

**Russian Academy of Sciences
Institute of Oriental Studies
St. Petersburg Branch**

**Российская Академия наук
Институт востоковедения
Санкт-Петербургский филиал**

Huan K'uan

**DEBATE ON SALT AND IRON
(YEN T'IEH LUN)**

Volume I

**A Translation from the Chinese
with Introduction and Notes
by Ju. L. Kröll**



**St. Petersburg
1997**

Хуань Куань

**СПОР О СОЛИ И ЖЕЛЕЗЕ
(ЯНЬ ТЕ ЛУНЬ)**

Том I

**Перевод с китайского,
введение и комментарий
Ю. Л. Кроля**



**Санкт-Петербург
1997**

ББК Ш5(5Кит)4-620

Ответственный редактор
профессор Л. П. Делюсин

*Автор и издательство Центр «Петербургское Востоковедение»
благодарят Фонд международного научного обмена Цзян Цзин-го
за финансовую поддержку издания этой книги*

Памяти моих родителей —
Александры Ефимовны Кроль
и Льва Соломоновича Гальперина

С 73 **Хуань Куань.** Спор о соли и железе (Янь те лунь). Т. 1. Пер. с кит., введ. и коммент. Ю. Л. Кроля. — СПб.: Центр «Петербургское Востоковедение», 1997. — 416 с. (Orientalia)

ISBN 5-85803-057-2

«Спор о соли и железе» — единственный дошедший до нас крупный памятник древнекитайского спора, важнейший источник сведений об идеологии, истории и культуре Западной Хань (II—I вв. до н. э.). До сих пор был опубликован лишь один полный — японский — перевод памятника с краткими примечаниями. Русский перевод предпринимается впервые и отличается гораздо более подробным комментарием.

Издание выходит в двух томах. В первый том вошли введение, перевод 12 глав памятника, комментарий к ним и библиография.

Издание предназначено для специалистов-китаеведов, а также для всех интересующихся культурой древнего Китая.

ББК Ш5(5Кит)4-620

*Перепечатка данного издания, а равно отдельных его частей запрещена.
Любое использование материалов данного издания возможно
исключительно с письменного разрешения издательства.*

*No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval systems
or transmitted in any form or by any means: electronic, magnetic tape,
mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise
without permission in writing form of the publishing house.*

ISBN 5-85803-057-2

© Ю. Л. Кроль, введение, перевод,
комментарий, библиография, 1997

© Центр «Петербургское
Востоковедение», 1997



Зарегистрированная торговая марка

© ORIENTALIA Зарегистрированная
торговая марка

SUMMARY

Yen t'ieh lun (“Debate on Salt and Iron”) composed by the Confucian Huan K'uan approximately in the second quarter of the 1st century B.C. is one of the most important Former Han treatises, an inexhaustible source of information on philosophy, political, economical, and social history as well as culture of the period. In spite of this it was studied rather insufficiently; till now it was fully translated only into Japanese and but partially rendered into English, French, and Russian. The present full annotated translation of the *Yen t'ieh lun* into Russian is destined to fill in the gap. Its volume I contains a long Introduction, a translation of the first 12 chapters of the *Yen t'ieh lun* with a detailed commentary, and a bibliography; its volume II will contain a translation of the remaining 48 chapters, the commentary, and indices.

The Introduction treats the problems of composition of the *Yen t'ieh lun* and of its prehistory and presents the treatise as a monument of Chinese culture. At least in one respect *Yen t'ieh lun* seems to be unique: it is the only extant large scale monument of ancient Chinese disputation based on respective traditions of culture and state system. Two kinds of disputation have deeply influenced the work: that of debates between philosophers, and that of debates held at court, especially of court conferences; the text of the *Yen t'ieh lun* is an enlarged and elaborated version of the records of a court conference held in 81 B.C. Its participants were capital officials and provincial Confucians, the latter being candidates for offices known as “Worthy and Good” and “Well Read in Writings” recommended by central and local authorities according to a state tradition connected with institutes of feed-back and criticism within the system of government.

