

The Real Judge Dee: Ti Jen-chieh and the T'ang Restoration of 705

Judge Dee, the urbane county magistrate whose cool detachment and superior intellect solved the sadistic crimes committed in his jurisdiction, probably has a larger international reputation than any other hero from China's past. The complex and, at least early in the process, ironical factors that lie behind his ascent to world-wide fame are, however, less widely known. The following pages describe how Ti Jen-chieh 狄仁傑 (630–700), the original historical figure, gave rise to a political legend, which, fully explored, offers a number of textual, political, and religious insights into the late-medieval period. They will show that Ti Jen-chieh's medieval reputation was essential to his much more recent, and largely fortuitous, international appearance as a fictional detective and judge.

The historical Ti Jen-chieh was a medieval statesman, whose career culminated at the late-seventh-century court of the usurping empress Wu 武后 (r. 690–705). This was a period, in history as in fiction, of high drama, when the empress's Chou 周 dynasty, replacing the T'ang 唐 in 690, was threatened by a succession crisis and when China itself was menaced by hostile Khitan and Turkish forces to the north. For most of the thirteen centuries since his death, Ti Jen-chieh has been seen, not as a detective or judge, but as a T'ang loyalist at the Chou court, working assiduously for the restoration that took place five years after his death. His traditional reputation crystalized around two specific achievements: first he was held to have secured the eventual restoration of the T'ang house by persuading the empress Wu to recall her son the T'ang prince Li Hsien 李顯 from exile and make him heir-apparent, and second he was credited with recommending and instructing five officials, the so-called "Five Princes." These men murdered the Chang 張 brothers, the most notorious of the empress's favorites, early in 705, and so brought about the abdication of the

The substance of this article was given to seminars at the University of Colorado at Boulder on March 8 and at Harvard University on March 11, 1991. I am grateful for their help to Paul W. Kroll at Boulder and Peter K. Bol at Harvard. Much of the section on *Ti Liang kung chuan* 狄梁公傳 was given as a paper at the 1991 International Conference on the History of the Sui, T'ang and Five Dynasties at the University of Hong Kong. I wish to thank Joseph Wong of the Centre of Asian Studies, its organizer, for helpful comments. Glen Dudbridge of Oxford University gave me a series of detailed and substantial suggestions. I also wish to thank Clifford Evans, Fellow of St John's College, Cambridge, for sharing with me his exhaustive knowledge of the Judge Dee stories, and my brother, James McMullen of Oxford University for suggesting numerous improvements to this article.

empress, the succession of her son as emperor and the full restoration of the T'ang.

Such, then, were the achievements at court that appealed to successive generations in dynastic China. From within a matter of decades after his death, they led to a surge of praise for Ti Jen-chieh. Tributes were paid him in prose and verse by a succession of emperors, officials, and scholars. In the ninth and tenth centuries, a large body of anecdotes celebrated his loyalty, daring, skills, and wit. At the height of his reputation, in the mid-eleventh century, Ti was praised by the great statesman and scholar Fan Chung-yen 范仲淹 (989-1052) in terms that suggested superhuman powers:

When heaven and earth are blocked up, who will open them forth? When sun and moon are in eclipse, who will reveal them? When a great edifice lies prostrate, who will raise it up? When the sacred vessels [of dynastic power] fall, who will lift them up? The greatness of Ti [Jen-chieh] alone is able to confront this task.¹

Only the analytical rigor of the neo-Confucian movement led to a revised assessment of the achievements with which tradition credited Ti. A turning point may be seen in Ssu-ma Kuang's 司馬光 analysis of the sources for the reign of the empress Wu. In compiling the chronological history *Tzu chih t'ung chien* 資治通鑑, Ssu-ma questioned the textual evidence for Ti's role at court by casting doubt on the authenticity of a much-praised biography of him titled *Ti Liang kung chuan* 狄梁公傳. This work, which was attributed to a well-known literary and calligraphic figure of the early-eighth century, Li Yung 李邕 (678-747), occupies a central place in the account of Ti's ascent to fame that follows.²

The transformation of Ti Jen-chieh, the T'ang loyalist of tradition, into Judge Dee, the fictional provincial detective, nearly thirteen centuries after his

¹ *Fan Wen-cheng kung chi* 范文正公集 (SPTK edn.) 11, p. 1a; *P'eng-tse hsien chih* 彭澤縣志, edn. of 1592, rpt. in *Chung-hua fang-chih ts'ing-shu* 中國方志叢書 (Taipei: Ch'eng-wen, n.d.) 9, pp. 6b-11b. For this stele text and Fan Chung-yen's interest in Ti Jen-chieh, see William H. Nienhauser, Jr. (Ni Hao-shih 倪豪士), "Tu Fan Chung-yen T'ang Ti Liang kung pei" 讀范仲淹唐狄梁公碑, in *Chün-nien Fan Chung-yen i-ch'ien nien tan-ch'ien kuo-chi hsüeh-shu yen-chiu t'ao-lun hui wen chi* 紀念范仲淹一千周年國際學術研究討論會文集 (Taipei: Wen-chien hui, 1989), pp. 411-44. This article takes Fan's text as its framework, dividing it into 20 sections, 19 of which concern Fan's account of Ti's career. The author adds comments and cites relevant T'ang sources. Though the material he quotes is also used in part of the analysis given below, the author's perspective clearly differs from that of the present article. I am grateful to the author for sending me a copy of his article, which I saw only while undertaking a final revision of the present work.

² *Tzu chih t'ung chien* 資治通鑑 (Peking: Ku-chi, 1956; hereafter *TCTC*) 206, p. 6527, *k'ao-i* 考異. Wang Shih-chen 王世貞 (1526-1590) was also sceptical: see "Ti Liang kung tz'u pei" 狄梁公祠碑, quoted from *Yen-chou shan jen kao* 兗州山人稿, in *Liu i chih i lu* 六藝之一錄 (SKCS edn.) 9, pp. 12b-13a. See the scathing comments of the Ch'ien-lung emperor on Ti, in *P'ing chieh ch'ün yao* 評鑑閩要 (1771 edn.) 5, pp. 13b-17b. See also below, "The Informal Biography *Ti Liang kung chuan*."

death is straightforwardly described. Robert van Gulik, the creator in English fiction of Judge Dee, based his master detective on the first section of the *Wu Tse-t'ien ssu ta ch'i an* 武則天四大奇案, an anonymous Ch'ing novel in which the historical Ti Jen-chieh was the protagonist. Van Gulik himself translated the first half of the novel, and provided it with a scholarly introduction and some annotation.³ In the translation, Ti Jen-chieh and his henchmen are immediately recognizable to their Western language devotees as the models of the long series of brief novels that followed from van Gulik's pen. Van Gulik himself conceded that his Judge Dee, though based on this figure in Ch'ing fiction, owes little to his seventh-century origins. Another Dutch scholar, W. L. Idema, tracing the role of Ti Jen-chieh in popular literature, was also unable to establish any continuity between the historical Ti Jen-chieh and the detective in the first half of the Ch'ing novel.⁴

Indeed, only one, laconically recorded, incident in Ti Jen-chieh's career as the earliest historical sources portray it suggests that he could solve legal cases.⁵

³ Robert van Gulik, *Celebrated Cases of Judge Dee (Dee Goong An): An Authentic Eighteenth-century Chinese Detective Novel, Translated and with an Introduction and Notes* (New York: Dover Publications Inc., 1976). First published as *Dee Goong An: Three Murder Cases Solved by Judge Dee* (Tokyo: 1949). For the Chinese novel, see *Wu Tse-t'ien ch'i an* 武則天奇案 (Shanghai: Chin-chang, 1939). See also van Gulik's "Translators Postscript," pp. 225-27, for other editions of this novel. For a translation of Ti Jen-chieh's biography in *Hsin T'ang shu* 新唐書, see Suzanne E. Cahill, "The Real Judge Dee: An Annotated Translation of the Official Biography of Ti Jen-chieh in Ch. 115 of the New T'ang History," *Phi Theta Papers* (University of California at Berkeley) 14 (September 1977). This paper permits the focus on the *Chiu T'ang shu* biography that runs through the present article. I am grateful to Vicky Cass of the University of Colorado at Boulder for sending me a copy.

⁴ W. L. Idema, "The Mystery of the Halved Judge Dee Novel: The Anonymous *Wu Tse-t'ien Ssu-ta Ch'i-an* 武則天四大奇案 and its Partial Translation by R.H. van Gulik," *Tamkang Review* 8.1 (1977), pp. 155-69, esp. 159-62.

⁵ As deputy president of the Court of Justice in the late 670s, Ti was said to have pronounced, within the space of one year, on criminal charges facing no fewer than 17,000 individuals, "and there were no complaints of injustice." High-ranking officials in the Court of Justice, by virtue of their role in deciding capital cases, exerted a power that had wide social repercussions. The threat of action by wrongly sentenced individuals as vengeful ghosts made it especially likely that such judicial figures might be remembered in popular lore. But nothing further in the history of Ti Jen-chieh's reputation for the ten centuries after his death suggests that he was a figure in either a popular or an elite tradition of judicial case solving. See *Chiu T'ang shu* 舊唐書 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1975; hereafter *GTS*) 89, p. 2886; *T'ang yu yüan kuai* 冊府元龜 (Li Ssu-ching's 1642 edn.; rpt. Peking: Chung-hua, 1960; hereafter *TFYK*) 618, p. 12b; *Hsin T'ang shu* (Peking: Chung-hua, 1975; hereafter *HTS*) 115, p. 4207; *Tu i chih* 獨異志 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1983) C, p. 69. This information is not included in anecdotal or institutional sources that have entries for the Court of Justice. See *Ta T'ang hsin yü* 大唐新語 (Taipei: Jen-ai, 1985; hereafter *THH*) 7, p. 102; *T'ung tien* 通典 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1988; hereafter *TT*) 25, p. 711, and *Tang hui yao* 唐會要 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1955; hereafter *THY*) 66, p. 1148, for the cases of Tai Chou 戴胄, Chang Wen-kuan 張文瓘, and Yuan Jen-ching 袁仁敬. The three judicial case books identified by van Gulik as the oldest in the Chinese tradition, *I yü chi* 疑獄集, *Chü yü kuai chien* 折獄龜鑒, and *Tang yin pi shih* 棠陰比事 do not mention any case involving Ti Jen-chieh. For the first two compilations, see Yang Feng-k'un 楊奉琨, ed., *I yü chi chü yü kuai chien chiao shih* 疑獄集折獄龜鑒校釋 (Shanghai: Fu-tan ta-hsüeh, 1988); for *Tang yin pi shih*, see R. H. van Gulik, *Tang yin-pi-shih: "Parallel Cases from under the Pear-tree"* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1956), pp. vii-xi.

The image of Ti Jen-chieh as a master detective is thus clearly a recent one. It represents a case of transposition: the author of the Ch'ing novel transferred to Ti Jen-chieh the tradition of detective writing that had developed around such later historical figures as Judge Pao (Pao Cheng 包拯, 998–1061) and Judge P'eng (P'eng P'eng 彭鵬, 1637–1704).⁶ As Idema suggests, in portraying Ti in this way, the author of *Wu Tse-t'ien ssu ta ch'i an* probably intended simply to create an effective introduction to the second half of his novel. In this, Ti is portrayed in his traditional role as a court statesman and T'ang loyalist. Van Gulik, however, dismissed this section of the novel as inferior to the first and not deserving of attention. Judge Dee as a high court official therefore hardly figures in his stories.

Since his death, therefore, Ti Jen-chieh has given rise to two traditions, not just one. The second, that of the master detective, is recent and, for all the pleasure that it affords, should be set aside as irrelevant to the historical Ti. But it is the contention of this article that the central theme in the first, more ancient, tradition about Ti, his loyalty under the empress Wu's brief Chou dynasty to the supplanted T'ang house, was also based if not on fiction then at least on hearsay and on a distortion of the facts of his life and attitudes. It is argued that, beginning in the mid-eighth century, Ti's achievements as a T'ang loyalist were significantly exaggerated. Unassailable facts about Ti's career contributed to the growing legend, but it developed largely through romantic invention. Its success is to be related to deep-seated changes in the political world of China in the eighth and ninth centuries. These changes concern the attitudes of the medieval elite to a central concept in Chinese political philosophy, that of dynastic loyalty.

Exploration of Ti Jen-chieh's historical role and attitudes during the final years of the seventh century involves close scrutiny of a range of sources from the T'ang and Sung, including Ti's own surviving works, formal historical material, epigraphical texts, verse, and anecdotal accounts. Particular attention will be paid to the textual history of his surviving memorials and of his official biography in *Chiu T'ang shu* 舊唐書, completed in its present form in 945. Neither a provincial detective nor a T'ang loyalist emerges from the sometimes conflicting evidence, but a figure of considerable interest nonetheless, a dynastic servant of energy and panache, a man who lived more dangerously than most at a time when high-level political life carried horrendous risks.

⁶ For Judge Pao, see Patrick Hanan, "Judge Bao's Hundred Cases Reconstructed," *HJAS* 40 (1980), pp. 301–23.

THE EVIDENCE FROM TI JEN-CHIEH'S OWN HAND

Ti Jen-chieh's reputation in the eighth and ninth centuries had many sides. As a major statesman, he held some of the highest posts in the official hierarchy. He was recognized as having been an effective administrator of the northeast frontier at a time of great crisis. Elsewhere in the provinces, he was known as a fearless challenger of disruptive supernatural forces, and as a compassionate administrator of the people in his charge. At court, he was seen as clear-minded and unsullied by the corruption and cruelty that surrounded him. He also had a reputation as a practitioner of medicine, and as a calligrapher. It is an assumption of this article that each facet of his reputation reinforced the whole, and that it was precisely this many-sidedness that enabled him to become a hero-figure, even though the various aspects are kept distinct in T'ang and Sung sources. But the search for the original figure and for the starting point of the legend that grew up around him must distinguish between early evidence and later accounts. And for the former, there is no better introduction than the few compositions that are attributed to his own hand.

Here, however, investigation is confronted by an immediate difficulty. A ten-chüan collection of Ti Jen-chieh's writings was extant in the eighth century, was held in the imperial library, and was recorded in the imperial catalogue of 722.⁷ Had his collection been transmitted, it would have provided answers to many of the questions with which this article is concerned. But it was very probably destroyed, with the imperial collections, in the sack of Ch'ang-an by An Lu-shan 安祿山 in 756. Very little of Ti's own writing, therefore, now survives. This makes it the more important to analyze what does remain, for it is this scanty and imperfectly transmitted primary material that points to Ti's real role in the late-seventh century. The few surviving works may, for convenience, be considered according to the division that gave structure to the Ch'ing novel about him, between those from the earlier, provincial phases of his career and those that were composed in the last years of his life, mostly at the capital and in the setting of the court.

Only two texts of any length attributed to Ti Jen-chieh survive from the period before he attained high court office. The first is a proclamation banishing a local divinity from his temple, the second a request for tax remission for the county of P'eng-tse 彭澤 in present-day Kiangsi, where Ti was banished to the magistracy for four years. Neither of these texts relates directly to the T'ang loyalism that was central to his later reputation among the elite. On the other

⁷ *CTS* 47, p. 2075; *HTS* 60, p. 1600. *HTS* 59, p. 1540, lists a work entitled *Chia fan* 家範 (*Model for the Family*) as by Ti Jen-chieh.

hand, each helps account for the enormous authority that he came to have in the wider late-medieval world, and to which Fan Chung-yen's encomium bears witness.

The Dispatch to Hsiang Yü

Ti's "Announcement to the Hegemon Prince of Western Ch'u," the first of these two texts, is a brief composition preserved in condensed form in the Ming-dynasty *Shuo fu* 說郭 and in some editions of the late-tenth-century *T'ai p'ing kuang chi* 太平廣記.⁸ It leads immediately into a dramatic episode in the provincial phase of Ti's career. Related to other similar incidents from other parts of China where he served, it helps explain an aspect of the reputation that he had in late-T'ang lore. In 688, Ti was appointed pacification commissioner (*hsün fu shih* 巡撫使) for the province of Chiang-nan, charged with inspecting the vast areas south of the Yangtze. In this capacity he undertook a large-scale and particularly harsh suppression of local religious cults. One of the shrines that he destroyed was dedicated to the spirit of Hsiang Yü 項羽, king of Ch'u 楚, the unsuccessful contender for the empire after the breakup of the Ch'in dynasty at the close of the third century BC.

The destruction of a cult that was held to have existed for nearly nine hundred years was not to be lightly undertaken. To achieve it, Ti cited the authority of the law in a written dispatch in which he directly addressed Hsiang Yü's spirit. The text of this dispatch demonstrates knowledge of the original account of Hsiang Yü's death on the banks of the Wu-chiang 烏江 contained in *Shih chi* 史記 and of Ssu-ma Ch'ien's 司馬遷 judgment on him.⁹ It also contains a reasoned case for the suppression of Hsiang Yü's cult. Ti Jen-chieh charged Hsiang Yü with having failed to recognize the destiny of the Han and the schedule of

history, and with having caused the deaths of the "eight thousand young men" with whom he had originally left Chiang-tung 江東 on his bid for conquest. He argued that Hsiang Yü's exclamation that "Heaven is destroying me" was a misapprehension: "[Your death] in truth derived from human actions; how could it have anything to do with destruction by Heaven?" Hsiang Yü was therefore not a fit subject for popular worship, and Ti was "sending the torch to destroy your shrine and to raze to level ground your halls and chambers. ... You should move away with all speed, and not bring about catastrophes for the people."¹⁰

This episode and Ti's actual destruction of local cults in the south in 688 made a vivid impression on the T'ang mind, for both are attested in several sources. The most important of these is *Feng shih wen chien chi* 封氏聞見記, the reminiscences of a certain Feng Yen 封演, probably of early-ninth-century date. In a brief account of Ti's suppression, Feng mentions the dispatch to Hsiang Yü's spirit and echoes the charge that Hsiang Yü had caused the deaths of "eight thousand young men." Thus he attests the text of the dispatch as it is contained in *T'ai p'ing kuang chi*. Other texts of T'ang date that mention the suppression are the mid-eighth-century *Ch'ao yeh ch'ien tsai* 朝野僉載 by Chang Cho 張鷟, the source also named in the *Shuo fu* version of the incident; a mid-eighth-century collection of anecdotes by Liu Su 劉餗, the *Sui Tang chia hua* 隋唐嘉話; the *Tu i chih* 獨異志 by Li Jung 李冗, of mid- to late-ninth-century date; *Tang hui yao* 唐會要; and Ti Jen-chieh's official biography in *Chiu Tang shu*.¹¹ Less directly, the late-eighth-century *Kuang i chi* 廣異記, a particularly important collection for the witness it bears to Ti's confrontations with the supernatural, also refers to Ti's campaign of suppression.¹²

⁸ *Shuo-fu* 說郭 (rpt. Shanghai: Shang-wu, 1927) 2, pp. 10b-11a; *T'ai-p'ing kuang chi* (Peking: Chung-hua, 1959; hereafter *TPKC*) 315, pp. 2495-96. Teng Ssu-yü 鄧嗣禹, ed., *T'ai-p'ing kuang chi p'ien mu chi yin shu yin-te* 太平廣記篇目及引書引得 (Peking: Harvard-Yenching, 1934), p. 9, suggests why, in the indexed edition, this anecdote is attributed to a Ming source entitled *Wu-hsing chang ku shih* 吳興掌故事. Lou Kam-t'ong 盧錦堂, in "T'ai-p'ing kuang chi yin shu chung shu shih t'an" 太平廣記引書種數試探, *Han hsiieh yen-chiu* 漢學研究 2.1 (1984), p. 262, indicates that the early ms. of *TPKC* consulted by the Ch'ing scholar Sun Ch'ien 孫潛 lacked this passage, and points to the version of it contained in *Shuo-fu*, where it is cited as drawn from the mid-eighth-century *Ch'ao yeh ch'ien tsai* 朝野僉載. The *Shuo-fu* version, which thus has a transmission independent of the present *TPKC*, contains a number of variants when compared to the *TPKC* version, and concludes by stating that only Yü's shrine at Kuei-chi 會稽 remained. I am grateful to Glen Dudbridge for this reference, for whom see also "Yü-ch'ih Chiung at An-yang: An Eighth Century Cult and Its Myths," *AM* 3d ser. 3.1 (1990), p. 44, n. 59; Fukuda Toshiaki 福田俊昭, *Chōya sensei itabun shu* 朝野僉載佚文集, in *Daishō bunka daigaku kiyō* 大東文化大學紀要 4 (1986), p. 9.

⁹ For the original text from which Ti Jen-chieh drew, see *Shih chi* 史記 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1959; hereafter *SC*) 7, p. 336; for Ssu-ma Ch'ien's assessment, see pp. 338-39. For independent confirmation of Ti's tenure as pacification commissioner in 688, see *Feng shih wen chien chi chiao cheng fu yin-te* 封氏聞見記校證附引得 (Peking: Harvard-Yenching, 1933) 7, p. 7.

¹⁰ Jean Levi, "Les fonctionnaires et le divin: Luites de pouvoirs entre divinités et administrateurs dans les contes des six dynasties et des Tang," in *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 2 (1986), pp. 81-110, esp. 89-90. For Hsiang Yü as a local divinity, see David Johnson, "The City God Cults of T'ang and Sung China," *HJAS* 45 (1985), pp. 363-457, and Dudbridge, "Yü-ch'ih Chiung," p. 32, n. 17, and p. 44. The reference to "eight thousand young men" was standard in Tang compositions on Hsiang Yü; see for example Wang Chi's 王績 "Hsiang Yü ssu Wu-chiang tsan" 項羽死烏江贊, *Wang Wu kang chi Tang kao tzu chi pu* 王無功集東臯子集補遺 (Tai-nan ko ts'ung shu edn.) 1, p. 5a; Ling I 靈一, "Hsiang wang miao" 項王廟, *Ch'uan Tang shih* 全唐詩 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1960; hereafter *CTShih*) 809, p. 9127; Li Te-yü 李德裕, "Hsiang wang t'ing fu ping hsü" 項王亭賦并序, *Li Wen-jao wen chi pieh chi* 李文饒文集別集 (SPTK edn.) 22, p. 116a. I am grateful to Rbt. Neather for drawing my attention to this composition.

¹¹ *Feng shih wen chien chi* 9, pp. 1-3; *Ch'ao yeh ch'ien tsai*, evaluation of prominent political figures by Fou-hsiu tzu 浮休子, quoted in *TPKC* 169, pp. 1235-36, "for razing improper shrines, he had the initiative of a heroic gentleman"; *Sui Tang chia hua* 隋唐嘉話 (Shanghai: Ku-tien wen-hsieh, 1958) 3, p. 24; *THY* 77, p. 1414. See also *TFK* 655, p. 142; and *Tang yü lin* 唐語林 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1987) 3, pp. 189-90, 219. The *Sui Tang chia hua* and second *Tang yü lin* account read 700 rather than 1,700. *Tu i chih* C, p. 76, makes the number 1,200. For "1,700," see *Han shu* 漢書 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1962) 25B, p. 1270.

¹² *Kuang i chi*, quoted in *TPKC* 298, p. 2371. For its authorship and dating, see Dudbridge (Tu Te-ch'iao 杜德橋), "Kuang i chi ch'u t'an" 廣異記初探, *Hsin-ya hsiieh pao* 新亞學報 15 (1986), pp. 395-414.

These texts establish that as pacification commissioner Ti put to the torch either 700 or 1,700 shrines for popular deities in south and southeast China. The accounts mention a small number of the deities by name, all of them historical figures: king Nan 赧, the last of the Chou kings;¹³ king Fu-chi 夫槩 of Wu 吳;¹⁴ lord Ch'un-shen 春申;¹⁵ Chao T'o 趙佗, ruler of Nan Yüeh 南越 in the early Han;¹⁶ the Later Han general Ma Yüan 馬援;¹⁷ and Sun Ts'e 孫策, king Hsüan 宣 of the San-kuo Wu 三國吳.¹⁸ Others, probably the great majority, were for unnamed local gods of the far south, in some cases not even Chinese. Only the four cults of Hsia Yü 夏禹,¹⁹ Wu T'ai-po 吳太伯,²⁰ Chi Cha 季札,²¹ and Wu Tzu-hsü 伍子胥 were left untouched.²²

¹³ SC 4, pp. 169–70. The commentary, from the eighth-century *Shih chi cheng i* 史記正義, quoted Liu Po-chuang 劉伯莊 as saying that the name Nan, meaning to flush red through shame, was an indication of his humiliating powerlessness. Ti may well have held that his performance as emperor did not merit his being a cult figure.

¹⁴ King Fu-chi of Wu was an actor in the drama in which Wu Tzu-hsü was involved, and his conduct was far from exemplary. In the account given in SC 31, pp. 1466–67, he advised his brother king Ho-lu 閼廬 of Wu to attack Ch'u, and then took the throne of Wu himself. When his brother returned to drive him out, Fu-chi fled to Ch'u and was enfeoffed at T'ang-chi 堂谿. Again it is possible to see how Ti Jen-chieh might have objected to such a man being a cult figure.

¹⁵ For Lord Ch'un-shen, see SC 78, pp. 2387–99. He was a minister of Ch'u for 25 years, whose decisions were controversial in later comment. He failed to accept the warning of Chu Ying 朱英 that Li Yüan 李園 planned his murder on the death of king K'ao-lieh 考烈 of Ch'u. He was in the event murdered, and his property destroyed. For Ssu-ma Ch'ien's comment, see SC 78, p. 2399. He was another figure who appealed to the literati imagination: see Chao Chü-chien 趙居貞, "Hsin hsiu Ch'un-shen chün miao chi" 新修春申君廟記, inscription dated 751, *Ch'üan T'ang wen* 全唐文 (rpt. Taipei: Hua-wen, 1965; hereafter CTW) 296, pp. 19b–21b; Liu K'o 劉軻, "Tai Hsün Ch'ing yü Ch'u hsiang Ch'un-shen chün shu" 代荀卿與楚相春申君書, *T'ang wen ts'ü* 唐文粹 (SPTK edn.; hereafter TWT) 89, pp. 9a–10b; Tu Mu 杜牧, "Ch'un-shen chün shih" 春申君詩, in *Fan ch'üan shih chi chu* 樊川詩集注 (Shanghai: Ku chi, 1973) 2, pp. 145–46; P'i Jih-hsiu 皮日休, "Ch'un-shen chün pei" 春申君碑, in *P'i tzu wen sou* 皮子文藪 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1959) 4, pp. 41–42.

¹⁶ Chao T'o, a former Ch'in general, established himself as king of Nan Yüeh in the early Han, but, on the arrival of Lu Chia 陸賈, the envoy of the emperor Wen 文, pleaded to revert to vassal status. Nonetheless, within his own country he continued to be honored as an emperor. See SC 113, pp. 2967–70; Harold J. Wiens, *Han Chinese Expansion in South China* (Hamden, Connecticut: Shoe String Press, 1967), pp. 133–38; and Donald Harper, "A Chinese Demonography of the Third Century B.C.," *HJAS* 45 (1985), pp. 476–77.

¹⁷ For Ma Yüan, see Donald S. Sutton, "A Case of Literati Piety: The Ma Yüan Cult from High T'ang to High Qing," *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles and Reviews* 11 (1989), pp. 79–114.

¹⁸ For Sun Ts'e, see *San kuo chih* 三國志 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1959) 46, pp. 1101–13.

¹⁹ For Hsia Yü, the paragon ruler of high antiquity, see SC 2, pp. 49–90. He was a frequent subject for composition: a contemporary of Ti's, the court writer Sung Chih-wen 宋之問, wrote a prayer text for his temple; see *Wen yüan yung hua* 文苑英華 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1966; hereafter WYH) 998, p. 2a; also 734, pp. 9a–10a, text by Sun T'i 孫逖.

²⁰ For Wu T'ai-po, see SC 31, pp. 1445–47. For an eighth-century tribute, see Wu Yün 吳筠, *CTShih* 853, p. 9656.

²¹ For Chi Cha, see SC 31, p. 1449–65; p. 1475 gives Ssu-ma Ch'ien's judgement. He was also a frequent topic for composition; see e.g. CTW 294, pp. 19a–20a, Kao Shao 高紹, dated 722; and CTW 364, pp. 1b–3b, Chao Chin-yung 趙晉用, dated 746.

²² For Wu Tzu-hsü, see the thorough analysis by David Johnson, "The Wu Tzu-hsü Pien-wen and Its Sources," *HJAS* 40 (1) pp. 93–156, and 40 (2) pp. 465–505.

Historians and social anthropologists of China have recently devoted significant research to the state's role in popular religion. They have established that the category of "improper offerings" (*yin ssu* 淫祀) or "improper shrines" (*yin tz'u* 淫祠), which was Ti's target, originates in the "Ch'ü li 曲禮" section of the *Li chi*. They have shown that it was elaborated in the Confucian writing of the Later Han, and became a frequently used term in the Period of Disunion and in the T'ang itself. The category also figures in Taoist usage, where it designated those popular cults to which organized religious Taoism had not extended sanction.²³ To a late-T'ang writer, advising officials, it was the absence of any written documentation that defined a cult as "improper":

If even [the shrines of] sacred peaks, seas, *chen* 鎮, famous mountains, and rivers are not at the places where they are officially established, and if they are not recorded in the literature, they are "improper offerings." If in life the performances of human beings have no merit to be acclaimed and in death no virtue to be used for exhortation, then [their worship] will constitute an "improper offering."²⁴

Suppression of "improper" cults is mentioned in official historical sources from Han times on. In popular lore, however, suppression carried a considerable risk, for it might provoke a response from the spirit whose shrine was destroyed.²⁵ In practice, therefore, the T'ang administrative response to *yin-ssu* varied widely. A moderate approach was to attempt to modify local belief in unorthodox spirits by education. There is an example of Chang Wen-ts'ung 張文琮, a matter of perhaps no more than a decade before Ti Jen-chieh's suppression. As prefect of Chien-chou 建州 in present-day Fukien, in Kao-tsung's reign, Chang found that the people within his borders "had always set value on improper offerings" and neglected the statutory cults to the god of the soil. He therefore issued a "document of instruction," linking recent crop failures in the prefecture to the neglect of the agricultural offering. "He showed the people the regulations for restraint, and they gladly put them into practice."²⁶ This approach was adopted by others, for example by Lo Hsiang 羅珣 as governor of Lu-chou

²³ For the term *yin ssu*, see *Li chi chü shu* 禮記注疏 (Taipei: Shih-chieh, 1971) 5, p. 31b. James Legge, *The Li Ki* (Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1885), p. 116, translates "licentious offerings." See also *Han shu* 12, p. 351; Ying Shao, *Feng su t'ung i chiao shih* 風俗通義校釋 (Tientsin: T'ien-chin jen-min, 1980) 9, p. 325, p. 339; *San kuo chih* 1, p. 4; 27, p. 740; 52, p. 1228.

