001), Intro, 3.

just penalty for his failure to know how to conduct a war.<sup>64</sup> Whereas the authors of the *Zuo zhuan* and the *Guliang zhuan* agree in condemning Duke Xiang of Song for his behavior, the *Gongyang zhuan*, in contrast, praises the duke for his firmness in not forgetting the great rites, ending with the statement that not even King Wen in his way of conducting wars had not surpassed Duke Xiang of Song.<sup>65</sup> From the comparison of the different interpretations it can be concluded that the *Shiji* author, in the very way he depicts the fate of Song, closely follows the adopts the position of the *Zuo zhuan* which criticizes the duke. His comment in the *taishigong yue* at the end of this section, however, clearly shows that he was perfectly aware of the positive attitude towards Duke Xiang found in the *Gongyang zhuan*; he considers this attitude, too, to be that of a *junzi*.<sup>66</sup> And in this story there is even one more striking detail, found in the rhymed preface to the „Hereditary House of Song“ chapter attached to the last *Shiji* chapter. There we find the rhetorical question regarding Duke Xiang of Song, “Who among the superior men would praise him?” (*junzi shu cheng* 君子孰稱), which strongly rejects any positive assessment of the duke’s behavior, and only slightly further on in the text it is emphasized that the consequence of all this was that Song perished.<sup>67</sup> If one compares this question to the final judgment given in the *taishigong yue*, one cannot but sense that the latter seems to mildly contradict the judgment passed in the rhymed preface.<sup>68</sup>

The following example is related to the quite famous case of a certain Zhao Dun, minister of Duke Ling of Jin, who, after his duke was murdered, intended to flee but who returned before he had crossed the border. The incident is recorded both in the chapter on the “Hereditary House of Jin” and that of the “Hereditary House of Zhao”, but in that on the state of Zhao we read:

君子譏盾為正卿，亡不出境，反不討賊，故太史書曰趙盾弑其君。

A superior man criticized Dun for (the fact that) “he as the highest minister of state tried to flee but did not cross the border, returned but did not punish the killer (of Zhao Dun).” Therefore, the Grand Scribe wrote, “Zhao Dun assassinated his ruler.”<sup>69</sup>

<sup>64</sup> *Guliang zhuan*, Xi 22.4/49/26.

<sup>65</sup> *Gongyang zhuan*, Xi 22.4/50/27.

<sup>66</sup> Interestingly, Sima Zhen in his *Suoyin* commentary also alerts the reader that the *Shiji* author here takes the position of the *Gongyang zhuan*, whereas the *Zuo zhuan* took a different stance. See *Shiji* 38.1633:10: 春秋公羊有此說，左氏則無譏焉。

<sup>67</sup> *Shiji* 130.3308:12. For the suggestion that the rhymed prefaces might at least to a large degree attributed to Sima Tan, please see the last section.

<sup>68</sup> For the account of Duke Xiang of Song, see also Schaab-Hanke (2005a), page 183.

<sup>69</sup> *Shiji* 43.1782:12. For more details of the Zhao Dun episode, see Schaab-Hanke (2002a), page 175f, and Schaab-Hanke (2007a), page 64ff.

If one searches this account in earlier sources, one finds more or less elaborated parallels in the *Zuo zhuan*, the *Guliang zhuan*, and the *Gongyang zhuan*. In all three sources, the central plot is essentially the same: according to the scribe's record, the minister of Jin, Zhao Dun, is charged for something which he did not do himself but for which he had to take moral responsibility, namely, the murder of Duke Ling of Jin. But there are differences between the sources as regards the judging authorities. In the *Zuo zhuan*, the Grand Scribe (Dong Hu) is referred to as the one who wrote down that Zhao Dun assassinated his ruler, but there is an additional comment by Master Kong, who praised both the scribe and the minister.<sup>70</sup> In the version of the *Guliang zhuan* and in that of the *Gongyang zhuan*, however, the scribe himself is the judging authority. This is most clearly visible in the later record, as it describes a dispute between the recording scribe and the angry Zhao Dun is described.<sup>71</sup> Since neither of the three commentaries here is wholly identical with the *Shiji* account, it seems that the historiographer's primary intent was to give an account of the historical event, together with the information that an ancient anonymous authority formally regarded Zhao Dun's behavior as equivalent to having assassinated his ruler, and that the Grand Scribe of Jin recorded that matter according to the ritual rules.

Summing up the results of the examples adduced in this section, we find that the *Shiji* author must have collected his role models from a great variety of sources. As far as the references of the “*junzi* as a paragon of virtue” type are concerned, we find parallel descriptions of what a superior man would do or not do, in philosophical texts such as the *Lunyu*, the *Kongzi jiayu*, the *Mengzi*, the *Xunzi*, and the *Da Dai liji*. Concerning persons of a remote past, the *Shiji* author discusses some personalities who represent philosophical schools, e.g., Laozi, whom he calls the “hidden superior man” (*yin junzi*), or Zuo Qiuming, the author of the *Zuo zhuan*, whom he calls the “superior man from Lu” (*Lu junzi*). Designations such as these are very interesting in that they point toward the historiographer's personal inclinations, especially in cases where no parallels in earlier sources for such designations are found. Of similar interest are instances in which worthies of a less remote age are described as “superior men”, often by comparing their merits with those of *junzi* of an earlier age; the historiographer thus continues the historical account of moral authorities almost up to his own lifetimes. Perhaps it should be added here that to record and to discuss the merits of worthy men is precisely the duty of the scribes from ancient times to the present, as Sima Tan reminds his son Qian on his deathbed. It

70 *Zuo zhuan*, Xuan 2.4 (Yang, 662f.).

71 *Guliang zhuan*, Xuan 2.4; *Gongyang zhuan*, Xuan 6.1.

was his fear that after his death the record might be interrupted, rendering useless the work of generations of scribes.<sup>72</sup>

The references to *junzi* representing moral values are thus highly interesting with regard to the historiographer's own personal preferences, but what seems to me to be even more interesting are the references of the second type, that of the “critically reflecting” type. It is here that the *Shiji* author, by referring to superior men who passed judgments on events of the past, relied heavily on moral authorities who themselves had often passed judgments on these events in earlier sources. As we saw, in some cases the historiographer simply copied the reference to an anonymous *junzi* from the earlier source. In still other instances, the historiographer deduced the exegetical position of a *junzi* from a final judgment given in the earlier source without reference to an earlier authority, thus referring to the opinion of the author or compiler of the exegetical text himself.

As we have seen, it is primarily the notion of the *junzi* of this second type for which we can find numerous parallels in the texts belonging to the *Chunqiu* exegetical tradition, i.e., the *Zuozhuan*, *Gongyang zhuan*, and *Guliang zhuan*. In some chapters, e.g., in chapter 14, which in itself serves as a synopsis of the events of the Chunqiu era, comparing the events that took place in the state of Lu with those of the other feudal states of that time, it is certainly the *Zuozhuan* which the *Shiji* author originally had in mind when recording the judgments passed by a superior man. But, as we saw in those chapters of the *Shiji* in which the judgments given in the three *Chunqiu* exegetical sources happened not to be in accord with each other, the historiographer at times also noted the concurring view, describing the alternative exegetical position like as that of a “superior man”. We can thus justly conclude that the *Shiji* author's primary aim was not simply to follow in his own account the one or other exegetical school, but rather to use a variety of judgments by earlier authorities as guidelines and as a basis upon which to build his own synthetic view, his own all-encompassing exegetical school.<sup>73</sup>

## Searching for the *Shiji* Author's Exegetical Preferences

In the previous section, I have proposed to look at the references to chapter 14 of the *Shiji*, “Table By Years of the Twelve Feudal Lords” as a group, mainly because they occur there in such an accumulated form. As I hope to have shown by adducing parallels from the three

---

72 See *Shiji* 130.3295:12-13.

73 Chen Tongsheng (1995), 94, comes to the admittedly cautiously asserted conclusion that „Sima Qian apparently wanted to include all kinds of judgments passed by the *junzi*, representing all three exegetical schools”.

