
SINO-PLATONIC PAPERS

Number 255

February, 2015

The *Zuozhuan* Story about Qi Xi's Recommendations and Its Sources

by
Jens Østergaard Petersen

Victor H. Mair, Editor
Sino-Platonic Papers
Department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6305 USA
vmair@sas.upenn.edu
www.sino-platonic.org

SINO-PLATONIC PAPERS

FOUNDED 1986

Editor-in-Chief
VICTOR H. MAIR

Associate Editors
PAULA ROBERTS MARK SWOFFORD

ISSN
2157-9679 (print) 2157-9687 (online)

SINO-PLATONIC PAPERS is an occasional series dedicated to making available to specialists and the interested public the results of research that, because of its unconventional or controversial nature, might otherwise go unpublished. The editor-in-chief actively encourages younger, not yet well established, scholars and independent authors to submit manuscripts for consideration. Contributions in any of the major scholarly languages of the world, including romanized modern standard Mandarin (MSM) and Japanese, are acceptable. In special circumstances, papers written in one of the Sinitic topolects (*fangyan*) may be considered for publication.

Although the chief focus of *Sino-Platonic Papers* is on the intercultural relations of China with other peoples, challenging and creative studies on a wide variety of philological subjects will be entertained. This series is **not** the place for safe, sober, and stodgy presentations. *Sino-Platonic Papers* prefers lively work that, while taking reasonable risks to advance the field, capitalizes on brilliant new insights into the development of civilization.

Submissions are regularly sent out to be refereed, and extensive editorial suggestions for revision may be offered.

Sino-Platonic Papers emphasizes substance over form. We do, however, strongly recommend that prospective authors consult our style guidelines at www.sino-platonic.org/stylesheet.doc. Manuscripts should be submitted as electronic files, preferably in Microsoft Word format. You may wish to use our sample document template, available here: www.sino-platonic.org/spp.dot.

Beginning with issue no. 171, *Sino-Platonic Papers* has been published electronically on the Web at www.sino-platonic.org. Issues 1–170, however, will continue to be sold as paper copies until our stock runs out, after which they too will be made available on the Web.

Please note: When the editor goes on an expedition or research trip, all operations (including filling orders) may temporarily cease for up to three months at a time. In such circumstances, those who wish to purchase various issues of *SPP* are requested to wait patiently until he returns. If issues are urgently needed while the editor is away, they may be requested through Interlibrary Loan. You should also check our Web site at www.sino-platonic.org, as back issues are regularly rereleased for free as PDF editions.

Sino-Platonic Papers is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 2.5 License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, 543 Howard Street, 5th Floor, San Francisco, California, 94105, USA.

The *Zuozhuan* Story about Qi Xi's Recommendations and Its Sources

Jens Østergaard Petersen, Copenhagen

In early Chinese collections of didactic anecdotes there are a number of versions of a story devoted to the theme of impartiality that feature Qi Xi 祁奚, senior officer of the Jin 晉 central army. The story is also found in *Zuozhuan* 左傳. In this paper I wish to examine the relationship between the *Zuozhuan* version of the story and its parallels in the early literature. It is my claim that the *Zuozhuan* version is an adaptation of a version of the story which resembles that found in the collections of didactic anecdotes. In support of this, I argue that it is unlikely that the *Zuozhuan* version served as the source of the versions in these collections, since this would require later editors to have independently made identical changes to the *Zuozhuan* story, which I regard as improbable. The *Zuozhuan* version is rather an adaptation of a version of the story close to that found in the collections of didactic anecdotes, an adaptation to make it illustrate a theme that is prominent in the *Zuozhuan* account of the fate of the state of Jin.

The general hypothesis I wish to advance is that *Zuozhuan* draws on material that is independently transmitted in later collections of didactic stories, not just in this case, but in a number of other cases. This paper is a sequel to “The *Zuozhuan* Account of the Death of King Zhao of Chu and Its Sources,”¹ in which I analyze another instance of this phenomenon and

¹ “The *Zuozhuan* Account of the Death of King Zhao of Chu and Its Sources,” *Sino-Platonic Papers* 159 (2005), http://www.sino-platonic.org/complete/spp159_zuozhuan_king_zhao_chu.pdf (accessed 2014-12-12). The groundwork for the present paper was laid whilst the recipient of a Carlsberg-Clare Hall Visiting Fellowship in 1991–1992 in Cambridge, UK. An early version was presented in 2009 at the International Conference on Pre-Han and Han Traditional Chinese Texts (古道照顏色—先秦兩漢古籍國際學術研討會) at The Chinese University of Hong Kong. A reworked version was presented in 2013 at Anecdotes Workshop Chinese Texts at Leiden University. I wish to thank Paul van Els and Sarah Queen for their feedback on the last occasion.

discuss the problems connected with how to account for the relationship between compilations of didactic stories and their parallels in *Zuozhuan*.

The main sources discussed in the present paper are presented in an appendix. Table 1 contains the major versions of the Qi Xi story, centering on *Zuozhuan*, and Table 2 contains a number of additional versions. Table 3 displays the structure of the appreciation of Qi Xi that follows the story proper. Since my discussion often focuses on textual details, one will need to refer to these tables in order to follow my argument. Because the interpretation of the stories influences their translation, the stories are not translated when introduced, but paraphrased instead.

The *Lüshi chunqiu* story

In *Lüshi chunqiu* 呂氏春秋,² Qi Xi³ is asked by Duke Ping of Jin 晉平公 (0557–0532) who is best suited to become prefect of Nanyang 南陽令; Qi Xi recommends Xie Hu 解狐. Asked whether Xie Hu is not his enemy (讎), Qi Xi replies that the question he had been asked was not

² *Lüshi chunqiu zhushu* 呂氏春秋注疏, ed. Wang Liqi 王利器 (Chengdu: Ba Shu Shushe, 2002), 1/130-6; *The Annals of Lü Buwei*, tr. John Knoblock and Jeffrey Riegel (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2000), 74.

³ His *zi* 字, Huangyang ‘黃羊,’ is used in *Lüshi chunqiu*; it does not occur elsewhere. See Yu Xingwu 于省吾, “Jin Qi Xi zi Huangyang jie” 晉祁奚字黃羊解, *Wenshi* 文史 5 (1978), 1–5, for a discussion of Qi Xi’s names. Yu interprets ‘奚’ as a kind of slave and ‘黃羊’ as a kind of sacrificial victim, arguing that both were possessed by slave owners and that in this way there is the customary agreement between Qi Xi’s 名 and 字. Yu, however, does not address the question why Qi Xi should have had a name which expresses low social status. The *Da Dai liji* 大戴禮記 notes in relation to Yangshe dafu 羊舌大夫 (whose given name is unknown) that Qi Xi “grew up in his household as young” (少長乎其所) (*Da Dai liji huijiao jizhu* 大戴禮記彙校集注, ed. Huang Huaixin 黃懷信 (Xi’an: San Qin, 2005), 60/708–11). Does this imply some kind of servility? Note that Gong Zhi Qi 宮之奇 is also said to have “grown up close to his lord” (少長於君) and to have been timid (懦) and of low status (位下 and 勢卑); see the discussion in my forthcoming paper on “The *Zuozhuan* account of Jin’s conquest of Guo and Yu and its sources.” Qi Xi’s name might in this way be an epithet characterizing him as a child or young man. Knoblock and Riegel write in a note to their translation of the story that “Qi Huangyang’s given name, “Yellow Ram,” evokes the ancient belief that rams were impartial beasts” (*The Annals of Lü Buwei*, 711). It is not clear what Knoblock and Riegel mean by interpreting Qi Xi’s name as meaningful — since Qi Xi’s impartiality presumably did not characterize him as a child, are they suggesting that Qi Xi’s name is an epithet given to him as an adult?

who his enemy was, but who was suitable (可). The ruler applauds what Qi Xi says and employs Xie Hu. This action is widely praised in Jin. After a while, when questioned by the duke about who is best suited as senior officer of the central army (國尉), Qi Xi replies that Wu 午 is. Asked whether Wu is not his son, Qi Xi replies that the question he had been posed was not who his son was, but who was suitable. The ruler applauds what Qi Xi says and employs Qi Wu. This is also widely praised in Jin. Following the story proper Confucius 孔子 praises Qi Xi’s conduct, by quoting a proverbial expression said to characterize Qi Xi’s impartiality (公).

Impartiality typically manifests itself in a willingness to advance persons not related to oneself by ties of blood or friendship, but in this story the point is made that a father is obligated to recommend even his own son for a position, should he be the best candidate. Qi Xi first recommends an enemy for office; having in this way proven his impartiality, he cannot be charged with nepotism when subsequently recommending his own son for another office — because Qi Xi’s last action *appears* to be partial, but he has shown that he *is not* partial, so we know that his recommendations exhibit a higher form of impartiality, an impartiality that allows, or even requires, the advancement of one’s next-of-kin, if best qualified.

The different versions of the story and their different casts

The story appears in a number of versions in the early literature.

The same persons are featured in the *Shiji* 史記 and *Xinxu* 新序 parallels.⁴ In the *Zuozhuan* version,⁵ the same persons occur, but two additional persons appear as well, as we shall see. The ruler is not named in *Xinxu* and *Zuozhuan*, but we know from the placement of the story in *Zuozhuan* that the ruler there was Duke Dao of Jin 晉悼公 (0573–0558), the predecessor of Duke Ping of Jin.

⁴ *Shiji* 史記 (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1982), 39/1682; *Xinxu jiaoshi* 新序校釋, ed. Shi Guangying 石光瑛 (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 2001), 1.5/46–52; *The Grand Scribe’s Records, Volume 1*, ed. William H. Nienhauser (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006), 360–1. See Table 1.

⁵ *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu* 春秋左傳注, rev. ed., ed. Yang Bojun 楊伯峻 (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1990), Xiang 3.4/927–8. See Table 1.

Stories of this kind often occur with different casts; in *Han Feizi* 韓非子 the same story is told, but here the Jin minister Zhao Wu 趙武 (0597–0541)⁶ recommends Xing Bozi 邢伯子⁷ and his own son to Duke Ping of Jin.⁸

“Half” variants of the story, with only the recommendation of an enemy, occur as well. *Han Shi waizhuan* 韓詩外傳 thus has Xie Hu recommending Jing Bo Liu 荊伯柳 to Duke Wen of Wei 魏文侯 (0424–0396);⁹ Jing Bo Liu is presumably the same person as *Han Fei zi*’s Xing Bozi. In *Shuoyuan* 說苑 the Jin minister Jiu Fan 咎犯 likewise recommends Yu Zigao 虞子羔 to Duke Wen of Jin 晉文公 (0636–0628).¹⁰

Quotations from additional versions of the story are found in the encyclopedias,¹¹ and reflections of it are to be found in Eastern Han and post-Han literature as well.¹²

⁶ The recommendations made by Zhao Wu are also celebrated by Shu Xiang 叔向 in a story evidenced in *Han Fei zi*; *Han Fei zi xin jiaozhu* 韓非子新校注, ed. Chen Qiyong 陳奇猷 (Shanghai: Guji Chubanshe, 2000), 12/33/752–3, tr. W. K. Liao, *The Complete Works of Han Fei Tzū* (London: Arthur Probsthain, 1959), 2/82–3. The motto “private grudges do not enter public gates” (私讎不入公門), stated by Zhao Wu to legitimize the recommendation of his enemy in the *Han Fei zi* parallel to the Qi Xi story (see Table 2), could be due to influence from the “private grudges do not enter public gates” (私怨不入公門) of the *Han Fei zi* story about Xie Hu. *Xinxu* contains another story celebrating the impartiality of Zhao Wu; *Xinxu jiaoshi*, 4.22/597–604.

⁷ Xing Bozi/Jing Bo Liu is possibly the Jin grandee Xing Bo 邢伯 (*Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, Xiang 18.3/1038), but it is unclear why he should be cast as Zhao Wu’s enemy.

⁸ *Han Fei zi xin jiaozhu*, 12/33/751–2, *The Complete Works of Han Fei Tzū*, 2/82. See Table 2.

⁹ *Han Shi waizhuan jianshu* 韓詩外傳箋疏, ed. Qu Shouyuan 屈守元 (Chengdu: Ba Shu Shushe, 1996) 9.11/774. See Table 2.

¹⁰ *Shuoyuan jiaozheng* 說苑校證, ed. Xiang Zonglu 向宗魯 (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1987), 14/357–8. See Table 2.

¹¹ *Hanzi* 韓子 (the early title of *Han Fei zi*), quoted *Qunshu zhiyao* 群書治要 (*Sibu congkan* 四部叢刊 edition) 40, 7a, *Taiping yulan* 太平御覽 (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1985) 429, 6b/1976, *Hanzi*, quoted *Beitang shuchao* 北堂書鈔 (Tianjin: Guji Chubanshe, 1988) 37, 7a/128, and *Han Shi waizhuan*, quoted *Taiping yulan* 429, 6b/1976, all feature Xie Hu recommending Xing Bo Liu 邢伯柳 to Zhao Jianzhu 趙簡主; see also *Hanzi*, quoted *Bai Kong liutie* 白孔六帖 (*Siku quanshu* edition) 44, 9b. *Han Shi waizhuan*, quoted *Taiping yulan* 482, 2a/2206, features Xie Hu recommending Xing Bo Liu 荊伯柳 to Wei Wenhou 魏文侯. *Shuoyuan*, quoted *Taiping yulan* 429, 8b/1977, features Jiu Fan recommending 虞子羔 (=虞子羔) to Jin Wenhou 晉文侯 (= Duke Wen of Jin). *Shuoyuan*, quoted *Yiwen*

The *Guoyu* 國語 version of the story is rather different.¹³ Qi Xi retires from the position of senior officer of the central army (軍衛), and when asked by Duke Dao of Jin who will do (孰可) as his successor, Qi Xi launches into a verbose panegyric of his son Wu. The Jin lord accordingly appoints Wu in his stead, and we are told that, as a result, the army was administered without blemish. There is no mention of Qi Xi recommending an enemy for office, nor is there any evaluation of the virtues exemplified by Qi Xi on this occasion.

