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MANCHU was the imperial language of the Ch’ing dynasty. It was the fundamental medium of communications within the imperial family, and within the court it was used for worship, ideological expression, address to the bannermen and nobility, and confidential political and military communications. From the eighteenth century on, Manchu also became a cultural emblem, a marker of Manchu identity and status, and an artifact of the universalism of the Ch’ien-lung emperor. Early Ch’ing policy required that selected civilians as well as bannermen and nobles acquire literacy in Manchu. This state interest in generalizing the function of Manchu had an impact on eighteenth-century scholarship, particularly as it affected and was affected by the “Four Treasuries” (ssu-k’u ch’üan-shu) project. Ultimately the tradition of literati training in Manchu produced a private field of Manchu-oriented scholarship.¹

¹ The authors wish to thank Eugene Wu, Tim Connor, Sidney Tai, and the staff of the Harvard-Yenching Library; Tony Marr, Martin Heijdra, and the staff of the Gest Oriental Library, Princeton University; Monique Cohen and the staff of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris; James Cheng, of the Han Yü-shan Collection, University of California, Los Angeles; Chuang Chi-fa and the late Chiang Fu-ts’ung, of the National Palace Archives (Ku-kung po-wu-kuan), Taipei; R. Po-chia Hsia for information on the archives of the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel. For technical suggestions we are indebted to Gertraude Roth
Both as a political instrument and as a natural language, Manchu had a variety of roles to play in Ch’ing life. It also plays a variety of roles in the extant documentation available to students of Ch’ing history. Nineteenth-century Western scholars emphasized the significance of Manchu in the Ch’ing order, although after the fall of the dynasty some Ch’ing specialists questioned the necessity of acquiring literacy in the language. In recent years access to Manchu materials has increased dramatically, and a reassessment of the importance of Manchu for Ch’ing research is in order. In this essay we review the functions of Manchu under the Ch’ing dynasty and how those functions are reflected in known extant documentation. We do not intend to repeat the historiographical and bibliographical work of generations of scholars. For such information we refer readers to essays on Manchu documents, and to published

---

Li, Cheryl Boettcher, and Robin Kornman. Thomas G. Rawski has provided computer assistance, and Hyong-muk Lee has aided in editorial tasks. We are particularly grateful to Gertraude Roth Li and Susan Naquin for their trenchant critiques of an earlier form of this article.

Because of space constraints, we include Chinese characters only for terms and titles that would not be easily identified by HJAS readers. Where phrases or titles are cited in both Manchu and Chinese, Manchu precedes. We generally adhere to the Möllendorf system. However, we have adopted practices suggested by Cheryl Boettcher, who was kind enough to show us a draft of her “Standard Romanization of Manchu: A Recommendation,” and we hope that these modifications will aid in consistent representation of etymology and case. Manchus and Mongols conventionally did not use a clan or lineage (mukün) name during the dynasty, but because lineage names are significant to the historian, we have placed them in brackets.

For well over a century the necessity of studying Manchu for purposes of research on the Ch’ing period has been the subject of occasional hortatory pronouncements. For glimpses of the debate see Thomas Taylor Meadows’s introduction to Translations from the Manchu with the Original Texts (Canton: S. Wells Williams, 1849); A. V. Grebenščikov, Man’çzury: ich jazyk i pis’mennost’ (Vladivostok, 1912); Erich Hauer, “Why the Sinologue Should Study Manchu,” Journal of the North China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society 61 (1930): 156–64; Erich Haenisch’s introduction to his Mandschu-Grammatik mit Lesestücken und 23 Texttafeln (Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1961); Beatrice S. Bartlett, “Books of Revelations: The Importance of the Manchu Language Archival Record Books for Research on Ch’ing History,” Late Imperial China 6.2 (1986): 25–36; Hukjintai’s address to the Fifth East Asian Altaistic Conference, “Manju bithe kemuni oyonggo” (now published in the Proceedings [Taipei: National Taiwan University Press, 1980]); and the passages from the work of Joseph F. Fletcher, Jr., quoted at the end of this essay.

catalogues of important holdings throughout the world. We hope to provide a useful guide to opportunities now available for research on Chinese history and culture through the Manchu language.

THE ROLE OF MANCHU IN CH'ING POLITICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE HISTORY

Manchu has a long and complex history as a vernacular


language. It has a demonstrable relationship to both its ancestral language, Jurchen, and its contemporaneous languages and dialects of Northeast Asia; it has a rich oral literature; and it has a documented connection to the political concepts and religious life of Inner Asia. Manchu’s functions as a natural language should not obscure another fact, which is that documentary Manchu was a creation of the early Ch’ing state. The forerunners of the Ch’ing, particularly the Jurchens of the Chien-chou “garrisons” (wei-so), used Mongolian and t’ung-wen 同文, a form of written Chinese that imitated the grammatical order of the Jurchen language.\(^5\) Ch’ing historical memory credited to Nurgaci in 1599 the commissioning of a script, to be adapted from Mongolian, to allow Jurchen/Manchu to achieve its own documentary form.

Annalistic materials were revised and reprinted at intervals, some of which coincided with major stages in the evolution of the script. The records of the Nurgaci era were first produced in Manchu script during the reigns of Hung Taiji (1627-35; 1636-43) and revised repeatedly during the later seventeenth century. In the second Hung Taiji reign, the script was partially vocalized, using the “circles and dots” that today distinguish “New Manchu” (tongki fuka sindaha hergen, hsin man-wen) from “Old Manchu” (lao man-wen), or “script without circles or dots” (tongki fuka akū hergen). The emergence of the Manchu script and Manchu documents accompanied the rise of the Ch’ing and formation of the state. Quite apart from the value of what is written in Manchu, the language and evolving script are organically linked to institutional development in the early Ch’ing period.

Compared with the volume of post-1644 materials, relatively few original Manchu documents of the preconquest period are extant. The best-known and perhaps most frequently utilized early Ch'ing historical source in Manchu is the collection of annals commonly known as Mambun rōtō (Man-wen lao-tang), which Japanese scholars collected from the palace archives at Shen-yang in the early 1930s. These are Ch'ien-lung era revisions of the seventeenth-century documents known collectively as Chiu Man-chou tang. The originals, which are now in the archival collection of the National Palace Museum (Ku-kung po-wu-yüan) near Taipei, are available in reprint and have been utilized in research, although they are more difficult to read.

The materials in this group of documents have varied over the years, and there have been several incomplete or complete publications of them, whether in the original, in transliterated form, or in translation. The materials were not used in the compilation of the Ch'ing-shih kao (1928) or earlier histories of the dynasty. The first attempt to bring them to the attention of scholars was that of [Suwan Güwalgiya] Jinliang 金梁, the Manchu curator of the Shen-yang (Mukden) palace archives prior to the Japanese occupation of Shen-yang in 1931. See his Man-chou lao-tang pi-lu (Peiping: N.p., 1929) and Man-chou pi-tang (Peiping: N.p., 1934). Japanese curatorship (begun in the very early years of this century by Naitō Torajirō), which has gradually encouraged the use of the term Mambun rōtō to refer to the Shen-yang collection, produced the first extensive, systematic publication of the sources in Fujioka Katsuji 藤岡勝二, Mambun rōtō (Iwanami Shoten, 1939). Imanishi Shunju 今西春秋 published running excerpts from the archives under the same title in the periodical Shokō 書香 in 1943 and 1944, and from 1955 to 1963 a team headed by Kanda Nobuo 神田信夫, Matsumura Jun 松村潤, and Okada Hidehiro 岡田英弘 published their series of volumes, Mambun rōtō (Tōyō Bunko, vols. 1-7), which provided transliteration, translation, annotation, and index to the documents in Shen-yang. Excerpts from the Shen-yang archives were republished in Chinese by Liao-ning Provincial Press in 1978.

The materials now in Taiwan are generally known, after the suggestion of Ch'en Chieh-hsien, as Chiu Man-chou tang, and consist of documents in both Old Manchu and New Manchu script; see "The Value of The Early Manchu Archives," in Ch'en Chieh-hsien and Sechin Jagchid, eds., Proceedings of the Third East Asian Altaistic Conference (Taipei: N.p., 1969). Unlike the Shen-yang materials, they include annals for the year 1635/1636 (with interlinear Chinese annotation); the Taiwan collection has been published as Chiu Man-chou tang (photoreprint, Taipei: Palace Museum, 1969), and it has been partially transliterated and translated into Chinese as Chiu Man-chou tang i-chu (1977, 1979), and the year 1635/1636 has been transliterated and translated by the Kanda/Matsumura/Okada team as Chiu Man-chou tang, The Ninth Year of T'i'en-ts'ung (Tōyō Bunko, 1972–1975). On the differences in content between Chiu Man-chou tang and Mambun rōtō see Michael Weiers, "Konkordanz zum Aktenmaterial der Chiu Man-chou Tang und Man-wen lao-tang, Jahrgänge 1620-1630," in G. Stary, ed., Misszellen zur Mandschurischen Sprache, Literatur und Geschichte im 17. und 20. Jahrhundert (Weisbaden: Kommissionsverlag Otto Harrassowitz, 1987), pp. 166-469. The most extensive research application of these materials thus far has been Gertraude Roth [Li]'s
in the “Shen-yang Archives” (Sheng-ching yüan-tang), which are now incorporated into the First Historical Archives (Ti-i li-shih tang-an kuan) in Peking. 8 Outside these two collections, a few other sixteenth-century originals are extant. For instance, early Ch’ing edicts and other materials are in the collection of Academia Sinica in Taiwan. The manuscript revision made in the 1630s of the legal and household code of the Later Chin, Jin gurun i hacin kooli bithe, is listed in the “Manchu” catalogue of the First Historical Archives in Peking. Other original Manchu materials are known to be housed in archives in Japan, Russia, Mongolia, Germany, and the United States. 9

By 1635, the production of multilingual documentation in Chinese, Manchu, and Mongolian had become a routine function of the bureaucracy, and was, in fact, the raison d ’être of large sectors of the early state (that is, the wen-kuan 文館). 10 Even the temple name of Hung Taiji (genggiyen ʂù ʰяемwàngdi, wen huang-ti) at least partially reflects the significance of this enterprise. 11 It is useful on one level to think of this documentation as “simultaneous” in the languages concerned (which is exactly what is suggested by the Manchu title
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8 For an introduction to these materials see Sheng-ching hsing-pu yüan-tang: Ch’ing T’ai-tsung Ch’ung-te san nien chih Ch’ung-te ssu nien 盛京刑部原档: 清太宗崇德三年至崇德四年, comp. Chung-kuo jen-min ta-hsüeh, Ch’ing-shih yen-chiu-so, and Chung-kuo ti-i li-shih tang-an-kuan (Peking: Ch’ün-chung ch’u-pan-she, 1985), pp. 1–8.

9 The archives of the National Palace Museum in Taiwan, for instance, contain several hundreds of uncatalogued Manchu documents, including fragments of a translation of the Ming shih. We are grateful to Dr. Nicola di Cosmo for a brief description of these materials and of the cataloguing in which he and the staff of the archives are engaged. See also Fletcher, “Manchu Sources,” pp. 143–44.

