

Jilinghu 畸零戶 (Supernumerary Households) during the Ming Dynasty

TSURUMI, Naohiro

1. Preamble

At a joint meeting of the Ancient and Feudal Sections of the Association for the Study of Historiography, TANAKA Masatoshi 田中正俊 once made the following observations on differences in analytical perspectives on basic production relationships in the study of Chinese history:¹⁾

In the study of ancient history [focussing on the Qin 秦 and Han 漢 empires] the basic relationship is conceived of as the despotic ruler's individual and personal control of the people, with state power being understood as a constituent element intrinsic to the basic production relationship, whereas in the study of medieval history there has been a tendency for this basic relationship to be conceived of as a direct production relationship obtaining between landlord and tenant farmer, with state power being separated and abstracted from this relationship and not linked to it by any sort of intermediary agency.

Tanaka then went on to define the issue facing the study of Chinese history as "how to link state power during the historical stage in question to the so-called landlord-tenant relationship through a concrete, specific agency peculiar to 'medieval' China."

This question raised by Tanaka may be considered to retain its validity and relevance even today, more than thirty years later. The points at issue are, however, extremely wide-ranging, and the answer to this question is made all the more difficult by the current state of research on the land system, labour service system and various other aspects of institutional history, which is still inadequate. It would seem, therefore, that for the time being one method of approaching this issue will be to build up a body of research on institutional history while constantly questioning the links between different institutions, with a view to eventually bringing this research together in an integrated whole.

It is from such a perspective that I propose to reexamine the *lijia* 里甲 system, which provided the actual locus for the formation of the various relationships obtaining between state power and direct producers during the Ming 明 dynasty.

But I will not consider only organizational questions such as whether the *lijia* system constituted natural villages or administrative villages, as has been the case in previous studies of the *lijia* system,²⁾ and instead, basing myself on a standpoint that would understand what is generally termed a “system” or “institution” to be an abstract entity differentiated from reality and invariably endowed in its actualization with certain distinctive aspects, I shall attempt to shed light on one facet of the *lijia* system by examining the realities of the *jilinghu* 畸零戶 or “supernumerary households”.

It has long been accepted in academic circles that the *lijia* system of the Ming was based on a principle of organization centred on landowners and that its original constituent members were the households of *li* captains (*lizhang* 里長) and *jia* heads (*jiashou* 甲首), and it is also common knowledge that in addition there existed households called *jilinghu* or *daiguanhu* 帶管戶. On the basis of passages in the *Veritable Records of the Ming* dealing with the introduction of the *lijia* system in Hongwu 洪武 14 (1381) and the account in the *Da Ming huidian* 大明會典 on the second compilation of Yellow Registers (*huangce* 黃冊) in Hongwu 24 (1391), these *jilinghu* have been defined as “households of widowers, widows, orphans and the elderly that were not directly concerned with land taxes and labour service”,³⁾ “households of the elderly, chronically ill, children under the age of ten, widows and absentee landowners”,⁴⁾ or “widowers, widows, orphans and the elderly who were unfit for labour service and were placed outside the 110 households comprising a *li* 里”.⁵⁾ It would thus appear that the *jilinghu* have been understood to represent households that did not own land and were either not directly concerned with land taxes and labour service or incapable of bearing their burden.

However, in the course of examining material on *jilinghu* to be found in local gazetteers and literary writings, I have encountered a number of examples for which the above explanations are inadequate, and I have come to feel a need to examine anew the actual content of these so-called *jilinghu*. The aim of this article, then, is to present a preliminary study of institutional history in which I will undertake to reconsider the *jilinghu* and also explore class relationships within the *lijia* system.

II. The System of Small Yellow Registers

It had previously been considered that the *lijia* system of the Ming was implemented in the first month of Hongwu 14⁶⁾ and that prior to this taxes and labour service had been levied without the mediation of *lijia* units and in an uncoordinated manner.⁷⁾ However, a quotation from the *Wuxing xuzhi* 吳興續志 contained in the *Yongle dadian* 永樂大典, of which a photofacsimile edition was published in China some years ago, has made it clear that at least in Huzhou 湖州 prefecture a system involving “Small Yellow Registers” had been current prior to this and that *li*-captain and *jia*-head households had already been established, and

it has therefore become necessary to reexamine questions pertaining to the establishment of the *lijia* system.

This point has already been made by FUJII Hiroshi 藤井 宏,⁸⁾ OYAMA Masaaki 小山正明 and myself,⁹⁾ and Oyama in particular previously presented to the Jisseiroku Kenkyūkai 實政錄研究會 a paper entitled “On the Date of the Establishment of the *Lijia* System”¹⁰⁾ in which he reported that, following the example of the township-ward (*dubao* 都保) system of the Yuan 元, *li*-captains had already been appointed from the time of the kingdom of Wu 吳 and that an organization similar in character to the *lijia* system implemented nationwide in Hongwu 14 began to be gradually introduced in different parts of the country from Hongwu 2 or 3.¹¹⁾ I too am of much the same view, but because it has some bearing on my arguments below, I first wish to examine the passage on Huzhou prefecture in the *Yongle dadian*.

In the *Yongle dadian* 2277, “Hu” 湖, “Huzhou fu” 湖州府 3, “Tianfu” 田賦, we find the following quotation from the *Wuxing xuzhi*:

役法。元各都設里正主首。後止設里正。以田及頃者。充催辦稅糧。...國初各都仍立里長。洪武三年以來。催辦稅糧軍需。則爲小黃冊圖之法。...黃冊里長甲首。洪武三年爲始。編置小黃冊。每百¹²⁾家畫爲一圖。內推丁力田糧近上者十名爲里長。餘十名爲甲首。每歲輪流。里長一名。管甲首十名。甲首一名。管人戶九名。催稅糧。以十年一周。其數分見各縣。

Similarly, in the section on Changxing 長興 county there is another quotation from the *Wuxing xuzhi*:

黃冊里長。洪武三年定擬。每百家爲一圖。里長一名。甲首一十名。不盡畸零。九戶以下附正圖。十戶之上者。亦爲一圖。設里長一名。甲首隨戶多寡設焉。共計四百三十四圖。逐年輪當催辦稅糧。

The first point to be noted in the above passages is that whereas during the Yuan dynasty village heads (*lizheng* 里正) were selected primarily on the basis of the size of their landholdings, from Hongwu 3 onwards, in addition to the amount of land taxes due, the number of adult male members in a household was also taken into account when appointing *li* captains.¹³⁾ Secondly, as regards the relationship between regular wards (*zhengtu* 正圖) and supernumerary households (*jiling* 畸零), when the number of supernumerary households was no more than nine, they were attached to a regular ward, but when they exceeded ten in number, they formed a separate unit with its own *li* captain, and *jia*-heads were also appointed in accordance with the number of households.¹⁴⁾ Here the use of the term *jiling* is unrelated to a household's ability to bear its tax burdens, being used instead to signify odd numbers of households falling outside the bounds of regular units of household organization, and it thus differs in meaning from the *jilinghu* referred to in the subsequent edict of Hongwu 14. If this method of

household organization was indeed actually put into practice, then it is to be surmised that there would naturally have existed wards of less than one hundred households.

Let us next consider this point in a little more detail. We are fortunate in that the number of wards at the time of the introduction of the method of household organization employing a system of Small Yellow Registers in the counties of Huzhou prefecture at the start of the Hongwu era is given in the *Wuxing xuzhi*. However, the earliest record of the number of *li* in the counties of Huzhou after Hongwu 14 (1381), when the *lijia* system is considered to have been implemented nationwide, would seem to date only from Chenghua 8 (1472). Although it cannot necessarily be said that there would have been no changes whatsoever in the number of *lijia* units in the counties of Huzhou prefecture during the ninety-odd years between the nationwide implementation of the *lijia* system and Chenghua 8, in view of the fact that the aim of the establishment of the *lijia* system in the Ming was to ensure the stabilization of imperial power by securing a fixed amount of tax revenue for the imperial authorities, one would probably not be greatly mistaken in assuming that, providing there were no marked changes in the number of households and residents, there would have been no large-scale modification of the original basic number of *lijia* units in the early and mid-Ming, when the contradictions inherent in the *lijia* system are not yet thought to have been particularly evident. On the basis of this assumption, let us now compare the number of wards given in the Small Yellow Registers for the counties of Huzhou prefecture with the number of *li* in Chenghua 8.

It will be evident from Table 1 that the number of wards given in the Small Yellow Registers for each county far exceeds the number of *li* in Chenghua 8, and this change is especially pronounced in the case of Wukang 武康 and Anji 安吉 counties, which evidence little variation in their number of households during these ninety-odd years. If we also compare the average number of households per *li* (Table 2), we find that whereas under the system of Small Yellow Registers the average number of households per ward was at the most 95 and in the case of Deching 德清 county less than 60, in Chenghua 8 the average number of households per *li* was in excess of 130 and in Wukang county exceeded 170.

These facts would suggest that the original number of wards under the system of Small Yellow Registers introduced in Hongwu 3 was not retained as the basic number of *lijia* units after Hongwu 14, and that instead a figure differing from the number of wards to be seen under the system of Small Yellow Registers was later introduced as the basic figure for the organization of *lijia* units. If understood in this manner, it may then be assumed that there were differences between the method used under the system of Small Yellow Registers introduced in Hongwu 3 and the method of *lijia* organization implemented nationwide in Hongwu 14, and in particular, as was suggested earlier, the relationship between *jilinghu* and regular wards in *lijia* organization would have differed, with the changes probably having occurred after Hongwu 14.

