

The Adaptive Commentary of Du Yu (222–284): Schematizing the Presence and Absence of “Norms” (*li* 例) in the Tri-Partite *Annals* through the *Zuo Tradition*

PAULI TASHIMA

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, GREENSBORO

Du Yu’s 杜預 (222–284) commentary on the *Zuo Tradition* 左傳 (ca. 4th c. BCE.) is often touted as an enduring scholarly achievement from a latter-day perspective, because early Tang scholars treated it as the definitive official interpretation of the imperially approved *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhengyi* 春秋左傳正義 (promulgated in 653). But few studies have analyzed the specific components of Du Yu’s thought that sometimes adapt, other times maintain, previous conceptions of the *Annals* and *Zuo*. This paper argues that Du Yu’s schematization of the *Annals* into three categories of material—Zhou/institutional “general norms,” Confucian/moral “transformed norms,” and historical/neutral “non-norms”—configures older ideas into a new structure of understanding designed to elevate the authority of the *Zuo Tradition*, unofficial but influential in the Western Jin (265–317), above that of rival *Gongyang* 公羊 and *Guliang* 穀梁 traditions during his time. Included in this discussion is Du Yu’s treatment of the *Annals* as a text that can be checked against a parallel ancient source newly available to him, the *Bamboo Annals*.

1. INTRODUCTION

The commentary of Western Jin scholar Du Yu 杜預 (222–284), courtesy name Yuankai 元凱, dominates the premodern Chinese history of scholarship on the *Zuo Tradition* 左傳 (ca. 4th c. BCE), traditionally treated as exegesis to the *Spring and Autumn Annals* 春秋 (covering the period 722–479 BCE; hereafter *Annals*). One of Du’s major commentaries, the *Collected Explanations of the Classic and Tradition of the Annals* (*Chunqiu jingzhuān jijie* 春秋經傳集解, hereafter *Jijie*),¹ compiled in 283 CE and still virtually intact today in thirty fascicles (*juan* 卷),² ranks as the most influential commentary on the *Zuo Tradition* from early medieval China (2nd–7th c.), while competing commentaries gradually disappeared.³ Benefitting from his philological expertise,⁴ scholars transmitted Du’s commentary

1. Adopted by the most recent Shanghai guji edition, the *Chunqiu jingzhuān jijie* 春秋經傳集解 is the most common title among Ruan Yuan’s 阮元 (1764–1849) base texts for the *Jijie*. Du Yu, *Chunqiu jingzhuān jijie* (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1988). Ruan’s “Preface” in the following contains the most detailed textual history of the *Jijie* to date: Ruan Yuan, ed., *Chongkan Songben Zuozhuan zhushu fu jiaokan ji* 重校宋本左傳注疏附校勘記, vol. 6, *Chongkan Songben Shisanjing zhushu fu jiaokan ji* 重校宋本十三經注疏附校勘記 (Jiangxi Nanchang fu xue 江西南昌府學, 1815 carving; rpt. Taipei: Yiwen yinshuguan, 1955), 1a.20–5b.22.

2. The *Jijie* is listed as having thirty fascicles in the *Suishu* 隋書, *Jiu Tangshu* 舊唐書, and *Xin Tangshu* 新唐書 bibliographies. *Suishu* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1982), 32.928; *Jiu Tangshu* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1975), 46.1976; and *Xin Tangshu* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1975), 57.1437.

3. The *Siku quanshu* 四庫全書 preface to the *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhengyi* notes that fragments of Han (206 BCE–220 CE) scholars’ commentaries “only occasionally appear in other books” 僅偶見他書. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 3a.2.

4. See Barry B. Blakeley, “Notes on the Reliability and Objectivity of the Tu Yu Commentary on the *Tso Chuan*,” *JAOS* 101 (1981): 207–12.

alongside other commentaries on the *Zuo* for most of the Six Dynasties, but by Sui times Du Yu's influence had eclipsed all others.⁵ His influence led the Tang court to canonize Du's *Jijie* as the official commentary for the *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhengyi* 春秋左傳正義 (Corrected meaning of the *Annals* and *Zuo Tradition*, compiled in 639, sixty fascicles). This canonization not only caused competing Six Dynasties commentaries to eventually become lost or severely fragmented, but also established Du's conception of the *Annals* and *Zuo Tradition* as authoritative. Aside from esteeming Du's work, Western scholarship has yet to look more closely at how Du Yu refashions previous ideas into new conceptions, instantiating such adaptations in both his discursive expositions and line-by-line comments.⁶

Limited in range but relatively well preserved, Du Yu's extant corpus of textual exegesis consists of the *Jijie* and the *Chunqiu shili* 春秋釋例 (hereafter *Shili*),⁷ both of which explicate the *Annals* and *Zuo* alike.⁸ Du's glosses, annotations, and short comments on the chronologically intercalated *Annals-Zuo* text make up the bulk of the *Jijie*.⁹ Approximately half of the

5. According to the *Suishu*, both Du Yu's and Fu Qian's commentaries on the *Zuo Tradition* were established in the Imperial University in the Eastern Jin (317–420). *Suishu* 32.933. Du's commentaries are said to have circulated head-to-head with Fu's commentaries (世並傳焉) in the Liang dynasty (502–557). See *Nanshi* 南史 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1997), 71.1739. According to the standard histories, Du Yu's commentary held sway in the south, while Fu Qian's was popular in the north. See *Beishi* 北史 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1997), 81.2709; and *Suishu* 75.1705–6. But in the Sui, scholars began to show greater favor toward Du's commentary than toward Fu's in the north as well. *Suishu* 32.933.

6. There are four Western scholarly items exclusively focused on Du Yu: David R. Knechtges and Chang Taiping, eds., *Ancient and Early Medieval Chinese Literature: A Reference Guide Part One* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 206–7; Blakeley, "Tu Yu Commentary," 207–12; Dors Heyde, "Du Yu: Eine Biographie aus den Gründungsjahren der Jin-Dynastie," *Altorientalische Forschungen* 8 (1981): 299–322; and a translation of Du's memorial on agricultural policy in Yang Lien-sheng, "Notes on the Economic History of the Chin Dynasty," in *Studies in Chinese Institutional History* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1961), 173–78. Major modern studies that focus on Du Yu's interpretive principles are Cheng Yuanmin 程元敏, *Chunqiu Zuoshi jingzhuan jijie xu shuzheng* 春秋左氏經傳集解序疏證 (Taipei: Taiwan xuesheng shuju, 1991); Ye Zhengxin 葉政欣, *Du Yu ji qi Chunqiu Zuoshi xue* 杜預及其春秋左氏學 (Taipei: Wenjin chubanshe, 1989); Cheng Nanzhou 程南州, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan Jia Kui zhu yu Du Yu zhu zhi bijiao yanjiu* 春秋左傳賈逵注與杜預注之比較研究 (Taipei: Wenjin chubanshe, 1982); Wang Chuqing 王初慶, "Chunqiu Zuozhuan Dushi yi shuyao" 春秋左傳杜氏義述要, *Renwen xuebao* (Furen daxue) 4 (1975): 355–418; and Ye Zhengxin, *Chunqiu Zuoshi zhuan Du zhu shili* 春秋左氏傳杜注釋例 (Taipei: Jiaxin shuini gongsi, 1966). These modern works have their foundation in traditional scholarship that systematizes and comments on *li* 例 (norms) operating in the *Annals* corpus. Too many to enumerate here, works featuring the word *li* in their titles appear regularly in all major traditional bibliographies. For a history of changing treatments and attitudes toward *li* after Du Yu through the dynasties, see Zhao Youlin 趙友林, *Chunqiu sanzhuo shufa yili yanjiu* 春秋三傳書法義例研究 (Beijing: Renmin chubanshe, 2010), 244–79.

7. Unlike the "comprehensive classicists" 通儒 defining the age of the Eastern Han, Du Yu comments on only one other Classic, the "Sangfu" 喪服 chapters of the *Yili* 儀禮. That commentary is known as the *Sangfu yaoji* 喪服要集. Other than that, his singular devotion to the *Zuo Tradition* is legendized in his official biography. As recorded there, when Jin Wudi 晉武帝 (r. 265–290) asked him if he had any particular obsessions, he replied: "Your humble servant has an obsession with the *Zuo Tradition*" 臣有左傳癖. *Jinshu* 晉書 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2003), 34.1032. Other writings by Du Yu—including agricultural policies, legal codes, memorials, and biographies of women—are listed in the *Suishu* bibliography but are no longer extant except as a handful of fragments. For more details on Du Yu's oeuvre, see Ye Zhengxin, *Du Yu*, 30–44.

8. In contrast, Du Yu's immediate predecessor, Fu Qian 服虔 (d. ca. 195), elucidates the *Zuo Tradition* text only. This is evident in the 800-plus extant fragments of commentary by Fu. According to later attestation also, within Du Yu's lifetime, Fu Qian's commentary (*Fu zhuan* 服傳) had to be referenced against the *Annals* text commented on by Jia Kui (30–101, *Jia Kui jing* 賈逵經). *Nan Qishu* 南齊書 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1972), 39.684.

9. We can consider Du Yu's *Jijie* a collection of commentaries, as it draws on earlier commentaries; however, Du rarely acknowledges his sources in his comments. He mentions the names of some earlier commentators on the *Zuo Tradition* in his "Preface," but pointedly fails to mention Fu Qian, his main competitor. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 1.21a.16. Cheng Nanzhou's study reveals that at least 12 of Du's comments are based on Zheng Zhong's 鄭眾 (d. 83), 119 are based on Jia Kui's, and 83 are based on Fu Qian's commentary. Cheng Nanzhou, *Donghan shidai zhi Chunqiu Zuoshi xue* 東漢時代之春秋左氏學 (Shanghai: Huadong shifan daxue chubanshe, 2011), 62–64, 179–94, and 440–50. Ye Zhengxin also compares Du's comments with eight Han-Wei commentators. See Ye Zhengxin, *Du*

original *Shili* remains, after the *Siku quanshu* editors salvaged the *Shili* from the damaged *Yongle dadian* 永樂大典 (completed 1407) and patched it up with citations mostly from the *Zuozhuan zhengyi*.¹⁰ Du's major expository works consist of a lengthy "Preface" (Chunqiu xu 春秋序, 1,610 characters) and a shorter "Postface" (Houxu 後序, 896 characters) to the *Jijie*,¹¹ as well as a "Concluding Chapter" (Zhongpian 終篇, 877 characters salvaged) to the *Shili*. The *Shili* also contains discussions spanning a paragraph to a few pages on each of the forty-two topics he creates.¹² Throughout all of these works, Du Yu treats the *Annals* and *Zuo Tradition* as one integrated text, consistently using them to throw light on each other.¹³

This article concentrates on a fraction of Du Yu's expository writings and running comments,¹⁴ targeting his specific assertions about his tripartite conception of the *Annals* and the *Zuo Tradition's* ability to explicate that conception. Time and again, the *Zuozhuan zhengyi* editors express their inability to find precedent for this conception.¹⁵ I have chosen only those textual examples that exemplify the theoretical principles behind Du's division of the *Annals* into three categories of meaning, as expounded upon in his discursive writings. Whereas the vast majority of Du's comments fail to touch upon this theoretical conception, because they primarily explicate objects, names, places, lexicon, etc., the examples considered here capture the instances when Du Yu "applies" his theoretical conceptions to his commentarial practice.¹⁶

Du Yu both resists and adapts his predecessors' ideas, even as he practices Han scholars' dominant hermeneutic in assuming that moral judgments are intentionally embedded in the *Annals's* specific wording.¹⁷ Making a novel contribution, he stratifies the *Annals* into

Yu, 81–95; and idem, *Chunqiu Zuoshi*, 79–109. Du's glosses on rituals, institutions, objects, names, and language mostly inherit those by Han-Wei commentators, whereas his interpretations of the *Zuo Tradition's* exegetical principles are drawn from *Gongyang/Guliang* and *yinyang/wuxing* interpretations popular among Han commentators. Ye Zhengxin, *Du Yu*, 97–98.

