

SOME RECENT EDITIONS OF THE CH' IEN-HAN-SHU

by M. A. N. LOEWE

The *Han-shu* is in many ways the best known work in the corpus of Chinese dynastic histories. It has been subject to the study and criticism of Chinese scholars for some two thousand years, and has frequently featured in the voluminous output of China's official and private printing houses. Stylistically the book has had no small effect on subsequent historical writing; and thanks to the labours of a few sinologues in recent years, historians of the West are now in a position to appreciate parts of this history in translation. The publication of a newly printed edition of the complete work calls for comment.¹

In the new edition the basic text of the history and the notes of Yen Shih-ku 顏師古 (581-645) are presented with a full punctuation of a Western type. Sentences are divided by means of commas, colons and full-stops; speeches, and citations that are made in the notes from other sources, are suitably distinguished with inverted commas; and side lines have been printed alongside proper names. Usually the chapters have been divided into short sections, which are followed by the appropriate notes of Yen Shih-ku; exceptionally (e.g., chapters 13 to 20, which consist of tables) these notes are incorporated in the body of the text, in the traditional manner. At the end of each chapter the editors have appended their own notes (*chiao-k'an-chi* 校勘記) which are concerned with the collation of various editions of the text; where necessary, they cite from the comments that are included in Wang Hsien-ch'ien's edition,² and from the *Han-shu-k'uei-kuan* 漢書窺管 of Yang Shu-ta 楊樹達 (Peking, 1955). The style of the edition is uniform with that of a punctuated text of the *Shih-chi* 史記, which was published by the same press in 1959, on the basis of Ku Chieh-kang's 顧頡剛 punctuation.

A number of features render these eight volumes easy to handle. Both the large type used for the text and the smaller type of the notes are easily legible. In general, ample spacing is left between the columns, but a better and clearer arrangement could perhaps have been devised to distinguish the

¹ *Han-shu* 漢書, published by the *Chung-hua-shu-chü* 中華書局 Peking, 1962, in eight volumes.

² See s.v. edition No. 7, below.

original comments (probably by Pan Ku 班固) from the place-names that are listed in the text of Chapter 28. Figures are used to indicate the positions in the text to which Yen Shih-ku's notes refer, and a single pagination runs throughout the book. The paper is of considerably better quality than that used in Chinese book-production a few years ago, and the text is preceded by facsimile reproductions of five earlier prints of the *Han-shu*;³ unfortunately there is no indication of the actual size of these pages. The punctuation of the text of this edition was undertaken by members of the historical section of the University of the North-West, who remain anonymous. The notes concerning the collation of the text were written by Fu Tung-hua 傅東華.

The main interest of this edition lies in the choice of text that has been followed and the methods of collation that have been adopted. An account of the surviving fragments of manuscript copies and the prints of the *Han-shu* that were made before the Ch'ing period has been provided elsewhere⁴ by Mr. Kurata Junnosuke 倉田淳之助, and it is not proposed to present a comprehensive list of the various editions here. The following notes are intended solely as a guide to the use of the principal editions which are easily available to students.

In general it is possible to discriminate between two groups of prints, in which the following editions are concerned (the figures given in parentheses are used for purposes of reference below):

- | A | B |
|--|---|
| (1) <i>Ching-yu</i> 景祐
edition, 1035 | |
| (2) <i>Chien-an</i> 建安
edition, 1195-1200 | |
| (3) Ming <i>Nan-chien</i> 南監
edition, 1529-1533 | |
| | (4) <i>Chi-ku-ko</i> 汲古閣
edition, 1641 |
| (5) <i>Wu-ying-tien</i> 武英殿
edition, 1739 | |
| | (6) <i>Chin-ling</i> 金陵
edition, 1869 |
| | (7) Wang Hsien-ch'ien's
edition, 1900 |

From an early stage it was found that the text of the *Han-shu* presented readers with some difficulty, and explanatory notes were written by scholars

³ Editions Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, and 7 that are discussed below.