Table 1 Number of Households in Counties of Huzhou Prefecture¹⁵⁾

Year County	Early Hongwu Era (civilian and artisan households: Hongwu 9; military households: Hongwu 10)	Hongwu 24 (1391)	Xuande 宣德 7 (1432)	Tianshun 天順 6 (1462)	Chenghua 8 (1472)
Wucheng 烏程	57,211	58,617	39,944	36,940	37,071
Guian 歸安	58,377	61,950	45,285	41,579	41,490
Chang-xing 長興	41,187	40,124	37,559	34,562	33,759
Wukang 武康	10,887	10,256	11,262	10,767	10,773
Deching 德清	34,880	11,057	35,664	33,746	33,853
Anji 安吉	17,696	18,044	16,486	14,727	14,547

Table 2 Number of *Li* and Their Average Number of Households in Small Yellow Registers and Chenghua 8

County	Small Yellow Registers		Chenghua 8 ¹⁸⁾	
	Number of Wards ¹⁶⁾	Average Number of Households per Ward	Number of <i>Li</i>	Average Number of Households per <i>Li</i>
Wucheng	675	84.8	282	131.5
Guian	766 ¹⁷⁾	76.2	309	134.3
Changxing	434	94.9	259	130.3
Wukang	166	65.6	62	173.8
Deching	589	59.2	217	156
Anji	195	90.7	90	161.6

Next, let us consider the *lijia* system in Wujiang 吳江 county in neighbouring Suzhou 蘇州 prefecture, which was well-known for its heavy taxes. In Wujiang county the *lijia* system had been implemented already in Hongwu 2, one year

Table 3 Number of Households in Wujiang County¹⁹⁾

Year	Hongwu 4	Hongwu 9	Hongwu 24	Xuande 7	Tianshun 6	Chenghua 22
Number of Households	80,382	81,572	74,831	79,645	68,365	72,445

Table 4 Number of *li* in Wujiang County and Their Average Number of Households²⁰⁾

Year	Hongwu 2	Tianshun 6	Chenghua 18	Chenghua 22
Number of Villages	530	549 ²¹⁾	550	564
Average Number of Households per Village	151.6	124.5	?	128.4

earlier than in Huzhou prefecture, and here too, as is evident from Tables 3 and 4, there was a general decline in the number of households from the Hongwu through to the Tianshun and Chenghua eras, as had also been the case in the counties of Huzhou prefecture. Wujiang county differed from the counties of Huzhou, however, in that there was virtually no change in the number of *li*.

In addition, we find the following passage in the Qianlong 乾隆-era *Wujiang xian zhi* 吳江縣志 16, “Yaoyi” 徭役, “Mingdai yifa” 明代役法:

甲首每圖十人、洪武初定制。民十戶爲一甲。曰甲首。又以丁田多者一戶領戶。曰里長。凡十甲則一百一十戶。謂之一里。...里甲本縣五百三十圖。後增一十八圖。凡里長五百四十八人。甲首五千四百八十人。按洪武初五百三十圖。時城郭六圖。鄉都五百二十四圖。成化中則五百四十八圖。時城郭九圖。鄉都五百三十九圖也。

Although it is not clear whether the “early Hongwu [era]” (洪武初) referred to here signifies the period before or after Hongwu 14, in content the system ascribed here to the early Hongwu era is the same as the *lijia* system hitherto considered to have been established after Hongwu 14, with one *li* consisting of 110 households. It is, moreover, stated that at the time the *li* in Wujiang county numbered 530. As is indicated in Table 4, according to the Jiajing 嘉靖-era *Wujiang xian zhi*, the number of *li* in Hongwu 2 was also 530, and this means that the number of *li* in Hongwu 2 and in the “early Hongwu” era was identical. Therefore, regardless of whether the number of *li* given for the early Hongwu era represents the number of *li* in Hongwu 2 or that of a later date, it may be assumed that the *li* were organized on the basis of the number of *li* in Hongwu 2.

When considered in this light, it would appear that the so-styled *lijia* system implemented in Wujiang county in Hongwu 2 was either based on the same

organizational principles as was the *lijia* system, hitherto believed to have been implemented after Hongwu 14, or else bore a very close resemblance to it, and it may therefore be said to have already embodied the standard form assumed by the *lijia* system of the Ming.

If the *lijia* system of the early Hongwu era is understood in this fashion, then the so-called *lijia* system that began to be gradually implemented throughout China from about Hongwu 2–3 onwards and was organized on the basis of adult male labour and land tax may be said to have been implemented in a variety of forms that accorded with the individual circumstances of *li* in different regions and were most suited to the collection of taxes. Then, with the establishment of the Ming dynasty's power base, the *lijia* system that had been locally implemented in accordance with these diverse realities and on the basis of varying forms was given a uniform and standardized form, and it is to be surmised that this occurred some time around Hongwu 14.

However, generally speaking, insofar that any institution is an abstract entity always differentiated from reality, even an institution that has come to be endowed with a standardized form will, when actually implemented, invariably possess distinctive aspects in response to distinctive forms of reality, and the *lijia* system was no exception to this. Let us now consider the relationship between the *lijia* system and the *jilinghu*.

III. *Jilinghu*

Previous scholars have assumed that the *lijia* system of the Ming was implemented on a nationwide scale in Hongwu 14, and hitherto the relevant passages in the *Veritable Records of the Ming* and the *Da Ming huidian* have been cited as the most basic source materials describing the *lijia* system as an institution. According to the entry for the first month of Hongwu 14 in the *Veritable Records of the Ming*,

是月命天下郡縣。編賦役黃冊。其法以一百一十戶爲里。一里之中推丁糧多者十人爲之長。餘百戶爲十甲。甲凡十人。歲役里長一人甲首十人。管攝一里之事。城中曰坊。近城曰廂。鄉都曰里。凡十年一周。先後則各以丁糧多寡爲次。每里編爲一冊。冊之首總爲一圖。其里中鰥寡孤獨不任役者。則帶管於百一十戶之外。而列於圖後。名曰畸零。冊成爲四本。一以進戶部。其三則布政司府縣各留其一焉。

In other words, each *li* was composed of 110 households, and within each *li* the ten households with the most adult male labour and land taxes due were designated *li* captains, while the remaining 100 households were divided into ten *jia*; each year one *li*-captain household and ten *jia* households took turns in serving as the *li* captain and *jia* heads respectively; in addition, widowers, widows, orphans and the elderly, who were exempt from labour service, existed outside the 110 households comprising the regular *lijia* membership and were called "supernumeraries." According to this account, *li* memberships were divided into (i)

li-captain households, (ii) *jia*-head households, and (iii) *jilinghu*, and an edict of similar content is also recorded in the Zhengde 正德-era *Da Ming huidian* 21, "Hukou" 戶口 2, in a section on the compilation of Yellow Registers.²²⁾

However, in the response to a memorial on the format for compiling Yellow Registers recorded in the same Zhengde-era *Da Ming huidian* in an entry for Hongwu 24, we find the following passage:

凡編排里長。務不出本都。且如一都有六百戶。將五百五十戶編爲五里。剩下五十戶。分派本都。附各里長名下。帶管當差。不許將別都人口補轄。其畸零人戶。許將年老殘疾并幼小十歲以下及寡婦外郡寄莊人戶編排。

This informs us that in a township (*dou* 都) with 600 households, 550 households would be divided into five *li*, with the remaining 50 households being placed under the supervision of the *li* captains, attached to each *li*, and assigned labour duties, and these 50 households were not allowed to be used to supplement the population of another township in order to create another *li*. In addition, this passage also explains in greater detail the Hongwu 14 edict concerning *li*, stating that they could consist of the elderly, the chronically ill, children under the age of ten, widows, and absentee landowners.

In addition to the (i) *li*-captain households, (ii) *jia*-head households and (iii) *jilinghu* alluded to in the *Veritable Records*, this passage from the *Da Ming huidian* makes special mention of (iv) households that were attached to each *li* and assigned labour duties (hereafter referred to as "*daiguanhu*").²³⁾ Since these "*daiguanhu*" existed outside the 110 households comprising the regular *lijia* membership and were under the supervision of the *li* captains, in principle they would not have been directly liable for regular *lijia* labour service, but in view of the fact that they represented the households that remained after the 110 households with the most adult male labour and land taxes due had been selected to form a *lijia* unit and were, moreover, distinguished from the *jilinghu* consisting of the elderly, the chronically ill, children under the age of ten, widows, and absentee landowners, they would have been households with some adult male labour and land²⁴⁾ and were presumably assigned miscellaneous labour duties.

