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Introduction

During the work on my book on Ch’u Shao-sun 楚少孫 (fl. 104–30 B.C.), entitled provisionally Ch’u Shao-sun—The Third Author of the Schih-chi. Studies and Translations, I have translated some chapters on their parts written by this specialist of the Shih-ching studies and partly by Ssu-ma Ch’ien, the main author of the SC (i.a. 60, 126, 127, 128) and I found\(^1\) that only two full chapters of the SC have not been translated at all. I mean the chapters 95 and 98, both devoted to the collective biographies of four more eminent followers of Kao-tsu—Fan K’uai, Li Shang, Hsia-hou Ying and Kuan Ying—and three other less eminent ones—Fu K’uan, Chin Hsi and Chou Hsieh respectively. In others words, those seven men belonged to the second and third category of Kao-tsu’s followers, both before and after the fall of the Ch’in in 206 B.C., while the accounts on the most eminent followers of the First Emperor of the Han like Hsiao Ho 萧何, Ts’ao Ts’an 史德 and Ch’en P’ing 陳平 were included in the SC into the higher category of Hereditary Houses.

Pan Ku was seemingly and partially of a different opinion since he classed the followers of Kao-tsu into two categories only; while Hsiao Ho and others retained their individual biographies (after the abolition of the Hereditary Houses in HS), the biographies of SC 95 and 98 were united into the chapter 41 of the HS. But, since Pan Ku retained the original sequence of the personalities as found in the SC and did not even introduce any substantial changes into the text, his ideas could not differ essentially from those of Ssu-ma Ch’ien.

The principal difference between the more and less eminent followers may be illustrated by the fact that some nine pages are devoted to every of the four men in SC 95 but only three pages to each one in SC 98 (see the Finding List below). It is surprising that both chapters do not follow one after the other although they deal with the same category of men of the same time\(^2\). Such an arrangement hardly reflects the opinion of Ssu-ma Ch’ien.

---


\(^{2}\) SC 96 deals with Chang Ts’ang 張苍, 97 with Li I-chi 郦騫, Lu Chia 陸贾 and Chu Chien 朱建, all of them being from the beginning of the Han, too.
Another common trait of both chapters is their unattractivity. B. Watson is right when pointing out in his comment to the chapter 98: "Like the biographies in Shih-chi 95 above, it is made up almost entirely of brief, bare statistics on military achievements and promotion in rank. The lives of such men, marked by continuous but scarcely memorable success, obviously had little appeal for Ssu-ma Ch'ien and this seems the best what he could do." Watson therefore did not include the two chapters into his great anthology of translations from the SC while another anthology from 1974 by Yang Hsien-yi and Gladys Yang followed this example.

Such an attitude which pays most attention to the artistic value of the text is not surprising but, of course, it is not the only possible one. We have only to remember the translation of similar texts by E. Chavannes and H. H. Dubs or, more recently, the large translation into Russian by R. V. Vjatkin concentrated on the historical information found in the SC or HS.

Relatively much information is available on the two first categories of Kao-tsu's followers in different parts of the SC but, as far as the three Marquises Fu K'uan, Chin Hsi and Chou Hsieh are concerned, the information on them is found almost exclusively in SC 98 (cf. the Appendix on Families below). This, and the fact that we need a complete translation of the SC, qualifies a commented translation as well as a study on the present chapter.

We should first of all occupy ourselves with the well-known—and never solved—problem of the nine lost chapters of the SC. Those were, according to Chang Yen, of the Ts'ao-Wei dynasty, the following chapters: 11, 12, 22, 23, 24, 25, 98, 127, 129, and finally, during the reign of the Emperors Yüan and Ch'eng (48–7 B.C.), states Chang Yen, Ch'u Shao-sun rewrote the chapters 12, 60, 127 and 128.

This means that Chang Yen does not ascribe to Ch'u Shao-sun the compilation of the lost chapter 98 but, somehow surprisingly, he does attribute to Ch'u the writing of the 60th chapter which, according to the same Chang Yen, has not been lost. This being no place for studying the issues of the lost chap-

---

3 Records I, p. 284; for Watson's opinion on SC 95 see ibidem, pp. 255–6.
4 Records of the Historian. Written by Ssu-ma Chien. Translated by Yang Hsien-i and Gladys Yang, Hong Kong 1975.
5 See note 87.
7 And of course in the chronological tables where the information is however rather restricted.
8 SC 130, p. 65. Cf. also SC 12, pp. 1–2.
ters, we may restrict ourselves to a few statements. Chang Yen was the first to mention, in the 3rd century, the contribution of Ch'ü Shao-sun to the SC which has been unknown to Pan Ku in the end of the first century A.D., i.e. some hundred and thirty years (or even more) before Chang Yen. However, Chang Yen's information was neither full nor consistent. Thus we may agree with Takigawa Kametaro's conclusion on Chang Yen's opinion on the non-existence of the chapter 98: "This uttering cannot be trusted".9

K'o Wei-ch'i 柯維騏 (1497–1574), SC k'ao-yao10 考要 finds the style of the chapter not unified and inconsistent, because for the description of the merits of Fu K'uan and Chin Hsi three different words are used11, resembling thus the style of the parallel chapter 95. Indeed, Mao K'un 茅坤 (1512–1601), SC ch'ao 錶, reproaches the author of the SC 95 to use thirteen different words for military actions12. Of course, according to the present point of view, a more variegated style is believed to be better. Therefore we would rather agree with Ling Chih-lung's13 criticism, as found in his SC p'ing-lin (1576) that one single word is repeated fifteen times in one chapter14.

But we have to return to K'o Wei-ch'i who, somehow in accord with Wattson15, carefully formulates that in the case of SC 98 "it is not that it could not have been written by the t'ai-shih-kung"16. Ts'ui Shih 崔適 (1851–1924), SC t'an-yüan 探源 remarks: "The chronology of the establishment of the kingdoms of the three Marquises all agree with the Table of Merited Dignitaries17. All other what has been added and written is not complete and thorough"18.

Yü Yüeh19 資 橋 (1821–1907) contributed another argument concerning the reliability of SC 98 in his Hu-lou pi-t'an20 when stating that during the civil war after the fall of the Ch'in—between the Ch'u of Hsiang Yü and the Han of the future Kao-tsu- the recipients of the fiefs established in this way sometime enjoyed only fame for this designation without really obtaining the relevant territory. As an example Yü Yüeh presents Fu K'uan who became Lord of Respectful

9 SC 98, p.l. It was rather customary to attribute a text to Ch'ü Shao-sun if there was no possibility to find out a more plausible explanation.
10 Quoted according to Ling Chih-lung's 凌維隆 SC p'ing-lin 評林.
11 SC 98, p. 2.
12 Ibid.
13 See note 10.
14 SC 95, p. 2.
15 See note 3.
16 SC 98, p. 2. SC t'an-yüan 8.4a, Peking 1924.
17 Of Kao-tsu, SC 18.
18 SC 98, p. 2.
19 Not quoted by Takigawa Kametaro.
20 4.10a. Hu-lou pi-t'an 胡樓筆談 represents the 9th part of Yü Yüeh's Ti-i lou ts'ung-shu 第一樓叢書 of his Yü-shih ts'ung-shu 烏氏. Preface 1871, the place of publication is not given.
Virtue\textsuperscript{21}. As for a general opinion, Yü Yüeh refers to Yen Shih-k"u who stated that one had either received the fief with the territory and the income of it or an empty title of nobility only. Another example, as proposed by Yü Yüeh, might apply to Chin Hsi who received the title of the Lord of Lin-p'ing\textsuperscript{22}. Nevertheless, the treatise on geography in HS\textsuperscript{23} mentions the existence of the Lin-p'ing prefecture in the Chu-lu 钜鹿 commandery. Therefore, concludes Yü Yüeh, this enfeofment of Chin Hsi was a real one while the authors (and the commentators) of both the SC and HS did not point out to this fact, evidently under the wrong assumption that the fief did not exist in reality.

