DOI 10.3868/s020-012-023-0028-2

Moving Towards Refinement: Rural Organizations and Rural Governance in the Song Dynasty*

> Liao Yin[a], Du Yangyang[a]

Abstract With the society moving from decentralization to a whole and the strengthening of centralization, the state gradually enhanced the involvement in rural community. At the same time, the management of people-land relationship tended to be refined. The original Xiang-Li system, which was suitable to decentralized community, was no longer needed by the state, and would be inevitably replaced by smaller rural organizations that were suitable to centralized community. In this context, the Du-Bao system emerged as the times required. During this process, the combination of the Bao-Jia system, territory division, and mapping technique played a key role in pushing forward the refinement management of people-land relationship. From the Xiang-Li system to the Du-Bao system, from rural officials to rural servants, when rural power was transferred to the government, more new rural authority systems that embodied the state will replaced the traditional rural authority system. There was a lack of obvious dominant class such as aristocratic families and gentry representatives in rural community in the Song Dynasty. Such a unique era provided an excellent opportunity for the state forces to go deep into and change rural community. For this reason, the state authority upon rural areas in the Song Dynasty exceeded the Han and Tang dynasties, and even the subsequent Yuan, Ming, and Qing dynasties.

Keywords the Song Dynasty, rural organization, rural governance, refinement progress

As is known to all, the formal administrative system in ancient China only reached the county level. In the vast rural areas under counties, there were neither formal administrative organizations nor national officials. For a long term, there have been heated arguments in the academic circles and civil society over whether the imperial power reached below counties. However, various forces were competing behind the seemingly persistent and peaceful rural community, in which the governance subject and governance methods were both updating constantly. Throughout the ancient Chinese history, the Song Dynasty was undoubtedly an era with very active social activities, when rural organizations and rural governance methods represented distinctive characteristics of the times. At present, there are a wide range of results in the academic circles on the study of

* This paper is translated from 清华大学学报(哲学社会科学版) (*Journal of Tsinghua University [Philosophy and Social Sciences]*) 3 (2021): 13–24.

a Research Center of Song Dynasty History, Hebei University, Baoding 071002, China

rural organizations and rural governance in the Song Dynasty.[1] However, it is necessary to further explore how rural organizations and rural governance in the Song Dynasty moved towards refinement and the inevitable trend of the refinement progress.

I From the Xiang-Li System to the Du-Bao System: Refinement of Rural Governance Units in the Song Dynasty[2]

China's rural organizations have a very long history. Rural organizations formally appeared in the Spring and Autumn period and were established nationwide in the Qin and Han dynasties. Typical rural organizations roughly extended to the early Tang Dynasty. Afterwards, the Xiang system was gradually ignored, while the Li system was enhanced (Lu 2017; Zhao 2002, 4–24). Rural organizations in different eras varied greatly in territory. Overall, the number of households rural areas was constantly shrinking. According to the system of the Qin and Han dynasties, a Li 里 covered a hundred households; "a Ting 亭 covers ten Li"; "a Xiang 乡 covers ten Ting," as many as 12,500 households (Ban 1976, 1121). In the system of the Jin Dynasty, "a Xiang shall be set up for more than five hundred households, two Xiang for more than three thousand households; three Xiang for more than five thousand households; four Xiang for more than ten thousand households" (Du 1988, 923). One Xiang covered about 500–2,500 households. In the system of the Sui and Tang dynasties, "a hundred households form a Li; five Li form a Xiang"[3] (Li et al. 1992, 73). One Xiang covered about 500 households. It can be seen that national strength was broadening and deepening its penetration into rural areas. When the penetration of national strength reached a certain degree, the large-scale Xiang-Li system that adapted to decentralized community would no longer be needed by the state. Due to the large territory of Xiang, only 3–5 Xiang were generally within the jurisdiction of a county (Zhang 1997, 28). In extreme situation, two counties even jointly administered one Xiang (Wei et al. 1973, 1200). Therefore, the Xiang system was first ignored in the Tang Dynasty. As the Xiang system was ignored, Li gradually became the actually highest and most important organization from the mid-Tang Dynasty to the mid-Northern Song Dynasty. "Many Xiang appointed Li heads to manage taxes and levies." (Xu 1957, 3468)

From the Tang to the Song dynasties,

1 There are a large number of research results. For studies before 2015, refer to Tan (2010), Jia (2014), and Fu (2015). There are not many new results after 2015, but they are very important, particularly a series of results of Bao Weimin 包伟民 (2015, 2016a, 2016b).

2 In addition to Bao Weimin's studies, the specific studies on the evolution of rural system from Xiang-Li system to Du-Bao system in the Song Dynasty include: Wang (2008), Sudō (1965), Satake (1966), and Yanagida (1986). Among these works, Sudō Yoshiyuki's "The Changing Process of Rural System in the Song Dynasty" is most related with this section. His paper analyzes the changing process of and reasons for the rural system from Xiang-Li to Du-Bao since the late Tang Dynasty. However, when exploring the reasons for changes, Sudō mainly analyzed from the perspective of land system and tax system, while this paper mainly makes analysis from the national management over rural refinement.

3 In the Sui Dynasty, "five hundred households form a Xiang"; "a hundred households form a Li." Actually, it also means that "a hundred households form a Li; five Li form a Xiang" (Wei et al. 1973, 32).

there were organizations similar to Li. In the fifth year of the Xiande period in the Later Zhou Dynasty (958), "prefectures and prefectures of all provinces ordered Tuan 团 to merge villages. A hundred households were mostly merged into one Tuan. The three major households were selected as Qi 耆 heads" (Wang 1978, 405). The systems that a hundred households formed a Tuan and that a hundred households formed a Li were identical. In the seventh year of the Kaibao period in the Northern Song Dynasty (974), "Xiang were abolished and divided into Guan 管. The household heads were appointed to manage tax collection; the Qi heads were appointed to manage lawsuits against robberies" (Xu 1957, 3468). The seventh year of the Kaibao period was only 17 years apart from the fifth year of the Xiande period, but both Guan and Tuan had Qi heads. This indicates that Guan and Tuan were very similar, and they were organizations like Li. In the *Affairs of Imperial Edicts in the Third Year of the Yuanfu Period* 元符三年应诏封事, Chao Yuezhi 晁说之 (1985, 26) said, "Bao 保 are set up by merging and removing Tuan and Guan. The Bao heads are hired and recruited to take the place of Qi heads." Chao Yuezhi jointly named "Tuan" and "Guan," which indicates that they had similar natures and they were both organizations similar to Li. The leaders of Tuan and Guan were called Qi heads. Thus, the jurisdiction of Qi heads was called Qi in some areas. The *Record of Jiangyang* 江阳谱 in Luzhou said, "The government's tax registration shall be separately administered by Qi" (Xie et al. 1959, 633). However, neither Tuan nor Guan were rolled out nationwide. Under the reign of Emperor Zhenzong, Wang Qinruo et al. explained the three heads in the Northern Wei Dynasty to the emperor, clarifying that they "are similar with our heads of Li and villages" (Wang et al. 2006, 1148). It can be seen that the establishment of Li (village) was normal of society at that time.[4] Bao Weimin (2016b, 116) said, "As the imperial edict in the seventh year of the Kaibao period was implemented, the national rural management system of the Northern Song Dynasty had overall evolved from the Xiang-Li system of previous dynasties to the Xiang-Guan system." If it was really overall evolved to the Xiang-Guan system, Guan was actually similar with Li. Before the second year of the Zhihe period (1055) in the Northern Song Dynasty, the position of "lizheng yaqian" (Li head and *yamen* runner) had maintained (Li 2004, 4330), which showed that the Li system or an organization similar to Li (Guan) was still the most important organization at that time.

In the Tang Dynasty, the Xiang system tended to be ignored, and was formally abolished in the seventh year of the Kaibao period. There is a great controversy in academic circles about the imperial order of abolishing Xiang in the seventh year of the Kaibao period. Some scholars argued that Xiang was indeed abolished, at least in some regions (Liang 2006, 86); other scholars claimed that Xiang was never abolished (Bao 2016b, 116). Both views are reasonable to some extent. The imperial

4 Li and village were actually the same and could sometimes replace each other, though they had different names. In the first year of the Xining period, when Jia Changchao's 贾昌朝 tomb was moved to Zhiliu Village, Sanfeng Xiang, Yangzhai County, Xuzhou, "the Xiang was renamed Daru, and the village was renamed Yuanlao Li, according to the imperial order" (Wang 1959, 906).

order of abolishing Xiang comes from the *National History* 国史 in the Song Dynasty, which is rather reliable. Meanwhile, after the seventh year of the Kaibao period, it was found that many Xiang systems did exist in the Song Dynasty. A more reasonable explanation is: The imperial order of abolishing Xiang in the seventh year of the Kaibao period abolished the "Xiang" as a rural organization, while "Xiang" still existed in the administrative division. In the Song Dynasty, the apportionment of taxes and levies as well as the arrangement of Du heads were carried out on basis of Xiang. It was a basic principle that tax and levies were imposed within Xiang and Du heads were appointed within the jurisdiction of Xiang.[5] In other words, there was always the administration division of "Xiang" rather than the organization of "Xiang" in the Song Dynasty. The Song Dynasty abolished the "Xiang" as a rural organization based on the need of centralization. When Fan Zuyu 范祖禹 (2004, 276), a famous minister, summarized the centralization progress of the Song Dynasty, he said, "Since our ancestors set up administrative divisions and cut down military towns . . . the power of Xiang heads and town generals was transferred to the counties; the power of counties was transferred to the subprefectures; the power of subprefectures was transferred to the supervision commissions; the power of supervision commissions was transferred to the imperial court." All the officials of subprefectures and counties were appointed by the imperial court. Although their powers were taken over, the established system could still exist as original. Xiang heads were different, as they were not appointed by the imperial court. After the powers of Xiang heads were taken over, Xiang would inevitably be abolished.