⁴ In *Tōhō Gakuhō* (Kyoto), number 27, March 1957, pp. 235 f.

such as Ying Shao 應劭 (c. 140-206) and Fu Ch'ien 服虔 (c. 169-189), who lived at no great interval after the work's completion. It is possible that an attempt to produce an annotated copy of the book, with notes inserted immediately after the point of difficulty, was made by Ts'ai Mo 蔡謨, who lived from 281 to 356; and one of the manuscript fragments of the *Han-shu* that were found at Tunhuang may possibly be part of a later copy of such an edition.⁵ Such fragments derive from a number of different copies of the *Han-shu*, and were probably written in the T'ang period. At least one fragment,⁶ which can probably be dated in the reign of T'ai Tsung (627-649), carries the commentary of Yen Shih-ku (581-645); other fragments with this commentary may exist in various collections in Japan.

The importance of Yen Shih-ku's commentary has long been recognised. His notes have constituted the first "standard" commentary on the *Han-shu*, and they have been included regularly in the editions that have been produced from Sung times until now. As Yen's work was probably completed by 641,⁷ the manuscript fragment mentioned above may be of almost contemporary origin. Yen Shih-ku set out to collect and incorporate the notes of some twenty scholars, written both before and after the time of Ts'ai Mo, and including some suggestions that had been made by his uncle, Yen Yu-ch'in 顏游秦. The source or authority of the opinions given is not always cited. Yen Shih-ku also claims to have discerned a number of instances in which the archaic characters of the original *Han-shu* had been altered, simplified or corrupted during the passage of time, and to have restored these to their original forms.

Kurata⁸ discriminates between no less than fifteen prints of the *Han-shu* that were put in hand during the Sung period. The two earliest of these, dated in 994 and 1005, were ordered by imperial decree, and no surviving parts have been traced. An edition cut in 1035 constitutes the earliest surviving print (No. 1), and is frequently termed the *Ching-yu* edition. The print was made following a request of Yü Ching 余靖, who had noticed the existence of errors in the printed copies of both the *Han-shu* and the *Hou-Han-shu*; Yü Ching was duly ordered to collate the variants of existing texts. The *Ching-yu* edition has been generally available to scholars since 1930, when it was included in the *Po-na-pen* 百衲本 series of reprints (*Ssu-pu-ts'ung-k'an*). The copy used for reproduction was complete except for two chapters and a few pages, but it included no preface or table of contents; at the end there is a colophon written by Yü Ching. Yen Shih-ku's commentary is included, and at the end of a few chapters (e.g.,

⁵ See Kurata, *loc. cit.*, p. 260.

⁶ Pelliot No. 2513.

⁷ See the notes which follow the preface, folio 1a, in edition No. 5.

⁸ Kurata, pp. 263-279.

30, 40, 49, 65) Yü Ching appended notes written by a scholar whose given name was Pi 秘; the identity of this writer is discussed below, in connection with edition No. 2.

The *Ching-yu* edition was one of the works used in the preparation of edition No. 2, which was made as part of a project in which the *Shih-chi*, *Han-shu* and *Hou-Han-shu* were reprinted, during the *Ch'ing-yüan* period 慶元 (1195-1200). The names of Liu Chih-wen 劉之問 (style Yüan-ch'i 元起) of Chien-an 建安 prefecture, and Huang Tsung-jen 黃宗仁 (style Shan-fu 善夫) are associated with different parts of these prints, and this edition of the *Han-shu* is variously referred to as Liu Chih-wen's edition, the *Chien-an* edition, or the *Ch'ing-yüan* edition. A copy which had belonged to Chou Shou-ch'ang 周壽昌 (1814-1884) is mentioned in the entry for the *Han-shu* in Mo Yu-chih's 莫友芝 *Lü-t'ing-chih-chien-ch'uan-pen-shu-mu* 邵亭知見傳本書目 (preface dated 1873).⁹ It is not known whether this is the same copy as one which was formerly held in the *Mu-hsi-hsüan* 木犀軒 collection of Li Sheng-to 李盛鐸 (1860-1937), and which is now held in the University library, Peking.¹⁰ A copy which has been kept in the possession of the Uesugi 上杉 family, of the Yonezawa 米澤 clan, was critically examined and photographed by Hiranaka Reiji 平中荅次, Uchida Tomoo 內田智雄, Mizuzawa Toshitada 水澤利忠, and Oba Osamu 大庭脩 in August 1956, and it is principally thanks to Hiranaka's report¹¹ that details of this edition are available. A facsimile of part of the print has appeared in Uchida's edition of *Han-shu* chapter 23;¹² the sister print, of the *Shih-chi*, has been reproduced in the *Po-na-pen* (*Ssu-pu-ts'ung-k'an*) series.

