

中國歷史地圖集

THE HISTORICAL ATLAS OF CHINA

第一冊

Volume I

原始社会·夏·商·西周·春秋·战国时期

The Primitive Society,

Xia, Shang, Western Zhou,

the Spring and Autumn, Warring States Period

主办单位 中国社会科学院

SPONSOR

CHINESE ACADEMY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

主编 谭其骧

CHIEF EDITOR

PROF. TAN QIXIANG

中国地图出版社

CHINA CARTOGRAPHIC PUBLISHING HOUSE

前 言

我们伟大的祖国历史悠久，幅员辽阔，历史资料浩如烟海。远在两千多年前，就出现了杰出的地理著作《禹贡》、《山海经》；以此为基础，很早就产生了一种重视历史地理的学术传统。班固所撰《汉书·地理志》不仅记叙了西汉时代的地理，同时又是一部用西汉地理注释前代地名的历史地理著作。郦道元的《水经注》，也用了大量的篇幅存古迹，述往事。唐宋以来传世的著名的舆地书，祖述班、郦，几乎无一不是由当世追溯到往古。可以说，中国古代所谓舆地之学，审其内容，几乎都与历史地理密切相关。

重视历史地理，当然会导致历史地图制作的兴起和昌盛。中国古代制图史上的权威、公元三世纪西晋裴秀用“制图六体”制成的《禹贡地域图》，公元八世纪唐中叶贾耽用古墨今朱法绘成的《海内华夷图》，都是在世界地图学史上有重要地位的历史地图。此二图久已亡佚（见存西安碑林伪齐时上石的《华夷图》和《禹迹图》是贾氏图的缩本），而将近九百年前北宋元符中税安礼所绘《历代地理指掌图》，“始自帝嚳”，迄于北宋，“著其因革，刊其异同”，共有图四十四幅，至今犹有翻刻本传世。税氏以后直到清末，传世的木刻本历史地图集不下十余种。

清代集舆地之学大成的杨守敬，在其门人协助下，于本世纪初，编绘刊行《历代舆地图》线装本三十四册，始于春秋，止于明代，古今对照，朱墨套印，见于《左传》、《战国策》和各史《地理志》的地名，基本上都上了图，这是历史地图绘制史上的里程碑，较前此诸图更为详细。杨氏之后民国年代所出版的几种用新法绘制新式装帧的历史地图，内容较杨图远为简略。

任何一个时代的历史地图都反映了当时人们的历史地理知识和绘制技术所能达到的水平。随着近代科学技术在我国的传播和发展，人们迫切希望出现一部用现代制图技术绘制的详细而精确的中国历史地图集。然而为什么直到解放以前，始终没有出过一部这样的图集呢？这主要是由于：一、详细而精确的今地图是制作详细而精确的历史地图的先决条件，而解放前的中国不论在技术上还是在财力上都无法提供这种保证；二、历代疆界、政区、城邑、水系等各项地理要素的变迁极为复杂频繁，而文献记载或不够明确，或互有出入，要一一考订清楚，并在图上正确定位、定点、定线，工作量繁巨，需要大批学者、专家的通力合作，这

在解放前的中国自然是很难做到的。本世纪三十年代顾颉刚先生倡导成立的禹贡学会,曾经把绘制这种图集作为学会的重点工作之一。可是限于经费和人力,经过三年多的时间,连用作底图的今地图还没有画全,就因日本侵略者的入侵而中断,编绘历史地图的计划,终成泡影。实践证明,这一良好的愿望只有在解放后的新中国才能实现。

1954年冬,以范文澜、吴晗为首,组成了“重编改绘杨守敬《历代舆地图》委员会”,简称“杨图委员会”。1955年初,开始在北京展开编绘工作。当时设想只是把杨守敬的图予以现代化,即:把杨图显著讹脱之处改正增补;把以《大清一统舆图》为底图的杨图的历史内容移绘到今地图上;把木板印刷的线装本三十四册改制成几册现代式的地图。“杨图委员会”设在中国科学院哲学社会科学部,编绘工作由复旦大学谭其骧负责,制图工作则由地图出版社负责。

工作开始后,就发现原设想是行不通的,“重编改绘”杨图不能适应时代的要求。在历次杨图委员会会议上,对原计划多次进行修改,主要是这么几项:

一、杨图只画中原王朝的直辖地区,甚至连中原王朝都没有画全,而我们伟大的祖国是几十个民族共同缔造的,各少数民族在各个历史时期不论是隶属于中原王朝还是自立政权,都是中国的一部分。我们所画的地域范围应该包括各边区民族的分布地及其所建立的政权版图。

二、杨守敬是清朝人,他所谓的“历代”不包括清代,现在清朝已成历史,对这样一个重要的朝代的疆域当然不能不补绘。

三、杨图以刊行于1863年的《大清一统舆图》为底图,这个底图与根据现代测绘技术所制成的今图差别很大,想直接把杨图“移绘”到今图上是根本不可能的,必须根据历史资料重新考虑定点。