10. Ji Yun 紀昀 (1724–1805) et al., *Wuyingdian ben Qinding Siku quanshu zongmu tiyao* 武英殿本欽定四庫全書總目提要 (Taipei: Taiwan Shangwu yinshuguan, 1983), 1:26.11b.530–12a.531. This paper uses the following redaction of the *Shili* in fifteen fascicles: *Chunqiu shili fu jiaokan ji* 春秋釋例附校勘記, ed. Sun Xingyan 孫星衍 (1753–1818) et al., edn. *Congshu jicheng jianbian*.

11. The multiplicity of early medieval commentaries written on Du Yu's "Preface" speaks to the importance scholars attached to this essay prior to the Tang. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 1.1a.6.

12. For each of the forty-two topics he calls *li* 例 (norms), Du supplies a list of examples from the *Annals* and *Zuo Tradition*, followed by his remarks.

13. By necessity, He Xiu 何休 (129–182), commentator on the *Gongyang Tradition*, also comments on both the *Annals* and the *Gongyang*. But He Xiu's comments immediately follow the text of the *Gongyang* only, whereas Du Yu's comments follow first the *Annals* records, then the *Zuo* text. The *Siku* editors maintain that Du was the first one to intercalate the texts of both 經 *jing* and 傳 *zhuān*. *Siku quanshu zongmu tiyao* 26.6a.528.

14. This article quotes 660 characters from Du Yu's extant writings. Excluded from detailed discussion are Du's statements on topics such as the pleasures of reading the *Zuo Tradition*, his opinion of other *Zuo* commentators, his taxonomy of "norms," and his rebuttals of specific propositions by *Gongyang* and *Guliang* exegetes.

15. Based on the *Suishu* bibliography, the *Zhengyi* editors had the full Han commentaries on the *Zuo Tradition* available to them, so their claim about the unprecedented nature of Du Yu's conception should have a certain validity to it. Unfortunately, the loss of these pre-Du Yu commentaries makes it difficult for us to fully investigate the question of precedents. *Suishu* 32.928–33.

16. Fortunately in many cases in his running commentary, Du Yu himself explicitly identifies which of his comments are meant to elucidate the key principles presented in his expositions. For the sake of economy, this paper only presents textual cases that I deem to be the most pertinent examples. References to parallel examples or to scholarly works that collate all other examples are made in the footnotes. This article does not address Du's comments on text in the *Zuo Tradition* that constructs historical accounts, due to this essay's main concern with his overarching theoretical conceptions of the *Annals* and *Zuo*.

17. Early exegetes on all three extant exegetical traditions of the *Annals* share this basic assumption. From the earliest mention in the *Shiji* 史記, the *Zuo Tradition* is treated as the title of a written text, associated with Confucius, and characterized as a reliable explication of the sage's concealed judgments in the *Annals*. *Shiji* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2003), 14.509–10. Du Yu is no different in regarding the *Annals* and *Zuo* in such ways. For a typical example

three categories of material: he proposes that Western Zhou institutional norms compose the foundational category, the product of Confucius' editorial work composes the secondary category, and straightforward historical records compose the final category. Meanwhile, Du champions the unofficial *Zuo Tradition* exclusively as the exponent par excellence of this segmented *Annals*, while he dismisses the rival *Gongyang* 公羊 and *Guliang* 穀梁 exegetical traditions, which had been made official long ago in the Western Han.¹⁸ Whereas Han commentators on the *Zuo* voluntarily borrow the ideologies or interpretations of *Gongyang/Guliang* exegetes,¹⁹ Du vocally rejects these borrowings in certain respects, and in this way seeks to dissociate himself from Han commentators:²⁰ for instance, Du disavows the *Gongyang* proponents' veneration of Confucius as the "uncrowned king" 素王 who "demoted Zhou and made Lu rule as kings" 黜周而王魯.²¹ Whereas *Gongyang/Guliang* exegetes treat the *Annals* as one undifferentiated text attributed to Confucius alone, Du advances his own tripartite division of an *Annals* attributed to three kinds of authority, with Confucius figuring as only one of them. This paper examines both the conservative and innovative aspects of Du Yu's thought, revealing them as attempts calculated to elevate the *Zuo Tradition* above the *Gongyang* and *Guliang* traditions in status.

This article joins a growing body of research on Chinese commentaries by studying how a major commentator in the Western Jin theorizes about the *Annals* and *Zuo Tradition* while both inheriting and redirecting the concerns of his Han predecessors. This essay neither details the formal characteristics of Du's comments nor tests the validity of his categorizations against the actual textual terrain of the *Annals* and *Zuo*.²² Finally, my parallel treatment of Du Yu's expository writings and discrete comments illuminates the points at which his theoretical discourse and actual commentarial practice converge.²³

2. FOUNDATIONAL CATEGORY: THE PRIMARY AUTHORITY OF ZHOU PARADIGMS

Part of Du Yu's adaptation lies in his argument that Western Zhou institutional culture forms the backbone of the *Annals*,²⁴ and that the *Zuo Tradition* offers exegesis that explicates

(in Xi 僖 5) of these moralizing interpretations shared by the *Gongyang*, *Guliang*, and Du Yu see *Gongyang zhushu* 10.16b.127; *Guliang zhushu* 7.12a.74; and *Zuozhuan zhushu* 12.16a.204.

18. In Wudi's 武帝 (140–86 BCE) and Xuandi's 宣帝 (73–48) reigns, official Academicians were appointed for the study of the *Gongyang* and *Guliang* respectively. For a time, in Pingdi's 平帝 reign (1 BCE–6 CE), the *Zuo Tradition* was said to have received official sponsorship, but this sponsorship discontinued in the Eastern Han. *Hanshu* 漢書 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1997), 88.3620–21.

19. For lists of these borrowings, see Cheng Nanzhou, *Donghan shidai*, 164–65 and 435.

20. In Du Yu's "Preface," he excoriates Han commentators for "superficially citing" 膚引 the *Gongyang* and *Guliang* traditions and thereby "throwing themselves into chaos" 自亂. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 1.20a.15. For a study of Du's refutations of Jia Kui's and Fu Qian's *Gongyang*- and *Guliang*-based interpretations, see Ma Nan 馬楠, "Zuozhuan zhengyi zhu Du Yu bu zhu Jia Fu yi" 《左傳正義》主杜預不主賈服議, *Suihua xueyuan xuebao* 2007.4: 46–49. However, for all of Du's rhetoric against citing the *Gongyang* and *Guliang*, he bases his interpretations on the *Gongyang* a total of twenty-one times, the *Guliang* eight times, both together eleven times. These are relatively small numbers, considering that Du Yu's comments in the *Jijie* number in the thousands. For complete textual examples, see Cheng Nanzhou, *Chunqiu Zuoshi*, 65–69; Ye Zhengxin, *Chunqiu Zuoshi*, 13–20. Of the examples quoted in this paper, Du's *Jijie* comments in Yin 1 and Xiang 14 have some basis in the interpretations of the *Gongyang* and *Guliang* traditions. The rest do not.

21. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 1.22b.16–23a.17.

22. Worthy research pursuing these aims already exists: Ye Zhengxin, *Chunqiu Zuoshi*, 1966; Newell Ann Van Auken, *The Commentarial Transformation of the Spring and Autumn* (Albany: State Univ. of New York Press, 2016).

23. Van Auken's book contains a translation and an overview of Du Yu's discursive remarks in the "Preface" concerning the Duke of Zhou, Confucius, and their relation to "direct commentaries" in the *Zuo Tradition*. Van Auken, *Commentarial Transformation*, 21–25. This paper presents a detailed analysis of the interface between Du's language in the "Preface" and his specific comments in his *Jijie*.

24. This institutional culture consists of scribal rules and social protocols governing the following: successions, names and titles, marriages, diplomatic meetings and visits, official travel, covenant making, burials, mourning,

this primary category of meaning. This argument represents Du's adaptation of the hagiography on the Duke of Zhou 周公 (personal name Dan 旦, ca. 11th c. BCE), developed over many centuries as writers idealized this figure by attaching to him an increasing number of virtues.²⁵ Contributing to this accretion of ideas about the duke, Du ascribes the creation of specific scribal rules to the duke also, thus adding a new spin to the cult of the Duke of Zhou expanding into the Han to Wei-Jin period.²⁶ By the Eastern Han, four of the Five Classics had at least been partially attributed to the duke, while the *Annals* remained the only Classic still solely attributed to Confucius.²⁷ Du Yu's ascription of the foundational part of the *Annals* to the duke gives a more hoary distinction to the Classic and elevates the status of *Zuo's* exegesis, particularly exegesis on parts of the *Annals* he claims date back to the Western Zhou.²⁸ As will be demonstrated shortly, Du Yu becomes the first scholar to designate the Duke of Zhou as the primary "co-author" of material incorporated into the *Annals*.

2.1 General Scribal Norms as Zhou Paradigms

In both Du Yu's "Preface" and his comments in the *Jijie*, he advances his conception of the *Annals* as a critical source preserving Western Zhou ritual and administrative models by stressing a connection between Lu scribal records and the Duke of Zhou, as first intimated in the *Zuo Tradition*. To highlight that the Lu annals embody the duke's charisma, Du quotes exact language (underlined below) from a well-known episode in the *Zuo* featuring Han

ancestral worship, ritual sacrifices, exiles and returns, military battles, infrastructure building, and responses to natural phenomena, etc.

25. According to Mark Edward Lewis, the Duke of Zhou as a model of the virtuous minister emerges in the late Western Zhou, whereas the duke as "an archetype of the scholar, a founder of textual traditions, and a predecessor of Confucius" becomes a dominant theme in Warring States (481–221 BCE) texts. Lewis, *Writing and Authority in Early China* (Albany: State Univ. of New York Press, 1999), 209–18. In this sense, Du Yu's portrayal of the Duke of Zhou appears to have inherited much of such earlier ideas. Du's set of ideas about the duke is also present in—and thus seems partly to derive from—the *Zuo Tradition* itself. Outside of glosses establishing identity or historical facts (such as "so-and-so is the Duke of Zhou's relative"), the "Duke of Zhou" appears five times in Du Yu's "Preface," eight times in his *Jijie* comments, and three times in his *Shili*. See *Zuozhuan zhushu* 1.8a.9, 1.9b.10, 1.10b.10, 1.12b.11, and 1.25a.18; 4.5a.72 (Yin 隱 7), 15.21b.257 (Xi 24), 16.7a.265 (Xi 26); 20.13a–b.352 (Wen 文 18), 39.8b.667 (Xiang 襄 29), 42.1b.–2a.718 (Zhao 昭 2), 54.15b.947 (Ding 定 4), and 58.28a.1019 (Ai 哀 11); and Du Yu, *Chunqiu shili* 3.71, 4.84, and 15.661. All are instances forwarding claims about the rituals, music, institutions, and documents that could be traced back to the duke. Except for Du's comment in Yin 7, all other instances in his *Jijie* expand upon claims about the duke in the *Zuo*; only once does Du refer to the "Duke of Zhou" on his own accord without the *Zuo* itself mentioning this figure. Michael Nylan complicates this phenomenon of idealizing the duke by examining a wider range of mid-Zhou to late Western Han sources that also challenge this figure's infallibility. Nylan, "The Many Dukes of Zhou," in *Statecraft and Classical Learning: The Rituals of Zhou in East Asian History*, ed. Benjamin A. Elman and Martin Kern (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 94–128.

26. Nylan sees this expansion culminating in the elevation of the *Rituals of Zhou* (Zhouli 周禮) to canonical status in late Eastern Han. Nylan, "Many Dukes of Zhou," 94.