It would, however, have been inconceivable that when actually organizing the population into *lijia* units, the number of landowners in all *li* would have represented multiples of 110, and it is only natural to assume the existence of (iv) surplus households in actual *lijia* organization. Why, then, was it that the edict of Hongwu 14 nevertheless makes no mention of the existence of (iv)? Generally speaking, institutions are implemented in accordance with specific political aims for the purpose of realizing those aims, and although institutions and reality are by no means unrelated, it is normal for an institution itself to be underpinned by specific political and subjective aims. When there is a despotic ruler, as was the case in China, these subjective aims will represent the ideals of the emperor, and there will in all likelihood be a tendency for these ideals to assume a form still

further removed from reality.²⁵⁾ If institutions may be conceived of in such terms, then the passages relating to Hongwu 14 would have expressed most clearly the ideals of Taizu 太祖, who believed that all households possessing adult male labour and land should perform regular *lijia* labour service, and only those possessing neither adult male labour nor land and truly incapable of bearing the burdens of taxation should be attached as *jilinghu* to the 110 households comprising regular *lijia* membership. These subjective ideals of the emperor, who sought to uniformly incorporate into each 110-household *li* all households possessing adult male labour and land, may thus be considered to have been expressed in an unadulterated form in the Hongwu 14 edict. By way of contrast, the passage from Hongwu 24 in the *Da Ming huidian* records regulations that took into account to a certain degree problems that had arisen in the actual organization of *lijia* units, and when compared with the edict of Hongwu 14, they may be said to have been based on a more practical and realistic standpoint.²⁶⁾

When considered in this manner, the stratification within *lijia* units that the imperial authorities actually had in mind would have consisted of the four categories of (i) *li*-captain households, (ii) *jia*-head households, (iv) “*daiguanhu*,” and (iii) *jilinghu*, with (iv) representing those households that were liable for miscellaneous labour duties other than regular *lijia* labour service and (iii) corresponding to those households described in the *Veritable Records* as “widowers, widows, orphans and the elderly unfit for labour service.”

In point of fact, a clear reference to these four categories in connection with the ranking of households is to be found in the Jiajing-era *Haining xian zhi* 海寧縣志 2, “Tianfu zhi” 田賦志, in a section on labour service.

國朝定制。凡府縣都里每十年一造賦役黃冊。分轄上中下三戶。三等人戶內不揀軍民竈匠等籍。但一百一十戶定爲一里。內十名爲里長。一百名爲甲首。每里長一名領甲首十名。其外又有一等下戶。編作帶管。又下爲畸零。分派於十里長下。排定十年。里甲依次輪當。

According to this passage, under the regulations laid down by the national authorities, once every ten years Yellow Registers were to be compiled for each subprefecture (*hu* 府), county (*xian* 縣), township (*dou*) and village (*li*),²⁷⁾ and these divided all households into three ranks without taking into account the four occupational categories of military, civilian, saltern and artisan;²⁸⁾ among the 110 households constituting a *li*, ten were appointed *li* captains, while the remaining 100 households became *jia* heads; lower-grade households other than these formed attached households, while still lower-grade households were regarded as *jilinghu* and apportioned among the ten *li* captains. The four household categories alluded to above are thus clearly distinguished here, being divided into four or five grades.

It was not always possible, however, to realize in actual *lijia* organization the intentions of the imperial authorities as expressed in the form of an institution,

and there were naturally major discrepancies between imperial ideals and actual *lijia* organization with respect to the treatment of *jilinghu* too. An example of this may be seen in the Jiajing-era *Huizhou fu zhi* 惠州府志 5, “Hukou zhi” 戶口志.

每一百一十戶爲一里。同一格眼謂之一圖。立公正材幹者爲長。其戶十。甲首戶百。在城曰坊長。在廂曰廂長。在鄉曰里長。餘者附於格眼外。謂之畸零。

According to this passage, a *li* was composed of 110 households, with ten upright and competent households being appointed *li*-captain households and the remaining 100 households acting as *jia* heads, and any extra households were called “supernumeraries.” Here, *jilinghu* are not determined on the basis of their ability to bear the burden of taxes, as was laid down in the edict of Hongwu 14, but are instead defined as those surplus households falling outside the 110 households constituting a regular *li*.

This usage of the term *jilinghu* is, however, by no means unusual, and examples may be found in various local gazetteers. For instance, in the Tianqi 天啓-era *Dongan xian zhi* 東安縣志 2, “Buyi 補遺: Hukou,” concerning the Northern Metropolitan Area, we find the following passage:

每里十甲。每甲里長一戶。甲首十戶。又有畸零戶。此十戶之外附餘者。洪武初我邑編四十四里。該戶四千八百四十。而畸零尙多。則戶口槩可見矣。

Each *jia* consisted of one *li*-captain household and ten *jia*-head households, and any remaining households were designated *jilinghu*, and since it is further stated that there were 44 *li* in the early Hongwu era, with many *jilinghu* existing outside the approximately 4,840 regular households,²⁹⁾ this usage of the term *jilinghu* probably dates from the early Ming.

As an example from the Southern Metropolitan Area, one may quote the Wanli 萬曆-era *Shangyuan xian zhi* 上元縣志 12, “Iwen zhi: Jizhuang yi” 藝文志、寄庄議, in a section on Yao Ruxun 姚汝循, governor of Daming 大名守:

今夫一里十甲。一甲十排。一排十戶。此正法也。十戶之外有奇零。則謂之奇零戶。This tells us that if there were any households falling outside the ten households constituting one *jia*, these were called “supernumerary households” (*qilinghu* 奇零戶).

The Qianlong-era *Wujiang xian zhi* 16, “Yaoyi: Mingdai yifa,” similarly states that any households that were left over when organizing a ward were attached to each *jia* and called “supernumerary households” (*qilinghu*):

甲首每圖十人。洪武初定制。民十戶爲一甲。曰甲首。又以丁田多者一戶領戶。曰里長。凡十甲則一百一十戶。謂之一里。編成一圖。有餘則附於各甲之後。曰奇零戶。

The Qianlong-era *Fenghua xian zhi* 奉化縣志 1, “Yudi zhi: Xiangdu” 輿地志、鄉都, also pertaining to Jiangnan 江南, describes the system of *li* organization

during the Ming in the following terms:

里各以百十戶。爲十年。圖年推一人爲長。領甲首十戶。不足者爲帶管畸零。每十年更造冊籍。五年審察丁糧上下。以爲正差雜差。

Each *li* consisted, namely, of 110 households, and because a unit of less than 110 households could not form a *li*, these were treated as “attached” or “supernumerary” households and did not form a separate *li*.

The Wanli-era *Ningde xian zhi* 寧德縣志 1, “Yudi zhi: Jiangyu 疆域,” from Fujian 福建, likewise states that any households falling outside the ten households constituting one *jia* were called “supernumeraries”:

我朝...一圖一長。而統十戶。爲一甲。或有過十戶之外者謂畸零。

This type of usage is not, however, confined to local gazetteers, but is in fact also found in the *Veritable Records of the Ming*. In an entry for Hongwu 23, 8th month, *bingyin* 丙寅, we read:

戶部奏。重造黃冊以冊式一本并合行事宜條例頒行。...凡一十一戶以附坊廂里長。坊廂里長以十甲所造冊。凡一百一十戶攢成一本。有餘則附其後曰畸零戶。

Here too it is stated that if there should be any households falling outside the 110 households constituting a *li*, they were to be attached to the *li* and called *jilinghu*. This particular entry sets down the procedures to be followed in the second compilation of Yellow Registers, scheduled for the following year (Hongwu 24), and it indicates that ever since the implementation of the Ming *lijia* system there had existed two different interpretations of *jilinghu* on the part of the imperial authorities.

Furthermore, as was pointed out in the previous section, under the system of Small Yellow Registers introduced in Huzhou prefecture in Hongwu 3, *jilinghu* were defined as households attached to regular wards, and this would indicate that in some regions the term *jilinghu* was being used in its original sense of “surplus household” already in the first years of the Ming dynasty. It was in the context of this general understanding that the imperial ideal, identifying *jilinghu* with “widowers, widows, orphans and the elderly unfit for labour service,” was presented in the edict of Hongwu 14.

Thus, although it is true that in the ideals of the imperial authorities the *jilinghu* as a theoretical institution would indeed have represented “widowers, widows, orphans and the elderly unfit for labour service” or “households of the elderly, the chronically ill, children under the age of ten, widows, and absentee landowners,” it may be assumed that the households referred to as *jilinghu* in the actual *lijia* system would have included households left over when selecting 110 upper-, middle- and lower-grade households to form a *li*, namely, households corresponding to the aforementioned (iv) “*daiguanhu*” and (iii) *jilinghu*.³⁰⁾ This is

evident from the following passage from the Jiajing-era *Xiangshan xian zhi* 香山縣志 2, “Yaoyi,” where it is clearly stated that *jilinghu* included both households with “very little adult male labour and land tax”³¹⁾ and the households of “widowers, widows, orphans and the elderly unfit for labour service.”

里甲之制。洪武十四年始詔天下編賦役黃冊。以一百一十戶爲一里。同一格眼謂之一圖。推丁糧多者一人爲長。在城曰坊長。在鄉曰里長。餘一百人分十甲。每一甲則一長。管攝甲首十戶。丁糧絕少及鰥寡孤獨不任事者附於格眼外。謂之畸零戶。輪年在官者曰見年里長。空歇者謂之排年。十歲而周。凡長自洪武來皆歲更。宣德初用戶部建言。擇丁產之尤殷者充之。自是非有大故者不更。³²⁾ 成化以後丁糧消長代換無定。

In conclusion, it may be said that whereas the definition of *jilinghu* as “widowers, widows, orphans and the elderly unfit for labour service” reflected a substantive assessment of the peasantry with respect to their ability to bear the burden of taxes and was a manifestation of the state’s desire to gain the greatest possible degree of control over them as targets of taxation, the identification of *jilinghu* with those falling outside the 110 households forming a regular *li* had as its goal the formal consistency of the *lijia* system from a standpoint aiming at the smooth and uniform operation of the system while conforming with the realities of actual *li* composition. It was in this manner that the *jilinghu*, which in principle did not include households other than those unfit for labour service but in actual practice included surplus households capable of labour service that were formally placed outside the regular *lijia* unit and, as will be described below, were charged with supplementary or reserve roles for the purposes of taxation, evolved as a concrete manifestation of an attempt to reconcile the unlimited demands of tax collection with the limitations of their practical realization in the actual *li* context.

