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

Redaktion, Satz und Umschlaggestaltung: Martin Hanke und Dorothee Schaab-Hanke
Druck und Bindung: Rosch-Buch Druckerei GmbH, Scheßlitz
Printed in Germany

Inhalt

Subjectivity as a Form of Authority: The "I" Voice in the *Taishigong yue* Sections of the *Shiji*

Although quite a few studies in both Eastern and Western languages have already been concerned with the historiographer's[1] authoritative voice as an important aspect of the *Shiji*,[2] surprisingly little attention has hitherto been given to the subjective voice in this work and the impact it has on the text when it emerges.[3] There is a linguistically sound study, published by Qi Quan in 1984. In it, all the personal pronouns occurring throughout the received *Shiji* text are listed up and briefly analysed.[4] However, such a list is of limited value if one searches for the historiographer's subjective voice, since no distinction has been made there between the historiographer's own "I" voice and other "I" voices taken more or less verbatim from other texts to compile the historical account.

Certainly the best places to find the *Shiji* author's authentic self-referential voice are in the sections introduced by the formula "His Honor the Grand Scribe said" (*taishigong yue* 太史公曰). In these parts which are in most cases placed at the end of a given *Shiji* chapter, the historiographer adds his own observations and reflections that are – in

1 I am intentionally referring simply to "the historiographer" here, in spite of my assumption that we should rather reckon with at least two historiographers who shared in the conception of this work, namely apart from Sima Qian also his father, Sima Tan. Of course, this hypothesis is of special interest with regard to a possible distinction of two "I" voices here. The question of a possible distinction between Tan and Qian on the basis of "I" evidences will, however, be delayed to the end of this study.

2 For studies on the question of authority in the *Shiji*, see, among others, Li Wai-yee (1994). The relationship between authority and subjectivity in the *Shiji* is mentioned by her only once, (p. 360): "The historian's vision gains cogency because it is profoundly personal." Mark Edward Lewis (1999) in his comprehensive monograph on "Writing and Authority in Early China" does not mention the role of the historiographer's subjective voice as a central part of his authoritative voice at all.

3 Bernhard Karlgren (1970) in his linguistic studies on the *Shiji* unfortunately makes no mention of the first person pronouns as used by the historiographer. An interesting approach at the function of subjectivity in the *Shiji* has, however, been made by Fritz Jäger early in 1955. As he points out, the *Shiji* contains some stereotype figures of speech which are all part of special passages of the *Shiji* that he calls "subjective passages" ("subjektive Abschnitte"). See Jäger (1955), 17.

4 Qi Quan (1984, 189). According to him, the occurrences of first person pronouns throughout the *Shiji* text are as follows: *wo* 我 1103 times, *wu* 吾 848 times, *yu* 余 105 times, and 予 (the graphic variant of the latter) 58 times.

some way or the other – related to the content of the chapter to which the *taishigong yue* section belongs.

For this study, I have collected and listed all the "I" references occurring in the *taishigong yue* sections (table 1). In order to have a better basis for further analysis I then subsumed them under six categories according to the circumstances to which the "I" voice refers in each case (table 2). Since classical Chinese Grammar allows phrase clusters in which the subject applies throughout many phrases without being repeated, I decided to make a distinction between explicit (i.e. marked by a first person pronoun) "I" references, i.e., those in which a first person pronoun is used, and implicit "I" references, i.e., those in which the pronoun is simply implied, quite clearly, by the context.

All told, the number of all explicit and implicit "I" references in the *taishigong yue* sections amounts to 125. Among them, there are 62 explicit "I" evidences and 63 implicit occurrences of the "I" voice. A closer look at the same table reveals that of the two first person pronouns used in the *taishigong yue* sections as an expression of the historiographer's subjective voice, the explicit *yu* 余 occurs almost three times more often than the explicit *wu* 吾, and the implicit *yu* pronouns would be even five times more than the implicit *wu* pronouns. This is in stark contrast to the results reported by Qi Quan according to whom the pronoun *wu* occurred about seven times as often as the pronoun *yu* throughout the *Shiji* text.[5]

The relatively frequent use of first person pronouns – explicit *wu* and *yu* taken together occur 62 times – in the *taishigong yue* sections of the *Shiji* may be perceived as being all the more significant if one searches for first person pronouns in the *zan yue* 贊曰 sections of the *Hanshu*, the counterpart of the *Shiji*'s *taishigong yue* sections. Occurrences of first person pronouns in those sections of the *Hanshu* are, as one can easily see, confined solely to quotations of direct speech, but are nowhere found there as part of the author's subjective voice.[6] Since, as I have already argued in an earlier study,[7] Ban Gu in his historiographical style often seems to have intentionally differed from that of the S*hiji*, it is certainly not too far-fetched to assume that the complete absence of first person pronouns in those sections of his historical account in which the judgmental standards are given was also intentional; the avoidance of any subjective expressions fits well with the ideal of a historiographer who represented a rather remote judging moral authority.

---

5 In the TSG sections of the *Shiji,* I found no occurrence of the first person pronoun *wo* 我 to express the historiographer's subjective voice.

6 See e.g., *Hanshu* 15.1698:13 (*wu* 吾); 16.1826:13 (*wo* 我); 79.4081:1 (*yu* 予).

7 See Schaab-Hanke (2006a) page 363.

This article will first examine the first person pronouns *wu* and *yu* in the *taishigong yue* sections in terms of the circumstances in which they occur. Then, both pronouns will be scrutinized more closely within their argumentative context. Finally, both first person pronouns will be analysed separately, and and the results of this analysis will be discussed with regard to the question whether the different meaning and function of *wu* and *yu* as they come to be applied in the text point to two aspects or identities of the "I" voice of one historiographer or rather to the distinct stylistic preferences of two historiographers.

Types of "I" References in the *Taishigong yue* Sections

If one takes a closer look at the circumstances in which "I" references, be it by use of *wu* or by that of *yu*, occur in the *taishigong yue* sections, these references can be plausibly subsumed under six categories, namely: (1) References to a moving (i.e. visiting, traveling, climbing) "I"; (2) references to a perceiving "I"; (3) references to a communicating "I"; (4) references to a reading "I"; (5) references to an emotionally engaged, reflective "I"; and (6) references to a writing, e.g., a compiling or arranging "I". For each of these categories only some examples will be given below. For a complete list see Tables 1 and 2.

(1) References to a moving "I"

The "I" voice references of the "moving I" variety most often refer to the historiographer's travels to places of historical or other interest. The "I" tells the reader of his climbing of mountains, of his talks with the local people, of his visits to graveyards, and so forth. At least part of these travels can be discerned to be travels undertaken in an official mission, e.g., the travel to Mount Tai, where the historiographer had to supervise the making of the correct preparations taken for the emperor's planned Feng and Shan sacrifices. [8] Other travels might have been made on his private initiative. That Sima Qian had already traveled in his youth is clear from a remark in the last, autobiographical chapter of the *Shiji*, where it is stated that, at the age of twenty, he traveled to far-away places within the empire, before he entered his first office at court.[9] Whether or not his father accompanied him on these travels is not quite clear from the context. Here is an example for the traveling "I":

8 *Shiji* 28.1404:4.
9 *Shiji* 130.3293:12.