27. The Five Classics were the *Yi* 易 (Changes), *Shu* 書 (Documents), *Shi* 詩 (Odes), *Li* 禮 (Rites [corpus]), and *Annals*. Sima Qian 司馬遷 (?145–?86 BCE) attributes the *Zhouguan* 周官 (known as the *Zhouli* 周禮 in the Eastern Han) and different pieces of the *Odes* and *Documents* to the Duke of Zhou. *Shiji* 33.1515–22. Eastern Han scholars attribute "line statements" 爻辭 in the *Changes* to the duke also. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 1.8b.9. For a summary of scholastic arguments over the linking of Duke of Zhou to the *Annals*, see Van Auken, *Commentarial Transformation*, 259 n. 3.

28. Du Yu never explicitly states his position on the relative chronology of the *Zuo*, *Gongyang*, and *Guliang* traditions. However, his "Preface" implicitly dates the *Zuo Tradition* to the moment when "Zuo Qiuming [putative author of the *Zuo*] received the Classic [Annals] from Confucius" 左丘明受經於仲尼, then began to write exegesis to the *Annals*. This statement shows Du subscribing to the emerging narrative in the Han concerning the *Zuo's* origins in the time of Confucius, as established in the *Shiji* and *Hanshu*. These Han accounts claim that Zuo Qiuming was a contemporary of Confucius who had privileged knowledge of the sage's intended meanings, or even had personal contact with Confucius. This narrative also dates the generation of the *Gongyang* and *Guliang* traditions later than the *Zuo Tradition*. See *Zuozhuan zhushu* 1.11a.11; *Shiji* 14.509–10; and *Hanshu* 30.1715 and 36.1967.

Xuanzi 韓宣子 (personal name Qi 起, 566–514 BCE), as it is one of a few rare explicit references to a textual *chunqiu* 春秋 in the *Zuo*:²⁹

Zuo Tradition (Zhao 2):

晉侯使韓宣子來聘。... 觀書於大史氏，見易象與魯春秋，曰：「周禮盡在魯矣，吾乃今知周公之德與周之所以王也。」³⁰

The Marquis of Jin sent Han Xuanzi here on an official visit. . . . He viewed documents kept at the offices of the Grand Scribe and saw the images of the *Changes* and the Lu annals.³¹ He remarked, “All of the rituals of Zhou are in Lu. Only now do I understand the charismatic power of the Duke of Zhou and why Zhou ruled as kings.”

Du Yu’s “Preface”:

韓宣子適魯，見易象與魯春秋，曰：「周禮盡在魯矣，吾乃今知周公之德與周之所以王。」韓子所見，蓋周之舊典禮經也。³²

When Han Xuanzi traveled to Lu, he saw the images of the *Changes* and the Lu annals. He remarked, “All of the rituals of Zhou are in Lu. Only now do I understand the charismatic power of the Duke of Zhou and why Zhou ruled as kings.” The things Hanzi saw were presumably the old authoritative documents and ritual guidelines of Zhou.

The above passage from Du’s “Preface” is lifted almost directly out of the *Zuo Tradition*. The only important difference between the two passages is Du’s addition of a declaration, after the word *gai* 蓋 (presumably),³³ that the set of texts Han Xuanzi saw were the “old authoritative documents and ritual guidelines of Zhou” 周之舊典禮經也. Technically, as Han Xuanzi preceded the time of Confucius, the “Lu annals” in both passages here would not refer to the *Annals* Confucius authored/compiled, as first famously alluded to in *Mencius* 3B.9.³⁴ Instead, Du Yu defines the “Lu annals” partly with language adopted from *Mencius* 4B.21, the *Shiji*, and *Hanshu*, all of which allude to the historical sources Confucius drew upon:³⁵

29. The only two other references in the *Zuo Tradition* to a textual *chunqiu* 春秋 are to the *Annals* (not the Lu annals). These places present the *Annals* as a text that contains inscribed judgments; however, Confucius is not named. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 27.19b.465 (Cheng 成 14) and 53.21a–b.930 (Zhao 31).

30. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 42.1b–2a.718.

31. My translation “images of the *Changes*” follows Du Yu’s comment on the Han Xuanzi quotation in Zhao 2. There, Du says *yi xiang* 易象 are *xiangci* 象辭 (statements about the images). As the *Zuozhuan zhengyi* explains, and Cheng Yuanmin further clarifies, by *xiangci* Du means the judgments (*tuán* 彖)—otherwise known as hexagram statements (*guaci* 卦辭)—and line statements (*yaoci* 爻辭), which are traditionally attributed to King Wen 文王 and the Duke of Zhou respectively. This reading of *xiangci* is attributed to the Han commentators Zheng Zhong, Jia Kui, and others, so Du Yu could have adopted it from them. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 1.8b.9 and 42.1b–2b.718. David Schaberg follows Yang Bojun 楊伯峻 and others in accepting *xiang* as meaning “administrative documents,” but Cheng Yuanmin offers a robust rebuttal of this interpretation. Schaberg, *A Patterned Past: Form and Thought in Early Chinese Historiography* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Asia Center, 2001), 344 n. 47; Yang Bojun, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu* 春秋左傳注 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2005), 1226–27; and Cheng Yanming, *Chunqiu Zuoshi*, 22.

32. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 1.8a–b.9.

33. The *Zuozhuan zhengyi* affirms that *gai* 蓋 indicates the place where Du Yu inserts his own interpretation. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 1.8b.9.

34. This is traditionally regarded as the locus classicus for Confucius’ authorship of the *Annals*: “The world declined and the way grew subtle . . . Confucius trembled and composed the *Annals*” 世衰道微 . . . 孔子懼，作春秋. *Sishu zhangju jizhu* 四書章句集注, ed. Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130–1200) (Taipei: Da’an chubanshe, 1994), 272.

35. These works similarly describe the Lu annals as pre-existing sources Confucius viewed. The *Mencius* says: “The *sheng* of Jin, the *daowu* of Chu, and the annals of Lu—they are the same. . . . Confucius adds: ‘As for the meaning, I humbly construe it in my own way.’” 晉之乘，楚之檮杌，魯之春秋，一也。 . . . 孔子曰：其義則丘竊取之矣. *Sishu zhangju*, 295. The *Shiji* says: Confucius “arrayed the scribal records and old accounts, and arranged the *Annals* by establishing it in Lu” 論史記舊聞，興於魯而次春秋. *Shiji* 14.509. The *Hanshu* says: Confucius was at Lu and “perused its scribal records” 觀其史記. *Hanshu* 30.1715.

Du Yu's comment in his *Jijie* (Zhao 2):

魯春秋，史記之策書。春秋尊周公之典以序事。³⁶

The “Lu annals” are the scribal records on connected slips. These annals adhere to the authoritative documents of the Duke of Zhou to order affairs.

The first part of Du Yu's definition of the Lu annals as “scribal records” represents a continuation of the older understanding that emphasizes the availability of source materials to Confucius. The Eastern Han commentator Jia Kui 賈逵 (30–101) also glosses the *Zuo* line “All of the rituals of Zhou are in Lu” 周禮盡在魯矣 in a similarly historical vein: “Lu had the most complete scribal methods, therefore the scribal records [i.e., the “Lu annals”] and the rituals of Zhou were referred to as the same thing” 史法最備，故史記與周禮同名。³⁷ The second part of Du's definition, that “these annals adhered to the authoritative documents of the Duke of Zhou,” builds on Jia Kui's gloss and extends the older understanding. This augmentation mirrors what Du has done in his “Preface,” where he asserts that Han Xuanzi saw the “old authoritative documents and ritual guidelines of Zhou” 周之舊典禮經. In both his comment and his “Preface,” Du Yu maintains that the Lu annals (upon which he later claims the *Annals* was based) are not simply old documents as previously understood. More importantly, they epitomize Western Zhou institutional paradigms embodying the “rituals of Zhou” and the Duke of Zhou's “charismatic power.” In these ways, Du Yu appropriates and refashions language from previous sources (including the *Zuo Tradition* itself), while adding his own emphasis on Zhou institutional memory, in order to give new significance to Confucius' inheritance of the “Lu annals.”

In particular, taking his cue from the *Zuo Tradition*, Du Yu posits that the Zhou models embedded in Confucius' sources manifest themselves as a system of scribal rules codified into institutional practice. In Du's comment to a passage in the *Zuo Tradition*, his usage of the term *lijing* 禮經, invoked earlier in his “Preface,” follows the specific sense explicated once in the *Zuo*:

Annals (Yin 7):

滕侯卒。³⁸

The Marquis of Teng died.

Zuo Tradition:

七年，春，滕侯卒。不書名，未同盟也。凡諸侯同盟，於是稱名，故薨則赴以名，告終、嗣也，³⁹以繼好息民，謂之禮經。⁴⁰

In the seventh year, in spring, the Marquis of Teng died. His personal name is not recorded because the states of Teng and Lu had not yet sworn a covenant. In all cases where the feudal lords swore a covenant,⁴¹ their names are recorded. Therefore when such lords pass away, notices of death with their personal names were sent out, because the reportage of deaths and heirs perpetuated good relations and pacified the people. These practices are called ritual guidelines.

36. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 42.1b.718.

37. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 1.8a.9. Of all the *Zuozhuan* textual examples showcased in this paper, only this one comes with a comment from a Han scholar, as preserved by the *Zuozhuan zhengyi* subcommentary. For all other *Zuo* text treated in this paper, we are left with Du Yu's comments only, leaving it impossible for us to directly compare Du's comments with his predecessors' line by line.

38. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 4.4a.71.

39. Ruan Yuan cites multiple other editions with *cheng* 稱 following *zhong* 終. *Zuozhuan zhushu jiaokan ji* 4.2b.84.

40. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 4.5a.72.

41. *Fan* 凡 is rendered as “in cases of” or “whenever” in Li Wai-ye, *The Readability of the Past in Early Chinese Historiography* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Asia Center, 2007), 104.

Du Yu's comment in his *Jijie*:

此言凡例，乃周公所制禮經也。... 禮經皆當書於策。⁴²

Here the *Zuo Tradition* is speaking of general norms,⁴³ which are the ritual guidelines made by the Duke of Zhou. . . . All ritual guidelines should have been inscribed on connected slips.

In the immediate context of the *Zuo* passage, *lijing* (ritual guidelines) refers mainly to protocols governing the recording of reports sent to Lu, in this case, the registration of names according to the status of diplomatic relations. Implicit in the *Zuo* passage is the notion that standardized scribal rules such as the one prescribed here should be equated with “ritual guidelines.” But Du Yu goes further than the *Zuo* to 1) give these scribal/ritual guidelines a terminology, calling them *fanli* 凡例 (general norms); 2) attribute them to the Duke of Zhou; and 3) state that they are all already “inscribed” on important historical records.

Within the *Annals* and its three exegetical traditions, the word *li* 例 appears only once in the *Gongyang* and nowhere in the *Zuo*.⁴⁴ Despite the virtual absence of this term in the *Annals* corpus, early and medieval commentators often explicate this corpus with *li* (norms) in mind.⁴⁵ The *Suishu* bibliography of the *Annals* corpus contains fourteen titles (all non-extant now) featuring the terms *li* 例 (norms) or *tiaoli* 條例 (organized norms); five of these titles are attributed to Du Yu's predecessors and contemporaries.⁴⁶ There are many such examples where *Zuo* exegetes prior to Du would comment on scribal rules explained in the *Zuo*, but without referring to them by any special terminology such as *li*.⁴⁷ Participating in this common type of interpretive practice, Du Yu is nevertheless apparently the first scholar to apply the term *fanli* (general norms) to scribal rules pointed out by the *Zuo*, then to further

42. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 4.5a.72. For a study rejecting the validity of this particular comment by Du Yu, see Chao Yuepei 晁岳佩, “Du Yu ‘lijing’ shuo boyi” 杜預‘禮經’說駁議, *Shandong daxuebao (shehui kexue ban)* 1996.2: 39–43.