四、杨图内容的脱漏讹误处比我们开始时估计的要多得多,必须一一查检原始资料,仔细考核,并吸收近人研究成果和考古发现,在以最新测绘资料制成的今地图上定点定线。

五、各史《地理志》对断限一般都不够重视,往往混一朝前后不同年代的建制于一篇。杨图自汉以后各册全部径按《地理志》(或《补志》)编绘成图,一册之内,所收的往往不是同一年代的建制,相去或数十年,或百余年。为了提高图幅的科学性,不应受正史《地理志》的束缚,各时期尽可能按同一年代的政权疆界和政区建制画出,至少在同一政权的直辖区域内不容许出现不同年代的建制。

六、杨图把一代疆域用同一比例尺画成一大幅图,然后分割成数十方块,以一块为一幅,按自北而南、自东而西次序编排装订成册,一个政区往往分见于前后几幅图上,查阅极为不便。应改为按各历史时期的大行政区(或监察区或地理区域)分幅,各幅按其内容的不同密度采用不同的比例尺。

随着原计划的逐步修改,工作量当然也就相应地成倍增加。特别是边疆民族地区,为各史《地理志》记载所不及,全凭从诸史有关纪传和有关群籍中搜集地名,考订方位,编绘的难度更有过于中原地区。同时由于我们缺乏经验,工作中的崎岖曲折远远超出事前的预想,光是底图,就改换了四次之多。每一图组开编时定的编例,在编绘过程中一般都得作出若干改变。这样在探索前进中不得不用去相当多的时间和精力。

随着工作量的增加,编绘、制图队伍也相应地逐渐扩大。1957年编绘工作移到上海,在复旦大学内组成了一个五人小组,两三年内陆续增加到二十多人,从而在1959年成立了历史地理研究室。此后又陆续邀请了中央民族学院傅乐焕等、南京大学韩儒林等、科学院民族研究所冯家昇等、近代史研究所王忠等、云南大学方国瑜等参加各边区图的编绘工作,历史研究所、考古研究所等单位参加原始社会遗址图和其他图的编绘。编绘人员最多时达七八十人,长期参加者也不下二三十人。制图工作在五十年代末曾改由武汉测绘学院承担,六十年代初又移交国家测绘总局测绘科学研究所负责。主办单位仍沿用杨图委员会名称不改,范文澜改任顾问,具体领导工作主要由吴晗、尹达担任。

最后一次杨图委员会会议召开于1965年夏,根据当时估计,全部编稿大致可在1967年完成。会后不久,文化大革命开始,各单位的编绘工作全部被迫停顿,测绘科学研究所撤销。三年之后才得复工,但在文化大革命极左思潮破坏之下,编者能够勉强坚持这一集体事业,所受到的严重的阻碍和干扰,是可以想象到的,这里就不一一缕述。终于在1973年完成编稿,交付地图出版社制印。自1974年起,用中华地图学社名义,分八册陆续出版内部试行本。

内部本发行后,在受到国内有关学术界热烈欢迎的同时,读者和编者也发现了它还存在着不少缺点和错误,有些是必须予以改正或增补的。1980年,中国社会科学院考虑到这一情况,及时作出决定,由编者对内部本进行必要的修订补正,争取早日公开出版。

现在这套公开发行本,就是在中国社会科学院主持之下,由复旦大学历史地

理研究所和中国社会科学院民族研究所、南京大学历史系、中央民族学院的有关同志,以内部本为基础,自1981年起用了一年多时间修改增补定稿,由地图出版社就原版修补制成的。

为了尽快公开出版,我们不可能多做增改,公开本不同于内部本之处主要是:

一、内部本每一个历史时期不管历史长短,都只有显示某一年代疆域政区的一幅全图,看不到这个时期的前后变化。公开本对前后变化较大的若干时期都酌量加画几幅全图,南北朝增至四幅,唐增至三幅,宋金、元、明都增至二幅。

二、在唐图组内增补了一幅八世纪中叶的突厥图;将原来的741年吐蕃图改按吐蕃极盛时期的820年画出。

三、在内部本有些全图上,各边疆地区所画疆域或政区往往不是同一年代的情况,公开本一律改为按同一年代画出。

四、增改了经近年来的考古发现和研究成果证明内部本中的脱误之处。

五、内部本在着色、注记和边界线画法等方面处理得不够妥善之处,公开本酌情改正了一部分。

此外各图幅或多或少增改了一些点、线;增补了几幅插图。但文革中被无理删除的唐大中时期图组、首都城市图和一些首都近郊插图,被简化为只画州郡不画县治的东晋十六国、南朝宋梁陈、北朝东西魏北齐周、五代十国等图,以及各图幅中被删除的民族注记和一些县级以上地名,若要一一恢复,制图工作量太大,只得暂不改动。内部本有些图例定得不很妥当,有些点线定位稍有偏差,也就不再改动。

虽然如此,公开本仍然存在着不足之处,主要有两点:

一、历史上每一个政权的疆域都时有伸缩,政区分划时有变革,治所时有迁移,地名时有改易;各图组的每一幅图都按照这个时期中的某一年代画,这样做科学性固然比较强,但凡是这个时期出现过的与这一年代不同的疆界和州县名称、治所,除一小部分用不同符号注记或括注表示外,大部分在这套图上是查不到的,读者如要在图上查找这些地名,那就不免失望。

