

Empowered by Ancestors

Controversy over the Imperial Temple in Song China (960–1279)

Cheung Hiu Yu

Hong Kong University Press
The University of Hong Kong
Pokfulam Road
Hong Kong
<https://hkupress.hku.hk>

© 2021 Hong Kong University Press

ISBN 978-988-8528-58-5 (*Hardback*)

All rights reserved. No portion of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publisher.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Printed and bound by Hang Tai Printing Co., Ltd. in Hong Kong, China

Contents

List of Illustrations	ix
List of Figures and Tables	x
Acknowledgments	xi
Note to the Reader	xiii
Song Ancestors and Emperors in Their Temple Names and Personal Names	xiv
Introduction	1
Why the Song Imperial Temple?	3
The Imperial Temple: A Literature Review	6
Theoretical Consideration, Sources, and Structure	9
Section One: Imperial Temple: Early History and Main Controversies	
Chapter 1: Pre-Song Interpretations of the Imperial Temple	15
Centralizing the Imperial Temple in Early China	15
Controversies in the Tang Conceptions of the Imperial Temple	26
Concluding Remarks	36
Chapter 2: Northern Song Conceptions of the Imperial Temple and Temple	
Sacrifices	38
Song Ritual Institutions and Ritual Officials	39
Basic Setting of the Song Imperial Temple and Temple Sacrifices	41
Fraternal Succession and the Discourse of Filial Piety	47
Concluding Remarks	58
Section Two: Song Imperial Temple: Ritual Debates, Factional Politics, and Intellectual Diversity	
Chapter 3: An Examination of the 1072 Controversy over the Song Primal	
Ancestor	63
Launch and Development of the 1072 Primal Ancestor Debate	63
Intellectual Interest and Political Stance of Ritual Officials in the 1072	
Debate	69
Concluding Remarks	83

Chapter 4: Yuanfeng Ritual Reforms and the 1079 <i>Zhaomu</i> Debate	85
DPATR and the Yuanfeng Scheme of the Imperial Temple	86
The 1079 <i>Zhaomu</i> Debate: Lu Dian and the DPATR	93
The 1079 <i>Zhaomu</i> Debate: Lu Dian Versus He Xunzhi and Zhang Zao	97
Concluding Remarks	102
Chapter 5: Imperial Temple in the New Learning	104
An Appraisal of New Learning Ritual Scholarship	104
From Wang Anshi to Wang Zhaoyu: New Learning Conception of the Imperial Temple	110
Chen Xiangdao's Conception of the Imperial Temple in the <i>Lishu</i>	115
Reconciliation and Codification: Ma Ximeng, Fang Que, and the <i>Zhenghe wuli xinyi</i>	121
Concluding Remarks	129
Section Three: Imperial Temple, Daoxue Scholars, and the Socialization of Temple Rites	
Chapter 6: Daoxue Conception of the Song Imperial Temple: Zhu Xi and His Disciples	133
Zhu Xi's Rediscovery of the 1079 Ritual Controversy	135
New Understanding of the Spatial Arrangement of the Imperial Temple: Zhu Xi and Yang Fu	139
Zhu Xi's Conception of the <i>Zhaomu</i> Sequence	149
Concluding Remarks	157
Chapter 7: Socialization of the Discourse of Temple Rituals in the Late Southern Song	159
From the <i>Comprehensive Commentary</i> to Other Southern Song Ritual Commentaries	160
Adoption of Temple Rituals in the Southern Song: An Emphasis on Orthopraxy	167
Concluding Remarks	181
Conclusion	183
Bibliography	191
Index	208

Illustrations

Illustration 1.1: A Qing Illustration of the Tang Imperial Temple	29
Illustration 2.1: Nie Chongyi’s <i>Mingtang</i> Illustration	44
Illustration 5.1: Visualization of the Arrangement of Spirit Tablets in the <i>Di</i> Sacrifice	117
Illustration 5.2: Depiction of <i>Mingtang</i>	119
Illustration 6.1: Zhu Xi’s Temple Scheme for Feudal Lords	141
Illustration 7.1: A Diagram of Seasonal Sacrifices in a Thirteenth-Century Encyclopedia	174

Figures and Tables

Figures

Figure 4.1: Diagram of the Configuration of Eight Temples with Different Chambers	92
Figure 4.2: <i>Zhaomu</i> Sequence Suggested by Lu Dian in the 1079 Debate	96
Figure 5.1: Wang Anshi's Perception of the Imperial Temple	111
Figure 6.1: Zhu Xi's Spatial Setting of the Imperial Temple	140
Figure 6.2: Zhu Xi's Depiction of the Imperial Temple in "Lunbenchao miaozi"	143
Figure 6.3: Zhu Xi's Visualization of the Imperial Temple's Main Chamber	150
Figure 6.4: Zhu Xi's Solution to the Seniority Problem in the <i>Zhaomu</i> Sequence	156

Tables

Table 3.1: Officials Involved in the 1072 Primal Ancestor Debate: Ritual Interests and Political Stance	81
Table 5.1: A Survey of Ritual Writings Composed by New Learning Scholars	108
Table 7.1: A Comparison between Seasonal Sacrifices in the <i>Family Precepts</i> of the Lü Family and the Official Ritual Code <i>Zhenghe wuli xinyi</i>	171

Song Ancestors and Emperors in Their Temple Names and Personal Names

Shengzu 聖祖, Zhao Xuanlang 趙玄朗 (???–???, a Daoist deity as the legendary ancestor of the Song imperial house)

Xizu 僖祖, Zhao Tiao 趙朁 (828–874)

Shunzu 順祖, Zhao Ting 趙瑋 (851–928)

Yizu 翼祖, Zhao Jing 趙敬 (872–933)

Xuanzu 宣祖, Zhao Hongyin 趙洪殷 (899–956)

Northern Song dynasty (960–1127)

Taizu 太祖, Zhao Kuangyin 趙匡胤 (927–976, r. 960–976)

Taizong 太宗, Zhao Guangyi 趙光義 (939–997, r. 976–997)

Zhenzong 真宗, Zhao Heng 趙恆 (968–1022, r. 997–1022)

Renzong 仁宗, Zhao Zhen 趙禎 (1010–1063, r. 1022–1063)

Yingzong 英宗, Zhao Shu 趙曙 (1032–1067, r. 1063–1067)

Shenzong 神宗, Zhao Xu 趙頊 (1048–1085, r. 1067–1085)

Zhezong 哲宗, Zhao Xu 趙煦 (1077–1100, r. 1085–1100)

Huizong 徽宗, Zhao Ji 趙佶 (1082–1135, r. 1100–1125)

Qinzong 欽宗, Zhao Huan 趙桓 (1100–1161, r. 1125–1127)

Southern Song dynasty (1127–1279)

Gaozong 高宗, Zhao Gou 趙構 (1107–1187, r. 1127–1162)

Xiaozong 孝宗, Zhao Shen 趙昚 (1127–1194, r. 1162–1189)

Guangzong 光宗, Zhao Dun 趙惇 (1147–1200, r. 1189–1194)

Ningzong 寧宗, Zhao Kuo 趙擴 (1168–1224, r. 1194–1224)

Lizong 理宗, Zhao Yun 趙昀 (1205–1264, r. 1224–1264)

Duzong 度宗, Zhao Qi 趙祺 (1240–1274, r. 1264–1274)

Gongdi 恭帝, Zhao Xian 趙顯 (1271–1323, r. 1275–1276)

Duanzong 端宗, Zhao Shi 趙昰 (1268–1278, r. 1276–1278)

Introduction

The most obvious trace of perfect governance is seen in the Imperial Temple.

王道之可觀者，莫盛乎宗廟。

—Wang Bi 王弼 (226–249)¹

Ancestral worship and related ancestral rituals played a central role in Chinese culture. Historically, ancestral rites and ceremonies in imperial China underwent both social and intellectual developments. Traditional Chinese—including elites—emphasized taking care of the world of ancestral spirits through funeral rites and sacrificial ceremonies.² On the local level, ancestral rituals promoted by Confucian scholars progressively penetrated village societies through the spread of clan rules, family rituals, and social institutions.³ On the state level, central governments actively participated in the campaign of ritualizing society and eagerly promoted particular ritual norms. Considering the significant role played by ancestral rituals in connecting state and society, the current book explores the making of ancestral ritual norms by focusing on ritual debates in the imperial courts of Song China (960–1279). Generally, it argues that court ritual debates among Song scholar-officials (*shidafu* 士大夫) empowered them with cultural authority to confront the state and reshape society.

Song China witnessed the beginning of a great transformation of ritual norms on both state and local levels. Along with the revival of Confucianism, Song scholar-officials actively participated in debates concerning various ritual affairs.

1. *Zhouyi zhushu* 周易注疏, *Tang Song zhushu shisanjing* 唐宋注疏十三經 (hereafter *TSZSSS*), *Sibu beiyao* edition 四部備要本 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1998), 1:3.43.
2. Francis Hsu's early work analyzed the anxiety between the living people and their ancestors experienced in Chinese villages. See L. K. Francis Hsu, *Under the Ancestors' Shadow: Kinship, Personality, and Social Mobility in Village China* (New York: Natural History Library, 1967), 131–99. Also see Stephen Bokenkamp, *Ancestors and Anxiety: Daoism and the Birth of Rebirth in China* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), 60–94.
3. Patricia Ebrey's detailed annotation of Zhu Xi's 朱熹 (also spelled Chu Hsi, 1130–1200) *Family Rituals* and its repercussion throughout late imperial China persuasively demonstrates how various ideas and practices of family rituals—capping, wedding, funeral, and sacrificial offerings—gradually diffused into society through the circulation of Confucianized ritual texts. Patricia Ebrey, *Chu Hsi's Family Rituals: A Twelfth-Century Chinese Manual for the Performance of Cappings, Weddings, Funerals, and Ancestral Rites* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991), 153–77; also see Ebrey, *Confucianism and Family Rituals in Imperial China: A Social History of Writing about Rites* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991), 9–13, 220–29.

Thanks to these debates, a consensus gradually formed within the circles of Song scholar-officials: the court should rectify some key ritual norms to regulate relationships among the government, cultural values, and society. Confucian scholar-officials allied with the court to promote ritual from the top stratum downward. They considered imperial rituals the highest standard of ritual performance and understood the rectification of these rituals (*zhengli* 正禮) to be their responsibility. From the perspective of scholar-officials, imperial ancestral rituals served not only as a “pretense for cultural agendas”⁴ but also as a way of self-identification. In this light, court discussions and debates over imperial ancestral rituals transcended the private sector of imperial families and constituted one of the most heated issues in Song state policies.⁵

Specifically, I focus on the ritual discussions about a significant ritual architecture in Song China, that is, the complex of the Imperial Temple (*taimiao* 太廟). Spatially, the Imperial Temple emblemizes the succession of the ruling house through a display of the royal ancestral line.⁶ On the one hand, the Imperial Temple nearby the palace displays the authority of the ruling house by its grandiose appearance. In the orthodox Confucian setting of a royal capital, the Imperial Temple, the royal palace, and the State Altar of the Grain and Soil (*shejitan* 社稷壇) are arranged according to a fixed order, which is first documented in the *Kaogong ji* 考工記 (literally, *Records of Artificers*).⁷ The order reads: “the Altar is located on the right and the Imperial Temple on the left, the administrative palace is located in the front and the market place in the rear” 左祖右社，面朝後市。⁸ This placement identifies the Imperial Temple as one of the four fundamental architectural structures of a royal capital. At the same time, the Imperial Temple embodies the Confucian virtue of filial piety at the highest level of political realm: the emperor himself shows due respect to his ancestors through solemn sacrifices and ceremonies that are regularly

4. I have borrowed this phrase from Kevin E. Brashier, *Ancestral Memory in Early China* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011), 348.

5. In her study of Qing 清 (1636–1912) court rituals, Evelyn Rawski distinguishes between private and public imperial rituals based on Qing official archives. Rawski, *The Last Emperors: A Social History of Qing Imperial Institutions* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 264–68, 277–85. However, most “private” ancestral rites defined by Rawski still had an empathetic function that aimed to arouse emotions among members of particular groups. Non-Confucian funeral rites adopted by the Qing rulers involved physiological stimuli that contributed to a shared experience of the symbolic power of ritual. In this light, imperial ancestral rituals are at least “public” to their spectators, as they cast empathetic effects on the spectators’ minds.

6. As put forward by Michael Loewe, the Imperial Temple demonstrated that “the imperial house was of a more permanent duration.” Michael Loewe, *Problems of Han Administration: Ancestral Rites, Weights and Measures, and the Means of Protest* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 9.

7. The *Kaogong ji* is the earliest surviving record of Chinese architectural and handicraft industries. Some scholars have identified it with an official record that was composed by the Qi 齊 state during the Warring States period. In general, it conveys an imagination of the ideal architectural settings of the Zhou dynasty. During the Western Han dynasty, some scholars attached the *Kaogong ji* to the *Rituals of Zhou* and made it the latter’s last section, the *Dongguan* 冬官 (Winter Bureau). For a textual history of the *Kaogong ji*, see Feng Jiren, *Chinese Architecture and Metaphor: Song Culture in the Yingzhao Fashi Building Manual* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2012), 26–27. Also, Wen Renjun 聞人軍, *Kaogong ji yizhu* 考工記譯註 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1993), 138–53.

8. *Zhouli zhushu* 周禮注疏, TSZSSSJ, 2:41.411.

performed in the temple. Additionally, the Imperial Temple serves as a symbolic microcosm that connects imperial clansmen. In view of the above, the Imperial Temple serves as an “intimacy-oriented political model” of Confucianism that connects ritual with politics between private and public spheres.⁹ In summary, the Imperial Temple and its relevant rituals crystallized the tension between cultural authority and political ends. In the Song context, scholar-officials utilized various discourses to conceptualize the Imperial Temple. These discourses included the political contributions and merits of imperial ancestors, the Confucian idea of filial piety, and the revival of ancient rituals. How did these discourses flourish in court ritual debates? To what extent were they measured and valued by Chinese scholar-officials? How did they shape the “rectification of rituals” within the circles of Confucian scholars on the social level? Answers to these questions constitute the main body of this book.

Why the Song Imperial Temple?

Since the Japanese Sinologist Naitō Konan 内藤湖南 (1866–1934) proposed his famous “Naitō hypothesis,” historians have generally considered political interest as the core value of Song “factions” (*dang* 黨).¹⁰ As is well understood, “political factions” (*pengdang* 朋黨) played a central role in Song history and have attracted scholarly attention from a number of historians. Fan Zhongyan’s 范仲淹’s (989–1052) Qingli Reforms (Qingli *xinzheng* 慶曆新政) and Wang Anshi’s 王安石 (1021–1086) New Policies (*xinfa* 新法) have generally identified Song factionalism with a direct political confrontation between reformists and anti-reformists, especially in the New Policies of the late Northern Song.¹¹

Nevertheless, Song ritual controversy over the Imperial Temple reflects another dimension of Song factionalism that was more defined by intellectual than political

9. I borrow this phrase from Jiang Tao 蔣韜, “Intimate Authority: The Rule of Ritual in Classical Confucian Political Discourse,” in *Confucian Cultures of Authority*, ed. Peter D. Herschok and Roger T. Ames (New York: State University of New York Press, 2006), 30.

10. In the original version of the “Naitō hypothesis,” Naitō Konan argued for a shift in the nature of scholar-officials’ “faction” from martial relations to political interests in the Tang–Song transition. See Naitō, “Gaikakuteki To-So jidai kan” 概括の唐宋時代観. *Rekishi to chiri* 歴史と地理 9:5 (1922): 1–12, especially 7–8. For more details of the Naitō hypothesis and its evolution in scholarship, see Hisayuki Miyakawa 宮川尚志, “An Outline of the Naitō Hypothesis and Its Effects on Japanese Studies of China,” *The Far Eastern Quarterly* 14.4 (1955): 533–52, especially 535–38. Zhang Guangda 張廣達, “Neiteng hunan de Tang Song biangeshuo jiqi yingxiang” 內藤湖南的唐宋變革說及其影響, *Tang Yanjiu* 唐研究 11 (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2005): 5–71.

