Introduction

An ethnic minority in China today, the Manchus enjoy a long history. The Qing dynasty (1644–1912) they founded was an apex of Chinese civilization, distinguished by its immense geographical dimensions, which contemporary China has inherited. As descendants of the Jurchens—members of the southern Tungus—they had been considered aliens by the Chinese, but this alien aspect was overstated by loyalists of the Ming dynasty (1368–1644) and by organizers of the revolution of 1911. The Manchus, one should add, have been characterized by cultural adaptability. They included both Jurchen and non-Jurchen components. Among the non-Jurchen elements were Mongols, Chinese, and Koreans. As one scholar points out, the term Manchu does not represent any “race” in a strict sense. On all accounts the Manchus were close to the Chinese, not really alien or “barbarian.” With continuous accommodations to Chinese culture they became almost indistinguishable from the Chinese people.¹

The history of the Manchus indeed is fascinating and one cannot appreciate it without considering their immediate ancestors, the Jurchens, who appeared in Manchuria, China’s northeast frontier, and organized themselves into clans, tribes, and regional alliances. They founded the Jin dynasty (1115–1234), a vast kingdom covering Manchuria, part of Mongolia, and North China. In due course many Jurchens in North China accommodated themselves to Chinese ways of life. Therefore, they were classified as Northern Chinese by the Mongol conquerors. Those Jurchens who remained in their homeland—the Amur-Sungari region—divided, regrouped, migrated to southern Manchuria, and finally became the immediate ancestors of the Man-
chus. In the Ming period they were under China’s guard-post system, a device for loose control, and comprised three groups: Jianzhou, Haixi, and Wild. Nurhaci (1559–1626) and his son Hong Taiji (1592–1643) came from the left branch of the Jianzhou tribe. When unifying the Jurchens they accepted assistance from non-Jurchen elements. In 1635, for good political reasons, Hong Taiji named his group Manchus, with of course Jurchens as the core. He then founded the Qing dynasty, marking the second foreign conquest of all of China.

1. Theme and Approach

This book constitutes a study of the Manchus, attempting to show how they adopted Chinese methods of governing and ways of life and what changes occurred among them during the years 1583–1795. Studies that deal with sinicization (or sinification) of China’s frontier peoples, including the Manchus, are mainly articles. As a result, my work aims at a book-length study and follows an analytical, systematic, and topical approach, with a focus on major adoptions—for example, economic, legal, and social institutions. To show the depth of Chinese influence on the Manchus, however, it occasionally covers some neglected and important aspects, such as the transformation of the fadu, a rustic Jurchen bag for hunters and warriors to carry food, to the hebao, a small and elegant Chinese pouch of an aesthetic nature. This replacement evidenced the decline of Manchu martial virtues, a major component of their cultural identity. One should point out that sinicization was never a one-way street. When receiving Chinese influence, the Manchus left their cultural marks on China. Since Manchu cultural influence should be treated as a separate subject, my study will concentrate, as the title suggests, on sinicization of the Manchus. Following general practice, I select the aforesaid dates for convenience. Long before Nurhaci took up arms against the Ming in 1583, sinicization was already under way. It reached a climax during the Qianlong reign (1736–1795) and continued among the Manchus even after the end of the dynasty.

One may divide Manchu adoption of Chinese culture into two stages. The first was a Jurchen phase, with the Liaodong frontier in Manchuria as the chief setting, opening with the Jurchens’s south-
ward migration in the mid-fourteenth century from the area of Yilan in today’s Heilongjiang Province and lasted until the mid-1630s. They kept in touch with China through geographical, economic, political, and social channels. It was a relationship built on mutual interests. The long and multifarious contacts helped the Jurchens improve their economy and technology, contributed to the rise of Nurhaci’s frontier kingdom, laid the groundwork for the Qing dynasty, and enriched their language with many Chinese loanwords. China benefited from Jurchen products, among which were horses, furs, ginseng, and pearls. More importantly, such a relationship helped China maintain peace on its frontier. This stage came to an end when Hong Taiji forged a new ethnic identity for his subjects by changing the name Jurchen to Manchu. The following year, 1636, he proclaimed the Qing dynasty and began a second stage, the focal point of this study, with Manchus as protagonists of sinicization. Their conquest of China proper in 1644 created a new situation, which made contact easier, broader, and deeper. The Manchus now faced a prevailing Chinese society and were subject to more Chinese influence than had the Jurchens. Chinese norms, mores, and values made inroads into their cultural heritage and thus weakened their ethnic solidarity. They fell helplessly into an identity crisis, which the Qing emperors desperately tried to overcome.

The term “sinicization” first appeared in *Athenaeum*, a literary weekly published in London. When reviewing a book on Japan in 1898, a scholar mentioned that Japanese Shintoism was influenced by sinicization. Although the reviewer did not further delineate the term, it was soon adopted by scholars everywhere.4 To make matters worse, dictionaries fail to agree on a specific definition of sinicization. *The Oxford English Dictionary* defines it as “the action or process of sinicizing” and “sinicizing” as “to invest with a Chinese character.” According to *Webster’s Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged*, “sinicize” means “to modify by Chinese influence.” The same verb is defined as “to make Chinese in character or bring under Chinese influence” in *The Random House Dictionary of the English Language*. Even today there is little consensus among scholars about its meaning. Some define it in terms of ethnic assimilation, while some view it as adoption of institutions or cultural
fusion. Obviously it is difficult to define sinicization precisely. However insufficient, the definitions given by the above dictionaries are useful for my purpose, for I apply the term only as my framework to study how the Manchus were brought under Chinese influence and acquired a Chinese character. To facilitate my work, I interpret sinicization as adoption of, accommodation to, and participation in Chinese ways of life, such as attitudes, manners, ideas, beliefs, values, and various institutions.

