

3-2007

# Confucius Said What? Baobian and the Voice of Judgment in the Hanshu

Anthony E. Clark

Whitworth University, [aclark@whitworth.edu](mailto:aclark@whitworth.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.whitworth.edu/historyfaculty>



Part of the [Asian History Commons](#), and the [Cultural History Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Clark, Anthony E. , "Confucius Said What? Baobian and the Voice of Judgment in the Hanshu" Whitworth University (2007). *History Faculty Scholarship*. Paper 27.

<http://digitalcommons.whitworth.edu/historyfaculty/27>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the History at Whitworth University. It has been accepted for inclusion in History Faculty Scholarship by an authorized administrator of Whitworth University.

AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY 217<sup>TH</sup> MEETING  
SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS: 16-19 MARCH 2007  
COMMUNICATION TO BE READ AT CONFERENCE (PAPER)

Anthony E. Clark, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Chinese History  
The University of Alabama

“CONFUCIUS SAID WHAT? *BAOBIAN* AND THE VOICE OF JUDGMENT IN THE  
*HANSHU*”

~~Today I'd like to revisit a topic that has been discussed in several Sinological works~~  
I'd like, then, to focus on the historiographical impulse to moralize, to  
~~over the past few decades~~ praise and blame, or *bāobiǎn* 褒貶, I shall be focusing most  
specifically on how the *Hànshū* 漢書 (Records of the Han) employed *bāobiǎn* to render  
judgment on the subjects of its history, and I should state at the outset that the first mention  
of the concept of praise and blame using the specific <sup>characters</sup> ~~graphs~~ “*bāo*” 褒 and “*biǎn*” 貶 in  
Chinese texts, ~~as far as I can locate~~, is in Ban Gu's 班固 (A.D. 32-92) “Treatise on Classic  
Writings,” *Yì wén zhì* 藝文志. In his discussion of the *Zuǒ zhuàn* 左傳 (Commentary of Mr.  
Zuo) and *Chūnqiū* 春秋 (Spring and Autumn), Ban Gu notes that in Zuo Qiuming's 左丘明  
writing, <sup>quote</sup> “There are [parts] wherein praise is hidden and blame is concealed” 有所褒諱貶損.<sup>1</sup>  
He continues to note that Zuo's use of *bāobiǎn*, <sup>quote</sup> “cannot be seen in his writing” 不可書見,”  
and furthermore that his hidden praise and blame was transmitted orally to his students.<sup>2</sup> In  
the same passage Ban Gu suggests that the concealed blame in the *Chūnqiū* is directed  
toward the great men, lords and officials, of its era. For Ban Gu the function of history is to  
render judgment on the great <sup>moral</sup> ~~men~~ <sup>people</sup> who <sup>occupied</sup> ~~occupy~~ the political arena. Of course explicit  
criticism of one's superiors was <sup>dangerous</sup> ~~precautions~~, so, as Ban Gu states, writers <sup>quote</sup> “therefore obscured

<sup>1</sup> HS30.1714.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

[their criticisms] in their works and did not broadcast them, and thus they avoided the difficulties of their times” 隱其書而不宣，所以免時難也。<sup>3</sup>

~~We see similar historical~~ <sup>Moral</sup> judgments, <sup>are also made</sup> made in the West by such historians as Julius Caesar (100-44 B.C.), Mestrius Plutarchus (c. 46-127), and Cornelius Tacitus (c. 56-c.117); and moral verdicts and judgments were rendered by such medieval writers as Matthew Paris (c. 1200-1259). Historiographical moralism was not, then, only ~~endemic~~ <sup>common</sup> in ~~the~~ China; the West is replete with what could be called a Western equivalent of *bāobiǎn*. In his *An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*, David Hume (1711-1776) made a comment that could just as easily have been asserted by an early Chinese historian. Hume ~~wrote:~~ <sup>writes:</sup>

<sup>Quote</sup> The final sentence, it is probable, which pronounces characters and actions amiable or odious, praiseworthy or blameable; that which stamps on them the mark of honor or infamy, approbation or censure; that which renders morality an active principle and constitutes virtue our happiness and vice our misery; it is probable, I say, that this final sentence depends on some internal sense or feeling, which nature has made universal in the whole species.<sup>4</sup>

