

# **The Putting-out System of Production in the Ming and Qing Periods: With a Focus on Clothing Production (II)\***

TANAKA, Masatoshi

## **VI. Various Modes of Approach to and Participation in Small Producers' Production by Wholesale Merchant Capital in the Ming and Qing Periods**

As was pointed out in Part I of this article (*Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko*, No. 52 [1994]), a debate on the germs of Chinese capitalism has been continuing in China since the start of 1955,<sup>23)</sup> and although it came to a temporary halt during the Cultural Revolution, currently this debate appears to be experiencing something of a revival. As was only natural, in the course of this debate, which mobilized researchers on a nationwide scale, many new historical sources relating to handicraft operations were discovered, and these include some, by no means few in number, that would indicate that merchant capital made approaches to and participated in the production process of small producers. In the following, availing myself of this and other material that I have been able to ascertain, I wish to classify and present examples indicative of the existence of a "putting-out system of production" during the Ming 明 and Qing 清 periods.

It should be pointed out at the outset, however, that merchant capital is not a producer, and since this merchant capital, standing as it does outside the production process, cannot act as a driving force behind historical developments, the classification of the examples given below is no more than a classification of different "modes" of management of the putting-out system, which have been arranged in accordance with the degree and proximity to which wholesale merchant capital approached the small producers. Therefore, the order in which these different "modes" have been classified here does not represent any ordering of different "stages" of historical development through which handicraft industries must invariably pass in the course of their development.

---

\*Note numbers follow on from those of Part I (M.T.B. No. 52) of this article.

### 1. The original mode of management by merchant capital.

In the buyers' market that it controls, merchant capital exercises overwhelming control over the small producer peasants working in handicraft industries, and in the exchange process it practises "exploitation" of the small producers in the form of the exchange of non-equivalents by means of pricing. At the same time, it is only through the intermediation of this merchant capital that small producers are able to place their products on the market and, in some cases, to obtain from the market the raw materials necessary for their production. However, the relationship of merchant capital to the small producers involves nothing more than purchasing the latter's products, selling them on the market as they are and, in some instances, selling raw materials to the small producers, and it does not go so far as to intervene in the small producers' production process. —This represents the original mode of management by merchant capital, and among the many examples of this that are to be found, I shall cite only a small sampling.

(1) For commoners raising silkworms is like refining cinnabar [in order to obtain the elixir of immortality], for their strength is completely exhausted and success or failure may change at a moment's notice [through natural disasters and other changes in conditions]. Moreover, the raw-silk wholesalers and cunning brokers hoodwink the countryfolk [who raise silkworms], for [whereas in standard scales 1 catty (*jin* 觔) is equivalent to 16 taels (*liang* 兩)] they construct "large scales" with more than 20 taels to 1 catty [which they use to buy large quantities of raw silk cheaply from the peasants by claiming that the silk is light, and when paying the peasants who raise silkworms and reel silk] they invariably substitute silver of 97% or 98% purity for pure silver and intermix silver of high and low purity .... [This tendency] is worsening year by year, and there seems to be no end to it. The authorities make frequent attempts to strictly prohibit it, but they are still unable to put a stop to it. (Wanli 萬曆-era *Chongde xian zhi* 崇德縣志; quoted in Guangxu 光緒-era *Shimen xian zhi* 石門縣志 11, "Fengsu" 風俗)

(2) Entrusting their life to the thin cotton yarn, they [weave cotton and] starve two days out of three. If they take the cloth to sell at the market, it is as cheap as dirt. [Therefore the cloth shops] are called "death shops." (Qin Shan 欽善, "Songwen" 松問 [see Part I, p. 26])

(3) Now, when [that year's] new raw silk comes on the market, those who buy raw silk are called "silk guests" (*sikeren* 絲客人) and those who open wholesale stores and buy [raw silk] on behalf [of the "silk guests"] are called

“silk masters” (*sizhuren* 絲主人) or “scalars” (*pingshou* 秤手). The scaler uses honeyed words but has a dagger at heart and employs all manner of craftiness. If he encounters honest [silkworm-raising and silk-reeling] countryfolk, with regard to the raw silk [that he wishes to buy] he always [falsifies the weights and] declares that what is heavy is light and with regard to the buying price he gives a low price for what ought to be high in price. But if [the villagers] should give up the idea of selling to him and leave his store, he will pretend to double the price and prevent them from doing business elsewhere. This is popularly called “a hammer on entering and a dyke bag on leaving.” The “hammer” refers to closing the door and getting the better of a person, while “dyke bag” refers to constructing a dyke, as it were, to block his path of escape. Men and women of poor households neglect sleep and miss meals as they raise silkworms and produce raw silk, and their suffering beggars description. Their annual land tax, tenancy rent, debts, food and clothing, and daily necessities are all paid for with their earnings [from this raw silk]. Even if they sell at a good price, they are still afraid that it will be insufficient [for their expenses], and yet the common merchants bully them in every possible way. If one can endure such treatment, what is there that one cannot endure? In Chang[xing] 長[興] silk buyers are commonly called “silk devils” (*sigui* 絲鬼), and this is only natural. (Guangxu 1 [1875] edition of *Changxing xian zhi* 長興縣志 8, “Cansang” 蠶桑)

From the economically unequal relationship between small producer peasants and merchant capital described in Source (1) in an account of seventeenth-century Chongde 崇德 county (Jiaxing 嘉興 prefecture) during the late Ming there emerged the voices of resentment to be seen in Source (2) in the peasant weavers' appellation of “death shops” for wholesale dealers in cloth in the first half of the nineteenth century and the circumstances that led silkworm-raising and silk-reeling peasants to refer in Source (3) to raw-silk wholesalers and brokers as “silk devils” in the second half of the nineteenth century, and it may be said that in each case this merciless relationship between the two developed in a buyers' market in which wholesale capital held a position of dominance over the peasant producers.

Moreover, the factors that made possible this deceit and trickery on the part of the merchants and forced the peasants to submit to the same should not be judged from the viewpoint of commercial ethics, for they were due to nothing other than the historical and social conditions in which peasant domestic industry was placed in isolated and closed villages. As may be seen in expressions such as “hoodwink the countryfolk,” “death shops,” “employ all manner of craftiness” and “silk devils” appearing in the above quotations, the small producer peasants had namely, on account of the closed nature of premodern rural society characterized by the landlord system, no choice but to depend upon merchant capital in order to obtain money, and therefore merchant capital acted as a

parasite on this feudal mode of production and monopolized the pipeline linking closed rural society to outside markets, and by controlling the distribution of commodities in rural society through a buyers' market of monopolist wholesale merchants (premodern monopolistic merchants) they were able to practise merciless "exploitation" of the small producers on the basis of the exchange of non-equivalents in the form of prices just as the feudal landlords practised exploitation based on extra-economic coercion of the tenant farmers. Herein lay the social and economic basis of the peasants' voices of resentment.<sup>24)</sup>

It is worth noting that, according to Source (3), although the merchants with their overwhelming strength treated the peasants as they wished, the relationship between the two had not necessarily become one of direct economic subservience of individual peasants to individual merchants, and instead the merchants, having granted peasants the "freedom" of access to more than one wholesaler, practised exploitation through prices. Thus the merchant class, utilizing the closed and isolated nature of rural society as the precondition of its own profit-making, controlled and monopolized the pipeline linking rural villages to outside markets. But in spite of this, so long as it remained at the level of the distribution process external to the production process, the merchants were doing no more than monopolizing a particular market sphere as a group, and within this market individual merchants had not yet been able to establish direct and individual monopolistic economic control over the individual peasants with whom they did business.<sup>25)</sup>

2. Mode whereby merchant capital exercises its original function of usury by lending production funds to small producer peasants placed in a state of chronic shortage of production funds.

With the gradual consolidation of this mode, in which merchant capital and small producers are linked by a creditor-debtor relationship, the peasant debtors will, if for instance they encounter a bad year of farming or sericulture, inevitably tread a path leading to permanent subservience to their merchant creditors, that is to say, a path leading from a relationship between mutually independent creditors and debtors based on the "conferral of trust" to a situation in which the small producer peasants find themselves to a certain degree permanently and directly subservient to merchant or usurious capital. In this manner not only do the social conditions for the extraction of profit by merchant capital in the distribution process, and therefore the social conditions of the very existence of merchant capital, come to share points in common with usurious capital, but through these circumstances merchant capital will come to function as a permanent form of management, now in effect identical to usurious capital (*viz.* merchant-usurer capital), which more deeply influences the small producers' production funds and regulates the success of their operations. For the peasant debtors, on the other hand, succumbing to a relationship such as this signifies the

reinforcement of poverty and subservience and their entrapment in a vicious circle. But one should also not overlook the fact that if a relationship of trust were not preserved in conjunction with this relationship of direct economic subservience, it would be impossible for merchant-usurer capital to make usurious loans to the peasants.

I shall now give a number of examples that illustrate this creditor-debtor relationship.

(4) Because the peasants do not have the funds to raise silkworms, they borrow money from wealthy households, and when they finish raising their silkworms, they sell the raw silk to repay these loans. For 1,000 [cash (*wen* 文) in] copper coins the interest is 100 [cash], and this [interest] is called the “10% surcharge” (*jiayiqian* 加一錢). Mostly [the loans] come to term on the summer solstice, and if this passes [without the loan being repaid], a small amount of extra interest is invariably added. The wealthy households profit enormously from this, but the peasants too are thereby able to complete their raising of silkworms, and so they find it convenient. (*Shuanglin ji zengzuan* 雙林記增纂 8, “Fengsu: Canshi zonglun 蠶事總論” [main text]).

(5) In Chong [de] county paddy fields and dry fields are comparable in area. Therefore, the paddy crop is sufficient only to provide the people with food for eight months [after they have paid rice taxes to the government and tenancy rent to the landlords], and for the remaining months [of the year the peasants too] generally buy rice to provide for themselves. To meet their public and private obligations they rely solely on the profits from silkworms, and therefore sericulture is the most important [source of income]. In loan contracts the repayment date is always fixed at the end of the silkworm season. (Wanli-era *Chongde xian zhi*; quoted in Guangxu-era *Shimen xian zhi* 11, “Fengsu”)

(6) In Hu[zhou] 湖[州] prefecture the interest on loans has hitherto always been 1.5% per month for [loans of] more than 10 taels, 2% per month for [loans of] more than 1 tael, and 3% per month for [loans of] less than 1 tael. The clothes of the poor [that they can put in pawn] are limited, and even in cases [in which the loan] does not amount to 1 tael, one or two years will often elapse, and when the original loan and interest are added together, they are unable to redeem their pawned articles, many of which are [thus] always being forfeited. (*Xiaogukou huizui* 小谷口薈叢; quoted in *Changxing xian zhi* [Preface dated Qianlong 乾隆 14 (1749)] 12, “Zazhi” 雜誌)

(7) Comment: Recently, when wealthy households in the southern part of [Changxing] county lend money, regardless of whether they make loans at the end of winter or during the spring, all the calculations are made before

the silkworm season, and [the loans] come to term on the day called “lesser ripening” (*xiaoman* 小滿; ca. 21 May) at the end of the silkworm season. For every 1,000 [cash in] copper coins they pay 200 cash in interest, and the wealthy households call [these loans] “lending money for the lesser ripening” (*fang xiaoman qian* 放小滿錢), while the borrowers call them “borrowing money absentmindedly at 20%” (*jie daitou erfen qian* 借呆頭二分錢). (Guangxu 1 [1875] edition of *Changxing xian zhi* 8, “Cansang”).

It should go without saying that although the absolute value of, for instance, 10% interest per annum may not seem very high in comparison with today’s interest rates, in contemporary rural society, which had a low level of productive forces and was susceptible to natural disasters and where the seasons suited to production were limited or production required a long period of time and the turnover in funds was slow, such interest rates were high. It is for this reason that loan capital prior to the modern period is called “usurious capital.”

3. Mode that sees the establishment of an individual and direct coemptive relationship between merchant capital and small producers in which individual merchant capitalists, on the precondition of their monopolization of the small producers’ pipeline to the market for raw materials and products and their lending of funds at high interest rates to small producers, corner the products of individual small producers.

With respect to this mode of management, one should not overlook the fact that just as the exploitation of feudal peasants by feudal landlords had to rely upon “extra-economic coercion” because, even though the peasants merely occupied the land which constituted the chief of their production conditions, their operations were independent and self-managing, so too did the operations of small producer peasants remain essentially independent and self-managing even with the establishment of this direct coemptive relationship between merchant capital and small producers.

