

# The *junzi* (Gentleman) in the *Shiji* and the question of authorial intent\*

Dorothee Schaab-Hanke

## Introduction

This essay scrutinizes references to a *junzi* 君子 (Gentleman, hereafter: G.) in the book which later came to be called the *Shiji* 史記.<sup>1</sup> These references will be analysed and interpreted primarily with regard to what they convey to an attentive reader about the basic tenets and inclinations of the author, or, as we shall have to take into account, possibly the authors of the *Shiji*. The question of how probable a dual authorship is will, however, be postponed to the last section of this essay and it will, for sake of convenience, until then only neutrally be referred to “the author” or “the author’s intent”.

The analysis will be based on a typification of all the G. references in the *Shiji* text.<sup>2</sup> The primary criteria for the classification of the G. entries will be the degree of what may be called the author’s “intellectual digest”, reaching from references which seem to have been directly transported to the *Shiji* from earlier sources to remarks which can safely be identified as genuine (or at least to a great degree genuine) reflections of the *Shiji* author himself. Especially those passages, in which we find traces of a conscious choice by the author, at times even discussing several judgements made by authorities in earlier sources, enable an attentive reader to find out much about the underlying standards of the person responsible for the record. The method I propose to follow here is thus to start out from the angle of “ideology” and to relate the results in a second step to other pieces of evidence and thus contribute to the finding of answers regarding the difficult question of *Shiji* authorship.

As far as I know, a closer scrutiny of the G. entries in the *Shiji*, other than that of those contained in *Zuozhuan*, has hitherto not yet been undertaken.<sup>3</sup> Probably the main reason for this is that the ultimate authorial judgement which corresponds to what is represented in the

---

\* This paper was originally prepared for publication in WSP (Warring States Papers). But since that publication seems to be delayed incalculably, I decided to provide it here for readers who might be interested in the topic.

<sup>1</sup> There have been many different proposals as to how the term *junzi* should be rendered most aptly. James Legge, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan (Chinese Classics)*, Oxford: Oxford, 1893–95, vol. V), translated the term with “the superior man”, John Knoblock in his translation of the *Xunzi* (Stanford: Stanford, 1988–94) prefers “Gentleman”. Stephen W. Durrant, *The Cloudy Mirror: Tension and Conflict in the Writings of Sima Qian* (New York: New York, 1995) chose the term “True Gentleman”. In this paper, I have decided to use the term “gentleman”, as the probably most often applied and also quite neutral term.

<sup>2</sup> In spite of the deficiencies of this edition, this research has been based on the Zhonghua shuju 中華書局 edition (repr. of Beijing, 1959). All references hereafter are to this edition.

<sup>3</sup> A careful study of the entries of the formula “G. says” (*junzi yue* 君子曰) in the *Zuozhuan* is that of Eric Henry, “Junzi Yue’ Versus ‘Zhongni Yue’ in *Zuozhuan*”, *HJAS* 59.1 (1999): 125–161.

formula “the G. says” (*junzi yue* 君子曰) in the *Zuo zhuan* is replaced by the formula “*Taishigong yue* 太史公曰 (The Lord The Grand Scribe says, hereafter: TSG judgement) in the *Shiji*.<sup>4</sup>

But although in the *Shiji* it is thus distinctly marked that the ultimate authority here is now represented by the judgement of a (Grand) Scribe rather than by that of an anonymous G., there are still plenty of references to a G. in the *Shiji*, notions of how a G. did or would behave in a given situation, which apparently play, as will be shown, an enormous role in this work and should thus no longer be underestimated in its interpretative value for the question of authorial intent.

## 1 Typification of the G. passages in the *Shiji*

The *Shiji* text, as in the Zhonghua shuju edition, contains altogether 152 passages in which a G. is referred to.<sup>5</sup> The range of these entries is wide. Taking the above indicated criteria of an author’s “intellectual digest” into account, I propose to distinguish four main categories of *junzi* passages:

1. Passages in which the references to a G. are explicitly marked by the *Shiji* author as either part of a direct speech or quoted from an earlier source (marked in the typification in the appendix by the letter “A”)
2. Passages in which references to G. in the *Shiji* have a direct parallel in an earlier source (marked in the typification in the appendix by the letter “B”).
3. Passages in which references to a G. have a precedent in an earlier source, either in the form that the earlier source refers to a concrete historical person who expresses criticism or praise, or in the form that the judgement expressed by the author/ compiler of the earlier source himself is transmitted by the *Shiji* author (marked in the typification in the appendix by the letter “C”)
4. Passages in which references to a G. are either by themselves part of the TSG judgement section of the *Shiji* or can plausibly be interpreted as the genuine (or to a great degree genuine) reflections of the *Shiji* author himself (marked in the typification in the appendix by “D”).

Apart from these four main categories, I have distinguished four types of entries which are mostly, but not necessarily, accumulated in one of the four main categories. These are:

1. Entries of the Acting G. type, focussing on the way a G. behaves (a)
2. Entries of the Designated G. type, in which certain persons are addressed as G. (b)
3. Entries of the Reflecting G. type (c), expressed in one of the following formulae:
  - (c1) G. says (*junzi yue* 君子曰)
  - (c2) G. criticizes (s.th.) (*junzi jizhi* 君子譏之)
  - (c3) G. knows it (*junzi zhi zhi* 君子知之)
  - (c4) G. alarmed about s.th. (*junzi ju yan* 君子懼焉)
  - (c5) G. speaks of (*junzi wei* 君子謂)
  - (c6) G. estimates s.th. highly (*junzi chang zhi* 君子長之)

<sup>4</sup> See, e.g., Li, Wai-ye, “The Idea of Authority in the *Shih chi* (*Records of the Historian*)”, *HJAS* 54.1 (1994): 345–405.

<sup>5</sup> This number includes both the doublet to *Shiji* (hereafter: SJ) 28/1404: SJ 12/486 and the G. passages in those parts for which Chu Shaosun by way of his *Chu xiansheng yue* formula signed responsible: SJ 20/1059, 58/2091, 60/2114-15, 2116, 2119, 126/3208, 3211, 127/3221 (altogether 8 passages).

## 4. Entries of the Future G. Addressed type (d)

1.1 *Junzi* references as listed in category A

Examples of this category comprise, as above defined, those passages in which the references to a G. are explicitly marked by the *Shiji* author as either part of a direct speech or quoted from an earlier source. The altogether 78 passages of this category make up 51,3% of the total. Of this category, 69 of the passages can be subsumed under the subtype (a), 8 under (b) and 1 under (c1).

Regarded from the aspect of the author's "intellectual digest", this group is the one which has the least value for the question in focus, as it is especially difficult and risky to draw any safe conclusions from statements made in a direct speech which the author has possibly transmitted from an earlier source, as to the author's intent proper.

Included in this group, though already of higher interest for the present study, are, of course, cases in which a G.'s judgement is again encapsulated in a dialogue or a context which can be identified as taken from an earlier source, as already the choice to include this - and not another - passage into the work may be interpretable as the author's conscious choice.

In the "House of Wu"<sup>6</sup> chapter of the *Shiji*, the diplomat Ji Zha is reported to praise Zizang for his decision to decline the throne offered to him after the death of Duke Xuan of Cao, saying that a G. would call him to be someone who upheld the rites (*junzi yue neng shou jie yi* 君子曰能守節矣, SJ 31/1450). A wholly parallel passage of Ji Zha's speech including his reference to the judgement of a G. is contained in the *Zuo zhuan*<sup>7</sup> (ZZ, Xiang 14.2). Here, the words of a G. are not only explicitly marked by the *Shiji* author as part of a direct speech, but become also discernible as taken from an earlier source. It is, however, the fact that the judgement is part of Ji Zha's speech which justifies subsuming the whole entry among cat. A, regardless whether in addition to this, the passage as a whole can be found in an earlier source or not.

1.2 *Junzi* references as listed in category B

This group comprises passages in which references to G. in the *Shiji* have a direct parallel in an earlier source, i.e. the passage in which a G. is referred to is identified to correspond to a passage in at least one earlier source, but without the author's direct mentioning of such an earlier source. The altogether 26 passages of this category make up 17,1% of the total. Of this category, 12 passages can be subsumed under (a), 4 under (b), 8 under (c1) and 2 under (c2).

To begin with an example for the Designated G. type (b): In „Table by Years of Twelve Feudal Lords“ in the *Shiji*, a laconic entry under “Cao” refers to someone of the state of Cao who dreamt that “all the G. had established a palace for (the goddess of) Earth (SJ 14/669). A more detailed account, also referring to the G. who established such a palace (or altar?) is

<sup>6</sup> Hereafter, titles of *Shiji* chapters will be rendered in a slightly abbreviated, but easily recognizable form, the concrete reference following at the end of the sentence within brackets.

