

中央研究院歷史語言研究所集刊  
第六十七本，第四本  
出版日期：民國八十五年十二月

## *Yen t'ieh lun* (鹽鐵論 Discourses on Salt and Iron) as a Historical Source

Tao Tien-yi \*

We try to examine the work *Yen t'ieh lun* with two questions: the information supplied by this source and the reliability of these information.

(a) Information: *Yen t'ieh lun* was the record of a court conference which took place in 81B.C. The subjects discussed in the conference cover very wide range: political, economical, military, foreign relations, social, intellect etc. It supplies valuable data on Han China. (b) Reliability of these information: After close examination, we can be assured that 1. being the actual record of the court debate, *Yen t'ieh lun* supplies us with first hand information. 2. the copy of this work in our hand today did not suffer serious corruption during its two thousand years of transmission. We can recommend *Yen t'ieh lun* as a highly reliable and valuable first hand source in the study of the Han period.

This article is based on lectures used to teach a course on Chinese historical sources in 1968. The author is most grateful to the Institute of History and Philology for the opportunity to publish these materials.

**Key words:** *Yen t'ieh lun*, historical sources, records of conferences,  
Han dynasty, government monopolies

---

\* University of Hawaii at Manoa, Department of History \*

In evaluating *Yen t'ieh lun* as a historical source, we try to examine it in two aspects: 1. historical data supplied by this work and 2. the reliability of these historical data.

*Yen t'ieh lun* is the record of a court debate which took place in 81 B.C. during the reign of Chao-ti (昭帝始元六年) of the Former Han dynasty.<sup>1</sup> It was a common practice for the Han government to have various kinds of issues deliberated in court conferences. In 81 B.C. the government, intending to sound out people's grievances, called this conference into session. There was a heated debate between the leading government officials and the hsien-liang delegates and the wen-hsüeh delegates (賢良文學) sent from the provinces.<sup>2</sup> The debate covered extensively the various aspects of government policies: military, economic, social, political, intellectual and so on. For example, it was argued for and against whether China should launch an attack against Hsiung-nu (匈奴); whether the government should launch campaigns in all the four directions and expand China's territory; whether the government should solve its financial crisis and control the prices of various commodities by actively taking part in the commercial activities of society by monopolizing the manufacture and sale of certain commodities, such as salt and iron; whether the government should adopt Confucian or Legalist teachings in formulating its policy; whether legal punishment or moral persuasion should be the means used by government in molding the people and achieving a good society; whether taxes, and the military and corvee duties which the government imposed on the people were at reasonable levels; and whether Confucianists were good government officials and capable in carrying out government responsibilities. The record of this debate, *Yen t'ieh lun*, supplies valuable information on the Former Han period.

---

<sup>1</sup> Pan Ku, *Ch'ien han shu* (Shanghai: T'ung wen shu chü reprint of 1736 edition, 1884; hereafter referred to as HS), vol. 66, 7b, 19a-20b.

<sup>2</sup> HS (*Han shu*), vol. 66, 7b, 19a-20b.

Reliability of *Yen t'ieh lun* as a historical source.

As to the problem of how reliable are the data supplied by *Yen t'ieh lun*, we have to examine this source with two sets of questions in mind. (1) Who was the author? Can he supply us with first hand information? (2) How was the information handed down to us? Were there changes made to the work during its two thousand years of transmission.

(I) Authorship: was the author in a position to supply us with first hand or second hand information, or was he in a position to supply us any information at all?

It is well documented that Huan Kuan (桓寬) was the author. For Han period documents, authorship is no longer a serious problem as with the works before Ch'in (秦). The authorship of *Yen t'ieh lun* is mentioned in the following sources.

Works of the Later Han period:

1. *Han shu* (漢書): Pan Ku (班固) in his *Han shu* described *Yen t'ieh lun* in detail. The bibliographical section of *Han shu* is an especially good source in solving questions of authorship of Han works. In the bibliographical section, Pan Ku recorded this work and unmistakably attributed its authorship to Huan K'uan. It says. "Huan K'uan, *Yen t'ieh lun*, liu shih p'ien (桓寬鹽鐵論六十篇)".<sup>3</sup> In its biographical section it says that in the 6th year of Shih Yüan (始元六年 81 B.C), the emperor, by decree, ordered the provinces and vassal kingdoms to recommend hsien liang (賢良) delegates and Wen hsüen (文學) delegates to the government in order to investigate the people's sufferings. This brought about the discussion of salt and iron policies.<sup>4</sup> Again it says that Huan K'uan, an official in the provincial government of Lu chiang province (廬江太守丞) developed the debate of the (conference on) salt and iron, adding subheadings (to the discussion), showing its fullness of argument, and wrote (a work) of scores of thousands of words (推衍鹽鐵之議增廣條目極

---

<sup>3</sup> *HS*, vol. 30, 19a.

<sup>4</sup> *HS*, vol. 66, 7b, 19a-20b.

其論難著數萬言).<sup>5</sup> Huan Kuan was the author of *Yen t'ieh lun*.

2. *Lun hun* (論衡): Wang Ch'ung (王充) in his *Lun hun* also shows his familiarity with *Yen t'ieh lun* and unmistakably names Huan K'uan as its author.<sup>6</sup>

The establishment of Huan K'uan as the author leads us to the question as to whether he could supply us with first hand information of the conference? The debate took place in the 6th year of Shih Yüan of Chao-ti (81 B.C.), while Huan K'uan wrote his book during the reign of Hsüan-ti (宣帝). Hsüan-ti's reign lasted from 73-49 B.C.. It means that *Yen t'ieh lun* was written between eight to thirty-two years after the court conference. Huan K'uan was not a participant of the court debate, and he wrote his book at a much later time. It is problematic whether Huan Kuan was in a position to supply us with first hand information.

Two pieces of crucial data established *Yen t'ieh lun* as a work which supplies us with first hand information. (1) In *Han shu*, Pan Ku, after mentioning the 81 B.C. debate, told us that at that time there were quite a lot of records of the debate circulating (當時相詰難頗有其議文) and that during the reign of Hsüan-ti (宣帝), Huan Kuan, developing the discussion of the government policy on salt and iron provided at that debate, wrote a work of several scores of thousands words. (汝南相(桓)寬…至廬江太守丞…推衍鹽鐵之議增廣條目極其論難著數萬言).<sup>7</sup> It tells us that Huan Kuan wrote *Yen t'ieh lun* based on the record of the debate. (2) Huan Kuan himself also told us in the *Yen t'ieh lun*, "the guest (Huan Kuan) says that he saw the record of the discussion on the policy of salt and iron" (客曰余覩鹽鐵之義).<sup>8</sup> Here he clearly stated that his source was a record of the conference.

---

<sup>5</sup> *HS*, vol. 66, 19a-20b.

<sup>6</sup> Wang Ch'ung, *Lun hun*, vol. 29, 5b, in *Han wei ts'ung shu*, comp. by Ch'eng Yung (Taipei: Hsin hsing shu chü, 1966), 1957.

<sup>7</sup> *HS*, vol. 66, 19a-20b.

<sup>8</sup> Huan K'uan, *Yen t'ieh lun* (Shanghai: Shang wu yin shu kuan, 1929. SPTK ed.; Hereafter referred to as YTL), vol. 10, 12b.



Two more factors have to be taken into consideration before we can accept *Yen t'ieh lun* as a reliable record of the 81 B.C. debate. (1) Was the record of the meeting which came into the hands of Huan Kuan an accurate one of the discussion of the conference? (2) Did the editing work done by Huan Kuan on that record change it substantially?

On the first question, one item of data deserves our attention. In the section where *Han shu* quoted *Yen t'ieh lun*, it says "...examining the discussion of the ministers, the hsien liang delegates and the wen-hsüeh delegates, it was different from what I heard" (其辭曰觀公卿賢良文學之議異乎吾所聞).<sup>9</sup> It means that the record of the debate which came into Huan Kuan's hands was different from what he heard about the debate. It casts a doubt on the accuracy of the record of the debate. However, at a closer examination, the doubt can be removed. The same sentence in *Yen t'ieh lun* was written differently. "The guest said, 'I read the salt and iron discussion and looked at the debate of the ministers, the wen hsüeh delegates and the hsien liang delegates, ...What I heard was extraordinary.'" (客曰余觀鹽鐵之對觀乎公卿文學賢良之論...異哉吾所聞).<sup>10</sup> The important difference between these two versions is caused by one word. *Han shu* used the character "hu" (乎), 「異乎吾所聞」, while *Yen t'ieh lun* used the character "tsai" (哉), 「異哉吾所聞」. The difference in one character renders two completely different sentence. *Han Shu* says "it was different from what I heard", while *Yen t'ieh lun* says "What I heard was extraordinary". We tend to accept *Yen t'ieh lun*'s version as true to what was originally written by Huan Kuan. The passage following the above controversial sentence was in praise of various candidates' performance in the debate, not the elaboration on the differences between what Huan Kuan heard about the debate and

---

<sup>9</sup> *HS*, vol. 66, 16b.

<sup>10</sup> Wang Li-ch'i, *Yen t'ieh lun chiao chu* (Tien ching: Tien ching ku chi chu pan she, 1983. Hereafter referred to as *YTLCC*), 629.

what he learned from the record of the debate. The version "What I heard was extraordinary" fits very well with its following passage, while the version "it was different with what I heard" does not. Moreover, another highly relevant factor in making a choice between "tsai" and "hu" is that only *Han shu* used the character "hu", while all other independent editions of *Yen t'ieh lun* used the character "tsai".<sup>11</sup> The word "哉 extraordinary" is a better choice.<sup>12</sup>

On the second question, about the way Huan Kuan wrote his work *Yen t'ieh lun*, *Han shu* mentioned that Huan Kuan developed the debate of the conference, added subheadings (to the discussion), developed the argument to its fullness, and wrote (a work) of scores of thousand of words. Thus Pan Ku had the impression that Huan Kuan did modify the original record. But we can assume that what Huan Kuan did to the document, such as developing the debate, adding subheadings and presenting the argument in its fullness were editing jobs which did not alter the meaning of the debate.