余嘗西至空桐，北過涿鹿，東漸於海，南浮江淮矣，至長老皆各往往稱黃帝、堯、舜之處，〔…〕。[10]

I once traveled west to Mount Kongtong and Zhuolu [Mountain] in the north; to the east (I) drifted along the coast, and to the south (I) floated over the Jiang and Huai [Rivers]. Wherever (I) went, all of the village elders would point out for me the sites of Huangdi, Yao and Shun; […].[11]

(2) References to a perceiving (seeing, hearing) "I"

To this category belong all kinds of sense perceptions, e.g., seeing (*jian* 見) and hearing (*wen* 聞). Often, the historiographer records what he had heard from someone else. For example, in the autobiographical last chapter of the *Shiji*, he mentions words uttered by his father ("I have heard my father say" 余聞之先人曰).[12] This "hearing" is not necessarily confined to persons in the historiographer's physical presence. He frequently refers to oral traditions by quoting earlier authorities who passed judgments on events that had occurred during their own life times or even earlier.[13]

The perceiving "I" is often used by the historiographer to play the role of an eye-witness. For example, in the *taishigong yue* section concluding the biography of Han Xin, the historiographer comments:

余視其母冢，良然。[14]

I have seen the gravesite of his mother; it was really luxurious!

In the lines preceding this remark we learn that the historiographer had travelled in person to Huaiyin, where he talked with the local people. They told him that in the beginning Han Xin was so poor that he could not even afford to pay for his mother's burial. Later, after he had made his career and had become the Lord of Huaiyin, he purchased a huge tract of land and made it his mother's burial ground.

(3) References to a communicating "I"

To this category belong all kinds of contacts between the historiographer and other people, be it verbal communication (talk, report, etc.) or non-verbal communication, such as being on good terms with or writing letters to someone, etc.

For example, in the *taishigong yue* section of the biographical chapter on Tian Shu we find the remark:

仁與余善，〔…〕余故并論之。[15]

(Tian) Ren and I were friends. This is why I added a section about him.

---

10 *Shiji* 1.46:11.
11 Tr. after Nienhauser I, 17.
12 *Shiji* 130.3299:11.
13 For the role of scribes as transmitters of early traditions, see also Schaab-Hanke (2007a).
14 *Shiji* 92.2630:1.
15 *Shiji* 104.2779:2.

If we look at the chapter itself, we see that there is in fact a small biographical account of Tian Ren attached to the biography of his father, Tian Shu. The historiographer's remark thus justifies his decision to devote some space in his historical work to his friend, Tian Ren.

Another example for the communicating "I" is found in the *taishigong yue* section of the chapter on Master Li and Lu Jia. There the historiographer writes:

> 至平原君子與余善，是以得具論之。[16]
> Since the son of the Lord of Pingyuan was a friend of mine, I was able to discuss (all I said above) in detail.

Here the historiographer uses the communicating "I" to inform his reader how he got access to important source material he needed for his biographical account.

(4) References to a reading "I"

References to the reading "I" are very numerous in the *taishigong yue* sections of the *Shiji*. In the context of the verb *du* 讀 (to read) we learn about all kinds of books that the historiographer apparently had at his disposal. Apart from the specific *du*-reading, some references which might, at first sight, seem to belong to one of the other types also fall under this category. For example, references combined with the verb *guan* 觀 (to see) should properly belong to the type of the perceiving "I" and thus be classed under category (2). However, from a passage in which the historiographer writes that he "saw the records of scribes" (*guan shiji* 觀史記),[17] it becomes clear that this is not a case of physical perception, but only of virtual perception, and thus refers to a reading "I". The same problem occurs in several cases with the verb *zhi* 至 (to come to). In a passage where the historiographer writes: "When I came to the 'Annals of Yu' (*zhi* "Yu benji" 至禹本紀),[18] it would certainly not be appropriate to subsume *zhi* under the category of the moving" but again under that of the reading "I".

The reading "I" often occurs in combination with another type of "I" reference, namely that of category (5), the emotionally engaged, reflective type. Here is one example – certainly the most well-known one – of this type of combined "I" reference:

> 余讀孟子書，至梁惠王問「何以利吾國」，未嘗不廢書而歎也。
> Whenever I read the book of Master Meng, when (I) come to the passage in which King Hui of Liang asks (Master Meng) how he would be of benefit for his state, (I) must put the book aside and sigh.[19]

---

16 *Shiji* 97.2705:15.
17 *Shiji* 27.1350:3.
18 *Shiji* 123.3179:13.

This is indeed a highly interesting remark, since everybody who is familiar with the *Mengzi* text will know that the meeting between Meng Ke and the King of Liang referred to here is mentioned in the very first paragraph of the *Mengzi*, at least in its received form. One might thus suggest that the reason why the historiographer never got very far with his *Mengzi* lectures was that he was so easily overwhelmed, even when he had just begun to read the *Mengzi*.

(5) References to an emotionally engaged, reflective "I"

The typical "I" reference of this category, as has been implied above, is one that reflects on something, often a book or other text which the historiographer mentions in his present lecture, to which he has a strong emotional reaction, such as sighing or even shedding tears. Although this is not yet the place to turn to the question whether or not the first person pronouns *wu* and *yu* are used for different purposes, it should at least be mentioned that there is not even one "I" reference of this type displayed by the use of *wu* (neither explicit nor implicit), whereas for *yu* we have 7 explicit and 18 additional implicit "I" references. Jäger in his essay suggests that what he calls a "stereotype figure of speech" – the combination of the historiographer's reading with his emotional or reflective reaction to it – was possibly an invention by Sima Qian.[20]

Another feature which is typical for "I" references of this category is the verb-combination *yiwei* 以為 (to be of the opinion), occurring several times in the *taishigong yue* sections. In some cases the historiographer balances pros and cons by using the phrase *yu yiwei* 余以為;[21] in other cases he uses the phrase negatively, as in: "I (personally) think that this is not correct!" (*yu yiwei buran* 余以為不然),[22] to reject a position taken by someone else. Since "I" references of this category, as it is often the case with references of other categories, mostly occur in series combined with other types of references, I will quote here a complete *taishigong yue* section. It starts with an "I" reference of the "moving" type and continues with an "I" reference of the "reflective" type:

> 太史公曰：吾適故大梁之墟，墟中人曰：秦之破梁，引河溝而灌大梁，三月城壞，王請降，遂滅魏。說者皆曰魏以不用信陵君故，國削弱至於亡，余以為不然。天方令秦平海內，其業未成，魏雖得阿衡之佐，曷益乎？[23]
> His Honor the Grand Scribe said: "When I visited the ruins of Daliang, the people around the place said: 'When Qin overthrew Liang, (he) dug canals

19 *Shiji* 74.2343:6.

20 See Jäger (1955), 19: "Solange also nicht ein früheres Zeugnis gefunden ist, muß jedenfalls Ssu-ma Ch'ien als Schöpfer dieser Figur bezeichnet werden."

21 *Shiji* 47.1947:8.

22 *Shiji* 44.1864:9.

23 *Shiji* 44.1864:8-10.

> from the Yellow River and flooded Daliang. Within three months, the city walls collapsed and the king begged to surrender. As a consequence Wei was destroyed.' The rhetoricians all say that it was because Wei did not make use of the Lord of Xinling that the state became so feeble and was finally wiped out. But I do not think that this is correct. Heaven at this time had commanded Qin to pacify all within the seas, and this task was not yet completed. Although Wei might have had the services of Aheng, of what use would it have been?"

The central topic discussed here is the question why the state of Wei was bound to perish. The historiographer's personal opinion deviates from both the opinion of the local populace with whom he had communicated on his visit to the ruins of Daliang and from that of the "rhetoricians" (*shuozhe* 說者) according to whom the ruler of the state of Wei himself had caused the state's ruin because he had not made use of the Lord of Xinling, a high official at the court of Wei whose personal name was Wu Ji 無忌. In the historiographer's opinion, the state of Wei was bound to perish because at that time it was the will of Heaven to give the state of Qin the chance to rule over all other feudal states. Therefore, he argues, the ruler of Wei was not personally responsible for the downfall of the state of Wei.