And in ~~the recent work of~~ Daniel Robinson,<sup>5</sup> *Praise and Blame: Moral <sup>Realism</sup> Reason and its Applications*, Robinson states:

<sup>Quote</sup> Praise and blame are central features of scripture, of ethics and moral philosophy of ancient schools of rhetoric, of criminal and civil law, of the behavioral and social sciences. They are the tested tools of childrearing and interpersonal influence, staples in the busy world of advertising and the murky world of propaganda. They are the means by which attention is drawn to the hero and the villain, the saint and the sinner, the victor and the vanquished.<sup>5</sup>

The impulse to praise and blame is indeed universal, ~~sweeping across cultural lines.~~ <sup>but the</sup> The early Chinese compulsion to render praise and blame through circuitous enunciation, however, is ~~quite~~ unparalleled in Western texts.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> David Hume, *An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*, Chapter One.

<sup>5</sup> Daniel N. Robinson, *Praise and Blame: Moral Realism and its Applications* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), ix.

## Mencius and the Tradition of Hidden Enunciation

So, from where does the concept of *bāobiǎn* derive? <sup>An</sup> ~~One~~ early source of the idea appears in *Mèngzǐ* 孟子 (Master Meng). In the ~~text's~~ "Téngwéngōng" 滕文公 chapter, we <sup>read</sup> ~~are told~~ that:

世衰道微，邪說暴行有作，<sup>vì</sup>臣弑其君者有之，子弑其父者有之，孔子懼，作《春秋》。· · · 昔者禹抑洪水而天下平，周公兼夷狄、<sup>vì</sup>驅猛獸而百姓寧，孔子成《春秋》而亂臣賊子懼。

<sup>Quote</sup> The era was in great decay and the Way was diminished; heterodox sayings and cruel actions were committed; there were ministers who committed regicide against their rulers and sons who committed patricide against their fathers. Confucius was fearful and produced the *Chūnqū*. . . . Anciently, Yao controlled the floodwaters and the kingdom was peaceful; the Duke of Zhou annexed the Yi and Di tribes, expelled fearsome beasts, and the various clans were made tranquil. Confucius produced the *Chūnqū* and rebellious ministers and cruel sons were terrified.

According to Mencius 孟子 (ca. 372-289 B.C.) ~~in this passage~~, during an era of political turbulence, regicide, and patricide, Confucius 孔子 (551-479 B.C.) sought to curb the diminishing Way, heterodoxy, and cruel actions by retreating to his studio to produce a laconic text with such decay-reviving, Way-restoring, heterodoxy-fighting, and cruel-action-dispensing passages as: <sup>Quote</sup> "There were locusts."<sup>6</sup> In the language of the *Chunqiu* this entry merely consists of a single <sup>character</sup> ~~graph~~ - 螽 *zhōng*, or "locusts." Other equally unprovocative passages include: <sup>Quote</sup> "Winter: we walled Zhongcheng" 冬城中城;<sup>7</sup> <sup>Quote</sup> "Winter: the tenth month" 冬十月;<sup>8</sup> <sup>Quote</sup> "There was famine" 大饑;<sup>9</sup> and the even more odd comment that, <sup>Quote</sup> "There was no ice" 無冰.<sup>10</sup> Other similarly <sup>short</sup>  ~~terse~~ lines note such events as meetings, rain sacrifices, and

<sup>6</sup> Wengong, 8<sup>th</sup> year/Legge, 250.

<sup>7</sup> Chenggong, 9<sup>th</sup> year/Legge, 368.

<sup>8</sup> Chenggong, 10<sup>th</sup> year/Legge, 373.

<sup>9</sup> Xianggong, 24<sup>th</sup> year/Legge, 507.

<sup>10</sup> Chenggong 1<sup>st</sup> year/Legge, 336.

military invasions. The question arises, ~~then, after reading through the *Chūnqū*~~, why is it that after Confucius produced this annalistic record, “rebellious ministers and cruel sons were terrified”?