---

<sup>11</sup> (a) YTLCC, 629,630. (b) Lao Kan, "Yen t'ieh lun chiao chi," *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology* 5.1 (1953): 13-51.

<sup>12</sup> As to whether the character in the lost original text was "hu" or "tsai", one scholar who reviewed this paper suggested that it had to be "hu" and that "tsai" was a corruption of the original text. The reason he advanced was that in the work of *Li chi* (禮記), in the chapter *T'an kung* (檀弓) there was such a sentence, "i hu wo so wen", and that Huan Kuan was quoting this sentence. I was advised by the reviewer to accept "hu" rather "tsai" as the correct word.

When we say such a sentence like "chi so pu yüeh wu shih yü jen 己所不欲勿施於人", we have to attribute it to Confucius. However, the particular sentence in question, "i tsai wo so wen", is just a common expression like the weather is fine today. There is no way to prove that when Huan Kuan wrote this sentence, he is quoting from *Li chi*. It is quite arbitrary to say that after *Li chi* saying "i hu wo so wen" all sentences "i tsai wo so wen" must be the corrupted version of the quoted sentence "i hu wo so wen" of *Li chi*, *Tan kung*.

The original text of *Yen t'ieh lun* was lost. It is impossible to prove wheater "hu" or "tsai" or even some other word is the word in the original version. While keeping in question whether it is "hu" or "tsai", I would rather read the sentence in the context of the whole passage. If we do that, it seems to me that the word "tasi" (extraordinary) is a better choice.

Moreover, two circumstantial factors further suggest to us that the record of the conference which Huan Kuan had was an accurate one of the debate and that what Huan Kuan did to the record in turning it into his work *Yen t'ieh lun* was only editing work which did not alter the meaning of the debate. (1) It was a common practice for the Han government to have issues of various kinds to be discussed in conferences and the Han government had an elaborate system of keeping records. (2) The 81 B.C. debate and the book *Yen t'ieh lun* were both well known. Contemporaries, especially some of those who participated in that debate, were still alive. For example, the author told us that he still heard people mentioning things about the conference. Chu tzu po (朱子伯), who supplied information of the conference to Huan Kuan likely was one who took part in the debate.<sup>13</sup> They had opportunities to point out discrepancies, if there was any, between the work *Yen t'ieh lun* and the debate. The *Yen t'ieh lun* can be taken as a reliable record of the debate. If this is the case, those who engaged in that debate, not Huan Kuan, are our sources of information.

Two groups of people participated in this debate: the hsien liang delegates and the wen hsieh delegates sent from provinces and the leading officials of the government. The hsien liang and the wen hsieh delegates were outstanding scholars selected by provincial governments. They came from all over the country and were well informed about governmental affairs, while the leading officials were an excellent source of first hand information on government policy. *Yen t'ieh lun* can thus supply us with first hand information.

(II) The second question poses whether during its two thousands years of transmission was there any changes made to the work. Several issues deserve our attention: (a.) During its two thousand years of transmission did *Yen t'ieh lun* ever drop from sight. If the work has never dropped from sight, the possibility of corruption to the text will be greatly reduced. (b.) The history of its transmission and

---

<sup>13</sup> *YTLCC*, 629.

the surviving earliest text of the work. From surviving rare early editions, we have actual copies of this work in our hands and know exactly the contents of this work when these early editions were made. (c.) Another way to detect corruption in the work, if there is any, is by checking passages of the *Yen t'ieh lun* preserved in quotations in other works of different periods with the *Yen t'ieh lun* in our hands for textual variations. If there are no serious discrepancies, it strongly suggests that there might be no corruption.

(A) During its two thousand years of transmission, did *Yen t'ieh lun* ever drop from sight. The answer is a negative one. It was included in various bibliographies and mentioned by scholars all the way from the Han dynasty to the present. For example:

(a) The Han period: it was recorded in the bibliography of the Former Han period, Pan Ku's *Han shu, i wen chih* (班固 漢書藝文志),<sup>14</sup> and was mentioned by Wang Chung (王充) in his work, *Lung hen* (論衡).<sup>15</sup> (b) The Southern and Northern dynasties: it was mentioned in a Hsiao tai-wei's (蕭太尉) memorial in Chiang Yen's *Chiang wen t'ung chi* (江淹 江文通集).<sup>16</sup> (c) The Sui period: *Sui shu, ching chi chih* (隋書經籍志) recorded it.<sup>17</sup> (d) The T'ang period: *Chiu t'ang shu, ching chi chih* (舊唐書經籍志),<sup>18</sup> *T'ang shu, i wen chih* (唐書藝文志)<sup>19</sup> and Ma Tsung's (馬總) *I ling* (意林)<sup>20</sup> recorded it. (e) The Sung period: *Sung shih, i wen chih* (宋史藝文

---

<sup>14</sup> *HS*, vol. 30, 19a.

<sup>15</sup> *Lun hun*, vol. 29, 5b.

<sup>16</sup> *YTLCC* (Appendix), 198.

<sup>17</sup> Ch'ang-sun Wu-chi, *Sui shu* (Taipei: I wen yin shu kuan, reprint of 1739 Wu ying tien ed.), vol. 34, 1a.

<sup>18</sup> Liu Hsü, *Chiu t'ang shu* (Taipei: I wen yin shu kuan, reprint of 1739 Wu ying tien ed.), vol. 47, 1a, 1b.

<sup>19</sup> Ou-yang Hsiu, *T'ang shu* (Taipei: I wen yin shu kuan, reprint of 1739 Wu ying tien ed.), vol. 59, 1a, 1b.

<sup>20</sup> *YTLCC* (Appendix), 799.

志),<sup>21</sup> Ch'ao Kung-wu's *Chün chai tu shu chih* (晁公武 郡齋讀書志),<sup>22</sup> Ch'en Chen-sun's *Chih chai shu lu chieh t'i* (陳振孫 直齋書錄解題),<sup>23</sup> Wang Ch'in-jo's *Ch'ung wen tsung mu* (王欽若 崇文總目)<sup>24</sup> recorded it. (f) The Ming period, Fang Hsiao-ju's *Hsün chih chai chi* (方孝孺 遜志齋集)<sup>25</sup> recorded it. (g) The Ch'ing period, *Ssu ku ch'uan shu chung mu t'i yao* (四庫全書總目提要),<sup>26</sup> Lu Wen-chao's *Ch'ün shu shih pu* (盧文弨 群書拾補),<sup>27</sup> Ting Shih-ch'ang's *Chih ch'ing ch'a shu mu* (丁日昌 持靜齋書目),<sup>28</sup> Mu Yu-chih's *Chih ch'ing ch'a ch'ang shu chi yao* (莫友芝 持靜齋藏書紀要),<sup>29</sup> Mu Yu-chih's *Sung yüan chiu peng shu ching yen lu* (宋元舊本書經眼錄)<sup>30</sup> recorded it. The fact that the work has never dropped from sight greatly reduces the possibility of corruption.

(B) The history of the transmission of the work *Yen t'ieh lun* and the earliest surviving text we have today, hand copied or printed.

Before the T'ang dynasty, books were circulated in hand copied form. After T'ang, books began to be published in engraved block printing. This gave books a much wider circulation and greatly reduced the possibility of corruption. *Yen t'ieh lun* began to be published in engraved block printing during the Sung dynasty, but none of the Sung editions survive today. The earliest copy extant today is most likely a block printing of the Ming dynasty which was a reprint of a Sung edition. Thus, from this Ming edition, we know how the text of *Yen t'ieh lun* looked like at the Sung period.

---

<sup>21</sup> T'o T'o. *Sung shih* (Taipei: I wen yin shu kuan, reprint of 1793 Wu ying tien ed.), vol. 205, 1b.

<sup>22</sup> YTLCC (Appendix), 799.

<sup>23</sup> YTLCC (Appendix), 800, 801.

<sup>24</sup> YTLCC, 826.

<sup>25</sup> YTLCC (Appendix), 802.

<sup>26</sup> YTLCC (Appendix), 814.

<sup>27</sup> Lu Wen-chao, *Ch'ün shu shih pu* (Pao ching t'ang, 1787), vol. 6.

<sup>28</sup> YTLCC (Appendix), 834.

<sup>29</sup> YTLCC (Appendix), 834.

<sup>30</sup> YTLCC (Appendix), 835.

We tried to trace the different past editions of this work by checking the bibliographies of the various periods and the prefaces of various editions. Some of the early block printing editions of *Yen t'ieh lun* are the Sung editions, for example, Shun hsi edition of the year A.D.1174, Chia t'ai edition of the year A.D.1202.

(a) Chia t'ai (嘉泰壬戌 A.D.1202) edition: We learn of this edition from T'u Chen (涂禎) of the Ming dynasty. When T'u Chen published the *Yen t'ieh lun*, he included a preface. The preface was dated to A.D.1501 (the Hsin yu year of the Hung chih reign 弘治辛酉). In the preface he clearly stated that he obtained a *Yen t'ieh lun* published in A.D. 1202 (the Jen hsü year of the Chia tai reign of the Sung dynasty...始得宋嘉泰壬戌刻本), and based on this Chia tai edition he published his Hung chih edition.<sup>31</sup> Thus, from this Ming Hung chih edition we can trace back to the Sung Chia t'ai edition. The A.D. 1202 Chia tai edition preserved in the Hung chih edition is likely the earliest one we have today.