(6) References to a writing, arranging and compiling "I"

Closely related to the previous type but still in a category of its own are references to the writing, arranging, and compiling "I", all those activities which lie at the heart of the historiographer's duties. In almost all cases the activities mentioned in this context are directly related to the *Shiji* itself; in just one case, another important duty of the historiographer is mentioned with a reference that belongs to this category. That is the project of compiling the new calendar of the Han, a project on which Sima Qian was ordered by the emperor to work together with his colleague Hu Sui.[24]

There are many instances in which the historiographer explains in detail how he proceeded in compiling a given chapter, which texts he used, and what he decided to leave out. A good example is the following passage in the *taishigong yue* section at the end of chapter 67, the chapter on the disciples of Confucius:

> 余以弟子名姓文字悉取論語弟子問并次為篇，疑者闕焉。[25]
> I took the names of the disciples, then gathered all the records concerning them from among the questions posed by the disciples in the Analects and arranged the information in one chapter. (I) have left out the dubious.[26]

---

24 See *Shiji* 108.2865:4: 余與壺遂定律曆，〔…〕。
25 *Shiji* 67.2226:10-11.
26 Cf. Nienhauser VII, 84.

Of course, the "I" references, which we have considered by themselves or in combinations of only two so far, in fact more often than not occur in series and thus build complex argumentative clusters. For example, in the judgmental section in *Shiji* 128, the historiographer uses a combination of moving "I", perceiving "I" and communicating "I". He traveled to a certain region in order to gain a personal impression; he asked the elders of the village, and they told him sth.[27] In the following section, some examples will be given to illustrate how the historiographer uses his personal experiences, perceptions and reflections within an argumentative context. We will see that rather than weakening his historical account by referring towards himself, the historiographer in fact uses the "I" voice to give his argument additional strength and cogency.

"I" evidences in the Context of Arguments

Let us now take a closer look at the argumentative function of the "I" references in argument, both within the *taishigong yue* sections themselves and in their relation to the *Shiji* chapters to which they belong. As we shall see, the function of the "I" references is by no means only to pass final "judgments" on the content of a given chapter. In quite a few cases the "I" voice adds various kinds of remarks, justifying rather than judging, confirming or even rejecting what has been said in the chapter to which the *taishigong yue* section belongs. Below, three case examples will be analysed. In each case, the text of the *taishigong yue* section will be given in full, for the sake of the clarity of the argument.

The first example is the *taishigong yue* section which concludes the first chapter of the *Shiji*, the "Annals of the Five God-Emperors".[28]

> 太史公曰：學者多稱五帝，尚矣。然尚書獨載堯以來；而百家言黃帝，其文不雅馴，薦紳先生難言之。
> His Honor the Grand Scribe said: "Scholars often claim that the Five God-Emperors belong to high antiquity. But the "Book of Documents" only records (God-Emperor) Yao and (the rulers) thereafter. The (scholars of the) Hundred Schools do mention the Yellow God-Emperor, but since their texts are not purely orthodox, the high dignitaries would have difficulty making use of them in their discussions."
>
> 孔子所傳宰予問五帝德及帝繫姓，儒者或不傳。余嘗西至空桐，北過涿鹿，東漸於海，南浮江淮矣，至長老皆各往往稱黃帝、堯、舜之處，風教固殊焉，總之不離古文者近是。
> As far as (the texts) "Zai Yu asks about the Virtues of the Five Emperors" and "Genealogies of the God-Emperors" transmitted by Master Kong are concerned, at least some of the scholars in the Confucian tradition would not

27 *Shiji* 128.3225:9: 余至江南，觀其行事，問其長老，云〔…〕。
28 *Shiji* 1.46:11-16.

transmit them. I once travelled west to (Mount) Kongtong, passed (Mount) Zhuolu in the North, drifted along the coast in the North, and floated over the Jiang and Huai rivers in the South. Wherever (I) met with the village elders, they would all together and individually in their respective regions point out (to me) the sites of the Yellow God-Emperor, of Yao and Shun. Even though their local customs may differ from each other, in sum they do not deviate much from the ancient texts and are close to the truth.

予觀春秋、國語，其發明五帝德、帝繫姓章矣，顧弟弗深考，其所表見皆不虛。書缺有閒矣，其軼乃時時見於他說。非好學深思，心知其意，固難為淺見寡聞道也。

I have read the "Spring and Autumn Annals" and the "Lessons from the States", and it is clearly evident that they are likely to shed new light on the (reliability of texts such as) "Zai Yu asks about the Virtues of the Five Emperors" and the "Genealogies of the God-Emperors". Even if there may be no deep investigation (made in them), what they reveal is certainly not without a foundation. The "Book of Documents" has both shortcomings and lacunae. What is still current can from time to time be seen in other teachings. Unless one does not diligently study and ponder deeply (about what one has read), one will not know in one's heart what (these books) want to convey, and thus one will have difficulty in recognizing what is shallow and in finding one's own (method) for perceiving the (right) way.

余并論次，擇其言尤雅者，故著為本紀書首。

I have (thus) collected these (accounts) and put them in the right order, selecting among them those words which were the most refined, and therefore (I) have compiled this as the first of the "Basic Annals" chapters.[29]

In this *taishigong yue* section we find three explicit "I" references, belonging to categories (1) ("I have once been travelling…"), (4) ("I have read the "Spring and Autumn Annals…") and (6) ("I have thus collected these accounts and put them in the right order…"). Besides, there are three further, implicit "I" references. All three explicit types of "I" references are combined here in a way that allows the historiographer to make a highly personal choice, one which is both an exegetical one and at the same time a highly ideological one.

In the first "I" reference, the historiographer tells the reader of his travels through the empire. He informs him of his talks with local people who showed him, among others, the site of Huangdi, the Yellow God-Emperor. The information given by them seems to be mentioned by the historiographer as some kind of "proof" that Huangdi had really existed. Then, the historiographer criticizes the "high dignitaries" (*jianshen xiansheng* 薦紳先生) for their having "difficulties in using them in their discussions" (*nan yi yan zhi* 難以言之, for the venerated classic, the "Book of Documents" (*Shangshu*), does not mention Huangdi at all.

29 Cf. Nienhauser I, 17.

The second "I" reference draws on books the historiographer had read, and his reading evidence serves him as a further argument to justify his decision to start out on his historical quest for Huangdi. While I will not go into much detail here, the most important point to bear in mind is that the historiographer rejects those books in which no mention is made of Huangdi and instead lays much stress on those texts in which Huangdi is mentioned as the progenitor of all the Chinese rulers.[30] And what is more, he explicitly encourages his reader not to confine himself on reading only those books which are acknowledged by the Confucian scholars of his life times as being "orthodox" but rather urges him to read all books available to him in order to be able to build his own independent opinion.

In the third "I" reference the historiographer explains that, as a consequence of the principles revealed to his reader in the previous paragraph, he decided to arrange the first chapter of his historical account the way he did, with Huangdi at the very beginning of his work.

To sum up, all three explicit "I" references occurring in this *taishigong yue* section help the historiographer justify his decision to give Huangdi such an overriding role in his work. By emphasizing the fact that his beliefs daviate from what other scholars (*xuezhe* 學者) would acknowledge as orthodox, he places his personal opinion in the position of a new authority, possibly in the hope that his readers would acknowledge his authority as the ultimate one.