Thanks to the information of SC 98 we are able to observe the practice of the strict Ch'\in system of rewarding by titles those who had obtained a certain amount of the enemy's heads—chi\textsuperscript{24}, a system used also after the fall of this dynasty. Those who produced one or more heads were rewarded accordingly by different titles. But the just quoted case of Chin Hsi is not clear since the text mentions his beheading (chan 斬)\textsuperscript{25} of one general of one cavalry unit as well as of receiving of fifty seven heads while Li Hsien states that one head represented one grade\textsuperscript{26}. We have therefore to wait for the publication of the studies on the newly found Ch'in code, i.a. by Derk Bodde and A. F. P. Hu l'se wé to see if such laws may really be attributed to the Ch'in only\textsuperscript{27}. After all, just the SC chapter 98 shows that the same system of chi—meaning both a decapitated head and a rank—has been used by the followers of Liu Pang.

No less interesting, if less clear, are the words of Chou Hsieh, not quoted by Pan Ku, on the privilege or political principle not to kill the eminent followers of Hsiang Yü who exterminated many soldiers of the Han. This sort of pragmatic agreement might have later develop in a system of "iron bonds" during the enfeofment of the nobles and of presenting them with some kind of personal security even if they had previously been opposed to their present ruler. SC 98 formulates this principle in a straightforward way, viz. that "men who killed others shall not die"\textsuperscript{28}. Of course, such a statement gave rise to sharp criticism and had to be concealed in the HS\textsuperscript{29}.

\textsuperscript{21} For Fu K'uan see SC 98, p. 2 and note 36.
\textsuperscript{22} See for him 98, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{23} HS 28 A, p. 2669.
\textsuperscript{24} SC 98, p. 4. See also note 58 below.
\textsuperscript{25} The original meaning of chan is, in fact, 'to cut asunder', cf. A. F. P. H u l'se w é, Remnants of Han Law, Leiden 1955, p. 110.
\textsuperscript{26} See note 24.
\textsuperscript{27} The Ch'in laws on strips were found in December 1975 in Yün-meng in the Hupei province and published in "Wen Wu" 1976, 6, pp. 11–14; 7, pp. 1–10; 8, pp. 27–37. The general description is to be found in Wen-wu 1976, 5.
\textsuperscript{29} See our detailed arguments in the note 94.
Returning to the characteristic formulated by Watson and quoted above, we may state that at least Chou Hsieh had an appeal for Ssu-ma Ch’ien who sums up that this permanent charioteer and bodyguard “restrained his mind in order to be hard and upright” although I do not believe that “he did never give opportunity to any doubts”\(^{30}\). And, as we have to see in the following translation, the two other biographies of the SC 98 contribute in some way to the history of the rise of the Han on the example of two plain, almost forgotten men, too. We should not forget that among the 143 men upon which Kao-tsu bestowed the title of Marquis, eighteen only were hereditary; among them Fu K’u’an was on the eleventh and Chin Hsi on the twelfth place\(^{31}\).

Appendix

Finding List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>SC 95, pp. 2–13</th>
<th>SC 98, pp. 2–7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fan K’uui</td>
<td>13–19</td>
<td>3531–3535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li Shang</td>
<td>3535–3539</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsia-hou Ying</td>
<td>19–24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuan Ying</td>
<td>3539–3545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postface</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fu K’uuan</td>
<td>3545–3546</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin Hsi</td>
<td>3547–3549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chou Hsieh</td>
<td>3549–3551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postface</td>
<td>3551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Families (and their fiefs)

- Fu K’uuan, Marquis of Yang-ling  陽陵侯
  - February 13, 201–190 B.C.
- Fu Ching, Marquis of (Sui)-ch’ing 精(隨)侯
  - 189–165
- Fu Tse (Ming), Marquis of Kung 則攻侯
  - 165–153
- Fu Yen, Marquis 廬侯
  - 153–122

Sources: SC 18, p. 15; HS 16, pp. 736–737; MH III, p. 145, number 136

- Chin Hsi, Marquis of Hsin-wu 銃侯
  - February 201–183
  - since 207

- Chin T’ing, Marquis of Tai 銃侯
  - 182–161

Sources: SC 18, p. 13; HS 16, p. 732; MH III, p. 139, number 94

- Chou Hsieh, Marquis of K’uai-ch’eng 剃侯
  - September 20, 201–175
  - cf. note 93

- Chou Ch’ang, Marquis of Tai 銃侯
  - 175–148

- Chou Ying, Marquis of Tan 應侯
  - 149

- Chou Chung-chü, Marquis of Tai 應侯
  - 148–114

Sources: SC 18, p. 64; HS 16, p. 812; MH III, p. 134, number 48

---

\(^{30}\) SC 98, pp. 9–10.

\(^{31}\) In HS 18, p. 724 Pan Ku’s sister Pan Chao speaks only on eighteen Marquises who are identified by Yen Shih-ku. For a translation of the text see Ю. Л. Кроль, Сыма Цзянь — историк, Москва 1970, p. 300 and note 52.
An Annotated Translation of the Shih-chi Chapter 98:

The Biographies of Fu K’uan, Chin Hsi, the Marquis of K’uai-ch’eng Chou Hsieh
(Fu, Chin, K’uai-ch’eng lieh-chuan)

2 Fu K’uan, Marquis of Yang-ling\(^{32}\), due to (his position) of Quintuple Grandee and leader of the cavalry of Wei 西魏 (Shi Wei) followed (Liu Pang) as a Companion; he rose up in Heng-yang\(^{33}\), marched to attack An-yang 安陽, and Kang-lic 江陰, routed the army of Chao Pen at K’ai-feng 華陰, then attacked Yang-hsiung 楊廬, Ch’ü-nung 曲氟 and Yang-wu 柳州. After having cut twelve heads, he was bestowed a title of nobility and high office.

He then arrived at Pa-shang where the Duke of Pei 梁公 (Liu Pang) became established as King of Han 漢王. King of Han bestowed upon (Fu) the commandery of Chao 霸上 and the prefecture of Yang-ling. Chang Chao 張敞 (1691-1745), SC k’a-o-cheng 藤證: “According to Hsin-shu ti-li chih Yang-ling represented the ancient I-yang 雒陽, reestablished by Emperor Ching. There was no such a name before Emperor Kao”.

The So-yin commentary to the Table of Years of Merited Dignitaries of Kao-ts’u 18, p. 15 states: “Ch’u-Han ch’un-ch’iu 錠陽, has Yin-ling 薛陽. Cf. MH III, p. 145, No. 136. Chang Wen-hu, Chiao-k’an SC, Chi-chien, So-yin, Cheng-i cha-chi 社記 5.325: The Sung, Chung-t’ung, Yu and the Mao editions all do not have this chi-chien commentary. It might have been added later”. Chang Wen-hu’s (1808-1885) book Chiao-k’an SC has a postface dated 1872, no place of publication is given.

32 Chi-chien quotes Ti-li chih 地理志: “P’ing-i 醴陽, prefecture Yang-ling”. Chang Chao 張敞: “According to Han (shu) ti-li chih Yang-ling represented the ancient I-yang 雒陽, reestablished by Emperor Ching”.