11. For a thorough study of Northern Song factionalism, see Ari Levine, *Divided by a Common Language: Factional Conflict in Late Northern Song China* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2008), 44–71. According to Levine, Northern Song politicians tended to conceptualize factionalism with polarized vocabularies for the purpose of persuading the emperor to support their interest groups and to expel their adversaries. Their factional rhetoric reflected their political interests on a conceptual level. In practice, Song factionalism was rather volatile—always changing with the times and the external political environment. Some historians have challenged Levine’s methodological choices, especially his focus on the use of terminology for factions. For example, see Hilde de Weerd’s “Review of *Divided by a Common Language: Factional Conflict in Late Northern Song China*, by Ari Levine,” *Journal of Asian Studies* 69.2 (2010): 556–58.

factors. This study argues that the ritual interests of Song scholar-officials were more associated with their scholarly backgrounds rather than with their political stances or affiliations. Song ritual discussions and debates on the Imperial Temple involved scholar-officials from various departments in the central bureaucracy, including chief councilors, the emperors' private secretaries, academicians, and ritual officials from various ritual bureaus (*lichen* 禮臣). It is worth noting that Song ritual officials did not hold lifelong appointments. As such, they should not be simply treated as a monolithic group of professionals. Scholar-officials who had never served in ritual bureaus may have been as knowledgeable about ritual issues as ritual officials. Generally, ritual debates between scholar-officials reflected how these officials formulated and promoted particular intellectual interests. Through a thorough analysis of these interests, this study reveals the intellectual confrontation between Song scholar-officials behind the veil of political factions. Hence, it offers historians a new perspective to understand Song factionalism.

As an intellectual discourse, Song ritual debates on the Imperial Temple is also associated with the identity of scholar-officials. Peter Bol's significant work on the intellectual transitions in Tang (618–907) and Song China explores the formation of scholar-officials' identity and the shift of a view of literati culture from literary accomplishment to ethical values.¹² In the Song ritual discourses of the Imperial Temple, scholar-officials rendered a separate intellectual identity that transcended the boundaries of not only factional politics but also the strictly defined "schools" (*xuepai* 學派) of Song scholarship. In terms of intellectual identity, Song scholar-officials are more eclectic than historians have previously thought, if ritual interest is taken into consideration. Song ritual discourse of the Imperial Temple reveals some discrepancies between conservative and reformist ideas among scholar-officials. Nonetheless, that discrepancy does not necessarily concur with the conventional understanding of Song scholar-officials' political and intellectual identities as represented in the Yuan-compiled *Song shi* 宋史 (official dynastic history of Song) and the Qing-compiled *Song Yuan xuean* 宋元學案 (Case Studies of the Learning of Song and Yuan Scholars). In this light, this study supplements and enriches Bol's and other scholars' research on the construction of Song literati identity as a kind of self-identification process along with the Daoxue 道學 movement.¹³

Ritual debates over the Imperial Temple also inspired some Song Confucian scholars to promote imperial ritual norms on the social level. Anthropologists have significantly explored and enriched the research field of Chinese ancestral rituals. Historians have also made substantial contributions from various perspectives.¹⁴

12. Peter Bol, *This Culture of Ours: Intellectual Transitions in T'ang and Sung China* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992).

13. Peter Bol, "Neo-Confucianism and Local Society, 12th–16th Century: A Case Study," in *The Song-Yuan-Ming Transition in Chinese History*, ed. Paul Jakov Smith and Richard von Glahn (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2003), 241–83. Also see Chen Wenyi 陳雯怡, "Networks, Communities, and Identities: On the Discursive Practices of Yuan Literati" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 2007), chap. 4.

14. Stephan Feuchtwang and Arthur Wolf, ed., *Religion and Ritual in Chinese Society* (Stanford, CA: Stanford

Nonetheless, the intellectual origin of the pivotal role played by ancestral rituals in shaping kinship organizations of late imperial China still remains obscure to this date. Recent studies scarcely discuss the “medieval” origin of these ritual norms, especially compared with the rich literature on the formation and development of different kinship rituals in late imperial China. The interest in tracing that origin has driven me to venture into the field of imperial ancestral rituals. Through a careful examination of Song ritual texts, I argue that intensive court debates over the Imperial Temple during the Song dynasty had codified some ritual norms for the ancestral rituals of later periods to follow. In this light, an analysis of the ritual order of royal ancestors in the Imperial Temple could shed new light on how some ritual norms were rectified on the state level to create a Confucian model of ritual propriety for adoption on the social level, such as the way of ordering ancestors in genealogical writings. Therefore, a study of the Imperial Temple and related ritual controversies contributes to a better understanding of the Song conception of ritual “orthodoxy” and “orthopraxy.”¹⁵

Lastly, a study on the Song Imperial Temple provides us an opportunity to rethink state-elite and state-society relationships in Chinese history. Robert Hartwell’s classic argument on the *longue durée* transformation in the Middle Period of China emphasizes the “local turn” in the Tang and Song periods, which indicates a shift in educated elites’ focus from the central state to local society.¹⁶ This book reexamines and enriches the “local-turn” approach from the perspective of ritual studies. Since the Song dynasty, scholar-officials and ritualists (*lixue jia* 禮學家) had served as collaborators of emperors in formulating court rituals. Reciprocally, as Confucian scholars, these educated elites (*shi* 士) possessed adequate cultural capital that enabled them to construct ritual norms based on their own conceptions

University Press, 1974), 106–7; Joseph McDermott, *The Making of a New Rural Order in South China* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); Patricia Ebrey, *Confucianism and Family Rituals in Imperial China*; David Faure, *Emperor and Ancestor: State and Lineage in South China* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2007).

15. For the concept of orthopraxy, see Catherine Bell, *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 191–97. Bell differentiates orthodoxic and orthopraxic ritual traditions and links rituals in the orthopraxic tradition with specific religious activities that sustain a holistic cultural heritage. In contrast to Bell, anthropologists such as James Watson emphasize the performative aspect of ritual orthopraxy and argue for more pluralistic and discursive understandings of ritual practices in nonreligious contexts. See James Watson, “Anthropological Analyses of Chinese Religion,” *China Quarterly* 66 (June 1976): 355–64, and Donald Sutton, “Ritual, Cultural Standardization, and Orthopraxy in China: Reconsidering James L. Watson’s Ideas,” *Modern China* 33 (January 2007): 3–21.
16. Robert Hartwell, “Demographic, Political and Social Transformation of China, 750–1550,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 42.2 (1982): 365–442. Other major contributors to the “local-turn” approach include Peter Bol, Robert Hymes, Paul Smith, and Hugh Clark, whose research mostly covers crucial areas of the southeastern coastal regions in China. Peter Bol, “The Rise of Local History: History, Geography, and Culture in Southern Song and Yuan Wuzhou,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 61.1 (2001): 37–76; Robert Hymes, *Statesmen and Gentlemen: The Elite of Fu-Chou, Chiang-Hsi, in Northern and Southern Song* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986); Paul Smith, *Taxing Heaven’s Storehouse: Horses, Bureaucrats, and the Destruction of the Sichuan Tea Industry, 1074–1224* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991); Hugh Clark, *Community, Trade and Networks* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

of cardinal Confucian values.¹⁷ This symbiotic relationship between educated elites and rulers ensured the continuity and legitimacy of the Chinese monarchy for hundreds of years.

Concerning ritual discourse on the Song Imperial Temple, ritual debates in the Northern Song consolidated a set of standardized codes that imbued temple rituals with Confucian values, especially filial piety. These standardized codes include oversight of regular and irregular temple sacrifices, the arrangement of ancestral chambers in the temple, sacrificial offerings, and ritual utensils. In the eleventh century, scholar-officials employed court ritual debates to assert their autonomy in modifying and rectifying these standardized codes. However, given the rise of monarchical power in the late Northern Song, monarchical authority gradually dominated ritual discussions on temple rituals. Correspondingly, educated elites of Southern Song conceptualized temple rituals within a socio-intellectual framework, under which they textually modified and codified the imperial rituals in genealogical records to symbolize their social prestige.¹⁸ After all, knowledge about temple rituals offered educated elites not only the cultural authority to confront monarchical power but also a means to empower themselves regarding their own pedigree.

The Imperial Temple: A Literature Review

Since the 1970s, political and social historians have devoted considerable attention to how ancestral rituals have been institutionalized and politicalized according to Confucian doctrines in the Middle Period of China (seventh to thirteenth centuries). In recent decades, scholars have published extensive research regarding imperial ancestral rituals, especially on how these rituals were connected to various political implications such as legitimacy and monarchical authority. Japanese and Chinese historians have approached imperial ancestral rituals based on a binary conception of Chinese monarchs as both the Son of Heaven (*tianzi* 天子) and the emperor. The works of Sadao Nishijima 西嶋定生 and his student Kaneko Shūichi 金子修一 demarcated the political and ritual identities of Chinese emperors in a public-versus-private conceptual framework.¹⁹ Throughout the 1980s and the 1990s, Japanese historians gradually shifted their focus from a general overview

17. For a classic presentation of cultural capital theory, see Pierre Bourdieu, "The Forms of Capital," in *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, ed. John Richardson (New York, Greenwood, 1986), 241–58.

18. To borrow terms from Robert Hymes, temple rituals underwent a shift from the top stratum of "court-oriented" authority downward to local "shi-oriented" authority in the Song period. Robert Hymes, "Sung Society and Social Change," in *The Cambridge History of China, Vol. 5, Part Two: Sung China, 907–1279*, ed. John W. Chaffee and Denis Twitchett (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 621–60, especially 631–32.

19. Sadao Nishijima, "Kōtei shihai no shutsugen" 皇帝支配の出現, in *Chūgoku kodai kokka to hīgashi ajia sekai* 中国古代国家と東アジア世界 (Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1983), 370–93; Kaneko Shūichi, *Chūgoku kodai kōtei saishi no kenkyū* 中国古代皇帝祭祀の研究 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2006), 1–28, 431–52; Ogata Isamu 尾形勇, *Zhongguo gudai de jia yu guojia* 中國古代的家與國家 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2010), 205–31.

of imperial ancestral rituals to concern with specific rites and ceremonies.²⁰ The endeavors of Japanese scholars in exploring ritual details have been echoed by ritual historians in China since the 1990s. Ritual historians have examined the institutional changes of imperial rites and ceremonies.²¹ Ritual historians like Wu Liyu 吳麗娛, Lei Wen 雷聞, Li Hengmei 李衡眉, Chen Shuguo 陳戌國, Guo Shanbing 郭善兵, Zhang Wenchang 張文昌, Zhu Yi 朱溢, and many others have greatly enhanced our understanding of dynastic ritual codes, ritual institutions, and the Confucianization of state rituals in the Middle Period of China's history.²²

In contrast to Japanese and Chinese scholarship, ritual studies in Western languages focus more on how imperial ancestral rituals were conceptualized in their times. In his pioneering work on Tang imperial rituals, Howard Wechsler revealed how ancestral ceremonies were utilized as effective tools to sustain legitimacy by retaining the dynasty's mandate from Heaven through a twofold worship of Heaven and ancestors.²³ With its inspiring theoretical exploration, Wechsler's monograph remains one of the most important references in understanding the political implications of Chinese imperial rituals. Among other relevant publications in the 1980s, only David McMullen's study on Tang imperial rituals and Antonino Forte's research on Tang ancestral buildings can rival Wechsler's work in depth and scope.²⁴

20. To list a few, Tozaki Tetsuhiko 戶崎哲彦, "Tōdai niokeru teikyū ronsōto sono igi" 唐代における禘祫論争とその意義, *Tōhōgaku* 東方學 80 (1990): 82–96; Tozaki Tetsuhiko, "Tōdai niokeru taibyō seido no bensen" 唐代における太廟制度の変遷, *Hikone ronsō* 彦根論叢 262–263 (1989): 371–90; Egawa Shikibu 江川武部, "Teigen nenkan no taibyōsōgi to tōdaikōki no reisei kaikaku" 貞元年間の太廟奏議と唐代後期の禮制改革, *Chūgoku shigaku* 20 中國史學 (2010): 153–75; Kaneko Shūichi, *Chūgoku kodai kōtei saishi no kenkyū*, 141–430; Kojima Tsuyoshi 小島毅, "Kō shi seido no henshen" 郊祀制度の變遷, *Tōyō bunka kenkyūsho kiyō* 108 (1989): 123–219; Yamauchi Kōichi 山内弘一, "Hokusō jidai no kō shi" 北宋時代の郊祀, *Shigaku zasshi* 史學雜誌 92:1 (1985): 40–66; Yamauchi Kōichi, "Hokusō jidai no taibyō" 北宋時代の太廟, *Jochi shigaku* 上智史學 35 (1990): 91–119; Nishioka Ichisuke 西岡市祐, "Shaku Tougyo: Daitō kaigenrei senshin u taibyōrei no senshinbutsu sonoichi" 《大唐開元禮》荐新於太廟禮の荐新物その一, *Bulletin of the Sinological Society of Kokugakuin* 国学院中国学会報 38 (1992): 74–90.
21. Gao Mingshi 高明士, "Lifa yi yi xiade zongmiao: yi zhongguo zhonggu weizhu" 禮法意義下的宗廟—以中國中古為主, in *Dongya chuantong jiali, jiaoyu yu guofa: jiazuo, jiali yu jiaoyu* 東亞傳統家禮、教育與國法：家族、家禮與教育 (Shanghai: Huadong shifan daxue chubanshe, 2008), 23–86; Gan Huaizhen 甘懷真, *Tangdai jiamiao lizhi yanjiu* 唐代家廟禮制研究 (Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1991); Gan, *Huangquan liyi yu jingdianquanshi: zhongguo gudai zhengzhishi yanjiu* 皇權、禮儀與經典詮釋：中國古代政治史研究 (Taipei: Ximalaya yanjiufazhan jijinhui, 2003); Huang Jinxing 黃進興, *Youru shengyu: quanli, xinyang yu zhengdangxing* 優入聖域：權力、信仰與正當性 (Taipei: Yunchen wenhuashiye gufenyouxian gongsi, 1994); Kang Le 康樂, *Congxijiao dao nanjiao: guojia jidian yu beiwei zhengzhi* 從西郊到南郊：國家祭典與北魏政治 (Taipei: Daohe chubanshe, 1995).
22. Wu Liyu, *Zhongji zhi dian: zhongguo sangzang zhidu yanjiu* 終極之典：中古喪葬制度研究 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2012); Lei Wen, *Jiaomiao zhiwai: Suitang guojia jisi yu zongjiao* 郊廟之外：隋唐國家祭祀與宗教 (Beijing: Sanlian shudian, 2009), 72–100; Li Hengmei, *Zhaomu zhidu yanjiu* 昭穆制度研究 (Jinan: Qilu shushe, 1996); Chen Shuguo, *Zhongguo lizhishi: suitang wudai juan* 中國禮制史：隋唐五代卷 (Changsha: Hunan jiaoyu chubanshe, 1998); Guo Shanbing, *Zhongguo gudai diwang zongmiao lizhi yanjiu* 中國古代帝王宗廟禮制研究 (Beijing: Renmin chubanshe, 2007); Zhang Wenchang, *Zhili yijiao tianxia: Tang Song lishu yu guojia shehui* 制禮以教天下：唐宋禮書與國家社會 (Taipei: Guoli Taiwan daxue chubanshe, 2012); Zhu Yi, *Shibangguo zhi shenzhi: tangzhibeison gongji bianqian yanjiu* 事邦國之神祇：唐至北宋吉禮變遷研究 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2014).
23. Howard Wechsler, *Offerings of Jade and Silk: Ritual and Symbol in the Legitimization of the T'ang Dynasty* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985), 1–106.
24. David McMullen, *State and Scholars in T'ang China* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988),

Compared to studies on Tang imperial rituals, studies on Song imperial rituals only proliferated after the 1990s. Patricia Ebrey's early work examines the Song tradition of adopting portrait scriptures in imperial ancestral rituals.²⁵ Song Jaeyoon's recent monograph provides hitherto the most comprehensive description of some significant Song commentaries on the Confucian ritual Classics within the framework of state policy, including some key passages about imperial ancestral rituals.²⁶ Mihwa Choi's book studies Song death and sacrificial rituals performed in society and at the imperial court, with a special focus on their political messages.²⁷

Although much scholarly attention has been devoted to imperial ancestral rituals, debates and discussions over these rituals have received scant attention from historians.²⁸ Christian Meyer's work on the eleventh-century court ritual debates over imperial rituals is an exception, as it focuses on the court debates and discussions through which imperial rituals were codified and instituted.²⁹ Specifically, Meyer attempts to link his study of Song ritual debates to factional politics and the emergence of neo-Confucian philosophy during the same period. Meyer has painstakingly reconstructed neglected aspects of Song ritual history, especially some debates on Song state sacrifices and the ceremonial music used in these sacrifices. Despite his efforts it is difficult to say that he has successfully confirmed his observation on the relationships between ritual, politics, and intellectual campaigns. The lack of a persuasive explanation of these relationships should be attributed to the fact that ritual debates were not solely dominated by political factors during the Song dynasty.³⁰ In ritual debates, intellectual factors were equivalent to or even more important than political factors. However, a thorough analysis of Song ritual debates in relation to their intellectual context is still absent in related fields. This

especially 113–58; McMullen, “Bureaucrats and Cosmology: The Ritual Code of T'ang China,” in *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies*, ed. David Cannadine and Simon Price (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 181–236. Antonino Forte, *Mingtang and Buddhist Utopias in the History of the Astronomical Clock: The Tower, Statue and Armillary Sphere Constructed by Empress Wu* (Rome: Instituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1988).