(b) Shun hsi (淳熙改元A.D. 1174) edition: We learn of this edition from several bibliographies: Ting Shih-ch'ang's *Chih ch'ing ch'a shu mu* (丁日昌 持靜齋書目), Mu Yu-Chih's *Chih ch'ing ch'a ch'ang shu chih yao* (莫友芝 持靜齋藏書紀要) and Mu's another bibliography *Sung yuan chiu peng shu ching yen lu* (宋元舊本書經眼錄).

Ting Shih-ch'ang, in his above bibliography, described the *Yen t'ieh lun* in his own collection as a Sung edition. At the end of the last volume of the work there were two lines of characters saying that this fine edition was published by the family of tax collector Chang of Chin shi, in the year when the reign title was changed to Shun hsi (淳熙改元錦谿張監宅善本).<sup>32</sup> On the front page of the book, there are some comments written by Fung Wu of Hu han in the year of chi-szu (己巳孟春馮武).<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> T'u Chen's preface to his Hung chih edition, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 803, 804.

<sup>32</sup> *YTLCC* (Appendix), 834.

<sup>33</sup> *YTLCC* (Appendix), 834.

Mu Yu-chih in his *Chih ch'ing ch'ai ch'ang shu chih yao* had a similar description of the above Shun hsi edition. He mentioned that it was a Sung edition. He also mentioned that, at the end of the last volumn of the work, there were two lines of characters saying that this fine edition was published in the year when the reign year was changed to Shung hsi by the family of tax collector Chang of Chin shi (淳熙改元 錦谿張監稅宅善本). He also mentioned, as Ting did in the above bibliography, that on the front page of the book, there were some comments written by Fung Hu of Hu han in the year of chi-szu.<sup>34</sup>

Mu Yu-chih, in his another bibliography, gave a little more information on that book than did the above two bibliographies. He named this edition as a Sung edition, and also mentioned the two lines of characters at the last page of the tenth volume (the last volume) saying that this fine edition was published, in the year when the reign year was changed to Shung hsi, by the family of tax collector Chang of Chin shi (淳熙改元 錦谿張監稅宅善本). He mentioned also the comment written by Fung Hu at the front page of the book, but in much more detail. Fung Wu said that his ancestor, the t'ai-shih (太史) had a large collection of ten thousand volumes. His descendants neither knew how to read nor valued them. His family eventually even lost those fine editions of the Sung and Yüan periods. He had a *Yen t'ieh lun* of ten volumes which was mentioned as a Sung edition. At the end of the book, there were characters which stated that this fine edition was published, in the year when the reign year was changed to Shung hsi, by the family of Chang tax collector of the place of Chin shi. He valued and loved this work. Then he obtained another edition of a block-printed *Yen t'ieh lun*. Therefore he gave this book (from his own family collection) to Wen Hu of P'ing-yüan. Fung Wu of Ho-han (河漢馮武) wrote this passage in the late Spring of the year of chi-szu (己巳年暮春).<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> YTLCC (Appendix), 834, 835.

<sup>35</sup> YTLCC (Appendix), 835.

The above three bibliographies mentioned the Shung hsi edition. Yeh Te-huei (葉德輝) even went further to suggest that the above Chia tai edition was based on the Shen-hsi edition. In his work *Shi yuan tu shu chih* (卽園讀書志) he mentioned that in A.D. 1896 (the Ping sheng year of Kuang-hsü 光緒丙申) he saw the above Shen-hsi work at Ting Su-ya's (the son of Ting Jih-ch'ang) place. He believed that the above Sung dynasty Chia tai edition was based on the Shen hsi edition. However, he did not back up his statement with evidence.<sup>36</sup>

Then, Fu Cheng-hsiang (傅增湘), in his *hsuang chien lou chuang shu hsü chi* (雙鑑樓藏書續記), commented that this Sung edition was not dependable and dated it to the Ming dynasty, sometime between the Cheng (Cheng te 正德 A.D.1506-1521) and Chia (Chia Ching 嘉靖 A.D. 1522-1566) periods. He pointed out that the two lines saying that this fine edition was published in the year when the reign year was changed to Sheng-hsi by the Chang tax collector's family was printed on a separate piece of paper and was pasted on at the end of the book.<sup>37</sup>

This edition in Ting Shih-ch'ang's collection is now in the Peking Library.<sup>38</sup>

(c) *Hsin k'an Yen t'ieh lun* (新刊鹽鐵論) of the Sung and Yüan period: This edition was printed in the format of thirteen lines to each half-page, and twenty five characters to each line. In A.D.1935 it was in Fu Yüan-shu's collection.<sup>39</sup>

(d) Two Sung editions recorded in the bibliography *P'ang hsi chai sung yüan pen shu mu* (滂憲齋宋元書目): The above bibliography only mentioned that there were two Sung editions, without supplying any further information on these two editions. Knowledge about these two editions is lacking.<sup>40</sup>

Among the yüan editions, for example, there is one called Ma sha edition (元麻沙

---

<sup>36</sup> YTLCC (Appendix), 837, 839.

<sup>37</sup> YTLCC (Appendix), 844.

<sup>38</sup> YTLCC, 848.

<sup>39</sup> Lao Kan, *chiao chi*, 13.

<sup>40</sup> YTLCC (Appendix), 834.



本). Yeh Te-hui (葉德輝) in his *Shi yuan tu shu chih* (邵園讀書志) mentioned that he copied this work from the Yüan edition collected by Chiang Chien-ya (江標字建霞), and he also mentioned that this was a very poor edition with all kinds of mistakes and missing sentences, paragraphs and sections.<sup>41</sup> Fu Cheng-hsiang also pointed out the fact that this edition had a lot of missing parts.<sup>42</sup> Wang Li ch'i in his *Yeh t'ieh lun chiao chu* (鹽鐵論校注) wrote that this edition is now kept in the Peking Library (北京圖書館) and that it has been dated to the early Ming period.<sup>43</sup>

Among the Ming editions: (1) The most important one we should mention here is Tu Chen's *Yen t'ieh lun*. As we mentioned above, this edition was based on the Sung Chia-tai edition. Two prefaces of the Tu Chen's work established this important fact. In his A.D.1501 preface (Hung chih reign, Hsin yu year 弘治辛酉), he mentioned that he got the Sung dynasty Chia-tai reign Jen hsü year block printing edition (A.D.1202) at a place called Chiang ying (江陰) and published it.<sup>44</sup> Besides his own preface, this book also includes a preface written by Tu Mu (都穆), one who passed the ching shih (進士) examination in the same year as Tu Chen. The preface maintains that during the Sung dynasty there were still block printing editions of the work *Yen t'ieh lun*. However, after a long period of time, the Sung editions passed from sight and not too many people knew about them. Tu Chen in the second year of his serving as the magistrate at Chiang ying (江陰) corrected this work and published it. Thus people had an opportunity to see the complete text of this ancient work.<sup>45</sup> The Hung chih edition was based on the Chia tai edition.

Scholars praised this edition. For example, Yeh Ch'an-chih (葉昌熾) in his comment in the copied edition of the Ying ning chai (櫻寧齋鈔本) mentioned that it

---

<sup>41</sup> *YTLCC* (Appendix), 835, 836, 838, 840.

<sup>42</sup> *YTLCC* (Appendix), 840, 844.

<sup>43</sup> *YTLCC*, 837.

<sup>44</sup> Tu Chen's preface, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 804.

<sup>45</sup> Tu Mu's preface is included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 803.

was impossible to get the Sung Chia t'ai edition at his time and that the Tu Chen's Hung chih edition should be considered as the oldest one.<sup>46</sup> Wang Hsien-ch'ien (王先謙) mentioned that Tu Ch'en's Ming dynasty Hung chih edition, which was based on the Sung dynasty Chia t'ai edition, should be considered as the best one.<sup>47</sup>

This Hung chih edition was important because (a.) it enables us to trace *Yen t'ieh lun* to its A.D.1202 edition. (b.) it was praised as the best and the oldest edition. (c.) it is still available today in the rare book collections at both the Peking Library and the Palace Museum in Taipei.<sup>48</sup>

Several later editions were based on this one. For example, the A.D. 1551 Ni Pang-yen's edition (明嘉靖三十年倪邦彥刻本);<sup>49</sup> the A.D.1582 *Liang ching i pien* edition (萬曆十年兩京遺編本);<sup>50</sup> and the A.D.1807 Chang Teng-jen's edition (嘉慶丁卯張敦仁重雕涂本).<sup>51</sup>

(2) The Ying-ning chai hand copied edition (明櫻寧齋鈔本). This one was based on Tu Chen's edition and was a very fine one, better than other Ming period

---

<sup>46</sup> Yeh Ch'an-chih's comment was included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 822.

<sup>47</sup> Wang Hsien-ch'ien's notes on collation of the *Yen t'ieh lun* of A.D. 1891 edition, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 831.

<sup>48</sup> (a) Pei ching tu shu kuan, *Pei ching tu shu kuan ku chi shan pen shu mu* (Peking: shu mu wen hsien, 1987), 1185, 1186. (b) Kuo li ku kung pu wu yüan, *Kuo li ku kung pu wu yüan shan pen chiu chi tsung mu* (Taipei: Kuo li ku kung pu wu yüan, 1983), 640, 641. (c) In A.D. 1935, Lao Kan used one copy of this edition from Fu Yüan-shu's collection in collating various editions of the *Yen t'ieh lun* (Lao Kan, *chiaochi*, 13).

<sup>49</sup> Ni Pang-yen's preface, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 804; Yeh Te-hui's comment, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 838, 839.

<sup>50</sup> Yeh Te-hui's comment, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 837-39.

