

JOURNAL OF ASIAN HISTORY

EDITED BY

DOROTHEE SCHAAB-HANKE AND ACHIM MITTAG

51 (2017) 1

HARRASSOWITZ VERLAG · WIESBADEN

Editors / Contact:

Dorothee Schaab-Hanke (Großheirath): DSchaab-Hanke@t-online.de

Achim Mittag (Tübingen): achim.mittag@uni-tuebingen.de

International Advisory Board:

Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Behr (Zuerich), Prof. Dr. Timothy Brook (British Columbia),

Prof. Dr. Christopher Cullen (Cambridge), Prof. Dr. Roderich Ptak (Munich),

Prof. Dr. Nicolas Standaert (Leuven), Prof. Dr. Barend Jan Terwiel (Hamburg)

The *Journal of Asian History* is a refereed journal.

Zugang zur elektronischen Version / Access to electronic format

Diese Zeitschrift kann auch in elektronischer Form über JSTOR (www.jstor.org) bezogen werden.

This journal can also be accessed electronically via JSTOR (www.jstor.org).

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2017

This journal, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright. Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

Copyediting and phototypesetting: Martin Hanke, Großheirath

Language editing: Markus Conley

Printing and binding by Hubert & Co., Göttingen

Printed on permanent / durable paper

Printed in Germany

www.harrassowitz-verlag.de

ISSN 0021-910X

Contents

Articles

- Maddalena BARENGHI*, Ancestral Sites and Lineages of the Later Tang (923–936) and the Later Jin (936–947) Dynasties According to the Song Sources 1
- Ma Guang* 馬光, Tributary Ceremony and National Security: A Reassessment of *Wokou* Diplomacy between China and Japan during the Early Ming Dynasty 27
- Eugene Y. PARK*, Dynastic Change and Politicide in Early Modern Korea: The Chosŏn Persecution of the Koryŏ Wang, 1392–1413 55
- CHO Hung-guk* 조흥국 (趙興國), The 1592 Japanese Invasion of Korea and Diplomacies of Siam and China 87
- Alexander K. NEFĚDKIN*, War and Peace in the Bering Strait (in the 18th and First Half of the 19th Centuries) 103
- David KIM*, Australian Female Volunteerism in Modern Korea (1889–1941): An Enlightenment Campaign 145

Reviews of Books

- Shi Ping 时平, ed. *Haixia liang'an Zheng He yanjiu wenji* 海峡两岸郑和研究文集 (Roderich Ptak) 171
- Jeong Moon-soo [鄭文洙] et al., eds. *The Maritime Silk Road and Seaport Cities* (Roderich Ptak) 177
- George Bryan Souza and Jeffrey Scott Turley, eds. *The Boxer Codex: Transcription and Translation of an Illustrated Late Sixteenth-Century Spanish Manuscript Concerning the Geography, History and Ethnography of the Pacific, South-East and East Asia* (Manel Ollé) 182

Ancestral Sites and Lineages of the Later Tang (923–936) and the Later Jin (936–947) Dynasties According to the Song Sources*

Maddalena Barengi**

Introduction

Ouyang Xiu 歐陽修 (1007–1072) opens the chapter “Sitian kao” 司天考 (Treatise on Astronomy) of the *Xin Wudai shi* 新五代史 (New History of the Five Dynasties) with the following statement:

“Alas! As far as the documentation on the rites and music of the Five Dynasties is concerned, I won’t use it. May those of future generations who want to learn about it not be able to do so because of its loss!”¹

The *Xin Wudai shi* clearly does not leave room for a treatise on rites and music, and Ouyang Xiu further advocates that the records on rituals be lost, so that future generations would be prevented from regarding them as historical precedents.² Ouyang Xiu would have probably succeeded in his intent if not for the revived interest of eighteenth-century scholars in those records, along with the recovery of the *Jiu Wudai shi* 舊五代史 (Old History of the Five

* I want to express my thanks to the anonymous reader for his valuable insights and suggestions. I also would like to thank the editors for their careful reading and editing of the final version of the manuscript. This paper has been finalized with the help of a grant awarded by the Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation for International Scholarly Exchange for one year of postdoctoral studies at the Institute of Sinology, LMU (Munich). I thank the Foundation for the generous financial support.

** Maddalena Barengi is currently Research Assistant at the Department of History, University of Salzburg. She can be reached at maddalena.barengi@sbg.ac.at.

1 *Xin Wudai shi* 58.669: 嗚呼！五代禮樂文章，吾無取焉。其後世有欲知之者，不可以遺也。

2 The *Xin Wudai shi* contains only two monographic treatises: the “Sitian kao” (ch. 58–59) and the “Zhifang kao” 職方考 (Treatise on Administrative Geography, ch. 60). In the introduction to the Treatise on Rites and Music (“Liyue zhi” 禮樂志) of the *Xin Tang shu* 新唐書, Ouyang Xiu presents his view of the history of rites from high antiquity as a path of decline. In this treatment, the Five Dynasties period is represented as the nadir of this decline, thus its ritual system ought not to be recorded (*Xin Tang shu* 11/307ff; for a partial translation of the introduction see Bol 1992, 195f).

Dynasties).³ Indeed, a rather different attitude towards the documentation on rites can be detected in the late tenth-century institutional histories.

While some attention has been given to these early Song sources, very little research has been done on the documentation on ritual matters such as the system of ancestral worship. In the present article I intend to explore some aspects of this system that exemplify the shifting perspectives of the Song on ancestral worship. Most of the information on ancestral worship preserved in late tenth- and early eleventh-century institutional histories concerns two of the five Northern dynasties: the Shatuo 沙陀 Turk Hou Tang 後唐 (Later Tang, 923–936) and the Hou Jin 後晉 (Later Jin, 936–947). It is thus with these two dynasties that the present essay will chiefly deal. I will focus on two specific matters concerning the number of ancestral tablets and the location of the shrines. The memorials presented by court ceremonialists that will be considered below may be found in the *Wudai huiyao* 五代會要 (Essentials of the Five Dynasties), the first institutional history on the period compiled under the supervision of Wang Pu 王溥 (922–982) and Fan Zhi 范質 (911–964) in the early Song period,⁴ as well as in the Treatise on Rites of the *Jiu Wudai shi*.⁵ I will draw my material mainly from the chapters of the *Wudai huiyao* concerning the system of state ceremonies and the imperial ancestral temples, “Miao yi” 廟儀, “Miao zhidu” 廟制度 and “Dixia” 禘祫. The memorials are collected chronologically for each of the three. Scant information is provided with regard to the frequency of the performance of ritual sacrifices. The memorials are also preserved, with some variants, in the *Cefu yuangui* 冊府元龜 (Primary Guide to the Records Office), a huge historical-political encyclopedia compiled between 1005 and 1013.

As a comparison, I will consider the narratives on ancestral rituals found in historical records dating to the eleventh century. Despite the ban on the rites of the Five Dynasties, some entries concerning the relocation of the temples can be found in the biographical section of

3 For some remarks on the use of *xin* and *jiu* (“new history” and “old history” see Sung 2016, 361, n. 5).

4 Following the model of the *huiyao* compiled in the Tang period, the *Wudai huiyao* is a collection of documents in thirty chapters in which the material is arranged according to straightforward institutional criteria, yet unlike other histories of institutions, it lacks overt editorialization. The division into topic-oriented sections limits the narrative of events to a bare chronology of the facts. Very little information exists on the transmission of the *Wudai huiyao* from the Southern Song period to the Qing period. The Song sources occasionally refer to the text as *Wudai shi*, creating some confusion with the *Jiu Wudai shi*; see for instance *Junzhai dusbu zhi jiaozheng* 6/260, amended by Huang Pilie 黃丕烈 (1763–1825). After the Song period, the *Wudai huiyao* is not mentioned in any bibliographical catalogues of the official dynastic histories until the Qing period (*Siku quanshu zongmu tiyao*, 81/694). The text almost fell into oblivion after the eleventh century, until its reprint in the nineteenth century. On the *Wudai huiyao* see also Twitchett 1992, 114.

5 According to Wang (1957, 3) and Chen (2005, 1–82), eight out of twelve treatises of the *Jiu Wudai shi*, including the “Treatise on Rites”, were fully recovered from the *Yongle dadian* 永樂大典.

the *Xin Wudai shi*. As for the comprehensive chronological history compiled by Sima Guang 司馬光 (1019–1086), the *Zizhi tongjian* 資治通鑑 (Comprehensive Mirror to Aid in Government), this work devotes only terse entries to matters concerning the early tenth-century ritual system. The *Zizhi tongjian kaoyi* 資治通鑑考異 (henceforth *Kaoyi*), the critical commentary compiled by Sima Guang and appended to his chronicle, offers some insights into the way the sources were selected. Understanding how the *Zizhi tongjian* approaches the matter of ancestral rituals is a main concern of this study.

