

# Discussing the period within which a Qing Landscape map of the Northern Plank Road was drawn

David Jupp

## 1. Background

The map in question is a 17 metre (55 foot) long scroll preserved and held in the collection of the [US Library of Congress](#). The scroll map shows the main (postal) road from the Wei River valley of Shaanxi Province to the border with Shu (Sichuan) in the mid Qing Period. It starts at the walled city of Baoji in Shaanxi to finish on the border between Shaanxi and Sichuan Province at a place called Qipanguan. There is a section of the road including Mianxian that is missing from the scroll, but it does not detract from the overall value of the map. It was purchased by Arthur W. Hummel (Heng Muyi, 恒慕义) in China in 1930. Herold Wiens used material from the Map for his Thesis and in his article in the *Geographical Review* in 1949 [R.1]. Information on the scroll map as well as access to images of it can be found on the Qinling Plank Roads to Shu web site [HERE](#).

The web page lists opinions published by Prof Li Xiaocong, Bi Qiong, Feng Suiping and Prof Lin Tianren, all of whom discussed the like period within which the map was drawn. Herold Wiens' [R.1] suggestion on the date was that it must certainly predate 1862 since the name Feiqiuguan (廢邱关) is used at a place whose name changed to Liufengguan (留凤关) in 1862. However, the others have gone into much greater detail in the quest for a narrow time period when it was drawn. Despite making use of much the same material and original texts, the various scholars have come to different opinions. This document discusses these differences and explore how they may be reconciled.

In his carto-bibliography on the ancient Chinese Map holdings of the US Library of Congress [R.2] Prof. Li Xiaocong offered some initial opinions on the date when the map was drawn. Later in a paper with Bi Qiong [R.2a] they consolidated the opinion with additional support and discussion. The presence at Jitouguan of a commemorative gate called "Guo Qinwang Gate" (果亲王牌楼) which must post-date the visit to this area by the Guoqinwang was taken into account. They also used the situation at Liuba, which had not yet become Liuba Ting, and the fact that it was still under Hanzhong at the time of the additional annotation to place the material in the scroll map as being from between 1735 and 1773.

The specific arguments put forward in [R.2a] were as follows (Chinese text in Endnote 1):

*'In the "Account of Liuba Ting" in the "Sketch of Qing History" is written: "In the 15th Qianlong year, an assistant prefectural magistrate (捕盜通判, Budao Tongpan) from Hanzhong took up residence; in the 30th year the position was changed to Tongpan who calms the people and Liuba was separated (析置, xi zhi). In the 39th year a vice prefect (同知, Tongzhi) was appointed". The account of "Hanzhong Fu" [R.4] [also] records: "In the 38th Qianlong year, Liuba Ting was established". Again, from the Bureau of Qing History "Dynastic geographic records", in the "Record of the Jiaqing unification" [R.5] it appears that Liuba Ting was founded in the 38th Qianlong year. In the "Sketch of Qing History", in*

the “Account of Han Zhong Fu” [R.4] is found further confirmation. This leads us to believe that Liuba changed to a “Ting” prefecture in the 38th Qianlong year (1773). In the “Map of the Shu Road from Shaanxi to the Sichuan border” it appears that Liuba is not yet a “Ting”, but rather is labelled “Greater Liuba” and “Lesser Liuba” (Figure 6). Underneath the depiction of Greater Liuba is written: “Hanzhong magistrate in residence”. This explanation is written by the map user, so the map would have been available at the time. It can be seen that when this map was used, Liuba was still under the Hanzhong magistrate's administration, and had not advanced to the “Ting” [Prefecture] administrative level of local government. Accordingly we may suggest that this map was drawn earlier than the formation of Liuba Ting, ie before 1773.’