After the Xiang system was abolished, Li was theoretically a very applicable rural governance unit. A hundred households formed a Li, which was a moderate size. However, the population of the Northern Song Dynasty grew very rapidly. In 960, at the beginning of the Song Dynasty, there were 2,500,000 households; in 979, when the country was reunified, there were 6,418,500 households nationwide; in 1053, there were already 10,792,705 households (Wu 2000, 346–47), which was 4.3 times that of 960 and 1.7 times that of 979. Both Li and Guan were limited by the number of households at the beginning of the administrative division. However, once regions were divided, it would be difficult to adjust them to the standard dynamically at any time. As Lu Xiqi 鲁西奇 (2005, 619) said, "Once Xiang and Li were established based on the approximate number of households, they must be relatively stable, and should not be adjusted (divided or merged) at will with the increase or decrease of households. Thus, the territory of Xiang and Li was gradually separated from household standard." For this reason, in the mid-Northern Song Dynasty, the number of households under the jurisdiction of Li or Guan far exceeded the intended number. Let us take Xiangzhou as an example. As calculated by Bao Weimin (2016b, 114), according to the number of households during the Taiping

5 Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1986, 2715), a famous Confucian scholar, used to discuss the principle that "taxes are imposed within Xiang" specifically with his disciples.

Xingguo period (976–983), there were an average of 193 settled households and a total of nearly 360 settled and tenant households per Guan in Xiangzhou. In the Yuanfeng period, there were an average of 438 settled households and a total of nearly 784 settled and tenant households per Guan. Obviously, in the mid-Northern Song Dynasty, the number of households per Guan (Li) had reached that of a traditional Xiang. Therefore, rural organizations were urged to be further refined, and the adjustment of Li (Guan) became inevitable.

The ultimate refinement scheme of rural organizations in the Song Dynasty was to abolish Li and implement the Du-Bao system. Regarding the conversion from the Li system to the Du-Bao system, the *Casual Notes on the Mountain among Clouds* 云麓漫钞 has detailed records, which are copied as follows,

> In the early years after the state [Northern Song Dynasty] was founded, Li heads and household heads mastered tax collection, and Xiang head assistants were subordinate to Li heads . . . . Qi heads were in charge of robberies and had strong runners . . . . In the first year of the Zhihe period [1054], Li heads were dismissed and household heads were added. In the fifth year . . . . of the Xining period [1072], household heads were dismissed. In the sixth year of the Xining period [1073], the law of Bao-Jia was implemented. Bao heads and deputy Bao heads, big and minor Bao heads were initially appointed . . . . In the seventh year of the Xining period [1074], Bao runners worked on shifts to urge taxes instead of Jia 甲 heads. In the first year of the Shaosheng period [1094], Qi heads and strong runners were hired and recruited again, and should not be replaced by Bao heads and Bao runners. The rules for Bao heads were recovered. Then, Jia heads were dismissed, and large Bao heads were appointed to urge taxes. If the Bao heads refused to be hired, tax households would be recruited to be Qi heads and strong runners based on the old rules. In the first year of the Jianyan period [1127], household heads who urged taxes were dismissed, and Jia heads were resumed. In the early Shaoxing period, the salaries of Qi heads were confiscated, and the organization was soon canceled. In the seventh year of the Shaoxing period [1137], large Bao heads still urged taxes. In the ninth year of the Shaoxing period [1139], Bao heads were ordered to take charge of fires and robberies . . . . In the tenth year of the Shaoxing period [1140], the salaries of Qi heads were confiscated to pay the governor's expenditure. In the next year, the salaries of strong runners were confiscated again to fill this payment. (Zhao Yanwei 2007, 219–20)[6]

But the record is not completely

6 In addition, there are similar records in *The Record of Chicheng, Jiading* 嘉定赤城志 and *The Record of Sanshan in the Chunxi Period* 淳熙三山志.

accurate. "In the first year of the Zhihe period, Li heads were dismissed." Both the time and content are wrong. In fact, Li heads and *yamen* runners were dismissed in the second year of the Zhihe period. The *Long Compilation of Continuation to Comprehensive Mirror in Aid of Governance* 续资治通鉴长编 has a clear record on this (Li 2004, 4330). After Li heads and *yamen* runners were dismissed, Li heads still existed. In this way, the functions of Li heads and *yamen* runners were combined. Li heads had two basic functions: One was "managing tax collection" as a traditional function; the other was the function of *yamen* runners "in charge of official affairs" (Li 2004, 4182). For example, Zhang Wenyu 张文玉 who came from Shangdang "engaged in farming by inheritance, and ranked the top among households in the Xiang." "The county officials recommended him to be a Li head." "He supervised the people's taxes on time, and no taxes were delayed." "Grains were transported to ensure the supply in border areas, with no shortage of supplies" (Guo and Liu 2016, 261). That "he supervised the people's taxes on time, and no taxes were delayed" shows the traditional function of "managing tax collection"; that "grains were transported to ensure the supply in border areas, with no shortage of supplies" shows the new function of *yamen* runners "in charge of official affairs." This is the only empirical material that Li heads had two functions in the Song Dynasty. Therefore, the separation of Li heads from *yamen* runners did not prevent Li heads from continuing to exercise the duty of "managing tax collection." In the fourth year of the Xining period (1071), when Wang Anshi 王安石, the Prime Minister, talked with Emperor Shenzong about the rise and fall of the household class, he said, "The rise and fall of the household class should be determined by the county based on their properties. The county should rely on household heads and Li heads; household heads and Li heads should rely on neighborhood Li. Thus, the policy will be put into practice from top to bottom" (Li 2004, 5429–30). It can be seen that Li heads had existed before the fourth year of the Xining period. Due to the long history, *Casual Notes on the Mountain among Clouds* and other books mistook the dismissal of Li heads and *yamen* runners as the dismissal of Li heads. Many scholars have followed this misunderstanding (Diao 2004a, 107; Ma 2012, 110; Satake 1966, 272; Sudō 1965, 564). Like household heads, Li heads were also dismissed in the fifth year of the Xining period. After that, there was no record on the appointment of Li heads in the Song Dynasty (Sudō 1965, 564).[7] As soon as Li heads and household heads were dismissed, the law of Bao-Jia was rolled out. "In the sixth year (of the Xining period), the law of Bao-Jia was implemented. Bao heads and deputy Bao heads, as well as large Bao heads and small Bao heads were initially appointed." Obviously, the Du-Bao system took the place of the Li system.

As Li heads were abolished, the administrative division of "Li" no longer existed. But the Li system was not completely abolished. The Qi heads and household heads under the Li system were

7 There are still many records about "Li heads" in the Southern Song Dynasty, but they referred to Bao heads in fact.

transplanted into the Du-Bao system and co-existed with the Bao-Jia system. In the late Northern Song Dynasty, Qi heads and household heads were at times abolished, but still existed on the whole, and were necessary in that period.[8] The original intention of the law of Bao-Jia was "training peasants as soldiers," "uniting households into Bao, and uniting strong men into the army" (Li 2004, 7804). The military purpose was greater than the civilian purpose. Therefore, the Li system with civilian purpose was still necessary when the military purpose of the Bao-Jia system was highlighted. Ye Shi 叶适 had a very clear understanding of this. He said, "In the past, there were Bao heads and deputy heads who managed the people. Generals managed their soldiers according to the law of the army. The law said, 'The capable and brave ones and those with the most properties in a Du shall be recruited. The household heads shall urge taxes; Qi heads shall catch thefts. They all have salaries.' The law in the Xifeng period was detailed like this." However, in the Southern Song Dynasty, it was completely impossible to "train peasants as soldiers." It was obviously unnecessary for the Bao-Jia system and the Li system to co-exist, and either of them was bound to leave the historical stage. Finally, the Li system was abolished in around the ninth year of the Shaoxing period. Like *Casual Notes on the Mountain among Clouds*, Ye Shi attributed the withdrawal of the Li system from the historical stage to the government's misappropriating the salaries. He said, "Days afterwards were difficult and supplies were gradually lacking . . . . The salaries of Qi heads were not fully paid, and they were not willing to request payment. Thus, these salaries were misappropriated, while the duties of Qi heads were all transferred to Bao heads." Ye Shi also expected to recover the co-existence of the two systems. He said, "Today, the salaries of Qi heads should be returned to subprefectures and counties, so that the duties of urging taxes can be shared. These Qi heads are subordinate to Bao heads" (Ye 2010a, 804–5). Although salary was one reason why the Li system was completely abolished, the basic reason was that it was completely unnecessary for two administrative systems to co-exist within small Du and Bao. But this was the general trend. In local areas, especially in Fujian Province, the Qi head system existed until the end of the Southern Song Dynasty.[9] In the reign of Emperor Xiaozong, Yan Shilu 颜师鲁 from Zhangzhou, Fujian said in the *Memorial Requesting Exemption from Urging Taxes by Bao Heads* 奏免保正催科疏, "The tax law of Fujian is good. The reason why the households in charge of taxes do not go to the government all year round is that they have Qi heads in place. I wanted to implement the law in western Zhejiang, but I could not do this, limited by the context" (Yuan and Liu 1965, 346).

8 The political situation was changeable in the late Northern Song Dynasty, and the national policy of primary level governance also changed frequently. About the rise and fall of the Bao-Jia system and Qi head system in the late Northern Song Dynasty, see Sudō (1965, 577–95).

9 Sudō Yoshiyuki also noted that the Qi head system always existed in Fujian Province in the Southern Song Dynasty. But he inferred from *The Record of Jiangyang* that Luzhou, Sichuan also retained the Qi head system, which lacks of evidence (Sudō 1965, 637).

In the reign of Emperor Ningzong, Zhen Dexiu 真德秀 (1935, 506) from Pucheng, Fujian said in "Preface to Regulations on Dismissal of Bao Heads in Fujian" 福建罢差保长条令本末序, "According to the latest system, Minzhong Province still appoints Qi heads rather than Bao heads." It was obvious for the continuous struggle of local officials that Fujian could hold on to its unique system in the whole state, and non-Fujian officials had complaints about this. In the sixth year of the Chunxi period (1179), Chen Fuliang 陈傅良, a native of Wenzhou and the Assistant Prefectural Magistrate of Fuzhou said in "A Talk with Prime Minister Liang (Kejia), General of Fujian, about Qi Heads and Strong Runners" 与闽帅梁丞相 (克家) 论耆长壮丁事, "Qi heads and strong runners were abolished in all the subprefectures in Jiang-Zhe area, while they have existed in all the subprefectures in Fujian . . . . In my opinion, they should be abolished like Jiang-Zhe area, in case they harm the people" (Chen 1999a, 451).

