

Landlords and Farm Management: Comments on Ching Su
and Lo Lun, *Ch'ing-tai Shan-tung ching-ying ti-chu ti
she-hui hsing-chih* (Tsinan, 1959), translated into English
by Endymion Wilkinson as *Landlord and Labour in Late
Imperial China, Case Studies from Shandong*
(Camb. Mass., 1978)

David Faure

In the study of Ch'ing social history, the research of Fu I-ling, Muramatsu Yūji, and Maurice Freedman stands out among the most enlightening on land-holding relationships.¹ Fu I-ling taught us about the *i-t'ien liang-chu* (one-field two-masters) type of tenancy and the *tien-pu* (bonded tenants) type of near serfdom. From Muramatsu we gained some understanding of the rent-collection bursaries of Chiangnan, and hence the operation of the large landlords. Freedman showed us how clan estates functioned in south China, and how land played an important part in the clan's organization. Land holding being one of the most fundamental factors that marked subsistence from starvation, wealth from poverty, and domination from submission, the accurate description of social relations connected with land holding has given us insights into the dynamics of social development in China.

Ching and Lo's book had more than a fair chance of making as much impact on the study of Ch'ing social history as Fu's, Muramatsu's, or Freedman's books did.² Although they did not invent the concept of the *ching-ying ti-chu* (managerial landlord), their book was the most detailed discussion of the managerial aspect of farm operation, and it still is. The translation of this book into English will no doubt contribute to fruitful discussion.

As used by Ching and Lo, the term *ching-ying ti-chu* referred to a landlord who farmed his land with hired labour, but who farmed on a scale that would warrant the conclusion that he farmed for profit rather than subsistence. Ching and Lo considered this type of landlord distinct from the *tsu-tien ti-chu* (rentier landlord—Wilkinson's translation), who rented out his land to tenants. Equally important should be the distinction between hired labourers and bonded servants, the one being labourers employed for wages from a labour market more or less free of legal personal bonds, and the other servants with inferior status and obligations that could be passed on from

¹ See Fu I-ling, *Ming-Ch'ing nung-ts'un she-hui ching-chi* (Peking, 1961), Muramatsu Yūji, *Kindai kōnan no sosan* (Tokyo, 1970), and Maurice Freedman, *Chinese Lineage and Society: Fukien and Kwangtung* (London, 1966).

² For an account of the reception of Ching and Lo's book, see Wilkinson's translation, p. 255, footnote 1.

generation to generation.³ Thus, Ching and Lo saw in the rise of the *ching-ying ti-chu* system of farm management a form of management for profit founded on wage relations, and they gathered information in an attempt to show that this development reflected the increasing commercial advance in rural Shantung from the late Ming onwards.

The evidence that Ching and Lo used as the basis of their argument is of two kinds. From account books that belonged to these *ching-ying ti-chu*, they found the names of long-term (*ch'ang-kung*) as well as short-term labourers (*tuan-kung*) and the money wages that were paid to them. They noted also that sometimes wages were paid in kind, but this fact in itself was not necessarily incompatible with the operations of a labour market. In addition, they obtained a considerable amount of information from interviews, and from a postal survey the basis of which must also have been interviews.⁴ Most of these reports described the supposed wage relation in very general terms. They referred to middlemen who were instrumental in hiring, quite often these middlemen being long-term labourers already in the landlord's service. They referred to wages, most of which were monetary. It is also clear that most of the long-term labourers and all the short-term labourers had other occupations.

These reports do not warrant the conclusion that hired labour necessarily implied a simple wage relation. For a good reason to be more careful with such relationships in the Ch'ing countryside, we have only to read the relevant passage in the *Pu-nung-shu* the handbook for farm management in Chiang-nan in the early Ch'ing:⁵

The wages for a long-term labourer amount to 5 taels of silver, and he eats 5 *shih* and 5 *tou* of rice, averaging 5 taels and 5 mace. Transport costs amount to 1 tael, tools 3 mace, firewood and wine 1 tael and 2 mace, altogether amounting to approximately 13 taels. He is in charge of 4 *mou* of dry land, for which he guarantees a value of 4 taels. He farms 8 *mou* of paddy land, which in a good year yields 8 *shih* of rice after rent has been deducted, which amounts to 8 taels on average. Additional expenses such as fertilizer, wages for short-term labourers, can be met by income from vegetables and reed. But as they say, 'when one item is set against another item', the landlord is left no profit. He

³ The distinction between hired labourers and bonded servants was a highly controversial topic in the "sprout of capitalism" debate in China. See Liu Yung-ch'eng, "Lun Ch'ing-tai ku-yung lao-tung", *Li-shih yen-chiu*, 4 (1962) for a summary and additional material. Wu Liang-k'ai, "Ch'ing-tai Ch'ien-lung shih-chi nung-yeh ching-chi kuan-hsi ti yen-pien ho fa-chan", *Ch'ing-shih lun-ts'ung* (1979) is a more up-to-date account.