10 The keeping of the records on the activities of the emperor (ch ’ i-chu chû) was originally an extension of these bureaucratic structures, and got a rather fitful start under the Ch’ing. On the historical background of such record-keeping in Manchu and the status of current holdings in Taiwan, see Ch’ en Chieh-hsien, “Introduction to the Manchu Text Version of the Ch’ing Emperors’ Ch’ i-chu-chû (Notes on the Emperors’ Daily Activities),” CAJ 17.2–4 (1973): 111–27.

term kamcime, Chinese ho-pi 合璧), and in many cases edicts, regulations, compendia, and some memorials were completely rendered in two or three languages with no obvious loss of information or connotation. It is a mistake, however, before examining both or all versions, to assume that any translation wholly corresponds to its original. There are instances of error, omission, and deliberate censorship in materials generated in Manchu and later rendered into Chinese. Some abridgments, such as those found in certain passages translated from the early Manchu annals into Chinese, were made by deleting what at the time were considered to be extraneous details; historians will be interested to view the most complete and original version. That Manchu-language texts were deliberately altered has been well established by previous scholars like Mo Tung-yin, who in 1958 pointed out that the shamanic context of Nurgaci’s original oaths against the Ming was purposely obscured when the passages were translated into Chinese. Other omissions from the Manchu documents, though perhaps not intentional, can be revealing. Beatrice Bartlett, for example, has cited the unpublished Manchu version of a rescript that reveals especially vivid threats of the Yung-cheng emperor against his brother Yin-ssu, the flavor of which can hardly be captured in the Chinese rendition.

12 See “Ch’ing-ch’u Man-tsu te sa-man-chiao,” in Man-tsu shih lun-ts’ung (1958; reprint, Peking: San-lien shu-chü, 1979), pp. 190 and 203 n. 33. Although our research affirms Mo’s basic argument regarding the non-transferal of some information from Manchu records, it is important to note that Mo may have overcorrected the passage in question. He asserts that the Manchu word tangse (Chinese: t’ang-tzu) has been omitted in the Chinese narration of Nurgaci’s oath. However, we do not find the word tangse in the Manchu annals (Mambun rōō, 1:89–91). Although Mo has not documented the source for his claim here, it is possible that it comes from A-kuei 阿桂 et al., “Hen kao ch’i-t’iao shi ch’u cheng,” (Ch’ing ch’ao) K’ai-kuo fang-lüeh (清朝) 開國方略, chuàn shou-shang, 4a (reprint Taipei: Wen-hai, 1967), p. 27, where the characters t’ang-tzu have been supplied. There is no evidence that, in 1958, Mo was able to consult the Manchu materials himself. It appears, however, that by comparing K’ai-kuo fang-lüeh and Man-chou shih-lu Mo made a shrewd guess that, though in error on this subsidiary point, has in its basic insight been sustained by all subsequent research.

Standard written Manchu, referred to in Chinese as Ch’ing wen (Ch’ing writing), was the official state language. Through the Chia-ch’ing reign, banner officials, generals commanding the armies of the north and west, and Manchu officials receiving edicts written in Manchu were obliged to write their memorials to the throne in Manchu. In addition, as part of their normal procedures, some departments were required to prevent selected documents from passing to related organs of the bureaucracy, particularly the State Historical Office (suduri i yamun, kuo-shih kuan). Manchu-language palace memorials predate the creation of the Grand Council; those for the K’ang-hsi reign have been published by the Palace Museum in Taiwan. These materials, as well as the as yet unpublished 180,000 items of Manchu palace memorials, court letters, and other central government documents passing through the Grand Council that were organized into the monthly packets known as yüeh che pao are extremely valuable primary sources for future research. Just as the first access to palace memorials enabled scholars to realize through comparison how earlier documentary collections had been “politically oriented” or “censored for political reasons,” the comparison of Manchu-language palace memorials with their Chinese counterparts can reveal the extent to which certain types of information were reserved for officials who could read Manchu.

One reason for the protective posture toward communications in Manchu was that Manchu functioned as a security language in
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14 For example, some Manchu memorials of the Board of Punishments (hsing-pu) are marked “write” (ara) or “prohibited” (ume) to indicate whether they would be permitted to pass to the State Historical Office. See Sheng-ching hsing-pu yüan-tang, pp. 2–3.


18 The broad significance of these materials for Ch’ing researchers was first noted by Beatrice S. Bartlett in “Books of Revelations.” Bartlett’s scrutiny of the Grand Council’s archival inventories of the Manchu documents led her to conclude that “many unique Manchu documents, never translated into Chinese, were produced in the middle and even the late Ch’ing” (p. 26).
military affairs through most of the dynasty. This historic function was a generalization of the use of Manchu for secret communications, which may have taken a quasi-institutional form beginning with the Dorgon regency. An illustration is found in the K'ang-hsi period palace memorials concerning the years 1696 and 1697, when the K'ang-hsi emperor led his armies into Central Asia against the Jungar Mongol chieftain Galdan (d. 1697). The Manchu-language palace memorials of this period include several intelligence reports on conditions along the army's proposed route, Galdan, and Galdan's nephew Tsewangrabdan (1643–1727) that bear the Chinese notation, "Don't translate," above the Manchu language text. Until the 1760s, military matters especially continued to be reported in Manchu. After 1723, the palace memorials with their appended imperial responses were copied and grouped into packets (lu-fu tsou-che 錄副奏摺) to be stored in the government archives; frequently those pertaining to a military campaign were separately collected into a "military affairs bundle" (chün-wu pao). One scholar estimates that eighty percent of the Manchu-language packets from 1724 to 1910 dealt with military matters, primarily of campaigns before 1760.

Manchu was also protected because it was the language of the Aisin Gioro—the imperial lineage, or imperial "clan" (uksun)—and in policy remained so until the end of the dynasty. The collections of Manchu palace memorials reprinted in Taiwan show the K'ang-hsi emperor's fluent Manchu script on what must have been the original text. Here, too, the notation, "Don't translate," appears above many of the Manchu-language communications between the K'ang-hsi emperor and his heir Yin-jeng during the Galdan campaign from 1696 to 1697. Although most of these communications

22 For the early period this needs no comment, but for the role of Manchu in the education of the imperial family from the late nineteenth century through the Manchukuo period see Martin Gimm, "Marginalien zum letzten chinesischen Kaiser Pu'I und zu seiner Familie (Teil I)," in G. Stary, ed., *Miszellen zur Mandschurischen Sprache*, esp. pp. 67–98.
concern matters of state, they also include homely, intimate details regarding the relations between father and son. Yin-jeng is left behind as regent in Peking; he protests enviously upon receiving his father’s description of the magnificent hunts while on campaign and offers to rush out to join him. The father in turn chides Yin-jeng for forgetting his weighty responsibilities of state and counsels patience until the campaign is victoriously concluded. For his part, the emperor writes frequently because he knows his son is anxious for news. But why, he asks, has he not received replies from the Heir Apparent? He concludes, “From now on I will not write a lot.”

The Manchu-language communications between the K’ang-hsi emperor and the Heir Apparent (Yin-jeng), which are absent from the Chinese-language archives, constitute one example of a politically sensitive subject that seems to have been deliberately removed from the purview of Chinese bureaucrats, yet was retained in its entirety in Manchu.

Several kinds of Chinese-language notations appear above the Manchu-language texts in published collections of the K’ang-hsi period palace memorials. Some state that the whole document (the memorial and imperial response) should not be translated (ni pu-i 擬不譯, pu-i); some direct that the imperial edict (but not the memorial) should be translated; and some suppress the translation

---


24 The Manchu palace memorials of K’ang-hsi are written in his own handwriting, which is distinctive and contrasts with the clerkly handwriting found in other documents; we can thus be fairly sure that these were not edited texts. In addition to the first seven volumes, Kung-chung-tang K’ang-hsi ch’ao tsou-che, comp. National Palace Museum editorial committee (Taipei: National Palace Museum, 1976), eight volumes of palace memorials with vermilion edicts have recently been compiled and published by the China First Historical Archives as K’ang-hsi ch’ao Han-wen chu-p’i tsou-che hui-pien (Peking: Archives Bureau, 1985). In his Passage to Power: K’ang-hsi and His Heir Apparent, 1661–1722 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979), p. 229, Silas H. L. Wu suggests that the emperor had ordered that his “instructions” to Yin-jeng be kept in a separate file; this would explain their absence from the Chinese-language archival collections.
of the imperial response while allowing translation of the memo-
rial.  Although the significance of this kind of editorial discrimi-
nation cannot be determined without careful comparison of relevant docu-
ments, these notations are evidence that the Ch’ing rulers purpose-
fully controlled the translation into Chinese of personally and mili-
tarily significant communications. To the end of the Ch’ien-lung
reign, at least, emperors gave priority in their daily schedules to
the perusal of edicts and other communications translated among
Manchu, Mongolian, and Chinese, so important to them was
management of the transferal of information, ideas, and sentiments
among languages.

Through the eighteenth century, Manchu remained an indispens-
able tool for central sectors of the Qing bureaucracy. An explana-
tion for this is suggested by the “inner-court” concept utilized by
Beatrice Bartlett in her study of the Grand Council. Bartlett shows
that this major decision-making organ originated in the small, divi-
ed, and informal committees housed in the inner court that the
Yung-cheng emperor used to expand imperial power over the
“outer-court” civil service. To a considerable extent, the inner
court continued to be manned by members of the conquest elite,
even though Yung-cheng turned against the particular Manchu and
Mongol nobles who had dominated the decision-making process in
his father’s reign. Although one of Yung-cheng’s most trusted
ministers, Chang T’ing-yü (1672–1755), was Chinese, the other
trusted aide was Yin-chen’s brother, Prince I, and after Prince I’s
death, Ortai, a member of the Silin Gioro clan who belonged to the

25 Kung-chung-tang K’ang-hsi ch’ao tsou-che, vol. 8, for example, contains twenty-six docu-
ments where both the memorial and edict are not to be translated; in eighteen other docu-
ments, only the imperial response (sometimes only selected parts) is to be translated; and
in two other documents, only the memorial is to be translated. Vol. 9 has two memorials from
the heir, Yin-jeng, to the emperor in which the memorial itself is marked “Don’t translate,”
but the notation “Translate” appears over the emperor’s reply (nos. 204, 205); another
memorial from Yin-jeng has “Don’t translate” over the emperor’s reply (no. 210).

