

# THE CHIU WU-TAI SHIH AND HISTORY-WRITING DURING THE FIVE DYNASTIES

by WANG GUNG-WU

The Five Dynasties period in Chinese history (907-59) has received little attention from historians in the West. Only very lately has there been interest in this turbulent half-century. But till now, nothing in an European language has appeared about the value of the major source of the history of the Five Dynasties, the *Chiu Wu-tai shih* (hereafter referred to as the *Old History* or the *History*). Professor W. Eberhard has been particularly interested in this period and, in 1948, proposed to study the work. But to the best of my knowledge, such a study has yet to be made.<sup>1</sup>

## I

Our present editions of the *Old History* are not from the original work compiled in 973-4, but from the re-compiled work completed in 1775 by the Ch'ing scholar Shao Chin-han (邵晉涵, 1743-96) and then collated by a team of scholars of the Ssü-k'ü kuan. The original work was supplemented by the posthumous *New Wu-tai History* of Ou-yang Hsiu about a hundred years after its compilation. It was probably still used for examination purposes till the early years of the Southern Sung dynasty (after 1127), and was certainly so used by the Chin (Juchen) National University till 1207 when it was taken off the syllabus. After 1207, it was more and more neglected and was wholly replaced by the *New History*.<sup>2</sup> The Yüan official collection of *Seventeen Histories* did not include it, nor did the Ming collection of *Twenty-one Histories*.

The Imperial Catalogue (*Ssü-k'ü ch'üan-shu tsung-mu t'i-yao*) reports that there was a copy of the original work in the Ming Imperial Library, but it has been doubted whether the list of copies of the *Wu-tai History* in the Ming *Wên-yüan ko Catalogue* actually included a copy of the *Old History*.<sup>3</sup> In any case, it certainly survived till early Ming times when the *Yung-lo ta-tien* was compiled (1403-08). This encyclopædia broke up the

<sup>1</sup> W. Eberhard, "Some sociological remarks on the system of provincial administration during the period of the Five Dynasties", *Studia Serica*, No. 7, 1948, p. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Shao Erh-yün *Nien-p'u*, pp. 52b-53a; *Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period*, p. 637; Chiao Shih sui-pi, p. 84b.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 84b-85a.

original work to fit in with its needs, but it quoted the *History* very fully and thus preserved most of it. It is not known how well preserved was the edition of the *History* used. It has to be assumed that it was in comparatively good condition.

There are several accounts of surviving copies of the original work in late Ming and early Ch'ing. A Ming book collector in Fukien had a copy which survived the early Ch'ing years and was reported to have come on the market in the Chia-ch'ing period (1796-1820) before it was lost.<sup>4</sup> The seventeenth-century scholar Huang Tsung-hsi was said to have had a copy which was later destroyed in a fire. And Wu Jên-ch'ên, the author of *Shih-kuo ch'un-ch'iu*, seemed to have consulted a copy of the *Old History* other than that of Huang Tsung-hsi. But nothing else is known of it.<sup>5</sup>

Recently, there have been claims that a copy of a Chin edition owned by a collector in Chekiang in Ch'ing times (an 1199 edition, but spoken of by the collector himself as of the Ta-ting period, 1161-89) may have been the one sold as lately as in 1915 in Hongkong.<sup>6</sup> Several attempts have been made to trace this. The copy has not re-appeared and there is little reason to believe that the original work is still in existence.

We are thus left with the re-compiled work which the editorial introduction of the present editions claims is eight- to nine-tenths of the original. The text was chiefly taken out of the *Yung-lo ta-tien* and put together according to the sectional breakdown given in the *Yü hai* as 61 chüans of Basic Annals, 12 of Monographs, and 77 of Biographies.<sup>7</sup> Supplementary materials and corrections of the *Yung-lo ta-tien* copyists' errors were based

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 85a. There is some confusion over this. Chang Yüan-chi says that the nineteenth-century bibliophile Lu Hsin-yüan (陸心源) noted that the work came on the market in 1796-1820, and the famous eighteenth-century collector, Chao Yü (趙昱) tried to buy it. But Chao Yü died in 1747. Lu was wrong either about the time and meant the (early part of the) previous reign-period of Ch'ien-lung, 1736-95, or about the person and was thinking of Chao Yü's family, possibly the grandson Tsai-yüan (載元), for his son I-ch'ing (一淸) had also died (about 1764) before the Chia-ch'ing period.

<sup>5</sup> Huang Tsung-hsi, *Nan-hai wen-ting*, Appendix, p. 4b, contains a letter to him from Wu Jên-ch'ên saying that he would like a loan of his copy of the *Old History* for purposes of collation. The eighteenth-century historian Ch'üan Tsu-wang (全祖望) noted that this copy was destroyed in a fire. Wu Jên-ch'ên frequently says in *Shih-kuo ch'un-ch'iu* that he follows the *Old History* version.

<sup>6</sup> *Chiao Shih sui-pi*, pp. 85a-86b, quotes an account of this written by the collector himself, and another account of the sale of the precious copy by the man who claims to have sold it.

<sup>7</sup> *Yü hai*, 46, 45a. The Editorial Note (提要) in the *Old History* says that this was quoted from the Chung Hsing Catalogue, and this has been widely accepted, for example, in *Shih-ch'i shih shang-ch'üeh*, *Nien-Érh-shih cha-chi* and a modern work like *Nien-wu Shih Lun Kang*. But Chao Shih-wei doubts this and does not include it in his re-compiled Chung Hsing Catalogue; *Chung-hsing kuan-ko shu-mu chi-kao*, 2, 48. The note in *Yü hai* was probably made by Wang Ying-lin himself.

on surviving contemporary documents and early Sung works, and given full references.

The Basic Annals have been fully recovered with the exception of the Annals for the reign of Liang T'ai-tsu (907-12), of which only a few fragments have survived, some in the *Tsü-chih t'ung-chien k'ao-i*. Most of the seven chüans in our present editions have been elaborately reconstructed from materials in the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei*. The editors have assumed, with some justification, that these materials were similar to those in the *Old History*. Eight of the Monographs have also been preserved in the *Yung-lo ta-tien*. The two on Economics and Geography, which are missing, have been partially filled by quotations of the *History* found in the *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan* and annotated with similar information found in works like the *Wu-tai hui-yao*.

As for the Biographies quoted in the *Yung-lo ta-tien*, those of the empresses and other members of the Imperial Families were incomplete and had to be considerably supplemented with other materials. The remaining biographies were much better preserved. The editors followed the original order of compilation wherever the historians' comments (論贊) at the end of each chüan were also preserved. Otherwise, they were grouped according to the person's activities and period.

There were many changes in the original text. This was because the Manchu emperors were conscious of their ancestral links with the Khitans who played such a great part in Wu-tai history. So the final approved edition had all the unflattering names for the Khitans changed and the Liao official titles now follow those used in the *Liao History* (遼史).<sup>8</sup>

The re-compiled work went through at least three stages of revision before it was finally printed in 1784. This was the palace edition and was the only one in circulation for more than a hundred years. At an early stage of revision, between 1775 and 1784, a manuscript copy, now called the Ssü-k'u ch'üan-shu copy (四庫全書寫本), was made which has survived. This was privately printed in 1921. At another stage before the final revision for publication, another manuscript copy was made, probably a copy of Shao Chin-han's original re-compilation, which has survived. In 1925, this was printed, also privately, by Liu Ch'êng-kan (劉承幹) of Chekiang who had bought the manuscript from a great family library at Ningpo.<sup>9</sup> There is a fourth version which has not been printed. This is the revision of Shao Chin-han's work by his friend K'ung Chi-han (孔繼涵).