(8) [The production of] ramie cloth is found in all counties [in Ganzhou 贛州 prefecture], and ramie is planted widely in mountain valleys and fields. In the second month Min 閩 [travelling] merchants [from Fujian 福建] will sometimes lend [ramie-producing peasants an advance called] “ramie money” (*zhuqian* 苧錢), and when summer and autumn come, they collect the ramie [cloth from the peasants to whom they lent money] and return home. (Qianlong-era *Ganzhou fu zhi* 贛州府志 [1782 ed.] 2, “Wuchan” 物產)<sup>26)</sup>

The closing statement that “they collect the ramie and return home” (*shou zhu yi gui* 收苧以歸) does not make it clear whether the merchants purchased the ramie cloth by paying for it or took it without recompense in return for the earlier

advance of “ramie money,” but in either case the loans made by travelling merchant capital not only represented advances of production funds, but would also have enabled the travelling merchants to thereby corner the agricultural produce or domestic products of the small producers and to reduce the purchase price. By taking advantage of the shortage of production funds in the operations of ultra-small producers, it thus became possible for travelling merchant capital to practise double exploitation of small producers in its capacity as both merchant capital and usurious capital.<sup>27)</sup>

4. [Here I shall deal not with the different “modes” indicative of the relationships obtaining between merchant capital and small producers, but shall instead touch on the important fact that, as an indispensable precondition of the establishment and spread of the different modes of putting-out system to be discussed in 5 *infra*, the small producers, who were the direct producers in premodern society and the bearers of productive forces, must for their part exhibit the following specific historical conditions so that merchant capital can incorporate them into a putting-out system.]

Developments in productive forces brought about a historical situation in which there occurred a certain degree of dissolution of the firm and organic integration of agriculture and domestic industry that had obtained within the operations of the small producer peasants who were the direct bearers of productive forces—a dissolution such that domestic industries were no longer direct processing industries coupled to and using as raw materials the agricultural produce of the peasants themselves, but had reached a stage where the farming operations of one and the same peasant, to all appearances still engaged in the two activities of agriculture and domestic industry, were being subjected to the momenta of commodity exchange and social division of labour in the form of the sale of agricultural produce on the one hand and the purchase of raw materials for domestic industry and the sale of finished products on the other, and through the medium of these social momenta agriculture and domestic industry had begun to structurally separate within one and the same peasant’s operations—and as domestic industry as a part of farm operations became more separated from agriculture, this dissolution became more socially conspicuous. Since the agent acting as the driving force behind historical developments is the working direct producer, this question of the gradual transformation of the operations of these direct producers in the direction of the social division of labour is a fundamental issue of considerable importance. Material pertaining to this issue includes the following passages.

(9) In districts such as Huairen 懷仁, Zhairen 宅仁, Jiaoshan 膠山 and Shangfu 上福 in northeastern [Wuxi 無錫] the soil is impoverished and the peasants are simplehearted. [Therefore] both men and women weave cloth

and spin cotton at home and have no other work. (Huang Ang 黃印, *Xijin zhi xiaolu* 錫金識小錄 [1752] 1, “Beican” 備參 1: “Lizuo zhi li” 力作之利)

(10) People throughout the empire have nowhere to live once they leave their home district, but the people of Su[zhou] 蘇 [州] and Song[jiang] 松 [江] can make a living by selling their skills [in domestic industry] even if they leave their home district. ([Jiang-nan 江南 Governor] Zhou Chen 周忱, “Yu xingzai hubu zhugong shu” 與行在戶部諸公書 [1432]; quoted in *Huangming jingshi wenbian* 皇明經世文編 22)<sup>28)</sup>

(11) I believe that in several villages near the market town [of Shuanglin 雙林] they make their living from weaving silk. The men will sometimes also work at silk-twisting, but in addition they must often go to market to buy raw silk [as raw material] and sell silk fabric [woven by family members]. [For this reason] the work in the fields is left half neglected, and yet they wear fine clothes and eat fresh food, and there are also not a few [silk-weaving peasants] who get drunk and become raucous in teahouses and restaurants [in the market town]. (*Shuanglin ji zengzuan* 8, “Fengsu: Nong” 農 [main text])

(12) [Here in the market town of Puyuan 濮院 county] the weaving loom corresponds to the fields [in that it is an important object of labour] and the shuttle corresponds to the plough [in that it is an important instrument of labour]. (Hu Zhuo 胡琢, *Pu zhen jiwen* 濮鎮紀聞 [1787] 1, “Fengsu”)<sup>29)</sup>

(13) It seems to me that prior to the Zhengde 正德 era (1506–21) one tenth of the population [in our county] were [bureaucrats] in government employ and nine tenths were [peasants] in the fields. This was because the four classes [of scholars, peasants, artisans and merchants] each had a fixed occupation, and all were firmly grounded in farming and had no thought of [changing their occupation to] something else.... [But] during the past forty or fifty years taxes have been rising daily and corvée labour has become more strenuous by the day, and the people, unable to endure it, have all finally changed their occupation [from farming to something else].... Formerly there were still few people who pursued [profits from] the lowly professions [of commerce and industry], but now those who leave farming and change their occupation to industry and commerce have tripled in comparison with earlier times. Formerly there were in fact no unemployed people, but now those who leave farming and live unemployed also account for twenty to thirty percent [of the population]. About sixty to seventy percent of the population has already left farming. (He Liangjun 何良俊 [of Huating 華亭 county, Songjiang prefecture], *Siyouzhai congshuo* 四友齋叢說 [Preface dated 1569] 13, “Shi” 史 9)

As domestic industry gradually expanded and grew as a sideline occupation



within peasant operations that had hitherto been conducted on the basis of the firm and organic integration of agriculture and domestic industry, peasant operations began, through the medium of the social momentum of commodity exchange, to move away from the self-sufficient system of peasant operations rooted in the occupation of land and the possession of instruments of labour. For example, Source (9), taken from the *Xijin zhi xiaolu* dating from the mid-eighteenth century, could also be interpreted to mean that the inhabitants were engaged only in weaving and spinning because physical conditions in the form of impoverished soil had made it impossible for them to continue farming. But if one takes into consideration the mode of existence of monopolistic wholesale merchants in this region mentioned in another passage already cited from the same *Xijin zhi xiaolu* (see Part I, pp. 32–33), the situation described in Source (9) could be said to indicate that there existed villagers whose self-sufficient system of farm management was in the process of dissolution and that their livelihood, probably under the economic control of monopolistic wholesale merchants, was largely dependent upon income gained from domestic industrial production.

Meanwhile, Source (10) informs us that as early as 1432 the peasants of Suzhou, Songjiang and other parts of rural Jiangnan, even when forced to leave their home villages, had reached the stage where they were able to make a living by selling their skills in domestic industrial production, while Source (11), which paints a vivid picture of the situation in Shuanglin market town in Wuxing 吳興 county, Huzhou prefecture, in the late Ming, hints at the dramatic changes that the separation of agriculture and industry had in its early stages brought to the lives of peasants. In addition, Source (12), dating from the late eighteenth century, indicates that in Puyuan market town, again in the rural handicraft industrial region of Jiangnan, the separation of domestic industry from agriculture within peasant operations had already taken place on a scale encompassing regional society as a whole.

Finally, Source (13) from the second half of the sixteenth century could be said to summarize a situation in which the two trends of the dissolution of the original form of peasant operations based on the organic integration of agriculture and industry and the dissolution of the peasant class of direct producers had become a general current of the times. Needless to say, this dissolution of the peasant class of direct producers did not at this stage represent the “modern dissolution of the peasant class” in which the *petit bourgeois* peasant class, grounded in the free ownership of land following its emancipation from premodern social relationships, quickly dissolved in the direction of a new capital-wage labour relationship, but was still no more than a phenomenal dissolution and a dissolution within the existing system that resulted only in the replication of a premodern production relationship rooted in the landlord system.

But at the same time this Source (13) also describes as indicative of the historical characteristics of the period in question a situation in which, under the influence of this general historical and social trend, large numbers of peasants

were being gradually drawn away from agriculture and not only used their skills in domestic industrial production to become the small producers and proletariat labour force of rural and urban handicraft industries, but also created an urban influx of the unemployed.

As a result of these changes in the structure of rural industry, there was a marked spread of small-to-medium market towns (*shizhen* 市鎮) in rural areas, especially in the Jiangsu 江蘇 and Zhejiang 浙江 region, reaching a peak in the late Ming and early Qing between the sixteenth and early eighteenth centuries.<sup>30)</sup> For example, Shengze 盛澤 in Suzhou prefecture, Jiangsu province, was in the early Ming (second half of the fourteenth century) a village of a mere fifty or sixty households, but during the Chenghua 成化 era (1465–87) its population, including merchants, gradually increased, and by Jiajing 嘉靖 40 (1561) it had become a “market” (*shi* 市) in the sense of an administrative division with several hundred households making their living from floss silk and pongee; then by the Tianqi 天啓 era (1620’s) there were more than eleven hundred wholesalers in pongee and raw silk, by the Kangxi 康熙 era (1662–1722) its population had increased to more than ten thousand households, and in Qianlong 5 (1740) it was raised to the status of a “market town” (*zhen* 鎮), coming to be regarded as the foremost market town in Wujiang 吳江 county, Suzhou prefecture.<sup>31)</sup> Similarly Zhenze 震澤, also in Wujiang county, was during the Zhizheng 至正 era (1341–67) in the late Yuan 元 described as a “desolate village market with a few dozen households,” but it had grown to three or four hundred households by the Chenghua era during the Ming and to one thousand households by the Jiajing era. Then in Yongzheng 雍正 4 (1726) under the Qing, “Zhenze county” was separated from Wujiang county, and during the Qianlong era the market town of Zhenze under the jurisdiction of this new county is said to have had a population of two to three thousand households.<sup>32)</sup>

The motive force behind this development and prosperity of market towns was the growth of rural handicraft industries (silk-reeling, silk textiles, spinning, weaving, etc.) in rural areas and the nationwide spread of a distribution market for these commodities. Other examples of former remote hamlets in Jiangnan growing into “markets” and then “market towns” with the development of the rural economy from the fifteenth century onwards, and especially with the spread of the production and distribution of commodities, also include, in addition to Shengze and Zhenze mentioned above, Wangjiangjing 王江涇 and Puyuanzhen 濮院鎮 in Xiushui 秀水 county (Jiaxing prefecture), Wangdianzhen 王店鎮 in Jiaying county (Jiaxing prefecture), Shuanglinzhen 菱湖鎮 and Linghuzhen 菱湖鎮 in Guian county (Huzhou prefecture), and Wuzhen 烏鎮 and Nanxunzhen 南潯鎮 in Wucheng 烏程 county (Huzhou prefecture), the growth of which was all based on the silk-reeling and silk textile industries, while with respect to centres of the rural cotton industry in Jiangnan mention may be made of Fengjingzhen 楓涇鎮 and Weitangzhen 魏塘鎮 in Jiashan 嘉善 county (Jiaxing prefecture), Zhujingzhen 朱涇鎮 in Huating county (Songjiang prefecture), and Xinjingzhen 新涇鎮 and

Antingzhen 安亭鎮 in Jiading 嘉定 county (Suzhou prefecture).<sup>33)</sup> The evolution of new towns on the basis of the spread of rural handicraft industries was not restricted to market towns, and on the basis of the development of local handicraft industries a considerable number of regional administrative centres representing prefectural headquarters (*fucheng* 府城) and county headquarters (*xiancheng* 縣城) assumed anew or further strengthened their character as commercial and industrial towns and prospered. These included the county headquarters of Wujiang and Huating and Suzhou prefectural headquarters, which was a large city.<sup>34)</sup>

As an example of the growth of a regional city in conjunction with the spread of rural domestic industries, we may quote the following passage on the above-mentioned Zhenze from the *Zhenze xian zhi* 震澤縣志 compiled in Qianlong 11 (1746):

(14) Pongee weaving was prior to the Song 宋 and Yuan carried out only by people in the prefectural headquarters [of Suzhou]. Later during the [Hong]xi [洪]熙 and Xuan[de] 宣[德] eras (1425–35) of the Ming inhabitants of the county headquarters [of Wujiang county, Suzhou prefecture] also came to take up silk-weaving for the first time, but they still often employed people from the prefectural headquarters [of Suzhou] to weave [for them]. But from the Cheng[hua] and Hong[zhi] 弘[治] eras (1465–1505) onwards there also appeared some local inhabitants [of Wujiang county] who had become proficient in this occupation, and it became a common practice. With this the inhabitants of Zhenze market town and neighbouring villages all came to pursue the profits of pongee weaving. (Qianlong-era *Zhenze xian zhi* 25, “Shengye” 生業)

It may thus be said that the development of handicraft industries from the fifteenth century onwards in the small-to-medium towns of rural Jiangnan and their growth in population were the result of a concentration of people who, unable to gain a stable livelihood through existing forms of agricultural management, had abandoned farming.