The *Han Shi waizhuan* and *Shuoyuan* versions of the story incorporate a different story about impartiality, a story that is rendered separately in *Han Fei zi*,¹⁴ in two versions, both featuring Xie Hu. In this story, Xie Hu recommends his enemy for office; when this person finds out that Xie Hu is his benefactor, he goes to express his gratitude, but is rebuffed by Xie Hu, with bow in hand: Xie Hu states that his recommendation was public (公), whereas his resentment, unaltered, is private (私). The point of story is conveyed by Xie Hu’s declaring his principles before shooting an arrow at his recommendee.

leiju 藝文類聚 (Shanghai: Guji Chubanshe, 1965) 50/907–8, and *Xinxu*, quoted *Beitang shuchao* 78, 9a/323, feature Zhao Wu recommending Xingzi 邢子 and his own son to Duke Ping of Jin. The Tang Dunhuang manuscript S1441 of *Lizhong jiechao* 勵中節鈔 features Jiu Fan recommending 子羔 (=虞子羔) to Duke Wen of Jin in an unattributed version of the story close to *Shuoyuan*; see Qu Zhimin 屈直敏, *Dunhuang xieben leishu Lizhong jiechao yanjiu* 敦煌寫本類書勵中節鈔研究 (Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe, 2007), 275–6. In some of these cases, mistakes of attribution may be involved. Most of these quotations are discussed in Jin Chunmei 金春梅, “Gudai jianchou gushi shuzheng” 古代薦讎故事疏證 *Guji zhengli yanjiu xuekan* 古籍整理研究學刊 2001.6, 18–21.

¹² Qi Xi’s name eventually attained lexical status, as illustrated by the Wu ruler Sun Quan’s 孫權 (182–252) reaction when an official recommended a person for office by whom he had been criticized, whereupon Sun Quan laughed and remarked: “Are you planning to do a Qi Xi?” (君欲為祁奚耶); *Sanguo zhi* 三國志 (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1982) 54/1280; compare *Jiangbiao zhuan* 江表傳, quoted *Sanguo zhi* 55/1287.

¹³ *Guoyu jijie* 國語集解, ed. Xu Yuangao 徐元誥 (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 2002) 13.3/410–1, tr. Alan Imber, *Kuo Yü: An Early Chinese Text and Its Relationship with the Tso Chuan* (Stockholm: University of Stockholm, 1975), 132. See Table 1.

¹⁴ *Han Fei zi xin jiaozhu*, 12/33/753, *The Complete Works of Han Fei Tzū*, 2/83.

All versions of the story agree that the events took place in Jin or in one of its successor states.¹⁵ This in itself is a little curious: since the cast is so very variable, why do only Jin persons qualify as exemplifying the virtue of impartiality? We must assume that the story originated and spread in Jin territory and had the function of, broadly speaking, legitimizing Jin rulership.

The dating of the events narrated differs considerably, ranging from the reign of Duke Wen of Jin (0636–0628) to that of Duke Wen of Wei 魏文侯 (0424–0396). In all versions, the persons appearing plausibly match their rulers. *Lüshi chunqiu* has Duke Ping of Jin where *Zuozhuan* has Duke Dao of Jin, but while this may be historically wrong, it is not anachronistic, since Qi Xi was active as late as in what corresponds to the sixth year of Duke Ping of Jin. In didactic stories, the figure of the ruler is the most volatile — probably the ruler was originally referred to simply as “the ruler of Jin” and only identified with a specific ruler at a later stage of the story.

The body of the *Zuozhuan* story does not supply any dating, nor does it derive its dating by being attached to any *Chunqiu* entry, but the story is dated implicitly to the fourth or fifth month of the third year of Duke Xiang of Lu (0570) by the entries that surround it. When the *Zuozhuan* author wove together the sources at his disposal, he arranged them according to the chronological information they contained. If they contained a date that coincided with the date of the previous event (or a date that was more general than that of the preceding narrative), the date information had to be removed from the entry, otherwise duplications of dates would occur.¹⁶ Therefore, it could have been the case that the story incorporated in *Zuozhuan* originally noted that Qi Xi’s retirement happened in the summer of 0570, but since this date was already noted in the preceding entry, it was left out. On the other hand, didactic stories typically do not supply dates, and it may also have been the case that the *Zuozhuan* author had independent information about the date of his retirement and used that to arrange the dateless story chronologically. The historical narrative about the beginnings of the reign of Duke Dao of Jin in *Zuozhuan* and *Guoyu* is very particular about who was appointed to which position and who substituted when someone

¹⁵ This is also noted by Jin Chunmei in “Gudai jianchou gushi shuzheng,” 19.

¹⁶ See my forthcoming study on *Zuozhuan* dating conventions.

died, and I think it is likely that that the *Zuozhuan* author had other information indicating when Qi Xi retired, and this information allowed him to place the story in his narrative.

The *Guoyu* ordering of events surrounding the story is a little chaotic. It tells of a covenant entered in the fifth year of Duke Dao, but then backtracks and first tells a story relating to another covenant already introduced, a story that is said to have taken place in the fourth year, and subsequently tells the story about Qi Xi's recommendations; after the Qi Xi story, the narrative then returns to the fifth year. It thus appears that, according to *Guoyu*, Qi Xi retired in the fourth year of Duke Dao of Jin, corresponding to the third year of Duke Xiang of Lu, in agreement with *Zuozhuan*. Since *Guoyu* definitely draws on *Zuozhuan* elsewhere,¹⁷ however, this evidence may not be independent. The body of the *Guoyu* version of the story likewise contains no dates, so the situation is the same as with *Zuozhuan*.

In *Shiji* the story is placed in the third year of Duke Dao of Jin, not in the fourth year, that is, one year earlier than in *Zuozhuan*, but the *Shiji* chronology of Jin rulers is here off by one year in relation to *Zuozhuan*,¹⁸ so again there is agreement with *Zuozhuan*. However, *Shiji* obviously derives its chronological sequencing from *Zuozhuan*, so this is what we should expect, and it does not supply independent testimony as to the date of Qi Xi's retirement.

We can conclude that the *Zuozhuan* author probably had reasons to believe that Qi Xi retired in the fourth year of Duke Dao of Jin, that is, in 0570.

The question naturally arises, which cast is original? I do not believe there is a clear answer to this. However, I see no reason to doubt that the oldest version of the story included the characters that occur in both *Zuozhuan*, *Lüshi chunqiu* and *Xinxu*, that is, Qi Xi, Xie Hu and Qi Wu. More specifically, there is no reason to suppose that *Zuozhuan* substituted the character of Qi Xi for another character found in its source.

Xie Hu is known only in the context of this cluster of stories.¹⁹ Being Qi Xi's enemy does not, strictly speaking, say anything about his moral qualities, but it is nevertheless interesting to

¹⁷ Yoshimoto Michimasa 吉本道雅, *Kokugō shōkō* 國語小考, *Tōyōshi kenkyū* 48.3 (1989), 1–31.

¹⁸ See also *Shiji* 14/629.

¹⁹ He is presumably related to Xie Yang 解揚 (*Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, Cheng 8.1/565, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*,

see how his image was so indeterminate that he could assume both the role of (impartial) recommender and (reprobate) recommendee in the different versions. If number of appearances were to indicate which version is original, the archetype of the story would probably be about Xie Hu, not Qi Xi; his malleability as a character may well have caused his multiplication.

Whether the “half” or “full” version of the story was original is also unclear, but since Qi Xi does not appear in the “half” versions, presumably a full version was original.

It should be noted that in *Zuozhuan*, a story with the same theme occurs, said to have taken place at a later date.²⁰ The plot is again set in Jin: Wang Sheng 王生 dislikes Zhangliu Shuo 張柳朔, but recommends him for the position as head of Bairen 柏人. The Fan 范 clan leader Zhaozi 昭子 asks whether he is not his enemy (夫非而讎乎), and Wang Sheng defends his recommendation by saying that private grudges should not influence public affairs (私讎不及公). Although there are some verbal correspondences with the story discussed in this paper, and the two stories obviously share the same theme, I do not think they are textually related, so it will not add to our understanding of the Qi Xi story to include the Wang Sheng story in the discussion.

The *Zuozhuan* version

In *Zuozhuan*, the story line is rather different from that in the *Lüshi chunqiu* version, paraphrased above.

Qi Xi is here about to retire and he is asked by the Jin ruler who is best suited to succeed (嗣) him. He recommends Xie Hu, who the narrator (not the Jin ruler, as in *Lüshi chunqiu*) indicates to have been Qi Xi’s enemy. Xie Hu, however, dies before taking up office, and upon being questioned again who is best suited, Qi Xi recommends Wu. Thereupon Yangshe Zhi 羊舌

Xuan 1.8/649) and Xie Zhang 解張 (*Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, Cheng 2.3/791). (Thanks to Yuri Pines for correcting a mistake of mine in this connection.) To hold that several persons with this name, living at different times, are involved, as does Ma Zonglian 馬宗璉 (d. 1802), quoted *Chunqiu Zuoshizhuan jiu zhu shuzheng* 春秋左氏傳舊注疏證, ed. Liu Wenqi 劉文淇 (Beijing: Zhongguo Kexueyuan Lishi Yanjiusuo, 1959), 994, is to misconstrue the loose nature of the narratives.

²⁰ *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, Ai 5.1/1629–30

職 dies, and when Qi Xi is asked who is best suited to replace (代) him, he replies that Chi 赤 is. This is followed by an evaluation of the character of Qi Xi by the *junzi* 君子.

While *Zuozhuan* helps us by identifying Xie Hu as the enemy of Qi Xi, it assumes that we know that Wu is his son and that Chi is the son of Yangshe Zhi, for the duke does not ask Qi Xi about this as in the other versions, and it must do so because this information is available elsewhere in *Zuozhuan* or can be deduced from the story. When reading the *Zuozhuan*, one is required to pay very close attention to a large number of persons and the different names used for them, so this agrees with the text as a whole, as does its reticence about the relationship between the persons involved, even though the whole point of the story hinges on this.

We can figure out from the story itself that Qi Xi’s position upon retiring was the same that his son came to have, and that Yangshe Zhi had been adjutant to him upon his death, since this is the position that Yangshe Chi then occupies, but this information is also available elsewhere in *Zuozhuan*. In the entry on the accession to the throne of Duke Dao of Jin in 0573, *Zuozhuan* thus states that Qi Xi was made senior officer of the central army (中軍尉) and that Yangshe Zhi was to assist (佐) him, and the *Zuozhuan* author would feel at liberty to assume knowledge of this piece of information in a later entry.

In *Zuozhuan* the formulaic nature of the question-and-answer sequence found in the *Lüshi chunqiu* (and *Xinxu*) versions of the story is not mirrored in the part which concerns Xie Hu, but we do find the identically phrased ‘午也可’ and ‘赤也可.’ We may perhaps say that the *Zuozhuan* author in this way avoids having Qi Xi express his explicit approval of Xie Hu and avoids using the same formula thrice — more importantly, this serves to pair the two sons who both succeed to their fathers’ offices after Xie Hu dies. It is an interesting circumstance that it is only in connection with the “extra” cast member, Yangshe Chi, that *Zuozhuan* renders part of the dialogue between the ruler and Qi Xi, a feature quite prominent in *Lüshi chunqiu* and *Xinxu*.

The appearance of members of the Yangshe clan and the death of Xie Hu right after his recommendation are unique to *Zuozhuan*. The death of Yangshe Zhi is not noted elsewhere, but the *Zuozhuan* author could well have been in possession of information about this.

The statements made by Qi Xi in the *Lüshi chunqiu* and *Xinxu* versions in order to defend his surprising recommendations (君問可, 非問讎/子 in *Xinxu*) are notably absent from the

Zuozhuan version. In the story as told in *Zuozhuan* only statements necessary to set in train the events leading to the hereditary succession to office of Qi Wu and Yangshe Chi are rendered, and Qi Xi does not express verbally that he is actively adhering to any principle, the elucidation of his motivation being left to the *junzi*, making the separation of narrative and message clearer in *Zuozhuan* than in the other versions.

The evaluation of Qi Xi

In the ensuing evaluation of Qi Xi, there are also a number of interesting differences between *Zuozhuan*, *Lüshi chunqiu* and *Xinxu*.²¹

If we compare these three versions, *Lüshi chunqiu* is the simplest: it contains an initial appreciation of Qi Xi, “善哉，祁黃羊之論也” (How excellent were Qi Huangyang’s appointments²²), voiced by Confucius, followed by the quotation of a proverb, “外舉不避讎，內舉不避子，”²³ (which can be translated as “when recommending persons for provincial posts, he did not avoid his enemies; when recommending persons for capital posts, he did not avoid his relatives” or as “when recommending those of his own clan he did not avoid (even) those closely related to himself”) and a final evaluation, “祁黃羊可謂公矣” (Qi Huangyang can be said to have been impartial!).²⁴ The exact meaning of the proverb (and how it is to be translated in the

²¹ The following comparison will also involve the evidence of the *Xinxu*; however, the discussion of the story line of the *Xinxu* version will have to be postponed, due to its complicated relation to *Zuozhuan*.

²² Interpreting ‘論’ as ‘掄’; see the discussion *Lüshi chunqiu zhushu* 1/136. Qi Xi obviously does not engage in any discussion or propound any theory (which would be the normal way of interpreting ‘論’).

²³ The proverb occurs outside the context of any story in *Han Fei zi xin jiaozhu* 17/44/976, *The Complete Works of Han Fei Tzū*, 2/222, and is mentioned by Confucius as being a principle followed by the *ru* 儒 in *Liji jijie* 禮記集解, ed. Sun Xidan 孫希旦 (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1989) 57/41/1406: 孔子曰: 儒有內稱不避親, 外舉不避怨. It also occurs in *Shizi* 尸子, ed. Wang Jipei 汪繼培 (Shanghai: Guji Chubanshe, 1989) A/11 and *Liuzi jiaoshi* 劉子校釋 (*Xinbian zhuzi jicheng* ed.) (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1998), 4/19/188.