33 So-yin: “Heng-yang is the name of a district city in Han 陳, the son of the Duke of the Han Kingdom, was first enfeoffed as Lord of Heng-yang while Chang Liang 張良 was established as King of Han”. Cheng-i: “According to Kua-ti chih Heng-ch’eng of old was in Sung-chou 蘇州, 30 miles southwest of Sung-ch’eng 宋城, prefecture. This was evidently Heng-yang”. Wang Hsin-ch’ien adds that Heng-yang was south-west of Shang-ch’iu 柴邱 in the Kuei-te 經手 prefecture, i.e. in eastern Honan. HS 41, p. 3545. Ch’ien Ta-hsin 謝大炘 (1728-1804), SC k’a-o-cheng: “The histories do not mention the commanderies and prefectures in which Fu K’uan and the venerable Chin were (originally) staying. The wu ta-fu 王大付 was probably a title obtained during the Ch’in (dynasty), and, when Wei was raised, (Fu K’uan) still used this denomination”. For the title wu ta-fu — Quintuple Grandee, see MH I, p. 528. Dubs, HFHD I, p. 174 translates it “the aristocratic rank of Fifth (Rank) Grandee”. For the discrepancies between the SC and HS see Chang Hsi-yü 張錫瑜, Shih-piao kung-pi shuo 史表公比說, p. 10; ed. TSCC.

34 Cheng-i quotes the Ti-hsing chih 地形志 of Hou Wei 封 傳: “In the Chi-shih 已氏 (prefecture) was the town of An-yang. During the Sui, Chi-shih was changed to Ch’u-ch’iu 鄭州. This is nowadays 40 li west of Sung-chou, Ch’u-ch’iu prefecture. An-yang is the old town”. I read chi 已 for i 己 of the text. Chang Wen-hu, Chiao-k’an SC 5.326 remarks that instead of Kang-lic two editions wrongly have “Tu-chu”.

35 For Chao Pen see note 68. Cheng-i, dealing with the reading of some characters proposes for yü 遇 the reading nung, Ssu-ma Piao 司馬彪, Chün-kuo chih 郵國志 (in HHS): “There was in Chung-mou 重南 a Ch’ü-nung community. This was the Chung-mou prefecture of the Cheng-chou 鄭州 (commandery); Yang-wu was a prefecture of Cheng-chou”.


K’uan the designation of the Lord of Respectful Virtue. Then, after having entered Han-chung, (Fu K’uan) was nominated Leader of the Cavalry of the Right. He marched, pacified the Three Ch’in  and was bestowed the emolument from the region Tiao-yin. Then he marched and routed Hsiang Chi  and waited for (the King of Han) at Huai. He was given the title of the Marquis of Universal Virtue.

Then he routed Hsiang Kuan, Chou Lan and Lung Ch’ü  His generals and soldiers heheaded one Leader of Cavalry under Ao and (thus Fu K’uan’s) emolument from the region has been increased. Being subordinated to (Han Hsin, the Marquis of) Huai, he routed and destroyed the Ch’i army at Li-hsia, routing T’ien Hsieh  Subordinated

Kung-te chün  . So-yin: “This means an embellishing designation, not a place-name”.

Ch’i-ch’ieh quotes Hsü Kuang: “Belongs to the Shang commandery”. So-yin: “Meng K’ang and Hsü Kuang say: ‘The name of a prefecture; belonging to the Shang commandery’”. Cheng-i: “Fu-ch’ien, Lo-chiao: prefecture; the old town of Tiao-yin is just thirty li from it”.

Better known as Hsiang Yü.


Hsiang Kuan was a general of Hsiang Yü. SC 95, p. 27. HS 41, p. 3541. For the role of Chou Lan and Lung Ch’ü, two officers of Hsiang Yü in a battle against Han Hsin in 204 B.C., see SC 8, p. 55; MH II, pp. 372–3. Lung Ch’ü was killed. See also SC 94, p. 8; Watson, Records I, p. 249.

Chi-ch’ieh quotes Hsü Kuang: “Under the Ao granary”.


So-yin quotes in a shortened form Ch’ang Yen’s text: “Since (Han) Hsin was at that time Chancellor of the Kingdom, it is said ‘that of Huai-yin’...” Liang Yü-sheng  (1745–1815), SC chih-i  32.7a (ed. Shih-Hsüeh ts’ung-shu, 1893) writes: “At that time Han Hsin was the Chancellor of the Kingdom. According to the text below he was connected with the Chancellor of the Kingdom (Ts’ao) Ts’an. This belongs to such cases as that of the Great Commandant (Chou) P’o. It should run as follows: ‘In connection with the Chancellor of the Kingdom (Han) Hsin’ and not ‘Huai-yin’. The same mistake is also in the Table (of Merited Dignitaries of Kao-tsu 18, p. 46)”. Cf. MH III, p. 129, No. 17. Wang Hsien-ch’ien says: “According to the biography of T’ien Tan  (SC 94, p. 8; Watson, Records I, p. 248) the King of Ch’i sent Hua Wu-shang and T’ien Hsieh with an army to Li-hsia. Therefore the attack of the army at Li-hsia and the attack against (T’ien) Hsieh cannot be (constructed) as two affairs. Hua Wu-shang was captured by Kuan Ying while T’ien Hsieh could not escape alone. Ch’i’s 'to route' should be read (either) as chan ‘to behead’ or it is the character te 'to obtain', being a distortion of lu 'captive'. SC is also wrong”. HS 41, p. 3546.
to the Chancellor of State (Ts'ao) Ts'an, he has destroyed (the enemy) at Po 変; his emolument from the region was increased43.

Thereafter he pacified the territory of Ch'i and (received) split tallies (entitling his heirs to hold the fief) for generation after generation without end. He was enfeoffed as Marquis of Yang-ling44 with two thousand and six hundred families while his previous emoluments have been abolished. He became Senior Lieutenant Chancellor preparing Ch'i militarily45. He was chancellor of the Kingdom of Ch'i during five years46.

43 So-yin: "Po is the prefecture of T'ai-shan. The Secret Inspector states: 'Subordinated to Ts'ao Ts'an in order to destroy and defeat (the enemy) at the Po prefecture'." Taki gawa Kametarō remarks that the Secret Inspector of the So-yin commentary reads in four editions Ku 風 in SC 111, p. 10; Watson, Records II, p. 198) which states that an army unit had to protect the King. So-yin means also the same (as the Secret Inspector Ku). Ch'ien T'ai-chi however does not mention that in SC 111 Ku, i.e. Ku Yin 閔, interprets Po 変, not as a place-name but as ling 令 "to lead", "to guide". Yen Shih-ku, quoted ibidem, interprets po as fu 附, a reserve army unit. For the commentary of Yen Shih-ku and for other commentaries see HS 55, pp. 3965-6; cf. also Chang Wen-hu, Chiao-k'an SC 5.32b. Ch'ien T'ai-chi still says: "The bibliographical chapter of the T'ang-shu lists Yu Yin, HS ku-chin chi-i 吉 in 20 chüan. He is quoted by the Small Yen who also in other places adjoins Yu Yin frequently." See the separate edition T'ang-shu ching-chi i-wen ho-chih, Shanghai 1956, p. 64.

44 Ch'ien Ta-chao 夢 (1744-1813), HS pien-i 辨疑 17, p. 290 (ed. TSCC) says that the text misses two characters shih-i 尊, i.e. "emolument of the region". According to SC 18 (cf. note 32 above), this happened on the chia-shen 申 day of the 12th month of the 8th year of Emperor Kao, i.e. on February 13, 201 B.C., according to MH III, p. 145, No. 136. As for the unlimited number of generations holding the fief, this was in general a hackneyed saying only: the fief of the Fu family lasted only three generations. Fu Yen was sentenced to death and exterminated in 122 B.C., in connection with the plot of Liu An. See also HS 16, pp. 736-7 and the first table of generations (Families) compiled by me.