*Chunqiu* exegetical “commentaries”, the judgments passed by the authoritative *junzi* in the references found in this chapter are admittedly often, but certainly not always, identical with the judgments given in the *Zuo zhuan*. Thus we can cautiously conclude that the *junzi* judgments referred to in this table are an amalgam of judgments given in the three texts. The judgments given in the *Zuo zhuan* clearly predominate and are followed in importance by the judgments given in the *Gongyang zhuan*, and, finally, by those given in the *Guliang zhuan*. The identity of the *junzi*, one may thus say, in the table certainly functions as a kind of synopsis of authoritative judgments on passed events given in these three texts. Thus one may say that the identity of the *junzi* in the table certainly functions as a kind of synopsis of authoritative judgments on passed events given in these three texts. And, as we saw in cases in which the judgments of one of the three or all three texts were at variance with each other, the historiographer at times even perceived the existence of different judgments, even acknowledging in at least one case that, though the judgments are different, they were in every case the judgments of *junzi*, i.e., of moral authorities.

If this supposition is correct, it differs slightly from the conclusions drawn by Grant Hardy who in a study on the “interpretative function” of chapter 14 of the *Shiji* maintained that,

Ssu-ma almost never addresses the terminological issues that were the focus of the *Kung-yang* and the *Ku-liang*, and although the table sometimes follows the *Tso chuan* when it contradicts the *Kung-yang* or *Ku-liang*, I find no cases of the opposite.<sup>74</sup>

By searching this table for its treatment of events of significance, Hardy found out that especially the references of the formula, “*junzi ji zhi* 君子譏之” (a superior man criticized something), seemed to be of utmost importance for the *Shiji* author. His overall impression was that, when a reference to the criticizing *junzi* occurs in the *Shiji* text, the author’s “own disapproval is clear”. Moreover, Hardy argues that in his view, the *Shiji* author throughout this table relied heavily on the *Zuo zhuan*, following it even in cases in which the *Zuo zhuan* position contradicts that of the *Gongyang zhuan* and *Guliang zhuan*, it follows the *Zuo zhuan*.<sup>75</sup>

Admittedly, there is no doubt that the *Zuo zhuan* was of overriding importance to the author of the *Shiji*, at least in major parts of the *Shiji* text. That in the introductory remark to the same table Zuo Qiuming, the author or compiler of the *Zuo zhuan*, is called the “*junzi* from (the state of) Lu”<sup>76</sup> may be taken as a strong indication that this text played

74 Hardy (1993), 22, fn. 46.

75 Hardy (1993), 21, and again, fn. 46.

76 *Shiji* 14.509:15.

a central role for the author of the *Shiji*. As Stephen Durrant pointed out, in a study entitled “Ssu-ma Ch’ien’s Conception of the *Tso-chuan*”, the very fact that in the preface to chapter 14 of the *Shiji* the historiographer treated Zuo Qiuming as the one who handed down the words of Confucius is a sure sign that, at least in this table, the exegetical tradition of the *Zuozhuan* has a prominent position among the *Chunqiu* exegetical texts.<sup>77</sup>

However, as I hope I have been able to illustrate sufficiently by the examples adduced in the previous section, even if the *Shiji* author relied primarily, he certainly did not rely exclusively on the *Zuozhuan*. Also, it is important to note that, in contrast to what Hardy suggests, we cannot directly deduce the historiographer’s own ultimate exegetical position from the *junzi* references he records. Rather, the historiographer appears to have made at the very beginning a thorough synopsis of all those judgments passed by the moral authorities that are pointed out in the three *Chunqiu* exegetical traditions. We should thus, in my view, conceive of the Grand Scribe’s attitude rather as that of someone who in his quest for authorities offering valid judgments concerning ancient persons and events strove to use them as a basis for an all-compassing exegetical account of history yet to be made.

Chapter 14 is thus certainly a key chapter in the *Shiji*, one that should be looked at in its relations to the chapters on the hereditary houses, since it provides, as Hardy has well observed,

an overall temporal structure for the fragmented narratives (for example, the table’s synopsis for the order of local rulers is invaluable when one is thumbing through the *Shih chi* trying to determine if there is more information on a specific person).<sup>78</sup>

But this chapter is only one among all the chapters of the *Shiji*, and, as we have seen already when studying the examples in which references to a *junzi* were made, in other contexts the *Shiji* author shows clearly in other contexts that he included not only the *Zuozhuan*, but the *Gongyang zhuan* and also the *Guliang zhuan*. It is, however, elsewhere in the *Shiji* that we find passages from which we can clearly conclude that it is there that the *Gongyang zhuan* and texts in the *Gongyang* tradition have primary importance for the *Shiji* author.

Let us search for a topic in which the exegetical tradition of the *Gongyang zhuan* differs greatly from those of the other *Chunqiu* exegetical schools. A good example is certainly the *Chunqiu* entry on the fourteenth year of

77 Durrant (1992), 297, writes that Sima Qian in this chapter “claims that (the *Zuozhuan*) is a record of the authoritative oral tradition that accompanied *Ch’um-ch’iu*.”

78 Hardy (1993), 14.

Duke Ai of Lu (487), where it is recorded that a unicorn was caught in the West.<sup>79</sup>

All three texts comment on the event, but there are important differences. While both the *Guliang zhuan* and the *Gongyang zhuan* end with this *Chunqiu* entry on the capture of the unicorn, the author of the *Zuo zhuan* continues his account for more than twelve years after the capture of the unicorn, thus being the only one of the three authors to comment on the *Chunqiu* record of Confucius' death two years later (477).<sup>80</sup> The *Gongyang zhuan*, then is unique among the three texts in reporting Confucius' prediction of his own death when he saw the unicorn, saying:

吾道窮矣。

"My way has come to an end.",

And putting the question,

春秋何以始乎隱？

"Why did the *Chunqiu* begin with (Duke) Yin?",

And the further question,

何以終乎哀十四年？

"Why did it end with the 14th year of (Duke) Ai?",

And the question that follows slightly later,

君子曷為為春秋？

"To which end did the Superior Man write the *Chunqiu*? ",

And the response given to this:

撥亂世。反諸正。莫近諸春秋。

"In order to help an age that has declined and to get it back to order again, nothing is more appropriate than the *Chunqiu*.",

And finally the answer:

制春秋之義。以俟後聖。以君子之為，亦有樂乎此也。

"He made the morality of the *Chunqiu*, awaiting the wise men of future ages, he did it for those superior men, and he took his pleasure in it."

In the *Guliang zhuan*, the capture of the unicorn is commented upon only briefly. The focus is on each word of the *Chunqiu* entry, but without relating it to the life of Confucius.<sup>81</sup>

79 *Gongyang zhuan* 12.14.1/158/7. The idea that among the three *Chunqiu* exegetical traditions the *Gongyang zhuan* attached the most attention to the event of the capture of the unicorn has been suggested earlier by Gentz (2001), 288.

80 *Zuo zhuan* 16.3/461/4.

81 *Guliang zhuan* 12.14.1/154/3.

With this in mind, let us now turn to the *Shiji* text. The capture of the unicorn is certainly recorded here, too, as an event of eminent importance. But since the event in itself is not only recorded in the *Chunqiu*, but has been commented on in all three commentaries, we will have to look at the references given there quite carefully.

The capture of the unicorn is first mentioned in the *Shiji* in the “Table by Years of the Twelve Feudal Lords”.<sup>82</sup> The entry is as laconic as it is in the *Chunqiu* itself, and from the very fact that the record is continuing and the death of Confucius is recorded for the year 479, we can conclude that the *Shiji* author here certainly follows neither the *Gongyang zhuan* nor the *Guliang zhuan*.<sup>83</sup>

The next chapter in which the capture of the unicorn is mentioned is, of course, in the “Hereditary House of Master Kong”. Here the capture of the animal is commented on by Confucius with the words, “My way has come to an end!”, as quoted above from the *Gongyang zhuan*.<sup>84</sup> But whether or not the reason to include this version here was the author’s predilection for the *Gongyang* school is open to question; one could argue just as well that the *Shiji* author simply searched among the sources at his disposal for all available material to write a good story of Confucius’ life.

