Zuo Tradition (Zuozhuan; sometimes called The Zuo Commentary) is China’s first great work of history. It consists of two interwoven texts—the Spring and Autumn Annals (Chunqiu, a terse annalistic record) and a vast web of narratives and speeches that add context and interpretation to the Annals. Completed by about 300 BCE, it is the longest and one of the most difficult texts surviving from preimperial times. It has been as important to the foundation and preservation of Chinese culture as the historical books of the Hebrew Bible have been to the Jewish and Christian traditions. It has shaped notions of history, justice, and the significance of human action in the Chinese tradition, perhaps more so than any comparable work of Latin or Greek historiography with respect to Western civilization. This translation, accompanied by the original text with an introduction and annotations, will finally make Zuozhuan accessible to all.
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Introduction

This is an introduction in three parts, arranged as a gradual entrée to Zuozhuan 左傳 (Zuo Tradition). The first section, designed for newcomers to Zuozhuan, is a general introduction to the work itself, to Chinese history from the late eighth to the early fifth century BCE, and to the principles of our translation. Nonspecialist readers may wish to proceed directly from this general introduction to the pleasures of the history itself. The remaining sections of the introduction are more technical and are addressed to scholars in Chinese studies, historians of the ancient world, and specialists in related fields. The second part examines the historical and intellectual context in which Zuozhuan originated and revisits the long scholarly debate over the text’s provenance. The third part details the critical place that Zuozhuan has occupied in the Chinese tradition during the past two millennia. With these observations on textual and cultural history as a foundation, the reader will be well prepared to understand the singular importance that Zuozhuan continues to have as a monument of early Chinese historical writing. We offer our introduction, and our translation itself, as a dedicatory gate and stairway to this edifice, with the fond hope that readers will visit often and stay long.

PART I: ON ZUOZHUAN, SPRING AND AUTUMN HISTORY, AND TRANSLATION CONVENTIONS

THE NATURE AND IMPORTANCE OF ZUOZHUAN

Zuozhuan is the largest text to come to us from pre-imperial China (i.e., from before 221 BCE). One might also argue that it is the most important text from that era. As such, Zuozhuan deserves a place alongside other great histories from the ancient world, like those of Herodotus, Thucydides, and the Deuteronomic historians, with which it is roughly contemporaneous. There are several reasons why Zuozhuan has not found
such a place. One of the chief of these is that it has been transmitted to us as a commentary to another text, the *Annals* (Chunqiu 春秋), and follows the year-by-year chronology of that text. Consequently, single story lines are often broken up and distributed in a strictly chronological fashion, with other story lines and unrelated events intervening, so that it requires an excellent memory, or at least patient cross-checking, to keep the various interweaving accounts straight. In addition, the voice of the *Zuo zhuan* historian is largely masked, so that the personality of the narrator rarely shines through. Put somewhat differently, there is no “I” in the text, no identifiable historian at our side guiding us in the fashion of Herodotus or Thucydides, who name themselves in the very first sentence of their respective texts and repeatedly appear as guides or commentators throughout their narratives. When compared with the works of such early Greek historians, *Zuo zhuan* can sound impersonal, but the absence of a self-conscious narrative voice also gives it a dramatic, authoritative tone. This stylistic feature, like the annalistic fragmentation of the narratives, poses unique challenges for the reader, but it also has its own appeal, as we hope this translation will demonstrate.

We have already noted the fact that *Zuo zhuan* narratives are distributed according to the year-by-year organization of the *Annals*, creating a pattern of interweaving story lines that can sometimes be difficult to follow. In addition, the language of the narrative sections of *Zuo zhuan* is exceedingly terse and elliptical. One scholar has aptly described *Zuo zhuan* narratives as “lapidary.” That is, episodes are carefully crafted and, in a manner of speaking, “hard.” Nouns and verbs predominate, characters act and are acted upon, with adjectival description rare and consequently taking on particular significance wherever it does occur. Very often sentences or events are simply juxtaposed without explicit connective tissue. In one brief narrative, for example, a ruler takes for himself a woman intended for his son because he “finds her beautiful” (*mei zhi* 美之). Unhappy consequences cascade from his decision, one of the first being that his wife “hangs herself” (*Huan* 16.2). The reader can easily understand why she has been driven to this extremity, but here, as so often elsewhere in *Zuo zhuan*, no explanation and certainly no psychological penetration into her unhappy mental state are provided, just as we are not told in the biblical narrative of Abraham and Isaac, to refer to another early narrative tradition, what Abraham thinks as he raises his knife to sacrifice his son. In general, the *Zuo zhuan* narrator is absent, allowing the action to speak for itself and deflecting his own judgments into the speeches and pronouncements of his characters, one of the most important of them being the moralizing “noble man” (*junzi* 君子). When, for example, the ever-present Herodotus, Greek author of *The Histories*, says that the Athenian Solon “claimed to be traveling to see the world, but it was really to avoid the possibility of having to repeal any of the laws he had made” (1.13), he is giving more explanation of a
character’s motives than one finds anywhere in Zuozhuan, at least in the
narrative voice.

But the narrative terseness of Zuozhuan stands in stark contrast to the
speeches the text presents. An exceedingly brief narrative can quickly
lead to a speech of considerable length and great rhetorical complexity.
Extensive parallelism, citation of earlier sources such as the Odes (Shijing
詩經), numbered sets, and a whole host of technical rhetorical features
are employed as speakers admonish and sometimes overwhelm their
audience. One of the functions of Zuozhuan, as we explain below, was to
model for aspiring officials the importance and power of speechmaking.

One must remain attentive while reading Zuozhuan, not only because
so much is left unexpressed and must be surmised but also because one
of the messages of this text is that the world is full of signs that can be
read: a general “lifts his feet too high,” and because of this a wise adviser
knows that “his intentions are not firm” (Huan 13.1); a prince receives a
ceremonial jade “indolently,” and a minister concludes that the prince
“will have no progeny” (Xii 11.2); a ruler’s index finger moves involun-
tarily, and he knows that that day he will “taste something extraordi-
nary” (Xuan 4.2). Just as meaning can be found in the smallest gestures
and briefest comments, so hidden significance can be mined from the
seemingly straightforward text of Zuozhuan and the Annals. But such
reading of the world is not always easy. In one peculiar case, a lord
dresses his heir apparent in a peculiar “half-body robe,” touching off a
dispute among the officials as to what this means, although it quickly
becomes clear that the costume is ominous (Min 2.7). Acts of oracle-bone
or milfoil divination and dream interpretation reported in Zuozhuan are
also often highly complicated and susceptible to a variety of readings,
some of them far-fetched on the surface.2

Many of these signs, and so much else about Zuozhuan narrative and
speechmaking, foreshadow the future. One does not continue reading
this text to find out who will rise and who will fall, who will win and who
will lose, for the careful reader knows in advance what outcomes will
ensue. The battle narratives are the clearest example of this. Much space
is given to the preparation for battle and the signs that foretell the out-
come, with the actual action on the battlefield typically narrated briefly
or ignored altogether. For example, Jiang Bingzhang 姜炳璋 (1709–86)
noted that, in one case where the “ruler’s virtue” has been described, “It
is precisely by reason of this quality that victory is determined even
before the battle begins.”3

The world of Zuozhuan can be read because it is a world filled with
the prescriptions of ritual propriety. One scholar of Zuozhuan narrative
has said that the message of this text is that the good are usually rewarded
and the bad punished.5 While this generalization applies in some cases,
the moral world of Zuozhuan is by no means a simple and straightforward
one. In fact, much of the text seems to be struggling in a fascinating
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way with the vast complexity of human situations and the need to see ritual propriety not as a clearly delineated list of rights and wrongs but as a guiding principle that must be adapted to particular situations with flexibility and intelligence. Mercy, for example, might often be a good thing, but the ritual obligations and the practical exigencies of war sometimes make acts of mercy not just foolhardy but morally wrong (Xi 22.8, Xuan 2.1).

The text we today call *Zuozhuan* might have been derived from a text originally known as *Zuo’s Annals* (*Zuoshi chunqiu* 左氏春秋). The earliest reference to this title is found in Sima Qian’s *Records of the Historian* (Shiji 史記). According to that account, after Confucius (551–479 BCE) died, his disciples began to disagree about the oral interpretation of the *Annals*, which the Master had supposedly transmitted to them. Consequently, “the Lu gentleman,” a certain Zuo Qiuming 左丘明, was afraid that the true teachings would be lost. “Therefore, taking Confucius’ scribal records as his basis, he put in order all their words and completed *Zuo’s Annals.*” While few scholars today still believe that Zuo Qiuming was responsible for *Zuozhuan*, its title, at least as usually understood, commemorates his surname.

In Ban Gu’s *History of the Han* (Hanshu 漢書), which was written approximately 150 years after the *Records of the Historian*, *Zuo’s Annals* is regularly called *Zuo’s Commentary* (*Zuoshi zhuan* 左氏傳). This new title may well have resulted from editorial work undertaken by Liu Xin 劉歆 (46 BCE–23 CE), who, along with his father, Liu Xiang 劉向 (79–8 BCE), had been employed by the Han Emperor Cheng (r. 33–7 BCE) to examine texts collected from across the empire and to collate them against material held in the imperial archives. Liu Xin seems to have spent considerable time on *Zuo’s Annals*, and he became an ardent supporter of this text, even pleading in a letter to court officials of Emperor Ai (r. 7–1 BCE) that the text be given official recognition, which means that it would have been taught in the Imperial Academy under the direction of officially appointed Academicians (boshi 博士). The title change from *Zuo’s Annals* to *Zuo’s Commentary* may signal changes Liu made in the nature and structure of the text in order to emphasize its exegetical relationship to the *Annals*, although it is unclear how extensive his editorial work might actually have been. The current name of the text, *Zuozhuan*, and the current structure of the text appear to derive from the hand of Du Yu 杜預 (222–84 CE), who is credited with weaving the *Annals* and *Zuozhuan* into a single text, giving *Zuozhuan* an even more obvious commentarial structure and thereby enhancing its prestige. Du Yu also reedited and standardized the text, while providing it with his own commentary, which drew upon and ultimately replaced much of the commentarial tradition preceding him. (For more on these issues, see part II below.)

For well over two millennia, the *Annals* has been listed among the
Confucian “Five Classics,” a group of texts that became the foundation of virtually all official imperial Chinese education. One eminent scholar, Pi Xirui 皮錫瑞 (1850–1908), even suggested that among these classics the Annals and the Classic of Changes (Yijing 易經) were preeminent, constituting a kind of advanced study that could be fully understood only by the best students. This elevated status derives in part from a tradition ascribing the Annals in its present form to Confucius himself. Such a tradition is already found in Mencius (Mengzi 孟子), a text written perhaps two hundred years after Confucius’ death, where we read that when Confucius completed the Annals, it had such powerful influence that “treasonous ministers and maleficient sons were terrified.” Mencius goes on to claim that Confucius once said, “Those who understand me will do so only through the Annals.” At a slightly later time, perhaps inspired by this Mencius passage, many believed not only that the Annals came from the hand of Confucius but that the Master had used this text to convey “lofty principles in subtle words.”

Anyone who turns to the Annals after encountering such views as those found in Mencius and in later Confucian writings will almost certainly be surprised, even disappointed. The Annals is a slender text composed of slightly fewer than seventeen thousand written Chinese characters. It appears, at least at first reading, to do little more than list in highly economical and straightforward language short notices of events that took place in the central domains between 722 and 479 BCE as seen from the small domain of Lu 魯, where it was compiled. It probably derives from official court records—and terse records at that. The name Chunqiu literally means “spring and autumn,” which is an abbreviation of the sequence of four seasons and refers to a type of record keeping in which events are registered not just under a year and a month but under a season as well. With relatively few exceptions, at least one event is registered for each season of each year for the 242 years included in the Annals. Other early Chinese domains might have maintained records similar to the Lu Annals. Passages in at least two early Chinese texts refer to other such court records, and an annalistic text for the domain of Wei 魏, known as Bamboo Annals (Zhushu jinian 竹書記年), was discovered around 280 CE.

The extraordinary stylistic precision and consistency of the Annals support the sense that Lu scribes adhered to a system in recording events. For example, a Lu ruler is usually referred to as “the lord” (gong 公) but, on the occasion of his funeral, is called “our ruler” (wojun 我君), with his posthumous honorific. Rulers of Chu and Wu, who styled themselves “kings” (wang 王), are called in the text “leaders” (ren 人) or “masters” (zi 子), one of the lower noble ranks. The assassination of a ruler is described with the word shi 弑, which indicates the violation of hierarchy—except for Lu rulers, whose murder is cloaked behind the word “expire” (hong 薨). Murdered rulers of other states are sometimes
simply reported to have “died” (zu 卒). Words associated with military conflicts, such as “battle” (zhan 戰), “defeat” (bai 敗), “overcome” (ke 克), “completely defeated” (baiji 敗績), “invade” (qin 侵), “surprise attack” (xi 襲), “attack” (fa 伐), “punish” (tao 討), “enter” (ru 入), “seize” (huo 賽), “lay siege to” (wei 围), or “extinguish” (mie 滅), seem to have precise meanings and imply evaluation of the justice or appropriateness of military operations. When Lu is defeated in battle, the words “roundly defeated” are not used (with one exception). As these examples and exceptions show, many “rules” can be deduced, although few are absolutely consistent.

Spurred on by the purported link to Confucius and the notion that there was much more to the Annals than a first reading might disclose, early Chinese scholars produced a rich body of commentarial literature on this text. In fact, the Annals has come down to us not as an independent text but only attached in slightly variant form to each of three commentaries, or “traditions” (zhuan 傳): Zuozhuan 左傳, Gongyang zhuan 公羊傳, and Guliang zhuan 毓梁傳. All three of these Annals commentaries have at times exercised a significant influence upon the Chinese tradition, but the longest and most complex of them, Zuozhuan, has eventually enjoyed the greatest prestige, although Gongyang reigned preeminent as official learning during the Han dynasty. Whereas the Gongyang and Guliang commentaries primarily dissect the “subtle words” of the Annals so as to lay bare the “great principles” it supposedly contains, Zuozhuan provides historical context for events that occurred during the Spring and Autumn period (770–476 BCE), some noted in the Annals and some not.

Zuozhuan also includes exegetical passages, although a good portion of the Annals has no Zuozhuan exegesis, and sometimes there seem to be pointed contradictions between the two texts. The sense of system in the Annals is challenged by shifts in meanings in Zuozhuan. Zuozhuan also covers events until 468 BCE (Ai 27), thirteen years after the capture of the lin (Ai 14.1), sometimes referred to as a “unicorn,” and eleven years after the death of Confucius (Ai 16.3), events that respectively mark the end of the Annals in Gongyang (the lin) and in Guliang and Zuozhuan (Confucius’ death). All these issues have raised doubts about the exact relationship between the Annals and Zuozhuan.

All three exegetical traditions interpret stylistic conventions and even textual corruption of the Annals as markers of the sage’s intention, although Gongyang and Guliang do so much more insistently and consistently than Zuozhuan. In one case, a missing word is construed as a deliberate expression of doubt. Designating Chu and Wu rulers (who called themselves kings) as “masters” is thought to convey criticism of the overreaching ambitions of “barbarians” and to set normative standards for “rectifying names” (zhengming 正名), so that names correspond to roles and functions. The omission in the Annals of references
to burials of Chu and Wu rulers supposedly functions to avoid the use of the title of “king.” Concealing a Lu ruler’s murder, which might have simply “reflected the wording of official notifications to other states” (cong fu 從訃, cong gao 從告), especially if we consider the new ruler’s frequent role as perpetrator, is said in Gongyang and Guliang to reflect Confucius’ choice of “concealment in internal matters” (neihui 内諱). “To conceal the truth” (hui 諡) to honor or protect one’s domain or ruler in turn implies that “bare facts” should yield pride of place to normative human relations in historical records.

Reverence for the Annals as the sage’s moral judgments was pervasive, but there have always been dissenters. The Tang scholar and thinker Liu Zhiji 劉知幾 (661–721), famous for his Comprehensive Study of Historical Writings (Shitong 史通), cast doubt on the sacrosanct text by examining its inconsistencies. The Song chief minister and scholar-poet Wang Anshi 王安石 (1021–86), with typical boldness, dismissed the Annals as “fragmentary and corrupt court reports” (duanlan chaobao 斷爛朝報). But criticism of this type reflects a distinctly minority view.

It is perhaps no accident that Liu Zhiji, skeptical about the Annals, should also have been an ardent champion of Zuozhuan; the latter spoke to his interests in the methods of historical writing much more than the former. More generally, most recognize that the historical events marked by the Annals would be incomprehensible without Zuozhuan. To read the Annals in China was most often to read it alongside Zuozhuan, with the latter providing the narrative detail and rhetorical flesh the former lacked.