Another example is the *taishigong yue* section which concludes *Shiji* 7, the "Annals of Xiang Yu". Xiang Yu 項羽 (c. 232– c. 202) was a general from the state of Chu who after the downfall of the Qin dynasty at first collaborated with Liu Bang and later fought against him. In the end, Liu Bang became the founder of the Han dynasty. For a while, it looked as if the successor of Qin would be the state of Chu instead. Here is the text in full:

> 太史公曰：吾聞之周生曰「舜目蓋重瞳子」，又聞項羽亦重瞳子。羽豈其苗裔邪？何興之暴也！夫秦失其政，陳涉首難，豪傑鬻起，相與並爭，不可勝數。然羽非有尺寸乘埶，起隴畝之中，三年，遂將五諸侯滅秦，分裂天下，而封王侯，政由羽出，號為「霸王」，位雖不終，近古以來未嘗有也。及羽背關懷楚，放逐義帝而自立，怨王侯叛己，難矣。自矜功伐，奮其私智而不師古，謂霸王之業，欲以力征經營天下，五年卒亡其國，身死東城，尚不覺寤而不自責，過矣。乃引「天亡我，非用兵之罪也」，豈不謬哉！[31]

---

30 For more details on the texts "Wudi de" 五帝德 (Virtues of the Five God-Emperors) and "Dixi xing" 帝繫姓 (Genealogies of the God-Emperors) which are both chapters of the received text of the *Da Dai liji* 大戴禮記, see Schaab-Hanke (2005a), page 184ff.

31 *Shiji* 7.338:14-15.

> His Honor the Grand Scribe said: "I have heard Master Zhou say that Emperor Shun supposedly had eyes with double pupils. (I) have also heard that Xiang Yu, too, had eyes with double pupils. Could it be that Xiang Yu was his descendant? How sudden was his rise! When Qin mishandled its government, Chen She initiated the rebellion, and men of power and distinction rose like a swarm of bees, struggling with each other, in numbers too great to count. This being so, without even an inch of territory, availing himself of the situation and rising in arms from the farming fields, within three years Xiang Yu led the five feudal lords in subjugating Qin, divided up the world, and enfeoffed kings and marquises. All power was delegated by Xiang Yu, who proclaimed himself Hegemonic King. Even though his reign did not come to a natural end, since ancient times there has never been such a person. By the time Xiang Yu turned his back on the land within the Pass to embrace Chu and banished Emperor Yi to enthrone himself, it is difficult to see how he could resent the feudal lords rebelling against him. He boasted of his achievements, asserted his own mind, but never learned from the ancients. He called his enterprise that of a Hegemon King, intending to manage the world by means of mighty campaigns. After five years, he finally lost his state and died himself at Dongcheng, yet even at the time of his death he did not come to his senses and blame himself. What an error it was, to excuse himself by claiming 'Heaven destroyed me, it was not any fault of mine in using troops!' How absurd!"[32]

To begin with, it is remarkable in itself that the historiographer decided to assign a whole chapter in the annals part to Xiang Yu, interspersed between the two annals devoted to Qin, before and after the unification of the empire, and the annals of the Han dynasty. Although one might argue that the decision to assign Xiang Yu a chapter of his own was simply a pragmatic one, based on the fact that Xiang Yu was, albeit merely for a short time, king of at least part of the former Qin empire, this explanation is not quite satisfactory. Rather, the historiographer seems to have made a highly personal decision. It is not so much the historical account itself which shows the historiographer's own attitude towards Qin, since there he primarily records the succession of events and only in some places reveals Xiang Yu as a somewhat ambiguous personality, as someone who at one point in his career wholly lost belief in himself, claiming that Heaven wanted him to perish and that he bore no personal responsibility.

We have to look into the *taishigong yue* section of this chapter to learn that the historiographer's personal conviction was that Xiang Yu had belonged to the founders of legitimate dynasties in Chinese history. This is already confirmed in the first sentence where the "I" voice reports a statement of a master Zhou who had assumed that Shun, one of the Five God-Emperors, had had double pupils. By reporting that he, the historiographer, had heard that Xiang Yu, too, had double pupils, he makes an important judgment in terms of legitimacy. He ties Xiang Yu genealogically

32 Cf. Nienhauser I, 208.

back to the mythical emperor Shun, one of the Five God-Emperors treated in this first chapter. Thus, the very first sentence of the *taishigong yue* section seems to concede to Xiang Yu at least a small chance that he (and with him the state of Chu) and not Liu Bang (and thus the Han) could have become the successor of the Qin dynasty. Anyone who is familiar also with other statements in the *Shiji* that pertain to the cycle of legitimate dynasties will know that this topic is of major importance in this work and that the mention made of the double pupils of the mythical Emperor Shun should thus be taken quite seriously.

As for the rest of the *taishigong yue* section, the major question the historiographer discusses is why Xiang Yu in the end forfeited the great chance given by Heaven and gave Liu Bang the chance to become the founder of the Han dynasty. The last sentence deserves special attention, since it refers back to the statement made by Xiang Yu, as it is recorded in the main text of the chapter in which Xiang Yu complains that it was Heaven who wanted to destroy him and that it was thus not his own fault. The historiographer in the *taishigong yue* section comments on Xiang Yu's complaint with the laconic remark: "How absurd!" (*qi bu miu zai* 豈不謬哉). In other words, the historiographer wanted to emphasize that in his view it was not Heaven but Xiang Yu himself who had forfeited the great chance that Heaven in his view had indeed offered to him.

This is not the place to reflect further on the historiographer's attitude towards the Han and the role of Liu Bang as the legitimate successor of the Qin dynasty, but in this context the remarkable fact to point out is that the historiographer's personal remark, introduced with "I heard that", points towards one of the central issues of the whole *Shiji* account, namely that of legitimacy.[33]

The third example I would like to adduce here is the *taishigong yue* section concluding chapter 28 of the *Shiji*, the "Monograph on the Feng and Shan Sacrifices". This monograph is certainly a key chapter for disclosing the historiographer's exegetical attitude, all the more since we have an almost identical text in *Shiji* chapter 12, the annals of Han Emperor Wu.[34] In it, the historiographer reports on the preparations made by Emperor Wu for proceeding to Mount Tai where he would eventually perform the holy Feng and Shan sacrifices, sacrifices which only a worthy ruler would be allowed to conduct and which only very few emperors in Chinese history had so far been able to conduct successfully.

---

33 For the different attitudes in the *Shiji* and the *Hanshu* towards the question of the downfall of the Qin dynasty, see Schaab-Hanke (2007b).

34 For a case study on chapter 28, see Schaab-Hanke (2002a). As I have pointed out in this study (page 143, footnote 10), there is only one Chinese character on which the TSG sections of both chapters differ from each other: the word *yi* 意 (intention), in *Shiji* 28.1404:4, is replaced in *Shiji* 12.486:4 by the word *yan* 言 (words).

> 太史公曰：余從巡祭天地諸神名山川而封禪焉。入壽宮侍祠神語，究觀方士祠官之意，於是退而論次自古以來用事於鬼神者，具見其表裏。後有君子，得以覽焉。至若俎豆珪幣之詳，獻酬之禮，則有司存焉。[35]
>
> His Honor the Grand Scribe said: "I accompanied (the emperor) when he proceeded to sacrifice to Heaven and Earth, the other deities, and the famous mountains and rivers, and when he went to perform the Feng and Shan (sacrifices). (I) entered the Temple of Long Life and assisted at the sacrifices there when the deity spoke, and (I) thus had an opportunity to study and examine the ways of the magicians and the sacrificial officials. Later (I) retired and wrote down in order all that (I) knew about the worship of the spirits from ancient times on, setting forth both the outside and the inside stories of these affairs. Gentlemen in later ages will thus be able to peruse these materials. As for the details of sacrificial plates and utensils, the types of jades and silks offered, or the exact ritual to be followed in presenting them – these will be left to the officials who handle such matters."[36]

Although the above quoted *taishigong yue* section contains only one explicit "I" reference, namely that in the very first sentence in which the historiographer reports of the imperial proceeding towards performing the sacrifices on which he accompanied the emperor, there is a series of four further statements from which the continued "I" voice can easily be inferred. These four implicit "I" references can be typified as a succession of moving "I", reflective "I", moving "I", and again reflective "I" (for details see Table 1).