Feng Suiping (2010) [R.6] refined these dates by using detailed arguments from various sources but mainly (as did Bi and Li) in regard to the time when Liuba became a “Ting”. He writes (see ENDNOTE 2):

*‘Was it really so that “Liuba Ting had not yet appeared”? As a matter of fact, the present scroll map not only records Liuba Ting but it appears twice. The first occurs between Nanxing and Sima Bridge in Feng County, where the scroll map records “Nanxing Guanyin Temple gully joins Liuba Ting at a common boundary”, so it can be seen that Nanxing Guanyin Temple gully is the boundary between Feng County (a Xian) and Liuba Ting. The second is at Chenzi gully on a built up section of the road at Wuguan, the annotation records “Liu Bao Boundary” where “Liu” is Liuba Ting and “Bao” is Baocheng County<sup>5</sup>, so it is the shared boundary between Liuba Ting and Baocheng County. Moreover, we have noticed, the style of characters used in these two place names was that of the original map drawer, and they were certainly not in the style of the later reviser. This leads to the conclusion that Liuba Ting was already on the map, so that the map must have been drawn after Liuba Ting was set up. As to why the map annotations (at Liuba) do not directly say Liuba Ting, but rather Greater Liuba, (we believe that) probably Greater Liuba and Lesser Liuba were paired, and people were used to these names.’*

Having established that Liuba Ting existed when the map was drawn, Feng Suiping continues:

*According to the Daoguang “Liuba Ting Gazetteer” [R.7] and the Jiaqing “Hanzhong Fu Gazetteer” [R.8] we find that in the 30th Qianlong year (1765): “In the first month, a section of Feng County became Liuba Ting, the administrator was promoted from Irrigation Official (Shuili Guan) to Tongpan with title 'Tongpan who soothes the people'.” Therefore, the time when the scroll map was first drawn would be after 1765. Looking at the content of the revisions on the map, the Greater Liuba revision says “The Hanzhong government Tongzhi official resides here”. Based on the same Gazetteers, in the 40th Qianlong year (1775), (10 years after Liuba was raised to a Ting) we find that the administrator's title was changed from Tongpan (Magistrate) to Tongzhi (Deputy Director) level, but was still under Hanzhong Fu. In other words, in the 40th Qianlong year, Liuba Ting changed to having a Tongzhi official in residence. The map reviser held the map in his hand and personally experienced the Lianyun Plank road, and by going to Liuba Ting he discovered this extremely important change and then added it to the map. Therefore, the time that the map was originally drawn must have been before the 40th Qianlong year. We can also see that because the map reviser updated the scroll with the additional content after the status of Liuba Ting was raised by the presence of a Tongzhi level official from Hanzhong, the revision was not long after the 40th Qianlong year.’*

Lin Tianren has also discussed this aspect of the map in his entry in the Taipei Palace Museum’s book on the US Library of Congress collection [R.9]. His view was (ENDNOTE 3):

*‘On the map, in the Hanzhong Fu jurisdiction, Greater Liuba has not yet become a "Ting". In the 15th Qianlong year (1750), it changed from a postal station to Liuba Ting (District Level), and was governed by an Official relocated there (reference: Ch. 2 "Liuba Ting Gazetteer"; cited in "Development of Qing Geography" by Zhao Quancheng, Qilu University, "China Studies Research Institute" Special Edition, 1941) [R.10]: in the 40th [Qianlong] year (1775), in a report to the Emperor, the Shaanxi Circuit Inspector Bi Yuanshu wrote: "Hanzhong Fu Liuba Ting Tongpan changed to a Tongzhi official from Hanzhong Fu" (reference: Ch. 979 "History of Gaozong", "Gengwu Year", March of the 40th Qianlong year) [R.11]; on the map Greater Liuba has been annotated at a later time by another person in a few characters saying "The Hanzhong Fu Tongzhi lives at this place"; [thus] it is judged that this map was drawn on or about 1750, and completed at the latest by 1775.’*

## 2. Discussion

The varying opinions all involve the date when Liuba became a Ting. There are four basic time periods of interest in regard to the differences and also the opinion as to whether the original Map recognises that Liuba was a Ting or not.

The four time periods involve the following date information:

Year Date	Year in Cycle	Year Characters	Reign Year
1750	7	庚午	乾隆十五年
1765	22	乙酉	乾隆三十年
1773	30	癸巳	乾隆三十八年
1775	32	乙未	乾隆四十年

The agreements seem to exist around the following summarised statement by Bi Qiong and Li Xiaocong [R.2a]:

In the 15th Qianlong year, a Hanzhong assistant official (捕盜通判, Budao Tongpan) took up residence;

In the 30th year the position changed to Tongpan who soothes the people (抚民通判) and “separated”.

In the 12<sup>th</sup> month of the 39th year (ie essentially 40<sup>th</sup> year) a vice prefect (同知, Tongzhi) was appointed.