²⁴ *T'ien hua lu* 因話錄 (Shanghai: Ku-tien wen-hsueh, 1957) 5, pp. 108–9. This unusually exact definition is foreshadowed by phrasing in the 7th-c. history of the Northern Chou (557–581 AD); see *Chou shu* 周書 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1971) 5, p. 85.

²⁵ For the example of Ku Shao 顧邵, see *San kuo chih* 52, p. 1229. For the anecdote about the ghost's retribution, see *TPKC* 293, p. 2332, and Levi, "La lutte," pp. 90–91.

²⁶ *CTS* 85, p. 2816; *HTS* 113, p. 4187, biography of Chang Wen-ts'ung.

廬州 in present-day Anhui,²⁷ and, alongside his harsher suppression, by Li Te-yü 李德裕.²⁸ In some cases, officials participated reluctantly and with condescension in offerings to local divinities, especially when they had power over the climate.²⁹ Or they might try to propitiate them with gifts or other favors.³⁰

Other T'ang central government officials might take an extreme position, do as Ti Jen-chieh did, and simply demolish the offending cults. This was done by Wei Ching-chün 韋景駿 at Fang-chou 房州 in present-day Hupei,³¹ by Yü Ti 于頔 at Su-chou 蘇州 in present-day Kiangsu,³² and by Li Te-yü more generally in the southeast. Indeed the people of the southeast and south, of "Wu and Ch'u 吳楚," were described in a range of sources as credulous and superstitious. Initiatives suppressing cults in those regions therefore appear to have been more numerous than elsewhere.³³

Some local cult figures who were mentioned in the histories or in literature, however, were not only deeply rooted in local society but also appealed to the imagination of successive generations of lettered Chinese. Some writers, therefore, took established local cults, those documented in respectable histories, as the starting point for their compositions, in some cases even describing their observances. Hsiang Yü, the very divinity whose shrine Ti Jen-chieh demolished, was a case in point. He was the subject of a number of compositions in the eighth and ninth centuries. Though some were ambivalent towards him, others were laudatory. His cult was therefore hardly likely to have been universally considered an "improper" one. The same was true of lord Ch'un-shen and of Ma Yüan, the "Wave Subduing General," whose cult Ti suppressed. It is not surprising, therefore, that in these cases the evidence of later T'ang writers shows that Ti's intervention was not permanently effective.³⁴

²⁷ *Ch'üan Tsai-chih wen chü* 權載之文集 (SPTK edn.) 23, pp. 6a-b.

²⁸ *CTS* 174, p. 4511; *HTS* 180, p. 53 28; *Li Wen-jao wai chü* 4, pp. 5b-6a. I am grateful to Jovana Muir for this reference.

²⁹ *Kuo shih pu* 國史補 (Shanghai: Ku-tien wen-hsüeh, 1957) 3, p. 65.

³⁰ Dudbridge, "Yü-ch'ih Chiung," p. 30, quoting *CTS* 88, p. 3093.

³¹ *CTS* 185A, pp. 4797-98.

³² *CTS* 156, p. 4129. See also Denis Twitchett, "The Seamy Side of Late T'ang Political Life: Yü Ti and His Family," *AM* 3d ser. 12 (1988), p. 35, and n. 12. The cults that Yü left untouched, those of Wu T'ai-po and Wu Tzu-hsiü, were two of the four that Ti was said to have spared.

³³ For the southern regions of Wu and Ch'u as especially credulous, see the references in preceding n.; also *TT* 182, p. 4849, and *TWT* 49, pp. 4b-5a, by Lo Yin 羅隱, and *TPKC* 288, p. 2292, quoting *Ch'ao yeh ch'ien tsai*.

³⁴ For compositions on Hsiang Yü, see n. 10, above. Also *Yen Lu kung wen chü* 顏魯公文集 (SPY edn.) 5, pp. 20b-21a. Yen's inscription includes the claim, "To the present, offerings of sustenance at his temple have been uninterrupted. The deeds wrought by his spirit appear comprehensively in the illustrated scripture recorded by Lu Yü 陸羽, Master of Chin-ling 金陵." *Li Wen-jao p'ieh chü* 22, p. 116a, preface to "Hsiang wang t'ing fu," indicates that the mid-8th-c. statesman Fang Kuan 房琯 had composed an inscription for Hsiang Yü that "praised his talents." A *lien chü* 聯句 poem in the collection of Yen Chen-ch'ing's contemporary and friend the monk poet Chiaio-jan 皎然, however,

It follows that Ti Jen-chieh's action in banishing the spirit of Hsiang Yü by written dispatch, and in burning down his shrine was, by T'ang standards, more than usually harsh. It is, therefore, important to emphasize that it was not undertaken in a spirit of open scepticism about the supernatural. In his dispatch Ti did not dispute the existence of Hsiang Yü's spirit; rather he acted on the grounds that Hsiang Yü was an inappropriate subject for worship. His action has rightly been seen as the ruthless wielding of superior power, the assertion of central dynastic authority over a troublesome local spirit.

It is likely that in the cases of the seven other listed historical figures whose cults Ti Jen-chieh suppressed, Ti also formally charged them and provided the political and moral reasons for their unacceptability. Thus a passage in *Kuang i chü* records a tradition that even in burning down the shrine of an unnamed aboriginal god in Tuan-chou 端州, in present-day Canton province, Ti served the spirit with a written notice of its fate.³⁵

Moreover the exceptional and daring exercise of central authority that marked Ti's treatment of Hsiang Yü characterizes a whole group of accounts of his confrontation with local spirits in provincial T'ang China. In these episodes, he prevailed over, demoted, or dismissed the spirits he encountered and remained unscathed. The episodes are recorded mainly in *Kuang i chü*; but several other sources, some from the eighth century, contain them.

The earliest such encounter is recorded in almost as much detail as Ti's confrontation with Hsiang Yü, and indeed immediately precedes it in several sources. It took place in 679, at least nine years before Ti suppressed the "improper" cults in the south. The emperor Kao-tsung was about to make a progress north to Fen-yang 汾陽, near T'ai-yüan 太原 in modern Shansi, the home of both Li Yüan 李淵, the T'ang founder, and Ti's own family. Ti was commissioned, in a junior capacity, to arrange the journey.

The route of the imperial progress involved passing by the shrine of another troublesome spirit, the Jealous Goddess (Tu shen 妒神) at Fen-yin 汾陰. Tradition maintained that this goddess was the younger sister of the ancient hero Chieh Chih-t'ui 介之推. She was represented by a statue in her shrine and by a nearby spring. It was believed that she would take revenge on any who slighted her, bringing down hail, storms, or thunder. The senior administrator of Ping-chou 并州, Li Yüan-ch'ung 李元冲, had undertaken to ensure that Kao-tsung's visit would not risk such humiliation by opening up a bypass route,

suggests a ruined temple; see *Chou shang-jen chü* 書上人集 (SPTK edn.) 10, p. 2b. For Ma Yüan, see Sutton, "A Case of Literati Piety." For Lord Ch'un-shen, see n. 15, above, inscription commemorating repair of his temple in 751.

³⁵ *TPKC* 298, p. 2371, quoting *Kuang i chü*, Levi, "La lutte," pp. 87-88.

using corvée labor on a large scale. But Ti Jen-chieh had intervened in the name of a higher authority, stating that:

The Son of Heaven's progresses have a thousand carriages and ten thousand cavalry. The Earl of the Wind pacifies the dust and the Master of the Rain sprinkles the road.³⁶ How could the Jealous Goddess dare to do harm, that he should wish to take avoiding action over her?

The construction of the alternative route was then abandoned. A note that is contained in *T'ung tien* 通典, in connection with another imperial visit to Fenyin, by the emperor Hsüan-tsung in 723, mentions that under the empress Wu a goddess's statue had been removed from the shrine, and another divinity installed instead. It seems likely, therefore, that Ti Jen-chieh's intervention led to the temporary suppression of the cult. However, the premises survived the An Lu-shan rebellion, and by the second half of the eighth century the Jealous Goddess was again being worshipped: there exists a lengthy inscription dedicated to her dated 776.³⁷ Again, therefore, Ti was in the long term unsuccessful in curbing a troublesome local divinity. But again, viewed closely in its context, his initiative was unusually bold: not only did he put down a disruptive spirit, he also prevailed over Li Yüan-ch'ung, the senior administrator of Ping-chou, a man who seems likely to have been a Li T'ang clansman and the nephew of one of the great dynastic servants of T'ai-tsung's reign. From both encounters, moreover, Ti remained unharmed.³⁸

Several other incidents demonstrate Ti Jen-chieh's role in exerting authority in the supernatural domain in provincial China. One of these, again recorded in *Kuang i chi*, involved his suppression in 688 of the aboriginal deity at

³⁶ The Earl of the Wind and the Master of the Rain were recognized T'ang gods; see *THY* 22, pp. 425-26. But this and the preceding sentence adapt a line from the "Fu on the Eastern Capital" by Pan Ku 班固, and may here simply be metonymic hyperbole for a grand imperial progress; see *Liu ch'ien chu Wen hsüan* 六臣注文選 (SPTK edn.) 1, pp. 31b-32a.

³⁷ *THY* 7, p. 517; *Feng shih wen ch'ien ch'ü* 9, p. 1, reading Li Yüan-ch'ung 李元冲; *CTS* 89, p. 2887; *T'ang yü li* 3, pp. 189-90. There is a fuller description of the Jealous Goddess that differs in detail from those cited above in *TPKC* 291, pp. 2314-15. See also *Yu yang tsu tsu* 酉陽雜俎 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1981) 14, p. 13, quoted by Nienhauser, "Tu Fan Chung-yen," p. 417. For 8th-c. developments, see David McMullen, "Bureaucrats and Cosmology: The Ritual Code in T'ang China," in David Cannadine and Simon Price, eds., *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremony in Traditional Societies* (Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 1987), p. 221. Again neither Ti's intervention nor the later changes resulted in the lasting suppression of the cult. See *Chin shih hsi pien* 金石續編 (rpt. Taipei: Kuo-lien t'u-shu, 1965) 8, pp. 189-92, stele text by Li Yen 李諶, dated 776. The text mentions two major provincial administrators, one of whom, Hsüeh Chien-hsun 薛兼訓, was replaced by Pao Fang 鮑防 late in 776; see *CTS* 11, p. 310; and 146, p. 3957.

³⁸ For Li Ch'ung-hsüan, see *CTS* 60, p. 351, and *HTS* 70A, p. 1984. He was the nephew of Li Hsiao-kung 李孝恭, prince of Ho-chien 河間, whose biography precedes his brief notice; see *CTS* 60, pp. 2347-49. *Chin shih lu chiao cheng* 金石錄校證 (Shanghai: Shang-hai shu-hua, 1985) 4, p. 73 (no. 773), records his epitaph dated 695.

Tuan-chou, to whom he served a written notice. In this episode, he was on the point of having his agents set to the torch the deity's shrine. But "those who entered the shrine died immediately." Ti nonetheless called for those able to burn down the shrine, offering them 100,000 cash, and obtained two volunteers. He provided them with a written order, so that the spirit became inactive and the temple was burnt.

On his way back to the capital, however, at Pien-chou 汴州, Ti was told by "a man who could see ghosts" that he was being followed by a ghost who sought revenge for the burning of its shrine. But his informant reassured Ti that he was on the point of being given high central office, and that, with a retinue of over twenty ghosts providing for his own safety, he was in no danger of harm. "After a while, the spirit went back to Ling-nan." In a different way, this episode again shows that Ti was the representative of the central government who prevailed over a local spirit precisely because he had greater authority. The Tuan-chou spirit gave up its pursuit of him as he neared the capital, powerless in the knowledge that he was destined for high office at the center of both political and supernatural power.³⁹ Since Ti did not have jurisdiction in Ling-nan, this story also suggests that traditions deriving from his suppression in Chiang-nan had spread to nearby areas.

Another account in *Kuang i chi* similarly emphasizes Ti's authority in the face of the supernatural. The incident, which may be dated to 686, concerns his arrival as governor of Ning-chou 寧州, in present-day Kansu. The governor's residence was haunted, and more than ten incumbents had died. Ti was informed on arrival that the house had been abandoned and had become delapidated, so that it was no longer habitable. But refusing to accept this situation, Ti had the original residence repaired. For several nights he was pestered by strange manifestations. Stung to anger, he remarked, "I am the prefect and this is my house. ... If you are a spirit, obey the true teaching forthwith. If you are a demon, how dare you interfere with me?" In a moment, a ghost, fully clothed, came out and identified himself as the official of a previous reign, buried under a tree on the west side, his corporeal soul (*p'o* 魄) pierced by the tree's roots. He had wished to state his case to Ti's predecessors, but they had died and he had not been able to reach them. Ti assented to his request for reburial elsewhere, and the activities ceased.⁴⁰

Yet another incident, comparable in the light it throws on Ti's relations with the supernatural, may perhaps be dated 696. Ti Jen-chieh was then overall

³⁹ See n. 35, above. The text of the anecdote presents difficulties and my understanding is tentative.

⁴⁰ *TPKC* 329, p. 2614; Levi, "La lutte," p. 89; Dudbridge, "Yü-ch'ih Chiung," p. 30. A comparable story is in *TPKC* 327, pp. 2597-98, citing *Liang ching chi* 兩京記, quoted by J. J. M. De Groot, *The Religious System of China* (rpt. Taipei: Literature House, 1964) 4, pp. 445-46.

commander (*tu-tu* 都督) at Yu-chou 幽州, in modern Hopei. In the neighboring province of Ho-tung 河東, present-day Shansi, a sophora tree had been split open by lightning, and it was believed that a thunder god had been squeezed in the tree. Ti Jen-chieh set out with a retinue; but as they approached, his followers all shied away, so that he went up to the tree on a single mount, and dealt successfully with the spirit.⁴¹ Again, as in the case of Tuan-chou, the setting was outside Ti's actual jurisdiction, and this again suggests that stories of his power over the supernatural had spread beyond the areas he administered.

A final, later story, also from *Kuang i chi*, is important in two respects. It indicates that Ti's general reputation was still very much alive in the fifth decade of the eighth century; and it also shows that by this time he had, in popular lore, crossed over the divide between the living and the dead, and was active among the "unseen authorities" beyond. Huo Yu-lin 霍有鄰, a junior officer in Chi 汲, had died and in the underworld been mistakenly charged with taking the kidneys from a living sheep, in order to gratify his local superior's appetite. Released to return to life, on his return journey he saw a court entitled "The Grand Censor's Court." His guide informed him that the grand censor in question had been Ti Jen-chieh. Huo Yu-lin was Ti's maternal nephew, and he requested to be allowed to see Ti. An emotional interview took place, and Ti ratified the appointment as chief minister of Li Shih-chih 李適之 (d. 747). He then gave Huo two pills to apply to parts of his body that had decayed since his death. Huo, returning to life after seven days, rubbed on the preparation, and the affected parts were cured. Li Shih-chih was in fact appointed chief minister about a month later.⁴²

The tradition that Ti was skilled in medicine cannot be attested by any text attributed to him. But it is strengthened by two other anecdotes, one from early in his career and another from near its close. In the Hsien-ch'ing 顯慶 reign period (656-661), he was said to have used acupuncture to cure a boy with an apparently terminal tumor of the nose. Ti then rejected the large reward offered and left the scene of his success.⁴³ In the second, which has a capital rather than a provincial setting, Ti described a young scholar, Yüan Hsing-ch'ung 元行沖, as "an item in my medicine store not to be left out for a single day," because of his ability to deliver astringent advice.⁴⁴

How literally true some of these anecdotes were is not altogether important; their "outer stories" are in most cases factual, for the narrative frames in which they are set are largely compatible with what is known of Ti's official career.⁴⁵ But anecdotes of this kind from the medieval period take the form of discrete episodes, and very rarely generalize or contain more than minimal parenthetical information about their subjects. The recurrent theme of Ti's tough-mindedness is therefore never explicitly characterized. There is also a conspicuous lack in these stories of references to the predominant late-medieval theme of his loyalty to the T'ang house, even though neither *Kuang i chi* nor *Feng shih wen chien chi* was oblivious to the events and personalities surrounding the empress Wu and her court.⁴⁶

Explored in its wider context, Ti's composition on Hsiang Yü suggests that he was a courageous official effective both in the supernatural and administrative realms. Unlike many others, he survived these confrontations victorious and unscathed. The fact, too, that he could achieve a remarkable cure before his official career had even begun and that as a junior official he could confront a senior administrator means that he was, in T'ang lore, not simply the agent of central power, but emphatically a heroic individual in his own right.

Concern for Popular Welfare

The second provincial text that purports to be from Ti Jen-chieh's own hand is a much less reliable document than his dispatch to Hsiang Yü. But whether authentic or not, it points to another aspect of his wider reputation from early times, his concern for popular well-being. The text purports to be a memorial submission asking for tax remission for the people of P'eng-tse on the grounds of crop failure through lack of rain.⁴⁷ The earliest version of it is contained in the P'eng-tse county gazetteer of 1582. This also prints a note dated 1344 by a scholar of the Yüan period, Wang Kuo-fu 王國輔. In this note, Wang mentions producing a version of the text in the hand of a calligrapher, Lu [Julin] 遼 [儒林], clearly a contemporary or earlier figure.⁴⁸

The grounds for suspicion about the memorial's authenticity are that it is not mentioned in either of Ti's official biographies, though all the other extant

been interested in medicine, see *TPKC* 146, pp. 1052-53, quoting *Ting ming lu* 定命錄, an anecdote in which at Pien-chou 汴州 he delays his journey to his place of banishment "to treat sickness," but is hastened on by the magistrate Huo Hsien-k'o.

⁴⁵ Dudbridge, "Yü-ch'ih Chiung," p. 43.

⁴⁶ See *TPKC* 298, p. 2371; 444, p. 3633, quoting *Kuang i chi*, and *Feng shih wen chien chi* 4, pp. 1, 27.

⁴⁷ The text is copied into *CTW* 169, pp. 8a-b, under the title "Memorial Requesting the Remission of the People's Grain Tax." See also *P'eng-tse hsien chi* 9, p. 3b.

⁴⁸ *CTW* 799, pp. 22a-b; *Pao k'o u'ung pien* 寶刻叢編 (TSCC edn.) 15, p. 430, quoting *Fu chai pei lu* 復齋碑錄. *Pi tsu wen sou* does not include this item.

⁴¹ *TPKC* 393, pp. 3138-39.

⁴² *TPKC* 381, p. 3032, quoting *Kuang i chi*. For a censor's court (*yü shih yuan* 御史院), see *Tu T'ang liu tien* 大唐六典 (rpt. Tokyo: Hiroike gakuen jigyo bu, 1973) 13, p. 9a; *Yin hua lu* 5, pp. 101-4. For Li Shih-chih 李適之, see *CTS* 9, p. 15; and 99, pp. 3101-2.

⁴³ *Chi i chi* 集異記, by Hsüeh Yung-jo 薛用弱 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1980) 2, pp. 14-15; *Lei shuo* 類說 (rpt. Peking: Wen-hsüeh ku-chi, 1955) 8, p. 3b.

⁴⁴ *CTS* 102, p. 3177; *TCTC* 206, p. 6532; *HTS* 200, p. 5690. For another hint that Ti may have

memorials by Ti are either incorporated or referred to in them. Nor is it referred to in other eighth- or ninth-century compilations that include material about Ti. The commemorative texts written for engraving and erection at P'eng-tse in 864 by P'i Jih-hsiu 皮日休 (ca. 834–883) and in 1038 by Fan Chung-yen do not mention this memorial, though the former survives only in a fragmentary state.

The earliest reference to the P'eng-tse memorial would seem to be in the Southern Sung geographical handbook *Yü ti chi sheng* 輿地紀勝, compiled by Wang Hsiang-chih 王象之 with an author's preface dated 1208. This text explains that the Southern Sung state promoted the cult of Ti Jen-chieh at P'eng-tse: in 1137 the emperor conferred on Ti's temple the title "Illustrious and Upright" (Hsien cheng 顯正). *Yü ti chi sheng* also records that "in the T'ien-shou 天授 period (690–692), Ti Jen-chieh had been slandered by Lai Chün-ch'en 來俊臣, and was banished to be magistrate of P'eng-tse." On arrival at P'eng-tse, it continues, Ti made a statue of the dead T'ang emperor Kao-tsung and presented twice-monthly offerings to it:

He was in this post for five years. ... The record [composed] for his shrine states, ... Since it had not rained for a long time, he submitted a memorial asking for the remission of one year's grain tax for his prefecture. Wu Tse-t'ien allowed this. In addition, he released prisoners so that they returned [home] in due time. The people of the prefecture were moved and set up a shrine for him.

The lateness of this, the earliest reference to a memorial from P'eng-tse, the patently fanciful detail about Ti's offerings to a statue of Kao-tsung, and the fact that no version of the text itself can be proven to be earlier than the Yüan period all justify suspicion that the memorial text may have been fabricated in the Southern Sung to amplify the cult to Ti. This amplification, in turn, may be related to the Southern Sung dynasty's need at a time of acute crisis to identify and extol exemplary loyalty.¹⁹

Despite its probable spuriousness, the P'eng-tse text articulates the theme of Ti Jen-chieh's concern for popular welfare that other, unquestionably authentic, texts and biographical records bear out in some detail. The early-ninth-century anecdotal collection *Ta Tang hsün yü* 大唐新語 suggests Ti's ability to

cut through normal legal procedures and attitudes in order to restore confidence in government. It records that as a commissioner at Ch'i-chou 岐州 in present-day Shensi, Ti encountered several hundred deserters who plundered by night and hid in the valleys by day. The prefectural and county authorities had caught several tens of them, before Ti interceded. He argued that "these are men who have reached the end of the road. If you do not treat them leniently, there will be disaster." He then put clear notices on the important routes, permitting them to confess, and had those already bound in jail released, provisioning them and sending them on their way. Kao-tsung commended the policy, which was then extended empire-wide.²⁰

Then probably in 686, as governor of Ning-chou, Ti "brought peace and harmony to Chinese and barbarian, so that the people found a spirit of rejoicing. The people of the commandery engraved a stele in praise of his virtue."²¹ Early in 688, as vice-president of the Board of Works, he was one of three commissioners for famine relief in the provinces of Shan-tung and Ho-nan.²² Later in 688, as governor of Yü-chou 豫州, following the abortive rebellion of Li Chen 李貞, the prince of Yüeh 越, against the empress Wu, he pleaded for clemency for the 600–700 under prosecution and the 5,000 under threat of dispossession. Again, this is said to have resulted in a popular expression of gratitude. Another stele was erected in praise of Ti, this time in Feng-chou 豐州 in present-day Suiyuan, where, after their execution had been commuted, the rebels had been banished.²³ This was an intervention that concerned participants in a purely political rebellion. Nearly a century later, when Ti Jen-chieh had become a loyalist hero, this plea was to be invoked as a precedent, in an effort to secure clemency for collaborators in the far more destructive political rebellion of An Lu-shan.

During this same incident at Yü-chou, Ti intervened to persuade the chief minister Chang Kuang-fu 張光輔, who led a force of 300,000 that crushed the rebellion of prince Chen, not to allow looting and the massacre of the people. A stele was again erected for him there, though its date is less certain. A late-T'ang story, preserved in *Liu Pin-k'o chia hua lu* 劉賓客嘉話錄, records a miraculous event relating to this stele and to another near it. This second stele, which stood facing the one for Ti, commemorated the good government at Yü-chou of the dubiously loyal Wu Shao-ch'eng 吳少誠 (750–809). Wu Shao-ch'eng

¹⁹ *Yü ti chi sheng* 輿地紀勝 (rpt. Taipei: Wenhai, 1962) 30, pp. 10b, 12a. There is valuable background information to this measure in Valerie Hansen, *Changing Gods in Medieval China 1127–1276* (Princeton: Princeton U.P., 1990) esp. pp. 99–104. This memorial should not be confused with the request for cessation of tax shipments from Chiang-nan that Ti made at the end of his career; see n. 61, below. A related local tradition about Ti at P'eng-tse is recorded in *Hu-k'ou hsien chih* 湖口縣志 (1756 edn.), rpt. in *Chung-kuo fang-chih ts'ung-shu*, pp. 501–2.

²⁰ *TTHY* 4, pp. 63–64.

²¹ *TTHY* 9, p. 139; *TFYK* 677, pp. 22b–23a; *CTS* 89, p. 2887; *HTS* 117, p. 4252; *TCTC* 203, p. 644, suggesting the date of 686. *TFYK* 820, p. 15b, contains the same account as *CTS*, but with the name of the prefecture missing.

²² *CTS* 6, p. 118. This is not mentioned in Ti's *CTS* biography.

²³ *TTHY* 4, p. 66; *CTS* 89, p. 2887; *TFYK* 618, p. 16b; *TCTC* 204, p. 6452.

was a fictive kinsman of the rebel Wu Yüan-chi 吳元濟 (d. 817), a provincial warlord based at Yü-chou (named Ts'ai-chou 蔡州 after 762) against whom imperial forces took the field in the celebrated Huai-hsi 淮西 campaign of 815-817. In the course of this campaign, a series of portents had taken place at Ts'ai-chou. Then finally: "The Wu stele sweated and turned to clay, while the stele for Ti [Jen-chieh] remained as before."⁵⁴ Engraved steles, this anecdote suggests, had supernatural properties. If, like the text for Wu Shao-ch'eng, they commemorated men contaminated by association with rebellion, they might, when imperial authority was reasserted, dramatically and spontaneously decay. A monument to a man of true uprightness and loyalty, like Ti Jen-chieh, on the other hand, was unaffected by such corrosive forces.

There are further examples of Ti Jen-chieh's concern for popular welfare. As prefect of Wei-chou 魏州 in present-day Hopei in 696-697, a tenure that followed his magistracy at P'eng-tse, Ti encouraged the people to continue normal farming activities in the face of the Khitan threat, rather than force them to withdraw to the towns, as his predecessor in office had done. The people erected a stele and built a shrine for him.⁵⁵ In a memorial submitted in 698 as overall commander in Ho-pei 河北, Ti asked for special clemency for the people in his jurisdiction, then under threat from barbarian power to the north and in a state of disaffection towards Chinese dynastic authority.⁵⁶ In one of a number of instances in which he asked for clemency for individuals, finally, Ti pleaded successfully for the life of Li K'ai-ku 李楷固, a junior Khitan general who defected to the Chou and later gave valuable service to the dynasty. The empress Wu expressed gratitude to Ti at a banquet in 700, the last year of his life.⁵⁷

It is of course difficult to assess these successive testimonies to Ti's concern for clemency and popular welfare. There was, even among his contemporaries, and certainly later, cynicism about the attitudes behind the erection of steles in

praise of local administrators.⁵⁸ At a time when disaffection in various sectors of society was taken as a serious threat, Ti's concerns may have been as much a matter of political calculation as of real solicitude. But the number of recorded monuments for him was unsurpassed in the documentation provided by *Chiu Tang shu* and other sources for any other late-seventh-century official. Even among a largely illiterate population, the display of these widely dispersed texts, with the supernatural powers that tradition accorded them, must surely have spread his fame.

Memorials to the Empress

The remaining texts transmitted as the works of Ti Jen-chieh all derive from the final stage of his career, when he served in high court or field-command posts. This last phase of his life has given rise not only to the tradition of his loyalty to the T'ang but also to a rich body of lore, much of it patently fanciful yet of great charm. The court in the final years of the empress Wu's reign was a very different environment from the provincial world of turbulent local spirits or disaffected populations in need of protection. Yet, refracted through hearsay and storytelling, it appealed no less vividly to T'ang tradition. From 697, the court was dominated by the notorious favorites Chang Ch'ang-tsung 張昌宗 and Chang I-chih 張易之, who stood for unprecedented dissipation and frivolity, and by the empress Wu's nephews, the politically ambitious Wu princes. Several of the stories about Ti from this period involve his confronting the Changs or the Wu princes and showing, through his quick wittedness and exemplary self-restraint, his superiority over them.⁵⁹

The texts by Ti that survive from this period, six in number, are, however, untouched by such lore. Four are policy recommendations and were transcribed into official compilations, probably at an early date. The remaining two, less directly political in content, were engraved in stone in the final year of Ti's life. In the search for the real Ti Jen-chieh, this small group of surviving works plays a central role. Three in particular strongly suggest that Ti was not the resolute T'ang loyalist that later tradition held him to be.

⁵⁴ *TIHY* 4, p. 66; *CTS* 89, p. 2887; *TFYK* 674, pp. 15b-16a; *TCTC* 204, p. 6453. *Pao k'o tsung pien* 5, p. 117, quotes *Fang pei lu* 訪碑錄 that a stele at Yü-chou had a text by Yüan T'ung-li 元通禮 written out by Tang Fu 黨復, and that it was reerected in 787. For the sequel, see *Liu Pin-k'o chia hua lu* 劉賓客嘉話錄 (TSCC edn.) by Wei Hsün 韋絢, preface dated 856, p. 6. This anecdote may be deficient: the text continues, "Before ten days were up a eunuch envoy arrived and erased Han [Yü's] 韓 [愈] composition, reengraving with an altered [text]." For the background to Han Yü's text commemorating the victory in Huai-hsi, and its replacement by one by Tuan Wen-ch'ang 段文昌, see Charles Hartman, *Han Yü and the T'ang Search for Unity* (Princeton: Princeton U.P., 1986), pp. 83-84, 261-62. For Wu Shao-ch'eng and Wu Yüan-chi, see *CTS* 145, pp. 3945-52. For the change of name from Yü-chou to Ts'ai-chou, see *CTS* 38, p. 1434.

⁵⁵ *TIHY* 4, p. 66; *WYTH* 877, pp. 3a-6a, Feng Su 馮宿; *TFYK* 688, pp. 13b-14a; 820, p. 15b. The Tu-ku Ssu-chuang 獨孤思莊 named here may be the same person as Tu-ku Chuang 獨孤莊, for whose notorious cruelty see *TPKC* 267, pp. 2094-95, quoting *Ch'ao yeh ch'ien tsai*.