In the third year of the Xining period (1070), the law of Bao-Jia began to be piloted. The pilot Du-Bao regulations were: Ten households formed one small Bao; five small Bao formed one large Bao; ten large Bao formed one Dubao; there were 500 households in total in one Du. In the sixth year of the Xining period, the law of Bao-Jia which was formally implemented nationwide adjusted the Du-Bao system as follows: Five households formed one small Bao; five small Bao formed one large Bao; ten large Bao formed one Dubao; there were 250 households in total in one Du (Xu 1957, 6774). The number of 250 households in one Du was only half the number of households per Xiang in the Tang Dynasty. Considering the rapid growth of population, the Du-Bao system was undoubtedly a leap-forward development in the progress of rural refinement management compared with the Xiang-Li system. The Song Dynasty had a vast territory. Neither the Xiang-Li system nor the Du-Bao system could be unified nationwide. The names of levels and relations between them varied greatly in different regions (Tan 2010, 48–56).[10] In this study, Yin County, Ming Subprefecture (today's Ningbo, Zhejiang) is taken as an example to analyze the refinement of rural organizations in the Song Dynasty (see Table 1).

As shown in Table 1, (1) The numbers of Xiang and Li in Yin County were the same, which should result from ignoring the Xiang system constantly after the mid-Tang Dynasty and abolishing Xiang in the seventh year of the Kaibao period in the Song Dynasty. After Xiang were abolished, Li heads took the place of the original Xiang heads. (2) Originally, Yin County only had 11 Xiang and 11 Li, while as much as 55 Du. The number of governance units was five times larger in the changing process from the Xiang-Li system to the Du-Bao system. (3) All of them were arranged in a unified way by ordinal number by counties, which might be the first attempt of numerical social management in Chinese history.

10 Before the establishment of the Du-Bao system, the forms of rural organizations in the Song Dynasty included: Xiang-Li, Xiang-village, Xiang-community, and Guan-village (Tuan, Li). After the establishment of the Du-Bao system, the forms of rural organizations in the Song Dynasty included: Xiang-Du, Xiang-Bao, and Xiang-Qi.

Table 1 The Changes of Rural Organizations in Yin County, Ming Subprefecture in the Song Dynasty

Xiang-Li	Du
Laojie Xiang, Wanling had one Li in the past	Du 1, Du 2, Du 3, Du 4
Yangtang Xiang had one Li in the past	Du 5, Du 6, Du 7, Du 8, Du 9, Du 10, Du 11
Xiangfeng Xiang had one Li in the past	Du 12, Du 13, Du 14, Du 15, Du 16
Shoujie Xiang, Wanling had one Li in the past	Du 17, Du 18, Du 19, Du 20, Du 21, Du 22
Fengle Xiang had one Li in the past	Du 23, Du 24, Du 25, Du 26
Yintang Xiang had one Li in the past	Du 27, Du 28, Du 29, Du 30, Du 31, Du 32
Juzhang Xiang had one Li in the past	Zhendu 镇都, Du 33, Du 34
Tongyuan Xiang had one Li in the past	Du 35, Du 36, Du 37, Du 38, Du 39
Guangtong Xiang had one Li in the past	Du 40, Du 41, Du 42, Du 43
Taoyuan Xiang had one Li in the past	Du 44, Du 45, Du 46, Du 47, Du 48
Qingdao Xiang had one Li in the past	Du 49, Du 50, Du 51, Du 52, Du 53, Zhendu

Source: The information in the table is taken from the "Local Record of Siming in the Yanyou Period" 延祐四明志 , 6280–81.

With the rapid growth of population, there might be little difference between the number of households in the Du-Bao system and the rated number of households in the Xiang-Li system. However, after such a refinement progress, the territory of Dubao was certainly much smaller than that of Xiang and Li. From the Xiang-Li system to the Du-Bao system, neither the Li system nor the Xiang system survived. This was the inevitable result of centralization and social refinement management. In the seventh year of the Kaibao period, Xiang were abolished so that the power of Xiang heads would be transferred to counties. Similarly, Li was abolished in the fifth year of the Xining period, so that the power of Li would be transferred to counties. This can be proved by the identity transformation of Xiang head assistant. A Xiang head assistant was originally the subordinate of Xiang head that existed in the Five Dynasties (Song 1978, 316; Yuan 1982, 435). After Xiang were abolished in the seventh year of the Kaibao period, the Xiang head assistant was managed by the Li head (Zhao Yanwei 2007, 219). After Li was abolished in the fifth year of the Xining period, Xiang head assistants were not managed by Dubao heads, but by the county government and became county officials. As Xiang head assistants turned from Xiang servants to county officials, their affiliation and identity changed, but their duties did not change. In the Song Dynasty, Xiang head assistants were still the only permanent personnel arranged by Xiang, and one Xiang head assistant was appointed for one Xiang as a principle (Wang 2000, 302).

II The Combination of the Bao-Jia System, Territory Division, and Mapping Technique: Refinement of People-Land Relationship in Rural Areas in the Song Dynasty

The Bao-Jia system and the Du-Bao system were not identical. The Du-Bao system was the core content of the Bao-Jia system, but it emphasized the characteristic of rural division; the Bao-Jia system emphasized the arrangement of form and structure. Beyond the Du-Bao system, the Bao-Jia system also existed in many sectors, such as

government lending, civil defense, disaster relief, etc. For example, the agricultural program stipulated, "Ten households make a Jia, in which one person of the top three classes shall guarantee for them" (Chen 2004, 90). The law of Bao-Jia was newly created in the Song Dynasty, but Bao had a very long history, which can date back to the Zhou Dynasty. The *Rites of Zhou* 周礼 records, "Five households shall be attached to and guarantee for each other" (Zheng 1985, 66). Before the Bao-Jia system was implemented, the organization for grassroots mutual guarantee was called Bao-Wu. "Five households make a Wu 伍; five Wu make a Bao. Wu means mutual attachment, and Bao means mutual guarantee" (Ye 2002, 556). As for Bao-Wu, Wu was the form and structure of arrangement; Bao originally meant mutual guarantee. Bao-Wu was named as a whole for a long time, thus Bao gradually became an arrangement of form and structure.

From the Bao-Wu system to the Bao-Jia system, the name changed, and more importantly, the rural organization made a leap-forward progress. The Bao-Wu system, which emphasized the mutual guarantee among five Wu, aimed to urge neighborhoods to supervise and rely on each other. However, the relationships inside and between Bao and Wu were loose, and they were not formal rural organizations. Though there is only a word difference between Bao-Jia and Bao-Wu, "Jia" fully highlights the uniqueness of Bao-Jia system. "Jia" in Bao-Jia was inspired by fish scales. "A fish scale is a fish shell. A shell, which is pronounced as 'jia' in Chinese, means armor. Fish scales look like armor" (Xu 1988, 580). The Bao-Jia system was no longer arranged by five households, but in tight rows like fish scales. Each piece of fish scale seems independent, but constitutes a whole with others. "Neighboring households are arranged into Baojia like fish scales" (Xu 1997, 30). "They are arranged in serial numbers according to the Bao-Jia system" (Huang 1985, 354). "Households in every Baojia . . . are given serial numbers as the format of fish scales." In this way, "households are arranged in order like fish scales." In other words, "households are arranged into Bao and Jia," "with no household and people missed" (Zhang 1969, 781). "Jia" in the Bao-Jia system of the Song Dynasty has two meanings: First, it was similar to fish shells (fish scales) in arrangement; second, it has the meaning of armor, indicating the military function of the Bao-Jia system. "Households are united into Bao, and labors are united into army"; "peasants are trained as soldiers." These were for the purpose of military use. However, with the failure of Wang Anshi's reforms, the military function of the Bao-Jia system was ignored, and civil administration became its main function.

In the Song Dynasty, the arrangement of Du-Bao system followed two principles: First, Du were arranged in a unified manner by ordinal number by counties,[11] which is clearly shown in Table 1. Second, Bao were arranged by Du as a unit. "Every Du is divided into ten Bao, each with a number (Shu 1969, 545), from "one, two to ten" (Yang 1990,

11 Du were arranged in a unified manner by counties. However, based on the principle that taxes and levies were collected within the Xiang, the arrangement of Du should not cross Xiang. Therefore, it seemed that Du were also arranged by Xiang.

2192). As the Du-Bao system was arranged by numbers, land and territory division were also gradually managed by numbers. In the fifth year of the Yuanfeng period (1082), Thousand-Character Classic was first used for territory division in the Song Dynasty (Li 2004, 7894). In the Southern Song Dynasty, Thousand-Character Classic was basically used nationwide to mark the land. The numerical arrangement of land was carried out by Du in the Song Dynasty. Because Du did not cross Xiang, it seemed that land arrangement was carried out by Xiang. The basic method to mark land with Thousand-Character Classic was: "Signs were put on the land, marked with numbers and sizes" (Shu 1969, 545). The registration information was more complete than those on the signs in the fields: "Registration number, Xiang division, name of place, surroundings, fertility of land, and hectares" (Xu 1957, 5882). There are still many cases about the arrangement of land by Xiang and number in the Song Dynasty, especially in school fields and temple fields. For example, the "Record of Farmland Registration of Second-Degree Scholars in Pingjiang" 平江贡士庄田籍记 written in the fourth year of the Chunyou period (1244) recorded the Xiang, numbers and surroundings of all the farmlands of second-degree scholars in Pingjiang. Herein, we just list the farmlands with numbers of Du 47 in Guizheng Xiang, Changshu County as follows,

> Lu 露 8, covers five *mu* 亩 (one *mu* is about 666.67 square meters) nine *bu* 步 (240 *bu* is about one *mu*), reaches the bank in the east, *ge* 葛 in the west, *chen* 陈 in the south, and *li* 李 in the north.
>
> Lu 9, covers one *mu* nine *bu*, reaches *ge* in the east, *zhang* 张 in the west, *wang* 王 in the south, and *jing* 泾 in the north.
>
> Lu 1, covers one *mu* ten *bu*, reaches *ge* in the east, *jing* in the west, and the bank in the south and north.
>
> Lu 11, covers five *mu* ten *bu*, reaches the bank in the east, west and north, and *ge* in the south. (Miao 1977, 9871)

The coverage of Du was much smaller than that of Xiang, which made it possible to arrange farmlands by Du according to the characters and numbers of Thousand-Character Classic. Although the farmlands of a Du could be calculated by a thousand characters, the land was seriously fragmented and refined due to frequent land sales in the Song Dynasty (Wang 2001, 203–4). The characters and numbers of Thousand-Character Classic could not meet the arrangement of all the plots. Based on the principle that 250 households formed a Du, every household only had 4 numbers from the Thousand-Character Classic. Actually, in terms of the land refinement in the Song Dynasty, every household covered far more than four plots. In other words, "settled farmlands are generally scattered in various places" (Shu 1969, 545). Moreover, "the farmlands of wealthy households are connected and across roads" (Li 2013, 2831), and every Du usually had many foreign households.[12] Therefore, the farmlands in the Song

12 A "foreign household" means a household whose farmland was located in this Du while was registered in another Du.

Dynasty should be arranged in ordinal number under the characters and numbers from the Thousand-Character Classic. This was the case of Lu number farmlands in Du 47 of Guizheng Xiang, Changshu County. According to the historical records handed down from the Song Dynasty, farmlands were arranged according to the Thousand-Character Classic. However, from the detailed arranged ordinal numbers under the characters and numbers from the Thousand-Character Classic, which were found in the historical records of stone carvings, the land refinement and detailed arrangement in the Song Dynasty far exceeded our imagination.