Zuozhuan is more than ten times longer than the Annals, containing just fewer than 180,000 written Chinese characters. A rich combination of narratives and speeches, it has been read as a reliable history of the Spring and Autumn era, as a great model of prose style, and as a repository of Confucian values. If we must now question Zuozhuan’s reliability as a historical source, at least for the period of time it claims to describe, and exercise care in reducing the text to a simple set of values, Confucian or otherwise, we can hardly question the raw power of its prose and the rhetorical brilliance of its speeches. One major voice in Chinese literary thought, Liu Xie 劉勰 (ca. 465–ca. 522), regarded Zuozhuan prose as “the winged glory of the sages’ writings, the crowning achievement of records and texts.” And Liu Zhiji found the speeches in the text “flowing and beautiful yet never in excess.”

Despite the importance of both the Annals and Zuozhuan within the Chinese tradition, these texts, as noted above, have never gained a significant readership outside East Asia beyond a small number of early-China specialists. Our hope is that the following translation will help change this situation. Translating these texts was a daunting task in part because of the many difficulties they present, some of which we will discuss below, and in part because there is already an excellent English-
language translation of both the Annals and Zuozhuan, James Legge’s (1855–97) The Ch’un T’s’ew with the Tso Chuen.

More than 140 years have now passed since James Legge published his complete translation of the Annals with an attached translation of almost the whole Zuozhuan. His work was the only largely complete English-language version until a reworking of Legge’s translation of Zuozhuan, without the accompanying Annals, was published in China several years ago. Legge’s work was a great sinological achievement and has become a standard source for students of early China, a measuring rod against which subsequent translations of these texts must be evaluated, including the present one. In view of Legge’s achievement, why, one might ask, is a new translation needed at all? In what follows we hope it will become clear how our own reading, understanding, and presentation of the Annals and Zuozhuan differ from Legge’s. But for now we would note three important reasons for this new translation. First, the last century or so has brought genuine advances in our understanding of the Annals and Zuozhuan, and some of these advances impinge directly upon questions of translation. Second, Legge’s Victorian prose, despite its stateliness, is not “the most stylistically expressive and elegant” and is, moreover, becoming more and more remote from the twenty-first-century reader. And third, the format and presentation of Legge’s text, despite several reprints, remain unattractive, awkward, and difficult to use, although recent online versions have to some extent remedied this situation. Still, we do not presume that our work replaces that of our predecessor. As we have said, his translation is the measuring rod, and readers can surely profit from consulting his version as well as our own.

We should add a brief word here concerning the complete French translation of the Annals and Zuozhuan by the tireless Jesuit scholar Séraphin Couvreur (1835–1919), Tch’ouen ts’iou et Tso tchouan. The format of this three-volume work makes it much easier to use than Legge’s text. It is also more conservative than Legge’s, consistently following Du Yu’s commentary. Paul Demiéville (1894–1979) judges Couvreur with reference to Legge as follows: “He makes no attempt at original interpretation or personal evaluation, such as James Legge rather prematurely attempted in his English version.” While this is an accurate characterization of Couvreur, whether it is fair to Legge depends on how one evaluates the latter’s “original interpretations.”

THE ANNALS, ZUOZHUAN, AND THE HISTORY OF THE SPRING AND AUTUMN PERIOD

The very term “Spring and Autumn period” (given above) points to the critical role the Annals and its commentaries have played in the construction of Chinese history. The period, which encompasses the years covered by the text, 722–479 BCE, is named for the text. The date 722 BCE
marks the ascension of Lord Yin to the position of ruler in the relatively small eastern domain of Lu. The start of Lord Yin’s reign is noteworthy only because the Annals begins in that year. Nothing else of great import occurs. In the Gongyang and Guliang commentaries, the Annals ends with the capture of the lin in 481 BCE, the fourteenth year of the reign of Lord Ai of Lu. In Zuozhuan, the Annals ends two years later, in 479 BCE, the year of Confucius’ death: “In summer, in the fourth month, on the jichou day, Kong Qiu [Confucius] died” (Ai 16.3).

Some historians have objected to demarcating a historical period with reference to the beginning and ending of a text, however much influence that text might have exerted, and suggest that periods should be defined by unquestionably important moments. One such moment is 770 BCE, when the Zhou court moved from its capital near modern-day Xi’an 西安 to the new capital Chengzhou 成周 in the region of modern-day Luoyang 洛阳. Since Luoyang is well to the east of Xi’an, 770 BCE separates the eras of what came to be known as the Western Zhou and the Eastern Zhou. This date also marks a significant milestone in the gradual decline of Zhou power, a decline that had begun almost a century earlier and was to continue until the Zhou kings became little more than figureheads by the middle of the Spring and Autumn period. 476 BCE is sometimes chosen as the closing date of the Spring and Autumn period because it marks the end of the reign of King Jing of Zhou 周敬王 (r. 519–476 BCE), when the capital moved further east, forming a new Chengzhou (the old Chengzhou was renamed Wangcheng 王城), due to Wangzi Zhao’s 王子朝 rebellion (Zhao 22–Zhao 29). Another significant event that some historians identify as the close of this period is the virtual breakup in 453 BCE of the once-powerful domain of Jin 晉 into three smaller domains: Han 韓, Wei 魏, and Zhao 趙, domains that were “officially recognized by the Zhou king in 403 BCE.”30 Besides marking the demise of a domain that had played a major role throughout much of the Spring and Autumn period, this event marks the ascendancy of powerful ministerial lineages, which had seriously undermined even the illusion of an old Zhou ritual order and had also marked a trend toward the bureaucratization and professionalization of the domains.31 Thus, although the dates 770 and 476 or 453 BCE might be preferred as commemorating major historical events, 722 and 479 BCE remain significant dates in the traditional periodization of Chinese history by reason of the prestige of a single text, the Annals.

We have referred above to Zuozhuan as a “history,” the quotation marks here reflecting our belief that it is a particularly problematic instance of this category. Still, no single text has had a greater influence upon the way Spring and Autumn history has been presented both in China and in the West. When the early historians Sima Tan 司馬談 (d. 110 BCE) and his son Sima Qian 司馬遷 (d. 100 BCE) wrote the first comprehensive history of China, in a certain sense creating “China” in the process, they used some of the
materials now found in our Zuozhuan as their single most important source for the Spring and Autumn period. This circumstance has not changed greatly over time. For example, in the article on Spring and Autumn history in the prestigious Cambridge History of Ancient China, we read: “Despite a lack of corroborating evidence from other sources, there is no reason to doubt the details of political and military activities given in Zuozhuan, or the roles played by prominent figures in it, such as Guan Zhong 管仲.” Such faith in the essential historical reliability of Zuozhuan has been labeled “the worst error in classical Sinology.”

If we commit this “worst error,” writing history as it is reported in Zuozhuan, what is the result? On the most basic level, we then produce an account replete with conflict. In fact, 490 instances of warfare are recorded in Zuozhuan. For this reason, one Qing scholar argued that Zuozhuan is “the ancestor of books on military strategy” (bingfa zhi zu 兵法之祖). The abundant instances of conflict recorded in Zuozhuan take place both between domains and within domains. The four major Spring and Autumn domains of Qi, Jin, Qin, and Chu annihilated 128 of the 148 other domains mentioned in Zuozhuan. Many of these domains were small and fell with relatively little resistance, but warfare between the major powers could be brutal. “Five great battles” described in Zuozhuan are often cited as examples: Jin and its allies’ victory over Chu at Chengpu in 632 BCE (Xi 28); Jin’s defeat of Qin at the battle of Yao in 627 BCE (Xi 33); Chu’s victory over Jin at Bi in 598 BCE (Xuan 12); Jin, Lu, and Wei’s decisive defeat of Qi at the battle of An in 589 BCE (Cheng 2); and Chu’s disastrous loss to Jin in the battle of Yanling in 575 BCE (Cheng 16). Conflict between the major domains was constant, and small domains scrambled to survive the violence.

Strife within a single domain, often within the same lineage or family, could also be relentless. The first major narrative of Zuozhuan describes the rebellion of a younger brother, supported by his mother, against his older brother, the rightful heir to the domain of Zheng (Yin 1.4). The text goes on to record a century of major succession crises in the larger domain of Jin, provoked in part by the establishment in 745 BCE of a subordinate lineage at Quwo that functioned very much like an independent power center (Huan 2.8, 3.1, 7.4, Zhuang 16.5). Fraternal conflict, ministerial rebellion, and intergenerational strife, often between father and son, continue on page after page throughout Zuozhuan. The old Zhou polity was founded on a kinship structure under which royal relatives were granted vassal domains. Meritorious officials and key allies who were granted domains often had marriage ties with the Zhou house. Within many of those subordinate domains, kinsmen also held the most important offices. This emphasis upon kinship and lineage continues throughout the Spring and Autumn period and is reflected in Zuozhuan. Thus, we can correctly say that Zuozhuan for the most part depicts aristocratic society as normative. This dominance of hered-
itary, lineage-based administrative power is eventually challenged by an emerging meritocracy and a weakening of “family sentiment,” which will come to characterize the Warring States period. Many of the Zuozhuan speeches can be regarded as high-minded but ultimately unsuccessful attempts to slow the decline of the Spring and Autumn kinship order.

A number of institutions described on the pages of Zuozhuan aim to stem the violence and bring stability to the strife-ridden domains. In the beginning of the Spring and Autumn period, the Zhou court still exercised some moral suasion, a faint echo of an earlier time, part memory and part myth, when they had brought peace to the realm, but their power had become vastly diminished. In 707 BCE, Zhou prestige suffered a terrible blow. The domain of Zheng, which had been a close supporter of Zhou and had provided three Zhou chief ministers, launched an attack on its former ally. Zhu Dan, a Zheng official, shot the king in the shoulder, and the latter was saved only when Zhu Dan’s ruler recommended forbearance: “A noble man does not wish always to assert superiority over others.”

With Zhou leadership in shambles, meetings between domains became frequent. The Annals provides contemporary evidence of many of these meetings and notes the covenants that were so frequently and solemnly sworn between participants, but only Zuozhuan and the other two commentary traditions refer to a new order under which one lord was recognized as first among equals—an “overlord” or “hegemon” (ba), as he is usually called. The first of these overlords was Lord Huan of Qi (r. 685–643 BCE). In the fifteenth year of Lord Zhuang of Lu (679 BCE), the Annals records a meeting between the Prince of Qi, the Duke of Song, the Prince of Chen, the Prince of Wei, and the Liege of Zheng at a place named Juan. Zuozhuan adds that “Qi was for the first time acting as overlord.” The famous Lord Wen of Jin (r. 636–628 BCE) also became overlord, striving, at least in theory, to preserve the Zhou order, and other rulers attempted to ascend to the same status. But what slowly emerged was a sort of balance of power or what some have referred to as a multistate system. Indeed, Zuozhuan describes a world in which power gradually shifted from the “central domains,” such as Zheng, Song, and Wei, to the periphery represented by four big powers: Jin in the north, Qi in the east, Chu in the south, and Qin in the west. As time passes, more and more of Zuozhuan’s attention focuses on these domains and then, in its final decades, on the two new players in the southeast, Wu and Yue.

As we have noted above, auxiliary aristocratic lineages and ministerial lineages become gradually more important in Zuozhuan. For example, much space is given to members of the three lineages descending from subordinate sons of Lord Huan of Lu (r. 711–694 BCE). One of these, the Ji lineage, came to dominate Lu politics and,
with the help of the other two lineages descended from Lord Huan 鲁桓公, even expelled Lord Zhao 鲁昭公 from the domain in 517 BCE. In describing this humiliating event, the *Annals* discreetly notes that “the lord retired to Qi,”43 but *Zuozhuan* makes it quite clear that his departure was coerced (see Zhao 25.6). Jin was another domain dominated by powerful ministers (who, unlike their counterparts in Lu, were not related to the ruling house) and beset by lineage rivalries from circa 600 BCE onward; these led to the partition of Jin in 453 by three warring lineages: Han, Wei, and Zhao. Other examples could be given of the ascension of originally subordinate lineages. Eventually, almost all Spring and Autumn rulers were “overshadowed by high ministers” who began “to dominate state affairs.”44

The order *Zuozhuan* offers as the surest antidote to the growing chaos of the age is ritual propriety, or *li* 礼. In speech after speech, *Zuozhuan* rhetoricians warn of the deleterious results of departures from ritual propriety. In fact, the motor of historical change—invariably change for the worse—is deviation from ritual. All the violence and conflict on the pages of *Zuozhuan*, and perhaps even the transforming processes of history itself, would stop if only leaders would conform to the good order that is inscribed in the patterns of ritual propriety.45 Two external voices in particular are cited repeatedly in the text as judges of ritual behavior: “the noble man” and Confucius.46 The former authority, who remains anonymous and somewhat mysterious, is quoted in seventy-eight instances distributed relatively evenly throughout the text, while Confucius is quoted twenty-five times, mostly in the years of the Lu Lords who ruled in the latter part of the Spring and Autumn period. These are voices of stability that try to bring order to a political and social world portrayed as being in decline.

If we reject an account of Spring and Autumn history that is largely based upon *Zuozhuan*, we are left with rather scanty material to reconstruct that history. Few would question the credibility of the *Annals* itself as an authentic record compiled by Lu domain scribes, but this text comprises records of only certain types of events and conveys information very selectively.47 The *Annals* does give evidence of a high level of interdomain diplomacy, along with frequent conflict, but as noted earlier it gives no support to the *Zuozhuan* notion that for the first century of the Spring and Autumn period a particular leader was recognized as overlord and that other rulers aspired to this status throughout the period. Moreover, there is no clear evidence in the *Annals* for the intermittent awareness in *Zuozhuan* of “a cultural divide between the ‘Huaxia’ 華夏 population and the totality of the ‘Rongdi’ 戎狄, which by the middle Spring and Autumn period had clearly gained a meaning similar to ‘barbarian’ as the word is used in English.”48

The few textual records that can be confidently dated to the Spring and Autumn period are overshadowed by the large and ever-growing
body of archaeological finds. Still, the archaeological evidence from early China remains fragmentary and strongly skewed toward the excavation of tombs rather than settlements, although there is some indication that this situation is now changing. It has been common for Chinese archaeologists to use the textual record as a filter through which to examine and categorize archaeological finds, and archaeological evidence does substantiate textual traditions in many instances. However, we must note that some of the material evidence does not support what we read in early texts. For example, early Confucian texts, *Zuozhuan* included, tend to idealize the early years of the Western Zhou and treat it as a radical break from the earlier Shang dynasty. The archaeological evidence indicates no wholesale cultural shift from the Shang to the Zhou, although the practice of massive human sacrifice does seem to have ceased under the Zhou. The Zhou people, insofar as they represent a new intrusion into the central China plains, for the most part seem to have continued Shang traditions. The idealization of the new Zhou ritual practice, which supposedly supplanted the older Shang order, might indeed reflect a ritual reform that actually took place in the Middle Western Zhou, sometime around 850 BCE, in an attempt to buttress Zhou ruling power when it had begun to decline.

This “Middle Western Zhou Ritual Reform,” as it has come to be called, seems to have marked a shift from an early ritual world characterized by rich and sometimes frightening animal motifs on sacrificial bronze vessels and by abundant ritual drinking to a more orderly system of ritual that reinforced political and social hierarchy, a shift, so to speak, from a more Dionysian to a more Apollonian habit of social interaction. Bronze vessels securely dated to the postreform period are humbler and “suggest a desire to reform the spirit of ritual by reducing its complexity and linking it with everyday activities.” It could indeed be that the remembrance of a superstitious Shang order, which is reflected in Sima Qian’s *Records of the Historian*, is actually a faint remembrance of times before the Middle Western Zhou Ritual Reform. In many ways, then, this reform might have created a foundation for the Spring and Autumn “segmentary aristocracy,” as well as for the skepticism about the supernatural that characterizes portions of *Zuozhuan*.

Archaeology also attests to a second significant shift, which has been labeled the “Middle Spring and Autumn Ritual Restructuring.” The assemblages found in tombs during this period, with the noteworthy exception of those deriving from the westernmost domain (Qin), show a growing split between a small elite and the more common people, the latter including the “lesser elite.” Gradually, Spring and Autumn society seems to have become dominated by a relatively small subset of ruling families eager to maintain distance between themselves and those they ruled, a trend that may indeed be reflected in the *Zuozhuan* emphasis upon lineages, which we have noted above.
The period of this ritual restructuring also saw an important religious transformation. Whereas early Zhou tombs emphasize continuity between this world and the next, with funerary ritual designed to mirror the “basic ritual dimension of the deceased’s social existence,”55 Spring and Autumn tomb architecture becomes more domestic, with tombs designed as homelike, self-sufficient enclosures intended to keep the dead content and contained. The emphasis is no longer upon “commonality” but upon “the discontinuity between the living and the dead.”56 One cannot help but recall in this regard the famous Confucian injunction to “respect the ghosts and spirits and keep them at a distance” or the Zheng minister Zichan’s 子產 statement, found in Zuozhuan, that “the Way of Heaven is far away, while the Way of men is near at hand.”57

It would be extreme to reject the historicity of Zuozhuan outright and to rely instead entirely upon archaeology, the Annals, and a few other texts or sections of texts for the reconstruction of Spring and Autumn history. Most recent studies of Zuozhuan agree that the text derives from various sources and is composed of strata that accumulated over time. As Yuri Pines observes, “Few would doubt that the Zuo is a compilation of earlier sources.”58 Enough of these sources, he believes, are sufficiently near in time to the events they describe that one can use Zuozhuan to reconstruct ideological change in the roughly two and a half centuries of Spring and Autumn history. But he also provides a list of thirteen Zuozhuan passages containing information unavailable at the close of the Spring and Autumn period.59 In addition, Pines notes other “spurious speeches and interpolations” that have also contaminated the text.60 For him, then, most of the strata of the text are from the period they describe, while a later stratum is clearly of Warring States origin. While holding that “early Chinese literary and scholarly practice, by its very nature, produced texts that must frustrate our attempts to fix their origins,”61 David Schaberg suggests that Zuozhuan draws both upon earlier textual sources and upon a rich tradition of orality.62 He describes a process whereby “anecdotes and speeches were transcribed from the oral tradition” beginning around 400 BCE, a process that then continued for some time.63 Thus, Zuozhuan might be a layered text, but the layers remain malleable and exceedingly difficult to define and date with any precision. This particular conception of the development of Zuozhuan will be explored in much greater detail in part II below.