<sup>51</sup> Chang Teng-jen's preface, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 819; Fu cheng-hsiang's comment, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 840. The above two sources tell us that Chang's edition was based on Tu Chen's. However, Yeh Te-hui maintained that the one which Chang Teng-jen considered as Tu Chen's original edition and used in publishing his edition was actually not Tu Chen's, but Ni Pang-yan's. Ni Pang-yan's edition was based on Tu Chen's (Yeh's comment was included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 838, 839).

reproductions of Tu Chen's work.<sup>52</sup> Moreover, there is a line written in the book which reads, "Hung chih sui chai chung kuang chu ngo" (弘治歲在重光作噩) which indicates that the book was copied during the same Hung chih reign when Tu Chen's edition was published.<sup>53</sup> It is not available now. However, Huang Pei-li used this edition in collating his hand copied Wa family movable type edition. Thus from Huang Pei-li's hand copied Wa family edition, we can get some idea about the contents of the Ying-ning chai edition.<sup>54</sup>

(3) The A.D.1551 Ming edition (the 30th year of Chia ching, Ni Peng-yan edition 明嘉靖三十年倪邦彥刻本). Ni Peng-yan included his preface in this work. In the preface, he mentioned that he had Tu Chen's work and collated it in publishing this edition.<sup>55</sup> In A.D.1935, Fu Yüan-shu had this work in his collection.<sup>56</sup>

(4) The A.D.1554 Ming (Chia ching reign, Chia yin year 嘉靖甲寅春) Chang family Ch'i lan t'ang edition (張氏猗蘭堂刻本). Chang Chih-hsiang (張之象) published this edition. In his preface, he mentioned that he had added a commentary to it.<sup>57</sup> This work was subject to quite a lot of criticism. First, he rearranged the original ten chapters into twelve.<sup>58</sup> Second, there were quite a lot of words printed

---

<sup>52</sup> Huang P'ei-li (黃丕烈), Yeh Chang-chih (葉昌熾), Wu Yü-sheng (吳郁生) and Ku Ch'ien-li's (顧廣圻字千里) comments on this edition were included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 822-24.

<sup>53</sup> *YTLCC* (Appendix), 848

<sup>54</sup> Lao Kan, *chiao chi*, 13, 20.

<sup>55</sup> Ni Peng-yan's preface was included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 804. Fu Chen-hsiang (傅增湘) of the late Ch'ing and early Republic period mentioned that Ni's edition was not readily available at his time (*Shuang chien lou ch'ang shu hsu chi*, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 842, 846).

<sup>56</sup> Lao Kan, *chiao chi*, 13.

<sup>57</sup> Chang Chih-hsiang's preface, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 805, 806.

<sup>58</sup> (a) Ch'ai Jung's *T'ieh ching tung chien lou chang shu mu lu* (瞿鏞鐵琴銅劍樓藏書目錄). included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 833, (b) Chang Tun-jen's (張敦仁) preface to his A.D.1807 edition, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 819. (c) Wang Mu's (王謨) comment, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 815. (d) Chou Chung-fu's *Cheng t'ang tu shu chi*, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 826.

wrongly.<sup>59</sup> For example, Lu Wen-chao (盧文弨), Wang Hsien-ch'ien (王先謙), Ch'ai Jung (瞿鏞), Yeh Te-hui (葉德輝) and Chang Tun-jen (張敦仁), all voiced their reservations about this edition. There were favorable comments too. For example, Lu Wen-chao described Chang's commentary as detailed and complete. He also indicated the possible reason for the many wrong characters contained in this edition. He mentioned that after the printing blocks were carved, they were set up for print without being subjected to proof-reading.<sup>60</sup> *Ssu ku ch'üan shu* (四庫全書)<sup>61</sup> and Chou Chung-fu (周中孚)<sup>62</sup> also commented favorably about Chang's commentary.

This edition was reproduced in Wang Mu's *Han wei ts'ung shu*.<sup>63</sup> Moreover, some original copies are still surviving today as rare books in various libraries. For example, there are five copies in the National Central Library in Taipei;<sup>64</sup> one copy in Princeton University Library;<sup>65</sup> one copy at the Library of Congress;<sup>66</sup> one in T'ung Ti-te's

---

<sup>59</sup> (a) Lu Wen-chao's *Pao ching t'ang wen chi* (盧文弨 抱經堂文集), included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 818, 819. (b) Chou Chung-fu's *Cheng t'ang tu shu chi* (周中孚 鄭堂讀書記), included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 826. (c) Wang Hsien-ch'ien's (王先謙) notes on collation included in his 1891 *Shih hsien ch'ang she* edition, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 832. (d) Ch'ai Jung's *T'ieh ching tung chien lou chang shu mu lu* (瞿鏞 鐵琴銅劍樓藏書目錄), included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 833. (e) Yeh Te-hui's *Shi yüan tu shu chih* (葉德輝 邵園讀書志), included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 387. (f) Chang Tun-jen's preface in his A.D.1807 edition, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 819.

<sup>60</sup> *YTLCC* (Appendix), 818, 819.

<sup>61</sup> *YTLCC* (Appendix), 833, 834.

<sup>62</sup> *YTLCC* (Appendix), 826.

<sup>63</sup> (a) Wang Mu's comment, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 815. (b) Wang Hsien-ch'ien's comment on his collation of *Yen t'ieh lun*, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 832. (c) *YTLCC* (Appendix), 826. (d) Lao Kan, *chiao chi*, 29.

<sup>64</sup> Kuo li chung yang tu shu kuan, *Kou li chung yang tu shu kuan shan pen shu mu*, 427.

<sup>65</sup> Ch'ü Wan-li, *Pu ling shih tun ta hsieh ke shih te tung fang tu shu kuan chung wen shan pen shu mu* (Taipei: Yi wen ying shu kuan, 1974), 215.

<sup>66</sup> *A Descriptive Catalog of Rare Chinese Books in the Library of Congress*, compiled by Wang Chung-min, edited by T.L. Yuan (Washington: Library of Congress, 1957), 447; Wang Chung-min, *Chung kuo shan pen shu ti yao* (Taipei: Ming wen shu chü, 1984), 220.

(童第德) collection;<sup>67</sup> one at the Institute of History and Philology;<sup>68</sup> one at the Palace Museum, Taipei;<sup>69</sup> and three at the Peking Library.<sup>70</sup>

(5) The hand copied Wa family movable type edition (Wa shih wo chih pen 華氏活字本): According to Ku Ch'ien -li's (顧千里) and Huang Pei-li's (黃丕烈) notes, Ku copied the Wa family movable type edition and Huang again copied from him. Both copied the previous one by tracing over it (影寫本).<sup>71</sup> What we have here is Huang Pei-li's hand copied edition, with the name of Huang's library, Hsiao chien ch'ing t'ang (小千頃堂) written on its cover.<sup>72</sup> The importance of this edition is that on the Wa family movable type edition there was an indication that the book was printed during the reign of Hung chih (弘治, A.D.1488-1505).<sup>73</sup> The Wa family movable type edition was a Ming edition.

This hand-copied Hsiao ch'ing t'ang edition is kept in the Peking library.<sup>74</sup>

(6) The A.D.1582 Yüan I-kuei, Hu Wei-hsin *Liang ching i pien* edition. In the 10th year of Wan li (萬曆十年) Yüan I-kuei (原一魁) published the collection of works *Liang ching i pien*. He included *Yen t'ieh lun* in it and Hu wei-hsin (胡維新)

<sup>67</sup> Wang Li-ch'i, *Yen t'ieh lun chiao chu* (Shanghai: Ku chi wen hsüeh ch'u pan she, 1958, hereafter referred to as *YTLCC* 58), 6, 9.

<sup>68</sup> *Chung yang yen chiu yüan li shih yü yen yen chiu so shan pen shu mu* (Taipei: Chung yang yen chiu yüan li shih yü yen yen chiu so, 1986), 114.

<sup>69</sup> Kuo li ku kung pu wu yüan, *Kuo li ku kung pu wu yüan shan pen chiu chi tsung mu* (Taipei: Kuo li ku kung pu wu yüan, 1983), 640, 641.

<sup>70</sup> *Pei ching tu shu kuan ku chi shan pen shu mu* (Peking: Shu mu wen hsien, [1987, preface]), 1185, 1186.

<sup>71</sup> (a) Huang Pei-li's note, in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 824. (b) Ku Ch'ien-li's note, in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 823. (c) Fu Chen-hsiang's note, in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 841, 842. (d) Wang Ch'ung-ming, *Chung kuo shan pen shu t'i yao* (Taipei: Ming wen shu chü, 1984), 220.

<sup>72</sup> Wang Ch'ung-ming, *Chung kuo shan pen shu t'i yao*, 220.

<sup>73</sup> (a) Huang Pei-li's note, in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 822, 823. (b) Wang Ch'ung-ming, *Chung kuo shan pen shu t'i yao*, 220.

<sup>74</sup> (a) Ibid. (b) Lao Kan, *chiao chi*, 13.

wrote a preface.<sup>75</sup> Yeh Te-hui (葉德輝) told us that this edition was based on Tu Chen's edition (涂禎) and considered it a very fine one, as good as the famous Sung and Yüan editions.<sup>76</sup>

Two copies are kept at the Taipei Palace Museum,<sup>77</sup> two at the National Central Library,<sup>78</sup> one at the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica,<sup>79</sup> one in Kuo Mo-je's (郭沫若) collection<sup>80</sup> and one at the Harvard Yenching Library.<sup>81</sup> In A.D. 1935, Lao Kan used one copy of this edition from Fu Yüan-shu's collection in collating various editions of *Yen t'ieh lun*.<sup>82</sup>

(7) The A.D.1586 (14th year of Wan-li) Hsin chü tang edition (星聚堂), or T'ai-yüan shu-she (太玄書室) edition. Chang Chih (張袞) collated and published this edition.<sup>83</sup> Huang Pei-li mentioned that this edition was quite similar to the Ying-ning-chai hand copied edition mentioned above.<sup>84</sup> One copy is kept at the Harvard Yenching library,

---

<sup>75</sup> (a) Hu Wei-hsin' preface to *Liang ching i pien*, in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 808; Yen I-p'ing, *Pai pu tsung shu chi ch'eng* (Taipei: I wen yin shu kuan, 1966), no. 11, *Liang ching i pien*, no. 6.

