

Celestial-Master Taoism and the Founding of the Ts'ao-Wei Dynasty: The Li Fu Document

For five weeks late in the fall of 220 AD, Ts'ao P'i 曹丕 consulted with advisers about the legitimacy and style of his new dynasty – the Wei 魏. During this time the Eastern Han emperor Hsien-ti 獻帝 made announcements at the shrine of the Han founder. In addition, seals were sought and obtained, and altars and platforms were constructed. Up until the moment of ritual enthronement Ts'ao P'i continued to make polite declinations. Later historians, both traditional and modern, have viewed such activities with scorn, suggesting that they were merely cynically staged. It is my belief, however, that the trappings of legitimacy and style raise important questions about the intellectual history of the Ts'ao-Wei period. In fact, the abdication of Hsien-ti, having been unique in historical memory, required that rituals be improvised. These weeks were fraught with worry and significance for political observers throughout China.

The discussions initiated by Ts'ao P'i dealt with the following: how Ts'ao P'i and the Han emperor would emulate the well-known legends about nonviolent abdication; how oracles and omens were to be treated; how the spirits of the Han ancestors and of Ts'ao P'i's famous father (Ts'ao Ts'ao 曹操, who had died only about eight months previously) were to be satisfied; which Han rituals and ceremonials would be adapted, reformed, or eliminated; and what styles, including literary, would Ts'ao P'i profess as ruler. The relevant documents were collected by the archivist-historian P'ei Sung-chih 裴松之 (372-451),¹ who ultimately placed them in what would

A 1994 LADY Davis Fellowship in conjunction with The Hebrew University of Jerusalem provided a portion of the time needed to research and write this essay. I thank the Fellowship administrator Tova Wilk, and Profs. Irene Eber and Rafi Israeli of the Department of East Asian Studies.

¹ See Ch'ien Mu 錢穆, *Chung-kuo shih-hsüeh ming-chu* 中國史學名著 (n.p.: Hsing-hsing ch'u-pan she, n.d.), pp. 114 ff.; Rafe de Crespigny, *The Records of the Three Kingdoms*, Occasional Paper 9 (Canberra: Australian National U., 1970); Carl Leban, "Ts'ao Ts'ao and the Rise of the Wei" (Ph.D., Columbia U., 1971), pp. 29-34; idem, "Managing Heaven's Mandate: Coded Communication in the Accession of Ts'ao P'ei," in D. Roy and T. H. Tsien, eds., *Ancient China: Studies in Early Civilization* (Hong Kong: Chinese U. P., 1978), p. 325;

become perhaps the longest footnote in commentative literature.

This essay deals with but one of the speeches, a text containing a then-current legend about an oracle in the region of Shu 蜀 (the traditional name for much of present-day Szechwan). The legend was narrated by a certain Li Fu 李伏 in his memorial to Ts'ao P'i. I translate the major part of the memorial, as found in *chüan* 2 of P'ei Sung-chih's *San-kuo chih chu* 三國志注.² Its basic point is that sometime between mid-213 and mid-216 persons in Shu witnessed an oracle claiming that Ts'ao P'i had been chosen by heaven to be emperor. Li Fu then describes the background of the revelation and adduces evidence for its validity.³

Li Fu's memorial is undated, but judging from its placement in P'ei Sung-chih's narrative, it probably occurred just after the Eastern Han emperor had gone to the shrine of Han Kao-ti 高帝 on November 19, 220, and announced the end of the Han. Because Li Fu sent his memorial at a serious moment, it may have served as a benediction for Ts'ao's dynasty. Whether such a benediction actually contained any priestly precept is a question that I raise in my conclusion. First we must identify the "priests" and establish, if possible, their teachings.

My investigation pursues two lines. First, I examine the document's historical context and discuss its credibility. Second, I connect the story and the characters who appear in it to questions pursued recently by historians of Taoism. The document contains several relatively solid items that bring into focus the otherwise hazy picture of the Celestial-Master movement (also called the Five Pecks of Rice rebels 五斗米道 in its incipient years) between 215 and about 230. These are the last years for which we have any notices before the Chang lineage and its cult were revived (or nostalgically reconstituted) in the south more than a century later. It was six centuries after that when Taoist scriptures began to trace the Chang masters systematically to a cult headquarters at Lung-hu 龍虎 Mountain.

and observations on P'ei's methods, with references to recent P'ei studies, in Howard L. Goodman, "The Calligrapher Chung Yu (ca. 163-230) and the Demographics of a Myth," *JOS* 114.4 (1994), pp. 555-71.

² See Ch'en Shou (d. 297) 陳壽, *San-kuo chih* 三國志 (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1959; hereafter *SKC*) 2, pp. 62-63; Lu Pi 盧弼, annot., *San-kuo chih chi-chieh* 三國志集解 (rpt. Taipei: Hsin-wen jeng, 1975; hereafter *SKCCC*) 2, pp. 14b-15a. The entire document is translated in chap. 1 of Goodman, "Intellectual Culture and the Founding of the Ts'ao-Wei Dynasty, 200-240 A.D.," unpublished ms.

³ Leban, "Managing Heaven's Mandate," pp. 326-27, utilizes only the last part of the document; I concentrate here on the first part.

LI FU AND THE SHU ORACLE

After the Han emperor's abdication speech – probably on the next day – a relatively recent courtier of Ts'ao P'i came forward with a memorial. This was Li Fu, whose office was Left General of the Gentlemen of Household 左中郎將. This title refers to the same college of advisers that Ts'ao P'i had put together originally in 211, as the prerogative of a potential heir-apparent, and which functioned as a literary court patterned after those created by Ts'ao Ts'ao.⁴ We know nothing of Li's family locale, nor who his family were, only that they were most likely from Shu, if not from farther northwest. His name turns up nowhere else in historical sources. From the document we learn that he had not been in Ts'ao P'i's court for long; earlier he was an intimate adviser of Chang Lu 張魯 in Han-chung 漢中 (a commandery in the northeast sector of the Shu region, about 110 miles due south of Ch'ang-an). Since about 190 Chang had been *de facto* local prefect, ruling with both religious and secular authority, but by 215 teetering on the verge of surrender to Ts'ao Ts'ao. By 220 Li was speaking as a surrendered adviser in Ts'ao P'i's entourage, and as we see in the following translation, eager, as an outsider, to make his mark.

The fact that many of the events narrated by Li Fu actually occurred raises interesting questions. We must understand, first of all, that in traditional China legends were not necessarily fictions, but simply appealing presentations of anecdotes or "news." Moreover, concerning oracles, in early China there was no discussion of authorship as we know it: some people "received" them by finding, studying, or perhaps inventing them, whereas some simply quoted and transmitted them. Oracles were popular as political commentary and temporal prediction, and their supermundane claims were viable – not discarded as irrational throwbacks. Also, we have supporting circumstantial evidence for other elements of the story: Chang Lu is known to have passed conservative judgment on political oracle-texts; and remnants of Chang's movement continued on in Shu and in Ho-nan after his death. Finally, we should not dismiss offhand a legendary (that is to say, gossipy) element of the story that claims that Chang Lu grew ill from anxiety about the fate of his movement. What is true for Shakespeare is true for early-medieval Chinese historiographers: such tragedies do engulf

⁴ A political analysis of Ts'ao P'i's pre-imperial career is given in Goodman, "Founding of the Ts'ao-Wei," chap. 2.

leaders.⁵ Except for a detail or two given in the Li Fu document, we know nothing about the man named Chiang Ho 姜合, who hailed from far northwestern Shu, the area of Wu-tu 武都.⁶ We also learn that Chiang was well known in other western regions for his gnostic arts, for example in Kuan-yu 關友, which lay west of the Han-ku 函谷 pass, encompassing today's Shensi-Kansu border. Chiang and his associate Li Shu 李庶 seem to have been itinerant advisers specializing in oracles. The document begins:

Left general of the gentlemen of household Li Fu memorialized to the Wei king: "Some time ago, when the former king [Ts'ao Ts'ao] had first established the principality of Wei (in the summer of 213), all those residing outside the territories [of the Han-Wei state] who heard about it but did not find out [the details] thought that he had been conferred [with the title] of king 在境外者聞之未審皆以為拜王. Li Shu and Chiang Ho of Wu-tu lodged for a while in Han-chung. They told me, 'It has to be a duke of Wei. A king will not do 未便王也. It is the duke of Wei [Ts'ao] Tzu-huan (referring to Ts'ao P'i by his courtesy name)⁷ who will bring order to the empire 定天下者魏公子桓. He is the one whom the spirits have declared; he is the match of the tallies and oracle-texts and thereby corresponds to the position [that joins] heaven and men' 以應天人之位.

"I described this speech to general-who-quells-the-south Chang Lu.⁸ He in turn asked about the provenance of the [oracle] book that Chiang had mastered. Chiang said, '[It is] *Confucius' Jade Tablet* 孔子

⁵ Donald Holzman, "Filial Piety in Ancient and Early Medieval China: Its Perennity and Its Importance in the Cult of the Emperor," paper presented at the Conference on the Nature of State and Society in Medieval China, Stanford, 1980, pp. 35-37, objects to a modern tendency (voiced earlier by a leading scholar of early-medieval historiography) to dismiss anecdotes and conversations, especially when formulaic.