This gravitation of the population towards towns and cities also occurred in large cities such as Suzhou and Nanjing 南京, and the “lusterers” (*chuaijiang* 踴匠) who provided the labour for the lustring industry in Suzhou to be discussed below were a motley lot that had migrated singly or in groups from different parts of Jiangnan and Jiangbei 江北 such as Jiangning 江寧 prefecture in Jiangsu province and Taiping 太平 and Ningguo 寧國 prefectures in Anhui 安徽 province.<sup>35)</sup> The labour market held every morning in Suzhou city for day labourers with various specialist skills in the textile industry, made famous through a description in the *Changzhou xian zhi* 長洲縣志 3 (“Fengsu”; Preface dated Kangxi 23 [1684]), was probably also composed of migrant labourers from primarily rural areas.

5. Mode whereby, in addition to cash, part of the payment for the purchase of the small producers' domestic industrial products by merchant capital is made with raw materials indispensable to the small producers.

Small producers are isolated not only from the sales market for their products, but also from the market for raw materials, and if the above type of transaction continues to be repeated in the context of the relationship obtaining between small producers and the merchant capital mediating between them and the market, it will become an "advance" of raw materials by merchant capital. In the *Xijin zhi xiaolu* quoted in Part I (pp. 32–33) we already saw signs of this shift to a putting-out system by "cotton cloth stores" (*huabuhang* 花布行) in Wuxi county whereby raw cotton was given to suppliers of *changtou* 長頭 and *duantou* 短頭 cloth, and further evidence of this may be seen in the following passages.

(15) In my family there was a person by the name of Kun 焜. He lived outside the north gate of the town of Wuxi, and with several hundred [taels of] money he opened a cotton store, making a living by exchanging [raw cotton] for cotton cloth. Nextdoor there lived a girl about thirteen or fourteen years of age and of unparalleled beauty. She always brought cotton cloth [which she had woven at home] and exchanged it for raw cotton... This took place in the first years of the Qianlong era (mid-18th century). (Qian Yong 錢泳, *Liyuan conghua* 履園叢話 [Preface dated 1825] 23, "Zaji" 雜記 1: "Huan mianhua" 換棉花)

(16) The shopkeepers of [Nanxun 南潯] market, waiting until [that year's] new cotton comes on the market, buy it with money from outsiders and store it in their shops. From top to bottom it is like frost or snow [in its whiteness]. If someone with cotton cloth [to sell] visits the shop, [the shopkeeper] will check the width [of the cloth], quote the current price for it, exchange raw cotton for the cotton cloth, and send [the seller] away. Then, if someone else comes with money [to buy cotton cloth], he will negotiate the price of the cloth, and if an agreement is reached, he will draw up a deed of transaction, give it [to the buyer] and send him away. The money will then remain [in the shopkeeper's hands]. (Shi Guochi 施國祁 [early 19th cent.], "Jibeiju xiachangji zixu" 吉貝居暇唱集自序; contained in Xianfeng 咸豐-era *Nanxun zhen zhi* 南潯鎮志 24, "Wuchan")<sup>36)</sup>

Source (15), from an essay by Qian Yong of Jinkui 金匱 county (formerly part of Wuxi county), does not make it clear whether the raw cotton that the "girl" living outside the north gate of the town of Wuxi in the mid-eighteenth century was receiving from the "cotton store" (*mianhuazhuang* 棉花莊) represented cotton that she herself had purchased with the money that the cotton dealer paid her for her cotton cloth, or whether it represented part of the cotton dealer's payment for

the cloth that he bought from her, or whether alternatively it was cotton that was handed over to her as part of her wages for labour provided under a putting-out system, but insofar that the relationship between the cotton dealer and girl was predicated on the girl's labour undertaken to provide for her own livelihood, their dealings would invariably have involved the transfer of some cash. Moreover, by becoming a cornerman or *huabuhang* dealing in both raw cotton and cotton cloth, this shopkeeper with capital of several hundred taels would come to permanently subject the small producers to the control of his own buyer's market, and the same merchant who had earlier cut the small producers off from the product market was now also debarring them from the market for raw materials by supplying them in one way or another with an indispensable raw material in the form of raw cotton.

Source (16), on the other hand, is from an essay by Shi Guochi who ran a "cotton store" (*jibeisi* 吉貝肆) in Nanxunzhen in Wucheng county, Huzhou prefecture, in the early nineteenth century, and without stirring from their shops the shopkeepers possessing large capital as described here would, through the intermediation of outside merchants and against the backdrop of a large-scale market transcending the small localized market, not only prevent the small producers, restricted in their means of production and sales on account of the small scale of their operations, from having direct contact with the distribution market for their products, but would also cut them off from the market for raw materials by directly giving them indispensable raw materials as part of the payment for their products. If this method of payment with raw materials, even if only for part of the payment, is practised and becomes a permanent institution, then the merchants will by that very fact become monopolist *huabuhang*, and their dealings with the small producers will follow a course leading to *de facto* advances of raw materials.

6. Mode whereby monopolist merchant capital makes direct advances of raw material in the form of unfinished products to small producers for them to add value to, whereafter they are paid *pro forma* wages and the products are retrieved.

As was pointed out in Part I (pp. 21–22), the original mode of profit-making on the part of merchant capital was to gain a profit from the difference in buying price and selling price by buying goods as cheaply as possible and selling them in their original form as dearly as possible, but once the merchant, keeping operations under his own control, starts to make advances of his own goods to small producers which he later retrieves after value has been added to them and then sells, this leads to a putting-out system of production. Under such a system the small producer, on the other hand, will become a "*pro forma* wage labourer" who processes the advanced materials in his own home by using labour resources in his own possession or lent to him by the wholesale merchant and receives *pro forma* wages from wholesale merchant capital.

From among the materials that I have gathered to date, I have already quoted in Part I (pp. 36–37) a poem by Shen Bocun 沈泊村, a metropolitan graduate (*jinshi* 進士) of Yongzheng 11 (1733), as an example of this system of production being used as a temporary measure and a passage from the Daoguang 道光-era *Zhenze zhen zhi* 震澤鎮志 2 (“Fengsu”) as an example of the same system being used as a permanent institution, but in addition the following passages may also be cited.

(17) In Songjiang there were formerly no shops [selling] summer socks, and even during the hot months of summer many people wore woolen socks. Since the Wanli era (1573–1620) thin summer socks have been made using *you dun* 尤墩 cotton cloth [produced on the western outskirts of Songjiang]. They were very light and pretty, and people came from afar to vie in buying them. Consequently shops for summer socks opened throughout the western outskirts of [Songjiang] prefectural headquarters, [reaching] more than one hundred [in number]. Men and women throughout the prefecture all made a living by producing [these summer] socks; they received wages in the form of bonds [convertible into money] from the shops [in accordance with the number of socks that they produced], and [this work] too became a new form of work beneficial to the people. (Fan Lian 范濂 [Wanli era, late Ming], *Yunjian jumu chao* 雲間據目鈔 2, “Ji fengsu” 記風俗)<sup>37)</sup>

(18) The *you dun* cotton cloth from the western outskirts [of Songjiang] is light, delicate and spotless, and the shops buy it to make socks. [Travelling] merchants from all [directions] buy and sell them, and they are renowned in the four quarters, being known as “*you dun* summer socks.” Among women who are unable to weave, there are many [to whom the shops make advances of *you dun* cloth and] who receive market wages for sewing [summer socks] for [the shopkeepers]. (*Qinding gujin tushu jicheng* 欽定古今圖書集成 [comp. 1725], “Fangyu huibian: Zhifangdian” 方輿彙編, 職方典 696, “Songjiangfubu hui kao” 松江府部彙考 8: “Songjiangfu fengsu kao” 松江府風俗考)<sup>38)</sup>

(19) Upon investigation it was found that in the incident at Pu[yuan]-zhen the affair began when lowly people [making a living by] selling pongee in exchange for silver caused trouble by suddenly destroying buildings and burning houses. Those who bared their arms and bestirred themselves to action were almost more than two thousand [in number], and those who had been called together instantly caused a commotion, with the whole market town in an uproar as if it had gone mad. If one speculates on the reasons for its having come to this pass, it was probably because Yang 楊 So-and-so, Gu 顧 So-and-so and another Gu So-and-so opened wholesale stores which dominated the market, monopolizing profits and incurring resentment; in setting their prices, they lowered or raised them at will, and petty merchants

swallowed their tears without any means of lodging complaints. [In addition,] when employing [weavers, the wholesalers] exploited them as they pleased, but the weavers, although harbouring enmity [against the wholesalers], were unable to object. Their accumulating resentment was already profound, and it immediately exploded. [Petty merchants and weavers such as] this Tsao Sixi 曹思溪, Lu Aming 陸阿明, Fan Si 范四 and Yao Yufeng 姚玉峯 were therefore prepared to give up their lives and struck gongs to assemble the multitudes, while many weavers too were enraged and disregarded their own well-being, and it was as if a smouldering fire had suddenly flared up, and once alight, it was impossible to extinguish it. (Lu Chongxing 盧崇興 [prefect of Jiaying prefecture, 1675–78], *Shouhe riji* 守禾日紀 6, “Yanyulei” 讞語類)<sup>39</sup>

(20) Dealers in crape and satin [who operate silk mills] are called *zhangfang* 賬房, and in all fifty-seven lie scattered in the northeastern sector of [Suzhou] city... The date of establishment of some of them goes back as far as over two hundred years ago (early 18th century during early Qing dynasty). Apart from those *zhangfang* that have installed their own looms and supervise weavers, the majority of them hand over the raw-silk warps and woofs to weavers, and they have these weavers employ workers at their own homes to weave [the cloth]. These are called “weaving households” (*jihu* 機戶). There are almost about one thousand of these weaving households and about three to four thousand weavers (*jijiang* 機匠) [who work under them], and [these *jihu* and *jijiang*] too live scattered around the two Lou 婁 and Qi 齊 Gates in the northeastern sector of [Suzhou] city. There are also some in neighbouring hamlets such as Weiting 唯亭 and Likou 蠡口. Women workers who twist silk are popularly called “warp-blending girls” (*tiaojingniang* 調經娘). There are many young girls and poor women at every house who do this to eke out a daily living. (Republican-period *Wu xian zhi* 吳縣志 [1933 ed.] 51, “Yudi kao” 輿地考, “Wuchan” 2: “Gongzuo zhi shu: Zhizuo” 工作之屬、織作)<sup>40</sup>

(21) The majority of merchants in Jinling 金陵 (Nanjing) are dealers in satin. ... Formerly the [number of] looms under the control of a single merchant was not allowed to exceed one hundred, thereby curbing mergers, and there were penalties if one exceeded [the limit]. [Then, during the Kangxi era] Tsao Yin 曹寅, the superintendent of imperial silk manufacturing (*shangyi* 尙衣) [in Jiangning 江寧], presented a memorial for exemption from regular taxes [for registered looms], and the ban [on excess looms] was finally relaxed. During the Qian[long] and Jia[qing] 嘉[慶] eras (1736–1820) the looms within the city [of Nanjing] numbered thirty thousand, and although they declined somewhat thereafter, there were still seventeen to eighteen thousand. ... Houses that operate textile business are called *zhangfang* 賬房 and weaving for the receipt of wages from them by weavers (*jihu*) is called “remuneration” (*dailiao* 代料). The woven [satin] is sent to a

“satin master” (*viz.* master of *zhangfang*, or satin merchant), and his inspection of its quality is called “comparing and evaluating the goods” (*chouhuo* 讐貨). Before weaving, the warps are always dyed first. The warps are made of Hu silk (a fine silk produced around Huzhou 湖州 prefecture). When the warps have been dyed, they are distributed among re-reeling workers (*luogong* 絡工).<sup>41)</sup> The re-reeling workers are poor women who re-reel three or four frames [of raw silk] daily and obtain money which they exchange for rice sufficient for one day’s food. (*Fenglu xiaozhi* 鳳麓小志 [Preface dated 1899] 3, “Zhishi: Ji jiye” 志事、記機業 7)<sup>42)</sup>

(22) In private [silk-weaving] operations there were formerly no so-called factories [with a concentration of looms and weavers]. In districts where the silk industry was developed, people installed wooden looms in their own homes and engaged in weaving. Usually these [weavers’ houses] are often called “weaving houses” (*jifang* 機房). There is a distinction between those who weave for themselves (*zizhi* 自織) and those who weave for others (*daizhi* 代織). Those who weave on behalf of other people are supplied with raw materials by these other people. This type of employer is called *zhangfang* 帳房 in places such as Jiang[su] and Zhe[jiang]. They are all silk merchants with abundant capital, and in every port they have wholesale agencies which are called “branch stores” (*fenzhuang* 分莊). (*Huangchao xu wenxian tongkao* 皇朝續文獻通考 [Preface dated 1915] 385, “Shiye” 實業 8)<sup>43)</sup>