⁴ Many objections can be raised about this methodology, not least of which is the accuracy of recall sixty years after the event. Another objection would be in-built sampling biases from over-representation of particular groups among the interviewees, and a third would be the interviewers' biases. Ching and Lo gave no indication that they took account of these sources of errors.

⁵ *Pu-nung-shu*, volume 1, reprinted in Ch'en Heng-li, *Pu-nung-shu yen-chiu* (Peking, 1958), p. 240. Ch'en discusses the author's background in various places in this book.

has risen early and retired late, but his energy has been wasted. Does one think one has to be so very busy? In the western *hsiang*, all the land is rented out, and the landlords enjoy an easy life. Is that not pleasant? However, in this area, there is no established practice for renting land out. If one has dry land, one has to have it farmed, and if one has paddy land, one has to hire long-term labourers. All this hard work for the entire year simply cannot be avoided. It is nonetheless good practice for the family, for one's descendents would then know that farming involves hard work. Look at the rich families in the market place: they rise easily and fall easily because their descendents think only of comfort and spend money easily. The old saying, "There is nothing that ultimately is better than farming" refers to this. Think about it.

This remarkable passage is highly revealing, and the only reason it has not been brought into the discussion on hired labour is probably that the standard commentary on the text is mistaken in its interpretation.⁶ In the particular village described in this passage, it was not the practice to rent out one's land, but to hire labourers, who received a wage for their work on paddy land, but who also paid a fixed sum for the use of dry land. Nonetheless, the use of a portion of the land in return for fixed payment to the landlord was not considered tenancy. Instead, it was considered to be part of the terms of employment.

Another passage, from the 1932 edition of the *Ching hsien chih* (Hopei), is much more puzzling, but nonetheless shows that the employment of labourers on the farm could be conceived of in more ways than one:⁷

Owner-cultivators—Owner-cultivators use purely their own labour. If their own labour is insufficient, they hire long-term labourers, or they recruit people to cultivate several *mou* and allow them to keep the produce. This is to say that we use their labour to work for us. They come when there is work, and go when there is not. Then, for the wheat harvest and the autumn harvest, we hire temporary labourers at current market wages. This is how owner-cultivators use labour.

The paragraph goes on to discuss share-cropping, which would be a form of tenancy. However, it would seem that in *Ching hsien*, recruiting people to cultivate land, and allowing them to keep the produce was not considered in the same terms. This practice was nonetheless considered to be a form of cultivation by the owner. In

⁶ Ch'en Heng-li's interpretation, *op. cit.* p. 241, differs from mine over the following line: 計管地四畝，包價值四兩，種田八畝，除租額外，上好盈米八石，平價算銀八兩，translated here as, "He is in charge . . . 8 taels on average." Ch'en's interpretation takes the 4 taels and 8 taels to be portions of the total wage paid, calculated to be 13 taels. This interpretation cannot explain the word 包 in relation to the 4 taels.

⁷ *Ching hsien chih* (1932) 2/70b.

addition, unlike tenants, people thus recruited could be dismissed when the work was over.

One might consider these practices to be subtleties of particular types of employment. Those who are familiar with the work of Fu I-ling, Muramatsu, and Freedman, would be well aware that such subtleties were commonplace in rural relations. One wonders if a postal survey could reveal them. The complete absence of any discussion of the relations between labourers and landlords in terms of the social structure that could have been understood by both parties renders Ching and Lo's descriptions of employment practices somewhat empty. This lack of clarity on a vital issue must count as one of the biggest shortcomings of this book.

The question arises if we learn very much from Ching and Lo concerning the handing of the labourers on the farm. Only two pieces of information emerge rather clearly: firstly, that long-term and short-term labour referred more to the mode of wage calculation than the length of service, as many long-term labourers only served several months; and secondly, on some of the *ching-ying ti-chu* holdings, overseers were employed (all long-term labourers), who decided what crops to plant, how to allocate the crops for the coming year, recruited the short-term labourers, and so on. Ching and Lo wanted to conclude from these descriptions that the *ching-ying ti-chu* managed their holdings in larger parcels than the *tsu-tien ti-chu* rented out, but the conclusion is totally unwarranted. They also implied that the labourers worked in co-ordination, but except for periods of heavy work such as sowing and harvest, there has never been any evidence—and certainly not from Ching and Lo—that Chinese farm labourers ever worked this way.