Taken the series of successive "I" references as a whole, what we find here is clearly the voice of the specialist who not only accompanied his emperor, Emperor Wu, but also took direct part in the preparations for the sacrifices, who then examined the intentions of the magicians and sacrificial officials, and afterwards retired in order to write down the results of his research down for superior men of a later generation (*hou you junzi*).[37] The matter of the only plausible identity of the person whose "I" voice is to be heard here, this question will be taken up again later in this study.

"Subjective Voice" versus "Authoritative Voice"? Telling *wu* from *yu* in the *Taishigong yue* Sections

So far, we have regarded the two first person pronouns *wu* and *yu* mostly as a unity, searching for the overall function of the "I" voice within the section of the historiographer's concluding remarks. But if in a given text two first person pronouns come to be used, apparently alternating in their application, it is perhaps justifiable to assume that there must be some difference between them, either in meaning or in function.

---

35 *Shiji* 12.486:3-5.

36 Translated after Watson (1961), 51f.

37 Cf. Lewis (1999); Schaab-Hanke (2003), esp. page 143f.

From dictionaries which explain the use of *wu* and *yu* we learn that in Classical Chinese both pronouns were used to express the first person singular ("I"), but that *wu* was also used for the first person plural ("We"). For both pronouns it is evident that they function as subject and as object, and also as possessive pronouns, meaning "my" (*wu* also meaning "our") is evidenced.[38] There is, however, one further detail which Georg von der Gabelentz suggests in his Chinese Grammar: a tendency of *yu* to be more "modest".[39] If it is true that the pronoun *yu* stands for a more modest attitude on the part of a person using the "I" voice, then *wu*, which, as we have seen, is also used as first person plural, i.e., "we", would probably be the more authoritative "I", perhaps comparable to our *pluralis majestatis*, the "We" as itis still often used in Western scholarly works. Would it be too farfetched then to assume that the difference between the two kinds of "I" voices is that *wu* was used by the historiographer to give expression to his voice as an authority, whereas *yu* was used when the historiographer intended to express his personal subjective attitudes, emotions and reflections?

In hopes of getting a valid answer to this question, a closer look will be taken at the distribution of *wu* and *yu* within the six categories of "I" references (table 2).

To begin with, the overall result that has already been mentioned earlier in this study is that in the *taishigong yue* sections, *yu* is much more often represented in the text than *wu*, namely 14 occurrences of explicit *wu* references versus 48 explicit *yu* references, and 8 implict *wu* references against 55 implicit *yu* references.

As for the moving "I", we still have a quite balanced distribution – 8 explicit occurrences of *wu* against 8 occurrences of *yu* (but only 1 implicit *wu* against 14 implicit *yu*). Since *wu* is evidenced as being used for both the first person singular and the first person plural, the use of *wu*, as contrasted to *yu*, might point to those travels on which Sima Qian accompanied his father, Tan.

For the perceiving "I", we have 3 explicit and 3 implicit *wu*, versus 6 explicit and 4 implicit *yu*. As we have seen, this "I" evidence is used by the historiographer to emphasize that he himself saw something described in the chapter. He thus uses the "I" voice here to confirm or to add to the historical record.

For the communicating "I" we have no explicit, but at least 3 implicit *wu*, versus 7 explicit and 5 further implicit *yu*. The "I" references of this category are, as we also saw, very similar to the perceiving "I", used by the historiographer to add to or comment on the historical record.

---

38 See, e.g., the laconic explanations given for *wu* and *yu* in Wu Qingfeng (2006), 298, 378.
39 See von der Gabelentz (1881, 1960), 173, §403.

In the category of the reading "I" we have only one case of an explicit *wu* (no case for an implicit one), whereas we here have 15 instances of explicit *yu* and 5 further cases of an implicit *yu*.

For the compiling "I", the table shows 2 explicit and 1 implicit *wu*, versus 5 explicit (and 9 implicit) *yu*. Here, too, a preference for *yu* is clearly recognizable.

By far the most revealing category is certainly that of the emotionally engaged, reflective "I". It is here that no use of *wu* at all is found in the *taishigong yue* sections. There are, however, 7 explicit and 18 further, implicit references to *yu*. Since, as we have seen before, the reading "I" and the emotionally engaged, reflective "I" often occur in combination in the *taishigong yue* sections, we can quite safely infer from a comparison of the numbers given for *wu* and *yu* that the highly personal and subjective process of reading, together with the emotional reaction on this reading, was something for which the use of *yu* seems to have been preferred by the historiographer.

It thus seems that the hypothesis raised above of a possible distinction of a more authoritative *wu* on the one hand and an emotionally engaged, reflective – and perhaps even more modest – *yu* on he other fits quite well with the context in which both personal pronouns occur.

But what was the reason for the appearance of two kinds of the self-referential "I" voice in the *taishigong yue* sections of the *Shiji*?

A possible explanation would be that one and the same historiographer had two different modes of expressing his personal attitudes, or, in other words, he used different personal pronouns in order to express his subjective voice according to the circumstances. In cases in which his authoritative voice was to be emphasized he would choose the *wu*-"I", and in cases in which the emphasis was laid on his subjective, reflective or emotionally engaged voice, he would choose the *yu*-"I" pronoun. To put it in terms of two bodies, a distinction might have consciously been made between a a more authoritative, more official, more institutional "I" body on the one hand and a more personal, emotional, subjective "I" body on the other hand. Such a distinction of two bodies incorporated in one and the same person has first been proposed for European medieval kingship by Ernst H. Kantorowicz. In his work, *The King's Two Bodies*, he distinguished between the king's natural body, with its physical attributes, a body that suffers and dies, on the one hand, and the king's spiritual body, which transcends the earthly and serves as a symbol of his office as majesty with the divine right to rule, on the other hand.[40] The notion of the two bodies allowed for the continuity of monarchy even when the monarch died, as summed up in the formulation "The king is dead. Long live the king."

---

40 See Kantorowicz (1957).

If the hypothesis of the two bodies were valid for the author of the *Shiji* text in his role of a virtual ruler over his own textual empire, we would have here a close parallel to the medieval king described by Kantorowicz here. It would be the holy task of the historiographer to record history for later generations of worthies, a task which transcends the personal body of each individual and binds him back to the community of historiographers recording the lessons given to emperors from generation to generation. One feels immediately reminded of the famous account of the three scribes of Qi preserved in several early historical sources, who regarded it as their primary duty to record the truth about a regicide committed by Cui Zhu. When the first of the three scribes was killed by Cui Zhu, his successor continued the record. After he was also killed, another scribe came over to Qi from another state to continue the record, and thus the memory of the ruler's regicide was kept in history.[41]

So far we have distinguished two "I" voices, a *wu*-"I" and a *yu*-"I", as two bodies or identities of one and the same person. The historiographer thus can well be imagined to have made use of the *wu*-"I" in cases where he acted as an overall judging authority, and the *yu*-"I" when he intended to make a more personal, subjective comment or addition. Of course, the authoritative *wu*-"I" fits well in the tradition of the formula "The Superior Man says" (*junzi yue* 君子曰) in the *Zuozhuan* tradition which also indicates an overall authority, in which tradition the historiographer is clearly recognizable.[42]

There is, however, yet another possible explanation which is, as I think, also worth considering. Could it be that the two "I" voices we are discussing here are not emerging from "the historiographer's two bodies", but rather from the "bodies of two historiographers? In other words, can we make a plausible argument for a Sima Tan/Sima Qian distinction based on preferences of the *wu*- and the *yu*-"I"?