Feng Suiping finds records and additional information that is not contradicted by the others:

In the 30th year, the Tongpan official variously referred to as Shuili Guan or Shuili Tongpan was promoted to higher grade Tongpan who soothes the people (抚民通判);

In the 40th year, the higher grade Tongpan was replaced by a Tongzhi official but still under Hanzhong.

Lin Tianren visits the same periods as:

In the 15th Qianlong year, Liba Ting was founded under a Hanzhong assistant official;  
In the 30th year the position was “separated” with a Tongpan who looks after the people (抚民通判).  
In the 40th year the Tongpan was upgraded to Tongzhi.

There is a lot of agreement above but also some different interpretations in and between the papers.

Bi and Li propose that the 38<sup>th</sup> Qianlong year (1773) was when Liuba was finally established as a Ting, Feng Suiping proposed that it was the 30<sup>th</sup> Qianlong year (1765) and Lin Tianren proposes the 15<sup>th</sup> Qianlong year (1750) as when Liuba became a Ting. Feng Suiping contributed the observation that the two boundaries between Feng and Liuba Districts exist on the map and would only have been there if Liuba was a District Level (Ting) at the time the map was drawn. Also, he found that one of the border annotations certainly uses the characters “Liuba Ting”. Hence he proposed that the map was drawn around the time Liuba Ting became a Ting which he takes to be the 30<sup>th</sup> Qianlong year (1765). They all generally agree that the additional annotation about the Hanzhong Tongzhi indicates the original map was drawn before 1775 and the annotation was added after 1775.

### 3. Reconciling the different views

How can the various dates be reconciled or the differences resolved? The issue in these opinions seems to involve around the meanings of “separated” and some differences in various records. Clearly, the source quoted by Bi and Li (《清史稿》) writes “separated” as xizhi (析置) which is the formation of a new entity – in this case presumably the Ting. However, the same events in various sources seem to have different interpretations or be inconsistent. In the end, reconciliation may involve making a choice of the “correct” records.

Prof Li Xiaocong rests his case on the Hanzhong Gazetteer and on an account of Qing History written in Chinese as 清国史馆 [R.5]. Li Lingtao was able to find one of the sections referenced (《嘉庆重修一统志》) (ie the Jiaqing Gazetteer) which he translated as (ENDNOTE 4):

*“[Liuba Ting] belonged to Gudao Xian in the Qin and Han dynasties, to Feng Zhou in the Tang dynasty, to Feng Xian in the Ming dynasty. A Liuba Xunsi (巡司) was once established, but rescinded later on. In the 38th Qianlong year it was separated from Feng Xian and a Fumin Tongpan (抚民通判) was created, in the 40th Qianlong year the position was changed to a Liuba Ting Tongzhi (留坝厅同知).”*

The Gazetteer also continued with text saying:

*In the 13<sup>th</sup> Jiaqing year (1808) the seat of government moved to Taiping Ling, under Hanzhong Fu.*

The term “separated” in the above case was “分” which certainly can mean divide or separate. But was it the establishment of Liuba as a Ting or just a separation of an area from Feng Zhou? The additional note about the move in 1808 is confusing but the times were also confused being at the end of the White Lotus rebellion.

Li Lingtao also found some additional information on the topic at the website <http://ai163.cn/xa/news/Hanzhong/20151017/1776.html>. It concerned the history of Liuba Ting since earliest times as contained in the most current “Liuba Xian Gazetteer” it records (ENDNOTE 5):

*“In spring of the 15<sup>th</sup> Qianlong Year (1750), a Hanzhong Water Control Tongpan (水利通判) accepted an appointment and re-located to Liuba, adding the additional title of Tongpan that arrests Bandits (捕盜通判). Because of this he would be in charge of flood control, act as the Postmaster and prison officer, supervising 36 employees in the Post station, with the authority to arrest thieves, reassure the public and repair the plank roads.”*

*“In the 12<sup>th</sup> month of the 29<sup>th</sup> Qianlong Year (1764), the governors of Shaanxi, Gansu and Sichuan engaged in the frontier defences of the three provinces and a committee of the Circuit legal inspectors, Administrators, Magistrates, Prosecutors, Tongzhi officials (Ting) and District officials (Zhixian) discussed the establishment of Liuba Ting. When there were no remaining disputes, the authorising official delivered the seals of office for Liuba Ting. The "Shaanxi Gazetteer" believes that Liuba Ting was set up in the 38<sup>th</sup> Qianlong Year (1773) but this is wrong.”*