(b) Yüan I-kuei's preface to *Liang ching i pien*, in *Pai pu tsung shu chi ch'eng*, no. 11, *Liang ching i pien*, no. 5. (c) Yeh Te-hui's comment in his *Hsi yüan tu shu chih*, *YTLCC* (Appendix), 837. (d) Fu Chen-hsiang's comment in his *Hsuang chien lu ch'ang shu hsü chi*, *YTLCC* (Appendix), 842.

<sup>76</sup> Yeh Te-hui's comment in his *Shi yüan tu shu chi*, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 838, 839.

<sup>77</sup> Kuo li ku kung pu wu yüan, *Kuo li ku kung pu wu yüan shan pen chiu chi tsung mu* (Taipei: Kuo li ku kung pu wu yüan, 1983), 640, 641.

<sup>78</sup> Kuo li chung yang t'u shu kuan t'e tsung chu, *Kuo li chung yang t'u shu kuan shan pen shu mu* (Taipei: Kuo li chung yang t'u shu kuan, 1986), 427.

<sup>79</sup> Kuo li chung yang t'u shu kuan, *Tai wan kung tsang shan pen shu mu shu ming so yin* (Taipei: Kuo li chung yang t'u shu kuan, 1971), 1836, 1837.

<sup>80</sup> *YTLCC* 58, 6, 9.

<sup>81</sup> *Catalogues of the Harvard-Yenching Library, Chinese Catalogue, Author/Title* (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1986), 104-6.

<sup>82</sup> Lao Kan, *chiao chi*, 13, 30.

<sup>83</sup> Chang Chih's preface, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 809, 810.

<sup>84</sup> Huang Pei-li's comment, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 825.

one at the National Central Library and one at the Peking Library.<sup>85</sup>

(8) Shen Yen-ch'üan's edition (沈延銓). Shen collated and published this edition.<sup>86</sup> Fu Chen-hsiang (傅增湘) suggested that its publishing date was some time after the Wan li period (萬曆 A.D.1573-1619).<sup>87</sup>

One copy is kept at the Peking Library, and one in Hsieh Kuo-ch'en's (謝國楨) collection.<sup>88</sup>

(9) A certain early Ming edition. The bibliography published by the Peking Library recorded an edition of the early Ming (明初) in its rare book collection. It is in two volumes, with thirteen lines to each half page and twenty six characters to each line.<sup>89</sup>

(10) Yeh Huan-ping (葉煥彬) edition with nine lines to each half a page and eighteen characters to each line: Yeh Huan-ping had a copy of *Yen t'ieh lun* of the Ming dynasty. He thought that it was Tu Chen's edition and published it. In fact, the original Ming copy was based on Ni Pang-yan's edition and collated with the Tu Chen's edition. It was published during the Chia-ching period. In A.D.1935 Lao Kan borrowed it from Fu Yüan-shu's collection.<sup>90</sup>

Among the Ch'ing editions, (1) the first to be introduced is Chang Tun-jen's edition (張敦仁). In A.D.1807 (嘉慶丁卯) Chang reproduced Tu Chen's A.D.1501

---

<sup>85</sup> (a) *Catalogues of the Harvard-Yenching Library, Chinese Catalogue, Author/Title* (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc. 1986), 104-106. (b) *Kuo li chung yang tu shu kuan shan pen shu mu*, 427. (c) *Pei ching tu shu kuan ku chi shan pen shu mu*, 1185, 1186. (d) A.D.1935, Lao Kan used one copy from Fu Yüan-shu's collection in collating various editions of *Yen t'ieh lun* (Lao Kan, *chiao chi*), 13, 30.

<sup>86</sup> Li Yüan-ting's preface for Shen's edition, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 811, 812.

<sup>87</sup> Fu Chen-hsiang's comment, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 842.

<sup>88</sup> (a) *Pei ching tu shu kuan ku chi shan pen shu mu*, 1185, 1186. (b) *YTLCC* 85, 6, 9. (c) In A.D.1935, Fu Yüan-shu had a copy in his collection (Lao Kan, *chiao chi*, 13).

<sup>89</sup> *Pei ching tu shu kuan, Pei ching tu shu kuan ku chi shan pen shu mu* (Peking: Shu mu wen hsien, [1987, preface]), 1185, 1186.

<sup>90</sup> (a) Lao Kan, *chiao chi*, 13, 28. (b) *YTLCC* (Appendix), 839, 842, 843.

Hung-chih edition and also included in it one volume of his collation.<sup>91</sup> This edition served as the basis for Wang Li-ch'i in publishing his *Yen t'ieh lun chiao chu*.<sup>92</sup> The University of London, School of Oriental and African Studies, has a copy.<sup>93</sup>

(2) The A.D.1891 (光緒辛卯) Shih hsien Chiang's edition (思賢講舍刊本). Wang Hsien-ch'ien (王先謙) incorporated collations of other scholars into his edition. For example, (a.) Lu Wen-chao's (盧文弨) collation. Lu checked the passages of *Yen t'ieh lun* quoted in *Yung lu ta tien* (永樂大典) and Tu Chen's edition with the A.D.1554 Chang Chih-hsiang's edition and included the result of his collation in his work *Chun shu shih i* (群書拾補). (b.) Chang Tun-jen's collation (張敦仁). (c.) Sentences of *Yen t'ieh lun* which were found by Wang Ch'i-yüan (王啓源) and Hu Yü an-ch'ang (胡元常) in other works, and (d.) Parts of *Yen t'ieh lun* which Wang himself found in the encyclopedias of the T'ang and Sung dynasties. Wang published his collation in the Shih hsien Chiang's edition.<sup>94</sup> The Harvard-Yenching library, and the University of California, Berkeley, each has a copy in its collection.<sup>95</sup>

Among the Republic period editions, Wang Li-ch'i's *Yen t'ieh lun chiao chu*: It was published in A.D.1958. He based his edition on Chang Tun-jen's reproduction of

---

<sup>91</sup> (a.) Chang's preface, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 819. (b.) Ku Ch'ien-li's preface for this edition, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 820, 821. (c.) Fu Cheng-hsiang's comment, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 840. (d.) Wang Hsien-ch'ien's comment, included in *YTLCC*, 832. Yeh Te-hui suggested that the copy which Chang Tun-jen used in reproducing his edition was not Tu Chen's original one, but the A.D. 1551 Ni Pang-yen's edition which was reproduced on the basis of Tu Ch'en's edition. Ni's edition had ten lines to each half a page, and twenty characters to each line. (Yeh Te-hui's comment, included in *YTLCC*, 838, 839).

<sup>92</sup> *YTLCC*, 849.

<sup>93</sup> *School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, Library Catalogue, Chinese Catalogue, Titles* (Boston: G.K.Hall & Co., 1963), 595.

<sup>94</sup> Wang Hsien-ch'ien's preface and his comment, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 831, 832.

<sup>95</sup> (a.) Harvard-Yenching Library: *Catalogues of the Harvard-Yenching Library, Chinese Catalogue, Author/Title*, 104-106. (b.) University of California Berkeley: *East Asiatic Library, University of California Berkeley, Author-Title Catalog* (Boston: G.K.Hall & Co., 1968), 201, 202.



Tu Chen's A.D.1501 edition. He checked the Chang Tun-jen's edition with (a.) eleven other editions and (b.) the *Yen t'ieh lun* quoted in various encyclopedias and commentaries.

Of the various editions mentioned above, some are still surviving to-day. For example:

(1) A certain early Ming edition: one copy is kept at the Peking Library.<sup>96</sup>

(2) The A.D.1501 Tu Chen's edition: a copy is kept at the National Palace Museum, in Taipei;<sup>97</sup> four copies at the Peking Library, in Peking,<sup>98</sup> and a copy at the National Normal University, in Taipei.<sup>99</sup>

(3) The A.D.1501 Ying ning chai hand-copied edition: a copy is kept in the Peking Library.<sup>100</sup>

(4) The A.D.1506-1566 (Cheng te, Chia ching) edition, with two lines indicating that the work was published in the year when the reign year Shun hsi was changed: this edition was originally in Ting Shih-ch'ang's private collection, and now is kept in the Peking Library.<sup>101</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup> *Pei ching tu shu kuan*, *Pei ching tu shu kuan ku chi shan pen shu mu* (Peking: Shu mu wen hsien, [1987, preface]), 1185, 1186.

<sup>97</sup> *Kou li ku kung pu wu yüan shan pen chiu chi tsung mu*, 640, 641. (b.) *Ku li chung yang tu shu küan*, *Tai wan kung tsang shan pen shu mu shu ming so yin* (Taipei: Kuo li chung yang tu shu küan, 1971), 1836, 1837.

<sup>98</sup> *Pei ching tu shu kuan ku chi shan pen shu mu*, 1185, 1186.