A. Taeko Brooks discerns some of the same change in Zuozhuan ideology noted by Pines. Focusing primarily upon the shifting conceptions of Heaven (tian 天) and ritual propriety, she identifies five layers in the text and, correlating these with ideology as reflected in other texts, dates the layers from 390 to 312 BCE. For her, then, Zuozhuan is a layered text that can be quite precisely dated and ascribed to the mid-Warring States period.64 In a study we shall turn to forthwith, Barry B. Blakeley notes that Brooks’ study “touches almost exclusively on the narratives (espe-
cially the Discourses)” and is therefore “relevant only to that segment of the text.”65 Thus, Brooks’ theory of the layered nature of the text leaves the door open to the possibility that some nonnarrative layers of the text predate her 390 BCE date.

Blakeley takes a formalistic approach to identifying a number of Zuozhuan sources. First of all, he notes a redaction of the Annals embedded in Zuozhuan that is not always the same as the various versions of the Annals that we possess today. In his conception, those sections of Zuozhuan that seem to be duplicates or near duplicates of Annals entries are a major part of this source. The implication is that the Zuozhuan we now find interwoven with the Annals was based upon explanations of a somewhat different transmission of the Annals. Second, Blakeley identifies other passages that resemble Annals entries but are “presumably derived from chronicles kept in states other than Lu.”66 Third, Zuozhuan contains commentary, such as the sayings of “the noble man” or of Confucius, and “value judgments concerning ritual or behavioral correctness” that might come from quite different hands and might even date from a time later than much of the rest of the text.67 Fourth, there is clearly material in Zuozhuan that dates to the Warring States period. If we take away the parts of Zuozhuan that come from these four sources, we are left with most of the narratives, which constitute the bulk of the text. Blakeley divides this material into two categories. The first of these categories includes what he describes as “simple, straightforward accounts of events that could reasonably represent contemporary records and may have been transmitted in written form.” These particular narratives have neither “didactic function nor entertainment value.”68 The second category includes longer, more elaborate narratives that might have been transmitted orally and are less reliable historically, although these too must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Consequently, Blakeley concludes that a generalized verdict about the date or reliability of a particular narrative is difficult: “Instead, every segment, even utterance, in the text must be judged independently.”69

Most scholars of early China would agree that it might be as dangerous to dismiss the historical reliability of all of Zuozhuan as it is to accept it all uncritically. As the extensive discussion in part II below indicates, we too believe that Zuozhuan is a text of great complexity deriving from a number of practices in early China: extensive record keeping; a strong tradition of teaching, which drew upon and further explicated written records; an emphasis upon effective rhetoric for political purposes, which led to the production and transmission of model speeches; and a scholarly practice of compiling, transmitting, and circulating texts. Whether future research can further unravel the sources and layers of Zuozhuan and the authenticity of each remains to be seen. But it is likely that Zuozhuan, carefully used, can contribute to our historical understanding of both the Spring and Autumn period and the Warring States
period—that is, both the years it purports to chronicle and the era defining its textual formation.

STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION OF THE TRANSLATION

The base Chinese text we have reproduced is that of Ruan Yuan 阮元 (1764–1849), which he published in 1815 as part of his highly influential reprint of rare Song editions of the thirteen classics.70 We have regularly consulted and followed the modern punctuated and annotated edition of Yang Bojun 楊伯峻 (1902–92), who sometimes alters Ruan’s text.71 In those cases where we adopt a reading differing from Yang and Ruan that significantly affects our translation, we have so noted. While our text is not a full critical edition consistently listing such variants as those from Dunhuang and Japanese manuscripts, it is practical and serviceable for the task at hand.

Our organization and numbering of the texts of the *Annals* and *Zuozhuan* follow Yang Bojun. Accordingly, all *Annals* entries for a given year appear before the *Zuozhuan* entries for the same year. In each case these entries are numbered successively. Thus, under “Lord Yin 3,” *Annals* entries are given as 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, and 3.7 and are followed by *Zuozhuan* entries 3.1 through 3.7.72 One of the interesting features of *Zuozhuan*, which indicates that it was originally not just a commentary, is that some *Annals* lines are not commented upon and, more significantly, some *Zuozhuan* entries have no *Annals* equivalent, as we have noted earlier. Where a particular *Annals* entry and a *Zuozhuan* entry have a close relationship, we indicate this by giving in parentheses the number of the corresponding entry. Thus, the first *Annals* entry of Lord Yin 3 is given as 3.1(2), which indicates that the corresponding *Zuozhuan* entry is *Zuozhuan* 3.2 below, which in turn will be fully numbered as 3.2(1), pointing to the corresponding *Annals* entry above. The lack of a number in parentheses for any given entry indicates that there is no counterpart in the other text. We must voice a word of caution: while the correspondence between the two texts is often clear, it occasionally becomes more questionable and requires subjective judgment. We have tried to be consistent, but the attentive reader may find passages where he or she disagrees with what we have marked or have failed to mark as a correspondence.

For each of the twelve Lords of Lu, we have provided an introduction. The purpose of the introduction is to highlight and clarify some of the important events and themes appearing in that particular section of the text. To further help readers, we give brief introductions to many individual entries and, on occasion, even to portions of particular entries. As we have noted earlier, one of the difficulties in reading *Zuozhuan* is that story lines or strings of related events are often broken up by the interposition of other events. In introducing entries, we attempt to indicate
previous entries and later entries belonging to the same sequence of events. We also try to identify recurrent themes or figures—for example, the wise barbarian, the humble adviser, communication through riddles, and so forth. This makes it possible to read our translation either successively or by jumping from place to place to follow a particular series of related entries. The latter way of reading, incidentally, was common in China, for several re-presentations of Zuozhuan from as early as the Song dynasty conveniently group related entries together.73

One of the biggest difficulties one encounters in reading Zuozhuan is that it is replete with personal names. One scholar has counted 2,767 persons who are named in the Annals and Zuozhuan. The largest number are people who come from the domain of Jin (411), followed by Lu (316), then Chu (279), Qi (273), Zhou (205), Zheng (203), Wei (197), and Song (191).74 Moreover, many persons in the Annals and Zuozhuan have two or more names, so that the reader is often left overwhelmed, if not completely bewildered. Naming conventions during the period of time reflected in these texts are extremely complex and often relate to clan and lineage organization and official ranks and positions. Basically, most elite members of society belong to a large descent group, or xing 姓 (sometimes called a “clan”), and a smaller unit known as a “lineage,” or shi 氏.

Lineage names can be derived from birth sequence (e.g., the Meng 孟 or Zhongsun 仲孫, Ji 季 or Jisun 季孫, Shusun 叔孫, and Shuzhong 叔仲 lineages in Lu); the name of the place where the lineage head was put in power (e.g., Fan 范, Zhao 趙, and Wei 魏 in Jin); the birth name of a lineage head (e.g., the descendants of Gongzi Dang 公子蕡, the son of Lord Huan of Song 宋桓公, became the Dang lineage 蕭氏); the courtesy name of a lineage head (e.g., Gongzi Yan 公子偃, the son of Lord Mu of Zheng 鄭穆公, had the courtesy name Ziyou 子游, and by his grandsons’ generation “You” had become the lineage name 游氏); the name of a noble’s natal domain after he flees to another domain (e.g., Gongzi Wan 公子完 flees from Chen to Qi [Zhuang 22.1a], and his descendants in Qi formed the Chen lineage 陳氏); or a rank in court or in the army (e.g., the Zhonghang 中行 lineage in Jin started with Xun Linfu 荀林父, who commanded the “central column,” or zhonghang 中行, in the Jin army [Xi 28.13]; the ancestor of the Ji 籍 lineage in Jin obtained that name because he was in charge of “texts and documents,” or dianji 典籍 [Zhao 15.7]). Typically, clan names appear in the names of elite females, whereas lineage names appear in the names of males.

Shortly after birth, persons received a name, or ming 名. A passage in Zuozhuan (Huan 6.6) briefly describes the naming ceremony and includes the Lu minister Shen Xu’s 申繹 explanation of appropriate and inappropriate naming. Somewhat earlier in Zuozhuan (Huan 2.8), there is an example of the potentially disastrous consequences of inappropriate naming. According to early ritual texts, upon the capping ceremony
for males at the age of twenty and the hair-pinning for females at the age of fifteen, the young person received a second name, or “courtesy name” (zi 字), sometimes called a “style name” or “cognomen” in English-language sources. As Wang Yinzhi 王引之 (1766–1834) convincingly showed, there is often semantic resonance between a person’s birth name and courtesy name. Birth sequence indicators are commonly attached to the courtesy name: meng 孟 or bo 伯 for the eldest, zhong 仲 for the middle, and shu 叔 or ji 季 for the youngest. In addition, such gender markers as zi 子 or fu 父 commonly appear in courtesy names.

A rich variety of possible name forms can arise from these principles and from several others, such as the use of posthumous names, or shihao 谥号, which supposedly convey an evaluation of a person’s life or achievement. Thus, it is not unusual in Zuozhuan for a single person to be called by four or five names, and one of the major characters, the Jin minister Fan Hui 范會, is called by nine names. Almost all major persons have at least two names: the basic lineage name / birth name combination and a courtesy name. Designations such as Gongzi 公子 (the lord’s son), Gongsun 公孫 (the lord’s grandson), Wangzi 王子 (the king’s son), Wangsun 王孫 (the king’s grandson), or Wangshu 王叔 (the king’s uncle) are used with birth names. Different permutations of lineage name, the place(s) a lineage head is put in power, birth sequence, birth name, courtesy name, and office held yield variations for men’s name forms. For women the components of name forms include varying combinations of two or three of the following: her birth sequence, the name or clan name of her natal domain, the name of her natal lineage, the posthumous name of her husband, the name or clan name of her husband’s domain, and her own posthumous name.

The conditions under which one name rather than another is used in Zuozhuan are not always clear. Whereas in the Annals birth names predominate, in Zuozhuan there is a marked preference for courtesy names. A few tendencies can be identified in the selection of one name over another. When a person first appears in the text, he is often identified by birth name. Characters also refer to themselves by birth name. Zuozhuan passages that draw on the Annals or imitate an annals style often follow the Annals convention of using the birth name.

As much as possible, we have simplified names in our translation by calling each person by a single name. Some will object to such a practice, since it erases a critical feature of the original text, and some scholars believe that different names convey judgment or information regarding the provenance of the materials, but Chinese names are difficult enough for a nonspecialist to recognize and remember without the added complexity of having to deal with several names for virtually every major character in the text. We have, however, prepared a personal name index and use a system of superscript references to indicate which of the variants actually appears in the Chinese text. For example, in our translation
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of Yin 8.9 the reader will encounter “Gongzi Hui.” By referring to the index under “Gongzi Hui,” the name we use throughout Zuozhuan for this figure, one sees that the superscript “a” corresponds to “Yufu.” This indicates that in the Chinese original of Yin 8.9 Yufu is actually the name being used in this particular instance. In deciding which name to use in our translation, we have sometimes chosen the name we thought an English reader might remember most easily, and we have sometimes decided to use the variant that actually appears in Zuozhuan most frequently or that most clearly indicates the relationship of a particular character to a lineage or clan. The first of these considerations means that birth names appear more often in our translation than in Zuozhuan itself. Sometimes, however, we have not been able to avoid using two different names for a single character. The most common examples of this type occur where one name appears in the Annals, but we have for one reason or another decided to use another name in Zuozhuan. Since we do not want to alter the formulaic language of the Annals, we have in such cases retained the Annals name in our translation of that text and have added the selected Zuozhuan variant immediately afterward in parentheses. In some cases, the change of status necessitates the use of different names: for example, Chong’er 重耳 becomes Lord Wen of Jin 晉文公 and Gongzi Wei 公子圍 is later King Ling of Chu 楚靈王. In the personal name index, we have provided information (when it is available) about dates, lineage affiliations, and kinship relations.

In the case of place-names that coincidentally share the same Mandarin romanization and that appear frequently and are of continuing significance in the narrative, we have used pinyin tone marks to remove ambiguities. For example, the large domain 齊 is romanized as “Qi,” whereas the small domain 杞 is romanized as “Qǐ,” and the settlement 戚, the power base of Wei ministers of the Sun line, is romanized as “Qī.” The domains 徐 and Xŭ and the domains 卫 and Wei 魏 are likewise differentiated. For the two domains written with the same character, 燕, one in the north and one in the south, we have arbitrarily decided to write the northern domain name as Yan and the southern domain as Yān. All such romanizations can be found in the place-name index.

The nature of the calendar followed in the Annals and Zuozhuan is complex and the subject of rich tradition of study, which we will not attempt to summarize here.77 Years, as noted above, are marked in the Annals and Zuozhuan by reference to the lords of the domain of Lu: “Lord Yin 1,” “Lord Yin 2,” . . . , “Lord Ai 27.” We have inserted a Western calendar equivalent after each of these years—for example, Lord Yin 1 (722 BCE)—although there is not a perfect correspondence between the beginning and ending of years in the ancient Chinese lunar calendar and modern Western calendars. As one would expect from an annals system that derives its name from the sequence of seasons, the four seasons are almost always noted, with at least one event typically registered for each
season. In the Zhou calendar, which was used in the domain of Lu, the designation *chun*, “spring,” roughly corresponds to our winter, and so forth. Days in traditional China were named by a sequence of characters recurring in a cycle of sixty combinations, the so-called sexagenary cycle. This cycle operates independently from the lunar months, so that it is impossible to tell from the date name in the sexagenary cycle alone how far into a particular month the event took place. Such correspondences, however, have been established, and Yang Bojun regularly provides in a note the numerical day of the month that corresponds to a date name. In our translation, we reproduce the cyclical date names and then, following Yang, give the sequence day of the month in parentheses. For example, note the following entry from Lord Xi 1 (659 BCE): “In the twelfth month, on the *dingsi* day (18), the funeral cortège of Lord Zhuang’s wife arrived from Qi.” *Dingsi* is the romanized equivalent of the two-character name of the day in the sexagenary cycle, while “(18),” which is added by reference to Yang’s gloss, indicates that in this case *dingsi* falls on the eighteenth day of the twelfth lunar month.

How much and what type of footnoting to provide in a translation are always difficult decisions. Our goal has been to produce a reader-friendly translation. Thus, we have tried to make our notes useful and have not consistently supplied footnotes giving information that an early-China scholar could easily access from a Chinese-language commentary. In some instances, we also supply in footnotes alternative versions of particular events as they appear in Warring States texts such as *Discourses of the States* (Guoyu 國語), *Master Han Fei* (Han Feizi 韓非子), and *Annals of Master Yan* (Yanzi chunqiu 晏子春秋), or even the considerably later *Records of the Historian*. These notes are meant, not as a comprehensive guide for the sinologist reader, who can find such information elsewhere, but as an indication to the more general reader of the rich texture of early Chinese texts and the way in which particular accounts are circulated and modified.

One problem with a face-to-face classical Chinese–English translation is that the Chinese text requires so much less space than the translation, leaving a large amount of empty space on the left side page. To compensate for this, we begin our footnotes on the left side and continue them, where necessary, on the right. Footnoting in this fashion will mean that the reader’s eyes must often sweep from the right page to the left page to find the relevant footnote, but it also means that the heft and price of the book the reader now holds have been somewhat reduced!