<sup>7</sup> The following acronyms will be used hereafter for precise text references: DDLJ for *Da Dai Liji*, GLZ for *Guliang zhuan*, GY for *Guoyu*, GYZ for *Gongyang zhuan*, HS for *Hanshu*, KZJY for *Kongzi jiyu*, LY for *Lunyu*, MZ for *Mengzi*, XDLJ for *Xiao Dai Liji*, XZ for *Xunzi*, YL for *Yili*, ZGC for *Zhangguo ce*, ZZ for *Zuo zhuan*. Dynastic Histories will be referred to on the basis of the Zhonghua shuju edition. *Guoyu* on the basis of the edition published by Shanghai guji chubanshe (Shanghai, 1978). All other text references are to the ICS Ancient Chinese Text Concordance Series (Hong Kong: Shangwu yinshuguan).

contained in the “House of Guan and Cai” chapter of the *Shiji* (SJ 14/669). A parallel passage can, as part of a flashback, be found in the *Zuoꝑhuan*: “Earlier, someone of the state of Cao dreamt that all the G. had established a palace for Earth” ZZ, Ai 7.5/444/18”.

And an example of the Reflecting G. type (c): In “Qin Annals”, the *Shiji* author records that after Duke Miu of Qin had died, 170 persons had to follow him into his tomb. Upon this follows the statement of a G. (*junꝑi yue*) who criticized the duke severely for his attitude to destroy the lives of people only because of his own need to die, coming to the conclusion that because of this “brain drain” of excellent officials to the grave, the state of Qin would be doomed to never be able to make a military expedition to the East again (SJ 5/194-5). More laconically, the event is recorded also in “Tables of Twelve Feudal Lords”, where the criticism of a G. is also mentioned (SJ 14/603). Turning to the *Zuoꝑhuan*, one finds the episode reported much more detailed than in the *Shiji*, telling what exactly the G. said about the decision taken by the Duke of Qin, his statement being introduced also by the formula “a G. said” (*junꝑi yue*, ZZ, Wen 6.3/131/14).

Another example which shows that the *Shiji* author here seems to have adopted the version of the *Zuoꝑhuan*, although a different judgement would have been offered by another *Chunqiu* exegetical source, the *Gongyang ꝑhuan*, is the following:

In the “House of Song” chapter of the *Shiji*, we learn that upon the death of Duke Mu of Song, Duke Xuan, his elder brother, decided to offer the throne to the duke’s son Yuli. A G., the account continues, upon hearing of this said (*junꝑi wenzꝑi yue*): “The Duke can be called someone who knew men. He put his younger brother on the throne, and upon his death, his son again followed him (SJ 38/1623). In the *Zuoꝑhuan*, we find the same judgement as the statement of a G. (ZZ, zu Yin 3.5/6/7). The author/ compiler of the *Gongyang ꝑhuan*, however, under the same *Chunqiu* entry (Duke Yin of Lu, 3rd year) comments that the calamity of Song had been brought about by Duke Xuan of Song (GYZ, Yin 3.7/4/7).

### 1.3 *Junꝑi* references as listed in category C

This group lists references to a G. which have a precedent in an earlier source, either in the form that the earlier source refers to a concrete historical person who expresses criticism or praise, or in the form that the judgement expressed by the author/ compiler of the earlier source himself is transmitted by the *Shiji* author. The altogether 14 passages of this category make up 9,2% of the total. All the passages of this category can be subsumed under the subtype (c), i.e. the Reflecting G. type. Of these, the most often appearing subtype is (c2): 10 passages out of 14,<sup>8</sup> followed by (c1): 2 p., (c3): 1 p., (c4): 1 p.

In some cases, both a concrete earlier historical persona and the author/ compiler of the earlier source comment on the case, or a whole chain of worthies of different ages is recorded with their respective comments. Of the many different forms of this category only one example for each will be given below.

(1) To begin with an example in which the G. reference in the *Shiji* has a precedent in an earlier source where a concrete persona expresses praise or blame:

According to “Tables of Twelve Feudal Lords”, a G. criticized the Earl of Jin’s decision to confer to his two sons names which would predetermine them to become rebels, a presage which, as the *Shiji* also records, in fact happened later (SJ 14/525). A more detailed account in

<sup>8</sup> It should be added here that of these 10 passages 7 are contained in ch.14; 2 in ch.33; 1 in ch.43.

which not an anonymous G. but Master Fu (*shi* Fu 師服) of Jin criticizes the duke is contained in the “House of Jin” chapter of the *Shiji* (SJ 39/1637). The *Zuo*zhuan reports of Jiang Shi’s giving birth to a son, designed to be the crown prince, named Chou (“enemy”), a second son (born during a fight) who got the name Chengshi 成師 (“accomplished general”) and an elaborate comment by Master Fu on the rules concerning properly naming and what happens if this is not the case (ZZ, Huan 2.8/21/1-3).

(2) As to cases in which criticism is not only expressed by a concrete historical persona referred to an earlier source but also by the author/ compiler of this earlier source, the example of Duke Yin of Lu’s wish to observe the fishing in Tang will be given below.

“Tables of Twelve Feudal Lords” records under „Lu“ for the 2nd year of Duke Yin of Lu (718 B.C.) that a G. criticized the Duke (Yin of Lu) for his desire to observe the fishing in Tang (SJ 14/551). A slightly more detailed account of this is contained in the “House of Lu” chapter, here also using the formula “a G. criticized it” (SJ 33/1529). In *Zuo*zhuan, we find under the 5<sup>th</sup> year of duke Yin of Lu the *Chunqiu* entry that in spring (of this year) the Duke went to observe the fishing. To this *Zuo*zhuan adds a long speech of Zang Xibo 臧僖伯 remonstrating with the duke. The duke, we learn, in the end did not obey Zang’s advice but went to see the fishing, upon which either Zang himself or someone who got the order by him, recorded the event, together with the judgement that this was contrary to the rites (ZZ, Yin 5.1/8/23-30).

Turning to the comments given by the *Gongyang* zhuan and *Guliang* zhuan under the *Chunqiu* record mentioning the Duke’s observing of the fishing in Tang, we find the following comment by the author/ compiler of the *Gongyang* zhuan: “Why has this been recorded? – In order to criticize (it). – Why was it criticized? – (Due to the fact that he would have moved) too far! - Why would the Duke have had to move too far in order to observe the fishing? – Because he would have had to climb in order to arrive there. ...” (GYZ, Yin 5.1/5/7) Very much in same vein, the author/ compiler of the *Guliang* zhuan comments: “In his 5th year, in spring, the Duke went to observe the fishing in Tang. ... The fact that the Duke went to observe it, was contrary to the rites!” (GLZ, Yin 5.1/4/17)

(3) In some cases, the *Shiji* author seems to have made his choice among a range of several given models of ritual/ ethical interpretation.

An example is the account on the defeat of Duke Xiang of Song at Hong, in which the *Shiji* author explicitly acknowledges contrary judgements from the part of the authors/ compilers of different *Chunqiu* exegetical sources, but clearly has his own preferences among them.

In the “House of Song” chapter, the author demonstrates how wrong decisions of rulers lead to the decay and finally the perishing of the state of Song. In the course of the chapter the author makes clear that because of the duke’s staunch sticking to a rule he had learned to obey and because he did not listen to the advice of Ziyu who recommended him to attack the army of Chu before the soldiers after passing the river had returned to correct array, only one further step to the decay and final extinction of the state of Song was done (SJ 38/1626). In the TSG judgement at the end of the chapter, the author refers, however, to the opinion of “some (or one) among the G. who judged the Duke’s decision as being superior” (*junzi buo yivei duo* 君子或以為多) to what Ziyu had advised him to do.

If one turns to the *Chunqiu* exegetical texts, one finds that not only *Zuo*zhuan but also *Gongyang* zhuan and *Guliang* zhuan comment on this episode. From the account given in the *Zuo*zhuan 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 of waiting, due to rites he had learned to obey to (ZZ, Xi 22.8/99/1).<sup>9</sup> The author of the *Guliang zhuàn* interprets the duke's defeat in Hong as the just penalty for his failure in how to lead a war (GLZ, Xi 22.4/49/26). Whereas both the author of the *Zuozhuan* and the *Guliang zhuàn* thus unanimously condemn Duke Xiang of Song for his acting, it is the *Gongyang zhuàn* which 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 (GYZ, Xi 22.4/50/27). From the comparison of the different interpretations it can be concluded that the *Shiji* author adopts the position of the *Zuozhuan* in the very way the fate of Song is depicted, but at the same time he is perfectly aware of a different possible evaluation of Duke Xiang and acknowledges the contrary position as being equally that of a G.

A detail which seems to me of special interest is a remark in the Rhymed Prefaces part of the *Shiji* related to the „House of Song“ chapter in which just the contrary opinion is expressed, namely it is called into question here that any G. would praise Duke Xiang of Song (*jūnzǐ shū chēng* 君子熟稱: “Who among the G. would praise him?”), and only slightly further on in the text it is emphasized that the consequence of all this was that Song had perished (SJ 130/ 3308). This remark is strikingly at variance with the moderate statement in ch.38 according to which it is even stressed that “some among the G.” estimated the duke's behaviour highly.

