

# Concerning Various Aspects of Public Finance, Land Management and Corvée Allotment outlined in the *Chou-li* 周禮

By Shigeaki OCHI

Editorial Note: So many studies have been made in connection with the date and objective of compilation of the *Chou-li*. But, it does not go too far to say that the definite conclusion is yet to be reached. Studies on the *Chou-li* so far published may be divided into two categories so long as the methodology is concerned, that is to say, ideological and grammatical or linguistic. From the ideological point of view, some people consider that the *Chou-li* is a description of utopian state based on Confucianism, while other people look upon it as described on the basis of Legalism. Though Edouard Biot denied as early as 1851 the authorship of Chou Kung 周公 (*Le Tcheou-Li ou Rites des Tcheou, I*, p. IX), Bruno Schindler tried to revive the theory considering that the *Chou-li* was compiled from materials concerning the Shang 商 by Chou Kung and his collaborators (*Königtum und Priestertum in alten China, Einleitung und Quellen, Leipzig, 1919*, p. 80). Schindler's standpoint may be obsolete by now and many people are of opinion that the *Chou-li* is closely connected with Wang Mang 王莽, who instituted a new Confucian regime, and Liu Hsin 劉歆, who established a theoretical basis for the new regime. On the other hand, Bernhard Karlgren analysed the *Chou-li* from grammatical or linguistic point of view and concluded that it is to be looked upon as written under the Former Han. (*The Early History of the Chou-li and Tso-chuan Texts*, in: *BMFEA*, III, p. 1 ff.)

Since 1979 three new studies have been published on the *Chou-li*. The first one is by Ku Hsieh-kang 顧頌剛 entitled 周公制禮的傳說和周官一書的出現 and published in the *Wên-shih* 文史, Vol. 6, November, 1979. Ku Hsieh-kang looks upon the *Chou-li* as a work by legalists who appeared after Sang H'ung-yang 桑弘羊 (153-80 B.C.). The second one is by Hsü Fu-kuang 徐復觀 under the title of 周官成立之時代及其思想性格, Tai-pei: Tai-wan Hsüeh-shêng shu-chü 臺灣學生書局, May 1980, XIII + 202 pp. Hsü Fu-kuang accepts the view that the *Chou-li* was compiled by Wang Mang and his colleagues, which is not new, but he applied a new linguistic and institutional method. Here, the linguistic method means location of so many Chinese characters invented Wang Mang in the *Chou-li* and the institutional one the comparison of administrative, financial, legal, and corvée system as described in

the *Chou-li* with those actually practiced under the reign of Wang Mang. The third one is by Ochi Shigeaki, Professor of East Asian History, University of Kyûshû, published under the title *Concerning Various Aspects of Public Finance, Land Management and Corvée Allotment outlined in the Chou-li* 周禮の財政制度・田制・役制をめぐって in the *Kyûshû Daigaku, Tôyôshi Ronsô* 九州大學東洋史論叢, IX, 1981, pp. 1-31. This is the article here translated. Ochi's article, as is clear from its title, tries to establish that the various aspects of institutions are closely related to the institutions actually practiced under the Former Han. Ochi says nothing about the strict date of compilation and about compilers. It is interesting, however, that both Hsü and Ochi applied the similar methodology to the study of *Chou-li* almost at the same time. And it will be more interesting to compare their argument with each other.

### Introduction

From times past the *Chou-li* 周禮 has been called a storehouse of doubts. Whenever the *Chou-li* has been taken up as a mode of history for a particular period, as a work indicating the ideal image of what should have been in a certain time, there is bound to be not a few confusing aspects which must be confronted. Especially when we come upon cases in which there are great discrepancies within the period being described by its various phenomena, why the name, a government shrouded in a tangle of doubts, has been given to the *Chou-li* can be easily understood. If only for this reason, when utilizing the *Chou-li* to unravel the history prior to the Former Han, one must use extreme caution.

With respect to the limitations of the views expressed by the author(s) of the *Chou-li*, broadly speaking, the work is not a composition like the *Kuan-tzu* 管子 as we know it today; that is, it is not a composition to which very different content was added through time by a number of different authors and editors. Rather, the *Chou-li* is a work completed in a particular era and for a fixed purpose. (How many authors were involved in its production is not certain.) The *Chou-li* presents a total picture of the ideal operation of a state in which the emperor holds control over the state's citizens as his own domestic wealth. It is not written as an idealized concept of some utopia, but as a concrete plan including all the contradictions which go to make up such an imperial household state. Though the *Chou-li* makes mention of lands granted to bureaucrats 采地 under such names as *shao* 稍, *hsien* 縣, and *chiang* 疆, as well as *chiu-ch'i* 九畿, land fiefs held by nobles of five ranks which are located in the territory divided into nine categories 九畿, it may probably be not necessary to the functioning of the imperial domestic state, and it seems that the compiler or compilers want to indicate that the *Chou-li* is a work of the Chou period, and therefore,

cannot be removed from its relationship to what we know of that period. However, this involvement with the times by no means vitiates the working of an imperial domestic state. We cannot merely end our discussion by showing the unsolvable inconsistencies between individual statement contained in this document which is truly historical. We must go further than that and discuss its overall purpose and the various systems which have been demarcated within it. Of course, we must carry out such an investigation together with a search for the essential significance of those particular phenomena described therein.

In this essay, I intend to take up the aspects of public finance, land management, and corvée allotment outlined in the *Chou-li*. My conclusions are as follows:

“Concerning its fiscal aspects, general fiscal income consisted fundamentally of taxes on harvests and head taxes. As I will take up in another paper, it is identical with taxation systems of the early Former Han era.

“Land management is characterized by the universality of a so-called privately owned rice landholding 私田 of a later form than the tribal remnant which combines Mencius’ concept of public land 公田 with private land ownership, and gives one the impression of a system which relies on privately owned land as the base of state land tax income. The *ching-t’ien* 井田 system was to be put into effect in only certain limited areas.

“The corvée allotment system in the period of the imperial domestic state was based on levying unpaid labor dues on all male citizens of a specified age. These dues can be divided into *ch’ün-i* 軍役 or military service in the narrow sense of the word, *t’u-i* 徒役, and *li-i* 力役, which included various types of labor to be performed in the provinces. This system corresponds almost exactly to the corvée system of the Han period.”

### I. *Chiu-kung* 九貢, *Chiu-fu* 九賦, and *Chiu-chih* 九職.

In the *Chou-li*, state fiscal income includes not only customary taxes of the nobility, but also taxes levied on the incomes of the citizenry and a head tax levied on men and women. The latter two income sources correspond to the taxation system of the Former Han period. In this section, I would like to consider these two sources which together were to some extent controlled by the power of the state. However, there are also examples of those who were subjected to no taxation, or to very little taxation. That is, while the *Chou-li* attempts to define all the people as the domestic property of the emperor, it also recognizes that there are those who have dropped out of the system. This point enables us to see that the *Chou-li* is to a certain extent based on historical reality.

In the *Chou-li*, Bk. VI, the following statements are given in connection with *Ta-fu* 大府. Chêng Hsüan’s 鄭玄 comments, if any, are printed in small

characters. Biot's French translations of the text are given just for the convenience to understand the outline of content.

大府，掌九貢九賦九功之貳，以受其貨賄之入，頒其貨于受藏之府，頒其賄于受用之府。九功，謂九職也。受藏之府，若內府也。受用之府，若職內也。凡貨賄皆藏以給用耳。賈者以給王之用，其餘以給國之用。或言受藏，或言受用。又雜言貨賄，皆互文。

Il est chargé de distinguer les neuf tributs, les neuf taxes, les neuf professions ou genres de travaux, afin de recevoir la livraison des matières et valeurs précieuses, qui en proviennent. Il répartit les matières précieuses, de première classe, dans le magasin où l'on reçoit ce qui doit être conservé. Il répartit les matières précieuses de deuxième classe, dans le magasin où l'on reçoit ce qui doit être employé. (Edouard Biot, *Le Tcheou-Li ou Rites des Tcheou*, Paris, 1851, Tome I, p. 121.)

凡官府都鄙之吏，及執事者，受財用焉。

Tous les officiers attachés à l'administration supérieure ou aux apanages et domaines affectés, ainsi que ceux qui sont chargés de travaux officiels, reçoivent les objets et matières de valeur qu'ils emploient. (Tome I, p. 122.)

凡頒財，以式灋授之。關市之賦，以待王之膳服。邦中之賦，以待賓客。四郊之賦，以待稍秣。家削之賦，以待匪頒。邦甸之賦，以待工事。邦縣之賦，以待幣帛。邦都之賦，以待祭祀。山澤之賦，以待喪紀。幣餘之賦，以待賜予。待，猶給也。此九賦之財，給九式者。膳服，卽羞服也。稍秣卽芻秣也。謂之稍，稍用之物也。喪紀，卽喪荒也。賜豫，卽好用也。鄭司農云，幣餘，使者有餘，來還也。玄謂，幣餘，占賣國之斥幣。

Il fait en général la répartition de ces matières et objets de valeur, d'après les règlements et proportions.

La taxe des barrières et marchés est affectée au service des mets et habillements de l'empereur.

La taxe du centre du royaume ou de la capitale est affectée à la réception des grands dignitaires qui visitent l'empereur.

La taxe des quatre banlieues est affectée aux fournitures de grains et fourrages.

La taxe des domaines appelés *Kia-sao* est affectée aux distributions en détail.

La taxe des terres impériales (*Thien*) est affectée aux dépenses en travail mécanique.

La taxe des dépendances du royaume impérial, appelés *Hien*, est affectée aux distributions des étoffes précieuses.

La taxe des apanages du royaume impérial, appelés *Tou*, est affectée aux sacrifices.

La taxe des montagnes et lacs est affectée aux cérémonies funèbres.

La taxe des excédants en soieries et autres objets précieux est affectée

aux cadeaux d'agrément. (Tome I, pp. 122-123.)