43. In view of Du Yu's conception, possible translations of *li* 例 are “rules,” “norms,” or “conventions.” The word “rules” suggests something prescribed, imposed from above, proceeding from a specifiable source, origin, or figure of authority. “Norms” and “conventions,” on the other hand, convey a general acceptance of rules as normative by a certain community, such that the rules are rendered part of the institutional or cultural fabric. “Rules” also suggests a “how to” or “must do” process as opposed to the sense that “this is how it has always been done.” Between “norms” and “conventions,” the former may be a better choice because it approximates the way Du understands these “norms” as carrying the force of authority and representing paradigmatic standards to be respected, as opposed to a default set of practices passively followed, as “conventions” would suggest. In Du's semantic range, “norms” furthermore encapsulate both “norms of composition” and “norms of interpretation,” whereby each side of the process is operable only if both the scribe and the reader embrace these “norms.” One scholar translates Du Yu's *Chunqiu shili* 春秋釋例 as “The Rules and Formulae of the *Spring and Autumn Annals*.” Knechtges, *Ancient and Early*, 207. The Oxford English Dictionary's definition of “formulae” captures the considerations set forth above concerning “norms”: “A set form of words in which something is defined, stated, or declared, or which is prescribed by authority or custom to be used on some ceremonial occasion.” But to avoid suggesting that *li* are spelled out, as “formulae” would suggest, “norms” is selected here, for the workings of *li* are implicit, requiring deductive and inductive reasoning, and not explicit like a handbook. Another scholar renders *Chunqiu shili* as “Explanations of the Precedents of the *Spring and Autumn*.” Newell Ann Van Auken, “Could ‘Subtle Words’ Have Conveyed ‘Praise and Blame’? The Implications of Formal Regularity and Variation in *Spring and Autumn* (Chūn Qiū) Records,” *Early China* 31 (2007): 60. Wai-ye Li renders *li* as “rules.” Li, *Readability of the Past*, 35–36. For more references to Du Yu's use of *fanli*, see Van Auken, *Commentarial Transformation*, 261 n. 16.

44. *Gongyang zhushu* 10.1a.120.

45. For complete extant textual examples, see Dai Junren 戴君仁, *Chunqiu bianli* 春秋辨例 (Taipei: Zhonghua congshu, 1964), 13–15; Cheng Nanzhou, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan*, 77–103; and idem, *Donghan shidai*, 75–89, 284, and 454–58.

46. *Suishu* 32.928–33. The only such title with extant fragments is Ying Rong's 穎容 (d. ca. 200) *Chunqiu shili* 春秋釋例.

47. For example, ten out of twenty-seven fragments of Ying Rong's *Chunqiu shili* show him commenting on scribal rules. See *Yuhan shanfang jiyi shu* (2) 玉函山房輯佚書 (二), ed. Ma Guohan 馬國翰 (1794–1857), vol. 47 of *Shandong wenxian jicheng* 山東文獻集成 (第一輯) (Jinan: Shandong daxue chubanshe, 2006), 555–59.

claim that the Duke of Zhou “made” (*zhi* 制) them. Even the *Zuozhuan zhengyi* editors profess their ignorance of any other scholar prior to Du who could have made this attribution.⁴⁸ In saying that “all ritual guidelines” are “inscribed on connected slips,” Du is not so much suggesting that these rules themselves are spelled out as he is stating that how these Zhou norms appear on the record conforms with implicit scribal conventions he calls *fanli* (general norms). Whereas the *Zuo Tradition* passage above simply states that following scribal conventions is a matter of ritual practice, Du Yu defines them as a system of normative scribal practices both responsible for the wording of important state records (including the *Annals*) and placed at the same level of authority as Western Zhou paradigms.

2.2 *The Function of the Zuo Tradition in Uncovering “General Norms”*

Within Du Yu’s schematic framework, only the *Zuo Tradition* can adequately explain the core system of “general norms” (*fanli*), which he claims lays the foundation of the *Annals*. As Du elaborates, the *Zuo* can signal the places where these “general norms” (*fanli*) of scribal recording exemplify the Duke of Zhou’s governance and legacy:

Du Yu’s “Preface”:

其發凡以言例，皆經國之常制，周公之垂法，史書之舊章，仲尼從而脩之，以成一經之通體。⁴⁹

Where the *Zuo Tradition* employs *fan* (“in all cases where”) to explain a norm, all such places [in the *Annals*] exemplify the constant institutions of state governance, the transmitted models of the Duke of Zhou, and the old conventions of scribal recording. Confucius adopts and edits them to complete the overall configuration of the Classic [i.e., *Annals*].

In this discursive passage, Du begins by simply pointing out the observable fact that the *Zuo* employs *fan* 凡 to explicate a scribal rule. Immediately thereafter, he advances his significant claim that the *Zuo*, in so doing, is also pinpointing precisely where “the constant institutions of state governance, the transmitted models of the Duke of Zhou” can be found embedded in the *Annals*. Likewise in his comment in the *Jijie* below, Du deliberately forges a connection between a specific scribal norm and broader Zhou institutional culture:

The *Zuo Tradition* (Yin 11):

凡諸侯有命告則書，不然則否。師出臧否，亦如之。雖及滅國，滅不告敗，勝不告克，不書于策。⁵⁰

In all cases where the feudal lords issue official commands, if we [i.e., Lu] are notified, then they are recorded; otherwise they are not. When troops go forth, whether resulting in gain or loss, it is the same. Even in the case of the extinguishment of a domain, if the extinguished does not report the defeat and the victorious does not report the conquest, it is not recorded on connected slips.

Du Yu’s comment in his *Jijie*:

命者，國之大事政令也。承其告辭，史乃書之於策。若所傳聞行言，非將君命，則記在簡牘而已，⁵¹不得記於典策，此蓋周禮之舊制。⁵²

48. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 4.5b.72. Zhao Kuang 趙匡 (fl. 766–779) is one of the first scholars in the Tang and later to challenge these new claims by Du. Zhao Kuang, *Chunqiu jizhuan zuanli* 春秋集傳纂例, in *Siku quanshu*, 146:385. For a discussion of such later disputes with Du’s claim that “general norms” originated with the Duke of Zhou, see also Wang Chuqing, “Dushi yi,” 41–43.

49. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 1.12b.11.

50. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 4.25b–26a.82.

51. Elsewhere, Du Yu’s “Preface” says: “The feudal lords each had their own state scribes. Great events were recorded on connected slips, minor events on individual slips and wooden tablets only” 諸侯亦各有國史，大事書之於策，小事簡牘而已。 *Zuozhuan zhushu* 1.6a.8.

52. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 4.25b.82.

Official commands are the orders of government pertaining to the domain's major events. If he receives the words of notification, then the [Lu] scribe records them on connected slips. If [he receives] rumors [lit. "words that traveled"] that are transmitted through hearsay and do not bear the ruler's command, then they are noted on individual slips and wooden tablets only, and are not noted on the authoritative documents on connected slips—these are presumably the old institutions of Zhou rituals.

The *Zuo Tradition* text following *fan* 凡 articulates the scribal convention stipulating that Lu scribes could only record events presented in official reports received from other kingdoms. Du Yu expands upon the *Zuo* text by adding that if these missives were made without the ruler's sanction (非將君命), then Lu scribes did not include them in their official records. This particular scribal rule or "norm," Du asserts, exemplifies "the old institutions of Zhou rituals" 周禮之舊制. By Du's count, exactly fifty places within the *Zuo* explicate how general norms (*fanli*) govern the writing of *Annals* entries: "there are fifty designations of general [norms]" 稱凡者五十.⁵³ In Du Yu's conception, this neat number of "general norms" comprise the basic scaffolding of the *Annals*, built out of Zhou norms only the *Zuo Tradition* can detect and explicate.

Placing these fifty scribal "general norms" (*fanli*) into its own category, Du Yu characterizes them as a collective reflection of the Western Zhou institutional legacy. This merging of scribal rules with Zhou models privileges the Duke of Zhou as the highest authority and conceives of the *Zuo Tradition* as the only instrument capable of pointing out fifty precise "stitches" where Confucius has woven the duke's principles into the *Annals* to form its basic structure ("the overall configuration of the Classic" 一經之通體). Such a vision casts the *Annals* into a new mold built around this primary category of content; it is a structure Han exegetes never quite imagined, even though it emerges out of a long history of venerating the Western Zhou.

3. CONFUCIUS' ANNALS VIS-À-VIS THE BAMBOO ANNALS

Du Yu's conception of the secondary category of meaning in the *Annals* reflects a shift in thinking about the *Annals* as a whole: Han thinkers treat it as a sacred text; Du emphasizes its historical dimension more strongly, but without diminishing the text's hallowed status. The 279–281 CE archaeological discovery of the *Bamboo Annals* (*Zhushu jinian* 竹書紀年), a pre-Qin historical chronicle, obliges Du to rearticulate the line differentiating *Annals*, a sacrosanct Classic, from the *Bamboo Annals*, a secular text. Faced with this challenge, Du Yu nevertheless underscores, rather than denies, the historical origins of the *Annals*. At the same time, he also schematizes the places of moral sacredness in the *Annals* more systematically than his predecessors have done. This balancing act highlights Du Yu's conception

53. Du Yu states this in the "Concluding Chapter" of his *Chunqiu shili* 15.661. In the *Suishu* bibliography, the mention of an anonymous work entitled *Chunqiu wushi fan yishu* 春秋五十凡義疏 indicates that a subcommentary was written to further explicate Du's fifty *fanli* ("general norms"), suggesting that his system of *fanli* attracted serious scholarly attention after its creation. *Suishu* 32.930. A Qing work entitled *Chunqiu fanli* 春秋凡例, by Wang Qiao 王樵 (1521–1599) and Zhu Heling 朱鶴齡 (1606–1683), similarly suggests the endurance of Du Yu's terminology. Listed in Zhang Yu 章鈺 and Wu Zuocheng 武作成 et al., *清史稿藝文志及補編 Qing shigao yiwenzhi ji bubian* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1982). Full text in *Xuxiu Siku quanshu*, vol. 120 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2002), 7–45. For complete textual examples of these fifty *fanli*, as well as all other *li* extracted from the *Zuo Tradition*, see Chen Pan 陳槃, *Zuoshi Chunqiu yili bian* 左氏春秋義例辯 (1947; rpt., Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2009), 37–43 and 141–742. For a study of all *li* addressed in Du's *Jijie*, see Ye Zhengxin, *Chunqiu Zuoshi*, 21–52.

of the Classic's hybrid nature while heightening the *Zuo Tradition's* status in the world of canonical exegesis.

Du Yu introduces his idea about the central moral feature—Confucius' ethically motivated edits—distinguishing the *Annals* from the annals produced by various state courts presumed to have been at the sage's disposal. By Han times, other than perhaps the Lu annals, none of the other annals had survived; however, memory of their prior existence persists in the *Gongyang Tradition's* allusion to such records as “the unedited annals” 不脩春秋.⁵⁴ Later scholars adopt this term to distinguish the various state annals from the moralized *Annals*.⁵⁵ Du never explicitly employs the term “unedited annals” in any of his extant writings, but it is apparent that he has adopted the idea behind this term when he refers to the state annals as “Lu scribal records” 魯史記, “records on connected slips” 策書, and “Lu annals” 魯春秋 in his “Preface.”⁵⁶ These terms essentially express Du Yu's subscription to the idea that “unedited annals” existed before Confucius interjected his moral vision into such writings.