I adopt the term sinicization because it is more suitable to my subject than two other terms, acculturation and assimilation, each with its own various theories. Acculturation is a term coined by American anthropologists when they investigated cultural change among the native Americans after the latter’s contact with white colonists. In other words, the term arose from a colonial background and was characterized by conquest and Christian conversion. One may question its applicability to other societies with different backgrounds. Assimilation, a sociological term, is a process wherein a subordinate group’s culture may be submerged or even destroyed by that of the dominant group. In reality, it chiefly involves individual or small groups of immigrants, who are eager to join the mainstream of the host society, but it is conditioned by many contingencies and variables. Neither acculturation nor assimilation can be a paradigm for my study of the Manchus, who began as a frontier people of China and finally became its conquering minority. The Manchu experience can be more effectively treated by the theme sinicization, a term that has been well received by international academic circles since its first appearance. Further, it is a process in which China’s population and history have been shaped and reshaped. For instance, it served to bring together all sorts of peoples in early China. Unification of China by the Qin dynasty in 221 BC put many ethnic groups into a single imperial framework and thus helped the molding of the Chinese. In the years 220–581 and again in 907–1234, such frontier peoples as the Xiongnu, Xianbei, Turks, Khitans, and Jurchens entered North China as immigrants or conquerors. In time they joined China’s mainstream and became ethnic minorities in a larger society. What the Manchus experienced was the same process, which should be studied in terms of sinicization. One may regard this as a process of integration which is still at work in China.
For example, all students in grades 1–12 must learn the official Chinese language no matter what dialects or ethnic languages they may use after school.

One cannot limit sinicization to any single aspect of Chinese culture or institutions, for it has a broad coverage and a complex nature. Therefore, whether or not a person was sinicized should not be judged by any single factor. Nor can one interpret it as an outcome of casual contact. There is no precise beginning or ending date because it is an ongoing process of contact through various channels. A sinicized Manchu was a person who had adopted certain Chinese cultural traits, but not all of them. In all likelihood, a sinicized Manchu was not aware of being sinicized because, according to specialists, ethnic identity is a subjective as well as changeable perception. What he regarded as Manchu traditions were actually the reinterpretation of a culture that had embraced Chinese elements resulting from contact.8

The Manchus, one may also add, were the most sinicized of all the frontier conquerors in Chinese history, and they founded the most enduring regime of the conquest dynasties. After 1644 almost all Manchus moved into China proper, a setting different from that of the Liaodong frontier. There they were numerically overwhelmed by the conquered and culturally penetrated by Chinese ways of life. With the exception of political control, they were in fact a subculture in a larger society. Nevertheless, it was not a civilizing process because the Manchus had their own cultural traditions. Nor does it mean the complete replacement of their heritages by Chinese culture. What the revolution of 1911 took away from the Manchus was their political domination, nothing else. They are an active ethnic minority group in China today, with millions of members.

The long contacts that resulted in sinicization were not planned by any individual or group. They were rather desired by both China and its frontier neighbors for reciprocal goals. Like their chiefs, Jurchen commoners played important roles in the contact. Although the commoners rarely appear in sources, their activities may be discerned from data that cover the upper levels of society. In the early days, these commoners kept in touch with Chinese and Korean frontiersmen to acquire cloth, farming tools, and many other commodities. They raided Chinese and Korean frontiers and held captives, deserters, or
fugitives as slaves. With the conquest of the Ming they became the ruling class in a dominant Chinese society. But under the onslaught of Chinese culture their ethnic identity was weakened. In two or three generations, they forgot their native tongue and gave up their warrior virtues. By imperial order they, together with their officers, attended indoctrination seminars filled with Confucian ideals, which actually further diluted their cultural heritage. With the increase in their population, they were financially hard-pressed. More and more, they transformed into an interest group fighting for its survival. In such circumstances the Qing court failed to hold them together as a close-knit ethnic group; nor could it maintain their privileged status. Finally, an imperial decree in 1865 allowed them and their officers to leave the banners, choose their occupations, and register as individuals under Chinese officials.9

Qing rulers, one should point out, actually helped sinicization, despite their efforts to keep the Manchus as a coherent ethnic group. Unlike Nurhaci, his father, Hong Taiji took it even farther, recruiting many Chinese into his service, adopting Chinese institutions, and planning to subjugate the Ming. His successors, in particular from Kangxi to Qianlong, faced two cultural worlds: the Manchu heritage and the traditions of the conquered.10 Through their measures, they championed Chinese culture to facilitate their rule. Perhaps the single most important measure taken by the Kangxi emperor was the founding of the palace school to teach imperial sons many subjects, among which were Chinese history and classics. Yongzheng patronized Chan Buddhism; his son, Qianlong, sponsored Chinese scholars, artists, literary men, and publication projects. But they were not captives of Chinese culture, for they were conscious of the political importance of their ethnic identity. They repeatedly exhorted the Manchus to return to their cultural heritage as a close-knit ethnic group. Since they had internalized Confucian precepts through education at an early age, they integrated them with those of the Manchus.11 Their exhortations were in fact couched in Confucian terms. They unconsciously accelerated what they desperately tried to stop.

Some Asianists, loosely known as the “New Qing” scholars, have recently dismissed the term sinicization as biased, misleading, and conceptually flawed. Many of their criticisms seem to have resulted
from their misinterpretation of the term, possibly because of its vague connotation. For example, they consider “circularity” a “conceptual flaw” inherent in sinicization. Yet it also exists within culture change, mainly as a process of constant cultural mutation. They also relate sinicization to Han Chinese chauvinism and “twentieth-century China’s nationalism.” These links can be debated because the term was a European creation when China was under intense pressure from foreign imperialism. It involved no Chinese chauvinism or nationalism.12

As a major regional power with more people and richer natural resources, China was attractive to its frontier neighbors. Through migration, invasion, or occupation, newcomers, like immigrants in the United States, adopted the culture of their hosts and joined the mainstream. This was a voluntary action in their own best interests and had nothing to do with the China-centered concept. The mischaracterizing of sinicization for Chinese chauvinism or nationalism may also have arisen from its Chinese rendering, Hanhua (transformation into Han Chinese). The translation does not seem appropriate for the so-called Han Chinese, not a monolithic or changeless group as one may believe, but one having numerous dialects and diverse customs. Such differences have both geographical and ethnic implications. Although the Han make up the majority of the Chinese population, more than fifty other ethnic groups exist in China today.13 Whatever the origin of this conception, the term sinicization in no way minimizes the significant contribution of the Manchus to Chinese history. As a matter of fact, the Chinese context speaks the more forcefully for the importance of the Manchu legacy.