Historical Precedents

Since Han times, ancestral rites established the royal lineage and were the basis for the institutional policies concerning imperial kin and mourning rules. The detailed procedures of the rituals on which court officials were called to debate, i. e. the number of rooms and of spirit tablets to be included, the system of deposition and the number of sacrifices to be performed each year, were important for the court's definition and limitation of privileges and material support for the royal clansmen on the basis of the degree of their ritual relationship with the ancestors.⁶

From the end of the third century through the succeeding dynasties, the interpretation provided by Zheng Xuan 鄭玄 (127–200) in his commentary to the “Wangzhi” 王制 (King's Regulations) chapter of the *Liji* 禮記 (Book of Rites) and its political implications would be the basis for discussion in any court debate concerning the system of ancestral temples. The *tianzi qimiao* 天子七廟 (Seven Halls of the Son of Heaven) canon presented there essentially limited the number of spirit tablets of the imperial ancestors to seven for each emperor. Zheng Xuan envisaged a system that referred back to the Zhou lineage (*zong* 宗). He established a room for the Great *zu*-ancestor (*taizu* 太祖), or Great Founder, and two for the two Great Ancestors (*er tiao* 二祧), and four rooms for the spirit tablets of the ancestors back to the fourth generation, the *qinmiao* 親廟. Accordingly, the spirit tablets of the Great Founder and the two Ancestors were not to be replaced, while in the case of the four ancestors of the *qinmiao*, as a new ancestor was added, an older one had to be replaced and moved to a separate room.⁷

6 This complex system is known as *zhaomu* 昭穆, namely “the positioning of shrines or ancestral tablets in generational sequence with provision for removal after the passage of a specified period of time” (Loewe 1998, 93).

7 According to Zheng Xuan, the canon of the Zhou dynasty included a separate hall for Taizu (Hou Ji 后稷) and two halls for the Great Ancestors (king Wen and king Wu), who were never to be deposed, plus the ancestors back to the fourth generation (Gaozu 高祖) of the *qinmiao*. The Shang instead had a system of temples with six halls and the Xia a system of temples with five. See *Liji zhengyi*, 382ff.

Beyond the question of the interpretation of the classical texts at the basis of Zheng Xuan's systematization, the Eastern Han reformist aimed at limiting the ancestors of the direct imperial blood lineage to the fourth generation. The main issue at stake was the demotion of the tablets, i. e. which spirit tablets could be removed from the temple and which were never to be removed. The establishment of new rules for the ancestral temples arose from institutional urgencies: the need to reduce the burden of this ever growing and costly apparatus, along with the control of the central government over the numerous branches of the royal clan. Attempts at reforming the ritual system had already been undertaken during the Western Han period, yet it was only in the Eastern Han period that the need for canonical rules for ritual and sacrificial matters had become particularly pressing.⁸ Guangwu 光武 (r. 25–57) initially established two ancestral temples in Luoyang: one for the spirit tablets of the five Former Han emperors and a *huangkao miao* 皇考廟 for the ancestral cult of his biological parents.⁹ The latter was later dismantled and moved outside the capital. From 43 CE onwards, only a single temple in which all the spirit tablets of the ancestors were worshipped existed in Luoyang. Guangwu's choice would become an historical precedent for later imperial courts.¹⁰ Later on, Mingzong 明宗 (r. 57–75) ordered the construction of an ancestral temple for the spirit tablet of Guangwu and bestowed upon him the title of Shizu 世祖.¹¹ As he had commanded, Mingzong's spirit tablet was placed in a hall in his father's shrine. Mingzong's case immediately became an historical precedent and, in like manner, the ensuing emperors were placed within the same temple. In this way, by the time of Emperor Zhang 章 (r. 75–88), Luoyang hosted two shrines: one for the spirit tablets of the Western Han emperors and one for those of the Eastern Han emperors. This "communal" system of ancestral cult worship was, as Kenneth Brashier describes it, "in part a strengthening of the lineage's corporate identity through both its shrine and its sacrificial rituals."¹²

From that time onward, during the reigns of the succeeding emperors the system of the ancestral cult kept growing and the number of tablets never fell below seven, as denounced by Cai Yong 蔡邕 (132–192) in his *Zongmiao diehui yi* 宗庙迭毁议.¹³ After the Han, the solution Wang Su 王肅 (195–256) devised in contrast to that of Zheng Xuan was probably meant to be more pragmatic. Wang rejected the distinction between *qinmiao* and the two Great Ancestors as not conforming to the canon; instead he proposed a different interpreta-

8 On the development of the ancestral cult in the Han period see also Brashier 2011, 102–183.

9 *Hou Han shu* 30/3193.

10 Brashier 2011, 48 and 152f.

11 Mansvelt Beck 1990, 20f and 106.

12 Brashier 2011, 155.

13 Brashier 2011, 176f.

tion that plausibly suited the political needs of his time better and envisaged a *qinmiao* that extended back to the sixth generation of ancestors of the imperial lineage. He thus stood for a system that provided a separate hall for the Great Founder and six halls for the ancestors (*san zhao san mu* 三昭三穆). The fact that practically no permanent halls for Taizu were established in the succeeding dynasties and all six spirit tablets could be removed in order to make room for new ones meant that royal clan status was to be defined by the mourning relation to the ancestor and that this status was limited to a certain degree of relation.¹⁴

The system of ancestral temples that developed through the assimilation of the canon handed down by Wang Su substantiated the definition of clan status according to the degree of relationship with the ancestor, and thus enhanced the relevance of close blood kinship. In the following centuries the emperors would order officials and ceremonialists to engage in debate in order to find textual evidence in support of one of the two interpretations of the canon.¹⁵ The succeeding emperors, under pressure to carry out their own political agendas, did not keep the number below the canonical limit of seven; the number rose to eleven in the

14 In support of his interpretation, Wang Su quotes the chapters “Li qi” 禮器 (Rites in the Formation of Character) and “Jifa” 祭法 (Rules for the Sacrifices) in the *Liji*, in which the canonical arrangement and rituals of the *tianzi qimiao* are described in a slightly different way. According to the text, the imperial ancestral temple included a *kao miao* 考廟 (father), a *wangkao miao* 王考廟 (grandfather), a *huangkao miao* 皇考廟 (great-grandfather), a *xiankao miao* 顯考廟 (great-great-grandfather) and a *zukai miao* 祖考廟 to be offered ritual sacrifices every month, plus the *er tiao*, the two sixth-generation ancestors (*Liji zhengyi*, 1300–1303). The formation of the Tang principle of the five mourning relations (*wufu* 五服) for the control of the royal family clan can be seen as a direct consequence of Wang Su’s reform.

15 In his first year of rule, Li Yuan 李淵 (Gaozu, r. 618–626) built an ancestral temple for the spirit tablets of his four ancestors: his father, Li Bing 李昉, was bestowed with the honorific title of Yuan Huangdi 元皇帝 and with the posthumous name of Shizu 世祖; his grandfather Li Hu 李虎 with the title of Jing Huangdi 景皇帝 and the posthumous name of Taizu 太祖; and his two ancestors of the third and fourth generation, Li Tianci 李天錫 and Li Xi 李, with the titles of king Xi 懿王 and Xuanjian gong 宣簡公 respectively. As the number of seven had not yet been reached, Taizu’s spirit tablet was included in the *qinmiao*, and the room for the Founder eliminated (*Jiu Tang shu* 25/941). During the reign of Li Shimin 李世民 (Taizong 太宗, r. 626–649), Kong Yingda 孔穎達 (574–648) edited the *Liji Zhengyi* 禮記正義 (The Correct Meaning of the Memoires of Rites), a sub-commentary to Zheng Xuan’s commentary of the *Liji*. The canon established an authoritative interpretation of the *tianzi qimiao* based on the system of Wang Su. Li Shimin followed Kong Yingda’s advice (or more likely, Kong Yingda conformed to the emperor’s wish of creating an eminent pre-imperial clan history). Upon the death of emperor Gaozu in 630, his spirit tablet was included in the *qinmiao* according to his wishes. Moreover, in order to reach the number of six spirit tablets, the spirit tablet of Li Zhong’er 禮重耳 (Li Xi’s father) was included in the *qinmiao* as that of the sixth ancestor (*Liji zhengyi*, 383f; *Jiu Tang shu* 25/942). On the opinion expressed by Kong Yingda on the system of ancestral temples see *Liji zhengyi*, 384.

last years of the Tang dynasty.¹⁶ Moreover, during the reign of Xuanzong 玄宗 (r. 712–756), the administration of the system of Imperial Ancestral Temples, traditionally supervised by the Taichang si 太常寺 (Court of Imperial Sacrifices), passed under the control of the Zongzheng si 宗正寺 (Court of the Imperial Clan), the office established in 670 to keep the genealogical records of the royal clan and to control the activities of the imperial relatives.¹⁷ This move led to deep changes in the general expression of the institutional ritual: it combined both the private ritual activities linked to the lineage of the royal family clan and the institutional system of ancestral temples for the spirit tablets of past emperors.¹⁸ As will be shown below, by the early tenth century the private aspect of the imperial cult was taken to an extreme. The institutional role of rites overlapped with the bonds of the family clan to the extent that the rulers of the Northern dynasties assimilated the private family clan worship into the system of ancestral temples. This is particularly well documented in the sources from the Later Tang and Later Jin that will be discussed below.¹⁹

The Ancestral Temple of Zhuangzong

The early Song sources contain very little information on the system of the Later Liang ancestral cult. In 907 Zhu Wen 朱溫 (Taizu 太祖, r. 907–912) established his *qinmiao* with four chambers on the old site of the Tang ancestral temple in Xijing 西京 (Western Capital, i. e. Chang'an). His biological relatives going back to the fourth generation were honored with temple names.²⁰ Two years later, their spirit tablets were moved to the new capital Luoyang.²¹ The Later Liang followed the early Tang system and kept the room for the Great *Zu*-ancestor empty; at his death, the temple name of Taizu was bestowed on Zhu Wen, and his spirit tablet was included in the *qinmiao*, and the canonical number of four ancestors was reached.