26 The well-known edict of Ch’ien-lung 44 (1778) in which the emperor excoriates his
officials after finding errors in their translations, has been reprinted in Chang Chung-ju 章中
如 et al., Ch’ing-tai k’ao-shih chih-tu tz’u-liao (reprint, Taipei: Wen-hai, 1968) and Hsi Yi-fu
度裕福, comp. Huang-ch’ao cheng-tien lei-tsun 皇朝政典類纂 (Taipei: Ch’eng Wen Book Co.,
1969). This edict has been repeatedly cited as indication of the emperor’s wrath at poor perfor-
manCe in the standard languages, but our interest here is in the exercise of imperial oversight
that produced the complaints.
Manchu Bordered Blue Banner. 27 Chang T’ing-yü and Chu Shih (1665–1736), another unusually high-ranking Chinese official, were also educated in Manchu. 28 Bartlett notes that Manchus still outnumbered Chinese Grand Councillors in the Ch’ien-lung reign, and the officials of the “inner court,” which included the Imperial Household Department, remained predominantly Manchu to the end of the dynasty. Wherever there was a predominance of Manchu personnel, “many if not most documents . . . were written only in Manchu.” 29 Many documents in the Imperial Household Department (Nei-wu-fu) during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries exist in the archives only in a Manchu version. 30

Manchu was the primary language of the leaders of the Eight Banners, who in the late seventeenth and in the eighteenth centuries expanded the empire to its largest size. Because questions of status and command turned upon hereditary claims, some of the most extensive banner documentation is in the form of genealogies written in the course of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. 31 An excellent example now in the Harvard-Yenching collection is Hsiang huang ch’i Man-chou Niohuru shih Hung-i kung teng shih-fang chia-p’u (which, like many Manchu documents, now has only a Chinese title). 32 This is the genealogy of the descendants of [Niohuru] Eidu (1562–1621), whose lineage dominated eight of eighteen companies

27 Bartlett, Monarchs and Ministers, Part One, esp. pp. 80-81. In a recent article based on Manchu and Chinese language archival materials, Chao Chih-ch’iang 趙志強 found that sixteen of the twenty-one persons who served on the Yung-cheng prototype of the Grand Council were Manchu and Mongol bannermen, predominantly from the upper three banners. See his “Yung-cheng ch’ao chün-chi ch’u ta-ch’en k’ao pu,” Li-shih t’ang-an 3 (1991): 93–104.
28 Chang T’ing-yü’s biography is given in Arthur W. Hummel et al., Eminent Chinese of the Ch‘ing Period (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1943) [hereafter ECCP], pp. 54–56. On Chu Shih’s status see Bartlett, Monarchs and Ministers, pp. 263, 327 n. 40, 340 n. 13; on his education in Manchu see ECCP, p. 188.
29 Bartlett, Monarchs and Ministers, p. 224.
30 See catalogue no. 446-5-55 at the First Historical Archives, Beijing, which includes memorials from 1727 to 1911.
31 See Ted A. Telford, Melvin P. Thatcher, and Basil P. N. Yang, comps., Chinese Genealogies at the Genealogical Society of Utah: An Annotated Bibliography (Taipei: Ch’eng Wen Book Co., 1983), which contains many banner genealogies (they were often duplicated in Chinese).
MANCHU SOURCES FOR CH’ING HISTORY

in the first division in the Manchu Bordered Yellow Banner. In addition to the genealogies of individual descent lines in the banner nobility the Genealogical Office for the Eight Banners (Jakūn gūsai uheri ejetun bithe), produced under the direction of [Silin Gioro] Ortai (1680–1745), the “Collected Genealogies of the Eight Banner Manchu Clans” (Manjusai mukūn hala be uheri ejehe bithe, Pa-ch’i Man-chou shih-ts’u t’ung-p’u), published in 1745 and thereafter a unified reference for banner command disputes.

Ortai also oversaw the compilation of the “General History of the Eight Banners” (Jakūn gūsai tong jy [i sucungga wailehe] bithe, Pa-ch’i t’ung-chih [ch’u-ch’i]) in 1739, and “Regulations of the Eight Banners” (Jakūn gūsai hacin i kooli bithe, Pa-ch’i tzu-li), published posthumous to Ortai in 1746. These compendia, and the revised “General History of the Eight Banners” ([Han i araha] jakūn gūsai tong jy, [Ch’in-ting] Pa-ch’i t’ung-chih) published under T’ieh-liang’s direction in 1799, exist in Chinese and Manchu editions. Indispensable references for the study of banner affairs, they provide information on banner populations, finances, draft regulations, transmission of hereditary posts, and communications with the Board of War or the Grand Council. Banner administration materials can be found in the Harvard-Yenching collection and in the large archival collections held in Peking, Liao-ning, and Tokyo. Recent

33 The Niohuru genealogy in the Fletcher collection has only four ts’e; it seems to differ from the three that are cited by Huang P’ei 黄培, “Ch’ing-ch’u te Man-chou kuei-ts’u (1583-1795)—Niu-hu-lu-ts’u,” in Lao Chen-i hsien-sheng pa-chih jung-ch’ing lun-wen chi, comp. Lao Chen-i hsien-sheng pa-chih jung-ch’ing lun-wen chi pien-chi wei-yūan-hui (Taipei: Commercial Press, 1986), p. 633. On the creation of clan legacies through banner companies see Crossley, Orphan Warriors: Three Manchu Generations and the End of the Qing World, pp. 43–45. On Eiu’s legacy see also ECCP, pp. 222.

34 The original title of this work was Jakūn gūsai tung jy, Pa ch’i t’ung-chih 八旗通志. Sixty years after its compilation it was retitled to distinguish it from its successor of 1799.


36 The Fletcher collection includes genealogical charts for the chiefs of the Bordered Yellow Chahar Banner (Ku buhe suwayan i Cahar gūsadei jasak obume kancibuhu hoosoon gung jasak tajiisai); an inventory of weapons for the Bordered Blue Banner (Ku buhe lamun i ujen cooha gūsai tuwabure acara coohai agura ton i [seegen]); and fragments of other banner documents for the Plain White Banner, Plain Yellow Mongol Banner, and Bordered Yellow Mongol Banner.

37 The Tōyō Bunko’s collection of materials relating to the Plain Red Banner are catalogued in Poppe, Hurwitz, and Okada, Catalogue of the Manchu-Mongol Section of the Tōyō Bunko; for recent Chinese translations of some of these documents see Ch’ing Yung-cheng-ch’ao
Chinese-language translations of selections from these banner archives suggest the range of subjects they cover.\textsuperscript{38}

The power of the Ch’ing imperial lineage was intimately linked to its control of the banners. The early Ch’ing struggle between the throne and the banner princes can be traced through documents on the imperial descent group such as \textit{Dorio akdun giyun wang ni jergi sirara ejeh} (a manuscript of which is in the Harvard-Yenching collection), the genealogy of the descendants of Nurgaci’s fifteenth son Dodo (1614–49). The second-degree princedom (\textit{giyun wang, chün-wang}) referred to in the title reflects Dodo’s posthumous demotion following the disgrace of his brother Dorgon in 1651, and dates the work to a period before 1778, when his first-degree title was restored by the Ch’ien-lung emperor. Such negotiations of genealogical status were characteristic for the imperial lineage, whose members were normally exempt from the civil judicial proceedings. Imperial decisions regarding the hereditary succession or deprivation of titles continued to have considerable political import to the end of the eighteenth century, and with respect to the Aisin Gioro they are recorded in Manchu in the archives of the Imperial Clan Court (\textit{uksun be kadalara yamun, tsung-jen fu}). The records permit us to describe with great precision the evolving relationship between the throne and the imperial princes who played important political roles throughout the dynasty.

Detailed analysis of the conquest elite based on Manchu language materials will probably renew our appreciation of the degree to which Mongol nobles participated in the Ch’ing order, and remind us of the Mongolian affinities—historical, cultural, symbolic, and consanguineal—of the Ch’ing. The Aisin Gioro conducted extensive marriage exchanges with the Mongol nobles.\textsuperscript{39} Court relations


\textsuperscript{38} See, for example, \textit{San-hsing fu-tu-t’ung ya-men Man-wen tang-an i-pien}, comp. Liao-ning sheng tang-an-kuan, Liao-ning she-hui k’o-hsüeh yüan, Li-shih yen-chiu-so, Shen-yang Ku-kung po-wu-yüan (Shen-yang: Liao-shen shu she, 1984), which presents translations of 178 archival materials from the San-hsing Deputy Lieutenant-General’s office, dated 1741 to 1906.

with Mongolian noble lineages did not observe the distinction between the Mongolian Eight Banners (generally those living in the Northeast who were incorporated into the banners before the Ch'ing conquest of China) and the confederated Mongols (generally those inhabiting Mongolia and experiencing progressive suppression, conquest, or co-optation during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries) that other state policies enforced. Confederated Mongols like [Borjigit] Tsereng (d. 1750), the Khalkha noble who married the K’ang-hsi emperor’s fourth daughter, performed exceptional military services for the dynasty in the Central Asian campaigns. Frequently, Mongols of the Eight Banners produced prominent bureaucratic lineages. A good example was the statesman [Alute] Saišangga (d. 1875), who had among his lesser achievements the compilation of the Manchu regulations of the Court of Colonial Affairs. He was the father of the statesman Ch’ung-ch’i (1829–1900), who was himself the father of the empress of the T’ung-chih emperor.\(^{40}\)

Even as the Ch’ing dynasty worked to preserve the prestige of Mongol culture and achievement with which it identified itself, it undermined the economic and political autonomy of the Mongol confederacies. The earliest, and what remained the primary, instrument for Ch’ing control of the Mongol confederacies was the Court of Colonial Affairs (literally, “the department for the governance of outlying provinces,” *tulergi golo be dasara jurgan, li-fan yüan*).\(^{41}\) Like other organs for the management of borders, the Court of Colonial Affairs did not use Chinese as its primary language of business. Its ancestor had been the Mongolian Bureau (*monggo yamun [monggo i jurgan], meng-ku ya-men*), which after 1638 became the Court of Colonial Affairs and expanded its jurisdiction to Turkic, Tibetan, and in some cases, Russian matters. Its president was by law a Manchu or Mongol.\(^{42}\) Since this agency handled negotiations with Russia as

\(^{40}\) Ch’ung-ch’i was a *chuang-yüan* in the 1865 *chin-shih* examinations and a Ch’ing official. His biography is in *ECCP*, pp. 208–9.


\(^{42}\) The Harvard-Yenching collection includes the regulations in Manchu (as mentioned above, compiled by Saišangga) governing the Court of Colonial Affairs. For a discussion of
well as with the Outer Mongol tribes, diplomatic communications and the major treaties with the Romanov empire were primarily in Manchu. The "Translators' Bureaus" (ssu-i kuan), once the main channels for ritual and tributary communications, retained a symbolic and curatorial role in the Ch'ing period. Yet even in tributary relations of the sort formerly dominated by the Translator's Bureaus, ritual communications could take place in Manchu: The Harvard-Yenching materials contain a Manchu memorial from a Ryūkyūan king, who stood high among the vassals the Ch'ing dynasty had inherited from its predecessor.