In my opinion it is also possible to make a plausible argument for such an explanation. In that case, my guess would be that the *wu*-"I" which is the calmer, more remote and thus the more authoritative one, was the preferred choice of Sima Tan, whereas the *yu*-"I" as the more emotional one which is characterized by a strong personal commitment which at times even tends to be slightly disturbed or bewildered was the pronoun preferred by Sima Qian.

As for the use of *yu*, at least three passages from the *Shiji* can be adduced where the *yu*-"I" can scarcely have been used by anyone else but Qian. First, in the sentence contained in the last chapter of the *Shiji* the

41 For an earlier discussion of the scribes of Qi, see Schaab-Hanke (2007a), page 63.

42 See Schaab-Hanke (2010b), page 120ff. For the continuation of the *junzi yue*/*taishigong yue* formulae in the form of the "Master Chu has said" (Chu *xiansheng yue* 褚先生曰) formula, see Schaab-Hanke (2003–2004), page 225ff.

statement: "I have heard my father say" (余聞之先人曰) undoubtedly refers to Sima Qian as the autobiographer of the chapter.[43] Secondly, the remark, "I have arranged the calendar together with Hu Sui" (余與壺遂定律曆), can only refer to Sima Qian, since Hu Sui and he were colleagues. This conclusion is, by the way, also corroborated by the chapter on the calendar in the *Hanshu*.[44] Likewise, the remark "I accompanied (the emperor) when he proceeded to sacrifice to Heaven and Earth, the other deities, and the famous mountains and rivers, and when he went to perform the Feng and Shan" (余從巡祭天地諸神名山川而封禪焉), must be a statement by Sima Qian, since we learn from the last chapter of the *Shiji* that his father, Sima Tan, had died shortly before Han Wudi's travels to perform the Feng and Shan sacrifices on Mount Tai.[45]

As mentioned earlier in this text, the *yu*-"I" tends to be so emotional that it culminates in some cases in complete bewilderment. The best example to illustrate this is perhaps the *taishigong yue* section concluding chapter 84 of the *Shiji*, the double biography devoted to Qu Yuan and Jia Yi:

> 太史公曰：余讀離騷、天問、招魂、哀郢，悲其志。適長沙，觀屈原所自沈淵，未嘗不垂涕，想見其為人。及見賈生弔之，又怪屈原以彼其材，游諸侯，何國不容，而自令若是。讀服鳥賦，同死生，輕去就，又爽然自失矣。[46]
>
> His Honor the Grand Scribe said: "When I read 'Encountering Sorrow', Heaven Questioned', 'Summoning the Soul', and 'A Lament for Ying'), I was moved by Qu Yuan's resolve. Whenever I go to Changsha and see the place where Qu Yuan sank into the depths, I weep and wish that I might have seen what sort of man he was. When I saw how Teacher Jia lamented for him, on the other hand, (I) wondered how a man with Qu Yuan' s talents, who could not have failed to find a welcome in any of the states if he had chosen to consort with the feudal lords, brought himself to such a pass. On reading 'The Rhapsody of an Owl' which equates life and death and makes light of leaving or taking political position, (I) was dumbfounded and dazed!"[47]

A reader who is familiar with Sima Qian's biography and also with Sima Qian's letter to his friend Ren An will certainly agree that only Sima Qian, and not his father Sima Tan, could have been the author of these lines. For Sima Qian, very much like Qu Yuan and later Jia Yi, lost the sympathy of his emperor due to the tragic circumstances of his life. The important point here is that on reading both the texts left by Qu Yuan and those by Jia Yi the historiographer is overwhelmed by his

43 *Shiji* 130.3299:11.
44 *Shiji* 108.2865:4; cf. *Hanshu* 21A.974.
45 *Shiji* 28.1404:4; cf. *Shiji* 130.3295.
46 *Shiji* 84.2503:13-15.
47 Tr. after Nienhauser VII, 307.

emotions.[48] It is precisely this empathy, the ability to share the feelings of others whose biography one writes, which is so typical for the "I" voice expressed by the pronoun *yu*, and this is, as I think, the "I" of Sima Qian.

In the present state of research we can, of course, not know for certain whether the "I" voice points to one or rather to two persons who contributed to the *Shiji*. But what we do know for certain is that by conceding the "I" voice a place in the *Shiji*, or at least in the parts of this work that concern judgment, a wholly new element, namely that of an expressly subjective perception, reflection, and emotion, came into Chinese historiography. Even though it may seem to be almost paradoxical at first sight, it is precisely this subjective voice which strengthens the authority of the historiographer's judgment. And at the same time the critical reader is addressed who not only learns from precedents how he should evaluate similar cases in his own age, but is also told by the historiographer on which sources a chapter is based, why the historiographer preferred one source and rejected another, whom the historiographer had visited on his travels and how he used information gained by what he had heard and seen as source material for his historical account. A Chinese scholar recently even went so far as to call the author of the *Shiji* the precursor of modern journalism.[49]

Seen in this light, the occurrence of the subjective voice in the *taishigong yue* sections of the *Shiji* as an important aspect of authority cannot not be overestimated. Indeed, it would be highly interesting to conduct some research in the field of the later Chinese historiographical tradition, focussing on the occurrence and the function of the "I" voice in some of these texts, but this is a task to be tackled in another study.

48 For the historical circumstances of Jia Yi's exile to Changsha and the implication of the "Rhapsody of an Owl" (*Fuwu fu* 服鳥賦) he wrote there to the memory of Qu Yuan, see Emmerich (1991), 123f. For the phenomenon of empathy as a central motivating force for the historiographer to invent the genre of biographical writing, see Mittag (2001).

49 See Miao Yu (2000), esp. the chapter "Qinjian qinwen chu zui keguan" 親見親聞最可觀 (things one has seen or heard personally, are the most valuable ones), where he adduces several case examples for the historiographer's searching for primary information.

Table 1: Explicit [and implicit] References to the "I" Voice in the *Taishigong yue* Sections of the *Shiji*

Types of First Person Pronouns (FP) used:	**Types of "I" References (IR)**
A: 余 (var:予)[50] / a: [余] B: 吾 / b: [吾]	(1) Reference to a moving (visiting, travelling, climbing) "I" (2) Reference to a perceiving (seeing, hearing and communicating) "I" (3) Reference to a communicating "I" (4) Reference to a reading "I" (5) Reference to an emotionally engaged, reflective "I" (6) Reference to a writing (compiling and critically discussing) "I"