Another criticism concerns the relationship between sinicization and the Manchu identity. Contrary to the views of the “New Qing” scholars, the two may go side by side, for their relationship is not dichotomous. The Qing rulers adopted Chinese culture, hoping to win Chinese support. At the same time they tried to maintain their Manchu identity as a coherent ruling group. These two goals were driven by the same impetus and were not in conflict. For realistic purposes, their Manchu subjects adopted Chinese culture and joined the mainstream of the conquered, but they retained membership in the Manchu ethnic group. Specialists in ethnic studies agree that the traditional culture of an ethnic group undergoes changes in the course of
contact with other groups. Consequently some of its elements trail off into oblivion, some others are recentered, and new ones are adopted.\textsuperscript{14} This is applicable to the concept of sinicization, essentially a gradual process, which does not work to replace any group’s ethnic identity \textit{in toto}.

“New Qing” scholars also dismiss sinicization on the grounds that in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the Manchus remained in high offices and that for security reasons, many Qing official documents were still written in Manchu.\textsuperscript{15} Their contentions do not seem relevant. Sinicization did not have to exclude the Manchus from high offices, for they were, first and foremost, the ruling class. Most Manchu high officials were loyal both to Qing emperors and to Confucian values. Language alone is not enough to prove one’s ethnic identity or deny the role of sinicization. From 1644 more and more Manchus, elite and commoners alike, had become interested in Chinese and forgotten their mother tongue. Two of Qianlong’s nephews, for example, could not speak Manchu. During the Qianlong reign, one may reasonably infer, the imperial clans divided into two linguistic subgroups, Chinese and Manchu.\textsuperscript{16}

Written Manchu was in the same situation. After the 1860s Manchu commanders were no longer required to submit military reports in Manchu unless they did not know Chinese. The late Qing monarchs required Manchu documents largely as an ethnic symbol of the ruling class. Indeed, most of the Manchu archives have not been used by researchers. While they may contain some important messages, as the “New Qing” historians speculate, there is also a possibility that these documents do not carry any information about sinicization. The case can be made that many materials, such as the bulky Manchu confidential memorials submitted by Manchu commanders and high provincial administrators during the Kangxi and Yongzheng reigns, are accessible today. They did not contain any data against the notion of sinicization or in favor of the arguments of the “New Qing” scholars. It is safe to say that once the contents of the Manchu archives are known to the scholarly community, the general picture of the Qing dynasty will remain the same, even though certain specific aspects may change.\textsuperscript{17}
The last issue is the Chinese animosity toward the Manchus, which the “New Qing” scholars stress in an attempt to invalidate the concept of sinicization.18 Once intense and widespread, this hatred faded with time. By the nineteenth century the Chinese-Manchu ethnic boundaries were blurred. Both the Chinese and the Manchus rallied around the Qing rulers against foreign imperialism. Like previous revolts in Chinese history, the mid-nineteenth century rebellions, especially the Taipings, who denounced the Qing dynasty in ethnic terms, essentially meant to overthrow the government, which happened to be under the Manchus. One should remember that all these mid-century revolts were suppressed by such Chinese armed forces as the Hunan and Anhui armies. The Hunan Army further recovered Sinkiang (Xinjiang) from Moslem rebels. The Guangxu emperor (r. 1875–1908) closely worked with Chinese scholar-officials to implement constitutional reforms. After the defeat of the reforms, these Chinese officials organized the Emperor Protection Society, active at home and abroad. To counteract its influence the revolutionaries under Sun Yat-sen (1866–1925) reminded their countrymen of Manchu cruelty during the conquest of the Ming dynasty and the Qing inability to defend China from foreign encroachment. Violent actions against the Manchus around the time of the fall of the Qing were sporadic and soon died down. While mentioning it as an alien regime responsible for China’s many problems, Chinese scholars greatly admired the Qing as an empire-builder, a promoter of Chinese culture, and so on.19

To the “New Qing” scholars there were close links between the Manchu ethnicity and the Inner Asian regions. With such links, they believe, the Qing emperors were able to draw on various ideologies and practices from the Mongols, Tibetans, and Moslems to create the Qing empire and rule it in different capacities.20 But historical evidence has not confirmed this theory. China played an indispensable role in the Qing empire. It was the empire’s geographical, political, and financial foundation. The Qing monarchs governed it from their throne in Peking. When they died they were buried in the metropolitan area, not anywhere else. Clearly China was the center of their lives and careers. Moreover, my study does not deal with Mongolia, Sinkiang, or Tibet, focusing only on the Manchu accommodation to Chinese ways of life.
Sources indicate that the “Inner Asian” commonality, especially the Mongols, did not play an important role in the Qing conquest of China. The conquest resulted chiefly from the actions of the Manchus and their Chinese collaborators, whose artillery units greatly contributed to the defeat of Ming forces during the reign of Hong Taiji. By 1593 three Mongol tribal chiefs joined forces with six Jurchen tribes in an attempt to overwhelm Nurhaci. In later years many Mongols, such as some Chahar tribes, fought on the Ming side. There is ample evidence that Manchus succeeded in controlling Mongolia, Sinkiang, and Tibet by diplomacy and war, not by their Inner Asian connection or by their Mongol allies. With the fall of the Yuan dynasty (1279–1368) the Mongols were divided and dispersed. Those in Manchuria were mainly the Qorčins, at first opposing Nurhaci and Hong Taiji. By means of war and marital ties the latter won the support of some Qorčin tribes. The rise of the Chahar Mongols under the Lindan Khutuktu Khan (1592–1634?), an ambitious and oppressive ruler, pushed such Mongol tribes as the Tümed, the Qaračin, and the Naiman to seek Manchu protection. After several expeditions, the Manchus destroyed the Lindan Khan’s power and controlled Inner Mongolia.21

The Eleuths (Oirats) provided a more complicated case of Manchu-Mongol relations. Under their aggressive rulers they invaded the Khalkha Mongols in Outer Mongolia, occupied Tibet, and posed a serious threat to the northern and western frontiers of the Qing. To safeguard their empire the Qing monarchs from Kangxi to Qianlong waged a long war against the Eleuths. A considerable number of Chinese soldiers from the Green Standard units joined each Qing task force, whose provisions were collected and transported from China proper.22 The defeat of the Eleuths enabled the Qing to control Outer Mongolia, Sinkiang, and Tibet. Suffice it to say that the founding and defending of the Qing empire depended to a large extent on military strength, to which China’s contribution was indispensable.