⁶ Wu-tu was well north of Ch'eng-tu and on the western outposts of Han-chung. See *SKC* 1, pp. 34-35, 45; 8, pp. 264-65, for the role of Wu-tu during the wars to extricate Chang Lu. Portions of the Five Pecks are known to have operated there among non-Chinese peoples; see Rolf Stein, "Remarques sur les mouvements du Taoïsme politico-religieux au IIe siècle ap. J.-C.," *TP* 50.1-3 (1963), p. 22.

⁷ According to Jack Dull, "A Historical Introduction to the Apocryphal (*ch'an-wei*) Texts of the Han Dynasty" (Ph.D. diss., U. of Washington, 1966), p. 305, Li Shu and Chiang Ho are exhorting a Ts'ao (assumed to be Ts'ao Ts'ao) to take the imperial title. But they were in fact addressing Li Fu in Han-chung.

⁸ This was a title given him by Ts'ao Ts'ao late in 215 upon Chang's surrender. Its use by Li Fu is anachronistic.

玉版.⁹ Emperors' computed dates [for ascending thrones] can be known even for hundreds of generations' 天子曆數雖百世可知. Just over a month after this [occurrence] a fugitive arrived and wrote out [oracle]-texts that turned out to be like Chiang Ho's speech 有亡人來寫得冊文卒如合辭.¹⁰ Chiang was an expert in inner studies 內學 and was well known in Kuan-yu.

"[Nevertheless], although [Chang] Lu's heart was set on the [Wei] state, he was drowning deeply in strange practices (or, the heterodox Tao) and [spirit] transformations, and did not fully understand what [Chiang] Ho was saying 雖有懷國之心, 沈溺異道變化, 不果寤合之言.¹¹ Sometime after this, [Chang Lu] met privately with me to review critically the particulars of [his] strategy (to surrender to Ts'ao Ts'ao). Our countrymen would not go along [with plans]; and some even wanted to go across to the west. Chang Lu then grew angry and said, 'I would rather be the slave of [such a] duke of Wei 寧為魏公奴 than the honored guest of Liu Pei!¹² It was truly due to this that they say he grew sick from anguish.

"[Chiang] Ho was among the first to welcome the king's (Ts'ao Ts'ao's) entourage; he grew ill and died in Yeh 鄴 last year (219).

⁹ This title is a variant of *Ch'un-ch'iu yü-p'an ch'an* 春秋玉版讖, which is cited and quoted only a day or two later during the discussions (*SKC* 2, p. 64). *SKCCC* 2, p. 14b [p. 80b], quotes evidence that *yü-p'an* oracle-texts in the Han were not necessarily called "K'ung-tzu yü-p'an," like those listed in Wei Cheng et al., *Sui shu* 隋書 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1973; hereafter *SS*) 32, "Treatise on Literature," p. 940. See the "Ch'un-ch'iu" texts noted in Yao Chen-tung 姚振宗, *Sui-shu ching-chi chih k'ao-cheng* 隋書經籍志考證, in *Erh-shih-wu shih pu-pien* 二十五史補編 (Shanghai: K'ai-ming shu-tien, 1936-37) 4, pp. 5194b-95a. Also, see Nakamura Shōhachi 中村璋八 and Yasui Kōzan 安居香山, comps., *sho shūsei* 緯書集成 (Tokyo: Kan Gi bunka kenkyūkai, 1959-64) 4.1-2. For reference to luminescent, cylindrical "jade tablets," see the commentary to *Hou Han-shu* 後漢書 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1973; hereafter, *HHS*) 59, p. 1913, biog. of Chang Heng 張衡. Chu I-tsun 朱彝尊, *Ching-i k'ao* 經義考 264, referred to this oracle-text as "河圖玉版"; and a reference also exists in *Pao-p'u tzu*. These last according to Jao Tsung-i 饒宗頤, *Lao-tzu Hsiang-erh chu chiao-cheng* 老子想爾注校證 (Shanghai: Shanghai Ku-chi, 1991), p. 152.

¹⁰ Cf. Dull, "Apocryphal Texts," p. 305. A correlation, based on *HHS*, between "inner studies" and oracle-texts is discussed in Yao, *Sui-shu k'ao-cheng*, p. 5195a. It is perhaps possible to interpret *wang-jen* as "dead person" (see Anna Seidel, "Traces of Han Religion in Funeral Texts Found in Tombs," in Akitsuki Kanei 秋月觀映, ed., *Dōkyō to shūkyō bunka* 道教と宗教文化 [Tokyo: Hirakawa shuppansha, 1987], p. 46, for the term in petitioning for release or reincorporation of dead relatives). For Li Fu, writs delivered from the "other side" would have been miraculous evidence for the oracle.

¹¹ The punctuation is that given by the Chung-hua eds., *SKC* 2, p. 62.

¹² *Hua-yang kuo-chih* 華陽國志 (KHCPTS edn.) 2, p. 17, places the context of this remark specifically at the moment of Chang's decision about surrendering.

"Ever since I (Li Fu) have been at [the Han-Wei] court, I have considered that I ought to state this [prophetic] intention whenever I was in [your] intimate company. But since the time as yet was inappropriate I dared not openly reveal it. In your first year having ascended the throne [as King of Wei], numerous lucky omens and hosts of auspicious portents have arrived daily and monthly. It is to be seen clearly that there is a mandate from Heaven: Your virtue reaches everywhere; tallies forecast the coming illustriousness. . . ."

Subsequently, Ts'ao P'i accepted the message of the oracle, adding his own interpretation, namely that the prediction could not be of his or anyone's making, but was sent, or at least influenced, by the spirit of his dead father.¹³ The whole context from which Li Fu's story emerges, that is, the sheaf of documents containing the discussion of Ts'ao P'i's dynastic legitimation, did not meet with success in the ensuing seventeen hundred years. In fact, *San-kuo chih* itself, along with P'ei Sung-chih's commentary, was criticized heavily; and in the late-T'ang examinations it was not chosen for study, as were other early standard histories.¹⁴

In the Sung era, although intellectuals wrote philosophies of history, made textual corrections in history books, and expanded the genres of historiography, still, the Han-Wei transition of power received attention most of all as a problem in the "correct succession of dynasties." Ou-yang Hsiu 歐陽修 (1007-1072) wrote a multipart "Essay on Correct Succession," in which he gave legitimate historical status to the Ts'ao-Wei.¹⁵ Su Shih 蘇軾 (1036-1101) openly adhered to Ou-yang's ideas about correct succession. He explained the lineaments of the current debate, and the role in it of the Ts'ao-Wei dynasty as a historical foil.¹⁶ Also, scholars generally con-

cerned with early literature, calligraphy, and epigraphy had occasion to refer to the culture of Ts'ao P'i's court and to P'ei Sung-chih's font of information.

Yet two of the most important historians of the Sung period passed over the documents. Ssu-ma Kuang's 司馬光 (1019-1086) *Tzu-chih t'ung-chien* 資治通鑑 – especially the long editorial asides – is larded with philosophy of history, focusing chiefly on ethics. Confronting the "correct succession" problem of the Ts'ao-Wei at the beginning of *chüan* 69, he excused himself from explaining "five phases" and other metaphysical matrices and numerologies – the province of the Han-era experts of political prediction. He disingenuously claimed not to have an opinion about such arcana and proceeded instead to describe Ts'ao P'i's enthronement in a few terse sentences about the jockeying for position of courtiers and generals. He supplied only one phrase to indicate that imperial authority was debated on the basis of oracles, divination, and spirits.¹⁷ Ssu-ma made much use of P'ei Sung-chih's material in other sections dealing with the San-kuo period – but not this particular string of documents. Much later, Chu Hsi's 朱熹 (1130-1200) reduced and clarified version of Ssu-ma's work, *Tzu-chih t'ung-chien kang-mu* 綱目, made no reference at all to such intellectual, and ideological, matters in describing Ts'ao P'i's dynastic founding.

It is tempting to essay a reason for this aversion when so many factors are at hand. Fashion is one of them: Sung thinking was influenced by a turn towards a new Confucian ethics and metaphysics that placed early court culture and imperial legitimation in rather a low light. Moreover, from 1008 to 1014 Sung officials and intellectuals had been deeply embarrassed over the emperor Chen-tsung's 真宗 obsession with revelations, miraculous writs, talismanic calligraphy, and "five phases" matrices. He had diverted officialdom into commenting about his dreams of Taoist revelation and his epiphanies; and he initiated expensive projects to carry forward his agenda. Chen-tsung's successor went so far as to bury the holy writs with the deceased emperor to try to stop what was literally termed a madness – one in which others besides Chen-tsung had been willingly complicit.¹⁸

As historians were passing over, or feeling uncomfortable with, the documents of Ts'ao P'i's dynastic founding, playwrights and dramatists,

¹³ See vol. 1 of Achilles Fang, trans., *The Chronicles of the Three Kingdoms (220-265): Chapters 69-78 from the Tzu Chih T'ung Chien of Ssu-ma Kuang (1029-1086)* (Cambridge: Harvard U.P., 1952; hereafter *TCIC/F*), pp. 7-11.

¹⁴ See Suzanne Cahill, "Taoism at the Sung Court: The Heavenly Text Affair of 1008," *Bulletin of Sung-Yüan Studies* 16 (1980), pp. 23-40.

¹³ *SKC* 2, p. 63, cit. "Hsien-ti chuan"; and *SKCCC* 2, p. 15a.

¹⁴ David McMullen, *State and Scholar in the Tang Dynasty* (Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 1988), p. 198. On early criticism of Ch'en Shou and P'ei, see Leban, "Ts'ao Ts'ao," pp. 11-14, 24-33.