二、古代城址有遗址保存到近现代,曾经考古、历史、地理学者调查考察过而写有报告公开发表或见于有关著作,我们得据以在今地图上正确定位的,只是极少数。极大多数城邑只能根据文献上“在某州县某方向若干里”一类记载定位,因为既没有现成的调查考察报告,又不可能付出大量时间去做这种工作,因

此,图中的点线和历史上的实际位置有误差的,肯定不在少数。特别是古代的水道径流、湖泊形状等,更难做到正确复原。

要消除这两项缺点,不是在短时期内所办得到的。这将伴随着我国历史学、考古学、地理学、民族学等学科的发展而逐步得到改正补充。

当然,除了上述这两项缺点外,其他错误和不妥之处还很不少。在内部本发行后,已有不少读者提出了各种宝贵意见,有的在这次修改中已采用,有的碍于体例或其他原因,未能照办。对这些同志我们表示衷心的感谢!现在图集公开出版,希望有更多的读者进一步予以批评指正。

尽管还存在着缺点和错误,这套图集毕竟是中国历史地图史上的空前巨著。全图集八册,二十个图组,共有图 304 幅(不另占篇幅的插图不计在内),549 页;每一幅图上所画出的城邑山川,或数百,或上千,全图集所收地名约计七万左右。从开始编绘到今天公开出版,历时将近三十年之久。先后参与编绘制图工作的单位有十几个,人员逾百。有不少人都停止了自己原来的研究计划,夜以继日地投入这项工作达十余年之久。共同的目标只有一个:就是要把我国自从石器时代以来祖先们生息活动的地区的变化,在目前力所能及的条件下,努力反映出来,使读者能够通过平面地图的形式看到一个统一的多民族的伟大国家的缔造和发展的进程,看到在这片河山壮丽的广阔土地上,我国各民族的祖先如何在不同的人类共同体内结邻错居,尽管在政治隶属上曾经有分有合,走过艰难曲折的路途,但是却互相吸引,日益接近,逐步融合,最后终于凝聚在一个疆界确定、领土完整的国家实体之内,从而激发热爱祖国、热爱祖国各族人民的感情,为崇高的人类进步事业而工作。整个编制的成功确实体现了科学研究工作在社会主义制度下组织协作的优越性,体现了全体工作人员的高度觉悟和热忱。所有曾经参加图集绘制工作人员的名单见第八册。

已故毛泽东主席和周恩来总理都很关怀图集的绘制工作,非常遗憾的是,他们没有能看到图集的出版。

吴晗同志是编制图集热忱的倡导者和杰出的领导者,不幸在十年动乱中被迫害致死,这是我们深感悲痛的。

曾为图集的编制贡献过力量的白敏、冯家昇、傅乐焕、胡德煌、施一揆等同志都已先后去世,在此图集出版之际,谨表悼念!

谭其骧

1982 年 1 月

FOREWORD

China, our great motherland, boasts a tremendous accumulation of historical data and records that emerged from her long history and vast territory. As early as more than 2,000 years ago there had appeared already two brilliant geographical books, i.e. *Yu Gong* (禹貢) and *Shan Hai Jing* (山海經). The significant recognition of historical geography studies based on them has ever since been kept to this day. *Han Shu Di Li Zhi* (漢書地理志, *Geographical Records in the History of the Han Dynasty*) authored by Ban Gu (班固) was not only a geographical book in general that dealt with the Western Han (漢) Dynasty but also a work of historical geography that provided contemporary references to the historical names. Li Dao Yuan (酈道元) in his famous *Shui Jing Zhu* (水經注, *Notes to the Book of Rivers*) devoted considerable pages to historical sites and anecdotes. Nearly all the well-known *Yu Di* (輿地, geographical and related studies) books, handed down through the generations since the Tang (唐) and Song (宋) Dynasties have carried on the fine tradition of Ban Gu and Li Dao Yuan. They almost invariably started with the contemporary and then traced things back into history. It may be safely said that what was called *Yu Di* studies in ancient China generally contained features closely related to historical geography.

The due attention historical geography received naturally led to the start and development of the production of historical maps. Pei Xiu (裴秀), one of the **acknowledged map-makers in ancient China**, formulated his *Zhi Tu Liu Ti* (製圖六體, six methods of charting) and produced the *Yu Gong Regional Maps* (禹貢地域圖) in the third century A.D. And Jia Dan (賈耽), another acknowledged map-maker, employed the method of *Gu Mo Jin Zhu* (古墨今朱, the historical in black ink while the contemporary in red ink) to draw his *Hai Nei Hua Yi Tu* (海內華夷圖, *Maps of the Hans and National Minorities of China*). Both of them deserve an outstanding place in the world map-making history. However, their originals had long been lost. What still exists are two reduced-size reproductions of Jia Dan's work made in 1137 A.D., separately called *Hua Yi Tu* (華夷圖) and *Yu Ji Tu* (禹蹟圖). Then about 900 years ago in the middle of Yuan Fu (元符) Period (1098-1100 A.D.) of the Northern Song Dynasty a man named Shui An Li (稅安禮) produced his *Li Dai Di Li Zhi Zhang Tu* (歷代地理指掌圖, *Chronological Directory Maps of Historical Geography*), 44 maps in all, that "begins with the time of Di Ku 帝嚳" and ends at the Northern Song Dynasty. It "records historical changes and makes comparisons". Wooden-plate reproductions of Shui's maps are now still available. And we have today more than 10 wooden-plate printed atlases of historical geography that came out between Shui's time and the end of the Qing (清) Dynasty.