The Later Tang, for their part, established a rather unique system of ancestral shrines, as far as both the number of the ancestral tablets and the locations of the cult sites are concerned.

16 Upon the death of Li Hong 李弘 in 705 (Yizong 義宗, r. 652–675), the number of spirit tablets had reached the number of seven, and at the time of emperor Xuanzong, ritual sacrifices were performed for nine spirit tablets of the ancestors four times a year. See Zhu 2010, 127–130.

17 Chaffee 1999, 8; Zhu 2012, 42.

18 The Zongzheng si was composed mainly of imperial kinsmen who were not members of the imperial house, which meant that from the eighth century into the Song period, the members of the royal clan had direct control over the system of the ancestral temple. On the Court of Clan Affairs in the Song period see Chaffee 1999, 40–44.

19 *Wudai huiyao* 4/59; Zhu 2012, 42.

20 *Wudai huiyao* 2/26 and 1/9f.

21 *Zizhi tongjian* 267/8707.

Moreover, as will be discussed below, the Later Tang rulers installed the Tang emperors as their own ancestral link and revitalized the rituals devoted to Gaozu 高祖 (r. 618–626), Taizong 太宗 (r. 626–649), Yizong 懿宗 (r. 859–873) and Zhaozong 昭宗 (r. 888–904). According to the *Cefu yuangui*, the ancestral site was called Zhongxing zongmiao 中興宗廟, the “Ancestral Temple of the Restoration”.²²

According to the official chronology, the history of the Later Tang ancestral cult started with Li Cunxu 李存勖 (Zhuangzong 莊宗, r. 923–926) and the plea put forward by court ceremonialists to relocate the ancestral site. The first memorial contained in the chapter “Miao yi” concerns the request made by the Ministry of Rites in 924 for the relocation of the ancestral temple of the Shatuo-Li family clan from Jinyang 晉陽 (Beidu 北都, Northern Capital) to the new capital Luoyang 洛陽.²³ The codified ritual prescribed dismantling the old ancestral site.²⁴ Accordingly, the court followed the prescribed procedures for the relocation; the Ritual Academy had called in a diviner to settle the matter, and the divination came out in favor of the relocation. Wang Zhengyan 王正言 and other court officials reported to the court as follows:

In ruling the palace, I regard the ancestral temple as being of the utmost importance. Today we performed a divination on the site of the temple and established the basis for the control of the empire; all affairs [related to the empire] must conform to the model of the ancients, and the spirits will certainly abide by that. In the Northern Capital an ancestral temple was established in earlier times, and it is not appropriate to maintain two [ancestral sites] at the same time. Furthermore, where would the spirits reside if the annual court rituals, performed according to the perpetual rules, are undertaken [in both temples] at the same time? I heard that it is the way of the ancients that [historical] precedents follow what is appropriate

22 *Cefu yuangui* 31/333.

23 Jinyang was the capital during the reign of the Jin and was renamed Northern Capital (Beidu) by Zhuangzong. At the beginning of his reign, Zhuangzong had the prefecture of Zhending 真定 (north of today's Shijia Zhuang) renamed Beidu (*Zizhi tongjian* 272/8883). A few month later the Northern Capital was again demoted to the level of a commandery, being named Chengde jun 成德軍 (*Zizhi tongjian* 272/8905), and Jinyang in Xijing 西京, Western Capital, was renamed Northern Capital. Luoyang was initially named Luodu 洛都 and in 924 renamed Dongdu 東都, Eastern Capital (*Jiu Wudai shi* 29/404; *Zizhi tongjian* 273/8929–8932). The memorial mentioned above was redacted in the sixth month of the second year of the Tongguang era (924), thus it is plausible that the text refers to Jinyang as Northern Capital. The memorial says that “at the beginning of the foundation of the state a temple had already been established in Northern Capital. Today [your Majesty] has conquered the empire and moved the capital to Luoyang.”

24 *Wudai huiyao* 2/26f.

to each contingency,²⁵ and when a spirit tablet is deposited, it is moved to a separate room; similarly, when the [worship of a] temple is concluded, it is left empty according to the old system [...]. The old practices of this dynasty are all known to the Ministry of Rites, Luo [Luoyang] is the ancient capital, [Xiao] Song and [Wang] Qiu established the correct site [for the ancestral rituals],²⁶ how could it be right that a place far away [from the court] be the location for the temple of the ancestors? This matter cannot be protracted any longer, for it is reasonable to pursue continuity; may the temple in the Northern Capital be destroyed and dismissed according to the request of the Ritual Academy.²⁷

The ancestral temple in the Northern Capital mentioned in the memorial was established in Jinyang only one year earlier. According to the *Jiu Wudai shi*,²⁸ in 923 an ancestral temple with seven halls was built in Jinyang for the spirit tablets of the three forefathers of the emperor and the four Tang emperors Gaozu, Taizong, Yizong and Zhaozong.²⁹ Zhuangzong's father, Li Keyong 李克用 (856–908), was conferred the title of Taizu 太祖, and his grandfather, Li Guochang 李國昌 (Zhuxie Chixin 朱邪赤心, d. 883),³⁰ that of Xianzu 獻祖. Li Guochang's father, Zhuxie Zhiyi 朱邪執宜, was bestowed with the title of Yizu 懿祖. As the sources tell us, the surname Li had been bestowed upon Li Guochang by Tang Yizong 懿宗

25 This part of the sentence is not entirely clear to me and I have not found a suitable explanation of why the memorial defines the deposition of the spirit tablet as *quan* 權, “to act according to each contingency”. The version in the *Jiu Wudai shi* 142/2730 (“Lizhi” 1, *Jiu Wudai shi xinji huizheng*, 4402) has 竊聞近例, “I heard that recent precedents...”, instead. The memorial is also recorded in *Cefu yuangui*, with slight variants; in that version the sentence reads 嘗聞近例，禮有從權, “I have heard from recent precedents that the ritual code has cases in which the ritual is carried out according to the contingency” (*Cefu yuangui* 593/7097).

26 Xiao Song 蕭嵩 (fl. eighth century) and Wang Zhongqiu 王仲邱 were the compilers of the *Da Tang Kaiyuan li* 大唐開元禮 (Ritual of the Kaiyuan era of the Great Tang), the ritual code presented to the court of Xuanzong in 732.

27 *Wudai huiyao* 2/26f: 伏以宮室之制，宗廟為先。今卜洛居尊，開基禦宇，事當師古，神必依人。北都先置宗廟，不宜並設。況每年朝享，禮有常規，時日既同，神何所據。竊聞古道，例亦從權，於神主已修，迎之藏於夾室，若廟宇已崇，虛之以為常制。[...] 況本朝故事，禮院具明，洛邑舊都，嵩丘正位，豈宜遠宮闕之居，建祖宗之廟。事非可久，理在從長，其北都宗廟，請准太常禮院申奏，宜從廢停。

28 *Jiu Wudai shi* 29/404.

29 The same event is reported with slightly different wording in *Cefu yuangui* 31/333: 詔於晉陽創中興宗廟, “An order was issued to build in Jinyang an ancestral temple of the restoration.”

30 *Wudai huiyao* 1/10. In the historical texts edited by Ouyang Xiu and Sima Guang we always find Zhuxie 朱邪, whereas in other tenth- to eleventh-century sources, historical works as well as epigraphic materials, 耶 alternated with 邪, such that scholars tend to prefer to read 邪 as *ye*. Christopher Atwood believes that 朱耶 is incorrect; for an explanation see Atwood, 600, n. 21.

(r. 859–873) for his merits as a loyal subject.³¹ The members of his family clan were registered as Tang subjects and a genealogy record of the Shatuo kinship group (*zongji* 宗籍) was created.³² The conferral of the Li surname to meritorious subjects was a common practice by the late Tang period. As Richard Davis remarks, with the Shatuo-Li family clan this practice “acquired an added layer of cultural meaning as Shatuo leaders became a symbolic extension of the ruling family and assumed its titles and offices.”³³

The three forefathers of Zhuangzong were acknowledged as progenitors of the royal ancestral line and pronounced *zu*-ancestors. The relocation of the ancestral temple from the old capital of the clan territories to the new capital testifies to the interrelationship of the ancestral cult and territorial control. According to the rites, only the imperial ancestral temple could be placed in the capital; by relocating the spirit tablets of the family clan’s ancestors, Zhuangzong officially elevated them to the rank of imperial ancestors and founders.³⁴

At roughly the same time, chronological records of the three *zu*-ancestors were compiled by the Historiography Office, mostly on the basis of the genealogical records of the Li family clan originally kept in the Tang archives and collected by Zhang Zhaoyuan 張昭遠 (*jinsbi* 877). The three *jinian lu* 紀年錄, now lost, covered the genealogical history of the ruling clan from the beginning of the ninth to the early tenth century.³⁵

The *Zizhi tongjian* on the Relocation of the Ancestral Shrines

In a concise entry, the *Zizhi tongjian* reports that in 923 Zhuangzong established an ancestral temple with seven halls (*shi* 室) in Jinyang for the spirit tablets of the three ancestors of the

31 Li Guochang had helped the Tang court in the suppression of the military mutiny of Pang Xun 龐勳 (d. 869) in 869 (*Zizhi tongjian* 251/8150).

32 *Tang huiyao* 65/1141. For an introduction to the Tang imperial kin see Chaffee 1999, 8f.