IV. The Relationship between the *Jilinghu* and Taxation

As was explained in the previous section, the households referred to as *jilinghu* within the *lijia* system also included households with adult male labour and land, and next I wish to consider the relationship between the *jilinghu* and taxation.

First, with regard to landownership by *jilinghu*, we find the following passage in the *Xicun ji* 西村集, “Dui: Gejian dui” 對、革姦對, by Shi Jian 史鑑 (1434–96):

或問邵監郡革姦之政於史。...曰。...今江南之稅與役爲天下最。吾蘇之稅與役。又爲江南最。諸凡科率調遣徵發。必視夫田之多寡輕重。而第其則焉。以爲布在方策。非若他貨財可藏掩也。法既以之爲準。於是豪猾者益翫法焉。假婦女老弱之名曰帶管。他郡別邑之名曰寄莊。莫不多占良田徼倖免役。...惟我監郡公知其然。其始受任也。卽下令曰。凡帶管戶。戶田十畝以下者聽。踰此數者悉編入爲正額。有不編者罰無赦。凡寄莊戶。戶籍其田之數於官。官卽牒本郡。若邑俾召役者有所徵焉。有不籍者罰無赦。...

According to this passage, during the mid-Ming in Suzhou prefecture in Jiangnan there were deceitful people who juggled with the law by borrowing the names of women, the elderly and the weak and purporting to be *daiguanhu*,³³⁾ or by borrowing the names of other counties and *li* and claiming to be absentee landowners, whereby they were able to avoid taxation while possessing large amounts of land, and so in order to prevent any inequities in taxation assistant prefect³⁴⁾ Shao 邵 issued instructions to the effect that only households with less than 10 *mu* 畝 of land could be deemed attached households, while households with more than 10 *mu* of land but claiming to be attached households were to be incorporated into the regular *lijia* membership. This means that in Suzhou prefecture during the mid-Ming there existed landowning attached households and that landowners with less than 10 *mu* were recognized institutionally too as attached households.

That being so, of how much value was 10 *mu* of land to contemporary peasants? In the Chongzheng 崇禎-era *Wucheng xian zhi* 烏程縣志 3, “Fuyi,” Shen Yan 沈演 (1566–1638) of Guian county, who served as Minister of Justice in Nanjing (Nanjing *xingbu shangshu* 南京刑部尚書), writes as follows:

以一夫拾畝之家論之。一夫終歲勤動可耕拾畝。壹畝米貳石亦稱有年。計爲米貳拾石。一夫食用可五石而贏。糞其田可四石而贏。蓋所存止十石矣。寔徵米銀正稅畝可六斗而辦。止餘米肆石耳。而妻孥之待哺。衣縷之蓋形。皆取資焉。又將別立役銀等項各色以困之。...又可輕言加派乎。

Shen Yan states, namely, that the area of land farmed by one peasant was 10 *mu*, but that very little remained once taxes had been paid. Although dating from some time later in the Qing dynasty, a farm management programme drawn up by Zhang Lixiang 張履祥 in Shunzhi 順治 15 for the surviving family of his friend Mr. Wu 鄔 of Ganpu 澉浦 in Haiyan 海鹽 county contains the following passage:³⁵⁾

瘠田十畝。自畊儘可足一家之食。若僱人代畊則與石田無異。若佃於人則計租入。僅足供賦役而已。...勤力而節用。佐以女工。養生送死。可以無闕。

This informs us that the tilling of 10 *mu* of poor farmland sufficed to feed a family, while if one was industrious and thrifty and the womenfolk engaged in manual homework, it was possible to lead a life of relative comfort and perform memorial rites for one's parents. This means that in Jiangnan 10 *mu* of farmland was the standard unit of arable land for a peasant family at the time,³⁶⁾ and this would have represented the minimum amount of land necessary for peasant households to sustain their reproduction provided that they tilled the land themselves and the womenfolk engaged in manual homework.

In addition, in the “Zi Guangdong xun'an zai jiang fuyi ce xiangyi bin chacui Guangxi wence you” 咨廣東巡按再將賦役冊詳議并查催廣西文冊由 contained in the *Huo Wenmin gong quanji* 霍文敏公全集 9A, “Libu gongxing” 吏部公行, by Huo Tao

霍韜 (1487–1540) we read as follows:

驗封清吏司案呈卷查。先奉本部送。據浙江布政司呈。送改議軍民賦役文冊。到部送司。查得冊內事宜備云等因。案呈到部。看得巡按廣東監察御史戴璟已將廣東一省賦役文冊查議。造送到部冊內事例。驛遞民壯等役。俱隨糧帶徵。革去貪官贓弊。法固極善。惟州縣官吏不肯將驛遞民壯合用銀數派入秋糧實徵冊內。致貪污官吏通同里胥多開條款。條款愈多奸利愈甚。須再行扣算。每縣秋糧若干。驛遞銀若干。民壯銀若干。除該優免人員及貧民田土十畝以下不算外。其餘闔縣通融派算。合徵銀兩俱均派入秋糧實徵冊內。量分三限帶徵。勿俾多開條款以滋奸弊。

We thus learn that the Ministry of Personnel (*libu* 吏部) was of the opinion that in Guangdong 廣東 impoverished families owning less than 10 *mu* of land ought to be differentiated from other households and exempted from taxation, and it may thus be assumed that in Guangdong too, as in Jiangnan, a minimum of 10 *mu* of land was considered to be necessary for a self-managing peasant to sustain his reproduction.

Meanwhile, in his *Hu Duanmin zouyi* 胡端敏奏議 3, “Ding ceji yi jun fuyi su” 定冊籍以均賦役疏, Hu Shining 胡世寧 (1469–1530) makes the following proposal as a way to equalize taxation in Sichuan 四川 province and thereby appease the populace:

已賣田糧即行開符。其未賣者通計。本里逃絕田地。若夠百畝上下則召佃一人。立戶當差編作正管。五十畝以下編作畸零。其人不拘本鄉或附籍客民。

He suggests, namely, that when installing tenant farmers on land the owners of which have fled, those who are given about 100 *mu* of land should be registered as households, assigned miscellaneous labour duties, and incorporated into the regular *lijia* membership, while those with less than 50 *mu* should be included among the *jilinghu*. In this case the land in question was abandoned land and may be assumed to have lain waste for some time, with a corresponding decline in its productivity, and it was presumably for this reason that the standard minimal area of arable land necessary for a self-managing peasant household to sustain its reproduction is given as about 100 *mu*, which was somewhat more than the normal standard minimum at the time.

It will now be evident that among the so-called *jilinghu* there were some who actually owned land and that the possession of a certain amount of land was sanctioned by some local officials, although the limits imposed on the area of such land would have depended on the labour productivity of the region and would have been determined in accordance with local conditions. However, the area of such land was generally less than that necessary to sustain a peasant household's reproduction, and those households that were incapable of sustaining their reproduction by means of their land alone were recognized as *jilinghu* by local bureaucrats.

Next let us consider the relationship between the *jilinghu* and the land tax. The Wanli-era *Xinning xian zhi* 新寧縣志 7, “Renshi kao: Dingliang” 人事考, 丁糧, contains the following passage:

一議隨糧派丁以除偏累事。...如活戶糧至二三石者編之一丁。五六石者編之二丁。彼亦無辭。次則糧至石數。尚堪責其輸納。至于畸零小戶糧僅斗許。或止升合。吊戶甚。而糧去戶存者亦皆派之一丁。名曰寡丁。黃冊里書籍此影射那移。其弊百出而窮民受累。因而逃閃貽及。里遞賠賒。此偏之爲累者二。

This tells us that when the Single Whip system was introduced, even though the land tax on small *jilinghu* was at the most no more than a few pecks of grain, they were assessed for the labour of one adult male along with households exempted from land taxes.

Furthermore, in a letter by Huo Tao contained in his *Huo Wenmin gong xuanji* 6B and addressed to Lin Ruhuan 林汝桓, in which he dwells on the futility of buying back monastery lands with public funds and then giving them to monks, it is stated that because regular *jia*-head households were fully occupied with supporting monks, small *jilinghu* were bearing the burden of providing military provisions:

且曰寺田。自正管甲首以上盡數給僧。惟畸^[sic]零小戶乃充軍餉³⁷⁾。夫寺觀田土必十數頃。非編里長則正管甲首。雖三尺童所能知也。今日畸^[sic]零乃充軍餉。則僧田無復有充軍餉者矣。

Likewise, in the Jiajing-era *Daye xian zhi* 大冶縣志 2, “Tianfu zhi: Qiuliang 秋糧,” pertaining to Huguang 湖廣, we read:

按田糧有定數。而積弊之爲民害民者久矣。如飛詭埋沒減畝遺糧。無主虛賠者謂之無徵。田去糧存者謂之坐戶。民之害政之累也。知縣趙³⁸⁾先因驛傳行查。勞逸不均。查出未上黃冊寄出畸零戶米一千一百四十三石六斗。全不上黃冊竝實徵米三十二石三斗。已入黃冊未入實徵米三十六石。私收私除米四百餘石。

This too indicates that there were instances in which *jilinghu* were liable for land taxes, and one can probably assume that, with the exception of special cases, all landowning *jilinghu* were burdened with land taxes.