This Qing Dynasty witnessed a very distinguished geographer, Yang Shou Jing (楊守敬), who epitomized nearly all the achievements in the *Yu Di* studies so far. At the turn of the present century, Yang together with his students compiled, drew and eventually published his *Li Dai Yu Di Tu* (歷代輿地圖, *The Chronological Maps of Historical Geography*), a book of 34 string-bound volumes. Its coverage extends from the Spring and Autumn Period down to the Ming (明) Dynasty. Found on his maps are basically all the names in *Zuo Zhuan* (左傳), *Zhan Guo Ce* (戰國策) and the *Di Li Zhi* (地理志) of various history books, with the contemporary elements in red against

their historical counter parts in black. This brilliant work achieved a milestone in the history of historical map making, notably for its unprecedentedly exhaustive details. Those maps that followed it from 1911 to 1949 were deplorably much simpler despite their modern method charting and new style binding.

The production of historical maps at a particular period reflects what its people can do with the relevant knowledge and charting technology they so far possess. With the dissemination and development of modern science and technology in China, our people had all along been looking forward to the publication of a precise and detailed Chinese historical atlas drawn with up-to-date charting techniques. But why had there not been one until after the Liberation? The principal answers are as follows. (1) The production of a precise and detailed historical map presupposes the existence of a contemporary map with matchable precision and details. But before the Liberation neither technology nor finance available in China was adequate enough to guarantee even the latter. (2) Over the historical periods changes in geographical elements like boundaries, administrative regions, cities and towns and river systems have been so frequent and complicated that their records are often found vague or contradictory. To check, verify and then correctly locate each and every direction, line and point would call for a gigantic bulk of work to be accomplished only through the combined efforts of numerous scholars and specialists. This, of course, was hardly possible in the pre-Liberation China. The Yu Gong Society (禹貢學會), set up on the initiation by Prof. Gu Jiegang (顧頡剛) in the 1930's, once considered the project of producing such an atlas as one of its priorities. However, owing to the lack of finance and staff the project lasted for only three and a half years until the Japanese aggression against China. This interruption prevented it from compiling the contemporary map to be used as the base, let alone the historical maps. As history has testified, our aspiration was able to be realized only in new China after the Liberation.

The winter of 1954 saw the founding of Committee for Revising and Re-drawing Yang Shou Jing's *Li Dai Yu Di Tu*, the Yang Maps Committee for short, headed by Prof. Fan Wenlan (范文瀾) and Prof. Wu Han (吳晗). Its work started in Beijing at the beginning of 1955. What the Committee had in mind then was to modernize the Yang Maps. That meant correcting the erroneous and supplying the missing in all obvious cases, transpositioning onto a contemporary map the historical elements superimposed on Yang's base map, i.e. the *Da Qing Yi Tong Yu Tu* (大清一統輿圖 , *The General Map of the Great Qing Dynasty*), and replacing Yang's original of wooden-plate printing and string-binding of 34 volumes with a modern version of only a few volumes. The Yang Maps Committee was at that time affiliated to the Philosophy and Social Sciences Department of the Chinese Academy of Sciences. Prof. Tan Qixiang (譚其驤), the present writer from Fudan University, took charge of the compilation while the Cartographic Publishing House was to handle the charting.

Our initial plan, not long after the work began, turned out to be impracticable. To merely "revise and re-draw" the Yang Maps would fall far short of meeting the needs of the present age. So it went through a number of alterations adopted at various sessions of the Yang Maps Committee. And here are the main points:

(1) The Yang Maps were limited to areas under the direct jurisdiction of central China regimes, and what they actually gave was an incomplete picture even of the

central China regimes. But our great motherland has been the joint creation by dozens of nationalities, of which all the national minorities constitute an inseparable part of China no matter what historical period they existed in and what form of regime they established, independent or in vassalage to the existing central China regime. The scope and range our maps cover should include all their distribution areas and the territories of the regimes they founded.

(2) Yang Shou Jing being a scholar of the Qing Dynasty, what was "historical" to him naturally excluded the Qing Dynasty, which to us has now become history already, and an important part of history at that. Its territory had of course to be drawn and incorporated into the whole atlas.

(3) Being published in 1863, Yang's base map, *Da Qing Yi Tong Yu Tu*, differed vastly from our contemporary map produced with up-to-date telemetric and charting methods. It was obviously impossible for us to merely "transposition" with any accuracy. Locating had to start anew in accordance with necessary historical records and data.

(4) The number of elements found to be erroneous or missing were far more than we had expected. So we had to look up the possible sources, carefully check with them, and, moreover take into account recent research achievements and archaeological discoveries, before putting any point or line on our contemporary map based on the latest data.

