

**The Origins of the Chinese Nation (Nicolas Tackett):**

**ORIGINAL EXTENDED FOOTNOTES**

Introduction

Note 7: Mullaney, *Coming to Terms with the Nation*. In fact, as Mullaney points out (pp. 129-130), a small number of citizens in today's China remain "yet-to-be-classified."

Note 9: Zhu Yu, *Pingzhou ketan*, 35. The Chinese Biographical Database estimates Zhu Yu was born in the early 1070s; he likely wrote the passage above sometime between 1110 and the Jurchen invasions of the 1120s. For confirmation in an eleventh-century text that people to the south referred to Chinese as "Tang people," see Jiang Shaoyu, *Songchao shishi leiyuan*, 77.1009.

Note 20: On general education and nationalism, see Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, 29-34; on printing, see B. Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, esp. 37-46. Although Anderson speaks of "print-capitalism" in sixteenth-century Europe, some historians of capitalism prefer the term "commercial printing." One can think of the civil service examination curriculum as a form of general education insofar as it came to define the fundamental knowledge that all educated men were expected to have. See Hymes, *Statesmen and Gentlemen*, 32-33; Bol, "The Sung Examination System," 154-71. Of course, the core elements of Chinese general education differed from the core elements of traditional Anglo-American general education (i.e., the "three R's"); in lieu of 'rithmetic, educated Chinese acquired civic and moral knowledge. On the vitality of profit-driven commercial printing during the Northern Song, see Hymes, "Sung Society and Social Change," esp. 546-58. Because woodblock printing allowed for print on demand, it is very difficult to determine the total number of printed books in circulation. McDermott, *Social History of the Chinese Book*, 44 estimates that one set of woodblocks could be used to print up to 30,000 copies of a work before wearing out.

Note 40: Zhang Fangping 張方平, "Ying xianliang fangzheng neng zhiyan jijian ke dui zhice yidao 應賢良方正能直言極諫科對制策一道," QSW 38:24.

Note 49: Franke, "Sung Embassies," 130-31. Franke provides a detailed list of gifts borne by the envoys to Liao announcing the death of the Song emperor in 1063. The gifts included gold vessels (2000 ounces), silver vessels (20,000 ounces), jade, ivory, and other rarities.

Note 50: For example, the powerful Song minister Sima Guang 司馬光 (1019-86) could not serve as ambassador to Liao because his given name coincided with part of the name of the second Liao emperor, Yelü Deguang 耶律德光. See Sima Guang, "Cimian guanban zhazi 辭免館伴劄子," QSW 55:123.

Note 51: On similarities with the Song-Jin agreement, see Franke, "Sung Embassies," 119. The oaths with Liao, Jin, and Xia all included nearly verbatim clauses regarding the repatriation of cross-border fugitives. In the Chanyuan agreement, the clause read, "if there are bandits and robbers who abscond and flee [to avoid arrest], neither side shall allow them to seek asylum" (或有盜賊逋逃, 彼此無令停匿). In the Song-Jin agreement, it read, "as for bandits, robbers, and [other] fugitives, neither side shall allow them to find asylum" (盜賊逃人彼此無令停止). In the Song-Xia agreement, it read, "residents who abscond from [either of] the two territories...shall not be allowed to seek asylum, and must all be made to return" (兩地逃民...不令停舍, 皆俾交還). Full transcriptions exist of the oath letters of Chanyuan as

well as of the Song-Jin oath letters of 1123. See XCB 58.1299; Yuwen Maozhao, *Da Jingguo zhi jiaozheng*, 37.527-528. For a description of the Song-Xia agreement, see XCB 80.2022.

Note 52: For descriptions of proper ritual protocols for the reception of envoys and of the choreography of diplomatic visits to the Song and Liao courts, see SS 119.2804-10, 328.10565; Li Xinchuan, *Jiyanan yilai chaoye zaji*, vol. 1, 3.97-98; Ye Longli, *Qidan guo zhi*, 21.200-03; Yu Jing 余靖, “Qidan guanyi 契丹官儀,” QSW 27:104-06; Chen Xiang 陳襄, “Shenzong huangdi jiwei shi Liao yulu 神宗皇帝即位使遼語錄,” QSW 50:228-37.

Note 58: E.g., in a memorial by Qiang Zhi (1023-1076) included in the compendium *Lidai mingchen zouyi*, two references to Khitans as “caitiffs” in the Ming version are eliminated from the *Siku quanshu* version through subtle changes in the grammar. All references to Khitans as “Tartars” (*huren*) are changed to “people of Liao” (*Liaoren*) or to “tribesmen” (*zhubu*); and one reference to “Tartar horses” (*huma*) is changed to “enemy horses” (*dima*). For the Ming version, see QSW 66:29-30; for the *Siku* version, see *Yingyin wenyuan ge siku quanshu*, vol. 442, 344.8b-10a. Unfortunately, XCB is also affected by such censorship. For example, if one compares XCB 185.4469-71 with SHY *bing* 27.41-43, one finds that the term “caitiff,” used in SHY to refer to Tanguts, has been systematically replaced with the terms “enemy” (*di*) or “Westerner” (*xiren*) in XCB.

Note 59: The text in question is Zong Ze 宗澤, “Qi huiluan shu 乞回鑾疏.” For the Ming version, see QSW 129:350; for the *Siku quanshu* version, see *Yingyin wenyuan ge siku quanshu*, vol. 325, 15.21b.

## Chapter One

Note 1: The scene that follows is described in Chen Xiang’s extant embassy report. See Chen Xiang 陳襄, “Shenzong huangdi jiwei shi Liao yulu 神宗皇帝即位使遼語錄,” QSW 50:230-31. For an English translation of the entire report, see D. C. Wright, *Ambassadors Records*, 63-88.

Note 10: Wu Chong 吳充, “[Ouyang Xiu] xingzhuang [歐陽修]行狀,” in *Ouyang Xiu quanji*, 6:2696; Sima Guang, *Sushui jiwén*, fulu, 1.334; Wang Pizhi, *Shengshui yantan lu*, 2.15.

Note 13: Chen Xiang 陳襄, “Shenzong huangdi jiwei shi Liao yulu 神宗皇帝即位使遼語錄,” QSW 50:228-37.

Note 14: For accounts of two Song envoys who proved able marksmen despite no training in archery, see Bi Zhongyou 畢仲游, “Bi Gong Yizhong xingzhuang 畢公夷仲行狀,” QSW 111:132; Li Pu 李朴, “Feng Qingmin [Ji] yishi 豐清敏[稷]遺事,” QSW 135:55. For the description of an unusual drinking game involving music and ice fishing, see XCB 177.4281; Liu Zhi 劉摯, “Wang [Gongchen] xingzhuang 王[拱辰]行狀,” *Zhongsu ji*, 475.

Note 15: For example, though Song envoys regularly met with the Khitan empress dowager, a Liao envoy was informed by his escort that even high-ranking Song ministers had never laid eyes on the Song empress dowager during her regency (because as a woman she attended court hidden behind a curtain). See SS 286.9630. On another occasion, Song censors were aghast at the presumptuousness of the Song envoy Han Zong 韓綜, who, during a banquet, had dared exchange toasts with the Liao emperor himself. See XCB 163.3919; SS 315.10300; Zhang Fangping 張方平, “Han [Zong] muzhiming 韓[綜]墓誌銘,”

*Zhang Fangping ji*, 697; Zhao Bian 趙抃, “Lun Wang Gongchen ruguo ruming qixing chujiang zhuang 論王拱辰入國辱命乞行黜降狀,” QSW 41:171.

Note 16: See, e.g., Nan Bian 南抃, “Wang Shiru muzhi 王師儒墓誌,” in Xiang Nan (ed.), *Liaodai shike wenbian*, 646, which suggests that the Liao escort Wang Shiru had lengthy scholarly conversations with his charge, the Song ambassador, while “on the road to the [next] post station.”

Note 17: Chen Xiang 陳襄, “Shenzong huangdi jiwei shi Liao yulu 神宗皇帝即位使遼語錄,” QSW 50:228-37. In addition, the envoy Lu Zhen 路振 (957-1014) noted in his embassy report that banquets were held “wherever envoys arrive” (國信所至), though, in his terse account, he is less consistent than Chen in documenting each and every one of the nightly banquets. See Jiang Shaoyu, *Songchao shishi leiyuan*, 77.1016.

Note 18: Bao Zheng 包拯, “Qing zhijue Sanfan qusuo zou 請止絕三番曲索奏,” QSW 25:368.