Next, there is the question of the relationship between the *jilinghu* and labour service. Since, as has already been noted, “widowers, widows, orphans and the elderly unfit for labour service” were, according to the state ideals of the early Ming, to be excluded from the 110 households constituting a regular *lijia* unit and were called *jilinghu*, these *jilinghu* were originally exempted from labour service, and this system thus became the target of abuse, an example of which we find in the *Veritable Records of the Ming* in an entry for Xuande 10, 6th month, *dingsi* 丁巳:

應天府奏。上元江寧二縣坊廂長甲首俱洪武閒起取殷實戶充役。後經年久有投軍充匠厨役及官医等戶者。每遇造冊輒賂官吏朦朧作帶管。却編畸零戶爲大戶。俾應前役以致負累。先所逃亡者衆。

In order to avoid *lijia* labour duties, wealthy households would, namely, offer bribes to officials so as to be made *daiguanhu*, and in their place *jilinghu* would be treated as leading households and allocated regular *lijia* labour duties. Similarly, the following entry for Jiajing 9, 3rd month, *mouxu* 戊戌, also reports that it was not uncommon for regular *lijia* households to arbitrarily assume the status of *daiguanhu* or *jilinghu* in order to avoid labour service:

戶部覆御史周禪所陳清冊籍事宜言。冊籍之設以定戶口均賦役也。祖宗立法不爲不嚴。而法軌民奸弊端百出。那移詭寄飛走灑派。及故爲破析寄頓。妄作畸零帶附。或投仕宦以借名。或稱絕戶以影射。

It would appear, however, that in actual practice guiding principles were not always strictly observed in all subprefectures, counties, townships and villages. For example, an epitaph (“Ming zhengfeng dafu zhengzhixiang Nanjing libu zuoshilang Fan gong muzhiming” 明正奉大夫正治鄉南京吏部左侍郎范公墓志銘) recorded in the *Yang Wenyi gong jinpo gao* 楊文懿公金坡稿 5, “Muzhiming” 墓志銘, by Yang Shouchen 楊守陳 (1425–89) contains the following passage:

公諱理。字道濟。一字士倫。号省菴。宋大傳覺民之後。世居台州。自臨海徙天台。又九葉矣。...還朝。時重守令之選。拜知江陵縣。作榜文諭民。懇且明。盡民口熟之。縣當四方之衝。過客旁午。公嚴禁令。雖權貴無敢漁一錢。先是民累歲負租至十四萬石。都御史徵之嚴。公以民貧不能償也。乃召將卒家之佃田號畸零戶者。諭之曰。世言戶役既佃田立戶而免役可乎。遂定其等。俾各出募役之米。因以償負租畢完。

It appears that when Fan Li 范理 became district magistrate of Jiangling 江陵 county during the Xuande era, the county's tax quota was 140,000 *shi* 石 of grain, but because the inhabitants were poor, they were unable to pay. At the time, some farmers who were tenanting land belonging to the families of military officers and soldiers and claiming to be *jilinghu* established independent households,³⁹⁾ yet avoided labour service while tilling the fields, and because this became a matter of public knowledge, they were given a household grade and made to pay the appropriate amount of rice tax, whereupon the county was able to pay its tax quota in full. This was a case of tenant farmers claiming to be *jilinghu*, who paid a rice tax instead of performing labour service, but it does not appear to have been a permanent arrangement.

As an example of a more permanent arrangement that was also institutionally recognized, we may cite the following passage concerning Shaanxi 陝西 from the Zhengde-era *Chaoyi xian zhi* 朝邑縣志 1, “Tianfu” 4:

弘治以前丁賦力差供歲足則止不派。故能以三十六里更用。而迭休之。以後乃通取焉。歲以然者以用聽差者。聽差者差已足。無差而聽差也。聽差者官盡收銀而貯之庫。上戶丁九錢至七錢。中戶丁六錢至四錢。下戶丁三錢至一錢。畸零者丁一錢。于是無空民矣。

Prior to the Hongzhi era, labour duties were allocated according to the requirements of the time; once these had been met, no further assessment was made, and each *li* was rested in turn. However, from the Hongzhi era onwards the “allowed assignment” (*tingchai* 聽差)⁴⁰⁾ system was adopted, with some households making an annual payment which was stored in the local treasury: upper-grade households were levied 7–9 *qian* 錢 for each adult male member, middle-grade households 4–6 *qian*, lower-grade households 1–3 *qian*, and *jilinghu* 1 *qian*, and as a result there were no longer any households that did not pay some form of taxation. It is stated here that, under the allowed assignment system, from the Hongzhi era onwards *jilinghu*, instead of performing labour service, paid 1 *qian* in silver for each adult male, and this means that, regardless of whether or not they were assessed for land taxes, all *jilinghu* with adult males were liable for a silver levy.

In addition, an entry in the *Veritable Records of the Ming* for Hongzhi 8, 11th month, *yiyou* 乙酉, contains the following passage:

戶部會各部都察院。議處明年漕運并各處合行事宜。...一直隸廬江縣流民。請編甲擇官。候造冊之年編作畸零人戶。聽當輕差。其開墾田地照例起科七。...上曰...准議。

In Lujiang 廬江 county in the Metropolitan Area people without any fixed abode were made to settle down and bring unused land under cultivation, and a request was made for them to be incorporated into *lijia* units as *jilinghu*, assigned light labour duties, and, in view of their cultivation of reclaimed land, assessed for land taxes. This would suggest that even households that owned reclaimed land and had adult male members were not assigned regular *lijia* labour duties when considered to be inadequately self-sufficient, but were recognized as *jilinghu* and assigned only light duties.⁴¹⁾

It has hitherto been considered that in principle only landowners were targetted for labour service during the Ming dynasty,⁴²⁾ but there is some evidence that from the mid-Ming onwards even households without land were assessed for labour service. For example, in a letter (“Wuzhong fushui shu yu xunfu Li sikong” 吳中賦稅書與巡撫李司空⁴³⁾) contained in the *Wang Wenke gong ji* 王文恪公集 36 by Wang Ao 王鏊 (1450–1524) of Wu 吳 county we read:

今之所謂均徭者大率以田爲定。田多爲上戶。上戶則重。田少則輕。無田又輕。亦不計其資力之如何也。

This informs us that under the equalized labour service system labour duties were

allocated on the basis of landholdings, with upper-grade households being assessed heavily, households with little land being assessed lightly, and households with no land being assessed even more lightly, and this would suggest that in Jiangnan in the early sixteenth century even households without land performed equalized labour service.

In addition, as has already been pointed out by Fujii Hiroshi,⁴⁴⁾ the *Da Ming huidian* 20, "Hubu" 戶部 7, "Hukou" 2, "Fuyi," contains the following passage concerning the implementation of the Single Whip system in Jiangxi 江西:

隆慶四年題准。江西布政司所屬府州縣各項差役。逐一較量輕重。係力差者則計其代當工食之費。量爲增減。係銀差者則計其扛解交納之費。加以增耗。通計一歲共用銀若干。照依丁糧編派。開載各戶由貼。立限徵收。其往年編某爲某役。某爲頭戶貼戶者盡行查革。如有丁無糧者編爲下戶。仍納丁銀。有丁有糧者編爲中戶。及糧多丁少與丁糧俱多者編爲上戶。俱照丁糧併納。著爲定例。此一條鞭法之始

Since it is here stated that households with adult male members but not liable for land tax were incorporated as lower-grade households and assessed for adult male labour and silver, this would indicate that even households without land were targetted under the Single Whip system if they had adult male members. In view of the fact that this explanation is given as an alternative to the foregoing reference to chief households (*touhu* 頭戶) that actually performed labour service and auxiliary households (*tiehu* 貼戶) that rendered assistance by giving money or grain under the equalized labour service system, it is possible that, as was the case in the above example from Suzhou, households with adult male members but no land were also liable for equalized labour service. An almost identical passage occurs in the Chongzheng-era *Minshu* 閩書 39, "Banji zhi 版籍志: Fuyi," where it is stated that the Single Whip system was introduced in Wanli 1, and it may be assumed that the situation was similar in Fujian.

In addition, the Tianqi-era *Dongan xian zhi* 2, "Buyi: Chaiyi 差役," contains the following passage:

東安土瘠民貧。比他州縣斯爲下矣。而差繁役重。實倍於他處。以地畝言之。霸州每畝出銀六厘。他州縣更又有輕者。東安縣出銀一分三厘。不旣倍之乎。至於人丁。胡知縣⁴⁵⁾奏議。霸州下丁出銀三錢。文安大城二縣止出二錢。惟獨東安縣出銀四錢八分。當時已稱過矣。目今下丁出至五錢五分。夫丁曰下者爲其無田產房屋生理也。爲人傭力也。四方就食也。是安所出銀乎。況出而又倍之乎。

Because labour service was frequent and heavy in Dongan 東安 county in the Metropolitan Area, the burdens of its inhabitants were heavier than in other counties and subprefectures, and whereas during the Jiajing era adult males of the lowest rank (*xiaxiading* 下下丁) were already paying 4 *qian* and 8 *fen* 分 in silver, by the Tianqi era they were paying 5 *qian* and 5 *fen*. Since these adult males of the lowest rank are described as workmen without property, dwelling or occupation,

it is clear that they here refer to people with no land.