In the refinement and numerical management of the Bao-Jia system and territory division, the Bao-Jia system and territory division gradually combined with another key technology—mapping. The Bao-Jia system was first combined with the mapping technique. Baojia were arranged in the format of fish scales and compiled into the Bao-Jia fish scale book, and drawn into the Baojia fish scale map. A fish scale book arranges neighboring houses. Households, strong or weak, starting from the first Du, are combined into a book" (Chen 1999b, 290). Du were arranged by county, and "neighboring houses" were arranged "from the first Du." If such a fish scale book was drawn on a map, it would make a fish scale map (Wang 2006, 578–81).[13] In the seventh year of the Qiandao period (1171) under the reign of Emperor Xiaozong, Zhang Zushun 张祖顺, the Magistrate of Longyou County, Quzhou, "drew fish scale maps according to the law of Bao-Wu. The positions of residences and the surroundings of mountains were clearly shown on the maps. On the map were recorded the family members, names, ages, and dates of birth of these households in details." In the fifth year of the Shaoxi period (1194), Zhang Zushun served as the Magistrate of Meizhou, where "he implemented the law of arranging households like fish scales in Longyou," and "robberies were not found for this reason" (Lou 1969, 590). Afterwards, when Lyu Qian 吕谦 from Quzhou served as the County Lieutenant of Linxiang County, Yuezhou, he transplanted the Baojia fish scale method into Linxiang County (Wang 2004, 123).

The combination of territory division and mapping was found between the twelfth and the nineteenth years in the Shaoxing period (1142–1149) (Li 2000, 123). The territory division in the Shaoxing period first realized the mapping of information in large Bao.[14] The large Bao map includes basic information such as mountains, roads, farmland houses, surroundings, and sizes of farmlands in large Bao. As Zhu Xi said, "Mountains, roads, and farmland houses must be connected in all directions. Thus, the sizes and heights of farmlands and landscapes . . . can be accurately shown on the map" (Zhu 1996, 782). Based on the large Bao map, Li Chunnian 李椿年, the presider of territory division and Vice Minister of Revenue "would combine the maps of ten Bao into one, so that the map

13 In the 1980s, Wang Zengyu 王曾瑜 noticed the fish scale book and map in the Song Dynasty. However, due to the difficulty in data retrieval, Wang only found that the two "were not the same kind of atlas." He did not notice the internal relationship between the two.

14 The complete Du-Bao system in the Song Dynasty was: small Bao, large Bao, Dubao. The "Bao" in the Song Dynasty mainly referred to large Bao.

would cross several adjacent Du." In this way, he tried to extend mapping to Du and counties. Ten Bao formed one Du; Du were arranged by counties; all neighboring Du were connected into the county map. However, this program faced insuperable technical problems. As Wang Dayou 汪大猷, a participant in territory division, said, "The map of a Bao is fully used, and there is no margin. If ten maps are combined, it will be very difficult for drawing. Besides, the composite map won't be practical. That will be a waste of labor, which isn't conducive to territory division." According to the cognitive logic at that time, large Bao maps were pieced into the map of Du, and maps of Du were pieced into the county map. With this technique, the county map would be very very large, and "it will be very difficult for drawing." Even though it was completed, the map would not be practical. Finally, Li Chunnian followed Wang Dayou's advice. "Thus, the mapping of counties was canceled." The maps of Du and counties were not drawn (Lou 1969, 357).

By the reign of Emperor Xiaozong, this technical problem had been solved: By integrating the Bao map of territory division and the existing Baojia fish scale map, the fish scale map of territory division was creatively developed. As mentioned above, the Southern Song Dynasty had created the Baojia fish scale map by the seventh year of Emperor Xiaozong's reign during the Qiandao period. The later fish scale map of territory division and the Baojia fish scale map in the seventh year of the Qiandao period highly shared information, so they should have inheritance or reference relationship. The fish scale maps of territory division of counties and Du were simplified level by level on basis of large Bao maps and formed layer by layer. Zhu Xi made a clear statement on this, "The technique of synthesizing maps starts with a Bao . . . . Ten maps of Bao are synthesized into a Du map. The landscapes on the maps are connected, and only the boundaries between Bao are drawn. The locations of farmland houses can be omitted. The maps of Du are combined into the county map, and the image layers are synthesized as the maps of Bao are synthesized into a Du map. The differences between the maps of Bao can be ignored. In this way, it will be easier to synthesize maps" (Zhu 1996, 782). With the gradual reduction method, the maps of Bao, Du and counties were independent. In drawing the Du map, it was sufficient to draw the landscape and the Bao boundaries, and other information could be omitted. Similarly, in drawing the county map, it was sufficient to draw the landscape and the Du boundaries, and other information could also be omitted. The Bao map and the Du map and county map, which were synthesized by gradual simplification, all looked like fish scales. Therefore, they were all called fish scale maps. In the first year of the Duanping period (1234), Wang Yue 王爚, the Magistrate of Changshu County, presided over territory division. "The county covers fifty Du, and every Du covers ten Bao. The sizes of farmlands are written on the maps, and Bao are listed by numbers in the farmland registration book. A fish scale map is drawn according to the territory" (Du 1969, 736).

The method of fish scale map profoundly influenced the social governance

in the Ming and Qing dynasties (Wang 2014, 2015). However, there were actually two systems of fish scale maps in the Southern Song Dynasty: One was pieced gradually on basis of large Bao maps as mentioned above; the other was pieced together based on the book of farmland surroundings (Shang 2007). The former emphasized comprehensive information. In addition to farmlands, it also included mountains and rivers, roads, bridges, temples, etc. It aimed at social comprehensive governance in addition to taxes and levies. This was the case with the fish scale map drawn by Zhang Zushun, the Magistrate of Longyou County, in the seventh year of the Qiandao period. The latter emphasized land information, aiming to ensure the normal operation of taxes and levies. When talking about the book of farmland surroundings in the territory division during the Shaoxing period, Zhu Xi said, "Taking Jiangsu and Zhejiang as examples, every section of map shows the surroundings, attached with the taxes. The total tax of the household is written on top of the book, which will be compared with that in the official book" (Zhu 1996, 869). In the 19th year of the Shaoxing period, when Lin Xiang 林珦 served as the Magistrate of Wuxi County, "more than seven thousand map books of male and female population were taken under the name of large Bao heads, which were all detailed fish scale maps" (Huang and Yang 1989, 33). There were sixty Du in total in Wuxi County (Wu and Li, 61–70). On basis of ten Bao per Du, there were only 600 large Bao maps in total. Obviously, the more than seven thousand books of detailed fish scale maps were not large Bao maps. They should be fish scale maps related to books of farmland surroundings, so they were called "household map books." However, fish scale maps gradually became single and systematic in the development process, and formed the fish scale maps in the Ming and Qing dynasties. Shang Ping 尚平 regarded the books of farmland surroundings as the premise and basis for the emergence of fish scale maps. Wang Qingyuan 汪庆元 directly denied Shang Ping's view. He claimed that the books of farmland surroundings could not synthesize fish scale maps. In fact, both views are biased (Wang 2015, 79). In the sixth year of the Jiading period (1213), Ye Wenbing 叶文炳, the Magistrate of Xianyou County, designated the education administrator to verify the rent rice in school fields. The book was compiled and maps were drawn as the book of farmland surroundings in territory division" (Zhao Yubi 1990, 8275). It can be seen that there was a certain relationship between the territory fish scale map and the map of farmland surroundings.

As mapping technique was combined with the Bao-Jia system and territory division, the practical functions of maps increased dramatically. "Detailed Maps" 详画地图 in *Outline of Subprefectures and Counties* 州县提纲 says, "The official just arrived. Although there was the atlas, it roughly described the situation. After understanding the situation, he would surely give an order to draw maps, which described the coverage of Yijing and Dubao, the residences of people, the length of roads, the quality of mountains, forests and farmlands. Then, the maps of all the Xiang would be synthesized into a big map,

which was put aside his seat. In this way, he could see the people, farmlands, mountains, forests, rivers and wetlands within his jurisdiction, just sitting in his office. Once there were lawsuits, levies, floods, droughts and arrests, he could see where they took place on the map" (Chen 1985, 22).[15] When Zhu Xi's Nankang Army relieved famine, "maps were drawn by county and Du. The locations of mountains, rivers, roads, paths and residences were all drawn on the maps" (Zhu 1996, 5569). When the Hanyang Army of Huang Gan 黄榦, a disciple of Zhu Xi, relieved famine, "maps were drawn by Xiang, with mountains and roads on them. Households were marked on the roadside" (Huang 2004, 664).