~~On this matter, Ban Gu offers an answer.~~ <sup>Ban Gu has something to say on this.</sup> In his <sup>opening</sup> introductory remarks to his “Treatise on Classic Writings” he recounts that, <sup>in</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>question</sup> ~~anciently~~, Confucius died and his subtle words were discontinued” 昔仲尼沒而微言絕.<sup>11</sup> After his death five different exegetical traditions emerged based on ~~the annals of the *Chūnqū*~~. That is, the text of the *Chūnqū* was so “subtle” that no-one knew how to interpret it after Confucius had died. From then on, his “subtle words” required <sup>explanation,</sup> ~~hermeneutical exegesis~~. One solution to the problem of how to read the *Chūnqū* as a repository of subtle words, or rather, “subtle judgments,” was “solved” by later commentaries such as the *Gūliáng zhuàn* 穀梁傳 and the *Gōngyáng zhuàn* 公羊傳.

These commentaries claimed to reveal the encoded judgments, ~~contained in the *Chūnqū*~~. As

Michael Nylan notes: “The *Gōngyáng*, through such glosses, seeks to unpack the oblique literary style of the *Chūnqū* in order to verify the Classic’s infallibility in laying down

judgments.”<sup>12</sup> First Mencius asserted that Confucius produced the *Chūnqū* to rectify the <sup>decay</sup> ~~predicaments~~ of his era, and later commentaries claimed to explain how. For Ban Gu,

Confucius’ judgments were encoded in his “subtle speech”; the most important point being that historical records should, in the tradition of the *Chūnqū*, include *bāobiǎn*, subtle or not.

### Historical Judgment in *Hànshū*

*so how does this apply to the moralistic*

*Now, how does all of this apply to my topic, historical judgment in the *Hànshū*? I*

suggest that Ban Gu responded to the tradition of encoded judgment, ~~derived as it is from~~

<sup>11</sup> HS30.1701.

<sup>12</sup> Michael Nylan, *The Five “Confucian” Classics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 260.

~~the accounts of Confucius' implicit praise and blame in the *Chūnqiū*, by generally~~  
by perpetuating the institution of moralistic assessment ~~in historical accounts~~ in two ways, one that is implicit, much like Confucius' "subtle speech," and one that is explicit, simply quoting the words of the Master. Ban Gu implicitly praises and blames by prioritization and ordering in his "Chart of Personages Past and Present" 古今人表, and he does so explicitly in his Zàn 贊 ("eulogia") by borrowing the locutions of Confucius, most often from passages in the *Lìnyǔ* 論語.

~~Now, in his chart on historical persons, Ban Gu divides 1,955 historical figures into~~  
~~in his chart on historical personages.~~  
nine categories. The highest three distinctions are the *Shèngrén* 聖人 ("Sagely Men"), *Rénrén* 仁人 (<sup>Humane</sup> "Benevolent Men"), and *Zhìrén* 智人 ("Wise Men"), and the lowest class in Ban Gu's ranking is the *Yúrén* 愚人 ("Stupid Men"). Each person ranked in his chart is placed in one of the nine categories. While it may appear that this categorization of historical persons is actually explicit, if we <sup>look at</sup> ~~consider~~ the chart more closely we discover that within its explicit ordering is an ideological prioritization. <sup>Ban Gu tells us himself why he produced this chart:</sup> ~~Let me note here Ban Gu's purpose for creating the chart, stated in his prefatory comments. He writes:~~

自書契之作，先民可得而聞者，經傳所稱，唐、虞以上，帝王有號諡。輔佐不可得而稱矣，而諸子頗言之。雖不考庖孔氏，然猶著在篇籍，歸乎顯善昭惡，勸戒后人，故博采焉。

<sup>Quote</sup> From the time written documents were produced, the men of the past whom we have been able to hear of are those exclaimed in classics and biographies. These include emperors and kings who have appellations and posthumous names from Tang and Yu upward. While their assistants (ministers?) were unable to be exclaimed [in these classics and biographies], the various philosophers discussed them quite often. Even though they were not investigated by Confucius, they were nonetheless written of in other writings, wherein they are exposed as good or proclaimed to be

evil. They serve to exhort and warn later <sup>people</sup> men, and I have thus drawn widely from these writings.<sup>13</sup>

In other words, ~~Ban Gu informs us that he~~ <sup>he</sup> has cited previous textual accounts of historical persons and arranged them to expose their good and evil. In addition to the moral concerns of the chart, Ban Gu makes mention of or directly cites Confucius in his preface four times. Indeed, he quotes no other person. As Derk Bodde has ~~asserted~~ <sup>noted</sup> in his study of this chart, <sup>of course</sup> "The numerous quotations from Confucius that appear in the above preface make it evident that Ban Gu has looked to him for inspiration in compiling the table."<sup>14</sup>