Du Yu's conception of the secondary part of the *Annals* represents a choice among two continuous Warring States-to-Han views concerning the authorship of the *Annals*.⁵⁷ As mentioned, *Mencius* is the first extant source to outright declare that Confucius composed the *Annals*. In various places, the *Shiji*, *Chunqiu fanlu* 春秋繁露, *Hanshu*, *Huainanzi* 淮南子, *Lunheng*, and *Yue jueshu* 越絕書 likewise assert that Confucius either “composed” (*zuo* 作 or *zhu* 著) or “arranged” (*ci* 次) the *Annals*.⁵⁸ Except for the *Chunqiu fanlu* and *Huainanzi*, all the above works also state the idea, phrased similarly, that Confucius drew upon past records while compiling the *Annals*.⁵⁹ It appears that the same work could, in one instance, state that Confucius simply “composed” the *Annals*, while, in another instance, also add that Confucius viewed previous historical sources as a first step. Whereas the former instance

54. In Zhuang 7, the *Annals* says, “The stars fell like rain” 星貫如雨. The *Gongyang Tradition* for that entry reads, “The unedited annals say, ‘It rained stars, which fell within a foot of the ground and then returned.’ The Gentleman edited it to ‘The stars fell like rain’ ” 不脩春秋曰：「雨星不及地尺而復。」君子脩之曰：「星貫如雨」。He Xiu's comment says, “‘The unedited annals’ refer to scribal records. In antiquity, scribal records were known as ‘annals’ ” 「不脩春秋」謂史記也。古者謂史記為「春秋」。 *Gongyang zhushu* 6.19a–b.81. The *Lunheng* 論衡 remains the only other extant early Chinese source that alludes to the difference between “unedited annals” by Lu scribes and an “edited *Annals*” by Confucius. *Lunheng jiaoshi* 論衡校釋, comp. Wang Chong 王充 (27–97), ed. Huang Hui 黃暉 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1990), 8.391–92 and 11.512.

55. Scholars often cite the following discrepancy to show the existence of a different—therefore in their minds an unedited—version of entries in the state annals. The *Liji* 禮記 cites exact text from the so-called Lu annals: “The Lu annals [魯春秋] record Jin's mourning, saying, ‘He killed his ruler's son Xiqi and his ruler Zhuo.’” *Liji zhushu* 51.20b.869. This is different from the *Annals* text in Xi 9: “Li [Xi]ke of Jin killed his ruler's son Xiqi”; then in Xi 10: “Li Ke of Jin murdered his ruler Zhuo and his high officer Xun Xi.” *Zuozhuan zhushu* 13.9a.218 and 13.14b.220. See discussion in Shen Yucheng 沈玉成 and Liu Ning 劉寧, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan xue shi gao* 春秋左傳學史稿 (Nanjing: Jiangsu guji chubanshe, 1992), 34.

56. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 1.2b.6, 1.8a.9, and 1.9a–b.10.

57. Among the *Annals's* three exegetical traditions, only a once extant version of the *Gongyang Tradition* (not the version commented on by He Xiu in the *Gongyang zhushu* now) clearly states that Confucius “composed the *Annals*” 作春秋. Du Yu himself acknowledges in his “Preface” that “the *Zuo* and *Guliang* traditions fail to contain any clear indications about the composition of the *Annals*” 春秋之作，左傳及穀梁無明文. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 1.22a–b.16.

58. *Shiji* 13.487, 14.509, 47.1943, 110.2919, and 130.3297. Dong Zhongshu 董仲舒 (c. 179–c. 104 BCE), *Chunqiu fanlu yizheng* 春秋繁露義證, ed. Su Yu 蘇輿 and Zhong Zhe 鍾哲 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1992), 6.149. *Hanshu* 36.1968, 76.3217, and 87B.3578. *Huainanzi*, ed. Liu Wendian 劉文典 et al. (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1989), 9.313. *Lunheng* 12.542, 13.606, 13.609, 27.1122, and 29.1177. *Yue jueshu jiaoshi* 越絕書校釋, ed. Li Bujia 李步嘉 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2013), 14.369.

59. See n. 35 for quotations from the *Mencius*, *Shiji*, and *Hanshu*. The *Lunheng* says: “Confucius obtained the scribal records to compose the *Annals*,” *Lunheng* 13.606. The *Yue jueshu* says: “when the Master composed the Classic, he browsed the scribal records,” *Yue jueshu* 14.369.

simply rehearses the notion that Confucius inscribes “praise and blame” in his text, the latter instance incorporates the additional notion that he alters old texts to accomplish this same aim. Unlike these earlier works’ free alternation between the two instances, Du Yu’s choice is strongly predicated on the latter idea that Confucius always utilizes past records first, as these lines emphasize:

Du Yu’s “Preface”:

仲尼因魯史策書成文。

Confucius relies upon the Lu scribal records on connected slips to complete his text.

史書之舊章，仲尼從而脩之。

With the old conventions of scribal recording, Confucius adopts and edits them.

春秋雖以一字為褒貶，然皆須數句以成言。⁶⁰

Even though the *Annals* may praise or blame with one word, yet it takes multiple phrases to complete sentences.

Like Du Yu, scholars before him generally maintained that Confucius adapts his source texts to compile the *Annals*; yet unlike Du, none of them attempted to delineate or quantify just how much of the old text Confucius emended to inscribe new meaning. Going one step further than his predecessors, Du Yu claims that one can detect those emendations by turning to the *Zuo Tradition*, for it can indicate to readers which exact words and phrases in the *Annals* delineate the extent of Confucius’ emendations.

Du Yu’s viewing of the *Bamboo Annals*, one of the scribal records compiled in various pre-Qin states,⁶¹ further buttresses his conception of an *Annals* that remains a historical chronicle at its core, even after having undergone Confucius’ surgical editing. By Du’s own account in his “Postface” to his *Jijie*,⁶² immediately after he finished his commentaries on the *Zuo Tradition*, he personally inspected the *Bamboo Annals*, newly unearthed among other tomb texts located in the Ji Commandery (known as the Jizhong 汲冢 texts) around 280 CE.⁶³ According to Du’s eyewitness account, the *Bamboo Annals* records major events from the Xia 夏 dynasty to the Jin state of the Spring and Autumn period (722–479 BCE) and Wei 魏 state of the Warring States period. Whereas the “Lu annals” never emerged, the *Bamboo Annals* (partly the Jin-Wei annals) surfaced, opening a window into one of those fabled “unedited annals.” Thereupon, Du Yu pinpoints the precise changes Confucius wrought on these chronicles to imprint his moral views, as manifested through the *Zuo Tradition*’s direct exegesis, Du claims.

In Du Yu’s “Postface” to his *Jijie*, he notes that the Jin state annals within the *Bamboo Annals* contain entries recording the same basic events as those recorded in Confucius’ *Annals* from 722–479 BCE. Du points out some parallels between the Jin annals and Confucius’ *Annals* without claiming that Confucius saw the Jin annals per se. Given these parallels, Du Yu seeks to prevent Confucius’ *Annals* from being downgraded to a mere historical docu-

60. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 1.9b.10, 1.12b.11, and 1.19a.15.

61. The *Mozi* mentions the “annals” 春秋 of Zhou, Yan 燕, Song 宋, and Qi 齊. *Mozi jiangou* 墨子間詁, ed. Sun Yirang 孫詒讓 (1848–1908) (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1986), 8.204–11.

62. This is a seldom discussed essay. The *Zuozhuan zhengyi* and *Saden kaisen* 左氏會箋 have very little commentary on Du Yu’s “Postface,” compared to the amount of commentary devoted to his “Preface.” *Zuozhuan zhushu jiaokanji* 60.16a.1063–8b.1064. Takezoe Kōkō 竹添光鴻, *Saden kaisen* (Chengdu: Bashu shushe, 2008), 2439–43. Shen Yucheng also makes no mention of Du’s “Postface” in his “textbook” on *Zuo Tradition* scholarship; see Shen, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan*, 1992. The entirety of Du’s “Postface” is translated in Edward L. Shaughnessy, *Rewriting Early Chinese Texts* (Albany: State Univ. of New York Press, 2006), 143–45 and 188–90.

63. Du Yu does not specify in his “Postface” how the *Bamboo Annals* was made available for him to inspect. For an in-depth study of the Jizhong texts, see Shaughnessy, *Rewriting*, 131–256.

ment (as eventually became the case in post-Tang periods for some skeptics).⁶⁴ Du handles the areas of textual overlap by identifying minute discrepancies in wording that he claims distinguish Confucius' morally charged *Annals* from the morally neutral Jin annals:

Du Yu's "Postface":

其著書文意，大似春秋經，推此足見古者國史策書之常也。文稱「魯隱公及邾莊公盟于姑蔑」。⁶⁵ 即春秋所書邾儀父「未王命，故不書爵。曰『儀父』，貴之也」。⁶⁶ 又稱「晉獻公會虞師伐虢，滅下陽」。⁶⁷ 即春秋所書「虞師、晉師滅下陽」，「先書虞，賄故也」。⁶⁸ 又稱「周襄王會諸侯于河陽」。⁶⁹ 即春秋所書「天王狩于河陽」，「以臣召君，不可以訓」也。⁷⁰ 諸若此輩甚多，略舉數條以明國史皆承告據實而書時事，仲尼脩春秋以義而制異文也。⁷¹

The text and contents of the *Bamboo Annals* greatly resemble those of *Annals*, the Classic. From this we can infer that these were the constant principles of records on connected slips by state scribes in antiquity. The text of the *Bamboo Annals* reads: "Lord Yin of Lu and Lord Zhuang of Zhu swore a covenant at Gumie." This is none other than what is recorded in the *Annals* [technically the *Zuo Tradition*]: Yifu of Zhu "has not been ordained by the King [of Zhou], therefore his rank is not recorded. Calling him 'Yifu' honors him." The *Bamboo Annals* also reads: "Lord Xian of Jin met with Yu troops to attack Guo. They extinguished Xiayang." This is none other than what is recorded in the *Annals*: "The Yu troops and Jin troops extinguished Xiayang." [The *Zuo Tradition* says:] "Yu is first recorded [before Jin] because of the bribe." The *Bamboo Annals* also reads: "King Xiang of Zhou met with the feudal lords at Heyang." This is none other than what is recorded in the *Annals*: "The heaven-appointed king went on a hunt at Heyang." [The *Zuo Tradition* says:] "It is not an instructive example for a subject to summon his ruler."⁷² There are many various such cases, so I have selectively listed a few entries to illustrate that all state scribes received reports and recorded the events of the day based on what was actually in those reports, and that Confucius edits his *Annals* with [moral] significance in mind as he alters the wording.

Confronted with the *Bamboo Annals*, Du Yu proposes ways to tackle these questions: Without the Jin annals or the presumed Lu annals for comparison, how would readers know where Confucius has "altered the wording" of various state records to convey his judgments? Where precisely are his small-scale but well-chosen edits? For instance, how could the reader discern that Confucius has redesignated "Lord Zhuang of Zhu" as "Yifu of Zhu," placed "Yu troops" before "Jin troops," and changed "met with the feudal lords" to "went on a hunt"? Du champions the *Zuo Tradition* as the ultimate solution to these problems, because, as he argues, the *Zuo* alerts the reader to textual discrepancies between the *Annals* and some no longer extant source. Du maintains that the *Zuo* renders explicit the praise or blame underlying the *Annals*' departures from its source texts, as when the *Zuo* informs readers that

64. To take a famous example, Wang Anshi 王安石 (1021–1086) derides the *Annals* as nothing but "disconnected and fragmentary court reports" 斷爛朝報. *Songshi* 宋史 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1977), 327.10550.

65. The only extant attestation to this line existing in the *Bamboo Annals* is from Du Yu's "Postface" here. Fang Shiming 方詩銘 and Wang Xiuling 王修齡, eds., *Guben Zhushu jinian jizheng* 古本竹書紀年輯證 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1981), 264.

66. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 2.14b.34 (Yin 1).

67. Aside from Du Yu's "Postface" here, the only other extant citation of this line from the *Bamboo Annals* is in Li Daoyuan's 酈道元 (d. 527) *Shujing zhu* 水經注; see *Shujing zhushu* (Nanjing: Jiangsu guji chubanshe, 1999), 4.350. Also see Fang, *Guben Zhushu*, 73 and 268–69.

68. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 12.5a.199 and 12.6b.199 (Xi 2).

69. Today, this line is also attested only in Du Yu's "Postface." Fang, *Guben Zhushu*, 270.

70. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 16.16b.269 and 16.30b.276 (Xi 28).

71. *Zuozhuan zhushu jiaokan ji*, 60.17a.1063.