We do not know enough to characterize the deployment of hired labour in Ch'ing China, but the data given by Ching and Lo on the three *ching-ying ti-chu* that they researched most thoroughly are as follows: The T'ai-ho *t'ang* of the Li family itself managed 472 *mou* located in its village, with 13 long-term labourers, 20 to 40 short-term labourers, and 3 to 5 labourers on monthly terms. However, between Kuang-hsü 33 (1907) and Hsüan-t'ung 1 (1909), from its account books, it is clear that 33 long-term labourers were on the payroll, but they worked on average only just over 130 days. The Shu-ching *t'ang* of the Pi family employed 30 long-term labourers, 50 short-term labourers in normal times, and as many as 120 in busy seasons, to farm 900 *mou* in its village. The Chin-hsiu *t'ang* of the Meng family, for its 450 *mou* also in its village, employed 37 long-term labourers, and 50 short-term labourers in busy seasons. In the T'ai-ho *t'ang* and the Shu-ching *t'ang*, one long-term labourer was the overseer and six looked after the cattle and the pigs, cooking, and the odd jobs. We do not know the breakdown for the Chin-hsiu *t'ang*, but apparently the tasks that had to be carried out on the land were similar.

These figures imply that for actual crop farming, each long-term labourer was

in charge of from 12 *mou* (Chin-hsiu *t'ang*) to 67 *mou* (T'ai-ho *t'ang*). This latter figure would seem to be almost an impossibility, especially when one realizes that most of these workers were employed for only 4 months each year. Such a figure would imply that these long-term labourers were employed for supervision rather than for manual work. This in itself would be very different from the work of their counterparts who looked after 12 *mou* each, which could, of course, also be an under-estimate as these workers were also employed probably not for the entire year. The figure of 12 *mou* per worker was close to the average of land held per family in Shantung in the early twentieth century, but was less than half of the figure for Chang-chiu *hsien*, where the Meng family lived.⁸

Where an overseer had to be in charge of 60 *mou* or more, the problems of supervision must have been tremendous. They must have gone far beyond the situation quoted by Wilkinson in the Introduction in which a father advised his son to check at night to see if the hired labourers were not asleep. In fact, in the original text, the advice referred to short-term labourers during the busy season.⁹ These problems requiring supervision were well noted in handbooks on farming and in some genealogies, and the general advice was that the landlord must not leave his land in the hands of an overseer without first acquiring a good knowledge about it himself. A set of late Ming or early Ch'ing family "advice" recorded in a genealogy from Fo-shan (Kwangtung) set out these problems succinctly:¹⁰

It is important to be vigilant that in sowing they do not steal the grain, in reaping they do not exchange the grain for food or wine, in carrying manure they do not pour it into other people's fields, and in preparing the young shoots (for transplanting) they do not sell them. All these things can happen if the landord is not watchful.

This passage is followed by another that discussed how rent should be collected, and hence the "advice" was not meant for a landlord who farmed with hired labour alone.

In fact, such problems of supervision posed quite a dilemma for landlords, as shown in the passage from the *Pu-nung-shu* already quoted. Ching and Lo's descriptions show that even for *ching-ying ti-chu*, the land held was scattered. We have no

⁸ For the size of land holding per family in the Republican period in Shantung, see Shih-yeh pu kuo-chi mao-i chü, *Chung-kuo shih-yeh chih, Shan-tung sheng* (Shanghai, 1934), pp. B10-17. The average for the entire province was 16.1 *mou*, for Chang-chiu (T'ai-ho *t'ang*, Chin-hsiu *t'ang*) 34.6 *mou*, and for Tzu-chuan (Shu-ching *t'ang*) 11.4 *mou*.

⁹ The text is Yang Hsiu-yüan, *Nung-yen chu-shih*, first published in 1856, and reprinted in Wang Yü-hu, *Ch'in-Chin nung-yen* (Peking, 1957).