The enhancement of realistic function accelerated the separation of maps from atlas. Before the Southern Song Dynasty, maps were mostly part of the atlas of subprefectures and counties. An atlas "describes the shape and records the events." In other words, "an atlas draws the mountains and rivers and takes down the facts" (Xue and Wu 1991, 959). "By looking at the maps, one can clearly see the coverage of city walls and territory, as well as the terrains and landscapes. By reading the records, one can understand the folk customs, taxes and levies, famous officials and figures in details" (Xue and Wu 1991, 650). An atlas emphasizes both "maps" and "records," but they are both extensive and not detailed enough. As written in the *Outline of Subprefectures and Counties*, "Although there was the atlas, it roughly described the situation." In an atlas, the maps mainly show the landmarks of subprefectures and counties, such as city walls, mountains and rivers, and terrains. Such extensive maps could hardly adapt to the rural management model which was gradually refined in the Southern Song Dynasty. Therefore, in the Southern Song Dynasty, maps and records tended to develop separately. Maps and social governance were closely combined, and numerous Bao maps, Du maps, and county maps were created. Records developed into local records, which gradually became "the history of a local area," while their social governance function gradually declined. The prosperity of local records resulted from the separated development of maps and records in the Southern Song Dynasty.[16]

With the combination of the Bao-Jia system, territory division and mapping technique, rural information became more accurate and detailed, which was undoubtedly conducive to social governance. Around the fifth year of the Chunxi period (1178), Peng Zhonggang 彭仲刚, the head of Linhai County, Taizhou, "ordered to draw maps of Xiang in the county, and synthesize the maps of several Du and Bao into a big map. All the things in this area could be found on the map." Peng Zhonggang was very clear about the hills and residences around them. In this way, the county was well governed. "No other county heads could do as well" (Ye 2010b, 274). Around the 13th year of the Chunxi period (1186), Yuan Xie 袁燮, the County Lieutenant of Jiangyin County, was

15 According to the Preface to the *Outline of Subprefectures and Counties* written by Wu Cheng 吴澄, the book was written in the late Southern Song Dynasty, and the author could not be Chen Xiang 陈襄, a famous minister in the Northern Song Dynasty (Wu 1969, 212–13).

16 About the separated development of maps and records in the Southern Song Dynasty, see Pan (2014).

designated to "manage the rural affairs," in a similar way with Zhu Xi. "He started with a Bao, and drew a map for every Bao. It covered all the farmlands, mountains, rivers, roads, bridges and temples. Residential houses were distributed among them, with detailed information about their properties and household registration." "The maps of Bao were synthesized into a map of Du; the maps of Du were synthesized into a map of Xiang; the maps of Xiang were synthesized into the county map." Such detailed information would surely assist with the governance effectively. "It can make the territory more accurate, record household registration, help collect taxes and levies, and investigate crimes and robberies. Everything can be checked on this map in case of levy collection, lawsuit, and arrest" (Zhen 1935, 864).

The combination of the Bao-Jia system, territory and mapping technique also promoted the solidification of people-land relationship. Baojia "unite people" (Li 2004, 8621), with the initial purpose of "uniting people" and "uniting households." But people and households did not certainly correspond to the regions one by one. In the late Northern Song Dynasty, Lyu Nangong 吕南公 said, "The problem of Bao-Jia system" lay in that "the territory division does not follow the principle." "People living in an area as neighbors may belong to different Bao, while people living far from each other may belong to the same Bao" (Lyu 1969, 140). "Some Bao cover as much as ten Li and even fifteen Li. With mountains and waters dividing them, some belong to different Bao and communities while live in the same area. The layout is scattered. Some households that should be included in this Bao are actually attached to another Bao" (Lyu 1969, 142). In the early Southern Song Dynasty, Lin Jizhong 林季仲 also said, "The law (of Du-Bao) has been long implemented and problems have early occurred . . . . Wealthy households are united . . . . Poor households are united . . . . This was caused by the problems when crafty officials arranged Jia at the beginning" (Lin 1969, 336). Wealthy households were united, and poor households were united, which would inevitably lead to the separation of people and households from regions. The separation of people and households from regions led to many strange administrative phenomena, such as urging taxes. "Officials in the outer suburbs urged taxes in the town; officials living in the eastern Xiang supervised the taxes in the western Bao. They did not know the names of residents living in the same Li, and did not know those who had escaped and died" (Wang 1969, 349). However, with the combination of the Bao-Jia system, territory division and mapping technique, all the information of people and households were marked on the maps. The relationship between residential households and regions was gradually fixed within Dubao. Zhu Xi's territory division scheme of Zhangzhou included "drawing boundaries between Du and setting up signs" (Zhu 1996, 879). As the people-land relationship solidified in Dubao, if residential households wanted to change their Dubao organizations, the only way was generally migration, that is, "moving to the neighbor Du" (Zhu 1996, 867–68).

With the popularization of Dubao maps, the registration of Dubao gradually

put the map of the Du in the first page. In the Yuan Dynasty, "Xiang are changed into Du; Li are changed into map." "People do not say Li but say map," because "a map is put in the first page of every Li book, so it was called map" (Gu 2014, 495). However, it should be noted that there were Xiang above Du in the Song Dynasty. In the Yuan Dynasty, "Xiang are changed into Du; Li are changed into Tu." As a result, the administrative levels of the Song Dynasty and the Yuan Dynasty were somewhat misplaced. The so-called Litu after the Yuan Dynasty was Dutu in the Southern Song Dynasty. Zhao Yi 赵翼 (1990, 470) in the Qing Dynasty had early clearly understood that the Du-Tu system in the Yuan and Ming dynasties was originated from the Southern Song Dynasty.[17]

III From Rural Officials to Rural Servants: The Inevitable Result of Refinement Progress of Rural Governance in the Song Dynasty[18]

Since the Qin and Han dynasties, most Chinese systems followed the *Rites of the Zhou* 周礼, and so did the Xiang system. The rural system of *Rites of the Zhou* was rural recommendation and election. In other words, rural officials were recommended and elected by rural community to some extent. As is recorded by the article "Rural Officials" 乡大夫 in *Rites of the Zhou*, "A major election shall be held every three years. The morality and ability of candidates shall be examined, and those with virtue and competence shall be selected" (Zheng 1985, 66). It means: "Rural recommendation and election is carried out for rural officials" (Du, 1969, 232). For this reason, rural officials generally had high status in the Zhou Dynasty. Ma Duanlin 马端临 said, "In the Zhou Dynasty, rural officials were all appointed by the imperial court with salaries and ranks. In the Han Dynasty, rural seniors and officials were all famous scholars with honors" (Ma 2000, 4). Yu Zhengxie 俞正燮, a scholar in the Qing Dynasty, commented the rural selection of wise and capable people in the *Rites of the Zhou*, "The wise ones will be hired as Wu leaders; the capable ones will be hired as Xiang officials." "From the Han to the Tang dynasties," "all famous scholars with major power came from noble families" (Yu 1957, 77).

The Zhou Dynasty was a peak period in Chinese feudal system. It is inevitable that the *Rites of the Zhou*, as the ancient statement of the Xiang system, was influenced by the feudal system. Luo Bi 罗泌 in the Song Dynasty said, "Without the feudal system, rural recommendation and election cannot be implemented" (Luo 1969,

17 Huang Rucheng 黄汝成 followed Zhao Yi's view in *Collected Interpretations to Daily Knowledge Records* 日知录集释.

18 There are many research results on the rural servants in the Song Dynasty. About the research before 2004, see Diao (2004b). Among them, important studies include: Wang (1979, 1993). Mcknight (1971). Research after 2004 is represented by Diao Peijun's series of results. They mainly include: Diao (2007, 2013, 2014). The existing results have fully studied the transformation process of the heads of primary-level administrative regions from rural officials to rural servants in the Tang and Song dynasties, as well as the nature and operation of rural servants in the Song Dynasty. This study further analyzes the inevitable transformation from rural officials to rural servants from the perspective of rural governance moving towards refinement in the Song Dynasty.

440). Luo Bi 罗璧 in the Song Dynasty also said, "If the feudal system did not continue, the Li election would not be implemented" (Luo 1991, 89). Hu Hong 胡宏, a thinker in the Song Dynasty, said, "Rural officials act in the feudal system, while the feudal system was established beyond rural officials" (Ke 1969, 1009). Lu Shiyi 陆世仪, a thinker in the late Ming Dynasty, also said, "Xiang division is a small feudal system" (Lu 1985, 190).

In the transformation process from Xiang-Li system to Du-Bao system, rural officials were also transforming to rural servants. Though the two transformations were not completely synchronous, they were internally related. Simply put, rural officials adapted to the Xiang-Li system, while rural servants were suitable to the Du-Bao system. From the Qin and Han dynasties to the Sui and Tang dynasties, the feudal system basically disappeared. However, because the rural community developed in a relatively scattered way, the state's involvement in rural community was relatively limited, and rural community was still dominated by noble and influential families for a long time. Accordingly, rural organizations generally covered a large area. The leaders of rural organizations, especially those at the primary level, enjoyed special identity and noble status, based on the social tradition. This kind of rural organizations, which were relatively less intervened by the state, were rather liberal, which were called "community" by Tanigawa Michio (2002, 1–8). It is consistently understood that from the Qin and Han dynasties to the Sui and Tang dynasties, the leaders of rural organizations were rural officials. Although they were not among the government's formal administrative ranks, they were widely recognized as "officials" by the society. The status of "rural officials," as the leaders of rural organizations, was also recognized by the government.[19] But this resulted more from helplessness. The state exchanged formal respect for cooperation with rural forces they could not control. With the in-depth development of social integration, the rural community gradually became less liberal, and the state's involvement gradually strengthened. Subsequently, the territory of Xiang and Li gradually reduced, and the status of rural officials gradually declined until they were replaced. Finally, the Du-Bao system dominated by the government fully took the place of the traditional Xiang-Li system. Due to the government's domination, the leaders of rural organizations, who were not included in the government's formal administrative ranks, could only yield to the role of rural servants, and they could no longer enjoy the status of rural officials.

After the establishment of the Du-Bao system, the level and territory of Du were actually close to Li (Tuan, Guan).[20] The chief of Du—Dubao leader—was often

19 "Submission of Governors of Jingzhao and Henan Government Offices" 京兆府河南府牧初上 in *Comprehensive Status* 通典 records "The county magistrates and Xiang heads above Grade 5 were led to court trials from the western steps" (3339). "Submission of Chang'an Magistrate" 万年长安令初上 also records "The master of ceremony led the Xiang heads as well as civil and military officials above Grade 5 to enter from the western steps" (3340). These indicate that Xiang heads enjoyed a certain status in the eyes of the government during the Qin and Tang dynasties.