⁵⁶ *THY* 77, p. 1414; *WYTH* 694, pp. 9a-b; *TFYK* 312, pp. 21b-22b. See also the next section.

⁵⁷ *CTS* 89, p. 2893; *TCTC* 205, p. 6547.

⁵⁸ *CTW* 207, p. 7b, by Sung Ching; *TFYK* 820, p. 15a. The rules for erecting steles to commemorate good government, involving a report and investigation at provincial level and a memorial to the throne, are in *T'ang liu tien* 4, p. 32a. See also *TCTC* 206, p. 6540, forbidding erection of stele without an imperial order.

⁵⁹ For two of the most vivid anecdotes concerning Ti at court, see *TPKC* 313, pp. 2478-79, quoting *Yu Tang hsien hua* 玉堂閒話; *Chi i chi*, in *Ku hsiao-shuo ts'ung-k'an* 古小說叢刊 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1980) 2, p. 9. (In a note reprinted for this text, Cheng Chen-to 鄭振鐸 states that this story was made into a *ku-chü* 雜劇 play by the Ch'ing writer Ch'iu Lien 裘理); *Lei shuo* 8, pp. 20b-22a; *Shuo fu* 25, pp. 7b-8a, "Chi ts'ui ch'iu" 集翠裘.

The four policy memorials form a homogeneous group. In them, Ti Jen-chieh urged the unwisdom of expansion beyond the traditional borders of China and the folly of grandiose religious building projects. Just over a decade after Ti's death, in the first years of Hsüan-tsung's reign, these principles were among the ideals of particular concern to a group of senior officials, some of them historians, led by Ti's former political ally Yao Ch'ung 姚崇 and by Sung Ching 宋璟. Their appeal to this group in turn may explain their incorporation into the official records.⁶⁰

The first memorial was submitted late in 697. Its background was the threat to dynastic power gathering on China's northeastern borders. From 696, first the disaffected Khitan, and then the Turks under the leadership of Mo-ch'o 默啜, made incursions into the northeastern plain, and at the same time tried actively to intervene in dynastic politics. Both groups were involved in the succession crisis of 696-698. Both proclaimed their preference for the Li-T'ang dynasty over the Wu-Chou. Ti, from being governor of Wei-chou, had been appointed overall commander of Yu-chou, with headquarters at modern Peking. From there he had been brought back to court with the post of vice-president of the Chancellery (*luan t'ai shih lang* 鸞臺侍郎). His advice on the northeastern frontier therefore had the benefit of first-hand experience.

This first memorial is a plea to abandon expansionist aims in both the far west and the northeast. Ti drew up arguments from history for a policy that required China to remain within her traditional borders. He argued that the "Four Garrisons" of Kucha, Khotan, Kashgar, and Tokmak should be abandoned and that the An-tung 安東 protectorate in the northeast should be entrusted to the Korean kingdom of Kao-li 高麗. Describing the possession of unproductive foreign territory as extravagant and vainglorious, he cited the Han emperors Yüan 元, who had disengaged from the commandery of Chu-yai 珠崖 in Hainan in 47 BC and Hsüan 宣, who had abandoned Chü-shih 車師 in present-day Sinkiang to the Hsiung-nu 匈奴 in 64 BC.

As well as occurring in *Chiu T'ang shu* and *Ts'ing yüan kuei*, commissioned in 1005, this memorial is included in *Wen yüan ying hua*, commissioned in 982, and *T'ang wen ts'ui*, completed in 1011. It is given in the same form in all four, and there are only minor, single- or two-character variations in the texts. Both *Chiu T'ang shu* and *Ts'ing yüan kuei* give the memorial the same narrative frame, and

⁶⁰ These concerns are listed in Yao Ch'ung's 姚崇 "Shih shih yao shuo" 十事要說, for which see *HTS* 14, p. 4383, and *CTW* 206, pp. 142-43. Other concerns that Yao lists include irregularities in the court, favoritism, excessive power in the hands of imperial relatives and the danger of too intimate a relationship between sovereign and high ministers, all of which play a part in the Ti story. See also the note in Po Chü-i's poem "The Old Man of Hsin-feng with the Bent Arm," *Po Chü-i chi* 白居易集 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1979), p. 62.

relate that Ti also submitted a memorial asking for the abolition of the An-tung protectorate, the restoration of the Korean kingdom of Kao-li as a T'ang dependent state, and the cessation of tax shipments from Chiang-nan. The memorial also occurs in a longer form in *T'ang hui yao*, completed in 961, where it is given an almost certainly inaccurate date and a more specific context. In this version, Ti's arguments were countered in a long statement by the court scholar Ts'ui Jung 崔融.⁶¹

The second memorial is a plea, dated late in 698, for a special act of leniency towards the people of Ho-pei.⁶² In that year, the situation with the Turks reached a crisis: Mo-ch'o, resentful at having been offered a Wu prince in marriage to one of his daughters instead of a Li prince, invaded Ho-pei. Chinese armies were at first unsuccessful against him. Only in the ninth month, after Li Hsien had been declared heir-apparent, was the Chou dynasty able to muster enough forces to deter the Turks and force their retreat. The heir-apparent did not lead the armies in person; this task fell rather to Ti Jen-chieh, and Ti's memorial was submitted when he held field command in Ho-pei. The memorial is the first composition by Ti that contains evidence for his attitude to the Chou.

The third memorial also concerned the northeastern frontier. It was probably submitted in 699, after Ti returned to Lo-yang from his Ho-pei field command. In it, Ti asked for the dismissal of Hsüeh Na 薛訥, who had been appointed protector general of An-tung in 698, the abolition of the An-tung protectorate, and the restoration of Kao-li in Korea as a dependent state. Ti likened the possession of territory in the east to having a serpent in one's hand. He again cited the examples of the Han emperors Yüan and Hsüan, who had abandoned far-off conquered territory.

This third memorial is unique among the four because it is not contained

⁶¹ *CTS* 89, pp. 2889-91; *THY* 73, pp. 1326-27; *TFYK* 991, pp. 132-134; *WYTH* 694, pp. 82-83; *TWT* 27, pp. 82-103; *TCTC* 206, p. 6524; R. W. L. Guisso, *Wu T'ie-t'ien and the Politics of Legitimation in T'ang China* (Bellingham: Western Washington, 1978), pp. 144-45, and notes. Denis Twitchett, ed., *The Cambridge History of China: Sui and T'ang China 589-906* (Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 1979) 3, part 1, p. 311. The *THY* text differs substantially from the other versions in two respects. First, it places the memorial in the context of a court discussion about the value of retaining the "Four Garrisons" recaptured by the general Wang Hsiao-chieh 王孝傑 in 692 (see *TCTC* 205, pp. 6487-88). It then has a long discussion by Ts'ui Jung 崔融 as historian of the right (*yu shih* 右史) opposing Ti's position, for which see also *WYTH* 769, pp. 86-122. Second, the text itself differs, including a citation from *Yen t'ieh lun* 鹽鐵論 absent from the other five versions. The *THY* date of 693 conflicts with the posts mentioned, since Ti Jen-chieh, according to *CTS* 89, p. 2889, was appointed vice-president of the Chancellery only in 697, while Ts'ui Jung was historian of the right probably only in the late 690s; see *CTS* 94, p. 2996, and Denis Twitchett, "A Confucian's View of the Taxation of Commerce: Ts'ui Jung's Memorial of 703," *BSOAS* 36 (1973), pp. 429-45. For Ti's references to Han history, see *TCTC* 28, pp. 902-5; and 25, pp. 827-29.

⁶² *CTS* 89, p. 2892; *THY* 77, pp. 1414-15; *TFYK* 312, pp. 216-222; *WYTH* 694, p. 112; *TCTC* 206, p. 6536.

in Ti's *Chiu Tang shu* biography or in *Ts'ê fu yüan kuei*, but in the early-ninth-century *T'ung tien*, in *T'ang hui yao*, and in an early-Sung geographical treatise, entitled *Tai-p'ing huan yü chi* 太平寰宇記. The most plausible explanation for the separate transmission of this memorial would seem to be that it was collected by Liu Chih 劉秩, the compiler of the institutional compendium *Cheng tien* 政典, before the loss of Ti Jen-chieh's works during the An Lu-shan rebellion. Liu Chih is believed to have advocated the same radical separation of the Chinese and barbarian worlds that this memorial argued. From *Cheng tien*, Ti's text would then have been copied into *T'ung tien*, in the slightly condensed form in which it is now represented there and, in a fuller version, into the *Hui yao* 會要 of Su Mien 蘇冕. Because to some extent it repeated the argument and content, even to the use of the same historical allusions, of the first memorial, it may not have been considered worth including alongside it in Ti's *Chiu Tang shu* biography and in *Ts'ê fu yüan kuei*. It is almost certainly one of the memorials referred to in the biography's narrative remarks following the first memorial. It is also the only one of Ti's four extant memorials that Ssu-ma Kuang omitted from *Tzu chih t'ung chien*.⁶³

The fourth memorial, submitted just weeks before Ti's death in late 700, attacked a proposal to exact a special tax on Buddhist clergy to meet the cost of a large statue of the Buddha. It is one of several memorials submitted by officials from this period protesting against expenditure on Buddhist projects. The text is contained in Ti's *Chiu Tang shu* biography, in *Ts'ê fu yüan kuei*, in *T'ang wen ts'ui*, and in *T'ang hui yao*. The *T'ang hui yao* version is shorter by a few sentences. The *Ts'ê fu yüan kuei* and *Chiu Tang shu* versions agree but for single- or two-character variations that do not affect the sense. A later Buddhist source, the Yüan-dynasty *Fo tsu li tai t'ung tsai* 佛祖歷代通載, contains a condensed version of the text and states that the statue was for the Pai-ma 白馬 slope.⁶⁴

It is the second memorial, then, pleading for compassion in Ho-pei, that is important to the argument of this article, for it contains an explicit statement of Ti's attitude to the Chou dynasty. As well as being contained in his *Chiu Tang shu* biography, the memorial is also entered in *Ts'ê fu yüan kuei*, *Wen yüan ying hua*,

and *T'ang hui yao*. The texts, however, vary significantly. The *Ts'ê fu yüan kuei* version contains a paragraph that is omitted from the *Chiu Tang shu*, *T'ang hui yao*, and *Wen yüan ying hua* versions. This paragraph includes a statement in which Ti clearly commits himself to the Chou dynasty in preference to the T'ang. The passage reads:

The people are like water. If you block it, it forms pools. If you channel it, it forms rivers. That it should pass through barriers or follow in a current is not [automatically] part of its unvarying nature. Let me use the T'ang dynasty as an illustration, for "the mirror of Yin 殷 is not far distant." In Ho-pei and Ho-nan at the time when there were labor levies for the [construction of] the Kung-ling 恭陵 [mausoleum for the heir-apparent Li Hung 李宏, who had died suddenly in 675], the authorities used coercion, and their harshness went beyond the regulations. Tiles and stones were thrown down in disorder, and in an instant [the labor force] had fled away. Surely this was because their strength was exhausted and they had become resentful, and had lost their fear of what the documents of punishment might bring. But men are not all of this category. Fortunately, we experienced the setting aside of the T'ang, and now the Great Chou has made men pure again. If we were to lack the gracious [virtues of] of compassion and reciprocity, how could we open the road for self-renewal?⁶⁵

Here then is an indication that Ti Jen-chieh, at least in his public pronouncements, was an open supporter of the Chou dynasty. There are, too, factors in the situation that Ti analyzed in this memorial that make his commitment the more significant. These concern the role that Ho-pei played in precisely the issue over which later tradition accorded Ti the fullest honors, namely the restoration of Li Hsien to the heir-apparency late in 698.

The memorial states that in 675, the year when the Kung-ling mausoleum for the heir-apparent Li Hung had been constructed, the labor force had rioted and anti-T'ang sentiment had flared among the population of Ho-nan and Ho-

⁶³ *TT* 186, pp. 5019-20; *THY* 73, pp. 1318-19; *Tai-p'ing huan yü chi* 太平寰宇記 (Hung-hsing shan-fang, 1803) 173, pp. 11b-12b. For Hsüeh Na's appointment as protector general of An-tung, see *CTS* 93, p. 2963, and *TCTC* 206, pp. 6534-35. The *THY* version is the longest, but erroneously has Hsüeh Jen-kuei 薛仁貴, Hsüeh Na's father, who had died in 683, instead of Hsüeh Na. For Liu Chih's implicit views on sino-barbarian relations, in his brother Liu K'uang's 劉琨 text "Wu chih 武指," see Lien-shang Yang, "Historical Notes on the Chinese World Order," in John King Fairbank, ed., *The Chinese World Order* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard U.P., 1968), pp. 3, 9-30; and *TT* 200, pp. 5498-502. This involves assuming that "Wu chih" was incorporated into Liu Chih's *Cheng tien*.

⁶⁴ *CTS* 89, p. 2893-94; *THY* 49, p. 657; *TFYK* 327, pp. 21b-23a; *TWT* 27, p. 10b; *TCTC* 207, pp. 6549-50; *Fo tsu li tai t'ung chi* (Taishō edn.) 1, p. 584c.

⁶⁵ The episode of the Kung-ling mausoleum for Li Hung, the heir-apparent, who died suddenly in 675, is confirmed in *CTS* 86, p. 2830; *THY* 21, p. 417. Wei Chi 韋機, who was in charge of construction, clashed with Ti, a consistent advocate of moderation in building projects, over other projects; see *CTS* 89, p. 2886. A satellite burial at Kung-ling is mentioned in *CTS* 85, p. 2816. Kung-ling was in Kou-shih, east of Lo-yang, near Mount Sung, and became a favorite area for the empress Wu in the final years of the seventh century; see below, "Engraved Compositions." The commemorative stele for the mausoleum, "Hsiao-ching huang-ti jui te chi" 孝敬皇帝徽德紀, is in Wang Ch'ang 王昶, ed., *Chün-shih ts'ui pien* 金石萃編 (1805 edn.) 58, p. 4b, and *Yen-shih hsien chih* 偃師縣志, rpt. of 1788 edn., in *Chung-huo fang-chih ts'ung-shu* 27, pp. 25b-29b. For Li Hung's death in 675, see *TCTC* 202, p. 6377. The tradition that the empress Wu may have murdered him may have derived from Li Mi 李泌, and is contained in *Yeh hou chia chuan* 鄭侯家傳, for which see below at n. 167 and Albert Dien, "The Use of the *Yeh hou chia chuan* as a Historical Source," *HJAS* 34 (1974), p. 234.

pei from which it had been drawn. It does not point out, however, that by the final decade of the century, their attitude to the T'ang had been reversed, a change brought about in part by the conduct of the Wu princes in military campaigns against the barbarians to the north. Wu San-ssu and Wu Yu-i 武攸宜, who were commissioned in 696 to resist the threat, had both proved ineffectual. It was against this background, of a Chinese population in Ho-pei made restive by military incompetence and brutality, that Ti Jen-chieh had been appointed governor of Wei-chou in 696. In 697, when Ti was still governor of Wei-chou, the situation had further deteriorated: Wu I-tsung 武懿宗 had behaved with extreme cruelty against the Chinese population of Ho-pei, and Ti Jen-chieh must have come close to witnessing his excesses.⁶⁶

The low standing of the Wu clan in Ho-pei also affected popular attitudes nearer the capital. When the newly invested heir-apparent Li Hsien was put in nominal charge of the campaign late in 698, the long-standing problem in mustering troops was said immediately to have been solved.⁶⁷ Ti was put in overall command of the resulting forces, and led them in the field. It was in this context that he submitted his memorial.

The Ho-pei population for which Ti now asked for special leniency had therefore changed from its earlier anti-T'ang outlook to an anti-Chou, pro-T'ang, attitude. It is therefore surprising that Ti should have included in his plea for leniency a reference to the anti-T'ang Kung-ling riots of 675 and an emphatic statement that the Chou was morally superior to the T'ang. Such a statement, given the context, is not likely to have come from a man deeply committed to using all available political means to achieve the restoration of the T'ang.

The *Ts'ê fu yüan kuei* paragraph of the memorial is so strikingly at odds with Ti's accepted reputation as an advocate of T'ang restoration that further analysis of its origin and transmission should be undertaken. It is particularly important to establish, in making this excursion into textual history, whether or not this was an early version of the memorial, one that preserved indications of Ti's outlook that later versions edited out.

⁶⁶ Wu San-ssu and Wu Yu-i both held high command in Ho-pei and were ineffectual; see *TCTC* 205, p. 6506, for Wu San-ssu; and *CTS* 199B, p. 5351; *TCTC* 205, p. 6507, for Wu Yu-i. For Wu I-tsung's cruelty see *TIHY* 2, p. 33; *CTS* 101, p. 3154, biography of Wang Ch'iu-li 王求禮; *CTS* 183, p. 4737; *CTS* 187A, p. 4884, second biography of Wang Ch'iu-li; *TIHY* 41, p. 744; 56, pp. 967-68; *TFYK* 459, p. 252; *TCTC* 206, pp. 6522, 6535, which mentions the appointment of Wu I-tsung and Wu Yu-kuei. For Wu I-tsung's cowardice, see also *Ch'ao yeh ch'ien tsai*, quoted by *TPKC* 254, pp. 1978-79; *TIHY* 2, p. 33.

⁶⁷ Guisso, *Wu T'ie-t'ien*, pp. 145-46; *TCTC* 206, p. 6534. The story is also in *Ch'ao yeh ch'ien tsai*, quoted by *TPKC* 277, p. 2196; see also *TCTC* 206, p. 6528, and in *TIHY* 2, p. 33.

The fact that the *Ts'ê fu yüan kuei* version is the fullest strongly suggests that its editors drew it from a source prior to the *Chiu T'ang shu* biography of Ti. For theirs was an editorial and compilatory discipline that emphasized the copying in of official documents. Copying, moreover, if not verbatim, tended to involve extracting or condensing, rarely if ever, expanding. In this tradition, therefore, fuller versions almost certainly mean earlier ones. There are grounds for believing that in this case the fuller source was one of three possibilities: the *shih-lu* 實錄, or Veritable Records, for the reign of the empress Wu, completed in 716; an independent collection of exemplary memorials compiled before the change in political climate made the survival of pro-Chou statements less likely; or else the 759 *kuo-shih* 國史, or National History, by Wei Shu 韋述 and Liu Fang 柳芳, which spanned this period. Though no certain answer as to which of these three sources contained the original memorial is possible, it seems that the balance of probability must fall on the *shih-lu*.

One reason for this is that T'ang official historians would very probably have placed critical policy memorials of this kind in the *shih-lu*'s main narrative under the date on which they were submitted. Evidence that this was regular T'ang practice is as follows: a remark, from later in the T'ang, criticized the official historian Ling-hu Huan 令狐綯, the compiler of *Tai-tsung shih-lu* 太宗實錄, for not including a memorial attacking Yüan Tsai 元載 by Yen Chen-ch'ing 顏真卿. Yen Chen-ch'ing's death did not occur until 784, and his biography should therefore have been entered under that year in the *shih-lu* for Tai-tsung's successor, the *Te-tsung shih-lu* 德宗實錄. But the *shih-lu* biography, if it was modeled on his *hsing-chuang* 行狀 or on his epitaph, both of which survive, would not in any case have contained the full text of Yen's policy memorials, since these were too long. The remark does, however, imply that it was accepted that important critical memorials should be entered in full in a *shih-lu*'s narrative at the point when they were submitted.⁶⁸

Inclusion in the *shih-lu* of policy memorials on issues about which historians felt keenly would also explain how groups of them, like those to which Ti's submissions belong, survived in *Ts'ê fu yüan kuei*, whose editors would simply have retrieved them from successive *shih-lu* and grouped them by categories in their compendium. Inclusion of memorials in *shih-lu*, moreover, helps explain why the role of official historian under the T'ang was as politically sensitive as it

⁶⁸ *TFYK* 562, p. 4a. One of the memorials concerned was probably that on direct access to the imperial presence, which was submitted in 766. It is referred to indirectly in Yen's *hsing-chuang* by Yin Liang 殷亮 and in his epitaph by Ling-hu Huan 令狐綯; see *Yen Lu kung wen chi* 14, pp. 6b-7a, 12a. The text is contained in *Yen Lu kung wen chi* 2, pp. 2b-3b; *TFYK* 546, pp. 10b-12b; *CTS* 128, pp. 3592-94; and *TCTC* 224, pp. 7189-90.

was. For to include a submission critical of the attitudes of a recently dead sovereign was to inflict grave embarrassment on his son, the reigning emperor. Yet, viewed in the context of medieval historiography and its ideals, it seems a wholly reasonable provision. It was, moreover, followed by Ssu-ma Kuang in his great chronicle, though considerations of space led Ssu-ma drastically to condense his texts. Thus Ssu-ma, perhaps even following the *shih-lu* for the empress Wu's reign itself, incorporates three of Ti's four memorials in his narrative.

Moreover, less directly, numbers of outspoken policy memorials from precisely this era, by otherwise obscure officials, are now included in the *lieh chuan* 列傳 section of *Chiu Tang shu*, where in some cases they are given minimal biographical settings. This seems to imply that, though their memorials had been preserved, no standard-form biographies for the authors concerned were available to the historians. Ti's near contemporary Hsin T'i-p'i 辛替否 is an example of this. His *Chiu Tang shu* biography consists essentially of two memorials. Both are harsh criticisms of over-expenditure on Buddhist buildings. The first was submitted in 708, the second in 711.⁶⁹ Another example, particularly relevant to the question of Ti Jen-chieh's T'ang loyalism, is provided by another otherwise obscure official, Su An-heng 蘇安恆. His *Chiu Tang shu* notice consists almost entirely of the text of three memorials submitted in 701, 702, and 703. The first two are the most outspoken of surviving attempts to induce the empress Wu to abdicate in favor of the heir-apparent and restore the T'ang dynasty. The third was an attempt to defend Wei Yüan-chung 魏元忠 from wrongful punishment by the notorious Chang brothers. Later historians, realizing the importance of these memorials, may have taken them from the *shih-lu* and provided them with the short biographical frames that they now have.⁷⁰

Ti Jen-chieh's Ho-pei memorial, moreover, is by no means the only case of a memorial text existing in full form in the *Ts'ê fu yüan kuei* and in shorter form in the *Chiu Tang shu* biography of its author. There are similar examples in the first of Hsin T'i-p'i's and Su An-heng's memorials and in others by Huan Yen-fan 桓彥範, one of the "Five Princes," and a figure politically close to Ti Jen-chieh,⁷¹ and Wei Yüan-chung.⁷² A likely source from which the *Ts'ê fu yüan kuei* editors drew the full forms of these memorials is the *shih-lu* for the reign of the empress Wu.

⁶⁹ For Hsin T'i-p'i's memorials, see *CTS* 101, pp. 3155-58; *THY* 48, p. 850; *WYTH* 698, p. 6a; *TFYK* 545, pp. 4a-7b, for the first; *CTS* 101, pp. 3158-61; *TT* 21, pp. 556-57; *TFYK* 545, pp. 7b-11a, for the second.

⁷⁰ For Su An-heng's three memorials, see (i) *CTS* 187A, pp. 4879-80; *WYTH* 694, pp. 1b-3a; *TFYK* 544, pp. 4a-6a. Part of this memorial is also included in *THY* 47, p. 831; (ii) *CTS* 187A, pp. 4880-81; *WYTH* 694, pp. 3a-4a; *TFYK* 544, pp. 6b-8a; (iii) *CTS* 187A, pp. 4881-83; *WYTH* 697, pp. 3b-4b; *TFYK* 875, pp. 20b-22b. A narrative frame similar to that of his *CTS* biography and a brief account of two of the three memorials is also at *THT* 2, pp. 25-26.

The second possible source for Ti's Ho-pei memorial was an independent collection of monitory memorials, compiled before the change in climate made it unlikely that pro-Chou sentiments like those it contained would have survived. The most likely work here is *T'ang ming ch'ên tsou* 唐名臣奏議, compiled by the long-serving official historian Wu Ching 吳兢, who lived through the events concerned. This work is not entered in the *Chiu Tang shu* bibliographic treatise, and was therefore probably completed after 722. But Wu Ching, its compiler, had served under the empress Wu. He also took part in the compilation of both versions of the *shih-lu* for the empress. He might have been expected to have preserved the whole text of pro-Chou memorials, rather than to have excised pro-Chou sentiment from them. Wu Ching believed strongly in monitory memorials and later urged their importance on Hsüan-tsung himself. His compilation cannot be ruled out as the source for the full form of Ti's Ho-pei memorial.⁷³

The third possible source, the *kuo-shih* presented to Su-tsung in 759, was 130 *chüan* in length and covered the whole of the T'ang to 759. It certainly contained an account of the dramatic events of the period 696-700, and equally certainly included a biography of Ti himself. Its principal compiler, Wei Shu, had started his career in the middle of the K'ai-yüan period, at a time when scholars such as Yüan Hsing-ch'ung, who had served the empress and known Ti Jen-chieh, were still in high office. Wei Shu's *kuo-shih* survived into the Sung and was available to the *Ts'ê fu yüan kuei* compilers. There is, however, a persuasive argument against accepting it as the source of the *Ts'ê fu yüan kuei* full texts of Ti's Ho-pei memorial and other full-form memorials, such as those by Hsin T'i-p'i, Su An-heng, Huan Yen-fan, and Wei Yüan-chung. Recent research has convincingly shown that the present *Chiu Tang shu* represents Wei Shu's *kuo-shih* without significant textual alteration. The condensation that can be detected in the present *Chiu Tang shu* text, not only in the cases of these memorials but also in narrative passages of Ti's biography analyzed below, must have been done, not by the *Chiu Tang shu* editors in the tenth century, but by Wei Shu and Liu Fang in the

⁷¹ Huan Yen-fan has two surviving memorials: one, concerning the impeachment of Chang Ch'ang-tung, is in *CTS* 91, p. 2927, where it has the introductory sentences removed. The fuller form is in *TFYK* 544, pp. 8a-b. The second, submitted soon after the T'ang restoration, is not present in *TFYK* but is summarized in *THY* 52, pp. 907-8, and quoted in part in *TT* 21, p. 541. *CTS* 91, p. 2929, closely follows *THY*.

⁷² For Wei Yüan-chung, see *TFYK* 331, pp. 13b-14b; his biography at *CTS* 92, p. 2954; and *TCTC* 208, p. 6615.

⁷³ For this, the *T'ang ming ch'ên tsou* by Wu Ching, see *HTS* 60, p. 1624. For Wu Ching's memorial on admonition to Hsüan-tsung, see *HTS* 133, pp. 4526-28; *CTW* 98, pp. 14a-16b. The memorial mentions Hsin T'i-p'i and Chang T'ing-kuei 張廷珪, for whom see n. 135, below, as exemplary admonishers early in Hsüan-tsung's reign.

mid-eighth century. It is thus unlikely that Wei Shu's history was the source from which the *T's'e fu yüan kuei* editors drew the full version of Ti Jen-chieh's Ho-pei memorial or other comparable submissions.⁷⁴

The *shih-lu* for the empress Wu, then, or else an independent collection of memorials made by one of its compilers, is the most likely source for Ti Jen-chieh's full memorial. It is as well, therefore, to recall the background and authorship of the *shih-lu*. It had first been compiled in 706, under the supervision of Wu San-ssu, Wei Yüan-chung, and others and had been approved by Chung-tsung. This version may be assumed to have been favorable to the Chou dynasty and the Wu clan, or at the very least not hostile to them. But the final political demise of the Wu clan with Wu San-ssu's death in 707 and the consolidation of T'ang dynastic power in the first years of Hsüan-tsung's reign made a revision on political grounds desirable. This was undertaken by a small commission consisting of Wu Ching and Liu Chih-chi 劉知幾.⁷⁵ Both these scholars had served under the empress Wu in the final years of her reign. Though they certainly felt hostile towards some of the central political figures of that period, they probably had little of the resentment against the empress and her court that was later to develop. Indeed Yao Ch'ung, who submitted a request that they be rewarded, was particularly devoted to her.⁷⁶

These historians were, therefore, more likely to be concerned with the policy content of Ti's memorials than with Ti's attitude to dynastic loyalty. They would thus have been prepared to respect the expression of loyalty to the Chou that Ti had included in his plea for leniency in Ho-pei. Indeed Liu Chih-chi had strong convictions precisely against trimming historical documentation for contemporary political purposes that altering Ti's pro-Chou stance would have entailed.⁷⁷ For this commission to have left Ti's statement unaltered in their *shih-lu* of 716 was fully consonant with their political and scholarly orientation.

Whichever work was the original full source, it is certain to have been an

⁷⁴ Denis Twitchett, *The Writing of Official History under the T'ang* (Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 1992). The complicated sequence of events behind the *T'ang shu* by Wu Ching, Wei Shu, and Liu Fang is described in pp. 171-87. See also the chart entitled "Filiation of the Various T'ang National Histories," on p. 165.

⁷⁵ Ibid. pp. 132-34, provides a full set of references. The first version of the *shih-lu* was directed by Wu San-ssu, Wei Yüan-chung, and Chu Ch'in-ming 祝欽明. The compilers included Liu Chih-chi. For the revised version commissioned from Liu Chih-chi and Wu Ching and submitted shortly after Jui-tsung's death in 716, see *ibid.*, and references. It was said to have covered the period 684-705. Penelope Herbert, "A Hawk among Rabbits: An Appraisal of the T'ang Chief Minister Li Lin-fu," in Nunome Chōfu Hakushi Kinen Ronshū Kankōkai Henshū Iinkai 布目潮風博士記念論集刊行會編集委員會, eds., *Tō Ajia no hō to shakai 東アジアの法と社会* (Tokyo: Kyōko syoin, 1990), p. 7, points out that relatives of the empress still served in the K'ai-yüan period.

⁷⁶ Yao Ch'ung, *GTS* 96, pp. 3022-23; *THY* 63, pp. 1094-95; *TFYK* 622, pp. 106-112.

⁷⁷ He had expressed his ideas in *Shih t'ung* just six years earlier; see *Shih t'ung tung shih* 史通通釋 (Taipei: Li-jen, 1980) 7, pp. 196-99.

early-eighth-century compilation, one that accepted Ti's commitment to the Chou dynasty with a detachment that later editors, identifying and promoting him as the greatest T'ang loyalist of his time, found unacceptable. But in preserving Ti's original wording, the editors ensured that a major clue as to his real attitude was preserved. Moreover, the absence in *T's'e fu yüan kuei* of any memorial by Ti asking for the restoration of the T'ang, comparable to those in it by Su An-heng, means that no such memorial by Ti existed in official sources. It is reasonable, therefore, to conclude that in the Ho-pei crisis of 698 Ti Jen-chieh was indeed openly committed to the Chou and was prepared to extol it as morally superior to the T'ang. He clearly envisaged no change in dynastic house in the foreseeable future.