Note 21: Fan Chunren 范純仁, “Fu [Bi] xingzhuang 富[弼]行狀,” QSW 71:317.

Note 22: Chen Xiang 陳襄, “Shenzong huangdi jiwei shi Liao yulu 神宗皇帝即位使遼語錄,” QSW 50:228-37.

Note 23: Wei Xiang 韋驥, “Zhang [Zao] xingzhuang 張[瓘]行狀,” QSW 82:61-62.

Note 24: Fan Zuyu 范祖禹, “Fan [Bailu] muzhiming 范[百祿]墓誌銘,” QSW 99:38. For other accounts in funerary biographies of Song officials reprimanding their Liao counterparts for lapses in protocol, see Yang Jie 楊傑, “Shen [Li] shendaobei 沈[立]神道碑銘,” QSW 75:261; Zhang Fangping 張方平, “Cheng [Kan] shendaobei 程[戡]神道碑銘,” *Zhang Fangping ji*, 604; Su Song 蘇頌, “Li [Gui] muzhiming 李[規]墓誌銘,” *Su Weigong wenji*, 2:920.

Note 26: Liu Zhi 劉摯, “Liang [Qian] muzhiming 梁[蘧]墓志銘,” *Zhongsu ji*, 273; XCB 138.3326.

Note 27: Chen Xiang 陳襄, “Shenzong huangdi jiwei shi Liao yulu 神宗皇帝即位使遼語錄,” QSW 50:228-37.

Note 31: Liu Zhi 劉摯, “Liang [Qian] muzhiming 梁[蘧]墓志銘,” *Zhongsu ji*, 273.

Note 33: Fan Chunren 范純仁, “Fu [Bi] xingzhuang 富[弼]行狀,” QSW 71:315. In Su Shi’s terse summary of their conversation, he notes simply that “[Fu Bi] spoke to them frankly, and did not treat them like barbarians” (公開懷與語, 不以夷狄待之). See Su Shi 蘇軾, “Fu Zhengong [Bi] shendaobei 富鄭公[弼]神道碑,” *Su Shi wenji*, 2:526.

Note 35: Su Shi 蘇軾, “Teng [Yuanfa] muzhiming 滕[元發]墓誌銘,” *Su Shi wenji*, 2:461-62. See also SS 332.10674. Note also the example of Zhang Fangping 張方平 (1007-91), who, in the mid-1070s, was selected to host a Liao embassy because, as an elder statement and in contrast with newer bureaucratic recruits, he might have the gravitas to “speak more frankly” (開懷譚話) with the foreign dignitaries. See Wang Gong 王鞏, “Zhang [Fangping] xingzhuang 張[方平]行狀,” *Zhang Fangping ji*, 810.

Note 36: Yu Jing 余靖, “Qidan guanyi 契丹官儀,” QSW 27:104.

Note 41: Liu Bin 劉敞, “Liu [Chang] xingzhuang 劉[敞]行狀,” QSW 69:209; SS 319.10384.

Note 42: Nan Bian 南抃, “Wang Shiru muzhi 王師儒墓誌,” in Xiang Nan (ed.), *Liaodai shike wenbian*, 646.

Note 44: Wang Gui 王珪, “Zhao [Gai] muzhiming 趙[槩]墓誌銘,” QSW 53:328.

Note 48: For descriptions of these poems, see Zhao Bian’s documents of impeachment, QSW 41:171-72.

Note 51: *Quan Liao shihua*, 124-27; Bi Zhongyou 畢仲游, “Bi Gong Yizhong xingzhuang 畢公夷仲行狀,” QSW 111:133; Su Song, *Su Weigong wenji*, 1:151.

Note 57: For evidence that food continued to play a similar role in diplomatic banquets after the Jurchen invasion, one can turn to Zhou Hui’s 周輝 1177 report describing his mission to the Jin capital. See Zhou Hui, *Beiyuan lu*, 1. One does not know whether these standardized representations of ethnicity were understood by Song Chinese, Liao and Jin Chinese, Liao Khitans, and Jurchens in the same way. Song Chinese viewed eating with chopsticks as a mark of civilization and the eating of large chunks of meat with one’s hands as a sign of barbarism, whereas Khitans and Jurchens perhaps saw the Chinese use of chopsticks as evidence of effete decadence.

Note 61: Zhang Fangping 張方平, “Song Gu Bian beiyou xu 送古卞北遊序,” *Zhang Fangping ji*, 561-62 [QSW 38:5]. For the convenience of readers, this and subsequent notes provide the QSW reference in brackets when referring to texts included in Table 1.6.

Note 62: See, e.g., Zhang Fangping 張方平, “Pingrong shi ce 平戎十策,” *Zhang Fangping ji*, 263 [QSW 37:35].

Note 63: Chen Shidao 陳師道, “Qin Shaoyou zixu 秦少游字序,” QSW 123:333.

Note 68: E.g., Su Shi 蘇軾, “Shang Shenzong huangdi shu 上神宗皇帝書,” *Su Shi wenji*, 2:737; XCB 363.8689-90; Feng Shan 馮山, “Shang yan liushi fengshi 上言六事封事,” QSW 78:266-67.

Note 70: Su Che 蘇轍, “Yan Ji 燕薊,” *Su Che ji*, 3:1012-13 [QSW 96:28].

Note 71: Hu Su 胡宿, “Lun bianjie shou yueshu zou 論邊界守約束奏,” QSW 22:44; Bi Zhongyou 畢仲游, “Yu Qidan yi 禦契丹議,” QSW 111:80; Zhang Fangping 張方平, “Song Gu Bian beiyou xu 送古卞北遊序,” *Zhang Fangping ji*, 561-62 [QSW 38:5]. For more claims that it was the Khitans who had begged for peace at Chanyuan, see Xia Song 夏竦, “Ji beikou ce 計北寇策,” QSW 17:53-54; Yin Zhu 尹洙, “Lun beidi yi 備北狄議,” QSW 27:302.

Note 72: For other references to the “five baits” in discussing Song-Liao relations, see Song Xiang 宋庠, “Chongzhengdian yu shumiyuan tongda shouzhao 崇政殿與樞密院同答手詔,” QSW 20:399; Song Qi 宋祁, “Yurong lun 禦戎論,” QSW 24:343; Wen Yanbo 文彥博, “Da Shenzong zifangzhao zou 答神宗諮訪詔奏,” QSW 30:223. For a discussion of the “five baits policy” under the Han, see Barfield, *Perilous Frontier*, 51-52.

Note 73: Chao Yuezhi 晁說之, “Yuanfu san nian yingzhao fengshi (xia) 元符三年應詔封事(下),” QSW 129:407.

Note 74: Fan Zhongyan 范仲淹, “Da anfu Wang neihan shu 答安撫王内翰書,” QSW 18:304.

Note 75: Zhang Fangping 張方平, “Pingrong shi ce 平戎十策,” *Zhang Fangping ji*, 263 [QSW 37:35].

Note 76: Hu Su 胡宿, “Lun bianshi zou 論邊事奏,” QSW 22:46; Hu Su makes nearly the same observation in “Lun bianjie shou yueshu zou 論邊界守約束奏,” QSW 22:44. These memorials apparently made a splash; they are cited (along with the reference to the unprecedented sixty years of peace) in his tomb epitaph. See Ouyang Xiu 歐陽修, “Hu [Su] muzhiming 胡[宿]墓誌銘,” *Ouyang Xiu quanji*, 2:517.

Note 77: Wen Yanbo 文彥博, “Da Shenzong zifangzhao zou 答神宗諮訪詔奏,” QSW 30:223.

Note 78: Su Song 蘇頌, “Huarong luwei xinlu zongxu 華戎魯衛信錄總序,” *Su Weigong wenji* 2:1005 [QSW 61:342].

Note 83: Zhang Fangping 張方平, “Pingrong shi ce 平戎十策,” *Zhang Fangping ji*, 263 [QSW 37:35]; Hu Su 胡宿, “Lun bianshi zou 論邊事奏,” QSW 22:46-47.

Note 84: E.g., Song Qi 宋祁, “Yurong lun 禦戎論,” QSW 24:351; Ren Boyu 任伯雨, “Shang Huizong lun yueyun wei maobi 上徽宗論月暈圍昴畢,” QSW 108:232-33.