25. Patricia Ebrey, “Portrait Sculptures in Imperial Ancestral Rites in Song China,” *T'oung Pao* 83 (1997): 42–92.

26. Song Jaeyoon, *Traces of Grand Peace: Classics and State Activism in Imperial China* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asian Center, 2015).

27. Choi Mihwa, *Death Rituals and Politics in Northern Song China* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017).

28. This is even more obvious in the study of Song ritual history. Wechsler and McMullen both focus on Tang state rituals, as well as Gao Mingshi, Gan Huaizhen, and Kaneko Shūichi. Joseph McDermott's edited volume concerning Chinese state rituals skips the Song period, regardless of the rich ritual texts that had been produced from the tenth to the thirteenth centuries. Joseph McDermott, ed., *State and Court Ritual in China* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999). Also see Zhu Yi's comments on Chinese and Japanese scholarship for a lack of attention to Song imperial rituals. Zhu, *Shibangguo zhi shenzhi*, 37.

29. Christian Meyer, *Ritendiskussionen am Hof der nördlichen Song-Dynastie (1034–1093): zwischen Ritengelehrsamkeit, Machtkampf und intellektuellen Bewegungen* (Sankt Augustin: Institut Monumenta Serica, 2008). Meyer later summarized the main ideas of his monograph in an English essay. Christian Meyer, “Negotiating Rites in Imperial China: The Case of Northern Song Court Ritual Debates from 1032 to 1093,” in *Negotiating Rites*, ed. Ute Hüsken and Frank Neubert (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 99–115.

30. Hilde de Weerdts has also pointed out this. See her review of Meyer's book on *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 72.1 (2009): 206.

study of Song debates over the Imperial Temple fills the void and thus contributes to a better understanding of the connotative meaning of Chinese rituals.

Theoretical Consideration, Sources, and Structure

It is commonly said that Chinese emperors were sanctified and empowered by the spiritual power of their ancestors through the appropriate arrangement of Imperial Temples and temple rituals. The Geertzian reading of ritual acts as a manifestation of power within a theatrical state has some explanatory value in explicating temple rituals from a performative perspective.³¹ Nonetheless, James Laidlaw has argued that the Geertzian account of ritual in the Chinese context tends to overlook the complicated intellectual actions that were involved in the making of court rituals.³² In the case of the Chinese Imperial Temple, related rituals were performed within a conceptual framework of particular cultural references and agendas. Under most circumstances, neither these rituals nor their symbolic meaning matters. What matters are the connections between rituals and various cultural agendas.

Anthropological studies of Chinese rituals focus more on the cultural agendas of village ancestral rituals. In an early study of Chinese village rituals, Stephan Feuchtwang and Arthur Wolf have claimed that the targets of traditional Chinese ancestral rituals could be aptly categorized into three different kinds of spiritual beings: ghosts, gods, and ancestors.³³ The separation of ancestors from ghosts and gods to a large degree reconciled the tension between this-worldliness and the anxiety surrounding the afterlife, as well as contributed to a sense of familial solidarity among lineage members. Generally, the Imperial Temple served the same purpose as village ancestral rituals in providing a bridge between the living and their ancestors. Thus, some social historians would hastily assume that there was an intrinsic interplay of Imperial Temple rituals and village ancestral practices. However, it is necessary to bear in mind the danger of overestimating the communication between court ritual norms and diverse ritual traditions on the village level. In fact, rural traditions of Chinese ancestral rituals mostly evolved from relevant practices of late imperial China, which differed significantly from their earlier counterparts before the sixteenth century.³⁴

31. Clifford Geertz, *Negara: The Theatrical State in Nineteenth-Century Bali* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980), 98–136.

32. James Laidlaw, “On Theatre and Theory: Reflections on Ritual in Imperial Chinese Politics,” in *State and Court Ritual in China*, ed. Joseph P. McDermott (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 399–405.

33. Feuchtwang and Wolf, ed., *Religion and Ritual in Chinese Society*, 106–7.

34. For two exemplars of anthropological studies of Chinese village rituals after the sixteen century, see David Johnson’s study on the marginalized “entertainers” (*yuehu* 樂戶) in Shanxi 山西, *Spectacle and Sacrifice: The Ritual Foundations of Village Life in North China* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009) and Liu Yonghua’s study on the “ritual experts” (*lisheng* 禮生) in Fujian 福建, *Confucian Rituals and Chinese Villagers: Ritual Change and Social Transformation in a Southeastern Chinese Community, 1368–1949* (Leiden: Brill, 2013).

Considering the aforementioned difficulties in studying Chinese imperial rituals, I argue that only if we see the formation of court ritual traditions as a dynamic process of intellectual endeavor in its historical context, can we understand it comprehensively. Beneath the apparently self-contained structure of ritual, researchers would confront the deep consciousness of those who set, performed, and manipulated court ritual for their own intellectual and political ends. Therefore, by focusing on how Song scholar-officials posited the Imperial Temple and related rituals, I aim to explore their mentality as ritual “manipulators” and their intellectual endeavor to transmit ritual ideas to a wider audience outside the imperial court.

Methodologically, I embrace a contextual reading of different ritual texts to reveal their intra- and inter-relations. Through a contextual analysis of these texts, I attempt to approach the decision-making moment of the authors who produced them. It does not mean that I intend to speak on behalf of Song scholar-officials in explicating their ritual texts. Instead, my study aims at interpreting Song ritual texts from their contemporary perspective and minimizing the impact of our modern interpretations. Borrowing hermeneutic terms, I try to let the voice of the past horizon reveal itself in a contextual space that is less influenced by modernity.

Furthermore, my study emphasizes the profound presentation and revisions of details regarding the Imperial Temple in Song ritual writings. Historians usually find liturgical details in dynastic ritual codes and commentaries on ritual Classics boring and insignificant. However, these details and commentaries were significant to Song scholar-officials. New-historicism argues that the “slippages, cracks, fault lines, and surprising absences in the monumental structures” of history deserves more attention.³⁵ The “surprising absences” of liturgical details in the English studies of Chinese ritual history deserves some reflection. By focusing on ritual details, this book challenges one of the basic assumptions of Chinese ritual history: historians can portray a panorama of traditional rituals through an overview of some eye-catching elements, such as spectacular state sacrifices and some general policies of imperial rituals. This assumption implies a prescribed order that values dynastic ritual codes more than the liturgical details upon which these codes were established. In practice, liturgical details were much more important than official ritual codes. An investigation of these details in various ritual texts helps to fill in a missing link, especially in English studies of Chinese rituals.

Concerning sources, most Chinese, Japanese, and Western works on Song ritual history rely on traditional historical sources, including the Yuan-compiled dynastic history of Song, the *Xu zizhi tongjian changbian* 續資治通鑑長編 (A Sequel to the Comprehensive Mirror for Aids in Governance in Detailed Version), and the sections of ritual affairs in the collections of Song official archives in the *Song huiyao jigao* 宋會要輯稿 (Collected Manuscripts on the Various Aspects of

35. Catherine Gallagher and Stephen Greenblatt, *Practicing New Historicism* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2000), 17.

the Song Dynasty). My study is no exception. It relies primarily on the latter two, especially the categories of imperial rituals in the *Song huiyao jigao*. Additionally, my study uses the extant Song official ritual codes, such as the *Zhenghe wuli xinyi* 政和五禮新儀 (New Forms for the Five Categories of Rites of the Zhenghe Era) and the *Zhongxing lishu* 中興禮書 (Ritual Manual of the Revived Song), because they have codified some official regulations of Song temple rituals.

More importantly, my research introduces Song ritual commentaries and annotations to the study of Song ritual history. None of the recent Western studies of Song rituals, so far as I know, has systematically used the rich repository of Song private commentaries on ritual Classics.³⁶ These commentaries provide abundant sources for my research on the formation of Song ritual discourse—to list some of them: Nie Chongyi's 聶崇義 (d. 962) *Sanlitu jizhu* 三禮圖集註 (Collected Commentary on the Illustrations of the Three Ritual Classics), Chen Xiangdao's 陳祥道 (1053–1093) *Lishu* 禮書 (Ritual Manual), Wang Zhaoyu's 王昭禹 (fl. 1080) *Zhouli xiangjie* 周禮詳解 (Detailed Explanation of the *Rituals of Zhou*), Wang Yuzhi's 王與之 (fl. 1242) *Zhouli dingyi* 周禮訂義 (Revised Explanations of the *Rituals of Zhou*), and Wei Shi's 衛湜 (fl. 1205–1224) *Liji jishuo* 禮記集說 (Collective Commentary on the *Book of Rites*). Having been conventionally conceived as repetitive, pompous, and vacuous records of ritual details, these ritual commentaries serve as one of the key sources of my book. Indeed, a close reading of these commentaries leads to a thorough understanding of what the Song ritualists were thinking about while they were penning these words. In this light, commentaries on ritual Classics are not arcane materials of little significance. Rather, they are a fascinating manifestation of intellectual curiosity in a peculiar form—a form that has been well adopted and accepted by traditional Chinese scholars for thousands of years.

To better present a panorama of the Song Imperial Temple controversies, I structure my research both chronologically and thematically. I have divided the whole story about the Imperial Temple into three sections. Section One includes Chapters 1 and 2. Chapter 1 addresses pre-Song interpretations of the Imperial Temple settings and the arrangement of the ritual order of ancestors from the thirteenth century BC to the end of Tang dynasty. This chapter classifies two important interpretations of the ritual status of imperial ancestors since early imperial China: one primarily emphasized ancestors' political merits; the other emphasized the factor of seniority and hence the Confucian value of filial piety. Chapter 2 briefly introduces Song ritual institutions and ritual officials, as well as early Song ritual controversies over fraternal succession and the discourse of filial piety. Through its two chapters, Section One lays the necessary foundation for the ensuing analysis of Song temple discourses.

Section Two, consisting of Chapters 3, 4, and 5, explores the disjunction between Song scholar-officials' political stances and intellectual interests in terms of their

36. The only exception is Song Jaeyoon's *Traces of Grand Peace*. However, as aforementioned, as a pioneering research it focuses on the conception of state policies in Song ritual commentaries but not on ritual history.

opinions on temple rituals. Chapters 3 and 4 examine two influential ritual debates over the placement and sequence of Song imperial ancestors in the Imperial Temple in the 1070s, a period that overlapped with the heyday of the political reforms led by Wang Anshi and Song Shenzong 宋神宗 (r. 1067–1085). Drawing on these two case studies, I plan to bridge Song intellectual history with Song factionalism in a contextual way that helps elucidate how ritual debates both divided and integrated different groups of scholar-officials in the reform eras of the late eleventh century.

Chapter 5 deals with the general intellectual background where the ritual debates of the 1070s were rooted. It discusses several crucial interpretations about the Imperial Temple raised by Wang Anshi's disciples from the late eleventh to the early twelfth centuries. This chapter also illustrates how Wang Anshi's disciples as ritualists elaborated and revised his ritual theory and thus contributed to the revival of ancient rituals under Song Huizong's 宋徽宗 (r. 1100–1125) reign.

Section Three, composed of Chapters 6 and 7, examines the Daoxue conceptions of the Imperial Temple and traces the intellectual origin of some key ritual norms in later Chinese societies to these conceptions. Chapter 6 focuses on the link between the eleventh-century ritual discussions on imperial ancestral sacrifices and the Daoxue conception of the Imperial Temple, represented by the prominent Daoxue scholar Zhu Xi and some of his best students in ritual scholarship. Chapter 7 analyzes the adoption of some ritual norms of the Imperial Temple in the Southern Song and Yuan societies. In the conclusion, I will discuss the repercussions of Song debates over the Imperial Temple in later periods, followed by a reflection on the modernization of Confucian ancestral rituals.

Yuanfeng Ritual Reforms and the 1079 *Zhaomu* Debate

The 1072 debate over Xizu's ritual status in the Imperial Temple and the formal recognition of Xizu's Primal Ancestor position foreshadowed a series of ritual rectification movements from 1077 onward. Officials and ritualists who advocated Xizu's Primal Ancestor position were the forerunners who called for sweeping reforms of court sacrificial rituals during the late Xining and the succeeding Yuanfeng 元豐 era (1078–1085). Since the reforms were primarily concerned with the formulation of sacrificial rituals held at the suburban Altar and the Imperial Temple, they had been referred to as the “Yuanfeng regulations on the suburban Altar and temple rituals” 元豐郊廟奉祀禮文 in Song official records. The year 1078 marked the initiation of the Yuanfeng ritual reforms and witnessed the establishment of a new ritual department within the Court of Imperial Sacrifices, the Department of Prescribed Altar and Temple Rites (*taichang jiaomiaofengsi xiangding liwensuo* 太常郊廟奉祀詳定禮文所, hereafter cited as DPATR).¹ In the same year, the court expanded the Administrative Office of South Altar Affairs (*tidian nanjiao shiwusuo* 提點南郊事務所) by subsuming into it the Editorial Board of the Regulations on the Hall of Brightness (*bianxiu mingtangshisuo* 編修明堂式所).² Institutionally, these changes set the stage for the succeeding ritual reforms involving the meticulous discussions about a number of altar and temple rituals, including the concrete performance of court sacrifices, the symbolic meaning of the South Altar as a ritualized space, and ritual utensils and offerings used in altar and temple sacrifices.³

In Chapter 3, I argued that the discrepancy among ritual officials in the 1072 Xining debate was primarily associated with their different understanding of ancient rituals. That discrepancy narrowed at the time of the Yuanfeng ritual reforms. Although the ritual officials in the DPATR came from different political backgrounds, they reached a consensus on the presupposition of reviving ancient rituals. None of them considered their contemporary practice of altar and temple rituals to be decent and satisfactory. Therefore, the crucial issue in the Yuanfeng

1. XCB, 287.7012.

2. XCB, 287.7029.

3. SHY, Li 2.28.55. Also see XCB, 291.7124; 292.7136–37; 292.7138–39.

ritual reforms shifted from the question of how ancient rituals should be understood to how they should be performed.

In 1079, the Yuanfeng ritual reforms reached the culmination, when a significant debate concerning the ritual order of ancestors in the Imperial Temple broke out.⁴ In this debate, three ritual officials from the DPATR—Lu Dian 陸佃 (1042–1102), Zhang Zao 張瓘 (d. 1093), and He Xunzhi 何洵直 (*jinshi*. 1078)—disputed the ritual sequence of *zhaomu* of Song imperial ancestors in the temple.⁵ Notably, these ritual officials were generally identified with the reformist faction in traditional narratives. Their conceptions of the *zhaomu* of Song imperial ancestors not only shaped later understanding of spatial arrangement of temple ancestors but also the ritual representation of familial relations reflected in that arrangement.

DPATR and the Yuanfeng Scheme of the Imperial Temple

Emperor Shenzong initiated his reforms on officialdom and bureaucracy at the beginning of the Yuanfeng era.⁶ Meanwhile, he turned his attention to imperial sacrificial rituals—an aspect that had disappointed him since the day of his enthronement. In 1078/1, Shenzong launched the Yuanfeng ritual reforms at the suggestion of a remonstrator named Huang Lü 黃履 (1030–1101).⁷ Shenzong regarded the ritual reforms as part of a general revival of ancient Statecraft—a practice inspired by Wang Anshi's active reading of the *Rituals of Zhou*.⁸ It is recorded in the *Wenxian tongkao* 文獻通考 that a ritual official named Yang Wan 楊完 compiled a thirty-*juan* 卷 collection to document all the memorials, regulations, and ritual writings

4. The *Song shi* dated the debate to 1078. SS, 106.2574. According to XCB, in 1079/1, Emperor Shenzong appointed Lu Dian to the DPATR to revise altar and temple rituals. Before 1079, Lu Dian served as one of the editors of the official edition of *Shuowen jiezi* 說文解字 (Explaining Graphs and Analyzing Characters). XCB, 296.7195. Therefore, it was only possible for Lu to participate in the debate after he joined the DPATR. Zhang Zao was only hired into the DPATR in 1079/1. So, I date the debate to 1079. XCB, 302.7349.