The potential for Manchu and Mongolian documents to alter our view of Ch'ing relations with the peoples of Inner Asia is great. Two authors working in Manchu, [Yehe Ayan Gioro] Tulišen (1667–1740) and Sungyun (1752–1835), provided seminal works on border and littoral affairs. Tulišen's Lakcaha jecn de takūrahabe ejehe bithe, I-yū lu, a report of his embassy to the Turguts from 1712 to 1715, is an outstanding geographical and ethnographical source of the time.

Sungyun, a Kharchin Mongol and official of the Court of

the history of this compilation, and identification of the items in the manuscript of ca. 1756 that were omitted in the printed versions, see Chao Yün-t'ien 走雲田, "Kuan yū Ch'ien-lung ch'ao Nei-fu ch'ao pen 'Li-fan yūan tse-li'," Hsi-peii shih ti 2 (1988): 122–25.

33 See also Tatiana A. Pang, "A Historical Sketch of the Study and Teaching of the Manchu Language in Russia (First part: Up to 1920)," CAJ 35.1–2 (1991): 123–37, and A. Liubimov, "Nekotorye man'sčursk'e dokumenty iz istorii russko-kitajskii snoshenii v XVII-


34 Although the ssu-i kuan were small and politically insignificant under the Ch'ing, their symbolic significance persisted throughout the entire later imperial period. There are many studies, but for unsurpassed primary information see Paul Pelliot, "Le Sseu-yi-kouan et le Houei-t'ong-kouan" in "Le Hoja et le Sayyid Husain de l'Histoire des Ming," TP 38 (1948): 2–5, Appendix III:207–90, and for a more recent interpretation see Pamela K. Crossley, "Structure and Symbol in the Ming-Ch'ing Translator's Bureaus (ssu-i kuan)," Central and Inner Asian Studies 5 (1991): 38–70.


36 Tulišen's Manchu manuscript was translated and then printed simultaneously in Manchu and Chinese, in two chüan each, in 1723. In 1781 the work was entered into the Four Treasuries, and in 1839 an inferior private printing was completed. Imanishi Shun'ju, in 1964, published a corrected and annotated version, Kochu I-yū lu 校注異域錄 (Tenri: Tenri daigaku oyasato kenkyūjo, 1964). The definitive modern published version of the text is now Chuang Chi-fa 莊吉發, ed., Man Han I-yū lu hsiao-chu (Taipei: Wen shih che ch'ü-pan-shê, 1983). Tulišen's work is the best representative of a series of travel writings in Manchu, which also included works by his predecessor Umuna and his successors Funingga and Bališen.
Colonial Affairs, had written extensively on Tibet and Mongolia before turning his attention to the banner communities of Urga. His notes on banner life there, *Emu tanggū orin sakda-i gisun sarkiyan*, probably first appeared in manuscript in 1791. The work is a didactic response to social problems within the garrison communities and consists of homilies and uplifting moral tales, mostly drawn from Chinese history. It is reasonable to assume that Sungyun hoped to find sponsorship for publication of the work from the Ch‘ien-lung court; but either the manuscript appeared too late in the reign to garner much active attention from Hung-li, or its attempt to cast Chinese moral models in Manchu did not sit well with the court. In any case, the work was neglected by the Chia-ch‘ing court and depended on private circulation. It is now a curiosity of its genre.47

Plentiful archival opportunities for the enhancing of our view of border history remain. When the affairs of independent Mongols threatened the stability of the empire, Manchu-language documents spilled outside the Court of Colonial Affairs and into the higher decision-making bodies, as is clear from recent Chinese translations of selected materials on the Turguts from the period

---

47 The manuscript appeared with two prefaces, the last dated 1791, by Sungyun’s friend Furentai, who was evidently responsible for ordering the chapters and giving the work its present form. In 1809, another of Sungyun’s associates, Fugiyūn, translated the work into Chinese. *Emu tanggū orin sakda-i gisun sarkiyan* (hereafter *Emu tanggū orin*) has been well examined by modern scholars. See Inaba Iwakichi’s 稲葉岩吉 “Shohon Hyakuni rōjin goroku oyobi sono chosha,” in Hattori sensei koki shukuga kinen rombunshū, comp. Hattori Sensei Koki Shukuga Kinen Ronbunshū Kankokai (Fuzanbō, 1936), pp. 121–37, a → Richard C. Rudolph’s description and selection of passages (“Emu tanggū orin sakda-i gisun sarkiyan, An Unedited Manchu Manuscript,” *JAOS* 60 (1940): 554–63. It has also been the subject of short works by Ura Ren‘ichi and Itō Tato, Martin Gimm, Ch‘oe Hak-kun, and Kanda Nobuo, who has done three short pieces, the most extensive of which is now printed as front matter to the Chinese Materials Center edition of *Emu tanggū orin*. The printed work in its entirety is now available in two editions, both of which are based upon a manuscript at the University of Chicago: *Emu tanggū orin sakda-i gisun sarkiyan* (Taipei: Chinese Materials Center, 1982) is a photoreprint without correction, transliteration, or annotation, but with an annotated introductory essay by Kanda Nobuo. *Emu tanggū orin sakda-i gisun sarkiyan, Erzählungen der 120 Alten, Beiträge zur mandschurischen Kulturgeschichte* (Wiesbaden: Kommissionsverlag Otto Harrassowitz, 1983) is a correction, translation, and annotation of the work, with introduction and extensive bibliography, by Giovanni Stary. On Sungyun see also *ECCP*, pp. 691–92; Walther Heissig, “Some Notes by Sung-yün on the Administration of Tibet,” *OE* 9.1 (1962): 85–89; Chi Ta-ch‘ün 紀大椿, “Lun Sung-yün,” *Min-tsu yen-chiu* 3 (1988): 71–79; and Giovanni Stary, *Emu tanggū orin sakda-i gisun sarkiyan*, pp. 1–2.
between 1771 and 1775.48 Manchu-language Grand Council documents in the First Historical Archives in Peking should illuminate Ch’ing relations with the Uighurs and Tibet during the eighteenth century, and inform studies of the nineteenth-century Ch’ing administration in Sinkiang.49

In short, Manchu-language documents will be particularly vital for scholars seeking to analyze the Ch’ing polity at its highest level, that is, the conquest elite, consisting of the imperial clan and banner nobility. Documents in Manchu and Mongolian are also important sources for historians analyzing banner administration, the military campaigns that created China’s largest territorial empire, the history of Ch’ing foreign relations with imperial Russia, Ch’ing incorporation of the Mongol tribes, and Ch’ing management of China’s northern and northwestern frontiers.

MANCHU EDUCATION, PRIMERS, AND LEXICONS

Manchu, Mongolian, and Chinese were all indispensable official languages, but it was not until the late eighteenth century that the court developed a cultural policy mandating that Manchus should express themselves in Manchu, Mongols in Mongolian, and Chinese in Chinese. In the areas not controlled by state policy, Mongols and Manchus learned Chinese as a convenience and a necessity. This does not necessarily mean that reading and writing in Manchu was proportionately abandoned. Professional and recreational literature in Manchu continued to be created. The history of pedagogical writing with respect to Manchu is a direct window on the involvement of bannermen and civilians, intellectuals and scribes, Ch’ing subjects and foreigners, in creating and sustaining a field of Manchu literacy.

The early state was inconsistent in its requirements for formal education of bannermen. Prior to the promulgation of a comprehensive educational plan in 1687, the government encouraged bannermen to develop literacy in Chinese, and sporadically rewarded those who had skills in documentary Manchu. This plan envisioned

that bannermen would be accomplished in Manchu and Chinese, military skills, and literary arts. This ideal continued to inform policy until the late eighteenth century, when the Ch’ien-lung emperor, displeased by the shallowness of banner education in both Manchu and Chinese, insisted that banner education emphasize Manchu language and military skills. Particularization of banner identity thereafter led to the banner schools becoming a source for the specialized military academies, language schools, and technical institutes of the nineteenth century.

The late eighteenth century should be noted as the threshold of a consolidated Manchu-Mongol "banner" identity, after which those identified as the Chinese-martial (han-chūn) population within the banners were gradually marginalized. Here again one should keep in mind that the the Mongolian cultural legacy was of central importance to the court. Manchu princes learned Mongolian from Mongol tutors in the Shang-shu fang 上書房, or palace school, and the court continued to educate Mongol bannermen, even as it attempted to co-opt or decapitate the traditional leadership hierarchies of the steppe. Indeed, from the eighteenth century on, the Ch’ing effort to educate bannermen in Mongolian at the banner schools and to disseminate Mongolian translations of important works in other languages stimulated the production of Mongolian grammars


and dictionaries critical to the standardization of the Mongolian language.\textsuperscript{53}

Just as Manchu orthography was the creation of the Ch’ing state, so was the notion of a standard Manchu language. Dialectal variations were prominent among the individuals incorporated into the Manchu banners, and a good number undoubtedly felt more comfortable in Chinese or Mongolian than in Manchu. Even among those who spoke something close to the new standard, literacy was rare. Moreover, the approved lexicon changed during the Ch’ien-lung reign, when many earlier Manchu loanwords from Chinese were replaced by “purer” Manchu equivalents. The language purification was a systematic acceleration (through pedagogical publications) of a process that had been evident since the creation of the Manchu script.\textsuperscript{54} Some colloquial changes had little political significance, but there was also a tendency to find patently Manchu words for the instruments and concepts of state. The earlier loanword for “memorial” (\textit{jedz} — from \textit{che tzu} 摺子) became \textit{bukdari}. The designation for “capital city,” \textit{ging hecen}, was replaced in later texts by the term \textit{gemun hecen} — the “central” or “universal” city.\textsuperscript{55} And the bureaucracy, which in its early form had been composed of “yamens” (\textit{yamun}), was reformed into \textit{jurgan} (from a word for line, row, pattern, rectitude, duty).\textsuperscript{56} At the same time, Manchu terms

\textsuperscript{53} As examples one might cite the Manchu-Mongol primer, \textit{Meng-ku hua-pen} (1761), the \textit{Meng-ku wen-chien} (redacted from the \textit{Ch’ing-wen chien} 清文鑑 of 1708) and, to demonstrate the persistence of this concern, the \textit{Manju Monggo nikan ilan acangga su-i tacibure hacin-i bithe}, comp. Chiang Wei-ch’iao 蒋維喬, Chhuang Yü 莊俞, and Jung-te 榮德, preface by Hsi-liang 錫良 (1909). See also Lù Ming-hui 盧明輝, “Ch’ing-tai pei-fang ko-min-tsü yü chung-yüan Hansu ti wen-hua chiao-liu chi ch’i kung-hsien,” \textit{Ch’ing-shih yen-chiu-chi} 6 (1988): 125.

\textsuperscript{54} As an illustration see the 1624 passage, in Manchu, from the China First Historical Archives, Peking, Manchu archives (\textit{Shih kung tang} no. 1, pp. 48b–49a). This passage demands a systematic translation of military ranks from borrowed Chinese terms to Manchu, and condemns as criminal all those who continued to use borrowed Chinese terms for instruments of state. For seventeenth-century changes in vocabulary see anecdotal evidence in Ch’en Chieh-hsien, “The Value of The Early Manchu Archives,” esp. p. 75. The Ch’ien-lung emperor also pronounced on the proper way to transliterate Manchu and Mongol personal and place names into Chinese. He personally made suggestions on how to select Manchu designations for Chinese place names that were homophones: see T’ung Yung-kung 佟永功, “Ch’ien-lung huang-ti yü Man-yü t-i-ming,” \textit{Ti-ming ts’ung-k’an} 6 (1967): 33–34.