¹⁵ See Ou-yang Hsiu, *Chü-shih wai-chi* 居士外集, ch. 9, pp. 414-15, as printed in *Ou-yang Hsiu ch'üan-chi* 全集 (Taipei: Shih-chieh, 1971), vol. 1 (p. 413 for the compiler's, perhaps Su Shih's, comment that it was an early version). This version of the essay is more readable and contains a great deal of comment on the Wei-Chin era, whereas the later version, as found in *Chü-shih chi*, *ibid.*, pp. 116-21, deletes nearly all those specifics. Quoted in Jao Tsung-i 饒宗頤, *Chung-kuo shih-hsiieh-shang chih cheng-t'ung lun* 中國史學上之正統論 (Hong Kong: Lungmen shu-chü, 1977), pp. 74-77.

¹⁶ Su Shih, *Ching-chin Tung-p'o wen-chi shih-lieh* 經進東坡文集事略 (Taipei: Shih-chieh, 1975), vol. 1, ch. 11, pp. 149-54.

beginning as early as the T'ang, produced a large variety of San-kuo plays, stories, and poems. This would culminate in the literati-style historical novel of the early-sixteenth century titled *San-kuo chih yen-i* 演義, which was based on a late-Yüan version.¹⁹ Its montage of Han-Wei court culture was a breath of fresh air, and it used the documents saved by P'ei Sung-chih with considerable skill. Li Fu shows up in the scene in which Han Hsien-ti first realizes his political demise.

Then Hua Hsin led forward Li Fu and Hsü Chih nearer the throne, saying, "Pray ask these two, who will explain." Hsü Chih said: "The astrologers, watching the aspect of the skies at night have seen the blazing light of the star of Han gradually fade away and Your Majesty's own star become dim. The lots have been cast and they gave the word 'devil' at the side of 'sent,' and there must be an inroad upon Han. The signs are unmistakable." "All empty words and madness, this talk of auguries and lots!" The Emperor wept aloud and retired to his private chamber, while the officers left the hall laughing.²⁰

The novelist has perceived a valuable point: people at courts believed, as did everyone else, that unseen forces acted all around them. This is not to say that all Chinese trusted every oracle, astrological finding, or divination that was put to them. But the traditions of revelation (along with those of legalism, ethics, and metaphysics) continued on until modern times.

Okazaki Fumio's 岡崎文夫 history of medieval China also correctly notes Li Fu's presence in the proceedings of 220 and gives more than due place to the power of oracles.²¹ But Achilles Fang, in his scholarly translation of the section on the Three Kingdoms in *Tzu-chih t'ung-chien*, seems to have returned to Sung attitudes. To Fang, the documents are useless in understanding the establishment of a dynasty. Fang thought that Ssu-ma Kuang's abandonment of the documents was sound, and that the texts were "farce," "long, fatuous verbiage," "esoteric," "a waste of time," and

¹⁹ See Andrew Plaks, *The Four Masterworks of the Ming Novel: Su ta ch'i-shu* (Princeton: Princeton U.P., 1987), and Andrew Lo, "San-kuo chih yen-i" and 'Shui-hu chuan' in the Context of Historiography: An Interpretive Study" (Ph.D. diss., Princeton U., 1981).

²⁰ Trans. C. H. Brewitt-Taylor, *Romance of the Three Kingdoms: "San Kuo Chih Yen-i"* (Rutland, Vt.: Tuttle, 1959), chap. 79, abridged.

²¹ See Okazaki, *Gi Shin Nanboku chō tsūshi* 魏晉南北朝通史 (Kyoto: Kōbundō, 1932), pp. 38-40.

reflective of the fact that Ts'ao P'i "manipulated the whole thing."²²

THE RELIABILITY OF "HSIENTI CHUAN"

Even without the influence of Sung historiography and Achilles Fang's judgment, the reader of the Li Fu document is suspicious: who are Li Fu and Chiang Ho really, besides surrendered officials attempting to please Ts'ao P'i? Why is Chang Lu made to look rather deluded and out of control? What may have been the motivation of the compiler of the source to have published this story? Was that compiler real, or a straw man of P'ei Sung-chih's (or someone else's) making? We turn to Liu Ai's 劉艾 "Hsien-ti chuan" 獻帝傳,²³ seeking to find out who Liu was, what kind of work "Hsien-ti chuan" was, and if it had ever been taken seriously by contemporaneous and later historiographers.

Liu is discussed in Rafe de Crespigny's 1970 analysis of the sources used by P'ei Sung-chih. De Crespigny drew upon the findings of earlier scholarship, especially that of Yao Chen-tung 姚振宗 (1842-1906),²⁴ and suggested finally that Liu Ai, whose personal activities and career markers are noted several times in *San-kuo chih chu*, and who was attributed there as the author of a court annal of Han Ling-ti 靈帝, also compiled "Hsien-ti chuan" at least up to a certain year.²⁵ This is an acceptable interpretation, to which I add refinements.

Liu Ai and the Authorship of "Hsien-ti chuan"

There exists no clear attribution of Hsien-ti annals to Liu Ai in *San-kuo chih*, *Hou Han-shu* 後漢書, or later bibliographic literature. At the head of the Li Fu document, P'ei Sung-chih gives neither a compiler's nor an

²² *TCICIF* 1, p. 36. This negative opinion was noticed by Dull, "Apocryphal Texts," p. 306; and Leban, "Managing Heaven's Mandate," p. 325, who argues that the discussions of Ts'ao and his advisers cynically manipulated ideology and beliefs.

²³ See Goodman, "Founding of the Ts'ao-Wei," Intro., sect. "The Reliability of the Sources."

²⁴ De Crespigny, *Records*. He does not, however, cite Yao's *Sui-shu ching-chi chih k'ao-cheng* in his bibliography; it is there that all the substantive sources and materials for arriving at a deduction are gathered (see Yao's *Shih-shih shan-fang ts'ung-shu* 師石山房叢書 [printed by K'ai-ming shu-tien, n.p., 1936?], ch. 11, p. 238B-C).

²⁵ See de Crespigny, *Records*, pp. 59-62; also Carl Leban, "Ts'ao Ts'ao," pp. 4-5, who became suspicious of "Hsien-ti chuan" and its authorship in his later "Managing Heaven's Mandate," p. 325. Jao, *Lao-tzu*, pp. 151-52, discusses Liu's identity while examining that of Chang Hsiu 張修.

author's name, just the title of the work: "Hsien-ti chuan."

As just mentioned, Liu Ai's authorship of the "Ling-ti Annals" is established in *San-kuo chih chu*.²⁶ The Chung-hua shu-chü editors' index to names and book titles, *San-kuo chih jen-ming so-yin* 人明索引,²⁷ also attributes the work to him, giving four occurrences of it in *San-kuo chih chu*, but curiously (and inexplicably) not the one just mentioned – the only anchored attribution. "Ling-ti chi" is quoted several times as 劉艾紀 in the T'ang-era notes to *Hou Han-shu* 8 ("Ling-ti Basic Annals").²⁸ Moreover, in its various comments, we see reference to events as far back as the mid-180s. Thus, there is no problem with asserting that someone named 劉艾 living in the 180s and 190s, wrote a court annal for the reign of Ling-ti, probably not under commission of the emperor, but working privately. The work in question was used as a respectable source by T'ang commentators, and we may surmise that this Liu Ai was born about 155-160, but not much earlier, since he is accounted for in 216 AD, and perhaps lived to complete "Hsien-ti chuan" soon after 220 (see below).²⁹

Later scribal attributions of Liu Ai's works are riddled with errors and problems:³⁰ there exist references to both a Hsien-ti "chuan 傳 and "chi 紀," and the author's name at some point is perhaps miswritten. *Sui-shu's* 隋書 "Treatise on Literature" calls "Liu Fang 芳" the author of a combined Ling and Hsien annals (not listing any free-standing Ling-ti or Hsien-ti annals), but *Chiu T'ang-shu* (compilation finished in 945) switches the attribution back to Ai, perhaps influenced by the commentative work on *Hou Han-shu* and by such florilegia as *Ch'u-hsüeh chi* 初學記 (compiled around 700), *chüan* 39 of which cites Ai's "Hsien-ti chuan" in the context of the year 194. Later, *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan* 太平御覽 (compilation finished in the 980s), *chüan*

²⁶ SKC 1, p. 45, where P'ei entered "劉艾靈帝紀曰" to introduce a short quotation.

²⁷ Published in Peking, 1980.

²⁸ T'ang Kao-tung's son Li Hsien 李賢, along with at least two others, but reportedly many others, began work on their commentary to Fan Yeh's history in 675 AD. The Chung-hua shu-chü editors of *HHS* suggest that the large number of people involved makes the Li Hsien annotations relatively less reliable, but I see no justification for this remark; *HHS*, publisher pref., p. 8.

²⁹ De Crespigny, *Records*, p. 60, explains that Liu might have been too old to have completed the Hsien-ti annals, not because they end in 220, but because to be titled "Hsien-ti" the work would have had to be completed after 234, when that temple name was bestowed on the Han emperor. But, of course, the work may have been completed before 234 and had its name appropriately altered; and, moreover, to have lived to 75 or more was not unknown.

³⁰ Most of the following points are gathered in Yao, *K'ao-cheng* (K'ai-ming edn.), p. 238.