Engraved Compositions

Two other compositions, each very different but both from the last year of his life and both preserved through engraving in stone, add weight to the argument that Ti Jen-chieh was a committed member of the empress Wu's court. The first of these to be written is his only surviving poem. This brief composition dates from the time when he enjoyed the highest esteem in the eyes of the empress. It concerns not the political world dominated by the threat of barbarian invasion, but rather the world of the court at leisure, seduced, as the empress herself began to fail in health, by Taoist images of longevity and by the religious environment of Mount Sung, east of Lo-yang. With other epigraphical evidence, it proves that Ti followed the empress faithfully in her journeys to Mount Sung in search of long life.

In the summer of 700 the court made a progress to the recently completed San-yang 三陽 Palace near the mountain. This was the newest of a succession of grandiose buildings that the empress had ordered in the course of her reign, and it expressed the changed climate of her final years on the throne. It was Taoist in conception. A building on the site of the "three yangs" had been enjoined in a prophetic inscription discovered at Mount Sung in 674 and presented to Kao-tsung, through the agency of Fan Wen 樊文. The inscription, in retrospect clearly fraudulent, was in the name of K'ou Ch'ien-chih 寇謙之, the great Taoist master of the Northern Wei (d. 448) and contained oblique references to Li-T'ang rule, to the Wu corregnum and to a long reign by the empress. It also suggested that the sovereign had obtained enlightenment at the Central Peak.

In about 690, the phrase "three yangs" had been interpreted by the commentators to the *Ta yüan ching* 大雲經 as a reference to the famous Ming t'ang 明堂, which was to be built not at Mount Sung but in the imperial city at Lo-

yang itself, while the enlightenment at the Central Peak was understood as a reference to the empress's grant of a title to Mount Sung in 688. But by 700, four years after the completion of the second Ming-t'ang, the empress had evidently ceased to believe that the K'ou Ch'ien-chih prophecy involved her greatest building, and held instead that it intended a Taoist-inspired palace at Mount Sung. She may also have hoped that the mountain would confer physical immortality on her.⁷⁴

At this newly built precinct, therefore, the court gathered in the summer of 700. They proceeded the short distance to Shih-ts'ung 石淙, a beauty spot to the south of it favored by the empress. It was probably at her behest that on the nineteenth day of the fifth lunar month the princes, senior officials, and literary men who made up the party all wrote poems to celebrate the occasion. Poems by sixteen officials, listed with their official titles, and a preface by the empress herself were written out by the calligrapher Hsüeh Yao 薛曜, cousin of the better known Hsüeh Chi 薛稷. They were later engraved on the north face of the rock at Shih-ts'ung, where they have survived to the present.⁷⁵

A check of the list of titles for the participants as other sources document them for the summer of 700 reveals very few discrepancies: for example, Chang I-chih was referred to as president of the Feng-ch'en fu 奉宸府, a title that was probably conferred on him only after the excursion at Shih-ts'ung. In the list, Ti Jen-chieh himself is referred to as president of the Central Secretariat, and *Chiu Tang shu* confirms that he had received this appointment on the first day of the second month of that year (December 12, 699).⁷⁶ The occasion of the poem makes it one of the last of Ti's extant compositions.

⁷⁴ Antonino Forte, *Political Propaganda and Ideology in China at the End of the Seventh Century* (Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale, 1976), pp. 230, 247-50, and plate 12, reproducing the relevant passage of Stein MS 6502; and idem, *Mingtang and Buddhist Utopias in the History of the Astronomical Clock* (Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1988), pp. 189-90. For the construction of the San-yang Palace on Mount Sung, see *THY* 30, p. 557; and *TCTC* 202, pp. 6545, 6546, 6548; and Yang Hung-nien 楊鴻年, *Sui Tang kung-t'ing chien-chu k'ao* 隋唐宮廷建築考 (Sian: Shan-hsi jen-min, 1992), pp. 4-5. The palace was completed in three months in 700, its construction involved loss of life, and it was demolished in 704. For K'ou Ch'ien-chih, see Richard B. Mather, "K'ou Ch'ien-chih and the Taoist Theocracy at the Northern Wei Court, 425-451," in Holmes Welch and Anna Seidel, eds., *Facets of Taoism: Essays in Chinese Religion* (New Haven and London: Yale U. P., 1979), pp. 103-22.

⁷⁵ *CTShih* 46, p. 555 with editorial introduction. The text and preface by the empress Wu are printed in *Chin shih ts'ui pien* 64, pp. 1a-5a. See also *Chin shih lu chiao cheng* 5, p. 86 (nos. 847-50). The inscription is reproduced as a rubbing in reduced size in *Pei-ching t'u-shu-kuan ts'ung Chung-kuo li-tai shih-k'o t'a-pen hui-pien* 北京圖書館藏中國歷代石刻拓本彙編 (Cheng-chow: Chung-chou ku-chi, 1989) 19, p. 2. See also Ku Yen-wu 顧炎武, *Chin shih wen tzu chi* 金石文字記 (rpt. Taipei: Chung-hua wen-hsien, 1969) 3, pp. 15a-b.

⁷⁶ For Ti's appointment see *CTS* 6, p. 128, which specifies the date *hsin-su* 辛巳 in the *la* 臘 month; also *TCTC* 206, p. 6545, and *HTS* 4, p. 100, which give the date *ling-yu* 丁酉 in the same month. The list of sixteen is given in *CTShih* 46, p. 555; *Chin shih wen tzu chi* 3, pp. 15a-b. In *Chin shih*

The gathering at Shih-ts'ung was politically significant in a number of respects. Nearly two years had passed since the empress had invested Li Hsien, who had taken the surname Wu in 699, as heir-apparent, and the court's political shape would remain as it was until the abdication in 705. Friction between Li Hsien's younger brother Li Tan 李旦, the future Jui-tsung, and the Wu princes had been at least ostensibly buried by a formal oath that they had taken in the Ming-t'ang in 699.⁷⁷ The heir-apparent and Li Tan, as prince of Hsiang 相, were both present, so was Wu San-ssu, the nephew of the empress and the ablest of the Wu princes, who still cherished imperial ambitions. But the new favorites, the notorious half-brothers Chang I-chih and Chang Ch'ang-tsung, whose ascent to full membership of the court circle had begun by 697, were also there. There was also a significant group of literary officials of varying ranks. They included Yen Ch'ao-yin 閻朝隱, who in 699, when the empress was ill, had offered his own life for hers to Mount Shao-shih 少室, the second of the two peaks on Mount Sung, and Ts'ui Jung, who had opposed Ti Jen-chieh in the debate of 698 about the scaling down of Chou power in the far northwest. The inclusion of the relatively less well-known calligrapher Hsüeh Yao and one or two other almost completely unknown figures adds authenticity to the list.

Although members of this assembly were later to be represented as implacably hostile to each other, this record shows that they were able to meet together and to join in a common activity. Indeed following the Ming-t'ang oath, this seems to have been a period of at least outward harmony. In two of the poems written for the excursion, references to the Two Houses, the nearby

ts'ui pien 64, pp. 7b-10b, the list is collated with their titles as recorded in their biographies. Some minor addition to this collation is as follows: Chang I-chih is listed as president of the Feng-ch'en fu 奉宸府, the renamed K'ung ho chien 控鶴監. According to *CTS* 78, p. 2706, and *TCTC* 206, p. 6546, Chang can only have received this appointment in the sixth month of 700, when the name of the institution was changed. Chang Ch'ang-tsung was listed as director of the Imperial Library (Lin t'ai chien 麟臺監) and baron of Chung-shan 中山 county. *CTS* 78, p. 2707, implies that he was director only after the completion of the encyclopaedia *San chiao chu ying* 三教珠英, which was in late 701; but *TCTC* 206, p. 6546, refers to Chang as director of the Imperial Library in the sixth month of 700. Hsüeh Yao 薛曜 is listed as a grandee of the Feng-ch'en fu and baron of Fen-yin 汾陰 county. The latter title as a hereditary fief for his family is confirmed by *HTS* 73B, p. 3007. He is also mentioned as a participant in the *San chiao chu ying* in the period 698-700; see *CTS* 73, p. 2591. Yang Ching-shu 楊敬述 is entered with the title deputy general of the left Yü-chin guards (*ts'o yü-chin wei lang chuang* 左玉鈐衛郎將). He is attested in surviving sources only at a later date and with different titles; see *WYTH* 402, p. 7a; and *T'ang fang chen nien piao* 唐方鎮年表 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1980) 8, p. 47b. Yü Chi-tzu 于季子 is entered as supernumerary secretary to the Bureau of Enfeoffments (*tsu feng yüan wai lang* 司封員外郎). He has other poems extant and is listed in *T'uan-ho hsing truan* 元和姓纂 (SKCS edn.) 2, p. 26b. Shen Chuan-ch'i 沈佺期 is entered as audience usher (*t'ung shih she jen* 通事舍人). *CTS* 190B, p. 5017, implies that he was given this post in the Ch'ang-an period (701-704), but also places his tenure before mentioning the *San chiao chu ying*.

⁷⁷ For the oath in the Ming-t'ang in 699, see *CTS* 6, p. 128; *TCTC* 206, p. 6540. For Chung-tsung's receiving the surname Wu early in 699, *TCTC* 206, p. 6539, and *THY* 1, p. 4. This is not mentioned in *CTS* 6, p. 18, or 7, p. 135.

mountains of T'ai-shih 太室 and Shao-shih, may thus have played on the participation of both Li and Wu princes at the gathering. But this was more than simply a conventional court literary occasion. It was the expression of a courtly literary milieu dominated by the aging empress and by extravagant imagery of longevity, immortality, harmony, and prosperity.

Moreover Shih-ts'ung was not the only place in the Mount Sung area to occasion verse of this kind. Not far to the east, at Kou-shih 緱氏, in the area of the Kung-ling mausoleum, there was a shrine for the mid-sixth-century BC Wang-tzu Chin 王子晉, a member of the ancient Chou-dynasty imperial line, who was traditionally held to have attained immortality on Mount Sung, riding off on a crane. In the spring of 699, just over a year before the Shih-ts'ung excursion, the empress had been to his shrine with an entourage of high ministers. She had composed for engraving a long and high-flown tribute to him, investing him with the name of "Heir-apparent Ascended to Immortality (Sheng hsien t'ai tzu 昇仙太子)." On the back of the stele was later added a list of the ministers who had accompanied her, and Ti Jen-chieh is included among them. The figure of Wang-tzu Chin, suggesting physical immortality, continued to exert appeal. In the court the following year Chang Ch'ang-tsung was identified as his descendant and was made to enact the part of Wang-tzu Chin, mounting a dummy bird. Just as at Shih-ts'ung, the company was called upon to compose verse. Those present included Ts'ui Jung, whose poem for the occasion was later upheld for special scorn, and Su Wei-tao 蘇味道, vice-president of the Central Secretariat, while the Wu princes, the Chang brothers, and Yen Ch'ao-yin were charged with participating in this kind of occasion.⁸²

Ti Jen-chieh was not of course listed in the transmitted records as being a member of the party who wrote verse for Wang-tzu Chin. But the imagery of

⁸² For Yen Ch'ao-yin, see *CTS* 190B, p. 506, and *TCTC* 206, p. 6539. For the empress's visit to the Wang-tzu Chin shrine in 699 and Chang Ch'ang-tsung's identification in 700 as his descendant, see *CTS* 6, p. 128; 78, p. 2706; 183, p. 4735; *TCTC* 206, pp. 6539, 6546. I am grateful to Jenny Liu for helping to clarify this sequence. See also *TPKC* 188, p. 1406, quoting *Kuo shih i tsuan* 國史異纂. For Ts'ui Jung's poem, see *CTShih* 68, p. 767, and *Tang shih chi shih* 唐詩紀事 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1965) 8, pp. 110-11. Wang-tzu Chin was a crown prince of the Chou royal house who became a commoner and roamed in the Lo-yang region. He dwelt with the Taoist Fou-ch'iu kung 浮丘公 for thirty years and became an immortal at Kou-shih shan 緱氏山. The empress's composition in which she invested him with the title Sheng hsien t'ai tzu is at *Chin shih ts'ui pien* 63, pp. 1a-6b. It is also reproduced as a rubbing in reduced size in *Li-tai shih-k'o t'a-pen hui-pien* 18, p. 161. See also *Chin shih wen tzu chi* 3, p. 14a. The reverse side of the stele has three horizontally divided registers, the first containing a poem on immortality by the empress, the second a list of the officials present on the visit of 699, and the third a list of those present, mainly belonging to the household of the prince of Hsiang, the future Jui-tsung, in 706, when the reverse side was engraved. There is a transcription of the reverse side in *Yen-shih hsien chih* 27, pp. 35b-39a. For the empress's interest in this cult, see Jao Tsung-i 饒宗頤, "Ts'ung shih-k'o lun Wu hou chih tsung-chiao hsin-yang" 從石刻論武后之宗教信仰, *CYYY* 45:3 (1974), pp. 397-418. See also Madeline K. Spring, "The Celebrated Cranes of Po Chü-i," *JAO* 111.1 (1991), pp. 8-18, esp. pp. 11-12 and n. 27.

his own poem for Shih-ts'ung shares features with the notorious Ts'ui Jung composition, and clearly derives from exactly the same milieu. And whatever Ti's own views on local cults may have been twelve years earlier, when protest against the Chang brothers came, it was not apparently from Ti, but from Chu Ching-tse 朱敬則 and from Wang Chi-shan 王及善, two senior but subsequently less well-known officials who evidently kept their distance from this activity. Again, had a memorial of protest by Ti existed in the early-eighth century, it would surely have been quoted or referred to in his biography.⁸³

What is more, Ti Jen-chieh's own poem concludes with what appears to be a particularly charged literary reference:

The flying springs scatter spray, forever resembling rain;
The dense trees hold the cool, for always like the autumn.
Your old servant, having partaken of this feast at Hsien-p'u 縣圃,
Would spend his last years roaming with the Master of the Red Pine.

The references here are first to the mountain of Hsien-p'u on K'un-lun, the abode of immortals, and second to the final episode in the life of a well-known hero in the Chinese tradition, the minister Chang Liang 張良. Chang had served the first emperor of the Han, Kao tsu 高祖, from his initial campaigns until the point when the great Hsiao Ho 蕭何 was appointed chancellor. He then decided to resign and pursue immortality, saying to Kao tsu, "... I wish to abandon human matters and to follow the Master of the Red Pine in his roaming."⁸⁴ References to the Master of the Red Pine as a symbol of longevity are common in T'ang verse, but Ti's citation permits a more specific reading: Ti identified himself with one of the great founding ministers of Chinese tradition, and saw the empress as a contemporary equivalent to Kao-tsu, the founder of a great dynastic house. His poem may be read as a valedictory, and hardly a modest one. Again, its tenor is not consistent with the tradition that he was a deeply convinced T'ang loyalist. Nor does it suggest that, as Wang Chi-shan and Chu Ching-tse had done, he kept himself detached from the empress Wu's court.

The final extant composition by Ti has the most dramatic implications of

⁸³ *CTS* 78, pp. 2706-7, biographies of Chang Ch'ang-tsung and Chang I-chih; *CTS* 90, p. 2911, biography of Wang Chi-shan. *Yen-shih hsien chih* 27, p. 36a, lists Wang as being present at the Wang-tzu Chin shrine in 699. He died later that year.

⁸⁴ *SC* 53, p. 2048, "Liu hou shih chia." It is possible that Ti was also referring to the empress Lü in this poem as an antecedent for the empress Wu. The empress Lü, after Kao-tsu's death, forced Chang Liang to abandon his ascetic regimen and to continue living. She was often cited as a precedent for a ruling empress; see Guisso, *Wu Tse-i-t'ien* p. 54; and *CTS* 87, p. 2844; 84, p. 2796; *TFYK* 544, p. 4b.

all for his reputation as a steadfast Li-T'ang loyalist. It was an epitaph text engraved on a stone measuring 70 cm by 74 cm. Though Ti may be assumed to have written numbers of such compositions, it is the only one by him so far to have been recovered. It was for Yüan Kung-yü 袁公瑜, a middle-ranking official buried on the twenty-eighth day of the tenth lunar month of 700 (December 12, 700). The engraved text lay buried for centuries after the events it commemorated, to be recovered and published in rubbing form only a decade ago. As evidence for Ti's outlook, it has a pristine quality denied even the engraved text at Shih-ts'ung, written earlier that summer.⁸⁵

Ti himself died on the twenty-sixth day of the ninth lunar month of 700 (November 11, 700), probably at least one month before Yüan Kung-yü's final burial took place.⁸⁶ There is likely to have been a straightforward explanation for this sequence of events: Yüan had in fact died in remote exile some fifteen years before, in the summer of 685, at Pai-chou 白州 in modern Kuang-hsi. His coffin was then brought north for temporary burial at Teng-chou 鄧州 in Honan. The burial for which Ti composed the text was therefore a reinterment. It took place on the same day and in the same graveyard as the burial of one of Yüan Kung-yü's sons, Yüan Ch'eng-chia 袁承嘉, for whom an epitaph text, not by Ti Jen-chieh, has also been retrieved and published. The day of the joint burial was probably determined by divination and incorporated in the two epitaph texts to be sent for engraving some weeks before the event. The whole process took time, and it was between the composition of the texts and their engraving and final burial that Ti died.⁸⁷

What is immediately striking about Ti's epitaph is that its subject, Yüan Kung-yü, far from being a T'ang loyalist, was actually instrumental in the rise to power of the empress Wu, and had even been publicly honored in this role. He is mentioned three times in *Chiu T'ang shu*. On two occasions, he provided substantial political help in her campaign to destroy a rival, the empress Wang, and to consolidate her position as Kao-tsung's empress. First in 655, he informed

on three senior officials, P'ei Hsing-chien 裴行儉, Chang-sun Wu-chi 長孫無忌, and Ch'u Sui-liang 褚遂良, who were discussing ways of blocking the establishment of the new empress. Yüan was linked at this time with Hsü Ching-tung 許敬宗, Li I-fu 李義府, and Ts'ui I-hsüan 崔義玄, all three of whom supported the empress, and who were destined to become notorious in that role.⁸⁸ Second, in 659, he was sent by Hsü Ching-tung to conduct a reinvestigation into the charges against Chang-sun Wu-chi, who had been banished to Ch'ien-chou 黔州 in modern Szechwan. Here in the far southwest, he forced Chang-sun to commit suicide.⁸⁹

In both these roles, Yüan was providing valuable support for the empress. She recognized this publicly after his death, for in 692 she posthumously appointed him governor of Chiang-chou 江州, and provided one of his sons, Chung-ch'en 忠臣, not the son buried with him in 700, with a fief income of 200 households.⁹⁰ Here then was a man who had staked his political future on supporting the empress very early in her ascent to power. The compilers of *Chiu T'ang shu* noted that role alone and implicitly condemned him. To them he was a minor and contemptible player at the start of the sequence of events that culminated in the Chou interregnum, and that dominated their narrative for more than half a century.

When Ti Jen-chieh composed his epitaph, Yüan Kung-yü had been dead for nearly fifteen years and the empress had been in power for over two decades. The heir-apparent, though a member of the Li-T'ang house, had taken the empress's own surname of Wu. Had Ti been, as tradition portrayed him, a steadfast T'ang loyalist, he would surely not have agreed at this time to write a text for one of the Chou's long-dead supporters.

The text itself of Ti's epitaph for Yüan Kung-yü, moreover, dispels any doubts that may remain about his approval of Yüan's career. For Ti actually commended Yüan for his foresight in helping to establish the empress. He did so, referring to his role as an informant, through historical references:

When the present ruler was a heavenly consort, at the beginning,
Before her secluded virtue had flown forth,
He early understood the auspicious signs of Sha-lu 沙鹿,
And argued in advance for the vapor of Ch'ung-ling 春陵.

⁸⁵ *Ch'ien T'ang chih ch'ai ts'ang chih* 千唐誌藏藏誌, intro. by Wu Chih-yüan 武志遠 and Kuo Chien-pang 郭建邦 (Peking: Wen-wu, 1983), no. 481; Chou Shao-liang 周紹良, ed., *T'ang tai mu chih hui pien* 唐代墓誌彙編 (Shanghai: Shang-hai ku-chi, 1992), pp. 975-76. The exhaustive work by Yoshioka Makoto 吉岡真, "Sen Tō shisai soshi kankai bunken chōsa gaiyō" 千唐誌藏藏誌關係文獻調査概要, in Yokoyama Sugata 横山英 and Teraji Jun 寺地尊, eds., *Chugoku shakaishi no shōshi* 中國社會史の諸相 (Tokyo: Keisō shobō, 1988), pp. 235-69, indicates, with references, that both Lo Chen-yü 羅振玉 and Ts'ien Chung-mien 岑仲勉 cited this and the following epitaph texts.

⁸⁶ *CTS* 6, p. 129; 89, p. 2894, say simply "the ninth month." The specific date *hsin ch'ou* 辛丑, corresponding to November 11, 700, is given in *HTS* 4, p. 101, and *TCTC* 207, p. 6551.

⁸⁷ *Ch'ien T'ang chih ch'ai ts'ang chih*, no. 482; *T'ang tai mu chih hui pien*, pp. 976-77. For divination for the day of burial, see *Ta T'ang K'ai-yuan li* 大唐開元禮 (rpt. Tokyo: Koten kenkyūkai, 1972) 138, pp. 165-172; 14, pp. 162-172; 146, pp. 15-132. For the special rituals prescribed for reinterments, see 141, pp. 12-73; 145, pp. 12-72; 149, pp. 12-72.

⁸⁸ *CTS* 84, p. 2801; *TCTC* 199, p. 6289.

⁸⁹ *CTS* 65, p. 2456; *TCTC* 200, p. 6316. Yüan Kung-yü is also mentioned in a separate anecdote, preserved in *TFYK* 337, p. 15b.

⁹⁰ *CTS* 8, pp. 770-71. The honor was annulled on the accession of Jui-tsung. Yüan Ch'eng-chia is mentioned at the close of Ti Jen-chieh's epitaph as holding the post of assistant in the Palace Service and inner attendant in the Feng-ch'en fu.

The "auspicious signs of Sha-lu" referred to a prophecy, originating in the *Ch'un-ch'iu* 春秋 tradition and described in *Han shu*, that after 645 years, following the collapse of the Sha-lu mountain, a sage woman would appear.⁹¹ The "vapor of Ch'ung-ling," a reference to an incident at the start of the Later Han period, refers to Su Po-a 蘇伯阿, who identified a vapor that symbolized that the mandate of heaven would be transferred to Kuang Wu-ti 光武帝 from Wang Mang 王莽.⁹²

Ti Jen-chieh also recorded the posthumous appointment that the empress had bestowed on Yuan. The date he gave was 692, the same year as that given in the *Chiu T'ang shu* account, though Ti describes the post as the governorship of Hsiang-chou 相州 rather than Chiang-chou.

It is therefore safe to conclude from the evidence of Ti's epitaph text for Yuan Kung-yü that at least in the final year of his life Ti was far from being committed exclusively to a restoration of the T'ang. He accepted the empress Wu's claim to be "the present ruler," and was willing to praise the sequence of political events, violent and treacherous though it seems likely to have been, that had enabled her to claim the throne and the mandate of Heaven.

The evidence of three of Ti Jen-chieh's small surviving corpus of court and high field-command compositions, his memorial asking for leniency in Ho-pei, his poem for the beauty spot at Shih-ts'ung, and his epitaph for Yuan Kung-yü therefore all indicate that in the final years of his life he was fully committed to the Chou dynasty, in two cases in open preference to the T'ang. They make untenable any idea that he can have been a relentless and profoundly convinced advocate of T'ang restoration. Clearly, if in 698 he played a part in the institution of the future Chung-tsung as heir-apparent, it is unlikely to have been in the extreme terms in which later tradition depicted it.

TI JEN-CHIEH'S *CHIU T'ANG SHU* BIOGRAPHY

Ti's own compositions, the foregoing argument shows, suggest that the picture of a deeply committed T'ang loyalist, the architect of the restoration of 705, has no basis in his own extant writings. The question is then: how did the later image of Ti develop, and is it possible to trace stages in its acceptance? There is indeed a process that may be traced in the growth of the tradition of Ti Jen-chieh as a T'ang loyalist, and it spans almost the entire eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries. A summary of this evidence shows how the story grew in authority, and how, when probably in the late-eighth century, the romanticized biography of Ti analyzed below, "Ti Liang kung chuan," was composed, the

tradition of his T'ang loyalism was greatly strengthened. In 945, towards the end of this process, an important official account of Ti's career, his *Chiu T'ang shu* biography, was approved in the form in which it now exists. This account is significant first because there is no other early commemorative account of Ti's career, and second because it makes no mention of Ti's loyalty to the T'ang until its final paragraph. Its text and the stages in its compilation should therefore be subjected to detailed examination, for they involved a complex process of condensing and addition.

It is now accepted that Ti's *Chiu T'ang shu* biography belongs to a part of *Chiu T'ang shu* that was compiled as a *kuo-shih* originally by Wei Shu in the K'ai-yüan or T'ien-pao periods, before the An Lu-shan rebellion. This work was submitted to the throne after completion by Liu Fang in the reign of Su-tsung. This account of Ti's career would, if standard procedure had been followed, have been based on the biography of him attached at the point of his death to the revised *shih-lu* for the reign of the empress Wu, completed in 716. The biography would have been edited for the *kuo-shih* by Wei Shu. Wei would have had access to Ti Jen-chieh's own collected works, the title of which was entered in the *Ch'ün shu ssu pu lu* catalogue of 722. He would also have had at his disposal any memorials by Ti incorporated at their point of submission in the *Wu Tse-t'ien shih-lu* and anecdotal sources completed up to the end of the T'ien-pao period.

In theory, insertions, additions, or alterations to Wei Shu's account of Ti Jen-chieh could have been made at any time from completion of his *kuo-shih* under Su-tsung until the completion of *Chiu T'ang shu* in 945. However, it has been convincingly argued that the *Chiu T'ang shu* editors, producing the text in its present form, adopted Wei Shu's text virtually without alteration. Identification of extraneous material, added in after the submission of the *kuo-shih* to Su-tsung, can therefore only be persuasively made on strong stylistic or textual historical grounds.⁹³

As a narrative, Ti's *Chiu T'ang shu* biography is full of incident and drama. It presents a figure of great ingenuity and resolution, who lived a life of high risk. The biography may be divided into thirty-four individual episodes. It is an indication of the enormous appeal of Ti Jen-chieh from the eighth to the tenth centuries that all these incidents are represented in other compendia and collections of anecdotes. The challenge posed by this situation is to ascertain whether these parallel versions, which often have only minor differences in wording when compared to his *Chiu T'ang shu* biography, can provide information about the

⁹¹ *Han shu* 98, pp. 4014, 4035. ⁹² *Hou Han shu* 後漢書 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1965) 1B, p. 86.

⁹³ See n. 74, above, and Twitchett, *Official History*, p. 187.

dating and composition of the original *Chiu Tang shu* text. Of course, the existence of parallel versions in other texts is in itself no proof that the *Chiu Tang shu* borrowed from those texts. The borrowing is as likely to have been in the reverse direction, or both versions may owe to a third, earlier, text. When the *Chiu Tang shu* version is significantly more abbreviated than that of other versions, it may be permissible to infer that the fuller versions preceded it. If material is added out of sequence, too, it may represent a later editorial hand.

Ti's biography in its present form, it is argued, is indeed likely to have been, almost in its entirety, an early text, written by Wei Shu probably before the mid-T'ien-pao period and contained in Liu Fang's *kuo-shih* submitted to Su-tsung. It was based principally on, and represents a slight condensation of, the account of Ti in the *shih-lu* for the empress Wu's reign, and contains, in the three monitory memorials that it includes, what Wei Shu, with access both to Ti's collected works and to the *shih-lu*, judged the most important of his submissions to the throne. The one passage in it that extols Ti's role in securing the reestablishment of Li Hsien as heir-apparent and in the restoration of the T'ang, coming anomalously at the end, is, it is argued, an addition, made in the light of his later, inflated reputation.

The compendium that contains most of the *Chiu Tang shu* materials is the early-eleventh-century *Ts'ê fu yüan kuei*. Its editors not only included full forms of three of his extant memorials, discussed above, they also excerpted no fewer than twenty-seven of the thirty-four episodes present in Ti's biography. What is more, *Ts'ê fu yüan kuei* contains, with the exception of one incident to be explored below, no material on Ti that does not have a close textual relation to the biography or to other parts of *Chiu Tang shu* where Ti is mentioned. This makes the compendium an enormously important source for Ti's career, and analysis of its text imperative for tracing the origins of the *Chiu Tang shu* account.

Because the *Ts'ê fu yüan kuei* editors reproduce verbatim its final, suspect paragraph, it is clear that they had access to Ti's *Chiu Tang shu* biography. But the *kuo-shih* of Wei Shu and Liu Fang was also extant, and the text of Ti's biography that it contained is believed to have been substantially the same as the present *Chiu Tang shu* version. The editors of *Ts'ê fu yüan kuei* also had the *Wu Tse-t'ien shih lu*, completed by Liu Chih-chi and Wu Ching in 716, the basic textual source for the *kuo-shih* and for *Chiu Tang shu*, for this was extant in Sung times. It has been argued above that they probably drew the full text of Ti's three memorials from the *shih-lu* biography of him. But which text did they use for the bulk of their narrative excerpts on Ti? Was it the *shih-lu* biography of 716, or the *kuo-shih* biography of 759, now contained in the *Chiu Tang shu* of 945?

There are indeed indications that the *Ts'ê fu* editors, in one of the episodes they excerpted, drew their account from a fuller source than Ti's present *Chiu Tang shu* biography, and therefore a fuller one also than his *kuo-shih* notice. Their account of the episode concerned includes proper names absent from the *Chiu Tang shu* version, and presumably therefore absent too from the *kuo-shih* version of 759.