²⁴ Jiang Weiqiao 蔣維喬 emends ‘公’ to ‘至公’ on the basis of *Taiping yulan* 429, 7a/1977 and the *Xinxu* parallel; see *Lüshi chunqiu zhushu* 1/136.

different stories) will be discussed below, but structurally it fits well the story as told in *Lüshi chunqiu*, its pairing of ‘讎’ and ‘子’ obviously matching Xie Hu and Qi Wu.

Xinxu renders the same proverb, and it fits the *Xinxu* story equally well, but it is conspicuously absent from the *Zuozhuan* — I will argue that the reason is that the proverb does not fit the *Zuozhuan* version of the story, with its additional cast members, and therefore has been removed. We should note, however, that *Zuozhuan* does contain a rendering of the proverb. It appears later, in an appreciation of the virtues of Qi Xi made by Shu Xiang 叔向 (Yangshe Xi 羊舌肸, the younger brother of Yangshe Chi, died ca. 0528) under the twenty-first year of Duke Xiang of Lu (0552). My thesis is that there is a connection between the absence of the proverb in the recommendation story and its presence in the story about this later event, that, in other words, it was moved from one story to the other.

Both *Zuozhuan* and *Xinxu* start out with a general appreciation of Qi Xi, “祁奚於是能舉善矣” (Qi Xi in this was definitely capable of recommending the good) (rendering here the *Zuozhuan* version), which plays the same role as the initial evaluation in *Lüshi chunqiu*, but whereas in *Lüshi chunqiu* this leads to quoting the proverb, in *Zuozhuan* and *Xinxu* it introduces an appreciation involving quotations from the *Shi* 詩 and *Shu* 書.

The *Zuozhuan* appreciation divides into three parts, one supported by a *Shu* quotation, one focusing on the offices involved, and one supported by a *Shi* quotation.

The part supported by a *Shu* quotation occurs in both *Zuozhuan* and *Xinxu*. In *Xinxu* it reads “稱其讎，不為諂，立其子，不為比” (when he recommended his enemy, he was not fawning, and when he established his son, he was not partial), which (like the proverb) includes ‘讎’ and ‘子,’ mirroring Xie Hu and Qi Wu, also present in the proverb rendered in *Xinxu*. In *Zuozhuan*, which leaves out the proverb, there is an additional “舉其偏，不為黨” (when he raised up his adjutant, he was not partisan), which covers the case of Yangshe Chi. Both the *Xinxu* and the *Zuozhuan* version thus achieve a high degree of consistency: in *Xinxu* two persons are involved, so the proverb is apt and the appreciation contains only two elements, whereas in *Zuozhuan*, an additional recommendee occurs which rules out use of the proverb and necessitates adding an element to the appreciation.

Zuozhuan continues with its second part, a passage summing up the recommendations, centering on the offices involved: “解狐得舉, 祁午得位, 伯華得官, 建一官而三物成, 能舉善也” (Xie Hu was recommended, Qi Wu obtained a position, and Bohua [Yangshe Chi] obtained an office. In establishing one office, three goals were accomplished: this shows that he was capable of raising up the good). This passage is not evidenced elsewhere. It is clearly tied to the three-person scenario of the *Zuozhuan* version. One notes that it recapitulates “能舉善” from the initial appreciation; this leads one to expect that it rounds up the whole appreciation of Xi Qi, but it actually continues with the part supported by the *Shi* quotation.

The third part, with the *Shi* quotation, lends weight to an evaluation that is the same in *Zuozhuan* and *Xinxu*, “唯善, 故能舉其類.” The meaning (and translation) of this will be discussed below, but obviously it expands on “能舉善” and thus naturally follows this and serves as a natural conclusion to the whole appreciation.

There is no way to judge which of the various versions of appreciation is original, based on the evidence of the appreciation alone, but in the following I wish to propose that the disappearance of the proverb from *Zuozhuan* and its reappearance later in the narrative allows us to argue that the *Zuozhuan* version is not the original, but instead derives from an account that contained the proverb.

The *Shiji* version

The *Shiji* parallel occurs in The Hereditary House of Jin (*Jin shijia* 晉世家). The story is here integrated into an account of the question of whom Jin should choose to represent itself at a meeting of the feudal lords: Qi Xi (the characters ‘祁奚’ are used) first recommends Xie Hu, his enemy, and then Qi Wu, his own son. Nothing is said about Xie Hu dying: Qi Xi is simply asked twice, without this repetition being accounted for. Similarly, nothing is said about Qi Xi retiring or indeed about which specific office or function is involved.

In *Zuozhuan*, the entry preceding the Qi Xi story concerns Jin’s wish to convene the feudal lords in what resulted in the covenant with Qi enacted outside of Er 郟, and it is followed by an entry about the covenant enacted at Jize 雞澤. The *Zuozhuan* contains no discussion about whom to send to represent Jin here, but Fan Xuanzi 范宣子 (d. 0548) is expressly said to arrange

the first covenant. It appears that the *Shiji* author fused the *Zuozhuan* account of one or both of the two covenants with the Qi Xi story.²⁵

In view of the express identification in *Zuozhuan* of the person first recommended by Qi Xi as his enemy, it is possible that *Shiji* narrative’s identification of Xie Hu as Qi Xi’s enemy, ‘祁奚舉解狐, 解狐, 奚之仇’ (Qi Xi recommended Xie Hu; Xie Hu was his enemy), derives from *Zuozhuan*’s ‘稱解狐, 其讎也’ (recommended Xie Hu; he was his enemy) — the expression ‘奚之仇’ could then be a paraphrase of ‘其讎也.’ While *Shiji* may thus conceivably draw on *Zuozhuan* in this detail, it is noteworthy that none of the other distinctive traits of the *Zuozhuan* version — the death of Xie Hu, the inclusion of members of the Yangshe clan, and the two passages summing up the lessons to be learned — are mirrored there.

I have previously discussed an instance in which the *Shiji* author has merged stories that we have reason to believe were separate in his sources and in which *Zuozhuan* is used primarily for the chronological scaffolding it provides, with narrative contents being supplied from collections of didactic stories, even when *Zuozhuan* presents similar details.²⁶ This also appears to be the case with the story at hand: the story about Qi Xi was placed in the chronological framework of the Hereditary House of Jin by reference to *Zuozhuan*, but other material on the same topic was used in preference to the *Zuozhuan* account, the main narrative contribution of the *Zuozhuan* being the intrusion of elements from neighboring *Zuozhuan* entries.

Surely, the task of synthesizing *Shiji* narrative was complicated enough in itself — so why does the *Shiji* author go out of his way to integrate a multiplicity of sources, sources that may differ subtly in their story line, but hardly in ways that materially affect the overall *Shiji* narrative? Perhaps it was satisfaction in weaving a text of such sophistication, perhaps there was

²⁵ See also Liu Caonan 劉操南, *Shiji Chunqiu shi'er zhuhou shishi jizheng* 史記春秋十二諸侯史事輯證 (Tianjin: Guji, 1992), 2/140.

²⁶ See “The *Zuozhuan* Account of the Death of King Zhao of Chu and Its Sources,” 22. I argue the same point in a forthcoming paper on the *Zuozhuan* account of the floods in Song (*Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, Zhuang 11.2/59).

a temptation to use all the materials that had been laboriously assembled and arranged for the task.²⁷

Shiji shares one prominent feature with *Xinxu* and *Lüshi chunqiu* that is not evidenced in *Zuozhuan*: the spelling out of the moral of the story in a variation of the proverb, '外舉不隱仇, 內舉不隱子.'

Whereas in *Lüshi chunqiu*, Qi Xi is lauded for impartiality (公), in *Shiji*, he is praised for non-partisanship (不黨). Though this could be the inconsequential use of a synonym, there is some suspicion that in the source used by the *Shiji* author, the *junzi* also quoted the *Shu* passage, rendered in *Zuozhuan* as '無偏無黨, 王道蕩蕩' (one should not be partial, one should not be partisan, the Way of a King is broad and fair) and in *Xinxu* as '不偏不黨, 王道蕩蕩,' leading to *Shiji*'s '祁奚可謂不黨矣' (Qi Xi can be said to be non-partisan). It could also be an echo of the *junzi*'s appreciation of Qi Xi's recommendation of Yangshe Chi in *Zuozhuan*, "舉其偏, 不為黨," also suggesting influence from *Zuozhuan*. We note that the order of the two elements of the appraisal made by the *junzi* in *Shiji*, the passage concerning non-partisanship and the proverb, is the same in *Shiji* and *Xinxu*. I thus do not rule out *Zuozhuan* influence on the narrative, but the main *Shiji* story line does not follow *Zuozhuan*.

The crucial point is the appearance of the proverb. Either it was in the *Shiji* author's source or he inserted it into the story from its later occurrence in *Zuozhuan*. To hold that the *Shiji* author conflated the *Zuozhuan* entry for the twenty-first year of Duke Xiang with that for the third year, independently inserting the proverb in exactly the same place as did the *Xinxu* author, strains credulity.²⁸ The more plausible explanation is that the *Shiji* author used a text with the proverb occurring in the story.

Additionally, if the *Shiji* author had conflated the two *Zuozhuan* accounts, we would expect the *Shiji* rendering of the proverb to resemble the *Zuozhuan* rendering, but this it does not.

²⁷ This involves the question of the practicalities related to the composition of the *Shiji*; for a study of this, see William H. Nienhauser, Jr. "A Note on a Textual Problem in the *Shih chi* and Some Speculations Concerning the Compilation of the Hereditary Houses," *T'oung Pao* 89.1-3 (2003), 39–58, in which it is argued that the Hereditary Houses are not the work of Sima Qian 司馬遷, but mainly of his assistants.

²⁸ However, Shi Guangying, *Xinxu jiaoshi*, 1.5/49, explicitly postulates that this is what happened.

The differences are minor, but there appears to be no plausible reason for holding *Shiji*’s ‘外舉不隱仇, 內舉不隱子’²⁹ to be based on *Zuozhuan*’s ‘外舉不棄讎, 內舉不失親’ — somewhat closer is *Lüshi chunqiu*’s ‘外舉不避讎, 內舉不避子.’³⁰ *Lüshi chunqiu* has Confucius voice the proverb, but he is to a large extent interchangeable with the *junzi*.³¹

It would simplify matters if we were able to say that a version close to the *Xinxu* version had served as source for *Shiji*, but against this argues the fact that the *Shiji* rendering of the proverb, ‘外舉不隱仇, 內舉不隱子,’ is actually least similar to *Xinxu*’s ‘外舉不避仇讎, 內舉不回親戚.’ The affinity of the *Shiji* version with the *Xinxu* version *on the whole* is, however, closest, since only *Xinxu* agrees with *Shiji* both in featuring the *junzi* and in rendering or alluding to the *Shu* passage.

Apparently, the *Shiji* author fused distinct historical events described close to each other in *Zuozhuan* in order to create an historical setting for the Qi Xi story, but looked elsewhere for material when he created his compressed version of the story itself. Whether a single source was used for this material, a source which is mirrored partly in *Xinxu*, partly in *Lüshi chunqiu*, or whether elements were drawn from several sources of this kind is impossible to say, but in any case, *Shiji* does not appear to relate any material that is able to illuminate the provenance of the *Zuozhuan* rendition that is not contained in *Xinxu* and *Lüshi chunqiu*, so we can leave it out of consideration in the following discussion.

The *Guoyu* version

In the *Guoyu* version of the story Qi Xi only recommends his son Wu, engaging in a long-winded eulogy of his virtues; there is nothing to parallel the part in the *Zuozhuan*, *Lüshi chunqiu* and

²⁹ Note that there is a variant reading, ‘避,’ for the first ‘隱’ in the Mao 毛 edition; Takigawa Kametarō 瀧川龜太郎, *Shiki kaichū kōshō* 史記會注考證 (1934); reprinted in *Shiji huizhu kaozheng fu jiaobu* 史記會注考證附校補 (Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Chubanshe, 1986), 39/1000.

³⁰ Or the *Han Fei zi* version of the story, which has ‘外舉不避讎, 內舉不避子’; however, *Han Fei zi* features Zhao Wu instead of Qi Xi.

³¹ Confucius had not been born when Qi Xi retired, but *Lüshi chunqiu* does not imply that his comment was contemporaneous.

Xinxu that tells how Qi Xi recommended his enemy Xie Hu, nor is there any mention of Yangshe Chi. The moral of the story is expressed as '擇臣莫若君, 擇子莫若父' (when selecting an official, no one is better than the ruler; when selecting a son, no one is better than his father), which appears to be another proverb.³² We should note that the proverb is not quite apposite here: a ruler knows which of his ministers is best and a father knows which of his sons is best, but here the problem is not to choose the best among a number of sons, but to choose a son above an unrelated person.

Stylistically speaking, Qi Xi's appraisal of Qi Wu resembles the evaluation of Yangshe dafu, the father of Yangshe Zhi and grandfather of Shu Xiang, made by Qi Xi in *Da Dai lijì* 大戴禮記 (where Qi Xi's name is written '祁奚'), an evaluation which is also evidenced in *Kongzi jiayu* 孔子家語.³³ To some extent it also resembles an evaluation made by Cheng Zhuan 成摶 of Yang Zhi 羊殖 (that is, Yangshe Zhi) in *Shuoyuan*.³⁴ In *Da Dai lijì*, Qi Xi is asked for his evaluation by Duke Ping of Jin. Possibly, the *Guoyu* account of Qi Wu has been influenced by a text containing an evaluation of Qi Wu belonging to this literary genre; however, no direct verbal parallels with extant texts are in evidence.