(5) There had been a usual negligence in *Di Li Zhi* in the history books of the exact termination of a historical existence. Hence the time discrepancy for some administrative establishments within a dynasty. The Yang Maps from the Han Dynasty down exclusively relied on *Di Li Zhi* or *Bu Zhi* (補志, supplements to *Di Li Zhi*). Consequently, a volume very often had on the same map administrative establishments that belonged to different periods between which the gap could be as long as dozens or even hundreds of years. In order to enhance the scientific value of our maps we were not going to be limited by the *Di Li Zhi* in *Zheng Shi* (正史, orthodox history books). Instead, we chose to adopt, in every possible way, a specific year or period for marking which the regime's territory and administrative establishments shared. At least, no time discrepancies should be allowed for elements within the area under the direct jurisdiction of the same regime.

(6) The process Yang followed was like this. First the general map of the territory of a dynasty was drawn up on the same scale and then cut into dozens of squares, each square being a component map itself. And then the individual component maps were arranged in order from north to south and from east to west. An administrative area, more often than not, was divided to appear in several component maps. This caused the reader great inconvenience in reading and checking. Each of our component maps should therefore be made to cover an administrative (or supervisory, or geographical) area in a considerable size, with a scale to suit the density of the elements it covers.

Work became doubled and even trebled along with the alterations of the initial plan. To make matters worse, the frontier minority regions were not to be found in *Di Li Zhi* of the history books. Geographical names there had to be gleaned up from related biographies in the history books or other books concerned. This gave us more trouble than we had with the central China areas. What's more, our lack of experience

gave rise to a number of unexpected obstacles and thankless repetitions. The base map alone went through four wholesale changes. The compiling principles set down for each map-group at the beginning were usually subjected to a number of alterations. Such difficulties as the pioneer work involved cost us much time and energy.

The increase of work to be done had to be matched with the progressive increase of compiling and charting staff. The compiling was decided to be done in Shanghai in 1957 and we started with a five-man team in Fudan University. The staff grew to more than 20 over the time of 2 to 3 years, and in 1959 the Historical Geography Research Section came into being. And from then on we had with us as guest compilers Prof. Fu Lehuan (傅樂煥) and others from the Central Institute for Nationalities, Prof. Han Rulin (韓儒林) and others from Nanjing University, Prof. Feng Jiasheng (馮家昇) and others from the Ethnological Research Institute under the Chinese Academy of Sciences, Mr. Wang Zhong (王忠) and others from the Modern History Research Institute under the Chinese Academy of Sciences, Prof. Fang Guoyu (方國瑜) and others from Yunnan University, who contributed to the border maps. We were also assisted by units like the History Research Institute and the Archaeology Research Institute under the Chinese Academy of Sciences that contributed to maps of primitive society sites and a few other maps. The whole staff reached about 80 at its maximum and long-timers undoubtedly exceeded 30. The charting was entrusted to Wuhan Institute of Geodesy, Photogrammetry and Cartography at the end of 50's, and in early 60's it was reassigned to the Research Institute of Surveying and Mapping under the National Bureau of Surveying and Mapping. The name of the Yang Maps Committee as the sponsor remained while, with Prof. Fan Wenlan as the counsellor, Prof. Wu Han and Prof. Yin Da (尹達) took over the directorship.

The last session of the Committee was held in the summer of 1965. It estimated that all the drafts could expect to be finished by 1967. Not long after the session the Cultural Revolution began and the compiling work in all units concerned was forced to a stop. The Research Institute of Surveying and Mapping ceased its existence. However, the project was resumed 3 years later. As the ultra-leftism during the Cultural Revolution was rampant, the frustrating hindrance and interference the compilers suffered in managing to keep the collective work going were not difficult to imagine. So no more details are to be mentioned here. In 1973 the whole thing was eventually ready for plate making and printing by the Cartographic Publishing House. The publication in a volume-by-volume manner of an 8-volume edition started from 1974 with restricted circulation, in the name of Zhong Hua Ti Du Xue She (中華地圖學社, China Map Press).

When the restricted-circulation edition went round, it was warmly received by the concerned academic circles at home. On the other hand, readers and compilers also found out quite a few errors and shortcomings it had. And it was absolutely necessary for some of them to be corrected or remedied. This led the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences to make a timely decision in 1980 that the restricted-circulation edition should be revised by the existing compilers by way of correction and supplement so that a new free-circulation edition could reach the public at an earliest possible date.

Now the present atlas is based on its restricted-circulation precedent with revision and refinement accomplished for a year and more from 1981, under the auspices of the

Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. Its compilers came from the Historical Geography Research Institute of Fudan University, the Ethnological Research Institute under the above mentioned Academy, the History Department of Nanjing University, the Central Institute for Nationalities. The Cartographic Publishing House handled the revision of the original plates.

Revision and supplement, nevertheless, were not to be excessive in order to save time. The following are the main differences between the two editions.

(1) In the restricted-circulation edition there was only one general map for a historical period, despite its varying length, to indicate the territory and administrative regions of a marking year. Changes before or after that time, though within the same period, got no indication. The new edition, however, provides additional general maps for those periods which had seen more such changes. The number of additions given varies according to the actual situation. There are three for the Northern and Southern Dynasties, two for the Tang Dynasty, and one for each of the Song and Jin (金) Dynasties, the Yuan (元) Dynasty, the Ming Dynasty.