<sup>8</sup> The *Old History* used a variety of words for "barbarians" and "bandits" for the Khitans. These were altered in the official edition. See Ch'en Yüan, *Chiu Wu-tai shih Chi-pên fa-fu*, *passim*, for examples of this Ch'ing "taboo".

<sup>9</sup> A manuscript copy of this survived as a "rare book" in the Peip'ing National Library and has been micro-filmed by the Library of Congress. A copy of the micro-film (A319-320) is in the Chinese library of the University of Cambridge.

It seems to have been based on the manuscript which was finally printed in 1925.<sup>10</sup>

Three editions are now available. Two of them at least have been found sufficiently different to be retained separately.

The texts of the three editions are more or less the same. Only the notes differ considerably.

According to Chang Yüan-chi, the 1925 edition contains some 1370 items, which is 538 items more than those in the palace edition, and 471 items more than those in the 1921 edition. On the other hand, there are 39 items in the palace edition and three items in the 1921 edition which are not included in the 1925 edition.<sup>11</sup> And finally, there are, in both the 1921 and the 1925 editions, all the chüan numbers of the *Yung-lo ta-tien* where each quotation was found which the palace edition has omitted. The palace edition retains its official importance, while the Po-na edition has made the 1925 edition available to a wider public.

It is clear that the present reconstructed editions of the *Old History* are as close to the original as can be hoped for in the case of a work that has been lost for at least 350 years. But before the surviving parts of it can be appreciated, it is necessary to return to its actual compilation and the materials from which it was compiled. This would also illuminate a period of history-writing which is quite well documented.

## II

The *Yü hai* records that in the 4th month of 973 (4th/973), the compilation was ordered of the history of the five dynasties of Liang, T'ang, Chin, Han and Chou. In the intercalary 10th/974, the work was completed in 150 chüans. Hsüeh Chü-chêng (薛居正), who was appointed Chief Minister and Supervisor of National History in 5th/973, supervised the compilation.<sup>12</sup> The actual work was left in the hands of seven other men.

The first of these, Lu To-hsün (盧多遜, 934-85), was perhaps a natural choice as he had been the last but one director of the History Office (968-71) and a powerful figure at this time. He was, however, politically

<sup>10</sup> *Chiao Shih sui-pi*, p. 87a ff., and the colophon to the Po-na edition of the *Old History*.

<sup>11</sup> *Chiao Shih sui-pi*, p. 87a. Chang Yüan-chi devoted considerable time to such textual problems. He has also compared the K'ung Chi-han revision (which has not been printed) with the 1925 edition and found that the revision had 381 items of notes less than the latter, with 23 items partly the same and only 65 items which were new.

<sup>12</sup> His biography (*SS*, 264, 1a-2a) says that he supervised the compilation from 972 and that the work was completed after more than a year. This must have been an error on the part of his biographer. The date given in the *Yü hai* (46, 45a) is confirmed in Lu To-sun's biography (*SS*, 264, 4b-7a) as well as in the *Hsiü T'zu-chih t'ung-chien ch'ang-pien* (14, 4a, and 15, 9b-10a). The *Sung hui-yao kao* (Chih-kuan section, vol. 38, p. 75a) also says that Hsüeh Chü-chêng was made responsible for the compilation of the *Wu-tai History* in 973 and then became Chief Minister and Supervisor of National History.

very active in 973-4 and was also engaged in other official writings. It is doubtful if he played a major part in this compilation.<sup>13</sup> More important was Hu Mêng (扈蒙, 915-86), also a natural choice as he was then director of the History Office. He had also been the chief compiler in 960-1 of the last set of the *Veritable Records* (that of Chou Shih-tsung). The division of authority between him and his previous superior, Lu To-sun, who was twenty years younger, is not clear. It is probable that there were disagreements between the two, for only a year after the work was completed, the conflict came into the open and Lu To-sun, who had become a deputy chief minister, had him sent out to the provinces.<sup>14</sup>

The third man, Li Fang (李昉, 925-96), had been a director of the History Office and Hu Mêng's superior some fifteen years earlier. His collaboration with Hu Mêng seems to have been successful.<sup>15</sup> So was that of the fourth compiler, Li Mu (李穆, 928-84), who had never been in the History Office before. A few years later, the three men came together again to compile the records of the Sung founder. Li Mu seems to have been so successful in his first work in history that he was twice made the director of the History Office soon afterwards.<sup>16</sup>

The fifth compiler, Chang Tan (張澹, 919-74), was experienced in writing official history, having been a co-compiler with Hu Mêng in 960-1. He was, however, found wanting in practical affairs and was sent in disgrace to the provinces early in the Sung dynasty. His part in editing the *Old History* was probably due to the influence of Hu Mêng. But as he died in 6th/974, five months before the work was submitted, it is not known whether he had completed his share of the work.<sup>17</sup> Of the remaining two compilers, there is no information apart from their names, Liu Chien (劉兼) and Li Chiu-ling (李九齡).<sup>18</sup>

The work was completed in a little over a year and a half. This was possible chiefly because the eleven *Veritable Records* (*shih-lu* 實錄) of the Five Dynasties were intact. The compilers had followed the Records very closely and the main criticism of the work was in fact directed against its slavish concurrence with them. None of the Records, however, have survived, so the extent to which they were copied cannot be exactly known. The *History* was also criticized for its failure to use more original sources. There can still be found in various Sung library catalogues like the *Ch'ung-*

*wên tsung-mu* and *Chung-hsing shu-mu*, the titles of several non-official works. But there is no evidence that these were used by the compilers.<sup>19</sup>

In addition to the *Veritable Records*, two other works based on them helped the compilers of the *Old History*. The first was the *T'ung-lu* (通錄) by Fan Chih (范質). Fan Chih was a Chief Minister and Supervisor of National History who thought that the *Veritable Records* were too cumbersome, and, in 960-2, re-edited them to make this 65-chüan work. Very little is known of the book which did not survive the Sung dynasty, but it has been praised for having cut out the redundancies and corrected the errors in the *Veritable Records*.<sup>20</sup> The other work was the *Wu-tai hui-yao* in 30 chüans by Wang P'u (王溥). He was in virtual retirement when he completed this but had also been a Chief Minister and Supervisor of National History. He presented it to the throne, with a similar collection for the T'ang dynasty, in 961. This collection was quite distinct from the work by Fan Chih but was complementary to it in that it provided the materials concerning institutions while the *T'ung-lu* was chiefly about events and people.