It should also be noted that early Qing rulers did not trust the Mongols. Nurhaci twice lashed out at some Mongol allies for their looting and killing in his frontier state. Hong Taiji entertained even more suspicions of the Mongols, forbidding people to give or sell weapons to them. He lodged many lengthy complaints against Oba, a Qorčin tribal leader, for deceptions, assistance to enemies, and failure
to take joint action against the Chahar Mongols. The Kangxi emperor regarded the Mongols as greedy, mean, and wretched. The imperial mistrust was justified by the revolts of the Sunid, Cecen, and Chahar Mongols in 1646 and 1675, when the Qing was engaged in a life-and-death struggle against the Rebellion of the Three Feudatories (1673–1681). During the Qing campaigns against the Zungar (Dzungar) tribe of the Eleuths in the mid-1750s, the Khalkha Mongols revolted.

Nor did any Inner Asians except the Manchus play a major part in the Qing imperial administration. At the top of the Qing imperial bureaucracy were the Grand Secretariat and the Grand Council. In particular, the Grand Council exercised considerable influence over Mongolia, Sinkiang, and Tibet. But throughout the dynasty there were only ten Mongol Grand Secretaries, and nine Mongol Grand Councilors. The nineteen names made up a tiny portion when compared with the number of their Manchu and Chinese colleagues. Moreover, because five people served in both offices, the actual number of top Mongol officials was fourteen. The Mongols did not even play a major administrative role in the Court of Dependent Peoples (Lifan yuan), an office originally created to deal with Mongol affairs. During the period of 152 years (1644–1795), however, there were as few as eleven Mongols made presidents of the court. Altogether, their tenures lasted for seventy-seven years only. There were no Tibetan or Uigher officials in the highest imperial bureaucracy. On all accounts the Inner Asian commonality did not contribute as much to the Qing empire as the Manchus or the Chinese did.

The above analysis shows that the Manchu ethnicity or Inner Asian approach to the study of Qing history would unlikely change anything significantly about the Qing dynasty or about the status of the Manchus as an ethnic minority in China today. Contrary to the views of the “New Qing” scholars, the sinicization approach did not diminish the Manchu role in Chinese history. As defined by the standard dictionaries, the concept of sinicization does not contain any notion of Chinese cultural or moral superiority. All additives seem to have been introduced into the term by some scholars because of misinterpretation. Therefore, what should be questioned is not the term itself, but the way to use it. If judiciously applied, it is a useful instrument for explaining Chinese history, specifically, China’s relations with frontier peoples.
2. Contents and Sources

This study is organized into eight chapters, with an introduction and a conclusion. Since the Introduction is being presented here, no summary of it is further needed. The first chapter seeks to explain the long and complex Manchu ethnic strands, with Jurchens as the core and the non-Jurchen components—Mongols, Chinese, and Koreans—as the outer layers. The Jurchens laid the groundwork for the sinicization of the Manchus. The second deals with creation of a frontier power by Nurhaci. His two brilliant sons, Hong Taiji and Dorgon, (1612–1650) founded the Qing empire and accelerated Manchu accommodation to Chinese ways of life. On the whole, these two chapters establish the framework of Manchu adoption of Chinese culture.

In Chapter III, I discuss the ecological system of Manchuria and the effect of agriculture, frontier markets, and tributary trade on the Jurchen economy. Economic activities improved their life, broadened their contact with Ming China, and facilitated their adoption of Chinese culture.

Chapter IV treats the status of Liaodong as a frontier society, centering on frontiersmen and transfrontiersmen. Their activities helped introduce Chinese culture to the Jurchens. Administrative and legal institutions are covered in Chapter V. Early Qing rulers from Hong Taiji on adopted the Ming ruling machinery and legal code. These Chinese institutions improved the Qing governing institutions, which were also marked by certain Manchu innovations. Transformation of the Manchu social institutions, including marriage, funerals, and naming practices, is the focal point of Chapter VI. Such changes greatly weakened the Manchu martial virtues.

Chapter VII traces changes in such aspects of Manchu culture as language and literature. The importance of the Manchu language diminished with time. Although it retained official status to the end of the dynasty, it was “lifeless.” As a result of education Manchu writers, mainly poets and essayists, wrote in Chinese characters and according to Chinese literary rules. The last chapter deals with the influence of Chinese aesthetic taste, religious belief, norms, and mores on the Manchu ethnic heritage. Construction of the Yuanming Yuan repre-
presented a climax of Chinese aesthetic impact. For political considerations, early Manchu rulers patronized Chinese Buddhism, popular cults, and Confucian teachings. The hortatory writings of Kangxi and Yongzheng were inculcated on Chinese and Manchus at lecture sessions nationwide.

The Conclusion seeks to summarize this study and also offers further insights on sinicization. One such idea is that Chinese culture and Manchu heritage do not exclude each other. However sinicized, Qing political institutions maintained some Manchu features. Even today the Manchus are able to preserve some ethnic heritage in their daily life. Another idea concerns that the Manchus left indelible marks on Chinese ways of life. Geopolitically, for example, modern China inherited from the Qing empire such important frontier regions as Mongolia, Sinkiang, and Tibet. Chinese culture and history had to be reinterpreted with the addition of the Manchu component. The last idea is about the Manchu reaction to sinicization.