(2) A map of Tu Jue (突厥, the Turks) in the middle of the eighth century is added to the Tang map-group. And the marking year of 741 for the map of Tu Bo (吐蕃, Tibet) is shifted to 820 when the Tu Bo was at its peak of influence.

(3) On some of the general maps of the restricted-circulation edition, the confines or administrative regions in frontier areas did not generally reflect the situation of a common marking year. The discrepancies are now eliminated in the present edition.

(4) What was found missing or erroneous in the former edition is here supplied or corrected in accordance with the more recent archaeological discoveries and research achievements.

(5) What was deemed as imperfection in the colouring, notes providing and border line drawing is now discreetly removed in part. Besides, there are more or less alterations or additions of points and lines made in almost each of the maps in the present edition. And a few insets are also added. Restoration to the pre-Cultural Revolution version was avoided in connection with the map-group of the Da Zhong (大中) Period (847-859 A.D.) of the Tang Dynasty, the capital municipality maps and a few insets of the suburbs of the historical capitals that had been unreasonably deleted during the Cultural Revolution, the maps of the Eastern Jin (晋) with 16 Kingdoms, Song (宋), Liang (梁), Chen (陈) of the Southern Dynasties, Eastern and Western Wei (魏), Northern Qi (齐) and Zhou (周) of the Northern Dynasties, Five Dynasties and Ten Kingdoms, etc. that had been simplified by removing the county seats, and the notes about nationalities and names of elements below the county-level that had also been deleted in various maps. The total amount of charting these would involve was so big that restoration had to be given up for the time being. And we also let remain in the new edition some scales not quite desirable and points and lines located with tolerable inaccuracy.

Well, the free-circulation edition still has something undesirable chiefly in the following two aspects:

(1) In the Chinese history, during the period of a regime, its territory would expand or shrink, its administrative regionalization would alter, its jurisdiction centres would shift and its geographical names would change. But every map of this atlas is

drawn to indicate the situation of a certain marking year. This treatment guarantees some recommendable scientific value. Yet most of the boundaries, names and seats of the prefectures and counties that appeared not in that particular marking year though within the duration of that period can hardly be found on our maps except a handful of them that are either marked with different signs with notes or mentioned in brackets. Readers would be disappointed if they expect to find such names.

(2) The number is quite small of the ancient cities and towns whose sites had or have been preserved to the modern or contemporary times and have been mentioned in published reports or related books after field investigation and study done by archaeologists, historians and geographers. Their significant work has thus enabled us to point to the accurate location. The location of the overwhelming majority of them, however, has to be decided by referring to the historical written records that tell roughly "how far and in what direction a certain element is located from what county and what prefecture". For them there are no field investigation reports to go by and we cannot afford so much time to do that ourselves. It is therefore not surprising that errors or differences in the location of points and lines on our maps as compared to their exact historical location will be found to be more than a few. What has proved more difficult is the reproduction of ancient river course and lake shape. These defects cannot be eliminated in a short time. Anyhow, the problems can expect to be gradually solved in the course of development in history, archaeology, geography, ethnology and other subjects.

Needless to say that apart from the two inadequacies mentioned above, there should exist some other things undesirable. Over the years since the publication of the restricted-circulation edition we have received with pleasure letters from many readers. Some of their valuable suggestions have been followed in the preparation of the present edition while others have not, either for technical reasons or because of other special considerations. We are, indeed, very much grateful to them all for their kindness. Now that this atlas has come out we naturally hope to hear more from our readers and will appreciate their comments or corrections.

This collection of maps, despite its existing imperfections, is to be counted as a monumental work unprecedented in Chinese historical map making. The 549-page atlas divides into 8 volumes with 20 map-groups that hold 304 maps, not counting the insets that only share part of a page space. Names of cities, towns, rivers, mountains and other elements in each map come in hundreds or thousands. The total number amount to about 70,000. The project, since the earliest attempt, has lasted for about 30 years, during which time more than a dozen units with more than a hundred staff participated in compiling and charting, and many scholars suspended their own researches to work on the project for more than a dozen years. They have devoted themselves to one common goal, i.e. to strive by every means so far available to show the historical changes that took place in areas where our ancestors have lived and operated since the stone age. The readers will thus be able to see, in the form of plane maps, the formation and growth a great, unified multi-ethnic nation has experienced, and to see how our ancestors of different nationalities lived as neighbours in human communities and, though there had been separations and unification of political jurisdiction, fared along a long and arduous course through mutual attraction, gradual

interchange and amalgamation to finally solidify into the substantiality of a country that has a well-defined territory and fixed boundaries. And the Chinese readers will feel a stronger love for their motherland, for the different Chinese nationalities, and ultimately for the noble progressive cause of the whole mankind. The very success in producing the atlas surely testifies to the superiority the mass collaboration in scientific research work has, which is only possible in a socialist system. And it also bears witness to the utter devotion and high political consciousness of the staff. All those who have taken part in this project will be listed in the eighth volume.