凡邦國之貢，以待弔用。此九貢之財所給也。給弔用給凶禮之五事。

En général, les tributs des principautés feudataires sont affectés au service des consolations. (Tome I, p. 123.)

凡萬民之貢，以充府庫。此九職之財。充，猶足。

En général, les tributs de toute la population servent à remplir les trésors et magasins impériaux. (Tome I, p. 124.)

凡式貢之餘財，以共玩好之用。謂先給九式及弔用，足府庫，而有餘財，乃可以共玩好。明玩好，非治國之用。言式言貢，互文。

En général, l'excédant des tributs et taxes conformes aux proportions réglées est employé pour les dépenses de plaisir et d'agrément. (Tome I, p. 124.)

凡邦之賦用，取具焉。賦用，用賦。

En général, il reçoit et classe les matières utiles, provenant des taxes. (Tome I, p. 124.)

歲終，則以貨賄之入出會之。

A la fin de l'année, alors il prend les entrées et sorties des matières précieuses de toute nature, et en fait le compte général. (Tome I, p. 124.)

First, concerning the statement that the *ta-fu* administers subsidiarily the *chiu-kung*, *chiu-fu* and *chiu-kung* 掌九貢九賦九功之貳 the character *érh* 貳 indicates that the *ta-fu* is an assistant to the *ta-tsai* 大宰. As Chêng Hsüan indicates in his note to the text, the *chiu-kung* is equivalent to *chiu-chih* or the nine professions which are outlined in the section of Bk. II of the *Chou-li* entitled *Ta-tsai* 大宰. Therefore, the *chiu-kung*, *chiu-fu* and *chiu-chih* can be taken as relating to the three sources of the government's fiscal income. Chêng Hsüan rightly explains that *shou-tsang* 受藏, *shou-yung* 受用, *hua* 貨 and *hui* 賄, being *hu-wen* 互文 of the Chinese grammatical construction one and all mean financial income.

The *chiu-kung* 九貢 may be thought of as corresponding to the customary taxes from the nobility. There should be no problem on that point. However, the same cannot be said about the content of *chiu-fu* and *chiu-chih*. In my view the *chiu-fu* refers to that which was to be levied by the state on the incomes of its commoners and the *chiu-chih* refers to head taxes to be levied on men and women.

As to *chiu-kung*, the *Chou-li*, Bk. II under *Ta-tsai* 大宰, states as follows:

以九貢致邦國之用。一曰祀貢。二曰嬪貢。三曰器貢。四曰幣貢。五曰材貢。六曰貨貢。七曰服貢。八曰旃貢。九曰物貢。

Par les neuf espèces de tributs, il détermine les dépenses des royaumes.

Il distingue:

Premièrement, le tribut des objets destinés aux sacrifices.

Deuxièmement, le tribut des ouvrages de femmes.

Troisièmement, le tribut des ustensiles.

Quatrièmement, le tribut des étoffes et objets précieux.

Cinquièmement, le tribut des bois de construction.

Sixièmement, le tribut des matières de valeur.

Septièmement, le tribut des objets d'habillements.

Huitièmement, le tribut des ornements d'étendards.

Neuvièmement, le tribut des objets divers. (Tome I, pp. 31-32.)

Concerning this passage, Chia Kung-yen 賈公彥 comments as follows:

釋曰，云致邦國之用者，謂此貢諸侯邦國歲之常貢。則小行人云今春入貢，是也。大行人云，侯服歲一見，其貢祀物，彼謂因朝而貢，與此別也。但諸侯國內得民稅，大國貢半，次國三之一，小國四之一。所貢者，市取當國所出美物。則禹貢所云厥篚厥貢之類是也。

And Sun I-jang 孫詒讓 explains the *chiu-kung* as the customary tribute from the nobility.

以九貢致邦國之用。此邦國即詛祝注云，諸侯國也。與前邦國通王國言者異。

As to *chiu-fu*, the *Chou-li*, Bk. II under *Ta-tsai*, it is stated as follows:

以九賦斂財賄。一曰邦中之賦。二曰四郊之賦。三曰邦甸之賦。四曰家削之賦。五曰邦縣之賦。六曰邦都之賦。七曰關市之賦。八曰山澤之賦。九曰幣餘之賦。

Par les neuf sortes de taxes, il rassemble les richesses et valeurs.

Il distingue:

Premièrement, la taxe du milieu du royaume ou de la capitale.

Deuxièmement, la taxe des quatre banlieues de la capitale.

Troisièmement, la taxe du territoire hors banlieue.

Quatrièmement, la taxe des domaines affectés, appelés *Kia-sao*.

Cinquièmement, la taxe des dépendances du Royaume impérial, appelées *Hien*.

Sixièmement, la taxe des apanages du Royaume impérial, appelés *Tou*.

Septièmement, la taxe des barrières et des marchés.

Huitièmement, la taxe des montagnes et des lacs.

Neuvièmement, la taxe des excédants en soieries et objets précieux.

(Tome I, pp. 27-29.)

Chêng Hsüan 鄭玄 explains the *fu* of this passage as head tax or *su-an-fu* 算賦 under the Han, in contrast with the explanation of Chêng Chung 鄭衆,

usually called *Chêng Ssu-nung* 鄭司農, which interpretes the *fu* as land tax.

財，泉穀也。鄭司農云，邦中之賦，二十而稅一。各有差也。幣餘，百工之餘。玄謂，賦，口率出泉也。今之算泉，民或謂之賦。此其舊名與。卿大夫以歲時登其夫家之象寡，辨其可任者。國中自七尺以及六十，野自六尺以及六十有五，皆征之。遂師之職亦云，以徵其財征。皆謂此賦也。邦中，在城郭者。四郊，去國百里。邦甸，二百里。家削，三百里，邦縣，四百里，邦都，五百里。此平民也。關市，山澤，謂占會百物。幣餘，謂占賣國中之斥幣。皆未作，當增賦者，若今賈人倍算矣。自邦中，以至幣餘，各入其所有穀物，以當賦泉之數。每處爲一書，所待異也。

For these two different interpretations, Sun I-jang proposes the third one which explains *fu* as a general collection (of taxes), which is a method for controlling state expenses by assigning *chiu-fu* to land.

以九賦斂財賄者，說文貝部云，賦，斂也。支部云，斂，收也。經凡征斂通謂之賦。此九賦，則皆任地以制國用之法也。黃以周云，九賦者，斂田地之租也。田地爲正稅。故九賦，司書亦謂之九正。…案，黃申先鄭說。是也。九職 (*sic!*) 蓋以田稅爲正。而它地稅亦無不眩焉。先鄭以載師任地之法爲釋。與司會令田野財用之文脗合。最爲得解。書禹貢九州之賦，亦各以上中下三等爲差。此卽田賦之正名也。蓋此經九賦，自國中至邦都六者，並以由內而外地之遠近，爲稅法輕重之差。關市山澤以及幣餘之斂於官府者，其地雜廁於六處之中，而於田稅之外，別爲科率。故列於諸賦之後。通校各職，征賦之法有二。一曰任地。卽此九賦地征是也。一曰任民。前九職之貢，與均人人民牛馬車輦之力政是也。

If limited to the first six divisions arranged from *kuo-chung* 國中 to *pang-tu* 邦都, such an explanation may be somewhat convincing; however, for the reason that all nine *fu* should be of similar quality, *fu* seven through nine, as indicated by the underlined portion of the above text, present problems from the point of views of land based taxes. Therefore, let us search for a uniform explanation for all the nine *fu* from a different standpoint.

The *Chou-li*, Bk. XIII, under *Tsai-shih* 載師, says:

凡任地，國宅無征。園廛二十而一。近郊十一。遠郊二十而三。甸稍縣都，皆無過十二。唯其漆林之征，二十而五。

En général, voici comment il classe la taxe des terres. Les maisons de la capitale ne sont pas taxées. Sur les enclos et terrains de dégagement, la taxe est le vingtième du produit; sur les terres de la banlieue voisine, on perçoit un dixième; sur les terres de la banlieue éloignée, on perçoit trois vingtièmes. Le droit sur les terres hors banlieue, domaines affectés, dépendances et apanages ne dépasse pas deux dixièmes. On ne prélève cinq vingtièmes que pour la taxe des marais et des bois. (Tome I, p. 278.)

Among the items mentioned here, taxes on *yüan* 園 or gardens and lands in

suburbs and on *tien* 廛 or places of business may be included in the *fu* inside the country 邦中之賦. Chêng Hsüan explains the one-twentieth tax on *yüan* and *tien* as 園廛亦輕之者，廛無穀，園少利也。古之宅必樹。而臺場有瓜，for which Sun I-jang gives the following comments:

廛無穀，園少利也者，國語魯語云，賦里以入而量其有無。韋注云，里，廛也。以入計其利入多少，而量其財業有無，以爲差也。與此經義合。賈疏云，以其廛則五畝之宅在國中。則孟子云五畝之宅，樹之以桑麻。是廛無穀也。此園則百畝。田畔家各二畝半。以爲井竈。種葱韭及瓜。是園少利。故亦輕之。案賈說非也。園自爲種草木之地。非田畔爲之。家二畝半之說，又鄭所不取。詳前疏。云古之宅必樹者，釋民宅有稅之義。明廛征卽征其所樹也。宅必樹，詳後。

云而臺場有瓜者，賈疏云，是信南山詩，云中田有盧，臺場有瓜，鄭云中田，田中作盧，以便其事。於其畔種瓜，瓜成又入其稅。天子剝削，以爲菹，獻之皇租。是其園廛皆有稅之事也。案臺場與園廛異地，鄭賈並合爲一，誤也。詳前疏。

I agree with Sun I-jang who, taking *yüan* as a place to grow grass and plants, *tien* as a dwelling house with plants, interpretes 園廛二十而一 as meaning the one-twentieth tax levied on such *yüan* and *tien*. In ancient times, a dwelling house was always with rows of trees, which is known from the following statement of the *Chou-li*, Bk. XIII, under *Tsai-shih*, as well as from the comments of Sun I-jang to it.