45 Chi-chieh quotes Chang Yen: "At the time T'ien Heng 天横 did not yet surrender and military camps have therefore been established". T'ien Heng was a very virtuous man; see for him Watson, Records I, pp. 249-251. Ch'eng-i: "He was a Chancellor of Han Hsin, the King of Ch'i". Ch'ien Ta-chao, HS pien-i 17, p. 296 states: "In the Table of Merited Ministers (HS, see the preceding note) there is no "right"—i.e. "senior".

46 Ch'eng-i: "He was a Chancellor during five years under Liu Fei 劉肥, the King Tao-hui 榮 of Ch'i". Liu Fei ruled between 201-189 B.C.; see on him SC 52; MH VI, Kaltenmark's translation, pp. 86-112. Nakai Sekitoku 甲井積徳 (1732-1817), Shiki Sadken 史記左傳考題: "The reference to 'five years' follows the text quoted above, i.e. after five years of being the Senior Lieutenant Chancellor of Ch'i. This is also the case with the text below 'four months, one month, two years'".—Wang Hsien-ch'ien refutes the information of the Cheng-i commentary on the five years under Liu Fei. Wang says: "This means that five years elapsed since Fu K'uan was the Senior Lieutenant
During the fourth month he routed Ch’en Hsi 胡, Subordinated to the Grand Commandant (Chou) P’o 周, and, substituting the Lieutenant Chancellor (Fan) K’uai, in his capacity of the Chancellor of the State, (Fu K’uan) routed (Ch’en) Hsi. After one month he was transferred to substitute the Chancellor of State, taking care of the encampments (at the frontier). Two years later he became substituting Lieutenant Chancellor, taking care of the encampments. (Fu K’uan) died in the fifth year of the Emperor Hsiao-Hui 皇帝 and was given the posthumous name Marquis of Ch’ing. His son Ching, Marquis of Ch’ing Chancellor in Ch’i before he became the Chancellor of State in Ch’i. Han Hsin was King of Ch’i during the 4th year of Kao-tsu (in March-April 203 B.C.; HFHD I, p. 92). (Fu) K’uan had thus to become Chancellor in the 5th year. Plus five years means that (Fu) K’uan was Chancellor of State in Ch’i in the 10th year of Kao-tsu. Ch’en Hsi revolted in the 9th month of the 10th year (September-October 197 B.C.; HFHD I, p. 125). Therefore the following text states that he routed Ch’en Hsi (after four months”). Wang Hsien-ch’ien is evidently right and moreover we obtain in this way another fixed date for Fu K’uan. HS 41, p. 3546.

Only Wang Hsien-ch’ien remarks: “According to the biography of Chou P’o he was nominated Grand Commandant (HS 40, p. 3510) and routed Ch’en Hsi. Lu Wan 魯安 revolted (in 195 B.C.; Watson, Records I, p. 240). Chou P’o has been substituted as Chancellor of State by Fan K’uai and routed (Lu) Wan. Above the words ‘Chancellor of State’, there should be P’o’; instead of routing (Ch’en) Hsi the text should read ‘routing Lu Wan’. Something is lacking and wrong in the historical text. SC is also wrong.” Thus, according to Wang Hsien-ch’ien, the text should read: “Subordinated to the Grand Commandant (Chou) P’o and while the Chancellor of State (Chou) P’o has been substituted by Lieutenant Chancellor (Fan) K’uai, he attacked Lu Wan”. Takigawa Kametaro does not mention this conjecture. The problem of dating the events has still to be studied.

Chi-chi-ch’ lengths: J u Shun 如淳 (fl. 221–265): “When he became the Chancellor of the State, there was a warning and hence (a mobilization of) generals and soldiers as well as military defense (measures had to be organized). The statute states that to force the soldiers to guard is ‘to camp’ (t’un 防).” So-yin: “Ju Shun says that in the beginning of Han the officers of all the feudal kings were subordinated (in the same way) as those of the Han dynasty. Therefore there were Lieutenant Chancellors in the antiquity. K’ung Wen-hsiang 孔文祥 states: ‘In the frontier commanderies the soldiers were encamped’. (Fu) K’uan became substituting Chancellor of the State and was concurrently leading the encamped soldiers. Therefore later on the generals of the encampments have been established”. K’ung Wen-hsiang seems to be otherwise unknown, he evidently lived before the 8th century. Yen Shih-k’u 史承反对 the first opinion of Ju Shun stating that the military encampments were not only in Ch’i but existed in other kingdoms too.

Takigawa Kametaro quotes I i Tzu-ming 李滋铭 (1830–1894), Yueh-man-t’ang jih-chi 越缦堂日記: “... At that time (the title) of the Chancellor of State (hsiang-kuo 相國) has been changed in the feudal kingdoms to Lieutenant Chancellor (ch’eng-hsiang 相相).” Wang Hsien-ch’ien presents this quote in a longer form (HS 41, p. 3546).

190 B.C.

Chou Shou-ch’ang 周寿昌 (1814–1884), HS chu pu-cheng 33, p. 569 (ed. Kuo-hsiüeh chi-pen ts’un-shu, Shanghai 1936) remarks that the Table of Merited Ministers states that Fu K’uan’s posthumous name was
was set up, died after twenty-four years. His son Tse  was Marquis of Kung ；was set up；died after twelve years. His son Yen  was established Marquis. During his thirty-first year he was tried at law and died in connection with the planned rebellion of the King of Huai-nan. His kingdom was abolished.

Chin Hsi  the Marquis of Hsin-wu, due to his position of Palace Internuncio, followed (Liu Pang). He rose in Yüan-chü ；attacked Chi-yang ；destroyed the army of Li Yu ；routed the Ch'in army south of Po .

Wu-chung hou  武忠 ；Yen Shih-ku opines that this must have been a title of nobility, although Fu K'uan has already previously been given the embelishing title of the Marquis of Universal Virtue. However the affair remains unclear.

52 T a k i g a w a Kametaro: "Instead of Marquis of Ch'ing one edition has Marquis of Hsü . Shen Chia-pen (1843–1913) refers to the fact that the SC Table has ch'ing ；while the Table in HS has ch'ing . Ching ruled between 189–165 B.C.

53 Tse ruled between 153–122 B.C. T a k i g a w a Kametaro says that one edition has 21 instead of 31 years；the first number is wrong. HS 41, p. 3546 states that the status of Marquis was transmitted until the great-grandson who was sentenced to death penalty because of a planned rebellion；the great-grandson was Fu Yen.

54 S o - y i n points out that Hsi has really to be read hsi. Chin Hsi is also mentioned in SC 18, p. 12；MH III, p. 139, No. 94. For the comments of Chang Wen-hu see note 33.