Note 85: Qiang Zhi 强至, “Lun bianshi zhazi 論邊事劄子,” QSW 66:29-30; XCB 154.3738; Fan Zhongyan 范仲淹, “Zou Shaanxi Hebei heshou gongbei si ce 奏陝西河北和守攻備四策,” QSW 18:159; Song Qi 宋祁, “Yurong lun 禦戎論,” QSW 24:349-50.

Note 86: Chao Buzhi 晁補之, “Shang huangdi lun beishi shu 上皇帝論北事書,” QSW 125:321-22.

Note 87: E.g., Fan Zhongyan 范仲淹, “Zou Shaanxi Hebei heshou gongbei si ce 奏陝西河北和守攻備四策,” QSW 18:157.

Note 88: For expressions of concern over military preparedness dating to the 1040s through the 1110s, see Fan Zhongyan 范仲淹, “Qi xiu jingcheng zhazi (yi) 乞修京城劄子(一),” QSW 18:95; XCB 142.3414; Bao Zheng 包拯, “Jin Zhang Tian ‘Bianshuo’ zhuang 進張田《邊說》狀,” QSW 26:40; Hu Su 胡宿, “Lun bianshi zou 論邊事奏,” QSW 22:46-47; Bi Zhongyou 畢仲游, “Yu Qidan yi 禦契丹議,” QSW 111:80; Hong Zhongfu 洪中孚, “Lun fa Liao zhazi 論伐遼劄子,” QSW 119:127-28.

Note 91: SCBM Zhengxuan, 1.5. Earlier, in 1076, Wen Yanbo urged the Song emperor to hold fast to the treaty on the grounds that Heaven would assist Song if Liao were to attack first. See “Da Shenzong zifangzhao zou 答神宗諮訪詔奏,” QSW 30:223-24.

Note 94: Hu Su 胡宿, “Lun bianjie shou yueshu zou 論邊界守約束奏,” QSW 22:44.

Note 98: Su Che, *Longchuan biezhi*, 1:72; XCB 67.1506. The notion that Zhenzong had condescended to peace with the Khitans for the benefit of his people was a common refrain later in the dynasty. See, e.g., Fan Zhongyan 范仲淹, “Zou Shaanxi Hebei heshou gongbei si ce 奏陝西河北和守攻備四策,” QSW 18:157; XCB 262.6386-87.

Note 99: Su Shi 蘇軾, “Shang Shenzong huangdi shu 上神宗皇帝書,” QSW 86:224.

Note 100: Bi Zhongyou 畢仲游, “Yu Qidan yi 禦契丹議,” QSW 111:80.

Note 102: Su Shi 蘇軾, “Ceduan 策斷” and “Ji lushi songshi 記虜使誦詩,” in *Su Shi wenji*, 1:288, 5:2154.

Note 103: Chen Xiang 陳襄, “Shenzong huangdi jiwei shi Liao yulu 神宗皇帝即位使遼語錄,” QSW 50:228-37. See esp. entries for the 11<sup>th</sup>, 13<sup>th</sup>, 15<sup>th</sup>, and 25<sup>th</sup> days of the 5<sup>th</sup> month; and the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup>, 18<sup>th</sup>, and 20<sup>th</sup> days of the 6<sup>th</sup> month. Similarly, acc. to Sima Guang 司馬光, Liao officials had once asked a Song envoy for news about him. See Sima Guang, *Sushui jiwén*, fulu, 2.354.

Note 104: Su Che 蘇轍, “Beishi huan lun beibianshi zhazi 北使還論北邊事劄子,” in *Su Che ji*, 2:747. For more on cross-border book embargoes during the Song period, see de Weerd, “*What did Su Che See.*”

Note 106: Su Shi 蘇軾, “Fang Jingren muzhiming 范景仁墓誌銘,” in *Su Shi wenji*, 2:442. The text is ambiguous about whether or not “Khitans” here refers to Liao Chinese.

Note 109: Fan Zuyu 范祖禹, “Zhang [Baosun] muzhiming 張[保孫]墓誌銘,” QSW 98:329.

Note 110: Chen Xiang 陳襄, “Shenzong huangdi jiwei shi Liao yulu 神宗皇帝即位使遼語錄,” QSW 50:230-31. It was in the context of this toast that Chen responded “Since antiquity, there has never been a friendship like the one between our two dynasties!” (自古兩朝歡好, 未有如此). A few weeks later, at a farewell banquet at the Liao capital, the deputy hospitality commissioner urged Chen and his colleagues to drink with a somewhat similar appeal: “In light of the friendship between our two states, every time the [Song] ambassador attends this [parting] banquet, one is most reluctant to see him go—let us all drink up!” (兩朝歡好, 信使每至此會, 最為惜別, 各請飲盡!) See p.234.

Note 111: For relevant passages in the three biographies, see Han Wei 韓維, “Fu Wenzhong Gong [Bi] muzhiming 富文忠公[弼]墓誌銘,” QSW 49:229-33; Su Shi 蘇軾, “Fu Zhenggong [Bi] shendaobei 富鄭公[弼]神道碑,” in *Su Shi wenji*, 2:526-28, 530-32; Fan Chunren 范純仁, “Fu [Bi] xingzhuang 富[弼]行狀,” QSW 71:314-21.

Note 112: Fan Chunren, “Fu [Bi] xingzhuang,” QSW 71:315.

Note 113: XCB 140.3360-61; Fan Chunren 范純仁, “Fu [Bi] xingzhuang 富[弼]行狀,” QSW 71:320.

Note 114: Su Shi 蘇軾, “Fu Zhenggong [Bi] shendaobei 富鄭公[弼]神道碑,” in *Su Shi wenji*, 2:531-32; Fan Chunren, “Fu [Bi] xingzhuang,” QSW 71:321.

Note 115: Cai Xiang 蔡襄, “Lun Qidan shiyi zou 論契丹事宜奏,” QSW 46:351-52. By 1076, Wen Yanbo 文彥博 would refer to the 1042 confrontation as a “mere trifle” (瑣瑣細故). See Wen Yanbo 文彥博, “Da Shenzong zifangzhao zou 答神宗諮訪詔奏,” QSW 30:223.

Note 116: Hu Su 胡宿, “Lun bianjie shou yueshu zou 論邊界守約束奏,” QSW 22:44.

Note 117: Zheng Xie 鄭獬, “Qing ba Hebei fuyi shu 請罷河北夫役疏,” QSW 68:49.

Note 125: Fan Zuyu 范祖禹, “Guo [Kui] muzhiming 郭[逵]墓誌銘,” QSW 98:340.

## Chapter Two

Note 2: Wang Anli 王安禮, “Yuanfeng wu nian dianshi jinshi cewen (si) 元豐五年殿試進士策問 (四),” QSW 83:71.

Note 8: As Song Qi 宋祁 observed, “The Middle Kingdom has few horses; moreover, the people do not learn to ride” (中國馬少, 又人不習騎). See “Lun fu Hebei Guangping liang jian Shan Yun liang jian zou 論復河北廣平兩監澶鄆兩監奏,” QSW 23:258. On horse breeding and trading under the Tang, Song, and Ming, respectively, see Skaff, “Straddling Steppe and Sown,” 178-207; P. J. Smith, *Taxing Heaven’s Storehouse*, 13-47; Perdue, *China Marches West*, 68-72.

Note 12: The remains of several Song fortresses just north of Guyuan appear as orange ovals on *Zhongguo wenwu ditu ji (Ningxia)*, 128-29. Two of these, Sanchuan 三川 and Gaoping 高平 (established in 1030 and 1042 according to Wang Cun, *Yuanfeng jiuyi zhi*, 3.136) are identifiable on Google or Bing satellite maps (as square structures with distinctive barbican protrusions shaped like the eye of a needle) at the following latitude-longitude coordinates: 36.125265N, 106.250609E; and 36.081780N, 106.175989E.

Note 21: Song policymakers also on occasion considered divide-and-conquer strategies, such as when they tried to instigate a feud between the Tanguts and the Tibetan tribes in the 1040s. See Zhang Fangping 張方平, “Pingrong shi ce ji biao 平戎十策及表,” QSW 37:36-37.

Note 27: Wang Anshi 王安石, “Taoyuan xing 桃源行,” *Wang Jing Gong shizhu bujian* 6.113.

Note 28: Su Che 蘇轍, “Zai lun hui He zhazi 再論回河劄子,” *Su Che ji*, 2:737.