My sources divide into categories: basic and monographic. In the first are archival materials, official compilations, collected memorials, local histories, genealogical records, and accounts by contemporaries. On the whole, they provide information on the ethnic composition, economic life, social structure, political development of the Jurchens, and the changes resulting from Chinese cultural influence, all important to the rise and sinicization of the Manchus. The old- and new-script Manchu archives, respectively known as Jiu Manzhou dang and Manwen laodang, are of a political nature, showing frontier relations between the Jurchens and Ming China. So are the two bulky batches of Ming-Qing archival materials published by the Academia Sinica in Taipei. The collected confidential Manchu memorials of the Kangxi and Yongzheng reigns contain a variety of important data, such as the heirdom struggle, Kangxi’s printing of the Chinese classics, the military campaigns in the Northwest, the language problem, and the imperial sensitivity to ethnicity. Equally important are the collected Chinese confidential memorials, entitled Gong-zhong tang and arranged by reigns from Kangxi to Qianlong. All published by the National Palace Museum in Taipei. Both collected Manchu and Chinese confidential memorials testify to the weakening of Manchu cultural identity and the imperial efforts to revive it.
cal, hereditary, service, and miscellaneous files, the *Eight Banners Archives* (*Baqi dang*) provide useful biographical data on Manchu elites. Of the archival sources the *Collected Liaodong Archival Compilation of the Ming Period* (*MLTT*) proved the best because it sheds light on many aspects of the region, among which were frontier markets and Jurchen raids and immigrants. These activities facilitated the sinicization of the Jurchens, Also very useful is *Zhongguo Ming-chao dang’an zonghui*, a multivolume collection of Ming archival materials, published in 2001.26

The Ming and Qing governments sponsored many types of official works. Among them were the *Shilu* (veritable records), a chronological account of important state affairs. The veritable records of the Ming dynasty (*Ming shilu*) contain data on appointments of Jurchen chiefs, tributary missions, immigrants, Chinese deserters and fugitives, all contributing to the sinicization of the Jurchens, ancestors of the Manchus. The *History of the Ming Dynasty* offers background information for my work. The Qing *Shilu* for the early reigns, including its Manchu version for the Nurhaci era, occasionally reveals changes in Manchu values. Their deficiencies in economic and social information are complemented by the Korean veritable records of the Yi dynasty (1392–1910), which have two versions: one published in Seoul in 1955–1958, the other in Tokyo in 1953–1967. Of the Yi records, those on the reigns from T’aejo to Injo (1392–1649) are the most useful for my study.27

Two works on the Eight Banners, a Qing official project printed in 1739 and 1799 in both Manchu and Chinese, are very useful. They contain, among other things, biographies of more than four thousand officers and officials. Accounts of filial and righteous individuals and model women disclose much adoption of Chinese culture. Under Yongzheng’s auspices three companion works on banner affairs appeared, with imperial edicts and memorials from banners. On the whole the three compilations show signs of sinicization. In 1783 the Qing court published a small compilation on the origins of the Manchus. Chapters 16–20 reveal much Chinese influence on Manchu social, cultural, and economic life.28

Other sources are collected memorials by Ming and Qing officials. *Chou-Liao shihua* (Great plans for Liaodong) consists of memorials
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by Ming officials, some of whom worked in or toured the region in 1618–1620. The Qing government prohibited printing or circulation, since the memorials recorded unfavorable information about the Manchus. In the years 1632–1635 Chinese staffers of the Literary Office (Wen-guan) made suggestions to Hong Taiji about adoption of Ming institutions. Ninety-seven of their memorials are available. Individual officials had their own collections of memorials. The collected memorials by Xiong Tingbi (d. 1625), who twice defended Liaodong against Nurhaci, are worth studying. In his memorials He Erjian, once an inspector of the region, related that many Chinese fled to Jurchen lands and created the Village of One Thousand Families (qianjia zhuang).

Local histories provide data on the physical and human environment of the Liaodong frontier not found in other sources. The Liaodong Gazetteer is the most useful local history, with two editions: Liaodong zhi and its enlarged version, Quan Liao zhi, each revised. They supply information on census figures, local customs, frontier interpreters, Jurchen culture, and more. Completed around 1620, the Illustrated Gazetteer of Kaiyuan, a fortified city and frontier market, details the Four Hūlun Tribes, intertribal affairs, and the tribes’ relations with China.

Manchu genealogies provide data on Manchu kinship structure, marriage relations, burial customs, and interest in civilian posts, with hints of Chinese influence. They also disclose a change in Manchu names. Since the Kangxi period, Manchus had adopted Chinese naming conventions. Most Manchu genealogies, official and private, appeared after the early 1740s. The Qing imperial family records (yudie) are in both Manchu and Chinese, with many branch records. Genealogy of the Manchu Clans in the Eight Banners, an official compilation printed in 1745, with Manchu and Chinese versions, has more than seven thousand short biographies of bannermen, containing invaluable information.

Private genealogies seem to have been begun by Chinese bannermen and became common in the nineteenth century. Scholars have recently discovered many Manchu genealogies in Liaoning. Politically the Manchus needed records to substantiate their claim to inheritance of titles or offices. Influenced by Chinese tradition, they compiled genealogies to maintain family values. Well organized and repeatedly
revised, the family records of Eidu (1562–1621), a great warrior from the Niohuru clan, are full of information and became a model for some genealogical works, such as the *Genealogy of the Gūwalgiya Clan of Hada in the Manchu Plain Red Banner*.33

When the situation in Liaodong deteriorated after the sixteenth century, the Jurchens attracted the attention of Chinese and Korean scholars, many of whom were officials. The best Chinese account was *A Brief Survey of the Eastern Barbarians* by Mao Ruizheng (fl. 1597–1636). It contains data on the settlement, life, and customs of Jurchen tribesmen, frontier markets, and the rise of Nurhaci. A high official in the late 1630s, Fang Kongzhao (1591–1655) wrote *A Brief Account of China’s Frontiers*, with a chapter on Chinese deserters and runaways and Jurchen influence on Chinese inhabitants. Qu Jiushi (1546–1617) wrote biographies about such people as rebels, bandit leaders, minority groups, and frontier tribesmen, devoting the eleventh chapter to the rise and fall of Jurchen chiefs, their relations with China, and their commercial activities.34

Some Korean sources are firsthand accounts. One of these was *An Illustrated Account of the Journey to Fe Ala*, written by Sin Ch’ung-il (1554–1622) after a visit with Nurhaci in 1596. Yi Min-hwan (1573–1649), a scholar-official on the staff of the Korean army dispatched to help fight Nurhaci at the Battle of Sarhū in 1619, was taken prisoner by the Jurchens. Based on observations and inquiries made during his captivity, his book covers nearly all aspects of Jurchen life and identifies Chinese and Koreans who joined the Jurchens.35 After capitulation, the Yi dynasty sent three princes as hostages and liaison officials to Shenyang, then the Manchu capital. They dispatched reports to the Yi court from 1637 to 1644. Out of these reports came three documentary compilations containing information on Manchu customs, Korean captives, and descendants of Jurchens who married Koreans. *Shenyang zhuangqi* includes the above dispatches, mostly to the Royal Secretariat, while *Shenyang riji* covers daily activities of the Korean office. The last compilation, *Shenguan lu*, was an abridged version of the first two.36

The vast body of sources available to me consists of monographic studies by both Asian and Western specialists. Because of space limitations, the works to be analyzed below must be highly selective. Most
studies do not focus on sinicization of the Manchus, but I was able to draw from them bits and pieces of data, especially fresh ideas, to enrich my work.