The author treats the problem of school of thought affiliation of debaters in detail. He does not accept their usual description as simply “Confucians” and “Legalists” unreservedly. He neither approves of Wang Li-ch'i's attempt (1983) to depict them as “pure Confucians” (adherents of “the way of the true king”) and as “eclectic Confucians” (adherents of “the way of the hegemon”) disputing inside the Confucian school, nor shares Michael Loewe's hypothesis (1974, 1986) that *Yen t'ieh lun* reflects the attitudes of “Reformists” and “Modernists” and not of adepts of two

schools of thought. He himself interprets the terms “the way of the true king” and “the way of the hegemon” as pointing to the political doctrines of eclectic Confucianism and eclectic Legalism respectively. The use of the two terms, the existence of the concept of a “school”, the emergence of earliest systematic descriptions of “six” and “nine” schools of thought under the Former Han, as well as the fact that in the 1st century A.D. a series of Han thinkers were described as belonging to one or the other of them, etc., show that schools of thought, those of Confucians and Legalists in particular, in a sense were then a reality. Therefore the author prefers to describe the participants of the discussion in the *Yen t'ieh lun* in terms of the followers of schools of thought, i. e. as eclectic Confucians and eclectic Legalists. The kind of eclectic Confucianism one finds in the *Yen t'ieh lun* contains many borrowings from the Yin Yang school, some borrowings from that of Mohists as well as certain ideas and quotations borrowed from Taoist-Legalist tradition. The kind of eclectic Legalism one finds there presents an alloy of Legalist and Taoist traditions including also many borrowings from the Yin Yang school and the ideology of merchants as well as a lot of quotations from Confucian texts. As to official ideology of the early empire, the author considers it to have been neither Confucian nor Legalist; according to him both Ch'in and Han official ideologies were of eclectic nature combining components of various teachings (including Confucianism and Legalism, ways of “the true king” and “the hegemon”) with a nucleus — the concept of a world-ordering king and a universal monarchy.

With regard to correlating *Yen t'ieh lun* debaters with social classes and groups as well as the state the author is critical of the approach in the vein of vulgar sociology mainly typical of the PRC scholars. According to him the imperial power operated as an economic force relatively independent of classes of private owners restricting their rights of land-ownership and exercising functions of organizing economics and redistributing wealth and supplies. It had a broad social base consisting of peasant families of 4 or 5 members each as real economic units; therefore it exercised economic policy of promoting the “fundamental” occupation and suppressing the “secondary” one and of curbing the rich aimed at preserving this social base in royal interests. It regulated economic relations between social classes and played the part of the representative of unity with regard to peasants and society as a whole. It was the imperial power that eclectic Confucians and Legalists appealed to proposing to it different ways of government that had certain common aims: both demonstrated care for small producers and suggested measures preventing the rich from ruining them; both brought forward the idea of unity. But the ways they proposed were different having been derived from different systems of views. Therefore the author has given up attempts to reduce Confucianism and Legalism to one or the other of class interests; he prefers to analyse these

teachings within the system of relations between a representative of a school of thought (i.e. an official or a potential official) and the state (i.e. the ruler). It makes him regard *Yen t'ieh lun* debaters in the first place as bearers of their respective teachings and only in the second place as spokesmen of aspirations of social classes and groups; it also makes him to do his best to interpret each of the two teachings as a system.

Predecessors of the author approached *Yen t'ieh lun* either as a monument of ideological struggle or as a source of economic ideas. According to the author in spite of their numerous achievements both kinds of scholars shared a common defect of completely (or almost completely) failing to pay due attention to cultural notions of cosmos, world-ordering nature of the royal *te* power, and of causality understood as mutual attraction of the like; as a result they did not notice the peculiarities of thinking of the debaters. The author in his turn offers a new approach to *Yen t'ieh lun* that allows both to interpret the views of the debaters as systems and to reveal their world pictures. Since *Yen t'ieh lun* is important for the history of Chinese culture it seems expedient to investigate it resorting to culturological methods. The heart of the approach consists in bringing out the most general concepts of the debaters, i.e. those of the level of categories of culture, and in tracing their realizations in the debaters' views on government, war and peace, law and economics. One can expect that as a result of adopting the approach inner connections between the views of each of the opposing parties will become evident and two systems of views will emerge in a form fit for comparison.