Although the *Shiji* author adopts the position of the author/ compiler of the *Gongyang zhuàn* by saying that “one among the G.” estimates (the duke's attitude) more highly. But at the same time it shows very clearly that the *Shiji* author must have keenly been aware of the existence of different judgements and noting their existing down in the way he did.

(4) In the following case, the account of one and the same episode in different chapters of the *Shiji* are conspicuously at variance with each other, corresponding with different accounts in texts representing different exegetical traditions of the *Chunqiu*:

In the “House of Zhao” chapter of the *Shiji*, a G. is recorded to have criticized Zhao Dun for his role in the context of the murder of Duke Ling of Jin. Due to this criticism, the account continues, the Grand Scribe (of Jin) recorded that Zhao Dun murdered his duke (SJ 43/1782). Interestingly enough, a reference to the same episode which seems, however, to be somewhat at variance with the account in the chapter on Zhao, is that contained in the “House of Jin” chapter of the *Shiji* (SJ 39/1675). There it is the Grand Scribe himself from whose mouth exactly the criticism is quoted, the same which is ascribed to an anonymous G. in the chapter on Zhao. In addition, a comment of Master Kong is found here, which modifies the severe reproach of murder into an equivalent praise on both the scribe and Zhao Dun.

In the *Zuozhuan*, we find under the 2nd ear of Duke Xuan of Lu of the *Chunqiu* entry which refers to the murder of Duke Ling a comment in which not only the criticism which was in *Shiji* 43 recorded as that of an anonymous G., here ascribed to the Grand Scribe (as in SJ 39), but also the modifying comment added by Confucius, following a defense by Zhao Dun on the Grand Scribe's reproach (ZZ, Xuan 2.3/158/16). Contrarily, both the *Gongyang zhuàn* and the *Guliang*

<sup>9</sup> 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, where he argues that: „In the accounts in the *Zuozhuan*, (...), the longer speech and the last word carry the greater weight.“

*zhuàn* end up with the reproach by the scribe of Jin, thus rejecting any apology for Zhao Dun, as the Zuozhuan author obviously does (GYZ, Xuan 6.1/75/13, GLZ, Xuan 2.4/71/19).

#### 1.4 *Junzi* references as listed in category D

This category comprises references to a G. which are either by themselves part of the TSG judgement section of the *Shiji* or can plausibly be interpreted as the genuine (or to a great degree genuine) reflection of the *Shiji* author himself. The altogether 34 passages of this category make up 22,4% of the total. Of this category, 11 passages are of subtype (a), 14 of (b), 1 each of (c2), (c5) and (c6), and 6 of (d).

Of course, the latter is at times difficult to decide with safety, especially in cases where an author's judgement may seem genuinely his own at first sight but at closer scrutiny one finds if not literal parallels but at least statements pointing to the same direction in earlier sources which the author probably knew. In what follows, only a provisory highlighting of typical examples counted among this category will be made; a more thorough approach would afford much more careful analysis and also more time and space.

(1) Among the passages which can rather safely be subsumed among "D" are those contained within the TSG judgement sections. Among them two sub-groups will be distinguished here:

(a) One group is that in which the TSG authority addresses G. of a future generation. As the examples of this group are few but important, they will all be listed here:

In the introduction to „Table by Years of Six States“, the TSG emphasizes that this table was conceived by him for the G. 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 zhi duan* 興壞之端, SJ 15/687).

In a very similar vein, and again introducing a table, namely that on meritorious generals of the time of Gaozu, the TSG addresses the G. of a future generation to draw their own conclusions from the data he had recorded on this table (SJ 18/878). There is an interesting addition there, namely, that he omitted what is dubious, thus alluding to a principle laid down earlier by Confucius.

At the end of the "Sacrifices" chapter, the TSG 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 addresses then future G. who should draw their conclusions from a comparison of Emperor Wu's outward behaviour and inner attitude (SJ 28/1404, and identically in the doublet, SJ 12/486).

Slightly different from the other examples, as it is not directly addressed to future G., but formulated as the hope that this work would await the Wise and the G. of a future generation, is the TSG remark at the end of the last chapter of the *Shiji*, which is at the same time part of the rhymed preface summarizing the overall idea of the last chapter of the *Shiji* (SJ 130/3320).<sup>10</sup>

(b) Another group which may be distinguished comprises judgements on persons of past and present. The examples which are contained in TSG judgement sections will be separately listed from those who are not, although both seem to me to represent genuine authorial judgements.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. the parallel remark in GYZ, Ai 14.1/158/15.

In the “House of Wu” chapter, Ji Zha, the famous prince and diplomat of Wu, is praised by the TSG at the end of the chapter as a “G. of vast insight and broad knowledge” (*bonglan bonu junzi* 閱覽博物君子, SJ 31/1475). There is a similar statement in the “House of Zheng” chapter, recorded as from the mouth of Duke Ping of Jin and Shu Xiang, denoting Zi Chan as a “G. of broad knowledge” (*bonu junzi* 博物君子, SJ 42/1772), and this has a literal parallel in the *Zuo zhuan* (ZZ, Zhao 1.12/319/17). In this case the author’s praise for Ji Zha may have been inspired by the praise addressed to Zi Chan, as evidenced in the *Zuo zhuan*.

In the introductory remark to the “Table of Twelve Feudal States” chapter, Zuo Qiuming is praised by the TSG as the “G. from Lu” (SJ 14/509).

In the chapter devoted to Huoli Ziji and Gan Mou, the author acknowledges both men as “though not G. of sincere conduct” (*fei duxing zhi junzi* 非篤行之君子), but belonging to the strategic heroes (*ceshi* 策士) of the Warring States times (SJ 71/2321).<sup>11</sup>

At the end of the composite biographies of Fu Kuan, Qin Xi and Zhou Xie, who lived during the reign of Han Gaozu, the TSG praises Zhou Xie as someone who should be called a sincere and magnanimous G. (*ke wei duhou junzi* 可謂篤厚君子, SJ 98/2713).

In the collective biography devoted to Shi Fen, Wei Wan, Zhi Buyi, Zhou Ren and Zhang Shu, two kinds of judgements as regards Shi Fen, Wei Wan and Zhang Shu are expressed in the TSG section (SJ 103/2774). The first judgement says “a G. would criticize them, due to their being close to servile flatterers” (*junzi jizhi, 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 judgement, saying that these men could (nevertheless) be called “G. of sincere conduct” (*duxing junzi* 篤行君子). Whereas the first statement thus seems to refer to some traditional or more conventional judgement, or even someone whose judgement the author was well familiar with and on which he reflects here, the second statement, i.e. the more moderate one, must be that of the author as ultimate instance himself. It should be added here that at the end of ch.130, the autobiographical last chapter of the *Shiji*, we find in the rhymed preface corresponding to ch.103 a further judgement of a G. which confirms that a G. would estimate these persons (whom the biography is devoted to) highly (SJ 130/3316).

The chapter on Han Changru (= Han Anguo) contains an almost ardently enthusiastic praise of Hu Sui, denoting him as a „respectful and devoted G.“ (*jugong junzi* 鞠躬君子, SJ 108/2865). This exuberant judgement is all the more surprising, as there is in fact not a single word of praise in the TSG judgement addressed to Han Anguo himself. The only bridge between Han Anguo and Hu Sui is the association that Han Anguo had recommended him for service in Liang.<sup>12</sup>

(2) Outside the TSG judgement sections proper there are several further examples of judgements in which persons of past and present or even representatives of groups are denoted as G. which I am also inclined to take as genuine judgements of the *Shiji* author. Some of these will be assembled below:

<sup>11</sup> For the request that a *Ru* scholar should have broad education (*boxue* 博學) and a sincere conduct (*duxing* 篤行) see XDIJ 42.6/163/27. For the Master’s response on Zizhang’s question about correct conduct, that in his conduct one should always be “sincere and respectful” (*xing dujing* 行篤敬), see LY 15.6/42/11.

<sup>12</sup> For the term *jugong* 鞠躬 (respectful and devoted) as a rule of conduct as prescribed for a guest who enters the door, see YL, „Binli“, 8/54/14.



In the “House of Chen and Qi” chapter, the author refers to the Duke of Zhou who in his “Cicai” (Timber of the *Ci* Tree)<sup>13</sup> intended to show what a G. would take as his model (SJ 37/1590).

In the chapter devoted to Laozi and Han Feizi, Laozi is designated as the Hidden G. (*yin junzi* 隱君子, SJ 63/2142).

In the “Pitch Pipes” chapter, the author praises Han Emperor Wen as someone whom Confucius would call a “G. who has virtue” (*you de junzi* 有德君子, SJ 25/1243).

In the “Officer of Heaven” chapter, the author refers to a G. who would be alarmed if the Four Planets had a conjunction, whereas the petty men would dissipate. It seems that the “G. versus Petty man” dichotomy has here intentionally been applied on the realm of astrologers (SJ 27/1321).