72. In actuality, it was Duke Wen of Jin 晉文公 (697–628 BCE) who summoned King Xiang of Zhou; therefore the summoning was euphemistically written down as a "hunt."

the original wording has been commuted to honor Yifu, indict Yu for taking a “bribe,” and criticize the ritual subordinate who had the audacity to “summon the ruler.” Granted, without corroboration from another text such as the *Bamboo Annals*, a situation that applies to the vast majority of *Annals* entries, the reader would have to take the *Zuo*’s word for it (or the *Gongyang*’s and *Guliang*’s for that matter). But this concern fails to trouble early scholars, because by the Eastern Han, these major exegetical traditions have established sufficient hermeneutical authority, even if sources corroborating the *Annals* have already disappeared.⁷³

Building upon this authority, Du Yu deploys the additional advantage of juxtaposing the *Annals* against a newly unearthed possible source text, such that, far from allowing the parallel text in the *Bamboo Annals* to diminish the *Annals*’ sanctity, he could attest to both the existence of Confucius’ word substitutions and the *Zuo*’s attendant capability to unbury them. By highlighting the role of the *Zuo Tradition*’s direct exegesis in uncovering presumed word changes in the mode of the *Gongyang* and *Guliang* traditions, Du works to ensure that scholars continue to uphold the *Annals* as a Classic pregnant with Confucian moral meanings, despite its textual basis in secular chronicles, as Du also avows. So while Du may have rejected most of these rival traditions’ interpretations, he in fact valorizes the method of word-for-word exegesis occasionally employed within the *Zuo Tradition* and that all three traditions share. In fact, Du Yu’s conception of the secondary authority in the *Annals*—Confucius’ textual emendations—depends upon the very existence of such direct exegesis in the *Zuo Tradition*.

4. SUBORDINATE CATEGORY: THE DELIMITED AUTHORITY OF CONFUCIUS

Much of Du Yu’s “Preface” returns to the idea of Confucius’ indebtedness to the Zhou legacy as he edits the Lu annals. Declaring Confucius the producer of the secondary category of material in the *Annals*, Du profiles him as an authority who largely defers to Zhou norms by minimizing his editing of historical documents to only those places that call for his rectification because of two pre-existing conditions: scribal errors and obscured morality. The Qing historian Zhang Xuecheng 章學誠 (1738–1801) remains the exceptional scholar in traditional China to have iconoclastically proclaimed that “all Six Classics are the old authoritative documents of the Duke of Zhou; Confucius does not have anything to do with them” 六藝皆周公之舊典，夫子無所事作也。⁷⁴ Du Yu, by comparison, may have repeatedly paid homage to the Duke of Zhou, but Du never denies Confucius’ role in the compilation of the *Annals* as completely as Zhang does. Instead, Du Yu defines Confucius’ role as strictly limited to his editing of the Lu annals within certain parameters established by Zhou norms. By implication then, in this limited capacity as suggested by Du Yu, Confucius makes editorial changes that amount to at least roughly 150 in number.⁷⁵

4.1 Limiting Confucius’ Edits to Pre-Existing Scribal Errors

Du Yu’s subordination of the second to the first class of meaning in the *Annals* stands out most clearly when he circumscribes Confucius’ editorial interventions to those that help to

73. See Van Auken, “‘Subtle Words,’” 50, for the availability and reliability of external material corresponding to *Annals* records.

74. Zhang Xuecheng, *Wenshi tongyi jiaozhu* 文史通義校注 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2000), 170.

75. Van Auken counts 152 instances of what she calls “specific remarks” in the *Zuo Tradition* that signal edits made to the source text(s) of the *Annals*. Van Auken, *Commentarial Transformation*, 39. We say “at least,” because if readers are meant to extrapolate from the “norms” explicated by the *Zuo* and apply them to other entries that present the same conditions for a given rule, then the number should be greater.

salvage decayed Zhou scribal norms at select places only. By no means does Du envision the sage revamping his source materials at will. Prior to Du's time, the *Mencius*, *Huainanzi*, *Shiji*, *Shuoyuan* 說苑, *Hanshu*, and *Lunheng* also espoused the broad idea that Confucius compiled the *Annals* to halt the decline of the age.⁷⁶ While Du adopts the broad strokes of this narrative as well, he represents, as far as we can judge, the first scholar to advance specific claims about the types of places where Confucius revises the old records while leaving the rest unchanged. Early Chinese scholars (including *Gongyang* and *Guliang* exegetes) before Du Yu fail to explicitly identify which parts of the *Annals* they believe signify the edits made by Confucius, which parts do not.⁷⁷

Echoing the *Hanshu* narrative in particular,⁷⁸ Du Yu depicts the Zhou decline and the documents' decay as conditions motivating Confucius to restore exemplary institutions associated with the Duke of Zhou. But complicating earlier Han formulations, Du maintains that the crumbling of Zhou institutions manifests itself specifically in deteriorating scribal practices, prompting Confucius to step in to rectify scribal standards:

Du Yu's "Preface":

周德既衰，官失其守，上之人不能使春秋昭明，赴告策書，諸所記注，多違舊章。仲尼因魯史策書成文，考其真偽，而志其典禮，上以遵周公之遺制，下以明將來之法。⁷⁹

Once the Zhou's charismatic power waned, officials grew remiss in their duties. The superiors could not make the annals manifest. Most of their death notices and reports, records on connected slips, as well as what they had variously recorded and commented upon, deviated from old conventions. Confucius adapts the Lu scribal records on connected slips to complete his text, investigates their truths and falsehoods, and records their codes and rituals. Looking backward in time, he defers to the remaining institutions inherited from the Duke of Zhou, and looking forward in time, he clarifies the laws for future use.

At first glance, Du Yu's narrative about the decay of Zhou institutions here—particularly as they relate to scribal conventions—appears to contradict his earlier demonstration of Lu as a bastion of Zhou culture (an idea immanent in the *Zuo* itself in the Han Xuanzi episode). So while Du Yu equates the Zhou and Lu as paradigmatic states, he also accommodates the prevailing narrative about their parallel decline, to better highlight the necessity for Confucius' subsequent limited editorial interventions. Du Yu's line "The superiors could not make the annals manifest" is the negation of a line from the *Zuo Tradition*: "The superiors could make them manifest" 上之人能使昭明.⁸⁰ The *Zuo* line occurs in a passage that lauds the praise-and-blame function of the *Annals* (author unnamed there) and expresses confidence in higher authorities to make plain its subtle messages. But Du Yu appropriates the line to speak

76. *Sishu zhangju* 272; *Huainanzi* 13.427; *Shiji* 14.509; *Shuoyuan*, comp. Liu Xiang 劉向 (70–8 BCE), ed. Lu Yuanjun 盧元駿 (Taipei: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1988), 1.42; *Hanshu* 30.1715 and 36.1968; and *Lunheng* 27.1121–22 and 29.1177.

77. Like the *Zuo Tradition*, the *Gongyang* and *Guliang* traditions fail to comment on the majority of the 1800-plus total entries of the *Annals*. The *Gongyang* only explicates around 500 *Annals* entries, whereas the *Zuo* and *Guliang* each explicates around 200 entries. All three texts fail to explicitly say whether the *Annals* entries left without comment are meant to be taken as edited or unedited.

78. That narrative begins: "Since the Zhou house declined, records were incomplete and documents had lacunae. Confucius longed to preserve the legacy of past sages." 周室既微，載籍殘缺，仲尼思存前聖之業。 *Hanshu* 30.1715.

79. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 1.9a–b.10.

80. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 53.20b.930 (Zhao 31). The full passage reads: "The designations [i.e., judgments] of the *Annals* are subtle yet manifest, indirect yet clear. The superiors could make them manifest. Virtuous men become encouraged and debauched men become fearful. This is why the Gentleman honors it" 春秋之稱微而顯，婉而辨，上之人能使昭明，善人勸焉，淫人懼焉，是以君子貴之。

not of the moralizing *Annals*, but of the morally neutral “annals” and their attendant scribal standards and conventions. He speaks of a general decline whereby what the “superiors” no longer make “manifest” is not so much the moral lessons in the text themselves per se, but the scribal methods serving as their vehicle. This emphasis on scribal concerns supports Du Yu’s assertion in the “Preface” that Confucius only edits the places where the presence of deteriorated scribal practices warrants his intervention.

Du Yu illustrates this limited and specific circumstance prompting Confucius to make changes by commenting on a scribal error the *Zuo Tradition* reveals:

Annals (Yin 3):

三月，庚戌，天王崩。⁸¹

In the third month, on the *gengxu* day (12), the heaven-appointed king succumbed.

Zuo Tradition:

三年，春，王三月，壬戌，平王崩。赴以庚戌，故書之。⁸²

In the third year, in spring, in the royal third month, on the *renxu* day (24), King Ping succumbed. The notice of death sent out says it was the *gengxu* day (12), and that is why it [*gengxu*] is recorded.

Du Yu’s comment in his *Jijie*:

實以壬戌崩，欲諸侯之速至，故遠日以赴。春秋不書實崩日而書遠日者，即傳其偽以懲臣子之過也。⁸³

In actuality, King Ping succumbed on the *renxu* day (24), but because it was desired that feudal lords would arrive soon, an earlier day of death was thus reported. The *Annals* does not record the actual day of the succumbing, but records the earlier day, for no reason other than to transmit its fabrication for the sake of punishing the officials [i.e., King’s scribes] for their [intentional] mistake.

Apparently, the messengers to Lu reported a date different from the actual one based on some other source the *Zuo Tradition* draws from. The *Zuo* attributes this dating discrepancy simply to the Lu scribe’s faithful transcription of the death notice sent from the Zhou court. Normally, too, Du would have explained away any such discrepancies by calling such instances *congfu* 從赴 (following the notice).⁸⁴ But in Du’s view, this particular discrepancy in Yin 3 represents an egregious case of inconsistency because the Zhou scribe knowingly falsified the date for the sake of expediency. According to this moralizing interpretation Du devises, Zhou officials falsified a date twelve days earlier than the real one, to create a sense of urgency among the feudal lords so that they might hasten to Zhou to mourn for their king.⁸⁵ As Du presumes, Confucius, understanding full well this tortured design, deliberately adopts the falsified date in the *Annals* to express his disapproval of the Zhou scribes’ intentional inaccuracy. Du’s comment proposes that Confucius warns against scribal inaccuracies precisely by preserving them, rather than erasing the trace of wrongdoing by restoring the right date. Du’s complication of a simple situation, while much ridiculed by later scholars,⁸⁶ nonetheless exemplifies his statement in his “Preface” that Confucius has the ability to distinguish

81. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 3.2a.49. The *Gongyang* and *Guliang* traditions fail to mention any dating discrepancy here.

82. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 3.4a.50.

83. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 3.2a.49.

84. See example in Huan 5, *Zuozhuan zhushu* 6.7a–b.105. Du Yu uses the term *congfu* twenty-one times in his *Jijie*.

85. In the absence of surviving comments prior to Du Yu’s on this entry, Qing scholar Liu Wenqi 劉文淇 (1789–1854) considers this interpretation Du’s own creation. Liu Wenqi, *Chunqiu Zuoshi zhuan jiuzhu shuzheng* 春秋左氏傳舊注疏證 (Taipei: Minglun chubanshe, 1971), 18.

86. For a compilation of such criticisms on this specific comment by Du Yu, see Chen, *Yili bian*, 8.619–21.

truths from falsehoods (考其真偽) laid down by scribes. Du Yu's paradoxical explanation about Confucius' edifying preservation of falsehood instantiates Du's claim earlier in his "Preface" that the sage's motivations are limited to a desire to restore the scribal standards once upheld by Zhou and Lu.

4.2 Limiting Confucius' Edits to Obscured Pre-Existing Lessons

It is evident that Du Yu recognizes the Han use of the *Annals* as a legal code (為漢制法),⁸⁷ in his acknowledgement that Confucius legislates "laws for future use" 將來之法 (quoted earlier from his "Preface"). Yet Du also refrains from vouching for Confucius' independent prerogatives as a judge, since Du regularly insists upon Confucius' indebtedness to the "institutions inherited from the Duke of Zhou" 周公之遺制 (quoted earlier from his "Preface"). This push and pull between the juridical and preservationist sides of Confucius represents the productive tensions in Du Yu's conception of the sage's editorial role.