(23) Upon investigation it was found that private weaving households (*jihu*) supply weavers (*jijiang*) with warps to weave, and although the capital is enormous, profits are paltry. [The reason for this is that] there are always wicked weavers who force [the weaving household] to increase their wages, and if they do not achieve their wish even in the slightest degree, then they immediately threaten to stop working, and eating away [at the weaving household’s capital] serves as the source of their own profits. In extreme cases, they secretly pawn the warps and woofs that they have been given to weave [or] they weave them into bolts of sheer silk [which they sell] and then pocket the proceeds. If [the weaving household] should make the slightest objection, [these weavers] will immediately urge others to stop working and join another [weaving] household. This type of evil practice is most despicable. (“Yuanhe xian yanjin jijiang jieduan shengshi changzhong tinggong bei” 元和縣嚴禁機匠借端生事倡衆停工碑 [1822])<sup>44)</sup>

On the subject of Source (17), Fu Zhufu 傅筑夫 and Li Jingneng 李競能 comment that “it is evident that in the cotton-spinning and -weaving industries in the Songjiang region in the late Ming and early Qing germs of capitalism had already emerged,”<sup>45)</sup> while Han Dacheng 韓大成 writes as follows: “A backward, decentralized mode of production remained as it was, with the small producers



being reduced to a most wretched existence on account of their slavlike labour under commercial capital, and in this respect too the more this [commercial] capital developed, the longer this backward mode of production would be retained and the development of industrial capital would become even more difficult.”<sup>46)</sup>

These two evaluations of Source (17) by Fu and Li on the one hand and Han on the other are mutually contradictory, and for my part I am of the same opinion as Han. But this source indicates at any rate that towards the end of the Ming dynasty there had evolved in Songjiang prefecture a putting-out system of production in which workers received wages from dealers in summer socks for making these summer socks. Source (18) is also an example of the putting-out system pertaining to summer socks. Source (19), on the other hand, informs us that during the second half of the seventeenth century in the early Qing dynasty there was to be found at Puyuanzhen, a regional centre of the rural silk textile industry, wholesale merchant capital that “opened wholesale stores which dominated the market” and controlled the weavers (*jihu*) by means of a harsh putting-out system that “exploited them as they pleased,” resulting in an outbreak of violent acts of resistance against these wholesale merchants. The passage quoted in Part I (p. 34) from the Yongzheng-era *Taishun xian zhi* 泰順縣志 with a preface dated 1729 and cited by Fujii Hiroshi 藤井宏 in his “Shin’an shōnin no kenkyū” 新安商人の研究 (Studies of Xin’an merchants) is also an example of the putting-out system of production, and I wish to draw attention to the fact, already noted previously, that the seemingly nonindependent small producers who found themselves in impoverished economic conditions were engaged in labour that was founded on a certain relationship of trust in that they were supplied with raw materials by wholesale capital.

With the epochal spread of handicraft industries in rural areas, a putting-out system of production also evolved on a large scale in cities such as Suzhou and Nanjing on the basis of this handicraft production in surrounding villages and market towns.

Source (20) is based on a “report” (*tsaifangce* 採訪冊)<sup>47)</sup> made on Suzhou in 1913, and although its primary aim is to describe conditions in the early twentieth century, it also states that among wholesale silk merchants with vast capital dealing in crape and satin (called *zhangfang*) there were some who had “installed their own looms and supervise[d] weavers”—corresponding to the category of “putting-out system of handicraft industry” described in 7 below—but the majority of operations represented a putting-out system whereby merchants put out warps and woofs to “weaving households” (*jihu*) under their control where “weavers” (*jijiang*) and “warp-blending girls” (*tiaojingniang*) worked for wages; it is also stated that the origins of this system went back as far as the early eighteenth century.<sup>48)</sup>

Meanwhile, according to Source (21), from around the time when Tsao Yin was superintendent of imperial silk manufacturing in Jiangning (appointed 1693) during the Kangxi era there were in Nanjing many *zhangfang* operated by satin

merchants that managed more than one hundred looms, and by the Qianlong and Jiaqing eras (1736–1820) the number of looms in Nanjing city had reached thirty thousand. The system of management was that of a putting-out system of production in which weavers (*jihu*) under the *zhangfang* received wages from the latter for what they wove and re-reeling workers (*luogong*) were supplied with warps and paid wages by the weavers. Although dating from later times, Source (22) may be said to be of importance for its expository role in assisting our understanding of Sources (20) and (21).

On the basis of Sources (20), (21) and (22) and the *Qing bailei chao* 清稗類鈔 alluded to in n. 48 it is to be surmised that wholesale silk merchants (*zhangfang* 賬房/帳房) operating a putting-out system of production that involved weavers who wove for them (*daizhi*) and worked for wages (*dailiao*) existed at the latest from the Kangxi era (1662–1722) onwards in large cities such as Suzhou and Nanjing. Yokoyama Suguru 横山英, in his “Shindai no toshi kinuorimonogyō no seisan keitai” 清代の都市絹織物業の生産形態 (Modes of production in the urban silk fabric industry during the Qing dynasty) mentioned in Part I (p. 37), avails himself of various Japanese and Chinese materials (Minemura Yoshizō 峰村喜藏, *Shinkoku sanshigyō shisatsu fukumeisho* 清國蠶絲業視察復命書 [Report on an inspection of sericulture in the Qing kingdom; Nōshōmushō Nōmukyoku 農商務省農務局, 1903]; Gaimushō Tsūshōkyoku 外務省通商局, *Shinkoku jijō* 清國事情 [Conditions in the Qing kingdom], Vol. 2., No. 5 [1906]; Tōa Dōbunkai 東亞同文會, *Shina keizai zensho* 支那經濟全書 [Encyclopaedia of the Chinese economy], Vol. 12 [Tōa Dōbunkai Hensankyoku 東亞同文會編纂局, 1908]; China Imperial Maritime Customs, *Decennial Reports, 1892–1901*, Vol. 1 [Shanghai, 1904]; Nanjing Bowuyuan Minsuzu 南京博物院民族組, “Qingmo Nanjing sizhiye de chubu diaocha” 清末南京絲織業的初步調查 [Elementary survey of the silk industry in Nanjing in the late Qing], *Jindaishi ziliao* 近代史資料 [Materials on modern history], 1958–2; and *Beike ziliao xuanji*), and on the basis of an analysis of these sources relating to wholesale silk merchants he demonstrates that in the premodern urban silk textile industry there existed three modes of operation—(i) direct management of silk weaving by wholesale silk merchants, (ii) independent self-management by small producers, and (iii) weaving for wages by small producers who received advances of raw materials from wholesale silk merchants—and that numerically speaking the third of these three modes predominated.<sup>49</sup> Presumably the re-reeling workers mentioned in Source (21) did not betake themselves to workshops operated by a wholesale silk merchant in order to work but were also supplied with raw materials under the wholesale silk merchant’s putting-out system and worked in their own homes.

In addition, according to Source (23), there existed a relationship based on the putting-out system between weaving households (*jihu*) and weavers (*jijiang*), and this relationship may be understood in any of the following ways: (i) independent weaving households not under the control of *zhangfang* capital themselves made advances of raw materials to weavers; (ii) *jihu* here corresponds

to the earlier *zhangfang* while *jijiang* corresponds to the earlier *jihu*; or (iii), according to Yokoyama, the *jihu* referred to here, although termed “weaving households,” were not in fact themselves engaged in weaving production but represented a type of contractor (*chengguan* 承管)<sup>50</sup> who acted as intermediary between the *zhangfang* and *jijiang* in the delivery and receipt of raw materials and finished products and was held responsible for the weavers’ wage production. Moreover, the statement that the latter threatened to “join another [weaving] household” would indicate that prior to the incident described here a continuing relationship based on advances of raw materials had been established between individual weaving households and weavers and that moves by weavers to break this relationship had become so frequent on a social level that they were regarded as “evil practices.”

It can at any rate be ascertained that from about the time when references to the operations of wholesale silk merchants in the early Qing begin to appear in historical sources there existed a putting-out system in the silk textile industry of large cities such as Suzhou and Nanjing.

7. Mode whereby wholesale merchant capital establishes its own large-scale manufacturing facilities for the finishing process, similar in appearance to those of early capitalist manufacture, which it manages or operates; within the “putting-out system” in a broad sense of the term, this should therefore be referred to as the “putting-out system of handicraft industry concentrated under the management of wholesale merchant capital” in contrast to the “putting-out system of production” described in 6.

It is the existence of this manufacturing style of operations by enormous wholesale merchant capital to be considered in this section that led to the following erroneous perception. This is, namely, the misconception that, without calling into question the production relationships constituting the real substance of its operations, and having been deceived by the large-scale outward manifestations of this mode of operation, would regard the merchant capital that was conducting these large-scale operations as the direct precursor of modern industrial capital; and for those who on the basis thereof espouse erroneous perceptions of the modernization of society and the economy and of historical developments, the grounds for these erroneous perceptions are provided by the existence of this manufacturing style of operations by wholesale merchant capital.

By examining the sources quoted below, I accordingly wish to consider questions such as the historical and social character of the manufacturing style of operations by wholesale merchant capital; then, as fundamental conditions determining this character, the production relationships under which those directly engaged in production were working and the nature of the wages they received; and in particular the manner in which labour was supervised.

(24) During the previous Ming [dynasty] there were several hundred thriving cotton cloth wholesalers all in [the two market towns of] Fengjing 楓涇 and Zhuqing 洙涇 in Songjiang prefecture, and dyeing workshops, lustring workshops and merchants were all dependent upon them [and under the control of their operations]. (Hu Gongxie 顧公燮, *Xiaoxia xianji zhaichao* 消夏閑記摘鈔 [Preface dated 1785] 2, “Furongtang” 芙蓉塘)<sup>51)</sup>

(25) Dyers and lusterers are both employed by shops. ... Upon reinvestigating the cotton cloth of Suzhou, [it was found that] the cotton cloth sold to travelling merchants who come here from different provinces is invariably [first] lusted and dyed by artisans. (Memorial by He Tianpei 何天培, dated 24th day of 5th month, Yongzheng 1 [1723]; in *Gongzhong dang Yongzheng chao zouzhe* 宮中檔雍正朝奏摺 1)

(26) [The town of] Suzhou is inhabited by people from all regions, and goods of all kinds converge here, making it an important centre for commerce and distribution. In particular, the blue and indigo cotton cloth [sent to] different provinces is all traded here. After [the cloth] has been dyed [here], it is invariably tread upon with the feet using large stones so as to produce a gloss. There is, namely, a type of person called *baotou* 包頭 who provides large lozenge-shaped stones, wooden rollers, furniture and lodgings, calls together lusterers whom he houses and to whom he makes advances of food and money, and receives cloth from cotton cloth wholesalers which he puts out [to the lusterers] for lustring. The [lusterers'] pay per bolt is [a piecework payment of] 1 *fen* 分, 1 *li* 釐 and 3 *hao* 毫 of silver, and it all [directly] becomes the lusterers' own earnings. [In addition] each [lusterer] pays out 3 *qian* 錢 and 6 *fen* of “*baotou* silver” monthly to repay [the *baotou*] for [the use of the lustring stones,] the house rent and the furniture hire. This work is impossible for those who are not strong and powerful. [The lusterers] are all people from the counties of Jiangnan and Jiangbei who have learnt of it by hearsay and have been brought here, and they are largely a motley crowd of single men and fellows who do not observe the duties proper to their status. ... Previously all the workshops had no more than seven or eight thousand people [altogether]. ... At present, upon making a detailed investigation of the area outside the Chang 闔 Gate of Suzhou [city, it was found that] there are altogether more than three hundred and forty *baotou*, that they have established more than four hundred and fifty lustring workshops, and that each workshop has several tens of lusterers [from other regions]. Upon investigating the [number of] lustring stones, [it was found that] there are more than ten thousand and nine hundred, and the number [of lusterers] tallies with this [number of stones]. (Memorial presented by Li Wei 李衛, dated 25th day of 7th month, Yongzheng 8 [1730]; in *Gongzhong dang Yongzheng chao zouzhe* 16)

Sources (24), (25) and (26) are all examples of the “putting-out system of handicraft industry concentrated under the management of wholesale merchant capital” as applied to lustring in the cotton-spinning and -weaving industry. Source (24) is, namely, an example of its operations under cotton wholesalers (*fuhao* 布號) who, with their vast organization, emerged in Songjiang prefecture in the late Ming, and from this passage it is to be inferred that dyeing workshops (*ranfang* 染坊), lustring workshops (*chuaifang* 踹坊) and merchants all formed a single organization under the control of the wholesalers. Sources (25) and (26), on the other hand, point to the existence of an organized relationship of a special character between cloth merchants, *baotou* or heads of contracted labour, and lusterers.<sup>52)</sup>

In his articles on the lustring industry cited at the end of Part I (p. 37), Yokoyama broadly divides hitherto characterizations of the management of the lustring industry in Suzhou into the “manufacture” thesis<sup>53)</sup> and the “domestic industry” thesis<sup>54)</sup> and presents a critical appraisal of the relevant studies. Then, by analyzing various inscriptions contained in the *Beike ziliao xuanji* that relate to the lustring industry and by comprehending in their entirety the different production relationships to which they attest, he defines the management of the lustring industry as a “putting-out system of domestic industry.” In doing so, Yokoyama pays special attention to the position of the *baotou* and shows on the basis of the above memorial presented by Li Wei (Source (26)) and contained in the Yongzheng-era *Zhupi yuzhi* 朱批諭旨 that (i) the *baotou* supplied instruments of labour such as lustring stones, (ii) received the cotton cloth to be lusted from wholesalers, and (iii) “called together” lusterers for whom he provided lodgings and meals, while (iv) the lusterers received processing wages on a piece-rate basis and paid the *baotou* 3 *qian* and 6 *fen* in silver monthly for rent and the use of furniture; in addition, availing himself of the “Suzhoufu wei yongjin chuaifang qixing zengjia bei” 蘇州府爲永禁踹匠齊行增價碑 (Kangxi 32 [1693]) and “Yuan-Chang-Wu sanxian huii chuaibu gongjia jifa yinliang bei” 元長吳三縣會議踹布工價給發銀兩碑 (Qianlong 60 [1795]) also contained in the *Beike ziliao xuanji* (although the names of both of these inscriptions are taken from the *Beikeji*), Yokoyama also notes that the *baotou* received from the lusterers a fee for hiring out lustring stones (*linshizu* 賃石租) and that there were cases in which the cloth merchants paid the processing fees to the *baotou*, who then gave part of them to the lusterers. Although he describes the *baotou* as the organizers of the lustring industry who brought together the instruments of labour, production materials and labour power and had the exclusive contracting rights of intermediary agents, Yokoyama does not however regard them as the managers of the lustring industry, and instead he defines the management of the lustring industry as a mode of production rooted in the relationship obtaining between the cotton cloth merchants and lusterers in which the lusterers, who can only be described as *pro forma* independent handicraftsmen, worked for processing fees which they received from the cloth merchants on a piece-rate basis; that is to say, he

characterizes the management of the lustring industry as a putting-out system of domestic industry.