33 Davis 2014, 11. According to *Jiu Wudai shi* 25/332, Li Guochang was also registered as member of the imperial family branch of the Prince of Zheng 鄭王. *Beimeng suoyan* 北夢瑣言 (17/317), an unofficial account of the event, narrates that when Yizong asked about the origins of his ancestors, Li Guochang replied that they were originally people from Jincheng in Longxi 隴西金城人, and the emperor commented: 我先與汝同鄉里, “My ancestors and yours were fellow villagers.”

34 According to *Cefu yuangui* 31/335, the old ancestral temple of the Tang in Luoyang had been destroyed by Zhu Wen.

35 The *Tang Taizu jinian lu* 唐太祖紀年錄 (Chronological Records of the Taizu Emperor of [Later] Tang) commemorated the life and deeds of Li Keyong, the *Tang Xianzu jinian* 唐獻祖紀年錄 (Chronological Records of Later Tang Xianzu) looked back to Li Guochang, and the *Tang Xizu jinian lu* 唐懿祖紀年錄 (Chronological Records of Later Tang Xizu) traced the origins of the Later Tang dynasty house to Zhuxie. Cf. *Wudai huiyao* 18/298f; Wang Gungwu 1957, 10ff. The integration of the Later Liang period into the *Jinian lu* served the dual goal of compensating for the lack of historical records on the last decades of the ninth century and that of establishing a direct line to the Tang legacy.

later Tang and the last four Tang emperors. The three Later Tang ancestors were all worshipped as *zu*-ancestors, contravening the code of the rites, which stipulated that only the first emperor was supposed to receive the title of Founder.³⁶ In the same year, the *Zizhi tongjian* says, the status of the two Later Liang emperors was downgraded to that of commoners and their spirit tablets were removed and destroyed.³⁷

The *Zizhi tongjian* offers a history of the relocation of the ancestral sites to Luoyang that differs in many details from the official version. It states that, in the winter of 923,

Zhang Quanyi 張全義 (852–926) [Zhang Yan 張言] requested that the emperor move the capital to Luoyang.³⁸

While both the *Shilu* and *Huiyao* agree on the fact that a decision was taken following a court debate, Sima Guang believed that the request to relocate the ancestral site came directly from Zhang Quanyi, a former general of the Huang Chao 黃巢 Rebellion who had served under the Later Liang and the Later Tang, and had been bestowed with the title of Prince of Qi 齊王 by Zhuangzong. In the late ninth century and the first two decades of the tenth century, Zhang Quanyi had control over Luoyang, and he was credited with having rebuilt the capital.³⁹ The *Zizhi tongjian* notes that the capital was moved to Luoyang because Zhang Quanyi requested it. Further evidence that the *Zizhi tongjian* shows a different version of the official story comes from the *Kaoyi*, the critical commentary redacted by Sima Guang, in which the passage of the *Shilu* referring to the court debate on the restoration of the ancestral temple in Luoyang (*yi xiu Luoyang taimiao* 議修洛陽太廟) is recorded.⁴⁰

The idea that the Later Tang court did not have actual control over Luoyang, or over its major ritual sites, is echoed in other entries in the *Zizhi tongjian*. Accordingly, in the same

36 *Zizhi tongjian* 272/8884: 立宗廟於晉陽，以高祖、太宗、懿宗、昭宗洎懿祖以下為七室。

37 *Zizhi tongjian* 272/8901.

38 *Zizhi tongjian* 273/8905: 張全義請帝遷都洛陽。

39 For the biographies of Zhang Quanyi see *Jiu Wudai shi* 63/837–844 and *Xin Wudai shi* 45/489–492. The *Luoyang jinsben jiu wenji* 洛陽縉紳舊聞記 (Record of Old Sayings from the Literati of Luoyang), redacted by Zhang Qixian 張齊賢 (942–1014), includes a biographical chapter on Zhang Quanyi, the *Zhang Qi wang quanyi waizhuan* 張齊王全義外傳 (Outer Biography of Zhang Quanyi, king of Qi). When Tang Zhaozong was relocated in Luoyang by Zhu Wen, the emperor and his courtiers moved into the imperial palaces rebuilt by Zhang Quanyi, who had by then been bestowed with the name Zongshi 宗爽. According to *Zizhi tongjian* 273/8928, his influence at the Later Liang and Later Tang courts extended so far that by the time of Zhuangzong, the Empress Dowager requested “to serve Quanyi as a father.” According to *Xin Wudai shi* 28/308, once when Zhuangzong was drunk, he requested that the empress regard Quanyi as her father. On the role of Zhang Quanyi in the reconstruction of Luoyang after the Huang Chao Rebellion, see Tackett 2014, 208f.

40 This is probably from the *Zhuangzong shilu*.

year Zhang Quanyi reiterated his request that Zhuangzong reach Luoyang.⁴¹ Moreover, a number of details in the narrative relating the relocation of the capital testify to Sima Guang's dissatisfaction with the official story. For instance, biographic data concerning the officials involved show slight variations.⁴² Another event mentioned in the *Zizhi tongjian* is connected to the relocation of the ancestral temple in Luoyang. In 924, when Zhuangzong moved his court to Luoyang, his stepmother and the formal wife of Li Keyong, the lady of Qin 秦, née Liu 劉, and future Huang Taifei 皇太妃, refused to leave Jinyang because there would have been no one to take care of the mounds and ancestral temple of the Li family clan there. Lady Liu was then left behind in the old capital where she died soon after.⁴³

The Lady of Qin, née Liu, the legal wife of Li Keyong, is depicted in the sources as a virtuous woman. She was childless, and her servant, Consort Cao 曹 from Jinyang, who was the concubine of Li Keyong, gave birth to the future Zhuangzong.⁴⁴ When Zhuangzong came to power, he decided to bestow a higher rank to his natural mother, rather than to his stepmother. He therefore conferred the title of Huang Taifei to Lady Liu and the title of Huang Taihou to his biological mother. According to the *Zizhi tongjian* commentator Hu Sanxing 胡三省 (1230–1302), the *Zizhi tongjian* expresses great distaste for Zhuangzong's choice of

41 *Zizhi tongjian* 272/8906: 張全義請上亟幸洛陽，謁廟畢。

42 For instance, regarding Wang Zhengyan, the official who released the memorial, a single entry in *Zizhi tongjian* 273/8924 for the eighth month of the second year of the Tongguang era (a date that corresponds to the time when Wang's memorial was compiled) says, "The official in charge of collecting taxes, Wang Zhengyan, suffered from numbness; he was absentminded and unable to handle his office duties; Jing Jin reported this [to the emperor] several times." According to the *Zizhi tongjian*, Wang Zhengyan was dismissed from the Ministry of Rites and obtained the title of "tax retainer". The *Jiu Wudai shi* says that Wang Zhengyan was first employed as an official responsible for collecting taxes and later as minister of rites. The biography of Wang Zhengyan in the *Jiu Wudai shi* (69/915) does not mention this memorial. It reports: 正言在職，主諾而已，權柄出于孔謙。正言不耐繁浩，簿領縱橫，觸事遺忘，物論以為不可，即以孔謙代之，正言守禮部尚書，"In [his] office [as an official responsible for collecting taxes], Zhengyan limited himself to approving decisions, while the real power was in the hands of Kong Qian. Zhengyan was not able to handle numerous important [affairs]. In managing the registers he was reckless; he would rush his affairs and be forgetful [of matters]; as for his discussing of matters [all the officials] believed that he was not capable. For this reason Kong Qian substituted him, and Zhengyan received the post of Magister of Documents of the Board of Rites."

43 *Zizhi tongjian* 273/8913: 太妃曰：「陵廟在此，若相與俱行，歲時何人奉祀！」遂留不來。"Huang Taifei said: "The mounds and the temple are here; if I come with you, who will perform the sacrifices every year? Thereupon she stayed and did not leave." *Zizhi tongjian* 272/8882. In 1989 the tomb mound of Li Keyong was discovered in Shanxi province, Dai prefecture (Daizhou 代州); see Zhou Agen 2012, 4.

44 *Jiu Wudai shi* 49/671.

privileging his natural mother, and thus taking her and her family clan to the new court in Luoyang while leaving the legitimate Empress Dowager, Lady Liu, back in Hedong.

Moreover, Lady Liu's words contradict the official version of the story of the relocation to Luoyang according to which the temple in Jinyang was demolished and the spirit tablets moved to Luoyang.⁴⁵ The *Zizhi tongjian* possibly hints at the fact that the Li family clan was still active in Jinyang after the official relocation to Luoyang. According to the late tenth-century sources, the ancestral temple was relocated from Jinyang to Luoyang in 924. As the *Zizhi tongjian* seems to suggest, it is possible that the ancestral shrines were never permanently relocated to Luoyang, and that the main ancestral site remained in Jinyang, where most of the family clan was still located. This idea is reiterated by Ouyang Xiu.⁴⁶ As will be shown below, in 933 Li Siyuan 李嗣源 (Mingzong 明宗, r. 926–933) similarly chose to locate his ancestral site far from the capital, in Yingzhou 應州.

Mingzong's Ancestral Lineage and Ritual Sites

Li Siyuan acceded to the throne through a military uprising, yet his reign was characterized by an unprecedented era of peace and welfare, such that future historians generally praised it as one of the most well-governed periods of the Five Dynasties.⁴⁷ Furthermore, in the first few years of his reign, Li Siyuan restored the duties of the Historiography Office and promoted a large-scale project to compile the history of the Shatuo-Li.⁴⁸ At the same time Li Siyuan created a unique system of ancestral temples inspired by the historical precedent of the Han emperor Guangwu's temple.