reference	passage in a *taishigong yue* section	FP	IR
1.46:11	余嘗西至空桐,	A	1
1.46:12	〔余〕北過涿鹿,	a	1
1.46:12	〔余〕東漸於海,	a	1
1.46:12	〔余〕南浮江淮矣,	a	1
1.46:12	〔余〕至長老皆各往往稱黃帝、堯、舜之處，風教固殊焉，總之不離古文者近是。〔…〕	a	1
1.46:13	予觀春秋、國語，其發明五帝德、帝繫姓章矣，顧弟弗深考，其所表見皆不虛	A	4
1.46:15	余并論次，擇其言尤雅者，故著為本紀書首。	A	5
1.46:15	〔余〕擇其言尤雅者，故著為本紀書首。	a	6
1.46:15	〔余〕故著為本紀書首。	a	6
3.109:14	余以頌次契之事，自成湯以來，采於書詩。	A	6
6.293:2[51]	[吾讀秦紀，〔…〕]	-	-
7.338:14	吾聞之周生曰「舜目蓋重瞳子」，又聞項羽亦重瞳子。羽豈其苗裔邪？何興之暴也！	B	2
7.338:14	〔吾〕又聞項羽亦重瞳子。羽豈其苗裔邪？何興之暴也！	b	2
12.486:3[52]	余從巡祭天地諸神名山川而封禪焉。	A	1
12.486:3	〔余〕入壽宮侍祠神語,	a	1
12.486:3	〔余〕究觀方士祠官之言,	a	5
12.486:4	於是〔余〕退	a	1
12.486:4	而〔余〕論次自古以來用事於鬼神者，具見其表裏。	a	6
13.488:1	余讀諜記，黃帝以來皆有年數。	A	4
15.687:3	余於是因秦記，踵春秋之後,	A	6
15.687:3	〔余〕起周元王,	a	6
15.687:3	〔余〕表六國時事,	a	6
15.687:3	〔余〕訖二世，凡二百七十年,	a	6
15.687:3	〔余〕著諸所聞興壞之端。後有君子，以覽觀焉。	a	6
18.877:11	余讀高祖侯功臣,	A	4
18.877:11	〔余〕察其首封，所以失之者，曰：異哉所聞！	a	5
18.877:11	所以失之者，〔余〕曰：異哉所聞！	a	3
23.1157:8	余至大行禮官,	A	1
23.1157:9	〔余〕觀三代損益,	a	4

50 Alternatively used for 余. Occurs only once, in *Shiji* 1.46:13.

51 The "I" voice emerging here is part of a later addition to the *Shiji* text so that it is not counted in the list. For a closer analysis of the text that can be assigned to Ban Gu, see my article on Ziying in this volume.

52 As I have discussed elsewhere, the text of this chapter is almost wholly a doublet of *Shiji* 28. See Schaab-Hanke (2002a), page 143, footnote 10. Nevertheless, since the text occurs twice in the received text, the "I" references occurring here have been included in the table.

reference	passage in a *taishigong yue* section	FP	IR
23.1157:9	〔余〕乃知緣人情而制禮，依人性而作儀，其所由來尚矣。	a	5
24.1175:10	余每讀虞書，	A	4
24.1175:10	〔余〕至於君臣相敕，	a	4
24.1175:10	維是幾安，而股肱不良，萬事墮壞，〔余〕未嘗不流涕也。	a	5
27.1350:3	余觀史記，	A	4
27.1350:3	〔余〕考行事，百年之中，五星無出而不反逆行，反逆行，嘗盛大而變色；日月薄蝕，行南北有時：此其大度也。	a	5
28.1404:4	余從巡祭天地諸神名山川而封禪焉。	A	1
28.1404:4	〔余〕入壽宮侍祠神語，	a	1
28.1404:4	〔余〕究觀方士祠官之意，	a	5
28.1404:5	〔余〕於是退	a	1
28.1404:5	而〔余〕論次自古以來用事於鬼神者，具見其表裏。	a	5
29.1415:4	余南登廬山，	A	1
29.1415:4	〔余〕觀禹疏九江，	a	2
29.1415:4	〔余〕遂至于會稽太湟，	a	1
29.1415:4	〔余〕上姑蘇，	a	1
29.1415:4	〔余〕望五湖；	a	2
29.1415:5	〔…〕〔余〕曰：甚哉，水之為利害也！	a	3
29.1415:6	余從負薪塞宣房，	A	1
29.1415:6	〔余〕悲瓠子之詩而作河渠書。	a	5
31.1475:13	余讀春秋古文，	A	4
31.1475:14	〔余〕乃知中國之虞與荊蠻句吳兄弟也。	a	5
32.1513:1	吾適齊，〔…〕	B	1
33.1548:3	余聞孔子稱曰「甚矣魯道之衰也！洙泗之閒斷斷如也」。	A	2
33.1548:3	〔余〕觀慶父及叔牙閔公之際，何其亂也？	a	4
35.1574:4	余尋曹共公之不用僖負羈，	A	5
35.1574:4	乃乘軒者三百人，〔余〕知唯德之不建。	a	5
37.1605:4	余讀世家言，	A	4
37.1605:4	〔余〕至於宣公之太子以婦見誅，弟壽爭死以相讓，此與晉太子申生不敢明驪姬之過同，俱惡傷父之志。然卒死亡，何其悲也！	a	1
43.1833:4	吾聞馮王孫曰：「趙王遷，其母倡也，嬖於悼襄王。	B	2
44.1864:8	吾適故大梁之墟，〔…〕	B	1
44.1864:9	〔…〕，余以為不然。天方令秦平海內，其業未成，魏雖得阿衡之佐，曷益乎？	A	4
47.1947:7	余讀孔氏書，	A	4
47.1947:7	〔余〕想見其為人。	a	5
47.1947:7	〔余〕適魯，	a	1
47.1947:7	〔余〕觀仲尼廟堂車服禮器，〔…〕	a	2
47.1947:8	余祗迴留之不能去云。	A	5
55.2049:5	余以為其人計魁梧奇偉，	A	5
55.2049:5	〔余〕至見其圖，狀貌如婦人好女。	A	2
61.2121:9	余登箕山，其上蓋有許由冢云。孔子序列古之仁聖賢人，如吳太伯、伯夷之倫詳矣。	A	1
61.2121:10	余以所聞由、光義至高，其文辭不少概見，何哉？	A	2
62.2136:4	吾讀管氏牧民、山高、乘馬、輕重、九府，及晏子春秋，詳哉其言之也。	B	4
62.2137:1	假令晏子而在，余雖為之執鞭，所忻慕焉。[53]	-	-
64.2160:4	余讀司馬兵法，閎廓深遠，	A	4
64.2160:4	雖三代征伐，〔余〕未能竟其義，〔…〕	a	5
67.2226:10	余以弟子名姓文字悉取論語弟子問，	A	6
67.2226:10	〔余〕并次為篇，疑者闕焉。	a	6

reference	passage in a *taishigong yue* section	FP	IR
68.2237:13	余嘗讀商君開塞耕戰書，與其人行事相類。卒受惡名於秦，有以也夫！[53]	A	4
69.2277:7	吾故列其行事，	B	6
69.2277:7	〔吾〕次其時序，毋令獨蒙惡聲焉。	b	6
74.2343:6	余讀孟子書，	A	4
74.2343:6	〔余〕至梁惠王問「何以利吾國」，	a	1
74.2343:6	〔余〕未嘗不廢書而歎也。	a	5
74.2343:6	〔余〕曰：〔…〕	a	3
75.2363:5	吾嘗過薛，其俗閭里率多暴桀子弟，與鄒、魯殊。問其故，曰：「孟嘗君招致天下任俠，姦人入薛中蓋六萬餘家矣。」世之傳孟嘗君好客自喜，名不虛矣。	B	1
77.2385:5	吾過大梁之墟，	B	1
77.2385:5	〔吾〕求問其所謂夷門。	b	3
78.2399:1	吾適楚，觀春申君故城，宮室盛矣哉！	B	1
78.2399:1	〔吾〕觀春申君故城，宮室盛矣哉！	b	2
83.2479:1	魯連其指意雖不合大義，然余多其在布衣之位，〔…〕	A	5
83.2479:2	〔…〕，吾是以附之列傳焉。	B	6
84.2503:13	余讀離騷、天問、招魂、哀郢，	A	4
84.2503:13	〔余〕悲其志。適長沙，	a	5
84.2503:13	〔余〕觀屈原所自沈淵，	a	4
84.2503:13	〔余〕未嘗不垂涕，	a	5
84.2503:13	〔余〕想見其為人。〔…〕	a	5
86.2538:9	始公孫季功、董生與夏無且游，具知其事，為余道之如是。	A	3
88.2570:10	吾適北邊，	B	1
88.2570:10	〔吾〕自直道歸，	b	1
88.2570:10	〔吾〕行觀蒙恬所為秦築長城亭障，塹山堙谷，通直道，固輕百姓力矣。〔…〕此其兄弟遇誅，不亦宜乎！何乃罪地脈哉？	b	2
92.2629:15	吾如淮陰，〔…〕	B	1
92.2629:15	〔…〕淮陰人為余言，〔…〕	A	3
92.2630:1	余視其母冢，良然。	A	2
95.2673:8	吾適豐沛，〔…〕	B	1
95.2673:8	〔吾〕問其遺老，	b	3
95.2673:8	〔吾〕觀故蕭、曹、樊噲、滕公之家，及其素，異哉所聞！	b	3
95.2673:9	余與他廣通，	A	3
95.2673:9	為〔余〕言高祖功臣之興時若此云。	a	5
97.2705:14	余讀陸生新語書十二篇，固當世之辯士。	A	4
97.2705:15	至平原君子與余善，	A	3
97.2705:15	〔余〕是以得具論之。	a	6
104.2779:2	仁與余善，	A	3
104.2779:2	余故并論之。	A	6
108.2865:4	余與壺遂定律曆，	A	6
108.2865:4	〔余〕觀韓長孺之義，〔…〕	a	4
109.2878:9	余睹李將軍悛悛如鄙人，〔…〕	A	2