It is difficult to determine whether or not the *Guoyu* version draws on *Zuozhuan*. In the part concerning the recommendation of Qi Wu, *Zuozhuan* does not contain anything corresponding to *Guoyu*'s '孰可,' an expression reflected only in *Xinxu*'s '孰可使嗣' – *Han Feizi*, *Lüshi chunqiu*, *Han Shi waizhuan* and *Shuoyuan* contain variations of this, employing '誰' instead of '孰.' However, *Zuozhuan* does use '孰可' in its passage about the recommendation of

³² For parallels, see Yang Bojun, commentary in *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, Xi 7.2/317; Zhao 11.10/1327–8.

³³ *Da Dai lijì huijiao jizhu* 60/708–11; *Kongzi jiayu*, ed. Zhang Mianzhou 張綿周 (Shanghai: Yuanji Shuzhuang, 1926) 12/64. In *Da Dai lijì*, the appreciation is framed by a series of appreciations that Confucius makes on Zi Gong's 子貢 request. Confucius begins with Bo Yi 伯夷 and Shu Qi 叔齊 and ends with Jiezi Tui 介子推. Yangshe Chi also occurs in this list of wise men, hinting that he in certain milieux was more highly regarded than we have reason to expect from e.g. *Zuozhuan*. Note also Confucius' forceful exclamation in *Kongzi jiayu*, "嚮使銅鞮伯華無死, 則天下其有定矣!" (If Yangshe Chi had not died, the world would have been at peace!) (*Kongzi jiayu* 13.7/68).

³⁴ *Shuoyuan* 11/291.

Yangshe Chi, writing '孰可以代之,' and parts of the *Guoyu* passage may thus conceivably be derived from *Zuozhuan* (though *Guoyu* does not mention Yangshe Chi in the story), though whereas in *Xinxu* and *Zuozhuan* '可' is an auxiliary verb, in *Guoyu* it is a full verb.

Interestingly, *Guoyu* integrates the story into its larger view of Jin history, with its closing remark that as a result of Qi Xi's recommendation, there was no misgovernance in the military throughout the reign of Duke Ping of Jin (殲平公，軍無秕政), the emphasis being on the lasting results of the Jin hegemony reestablished by Duke Dao of Jin. Similar remarks occur later in *Guoyu*, but in the reign of Duke Ping.³⁵ One might wonder whether this betrays that the story originally was held to take place under Duke Ping or whether the expression naturally encompasses the prior reign of Duke Dao, but this is a moot point.

In sum, there are no clear grounds for holding that the *Guoyu* is influenced here by the *Zuozhuan* version of the story and it can be left out of consideration in the following discussion. The *Guoyu* version may conceivably be earlier than the *Zuozhuan* version or it may an extremely attenuated version of it, altered to accommodate the *Guoyu*'s penchant for lengthy speeches.

The *Xinxu* version

The *Xinxu* version is difficult to account for. It does not appear to be independent of *Zuozhuan*, but the situation is not altogether clear.

Qi Xi is first asked who he will recommend to become his successor; subsequently he is asked who can fill the post of senior officer of the central army. The question is whether two different positions are involved here or just one.

The *Lüshi chunqiu* version of the story clearly holds that two positions were involved, since the position that Qi Xi recommends Xie Hu for is that of prefect of Nanyang, whereas his son is subsequently recommended for office because the state (國) of Jin lacked a senior officer of the central army (尉), the position he obtains obviously being that of senior officer of the central army, as in *Zuozhuan* and *Xinxu*. The same pattern is repeated in the versions of the story figuring other persons mentioned above: two persons and two offices are involved.

³⁵ *Guoyu jijie* 14.01/421, 14.11/429.

The *Zuozhuan* version clearly implies that Qi Xi was retiring from the position of senior officer of the central army, since his son is noted to have been installed in this position after Xie Hu dies. In the *Zuozhuan* appreciation, the point is also expressly made that only one office is involved.

Whereas the *Zuozhuan* is entitled to assume knowledge about which position Qi Xi held upon his retirement, the question is what the *Xinxu* author can assume its readers know. Qi Xi was not an illustrious personage, and the *Xinxu* can hardly have taken acquaintance with him for granted. It does not seem to be the case that the *Xinxu* reader was able to infer from the story itself that the position offered Xie Hu is the same as that offered Qi Wu, expressly named as senior officer of the central army, since Xie Hu is nowhere said to have died in *Xinxu*, and the reader can hardly be counted on to fill in this piece of information from general knowledge, since Xie Hu was possibly not known outside of the story.

The circumstance that *Zuozhuan* omits a piece of information that it is allowed to omit, whereas *Xinxu* does not supply the same piece of information, though we would expect it to do so, points in the direction that *Xinxu* text can only be understood against the background of *Zuozhuan*.

If the story originally concerned two distinct offices, there would probably be nothing in it about inheriting (嗣) a position and presumably nothing about Qi Xi retiring; these two elements are tied together and they are found in *Zuozhuan* and *Xinxu* only. In *Zuozhuan*, a major point of the appreciation is that *one* office is involved from beginning to end, and this is only possible if Qi Xi retires. In *Xinxu*, one can only figure out that Qi Xi retired from the position of senior officer of the central army if one knows that Xie Hu dies and that only one position is involved — *Xinxu*, however, neglects to inform us about these two matters.

My hypothesis is that the author of the *Xinxu* version started out with a version of the story largely similar to that in *Lüshi chunqiu*.³⁶ This version featured Qi Xi – otherwise, there would have been no temptation to align it with *Zuozhuan*. The harmonization of the two accounts

³⁶ See also Cai Xinfu 蔡信發, “Xinxu shuzheng” 新序疏證, *Taipei Shili Nüzi Shifan Zhuanke Xuexiao xuebao* 台北市立女子師範專科學校學報 8 (1976), 198. Cai holds the *Xinxu* version to be a modification based on *Lüshi chunqiu* (據呂覽而改).

took place in the simplest way imaginable, in that every element in the base version was sequentially aligned with the corresponding element in *Zuozhuan*. No effort was made to ensure that all elements of the *Zuozhuan* story were represented in the resulting version, only that the elements present in the base version approached those in the *Zuozhuan* version. This means that the original story line was basically left unchanged, giving rise to the problems of interpretation that make the *Xinxu* story hard to follow.

The beginning was paraphrased from *Zuozhuan*, leading to the situation that it was not mentioned which office was concerned, but only that the recommendee was to succeed to Qi Xi's position. The reason the position of senior officer of the central army is mentioned in connection with the second recommendation is simply that this is how the base version read, and there was nothing corresponding to this passage in *Zuozhuan* that differed. The pattern in these stories is that the first recommendation is for a provincial post, whereas the second is for a capital post, and the base text in this case mentioned a capital post, that of senior officer of the central army.

After the initial evaluation of Qi Xi, '祁奚能舉善矣,' corresponding to '善哉, 祁黃羊之論也' in *Lüshi chunqiu* and '其祁奚之謂矣' in *Zuozhuan*, the base version contained the proverb '外舉不避仇讎, 內舉不回親戚,' and this was left standing, even though it did not appear in *Zuozhuan*. Only passages which paralleled *Zuozhuan* were adapted.

What one imagines to have happened after this depends on whether or not one regards it as a possibility that *Xinxu* originally contained an appreciation voiced by the *junzi* which included quotations from the *Shi* and the *Shu*. That *junzi yue* 君子曰 passages are not the hallmark of *Zuozhuan*, but that *Zuozhuan* partakes in a larger tradition where historical judgments were attributed to a "gentleman" was argued early on by Liu Shipei 劉師培 (1884–1919).³⁷ *Xinxu* examples of *junzi yue* passages where no dependency upon *Zuozhuan* are in evidence, but none of these involve any quotations from *Shi* and *Shu* and most appear derived from other known texts, or could be from the hand of Liu Xiang 劉向, the *Xinxu*

³⁷ Liu Shipei, *Du Zuo zhaji* 讀左劄記, collected in *Liu Shenshu xiansheng yishu* 劉申叔先生遺書 (Nanjing: Jiangsu Guji Chubanshe, 1997). The literature on this subject is voluminous.

editor/compiler.³⁸ Quotations from *Shi* and *Shu* that are not paralleled in *Zuozhuan* are also in evidence, but these could also be supplied by Liu Xiang.³⁹

One might thus regard the *Xinxu* passage as an adaptation of the *Zuozhuan* version to the smaller cast of its (postulated) base story: as much was copied from *Zuozhuan* that did not touch upon the Yangshe family members who were not mentioned there. My argument for the secondary nature of *Zuozhuan* does not require that *Xinxu* contained the *junzi yue* passage, but rests on the presence of the proverb and the following summation involving the expression ‘至公.’

This in no way constitutes a proof, only a weak scenario that might show how the *Xinxu* came to have its present, “contaminated,” form. However, let us try to imagine the opposite: that *Xinxu* is a refashioning of the *Zuozhuan* account alone.

Most importantly, we should have to explain why the central messages of the *Zuozhuan* account — how inheritance of office can be impartial, how the fates of the Qi and Yangshe lineages were entwined, how Qi Xi achieved three goals by one action — have completely disappeared.

That it is implausible to suppose that *Zuozhuan* was copied, but that these elements were left out, is an argument of a “literary” nature, and it cannot be ruled out that someone completely insensitive to the underlying message of the *Zuozhuan* account should have excerpted the present *Xinxu* account. However, how can it be explained that these deletions produce an account that is in fundamental agreement with the other parallels in evidence, such as the *Lüshi chunqiu* version? For such things to happen independently is well-nigh impossible; the only way to carry through this argument would be to posit that the other editions were dependent on this original revision of *Zuozhuan*, but nothing points in that direction.

³⁸ *Xinxu jiaoshi* 7.2/845 (based on *Han Shi waizhuan*), 7.10/889–90 (basis unknown), 7.11/903 (basis unknown), 7.20/953 (based on *Han Shi waizhuan*), 7.23/967 (based on *Han Shi waizhuan*), 7.27/999–1000 (basis unknown). *Xinxu jiaoshi* 7.12/908 appears to depend on *Zuozhuan*; see Cai Xinfu, “*Xinxu shuzheng*,” 95.

³⁹ *Xinxu jiaoshi* 5.28/773 (*Shi*, basis unknown), 5.29/780 (*Shi* and *Shu*, basis unknown), 7.1/841 (*Shu*, basis unknown).

How the Yangshe family members completely disappeared in this adaptation process would be a mystery, but one might claim that this does not prove anything. However, even granted that the Yangshe family members are dispensable, the proverb occurs in *Zuozhuan* in connection with precisely Qi Xi and Shu Xiang of the Yangshe lineage later on in *Zuozhuan*, so in order to explain how the *Xinxu* could be derived from *Zuozhuan*, we will first have to postulate that the Yangshe family members were purged from the story and then postulate that the proverb was inserted from a later account, precisely on the basis of the perceived (but suppressed) connection seen between Qi Xi and the Yangshe family, and this strains credulity.

The *Lüshi chunqiu* version

The *Lüshi chunqiu* version has been touched several times upon above, and treated as if it was as clear as it was simple, but one thing that appears odd about it, seen from the background of the *Zuozhuan*, is that Qi Xi recommends his son for a position that he has held himself, without this being noted at all. In the *Lüshi chunqiu* version of the story, Qi Xi recommends Qi Wu for the position during the reign of Duke Ping, long time after he has himself retired from this post, but this omission is nonetheless puzzling.

I think we should bear in mind here the extreme schematism of the *Lüshi chunqiu* version. It presents only the bare facts necessary to put forth its point about impartiality and it lays out these facts with a formalism that is quite strict. If one of the recommendations was to be portrayed as special, involving transmission of office from father to son, the neat parallelism of the story would be broken. For someone interested in hereditary transmission of office, such as the *Zuozhuan* author, this omission would indeed be puzzling, but to the *Lüshi chunqiu* author, drawing attention to this circumstance would have confounded the point of his story.

Nonetheless, this does raise some doubts about the originality of the *Lüshi chunqiu* version: there are aspects of this story here that remain opaque.

The *Shu* quotation and the introduction of Yangshe Chi

I wish now to examine the passages that are unique to *Zuozhuan* in order to see whether we can learn anything about their provenance and their meaning within *Zuozhuan*.

In between the story proper and the pronouncement of the *junzi* occurs a summing-up of the results of Qi Xi's recommendations, '於是使祁午為中軍尉,羊舌赤佐之' (then he made Qi Wu senior officer of the central army; Yangshe Chi was his adjutant). This is not paralleled in any other version of the story, but since it does not present any new information, it is quite possible that it was filled in by the *Zuozhuan* author. It is unlikely, however, that it was made up by the *Zuozhuan* author solely on the basis of the version of the Qi Xi story at his disposal, for the passage closely mirrors the *Zuozhuan* account of the appointments made by Duke Dao of Jin when he ascended the throne three years earlier (0573): '祁奚為中軍尉, 羊舌職佐之' (Qi Wu was senior officer of the central army; Yangshe Zhi was his adjutant).⁴⁰ I wish to suggest, based on the closeness of the two *Zuozhuan* passages, that the *Zuozhuan* author adapted the original Qi Xi story by accommodating the information contained in this passage concerning Qi Xi and Yangshe Zhi to their sons.

Integrating the story about the recommendation made by Qi Xi and the *Zuozhuan* notice on Duke Dao's appointments entailed introducing the son of Yangshe Zhi, Chi (polite name 伯華), adjutant to Qi Wu, the senior officer of the central army, and this meant adapting the *junzi* passage.