The value of the *Chien-an* edition lies in its incorporation of a number of commentaries. At the time when the *Ching-yu* edition was being prepared, Sung Ch'i 宋祁 (998-1061; posthumous title Ching-wen 景文), co-editor with Ou-yang Hsiu 歐陽脩 of the New T'ang history, had been engaged in studying the text of the *Han-shu*.

Being at that time posted to the history office, Sung Ch'i was apparently not concerned with the production of the *Ching-yu* edition, and his own researches were not completed before 1035. In all probability Sung's notes were first included in a printed edition of the *Han-shu* in the *Chien-an* print, whose preface acknowledges the inclusion of Sung's work, and

⁹ For the ownership by Chou Shou-ch'ang, see Wang Hsien-ch'ien's preface to edition No. 7, 2b.

¹⁰ See Kurata, p. 274, and Hummel, *Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing period*, p. 520. The catalogue of the *Mu-hsi-hsüan* collection was made by Li Shih-to 李世鐸 in 1937.

¹¹ First published in 1958 by the Harvard-Yenching-Dōshisha Eastern Cultural Lectures' Committee, Kyoto; reprinted as a supplementary chapter in Hiranaka's *Chūgoku kodai no denshi to zeihō* 中國古代の田制と税法, Kyoto, 1961. References given below are to the reprint.

¹² Uchida Tomoo, *Kanjo keihōshi* 漢書刑法志, Kyoto, 1958.

provides a list of fifteen named books which had been at his disposal; this list includes the *Ching-yu* print of 1035.¹³ The preface names a further fourteen books which were used in the preparation of the *Chien-an* edition, including the *Han-shu-yin-i* 漢書音義 of the Sui writer Hsiao Kai 蕭該 and the *San-Liu-Han-shu-piao-chu* 三劉漢書標注. This latter consisted of comments written by three members of the Liu family of Hsin-yü 新喻, who lived in the second half of the eleventh century: Liu Ch'ang 劉敞, whose scholarship was highly respected by no less a figure than Ou-yang Hsiu; his younger brother Liu Pin 攸, who was co-author of the *Tzu-chih-t'ung-chien* with Ssu-ma Kuang 司馬光, and responsible for the section of that work which concerned the Han period; and Liu Ch'ang's son Liu Feng-shih 奉世, whose forte was the study of the *Han-shu*.

Both these works have since been lost, and the citations that appear in the *Chien-an* edition are fuller than those which appear in later prints. For this reason, edition No. 2 may be of unique value. It is also to be noted that Liu Chih-wen, like Yen Shih-ku, had attempted to restore the ancient forms of characters for which contemporary or popular forms had been substituted.¹⁴

Sung Ch'i identified the unknown writer Pi as Chang Pi 張泌, and this identification has been accepted by Wang Hsien-ch'ien.¹⁵ Possibly this is the Chang Pi who featured in an incident in 988-9, when a dispute arose regarding the wording of a posthumous title.¹⁶ Different sides were taken by Chang Pi and Chang Chi 張洎, and the imperial decision was pronounced against Chang Pi, who was consequently punished. At an earlier stage in his career, Chang Chi had served at one of the courts of the *Wu-tai*, and had acquired an extensive library. His grandson, Chang Kuei 瓌 (style T'ang-kung 唐公), is mentioned as the owner of a T'ang? manuscript copy of the *Han-shu*, which had been available for consultation to Sung Ch'i.¹⁷

Edition No. 2 formed the basic copy for the preparation of several prints of the Sung and Yüan periods.¹⁸ In addition, it was used in the

¹³ The authenticity of Sung Ch'i's work has been brought into question by Ch'üan Tsu-wang 全祖望 (1705-1755), but it has been accepted by Ch'ien Ta-hsin 錢大昕 (1728-1804), Wang Ming-sheng 王鳴盛 (1722-1798) and Wang Hsien-ch'ien (see Wang's preface to edition No. 7, 3b). Hiranaka (pp. 12 f.) shows that a number of comments of later scholars have been falsely accredited to Sung Ch'i in the extant versions of his notes.