\textsuperscript{55} The authors thank Jerry Norman for suggesting these and other examples of vocabulary changes.

MANCHU SOURCES FOR CH'ING HISTORY 83

were incorporated into common bureaucratic diction; for example, the Manchu term *hetu* ("horizontal") was the source for the Chinese term *hei-t’u* 黑圖 for memorials used to manage Shen-yang affairs. On one level these changes are cultural traces of the strong bureaucratic position of the Manchu elite through the early and middle Ch’ing period. On another they are emblematic of the ideological mood of the Ch’ien-lung court. The court attempted to encourage and enforce education in the purified language standard. Pedagogical materials generated under the court imprimatur also tended to undergo private reproduction and modification, sometimes keeping their titles while altering the text. The originals from which home study guides were derived may be found in many archives, and the most prominent should be identified here. Of special interest is Ortai’s guide to the reading of Old Manchu, *Tongki fuka akū hergen-i bithe* (1741), for those who were literate in Manchu but mystified by the unvocalized script. For readers not yet prepared for such esoteric study, the K’ang-hsi emperor’s authorized glossary, published in 1708 as *Han i araha manju gisun i buleku bithe, Yü-chih Ch’ing-wen chien*, remained the model; this text was revised and much elaborated in *Han i araha nonggime toktobuha manju gisun i buleku bithe, Yü-chih tseng-ting Ch’ing-wen chien* (1772). One of the most commonly used texts was the *Cing wen ki meng bithe, Ch’ing-wen ch’i-meng* (1729), attributed to Shou Ping. The *Ch’ing-wen hui-shu, Manju isabuha bithe* was completed in 1750 by Li Yen-chi. [Aisin Gioro] I-hsing’s *Manju gisun be niyeceme isabuha bithe (Ch’ing-wen pu-hui)*, first published in 1786, was revised and reissued by his son-in-law Fakjingge in 1802.

During the eighteenth century, Manchu, and to a lesser extent Mongolian, were skills acquired by many civilian officials and literati. All degree candidates could participate in the Manchu and

57 The same archive was in Manchu referred to as *heturi dangse*, meaning “ordinary or private communications.” See also Sheng-ching *hsing-pu yüan-tang*, p. 1; Bartlett, “Books of Revelations,” p. 31.

Mongolian essay portions of the examinations if they made a special petition; after 1661 bannermen and a few civilians could compete for a ‘‘translator’s’’ (ubaliyambume, fan-i) degree at the chin-shih level, and after 1722 candidates could sit for the ‘‘translator’s’’ examinations at the chü-jen and hsiu-ts'ai levels.59 For the Chinese-martial bannermen and bondservants of Chinese descent, of course, Manchu was regarded as a normal accomplishment. Fan Ch’engmo (1624–76) was an expert,60 and Sun Wen-ch’eng (fl. 1706–28)61 perhaps remains one of the best exemplars of the highly cultivated Chinese-martial bannerman with magisterial command of the Manchu language. Sun’s education in the language may be assumed to have resembled that of his maternal relatives Li Hsu (1655–1729) and Ts’ai ao Yin (1658–1712).

For civilians, too, Manchu and Mongolian were desired features of professional training. Selected civilian chin-shih recipients were assigned to begin study of Manchu at the Hanlin Academy and were normally examined in the language three years later. In form these assignments appear to have been conscriptions, but in substance they may have been opportunities for civilians who were personally interested in Manchu or its advantages.62 Failure to pass the comprehensive examination in Manchu after three years of study could result—as it did in 1742 for Yüan Mei (1716–98)—in expulsion from the Hanlin. In addition to those Chinese officials already mentioned there is evidence that many, if not a majority,63 of the high-ranking bureaucrats of the late seventeenth through early nine-

59 A small collection of original examination essays is part of the Han Yü-shan collection at UCLA. Of the numerous preparation books for the “translation” examinations, one excellent example is now at Wolfenbüttel (Ubaliyambume simnehe timu bithe, Herzog August Bibliothek, Codex. Guelph. 117.1 extravagantes); see also the essay by H. L. von Gabelentz in Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgen Ländischen Gesellschaft No. 16, pp. 184, 542–32.

60 His collected Manchu memorials were published in 1708; a copy, titled Tondo unenggi Fan Gung ni wen ji bithe (Chung-chen Fan Gung wen-chi 忠貞范公文集) is now item 118 in the oriental manuscripts of Bibliothèque Nationale.


63 See, for example, the biographies of Li Kuang-ti (1642–1718); Ch’en Meng-lei (1651–1723?), whose Manchu examination paper is preserved in the Han Yü-shan collection; Ch’ien Wei-ch’eng (1720–72); Yü Min-chung (1714–80); Yen Ch’ang-ming (1713–87); Chao I (1727–1814); and Kuo Shang-hsien (1785–1833) in ECCP.
teenth centuries had at least some training in Manchu. Prominent civilian literati who became adept in Manchu or Mongolian primarily for the purposes of philological or historical inquiry included Kung Kung-hsiang (also known as Kung Ch’eng, b. 1817, a son of Kung Tzu-chen) and Liang Chi (father of Liang Shou-ming).

In the aggregate, the pedagogical materials extant in archival collections indicate several interconnected cultural changes in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Prior to the early eighteenth century, court-sponsored pedagogical and lexicographical materials had tended to be designed for Manchu speakers (presumably banner-men being trained for bureaucratic service) seeking to learn Chinese. Materials for Chinese speakers of any identity seeking to learn Manchu had been produced primarily by Chinese or Chinese-martial scholars. Among the forerunners of those making outstanding contributions in the mid-eighteenth century in this critical area were Li Yen-chi and Shen Ch’i-liang, who represent a group of civilian intellectuals working intimately with Manchu.

Shen Ch’i-liang, unlike many members of the bureaucratic elite who were assigned to the Hanlin Academy, was not designated to study Manchu. He claims in the introduction to one of his works that he had a great curiosity about Manchu since he was a boy, and this curiosity alone appears to have been the driving force in his Manchu studies. The son of a colonel of the Green Standard armies who was killed fighting the forces of Cheng Ch’eng-kung (then harrowing the coasts of Fukien in attempts to resist the Ch’ing conquest of South China), Ch’i-liang underwent an apparently cursory military education and served in the armies fighting the forces of Keng Ching-chung in Fukien from 1674 to 1676. He received a dispensation to return to Peking to care for his sick and widowed mother, after which he began his higher education and his study of Manchu. Out of these studies came Shen’s first known work, Manju bitheijy nan, Ch’ing-shu chih-nan, which, among its other virtues, includes the texts of early Manchu lesson books (Juwan juwe uju and Dehi uju) that would otherwise be extremely rare, if not lost.64

64 In “Shen Ch’i-liang and his Works on the Manchu Language” (in Ch’en Chieh-hsien and Sechin Jagchid, eds., Proceedings of the Third East Asian Altaistic Conference), Kanda Nobuo has noted the differences between Shen’s Juwan juwe uju and other known editions. Kanda cites the 1670 text by Liao Lun-chi, but other texts are to be found, for instance as items 271
also completed an important revision of *Manju nikan minggan hergen i bithe*, *Man Han ch’ien-tse wen* that contributed to the development of a genre of pedagogical texts. His compilation of the *Dayicing Gurun i yooni bithe*, (Ta Ch’ing ch’üan-shu) was the earliest known privately-compiled Manchu-Chinese lexicon. Its order and contents anticipate the *Ch’ing-wen tsung-hui*, a Kuang-hsü period text produced by the brothers [Aisin Gioro] Chih-k’uan and P’ei-k’uan, which became one of the best known reference works for modern students of Manchu and a seminal source for western lexicographers.

The prefaces of the *Ch’ing-wen tsung-hui* note that it subsumes two earlier works, *Ch’ing-wen hui-shu* and *Ch’ing-wen pu-hui*. The latter is by Li Yen-chi, who was possibly a bondservant, perhaps a commoner, in the private employ of Yin-ssu, Prince Lien (1681–1726). Li resided in the imperial city, very close to—perhaps on the grounds of—Yin-ssu’s mansion, and records indicate that a stipend riot by bannermen in 1725 resulted in the vandalizing of both

and 273 in the oriental manuscripts of the Bibliothèque Nationale. These are inscribed as having been produced, at unknown date, “pour Monsieur de Fourmont” by Père Jean Domenge. The latter was also the author of a fragmentary Manchu grammar, based upon liberal borrowings from the *Ch’ing-wen ch’i-meng* 清文啓蒙 and Shen’s own *Ch’ing-shu chih-nan* 清書指南, which by a tortuous route found its way to Bibliothèque Nationale. The title *Juwan juwe uju* was a generic title for Manchu syllabaries and derived from the first tabulary rendition of the adapted Mongol syllabary of Dagai. It is possible that Domenge (who used the Chinese name Meng Cheng-ch’i 孟正氣) adopted the title *Juwan juwe uju* from Shen’s model text or even from Shen’s own work, and then recast his text to satisfy his own purposes. Alternatively, either Shen or Domenge may also have been working with a handbook, of the sort we have described above. *Dehi uju* is not known to have survived outside of Shen’s rendition of the text. Shen also compiled a bilingual *Ch’ien-tzu wen* 千字文 and a very rare Manchu version of the *Pai chia hsiing*, of which the only known copy is in the Vatican archives. (see Stary, *Opere mancese* p. 48, item 50).


The *Ta Ch’ing ch’üan-shu* 大清全書 is something of an enigma. Editions of the work now extant in Europe have been studied and commented upon by Walter Fuchs, Imanishi Shunju, and Kanda Nobuo, who suggest that it was modeled on an earlier, but lost, lexicon. Whatever its ancestry, the word order and the glosses of the *Ta Ch’ing ch’üan-shu* exactly anticipate those of the entries in *Ch’ing-wen tsung-hui* 清文總彙. A manuscript of Shen’s 1683 edition of *Ta Ch’ing ch’üan-shu*, now in the Gest Oriental Library, contains hand emendations that predict those of the *Ch’ing-wen tsung-hui*, and we suggest that it may be either the prelude to a draft of the later work, or a home edition with hand insertions taken from the *Ch’ing-wen tsung-hui*. 
residences. We do not know when Li compiled Manju gisun-i isabuha bithe, Ch’ing-wen hui-shu, a dictionary that was repeatedly reproduced during the eighteenth century and is widely available in Manchu-language collections. When it was republished by Fakjingge in 1802, it was accompanied by a supplement, Manju gisun be niyeceme isabuha bithe, Ch’ing-wen pu-hui, by [Aisin Gioro] I-hsing. Thus in the Kuang-hsü period, after an interval of well over a century, Li Yen-chi’s work on the Manchu language, having been preserved and enhanced by the Manchu aristocrat I-hsing, was married by the Manchu aristocrats Chih-k’uan and P’ei-k’uan to Shen Ch’i-liang’s work on the Manchu language. By that time, the concerns of nineteenth-century Manchus had come to resemble, to some degree, those of earlier, humbler Chinese: pressed to learn written Manchu, sinophone Manchus had to rely upon the primers, lexicons, and bilingual texts produced by the generation of Shen Ch’i-liang and Li Yen-chi. This was a species of knowledge that was very intimate to the policies and ideology of the court, and its heterocultural origin was characteristic of the Ch’ing imperial process.