The episode concerns an early but characteristic request for clemency by Ti, an attempt in 676 to rescue a certain Ch'üan Shan-ts'ai 權善才 from the death penalty. Ch'üan had been charged with cutting down cypress trees on the mausoleum of T'ai-tsung at Chao-ling 昭陵, and Kao-tsung, full of self-reproach at his own lack of filial concern for his father's grave, had ordered his execution. Ti intervened, pleading Ch'üan's case. The *Ts'ê fu yüan kuei* version, in common with versions held in two other sources, *Ta T'ang hsin yü* and *T'ang hui yao*, supplies the name of the minor official who first informed the emperor of Ch'üan's felony, Fan Huai-i 范懷義. It also provides the extra information, absent from the *Ta T'ang hsin yü* and *T'ang hui yao* versions, that the magistrate of Chao-ling, K'ung Chen 孔禎, was forced to leave office and that Fan Huai-i was banished to the far south. The *Ts'ê fu* editors, in other words, had access to a fuller, but otherwise very similar, account of the episode from that contained in the *kuo-shih* of Wei Shu, *Chiu Tang shu*, and other sources.¹⁴

Another, though indirect, indication that the editors may have been using a source earlier than Wei Shu's *kuo-shih* is supplied by the one major omission they made from Ti's biography. This was an account of Ti's escape from jail in the early summer of 692, the most dramatic incident in his career. Ti had been falsely charged with sedition by the sadistic Lai Chün-ch'en, and had pleaded guilty in order to avoid execution. Awaiting punishment, he had managed to smuggle out a message in his discarded winter clothing, and this message was submitted to the empress. As a result, she had the charges against Ti investigated, his death sentence was commuted, and he was banished to serve as magistrate of P'eng-tse.

The incident is told in detail in closely parallel versions no fewer than four times in three T'ang sources: it is contained in two anecdotal collections, *Yü shih t'ai chi* 御史臺記¹⁵ and *Ta T'ang hsin yü*. It is included in Ti's *Chiu Tang shu* biography, but also, in contravention of the rule that material should not be

¹⁴ *CTS* 89, p. 386; *TFYK* 617, pp. 12a-13a; *THY* 40, p. 73; *TTHY* 4, pp. 56-57. Both the latter versions mention Fan Huai-i. The episode is mentioned in de Groot, *The Religious System of China* 2, p. 446.

¹⁵ *Yü shih t'ai chi* 御史臺記, quoted in *TPKC* 267, pp. 2098-99. For this collection of anecdotes, its authorship, dating, contents, and transmission, see Ikeda On 池田溫, "Kan En Gyoshidaiki ni tsuite" 韓琬御史臺記について, in *To Ajia no hō to shakai*, pp. 111-38.

repeated in a history, in the *Chiu Tang shu* biography of Lai Chün-ch'en.⁹⁶ This latter biography is contained in the "Cruel Officials" (*k'u-li* 酷吏) section of *Chiu Tang shu*, which is believed to have been added in the reign of Tai-tsung or Te-tsung, some years after the completion of Wei Shu's *kuo-shih*.⁹⁷ *Ts'e fu yüan kuei*, however, has only a very general account of the imprisonment of Ti, with a number of other high-ranking officials, and of the efforts of the Wu faction, and specifically of Huo Hsien-k'o 霍獻可 and two others, to have them executed rather than banished. This account is sober and circumstantial; it is also unique in the *Ts'e fu*'s account of Ti's career in having textual parallels in neither the present *Chiu Tang shu* nor *Tang hui yao*.⁹⁸

It might be objected that the editors considered narrative material of this kind outside the scope of their compilation. But there is another explanation of this anomaly in the *Ts'e fu*'s otherwise virtually complete coverage of Ti's *Chiu Tang shu* biography. The earliest known account of Ti's escape ruse is that of *Yü shih t'ai chi*. This was a collection of anecdotes and lore relating to the censorate. Its compiler was Han Wan 韓琬, who lived early in the eighth century. *Yü shih t'ai chi* has not been transmitted as an integral text, but excerpts were edited into *T'ai p'ing kuang chi*. A Sung bibliography indicates that the original collection spanned the years from the start of the dynasty to 717, that is until one year after the completion of *Wu Tse-t'ien shih-lu*. The omission of this episode from *Ts'e fu yüan kuei* would be readily understandable if the editors had used as their main text the *shih-lu* version of Ti's biography, which had been compiled before the completion of *Yü shih t'ai chi*, and might well not therefore have featured an account of this incident. The jail ruse incident, this hypothesis argues, would have been edited into Ti's biography by Wei Shu some time between 717, the latest date represented in *Yü shih t'ai chi*, and 747, a date to be explored below. In the process of editing it in, moreover, Wei Shu condensed it, just as he condensed the episode involving Ch'üan Shan-ts'ai, for he omitted the names of Ti's fellow prisoners, and of a certain jailer. These names had, however, been included in *Yü shih t'ai chi*, and were preserved in the repetitious *Chiu Tang shu* Lai Chün-ch'en biography and in the *Ta Tang hsin yü* versions of the incident.

⁹⁶ *THY* 11, pp. 182-83; *TPK* 268, p. 2105, quoting *Shen i ching* 神異經. There are also references to Ti's imprisonment in *CTS* 94, p. 2992, biography of Li Chiao.

⁹⁷ *CTS* "K'u li chuan," biography of Lai Chün-ch'en. Arguments for dating the "K'u li chuan" section to the reign of Tai-tsung or Te-tsung are given in David L. McMullen, "The Death of Chou Li-chien: Imperially Ordered Suicide or Natural Causes?" *AM* 3d ser. 2.2 (1989), pp. 46-51. Ikeda On, "Kan En Gyoshi daiki," p. 137, n. 5, draws a similar conclusion.

⁹⁸ *TPYK* 522, pp. 17a-b, specifying Huo Hsien-k'o 霍獻可, Hsiang Kuang-tao 向光道, and Chang Chih-mo 張知默. The efforts of the Wu faction and of Huo Hsien-k'o to kill Ti are mentioned in *THY* 12, p. 185, and are included in *HTS* 115, p. 4210, but the other two names are omitted. For Huo Hsien-k'o and Ti, see n. 44, above.

There are, moreover, grounds, albeit negative ones, for holding that it was Wei Shu who condensed the account of Ti's escape, rather than the tenth-century editors of *Chiu Tang shu*. For if it was the latter, they would surely have paid attention to both accounts of the incident that their history contained, and would either have brought them carefully into line with each other or else have abbreviated the repetitious Lai Chün-ch'en account, to avoid duplication. Instead, however, they appear to have left both accounts alone. The Lai Chün-ch'en account, despite having been compiled later, is fuller: it contains an inaccurate list of Ti's fellow prisoners, but is otherwise closest of all versions to the original *Yü shih t'ai chi* version of the incident.⁹⁹ The account of the incident in Ti Jen-chieh's *Chiu Tang shu* biography is therefore likely to have stood condensed and unaltered since its completion and inclusion in the *kuo-shih* of 759.

So far, analysis of Ti's *Chiu Tang shu* biography has suggested, though it has not actually proved, that Wei Shu adopted the text of Ti's *shih-lu* biography, added in the texts of three memorials from their points of entry in the *shih-lu*, and also included at least one major episode in Ti's career from an anecdotal source. Comparison with other versions has indicated that he condensed all these sources slightly. In the case of the Ho-pei memorial, he excised Ti's statement of commitment to the Chou dynasty. In narrating two other incidents in Ti's career, he removed the names of certain minor participants. Otherwise, he kept faithfully to the wording of his primary sources. Beyond suggesting that Wei Shu's text was completed after 717, the latest date in *Yü shih t'ai chi*, the evidence considered so far has not narrowed down its date of composition.

Prima facie evidence, however, that the biography was compiled before the

⁹⁹ *Yü shih t'ai chi* lists by name "Ti Jen-chieh, Jen Ling-hui 任令暉, and Lu Hsien 盧獻, with a total of "five men in all." *THY* has exactly the same wording. *CTS* 186A, p. 4838, biography of Lai Chün-ch'en, lists Ti Jen-chieh, Jen Ling-hui, and Lu Hsien, and then three more, Li Yu-tao 李遊道, Yuan Chih-hung 袁智宏, and Ts'ui Shen-chi 崔神基, with the total "six in all." These last three, however, according to the very precise account of *HTS* 4, pp. 92-93, were not arrested and banished until the ninth month, after Ti's release and banishment, and this may therefore be another case of inaccuracy in the "K'u li chuan" section of *CTS*. *CTS* 94, p. 99, biography of Li Chiao, lists Li Ssu-chen 李嗣真 and P'ei Hsüan-li 裴宣禮. *CTS* 85, p. 2818, biography of Hsü Yu-kung 徐有功, lists by name two men only, P'ei Hsing-pen 裴行本 and Jen Chih-ku 任知古, with "seven in all." The total and the two names correspond with the list provided in the independent account in *TFYK* mentioned in n. 98, above. There the names of seven are given: Jen Ling-hui, Ti Jen-chieh, P'ei Hsing-pen, P'ei Hsüan-li, Lu Hsien, Wei Yüan-chung, and Li Ssu-chen. Ssu-ma Kuang, in his account of the incident, adopts this list; see *TCTC* 205, pp. 6479-81. For another case of repeated material in *CTS*, see n. 66, above. An epitaph writer for a descendant of Lu Hsien, Lu Po-ch'ing 盧伯卿, was to claim in a text of 840 that Lu Hsien, with Ti Jen-chieh and Wei Chih-ku 魏知古, was instrumental in the restoration of the Tang; see *Ch'ien Tang chih chai*, p. 1073, and *Tang tai mu-chih hui pien*, p. 2204. Wei Chih-ku seems likely to be an error here for Wei Yüan-chung, since Wei Chih-ku's career had barely started under the empress Wu; see *CTS* 98, p. 3061, and *HTS* 126, p. 4413. The claim is chiefly interesting as an indication of how imprecise by this stage recollection had become.

end of the T'ien-pao (742-756) period is supplied by its failure to mention one of the greatest of the posthumous honors that Ti Jen-chieh received. This was the introduction of his spirit tablet into the shrine of the emperor Chung-tsung in the T'ang ancestral temple. This great honor was bestowed on Ti by edict in 747. At the same time, the honor was given by edict to two of Ti's contemporaries, Wei Yüan-chung and Wang T'ung-chiao 王同皎, major statesmen who had also been honored by satellite burial at Chung-tsung's mausoleum. It was also bestowed on two officials of Kao-tsu's reign, three of T'ai-tsung's, and three of Kao-tsung's.¹⁰⁰ It is a general rule that this honor is entered in the *Chiu T'ang shu* biographies of the officials concerned. The officials honored in 747 are the most obvious exception from the first century and a half of the dynasty: none of the eight introduced in 747 has the honor listed. In all T'ang history, the only comparable omission is that of three of the four officials of Hsien-tsung's reign, who are known to have been introduced by edict in 846, after regularity over recording this sort of matter had been lost.¹⁰¹ In the case of Ti Jen-chieh and the others, this surely means that their biographies were completed before 747, and that later editors, including Liu Fang, who completed Wei Shu's *kuo-shih*, failed to enter the honor granted in that year.

The foregoing analysis suggests, therefore, that the *Chiu T'ang shu* biography of Ti Jen-chieh may have been a slightly condensed version of his *shih-lu* biography, with at least one episode, that of his escape from the hands of the sadistic Lai Chün-ch'en, drawn from a near contemporary source, Han Wan's *Yü shih t'ai chi*. Wei Shu edited the biography into his *kuo-shih* between 717 and 747; but the text itself was basically an early account of Ti's life, originating little more than a decade and a half from his death in 700. If this is so, the fact that it makes no mention of Ti's role in restoring the T'ang until its final paragraph must be significant, for it reinforces the picture of Ti as silent on this issue that analysis of his own writings has already suggested. It is to the final, problematic paragraph of his *Chiu T'ang shu* biography that attention must now be given.

This last paragraph of the biography appears to make up for the silence of the main account, for it describes Ti's role in the reinstating of Li Hsien as heir-apparent. There are, however, persuasive grounds for believing that it was a late addition, made under the influence of the romanticized account of his life in *Ti Liang kung chuan*. The passage reads as follows:

¹⁰⁰ *THY* 18, pp. 370-72; *TT* 50, pp. 1408-10. The meritorious officials up to those introduced in 718 are also listed in *Ta T'ang lu tien* 4, pp. 35b-36b.
¹⁰¹ *THY* 18, p. 372. The one exception is Kao Ch'ung-wen 高崇文, for whom, however, the honor is undated in *CTS* 151, p. 4053.

Earlier, when Chung-tsung was at Fang-ling 房陵, Chi Hsü 吉頊 and Li Chao-te 李昭德 both made loyal statements on the restoration [of the Li line], but [Wu] Tse-t'ien had no intention of restoring him [to the heir-apparency]. Ti, however, always used times of leisure to memorialize and give answers in conversation, ever speaking of the duty and love between mother and son. Tse-t'ien, moreover, gradually reflected and came to realize [the true position], eventually to summon Chung-tsung back and restore him as heir-apparent (*ch'u erh* 儲貳).

Earlier, when Chung-tsung returned to the palace from Fang-ling, Tse-t'ien concealed him in a curtained screen and summoned Jen-chieh to talk of [him]. Jen-chieh, full of feeling, memorialized, and wept as he spoke. Tse-t'ien suddenly produced Chung-tsung and said to Jen-chieh, "I am returning you your heir-apparent." Jen-chieh descended the steps and wept in congratulation, and having done so, memorialized to say, "The heir-apparent has returned to the palace, but none of the people know, and so how can public opinion conclude as to what is right and what is wrong?" Tse-t'ien agreed, and reestablished Chung-tsung at Lung-men 龍門, providing a ceremony to welcome him back, so that people's feelings were stirred and delighted.

Jen-chieh's successive memorials and conversations on restoring [Chung-tsung], in all amounted to several tens of thousands of words. In the K'ai-yüan period the governor of Pei-hai 北海 Li Yung composed an "Informal Biography of the Duke of Liang," comprehensively recording these statements.

There are two grounds for seeing this final paragraph as a later addition. The first is stylistic: the account of Ti's intervention is added on anomalously after the account of his death. The second is textual: other texts containing accounts of T'ang loyalist interventions compiled as late as the early-ninth century make no mention of Ti. There is also an unambiguous indication, supplied in Ssu-ma Kuang's textual notes to his *Tzu chih t'ung chien*, the *k'ao-i* 考異, that other sources, including even *Wu Tse-t'ien shih-lu*, the first official account of the period, made no reference to this episode.

The stylistic argument rests on an understanding of the conventions followed in the biographies contained in the early section of *Chiu T'ang shu*. Normally a biography closed with an account of its subject's death, followed by the posthumous honors accorded him. The early section of *Chiu T'ang shu*, with few

exceptions, adds only two categories of information after this: first, the personnel recommendations that an official may have made in the course of his career. The men an official recommended, if they in turn were successful, were an important dimension to his performance, and *Chiu T'ang shu* frequently records cases of effective recommendation. About half of these are given in the body of the biography, at the point in its subject's career when the recommendations were made, and about half follow after the subject's death. Secondly, if sons or brothers had run successful careers, this would be mentioned either before or after his recommendations. Any other material following this close to a biography is rare, and is usually added in from anecdotal sources.¹⁰⁰

With the exception of its final paragraph, Ti Jen-chieh's biography fulfills these conventions. In its closing passage, the biography notes Ti's final tenure, the submission of his anti-Buddhist memorial, and his death, which is given as taking place in the ninth lunar month of 700. "[Wu] Tse-t'ien held mourning for him, dispensing with the court for three days. He was posthumously promoted right chancellor of the Department of Affairs of State (*wen-ch'ang yu hsiang* 文昌右相) and given the canonization Wen-hui 文惠." There follows an account of the important officials whom Ti recommended. These were first Huan Yen-fan, whose recommendation is elsewhere set in a discrete anecdote,¹⁰¹ and then "Ching Hui 敬暉, Tou Huai-chen 竇懷貞, Yao Ch'ung, and others." All these last three had careers that were well advanced by the time of Ti's death. The version of these recommendations contained in *Ts'efu yüan kuei*, moreover, dates them to the time when Ti was president of the Central Secretariat, that is, during the last year of his life.¹⁰² After this list, there is a specific mention, made in an anecdotal frame, of a particularly famous official whom Ti is said to have recommended. This was Chang Chien-chih 張柬之, the first of the "Five Princes" and the instigator of the plot that five years after Ti's death resulted in the

execution of the Chang brothers, the abdication of the empress, and the full restoration of the T'ang.¹⁰³

Following these recommendations, the biography mentions two of Ti's sons. One, Ti Ching-hui 狄景暉, had brought disgrace on the family by rapacious conduct at Wei-chou, the Ho-pei prefecture that Ti himself had governed and in which a shrine to him stood. The result was that the local populace destroyed the shrine. The other, Ti Kuang-ssu 狄光嗣, had, contrary to good practice, been recommended by Ti Jen-chieh himself. His success in office had led the empress Wu to liken Ti to Ch'i Hsi 祁奚, an ancient grandee who had successfully recommended his own son, having first recommended an enemy.¹⁰⁴

So far, then, the biography has conformed to conventions. But it now proceeds to give the substantial piece of extra information translated above, which should, if the sequence had been chronological, have been set in the body of his biography, preceding the account of the end of his career and his death. That such an important episode should not have been entered at the appropriate point in the account of Ti's career is an obvious anomaly. Its only reasonable explanation is that, as with other accounts appended to *Chiu T'ang shu* biographies, the material was added in later. Very probably it was a condensed version of *Ti Liang kung chuan*, the informal biography attributed to Li Yung, to which it refers at the end of the passage.

To this stylistic evidence for the lateness of the final paragraph should be added the evidence of other texts that draw either on Ti's *kuo-shih* biography or on the earlier *shih-lu* version. Two major T'ang historical texts are involved here, and both were composed, wholly or in part, between 716 and 945. Both predominantly involved the copying of existing documents rather than reporting hearsay. Both appear to draw substantially from one or other of the early versions of Ti's biography.

¹⁰⁰ The following are some exceptions to the normal format for early *CTS* biographies: *CTS* 83, p. 2776, biography of Chang Chien 張柬之, adding a note about the lines of ceremonial halberds that he and his brothers erected at their gates; *CTS* 84, p. 2796, biography of Liu Jen-kuei, adding an incident about a well-known prognosticator, Yuan T'ien-kang 袁天綱, who early in Liu's career had foretold his rank and life-span; *CTS* 88, p. 2875, biography of Lu Yuan-fang 陸元方, where a story about Lu's scrupulousness in preserving confidentiality in making recommendations is traceable to *Yu shih t'ai chi*, quoted in *TPKC* 493, p. 4052; *CTS* 87, p. 2848, biography of Liu I-chih 劉祚之, describing his conduct as he met the death penalty; see also *TTHY* 9, p. 139; *CTS* 93, pp. 2975-76, biography of Lou Shih-te, quoting *Ch'ao yeh ch'ien tsai*, where the same incident is in *TTHY* 7, p. 108; *THY* 53, pp. 919-20; *TFYK* 321, pp. 5a-5b. Also *CTS* 186A, p. 4850, biography of Chi Hsu, describing his interest in restoring Li Hsien as heir-apparent, where the information also occurs in *Tan pin lu* 談賓錄, which is quoted in *TCTC* 202, pp. 6527-28; in *THY* 51, pp. 889-90; and in *TTHY* 1, pp. 6-7. Nienhauser, "Tu Fan Chung-yen," pp. 436-37, suggests that the narrative device *ch'u ch'u* in *CTS* biographies may denote supplementary material from a different source.

¹⁰¹ *TFYK* 321, pp. 17b-18a; *CTS* 91, p. 2927, biography of Huan Yen-fan.

¹⁰² *TFYK* 324, pp. 14b-15a; see also *THY* 75, p. 1357.

¹⁰³ *TTHY* 6, p. 94; *TT* 17, pp. 411-12; *THY* 53, p. 902; *TFYK* 324, p. 15a.

¹⁰⁴ *TTHY* 12, p. 177; *THY* 53, p. 920; 75, p. 1357; *TFYK* 867, p. 7a. For Ti Ching-hui, see also *TFYK* 940, p. 5b. For Ti Kuang-ssu, see also *THY* 44, p. 789, and *TPKC* 427, pp. 3474-75, quoting *Kuang i chi*. It was Ti Kuang-ssu who, probably in Jui-tsung's reign, as deputy president of the Hung-lu 鴻臚 Court commissioned a grandiose stele for Ti Jen-chieh's father Ti Chih-sun 狄知遜, who had been buried in 690. This stele has been damaged at least since Sung times, but a portion of its text is at *Chin shih ts'ui pien* 69, pp. 36b-43a, with a critical account of Ti's ancestry and descendants appended. See also *Chin shih lu chiao cheng* 4, p. 72 (no. 764); *CTW* 993, pp. 1a-4a; and a reproduction in *Li-tai shih-k'o p'a pen hui pien* 17, p. 115. Su Chien 蘇健, "T'ang Ch'ung-chou tz'u-shih Ti chün pei chi Ti Jen-chieh mu k'ao" 唐邛州刺史狄君碑及狄仁傑墓考, *Chung yüan wen wu* 中原文物 (1991.2), pp. 90-93, transcribes the stele, based on his own inspection of it at Ti-ch'üan 翟泉 village, Mang shan 陂山, near Lo-yang. This transcription, however, is not as full as those in *Chin shih ts'ui pien* or *CTW*. He also differs from the *Chin shih ts'ui pien* editor in dating the stele to the period 841-845, on the grounds that it matches a second stele 5 meters from it, for Ti's descendant Ti Chien-mou 狄兼謨. I am grateful to Glen Dudbridge for this reference. For Ch'i Hsi, see James Legge, *The Ch'ün T'ew with the Tso Chium* (London: Trubner and Co., 1872), p. 419-20.

The more important of these two compilations, because of its apparent homogeneity, is *Ta T'ang hsin yü*, a collection of episodes made by Liu Su 劉肅, with an author's preface bearing the date 807. It is modeled on the celebrated compilation *Shih shuo hsin yü* 世說新語, and gathers together under category headings anecdotal material about well-known T'ang figures. It spans the period from the start of the dynasty to 779, but is particularly full in its coverage of the reigns of the empress Wu, Chung-tsung, and Jui-tsung. A high proportion of this text may be seen to be parallel in wording to accounts of the same episodes as contained in their subjects' *Chiu T'ang shu* biographies.¹⁰⁷ In the case of Ti Jen-chieh's biography, no fewer than ten of the thirty-four episodes in his *Chiu T'ang shu* biography are present in the *Ta T'ang hsin yü*. They are distributed throughout the work, under the headings by which it is organized, and their wording often corresponds closely.

It is a conspicuous feature of this compilation that, despite its full coverage of Ti Jen-chieh, it fails to record the episode for which he became so famous in T'ang lore. This failure, moreover, is the more remarkable in that the work provides coverage of precisely the issue of the T'ang restoration. In its opening section, it enters accounts of some of the great T'ang loyalist interventions of the period from T'ai-tsung's reign to Hsüan-tsung's. It has two entries relating to the events of the Chou-T'ang transition. The first describes three conversations that Chi Hsü had, two with the empress Wu and one with Chang Ch'ang-tsung. In these, Chi Hsü urged the idea of "restoring" the princes of Hsiang and Lu-ling and warned against considering the Wu princes. It concludes by stating, "Then [the empress] welcomed [back] Chung-tsung. In the restoration of the T'ang house, Chi Hsü was effective."

The second episode concerned Li Chao-te and his attempt to demote the Wu clan in the empress's estimation. The empress was about to make Wu Ch'eng-ssu a chief minister, and defended her action to Li Chao-te on the grounds that he was her nephew. Li argued successfully that the parent-son relationship was more important and should take priority. "The empress . . . said, 'I had not thought this through.' That same day, she put a stop to Wu Ch'eng-ssu's governmental activities."

These two paragraphs are followed by a detailed account of the successful plan in 705 by the "Five Princes" to murder the Chang brothers, an episode that is particularly well covered in this compilation. In the section as a whole, there is no mention of Ti Jen-chieh.¹⁰⁸

Ta T'ang hsin yü clearly defers to a number of figures besides Ti Jen-chieh.

¹⁰⁷ The debt to the *kuo-shih* is suggested in the modern editorial preface, p. 1.

¹⁰⁸ *TTY* 1, pp. 6-8.

Distributed through the compilation are what might be called principal entries for such figures. These entries typically include a main anecdote, and then proceed to summarize the rest of their subject's career, to conclude with his death and posthumous honors. The principal entry for Ti Jen-chieh is in the "Ability in Administration" (*cheng neng* 政能) section. It relates his defense of the condemned participants of the prince of Yüeh's failed rebellion, and then concludes:

Subsequently, he was summoned back to be governor of Wei-chou. His authority and compassion were greatly wielded, and the common people set up a shrine for him. He was promoted president of the Central Secretariat. When he died, court and provinces were moved. [Wu] Tse-t'ien posthumously appointed him chancellor of the left. In Chung-tsung's court he was posthumously appointed master of works, and in Jui-tsung's court retrospectively made duke of Liang. The grief felt for him and the lustre bestowed on him were made complete in three courts. No one in his generation might compare with him.¹⁰⁹

Again, at this point it would have been natural to make reference to Ti's role in the T'ang restoration, but again the text remains silent on this point.

Silence about Ti's loyalism is also a feature of *T'ang hui yao*. This text, by virtue of the three stages of its compilation, is a problematic work; material was added to it at each stage in its history, often under its original, early-ninth-century headings, but probably sometimes also under new headings. It is, therefore, often difficult to determine at which stage, in 801, 853, or 961, entries were incorporated. Like *Ta T'ang hsin yü*, *T'ang hui yao* contains a number of entries on Ti Jen-chieh. There is a strong suspicion that at least one of these, claiming Ti as the promoter of all five of the "Five Princes," is a late entry, made possibly under the direct influence of the spurious *Ti Liang kung chuan*.¹¹⁰ But *T'ang hui yao*, like *Ta T'ang hsin yü*, also contains a section on crucial T'ang loyalist interventions in dynastic politics, which, under the heading of "Recognition" (*shih liang* 識量), enters much the same sequence of anti-Wu and pro-Li initiatives that *Ta T'ang hsin yü* contains. Its entry for Li Chao-te sets Li's discussion in the context of the attempt by Wang Ch'ing-chih 王慶之 in 692 to have Wu Ch'eng-ssu established as heir-apparent. Li argues in the same kinship terms as in the *Ta T'ang hsin yü* account: history had shown that even in transmitting the throne

¹⁰⁹ *TTY* 4, p. 66. It is conspicuous that the *TTY* general account of Ti fails to mention the honor accorded his spirit tablet in 747. The wording here closely parallels that of the close of Ti's *CTS* biography and likely came from the *shih-tu* or from Wei Shu's biography of Ti.

¹¹⁰ *TTY* 75, p. 1357; see also *TPKC* 185, p. 1386.

from father to son, there had been usurpations; how much more was this likely to happen if the throne was passed to a nephew. Moreover no nephew could be counted on to maintain a temple for his aunt.¹³

The second entry on the T'ang restoration concerns Chi Hsü's intervention of 698. It runs approximately parallel to the second half of the *Ta T'ang hsin yü* account. There are some differences of wording, and in the *T'ang hui yao* version it is Chang I-chih rather than Chang Ch'ang-tsung who is made to stand for the brothers. But the two versions are clearly textually related.¹⁴ Following this entry, *T'ang hui yao* includes one more item relating to the Chang brothers. It then relates an incident, occurring in 702, after Ti's death.¹⁵

Neither work, therefore, mentions any episode in which Ti Jen-chieh persuaded the empress to restore Li Hsien as heir-apparent. It has to be stressed that these were compilations that copied in existing texts, and it must be concluded that there was no document considered authentic in which Ti was described as doing this. Though Ti's collected works had almost certainly been lost by this stage, the *shih-lu* and *kuo-shih* biographies were available both to Liu Su and to Su Mien. The frequency with which these compilers mention Ti Jen-chieh shows that he had a considerable reputation at the time *Hsin yü* and *Hui yao* were compiled. But in the early-ninth century, Ti's loyalism was a matter of hearsay rather than of authentic, textually based record, and so neither text mentioned it.

Another example of textual silence over the question of Ti's T'ang loyalism is perhaps less significant. Tu Yu's 杜佑 *T'ung tien* is after all primarily concerned with impersonal institutional and political factors in shaping history, rather than with highlighting individual acts of heroism. But it does contain a brief account of Chung-tsung's installation as heir-apparent in 698, and it also records, in the form of a double-column commentary, loyalist interventions by Hao Ch'u-chün 郝處俊 in 676, and by Chi Hsü in 698. Again, however, it does not mention any act or speech by Ti Jen-chieh in this context.¹⁶

Similar testimony is given by *Ts'ü yüan kuai*, which postdates the completion of *Chiu T'ang shu* by some fifty years. It has already been pointed out how very fully this compilation incorporates material about Ti, and that only one of the major incidents of his life is omitted. It has been shown, too, that its editors had at their disposal the full range of sources about Ti that had survived the An

Lu-shan rebellion: *Wu Tse-t'ien shih-lu*, the *kuo-shih* of Liu Fang, and *Chiu T'ang shu*. They, too, were bound by the same discipline of faithfulness to documentary sources as the compilers of *T'ang hui yao*. Yet there is only one mention of Ti's role T'ang loyalism at the end of his life. This, set in its section on "Loyalty" (*kung-chung* 公忠), takes the form of a word-for-word citation of the final paragraph of Ti's *Chiu t'ang shu* biography.¹⁷

Lastly, the evidence of Ssu-ma Kuang's *Tzu chih t'ung chien* indicates clearly that no passage corresponding to the anomalous final passage of the *Chiu T'ang shu* biography, translated above, was contained in the *Wu Tse-t'ien shih-lu* of 716. In fact Ssu-ma Kuang covered the episode of the empress's summons of Chung-tsung back to the capital rather differently from the final paragraph, stating only:

In the third month, on the day *chi-ssu* 己巳, under the pretext that the prince of Lu-ling was ill, they dispatched the supernumerary secretary of the Bureau for the Military Organization of the Regions, Hsü Yen-po 徐彦伯 of Hsia-ch'iu 瑕丘, to summon the prince of Lu-ling and his consort and children to visit the temporary court to have his sickness cured. On the day *wu-tzu* 戊子, the prince of Lu-ling reached Shen-tu 神都 [Lo-yang].¹⁸

In his notes for this passage, Ssu-ma rejected both the episode contained in the final passage of Ti's *Chiu T'ang shu* biography and the longer and more highly dramatized version of it supplied by *Ti Liang kung chuan*. Ssu-ma Kuang also cited an independent history, *T'ang t'ung chi* 唐統紀 by Ch'en Yüeh 陳嶽, as confirming the involvement of Hsü Yen-po in Li Hsien's return to Lo-yang. An entry in *T'ang hui yao*, which Ssu-ma did not cite, also mentions Hsü Yen-po's involvement.¹⁹ Here, then, was a clear indication that the final paragraph of Ti's *Chiu T'ang shu* biography conflicted badly with the *shih-lu*, the primary account of the episode.