The late Chairman Mao Tsetung and late Premier Chou Enlai showed great concern for the project. It is extremely deplorable that they did not live to see the publication.

And we are here to express our deep sorrow for the passing away of Prof. Wu Han, who was a zealous sponsor and splendid director of the project. The frenzied persecution in that ten-year chaos took away his life.

Mr. Bai Min (白敏), Prof. Feng Jiasheng, Prof. Fu Lehuan, Mr. Hu Dehuang (胡德煌), Mr. Shi Yikui (施一揆) and a few others have rendered their service to the book and, on the occasion of its publication we give our condolence on their early departure.

Prof. Tan Qixiang
January, 1982

《中国历史地图集》总编例

1. 原始社会遗址图三幅，一幅显示全国所有已发表的原始社会时期的遗址，另二幅用扩大比例尺分别显示遗址比较稠密的东部地区的旧石器时代遗址和黄河流域及其附近地区的新石器时代遗址。

夏、商、周三代各有全图一幅，商、周二代各加一幅用扩大比例尺显示地名比较稠密的中心区域图。周代另加一幅王畿附近地区图。

2. 自春秋战国至明清各重要历史时期都制成分幅图若干幅，尽量容纳见于各该时期记载的各种地名，这是本图集的主体图幅，比例尺小或六、七、八、九百万分之一，大至二、三百万分之一。一幅若有部分地区地名过密难以容纳，则另制放大比例尺的插图附见图幅四角。每一图组另制全图一至四幅，用以显示每个时期某一年代或前后几个年代的全国概貌，内容从简，比例尺为二千一百万分之一。

3. 春秋、战国二图组的分幅图，凡见于这两个时期的地名，不分先后，一概入图。秦以后各图组的分幅图，其疆域和政区建制各选取该时期中某一年代为准，根据该时期的总志、地理志和其他有关记载，排出这一年代的政区建制表，据以画出各级政区。凡此年已废或始建于此年以后的郡县，一般只选画前后朝所没有的，采用聚邑注记符号予以表示；如其驻地当时已有别的地名，则在该地名旁括注郡县名称。聚邑除确知为后起者外，凡见于各该时期记载的，一律入图。

4. 春秋战国时期各国辖境难以详考，全图、分幅图都不画国界；惟战国中叶公元前350年左右可大致勾勒，另制诸侯形势图一幅，画出国界。

5. 秦以后各图组的政权疆界和政区建制的断限年代，其选择的条件是：一、该时疆域政区相对比较稳定，并具有代表性。二、有比较详确明细的文献依据。若不具备这两个条件，一般采用这一时期后期的某一年。

同时期并存着几个大政权，尽可能采用同一年代编绘，但有时为资料所限，或为了要显示边区政权强盛时期的情况，亦得另选不同年代。同一政权的直辖地区，一律按同一年代编绘，惟羁縻地区间或另选不同年代。

一个图组的分幅图如年代相同,全图亦即采用这个年代,径以各分幅删节缩拼成图。如分幅图年代不同,全图采用多数分幅的年代加以缩绘,对其不同年代分幅的地区,则依所定年代的情况改绘。一个图组或需要二至四幅全图用以显示这一时期前后疆域政区的变化,则各全图自选一有代表性的年代编绘。所选择的年代只有一部分地区与分幅图的年代相同,其余不属于这一年代的地区都按这个年代另编。全图年代不要求与分幅图完全取得一致。

6. 秦以后各时期的分幅图都画出县级以上政区的治所,郡级(秦至隋的郡、唐至宋金的府州、元代的路和直隶府州,明清的府和直隶州厅)以上政区的辖境。县治以下的聚邑、关津、堡垒等,隋以前凡见于记载的基本上都画出,唐以后则画出其一部分。各时期只画出见于当代记载的地名,凡只见于后代记载而不见于当代记载的地名一律不画。

府州郡县治所无确址可考而大致方位可指者,不画符号,作无定点注记于适当方位;凡大致方位也无可指者,列名于图框外或图幅背面。列目于《地理志》的名称因断限年代不同而不见于图的,均列表附于图后。

7. 东晋十六国、南北朝时期,或因前后朝变化不大,或资料不足,故只取南齐、北魏画分幅图,画全州、郡、县三级,以窥一斑。其余各朝皆画简图,或只画一级政区界,或只画政权界,各级政区只选画一部分;五代十国也同样处理。各时期边区政权,也因资料不足,或只在全图中表示,或一个、几个政权合一幅简图。除渤海、南诏、大理画出一级政区界线外,其他政权内部皆不画界线。

8. 各级政区治所一般根据《水经注》、《元和郡县志》和《太平寰宇记》等唐宋至明清的总志所载故址考定入图,一部分查对了地方志和其他专著,一部分采用了近今考古学者的调查或发掘报告。边区部分主要根据各史“四夷”传和有关边陲资料。政区界线除有明确记载者外,一般根据该政区当时领有哪几个县,这几个县相当于现今哪些县钩出,有时还参考了志书上所载州县的四至八到。有些地区缺少当时可资定线的依据,则袭用前一时期或后一时期的界线。有些边地州郡定点太稀,无法钩勒,则画其可画部分,允许中断,不强求连接。