EUROPEANS AND MANCHU STUDIES

Europeans received mixed signals from the court, being first welcomed as students of Manchu, then banned from study of the language. This is to be loosely connected with the maturation of Jesuit influence at the K’ang-hsi court after 1689 (the year Jesuits were licensed to begin study of Manchu) and its decay under the Ch’ien-lung emperor. Père Jean-Jacques Marie Amyot (or Amiot, 1718–94) is perhaps an exemplar of the significance of Manchu scholarship to eighteenth-century Europeans. Amyot reached China in 1750 and then lived in Peking until his death. Manchu was his primary means of communicating with the court, and he has left several important (if flawed) works for the study of eighteenth-century court culture. Among them were a rendition of the “Ode to Mukden,” which will be discussed below, an untitled transcription of a shamanic prayer that Amyot heard offered during the Chin-ch’uan wars,67 and at least two dictionaries. Amyot’s work was a

67 Item 285 in Bibliotheque Nationale, département des manuscrits, division des
stimulus to later research by J-P Abel-Rémusat (1788–1832) and Heinrich-Julius von (or Henri-Jules de) Klaproth (1783–1835); thus it not only helped form the corpus of Western (including Russian) scholarship on Asia but also was an indispensable part of the process by which much European knowledge about China was filtered through the Manchu language.

Long before Amyot’s arrival at Peking, Manchu was the primary medium between the court and the West for philosophical exchange and scientific instruction. Jesuits at the Ch’ing court used Manchu to converse with the emperors. Manchu was not only used in astronomical and mathematical instruction, as has been widely recognized, but also for teaching anatomy, as indicated by a rather enigmatic text, annotated in Manchu with no Chinese translation. This text is a window both into early Chinese exposure to Western medical ideas and the quality and origins of those ideas themselves. Manchu was also the linguistic medium for some diplomatic intercourse, particularly with Russia (an exchange in which Jesuits and other religions played a role). For the Jesuits knowledge of

manuscrits orientaux, titled, “Hymne mandchou chanté à l’occasion de la conquête du Kin-tch’ouan.”

68 This included Jesuit missionary work. Many seventeenth- and eighteenth-century works for religious instruction survive. See items 234–270 in Puyraimond, Catalogue du fonds Mandchou, pp. 114–27, and Stary, Opere Mancesi in Italia e in Vaticano, p. 16, item 2; p. 42, item 41; p. 50, item 53; p. 52, item 55; p. 53, items 56–57; p. 62, items 66–67; p. 63, items 68–69; p. 64, items 71–72. The first source of a Christian scripture in Manchu was a translation of Matteo Ricci’s T’ien-chu shih-i (original colophon 1601), undated but possibly completed before 1689, when the tuition of Jesuits in Manchu was authorized.

69 At least two complete copies of the work are extant, one in the National Palace Archives in Taiwan and one at Bibliothèque Nationale. The former has been published in photofac-simile by John B. de C. M. Saunders and Francis R. Lee as The Manchu Anatomy and its Historical Origin, with Annotations and Translations (Taipei: Li Ming Cultural Enterprise Co., 1981). On the basis of the observations of Joachim Bouvet and the internal evidence of the manuscript, the editors hypothesize that the work was prompted by the K’ang-hsi emperor’s contraction of malaria in 1692 and his consequent desire for an illustrated text that would permit him to understand both the physiological mechanisms of his disease and the effects of the medication (quinine) administered by Gerbillon and Pereira. On the Western provenance of its contents see also Marie-Rose Seguy’s introduction to Puyraimond, Catalogue de fonds Mandchou, p. 6.

70 Prior to 1860 Russian communications were handled by the Li-fan yüan, in whose archives (now part of the First at Peking) rest the Treaties of Nerchinsk and Kialkhta, among others. Of the languages used in these redactions—Chinese, Latin, Manchu, Russian, and Mongolian—Manchu was most likely to be intelligible at both ends of the negotiations.
Manchu opened the door to knowledge of the court’s shamanic rituals, which had been well concealed from unauthorized Chinese perusal. The religious interest of the Jesuits may have contributed to increasing Ch’ien-lung court suspicion of their presence and their motives; certainly curiosity of the sort exhibited by Amyot was not welcome. Later foreigners continued to exploit the grasp that Manchu offered of official communications in China, and by the early nineteenth century Protestant missionaries began to use Manchu to proselytize among the bannermen. The Chia-ch’ing emperor was alarmed that knowledge of Manchu was spreading among Europeans, and in 1805, during a series of anti-Christian proclamations, he prohibited the teaching of Manchu to foreigners. Despite the prohibition, foreigners continued to study Manchu, and now any history of the development of Western scholarship on Asia must grant that knowledge of Manchu and curatorship of Manchu materials were prominent. Seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Jesuits, who continually sent Manchu materials out of Peking, helped create the core of what are now the oriental manuscript collections in France and Italy. Similarly, late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century traders from Britain and the German territories created their respective collections. By the early nineteenth century, the great Chinese classics had all been translated into Manchu. Most of them were available in bilingual editions, and Europeans used Manchu as a bridge for the study of classical Chinese.

The first Manchu-Latin grammar was sent to France by Père Gerbillon and printed in 1696. A grammar (Grammaire tartare-mandchou,

71 Partial translations of New Testament passages into Manchu, some of which are associated with Protestant proselytizing via Siberia and later via the treaty ports, have been noted in Gimm, "Zur den mandjurischen Sammlungen der Sowjetunion, I." See also Boettcher, "In Search of Manchu Bibliography," pp. 74-81; Erling von Mende, "Einige Bemerkungen zu den Druckausgaben des mandjurischen Neuen Testaments," OE 19.1-2 (1972): 215-21; and the untitled fragment ("Abhandlung in Mandchusche Sprache") now in Wolfenbüttel (Herzog August Bibliothek. Codex Guelph 62.2 extravagantes). A complete new testament (Musei ejen isus heristos-i tutabuha ice hese)—a joint British-Russian enterprise—was not produced until 1835. Matsumura notes six copies of the S.V. Lipovcov translation (published in St. Petersburg, 1835) in the Library of Congress; see B-a12-B-a17. The same collection also includes two copies of a Lipovcov New Testament (Ice hese), published in Shanghai in 1929 (B-a18, B-a19).

72 On the xylographic background to these developments see also the important discussion and documentation in Boettcher, "In Search of Manchu Bibliography," pp. 68-81.
1787) and Manchu-French dictionary (Dictionnaire tartare-mandchou français, 1789–90), both of which may have been based on the Gerbillon work, were written by Amyot. The first known Russian grammar of Manchu was Illarion Kalinivč Rossochin’s translation of Ch’ing-wen ch’i-meng, also the first foreign adaptation of the primer. An unpublished but circulated Manchu-Russian lexicon was written by Feodor Baksheyev before 1787, and a grammar was completed in 1804 by Anton Vladykin. H. Conon de la Gabelenz [von Gabelentz] contributed Elémens de la grammaire mandchoue in 1832, and Mandschu-deutches Wörterbuch in 1864. The first work in English appears to have been Thomas Taylor Meadows’s chrestomathy, Translations from the Manchu (Canton, 1849). Like many of the Chinese pedagogical materials upon which it was patterned it has the great virtue of preserving archival materials that would otherwise be lost. In 1855 Alexander Wylie translated the popular primer Ch’ing-wen ch’i-meng into English as Ts’ing Wan K’e Mung.

THE MANCHU LANGUAGE AND CH’ING CULTURE

Neither Shen Ch’i-liang nor Li Yen-chi occupied official positions, but they exemplified a fundamental characteristic of eigh-

73 Amyot also included an abridged Manchu-French lexicon in his Mémoires concernant l’histoire des Chinois.
74 Pang, “A Historical Sketch of the Study and Teaching,” pp. 124–25. The date of Rossochin’s translation is uncertain, but probably was before 1750.
76 Man’djurskaya grammatika o pol’zu rossiiskago yunosestva socinennaia Antonom Vladykinim, now item 277 in Bibliothèque Nationale, whose copy has an interlinear hand-written translation into German by J. Klaproth.
77 For historians, the difference between a chrestomathy and a primer is fundamental. Primers are composed of sentences, frequently made up, to allow students to absorb fundamentals of the language. Chrestomathies are readers that are frequently composed of authentic materials. In some cases, as in those compiled by Westerners, the documents used in chrestomathies were acquired from archives and are the only remaining traces of the materials reproduced. For an overview and preliminary bibliography of Manchu chrestomathies in particular see Hartmut Walravens, “Mandjurische Chrestomathien, Eine Bibliographische übersicht,” in Michael Weiers and Giovanni Stary, eds., Florilegia Manjurica: In Memoriam Walter Fuchs (Wiesbaden: Komissionsverlag Otto Harrassowitz, 1982), pp. 87–105.
teenth- and nineteenth-century literati life: familiarity with (which is not to say expertise in) Manchu. Beyond the extensive official literature in Manchu, its function as an emblem of universal imperial power made Manchu writing visually ubiquitous, as the multilingual placards and stelae found in Peking attest. Bilingual texts provide opportunities for studying not only the differences in concepts and expression between the two languages, but also the actual pronunciations of Chinese and Manchu in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, since many of the glosses provide extensive phonetic clues. Above all, the archival holdings of Manchu documents attest to two truths of state and society: first is the degree to which the dynasty invested its legitimacy in the generation of a reflexive historical, genealogical, ritual, and romantic literature in Manchu; second is the degree to which a segment of the Ch’ing readership exerted itself beyond what the state required to sustain a bilingual literary milieu for its own inspiration and amusement.

Having created in the seventeenth century a literary language with no corpus, the Ch’ing court energetically sponsored the production of texts in Manchu. Though the original works are not extant, the Hsing-pu hui-tien, Ssu-shu, San-lüeh, Meng-tzu, San-kuo chih, T’ung-chien kang-mu, and Ta ch’eng-ching were probably all translated into Manchu during the Hung Taiji regime. The best-known title of Hung Taiji’s translation project was the Chin-shih, the history of the Jurchen Chin dynasty from whom Nurgaci had claimed legitimacy. Later, the examination system shaped the field of emerging Manchu works. The curriculum for the Manchu and fan-i examinations, which were modified to cover the same territory as the civilian examinations, was comprised of the Four Books, Five Classics (Wu ching), Principles of Nature (Hsing-li ching-i 性理精義), Comprehensive Mirror ([Tzu-chih] T’ung-chien), Thirteen Classics (Shih-san ching), and Twenty-one Histories (Erh-shih i shih), all of

---

78 Sun Wen-liang 孫文良 and Li Chih-t’ing 李治亭, Ch’ing T’ai-tsung ch’üan-chuan (Ch’ang-ch’un: Chi-lin wen-shih ch’u-pan-she, 1985), p. 310.