In the *Zuozhuan* version, the *junzi* first makes a general statement about Qi Xi's recommendations, '祁奚於是能舉善矣' (Qi Xi in this was definitely capable of recommending the good), and then comments on each of the three recommendations: '稱其讎, 不為諂; 立其子, 不為比; 舉其偏, 不為黨' (when recommending his enemy, he showed no flattery; when appointing his own son, he showed no partiality; when recommending his adjutant, he showed no partisanship). This contains a passage not contained in *Xinxu*, the last phrase '舉其偏, 不為黨.' The preceding two phrases, '稱其讎, 不為諂; 立其子, 不為比,' concern the first persons recommended by Qi Xi, Xie Hu (his 讎) and Wu (his 子), but the third passage pertains to his

⁴⁰ *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, Cheng 18.3/910. The *Guoyu* parallel reads: '公知祁奚之果而不淫也, 使為元尉, 知羊舌職之聰敏肅給也, 使佐之' (The duke knew that Xi Qi was resolute and never wanton, and so he made him senior officer of the central army; he knew that Yangshe Zhi was diligent and loyal, and so he made him adjutant) (*Guoyu jijie* 13.1/407).

recommendation of Yangshe Chi, the passage explaining that, even though Qi Xi recommended his adjutant (偏), this did not constitute partisanship (黨).⁴¹

This passage is strangely at odds with the following quotation from the *Shu*, ‘無偏無黨’ (one should not be partial, one should not be partisan), for whereas ‘偏’ and ‘黨’ clearly are synonyms in the *Shu*, they cannot be synonyms to the *junzi*. ‘偏’ must, as suggested by the commentator Du Yu 杜預 (222–285) mean ‘associate’ or ‘subordinate’ (屬) in ‘舉其偏,’ referring as it does to Yangshe Chi, who assisted Qi Wu. It looks as if the *Zuozhuan* author, having added Yangshe Zhi and Yangshe Chi to the story, felt the need for a further phrase and was inspired by the *Shu* quotation. Whether or not he realized that this entailed using ‘偏’ in conflicting senses is uncertain, but we might regard this as yet another instance of the *Zuozhuan* author’s “creativity” in relation to the interpretation of the classics, perhaps evidenced also by his *Shi* interpretation, discussed below.

After the *Shu* quotation, *Zuozhuan* sums up the outcome of Qi Xi’s actions: ‘解狐得舉, 祁午得位, 伯華得官, 建一官而三物成, 能舉善也’ (Xie Hu was recommended; Qi Wu obtained his position, and Bohua obtained his office: he set up one office, but accomplished three things: he was definitely capable of recommending the good.). The ‘一官’ is of course the office of 中軍尉, subsuming all of its top staff: Xie Hu was recommended for this position, but died; Qi Wu was recommended for the same position, and obtained it; and Yangshe Chi obtained the position as his adjutant: Qi Xi in this way accomplished three affairs (三物) in relation to a single office (一官), this sleight of hand obviously being seen as something praiseworthy.⁴² Needless to say, this embroidery on the story could well have been added by the *Zuozhuan* author himself on the basis of the information available to him — indeed, the use of numerical categories is one of the characteristics of *Zuozhuan* rhetorics.⁴³

⁴¹ Yangshe Chi was of course not adjutant to Qi Xi: his father, Yangshe Zhi, was, but Qi Xi recommended him to substitute for Yangshe Zhi, who was Qi Xi’s adjutant.

⁴² According to Fu Qian (quoted *Chunqiu Zuoshizhuan jiuzhu shuzheng*, 996), ‘三物’ refers to the three persons involved who all were able to accomplish their duties. This of course is a little strained when it comes to Xie Hu, since he died before taking up office; nonetheless, Liu Wenqi argues in favor of this interpretation.

⁴³ David C. Schaberg, *A Patterned Past: Form and Thought in Early Chinese Historiography* (Cambridge, Mass.:

The interpretation of the *Shi* quotation

Whereas the interpretation of the *Shu* quotation found in both *Xinxu* and *Zuozhuan* is unproblematic, being unquestionably about impartiality, the interpretation of the *Shi* quotation presents problems that are central to the understanding of the story in its various versions.

The *Shi* quotation ‘唯/惟其有之，是以似之’ should presumably be understood in connection with the ‘唯善，故能舉其類’ preceding it and with the ‘祁奚有焉’ following it. This would imply that ‘似’ and ‘類’ are synonymous and that ‘有’ has the same object in its two occurrences. This leads to a fairly straightforward interpretation:

He has (goodness/impartiality) and therefore he is capable of recommending those similar to himself (that is, persons equally good/impartial). The *Odes* say: “He is in possession of it (that is, goodness/impartiality), and therefore [those he recommends] resemble him (in being in possession of goodness/impartiality).” Qi Xi was definitely in possession of it!

This is the interpretation of Du Yu.⁴⁴ However, the *Shi* in question has traditionally been read as a defense of hereditary succession to office.⁴⁵ This is the interpretation made in the *Shixu* 詩序, which regards the poem as a praise of the ancient institution of hereditary office (世祿), as well as the interpretation suggested in the *Mao Commentary* 毛傳, which glosses ‘似’ as ‘嗣.’ According to Chen Huan 陳奐 (1786–1863), this interpretation is based in a wish to harmonize the *Shi* with the *Zuozhuan* story about Qi Xi: ‘傳實本左傳以立訓也’ (the commentary in fact bases itself on *Zuozhuan* when glossing).⁴⁶ Be that as it may, the whole Qi Xi story begins in

Harvard University Press, 2001), 47–8.

⁴⁴ ‘唯有德之人，能舉似己者也’ (Only persons of virtue are able to recommend those who resemble themselves); *Shisan jing zhushu* 十三經注疏, ed. Ruan Yuan 阮元 (Taipei: Xin Wenfeng Chuban Gongsì, reprint) 6/29/501b. Since evil persons surely would recommend persons resembling themselves as well, the interpretation is of course quite vacuous.

⁴⁵ *Shi, Xiao Ya* 小雅, *Tangtang zhe hua*: 裳裳者華; *Shisan jing zhushu* 2/14/480b.

⁴⁶ Chen Huan 陳奐, *Shi Maoshi zhuan shu* 詩毛氏傳疏 (*Guoxue jiben congshu* 國學基本叢書 ed.) (Shanghai: Shangwu Yinshuguan, 1933), 5/21/40.

Zuozhuan with the question about who is to succeed (嗣) to Qi Xi’s office and ends with the *Shi* quotation about how sons succeed (似 = 嗣) to the offices of their fathers, this coherence providing a strong argument in favor of reading ‘似’ as ‘嗣.’

This interpretation of ‘似’ as ‘嗣’ presumably entails reading ‘類’ as ‘lineage.’⁴⁷ Together these two glosses produce a reading which is quite apposite in the context of *Zuozhuan* story:

He has (goodness) and can therefore recommend his offspring. The *Odes* say: “He is in possession of it (goodness) and therefore [his offspring] inherit it (that is, goodness).” Qi Xi was definitely in possession of it!

Though there are no concrete indications that show which interpretation is adopted in the *Zuozhuan* and *Xinxu*, it would appear that the first interpretation fits the *Xinxu* version of the story, whereas the second interpretation fits the *Zuozhuan* version of the story.

The circumstance that Qi Wu and Yangshe Chi succeed to the positions of their fathers suggests that the *Zuozhuan* author was very much concerned to legitimize the “impartiality” of hereditary succession to office rather than impartiality in a more bureaucratic sense. The *Lüshi chunqiu* and *Xinxu*, on the other hand, show no concern with hereditary succession to office — here the idea is simply to contrast the recommendation of an enemy and the recommendation of a son and to argue that a man of utmost impartiality may be bound to recommend his own offspring.

If Qi Xi is unconcerned with impartiality in the bureaucratic sense, why then bother recommending Xie Hu? What would the point of this action be if hereditary succession to office was the concern from beginning to end? Xie Hu has a very clear role in the other versions, but in *Zuozhuan*, with its exclusive concern with heredity, his appearance appears unmotivated and is probably due to the *Zuozhuan* author’s incomplete assimilation of his sources for this story.

Above I have argued that the *Xinxu* version is not independent of the *Zuozhuan* version, but rather merged a version close to the *Lüshi chunqiu* version with the *Zuozhuan* wherever possible. Strangely, in adapting the *Zuozhuan*, *Xinxu* then managed to produce a more consistent

⁴⁷ Cf. *Shi, Da Ya* 大雅, *Ji zui* 既醉, *Shisan jing zhushu* 2/17/606a, quoted *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, Yin 1.4/16.

story, as shown in the interpretation of the *Shu* and *Shi* quotations that go naturally with it. If one upholds the primacy of *Zuozhuan* in relation to introducing the *Shi* and *Shu* quotations themselves, one therefore has to claim that in *Xinxu* a reinterpretation is performed which solves the contradictions found in *Zuozhuan*. While this is certainly not impossible, one would not normally expect such interventions to occur in collections of didactic stories, and it is more likely that the inconsistency evidenced in *Zuozhuan* is the result of a (forced) reinterpretation: just as the occurrence of '偏' was motivated by a wish to integrate Yangshe Chi with the *Shu* quotation, so the insistence that hereditary office was concerned influenced the interpretation of the *Shi* quotation.

The *Shi* and the *Shu* quotations should be read together, so what we have in *Xinxu* is the repeated statement of a simple moral about impartiality, whereas in *Zuozhuan* we have a contorted manipulation of the *Shu* to fit the different roles of Qi Wu and Yangshe Chi, as well as the use of the *Shi* to express what has admittedly become a standard interpretation (being possibly an interpretation based on *Zuozhuan* itself), but an interpretation that at least does not agree with the *Shu* quotation and therefore appears incongruous. On top of this, we have the occurrence of Xie Hu, which it does not appear possible to explain within a story dedicated to extolling the virtues of hereditary transmission of office.

The possibility suggests itself that *Zuozhuan* may not be original in this part in relation to *Xinxu* after all, but that the *Zuozhuan* author reinterpreted *Shi* and *Shu* passages occurring in a pre-existing story. This makes the interdependencies — complicated enough as they are — impossible to unravel, but my argument does not aim to restore a definite version of the story as original, but only to point to some of the structural features it had and to claim that in *Zuozhuan* a considerable amount of editing is in evidence.

Recommendations in *Zuozhuan*

The word '舉,' in the sense of an official recommending to a ruler that a certain person be bestowed with office, is only evidenced in *Zuozhuan* in the story under consideration. In *Zuozhuan*, '舉' is exclusively used of a ruler elevating a person from obscurity to (high) office; officials may well in fact have recommended that this be done, but the word '舉' is not used for

this.⁴⁸ Throughout *Zuozhuan*, the largest concentration of the use of ‘舉’ in related senses is found in the passages related to Qi Xi and Shu Xiang, and in *Zuozhuan* Qi Xi is the only official ever said to have recommended (舉) to his lord that somebody be appointed to office. Qi Xi also recommends (稱) Xie Hu; this also seems to be the only place in *Zuozhuan* where this word is evidenced.

We should not attach too much importance to a single lexical item, but if this is indeed an intrusion of a term common from a more bureaucratic era, it does add some support for the argument that the story of Qi Xi’s recommendations was not based originally on ideas of hereditary inheritance of office, but rather (incompletely) adapted to such ideas.

We shall discuss the meaning of ‘舉’ again below, for the second time it appears in connection with Qi Xi, it is also difficult to make sense of.

The proverb about inner 內 and outer 外

The words ‘內’ and ‘外’ in the proverb can be given at least two different interpretations.

According to one interpretation, ‘內’ and ‘外’ refer to the geographical location of the offices concerned, i.e. whether they were in the capital or in the provinces. On this interpretation the proverb reads: “when recommending persons for provincial posts, he did not avoid his enemies; when recommending persons for capital posts, he did not avoid his relatives.” Such an interpretation fits *Lüshi chunqiu* and *Han Fei zi* well, since in these versions the enemy is rather conspicuously offered a provincial office, whereas the office the son is recommended for is located in the capital.

This interpretation results in a moral that is strangely lacking in generality — one could justifiably ask, why not the opposite, why were enemies not avoided for capital posts and relatives not avoided for provincial posts? Could this be because provincial posts were of lower status and thus befitting only non-relatives? Though thoughts of this kind could lie behind the

⁴⁸ The word is used in *Zuozhuan* in the following passages: *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, Yin 3.5/29, Xi 33.6/502, Xi 33.6/503, Wen 3.4/530, Wen 18.7/638, Xuan 12.2/724, Cheng 18.3/911, Xiang 3.4/927 (Qi Xi), Xiang 9.4/966, Xiang 21.5/1060 (Qi Xi and Shu Xiang), Xiang 29.17/1168, Zhao 14.3/1365, Zhao 28.3/1494–6 (Yangshe and Qi clans).

proverb, presumably one should "cross-read" it, resorting to the principle of *huwen* 互文, so that it reads that in all cases, whether enemies or relatives and provincial or capital posts are concerned, one should only consider the suitability of the person recommended, not one's relationship with him.

According to another line of interpretation, '內' and '外' refer to an opposition between relatives and non-relatives; in this case, '內舉不回親戚'/'內舉不失親' would then be rendered "when recommending those of his own clan he did not avoid (even) those closely related to himself," and '外舉不避仇讎'/'外舉不棄讎' would be "when recommending those not of his own clan, he did not discard (even) those who were his enemies." This use of '內' and '外' is evidenced e.g. in *Zuozhuan*, in the expression '內姓選於親, 外姓選於舊' (if it is from among his own clan, he selects a person who is closely related to him, and if from among those of another surname, he selects a person long known to him),⁴⁹ in which '內' and '外' refer to people related and unrelated by ties of blood (here to the king of Chu 楚). This also fits the *Lüshi chunqiu*, the *Han Fei zi*, and probably the *Xinxu*, since here Qi Xi goes to the extreme of recommending his own son (and not some other, less close, relative) and goes to the extreme of recommending a foe (and not just someone he happened to disagree with).

A somewhat different construal of the terms '內' and '外' is found in a *Guoyu* passage in which Yangshe Chi declines to give advice to Fan Xuanzi on how to solve a dispute over land boundaries with (the otherwise unknown) He dafu 和大夫, stating that '外有軍, 內有事; 赤也, 外事也, 不敢侵官' (on the outside, there are army matters, on the inside, there are affairs. I, Chi, take care of outside affairs; I dare not infringe on the offices of others).⁵⁰ Here '內' refers to the private affairs of the clan of the ruler and '外' to the public affairs of the state, and the point made here by Yangshe Chi, is that he, an outer official, does not intend to encroach upon the jurisdiction of inner officials. To this, Qi Xi replies that matters concerning disrespectful relatives of the ruling clan, as well as cases of evil doings in "inner matters" (內事) and covetousness among grandees, are within his jurisdiction. Yangshe Chi thus takes care of 外 and Qi Xi 內.