20 "Communities and Li" 坊里 in *The New Records of Jinling in the Zhizheng Period* 至正金陵新志 recorded, "In the late Song Dynasty, Li was renamed as Bao, or Guan or Du" (Yang 1990, 5518). This record is not reliable, but it shows that Du and Li (Guan) are similar.

regarded as Li head and Qi head by people in the Song Dynasty. Yang Shi 杨石 said, "Bao heads were actually ranked in the three major households (Qi heads)" (Yang 1969, 287). Zhu Xi said, "If Bao heads want to serve as Qi heads, or large Bao heads want to serve as household heads, their will can be followed" (Zhu 1996, 865). The *Outline of Subprefectures and Counties* written in the late Southern Song Dynasty directly said "the Li head of a Du" or "the household head of a Bao" (Chen 1985, 23). In the Song Dynasty, after Xiang were abolished, Li (Tuan, Guan) were rural organizations with suitable territory. Why not follow the existing Li system but create the new Du-Bao system? The key point is that the Xiang-Li system, which lasted for more than one thousand years, was not only a form of rural organization, but also a rural authority system. The core content of such an authority system is rural recommendation and election. With the demise of the commandery quota system and the nine-rank system, rural recommendation and election at the national level had withdrawn from the historical stage.[21] However, the rural official system meant that rural community retained the will of rural recommendation and election. Chen Zhi 陈埴 in the Song Dynasty said, "If a head is recommended by five households and governs twenty-five households, or if a head is recommended by twenty-five households and governs a hundred households, this official is recommended for external governance. If a head is elected by five households and still governs these five households, or if a head is elected by twenty-five households and still governs these twenty-five households, this official is elected for internal governance. One from a village school shall be an official at a village school. This is the way of rural recommendation and election." (Chen 1969, 669–70) The building of Dubao organizations meant abandoning the traditional rural authority system and building a new state-led rural authority system. The transformation of the two authority systems was embodied in the change of Dubao organization leaders from rural officials to rural servants.

Compared with rural officials, the social status of rural servants greatly declined, while the national attribute rose greatly. Ma Duanlin, the author of *A General Textual Research of Literature* 文献通考, got a deep insight into this transformation. He said, "Officials manage people, while people are managed by officials . . . . There are heads in Xiang and Li. They have different positions, but they all manage people . . . . The heads of Xiang and Li were not servants. In later dynasties, the heads of Xiang and Li abused their power and imposed heavy burdens upon the people. Then, people began to call these household servants officials" (Ma 2000, 4). This change became very obvious from the late Tang Dynasty. Ma Duanlin (2000, 140) said, "According to the imperial edict in the ninth year of the Dazhong period [855], it was not easy to be rural officials, so they worked on shifts. From then on, officials of Xiang and Ting . . . .

21 Although the commandery quota system and the nine-rank system were not typical rural recommendation and election systems, they were variants of rural recommendation and election. As Ma Duanlin in *Textual Research on Election IX* 选举考九 said, "Officials in the nine-rank system were appointed in prefectures and counties based on the will of rural recommendation and election" (Ma 2000, 342).

were regarded as corvee. This was not the same as the meaning of rural officials given by ancestors." The "later generations" mentioned by Ma Duanlin refers to the period roughly between the late Tang Dynasty and the Song Dynasty, in particular the Song Dynasty.

In summary, the change from rural servants to rural officials seemed like a sad story, but it was a historical necessity and an inevitable result of the refinement progress of centralization and rural governance. This necessity is represented in two aspects: Firstly, with the society moving from decentralization to a whole, the state gradually enhanced the involvement in rural community. At the same time, the management of people-land relationship tended to be refined. The original Xiang-Li system, which was suitable to decentralized community, was no longer needed by the state, and would be inevitably replaced by smaller rural organizations that were suitable to centralized community. Secondly, Xiang and Li were abolished in the Song Dynasty, with the purpose of transferring the authority to the government. This means that with strengthening centralization, rural officials, as the rural authority system originating from the feudal system, would inevitably be replaced by rural servants, a new authority system that embodied more of the national will.

From the abolishment of Xiang and Li to the establishment of Dubao, from rural officials to rural servants, these transformations started in the late Tang Dynasty, but were really completed and finalized in the Song Dynasty. The unique environment of the Song Dynasty made these major transformations possible. The Song Dynasty is a special period regarded by many scholars as full of changes.[22] As far as the rural community, the influential families in the Wei and Jin dynasties and the Sui and Tang dynasties had completely collapsed. Although the gentry representatives in the Ming and Qing dynasties can date back to the Southern Song Dynasty, the latter can at most be regarded as the gestation stage of gentry representatives.[23] In other words, the dominant class in rural community was very subtle and vague in the Song Dynasty. Both noble families and gentry representatives were important ministers of the state and dominant powers in rural community. Officials of the Song Dynasty were known as "sojourners," which were unique in the Song Dynasty. Generally speaking, a sojourner means someone living in another place. But sojourners had a unique meaning in the Song Dynasty. A "sojourner," "or a private residence official," "is one who lives in an area neither as a traveler nor a native. It means an official of the imperial court (Zhao Sheng 2007, 47). Sojourners in the Song Dynasty were not named in terms of space, but of the imperial court. All the officials were appointed by the imperial court and subordinate to the state, so they were

22 There are numerous studies about "the theory of modernization in the Song Dynasty (the theory of reforms in the Tang and Song Dynasties)." The latest and most comprehensive summary of academic history should be Li Huarui's 李华瑞 (2018, 14–37) paper. However, "the theory of modernization in the Song Dynasty (the theory of reforms in the Tang and Song dynasties)" has been popular for more than a hundred years. We can re-examine the connotation of modernization in the Song Dynasty (reforms in the Tang and Song dynasties), though it is very difficult to step over it.

23 The "theory of local elites in the Southern Song Dynasty" and the "theory of gentry representatives in the Ming and Qing dynasties" advocated by Robert Hartwell, Robert Hymes, and other scholars are very similar, but the "theory of local elites in the Southern Song Dynasty" has not been widely received by the academic circles (Bao 2005, 653–70).

regarded as sojourners wherever they lived. In fact, all officials had local attributes, but the Song Dynasty was unique to emphasize the national attribute of officials in this way. Due to the strong national attribute of officials in the Song Dynasty, they kept a relatively detached relationship with rural community, which was not so organic and close as noble families in the Wei and Jin dynasties and gentry representatives in the Ming and Qing dynasties. This made the dominant class of rural community subtle and vague in the Song Dynasty. For this reason, some scholars said, "the wealthy class" was the backbone of the society in the Song Dynasty (Lin 2006, 33). The long-term vague dominant class in rural areas in the Song Dynasty provided an excellent opportunity for the state forces to go deep into and change rural community. This was an important reason for the transformation of rural organizations and rural governance in the Song Dynasty. It can be said that the state authority upon rural areas in the Song Dynasty exceeded the Han and Tang dynasties, and even the subsequent Yuan, Ming and Qing dynasties.[24] In the Ming and Qing dynasties, with the formation of gentry representative community, the state power that went deep into rural areas was squeezed by gentry representatives. Compared with the Song Dynasty, the state power withdrew from rural areas again in some aspects. Thereby, the phenomenon that "imperial power does not go to the countryside" appeared again in Chinese society.

Of course, the refinement process from rural organizations to rural governance in the Song Dynasty was a process and a trend, not a simple result. In this transformation process, rural organizations at different levels and in different regions did not necessarily change synchronously. In terms of levels, after Li and Xiang were abolished, the Li heads and Qi heads actually declined to rural servants, but they still carried the name of "Li heads" of rural officials.[25] The leaders of rural organizations did not decline to servants in both name and reality until the Xiang-Li system was transformed to the Du-Bao system. In terms of territory, the Song Dynasty covered a large area, with big differences between regions. The progresses and forms of rural organization changes were usually different in different regions. For example, after Xiang were abolished, "Li" was called "Guan," "Tuan," or "Qi," or still called "Li" as before. Even after the Du-Bao system was established, the names in different regions were not uniform. "Du" was used in most places, and "Bao" was directly used in some places. According to "Record of Grain Field Registration of Wu Schools" 吴学粮田籍记 (Miao 1977, 9764–70) and "Continued Record of Grain Fields of Wu Schools" 吴学粮田续记 (Miao

24 Brian E. Mcknight (1983) claimed that before the Song Dynasty, rural power was mainly controlled by aristocratic and influential forces. In the Ming and Qing dynasties, rural power was shared by gentry representatives, rural officials, and village leaders. The Song Dynasty was a turning point of the two eras, when rural power was controlled by rural servants. However, Mcknight's discussion was mainly made from the perspective of social governance structure. He emphasized that rural servants were the intermediary between the state and the people, while lacking of consideration about the characteristics of dominant class of rural community in the Song Dynasty as well as the influence of such characteristics on the social governance structure.

25 Ma Duanlin (2000, 4) said, "Xiang heads and Li heads" "are all rural servants," "who are officials."

1977, 9942–48), all the fields in Wuxian, Changzhou, Wujiang, Changshu and other counties of Pingjiang Prefecture in the Song Dynasty were marked with "No. ×× Du, ×× Xiang." But the grain fields of Kunshan County were marked with "No. ×× Bao, ×× Xiang." Besides, there were fifty-two Bao. Obviously, the Bao of Kunshan County were Du.

References

Ban Gu. 1976. 食货四 (Food and Money VI), in 汉书 (*Book of Han*), vol. 24. 中华书局 (Zhonghua Book Company).

Bao Weimin. 2005. 精英们"地方化"了吗?—试论韩明士(政治家与绅士)与"地方史"研究方法 (Are the Elites "Localized"?—On the Research Method of Robert Hymes on "Statesmen and Gentlemen" and "Local History"), in 唐研究 (*Tang Studies*), vol. 11. 北京大学出版社 (Peking University Press).

———. 2015. 中国近古时期"里"制的演变 (The Evolution of "Li" System in China in Late Ancient Times). 中国社会科学 (*Social Sciences in China*) 1: 183–201.