55 The title chung-chüan  中涓 occurs only in relation to some eminent men related to Emperor Kao as mentioned in the Table in SC 18. In SC 54, p. 2, the Chi-chi eh commentary quotes (Fu Ch'ien's) HS yin-i 音義 , stating that chung-chüan means the same as chung-yeh 中譜 , i.e. Palace Internuncio. Indeed, Kuan Ying, under the same condition, has been nominated chung-yeh ; HS 41, p. 3540. (Cf. however SC 95, p. 25 where T a k i g a w a Kametaro proposes some doubts). The same statement as that of Fu Ch'ien is attributed to Ju Shun in the commentary to HS 39, p. 3467. Yen Shih-ku points out to the meaning “pure” for chüan and opines that the chung-chüan took care of order. Wang Hsien-ch'ien refers to Shen Ch'in-han's (1775–1832) HS shu-cheng which states that the chapter Hao-ling ；of Mo-tzu (15, 70, p. 352 of the Chu-tzu chi-ch'eng edition, with other comments) mentions the chung-chüan and concludes that the title existed already during the Warring States period. However, both Wang Hsien-ch'ien in HS 39, p. 3467 and Takigawa Kametaro, SC 54, p. 2 read chung-chüan ts'ung 從 ；Takigawa does not read this way in SC 57, p. 3, translated by W a t s o n, Records I, p. 427 "... followed as one of his pages .... I believe that W a t s o n is right when understanding ts'ung as “to follow” but I prefer “Internuncio” instead of “page". As for the text of M o - t z u, cf. A. F o r k e, M e T i des Sozialethikers und seiner Schüler philosophische Werke ..., Berlin 1922, Beiband zum Jahrgang XXIII–XXV der „Mitteilungen des Seminars für orientalische Sprachen“, Buch XV, Kapitel 70: Befehle und Verordnungen, p. 619. The text of M o - t z u includes still the chapter 71, also belonging to the last part of the book which deals with military technic and has been written later.

56 C h e n g - i: "Thirty five miles south-west of Ts'ao-chou , in the prefecture Yüan-chu, is the ancient town of Chi-yang". Presently in the Shantung province. Also Chou P'o attacked this town; Watson, Records I, p. 428.

57 HS 41, p. 3547 does not have "south of Po".
north-east of K’ai-feng 開封. He beheaded one general of a cavalry (unit) of one thousand men and received degrees (chi 及)58 for fifty seven decapitated heads, captured seventy three men59. He was bestowed (the title of) nobility and enfeoffed as Lord of Lin-p’ing60. He also fought north of Lan-t’ien 蘭田, beheaded two Majors of the Equipages61, 5 one chief of Cavalry, received degrees for twenty eight decapitated heads, captured fifty seven men. He arrived at Pa-shang where the Duke of P’ei became established as King of Han62. He bestowed upon (Chin) Hsi (the title of) nobility of Marquises of Chien-wu (Established Warrior). He was nominated to the post of the Chief Commandant of Cavalry.

Following (the command) he pacified the Three Ch’in, moreover attacked in the west the army of Chang P’ing63 章平 at Lung-hsi 龍西 where he destructed it, pacifying thus six prefectures of the Lung-hsi (commandery). His generals and soldiers beheaded the Generals of Equipages, four men each, twelve Chiefs of Cavalry. Pursuing (the enemy) he attacked Ch’u from the east and reached Peng-ch’eng 彭城. When the Han army has been defeated, he returned to protect Yung-ch’iu. When leaving, he routed the revolting Wang Wu 王武64 and others (of the Han).

58 Chi is a word occurring of them in both the SC chapters 95 and 98 with the double meaning of ‘a grade’, ‘degree’, ‘class’ and ‘head degree’—shou-chi 首級. It allegedly represented the Ch’in system of remunerating those soldiers and officers who have beheaded the enemy’s fighters by different titles, in a certain per capita ration. We do not know much on this system. Li Hsien 南 漢 explained it in the 7th century in a note to HHS 1 A, p. 9: “According to the Ch’in law, if one head has been cut, there was the bestowal of one degree of nobility and therefore the cutting of heads was called ‘degree’”. M. Lowe, The Orders of Aristocratic Rank of Han China, TP XLVIII (1960) mentions on p. 106 i.a. Fu K’un as one of the heroes who joined Liu Pang, on p. 107 enumerates the ranks of Fan K’uai for killing and capturing the enemy’s soldiers but he does not deal with Ch’in law.

59 Chi-chi 誡 quotes Hsü Kuan: “Chiang 将 is once given as hou 候”. Ch’eng-i: “The Ch’in army was routed south of the Nan-po 南麾 prefecture, north-east of the K’ai-feng prefecture”. Takigawa Kametaro: Instead of ‘one thousand’, which agrees with the HS, many editions have ‘ten’”. Liang Yu-sheng, SC chih-i 32.7a: “The seven characters ‘he beheaded one thousand men and one general, of cavalry’, should read as one sentence. Ju Shun states: ‘The Chief Commandant of a cavalry (unit) was entitled: (commander) of one thousand’. Han-i chü 漢儀注: ‘The Chief Commandant of an army unit established in the frontier commanderies is a ssu-ma hou 司馬侯 of one thousand men’. Hsü Kuang: ‘Chiang (= general) is once given as hou 候’. The meaning of the two different hou characters of Hsü Kuang is the same.

60 See the text to the note 22.

61 Chi-chi 誡 quotes Ch’ang Yen: “The official carriage of the ruler (is meant)”.

62 In the end of 207 B.C.

63 Chang P’ing, the brother of the King of Yung, was captured in February 205 B.C.; MH III, p. 362.

64 The Han army has been defeated in May 205 B.C.; MH II, p. 366. For the rebellion of Wang Wu (as well as of Wei Kung 武公 and Shen T’u 申徒)
(Chin Hsi) seized the territory of Liang and was moreover going to attack the army of Hsing Yüeh which he destroyed south of Ts'ai. He obtained (Hsing) Yüeh personally, two Chief Commandants, twelve Generals of Equipages, four thousand one hundred and eighty officers and soldiers surrendered, and the Ch'u army was destroyed east of Yung-yang. During three years he received the emolument from a region with four thousand and two hundred families. He went separately to Ho-ni, routed the army of the Chao General Pen Shih at Chao-ko, destroying it. His generals and soldiers obtained two Cavalry Generals, two hundred and fifty carriages and horses. From there he attacked east of An-yang, reaching Chi-p'u and subjecting seven prefectures below it. He attacked separately and destroyed the army of Chao, obtaining two Generals of Equipages, four other generals while two thousand and four hundred officers and men have surrendered. Then he attacked and subjected Han-tan, subduing separately Ping-yang, beheading personally the high dignitary

see SC 95, p. 26 (HS 41, p. 3540). For Wang Wu's identity see the commentary of Wang Hsien-ch'ien to HS 41, p. 3541 where he refutes the opinion of Yen Shih-ku.

Chi-chièh quotes Ch'ang Yen concerning Hsing Yüeh: “He separately rose his troops. (The character) Shuo reads Yüeh”. So-yin states that Hsing Yüeh is the name of a man. Hsing Yüeh is otherwise unknown. Chang Wen-hu, Chiao-k' an SC 5.32b points out that the Mao edition reads Shui instead of Yüeh.

Chi-chièh quotes Hsü Kuang: “This is today's K'ao-ch'eng”. So-yin: “The character reads ts'ai. It is K'ao-ch'eng of today, belongs to Chi-yin”. Wang Hsien-ch'ien, HS 41, p. 3547 adds that Ts'ai was near to Kuei-te fu.

HS 41, p. 3547 does not have “during three years”.

Chi-chièh: “Pen Shih reads Fei Shihpei”. The first shih reads also ho or hao. So-yin: “HS has 'the army of Chao Pen'. (The affair) happened in Hopei, this is not the attack of Ts'ao Ts'an and Fan K'uai”. Cheng-i: “Since it is stated 'went separately to Ho-ni', HS may be wrong”. Takigawa Kametaro quotes some Li Kuang-ch'i, Li Kung-chieh: 'Obtained personally' means that he still obtained other officers and soldiers”. Li evidently refers to Hsing Yüeh. Wang Hsien-ch'ien, HS 41, p. 3547 quotes Chi, Shao-nan (1706-1768) stating that the name of the general of Chao was really Pen Shih and not Chao Pen as might be believed according to the HS. Chao Pen was a Chin general, the army of whom has been destroyed by Ts'ao Ts'an, Fan K'uai, etc. Chou Shou-ch'ang, HS chu pu-cheng 33, p. 569 however doubts the reliability of the text of the SC.