But there is another point relevant to my ~~assertion~~ <sup>claim</sup> that the chart functions as a form of praise and blame based on ~~Confucian~~ <sup>Ruist</sup> sensibilities. Given that Confucius twice referred to himself as "Hàngǔ 好古 ("fond of antiquity") in the *Lùnyǔ*, it is significant that Ban Gu ranks people higher in his moral ranking the further back in time they lived.<sup>15</sup> <sup>with this in mind,</sup> ~~On this point,~~ Bodde did a count of how many persons from high antiquity are ranked highly vis-à-vis persons who lived just prior to the Han. From the legendary period, ca. 2852 to 2206 B.C., 127 persons of the 140 ranked are placed in the top three categories; however, of the Warring States and Qin periods, only 40 out of 412 persons are placed in the top three. In fact, the closer to the Han one lived, the lower his placement is in the chart. And of the persons thus judged categorically, highest honors are given to the paragons often ~~lauded~~ <sup>praised</sup> by Confucius.

~~While Ban Gu does not explicitly state that Confucian worthies are the most valued persons in history, his~~ <sup>Ban Gu's</sup> implicit ordering reinforces ~~Confucian~~ <sup>Ruist</sup> estimations of the past and those who occupied it.

<sup>13</sup> HS20.861. For an alternate translation of this passage see Derk Bodde, "Types of Categorical Thinking," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 59, no. 2 (June 1939), 207-208.

<sup>14</sup> Bodde, 210.

<sup>15</sup> Two passages in the *Lunyu* attest to Confucius' fondness for the past, *Lunyu* 7.1, wherein he states, "I transmit and do not innovate, am truthful and fond of antiquity. I would compare myself to Old Peng" 述而不作，信而好古，竊比於我老彭， and *Lunyu* 7.20, where he says, "I was not born knowing, but I am fond of antiquity and diligently seek after knowledge" 我非生而知之者，好古，敏以求之者也。

So, just how prominently does Confucius play in Pan Gu's praise & blame in his Hanshu?

~~Let me move now to a more novel contribution to the larger discussion of praise and blame in the Hànshū.~~ In Li Weixiong's 李威熊 study of the Hànshū, Li states that the entire

work, <sup>Quack</sup> "employs the words of Confucius to offer criticisms of personages" 引用孔子的話來

批評人物, ~~an assertion that I felt required substantiation.~~ <sup>and I believe he is correct.</sup> ~~This contention, I now believe, is~~

~~quite legitimate.~~ Ban Gu commonly conjures the voice of Confucius in his writing as a form

of explicit commentary on the people he discusses. In Hànshū 54, Ban Gu uses the voice of

Confucius to <sup>praise</sup> ~~eulogize~~ Su Wu 蘇武 (fl. 100 B.C.), a loyal minister of Han Wudi 漢武帝 (r.

141-87 B.C.), ~~who reacted strongly to the news of his sovereign's death.~~ As Ban Gu puts it,

<sup>Quack</sup> "When Wu heard of Wudi's death, he faced south howling and weeping, and spitting up

blood morning and night" 武聞之，南鄉號哭，歐血，旦夕臨。<sup>17</sup> In his post-

chapter eulogy, Ban Gu writes, <sup>Quack</sup> "Confucius declared, 'a man of ideals, integrity, and

benevolence does not desire a life wherein he harms to <sup>humanness</sup> ~~benevolence~~; [he may] have to die

himself in order to achieve <sup>humanness</sup> ~~benevolence~~,' and, '[in being] sent throughout the four directions

he does not bring shame to his lord's commands" 孔子稱「志士仁人，有殺身以

成仁，無求生以害仁」，「使於四方，不辱君命」。<sup>18</sup> This statement

directly quotes Lìnyǔ 15.9 and 13.20. And following these two <sup>quotations</sup> ~~locutions~~, Ban Gu concisely

states that, <sup>Quack</sup> "Su Wu had these qualities" 蘇武有之矣。<sup>19</sup> Ban Gu merely <sup>uses</sup> ~~utilizes~~ the voice of

Confucius to apply his own judgment.