In his subsequently published article also cited at the end of Part I (p. 37), Terada Takanobu 寺田隆信 similarly analyzes various inscriptions contained in the *Beike ziliao xuanji*, and although he argues in particular against the monopolization of contracting in the lustring industry by the *baotou* as posited by Yokoyama, if we here set aside the differences in the views of Yokoyama and Terada and focus on the question with which we are concerned in the present study, namely, whether or not there existed a putting-out system, then it is found that Terada also maintains that although the lustring industry in Suzhou developed around the *baotou*, who constituted a distinctive feature of its mode of operations, the *baotou* were basically parasitical intermediary exploiters feeding on the relationship between the cotton cloth merchants and lusterers, and he too defines the overall setup as a putting-out system of domestic industry.

I also am of the opinion that in essence the operations of this lustring industry ought to be defined as a “putting-out system of handicraft industry concentrated under the management of wholesale merchant capital,” one of the subcategories within the category of “putting-out system” in a broad sense of the term. Therefore, however large-scale or extensive these operations may appear to have been, one cannot use such outward phenomena to define the operations of the lustring industry as “manufacture” in the sense of the operations of the early capitalist mode of production or to characterize them as “germs of capitalism.”

What merits special attention in the context of the present study is the fact that both Yokoyama and Terada, using epigraphical materials, state that many of the cloth merchants in Suzhou were so-called Xin'an merchants, or travelling merchants from Huizhou 徽州 prefecture in Anhui province. I shall return to this point later in connection with the question of determining the date of establishment of the putting-out system of production.

## VII. A Theoretical Critique of Nishijima's View That There Existed No Putting-out System of Production

As is evident from the materials quoted in the above, examples of the “putting-out system of production,” although not numerous, cannot be said to have been totally nonexistent in China from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries onwards. In addition, although still fewer in number than these instances of the putting-out system of production whereby merchants distribute raw materials among small producers for processing, there are also examples of the “putting-out system of domestic industry” or “putting-out system of handicraft industry” whereby merchant capital brings together and employs labour power in the processing industries, and these include, in addition to already known examples in the lustring industry, the example of a general store

by the name of “Tongtaisheng” 統泰升 in Daliuzhen 大柳鎮, Ningjin 寧津 county, Hebei 河北 province, in the early nineteenth century which also operated ironware and ginning handicraft industries and employed more than one hundred workers in its ginning factory, an example that is drawn from “shop account book” sources brought to light by Shang Yue 尙鉞 (see n. 53) in the course of the debate in China over the question of the germs of capitalism.<sup>55)</sup> One may expect further material of this type to be discovered in the future.

It may thus be said that Nishijima Sadao 西嶋定生’s view that there did not exist a putting-out system of production has been factually disproved on the basis of these historical facts. That being so, what then are the underlying problems in Nishijima’s demonstration of the nonexistence of such a system of production?

As was seen in Part I, it would appear that Nishijima set out to theoretically demonstrate the nonexistence of a putting-out system by arguing that in China’s rural cotton industry around the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (i) there not only did not exist an independent self-managing peasantry such as might engage in this industry, but it was also impossible for the rural cotton industry to create any such independent self-managing peasantry, and (ii) as long as those engaged in this industry were “nonindependent” ultra-small peasants antipodal to independent self-managing peasants and bound to a despotic land system, merchant capital, rather than granting them any guarantees for the receipt of their products by means of an advance system, was able to increase its intermediary profits in the distribution process by leaving untouched and even reinforcing their “nonindependence.” But these assertions require us to consider the following issues.

The first issue concerns the fact that, as was explained in Part I, historically speaking the so-called putting-out system of production manifests itself in two stages. One of these is that which appears in the stage of transition from a feudal mode of production to a capitalist mode of production, while the other is that which evolves prior to this and in a form peculiar to the stage of premodern society as a type of production control that is the inevitable result of the pursuit of profits by premodern merchant capital.

The first of these corresponds to one of the two paths leading to the establishment of industrial capital as propounded by Marx, that is, the second path whereby “the merchant establishes direct sway over production,” which is contrasted with the first “really revolutionizing path.” But as was noted earlier, this second path “cannot by itself contribute to the overthrow of the old mode of production, but tends rather to preserve and retain it as its precondition,” and “[t]his system presents everywhere an obstacle to the real capitalist mode of production and goes under with its development.” In other words, this path whereby “the merchant establishes direct sway over production,” a path which is ranked alongside the “really revolutionizing path” in which “[t]he producer becomes merchant and capitalist, in contrast to the natural agricultural economy and the guild-bound handicrafts of the medieval urban industries,”<sup>56)</sup> as if it were

a second path inherent to the development of industrial capital, was mentioned by Marx only as a secondary phenomenon that manifests itself on the foundations provided by the social conditions opened up by the “really revolutionizing path.”

The “necessary transitional stage”—“necessary” in respect to the laws of history and “transitional” in respect to the realities of history—that constitutes an indispensable precondition of the overall transition from the above feudal mode of production to a capitalist mode of production is held to be the emergence of the “peasant parcel holder” (*Parzellenbauer*) representing the independent self-managing peasant rooted in the *free ownership of land* that resulted from the emancipation of serfs.<sup>57)</sup> But as will be further discussed below, this definition of Marx’s applies to a “normal form” that is found among “the yeomanry in England, the peasantry in Sweden, [and] the French and West German peasants” “as *one of the forms* arising from the dissolution of feudal landownership,” and his definition is qualified by the proviso that he does not include other underdeveloped areas and “colonies here, since the independent peasant there *develops under different conditions*” (italics added).<sup>58)</sup>

When considered in this light, one is forced to conclude that many of the participants in the debate in China over the “germs of capitalism” have erred when, in evaluating the putting-out system of production in the Ming and Qing as a germ of capitalism, they have unmediatedly applied to totally different circumstances a theory concerning the highest form of merchant capital such as is described in Lenin’s *Development of Capitalism in Russia*, which presents an analysis limited to Russia after the albeit immature emancipation of serfs in 1861.<sup>59)</sup>

As may be inferred, however, from Marx’s statement that in the above-mentioned stage of transition to a capitalist mode of production a putting-out system of production in which “the merchant establishes direct sway over production” “cannot by itself contribute to the overthrow of the old mode of production, but tends rather to preserve and retain it as its precondition,” it is in the second of the two historical stages alluded to earlier, that is, in premodern society, that a putting-out system of production peculiar to merchant capital could be said to be able to develop in a true sense.<sup>60)</sup>

We here come to the second question concerning Nishijima’s thesis, namely, the question of whether a putting-out system of production will indeed not develop in this premodern society when the small producer peasants that would become the target of a putting-out system of production under merchant capital are “nonindependent.” In this regard the following three points may be made.

Firstly, insofar that peasants in premodern society are in their social standing frequently “subservient” peasants such as serfs, they are “nonindependent” peasants. But with regard to their operations, this type of “nonindependent” peasant is “in possession of his own means of production, the necessary material labour conditions required for the realization of his labour and the production of his means of subsistence” and “conducts his agricultural activity and *the rural home industries connected with it independently*,” and he is therefore a peasant whose



“surplus-labour for the nominal owner of the land can only be extorted from [him] by other than economic pressure” (italics added);<sup>61)</sup> that is to say, in his operations he is nothing less than an “independent self-managing peasant.” This is also why serfs or villeins are referred to as “feudal self-managing peasants.” In Japan, however, where the aforementioned “peasant parcel holder” is often translated as “independent self-managing peasant” (*dokuritsu jieï nômin* 獨立自營農民), there is by way of contrast a tendency to erroneously assume that the “subservient peasants” of earlier premodern society were all “nonindependent peasants.”

Secondly, even if we suppose that these subservient peasants in feudal society among various peoples in world history were generally “independent self-managing peasants,” were the direct producer peasants engaged in rural industry in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century rural China with which we are here concerned “nonindependent” peasants still unable to enjoy conditions that “feudal self-managing peasants” in general, found throughout the course of world history, had already obtained? The reality was not at all like this. As Nishijima himself recognizes, the basic mode of operation for the direct producer peasants engaged in rural industry in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century China too was already “a so-called handicraft-type management setup in which labour was provided by the women and children in the peasant’s own family while the peasant had complete ownership of raw materials, equipment and workplace and sold the finished products under the condition of obtaining payment in return,”<sup>62)</sup> and in cases where peasants were “nonindependent” in their funding, they also possessed the “independence” to be conferred trust as principals of debt when borrowing funds from usurious capital in order to conduct their operations.

Thirdly, one would therefore not be wrong to assume that, under historical and social conditions in which the domestic industries of “independent” but ultra-small and impoverished peasants had already evolved, the pursuit of profit characteristic of preindustrial merchant capital had as the *inevitable result* of its increasing greed brought about, as was pointed out by Hatano Yoshihiro 波多野善大 and as is evident from the examples cited earlier, the emergence of merchants who came to participate in production.

### VIII. Reasons for the Relatively Few Examples of a Putting-out System of Production in the Ming and Qing Periods: Conditions Appertaining to Merchant Capital

Notwithstanding my above comments, it is nevertheless true that examples of the putting-out system of production are so few that even Nishijima, who endeavoured to make an exhaustive collection of all the relevant historical sources, was unable to discover any examples relating to sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Jiangnan. Where, then, should the reasons for this dearth be

sought? I believe that at least part of the reason can be found in the conditions appertaining to contemporary merchant capital itself.

In the case of premodern Chinese society, for the pursuit of profit characteristic of contemporary premodern merchant capital to cause merchants to create a putting-out system of production that, as an inevitable result of their increasing greed, would have involved them in the small producers' production process, it would have had to be predicated on the following conditions peculiar to China:

(i) The most basic and indispensable precondition would have been that the domestic industries of ultra-small and impoverished but self-managing peasants had attained viability as "simple commodity production" and that within peasant operations agriculture and domestic industry had already lost their originally firm and organic integration and were coexisting in a certain degree of distinctive social separation, while on the other hand, against the background of a market of almost nationwide proportions mediated by merchants, there not only existed, as was noted earlier, simple commodity production by family labour, but clothing commodity production had also spread as a rural handicraft industry that employed the labour of other people, on the basis of which small-to-medium towns mushroomed in rural Jiangnan, resulting in a flourishing clothing industry in Suzhou, Nanjing and elsewhere.

(ii) Handicraft industries capable of developing a putting-out system of production must, as in the case of the silk-reeling, silk textile, and spinning and weaving industries, be supported, or be able to anticipate being supported in the future, by a lucrative and promising large market.

(iii) Merchant capital capable of operating a putting-out system of production must possess vast capital, as in the case of the capital of travelling merchants.

(iv) This vast merchant capital does not continue to function only as travelling capital, but by becoming localized in the form of "shopkeepers" (*zuojia* 坐賈) it must also achieve direct and permanent contact with small producers.

Among the above conditions, (i) and examples thereof have already been dealt with. As regards (ii), we find that in Jiangnan the most lucrative and promising market for handicraft products at the time was the market for products of the silk-reeling and silk textile industries.