⁴⁹ *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, *Xuan* 12.2/724.

⁵⁰ *Guoyu jijie* 14.5/423.

This is clearly connected with the circumstance that Qi Xi was appointed clan head (公族大夫) after retiring from the post of senior official of the central army — he had responsibility for the good behavior of members of the clan of the ruler, whose affairs were 內事 — just as it is clearly connected with the circumstance that Yangshe Chi was adjutant to the senior official of the central army.

The *Guoyu* version of the story does not render the proverb under discussion, but the fact that Qi Xi and Yangshe Chi occur in it renders it of potential relevance to the story about Qi Xi’s recommendations. If we interpret the proverb in the light of the *Guoyu* passage, we have “when recommending persons for outer (public) offices, he did not avoid enemies; when recommending persons for inner (private, clan) offices, he did not avoid relatives.” However, clearly the meaning attached to ‘內’ and ‘外’ in the *Guoyu* passage cannot be the meaning employed in the story about Qi Xi, since Qi Xi recommends that his son be given an outer (military position), whereas he should, according to this interpretation, have been given an inner office, so only the first two interpretations of the proverb are plausible.

We should note that an expression (which we will meet again below) occurs in *Zuozhuan* that bears a certain resemblance to the proverb: ‘近不失親, 遠不失舉’ (he did not neglect his relatives when giving fiefs to those closely related to him, and he did not neglect those who deserved fiefs when giving fiefs to those distantly related to him).⁵¹ If this is a reflection of the proverb (or can be taken to express the same moral), then the second interpretation is the more plausible, at least in *Zuozhuan*. However, I believe it would be wrong to rule out the first interpretation in relation to the original story.

The story about Shu Xiang’s release through the intercession of Qi Xi

A important fact, mentioned a number of times above, about the *Zuozhuan* version of the story concerning Qi Xi’s recommendations is that it does not render the proverb in the story itself: the proverb appears as the culmination of all full versions of the story, except that in *Zuozhuan*. It is my argument that the *Zuozhuan* author had to remove the proverb from the recommendation

⁵¹ *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, Zhao 28.3/1494–6.

story, because it agreed neither with its structure nor with the facts of the story as it had developed in his hands. However, the *Zuozhuan* author did not simply eliminate the proverb from his work; he decided instead to move it, keeping it as part of his account of a later incident, an incident that also illustrates the relationship between the Qi and Yangshe clans.

According to *Zuozhuan*,⁵² in the twenty-first year of Duke Xiang of Lu (0552), Shu Xiang and Yangshe Chi were in difficulties because of allegations of rebellion leveled against their youngest brother, Hu 虎. Shu Xiang refused an offer by Yue Wangfu 樂王鮒, to intercede on his behalf before Duke Ping, because he held Yue Wangfu to be a sycophant. He refused even to reply to his offer of help and did not bow when he took leave of him. Shu Xiang insisted that he could be helped by Qi Xi alone, and when he was criticized for his insistence by his chamberlain (室老), he characterized Qi Xi with the words ‘祁大夫外舉不棄讎, 內舉不失親’ (Grandee Qi does not discard enemies when recommending persons for outer offices/when recommending those unrelated to him and he does not overlook relatives when recommending persons for inner offices/when recommending those related to him), adding the rhetorical question “Should he alone discard me?” (其獨遺我). Quite clearly this is the same proverb that we see in the story of Qi Xi's recommendations. Hearing of this, Qi Xi then post-haste (乘駟 “by relay station”) came to the rescue of Shu Xiang, who was subsequently released.⁵³

Moving the proverb has left its traces, since it gives rise to problems of interpretation. How are ‘不棄讎’ and ‘不失親’ relevant to the situation at hand? Obviously, Qi Xi and Shu Xiang are not closely related, but then neither are they enemies. The proverb simply does not apply to the circumstances of Shu Xiang's arrest. Furthermore, what can ‘舉’ mean? While it fits the (bureaucratic) context of recommendation for office, it is not at all clear what this word is

⁵² *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, Xiang 21.5/1060–1.

⁵³ If Qi Xi had retired at the customary age of seventy in 0570, he must have been more than eighty-five years old when this happened. See Sun Liqin 孫立勤, “Jinguo zhishi zhidu de xingcheng ji qi tedian” 晉國致仕制度的形成及其特點, *Yanbei Shiyuan xuebao (sheke ban)* 雁北師院學報(社科版) 1995.4, 12, 78, for a note on the Jin retirement system.

supposed to mean when release from imprisonment is at stake.⁵⁴ The fact that the phrase appears out of context must be a sign that it has been transposed from its original setting.

Consequently, the Duke Ping asked Yue Wangfu about Shu Xiang's culpability, and, obviously irritated by Shu Xiang's rebuff, he answered, '不棄其親, 其有焉' (he can surely be said not to disregard his relatives), in effect accusing Shu Xiang of collusion with his brother. This reply echoes '外舉不棄讎, 內舉不失親' (and thus, incidentally, assumes knowledge of the conversation between Shu Xiang and his chamberlain, to which Yue Wangfu could hardly have been privy), but transfers its context from recommendation for office to protection of criminals. It also echoes the last words of the story concerning Qi Xi's recommendations, '祁奚有焉,' in its '其有焉'; this expression is echoed once again by Qi Xi when he lists Shu Xiang's virtues to the duke, concluding with '叔向有焉.'⁵⁵

Conceivably, there may be something about the word '舉' that we do not understand and, quite possibly, the two '有焉' are standard phraseology to which no importance should be attached, and, of course, the assumed knowledge by Yue Wangfu of the words uttered by Shu Xiang in private is an excusable narrative oversight, but I believe that the occurrence of the proverb itself is not easy to explain away, and when coincidences pile up in this way, we would do well to consider alternative explanations.⁵⁶

⁵⁴ Actually, '舉' in such contexts would mean 'to denounce,' but this does not fit the story at all.

⁵⁵ After Shu Xiang is released through Qi Xi's intercession, point is made of the fact that neither did Qi Xi visit Shu Xiang, nor did Shu Xiang go to thank Qi Xi. This in an obverse manner reflects the theme of gratitude highlighted in the "half" versions of the recommendation story: both Qi Xi and Shu Xiang are wise enough to know that the intercession was made in the public interest alone and that expressions of gratitude are not needed. Whether or not Yangshe Chi was released on this occasion is not known.

⁵⁶ There is in fact an alternative explanation, for Xu Renfu 徐仁甫 posits that the *Zuozhuan* author had two occurrences of the proverb, one as in *Xinxu* and one in the story about Shu Xiang's release, but that the *Zuozhuan* author deleted the first one in order to avoid repetition; *Zuozhuan shuzheng* 左傳疏證 (Chengdu: Sichuan Renmin, 1981), 401. Xu Renfu, who believes the actual text of the *Xinxu* to have been used by the *Zuozhuan* author (who according to him was Liu Xin 劉歆), sees this deletion as an effort to improve the literary value of the text. This argument is as far-fetched as is his postulate that *Zuozhuan* is a Western Han fabrication.

The story about the release by Shu Xiang through the intercession of Qi Xi is also told in *Lüshi chunqiu* and *Shuoyuan*.⁵⁷ The versions of the story in these two works are extremely close, but it is not necessary here to determine their precise relationship, since neither of them mention Yue Wangfu and Shu Xiang's chamberlain, so they do not include the elements of the *Zuozhuan* account that I suggest are due to inspiration from the story about Qi Xi's recommendations.⁵⁸

The problem of the derivation of the *Zuozhuan* version

How are we to account for the circumstance that *Lüshi chunqiu*, *Xinxu* and *Shiji* render this proverb in the appraisal of Qi Xi made by the *junzi* or Confucius, whereas in *Zuozhuan* the same proverb occurs in an appraisal of Qi Xi that was made by Shu Xiang? There are two options. One is that the state of the story reflected in *Zuozhuan*, with the two elements belonging to two separate stories, is original, and that the states mirrored in *Lüshi chunqiu*, *Xinxu* and *Shiji*, where the proverb is part of the appreciation following the recommendation story, is derived from *Zuozhuan* by merging the two *Zuozhuan* accounts. The other is that *Lüshi chunqiu*, *Xinxu* and *Shiji* reflect the state of the story that was used to fashion the *Zuozhuan* account and that the proverb was removed from the recommendation story by the *Zuozhuan* author and used by him in a related account.

The question, of course, is not whether the *Zuozhuan* author did, or did not, sit with a copy of the *Lüshi chunqiu*, *Xinxu* or the *Shiji*; the question is whether or not these three texts, through their transmission, reflect a state of the story that is antecedent to that mirrored in *Zuozhuan*, a state of the story that must then also be in the ancestry of the source used by the *Zuozhuan* author. I do not claim that any version in these later compilations in all respects render the original story, only that certain features, both lexical and structural (such as the occurrence of the proverb in a certain position), have been maintained throughout the transmission and continual adaptation of the stories.

⁵⁷ *Lüshi chunqiu zhushu* 21/1427; *Shuoyuan jiaozheng* 11/283–4.

⁵⁸ It is of course possible to argue that this may show that they do not derive from *Zuozhuan* (or even that the *Zuozhuan* author has embroidered on them), but this line of argument will not be pursued here.

It is of course *conceivable* that the *Zuozhuan* entries for the third and the twenty-first year of Duke Xiang should have been conflated at some point in time, and that this is reflected in *Lüshi chunqiu*, *Xinxu* and *Shiji* — in other words, that these versions of the story all derive from a composite of the two *Zuozhuan* accounts — but it is highly *improbable* that this happened independently in the three sources, in the exact same way.⁵⁹

If an account along the lines of *Lüshi chunqiu*, *Xinxu* and *Shiji* derives from *Zuozhuan*, someone at some point in time modified the *Zuozhuan* Qi Xi story to express the moral of impartiality in a bureaucratic setting, rather than “impartial” hereditary succession to office, applied a bipartite structure throughout the story instead of *Zuozhuan*’s tripartite division, changed the single office emphasized in *Zuozhuan* into two offices, and introduced formulaic language not prominent in *Zuozhuan*. He moreover excised all passages referring to the Yangshe family, removed the two passages summing up the story, and inserted the proverb from Shu Xiang’s later evaluation of Qi Xi. Having reached this stage, the story then mutated into the versions featuring other persons, the *Xinxu* version being special since it may subsequently have been “contaminated” by the *Zuozhuan* account.⁶⁰

⁵⁹ Though Liu Zhenghao 劉正浩 does not state this explicitly, this in effect seems to be his position. In his works tracing the correspondences between *Zuozhuan* and later works, he treats separately the *Lüshi chunqiu*, *Shiji*, and *Xinxu*. Since he does not discuss the parallels to a given *Zuozhuan* passage together, Liu does not answer the question what can explain the agreement between the *Lüshi chunqiu*, *Shiji*, and *Xinxu*. “Taishigong Zuoshi Chunqiu yi shu” 太史公左氏春秋義述, *Taiwan Shengli Shifan Daxue guowen yanjiu jikan* 臺灣省立師範大學國文研究集刊 6 (1962), 362; *Zhou Qin zhuzi shu Zuozhuan kao* 周秦諸子述左傳考 (Taipei: Taiwan Shangwu, 1966), 112–3; *Liang Han zhuzi shu Zuozhuan kao* 兩漢諸子述左傳考 (Taipei: Taiwan Shangwu, 1968), 113–4.

⁶⁰ In *Shishuo xinyu* 世說新語 there is a rendering of the story which at first sight might be held to perform the manipulations that I here hold to be implausible. In the *Shishuo xinyu* story (the details of which need not concern us) Xun Shuang 荀爽 (128–190) quotes the proverb, “昔者祁奚內舉不失其子，外舉不失其讎，以為至公” (In olden days, Qi Xi did not neglect his own son when recommending for inner offices and did not neglect his enemy when recommending for outer offices). Which text this is based on is unclear, but it is clearly not *Zuozhuan*, for *Zuozhuan* does not contain anything like “至公” (whereas e.g. *Lüshi chunqiu* does). However, in his commentary to this passage, Liu Xiaobiao 劉孝標 (462–521) quotes the *Zuozhuan*, adroitly leaving out all references to the Yangshe family: “祁奚為中軍尉，請老。晉侯問嗣焉，稱解狐，其讎也。將立之而卒，又問焉。對曰：「午也可。」其子也。君子謂祁奚可謂能舉善矣。稱其讎不為諂，立其子不為比。” *Shishuo xinyu jianshu* 世說新語箋疏, ed. Yu Jiayi 余

If we hold something like this to be the case, we must also hold that all subsequent changes to the story took place without any influence from *Zuozhuan*, since there is no trace of the passages here hypothesized to have been excised from *Zuozhuan* in any of the other versions of the story. We therefore have a situation where *Zuozhuan* served as inspiration for someone once, but then was completely neglected. The only exceptions are when the *Xinxu* version was refashioned and when the *Shiji* author utilized the *Zuozhuan* version, but even in these two cases it is significant that no trace of the passages I claim were excised is in evidence.

If, on the other hand, the *Zuozhuan* version derives from a version similar to that found in *Xinxu* and *Lüshi chunqiu*, the *Zuozhuan* author must have added the passage about Yangshe Chi and his father and the two passages summing up the story, and moved the proverb to Shu Xiang’s appreciation of Qi Xi. This simpler account would explain why *Zuozhuan* is the singular source. However, if an argument for the derivatory status of *Zuozhuan* is to have any power, convincing reasons must be presented to explain *why* the *Zuozhuan* author should have engaged in such textual manipulations.

The Qi and Yangshe clans and the end of Jin

The Qi and Yangshe families are intimately connected from beginning to end in *Zuozhuan*, and their common destiny carried great significance for the history of Jin, central to *Zuozhuan* concerns.