773, quotes a speech by Ts'ai Yung 蔡邕 (133-192) the primary source of which in *San-kuo chih chu* 6 cites "Hsien-ti chi." But the tenth-century encyclopedia calls it "Hsien-ti chuan." This switch of genre names causes us to suspect that the two titles (*chuan* and *chi*) were one and the same work. Again, *San-kuo chih jen-ming so-yin* is somewhat reticent; it lists 9 occurrences of "Hsien-ti chuan" without stating an author, yet it lists 14 occurrences of "Hsien-ti chi" as authored by Liu Ai.

Scholarship seems agreed in calling "Fang" a mistake for "Ai," and the combined Hsien- and Ling-ti annals as a special redaction of two otherwise independent annals, thus implying that Liu Ai wrote annals of both emperors' reigns. But is it more than an implication? Did Liu, and not someone else, write a Hsien-ti annals, and was it called a *chuan* or a *chi*?

P'ei's notes to *chüan* 6 of *San-kuo chih*, dealing, among other topics, with the life of Tung Cho 董卓 (d. 192), cite and quote all three titles – "Ling-ti chi," "Hsien-ti chi," and "Hsien-ti chuan." Yet unlike numerous other places of his commentary, P'ei does not decide on authorship or enter an opinion about the confusion. We know that P'ei did not solve every evidential problem of his sources, and sometimes even made comments that created confusion.³¹ In this case, it seems that he simply accepted the fact that three titles held source material on Tung Cho, one or more having been written by Liu Ai. P'ei had used various sources in his editing that mentioned Liu Ai's involvement with Tung Cho.³² Liu Ai also advised Han courtiers regarding the movements of the young Hsien-ti during his removal from the Tung Cho debacle in Ch'ang-an and his establishment in Lo-yang.³³ These events spanned the years from 189 to 195.

Liu Ai's offices were as follows: 1. "I was once prefect (*ling*) of Shan 陝;³⁴ 2. director of the Imperial Clan 宗正 – mentioned twice, once in about 195, and the other 214;³⁵ 3. gentleman in regular attendance 長史 seemingly also sometime in the 190s under Tung Cho;³⁶ and 4. in 216 使持節行御史大夫, that is, special emissary holding an imperial tally, with the

³¹ See Goodman, "Calligrapher Chung Yu."

³² SKC 6, p. 186, cit. "Hsien-ti chi"; and 46, p. 1098, cit. Yüeh Tzu's 樂資 "Shan-yang kung tsai-chi" 山陽公載記.

³³ SKC 1, p. 13, cit. Chang Fan's 張璠 "Han-chi" 漢紀.

³⁴ SKC 6, p. 186, cit. Liu's own "Hsien-ti chi."

³⁵ Respectively, SKC 1, p. 13, cit. Chang's "Han chi," and p. 43, cit. "Hsien-ti ch'i-chü chu."

³⁶ SKC 46, p. 1098, cit. "Shan-yang kung tsai-chi."

rank of grandee secretary.³⁷ Liu Ai, in various of these contexts, is seen to converse with an astrologer and to have possessed a curatorial specialty regarding seals. In the mid-190s he is known to have held the honorary title Minister of P'eng-ch'eng 彭城相 and *lieh-hou* 列侯 ("ranked marquis").

In sum, if Liu was one person, he was knowledgeable about events in Ch'ang-an, Hung-nung (the location of Shan), Ho-nan, and the strategic Hsü-chou province (the location of the principality of P'eng-ch'eng). He was privy to central power and may have known about events in Shu, since *Hou Han-shu* 8 quotes his Ling-ti annals for details about the early Five Pecks leader in Shu – Chang Hsiu 張修.³⁸ Therefore, Liu Ai wrote on Tung Cho and Ling-ti from both personal recognizance and a general familiarity with activities in Ch'ang-an and Shu. Moreover, where the Li Fu document quotes Li's defense of the Shu oracle-text by mentioning numerous other omens attesting Ts'ao P'i's mandate, we have circumstantial evidence that Liu Ai lived at least through 220 and probably further. The gathering of these dynasty-supporting omens, many based on provincial reports, occurred from 220 (beginning with Ts'ao P'i's ascension as king of Wei) until about 222, a process noticed in the fifth-century *Sung-shu* 宋書 and in the main text and addendum of the Ts'ao dynastic stele inscribed either very late in 221 or in 222.³⁹

It seems reasonable, based on the preceding, to accept the man Liu Ai, born in about 160 and dying probably sometime after 220, as the author of both Ling-ti and Hsien-ti court annals, the latter called by two different names.⁴⁰ The confusion between "Hsien-ti *chuan*" and "*chi*" is trivial when we understand the way in which genre names worked. *Sui-shu*, "Treatise on Literature" (*chüan* 33), categorizes historiography in the following way:

1. national histories 國史; 45 items through San-kuo, not including variants; for noncommentative works, a small variety of genre names (for example, 傳, 紀, 記, 書, 志);
2. dynastic chronologies 春秋體; 8 items through San-kuo; genre names mostly 紀 and 春秋;
3. annals and accounts; 26 items through San-kuo; a variety of genre names, such as 記, 策, 傳, 春秋. (Here is where *Sui-shu* places Liu Ai's

combined Ling-ti and Hsien-ti annals – 漢靈獻二帝紀, with the misattribution to Liu Fang, as described above. In the description of the genre, the compilers say, "In the time of Ling and Hsien, there was great civil disorder everywhere, and the historians' offices maintained none of their usual methods. Men of intelligence, saddened by such dissolution [in historical record keeping] individually recorded what they heard in order to set forth for posterity what had been preserved [by archivists]" 靈獻之世天下大亂, 史官失其長守, 博達之士, 愍其廢絕, 各記聞見以備遺亡.⁴¹ The message is that historiography continued, and the heroes were the private, individual compilers of national annals and records.)

4. provincial annals; 5 items through San-kuo; many 傳 and 書;
5. court diaries of imperial activity and repose 起居注; 2 items through San-kuo, including 漢獻帝起居注, which, as we saw above, once mentioned Liu Ai;
6. affairs of state and edicts; 3 items through San-kuo; often 事 and 記.

There are further categories – for instance, works on official protocols and ceremonies, and those on law, but we shall end the survey at this point.⁴² With the above outline of genres and types, the *Sui-shu* compilers have shown that Liu's court annalistic work was taken seriously and was considered an example of a genre of preserving conversations and events that was used by writers not commissioned by the court. We may infer in the converse that Liu's work was probably not considered a dynastic chronology, concerned merely with legitimate heirs and reign periods, nor an account devoted to the daily activities of just the emperor. Thus, Liu's genre was quite flexible; and taking advantage of this, Liu ranged from Shu to Lo-yang, and from Tung Cho to Hsien-ti's travails as a boy.

We also need not expect that this genre display rigid conformity to content. Liu's record of the memorials and speeches of the men about to take Hsien-ti's and his court's place, at first glance taxes our expectation of the contents of late-Han court annals. But Liu's motive, as we see, seems to have been Han-loyalist, and ultimately he has placed Ts'ao P'i and his advisers in an unkindly light. Moreover, a single genre name could operate

³⁷ SKC 1, p. 48, cit. Liu's own "Hsien-ti chuan."

³⁸ IHS 8, p. 349. Jao, *Lao-tzu*, p. 152, calls this a veracious report on activities in Shu, because Liu was contemporaneous.

³⁹ This is explained in Goodman, "Founding of the Ts'ao-Wei," chap. 11.

⁴⁰ Jao, *Lao-tzu*, p. 152, believes that Liu Ai wrote the reliable "Ling-ti chi," but only suggests that he wrote the Hsien-ti annals.

⁴¹ SS 33 ("Treatise on Literature" B), p. 962.

⁴² The Ch'ing-era scholar Hou K'ang 侯康, *Pu San-kuo i-wen chih* 補三國藝文志 (TSCC ch'u-pien edn.), vol. 3, ch. 3, lists eleven categories of historiography in the period he is covering: 正史, 編年, 雜史, 起居注, 職官, 儀注, 刑法, 雜傳, 地志, 譜牒, and 目錄.

under several categories of historiography (above, there are 記, 傳, and 春秋 throughout the categories). We should take this latitude into account also in explaining Liu Ai's accurate record of the other memorializers' names, the dates of their submissions, and various allusions and titles of works that they cited. Writers in the second and third centuries extended the role and size of commentative notes; *ku-wen* 古文 exegetes began to reorder and redact the classics; and new interests, such as phonological and lexical glosses, as well as interpretive and philosophical comments, became popular as scholarly genres and genre names.⁴³ Thus, Liu might not have felt constricted as to form, and could act as diarist of "imperial activity and repose" or transmitter of documents, as he wished.

The above points contribute, I believe, to the veracity of Liu's "Hsien-ti chuan." They show a many-sided recordist at work, someone familiar with national conversations among national leaders, and with the last Han emperors. He generally conveyed the exact dates of memorials, suggesting a dedication to preserving very important events that might have slipped by otherwise. But even the undated, legendary story about men of the Shu region and their pro-Ts'ao P'i oracle seems within his purview; there is far more justification to call it expected than to call it suspicious, or a forgery. Finally, its placement among the other documents, falling immediately after Hsien-ti's announcement to the Han founder at an established Kao-ti temple, carries enormous impact – whether a facet of Liu's or P'ei Sung-chih's editing. That it fell on about November 20 is logical, since the surrounding documents are dated accordingly. Its key feature – the authority of revelatory material – is also believable on more than just the grounds that oracles were commonly accepted at ruling courts. First of all, P'ei Sung-chih, if we follow his style and his own statement about method, would not have invented a story about such an oracle.⁴⁴ Moreover, the

⁴³ The historical developments in prose genres in this time period are touched upon in James Hightower, *Topics in Chinese Literature: Outlines and Bibliographies*, Harvard-Yenching Inst. Studies 3 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard U.P., 1950); but covered more fully in essays by Craig Fisk and William Nienhauser, Jr., in Nienhauser, comp., *The Indiana Companion to Traditional Chinese Literature* (Bloomington: Indiana U.P., 1986), pp. 49–58, and 93–120, respectively. For genres of classical exegesis in the third century, esp. those associated with *Iching*, see Goodman, "Exegetes and Exegeses of the *Book of Changes* in the Third Century AD" (Ph.D. diss., Princeton U., 1985), chap. 7.