The author investigated and compared Confucian and Legalist views embodying five categories of culture — the concepts of microcosm and macrocosm, time, “kind” (*lei*), and oneness (unity). The main diversities between Confucian and Legalist views he discovered are different concepts of human nature and its liability to transformation under the influences coming from without, Confucian orientation toward particularism and Legalist one toward universalism. But human nature mentioned above is that of subjects, its concept is correlated with that of personality of a monarch and of his ability to influence his subjects, whereas particularism and universalism are in the first place descriptions of a monarch's attitude towards his subjects (it seems proper to remind here that in ancient Chinese culture the idea of Heaven's benevolent attitude towards living beings seems to have served as a model both for particularism and universalism: Heaven's love for life and hate for death was used as a model for the former, while the image of Heaven that “covers everything” was used as a model for the latter). It follows that the main difference between the views of the debaters consists, on the one hand, of the dissimilarity of their interrelated concepts of the nature of subjects and the personality of a monarch and, on the other hand, of the dissimilarity of their notions of this personality's attitude towards and influence on the subjects. According

to Confucians a world-ordering king by means of his *te* power peacefully transforms the nature of his subjects and then also that of the Hsiung-nu, develops their ethical beginnings connected with *yang* and suppresses the mercenary ones connected with *yin*; his attitude towards their nature is active, orientated toward ethics, and particularistic. According to Legalists though an emperor possesses *te* power, he is unable to transform therewith the mercenary nature neither of his subjects nor of the Hsiung-nu; he has to accept this nature as it is and to conform to it affecting it by means of rewards and punishments (which in the case of the Hsiung-nu means the use of military force); his attitude towards his subjects is passive, indifferent to ethics, and universalistic.

As regards concepts of space and related ideas, the notion of the world-ordering king underlies the Confucian theory of gradual ordering of the inhabitants of concentric space in the direction from centre toward periphery, whereas the Legalist concept of the monarch underlies the ideas of his universalistic attitude towards all his subjects irrespective of their residence and royal concern for them consisting in offering them equal security and equalizing their economic conditions. As regards concepts of time, from the notion of the world-ordering king the orientation of Confucians towards “antiquity” and their belief in the possibility of its cyclical returns can be deduced, while from the Legalists' notion of the ruler their orientation towards “present age”, the idea that change in history is irretrievable, and the linear components of their concepts of time can be inferred.

As regards the concept of “kind” and related ideas, the notion of sacral personality of the world-ordering king shared by Confucians pertains to the world picture organized by this concept as a single continuum, the king both conforming to cosmos and receiving signs (that is, portents) from it in response to his deeds according to their kind; from the Legalist point of view the ruler only conforms to cosmos receiving no responses from it (which means lesser sacrality of the royal personality). As regards the concept of oneness (or unity), the Confucian theory of bringing the world to unity implying that a ruler transforms his people in his (i.e. one man's) own image by means both of his *te* power and his officials “of the same kind” as himself originates from the notion of the world-ordering king, while the Legalist theory of the important part that unified legal and economic standards play in government as embodiments of royal universalism originates from the Legalist concept of the ruler being the only source of power that adopts uniform attitude towards everybody. The views of the Confucians on law are dominated by their concept of the benevolent world-ordering king causing spiritual transformation and permeated with particularism, whereas those of the Legalists treat laws as standards and as an institution that compensates personal shortcomings of the ruler and inspires fear into law-breakers. Economic views of the

Confucians have the theory of world-ordering as their point of departure, while those of the Legalists are imbued in the first place with the idea of universalism of the monarch establishing economic standards, redistributing wealth and supplies, and equalizing economic conditions of the ruled.

This seems to justify the conclusion that differences of views of Confucians and Legalists enumerated above originate from the basic difference in their views on the ruler and the people, of the attitude of the former towards the latter and the influence exercised by the former on the latter.

The translation of the *Yen t'ieh lun* is based on the edition of 1958 by Wang Li-ch'i, whose edition of 1983 as well as other modern editions, commentaries, and translations were also consulted. The commentary treats a wide range of problems beginning with philological and textological ones and ending with those connected with history, geography, law, philosophy, material and spiritual culture, etc.; it also contains analysis and explanations of numerous ancient Chinese terms.