*“In the 30<sup>th</sup> Qianlong Year (1765), Zheng Jian of Hanzhong who was serving as Tongpan who soothes the people, accepted appointment as first Tongzhi of Liuba Ting.”*

*“In the 31<sup>st</sup> Qianlong Year (1766), this Ting undertook the repair of the Lianyun Road.”*

*“In the 38<sup>th</sup> Qianlong Year (1773), Song Qi held the positions of Hanzhong Tongpan who soothes the people and Liuba Ting Tongzhi. During this time, the (military) positions of Youji, Dusi, Shoubei, Qianzong, Bazong, Xunjian, Postmaster, Siyu, Pusi and Garrison Commander etc were all established.”*

*“In the 12<sup>th</sup> month of the 39<sup>th</sup> Qianlong Year (1774), the jointly appointed Hanzhong Tongpan who soothes the people and the Water Management Tongzhi with additional responsibility for Chaiguan post station and areas east of Jiudian Liang. In the following year, Tongpan position was rescinded and became Tongzhi.”*

This basically agrees with previous statements (and provides additional detail) but attributes the separation to the 30<sup>th</sup> Qianlong Year and says the Hanzhong Gazetteer (and presumably also the Qing History) were wrong to claim it for the 38<sup>th</sup> Qianlong Year. Unfortunately, it is not clear what original texts were used to make these claims.

Related quotations from the "History of Gaozong" which was used by Prof Lin Tianren [R.11] to come to his conclusions are as follows (ENDNOTE 6):

"Records of the Great Qing Gaozu Emperor (Qianlong)" 46, 15<sup>th</sup> Qianlong year (1750).

*“A stamp was prepared for the Budao Tongpan of Hanzhong Fu stationed at Liuba who also managed postal affairs. Also constructed government offices. Request came from Yin Jishan Governor of Shaanxi and Gansu.”*

"Records of the Great Qing Gaozu Emperor (Qianlong)" 84, 30th Qianlong year (1765).

*“At the suggestion of the Ministry of Revenue, the Shaanxi Circuit Inspector elect in a memorial to the throne suggested: Feng Xian has a large area. Please separate the villages and towns around Liuba, as well as the two post stations of Songlin and Wuguan, to be managed by a Tongpan. In addition to Minzhuang which is under discussion, there will be 2 Jinzu coming from Fengxian, 1 Wuzuo selected from Zaoyi and 4 Douji from Gongbing. The suggestion was accepted.”*

"Records of the Great Qing Gaozu Emperor (Qianlong)" 105, 38th Qianlong year (1773). Spring. First month of the Guisi year.

*“Between Shaanxi and Sichuan borders are the 11 Plank road Districts of Baoji, Nanzheng, Chenggu, Xixiang, Mianxian, Lueyang, Ningqiang, Baocheng, Yangxian, Fengxian and Liuba Ting. Basic government taxes were deferred with 50% levee'd.”*

The entry for 1750 does not really support Liuba Ting being formed and separated and nor does the entry for 1773. There was activity at these times that is also recorded in other sources but it is not clear as to if it was the beginning of a Ting. On the other hand, the 30<sup>th</sup> Qianlong Year is supported quite clearly.

Finally, if you look at the Baidu Baike web (wiki) entry on Liuba District (<http://www.baik.com/wiki/%E7%95%99%E5%9D%9D%E5%8E%BF>) (similar to text can also be found at the present day Liuba Xian web site) you will find under its History section the concise summary (ENDNOTE 7):

*‘In the 15th Qianlong Year (1750), the Hanzhong Fu Shuili Tongpan moved to be stationed at Liuba, in the 12th month of the 29th Qianlong year (1764), Liuba Ting was established. In the first month of the 30th Qianlong year (1765), between Liufengguan just south of Nanxing in Feng District, to just north of Wuxiuguan in Baocheng District, the area was then managed by Liuba Ting, with the east boundary at Songpingzi in Yangxian District and the west boundary at the Black River in Mian District, and the Hanzhong Fu Shuili Tongpan (水利通判) was upgraded to Tongpan who soothes the people (抚民通判). In the 12th month of the 39th Qianlong year (1774) the position was again upgraded to Zongbu Shuili Tong Zhi, who managed the general affairs of Liuba Ting as well as managed Feng Ling (east of Jiudian Liang) and Chaiguan Yi, but was still subordinate to Hanzhong Fu. In the 16th Jiaqing year (1811) the seat of government moved to Liuba.’*

This summary above seems to be well founded and it agrees generally with the previous more detailed web entry from the Liuba Xian Gazetteer located by Li Lingtao, But they both differ from the two texts that used “分” in the 38<sup>th</sup> Qianlong Year. Unfortunately, the two summary web sites do not have direct and locatable references to the original histories and gazetteers etc. from where the information was originally gathered.