In Hànshū 5, the biography of Han Jingdi 漢景帝 (r. 157-141 B.C.), Gu again quotes

Confucius in order to intimate his own judgment. He writes, <sup>Quack</sup> "Confucius declared, 'Such

<sup>16</sup> Li Weixiong, *Hanshu daodu* (Taipei: Wen shi zhe chubanshe, 1977), 34.

<sup>17</sup> HS54.2465.

<sup>18</sup> HS54.2469.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid.



people were employed to keep straight the Way of the Three Dynasties” 孔子稱「斯民，三代之所以直道而行也」.<sup>20</sup> Here, Ban Gu draws from *Lìnyǔ* 15.25, wherein Confucius also says, <sup>quote</sup> “In my dealings with others, whom do I upbraid and whom do I commend? If I have praised him, he has already been put to the test” 吾之於人也，誰毀誰譽？如有所譽者，其有所試矣。<sup>21</sup> By returning to the original <sup>passage</sup> ~~excerpt from the *Lìnyǔ*~~ we can see that Ban Gu has <sup>alluded to a comment</sup> ~~quoted a passage~~ wherein Confucius claims that if he has judged someone to be praiseworthy, he is said to be able to <sup>quote</sup> “keep straight the Way.” ~~The author of Ban Gu the *Hànshū* thus~~ uses previous judgment, in this case Confucius’, as a proxy for his own.

In Ban Gu’s <sup>eclogy</sup> ~~Zàn~~ following his <sup>on</sup> ~~biography~~ of Liu Jiao 劉交, *Hànshū* 36, he again draws from the *Lìnyǔ*, this time to <sup>praise</sup> ~~render accolades for~~ Liu Xiang 劉向 (ca. 79-6 B.C.). Quoting from *Lìnyǔ* 8.20, Ban states, <sup>quote</sup> “Confucius declared, “Talent is difficult to obtain, is it not?” 材難不其與。<sup>22</sup> After inserting this quotation Ban Gu suggests that following Confucius, the only scholars who had <sup>had</sup> ~~accumulated~~ literary refinement were Mencius, Sun Kuang 孫況, Dong Zhongshu 董仲舒 (176-104 B.C.), Sima Qian 司馬遷 (145-c. 86 B.C.), Liu Xiang, and Yang Xiong 揚雄 (58-18 B.C.), thus subtly comparing these <sup>scholars</sup> ~~great~~ ~~figures~~ to the five ministers of the sage king, Shun 舜 who were able to order the kingdom, mentioned in the original *Lìnyǔ* passage.

Ban Gu does not exclusively draw from the *Lìnyǔ*, however, to find useful quotations of the Master, ~~in order to render judgment in the *Hànshū*~~. In *Hànshū* 40, the biography of Zhang Liang 張良 (d. ca. 186 or 189 B.C.), an ~~honored~~ advisor to Han Wudi

8.20

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.  
<sup>21</sup> *Lìnyǔ* 15.25.  
<sup>22</sup> *Lìnyǔ* 8.20.

during his founding of the Han, Ban Gu uses a line from *Shiji* 史記 67, where Confucius praises Zi Yu 子羽. Ban Gu writes, <sup>quote</sup> "Confucius declared, "Thus, to choose a man on account of his <sup>appearance</sup> ~~countenance~~ would be to lose someone such as Zi Yu" 故孔子稱「以貌取人，失之子羽」.<sup>23</sup> Ban Gu derived this quotation from Sima Qian's final comments in *Shiji* 55.<sup>24</sup> On Ban Gu's passage, Yan Shigu 顏師古 (A.D. 581-645) notes that, <sup>quote</sup> "Zi Yu was a disciple of Confucius. . . . <sup>He was ugly</sup> ~~His countenance was ugly~~, but his actions were virtuous" 「子羽，孔子弟子，. . . 貌惡而行善，故云然也。」<sup>25</sup> Ban Gu is suggesting, then, that Zhang Liang, in spite of Sima Qian's <sup>criticism</sup> ~~pejorative estimation~~ of his appearance, was a <sup>good</sup> ~~fine~~ minister.