But again, in the group biography dedicated to the Confucian scholars, chap. 121, the capture of the unicorn is mentioned by the historiographer in his personal comment, right at the beginning of the chapter:

西狩獲麟，曰：吾道窮矣。故因史記作春秋，以當王法，其辭微而指博，後世學者多錄焉。

When during a hunt in the West a unicorn was caught, (Confucius) said: “My way has come to an end!” Therefore he made, based on the scribes’ records, the *Chunqiu*, in order to accord with the kingly rules. Its words are subtle but far-reaching, and the scholars of future generations will rely heavily on it for their own records.”<sup>85</sup>

In this case, the historiographer clearly relates the capture of the unicorn, together with his vision of his own death, to Confucius’ decision to write the *Chunqiu* which was to illustrate the “kingly rules” and thus give direction to scholars of a future generation. This is precisely the position of the *Gongyang zhuan*, and if the *Shiji* author expresses this position at the beginning of the chapter in which he presents the main exegetical schools of the classics, among them the *Chunqiu*, then this is certainly not

82 *Shiji* 14: 679: Lu481: 西狩獲麟。

83 *Shiji* 14.681:Lu479: 孔子卒。

84 *Shiji* 47:1942:3: 魯哀公十四年春，狩大野。 [...] 孔子曰：天喪予！及西狩見麟，曰：吾道窮矣！

85 *Shiji* 121.3115:9.

to be explained by the argument that the author simply wanted to tell a good story.

Finally, in chapter 130 of the *Shiji*, the unicorn does indeed play an eminent role. Not only is it mentioned in words that were attributed by Sima Qian to his father Tan,<sup>86</sup> but it is also among the very last words of the historiographer's account, before the list of rhymed prefaces of single chapters attached to it, make mention of the unicorn. Here the *Shiji* author traces the beginning of his work back to Huangdi and places the end with the unicorn,<sup>87</sup> which on the one hand alludes to the capture of a unicorn during the reign of Han Emperor Wu<sup>88</sup> and on the other hand to the capture of the unicorn recorded in the *Chunqiu*. By indirectly comparing his own historiographical effort with that of “*Chunqiu* making”, the *Shiji* author makes obvious his keen awareness his keen awareness of the exegetical position of the *Gongyang zhuan*, since the compiling of the *Chunqiu* as a direct consequence of the record of the caught of the unicorn is, as mentioned above, exactly what comes next in the text of the *Gongyang zhuan*; the compiling of the *Chunqiu* as a direct consequence of the record of the capture of the unicorn is, as mentioned above, exactly what comes next in the text of the *Gongyang zhuan*.

But certainly the one single text which illustrates the historiographer's intimate knowledge of the teachings of the *Gongyang* school most impressively is the famous dialogue between the historiographer and Hu Sui recorded also in chapter 130 of the *Shiji*. Already the point of departure of this dialogue, namely, Hu Sui's question,

昔孔子何為而作春秋哉？

“Why did Master Kong in former times make the *Chunqiu*? ”

is almost literally adopted from the *Gongyang zhuan* (*junzi hewei wei Chunqiu* 君子曷為為春秋). Since Sima Qian's response to this is of utmost

86 *Shiji* 130.3295:11. Sima Tan mentions the capture of the unicorn here as a point of departure of another time cycle of five hundred years, saying that “from the time of the capture of the unicorn until now more than four hundred years have passed”. This mention of the capture of the unicorn is thus part of a synopsis, very much like the one in the table in chapter 14, and both apparently had eschatological ideas in mind rather than being concerned with the moral lesson of the *Chunqiu*.

87 *Shiji* 130.3300:12: 故述往事，思來者。於是卒述陶唐以來，至于麟止，自黃帝始。

88 There are in fact two dates during Han Wudi's reign to which the mention of the unicorn may allude here: one is the year 122 B.C., after which a new era was proclaimed, named Yuanshou 元狩 (First capture); the second is the year 95 B.C. in which Wudi ordered the minting of golden coins in the form of the hoof of a unicorn, after he had caught a unicorn during a hunt in Yong. The latter is more probably the date at which the *Shiji* text was finalized, and this is what Sima Zhen in his *Suoyin* commentary also confirms. See *Shiji-K* 130.3301:3: 索隱服虔云：武帝至雍獲白麟，而鑄金作麟足形，故云「麟止」。遷作史記止於此，猶春秋終於獲麟然也。

importance with regard to his exegetical inclinations, I will render that key passage from the mouth of the Grand Scribe in full:

余聞董生曰：周道衰廢，孔子為魯司寇，諸侯害之，大夫壅之。孔子知言之不用，道之不行也，是非二百四十二年之中，以為天下儀表，貶天子，退諸侯，討大夫，以達王事而已矣。子曰：我欲載之空言，不如見之於行事之深切著明也。

I have heard Master Dong say, “When Confucius was chief minister of justice in Lu, the ways of the Zhou had declined and fallen into disuse. The feudal lords abused him and the high officials obstructed his plans. Confucius realized that his words were not being heeded, nor his doctrines put into practice. So he made a critical judgment of the rights and wrongs of a period of two hundred and forty years in order to provide a standard of rules and ceremonies for the world. He criticized the emperors, reprimanded the feudal lords, and condemned the high officials in order to make known the business of a true ruler and that was all. The master said, ‘It is even better than to point them [i.e. the rules of correct moral behavior] out in abstract words, if one makes them visible through the depth and clarity of past events.’”<sup>89</sup>

Sima Qian’s explicit reference to “Master Sheng” – that is, to Dong Zhongshu (c. 179– c. 104),<sup>90</sup> a Han scholar who had specialized on *Chunqiu* exegesis as it was transmitted by the *Gongyang* school – is highly significant, all the more so since some of the pronouncements Sima Qian proceeds to make are indeed closely parallel to passages contained in a text which later tradition had credited to Dong Zhongshu, its title being *Chunqiu fanlu* 春秋繁露 (Sweet Dew of the Spring and Autumn). Not only the sentence pointing toward the Zhou as a declining age (an idea which is already, as we saw, expressed in the last lines of the *Gongyang zhuan*, but not as emphasized as greatly as here), but even more the last sentence of the above quoted passage, which in the *Chunqiu fanlu*, more precisely, in the “Yuxu” 俞序 (Yu’s Postface) chapter of the transmitted *Chunqiu fanlu* text, is formulated as follows:

孔子曰： [...] 以為見之空言，不如行事博深切明。

Master Kong said, „What I think is that rather than pointing it out in abstract words, one should (point it out) by the depth and the clarity of past events.”<sup>91</sup>

89 *Shiji* 130.3297:6-8. Cf. the translation by Watson (1958) which has been used in a slightly modified version here.

90 As Loewe (2000), 70, however suggests, there is reason to believe that he died between 119 and 114.

91 *Chunqiu fanlu* 6.4/24/17. There has been much discussion on the question of the authenticity of this chapter among specialists. Joachim Gentz (2001), 499, esp. fn. 2, briefly summarized the positions of Gary Arbuckle (1993), 451, who called the authenticity of the chapter into question, and Sarah Queen (1996), 71, who, following the argumentation line of Sun Yirang, suggested that the chapter could in fact have originally been Dong Zhongshu’s own preface to what is now the *Chunqiu fanlu*. The degree to which the discussion of the authenticity of the “Yuxu” leads toward

What can be concluded from a closer comparison of the words Sima Qian uses in his dialogue with Hu Sui is thus that the historiographer not only in his response not only shows an exegetical attitude which is close to that of the *Gongyang zhuan*, but also shows one closer yet to the interpretation of the *Gongyang zhuan* that was current during Sima Qian's lifetime, namely one that was filtered through the interpretation of Dong Zhongshu.<sup>92</sup> On closer examination, even the central issue of the dialogue, namely the dilemma pointed out by Hu Sui through his question, which the historiographer then wants to illustrate as it pertains to an orderly age such as the Han under a wise ruler, Han Wudi, in interpreting the rules of the *Chunqiu* text, points to the way the *Gongyang zhuan* was interpreted by Dong Zhongshu. For here the *Chunqiu* as a tool for a *junzi* to save a world in disorder is given much more in detail than in its formulation in the *Gongyang zhuan*.<sup>93</sup>

A further important aspect which should at least be mentioned here is the fact that the *Shiji* author shows clearly his familiarity with ideas that are exclusively or almost exclusively contained in the *Gongyang zhuan* by the very way he addresses, in several parts of his work, the “superior men of future ages”. As mentioned before, it is primarily these sections which are introduced by the formula *taishigong yue*, where the historiographer directly addresses the *junzi* of a future generations as those who will be able to make use of the material he provides.<sup>94</sup>