Note 29: XTS 93.3818-3819; JTS 67.2486. This metaphorical use of the Great Wall may have originated in the biography of the general Tan Daoji 檀道濟 (d. 436). Before Tan was executed (unjustly), he took off his headdress, prostrated himself, and proclaimed: “So you overturn and destroy your myriad mile[-long] Great Wall!” (乃復壞汝萬里之長城!) This same line was later recycled by historians to describe the death in prison of Yue Fei. See Shen Yue, *Song shu*, 43.1344; SS 365.11397.

Note 30: E.g., Xu Xuan 徐鉉, “Xin Wang gaifeng Jiang Wang jia zhongshuling zhi 信王改封江王加中書令制,” QSW 2:108; Wang Yucheng 王禹偁, “Sang Gong [Guangfu] shendao beiming 桑公[光輔]神道碑銘,” QSW 8:168; Yu Jing 余靖, “Dianqian dushi yixia jia’en zhi 殿前都使已下加恩制,” QSW 26:211; Xia Song 夏竦, “Lun jiangshuai ce 論將帥策,” QSW 17:52. Expressions of this sort appear abundantly in Song prose and verse.

Note 34: Song Qi 宋祁, “Yurong lun 禦戎論,” QSW 24:343.

Note 37: For policy proposals dating probably to the 1020s and 1030s that express such concern, see Xia Song 夏竦, “Fu sai yuan ce 復塞垣策,” QSW 17:54-55; Ouyang Xiu 歐陽修, “Sai yuan 塞垣,” *Ouyang xiu quanji* 3:875-76. For a succinct account of much the same problem in an influential military manual submitted to the throne in 1045, see WJZY, part 1, 16.2b. For another proposal from the 1050s bringing up this problem, see Bao Zheng 包拯, “Lun bianjiang zou (er) 論邊將奏(二),” QSW 26:42.

Note 40: Hu Su 胡宿, “Lun bianshi zou 論邊事奏,” QSW 22:47.

Note 41: Hu Su explicitly brings up the 1004 invasion in a second memorial, probably written on the same occasion, in which he once more paints the Yan Mountains and the Yellow River as two barriers protecting the Chinese heartland. See “Lun Hebei bianbei shiyi zou 論河北邊備事宜奏,” QSW 22:43. On the strategic implications of the 1048 breach, see Song Qi 宋祁, “Yurong lun 禦戎論,” QSW 24:346; Lamouroux, “From the Yellow River to the Huai,” 561-62.

Note 43: See, e.g., Xia Song 夏竦, “Ji beikou ce 計北寇策,” QSW 17:54; Zheng Xie 鄭獬, “Qing ba Hebei fuyi shu 請罷河北夫役疏,” QSW 68:49; He Chang 何常, “Lun shibing zhi li zou 論士兵之利奏,” QSW 120:269; Li Jian 李薦, “Bingfa qizheng lun 兵法奇正論,” QSW 132:152. Cf. XCB 469.11212, which argues that rugged terrain in the northwest did not slow Tangut cavalymen, who “galloped over mountains and dales as if stomping on flat ground” (馳驟山嶺谿谷之間, 如踐平地).

Note 52: Zhang Fangping 張方平, “Qing xuanze Hebei yanbian shouchen shi zou 請選擇河北沿邊守臣事奏,” QSW 37:98-99.

Note 54: Fan Zuyu 范祖禹, “Qi ba He yi zhuang 乞罷河役狀,” QSW 98:92.

Note 56: Li Qingchen 李清臣, “Yirong ce (shang) 議戎策(上),” QSW 78:394.

Note 57: Chao Yuezhi 晁說之, “Beijing cewen 北京策問,” QSW 130:251.

Note 58: For this reason, Daizhou, situated just south of this mountain range, was apparently one of the best-defended sites on the northern frontier. See Ouyang Xiu 歐陽修, “Zai ju Mi guangjun zhuang 再舉米光濟狀,” *Ouyang Xiu quanji* 5:1742.

Note 64: Zhang Fangping 張方平, “Cai [Ting] muzhiming 蔡[挺]墓誌銘,” QSW 38:329; SHY *bing* 4.2. For reference to two additional forts in the region that lay “beyond the border trench” (邊壕外), see WJZY 18.22a-b.

Note 72: XCB 60.1338; SS 466.13613. Qin’s work force was composed entirely of soldiers, not conscripts taken from the local population, a decision for which Qin was praised by the court. Cao Wei made it a similar practice not to burden the local population of farmers; the two hundred-kilometer trench near Qinzhou was excavated entirely with labor supplied by the military forts, “without disturbing the populace” (無擾於民). See XCB 87.1992; SHY *bing* 27.19; XCB 86.1982.

Note 75: SS 190.4724. For a 1093 memorial referring to the Shaanxi “archers” as a “hedge,” see Zhang Qi 章棄, “Qi jinzhū huijiazui ji xiufu anjiang zhai zou 乞進築灰家嘴及修復安疆寨奏,” QSW 72:105.

Note 83: E.g., there were “assimilated households” encamped ten kilometers south of Fort Pingyuan 平遠寨 and seven kilometers east of Fort Damei 大枚寨 in Huanzhou, one kilometer north of Fort Zhifang 治坊寨 and ten kilometers both to the west and north of Fort Ningyuan 寧遠寨 in Qinzhou, and twenty kilometers south of Fort Jingbian 靜邊寨 in Deshun. See WJZY, part 1, 18.12b, 22b, 26b, 28b.

Note 91: Han Qi 韓琦, “Lun zhu bilicheng lihāi zou 論築棗栗城利害奏,” QSW 39:236.

Note 92: Xia Song 夏竦, “Chen bianshi shi ce 陳邊事十策,” QSW 17:59; Sima Guang 司馬光, “Hengshan shu 橫山疏,” QSW 55:116; Zhang Fangping 張方平, “Qinzhou zou Quesiluo shi di er zhuang 秦州奏确廡



囉事第二狀,” QSW 37:108. For other references to these units as a “hedge” or “screen,” see SS 187.4569, 191.4750; XCB 131.3111, 132.3144, 469.11212; Fan Chuncui 范純粹, “Qi bu wang dong yi guan chengbai zhi bian zou 乞不妄動以觀成敗之變奏,” QSW 108:305.

### Chapter 3

Note 7: It was one of the Liao envoys that claimed that an earthen ridge marked the border; however, when the Song and Liao negotiators went out to the region in person, they were unable to locate this ridge. See XCB 256.6254.

Note 10: Later historians, notably Li Tao, author of XCB, probably exaggerated the size of this stretch of territory. The chief border negotiator at the time was Han Zhen 韓績, labeled one of the “three traitors” (三姦) by Sima Guang and his “anti-reformist” faction after they seized power at court in late 1085. See Levine, “Che-tsung’s Reign,” 493. Sun Jue 孫覺 and Su Che 蘇轍 leveled their fierce criticism of Han Zhen for giving up these “700 li” a decade after the fact, in early 1086, as part of an aggressive campaign to remove Han and other reformists from prominent ministerships. See XCB 366.8810; XCB 369.8901; XCB 371.8988-89. Li Tao, no friend of the reformists, picked up on this line of argument, even foreshadowing Su Che’s critique in an annotation accompanying an entry in his chronicle concerning the completion of negotiations in 1076. See XCB 279.6825.

Note 15: XCB 228.5547. Three months earlier, the emperor had already announced to Xia that Song intended to do just this. See XCB 226.5515. For a tomb epitaph confirming that demarcation with earthen mounds was organized near Suizhou at this time, see Li Zhiyi 李之儀, “Zhe [Keshi] muzhiming 折 [可適]墓誌銘,” QSW 112:271.

Note 28: For example, in 1046, Zheng Jian 鄭戩 was asked to investigate and forward a map of Fengzhou 豐州 to court to help strategize the placement of the Song-Xia border at this location; the court representative dispatched later to negotiate with the Tanguts brought this map along to aid him in the deliberations. See XCB 159.3847; SHY *fangyu* 21.12-13. In 1075, Han Zhen 韓績 produced a map of mountains, streams, topography, and fortifications while negotiating the Hedong border. See XCB 266.6526. And in 1081, Huang Lian 黃廉 (1034-1092) drew a “Map of the Twelve Stockades 十二寨圖” of Daizhou in order to provide the court with his recommendations on where to delineate the Hedong border. This map (or a similar map) was then brought to the border by the Song negotiator. See XCB 317.7675-7676, 322.7760. In some cases, additional maps were sent to update the court on the direction of the negotiations. See XCB 432.10426.