¹⁴ See Liu Chih-wen's statement, as cited by Wang Hsien-ch'ien in edition No. 7 (preface, 4a, b) and in Hiranaka, p. 12.

¹⁵ See Wang's preface to edition No. 7, 2a and 6a.

¹⁶ See Kurata, p. 275. For biographies of Chang Pi and Chang Chi, see *Sung-shih*, chapters 267 and 330.

¹⁷ See edition No. 7, preface 2b.

¹⁸ E.g., see Kurata, pp. 277-8, items 11 and 12.

Ming sponsored *Nan-chien-pen* 南監本 (edition No. 3), which was prepared by the National Academy of Nanking, under the editorship of Chang Pang-ch'i 張邦奇 (posthumous title Wen-ting 文定) and Chiang Ju-pi 江汝璧. Various dates between 1529 and 1533 appear in different parts of the edition, which was also re-issued during the *Wan-li* period (1573-1619). Copies of the print are available in Peking, Taipei and in several libraries in Japan.¹⁹ In 1597 a further sponsored edition, the *Pei-chien-pen* 北監本 was issued; this was in turn based on the text of No. 3, but a different format was adopted. The notes that were included in edition No. 2 were duly copied in No. 3 and in the *Pei-chien-pen*, but in neither case completely. Moreover, although Liu Chih-wen's name is rendered correctly in the *Pei-chien* edition, in No. 3 it appears as Liu Chih-t'ung 同; this error led to further corruption in the Ch'ing period, when the third character was sometimes given as 岡.

The line of textual transmission which can thus be traced from 1035 to 1529 was continued with the publication of the Palace edition of the twenty-four histories in 1739 (the *Wu-ying-tien-pen* 武英殿, edition No. 5). This edition has been widely acclaimed by scholars, and has been praised by Kurata as being the best edition available for general use.²⁰ Facsimile or lithograph copies that have been made of this print include those of the *T'ung-wen-shu-chü* 同文書局 (1884), and the *Han-fen-lou* 涵芬樓 press (1916). Two well-known and widely used editions of the *Han-shu* (*Ssu-pu-pei-yao* and *K'ai-ming-shu-tien*) were made by re-printing the text, and there are also several rather poor reprints, in which the original format has been retained. The *T'ung-wen-shu-chü* edition was used in the Harvard-Yenching Institute's index of the *Han-shu*, and part of this text has been reproduced in Dr. Swann's translation of Chapter 24.²¹ Edition No. 5 is sometimes termed the *Tien-pen* 殿本 or the *Kuan-pen* 官本;²² Dubs refers to it as the *Palace edition* or the *Official edition*.

The format of this edition follows that of the *Pei-chien* print of 1597, but the text is derived from edition No. 2. Hiranaka has observed a number of discrepancies between the two editions, and cites occasions when long passages of Yen Shih-ku's notes, or those of later commentators, are less complete in No. 5 than they are in No. 2.²³ The work of editing this edition was entrusted to Ch'i-Shao-nan 齊召南 (1706-1768) and others;²⁴ while

¹⁹ E.g., the *Library of the Cabinet*, Tokyo; and the *Institute of Humanistic Studies*, Kyoto.

²⁰ Kurata, p. 284.

²¹ N. L. Swann, *Food and Money in Ancient China*, Princeton, 1950.

²² E.g., by Wang Hsien-ch'ien.

²³ See Hiranaka, p. 15.

²⁴ The names of ten scholars, other than Ch'i Shao-nan, that are given in the colophon of edition No. 5 include Ch'en Hao 陳浩 whose notes are cited and Tung Pang-ta 董邦達 (1699-1769) the painter, who had obtained his degree in 1733, very shortly before the completion of edition No. 5.

the notes of Yen Shih-ku and the Sung commentators are interspersed in the text of the book, the remarks of the Ch'ing editors, which concern textual differences and problems of interpretation, are given at the end of each chapter under the description *k'ao-cheng* 考證.²⁵

The text of a preface (*hsü-li* 敍例) which appears in edition No. 5 also appeared in Nos. 2 and 3, but it is not seen in the *Ssu-pu-ts'ung-k'an's* facsimile of No. 1. In some of the prints or copies that have been derived from No. 5 this preface is given at the end of the book (e.g., in the *Ssu-pu-pei-yao* print). An abbreviated citation from this preface occurs in Yü Ching's colophon to edition No. 1, and the citation is attributed there to Yen Shih-ku.²⁶ Liu Chih-wen and Wang Hsien-ch'ien both refer to the preface as being Yen Shih-ku's work,²⁷ but the present text also incorporates a list of commentators which probably derives from Yü Ching's colophon.²⁸ It is not known at what stage, or in what circumstances, Yen Shih-ku's preface and part of Yü Ching's list were joined together as consecutive text.