Takigawa Kametaro quotes Ch'ien T'ai-chi: “Both carriages and horses are reckoned as one of a pair, I am afraid that something is lacking or wrong”. Takigawa Kametaro: “The character chü has a related meaning”. Hung I-hsiúan (1746-1809), Tu-shu ts'ung-lu states: “The Hereditary House of Chao, 6th year of Marquis Ching (mentions that) Wei has been attacked and Chi-p'u taken. Chi-chièh (explains): 'Today Chao-chou is prefecture Ping-chi is a district town Chi-p'u of antiquity'. Insted of 'seven prefectures' HS has 'ten'”. For the translation of a text on Chi-p'u and its location see MH V, p. 56 and note 4.

Chi-chièh quotes Hsü Kuang: “There is the P'ing-yang town in the Yeh (prefecture)”. Cheng-i quotes the treatise Kua-ti chih: “P'ing-yang is an ancient town in Hsiang-chou, twenty-five li west of the Lin-chang prefecture”.

3 Rocznik Orientalistyczny
of defence while his generals and soldiers decapitated each one man of the military guard and the commandery guard. Yeh submitted.

Pursuing (the enemy, Chin Hsi) attacked Chao-ko and Han-tan, and he also separately routed and destroyed the Chao army bringing to submission six prefectures of the Han-tan commandery. The army returned to the Ao granary, destroyed the army of Hsiang-Chi south of Ch'eng-kao, attacked and cut the supply roads of Ch'u. He rose up at Jung-yang, reached Hsiang-i, destroyed the army of Hsiang Kuan below Lu. Occupied territories in the east until Tseng, T'an and Hsia-p'i, in the south reached Chi and Chu-i, routed Hsiang Han below Chi-yang. Returned, routed Hsiang

---

71 For a short explanation of shou-hsiang see HS 41, p. 3533, quoting Yen Shih-k'u, and DKJ 7071.105.

72 Chi-chiêh quotes Meng K'ang's opinion that the text should read: "Generals, soldiers, Administrator of the commandery". Takigawa Kametaro: "HS lacks the two characters shou-ko and the character ko is probably superfluous. HS has ping-shou ch'un, i.e. 'soldiers keeping the commandery'; this also cannot be understood". Nakai Sekitoku thus understands the sentence as follows: "Among (the captured) officers and soldiers, the governor of the commandery has been beheaded". Takigawa Kametaro for some unknown reason does not quote the commentaries to HS 41, p. 3548: Li Chi proposes the reading ch'un-shou 郡守 instead of shou-ch'un, i.e. the Administrator of the Commandery. Chin Cho (Chin period): chüang-ping ch'un-shou, i.e. "the general's soldiers and the Administrator of the Commandery". Yen Shih-k'u: "It should be read ping ch'un shou i jen 一人", i.e. "soldier of the Administrator of the Commandery, one man". Shen Ch'in-han again quotes the same chapter of Mo-tzu (see note 55 above; Forke, Mê Ti which differentiates between shou and t'ai-shou 太守. This means that the military garnisons are known as ping-shou 守, i.e. "military guards". Chou Shou-ch'ang, HS chu pu-cheng 33, p. 569 remarks that ping-shou should be interpreted ch'un-ch'ang 郡長, i.e. "the chief of the commandery".

73 Chi-chiêh quotes Hsü Kung: "Emperor Kao gave to Han-tan another name—Kingdom of Chao". Wang Hsien-ch'ien: "From 'went separately to Ho-nei' until here, all relates to the attacks against Chao and this should have taken place during the third year (i.e. 204 B.C.). When Han Hsin and Chang Er were attacking Chao, they separately commanded (Chin) Hsi with his generals and soldiers to seize the territory of Chao". HS 41, p. 3548.

74 For an explanation of the supply roads by Yen Shih-k'u see HS 41, p. 3541. Chang Wen-hu, Chiao-k'an SC 5.32b points out that the texts of the SC by K'o Wei-ch'i and Ling Chih-lung read simply hsiang instead of .

75 Cheng-i: "Below the Lu town. Now Yen-chou 阜州, prefecture Ch'üfu " (Shantung).

76 So-yin quotes the Ti-li chih: "Tseng belongs to Tung-hai 東海", Cheng-i: "Now the town Tseng in I-chou 湖州, prefecture Ch'eng", Hsia-p'i is in the Ssu-shui 浮水 prefecture; T'an belongs to Hai-chou 海州. Also in Shantung.

77 According to So-yin, Chi and Chu are names of two prefecture towns, the first of which reads Chi while the second one is Chu-i. For Chi see MH II, p. 396,
Chi below Ch'en and destroyed it; he moreover pacified Chiang-ling. The Pillar of State, the Grand Minister of War and eight people of a lower rank in 7 Chiang-ling surrendered. He personally obtained the King of Chiang-ling who was delivered alive to Lo-yang.

Thereafter the Nan commandery has been pacified. (Chin Hsi) then reached Ch'en, took hold of the King of Ch'ü (Han) Hsin and (received) split tallies (entitling his heirs to hold the fief) for generation after generation without end. His emolument was fixed to the income from four thousand and six hundred families, his designation was Marquis of Hsin-wu. In his capacity of a Chief Commandant of Cavalry, (Chin Hsi) accomplished an attack against Tai, attacked Han Hsin below P'ing-ch'eng, returned the army back to Tung-yuan and has won merit. He was promoted to the post of a General of Equipages and Cavalry, commanded the equipages and cavalry of Liang, Chao, Ch'i, Yen and Ch'ü. He moreover routed the Lieutenant Chancellor Ch'en Hsi and (Hou) Ch'ang destroying them. Therefore Chüni surrendered.

He then attacked Ching Pu and won merit. His fief was increased while for his emolument he had five thousand and three hundred families. All in all he beheaded ninety heads and captured one hundred thirty two men. He still destroyed fourteen armies, had fifty nine towns surrendered. He pacified each one commandery and one kingdom, twenty three prefectures, obtained each one king and one Pillar of State, thirty nine (officials with nominal salary) between two thousand until, below, five hundred piculs.

(Chin) Hsi died in the fifth year of Empress Kao. His posthumous name was Marquis Hsiao. His son T'ing was Marquis of Tai. During his twenty first year (of reign) he was tried at law because of the affair that somebody from his king-

---

note 3. According to T a k i g a w a Kametarō two editions “read Ch'ing-yang instead of Chi-yang”. Hsiang Han was evidently a relative of Hsiang Yu but we know almost nothing on him; cf. SC 56, p. 5 and Watson, Records I, p. 154.

78 S o - y i n quotes again K'ung Wen - hsiang: “The King of Chiang-ling was Kung Ao and his son Kung Wei”. Kung Ao became king thanks to Hsiang Yu in 206 B.C.; HFHD I, p. 67.

79 The same has been said above on Fu K'uan.

80 S o - y i n quotes Yen Shih-ku's identification: “Ch'ang is Hou Ch'ang”. Hou Ch'ang was one of the generals of Ch'en Hsi with more than ten thousand men who had to be attacked by Emperor Kao in the end of 196 B.C. MH II, p. 394; HFHD I, p. 127. Ch'en Hsi, the Lieutenant Chancellor of Tai, revolted in October 197. HFHD II, p. 125; Watson, Records I, p. 112; MH II, p. 393.

81 HS 41, p. 3549 reads 142 men instead of 132 of the SC. Shen Chia-pen: “According to the above text the number of the decapitated heads was in fact eighty five and the number of captured men in fact one hundred and thirty”.