5. Compared to the 1072 Primal Ancestor debate, not much scholarly attention has been devoted to the 1079 debate and its influence. As far as I know, I am the first scholar who has presented related research findings. See Cheung Hiu Yu, "The 1079 *zhaomu* Debate: The Song Ritual Controversy over Ancestral Rites," Western Branch Meeting of the American Oriental Society, 2012. After conducting more research on the 1079 debate, I integrated my revised argument into my dissertation, which was published online in 2015. I am pleased to learn that some Chinese scholars have recently started to pay attention to this debate when I came across an essay published in 2017. Hua Zhe 華喆, "Fuzi yulun: Bei Song Yuanfeng zhaomu zhiyi zai pinjia" 父子彝倫：北宋元豐昭穆之議再評價, *Zhongguo zhhexueshi* 中國哲學史 (2017.3): 18–29. In his article, Hua affirmed some of my research findings in 2012 and 2015. Different from Hua's research, which is based more on Classical studies, I devoted more attention to the debate's historical context and its meaning in the development of related Song ritual discourse. Moreover, I thoroughly investigated a Southern Song source that contains valuable records of the 1079 debate, which Hua ignored in his research—despite the fact that he did mention the source in his essay.

6. Emperor Shenzong selected the era name Yuanfeng from several other choices based on Wang Anshi's etymological study of characters. Ye Mengde 葉夢得 (1047–1118), *Shilin yanyu* 石林燕語 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1984), 5.

7. XCB, 286.6999.

8. See Peter Bol, "Wang Anshi and the Zhouli," *Statecraft and Classical Learning: The Rituals of Zhou in East Asian History*, ed. Benjamin Elman and Martin Kern (Boston: Brill), 229–51.

emerging from Shenzong's ritual reforms.⁹ Unfortunately, this valuable record has been lost since the late thirteenth century. However, we can still construct the history of Yuanfeng ritual reforms based on the excerpts in the collected works (*wenji* 文集) of ritual officials and their personal commentaries on ritual Classics.¹⁰

The Yuanfeng ritual reforms played a pivotal role in Song ritual history. Emperor Shenzong led the whole process of ritual reforms. From 1078 to 1082, Shenzong assembled a number of celebrated *Hanlin* academicians and ritual officials into the ritual bureau of DAPTR, including Huang Lü, Li Qingchen 李清臣 (1032–1102), Wang Cun 王存 (1023–1101), Sun E 孫諤 (1065–1096), Chen Xiang, He Xunzhi, and Zhang Zao.¹¹ Additionally, Shenzong commissioned ritual experts like Yang Wan to further examine the regulations drafted by the DPATR officials.¹² He also ordered officials from other bureaus to review the tentative conclusions made by the DPATR officials. Compared to the ritual debates in the Xining era, the Yuanfeng ritual reforms reflected more of Emperor Shenzong's personal will in reviving ancient rituals.¹³ Under usual circumstances, Shenzong instructed his ritual officials in the DPATR to express opinions on rituals that he considered problematic, especially on altar and temple rituals.¹⁴

Despite the diverse political backgrounds of the DPATR officials, they shared similar ritual interests in arguing for a revival of ancient rituals. Chen Xiang, the main drafter of the 1079 temple scheme and a myriad of other regulations of the Yuanfeng ritual reforms, was a typical conservative, as we have mentioned in

9. Ma Duanlin 馬端臨 (1254–1323). *Wen xian tongkao* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1986), 187.1598. The Song bibliographer Chao Gongwu 晁公武 (fl. twelfth century) documented a thirty-one *juan* in his *Junzhai dushuzhi* 郡齋讀書志. Yet, the Song bibliographer Chen Zhensun 陳振孫 (fl. 1211–1249) recorded Yang Wan's work as thirty *juan*. Chen Zhensun, *Zhizhai shulujieti* 直齋書錄解題 (Taipei: Guangwen shuju, 1968), 5.15b. The extra *juan* in *Junzhai dushuzhi* might be a table of contents. See Sun Meng 孫猛, *Junzhai dushuzhi jiaozheng* 郡齋讀書志校證 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1990), 83–84.

10. In general, Yang Wan's work continued the preceding practices of compiling ritual manuals in the form of *yizhu* 儀註 (ritual exegesis), *yingeli* 因革禮 (modification of rituals), and *xinyi* 新儀 (new rites and regulations). Concerning the Northern Song textual tradition of ritual codes, there was a tendency to favor the existing paradigm of ritual practices. *Taichang yingeli*, *Lige xinbian* 禮閣新編 (New Collections of Ritual Pavilion), and *Qingli siyi* 慶曆祀儀 (Sacrificial Ceremonies of the Qingli Era) all functioned as supplementary notes to the Song official ritual code of *Kanbao tongli*. However, Yang Wan's work posed challenge to the conventional ritual paradigm that sometimes hindered the development of new ritual theories. Based on Yang Wan's work, Su Song on behalf of the court compiled an official ritual code that summarized the accomplishments of Yuanfeng ritual reforms, titled the *Yuanfeng xinli* 元豐新禮 (New Ritual of the Yuanfeng Era). The *Yuanfeng xinli* textually integrated Yang Wan's work into the *Kaibao tongli*. Ye, *Shilin yanyu*, 8.

11. XCB, 287.7012; *Junzhai dushuzhi*, 83.

12. XCB, 287.7012.

13. Historians have already noted the involvement of Shenzong's own will in politics from Xining to Yuanfeng. In particular, it was reflected in the emperor's attitude toward Wang Anshi and his selection of ministers. See Paul Smith, "Shen-tsung's Reign and the New Policies of Wang An-shih, 1067–1085," 447–64; Luo, *Bei Song dangzheng yanjiu*, 97–108. In a broad sense, Shenzong also guided the progress of the Yuanfeng reforms on officialdom and bureaucracy, as noted by the Song scholar Wang Yingchen 汪應辰 (1118–1176). Wang, *Shilin yanyu biao* 石林燕語辨, Ye, *Shilin yanyu*, 202.

14. Pang Yanying 龐元英 (fl. 1080), Ouyang Xiu's son-in-law, considered the revision of suburban Altar sacrifices as the main thesis of the Yuanfeng ritual reforms. See Pang, *Wenchang zalu* 文昌雜錄, QSB, Series 2:4.160–61.

Chapter 3. Throughout his life, Chen strove to imitate ancient exemplars in order to “achieve a well-ordered world as great as the ancient one” 致治如古.¹⁵ Considering Chen’s interest in reviving ancient rituals, it is understandable that he enthusiastically participated in the Yuanfeng ritual reforms near the end of his life.

Huang Lü was the exact opposite of Chen Xiang. As an apparently hardcore defender of the New Policies, Huang was notorious for making false accusations against conservative officials and sowing discord among reform leaders. In spite of his opportunist character, Huang Lü was a formidable scholar of ancient rituals, especially suburban Altar sacrifices. Historical records show that he played a key role in solving one of the most controversial problems with respect to Shenzong’s ritual reforms: whether or not the South Altar and the North Altar sacrifices should be combined.¹⁶ By tracing back to the ritual performance of the Three Dynasties, Huang argued that suburban Altar sacrifices with different configurations should be separately held at the South Altar and the North Altar.¹⁷

He Xunzhi and Zhang Zao shared views with Huang Lü in terms of ritual expertise and hostility toward conservatives. Both He Xunzhi and Zhang Zao were associated with the reformist camp. The elder brother of Zhang Zao, Zhang Huan 張環, was a close friend of Wang Anshi. Conservatives hence attributed Zhang Zao’s promotion to the Secretariat position to his brother’s personal affiliations with Wang.¹⁸ Politically, Zhang Zao advocated Wang Anshi’s New Policies and recommended Cai Bian 蔡卞 (1048–1117), Wang Anshi’s son-in-law, to the position of Lecturer of the Directorate of Education in 1082.¹⁹ Zhang further gained a bad reputation among the conservatives, because he collaborated with the notorious remonstrator Li Ding 李定 to prosecute Su Shi in the Wutai Inquisition of Su’s poetic writings (*wutai shian* 烏臺詩案).²⁰

He Xunzhi leaned on the reformist camp as Zhang Zao did. He achieved his *jinshi* degree in the 1067 palace examination.²¹ Considering Emperor Shenzong’s burgeoning inclination toward reforms in 1067, the fact that he put He Xunzhi in the second place of the first rank among all of the *jinshi* graduates somewhat indicated He’s reformist tendency. In fact, when the conservatives regained power in the late 1080s, some of them explicitly denounced He Xunzhi for his reformist stance in Shenzong’s reign. Liu Anshi 劉安世 (1048–1125) argued that most scholar-officials

15. Liu Yi, “Chenxiansheng citang qi,” *Guling ji*, 25.29b; *DDSL*, 85.7a. Zhu Xi was aware of Chen Xiang’s interest in the general revival of ancient regime and collected the related writings of Chen Xiang in his edited volume of Song celebrated officials. Zhu Xi, *Sanchao mingchen yanxinglu* 三朝名臣言行錄, *SBCK*, 1094–101:14.1a–3b.

16. For a general portrait of this controversy, see Zhu Yi, “Cong jiaoqiuzhizheng dao tiandifenhe zhizheng: Tang zhi Beisong shiqi jiaosizhushenwei debianhua” 從郊丘之爭到天地分合之爭—唐至北宋時期郊祀主神位的變化, *Hanxueyanjiu* 漢學研究 27.2 (2009): 282–88.

17. *DDSL*, 96.6b–7b; *SS*, 328.10573–4.

18. *SS*, 328.10569. Owing to Zhang Zao’s close affiliation with Wang Anshi, conservatives like Su Zhe, Liu Zhi 劉摯 (1030–1097), and Wang Yansou 王巖叟 (1043–1093) charged him in the Yuanyou era, when the political atmosphere turned to their favor. *XCB*, 379.9213–14, 380.9230–33, 385.9373–74.

19. *SS*, 472.13728.

20. *DDSL*, 83.4a.

21. *SHY*, Xuanju 選舉, 5:2.10.

in his time considered He's words and deeds as vicious; Lu further criticized that He was not qualified for any reputable position in the court according to "public opinions" (*gongyi* 公議).²² Certainly, "public opinions" here referred to the judgment of the conservatives in the late 1080s, when the group of "Yuanyou conservatives" was at its culmination. In the 1070s, less-biased officials like Zeng Gong applauded He Xunzhi as "being able to respond to contemporary needs based on his interpretation of the Classics" 夫能據經之說適今之宜.²³ Emperor Shenzong also recognized He Xunzhi's erudition in Classics, especially in ritual Classics.²⁴ Indeed, Shenzong personally appointed He to the DPATR in 1079/1, right before the initiation of the Yuanfeng ritual reforms.²⁵

Unlike Chen Xiang, Huang Lü, He Xunzhi, and Zhang Zao, other DPATR officials displayed certain ambiguities concerning their political stances. Despite his inclination toward supporting Wang Anshi's New Policies, Sun E, a high-ranking official who previously served in the Court of Sacrifices, showed his sympathy toward the conservatives and attempted to protect them from being persecuted by the grand councilor Zhang Dun during Huizong's reign.²⁶ Sun also had the courage to deny Wang's interpretation of the *Book of Documents* at the height of the latter's power.²⁷ Likewise, Wang Cun, once a close friend of Wang Anshi, disagreed with Wang's political reforms but criticized the persecution of the reformer Cai Que through the literary inquisition of Cai's poems.²⁸ Due to their ambiguous political stances, Sun E and Wang Cun were discriminated against by both conservative and reformist camps, and infelicitously had their names inscribed on the Stele of Yuanyou Partisans.²⁹ Intellectually, Wang Cun was of the same type of ritual official as Huang Lü and Chen Xiang. He agreed that the South Altar and the North Altar sacrifices should be distinguished from each other by reclaiming the ancient configuration preserved in the *Rituals of Zhou*.³⁰ More importantly, Wang Cun claimed

22. XCB, 431.10421.

23. Zeng, *Yuanfeng leigao*, 20.158.

24. In 1079/10/4, Emperor Shenzong promoted He Xunzhi to sub-editor of the Imperial Archive. In his promotion edict, Shenzong praised He for his adroitness and erudition. XCB, 300.7306.

25. XCB, 287.7012.

26. Whereas Sun advised Emperor Huizong on the danger of clique politics and suggested the court reconcile the reformers and the conservatives, he was persecuted by Zhang Dun and other reformist leaders. SS, 346: 10984. Concerning New Policies, Sun in particular realized the benefits of implementing the Hired Service System (*muyifa* 募役法 or *mianyifa* 免役法) in local administration. See *Gaoben Songyuanxuean buyi*, 824.

27. However, Sun E's criticism of Wang Anshi's commentaries on Classics, methodologically, was still confined within the analytical framework of the Wang Learning. According to the Qing scholar Wang Zicai, Sun preferred to criticize Wang based on Han Confucian commentaries. See *Gaoben Songyuanxuean buyi*, 825. Yet Wang's ritual and Classical learnings were mostly characterized by their adaptation to the interpretations of Han Confucians. We will address this in detail in Chapter 5.

28. DDSL, 90.1b; SS, 341.10873.

29. Wang Chang, "Yuanyou dangjiwei xingmingkao," *Jinshi cuibian*, 144.15b (Wang Cun), 144.28b (Sun E); Lu Xinyuan, *Yuanyou dangrenzhuan*, 1.10a–b (Wang Cun), 6.11a (Sun E).

30. DDSL, 90:1a. Zeng Zhao, "Wang xueshi Cun muzhiming" 王學士存墓誌銘, in *Mingchen beizhuan wanyan zhi ji* 名臣碑傳琬琰之集, ed. Du Dagui 杜大珪 (fl. 1194), SKQS, 1092:30.12a.

to have built a private family shrine (*jiamiao* 家廟) for his ancestors “in the ancient manner” (*ru gufa* 如古法).³¹

As one of the chief directors of the Yuanfeng ritual reforms, Li Qingchen unreservedly supported Emperor Shenzong’s plan “to follow the footprint, the Statecraft, and the cultural legacy of the Three Dynasties, henceforth creating a spectacular new order” 欲繼三代絕蹟制度文理，燦然一新。³² Like Wang Cun, Li Qingchen emphasized the importance of reviving ancient rituals within and outside the court. The young Li had already underscored the decisive role of rituals in the promotion and demotion of clerks (*li* 吏) in his response to the palace examination questions.³³ Li’s political career was characterized by his long-term services in most ritual bureaus, which also symbolized the key role played by rituals in the broad spectrum of Song officialdom.³⁴

In 1078, Emperor Shenzong asked the DPATR officials to formulate a new model of the Imperial Temple configuration as a crucial part of his ritual reforms. Several months later, the DPATR submitted a scheme to Shenzong and asserted that it perfectly corresponded to the regulations of the previously compiled *Xining yi* 熙寧儀, a liturgical manual summarizing temple and altar rituals of the Xining era. Despite the negligible differences between the DPATR scheme and the *Xining yi*,³⁵ the former is a likely replication of Wang Anshi’s conception of the temple configuration, which had been successfully implemented after the 1072 debate. However, the DPATR scheme distinguishes itself from the Xining setting in a crucial way: it emphasizes the necessity to lodge spirit tablets in separate temples, rather than in one single temple. Hence, it proposes an architectural complex of multiple temples and focuses on the ritual sequence of these temples. In 1040, Zhao Xiyan had already purposed to establish multiple temples. But his proposal was turned down by Emperor Renzong.³⁶ Four decades later, the DPATR officials reignited Zhao Xiyan’s idea by memorializing a new scheme of multiple temples to Emperor Shenzong, who responded positively and called for a further discussion on the scheme. The DPATR memorial reads:

According to the Zhou setting, ancestral rituals of those who ranked above junior officials with honorable titles should be performed in this way: the tablets of grandfathers, fathers, and sons were placed in separate temples, in order to pay respect to ancestors and not to blaspheme them. As the *Law of Sacrifices* chapter in

31. Zeng Zhao, “Wang xueshi Cun muzhiming,” 30.16b–17a.

32. Chao, “Zizhengdian daxueshi ligong xingzhuang,” 資政殿大學士李公行狀, 487.

33. Chao, “Zizhengdian daxueshi ligong xingzhuang,” 485; *DDSL*, 96.3a.

34. Li Qingchen served successively at the Court of Imperial Sacrifices, the Commission of Ritual Affairs, the DPATR, and as the ritual practitioner of the mausoleum of Empress Gao (*xuanren huanghou shanling liyishi* 宣仁皇后山陵禮儀使), and the director of the Bureau of Rites throughout his career. Chao, “Zizhengdian daxueshi ligong xingzhuang,” 485b–489a.