In Jinling (Nanjing) there is a distinction between warps and woofs in the raw silk for weaving satin. Formerly, that of Zhenze and Nanxun was used for warps and that of Huzhou, Xinshi 新市 and Tangxi 塘棲 was used for woofs. ... Prior to the Xianfeng [era] (1851–62), [raw silk for] satin of fine

quality was all bought from Wu 吳 (Jiangsu) and Yue 越 (Zhejiang) because it was unadulterated, immaculate and suitable for use and it was also cheap in price. (Guangxu-era sequel to *Jiangning fu zhi* 江寧府志 [Preface dated 1881] 15, “Shibu zaji” 拾補雜記)

As is evident from this passage, there was a lucrative market aimed at China’s domestic urban textile industry, and the raw silk market, which through for example the so-called *itowappu* 絲割符 trade in raw silk that passed through Nagasaki 長崎 in Japan also provided overseas textile industries with raw materials for expensive high-quality silk goods, was endowed with the optimum conditions for establishing a putting-out system of production.

If one peruses history books, [one finds that] in Huangqi 黃溪 (Zhenze) during the Jianjing era (1522–67) of the former Ming the [market] price for pongee was 8 or 9 *fen* [in silver] for 1 tael and the [market] price for raw silk was 2 *fen* [in silver] for 1 tael. During the Kangxi era (1662–1723) of our [Qing] dynasty the [market] price for pongee was 1 *qian* [in silver] for 1 tael [whereas] the [market] price for raw silk still remained at 3 or 4 *fen* [in silver] for 1 tael]. But now (1746) the [market] price for pongee, when compared with the Kangxi era, has increased by only one third whereas the [market] price for raw silk has doubled. This is why the livelihood of those who weave pongee for a living is becoming tighter by the day. [Qianlong-era *Zhenze xian zhi* [Preface dated Qianlong 11 (1746)] 25, “Shengye”)

From this passage, which compares long-term differences in the rate of increase in the market prices of raw silk and pongee, both products of affiliated industries in the same region, it may be gathered that raw silk was far more profitable than pongee, which as a silk fabric was a low-quality product because it was produced by the technologically backward peasant weaving industry and as a clothing fabric for the general populace was unable to compete with cotton cloth which was just beginning to gain ground. (In spite of this, however, the peasants, after having sold all their raw silk, would again buy raw silk in small quantities and devote their remaining working hours to pongee weaving.)

Thus the scene in Linghuzhen 菱湖鎮, Guian county, Huzhou prefecture, during the fourth and fifth months when the season’s new silk came on the market is described in the following manner:

Among the shops in Linghu [zhen], Guian [county], there are many that receive people who come from [neighbouring districts in] the four quarters to sell raw silk. [These] shops overlook the river, and in the fourth and fifth months villagers [living] along the river [forgather] with loads of raw silk and rows of boats lie at anchor. (*Wuxing beizhi* 吳興備志 [comp. Tianqi 4 (1624)] 29, “Zaozheng” 瓔徵)

Similarly, we find the following reference to Nanxunzhen, Wucheng county, Huzhou prefecture:

When [new] raw silk comes on the market, travelling merchants throng [into Nanxun from all directions]. (Fan Yingtong 范穎通, *Yanbei jusuo lu* 研北居銷錄; quoted in Fan Qie 范鍇, *Xunqi jushi shi* 濶谿紀事詩 [Daoguang 16 (1836)] 1)

In this manner, raw silk brought enormous profits to travelling merchants, but at the same time local raw silk wholesalers also profitted from the wealth of these travelling merchants and were the wealthiest among local merchants, leading livers of extreme luxury, as may be inferred from the following passage:

[In general] merchant families are all very diligent and unaffected; for clothing they do not wear sheen or figured silks and for food they do not eat sweet or soft dishes; they are discreet and act according to their status, and their business grows more prosperous by the day. [However] the raw silk wholesalers alone accumulate the wealth of the travelling merchants [who come] from the four quarters, immediately winning wealth and splendorousness and vying [with one another] in prizing extravagance. (*Shuanglin ji zengzuan* 8, “Fengsu: Shangjia 商賈” [main text])

In the examples of temporary and permanent putting-out systems of production quoted in Part I from a poem by Shen Bocun, a metropolitan graduate of Yongzheng 11 (1733), and from the Daoguang-era *Zhenze xian zhi* respectively, those in charge of these putting-out systems of production were raw silk wholesalers supported by this thriving raw silk market.

With regard to the third of the four conditions noted above, it was the “travelling merchants from the four quarters,” or travelling capital, that brought wealth to local raw silk wholesalers. In the words of Ye Mengzhu 葉夢珠, who lived in Songjiang during the fourth decade of the Kangxi era (1691–1700):

During the previous [Ming] dynasty, [a type of cotton cloth called] “standard cloth” (*biaobu* 標布) became very popular, and wealthy merchants with large capital who came [to Songjiang to buy this cloth] employed several tens of thousands of taels in silver, ranging from as much as several hundred thousand taels to at least ten thousand taels. Therefore, the [local] wholesalers received [these travelling] cloth merchants as if they were royalty and fought [amongst themselves] for the cloth merchants’ [patronage] as if they were opposing camps. [Thus] it became impossible for [local] wholesalers to do business without making use of influential people. (Ye Mengzhu, *Yueshi bian* 閱世編 7, “Shihuo” 食貨)

The capital responsible for the local wholesalers’ wealth was, namely, none

other than the vast capital of travelling merchants, which was backed by a large market of almost nationwide proportions, employed enormous sums of capital, and allowed the local wholesalers to share in the benefits of its business activities; in the above instance it was the capital of cloth merchants dealing in cotton cloth, which had a large potential market as a popular fabric.

An indication of the enormous sums of capital that were necessary may be found in the following passage quoted by Miyazaki Ichisada 宮崎市定 in his "Gapon soshiki no hattatsu" 合本組織の發達 (The development of joint-capital organizations).<sup>63)</sup>

His business involved collecting capital from merchants, investing it in weaving households, collecting their bolts [of cloth which they produced], and returning them to the merchants. [In his management of the latter's funds] he calculated the increases and decreases [in their capital] and the rises and falls [in its value] and disbursed and received [funds accordingly]. He set times to audit the accounts and assisted both the merchants and the weaving households [to their advantage]. [Therefore] they all trusted him and submitted to him. (Zhu Yunming 祝允明, *Zhushi jilue* 祝氏集畧 19, "Chengshilang Qinjun muzhiming" 承事郎欽君墓誌銘)

The family business of this merchant by the name of Qin Yunyan 欽允言 (1467–1506) from Wu county, Suzhou prefecture, was a type of banking business and a trust business for business operations in which he collected capital from merchants, distributed it among weaving households, collected their clothing products, and returned them to the merchants, and this example shows that there existed possibilities for employing large sums of capital in the field of clothing production.

But however great the available capital might have been, it would have been impossible for merchant capital in the form of outside travelling merchants to become involved in the production process of the direct producers without fulfilling the fourth of the above four conditions; that is to say, it was necessary for them to gain access to the closed, premodern and localized market sphere of rural villages where small, independent petty merchants conducted their businesses and to there attain localization as "shopkeepers."

As was noted in Part I, Nishijima argues that the social division of labour in the production process born of the small producers' paucity of funds enabled merchant capital to intervene not only at the two poles of the raw material sector and finished product sector but also in the interstices between each unit of specialization and to thereby exploit the producers. This could be said of merchant capital as a group category, but the extraction of profit at each interstice in the production process was not in fact undertaken comprehensively by a single merchant, and just as the small producers' production process had become prematurely socially specialized on account of their paucity of funds, so too was

the trading system in the producing centres fragmented (as may be seen in the studies mentioned in n. 25) through the individual mediation of many “unpowerful” but independent petty merchants, and even the travelling merchants, who possessed the greatest amount of capital among contemporary Chinese merchants, were able to pursue their profit-making activities between various producing districts only by relying from the outside on this distribution system within the closed-off producing districts.

Therefore, it was presumably only when travelling merchants possessing large sums of capital but unable to enter the local market, such as those described by Ye Mengzhu in his *Yueshi bian*, did not restrict themselves to interregional commerce, which was the proper sphere of their profit-making activities, but also became “shopkeepers” and fulfilled the conditions enabling them to make direct contact with the small producers without the intermediation of local wholesalers, that there arose the opportunity for the development of a putting-out system of production. With regard to the small-to-medium towns in rural areas that were visited by travelling merchants, we may quote the following passage from the *Qiqi fengtu ji* 棲溪風土記 by the late-Ming Hu Yuanjing 胡元敬 of Tangqizhen 唐棲鎮, Renhe 仁和 county, Hangzhou 杭州 prefecture, which alludes to the local development of a putting-out system of production by enormous outside travelling merchant capital such as that of the Xin’an merchants:

[Tangqizhen is a place where] much wealth accumulates, and the great [travelling] merchants from Hui[zhou] and Hang[zhou] look upon [Tangqizhen] as a source of profit; [as local shopkeepers] they open pawnshops and store rice, and they buy raw silk and provide re-reeling equipment. [In this manner] many people and goods gather. (Hu Yuanjing, *Qiqi fengtu ji*; quoted in Guangxu-era *Tangqi zhi* 唐棲志 18, “Shiji: Ji fengsu” 事紀, 紀風俗)

Similarly, according to the articles by Yokoyama and Terada cited earlier, the merchants capable of operating a large-scale putting-out system of production in the lustring industry in traditional economic centres such as Suzhou are also said to have generally been none other than those associated with Xin’an travelling merchant capital.<sup>64</sup> The above example of “the great [travelling] merchants from Hui[zhou] and Hang[zhou]” who “buy raw silk and provide re-reeling equipment” and the earlier example of the Xin’an merchants who are said to have operated a “putting-out system of handicraft industry concentrated under the management of wholesale merchant capital” in the lustring industry both exemplify the fact that a putting-out system of production was able to develop only with the enormous capital of travelling merchants and only once they had become localized.

### IX. Concluding Remarks: The Historical Significance of the Establishment of a “Putting-out System of Production” in China

In the “Addendum” added to Part 3 of his *Chūgoku keizaishi kenyū* (see Part I, n. 5), Nishijima touches on the discovery of some examples of a putting-out system of production by subsequent researchers and makes the following comment:

However, the point at issue is what functions the existence of this putting-out system, indicative of a form of production control by commercial capital, had and what role it fulfilled in China’s early modern history, and the mere demonstration of its existence alone ought not to be regarded as the objective. (p. 909)

This is indeed so, and all the more so since, in my view, even if further new examples of the putting-out system of production should be discovered in the future, they themselves will have the condition of their existence in premodern society and will not represent the agents directly responsible for the advent of a capitalist mode of production. But was the putting-out system of production that evolved in China’s handicraft industries from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries onwards totally without significance in historical developments? In closing this article, I wish to raise the following points in regard to this question.

1. The establishment of a capitalist mode of production means nothing less than the establishment of a necessary relationship between the dialectically interrelated entities of “capital” and “wage labour,” and although neither of these two momenta should be disregarded, is there perhaps not a frequent tendency to neglect the formation of “wage labour” and trace only the genealogy of “capital”?

2. Before its own indigenous “capital” or, in plainer terms, “capitalists” had been able to evolve, China was subjected under the world-historical circumstances of the modern age to invasions by the capitalism and imperialism of Western powers, and when foreign “capital” thus made inroads into China, the “wage labour” that, by acting as the indigenous moment linking up with the external moment of foreign capital, actually led to the establishment of capitalism in China was nothing other than a product of Chinese society. That being so, as the outcome of what sort of historical process had this “wage labour” been nurtured?

3. When considered in this light, Marx’s theory relating to “peasant parcel holders,” alluded to earlier, is found to be most suggestive. The “peasant parcel holder” is, generally speaking, not only a “necessary transitional stage” for the establishment of a capitalist mode of production, but is also “an outstandingly *transitional* historical *medium* on account of his ability to achieve self-dissolution”

(italics in original)<sup>65)</sup> or the modern dissolution of peasantry, and as was noted earlier, this “necessary transitional stage” “develops under different conditions” in underdeveloped areas and colonies.

4. In China, up until the consummation of independent self-managing peasants rooted in the free ownership of land and their concurrent dissolution into socialist peasants as a result of the land reforms of the 1940’s, Chinese peasants, who were the direct bearers of productive forces, had arisen from a dissolution within the feudal establishment (even though this dissolution itself did not immediately bring about a capitalistic system), and during a long passage of time they followed a path that moulded them into the “wage labour” constituting one moment of the upcoming capitalist mode of production (regardless of whether the other moment be imperialist capital or national capital).