On the basis of the passages quoted above, it is possible to ascertain that from the mid-Ming onwards there were some regions where households with adult male members but no land were targetted under the equalized labour service system and Single Whip system, and since, as is indicated by the designation *xiaxiading* in the above passage from the *Dongan xian zhi*, they represented the lowest rank of households, it may be assumed that in the context of *lijia* organization many of them belonged to the category of *jilinghu*. If understood in this manner, it becomes clear that although in principle the so-called *jilinghu* of the Ming were exempted from taxation, in actual practice they were often assessed for labour service.

What significance, then, does this fact hold? Although it is undeniable that in one respect the *jilinghu* were originally of a *pro forma* extraneous character in relation to the *lijia* unit, on the other hand they also appear to have been a supplementary entity essential to the maintenance and survival of the *lijia* system. For example, an entry in the *Veritable Records of the Ming* for Hongwu 23, 8th month, *bingyin*, states that when vacancies occurred in the regular *lijia* membership, they were as a rule to be filled by *jilinghu*.⁴⁶⁾

戶部奏。重造黃冊。以冊式一本。并合行事宜條例頒行。...其排年里甲。仍依原定次第應役。如有貧乏。則於百戶內。選丁糧多者補充。事故絕者。於畸零戶內選湊。其上中下三等入戶。亦依原定編類。不許更改。

For this reason we find the following statement in the Zhengde-era *Da Ming huidian* 21, "Hukou" 2, "Cuanzao huangce: Chingli huangce fushili" 攢造黃冊, 清理黃冊附事例:

圖內有事故戶絕者。於畸零內補轉。如無畸零。方許於隣圖人戶內撥補。

In point of fact, the number of households established for each *lijia* unit in the early Ming was strictly adhered to, and permission to alter, abolish or combine *lijia* units was not readily granted. Therefore, it was only on the premise of the existence of *jilinghu* in reserve, as it were, that the reorganization and survival of *lijia* units was possible. In addition, as has been pointed out in the past, the *lijia* system was organized in principle on the basis of the number of regular-member households, and therefore the nature of the *lijia* system was such that it could be maintained on a permanent basis only on the premise of administrative stability based on the protection and nurturing of regular-member households.

However, as has already been pointed out by Oyama Masaaki, regular-member households under the *lijia* system were not necessarily all petty landowners of similar circumstances,⁴⁷⁾ but included households belonging to various social strata, and consequently it must be said that there would have been some disparity from the very outset among different *lijia* units in their actual

ability to bear the burden of their taxes. Therefore, even if the amount of taxation imposed on each *lijia* unit within the same county was more or less equalized,⁴⁸⁾ it would still have been difficult to avoid the imposition of excessive burdens on the *li*-captain and *jia*-head households of particular *li*. Thus it was inevitable, both from a need to prevent the ruin of regular-member households because of excessive taxes, and also with a view to maintaining stable administration, that there should have arisen the question of making *jilinghu* able to pay taxes assume part of this burden.

For these reasons it is to be surmised that, as was prescribed in the regulations of the *Da Ming huidian*, some *jilinghu* were forced to share the tax burden on a temporary basis already in the early Ming. But from the mid-Ming onwards, a gradual decline in the reproductive functions of *li* under the existing *lijia* system and steady increases in the tax burden of *lijia* units may be assumed to have resulted in a need to gradually perpetuate the burden imposed on *jilinghu*, which was then eventually institutionalized by local authorities.

V. Conclusion

As has been noted in the above, the actual mode of existence of the *jilinghu* during the Ming dynasty did not necessarily coincide with the intents of the imperial government as exemplified by their characterization as “widowers, widows, orphans and the elderly unfit for labour service,” and in actual practice the households comprising a *li* were classified into grades in accordance with their social status, with 110 households being selected from among the upper- to lower-grade households and the remaining households being termed *jilinghu*. How, then, did this relate to the operation of the *lijia* system?

The *li* that were actually organized into *lijia* units already possessed their own distinctive class relationships, and the introduction of household grades and the classification of households into a stratified order of *li*-captain households, *jia*-head households, “*daiguanhu*” and *jilinghu* represented a recognition and reinforcement on the part of the imperial authorities of the actual class and status relationships obtaining within a *li* and an attempt by the imperial authorities to create a unified system of control through the medium of these relationships. Therefore, although the *lijia* system was underpinned by an organizational principle of standard units consisting of 110 households, this method of organization, with its absolute figure of 110 households, was not strictly enforced within each *li*, and instead, while relying on a format whereby state power directly controlled the *li*-captain and *jia*-head households among the 110 households, in its actual content it represented an attempt to gain control of the peasant population by means of a form of *lijia* organization in which each *li* had its own particular number of households, including *jilinghu*, and which was of necessity predicated on the community functions of the actual *li*.

The *jilinghu* within a *lijia* unit included households with adult male members

and land, and they were frequently subjected to taxation. We know, moreover, that the tax burdens of each *lijia* unit within the same county were more or less equalized, and therefore the differences that actually existed between *lijia* units in their ability to meet these tax burdens inevitably resulted in excessive demands being made of the *li*-captain and *jia*-head households of particular *lijia* units. In such cases, the partial transfer of these tax burdens to *jilinghu* acted as a buffer and made up for some of the shortcomings of the fixed-amount tax payment system, as well as conducing towards the stable maintenance of community reproductive functions in *li* under the *lijia* system.

When considered in this light, the so-called *jilinghu* included within the *lijia* system, although appearing on the one hand to be, formally speaking, of an extraneous and parasitic character *vis-vis* the *lijia* system, were on the other hand an essential constituent element intrinsic to the *lijia* system. This was because these *jilinghu* played a particular role in the reproductive processes of the actual *li* under the *lijia* system, and it could be said that they were therefore made to play a distinctive role in the very maintenance of the *lijia* system itself.

Notes

- 1) "Chūsei Chūgoku ni okeru kokka kenryoku to tochi shoyū kankei" 「中世中國における國家權力と土地所有關係」 (State power and landownership relations in medieval China) (28 Feb. 1961).
- 2) YAMADA Shūji 山田秀二, "Min-Shin jidai no sonraku jichi ni tsuite" 「明清時代の村落自治に就いて」 (On village self-government in the Ming and Qing periods), *Rekishigaku Kenkyū* 『歴史學研究』, Vol. 2, Nos. 3, 5, 6; MATSUMOTO Yoshimi 松本善海, "Mindai" 「明代」 (The Ming dynasty), in *Shina chihō jichi hattatsu shi* 『支那地方自治發達史』 (The history of the development of local self-government in China), Chap. 4; id., "Mindai ni okeru risei nō soritsu" 「明代に於ける里制の創立」 (The establishment of the *li* system during the Ming dynasty), *Tōhō Gakuhō* 『東方學報』 (Tokyo), Vol. 12, No. 1; SHIMIZU Morimitsu 清水盛光, *Shina shakai no kenkyū* 『支那社會の研究』 (Studies in Chinese society); id., "Chūgoku no kyōson tōchi to sonraku" 「中國の鄉村統治と村落」 (Rural administration and villages in China), in *Shakai kōsei shi taikēi* 『社會構成史體系』 (Series on the history of social composition), Part 2; id., *Chūgoku kyōson shakai ron* 『中國鄉村社會論』 (A study of Chinese rural society); OBATA Tatsuo 小畑龍雄, "Minsho no chihō seido to rikōsei" 「明初の地方制度と里甲制」 (Local institutions and the *lijia* system in the early Ming), *Jinbun Kagaku* 『人文科學』, Vol. 1, No. 4.
- 3) MATSUMOTO Yoshimi, "Mindai" (see n. 2).
- 4) Obata Tatsuo, *op. cit.* (see n. 2).
- 5) YAMANE Yukio 山根幸夫, "Jū-go, -roku seiki Chūgoku ni okeru fueki rōdōsei no kaikaku — kin'yōhō o chūshin to shite —" 「十五・六世紀中國における賦役勞働制の改革—均徭法を中心として—」 (Reforms in the service levy system in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century China: With a focus on the equalized labour service system), *Shigaku Zasshi* 『史學雜誌』, Vol. 60, No. 11 (translated in Linda Grove and Christian Daniels, eds., *State and Society in China: Japanese Perspectives on Ming-Qing Social and Economic History* [University of Tokyo Press, 1984] as "Reforms in the Service Levy System in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries"); id., "Jūroku seiki Chūgoku ni okeru kokō tōkei" 「十六世紀中國に於ける戶口統計」 (Population figures in sixteenth-century China), *Tōyō Daigaku Kiyō* 『東洋大學紀要』, No. 6.
- 6) MATSUMOTO Yoshimi, "Mindai" (see n. 2).
- 7) *Ibid.*