凡宅不毛者有里布。凡田不耗者出屋粟。

En général, si le terrain de l'habitation n'est pas planté et semé, il y a, pour ce délit, la monnaie du terrain occupé. Si le champ du cultivateur n'est pas cultivé, on exige, pour ce délit, une quantité de grains égale à la taxe d'une maison de trois familles. (Tome I, p. 279.)

注，鄭司農云，宅不毛者，謂不樹桑麻也者，廣雅釋草云；毛，草也。穀梁定元年傳，云毛澤未盡。注，范邵云，凡地之所生謂之毛。公羊宣十二年傳，云錫之不毛之地。何注云，墻塙不生五穀，曰不毛。此宅不毛。與田不耕對文。則非不可種五穀。故據孟子爲不樹桑麻。遂人注，說王莽時，城郭中宅不樹者爲不毛。莽法卽放此經。

As seen above, *fu* one through six are income taxes with differences depending on geographical region, then *fu* seven to nine as well should conform to the rule of tax levy by income, and so, all nine *fu* should be understood as being expressed uniformly. While the underlined portion of the comments of Sun I-jang on *chiu-fu* is certainly not clear enough on this point, still the *Chou-li* text should be read in this way. Therefore, *fu* seven to nine become taxes based not on regional differences but on income. In other words, at barriers 關 and markets 市 taxes are levied on income from the sale of goods; in the mountains and marshes tax levies are made on income from fishing, hunting and lumbering; and in the manufacture of



goods taxes are levied on the income from the sale thereof. Here we take *pi* 幣 to mean artisans 百工 as understood by Chêng Chung 鄭衆.

The *Han-shu* 漢書, Bk. XXIVb on Food and Currency, states as an institution settled by Wang Mang as follows:

諸取象物鳥獸魚鼈百蟲於山林水澤，及畜牧者，嬪婦桑蠶織紵紡績補縫，工匠醫巫卜祝及它方技商販賈人坐肆列里區謁舍，皆各自占所爲，於其在所之，縣官除其本，計其利、十一分之，而以其一爲貢。敢不自占，自占不以實者，盡沒入所采取而作縣官一歲。

This passage indicates that traders, artisans and people of the backwoods 藪澤 are taxed according to income, which indicates that Wang Mang levied taxes on the income of tradesmen and mountain dwellers according to the *chiu-fu* 九賦 system as described in the *Chou-li*.

Rice land taxation of the early Former Han, as during the Warring States period, was to collect a certain percentage based on rice paddy harvest amounts. Also, taxation on the dealing of tradesmen and mountain dwellers of the Former Han was fixed according to the rate for *min-ch'ien* 緡錢. (On this point, see my forthcoming paper entitled *Min-ch'ien and Taxes on Wealth during the Han* 漢時代の緡錢と財産税.) For this reason, the tax system of the *Chou-li* may be seen as generally the same as that of the first half of the Former Han. (In the case of rice land harvests, there were also expenditures which should have been deducted from harvest amounts to reach total income. In this sense, the tax base cannot be strictly called total harvest income; however, from ancient times it has been understood as such, and so, we will defer to that understanding here. With respect to other types of income, we understand the taxation base as total output-income.)

As to *chiu-chih*, the *Chou-li*, Bk. II, under *Ta-tsai*, says as follows:

以九職任萬民。一曰三農。生九穀。二曰園圃。毓草木。三曰虞衡。作山澤之材。四曰藪牧。養蕃鳥獸。五曰百工。飭化八材。六曰商賈。阜通貨賄。七曰嬪婦。化治絲枲。八曰臣妾。聚斂疏材。九曰閭民。無常職，轉移執事。

Par les neuf professions ou classes de travail, il règle les divers travaux des peuples.

Première classe: les cultivateurs des trois genres. Ils produisent les neuf espèces de grains.

Deuxième classe: les jardiniers. Ils élèvent les plantes (potagères) et les arbres (à fruit).

Troisième classe: les bûcherons (*Iu-heng*). Ils préparent les matières utiles des montagnes et des lacs.

Quatrième classe: les pâtres des marais cultivés. Ils nourrissent, ils élèvent les oiseaux et les quadrupèdes.

Cinquième classe: les artisans des cent espèces (de toute nature). Ils transforment par leur travail les huit sortes de matières brutes.

Sixième classe: les marchands à boutiques et les commerçants ambulants. Ils amassent et font circuler les valeurs précieuses.

Septième classe: les femmes légitimes (femmes du premier rang). Elles transforment par leur travail la soie et le chanvre.

Huitième classe: les serviteurs et les servantes (femmes du second rang). Ils réunissent toutes les substances comestibles.

Neuvième classe: les individus intermédiaires. Ils n'ont pas de profession fixe; ils changent tour à tour d'ouvrage. (Tome I, pp. 26-27.)

First of all, let us take up *ch'ên-ch'ieh* 臣妾 and *chien-min* 閭民. Chêng Hsüan explains *chien-min* as one who has nothing to do, that is to say, a wage earner, quoting the interpretation of Chêng Chung, and *ch'ên-ch'ieh* as both men and women who are poor.

鄭司農云，…閭民，謂無事業者，轉移爲人執事，若今傭賃也。玄謂，…臣妾，男女貧賤之稱。…疏材，百草根實可食者。疏不熟曰饘。

Concerning this passage, Chia Kung-yen comments as follows:

釋曰，…八曰臣妾，聚斂疏材者，謂男女貧賤，號爲臣妾者，所爲事業，聚斂百草根實而已。九曰，閭民，無常職，轉移執事者，其人爲性不營己業，爲閭民，而好與人傭賃。非止一家轉移，爲人執事，以此爲業者耳。

And, in this connection, it should be referred to the following statements of *Chou-li*, Bk. XIII, under *Lü-shih* 閭師:

凡任民，任農以耕事，貢九穀。任圃以樹事，貢草木。任工以飭材事，貢器物。任商以市事，貢貨賄。任牧以畜事，貢鳥獸。任嬪以女事，貢布帛。任衡以山事，貢其物。任虞以澤事，貢其物。

凡無職者，出夫布。

凡庶民不畜者祭無牲。不耕者祭無盛。不樹者無禘。不蠶者不帛。不績者不衰。

En général, voici comment il classe les travaux du peuple. Il impose aux agriculteurs le travail du labourage; ceux-ci payent leur redevance avec les neuf sortes de grains. Il impose aux jardiniers le travail de la plantation; ceux-ci payent leur redevance en plantes potagères et fruits des arbres. Il impose aux artisans le travail des objets d'ornements; ceux-ci payent leur redevance en meubles et instruments. Il impose aux marchands le travail du marché ou du commerce; ceux-ci payent leur redevance en denrées et matières vendables. Il impose aux pâtres le soin des animaux; ceux-ci payent leur redevance en oiseaux et quadrupèdes. Il impose aux femmes les travaux de leur sexe; celles-ci payent leur redevance en toiles et étoffes de soie. Il impose aux ouvriers des montagnes les travaux des montagnes; ceux-ci payent leur redevance en produits spéciaux de ces régions. Il impose aux ouvriers des lacs les occupations

relatives aux lacs et étangs; ceux-ci payent leur redevance en produits spéciaux des lieux aquatiques.

Quant aux individus qui n'ont pas de profession spéciale, on en tire la monnaie correspondant à la taxe d'un chef de famille.

En général, parmi les hommes du peuple, ceux qui n'élèvent pas des bestiaux ne peuvent sacrifier avec des animaux vivants; ceux qui ne cultivent pas leurs lots de terre ne peuvent sacrifier avec des grains; ceux qui ne plantent pas leurs vergers ne peuvent avoir un cercueil complet avec coffre extérieur. Les personnes qui n'élèvent pas de vers à soie ne peuvent porter des étoffes de soie; les personnes qui ne filent pas ne peuvent porter un deuil complet avec habit de dessus. (Tome I, pp. 280-283.)

However, in these passages, nothing is mentioned about both *ch'ên-ch'ieh* and *chien-min* as tax payers. As to *ch'ên-ch'ieh*, Sun I-jang explains as follows:

此文次第，與大宰不同者。彼依事大小爲次。此不依彼爲次者，欲見事無常故也。且彼有九職。仍并山澤爲一。此文分山澤爲二。唯有八者。任九職有臣妾及間民，此無者，以周公設經任之，則有臣妾使得自生。若貢稅則無，以其聚斂疏材，無可稅故也。其間民，載師已見出夫家之征。故於此不言之矣。其分山澤爲二者，以山澤所貢不同，故分爲二，以充八，通間民爲九耳。江永云，九職中，惟臣妾不貢疏材。委人之薪芻疏材木材，掌荼之疏材。自是取之於虞衡及山澤之農。九職除臣妾，析虞衡爲二，仍是九。故大府言九功之人。案江說是也。此任民之法，校之大宰九職之人，唯無臣妾耳。蓋臣妾最賤。雖受職而不貢功。卽無口賦也。至下文夫布，卽間民之貢。賈因鄭以夫布入九賦，故謂此經間民無貢。不足據也。

I think that Sun is right when he justifies the *Chou-li* which does not mention *ch'ên-ch'ieh* for the reason that they, even when employed, could not earn enough money to pay taxes. As to *chien-min*, the *Chou-li*, Bk. XIII, under *Tsai-shih*, states:

凡宅不毛者有里布。凡田不耕者出屋粟。凡民無職事者，出夫家之征。

Quant aux hommes du peuple qui n'ont pas des devoirs de profession, on exige d'eux l'équivalent de la taxe d'un homme ayant femme ou d'un homme, établi. (Tome I, pp. 279-280.)

and under *Lü-shih*, as quoted above:

凡無職者，出夫布。(cf. p. 42)

Sun I-jang says about this last passage as follows:

朱大韶云，載師云，無職事者。閭師云，無職者。兩義迥別。不得合爲一。無職事，謂既無職而又不事事者。無職，乃九職之無常職也。冢宰謂之間民者。無職而轉移

執事。是仍有職業者也。鄭司農云，轉移爲人執事，若今傭賃也。故令出夫布。布泉也。謂出一夫之泉。閭師所任，卽冢宰所在。於農圃工商牧獮虞衡八者，皆任貢其物。於無職者云，出夫布者，蓋八者皆有物可貢。轉移執事之間民，但有一夫力征。故令出一夫之布。自凡任民至無職者出夫布爲一節。合之卽冢宰之九職，亦卽司會之九功。冢宰分其職，閭師徵其賦，司會給其用。不得但云八貢。下別言凡民不畜不耕不樹不蠶不績者。與載師凡宅不毛者節同。載師罰之，閭師則恥之。經於無職者，不云民，明與上八者合爲九職。賈沿注說，乃云其句下讀爲義。非也。至鄭以無職在九賦中，尤屬非是。案朱說是也。此經無職，與載師無職事者，義雖互通，而人實迥異也。

Chu Ta-chao's 朱大韶 explanation makes a distinction between 無職事者在 the section *Tsai-shih* and 無職者在 the section *Lü-shih*. The former are those who should not be considered as having a profession, and who are not in the employ of or service to anyone. The latter are those who are classified as having not of any regular profession, which is one of the nine professions or *chui-chih* and which pays *fu-fu* 夫布 as tax. Chu Ta-chao is quite right in the description of the latter, and we may take *chien-min* or people who had no regular profession as paying head tax in the form of *fu-fu*.

The problem here is the actual character of the taxes which we have seen so far. This character is the payment of taxes in kind; and with the exception of the previously mentioned *chien-min*, all taxpayers are giving the items which they themselves produce. On the other hand, in the case of *chien-min*, who are not apportioned according to their income, there is no doubt that the amount of tax is itself fixed. Within the fundamental taxation system of the *Chou-li*, *chui-fu* (including taxes on rice land) is being paid according to income, and the remaining payments are based on head taxes. From early times, there have been those who have argued the fact of the existence of a head tax in the *Chou-li*.

For example, Sun I-jang states under *Ta-tsai* as follows:

以九職任萬民者，任民以制國用之法也。黃以周云，九職者，任夫力也。任夫力以興功。故九職亦謂之九功。鄉大夫言，國中自七尺以及六十，野自六尺以及六十有五，皆征之。是九職任民之法。國語云，任力以夫，而議其老幼。謂此。閭師言，任農貢九穀，以至任虞貢其物。各以其所有穀物，以充力征。是九職徵賦之法。司會云，以九功之法，令民職之財用。謂此。

又云，周禮，民之受田地而不耕毛者，出里布屋粟，民之不受田地而無職事者，出夫家之征。皆示罰也。不以爲正稅。至孟子，言塵無夫里之布。則知戰國時，以成周所以罰惰民間民之征，爲經常之賦矣。

周初征民之常經，祇有九職九賦二法。而其國用之所仰給者，祇在九賦之一征。故九賦曰九正也。九職力征，祇以充府庫，以備非常之需。而里布夫家之征，特以禁閭惰之民。尤非國用之所待給也。周禮九職中，有貢九穀貢布帛二職。農貢九穀，不出布帛。獮貢布帛，不出九穀。非一人並征之。均人職云，凶札則無力征，無財賦。則經常之征，止有力賦兩稅，可知。

案，黃說是也。穀梁成元年傳云，古者立國家百官，具農工。皆有職以事上。桓寬

鹽鐵論本議篇云，古者之賦稅於民也，因其所工，不求其拙。農人納其獲，女工效其功。是有民則有職。有職則有功。九職者，謂任民以職事，其目有九也。民各以其力所能，受職而貢其功，以爲賦稅。故大府內府司會謂之九功。閭師謂之八貢。大府謂之萬民之貢，以充府庫。蓋任民之貢，不爲正賦。其率亦甚輕。故惟實府庫以其餘羨之用。下文九賦地稅，則爲賦法之正。大府以共九式之正法用。二者迥異，鄭以此爲正賦，對彼爲口賦，失之遠矣。

Huang I-chou's 黃以周 explanation makes clear the relationship between levying physical labor power (*corvée*) and collecting products in place of labor power. However, it is not certain as to the actual relationship between them. Is it that *corvée* taxation is the original form, and in kind payments a substitution? or do both forms exist side by side? It seems that the former is closer to reality, but in either case, those who were burdened with *ch'iu-chih* paid a head tax both in the case of professions (other than *ch'ên-eh'ieh* 臣妾 and *chien-min*) who submitted their products, and in the case of *ch'ên-ch'ieh* and *chien-min*, who submitted *fu-fu* payments.

There are also some additional points which I would like to make on the above commentary.

(a) Concerning *li-fu* 里布, *wu-su* 屋粟 and *fu-chia* 夫家, it is clear that these are being indicated for the purpose of punishing. However, it is not certain whether it was for punishing the lazy and jobless who existed during the Chou period, or it was established as one of the usual taxes levied in the period of the Warring States which succeeded the period of Chou. It is very probable that such forms of punishment may have been originated from the *Chou-li* itself.

(b) As seen previously in the *Ch'eng-i* commentary, the fundamental character of *ch'iu-fu* was taxation based on land. Also, taxes corresponding to *ch'iu-chih* was explained as a head tax, or in later times, *ting-shui* 丁稅 or head tax. Here females of a fixed age were also subjected to the head tax. It is interesting to note that from the Warring States period into the Han, women were also subjected to a head tax. (See Miyazaki Ichisada 宮崎市定, *Tax Systems of Ancient China* 古代中國賦稅制度, in: *Ajiashi Kenkyu* アジア史研究, Vol. I, p. 99; and my article entitled *On the suan-fu* 算賦 of the Han 漢時代の算賦制度, in: *Mikami Tsugio Hakase Shôjukinen Tôyôshi Kôkôgaku Ronshû* 三上次男博士頌壽記念東洋史考古學論集.)

As I will argue in a forthcoming paper on the taxation system of the Former Han, there were both income and head taxes, and these generally correspond to those of the *Chou-li*. (The character of the rice land income tax of the middle of the Former Han is markedly different, however.)

## II. The Tax 賦 at Customs and Markets.

In this chapter, I shall take up the income tax as levied at markets as

the main tax 正稅, which will supplement what I argued in the preceding chapter.

In the *Chou-li*, Bk. XV, under *Ch'an-jên* 塵人, the function of *tien-jên* is described as follows:

塵人，掌斂市歛布總布質布罰布塵布，而入于泉府。

Il est chargé de recueillir les droits payés en monnaie dans le marché, savoir: la monnaie de la toile, la monnaie payée par sommes (au terme du crédit fait par l'État), la monnaie sur les conventions écrites, la monnaie des amendes, la monnaie sur les boutiques, et il les remet au trésorier de la monnaie. (Tome I, p. 319-320.)

Among these taxes under the control of *ch'an-jên*, *chih-pu* 質布 means tax on *chih-chi* 質劑 or documents of contract, and *tz'u-pu* 歛布 and *ch'an-pu* 塵布 are explained by Sun I-jang as follows:

論讓案，孟子公孫丑篇，趙注云，塵，市宅也。蓋凡民居在里爲民宅。在市爲邸舍。其區域並謂之塵。此塵人所斂者，市中之塵布。故鄭偏舉貨物邸舍爲釋。邸舍，卽市宅也。詳敘宮疏。江永云，塵與歛異者，歛是賣物之肆，塵是停儲貨物之舍。賣者買者皆有之。今時謂之棧房。賣者肆中不能容，則停貨物於塵。買者當時不能卽運，又或儲之以待時鬻，亦須塵。此塵亦是官物。故當有稅。案江說固是。但市肆狹隘，止容販物商賈之家人。或於肆外近市之地別居者，則亦當納塵布，猶農民之受塵者有里布。則塵固不徒儲藏貨物之舍矣。

Here, Sun I-jang, quoting Chiang Yung 江永, explains *tz'u* as a shop in which merchants sell their wares, and *ch'an* 塵 as a building in which these merchants store their wares; and, because *ch'an* were public property, they should be subject to taxation. Whether or not *ch'an* constitute public property is not certain; however, concerning subjects other than this, Chiang Yung's understanding is not far off. In other words, Chiang is certainly correct in explaining *tz'u-pu* and *ch'an-pu* as taxes on shops and storage facilities.

As to *tsung-pu* 總布, Sun I-jang says as follows:

江永云，…總布者，貨賄之正稅。…閻師云，任商以市事貢貨賄。總布，正是貨賄之稅。又云，官獨以塵名者，舉塵以該肆也。五布惟總布最多。地稅有定。質劑物微。罰布無常。貨賄充物市塵，源源而至。非塵人所能盡稽。故必使每肆之肆長斂之，入於塵人。此總布是商賈之正賦。…案江說是也。

王與之云，總布，肆長總斂在肆之布也。貨入於肆，肆長隨其所貨之物，收其稅，總而計之。其數非一。謂之總布。

Chiang's explanation may be similar to that of Wang Yü-chih 王與之; that is, *tsung-pu* is a tax levied on merchandise 貨賄 being brought into the shops 肆.

However, when merchants carry on business in the markets, there is a market tax on the profit which they reap. The five types of tax managed

























Chêng Hsüan says about this passage, as has been quoted, 都鄙, 王子弟公卿大夫采地. 其界曰都鄙. 所居也, which is right. The *Chou-li*, Bk. XI, under *Hsiao-ssu-tu* 小司徒, writes:

乃經土地而井牧其田野. 九夫爲井. 四井爲邑. 四邑爲丘. 四丘爲甸. 四甸爲縣. 四縣爲都. 以任地事, 而令貢賦凡稅斂之事.