Translation from early Chinese is a challenging task, especially in the case of a text as linguistically rich and textually complex as *Zuozhuan*. We have tried to be reasonably consistent in our translation of terminology without becoming too rigid. Both the demands of English style and the basically heterogeneous nature of *Zuozhuan* itself should allow for some variance. Certain translation choices, we know, will raise eye-
brows, if not ire. For example, we have chosen to render guo 國 as “domain” rather than the usual “state.” We do this to remind the reader of two characteristics of the guo in Spring and Autumn China. First, a guo was a nexus of settlements extending out from a walled central city or capital, also called guo, toward a border area that was rarely as clearly delineated as the frontiers of a modern state. Second, power in the domain was usually a matter of lineage and sublineage relationships, with the lord (Latin dominus, a distant root of the word “domain”) at the center. Administrative structures were not elaborate, and official business was usually a “family affair.” High officers (dafu 大夫) and ministers (qing 卿), who come to overshadow many lords of the ruling houses, fill offices that often become hereditary; their source of power and revenue was settlements (yi 邑) under their administration and jurisdiction. Serving under them are officers (shi 士), usually unranked descendants of branch lineages serving in chariot units. Inhabitants of the capital (guoren 國人) sometimes seem to be able to act collectively and sway policy decisions.

We also have not adhered to the traditional way of translating the five ranks of early China: gong 公, hou 侯, bo 伯, zi 子, and nan 男, usually “duke,” “marquis,” “earl,” “count,” and “baron,” respectively. These terms not only lead the reader into the feudal world of medieval Europe but also convey a sense of hierarchy and orderliness that was not always so clear in the world of early China. Although a Zuozhuan passage indicates that these terms for ranks were not an entirely meaningless jumble (Xi 4.4), they were not applied consistently in Zuozhuan, as Chen Pan 陳槃 has so persuasively demonstrated. Consequently, we have rendered the five ranks as “duke,” “prince,” “liege,” “master,” and “head.”

The first of these terms, gong, not only is used to designate the rulers of such domains as Song and Guo but also is a more general honorific bestowed upon every ruler at the time of his death and used consistently thereafter, usually attached to the ruler’s posthumous name. Thus, our text is organized not around twelve Lu “dukes” but around twelve Lu “lords.” Each of these is identified in the text by his posthumous name (Yin, Huan, Zhuang, Min, etc.), with the honorific title gong that follows thus being understood as the general honorific “lord.” Things can become tricky when, for example, a particular Duke of Song (Song gong 宋公) becomes Lord Shang of Song (Song Shang gong 宋殤公) after he dies and is buried. Zuozhuan refers to both the “Duke of Song” (e.g., Yin 4.2, 4.3, 4.4) and “Lord Shang” (e.g., Yin 3.5, 4.3). We translate the term gong differently in the second case because every ruler becomes a “lord” when he dies and is given his posthumous name. For example, when Liege Fuchu of Cao (Cao bo Fuchu 曹伯負芻) dies, even though he was never a "duke" or a "lord" (gong) while alive, he is posthumously named Lord Cheng (Cheng gong 成公). Furthermore, gong is also often used on its own as a way of referring to a living ruler who is being spoken to or
mentioned. In the *Annals* an unqualified *gong* always refers to the Lord of Lu. In these cases we have typically translated *gong* as “our lord” to remind the reader that the *Annals* is a Lu text and maintains that perspective throughout. But in the case of *Zuozhuan*, we translate an unqualified *gong* as “our lord” when it refers to the Lu ruler and simply as “the lord” when it refers to the ruler of some other domain. This feature of our translation, which is meant to assist the reader, does have the result of giving *Zuozhuan* a Lu point of view that is not so apparent in the original and may not accurately reflect the origin of the text. In addition, Zhou court ministers are also called *gong*. To differentiate them from rulers of domains, we have rendered their names without the genitive—Liu Kang *gong* 刘康公, for example, is translated as Liu Duke Kang (rather than Duke Kang of Liu).

Many other translation choices, which we will not describe in further detail here, deviate from sinological convention, but we hope none of these are too jarring or, more seriously, too far removed from the meaning of the original. Without pretending that we have necessarily produced a translation superior to that of James Legge, we do think there is some merit in trying to defamiliarize the text somewhat for those readers already steeped in Legge’s version. One of the advantages to having so many different translations of Homer or of the Bible is that the person who does not read the original languages can move from translation to translation, gaining new insights and perspectives from each. We hope that the reader will find what we have produced here to be fresh and clear. And should our work encourage other translations of this rich and wonderful text, translations with styles and features that set them apart from ours, so much the better!
Lord Xuan
(608–591 BCE)

Lord Xuan became the ruler of Lu through the support of two Lu noblemen: Xiangzhong (Gongzi Sui) and Ji Wenzǐ (Jisun Hangfu). Xiangzhong, in league with Lord Xuan’s mother, murdered Lord Wen’s legitimate heirs in 609 BCE (Wen 18.5). Xiangzhong remained influential in Lu politics until his death in 601 BCE (Xuan 8.2). However, his Dongmen lineage, headed by his son Gongsun Guifu, was expelled upon Lord Xuan’s death ten years later (591 BCE), because Gongsun Guifu had plotted with Lord Xuan to oust the three powerful Ji (Jisun), Meng (Zhongsun), and Shu (Shusun) lineages descended from Lord Huan (Xuan 18.5). The Ji lineage, with Ji Wenzǐ as head, came to dominate Lu politics. A similar shift in the balance of power between ruler and minister is evident in Jin, with the difference that the powerful lineages there were not lateral branches of the ruling family because of earlier purges (Zhuang 23.2, 25.4, 25.5, Xuan 2.4). Zhao Dun, who had facilitated the accession of Lord Ling of Jin (then a mere infant or very young child) in 620 BCE after initial vacillations (Wen 73, 7.4) and was both praised and criticized for his policies (Wen 6.1, 7.5), was probably responsible for Lord Ling’s assassination thirteen years later (607 BCE, Xuan 2.3). That story, couched in terms of Lord Ling’s misdemeanors, defiance of remonstrances, and murderous plots against Zhao Dun, raises questions about the justifications for assassinating a ruler, the adjudication of responsibility, and “truth” in historical records. In the aftermath of Lord Ling’s death, the Zhao lineage expanded its influence in Jin. The Xi lineage also gained sway in Jin (Xuan 8.4, 17.1, 17.2). The rising power of ministerial lineages may account for arguments in Jin-related materials on why defeated commanders should be spared (Xuan 12.5) and why just rewards for ministers are fundamental (Xuan 15.6). Two other rulers were killed by their ministers during Lord Xuan’s reign. Lord Ling of Zheng was murdered in the first year of his reign (605 BCE) on account of an ostensibly
minor offense against ministers who had been denied turtle stew (Xuan 4.2). Lord Ling of Chen was assassinated in 599 BCE by Xia Zhengshu, the son of Lord Ling’s paramour Xia Ji, who had liberally bestowed her favor on the ruler and ministers of Chen (Xuan 9.6, 10.4). As one may gather from these stories, “Ling” as posthumous honorific conveys a negative judgment (see also Wen 1.7, Xiang 2.2, Xiang 13.4).

Violence in the other direction obtains in Chu, where King Zhuang eradicated almost the entire Dou (Ruo’ao) lineage following Dou Jiao’s abortive rebellion in 605 BCE (Xuan 4.3). A symbolically charged exchange between King Zhuang and a Zhou prince on the size and weight of Zhou cauldrons is supposed to show how the Chu king’s ambitions are curbed by the rhetoric of ritual propriety (Xuan 3.3). However, Chu continued to expand its territories and influence, annexing Shuliao (Xuan 8.3) and Xiao (Xuan 12.6) and attacking Chen (Xuan 1.8, 8.7, 11.5), Song (Xuan 1.8, 13.2, 14.2), and repeatedly Zheng (Xuan 3.4, 4.4, 5.5, 6.5, 9.7, 10.12, 11.1, 12.1). If the rhetoric of ritual propriety seems to have eluded King Zhuang in the cauldron episode, he demonstrates how expansion of power can be achieved through gestures of virtuous leniency in Chu’s aggression against Chen (Xuan 11.5), Zheng (12.1), and Song (15.2). Jin, unable to compete with Chu despite continued attempts to exact allegiance, sometimes through aggression, from smaller domains such as Song, Chen, and Zheng (Xuan 1.8, 1.10, 2.2, 3.2, 5.5, 6.1, 10.12, 11.1, 14.2), tried to frame its policies of appeasement as strategic timing and judicious self-preservation (Xuan 2.2, 15.2). Its weakening hold on the central domains is only partially compensated by victories over the Red Di tribes (Xuan 6.3, 11.4, 15.3, 16.1).

Chu ascendancy and Jin decline during this period culminate in Chu victory in the battle of Bi in 597 BCE (Xuan 12.2). As with the battle of Chengpu thirty-five years earlier (Xi 28), the narrative is much more concerned with the deliberations before and during battle rather than with the military action itself. Whereas the Chengpu campaign is presented more from the perspective of victorious Jin, the battle of Bi, like the battle of Yanling in the next section, is more distinctly multifocal, possibly because the account is prepared from both Jin and Chu sources. In the account of the battle of Bi, there are voices against the conflict on both sides, but the dissension in Jin is presented as deeper and ultimately more destructive. The lack of an efficient center of authority finally leads to a debacle for Jin. Some battle anecdotes retain a ritualized grandeur, depicting spectacular displays of valor and examples of polite rhetorical exchanges.

King Zhuang crowns his victory with a famous speech defining martial greatness and refusing an ostentatious celebration of Chu might. It harks back to his earlier restraint: he did not keep Chen as a dependency (Xuan 11.5) and refrained from destroying Zheng (Xuan 12.1). While the Jin-Chu conflict can be constructed as a narrative that spans many years,
The daughter of the Qi ruler was to marry Lord Xuan. For a minister to meet the bride is ritually proper (Wen 4.4), although some commentators have criticized Lord Xuan for excessive haste in proceeding with his marriage so soon after his father’s death. Gongzi Sui in the Annals is most often referred to as Xiangzhong and Dongmen Xiangzhong in Zuozhuan.

Pingzhou was on the border of Qi and Lu west of present-day Laiwu County, Shandong.

In 632 BCE (Xi 28.3a), Jin annexed Cao. In 629 BCE, when Jin divided up Cao territories, the share Lu received included the fields on the west bank of the Ji River (Xi 31.1), and this land is here offered to Qi as a bribe.
some of the most memorable stories during this reign are relatively self-contained. Besides the aforementioned assassination of the rulers of Jin, Zheng, and Chen, noteworthy episodes include the sheep stew incident that led to a Song defeat and the Song commander Hua Yuan’s exchange with laborers and builders (Xuan 2.1), the mysterious ties between orchids and Lord Mu of Zheng (Xuan 3.6), Dou Guwutu’s (Ziwen) miraculous infancy and its implications for the fate of the Dou lineage (Xuan 4.3), the death of the Chu envoy Shen Zhou owing to King Zhuang’s scheme to subjugate Song (Xuan 14.3), Xie Yang’s fulfillment of his charge of delivering a false promise to Song (Xuan 15.2), Hua Yuan’s desperate peace mission (Xuan 15.2), and a Jin commander’s enemy being defeated by “knotted grass” (Xuan 15.5).

------------------------

LORD XUAN 1 (608 BCE)

ANNALS

In the first year, in spring, in the royal first month, our lord acceded to his position. 1.1

Gongzi Sui (Xiangzhong) went to Qi to escort home a bride.1 1.2(1)

In the third month, Sui, bringing our lord’s wife, Lady Jiang, arrived from Qi. 1.3(2)

In summer, Jisun Hangfu (Ji Wenzi) went to Qi. 1.4(3)

Jin banished its high officer Xu Jiafu (Xu Jia) to Wei. 1.5(4)

Our lord met with the Prince of Qi at Pingzhou.2 1.6(5)

Gongzi Sui (Xiangzhong) went to Qi. 1.7(6)

In the sixth month, a Qi leader took lands to the west of the Ji River.3 1.8(7)

In autumn, the Master of Zhu came to visit our court.4 1.9

The Master of Chu and a Zheng leader invaded Chen.5 They then invaded Song. Zhao Dun of Jin led out troops and went to the aid of Chen. The Duke of Song, the Prince of Chen, the Prince of Wei, and the Liege of Cao met with Jin troops at Feilin and attacked Zheng.6 1.10(8)

---

4 The purpose was presumably to pay respects to the new Lu ruler. The last recorded visit from a Zhu ruler was in 697 BCE (Annals, Huan 15.8).
5 This is the first instance of designating the Chu ruler as “master” (zi 子) in accounts of Chu military expeditions. Traditional exegetes often understand this use of the word zi as a subtle critique of the Chu ruler, who referred to himself as “king” (wang 王).
6 Feilin 寶林 is probably the same place as Fei 棟 mentioned in Annals, Wen 13.9.
Chong, a Qin ally, was probably a small domain close to Jin, although there is no agreement on its precise location. King Wen of Zhou subjugated Chong, a Shang subsidiary domain (Xi 19.3, Xiang 31.13; Maoshi 241, “Huang yi” 皇矣, 16D.567–71; Maoshi 244, “Wen wang you sheng” 文王有聲, 16E.583), which Jiang Yong identifies as a different place (Yang, 2:647).

This is an instance of inferring judgment from the manner of naming in the Annals: the use of “Gongzi” supposedly honors the ruler’s command.

Zuo Tradition
In winter, Zhao Chuan of Jin led out troops and invaded Chong.⁷

A Jin leader and a Song leader attacked Zheng.

ZUO

Xiangzhong (Gongzi Sui), having murdered the legitimate heirs of Lord Wen and established Lord Xuan as ruler with the Qi ruler’s tacit support (Wen 18.4–5), now proceeds to seal the Qi-Lu alliance with a marriage and a bribe (Xuan 1.1–3, 1.5–7).

In the first year, in spring, in the royal first month, Gongzi Sui (Xiangzhong) went to Qi to escort home a bride: this designation honors the ruler’s command.⁸

In the third month, Sui, bringing our lord’s wife, Lady Jiang, arrived from Qi: this designation honors the lady.⁹

In summer, Ji Wenzi went to Qi, offered gifts, and requested a meeting.¹⁰

We are informed about a belated punishment for Xu Jia’s role in Jin’s defeat in the campaign of Hequ (Wen 12.6). Zhao Chuan, also responsible for the debacle, is spared because his kinsman, Zhao Dun, holds the reins of power in Jin.

Jin leaders chastised the insubordinate ones, banished Xu Jiafu (Xu Jia) to Wei, and established Xu Ke as his successor. Xian Xin fled to Qi.¹¹

Lord Xuan’s meeting with Lord Hui of Qi at Pingzhou implies tacit recognition from the latter and, by extension, the rulers of other domains.

They met at Pingzhou to confirm our lord’s position.

Xiangzhong went to Qi, bowing to affirm the alliance.

In the sixth month, a Qi leader took lands to the west of the Ji River. It was for the sake of establishing our lord as ruler that these had been given to Qi as a bribe.

---

⁹ Sui is designated without his title to show respect for Lady Jiang.

¹⁰ The bribe refers to the lands to the west of the Ji River. As usurper, Lord Xuan was in danger of being excluded from the meetings of rulers.

¹¹ Xu Ke was Xu Jia’s son; and Xian Xin was Xu Jia’s henchman.
宋人之弑昭公也，晉荀林父以諸侯之師伐宋。宋及晉平，宋文公受盟于晉。又會諸侯于扈，遂為魯討齊。皆取賂而還。鄭穆公曰：「晉不足與也。」遂受盟于楚。陳共公之卒，楚人不禮焉。陳靈公受盟于晉。秋，楚子侵陳，遂侵宋。晉趙盾帥師救陳，宋。會于棐林，以伐鄭也。楚蒍賈救鄭，遇于北林，囚鄭解揚。晉人乃還。

晉欲求成於秦。趙穿曰：「我侵崇，秦急崇，必救之。吾以求成焉。」冬，趙穿侵崇，秦弗與成。

晉人伐鄭，以報北林之役。於是晉侯侈，趙宣子為政，駭諫而不入，故不競於楚。
The smaller domains Zheng, Song, and Chen are caught in the struggle between Jin and Chu. The following three passages show Jin losing ground to Chu in interstate relations: having accepted bribes and reversed its declared goals regarding Song and Lu, Jin alienates Zheng and also fails to make peace with Qin. The extravagance of Lord Ling of Jin is blamed for these setbacks.

When the men of Song had assassinated Lord Zhao, Xun Linfu of Jin had led the princes’ armies to attack Song. Song and Jin made peace, and Lord Wen of Song accepted a covenant with Jin. Jin also gathered the princes for a meeting at Hu and was about to chastise Qi on behalf of Lu. In both cases, Jin took bribes and turned back. Lord Mu of Zheng said, “Jin does not deserve our loyalty,” and thereupon accepted a covenant with Chu. When Lord Gong of Chen died, Chu leaders did not respond with ritual propriety. Lord Ling of Chen accepted a covenant with Jin. In autumn, the Master of Chu invaded Chen and then invaded Song. Zhao Dun of Jin led out troops and went to the aid of Chen and Song. The lords joined forces at Beilin in order to attack Zheng. Wei Jia of Chu came to Zheng’s aid. The armies met at Beilin, and Xie Yang of Jin was captured. The men of Jin thus turned back.