And finally, the very last sentence of the rhymed preface to the last *Shiji* chapter ends with the words:

[...] 以拾遺補蓻，成一家之言，厥協六經異傳，整齊百家雜語，藏之名山，副在京師，俟後世聖人君子。第七十。

---

far-reaching doubts concerning the origin of the text is documented by a supposition made by Hans van Ess (2006), 165, who argued that, since the text of the *Chunqiu fanlu* was submitted to the Imperial court, by a man called Dong, only after the end of the Northern Song, it would appear to him that the conversation between Sima Qian and Hu Sui took place prior to the *Chunqiu fanlu*. In other words, the *Shiji* was used, in van Ess's view, as a source for the compilation of the *Chunqiu fanlu*. Although such an interpretation would indeed promote the *Shiji* as a text of *Chunqiu* exegesis to a new level of authority, there is in my view no plausible reason to challenge the statement that Sima Qian explicitly makes in his talk with Hu Sui, namely, that these were the words he had heard from Master Dong. As for the date of the final compilation of the *Chunqiu fanlu* as a whole and especially of the “Yuxu”, this may be open to speculation.

92 Gentz (2001), 541, suggested even more generally that “Sima Qian in his judgments passed on historical events in *Chunqiu* times seems to have followed largely the *Gongyang* exegesis which flourished during his life times”.

93 The key passage for this is again in the “Yuxu” chapter, *Chunqiu fanlu* 6.4/24/16, which says: 史記十二公之間，皆衰世之事。“What the scribes recorded relating to the time span of (the reigns of) the twelve dukes (of Lu) were all the matters of a declining age.”

94 For the *Shiji* passages in which the references to *junzi* of a future age are contained, see section 1.1 of this article.

(This work was) compiled in order to repair omissions and amplify the Six Disciplines, I completed the work of one school tradition, by supplementing the various interpretations of the Six Classics and putting into order the miscellaneous sayings of the Hundred Schools. I have placed one copy in the Famous Mountain and another in the capital, so that it may await the wise and superior men of a future age.<sup>95</sup>

Remarkably, since the rhymed prefaces follow the historical account proper, which ends with the capture of the unicorn, the passage referring to those later wise men for whom this text would be waiting is in fact the final one of the whole *Shiji* text. As said before, the remark that Confucius' work would await the wise men of future ages, is likewise the last sentence of the *Gongyang zhuan*, since, after the *Chunqiu* entry that records the capture of the unicorn, the *Gongyang zhuan* breaks off.<sup>96</sup> Here again, the *Gongyang zhuan* as it has been transmitted by Dong Zhongshu, also continues this line of addressing *future junzi*.<sup>97</sup>

Summing up, from references in various parts of the *Shiji*, other than those to the *junzi* in different parts of the *Shiji* it becomes apparent that the *Gongyang zhuan*, too, must have been of eminent importance to the historiographer. One might even cautiously say that, whereas in earlier parts of the *Shiji*, the *Zuo zhuan* appears to be the central text, in other chapters, especially in the *taishigong yue* parts of some chapters, and in the very last chapters of the work, the *Gongyang zhuan* even seems to be even more important to the historiographer than the *Zuo zhuan*.

### Sima Tan and Sima Qian – Two Distinct Exegetes?

So far, I have confined myself to talking about “the *Shiji* author” or the “historiographer”, as if there were for certain only one person who compiled the *Shiji*, an assumption which most scholars who deal with this work still seem to share. However, as we have seen, different scholars focusing on different passages or chapters of the *Shiji* came to rather different conclusions as regards the exegetical attitude of “the *Shiji* author”, who comes mostly to be equated with “Sima Qian”. But what if the different exegetical attitudes that become discernible in the text material at our disposal are not, as it might seem, irreconcilabilities within the thinking of one person but rather the exegetical inclinations of two persons, namely, Sima Tan and Sima Qian?

To be sure, as the analysis of several chapters of the *Shiji* in which *junzi* references occur has shown quite clearly, all the three exegetical

---

95 *Shiji* 130.3320:1; cf. Watson (1958), 57, in a slightly modified version.

96 *Gongyang zhuan* 12.14.1/158/15.

97 See *Chunqiu fanlu*, “Yuxu”, 6.4/24/16: 仲尼之作春秋也，〔…〕以待後聖。“The reason why Zhongni (= Confucius) made the *Chunqiu* was that he was waiting for the wise men of a future age.”

traditions interpreting the *Chunqiu* were certainly known and to a certain degree adopted by both Sima Tan and Sima Qian in their joint efforts. Father and son Sima were certainly above all a team of historiographers, albeit with almost equal certainty not colleagues working together at the same time, but one after the other. But it is important to bear in mind that they both maintained the position as Grand Scribe, as I have discussed it elsewhere in more detail.<sup>98</sup> To a certain degree they formed a corporate identity, and they would probably even not have imagined that anyone in later time would try to keep them apart from each other.

And yet there are, in my view, some very clear hints that point to the likelihood that Sima Tan and Sima Qian did not wholly represent one common identity, the *taishigong* identity. There are even hints given by Sima Qian in his autobiographical account that point towards his own perception that he is different from his father, or rather that his father differed from him in his approach. For example, there is the much discussed statement attributed to his father, the Grand Scribe.

太史公既掌天官，不治民。有子曰遷。

His Lord the Grand Scribe, since he fulfilled the duties of an Officer of Heaven, was not responsible for (the question) of how to rule the people; (but) he had a son, whose name was Qian.

This statement implies that precisely that which Sima Qian conceived to be his duty is not the duty of the Officer of Heaven. The verb *zhi* 治 – literally, “to administer”, “to rule”, “to master”, but translated here as “to be responsible for” – is used elsewhere in the *Shiji* in the sense of “to interpret (in the sense of exegesis)” and should perhaps be regarded as a key term in this context.<sup>99</sup>

Seen from an exegetical perspective, the use of the verb *zhi* in this context could thus well point to a difference between two exegetical schools within the *Chunqiu* tradition, namely, a school which emphasizes the events of the heavens on the one hand and one which emphasizes the morality of men, and perhaps especially that of the ruler of men, on the other. My guess would be that Sima Qian might have intended here to point out that, while his father was still mainly em-

98 For a detailed description of Sima Tan's and Sima Qian's duties as Grand Scribes at the court of Emperor Wu, see Schaab-Hanke (2002b), esp. pages 310ff.

99 In the chapter on the Confucian scholars, the term *zhi* 治 is used several times in an exegetical sense, e.g., related to Fu Sheng's and his grandson's exegesis of the *Shangshu* (*Shiji* 121.3124:13; 3125:9), as well as in Dong Zhongshu's and also Gongsun Hong's exegesis of the *Chunqiu* (*Shiji* 121.3127:14; 3128:9). A key passage in this context is, moreover, the claim made by Sima Qian in his dialogue with Hu Sui, namely, that since in the *Chunqiu* the differences between moral behavior which is in accordance with the rules and that which runs contrary to them, are pointed out, its strength lies in ruling over men. See *Shiji* 130.3297:12f.: 春秋辯是非，故長於治人。

bedded in the tradition of the *Chunqiu* as it had been handed down by the *Zuo zhuan*, he himself was well acquainted with the doctrines of the *Gongyang* school, especially as it was handed down by Dong Zhongshu, which emphasizes the doctrine of the kingly rule.