The *Wudai huiyao* reports that at the end of Zhuangzong's short reign, the Later Tang had a system of ancestral temples comprising three spirit tablets. Nonetheless, a comment to the text reports that according to the *Zhuangzong shilu* 莊宗實錄,⁴⁹ the four Tang emperors Gaozu, Taizong, Yizong and Zhaozong were worshipped in the same temple, making the number of spirit tablets seven.⁵⁰ The discrepancy in the number of spirit tablets, three versus seven, requires at least a tentative explanation. Some Song historians regarded the death of Zhuangzong as the end of the Shatuo-Li family blood lineage, as his stepbrother and succes-

45 *Wudai huiyao* 2/26.

46 *Xin Wudai shi* 55/633: 明宗入立，繼唐太祖、莊宗而不立親廟。

47 For a study of Mingzong's reign see Davis 2014.

48 *Wudai huiyao* 18/293f; *Cefu yuangui* 557/6689–6693.

49 The *Zhuangzong shilu* was compiled by Zhang Zhaoyuan around 929 and covered the period of reign of the Later Liang until the end of the reign of Zhuangzong, from 907 to 927.

50 *Wudai huiyao* 1/10.

Li Siyuan, had neither a clear origin nor had he been chosen as heir apparent.⁵¹ Therefore, the fact that the canonical number of seven ancestors had been reached by the end of Zhuangzong's reign possibly supported the idea that the era of Zhuangzong was the last reign period of the Shatuo-Li clan and, likewise, emphasized that the Later Tang was a continuation of the Tang dynasty.

Immediately following the death of Zhuangzong and Li Siyuan's ascent to the throne,⁵² the Secretariat Drafter Ma Gao 馬縞 requested the erection of a *qinmiao* for Li Siyuan's biological father and forefathers.⁵³ Ma Gao looked back to the historical precedent of the Eastern Han system of ancestral temples created by the Guangwu emperor and followed by his successors.⁵⁴ As mentioned above in the introduction, Guangwu established a separate temple for the worship of the ancestors of his branch of the Liu clan, which was eventually relocated outside the capital in the region where the family originated from. The system fitted Li Siyuan's agenda perfectly, and the precedent of the Later Han guaranteed its conformity to the norm. According to the *Wudai huiyao*, the issue was amply discussed by court officials. The location of the *qinmiao* and the choice of posthumous names to be conferred on the ancestors were the two main problems brought to the attention of officials. In both

51 Li Siyuan's ethnic origins are unclear. According to *Zizhi tongjian* 255/8307, his child name was Miaojielie 邁佶烈, and he acquired the surname Li after he was adopted by Li Keyong. By the late Tang and Five Dynasties period it was a common practice for a soldier or an official to be "adopted" by a prominent personality. Nine of the sons that were adopted by Li Keyong are known, and one of these was the future Mingzong, Li Siyuan. They occupied important military positions that were often passed on hereditarily to their sons. Li Sizhao 李嗣昭, born into a Han 韓 family from Fenzhou 汾州, became a high ranking military official. He died in battle during the reign of Zhuangzong. He had seven sons who also held military positions: Li Siben 李嗣本, born Zhang 張; Li Sien 李嗣恩, born Luo 駱; Li Cunxin 李存信, born Zhang; Li Cunxiao 李存孝, born An 安; Li Cunjin 李存進, born Sun 孫; Li Cunzhuang 李存璋 and Li Cunxian 李存賢, born Wang 王. All of them died either during emperor Zhuangzong's reign or soon after. Ouyang Xiu dedicated the "Yier zhuan" 義兒傳 (*Xin Wudai shi* 36/385–396) to the nine adopted sons of Li Keyong. Hu Sanxing (in his commentary to *Zizhi tongjian* 263/8569) also reports: 李克用親兵皆代北雜虜, "The closest soldiers of Li Keyong were mixed barbarians/slaves from Daibe." The difference in ethnic origin of the two Later Tang emperors is echoed in thirteenth-century sources; cf. *Wenxian tongkao* 95/863: 莊宗以沙陀為唐之嗣, 明宗又以代北狄裔為莊宗之嗣. On the different ethnic origins of Li Keyong and Li Siyuan, see also Fan 2005, 79–84.

52 As for the title of Founder, it had already been bestowed on his father and forefathers, and at his death, Li Cunxu received the title of Exemplar (*zong* 宗). According to the *Ai cewen* 哀冊文 (Grievance Document) included in the *Zhuangzong shilu* and mentioned in the *Kaoyi*, the tomb mound of Zhuangzong was placed in Yongling 雍陵 (Henan, prefecture of Xin'an); see *Zizhi tongjian* 275/8990.

53 *Wudai huiyao* 2/27. The memorial is also reported in *Cefu yuangui* (593/7098f) – and quoted in *Jiu Wudai shi xinji huizheng* 142/4403 – in a much longer version.

54 *Hou Han shu* 30/3193.

cases, Li Siyuan forced the officials to make decisions that accorded with his own wishes, such that the debate became a pure formality. The emperor opted for Yingzhou, a location close to the old residence of the family clan.⁵⁵ While Guangwu had lowered the rank of his biological forebears, Mingzong instead conferred on them the title of *zu*-ancestors. The emperor requested that posthumous titles be given to his natural forefathers and their respective wives. According to the record in the *Wudai huiyao*, ceremonialists debated whether to use the title *xiao huangdi* 孝皇帝 or *xiao huang* 孝皇.⁵⁶ Despite attempts made by all of the officials to convince the emperor that only *huang* or *di* was an appropriate title, Mingzong insisted that textual precedents for the title *huangdi* be found. During the reign of Tang Xuanzong, the emperor's eminent ancestry was traced back to Li Hao 李暹 (351–417), who was conferred the titles of Xingsheng Huangdi 興盛皇帝; Gao Yao 皋陶 (Deming Huangdi 德明皇帝) and Laozi 老子 (Xuanyuan Huangdi 玄元皇帝).⁵⁷ On the basis of these historical precedents, Li Siyuan's ancestors and their wives going back to the fourth generation were thus granted the posthumous titles of *huangdi* and *huanghou* respectively. Likewise, the four ancestors were conferred the surname Li: Li Yu 李聿 (Xiaogong Huangdi 孝恭皇帝, Huizu 惠祖), Li Jiao 李教 (Xiaozhi Huangdi 孝質皇帝, Yizu 毅祖), his grandfather Li Yan 李琰 (Xiaojing Huangdi 孝靖皇帝, Liezu 列祖) and emperor Mingzong's biological father Li Ni 李霓 (Xiaocheng Huangdi 孝成皇帝, Dezu 德祖).⁵⁸

Shortly thereafter, the spirit tablet of Zhuangzong was placed in the imperial ancestral temple in the capital, and the tablet of Yizu (Li Guochang's father) was moved to a separate room dedicated to the remote ancestors (*tiaoqian* 祧遷). The result was that at the end of the Later Tang period ritual sacrifices were performed for the four Tang and the three Later Tang ancestors, along with those performed for the four *huangdis* of the ancestral temple in Yingzhou.⁵⁹

Additionally, in 927 the court proposed the construction of a temple for the spirit tablet of the last Tang emperor, Zhaoxuan 昭宣 (r. 904–907). Some of the ceremonialists were reluctant to grant Zhaoxuan a title, due to his infamous reputation of being a mere puppet in the hands of Zhu Wen; nonetheless, he was bestowed with the title of Jingzong 景宗, and an ancestral temple was built in Caozhou 曹州. The Commissioner of Ceremonial Properties,

55 *Wudai huiyao* 2/27f. We do not know how influential this branch of the family clan was; nonetheless, by granting them ceremonial postings in Yingzhou, the emperor strategically moved them away from court.

56 *Wudai huiyao* 2/27f.

57 *Wudai huiyao* 2/28. According to *Jiu Wudai shi* 25/967, at this point the ancestral temple of the Tang had reached nine tablets and no system of deposition was respected.

58 *Wudai huiyao* 2/28f.

59 *Wudai huiyao* 2/29.

Lu Zhi 盧質 (867–942), was entrusted to officially inaugurate the new ritual site, but the shrine was removed in consequence of a remonstrance against the construction of a ritual site for the direct ancestors of Zhaoxuan.⁶⁰

Upon Li Siyuan's death in 934, one of the spirit tablets in the seven-hall shrine in Luoyang had to be moved to a separate room, in order to make space for his spirit tablet. The early Song sources report a memorial testifying to the debate that arose at court on the issue. Ceremonialists at court proposed to depose the spirit tablet of Li Guochang (Xianzu, Li Cunxu's step grandfather). As the Later Tang considered the four Tang emperors and the three ancestors a unique system of ancestral rituals, the decision to remove the spirit tablet of Xianzu was an important political move. In fact, the inclusion of Li Guochang, who had never actually ruled, was rather an expression of the worship of the Shatuo-Li family clan.⁶¹

It is unclear whether the sacrifices for the spirit tablet of Xianzu were terminated or whether the tablet was moved outside the capital. To sum up, according to the *Wudai huiyao*, at the end of the Later Tang five *zong*-ancestors (Tang Taizong, Yizong and Zhaozong, and Later Tang Zhuangzong and Mingzong) and two *zu*-ancestors (Tang Gaozu and the Later Tang Taizu) were offered regular ritual sacrifices in Luoyang. Moreover, regular sacrifices were performed at the shrines of the four ancestors of Li Siyuan's branch of the family and their wives. On the basis of the records available to us, we cannot tell for certain how frequently the ritual sacrifices were performed by the Later Tang period. The sole evidence we have is a memorial issued by the Ministry of Rites in 930, which mentions the performance of a *di* 禘 sacrifice in the following year.⁶²

Although not very informative about the actual practices, the memorial mentioned above reveals another detail concerning the system of temples created by Mingzong that well illustrates the issue that is at stake here. It states that the emperor wanted to perform ancestral rituals for Jing Huangdi 景皇帝, the posthumous name of Tang Gaozu's grandfather. The worship of Tang Gaozu's grandfather, established around 930, further attests to the uniqueness of the ancestral system created by Mingzong and to his almost obsessive urgency to create eminent sources of ancestors for the royal clan.⁶³ The Later Tang ruler took the broad Tang concept of ancestral worship and kinship to an extreme. The rising number of spirit tablets in the *taimiao* did not just mean an increase in the number of respective ritual sacrific-

60 *Wudai huiyao* 3/39f.