Note 29: A map accompanied Han Zhen’s detailed accounts of his negotiations with Liao. See XCB 282.6918. For other maps sent back to court after the conclusion of negotiations, by Sun Zhao 孫兆 and Su Anjing 蘇安靜, respectively, see XCB 186.4489, 193.4679-4680.

Note 32: SS 290.9724. There are other similar examples. In 1056, to demonstrate that the Liao farmers Nie Zaiyou and Su Zhi had encroached on Song territory, the court ordered the envoy Wang Zhu 王洙 (997-1057) to show a “Map of the Hedong Border 河東地界圖” to the Liao representative to explain the “whole picture” (本末). See SHY *fanyi* 2.18; XCB 184.4462. In 1074, after disagreeing on where negotiators should sit, the Song side produced a state letter establishing a precedent for the seating

protocol favored by the Song. As a result, the two Liao representatives “did not dare contest” (不敢爭) the point any further. See XCB 256.6253.

Note 37: XCB 434.10471, 437.10546, 445.10717-18, 452.10844-50. The Suizhou model was also referred to as the “Suide model” (綏德城體例) or the “Suizhou example” (綏州例).

Note 57: Wang Gungwu, “Rhetoric of a Lesser Empire,” 48-49, has identified a “rhetoric of contractual relations” in Tang diplomatic documents that he associates with an “external” language used with foreigners when chauvinistic rhetoric was inappropriate. During the Song, contractual rhetoric was utilized in “internal” court discussions as well. Thus, Hu Su 胡宿 (996-1067) argued for Song China’s rights to a frontier territory on the grounds that documents proved it had been offered to Song by Tibetan tribes two decades earlier; and Su Che 蘇轍 (1039-1112) argued it was “crooked” to annex Tangut territory seized by the Song military. See Hu Su 胡宿, “Lun Xi Xia shiyi zou 論西夏事宜奏,” QSW 22:45; XCB 381.9280; SS 339.10832-10833.

Note 60: Bao Zheng 包拯, “Qing nayi Hebei bingma shi zou (yi, er) 請那移河北兵馬事奏(一、二),” QSW 26:33-35; XCB 166.3991-94, 166.3997.

Note 62: In subsequent decades, opponents of the New Policies like Lü Tao 呂陶 and Shen Gua 沈括 opposed dismantling the hydraulic defenses, partly on the grounds that the amount of land lost to military fortifications had been exaggerated. See Lü Tao, “Fengshi Qidan hui shangdian zhazi 奉使契丹回上殿劄子,” QSW 73:180; Shen Gua, *Mengxi bitan*, 13.117-118 (#236).

Note 64: Ouyang Xiu 歐陽修, “Qing geng jindi zhazi 請耕禁地劄子,” *Ouyang Xiu quan ji*, 5:1762-63; XCB 154.3748-49; SHY *bing* 27.35-36.

Note 72: See, e.g., Bao Zheng 包拯, “Qing nayi Hebei bingma shi zou (yi) 請那移河北兵馬事奏(一),” QSW 26:33.

Note 87: Hu Su 胡宿, “Lun bianshi zou 論邊事奏,” QSW 22:47.

Note 90: Hu Su 胡宿, “Lun bianjie shou yueshu zou 論邊界守約束奏,” QSW 22:44. The prefect in question, Zhao Zi 趙滋, apparently encouraged local fishermen to enter the forbidden waters of the Baigou River that marked the Song-Liao border.

Note 103: XCB 445.10717, 449.10786. The word *fan* 蕃, which I translate here as “westerner” is problematic to translate in this and the subsequent texts. I have elsewhere translated *Fan-Han* as “tribal and Han people.” In some cases, Song writers did use it in this broad sense. But the more common use of *fan* in Northern Song texts was in an ethnic sense, in reference to non-Chinese living on the northwestern frontier, including both Tanguts and Tibetans. See Chapter 2, note 76. The term also seems at times to have referred to Tanguts exclusively (and probably did so here and on the next page). Thus, e.g., twelfth-century Tangut documents excavated at Kharakhoto include a bilingual Sino-Tangut dictionary that refers to the Tangut language using the word *fan*.

Note 111: For a description of linguistic confusion when implementing the law among mixed ethnic populations in the far southwest, see Zou Hao 鄒浩, “Hua Zhi xingzhuang 華[峙]行狀,” QSW 132:24.

Note 117: See, for example, Sima Guang's memorial of 1065: XCB 205.4969-70.

Note 119: XCB 154.3749; SHY *bing* 27.36; Ouyang Xiu 歐陽修, "Qing geng jindi zhazi 請耕禁地劄子," *Ouyang Xiu quan ji*, 5:1762. In the SHY and *wenji* versions of Ouyang's memorial, the encroaching farmers are described in most cases as "caitiffs" (虜); in the version in XCB (which frequently eliminates derogatory language), they are described as the "enemy" (敵). Bao Zheng refers to the encroachers as "foreign households" (蕃戶). See Bao Zheng 包拯, "Lun Qidan shiyi zou 論契丹事宜奏," QSW 26:45.

#### Chapter Four

Note 19: In Tang times and later, nearly all geographical texts make allusion to the Nine and the Twelve Provinces. For graphical depictions, see *Songben lidai dili zhizhang tu*, 12-15; Tang Zhongyou, *Diwang jingshi tupu*, 5.1a-2b. For the use of these models at the Northern Song court to justify an irredentist agenda, see Hua Zhen 華鎮, "Shiye lun 事業論," QSW 123:87-89. It should be remembered that the "Canon of Yao" and "Tribute of Yu" are late additions to the corpus, dating to no earlier than the third century BCE. See Nylan, *Five "Confucian" Classics*, 134.

Note 22: According to the official, "Between late spring of this year and next year, Jupiter will be in the Song sector [of the sky]; between early fall of this year and the year 989, Saturn will be in the Yan sector" (今年春末至來年, 歲在宋分, 今年初秋至六年, 鎮在燕分). See SS 432.12828. For other Tang-Song references to these correlations, see Schafer, *Pacing the Void*, 75-84; Shi Jie 石介, "Zhongguo lun 中國論," *Culai Shi xiansheng wenji*, 10.116; Tang Zhongyou, *Diwang jingshi tupu*, 6.8a-8b, 6.11a-15b; *Songben lidai dili zhizhang tu*, 80-83.

Note 27: Li Deyu 李德裕, "Ci Huihu shu yi 賜回鶻書意," QTW 699:7182; Drompp, *Tang China*, 230.

Note 29: Shi Jie, "Ganshi 感事," *Culai Shi xiansheng wenji*, 3.24.

Note 34: Tang Zhongyou, *Diwang jingshi tupu*, 6.4a-7a; *Songben lidai dili zhizhang tu*, 84-85; Wang Yinglin, *Yuhai*, 20.26a-28b; Zhang Ruyi, *Qunshu kaosuo*, 59.6b-7a; Lin Zhiqi, *Shangshu quanjie*, 10.4a-4b. In addition, Fang Yue 方岳 (1199-1262) three times mentions his strong emotional response to viewing a map of Yixing's Two Boundaries (which depicted land then under Mongol control). See "Xie chu libingbu jiage tiancha Zhigan qi 謝除禮兵部架閣添差制幹啓," QSW 341:399; "Daihui Shidu xiangqi 代回史督相啓," QSW 342:64; Fang Yue 方岳, "Jiuri yechenglou 九日冶城樓," *Qiuya shici jiaozhu* 秋崖詩詞校注, 35:601.

Note 38: For a good example of this phenomenon, one can turn to the example of the modern-day Yi people of southwest China. Though it is quite clear the Yi is a constructed category created by the state bureaucracy (that, for example, incorporates people speaking a variety of different languages), the Yi have since the 1950s come to claim common descent from people living in the region in Han times and earlier. See Harrell, "History of the History of the Yi."

Note 56: Su Song 蘇頌, "Huarong luwei xin lu zongxu 華戎魯衛信錄總序," *Su Weigong wenji* 2:1005. Similarly, a 1074 Buddhist temple inscription observes, in describing the place of origin of Buddhism, that "their language, clothing, utensils, and food and drink do not, for the most part, resemble those of the Central Plains" (其語言、衣服、器用、飲食, 大率與中夏不相侔). See Li Kui 李騏, "Kaiyuan si chongsu foxiang ji 開元寺重塑佛像記," QSW 82:107.

Note 57: The exception involves an edict by the Later Zhou Emperor Taizu 太祖 (r. 951-954), “Ding choushui fanhan tiaoyan zhao 定抽稅蕃漢糶鹽詔,” QTW 122.1231.