- 8) Fujii Hiroshi 藤井 宏, "Minsho ni okeru kinkōfu to zeiryō to no kankei" 「明初に於ける均工夫と税糧との關係」 (The relationship between the equalized labour levy and taxation in the early Ming), *Tōyō Gakuhō*, Vol. 44, No. 4.
- 9) "Chugoku no kokka kenryoku to nōmin shihai — Minsho no jisakunō o chūshin to shite —" 「中國の國家權力と農民支配—明初の自作農を中心として—」 (State power and peasant control in China: With a focus on owner-cultivators in the early Ming), *Tōyō Bunko Colloquia*, 13 May 1962.
- 10) March 1962 at the Tōyō Bunko.
- 11) Under the *lijia* system modelled on the *dubao* system of the Yuan, households paying the most land tax were appointed *li* captains, but under the *lijia* system implemented from Hongwu 14 onwards, *li* captains and *jia* heads were determined according to both the number of adult males in a household and the amount of land tax due. See Oyama's above report (n. 10).
- 12) Although it is here stated that one ward (*tu* 圖, synonymous with *li* 里) consisted of 100 households, it is possible that, as in the case of the edict issued in Hongwu 14, each ward consisted of 110 households since it is further stated that the *li* captain supervised 10 *jia* heads and each *jia* head supervised 9 households.
- 13) In a passage on Guian county in the same *Yongle dadian* it is stated that the household with the most land in each ward was appointed *li* captain (每圖以田多者一戶爲里長), thus suggesting a discrepancy in our sources, but since (as is pointed out in n. 14) the section on Guian county is inaccurate, I do not follow this reference here.
- 14) In a passage in the section on Guian county in the *Yongle dadian*, quoting from the *Wuxing xuzhi*, we read as follows: 黃冊里甲洪武三年始定。每一百戶爲一圖。每圖以田多者一戶爲里長。管甲首一十名。不盡之數。九戶以下附正圖。十戶以上自爲一圖。甲首隨其戶之多寡而置。編定十年一周。總計七千六百六十六圖。該里長七千六百六十名。甲首七萬六千六百六十名。
However, it is obvious from the fact that the number of *jia* heads far exceeds the number of households that this passage is inaccurate, and it is to be surmised that the numbers of wards, *li* captains and *jia* heads have each been increased by one place. In addition, the numbers of *li* captains and *jia* heads have been arrived at by mechanically multiplying the number of wards by 1 and 10 respectively, and the number of *jia* heads given here cannot possibly have corresponded to their actual number.
- 15) The number of households for the early Hongwu era is taken from a quotation from the *Wuxing xuzhi* in the *Yongle dadian* 2277, "Hu," "Huzhou fu" 3. The number of households is based on the *Huangchao chaoji liuxian junminhu* 皇朝抄籍六縣軍民戶, and it is expressly stated that the figures for Changxing, Wukang and Deching counties include artisan households. However, in the figures given in the table the civilian and artisan households in Hongwu 9 and the military households in Hongwu 10 have been added. All other household figures are based on the Hongzhi-era *Huzhou fu zhi* 8, "Hukou."
- 16) These figures are based on the *Wuxing xuzhi* quoted in the *Yongle dadian* 2277, "Hu," "Huzhou fu" 3. In some regions *li* were termed "wards" (*tu*).
- 17) This figure has been corrected in accordance with n. 14.
- 18) The figures for Chenghua 8 are based on the Hongzhi-era *Huzhou fu zhi* 4, "Xiangdu" 鄉都 8, "Hukou."
- 19) This table is based on the Jiajing-era *Wujiang xian zhi* 9, "Shihuo zhi" 食貨志 1, "Hukou."
- 20) This table is based on the Jiajing-era *Wujiang xian zhi* 1, "Jiangyu" 疆域. Because the number of households in Hongwu 2 is unknown, the average number of households per *li* in Hongwu 2 has been arrived at by dividing the number of households in Hongwu 4 by the number of *li* in Hongwu 2.
- 21) Although there is a gap of ten years between these figures and those referred to in n. 18, they have been used for convenience' sake because I have been unable to find any figures for a closer date.
- 22) The content of the corresponding passage in the Zhengde-era *Da Ming huidian* is stylistically almost identical to that of the *Veritable Records of the Ming*, but it has "... 以一百一十戶爲里。推丁多者十人爲長。...先後則各以丁數多寡爲次。..." where the *Veritable Records of the Ming* has 丁糧 for both 丁多 and 丁數.

- 23) “Attached household” (*daiguanhu* 帶管戶) is a term contrasting with “regular household” (*zhengguanhu* 正管戶), and whereas regular households represented the 110 households made up of *li*-captain and *jia*-head households, attached households were those that existed outside the regular *lijia* membership to which they were affiliated. Here, however, *daiguanhu* is used not in this general sense, but in contrast to *jilinghu*, and it has therefore been deliberately set off with quotation marks.
- 24) It is possible that households with adult male labour and land included not only households with both adult male labour and land, but also households with either adult male labour or land.
- 25) This is evident if one considers, for example, the early-Ming policies aimed at fostering owner-cultivators, centred on the policy of “enumerating the population and allotting land accordingly” (*jikou shoutian* 計口授田). Tanaka Masatoshi, “Minsho tochi mondai no ichi kōsatsu” 「明初土地問題の一考察」 (A consideration of the land question in the early Ming) (University of Tokyo Colloquia, on East Asian History, 6 July 1963) dealt with this question.
- 26) That the edict of Hongwu 14 lacked in concrete detail probably reflects the fact that, rather than the *lijia* system having been implemented anew nationwide as a result of this edict, it tended to confirm in the form of a uniform ideal the existence of a *lijia* system that had already been operating to some extent in various regions.
- 27) The Yellow Registers are considered to have comprised registers compiled by *li* captains (*liwence* 里文冊), general registers compiled at the county, subprefectural and prefectural levels, and registers presented to the emperor by the Ministry of Personnel (*hubu jinze* 戶部進冊) (Matsumoto Yoshimi, “Mindai” [see n. 2]), but the compilation of township registers (*duce* 都冊) is specifically mentioned in the case of Haining county.
- 28) Although it has been stated that “military, artisan and saltern households, whose very status indicated their labour duties, were each recorded in separate registers, and only civilian households were targetted in the compilation of the Yellow Registers” (Matsumoto Yoshimi, “Mindai” [see n. 2]), there are examples in materials from the Jiajing and Wanli eras in which all categories of households have been recorded together in the Yellow Registers; see Yamane Yukio, “Jūroku seiki Chūgoku ni okeru kokō tōkei” (see n. 5).
- 29) Although it cannot be unqualifiedly stated whether or not population statistics in local gazetteers included *jilinghu*, the section on Baoding 保定 prefecture in the Wanli-era *Baoding fu zhi* 保定府志 19, “Huyi zhi” 戶役志, contains the following passage: 戶口。戶五萬五百四十六。民戶三萬三千八百七十八。軍戶一萬三千六百六十二。雜役戶一千九百三十五。畸零戶一千七十一。口六十四萬八千五百八十五。In addition, in the population statistics for each county absentee landowner households are recorded in the corresponding column in the case of four of the twenty subprefectures and counties of Baoding prefecture, and since the total number of absentee landowner households in these four subprefectures and counties tallies with the number of *jilinghu* in Baoding prefecture, it is evident that some subprefectures and counties were reporting absentee landowner households as *jilinghu* to the prefectural authorities.
- 30) If the format of *lijia* organization is considered in this fashion, it is then also conceivable that in special circumstances tenant-farmer households may conversely have been included among regular-member households. Although I do not have any material at hand that is explicit in this regard, mention may be made of the following excerpt entitled “Ji you sung jian yi bai jia” 激友訟姦以敗家 from the *Dupian xinshu* 杜騙新書 (which has a preface dated Wanli 45): 馬自鳴浙江紹興人。環巧小人。柔媚多奸。族弟馬應璘。輕浮愚昧。家更富於自鳴。其父素與鳴父不睦。兩相圖而未發。自鳴見應璘愚呆。性又嗜酒。故時時與之會飲。亦連引諸人。共打平和。惟此兩人深相結納。人多厭之。不與共飲。二人乃對斟對酌。此唱彼和。自號為莫逆交。應璘有事。多取決於自鳴。自鳴亦時獻小計。以效忠款。應璘素與親兄不睦。數揚其短。欲狀告之。自鳴假意勸阻。實于當機處。反言以激之。益深其怒。應璘遂先往告兄。經官斷明。擬應璘歐兄之罪。又投分上解釋。此為破家之始。又屢屢唆其與人爭訟。家日破敗。後自鳴往小戶人家取債。見其婦幼美。歸向應璘前誇曰。我今往其家取債。其媳婦生甚美貌。女流中西施也。我以目挑之。俯首而過其屋。只一植數往來於前。我神魂飄蕩。不能自禁。又以笑語挑之。此婦亦笑臉回答。似亦可圖。只怕其夫姑有碍。未敢施為。至今挂戀在心。寤寐思服。應璘曰。此家是我甲首。又係仙戶。圖亦何難。我

必先取之。自鳴激之曰。汝若能得。我輸你一大東道。依我說勿去惹此愚夫。若捉住彼粗拳真打死也。應璘曰。未聞佃客敢欺主人者。次日即往其家收條編。一見其婦即挑之。遣其婆出外日。可外去覓菜來作午。婆方出。璘即強抱其婦入房。婦在從否之間。見隔壁一婦窺見躲開。婦指之曰。其婦在隔壁窺見你。勿爲此。璘那肯休。只以爲推托也。相纏已久。婆在外歸。婦只得叫媽媽曰。主人如此野意。婆作色叱璘。璘怒。先往縣呈其拖欠條編。反兇歐里長。其個人以強姦訴。官拘審璘婦。窺見親姑捉獲。其婦又貌美傾城。滿堂聚觀。嘖嘖嘆賞。因審作強姦應擬死罪。後投分上。改作戲姦未就。而家業盡傾。田宅皆賣與。自鳴反責璘曰。我當初叫你勿爲。你不聽吾言。以至於此。應璘曰。你口雖叫我勿爲。先已造橋。送我在橋中去矣。難回步也。今欲怪你。又怪不得。孟子謂非之無可舉。刺之無可刺。正你這樣人也。璘田賣盡。自鳴絕不與往來。朝夕相借。璘惟干謁親兄。方知親者終是親。彼酒肉朋友。真偽情也。

The wife who figures in this episode is described as being both a *jia* head in the *li* of which Ma Yinglin 馬應璘 is *li* captain and a tenant farmer, and at least as far as can be judged from this source, it was possible to be both a tenant farmer and a *jia* head, although there is no conclusive evidence that she was not a part owner-farmer. As regards the liability of non-landowning households for taxation under the Single Whip system, see Section 4 below.

