Ainsi, on se mit à utiliser les sous-multiples du *chang* (*ch'ih* 尺, *ts'un* 寸, *fen* 分, *li* 釐) comme des unités de surface : la longueur étant fixée à un *chang*, la surface est alors évaluée en fonction de la largeur et mesurée en *ch'ih*, *ts'un*, etc. La série *chang* était réservée à la mesure des surfaces à l'intérieur des villes tandis que la série *mu* était utilisée pour les terres de la campagne. Cette différence reflète sans doute la distinction fiscale entre ville et campagne.

[Amano Motonosuke

884. Tzu-hsi 紫溪, *Ku-tai liang-ch'i hsiao k'ao* 古代量器小考. WW 1964, 7, pp. 39-54, 2 pl.

A new reconstruction of ancient volume measures on the basis of archeological evidence. The author first cites early literature to establish the relations between various units of volume. He then records the measured capacities of 33 ancient measuring vessels from the Warring States' period to the Sui. Some were used to measure liquids, and some grain; 13 were inscribed with their capacities. Only 22 are in Chinese museums; for some the author had to rely on published information. He partly circumvents these uncertainties by further adducing 15 Ch'in and Han bronzes which were not intended to be measures but whose inscriptions note their volumes. He establishes the following very approximate equivalences for the *sheng* in milliliters : Warring States, 1870; Ch'in, 2000; Former Han, 1940-2000; Hsin, 1940-2012; Later Han, 2400; Early Chin, 2450. The figures for Ch'in /Han and Chin differ appreciably from the previously standard equivalences worked out by Wu Ch'eng-lo, but the author's method is not rigorous enough to consider this study definitive. One also misses a scientific discussion of probable error.

[N. Sivin

3. GÉOGRAPHIE

[Voir aussi /See also : 93, 109, 110, 147, 174, 244, 246]

885. Ch'ü Wan-li 屈萬里, *Lun Yü-kung chu-ch'eng ti shih-tai* 論禹貢著成的時代. CYYY 35, pp. 53-86.

In the present article, the author seeks to examine a variety of theories concerning the dating of the earliest extant record of Chinese geography, *Yü-kung*, in the last forty years. Although most of the specialists agree that the traditional account of *Yü-kung* as the work of the sage-king Yü is legendary, their attempts to date it vary from the Eastern Chou to the early Han. Strategically, the author uses seven concrete proofs stating that the work in question was completed between mid Spring and Autumn (722-481 B. C.)

and early Warring States' (403-222 B. C.) periods. His first five proofs are used to argue that *Yü-kung* could not have been written before the mid Spring and Autumn period. They include 1. the reference to the use of iron; 2. the internal inconsistency between the classificatory scheme of *chiu-chou* (nine administrative regions) and that of *wu-fu* 五服 (five tributary divisions); 3. the territorial demarcation of Liang-chou; 4. the concept of *chiu-chou* itself; and 5. the occurrence of the confusing reference to the Three rivers of Yang-chou. His last two proofs are used to contend that the work must have been written earlier than the Warring States' period. They are the tributary routes of Liang-chou and Hsü-chou, and the conspicuous absence of terms such as *wu-hsing* 五行 (five agents), *wu-yüeh* 五岳 (five mountains), and *ta chiu-chou* (great nine regions). This is an excellent example of sinological scholarship. After he has convincingly established his own thesis, in the last section of his article the author gives credit to those who hold different views from his. He even goes so far as to list the main points of other arguments so as to leave the question open for further exploration. [Tu Wei-ming

886. HSIN Shu-chih 辛樹幟, *Yü-kung hsin chieh* 禹貢新解. 3 + 3 + 367 p. Pékin : Nung-yeh ch'u-pan-she, 1964. ¥ 2.50.

L'auteur, actuellement directeur de l'Institut agronomique du Nord-Ouest (Wu-kung 武功, province du Shensi) en même temps que l'un des meilleurs spécialistes de l'agriculture et de l'agronomie de la Chine ancienne, donne dans cet ouvrage une étude magistrale des 1194 caractères qui constituent le chapitre « Yü-kung » du *Shang-shu*, le désespoir des commentateurs classiques. La première partie reproduit une étude sur la date de composition de l'œuvre, publiée en 1957. Il a réuni ensuite dans la seconde partie la correspondance (17 lettres de spécialistes et ses propres réponses) suscitée par la publication de son premier article. Dans la troisième partie, enfin, il propose une nouvelle interprétation de l'œuvre en regroupant autour d'une dizaine de thèmes (« les sols et le tribut payé par les Neuf régions », « protection des sols et des eaux », « Cinq *fu* 服 », etc.) ayant suscité les discussions des commentateurs anciens. En appendice, extraits des commentaires eux-mêmes. On ne peut que s'incliner devant la qualité exceptionnelle de ce travail, fruit des recherches poursuivies pendant de longues années par un spécialiste des sciences naturelles.

[Amano Motonosuke

887. UNNO Kazutaka 海野一隆, *Shu Shihon no Yochizu ni tsuite* 朱思本の輿地圖について. Shirin 47, pp. 416-440.

Nouvelle tentative pour reconstituer le « Yü-ti t'u », carte générale de la