Such an interpretation would fit well with several other hints which have been mentioned above, e.g., Sima Qian's referring to the words of Dong Zhongshu whom he called "Master Dong" in his talk with Hu Sui. This suggests some kind of personal acquaintance not only with the teachings of but also with the person Dong Zhongshu.<sup>100</sup>

What is important to keep in mind is that Sima Qian lived in a time in which a growing tendency toward the demarcation of what was regarded upon as "orthodox" led to the suppression of exegetical traditions. The *Gongyang* exegesis which then flourished came to be transmitted as the *Chunqiu fanlu* by Dong Zhongshu. Certainly Sima Qian, even if he did not really adhere to the one or other scholarly direction, was quite aware of the dangers inherent in everything which in this view came to be regarded upon as "heterodox". Sima Tan, in contrast, lived mainly in a time which adhered less strictly to the rules of orthodoxy. Han Emperor Wen was an admirer of the ideas of the "Huang-Lao" philosophy, i.e., the teachings of Laozi and Zhuangzi, and certainly the essay "Liu jia zhi yaozhi lun" 六家之要旨論 (Discussion of the Essentials of The Six Philosophical Schools), the only text that can, thanks to his son Qian, be safely attributed to Sima Tan, may justly be considered imbued by the ideas of Daoism on the one hand and a certain tolerance toward all other kinds of philosophies current at his life times on the other.<sup>101</sup>

---

<sup>100</sup> Sima Qian might even have been one of Dong Zhongshu's students, since, as we learn from *Shiji* 121, the chapter on Confucian scholars, Dong Zhongshu from Zhao was officially given a chair for teaching the *Chunqiu* during the reign of Han Emperor Jing (r. 157–142). He informs us that none of his students could ever see his face, since he taught them from behind a screen. *Shiji* 121.3127:14f. We also know of Dong Zhongshu's responses to several of Emperor Wu's edicts. In the "Monograph of Music", however, we find a slightly disdainful note according to which those gentlemen who all mastered only one classic (*tong yi jing zhi shi* 通一經之士), among whom Dong Zhongshu was certainly reckoned by the historiographer, had to put their heads together when they had to study a text such as the "Nineteen Songs", a cycle of sacrificial hymns probably composed by Sima Xiangru, another member of the Sima clan. See *Shiji* 124.1177:13. For Sima Xiangru's composition of this cycle, see also Schaab-Hanke (2002b), page 333, footnote 152. Thus it is not very probable that Sima Qian would have acknowledged Dong Zhongshu as his one and only master.

<sup>101</sup> For the supposition that Sima Tan himself might have changed his attitude from a Daoist to a more Confucian inclination later in his life, see Chen Tongsheng (1995b).

## Conclusions

If we try to distinguish between Sima Tan and Sima Qian in terms of their exegetical inclinations, we should probably consider Sima Tan to be the one who dealt more freely with texts of all sorts and kinds without any restrictions, and at the same time as the one who in the very first place made use of the material provided by the *Zuožhuan*. This is certainly no wonder, since the *Zuožhuan* with its many narratives, offered simply the ideal source for someone who intended to compile a historical account, starting from the most remote ages and ending with his own life times. Sima Qian, for his part, although trained in the mastery of all kinds of texts and schools, was certainly the one who, on the one hand, was more aware of slight differences in the interpretation of exegetical schools, e.g., the teachings of Dong Zhongshu interpreting the *Chunqiu* in the exegetical tradition of the *Gongyang* school, and, on the other, was more aware of the restrictions of his time.

As mentioned before, the *Gongyang zhuan*, and with it the teachings of Dong Zhongshu as they are transmitted in the *Chunqiu fanlu* seems to emphasize more the superior man's duty, in times of dynastic decline, to point out our moral obligations on the basis of historical events. The problem of how to justify writing a work like the *Shiji* in times that are not in decline stood at the very center of the dialogue between Sima Qian and Hu Sui. Even though, further on in this dialogue, Sima Qian hastens to assure Hu Sui that "making *Chunqiu*" can be done during an orderly age just as well as during times of disorder. At the end of the dialogue, Sima Qian even denies "making *Chunqiu*" at all, which may be interpreted as a sign for his personal nervousness facing Hu Sui's suggestive question. But, as I would like to suggest that, upon closer scrutiny, Sima Qian is seen to differ greatly from his father Sima Tan, precisely in his evaluation of the reign of Emperor Wu. If one compares what Sima Qian says in his dialogue with Hu Sui with what Sima Qian transmits as the words of his father who on his deathbed pled passionately with his son to continue the record of enlightened rulers and loyal ministers in order not to neglect the great merits of the earlier scribes,<sup>102</sup> and if one imagines Sima Tan's despair when he learned that, because of his illness, he would not be able to be in Emperor Wu's entourage when the emperor went to sacrifice at the Altar of Heaven on Mount Tai, one senses an optimism as regards this emperor which his son, as I have argued elsewhere,<sup>103</sup> certainly did not share. Thus, the repeated emphasis on the idea that this new all-encompassing account of history would await the supe-

---

102 See *Shiji* 130.3295:12-14.

103 For Sima Qian's critical stance towards Han Wudi, see also Schaab-Hanke (2002a), esp. page 165f.

rior men of future ages is certainly the expression of a hope held by Sima Qian, who had already lost any enthusiasm about the emperor of his own age. And, almost paradoxically, in following the *Gongyang zhuan* by referring almost verbatim to it in the *taishigong yue* sections of several chapters, he adopted an exegetical position that had been officially acknowledged by an emperor who had certainly not quite understood the subtle implications of its *Chunqiu* theory.

Table 1: Distribution of *Junzi* entries in the *Shiji* text

chapter	entries	chapter	entries	chapter	entries	chapter	entries
1	0	34	0	67	16	100	0
2	0	35	1	68	0	101	0
3	0	36	0	69	0	102	0
4	0	37	4	70	0	103	3
5	3	38	4	71	1	104	0
6	1	39	5	72	0	105	0
7	0	40	1	73	0	106	0
8	0	41	1	74	0	107	0
9	0	42	1	75	0	108	1
10	1	43	1	76	0	109	0
11	0	44	0	77	0	110	0
12	1	45	0	78	0	111	0
13	0	46	1	79	1	112	1
14	10	47	14	80	2	113	0
15	2	48	0	81	0	114	0
16	0	49	1	82	0	115	0
17	0	50	1	83	0	116	0
18	1	51	0	84	2	117	2
19	0	52	1	85	0	118	0
20	1	53	1	86	0	119	2
21	0	54	0	87	0	120	0
22	0	55	0	88	0	121	0
23	5	56	0	89	0	122	0
24	20	57	0	90	0	123	0
25	1	58	1	91	0	124	2
26	0	59	0	92	0	125	0
27	1	60	4	93	0	126	2
28	1	61	1	94	0	127	6
29	0	62	1	95	0	128	1
30	0	63	3	96	0	129	2
31	3	64	0	97	0		
32	0	65	0	98	1		
33	4	66	0	99	0		
						total	152

Table 2: A List of all *Junzi* Passages occurring in the *Shiji*

- This table comprises all the *junzi* entries occurring in the Zhonghua shuju edition of the *Shiji*. The table is arranged in the order of the occurrences of passages in the text.
- References to a *junzi* which are part of a section introduced by the *taishigong yue* formula [hereafter: TSG] are marked in the list by an asterisk (\*).
- References to a *junzi* which are part of the text added by Chu Shao-sun and introduced by the *Chu xiansheng yue* formula [hereafter: CXS], have been enclosed in the list within square brackets [...]