<sup>99</sup> (a.) *Tai wan kung tsang shan pen shu mu shu ming so yin*, 1836. (b.) *Kuo li tai wan ta hsüeh tai wan sheng li tai pei tu shu kuan kuo fang yen chiu yüan kuo li shih fan ta hsüeh shih li tung hai ta hsüeh*, *Kuo li tai wan ta hsüeh tai wan sheng li tai pei tu shu kuan Kuo fang yen chiu yüan kuo li shih fan ta hsüeh shih li tung hai ta hsüeh shan pen shu mu* (Taipei: Kuo li tai wan ta hsüeh tai wan sheng li tai pei tu shu kuan kuo fang yen chiu yüan kuo li shih fan ta hsüeh shih li tung hai ta hsüeh, 1968), 7. The fact whether this copy is Tu Chen's original A.D.1501 print still has to be confirmed.

<sup>100</sup> *Pei ching tu shu kuan ku chi shan pen shu mu*, 1185, 1186.

<sup>101</sup> *YTLCC*, 848.

(5) The Chia ching (A.D.1522-1566) edition: The Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica published the bibliography of its rare book section. It included a *Yen t'ieh lun* of the Chia ching reign (A.D.1522-1566).<sup>102</sup>

(6) The A.D.1551 Ni Pang-yen edition: One copy is kept at the Peking Library,<sup>103</sup> one at the Palace Museum in Taipei.<sup>104</sup>

(7) The A.D.1554 Chang Chih-hsiang edition: one copy is kept in the Library of Congress,<sup>105</sup> one copy at Princeton University Library,<sup>106</sup> one copy at the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica,<sup>107</sup> one copy at the Palace Museum, Taipei,<sup>108</sup> five copies at the National Central Library, Taipei,<sup>109</sup> one copy at T'ung Ti-te's (童第德) collection,<sup>110</sup> and three copies at the Peking Library.<sup>111</sup>

(8) The A.D.1573-1615 (Wan li) Shen Yen-ch'üan edition: one copy is kept at the Peking Library,<sup>112</sup> one in Hsieh Kuo-chen's (謝國楨) collection.<sup>113</sup>

(9) The A.D.1573-1615 (Wan li) Chin Chang's Yung wan t'ang (金閭擁萬堂) edition, commented by Chung Hsing (鍾惺): one copy is kept at the Palace Museum, Taipei.<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>102</sup> *Chung yang yen chiu yüan li shih yü yen yen chiu so shan pen shu mu*, 114.

<sup>103</sup> *Pei ching tu shu kuan ku chi shan pen shu mu*, 1185, 1186.

<sup>104</sup> *Tai wan kung tsang shan pen shu mu shu ming so yin*, 1836, 1837.

<sup>105</sup> *A Descriptive Catalog of Rare Chinese Books in the Library of Congress*, 447.

<sup>106</sup> Ch'ü Wan-li, *Pu ling shih tun ta hsüeh ke shih te tung fang tu shu kuan chung wen shan pen shu mu*, 215.

<sup>107</sup> *Chung yang yen chiu yüan li shih yü yen yen chiu so shan pen shu mu*, 114.

<sup>108</sup> *Kuo li ku kung pu wu yüan shan pen chiu chi tsung mu*, 640, 641.

<sup>109</sup> *Kuo li chung yang t'u shu kuan shan pen shu mu*, 427.

<sup>110</sup> *YTLCC* 58, 6, 9.

<sup>111</sup> *Pei ching tu shu kuan ku chi shan pen shu mu*, 1185, 1186.

<sup>112</sup> *Pei ching tu shu kuan ku chi shan pen shu mu*, 1185, 1186.

<sup>113</sup> *YTLCC* 85, 6, 9.

<sup>114</sup> *Kuo li ku kung pu wu yüan shan pen chiu chi tsung mu*, 640, 641; *Tai wan kung tsang shan pen shu mu shu ming so yin*, 1836, 1837.

(10) The A.D.1582 Yüan I-kuei and Hu Wei-hsing's *Liang chin i pien* edition (原一魁、胡維新 兩京遺編): two copies are kept at the Taipei Palace Museum,<sup>115</sup> two copies at the National Central Library,<sup>116</sup> one copy at the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica,<sup>117</sup> and one copy in Kuo mo-je's (郭沫若) collection.<sup>118</sup>

(11) The A.D.1586 Chang family Hsing chü t'ang (張氏星聚堂) edition: one copy is kept at the National Central Library,<sup>119</sup> one at the Peking Library<sup>120</sup> and one at the Harvard Yenching Library.<sup>121</sup>

(12) The Early Ming, Ma sha (麻沙本) edition: one copy is kept in the Peking Library.<sup>122</sup>

(13) The Late Ming edition, with Chang Chih-hsiang's and Chung Hsiung's commentary: one copy is kept at the National Central Library,<sup>123</sup> one at the Chinese Academy of Sciences, Peking.<sup>124</sup>

(13) The end of Ming, Ho Yung-chung's *Han wei tsung shu* (漢魏叢書) edition: one copy is kept at the National Central Library.<sup>125</sup>

(14) The A.D.1721 hand copied Huang family Shih li chü (黃氏士禮居) edition: one copy is kept at the National Central Library, Taipei.<sup>126</sup>

(15) The A.D.1736-1795 Ch'ien lung Ssu ku chüan shu edition, with Chang Chih-

---

<sup>115</sup> *Kuo li ku kung pu wu yüan shan pen chiu chi tsung mu*, 640, 641.

<sup>116</sup> *Kuo li chung yang t'u shu kuan shan pen shu mu*, 427.

<sup>117</sup> *Tai wan kung tsang shan pen shu mu shu ming so yin*, 1836, 1837.

<sup>118</sup> *YTLCC* 85, 6, 9.

<sup>119</sup> *Kuo li chung yang t'u shu kuan shan pen shu mu*, 427.

<sup>120</sup> *Pei ching tu shu kuan ku chi shan pen shu mu*, 1185, 1186.

<sup>121</sup> *Catalogues of the Harvard-Yenching Library, Chinese Catalogue, Author/Title*, 104-106.

<sup>122</sup> *YTLCC*, 837.

<sup>123</sup> *Kuo li chung yang tu shu kuan shan pen shu mu*, 427.

<sup>124</sup> Chinese Academy of Sciences, Library catalog, information supplied by Ms Mao Ching-hua of Academy of Sciences.

<sup>125</sup> *Kuo li chung yang t'u shu kuan shan pen shu mu*, 427.

<sup>126</sup> *Kuo li chung yang t'u shu kuan shan pen shu mu*, 427.

hsiang commentary: one copy is kept at the Palace Museum, Taipei.<sup>127</sup>

(16) The A.D.1736-1795 Ch'ien lung Ssu ku ch'uan shu selected edition, with Chang Chih-hsiang commentary: one copy is kept at the Palace Museum, Taipei.<sup>128</sup>

(17) The Ch'eng Jung edited, *Han wei ts'ung shu* edition: University of Michigan has a copy.<sup>129</sup>

(18) The A.D.1795 hand copied Wa family movable type (華氏活字本) edition: one copy is kept at the Peking Library.<sup>130</sup>

(19) The A.D.1807 Chang Tun-jeng's edition: the University of London has a copy.<sup>131</sup>

(20) The A.D.1891 Shih hsien ch'ang she edition (思賢講舍刊本): Harvard-Yenching Library and University of California Berkeley each has a copy.<sup>132</sup>

Of the above extant editions, the most important one is the Tu Ch'en's edition. As we mentioned above, Tu Chen's A.D.1501 Hung chih edition of the Ming dynasty is not only the best and one of the oldest editions we have today, but also enables us to trace *Yen t'ieh lun* to the A.D.1202 Chia tai edition of the Sung dynasty. Thus, the A.D.1202 Chai tai edition which was preserved in the A.D.1501 Hung chih edition, is the earliest text of *Yen t'ieh lun* we have.

(C) Another way to detect corruptions in the work done during the thousand years of transmission is by checking for textual variations passages of the *Yen t'ieh lun* preserved

---

<sup>127</sup> *Kuo li ku kung pu wu yüan shan pen chiu chi tsung mu*, 640, 641.

<sup>128</sup> *Kuo li ku kung pu wu yüan shan pen chiu chi tsung mu*, 641.

<sup>129</sup> *Catalogs of the Asia Library, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Chinese Catalog* (Boston: G.K.Hall & Co., 1978), 530, 531.

<sup>130</sup> (a.) Wang Ch'un-ming, *Chung kuo shan pen shu t'i yao* (Taipei: Ming wen shu ch'ü, 1984), 220.  
(b.) YTLCC, 390, 392.

<sup>131</sup> *School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, Library Catalogue, Titles*, 595.

<sup>132</sup> (a.) Harvard-Yenching Library: *Catalogues of the Harvard-Yenching Library, Chinese Catalogue, Author/Title*, 104-106. (b.) University of California Berkeley: *East Asiatic Library, University of California Berkeley, Author, Title Catalog*, 201, 202.

in quotations in other works of different periods with the *Yen t'ieh lun* in our hand.

