

Paper submitted to the IJSCS Conference
“Thought, Body, Culture: New Approaches to Chinese Historical Studies”
to be held at the National Ts'ing-hua University, Hsinchu, Taiwan, Nov 12-14, 2004
This is only a preliminary draft – please don't quote!

司馬貞爲何要補正《史記》的上古觀？

Why did Sima Zhen want to correct the *Shiji's* account of High Antiquity

Dorothee Schaab-Hanke 沙敦如 (Hamburg University 漢堡大學)

Content 目錄

Introduction [前言]

1 The man and author Sima Zhen

一、略談司馬貞及其作品

2 Sima Zhen's “Sanhuang benji” as the document of a scholarly dispute

二、司馬貞的「三皇本紀」作爲不同學術派看法的驗證

2.1 The object of Sima Zhen's criticism: The “Wudi benji” chapter of the *Shiji*

1、司馬貞所批評的對象《史記》・「五帝本紀」

2.2 The “Sanhuang benji” and its scholarly background

2、「三皇本紀」的學術背景

2.3 The implication of Sima Zhen's account of antiquity for the theory of dynastic cycles

3、司馬貞的上古觀對於五運說的後果

3 Why did Sima Zhen want to correct the *Shiji's* account of High Antiquity?

三、司馬貞爲何要補正《史記》的上古觀？

Concluding remarks [結語]

[論文摘要]

司馬貞（約 679–732）爲《史記》的注釋者之一。其《史記索隱》與南朝劉宋裴駟的《史記集解》及唐代張守節的《史記正義》在宋代被合入《史記》正文，通曰《史記三家注》。但司馬貞並沒有將自己局限於單純的注釋，而是對《史記》進行了補充。在《史記索隱後序》中司馬貞闡明其決心爲《史記》作注的因由：“初以殘闕處多，兼鄙褚少孫誣謬，因憤發而補史記(...).”

司馬貞在《補史記序》中又指出：司馬遷在《史記》開篇的〈五帝本紀〉僅從五帝的黃帝述起，而未涉及三皇，而三皇的歷史已散見於儒家經典之中。司馬貞把這一點看作《史記》的一個缺陷，因而他補寫了《三皇本紀》，以補正《史記》的上古觀。明版《史記評林》便把這一補卷排在了〈五帝本紀〉之前。

本文研究探討作爲注家與作者的司馬貞的思想背景根源。爲此，仔細分析了《三皇本紀》及司馬貞引用的文本，並與司馬遷的描述進行了比較。另外，還試述了西元八世紀的學術討論中司馬貞的立場。本文作者認爲：司馬貞在《三皇本紀》中體現的並不完全是當時流行的儒家思想，他所推崇的似乎略含「自成一家」的意味。

[Summary]

Sima Zhen (c. 679 — c.732) was one of the main commentators of the *Shiji*. His *Shiji Suoyin*, “Explorations into What is Hidden,” was added during the Song dynasty to the main text of the *Shiji*, together with the *Shiji jijie* by Pei Yin (Nanbei chao/ Liusong) and the *Zhengyi* commentary by Zhang Shoujie (Tang), commonly called the “*Shiji* edition with the Three Commentaries” (*Shiji sanjia zhu*). But Sima Zhen did not confine himself to merely writing a simple comment on the *Shiji*, but he wrote in fact a supplement to the *Shiji*. In his “Postface to the *Suoyin* Commentary” Sima Zhen explains why he decided to write these supplements saying: “In the beginning I started to supplement the *Shiji* out of anger, due to the many lacunae or even deficiencies (in the *Shiji*) including the vulgarities caused by Chu Shaosun (...).”

In his “Preface to the Supplemented *Shiji*” (*Bu Shiji xu*), Sima Zhen maintains that one of the deficiencies of the *Shiji* was that the first chapter of the *Shiji*, the “Basic Annals of the Five God-Emperors” (*Wudi benji*) only tells about Chinese history starting with the Yellow Emperor as the first of the Five God-Emperors (Wudi), but lacked an account of the Three Exalted (*sanhuang*) evidence for whom would be supported by the Classics. Sima Zhen thus wrote his “Basic Annals of the Three Exalted” (*Sanhuang benji*) in order to correct the view of antiquity represented by the *Shiji*. This supplement has later been placed, e.g. in the Ming edition *Shiji pinglin*, right before the first chapter of the *Shiji*.

In my paper, I shall investigate the ideological roots of the “commentator” and author Sima Zhen. To do this, the main focus will be laid on a closer analysis of his “*Sanhuang benji*” and its exegetical background as compared with that of the *Shiji* account. Besides, I shall try and explain Sima Zhen’s initiative within the scholarly disputes during his own lifetime. As will be argued, Sima Zhen in his account of the Three Exalted did not simply represent “main stream” *Ru* thought as it was current during his own lifetime but seems to have favored a special faction among the scholarly approaches of eighth century Confucianism.