As Du Yu states, far from transforming the old Lu chronicle with heavy-handed edits, Confucius changes the original wording only at certain precise points where pre-existing moral lessons are insufficiently clear:

Du Yu's "Preface":

其教之所存，文之所害，則刊而正之，以示勸戒。⁸⁸

Wherever the teachings are preserved, but are obscured by the language used, Confucius redacts and rectifies it in order to exhibit encouragement and warnings.

When Confucius deems the original message to be unclear in his source texts, he would tweak the language to restore the moral lessons to visibility, so argues Du. While crediting Confucius for his editorial work, Du claims that the "teachings" existed in the scribal records all along, but had lain concealed, awaiting Confucius to re-expose the buried lessons through his redactions. Du uses the following episode in the *Zuo Tradition* to adduce internal evidence of such a re-exposure:

Annals (Xiang 14):

己未，衛侯出奔齊。⁸⁹

On the *jiwei* day, the Marquis of Wei left Wei and fled to Qi.

Zuo Tradition (Xiang 20):

衛甯惠子疾，召悼子[甯喜]曰：「吾得罪於君，悔而無及也。名藏在諸侯之策，曰：『孫林父、甯殖出其君』。君入，則掩之。若能掩之，則吾子也。若不能，猶有鬼神，吾有餒而已，不來食矣」。悼子許諾，惠子遂卒。⁹⁰

Ning Huizi of Wei was gravely ill, so he summoned Daozi [Ning Xi], saying: "I have wronged our ruler, and though I may regret it, it is too late now. My name is stored in the connected slips of the feudal lords, which read: 'Sun Linfu and Ning Zhi expelled their ruler.' If our ruler reenters his state, then conceal my crime. If you can conceal it, then you are indeed my son. If you cannot do so, and there are ghosts and spirits yet, then I will starve and that is all, for I will not partake of your sacrifices." Daozi gave his promise, and Huizi subsequently died.

Du Yu's comment in his *Jijie* (Xiang 14):

諸侯之策書孫、甯逐衛侯。春秋以其自取奔亡之禍。以諸侯失國者，皆不書逐君之賊也。⁹¹

87. For this phrase, see Pi Xirui 皮錫瑞 (1850–1908), *Jingxue tonglun* 經學通論 (1968; rpt., Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2011), 4.11.

88. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 1.10a.10.

89. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 32.7b.557.

90. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 34.11a.589.

91. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 32.7b.557.

It is recorded on the connected slips of the feudal lords that Sun and Ning drove out the Marquis of Wei. The *Annals* considers this the ruler bringing onto himself the calamity of being forced to flee and go into exile. For all feudal lords who lost [authority over] their domains, the names of the villains who drove out their rulers are not recorded.

Du Yu proffers an explanation for the discrepancy between the feudal lords' and the *Annals*' records concerning Duke Xian of Wei's flight: whereas the lords' official records name the ministers who expelled him, Confucius omits these names in the *Annals* to convey the larger lesson that the Wei ruler himself ultimately deserved blame for losing his eminent authority over his subjects.⁹² It may occur to readers that Confucius' "editing" actually protects the reputation of Ning Huizi the "villain," fulfilling his dastardly wish to expunge his crime from the record. But Du proposes that Confucius is preoccupied with a larger issue: re-exposing the lesson about Duke Xian as a failed leader. This judgment of the Wei ruler accords with the implicit disapprobation of him conveyed through quite lengthy narratives in the *Zuo*, *Gongyang*, and *Guliang* traditions.⁹³ Du's comment is therefore solidly based on all three traditions' rich supply of historical information discrediting this ruler. Yet, going further than these exegetical traditions, Du elevates this particular omission of Ning Huizi's names to a universal editorial rule, as he says, "For all feudal lords who lost [authority over] their domains, the names of the villains who drove out their rulers are not recorded." This comment illustrates Du's statement in his "Preface" quoted earlier that, as a rule, Confucius "redacts and rectifies" 刊而正 the state records whenever "encouragement and warnings" 勸戒 are left "obscured" 害 by the sources' wording. In Du Yu's careful circumscription of Confucius' powers, Confucius only rises to this occasion when the limited condition of textual opacity is met.

5. THE *ZUO TRADITION*'S MECHANISMS FOR UNCOVERING CONFUCIUS' EDITS

Having established the parameters whereby Confucius only commits himself to editing those places where pre-existent scribal standards and moral teachings are dimmed, Du Yu next claims that the *Zuo Tradition* avails the reader of the mechanistic means for systematically uncovering these edits by the sage:

Du Yu's "Preface":

其微顯闡幽，⁹⁴ 裁成義類者，皆據舊例而發義，指行事以正褒貶。諸稱書、不書、先書、故書、不言、不稱、書曰之類，⁹⁵ 皆所以起新舊，發大義，謂之變例。⁹⁶

His making subtle the evident and elucidating the cryptic, and forming categories of significance—it is all for expounding upon the significance based on old norms, and pointing to the

92. Elsewhere in the *Jijie*, Du Yu makes similar comments to show that Confucius has revised the language to assign responsibility to someone else. For example, Du says Confucius "inserts 'committed regicide'" 加「弑」 to record someone who did not murder his ruler directly. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 48.22a.844 (Zhao 19) and 16.16b.269 (Xi 28).

93. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 37.2b.629–5b.631 (Xiang 26) and 38.3b.643–5a.644 (Xiang 27). *Gongyang zhushu* 20.4a.252 (Xiang 14) and 2.5a–6a.264 (Xiang 27). *Guliang zhushu* 15.13b.153 (Xiang 14) and 16.9b–10a.160 (Xiang 27).

94. An allusion to the *Classic of Changes* 易經, *weixian chanyou* 微顯闡幽 appears in the "Xici zhuan" 繫辭傳 (Commentary on the appended phrases). *Zhouyi zhushu* 8.16a.172.

95. Examples of comments by Du Yu on the use of *shu* 書 can be found in *Zuozhuan zhushu* 18.12a.302, 38.1a.642, and 38.11a.647. On *bushu* 不書, see 2.13b.34; on *xianshu* 先書, see 12.6b.199; on *gushu* 故書, see 26.23a.447; on *buyan* 不言, see 9.15b.159; on *bucheng* 不稱, see 8.3b.137; on *shuyue* 書曰, see 3.15b.56 and 3.17b–18a.57. Terms that practically fail to appear in the *Gongyang* and *Guliang* traditions are *xianshu*, *gushu* (only once in the *Guliang*), and *shuyue*; the other terms frequently do appear there. *Guliang zhushu* 12.4b.116.

96. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 1.13b–14b.12.

deeds and events in order to rectify [standards of] praise and blame. The various designations “is recorded,” “is not recorded,” “is first recorded,” “is therefore recorded,” “does not speak of,” “is not designated as,” “is recorded as saying,” and the like, are all the means by which [the *Zuo Tradition*] distinguishes the new from the old, and expounds upon the great significance. They are called transformed norms.

The first lines of this passage cause considerable dissension among Six Dynasties commentators, who disagree on whether Du Yu has designated Confucius or Zuo Qiuming as the subject of these actions (微顯闡幽; 據舊例; 指行事; 正褒貶).⁹⁷ This ambiguity could have stemmed from Du’s employment of the vocabulary of the dominant *Annals* hermeneutic to describe the *Zuo Tradition*, a hermeneutic based on the assumption that Confucius manipulates language to express subtle “praise and blame.” On the one hand, Du’s vocabulary evokes an image of Confucius first cast in the well-known *Shiji* account presenting Confucius’ self-conscious decision to utilize “deeds and events” 行事 rather than empty speech 空言 to substantiate his judgments in the *Annals*.⁹⁸ Additionally, with the term “old norms” 舊例, Du points back to the act of drawing upon Zhou “general norms” 凡例 and “old conventions” 舊章—a responsibility Du’s “Preface” has earlier assigned to Confucius.

On the other hand, since Du is devoting this part of his “Preface” to his argument that the *Zuo Tradition* compartmentalizes “norms” (*li*) into different “categories of significance” 義類, the *Zuo* could conceivably serve as the subject also. Indeed, the terms *fayi* 發義 (“expounding upon the significance”) and *fa dayi* 發大義 (“expounding upon the great significance”) depict the very function of exegesis on the *Annals* as agreed upon by early Chinese scholars: to elaborate on the moral significance Confucius merely hints at between the lines.⁹⁹ By describing the *Zuo Tradition* in terms previously reserved for the *Annals*, Du Yu presents the *Zuo* as sharing in the same moral vision of the *Annals*, thereby making the case that the *Zuo* represents Confucius’ perfect exponent.

The subsequent lines of the foregoing passage beginning with “the various designations” 諸稱 indisputably refer to the *Zuo Tradition*, as Du Yu claims that linguistic markers such as *shu* 書 (“is recorded”) or *bushu* 不書 (“is not recorded”) in the *Zuo* flag the reader’s attention to spots in the *Annals* where Confucius has emended his sources. While these linguistic tags are already sprinkled throughout the *Zuo* text itself, Du groups them into a system for the first time. Together, Du postulates, these cues in the *Zuo* explicate the system of “transformed norms” (*bianli* 變例) Confucius has produced by modifying Zhou “old norms.”¹⁰⁰ The *Zuozhuan zhengyi* editors declare *bianli* a neologism created by Du Yu, as these Tang scholars fail to locate precedents in the use of this term by any previous scholar, although the *Zhengyi* does note its parallelism to the “transformed airs” 變風 and “transformed elegantia” 變雅 of the *Odes*.¹⁰¹

97. Commentators He Daoyang 賀道養 (?–?) and Shen Wen’ā 沈文阿 (503–563) support Confucius as the subject, whereas Liu Xuan 劉炫 (546?–613?) and the *Zhengyi* editors support Zuo Qiuming. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 1.14a.12.

98. *Shiji* 130.3297. This statement about Confucius is repeated in *Hanshu* 30.1715.

99. In the context of discussions of the *Annals* in Han sources, the term *yi* 義 or *dayi* 大義 frequently refers specifically to the judgments of Confucius. See *Chunqiu fanlu*, passim; *Shiji* 130.3296–300 and 14.509; and *Hanshu* 36.1967–68 and 36.1971.

100. It must be emphasized that this is Du Yu’s own claim about Confucius actually modifying, or “transforming,” the old norms. But as Van Auken demonstrates, the exegetical text itself in fact treats these places as “specific applications of regular recording rules” and not “departures or ‘transformations’ of those rules.” Van Auken, *Commentarial Transformation*, 37.

101. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 1.12b.11. For a brief discussion of this parallelism and possible borrowing of language, see Van Auken, *Commentarial Transformation*, 23–24.

The concept of “transformed norms” derives from Du’s notion of a clear distinction between traditional “old” Zhou norms and newly “transformed” norms that are nonetheless “based on old norms.” The following example illustrates the workings of such a “transformed norm” in Du’s terms:

Annals (Wen 2):

夏，六月，公孫敖會宋公、陳侯、鄭伯、晉士穀盟于垂隴。¹⁰²

In summer, the sixth month, Gongsun Ao met with the Duke of Song, Marquis of Chen, Earl of Zheng, and Shi Hu of Jin to swear a covenant at Chuilong.

Zuo Tradition:

書「士穀」，堪其事也。¹⁰³

“Shi Hu” is recorded, because he could handle his given duty.

Du Yu’s comment in his *Jijie*:

晉司空，非卿也。以士穀能堪卿事，故書。¹⁰⁴

As *Sikong* (Excellency of Works) of Jin, Shi Hu was not a royal appointed minister. But because Shi Hu could handle the duties of royal appointed ministers, therefore his name is recorded.