In the collective biography devoted to the social group of “wandering knights” (*youxia* 游俠), the author refers, probably as an ironical pun which alludes to the above mentioned *duxing junzi* 篤行君子 (G. of sincere conduct), to people who “when reading books long for the virtue of an independently acting G. (*du shu huai duxing junzi zhi de* 讀書懷獨行君子之德, SJ 124/3181). And later in the same chapter, shortly before the beginning of the TSG judgement section, the author states that “although these people were among the knights, they still breathe the air of G. who due to their own retiring advance others” (*suiran wei xia er lingling you tuirang junzi zhi feng* 雖為俠而遂有退讓君子之風, SJ 124/3188). If one tries to imagine how Confucius would have judged on people such as the “wandering knights” one gets the impression that the judgement expressed here is conspicuously mild.

In the “Hemerologists” chapter, Sima Jizhu, an astrologer working on the market place of Chang’an, meets the court officials Jia Yi and Song Zhong and instructs them with the maxim of “transmitting and not inventing is the righteousness of the G.” (*shu er bu zuo, junzi yi ye* 述而不作, 君子義也), as interpreted in the light of observing and interpreting the motions of the heavenly bodies (SJ 127/3219).

## 2 Ideological differences or inconsistencies within the G. material

It is time now to summarize the results we have so far as regards the evidence of the examples of the four categories with regard to the question of authorial intent.

What the in fact very heterogeneous examples listed among category A have in common is that it is very difficult to draw more than only very rough conclusions from them as regards the underlying intent of the *Shiji* author. The major part of the passages quote someone else’s definition for what a G. would do or say in a given situation. For only a minority of them I have hitherto been able to find a parallel in an earlier source. Quite a few of these reveal, however, one very important detail about the author’s intent when making his choice among the material which he had at his disposal: that in a broad variety of spheres (historical events, rites, music, etc.) the record of the judgements of a G. or even the definition of what a G. would do in a given situation, must have played an enormous role for the author, in other words, the author seems to have been much inclined to refer to models in his work which would serve as an orientation aid for himself and for his future readers.

As for the examples listed in the categories B and C, at the very centre of both are the reflections of a G., either in the parallel form as “a G.” (if transmitted in the form of cat. B.) or in an

<sup>13</sup> “Cicai 梓材” is chapter 29 of the *Shangshu*.

intellectually more digested manner (if transmitted from cat. C) which could be identified as taken from some earlier source by the *Shiji* author. Both the examples belonging to categories B and C. often appear in the *Shiji* in a much more laconic form. From this it may be inferred that the main interest of the author did not lie so much on the exact words of that G. but rather on the outcome, whether he criticized or whether he praised a given situation, and this judgement again is often recorded in combination with a presage concerning the fate of an individual or a state. What is more, from examples raised with regard to cases where even the judgements of the authors/ compilers of the *Zuo zhuan*, *Gongyang zhuan* or *Guliang zhuan* have been included by the *Shiji* author, we can infer that the author himself acts here in the role of a *Chunqiu* exegete, as someone who cares much for the judgements of earlier exegetes, but feels competent to weigh them one against the other, competent also to make his own choice among them.

As for category D, the examples assembled here are certainly the most heterogeneous and at times even conspicuously contradictory. The majority of them seem also, as we have seen, to be very much directed toward the past, adopting earlier personae and historical events as models which have been applied by the *Shiji* author on other, mostly more recent, sometimes surprisingly unconventional cases. It even seems that in some cases the degree in which the application deviated from a model given is so high that the authorial intent almost seems to convey a kind of irony or even a cynical vein.

On a whole, but perhaps primarily as evolving from the examples contained in cat. D, the attentive reader cannot help feeling that the G. material is too heterogeneous for convincingly be attributable to one single author or to a single authorial intent. Rather, the material in many cases could easily be separated as to originate from exactly two authorial intents. There is, however, as will be argued below, equally distinct, one major concern, a concern which seems to underlie the majority of examples in all the four categories. Upon focusing on this major concern as a first, I will proceed then and try to distinguish between the above suggested “two authorial intents” as evolving from within this major trend.

### 3 The TSG identity as the intended common denominator in the *Shiji*

As the above raised examples show, it seems possible to perceive differences as to ideological basic tenets from G. material. One has, however, to be extremely cautious with attributing passages or even whole chapters to either Tan or Qian, especially from the angle of ideology, because one has to take into account that the major intent of this book consists in conveying something which can be characterized as a corporate identity. As the instance of the ultimate judging authority in this work is incorporated by the well-known formula “The Lord The Grand Scribe (TSG) says”, I propose to use the term “TSG identity” as a term for this corporate identity. This identity may well be first have been established by Sima Tan himself, and it is of pivotal importance, as I had emphasized already in earlier studies, to separate this identity completely from the official tasks he fulfilled at the court of Han Emperor. The domain for which the TSG claims to be responsible surpasses by far his official competences, although these are also part of this identity: the choosing of ominous days for sacrifices and other ritual activities, advisory tasks concerning these sacrifices, recording of things (mostly related to portents and sacrifices, interpreting of the positions of the planets, sun eclipses, calculations of the calendar, etc. But the TSG identity encompasses much more than that. It encompasses the competence of evaluating events of past and present, encompasses the knowledge of earlier interpreters of historical events, it encompasses the right of acting as a kind of judge even with

regard to a ruler (including thus the right of criticising him) and it obviously encompasses the obligation toward worthies of a later age to share all the knowledge a TSG possess with them (this makes it necessary to record this things down and make them transparent as a system of causations) and thus enable them to assist a good ruler in a time when such a worthy ruler will appear.<sup>14</sup>

An important hint at the degree to which Qian felt urged to adapt to this kind of corporate identity is his remark in the last chapter where he records the words of his father when lying on his death-bed. Both his father's demand to continue in his sense (what I would interpret as the whole thing, i.e., the TSG identity and not only the job he in fact inherited three years after his father's death) and his own, the son's promise to be filial and not dare to remiss exactly point to the strict demand for the subjugating of any traits of authorial freedom and individuality to the interest of what has been called elsewhere in the *Shiji* and in Qian's letter to his friend Ren An to the "perfection of the words of one single master" (*cheng yi jia zhi yan* 成一家之言).<sup>15</sup>

However, at closer scrutiny, there still seems to have been at least some space left for authorial freedom and individuality, and in spite of the pressure of conformity there are, without doubts, differences with regard to authorial inclination and preference, a few examples of which will be discussed in the section below.

#### 4 Attempts at distinguishing Qian from Tan as inferred from the G. material

As has been emphasized above, when attempting at distinguishing Sima Tan and Sima Qian in the material we have, we should always take into consideration that the major ideological concern conveyed by the *Shiji* is an intended corporate identity, an identity which I call the TSG identity. As far as Tan is concerned, to adapt to this identity may not have caused him as much difficulty as it might have been to Qian, as it seems that it was exactly Tan who had established or, at least in parts, even invented exactly this identity to which son Qian was urged to adapt. Regarded in this light, for Tan the overlapping of the ultimate authority represented by the TSG judgement and Tan's thinking as a distinct individual personality may have been so strong that it will become difficult for searchers to distinguish between both. In the case of Qian it seems, however, possible to gather from the G. material at least some hints as to where he emerges as an independently judging authority, which will of course contribute to the possibility of drawing a more distinct picture of Tan as an individual, too. Below, I will raise examples for a tentative approach to distinguish Tan's from Qian's intent with regard to five different aspects:

(1) The judgements on persons of past and present as to who should be called a G., both inside and outside the TSG judgement sections, seem to originate partly from Tan and partly from Qian.

(a) We have at least one piece of hard evidence for a safe attribution of such a judgement to Sima Qian. These are the words contained in the TSG judgement section at the very end of

<sup>14</sup> There are two hints, conspicuously ad odds with each other, in SJ 130/3295 and 3296, possibly both by Sima Qian, at his fathers believing in the eschatological hope expressed in the *Mengzi* text that a wise ruler would appear in cycles of five hundred years. Cf. my: "Ein Philosoph in der Krise? - Mengzi und die Zeitenwende", *BJOAF* 24 (2000): 113-132.

<sup>15</sup> As stated in SJ 130/3320 and in the letter to Ren An (HS 62/2735).

the chapter properly devoted to the biography of Han Anguo (SJ 107/2865), praising Hu Sui as a „respectful and devoted G.“ (*jugong junzi* 鞠躬君子), instead of saying a word about Han Anguo himself. Hu Sui was, as we learn both from this passage and from the “Pitch Pipes and Calendar” chapter of the *Hanshu*,<sup>16</sup> one of Sima Qian’s colleagues with whom he had deliberated on the question of the new calendar of the Han. It is also him who is reported by Qian to have acted as a kind of *advocatus diaboli* in the conversation they had on the delicate maxim of *shu er bu zuo* 述而不作 (to transmit and not to invent).<sup>17</sup> Alone the fact that the early death of this man<sup>18</sup> is bewailed here, makes it impossible that Tan could be responsible for this judgement, but in addition, there is a very openly expressed sympathy for this man, and this can scarcely be that of any other man but Qian.<sup>19</sup>

(b) Of special interest with regard to the search for explicitly different expression of both Tan and Qian are the two judgements at the end of the chapter 103, the collective biography of Shi Fen, Wei Wan, Zhang Shu and two others (SJ 103/2774). The first judgement is an example of the (c2) type, referring to an earlier or more conventional judgement of a G. who would criticize behaviour which is “so close to that of servile flatterers”. But upon this follows a rather unconventional judgement, namely that these men should indeed be called “G. of sincere conduct”. I am inclined to interpret these two subsequential judgements both as originating from Sima Qian, but in a form in which he first reflects on how someone who would rigorously take more traditional standards of conduct as the basis against which he weighs the behaviour of Shi Fen, Wei Wan and Zhang Shu, an authority as Sima Tan may have represented it, and then arrives at his own, different final judgement, denoting them as “G. of sincere conduct”. I would thus assume that Qian is here reflecting on what his father would have said if he had the task of evaluating these men, but deviating from this in his own personal judgement.