## 4. Suggested Story

Taking everything together, and noting that the 12<sup>th</sup> month of one year and the first month of the next are not very different, there seems to be a supported and consistent story here that can be summarised as follows:

*In the 15<sup>th</sup> Qianlong year there was an official appointed for Liuba who was a (Shuili) Tongpan. At the beginning of the 30<sup>th</sup> Qianlong year, following discussions between three provinces, Liuba became an official Ting, the Shuili Tongpan was upgraded to a Fumin Tongpan (“sooth the people”) and the boundaries were determined on the Northern Road<sup>1</sup>. Then at the beginning of the 40<sup>th</sup> Qianlong year the Tongpan was upgraded to Tong Zhi as previously noted. It seems that Feng Suiping’s ideas have good support in this summary as well as most sources. The “separated” in the Gazetteers generally meant that the Ting was formed and had its official seal but there are a few ambiguous listings. There is also a broad outer date here for the later annotations and updates to the map being between 1775 and the 16<sup>th</sup> Jiaqing year (1811) as after that time Liuba was not directly under Hanzhong.*

*The local area where Liuba was located was earlier part of Fengxian which was also under Hanzhong Fu. A Tongpan went to Liuba in 1750 to manage local affairs on behalf of Hanzhong Fu, but while a Tongpan is a position held by the administrator of a Ting there was still discussion to take place before it was officially a Ting. In 1765 the position was upgraded in status, Liuba Ting was founded and the borders marked taking areas of administration from Fengxian and Baocheng, finally in 1775 the higher grade of Tong Zhi official was appointed.*

The addition obtained from the new text suggests that it was only after 1811 that Hanzhong did not directly control the management. This would provide a latest possible date for the added annotation at Liuba. This also makes it possible that the map was used later during surveys to update the Hanzhong Gazetteer maps of 1813 although the confusing reference to Taiping Lin before makes this simply conjecture. The boundary in the West (somewhere at the Black River) is also vague in the summary which matches the rough positioning found in the later maps.

On the original map, the Liu/Feng boundary is marked just north of Nanxing and the southern boundary is just south of Wuguan Jie so the borders are not quite correct and this may indicate they were not visited but rather drawn in a convenient but close position. The same web site records that the Ming Period boundary between Feng and Baocheng was at Chaiguan Ling. Another record mentioned that the new Ting was cut out of Feng District but this seems not really true. Both Feng and Baocheng were reduced with the greatest part from Baocheng – perhaps during the discussions mentioned. But for a number of periods (and not always when Liuba was a Ting) it seems that the Liuba garrison was responsible for keeping the peace right up to the Feng Ling – well into Feng District.

So if the boundaries on the map were part of the original drawing, the early date for when the original map was drawn is after 1765 and before 1775; and after 1775 and before 1811 for the additional information annotated by a different hand. This is the suggestion made here which seems most consistent with the suggestions of Feng Suiping but obviously more will be

---

<sup>1</sup> This is very significant, as the original map has these boundaries, and they were used as important date markers by Feng Suiping.

needed to obtain the concurrence of all experts! Perhaps if the sources for the information summarised at the web sites can be made known then a consensus may finally be reached.