A second group of editions can be traced from the print of the *Han-shu* that was included in Mao Chin's 毛晉 *Chi-ku-ko* 汲古閣 edition of seventeen dynastic histories (edition No. 4). This print was dated in 1641, and includes the comments of Yen Shih-ku and Chang Pi only; Yen Shih-ku's preface is omitted. Copies of the book are available in Peking and Taipei, and in various institutions in Japan.²⁹ Part of a copy of the *Han-shu*, which was probably made from the original *Chi-ku-ko* blocks at a later date, is included in a copy of the collection of twenty-two histories, which is held by the *Royal Asiatic Society*, London; and a re-issue of the text has been made by the *Sao-yeh* 掃葉 press (undated). Although it is claimed that the text of edition No. 4 was drawn from a Sung print, it is by no means clear which particular one was used. Kurata surmises, on internal evidence,³⁰ that the text was based on a print of the *Shao-hsing* period (1131-1162); although there are several indications of the existence of prints made at that time, no definite traces survive.

Edition No. 4 was in turn used as the basis for Nos. 6 and 7. In his preface to No. 7, Wang Hsien-ch'ien 王先謙 (1842-1918) observes that many contemporary scholars were using the *Nan-chien* edition (No. 3); he

²⁵ Remarks of other scholars, whose names are not given in the colophon, are also included in the *k'ao-cheng*.

²⁶ See f. 1a of the colophon.

²⁷ For Liu Chih-wen's citation of part of the preface, as from Yen Shih-ku, see Hiranaka, p. 12. For Wang Hsien-ch'ien's acceptance, see the preface to edition No. 7, 2a and 4a.

²⁸ This distinction was observed by Chu I-hsin 朱一新 (fl. c. 1896); see the note to Yen's preface in edition No. 7, 27b.

²⁹ E.g., the *Library of the Cabinet*, Tokyo; the *Seikadō library*; the *Institute of Humanistic Studies*, Kyoto. A copy is also owned by the *Harvard-Yenching Institute*.

³⁰ Kurata, p. 284.

also expresses respect for edition No. 5.³¹ In his edition of the *Hou-Han-shu*, Wang Hsien-ch'ien again chose to follow the *Chi-ku-ko* print, and it is perhaps somewhat surprising that he does not state the reason for his preference. Wang's contribution to the study of the *Han-shu* ranks second only to that of Yen Shih-ku; he has collected the opinions of a large number of Ch'ing scholars and incorporated them, together with his own remarks, in a copious commentary to the text. The extent of Wang's researches, and the pains which he took, can be estimated from the list of authorities which he has happily included in his preface.³² He includes contributions made by the editors of No. 5, and reprints the text of Yen Shih-ku's preface from that edition, together with the notes of the Sung scholars, which are not included in No. 4. Original copies of Wang Hsien-ch'ien's book (published in 1900) can still be obtained in the Far East, and the work has been made generally available to students thanks to the facsimile copy, in reduced size, published recently by the *I-wen* 藝文 press, Taipei. Wang's text has also been reprinted, with a punctuation in Chinese style, by the *Wen-jui-lou* 文瑞樓 press of Shanghai (undated), and in the *Basic Sinological Series* (1941 and 1959). The original print of No. 7 has been used by a number of scholars who have recently published critical editions of different chapters of the *Han-shu*.³³

Edition No. 6 was made by using the original blocks of No. 4, and the name *Chi-ku-ko* is retained between each half-folio of the print (see Plate No. 4 in the 1962 punctuated edition). No. 6 was originally published in 1869, by the *Chin-ling-shu-chū* 金陵書局, and it was included in the collection of the twenty-four histories of the *Wu-sheng-kuan shu-chū* 五省官書局. The edition is sometimes termed the *chū-pen* 局本 (e.g., in the 1962 punctuated edition). No. 6 includes no commentaries in addition to those of No. 4, but the text of Yen Shih-ku's preface has been inserted.