Works that deal with sinicization of China’s frontier peoples, including the Manchus, are in the main articles. Wang Tongling’s study briefly covers the subject. The article by Mao Wen discusses the influence of the Chinese language on Manchu. By the 1950s Yao Congwu, an expert on China’s frontiers, published a series of studies on the Khitans of the Liao state and the Jurchens of the Jin dynasty. He argues that the expansion and continuation of Chinese history resulted from adoption of Chinese culture by successive groups of frontier people. In the 1960s more progress was made in the study of Manchu sinicization. The articles by Guan Donggui, another specialist, define the meaning of sinicization, analyze the importance of agriculture to Jurchen adoption of Chinese culture, and cover sinicization of Manchuria, the native land of the Manchus. Bernd-Michael Linke’s study concerns Chinese influence on bureaucratization of the Manchu state during the time of conquest. The article by Ping-ti Ho is a systematic study of sinicization throughout Chinese history, with special reference to the Qing dynasty. Most recently, Guo Chengkang wrote an article viewing sinicization in terms of cultural fusion.37

Almost all Chinese works, such as *Qingdai shi* (History of the Qing period) and *Qingchao tongshi* (General history of the Qing dynasty), complain about the Qing’s inability to defend China against foreign imperialism during the second half of the nineteenth century, but they affirm the Manchu contribution to China. There are fine studies on the history of the Jurchen and Manchu peoples as well as their relations with China and Korea by such scholars as Kawachi Yoshihiro, Wada Sei, Mitamura Taisuka, Sun Jinji, and Li Yanguang. Frederic Wakeman’s *The Great Enterprise* sheds light on the frontier society of the Liaodong region, the rise of the Manchus, the founding of the Qing dynasty, the conquest of China, the creation of a governing machinery, and the Chinese influence on them.38

Many works center on Qing rulers from Nurhaci to Qianlong, covering their efforts to retain the Manchu ethnic identity, as well as their role in adopting Chinese culture. Some scholars considered Hong Taiji a cultural and institutional reformer since he took over from his father
a Jurchen-Mongol-oriented frontier state and turned it into a central-
ized, bureaucratic empire after the Chinese style. Under the guidance
of Fan Wencheng (1597–1666) and Hong Cheng-chou (1595–1665), as
recent studies point out, Confucian values were adopted during
the Shunzhi reign. During the Kangxi and Yongzheng reigns (1662–
1722, 1723–1735) sinicization made further progress. To historians,
Kangxi was a great monarch, for he maintained China’s unification,
defeated the Eleuth Mongols, adopted more Chinese institutions, and
printed books on the Chinese classics. Scholars agree that Yongzheng
was an efficient, hardworking, and benevolent autocratic ruler. He
wrote long commentaries on the Sacred Edict, sixteen commands is-
sued by Kangxi and based on Neo-Confucian tenets, and inculcated
them in all his subjects. The Qianlong emperor, a prolific poet, loved
Chinese art, collected rare books, and strove, as his ancestors did, to
keep Manchu ethnicity intact.39 But the Manchu tradition he tried to
enforce had already embraced Chinese cultural components.

Of Chinese studies on Manchu political, legal, and social institu-
tions, History of the Manchu State, Law, and Government Institutions
before 1644 by Zhang Jinfan and Guo Chenkang is the best. It treats
the subject mainly from a Manchu perspective. Also important is Liu
Xiaomeng’s Tribe and State of the Manchus, which deals with clan,
village, and tribal institutions and their transformation into a frontier
state. Among Japanese scholars, Kanda Nobuo studied the Manchu
Literary Office while Oshibauchi Hajime discussed criminal laws un-
der Nurhaci and Hong Taiji. The article by Fang Chaoying explores
ultimogeniture, an important Manchu social institution, which trailed
off in the early eighteenth century. The work by Yang Yingjie covers
almost all aspects of Manchu society.40

Manchu is a subgroup of the Tungusic language family, which, as
Zhao Zhencai concludes after studying ethnological, archaeological,
and documentary sources, shares common linguistic elements with
Chinese. Some scholars believe that Chinese loanwords contributed
to popularization of the Chinese language among the Manchus. Natu-
really, Manchu translations of the Chinese classics helped spread Chi-
nese culture. According to J. R. P. King’s study, the dot and circle that
distinguish the new Manchu script from the old was adopted from the
Korean writing system.41
Introduction

Some scholars have recently become interested in Manchu literature. According to Zhang Jiasheng, by the second half of the seventeenth century, Manchu poets had emerged, first from aristocratic families with official status, and then from private individuals. Despite their diverse backgrounds, Manchu poets had something in common. They learned poetry from Chinese teachers, wrote in Chinese, and observed the rules of Chinese poems. Singde (1655–1685), the most important lyric poet of the Qing dynasty, is representative of the aristocratic poets. The other category of poets, such as Funing and Canghai, appeared late and pursued literary achievement, not an official career.42

The influence of Chinese architecture on Manchu palaces, temples, and imperial tombs has been confirmed by Asian and Western scholars. Murada Jirō provided a detailed and illustrated study of the Shenyang palaces. Tie Yuqin, a specialist on Qing history of Manchu descent, believes that Chinese architecture affected the structural evolution of Manchu palaces at Liaoyang and Shenyang. An article on palaces and mausoleums in Shenyang by Paula Swart and Barry Till reached the same conclusion.43

Some scholars study religion and philosophy. The Manchus practiced Shamanism and Chinese Buddhism. Based on fieldwork and covering the history, rituals, and training of shamans, A Study of Manchu Shamanism is the most informative study. Shunzhi and Yongzheng were patrons of Chan Buddhism. To control the Mongols and Tibetans, however, the Qing court sponsored Lamaism.44 Qing patronage of Confucianism began with Hong Taiji and reached a peak during the Kangxi reign. Many recent studies, including those by Lü Shipeng, Liu Zhiyang, and especially Ping-ti Ho, agree that this patronage was important to sinicization.45

Notes

1. Owen Lattimore argues that the Tungus people were noted for “cultural adaptability.” See his Manchuria: Cradle of Conflict (New York: MacMillan Company, rev. ed., 1935), 18–19. As members of the southern Tungus, one may assume, the Manchus shared the same characteristic. For the quoted word, see Li Chi, “Manchuria in History,” Chinese Social and Political Science Review, 16. 2 (1932): 227.