61 *Wudai huiyao* 2/30; *Cefu yuangui* 594/7105.

62 *Wudai huiyao* 3/43f. According to the norm, the *di* sacrifice was performed every three years at the beginning of summer, while the *xia* sacrifice was performed every five years in the first month of winter.

63 *Wudai huiyao* 3/44.

es to be performed but also an enlargement of the royal family clan.⁶⁴ If we also consider the families of the soldiers adopted by Li Keyong who bore the surname Li, the size of the kin clan at the end of the Later Tang must have been considerable. Mingzong solved part of the problem by killing four of Li Cunxu's natural sons during and after the military uprising surrounding the dethronement of Zhuangzong, and by arranging diplomatic marriages between the numerous women in Zhuangzong's branch of the family and Mingzong's close relatives.⁶⁵

Hints of the Northern rulers' incapacity to control the imperial clansmen can be found scattered throughout the *Xin Wudai shi*. Evidence of these judgments may be found in the biographical section, where Ouyang Xiu mentions here and there the implementation of ancestral worship. In the case of the Later Tang Shatuo-Li, the historian reports that, when Zhuangzong decided to establish an Administrator for the Imperial Tombs (*lingtai ling* 置臺令), who would be in charge of the tombs of Xianzu and Yizu in Daizhou,

[...] in the county [where the tombs of Xianzu and Yizu were located] there were over one hundred indigent self-proclaimed clansmen, but the [Court of the] Imperial Clan had no genealogical records, and nobody was able to verify the claims.⁶⁶

Similarly, the *Zizhi tongjian* reflects some concern about Mingzong's policy. Sima Guang reports that despite the opinion of the ceremonialists at court, in 927 Mingzong ordered the building of the ancestral temple in Yingzhou.⁶⁷ An inauspicious event follows the entry reporting the conferral of honorific titles to the family clan of Mingzong. The *Zizhi tongjian* reports a fall in the cost of millet, a fact that eventually caused the impoverishment of peasants in two prefectures of Hedong province:

In that year, in the Wei and Dai border prefectures one *dou* of millet was worth no more than ten coins.⁶⁸

64 See Chaffee 1999, 8f.

65 On the killings see *Xin Wudai shi* 14/155. The fate of the rest of Zhuangzong's sons is unknown, except for that of the eldest son. As for the marriages, the information is recorded in the *Kaoyi* of *Zizhi tongjian* 277/9067 as belonging to the *Jiu Wudai shi*: 薛史曰：明宗入洛，莊宗宮人數百悉令歸其骨肉。Nonetheless, this sentence is not contained in the modern edition of the text.

66 *Xin Wudai shi* 57/656: 縣中無賴子自稱宗子者百餘人，宗正無譜牒，莫能考按。Cf. Johnson 1977, 56f.

67 *Zizhi tongjian* 276/9012: 帝令立於應州舊宅。

68 *Zizhi tongjian* 276/9012: 是歲，蔚、代緣邊粟斗不過十錢。

These frontier districts were part of the territories between Yan 燕 and Yun 雲 (present-day Beijing and Tianjin municipalities) that would be ceded to the Khitan 契丹-led Liao 遼 (907–1125) and integrated into the Liao empire after 938.

Duan Yu and Zhang Zhaoyuan on Tang Rituals: Ancestral Worship in the Later Jin

Despite the unfavorable conditions of the pact between Shi Jingtang 石敬瑭 (Gaozu, r. 936–942) and the Liao, the alliance brought a ten-year period of relative peace in the empire, which allowed the Later Jin to engage in the compilation of historical works. Like their predecessors, the Later Jin rulers referred to the Tang legacy in order to legitimate their rule over the empire, and they engaged in the first large-scale compilation project of the Tang history. The *Tang shu* 唐書 (later known as *Jiu Tang shu* 舊唐書) was commissioned by Shi Jingtang in 941 and was concluded during the reign of his successor in 945.⁶⁹ The project involved the efforts of historians and experts on Tang history such as Zhang Zhaoyuan and Jia Wei 賈緯 (d. 952). In this context, the systematization of Tang documents on rituals was, of course, one of the main tasks carried out by the compilers. This is reflected in the memorials on ancestral worship, in which the Later Jin historians often hark back to early Tang precedents. While Mingzong of the Later Tang looked to Guangwu of the Later Han as a model for his restoration of the dynasty, here the Tang are preferred over the Han as sources for historical precedents on ritual matters.

The Later Jin's claim of a strong multi-generational descent was probably forged to a much greater degree than that of the Later Tang. The *Jiu Wudai shi* traces the origins of the Shi family clan back to the Han high official Shi Fen 石奮 (ca. 219–124 B.C.).⁷⁰ On the contrary,

69 According to Twitchett (1992, 160–187), most of the content of the *Jiu Tang shu* is based on the *Guoshi* 國史 completed by Liu Fang 柳芳 in 759–760. The project was affected by the continuous changes in the position of director of the Historiographical Office, which was occupied by Zhao Yin 趙瑩 until 943, and then by Sang Weihan, who was substituted by Liu Xu 劉煦 (888–947) two years later. Tradition attributes the work to the then director Liu Xu 劉煦 (888–947), although Liu was only responsible for the final memorial presented to the court. Cf. *Cefu yuangui* 557/6693.

70 There is a biography of Shi Fen in the *Shiji* (103/2763–2768, translated by Wang Jing in Nienhauser 2008, 373–382) under the honorific title “Lord of the Ten Thousand Bushels” 萬石君, which was bestowed upon him by Emperor Jing due to the fact that Shi Fen and his four sons all reached the rank of two thousand bushels, the highest rank in the early Han. See Nienhauser 2008, 373, n. 2. Shi Fen is described in the *Shiji* (101/2763: 無文學，恭謹無與比) as somebody who “did not have the literary knowledge [of the Confucian scholars], but in terms of respectfulness and circumspection, none could be compared to him” (Nienhauser 2008, 374). During the reign of Emperor Jing, Shi Fen reached the rank of Senior Grandee (*Shang daifu* 上大夫; *Shiji* 103/2764, Nienhauser 2008, 375, n. 21).

according to the entombed epitaph of Shi Chonggui 石重貴 (r. 942–947), the last emperor of the Later Jin,⁷¹ the Shi descended from the Prince of Zhao 趙王, Shi Le 石勒 (274–333), the Xiongnu general who in 319 established the short-lived Later Zhao dynasty.⁷² Both versions are almost certainly forgeries, and the only information we have about the Shi family is that Nieleji 梟掇雞, the father of Shi Jingtang, was a former military general of Li Keyong.

The memorials concerning the system of ancestral rituals of the Later Jin can be found in two different chapters of the *Wudai huiyao*. While the “Miao yi” collects a series of memorials concerning the construction of the *qinmiao* for the ancestors of the Shi family clan, completed in 938, the “Miao zhidu” provides the memorial issued in 940 for the ancestral rituals of the Tang and Later Tang emperors. The information in the two chapters is sometimes contradictory.⁷³ A complete account of the debate of 938 between the ceremonialists Duan Yu 段顛 and Zhang Zhaoyuan at the court of the Later Jin is contained in the *Wudai huiyao*, the *Jiu Wudai shi* and the *Cefu yuangui*. Duan Yu looked back to the chapter “Jifa” 祭法 in the *Liji* and other Han sources as models, according to which the emperor could have between four and seven ancestral tablets. The title of Founder was to be bestowed on the “Meritorious Ones” (*yougong* 有功), while the title of Exemplar was given to the “Virtuous Ones” (*youde* 有德). Duan Yu then suggested the creation of a temple made up of seven halls. Moreover, he requested that the Founder be called *shizu* 始祖 (First Founder) and that his spirit tablet be worshipped in a separate temple.⁷⁴

For his part, the historian Zhang Zhaoyuan looked back at the early Tang system and argued that at the beginning of a dynasty the system had to be limited to four halls. Zhang Zhaoyuan claimed that the system of ancestral rituals had to follow the canon established at the beginning of the Tang, in the Wude era 武德 (580–643), by scholars such as Wei Zheng 魏徵 (580–643), Wen Daya 溫大雅 (572–629) and Yan Shigu 顏師古 (581–645).⁷⁵ Likewise, Zhang Zhaoyuan demonstrated that, in the past, the title *shizu* had always been left empty.⁷⁶ Despite Zhang Zhaoyuan’s memorial, the court ultimately ordered

71 The tomb mound of Shi Chonggui and his adoptive son, Shi Yanxu 石延煦, was found in 2000 near Shaoyang in Liaoning province. A transcription of the two tomb inscriptions was published in 2004 by Du Xingzhi 都興智 and Tian Likun 田立坤. See also *Jiu Wudai shi xinji huizheng* 85 (“Jinshu” 11), 2664f and 87 (“Jinshu” 13), 2685f.