There is an important difference in the presentation of the text in Nos. 6 and 7. In No. 7 Wang Hsien-ch'ien follows the version of the *Chi-ku-ko* edition without intended alterations, and contents himself with observing cases of textual variants in his commentary. Very often Wang expresses approval of the readings seen elsewhere, e.g., in the Palace edition of 1739. However, in edition No. 6, the text of the *Chi-ku-ko* edition has frequently been altered so as to conform with that of edition No. 1 or the Palace edition; in these cases there is no indication of the departure that has been made.

In these circumstances, editions Nos. 6 and 7 must be used with some

³¹ Edition No. 7, preface, 3a and 2b.

³² *Ib.*, 6a-8b.

³³ E.g., Dubs, *History of the Former Han dynasty*, Baltimore and London, 1938-1955; Uchida, *op. cit.*; and Hulswé, *Remnants of Han Law*, Leiden, 1955. These authors usually note the existence of variant readings in other editions.

care; both copies derive from a Ming source, whose antecedents are unknown; and although the errors of that source are recognised by Wang Hsien-ch'ien, they are none the less repeated in his text, subject to corrections that may be buried in his long comments. In No. 6, there is no immediate means of determining which text has been followed.

The editors of the punctuated edition of 1962 take Wang Hsien-ch'ien's text as their basic version. They discriminate between two formulae used by Wang to indicate textual differences between editions Nos. 4 and 5; in the one case Wang adds his personal approval of the reading of No. 5, in the other he does not. Where Wang approves (*i.e.*, by the addition of the single character *shih* 是 in his note), it has been found that edition No. 5 agrees with No. 1. In such cases, the editors of the 1962 edition have first printed the version of editions 4 and 7; this is given in small type, enclosed in round brackets, and it is immediately followed by the reading of editions 1 and 5, printed in normal size, and enclosed in square brackets. However, it is claimed that where Wang Hsien-ch'ien has not appended his approval of the reading of No. 5, his own reading, and therefore that of No. 4, agrees with that of No. 1; in these cases, Wang's text has been reproduced in the punctuated edition of 1962, whose editors have noted the variants between editions 1, 4, 5, and 6. This method of collation would suffice for the texts in question, provided that complete reliance could be placed on Wang Hsien-ch'ien's accurate discrimination. Unfortunately this cannot be done.

Occasionally emendations have been introduced in the text of the new edition of 1962, but only if they can be well-supported; alterations of this type are indicated with the use of round and square brackets, and appropriate comment in the notes. The editors are at pains to point out that poorly evidenced emendations of previous scholars cannot necessarily be accepted.

In many cases it will be found that the text of the Palace edition of 1739 (No. 5) is to be preferred to that of No. 4. This conclusion is frequently supported by Wang Hsien-ch'ien's notes, and by the editors of No. 6. It should also be noted that Wang Hsien-ch'ien's text cannot always be accepted as a strictly accurate copy of edition No. 4. Moreover, the edition of 1962 cannot be regarded as including a complete collation of variants between the texts of groups A and B that are discussed above. In cases where edition No. 1 varies from Nos. 4 and 7, and where that of the latter is preferred, a note of the variants is not necessarily included in the 1962 edition.

Finally it is worth noting a few commentaries to the text of the *Han-shu* which have not been included in the editions considered above. Reference must first be made to a set of notes entitled *Han-shu-su-cheng* 漢書疏證 in 27 chapters, which were apparently not available to Wang Hsien-ch'ien. Copies of these notes were reproduced by the Naigai 內外 press in 1939,