53 Here, the historiographer clearly refers to *Lunyu* 7.12 where the Master is quoted with the words: 富而可求也，雖執鞭之士，吾亦為之。如不可求，從吾所好。 Remarkably, the pronoun 吾 used in *Lunyu* is replaced by 余 here.

111.2946:11	蘇建語余曰：「吾嘗責大將軍至尊重，〔…〕	A	3
117.3073:7	[余采其語可論者著于篇。][54]	-	-
121.3115:6	余讀功令，	A	3
121.3115:6	〔余〕至於廣厲學官之路，	a	1
121.3115:6	〔余〕未嘗不廢書而歎也。	a	5
121.3115:6	〔余〕曰：〔…〕	a	3
123.3179:13	〔…〕至禹本紀、山海經所有怪物，余不敢言之也。	A	4
124.3189:9	吾視郭解，狀貌不及中人，〔…〕	B	2
127.3221:4	古者卜人所以不載者，多不見于篇。及至司馬季主，余志而著之。	A	5
128.3225:9	余至江南，〔…〕	A	1
128.3225:9	〔…〕，〔余〕觀其行事，〔…〕	a	2
128.3225:9	〔…〕，〔余〕 問其長老，云龜千歲乃遊蓮葉之上，蓍百莖共一根。又其所生，獸無虎狼，草無毒螫。	a	3
130.3299:11	余聞之先人曰：〔…〕	A	2
130.3321:11	余述歷黃帝以來至太初而訖，百三十篇。	A	5

Table 2: Occurrences of *Wu* 吾 and *Yu* 余
Within Six Categories of Circumstantial Evidence[55]

categories	"I"-references	by use of		occurrences
		吾	余 [予]	
1 (moving "I")	16+[15]	8+[1]	8+[14]	1.46:11 余; 1.46:12 [余]; 1.46:12 [余]; 1.46:12 [余]; 1.46:12 [余]; 12.486:3 余[56]; 12.486:3 [余]; 12.486:4 [余]; 23.1157:8 余; 28.1404:4 余; 28.1404:4 [余]; 28.1404:5 [余]; 29.1415:4 余; 29.1415:4 [余]; 29.1415:4 [余]; 29.1415:6 余; 32.1513:1 吾; 44.1864:8 吾; 47.1947:7 [余]; 61.2121:9 余; 74.2343:6 [余]; 75.2363:5 吾; 77.2385:5 吾; 78.2399:1 吾; 88.2570:10 吾; 88.2570:10 [吾]; 92.2629:15 余; 95.2673:8 吾; 121.3115:6 [余]; 128.3225:9 余

54 Since in this passage, a comparison is drawn between Sima Xiangru and Yang Xiong, who both lived later than Sima Qian, this passage must be an interpolation; thus the *yu* which occurs there is not counted in the list.

55 A first person pronoun (FP) put in parentheses means that the reference is not explicit but implicit, because the effect of a FP in the first part of the sentence is still continuing.

categories	"I"-references	by use of		occurrences
		吾	余 [予]	
2 (perceiving "I")	9+[7]	3+[3]	6+[4]	7.338:14 吾; 7.338:14 [吾]; 29.1415:4 [余]; 29.1415:4 [余]; 33.1548:3 余; 43.1833:4 吾; 47.1947:7 [余]; 55.2049:5 [余]; 61.2121:10 余; 78.2399:1 [吾]; 88.2570:10 [吾]; 92.2630:1 余; 95.2673:8 [吾]; 97.2705:15 余; 109.2878:9 余; 124.3189:9 吾; 128.3225:9 [余]; 130.3299:11 余
3 (communicating "I")	7+[8]	0+[3]	7+[5]	18.877:11 [余]; 29.1415:5 [余]; 74.2343:6 [余]; 77.2385:5 [吾]; 86.2538:9 余; 92.2629:15 余; 95.2673:8 [吾]; 95.2673:8 [吾]; 95.2673:9 余; 97.2705:15: 余; 104.2779:2 余; 111.2946:11 余; 121.3115:6 [余]; 128.3225:9 [余];
4 (reading "I")	16+[5]	1+[0]	15+[5]	1.46:14予; 13.488:1 余; 15.687:3 余; 18.877:11 余; 23.1157:9 [余]; 24.1175:10 余; 24.1175:10 [余]; 27.1350:3 余; 31.1475:13 余; 33.1548:3 [余]; 37.1605:4 余; 47.1947:7 余; 62.2136:4 吾; 64.2160:4 余; 68.2237:13 余; 74.2343:6 余; 84.2503:13 余; 84.2503:13 [余]; 97.2705:14 余; 121.3115:6 余

56 As I have been able to show elsewhere, a major part of *Shiji* 12 is simply a doublet of *Shiji* 28 and has probably been copied later into the chapter. It is for this reason that the *yu* of *Shiji* 12 is enclosed in brackets.

categories	"I"-references	by use of		occurrences
		吾	余 [予]	
5 (reflective "I)	7+[18]	0+[0]	7+[18]	12.486:3 [余]; 18.877:11 [余]; 23.1157:9 [余]; 24.1175:10 [余]; 27.1350:3 [余]; 28.1404:4 [余]; 28.1404:5 [余]; 29.1415:6 [余]; 31.1475:14 [余]; 35.1574:4 余; 35.1574:4 [余]; 44.1864:9 余; 47.1947:7 [余]; 47.1947:8 余; 55.2049:5 余; 64.2160:4 [余]; 74.2343:6 [余]; 83.2479:1 余; 84.2503:13 [余]; 84.2503:13 [余]; 84.2503:13 [余]; 108.2865:4 [余]; 121.3115:6 [余]; 123.3179:13 余;
6 (compiling "I")	7+[10]	2+[1]	5+[9]	1.46:15 [余]; 1.46:15 [余]; 1.46:16 余; 3.109:14 余; 12.486:4 [余]; 15.687:3 余; 15.687:3 [余]; 15.687:3 [余]; 15.687:3 [余]; 15.687:3 [余]; 67.2226:10 余; 67.2226:10 [余]; 69.2277:7 吾; 69.2277:7 [吾]; 83.2479:2 吾; 97.2705:15 [余]; 104.2779:2 余; 108.2865:4 余; 127.3221:4 余; 130.3321:11 余
total:	**125=62+[63]**	**14+[8]**	**48+[55]**	