The compilers of the *Old Wu-tai History* must have found these two books a considerable help in putting the confusing period and the great detail of the *Veritable Records* into better perspective. In fact, the *Sung hui-yao kao* refers significantly to the work of these compilers as "revising (重修) the *Wu-tai history*".<sup>21</sup>

The importance of *Veritable Records* has always been acknowledged. They were compiled from original documents sent to the Imperial Archives, various contemporary writings on men and events (especially biographical notices, 行狀), and most important of all, the Imperial Diaries (起居注) prepared by Imperial Recorders (起居郎 and 起居舍人). There were also the Court Diaries (時政記) first prepared in Empress Wu's reign at the end of the seventh century and later on revived and continually submitted till the last year of the Five Dynasties. These were compiled monthly by one of the Chief Ministers, possibly by the man who had also the title of Supervisor of National History. In the last century of T'ang, a new record, the *Diary* (日曆) was introduced which was chiefly compiled from the Imperial and Court Diaries. This was continued in the *Wu-tai*, and served

<sup>13</sup> As it is doubtful how much was used, I have decided not to include a list of them. They may easily be referred to in the two catalogues mentioned. The *T'ung-chien k'ao-i*, chs. 27-30, where some of these are quoted, confirms the impression that none of them were used by the compilers.

<sup>14</sup> *Yü hai*, 48, 10b. It adds that there were a total of 360 chüans of *Veritable Records*. In Table II following, it is shown that the *Veritable Records* did not exceed 265 chüans while the total *Official Records* was only 311 chüans (if the supplementary set of *Revised Records* for Liang were included, it would still not have exceeded 341 chüans). If 360 was an error for 260, it would still have been five chüans short of the total number now known.

<sup>21</sup> *Sung hui-yao kao*, Chih-kuan section, vol. 18, 75a.

<sup>13</sup> *SS*, 264, 4b-7a; and *Hsiü Tsü-chih t'ung-chien ch'ang-pien*, 14, 3b and 14 a-b for his activities during this year.

<sup>14</sup> *SS*, 269, 3a-4a.

<sup>15</sup> *SS*, 265, 1a-3b. He is better known as the editor of the famous collection, the *Wên-yüan ying-hua* (文苑英華).

<sup>16</sup> His biography (*SS*, 263, 11b-12b) does not mention his part in this compilation. He is mentioned in Hu Mêng's biography, *SS*, 269, 3a; and in *Yü hai*, 46, 45a.

<sup>17</sup> *SS*, 269, 8a-b; and *Ch'ang-pien*, 15, 4b.

<sup>18</sup> *Nien-Erh shih cha-chi*, 20, 24a, taken from the *Chün-chai tu-shu chih*.

as a preliminary collection of materials for compiling the Veritable Records later on.<sup>22</sup>

In short, the Veritable Records were a kind of contemporary history, one step further from the collection, collation and even selection of documents. It was one more stage of selection, sorting out the materials to a manageable size. A short T'ang example of one of them is still partially extant and illustrates some of the features which must have persisted in the Wu-tai Veritable Records.<sup>23</sup>

None of these for the Wu-tai have survived. But a certain amount of information about them still may be found. I hope by the following table to show what they were like and then follow with brief studies of each of them.

TABLE I. WU-TAI VERITABLE RECORDS<sup>24</sup>

Title (Veritable Records)	No. of chüans	Period covered	Date of compilation	Names of Compilers
1. <i>Liang T'ai-tsu</i> (梁太祖)	30	907-12	915-18 <sup>25</sup>	Li Ch'i (李琪), Chang Kun (張袞), Hsi Yin-hsiang (郗殷象) and Fêng Hsi-chia (馮錫嘉)
2. <i>T'ang Chuang-tsung</i> (唐莊宗)	30	908-26	929	Chang Chao (張昭), Chao Fêng (趙鳳) and Lü Hsien-hsiu (呂咸休)
3. <i>T'ang Ming-tsung</i> (明宗)	30	926-33	935-6	Chang Chao, Li Hsiang (李祥), Wu Ch'êng-fan (吳承範), Yang Chao-chien (楊昭儉) and Yao I (姚頌)
4. <i>T'ang Min-ti</i> (閔帝)	3	933-4	957	Chang Chao, Yin Cho (尹拙), (and Liu Wên-sou, 劉溫叟)

<sup>22</sup> WTHY, 18, p. 227; *T'ang hui-yao*, 63, pp. 1089-90; Chin Yü-fu's article in *Kuo-shih-kuan kuan-k'ao*, 1/2 (1948), pp. 6-18.

<sup>23</sup> There are the Veritable Records for Shun-tsung's short reign in 805; translated by Bernard J. Solomon, Harvard, 1955.

<sup>24</sup> This table has been compiled from information given in WTHY, 18, pp. 231-2; TFYK, chüans 554 and 557; CWTS, chüans 18 (5a), 40 (3a-b), 48 (1a), 92 (4a), 102 (2a, 4b), 111 (5a), 116 (7b), 117 (1a), 120 (4a) and 131 (4a-5a); SS, chüans 249 (5a), 262 (11b-12b), 263 (2a-4a, 6b) and 431 (14a-b); and *Ch'ang Pien*, 2, 144.

<sup>25</sup> CWTS, 18, 52, says that the work was completed in the reign-period 915-20. So was Ching Hsiang's *Revised Records*, which suggests that the *Veritable Records* was prepared in the earlier half of the period. I suggest that it was done before 918 because the man who was still the Redactor and Compiler of the History Office in 918, Tou Chuan (竇纂) who would normally have had a hand in its preparation, was not involved; CWTS, 9, 3b.

5. <i>T'ang Fei-ti</i> (廢帝)	17	934-6	957	Chang Chao, Yin Cho (and Liu Wên-shou)
6. <i>Chin Kao-tsu</i> (晉高祖)	30	936-42	950-1	Chia Wei (賈緯), Wang Shên (王伸), Tou Yen (賈儼) and (Tou Chên-ku, 竇貞固, and Su Fêng-chi, 蘇逢吉)
7. <i>Chin Shao-ti</i> (少帝)	20	942-6	950-1	Chia Wei, Wang Shên, Tou Yen (and Tou Chên-ku and Su Fêng-chi)
8. <i>Han Kao-tsu</i> (漢高祖)	20	947-8	949	Chia Wei, Wang Shên, Tou Yen and Su Fêng-chi
9. <i>Han Yin-ti</i> (隱帝)	15	948-50	957	Chang Chao, Liu Wên-shou (and Yin Cho)
10. <i>Chou T'ai-tsu</i> (周太祖)	30	951-4	957-8	Chang Chao, Yin Cho and Liu Wên-shou
11. <i>Chou Shih-tsung</i> (世宗)	40	954-9	960-1	Hu Mêng, Chang Tan, Wang Ko (王格), Tung Ch'un (董淳) and Wang P'u

265

1. Except for Li Ch'i, a Chief Minister of the Liang, the compilers of *Liang T'ai-tsu Veritable Records* are little known and Li Ch'i's part in the compilation is dubious as the Sung works referring to these Veritable Records do not mention him. None of them, however, seem to have been historians before they compiled the work.<sup>26</sup> On its completion, the *Records* were found to be full of omissions and Ching Hsiang (敬翔), one of the Chief Ministers, was ordered to re-edit the materials and fill in the necessary gaps. Ching Hsiang then produced the *Revised Records of Great Liang* (大梁編遺錄) in 30 chüans.<sup>27</sup> This second collection, however, was not highly regarded by later historians who condemned Ching Hsiang's admiration for the founder of the dynasty. One Sung bibliographer went so far as

<sup>26</sup> *Ch'ung-wên tsung-mu* (2, pp. 55-6), *T'ung-chih* (65, 7a) and *T'ung-chien k'ao-i* (26, 3a) say that it was compiled by Hsi Hsiang, while SS, I Wen Chih, says it was compiled by Chang Kun and Hsi Hsiang.