reference	context
5.189:2	The behaving of a <i>junzi</i> is mentioned in a speech by Duke Miu of Qin 秦繆公.
5.194:2	Duke Miu of Qin assumes responsibility for mistakes he had made; upon hearing this, all the <i>junzi</i> shed tears and said that the duke was a magnanimous ruler [parallel in <i>Zuozhuan</i> , Wen 3.4/127/15: a <i>junzi</i> thus learned about that ( <i>junzi shiyi zhi ... 君子是以知...</i> )].
5.194:16	When a <i>junzi</i> heard that after duke Miu's death, 170 men had to follow him into his tomb, he criticized this; cf. <i>Shiji</i> 14.603.
6.278:9	The moral behavior of a <i>junzi</i> who rules over the state is referred to in a passage from Jia [Yi]'s „Guo Qin lun”.
10.428:1	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a text quoted from the <i>Shi</i> 詩 (Mao 251).
12.486:4*	TSG addresses future readers as <i>junzi</i> [parallel in <i>Shiji</i> 28.1404].
14.509:15*	TSG designates Zuo Qiuming as “superior man of Lu” (Lu <i>junzi</i> 魯君子).
14.525: Jin802	A <i>junzi</i> criticizes Duke Mu for Jin's policy of conferring names to his sons (cf. <i>Shiji</i> 39.1637, <i>Shiji</i> 130.3309) [parallel in <i>Zuozhuan</i> , Huan 2.8: <i>shi Fu</i> 師服].
14.540: Jin745	A <i>junzi</i> criticizes that the disorder in Jin had its origins in Quwo; (cf. <i>Shiji</i> 39.1638) [parallel in <i>Zuozhuan</i> , Huan 2.8/21/5: <i>shi Fu</i> 師服 criticizes this].
14.551: Lu718	G. criticizes that Duke Yin of Lu went to observe the fishing in Tang (cf. <i>Shiji</i> 33.1529) [parallel in <i>Zuozhuan</i> , Yin 5.1: Zang Xibo 臧僖伯 criticizes; <i>Gongyang zhuan</i> , Yin 5.1/5/7: author criticizes; <i>Guliang zhuan</i> , Yin 5.1/4/17: author criticizes that].
14.552: Lu715	A <i>junzi</i> criticizes that the states of Lu and Zheng exchanged fields (cf. <i>Shiji</i> 33.1529) [parallels in <i>Zuozhuan</i> , Yin, 8.2/12/26, and <i>Guliang zhuan</i> , Huan 1.3/9/1: authors both emphasize that Zheng did not perform sacrifices on Mount Tai].
14.556: Lu710	A <i>junzi</i> criticizes the decision to place a tripod in the ancestral temple of Song (cf. <i>Shiji</i> 33.1530) [parallels in <i>Zuozhuan</i> , Huan 2.2/20/1: author criticizes decision to be contrary to rule, reports of Zang Aibo's 臣哀伯 criticism (20/1-10) and of the Inner Scribe of Zhou's 周內史 comment on that (20/12); <i>Guliang zhuan</i> , Huan 2.4/10/10, and <i>Guliang zhuan</i> , Huan 2.4/9/24, authors both criticize his decision as being against the rules].
14.557: Lu709	A <i>junzi</i> criticizes that the Earl of Qi 齊侯 sent a woman to the ruler of Lu; cf. <i>Shiji</i> 32.1458; <i>Shiji</i> 33.1530; 47/1918 [parallel in <i>Zuozhuan</i> , Huan 3.5/22/18, <i>Gongyang zhuan</i> , Huan 3.6/11/4, and <i>Guliang zhuan</i> , Huan 3.5/10/19: all authors condemn the reception of the woman (Jiang Shi 姜氏) as being “contrary to the rules”].

reference	context
14.581: Jin660	A <i>junzi</i> knows of the impending end of Master Shen, crownprince of the Duke of Jin; cf. <i>Shiji</i> 39.1643 [parallel in <i>Zuo zhuan</i> , Min 2.7/69/16; Li Ke 里克 criticizes this].
14.603: Qin621	A <i>junzi</i> criticizes the order given by Duke Miu of Qin that after his death 170 persons had to follow him into his tomb (cf. <i>Shiji</i> 5.194-195) [parallel in <i>Zuo zhuan</i> , Wen 6.3/131/14; <i>junzi</i> thus knew that ( <i>junzi shi yi zhi</i> 君子是以知...)].
14.669: Cao499	A man of the state of Jin had a dream in which all the <i>junzi</i> erected an Earth Altar; cf. <i>Shiji</i> 35.1573 [parallel in <i>Zuo zhuan</i> , Ai 7.5/444/18].
15.685:8*	The TSG states that a <i>junzi</i> was alarmed about the general decay in the world, due to the misbehavior of Qin [cf. <i>Mengzi</i> 6/34/26: Kongzi is alarmed 孔子懼].
15.687:4*	The TSG addresses future readers to be <i>junzi</i> .
18.878:10*	The TSG addresses future readers to be <i>junzi</i> .
[20.1059:2]	[The CXS addresses his readers as the <i>junzi</i> of the present generation ( <i>dangshi zhi junzi</i> 當時之君子).]
23.1161:15	A <i>junzi</i> after having received his nutrition, is good at discerning [parallel in <i>Xunzi</i> 19/90/10].
23.1172:3	A <i>junzi</i> who examines <i>li</i> will not be deceived by that [parallel in <i>Xunzi</i> 19/92/14].
23.1173:12	A <i>junzi</i> above brings about his ascent [parallel in <i>Xunzi</i> 19/93/1].
23.1173:13	Refers to the character of a <i>junzi</i> [parallel in <i>Xunzi</i> 19/93/2].
23.1173:14	Refers to the qualities of a knight- <i>junzi</i> ( <i>shi junzi</i> 士君子) [parallel in <i>Xunzi</i> 19/93/2].
24.1175:11*	The TSG refers to the qualities of a <i>junzi</i> .
24.1175:14*	The TSG refers to the qualities of a <i>junzi</i> [perhaps alluding to <i>Da Dai liji</i> 1.6/1/18].
24.1184:3	Only a <i>junzi</i> is capable to understand music [parallel in <i>Da Dai liji</i> 19.1/98/25].
24.1209:15	This is why a <i>junzi</i> does not estimate it much [parallel in <i>Da Dai liji</i> 19.12/101/7].
24.1211:11	This is why a <i>junzi</i> reverts his emotions and thus knows his destination [parallel in <i>Da Dai liji</i> 19.15/101/21].
24.1212:1	A <i>junzi</i> rejoices in sticking to his principles [parallel in <i>Da Dai liji</i> 19.14/101/18].
24.1212:2	This is why a <i>junzi</i> reverts his emotions and thus knows his destination [parallel in <i>Da Dai liji</i> 19.15/101/21].
24.1215:13	A <i>junzi</i> is moved by its roots [parallel in <i>Da Dai liji</i> 19.16/101/26].
24.1215:16	A <i>junzi</i> loves what is good [parallel in <i>Da Dai liji</i> 19.17/101/30].
24.1217:14	A <i>junzi</i> says that “rites and music must never be dismissed from oneself” [parallel in <i>Da Dai liji</i> 19.26/104/7].
24.1222:6	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to as part of a speech by Zixia [parallel in <i>Da Dai liji</i> 19.24/102/24].
24.1225:1	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to as part of a speech by Zixia [parallel in <i>Da Dai liji</i> 19.25/103/10].
24.1225:2	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to as part of a speech by Zixia [parallel in <i>Da Dai liji</i> 19.25/103/10].
24.1225:2	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to as part of a speech by Zixia [parallel in <i>Da Dai liji</i> 19.25/103/11].
24.1225:3	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to as part of a speech by Zixia [parallel in <i>Da Dai liji</i> 19.25/103/12].