Jin wished to seek an accord with Qin. Zhao Chuan said, “If we invade Chong, Qin, anxious about Chong, is sure to come to Chong’s aid. On that basis we can seek an accord.” In winter, Zhao Chuan invaded Chong. Qin refused to make peace with Jin.

The men of Jin attacked Zheng in retaliation for the campaign of Beilin. At that time the Jin prince was extravagant. Zhao Dun was in charge of policies. He repeatedly remonstrated with the ruler but was not heeded. Consequently, Jin could not compete with Chu.

**LORD XUAN 2 (607 BCE)**

**ANNALS**

In the second year, in spring, in the royal second month, on the renzi day, Hua Yuan of Song and Gongzi Guisheng (Zijia) of Zheng led out troops and did battle at Daji. The Song troops were completely defeated, and Hua Yuan of Song was captured.

Qin troops attacked Jin.

In summer, a Jin leader, a Song leader, a Wei leader, and a Chen leader invaded Zheng.

---

14 Beilin was a settlement of Zheng located just north of present-day Xinzheng 新鄭.
15 This settlement was located in the domain of Song, south of present-day Sui County 睢縣, Henan.
A person can be “captured” (huò) alive or dead. Here the juxtaposition with Hua Yuan implies that Yue Lü had been killed.

Compare Da Dai Liji 69.340: “Do not abandon the injunctions of the armored state: manifest decisiveness and determination in obeying commands” 無廢甲胄之戒 , 昭果毅以聽 . The Qing philologist Hui Dong (Zuozhuan buzhu) reads jie 戒 as rong 戎 and claims that here Zuozhuan is quoting from a standard saying that explains “martiality” (rong 戎) as the ability to “manifest decisiveness and determination in obeying commands” 昭果毅以聽 (Liu Wenqi, Chunqiu Zuoshi zhuan jiuzhu zheng, 616). Karlgren (gl. 257) prefers to read rong 戎 in this passage as jie 戒: “The injunctions make it clear that to use decisiveness and determination in obeying commands is ritual propriety” 戒昭果毅以聽之之謂禮 .

Cf. Huainanzi 10.335, “The soupy mutton stew (geng) was not ladled (zhen) and Song was imperiled” 羊羹不斟而宋國危 ; and Shiji 38.1629, “His chariot driver did not get to have the soupy mutton stew (yanggeng) 客御羊羹不及 .” The closes connection between these two graphs has led some scholars to speculate that “Yang Zhen” here is not a proper name but refers instead to the stew. It is also possible that Yang Zhen was denied the punning stew as a deliberate joke. A story in Zhanluo ce, “Zhongshan”中山, 33.1183, seems to combine elements from this and other food anecdotes in Xuan 2.3b and Xuan 4.3. A Zhongshan minister, having been denied mutton stew by his ruler, instigates the Chu invasion of Zhongshan. Two officers, whose once-starving father was offered food by the Zhongshan ruler, come to the latter’s defense when he is fleeing. Cf. Qian Zhongshu, Guanzhui bian, 1:201–2.

The analogous passage in Lüshi chunqiu 16.1044 has zhi 政 instead of zheng 政: “With yesterday’s mutton, you set the rules, but in today’s affairs, I set the rules.” Hong Liangji (Chunqiu Zuozhuan gu, 395) believes that the change was meant to avoid the taboo of the name of the First Emperor of Qin. Hua Yuan is blamed for
In autumn, in the ninth month, on the yichou day (26), Zhao Dun of Jin assassinated his ruler, Yigao.

In winter, in the tenth month, on the yihai day (6), the Heaven-appointed king succumbed.

ZUO

A battle occurs between Song and Zheng, which are allied to Jin and Chu, respectively. Song is again associated with an impractical and ill-advised sense of honor in the conduct of war (for an earlier example, see Xi 22.8). The Song commander Hua Yuan is captured because he denied his chariot driver sheep stew. This is one of several “food stories” in Zuozhuan. The bestowal or denial of food also determines the plot in Xuan 2.3b, 4.2, and Xiang 28.9.

In the second year, in spring, Gongzi Guisheng of Zheng received a command from Chu to attack Song. Hua Yuan and Yue Lü of Song led the defense. In the second month, on the renzi day, they did battle at Daji. The Song army was completely defeated. The Zheng army took Hua Yuan prisoner, captured Yue Lü, along with four hundred and sixty chariots drawn by armored horses, took two hundred and fifty captives, and cut off the ears of a hundred slain soldiers. As Kuang Jiao of Song and a man of Zheng were locked in combat, the Zheng man fell into a well. When Kuang Jiao turned his halberd around and with the handle hauled him out, he seized Kuang Jiao. The noble man said, “He deviated from ritual propriety and disobeyed commands. It is fitting that he became a captive. In martial affairs, to manifest decisiveness and determination in obeying commands is ritual propriety. To kill the enemy is decisiveness; to sustain decisiveness is determination. To change this is to incur punishment and execution.”

On the eve of battle, Hua Yuan had slaughtered a sheep to feed his men, but his chariot driver Yang Zhen had been denied his portion. When it was time for battle, Yang said, “With yesterday’s mutton, you were in charge, but in today’s affair, I am in charge.” He drove the chariot into the ranks of the Zheng army, hence Song’s defeat. The noble man said of Yang Zhen: “He was not human. Because of a private grudge, he brought about defeat for the domain and devastation for the people. At that moment, what punishment could be too great for him? Where the Odes speaks of ‘men of no goodness,’ does it not refer to the likes of Yang Zhen! He inflicted harm on the people for his own satisfaction.”

failing to “discern minute beginnings” (chawei 察微) in Lüshi chunqiu, whereas Yang Zhen is condemned for his disloyalty in Zuozhuan. The version of the anecdote in Shuoyuan 5.21 is identical to the Zuozhuan version.

20 Maoshi 233, “jiaogong” 角弓, 15A.504.

Lord Xuan
2.1b  宋人以兵车百乘、文马百騂以赎华元于郑。半人，华元逃归。立于门外，告入。见叔牂，曰：「子之马然也？」对曰：「非马也，其人也。」既合而来奔。宋城，华元为植，巡功。城者謳曰：

               晤其目，
               晤其腹，
               惜甲而复。
               于思于思，
               惜甲復來。

使其驂乘谓之曰：

               牛则有皮，
               犀兕尚多，
               惜甲则那？

役人曰：

               從其有皮，
               丹漆若何？

华元曰：「去之！夫其口眾我寡。」

2.2(2)  秦师伐晋，以报崇也，遂围焦。夏，晋赵盾救焦，遂自阴地，及诸侯之师侵郑，以报大棘之役。

楚鬬椒救郑，曰：「能欲诸侯，而恶其难乎？」遂次于郑，以待晋师。趙盾曰：「彼宗竞于楚，殆将毙矣。姑益其疾。」乃去之。

21  Du Yu (ZZ 21.363) identifies Shuzang as Yang Zhen. For Jia Kui, he is “a Song official who guarded the gate.” According to Fu Qian, Yang Zhen asks the question and Hua Yuan gives the reply (Liu Wenqi, Chunqiu Zuoshi zhuan jiuzhu shuzheng, 618).
22  Hua Yuan, suspecting Yang Zhen’s treachery, ironically questions whether the horses are to be blamed. Yang Zhen admits that he himself brought about Song’s defeat. “The man” can also refer to Hua Yuan—i.e., Hua Yuan is ultimately responsible because of the mutton stew incident.
23  Du Yu (ZZ 21.363) reads yusai 于思 as “great beard,” a meaning that has entered the Chinese lexicon. Karlgren (gl. 262) opines that yu 于 and sai 思 are loans for yu 宇 and sai 倪, “big” and “strong.”
24  We follow the reading of na 那 as “abundant or plentiful” in Karlgren, gl. 263. Du Yu (ZZ 21.363) and others read na as he 何 (“so what”) or nathe 奈何 (“what can be done?”).
25  The small domain of Jiao 焦 has already been mentioned in Xi 30.3.
26  Yindi 陰地 was located northeast of present-day Lushi County 麗氏縣, Henan.
27  The fall of Dou Jiao’s lineage is recounted in Zuozhuan, Xuan 4.3. Zhao Dun claims to bring about Dou Jiao’s doom by encouraging his ambitions with a show of Jin weakness.
Hua Yuan escapes from captivity and returns to Song. His exchange with builders and laborers features songs as the commoners’ vehicle for voicing criticism of those in power. For another example, see Xiang 4.8, 17.6.

The leaders of Song offered a hundred war chariots and a hundred four some teams of dappled horses to ransom Hua Yuan from Zheng. When only half of the ransom had entered Zheng, Hua Yuan escaped and returned. He stood outside the city gate, declared his identity, and entered. He saw Shuzang and said, “It was your horses that did this, was it not?” He replied, “It was not the horses but the man.” Having answered, he fled to Lu.

The city walls of Song were being fortified. Hua Yuan was in charge and went on circuits of inspection to check progress. The builders sang,

- Bulging are his eyes,
- Protruding is his belly.
- He abandoned his armor and returned.
- Big and strong! Big and strong!
- Abandoning his armor he has come again.

Hua Yuan had his chariot attendants sing in reply,

- Oxen would have their hides,
- Wild bovines and rhinoceros are yet plentiful.
- So I abandoned armor: but what abundance still?

The laborers sang,

- Even if the hides are there,
- What about red lacquer?

Hua Yuan said, “Let us go! For they are many and we are few.”

Now we learn about the consequences of the conflicts at Chong (Xuan 1.9) and Daji (Xuan 2.1). Jin confronts Qin and, half-heartedly, Chu. Zhao Dun defends Jin weakness as strategic indulgence of the enemy.

Qin troops attacked Jin in retaliation for the Chong campaign. It then laid siege to Jiao. In summer, Zhao Dun of Jin came to the aid of Jiao. Then he set out from Yindi and joined with the princes’ troops to invade Zheng in retaliation for the Daji campaign.

Dou Jiao of Chu came to the aid of Zheng, saying, “How is it possible to desire the princes’ support and yet balk at the difficulties?” He then set up camp at Zheng to wait for the Jin army. Zhao Dun said, “That lineage is poweful in Chu, but it is about to meet its doom. Let us just allow its malady to deepen.” He thus withdrew.
That is, his conduct is such that he is unworthy of the title of ruler. Cf. *Analects* 12.11.


The pellets are probably made of mud or clay. *Gongyang*, Xuan 6 (15.192), and *Guliang*, Xuan 2 (12.116), specify that Lord Ling is taking aim at officials, presumably to emphasize the heinousness of Lord Ling’s act. However, if the terrace is inside the palace, then it is not likely that officials would be present.

Bear paws, considered a great delicacy, take a long time to cook. That is why King Cheng of Chu, when surrounded by his enemies, asks to have a meal of bear paws before he dies (Wen 1.7).

According to *Lüshi chunqiu* 23.1599, Lord Ling intends in this way to intimidate his officials. The account in *Shiji* 39.1673 claims that the women are merely taking the corpse out to be discarded. The women’s passage through a space frequented by outsiders (the court or audience chamber) shows Lord Ling as either oblivious to his own transgression or deliberately defiant of his ministers’ disapproval.

Li溜 is read as *liu* 潮, meaning eaves (*ZZ-Kong* 21.364). Shen Qinhan identifies *sanjin* 三進 as three stages of advancement: the gate, the inner courtyard (ting 庭), and the steps to the audience chamber (tang 堂) (Yang, 2:656–57). Lord Ling pretends not to see Fan Hui until he reaches the eaves over the steps of the audience chamber, when under normal circumstances he would have looked at him much earlier. By acknowledging his errors, Lord Ling disarms further remonstrances.

Fan Hui is using the vestment to refer to both the dignity of Lord Ling’s office and the stability of the Jin domain.
Lord Ling of Jin, now in his teens, persists in his errant course and defies remonstrances. The story seems to have been told in such a way as to justify his later murder. The Jin minister Zhao Dun, who later faces allegations of playing a role in the assassination, is presented as the victim. Zuozhuan encompasses two perspectives on Zhao Dun: one indicts him, while the other retains sympathy for him. This apparent ambivalence may be traced to differences rooted in the political reality of the fifth or fourth century BCE (voices for or against the Zhao house) or divergent conceptions of the ruler-minister relationship. In an analogous example, Chen Qi is identified as the one who assassinates the Qi ruler Tu in the Annals, while Zuozhuan portrays his reluctant or even inadvertent acquiescence to the murder (Ai 6.6).

Lord Ling of Jin was no ruler. He levied heavy taxes in order to lavishly decorate the walls of his palace with painted patterns. From atop his terrace he shot pellets at people, so that he could watch how they tried to escape from the pellets. When the cook did not thoroughly stew bear paws, Lord Ling had him killed and put in a reed basket, and he had women pass through court carrying the basket. When Zhao Dun and Fan Hui saw the dead man’s hand and asked what had happened, they were deeply dismayed. They were about to remonstrate, when Fan Hui said, “If our remonstrances are not heeded, then there is no one who can follow us. I beg leave to go first. If I am not heeded, then you can follow.” Over three stages he advanced, but only when he reached the eaves did the lord look at him. The lord said, “I know my errors. I will correct them.” Fan Hui bowed, touching the ground with his forehead, and replied, “Who among men is without errors? Having erred and being capable of correction—there is no good greater than that. As it says in the Odes,

There is none who does not have beginnings,
Few are those who fulfill them as endings.

For if it is so, then those who can make good their errors are few. If my lord can persist to the end, then the altars of the domain will have a solid foundation. Surely it is not only your subjects who rely on that! As it also says in the Odes,

The ritual vestment had holes—
It was Zhongshan Fu who mended it.

This is about being able to make good one’s errors. If my lord can do so, then the ritual vestment will not fall into disuse.”
F. u Qian reads the graph 扶 ("to help someone by being leaned on") as 跣 ("barefooted") (Yang, 2:659). With 跣 as verb, the subject of the sentence would be Zhao Dun instead of Timi Ming: "He thereupon came down barefooted."

According to Yili 15.184 and Liji 35.632, guests take off their shoes before coming to the mat where the feast is spread. Cf. Ai 25.1, where, by keeping his socks on, Market Overseer Bia arouses the fury of the "Ousted Lord" of Wei.

Erya (10.195) defines 獬 as a large hound of about four chi (roughly three feet), and Shuowen jiezi (10A.5b) identifies it as a hound trained to do its master's bidding.

Mount Shou 首山 should probably be identified with present-day Leishou Mountain 雷首山, Yongji County 永濟縣, Shanxi.

Du Yu (ZZ 21.365) glosses 跣桑 as “luxuriant mulberry,” following cues from Gongyang, Xuan 6 (15.193); Huainanzi 18.622; Lüshi chunqiu 15.893; and Shiji 39.1647; all of which mention the starving man "under the mulberry." But since Zuozhuan indicates location with 于 (and not 下), we have followed Wang Yinzhi (Jingyi shuwen, 685) in reading Yisang as a place-name of unknown location.

Zuo Tradition
Still the lord did not correct his errors. Zhao Dun remonstrated with him several times. The lord loathed this and sent Chu Ni to murder him. When Chu Ni went just before sunrise, the doors of the bedchamber were open. Zhao Dun was fully dressed in official robes and was about to go to court. It was still early, and he was sitting with closed eyes. Chu Ni withdrew and sighed, saying, “He who does not forget reverence is the master of the people. To murder the master of the people is not loyal; to discard the ruler’s command is faithless. To be guilty of either of these is worse than death.” He smashed his head against a locust tree and died.

The Jin ruler’s attempts to kill Zhao Dun are repeatedly foiled as men who earlier received help from Zhao Dun now requite his beneficence by saving him. Zhao Dun flees Jin.

In autumn, in the ninth month, the Prince of Jin entertained Zhao Dun with wine. The prince had hidden armored soldiers who were going to attack him. Zhao’s aide on the right, Timi Ming, learned of this, rushed forward, and ascended the steps, saying, “For a subject waiting on a ruler at a feast to drink more than three rounds is not in accordance with ritual propriety.” He then helped Zhao Dun step down. The lord whistled for his fierce hounds. Timi Ming wrestled with them and killed them. Zhao Dun said, “He deserts men and uses hounds—fierce, to be sure, but to what avail?” All the while fighting and struggling, they came out. Timi Ming died defending Zhao Dun.