Chang Kun is mentioned as a secretary of the Grand Imperial Secretariat (CWTS, 147, 1a) and Hsi Hsiang as a vice-president in the Ministry of War (CWTS, 68, 3a; of his early career in the T'ang, see *Chiu T'ang-shu*, 20A, 29b and 20B, 5b). Fêng Hsi-chia, the fourth compiler, became later a vice-president of the Ministry of Finance (CWTS, 30, 5b).

<sup>27</sup> CWTS, 18, 5a. Also known as *Chu Liang Hsiang Ch'uang I Pien* (朱梁興創遺編) in 20 chüans in the *Chih-chai shu-lu chieh-t'i*, 5, p. 142. *T'ung Chih*, 65, 6a, agrees with the CWTS, and so does *Nien-Érh-shih cha-chi*, 20, 24a-b. *T'ung-chien k'ao-i*, chüan 28, refers to it as just *Pien-tu*.

to speak of Ching Hsiang's "shameless" descriptions of the usurper of the T'ang throne and to criticize his literary style as vulgar.<sup>28</sup> This was probably quite unfair, for the *T'ung-chien k'ao-i* shows it to have been a major source for Liang history, augmenting and correcting the *Veritable Records*.

There was a third source for this period, 907-12, which the *Old History* used, that is, the *Liang Biographies* (梁列傳) in 15 chüans. This was a work compiled some time after the end of the Liang dynasty by an unknown author and was also called the *Liang Biographies of Meritorious Officials* in the *T'ung-chien k'ao-i*. From the three quotations preserved there, it would seem that this source was sometimes preferred to the two *Records*.<sup>29</sup>

With three sources for this period of six years (907-12), it contrasted strongly with the following period of twelve years (912-23). There is evidence that Imperial and Court Diaries and administrative reports, as well as biographical notices of the chief figures during this reign, were collected by the History Office till the last years of the dynasty.<sup>30</sup> But the Hou-T'ang successors were determined to regard the Liang as a "false"<sup>31</sup> dynasty and no attempt was made to preserve them. Further, there was no precedent for writing up the Records of a fallen dynasty. Liang had not done so for the last emperors of T'ang, and its successors certainly had no obligation to do so for a usurper's progeny. These were the only years of the whole period of the Five Dynasties without *Veritable Records*. The only set which dealt with the period was that for T'ang Chuang-tsung. This devoted considerable space to Chuang-tsung's early career when he was fighting Liang, but the events of 908-23 would have been compiled from an enemy's point of view.

There were, however, attempts later to fill this gap. One was in 957 when Chang Chao tried to compile *Veritable Records* for Mo-ti's reign. He had to abandon it because no adequate materials for these years had survived.<sup>32</sup> Later in 960-2 when Fan Chih worked on his *T'ung-lu* he was

<sup>28</sup> *Chih-chai shu-lu chieh-t'i*, 5, p. 142.

<sup>29</sup> *T'ung-chien k'ao-i*, 28, 5a and 7b, quote the *Liang Biographies of Meritorious Officials*, while in 28, 3b, it quotes the *Liang Biographies*. *Ch'ung-wên tsung-mu*, 2, p. 56, and *T'ung chih*, 65, 6a, are both wrong to call it a work by Chang Chao.

<sup>30</sup> In 2nd/921, the History Office asked that biographical notices be prepared of important officials and all relevant memorials, etc., in private hands be submitted for collation with the records of the Imperial Secretariat; *CWTS*, 10, 3a-b.

<sup>31</sup> In 929, an ex-Liang Chief Minister wrote the epitaph for a Liang general without using the word "false" (*wei* 偽) when referring to the dynasty. He was promptly criticized for this and ordered to re-write the epitaph; *CWTS*, 40, 3b.

<sup>32</sup> *WTHY*, 18, p. 232, gives the impression that these records were successfully compiled and *Nien-êrh-shih cha-chi*, 20, 24b, which quotes from it, actually says that they were completed, and adds that "it can thus be seen that there were *Veritable Records* for all the emperors of the Five Dynasties". But this is wrong. Both Chang Chao's biography in *SS*, 263, 4a, and the *Ch'ung-wên tsung-mu*, 2, p. 49, make it quite clear that the work on Liang records had to be abandoned.

faced with this gap in the *Veritable Records*. He therefore "filled it himself with what he heard and found" and was highly praised for making excellent order out of the available material.<sup>33</sup> How much he did find though is not recorded.

It is therefore no wonder that the longest of the five dynasties was so poorly served in the *Old History*. Of the 10 chüans of *Basic Annals* of Liang in the *History*, seven dealt with the six years of T'ai-tsu's reign and three with the eleven years of Mo-ti's. Further, there were few biographies of men who were active during the later half of the dynasty.

2. The *Chuang-tsung Veritable Records* covered the whole period of 908-26 and almost linked up the two T'ang dynasties by ignoring the Liang. The work was planned not long after Chuang-tsung's death in 927, but it was not till 6th/929 that Chang Chao was placed in charge of the work. He had been chosen because he had, on his own initiative, started to collect materials for the work.<sup>34</sup>

It is important to note that a new era of history-writing began with this set of *Veritable Records* and put an end to more than half a century of haphazard and lost records. Chang Chao could work on materials put together by a reorganized History Office. This reorganization, though without innovations, deserves a short account here because it illustrates the nature of some of the raw materials which entered the compilation of *Veritable Records*.

The History Office memorialized in 924 for all official documents and reports to be submitted to the Office as had been done in the past. The Imperial Secretariat and the Imperial Chancellery were to send in all edicts and memorials as well as their Court Diaries prepared by one of the Chief Ministers, and the Imperial Recorders were to send in the Imperial Diaries. Apart from these, the ministries were to send in their respective reports, the Court of Imperial Sacrifices to send in accounts of reforms and innovations in music, the Supreme Court of Justice to report on amnesties and pardons every season, the Court of Diplomatic Reception to describe foreign missions and their tributes, their customs and geography, the Tribunal of Astronomical Observations to send in all observed signs and potents, and the various prefectural heads to send in accounts of able and meritorious officers in the service.<sup>35</sup>

Another source for this period, 908-26, was the *Chuang-tsung Biographies* in 30 chüans. This was a work conceived by a military governor

<sup>33</sup> *Ch'ung-wên tsung-mu*, 2, p. 49.

<sup>34</sup> *SS*, 263, 1b-2a.