Il mesure les terres; il divise leurs champs et landes en terres à puits commun (*Tsing*), et terres de pacage (*Mo*). Neuf lots de cultivateurs forment un groupe à puits commun (*Tsing*); quatre *Tsing* forment une section (*Y*); quatre sections *Y* forment un *Khieou* (colline); quatre *Khieou* forment un *Tien*; quatre *Tien* forment un *Hien*; quatre *Hien* forment une réunion *Tou*. Ce mode de division sert à déterminer les travaux de la terre et à régler le tribut, la taxe, en général toutes les opérations relatives à la perception de l'impôt. (Tome I, pp. 226-227.)

Sun I-jang comments as follows:

凡造都鄙, 制其地域, 而封溝之者, 此畿內稍縣置三等采邑, 井田授地之法也. 縣師云, 凡造都邑, 量其地, 辨其物, 而制其域. 是制域爲縣師所職. 司徒則以法命之, 其封溝則封人匠人等爲之. 詳前疏. 賈疏云, 案載師職, 家邑任稍地, 小都任縣地, 大都任置地. 又下文小司徒職云, 四丘爲甸, 四甸爲縣, 四縣爲都, 家邑二十五里. 小都五十里. 大都百里. 是造都鄙制其地域也. 云以其室數制之者, 賈疏云, 其室在都邑之內, 而云制之者, 依其城內室數, 於四野之中, 制地與之, 謂若九夫爲井, 四井爲邑, 四邑爲丘, 四丘爲甸, 四甸爲縣, 四縣爲都之等, 是也. 沈彤云, 凡造都鄙, 制其地域而封溝之, 謂先量地定域也. 則都邑之大小, 正繫其地, 以其室數制之. 乃即域內之室數, 以爲縣鄙之屬, 使多寡與地邑相得, 民寡則徙之入, 民多則徙之出. 非計其室數, 以制都邑也. 案沈說是也.

This item explains that in the territories named *shao* 稍, *hsien* 縣, and *chiang* 置 of the imperial realm 王畿, *tu-pi* 都鄙 are set up, the land being divided among the people according to *ching-t'ien* system. I presume that Sun I-jang explains why the *ching-t'ien* system was carried out in *shao*, *hsien* and *chiang* in the following way: with respect to the nobility or *ch'ing* 卿, a *hsien* 縣 indicates their feudal lands or *hsiao-tu* 小都; these nobles hold lands on which an area of four *t'ien* 廛, which equal to a *hsien* is based on the land division of *ching-t'ien* system. According to the comments of Sun I-jang on *tsai-shih* 載師, a *ch'ing* 卿 received four *hsien*. As four *ching* 井, it equals to one *i* 邑 which measures two square *li*, four *hsien* coming to thirty-two square *li*. If uncultivable land 虛地 is added, the area of four *hsien* increases to forty square *li*. If excess land 餘地 is added, the area comes to a total of fifty square *li*. Therefore, according to the two-sided meaning of the term *hsien*, nobles hold *hsien* as one of *tu-pi* and its rice lands form the *ching-t'ien* system. The forgoing understanding pertains to

nobles called *kung* 公. In this case, feudal lands or *ta-tu* 大都 are *chiang* 薑, and four *hsien* which equals to one *tu* is the cultivable land area held by a noble of this rank. The same kind of things may be applied to *ta-fu* 大夫. Shên T'ung's 沈彤 interpretation may not be acceptable. Those called *ta-fu* 大夫, as well, follow a similar pattern of landholding. (In this case, their landholding, or *tien* 甸, are in *shao* 稍; and each *ta-fu* holds a cultivable area of four *ch'iu* 丘 = one *tien* 甸.) As to the above interpretation, there may be no question. And with respect to the actual form of the process indicated by the phrase 造都鄙, 制其地域, 而封溝之, the explanation by Shên T'ung 沈彤 is quite acceptable.

Concerning this land system, that is to say, the *ching-t'ien* system, Sun I-jang says under *Hsiao-ssu-tu* of the *Chou-li* Bk. X as follows:

云其制似井之字, 因取名焉者, 釋名釋州國云, 周制, 九夫爲井, 其制似井字也. 論語學而皇疏云, 名爲井者, 因夫間有遂, 水縱橫相通, 成井字也. 程璠田云, 屋三爲井, 井之名命於疆, 別九夫二縱二橫如井字也.

Anyway, the name *ching-t'ien* must have come from the resemblance of land division to the shape of character *ching* 井. Sun I-jang continues to say as follows:

論讓案, 衍沃之地可爲井者, 則平方如圖. 其不可爲井者, 則以九章方田之術步之, 使其分率均平, 則雖不如井字, 而步積之數, 亦相等也.

Sun I-jang explains here that areas not in the shape of the character 井 are still calculated so that total land area is the same as lands conforming to that shape. Assuming that the *ching-t'ien* system was actually put into operation, such an understanding has a certain correctness. Also, there are bound to be differences in fertility within the one hundred *mu* 畝. However, the system of *pu-i-t'ien* 不易田, *i-i-t'ien* 一易田 and *tsai-i-t'ien* 再易田 (as I will explain later, this system also existed in the *ching-t'ien* system of *kung-i* 公邑) in *tu* 都 and *pi* 鄙 eliminates such differences. Needless to say, the thinking about *i-t'ien* 易田 should be understood as a concept arising with the flow of the period. I will take up this point later.

Thirdly, the *ching-t'ien* system in *kung-i* 公邑 is explained by Sun I-jang under *Siao-ssu-tu* as follows:

以經攷之, 王城外二百里內, 六鄉六遂, 皆不爲井田. 四郊爲六遂之餘地. 縣師謂之郊里. 郊旣稱里, 則與鄉里同. 五五相任, 亦不爲井田. 載師云, 以公邑之田任甸地. 明四等公邑, 自內向外, 以甸爲始, 是六遂之餘地, 始爲公邑, 六鄉四郊之餘地, 皆不爲公邑也. 公邑稱邑, 卽以四井爲名. 則當以三三相任爲井田, 此云攷夫屋. 卽謂通溝洫井田之制, 鄉遂四郊, 則百畝爲夫, 十夫有溝. 六遂外之公邑, 則三夫爲屋, 三屋爲井也. 蓋小司徒, 爲地官之貳. 其職掌雖專主鄉郊, 而六遂公邑, 亦皆其所兼統. 故有攷夫屋之事. 據上經注, 謂大比兼受鄉遂邦國之比要. 則

公邑非其職掌所不及。可知，此經言比吏，但舉六鄉四郊，而不及六遂公邑者，文偶不具耳。鄭君不悟，以為鄉遂餘地，甸稍縣置之公邑，皆不為井田。故於此經不得其解。四等公邑制井田，互詳匠人疏。

In his commentary quoted earlier, we saw that Sun I-jang explains that while *hsiang* 鄉 is enclosed by *chiao* 郊, if taken separately, *chiao* should be considered outside of *hsiang*. In addition, he argues that there are *chiao* in the excess land 餘地 of *sui* 遂. At first glance, his interpretation of *chiao* and *sui* seems to be in opposition to each other, because collectively from the standpoint of the imperial realm there exist *hsiang* and *sui* and *chiao* becomes an area geographically situated within the excess land of *sui*. Functionally, however, *chiao* comes under *hsiang* as is shown from that *shang-t'ien* 賞田 within *remote chiao* 遠郊 is understood as 六鄉賞田. In the *Chêng-i* commentary above, there is *kung-i* 公邑 in the excess land of *six sui* 六遂. (There is no *kung-i* in the excess land of *hsiang* and *chiao*.) *Kung-i* in the broad meaning should be understood as consisting of *kung-i* in the narrow sense, *chia-i* 家邑, and *t'ien* of small *tu* 小都之田 and that of large *tu* 大都之田. Because *chiao* is a *li* 里 and *kung-i* is a *i* 邑, the former does not consist of *ching-t'ien*, but the latter does. This understanding is correct in the light of our previous discussion concerning the relationship between *hsiang*, *sui* and *tu*. Also concerning the duties of *hsiao-ssu-t'u* 小司徒, we should adhere to the understanding that as the adjutant to *ti-kuan* 地官之貳, he is in charge of the *kung-i* of *six sui* 六遂. (The actual location of *kung-i* is an entirely different problem, discussion of which we will omit here. We would like to add that theoretically within *kung-i* (in the narrow sense) the *ching-t'ien* system was carried out.)

By the way, the *ching-t'ien* system as described by Mencius is interconnected by both public and private landholdings. The period indicated by the *Chou-li's ching-t'ien* system is a period characterised by mainly private landholdings. While this may be true, still something like Mencius' public land 公田 or at least a later system of it could have in part existed at the time when the *Chou-li* was compiled. If so, then this version of public land would be intertwined with private land, thus opening up the possibility that the *ching-t'ien* system of the *Chou-li* indicates a similar system to that outlined by Mencius. However, while in the *Chou-li* the *ching-t'ien* system was instituted on public land or *kung-i*, it was not at all interconnected with private land. In the period indicated by the *Chou-li*, any possible connection between public and private land is no doubt completely devoid of any reality. In this sense, therefore, the political purpose of the imperial domestic state held by the *Chou-li*, to a certain extent, may be understood as having a sense of reality current with the times.

Fourthly, the *Chou-li*, Bk. XI, under *Hsiao-ssu-tu*, says, as quoted above, 乃經土地，而井牧其田野。Chêng Hsüan explains *ching-mu* 井牧 here mentioned as follows:

鄭司農云，井牧者，春秋傳所謂井衍沃，牧隰臯者也。玄謂，隰臯之地，九夫爲牧。二牧而當一井。今造都鄙授民田。有不易，有一易，有再易，通率二而當一，是之謂井牧，昔夏少康在虞思，有田一成。有豭一旅。一旅之豭而田一成。則井牧之法，先古然矣。

Sun I-jang writes on these comments as follows:

鄭司農云，井牧者，春秋傳所謂井衍沃，牧隰臯者也者，左襄二十五年傳，說楚蔣掩書九等土田之事，云度山林，鳩藪澤，辨京陵，表淳鹵，數疆潦，規偃豬，町原防、牧隰臯，井衍沃。杜注云，隰臯，水岸下溼，爲芻牧之地。衍沃，平美之地。則如周禮制以爲井田。云玄謂隰臯之地，九夫爲牧，二牧而當一井者，兼釋此經及左傳義也。

Sun I-jang also indicates K'ung An-kuo's interpretation of *i-t'ien* 易田, which is different from that of Chêng Hsüan.