79 Though Hung Taiji is well-known to have commented particularly upon the Chin history, Aisin guran-i suduri, the translation was originally commissioned together with those of the Liao (Dailiyo guran-i suduri) and Yuan (Dai Yuwan guran-i suduri) histories. The value of translating the histories was noted by Nurgaci, but it was Hung Taiji who appointed the translation staff—probably [Hešeri] Kife, Jamba, Cabuhai, and Wang Wen-kuei—who undertook the projects. The finished works seem to have been presented to the court in 1646.
which could be studied in either Manchu or Chinese.\textsuperscript{80}

The ideological program calling for the translation of edifying works into Manchu created some professional specialization as well as some political debate among early Manchu literati. [Wanggiya] Asitan (d. 1683?), for instance, distinguished himself as one of the bakši, or literate men, of the second Hung Taiji reign. He gained the Manchu chin-shih in 1651 (the second time those examinations were administered), after he had actually risen to high rank in the central bureaucracy. Shortly after taking his degree he contributed Manchu translations of Chung-yung, T’ai-kung chia-chiao, and P’an Jung’s T’ung-chien ts’ung-lun. In 1652 he memorialized the court against the translation of Chinese novels into Manchu, on the grounds that such literature was frivolous and subversive. It should be noted that the primary translator of novels was [Usu] Kicungge, who had just been put to death with another outstanding Manchu scholar and translator, [Suwan Gūwalgiya] Garin, because of his support for the deposed Dorgon clique.\textsuperscript{81} Although both Nurgaci and Hung Taiji had encouraged, if not demanded, the translation of at least some Chinese fiction into Manchu, the Shun-chih court ratified Asitan’s petition that Chinese fiction be suppressed. Asitan’s son Hesu (1652-1718), who was later a tutor to the sons of the K’anghsi emperor and was himself a brilliant translator, strictly limited his labors to poetry and to ideological and edifying literature. The moment in which Kicungge and Garin were swept aside in favor of Asitan and Hesu marks the maturing Chi’ing awareness of the power of translated, modified, and adapted concepts, and the court’s enduring determination to control as much as possible the intercourse between the Chinese and Manchu languages.

The court’s policy kept Manchu orthography and the formal Manchu corpus in some tension with Manchu’s survival as a living language and the generation of informal literature in Manchu. Collections of Manchu materials unambiguously show that production

\textsuperscript{80} See Ch’ing-shih kao, p. 3101. The court had established separate offices within the Hanlin Academy for the revision, annotation, and writing of commentaries on T’ung-chien (T’ung-chien kuan), the Hsiao-ching (Hsiao-ching kuan) and all other major works in the examination curriculum. See Bartlett, “History as Mirror” p. 4, 16 n. 7.

\textsuperscript{81} See ECCP, pp. 13–14; on Kicungge see Man-chou ming ch’en chuan 1.8a–10a; on Garin see ibid., 1.33b–35b.
and consumption were not confined to obligatory reading or limited without exception to what the state approved. Readers of Manchu sought—and when they could not acquire it, produced—recreational reading, exerting themselves to sow a Manchu or bilingual literary field of their own. The collections of this woodblock literature now extant do not always give a very clear picture of their provenance. A large number of the translations and bilingual editions either originated at or were reprinted at one of the printing establishments clustered in the general vicinity of the Lung-fu Temple, slightly to the west of the intensely commercial Tung Ssu P’ai-lou district in Peking. Many of these printing houses had links with the imperial printing enterprises, and it is impossible to disprove imperial encouragement in the genesis of this literature. But whether the selections were chosen by the printers themselves or were commissioned by prospective readers or merchants, they clearly resulted from a substantial and continuing commerce in recreational literature in Manchu that remained strong through the mid-nineteenth century. The most obvious market for these books was the small but influential class of urban bannermen who were property owners, money-lenders, businessmen, and artisans. But there is no evidence limiting the identity of the readership to bannermen, and the robustness of the literature suggests that it may have had a broader appeal, at least in Peking.

Despite official censorship, “Romance of the Three Kingdoms” (Ilan gurun-i bi the, San-kuo yen-i) was of peculiar interest to the Ch’ing court, which conflated the folk cult of Kuan Ti with the shamanic cult of Nurgaci. Historical memory at the court described Nurgaci and Hung Taiji as intense enthusiasts of the “Romance” stories, and it is probable that Hung Taiji commanded the translation of Lo Kuan-chung’s novel (San-kuo chih yen-i) into Manchu, ostensibly to instruct his generals in military arts. The earliest known translation was completed by a team headed by Kicungge in 1650 (the year before he was executed). Later bannermen were famous for their attachment to the “Romance”

82 Mo Tung-yin, “Ch’ing-ch’u Man-tsu te sa-man-chiao,” pp. 46-47. On the related Nurgaci legends among Manchus that continued to circulate into the twentieth century, see Meng Hui-ying 孟慧英, Man-tsu min-chien wen-hua lun-chi (Shen-yang: Chi-lin jen-min ch’u-pan-she, 1990), pp. 16-35.
cycles, and [Gûwalgiya] Eldemboo (1748–1805), who read no Chinese, credited his success against the White Lotus rebels to insights gained from "Romance" (via Lo and Kicungge). In the ensuing century, Kicungge’s translation was frequently privately reproduced, sometimes as a bilingual text, and in 1769 an illustrated version was done at the imperial household settlement at La-lin.

Manchu versions of "Romance" are represented in all major Manchu archives, but they should not overshadow other novels that are known to have been translated and widely circulated: Lo’s "Water Margin" (Sui hû bithe, Shui-hu chuan); "Golden Lotus" (Gin ping mei bithe, Chin-p’ing mei), bilingual editions of which date from 1708; the bilingual version of Wang Che-fu’s Manju nikan Si siang ki, Hsi-hsiang chi, published in 1710; Ciyoo liyan ju-i bithe, Ch’iao-lien chu; and Jakdan’s 1848 translation of P’u Sung-ling’s Sonjofi ubaliyambuha Liyoo jai jy i bithe, Liao chai chih i.

In addition to translations from Chinese, Manchu literature consisted of some original prose works and poetry, including eulogies, folk songs, and ballads, many having a rhyme scheme and alliteration that Giovanni Stary has pronounced "typical of the poetry of many Altaic peoples." These literary forms in part evolved from traditional Jurchen/Manchu oral literature, which was not well documented before the end of the nineteenth century. Poems alternating Manchu and Chinese lines, as in the tsu-ti genre, testify to the profound and extensive Manchu impact on Peking’s popular performing arts. Although the court repeatedly promulgated


regulations against the participation of bannermen in either street or more formal theater, it is well known that the regulations were disregarded not only by banner commoners, but also by noblemen and imperial clansmen, some of whom dissipated their fortunes by supporting theatrical troupes and commissioning entertainments. What is often overlooked in this famous tradition, however, is that the theater provided an environment for the continued nurturing of Manchu in the folk arts.

The Ch‘ing court used the officially sanctioned taste for poetics and romance to glorify the regional origins of the dynasty. There are two outstanding products of this policy. The first, of the K’ang-hsi era, Pi-shu shan-chuang (Alin i tokso de halhūn be jaiilaha gi bithe) and its illustrated edition, Pi-shu shan-chuang t’u-ying, celebrated the scenes of the summer palace in Jehol, the high plateau outside the Great Wall, where the emperor, accompanied by as many as twelve thousand courtiers and banner troops, spent four to five months each year hunting, drilling the troops in martial arts, and feting Mongol nobles. The poem and its illustrations were the result of collaboration among the emperor, civilian and bannerman scribes and poets, draftsmen and artists, and Ripa, who engraved the copper plates.

The second great work was the Ch‘ien-lung emperor’s “Ode to Mukden” (Sheng-ching fu, Mukden i fujurun bithe). The “Ode” had complex origins and an equally complex role in the construction of a Ch‘ien-lung ideological facade, and its importance can only be suggested here. It may have been inspired by travelogues and territorial disputes of the K‘ang-hsi era, and it certainly owed a debt to the folklore-envy of Hung Taiji’s state-building. When completed, the poem was transcribed in thirty-two “fancy” or “imaginary”

86 Meng Chao-ch‘en 孟兆祺, Pi-shu shan-chuang yūan-lin i-shu 避暑山庄園林藝術 (Peking: Tzu-chin ch‘eng ch’u-pan she, 1985); the annual treks to Jehol began in the 1680s and continued until 1821. The name Pi-shu shan-chuang was given to the retreat by K‘ang-hsi in 1708.

scripts (*fukjingge hergen*, *chüan-wen* 筹文), for the express purpose of placing Manchu among the classic cultural institutions of the world. It is unclear how many complete *fukjingge hergen* copies of the original (beyond the seven that would have been required for the imperial repositories) were produced. The Gest Oriental Library has a complete fancy-script edition in original covers. The Bibliothèque Nationale has a complete and well-examined edition, but the covers have been replaced by blue silk and have tags written in P. Amyot’s hand translating the names for the scripts.

This alliance of ideology and literature was also manifested in the monumentalism of Ch’ing literary expression, particularly in the eighteenth century. Like the Mongolian great-khans, the Ch’ien-lung emperor ruled a universal realm that had no external boundaries but was internally marked by distinctions of history, culture, and status. Architectural facades, stelae, and printed pages were a continuous surface for the production of universalistic figures. Poly-lingual lexicographical, liturgical, or literary compilations constituted a monumental expression of the emperor’s vision. For instance, the *Wu-t’i Ch’ing-wen chien* produced under the Ch’ien-lung emperor is better understood as monumental literature than as a lexicographical aid. It was a simultaneous gloss in five languages—Manchu, Mongolian, Chinese, Tibetan, and Uigur—whose single-word entries do little to instruct in the nuances of the languages concerned but much to serve the ideological interests of the court. *Yü-chih* Man Han Meng-ku Hsi-fan ho-pi ta-tsang ch’üan-chou (Han-i araha manju nikan mongo tanggūt hergen-i kamchha amba g’anjur nomun-i uheri tarni, Qaghan-u bicigsen manju kitad monggol tubed kele qabsurughsan büküli ganjur-un tarni) falls into the same category. It is a massive four-language (Manchu, Chinese, Mongolian, and Tibetan) simultaneous text of *dharanī* (magical incantations) from the Kanjur (Tibetan Buddhist canon), cumbersome to use and of little practical

---

88 [Yü-chih] *Sheng-ching fu*, chüan 1, p. 1b, [Han i araha] *Mukden i furyun bithe, fyelen* 1, p. 2a. Père Amyot, who was resident in China at the time of the Ode’s publication, presented a very free translation of it to the French public in 1770. J. H. von Klaproth published another translation in 1828 in his *Chrestomathie Mandchou* (with a preface excoriating the Amyot work). Neither edition translated the imperial foreword.