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

Введение	7
I. Создание «Спора о соли и железе» и его предыстория	7
Примечания	23
II. «Спор о соли и железе» как памятник китайской культуры	28
Примечания	112
Перевод	129
СВИТОК 1	131
Глава 1. Основные суждения	131
Глава 2. Усердно пахать	137
Глава 3. Пустить в обращение то, что имеет [народ]	141
Глава 4. Литье монеты	146
Глава 5. Запрет пахарям	149
Глава 6. Восстановить древние [порядки]	152
СВИТОК 2	157
Глава 7. Осуждение [Шанского] Яна	157
Глава 8. Чао Цо	163
Глава 9. Язвительная критика могущественных	164
Глава 10. Язвительная критика в ответ	168
Глава 11. Обсуждение конфуцианских ученых	173
Глава 12. Озабоченность границами	177
Комментарий	181
Глава 1	183
Глава 2	222
Глава 3	237
Глава 4	250
Глава 5	264
Глава 6	274
Глава 7	291
Глава 8	306
Глава 9	311
Глава 10	321
Глава 11	340
Глава 12	354
Приложения	365
Библиография	367
Список сокращений	395
Иероглифы к тексту введения и комментария	397
Summary	408

серия

ORIENTALIA

Хуань Куань
СПОР О СОЛИ И ЖЕЛЕЗЕ
(ЯНЬ ТЕ ЛУНЬ)
Перевод с китайского,
введение и комментарий
Ю. Л. Кроля

научное издание

Утверждено к печати Санкт-Петербургским филиалом
Института Востоковедения Российской Академии наук

ISBN 5-85803-057-2

Макет подготовлен Центром
«Петербургское Востоковедение»

Набор – Г. А. Кочугурова
Китайский набор – В. М. Рыбаков
Редакторы – И. П. Сологуб, Т. Г. Бугакова
Технический редактор – Г. В. Тихомирова
Корректор – Т. Г. Бугакова
Выпускающий – Д. А. Ильин

Издательство
Центр "Петербургское Востоковедение"
191186, Россия, Санкт-Петербург, Дворцовая наб., 18

ЛР № 061800
Подписано в печать 14.11.97. Формат 60x90 1/16
Бумага офсетная. Гарнитура «Таймс»
Печать офсетная. Объем 26 п. л.
Заказ № 1

Отпечатано в России
Типография издательства
Санкт-Петербургского университета

В СЕРИИ ГОТОВИТСЯ К ВЫХОДУ ОЧЕРЕДНОЙ ТОМ

XI. Гэ Хун.
МУДРЕЦ. ОБЪЕМЛЯЩИЙ
ПЕРВОЗДАННУЮ ПУСТОТУ (Баопу-цзы)
Эзотерический раздел
(нэй пянь)



Трактат выдающегося даосского философа, алхимика, медика и историка Гэ Хуна «Баопу-цзы», написанный около 320 г. н. э., представляет собой своеобразную энциклопедию раннесредневекового даосизма. Учение о Дао-Пути вселенной и путях его обретения, алхимия и магия, медицина и астрология, учение о бессмертных небожителях и рецепты изготовления эликсира вечной жизни — вот только некоторые из тем, подробно рассматриваемых Гэ Хуном в его «алхимическом апокалипсисе», как назвал трактат «Баопу-цзы» великий российский китаевед академик В. М. Алексеев.

Трактат Гэ Хуна уже давно привлекал внимание отечественных исследователей. Еще в 20-е годы над ним начал работать выдающийся синолог Ю. К. Щуцкий, однако его трудам не суждено было завершиться. И только теперь российский читатель получает возможность познакомиться с этим удивительным текстом, в котором переплетаются описания магических грибов и рассуждения о даосизме и конфуцианстве, рецепты трансмутации металлов и увлекательные новеллы о бессмертных, философские размышления и рекомендации по дыхательной практике и сексуальной гигиене.

Перевод представляет значительный интерес для востоковедов, культурологов, религиоведов, историков науки, медиков и всех интересующихся духовной культурой Китая.

Первый полный перевод трактата «Баопу-цзы» на русский язык выполнен **Е. А. Торчиновым.**



葛洪抱朴子内篇