(c) Very much in the same vein is the TSG judgement at the end of ch.124, the collective biography on “wandering knights”, where it is argued that these people “breathe the air of G. who due to their own retiring advance others” (SJ 124/3188). A closer look at the content of that chapter strongly conveys to the reader the impression that someone firmly rooted in conventional standard would scarcely have found so nice words for representatives of such a group. But the judge here seems somewhat detached from these standards, he is either more liberal or thoroughly cynical as regards the value of such a rigorous ranking.

(2) The address to G. of a later generation is a further example for both the power of the intended corporate identity and the possible chance of distinguishing between Tan and Qian. Conspicuously enough, two out of three passages (i.e. SJ 15/687 and 18/878,) following the Future G. addressed formula are parts of chapters containing tables, and even the third of the group (SJ 28/1404, the doublet in SJ 12/486 not reckoned here!) is a chapter which is obviously conceived to be a kind of table, even though it is not progressing in an x axis, y axis

<sup>16</sup> HS 21A/975.

<sup>17</sup> SJ 130/3297.

<sup>18</sup> Hu Sui had died in 127 B.C.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Zhang Dake 張大可, *Shiji xinzhu* 史記新注 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 2000), 1835, who interprets the praise on Hu Sui and his keeping silent at the same time about Han Anguo as an indirect remonstrance directed toward Han Anguo and an expression of the hope he had cherished that not Han Anguo but Hu Sui would have become chancellor, had he not died so early.

structure, but instead containing record which is denoted in the TSG judgement section as a text which should be read in the manner of comparing its *biao* 表 and *li* 裏! In other words, all the chapters in which the TSG addresses his readers to draw attentively and carefully their conclusions from it are chapters which may be called core chapters with regard to the idea that if a synopsis of past events is made thoroughly enough, a cognate mind of a future time should be able to read it as a kind of revelation and help for future decisions.

As this idea is probably exactly the common devotion of exactly the TSG identity and those sharing it, it is very difficult to decide here who wrote which part. Unfortunately, exactly the table of ch.14, “Tables for Years of the Twelve Feudal Lords”, in which, as we saw, the major part of the (c2) type formula is accumulated and which assumes that this table has been written by Tan, does not have an address to future *junzi* at all.<sup>20</sup>

In addition, the address to future G. in SJ 28/1404 is rather probably by Qian, because it contains a hint at many travels in the entourage of the emperor, and that he accompanied him to the *Feng* and *Shan* sacrifices. As we know from Qian’s letter to Ren An, Qian apologizes for just having returned from such a travel and thus only now responds to his letter.<sup>21</sup> Besides, we know from ch.130 that Tan died exactly in the year when the *Feng* and *Shan* sacrifices were performed by the emperor for the first time. Only Qian can be the one who had accompanied him and made the record of this and the later repetitions of these sacrifices.

In addition, the passage at the close of the book in which the TSG expressed the idea that this opus will be waiting for the Wise and G. of a future generation is exactly because it is part of the rhymed preface to the last chapter, i.e. the chapter in which it is contained, a strange example, almost comparable to M. C. Escher’s picture of two hands, each drawing the other hand. If not we conceive of a very complicated accretional layer structure of this chapter and assume that father Tan not only had conceived the whole book including the last, autobiographical chapter, but also ordered the son in advance to put the rhymed prefaces at its very end after having added his additional account on his father and himself, we should rather be inclined, I think to attribute this passage to Qian.

(3) The role of the TSG as a *Chunqiu* exegete is a further important aspect of the corporate identity. Part of this identity - as it is incorporated, probably, in the first place by Tan himself, is the browsing of earlier sources for judgement of earlier G. All the three *Chunqiu* exegetical sources (and not only the *Zuo zhuan*, though this was certainly the most important source among the three to the *Shiji* author)<sup>22</sup> were considered. As mentioned earlier, we even have evidence for cases in which judgements given by the authors/ compilers of the *Gongyang zhuan* and *Guliang zhuan* seem to have been preferred by the *Shiji* author. Though it seems to me

<sup>20</sup> This includes, by the way, the *Chu xiansheng yue* 褚先生曰 (CXS) judgement, as Chu Shaosun 褚少孫 as a kind of intellectual descendent also borrows this identity. For a first attempt at defining Chu Shaosun’s contribution to this corporate identity, see my paper: “Did Chu Shaosun Contribute to a Tradition of the Scribe?”, presented at the XIV. EACS Conference, Moscow, 26-28 August, 2002, forthcoming in *OE* 44 (2003-2004).

<sup>21</sup> HS 62/2726.

<sup>22</sup> The overriding importance of the *Zuo zhuan* tradition for the *Shiji* author has been emphasized by Steven H. Durrant in his study “Ssu-ma Ch’ien’s Conception of ‘Tso chuan’”, *JAOS* 112.2 (1992): 295-301.

rather difficult to distinguish between Tan and Qian with regard to the exegetical aspect, two cases will at least tentatively be discussed below.

(a) As mentioned above, there is an apparent contradiction between the TSG judgement in the “House of Song” chapter (SJ 38/1626) and in the rhymed preface related to this chapter (SJ 130/3308). Whereas in the chapter itself, in spite of a general trend of the overall account to blame Duke Xiang of Song for his staunch behaviour, in the TSG judgement section there is clear acknowledgement of a judgement praising the duke for his obeying of an earlier rule he had heard as that of a G. by the TSG authority. This stands in very contrast to the rhymed preface where it is rejected that any G. would praise the duke’s conduct as being superior.

(b) Another point in case is the twofold account of Zhao Dun being reproached to be responsible for the murder of Duke Ling of Jin. According to the “House of Jin” chapter, the Grand Scribe of Jin explains to Zhao Dun why he had recorded in the annals that Zhao Dun murdered his ruler by charging him responsible due to his attempt at leaving the state when the murder happened (SJ 39/1675). Whereas in this account, the later judgement of Confucius who praised both the scribe and Zhao Dun is added, thus in a way exculpating Dun, as it is paralleled by the *Zuo*zhuan, the account in the “House of Zhao” chapter is shorter, replaces the reference to the Scribe of Jin by that to a “G.” and omits the additional comment by Confucius altogether (SJ 43/1782). The effect of this second appearance is that this account seems at least to be closer to the judgements expressed by both the authors/ compilers of the *Gongyang* zhuan and *Guliang* zhuan who end with the reproach against Zhao Dun. If this were the case, one could further speculate on the question whether either Tan or Qian may have preferred the *Zuo*zhuan interpretation to that of the two other exegetical traditions. One should, however, in my view also consider here that ch.39 and 43 are subsequential chapters in view of Zhao being the political successor of Jin. As in other cases where the account is interrupted to concurring interests of the overall work structure, the account on Zhao Dun here is merely a flashback on important events which had happened earlier. I thus abandon a previous hypothesis of mine that the very existence of a double but slightly differing account in the *Shiji* should be interpreted as a specific exegetical attitude of the *Shiji* author.<sup>23</sup>

(4) References toward a G. within the realm of the milieu of astrologers may be taken as a further pointer toward Sima Tan, but may also at times be the reflections of Qian on Tan.

Thus the remark made in “Officer of Heaven” chapter where the author refers to a G. who would be alarmed if the Four Planets had a conjunction, whereas the petty men would dissipate, is in my view a strong pointer toward a contribution by Tan (SJ 27/1321).

The passage in the chapter on hemerologists in which Sima Jizhu instructs Jia Yi and Song Zhong as regards the maxim of “transmitting and not inventing” is a further example for the method of someone belonging to the milieu of astrology to adapt ideas which originally belong to a completely different sphere (SJ 127/3219). It would seem plausible to me if this passage was from the hand of Sima Qian reflecting on an increasing “sophistication” within the milieu of astrology at the beginning of Han times and thus writing about the ideological

<sup>23</sup> I had raised this hypothesis in my paper “The *junzi* prior to Confucius in the *Shiji*”, presented at the WSWG 17 conference at Leiden, 17-18 September 2003. See [http://www.china-buchservice.de/Forschung/Schaab-Hanke/Vortraege/WSWG\\_17\\_Schaab-Hanke.pdf](http://www.china-buchservice.de/Forschung/Schaab-Hanke/Vortraege/WSWG_17_Schaab-Hanke.pdf).

background not only of Sima Jizhu (who might as well have been a further member of the Sima clan) but only that of his father Tan.