82 H s ü K u a n g remarks that one text does not have the five characters hsia chih wu pai shih. HS 41, p. 3549 has hsia chih wu shih, i.e. “five piculs”; this is clearly impossible. Ch'ien Ta-chao, HS pien-i 17, p. 290 points out that these two editions have “five hundred”, i.e. they correspond with the SC.

83 183 B.C.
dom trespassed the law. In the third year of the second period of (the Emperor) Hsiao-Wen's reign, the title of Marquis has been taken from him and his kingdom abolished.

8 Hsieh, Marquis of K'uai-ch'eng, was a man from P'ei. His surname was Chou, he was a permanent charioteer-bodyguard of Kao-tsu. As a Companion of him he rose together with him in P'ei. (Chou Hsieh) arrived at Pa-shang, in the west entered Shu-Han, returned and pacified the Three Ch'in. He had his emolument from the (town) Ch'i-h-yang. In the east he has cut the walled

84 So-yin quotes Liu (Po-chuang): "Affair means 'to employ' as a servant'. This means that (Chin Hsi) sent many times men to disobey law". This happened in 162 B.C. Pan Ku truncated the information, probably with the aim not to disclose the crimes of an aristocrat.

85 161 B.C.

86 His posthumous name was I 當. The text on him in HS 41, p. 3549 is shortened.

87 In a commentary found in SC 130, p. 53 Liang Yü-sheng, SC chih-i 36.6b states that the biography of Su-ma Ch'ien in HS 62, p. 4255 writes K'uai-ch'eng hou, i.e. Marquis of K'uai-ch'eng, and finds this wrong, since both the biographies do not write 'hou'. As we see, this is not the case here. See also SC chih-i 32.7a—Chi-chieh quotes Fu Ch'ien asserting that K'uai reads K'uai. So-yin proposes that reads Hsieh and represents the name of a village; K'uai reads P'ei. According to So-yin, the Ch'u-Han ch'un-ch'iu reads P'ing-ch'eng hou 潍昌, and the same believes that P'ei and P'ing are phonetically near. So-yin quotes the San-ts'ang stating that the village K'uai was in the Ch'eng-fu prefecture. Cheng-i quotes the Kua-ti chih in order to show that the commune K'uai was in Wan-chung 蘭中, fourteen li west of the Honan prefecture. According to the Yü-hsi 莊 the prefecture K'uai-ch'eng is the name which originates from a locality in the ancient Ch'en-ts'ang 陳倉 prefecture. In A.D. 278 (4th year of Emperor Wen of the Chin dynasty) Ch'en-ts'ang was divided and the prefecture K'uai-ch'eng established. The So-yin and Chi-chieh commentaries may also be found in SC 130, p. 53. See also the commentary of Chou Shou-ch'ang, HS chu pu-cheng 33, p. 570.—Ts'an-ch'eng 參乘 is the same as p'ei-ch'eng 陪, a chariot with three horses; as may be seen from the word ts'an—one of three. The ruler was sitting in the chariot at the right side, the charioteer in the middle, and the third one, the bodyguard (also ts'an-ch'eng) at the left side. For previous translations see MH II, pp. 447–8 and HFHD I, p. 226. For a correct explanation see Szyma Cz.jan', Istoričeskie zapiski (Ścieży), translated and edited by R. Vjacinskin and V.S. Taskin, Vol. II, p. 391, note 104 and p. 452, note 5, Moscow 1975.

88 Ch'eng-i: "Yung-chou 蓬州, three li north-east of the Ching-yang 淄陽 prefecture. This is the ancient town of Ch'i-h-yang". Yen Shih-ku: "The Ch'i-h-yang prefecture of P'ing-i is meant". Wang Hsien-ch'ien points out that Ch'i-h-yang prefecture did not yet exist at the time when Chou Hsieh is referred to have received emoluments from it since it came into being only under Emperor Hui of the Han. The Ch'in established the prefecture T'ang-she 蘭社 on the territory of which was Ch'i-h-yang, evidently the name of a rural community. Chou Hsieh received its emolument from it. HS 41, p. 3549.
way, then came out, crossed the P'ing-yin 阴 (ford), met the soldiers of the Marquis of Huai-yin (Han Hsin) in Hsiang-kuo. The army being once profitable and once not—he finally left the intention to leave the Emperor. (Chou) Hsieh became Marquis of Hsin-wu and was granted three thousand and three hundred households. In the twelfth year of Kao-tsuj (Chou) Hsieh became Marquis of K'uai-ch'eng while his previous emoluments from his regions have been abolished.

The Emperor wished to route Ch'en Hsi personally. (Chou Hsieh), Marquis of K'uai-ch'eng, said weeping: "When the First (Emperor) of the Ch'in attacked and destroyed the Empire, he never personally participated in military actions while the present Emperor constantly engages himself. Are there no men which he could send? The Emperor, because of his love for me, bestowed (the privilege) to enter the gate of the Palace without hastening; the men who killed others shall not die!"  

89 Yung-tao 通道 is, according to Chavannes, MH II, p. 139, note 4: "... un chemin bordé de murs dans lequel l'empereur pouvait passer sans être vu du dehors".

90 Chi-chieh quotes Hsü K'uang: "The Table states on Marquis of K'uai-ch'eng to have met the army of the Marquis of Huai-yin in Hsiang-kuo. Ch'u and Han agreed to divide (their territories and to fix the frontier) at the Hung Ditch. (Chou) Hsieh became Marquis of Hsin-wu. The war was without profit, he did not dare to leave the emperor". The reference is to SC 18, pp. 64–5. For the ditch see MH II, p. 312, note 1. In fact, the present text of SC 18 has Hsieh wei Hsin, instead of (Hsieh wei Hsin) wu hou 經信武侯. Concerning the title Marquis of Hsin-wu, Yen Shih-ku remarks on Chou Hsieh that he was loyal and sincere (hsin) and therefore received the title. The text of the Table should be interpreted in the sense that both Ch'u and Han found Chou Hsieh sincere and hence the title "sincere warrior". However, Chou Hsieh might have not been a fully reliable warrior if he hesitated to stay in the army.—Takigawa Kametaro: "HS cancels the character 'east'". Li Tz'u-ming, Yüeh-man-t'ang jih-chi: "Up and below of 'met Han Hsin's army in Hsiang-kuo' something is lacking and omitted". Wang Hsien-ch'ien, HS 41, p. 3549 agrees with Li and presents other arguments on the disorder of both SC and HS. The text from Yüeh-man-t'ang jih-chi as quoted by Wang Hsien-ch'ien is longer then that of Takigawa Kametaro.

91 HS 41, p. 3549 has: "... the war is profitable or not ...". Did Chou Hsieh had the intention to leave the fighting or to change over to Hsiang Yu?

92 Wang Hsien-ch'ien states that the Table (HS 16, p. 812) reads two thousand and two hundred households.

93 In 195 B.C. See note 47. HS 41, p. 3549–3550 does not reproduce the rest of the sentence while many commentaries concerning the locality of K'uai-ch'eng are appended.