Note 63: Fan Chunren 范純仁, “Fu [Bi] xingzhuang 富[弼]行狀,” QSW 71:315.

Note 64: E.g., Li Xian 李憲 insisted in a 1083 memorial that frontier militias should segregate Han and Tibetan troops. See XCB 338.8141-42. Li’s contemporary Fan Chuncui 范純粹 (1046-1117) took a similar position on the segregation of troops, while simultaneously arguing that ethnic Tibetan officials in regions of Song control should not be allowed to assume Han surnames, nor to be put in charge of Han populations. See SS 191.4761; XCB 375.9090-91, 476.11343; Fan Chuncui, “Qi ling fanguan bude huan shou hanguan chaiqian zou 乞令蕃官不得換授漢官差遣奏,” QSW 108:339-340. On anti-miscegenation, see also Fan Chuncui, “Lun kunzei fanglue zou 論困賊方略奏,” QSW 108:326; Lü Tao 呂陶, “Liu [Xiang] muzhiming 劉[庠]墓誌銘,” QSW 74:67-68.

Note 72: Fan Zhongyan 范仲淹, “Zou Shaanxi Hebei heshou gongbei si ce 奏陝西河北和守攻備四策,” QSW 18:159. For similar examples dating to the mid to late eleventh century, see Xia Song 夏竦, “Fu sai yuan ce 復塞垣策,” QSW 17:55; Feng Shan 馮山, “Shang yan liu shi fengshi 上言六事封事,” QSW 78:266; Chao Yuezhi 晁說之, “Yuanfu san nian yingzhao fengshi (xia) 元符三年應詔封事(下),” QSW 129:407; Ding Chuanjing, *Songren yishi huibian*, 20.1103.

Note 79: Fu Bi, “Shang Hebei shouyu shisan ce 上河北守禦十三策,” QSW 28:317-18; XCB 150.3650.

Note 80: Su Shi 蘇軾, “Ceduan (san) 策斷(三),” *Su Shi wenji* 1:288.

Note 82: Li Qingchen, “Yi rong ce (xia) 議戎策(下),” QSW 78:396.

Note 83: For example, in the 1070s, both doves like Qiang Zhi 强至 (1023-1076) and hawks like Chao Buzhi 晁補之 (1053-1110) asserted that loyalists in Yan were ready to take up arms for the Song cause. See Qiang Zhi, “Lun bianshi zhazi 論邊事劄子,” QSW 66:29; Chao Buzhi, “Shang huangdi lun beishi shu 上皇帝論北事書,” QSW 125:333.

Note 85: Zhao Dingchen, “Dai tiaoju beibian shiyi zhuang 代條具北邊事宜狀,” QSW 138:156.

Note 91: Hong Zhongfu 洪中孚, “Lun fa Liao zhazi 論伐遼劄子,” QSW 119:127-128; SCBM Zhengxuan, 19.179-181.

Note 93: For various claims of this sort dating roughly to the 1130s or 1140s, see Zhu Xi 朱熹, “Wu Gong [Fei] shendaobei 吳公[芾]神道碑,” QSW 253:9; SS 475.13801; Li Xinchuan, *Jiyan yilai xinian yaolu*, 20.400; SHY *zhiguan* 41.9; Levine, “Welcome to the Occupation,” 401-2.

Note 94: Chao Gongsu 晁公溯, “De dongnan shubao luanhou Dongdu guju you cun er zhoubei songjia yi wuhuizhe 得東南書報亂後東都故居猶存而州北松檟亦無毀者,” QSS 35:22395. For an English translation of a portion of this poem, see De Weerd, “Maps and Memory,” 161.

Note 96: Xu Han 許翰, “Shang jiwu shu 上急務疏,” QSW 144:313.

Note 97: Lu You 陸游, “Qiuye jiang xiao chu limen yingliang you gan 秋夜將曉出籬門迎涼有感,” *Jiannan shigao jiaozhu*, 4:1774. For two similar poems from the same period, see *ibid.*, 2:552, 2:623 (i.e., the poems “Zhongye wen daxueyu 中夜聞大雷雨” and “Guanshan yue 關山月”).

Note 101: Qian Yue 錢禴, “Fuyang xian wenmiao ji 富陽縣文廟記,” QSW 20:98.

Note 103: Liang Zhouhan 梁周翰, “Da Song xinxiu Shang Zhongzong miao beiming 大宋新修商中宗廟碑銘,” QSW 3:238. Others used very similar language to describe Song unification. In 1085, for example, Sima Guang asserted that, after Taizong’s seizure of Hedong, “the tracks of the Great Yu were all possessed by the Song” (大禹之跡, 悉為宋有). See XCB 363.8689.

Note 104: Liu Chang 劉敞, “Xianzu moka fujun jiazhuan 先祖磨勘府君家傳,” QSW 59:379.

Note 108: For their memorials encouraging a reconquest of Yan, see, respectively, SS 264.9123-28, 432.12828-29; Fu Bi 富弼, “Han [Guohua] shendaobeiming 韓[國華]神道碑銘,” QSW 29:48; Liu Kai 柳開, “Zou shiyi biao 奏事宜表,” QSW 6:273-76.

Note 110: For a rare early Song policy proposal (dating to 997) promoting the conquest of both Yan and Hehuang in the northwest, see Sun He 孫何, “Shang Zhenzong qi canyon rujiang 上真宗乞參用儒將,” QSW 9:177. By contrast, when, a few years later, Yang Yi identified both Yan and Hehuang as “lost territories” (失地), he did so to argue against the idea that the Song needed to maintain control of Lingzhou (site of modern-day Yinchuan) simply because it had once been under Chinese control. See Yang Yi 楊億, “Yi Lingzhou shiyi zhuang 議靈州事宜狀,” QSW 14:257.

Note 118: Zeng Zhao 曾肇, “Zeng Taishi Gongliang xingzhuang 曾太師公亮行狀,” QSW 110:103.

Note 119: Zhang Fangping 張方平, “Cai [Ting] muzhiming 蔡[挺]墓誌銘,” QSW 38:330; Chen Jian 陳薦, “Han [Qi] muzhiming 韓[琦]墓誌銘,” QSW 48:337; Zhang Shunmin 張舜民, “He shoufu Xihe biao 賀收復熙河表,” QSW 83:284.

Note 120: XCB 134.3189; Fan Zhongyan 范仲淹, “Zou Shaanxi Hebei heshou gongbei si ce 奏陝西河北和守攻備四策,” QSW 18:157; XCB 506.12265. For a similar remark by Wang Anshi, see P. J. Smith, “Shen-tsung’s Reign,” 465. In a somewhat different version of this historical claim, Chinese control of these territories was said to extend back to the time of Yu the Great. See Hua Zhen 華鎮, “Shiye lun 事業論,” QSW 123:88-89.

Note 121: Xu Han 許翰, “Dai he zhizheng zhuanguan qi 代賀執政轉官啟,” QSW 144:351. For similar examples, see Zhao Dingchen 趙鼎臣, “Dai he shoufu Shan Kuo zhou biao 代賀收復鄴廓州表,” QSW 138:123-24; Shen Gua 沈括, “He jie biao 賀捷表,” QSW 77:239; and Zhang Dun 章惇, “He Qingtang weizhu chujiang biao (yi) 賀青唐僞主出降表(一),” QSW 82:359.

Note 122: Zhang Fangping 張方平, “Pingrong shi ce ji biao 平戎十策及表,” QSW 37:34.

Note 125: Chao Yuezhi 晁說之, “Yuanfu san nian yingzhao fengshi (xia) 元符三年應詔封事(下),” QSW 129:406.

Note 126: Qin Guan 秦觀, “Bianfang (shang) 邊防(上),” QSW 120:64-65. According to Feng Shan 馮山, “Shang yan liu shi fengshi 上言六事封事,” QSW 78:265, expansionism in the northwest and south had as its goal to seize a mere one hundredth of the territories of the Han and Tang, yet at very high cost.

Note 127: Bi Zhongyou 畢仲游, “Xihe Lan Hui yi 熙河蘭會議,” QSW 111:78.

Note 129: Zeng Zhao 曾肇, “Wang xueshi Cun muzhiming 王學士存墓誌銘,” QSW 110:129; Xianyu Chuo 鮮于綽, “Han Wei xingzhuang 韓維行狀,” QSW 93:208. The land in question had been seized purportedly to punish the Tangut queen mother for deposing her son.