Earlier, Zhao Dun had hunted at Mount Shou. While lodging at Yisang then, he saw Ling Zhe, who was starving, and asked what ailed him. Ling Zhe said, “I have not eaten for three days.” Zhao Dun gave him food, but Ling Zhe set half of it aside. When asked about it, he said, “For three full years I have been in service. I do not yet know whether my mother is still alive. Now that I am close to home, I beg leave to send her this food.” Zhao Dun had him finish eating, then prepared for him a bamboo basket filled with food and meat, put it in a sack, and gave it to him. Later, he joined the ranks of the lord’s armored attendants. He turned his dagger-axe against the lord’s men to defend Zhao and thereby saved him. Zhao asked why he did that, and he replied, “I was the starving man at Yisang.” Zhao asked his name and where he lived, but he withdrew without telling him. Then Zhao himself fled.
2.3c 乙丑，趙穿殺靈公於桃園。宣子未出山而復。大史書曰「趙盾弒其君」，以示於朝。宣子曰：「不然。」對曰：「子為正卿，亡不越竟，反不討賊，非子而誰？」宣子曰：「烏呼！

其我之謂矣。」孔子曰：「董狐，古之良史也，書法不隱。趙宣子，古之良大夫也，為法受惡，惜也，越竟乃免。」

宣子使趙穿逆公子黑臀于周而立之。壬申，朝于武宮。

2.4 初，麗姬之亂，詛無畜群公子，自是晉無公族。及成公即位，乃宦卿之適而為之田，以為公族。又宦其餘子，亦為餘子；其庶子為公行。晉於是有公族、餘子、公行。

42 Du Yu (ZZ 21.365) classifies this as an uncollected ode. However, very similar lines appear in Maoshi 33, “Xiongzhì” 雄雉, 2B.86, and Maoshi 207, “Xiaoming” 小明, 13A.447.

43 Can Confucius possibly mean that a technical detail of location would have absolved Zhao Dun even if he were guilty? Or does he mean that he wishes for exonerating evidence (i.e., had Zhao Dun crossed the border, it would have proved that he was not party to the assassination)? One would assume the latter, considering Confucius’ implied sympathy for Zhao Dun. The idea of possible justification for Zhao Dun was anathema for many traditional commentators. Zhu Xi (Zhuzi yulei 83.2150–51) criticizes the comment as justifying compromises and equivocation. Gu Yanwu (Rizhi lu, 5.112), writing as a Ming loyalist after the Qing conquest, emphasizes loyalty as absolute: “There is no escape from the principle of duty tying ruler and subject together anywhere between heaven and earth. How can one escape from it by crossing the border?” Wang Fuzhi (Chunqiu jia shuo, 218) considers the defense of Zhao Dun “partisan words” (dangci 党詞), evidence that the Zhao lineage played a role is shaping this narrative. Ma Su (Zuozhuan shi wei, 145) maintains that the comment praising Zhao Dun could not have come from Confucius.

44 Heitun became Lord Cheng of Jin. According to Shiji 39.1676, Heitun was Lord Wen’s younger son, and his mother was a Zhou lady. Cf. Guoyu, “Zhou yu 3,” 3.99: “Moreover, I have heard that when Lord Cheng was born, his mother dreamed that the gods drew with ink on his buttocks, saying, ‘He will rule Jin; and three generations later, rulership will be given to Huan’s [Lord Xiang of Jin] grandson.’ That was why he was called Heitun [which means, literally, ‘black buttocks’].”

45 The Martial Temple was the Ancestral Temple of Lord Wu (“martial”) of Quwo at Jiang. All Jin rulers offered sacrifices there upon accession to the throne. See Xi 24.1 (Yang, 1:413–14).

46 See Zhuang 28.2. Noble sons from the lateral branches of the Jin house were already targets even earlier (Zhuang 23.2, 24.3, 25.4, 25.5). That was why lineages related to the ruling house were weaker in Jin, in contradistinction to Lu, Wei, and Song. Many of Lord Wen’s sons were not in Jin: Yong was in Qin, Le served in Chen, and Heitun served in Zhou. See Gu Donggao, “Chunqiu Chu lingyi lun” 春秋楚令尹論, in Chunqiu dashi biao, 2:840.
The assassination of Lord Ling of Jin is followed by an exchange on the issue of guilt. The Annals and Zuozhuan, as well as Gongyang and Guliang, name Zhao Dun as having assassinated his ruler, although according to the narrative in Zuozhuan and Guliang, the actual act was committed by Zhao Chuan. Dong Hu’s record is upheld in the tradition as historical writing that “targets the intention” (zhuxin 訴心). Zhao Dun’s culpability may indeed be inferred from the way he protects the assassin—by making Zhao Chuan instrumental in establishing the new Jin ruler, he protects him from future prosecution. Confucius’ comments add another level of self-conscious deliberation.

On the yichou day (26), Zhao Chuan assassinated Lord Ling at Taoyuan. Zhao Dun returned before leaving the mountains of Jin. The scribe wrote, “Zhao Dun assassinated his ruler,” and showed the record at court. Zhao Dun said, “This was not so.” He replied, “You are the chief minister. Yet fleeing you did not cross the domain border; upon returning you did not chastise the culprit. If you are not responsible, who would be?” Zhao Dun said, “Alas! As it says in the Odes,

I so cherished him  
That I bring sorrow upon myself.42

That describes me indeed!” Confucius said, “Dong Hu was a worthy scribe of ancient times: he did not conceal anything in his rules of writing. Zhao Dun was a worthy high officer of ancient times: he bore a guilty verdict for the sake of those rules. What a pity! Had he crossed the domain border, he would have been absolved.”43

Zhao Dun sent Zhao Chuan to welcome Gongzi Heitun at Zhou and established him as ruler.44 On the renshen day (third day of the tenth month), they offered sacrifices at the Martial Temple.45

Ministerial lineages in Jin, especially the Zhao lineage, continue to rise in importance. Zhao Dun, in his role as the son of a minister’s concubine, takes up a new military office. The lineage gains greater sway under the nominal leadership of Zhao Dun’s half brother Zhao Kuo. An apparently yielding gesture thus increases the power of Zhao Dun and his lineage.

Earlier, with the havoc wrought by Li Ji, there was a punitive oath against maintaining the noble sons within the domain of Jin.46 From that time on, Jin did not have lateral branches of the ruling house in government. When Lord Cheng acceded to his position, he took the primary sons of ministers into service, giving them land and granting them the status of ruling lineages. He also took their remaining sons into service and appointed them as supernumeraries. Sons of ministers’ concubines were made members of the lord’s ranks. Jin thus had ruling lineages, supernumeraries, and lord’s ranks.

LORD XUAN 597
Lord Wen’s daughter, Lady Ji, married Zhao Cui and gave birth to Zhao Tong and Zhao Kuo. Zhao Cui had married Shu Wei, a daughter of the Di tribe, when he followed Chong’er into exile (Xi 23.6). Lady Ji ensured Shu Wei’s return to Jin and made her son, Zhao Dun, Zhao Cui’s heir (Xi 24.1c).

Zhao Dun apparently orchestrates the creation of two parallel hierarchies: the military one (according to which the actual leader of Jin is the commander of the central army) and a less specific one defined by “ruling lineages.”

According to Du Yu (ZZ 21.366), after a bull was chosen through divination for sacrifice, there would be divination about the date, after which that bull became “the sacrificial bull” (sheng 牲). Here the designation of the animal as simply “bull” indicates that the date has not yet been set. Yang (2:667) opines that three or four months elapsed between the first divination and the sacrifice. Here the mouth injury means that the bull could not be used for sacrifice. Cf. Annals, Xi 31.3, Cheng 7.1, Ding 15.2, Ai 1.3.
Lord Xuan requested to have Zhao Kuo made a member of the ruling lineage, saying, “He is the beloved son of the ruler’s daughter Lady Ji. If it were not for Lady Ji, your subject would have remained a man of Di.” The lord assented. In winter, Zhao Dun took charge of the lineage overseeing bannered chariots, and the lord appointed Zhao Kuo, leading the Zhao lineage of old, as a high officer of ruling lineages.

**LORD XUAN 3 (606 BCE)**

**ANNALS**

In the third year, in spring, in the royal first month, the bull designated for the sacrifice in the outskirts was injured in the mouth. We divined about using another bull. That bull died, so we did not perform the sacrifice in the outskirts. Still we performed the sacrifices to the Three Prospects.

King Kuang was buried.

The Master of Chu attacked the Rong of Luhun.

In summer, a Chu leader invaded Zheng.

In autumn, the Red Di invaded Qi.

Song troops laid siege to Cao.

In winter, in the tenth month, on the bingxu day (23), Lan, the Liege of Zheng, died.

Lord Mu of Zheng was buried.

---

50 The term “Three Prospects (Sanwang 三望) is also mentioned in *Annals*, Xi 31.3, Cheng 7.4, and *Zuo zhuan*, Xi 31.3. The prospect (wang 望) sacrifice was offered to mountains and rivers within the purview of the domain. In Ai 6.4c, King Zhao of Chu maintains that “one was not to perform sacrifice beyond one’s purview” (*ji bu yue wang* 祭不越望).

51 King Kuang had died in the tenth month of the previous year; the ritually prescribed interval of seven months between death and burial for Zhou kings (Yin 1.5) was not observed. Du Yu (ZZ 21.366) notes the haste.

52 Recall that Qin and Jin moved the Rong of Luhun to Yichuan thirty-two years earlier (Xi 22.4).

53 The White Di were first mentioned in Xi 33.6. The term “Red Di” appears for the first time here. Liang Qichao (“Chunqiu Yi Man Rong Di kao” 春秋夷蠻戎狄考) opines that terms like “White Di” and “Red Di” signal divisions that eventually weakened the Di.
Yan, in present-day Huaxian in Henan, is identified as the same place as Linyan in Yin 1.11.

According to Huan 2.2, “Even when King Wu conquered Shang and moved the nine cauldrons to the settlement at Luo, there were nonetheless some men of lofty principles who criticized him.” Since the cauldrons are a symbol of legitimate sovereignty, moving them is not to be undertaken lightly. Du Yu (ZZ 21.367) interprets the Chu king’s question as a sign of his ambition to challenge Zhou’s claim to the Mandate of Heaven. The symbolism is also operative in the first entry in Zhanguo ce, “Dong Zhou 1,” 1.1, where Qin seeks the nine cauldrons.

In Mozi 46.389, we are told that the Xia King Qi cast the cauldrons, and the prophecy on their transference from Xia to Shang and from Shang to Zhou is adduced as proof of the existence of the spirits. The Shiji 40.1700 account of this episode refers to “Yu and Xia in their prime” 虞夏之盛, which suggests that the legendary sage-king Yu cast the cauldrons.

Our translation follows Du Yu’s reading (based on Fu Qian) (ZZ 21.367), as well as Ban Gu’s paraphrase of this account (Hanshu 25.1225). Cf. Karlgren, gl. 270: “men from afar depicted various creatures, and submitted metal to the superintendents of the nine domains.”
Zuo

Sacrificial impropriety occurs in Lu. On the treatment of the sacrificial bull, see also Xi 31.2 and the Annals, Ding 15.2.

In the third year, in spring, we did not perform the sacrifice in the outskirts, yet we performed the sacrifices to the prospects. In both cases this was not in accordance with ritual propriety. Sacrifices to the prospects were subordinate to the sacrifice in the outskirts. If we did not perform the sacrifice in the outskirts, then it would be admissible not to perform the sacrifices to the prospects.

Zheng is again caught in the rivalry between Chu and Jin. Because of the covenant sworn here, Chu will invade Zheng.


The confrontation between Chu and the Rong highlights the nuances in the idea of the barbarian. Sometimes described as "the cultural other," Chu here presents itself as the bulwark against barbarian invaders, the Rong of Luhun, who had been moved to the outskirts of Zhou through the maneuvers of Qin and Jin (Xi 22.4). King Zhuang of Chu attacks the Rong but, instead of defending Zhou, seems to question its prerogatives. However, the rhetoric of ritual propriety triumphs in the exchange between a Zhou prince and King Zhuang on the meanings of royal cauldrons.

The Master of Chu attacked the Rong of Luhun, and consequently reached the Luo River. He drilled his troops at the border of Zhou. King Ding sent Wangsun Man to honor the exertions of the Master of Chu. The latter asked about the size and weight of the cauldrons. Wangsun Man replied, "Size and weight depend on virtue, not on the cauldrons. In the past, just when Xia possessed virtue, men from afar depicted various creatures, and the nine superintendents submitted metal, so that cauldrons were cast with images of various creatures. The hundred things were therewith completely set forth, and the people thus knew the spirits and the evil things. That was why when the people entered rivers, marshes, mountains, and forests, they would not meet what could harm them, and the sprites of the hills and waters could not get at them. Thus,
Jiaru, in present-day Henan, is identified as the City of the King (Wangcheng) (Takezoe, 10.20) and thus located in present-day Luoyang City, Henan. King Wu is said to have moved the cauldrons there, and King Cheng is said to have "put them in place" there.

The command of Heaven (tianming) here suggests something preordained, as distinct from its implication of moral imperative in some other passages (e.g., Wen 13.3, Xiang 29.17, Ding 4.3). Since most prophecies in Zuozhuan are accurate—that is, fashioned to fit events that had already transpired at the time of writing—this prediction has been used to date Zuozhuan well before Qin's annihilation of Eastern Zhou in 256 BCE (Yang, 2:671–72). Takezoe (10.20) argues that the span of thirty kings and 700 years refers not to the length of the Zhou reign (which lasted 874 years, with thirty-six kings) but to the time between the cauldrons' being "put in place" (dingding 定鼎) and...
they were able to harmonize with those above and below them and to receive Heaven's blessings. The last Xia king, Jie, possessed dimmed virtue, and the cauldrons were moved to the house of Shang, there to remain for six hundred years. The last Shang king, Zhòu, was violent and tyrannical, and the cauldrons were moved to the house of Zhou. When virtue is bright and resplendent, the cauldrons, though small, are heavy. When virtue is distorted, dimmed, and confused, the cauldrons, though large, are light. Heaven blesses those of bright virtue, giving them the place for realizing and maintaining it. When King Cheng put the cauldrons in place at Jiaru, he divined about the number of generations and got thirty; he divined about the number of years and got seven hundred. This is what Heaven has commanded. Although Zhou virtue is in decline, the heavenly command has not yet changed. The question of whether the cauldrons are light or heavy may not be asked yet.”

In summer, a Chu leader invaded Zheng: the latter had gone over to Jin.

**3.4(4)**

*Internecine struggles pitting groups of descendants of various former dukes against one another in Song, last touched on in Wen 18.8, now involve Cao.*

Three years after the accession of Lord Wen of Song, he put to death his full brother Xu and the sons of Lord Zhao. This was because of the conspiracy of the Wu lineage head. He had the houses of Dai and Huan attack the Wu lineage at the abode of the supervisor of the military Hua Ou and drove out every last member of the houses of Wu and Mu. The latter relied on Cao troops to attack Song. In autumn, Song troops laid siege to Cao in retaliation for the turmoil brought about by the Wu lineage.

---

their sinking in the Si River in 327 BCE. Hong Ye (*Chunjia jingzhuan yinde*, xc–xcii) avers that the story of the sinking of the cauldrons in the Si River is a Han invention, which may indicate that this prophecy or this passage belongs to a later layer of the text. Even if one disagrees with Hong Ye, whatever dating conclusion one draws should pertain to this passage rather than the whole text, once one accepts that *Zuo zhuan* is a sedimented text formed over a long period of accretion.

61 This is the fifth year of the Song Lord Wen’s reign, six years after his accession.
On dreams in Zuozhuan, see Wai-yee Li, “Dreams of Interpretation.”

Bochou is identified in Wang Fu, Qianfu lun, 9.409, as one of the Yellow Emperor’s descendants. According to Jia Kui, Bochou was the ancestor of the Southern Yan (Hong Liangji, Chunqiu Zuozhuan gu, 402). Yan Jí means Jí from Yan, but since she is said to be a lowly concubine, she could not have been the daughter of the Southern Yan ruler.

The Zheng Master is identified as Ziyi, younger brother of Lord Zhao and Lord Wen’s paternal uncle. The impropriety of the relationship is indicated by the word bao 報, which according to Fu Qian (Maoshi-Fu 21B.86) refers to a liaison with a relative’s wife.

See Xi 24.3.

Chu annexed Jiang and might have feared enmity from Gongzi Shi. She was within Chu territories.

See Xi 31.6.

Qun gongzi 群公子 can refer both to his own sons and also to all members of lines of former Zheng rulers.

This harks back to events twenty-four years earlier, when Jin decided to support Lan (Xi 30.3). The narratives in Xi 73 and 33.9 pertain to the fate of Lord Wen’s other sons. The account here in Xuan 3.6 refers to these earlier events but answers new questions as to how Lord Mu became ruler and why he died.

“Lord Millet” (Hou ji 后稷) was the earliest male ancestor of the Zhou ruling house. See Maoshi 245, “Sheng min” 生民, 17A.587. On sacrifices to Lord Millet, see Wen 2.5, Xiang 7.2, Zhao 9.3; Maoshi 275, “Siwen” 思文, 19B.721.
We now learn of the death of Lord Mu of Zheng, followed by a retrospective account of his extraordinary destiny, as announced in a dream to his humble mother and confirmed by his mysterious ties to orchids. This is one of many prophetic dreams in Zuozhuan that feature ancestors (see also Xi 31.5, Cheng 2.3, Zhao 7.15, 17.4, Ai 7.5).

In winter, Lord Mu of Zheng died.