When Wei Xianzi 魏獻子 assumed control of Jin government in 0514, the Qi and Yangshe families, having long been declining, were finally annihilated. Qi Ying 祁盈, the grandson of Qi Xi, and Yangshi Wo 楊食我, the son of Shu Xiang, were put to death and the

家錫 (rev. ed., Shanghai: Shanghai Guji, 1993) 2.7/63; *Shih-shuo Hsin-yü: A New Account of Tales of the World*, tr. Richard B. Mather (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1976), 29–30. In this rendering, “其子也” could be Liu Xiaobiao’s own insertion, echoing *Zuozhuan*’s “其讎也,” but where does “可謂” come from? Why would it occur in *Lüshi chunqiu*, *Shiji* and *Xinxu*, but not in *Zuozhuan*? In the *junzi*’s appreciation, the absence of “舉其偏,不為黨,” the passage that accounts for the Yangshe family members, is striking, but since Liu Xiaobiao shows that he relies on a source other than *Zuozhuan*, can we be sure that this omission is due to his own tailoring of the story? I think this is at least unclear. Anyway, we cannot hold that, even as a composite of text and commentary, the *Shishuo xinyu* conflates the *Zuozhuan* Xiang 3 and 21 entries, for the proverb obviously derives from another text.

lands of the two lineages redistributed.⁶¹ The power of the Jin ruling house had long been on the wane, but this action rendered it completely without allies. Among the eight powerful Jin clans, only Qi and Yangshe were natives of Jin, since the rest, the so-called Six Ministers 六卿 or Six Generals 六將 (Han 韓, Zhao 趙, Zhonghang 中行, Wei 魏, Fan 範, and Zhi 知) all were of foreign extraction. Seen from the vantage point of Jin, the extermination of the Qi and Yangshe clans was thus of capital importance.

The interpretation has been put forth that the *Zuozhuan* in many places has a marked pro-Wei attitude,⁶² and a good example of this is provided by the account of the enfeoffment of a relative with lands confiscated from the Qi and Yangshe clans, culminating in his self-righteous defense of this and Confucius’ flagrant praise of him.⁶³ Here as well we find echoes of the recommendation story.

Wei Xianzi begins the passage by expressing his fears that his enfeoffment of his clansman Wei Wu 魏戊 will be regarded as partiality (人其以我為黨乎), reflecting closely the theme of the discussion of Qi Xi’s recommendations. His interlocutor Cheng Zhuan 成搏 defends Wei Xianzi in an elaborately constructed speech,⁶⁴ in which he first defends Wei Xianzi by emphasizing the virtue of the recipient of the fief, but then pursues his real objective, which is to heap lavish praise upon Wei Xianzi himself, equating him in effect to the founders of the Zhou

⁶¹ *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, Zhao 28.3/1493. The Qi lands were divided into seven *xian* 縣 and the Yangshe lands into three, hinting that the Qi were more wealthy than the Yangshe. A recipient of one of the ten *xian* was a member of the Zhao clan. Earlier, Qi Xi had been the recipient of lands confiscated after the massacre on the Zhao clan in 0582, but after the establishment of Zhao Wu as clan leader, they were restored to Zhao (*Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, Cheng 8.6/838–9). Qi Xi appears to have played no active role in this debacle; cf. Bai Guohong 白國紅, *Chunqiu Jinguo Zhaoshi yanjiu* 春秋晉國趙氏研究 (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 2007), 107–16. Presumably Shu Xiang was deceased at this time. See Xiucai Zheng, “A comparison of the representations of women in *Zuozhuan* and *Shiji*” (Ph.D. thesis, University of Oregon, 2012), 111–6, for an interesting analysis of the *Zuozhuan* and *Shiji* accounts of the role played by Zhuang Ji 莊姬 in this near-elimination of the Zhao clan.

⁶² See e.g. Kamata Tadashi 鎌田正, *Saden no seiritsu to sono tenkai* 左傳の成立と其の展開 (Tokyo: Taishūkan, 1963), 305–61.

⁶³ *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, Zhao 28.3/1494–6.

⁶⁴ Cheng Zhuan is known as 成搏 in *Shuoyuan*; see above.

dynasty. King Wu gave the lands conquered from Shang as fiefs to relatives only (皆舉親也), and the moral to be derived from this is that when a sage ruler raises up (舉) someone (bestows a fief or an office on him), only the moral qualities of the person in question are considered — whether he is a relative or not is of no consequence (夫舉無他, 唯善所在, 親疏一也). We note that this is actually a restatement of the moral that can be drawn from Qi Xi’s three recommendations in *Zuozhuan*.⁶⁵ Cheng Zhuan then quotes a poem about King Wen,⁶⁶ the central concepts of which he glosses in a rather belabored manner to show that King Wen was in possession of nine virtues (度, 莫, 明, 類, 長, 君, 順, 比, 文), his faultlessness ensuring that his sons and grandsons would inherit the blessings Heaven had bestowed on him. He concludes that Wei Xianzi approaches King Wen in virtue and that his virtue will be transmitted over many generations.⁶⁷ We thus have a discussion on the same theme as that in the Qi Xi story, occurring in connection with the donation of the lands that originally belonged to the Qi and Yangshe clans.

Not all of the exposition of the poem is relevant to the discussion of the propriety of enfeoffing clansmen; only Cheng Zhuan’s definitions of ‘類’ as ‘勤施無私’ (“to bestow gifts in a persevering manner and without favoritism”) and of ‘比’ as ‘擇善而從之’ (“to seek out the good [in others] and follow it”) are relevant to this issue.⁶⁸ Both ‘類’ and ‘比’ are praised, which, viewed in the context of early Confucianism, is rather peculiar. In *Lunyu* 論語, both concepts express negative qualities related to partiality. Only 比 can be said to be discussed thematically there, but the use of ‘類’ in ‘有教無類’ surely is a clear indication that ‘類’ (whatever

⁶⁵ Ying Shao 應劭 (ca. 140 – before 204) also links the two stories; *Fengsu tongyi jiaoshi* 風俗通義校釋, ed. Wu Shuping 吳樹平 (Tianjin: Guji Chubanshe, 1988) 6/191, as noted by Liu Zhenghao, *Liang Han zhuzi shu Zuozhuan kao*, 114.

⁶⁶ Shi, *Da Ya, Huang yi* 皇矣 *Shisan jing zhushu* 2/16/567a–574b.

⁶⁷ Schaberg, *A Patterned Past*, 76–7, translates and analyzes the rhetorical patterns of this passage. The “duplicity” and “jarring” rhetorics of the passage is described by Wai-ye Li, *The Readability of the Past in Early Chinese Historiography* (Cambridge, Mass., 2007), 12–4; cf. also, 54, note 71. Li regards this passage as “one of the most blatant discrepancies between rhetoric and reality in *Zuozhuan*,” 159.

⁶⁸ This appears also to be Du Yu’s view; note that he only glosses these two concepts in his final comment on Cheng Zhuan’s speech.

distinctions it referred to) was something to overcome.⁶⁹ The two words are presumably used causatively in the *Shi* poem, King Wen being praised for his ability to cause others to follow him 類 and to cause others to ally with him 比; in Cheng Zhuan's interpretation, however, the words denote qualities of King Wen himself. This makes for some rather forced interpretations: concepts usually denoting partiality are twisted to express the virtue of impartiality — the same procedure we observed in connection with the *Shi* and *Shu* quotations in the appreciation of Qi Xi.

Just as does Cheng Zhuan, Confucius prognosticates a bright future for Wei Xianzi, basing his opinion on what he heard about the people Wei Xianzi had enfeoffed and the charge he gave one of these, Jia Xin 賈辛, to exert himself, since Wei Xianzi had enfeoffed him because of his service to the royal house. Confucius attributes two qualities to Wei Xianzi, '義' because of his enfeoffment and '忠' because of his charge. Wei Xianzi was '義' because he did not neglect his relatives when giving fiefs to those closely related to him and did not neglect those who deserved fiefs when giving fiefs to those distantly related to him (近不失親, 遠不失舉, 可謂義矣). The resemblance of this expression to that uttered by the *junzi* in connection with Qi Xi (外舉不棄讎, 內舉不失親) is striking; the expression '失親' occurs in both. Confucius also concludes by prognosticating a promising future for the descendants of Wei Xianzi.⁷⁰

So we have Confucius (albeit a singularly hypocritical one) and we have a number of concepts occurring with meaning contrary to that usually invested in them by his followers.⁷¹

⁶⁹ *Lunyu huijiao jishi* 論語彙校集釋, ed. Huang Huaixin (Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Chubanshe, 2008), 2.14/150, 15.39/1440.

⁷⁰ *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, Zhao 28.3/1496. '晉' is here used in the sense of '魏'; cf. Yang Bojun, "Zuozhuan chengshu niandai lunshu" 《左傳》成書年代論述, *Wenshi* 文史 6 (1979), 71.

⁷¹ In addition, there is a possibility that we have as well a number of quotations from an early *Lunyu*. On three occasions Cheng Zhuan uses expressions that parallel sayings found in *Lunyu*: in his characterization of Wei Wu as '居利思義' (he considers duty when in situations that are to his advantage) he may be said to mirror *Lunyu huijiao jishi* 14.12/1260 '見利思義'; in his gloss of '長' as '教誨不倦' (he teaches tirelessly) he seems to parallel *Lunyu huijiao jishi* 7.2/562 and 7.34/652 '誨人不倦'; and in his gloss of '比' as '擇善而從之' (he chooses the good and follows it) he appears to draw upon *Lunyu huijiao jishi* 7.22/621 and 7.28/635 '擇其善者而從之.'

I think there can be no doubt that we can detect a connection between the account of Qi Xi's recommendations (舉) and the account of Wei Xianzi's appointments (舉). The identical themes, the crucial parts played by the Qi and Yangshe clans in both, and the manifest similarities in the language employed all speak for this.

For the *Zuozhuan* author, the story about Wei Xianzi was probably the main focus. His motivation was to legitimize Wei rule, and the episode thus performs a function similar to that of the prognostication involving Bi Wan 畢萬.⁷² Elements of the story about Qi Xi found a way into the story about Wei Xianzi, notably the proverb, but the Wei Xianzi story also influenced the story about Qi Xi: the role played by the lands originally belonging to the Qi and Yangshe families in the territory of Wei lead the *Zuozhuan* author to amplify a story about the impartiality of Qi Xi's recommendations into a story about hereditary succession within these two families, the link between the two families in 0514 being projected back in time, to the 0570 story about Qi Xi's recommendations.

When molding this story, the *Zuozhuan* author went further back to the appointments of Qi Xi and Yangshe Zhi under Duke Dao, the wording of this event influencing the recommendation story. However, this was not just a case of wording: at his accession, the very first thing Duke Dao did was to raise to high office the sons of three persons who had acquired great merit under Duke Wen, but who had not been properly recognized in the chaotic period that came before him: as is said of one of them “其子不可不興也” (his son must be raised).⁷³ Right when Qi Xi and Yangshe Zhi are given office, we thus find the theme expressed that pervades the *Zuozhuan* story of Qi Xi's recommendations: virtuous men have virtuous sons.

⁷² *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, Min 1.6/259. See Li, *The Readability of the Past in Early Chinese Historiography*, 212–6 for translation and analysis; see also 159–60 for the “explicit glorification“ of Wei in *Zuozhuan*.

⁷³ *Guoyu jijie* 13.1/406; Imber, *Kuo Yü: An Early Chinese Text and Its Relationship with the Tso Chuan*, 129.

Conclusion

What we are witnessing in relation to the *Zuozhuan* story about Qi Xi is a series of textual displacements and influences.⁷⁴ The notice about the office held by Qi Xi and Yangshe Zhi upon the accession of Duke Dao of Jin influenced a story about Qi Xi's recommendations. The *Zuozhuan* author's source for this story was probably close to the version of the story found in *Lüshi chunqiu*, perhaps close to that found in *Xinxu*. The emphasis placed by Duke Dao upon the appointment of descendants of meritorious officials from the reign of Duke Wen and the pairing of the Qi and Yangshe clans from the reign of Duke Dao until the final breakdown of the old Jin ruling structure led the *Zuozhuan* author to include the son of Yangshe Zhi in the story about Qi Xi's recommendation of his own son. This story originally contained the proverb about 內 and 外, which was not apposite to the story in the "feudal" form it had assumed and did not fit with the circumstance that the appointees were now three in number, not two, so it was removed and inserted instead into a story about Qi Xi interceding for Shu Xiang, Shu Xiang also being a member of the Yangshe family. The link between the Qi and the Yangshe families dominates these displacements, a link that I hypothesize is based primarily on the importance of these two families in relation to the eventual demise of Jin and emergence of Wei. This leads to the appearance of echoes of the recommendation story in the evaluation of Wei Xianzi in one of the major pro-Wei passages of *Zuozhuan*, where the destinies of the Qi and Yangshe clans are coupled for the last time.

⁷⁴ The question of the role played by orality in the story discussed here needs to be addressed, but this would go beyond the limits of this paper. For assertions that orality and collective creation is at play in this story, see Zhao Zhongyi 趙仲邑, "Xinxu shilun" 新序試論, *Zhongshan Daxue xuebao (shehui kexue)* 中山大學學報(社會科學) 1957.3, 180; Gu Xijia 顧希佳, "Qin Han dianji zhong renwu chuanshuo de bijiao yanjiu" 秦漢典籍中人物傳說的比較研究, *Minjian wenxue luntan* 民間文學論壇 1996.4, 42–8. While not wishing to rule out the influence of orality, I note that there is a tendency to attribute all kinds of "playfulness" and variation to this phenomenon, and I do not believe this is warranted. See also Paul Fischer. "Intertextuality in Early Chinese Masters-Texts: Shared Narratives in *Shi Zi*," *Asia Major* (third series) 22.2 (2009), 1–34, for a discussion of the different forms of parallelism in early Chinese texts and of the factors leading to the appearance of parallel accounts, only one of which is orality. Due to reasons of space, Fischer does not discuss parallels between stories of the kind discussed in this paper.