## 5. References:

- [R.1] Wiens, Herold (1949). The Shu Tao or Road to Sichuan, Geographical Review, 39 (1949), pp. 584-604.
- [R.2] Li Xiaocong (Ed) (2004). "Summaries of holdings in the US Library of Congress' Collection of ancient Chinese maps", Beijing, Cultural Press, October 2004. (Chinese and English)  
美国国会图书馆藏中文古地图叙录, 李孝聪编著, 北京:文物出版社, 2004—10. (中英)
- [R.2a] Bi, Qiong and Li, Xiaocong (2004). Research into "The Shu Road from Shaanxi to the Sichuan Border". Cartography (China, in Chinese), 4, 45-50.  
"Shan jing shu dao tu" yan jiu. Bi Qiong & Li Xiaocong, Ditu, 2004(4), ye 45  
《陕境蜀道图》研究, 毕琼李孝聪 (作者), 地图 2004(4), 页 45
- [R.3] 《清史稿》"留坝厅"
- [R.4] 《清史稿》"汉中府"
- [R.5] 清国史馆《皇朝地理志》、《嘉庆重修一统志》
- [R.6] Feng Suiping (2010). Further investigation of the Qing period "Map of the Shu Road to the Shaanxi border", Wenbo (Museums & Cultural Relics), Number 2, 2010 (In Chinese)  
"Qing 'Shanjing Shudao Tu' zai tan", Feng Suiping, Wenbo, 2010 nian, di 2 qi.  
"清《陕境蜀道图》再探", 冯岁平者, 《文博》2010年, 第2期
- [R.7] Hanzhong Fu. Hanzhong Fu Gazetteer, Qing Jiaqing Period  
嘉庆《汉中府志》
- [R.8] Liuba Ting (1842?). Liuba Ting Gazetteer, Qing Daoguang Period  
道光《留坝厅志》
- [R.9] Lin, Tianren and Zhang, Min, Eds (2013). "Reading imperial cartography: Ming-Qing historical maps in the Library of Congress", Published by the Academia Sinica Digital Center (Taipei), 2013/11/01. (Chinese and English)  
林天人編撰、張敏編譯: 《皇輿搜覽——美國國會圖書館所藏明清輿圖》, 臺北中央研究院, 數位文化中心出版, 2013年11月。
- [R.10] Ch. 2 "Liuba Ting Gazetteer"; cited in "Development of Qing Geography" by Zhao Quancheng, Qilu University, "China Studies Research Institute" Special Edition, 1941  
《留壩廳志》卷二; 引自趙泉澄, 《清代地理沿革表》, 齊魯大學, 國學研究所專刊, 1941

[R.11] Ch. 979 "History of Gaozong", March of the 40th Qianlong year (1775). ["Gengwu Year"]

《高宗實錄》卷九七九，乾隆四十年三月下，庚午

#### ENDNOTE 1: Extract from Bi and Li [R.2a]

《清史稿》“留坝厅条”载：“乾隆十五年，移汉中捕盗通判驻之，三十年析置，职抚民。三十九年改置同知。”“汉中府”条下则记载“乾隆三十八年，置留坝厅”。另据清国史馆《皇朝地理志》、《嘉庆重修一统志》载置留坝厅是在乾隆三十八年，与《清史稿》“汉中府”条载相符。故可以大体认定留坝设厅在乾隆三十八年(1773年)。《陕境蜀道图》中尚未出现留坝厅，而有大留坝、小留坝，在大留坝的下方有添写的“汉中府同知驻此处”字样，说明这是用图者途经这里时随手所注，应该属于当时人的记载。可见直到本图投入使用，留坝仍然作为汉中府同知的驻地而没有成为府州厅县行政体系中的一级。据此可以判定，本图的绘制年代早于留坝厅的出现，即 1773 年。

#### ENDNOTE 2: Extract from Feng Suiping [R.6]

长卷中是否“尚未出现留坝厅”？其实长卷不仅有留坝厅，而且还出现了两次：一在凤县南星与驷马桥之间，图注“南星观音堂沟接留坝厅交界”，可见南星观音堂沟是凤县与留坝厅的分界。二在陈子沟与武关街之间，标注“留褒交界”，留指留坝厅，褒指褒城县，说明这里是留坝厅与褒城县的交界。] 同时我们注意到，这两处标注的书体是最初绘制者的，丝毫没有添补者的书体风格。这样说来，图中已有留坝厅，所以该卷绘制的时间只能在留坝厅设置之后。至于图中为何不直接书留坝厅，而作大留坝，大概它与小留坝相对应，且人们习以为常。按，乾隆三十年(1765)“正月，剖凤县地为留坝厅，其(水利)官改为抚民通判。”所以它绘制的时间是乾隆三十年之后。再看补写的内容，大留坝补注“汉中府同知住此处”。乾隆四十年(1775)年，始裁通判，升留坝厅为同知，仍属汉中府。也就是说，乾隆四十年，留坝厅始升汉中同知。补写者手持图卷，亲历云栈，到留坝厅后才发现这个十分重要的变化，遂在图卷补添上去。因此图卷绘制的时间只能在乾隆四十年之前，同时还可看出图卷完成后，补写者应在留坝厅升为汉中府同知之后，即乾隆四十年之后不久，才补进这个内容的。