王制孔疏云，按異義左氏說，山林之地，九夫爲度，九度而當一井。藪澤之地，九夫爲鳩，八鳩當一井。京陵之地，九夫爲辨，七辨而當一井。淳鹵之地，九夫爲表，六表而當一井。疆潦之地，九夫爲數，五數而當一井。偃豬之地，九夫爲規，四規而當一井。原防之地，九夫爲町，三町而當一井。隰臯之地，九夫爲牧，二牧而當一井，衍沃之地，九夫爲井。賦法積百井，除山川坑斥三十六井，定出賦者六十四井。

Let us look at the thinking expressed here concerning *i-t'ien* 易田. The above item from the *Tso-shih-chuan* 左氏傳 explains that the monarch, who is thought of as the head of the imperial household, attempts to form all the land appearing on a chart in his possession into a base for his direct ruling power. However, *i-t'ien* does not appear. Also, the *ching-t'ien* system (in the case of Mencius) cannot be thought of as including *i-t'ien*. If *i-t'ien* and *tsai-i-t'ien* were to enter into the system, in reality the *ching-t'ien* form of nine *fu* 夫 per one *ching* 井 would not be able to function completely. As quoted above, the *Chou-li*, Bk. XI, under *Hsiao-ssu-tu*, states:

乃經土地而井牧其田野。九夫爲井。四井爲邑。四邑爲丘。四丘爲甸。四甸爲縣。四縣爲都。以任地事，而令貢賦凡稅斂之事。(cf. p. 57)

And Chêng Hsüan comments on it as follows:

此制小司徒經之。匠人爲之溝洫。相包乃成耳。邑丘之屬相連比以出田稅。溝洫爲除水害。四井爲邑。方二里。四邑爲丘。方四里。四丘爲甸。甸之言乘也。讀如袁甸之甸。甸方八里。旁加一里，則方十里爲一成。積百井，九百夫。其中六十四井，五百七十六夫，出田稅。三十六井，三百二十四夫，治洫。

As to the *i* 邑, *chiu* 丘, *t'ien* 甸, etc. as a unit of area, as described in

both the *Chou-li* text and Chêng Hsüan's note, it was based on *pu-i-t'ien* 不易田. And as we saw previously in Sun I-jang's commentary, if *i-i-t'ien* 一易田 and *tsai-i-t'ien* 再易田 become involved in the system, then because of the land characteristics, there will occur many cases in which only the area size conforms without actually forming the 井-character shape. Such a fact, when viewed from the opposite perspective, shows that the *ching-t'ien* system as outlined above cannot easily accommodate *i-i-t'ien* and *tsai-i-t'ien*. In spite of this, *i-i-t'ien* and *tsai-i-t'ien* did become intertwined with the *ching-t'ien* system, probably due to the development both of the feudal state after the Warring States period, and of the imperial domestic state itself, a development which was brought about in most part by the reclamation and cultivation of bush and range lands.

The various reinterpretations of land seen in the above *I-i Tso-shih-shuo* 異義左氏說 commentary arose as a result of targetting as much as possible of the land in the emperor's chart for land taxes in an effort to increase income.

Sun I-jang says on the above passage of *Hsiao-ssu-tu* 小司徒 as follows:

案左傳孔疏，又引賈逵說。與異義左氏說同。即二鄭所本也。依異義及賈鄭說，則牧即一易之田。因以爲隰臯九夫之地。…書禹貢青州云，萊夷既牧。明萊田宜畜牧矣，云今造都鄙，授民田，有不易，有一易，有再易。通率二而當一。是之謂井牧者。

The explanation of Chia K'ui 賈逵 quoted by K'ung An-kuo 孔安國 is given in the *Tso-chuan* 左傳 under the twenty-fifth year of Duke Hsiang 襄公, which runs as follows:

賈逵云，下平曰衍。有漑曰澤。所指雖異，俱謂良美之田也。

Thus, Chia K'ui explains *i-i-t'ien* 一易田 as the rice field made on pasture land 隰臯. The idea of *i-i-t'ien* and *tsai-i-t'ien* 再易田 as appeared in the *Chou-li* may have arisen.

Sun I-jang says in his commentary of *Siao-ssu-tu* in connection with *tu-pi* 都鄙 as follows:

乃經土地而井牧其田野者，此都鄙井田之法也。賈疏云，此小司徒佐大司徒，掌其都鄙。都鄙則三等采地，是也。井方一里，兼言牧地。是次田二牧，當上地一井。授民田之時，上地不易，家百畝。中地一易，家二百畝。下地再易，家三百畝。通率三家受六夫之地。一家受二夫，與牧地同。故云井牧其田野。

This *ching-t'ien* system concerns its ultimate base, rice land, and at the same time *i-i* 一易 and *tsai-i* 再易 pasture lands. This was probably also indicated in the *Chou-li*. On such an occasion, if those who cultivated middle-quality-land 中地 and low-quality-land 下地 received pasture land, and then reclaimed this land into rice paddy, a great deal of labor power should have been required. As I will touch upon later, there was less labor power

available to those who cultivated middle-quality-land and low-quality-land than to those who cultivated high-quality-land 上地. From this point, it should not be difficult to conclude that a *ching-t'ien* system which included both *i-i* and *tsai-i* pasture land would be extremely difficult to establish. However, in spite of this, the historical background which enabled such a system, in other words the growth and development of the imperial domestic state, brought to the forefront the necessity of such a system.

Also Sun I-jang explains that *lai-t'ien* 萊田 seen in the *Yü-kung* 禹貢 under Ching-chou 青州 is land which should be utilized in raising domestic animals, which is related to the *Chou-li's* formula 易田=萊=牧, that is, land which is good for raising livestock. On this point, it is quite likely that for some reason Sun I-jang wants to interpret *shih-kao* 隰臯, pasture land or *ch'u-mu* 芻牧, as having the characteristics of *lai* 萊, that is, as cultivable land lying fallow.

Fifthly, I would like to point out the fundamental difference between the *ching-t'ien* system described by Mencius and that by the *Chou-li*. The *Chou-li*, Bk. XI, under *Hsiao-ssu-tu*, the *ching-t'ien* system is described as follows:

乃經土地，而井牧其田野。九夫爲井。四井爲邑。四邑爲丘。四丘爲甸。四甸爲縣。四縣爲都。以任地事，而令貢賦凡稅斂之事。(cf. p. 57)

As seen above, Chêng Hsüan identifies the *ching-t'ien* system as the land system applied to *tu-pi* 都鄙 and Sun I-jang is of the same opinion. Sun I-jang comments on the above passage of *Hsiao-ssu-tu* as follows:

江永云，井牧其田野，衍沃用井，隰臯用牧。有此通融之法。則凡高下偏邪之地，皆可以方田之算術齊之。無地不可井矣。但有公田，無公田。其制不能畫一。孟子，諸野九一而助，國中什一使自賦。是有通融之法。而小司徒惟言九夫爲井，未及論其中區之爲公爲私。載師，任地，近郊什一，遠郊二十而三，甸稍縣都，皆無過什二。似皆無公田。司稼巡野觀察，以年之上下出斂法。亦惟皆私田乃有不定之斂法。如行助法，則惟以公田之稼歸公，不必論年之上下矣。據司馬法，畝百爲夫，夫三爲屋，屋三爲井。而小司徒言攷夫屋，旅師言聚野之屋粟。是用夫三爲屋之法矣。用屋法，則非八家同井之法。案江說，是也。

此經井邑丘甸縣都，是徹法九家同井之井田。孟子所說，是助法八家同井之井田。助有公田。徹無公田。兩法形體雖同，而家數迥異。徹法以一井九百畝之田，分授九家。而載師以郊甸稍縣都地之遠近，司稼以年之上下，通校其差率而爲斂法。孟子滕文公篇，趙注謂徹法耕百畝者，徹取十畝以爲賦。殆未憭其制。

Concerning the quotation from Mencius: 請野九一而助，國中什一使自賦, I have already explained in my paper *Shé* 社 and *T'ien* 田, in the *Tôyô Gakuhô* 東洋學報, Vol. LVII, No. 3/4. In my opinion, the *chu* 助 refers to *chu-fa* 助法, which the taxation method of the Yin 殷 period, and the *fu* 賦 refers to *ch'é-fa* 徹法, the land tax method of the Chou 周 period.

(Here Chiang Yung 江永 is perhaps taking the latter as referring to *chu-fa* taxation as well.) In any case, Sun I-jang quoting Chiang Yung comments that in Mencius' *ching-t'ien*, distinctions were made between public land 公田 and private land 私田, but the rice lands of the *Chou-li* do not make such a distinction, all land being private land. Also, Sun I-jang comments that (when speaking fundamentally without utilizing the *t'ung-yu* 通融 method) the *Chou-li's* one *ching* 井 is cultivated by nine households and Mencius' one *ching* is cultivated by eight households; and this accounts for the distinction and non-distinction between public and private lands in Mencius and the *Chou-li* respectively. Roughly speaking, this is the fundamental difference between the two *ching-t'ien* systems (from an exterior aspect).