———. 2016a. 宋代乡村"管"制再释 (Reinterpretation of the "Guan" System in Rural Areas in the Song Dynasty). 中国史研究 (*Journal of Chinese Historical Studies*) 3: 103–16.

———. 2016b. 新旧叠加: 中国近古乡都制度的继承与演化 (The Superposition of the Old and the New: The Inheritance and Evolution of China's Rural Capital System in Late Ancient Times). 中国经济史研究 (*Researches in Chinese Economic History*) 2: 5–15.

Chao Yuezhi. 1985. 嵩山文集 (*Anthology of Songshan*), vol. 1. 上海书店出版社 (Shanghai Bookstore Publishing House).

Chen Fuliang. 1999a. 陈傅良文集 (*Anthology of Chen Fuliang*). Annotated by Zhou Mengjiang. 浙江大学出版社 (Zhejiang University Press).

———. 1999b. 转对论役法札子 (Document on Corvee Labor Decree on Periodic Politicized Proposition), in 陈傅良文集 (*Anthology of Chen Fuliang*), vol. 21. Annotated by Zhou Mengjiang. 浙江大学出版社 (Zhengjiang University Press).

Chen Shunyu. 2004. 都官集 (*Anthology of the Du Official*). 宋集珍本丛刊 (Collection of Rare Books of Song Dynasty), vol. 13. 线装书局 (Thread-Binding Books Publishing House).

Chen Xiang. 1985. 州县提纲 (*Outline of Subprefectures and Counties*). 中华书局 (Zhonghua Book Company).

Chen Zhi. 1969. 木钟集 (*Anthology of Muzhong*). 文渊图四库全书 (Complete Library of the Four Treasuries by Wenyuange), vol. 703. 商务印书馆 (The Commercial Press).

Diao Peijun. 2004a. 由"职" 到"役": 两宋乡役负担的演变 (From "Officials'" to "Servants": Evolution of Rural Service Burden in the Song Dynasty). 云南社会科学 (*Social Sciences in Yunnan*) 5: 107–12.

———. 2004b. 20世纪宋朝职役制度研究的回顾与展望 (Review and Prospect of Studies in the 20th Century on the Service System in the Song Dynasty). 宋史研究通讯 (*Journal of Song Dynasty History Studies*) 1: 16–27.

Du Fan. 1969. 清献集 (*Anthology of Qingxian*). 文渊图四库全书 (Complete Library of the Four Treasuries by Wenyuange), vol. 1175. 商务印书馆 (The Commercial Press).

Du You. 1988. 乡官 (Township Officials), in 通典 (*Tongdian*). 中华书局 (Zhonghua Book Company).

Du Zheng. 1969. 性善堂稿 (*Manuscripts in the Goodness Hall*). 文渊图四库全书 (Complete Library of the Four Treasuries by Wenyuange), vol. 1170. 商务印书馆 (The Commercial Press).

———. 2007. 两宋乡役与乡村秩序研究 (*Research on Rural Servants and Rural Order in the Song Dynasty*). PhD dissertation., 南开大学

(Nankai University).

———. 2013. 从乡官到乡役: 唐宋时期帝制中国乡村管理模式的转型 (From Rural Officials to Rural Servants: The Transformation of Chinese Rural Management Model under Imperial System in the Tang and Song Dynasties), International Seminar on 宋代政治史研究的新视野 (New Views of Political History Study of the Song Dynasty).

———. 2014. 乡官・乡役・乡绅: 两宋乡村治理模式的重建 (Rural Officials, Rural Servants, Gentry Representatives: Reconstruction of Rural Governance Model in the Song Dynasty). International Seminar on 10–13 世纪中国国家与社会 (China and Chinese Society from the 10th to 13th Centuries) and 中国宋史研究会第16届年会论文 (The 16th Annual Meeting of the China Association for Song Dynasty Studies)

Fan Zuyu. 2004. 太史范公文集 (*Anthology of Court Historian Lord Fan*). 宋集珍本丛刊 (Collection of Rare Books of Song Dynasty), vol. 24. 线装书局 (Thread-Binding Books Publishing House).

Fu Jun. 2015. 理论、文本与现场——宋代乡村研究省思 (Theory, Texts and Field: Reflection on the Study of Rural Areas in the Song Dynasty), in 唐宋历史评论 (*Comments on the History of the Tang and Song Dynasties*). Edited by Bao Weimin, and Liu Houbin. 社会科学文献出版社 (Social Sciences Academic Press).

Gu Yanwu. 2014. 图 (Map), in 日知录集释 (*Collected Interpretations to Daily Knowledge Records*). 上海古籍出版社 (Shanghai Classics Publishing House).

Guo Yumao, and Liu Jibao. 2016. 宋代墓志辑释 (*Interpretations to Epitaphs in the Song Dynasty*). 中州古籍出版社 (Zhongzhou Ancient Books Publishing House).

Huang Gan. 2004. 勉斋先生黄文肃公文集 (*Anthology of Lord Huang Wensu, Mr. Mianzhai*). 宋集珍本丛刊 (Collection of Rare Books of Song Dynasty), vol. 68. 线装书局 (Thread-Binding Books Publishing House).

Huang Huai, and Yang Shiqi. 1989. 历代名臣奏议 (*Memorials and Discussions of Famous Ministers throughout the History*), vol. 143. 上海古籍出版社 (Shanghai Classics Publishing House).

Huang Jin. 1985. 奉议大夫御史台都事李公墓志铭 (The Epitaph of Lord Li, A Senior Official in Censorate), in 黄文献公集 (*The Collection of Lord Huang Wenxian*). 中华书局 (Zhonghua Book Company).

Jia Liangang. 2014. 宋代乡村行政制度及相关问题研究的回顾与展望 (Review and Prospect of Rural Administrative System and Related Issues in the Song Dynasty). 中国史研究动态 (*Trends of Recent Researches on the History of China*) 1: 22–30.

Ke Shangqian. 1969. 周礼全经释原 (*Interpretations to the Whole Classic of Rites of Zhou*). 文渊图四库全书 (Complete Library of the Four Treasuries by Wenyuange), vol. 96. 商务印书馆 (The Commercial Press).

Li Huarui. 2018. 唐宋史研究应当翻过这一页——多视角看"宋代近世说(唐宋变革论)" (About the Studies of Tang and Song Dynasties History: "The Theory of Modernization in the Song Dynasty [The Theory of Reforms in the Tang and Song Dynasties from Multiple Views]). 古代文明 (*The Journal of Ancient Civilizations*) 1: 14–37.

Li Linfu, et al., eds. 1992. 唐六典 (*The Six Codes of the Tang Dynasty*), chap. 3. Annotated by Chen Zhongfu. 中华书局 (Zhonghua Book Company).

Li Tao. 2004. 续资治通鉴长编 (*Long Compilation of Continuation to Comprehensive Mirror in Aid of Governance*). 中华书局 (Zhonghua Book Company).

Li Xinchuan. 2000. 经界法 (Measures on Land Boundaries Definition), in 建炎以来朝野杂记 (*Miscellanies on the Court and the Commonalty since the Jianyan Period*), vol. 5. 中华书局 (Zhonghua Book Company).

Li Xinchuan. 2013. 建炎以来系年要录 (Important Records since the Jianyan Period), vol. 172. 中华书局 (Zhonghua Book Company).

Liang Jianguo. 2006. 北宋前期的乡村区划 (Rural Division in the Early Northern Song Dynasty). 史学集刊 (*Collected Papers of History Studies*) 3: 86.

Lin Jizhong. 1969. 竹轩杂著 (*Miscellaneous Works in the Bamboo House*). 文渊图四库全书 (Complete Library of the Four Treasuries by Wenyuange), vol. 1140. 商务印书馆 (The Commercial Press).

Lin Wenxun. 2006. 中国古代"富民社会"的形成及其历史地位 (The Formation of "the Wealthy

Community" and Its Historical Role in Ancient China). 中国经济史研究 (*Researches in Chinese Economic History*) 2: 30–37.

Lou Yue. 1969. 攻媿集 (*Anthology of Gongkui*). 文淵阁四库全书 (Complete Library of the Four Treasuries by Wenyuange), vol. 1153. 商务印书馆 (The Commercial Press).

Lu Shiyi. 1985. 思辨录辑要 (*Summary of Speculation Notes*). 中华书局 (Zhonghua Book Company).

Lu Xiqi. 2005. 宋代蕲州的乡里区划与组织——基于鄂东所见地券文的考察 (The Xiang-Li Division and Organization of Qizhou in the Song Dynasty—Investigation Based on the Land Contracts Found in Eastern Hubei), in 唐研究 (*Study on the Tang Dynasty*), vol. 11. 北京大学出版社 (Peking University Press).

———. 2017. 制度的地方差异性与统一性: 隋代乡里制度及其实行 (The Local Difference and Unity of Systems: The Xiang-Li System in the Sui Dynasty and Its Implementation). 中国社会科学 (*Social Sciences in China*) 10: 181–203.

Luo Bi 罗泌. 1969. 路史 (*Lu Shi*). 文淵图四库全书 (Complete Library of the Four Treasuries by Wenyuange), vol. 383. 商务印书馆 (The Commercial Press).

Luo Bi 罗璧. 1991. 乡举里选 (Countryside Election), 识遗 (*Learning Heritages*). 中华书局 (Zhonghua Book Company).

Lyu Nangong. 1969. 灌园集 (*A Collection of Works in Guanyuan*). 文淵图四库全书 (Complete Library of the Four Treasuries by Wenyuange), vol. 1123. 商务印书馆 (The Commercial Press).

Ma Duanlin. 2000. 文献通考 (*A General Textual Research on Literature*). 浙江古籍出版社 (Zhejiang Ancient Books Publishing House).

Ma Xin. 2012. 试论宋代的乡村建制 (On the Rural System in the Song Dynasty). 文史哲 (*Journal of Literature, History and Philosophy*) 5: 108–21.

Mcknight, Brain E. 1971. *Village and Bureaucracy in Southern Sung China*. The University of Chicago Press.

Miao Quansun. 1977. 石刻史料新编 (*New Compilation of Historical Materials in Stone Inscriptions*), series 1, vol. 13. 新文丰出版公司 (Shin Wen Feng Print Company).

