Among the large caches of private documents discovered and collected in China over the past century, few rival the Huizhou sources for the range and depth of insight they provide into the workings of Chinese local society and economy over the past millennium. Having spent decades researching these exceptionally rich sources, Joseph P. McDermott presents in two volumes his findings about the major social and economic changes in this important prefecture of south China from around 900 to 1700. In this first volume, covering Huizhou’s history up to the end of the sixteenth century, we learn about the process of village settlement, competition among village religious institutions, premodern agricultural production, the management of land and lineage, the rise of the lineage as the dominant institution, and its members’ application of commercial practices to local forestry operations. This landmark study seeks to understand how these lineages gained their social and commercial success and thereby laid the basis for their becoming the pre-eminent regional group of merchants in south China. Its analysis of religious life and economic activity, of lineage and land, and of rural residents and urban commercial practices provides a comprehensive and compelling new framework for understanding a distinctive path of economic and social development for premodern China and beyond.
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Imagine that you have gained entry to a grand house, whose host welcomes you into a well-appointed drawing room. Seated alongside a fireplace, he treats you to a smooth account of how this house has become big and successful. The longer he holds forth, however, the more you feel strangely displaced. It is not simply that the room’s windows are few and their views unrevealing. Even sharper is the sense that the entire room is tangentially connected to the rest of the house. Your host’s talk mentions other places and events in the house, but he never takes you outside his room. The kitchen seems far away, the servants even farther. He discusses his family, but introduces none of its members. More oddly, he never mentions upstairs, though you hear noises through the ceiling – is someone raising his, or her, voice? Down the corridor a door slams – has another guest come and gone? And some cheerful sounds slip through the window casements – is someone playing in the garden, or is it laughter at what your host has just said?

Meanwhile, your host continues with his story, as if nothing else matters to you and indeed as if nothing else matters to him and his story. Eventually, you depart, more knowledgeable than before about the house but not about what you had come to learn: how has this house been built? How is it run and used? What makes its residents tick? And what are they up to?

This sense of a mission only partly accomplished, I confess, is what I have often felt after reading the traditional Chinese dynastic histories. Filtered through several committees of court officials, these standard histories stick faithfully to their assigned agenda of explaining the dynasty’s fate. Official memorials and reports, though originating outside the court, all too often share this blinkered perspective, and so their reports are as likely to reveal official views and assumptions as to express provincial concerns and realities. Admittedly, poems, unofficial histories, memoirs, family instruction manuals, stone inscriptions,
and records of local affairs provide relief from the heavy hand of
dynastic concerns. But rarely have they satisfied my wish to investigate
those noises upstairs and voices next-door, to learn about the unnamed
men and women who crowded local villages as well as those who left
unpublished records about their lives there. If we were to start our
exploration of Chinese history from inside one such family and gain
entry to the private documents stored in its back rooms, how then
might the story told so competently by our host have to be rewritten?

This book, especially its first volume, is my response to this question,
to my growing doubts about the standard accounts of Chinese history
so fluently reported in the latest of publications. It delves into the rich
family records of the southern prefecture of Huizhou and comes out,
I believe, with a different story of this prefecture’s history and, by loose
extension, that of much of the rest of China. It is concerned not with
officials but with ordinary people, not with claims of a twelfth-century
shift of elite interest from the court to the local but with how village
institutions and villagers’ ways of living and making a living changed
over a very long period of time. It has explored the links between
religious institutions and economic life, between families and other
village institutions, between land management and labor, and between
agricultural lives and commercial practices. In short, it is a book
written for a time like ours, when the lives of ordinary Chinese fascin-
ate us as much as those of their lettered betters.

To complete this research I have had the good fortune of gaining
entry to the back rooms of numerous libraries on three continents.
Most deserving of my gratitude are those institutions and people in
China who brought out their Huizhou sources for me to examine: Anhui
Provincial Library and Anhui University, the History Department of Nanjing University, Beijing University Library, the Institute of
Economics and the Institute of History of CASS, the National Library
of China, and especially the Shanghai Library. Next, in Japan I found
genealogies and other rare Huizhou materials in the Tōyō bunko, the
Tōyō bunka kenkyūjo at the University of Tokyo, the Naikaku bunko,
and the Sonkeikaku bunko; for some reason the librarians at each of
these places never tired of my requests. In the United States, the
Harvard-Yenching Library, the Gest Library at Princeton, the East
Asian Collection at Columbia, and the Library of Congress Collection
all opened their doors and shared their books. Back in Britain, the
Cambridge University Library and the Bodleian likewise indulged my
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Ming weights and measures

Weight

1 liang 两 = 1.3 ounces
1 jin 斤 = 16 liang = c. 1.3 pounds

Capacity

1 sbeng 升 = c. 0.99 quart
1 dou 斗 = 10 sbeng
1 dan 石 = 10 dou = 99 quarts = 3.1 bushels

Area

1 mu 亩 = 0.14 acre

Note: Premodern Chinese measurements are notoriously unreliable, and not only because landlords replaced standard-size grain measures with those more to their liking or because at times government clerks indiscriminately used areal and fiscal units of land measurement without indicating the distinction. Some prefectures in addition had local rice-measuring units with their own variations. In Huizhou, for instance, landowners commonly measured rice in units of cheng 粕 rather than dan. Yet, no uniform exchange rate between their cheng and the standard units of jin and dan can be assumed, either over time or even within a rural district. One cheng is said to have equalled fifteen jin in the Song, but often rose to twenty jin in the Ming and Qing dynasties. Some Ming tenancy contracts indicate an even wider range of exchange rates, varying from eighteen to thirty-five jin for each cheng.1 Likewise, each dou might equal fourteen, fifteen, or seventeen jin, thereby making one dan equal to 140, 150, or 170 jin. Although scholarly convention considers twenty jin the equivalent of a cheng and 150 jin the equivalent of a dan,2 determining a fixed cheng-to-dan rate on the basis of

1 Huidong, “Ming Qing shiqi Huizhou de muzhi he zuliang,” Anhui sbixue 1986.6, 69–70.
these sets of figures is clearly hazardous. On the few occasions such calculations are attempted in this book, the rate adopted is roughly seven to eight cheng per dan. Such extrapolations should be considered tentative.