on the basis of an unpaginated manuscript; this had formerly been in the possession of the *Institute of Humanist Studies*, Peking (北京人文科學研究所). According to a colophon, which appears over the names of Yoshikawa Kōjiro 吉川辛次郎 and Hiraoka Takeo 平岡武夫, the name of the compiler of these notes was not recorded on the original manuscript; the notes cite the views of scholars up to and including Ch'i Shao-nan (1706-1768) and Chao I-ch'ing 趙一清 (1710?-1764?) and were presumably compiled during the *Ch'ien-lung* period. The writer introduces his own remarks under the modest, but unfortunately anonymous, formula *yü an* 愚按. A similarly entitled work, which is ascribed to Hang Shih-chün 杭世駿 (1696-1773), is listed in the *Kuo-ch'ao-wei-k'an-i-shu-chih-lüeh* 國朝未刊遺書志略 of Chu Chi-jung 朱記榮;³⁴ Yoshikawa and Hiraoka remark that it is not known whether this can be identified with the work of 27 chapters, reproduced in 1939. A different and later book, also entitled *Han-shu-su-cheng*, appears under the name of Shen Ch'in-han 沈欽韓 (1775-1832) in Wang Hsien-ch'ien's list of authorities.³⁵ This commentary ran to 36 chapters, and was published in 1900 together with similar notes on the *Hou-Han-shu*.

Some of Hang Shih-chün's comments are included in the *k'ao-cheng* of the 1739 edition. As Hang was a compiler in the Hanlin Academy from c. 1736, and was engaged in preparing the Palace editions of the Thirteen Classics and the Twenty-four Histories, this is not surprising. It is possible that the unpublished notes listed by Chu Chi-jung were a private version of Hang's views; and these may have been used in the compilation of the Palace edition. Similarly, the *Han-shu-su-cheng* of 27 chapters may consist of notes made privately by one of the scholars engaged in or consulted during the preparation of edition No. 5. However, the precise relationship between notes of this type and the comments included in that edition has yet to be determined.³⁶

Of more modern works, reference has been made above to Yang Shu-ta's *Han-shu-k'uei-kuan*. In Japan, draft notes to the text of the *Han-shu* were prepared by Kano Naoki 狩野直喜. These were written in Chinese, under the title *Han-shu-pu-chu-pu* 漢書補注補, and concerned

³⁴ Preface dated 1882. This work is included in the *Kuan-tzu-te-chai* 觀自得齋 *ts'ung-shu*; the entry for Hang's notes appears on 22b, without any details of length.

³⁵ See Wang Hsien-ch'ien's preface to addition No. 7, 7b.

³⁶ Obvious difficulties are involved here, *e.g.*; (1) There are considerable differences between the remarks ascribed to Ch'i Shao-nan in (a) the *k'ao-cheng* notes of 1739, and (b) the 27 chapter *Han-shu-su-cheng*; on the whole, (b) is fuller than (a). (2) In at least one instance, an almost identical comment is ascribed to Hang Shih-chün in (a) and to Ch'i Shao-nan in (b) (see the note to 東萊郡曲成, *Han-shu* Ch. 28, A, *k'ao-cheng* 5a). (3) On some occasions (*e.g.*, notes to *Han-shu* Ch. 30), (b) cites extensive notes from a source which is entitled *k'ao-cheng*, but these notes are not seen in (a). (4) Notes ascribed to Hang Shih-chün in (a) are not necessarily included in (b); such cases could imply that (b) is not to be identified with the work listed by Chu Chi-jung.

passages in the first twenty-two chapters of the work. These notes were published in eight separate parts, in various numbers of the *Tōhō Gakuhō* (Kyoto) between October 1938 and September 1941.

A book entitled *Han-shu-hsin-cheng* 漢書新証, by Ch'en Chih 陳直, was published in Tientsin in 1959. In these notes the author brings archaeological evidence to bear on the interpretation of technical terms and on problems regarding the operation of Han institutions. A large proportion of these notes is concerned with the titles of officials that are listed in *Han-shu* chapter 19.

In his *Han-shu-pu-chu-pien-cheng* 漢書補注辨證 (Kowloon, 1961), Shih Chih-mien 施之勉 has assembled comments to passages which lie throughout the hundred chapters of the *Han-shu*. In these notes attention is drawn sometimes to variant readings that are found in different editions, sometimes to parallel passages which are seen in other texts. Some material which was published at an earlier date has been included.³⁷

³⁷ E.g., the notes published in *Ta-lu-tsa-chih* VIII, No. 4 (1954), pp. 115-119. For other publications by Shih Chih-mien on this subject, see *T'oung Pao* XLVII, p. 318 note (2).