Of course, there are places where Sun I-jang's explanation in the *Chêng-i* commentaries should be supplemented and revised. One of those places concerns the statement about Mencius' *ching-t'ien* system: 其中區之爲公爲私. This refers to eight households cultivating ten *mu* 畝, each of the one hundred *mu* of public land located in the center of the *ching-t'ien's* nine hundred *mu* and presenting the harvest to the public entity 公, the remaining twenty *mu* (two and a half *mu* per household) to be used privately as residential land. However, what this really means is that, of the total nine hundred *mu* harvest, one hundred *mu* or 1/9 is submitted to the public entity 公. Related to this point Mencius states in the first part of chapter *T'êng-wên-kung* 滕文公 as follows:

夏后氏五十而貢，殷人七十而助，周人百畝而徹。其實皆什一也。徹者，徹也。助者，籍也。

The sovereign of the Hea dynasty enacted the fifty mow allotment, and the payment of a tax. The founder of the Yin enacted the seventy mow allotment, and the system of mutual aid. The founder of the Chow enacted the hundred mow allotment, and the share system. In reality, what was paid in all these was a tithe. The share system means mutual division. The aid system means mutual dependence. (*James Legge, The Chinese Classics*, London, 1861, Vol. II, pp. 116-117.)

Other *kung* 貢 and *ch'é* 徹, seventy and one hundred *mu* 畝 respectively mean both private land. The problem of whether or not the *chu* 助 taxation method of the Yin period was based on a *ching-t'ien* system has really never been taken up. From the fact of *one tenth* 什一 and that the *chu* method was carried out during this period, seventy *mu* was probably the total area of public and private land, and therefore a *chu* of *one tenth* would come to crops from sixty three *mu* of private land going to private use, and the harvest from seven *mu* of public land going into the public coffers. (In other words *one-tenth* equals to 7/70.) However the *chu* method

of the Yin period will not allow the establishment of a *ching-t'ien* system of the form: eight households cultivating one *ching* of public and private land.

Sun I-jang comments on the *chiu-i* 九一 system in his commentary on *Chiang-jên* 匠人 in the *Chou-li*, Bk. XIV, as follows:

金鶚亦云，九一爲助法。以九百畝而得一百畝也。若公田僅八十畝，是輕於九一矣。亦與孟子不合。五畝之宅，皆在邑中，猶今之村落。詩所謂中田有廬者，乃於田畔爲之，以避雨與暑，大不容一畝。必無二畝半之廣在公田之中也。案金說是也。

Sun I-jang is right when he says that Chin Ê 金鶚 is right. Now, we get the feeling that the differences between Mencius' and the *Chou-li's ching-t'ien* systems are mainly differences between historical periods. In other words, Mencius' system, being a system to be carried out on the plains, does not conjure up the concepts of *i-i* 一易 and *tsai-i* 再易 seen previously. Mencius also states in the second part of chapter *Kao-tzu* 告子 as follows:

孟子曰，今之事君者曰，我能爲君辟土地，充府庫。今之所謂良臣，古之所謂民賊也。

Mencius said, "Those who now-a-days serve their sovereigns say, 'We can for our sovereign enlarge the limits of the cultivated ground, and fill his treasuries and arsenals.' Such persons are now-a-days called 'Good ministers,' but anciently they were called 'Robbers of the people.' (*The Chinese Classics*, Vol. II, p. 316.)

Even if Mencius was a confucian scholar who turned back the flow of history, his opposition to the opening of the bush and the plains is also important. During the period and in the area in which Mencius lived, the opening of the bush and plains to agriculture was not as necessary to the feudal state and the ruler, being head of an imperial domestic state, as such reclamation was to the period indicated by the *Chou-li*. In this respect, Chia-Kung-yen 賈公彥 comments on the section *Hsiao-ssu-t'u* 小司徒 of the *Chou-li* states:

云凡稅斂之事者，采地之中，皆爲井田之法。一井之田，一夫稅入於官。故云稅斂之事。

Here, of one *ching* = nine hundred *mu* the income from rice land of one *fu* 夫 = one hundred *mu* is to be submitted to the appropriate public office as a tax. This must have based on the *ching-t'ien* system of Mencius, in which paddy of one hundred *mu* becomes public land, and the remaining eight hundred *mu* becomes private land. Sun I-jang is right when he criticizes Chia Kung-yen as follows:



云凡稅斂之事者，都鄙雖制井田，而此經則是徹法。無公田。一井九家，各受田百畝，而斂其什一之稅。賈疏釋稅斂，爲一井之田，一夫稅入於官。則是徹助爲一法。非經義也。

It goes without saying that Chia Kung-yen is wrong when he looks *ch'ê* 徹 as the same as *chu* 助.

## V. Corvée 徒役

I would like to establish here that the *t'u-i* as described in the *Chou-li*, Bk. XI, under *Hsiao-ssu-t'u* is a kind of corvée excluding the military service in the narrow sense of word and that the family to which the *t'u-i* is applied contains more than one young man for conscription.

In the *Chou-li*, Bk. XI, under *Hsiao-ssu-t'u*, it is said as follows:

凡起徒役，毋過家一人。以其餘爲羨。唯田與追胥竭作。

En général, quand on fait une levée pour un service collectif, on ne dépasse point un homme par famille. Les hommes excédants sont les supplémentaires, seulement pour les grandes chasses et pour les escortes, le service est général. (Tous doivent marcher à la réquisition de l'autorité.) (Biot, Tome I, pp. 223-225.)

Chêng Hsüan rightly comments on this as follows:

鄭司農云，田謂獵也。追，追寇賊也。竭作，盡行。

Then what does mean the term *t'u-i*? It means *i* named *t'u*, which consists of two kinds of *i*, named *t'ien* 田 and *ch'ui-hsü* 追胥. The *Chou-li*, Bk. I, under *T'ien-kuan chung-tsai* 天官冢宰, enumerates twelve *hsü* 胥 胥十有二人, and one hundred and twenty *t'u* 徒 徒百有二十人 (Biot, Tome I, p. 4), of which Chêng Hsüan comments as follows:

此民給徭役者。若今衛士矣。胥，讀如謂。謂其有才知爲什長。

In short, *t'u* means conscription for corvée. It is a kind of *wei-shih* 衛士 under the Han and it is also for hunting and thief catching. The *Chou-li*, Bk. IX, under *Wu-shih* 舞師, enumerates 下士二人, 胥四人, 舞徒四十人, of which Chêng Hsüan says 舞徒，給繇役，能舞者以爲之。The *wu-shih* is to be looked upon as a sort of *t'u*.

The *t'u* of *t'u-i* can mean several things, which will show that there are several kinds of *t'u-i*. The manual labour to be conscripted (military service excluded) is one of them. The *t'u-i* mentioned in the *Hsiao-ching in ancient characters* 古文孝經, under *Kui-mên* 闔門 XIX, as 子曰，闔門之內，具禮矣乎，嚴親嚴兄，妻子臣妾，繇百姓徒役也 will mean a manual labour conscription at

governmental offices. On the other hand, the *t'u-i* mentioned in the *Han-fei-tzu* 韓非子, Bk. XIX, under *Hsien-tzu* 顯子 XIX, as

今上尊貴輕物重生之士，而索民之出死而重殉上事，不可得也。藏書策，習談論，聚徒役，服文學而議說，世上必從而禮之。曰，敬賢士，先王之道也。

must be looked upon as meaning people who are studying Confucianism and the philosophy of *Mo-tzu* 墨子. In the *Hsiao-ssu-t'u* of the *Chou-li*, Bk. XI, it is stated as follows:

乃會萬民之卒伍而用之。五人爲伍。五伍爲兩。四兩爲卒。五卒爲旅。五旅爲師。五師爲軍。以起軍旅，以作田役。以比追胥，以令貢賦。

Il réunit la population par groupes de cinq et de cent hommes et l'emploie ainsi: Cinq hommes font une escouade *Ou*; cinq escouades font un peloton *Liang*; quatre pelotons font une compagnie *Tso*; cinq compagnies font un bataillon *Liu*; cinq bataillons font un régiment *Chi*; cinq régiments font un corps d'armée *Kiun*. Il divise ainsi la population pour former les troupes des corps d'armée, pour exécuter le service des grandes chasses, pour régler les escortes et suites, pour ordonner la perception des taxes. (Tome I, p. 222.)

Here, *chün-i* 軍役, *t'ien-i* 田役, and *chui-hsü* 追胥 for conscripts are meant. If we take into our consideration that only *t'ien-i* and *chui-hsü* are included in *t'u-i* 徒役 and that no military service have nothing to do with it, *t'u-i*, which consists of several kinds of *i* 役 or services, stands side by side with military service in the strict sense of word. And there are two kinds of services in *t'u-i*, of which one are *t'ien-i* and *chui-hsü* meant for all members of conscripts in a family and the other meant for just a single conscript. By the way, the *Chou-li*, Bk. XII, under *Ts'u-shih* 族師, states as follows:

若作民而師·田·行役，則合其卒伍，簡其兵器，以鼓鐸旗物，帥而至。掌其治令戒禁刑罰。

Si l'on fait agir le peuple pour une convocation d'armée, une chasse, une tournée impériale, une grande corvée, alors chaque chef de commune rassemble les groupes de cinq hommes, ses compagnies de cent hommes; il examine leurs armes et outils; avec le tambour, la clochette, le drapeau, le guidon, il vient à leur tête; il est chargé de les diriger, de leur faire observer les défenses, et de les punir. (Tome I, pp. 256-257.)

This statement concerns *i* in *Liu-hsiang* and Chêng Hsüan explains as 亦於軍，因爲卒長。 But *shih* 師, *t'ien* 田, and *hsing-i* 行役 should be looked upon as military services. Among others, *shih* means military service in the strict sense of word, while *t'ien-i* in broader meaning. With respect to *hsing-i*, Chia Kung-yen explains in his commentary on the *Chou-li*, Bk. XII, under

*Chou-chang* 州長, as follows: 行, 謂巡狩, 役, 謂役作. However, in this case it will be better to think of *chui-hsü* and, as I have clarified in my article *Households under the ching-t'ien system* 井田制の家 in the *Kodai Bunka* 古代文化, Vol. 24, No. 4, in each household there were usually two or three persons for conscripts.