<sup>35</sup> *WTHY*, 18, p. 227. While there is nothing exceptional in this summarized list (compare that in the *T'ang hui-yao*, 63, pp. 1089-90), it shows the inclusiveness of the History Office. A breakdown of this memorial and that in the *T'ang hui-yao* has been made by Chin Yü-fu in *Kuo-shih-kuan kuan-k'an*, 1/2, 1948, pp. 12-13, with impressive results.

and a greatly respected "meritorious official", Lu Chih (盧質), about the same time as the *Records* was planned. But it was not completed till much later, in 934, by Chang Chao, the Director of the History Office.<sup>36</sup>

Of this work, there is an interesting memorial recorded in the *Wu Tai Hui Yao* which shows that it was a carefully prepared work. In 933, the History Office memorialized:

When this office was ordered to compile the *Biographies of Meritorious Officials*, the ninety-two officials to be considered in the original memorial were distributed among the present members of the Office so that their biographies may be compiled. There were amongst them officials who were not meritorious officials since the "re-establishment" (of T'ang in 923)<sup>37</sup>, but they were for the time being distributed for compilation according to their names. In order to discover their suitability (for this collection), it is necessary to examine them carefully. And if there are amongst them really meritorious officials who have helped to re-establish the commonwealth, it is necessary to examine the size of their contributions and the weight of their achievements in order to determine their proper order of compilation and arrangement.

It is requested hereby that this be done to the many biographical notices submitted to this Office which concern people who were not meritorious officials since the restoration. If the events recorded in these biographical notices are connected with the events recorded in the *Histories*, the *Veritable Records* and the *Biographies*, then we request that they be added to the Basic Annals and Biographies (紀傳) in a summarized form. As for the biographical notices concerning men who have done neither service to the state nor to their fellow-men, and which merely record their names and the offices they held, or describe their small talents and inferior skills, if there is nothing there which can be instructive to future generations they should not be taken within the limits of this compilation . . .

There follows a summary of previous methods and standards in the compilation of histories, especially in the use of biographical materials. It then continues,

As for those meritorious officials whose biographical notices have still not been received, the Office is now urging that they be submitted. When these arrive, they shall be distributed for compilation.

Biographical notices of officials are generally all written by their disciples or their junior colleagues and most of them are full of exaggeration and literary extravagance. It is therefore requested that from

now on all biographical notices to be presented to this Office should be straight reports of deeds and achievements without conventional and decorative phrases. As for those already received which deserve consideration in this compilation, it is requested that the redactors and compilers cut off all the unnecessary descriptions and select only the facts.

This memorial was accepted and a high standard of work probably achieved. The "Basic Annals and Biographies" referred to were very likely to have been parts of the *Chuang-tsung Veritable Records*. It is known from the *T'ung-chien k'ao-i* that the *Records* contained a set of biographies (莊宗實錄列傳) separate from those in the *Chuang-tsung Biographies*.<sup>38</sup> Presumably, the latter supplemented the former biographies in the *Records*, or else they would not have been compiled. The *Biographies* might have dealt more fully with "meritorious officials", but the limits of this phrase becomes dubious when we come across in the *T'ung-chien k'ao-i* quotations from this work which shows that it included biographies of the three Liang emperors.<sup>39</sup>

3. The *Ming-tsung Veritable Records* were praised for being a very thorough work. The early years of the dynasty had seen an overhaul of the History Office with regard to the accumulation of documentary material for its archives. An example of the continued watchfulness over the materials is the request by Chao Hsi (趙熙) in 927 for the edicts and memorials and matters of policy which did not need to go through the Grand Imperial Secretariat to be recorded by a palace official and submitted monthly to the History Office. This was agreed to, and the Scholar of the Military Secretariat was ordered to do so at the end of every month.<sup>40</sup>

But the History Office was not always promptly fed with the documents, and in 931, the Office had to memorialize asking for the regular delivery of the Court and Imperial Diaries. It then described the unsatisfactory reports that had lately been arriving at the Office and asked for fuller details of Court decisions as well as for information concerning rejected proposals and delayed plans.<sup>41</sup> Again in 934, the Office asked for all edicts and memorials to be delivered, and there was an edict ordering the Scholar of the Military Secretariat to do so.<sup>42</sup> This suggests that the responsible heads of the Office were alert and quick to seek remedies for administrative slackness.

<sup>38</sup> *T'ung-chien k'ao-i*, 29, 4b. The biography of Chang Wan-chin (張萬進) occurs in both the *Chuang-tsung Biographies* and in the *Biographies of the Chuang-tsung Veritable Records*.

<sup>39</sup> *T'ung-chien k'ao-i*, 28, 3b and 8a; and 29, 1a.

<sup>40</sup> *WTHY*, 18, p. 234.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>42</sup> *CWTS*, 46, 5b.

<sup>36</sup> *TFYK*, 557, 4a; *CWTS*, 93, 1a-b; and *WTHY*, 18, p. 231.

<sup>37</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 235-6. Early the next year, there was an edict agreeing to the official preparation of biographical epitaphs of high officials; *CWTS*, 45, 4a.

This, however, was not true of all the officials in the Office, and a criticism of their work appeared in a memorial prepared in 933. The memorial began with a short description of the organization of the Office. It went on to say,

Among the previous Redactors and Compilers and Auxiliary Compilers, there were those who were industrious, and they prepared their work without leisure for themselves. But there were also those who were lazy and performed their daily duties in a perfunctory way, using the History Office as a step in their career to help them further their own ends. And when these men were appointed elsewhere, or were sent out to the provinces, they left their work, whether it was done by themselves or together with others, to their successors. The successors imitated them and were worse—and, as before, through laziness, piled up their work and never fulfilled their public duties.

The evils are indeed many. It is therefore necessary to set up rules and regulations in order to end this wastefulness and inefficiency

.....  
The memorial then continued to propose a new set of conditions of service, limiting the duration to two years. It also suggested that officials be free to leave the service before the last month of service if the allotted work was completed, and be refused this freedom if it was not. There should be punishments for those who were lazy and rewards for those who contributed extra research results to the national history. It emphasized that promotion should be recommended for those who had served the Office well, and the imperial judgment should await those who continued to be inefficient thereafter.<sup>43</sup>

It is clear that the historians in the Office were vigilant during Ming-tsung's reign and that the *Records* were compiled from materials which were relatively complete.

4 and 5. The *Min-ti* and *Fei-ti Records* were compiled together more than twenty years after the end of the dynasty. Their chief purpose was to supplement and correct, wherever possible, the materials for the years 934-6 in the *Chin Kao-tsu Records* collected by another group of historians some six years earlier. It is interesting to note that there being still no precedent for the compilation of *Records* for a fallen dynasty, no attempt was made in Chin to do so for the last two emperors of T'ang.

6 and 7. The *Chin Kao-tsu* and *Shao-ti Veritable Records* were compiled together in the transitional two years between the Han and the Chou dynasties. The Chin archives seem to have survived the Khitan sack of the capital in 946-7, and these had been in able hands. For example, there

<sup>43</sup> *WTHY*, 18, p. 233.



was a reform in the preparation of the Court Diary in 939, taking away the responsibility from the Adviser of the Military Secretariat and giving it back to one of the Chief Ministers.<sup>44</sup> We also know that Chang Chao was Director of the Office from 941 to 945, helped by the other great historian of the period, Chia Wei. Though the two, and many others, were engaged during these years in the compilation of the *Chiu T'ang Shu*, the ordinary archival work of the Office probably continued smoothly.