As for the designation of Laozi as a “Hidden G.” which clearly shows a Daoist concern for the one who wrote this down, I would also propose to subsume this among the Officer of Heaven identity category (SJ 63/2142). It is clear, from one of the few safe pieces of evidence for the thinking of Tan as transmitted by Qian, that he had a strong inclination toward Daoism. This inclination is, however, certainly not something which was contrasted by being “Confucian”, on the contrary Tan seems to apply ideas taken from among the followers of Confucius very much on things originally belonging to a different sphere, but it fits well with basic tenets of specialists who regard Heaven, Earth and Man as an organic universe whose mechanics to understand would be the task of the future.

(5) Last but not least: Sima Tan and Sima Qian must have had a rather different approach toward history and especially toward the ends of history. For Tan, history, i.e. the attempt to make sense of things gone by, must have been primarily a complementary science, an aid for what he himself would probably have called the “science” of presaging the future. The strong desire for searching the judgements of earlier “G.” in history and the stress laid not so much on preserving the contribution of individuals but mainly the overall results, as a guide-line for orientation, for applying precedents on more recent case-examples and to establish a foundation for future generations of “G.” It is them who should be enabled to use this synopsis of what G. Hardy has denoted aptly as the “lines of causation”<sup>24</sup> traced from history. An attentive reader cannot help feeling that the one who arranged all these materials was firmly grounded in the belief that if only enough material of the past would be assembled, all the statements of earlier wise and worthy taken seriously enough as to further on avoid steps into the “wrong” direction.

It is the belief of someone whose roots are still lying in the realm of the Heaven Officer, of the astrologer, of someone who has learned that human fate on a whole is intrinsically linked with the universe, that it is Heaven who punishes rulers for bad behaviour and who believes that a specialist trained in what he would conceive as the knowledge of Heaven mechanics would be the ideal official to a future ruler, presumed that this ruler is worthy and, above all, open toward such a specialist’s advice.

Most examples belonging to categories C and D, especially those of type (c), the Reflecting G. type and among those especially subtype (c2), a whole series which appears in an accumulated form in ch.12, will thus, as I assume, be the contribution of Sima Tan.

In very contrast to this, Sima Qian shows clear traits of having challenged this hermetically closed frame of mind and also his father’s approach to history on a whole. As I have shown in a previous study, Qian seems to intentionally cross lines of causation which his father clearly tries to lay out as a kind of ground plan in his work.<sup>25</sup> His attitude toward the questions as to who should be called a G. is much less rigorous than the definition underlying the designations given by his father. He is in a way more lash, at times he seems to be intricately cynical and thus tends toward resistance in spite of the filial attitude he transmits to have promised his father in the face

<sup>24</sup> See Grant Hardy, “The Interpretive Function of Shih Chi 14, ‘The Table By Years of the Twelve Feudal Lords’”, *JAO* 113.1 (1993), 22.

<sup>25</sup> See my “The Power of an Alleged Tradition: A Prophecy Flattering Han Emperor Wu and its Relation to the Sima Clan”, *BMFEA* 74 (2002), esp. 287-294 (“Tracing the cosmologists’ ideas in the Grand Scribe’s Record”).

of death. Sima Qian's approach to history is thus much more down to earth, in a way more sober, but on the other hand extremely political and interested in human affairs. I think it is this what he reflects himself as the contrast between him and his father: that he was only concerned with Heaven but not with dealing with the people, and that he had son, named Qian.

As the few examples assembled above may suffice to convince, the G. material in the *Shiji* offers a crucial key to a closer understanding of both the shared identity and the subtle differences in the thinking of Sima Tan and Sima Qian as the two main contributors to the *Shiji*. A more thorough analysis, which would certainly have been desirable, would afford much more space than was conceded to me, but for a systematic typification and survey of all the G. references, the table added in the appendix may serve as an aid to a more thorough account.

## Appendix: Typification of the G. passages in the *Shiji*<sup>26</sup>

### I (main category)

- A References to a G. explicitly marked as either part of a direct speech or quoted from an earlier source
  - B References to G. having a direct parallel in an earlier source
  - C References to a G. having a precedent in an earlier source
  - D References to a G. either part of the *Taishigong yue* 太史公曰 (TSG judgement) section (marked by an asterisk\*) or interpreted as genuine reflections of the *Shiji* author.
- References to a G. which are part of the text added by Chu Shaosun, *Chu xiansheng yue* 褚先生曰, (CXS judgement) are given in brackets [...]

### II (subcategory)

- (a) Acting G. type
- (b) Designated G. type
- (c) Reflecting G. type, belonging to one of the following formulae:
  - (c1) G. says (*junzi yue* 君子曰)
  - (c2) G. criticizes (s.th.) (*junzi jizhi* 君子譏之)
  - (c3) G. knows it (*junzi zhi zhi* 君子知之)
  - (c4) G. alarmed about s.th. (*junzi ju yan* 君子懼焉)
  - (c5) G. speaks of (*junzi wei* 君子謂)
  - (c6) G. estimates s.th. highly (*junzi chang zhi* 君子長之)
- (d) Future G. Addressed type

reference	I	II	context
5/189	A	a	as part of a speech by Duke Miu of Qin 秦繆公
5/194	B	c1	Duke Miu of Qin charges himself responsible for mistakes he had made; upon hearing his, G. shed tears and said that the Duke was a fair ruler; parallel in ZZ, Wen 3.4/127/15: G. thus knew that ( <i>junzi shiyi zhi</i> 君子是以知...)
5/194	B	c1	When G. heard of Duke Miu of Qin's order that after his death 170 men should follow him into his tomb; cf. SJ 14/603
6/278	A	a	in a text quoted from Master Jia [Yi] 賈生 („Guo Qin lun”) as
10/428	A	a	in a text quoted from the <i>Shi</i> 詩 (Mao 251) as part of an Imperial edict
12/486	D*	d	TSG addresses future readers as G; identical passage in SJ 28/1404
14/509	D*	b	TSG denotes Zuo Qiuming as the “G. of Lu ( <i>Lu junzi</i> 魯君子)
14/525	C	c2	G. criticizes Duke Mu of Jin's policy of conferring names to his sons (cf. SJ 39/1637, SJ

<sup>26</sup> This table comprises all the “*junzi*” entries on the basis of the Zhonghua shuju edition of the *Shiji*. The table is arranged in the order of the occurrences of passages in the text. The term “*junzi*” (Gentleman) is abbreviated as “G.”