Earlier, Lord Wen of Zheng had a lowly concubine named Yan Ji. She dreamed that a heavenly messenger gave her an orchid with these words, “I am Bochou. I am your ancestor. Let this be your child. As the orchid is the most fragrant flower of the domain, people will take him to themselves and love him, just as they do this flower.” Not long after, Lord Wen saw her, gave her an orchid, and had her serve him. She stated her case: “I am without merit. If I will be so fortunate as to bear a child, others will not believe me. May I presume to use the orchid as proof?” The lord said, “Agreed.” She gave birth to Lord Mu and named him Lan, or “Orchid.”

Lan, Lord Mu of Zheng, survived the turmoil that embroiled his brothers and half brothers and became the ruler of Zheng through Jin support. The seven Mu lineages (Liang, You, Guo, Han, Si, Yin, Feng) that descended from him dominate Zheng politics for the rest of the period covered by Zuozhuan.

Lord Wen had a liaison with the Zheng Master’s wife Chen Gui, and she gave birth to Zihua and Zizang. Zizang was guilty of an offense and fled to Song. Lord Wen induced Zihua to go to Nanli and put him to death there, and he sent brigands to kill Zizang between Chen and Song. Lord Wen also married a woman of Jiang, who gave birth to Gongzi Shi. While he was visiting the court of Chu, the men of Chu poisoned him, and he died upon reaching She. Lord Wen also married a woman of Su, who gave birth to Gongzi Xia and Xiedu Yumi, and the latter died young. The Zheng minister Xie Jia detested Gongzi Xia, and so did Lord Wen. That was why he was not established as heir.

The lord expelled the noble sons. Gongzi Lan fled to Jin and followed Lord Wen of Jin in his military expedition against Zheng. Shi Jiafu said, “I have heard that when the Ji and Ji lineages make a match, their descendants are sure to flourish. ‘Ji’ means an auspicious person; such was the name of the original consort of Lord Millet. Now Gongzi Lan is descended on his mother’s side from the Ji lineage. Perhaps Heaven has opened a way for him. He must become ruler, and his progeny are sure to flourish. If we are the first to receive him, we may in this way win greater favor.” Shi Jiafu, together with Kong Jiangchu and Hou Xuanduo, received him, swore a covenant with him at the Ancestral Temple, and established him as ruler so as to achieve peace with Jin.
穆公有疾，日：「聞死，吾其死乎！吾所以生者。」刈蘭而卒。

春秋

4.1(1) 四年，春，王正月，公及齊侯平莒及郯。莒人不願。公伐莒，取向。
4.2 秦伯稻卒。
4.3(2) 夏，六月乙酉，鄭公子歸生弑其君夷。
4.4 赤狄侵齊。
4.5 秋，公如齊。
4.6 公至自齊。
4.7 冬，楚子伐鄭。

左傳

4.1(1) 四年，春，公及齊侯平莒及郯。莒人不願。公伐莒，取向。非禮也。平國

以禮，不以亂。伐而不治，亂也。以亂平亂，何治之有？無治，何以行禮？
Lord Mu fell ill. He said, “When the orchids die, I will likely die also! I was born because of them.” The orchids were cut and he died.73

**LORD XUAN 4 (605 BCE)**

**ANNALS**

In the fourth year, in spring, in the royal first month, our lord and the Prince of Qi tried to make peace between Ju and Tan. A Ju leader refused. Our lord attacked Ju and took Xiang.74

Dao, the Liege of Qin, died.

In summer, in the sixth month, on the *yìyòu* day (26), Gongzi Guisheng (Zijia) of Zheng assassinated his ruler, Yi.

The Red Di invaded Qi.

In autumn, our lord went to Qi.

Our lord arrived from Qi.

In winter, the Master of Chu attacked Zheng.

**ZUO**

*Lord Xuan of Lu is criticized for attacking Ju after failing to resolve the conflict between the small domains of Ju and Tan.*

In the fourth year, in spring, our lord and the Prince of Qi tried to make peace between Ju and Tan. A Ju leader refused. Our lord attacked Ju and took Xiang. This was not in accordance with ritual propriety. Domains make peace through ritual propriety, not through disorder. Attacking and then failing to establish good order—that is disorder. If one quells disorder with disorder, what good order will there be? Without good order, how can one realize ritual propriety?

---

73 It is not clear whether Lord Mu or someone else cuts the orchids.
74 Ju had occupied the small domain of Xiang long before (see *Annals*, Yin 2.2).
Zuo Tradition

Liu Xiang (Shuoyuan 6.27) cites a comment attributed to Confucius’ disciple Zixia:
“The Annals records rulers not acting like rulers, subject not like subjects, fathers
not like fathers, sons not like sons—all these are not what happened over one day.
There were gradual developments that led to these.” Similar reasoning is found in
Han Feizi 34.717. The same argument on gradual and irreversible development is
used to urge moral vigilance in Zhouyi 1.20.

The text has “the eating finger” (shizhi 食指), which is the name for the index finger
in classical and modern Chinese. It is not clear whether the term predates Zuozhuan
or whether later usage derives from this passage. The story here has given rise to
common idioms such as “the eating finger moves” (shizhi dong 食指動, meaning
“appetite is whetted”) and “to dip one’s finger” (ranzhi 染指, meaning “to interfere
when one should not”).

Jieyuan 解黿 can also be read as “butcher the turtle.”

Wang Yinzhi (Jingyi shuwen, 688) suggests that the word geng 羹 (“stew”) should
follow the word yuan 鱉 (“turtle”).

The Jin minister Han Jue quotes a similar saying in Cheng 17.10.

This entry aims to explain why the Annals mentions only Gongzi Guisheng when
the main instigator of the murder seems to be Gongzi Song. Du Yu (ZZ 21.368)
glosses quan as “authority”: quan buzhu 權不足 means “his authority was insuffi-
cient to quell disorder.” The emphasis on insufficient authority is curious, because
elsewhere Gongzi Guisheng seems to play an important role in Zheng government:
he sends a letter to Jin in 610 BCE (Wen 17.4) protesting Jin demands on Zheng and
leads the Zheng army to victory in the Daji campaign against Song in 607 BCE (Xuan
2.1). We have chosen to gloss quan as “weighing the odds,” the ability to judge a situa-
tion and adapt to exigencies. As in Xuan 2.3, the Annals identifies the most powerful
minister as the person responsible for assassinating the ruler, while Zuozhuan supplies
an anecdote with circumstantial details involving other culprits that necessitates
further exegetical commentary reconciling the two versions.

Reluctance to kill an animal is cited as evidence of compassion and potential desire
to benefit the people in Mencius 1A.7. However, the definition of “benevolence” (ren)
here is somewhat incongruous, based as it is on the comparison of the ruler to an
aging animal that inspires enough pity to be spared slaughter. Alternatively, “benev-
olence” can refer to Lord Ling, who is faulted for failing to act decisively against his
ministers, as in Han Feizi 39.878. Cf. Liu Wenqi, Chunqiu Zuoshi zhuan jiuju zheng,
641.

By this logic both the assassins and the Zheng ruler are faulted in the Annals entry.
Du Yu turns this into one of the “significatory principles” in the Annals (ZZ 3.55,
20.348, 21.369; ZZ-Kong 4.73, 59.1031). As with other categorical statements of this

Zuo Tradition
A turtle dish leads to the assassination of Lord Ling of Zheng. Han Feizi 39.878–79 and the Han collection Shuoyuan 6.27 use this story to illustrate the ruler’s need to be vigilant to stamp out incipient subversion.\(^3\) The Zuo zhuan account, however, seems to blame Lord Ling. The assassin is not unequivocally condemned; he is just said to have failed to “weigh the odds.” It is ironic that despite the earlier prediction that Lord Mu’s progeny will flourish (Xuan 3.6b), his heir does not survive the first year of his reign. The attempt to wrest a “significatory principle” from Lord Ling’s murder also implicitly justifies the assassination of a ruler who “violated the way of rulership.” Similar arguments are found in Mencius 1B.1 and Xunzi 15.317, 18.388–89, although Lord Ling’s misdemeanor does not seem to be on the same par with those of the tyrants Jie and Zhou.

The leaders of Chu presented a large turtle to Lord Ling of Zheng. Gongzi Song and Gongzi Guisheng\(^a\) were about to have an audience with the lord. Gongzi Song’s index finger moved involuntarily.\(^76\) He showed it to Gongzi Guisheng\(^a\) and said, “On other days when my finger did this, I always without fail got to taste something extraordinary.” As they entered, the cook was about to take the turtle apart.\(^77\) They looked at each other and smiled. The lord asked why, and Gongzi Guisheng\(^a\) told him. When the lord had the high officers partake of the turtle,\(^78\) he called Gongzi Song\(^a\) forward but did not give him any. Furious, Gongzi Song\(^a\) dipped his finger into the cauldron, tasted the turtle, and left. The lord was so enraged that he wanted to kill Gongzi Song\(^a\). Gongzi Song\(^a\) plotted with Gongzi Guisheng\(^a\) to act first. Gongzi Guisheng\(^a\) said, “Even with an aging domestic animal, one is reluctant to kill it.\(^79\) How much more so then with the ruler?” Gongzi Song\(^a\) turned things around and slandered Gongzi Guisheng\(^a\). Gongzi Guisheng\(^a\) became fearful and complied with him. In the summer, they assassinated Lord Ling.

The text says, “Gongzi Guisheng of Zheng assassinated his ruler, Yi”: this is because he fell short in weighing the odds.\(^80\) The noble man said, “To be benevolent without martial valor is to achieve nothing.”\(^81\) In all cases when a ruler is assassinated, naming the ruler means that he violated the way of rulership; naming the subject means that the blame lies with him.\(^82\)

The leaders of Zheng wanted to establish Gongzi Quji\(^a\) as ruler.\(^83\) He declined: “If the criterion is merit, then mine does not suffice; if the criterion is natural order, then Gongzi Jian is the oldest.” They thus established Lord Xiang (Gongzi Jian) as ruler.

---

\(^3\) kind, the application is not consistent—in some cases, murdered rulers not criticized as unworthy are named (e.g., Annals, Wen 1.10, 14.9, Ai 14.11).

83 Gongzi Quji, called Ziliang in the text, is the ancestor of the Liang lineage in Zheng. We have chosen to call him by his birth name to avoid confusion with Ziliang of Chu.
That is, Lord Xiang planned to drive out the other sons of Lord Mu (his own brothers and half brothers), sparing Gongzi Quji because he had insisted on yielding accession to Lord Xiang.

The seven lineages of Lord Mu (qi Mu 七穆) continued to dominate Zheng government till the end of the Spring and Autumn era. They are mentioned in Xiang 26.7.

Dou Guwutu (Ziwen), Ziliang’s older brother, was chief minister in Chu from 664 (Zhuang 30.2) to 637 BCE (Xi 23.3).

Dou Jiao’s improper ritual bearing provokes dire predictions from the Lu high officer Shuzhong Huibo in Wen 9.9. This proverb is also cited in Zhao 28.2, when another newborn child is declared evil.

The elimination of the Ruo’ao lineage means that there will be no descendants left to offer sacrifices to its ancestors.

Several other chief ministers served after Dou Guwutu yielded that position and before his son, Dou Ban, assumed it. See Gu Donggao, “Chunqiu Chu lingyin biao 春秋楚令尹表,” in Chunqiu dashi biao 春秋大史表, 2:1814–20.

Liaoyang 轏陽 was in the domain of Chu and was located northwest of present-day Nanyang City 南陽市, Henan.

That is, King Wen, King Cheng, and King Mu.

An alternative reading has King Zhuang stationing his troops by the Zhang River (Yang, 2:681). In the original and the place-name index, this place is called Zhangshi 漳澨, which means “alongside the Zhang River.”

King Zhuang narrowly escapes being hit, since the arrows miss by hitting a little too low and too high, respectively. Karlgren (gl. 276) points out the incongruity of a canopy (ligu 笠毂) on a battlefield and concludes that “these are so many guesses; nothing definite can be known about the ligu.”

King Wen was King Zhuang’s great-grandfather; for King Wen’s conquest of Xi, see Zhuang 14.3.
Lord Xiang was about to drive out the lines descended from Lord Mu, while sparing Gongzi Quji. Gongzi Quji would not permit this. He said, “If the Mu lineages should be preserved, then of course I wish to stay. But if they are to be banished, then all of them should be banished together. Why should I alone stay?” Lord Xiang thus spared them, and all of them became high officers.

Dou Jiao’s rebellion leads to the near-complete extinction of the Ruo’ao line in Chu predicted thirteen years earlier (Wen 9.9). Retrospective accounts of his uncle Dou Guwutu’s prescience, miraculous infancy, and able governance explain the continuation of the line against all odds. The trope of prophecy on the evil nature of a newborn child who will bring about future destruction also appears in Zhao 28.2.

Earlier, the Chu supervisor of the military Ziliang had fathered Dou Jiao. Dou Guwutu said, “He must be put to death! He has the appearance of a bear or a tiger, and the voice of a jackal or a wolf. If he is not put to death, he will certainly destroy the Ruo’ao lineage. The proverb says, ‘The wolf cub is wild at heart.’ This is a wolf—how can he be kept and raised?” Ziliang would not allow this, to the great grief of Dou Guwutu. When Dou Guwutu was about to die, he gathered his kinsmen and said, “If Dou Jiao gains power in government, you should leave quickly, so as not to be overtaken by disaster.” He further wept, “If ghosts seek food, will the ghosts of the Ruo’ao lineage not suffer hunger?”

Upon the death of Chief Minister Dou Guwutu, Dou Ban became chief minister, and Dou Jiao the supervisor of the military. Wei Jia was the overseer of works. He slandered Dou Ban and brought about his death, so that Dou Jiao was made chief minister and he himself was made supervisor of the military. But then Dou Jiao came to hate Wei Jia; with the kinsmen of the Ruo’ao lineage, he imprisoned Wei Jia at Liaoyang and put him to death. Thereafter positioned at Zhengye, he was about to attack the king. The king offered the sons of three former kings as hostages, but he refused and stationed his troops by the edge of the Zhang River. In autumn, on the wuxu day (9) of the seventh month, the Master of Chu and the Ruo’ao lineage fought on the banks of the Gao River. Dou Jiao shot an arrow at the king, which by excessive force flew past the curved pole of his chariot, reached the stand of his war drum, and affixed itself to the metal bells under the drum. He shot again; the arrow flew past the curved pole of the king’s chariot and pierced the ribs of its canopy. The king’s troops retreated in fear. The king sent messengers who circulated among the troops with these words: “When our late ruler King Wen vanquished Xi, he obtained three arrows. Dou Jiao stole two of them, and they have been used up here.” The troops advanced to the drumbeats of war, and thus extinguished the Ruo’ao lineage.
Yun was a small domain mentioned earlier in Huan 11.2.

That is, she told him about their daughter’s liaison and the birth of the “tiger-child.”

According to Du Yu (21.371), Kehuang was the son of Dou Ban. Kehuang’s readiness to brave death while submitting to duty may be compared to the Lu minister Shuzhong Huibo’s decision in Wen 18.5.

Another Chu minister uses these lines to argue that vengeance against one’s ruler is inadmissible. See Ding 4.3.

See Zhuang 30.2, Xi 7.2, 23.3, 27.4. Various early texts emphasize Dou Guwutu’s perspicacity, self-denial, and loyal service to the state; see, e.g., Analects 5.19; Guoyu “Chu yu 2,” 18.573; Zhanguo ce, “Chu 1,” 14.514. The Han historian Ban Gu traces his family’s ancestry to the Ruo’ao lineage, stating that his lineage took their name from Dou Ban. He notes also that ban means “tiger” in the Chu language (Hanshu 100A.4297).

4.3b 初，若敖氏娶於䢵，生鬬伯比。若敖卒，從其母畜於䢵，淫於䢵子之女，生子文焉。䢵夫人使棄諸夢中。虎乳之。䢵子田，見之，懼而歸。夫人以告，遂使收之。楚人謂乳穀，謂虎於菟。故命之曰鬬穀於菟。以其女妻伯比。實為令尹子文。

其孫箴尹克黃使於齊，還及宋，聞亂。其人曰：「不可以入矣。」箴尹曰：「棄君之命，獨誰受之？君，天也，天可逃乎？」遂歸，復命，而自拘於司敗。王思子文之治楚國也，曰：「子文無後，何以勸善？」使復其所，改命曰生。

4.4 冬，楚子伐鄭，鄭未服也。
Place Name Index

Most of the information below has been drawn from Yang Bojun and Xu Ti, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan cidian*. This has been a choice of convenience. Yang’s and Xu’s work, in turn, draws upon a rich tradition of historical geography in China that culminates in the Qing with such works as Gao Shiqi (1645–1703), *Chunqiu diming kaolue*, and Jiang Yong (1681–1762), *Chunqiu dili kaoshi*. In preparing the index, we have also drawn upon Shen Shu (1702–30), *Chunqiu Zuozhuan fenguo tudiming*, to help determine the domain in which a place was located and occasionally Tan Qixiang, ed., *Zhongguo lishi ditu ji*, vol. 1. While the effort to locate the places mentioned in the *Annals* and *Zuozhuan* has resulted in an immense body of scholarship, many problems remain. We indicate when the location of a particular place is unknown (Unk) or seriously problematic (P).