Note 133: Qian Yanyuan 錢彥遠, “Dazhao lun hanzai zou 答詔論旱災奏,” QSW 20:25.

Note 134: Chen Shidao 陳師道, “Qin Shaoyou zi xu 秦少游字序,” QSW 123:333.

Note 135: XCB 137.3284-85. Fu Bi was later remembered for such quips, which are cited in his spirit path inscription. See Su Shi 蘇軾, “Fu Zhenggong [Bi] shendaobei 富鄭公[弼]神道碑,” *Su Shi wenji* 2:526-27.

Note 137: Chao Buzhi 晁補之, “Shang huangdi lun beishi shu 上皇帝論北事書,” QSW 125:329.

Note 139: Zhang Lei 張耒, “Yuanlü pian (xia) 遠慮篇(下),” QSW 128:35.

Note 140: Huang Tingjian 黃庭堅, “Ciyun Gongding, Shibi deng beidu donglou si shou (qi er) 次韻公定、世弼登北都東樓四首(其二),” *Huang Tingjian shi jizhu*, 3:868.

Note 144: SCBM Zhengxuan, 4.36. Finally, after the Jurchens transferred control of Yan to the Song in early 1123, numerous Song officials submitted congratulatory memorials to their emperor. A typical one of these memorials praised the emperor for having “seized the former land of Yan, and consoled the people left behind in the clutches of the enemy” (舉全燕之故地, 弔陷敵之遺民). See SCBM Zhengxuan, 17.158, collated against the *Siku quanshu* ed. of this same text. For other contemporaneous documents using such language, see SHY *fanyi* 2.35-36; Li Xin 李新, “He Yuwen Shutong qi 賀宇文叔通啓,” QSW 134:60; Ge Shengzhong 葛勝仲, “He shoufu Yanshanfu biao 賀收復燕山府表,” QSW 142:241; Xu Han 許翰, “He fuding Yanshanfu biao 賀撫定燕山府表,” QSW 144:285-86; Zhai Ruwen 翟汝文, “He shoufu Yan Yun biao 賀收復燕、雲表,” QSW 149:140-41; Cheng Ju 程俱, “He shoufu Zhuo Yi erzhou biao 賀收復涿易二州表,” QSW 155:137; Wang Zao 汪藻, “He shoufu Zhuo Yi erzhou biao 賀收復涿易二州表,” QSW 157:107.

Note 145: By “former lands,” I generally refer to one of the following terms: 舊土, 舊地, 故地, 故土. The term 故土 usually referred to an individual’s place of origin, whereas 故地 could refer to a tribe’s homeland or a state’s former territory.

Note 146: E.g., after the reconquest of the Four Garrisons in the Tarim Basin, Empress Wu praised her general Wang Xiaojie 王孝傑 (d. 697) for reconquering “former lands” once under Tang control: “In the Zhenguan era, the western frontier stood at the Four Garrisons. Subsequently, they were not well defended, and were abandoned to the Tibetans. Now, this former land has been entirely recovered, all thanks to the meritorious service of Xiaojie.” (貞觀中, 西境在四鎮, 其後不善守, 棄之吐蕃. 今故土盡復, 孝傑功也.) See XTS 111.4148. Later in the dynasty, Emperor Xianzong 憲宗 (r. 805-820) “wished to

recover the former land of Longyou [i.e., Gansu]” (有意復隴右故地). See JTS 133.3681. In both cases, the monarchs referred to “former lands” of the dynasty (or, in the case of Empress Wu, of her deceased husband’s dynasty), not of a transdynastic “Middle Kingdom”; moreover, in both cases, the land was described as a “former land” only in passing, not as a basis to justify military action.

Note 155: See Lu Zhi 陸贄, “Weiwen sizhen beiting jiangli chishu 慰問四鎮北庭將吏敕書,” QTW 464:4738-4739.

Note 157: Chao Buzhi 晁補之, “Shang huangdi lun beishi shu 上皇帝論北事書,” QSW 125:335.

Note 167: Fan Zhongyan 范仲淹, “Lun Yuan Hao qinghe bukexu zhe san da kefang zhe san zou 論元昊請和不可許者三大可防者三奏,” QSW 18:225.

Note 168: Zhang Fangping 張方平, “Yuandu zhongpian 原蠹中篇,” QSW 38:117.

Note 170: Zheng Sixiao 鄭思肖, “Gujin zhengtong dalun 古今正統大論,” QSW 360:56-57. On the Tabgach claim of descent from Yellow Emperor, see ZJTJ 140.4393.

Note 179: For maps with very similar outlines, see Cao Wanru, et al. (eds.), *Zhongguo gudai ditu ji*, pls. 61-62, 92, 94-101, 152, 174, 196. On the iconic shape of the “geo-body of a nation,” see Thongchai, *Siam Mapped*, esp. 137-139. In the same way that a standardized shape of the empire appeared on multiple maps, textual annotations were also commonly recycled. See Cao Wanru, “Youguan *Huayi tu* wenti de tantao,” 42-44.

Note 181: De Weerd, “Maps and Memory.” For an additional poem of this genre, written upon seeing a map of the Western Regions, see Huang Wenlei 黃文雷, “Xiyu tu 西域圖,” QSS 65:41083.

Note 184: Lu You 陸游, “Guan Dasan guan tu you gan 觀大散關圖有感,” *Jiannan shigao jiaozhu*, 1:357-358.

Note 186: Song Qi 宋祁, “Shang bianyi zhazi 上便宜劄子,” QSW 23:268.

Note 187: Qin Guan 秦觀, “Daozei (shang) 盜賊(上),” QSW 120:58.

Note 188: Cf. Xia Song 夏竦, who believed the Great Wall of the Qin (and Han) constituted “the hard labor of past dynasties that is to the benefit of later kings” (先代之勞, 後王之利). See Xia Song 夏竦, “Fu sai yuan ce 復塞垣策,” QSW 17:55.

Note 189: Ye Shi 葉適, “Jigang (yi) 紀綱(一),” QSW 285:263.

Note 190: Lou Yao 樓鑰, “Lun neiwai zhi zhi zou 論內外之治奏,” QSW 263:237.

Note 192: Liu Chang 劉敞, “Guan Shaanxi tu 觀陝西圖,” QSS 9:5822.

Note 197: Lu You 陸游, “Junzhong zage 軍中雜歌,” *Jiannan shigao jiaozhu*, 3:1158.

Note 198: Lu You 陸游, “Shugan 書感,” *Jiannan shigao jiaozhu*, 6:3001.

Note 199: Lu You 陸游, “Du Cheng Xiucan shi 讀程秀才詩,” *Jiannan shigao jiaozhu* 2:956. For other uses by Lu You of a similar metaphor, see *Jiannan shigao jiaozhu* 1:433, 5:2717, 6:3119 (i.e., respectively, the poems “Yuezhong gui yishe 月中歸驛舍,” “Du Su Shudang Ruzhou Beishan zashi ci qi yun 讀蘇叔黨汝州北山雜詩次其韻,” and “Xie Wang Zilin panyuan hui shibian 謝王子林判院惠詩編”). For an example from the poetry of Fan Chengda 范成大, see “Ciyun Li Qizhi bianxiu Lingshishan wansuiteng ge 次韻李器之編修靈石山萬歲藤歌,” *Fan Shihu ji*, 1:114. This metaphor seems to have originated in a comment that Quan Deyu 權德輿 (759-818) once made in praise of the verse of Liu Changqing 劉長卿 (j.s. 733). See XTS 196.5608.

Note 200: Lu You 陸游, “Shi'er yue shiyi ri shi zhu di 十二月十一日視築隄,” *Jiannan shigao jiaozhu*, 1:387.

Note 202: Lu You 陸游, “Song Xue Jiancheng chu shou Xuyi 送霍監丞出守盱眙,” *Jiannan shigao jiaozhu*, 3:1582.

Note 203: Zhang Huang, *Tushu bian*, 44.26a-26b. For a very similar observation by Yan Song 嚴嵩 (1480-1567), see *Ming shilu* 103:7601-02 (Shizong 446.2a-2b).

Note 208: For an exceptional eleventh-century poem calling in passionate terms for the liberation of Yan, see Zhang Fangping 張方平, “Youji xing 幽薊行,” QSS 6:3874-5.

Note 209: Ye Shi 葉適, “Qu Yan (yi) 取燕(一),” QSW 285:214.

Note 212: Lu You 陸游, “He Ye shumiqi 賀葉樞密啓,” QSW 222:284.