72 There is a biography of Shi Le in *Jinshu* 104/2707–2756.

73 *Wudai huiyao* 1/11.

74 *Wudai huiyao* 2/30f.

75 *Wudai huiyao* 2/31–34.

76 The only exception being that of Wu Zetian 武則天 (r. 690–705), who bestowed on King Wen of Zhou the title of “First Founder”, and for this reason scholars and ceremonialists “to this day still laugh [at her]” (到今嗤謔). See *Wudai huiyao* 2/30; *Jiu Wudai shi* 142/1901.

that the title of Founder be bestowed upon the four ancestors of the Shi family clan: Jingzu 靖祖 (Shi Jing 石璟), Suzu 肅祖 (Shi Chen 石榘), Ruizu 睿祖 (Shi Yu 石昱), and Xianzu 憲祖 (Shi Shaoyong 石紹雍, Nielieji), the father of Shi Jingtang. Biographical data on the first three ancestors is almost nonexistent. Song historians such as Ouyang Xiu thus believed that the surname Shi had been attributed to them only in the Later Jin period for the purpose of constructing an eminent genealogy for the Shi royal clan.⁷⁷ The shrines for the spirit tablets of the Shi ancestors were set up in the Zhide gong 至德宮 (Palace of Ultimate Virtue), one of the old estates of the Later Tang emperors and the former residence of Zhang Quanyi in Luoyang. Five chambers were provided to house the spirit tablets of the two Tang emperors Gaozu and Taizong, and the three Later Tang emperors Zhuangzong, Mingzong and emperor Min, though the latter did not receive the title of Exemplar because his reign lasted only four months and he did not show particular merit. Li Congke 李從珂 (r. 934–937), the last emperor of the Later Tang, had been declared illegitimate by Shi Jingtang and was thus wholly excluded from the ritual services.⁷⁸

At his death, Shi Jingtang was bestowed the title of Gaozu.⁷⁹ As a result, during the reign of the second and last emperor of the Later Jin, rituals may have been performed for ten spirit tablets, although we have no information about the actual implementation of the ritual services.

The Narrative in the *Zizhi tongjian*

The *Zizhi tongjian* does not mention the construction of the ancestral shrines in the Palace of Supreme Virtue. The entry concerning the ancestral temple of the Later Jin only records the request to have the imperial ancestral temple moved to the new capital, Da Liang, and the

77 The only piece of information we have comes from the *Wudai huiyao*, which mentions the location of the tomb molds (*Wudai huiyao* 1/11).

78 *Wudai huiyao* 3/40.

79 *Wudai huiyao* 2/35. Two interesting documents dating from 942 that are part of the Dunhuang scroll (S4437) are concerned with the services and procedures in honor of the deceased Gaozu. The first one, the *Da Jin Huangdi juwen* 大晉皇帝祭文, is a prayer for the service of the funeral sacrifices. The second one is the *Daxing Huangdi shizhuang* 大行皇帝諡狀, which, in the definition of Lionel Giles (1940, 339), is a “panegyric preceding the canonization of the emperor Kao Tsu”, where “‘Great Virtuous’ (*daxing*) was the title given to the deceased ruler before the canonization.” The two documents form part of the same scroll that contains the more famous “Posthumous letter” (*yishu* 遺書) allegedly written by Chudi 出帝 (942–465) on behalf of the dying Shi Jingtang to the emperor of the Liao dynasty, Yelü Deguang 耶律德光. See Yang 1969, 418ff.

emperor's decision to keep it in Luoyang.⁸⁰ Here again, the historian does not devote even one entry to the debate on the ancestral temple of 938. Instead, the event is described as follows:

[The emperor] conferred the honorific titles of *di* and *hou* on his deceased mother and father, and [on his ancestors] back to the fourth generation. On the *yimao* day, [the emperor] ordered the heads and ears of the relatives of the guilty [last ruler of the Later] Tang, which were kept in the Altar for Imperial Sacrifices, be buried. In the past the high general Lou Jiyong had served Prince Jun of the Later Liang [Zhu Youzhen] as Inner Commissioner of the Various Offices. [This is the reason why] at this time he asked for his [Prince Jun's] head in order to bury it.⁸¹

The burial of Zhu Youzhen 朱友貞 (r. 913–923), the last ruler of the Later Liang, is narrated in the first chapter of the Annals of the Later Tang:

[Zhuangzong] ordered Wang Zan 王瓚 to take Zhu Youzhen's corpse, bury it in a Buddhist temple and, after having lacquered its head, to seal it in a case and conceal it under the Altar for Imperial Sacrifices (*taishe* 太社).⁸²

The same episode is narrated in the *Jiu Wudai shi*, yet without the macabre emphasis of the *Zizhi tongjian*. Xue Juzheng reports that

[Zhuangzong] ordered the governor of Henan Zhang Quanyi to bury it.⁸³

In the brief entry quoted above, the *Zizhi tongjian* combines the conferral of honorific titles on the ancestors of the Shi family clan with the burial of the heads of members of the Later Tang and Later Liang clans. Voided honorific names for the ancestors and the ending of a lineage are combined in order to create an example meant to serve as a warning to the emperor.

80 Bianzhou was renamed Daliang by the Later Liang who made it their capital. When the Later Tang defeated the Zhu family clan, Bianzhou became a prefecture again, whereas Luoyang was named Capital of the East (Dongjin 東京) and Chang'an Capital of the West 西京. The Later Jin brought the Capital of the East back to Bianzhou, and renamed Luoyang Capital of the West. *Zizhi tongjian* 281/9190 reports: 太常奏:「今建東京,而宗廟、社稷皆在西京,請遷置大梁。」敕旨:「且仍舊」“The official in charge of rituals [Duan Yu] memorialized: “Today the Capital of the East [Bianzhou 汴州, Kaifeng fu 開封府] is established, yet the imperial temple and the altar for the imperial sacrifices are still in the Capital of the West [Luoyang]. We request to relocate them to Da Liang.” The imperial order proclaimed: “The old [system] should be maintained.”

81 *Zizhi tongjian* 281/9173: 追尊四代考妣為帝后。己卯,詔太社所藏唐室罪人首聽親舊收葬。初,武衛上將軍婁繼英嘗事梁均王,為內諸司使,至是,請其首而葬之。

82 *Zizhi tongjian* 272/8900: 詔王瓚收朱友貞屍,殯於佛寺,漆其首,函之,藏於太社。According to the *Kaoyi*, the version narrated in the *Zizhi tongjian* is based on that in the *Zhuangzong shilu*.

83 *Jiu Wudai shi* 10/152: 尋詔河南尹張全義收葬之,其首藏於太社。

Hints at unorthodox practices involving the sacrifice of human blood are scattered throughout the annals of the Later Tang and Later Jin in the *Zizhi tongjian*, as well as in the *Xin Wudai shi*. One remarkable case involved the military governor Liu Rengong 劉仁恭 (d. 914). According to eleventh-century sources, Li Keyong ordered his subordinate Lu Rubi 盧汝弼 to cut Liu Rengong's heart out and sacrifice the blood on the burial mounds of Li Keyong's ancestors in Daizhou.⁸⁴

Concluding Remarks: Ancestral Worship in the Southern Tang as Positive Projection

Although they do not provide much factual information on how ancestral rituals were actually performed, the memorials related to the system of the ancestral cult that have been presented above testify to the great importance the tenth-century Later Tang and Later Jin rulers placed on the claim of eminent ancestries. On the other hand, while Ouyang Xiu calls the ritual system of the Five Dynasties culturally other and not worthy of remembrance, Sima Guang does not discuss matters of ancestral worship at all. This is possibly due to the fact that the historian is less interested in ancestral lineages and genealogy than his contemporaries. Instead, Sima Guang limits himself to providing rather terse information on matters concerning the ancestral cults of the Northern dynasties. I argue that the entries in the *Zizhi tongjian* on the establishment of ancestral shrines and conferral of honorific titles are associated with unorthodox practices and bad omens and that they have derogatory connotations: the request to relocate the ancestral temple of the Li family clan of the Later Tang in 923 is associated with the anecdote concerning Lady Liu, the formal wife of Li Keyong and stepmother of Zhuangzong, who was left behind in Jinyang, while the emperor's natural mother moved to Luoyang. Sima Guang criticizes the fact that Zhuangzong privileged his natural mother and conferred on her the title of Huang Taihou, while Lady Liu was named Great Concubine. As for the second Later Tang emperor, Mingzong, his system of ancestral worship, whereby honorific titles were conferred on his blood relatives, is associated with the impoverishment of peasants in the border area between Wei and Dai, which was considered inauspicious, a region that in fact would be lost to the Khitan not long after. According to the *Zizhi tongjian*, the two Later Tang rulers, Zhuangzong and Mingzong, may never have gained control over the ancestral site in the capital. At the beginning of Zhuangzong's reign, under the aegis of Zhang Quanyi, the old Tang ancestral site was restored, and the spirit tablets of the emperor's ancestors were

84 *Zizhi tongjian* 269/8781f; *XWDS* 39/427.

probably relocated from Jinyang, but it is possible that no services were performed throughout the period of his reign.

The historian reprimands the early tenth-century Northern courts for not being able to control the side branches of the family clans. The Later Tang rulers proved unable to impose a structure upon ancestral worship and consequently failed to maintain a hierarchy among the different branches of the family clan. The emperor was thus one among a whole crowd of individuals who claimed the right to perform ancestral sacrifices. This critical stance contrasts with the rather positive depiction of the Southern Tang's 南唐 (937–975) ancestral cult.