- 31) *Dingliang juehao* 丁糧絕少. According to Morohashi Tetsuji 諸橋轍次, *Dai kanwa jiten* 大漢和辭典 (Vol. 8), *juehao* 絕少 means "very little." Furthermore, in Wan Qi 王圻's *Xu wenxian tongkao* 續文獻通考 20, "Hukou kao: Ceji" 戶口考, 冊籍, it is stated that those whose land tax is less than those of *jia* heads are called "supernumerary [households]":

以一百一十戶爲一里。推其中丁糧多者十人爲里長。餘百戶分爲十甲。歲役里長一人。管攝一里之事。...其田糧不及而附於一甲內者曰畸零。不在十戶之限。

Similarly, in the Kangxi 康熙-era *Shimen xian zhi* 石門縣志 2, "Jijiang 紀疆: Fuyi," it is stated that households with little adult male labour and land are called *linghu* 零戶 and attached to a *jia*: 明洪武...至十四年定以一里分一百一十戶。設里長十名。以一里長管十甲首。其丁田少者立爲零戶。附各甲後。

Since *linghu* is equivalent to *jilinghu*, it is evident from these two sources too that households with little adult male labour or land were classified as supernumerary households.

- 32) This means that, following a suggestion from the Ministry of Personnel, *li*-captain households were appointed in perpetuity in Xiangshan county from the Xuande era onwards.
- 33) As an example of the names of female households being appropriated in order to claim the status of *jilinghu*, we may quote the following passage from the Jiajing-era *Huizhou fu zhi* 惠州府志 1, "Tujing: Changluo xian tujing" 圖經, 長樂縣圖經: 嘉靖二十一年。里老上言于縣請。...長樂守禦所富軍。收買各圖民田。秋糧一百六十餘石。詭將女口寄籍計三十六戶。多在葵江都良善。里長班下報作畸零。多肆刁頑。累及本眼。
- 34) *Jianjun* 監郡. This term perhaps signifies an assistant prefect (*tongpan* 通判) of a prefecture. Details about assistant prefect Shao are unknown.
- 35) The surviving family of Mr. Wu consisted of his mother, wife, two sons and an infant, but because the mother and infant were incapable of providing for themselves, each year his three friends Zhang Lixiang, Yun Si 韞斯 and Wu Pouzhong 吳裒仲 would together contribute 10 *shi* of rice in order to assist them. Therefore, the farm management programme in question was drawn up so that they could be supported by the labour of the wife and two sons. Although a family of three would seem to be somewhat small when compared with the norm for the average family at the time, because they had to rely on the labour of only a woman and two children and frequent complaints were made of a lack of manpower, their farm management itself would inevitably have been of the extensive type, and since a decline in production is also to be inferred, they would not have been particularly well-off in comparison with standard contemporary farms. (See *Bu nongshu* 補農書 2, Appendix: "Ce Wushi shengye" 策鄔氏生業; *Zhang Yangyuan quanji* 張楊園全集 10.9, "Yu Wu Pouzhong" 與吳裒仲; *ibid.* 16, "Wushi yixu xu" 鄔氏議鄔序.)
- 36) See AMANO Motonosuke 天野元之助, "Chin Fu no 'Nōsho' to suitōsaku gijutsu no tenkai" 「陳馮の「農書」と水稻作技術の展開」(Chen Fu's *Nungshu* and the development of wet-rice farming technology), *Tōhō Gakuhō* (Kyoto), Nos. 19, 21; SAEKI Yūichi 佐伯有一 and TANAKA Masatoshi, "Jū-roku, -nana seiki no Chūgoku nōson seishi-, kinuori-gyō" 「十六・七世紀の中國農村製糸・絹織業」

- (Chinese rural silk-spinning and -weaving industry in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries), in *Sehai shi kōza I: Tokushū kenkyū* 世界史講座 I 特殊研究 (Lectures on world history I: Special studies); OYAMA Masaaki, “Minmatsu, Shinsho no dai tochi shoyū (ichi)” 「明末・清初の大土地所有」 (一) (Large landownership in the late Ming and early Qing, 1), *Shigaku Zasshi*, Vol. 66, No. 12.
- 37) Military provisions (*junxiang* 軍餉) became a major issue during the Ming dynasty with the invasion of China by the Tatar chieftain Altan Khan in Jiajing 29, when they were doubled (SHIMIZU Taiji 清水泰次, *Chūgoku kinsei shakai keizai shi* 『中國近世社會經濟史』 [The socio-economic history of early modern China]). But since Huo Tao died in Jiajing 19, this material refers to an earlier period.
- 38) Zhao Nai 趙鼐, from Heyang 河陽 county in Yunnan 雲南, became district magistrate (*zhixian* 知縣) in Jiajing 14; he also compiled the Jiajing-era *Daye xian zhi* (with a preface dated Jiajing 19).
- 39) Since the text has 佃田立戶, the tenant-farmer households in this instance constituted independent households in the household registers and were understood as such by the state authorities.
- 40) Under this system, when there were surplus households within an equalized labour service *lijia* unit — that is to say, households for whom there were no labour services to be allotted — the surplus households were required to pay silver in lieu of labour service; this was also referred to as “surplus equalized labour” (*yusheng junyao* 餘剩均徭) (Yamane Yukio, “Jū-go, -roku seiki Chūgoku ni okeru fueki rōdōsei no kaikaku” [see n. 5]).
- 41) An entry in the *Veritable Records of the Ming* for Zhengtong 正統 5, 3rd month, *dingsi*, indicates that it was permissible for indigent households to be assigned light duties:
監察御史丘俊言二事。一令直隸府州并各布政司通行所屬每歲勘實見在入戶。丁糧多者爲上。次者爲中。少者爲下。其雖有糧而產去。及雖有丁而家貧者。爲貧難戶。凡遇差役驗冊畚尙。貧難者止聽本縣輕役。其有那移作弊。放富差貧者。治其官吏之罪。...從之。
- 42) *Minshi shokkashi yakuchū* 『明史食貨志譯註』 (Annotated translation of the *Mingshi*, “Shihuo zhi”), “Ekiho” 「役法」 (Service labour laws).
- 43) Li Chongsi 李充嗣 of Neijiang 內江; he was grand coordinator (*xunfu* 巡撫) from Zhengde 13 to Jiajing 2 and later served as Minister of Works (*gongbu shangshu* 工部尚書) and Minister of War in Nanjing (Nanjing *bingbu shangshu* 南京兵部尚書).
- 44) Fujii Hiroshi, “Ichijō benpō no ichi sokumen” 「一條鞭法の一側面」 (One aspect of the Single Whip system), in *Wada hakushi kanreki kinen Tōyōshi ronsō* 『和田博士還暦記念東洋史論叢』 (Collected studies on East Asian history in honour of Dr. WADA [Sei 清] on his 60th birthday).
- 45) Two district magistrates of Dongan county with the family name Hu 胡 are known, but they both served in the Jiajing era: Hu Yo 胡瀾, who became district magistrate in Jiajing 2, and Hu Rufu 胡汝輔, who was appointed in Jiajing 14.
- 46) In the Wanli-era *Zhangzhou fu zhi* 漳州府志 8, “Fuyi zhi: Hukou,” we read: 令軍民匠竈等戶各以本等名色占籍。民戶丁多者許其開拆立戶。惟軍匠等戶不許開拆。
This indicates that it was permissible for civilian households to subdivide and create separate households, and it would therefore have been possible to supplement households in this fashion. In addition, the Jiajing-era *Huizhou fu zhi* 1, “Tujing: Changluo xian tujing” gives the criteria for establishing a separate household:
嘉靖二十一年里老上言于縣請。...原額人戶秋糧多者。除軍戶不拆籍外。其民戶止許。里長秋糧十石餘。甲首秋糧三五石爲一戶。
- 47) OYAMA Masaaki, “Mindai Kahoku fueki seido kaikaku shi kenkyū no ichi kentō” 「明代華北賦・役制度改革史研究の一検討」 (An examination of studies on the history of the reform of the tax and labour service system in north China during the Ming dynasty), *Tōyō Bunka* 『東洋文化』, No. 37.
- 48) YAMANE Yukio, “Jū-go, -roku seiki Chūgoku ni okeru fueki rōdōsei no kaikaku” (see n. 5).

[This article was translated by Rolf W. Giebel.]

(Certain terms [such as village → *li*] were later changed by the author.)