9. 图上只标出具有政区性质的部族分布注记,凡有政区建制的地域,一般不再标当地部族名称。

10. 河流湖泊当代有记载的按记载选择一部分入图,无记载的按前代或后

代画。海岸线根据今人的研究画出。山川不见于当代记载的,一般即不作标注,有时不能不注,则采用前代或后代名称。

11. 画出国、秦、汉、辽、金和明代的长城、边塞,有遗址的和没有遗址的采用不同符号。北魏、北齐、北周和隋代的长城记载过于简略,又无遗址可寻,故不画。

12. 分幅图多数系在内部本原版上修补挖改而成。全图多数出自新绘。今行政区划改用 1980 年的建制。

13. 十八世纪五十年代清朝完成统一之后,十九世纪四十年代帝国主义入侵以前的中国版图,是几千年来历史发展所形成的中国的范围。历史时期所有在这个范围之内活动的民族,都是中国史上的民族,他们所建立的政权,都是历史上中国的一部分。这套图集力求把这个范围内历史上各个民族、各个政权的疆域政区全部画清楚。有些政权的辖境可能在有些时期一部分在这个范围以内,一部分在这个范围以外,那就以它的政治中心为转移,中心在范围内则作中国政权处理,在范围外则作邻国处理。

14. 全图凡中国内部各政权分别着不同的较深色,邻国皆着同一淡色。分幅图主区着比较鲜艳色。邻区有与主区同属一政权者,有属于另一政权而仍在中国范围内者,有不在中国范围内者,分别着色。

15. 历史上有些地区本属两个政权间的瓯脱地带,不应勉强划属某一政权,图中不画界,用着色示意或为两不管地带,或为双方势力交错地带。

16. 各图组图幅的排列,若同时有几个政权,先中原,后边区,或依政权建立先后为序;同一政权内各政区,按当时官书或正史《地理志》中的次序排列。

GENERAL COMPILING PRINCIPLES FOR THE HISTORICAL ATLAS OF CHINA

1. There are three maps indicating the primitive society sites: one shows all such discovered sites throughout China, the other two in bigger scale localize respectively on the paleolithic sites that are fairly dense in the east China, and the neolithic ones that are found along the Huanghe River (Yellow River) Basin and in its vicinities.

Xia, Shang and Zhou (夏、商、周) have to each a general map while the latter two each have an addition on bigger scale to show the name-dense central areas. Zhou Dynasty enjoys a special treatment in the form of a capital and its vicinities map.

2. All the important historical periods, from the Spring and Autumn Period and the Warring States down to Ming (明) and Qing (清) Dynasties, have all been given separate treatment in which maximum names recorded in that particular time are included. Such maps make the main body of the book. Scales vary between one to six (or seven, or eight, or nine) million and one to two or three million. When the names somewhere are dense enough, special insets on bigger scale are provided in the corners of the map. General maps from one to four are provided for each map-group to cover the whole picture of China at a certain year, or years before and after. Their contents are naturally simpler on the scale of one to twenty-one million.

3. In the map-groups of Spring and Autumn Period and the Warring States, names found within the duration of the time are all marked on the map irrespective of their temporal precedence. However, for maps from Qin (秦) Dynasty down, a certain year of that period is chosen to mark its contemporary territorial areas and administrative establishments. A tabulated system of administrative establishments of that marking year is first worked out, basing itself on the available records and data from the *Zong Zhi* (總志, general records), *Di Li Zhi* (地理志, geographical records) and other sources about that historical period, and then the administrative regions at various levels are drawn accordingly. Those Xian (縣, county) and Jun (郡, prefecture) that remained disqualified or just came into being at that marking year are selectively drawn and indicated as Ju Yi (聚邑, inhabited localities) provided they did not appear in periods before and after. When their seats had already been named otherwise, their names are given in brackets next to the existing names. And all the Ju Yi recorded to belong to that time, unless found to be an after-establishment, are marked without exception.

4. Boundaries between the states during the Spring and Autumn Period and the Warring States are not drawn in the general or component maps owing to the inavailability of necessary details. But a special map on the distribution of Zhu Hou (諸侯, kingdoms, dukedoms, etc.) is offered with state boundaries as, at the time about 350 B.C., i.e. in the middle of the Warring States, state boundaries were roughly traceable.

5. Two factors are considered in choosing the marking time at which the boundaries of a regime and its administrative establishments existed. One is the relative stability and typicalness of the regime or administration at the chosen time. The other is the availability of fairly detailed historical data and records required. In the absence of the two, we generally use a certain year in the later part of the period.

The co-existing major regimes are described synchronically whenever possible. But there are occasions when a different year has to be used either for the lack of necessary data or for the fact that some frontier regimes have to be illustrated at their particular strongest time. Synchronicity is also observed in defining areas under the direct jurisdiction of the same regime. Only the Ji Mi Di Qu (羈縻地區, attached establishments) may occasionally be treated differently.

If component maps of a group share the same marking year, the general map or maps also do the same and thus become the putting-together of abridged components. When the component maps of a group do not share the same year, the year chosen for the general map is