If it is accepted that the main text of Ti Jen-chieh's *Chiu T'ang shu* biography represents a condensation by Wei Shu of his *shih-lu* notice of 716 and that the final paragraph is a late addition, then the picture of Ti that the biography supplies is again very different from his conventional late-medieval image. He was a powerful and successful official, the leader of a moderate faction in the late-seventh-century court. He lived dangerously and barely escaped death on at least one occasion. He may even have urged the empress Wu to make Li

¹³ *THY* 51, p. 889.

¹⁴ *THY* 51, pp. 889-90. Ssu-ma Kuang in *TCTC* 206, pp. 6526-28, also accepted that Chi Hsü had played a role.

¹⁵ *THY* 51, p. 890.

¹⁶ *TT* 198, p. 5436; *TT* 21, p. 541. For Hao Ch'u-chün's intervention, see also *CTS* 84, pp. 2799-800; *TFYK* 317, pp. 2a-b; *THY* 51, pp. 887-88.

¹⁷ *TFYK* 315, pp. 21b-22a. ¹⁸ *TCTC* 206, pp. 6529-30.

¹⁹ *THY* 1, p. 4. "In the year 698, the sixth month, they dispatched the supernumerary secretary of the Bureau for the Military Organization of the Regions Hsü Yen-po to welcome him at Fang-chou."

Hsien, rather than any of her paternal relatives, her successor. But he was by no means necessarily the undying T'ang restorationist that he was later portrayed as having been. The main text of the *Chiu T'ang shu* biography, in fact, offers testimony to an early stage in his eighth-century reputation, one in which he was not yet acclaimed for the achievements for which he was later to be known.

The final and completed *Chiu T'ang shu*, on the other hand, both by virtue of the added paragraph and because the assessments and historians' comments it includes elsewhere betray so high an opinion of 'Ti,'¹⁰⁸ belongs to the period when his fame knew few bounds, and when he was venerated particularly as the architect of the T'ang restoration and the secret instructor of the "Five Princes." It is to tracing the process by which he gained this reputation that the next section of this article is devoted.

THE GROWTH OF THE LEGEND

There can be no doubt that Ti Jen-chieh was one of the central political figures in the final years of the seventh century. He held very high offices then, and took part in major political and military initiatives. On his death he was honored as highly as any great medieval statesman. But analysis of both his own writing and his *Chiu T'ang shu* biography has suggested that his reputation as a T'ang loyalist was a matter of hearsay and did not have a secure basis in the official documentary tradition until after the completion of the *kuo-shih* by Wei Shu and Liu Fang. The way in which the tradition of his loyalism developed, and the long series of commendations he received under its influence, can be traced in some detail. But a summary of this story should be set, for the sake of completeness, in an account of all the honors paid to Ti by members of the elite and by high authority from his death until the tenth century.

The first stage involved conventional rather than exceptional recognition. Immediately after his death in 700, Ti was given high posthumous honors. *T'ang hsin yü* and *Chiu T'ang shu* both record that he was canonized Wen-hui, the first character indicating literary or scholarly achievement, the second probably a reference to his compassion as a provincial administrator. *Chiu T'ang shu* states also that he was posthumously appointed chancellor of the right of the Department of Affairs of State and that on his death the court adjourned for three days of mourning.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁸ *CTS* 6, p. 133; 7, p. 151; 93, p. 2990; 94, p. 3007.

¹⁰⁹ *TTHY* 4, p. 66, says chancellor of the left; *CTS* 89, p. 2894, says chancellor of the right. The term *hui* was used to describe Ti's administration in Wei-chou; see *WYTH* 877, p. 4b, text by Feng Su; and *TTHY* 4, p. 66.

When Chung-tsung succeeded in 705, he honored many of the officials, both living and deceased, who had exerted a moderating influence on political life in his cause in the preceding ten years. The highest awards of rank went to the "Five Princes," the coordinators of the plan to purge the "Two Lackeys (*erh shu* 二豎)," Chang Ch'ang-tsung and Cheng I-chih. Ti was among the most highly honored of deceased officials. The post of master of works (*ssu-k'ung* 司空) conferred on him was comparable with the post of grand marshal (*t'ai-wei* 太尉) granted to his former colleague, the senior official Liu Jen-kuei 劉仁軌 (602–685) at about the same time. It cannot, however, be tied to any idea that he was loyal to the T'ang at the expense of the Chou.¹¹⁰ This is particularly so because in 705 Chung-tsung was anxious to show every respect to his mother and was himself hesitant over the restoration of the T'ang.¹¹¹

When in 710 Jui-tsung ascended, however, there was a large-scale and probably systematic program of honoring T'ang loyalists. The "Five Princes," who had been demoted and had died in exile in the far south in the course of 706, had their original titles as princes restored. Particularly high honors were paid to Wei Yüan-chung, who had fearlessly resisted the Chang brothers after Ti's death. Wei had died in exile in about 707 at Fu-chou 涪州 in present-day Szechwan. With another member of the anti-Chang party, Wang T'ung-chiao, duke of Lang-yeh 琅琊, who had died in 706 when a plot to assassinate Wu San-ssu leaked, he was given the honor of satellite reburial at Ting-ling 定陵, the mausoleum of Chung-tsung. Comparable recognition apparently was not recorded for Ti Jen-chieh. Wei Yüan-chung was bracketed with Ti Jen-chieh by memorialists over this period, and indeed his career has the same quality of drama and endurance. It is therefore important to stress that, courageously though he resisted the Changs, Wei was never described as a T'ang loyalist. Rather, after the empress's death, as chief minister he failed to curb the ambitions of the Wu clan. He was also involved under Wu San-ssu in the first *shih-lu* for her reign, and was willing, after the T'ang restoration, to recall his service under her.¹¹²

¹¹⁰ *TTHY* 4, p. 66; *CTS* 89, p. 2895. For Liu Jen-kuei, see *CTS* 84, pp. 2796–97. The common ground between him and Ti Jen-chieh is suggested by the conversation between them recorded in *THY* 30, pp. 552–53.

¹¹¹ See the references in n. 126, below.

¹¹² For Wei Yüan-chung, see *CTS* 92, p. 2955; *HTS* 122, p. 4345; for his date of death, see *TCTC* 208, p. 6616; for Wang T'ung-chiao, see *CTS* 187A, p. 4878, and *THY* 21, pp. 414–15. Wei recalled his service under the empress Wu in a resignation statement to Chung-tsung; see *TFYK* 331, pp. 13b–14b, which supplies the text of the statement and *CTS* 92, p. 2954, which contains a similar narrative frame, but omits the text. It was the return of Wei's body from his place of banishment that gave the chance for burial at Ting-ling. Ti Jen-chieh had presumably been honorably buried in 700, while the empress Wu was still on the throne, and it may have been considered inappropriate to reinter him on Chung-tsung's death in 710. For mentions of Ti and Wei Yüan-chung together, see *TFYK* 322, p. 22b, memorial by Ning Yüan-ti 寧原德; and *CTS* 88, p. 2868, biography of Wei Ssu-li

In this large-scale distribution of posthumous honors, Ti Jen-chieh was made duke of Liang, the title by which he became conventionally known.¹²³ In a rescript addressed to Ti's eldest son and issued about this time in connection with his refusal to quit mourning for his mother, Jui-tsung opened by stating, "We recall that your family has been loyal to the royal house." This statement, preserved in a brief entry in *Ta T'ang hsin yü*, is too general to be interpreted as a commendation of Ti Jen-chieh's loyalty to Kao-tsung and Chung-tsung at the expense of Jui-tsung's own mother, the empress Wu. But it is a first indication that Ti might have opposed the Wu faction at court and advocated the reestablishment of Li Hsien.¹²⁴

No further award for Ti is recorded on the accession of Hsüan-tsung in 712. There are, however, references to Ti from this early period that were critical of him. The *Chiu T'ang shu* biography of Wei Yüan-chung records that in 707 no less a person than the emperor Chung-tsung himself criticized Ti for having attempted to persuade him to assume control of the government when the empress was ill. For him to do this, Chung-tsung stated, was to contravene the principle that there should be complete unity between minister and sovereign. Ti had been guilty of trying to "incur a private debt" from Chung-tsung. Wei Yüan-chung, who had secretly opposed Ti's suggestion, had been correct to have done so.¹²⁵

This brief anecdote suggests that Chung-tsung, even two years after the T'ang restoration, resented as sycophantic Ti's attempt to detract from his mother's status as rightful sovereign of the empire. In turn, it underlines that Chung-tsung, a reluctant and frightened participant in the plan to eradicate the Changs, did not see the abdication of the empress, his own succession, and the restoration of 705 straightforwardly as a recovery of legitimate rule. Chung-tsung's loyalty to his mother also makes it seem less likely that, five years earlier, Ti Jen-chieh would have seen his return from exile and reestablishment as heir-apparent as leading automatically to the restoration of the T'ang.¹²⁶

韋嗣立, memorial of 699. Unusually, *TFYK* 604, pp. 4a-5a, has only a shortened version of this latter memorial. For informed speculation as to Ti's place of burial, see Su, "T'ang Ch'ung-chou t'z'u-shih Ti chün pei," p. 93, and n. 106, above.

¹²³ *TIHY* 4, p. 66; *CTS* 89, p. 2895.

¹²⁴ *TIHY* 12, p. 177. The account ends by stating that there was an order that the rescript be edited into the "dynastic history," probably here the *shih-lu* for Jui-tsung's reign. The phrase *chung yü wang shih* 忠於王室 is applied to Ti Kuang-ssu's family (*chia-men* 家門), and not specifically to his father Ti Jen-chieh. Similar language was used in a general reference to officials of the generation of Wei Yüan-chung and Ning Yüan-ti; see *TFYK* 532, p. 22b.

¹²⁵ *CTS* 92, pp. 2954-55. For other occurrences of the phrase *ssu hui* 私惠, see *THY* 56, p. 969, memorial of Chia Shou 賈綬 in 705; *CTS* 183, p. 4731, memorial of Ching Hui 敬暉, also in 705; *Li Wen-jao wen chi pu* 補, p. 3a.

¹²⁶ See also *TIHY* 2, p. 26; *THY* 56, p. 968; *CTS* 88, p. 2865. Chung-tsung's attitude to his mother is further suggested by *TCTC* 208, p. 6591, quoting *T'ang tung chi*.

A second comment on Ti, to be dated to the early- or mid-K'ai-yüan period, is by Chang Cho, the author of *Ch'ao yeh ch'ien tsai*. Chang included an anecdote about Ti at court, in which he interpreted one of two dreams the empress Wu had had in the light of the succession crisis, and which are discussed below. He also gave a series of unusually incisive and clearly independent assessments of the major political figures of the period 695-710, including even the notorious Lai Chün-chen and Wu San-ssu. Ti was second on his list, behind Lou Shih-te 婁師德 (d. 699), a former *chin-shih*, a self-effacing and long-suffering official who spent most of his life in frontier commands and whom he praised in terms taken from the *Analekts*. Chang wrote of Ti's rough reading of the classics and histories, and his superficial acquaintance with literature. He commended his formulation of rules and principles, and his keenness in giving admonition. He praised his suppression of "improper" cults in the southeast, and spoke of him as courageous and decisive. He also quoted the *Analekts* in praise of his uprightness: "White indeed is one who can withstand black dye." But he mentioned an addiction to money in his late years, and characterized Ti as the Ho Chiao 和喬 of his age, that is as someone who was mocked for his miserliness.¹²⁷

It was not until 747 that Ti received further imperial recognition. In that year his spirit tablet was introduced to the shrine of Chung-tsung in the imperial dynastic temple. It has been mentioned that none of the *Chiu T'ang shu* biographies of the various recipients mentions this honor, suggesting that these biographies were completed before 747. This measure, moreover, coming so soon after Ti Jen-chieh's death, and thirty years after the same honor had been paid to the "Five Princes," registers a change in attitudes towards Ti's role in the T'ang restoration, and an increase in his prestige. This change took place not only in the court but also among officials and men of letters outside court society.

In this development, the contribution of one man, Li Yung, the writer to whom *Ti Liang kung chuan* was attributed, appears of germane importance. Li Yung was the author of the earliest known inscribed texts in praise of Ti, while other surviving tributes to Ti given in the middle decades of the eighth century were almost without exception by those who had direct or indirect contact with him. Li was himself in many ways fully as colorful a figure as Ti Jen-chieh, leading a life of adventure and risk.¹²⁸ His political career started late in the empress Wu's reign, at a time when the restoration forces were gathering. His

¹²⁷ *TPKC* 169, pp. 1235-36, quoting *Ch'ao yeh ch'ien tsai*. For Lou Shih-te, see n. 102, above. See *Analekts* 17, verse 6, and for Ho Chiao, *Chün shu* 晉書 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1974) 45, pp. 1283-84.

¹²⁸ Much of the primary material relating to Li Yung is collected in T'ang Tsu-p'ei 唐祖培, ed., *Li Pei-hai ch'uan shu* 李北海全書 (Taipei: I-wen, 1968). This includes a detailed biography and a reduced size reproduction of a rubbing of his recovered epitaph, for which see also *Ch'ien T'ang chih chai*, p. 916, and *T'ang tai mu chih hui pien*, p. 1766.

first significant tenure was as an omissioner, and it was in this role that he first showed his mettle. In 704 he earned celebrity by supporting Sung Ching in an attempted impeachment of the Chang brothers. He told the empress that the matter "concerned the dynasty itself." When asked why he had risked provoking her, he answered, "If a man is not resolved and not rash, his name will not become known."¹²⁹ At this stage he was politically allied to the "Five Princes," for he submitted a memorial objecting to the appointment of a charlatan, Cheng P'u-ssu 鄭普思, as director of the Imperial Library, that parallels a memorial by Huan Yen-fan on the same subject. He was also a friend of Chang Chien-chih, the first of the "Five Princes," and, when in 706 the "Five Princes" lost politically to Wu San-ssu, he was banished for his connection with Chang. Chang Chien-chih was closely connected with Ti Jen-chieh, who is said to have singled him out for promotion to chief minister. This means that Li Yung, though forty-four years younger than Ti, had at the very least immediate second-hand experience of him through Chang Chien-chih.¹³⁰

Li Yung was brought back to the capital after the defeat of the Wu clan. As a serving censor in 710, he played a dramatic part in the sequence of events that led to Hsüan-tsung's accession. By acting quickly to shut the gates of the inner city at Lo-yang, and by encouraging the city guard to "do great deeds and earn wealth and honor," he ensured that the attempt by Li Chung-fu 李重福, prince of Ch'iao 譙, to take the throne was defeated.¹³¹ But early in Hsüan-tsung's reign Li's impetuosity earned him the hatred of both Yao Ch'ung and Chang Yüeh 張說. He was again removed from the capital, to take up a long series of provincial appointments. At one stage he was involved in a corruption case and was sentenced to death; but an eloquent plea by a commoner, K'ung Chang 孔璋, which emphasized that he had "done great things for the dynasty" secured commutation.¹³² Though he probably regained access to metropolitan literary and scholarly society in about 735,¹³³ he was not destined to resume a career in the capital bureaucracy. As governor of Pei-hai, he was murdered by one of Li Lin-fu's 李林甫 agents in 747.

It may be an indication of the change in conditions during the K'ai-yüan peace and of the sense of distance that was evolving towards the Chou interregnum, that, returning to the capital briefly in mid-career, Li was the subject of general public curiosity, as a man who had survived from a different

age.¹³⁴ Yet it is easy to see why he and others like him had an interest in promoting Ti Jen-chieh's reputation. He identified himself with dramatic interventions on behalf of the dynasty, and could claim a key role in the sequence of events that led to the glorious reign of Hsüan-tsung. By building up the reputations of those who had contributed to the early stages of the sequence, he emphasized the political background to the great K'ai-yüan era. Indirectly, at the same time he drew attention to his own achievements, perhaps in the hope of improving his prospects for appointment at Ch'ang-an.

Li Yung was a prolific writer, a master of the literary tradition, and a recognized calligrapher. But, sadly, only a minute proportion of his collected works survives today. Among the compositions that are known only by title two are concerned with Ti Jen-chieh. Both are supported by details that suggest authenticity. One of these compositions was a tribute to Ti engraved in stone and set up at Ti's shrine at Wei-chou in 722. The stele and its text are now lost, but were recorded from Sung times. The earliest record of them is contained in the great Sung epigraphical catalogue by Chao Ming-ch'eng 趙明誠, the *Chin shih lu* 金石錄. This states that the stele was set up in the eleventh month of 722 and that the text was written in the hand of Chang T'ing-kuei 張廷珪 in *pa-fen* 八分 style.¹³⁵ Chang T'ing-kuei was a particularly well-known calligrapher, and the collaboration between him and Li Yung as the writer of his texts is well attested. Li's *Chiu Tang shu* biography records that they were allies from early in the Ch'ang-an period (701-704).¹³⁶ Moreover Chang's biography both confirms their collaboration and also records that Chang was governor of Wei-chou, listing this tenure as his fourth post since the start of the K'ai-yüan period. At about this time, Li Yung was governor of Ch'en-chou 陳州, due south of Wei-chou.¹³⁷

Li Yung's other tribute to Ti Jen-chieh was in a poem entitled "The Six Gentlemen" ("Liu kung p'ien" 六公篇), was also engraved, and has also failed to survive. This poem is first attested by no less a figure than the poet Tu Fu. Tu Fu was an ardent admirer of Li Yung, and included Li as one of eight deceased officials in his series of "Eight Laments," composed in the period 766-768, some two decades after Li's murder. A Sung commentary to the poem identifies the "Six Gentlemen" as Ti Jen-chieh and the "Five Princes." Here was a deeply

¹²⁹ For this incident, see *Yen Lu kung wen chi* 10, p. 3b, spirit-path stele for Sung Ching; *THY* 2, pp. 31-32; *CTS* 190B, pp. 5039-40; *TCTC* 207, pp. 6575-76; *T'ang yü lin* 5, p. 444; 3, pp. 228-29.

¹³⁰ *CTS* 190B, p. 5040. ¹³¹ *CTS* 86, p. 2836; *TCTC* 210, p. 6654.

¹³² *CTS* 190B, pp. 5041-42; *TFYK* 804, pp. 16b-18a; *WYTH* 619, pp. 5b-6b.

¹³³ *TFYK* 882, pp. 18b-19a; *Yen Lu kung wen chi* 5, p. 1b, preface to the collected works of Sun T'i.

¹³⁴ *Nan pu hsin shu* 南部新書 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1960) p. 8; *CTS* 190B, p. 5042. The degree to which antipathies aroused over the restoration period may have receded at about this time is suggested by Yang Kuo-chung's 楊國忠 successful attempt to rehabilitate the Chang brothers in 750; see *TCTC* 206, pp. 6900-1.

¹³⁵ *Chin shih lu chiao cheng* 5, p. 94 (no. 961).

¹³⁶ *CTS* 190B, pp. 5039, 5041.

¹³⁷ *CTS* 101, p. 3154. For Chang's tenure at Wei-chou, see *CTS* 101, p. 3153. Li Yung's posting at Ch'en-chou is recorded at *CTS* 190B, p. 5041.

considered and highly crafted reflection on Li's troubled career. In reserving mention of Li's poem for Ti Jen-chieh until the final phrase of the final couplet, Tu Fu in effect emphasizes its importance among Li's collected works. He implies that Li should be known by this poem and that, further, Li himself deserved comparison with its six subjects, including Ti Jen-chieh.¹³⁸

More detail about this poem is supplied again by Chao Ming-ch'eng. In an entry in the second part of *Chin-shih lu*, Chao recorded that he had known of Li Yung's poem from Tu Fu's mention of it, that he had longed to read it, that it was not generally available, and that he had secured a rubbing of a stone engraving of it written out in the hand of Hu Lü-hsü 胡履虛. It was, Chao confirmed, a "timeless composition." It was divided in two sections, one devoted to Ti Jen-chieh and the second to the "Five Princes."¹³⁹ In preserving the name of the calligrapher, Chao Ming-ch'eng provides valuable evidence of the date of the composition of Li's poem. Hu Lü-hsü is said to have given shelter to Ts'ui Yeh 崔液, a friend of P'ei Yao-ch'ing 裴耀卿 (681-743) and younger brother of Ts'ui Shih 崔湜 (670-712). Hu Lü-hsü was therefore in all probability alive in the mid-K'ai-yüan period, and probably wrote the poem for engraving on behalf of Li Yung at or near the time of its composition.¹⁴⁰

The uneven process of transmission that has resulted in the loss of these two early engraved tributes to Ti Jen-chieh by Li Yung was kinder in the cases of two tributes to Ti by admirers of Li. The first of these was by Kao Shih 高適, a well known verse writer of the mid-eighth century. Kao passed through Wei-chou on his way north in the autumn of 731. He marked his visit by composing three poems, each in the form of a brief tribute to a famous T'ang official who had lived at Wei-chou. Ti Jen-chieh was the third of these, and Kao's preface to the poems specifically mentions his shrine. The poem itself is a short encomium:

Upright and resolute the duke of Liang
His merit and lustre passed down on bamboo and silk.
He spoke loyally in the court of the great empress;
He secretly moved the stratagem for the imperial successor.
He welcomed good men and kept a storehouseful of ministers;
In sharing administration he rose to be an earl of a region.
To this day the men in the blue clouds
Are those who were once clients at his gates.¹⁴¹

¹³⁸ *Chiu chia chi chu Tu shih* 九家集注杜詩 (Peking: Harvard-Yenching, 1940) 14, p. 210.

¹³⁹ *Chin shih lu chiao cheng* 26, p. 474. ¹⁴⁰ For the mention of Hu Lü-hsü, see *CTS* 74, p. 2624.

¹⁴¹ "San chün yung" 三君詠, "Ti Liang kung," in Liu K'ai-yang 劉開揚, *Kao Shih shih chi pien nien chien chu* 高適詩集編年箋註 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1981), pp. 14-18; also Sun Ch'in-shan 孫欽善, ed., *Kao Shih chi chiao chu* 高適集校注 (Shanghai: Shang-hai ku-chi, 1984), pp. 86-90.

It is all but certain that when Kao composed this poem at Wei-chou he had seen Li Yung's engraved monument of 722, and it may be assumed also that in summarizing Ti Jen-chieh's achievement he drew from Li's account. The poem is the first extant tribute to Ti to describe four of the achievements on which his fame rested, his general political stance in the court of the empress, his role in reestablishing the Li-T'ang line, his promotion of talented officials, and his achievements as a provincial commander. It is important in tracing the history of Ti's reputation for two reasons. First, it suggests that by this time there was already a formal written record of Ti's achievements, for the term "bamboo and silk" should normally refer to a high-status dynastic record.¹⁴² Second, it claims that Ti's role in the succession crisis was "secret." Whether this refers to his persuading the empress to reinstate Li Hsien as heir-apparent, or to the tradition that he secretly instructed the "Five Princes" is not clear. But the use of the word "secret" is significant, for it implies that the proceedings were confidentially transmitted rather than regularly recorded. It was to be a persistent feature of the later tradition that Ti had given clandestine instructions to the "Five Princes."

When Kao Shih wrote this poem in 731, he almost certainly had not met Li Yung. He was to do so, probably for the first time, in 746, when Li Yung had taken up his final post as governor of Pei-hai. Kao Shih's fulsome praise for Li on that occasion, again given in verse, recalled his role as a monitory official under the empress Wu. It underlines the growing view of the empress's reign as a time when, in Kao's words, "Long ago the imperial cycle was obstructed." It also underscores Li Yung's origins in the same milieu in which Ti Jen-chieh had spent his final years.¹⁴³

The middle years of the eighth century were dominated by the trauma of the rebellion of An Lu-shan, an event that had profound repercussions for all aspects of the T'ang world. Its effects on Ti Jen-chieh's standing in T'ang tradition were complex. The massive destruction at the hands of the rebels of written materials in the central libraries at Ch'ang-an probably accounted for the loss of his collected works. A ninth-century account indicates also that the shrine commemorating his good government at Wei-chou, standing in the heart of territory conquered by An Lu-shan in the winter of 755, was destroyed.¹⁴⁴ But other changes in his status were, ironically, positive. The very concept of loyalty to the T'ang dynastic house, for which he now stood, acquired a new immediacy. In the reigns of the empress Wu, Chung-tsung, and Jui-tsung, loyalty sug-

¹⁴² For the phrase "bamboo and silk," see, e.g., *Han shu* 54, p. 2466; *Hou Han shu* 16, p. 599.

¹⁴³ *Kao Shih shih chi pien nien chien chu*, pp. 163-68; also *Kao Shih chi chiao chu*, pp. 147-51.

¹⁴⁴ *WYTH* 877, pp. 3a-6a, Feng Su.

gested the ability, mainly in a court context, to withstand the machinations of the Wu clan. In the era of peace that had preceded the rebellion, dynastic loyalty had receded in importance as a political value. Readiness to express fervor in support of one of the most successful sovereigns China had seen, and perhaps, as Li Yung had done, to praise the sequence of events that had brought him to the throne did not count as loyalty in contemporary usage. But from 756 on, loyalty to the dynasty came into prominence as a far more demanding value, tested in bloody conflict. The official community had before it the image of the 3,000 or so of their colleagues who had failed the test. As collaborators, they were paraded at the capital late in 757, in disgrace, bareheaded, bare-footed, and surrounded by troops.¹⁴⁵

Further humiliations followed for the dynasty, and the standing of those past servants of the T'ang who, in contrast to these collaborators, had withstood earlier crises correspondingly rose. In the post-rebellion reigns, therefore, Ti Jen-chieh figures in successive edicts conferring honors on earlier T'ang loyalists and their descendants. He was, by this time, firmly recognized as one of the great servants of the T'ang.¹⁴⁶

The next detailed tribute to him that survives, however, again comes not from high authority but from a man who lived in the same milieu as that of Kao Shih. Tu Fu belongs firmly in the circle of Ti Jen-chieh's admirers. Not only was he a colleague of Kao Shih, it has been shown that he was also an admirer of Li Yung. Moreover, he had a direct connection with Ti Jen-chieh, for his niece was married to one of Ti's great-grandsons. It was an encounter with Ti Po-chi 狄博濟, one of many Ti progeny living in the mid-eighth century, that led Tu Fu to summarize Ti's achievements in a poem to his relative:

When the great empress held the court, cunning and slander abounded.

Duke Ti upheld the government in her final years.

In a polluted river, he made an unsullied crossing;

¹⁴⁵ *TCTC* 220, p. 7042, and *CTS* 50, pp. 151-55. I am grateful to Naomi Standen for the second reference. The figure of 3,000 is taken from the spirit-path stele for Hsü Hao 徐浩 cited in n. 155, below.

¹⁴⁶ *Li Wen jan wen chi* 12, p. 2b; *THY* 45, pp. 810, 811. For the emperor Te-tsung's deliberate attempts to strengthen the tradition of dynastic loyalty at the start of his reign, see McMullen, "The Death of Chou Li-chen," pp. 63-64. The "Chung-i chuan 忠義傳" section of *CTS* (*CTS* 187A-187B, pp. 4863-916) might have been written at about this time. Its organization parallels that of the "K'u-li chuan," in dividing into two *chuan*, the first in this case being principally concerned with loyalty at the foundation, under the empress Wu, Chung-tsung, and Jui-tsung, the second with loyalty in the course of the An Lu-shan rebellion. Though later material is included, starting with the biography of Chang Pei 張佖 and supplying notices for the sons of Li Ch'ing 李愔, the preface, which mentions figures no later than Tuan Hsü-shih 段秀實 (d. 783) and Yen Chen-ch'ing (d. 784), is consistent with a compilation date of about 785. Like the "K'u-li chuan," it contains repeated material; see n. 66, above.

The dynastic succession was to be assigned to the Wu princes.

But he alone gave remonstrance, and held to the red throne-steps.

From within the Forbidden City it was decided to send a request to Fang-ling.

The elders of the former court all wept copious tears.

In one morning the altars of T'ai-tsung were rectified.

The rites of the Han officials were washed shining bright again.¹⁴⁷

Here was seemingly a cautious but emphatic tribute to Ti: Tu Fu restricts himself to claiming that Ti persuaded the empress to bring Li Hsien back to the capital from Fang-ling, and does not mention the tradition that he also gave secret instructions to the "Five Princes" for the coup of 705. Yet this was not a historically accurate statement, for it was never the case that Ti Jen-chieh had been alone in giving remonstrance. It has been shown that during the succession crisis other figures, some like Li Chao-te and Chi Hsü, far from exemplary in their political conduct, had also advised the empress in favor of Li Hsien.

Other writers mentioning Ti Jen-chieh at about this period do not specifically refer to his role in the restoration of the T'ang line. Sun T'i 孫逖, a member of the circle that included Li Yung, referred to him in a eulogy for Chang Yüeh as governor of Yu-chou 幽州, the ever troublesome northeastern frontier where Ti had held command.¹⁴⁸ The great loyalist official and calligrapher Yen Chen-ch'ing, an examination graduate under Sun T'i and another admirer of Li Yung, twice mentioned Ti in commemorative texts composed after the rebellion. In a spirit path stele for K'ang Hsi-hsien 康希銑, he recalled him as a member of a group of high-ranking officials who composed poems of farewell for K'ang.¹⁴⁹ He also recorded an incident in which Yao Ch'ung, who has been mentioned as particularly devoted to the empress, in conversation with Ti expressed admiration for a young student of ten or so who had complete powers of recall.¹⁵⁰ Yen Chen-ch'ing may also possibly have kept an example of Ti Jen-chieh's calligraphy. There is a colophon written in the name of Han Tse-mu 韓擇木, a recognized calligrapher and an associate of Yen's, stating that "president

¹⁴⁷ *Chiu chia chi chu Tu shih* 11, pp. 155-56, "Ti ming fu" 狄明府. Ti Po-chi is attested in Stein MS no. 516, *Li tai fa pao chi* 歷代法寶記. He was alive in 793; see n. 157, below.