5. In this connection, there is a need to elucidate the skills and awareness to be later inherited in the disposition of Chinese labourers under future foreign and national capital that the putting-out system of production — that is, the relationship between merchant capital and direct producers — cultivated and fostered in the direct producers from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries onwards while at the same time subjecting them to poverty and misery. In this sense, an important future task must be to consider not only the question of the creation of a vast proletarian mass as a result of the peasantry’s dissolution within the feudal establishment, but also the question of the historical results of the struggles through which this labour force passed both historically and socially, that is to say, the struggles by handicraft labourers under the guild and putting-out systems and by the direct producers attested to in large numbers in the *Shouhe riji* and the two aforementioned collections of inscriptions (*Beikeji* and *Beike ziliao xuanji*).

## Notes

[Note numbers follow on from those of Part I of this article.]

- 23) The main articles to be published during the course of the debate over the germs of capitalism in China may be found in the following volumes: *Taolunji* (see Part I, n. 9), 2 vols.; Nanjing Daxue Lishixi Zhongguo Gudaishi Jiaoyanshi 南京大學歷史系中國古代史教研室, ed., *Zhongguo zibenzhuyi mengya wenti taolunji, xupian* 中國資本主義萌芽問題討論集, 續篇 (Collected discussions on the question of the germs of capitalism in China: A sequel [hereafter: *Taolunji xupian*]; Beijing: Sanlian Shudian 三聯書店, 1960); and *Lunwenji* (see Part I, n. 10). See also Tanaka Masatoshi 田中正俊, “Chūgoku rekishi gakkai ni okeru ‘shihonshugi no hōga’ kenkyū” (see Part I, n. 1, where *Chūgoku kindai keizaishi kenkyū* 『中國近代經濟史研究』 is an error for *Chūgoku kindai keizaishi kenkyū josetsu* 『中國近代經濟史研究序說』).
- 24) On the testimony of Jin Yipai 靳一派, county magistrate (*zhixian* 知縣) of Chongde county, Jiaying prefecture, in 1607–09, who makes the most penetrating observations on the historical character of rural domestic industry in the socio-economy of contemporary Jiangnan (contained in the Kangxi-era *Shimen xian zhi*), see Tanaka Masatoshi, “Jūroku-, jūnana-seiki no Kōnan ni okeru nōson shukōgyō” (see Part I, n. 6); also translated into Chinese: Yang Pinquan 楊品泉, tr., “Shiliu-,



shiqi shiji Jiangnan de nongcun shougongye” 一六、十七世紀江南的農村手工業, in *Zhongguo Shehuikexueyuan Lishi Yanjiusuo Mingshi Yanjiushi* 中國社會科學院歷史研究所明史研究室, ed., *Mingshi yanjiu luncong* 明史研究論叢, No. 4(1991).

- 25) We also find the following passage in the *Shuanglin ji zengzuan* 雙林記增纂 9, “Wuchan” 物產 (main text):

When they encounter times of many travelling [merchants coming to buy raw silk] but have few goods (*viz.* raw silk) [in stock], [local] wholesalers (*hangjia* 行家) summon boats and go to the villages to buy [raw silk], and this is called “going out into the villages” (*chuxiang* 出鄉). Again, those who buy on behalf of the wholesalers are called *chaozhuang* 抄莊; those who go [of their own accord to the villages] to buy [raw silk] and sell it to wholesalers in different places are called *duozhuang* 攬莊 or *fanzi* 販子; those who attend to the task of [buying] the village goods and selling them to wholesalers on behalf of the *duozhuang* are called *chenghanchuan* 撐旱船; and those who normally sell [raw silk] in small quantities to the weaving households (in the main, probably pongee-weaving peasants) are called *chaisizhuang* 拆絲莊.

Worthy of note is the fact that just as the production process of silk-raising, silk-reeling and silk-weaving by small peasants had prematurely exhibited a social division of labour because of limited funds, so too was the distribution system fragmented by the trading activities of large numbers of petty merchants with little capital who, moreover, were acting independently of one another, and there is little evidence of monopolization by individual wholesale merchants or direct subservience to them by petty merchants.

It should be mentioned that the manuscript of the *Shuanglin ji zengzuan* which I have been able to consult, held at the Seikadō Bunko 靜嘉堂文庫, is a brush-written copy from the late Qing, to the main text of which there have been added supplementary sections and glosses that postdate the compilation of the *Shuanglin zhi* 雙林志 in the late Ming. The passage quoted above is taken from the main text, and it may be assumed to describe conditions in the late Ming.

- 26) Also quoted in Li Zhichin 李之勤, “Lun Mingmo Qingchu shangye ziben dui zibenzhuoyi mengya de fasheng he fazhan de jiji zuoyong” 論明末清初商業資本對資本主義萌芽的發生和發展的積極作用 (On the positive effect of commercial capital on the genesis and development of the germs of capitalism in the late Ming and early Qing), in *Lunwenji*.
- 27) On the advancing of funds to small producers by merchants in the sugar industry in southern Taiwan in the late Qing, see Christian Daniels, “Shinmatsu Taiwan nanbu seitōgyō to shōnin shihon—1870–1895nen—” 「清末台灣南部製糖業と商人資本——一八七〇—一八九五年—」 (The sugar-manufacturing industry in southern Taiwan in the late Qing and merchant capital: 1879–1895), *Tōyō Gakuhō* 『東洋學報』, Vol. 64, Nos. 3–4 (1983).
- 28) Also quoted in Hong Huanchun 洪煥椿, “Lun shiwu-shiliu shiji Jiangnan diqu zibenzhuoyi shengchan guanxi de mengya” 論十五-十六世紀江南地區資本主義生產關係的萌芽 (On the germs of capitalist production relationships in the Jiangnan area in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries), *Lishi Jiaoxue Wenti* 歷史教學問題, April 1958 (reprinted in *Taolunji xupian*).
- 29) Taken from Liu Yongcheng 劉永成, “Lun Zhongguo zibenzhuoyi mengya de lishi qianti” 論中國資本主義萌芽的歷史前提 (On the historical premises of the germs of capitalism in China), *Zhongguoshi Yanjiu* 中國史研究, 1979–2 (reprinted in *Lunwenji*), p. 3. That this statement refers to Puyuanzhen can be ascertained on the basis of a similar statement that “for the people of this market town the weaving loom corresponds to the fields and the shuttle corresponds to the plough” appearing in Yang Shuben 楊樹本 *et al.*, eds., *Puchuan suowen ji* 濮川所聞記 4, printed in Jiaqing 嘉慶 25 (1820) and quoted in Liu Yongcheng, *op. cit.*
- 30) Hou Wailu 侯外廬, *Zhongguo zaoqi qimeng sixiang shi* 中國早期啓蒙思想史 (The history of early enlightenment thought in China; Beijing: Renmin Chubanshe 人民出版社, 1956); Fu Yiling 傅衣凌, “Ming-Qing shidai Jiangnan shizhen jingji de fenxi” 明清時代江南市鎮經濟的分析 (An analysis of the economy of Jiangnan market towns during the Ming and Qing periods), *Lishi Jiaoxue* 歷史教學, May 1964; Fan Shuzhi 樊樹志, *Ming-Qing Jiangnan shizhen tanwei* 明清江南市鎮探微 (An inquiry into Jiangnan market towns during the Ming and Qing; Fudan Daxue Chubanshe 復旦大學出版社, 1990).

- 31) Kangxi-era *Wujiang xian zhi* 吳江縣志 1, “Yudi zhi” 輿地志 1: “Shizhen” 市鎮; Qianlong-era *Wujiang xian zhi* 4, “Jiangtu” 疆土 4: “Zhenshicun” 鎮市村; Fu Yiling, *op. cit.*
- 32) Qianlong-era *Zhenze xian zhi* 震澤縣志 1, “Jiangtu” 1: “Yange” 沿革; *ibid.* 4, “Jiangtu” 4: “Zhenshicun.”
- 33) Fu Yiling, *op. cit.*
- 34) On the growth and prosperity of Puyuanzhen, etc., as centres of the rural silk textile industry from the mid-Ming onwards, see Tanaka Masatoshi, “Chūgoku ni okeru chihō toshi no shukōgyō—Kōnan no seishi, kinuorimonogyō o chūshin ni—” 「中國における地方都市の手工業—江南の製絲・絹織物業を中心に—」 (Handicraft industries in regional towns in China: With a focus on the silk-reeling and silk textile industries in Jiangnan), in *Chūseishi kōza 3: Chūsei no toshi* 『中世史講座 3 中世の都市』 (Lecture series on medieval history 3: Medieval towns; Gakuseisha 學生社, 1982).
- 35) Yokoyama Suguru, *Chūgoku kindai no keizai kōzō* (see Part I, n. 22), p. 82.
- 36) This source is also quoted in Qian Hong 錢宏, *op. cit.* (see Part I, n. 9); Li Zhichin, *op. cit.*; Yang Chao 楊超, “Ming-Qing fangzhiye zhong zibenzhuoyi shougong gongchang de liangzhong fasheng guocheng” 明清紡織業中資本主義手工工場的兩種發生過程 (The two kinds of evolutionary process in capitalist handicraft factories in the spinning and weaving industry in the Ming and Qing), *Guangming Ribao* (Shixue) 光明日報 (史學), No. 71 (8.12.1955; reprinted in *Lunwenji*); and Kitamura Hirano 北村敬直, “Shindai ni okeru Koshūfu Nanjinchin no wata toiya ni tsuite” 「清代における湖州府南潯鎮の棉問屋について」 (On the cotton wholesalers of Nanxunzhen, Huzhou prefecture, during the Qing dynasty), *Keizaigaku Zasshi* 『經濟學雜誌』, Vol. 57, No. 3 (1967).
- 37) This source is also quoted in Fu Yiling, “Mingdai Jiangnan dizhu jingji xin fazhan de chubu yanjiu” 明代江南地主經濟新發展的初步研究 (An elementary study of new developments in the landlord economy in Jiangnan during the Ming dynasty), *Xiamen Daxue Xuebao* (Wenshi Ban) 廈門大學學報 (文史版), 1954–5 (revised and reprinted in *id.*, *Mingdai Jiangnan shimin jingji shitan* [see Part I, n. 9]); Fu Zhufu 傅筑夫 and Li Jingneng 李競能, *Zhongguo fengjian shehui nei zibenzhuoyi yinsu de mengya* 中國封建社會內資本主義因素的萌芽 (Germs of capitalist elements within Chinese feudal society; Shanghai Renmin Chubanshe 上海人民出版社, 1956; reprinted in *Taolunji* 1); Han Dacheng 韓大成, “Mingdai shangpin jingji de fazhan yu zibenzhuoyi de mengya” 明代商品經濟的發展與資本主義的萌芽 (The development of a commodity economy during the Ming dynasty and germs of capitalism), in *Taolunji* 2 and *Zhongguo Renmin Daxue Zhongguo Lishi Jiaoyanshi* 中國人民大學中國歷史教研室, ed., *Ming-Qing shehui jingji xingtai de yanjiu* 明清社會經濟形態的研究 (Studies in socio-economic modes in the Ming and Qing; Shanghai Renmin Chubanshe, 1957); and Li Zhichin, *op. cit.*
- 38) This source is also quoted in Li Zhichin, *op. cit.*
- 39) This source is also taken up in Tanaka Masatoshi, “Minmatsu Shinsho Kōnan nōson shukōgyō ni kansuru ichi kōsatsu” (see Part I, p. 35), but at the time (1961) I had not yet come to view it as an example of the putting-out system of production.
- 40) This source is also alluded to in Qian Hong, *op. cit.*; Xu Daling 許大齡, *op. cit.* (see Part I, n. 9); and Yokoyama Suguru, “Shindai no toshi kinuorimonogyō no seisan keitai” (see Part I, p. 37).
- 41) The silk-reeling process in China formerly involved the following three stages: (1) reeling (*saosi* 繅絲)—several cocoons were put into a pan filled with hot water, and after one filament of silk had been extricated from each cocoon, several such filaments were twisted together and wound onto a reel; (2) dyeing—the raw silk reeled off in stage (1) was often dyed for specific uses; and (3) re-reeling—in order to produce silk thread of a desired thickness, several strands of raw silk that had passed through either stage (1) or stages (1) and (2) were re-reeled to form a single thread, and the workers engaged in this re-reeling were called *luogong*.
- 42) This source is also quoted in Deng Zhi 鄧拓, “Lun ‘Honglougong’ de shehui beijing he lishi yiyi” 論“紅樓夢”的社會背景和歷史意義 (On the social background and historical significance of the *Honglougong*), *Renmin Ribao* 人民日報 (9.1.1955; revised and reprinted in *id.*, *Lun Zhongguo lishi de jige wenti* 論中國歷史的幾個問題 [On some questions in Chinese history; Beijing: Sanlian Shudian, 1959], and *Taolunji* 1); Qian Hong, *op. cit.*; Jian Baizan 翦伯贊, *op. cit.* (see Part I, n. 11); Chen Zhanruo 陳湛若, “Lüelun ‘Honglougong’ shehui beijing—ping Wu Dagun xiansheng de jige