			130/3309; parallel in ZZ, Huan 2.8: <i>shi</i> Fu 師服)
14/540	C	c2	G. criticizes that disorder in Jin originated in Quwo; (cf. SJ 39/1638; parallel in ZZ, Huan 2.8/21/5: <i>shi</i> Fu 師服 criticizes)
14/551	C	c2	G. criticizes that Duke Yin of Lu went to observe the fishing in Tang (cf. SJ 33/1529; parallel in ZZ, Yin 5.1: Zang Xibo 臧僖伯 criticizes; GYZ, Yin 5.1/5/7: author criticizes; GLZ, Yin 5.1/4/17: author criticizes.
14/552-53	C	c2	G. criticizes that the states of Lu and Zheng exchange fields (cf. SJ 33/1529; parallel in ZZ, Yin, 8.2/12/26, and GLZ, Huan 1.3/9/1: authors both emphasize that Zheng did not perform sacrifices on Mount Tai)
14/556	C	c2	G. criticizes the decision to deposit a tripod in the ancestral temple of Song (cf. SJ 33/1530; parallels in ZZ, Huan 2.2/20/1: author criticizes decision to be contrary to rule, reports of Zang Aibo's 臧哀伯 criticism (20/1-10) and of the Inner Scribe of Zhou's 周內史 comment on that (20/12); GLZ, Huan 2.4/10/10, and GLZ, Huan 2.4/9/24, authors both criticize decision to be contrary to rule)
14/557	C	c2	G. criticizes that the Earl of Qi 齊侯 sent a woman to the ruler of Lu; cf. SJ 32/1458; SJ 33/1530; 47/1918; parallel in ZZ, Huan 3.5/22/18, GYZ, Huan 3.6/11/4, and GLZ, Huan 3.5/10/19: all authors condemn the reception of the woman (Jiang Shi 姜氏) as being "contrary to the rules"
15/581	C	c3	G. knows of the impending end of Master Shen, crownprince of the Duke of Jin; cf. SJ 39/1643 (parallel in ZZ, Min 2.7/69/16: Li Ke 里克 criticizes)
14/603	B	c2	G. criticizes the order given by Duke Miu of Qin that after his death 170 persons had to follow him into his tomb (cf. SJ 5/194-195; parallel in ZZ, Wen 6.3/131/14: G. thus knew that ( <i>junzi shiji zhi</i> 君子是以知...))
14/669	B	b	A man of the state of Jin had a dream in which all the G. erected an Earth Altar; cf. SJ 35/1573; parallel in ZZ, Ai 7.5/444/18: all the G. erected ...
15/685	C*	c4	TSG states that a G. was alarmed about the general decay in the world, due to the misbehaviour of Qin; (cf. <i>Mengzi</i> 6/34/26: Kongzi is alarmed 孔子懼)
15/687	D*	d	TSG addresses future readers as G.
18/878	D*	d	TSG addresses future readers as G.
[20/1059]	[D]	[d]	[CXS addresses readers as the G. of the present generation ( <i>dangshi zhi junzi</i> 當時之君子)]
23/1161	B	a	G. after having received his nutrition, is good at discerning; parallel in XZ 19/90/10
23/1172	B	a	G. when examining <i>li</i> will not be deceived by that; parallel in XZ 19/92/14
23/1173	B	a	G. above brings about his ascent; parallel in XZ 19/93/1
23/1173	B	a	refers to the character of a G.; parallel in XZ 19/93/2
23/1173	B	a	refers to the qualities of a scholar-G. ( <i>shi junzi</i> 士君子); parallel in XZ 19/93/2
24/1175	D*	a	TSG refers to the qualities of a G.
24/1175	D*	a	TSG refers to the qualities of a G.; perhaps alluding to XDLJ 1.6/1/18
24/1184	B	a	only G. is capable to understand music (parallel in XDLJ 19.1/98/25)
24/1209	B	a	this is why G. estimates it lowly (parallel in XDLJ 19.12/101/7)
24/1211	B	a	this is why G. reverts his emotions and thus knows his destination (parallel in XDLJ 19.15/101/21)
24/1212	B	a	G. rejoices in obtaining his principles (parallel in XDLJ 19.14/101/18)
24/1212	B	a	this is why G. reverts his emotions and thus knows his destination (parallel in XDLJ 19.15/101/21)
24/1215	B	a	G. is moved by its roots (parallel in XDLJ 19.16/101/26)
24/1215	B	a	G. loves what is good (parallel in XDLJ 19.17/101/30)
24/1217	B	c1	G. says that "rites and music must never be dismissed from oneself?" (parallel in XDLJ 19.26/104/7)
24/1222	A	a	as part of a speech by Zixia (parallel in XDLJ 19.24/102/24)
24/1225	A	a	as part of a speech by Zixia (parallel in XDLJ 19.25/103/10)
24/1225	A	a	as part of a speech by Zixia (parallel in XDLJ 19.25/103/10)
24/1225	A	a	as part of a speech by Zixia (parallel in XDLJ 19.25/103/11)
24/1225	A	a	as part of a speech by Zixia (parallel in XDLJ 19.25/103/12)
24/1225	A	a	as part of a speech by Zixia (parallel in XDLJ 19.25/103/13)
24/1225	A	a	as part of a speech by Zixia (parallel in XDLJ 19.25/103/13)
24/1237	D*	a	TSG refers to the qualities of a G.

24/1237	D*	a	TSG refers to the qualities of a G.
24/1237	D*	a	TSG refers to the qualities of a G.
25/1243	D*	b	TSG praises Han Emperor Wen as someone whom Confucius called a “G. who has virtue” ( <i>you de junzi</i> 有德君子)
27/1321	D	b	contrasts the sorrow of a G. vs. the dissipating of a petty man as related to the astrologer’s domain
28/1404	D*	d	TSG addresses future readers as G.; identical passage in SJ 12/486
31/1450	A	c1	in a speech by Ji Zha 季扎 (parallel in ZZ, Xiang 14.2/254/12)
31/1458	A	b	refers to “many G. in Wei” ( <i>Wei duo junzi</i> 衛多君子) in a statement by Ji Zha responding to Zichan 子產 (cf. SJ 37/1597; parallel in ZZ, Xiang 29.13/304/3).
31/1475	D*	b	TSG praises Jizi 季子 (= Ji Zha 季扎) as “G. of vast insight and broad knowledge” ( <i>honglan bowu junzi</i> 闡覽博物君子; cf. SJ 42/1772)
33/1529	C	c2	G. criticized here both that Duke Yin of Lu went to observe the fishing in Tang and that the states of Lu and Zheng exchange fields [cf. SJ 14/551]
33/1530	C	c2	G. criticized that a tripod was stored in the ancestral temple of Song [cf. SJ 14/556]
33/1538	B	c1	G. said that Ji Wenzi was as a man of utmost loyalty (parallel in ZZ, Xiang 5.10/235/22: G. thus knew that ( <i>junzi shiyi zhi</i> 君子是以知...))
33/1539	B	c1	G. said that this was not the end as yet (parallel in ZZ, Xiang 31.4/310/17: a G. thus knew that this could not as yet be the end)
35/1573	B	b	A man of the state of Jin has a dream in which all the „G.“ had erected an earth altar (cf. SJ 14/669)
37/1590	A	b	in a statement of Dan, Duke of Zhou 周公旦, addressing Wei Kangshu 衛康叔
37/1590	D	a	referring to the Duke of Zhou who by his “Cicai” (Timber of the Ci Tree) intended to show what a G. would take as his model
37/1597	B	b	refers to “many G. in Wei” in a statement of Ji Zha (parallel in ZZ, Xiang 29.13/304/3). [cf. SJ 31/1458]
37/1601	A	a	in a statement by Zilu 子路
38/1623	B	c1	G. who heard of that said that Duke Xuan of Song 宋宣公 was someone who knew men; parallel in ZZ, Yin 3.5/6/7: a G. says/ said ( <i>junzi yue</i> 君子曰); GYZ, Yin 3.7/4/7: G. here charges the Duke with responsibility with calamity
38/1626	A	a	in a speech by Duke Xiang of Song 宋襄公 in response to Ziyu 子魚
38/1630	B	c2	G. criticizes Hua Yuan of Song 宋華元 for his not being a good minister; cf. SJ 40/1703; parallel in ZZ, Cheng 2.4/189/4: a G. states/ stated that Hua Yuan was no good minister ( <i>junzi wei</i> 君子謂...)
38/1633	C*	c1	TSG reports different judgements of G. on Duke Xiang of Song’s 宋襄公 attitude in the battle against Song (parallels in GYZ, Xi 22.4/50/27: author praises Duke Xiang for his unambiguous sticking to the rules; ZZ, Xi 22.8/99/1, reports the story giving Ziyu’s criticism more weight than Duke Xiang’s argument, but without explicit authorial judgment; GLZ, Xi 22.4/49/26: author condemns Duke Xiang for wrong behavior).
39/1638	C	c1	G. says that the disorder of Jin took its origins in Quwo; cf. SJ 14/540
39/1649	B	c1	refers to a G. who quotes from the <i>Shi</i> (parallel in ZZ, Xi 9.6/82/22)
39/1654	A	a	in a speech by Lü Sheng 呂省 responding to Duke Miu of Qin
39/1671	A	b	as part of a speech by Zhao Dun 趙盾 ( <i>xian junzi</i> 先君子)
39/1682	B	c1	refers to a G.’s appraisal of Qi Xi 祁奚; parallel in ZZ, Xiang 3.4/230/16: a G. states/ stated that ... ( <i>junzi wei</i> 君子謂...); parallel in LSCQ 1.5/5/21: Confucius upon hearing of it said (about Qi Xi)
40/1703	A	b	as a designation for Hua Yuan of Song by King Zhuang of Chu 楚莊王 (vgl. SJ 38/1630)
41/1744	B	b	reports on the recruitment of “6000 G.” ( <i>junzi liuqian ren</i> 君子六千人) for an attack against Wu; parallel in ZZ, Zhao 27.2/394/28, and GY 19.9/626: designation of people of Wu as G.
42/1772	A	b	Zichan 子產 is praised as a “G. of broad knowledge” ( <i>bowu 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 Ji Zha, in SJ 31/1475; parallel in ZZ, Zhao 1.12/319/17
43/1782	C	c2	G. condemns Zhao Dun 趙盾 as being guilty in the case of the murder of Duke Ling of Jin 晉靈公; cf. SJ 39/1675; parallels in ZZ, Xuan 2.3/158/16, GYZ, Xuan 6.1/75/13, GLZ, Xuan 2.4/71/19: all referring to the (Grand) scribe of Jin, Dong Hu 晉太史董狐

