

100 mou or 1 ch'ing.

p. 6

p. 8 bottom - p. 14

pp. 12-14

- differences from ① diligence in cultivation

② land/pop. ratios

③ fertile or infertile land

④ fallow system 代田

pp. 26-34

斗角斗 system in decimal units
結算 system

p. 30/15 squares

p. 40 42 land survey system

莊憲 元, 張昉 (4-9812: 600) ① 證

“ “ 右. 唐, 順宗 ① 右, 王右 7-20823-390.

康靖: 宋, 趙槩 (10-32171-61) ① 證

宋, 王貽永 (7-20823-112)

元, 孟夢相 3-6960-338

明, 鄒華榘 11-39562-“

→ “ “ 皇帝: 西夏, 李承康帝 6-14459-
p. 1927

“ 先生 宋, 崇大年 4-8152 p. 228.

(indented section). Also I note that in ancient times everyone who received land got (obtained) 100 mu, but in the case of the families of the sadaebu (scholars and officials) they also had ts'ai-ti (米地) and hereditary salary land (shih-lu-t'ien, serokchŏn 世禄田), and these ~~xx~~ ch'aeji (ts'ai-ti) and salary lands also only allowed (the recipient) to receive the income from public taxes (kongse 公税) and that was all (i.e. PREBENDS). Under this system there were no problems deriving from increases or reductions in the amount of land received (granted), nor were there problems involved in the registering of soldiers or in people moving (from one place to another) and changing (residence). It was an extremely well ordered system, but in later ages (huse) with regard to the appointment of people to office and their promotion or demotion there was no law establishing the grant of prebends (sikse 食税: allocation of tax revenues to scholar-officials) for the situation was such that it was difficult to carry out. If (however) you wanted to use this system without restoring feng-chien (feudalism), you then would not be able to avoid opening the opportunity for (the creation) of the hereditary ministers of the Spring and Autumn period (ch'un-ch'iu shih-ching

9:1:7a

春秋世卿

). Therefore at the present time I am adopting along with (the principles of the ancient system?) (kyŏmch'wi 兼取) the limited land system (hanjŏnbŏp 限田法), according to which people who are Confucian scholars (yusa 儒士) or higher (in rank and status) will be granted additional amounts of land (over the base grant of 100 myo) and will be exempted from military service (myŏn ki ch'ulbyŏng 免其出兵).

(f.n.: Someone might say: The limited field system (hanjŏn) is really appropriate, but even though it suits the circumstances to grant a scholar (sa) 4 kyŏng of land, people with rank 9 (through 7) 6 kyŏng, people with ranks 6 (through 4) 8 kyŏng, people with ranks 3 (through 2B) 10 kyŏng, and people with rank 2A and up 12 kyŏng, nevertheless since incumbent office-holders already have p'umnok (品禄: salaries by rank) in order to distinguish higher from lower (ranked official), then the land grant is basically for the

adaptation -
of 限田 and
land grant system
(as in will fields)
+ 限田 feature
to take that place
of 米地 and
世禄田 =
定田有加
add'l land grants

is necessary, and a

in this situation

9: 1:7a) support of their families and that is all. It is too great a problem to have too many bothersome categories of land grants, so how would it be if (we only established three categories) and provided scholars (sa) and people with ranks 7-9 with 4 kyöng, people with ranks 6 to 3 ~~wixix~~ with ⁸ 8 kyöng, and people with rank 2 and higher with 12 kyöng, using 4 kyöng as the basis for one class, thus simplifying the grades and categories?

(I would reply) that there is no harm in doing it that way.

-Someone might say: Is it justifiable to provide extra grants of land to those who are scholars or higher (i.e. ranked officials) since they are not engaged in agriculture?

To this I would reply: The reason why it works out this way is because I am adopting the limited field system (hanjõnbõp). After it is carried out, then we could allow family members (solchõng 率丁) to maintain the family (livelihood). If you do not grant land (to these people), then the officials (state) would be obliged to grant salaries, but it would not be appropriate to grant monthly salaries to those ~~ex~~ people who are not employed in the service of the kong (公 :state, public). According to my understanding of the intention of the ancient (system), we ought to copy the principle of sikchae (食采 : granting prebends) and in accordance with the precedent of royal grants of tax (collection rights) (hasa se ryõl 下賜稅例) estimate and establish prebends (sikse 食稅) for everyone from the Confucian scholars (Yusa) up, to the taebu-gyõng (大夫卿: highest ministers of state). Confucian scholars and men with official ranks 7 through 9 (would receive these prebends) only for their own lifetime. (subnote: If the recipient has no sons, then after his death his wife would inherit/his prebend only for her own lifetime.). In the case of those with rank 6 and higher, they and their sons (would retain the prebend for their lifetimes). In the case of taebu and kyõng (high ministers?), the prebend would be retained by their grandsons or great-grandsons.

land salaries or prebends



9:17a) (However), if we did it this way, then/the taxable land (sejön 稅田) of the whole country would end up (in the hands of) the families of the sadaebu and the state would not have enough for its expenses. If you do not propose to restore the feng-chieng system and only want to adopt (the prebendal system), then small parcels of land set aside for prebendal tax grants (sikse chi chi 食稅之地) will be spread and scattered over a thousand or ten thousand places, and each of them will be assigned (1:7b) to a thousand or ten thousand individuals. Not only will this cause great bother at the time when allotments are to be raised or eliminated in terms of registration, much more than if we were to grant land (küpchön 給田), but also ~~every~~ every year when there is crop damage the peasants will hope for adjustments, and this will necessarily result in the problem of inequalities in the taxes levied on the people. And if it becomes an established custom, then after a long time goes by we definitely will be plagued by the gradual increase of tax burdens on the people, and this is the greatest harm that could befall the country. It would be better not to carry out a land system (i.e. land reform) at all. How could this help but be a major cause for concern?

Moreover, in past ages when reforms were tried, when the people suffered from war and privation, there were cases when the king made grants of half the cho (租) tax on minjön (民田 :people's land), but if this method were adopted, than in the manner of the (above-described) problems, there would be a number of inconveniences in implementing it.

Generally speaking, the management of land (ch'ijön 治田) and the payment of (land) taxes (ch'ulse 出稅) and royal tribute (kongsang 貢上) is the responsibility of the "men of the fields" (yain 野人 :from Mencius? the peasants). Studying the Way, performing their (official) tasks, and consuming taxes (sikse 食稅) is the job of the sa (scholars) and kunja 士君子 (chün-tzu) (also from Mencius?). This is thus a universal principle and also the intention of the ancients. However, in ancient times they granted fiefs (feng-chien)

9:1:7b) according to which the families who had ts'ai-i^{bejs} (米邑) and
 prebends (sikse, shih-shui 食稅) were also in charge of the governance
 of the people on their land, or entrusted it to their chi-jen (kiin 其人 :
 pyōng chaek chi kiin 并責之其人) (subnote: Even though the kiin
 were public servants, the court ordered their household heads to manage (land)
 in their place, as in the case where a family of a hundred chart^{ts} (was
 absorbed into) a state of 1,000 chariots. And if the state (konka 公家)
 had some use (for them), it also would have the kiin take care of it.) (end subnote)