35. For instance, in the DPATR scheme Shunzu’s tablet had already been removed from the Imperial Temple. *SS*, *Zhi* 59.2574.

36. *XCB*, 129.3059–60; *SHY*, Li 1:15.29.

Socialization of the Discourse of Temple Rituals in the Late Southern Song

Zhu Xi's ritual learning and his explication of temple rituals left a significant legacy to his contemporaries. In Emperor Lizong's 理宗 (r. 1224–1264) reign, ritual officials referred back to Zhu Xi and his emphasis on Yuanfeng ritual reforms in dealing with ritual controversies over the Imperial Temple. In 1231/9, the Imperial Temple in Linan was burned down in an accident. Du Zheng 度正 (1166–1235), the deputy prefect of the Court of Imperial Sacrifices and an admirer of Zhu Xi, submitted a memorial to the emperor and claimed that it was opportune to reexamine the temple arrangement after the fire accident. Considering the fire as a bad portent, Du advised the court to reconsider Zhu Xi's earlier opinion in placing Xizu's tablet at the center of the Imperial Temple. Du Zheng suggested two plans in his memorial. The first plan was an adapted version of Zhu Xi's temple scheme; the second plan was a compromise between Zhu Xi's scheme and the conventional temple settings in Emperor Lizong's time.¹ In a tone of regret, Du stated that the Yuanfeng ritual controversy in 1079 had not received adequate attention.² Among the ritual officials who were involved in the Yuanfeng controversy, Du highlighted the contributions made by Lu Dian, possibly because Zhu Xi had mentioned Lu in the “Dixia yi.” Hence, Du suggested compartmentalizing the Song Imperial Temple in a way that the front areas of each chamber would be combined into one single space to host the offerings to ancestors in state sacrifices. However, after some discussions at a collective advisory meeting, the court rejected Du Zheng's suggestion.³

Du Zheng's proposed revision on the Imperial Temple in 1232 marked the decline of ritual officials' interests in temple-related issues. No court debates over the Imperial Temple had left their traces in the official records of the thirteenth century. Instead, the advocacy of establishing ancestral halls (*citang* 祠堂) gained popularity in southern rural regions. While a great deal of scholarly attention focuses on the social history of ancestral worship in southern rural areas after the thirteenth century, scant scholarship explores the relationships between imperial ancestral rituals and the social norms of ancestral worship. Owing to the vital role

1. SS, 107.2589.

2. SS, 107.2590.

3. SS, 107.2590.

of the Imperial Temple in the rubric of imperial ancestral rituals, I am going to examine the “socialization” of the discourse of temple rituals in Southern Song and Yuan periods. As the term *socialization* here refers to a differentiation between central court and local society, the socialization of temple rituals indicates a detachment of these rituals from their imperial context.⁴ Although most temple rituals as social practices had not been widely instituted until the sixteenth century, some new understandings about these rituals had been formally constructed by Southern Song scholars and educated elites in various ritual texts. Still, Zhu Xi’s *Comprehensive Commentary* serves as a point of departure for our adventure in these texts.

From the *Comprehensive Commentary* to Other Southern Song Ritual Commentaries

In all fairness, the *Comprehensive Commentary* was a tremendous success. Not only did it crystallize the ritual learning of Zhu Xi and his direct disciples, but it also laid the cornerstone for the ritual scholarship of later Confucians who recognized themselves as Daoxue scholars. In the two major editions of the *Comprehensive Commentary*, Zhu Xi, Huang Gan, and Yang Fu generally understood the ritual intent of the Imperial Temple and related rituals based on a quote from the *Doctrine of the Mean*. As it is said:

In spring and autumn, they repair and beautify the temple halls of their ancestors, set forth their ritual utensils, display their various robes and garments, and present the offerings in seasonal sacrifices. By means of the rituals of the Imperial Temple, they distinguish the imperial kindred according to the *zhaomu* sequence.⁵

春、秋修其祖廟，陳其宗器，設其裳衣薦其時食。宗廟之禮，所以序昭穆也。

The subjects of this passage refer to King Wu and the Duke of Zhou.⁶ Rhetorically, the revision of ancestral rituals in the *Comprehensive Commentary* is built upon the authors’ interpretations of the Zhou ritual rubric. However, as we have analyzed in Chapter 6, Zhu Xi, Huang Gan, and Yang Fu compromised the basic idea of Zhou ancestral rituals with concrete ritual practices that had been recorded in performative texts, such as the *Jiangdou jili* and the *Dadai lijì*.

In his celebrated commentary on the *Doctrine of the Mean*, Zhu Xi cited texts from the *Jitong* chapter to annotate the sentence that “by means of the rituals of the Imperial Temple, they distinguish the imperial kindred according to the *zhaomu*

4. For a discussion on the adaptability of the term *socialization* in modern studies of Chinese rituals, see Robert Weller, “Religion, Ritual, and the Public Good in China,” in *Confucianism and Spiritual Traditions in Modern China and Beyond*, ed. Fenggang Yang and Joseph B. Tomney (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 332, 343–45.

5. Yang, YLJZT: JL, 618. For the original sources, see *Liji zhushu*, TSZSSJ, 2:52.569; I consulted James Legge’s translation here. See Legge, *The Sacred Books of China*, 4:310.

6. Zhu Bin, *Liji xunzuan*, 775.

sequence.”⁷ Considering the significance of the *Doctrine of the Mean* in Zhu Xi’s philosophy,⁸ Zhu’s citation of a less authorized text in annotating a text under canonization reveals what Walter Benjamin called an “implicit interruption to the fundamental structure and context” of the established textual norms.⁹ By conceptually bridging the theoretical *zhaomu* notion mentioned in the *Doctrine of the Mean* and the operational *zhaomu* sequence described in *Jitong*, Zhu Xi initiated a synthesis of the “higher-order” ritual theories based upon a discourse of reviving ancient Zhou rituals and the “lower-order” ritual practices emphasizing consistency on the practical level.¹⁰ Theoretically, Zhu’s compilation of the *Comprehensive Commentary* gave the literati community access to the complicated theories of ancient rituals. His endeavors earned support from a number of Southern Song scholars, especially those who were also interested in remodeling their contemporary world through a revival of Confucian rituals.

Consequently, discourses concerning the Imperial Temple in the thirteenth century saw the recurrence of intellectual synthesis initiated by Zhu Xi’s *Comprehensive Commentary*. These discourses embraced Zhu’s general understanding of the Imperial Temple as a crucial part of ancestral worship in symbolizing filial piety. In fact, opinions of scholars and ritualists in the late Southern Song followed the framework established by the Northern Song ritual officials and elaborated by Zhu Xi. “High-order” ritual theories with an imperial context, such as Xizu’s ritual status in the Imperial Temple, still constituted a crucial part of the related writings of Southern Song scholars. Nevertheless, when it came to “lower-order” ritual practices, these scholars and ritualists invented new discourses connecting the theories of temple rituals with their practices. I will analyze how the explications of temple rituals in two Southern Song ritual commentaries emphasize the performativity of rituals.

The first piece of ritual text is the *Zhouguan zongyi* 周官總義 (Summary of the *Rituals of Zhou*), authored by Yi Fu 易祓 (1156–1240). Yi Fu’s contemporaries recognized him as a gifted but vicious scholar. Yi’s political affiliation with the powerful minister Han Tuozhou 韓侂胄 (1152–1207) and Han’s military adviser Su Shidan 蘇師旦 rendered Yi an infamous reputation as an opportunist.¹¹ Despite his

7. Zhu Xi, *Zhongyong zhangju* 中庸章句, in Zhu, *Sishu zhangjujizhu* 四書章句集注 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, Anhui jiaoyu chubanshe, 2001), 31–32. The Daoxue scholar Yang Shi first linked the phrase from the *Doctrine of the Mean* to the *Jitong* text in his study of sacrificial rites (Wei, *LJJS*, 129.22a). The difference is that Yang Shi included both texts in the main body of the same paragraph, while Zhu Xi put the *Jitong* text as an annotation to the *Doctrine of the Mean*.

8. Soffel and Tillman, *Cultural Authority and Political Culture*, 52–86.

9. Walter Benjamin, *Illumination* (NY: Schocken Books, 2007), 151.

10. I borrowed the two terms here from Patricia Ebrey’s work on Chinese family rituals. Ebrey uses both “lower-order” and “higher-order” in referring to ideas. She understands “higher-order” ideas as those about general Confucian ethics, such as filial piety and the authority of ancient sages. “Lower-order” ideas, in contrast, refer to Confucian scholars’ conceptions of ritual details. Ebrey, *Confucianism and Family Rituals in Imperial China*, 220.

11. Zhou Mi described how Yi flattered Su by writing him a draft edict of promotion, in which he compared Su with Confucius. Zhou, *Qidong yeyu*, 11.200. Also, Wang Xexi 王可喜, Wang Zhaopeng 王兆鵬, “Nansong

bad reputation, Yi's achievement in ritual learning was remarkable. For example, the Qing editors of *Siku quanshu* acknowledged that Yi's *Zhouguan zongyi* had succeeded in introducing an intertextual analysis of Classics into the study of ancient rituals.¹²

No extant historical sources have suggested a direct link between Yi Fu and Zhu Xi. But Yi had some connections with the Daoxue fellowship. As a senior student of the Imperial College, Yi developed his interest in the *Rituals of Zhou* in youth.¹³ In 1194, Yi began to serve in the secretariat of Zhou Bida 周必大 (1126–1204), the Military Commissioner (*anfushi* 安撫使) of the Southern Jinghu Circuit (荊湖南路, modern Hunan 湖南 province).¹⁴ Zhou had patronized the Daoxue fellowship since the 1180s, when he had been promoted to the Grand Councilor position. Zhou Bida's personal friendship with Daoxue leaders, such as Zhu Xi and Zhang Shi 張栻 (1133–1180), led to his sympathetic view of Daoxue scholarship and Daoxue-related scholars in the 1197 Qingyuan prohibition of False Scholarship. Although Zhou and Zhu Xi construed “the learning of the Way” ways and sometimes disagreed with each other about the means to promote Daoxue members, they partook in the same campaign of pursuing an intrinsic learning of the Way.¹⁵ Zhou Bida's wide circle of acquaintances contributed to the spread of Daoxue scholarship to other scholars. As Hoyt Tillman has pointed out, the full-scale persecution of Daoxue scholars in the Qingyuan era revealed how the Daoxue fellowship as a loosely defined entity gradually gained attention from its contemporary allies and opponents.¹⁶ Zhou's contribution to the long-term development of the Daoxue scholarship might be small, but he spoke for the Daoxue interest in the central government.

Yi Fu's early contact with Zhou Bida possibly accounts for his new interest in the Daoxue learning in ancient rituals. His extant work, the *Zhouguan zongyi*, serves as a testament to the influence of Zhu Xi's ritual scholarship.¹⁷ Regarding Zhu Xi's discourse on ancient rituals, Yi Fu was particularly attracted by Zhu's hypothetical model about the temple of Zhou feudal lords. He cited Zhu Xi's description of the model in considerable length in the *Zhouguan zongyi*.¹⁸ In explaining the setting of the Imperial Temple, Yi valued Zhu Xi's model above and beyond the traditional

ciren Yifu xingniankao” 南宋詞人易祓行年考, *Zhongguo yunwen xuekan* 中國韻文學刊, 19:4 (2005): 71–72.

12. In their own words, “to explicate the Classic texts based on Classics” (*yijing shijing* 以經釋經). Yi, *Zhouguan zongyi*, *tiyao*.2a.

13. *Nansong guange xulu* 南宋館閣續錄 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1998), 4:281.

14. Wang, “Nansong ciren Yifu,” 70.

15. See Yu, *Zhu Xi de lishi shijie*, 497–523, especially, 499–508.

16. Hoyt Cleveland Tillman (Tian Hao), “Ping Yu Yingshi de Zhu Xi de lishi shijie” 評余英時的朱熹的歷史世界, *Shijie zhixue* 世界哲學 (2004:4): 103–7.

17. Yi Fu, *Zhouguan zongyi*, SKQS, 92: *tiyao*.1a.

18. Yi, *Zhouguan zongyi*, 92:12.3a–5a. In addition to the *Zhouguan zongyi*, two other Southern Song commentaries cited Zhu Xi's model in great length. One is Wei Shi's encyclopedic work *Liji jishuo*; the other is the *Zhouli jishuo* 周禮集說 (Collective Explanations of the *Rituals of Zhou*), an anonymous work that was compiled by a Yuan scholar named Chen Youren 陳友仁. In a number of sections, the *Zhouli jishuo* quotes Wang Anshi's *Zhouli xinyi*. The author might be one of Wang Anshi's admirers in the late Southern Song. For the quoted part of Zhu Xi's temple model, see *Zhouli jishuo*, SKQS, 95:4.40b–44b.

interpretations. Although Zhu Xi mentioned several alternative interpretations about the Imperial Temple of the Son of Heaven in his own works,¹⁹ Yi Fu disregarded those interpretations and concluded his commentary by arguing that the Imperial Temple of the Son of Heaven should strictly follow Zhu Xi's hypothetical model of the feudal lords' temple.²⁰ Yi appeared to have considered that traditional interpretations could be replaced by better alternatives, such as Zhu Xi's temple model.

Regarding the performance of concrete temple rites, Yi Fu remarked on the conventional performance of temple sacrificial rites of his time. Yi argued that the first two offerings of the nine libations of ritual wine (*jiuxian* 九獻) in seasonal sacrifices should be abandoned, because the performance of the two offerings assumes the ritual procedure of *guan* 裸, which refers to the pouring of wine on the ground. Yi considered this procedure as inappropriate to solemn rituals like seasonal sacrifices.²¹ While in Yi Fu's time the *guan* rite had already been removed from the nine libations in the ancestral offerings to high-ranking officials, Yi questioned why the same rite was still performed in the Imperial Temple, which was clearly a more sacred space than the family shrines of high-ranking officials.²² Following Zhu Xi and Yang Yu, Yi linked the "lower-order" ritual practices of his contemporary world to the "higher-order" ritual theories in his ritual commentaries.

The second piece of ritual text that reveals the influence of "lower-order" ritual practices is Wang Yuzhi's *Zhouli dingyi* (Revised Explanations of the *Rituals of Zhou*). Wang Yuzhi was born in Leqing 樂清, in the prefecture of Wenzhou 溫州 (modern Zhejiang), where the regional scholarly tradition of the Yongjia School had a deep imprint. Wang's *Zhouli dingyi* is the most comprehensive synthesis of Song commentaries on the *Rituals of Zhou*.²³ It includes fifty-one commentaries covering a wide span of ritual writings from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries. Albeit an admirer of the Daoxue scholarship, Wang Yuzhi had reservations about Zhu Xi's ritual learning.²⁴ The most compelling evidence is that he scarcely cited Zhu Xi's work in the *Zhouli dingyi*. Considering that Zhu Xi's *Comprehensive Commentary* was published two decades prior to the *Zhouli dingyi*, Wang's oversight of Zhu Xi's ritual learning is unusual.²⁵

19. Wei, *LJJS*, 30:47b–48a.

20. Yi, *Zhouguan zongyi*, 12.5a.

21. Yi, *Zhouguan zongyi*, 92:12.14b–15a.

22. Yi, *Zhouguan zongyi*, 92:12.15a.

23. For an introduction of the *Zhouli dingyi*, see Song Jaeyoon, "Tension and Balance: Changes of Constitutional Schemes in Southern Song Commentaries on the *Rituals of Zhou*," in *Statecraft and Classical Learning: The Rituals of Zhou in East Asian History*, 253.

24. According to Zhen Dexiu's 真德秀 (1178–1235) preface to *Zhouli dingyi*, as a Yongjia scholar, Wang Yuzhi's learning resonated with Cheng Yi and Zhang Zai's scholarship. Zhen Dexiu, "Zhouli dingyi xu" 周禮訂義序, in Wang Yuzhi, *Zhouli dingyi*, QSW, 313:7170.166.