⁴⁴ On P'ei's nonjudgmental, nearly scientific, attitude towards rites, post-mortem souls, and divination, see Goodman, "Exegetes and Exegeses," pp. 23–25; and idem, "Calligrapher Chung Yu."

bearer of the oracle, Chiang Ho, cites the name of the oracular book from which it came, a book evidenced elsewhere. It was, after all, an example of a genre much studied and known by scholars since the beginning of Eastern Han, in other words, not easily forged by later scholars.

THE LI FU DOCUMENT

IN THE STUDY OF EARLY TAOISM

We turn once more to the questions raised by the Li Fu document. Who were Chiang Ho and Li Fu? Why did they do and say the things they did? And why is any of it important outside the narrow confines of a story relayed to Ts'ao P'i in 220? Here I do not even consider the rhetorical and literary qualities of the document that give it interest over and above the surface facts.⁴⁵ Instead, I link it directly with the history of early Taoism and several recent issues in that field. The link is quite salient, since one of the characters is Chang Lu, an important figure in the history of the Taoist Celestial-Master cult that survives to today.⁴⁶ But also, the time and place, as we see, supply circumstantial evidence for the link; and the fact that it involves Ts'ao P'i and his father alerts us to the well-known fascination of the Ts'ao family with wonder-workers and Taoist religious leaders, and the Ts'aos' alternation between tolerance and proscription. The issues themselves are also salient. Recent historians do a great service by carefully criticizing Taoist biographies and histories, not content to accept the narratives without evidence. The result is that we are learning which traditions were inflated at what time periods and for what reasons. Thus, we need to know whether the Celestial-Master presence in third-century Shu and at the early-Wei court was a fiction of the ninth century, or if this major cult lineage in fact originated among the masses and held together its own sense of mission over time and space.

Sources for Tracking the Celestial-Master Taoists from 215 to ca. 230

We need not rehearse the Celestial-Master origins as the Five-Pecks-of-Rice Taoist movement and the historicity of the various accounts of Chang

⁴⁵ See Goodman, "Founding of the Ts'ao-Wei," chap. 4, for an analysis of its "inner" and "outer" aspects.

⁴⁶ See Holmes Welch, "The Chang T'ien Shih and Taoism in China," *Journal of Oriental Studies* 1 (1957–58), pp. 188–212.

Lu and his immediate family and followers. In his *San-kuo chih chi-chieh* 三國志集解 notes to *chüan* 8 of *San-kuo chih*, Lu Pi 盧弼 gathered almost all of the relevant references, and it is thus easy to learn about the various factual problems. One may also turn to T'ang Ch'ang-ju's 唐長孺 masterful, short account of the Chang-family movement.⁴⁷ As a convenience, let us distinguish the "historiographical" sources (as gathered by Lu Pi – plus some other items) from the hagiographical tradition about the Celestial-Master Changs that seems to have come into existence beginning in the ninth or tenth centuries.⁴⁸

As far as I am aware, pre-1900 Chinese historians did not make any special study of the origins of the Five-Peck, cum Celestial-Master, Taoists. Working in the 1930s, Henri Maspero was the first to approach that within the context of the history of Taoism.⁴⁹ His work was translated into Japanese (before English), thus influencing Chinese anthropology and religions there.⁵⁰ Maspero basically relied on the historiographic tradition, which says that Chang Lu's grandfather Tao-ling 道陵, or Ling 陵, came to the Shu area from P'ei principality 沛國, the same home region as that of the Ts'ao and their generals. Chang Tao-ling moved the family into Shu as clients of an estate-holding family in the 130s or 140s.

T'ang Ch'ang-ju shows that Chang Tao-ling had previously been influenced by Yellow Turban activity in P'ei, and when he got to Shu found Five-Peck Taoism already in full swing led by Chang Hsiu 修, who was not, contrary to P'ei Sung-chih's opinion, one of the Chang Celestial-Master family.⁵¹ Tao-ling and his son Heng 衡 instituted variations in Taoist techniques, gradually developing their own identity in concert with Chang Lu's mother, who seems to have held sway as a practitioner of demonic possession (or expulsion).⁵² When Chang Lu, Heng's son, was sent out by

⁴⁷ T'ang, "Wei Chin ch'i chien pei-fang T'ien-shih tao te ch'uan-po" 魏晉期間北方天師道的傳播, idem, *Wei Chin Nan-pei ch'ao shih-lun shih-i* 魏晉南北朝史論拾遺 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1983), pp. 218–32.

⁴⁸ The history of this tradition is summarized and explained in T. H. Barrett, "The Emergence of the Taoist Papacy in the T'ang Dynasty," also in this issue of *Asia Major*.

⁴⁹ See Henri Maspero, *Taoism in Chinese Religion*, trans. Frank Kierman (Amherst: U. of Massachusetts P., 1981), pp. 373–88.

⁵⁰ See Barrett's introduction in *ibid.*, pp. viii–xxiii, explaining the role of Kawakatsu Yoshio in bringing Maspero to Japan.

⁵¹ *SKC* 8, p. 264; also *SKCCC* 8, pp. 45a–b.

⁵² *SKC* 31, p. 868. The term for her practice is "the way of demons (or ghosts)" 鬼道. See Maspero, *Taoism*, p. 375, for the context as that of ecstatic practices.

the local Han-appointed prefect on a military mission along with Chang Hsiu (presumably quite old by this time), Hsiu was murdered by Chang Lu; his followers were then coopted into the Chang-family movement.⁵³

A small but telling aspect of Chang Lu's leadership in Shu must be mentioned for its relevance to the Li Fu document. Once, when Chang Lu had achieved political control of Han-chung and had been appointed by the Han court as Han-ning Grand Administrator 漢寧太守, "people found a jade seal in the earth, and [thereupon] all his subordinates wanted to honor Chang as king of Han-ning." But Lu's important aide, an official in the Bureau of Merit named Yen P'u 閻圃, said that this would be a disaster; and Chang accordingly refused.⁵⁴

Let us turn close attention to Chang Lu's and his followers' movements when they were defeated by Ts'ao Ts'ao in 215. Historians of Taoism consider this a crucial time for the movement, but have not had success in figuring out a plausible scenario. Such a scenario is not easily, or fully, available. But a systematic review of historiographic sources helps, and the result is something a bit more solid. The sources are: the Li Fu document from "Hsien-ti chuan" (which historians of Taoism have not utilized); Ch'en Shou's 陳壽 *San-kuo chih*, ch. 1 and 8, the biographies of Ts'ao Ts'ao and Chang Lu, respectively, plus others of P'ei's many cited sources; *Hou Han-shu*; *Shui-ching chu* 水經注; *Tai-p'ing yü-lan* 太平御覽, quoting a fragment from "Wei chih 魏志" not parallel with any known passages in *San-kuo chih*; *Hua-yang kuo-chih* 華陽國志; and the ritual stele for the Wei dynastic founding titled "Memorial of the [Three] Excellencies, [Nine] Ministers, [and Generals] Offered Up in Praiseful Exhortation" 魏公脚上尊號奏, incised and erected after the discussions among Ts'ao P'i and his advisers, probably early in 222.⁵⁵

Some of the above purport to be direct accounts of Chang and his followers, while others give indirect or circumstantial evidence. I follow T'ang Ch'ang-ju's belief that we can use the historiographic sources, with

⁵³ T'ang, "T'ien-shih tao," pp. 221–23.

⁵⁴ *HHS* 75, pp. 2436–37, biog. of Liu Yen; for another instance of Chang's conservative attitudes towards omens and oracles, see *SKC* 9, p. 290, cit. "Wei lüeh."

⁵⁵ See Hung Kua 洪适, *Li shih* 隸釋 (Wan-li era woodblock; SPTK san-pien, shih-pu edn.; photopr. Tokyo: Kyokuto shoten, 1966) 19, pp. 3b–8b. A complete study and translation is in Goodman, "Founding of the Ts'ao-Wei," chap. 11. The text was a subject for epigraphers beginning in the T'ang; and most writers agreed that it was calligraphed, or at least incised based on another's calligraphy, by Chung Yu 鍾繇. It was not mentioned in *SKC*, but P'ei's commentary captured a major portion of the text.

their veracious scenarios and actors, in order to read and interpret other evidences that lie outside historiography – passages from canonic Taoist scripture. We return to that method a bit later. Here, let us review those pertinent sources just mentioned.