*Yen t'ieh lun* was quoted by other works in various periods. For example, Pan ku's *Han shu* (班固 漢書) of the Later Han dynasty, Li, Tao-yüan's *Shui ching chu* (酈道元 水經注), Chia, Ssu-hsüeh's *Ch'i min yao shu* (賈思勰 齊民要術) of the Wei dynasty, Liu Chao's commentary on *Hsü han shu pai kuan chih* (劉昭 續漢書百官志) of the Southern and Northern dynasties; Tu Yu's *T'ung tien* (杜佑 通典), Wei Cheng's *Chün shu chih yao* (魏徵 群書治要), Ou-yang Hsün's *I wen lei chü* (歐陽詢 藝文類聚), Yü Shih-nan's *Pei t'ang shu ch'ao* (虞世南 北堂書鈔), Pai Chü-i's *Pai shih liu t'ieh shih lei chi* (白居易 白氏六帖事類集), Ma Tsung's *I lin* (馬總 意林) of the T'ang dynasty; Li Fang's *T'ai p'ing yü lan* (李昉 太平御覽), Wang Ying-lin's *Yü hai* (王應麟 玉海), Ma Tuan-lin's *Wen hsien t'ung k'ao* (馬端臨 文獻通考), Sung Feng-chi's *Chih kuan fen chi* (孫逢吉 職官分紀) of the Sung dynasty; Yao Kuang-hsiao's *Yung-lo ta tien* (姚廣孝等 永樂大典), Chu T'ing-li's *Yen cheng chih* (朱廷立 鹽政志), Shen Chin's *Pai chia lei tsuan* (沈津 百家類纂), Chen Shen's *Chu tzu p'ing chieh* (陳深 諸子品節), Feng Ch'i's *Ching chi lei pien* (馮琦 經濟類編), Yeh Hsiung-kao's *Pai tzu lei han* (葉向高 百子類函), Kuei Yu-kuang's *Chu tzu hui han* (歸有光 諸子彙函), Li Yün-hsiang's *Chu tzu pa ts'ui* (李雲翔 諸子拔萃), Huang Chu and Yeh shao-t'ai's *Liang han wen pieh chieh* (黃澍 葉紹泰 兩漢文別解), and Kuo Wei's *Pai tzu chin tan* (郭偉 百子金丹) of the Ming dynasty.

Two kinds of works especially attracted our attention. First, those works which were written close in time to *Yen t'ieh lun*. The writers of these works had the opportunity to see the original text of *Yen t'ieh lun* when it was first made available to the public. For example, Pan ku, lived close in time to Huan Kuan, and had the opportunity to have access to *Yen t'ieh lun* when it was first written. When he quoted *Yen t'ieh lun* in his *Han shu*, he was likely in the position to supply us with *Yen t'ieh lun* in its original form. If there is no serious difference between the *Yen t'ieh lun* quoted in *Han shu* and the *Yen t'ieh lun* which we have today in our hand, it strongly suggests that there might be no serious corruption in *Yen t'ieh lun* despite its years of

transmission. Second, encyclopedias of various periods. Chinese encyclopedias organize Chinese knowledge on all subjects by collecting passages from extant literature on each subject. They quote passages from extant literatures in their original words without alteration. Thus encyclopedias preserve many works, including *Yen t'ieh lun*. We can check passages of *Yen t'ieh lun* quoted in encyclopedias of various periods with the *Yen t'ieh lun* in our hands to search for corruption done to *Yen t'ieh lun* during its years of transmission, especially the encyclopedias of the T'ang and Sung periods and *Yung-lo ta-tien* of the Ming dynasty. The gigantic work *Yung-lo ta-tien* tried to preserve the sum total of Chinese written knowledge. Moreover, at the time when the *Yung-lo ta-tien* was compiled, many ancient texts of Chinese books were still extant.

Pan Ku in *Han shu* vol. 66 quoted the 60th section of *Yen t'ieh lun*.

Quoted section of *Yen t'ieh lun* in *Han shu*, vol. 66.<sup>133</sup>

…其辭曰、觀公卿賢良文學之議、異乎吾所聞、聞汝南朱生言、當此之時、英俊並進、賢良茂陵唐生、文學魯國萬生之徒、六十有餘人、咸聚闕庭、舒六藝之風、陳治平之原、知者贊其慮、仁者明其施、勇者見其斷、辯者聘其辭、斷斷焉、行行焉、雖未詳備、斯可略觀矣、中山劉子推、言王道、矯當世、反諸正、彬彬然、弘博君子也、九江祝生、奮史魚之節、發憤懣、譏公卿、介然直而不撓、可謂不畏彊圉矣、桑大夫、據當世、合時變、上權利之略、雖非正法、鉅儒宿學、不能自解、博物通達之士也、然攝公卿之柄、不師古始、放於末利、處非其位、行非其道、果隕其性、呂及厥宗、車丞相、履伊呂之列、當軸處中、括囊不言、容身而去、彼哉、彼哉、若夫、丞相御史兩府之士、不能正議、輔宰相、成同類、長同行、阿意苟合、昌說其上、斗筭之徒、何足選也。

...Huan Kuan said that examining the discussion of the ministers, the hsien liang delegates and the wen hsüeh delegates, it was different from what I heard. I heard Mr. Chu of Ju nan saying that, at that time, many superior scholars came

---

<sup>133</sup> HS, vol. 66, 16b-17b.

together. Over sixty of them, such as the hsien liang delegate, Mr. T'ang of Mu ling, and the wen hsüeh delegate, Mr. Wan of the kingdom of Lu, all gathered in the court, spreading the influence of the six Classics and presenting the causes which brought about good governing. Those who had wisdom illuminated their thought. Those who were benevolent manifested their kindness. Those who were brave displayed their decisiveness. Those who were versed in debate released the full force of their argument. All earnestly and strongly engaged in debate. Although their deliberation and arguments were not comprehensive and detailed, they were worth observing. Mr. Liu of Chung shan, expounding the kingly way, suggested how to return society of today to its correct course. He was a refined gentleman of extensive learning. Faithfully following the moral integrity of the historian Yü, Mr. Chu of Chiu chiang bursted with anger and bitterly criticized the ministers with satires. His determined, unbending straightforwardness could be described as without fear of the powerful ministers. Yü-shih ta-fu (御史大夫) Shang, examining the situation of his time, adapting his consideration to the circumstances of the day, presented a policy expedient at that time. Although the laws he promoted were not orthodox, the great Confucianists and seasoned scholars could not expound their opinions to win the argument with him. Minister Shang could be called a scholar of broad knowledge and versed in the ways of the world. However, holding the authority of a minister, he did not follow the ancient ways but indulged instead in pursuing commercial profits. He occupied a position which was not suitable to him. He did not act according to the way. He did finally bring death to himself and disaster to his clan. Cheng hsiang Ch'e (車丞相 Chancellor) who stood in history among such famous statemen as Yi Ying (伊尹) and Lü Shang (呂尚), controlled the pivot of the government and occupied the central position of the state. However, he kept complete silence in the debate, protected himself and left the conference. That one! That one!

He was not worth a mention. As for the officials in the offices of the chancellor's and the vice chancellor's, they could not assist the chancellor by offering the right opinions. They gathered around them men of the same kind and they aided each other. They bent their own judgment so as to be in conformity with their superiors and to please their superiors. Being men of small capacities, they were not worth being selected to participate in this debate.

The 60th Section of *Yen t'ieh lun* in the *Yen t'ieh lun* which is in our hands today.<sup>134</sup>

客曰、余睹鹽鐵之義、觀乎公卿文學賢良之論、意指殊路、各有所出、或上仁義、或務權利、異哉吾所聞、周秦粲然、皆有天下而南面焉、然安危長久殊世、始汝南朱子伯爲予言、當此之時、豪俊並進、四方輻湊、賢良茂陵唐生、文學魯國萬生之倫、六十餘人、咸聚闕庭、舒六藝之風、論太平之原、智者贊其慮、仁者明其施、勇者見其斷、辯者陳其詞、閭閻焉、侃侃焉、雖未能詳備、斯可略觀矣、然蔽於雲霧、終廢而不行、悲夫、公卿知任武可以辟地、而不知廣德可以附遠、知權利可以廣用、而不知稼穡可以富國也、近者親附、遠者說德、則何爲而不成、何求而不得、不出於斯路、而務畜利長威、豈不謬哉、中山劉子雍、言王道、矯當世、復諸正、務在乎反本、直而不徼、切而不燖、斌斌然、斯可謂弘博君子矣、九江祝生、奮由路之意、推史魚之節、發憤懣、刺譏公卿、介然直而不撓、可謂不畏強禦矣、桑大夫、據當世、合時變、推道術、尚權利、辟略小辯、雖非正法、然巨儒宿學罔然不能自解、可謂博物通士矣、然攝卿相之位、不引準繩、以道化下、放於利末、不師始古、易曰、焚如、棄如、處非其位、行非其道、果隕其性、以及厥宗、車丞相即周呂之列、當軸處中、括囊不言、容身而去、彼哉、彼哉、若夫群丞相御史、不能正議以輔宰相、成同類、長同行、阿意苟合、以說其上、斗筭之人、道諛之徒、何足算哉。

---

<sup>134</sup> YTLCC, 629, 630.