¹⁰ T'ai-yüan Huo-shih Ch'ung-pen *t'ang tsu-p'u* (date?), ch. 3. The set of "advice" from which this passage is quoted was written by a member of the seventh generation, which should place it late Ming or early Ch'ing. The genealogy was discovered in Fo-shan several years ago, and I am most grateful to the Fo-shan Museum for showing it to me.

way of knowing the size of each plot owned by these landlords, but a 450 *mou* holding, for instance, would have been scattered literally in hundreds of plots.¹¹ When one realizes this, one sees the concern shown in most texts on land holding that landlords (rentier landlords included) should know the precise locations of their own land. However, the dilemma then begins: Hired labour was only more advantageous than a rental system if the labour cost per unit area farmed was below what the tenant would keep of the produce after paying rent. When the acreage farmed per labourer was equal to the acreage rented per tenant, unless the labourer could subsist on a wage that was considerably below what the tenant would keep after rent, the landlord received no additional advantage. But it is most unlikely that the labourer could subsist on such a wage, as tenants who actually cultivated the land they rented were probably already at a very low standard of living. Farming with hired labour, therefore, could only be more profitable than renting the land out if the labourer farmed a larger tract than a tenant. The larger the tract farmed, however, the more supervision would have been required, at greater cost.¹²

Hence, one wonders if it could be true, as Ching and Lo were so confident to conclude, that the *ching-ying ti-chu's* management was necessarily more profitable than the *tsu-tien ti-chu's* rental systems. Compared to self-owners, the *ching-ying ti-chu* of course could have provided higher capital investment per unit labour. Compared to the *tsu-tien ti-chu*, whether the *ching-ying ti-chu* had a more profitable operation would depend to a large extent on supervision costs, which Ching and Lo totally ignored.

To continue with the comparison, we would do well to discard the idea that the *ching-ying ti-chu* was a type of landlord as distinct from another type, although we might accept that farming with hired labour could be an alternative to renting land out. However, Ching and Lo's evidence shows that the two forms of management were not mutually exclusive, and many landlords both managed part of their holdings directly and rented out part. Many of what Ching and Lo referred to as *ching-ying ti-chu* rented out more land than they directly managed. In fact, the evidence shows that no *ching-ying ti-chu* managed directly land located outside their own villages. In his Introduction, Wilkinson also observed that in general "the more land owned, the

¹¹ In the districts surveyed by J. L. Buck in the 1930's, the average size of each parcel of land within a farm ranged from .49 *mou* to 9.4 *mou*. Even if the *ching-ying ti-chu* could have larger parcels than tenants, the problem posed by land fragmentation was considerable. For Buck's report, see J. L. Buck, *Land Utilization in China*, Statistics (Shanghai, 1937), p. 47.

¹² Ching and Lo pp. 114-116 argued with a hypothetical case which concluded that hired labour would be more profitable. They assumed that rent was 50 percent of produce, and hired labour 10 percent, while supervision costs were negligible. At these figures, management with hired labour would probably be more profitable, but when the acreage farmed per head is taken into account, the hired labourer who was employed an entire year in Chang-chiu would have received only one-tenth of the income of the tenant. This is hardly realistic.

less farmed directly; the less land owned, the more farmed directly". it is not difficult to see that supervision costs could have been related to these tendencies.

However, the problem is more complicated. When one considers supervision costs, one should realize that renting land out also involved supervision. The image that the rentier landlord could sit idle is grossly mistaken. The passage on rent collection in the Fo-shan genealogy referred to above makes clear why supervision was important:¹³

When your tenants have stayed for many years, they may have brothers who have divided up the land among themselves, or they may have sold part of their land to their neighbours; or, in a year of disaster, they may ask for rent reduction, and show you their neighbour's poor harvest to mislead you. When you actually go into the fields, you will see that sometimes the crop on one side of a field may be poor when on the other side it may be quite good.

Similar advice was given in the *Heng-ch'an so-yen* written in the early Ch'ing¹⁴. The entire tract is relevant to the issue of supervision, but it is too long to quote in full. Briefly, the author advised that land was the best form of investment, even though the annual returns were lower than what one could receive from business. However, one must know how to hold land. One must choose good tenants, and one must look after water projects. One should not work through hired supervisors, for they would collude with one's tenants. One must see for oneself the boundaries of one's holdings, examine the constructions for irrigation, enquire about the price of grain, and so on. According to this tract, holding land involved a considerable amount of work, and it should not be taken for granted that supervision costs in a rental system were necessarily lower than in direct management.