Michel Strickmann discussed Chang Lu's surrender and claimed that Chang went to Yeh 鄴 and died in 242.⁵⁶ He cites *Shen-hsien chuan*, *chüan* 4, "Biography of Chang Tao-ling," and the "Wei chih" fragment in *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan*, section "Clan Relatives," *chüan* 518.⁵⁷ The *Shen-hsien chuan* biography mentions that the Chang family hailed from P'ei, but gives nothing about Chang Lu. The "Wei chih" fragment is as follows:

1

The "Record of Wei" says: "Chang Kuang 張廣, styled Ssu-tzung 嗣宗, was Chang Lu's second son. Lu was frequently rewarded by Wu- [ti] of Wei (that is, Ts'ao Ts'ao). His various sons, before they were ready for the capping [ceremony], were all made palace messengers, and were granted noble titles and appointed to offices 諸子未勝纓並遣中使拜授官爵. A memorial inscription at the city of Nan-cheng says: '[His] place was revered and exalted; [he] embodied the supreme characteristics of a subject. His five sons and ten consorts were all honored equally and ennobled at the same degree. In many cases, [Chang] youths and infants were appointed as kings while still babes in arms, or commanded to marry members of the imperial house – either as consorts of princesses or as minor imperial consorts' 位尊上將體極人臣五子十室榮並爵均童年嬰稚抱拜王人命婚帝族或尚或嬪

This mentions nothing of Chang Lu's being in Yeh or his living until 242. Perhaps Strickmann followed Henri Maspero, who said that after Chang Lu surrendered and received rewards for him and his family from Ts'ao Ts'ao, he "lived for several years at the Wei court; and he took part in a discussion before the emperor in 220." Maspero's statement contains errors: it was Li Fu, not Chang Lu, who was in the discussions recorded by

⁵⁶ See "On the Alchemy of T'ao Hung-ching," in A. Seidel and H. Welch, eds., *Facets of Taoism* (New Haven: Yale U.P., 1979), p. 167, and idem, *Le taoïsme du Mao Chan: Chronique d'une révolution*, Mémoires de l'Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises 17 (Paris: P.U. de France, 1983), p. 135.

⁵⁷ See the Chung-hua edn. of 1965, pp. 3b-4a; also *SKCC* 8, pp. 48a-b.

Liu Ai, during which time Ts'ao Ts'ao was dead and there was as yet no Wei "emperor." Maspero's references had to be reconstructed by Max Kaltenmark, Paul Demiéville, Kawakatsu Yoshio 川勝義雄, and others, and thus we cannot be sure of exactly which evidences he used, and how so. None of his apparent references (which I examine here) mentions Chang Lu's coming to Ts'ao Ts'ao's or Ts'ao P'i's court.⁵⁸

We turn to notices in *San-kuo chih*, *Hou Han-shu*, and *Hua-yang kuo-chih*.

2

In late-summer of 215 Ts'ao Ts'ao began a flanking operation, hoping to enter central Shu from Wu-tu, which was west of Han-chung. He reached Yang-p'ing Pass 陽平關, leading generals Hsin P'i 辛毗, and Liu Yeh 劉曄. Chang Lu's brother Chang Wei 衛 wanted to resist Ts'ao at the Pass, against the wishes of Chang Lu. Chang Wei was crushed, and Lu then was "on the verge of surrendering" 將稽顙. His close adviser Yen P'u, however, strongly urged him not to be forced into it with no appearance of military achievement, but instead to wait until an imminent large-scale conflict among Shu tribes broke out, and then he would be better placed for the surrender. It was probably at this point in time that Chang Lu also decided not to destroy his goods and supplies in Nan-cheng, but to leave them for Ts'ao Ts'ao. Chang then "fled to Nan-shan 南山 and entered Pa-chung 巴中."⁵⁹ The Nan-shan mountains were just south of the Han-chung/Nan-cheng urban complex, separating it from central Pa. The mountains offered isolation for Chang while he decided his next step. He was torn between immediate surrender to Ts'ao, struggling on his own (apparently with plans to manipulate local unrest), or to go at least temporarily westward – to Liu Pei 劉備.

3

"Liu Pei appointed Huang Ch'üan 皇權 to lead all his generals to welcome Lu. Lu [however] had already returned to Nan-cheng in his

⁵⁸ See Maspero, *Taoism*, p. 374, and translator's n. 2, which shows, via Kawakatsu, Maspero's error in placing Chang as a participant in 220.

⁵⁹ *SKC* 8, pp. 264-65; also 1, pp. 45-46. The narrative at 8, p. 265, implies that the decision to seal his storehouses for the eventual use of Ts'ao Ts'ao occurred after moving south into Nan-shan. But this would seem to be out of order, or else some of his lieutenants left behind in Nan-cheng carried out his instructions.

northward surrender to Ts'ao Ts'ao."⁶⁰ Here, "northward" does not mean towards the Central Plain, to Hsü-ch'ang, or Yeh. Nan-cheng was Chang's normal center of operations and the location of his stores and supplies. It was one of the nine walled cities of Han-chung commandery – attached to Han-chung fu.⁶¹ Chang was thus simply going back northwards across the mountains to Han-chung-fu. Ts'ao Ts'ao at that point had also entered Nan-cheng and raided Chang Lu's storehouses in order to feast his troops, who were weary from the treacherous journey from Wu-tu. He was extremely impressed with Chang's forethought in supplying him with such goods and supplies.⁶² The two great warriors were now in close proximity, and cooperating in some way. The time was roughly September, 215.

4
In September-October, Ts'ao Ts'ao took both central Pa and Han-chung and restructured the administration. In October/November Ts'ao Ts'ao received surrendered tribespeople (as supposedly anticipated by Chang Lu and Yen P'u) and gave their leaders administrative posts in a newly divided Pa commandery. Sometime in December, 215, or January 216, "Chang was finishing leading his family out, when Ts'ao Ts'ao welcomed him by appointing him general-who-quells-the-south. He treated him with courtesies afforded a guest, and ennobled him as marquis of Lang-chung 關中侯." In addition, Yen P'u and all five of Chang's sons were ennobled equally, and one of his daughters was given in marriage to Ts'ao Ts'ao's son Ts'ao Yü.⁶³ This is supported by the "Wei chih" fragment, noted above.

⁶⁰ *SKC* 43, p. 1043; also *Hua-yang kuo-chih* 2, p. 17, adding that at this point it was Yen P'u who suggested joining westward with Liu as a means of getting through to Ts'ao Ts'ao, instead of going directly "northward to surrender to Ts'ao"; see *SKCCG* 8, p. 47b, for Ch'ing-era comments on all of these passages. These events are described in B. J. Mansvelt Beck, "The Fall of Han," chapter 5 of Denis Twitchett and Michael Loewe, eds., *The Cambridge History of China* (Cambridge U.P., 1987), vol. 1.

⁶¹ See *IHS*, "Treatise on Commanderies and Principalities," sect. 5, p. 3506 (which also states Nan-cheng was on the Ch'ih 池 R.). Ku Tsu-yü's 顧祖禹 *Tu-shih fang-yü chi-yao* 讀史方輿紀要 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1953) 56, p. 2447, claims that just before Han it was a suburban enceinte attached to Han-chung city. It became a separate capital and administrative unit subsequently. See also Li Chi-fu 李吉甫, *Yüan-ho chün-hsien t'u-chih* 元和郡縣圖志 (Peking: Chung-hua, 1983; hereafter *YHC/TC*), vol. 1, p. 558.

⁶² *SKC* 1, p. 45.

⁶³ *SKC* 8, p. 265; also 1, p. 46. A variant (*IHS* 75, p. 2437) contains the terse "was about

After defeating Chang Lu, Ts'ao Ts'ao returned to Yeh, which was not just his headquarters, but, for decades, a troop-mustering locale.⁶⁴ The historiographic sources also tell us about rewards given to various of Chang's former advisers and followers and their moving to Yeh.⁶⁵ In fact, as the anti-Chang campaign was coming to a close, and for some time afterward, people "gladly migrated of their own accord to Lo-yang and Yeh."⁶⁶ T'ang Ch'ang-ju brings together other evidence to show that these migrations were enormous and comprised the crucial Celestial-Master presence in Yeh and the Central Plain after 216.⁶⁷

Other items suggest that several members of the Chang family stayed in the Han-chung and western Pa regions, or at least that their memory and influence lingered.

5
Chang Lu was ennobled as Lang-chung *hou* (see above). Lang-chung is generally agreed to have been in Pa-hsi commandery, that is, about 100 miles south of Han-chung.⁶⁸ *Hua-yang kuo-chih*, however, says that Chang Lu's fief was at Hsiang-p'ing 襄平, presumably a locale at the other end of the continent, in Liao-tung 遼東.⁶⁹ It seems untenable that Chang would have gone in person to such a distant fief, but possible that it was an honorary fief. On the whole, Lang-chung is the likely case, and is accepted by most of the commentators.

If Chang actually went to Lang-chung to take up residence, he might have served as a kind of adjutant for Ts'ao Ts'ao, to keep watch on Liu Pei's power. Ts'ao was concerned with just this problem and appointed others to stay in Han-chung to form a line of resistance.⁷⁰ Chang Lu's son Chang Fu

to return to the central states [i.e., China of the Central Plain].” But the person “about to return” refers to Ts'ao Ts'ao, not Chang Lu.

⁶⁴ See, e.g., *SKC* 9, p. 272.

⁶⁵ E.g., *SKC* 9, p. 290.

⁶⁶ *SKC* 23, p. 666.

⁶⁷ T'ang, "T'ien-shih tao," pp. 229–30.

⁶⁸ *YHC/TC*, vol. 2, p. 1066, refers to Chang Lu's ennoblement and fief. Lang-chung was a suburban walled addition to Pa-hsi city, on the Western Han R., running through Pa-hsi commandery (previous to the 220s also called Pa commandery). Ku's notes (*Fang-yü chi-yao* 68, p. 2919) state that it was about 7 mi. east of Pa-hsi city, and that in 200 AD Liu Ch'uan 劉禪 set up garrison farms there to offset Chang Lu's power in Han-chung.