2. For the evolution of Manchuria as a geographical and political identity, see
Mark C. Elliott, “The Limits of Tartary: Manchuria in Imperial and National Geographies,” *Journal of Asian Studies*, 59. 3 (2000): 603–46. In Chinese the guard-post system is *weisuo*. From the Jianzhou Jurchens stemmed the left and right branches. The Haixi group is alternatively known as the Four Hūlun tribes. The Wild Jurchens are referred to as the *Yeren*.

3. For a discussion of the *fadu* and its transformation, see the last few pages of Chapter VI. For Manchu influence on China, in particular in the Peking area, see Aixin Gioro Ying-sheng, *Lao Beijing yu Manzu* (Peking: Xueyuan chuban she, 2005), 19–30 ff. The book provides many examples and anecdotes and also covers Chinese influence on the Manchus. Although it is intended for the general public, the book is informative and useful. I am grateful to Dr. Wei-ping Wu for reminding me of the above book and lending it to me.
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10. For Manchu adoption of Chinese political and legal institutions, see Chapter V below. For Hong Taiji’s policy toward the Chinese, see Gertraude Roth, “The Manchu-Chinese Relationship, 1618–1636.” In Jonathan D. Spence and John E. Wills, Jr., eds., From Ming to Ch’ing: Conquest, Region, and Continuity in Seventeenth-Century China (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1979), 6–7, 22–24. When discussing the two cultural worlds that the Qianlong
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...era faced, Philip A. Kuhn uses the term “two rhetorical arenas.” This can be applied to the earlier reigns of the Qing. See Kuhn, Soulstealers: The Chinese Sorcery Scare of 1768 (Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press, 1990), 60.

11. For exhortations of the three emperors, see Chapters VI–VIII. For steps taken by Qing rulers from Kangxi to Qianglong, see Chapter VIII.


13. For the origin and evolution of the term Han, see CKMT, 149, 155–56; Jia Jingyan, “‘Han-ren’ kao.” In Fei Xiaotong et al., Zhonghua minzu duoyuan yiti geju (Peking: Zhong-yang minzu xueyuan chuban she, 1989), 137–52. For the diverse composition of the Han Chinese and their culture, see Li Xun and Xue Hong, eds., Qingdai quanshi, volume 1 (Shenyang: Liaoning renmin chuban she, 1991), 331–32. For the meaning of the term under the Yuan dynasty, see Yao Cong-wu, Yao Congwu xian-sheng quanji (Taipei: Zheng-zhong shuju, 1982, in 10 volumes), 7:1–3.

14. For these specialists, see note 8 above.


16. For Qianlong’s nephews, see CSL, Qianlong reign, 992: 12a–13b, 40/10/xinsi.


For military reports in Chinese, see CSL, Tongzhi reign, 305: 4a, 10/2/xinwei. For Manchu memorials, see Kangxi chao Manwen zhupi zouzhe quanyi,


20. For the Inner Asian links and the important role played by the Mongols, see Rawski, “Presidential Address,” 829–42, especially 831–34. For a refutation of Rawski’s view, see Ho, “In Defense of Sinicization,” 123–155. For denunciation of sinicization, see Crossley, “Thinking about Ethnicity in Early Modern China,” 2–5; for drawing on ideologies and practices from other Inner Asian members, see Mark C. Elliott, The Manchu Way, 4–5, 355.

21. For example, the artillery units under Tong Yangxing and Kong Youde helped defeat Ming defenders in many cities, including Jinzhou. See CSKC, 10: 8064 and 8124–25. For the three Mongol tribes, see Qing taizu wu huangdi Nuer-haqi shilu (Peiping: Palace Museum, 1932), 1: 10b–11a. For Mongols on the Ming side, see CSKC, 1: 29, 33. For Qorčins’ hostility toward Nurhaci, see Yan Chong-nian, Nuer-haci zhuan (Peking: Beijing chuban she, 1983), pp. 49–52. For the marital diplomacy, see Manchu-Mongol nuptial links, Chapter I, Section 3. For Hong Taiji’s expeditions against the Lindan Khan, see Yuan Senpo, “Lun Huang Taiji tongyi Chahaaer di douzheng,” Qingshi yanjiu, 6 (1988): 38–61.


23. For Nurhaci’s complaint, see Guang Lu and Li Xuezhi, Qing Taizu chao lao Manwen yuandang (Taipei: Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, 1970–71, 2 volumes), 2: 231–36. For Hong Taiji’s order, see CSL, reign of Taizong, 1: 19a, Tianming 11/12/gengzi. For Hong Taiji’s complaint, see CSL, reign of Taizong, 1: 19b, Tianming 11/12/gengxu; 4: 23a–26a, Tiancong 2/12/dinghai. For a translation of the document, see Nicola Di Cosmo and Dalizha-
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The *Jiu Manzhou dang* (see CMCT) has been partially translated, with two versions. One is entitled *Qing Taizu chao lao Manwen yuandang* by Guang Lu and Li Xuezhi. The other version is *Jiu Manzhou dang yizhu*, sponsored and published by the National Palace Museum in Taipei. The *Manwen laodang* has three renditions, two Chinese and one Japanese. In 1929 Jinhua translated some documents from it under the title *Manzhou laodang bilu* (Peiping: 2 volumes.). For comments on his translation, see Jin Yufu, “Manwen laodang kao,” *Shenyang bowu yuan choubei weiyuan hui kan*, 1 (1947): 8. For the second Chinese rendition, see MWLT. For the Japanese translation, see MBRT.