Now, I've only <sup>mentioned</sup> ~~cited~~ here a few brief examples of Ban Gu's use of <sup>Confucius</sup> ~~the Master's~~ voice as the ultimate moral <sup>judge</sup> ~~adjudicator~~ of historical ~~moral~~ worth, but there are many other places in the *Hanshu* where Gu uses the voice of Confucius to render praise and blame. ~~Several, if not~~ <sup>Most</sup> ~~most~~ of these instances are appropriately located in the <sup>eulogia</sup> ~~Zi~~ ~~comments~~ appended to the end of biographies. In addition to the examples <sup>I've</sup> ~~have~~ noted, Ban Gu acts as <sup>judge through</sup> ~~an arbiter~~ via the voice of Confucius in *Hanshu* chapters 41, 45, 46, 49, 66, 67, 71, 74, 77, 83, 85, 93, and 99. And of the instances <sup>where Confucius'</sup> ~~wherein the Master's~~ voice is employed for historical judgment, all but the single passage from the *Shiji* are drawn directly from the *Linyu*. In addition, this list does not include <sup>eulogia</sup> ~~Zi~~ ~~passages~~ in which Ban Gu praises or blames ~~the subjects of his history~~ in decidedly <sup>ruist</sup> ~~Confucian~~ terms. The final comments in Ban's biography of Han Wendi 漢文帝 (r. A.D. 184-180), for example, praises the emperor for, <sup>quote</sup> "being especially devoted to

<sup>23</sup> HS40.2063.

<sup>24</sup> SJ55.2049

<sup>25</sup> HS40.2063.

using virtue in order to transform the people” 專務以德化民 • a very ~~Mencian form~~ of Confucianism indeed.<sup>26</sup>

Let me end ~~here~~ with two final <sup>points</sup> ~~comments~~. First while it is certain that Ban Gu has appropriated Confucius as the principle voice of moral ~~historical~~ judgment of the persons of his writing, it remains curious that Confucius himself ~~seems to have criticized~~ the practice of praising and blaming <sup>people</sup> ~~men~~ of the past. When in the *Linyǔ* Duke Ai of Lu 魯哀公 (r. 494-469 B.C.) asks Zai Wo 宰我 about the altar of the soil, marked with a sacred tree, Confucius <sup>says</sup> ~~asserts~~ that, <sup>quote</sup> “One does not explain what has already happened, one does not criticize what is done, and one does not censure the past” 成事不說，遂事不諫，既往不咎.<sup>27</sup> Yet in another passage Confucius emphasizes the importance of keeping historical records so that the past can be discussed, especially, it appears, when it comes to rites.<sup>28</sup> But despite Confucius’ ~~apparent~~ opinion on what was later called “*bāobiǎn*,” many other historical works, from the *Zuǒzhuan* forward, made praise and blame the mainstay of their narratives.

And second, Ban Gu appears to have greatly expanded the tradition of using Confucius as a voice of judgment, first inaugurated by his ~~esteemed~~ predecessor, Sima Qian. In Sima Qian’s final biographical comments, he uses Confucius as a voice of judgment after the formulaic introduction, “*Kǒngzǐ yuē*” 孔子公曰, a total of four times. He never quotes Confucius after the formula, “*Zhòngnǐ yuē*” 仲尼曰. Ban Gu, on the other hand, borrows the voice of Confucius after the formula “*Kǒngzǐ yuē*,” seven times, and after “*Zhòngnǐ yuē*,” three times. And subsequent Standard Histories 正史 <sup>use</sup> ~~employ~~ these formulae to use Confucius as a voice of judgment even more. Indeed Ban Gu appears to have been an important

<sup>26</sup> HS4.135.

<sup>27</sup> *Linyu* 3.21.

<sup>28</sup> See *Linyu* 3.9.

progenitor of the historiographical tradition of *bāobiǎn* à la Confucius. As Daniel Robinson writes: <sup>quote</sup> "... for praise or blame to be accepted as such, the source must be recognized as authoritative and not merely in possession of power or material resources. . . ." and who better qualifies as an authority without power or resources than Confucius, the "uncrowned king" 素王 of early China?<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> Robinson, 5.

AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY 217<sup>TH</sup> MEETING  
SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS: 16-19 MARCH 2007  
COMMUNICATION (PAPER) PERSONAGES, TERMS, TEXTS, AND TRANSLATED PASSAGES

Anthony E. Clark, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Chinese History  
The University of Alabama

“CONFUCIUS SAID WHAT? *BAOBIAN* AND THE VOICE OF JUDGMENT IN THE  
*HANSHU*”

Personages:

Ban Gu 班固 (A.D. 32-92)  
Zuo Qiuming 左丘明 (?)  
Daniel N. Robinson (1937-)  
Julius Caesar (100-44 B.C.)  
Mestrius Plutarchus (c. 46-127)  
Cornelius Tacitus (c. 56-c.117)  
Matthew Paris (c. 1200-1259)  
David Hume (1711-1776)  
Mencius 孟子 (ca. 372-289 B.C.)  
Confucius 孔子 (551-479 B.C.)  
Derk Bodde (1909-2003)  
Li Weixiong 李威熊 (?)  
Su Wu 蘇武 (fl. 100 B.C.)  
Han Wudi 漢武帝 (r. 141-87 B.C.)  
Jingdi 漢景帝 (r. 157-141 B.C.)  
Liu Jiao 劉交 (?)  
Liu Xiang 劉向 (ca. 79-6 B.C.)  
Sun Kuang 孫況 (?)  
Dong Zhongshu 董仲舒 (176-104 B.C.)  
Sima Qian 司馬遷 (145-c. 86 B.C.)  
Yang Xiong 揚雄 (58-18 B.C.)  
Shun 舜 (legendary)  
Zhang Liang 張良 (d. ca. 186 or 189 B.C.)  
Zi Yu 子羽 (?)  
Yan Shigu 顏師古 (A.D. 581-645)  
Han Wendi 漢文帝 (r. A.D. 184-180)  
Duke Ai of Lu 魯哀公 (r. 494-469 B.C.)  
Zai Wo 宰我 (?)

### Translated Passages:

1. "There are [parts] wherein praise is hidden and blame is concealed" 有所褒諱貶損 (HS30.1714).
2. "... cannot be seen in his writing" 不可書見 (Ibid).
3. "... therefore obscured [their criticisms] in their works and did not broadcast them, and thus they avoided the difficulties of their times" 隱其書而不宣，所以免時難也 (Ibid).
4. "The era was in great decay and the Way was diminished; heterodox sayings and cruel actions were committed; there were ministers who committed regicide against their rulers and sons who committed patricide against their fathers. Confucius was fearful and produced the *Chūnqū*. . . . Anciently, Yao controlled the floodwaters and the kingdom was peaceful; the Duke of Zhou annexed the Yi and Di tribes, expelled fearsome beasts, and the various clans were made tranquil. Confucius produced the *Chūnqū* and rebellious ministers and cruel sons were terrified" 世衰道微，邪說暴行有作。臣弑其君者有之，子弑其父者有之。孔子懼，作《春秋》。 . . . 昔者禹抑洪水而天下平，周公兼夷狄、驅猛獸而百姓寧，孔子成《春秋》而亂臣賊子懼 (*Mengzi*, "Tengwengong").
5. "Anciently, Confucius died and his subtle words were discontinued" 昔仲尼沒而微言絕 (HS30.1701).
6. "From the time written documents were produced, the men of the past whom we have been able to hear of are those exclaimed in classics and biographies. These include emperors and kings who have appellations and posthumous names from Tang and Yu upward. While their assistants (ministers?) were unable to be exclaimed [in these classics and biographies], the various philosophers discussed them quite often. Even though they were not investigated by Confucius, they were nonetheless written of in other writings, wherein they are exposed as good or proclaimed to be evil. They serve to exhort and warn later men, and I have thus drawn widely from these writings" 自書契之作，先民可得而聞者，經傳所稱，唐、虞以上，帝王有號諡。輔佐不可得而稱矣，而諸子頗言之。雖不考庠孔氏，然猶著在篇籍，歸乎顯善昭惡，勸戒后人，故博采焉 (HS20.861).
7. "... employs the words of Confucius to offer criticisms of personages" 引用孔子的話來批評人物 (*Li Weixiong*, *Hanshu daodu*, 34).
8. "When Wu heard of Wudi's death, he faced south howling and weeping, and spitting up blood morning and night" 武聞之，南鄉號哭，歐血，旦夕臨 (HS54.2465).