¹⁴⁸ *WYTH* 775, p. 6b, eulogy for Chang Yüeh's service as governor-general of and military governor of Yu-chou.

¹⁴⁹ *Yen Lu kung wen chi* 9, p. 1b, spirit-path stele for Hsü Hsü 徐秀 (685-754), completed in or after 764. Yen mentions that Yao Yüan-chung had shown the young Hsü Hsü a poem of 300 words, and that he had been able to recite it from memory on one reading. Yao then said to Ti Jen-chieh, "Young master Hsü is as fine as a pearl, and as pure as jade. It is just that we do not know what his destiny is to be."

¹⁵⁰ *Yen Lu kung wen chi* 10, p. 9b, spirit-path stele for K'ang Hsi-hsien 康希銑 (645-715), completed in 776.

Yen at his home had a hand-written memorial by Ti, in over 700 characters, entitled 'A Request that the Heir-Apparent Return to the Capital.'¹⁵¹

Ts'en Shen 岑參, a friend of Tu Fu, Kao Shih, and Yen Chen-ch'ing, was another writer of the post-rebellion period who referred to Ti's reputation. He did so in a poem of 768, again in the context of a meeting with one of his descendants.¹⁵² The next important references to Ti were made by another calligrapher: Hsü Hao 徐浩 was a general service official whose career had been well advanced by 755. There are indications that he had a special interest in promoting both Ti Jen-chieh's reputation and the ideal of loyal service to the T'ang. In a work on the holdings of calligraphy in the imperial collection, he described how the empress Wu admired Ti's calligraphy, and how she had twenty *chüan* in the hand of the Chin-dynasty masters Wang Hsi-chih 王羲之 and Wang Hsien-chih 王獻之 brought out from the inner palace to show him and others.¹⁵³ In a commemorative text for the great K'ai-yüan minister Chang Chiu-ling 張九齡, Hsü Hao also praised Ti Jen-chieh as, with some of the statesmen of the reign of T'ai-tsung and with Chang Chieh-chih and Huan Yen-fan of Chung-tsung's reign, one of the great political figures of the dynasty.¹⁵⁴ In Hsü's own epitaph, moreover, there is a brief account of a memorial Hsü submitted in about 757 asking for clemency for those officials who had collaborated with the An Lu-shan insurgents. In this memorial, Hsü cited two precedents for lenient treatment of political rebels. The first was provided by the great emperor T'ang T'ai-tsung, for, confronted by the sedition of his general Hou Chün-chi 侯君集 in 643, T'ai-tsung had charged only four men, rather than the whole of Hou's following. The second precedent concerned Ti himself, for in 688 at Yü-chou Ti had pleaded for leniency in the treatment of the large following led by the T'ang imperial clansman and political rebel Li Chen, prince of Yüeh. That Ti's initiative should have been mentioned alongside an act of clemency by no less a

figure than T'ai-tsung himself is an indication of his high standing. Hsü's memorial also shows that in the crisis of the An Lu-shan rebellion, for the disgraced collaborators and their colleagues, Ti stood for wisdom and mercy as well as for loyalty to the T'ang.¹⁵⁵

Hsü Hao, even more interestingly, was the author of a short account of the T'ang restoration of 705. This work, in one *chüan*, is entered in the bibliographical survey contained in the Sung-era *Wen hsien t'ung k'ao* 文獻通考. Its title is given as *Lu-ling wang chuan* 廬陵王傳, and a brief note states that it "tells of the episode of Ti Jen-chieh and the 'Five Princes.'" There is no further information and no citations have been preserved. But the work is clear proof that the tradition of Ti's role in the restoration of 705 was now considered to merit an independent narrative.¹⁵⁶

Late in the eighth century there were more tributes to Ti. In 793 the emperor promoted Ti's descendant Ti Po-chi, Tu Fu's relative, from a prefectural governorship to the post of vice-president of the Court of Guards, and in a citation praised Ti Jen-chieh as one who:

... provided succour to the empress, and determined a strategy for the continuation of the T'ang. He produced from hidden origins the revival of the dynasty.

Again, therefore, and this time from the emperor himself, there was emphasis on the clandestine nature of the achievement attributed to Ti. In 787 at Yü-chou, or Ts'ai-chou 蔡州 as it was now called, in Honan, a stele for him was reerected. Yü-chou, where Ti had been governor in 688, had special associations in loyalist eyes, for it was here that Ti Jen-chieh had successfully pleaded for leniency for those involved in the revolt of Li Chen and later for the population of the whole prefecture, threatened by the troops of Chang Kuang-fu. The record for the stele for Ti states merely that it was "reerected"; the text has not survived, and the names of its composer, Yüan T'ung-li 元通禮, and calligrapher, Tang Fu 黨復, are obscure.¹⁵⁷

Early the following century, more than one hundred years after Ti's death, several more incidents indicate the prestige that Ti now commanded. T'ien

¹⁵¹ *T'ang wen shih* i 唐文拾遺 (rpt. Taipei: Wen-hai, 1979) 22, pp. 22a-b. I have been unable to trace this colophon. Han Tse-mu was Yen's associate; see *Yen Lu kang wen chi nien-p'ü*, p. 12a. To judge from its title, the memorial in Ti's own hand referred to was submitted after Chung-tsung had been reinstated as heir-apparent, and therefore after any loyalist intervention by Ti could have occurred. It might just have been the submission referred to in *CTS* 92, p. 2954, biography of Wei Yüan-chung; see n. 125, above.

¹⁵² Ch'en T'ieh-min 陳鐵民 and Hou Chung-i 侯忠義, eds., *Ts'en Shen chi chiao chu* 岑參集校注 (Taipei: Han Ching wen-hua, 1985) 4, p. 372; see also 1, p. 26; 4, pp. 332, 336.

¹⁵³ *Fa shu yao lu* 法書要錄 3, "Hsü Hao ku chi chi" 徐浩古蹟記, in Ikeda On, *Chügoku kodai shahon shikigo shirōku* 中國古代寫本識語集錄 (Tokyo: Tokyo daigaku Tōyōbunka kenkyūjo, 1990), p. 312. Ti had died before the brief Ta-tsu 大足 reign period (701), so that the dating must be wrong. The Hsü Hao mentioned as a subordinate officer under Yen Chen-ch'ing in the early crisis days of the An Lu-shan rebellion is unlikely to be the same person; see *CTS* 128, pp. 3590-91, and "Yen Lu kang hsiung-chuang," in *Yen Lu kang wen chi* 14, pp. 3a-4b, where the spelling is Hao 皓.

¹⁵⁴ *Chin shih hsiü pien* 14, p. 33; *CTW* 440, p. 13a, spirit-path stele for Chang Chiu-ling 張九齡, by Hsü Hao. The latter text supplies the reading.

¹⁵⁵ *Chin shih ts'ü pien* 104, pp. 13a-24b, stele for Hsü Hao by Chang Shih 張式, at p. 16b. See also *CTW* 445, p. 19a, for a transcription of this text. For Hou Chün-chi, see *CTS* 3, p. 55; 69, pp. 2511-14; *TCTC* 197, p. 6194.

¹⁵⁶ *Wen hsien t'ung k'ao* 文獻通考 (rpt. Taipei: Hsin-hsing, 1965) 195, p. 1651.3, quoting Ch'en Chen-sun 陳振孫, *Chih-chai shu lu chieh i' 直齋書錄解題* (Shanghai: Shang-hai ku-chi, 1987) p. 144. This work is not in the *CTS* or *HTS* bibliographies, nor do Hsü Hao's epitaph by Chang Shih (see preceding note) or his biographies, *CTS* 137, pp. 3759-60, and *HTS* 160, p. 4965, mention it.

¹⁵⁷ For the Yü-chou stele, see n. 54, above. Te-tsung's proclamation promoting Ti Po-chi is at *TFK* 131, p. 15b.

Hung-cheng 田弘正, the military governor of Wei-chou, refurbished Ti's shrine there, and commissioned Feng Su 馮宿, a colleague of the famous Han Yü, to compose a grandiloquent inscription for it. This describes both Ti's good government at Wei-chou and his role in the succession crisis of 698. Calling Ti "the single pillar that stood firm," it speaks of him as "supporting [a building] that had already toppled, and binding [a cord] that was about to be severed." It also makes it clear that the tradition that he had secretly instructed to the "Five Princes" was now accepted.¹⁵⁸

Two episodes that show how high Ti's standing was early in the ninth century concerned two officials who were descended from the empress Wu's family, Wu Yuan-heng 武元衡 and his cousin Wu Ju-heng 武儒衡. Although their ancestor had been Wu P'ing-i 武平一, the one member of the Wu clan who had kept strictly aloof from the dynastic politics of the interregnum, they were, more than a century after the events concerned, still vulnerable to the charge that they were descended from the empress's clan. In one incident, the chief minister Li Chi-fu 李吉甫, who was said to have had poor relations with Wu Yuan-heng, also a chief minister, at the instigation of his son Li Te-yü, signaled his displeasure by submitting a request that the shrine for Ti Jen-chieh be refurbished. Wu Yuan-heng is said to have recognized the threat implicit in this and to have started to look for a provincial appointment. Merely by drawing attention to Ti's shrine, therefore, Li Chi-fu reminded Wu Yuan-heng of Ti's supposed role in the restoration and of the permanent disgrace that the usurpation had brought to the Wu clan.¹⁵⁹ In a second episode, the chief minister Ling-hu Ch'u 令狐楚, wanting to neutralize the influence at court of Wu Ju-heng, located a descendant of Ti Jen-chieh, Ti Chien-mou 狄兼謨, in minor office at Hsiang-yang 襄陽, and forged an imperial rescript appointing him to the key court post of omissioner. The rescript, preserved in Wu Ju-heng's *Chiu T'ang shu* biography, put the following words into Hsien-tsung's mouth:

In our leisure from conducting government, we read in person the documents of our dynasty. We realize how evil ministers came to gain hold on power, and we witness the events of the Mother Empress's usurpation. The sacred vessels and great jewels of our dynasty were about to be passed on to other men. But High Heaven is great indeed; it sent down a mirror to the succession. It caused [Ti] Jen-chieh to be born, to protect Chung-tsung. It

made the severed cord be redeployed and the enlightened successor be restored.

When the rescript was issued, Wu Ju-heng is said to have wept before the emperor, and to have reiterated that his own ancestor Wu P'ing-i had not been involved.¹⁶⁰

These accounts show that by the early-ninth century Ti Jen-chieh was recognized as a great T'ang dynastic servant. Cult shrines or commemorative steles to him were maintained in different parts of China. "Documents of the dynasty (*kuo-shu* 國書)" were said to have told the story of his loyalism. As a statesman, he had a reputation for compassion as well as for daring. Among the people, he stood for courage as well as mercy. The tradition of his role in the succession crisis of 698 and of his secret instructions to the "Five Princes" had been elaborated and retold, in verse as well as in prose. The praise bestowed on him had already struck the hyperbolic note that was to mark it into Sung times.

The Informal Biography Ti Liang kung chuan

It was at about this time that mention was first made of *Ti Liang kung chuan*, the unofficial biography of Ti Jen-chieh that was destined significantly to add to the lore about him. In the early-ninth century this was accepted as a work by Li Yung, the T'ang loyalist who had composed the first known independent commemorative texts for Ti. A number of different titles, *Ti Liang kung chuan*, *Ti Liang kung li Lu-ling wang chuan*, *Ti kung chia chuan*, *Liang kung pieh chuan*, and *Ti Jen-chieh chuan* are given for what may well be the same work.¹⁶¹ It was in three *chüan*, much longer than either of the official notices. It has not been transmitted in full, but passages of it are preserved by Ssu-ma Kuang, under the title *Ti Liang kung chuan*, in his notes, and both Fan Chung-yen and the *Hsin T'ang shu* compilers drew from it in their biographies of Ti. From these and other references, it is possible to infer its likely contents, style, and tone. It was, the following analysis will show, a lively collocation that drew from many of the anecdotes, speeches, and dialogues of the last years of the empress Wu's court, adapting them to make Ti their subject. It gave prominent and dramatic treatment to the inherently improbable idea that five years before his death Ti had secretly instructed all the "Five Princes" in their task of restoring the T'ang.

¹⁵⁸ CTS 158, p. 4162, biography of Wu Ju-heng.

¹⁵⁹ For the variant title "Ti kung chia chuan" 狄公家傳, see CTS 5, p. 59; for "Ti Liang kung chia chuan" 狄梁公家傳, see *Chih chai shu lu chieh t'i* p. 197; for "Liang kung pieh chuan" 梁公別傳, see CTS 89, p. 2895, and *Fan Wen cheng kung chi* 11, p. 4; for "Ti Jen-chieh chuan" 狄仁傑傳, see *Ch'ung wen tsung mu* 崇文總目 (KHCPTS edn.) 3, p. 108; for "Ti Liang kung li Lu-ling wang chuan" 狄梁公立廬陵王傳, see n. 168, below.

¹⁶⁰ WYH 877, pp. 3a-6a.

¹⁶¹ *Pei meng so yen* 北夢瑣言 (Shanghai: Shang-hai ku-chi, 1981) 6, p. 44. Fu Hsüan-ts'ung 傅璇琮, *Li Te-yü nien-p'u* 李德裕年譜 (Chi-nan: Ch'i Lu shu-she, 1984), pp. 67-68, is skeptical about the historicity of this anecdote. I am grateful to Jovana Muir for this reference.

A biography of this exceptional length should be set in the context of biographical writing in medieval China, for in the second half of the eighth century this was a changing and expanding tradition.⁶² On the one hand there were commemorative accounts, composed for official purposes, reports of conduct (*hsing-chuang*), tomb steles (*mu-pei ming* 墓碑銘), and epitaphs for burial (*mu-chih ming* 墓誌銘). Though these genres were still dominated by the models provided by successive *lieh-chuan* in the dynastic histories, and though they shared the same formal organization and moralistic and illustrative purpose, in this period they nonetheless show a new flexibility. Epitaphs lost some of the stiffness and formality that marked seventh-century examples, including Ti's epitaph for Yüan Kung-yü. Biographies were freer, sometimes structured around a single episode or speech, again often with a moral purpose. Some of these less formal works were intended to give an alternative view of their subject, based on a unique source, on new evidence, or personal knowledge. Many were for unofficial circulation. In addition, highly crafted, autobiographical, and satirical or self-satirical parodies of the biography form, and fictional biographies, sometimes elaborate *romans à clef*, represent one of the great achievements of T'ang literature.

Most of these works, following their *lieh-chuan* models, were short, though there are some longer *hsing-chuang* recorded in the second half of the eighth century, and fictional biographies might also be longer. There was also, however, from the second half of the eighth century, a small group of much longer biographies, of heroic figures of the dynasty. These were for men whose dramatic careers and great reputations were still fresh in reader's memories. The style was more discursive, the amount of narrative detail much greater, and the records of conversations and set speeches altogether fuller.

The *Hsin Tang shu* bibliography, in its subsection reserved for various categories of biography (*isa chuan* 雜傳),⁶³ lists titles of several works of this kind: for example, a biography of the loyalist heroes Chang Hsün 張巡 and Yao Yin 姚閔 in two *chüan*, attributed to the well-known writer Li Han 李翰 (*Chang Hsün Yao Yin chuan* 張巡姚閔傳). This gave a vivid and detailed narrative account of the horrifying siege of Sui-yang 睢陽 by rebel forces in 757. It was presented to the throne, circulated and read, and even supplemented, into the ninth century.⁶⁴

⁶² For an analysis of the range of biography forms, see William H. Nienhauser, Jr., "A Structural Reading of the Chuan in the Wen-yüan ying-hua," *JAS* 36 (1977), pp. 443-56. Also, D. C. Twitchett, "Chinese Biographical Writing," in W. G. Beasley and E. G. Pulleyblank, eds., *Historians of China and Japan* (London: Oxford U.P., 1961), pp. 95-114.

⁶³ *HTS* 58, p. 1484, sect. "I-wen chih" 藝文志, "Tsa chuan-chi" 雜傳記.

⁶⁴ Li Han 李翰, "Chin Chang Hsün chung-ch'eng chuan piao" 進張巡中丞傳表, *TWT* 25, p. 11a; *Han Ch'ang-li wen chi chiao chu* 韓昌黎文集校注 (Shanghai: Ku-tien wen-hsüeh, 1957) 2, pp. 42-45.

Other examples listed are biographies for the loyalist general Tuan Hsiu-shih 段秀實⁶⁵ and the great post-rebellion soldier Kuo Tzu-i 郭子儀.⁶⁶ The longest of all was a biography of the chief minister and adviser to four emperors Li Mi 李泌 (722-789) in ten *chüan* attributed to his son Li Fan 李繁 (*Hsiang kuo Yeh hou chia chuan* 相國鄒侯家傳).⁶⁷

None of these longer biographies has survived to the present as an integral text. All were, however, accepted as works of history, as their listing by the *Hsin Tang shu* editors confirms. All were consulted and used selectively, though often under variant titles, in Ssu-ma Kuang's *Tzu chih t'ung chien*. Following his normal practice, Ssu-ma, in discussing conflicts of evidence, also quoted extensively those passages of the works concerned that he rejected. It is therefore possible, using mainly his notes, to some extent to reconstruct these works and, within limits, to analyze their style.

Ti Liang kung chuan belongs on the margins of this group. It shares with these works not only its bibliographical classification, but also its greater length and the fact that it celebrates loyalty to the T'ang dynasty. It has in common with Li Mi's biography a court setting, and like Li Mi's it idealizes the relationship between its subject and the sovereign. Like the others too, it was used by Ssu-ma Kuang. It differs in that Ti's career had ended over fifty years before the An Lu-shan rebellion, whereas, with the exception of Li Mi's, the other longer biographies were for subjects who fought for the T'ang in or after the rebellion. This earlier setting gave *Ti Liang kung chuan* a distinctive tone and content.

The first reference to this composition was made by Lü Wen 呂溫 (772-811), a literary figure who composed a series of tributes to former servants of the dynasty. Lü Wen wrote of the biography:

It was through [Ti Jen-chieh] that the T'ang was restored to its status as the T'ang. Those who are blind to this in later times accord the merit to the "Five Princes." They wholly fail to realize that the achievement of the "Five Princes" was made through his teaching. A visitor showed me the biography

"Chang chung-ch'eng chuan hou hsü" 張中丞傳後序. Li Han's biography is quoted by Ssu-ma Kuang in *TCTC*, *k'ao-i*, under the title "Chang chung-ch'eng chuan" 張中丞傳, e.g., 218, p. 6989.

⁶⁵ For Tuan Hsiu-shih, see Jonathan Mirsky, "The Life of Tuan Hsiu-shih Based on Translations of his Biographies in the T'ang Histories," *Journal of the China Society* 1 (1961), pp. 146-65. The biography was quoted by Ssu-ma Kuang in the *k'ao-i* under the same title; e.g., *TCTC* 224, p. 7190.

⁶⁶ This was quoted by Ssu-ma Kuang in the *k'ao-i* under the title "Fen-yang chia chuan" 汾陽家傳; e.g., *TCTC* 218, p. 6985.

⁶⁷ This was quoted by Ssu-ma Kuang in the *k'ao-i* under the title "Yeh hou chia chuan" 鄒侯家傳; see *TCTC* 218, p. 6985. For a much shorter text bearing a similar title, "Yeh hou wai chuan" 鄒侯外傳, see *TPKC* 38, pp. 238-44. In its style and its emphasis on the supernatural the *TPKC* version is perhaps closest to *Ti Liang kung chuan*. This work and its relation to the *Yeh hou chia chuan* are explored by Dien, in "The Use of the *Yeh-hou chia chuan*," pp. 221-47.

that Li [Yung governor of] Pei-hai had composed. Its account of the interval when the prince of Lu-ling was deposed [as heir-apparent] made one see [Ti Jen-chieh] as if in life.

In Lü Wen's tribute, the language used to describe the empress Wu's Chou dynasty is sharply derogatory. Lü spoke of "An evil rainbow stretching across the sky," and of "A crowing hen commanding the dawn." The latter image, drawn from *Shang shu* 尚書, was much used to refer to the empress Wu's regime. Much more interestingly, Lü referred to Ti's instruction of the "Five Princes" as "secret," and spoke of Ti's death-bed instructions on how to proceed with the restoration plot. Such a scene was precisely a feature of the final, dramatic passage of the biography that Ssu-ma Kuang preserved in his notes.¹⁶⁸

Another literary figure, Chang Hu 張祐 (793–853), a prolific verse writer, wrote a poem entitled, "On Reading the Biography of Ti, Duke of Liang," which is very likely to be a reference to this work. The poem praises both Ti Jen-chieh and the "Five Princes." It too seems to accept that Ti was the teacher and promoter of all five. It called Ti, "the single pillar that stood firm in the universe," a commendation that echoes Feng Su's "single pillar that stood firm," and suggests that a stock of laudatory images for Ti may now have developed.¹⁶⁹

There are extended tributes to Ti by other well-known literary figures of the ninth century, including one by P'i Jih-hsiu for Ti's shrine at P'eng-tse that was set up in 864.¹⁷⁰ The mid-ninth century witnessed a vogue among scholars for collecting records of dialogues believed to have taken place between the empress Wu and her ministers, especially if they featured defiance or resistance on the latter's part. None of the resulting records that involved Ti, however, can definitely be proven to refer to his long, informal biography.¹⁷¹ The next unambiguous reference comes in the Five Dynasties period, and forms the final paragraph in Ti's *Chiu Tang shu* biography. It has already been argued above that this brief paragraph was probably a late addition to Wei Shu's *kuo-shih*.¹⁷² In addi-

tion, four *Chiu Tang shu* editorial insertions mention Ti in highly laudatory terms, indicating that its tenth-century editors wrote under the influence of the enormous reputation that he had acquired by this time.¹⁷³

Although other tributes to Ti Jen-chieh survive from the tenth century,¹⁷⁴ the next clear references to the biography are those by Ssu-ma Kuang. In constructing his account for the final years of the empress Wu's reign, Ssu-ma was confronted not only with *Ti Liang kung chuan* and its evidently highly detailed version of events, but also with several general histories and with numerous anecdotal sources, some no less detailed. The task of reconciling all these accounts and producing a historically plausible narrative must have been formidable. Ssu-ma's attitude to *Ti Liang kung chuan*, as to other anecdotal texts, shows an ambivalence characteristic of many medieval Chinese exegetical or compilatory scholars. Introducing the text at the point of first citation from it in his *k'ao-i*, he condemned it as "crude and far-fetched" and queried its attribution to Li Yung. Yet he did not hesitate selectively to adopt material from it for his main narrative, for in some cases the same passages are also cited in *k'ao-i*. In other cases, too, it may be surmised that certain passages in the main narrative, which cannot be located in other official or anecdotal sources, may have come from *Ti Liang kung chuan*. There are six explicit citations from the biography in the *k'ao-i*, and perhaps as many were incorporated without attribution in the main narrative.

The *k'ao-i* citations provide a key to the extent to which the biography was current in the eleventh century. It is immediately apparent from textual parallels that the informal biography was used by two other, slightly earlier, major eleventh-century authorities in their accounts of Ti. The earlier of these was the statesman Fan Chung-yen. Fan's text of 1038 for Ti's shrine at P'eng-tse contained both the encomium to Ti cited at the opening of this article, and an extended biography of him. In the biography, the close verbal parallels with the excerpts preserved in Ssu-ma Kuang's *k'ao-i* make it certain that Fan and Ssu-ma were citing from the same or very similar texts. The same holds for the

¹⁶⁸ *Li Ho-shu wen chi* 呂和叔文集 (SPTK edn.) 9, pp. 11b–12a, and *WYTH* 780, pp. 11b–12a. The hen controlling the dawn citation had first been made by Huan Yen-fan with reference to the empress Wei immediately after the restoration; see *CTS* 91, p. 2929; *THY* 3, p. 26; and in a more general context concerning female intrusion in rituals, but referring to the empresses Wu and Wei, by Lu Lü-ping 盧履冰 in 717; see *TT* 21, p. 54; *THY* 52, p. 907; *CTS* 27, p. 1027; and *TFYK* 588, p. 20b.

¹⁶⁹ Chang Hu 張祐, "On Reading the Biography of Ti, Duke of Liang," *CTS* 510, p. 5804. For Chang Hu, see Yin Chan-hua 尹占華, "Chang Hu hsi nien k'ao 張祐系年考," in Fu Hsüan-ts'ung 傅璇琮 et al., eds., *Tang tai wen-hsüeh yen-chiu* (Kuang-hsi: Kuei-lin, 1990), pp. 186–205. Feng Su, *WYTH* 877, pp. 3a–6a.

¹⁷⁰ *CTW* 799, pp. 22a–b.

¹⁷¹ *Li Wen-jao wen chi* 2, p. 3b; *Li Wen-jao wen chi* 12, p. 1b; *TWT* 45, p. 9a, Yang K'uei 楊夔, "A Record of a Reply by the Duke of Liang."

¹⁷² *CTS* 89, p. 2895. See above, "Ti Jen-chieh's *Chiu Tang shu* Biography."

¹⁷³ *CTS* 6, p. 133; 7, p. 151; 93, p. 2990; 94, p. 3007.

¹⁷⁴ The emperor Kao-tsu 高祖 of the Chin 晉 dynasty promoted Ti to be grand tutor (*t'ai shih* 太師); see *CTW* 115, p. 5b. The text composed for engraving on this occasion is the first to mention Ti's "nine remonstrances" to the empress. The "nine remonstrances" later supplied the title of an extant work in semi-vernacular Chinese that described Ti's conversations and memorials to the throne. The textual history of this work, *Liang kung chiu chien* 梁公九諫, is traced by the Soochow bibliophile Huang P'ei-lieh 黃丕烈, in a colophon dated 1803, to a version bearing the seals of two mid-sixteenth century Soochow book collectors. Li Meng-sheng 李夢生, the preface writer to the rpt. from Huang's *Shih li chü ts'ung shu* edn. in *Kü pen hsiao shuo chi-ch'eng* (Shanghai: Shang-hai ku-chi, 1992), believes it to be a work of Sung or Yuan date. The relation of this work to *Ti Liang kung chuan* is yet to be determined; there is some common ground, but the work contains no narrative passages matching those cited by Ssu-ma Kuang as passages 5–7, below.

second biography of Ti composed in the eleventh century, the *Hsin Tang shu* entry for him, composed by Sung Ch'i 宋祁 and included in the completed work, submitted in 1060. Here again there are such close parallels in phrasing that the same conclusion has to be reached. The *Hsin T'ang shu* editors used the same, or a very similar, text to amplify the *Chiu T'ang shu* account. In addition, the *Hsin T'ang shu* biography has a brief account of an episode late in Ti's career that another source, the eighteenth-century *Ch'üan T'ang shih* 全唐詩, attributes to the informal biography. This may therefore make a seventh citation from the text.¹⁷⁵

The Seven Excerpts

In what follows, the seven citations from *Ti Liang kung chuan*, which involve events between the years from 698 until 705, are translated in full. The reasons for which Ssu-ma Kuang rejected, or in the case of two brief excerpts accepted and incorporated, his six citations are analyzed, and observations made concerning the similarity they bear to other passages in T'ang writing. It is the contention of this article that as well as being a "far-fetched" composition, as Ssu-ma Kuang believed, the biography was a patchwork of borrowings and transferences from the anecdotal literature that had grown up around the empress Wu and her court, and from other T'ang sources. Despite this derivative character, the excerpts generally have a narrative momentum of their own, and are easily understood as an imaginative version of the climactic sequence of events at the close of the Chou interregnum.

1.

The empress then accepted the arguments of the Wu [princes] and was on the point of transferring the ancestral altars and establishing Wu San-ssu as heir-apparent (*ch'u-fu* 儲副). She moved the prince of Lu-ling to Fang-ling. The Wu princes planned in secret, offering their counsel day and night, saying, "Your majesty bears the surname Wu, and you should therefore establish a member of the Wu clan [as heir-apparent], for there has never been a Son of Heaven who took someone of another surname to be his successor." The empress had already ceded this, but questioned her ministers for politeness's sake, saying, "I am of the age to grow feeble, and the state has no successor as sovereign (*ch'u-chu* 儲主). If am now to choose the best person, who would be able to confront [the task]? Though I may have found the right person, ultimately it is for you to argue." The ministers had mostly heard that the plan had already been settled, and all made sycophantic

statements. [Ti] Jen-chieh alone withdrew and remained standing, staying quiet and offering no statement.

The empress then asked him, "You are the only one to have said nothing, and you must [therefore] have a different view." He answered, "I do. I have observed the signs in the heavens above, and there is no pattern there for changing the ruler. I have investigated men's minds within, and they have not yet had sufficient of the virtue of the T'ang." The empress said, "How do you know this?" He answered, "The Hsiung-nu have recently violated our frontiers, and your majesty had [Wu] San-ssu, the prince of Liang 梁, conduct a muster of troops in the capital market. After more than a month, fewer than one thousand men [had come forward]. Later the prince of Lu-ling followed him, and in less than twenty days, the number reached fifty thousand. It can be seen from this that the minds of the people have not yet deserted [the T'ang]. If your majesty is on the point of continuing the succession, and if it is not the prince of Lu-ling [whom you choose], I truly cannot ascertain what the rest will bring." The empress shook with fury and had her entourage support him out."¹⁷⁶

It was in his narrative for the year 698 that Ssu-ma Kuang made his first citation in the *k'ao-i* from *Ti Liang kung chuan*. This excerpt illustrates a feature of the biography, its dramatization of Ti's role. Ti is portrayed as the only figure of integrity in the court, and, at the same time, someone in ready communication with the empress. Where all others failed to resist, he braved the empress's anger and insisted on a T'ang loyalist course.

Both Fan Chung-yen and Sung Ch'i included abbreviated versions of this incident. Ssu-ma Kuang, however, rejected the passage on the grounds that it contained a historical inaccuracy. It stated that Li Hsien, the future Chung-tsung, had mustered troops as prince of Lu-ling. Other sources, Ssu-ma implies, make it clear that it was only after he had been instituted as heir-apparent that he was given the overall command of the Ho-pei armies and undertook his highly successful call to arms. These two events, his investiture as heir-apparent and his nominal field appointment, followed in the ninth lunar month of 698, some sixth months later in the narrative than his return to Lo-yang.