25. According to Zhen Dexiu's preface, although a full version of the *Zhouli dingyi* had already been compiled in 1232, an officially authorized copy of it was only published in the second year of the Chunyou 淳祐 era (1242). Zhao Ruteng's 趙汝騰 (d. 1261), the local governor of Wang Yuzhi's hometown of Le Qing, submitted a printed copy of the *Zhouli dingyi* to the court in 1242. Zhao's memorial and the court's edict illustrate how

In his preface, Wang claimed that his own *Zhouli dingyi* was written with close reference to Zhu Xi's annotation format in the latter's *Lunmeng jizhu* 論孟集注 (Commentaries on the Analects and the Mencius).²⁶ Intriguingly, while Wang was explaining his basic ideas about Zhou rituals, such as the priority of the Six Bureaus and the number of Zhou offices in the *Rituals of Zhou*, he tended to adopt the opinions from scholars other than Zhu Xi. He also had a special liking for the Yongjia scholars.²⁷ Among the fifty-one commentaries that he had taken as references, twelve were composed by Yongjia scholars, including Xue Jixuan 薛季宣 (1134–1173), Chen Fuliang 陳傅良 (1137–1203), Liu Ying 劉迎, a scholar with the surname of Wang, Yang Que 楊格, Chen Ji 陳汲, Huang Du 黃度 (1138–1213), Zheng Boqian 鄭伯謙, Cao Shuyuan 曹叔遠 (1159–1234), Lin He 林荷, Chen Wang 陳汪, and Li Jiahui 李嘉會.²⁸ Geographical factors may explain Wang Yuzhi's wide adoption of the Yongjia scholars' commentaries on the *Rituals of Zhou*. Wang might have close affiliations with the Yongjia scholars who lived nearby his hometown and thus rendered their ritual writings more accessible to him. Still, it is necessary to ask why Wang Yuzhi overlooked Zhu Xi and the *Comprehensive Commentary* in the *Zhouli dingyi*.

The answer lies in the text of the *Zhouli dingyi*. If one reads the explanatory note of the *Zhouli dingyi*, he would notice how Wang Yuzhi emphasized the importance of selecting appropriate commentaries for each passage in the *Rituals of Zhou*.²⁹ In his preface to the *Zhouli dingyi*, Zhen Dexiu summarized the intention of Wang Yuzhi's work as to reveal the "public heart" (*gongxin* 公心) of the *Rituals of Zhou*. Zhen Dexiu understood the "public heart" as a shared value of Ancient Kings and the Duke of Zhou, which sharply contradicted the "private heart" (*sixin* 私心) of later scholars and officials who contaminated the true meaning of the *Rituals of Zhou* by their deviant learning and political maneuvers.³⁰ By juxtaposing the "public heart" and the "private heart," Zhen implicitly criticized the Northern Song reformer Wang Anshi as a deviant scholar who had annotated the *Rituals of Zhou* with his "private heart" and made erroneous policies based on his deviant understanding of the *Rituals of Zhou*. However, Zhen Dexiu ignored the fact that Wang Yuzhi's interest to reveal the "public heart" of the *Rituals of Zhou* was meant to include as many interpretative traditions in the *Zhouli dingyi* as possible. Alongside Daoxue scholars like Zhu Xi, Zhang Zai, and the Cheng Brothers, Wang Yuzhi quoted numerous commentaries from the Yongjia scholars who were not well-known but were more familiar with the ritual theories of the *Rituals of Zhou*. In a number of cases, Wang

the state power and its local capillaries attempted to absorb regional scholarly traditions into a holistic project of ritual orthodoxy. Wang, *Zhouli dingyi*, SKQS, zoule 奏勒.1a–2b; diwen 牒文.1a–2a; zhouzhuang 州狀.1a–b.

26. Wang, *Zhouli dingyi*, tiaoli 條例.1a.

27. Wang Yuzhi discussed these ideas in his foreword to the *Zhouli dingyi*. See Wang, *Zhouli dingyi*, bianyan 弁言 1a–18a, especially 6a–9a, 12a–18b.

28. Wang, *Zhouli dingyi*, 93: xingshi 姓氏.3a–4a.

29. Wang, *Zhouli dingyi*, tiaoli.1a.

30. Zhen Dexiu, "Zhouli dingyi xu," *Zhouli dingyi*, xu.1a–3b. The "private heart" in Zhen Dexiu's Preface also refers to the self-interest of deviant rulers and politicians.

Conclusion

This book provides a missing link in the history of the Middle Period of China. It demonstrates how ritual in the Song dynasty intertwined more with scholar-officials' intellectual endeavors than with their political stances. Based on their own interpretations of imperial ritual traditions and related ritual commentaries, Northern Song ritual officials sought monarchical support to initiate a campaign of reviving ancient temple rituals. In particular, officials and scholars under the influence of Wang Anshi's ritual scholarship emphasized the necessity of revising the layout of the Imperial Temple, in order to conform to the ancient setting that was recorded in the ritual Classics. Scholar-officials outside the New Learning circle also championed the New Learning advocacy of an idealized ancient Imperial Temple. Some of them were adamant opponents of Wang Anshi's New Policies. The disjunction between scholar-officials' political stances and their ritual interests provides a counterexample to the conventional understanding of Song factional politics as polarizing political groups. As I have demonstrated in my discussion of the 1072 debate on the Primal Ancestor of the temple, it was quite understandable for some late eleventh-century ritual officials to share a common interest with Wang Anshi and Emperor Shenzong in promoting ritual reforms—despite the conservative stances of these same ritual officials on the political level. In this light, this book illustrates how Song debates and discussions over the Imperial Temple and temple rituals differentiated scholar-officials' ritual interests and shaped their identities on the intellectual dimension.

The Song ritual controversy over the Imperial Temple was also a continuation of previous dynasties' discussions and practices on the arrangement of the *zhaomu* sequence of temples. I have thoroughly surveyed this continuation from different perspectives. Since the Han period, the conflict between the two approaches of meritocracy and filial piety had been borne on the theories and practices of *zhaomu*. Song ritual officials developed both approaches in conceptualizing the *zhaomu* of imperial ancestors and the placement of the Primal Ancestor. Three New Learning ritual officials who were engaged in the 1079 debate over the *zhaomu* sequence—Lu Dian, He Xunzhi, and Zhang Zao—interpreted the *zhaomu* sequence according to their individual conceptions of ritual texts. On the one hand, the Confucian

discourse of filial piety provided a general framework for a hierarchical account of *zhaomu* and the familial relation between ancestors of different generations. On the other hand, the perception of *zhao* and *mu* as genealogical markers indicated a typical merit-based approach, in which the positions of imperial ancestors were determined by their political merits, especially in the case of the Primal Ancestor.

New Learning ritualists who had no chance to participate in court ritual debates also contributed to a discursive understanding of the Imperial Temple. In fact, their discursive interpretations of the temple and temple rituals not only blurred the disciplinary boundary of Wang Anshi's ritual learning but also reflect considerable diversity and comprehensiveness. Through a series of ritual reforms in the late eleventh century, especially the sweeping reforms of imperial sacrificial rituals in the 1080s, New Learning ritualists drastically revised the imperial rituals of the late Northern Song. The reforms eventually led to Emperor Huizong's pursuit of monumental ritual projects in the early twelfth century, including the promulgation of a new ritual code, the compilation of a new Daoist Canon, the call for a reform on liturgical music, and the endeavor to build an independent Luminous Hall of sacrifice.¹

Eventually, immense attention to the Imperial Temple in the Northern Song resulted in the proliferation of related discourses in the Southern Song. The correlation between New Learning and Daoxue ritual scholarship is worth noting. In the canonic synthesis of Daoxue ritual scholarship, the *Comprehensive Commentary and Explanation of the Rites and Ceremonies*, New Learning and Daoxue converged on the Imperial Temple issue. Furthermore, along with the Daoxue interpretation of the Imperial Temple, the Southern Song and early Yuan witnessed a conceptual shift in the understanding of temple rituals from political agendas to social applications. I have termed this shift as "socialization" in this book. Southern Song and Yuan educated elites incorporated temple rituals into family precepts and lineage regulations for the consolidation of descent groups and lineage organizations. Since the Yuan period, in local ancestral halls and cemetery grounds, the tension between merit-based and filial-based approaches in understanding temple rituals was less intense. This is reflected in the obscure merits of lineage members from a political perspective, and because filial piety itself was more regarded as a merit in most lineage regulations.²

The "socialization" of temple rituals continued in late imperial China. In his pioneering study of Ming and Qing ritual studies, Chow Kai-wing has argued that "the ascendancy of ritualism also contributed significantly to the growth of the lineage-oriented ancestral cult, which helped reshape the relationship between the imperial

1. Ebrey, *Emperor Huizong*, 243–54, 160–65, 265–73.

2. For a general explanation of filial piety in Ming and Qing lineage and clan regulations, see Hui-Chen Wang Liu, "An Analysis of Chinese Clan Rules: Confucian Theories in Action," in *Confucianism in Action*, ed. David Nivison and Arthur Wright (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1959), 63–96, especially 84–86.

state and the gentry at the local level.”³ The socialization of imperial ancestral cults among the gentry and the commoners accompanied the ascendancy of what Chow has described as “ritualism.” The *zhaomu* discourse in the writings of Ming and Qing ritualists exemplify this phenomenon. For example, Ji Ben 季本 (1485–1563), a Ming Confucian who has been generally considered a follower of Wang Shouren’s 王守仁 (1472–1529) scholarship, criticized how previous Confucians from Lin Yin to Zhu Xi had misinterpreted *zhaomu* by confining it to the imperial domain. Possibly influenced by the Great Ritual Controversy (*dali yi* 大禮議) of the 1520s and the 1530s,⁴ Ji Ben advocated for a general revival of Confucian rituals. He also asserted that an ideal *zhaomu* reflecting “the ultimate virtues of all-under-Heaven” (*tianxia zhi dadao* 天下之達道) should be applied to families from any social background.⁵ Ji Ben argued that *zhaomu* could be practiced in local lineages and families on a smaller scale, as it was commonly practiced in state sacrifices and ancestral rituals in the Imperial Temple.

A detailed analysis of Ji Ben’s *zhaomu* theory would be beyond the scope of this book. Nonetheless, it is worth noting that Ji paid special attention to the 1079 debate and Zhu Xi’s response to it.⁶ He agreed with Lu Dian that the differentiation of *zhao* and *mu* designations indicates a familial relationship between father- and son-ancestors. Regarding his contemporary practices of ancestral rituals, Ji Ben proposed a relaxation of regulations on the orientation of ancestral buildings, in which *zhao* and *mu* ancestors are not strictly arranged to the left and right sides of the Primal Ancestor. According to Ji, the *zhaomu* arrangement depends on the geographical landscape where the ancestral buildings are located.⁷ As Ji argued, the ultimate goal of adopting *zhaomu* and other temple rituals in local ancestral buildings is to unveil the virtue of filial piety in all circumstances.

Ji Ben advocated for a general adoption of *zhaomu* in the ancestral-cult practices of the sixteenth-century society. At the same time, the Ming court was revising

3. Chow Kai-wing, *The Rise of Confucian Ritualism in Late Imperial China* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994), 224.

4. Plenty of research has been done on the Great Rituals controversy of the mid-Ming period. Carney Fisher’s early work still stands out as the most detailed description of the controversy among Western-language works. See Fisher, *The Chosen One: Succession and Adoption in the Court of Ming Shizong* (Sydney: Allen and Unwin 1990). An interesting article examines the controversy by taking it as the final chapter of a peculiar practice of mass demonstration of Ming scholar-officials, namely *fuque* 扶闕 (literally, to prostrate in a kneeling position at the imperial gate for the purpose of presenting a compelling plea to the throne). John Dardess, “Protesting to the Death: The *fuque* in Ming Political History,” *Ming Studies* (2003:1): 86–125, especially 109–19. David Faure links the Great Rituals controversy to the general revival of Confucian rites and related social transformation after the 1530s. Faure, *Emperor and Ancestor*, 100–108. His work inspires me to understand Ji Ben’s writings about temple rituals.

5. Ji Ben, *Miaozhi kaoyi* 廟制考議, *Siku quanshu cunmu congshu* 四庫全書存目叢書 (Tainan: Zhuangyan wenhua shiye youxian gongsi, 1997), 105:16b. The phrase “the ultimate virtues of all-under-Heaven” comes from the *Doctrine of the Mean*, which originally refers to “the virtue of harmony” (*he* 和).

6. Ji, *Miaozhi kaoyi*, 105:17a–18b.

7. As Ji Ben put it, “It is appropriate to build temples according to the sequence of ancestors, but not the reverse—that is, to place ancestors into fixed temple space” 以人定廟，則可；以廟定人，則不可。 Ji, *Miaozhi kaoyi*, 105:18b–19a.

Index

- Academy of Scholarly Worthies (*jixianyuan* 集賢院), 73
- An Tao 安燾 (*jinshi*. 1059), 105
- ancestral halls (*citang* 祠堂), 159, 170, 172, 176–77, 184
- ancestral worship, 1, 16, 45, 47, 64–67, 70, 76, 103, 114, 122, 159, 161, 176
- ancient sage-kings, 42, 56, 69, 71–73, 76, 78–80, 82–84, 99, 127–28
- Annals of Spring and Autumn* 春秋:
Gongyang Commentary on the Annals 公羊傳, 22n35, 52; *Guliang Commentary on the Annals* 穀梁傳, 120, 142n41; *Zuo Commentary of the Annals* 左傳, 49, 98–99, 118
- apocryphal texts (*weishu* 緯書): *Junmingjue* 鈞命決, *Qimingzheng* 稽命徵, *Liwei* 禮緯, 20, 27, 116
- assistant practitioners (*zhuji* 助祭), 170, 171 table 7.1
- bamiao yigong* 八廟異宮, 91–92, 92 fig. 4.1
- black column (*heiying* 黑楹), 94
- black threshold (*xuankun* 玄閭), 94
- Book of Rites* 禮記, 18n16, 52, 97, 106–7, 110, 116, 121–22, 175; *Dazhuan* 大傳, 18, 20, 23, 169, 176n81; *Jifa* 祭法, 18–19, 78, 78n89, 122, 147, 175; *Jitong* 祭統, 18, 20, 24, 51, 123, 160–61; *Liyun* 禮運, 177; *Tangong* 檀弓, 100, 101n82; *Wangzhi* 王制, 18–20, 22, 26, 33, 42n25, 48n46, 54, 122–23, 147, 170, 172, 175; *Yueling* 月令, 142, *Zengziwen* 曾子問, 22n35
- Book of Songs* 詩經, 15, 68, 94, 106
- branches (*fang* 房), 175, 177–180; adoption between male members of different branches (*guofang* 過房), 180
- Bureau of Ritual Deliberation (*yili ju* 議禮局), 124, 126–27
- Cai Bian 蔡卞 (1048–1117), 73, 88, 113
- Cai Jing 蔡京 (1047–1126), 77, 77n83, 124
- Cai Que 蔡確 (1037–1093), 73, 89, 105
- Cai Yong 蔡邕 (132–192), 22–24, 26, 36
- Cao Shuyuan 曹叔遠 (1159–1234), 164
- carved screen (*shuping* 疏屏), 94
- censor (*yishi* 御史), 47, 57
- central yard (*titang* 提唐), 94
- Chen Fuliang 陳傅良 (1137–1203), 164
- Chen Gao 陳高 (1314–1366), 177n85
- Chen Ji 陳汲, 164
- Chen Jing 陳京, 35–36
- Chen Lü 陳旅 (1287–1342), 177
- Chen Wang 陳汪, 164
- Chen Xiang 陳襄 (1017–1080), 75–76, 87–89, 91, 91n41, 92n42, 93
- Chen Xiangdao 陳祥道 (1053–1093), 11, 108 table 5.1, 115–121, 123, 129, 147, 165–66
- Chen Yang 陳暘 (1064–1128), 108 table 5.1
- Chen Yi 陳繹 (1021–1088), 73, 75, 79, 81 table 3.1
- Chen Yuanjing 陳元靚, 172–73, 174 illu. 7.1
- Chen Zhenjie 陳貞節, 32, 49n50
- Chunqiu fanlu* 春秋繁露, 24, 24n44
- clan cemetery burial (*zuzang* 族葬), 180–81, 181n101