- lundian —” 略論“紅樓夢”社會背景—評吳大琨先生的幾個論點— (A brief discussion of the social background of the *Hongloumeng*: Evaluating some of Mr. Wu Dagon's arguments), in Shandong Daxue 山東大學, *Wenzhizhe* 文史哲, 1956–4 (reprinted in *Taolunji* 2); Wu Hairuo 吳海若, “Zhongguo zibenzhuyi shengchan de mengya” 中國資本主義生產的萌芽 (Germs of capitalist production in China), *Jingji Yanjiu* 經濟研究, 1956–4 (reprinted in *Taolunji* 2); and Li Zhichin, *op. cit.* Tsao Yin lived from 1658 to 1712. His “memorial for exemption from regular taxes” probably corresponds to the “Zouchen zhizao shiyi liu kuanzhe” 秦陳織造事宜六款摺 submitted in the 6th month, Kangxi 47 (1708), and reproduced in: Zhongguo Diyi Lishi Dang'anguan 中國第一歷史檔案館, ed., *Kangxi chao hanwen zhupi zouzhe huibian* 康熙朝漢文硃批奏摺彙編 (Collection of confidential memorials in Chinese with the emperor's comments in red ink from Kangxi's reign), Vol. 2 (Beijing: Dang'an Chubanshe 檔案出版社, 1984); Gugong Bowuyuan Ming-Qing Dang'anbu 故宮博物院明清檔案部, ed., *Guanyu Jiangning zhizao Tsaojia dang'an shiliao* 關於江寧織造曹家檔案史料 (Documentary sources relating to the Tsao family of superintendents of imperial silk manufacturing in Jiangning; Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju 中華書局, 1975); and Gugong Bowuyuan Ming-Qing Dang'anbu, ed., *Li Xu zouzhe* 李煦奏摺 (Confidential memorials of Li Xu; Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1976).
- 43) This passage is also mentioned in Shang Yue 尙鉞, “Youguan Zhongguo zibenzhuyi mengya wenti de ersanshi” 有關中國資本主義萌芽問題的二三事 (Two or three matters relating to the question of the germs of capitalism in China), *Lishi Yanjiu* 歷史研究, 1959–7 (reprinted in *Taolunji xupian*), and Wang Yuxin 王鈺欣, “Qingdai qianqi shougongye jingji de xingzhi he tedian—dui shougongye zibenzhuyi mengya fazhan shuiping de jiben guji—” 清代前期手工業經濟的性質和特點—對手工業資本主義萌芽發展水平的基本估計 (The nature and characteristics of the handicraft economy during the first half of the Qing dynasty: A basic estimate of the level of development of the germs of capitalism in the handicraft industries), in *Lunwenji*.
- 44) This inscription is contained in *Beike ziliao xuanji* (see Part I, n. 21) and in Suzhou Bowuguan 蘇州博物館, Jiangsu Shifan Xueyuan Lishixi 江蘇師範學院歷史系 and Nanjing Daxue Ming-Qingshi Yanjiushi 南京大學明清史研究室, eds., *Ming-Qing Suzhou gongshangye beikeji* 明清蘇州工商業碑刻集 (Collected inscriptions on industry and commerce in Suzhou during the Ming and Qing [hereafter: *Beikeji*]; Jiangsu Renmin Chubanshe 江蘇人民出版社, 1981), and it is also taken up by Yokoyama Suguru.
- 45) Fu Zhufu and Li Jingneng, *op. cit.* (*Taolunji* 1), p. 324.
- 46) Han Dacheng, *op. cit.* (*Taolunji* 2), p. 1058.
- 47) According to Yokoyama Suguru, *op. cit.* (n. 40), this *tsaifangce* corresponds to Jiangsu-sheng Shiyesi 江蘇省實業司, *Jiangsu-sheng shiye xingzheng baogaoshu* 江蘇省實業行政報告書, dated May 1913.
- 48) According to Xu Ko 徐珂, *Qingbai leichao* 清稗類鈔, “Gongilei: Zhichouchang” 工藝類、織綢廠, among the *zhangfang* operating in Suzhou at the start of the twentieth century, Shi Hengmao 石恆茂, Ying Ji 英記 and Li Qitai 李啓泰 were established during the Qianlong and Jiaqing eras (1736–1820). See also Qian Hong, *op. cit.*, and Liu Yuncun 劉雲村, “Guanyu Zhongguo zibenzhuyi mengya wenti de shangque” 關於中國資本主義萌芽問題的商榷 (A discussion about the question of the germs of capitalism in China), in *Lunwenji*.
- 49) Yokoyama (*op. cit.* [n. 35], p. 32) makes the following comment on the views expressed in Hatano Yoshihiro 波多野善大, *op. cit.* (see Part I, n. 9): “Hatano Yoshihiro reasons that in the early Qing dynasty independent self-managing weavers predominated, but that from the late eighteenth century (late Qianlong era) onwards the class dissolution of weavers occurred and a putting-out system based on a system of weaving for wages developed. But since, as noted above, a system of weaving for wages is already mentioned in an inscription of 1734 [contained in the *Beike ziliao xuanji*], it may be assumed that the class dissolution of weavers in their capacity as independent self-managing artisans was already taking place considerably earlier than the period posited by Hatano. In addition, Hatano conjectures that the weaving shop managers represented leading figures among the independent self-managing weavers who had become wholesalers, but I feel that this interpretation, positing a bipolar dissolution of independent self-managing artisans into weaving shop managers and waged weavers, is too mechanical. Rather, is it not more reasonable to

suppose that the independent self-managing weavers (*Zunft* artisans) fell into decline, becoming removed from their means of production, and that the silk wholesalers, or commercial capital, then controlled them by means of a putting-out system?" Yokoyama nevertheless takes a cautious stance, adding, "However, since, as in the case of Hatano, there is no supporting evidence in historical sources, this view is no more than a conjecture." But in light of the position of merchant capital and small producers in the late Ming and early Qing, it would seem to be a reasonable view.

- 50) On the *chengguan* in the Nanjing weaving industry after the late nineteenth century, see Yokoyama, *ibid.*, pp. 45–49. Kojima Yoshio 小島淑男, in "Shinmatsu Minkokushoki Soshūfu no kinuorigyō to kiko no dōkō" 「清末民初蘇州府の絹織業と機戸の動向」 (Movements in the silk-weaving industry and among weavers in Suzhou prefecture in the late Qing and early Republican period), *Shakai Keizai Shigaku* [社會經濟史學], Vol. 34, No. 5 (1969), also dealing with a later period, writes as follows (pp. 37–38): "The *zhangfang* (—wholesale silk merchants are hereafter referred to as *zhangfang*), who represented weaving shops, were also called *dashu* 大叔 ("big uncle"), and the greater part of the weaving looms and raw silk in their possession was handed over directly to weavers with whom they were on familiar terms. These weavers were usually called *laojiu* 老機戶 ("old weaver") or *ershū* 二叔 ("second uncle"). Apart from what he wove himself, the weaving looms that the *ershū* borrowed and the raw silk that he took on were handed over to yet another weaver. Weavers with no direct relationship with the *zhangfang* thus entered the picture, and they were known as *daizhi jihu* 代織機戶 ("weaver who weaves in proxy") or *sanshu* 三叔 ("third uncle")." We are thus apprised of the fact that the *chengguan* of Nanjing corresponded in Suzhou to weavers (*jihu*) who were called *laojiu* or *ershū*, but the point at issue is just how far back in time the origins of this *chengguan* or *laojihulershū* of the late Qing and later can be traced.
- 51) See Tanaka, *op. cit.* (n. 34). Until Shunzhi 順治 13 (1656) Fengjingzhen 楓涇鎮 lay astride both Huating county in Songjiang prefecture and Jiashan 嘉善 county in Jiaxing prefecture, but thereafter, as may be gathered from the *Xiaoxia xianji zhaichao*, it became part of Lou 婁 county in Songjiang prefecture.
- 52) Quan Hansheng 全漢昇, "Qingdai Suzhou de chuaibuye" 清代蘇州的踹布業 (Suzhou's lustring industry during the Qing dynasty), *Xinya Xuebao* 新亞學報, No. 13 (1980).
- 53) Yokoyama mentions the views of: Shang Yue, "Qingdai qianqi Zhongguo shehui zhi tingzhi, bianhua he fazhan" 清代前期中國社會之停滯、變化和發展 (The stagnation, change and development of Chinese society in the first half of the Qing dynasty), *Jiaoxue yu Yanjiu* 教學與研究, 1955–6–7 (reprinted with revisions and a new title in *id.*, *Zhongguo zibenzhuyi guanxi fasheng ji yanbian de chubu yanjiu* 中國資本主義關係發生及演變的初步研究 [An elementary study of the genesis and evolution of capitalist relations in China; Beijing: Sanlian Shudian, 1956], and *Taolunji* 1); Qian Hong, *op. cit.*; Xu Daling, *op. cit.*; and Kitamura Hironao, "Shingai kakumei to sangyō kōzō" 「辛亥革命と産業構造」 (The 1911 Revolution and the industrial structure), in Kuwabara Takeo 桑原武夫, ed., *Burujowa hakumei no hikaku kenkyū* 『ブルジョワ革命の比較研究』 (The comparative study of the bourgeois revolution; Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房, 1964).
- 54) Yokoyama mentions the views of: Fu Zhufu and Li Jingneng, *op. cit.*; Quan Hansheng, "Yapian zhanzheng qian Jiangsu de mianfangzhiye" 鴉片戰爭前江蘇的棉紡織業 (The cotton-spinning and -weaving industry in Jiangsu prior to the Opium War), *Qinghua Xuebao* 清華學報 (n. s.), Vol. 1, No. 3 (1958); Peng Yuxin 彭雨新, "Cong Qingdai qianqi Suzhou de chuaibuye kan zibenzhuyi mengya" 從清代前期蘇州的踹布業看資本主義萌芽 (The germs of capitalism as seen from the lustring industry in Suzhou during the first half of the Qing dynasty), *Lilun Zhanxian* 理論戰線, 1959–12; and Cong Hanxiang 從翰香, "Zhongguo fengjian shehui nei zibenzhuyi mengya zhuwenti" 中國封建社會內資本主義萌芽諸問題 (Various questions concerning the germs of capitalism within Chinese feudal society), *Lishi Yanjiu*, 1963–6. It should be noted that the category "domestic industry" is used by Yokoyama in a broad sense, signifying all premanufacture-type industries with "domestic industry" characterized by the "firm and organic integration of agriculture and domestic industry" as their prototype, but in the present article I have used it in a narrow sense and referred to those industries within the broader category of "domestic industry" that use the

labour of people outside the family as “handicraft industries”; therefore, in my terminology Yokoyama’s classification becomes the “manufacture” thesis and the “putting-out system of handicraft industry” thesis.

- 55) Shang Yue quotes this example from the *Tongtaisheng zhangbu* 統泰升帳簿 preserved at Peking Library.
- 56) K. Marx, *op. cit.* (see Part I, n. 3), Bd. III, S. 347; Vol. III, p. 329.
- 57) K. Marx, *ibid.*, Bd. III, S. 815; Vol. III, p. 787.
- 58) K. Marx, *ibid.*, Bd. III, S. 815; Vol. III, p. 786.
- 59) Peng Zeyi 彭澤益, “Yapian zhanzheng qian Qingdai Suzhou sizhiye shengchan guanxi de xingshi yu xingzhi” (see Part I, n. 10), p. 354, also makes this point.
- 60) See Ōtsuka Hisao 大塚久雄, “Iwayuru toiya seido o dō toraeru ka” (see Part I, n. 3).
- 61) K. Marx, *op. cit.*, Bd. III, S. 798–799; Vol. III, p. 771.
- 62) Nishijima Sadao, *Chūgoku keizaishi kenkyū* (see Part I, n. 5), p. 856.
- 63) Miyazaki Ichisada, *Ajiashi kenkyū* 『アジア史研究』 (Studies in Asian history), Vol. 3 (Tōyōshi Kenkyūkai 東洋史研究會, 1963), p. 195.
- 64) See especially Terada Takanobu, *Sansei shōnin no kenkyū* (see Part I, n. 20), pp. 385–386.
- 65) Takahashi Kōhachirō 高橋幸八郎, *Kindai shakai seiritsushi ron—Ōshū keizai kenkyūshi* 『近代社會成立史論—歐州經濟研究史—』 (A study of the history of the establishment of modern society: The history of research on Europe’s economy; Nihon Hyōronsha 日本評論社, 1947), p. 13. In the “Preface” to his *Kindai Ōshū keizaishi josetsu* 『近代歐州經濟史序說』 (Introduction to the economic history of modern Europe; Nihon Hyōronsha, 1946<sup>2</sup>), Ōtsuka Hisao describes the “independent and free landowning peasantry” as “having become the leaven, as it were, for the building in modern Europe of enormous productive forces unparalleled in history,” thereby giving apt expression by means of a biblical analogy to the historical character of the “peasant parcel holders” who underwent self-dissolution and created a new entity, that is to say, the modern capitalistic structure.

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