An important feature of these two *Records* was that they were the first ever to be compiled by a succeeding dynasty. This was due to the request by a Chief Minister, Tou Chên-ku, who had held high executive posts in the Chin. That he had to ask the throne directly for this suggests the unwillingness of the Supervisor of National History, Su Fêng-chi, to create a precedent.<sup>45</sup> The precedent turned the *Records* into a kind of draft history of a past dynasty. In changing the nature of the *Records*, the historians introduced the bias of the later dynasties, especially against the hated Khitans who had, in fact, dominated the Chin. The precedent was, however, valuable because it filled the gaps in the period and also encouraged Chang Chao in 957 to compile the missing records of Han and T'ang and to try to do so for Liang.

8. As Han Kao-tsu reigned for less than a year, the size of the *Veritable Records*, in 20 chüans, was formidable. Much of the materials must have dealt with the early years of his career in the last years of the Chin dynasty.

A criticism of them arises from the character of the chief compiler, Chia Wei, who has been described as a most energetic historian. He was accused of altering the language and style of his materials, and "in his criticism, of allowing his personal likes and dislikes to determine his writing". His bias against the late Chief Minister, Sang Wei-han (桑維翰) came out in the biography he prepared of him.<sup>46</sup> This was noticed, and somewhat unsatisfactorily corrected. But this is no assurance that his other prejudices in the other biographies, and perhaps even in the basic annals, of this work, had also been noticed, and corrected, however unsatisfactorily.

9. The *Han Yin-ti Veritable Records* was compiled as an afterthought when Chang Chao was asked to compile the Records of Chou T'ai-tsu,<sup>47</sup> and thus compiled by historians who had to justify immediately afterwards

<sup>44</sup> *Op. Cit.*, p. 236; *CWTS*, 78, 5b.

<sup>45</sup> *SS*, 262, 4b-5b; and *WTHY*, 18, p. 232.

<sup>46</sup> *CWTS*, 131, 4b-5a. *Sang Wei-han* had probably insulted Chia Wei, so when Chia Wei prepared his biography, he said that when Sang Wei-han died, he had 8000 bars (r'ing 錠) of "white gold" (silver). The Hanlin Academician, Hsü T'ai-fu (徐台符) remonstrated with him, and he had to change it to read "several thousand (small?) bars (ting 錠)". (I have not been able to discover if, in the Five Dynasties period, r'ing was heavier than a ting).

<sup>47</sup> *WTHY*, 18, p. 232.

the founding of the succeeding dynasty. This was significant because an uncle of Yin-ti ruled as Han emperor at T'ai-yüan and defied all the Chou attempts to oust him. Hence the doubt whether Yin-ti was really killed by one of his own advisers as was claimed by the *Records* and not by Chou T'ai-tsu's men. The *T'ung-chien k'ao-i* examines this and shows that the Basic Annals of Han and those of Chou in the *Old History* have followed the *Records* closely for this event.<sup>48</sup>

An incident during the campaign against the rebellion at Ho-chung in 948-9 is noteworthy. After the victory, many papers and letters were discovered concerning the intrigues between the rebel and several military governors and court officials. The commander listed the names of the men so that he could expose them when he returned to the capital, but Wang P'u, later the historian of institutions and at this time a brilliant examination graduate, advised him not to do so and to burn the documents instead, arguing that any persecution of the men would lead to more discontent and other rebellions. His advice was followed, and valuable materials about the rebellion and its wide connections were destroyed.<sup>49</sup> No doubt this was not an isolated incident of vandalism, but it would have had its effect on the materials in the *Records*, which in turn must have had its effect on the *Old History*.

10. The *Chou T'ai-tsu Veritable Records* was another large work for a short reign. It was distinguished for having been the only *Records* of a new dynasty compiled together with that of the last emperor of the preceding dynasty (see No. 9).

There is some information about the Diary (日曆) which would have been a major source for the *Records*. The Diary was prepared by Chia Wei and shown to the Supervisor of National History, Wang Chün (王峻) in 951. Chia Wei was accused of subtly inserting into it his views on the wickedness of two past Chief Ministers and systematically defaming the administrators of the previous dynasty. Because of this Wang Chün complained to the emperor and ultimately had Chia Wei removed from his post as Redactor and Compiler of the History Office. But it is not known how much the Diary for those months was revised. Even if it had been considerably revised, the alterations are of doubtful value, for Wang Chün's views on the subject were not based on a desire for historical accuracy. He said this about Chia Wei,

The Secretary Chia (Wei) himself has (younger) members of his family who will like his rank and length of service to be without

<sup>48</sup> *T'ung-chien k'ao-i*, 30, 8a-b, quotes the *Veritable Records* and shows how the *History* (*CWTS*, 103, 5a, and 110, 5a) followed it. Doubt about the authenticity of this account was first raised by the historian Liu Shu (劉恕), a contemporary of Ssu-ma Kuang.

<sup>49</sup> *SS*, 249, 4a-5a.

blemish. Now all the officials at court are being thus criticized and condemned; how can they (and their families) then advance themselves?<sup>50</sup>

While this attitude was by no means peculiar to the Chou officials, it is well to note it when it was so clearly put.

11. The *Shih-tsung Veritable Records* in 40 chüans, the largest in the Five Dynasties, was planned about six months after the emperor's death. Its size is not surprising for the Supervisor of National History had further reformed the archives in 954, the memorial recommending improvements in the preparation of Court and Imperial Diaries being a small landmark in the growth of the History Office.<sup>51</sup>

In spite of the size, the *Records* was far from complete. In fact, for the most important campaigns of the reign, they would have been lamentably one-sided. All the three states which engaged most of Shih-tsung's attentions preserved their own records which could not be included. The relevant thing is that the compilers of the *Old History* were not in a position to remedy the great gaps of important materials concerning the Chou campaigns against Nan T'ang, Pei Han and the Khitans. Nan T'ang did not surrender till 975, the year after they had completed the *History*; Pei Han was not finally defeated till 979; and the Khitans were barely kept at bay for many more years. This was one of the chief reasons why the *Old History* was criticized by Sung historians and replaced by the *New History* almost as soon as the later work appeared. The *Old History* was clearly a work limited to the history of the North China "central government" with very scanty references to the rest of China.

Supplementary to the last Veritable Records as materials for the Chou dynasty, was a Diary in one chüan for the brief reign of Kung-ti the boy emperor. This was a diary prepared by three historians, each compiling it for one of the last three seasons of 959. It was the only one of its kind of the Five Dynasties which was preserved for any length of time.<sup>52</sup> That no attempt was made to compile Veritable Records for the reign of Kung-ti probably helped its survival. It was the only source of the single chüan of Basic Annals for Kung-ti in the *Old History* which rounds off the whole period before the foundation of the "August Dynasty" of Sung.

<sup>50</sup> CWTS, 131, 5a.

<sup>51</sup> SS, 262, 1a-3b. This memorial, more fully preserved in WTHY, 18, p. 232, and CWTS, 114, 13a-14a, pointed out the failure to have full Court and Imperial Diaries kept and presented to the History Office as in Ming-tsung's time (926-33), and suggested ways and means how this might once again be done.

<sup>52</sup> *Chung-hsing shu-mu*, as quoted in *Yü hai*, 47, 31a. It was also known as the *Hsien-tê jih-li* (顯德日曆) after the reign-period, but this is misleading since it only dealt with a part of the sixth year of Hsien-tê (959).

## III

The above survey of the individual Veritable Records may be augmented by a short analysis of the main trends in history-compilation during this period. The following breakdown of the *Old History* sections and the *Veritable Records* are quite revealing.