46/1890	A	b	request in a speech of Zou Jizi 驪忌子 to select only “junzi” and no petty men
47/1915	A	a	as referred to in statement of Duke Jing of Lu 魯景公; parallel in KZJY 1.2/1/23
47/1916	A	a	as referred to in a speech by an official of Duke Jing of Lu
47/1917	A	a	as referred to in a response of an official on Duke Jing’s words; parallel in KZJY 2.1/2/9
47/1920	A	a	as 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	A	a	as referred to in a speech by Zilu talking to Confucius; parallel in LY 17.7/48/20
47/1926	A	a	as referred to in a speech by Confucius
47/1930	A	a	as referred to in a question posed by Zilu; parallel in LY 15.2/42/1
47/1930	A	a	as referred to in a response by Confucius on Zilu’s question; parallel in LY 15.2/42/1
47/1931	A	a	as referred to in a speech by Confucius; parallel in KZJY 20.1/40/12
47/1932	A	a	as referred to in a speech by Yanhui; parallel in KZJY 20.1/40/15: no G.
47/1932	A	a	as referred to in a speech by Yanhui; parallel in KZJY 20.1/40/15
47/1934	A	a	as referred to in a speech by Confucius; parallel in LY 13.3/34/1-3
47/1934	A	a	as referred to in a speech by Confucius; parallel in LY 13.3/34/1-3
47/1943	A	a	as referred to in a speech by the Master; cf. SJ 61/2127; parallel in LY 13.3/34/1-3
49/1974	D	b	author reflects that Dou Changjun 竇長君 und Shaojun 少君 retreated in order to advance G. (cf. SJ 124/3188: <i>tuirang junzi zhi feng</i> 退讓君子之風)
50/1990	D*	a	TSG reflects on times in which G. are appointed and petty men retreat
52/2003	A	a	referred to in a speech by Lang Yewang 琅邪王 and others
53/2015	A	a	referred to in a speech by Master Bao 鮑生
[58/2091]	[A]	[a]	[referred to in a quote from <i>Chunqiu</i> ; cf. GYZ, Yin 3.7/4/6]
60/2111	A	a	as referred to in a written document by Liu Hong 劉閔, the king of Qi 齊王
[60/2114-5]	[D]	[d]	[CXS addresses those who are G. ( <i>junzi zhe</i> 君子者)]
[60/2116]	[A]	[b]	G. being treated unfriendly [as quoted from an “admonition” ( <i>jie</i> 戒)]
[60/2119]	[A]	[a]	[as referred to in a quotation from the “Commentary” ( <i>zhuàn</i> ); cf. XZ 1/1/20]
61/2127	A	a	authorial remark referring to a word of the Master (explicitly quoted in 47/1943); cf. LY 15.20/43/15
62/2135	A	a	as referred to from the mouth of Yue Shifu 越石父
63/2140	A	a	as referred to from the mouth of Laozi talking to Confucius
63/2140	A	a	as referred to from the mouth of Laozi talking to Confucius
63/2142	D	b	TSG denotes Laozi as the “Hidden G.” ( <i>yin junzi</i> 隱君子)
67/2192	A	a	in a question Zilu asks Confucius (parallel in LY 17.23/50/16)
67/2192	A	a	in the Master’s response to Zilu (parallel in LY 17.23/50/16)
67/2193	A	a	as referred to in words by Zilu; cf. ZZ, Ai 15.5/460/13
67/2194	A	a	in a question Zaiyu 宰予 asks Confucius (parallel in LY 17.21/50/1)
67/2194	A	a	in the Master’s response to Zaiyu (parallel in LY 17.21/50/8)
67/2201	A	a	in a response by Ziyou 子游 to Confucius in which he quotes an earlier master (parallel in LY 17.4/48/3)
67/2203	A	a	in a remark by the Master addressing Zixia 子夏 (parallel in LY 6.13/13/9)
67/2207	A	a	in a remark by Confucius about Mi Zijian 宓子賤 (parallel in LY 5.3/9/9)
67/2207	A	a	in a remark by Confucius about Mi Zijian (parallel in LY 5.3/9/9)
67/2209	A	a	in a remark by Confucius about Nangong Kuo 南宮适 (parallel in LY 14.5/37/17)
67/2214	A	a	in a question Sima Ziniu 司馬子牛 asks Confucius (parallel in LY 12.4/31/1)
67/2214	A	a	in the Master’s response to Sima Ziniu (parallel in LY 12.4/31/1)
67/2214	A	a	in another question by Sima Ziniu (parallel in LY 12.4/31/3)
67/2217	A	a	in the Master’s response to Ranyou 冉有 (parallel in LY 6.4/12/13)
67/2218	A	a	in the Master’s response to Wuma Qi 巫馬旗 (parallel in LY 7.31/17/16)
67/2218	A	a	in the Master’s response to Wuma Qi (parallel in LY 7.31/17/16)
71/2321	D*	b	TSG denotes Huoli Zijian 樛里子疾 and Gan Mou 甘茂 as persons who were “though not G. of sincere conduct, but belong to 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	A	a	as referred to from a speech by Cai Ze 蔡澤
80/2433	A	a	as quoted from a letter by Yue Yi 樂毅 addressed to King Hui of Yan 燕惠王
80/2433	A	a	as quoted from a letter by Yue Yi addressed to King Hui of Yan
84/2487	A	a	as quoted from Qu Yuan's "Huaisha fu 懷沙賦"
84/2490	A	b	as quoted from Qu Yuan's "Huaisha fu 懷沙賦"
98/2713	D*	b	TSG praises Xie, Earl of Kuaicheng 蒯成侯譚, as someone who should be called a sincere and magnanimous G. ( <i>ke wei dubou junzi yi</i> 可謂篤厚君子矣); cf. SJ 103/2774
103/2773	A*	a	referred to in an explicit quote from the mouth of "Zhongni"
103/2774	D*	c2	TSG remarks that a G. (of old) would criticize persons such as Shi Fen 石奮, Wei Wan 衛綰 and Zhang Shu 張叔 (whom the chapter is devoted to) due to their being close to servile flatterers.
103/2774	D*	b	TSG adds (to the previous remark) that the men whom the chapter is devoted to should (nevertheless) be denoted as G. of sincere conduct ( <i>ke wei duxing junzi yi</i> 可謂篤行君子矣, cf. SJ 98/2713)
108/2865	D*	b	TSG praises Hu Sui as a „respectful and devoted G.“ ( <i>jugong junzi</i> 鞠躬君子)
112/2952	A	a	as referred to in an Imperial document responding to a letter by Gongsun Hong 公孫宏
117/3045	A	a	as referred to in a official proclamation from the hand of Sima Xiangru
117/3071	A	a	as referred to in Sima Xiangru's hymn focusing on the <i>Feng</i> and <i>Shan</i> sacrifices ( <i>Fengshan wen</i> )
119/3100	A	a	as referred to in a speech by the chancellor of king Zhuang of Chu
119/3100	A	a	as referred to in a speech by the chancellor of king Zhuang of Chu
124/3181	D	b	author refers to people who "when reading books long for the virtue of an independently acting G. ( <i>du shu buai duxing junzi</i> 讀書懷獨行君子之德).
124/3188	D	b	author again refers to the "wandering knights" maintaining that "although these people were among the knights, they still breathe the air of G. who due to their own retiring advance others" ( <i>suiran wei xia er lingling you tuirang junzi zhi feng</i> 雖為俠而遠遑有退讓君子之風)
[126/3208]	[A]	[a]	[refers to the <i>junzi</i> as quoted from the <i>Shijing</i> ]
[126/3211]	[A]	[a]	[refers to the <i>junzi</i> as part of a quotation from a "Commentary" ( <i>zhu</i> )]
127/3218	A	a	referred to from the mouth of the hemerologist Sima Jizhu talking to Jia Yi and Song Zhong
127/3218	A	a	referred to from the mouth of Sima Jizhu, pointing toward maxime of transmitting but not inventing as the righteousness of a G. ( <i>shu er bu zuo, junzi yi ye</i> 述而不作君子義也)
127/3219	A	a	referred to in a quotation from the <i>Zhuangzi</i> , as part of the speech of Sima Jizhu
127/3219	A	a	referred to in a quotation from the <i>Zhuangzi</i> , as part of the speech of Sima Jizhu
127/3219	A	a	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]	[D]	[a]	[CXS refers to the "air of the junzi" ( <i>junzi zhi feng</i> 君子之風)]
128/3225	D*	c5	TSG states that if a G. spoke disdainfully about the arts of divining by tortoise shells or milfoil, he would be someone without inspect.
129/3255	D*	a	TSG remarks that it is the happiness of the G. to love keeping fast to a virtuous conduct
129/3266	D	b	author refers to G. living in the regions of the states of Liang and Song
130/3308	D*	a	TSG concludes in the rhymed preface to SJ 38 that no G. would praise Duke Xiang of Song
130/3309	C*	c2	TSG refers to a G. who condemns Duke Mu of Jin's policy of conferring names to his sons / rhymed preface to SJ 39; cf. SJ 14/525, 39/1637
130/3313	D*	a	TSG concludes in the rhymed preface to SJ 65 that a G. compares virtue among them, i.e. Sunzi and Wu Qi ( <i>junzi bi de yan</i> 君子比德焉)
130/3316	D*	c6	TSG concludes in the rhymed preface to SJ 103 that a G. would rank them (i.e. people such as Shi Fen, Wei Wan and Zhang Shu) highly ( <i>junzi chang zhi</i> 君子長之); cf. SJ 103/2774
130/3320	D*	b	TSG addresses in the rhymed preface to SJ 130 future readers as the wise and G. ( <i>sheng ren junzi</i> 聖人君子) of a later generation