We typically provide the name of the domain in which a particular place is located. If the place is a river, mountain, or domain (dom), we have so indicated. Otherwise, the place is a settlement. We have next given an indication of the location of the ancient place by reference to a modern place. In the case of domains, we have, where known, additionally provided the clan name of the ruling family (CN). This is important information because in ancient China the strict practice of exogamy means that clan names have important implications for marriage and thus influence relationships between domains. Finally, we list passages in the text where the place name appears, marking references to the *Annals* (Chunqiu) with (C). References to certain domains are so numerous, however, that in such cases we list only the first passage in the text where that domain name appears. Entries for place names that appear in the maps in this volume include a reference to the relevant map. Whenever several places are known by the same Chinese name—that is, by the same Chinese character(s)—they are numbered successively to facilitate cross-referencing.
ABBREVIATIONS

C  Annals (Chunqiu)
cap  capital
CN  clan name
Co  county (xian 縣)
dom  domain (guo 國, often translated by others as “state”)
E, W, N, S, NE, etc.  east, west, north, south, northeast, etc.
P  location problematic
Unk  location unknown

Ai  艾. Qi. SW of Xintai Co 新泰縣, Shandong. Yin 6.2(C), 63, 73; Huan 15.5.
Ailing 艾陵. Qi. E of Laiwu Co 萊蕪縣, Shandong. Ai 11.3(C), 11.3.
Anfu 安甫. Unk. Ding 10.10.
Ao 敖. A place along the coast of modern Zhejiang. Ai 19.2.

Ba  巴. Dom, CN Ji 姬. Near Xiangfan City 襄樊市, Hubei. Huan 9.2; Zhao 9.3.
Baiyu 白羽. Xu. Same place as Xi 析. W of Xixia Co 西峽縣, Henan. Zhao 18.5(C), 18.3, 18.7.
Banquan 阪泉. E of Zhoulu Co 深鹿縣, Hebei. Xi 25.2.
Bao 暴 / Baosui 暴隧. Zhou, then Zheng. W of Yuanyang Co 原陽縣, Henan. Wen 8.5(C); Cheng 15.3.
Beidian 邳殿. Qi. NW of Changyi Co 昌邑縣, Shandong. Xiang 28.11; Zhao 1.2; Ding 1.1.
Beilin 北林 / Feilin 斐林. Zheng. N of Xinzeng Co 新鄭縣, Henan. Xuan 1.8, 1.10; Xiang 11.3.
Beng 禿. Zheng, then Lu. E of Fei Co 費縣, Shandong. Yin 8.2(C), 8.2; Huan 1.1, 1.2.
Bi 鯀. Zheng. NE of Xingyang Co 濟陽縣, Henan. Xuan 12.3(C), 12.2, 13.4, 14.2; Cheng 2.6, 3.1, 16.5; Zhao 5.4, 5.8.
Bi 蕭. Dom, CN Ji 姬. NW of Xi’an City 西安市, Shaanxi. Xi 24.2; Zhao 9.3.
Bi 費. Lu. SW of Yutai Co 魯臺縣, Shandong. Xi 1.6; Xiang 7.4(C), 7.3; Zhao 12.1, 13.1(C), 13.1, 14.2, 21.3, 25.6, 31.2, 32.4; Ding 5.4, 12.5(C), 12.2. See map 2.
Bian 卞. Lu. E of Sishui Co 泗水縣, Shandong. Xi 17.3(C), 17.4; Xiang 15.4, 29.4; Zhao 25.6.

Bihua 貉滑. An alternate name for the domain Hua 滑 (see Hua [2]). The capital of Hua was located at Bi 貉, the latter to be distinguished from the place of the same name in Shandong. Cheng 13.3; Xiang 18.4.

Bipu 比蒲. Lu. Unk. Zhao 11.6(C), 11.3; Ding 13.3(C), 14.13.

Biyang 傕陽. Dom, CN Yun 妘, taken by Jin, then given to Song. S of Yi Co 嶧縣, Shandong. Xiang 10.11(C), 10.2.


Bo 栢. Dom. SE of Wuyang Co 舞陽縣, Henan. Xi 5.7.


Bo 博. Qi. SE of Taian Co 泰安縣, Shandong. Ai 11.3.

Bo 濮. Song. N of Shangqiu City 商丘市, Henan. Xi 21.7(C), 21.3; Ai 14.4.


Boju 柏(柏)舉. Chu. NW of Macheng Co 麻城縣, Hubei. Ding 4.3, 5.5; Ai 1.1, 1.6. See map 4.


Bugeng 不羮. Chu. Two small regions: East Bugeng is just north of Wuyang 舞陽縣, Henan, and West Bugeng is southeast of Xiangcheng Co 襄城縣, Henan. Zhao 11.10, 12.1, 13.2.


Cao 曹 (1). Dom, CN Ji 姬. Cap Taoqiu 陶丘. SW of Dingtao Co 定陶縣, Shandong. Huan 5.9(C) passim. Later absorbed by Song. Ai 14.7(C), 14.9(C), 14.4. See map 2.

Cao 曹 (2). Wei. SW of Hua Co 滑縣, Henan. Huan 14.1.


Chan 闡. Lu. NE of Ningyang Co 寧陽縣. Ai 8.3(C), 8.7(C), 8.3, 8.7, 15.4, 17.7.


Changge 長葛. Zheng. NE of Changge Co 長葛縣, Henan. Also known as Xuge 繹葛. Yin 5.8(C), 5.10, 6.5(C).

Changjian 昌問. Lu. In Sishui Co 泗水縣, Shandong. Zhao 22.3(C).


Changyan 昌衍. Lu. SE of Qufu Co 曲阜縣, Shandong. Xi 29.1.


Chanyuan 滬濱. Wei, then Jin. NW of Puyang Co 濮陽縣, Henan. Xiang 20.2(C), 20.2, 26.5(C), 26.7, 30.9(C), 30.12.

Chao 巢 (1). Dom, passed back and forth between Chu and Wu. Wen 12.4(C), 12.3; Cheng 7.5, 17.11; Xiang 25.10(C), 25.12, 26.10, 31.9; Zhao 4.7, 5.8, 24.6(C), 24.9, 25.1; Ding 2.2. See map 4.


Chaoqiu 朝丘. Lu. NE of Ningyang Co 宁陽縣, Shandong. Huan 6.2(C), 6.3; Zhuang 30.2(C); Xiang 15.3(C), 15.4(C), 15.5, 16.8(C), 16.4; Zhao 7.5, 26.4; Ding 8.1, 12.10(C), 12.11(C), 12.2; Ai 14.6, 15.1(C), 15.1, 15.4. See map 4.

Cheng 成 (also Cheng 鄴). Lu. NE of Ningyang Co 寧陽縣, Shandong. Huan 6.2(C), 6.3; Zhuang 30.2(C); Xiang 15.3(C), 15.4(C), 15.5, 16.8(C), 16.4; Zhao 7.5, 26.4; Ding 8.1, 12.10(C), 12.11(C), 12.2; Ai 14.6, 15.1(C), 15.1, 15.4. See map 4.

Cheng 鄴. Small dom SE of Pu Co 濮縣, Shandong. Yin 5.3(C), 5.6, 10.5(C), 10.4; Zhuang 8.3(C), 8.2; Xi 24.2; Wen 11.6, 12.1.

Cheng 橈. Song. See Luo 潷. Xi 1.7(C).

Chengchuo 城鉧. Song, then Wei. E of Huaxian 滑縣, Henan. Ai 11.6, 25.1, 26.3.


Chengfu 城父 (1). Chu. SE of Bo Co 亳縣, Anhui. Zhao 9.2, 30.3


Chengkou passes 城口. Chu. Collective name of the three passes Dasui 大隧, Zhiyuan 直轅, and Ming'e 冥阨. Ding 4.3.

Chengkuang 承匡. Song. Wu 11.2(C), 11.2; Xiang 30.3.

Chengpu 城濮. Wei. Same as modern Linpu Cheng 臨濮城 in Fan Co 范縣, Shandong. Zhuang 27.7(C); Xi 28.5(C), 28.3, 28.6; Wen 10.3; Xuan 12.5; Cheng 2.3; Xiang 8.8, 25.10; Zhao 5.4, 5.8. See map 2.


Chengzhou 成周. Zhou. Eastern cap of Zhou. E of Loyang City 洛陽市, Henan. Yin 3.3; Zhuang 20.1; Xi 24.2; Xuan 16.2(C), 16.2; Zhao 24.8, 26.7(C), 26.9, 32.5(C), 32.3; Ding 1.1. See map 3.


Chengzhou 成周. Zhou. Eastern cap of Zhou. E of Loyang City 洛陽市, Henan. Yin 3.3; Zhuang 20.1; Xi 24.2; Xuan 16.2(C), 16.2; Zhao 24.8, 26.7(C), 26.9, 32.5(C), 32.3; Ding 1.1. See map 3.


Chi 衿. Song. Su Co 宿縣, Henan. Huan 15.10(C), 15.7.


Chong 重. Lu. NW of Yutai Co 魁臺縣, Shandong. Xi 31.1.

Personal Name Index

In each entry below, the only name or the main name by which a person is known in the translation is listed first. Following this, we provide the domain or ethnic group to which the person belongs and additionally note if the person is a woman (W) or a ruler (R). For women born into one domain and marrying into another and for ministers or officers whose careers span two domains, we provide both domain names. When known, we have also given the lineage to which each person belongs. In cases where a person has multiple names or titles, these are listed next. Such cases are of two types. The first type includes persons with alternative names that are either self-evident or of not high importance. In these cases, we have preserved the alternative names in the translation and introduce them in the index by “also.” (This pertains, for example, to persons whose change of status necessitates different designations, as in the case of Chong’er, who became Lord Wen of Jin, or Gongzi Wei, who became King Ling of Chu.) The second type includes those persons whose alternative names have been regularized in the translation to accord with the head name in the index entry below. The alternative names following the head name are preceded by the letters a, b, c, d, etc. As explained in the introduction, when a person is designated in the Chinese text by one of these alternative names, in our translation we have used the head name listed below and then have added a superscript a, b, c, d, etc. after the regularized name to indicate which alternative name that name is replacing. Rulers of domains have typically been indexed under their titles and posthumous names (e.g., “Lord Huan of Lu”), with some cross-referencing provided for other names by which they are commonly known in Zuo-zhuan. We have also sometimes used the title of a person as the head name in the index if the name of the person is a single Chinese character or the person appears in only one or two places (e.g., Scribe Su 史蘇, Lady Jiang 姜氏, Ritual Officer Qu 宗人區). Such rules are difficult to apply with absolute consistency, and we have attempted to use cross-references for problematic cases.
In the listings of the passages where the names occur we have marked references to the *Annals* (Chunqiu) with (C).

Three works have been particularly helpful in preparing this index: Gu Donggao, *Chunqiu dashi biao*; Fang Xuanchen, “Zuozhuan renwu minghao yanjiu”; and Yang Bojun and Xu Ti, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan cidian*.

**Ai Jiang** 哀姜 (d. 660). Lu (W). Daughter of a Qi ruler. Wife of Lord Zhuang of Lu. Lover of Gongzi Qingfu. Also Lord Zhuang’s wife Lady Jiang 夫人姜氏, Lord Zhuang’s wife 夫人氏. Zhuang 24.5(C), 24.2; Min 2.4(C), 2.3; Xi 1.5(C), 1.7, 2.2(C), 8.3.

**Ai Jiang** 哀姜. Lu (W). Daughter of a Qi ruler. Wife of Lord Wen of Lu. Also Jiang 姜, Lady Jiang 姜氏. Wen 4.2(C), 4.4, 9.2(C), 9.5(C), 18.7(C), 18.6.

**Ai, Liege of Northern Yan.** See Lord Jian of Yan.

**Aide Bi** 徒人費 (d. 686). Qi. Also Bi 費. Zhuang 8.3.

**Ancestral Attendant Xin Xia** 宗人釁夏. Lu. Ai 24.3.

**Ao of Youguo** 有過澆. Legendary figure of antiquity. Also Ao 濆. Xiang 4.7; Ai 1.2.


**Bai Yi** 白乙. Qin. a. Bai Yibing 白乙丙. Xi 32.3, 33.3.

**Baili** 百里. Xū. Yin 11.3.

**Baili** 百里. Yu/Qin. Xi 13.4.

**Ban, Liege of Cao.** See Lord Zhao of Cao.

**Ban, Lord of Shen.** See Dou Ban.

**Ban, Prince of Cai.** See Lord Ling of Cai.

**Bao, Duke of Song.** See Lord Wen of Song.

**Bao, Master of Hu** 胡子豹. Hu. Also Master of Hu 胡子. Ding 4.2(C), 15.3(C), 15.2.

**Bao, Prince of Chen.** See Lord Huan of Chen.


**Beigong Kuo** 北宮括. Wei. First person of the Beigong lineage of Wei men-
tioned in Zuozhuan. Descendant of King Cheng of Wei. a. Beigong Yizi 北宮懿子, b. Yizi 懿子. Cheng 17.1(C); Xiang 9.5, 14.3(C), 14.3.


Beiguo Qi 北郭啟. Qi. Zhao 22.1.


Bi Wan 卜萬. Jin. Ancestor of the Wei 魏 lineage. Min 1.6; Ai 2.3.

Bi Wucun 比無存 (d. 501). Qi. Ding 9.4.


Biao, Prince of Jin. See Lord Ping of Jin.

Biao Xi 彪徯. Wei. Zhao 32.3; Ding 1.1.

Bin Hua 賓滑. Zhou. Zhao 9.3.


Bing Chu 邉歜. Qi. Also Chu 歜. Wen 18.2.

Bing Shi 邱師. Jin. Xiang 21.5.

Bing Shi 邱師 (d. 548). Qi. Xiang 25.2.

Bing Xia 邱夏. Qi. Cheng 2.3.


Bing Yizi 邱意茲. Qi. Ding 13.1; Ai 6.5.


Bo 伯. Song. Huang lineage. Older brother of Huang Feiwo.

Bo Fu 伯服 (d. 771). Zhou. Son of King You of Zhou and Bao Si. Xi 24.2.

Bo Hu 伯虎. Wen 18.7.

Bo Ji 伯姬. Jin/Lù (W). Sister of Lord Jing of Jin. Wife of Ying’er, Master of Lù. Xuan 15.3. (Bo Ji, which means the oldest daughter with the Ji clan name, is used to refer to several aristocratic women in Zuozhuan; see names listed below.)

Bo Ji 伯姬. Lu/Ji (W). Daughter of Lord Hui of Lu. Wife of the Ji ruler. Yin 2.6; Zhuang 4.2(C), 4.5(C).

Bo Ji. Jin/Qin (W). See Mu Ji of Qin.

Bo Ji. Lu/Song (W). See Gong Ji.
Bo Ji of Qi 杞伯姬. Lu/Qi (W). Daughter of Lord Zhuang of Lu. Wife of Lord Cheng of Qi. Also Bo Ji 伯姬. Zhuang 25.4(C), 27.1(C), 27.4; Xi 5.2(C), 9.3(C), 28.13(C).


Bo Ji of the Dang lineage 蕩伯姬. Lu/Song (W). Daughter of Gongzi Dang or another person from the Dang lineage in Song. Xi 25.3(C).

Bo lineage head 伯氏. Song. Xiang 9.1.


Bo Zhouli 伯州犁 (d. 541). Jin/Chu. Son of Bo Zong. Also grand steward Bo Zhouli 大宰伯州犁. grand steward 大宰. Cheng 15.5, 16.5; Xiang 26.6; Zhao 1.3, 1.13; Ding 4.3.


Bo Zong 伯宗 (d. 576). Jin. First person of the Bo lineage of Jin mentioned in Zuozhuan. Xuan 15.2, 15.3; Cheng 5.4, 6.4, 15.5.


Bofen 伯奮. Son of the legendary Gaoxin lineage. Wen 18.7.


Boming Lord Han 伯明后寒. Legendary figure of antiquity. Boming was the name of an ethnic group during the legendary Xia dynasty (R). Xiang 4.7.


Boxi 伯戲. Legendary figure of antiquity. Zhao 3.3.

Boyin 伯因. Legendary figure of antiquity. Xiang 4.7.


Bu Zhao 步招. Jin. Wen 7.4.

Buku 不窟. Legendary figure of antiquity. One of the ancestors of Zhou. Wen 2.5.

Buyin, Lord of Hu. See Lord Hu.

Cai Ji 蔡姬. Cai/Qi (W). Sister of Lord Mu of Cai. Wife of Lord Huan of Qi. Xi 3.5, 17.5.


Cai Shu 蔡叔. Son of King Wen of Zhou. Younger brother of King Wu and the Zhou Duke. Ancestral ruler of Cai. Xiang 21.5; Zhao 1.7; Ding 4.1.


Cai Zhao 蔡朝. Qi. Xuan 17.1, 18.1.