Looking at it in this way, *i* 役 or *corvée* in the *Chou-li* includes both military service in the narrow sense and *t'u-i* 徒役 including military service in the broad meaning. The former takes as its draftees all conscripts. In relation to the household, all members of conscript status were to be drafted for military service. The *t'u-i* took as its object both those drafted into the former military service plus one member of conscript status from each household. Therefore, such households subjected to both types of service would include conscripts of a greater number than the actual number of conscript members.

The *Chou-i*, Bk. III, under *Kung-po* 宮伯, states as follows:

宮伯掌王宮之士庶子凡在版者。掌其政令，行其秩叙，作其徒役之事。授八次八舍之職事。若邦有大事，作宮衆則令之。月終則均秩，歲終則均敘。以時頒其衣裘。掌其誅賞。

Il est préposé aux guerriers d'élite et cadets du palais impérial, en général à tous ceux qui sont inscrits sur les rôles.

Il est chargé de leur commandement et direction. Il classe leurs rations et leurs grades. Il dispose l'ordre de leurs mouvements et de leurs opérations.

Il distribue les services des huit postes, des huit logements.

S'il y a un grand service d'urgence, requis pour l'état, on fait agir les troupes du palais. Alors il leur donne ses ordres.

A la fin de chaque lune, il répartit les rations. A la fin de l'année, il répartit les rangs.

Aux époques déterminées, il leur distribue les habillements simples, les habillements de peau. Il s'occupe de les punir et de les récompenser. (Tome I, pp. 68-70.)

The *t'u-i* mentioned here is explained by Chêng Hsüan as follows:

鄭司農云，庶子，宿衛之官。版，名籍也。以版爲之。今時鄉戶籍，謂之戶版。玄謂，王宮之士，謂王宮中諸吏之適子也。庶子，其支庶也。

and Sun I-jang comments as follows:

蓋周時凡貴族子弟，無論適庶，並謂之國子。師氏所教，保氏所養，諸子所掌者，是也。國子之中適者，謂之門子。小宗伯所掌者是也。其以才藝選擇爲宿衛，及給侍御守圍者，謂之士庶子，則無適庶之分。其備宿衛者，亦不必王宮內諸吏之子也。

凡士庶子或出於王族。其在侯國，謂之公族。故衛宏漢舊儀云，周千八百諸侯，其長伯爲君。次仲叔季爲卿大夫。其支屬爲士庶子。皆世官位，是也。或出於異姓卿大夫士子弟。若趙左師觸龍請以少子衛王宮，是也。綜校全經，士庶子內備宿衛，外從巡守，且歲時有饗。死傷有弔勞。職任既親，恩禮尤備。其爲貴游子弟，殆無疑義。象胥掌客敍庶子於士之下，皆單稱庶子。不連士爲文。則經之凡言士庶子者，所謂，士，卽上中下士。凡王族及群臣子弟既命而有爵者，如司士王族故士，是也。春秋繁露爵國篇說天子官制云，士入仕宿衛天子者，比下士。蓋卽指此。其未命者，下士一等，則與庶子在官者等，以其世家貴胄殊異之。故不曰庶人，而曰庶子。

I agree with Sun I-jang when he considers that sons of nobles, who are in the service of guarding imperial palaces, are called *shih* 士 when they were formerly nominated and *shu-shih* 庶士 when not yet. Anyway, the statement means that *shih* and *shu-shih* take charge of guarding the imperial palaces. As to their ranking, Sun I-jang rightly says as follows:

王引之云，秩敍，謂士庶子更番宿衛之次。第一月之次謂之秩，一歲之次謂之敍。故下文月終則均秩，歲終則均敍。均者，齊其勞逸。

Concerning *t'u-i* of *kung-po*, Chêng Hsüan says as follows: 作徒役之事，天子所用。And Sun I-jang comments on it as follows:

云作徒役之事，天子所用者，據諸子云，國有大事，則帥國子而致于天子，唯所用之。又云，凡國正勿及。是它官不得役國子。此宿衛士庶子，卽於國子中選擇用之。鄭意，宮伯雖專主宮中士庶子，與諸子通掌國子，不同。然庶子本屬天子。則天子有事，得役宮家。故據彼文爲釋。

Here *chu-tzu* 諸子 indicates the section of Bk. 31 of the *Chou-li* entitled *Chu-tzu*. This *chu-tzu* is an official who was in charge of military troops organized with *kuo-tzu* 國子. The meaning of Chêng Chung's note is as explained by the *Chêng-i* commentary. However, because there is a separate item 若邦有大事，作宮家則令之， specifying a time of national emergency, it is not necessary for the commentary to relate *t'u-i* to 天子所用, which should rather be connected to such national emergencies. In summing up what we have seen up until now, *t'u-i* business 徒役之事 should be understood as related generally to *su-wei* 宿衛 or guard duty. In addition, in the commentary Chia Kung-yen explains emergencies *k'ou-jung* 寇戎 or foreign invasion, but we should probably adhere to Sun I-jang who says 大事亦當兼大喪戎守及王巡守。殷國，士庶子從行，不徒大師也。互詳宮正疏。

The *Chou-li*, Bk. XIV, under *Chün-jén* 均人, states as follows:

均人掌...均人民牛馬車輦之力政，凡均力政，以歲上下，豐年則公旬用三日焉。中年則公旬用二日焉。無年則公旬用一日焉。凶札則無力政，無財賦。

... ils sont aussi chargés d'égaliser les services pénibles exécutés par les hommes, boeufs, chevaux, chars et chariots à bras.

En général, ils égalisent les services pénibles ou corvées, suivant que l'année est bonne ou mauvaise. Si l'année est bonne, on prend trois jours pour la décade du prince; si l'année médiocre, on prend deux jours pour la décade du prince; si l'année est nulle ou sans récolte, on prend seulement un jour pour la décade du prince.

S'il y a une calamité publique, une épidémie, alors il n'y a ni service de corvées, ni prélèvement de la taxe sur les produits; . . . (Tome I, pp. 289-291.)

Concerning *kung-hsün* 公旬 in this passage, Sun I-jang says as follows:

江永云，公旬者，公家力役之程日也。力役以旬計。左傳宣十一年，楚令尹薳艾獵城沂，三旬而成，不愆于素。定元年，士彌牟營成周，量事期，三旬而畢。公旬卽此旬字。舊讀均。非。是力役或一旬二旬三旬。而一夫不過三日。三日之外，他役代之。案江讀是也。王昭禹，陳祥道，鄭鏜，方苞，王引之，並讀旬如字。與江略同。蓋鄉師大役，有役要。亦案日校計，旬者日之小成，宰夫所謂旬終則令正日成，是也。役要計日受功。故亦謂之公旬。依江說，則不論公役之多少，而一人一年，止用三日二日一日。與王制及賈申鄭義並合。於義爲允。大戴禮記王言篇，亦有使民之力，歲不過三日之文。蓋力役大小遲速，不能豫定。而一人應直之役，歲必以三日爲正。其中興發，亦自有更遞及顧代之法。不慮其廢事而厲民也。

As is shown here, Chiang Yung 江永 denies Chêng Hsüan's insistence that *hsün* 旬 should be understood as *chün* 均; and basing on the passage of the *Tso-shih-chuan* 左氏傳 argues that *kung-hsün* 公旬 is *li-i* 力役 paid to the imperial family. This is probably the correct use of the character 旬. Also, concerning the maximum yearly service of three days per person, Chiang Yung seems to be saying that there were other types of corvée levied as a substitute when necessary. While accepting Chiang Yung's explanation, Sun I-jang indicates that public offices would, according to labor needs, transfer personnel and hire workers. Whether or not this is what Chiang Yung was thinking of or not remains a problem; however, from the viewpoint of the realities of Han history, such a substitution of corvée certainly becomes a possibility. (See my article *On Corvée in the Former Han* 前漢時代の徭役について in *Hōseishi Kenkyū* 法制史研究, No. 25.)

It has become the general understanding that the use of the people's labor in the period of Saint Kings 聖王 was limited to a mere three days per person per year. In the *Chou-li*, however, three days per person per year pertains to the corvée described above as *niu-ma ch'ê-nien* 牛馬車輦, and these three days prescribe a maximum. In the *Chou-li*, in addition to such corvée there is also *chün-i* 軍役 and *t'u-i* 徒役. The scholar of the Former Han, Tung Chung-shu 董仲舒 explains that in ancient times, three days were demanded for military service in the strict sense, and that this service developed into what was known in the Former Han as military service in

both the broad 正 and narrow 軍役 meanings, as well as local *ken-tsu* 更卒. While this indicates the system of corvée during the Chin and Former Han (See *ibid.*), in terms of the above corvée system of the *Chou-li*, this corresponds approximately to military service in the narrow sense 軍役 and the broad sense of *t'u-i* 徒役 which included both *t'ien-i* 田役 and *chui-hsü* 追胥 corvée; and possibly a local corvée of various kind 力役 in times of necessity.

Now, in the *Shih-hua-chih* 食貨志 of *Sui-shu* 隋書, Bk. XXIV, the following statement is made in connection with the institution of corvée established by T'ai-tsu 太祖 (reg. 535-556) of the Northern Chou 北周.

司役掌力役之政令，凡人自十八以至五十有九，皆任於役。豐年不過三旬。中年則二旬。下年則一旬。凡起徒役，無過家一人。

Here three days 三日, two days 二日, one day 一日 in the *Chou-li* is changed to as thirty, twenty and ten days respectively. This system of *li-i* 力役 was perhaps succeeded by the Northern Chou 北周. In the Western Wei 魏, the predecessor of the Northern Chou, the military draft system (later adopted by the first Emperor of the northern Chou) enlisted all people of *t'ing-nan* 丁男 status for a total of two months out of the year. (See my article *The Military Draft System of the Northern Court* 北朝の丁兵制について, in *Tôhōgaku* 東方學, No. 32.) The above *li-i* corvée and *chün-i* or military service each display differences in their characteristics. Perhaps, too, in the Northern Chou there was a separate military service in the narrow sense, in addition to a *t'u-i* and *li-i*.