The Southern Tang ruler, Li Bian 李昇 (r. 937–943), originally a subject of Wu 吳 (902–937) known as Xu Zhigao 徐知誥, restored the Li surname in 937. From the late thirties until the foundation of the Song dynasty, the Southern Tang would contend the mandate to rule with the Northern dynasties. In particular, under the reign of Li Bian's son, Li Jing 李景 (r. 943–960), the Southern Tang claimed legitimate rulership over the empire.⁸⁵ The issue of the legitimacy of Song rule imposed on Sima Guang a binding solution to the question of the chronological succession of the five Northern dynasties. Although the *Zizhi tongjian* draws a line between legitimate and illegitimate by referring to Shi Jingtang as “emperor” and to Li Bian as “Tang ruler” (Tangzhu 唐主),⁸⁶ in several cases Sima Guang shows a rather sympathetic attitude towards the Southern Tang.

The *Zizhi tongjian* reports that in 939 Xu Zhizheng 徐知證, king of Jing and adopted brother of Li Bian, repeatedly sent memorials to the ruler requesting the permission to adopt the Li surname and to establish the ancestral temple for the Tang emperors. Li Bian agreed to do so, but the relatives from the branch of the family to which the empress dowager belonged were excluded from governmental agencies, and likewise, the eunuchs were not allowed to participate in public affairs either. In the same year, Li Bian conferred on his stepfather, Xu Wen 徐溫 (862–927), the title of Yizu 義祖 and performed the mourning rituals for his deceased natural parents; together with the empress, they wore the mourning sackcloth, and, according to the ancient rituals, they took their place inside the funeral chamber, mourning day and night for fifty-four days. When his step-brothers, Xu Zhizheng and Xu Zhi'e 徐知諤 (both fl. 937–946) requested to take part in the funerary ritual, their request was denied. The *Zizhi tongjian* reports that Xu Wen's daughter made herself mourning clothes and entered the chamber, crying until the ritual was finished, as if it were her own parents' funeral.⁸⁷

85 On the creation of the imperial genealogy of the Southern Tang see Kurz 2014, 601–621.

86 In one single entry he is referred to as “emperor”.

87 *Zizhi tongjian* 282/9197.

According to the historian, unlike their Northern neighbors, the Southern Tang rulers were able to keep the collateral branches of the family clan and their blood relatives away from government administration. In this way, the hierarchy among the different branches of the family clan was maintained, and the Southern Tang did not witness the inter-lineage strife that characterized the court politics of their Northern neighbors. Li Bian's example positively influenced the members of his family clan and his progeny. This ensured that the court would enjoy both political stability and a smooth running administrative apparatus and prevented them from suffering from the excesses that plagued the Northern dynasties. Sima Guang states that these are "all [achievements that] the other states were not able to make."⁸⁸

References

- Aigle, Denise / Charleux, Isabelle / Goossaert, Vincent / Hamayon, Roberte (eds.): *Miscellanea Asiatica: Mélanges en l'honneur de Françoise Aubin*. Sankt Augustin: Institut Monumenta Serica, 2010.
- Atwood, Christopher P: "The Notion of Tribe in Medieval China. Ouyang Xiu and the Shatuo Dynastic Myth", in: Aigle et al. 2010, 593–621.
- Beimeng suoyan* 北夢瑣言, by Sun Guangxian 孫光憲 (900–968). Tang Song shiliao biji congkan. Beijing: Zhonghua, 2002.
- Bol, Peter K: *This Culture of Ours: Intellectual Transitions in Tang and Sung China*. Stanford: Stanford University, 1992.
- Brashier, Kenneth E: *Ancestral Memory in Early China*. Cambridge: Harvard University, 2011.
- Cefu yuangui* 冊府元龜, by Wang Qinruo 王欽若 (962–1025). Beijing: Zhonghua, 1986.
- Chaffee, John W: *Branches of Heaven: A History of the Imperial Clan of Sung China*. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 1999.
- Chen Shanjun 陳尚君 (ed.). *Jiu Wudai shi xinji huizheng* 舊五代史新輯會證. Shanghai: Fudan daxue, 2005.
- Davis, Richard L: *From Warhorses to Ploughshares: The Later Tang Reign of Emperor Mingzong*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University, 2014.
- Du Xingzhi 都興智 and Tian Likun 田立坤: "Hou Jin Shi Chonggui Shi Yanxu muzhiming kao" 后晋石重贵石延煦墓志铭考, *Wenwu* 2004:11, 87–95.
- Fan Wenli 樊文礼: *Li Keyong pingzhuàn* 李克用评传. Jinan: Shandong daxue, 2005.
- Giles, Lionel: "Dated Chinese Manuscripts in the Stein Collection", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 11:1 (1940), 317–344.

88 *Zizhi tongjian* 282/9197: 皆他國所不及。

- Hou Han shu* 後漢書, by Fan Ye 范曄 (398–445). Beijing: Zhonghua, 1965.
- Jinshu* 晉書, by Fang Xuanling 房玄齡 (578–648) et al. Beijing: Zhonghua, 1975.
- Jiu Tang shu* 舊唐書, by Liu Xu 劉煦 (887–946). Beijing: Zhonghua, 1975.
- Jiu Wudai shi* 舊五代史, by Xue Juzheng 薛居正 (912–981). Beijing: Zhonghua, 1976.
- Jiu Wudai shi xinji huizheng*. See Chen Shangjun 2005.
- Johnson, David: “The Last Years of a Great Clan: The Li Family of Chao Jun in Late Tang and Early Sung”, *Harvard Journal of Asian Studies* 37:1 (1977), 377–403.
- Junzhai dushu zhi jiaozheng* 郡齋讀書志, by Chao Gongwu 晁公武 (1105–1180). See Sun Meng 1990.
- Kurz, Johannes: “On the Southern Tang Imperial Genealogy”, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 133:4 (2014), 601–621.
- Liji zhengyi* 禮記正義, by Kong Yingda 孔穎達 (574–648). *Shisan jing zhushu* (biaodian ben) 十三經注疏 (標點本), ed. by Li Xueqin 李學勤, vol. 6. Beijing: Beijing daxue, 1999.
- Mansvelt Beck, Burchard Jan: *The Treatises of Later Han: Their Author, Sources, Contents and Place in Chinese Historiography*. Leiden: Brill, 1990.
- Nienhauser, William H. (ed.): *The Grand Scribe's Records, Vol. 8: The Memoirs of Han China, Pt. 1*. Bloomington: Indiana University, 2008.
- Siku quanshu zongmu tiyao* 四庫全書總目提要, ed. by Ji Yun 紀昀 (1724–1805). Shanghai: Shangwu, 1931.
- Sun Meng 孫猛 (ed.). *Junzhai dushu zhi jiaozheng* 郡齋讀書志校證. Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 1990.
- Sung, Chia-fu. “An Ambivalent Historian: Ouyang Xiu and His New Histories”, *T'oung Pao* 102:4–5 (2016), 358–406.
- Tackett, Nicolas: *The Destruction of Medieval Aristocracy*. Cambridge: Harvard University, 2014.
- Tang huiyao* 唐會要, by Wang Pu 王溥 (922–982). *Lidai huiyao congshu*. Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 1991.
- Wang, Gungwu: “The *Chiu Wu-tai shih* and History-writing during the Five Dynasties”, *Asia Major* 6.1(1957), 1–13.
- Wudai huiyao* 五代會要, by Wang Pu. *Lidai huiyao congshu*. Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 1978 [rpt. 2006].
- Xie Baocheng 謝保成: “Bei Song zhongqi de Tang shi yanjiu yu *Xin Tang shu* chongxiu zhong de jige wenti” 北宋中期的唐史研究与新唐书重修中的几个问题, *Zhongguo shixue yanjiu* 中国史学研究 4(1997), 106–117.
- Xin Wudai shi* 新五代史, by Ouyang Xiu 歐陽修 (1007–1072). Beijing: Zhonghua, [1974] 2011.
- Yang Lien-sheng: “A ‘Posthumous Letter’ from the Chin Emperor to the Khitan Emperor in 942”, in: *Excursions in Sinology* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1969), 418–420.

- Yuhai* 玉海, by Wang Yinglin 王應麟 (1223–1296). Taipei: Taiwan huawen, 1964.
- Zhu Yi 朱溢: “Tang zhi Bei Song shiqi de Huangdi qijiao” 唐至北宋時期的皇帝親郊, *Guoli Zhengzhi daxue lishi xuebao* 國立政治大學歷史學報 34 (2010), 1–55.
- : “Tang zhi Bei Song shiqi Tai Miao jisi zhong sijia yinsu de cheng zhang” 唐至北宋時期太廟祭祀中私家因素的成長, *Taida lishi xuebao* 台大歷史學報 46 (2012), 36–84.
- : “Tang Song shiqi Tai miao miaoshu de bianqian” 唐宋時期太廟廟數的變遷, *Zhonghua wenshi luncong* 中華文史論叢 2012:2, 124–160 [Zhu Yi 2012 (2)].
- Zizhi tongjian* 資治通鑑, by Sima Guang 司馬光 (1019–1086). Beijing: Zhonghua, 1956 [rpt. 2010].
- Zhou Agen 周阿根: *Wudai muzhi huikao* 五代墓誌彙考. Anhui: Huangshan shushe, 2012.