reference	context
24.1225:4	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to as part of a speech by Zixia [parallel in <i>Da Dai liji</i> 19.25/103/13].
24.1225:4	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to as part of a speech by Zixia [parallel in <i>Da Dai liji</i> 19.25/103/13].
24.1237:3*	The TSG refers to the qualities of a <i>junzi</i> .
24.1237:4*	The TSG refers to the qualities of a <i>junzi</i> .
24.1237:7*	The TSG refers to the qualities of a <i>junzi</i> .
25.1243:5*	The TSG praises Han Emperor Wen as someone whom Confucius called a “ <i>junzi</i> who has virtue” ( <i>you de junzi</i> 有德君子).
27.1321:1	The sorrow of a <i>junzi</i> is contrasted with the dissipating of a petty man as related to the astrologer’s domain.
28.1404:5*	The TSG addresses future readers to be <i>junzi</i> ; cf. <i>Shiji</i> 12.486.
31.1450:6	Jizha 季扎 reported that Zizang 子臧 was praised by a <i>junzi</i> as someone who was capable to uphold the rites ( <i>neng shou jie</i> 能守節) [parallel in <i>Zuo zhuan</i> , Xiang 14.2/254/12].
31.1458:3	Jizha in a conversation with Zichan 子產 says that since there are many <i>junzi</i> in Wei (Wei duo <i>junzi</i> 衛多君子), no calamity has to be feared yet (cf. <i>Shiji</i> 37.1597) [parallel in <i>Zuo zhuan</i> , Xiang 29.13/304/3].
31.1475:15*	The historiographer praises Jizi 季子 (= Jizha 季扎) as a <i>junzi</i> of vast insight and broad knowledge ( <i>bonglan bowu junzi</i> 閱覽博物君子).
33.1529:8	A <i>junzi</i> criticized both that Duke Yin of Lu went to observe the fishing in Tang and that the states of Lu and Zheng exchanged fields; cf. <i>Shiji</i> 14.551.
33.1530:7	A <i>junzi</i> criticized that a tripod was stored in the ancestral temple of Song; cf. <i>Shiji</i> 14.556.
33.1538:1	A <i>junzi</i> said that Ji Wenzi was as a man of utmost loyalty [parallel in <i>Zuo zhuan</i> , Xiang 5.10/235/22; <i>junzi</i> thus knew that... ( <i>junzi shiyi zhi</i> 君子是以知...)].
33.1539:6	A <i>junzi</i> said that this was not yet the end [parallel in <i>Zuo zhuan</i> , Xiang 31.4/310/17: a <i>junzi</i> thus knew that this could not yet be the end)].
35.1573:8	A man of the state of Jin dreamt that all the <i>junzi</i> had erected an Earth Altar; cf. <i>Shiji</i> 14.669.
37.1590:2	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a statement of Dan, Duke of Zhou 周公旦, addressing Wei Kangshu 衛康叔.
37.1590:4	Duke of Zhou in his “Cicai” (Timber of the Ci Tree) intended to show what a <i>junzi</i> would take as his model.
37.1597:16	“Many <i>junzi</i> in Wei” are referred to in a statement of Jizha; cf. <i>Shiji</i> 31.1458 [parallel in <i>Zuo zhuan</i> , Xiang 29.13/304/3].
37.1601:8	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a statement by Zilu 子路.
38.1623:3	A <i>junzi</i> who heard of that said that Duke Xuan of Song 宋宣公 was someone who knew men [parallels in <i>Zuo zhuan</i> , Yin 3.5/6/7: a <i>junzi</i> says/ said ( <i>junzi yue</i> 君子曰); <i>Gongyang zhuan</i> , Yin 3.7/4/7: <i>junzi</i> holds the Duke responsible for the calamity.
38.1626:10	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a speech by Duke Xiang of Song 宋襄公 in response to Zi Yu 子魚.
38.1630:1	A <i>junzi</i> criticizes Hua Yuan of Song 宋華元 for his not being a good minister; cf. <i>Shiji</i> 40.1703 [parallel in <i>Zuo zhuan</i> , Cheng 2.4/189/4: a <i>junzi</i> states/ stated that Hua Yuan was no good minister ( <i>junzi wei</i> 君子謂...)].

reference	context
38.1633:3*	The TSG reports different judgments of <i>junzi</i> on Duke Xiang of Song's 宋襄公 attitude in the battle against Song [parallels in <i>Gongyang zhuan</i> , Xi 22.4/50/27; author praises Duke Xiang for his unambiguous sticking to the rules; <i>Zuo zhuan</i> , Xi 22.8/99/1, reports the story giving Ziyu's criticism more weight than Duke Xiang's argument, but without explicit authorial judgment; <i>Guliang zhuan</i> , Xi 22.4/49/26; author condemns Duke Xiang for morally wrong behavior].
39.1638:6	A <i>junzi</i> says that the disorder of Jin took its origins in Quwo; cf. <i>Shiji</i> 14.540.
39.1649:5	Refers to a <i>junzi</i> who quotes from the <i>Shi</i> [parallel in <i>Zuo zhuan</i> , Xi 9.6/82/22].
39.1654:5	Refers to a <i>junzi</i> in a speech by Lü Sheng 呂省 responding to Duke Miu of Qin.
39.1671:12	Zhao Dun 趙盾 in his speech refers to an “earlier” <i>junzi</i> ( <i>xian junzi</i> 先君子).
39.1682:10	Refers to a <i>junzi</i> 's appraisal of Qi Xi 祁奚 [parallel in <i>Zuo zhuan</i> , Xiang 3.4/230/16; a <i>junzi</i> states/ stated that ... ( <i>junzi wei</i> 君子謂...); parallel in <i>Lüshi Chunqiu</i> 1.5/5/21: Confucius upon hearing of it said (about Qi Xi)].
40.1703:1	King Zhuang of Chu 楚莊王 designates Hua Yuan of Song as a <i>junzi</i> (cf. <i>Shiji</i> 38.1630).
41.1744:11	Refers to the recruitment of six thousand 6000 <i>junzi</i> in the context of an attack against Wu [parallel in <i>Zuo zhuan</i> , Zhao 27.2/394/28, and <i>Guoyu</i> 19.9/626: designation of people of Wu as <i>junzi</i> ].
42.1772:14	Zichan 子產 is praised as a “ <i>junzi</i> of broad knowledge” ( <i>boru junzi</i> 博物君子) in a speech by Duke Ping of Zheng 鄭平公 and Shu Xiang 叔嚮; cf. similar appraisal, referring to Jizha, in <i>Shiji</i> 31.1475 [parallel in <i>Zuo zhuan</i> , Zhao 1.12/319/17].
43.1782:12	A <i>junzi</i> condemns Zhao Dun 趙盾 to be responsible for the murder of Duke Ling of Jin 詩靈公; cf. <i>Shiji</i> 39.1675 [parallels in <i>Zuo zhuan</i> , Xuan 2.3/158/16, <i>Gongyang zhuan</i> , Xuan 6.1/75/13, <i>Guliang zhuan</i> , Xuan 2.4/71/19: all referring to the (Grand) scribe of Jin, Dong Hu 董狐].
46.1890:6	Zou Jizi 骡忌子 requires in a speech that only <i>junzi</i> and no petty men should be selected.
47.1915:15	Duke Jing of Lu 魯景公 refers to a <i>junzi</i> [parallel in <i>Kongzi juyu</i> 1.2/1/23].
47.1916:1	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a speech by an official of Duke Jing of Lu.
47.1917:12	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a response of an official on Duke Jing's words [parallel in <i>Kongzi juyu</i> 2.1/2/9].
47.1920:14	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a speech by someone ordered by the wife of Duke Ling of Wei 衛靈公 to say to Confucius.
47.1924:12	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a speech by Zilu talking to Confucius [parallel in <i>Lunyu</i> 17.7/48/20].
47.1926:7	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a speech by Confucius.
47.1930:8	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a question posed by Zilu [parallel in <i>Lunyu</i> 15.2/42/1].
47.1930:8	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a response by Confucius on Zilu's question [parallel in <i>Lunyu</i> 15.2/42/1].
47.1931:12	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a speech by Confucius [parallel in <i>Kongzi juyu</i> 20.1/40/12].
47.1932:3	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a speech by Yanhui [parallel in <i>Kongzi juyu</i> 20.1/40/15].