- collective advisory meeting (*jiyi* 集議), 41, 41n17, 49, 51, 68, 159
- Commission of Ritual Affairs (*taichang liyuan* 太常禮院), 39–41, 39n5, 46, 48–49, 51–53, 55, 58, 67–68, 73, 76, 79
- Comprehensive Commentary of the Explanation of the Rites and Ceremonies* 儀禮經傳通解, 135–36, 135n11, 136n14, 144, 145n51, 147–48, 151–52, 156–57, 160–61, 163–65, 167, 184; *Sacrificial Rites: An Extension on the Comprehensive Commentary of the Explanation of the Rites and Ceremonies* 儀禮經傳通解續卷祭禮, 136, 140, 142, 144, 146–49, 154
- containers of temple offerings: *bian* 籩, *dou* 豆, *gui* 簋, and *fu* 簠, 171 table 7.1
- conventional learning (*suxue* 俗學), 128
- court gentlemen for ceremonies (*fengli lang* 奉禮郎), 41, 41n16
- court gentleman of temple fasting (*taimiao zhailang* 太廟齋郎), 40–41, 41n16
- Court of the Imperial Clan (*zongzheng si* 宗正寺), 27, 39, 55
- Court of Imperial Sacrifices (*taichang si* 太常寺), 27, 32, 39–41, 54, 67–69, 85, 115, 133, 159, 171 table 7.1
- crop offerings before the day of sacrifice (*shengshengqi* 省牲器), 46
- Dadai liji* 大戴禮記, 142, 144, 146–47, 149, 160
- Daizong of Tang 唐代宗 (r. 762–779), 33, 34n92
- dan* altar 壇, 18, 118, 153, 175
- Daoxue 道學, 4, 12, 53, 129, 133–35, 139, 147–48, 157–58, 160, 162–64, 170, 172–73, 176, 181, 184
- daqiu yi* 大裘, 94, 94n56, 108 table 5.1
- decorated square timber (*fuge* 復格), 94
- Department of Prescribed Altar and Temple Rites (DPATR, *taichang jiaomiaofengsi xiangding liwensuo* 太常郊廟奉祀詳定禮文所), 85–87, 89–96, 102–3
- Department of State Affairs (*shangshu sheng* 尚書省), 49, 68
- descent group records (*zupu* 族譜), 167, 169, 177–82; great descent group (*dazong* 大宗), 175, 175n74; lesser descent group (*xiaozong* 小宗), 175
- di* sacrifice 禘, 16–17, 17n8, 28n66, 35, 58, 66, 96, 116, 134, 140, 169, 172; spirit tablets in the *di* sacrifice, 58, 66, 117 illu. 5.1
- differentiating surnames (*bie xing* 別姓), 170, 177; major surnames (*zhengxing* 正姓) and minor surnames (*shuxing* 庶姓), 176
- dignity of ancestors (*zunzun* 尊尊), 121
- Dilixinshu* 地理新書, 168
- Dong Zhongshu 董仲舒 (179–104 BC), 24
- dugong* 都宮: separate configuration of temples, 54; temple's wall, 139. See also *wei* 墼
- Du Yu 杜預 (222–285), 99
- Du Zheng 度正 (1166–1235), 159
- Duke Wen of Lu 魯文公, 121
- Duke Xi of Lu 魯僖公, 121
- Duke Zhuang of Lu 魯莊公, 121
- eight state pillars (*ba zhuguo* 八柱國), 31
- eight trigrams (*bagua* 八卦), 92
- Empress Dowager Liu 劉太后 (969–1033), 53
- Empress Dowager Xuanren 宣仁太后 (1032–1093), 123–24
- Empress Dowager Cao 曹太后 (1016–1079), 57
- encyclopedia collections of daily-use rites (*rirong leishu* 日用類書), 169, 172–73, 182
- entrance door of the temple (*beng* 闕), 147
- erudites of *taichang* institutions (*taichang boshi* 太常博士), 40, 42, 115. See also Commission of Ritual Affairs; Court of Imperial Sacrifices
- Erya* 爾雅, 147
- examining editor (*jiantao* 檢討), 75, 127
- Exemplar Ancestor (*zong* 宗), 34, 36, 49–50
- expositor in attendance (*sijiang* 侍講), 94
- Fang Dazong 方大琮 (1183–1247), 179–81

- Fang Hong 方紘, 179
 Fang Que 方慤, 121–23, 129, 138
 Fan Zuyu 范祖禹 (1041–1098), 115
 family precepts (*jiafan* 家範), 169–70, 171
 table 7.1, 172, 182, 184
 family shrine (*jiamiao* 家廟), 38n3, 90, 127,
 150, 163, 167
 filial-piety discourse, 15, 33–37, 52–55,
 57–59, 65, 69, 76, 97, 100, 121, 127,
 139, 161, 183–88. *See also* Primal
 Ancestor
 Finance Planning Commission (*zhizhi sansi*
tiaolisi 制置三司條例司), 65
 five mourning grades (*wufu* 五服), 65
 Founding Ancestor (*zu* 祖), 34, 36, 47, 49,
 52, 57, 69–70
 fresh food offering (*jianxin* 薦新), 24n44,
 45, 165
fu ritual of attaching spirit tablets in a
 temple 祔廟, 100–102, 100n79,
 118n59, 120

 Gang of Four (*siren bang* 四人幫), 188
 Gaozong of Tang 唐高宗 (r. 649–683), 32
 Gaozong of Song 宋高宗 (r. 1127–1162),
 133–34
 genealogical sequence (*shici* 世次), 99, 153,
 180
 Geng Nanzhong 耿南仲 (*jinshi*. 1082), 113
 Gong Yuan 龔原, 108 table 5.1, 113
gongyang scholarship 公羊學, 22n35, 24, 36
 grand councilor (*pingzhang zhengshi* 平章
 政事), 63, 77–78, 89, 162
 grand mentor (*taifu* 太傅)
 Great Office of Clan Affairs (*da zongzheng si*
 大宗正司), 39
 Great Ritual Controversy (*dali yi* 大禮議),
 185
 great supplicators (*taizhu* 太祝), 41, 41n16
 Gu Tang 顧棠, 113
 Guangwu of Han 漢光武帝 (r. 25–57),
 25–26, 91
Gujin hebi shilei beiyao 古今合璧事類備
 要, 173
 Guo Pu 郭璞 (276–324), 147
 Guo Zicong 郭子從, 157

 Han Imperial Temple of Gaozu 漢高祖廟,
 22–23, 25, 91. *See also* Imperial Temple
 Han Qi 韓琦 (1008–1075), 57, 77–79
 Han Wei 韓維 (1017–1098), 66–68, 77,
 79–82, 81 table 3.1
 Han Tuozhou 韓侂胄 (1152–1207), 161
 Han Yu 韓愈 (768–824), 34–37
 He Xiu 何休 (129–182), 24
 He Xun 賀循 (260–319), 51n62
 He Xunzhi 何洵直 (*jinshi*. 1078), 86–89,
 92, 92n42, 95–104, 108 table 5.1, 110,
 112, 114, 121, 128, 138, 151, 153–55,
 157, 183
 He Zhengchen 何正臣, 93
 head of temple chambers (*taimiao shizhang*
 太廟室長), 40
 Heavenly Way (*tiandao* 天道), 70
 Holy Ancestor of Song (*shengzu* 聖祖, Zhao
 Xuanlang 趙玄朗), 45, 127n92
 Hou Ji 後稷, 65–66, 68, 99, 152–53, 156 fig.
 6.4
 Hu Ciyao 胡次焱, 180
 Hu Yuan 胡瑗 (993–1059), 77
 Huang Du 黃度 (1138–1213), 164, 166,
 166n37
 Huang Gan 黃榦 (1152–1221), 135–36,
 147–49, 151–52, 156, 160
 Huang Lü 黃履 (1030–1101), 86–89, 105
 Huang Shang 黃裳 (1044–1130), 124
 Huang Yizhou 黃以周 (1828–1899),
 120n59, 186
 Huang Zhongyuan 黃仲元 (1231–1312),
 177
 Hui Dong 惠棟 (1697–1758), 186
 Huizong of Song 宋徽宗 (r. 1100–1125), 12,
 89, 110, 113, 124–29, 184
 human Way (*rendao* 人道), 70

 Imperial Archives (*mige* 秘閣): auxiliary of
 the Imperial Archive, 53; sub-editor of
 the Imperial Archive, 67, 89n24
 imperially composed edicts (*yubi* 御筆),
 126
 Imperial Temple (*taimiao* 太廟), 1–6, 9, 12,
 15, 17–43, 45–47, 50, 53–59, 63, 65–67,
 69–70, 72, 77, 79, 81–83, 85–86, 90,

- 91–95, 97–98, 100, 102–4, 106, 110–16, 118, 120–24, 127–29, 133–40, 142–44, 147–51, 153–54, 157–61, 163, 165–70, 171 table 7.1, 172–73, 175, 181–88; main chamber (*qin* 寢), 18, 22, 32, 37, 55n79, 58, 94, 127, 137, 140, 142–44, 149, 150 fig. 6.3, 155–57, 165, 172–73; temple doors, 22n37, 94, 140, 145–47
inverse sacrifice (*nisi* 逆祀), 120–21
- Ji Ben 季本 (1485–1563), 185–86
Ji Ling 季陵, 133
Jia Gongyan 賈公彥, 43, 114n37, 170n59
Jiangdu jili 江都集禮, 49
Jiaosi lu 郊祀錄, 51
- Kaibao tongli* 開寶通禮, 43, 43n30, 51, 87n10
Kaiyuan li 開元禮, 28n64n66
Kaogong ji 考工記, 2, 2n7, 109, 147–48
King Cheng of Zhou 周成王, 98, 154, 156 fig. 6.4
King Kang of Zhou 周康王, 98, 101, 155, 156 fig. 6.4
King Wen and King Wu of Zhou 周文王, 周武王, 19, 21, 36, 65, 83, 98–99, 98nn69–70, 118, 152, 154–56, 156 fig. 6.4
King Xingxian of Ming 興獻王, 186
King Zhao of Zhou, 98, 155, 156 fig. 6.4
Kong Yingda 孔穎達 (574–648), 49–50, 116, 152, 177n82
- lanes within the temple (*chen* 陳), 147
Li Bao 李寶, 133
Li Bing 李昉, 28, 34
Li Cun 李存 (1281–1354), 178
Li Ding 李定, 88
Li Hu 李虎 (d. 551), 28, 30–37
Li Jiahui 李嘉會, 164
Li Qingchen 李清臣 (1032–1102), 87, 90, 90n34
Li Rugui 李如圭 (*jinshe*. 1193), 144–45, 144n51, 150 fig. 6.3
Li Yuan 李淵 (566–635), 28, 30, 34, 36n100
Li Zhi 李廌 (1059–1109), 38
Li Zongne 李宗訥, 48
Lizong of Song 宋理宗 (r. 1224–1264), 159
lineage and generations (*xishi* 繫世), 114
Lixiang 禮象, 108 table 5.1
Liang Tao 梁燾 (1034–1097), 68, 77, 79, 81 table 3.1, 83, 105
Liji faming 禮記發明, 107, 108 table 5.1
Liji jiangyi 禮記講義, 108 table 5.1
Liji jie 禮記解 (Lu Dian), 97–98, 108 table 5.1, 165; *Liji jie* (Fang Que), 108 table 5.1; *Liji jie* (Ma Ximeng), 108 table 5.1; *Liji jie* (Yang Xun 楊訓), 108 table 5.1
Liji jishuo 禮記集說, 11, 97–98, 109 table 5.1, 120n61, 140n37, 150 fig. 6.3, 162n18
Lijing yaoyi 禮經要義, 107, 108 table 5.1
Lili xiangjie 禮例詳解, 108 table 5.1
Lilun 禮論, 108 table 5.1
Lishu 禮書, 11, 108 table 5.1, 115–16, 115n41, 117 illu. 5.1, 118, 119 illu. 5.2, 121, 147, 165
Lin Biao 林彪 (1907–1971), 188
Lin He 林荷, 164
Liu Anshi 劉安世 (1048–1125), 88
Liu Chang 劉敞 (1019–1068), 52, 58–59
Liu Mian 柳冕 (ca. 730–ca. 804), 56, 56n87
Liu Xin 劉歆 (ca. 50BC–AD 23), 101–2
Liu Ying 劉迎, 164
Lu Bian 盧辯 (d. 557), 146
Lu Dian 陸佃 (1042–1102), 86, 86n4, 92n42, 93–106, 96 fig. 4.2, 108 table 5.1, 110, 112, 114, 118, 120, 123–24, 138–39, 149, 153–54, 157, 159, 165–66, 183, 185, 188; Lu Dian's *Liji jie* 禮記解 and *Liji xinshuo* 禮記新說, 97–98, 97n65, 108 table 5.1
Lu Jiuling 陸九齡 (1132–1180), 150–51
Lu Jiuyuan 陸九淵 (1139–1192), 150–51
Lunmeng jizhu 論孟集注, 164
Lü Benzhong 呂本中 (1084–1145), 78n89
Lü Dafang 呂大防 (1027–1097), 81
Lü Dalin 呂大臨 (1044–1091), 173
Lü Gongzhu 呂公著 (1018–1089), 77
Lü Hui 呂誨 (1014–1071), 57
Lü Huiqing 呂惠卿 (1032–1111), 105
Lü Jiawen 呂嘉問, 105

- Lü Zuqian 呂祖謙 (1137–1181), 169–70, 171 table 7.1, 172, 180–81
- Ma Ximeng 馬希孟, 121–22, 129, 138
- Ma Zhao 馬昭, 27
- Mao Qiling 毛奇齡 (1623–1726), 186
- merit-based discourse regarding Primal Ancestor, 15, 35–36, 49, 53, 57–59, 65–69, 80, 103, 114, 129, 183–84, 187; meritorious ancestors, 21, 31, 34, 37, 50, 52, 56n87, 118, 122; merits of ancestors, 3, 11, 70, 73, 137. *See also* Primal Ancestor
- Military Commissioner (*anfushi* 安撫使), 162
- mingtang* 明堂, 23, 24n42, 42–43, 44 illu. 2.1, 54, 85, 118, 119 illu. 5.2, 116n60
- Minor Scribe (*xiaoshi* 小史), 20, 113–14
- monthly offerings (*shuoji* 朔祭), 45, 134
- morning ceremony of pouring the ritual wine (*chenluo* 晨裸), 46
- morning offerings in the temple (*chaoxiang* 朝享), 45, 127, 134
- multiple corridor (*chonglang* 重廊), 94–95
- New Learning (*xinxue* 新學), 103–5, 107, 108–9 table 5.1, 110, 112–15, 118, 121–24, 127–30, 135, 138–39, 147–48, 154, 157–58, 165–66, 183–84, 188
- New Policies (*xinfa* 新法): 3, 58–59, 64n3, 74–75, 77–78, 80, 82, 88–89, 105, 110, 124, 138, 183; Green Sprouts Policy (*qingmiao fa* 青苗法), 76
- Nie Chongyi 聶崇義, 11, 42–43, 44 illu. 2.1, 115, 118
- nine libations of wine (*jiuxian* 九獻), 163
- Ningzong of Song 宋寧宗 (r. 1194–1224), 134
- novel temple (*xinmiao* 新廟), 142, 142n41, 144–45
- order of seniority (*zunbei* 尊卑), 22, 36, 95, 99, 103, 121, 129, 153–56
- original lineage (*bentong* 本統), 65–66, 69, 168
- outer wall of mountain paintings (*shan-qiang* 山牆), 95
- paths within the temple (*tang* 唐), 147
- Peng Ruli 彭汝礪 (1042–1095), 105
- Pi Xirui 皮錫瑞 (1850–1908), 186
- personal affection (*qinqin* 親親), 121, 170
- prefect and supervisor of the Commission of Ritual Affairs (*zhi liyuan* 知禮院/*pan liyuan* 判禮院), 40, 48, 67
- prefect and supervisor of the Court of Imperial Sacrifices (*zhi taichang si* 知太常寺/*pan taichang si* 判太常寺), 40, 54, 133
- Primal Ancestor 始祖/大祖, 18–23, 19n20, 114, 122, 129, 139, 149, 155, 168, 173, 185; Song Primal Ancestor temple/chamber, 42, 91–92m 92 fig. 4.1, 134, 137–38; Tang Primal Ancestor, 30–37; the 1072 Primal Ancestor debate, 63–70, 72–85, 103, 122, 183; Zhou Primal Ancestor, 152–53
- Pu Zongmeng 浦宗孟 (1022–1088), 105
- puyi* 濮議, 56–57, 56n91
- Qin Huitian 秦蕙田 (1702–1764), 47, 186
- Qingyuan prohibition of False Scholarship (*qingyuan dangjin* 慶元黨禁), 135, 162
- rectification of rituals (*zhengli* 正禮), 2–3, 39, 175; rectification of ancestors' ritual status and positions, 69, 75, 77, 80, 82, 137–38, 165, 182
- red rafter (*danjue* 丹桷), 94
- regular offerings of daily food (*yapan* 牙盤), 94
- regular rites (*changyi* 常儀), 127
- remonstrators (*jianguan* 諫官), 57, 86, 88, 93
- removal of temples or temple ancestors (*qian* 遷), 99–102, 99n74, 118, 144n46, 147
- Ren Che 任徹, 42–43
- Renzong of Song 宋仁宗 (r. 1022–1063), 39, 45, 47, 53–58, 66, 76, 79, 83, 90, 92, 95, 97, 128