One can, of course, give the term *ching-ying ti-chu* an operational definition, and define *ching-ying* to mean managing land with hired labour. In the light of such a text as the *Heng-ch'an so-yen*, however, it would be a mistake to think that *tsu-tien ti-chu* were not involved in managing their land. They not only did, but they could also use the rental system to produce for the market, not necessarily with less efficiency than when farming was carried out by hired labour. Ching and Lo's description also shows that the *tsu-tien ti-chu* Chin-shu t'ang of the Meng family collected its rent in kind, most of it being cotton, and sold it. In rice producing areas, such as Chiang-nan, much of the rice that entered the market was extracted in the first place as rent.¹⁵

¹³ T'ai-yüan Huo-shih Ch'ung-pen t'ang tsu-p'u, ch. 3.

¹⁴ Chang Ying, *Heng-ch'an so-yen* (18th century), included in Ch'en Hung-mou, *Hsun-su i-kuei* (1742) 4/11b-13a.

¹⁵ David Faure, "The Rural Economy of Kiangsu Province, 1870-1911", *Journal of the Institute of Chinese Studies*, volume 9 (1978), p. 420.

The reverse can also be said. The object of managing through hired labour was not necessarily production for the market, or even to make a profit. Ch'en Ch'üeh (1604-1677) had only 10 *mou*, but the land was farmed by a devoted servant. His father in his younger days was a poor teacher, and had 4 *mou*, but even then had a servant to farm it. Both father and son were scholars, and certainly did not undertake farming themselves.¹⁶


One can indeed make a case that in the late Ming and early Ch'ing, there were indications that landlords came to be interested in maximizing the returns from their land. Such an inclination is quite obvious in the *Pu-nung-shu* and other text.¹⁷ From the late Ming to the early Ch'ing, there is also little question that hired labour was common. However, it does not follow that hired labour implied a simple wage relation, or that farming with hired labour was necessarily more profit-oriented, or that hired labourers worked in co-ordination as on large estates. Ching and Lo's overall approach reflects gross misconceptions concerning farming with hired labour as well as rental arrangements.

As for the translation, while readers should be grateful for a readable free-flowing style, it must also be pointed out that Wilkinson does take quite a few liberties. Here and there, there are some careless errors, such as translating *yü-mi* (maize) as millet (page 119), and *ch'u-t'ou* (hoe) as saw (page 120). Liao-tso on page 48 should be Liaotung, and on page 135, what the translator reads as "silk and cotton, tea, and glassware" is probably silk, tea, and material, this last referring to cotton cloth. Some lines are misleading. For instance, on page 107, the translation refers to two people who bit by bit bought for the ancestral hall 164 *mou* of land, when the text says that the ancestral hall bought the land in their names. Or, on page 151, after stating the fixed rent in a particular holding was charged at 50 percent of the harvest, the translation goes on to say that the annual yields at this locality amounted to 100 to 150 catties per *mou* and rent was between 50 to 75; but the text actually says that based on such a yield, one might conclude that the rent was this amount. Now that Ching and Lo's book is often used as rent data, this distinction is very important, for what the translation implies as an observation, in the text it is an estimate based on the normally accepted rate which was not necessarily imposed in full in practice. Then on page 111, the translation leaves out half a statement in the text, referring to a 40-60 division of the produce in the rental arrangement, on page 112, "farm hands" should read "long-term labourers", and on page 120, the text does not say that the other worker in the pharmacy "mixed the medicines" but that he "looked after the affairs of the shop". Personally, I think most of the discrepancies


¹⁶ Ch'en Ch'üeh, *Ch'en Ch'üeh chi* (reprint, Peking, 1979), see pp. 347-348, 530-525.


¹⁷ See also the passage quoted from Li Chao-lo, *Feng-t'ai hsien chih* in Wu Liang-k'ai, *op. cit.* p. 20.

with the text are fairly minor, and in one or two places, they are improvements. For instance, on page 78, Wilkinson corrects Ching and Lo for thinking that Ch'ang in Lai-chou *fu* refers to Ch'ang-lo and correctly renders it as Ch'ang-yi. In many places, Wilkinson's arrangement is a stylistic improvement over the text. Anyone who specializes in the field will read from the original anyway, and Wilkinson has quite successfully provided a version of this text that will be interesting to the non-specialist.