89 A photoreprint of the Ch’ien-lung period original was published by Min-tsu ch’u-panshe, Peking, 1957.
application apart from displaying the supernatural dominion of the Ch‘ing court. These apparently literary works are better understood as visual monuments to imperial universalism.90

The court’s eclectic religious patronage also reflected Manchu claims to imperial universalism. Although they fulfilled their Confucian ritual roles by sacrificing at the state altars of Heaven, Earth, and the Temple of the Ancestors, the rulers were also attached to the shamanic traditions of the Northeast. The Ch‘ien-lung emperor took this religious tradition so seriously that he gave its survival as one of the main reasons for insisting that nobles and bannermen assiduously study Manchu, in order to understand the shamanic invocations.91 Indeed, the Manchu edition of the [Hesei toktobuha] Manjusai wecere metere kooli bithe, Man-chou chi-shen chi-t‘ien tien-li92 commissioned by the Ch‘ien-lung emperor, has more detailed illustrations and explanations than the Chinese edition, which suggests the concern of the court for correct performance in the Manchu.93

From the time of Nurgaci, Manchu rulers had simultaneously embraced Tibetan Buddhism and appropriated its political models.94 In view of the widespread conversion of the Mongols to Lamaism in the seventeenth century, imperial patronage made political good sense, but there is also evidence (some of it in Tibetan-language materials) that the K‘ang-hsi, Yung-cheng, and, especially,

Ch’ien-lung emperors practiced Tibetan Buddhist devotions. The Tibetan Buddhism was enshrined in various temples closely linked with the imperial family. During the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the most prominent of these temples, the Yung-ho kung, housed several hundred Tibetan, Mongol, and Manchu monks and served as a teaching center of the Yellow Hat sect.

The Ch’ing conquests in Central Asia intensified the cultural exchange among China, Tibet, and the societies of the steppe. The K’ang-hsi emperor had the Tibetan Buddhist canon (Kanjur) rendered into Mongolian and distributed "throughout Mongolia"; under the Ch’ien-lung emperor the commentaries to the Kanjur were translated into Mongolian. The heightened interaction between Mongolia and Tibet stimulated not only translations but original commentaries on Tibetan scriptures by Mongol scholars. Peking was a major center for production of religious literature in Mongolian; a total of 554 extant works printed there (cited by Walther Heissig) constitutes a rich corpus of materials for future research.

Given that Manchu was significant in the creation of an imperial literary edifice, and considering the autonomous development of literati interest in Manchu and Mongolian as philological and anthropological knowledge, some well-known features of Ch’ing culture can be re-examined in a new light. Perhaps most obvious is the possibility of reinterpreting the "Four Treasuries." In the im-

---


97 Heissig, *The Religions of Mongolia*, pp. 32–33 describes the Manchu patronage of Tibetan Buddhist activities among the Mongols.

perial view, the intellectual technologies behind the Four Treasuries projects—foremost evidential research (k’ao-cheng)—were useful not only for elucidating the autochthonous cultural origins of the Ch’ing in the Northeast and confirming the historical legitimacy of the dynasty in China, but also for eliminating the ethnological authority of previous dynasties.99 Manchu, Mongolian, and k’ao-cheng were important instruments in the Four Treasuries compilation process. Using philological studies to revise the histories of the Liao, Chin, and Yüan dynasties—a project that was undertaken in the 1770s and 1780s—was an indispensable part of the Four Treasuries program.100 Manchu was used to compile and correct the kuo-yü chieh of the Chin history, and for unknown reasons Solon (Evenk), which was very close to Manchu, was used to correct the kuo-yü chieh of the Liao history; and Mongolian was used to revise the Yüan history.101 The literary activities of the Ch’ien-lung era, which were highlighted by the Four Treasuries project, included major compilations that institutionalized Manchu cultural identity and history. The cumulative, and evidently intended, effect was to eradicate the Ming dynasty’s curatorial authority over the histories of Northeastern dynasties in China.

Many of the Manchu works commissioned in the early years of the Ch’ien-lung reign were bodogon i bithe, fang-lüeh, reports on military campaigns that were recast as history (often by those whose actions they described) and then institutionalized as literary works in the Four Treasuries.102 In this way, military bureaucrats such as [Janggiya] A-kuei (1717–97), [Fuca] Fu-k’ang-an (d. 1796), [Fuca] Fu-heng (d. 1770), and others became “literary” men, figureheads

99 On the background to the development of a private scholarship of historical geography, onomastics, and comparative linguistics in the nineteenth century see Crossley, “Manzhou yuanliu kao.”

100 On Ssu-k’u ch’üan-shu see R. Kent Guy, The Emperor’s Four Treasuries: Scholars and the State in the Late Ch’ien-lung Era (Cambridge: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 1987). Although Guy did not discuss the role of Manchu literature in the Four Treasuries process, he did give extensive consideration to the possible integration of language standardization, historical revision, and literary curatorship in the maturation of the Ch’ing imperial institution. See particularly pp. 30–31.

101 See commentary on the works in Yang Li-ch’eng 楊立成, Ssu-k’u mu-lüeh (reprint, Taipei: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1969).

102 On the Office of Military Archives, which produced these histories, see Bartlett, Monarchs and Ministers, pp. 225–28 and Guy, The Emperor’s Four Treasuries, pp. 31, 218 n. 65.
of the Four Treasuries project. This not only permitted the rulers to exert close control over the development of a contemporaneous political narrative, but also allowed them to establish decisive authority over the past. It was the emperor’s express wish that these works, signifying the history and culture of the Manchus and Mongols and the rectitude of their role in China, should be made classic by their incorporation into the Four Treasuries. The court’s agenda for the Four Treasuries project thus went beyond a “literary inquisition,” or, as scholars have more recently suggested, a curatorial enterprise: the Four Treasuries compilation also attempted to provide a symbolic pedigree for the imperial culture. The goals of this agenda were in no way mutually exclusive. But only by an overview of the imperial literatures represented in the eighteenth century may a more complete understanding of court motivations be approached.

CONCLUSION

We have presented a contradiction in the status of Manchu under the Ch’ing. On the one hand, Manchu was significant as a language that, being protected from public scrutiny, could be used in critical sectors of the bureaucracy and ritual organs and carefully controlled by the state. On the other hand, Manchu was significant in having a cultural role as a surviving folk form and as a literary language that generated interest beyond what was demanded by the state and in consequence frequently outgrew state control. The contradiction can be resolved by surveying the different functions of Manchu and periodizing those functions.

Manchu had an official life of administrative utility, which is represented not only in official historical compilations but also in court-sponsored pedagogical, historical, genealogical, and administrative materials. The use of Manchu as a security language, well developed by the early K’ang-hsi reign, dissipated after the dismantling, in the 1860s, of regulations requiring banner officers to master the written standard. Because Manchu was the imperial language, elementary errors and misunderstandings concerning the rise of the Ch’ing and the nature of the dynasty can and have been corrected by scholars with access to Manchu documents. Whether it
be matters as simple as the origins of the (false) attribution of "Abahai" as the personal name of the second Manchu ruler Hung Taiji,\(^{103}\) or more complex misunderstandings concerning the political character of the Ch‘ing state, documents such as those we have discussed present researchers with abundant data to reinter-
pret this last conquest dynasty. Ch‘ing historians who study the regime’s foreign relations, politics, military organization, decision-
making processes, and the imperial court will find that Manchu-
language documents provide information and insights unavailable
in the Chinese record.\(^{104}\)

Manchu also played an important symbolic role for the Qing
court. It was used to bolster the identity of the ruling house and to
superimpose that image upon the culturally diverse empire created
in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The special in-
terest of the Ch‘ien-lung emperor in the ideological and religious
powers of the language helped to stimulate transformation of the
banner educational system and massive publication of standardiz-
ing literature. The ideological manipulation of Manchu by the state
is a topic that, in its own right, deserves further research and
analysis.

Manchu had also an unofficial role in oral literature and polyglot
vernacularism, demonstrated by its survival in the garrison com-
munities—which were vastly disparate in cultural and economic
development—and in the folk culture of Peking to the end of the
dynasty. The sources for this research contain evidence of a genuine
folk culture, distinct from and often in tension with state policy. Not
only does this popular urban culture need further elucidation, but
its relationship to the more formalized literature represented in the
commercial productions discussed above needs to be examined.

\(^{103}\) The mistaken appellation in Erich Hauer’s translation of the K’ai-kuo fang-lüeh was
noted by Gertraude Roth [Li] in “The Manchu-Chinese Relationship, 1616–1636,” in Jonathan D. Spence and John E. Wills, Jr., eds., From Ming to Ch‘ing: Conquest, Region and Con-
tinuity in Seventeenth-Century China (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979), p. 7. For a note
on the introduction of “Abahai” into English-language scholarship in Herbert Giles, China
and the Manchus (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912), see Giovanni Stary, “The

\(^{104}\) Beatrice Bartlett’s pathbreaking study of the evolution of the Grand Council, Monarchs
and Ministers, is a recent example. Professor Bartlett has noted that her acquaintance with
Manchu proved “essential” to her research (p. xiii).
Finally, Manchu was in the nineteenth century, and even now continues to be, a fount of information for private scholarship on philology, religion, and historical geography. From the late eighteenth century, Manchu enjoyed an emblematic status, and consequently its symbolic ubiquity—if not its actual function as a vital language—won literati recognition during the late Ch’ien-lung, Chia-ch’ing, and Tao-kuang reigns. The development of a private scholarly interest in Manchu literature and language may have roughly coincided with the government’s gradual loss of control, through the Tao-kuang reign, over publication and republication; this is the era, for instance, of the publication and distribution (by Manchu noblemen and their collaborators) of the Tung-hua lu, a work which had been banned by the Ch’ien-lung court, and also the era of unauthorized reprintings of materials commissioned for or brought under the curatorship of the Four Treasuries. The participants in this Manchu-oriented scholarly stratum were international, including not only bannermen, but also civilian literati and Westerners. Much of the work produced by these nineteenth-century writers remains fundamental to ongoing research on Ch’ing history and culture.

We remind readers of the late Joseph Fletcher’s injunction to China scholars in 1981: “A Ch’ing scholar who wants to do first-class work in the archives must, from now on, learn Manchu and routinely compare the Manchu and Chinese sources for their topics of research.” Improved access to Manchu archives, especially in China, means that the relevance of the language to any particular category of research is not as predictable as it was once assumed to be. We look forward to the fresh perspectives new scholarship utilizing these archival resources will produce.

105 For further comment, though only on circumstantial evidence, see Fu Kuei-chiu 傅貴九, “Tung-hua lu tso-che hsin-cheng,” LSYC 5 (1984): 168–70.