#### ENDNOTE 3: Extract from Lin Tianren [R.9]

圖中漢中府大留坝尚未置廳。乾隆十五年(1750)，改留坝驛為留坝廳，移府通紮（參：《留壩廳志》卷二；引自趙泉澄，《清代地理沿革表》，齊魯大學，國學研究所專刊，1941）：四十年(1775)，陝西巡撫畢沅疏：「漢中府留坝廳通判改為撫民同知，仍隸府屬」（參：《高宗實錄》卷九七九，乾隆四十年三月下，庚午）；圖中大留坝旁明顯被後人加註「漢中府同知住此處」數字；判斷本圖繪成於 1750 前後，至遲在 1775 前已完成。

#### ENDNOTE 4: Extract from Reference [R.5]

秦漢故道縣地唐鳳州地明鳳縣地[?]置留壩巡司[?]

本朝乾隆三十八年分鳳縣地撫民通判四十年改設留壩廳同知

嘉慶十三年移駐太平嶺屬漢中府

#### ENDNOTE 5: Extract from web version of Liuba Xian Gazetteer

乾隆十五年（1750）春，汉中府水利通判奉迁驻留坝，加封捕盗通判之职，既处理水患之事，又任驿丞兼司狱，设铺司养地丁三十六名。缉盗安民，整修栈道。

乾隆二十九年（1764）十二月，陕、甘、川总督率三省边防及省、道、府、县等巡道、守道、知府、按察使、同知、知县诸员会设留坝厅议事，具当无疑义后由钦差大臣送交留坝厅之印档。《陕西省通志》以为留坝厅分置于清乾隆三十八年（1773），误。

乾隆三十年（1765），郑建任汉中府抚民通判，首任留坝厅同知。

乾隆三十一年（1766），本厅大修连云道。

乾隆三十八年（1773），宋琦为汉中府抚民通判，兼任留坝厅同知。自此本厅游击、都司、守备、千总、把总、巡检、驿丞、司狱、铺司、营署等机构俱全。

乾隆三十九年（1774）十二月，升汉中府抚民通判为总捕水利同知，兼领酒奠梁以东柴关驿站事务。次年，裁通判，设同知署。

#### ENDNOTE 6: Extracts from Qing History reference [R.5]

大清高宗实录 46 乾隆十五年(1750)

铸给汉中府捕盗通判驻筭留霸兼管驿务关防。并建衙署。从陕甘总督尹继善请也。

大清高宗实录 84 乾隆三十年(1765)

户部议准、调任陕西巡抚明德疏称、凤县地方。幅员辽阔。请将附近留坝一带村庄。及松林、武关、二驿。分隶通判管辖。其民壮一项。除现在筹议外。禁卒二名。应准在凤县内酌拨二名。作作一名。于皂役内拨充。斗级四名。于弓兵内拨给。从之

大清高宗实录 105 乾隆三十八年(1773)。癸巳。春。正月

所有陕省接壤川境临栈之宝鸡、南郑、城固、西乡、沔县、略阳、宁羌、褒城、洋县、凤县、留坝厅、十一厅州县缓徵正赋钱粮十分之五。

#### ENDNOTE 7: Extract from Baidu Baike Wiki on History of Liuba Xian

留坝县历史

<http://www.baik.com/wiki/%E7%95%99%E5%9D%9D%E5%8E%BF>

清乾隆十五年（公元 1750 年），汉中府水利通判迁驻留坝，乾隆二十九年（公元 1764）十二月，设置留坝厅。乾隆三十年（公元 1765）正月，将凤县南星（留凤关为界）以南，褒城县武休关以北，划归留坝厅管辖，东与洋县松坪子交界，西以沔县黑河为界，改汉中府水利通判为抚民通判。乾隆三十九（公元 1774 年）十二月，升汉中府抚民通判为总捕水利同知，主理留坝厅行政事务，兼理凤岭（酒奠梁以东）、柴关驿务，隶属汉中府。嘉庆十六年（公元 1811 年），治所移至留坝。