I believe it is implausible that *Zuozhuan* should be the origin of all the accounts that parallel it in relation to Qi Xi. In this paper I have shown how the *Zuozhuan* author might have gone about making this series of displacements, and why he might have bothered doing so, having the historiographical interests he had; moreover, I would add that he also had the sophistication to do so, judging from the intricate richness of his narrative.

Table 1

呂氏春秋	新序	左傳	史記	國語
			三年。會諸侯。	
	晉大夫祁奚老。	祁奚請老。		祁奚辭於軍尉。
平公問於祁黃羊曰。	晉君問曰。	晉侯問嗣焉。	悼公問群臣可用者。	
「南陽無令。其誰可而為之。」	「孰可使嗣。」			
祁黃羊對曰。「解狐可。」	祁奚對曰。「解狐可。」	稱解狐。	祁奚舉解狐。	
平公曰。「解狐非子之讎邪。」	君曰。「非子之讎耶。」	其讎也。	解狐。奚之仇。	
		將立之而卒。		
對曰。「君問可。非問臣之讎也。」	對曰。「君問可。非問讎也。」			
平公曰。「善。」				
遂用之。	晉遂舉解狐。			
國人稱善焉。				
居有間。	後			
平公又問祁黃羊曰。	又問。	又問焉。	復問。	公問焉。曰。
「國無尉。其誰可而為之。」	「孰可以為國尉。」		舉其子祁午。	「孰可。」
對曰。「午可。」	祁奚對曰。「午也可。」	對曰。「午也可。」		對曰。「臣之子午可。」
平公曰。「午非子之子邪。」	君曰。「非子之子耶。」			

呂氏春秋	新序	左傳	史記	國語
對曰。「君問可。非問臣之子也。」	對曰。「君問可。非問子也。」			
平公曰。「善。」				
又遂用之。				
國人稱善焉。				
		於是羊舌職死矣。		
		晉侯曰。「孰可以代之。」		
		對曰。「赤也可。」		
		於是使祁午為中軍尉。羊舌赤佐之。		
孔子聞之。曰。	君子謂。	君子謂。	君子曰。	
「善哉。祁黃羊之論也。」	「祁奚能舉善矣。」	「祁奚於是能舉善矣。」	「祁奚可謂不黨矣。」	
	稱其讎。不為諂。立其子。不為比。	稱其讎。不為諂。立其子。不為比。舉其偏。不為黨。		
	書曰。『不偏不黨。王道蕩蕩。』	商書曰。『無偏無黨。王道蕩蕩。』		
	祁奚之謂也。	其祁奚之謂矣。		
		解狐得舉。祁午得位。伯華得官。建一官而三物成。能舉善也。		

呂氏春秋	新序	左傳	史記	國語
外舉不避讎。內舉不避子。	外舉不避仇讎。內舉不回親戚。		外舉不隱仇。內舉不隱子。」	
祁黃羊可謂公矣。」	可謂至公矣。			
	唯善。故能舉其類。	夫唯善。故能舉其類。		
	詩曰。『唯其有之。是以似之。』	詩云。『惟其有之。是以似之。』		
	祁奚有焉。」	祁奚有焉。		
			方會諸侯，悼公弟楊干亂行，魏絳戮其仆。	人有言曰。『擇臣莫若君。擇子莫若父。』午之少也。婉以從令。遊有鄉。處有所。好學而不戲。其壯也。彊志而用命。守業而不淫。其冠也。和安而好敬。柔惠小物。而鎮定大事。有質直而無流心。非義不變。非止不舉。若臨大事。其可以賢於臣。臣請薦所能擇。而君比義焉。」公使祁午為軍尉。歿平公。軍無秕政。

呂氏春秋 呂氏春秋·孟春紀第一·去私; *Lüshi chunqiu zhushu* 呂氏春秋注疏, ed. Wang Liqi 王利器 (Chengdu: Ba Shu Shushe, 2002), 1/130–6.

新序 新序·雜事第一; *Xinxu jiaoshi* 新序校釋, ed. Shi Guangying 石光瑛 (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 2001) 1, 46–52.

左傳 左傳·襄公三年; *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu* 左傳注, ed. by Yang Bojun 楊伯峻 (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1981), Xiang 3.4/927–8.

史記 史記·晉世家; *Shiji* 史記 (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1982), 39, 1682.

國語 國語·晉語七; *Guoyu jijie* 國語集解, ed. Xu Yuangao 徐元誥 (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 2002)
13.3/410–1

Translation of the *Zuozhuan* version

Qi Xi asked leave to resign his office on account of old age. The marquis of Jin asked him about his successor, and he recommended Xie Hu, who was his enemy. Xie Hu, however, died as he was about to be appointed. The marquis consulted Qi Xi again. He replied, “Wu may do.” Thus, Qi Wu was made senior officer of the central army, with Yangshe Chi assisting him.

The superior man will say that Qi Xi thus showed himself capable of recommending good men. When recommending his enemy, he showed no flattery; when appointing his own son, he showed no partiality; when recommending his adjutant, he showed no partisanship.

One of the books of Shang says, “Without partiality and without forming factions, the royal path is broad and long.” These words could be applied to Qi Xi!

Xie Hu was recommended, Qi Wu obtained a position, and Bohua obtained an office. In establishing one office, three affairs were accomplished: this shows that he was capable of recommending the good. He has (goodness) and can therefore recommend his offspring.

The Odes say: “He is in possession of goodness and therefore his offspring inherit it.” Qi Xi was definitely in possession of it! (After Legge)

Translation of the *Lüshi chunqiu* version

Duke Ping of Jin consulted Qi Huangyang: “Nanyang is without a commandant. Who would be suitable?” Qi Huangyang replied: “Xie Hu would be suitable.” Duke Ping said: “Isn’t Xie Hu your enemy?” He replied: “Your highness asked who would be suitable, not who my enemy was.” Duke Ping said: “Excellent!” and subsequently appointed him. All the people praised this. Sometime later Duke Ping of Jin again consulted Qi Huangyang: “The country lacks a senior officer of the military. Who would be suitable?” Qi Huangyang replied: “Wu would be suitable.” Duke Ping said: “Isn’t Wu your son?” He replied: “Your highness asked who would be suitable, not who my son was.” Duke Ping said: “Excellent!” and subsequently also appointed him. All

the people praised this. When Confucius learned about this, he said: "Excellent indeed were the selections made by Qi Huangyang! When recommending those from without, he did not avoid his enemy, and when recommending those from within, he did not avoid his son." Qi Huangyang may definitely be called impartial! (After Knoblock and Riegel)

Translation of the *Xinxu* version

Qi Xi was old. The ruler of Jin asked him, "Who can I make succeed you?" Qi Xi replied, "Xie Hu is suitable." The ruler said, "Isn't he your enemy?" He replied, "My ruler asked who would be suitable, not who my enemy was." Subsequently the ruler elevated Xie Hu. Later, he asked again, "Who can become senior officer of the army?" Qi Xi replied, "Wu is suitable." The ruler said, "Isn't he your son?" He replied, "My ruler asked who would be suitable, not who my son was."

The superior man will say that Qi Xi showed himself capable of recommending good men. When recommending his enemy, he showed no flattery; when appointing his own son, he showed no partiality.

One of the books of Shang says, "Without partiality and without forming factions, the royal path is broad and long." These words could be applied to Qi Xi!

"When recommending those from without, he did not avoid his enemy, and when recommending those from within, he did not avoid his son." He may definitely be called uttermost impartial!

The Odes say: "He is in possession of goodness and therefore his offspring inherit it." Qi Xi was definitely in possession of it!

Translation of the *Guoyu* version

Qi Xi asked the prince that he be excused from the post of senior officer of the central army. "But who could replace you?" the duke asked him. "Your servant's son Wu could do the job," replied Qi Xi. "There is a saying among the people: 'In choosing a minister there is no one equal to his prince; in picking out a son there is no one to match his father.' When Wu was young he was docile and followed orders. When he was away from home he always had a goal and at

home he knew his proper place. He loved studying, but he was never flippant in his behavior. Before he was twenty his memory was strong and he was well able to carry out his father's orders. He observed all the proper conventions of his calling but never went to excess, and by the time he took the cap of manhood he was harmonious and quiet in his person with a reverence for true respect. Even towards the most insignificant he is mild and gentle, and yet he will always take care to settle those things which matter. His nature is upright and honest, his mind does not wander from his purpose, nor will he adopt himself to the unrighteous or support the unworthy. If given an important military appointment he will be able to do far better than I, your servant. Your servant requests to recommend the one he is able to choose and let my lord decide whether he is suitable." The duke appointed Qi Wu to be senior officer of the central army, and to end of Duke Ping's reign the administration of the army was without blemish. (After Imber)

Translation of the *Shiji* version

In the third year, Jin assembled the feudal lords. Duke Dao asked who among his assembled ministers could be employed. Qi Xi recommended Xie Hu. Xie Hu was an enemy of [Qi] Xi. [Duke Dao] asked again and [Qi Xi] recommended his son, Qi Wu. The gentleman said, "Qi Xi can be described as one who was not partisan! When he recommended from outside, he did not conceal his enemy. When he recommended from within, he did not conceal his son." Just when [Jin] was assembling the feudal lords, Yang Gan, the younger brother of Duke Dao, caused chaos among the ranks [of his troops], and Wei Jiang put his driver to death. (After Nienhauser)

Table 2

呂氏春秋	韓非子	韓詩外傳	說苑
	中牟無令。		
平公問於祁黃羊曰。	晉平公問趙武曰。	魏文侯問於解狐。 曰。	晉文公問於咎犯。 曰。
	「中牟。三國之股肱。 邯鄲之肩髀。寡人欲得 其良令也。」	「寡人將立西河之 守。」	「誰可使為西河守 者。」
「南陽無令。其誰可而 為之。」	誰使而可。」	誰可用者。」	
祁黃羊對曰。「解狐 可。」	武曰。「刑伯子可。」	解狐對曰。「荊伯柳 者。賢人。殆可。」	咎犯對曰。「虞子羔 可也。」
平公曰。「解狐非子之 讎邪。」	公曰。「非子之讎 也。」		文侯曰。「子羔非汝 之讎也。」
對曰。「君問可。非問 臣之讎也。」			對曰。「君問可為守 者。非問臣之讎也。 」
	曰。「私讎不入公 門。」		
平公曰。「善。」			
遂用之。		文侯將以荊伯柳為西 河守。	
國人稱善焉。			
居有間。			
平公又問祁黃羊曰。	公又問曰。		
「國無尉。其誰可而為 之。」	「中府之令。誰使而 可。」		
對曰。「午可。」	曰。「臣子可。」		

呂氏春秋	韓非子	韓詩外傳	說苑
平公曰。「午非子之子邪。」			
對曰。「君問可。非問臣之子也。」			
平公曰。「善。」			
又遂用之。			
國人稱善焉。			
孔子聞之。曰。			
「善哉。祁黃羊之論也。」			
外舉不避讎。內舉不避子。	故曰。「外舉不避讎。外舉不避子。」		
祁黃羊可謂公矣。」			
	趙武所薦四十六人。及武死。各就賓位。其無私德若此也。		
		荊伯柳問左右。「誰言我於吾君。」左右皆曰。「解狐。」荊伯柳往見解狐而謝之。曰。「子乃寬臣之過也。言於君。謹再拜謝。」解狐曰。「言子者公也。怨子者吾私也。公事已行。怨子如故。」張弓射之。走十步而沒。可謂勇矣。詩曰。「邦之司直。」	子羔見咎犯而謝之。曰。「幸赦臣之過。薦之於君。得為西河守。」咎犯曰。「薦子者。公也。怨子者。私也。吾不以私事害公義。子其去矣。顧。吾射子也。」

- 呂氏春秋 呂氏春秋·孟春紀第一·去私; *Lüshi chunqiu zhushu* 呂氏春秋注疏, ed. Wang Liqi 王利器 (Chengdu: Ba Shu Shushe, 2002), 1/130–6.
- 韓非子 韓非子·外儲說左下; *Han Fei zi xin jiaozhu* 韓非子新校注, ed. Chen Qiyou 陳奇猷 (Shanghai: Guji, 2000), 12/33/752–3.
- 韓詩外傳 韓詩外傳 9.11; *Han Shi waizhuan jianshu* 韓詩外傳箋疏, ed. Qu Shouyuan 屈守元 (Chengdu: Ba Shu Shushe, 1996) 9.11/774.
- 說苑 說苑·至公; *Shuoyuan jiaozheng* 說苑校證, ed. Xiang Zonglu 向宗魯 (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1987), 14/357–8.

Table 3

	新序	左傳		
	君子謂。	君子謂。		
initial appreciation	「祁奚能舉善矣。」	「祁奚於是能舉善矣。」		general appreciation
<i>Shu</i> -based appreciation	稱其讎。不為諂。立其子。不為比。	稱其讎。不為諂。立其子。不為比。舉其偏。不為黨。	<i>Shu</i> -based appreciation	
	書曰。『不偏不黨。王道蕩蕩。』	商書曰。『無偏無黨。王道蕩蕩。』		
	祁奚之謂也。	其祁奚之謂矣。		
		解狐得舉。祁午得位。伯華得官。建一官而三物成。	tail	
		能舉善也。		
proverb-based appreciation	外舉不避仇讎。內舉不回親戚。			
	可謂至公矣。			
<i>Shi</i> -based appreciation	唯善。故能舉其類。	夫唯善。故能舉其類。	<i>Shi</i> -based appreciation	
	詩曰。『唯其有之。是以似之。』	詩云。『惟其有之。是以似之。』		
	祁奚有焉。」	祁奚有焉。		

Since June 2006, all new issues of *Sino-Platonic Papers* have been published electronically on the Web and are accessible to readers at no charge. Back issues are also being released periodically in e-editions, also free.

For a complete catalog of *Sino-Platonic Papers*, with links to free issues, visit the *SPP* Web site.

www.sino-platonic.org