94 Cheng-i quotes the Ch'u-Han ch'un-ch'iu: "The Emperor ordered that the men who killed others should not die; they enter the court of the Palace without hastening". The allusion to the entering the Palace Gate without hastening refers probably to the King Wen of Chao who was fond of swords; Chuang-tzu succeeded by this method that the King abandoned this habit. Wang Hsien-ch'ien, 蒋志

During the fifth year of (the Emperor) Hsiao-Wen (Chou) Hsieh died at a high age. His posthumous title was Marquis of Chen. His son Ch'ang inherited the marquise but after having committed a crime, his kingdom has been abolished. Since the second year chung of (the Emperor) Hsiao-Ching, (Chou) Hsieh's son Chü was enfeoffed as Marquis of Tai. During the third year yüan-ting (Chou) says i.a.: "All the greatly merited ministers did not yet hear about such a bestowal". Nakai Sekitoku, Shiki Saden Chōden: "Should the (right) be bestowed enabling men to kill others while the former ones would not die (because of it), this would mean a permission of bad acts. It might be said that this would bring the government into disorder. HS omits the four characters (the men who killed shall not die)—this had to be concealed".—Yü Yüeh, Hu-lou pi-t'an 4.23b states: "Bestowing (the privilege) of not being obliged to die to those who killed, the bestowal of 'iron bonds' of later ages—did it not start in this way?" Takigawa Kametaro: "Not to let the men who kill others die' means to decrease the punishment of death by one degree". Yü Yüeh is right when using the question mark in relation to the "iron bonds". We find that those bonds are mentioned in the end of the Annals of Emperor Kao in HS I B, just after the "chronological account" and before the eulogy: "With his meritorious followers he split tallies and made oaths, with read writing and iron certificate , a golden box and a stone chest, and kept them in the ancestral temple" (HFHD I, p. 146). As we have seen, the split tallies represented also a kind of Emperor's obligation—to let the fief intact. H. H. Dubs is right when pointing out: "The foregoing items are used in connection with the ceremonies of enfeoffing the nobles" (idem, note 7).—For the text and the commentaries of Ju Shun, Yen Shih-ku, Hu San-hsing 胡三省 (1230-1302) and Wang Hsien-ch'ien, see HS I B, p. 97.

A. F. P. Hulsewé does not deal explicitly with the "iron bonds" but he points out that, around 130 B.C., the aristocratic ranks were on sale. He concludes that "these dearly bought ranks could be used for ... remission and decrease of punishment"; Remnants of Han Law I, p. 216. Since the text quoted from the HS is not to be found in the Basic Annals of Emperor Kao in the SC, the "iron certificate" did evidently not yet exist. If Chou Hsieh's wish to preserve the life of Ch'en Hsi has been based on legal ground, not only on the moral one, remains doubtful. Surprisingly enough, Wang Hsien-ch'ien does not say any single word on this important problem. Li Li 李笠, SC ting-pu 蜻蜓谱, 8, p. 10 b, Peking 1930 (?; preface dated 1925) points out that Pan Ku did not describe this event evidently because of doubting if something deficient might be involved in it. Li Li also points out that the drastic penal law of the Ch'in remained still valid under Kao-tsu, being abolished only by the Emperor Wen. Referring to the above quoted opinion of Liang Yü-sheng on the stupefied greatly merited ministers, Li Li reflects if Chou Hsieh was an intimate dignitary of the Emperor or if the same has been accorded a special favour in this case in order to be able to astonish the ministers in this form.

In 175 B.C. Ch'eng-i: The posthumous title was Marquis of Tsun, while one reading is cho. Takigawa Kametarō: "The biography in HS (41, p. 3550) has Marquis of Chen, the Table in the SC (18, p. 65) has Marquis of Cho. Tsun 總 and chen 賁 are similar graphs, therefrom the error. Cho represents, with one omission, the lower part of chen". This is, in fact, the opinion of Chou Shou-ch'ang, HS chu pu-cheng 33, p. 570.

In the year 149 B.C. Chi-chieh quotes Hsü Kuang: "The Table has: 'During the chung-yüan year of the (Emperor) Hsiao-Ching (156 B.C.), Ying, the son of (Chou) Hsieh, was enfeoffed as Marquis of Tan; his posthumous name was
Chü became the Great Master of Ceremonies. He committed a crime and his kingdom has been abolished. The Grand Historian says: "Fu K'uan, the Marquis of Yang-ling, and Chin Hsi, the Marquis of Hsin-wu, both had high titles of nobility. They followed Kao-tsu when he rose east of the mountains, attacked Hsiang Chi, they have put to death eminent generals, had armies destructed while the towns brought by them to surrender numbered more then ten. They never encountered distress or disgrace. This has also been conferred by Heaven! Chou Hsieh, the Marquis of K'uai-ch'eng, restrained his mind in order to be hard and upright; he personally did not give opportunity to any doubts. When the Emperor wished to accomplish (himself a military expedition, Chou Hsieh) always shed tears being like a man distressed at heart. It may be said that he was a sincere and straightforward gentleman.

The characteristic of the chapter 98 as found in SC 130, p. 53: "Should somebody wish to know in detail the affair (of the struggle) between Ch'in and Ch'u, (he should know) Chou Hsieh who alone permanently followed Kao-tsu when pacifying and settling the feudal lords."

K'ang. In the second year chung (155 B.C.) Marquis Chü has been established. In the P'ei commandery is the prefecture Yün. Yün is once read Tan. So-yin: "Tan, which — according to Su Lin — reads 'to', belonged to the Ch'en Kingdom. Ti-li chih states: 'The prefecture Tan is in the P'ei commandery'. The present text speaks on the son Chü while the Table speaks on the son Ying — this does not agree. Cheng-i: "The Table states that Ying, Marquis of Tan, died during one year while the Marquis Chü succeeded him, but the text does not mention him because of his being young. Tan reads 'to'". Liang Yü-sheng, SC chih-i 32.7b: "The Table of Merited Dignitaries and the HS state that in the first year of Hsiao-Ching, (Chou) Hsieh's son Ying, the Marquis of K'ang, was enfeoffed as Marquis of Tan. When Ying died, he was succeeded by his son Chung-chū. This does not mean the second year chung. It was not Chung-chū, neither was Chung-chū the son of (Chou) Hsieh — this is a mistake." HS 41, pp. 3550-1 quotes many commentaries concerning the reading of Tan or to respectively. Wang Hsien-ch'ien reproduces the opinion of Wang Nien-sun 王念孫 (1744—1832), Tu-shih tsa-chih while the opinions of Chou Shou-ch'ang, HS chu pu-cheng 33, p. 570 and of Li Tz'u-ming, Yüeh-man-t'ang tu-shu chi. This statement is hardly compatible with the above text (cf. note 91).

114 B.C. The Table of Officials, Dukes and Nobles in HS 19B, pp. 1207-9 states that Chou Chung-chū, the Marquis of Tan and Great Master of Ceremonies, has been tried at law because of his manipulation with coins.

Chi-chieh quotes H'sü Kuo: "Once the character Kao is not given while another print has 'all followed Kao-tsu'". Cheng-i: "This means that his name was low while he had many households bestowed. This is meant by 'high nobility titles'."

Both the characteristics written by Su-ma Ch'ien were translated by Watson, Records I, p. 214. It is surprising that both Fu K'uan and Chin Hsi are not mentioned. Pan Ku does not mention in his postface any of the three personalities described by him and Su-ma Ch'ien although he mentions some others dealt with in SC 95. The characteristics of Fu K'uan and Chin
The postface of Ssu-ma Cheng, the author of the So-yin commentary, states in the end of SC 98: In eulogy we say: "The (Marquises of) Yang-ling and Hsin-wu (Fu K’uan and Chin Hsi) followed Han with their hairs tied up (being young); when moving, they were uniting the plans of the people. Their merit was really second only to Heaven. They settled Ch’i, destroyed the Hsiang (family)—our army excelled permanently. (Chou Hsieh, Marquis of) K’uai-ch’eng, bent and kneeled—the evils of the level land did not lead to any disturbance. The rulers and Emperor praised his loyalty, while the subjects felt to be bound to him".\textsuperscript{101}

\textsuperscript{101} The meaning of \textit{Ssu-ma Cheng’s} opinion is not clear.