The guest says, "I saw the discussion that took place about salt and iron. Examining the arguments of the ministers, the delegates of wen hsüeh and of hsien liang, each one's intention and viewpoint led in different directions and each one's opinion was based on a different motive. Some emphasized jen and i (仁義 benevolence and righteousness). Some indulged in pursuing power and profit. What I heard was extraordinary. Chou and Ch'in, both dynasties, were brilliant and glorious and had the whole world under their rule. However, the two belonged to two completely different worlds: one enjoyed longevity, security and peace, while the other had a short life span and was threatened with dangers. Mr. Chu Pu of Ju nan told me that, at that time, many superior talented scholars came together from the four directions like the spokes centering at the hub. Over sixty of them, such as the hsien liang delegate, Mr. T'ang of Mu ling, and the wen hsüeh delegate, Mr. Wan of the kingdom of Lu, all gathered in the court, spreading the influence of the six Classics and presenting the causes which brought about good governing. Those who had wisdom brought to light their thoughtful thinking. Those benevolent ones manifested their kindness. Those brave ones displayed their decisiveness. Those versed in debate presented their argument forcefully and with great aplomb. All earnestly and strongly engaged in debate. Although their deliberation and arguments were not comprehensive and detailed, they were worth observing. However, the ministers, as if they were blinded by cloud and mist, discarded the delegates' suggestions and did not carry them out. Alas, the ministers knew that one could expand the territory by relying on military force, but did not know that one could have people in far away lands attached to you by extending your virtue. They knew that commercial profits could increase the government's wealth, but did not know that agriculture could enrich the country. If those close to you followed you intimately and if those who were far away were attracted to your virtue, what deeds could not be

accomplished and what goal could not be achieved? The ministers did not take this path in formulating their policy, instead they concentrated on accumulating profits and augmenting awesome power. Was not it utterly absurd? Mr. Liu Yung of Chung shan, expounding the kindly way, wanted to bring society of to-day to a correct course and to its important fundamental principles. He was straitforward, and did not seek for fame. He was earnest, severe and not timid. He was refined and ornamental and could be called a gentleman of extensive learning. Mr. Chu of Chiu chiang, tried hard to follow Yu lu's (Chung yu) idea of bravely accepting death in carrying out one's duty and promoted the moral integrity of the historian Yü. He, bursting with anger, satired the ministers. His determined, unbending straightforwardness could be described as without fear of the powerful ministers. Yü-shih ta-fu (御史大夫) Shang, (in formulating government policy), based his consideration on the current situation of the time, and tried to adapt policy to the circumstances of his day. He searched into the learning (for answers) and had commercial profits and expedient solutions as his priorities. Although his specious plans and skilful trivial debate did not follow orthodox ways and methods, the great Confucianists and seasoned scholars embarrassingly could not expound their own opinions to win the argument with him. Minister Shang could be called a scholar of broad knowledge and versed in the ways of the world. However, occupying the position of a minister, he did not use rules, standards and the Way to regulate and to mold those below him. He did not follow the ancient ways but indulged instead in pursuing commercial profits. He would be ruined by being burned and abandoned as the Book of Changes described. He occupied a position which was not suitable to him. He did not act according to the Way. He finally brought death to himself and brought disaster to his clan. Cheng hsiang Ch'e (車丞相 chancellor) who stood in history among such famous statesman as the Duke of Chou and Lü shang, controlled the pivot

of the government and occupied the central position of the state. However, he kept complete silence in the debate, protected himself and left the conference. That one! That one! He was not worth a mention. As for those officials under the chen hsiang and yü shih, they could not assist the chancellor by offering the right opinions. They gathered around them men of the same kind and they aided each other. They bent their own judgement so as to be in conformity with their superiors and to please their superiors. Being men of small capacities and flattery, they were not worth being counted.

After we compared the same section of *Yen t'ieh lun* in the above two works, we found that Pan Ku quoted neither the whole section of *Yen t'ieh lun*, neither did he render the passage in the form of a summary. He quoted the 60th section word by word, but skipped sentences and changed words here and there. There are variations between the *Yen t'ieh lun* preserved by Pan Ku in his *Han shu* vol. 66 and the 60th section of *Yen t'ieh lun* we have today. One variation is of a serious nature. The other difference are not important ones and do not change the meaning of the *Yen t'ieh lun*. The serious variation is that the character "hu" in the sentence "i hu wo so wen" in *Han shu* (異乎吾所聞 it was different from what I heard) is different from the character "tsai" in the same sentence "i tsai wo so wen" in *Yen t'ieh lun* (異哉吾所聞 extraordinary was what I heard). This variation, as we discussed in the early part of the paper, was likely caused by Pan Ku when he misquoted *Yen t'ieh lun* in his *Han shu*. The 60th section of *Yen t'ieh lun* has not suffered serious corruption in its two thousands years of transmission.

Likewise, *Yen t'ieh lun*, as we mentioned above, was also quoted and preserved by other works of the following dynasties. For example, *Shui ching chu* (水經注), *Chi min yao shu* (齊民要術), *T'ung tien* (通典), *Chün shu chih yao* (群書治要), *I wen lei chü* (藝文類聚), *Pei t'ang shu ch'ao* (北堂書鈔), *Pai shih liu t'ieh shih lei chi* (白氏六帖事類集), *I lin* (意林), *T'ai p'ing yü lan* (太平御覽), *Yü hai* (玉海), *Wen hsien t'ung k'ao* (文獻通考), *Chih kuan fen chi* (職官分紀), *Yung-lo ta-tien* (永樂大典),

*Yen cheng chih* (鹽政志), *Pai chia lei tsuan* (百家類纂), *Chu tzu p'ing chieh* (諸子品節), *Ching chi lei pien* (經濟類編), *Pai tzu lei han* (百子類函), *Chu tzu lei han* (諸子類函), *Chu tzu pa ts'ui* (諸子拔萃), *Liang han wen pieh chieh* (兩漢文別解) and *Pai tzu chin tan* (百子金丹), and so on. The quotations of *Yen t'ieh lun* in these works are valuable to us in detecting the corruption in today's text of *Yen t'ieh lun*.

Many scholar did collating works of *Yen t'ieh lun*. For example, Chang Chih-hsiang wrote a commentary (張之象) to it.<sup>135</sup> Lu Wen-chao (盧文弨) collated Chang Chih-hsiang's edition by checking it with Tu Chen's (涂禎) edition and with the *Yen t'ieh lun* quoted in *Yung-lo ta-tien* (永樂大典), the monumental encyclopedia of the Ming dynasty. He published the result in his work *Ch'ün shu shih pu* (群書拾捕).<sup>136</sup> Chang Tun-jen also published one volume of his collation (張敦仁).<sup>137</sup> Wang Hsien-ch'ien (王先謙) in publishing his edition included Lu Wen-chao's and Chang Tun-jen's above collations into his work. He also checked *Yen t'ieh lun* against its quotations found in the encyclopedias of the T'ang and Sung dynasties and published the result of his collation in one volume.<sup>138</sup> Lao Kan (勞幹) checked Tu Chen's edition with the other seven editions.<sup>139</sup> Wang Li-ch'i published an edition. It was based on Chang Tun-jen's reproduction of Tu Chen's edition. He checked Chang Tun-jen's edition with eleven other editions and also with the *Yen t'ieh lun* quoted in various encyclopedias and commentaries.<sup>140</sup>

Scholars, for example the ones mentioned above, checked the *Yen t'ieh lun* text in their hands with its quotations in various work of different periods for textual

<sup>135</sup> Chang Chih-hsiang's preface, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 805, 806.

<sup>136</sup> Lu Wen-chao, *Ch'ün shu shih pu* (Pao Ching t'ang, [1787]), vol. 6, la.

<sup>137</sup> (a.) Chang Tun-jen's preface, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 819. (b.) Ku Ch'ien-li's preface for Chang's edition, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 820, 821.

<sup>138</sup> Wang Hsien-ch'ien's comment on his volume of collation, included in *YTLCC* (Appendix), 831, 832.

<sup>139</sup> Lao Kan, *chiao chih*, 13-52.

<sup>140</sup> *YTLCC* 85, 6.

variations. They all found variations. However, the variations are not of importance and do not change the contents of the *Yen t'ieh lun*. It is likely that *Yen t'ieh lun* did not suffer serious corruption during its two thousand years of transmission.

In conclusion, after the above examination of the *Yen t'ieh lun* as a historical source, we find that it supplies valuable data on the Han period. The 81B.C. court debate presented in *Yen t'ieh lun* covered extensively the various aspects of government policies: political, economical, intellectual, social, military and so on. Moreover, being the actual record of the court debate, it supplies us with first hand information. Then, we are further assured that the copy of this work in our hand today did not suffer serious corruption during its two thousand years of transmission. We can recommend *Yen t'ieh lun* as a reliable, valuable primary source of the Former Han period.

(Accepted for publication 23 November 1995)

## References

- Chang Chih-hsiang. *Yen t'ieh lun*. Taipei: Chung kuo tzu hsüeh ming chu chi cheng pien yin chi chin hui, [1977].
- Chang Tun-jen. *Yen t'ieh lun fu kao cheng*. Taipei: Taiwan shang wu Yin shu kuan, 1965.
- Hsü Han-ch'ang. *Yen t'ieh lun yen chiu*. Taipei: Wen shih che, 1983.
- Lao kan. Yen t'ieh lun chiao chi, in *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica* 5.1 (1953): 13-51.
- Loewe, Michael. Yen t'ieh lun, in *Early Chinese Texts: a Bibliographical Guide*, ed. by Michael Loewe. Berkely, California: Society for the Study of Early China: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 1993.
- Lu Wen-Chao. *Ch'ün shu shih pu*. Pao ching t'ang, [1787].
- Tao Tien-yi. Yen t'ieh lun as a Historical Source, unpublished class notes, University of Hawaii, 1968.
- Wang Hsien-ch'ien. *Yen t'ieh lun*. Ch'ang sha: Shih hsieh chiang she, [1891].
- Wang Li-chi. *Yen t'ieh lun chiao chu*. T'ien ching: T'ien ching ku chi chu pan she, 1983.

## 鹽鐵論的史料價值

陶天翼

美國夏威夷大學歷史系

我們試從兩個角度去檢查鹽鐵論這份史料，（甲）它所提供的資料；（乙）這些資料的可信性。

（甲）資料：鹽鐵論是公元前八十一年的一次朝議的記錄，會中所討論的問題牽涉極廣，包括政治、經濟、外交、軍事、社會、思想等等問題，提供瞭解前漢很多可貴的資料。（乙）可信性：經深入的檢查，（一）鹽鐵論確實是這次會議的記錄，不是道聽塗說的傳聞或是虛構的故事，是第一手史料。（二）這份記錄經桓寬整理成書，兩千年以來流傳迄今，內容沒有受到很大的變動，這兩點確定以後我們可以推薦鹽鐵論是一份研究前漢極有價值的可信的第一手史料。

本文取材於一九六八年所授一門中國史料課裡的講稿，承史語所允與發表，謹致最深的謝意。