⁶⁹ *Hua-yang kuo-chih* 2, p. 17. *YHC/TC* has no entry for Hsiang-p'ing; Ku, *Fang-yü chi-yao*, treats it under the Shan-tung/Liao-tung section.

⁷⁰ Rafe de Crespigny, trans., *The Last of the Han: Being the Chronicle of the Years 181–220 A.D. as Recorded in Chapters 58–64 of the Tzu-chih t'ung-chien of Su-ma Kuang*, Centre of Oriental Studies 9 (Canberra: Australian Natl. U., 1969), pp. 319, 321.

富 succeeded to the Lang-chung fief.⁷¹

We turn now to *Shui-ching chu*, to learn more about a Celestial-Master, specifically Chang-family, presence having continued to thrive in Shu. This gazetteer was written early in the sixth century. The relevant passage concerns Chang Lu's lingering influence in central Shu and his daughter, who was given in marriage to Ts'ao's son Ts'ao Yü 宇 (t' P'eng-tsu 彭祖).

6

"The Chin-shui 瀘水 flows north outward through the center of [the territory] of the Wu-tu Ti 狄 [people]. Southward it crosses the eastern sector of Chang Lu City. . . Chin-shui further crosses southward through the eastern [part of] the territory that Chang Lu administered. The western [stretch of] the river is high in the mountains; and there is a Chang Celestial Master Hall. Up to today, the people do service to him. Yü Chung-yung 庾仲雍 says that the mountain is Po-ma Baricade 白馬塞. The hall belonged to Chang Lu's administration."⁷² Also: "[Where Huang-sha shui 黃沙水] joins with the Han River, south of the river is a [certain] Worthy Lady 女郎 Mountain on which is Worthy Lady Tumulus. . . On top of the mountain a straight road goes downward; here no grasses or trees grow. People of the time called it Worthy Lady Road. Below it is the Worthy Lady Temple and Clothes-washing Stone. It (the stone? the temple?) says [or, they say] that it is [in memory of] Chang Lu's daughter. Here there is a small river that flows northward to enter the Han and is called the Worthy Lady River."⁷³

The above, coupled with the inscription from Nan-cheng city quoted in the *Tai-p'ing yü-lan* fragment, suggests that Chang Lu's daughter remained in Han-chung. A Liang-era inscription provides yet another hint in that direction.⁷⁴ But, since she was married to Ts'ao Yü, who in the 230s received favor under the reign of Ts'ao P'i's son, the emperor Ming of Wei, and is mentioned several times "returning to Yeh,"⁷⁵ it is hard to imagine

that Lady Chang remained in the mountains of Han-chung, while her husband went about in Yeh and Lo-yang among his family members. T'ang Ch'ang-ju's deduction of a massive influx of Celestial-Master followers into Yeh and probably other parts of Ho-nan and the Central Plain seems reasonable and probable. But there also seems to have been lasting influence of the Chang-led religion in Shu, especially the Han-chung area, even if what we have read was adulation of the Chang family and not evidence of their physical presence.

7

The stele in honor of Ts'ao P'i's enthronement gives Yen P'u's name as a signatory, but no other Celestial-Master personage is so listed.⁷⁶

This last is a curious and important fact. A study of the signers reveals that not only were important court groupings represented, but also clusters of Ts'ao-family military supporters, western campaign generals, and the court representative of the Southern Hsiung-nu.⁷⁷ It is safe to assume that had Chang Lu been alive, and anywhere near Ts'ao P'i's entourage in December of 220, when Ts'ao P'i was elevated, his own name and not his adviser's would have appeared.

The only counter-argument to this rests on the fact that during these years Ts'ao P'i reversed many of his father's policies, ranging from court honors, music, law, and, most importantly, toleration of cults and Taoist temples. He not only reversed ceremonial and ritual items, but also in some cases had Ts'ao Ts'ao's ritual advisers removed.⁷⁸ In 222 Ts'ao P'i had a Taoist temple restored, but explained that it was merely to lessen people's anxieties about its physical condition, and that the Han emperor Huan-ti and his own father Ts'ao Ts'ao had been too permissive because they revered Lao-tzu. In 224, Ts'ao P'i prohibited "offerings not of a sacrificial [nature] and prayer-liturgies of shamans," calling them "all affirmations of left-Tao teachings," that is, heterodox.⁷⁹ In spite of such attitudes though, I

⁷¹ SKC 8, p. 265.

⁷² Wang Kuo-wei 王國維, *Shui-ching chu chiao* 水經注校 (Shanghai: Jen-min, 1984) 27, sect. Mien-shui, p. 876; I could not determine the identity of Yü.

⁷³ Ibid., pp. 879-80. ⁷⁴ This is described in Barrett, "Taoist Papacy," p. 9, n. 25.

⁷⁵ T'ang, "T'ien-shih tao," p. 223; and SKC 20 ("Biogs. of the Ts'ao Princes"), p. 582 (trans. *TICF* 1, p. 610).

⁷⁶ Noticed by T'ang, "T'ien-shih tao," p. 230.

⁷⁷ A social analysis of the signers is in Goodman, "Founding of the Ts'ao-Wei," chap. 11.

⁷⁸ Ibid., chap. 10.

⁷⁹ This is examined in detail in T'ang, "T'ien-shih tao," pp. 219-20; the 222 edict derives from a partly-preserved epigraphic text transcribed in Hung Kua's 洪适 *Li shih* 隸續, ch. 4 (T'ang mistakenly named the source as Hung Kua's *Li shih*), but filled in by the compiler of the 645 AD 續高僧傳, ch. 230. That of 224 is retained in SKC 2, p. 84.

do not think that Ts'ao P'i, still nominally in mourning, would have snubbed Chang Lu, a warrior so greatly rewarded by his father.

We have seen, though, that Li Fu's story broadcast a negative image of Chang Lu. To understand this, we turn, finally, to the Li Fu document, translated above.

8

In 220, Li Fu narrated to Ts'ao P'i the following facts:

- a. People in Shu mistakenly assumed that in 213 Ts'ao Ts'ao was made a king upon the establishment of his Wei fief.⁸⁰ Chiang Ho and Li Shu came to Li Fu in Han-chung with revelatory news about the Ts'aos, yet the two men made the same mistake. Thus their revelation occurred between mid-summer 213 and mid-summer 216 (when Ts'ao Ts'ao in fact was made king and no one would have been mistaken);
- b. the revelation claimed that the new emperor would be a Wei duke, specifically Ts'ao P'i. Chiang inferred from the oracle that, conversely, a king of Wei (viz. Ts'ao Ts'ao [sic]), could not be heir to the Han;
- c. Li Fu described the oracle to Chang Lu, who made Chiang Ho appear before him. Chiang named a source oracle-book;
- d. a month went by, and further proof of the oracle came about in the form of a fugitive (or possibly a wraith) who independently wrote the same oracular message;
- e. Chang Lu's true intent was to make allegiance with the Wei court (P'ei Sung-chih in fact criticized Ts'ao Ts'ao's kindness towards Chang Lu).⁸¹ But because Chang Lu was deluded by his religious practices, he failed to understand the pro-Ts'ao P'i message, and continued planning his surrender to Ts'ao Ts'ao. His expression "slave of [such] a duke of Wei" in fact may be seen as an angry retort to the Chiang Ho oracle, as if saying: "I'd rather sink to being a slave in this so-called 'duke' Ts'ao P'i's court, than to go over to Liu Pei." The time frame can thus be drawn more exactly – it was the month, or perhaps two, prior to late December, 215;
- f. Chang was so infuriated by his lieutenants' (probably Yen P'u's) lack of immediate approval of pro-Ts'ao Ts'ao plans, and perhaps also by the

attempt to promote Ts'ao P'i (which he rebuffed), that he became ill; g. Chiang Ho turned coat after failing to interest Chang Lu in Ts'ao P'i: he was one of the first to welcome Ts'ao Ts'ao in Yeh and died there in about 219; and

h. Li Fu mentioned the numerous omens observed since Ts'ao P'i took the noble title of king of Wei (April, 220), and that these supported the truth of Chiang Ho's oracle.

The facts contained here are believable to varying degrees. A key to our understanding of Chang Lu's death and the leadership and location of the movement is the implication of internal friction. Chiang Ho, possibly supported temporarily by Yen P'u, argued for a surrender neither to Ts'ao Ts'ao nor to Liu Pei, in contradiction to Li Fu and Chang Lu. Yen at this time seems to have advised taking up, prior to any other strategies, Liu Pei's offer to go westward. Chiang introduced a pro-Ts'ao P'i position, implying that Chang Lu should remain independent and wait. Also, the conversation took place in about November or December of 215, and Chang's health took a sudden downturn – both important items.

My argument here is that the Five-Peck movement was in the throes of dissolution: Chang Lu was failing in leadership and may have been ill or entirely over-anxious, and Ts'ao Ts'ao was growing old. Pictured as allies, they held out the promise of good times for the movement, but the picture was now dimming. Chiang Ho can be seen as a potential leader of the movement, jockeying for position. Li Fu was a loyal aide to Chang Lu who stayed with the pro-Ts'ao line, but who was tempted to paint a less than pretty picture of Chang when he was face-to-face with Ts'ao P'i. Li Fu may have considered that a role for Celestial-Master Taoism at the Wei court was politically more important than presenting loyal hagiographies. We know that Ts'ao P'i was not enamored of Taoist religious sentiments and movements, and thus would have delighted in Li's narrative.