TABLE II  
THE OLD WU-TAI HISTORY AND ITS SOURCES

(a) Duration	Old History (in chüans)			Chief sources		
	(b) Basic Annals	(c) Biographies	(d) Total	(e) Veritable Records	(f) V.R. + other sources	(g) (d)/(f)
Liang 16 (percentage 30% of total)	10 17%	14 20%	24 18.5%	30 <sup>53</sup> 11%	45* 15%	53%
T'ang 13 (percentage 24.5% of total)	24 39%	26 37%	50 38%	80 30%	110† 36%	45.5%
Chin 11 (percentage 21% of total)	11 18%	13 18.5%	24 18.5%	50 19%	50 16%	48%
Han 4 (percentage 7.5% of total)	5 8%	6 8.5%	11 8%	35 13%	35 11%	31.5%
Chou 9 (percentage 17% of total)	11 18%	11 16%	22 17%	70 27%	71‡ 22%	31%
TOTAL 53	61	70	131	265	311	42%

\* with the addition of *Liang Biographies*

† with the addition of *T'ang Biographies of Meritorious Officials*

‡ with the addition of the *Chou Kung-ti Diary*

Firstly, there are notable discrepancies between the percentage figures for the number of years of each dynasty to the total for the period in column

<sup>53</sup> The 30 chüans of *Veritable Records* and the 30 chüans of *Revised Records* supplemented each other. I do not feel it justified to consider them as 60 chüans of Records. On the other hand, they may deserve to be considered as a little more than 30 chüans.

(a) and those for their respective number of chüans to the totals in the *History* in columns (b), (c), and (d) for the first two dynasties of Liang and T'ang. While Liang was the longest dynasty lasting 30 per cent of the whole period, its space in the *History* in proportion to the other four dynasties is much less, only 18.5 per cent. The reverse is true with T'ang, and 24.5 per cent of time was extended into 38 per cent of space. The other three dynasties seem normal in that they were given by the compilers of the *History* the space commensurate with their duration.

On the other hand, the percentage figures for the number of chüans in the *History*, in columns (b), (c), and (d), more or less follow the percentages of the respective number of chüans to the total for Veritable Records, and other sources, in columns (e) and (f). This is specially interesting for the Liang and the T'ang dynasties where it may be observed how the two additional sets of *Biographies* added to the *Veritable Records* brought the proportions of the *History* and the source materials much closer (compare columns (e) and (f), and then (d) and (f) for these dynasties).

As far as proportions can be a guide, the discrepancies between the percentages of the (d) and (f) columns for the various dynasties are interesting. They illustrate how the compilers of the *History* were guided in their allocation of space not by what each dynasty *should* have received according to its duration, but by what it *could* receive considering the respective amount of sources available.

The Liang figures of 18.5 per cent in (d) is higher than that of 15 per cent in (f). Since it is clear from column (g) that the Liang sources were quite fully utilized (in comparison with those of the other dynasties), the discrepancy of 3.5 per cent may have been brought about by the use of T'ang sources to fill in the blanks in Liang history. The T'ang figure of 38 per cent in (d) is higher than that of 36 per cent in (f), though again from column (g) it may be seen that the use of the dynastic sources was above average (45.5 per cent as compared with the average of 42 per cent for the whole period). The discrepancy of 2 per cent was perhaps due to the additional use of Chin sources. As for the Chin figures for (d) and (f), there is a discrepancy of 2.5 per cent. Considering that there was an above average use of the dynastic sources (48 per cent as compared with 42 per cent in column (g)), this may also have been due to the augmenting of Chin history with Han sources.

But this does not seem to apply to the next two dynasties of Han and Chou—for which there seems to have been proportionately more sources available than were used (for both dynasties, the ratios of 31.5 per cent and 31 per cent respectively in column (g) are well below the average of 42 per cent).

In the case of the Han dynasty, the percentage figure of 11 per cent for the *Veritable Records* in column (f) is misleading, since more than half

of the sources concern the years before 948 (20 chüans out of the 35) and a great part of this would have been used to augment Chin history. As for the remainder dealing with Yin-ti's rule (948-50), the Chou historians who compiled them were inhibited by the fact that the Han dynasty had not really come to an end, and the 15 chüans for the three years (contrast this with 30 chüans for the next three years of the Chou founder) were compiled, in any case, as an afterthought, chiefly to give continuity to the Chou dynasty. Further, the *Han Yin-ti Veritable Records* was compiled together with that of Chou T'ai-tsu, which makes it even less necessary for the compilers of the *History* to use Chou sources to augment Han history. Hence its lower percentage of 8 per cent in column (d). On the other hand, this figure is the right proportion for this dynasty in relation with its length of years.

As for the Chou history, the discrepancy of 5 per cent between columns (d) and (f) is even more difficult to explain. It may have been chiefly due to the fact that the *History* was compiled in the Sung dynasty and ended in the year 959 with the fall of the Chou. Most of the leading officials served on under the Sung, and many of them were still alive when the *History* was being compiled fourteen years afterwards. In fact, all the compilers themselves had served under the Chou and at least two of them had held high positions. That there are more than a hundred biographies in the *Sung History* of men who had served the Chou, in one capacity or another, is significant. It is also significant that the two Chou Veritable Records totalling 70 chüans for the period of nine years (a record number for any period of nine years) were both compiled soon after the end of the two reigns, and the *Shih-tsung Veritable Records* was started before the end of the dynasty. That these Veritable Records were found inordinately large, and that the activities of many of the survivors among the leading figures required reevaluation and discreet omission seem to be good reasons why the compilers had not made fuller use of the available materials when they edited the *History*. What remains puzzling, though, is the presence among the compilers of Hu Mêng and Chang Tan, who were the chief editors of the *Shih-tsung Veritable Records* and who could be expected to have given the later years of the Chou dynasty greater prominence than was done. However, the figure of 17 per cent in column (d) agrees exactly with the 17 per cent in column (a) which suggests that the dynasty did get its due in the *History*.

Finally, it is important to note column (g) which is a good guide to the probable extent to which the compilers of the *History* made use of the official sources for each dynasty and for the whole period.

I include here a few words on the men at the History Office. As in the T'ang dynasty, the posts in the Office were not ranked in the official hierarchy. Each of them was always held in conjunction with a post that had a

rank. The Redactor and Compilers have included presidents and vice-presidents of ministries, secretaries of ministries down to minor secretaries and junior scholars known for their scholarship. Even Auxiliary Compilers have included omissioners and imperial advisers.<sup>54</sup> Most of these were expected to perform double duties. The full-time professional historian did not exist. The greatest historian of the period, Chang Chao, started in the Office when he was a mere secretary to a governor. He then became an Auxiliary Secretary at the court and was still serving the Office thirty years later when he had been president and vice-president of several ministries.

Chang Chao and Chia Wei were the two most active compilers. Chang Chao dominated three dynasties (T'ang, Chin and Chou), having been at the History Office for at least fourteen years. He was responsible for the greater part of six sets of Veritable Records. Chia Wei was the chief editor of all the three Veritable Records planned during the Han dynasty. Between the two of them, they compiled most of nine sets out of a total of eleven. Chang Chao also edited the T'ang *Biographies* that supplement the *Veritable Records*. He was, therefore, responsible for 155 chüans out of the total of 311 chüans of official sources for the *Old History*. And Chia Wei's contribution of 70 chüans is over 20 per cent of the total. It is perhaps relevant to note what later historians had to say about these two men who did so much for the history of an age.