 版權為香港中文大學中國文化研究所
所有 未經批准 不得翻印

 版權為香港中文大學中國文化研究所
所有 未經批准 不得翻印

 版權為香港中文大學中國文化研究所
所有 未經批准 不得翻印

 版權為香港中文大學中國文化研究所
所有 未經批准 不得翻印



Glossary

Ch'ang 昌	<i>mou</i> 畝
Chang-chiu 章邱	Pi 畢
Ch'ang-lo 昌樂	Chin-shu t'ang 矜恕堂
Ch'ang-yi 昌邑	<i>shih</i> 石
<i>ch'ang-kung</i> 長工	Shu-ching t'ang 樹荊堂
Chin-hsiu t'ang 進修堂	T'ai-ho t'ang 太和堂
<i>ching-ying ti-chu</i> 經營地主	<i>tan</i> 担
<i>ch'u-t'ou</i> 鋤頭	<i>tien-pu</i> 佃僕
Fo-shan 佛山	<i>tou</i> 斗
<i>hsiang</i> 鄉	<i>tsu-tien ti-chu</i> 租佃地主
<i>i-t'ien liang-chu</i> 一田兩主	<i>tuán-kung</i> 短工
Lai-chou fu 萊州府	Tzu-chuan 淄川
Li 李	yü-mi 玉米
Meng 孟	

Chinese/Japanese titles (for publication details, see footnotes)

- Chang Ying, *Heng-ch'an so-yen* 張英《恆產瑣言》
- Ch'en Chü'eh, *Ch'en Ch'ueh chi* 陳確《陳確集》
- Ch'en Heng-li, *Pu-nung-shu yen-chiu* 陳恆力《補農書研究》
- Ch'en Hung-mou, *Hsun-su i-kuei* 陳宏謀《訓俗遺規》
- Ching hsien chih* 《景縣志》
- Ch'ing-shih lun-ts'ung* 《清史論叢》
- Ching Su, Lo Lun, *Ch'ing-tai Shan-tung ching-ying ti-chu ti she-hui hsing-chih* 景甦、羅崑《清代山東經營地主底社會性質》
- Fu I-ling, *Ming-Ch'ing nung-ts'un she-hui ching-chi* 傅衣凌《明清農村社會經濟》
- Li Chao-lo, *Feng-t'ai hsien chih* 李兆洛《鳳臺縣志》
- Liu Yung-ch'eng, "Lun Ch'ing-tai ku-yung lao-tung" 劉永成《論清代僱傭勞動》
- Muramatsu Yūji *Kindai kōnan no sosan* 村松祐次《近代江南の租棧》
- Pu-nung-shu* 《補農書》
- Shih-yeh-pu kuo-chi mao-i chü, *Chung-kuo shih-yeh chih, Shan-tung sheng* 實業部國際貿易局《中國實業志·山東省》
- T'ai yüan Huo-shih Ch'ung-pen t'ang tsu-p'u* 《太原霍氏崇本堂族譜》
- Wang Yü-hu, *Ch'in-Chin nung-yen* 王毓湖《秦晉農言》
- Wu Liang-k'ai, "Ch'ing-tai Ch'ien-lung shih-chi nung-yeh ching-chi kuan-hsi ti yen-pien ho fa-chan" 吳量愷《清代乾隆時期農業經濟關係的演變和發展》
- Yang Hsiu-yüan, *Nung-yen chu-shih* 楊秀元《農言著實》



版權為香港中文大學中國文化研究所
所有 未經批准 不得翻印

地主與農田經營： 評景甦、羅崙《清代山東經營地主底社會性質》 (濟南1959；英譯本1978)

(中文摘要)

科大衛

景甦、羅崙《清代山東經營地主社會底性質》一書認為在清代農業商品化的情況下，農村出現了一個新的「經營地主」階層。所謂「經營地主」就是超出了自給自足的經濟範疇，以雇工方式經營土地之地主。

本文並不否認自明末清初以來，農業商品化對地主之田土經營有一定之影響，惟對景、羅兩教授對「經營地主」之論點則有不同之見解。本文以簡畧之資料說明(1)雇工(尤其是長工)與雇主之關係並非純貨幣僱傭之關係；(2)「經營地主」之經營未必比租佃制度更為有利；「經營地主」所付出之督察費用一定相當大，對利潤有一定之影響。(3)雇工經營之目的亦未必與利潤之要求有關。

農田經營是近代經濟史一個極重要而資料極少的問題。景、羅兩教授對此問題提出了不少寶貴資料，英譯本亦大致不差。

版權為香港中文大學中國文化研究所
所有 未經批准 不得翻印

版權為香港中文大學中國文化研究所
所有 未經批准 不得翻印