Note 214: Lu You 陸游, “Yi xi 憶昔,” *Jiannan shigao jiaozhu*, 4:1894.

Note 215: Lu You 陸游, “Dongye dushu yougan 冬夜讀書有感,” *Jiannan shigao jiaozhu*, 4:1969. For poems invoking a similar theme, see “Chengdong zuigui shenye fu hu jiu zuo ci shi 城東醉歸深夜復呼酒作此詩” and “Wen Shudao yi ping, xian guo miaoshe, xie er you shu 聞蜀盜已平獻馘廟社喜而有述,” *Jiannan shigao jiaozhu*, 2:615-16, 7:3952.

Note 216: Lu You 陸游, “Beige xing 悲歌行,” *Jiannan shigao jiaozhu*, 4:2197.

Note 217: Cao Xun 曹勛, “Chunfeng yin 春風引,” QSS 33:21049.

Note 218: Cao Xun 曹勛, “Ai guhong 哀孤鴻,” QSS 33:21078.

Note 219: Yan Yuan 閻苑, “Shu xianting fu bing xu 述賢亭賦并序,” QSW 135:278

Note 220: Liao Xingzhi 廖行之, “He youzi tan 和游子歎,” QSS 47:29167-29168.

#### Chapter Five:

Note 5: Because stone epitaphs are rarely encountered in eleventh-century tombs, very few excavated tombs of this period can be dated precisely. In general, I followed the intuition of the excavators when assessing whether specific tombs dated to the Liao-Northern Song period, except in cases where I found



their dating to be particularly problematic. But dating practices for medieval Chinese tombs still leave much to be desired. Periodizations are usually based on “representative” tombs that often turn out to be the only known dated tomb of that period in a particular region; how “representative” these tombs are in fact is far from clear. It is worth observing, however, that occasional errors in dating do not affect conclusions regarding the maximal geographic extent of particular tomb features.

Note 22: In Henan, spittoons first appear in tombs in the late Tang, where they may have constituted a “symbol of a delicate and cultivated way of life.” See Ye Wa, “Mortuary Practice in Medieval China,” 172-73.

Note 46: Jin Yongtian, “Liao Shangjing chengzhi fujin fosi yizhi”; Jin Yongtian, “Shangjing fujin faxian de xiaoxing muzang.” In these tombs, the cremated remains were contained in ceramic or wooden urns, some of which were inscribed with both the name of the monastery and the date of burial. A few of these ceramic urns appear to be shaped like steppe yurts. See Jin Yongtian, “Shangjing fujin faxian de xiaoxing muzang,” 47 for a good photograph; see also Wen Yu, “Qionglu shi guhui guan.”

Note 68: For tables indicating where Han Chinese, Parhae, and other populations were resettled at various sites around the Liao empire, see Wittfogel and Feng, *History of Chinese Society: Liao*, 62-83. E.g., after the Khitan conquest of Parhae, the Liao broke up the Parhae population, resettling large numbers of them all over the empire. See Wittfogel and Feng, *History of Chinese Society: Liao*, 46, 112.

## Chapter Six

Note 4: Du Mu 杜牧, “Lu [Pei] muzhi 盧[霽]墓誌,” *Du Mu ji xinian jiaozhu*, 3:767.

Note 12: Only the preface of this guide survives. See Su Song 蘇頌, “Huarong luwei xinlu zongxu 華戎魯衛信錄總序,” *Su Weigong wenji*, 66:1003-06.

Note 13: See, for example, Su Song, *Su Weigong wenji*, 13:170 (“奚山道中”), 13:171 (“契丹帳”), 13:173 (“觀北人圍獵,” “遼人牧”), 13:175 (“契丹馬”); QSS 9:5845 (“鐵漿館”), 9:5917 (“古北口”).

Note 19: The temple to Yang Ye is commemorated in poetry by Su Song (*Su Weigong wenji*, 1:162), Liu Chang (QSS 9:5916), Su Che (*Su Che ji*, 1:319), and Peng Ruli (QSS 16:10504).

Note 20: Huixian Rock is commemorated in poetry by Wang Gui (QSS 9:5992), Su Song (*Su Weigong wenji*, 1:164), and Peng Ruli (QSS 16:10546, 16:10589). This formation is also noted in the embassy journal of Shen Gua (QSW 77:380).

Note 21: Sixiang Ling (sometimes called Cixiang Ling 辭鄉嶺) is mentioned in poetry by Su Che (*Su Che ji*, 1:319), Liu Chang (QSS 9:5909, 9:5871), Wang Gui (QSS 9:5991), and Zhang Shunmin (QSS 14:9692). This peak is also noted in the embassy journals of Lu Zhen (*Chengyao lu*, 2), Wang Zeng (XCB 79.1795), and Shen Gua (QSW 77:379).

Note 24: Su Che 蘇轍, “Shang shumì Han taiwei shu 上樞密韓太尉書,” *Su che ji*, 2:381. Translation adapted from Zhang Cong, *Transformative Journeys*, 162.

Note 26: Su Shunqin 蘇舜欽, “[Su Qi] muzhiming [蘇耆]墓誌銘,” QSW 41:110.

Note 27: Su Che 蘇轍, “Lun Huanghe bi fei dong jue zhazi 論黃河必非東決劄子,” *Su Che ji*, 2:747-48.

Note 28: XCB 127.3007. Wang’s primary motivation was probably fiscal responsibility: whereas local militias were expected to feed themselves, government troops required state provisioning.

Note 29: For Fu Bi, see XCB 150.3639, 3650, 3654; for Lü Tao, see QSW 73:180-81; for Zhang Fangping, see XCB 138.3326-27. For other claims of expertise on the basis of travels abroad, see the memorial by Chen Xiang 陳襄 (QSW 50:41-42) and the reference to Zhang Heng 章衡 in XCB 242.5906.

Note 43: Han Qi, *Anyang ji biannian jianzhu*, 1:170. Heaven-ordained topographical barriers did not only apply to China. Xu Kangzong encountered a flat wasteland between traditional Khitan and Jurchen territory. According to Xu, “Surely this [wasteland] is that by which Heaven and Earth separated the two countries!” (豈天地以此限兩國也!) See Jue’an and Nai’an, *Jingkang baishi jianzheng*, 34 (stage 36).

Note 66: XCB 97.2253; QSW 77:381. Lu Zhen 路振 also describes an open space occupied by yurts within the inner city walls of the Central Capital. See Jiang Shaoyu, *Songchao shishi leiyuan*, 77.1012, 1014. For an excellent description of steppe urbanization, see Rogers, “Urban Centres.” According to p. 811, among the principle features of urban centers of the eastern Eurasian steppe were the “large areas within the outer walls...typically devoid of architectural evidence, implying the presence of tent neighbourhoods, not unlike walled tent communities known from recent times.”

Note 88: Wang Anshi, *Wang Jinggong shi zhu bujian*, 45.881-82. For the argument that Wang in fact did cross the border and travel as an envoy to Liao, see Zhang Diyun, “Guanyu Wang Anshi shi Liao”; *Quan Liao shi hua*, 288-89.

### Conclusion

Note 6: Su Song 蘇頌, “Huarong luwei xinlu zongxu 華戎魯衛信錄總序,” *Su Weigong wenji* 2:1005.

Note 8: Phan, “Chu Nom and the Taming of the South.” For the argument that the Chu Nom script developed around the twelfth century, see Nguyen, “Graphemic Borrowings,” 384-97. The nineteenth-century Vietnamese regime based in Hue apparently also viewed itself as a civilized center. In 1813, it built at Phnom Penh a “Pavilion of the Pacified Frontier,” thereby applying the language of the “zones of submission” to Cambodia. See Fairbank, *Chinese World Order*, 68.

### Appendix A

Note 5: Li Qingfa, “Jianping Xiyaocun Liao mu,” 121; “Jilin Shuangliao xian Gaolige Liao mu qun,” 140. For Aurel Stein’s colorful account of twentieth-century tomb robbers in the Turfan region breaking the jawbones of desiccated corpses in order to obtain the coins inside their mouths, see Hansen, “Introduction,” 4.

Note 7: “Shanxi Datong jiaoqu wu zuo Liao bihua mu,” 39; Li Zhongyi, “Handan shiqu faxian Songdai muzang,” 20. For examples of Tang-era tombs where coins were found under the corpse or in the hands or mouths, see Ye Wa, “Mortuary Practice in Medieval China,” 159-66.