Of Chang Chao (894-972), his Sung biographer noted his early decision to specialize in history. On his own he had collected more than ninety original edicts and imperial letters to the leader of the Sha-t'ou Turks with the intention of writing a history of the last years of T'ang. He had also started by himself a set of Veritable Records for the years 923-6. Once his career began in the History Office, he was never idle. When his biographer had acknowledged his scholarship and wide reading, his great library and his critical historiography, he added that Chang Chao had ably served five dynasties, from T'ang to Sung.<sup>55</sup> Perhaps it should be noted here that never had there been a man who was given such great opportunities to study at first hand the rise and fall of dynasties.

Of Chia Wei (d.952), his Chou biographer noted how he had persevered

<sup>54</sup> It is possible to list almost without a break the Redactor and Compilers of the History Office (one of them may at the same time be Director of the Office) from the Hou T'ang dynasty onwards. Professor Eberhard has noted some of them in his study of their origins and family connections, but has included Supervisors of National History without clearly distinguishing these successful politicians and men of affairs from the men who actually did the work of selection and compilation. Further, he did not include those mentioned in the *Wu-tai hui-yao* and the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei*, nor did he give full consideration to those historians of the second half of the Five Dynasties who had lived on to the Sung. *Conquerors and Rulers*, pp. 106-15.

I propose to produce a fuller list in a future study of the historians of the tenth century.

<sup>55</sup> *SS*, 263, 12-4b.

in his studies in spite of his failure in the imperial examinations at the end of T'ang and later specialized in history-writing. His first major work, a massive collection in 65 chüans of miscellaneous materials pertaining to the last sixty years of T'ang, was highly praised. He had a very high opinion of his own historiographical abilities and in the Chin dynasty, sought a History Office appointment with a long poem to the Supervisor of National History exhorting him to use all the historical talent he could find as it was rare. He got the post he wanted and was soon eagerly agitating for the compilation of a T'ang history. He was given a part in it together with Chang Chao. From then to his removal in 951 from the History Office, he worked strenuously on one historical work after another. His prejudices are well-known and have been noted in the above survey. His biographer, perhaps, should be left to say the last word:

(Chia) Wei was specially good at recording and annotating. He may not have been exceptional in his style and use of language, but he argued outspokenly, so much so that his colleagues disliked him and considered him as Chia Iron-mouth (賈鐵嘴).<sup>56</sup>

Of other Redactors and Compilers, many are better known in other fields of activity and some quite unknown. The fame of an historian during this period of the Five Dynasties was connected with the responsibility he bore for the compilation of the Veritable Records and his success and failure in the History Office may have depended on whether there were such works to compile at that time.

#### LIST OF WORKS CITED

##### ABBREVIATIONS

CWTS	<i>Chiu Wu-tai Shih</i>
SS	<i>Sung Shih</i>
TFYK	<i>Ts'ê Fu Yüan Kuei</i>
WTHY	<i>Wu Tai Hui Yao</i>

*Chih-chai shu-lu chieh-t'i*, 直齋書錄解題, by Ch'en Chên-sun 陳振孫, edition of the Basic Sinological Series.

*Chin shih*, 金史, edition of Ssü-pu Pei-yao.

*Chiu T'ang-shu*, 舊唐書, edition of Ssü-pu Ts'ung-k'an.

*Chiu Wu-tai shih*, 舊五代史, edition of Ssü-pu Pei-yao (in the cited parts, there were no variants in the Ssü-pu Ts'ung-k'an edition, except for the colophon 跋 by Chang Yüan-chi 張元濟).

*Ch'ung-wên tsung-mu*, 崇文總目, edition of the Basic Sinological Series.

*Ch'üan T'ang wên*, 全唐文, Imperial edition (undated).

*Chün-chai tu-shu chih*, 郡齋讀書志, by Chao Kung-wu 晁公武, edition of the Ssü-pu Ts'ung-k'an.

<sup>56</sup> *CWTS*, 131, 4a-5a.

- Hsin Wu-tai shih*, 新五代史, edition of the Ssü-pu pei-yao.
- Hsü tzü-chih t'ung-chien ch'ang-pien*, 續資治通鑑長編, edition of the Chekiang Shu-chü 浙江書局, 1881.
- Nan-lei wên-ting*, 南雷文定, by Huang Tsung-hsi 黃宗羲, edition of Ssü-pu Pei-yao.
- Nien-er-shih cha-chi*, 廿二史劄記, by Chao I 趙翼, edition of Ch'ien Wan 錢畹, 1898.
- Shih-ch'i shih shang-ch'üeh*, 十七史商榷, by Wang Ming-shêng 王鳴盛, edition of Kuang-ya Ts'ung-shu, 1920.
- Shih-kuo ch'un-ch'iu*, 十國春秋, by Wu Jên-ch'ên 吳任臣, edition of 1793.
- Sung hui-yao kao*, 宋會要稿, Chih Kuan section 職官, Shang-hai, 1936.
- Sung shih*, 宋史, edition of Ssü-pu Pei-yao.
- T'ang hui-yao*, 唐會要, edition of Ts'ung-shu Chi-ch'êng, 1936.
- Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei*, 冊府元龜, edition of Li Ssü-ching 李嗣京, 1642.
- T'ung chih*, 通志, edition of T'u-shu chi-ch'êng, 1901.
- Tzü-chih t'ung-chien k'ao-i*, 資治通鑑考異, edition of Ssü-pu Ts'ung-k'an.
- Wên-hsien t'ung-k'ao*, 文獻通考, edition of T'u-shu Chi-ch'êng, 1901.
- Wu-tai hui-yao*, 五代會要, Wan-yu Wen-k'u edition, 1937.
- Yü hai*, 玉海, by Wang Ying-lin 王應麟, edition of Chang O-nien 張嶠年, 1738.

- 
- Chang Yüan-chi 張元濟, *Chiao-shih sui-pi* 校史隨筆, Commercial Press, 1939.
- Chao Shih-wei 趙士焯, *Chung-hsing kuan-ko shu-mu chi-k'ao* 中興館閣書目輯考, Peking National Library, 1933.
- Ch'ên Yüan 陳垣, *Chiu Wu-tai shih chi-pên fa-fu* 舊五代史輯本發覆, Fu-jên University, 1937.
- Chin Yü-fu 金毓黻, "T'ang Sung Shih-tai shih-kuan hsiu-shih chih-tu k'ao" (A study of the Institutions of the History Office in T'ang and Sung times) 唐宋時代史館修史制度考, *Kuo-shih-kuan kuan-k'an* 國史館館刊, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 6-18, 1948.
- Hsü Hao 徐浩, *Nien-wu shih lun-kang* 廿五史論綱, Shanghai, 1947.
- Hummel, Arthur W. (ed.) *Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period*, 2 vols., Library of Congress, 1944.
- Huang Yün-mei 黃雲眉, *Shao Erh-yün nien-p'u* 邵二巖年譜, Nanking University, 1933.