- Rites and Ceremonies* 儀禮, 69, 91, 93, 106–7, 112, 118
- ritual duty officials (*lizhi* 禮直), 41
- ritual intent (*liyi* 禮意), 56, 66, 72, 76, 78–79, 81–82, 96, 98, 125–26, 136, 160, 169
- ritual officials (*lichen* 禮臣), 4, 11, 38–43, 45, 47–49, 53, 58–59, 63, 67–69, 74–75, 78n89, 79–87, 92–93, 95–96, 102–4, 115, 124, 126–27, 157, 159, 161, 166, 171 table 7.1, 182–83
- ritual sequence of temple ancestors (*miaoci* 廟次), 99–100, 102, 153
- ritualists (*lixuejia* 禮學家), 5, 11–12, 52, 58, 85, 104, 139, 147–48, 151, 161, 167, 184–86
- Rituals of Zhou* 周禮, 18, 18n15, 20–21, 43, 83, 86, 89, 106–7, 110, 113, 125, 125n82, 147–48, 151–52, 170, 181
- round altar (*yuanqiu* 圓丘), 42, 43n27
- Ruizong of Tang 唐睿宗 (r. 684–690, 710–712), 32–33, 48, 49n50
- sacrifice of stopping wailing (*zuku* 卒哭), 100, 120n59
- Sanjing xingyi* 三經新義, 104–5, 104n1, 110, 121, 123; *Shangshu xinyi* 尚書新義, 104; *Shijing xinyi* 詩經新義, 104; *Zhouli xinyi* 周禮新義, 104, 106, 108 table 5.1, 110–12, 162n18
- Sanlitu jizhu* 三禮圖集注, 11, 43, 44 illu. 2.1, 115
- scholar-officials (*shidafu* 士大夫), 1–6, 10–12, 32, 37, 40–41, 48, 63, 80, 83n105, 88, 93, 103, 114–15, 127, 134, 137, 167–69, 172–73, 183, 188
- seasonal sacrifices (*shiji* 時祭), 24, 28, 43, 45, 46–47, 53, 91n37, 99, 114, 127, 134, 145n54, 155, 160, 163, 168, 171 table 7.1, 172–73, 174 illu. 7.1, 186n10; *laxiang* 臘享, 28, 28n64, 43
- secret merits (*yinggong* 陰功), 137
- Secretariat-Chancellery (*zhongshu menxia* 中書門下), 53, 64–65, 69, 75
- shan yard* 壇, 18, 118, 153, 175
- Shao Bo 邵博 (d. 1158), 106
- Shao Gu 邵古, 75
- Shao Yong 邵雍 (1011–1077), 74–75, 168
- Shen Gua 沈括 (1031–1095), 105
- Shenyi zhidu* 深衣制度, 108 table 5.1
- Shenzong of Song 宋神宗 (r. 1067–1085), 12, 45, 58, 63–64, 69–70, 73, 77–78, 86–90, 86n4, 93–94, 102, 104, 107, 124, 128, 138, 183
- Shilin guangji* 事林廣記, 173, 174 illu. 7.1
- Shizong of Ming 明世宗 (r. 1522–1567), 186
- Shu Dan 舒亶, 73, 105
- Shuli xinshuo* 述禮新說, 108 table 5.1
- Shuyi* 書儀, 167–68, 172
- Shunzu 順祖 (Zhao Ting 趙昞, 851–928), 42, 69, 90n35, 95n60
- side and cross-framed windows (*daxiang* 達鄉/*jiaoyou* 交牖), 94
- Sima Guang 司馬光 (1019–1086), 55–58, 66, 73–74, 77, 81n98, 167–68, 172
- square altar (*fangqiu* 方丘), 42, 43n27
- Song Chongguo 宋充國, 68, 75–77, 81 table 3.1, 82
- Song Minqiu 宋敏求 (1019–1079), 55, 55n80, 67
- Song political factions and factionalism, 3–4, 3n11, 12, 63n1, 72–77, 79–84, 87–90, 103
- Song Qi 宋祁 (998–1061), 54, 58
- Song Shi 宋湜 (948–999), 51
- Song Xiang 宋庠 (996–1066), 76
- Song Yuan xuean* 宋元學案, 4; *Gaoben Song Yuan xuean buyi* 稿本宋元學案補遺, 74n58
- stairs and doorsteps (*zuoqi* 左城/*xuanbi* 玄陛), 94
- Stele of Yuanyou Partisans (*Yuanyou dangjibei* 元祐黨籍碑), 77, 77n82, 89
- Su Shi 蘇軾 (1037–1101), 75, 77, 88, 128
- Su Shidan 蘇師旦, 161
- Su Song 蘇頌 (1020–1101), 72–73, 87n10
- Su Xian 蘇獻, 32, 49n50
- Su Xun 蘇洵 (1009–1066), 175
- Su Zhe 蘇轍 (1039–1112), 81
- Su Zhuo 蘇稅, 68, 81 table 3.1, 82

- subsidiary imperial ancestral buildings (*yuanmiao* 原廟), 45, 45n33n37, 127, 165
- subsidiary temple or chamber (*biemiao* 別廟), 32. *See also* subsidiary chambers
- subsidiary chambers (*bieshi* 別室 or *xiangfang* 廂房), 48, 54–55, 64, 142, 143 fig. 6.2, 144, 146–47, 149
- suburban Altars (*jiaosi* 郊), 23, 27, 43n27, 51, 85, 137; Altar sacrifices, 17, 28, 34, 43, 46, 50, 70, 81–82, 88, 102
- succession of ancient rituals (*litong* 禮統), 126
- succession of the Way (*daotong* 道統), 126, 126n85
- Sun Bian 孫抃 (996–1064), 55–56, 58
- Sun Congzi 孫從之, 137
- Sun E 孫鄂 (1065–1096), 87, 89
- Sun Gu 孫固 (1016–1090), 66–68, 77–82, 81 table 3.1
- Sun Pingzi 孫平子, 32
- Sun Yu 孫毓, 139–40
- Taichangyingeli* 太常因革禮, 79, 79n95
- Taizong of Song 宋太宗 (r. 976–997), 47–53, 55, 58–59, 82, 92, 95, 97, 128, 134, 153
- taizu* 太祖: *taizu* of Tang, 28, 30, 34–35; *taizu* of Song, 41–42, 46–53, 55n80, 57–59, 65–67, 69–70, 77–78, 80–83, 92, 95, 97, 122, 128, 133–34, 137–38, 153. *See also* Founding Ancestor
- Temple of Spectacular Numina (*jingling gong* 景靈宮), 45, 45n33, 68, 127
- textual analysis (*kaozheng* 考證), 151
- Three Dynasties (*sandai* 三代), 24, 51, 56, 72, 78–82, 88, 90, 128, 136, 138
- three offerings on the day of sacrifice (*sanxian* 三獻), 171 table 7.1
- tiao* temple 祧廟, 19, 34, 36, 54, 114, 116, 118; *tiao*-preservation bureau (*shoutiao* 守祧), 83, 112, 147
- towered gateways (*taimen* 臺門), 94
- Two Drafting Groups (*liangzhi* 兩制), 49–50, 52, 56n90, 65–67, 73; Hanling academicians 翰林學士, 41, 65; edict drafters of the Secretariat 中書舍人, 41, 65, 73, 75
- Vice Minister (*xiaozongbo* 小宗伯), 20, 113–14, 170
- wall-gate (*yuanmeng* 垣門), 140
- Wan Sitong 萬斯同 (1638–1702), 26n58, 186
- Wang Anli 王安禮 (1034–1095), 105
- Wang Anshi 王安石 (1021–1086), 3, 12, 58–59, 63–65, 64n3, 68–80, 81 table 3.1, 82–84, 86, 88–90, 93, 103–7, 105n5, 108 table 5.1, 110–15, 120–23, 128–30, 134–35, 137–39, 157, 164–66, 168, 183–84
- Wang Cun 王存 (1023–1101), 87, 89–90
- Wang Ji of Zhou 王季, 98, 98n68, 101, 118, 155–56, 156 fig. 6.4
- Wang Jie 王介 (1015–1087), 67–68, 77–80, 81 table 3.1
- Wang Li 王禮 (1314–1389), 178
- Wang Mang 王莽 (r. 9–23), 25, 179
- Wang Pang 王雱 (1044–1076), 105n3, 113
- Wang Shouren 王守仁 (1472–1529), 185
- Wang Su 王肅 (195–256), 26–27, 33, 112n29, 116, 166
- Wang Yan 王炎, 179–80
- Wang Yuzhi 王與之 (fl. 1242), 11, 107n18, 111n25, 163–66
- Wang Zhaoyu 王昭禹 (fl. 1080), 11, 108 table 5.1, 110, 112–16, 118, 120, 122, 129, 147, 165–66
- Wang Yirou 王益柔 (1015–1086), 73–76, 81 table 3.1
- wei* 塹, 165
- Wei Hong 衛宏, 23, 26
- Wei Liaoweng 魏了翁 (1178–1237), 176–77
- Wei Shi 衛湜 (fl. 1205–1224), 11, 97, 120n61, 140n37, 150 fig. 6.3, 162n18
- Wei Xuancheng 韋玄成 (d. 36 BC), 21–22, 26
- Wenxian tongkao* 文獻通考, 86, 109 table 5.1
- Wu Zetian 武則天 (r. 684–705), 30, 30n72

- xia* sacrifice 祫, 22–23, 22n35, 28n66, 34–36, 45, 58, 66, 96, 128, 134, 140, 149; the *zhaomu* of imperial ancestors in the *xia* sacrifice, 150 fig. 6.3, 155–57, 176
- Xiaozong of Song 宋孝宗 (r. 1162–1189), 134
- Xie Jingwen 謝景溫 (1021–1097), 105
- Xining yi* 熙寧儀, 90
- Xizu 僖祖 (Zhao Tiao 趙眚, 828–874): Xizu as the Primal Ancestor, 64–69, 73–77, 79–83, 85, 92–93, 128, 134, 134n6, 137–38, 159, 161; Xizu's spirit tablet and chamber, 54–56, 58, 70. *See also* Primal Ancestor
- Xu Jiang 許將 (1037–1111), 73, 81 table 3.1
- Xu qutai li* 續曲台禮, 51
- Xuanzong of Tang 唐玄宗 (r. 713–756), 33, 49n50
- Xuanzu 宣祖 (Zhao Hongyin 趙洪殷, 899–956), 42, 92, 95, 97, 128
- Xue Jixuan 薛季宣 (1134–1173), 164–66, 177
- Xun Zi 荀子 (313–238 BC), 70, 70n32
- Yan Zhenqing 顏真卿 (709–785), 33–34, 36–37
- Yang Fu 楊復 (fl. 1228), 136, 140, 141 illu. 6.1, 142, 144–49, 150 fig. 6.3, 151–52, 154, 156–57, 160
- Yang Jie 楊傑, 68, 75–77, 76n77, 81 table 3.1, 82, 182n104
- Yang Que 楊格, 164
- Yang Shi 楊時 (1053–1135), 53, 58, 138–39, 138n33, 161n7
- Yang Wan 楊完, 86–87, 87n9, 109 table. 5.1
- Yang Xun 楊訓, 108 table 5.1
- Yantie lun* 鹽鐵論, 24–25
- Ye Zuqia 葉祖洽 (1046–1117), 105
- Yi Fu 易祓 (1156–1240), 161–63, 161n11, 165–66
- Yi Zhoushu* 逸周書, 95
- Yili yi* 儀禮義, 108 table 5.1
- Yin Zhizhang 尹知章 (fl. 669–718), 31, 34, 36
- Yin Zhu 尹洙 (1001–1047), 74
- Yingzong of Song 宋英宗 (r. 1063–1067), 56–58, 75, 92, 95, 128
- Yizu 翼祖 (Zhao Jing 趙敬, 872–933), 42, 92, 95, 97, 128
- Yu Ji 虞集 (1272–1348), 115
- Yu Li 俞鼎, 127
- Yuan Jiang 元絳 (1008–1083), 65–70, 72–75, 81 table 3.1, 168
- Yuanfeng regulations on the suburban Altar and temple rituals 元豐郊廟奉祀禮文, 85, 109 table 5.1
- Yueshu* 樂書, 108 table 5.1
- Zeng Bu 曾布 (1035–1107), 72n46, 73, 75, 81 table 3.1, 105
- Zeng Zhao 曾肇 (1047–1107), 72n46, 102, 105
- Zhang Cun 張純, 26
- Zhang Dun 章惇 (1035–1105), 73, 75, 89, 105
- Zhang Fangping 張方平 (1007–1091), 58
- Zhang Fu 張處, 136
- Zhang Gongyu 張公裕, 68, 81 table 3.1, 83
- Zhang Heng 章衡 (1025–1099), 69, 75–76, 81 table 3.1
- Zhang Huan 張環, 88
- Zhang Qixian 張齊賢 (the Tang ritual official), 31
- Zhang Qixian 張齊賢 (942–1014), 48
- Zhang Rong 張融 (444–497), 27
- Zhang Shangying 張商英 (1043–1121), 105
- Zhang Shiyan 張師顏, 68, 81 table 3.1, 83
- Zhang Zao 張瑑, 86–89, 86n4, 92, 95–103, 112, 121, 155, 183
- Zhang Zhao 張昭, 42–43, 58
- Zhao Kuangyi 趙匡胤 (r. 960–976). *See taizu* of Song
- Zhao Lianggui 趙良規, 55
- Zhao Ruayu 趙汝愚 (1140–1196), 134, 135n9
- Zhao Shican 趙士藪, 77
- Zhao Tingzhi 趙挺之 (1040–1107), 105
- Zhao Xiyan 趙希言, 53–54, 58, 90
- Zhao Yiruo 趙彥若, 67–68
- zhaomu* 昭穆, 19–21, 19nn20–21, 25–25n50, 26, 33–34, 48, 50–51, 76, 91, 99n77, 100n79n81, 112–14,

- 118, 120–21, 123, 128, 129, 149–58, 160–61, 166–69, 173, 175–86; the 1079 *zhaomu* debate, 85–86, 86n5, 93–98, 138, 154, 101–3, 121, 123, 128, 135, 138, 149, 151, 154, 155, 157, 159, 183, 185; secular and spiritual *zhaomu*, 123; *Wuyin zhaomu zang* 五音昭穆葬 (*guanyu zang* 貫魚葬), 168–69
- Zheng Boqian 鄭伯謙, 164
- Zheng Genglao 鄭耕老 (1108–1172), 175–76, 175n75
- Zheng Xuan 鄭玄 (127–200), 19–21, 26–27, 30, 33, 36, 54, 69, 116, 118–120n59, 142, 166, 176n81
- Zheng Zongyan 鄭宗顏, 108 table 5.1
- Zhenghe wuli xinyi* 政和五禮新儀, 11, 46n38, 121, 125–29, 171
- Zhenzong of Song 宋真宗 (r. 997–1022), 48–54, 82, 92, 95, 97, 128
- Zhezong of Song 宋哲宗 (r. 1085–1100), 124, 128
- Zhongxing lishu* 中興禮書, 11, 133n3
- Zhongzong of Tang 唐中宗 (r. 684, 705–710), 30, 32–33, 48, 49n50
- Zhou Bida 周必大 (1126–1204), 162
- Zhou Mengyang 周孟陽, 68, 75–77, 81 table 3.1, 82
- Zhouguan zongyi* 周官總義, 161–63
- Zhouli dingyi* 周禮訂義, 11, 111n25, 163–66
- Zhouli quanjie* 周禮全解, 167n41
- Zhouli tu* 周禮圖, 108 table 5.1
- Zhouli xiangjie* 周禮詳解, 11, 108 table 5.1, 112, 114–15, 147
- Zhujie yili* 註解儀禮, 108 table 5.1
- Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130–1200), 1n3, 12, 35, 88n15, 130, 134–40, 141 illu. 6.1, 142–44, 147–49, 150 fig. 6.3, 151–67, 172–73, 175–76, 185, 188
- Zhuzi jiali* 朱子家禮 (*Zhu Xi's Family Rituals*), 1n3, 136, 172–73