reference	context
47.1932:4	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a speech by Yanhui [parallel in <i>Kongzi jiyu</i> 20.1/40/15].
47.1934:2	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a speech by Confucius [parallel in <i>Lunyu</i> 13.3/34/1-3].
47.1934:2	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a speech by Confucius [parallel in <i>Lunyu</i> 13.3/34/1-3].
47.1943:11	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a speech by the Master; cf. <i>Shiji</i> 61.2127 [parallel in <i>Lunyu</i> 13.3/34/1-3].
49.1974:9	The TSG reflects that Dou Changjun 寶長君 und Shaojun 少君 retired themselves in order to advance <i>junzi</i> (cf. <i>Shiji</i> 124.3188: <i>tuirang junzi zhifeng</i> 退讓君子之風).
50.1990:12*	The TSG reflects on times in which <i>junzi</i> are appointed and petty men retire.
52.2003:14	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a speech by Lang Yewang 狼邪王 and others.
53.2015:7	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a speech by Master Bao 鮑生.
[58.2091:13]	[A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a quote from <i>Chunqiu</i> ; cf. <i>Gongyang zhuan</i> , Yin 3.7/4/6.]
60.2111:7	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a written document by Liu Hong 劉闊, the King of Qi 齊王.
[60.2114:15]	[The CXS addresses those who are <i>junzi</i> ( <i>junzi zhe</i> 君子者).]
[60.2116:3]	[Refers to <i>junzi</i> that were treated badly, as quoted from an “admonition” ( <i>jie</i> 戒).]
[60.2119:15]	[Refers to <i>junzi</i> in a quotation from the “Commentary” ( <i>zhuhan</i> ); cf. <i>Xunzi</i> 1/1/20.]
61.2127:7	The TSG refers to a word of the Master (explicitly quoted in <i>Shiji</i> 47.1943) [cf. <i>Lunyu</i> 15.20/43/15].
62.2135:6	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to by Yue Shifu 越石父.
63.2140:9	Laozi talking to Confucius refers to a <i>junzi</i> .
63.2140:9	Laozi talking to Confucius refers to a <i>junzi</i> .
63.2142:11	The TSG designates Laozi as the “Hidden <i>junzi</i> ” ( <i>yin junzi</i> 隱君子).
67.2192:1	In a question, Zilu asks Confucius about a <i>junzi</i> [parallel in <i>Lunyu</i> 17.23/50/16].
67.2192:1	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in the Master’s response to Zilu [parallel in <i>Lunyu</i> 17.23/50/16].
67.2193:15	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in words by Zilu [cf. <i>Zuo zhuan</i> , Ai 15.5/460/13].
67.2194:10	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a question Zaiyu 宰予 asks Confucius [parallel in <i>Lunyu</i> 17.21/50/1].
67.2194:8	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in the Master’s response to Zaiyu [parallel in <i>Lunyu</i> 17.21/50/8].
67.2201:9	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a response by Ziyou 子游 to Confucius in which he quotes an earlier master (parallel in <i>Lunyu</i> 17.4/48/3).
67.2203:6	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a remark by the Master addressing Zixia 子夏 [parallel in <i>Lunyu</i> 6.13/13/9].
67.2207:1	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a remark by Confucius about Mi Zijian 宓子賤 [parallel in <i>Lunyu</i> 5.3/9/9].
67.2207:1	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a remark by Confucius about Mi Zijian [parallel in <i>Lunyu</i> 5.3/9/9].
67.2209:2	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a remark by Confucius about Nangong Kuo 南宮适 [parallel in <i>Lunyu</i> 14.5/37/17].
67.2214:14	Sima Geng 司馬耕 asks Confucius about the qualities of a <i>junzi</i> [parallel in <i>Lunyu</i> 12.4/31/1].

reference	context
67.2214:14	Confucius responds to Sima Geng's questions by describing the qualities of a <i>junzi</i> [parallel in <i>Lunyu</i> 12.4/31/1].
67.2214:14	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in another question by Sima Ziniu [parallel in <i>Lunyu</i> 12.4/31/3].
67.2217:11	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in the Master's response to Ranyou 冉有 [parallel in <i>Lunyu</i> 6.4/12/13].
67.2218:4	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in the Master's response to Wuma Qi 巫馬旗 [parallel in <i>Lunyu</i> 7.31/17/16].
67.2218:4	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in the Master's response to Wuma Qi [parallel in <i>Lunyu</i> 7.31/17/16].
71.2321:4*	The TSG designates Huoli Ziji 檮里子疾 and Gan Mou 甘茂 as persons who “although they were not <i>junzi</i> of sincere conduct, but still should be reckoned among the strategists of the Warring States” ( <i>fei duxing zhi junzi</i> 非篤行之君子，然亦戰國之策士也).
79.2420:13	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a speech by Cai Ze 蔡澤.
80.2433:6	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a letter by Yue Yi 樂毅 addressed to King Hui of Yan 燕惠王.
80.2433:7	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a letter by Yue Yi addressed to King Hui of Yan.
84.2487:10	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in Qu Yuan's “Huaisha fu” 懷沙賦.
84.2490:3	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in Qu Yuan's “Huaisha fu” 懹沙賦.
98.2713:2*	The TSG praises Xie, Earl of Kuacheng 削成侯譖, as someone who could justly be called a sincere and magnanimous <i>junzi</i> ( <i>ke wei dubou junzi yi</i> 可謂篤厚君子矣); cf. <i>Shiji</i> 103.2774.
103.2773:13*	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in an explicit quote from the mouth of “Zhongni”.
103.2774:1*	The TSG remarks that a <i>junzi</i> (of old) would criticize persons such as Shi Fen 石奮, Wei Wan 衛綰 and Zhang Shu 張叔 (to whom the chapter is devoted) due to their being close to servile flatterers.
103.2774:2*	The TSG adds (to the previous remark) that the men to whom the chapter is devoted should (nevertheless) be called <i>junzi</i> of sincere conduct ( <i>ke wei duxing junzi yi</i> 可謂篤行君子矣; cf. <i>Shiji</i> 98.2713).
108.2865:5*	The TSG praises Hu Sui as a „respectful and devoted <i>junzi</i> “ ( <i>jugong junzi</i> 鞠躬君子).
112.2952:13	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in an Imperial document responding to a letter by Gongsun Hong 公孫宏.
117.3045:12	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in an official proclamation from the hand of Sima Xiangru.
117.3071:1	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in Sima Xiangru's hymn focusing on the Feng and Shan sacrifices ( <i>Fengshan wen</i> ).
119.3100:6	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a speech by the chancellor of King Zhuang of Chu.
119.3100:6	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a speech by the chancellor of King Zhuang of Chu.
124.3181:8	The TSG refers to people who “when reading books long for the virtue of an independently acting <i>junzi</i> ( <i>du shu huai duxing junzi</i> 讀書懷獨行君子之德).
124.3188:15	The TSG again refers to the “wandering knights” maintaining that “although these people were among the knights, they still breathe the air of <i>junzi</i> who due to their own retiring advance others” ( <i>suiran wei xia er lingling you tuirang junzi zhi feng</i> 虽為俠而逡逡有退讓君子之風).
126.3208:1	Refers to a <i>junzi</i> by explicitly quoting the <i>Shijing</i> .
126.3211:1	Refers to a <i>junzi</i> as part of an explicit quote from a “Commentary” ( <i>zhuhan</i> ).

reference	context
127.3218:6	referred to from the mouth of the hemerologist Sima Jizhu talking to Jia Yi and Song Zhong.
127.3218:9	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to by Sima Jizhu, who points out the doctrine of „transmitting but not inventing“ to be the righteousness of a <i>junzi</i> ( <i>shu er bu zuo, junzi yi ye</i> 述而不作君子義也).
127.3219:5	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a quotation from the <i>Zhuangzi</i> , as part of the speech of Sima Jizhu.
127.3219:5	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to in a quotation from the <i>Zhuangzi</i> , as part of the speech of Sima Jizhu.
127.3219:15	A <i>junzi</i> is referred to as part of a speech of Sima Jizhu who instructs Jia Yi and Song Zhong on the market place of Chang'an.
[127.3221:4]	[CXS refers to the “air of a <i>junzi</i> ” ( <i>junzi zhi feng</i> 君子之風).]
128.3225:1*	The TSG states that if a <i>junzi</i> spoke disdainfully about the arts of divining by tortoise shells or milfoil, he would be someone who has no inspect.
129.3255:14*	The TSG remarks that it is the happiness of the <i>junzi</i> to love sticking to his virtues
129.3266:7	The TSG refers to <i>junzi</i> who live in the states of Liang and Song.
130.3308:12*	In the rhymed preface to <i>Shiji</i> 38, the TSG states that no <i>junzi</i> would praise Duke Xiang of Song.
130.3309:3*	In the rhymed preface to <i>Shiji</i> 39, the TSG refers to a <i>junzi</i> who criticizes Duke Mu of Jin's policy of conferring names to his sons ( <i>junzi ji ming</i> 君子議名).
130.3313:4*	In the rhymed preface to <i>Shiji</i> 65, the TSG says that a <i>junzi</i> compares virtue among them, i.e. Sunzi and Wu Qi ( <i>junzi bi de yan</i> 君子比德焉).
130.3316:7*	In the rhymed preface to <i>Shiji</i> 103, the TSG says that the three persons to whom the biography is devoted (Shi Fen, Wei Wan and Zhang Shu) could be regarded even as belonging to the most elevated among the superior men ( <i>junzi chang zhe</i> 君子長者); cf. <i>Shiji</i> 103.2774.
130.3320:1*	In the rhymed preface to <i>Shiji</i> 130, the TSG addresses future readers as the wise men and <i>junzi</i> ( <i>sheng ren junzi</i> 聖人君子) of a later generation.