Ssu-ma also believed that Ti would not have urged the empress to designate Li Hsien as heir-apparent, since Li Tan, the future Jui-tsung, who had remained in the palace throughout the period, was still heir presumptive (*huang-ssu* 皇嗣). The most Ti would have done, Ssu-ma argued, was to ask the empress that Li Hsien should be brought back from his imprisonment at Fang-ling.

¹⁷⁵ *CTShih* 5, p. 59.

¹⁷⁶ *TCTC* 206, p. 6527.

Ssu-ma argued, using the evidence of other anecdotal collections, that the plan to make Li Hsien heir-apparent originated with Chi Hsü, rather than with Ti, and that it had been evolved by Chi, with the detested Chang brothers, as a way of ensuring their survival.¹⁷⁷

Elsewhere in *Tzu chih t'ung chien*, however, especially in his coverage of Ti's death, Ssu-ma accepts the vivid picture of Ti as close to the empress and as the only official brave enough to resist her.¹⁷⁸ But other evidence makes it seem likely that Ti was not the only person to urge the empress to recall Li Hsien from Fang-ling. The ninth-century scholar Li Te-yü records a dialogue between the empress and Wang Fang-ch'ing 王方慶 (d. 702), a prominent court official of the period, who probably had a standing comparable with Ti's and who shares a *chüan* in *Chiu T'ang shu* with him and Yao Shou 姚瑋 (631–705). In this conversation, Wang rebuked the empress for her treatment of her son:

In recent days, when the celebrated official the [duke of] Shih-ch'üan 石泉 was in the post of minister, and his son was a director (*ssu-shih* 司士) of Mei-chou 眉州 [in present-day Szechwan], the empress asked him, "How is it that when you are a minister, your son is in such a remote place?" He answered, "[The prince of] Lu-ling is your favorite son, but he is now still far away. So how could I dare to have my son close to me?"¹⁷⁹

It may well be because of this passage that Ssu-ma Kuang's main narrative specifies that as well as Ti Jen-chieh, "Wang Chi-shan and Wang Fang-ch'ing also exhorted her."¹⁸⁰

2.

Ten days later the empress summoned him to her presence and said, "Last night, I dreamt that I was playing with others at backgammon, and time after time failed to win. Why should this have been?" He answered, "Not winning at backgammon means probably that there are no sons in the palace. This is a message from Heaven, working through this event to show you. How could you keep the heir-apparency vacant for so long?"

The empress said, "This is my family concern, and it is to be decided in my heart. How is it appropriate for you to take any part in it?" [Ti] Jen-

chieh answered, "Your servant has heard that the true king takes the whole world to be his family. Within the four seas all are his servants and handmaids. How could this be other than your majesty's family concern? The ruler is the head, the ministers are the limbs; how could I do other than have a role in this? She again ordered him to be supported out, and to the end declined his counsel."¹⁸¹

This is one of two stories in the anecdotal literature for this period in which Ti interpreted dreams to the empress. A second, in Chang Cho's mid-eighth-century *Ch'ao yeh ch'ien tsai*, concerned a parrot (*ying wu* 鸚鵡) with broken wings, symbols to Ti, by virtue of the homophone *wu*, of her politically impotent sons.¹⁸² As well as being contained in *Ti Liang kung chuan*, the backgammon dream is entered in the early-ninth-century *Kuo-shih pu* 國史補 by Li Chao 李肇.¹⁸³ Perhaps more significantly, the Sung-era *sui-pi* 隨筆 writer Hung Mai 洪邁 notes that the T'ang collection of anecdotes *Ta T'ang shuo tsuan* 大唐說纂 also contains this story. In the *Ta T'ang shuo tsuan* version, however, it is not Ti but again his contemporary Wang Fang-ch'ing, the duke of Shih-ch'üan, who interprets the dream. Hung Mai then notes that Ti's *Hsin T'ang shu* biography amalgamates the two versions of the story by stating that "both men were present and both answered the same way. . . ."¹⁸⁴ Here then is a first suggestion that the *Ti Liang kung chuan*, perhaps with the *Kuo-shih pu* acting as an intermediary, may have appropriated anecdotes that originally had less celebrated figures as their subjects, and made Ti Jen-chieh their protagonist.

Ssu-ma Kuang rejected this passage on the grounds that the heir-presumptive Li Tan was resident in the palace through this period, and Ti could never have stated either that there were no sons in the palace or that the heir-apparency had so long been vacant. He did, however, as also did Fan Chung-yen and Sung Ch'ü, accept the anecdote about the empress's dream of the parrot with broken wings, and integrated it in his main narrative.

The homily on political morality that Ti is represented as giving in this passage is paralleled by a passage of dialogue between the emperor Te-tsung and Li Mi in 787. In *Ti Liang kung chuan*, Ti's homily closes with unacknowledged quotations from *Shang shu* and from an address by the famous Han minister

¹⁷⁷ For Chi Hsü's conversation with the Chang brothers and intervention with the empress, see nn. 108 and 112, above; *CTS* 186A, p. 4850, and Ssu-ma Kuang's *k'ao-i* at *TCTC* 206, pp. 6527–28, quoting *T'an pin lu* and *Yü shih t'ai chi*. Ssu-ma also rejected a version of the story contained in Ti's *HTS* biography, which made Ti rather than Chi Hsü converse with the Chang's "... How could Jen-chieh have been willing to hold a profound conversation with [Chang] I-chih on this question?" See *HTS* 115, p. 4211.

¹⁷⁸ *TCTC* 206, pp. 6550–51. ¹⁷⁹ *Li Wen-jao wen chi wai chi* 2, p. 4b, "Essay on Loyal Ministers."

¹⁸⁰ *TCTC* 202, p. 6526.

¹⁸¹ *TCTC* 202, p. 6528.

¹⁸² *Ch'ao yeh ch'ien tsai*, quoted in *TPKC* 277, pp. 2195–96. For parrots, see Edward H. Schafer, "Parrots in Medieval China," *Studia Serica Bernhard Karlgren Dedicata* (Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1954), pp. 271–82.

¹⁸³ *Kuo shih pu* C, p. 61.

¹⁸⁴ Hung Mai 洪邁, *Jung ch'ai sui-pi* 容齋隨筆 (Shanghai: Shang-hai ku-chi, 1978), *sui pi* 四筆 8, p. 707. See also *Wen hsien t'ung-k'ao* 195, p. 1651.

Hsiao Ho to Kao-tsu contained in *Shih chi*. But in other respects the two conversations are similar:

The emperor [Te-tsung] said, "This is my family concern. How, therefore, can you have any part in it, that you contend so forcefully?" [Li Mi] answered, "The Son of Heaven takes all within the four seas to be his family. Your servant now alone holds the heavy responsibility of being chief minister. If anything should lose its proper place, the charge will be made to me."¹⁸⁵

There is another echo of this speech in the biography of Li Mi preserved in *T'ai p'ing kuang chi*. Here the emperor Su-tsung, in gratitude for Li Mi's advice at the time of another succession crisis, that of 756, says to Li:

You, sir, are loyal to the imperial ancestral altars and show concern over my domestic matters. Your words are all "tortoise mirrors" for the state. How can you be for a moment separated from me?"¹⁸⁶

3.

Later, they secretly sent ten palace women to go to Fang-chou, and also issued an order that said, "My son [Li Hsien] is there, and I am ordering the women to go and see him. The senior officials of the prefectures and counties [through which they pass] should respectfully count them out and count them back, and not permit any mingling [with others]." They secretly ordered one of the women to substitute for the prince of Lu-ling, and had the prince dress in the woman's clothes and return as one of the original number. The prefectures and counties were unaware [of this ruse] and in several days they reached the capital. The officials of the court were without exception ignorant [of the matter].

Fan Chung-yen represents this colorful incident in his biography, but with different wording. Ssu-ma Kuang rejects the passage on the ground that ten palace women could not possibly have made the journey to Fang-ling and back without attracting notice. It was shown above, too, that he indicates that the late-T'ang history *T'ang t'ung chi* as well as *Wu Tse-t'ien shih lu* specifically mention that the envoy sent to bring back Li Hsien had been Hsü Yen-po, a well-known official and court literary figure, and that *T'ang hui yao* corroborates this. The *shih-lu*, moreover, Ssu-ma pointed out, supplied the exact date of his arrival at the capital from Fang-ling. The *shih-lu* was therefore to be preferred to both

¹⁸⁵ TCTC 233, p. 7500. *Shang shu* 尚書 (SPTK edn.) 2, pp. 13a-b; SC 8, p. 386. See also THY 3, p. 24, for similar wording in a speech by Li Chi 李勣; cf. TCTC 214, p. 6824, speech by Li Lin-fu.

¹⁸⁶ TPKC 38, p. 243, quoting "Yeh hou wai chuan."

Ti Liang kung chuan and the final paragraph of the *Chiu T'ang shu* biography of Ti, which here apparently borrows from it. His reasons are surely convincing: the evidence of the *shih-lu* and *T'ang t'ung chi*, supported as it is by *T'ang hui yao*, is preferable to the fanciful and romanticized account supplied by the informal biography. Sung Ch'i adheres to the *shih-lu* version, having Hsü Yen-po sent to Fang-chou as an envoy to fetch Li Hsien.¹⁸⁷

4.

The empress went to a small palace and had a screen hung at its rear. Her entourage were hidden and no one outside could have known. She then ordered [Ti Jen-chieh] to sit below the steps and said, "What we discussed on a previous occasion truly was no small matter. Waking or sleeping, I have gone over and over it. I have thought over what you said, and I grow ever more aware that your reasoning is not awry. I hold that a loyal minister in serving his sovereign should surely not often be at odds with her. In the space of today I should change my previous view. Let the positions of the world depend on a single statement from you. If you approve my own purpose, then both may forthwith live; if you go against it, then both should forthwith be killed."

He said slowly, "In what you have talked of, we should restrict ourselves to the position of the Son of Heaven. As I well know, this is the position of T'ai-tsung the Civil and Military Emperor, and how could your majesty have it for yourself? T'ai-tsung in person went through the spear tips and arrow barbs [of war], and brought [civil] administration to the four seas. The reason that he never sought respite from his toils was surely for the sake of his sons and grandsons; how could it have been for the sake of Wu San-ssu? Your majesty is in person the empress of the Great Emperor [Kao-tsung], and when the Great Emperor was lying ill, he had your majesty direct the state as an expedient. After he had passed away, it was fitting that it should revert to his eldest son. But it has been more than ten years now since your majesty suddenly took possession of the sacred vessels. You now discuss the succession; but how is it permissible to make changes. Moreover which is closer, the aunt or the mother? Which is nearer, the son or the nephew?"

At this the empress gasped and sobbed, and ordered her entourage to pull up the screen. She stroked his back herself, and called out, "You are not my minister, but the minister of the altars of the T'ang." She turned

¹⁸⁷ TCTC 206, p. 6529. For Hsü Yen-po's role, see also THY 1, p. 4. For a comparable ruse involving disguise, see n. 188, below, and Legge, *Ch'un T'zu*, pp. 797-99.

and called to the prince of Lu-ling, "Bow to the elder of state; today he has granted you the Sonship of Heaven." [Ti Jen-chieh] took off his hat and knocked his head [on the floor], his tears and blood sprinkling the ground. Those around him supported him, but for a long time he was unable to rise.

The empress said, "What you have said should be announced within and without. We should select a day for the ritual investiture." [Ti] brushed aside his tears and said, "From ancient times until now, can there have been a case of someone being appropriated by stealth to be the Son of Heaven? That the Prince of Lu-ling was at Fang-chou has been something that everyone in the world has known. That he was today in the inner palace, even I did not realize. I wish to honor any proclamation you may make, for if this were to be like the disaster of the heir-apparent Wei, how could you regard me as an enlightened minister?"

The empress said, "How could he go back [all the way] to Fang-ling? We should just arrange it at Shih-hsiang 石像 postal station, provide a ritual carriage, deploy all the officials and proceed to welcome him. At this they called out loudly, "wan-sui," and the heir-apparency was settled."¹⁸⁸

Again, the emphasis in this passage on Ti's being alone with the empress is likely to be fictional. There is evidence that by this time it was generally believed that the secrecy that had surrounded the succession crisis and probably court politics more generally should be ended. Thus at least two other officials urged the empress to let the heir-apparent be widely exposed to the public, in order to improve the morale of the officials and people. One who did this was Hsüeh Na, whose special concern was to reduce the barbarian threat. Ssu-ma Kuang mentions him as urging the empress to let the public see the heir-apparent.¹⁸⁹ With Hsüeh Na was probably again Wang Chi-shan. Both the main narrative of *Tzu chih t'ung chien* and Wang Chi-shan's *Chiu T'ang shu* biography state that Wang urged the empress to reveal the newly designated heir-apparent to the people.¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁸ TCTC 206, pp. 6529-30. The heir-apparent Wei was Liu Chü 劉據, the son of Han Wu-ti by the empress Wei, and was heir-apparent from 122 BC until 91 BC, when he was believed to have committed suicide. See SC 49, p. 1980, and Michael Loewe, ed., *The Cambridge History of China: The Ch'in and Han Empires 221 BC-AD 220* (Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 1986) 1, pp. 177-78. In 82 BC an imposter closely resembling him appeared at the palace gates and was only exposed by a bold official. See *Han shu* 71, pp. 3037-38, and TCTC 23, pp. 755-56. The reference may also be to the seclusion of K'uai-wai 蒯瞶, heir-apparent of Wei, called Wei ta tzu 衛太子 in *Tso chuan* (Legge, *Ch'un Ts'ew*, pp. 797-99). He had offended his parents and had taken refuge in Chin, to be succeeded by his son. Later he recovered his throne, and his succession was acknowledged in a congratulatory message by the Chou king; *ibid.*, p. 846. In SC 37, p. 1602, he is said to have "resented that none of the grandees welcomed his succession, and to have asked them, 'I have lived away for a long time; have you heard of this?'" See also Ku Yen-wu, *Ku chung sui-pi* 晁中隨筆 (TSCC edn.), p. 39.

¹⁸⁹ CTS 93, p. 2983, biography of Hsüeh Na; TCTC 206, p. 6535.

¹⁹⁰ CTS 90, p. 2910, biography of Wang Chi-shan; TCTC 206, p. 6535. The *k'ao-i* here cites *Wu*

The argument used by Ti Jen-chieh to the empress in this passage, that the empire was not hers to give away to Wu San-ssu, resembles the argument used earlier by Hao Ch'u-chün to the ailing emperor Kao-tsung in 676. Hao stated:

How much more is this the case because the empire is the empire of the two Sage Emperors Kao-tsu and T'ai-tsung, and not your majesty's empire. Truly your majesty should diligently maintain the ancestral temple, and transmit it to your sons and grandsons. Truly, you cannot take the state and give it to someone else, and so show partiality to the empress's clan."¹⁹¹

The appeal Ti makes to the priority of the mother-son relationship over that of aunt and nephew also echoes the wording of Li Chao-te's appeal in 692 to the empress attempting to dissuade her from granting Wu Ch'eng-ssu high official position.

Ssu-ma Kuang has only a short comment on this passage, which he probably considered as immediately following passage 3, above. He rejected it because it involved an improbable sequence of events between this time, the third lunar month of 698, and the ninth month, when, more reliable sources stated, Li Hsien was finally made heir-apparent: "If at this time the heir-apparency had already been decided on, then how could it have been only after the interval from the third to the ninth month that [Li Hsien] was [formally] established as heir-apparent? It was probably because after the prince of Lu-ling arrived, the empress wished to establish them in accordance with their respective ages, and the heir-apparent [Li Tan] on this basis ceded the position; thus [the process] was protracted for half a year." Ssu-ma did, however, copy a version of Ti's homily on the strictly patrimonial nature of the state into his main narrative. Fan Chung-yen and Sung Ch'i also both represented this incident.

5.

The heir-apparent was the overall commander; he was the deputy.¹⁹²

Ssu-ma Kuang quoted this sentence in the *k'ao-i* simply because it appeared to lend support to his argument that Li Hsien was first invested as heir-apparent and only then appointed to the nominal field command of the Ho-pei armies. He had before him a minor discrepancy in dating between the *shih-tu* and another major T'ang source, *T'ang li* 唐曆, compiled by Liu Fang. The investiture took place on the fifteenth day (*jen-shen* 壬申) of the ninth month. The *shih-tu*

T'ao-t'ien shih-tu stating that on the day *hsin-ssu* the heir-apparent made a court appearance.

¹⁹¹ *Li Wen-jao chi* 12, p. 1b; CTS 84, pp. 2799-800; THY 51, pp. 887-88; TT 21, p. 541, double column entry.

¹⁹² TCTC 206, p. 6534.

had Li Hsien given his military appointment on the nineteenth day (*ping-tzu* 丙子). The *T'ang li* text records the seventeenth day (*chia-hsü* 甲戌), that is, only two days after the investiture. *Ti Liang kung chuan*, despite its implication to the contrary in excerpt 1, here confirmed Ssu-ma's belief that Li Hsien was first invested as heir-apparent, and then given his nominal military command in Ho-pei.

6.

Chang Chien-chih, Huan Yen-fan, Ching Hui, Ts'ui Hsüan-wei 崔玄暉, and Yüan Shu-chi 袁恕己 had all been recommended by him. Once after he had taken a meal and withdrawn, he said to the five, "My grievance is that I am feeble, that I shall pass away ahead of you, and not manage to see your great deeds. I hope that you will protect, love, and carry out fully my basic intention. The five were wholly enlightened and realized his purpose.

When he was bedridden, the five waited on him. They kept him company to the end of the day, but he made no statement. Then after a while his tears fell to the pillow, but he did no more than look at them. When the five had left, they asked each other in turn the reason. Yüan Shu-chi said, "Surely it is because his breath and strength have turned more feeble, and he needs to ask about domestic matters?" Chang Chien-chih said, "I have never heard of a great sage setting aside the state to take counsel with his family."

A moment later, he ordered Chang Chien-chih, Yüan Shu-chi, and Huan Yen-fan to come in, and the remaining two to wait outside the door. He said, "The reason I did not talk just now was because of the other two. For they are men of decision, but not of confidentiality. If I discuss this with them ahead of time, the matter will certainly leak out. Once it has leaked, then the state will be affected, and the [dynastic] family will be destroyed. But if when the time comes, you do not share it with them, the matter will not proceed either. [Wu] San-ssu, the prince of Liang, should first be apprehended, and then only should you proceed. If this is not done, then it will certainly turn into a great catastrophe."

More than a year later, after Ti had died, the five secretly met in a secluded place, [in order to] go through his words of that time, and to renew their vows. After they had taken away the dishes, they looked at each other and were on the point of speaking, but the time had not come, and they were fearful of going against their previous agreement. They were then on the point of speaking, and stopped yet again, back and forth several times. Then Huan Yen-fan went through [Ti Jen-chieh's] words. Before he had finished speaking, from outside the windows they heard a sound like thunder, and suddenly wind and rain came, so that they could not see

a foot in front of them. The couch and covers where they sat were all hurled down the steps. The five were afraid, and did not know how to proceed. They said to one another, "This is his extreme loyalty and heroism, availing itself of this supernatural happening to frighten the minds of everyone. He does not want us to discuss this matter in advance. While the time has not yet come, it should not be spoken of again." In a moment, the sky cleared and the sun was bright exactly as before.

When [Chang] I-chih and the others had been executed, Yüan said to Chang [Chien-chih], "The words passed to us long ago were that we should first apprehend [Wu] San-ssu; how can he escape?" Chang [Chien-chih] said, "[All that matters] is that the great undertaking has been completely achieved; this [other matter] is just a ready morsel [for us]." Later the prince of Liang developed relations within the palace [with the empress Wei], and the five were in fact slandered, all to meet with the lives of exiles. The year and month that had been fixed for their rising up and their rejection were not in the slightest degree different from the guidelines of the agreement that he had bequeathed them."¹⁰³

Ssu-ma Kuang treated this highly detailed and colorful episode as summarily as he did the other long dramatic excerpt from the biography. He rejected it on the ground of simple implausibility. He argued that nearly five years after Ti's death, in the spring of 705, it could only have been by coincidence that the "Five Princes" were in metropolitan posts together. Ti could not possibly have known in advance that this would be the situation, nor could he have promoted the five with the specific purpose of having them assist in the plot to establish the heir-apparent.

Moreover if [in Ti's lifetime] it was convenient that [Chang] I-chih be executed and if the heir-apparent had the potential to be established, then [Ti] was himself a chief minister, so why should he have waited five years, needed [Chang] Chien-chih and the others, and only then brought it into the open? This is probably because the composer of the biography, following up the five's success in setting up the restoration, made a forced correspondence of these episodes, stating that all five had been recommended by [Ti] and been instructed by him.

Ssu-ma also quoted the sentences of dialogue, in which Yüan Shu-chi tried to persuade Chang Chien-chih to kill Wu San-ssu, in his *k'ao-i* at a later point in the narrative. He did so to refute *Yü shih i'ai chi*, which here differed from other

¹⁰³ *TCTC* 206, pp. 6551-52.

sources in representing Chang Chien-chih as trying to persuade Huan Yen-fan to kill Wu San-ssu. Ssu-ma demonstrated that, on the contrary, Chang Chien-chih, Huan Yen-fan, and Ching Hui had all wished to refrain from unnecessary slaughter. He also incidentally indicated that there was a source for the biography's remark, "He (Wu San-ssu) is just a ready morsel [for us]; how could he escape?" Ssu-ma quoted the *Hsin T'ang shu* biography of Huan Yen-fan, in which this remark, in slightly different form, was put into the mouth of Huan rather than that of Chang Chien-chih: "He is a ready morsel; let him be kept back as a gift for the Son of Heaven." Here again then was an example of the biography's capacity to appropriate remarks from a minor to a major figure in the story.⁹⁴

7.

[Ti Jen-chieh] had bestowed on him a purple robe and a turtle belt. The empress herself embroidered [the following] twelve characters in gold [on the robe], as a public commendation of his loyalty: "You have spread abroad the correct methods of administration. You have maintained your purity and diligence. You have given encouragement to my ministers."⁹⁵

This episode is recorded in Ti's *Hsin T'ang shu* biography. The twelve characters are also entered in *Ch'üan T'ang shih*, with the source quoted as *Ti kung chia chuan*. This is likely to be a variant title for the *Ti Liang kung chuan*, and makes it seem the probable source for *Hsin T'ang shu*. This record is the only one of a number of special honors conferred by the empress on Ti that can be traced to the informal biography. It remains very possible that Ssu-ma Kuang, Fan Chung-yen, and Sung Ch'i drew others, not mentioned in *Chiu T'ang shu* or in other anecdotal sources, from the biography.

This examination of the seven excerpts from *Ti Liang kung chuan* that have survived has shown that the work relates unsatisfactorily to earlier sources that covered the same ground, notably the revised *shih-lu* for the reign of the empress Wu, *Wu Tse-t'ien shih-lu* compiled by Liu Chih-chi and Wu Ching, presented in 716. It also has a complex relationship with the other anecdotal sources that span this period, especially *Ch'ao yeh ch'ien tsai*. Whether or not the biography also entirely deserves Ssu-ma Kuang's epithet "crude" is perhaps another question. Its author was clearly well informed about the court discussions on the succession issue. He was able to incorporate into his narrative speeches that were allusive and scholarly in their tone, and that can certainly stand comparison with other speeches made in the T'ang court. Most if not all of the positions

Ti is portrayed as having adopted in resisting the empress were historically within the compass of possibility: they were adopted by other, less well-known, officials. Though his stance before the empress is clearly a romanticized one, the points that he made to her were not in themselves ahistorical.

Yet the biography clearly contains information that is inherently far-fetched. It is more adulatory in style and less dispassionate than the standard official biography. Its narrative standpoint differs from the majority of freer biographies from the eighth century: it is apparently neither that of the researcher who has located fresh information nor that of the witness who has seen events that the official accounts omitted. It portrays Ti as a supreme hero, a man driven by profound moral energy to resist evil forces and to plan ahead for the T'ang restoration. So great is his authority that even the cosmic forces respond to it. At the same time, paradoxically, Ti is portrayed as a loyal servant of the empress, who had special access to her presence, and whom she went out of her way to honor.

CONCLUSION

This article has described the process by which the political legend of Ti Jen-chieh developed. It has shown how the historical Ti Jen-chieh had had as vigorous and varied an official career, in court and provinces, as any general-service official of the period. His life had been endangered by demonstrably evil men at several points. He had served through the whole of the Wu-Chou reign, and had somehow remained aloof from the corruption of the late-seventh-century court. In the words of Chang Cho, adapting the *Analekts* of Confucius, he had "withstood black dye," or in Tu Fu's eloquent image, "made an unsullied crossing." He had a large following of officials, a "storehouseful of ministers" who were loyal to him. Some of them were much younger than he was, and it is likely that as they pursued their successful careers under Hsüan-tsung they built up the tradition that he was in some way an immaculate figure and that he had planned ahead for the renewal of T'ang political prosperity.

Then in the mid-eighth century, more than fifty years after his death, the An Lu-shan rebellion demonstrated that under crisis the loyalty of official scholars themselves could not be taken for granted. The post-rebellion official community now saw loyalty as a harsh test of moral and physical courage in the service of the dynasty, which now stood still more in need of heroes. The longer biographies for rebellion or post-rebellion loyalists that now appeared are an indication of the demand for accounts of brave and loyal service to the beleaguered T'ang. But the T'ang restoration of 705 was also seen in retrospect as a major

⁹⁴ TCTC 206, p. 6586; HTS 120, p. 4313. ⁹⁵ HTS 115, p. 4210, and CTShih 5, p. 59.

dynastic crisis. The successful resolution of the dynasty's difficulties that followed 705 ushered in the great age of Hsüan-tsung, the most resplendent era that China had seen. The "Five Princes" were seen as the immediate agents of the coup against the Changs in 705, and were increasingly honored by the state and in eighth-century lore. But there was a need to create a further hero. None of those who had argued for the restoration of Li Hsien as heir-apparent was suitable, because they had been involved in the corrupt and brutal politics of the empress's reign. Li Chao-te, though an opponent of both Lai Chün-ch'en and the Wu princes, was greatly resented in the period when he held power. Chi Hsü had a record of cruelty, and his status was further reduced in the second half of Hsüan-tsung's reign by the conduct of his nephew Chi Wen 吉溫, a sadistic agent of the detested Li Lin-fu. The Chang brothers, the "Two Lackeys," were still less acceptable, and from the T'ien-pao period their blood connection with the hated chief minister Yang Kuo-chung 楊國忠 even further increased the odium against them.

There had also been from early on a strong hearsay tradition that, in the competition over the empress Wu's succession, Ti Jen-chieh had intervened at court in favor of Li Hsien. In explaining the fictionalized and romanticized account of Ti's exploits at court, an important fact is that from the earliest surviving account of it, in Kao Shih's verse tribute to Ti of 731, his intervention was consistently described as "secret." It was precisely the supposedly clandestine character of Ti's role in the succession dispute and the fact that it was not documented in the earliest official records of the period that allowed his role to become exaggerated by his followers, and by society more generally, then to be taken up by those who wished to advertise their loyalty to the dynasty and finally by the dynasty itself. His role as a loyalist, though it was described as "secret," was filled out. He became the "single pillar," the man who "bound the severed cord" of the Li-T'ang line, and, improbably, the tutor and guide to the "Five Princes" whose decisive intervention came five years after his death. This was a configuration that had religious and iconographical parallels, for Confucius had been the teacher of the "ten wise men," and the Buddha had his small inner group of disciples. The very high status Ti enjoyed as the mentor of the "Five Princes" enabled the composer of *Ti Liang kung chuan* to gather in and amplify hearsay and anecdote surrounding the court of the empress, to make Ti its central figure, and to suggest that even supernatural forces responded to him.

In turn, the prestige that Ti had acquired in T'ang lore and through *Ti Liang kung chuan* was fed back into the official accounts of the restoration, and from the tenth century Ti's image as the leading figure in planning it became generally accepted. Only Ssu-ma Kuang retained a measure of scepticism, and

in citing and rejecting passages of the biography provided a key to the problem of Ti's inflated reputation.

But Ti Jen-chieh's ascent to cult status, although dubiously justified by the facts of his life, has its own claim to historical importance. He represents an early and relatively well-documented example in Chinese history of a high-ranking official promoted as an empire-wide, rather than merely local, cult figure from a matter of decades after his death. He was revered among the elite as a symbol of loyalty, and at the same time acknowledged by a wider community as a daring and effective administrator. The wide appeal of his cult is borne out both by the existence of local shrines and steles for him and by the many anecdotes celebrating his panache at court and in the provinces. His cult, and the lore that surrounded it, demonstrate the "continual dialogue [between] the ... high culture of intellectuals, the official culture of the state and the common culture of everyday work."⁹⁶ They show, too, how the state could promote symbols, while tacitly accepting that these symbols might have different value for different elements in society. They indicate that, in the medieval period, as later, there was unlikely to have been a simple cleavage between elite, state-centered, views of a cult figure and his position in wider society. Nor did the contempt Ti Jen-chieh had shown for local religious cults prevent him from becoming in turn a focus for worship. Rather he transcended social divisions and interests and even what appear superficially to have been mutually exclusive views of the supernatural world. That such a remarkable figure should have gone on, over twelve centuries later, to enjoy a worldwide reputation in yet another, radically implausible, guise seems not inappropriate.

⁹⁶ Patricia Buckley Ebrey, *Confucianism and Family Rituals in Imperial China* (Princeton: Princeton U.P., 1991), pp. 10-11.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CTS	<i>Chiu Tang shu</i> 舊唐書
CTShih	<i>Ch'üan T'ang shih</i> 全唐詩
CTW	<i>Ch'üan T'ang wen</i> 全唐文
HTS	<i>Hsin Tang shu</i> 新唐書
SC	<i>Shih chi</i> 史記
TCTC	<i>Tzu chih t'ung chien</i> 資治通鑑
TFYK	<i>Ts'ê fu yüan kuei</i> 冊府元龜
THY	<i>T'ang hui yao</i> 唐會要
TPKC	<i>T'ai p'ing kuang chi</i> 太平廣記
TT	<i>T'ang tien</i> 通典
TTHY	<i>Ta T'ang hsin yü</i> 大唐新語
TWT	<i>T'ang wen ts'ui</i> 唐文粹
WYTH	<i>Wen yüan ying hua</i> 文苑英華