In this review of historiographic sources, we have no indication of Chang Lu's activities beyond early 216, and in addition some indication that he became ill at that time. There is compelling negative evidence that Chang was not alive in 219, when Chiang Ho greeted Ts'ao Ts'ao in Yeh. There is positive evidence that Chang's young sons and a daughter were set up at the Wei courts in Yeh and Hsü-ch'ang 許昌, that great numbers of Five-Peck followers went to Yeh, and that several important Five-Peck spokesmen (Yen P'u, Chiang Ho, and Li Fu) went either to Yeh or to Hsü-

⁸⁰ Ts'ao Ts'ao took the title of duke when the fief was established in 213, and he remained "duke" until 216, when he was advanced to "king." Ts'ao P'i never held title as "duke," but went from general of court gentlemen (since 211) to heir-apparent to the kingship, in November of 217.

⁸¹ *SKC* 8, p. 265, cit. P'ei's comment.

ch'ang, or both. We now turn to the Taoist scriptures.

Evidence of the Movement's Early Years in Two Taoist Scriptures

Anna Seidel's work has proved to be among the most useful for establishing a chronology and an ethos of early Chinese religions. In 1969 she turned her attention to portions of a Taoist scripture, *Cheng-i fa-wen t'ien-shih-chiao chieh-k'o ching* (*Official Text of the Correct Unity [Sect]: The Scripture of Regulations for the Celestial-Master Teaching*) 正一法文天師教戒科經, that purport to date from the Ts'ao-Wei dynasty, or possibly Ts'ao Ts'ao's last years. Seidel described the narrative voice, which although hard to determine, was apparently that of a "Celestial-Master" leader, perhaps Chang Lu or his successor.⁸² This leader, in a pontifical role as "national teacher" 國師, offers to affirm Ts'ao rule if the dynasty will only accept the Tao. Seidel implied, cautiously, that at one point the text is located within the time 217-220, and that the "Wu-ti" referred to is Ts'ao Ts'ao.⁸³ As Seidel warned, it is hard to determine to whom the word "I" (or "We") in the text refers: in fact it may indicate the voice of Lord Lao himself.

It is good that Seidel tread softly over the issues of dating and narrative voice. This is because other scholars had already focused on them. But the research in question did not come into wide circulation until only the last decade. And although Seidel's herculean 1991 effort to summarize the field did not include non-western scholarship, one suspects that she may have known the particular ones here.⁸⁴ Coming before her on the same subject were Hu Shih 胡適 and Yang Lien-sheng 楊蓮生, whose epistolary exchange in the late 1950s on the date of *Chieh-k'o ching* has now appeared as appendix 2 of the revised edition of Jao Tsung-i's 饒宗頤 study of the Hsiang-erh 想爾 *Lao-tzu*,⁸⁵ and at about the same time, but not published until later, was T'ang Ch'ang-ju's work.⁸⁶

T'ang's is the most useful for our purposes: it synthesizes the problem

⁸² Seidel, *La Division de Lao tseu dans le Taoisme des Han*, Publications de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient 71 (Paris: École Française d'Extrême-Orient, 1969), p. 80-84.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 82 (citing *T'ien-shih-chiao chieh-k'o ching*, p. 18a, l. 2); and *idem*, "The Image of the Perfect Ruler in Early Taoist Messianism: Lao-tzu and Li Hung," *History of Religions* 9.2-3 (1969-70), p. 227, n. 35 (note the misprint of the character for "Wu" in "Wu-ti").

⁸⁴ See her "Chronicle of Taoist Studies in the West 1950-1990," in *Cahiers d'extrême Asie* 5 (1989-90), pp. 223-347.

⁸⁵ Jao, *Lao-tzu*, pp. 162-66.

⁸⁶ T'ang, "T'ien-shih tao"; these scholars' findings are utilized in Barrett's "Taoist Papacy."

areas surrounding the scripture and explains in great detail the makeup of its constituent parts. T'ang also feels that the narrative voice was that of the Lord Lao. But more important is his skilled use of philology and historiographic materials to show that although the time of the actual writing of the pertinent passages was the several decades before the beginning of Northern Wei (386 AD), it relies on conditions that actually existed from 215 to 230. Several of the scripture's allusions refer to the evacuations of Chang Lu's followers to Yeh, to the fact that the Five-Peck movement was rudderless after 216, and to the apparent reestablishment of Five-Peck administrative categories as titles for the followers now settled in Yeh and coopted into the incipient Wei regime.⁸⁷ T'ang framed his study by explaining that Ts'ao P'i was negative towards the religion, but his son, the emperor Ming, was not. This is why the movement was vulnerable and struggling for an influential leader between 216 and 226. The Li Fu document, I believe, provides even further support for every one of T'ang's assertions.

Finally, T'ang brings into his discussion the second of the Taoist scriptures, one that I have not seen discussed by others. He shows that Chang Lu went to Yeh, leading his minions, in January, 216, after the surrender and died there within the year. The source is taken from the *Declarations of the Perfected* 真告: "The hereditary leader Chang was made general-who-quells-the-south and died in the twenty-first year of Chien-an 建安 (ranging from February 6, 216, to January 25 of 217); he was buried in the east [section] of Yeh."⁸⁸ Once again, the Li Fu document is good ancillary support, reporting both Chang's sudden illness and the fact that Chiang Ho - not Chang Lu - met Ts'ao Ts'ao in Yeh in 219.

CONCLUSION

The Li Fu document came from annals that were drafted, probably in stages from 195 to perhaps about 221 or 222, by Liu Ai, who was privy to much of the political activity of the Shu region. It reflects a pro-Han point of view: Chang Lu's movement is cast as a struggling one, its leader failing and somewhat deluded, and the messengers of the Shu oracle as mistaken

⁸⁷ T'ang, "T'ien-shih tao," pp. 222-23, 227-31.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 230, citing *Chen kao* 4 (sect. "張鎮南之夜解").

about Ts'ao Ts'ao's political position. Furthermore, it depicts Ts'ao Ts'ao as strategically naive in his solicitous position towards the movement. It portrays Ts'ao P'i as unfilial, because in the state of mourning he accepted an oracle that announced his father's unworthiness to rule.

The Celestial Masters, led temporarily by men like Li Fu and Chiang Ho, likely were seeking recognition from the Ts'ao court, which fits perfectly with both the ethos that was purposefully recreated in *Chieh-k'o ching* in the fourth century and with the fact that the movement remained alive in Yeh.⁸⁹ It is now possible to say that the persons known to have moved to southern China in the third century and who professed Celestial-Master Taoist ideas (as described by T'ang) created a powerful resonance in people's imaginations. The third-century Celestial-Master movement was a bigger, longer-lasting event than heretofore thought.

Li Fu's memorial thus is a kind of religious precept, an invocation for Ts'ao P'i's coming enthronement, which took place only three or four weeks after the memorial was submitted and which emphasized revelatory texts. As such, the document assumes a valuable place in a long tradition of court religious preceptors that picked up steam in the coming centuries, only to become a more entrenched element of political culture, specifically dynastic legitimation.⁹⁰ We have our would-be priests and a founding dynasty that wanted their participation. But where were Celestial-Master theology and liturgy? This final note: in the political exigencies of the moment there was probably no special time at court for preaching the Tao. The receipt and broadcast of the oracle-text – a normative part of politics – was the teaching in and of itself. Taoism, as it formed in the last decades of the Han, was heavily oriented not only towards Lao-tzu the godhead, the legendary Yellow Emperor, and practices involving healing through circulation of the Tao, but also towards neo-classical revelation, talismans, and the

patently Chinese, even Confucian, arts of divination. A shared indigenous culture, as Anna Seidel showed in many of her works, flowed from all directions into Taoist messianism.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

HHS	<i>Hou Han-shu</i> 後漢書
SKC	<i>San-kuo chih</i> 三國志
SKCCC	<i>San-kuo chih chi-chieh</i> 三國志集解
SS	<i>Sui-shu</i> 隋書
TCIC/F	A. Fang, trans., <i>The Chronicle of the Three Kingdoms</i>
YHCHTC	<i>Yuan-ho chün-hsien t'u-chih</i> 元和郡縣圖志

⁸⁹ This is a point made by Ch'en Yin-k'o 陳寅恪, "P'ien-shih tao yü pin-hai ti-yü chih kuan-hsi" 天師道與濱海地域之關係, rpt. in idem, *Chin-ming kuan ts'ung-kao ch'u-pien* 金明館叢稿初編 (Shanghai: Shang-hai ku-chi, 1980) 2, pp. 1-40, who uses *Chien-kao* considerably as a source of evidence about the later movement.

⁹⁰ See Anna Seidel's "Imperial Treasures and Taoist Sacraments: Taoist Roots in the Apocrypha," in vol. 2 of Michel Strickmann, ed., *Tantric and Taoist Studies: In Honour of R. A. Stein*, *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* 21 (Brussels: Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises, 1983), pp. 291-371; Franciscus Verellen, "Liturgy and Sovereignty: The Role of Taoist Ritual in the Foundation of the Shu Kingdom (907-925)," *AM* 3d ser. 2.1 (1989), pp. 59-78; and Ruth Dunnell, "The Hsia Origins of the Yüan Institution of Imperial Preceptor," *AM* 3d ser. 5.1 (1992), pp. 85-112.