Pan Sheng. 2014. 九州封域—从闰年图到州郡志 (Territory across the Country: From Leap Year Map to Subprefecture and County Records), in 宋代地理学的观念、体系与知识兴趣 (*Concept, System and Knowledge Interest of Geography in the Song Dynasty*). 商务印书馆 (The Commercial Press).

Satake, Yasuhiko. 1966. 宋代鄉村制の形成過程 (The Formation Process of Rural System in the Song Dynasty). 東洋史研究 (*The Society of Oriental Researches*) 3.

Shang Ping. 2007. 南宋砧基簿与鱼鳞图册的关系 (The Relationship between Books of Farmland Surroundings and Fish Scale Maps in the Southern Song Dynasty). 史学月刊 (*Journal of Historical Science*) 6: 31–32.

Shu Lin. 1969. 舒文靖集 (下) (*Anthology of Shu Wenjing II*). 文淵阁四库全书 (Complete Library of the Four Treasuries by Wenyuange), vol. 1157. 商务印书馆 (The Commercial Press).

Song Wangfu. 1978. 县令上 (County Magistrate I), in 五代会要 (*State Regulations of the Five Dynasties*). 上海古籍出版社 (Shanghai Classics Publishing House).

Sudō, Yoshiyuki. 1965. 宋代鄉村制度の変化過程 (The Changing Process of Rural System in the Song Dynasty), in 唐宋社会経済史研究 (*A Study of Social and Economic History of the Tang and Song Dynasties*). 東京大学出版会 (The University of Tokyo Press).

Tan Jingyu. 2010. 宋代乡村组织研究 (*The Research on Rural Organizations in the Song Dynasty*). 山东大学出版社 (Shandong University Press).

Tanigawa, Michio. 2002. 日本中国史研究的共同问题 (About a Shared Community in Japanese Study of Chinese History), translated by Li Jicang, in 魏晋南北朝隋唐史资料 (*Historical Records on the Wei, Jin, North and South Dynasties, the Sui and Tang Dynasties*). 武汉大学出版社 (Wuhan University Press).

Wang Anshi. 1959. 赠司空兼侍中文元贾魏公神道碑 (Inscriptions to Jia Weigong, Minister of Public Works and Attendant Servant), in 临川先生文集 (*Anthology of Mr. Linchuan*). 中华书局 (Zhonghua Book Company).

Wang Di. 2000. 宋代乡书手初探 (*A Preliminary Study of Township Head Assistants in the Song Dynasty*). 人民出版社 (People's Publishing House).

———. 2001. 宋代经济史稿 (*Manuscript of Economic History of the Song Dynasty*). 长春出版

社 (Changchun Publishing House).

Wang Pu. 1978. 团貌 (About the Rural Institution Named Tuan), in 五代会要 (*State Regulations of the Five Dynasties*). 上海古籍出版社 (Shanghai Classics Publishing House).

Wang Qingyuan. 2014. 20世纪以来鱼鳞图册研究述评 (Comments on the Study of Fish Scale Atlas since the 20th Century). 古今农业 (*Ancient and Modern Agriculture*) 2: 106–13.

———. 2015. 明清鱼鳞总图汇考—以徽州鱼鳞图册为中心 (A Textual Research on General Fish Scale Maps in Ming and Qing Dynasties: Focusing on Huizhou Fish Scale Atlas). 历史研究 (*Historical Research*) 6: 78–94.

Wang Qinruo, et al. 2006. 册府元龟 (*Prime Tortoise of the Record Bureau*). Annotated by Zhou Xunruo, et al. 凤凰出版社 (Phoenix Press).

Wang Yan. 2004. 双溪文集 (*Anthology of Shuangxi*). 宋集珍本丛刊 (Collection of Rare Books of Song Dynasty), vol. 63. 线装书局 (Thread-Binding Books Publishing House).

Wang Yuzhi. 1969. 周礼订义 (*Interpretations to the Rites of Zhou*). 文渊阁四库全书 (Complete Library of the Four Treasuries by Wenyuange), vol. 93. 商务印书馆 (The Commercial Press).

Wang Zengyu. 1979. 宋朝的差役和形势户 (Yamen Runners and Policy Households in the Song Dynasty). 历史学 (*History*) 1.

———. 1993. 宋朝的吏户 (Official Households in the Song Dynasty). 新史学 (*New History*) 1.

———. 2006. 锱铢编 (*A Compilation of Trifles*). 河北大学出版社 (Hebei University Press).

———. 2008. 宋代社会结构 (Social Structure in the Song Dynasty), in 涓埃编 (*Negligible Stories*). 河北大学出版社 (Hebei University Press).

Wei Zheng, et al. 1973. 隋书 (*Book of Sui*). 中华书局 (Zhonghua Book Company).

Wu Cheng. 1969. 吴文正集 (*Collection of Wu Wenzheng's Works*). 文渊图四库全书 (Complete Library of the Four Treasuries by Wenyuange), vol. 1197. 商务印书馆 (The Commercial Press).

Wu Fengxiang, and Li Shunming. 乡都 (Xiang and Countryside), in 无锡县志 (*The History of Wuxi County*).

Wu Songdi. 2000. 中国人口史 (*The History of Chinese Population*), vol. 3. 复旦大学出版社 (Fudan University Press).

Xie Jin, et al. 1959. 永乐大典 (*Yongle Encyclopedia*). 中华书局 (Zhonghua Book Company).

Xu Rijiu. 1997. 五边典则 (*Regulations and Cases of Border Areas*). 四库禁毁书丛刊・史部 (Series of Banned and Destroyed Books of the Four Treasuries: History Catagory), vol. 26. 北京出版社 (Beijing Publishing House).

Xu Shen. 1988. 说文解字注 (*Notes to Shuowen Jiezi*), part 2. 上海古籍出版社 (Shanghai Classics Publishing House).

Xu Song. 1957. 宋会要辑稿 (*Manuscript of State Regulations in the Song Dynasty*). 中华书局 (Zhonghua Book Company).

Xue Gang, and Wu Tingju. 1991. 湖广图经志书 (*The Book of Maps and Records of Huguang*). 书目文献出版社 (Books and Literature Publishing House).

Yang Qianxiu. 1990. 无锡志 (*Wuxi Chronicle*). 宋元方志丛刊 (Series of Local Records in the Song and Yuan Dynasties), vol. 3. 中华书局 (Zhonghua Book Company).

Yang Shi. 1969. 龟山集 (*Anthology of Guishan*). 文渊图四库全书 (Complete Library of the Four Treasuries by Wenyuange), vol. 1125. 商务印书馆 (The Commercial Press).

Yanagida. 1986. 郷村制度の展開 (Development of Rural System), in 宋元郷村制の研究 (*Research on Rural System in the Song and Yuan Dynasties*). 創文社 (SeLn Inc).

Ye Cai. 2002. 近思录集解 (*Collected Interpretations to Recent Reflection Diaries*). 续修四库全书 (Continuation to Complete Library of the Four Treasuries), vol. 934. 上海古籍出版社 (Shanghai Classics Publishing House).

Ye Shi. 2010a. 役法 (Corvee Labor Decree), in 叶适集・水心别集 (*The Collection of Ye Shi: Compile Collection of Shuixin*), vol. 3. 中华书局 (Zhonghua Book Company).

———. 2010b. 彭子复墓志铭 (The Epitaph of Peng Zifu), in 叶适集・水心集 (*The Collection of Ye Shi: Collection of Shuixin*), vol. 15. 中华书局 (Zhonghua Book Company).

Yu Zhengxie. 1957. 乡兴贤能论 (On the Xiang Election System), in 癸巳类稿 (*Similar Manuscripts in the Year of Guisi*). 商务印书馆 (The Commercial Press).

Yuan Yesi, and Liu Tinghui. 1965. 漳州府志 (*The Record of Zhangzhou Government Office*). 学

生书局 (Student Book Company).

Yuan Zhen. 1982. 同州奏均田状 (Report on the Equal-Dividing-Farmland System in Tongzhou Subprefecture), in 元稹集 (*The Collection of Yuan Zhen's Works*). 中华书局 (Zhonghua Book Company).

Zhang Huang. 1969. 图书编 (*A Compilation of Books*). 文渊阁四库全书 (Complete Library of the Four Treasuries by Wenyuange), vol. 971. 商务印书馆 (The Commercial Press).

Zhang Jinguang. 1997. 秦乡官制度及乡、亭、里关系 (Rural Official System and the Relationship between Xiang, Ting, and Li in the Qin Dynasty). 历史研究 (*Historical Research*) 6: 23–41.

Zhao Sheng. 2007. 寄居官 (Jiju Officials), in 朝野类要 (*A Brief Introduction to the Court and the Commonalty*). Annotated by Wang Ruilai. 中华书局 (Zhonghua Book Company).

Zhao Xiuling. 2002. 中国乡里制度 (*Chinese Xiang-Li System*). 社会科学文献出版社 (Social Sciences Academic Press).

Zhao Yanwei. 2007. 云麓漫钞 (*Casual Notes on the Mountain among Clouds*). 中华书局 (Zhonghua Book Company).

Zhao Yi. 1990. 乡都图 (Xiang and Countryside System Diagram), in 陔余丛考 (*A Series of Text Researches in Spare Time of Raising Parents*). Annotated by Luan Baoqun, Lyu Zongli. 河北人民出版社 (Hebei People's Publishing House).

Zhao Yubi. 1990. 学田祀田 (School-Owned Land and Land Rented for Sacrifice Expenditure), in 仙溪志 (*Local Records of Xianxi*). 宋元方志丛刊, vol. 8. 中华书局 (Zhonghua Book Company).

Zhen Dexiu. 1935. 西山先生真文忠公文集 (*Anthology of Mr. Xishan, Lord Zhen Wenzhong*). 商务印书馆 (The Commercial Press).

Zheng Xuan. 1985. 周礼 (*Rites of Zhou*). 中华书局 (Zhonghua Book Company).

Zhu Xi. 1986. 论民 (On the People), in 朱子语类 (*Classified Conversations of Zhu Xi*). Edited by Li Jingde, annotated by Wang Xingxian. 中华书局 (Zhonghua Book Company).

———. 1996. 朱熹集 (*The Collection of Zhu Xi's Works*). 四川教育出版社 (Sichuan Education Press).