The *Zuo Tradition* uses the marker *shu* 書 to point out the inclusion of Shi Hu’s name in the *Annals* entry, even though his rank was too low to deserve such an honor under an “old norm.” This exception implies that the “old norm” involves the scribal rule of only recording the heads of states or Zhou royal ministers who had sworn covenants with other states. But as the *Zuo* intimates, and Du Yu further explicates, Shi Hu’s name is inserted into the *Annals* expressly to commend his outstanding ability,¹⁰⁵ preserving his achievement for posterity to see. The above example represents one of approximately 150 such cases where the *Zuo* points out, as Du conceives it, that Confucius has inserted, deleted, or altered words in the old annals to create “transformed norms” (*bianli*). Du Yu’s schematic division between “old” and “transformed” norms serves the ideological function of emphasizing Confucius’ necessary dependency on “old norms” as the primary foundation upon which he builds his own judgments.

Du Yu understands the *Annals* to be a historical text that follows Zhou institutional and ethical norms while retaining the stamp of Confucius’ moral signature. This compromise is reflected in Du’s articulation of the “transformed” category comprising Confucius’ limited but pointed modifications of “old” norms. Giving prominence to the instrumental role of the *Zuo Tradition* in drawing the distinction between these two categories of meaning in the *Annals*, Du Yu argues that the *Zuo* constitutes the unparalleled authority on the internal hierarchy of the *Annals*’ moral universe.

6. NEUTRAL CATEGORY: THE REMAINING AUTHORITY OF SCRIBAL RECORDS

Completing Du Yu’s schematization of the *Annals*, he assigns the third division of meaning to a category that fails to have explicitly marked instructive value. Han scholars may have explained scribal rules wherever they perceive them to be at work in the *Annals*, but as far as extant literature shows, Han exegetes do not generally explicitly say what is *not* a

102. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 18.8b.300.

103. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 18.12a.302.

104. *Ibid.*

105. For a complementary discussion of this entry involving Shi Hu, cf. Newell Ann Van Auken, “Who is a *Rén* 人? The Use of *Rén* in *Spring and Autumn* Records and Its Interpretation in the *Zuǒ*, *Gōngyáng*, and *Gūliáng* Commentaries,” *JAOS* 131 (2011): 573–75.

scribal rule or norm—that is, they do not invoke the principle of negative exclusion the way Du Yu consistently does.

According to Du, a final category demarcates the area within the *Annals* that is free of exemplary or moral significance, and thus differs from the first two categories embedding the Duke of Zhou’s “general norms” (*fanli*) and Confucius’ “transformed norms” (*bianli*) respectively. As Du argues, this third category encapsulates the purely historical content of Confucius’ source materials:

Du Yu’s “Preface”:

其經無義例，¹⁰⁶ 因行事而言，則傳直言其歸趣而已，非例也。¹⁰⁷

Where the Classic has no norms governing significance and speaks in accordance with the deeds and events, the *Zuo Tradition* would only convey the gist of it and that is all, as these instances are not norms.

In the passage above, Du introduces the idea that not every entry in Confucius’ text encodes normative meaning according to a system of signification.¹⁰⁸ Du posits that wherever the *Zuo Tradition* merely comments on an *Annals* record without explicating scribal rules or textual changes, one may regard that *Annals* entry as being empty of paradigmatic content. In the following example, Du’s comment illustrates his conception of the *Zuo*’s ability to indicate this morally neutral category:

Annals (Yin 1):

九月，及宋人盟于宿。¹⁰⁹

In the ninth month, we [Lu] swore a covenant with the leaders of Song at Su.

Zuo Tradition:

始通也。¹¹⁰

Lu began to have diplomatic relations with Song.

Du Yu’s comment in his *Jijie*:

經無義例，故傳直言其歸宿而已，他皆倣此。¹¹¹

The Classic does not embed norms governing significance [here]; therefore the *Zuo Tradition* only conveys the gist of it and that is all. All other [instances] are modeled on this [example].

By highlighting areas of neutrality in the *Annals*, Du Yu redefines the *Zuo*’s exegetical function to include its ability to simply clarify scribal records without necessarily explicating any “norms.” As he conceives it, the *Zuo* can point out non-paradigmatic material in the

106. In Du Yu’s usage, *li* 例 is short for *yili* 義例. Indeed, traditional Chinese scholars of *Chunqiu xue* 春秋學 (Studies of the *Annals* corpus) use *li* (“norms”) and *yili* (“norms governing significance”) interchangeably. A cumbersome but accurate translation that captures the precise valances of *yili* within Du’s discourse would be “norms governing both the embedding and interpretation of meaning that hold paradigmatic (Zhou cultural) and moral (Confucian) significance.” The translation “norms of significance” is avoided here because, while it suggests that these norms are of particular noteworthiness, it does not immediately suggest that they embody specific meanings to be encoded and decoded.

107. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 1.15b.13.

108. Echoing Du Yu, the *Zuozhuan zhengyi* clarifies that *feili* 非例 does not involve praise or blame and that most of the *Annals* text belongs in this category. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 1.16a.13.

109. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 2.11b.33. Du Yu’s comment on this *Annals* record reads: “The guest and host are unnamed because both are insignificant” 客主無名，皆微者也. This seems to be a modification of the *Gongyang* comment, which reads: “With whom [did the Song leaders swear a covenant]? Someone insignificant within [Lu]” 孰及之？內之微者也. *Gongyang zhushu* 1.21a.16.

110. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 2.25b.40.

111. *Ibid.* For an example of an identical comment by Du Yu elsewhere, see *Zuozhuan zhushu* 8.22a.146 (Zhuang 10).

Annals that presumably preserves intact the material in the “Lu annals.” As with the first two categories, Du positions the *Zuo Tradition* as the means for systematically communicating to readers how to locate this neutral category in the *Annals*: this time simply through the absence of linguistic markers such as *fan* 凡 or *bushu* 不書 in the *Zuo*’s explanation. In the above comment, he describes such an absence as *wu yili* 無義例. There are thirty-four other instances total in Du Yu’s *Jijie* and *Chunqiu shili* where he indicates (with the phrase *wu yili*, *wuli* 無例, *feili* 非例, or *fei yili* 非義例) *Annals* entries that are to be treated as neutral.¹¹²

In some of these instances, Du Yu is countering Han scholars who would read moral significance into these same entries prior to him. For example, Du opposes Jia Kui’s interpretation of *ji* 及 as encoding a subtle message in the following case:

Annals (Wen 9):

晉人殺其大夫士穀及箕鄭父。¹¹³

The Jin leaders killed their noblemen Shi Hu and Ji Zhengfu.

Jia Kui’s comment:

箕鄭稱及，非首謀。¹¹⁴

Ji Zheng is designated [after] “and” (*ji*), because he was not the lead conspirator.

Annals (Xiang 23):

陳殺其大夫慶虎及慶寅。¹¹⁵

Chen killed their noblemen Qing Hu and Qing Yin.

Guliang Tradition:

及慶寅，慶寅累也。¹¹⁶

The *Annals* says: “and (*ji*) Qing Yin” because he was implicated [on account of Qing Hu].

Du Yu’s comment in his *Jijie*:

言及，史異辭，無義例。¹¹⁷

The *Annals* says “and” (*ji*). This is a different wording used by the scribe. There are no norms governing significance [here].

In both *Annals* records above, *ji* 及 (“and”) links the names of the two killed ministers. Jia Kui offers an explanation for the use of this character that is loosely based on the *Guliang* interpretation of the *Annals* record in Xiang 23 as shown above. Both Jia Kui and the *Guliang* treat the use of *ji* before a person’s name as indicating that that individual deserves less blame because of his lesser role in a given plot. Du Yu, however, refuses to see that any special significance underlies such a particular use of *ji*.¹¹⁸ He asserts that, in this case, the use of *ji*

112. This is my count. Du Yu also uses a variety of other expressions, such as *congfu* 從赴 (follows the notice), *congao* 從告 (follows the report), *shi quewen* 史闕文 (the scribal record has gaps), *quewen* 闕文 (missing text), *shi shizhi* 史失之 (the scribe missed it), *buzai li* 不在例 (norms do not apply here), *jing wu* 經誤 (the Classic is in error), *jing que* 經闕 (the Classic has gaps), etc., to highlight the absence of special moral meaning in certain irregularities in the *Annals*. Du fails to specify whether the rest of the *Annals* records he does not designate as belonging to this neutral category are to be regarded as such or not.

113. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 19A.20b.320. The *Gongyang* tradition has no exegesis on this entry nor the one below from Xiang 23. The *Zuo* has narratives following both entries but fails to explicate the use of *ji* 及. Both the *Guliang*’s and Du Yu’s comment on this entry fail to do likewise.

114. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 19A.22a.321.

115. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 35.7a.601.

116. *Guliang zhushu* 16.5b.158.

117. *Zuozhuan zhushu* 35.7a.601.

118. Outside of this particular use, the *Gongyang*, *Guliang*, *Zuo* traditions, as well as Du Yu himself, proposes a total of over two dozen other interpretations concerning the use of *ji* 及, in various contexts and in ways oftentimes inconsistent with each other, even within the same commentary.

is simply part of the scribe's regular use of language to construct a record, and variations in wording are bound to occur from entry to entry without any special rules (無義例) governing the differences in wording (異辭). His disagreement from the *Guliang* and *Jia Kui* suggests that not only is he willing to countenance, but he is also explicitly proclaiming, that much of the language in the *Annals* simply states the plain facts without embedding special meaning.

Implicitly, this particular conception by Du Yu highlights his differentiation of the *Zuo* from the *Gongyang* and *Guliang* traditions, which in most cases either fail to comment on the *Annals* records entirely or extract highly charged moral meanings from them.¹¹⁹ In essence, Du makes a category out of exegesis in the *Zuo* that, in contrast to the *Gongyang* and *Guliang*, does comment on the *Annals* but does so without extracting explicit lessons from it. Completing his tripartite framework, Du Yu suggests that this third category of exegesis corresponds to the third category of material in the *Annals* consisting of purely historical content. In this manner, he underlines the historical character of the Classic more formally and structurally than any of his predecessors did.

7. CONCLUSION

Within Du Yu's conception of the *Annals* and *Zuo Tradition* as a schematic hermeneutical system, a primary textual category consists of "general norms" (*fanli*) that exemplify Zhou institutional culture and normative teachings. A secondary textual category consists of "transformed norms" (*bianli*) that represent Confucius' editorial changes to older scribal records according to the parameters of the first category. Underscoring the subordination of Confucius to the Duke of Zhou, Du takes pains to insist that Confucius does not innovate changes upon his own authority, but adapts Zhou norms as his frame of reference. Thirdly, Du delineates a category of text in the *Annals* that preserves neutral scribal records without embedding any normative paradigms in formulaic ways. His adaptation of the dominant hermeneutical approach to the *Annals* since the Han divides authority between the Duke of Zhou, Confucius, and official state scribes, in descending order. By extension, Du Yu's conception of the *Zuo Tradition* upholds this text as an interpretive apparatus that can effectively demarcate the lines between the normative/Zhou/institutional, normative/Confucian/moral, and non-normative/historical/neutral categories of meaning within the *Annals* in ways the *Gongyang* and *Guliang* traditions fundamentally do not.

Du Yu's theoretical conceptions not only give some structure to his otherwise diffuse comments in the *Jijie*, but also distinguish his view of the *Annals* and *Zuo* from his predecessors', to the bafflement of scholars from mid-Tang onward who found Du's innovative spirit unusual and even disagreeable. Yet our closer examination has revealed that Du's innovations—paralleling his ideas about Confucius' editorship—are never original inventions, but nimble adaptations of older ideas and material. Du engineers these adaptations to make the *Zuo Tradition* eclipse the previously dominant *Gongyang/Guliang* traditions and become the most authoritative exegetical tradition of the *Annals* in the eyes of scholars coming after him. Du Yu's objective was achieved posthumously, as eventually the early Tang imperium did endorse the *Zuo Tradition* only and exclude the *Gongyang* and *Guliang* traditions from the approved corpus of interpretations for the Five Classics.

119. See n. 77 for the number of *Annals* records each of the three exegetical traditions falls silent on.