The earlier collection of Ming-Qing materials is known in Chinese as *Ming-Qing shiliao*, published in different formats and dates. The Chinese title for the later collection is *Ming-Qing dang’an*, ed., Chang Weiren (Taipei: Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, 1986–92, 261 volumes). For the confidential Manchu memorials of the Kangxi and Yongzheng eras, see note 17 above. For the collected Chinese confidential memorials, see Gong-zhong dang: Kangxi chao zouzhe (Taipei: National Palace Museum, 1976, 7 volumes); Gong-zhong dang: Yongzheng chao zouzhe (Taipei: National Palace Museum, 1977–80, 27 volumes); Gong-zhong dang: Qianlong chao zouzhe (Taipei: National Palace Museum, 1982–86, 75 volumes). For the collected Liaodong archival source, see MLTT. The eight banners archives are available in the First Historical Archives in Peking. *Zhongguo Mingchao dang’an zonghui* was edited by Zhongguo diyi lishi dang’an guan and Liaoning sheng dang’an guan (Guilin, Guangxi: Guangxi sifan daxue chuban she, 2001, 101 volumes).

The best edition of *Ming shilu* was published by the Academia Sinica in 1962–1968 and collated by Huang Zhangjian (see MSL). In addition to the text, it has twenty-one volumes of appendices and twenty-eight volumes of critical notes. For a discussion of the work, see Wolfgang Franke, comp., *An Introduction to the Sources of Ming History* (Kula Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1968), 3–23, 30–33. *Mingshi* (History of the Ming Dynasty) was compiled by Zhang

There are two versions of Qing shilu. One, Da Qing lichao shilu, appeared in the traditional format in 1936, with reprints (see CSL). The other, Qing shilu, in sixty volumes, is a better version, printed in 1986 by the Zhonghua Book Company in Peking. The Manchu version of Qing shilu for the Nurhaci reign is known as Daicing gurun i manju yargiyan kooli (Taipei: Hualian chuban she, 1964, reprint) in one volume.

Entitled Chosŏn wangjo sillok (see CWS), the Seoul edition is better than the other version, for it is indexed, with dates and chapter (juan) number on the margin of each page. The Tokyo edition—Yijo sillok—was published by the Gakushuin, Tōyō Bunka Kenkyūjo in 56 volumes.

One of the two multivolume works is known as Baqi tongzhi chuiji, with two reprints. The earlier reprint came out in Taipei in 1968 (see TCCC); the later one, a nicer reprint, appeared in 1985 (see TCCC, 1985). Their Manchu version, Jakūn gūsaı̄ tung jy sucungga weilehe bithe (prefaced in 1739), is available. The other multivolume work, Baqi tongzhi, included data for the years 1727–1799 (see volumes 38–40 and 41–44, respectively). One of the three works on banner affairs is Dergi hese jakūn gūsa de wesimbuhengge (Late Yongzheng period, 10 volumes), with a Chinese version known as Shangyuu baqi (1723–35, palace ed., 10 volumes). Another is entitled Shangyuu qiwu yifu (Yongzheng period, 8 volumes). Its Manchu version is referred to as Dergi hesei wesimbuhe gūsai baita be dahūme gisuriri wesimbuhe (10 volumes). The last is Hesei yabubuha hacilama wesimbuhe gūsai baita (10 volumes). It also has a Chinese version, Yuxing qiwu zouyi comp. Yun-.lu et al. (palace ed., 5 volumes). The Chinese title for the work on the origins of the Manchus is Agui and Yu Ming-zhong, Qinting Manzhou yuanliu kao (Taipei: Wen-hai chuban she, 1966, CCST, No. 14, volume 131).

The collected memorials by Ming officials, originally compiled and printed by Cheng Kaihu in the seventeenth century, is a reprint (Peiping: National Peiping Library Rare Books Series 1, 1936, prefaced in 1620, 44 volumes). The ninety-seven memorials were compiled by Luo Zhenyu as Tiancong chao cheng-gong zouyi, available in his Shiliao congkan chubian (N. p.: Dongfang xuehui, 1924, volumes 2–3). Recently, it was included in Pan Zhe, Sun Fangming, and Li Hongbin, comps., Qing juguan qian shiliao xuanji (Peking: Chinese People’s University Press, 1989), 2: 1–116.


The Liaodong zhi was first compiled in 1443 by Bi Gong, an assistant military commissioner of the region. The Quan Liao zhi was compiled by Li Fu in 1565,
with six chapters and in six volumes. Both are included in the Liaohai congshu, Series 2, 1934, volumes 1–4, 5–10, respectively. Compiled by Feng Yuan, the illustrated gazetteer is known as the *Kaiyuan tushuo* (HLTS ed., 1941, volumes 26–27).

31. For example, the *Nayin Fucha shi zengxiu zhipu* compiled by Dexing (N. p., 1889–1890, handwritten) indicates that almost all the male members of the 12th generation shared the character “chang” as the first part of their names. See the section marked by “12th Generation.” This had long been a Chinese naming tradition. The Kangxi emperor was the first Manchu throne to adopt the Chinese way of naming. Other Manchus follow suit.

The imperial genealogy is known as *Aixin juelo zongpu*, comp. Aixin juelo xiupu chu (Shenyang: 1938, 8 volumes). Its first volume is entitled *Xingyuan jiqing*. Among such branch records in the Tōyō Bunko is the genealogy of the Dorgon line, see *Taizu Gao huangdi wei xia hoshi Ruizhong qinwang zhi zisun* (handwritten, 3 volumes). For more branch records, see Taga Akigorō, *Sofu no kenkyū* (Tokyo: The Tōyō Bunko, 1960), 185–86.

The Chinese title of this genealogy is *Baqi Manzhou shizu tongpu* (see STTP). Its new printing has a biographical index (Shenyang: Liao-Shen shushe, 1989). Its Manchu version is entitled *Jakūn gūsai manjusai mukūn hala be uheri ejee he bith* (26 volumes).

32. For instance, *Zhangshi jiapu*, comp. by Zhang Chaolin and Chang Chaozhen and prefaced in 1679. *Liushi jiapu* was compiled by Liu Anguo in 1684 (N. p.: various page numbers). For the new discoveries in Liaoning, see Li Lin, ed., *Manzu jiapu xuanbian* (Shenyang: Liaoning minzu chuban she, 1988); Li Lin, Hou Jinbang, et al., *Benqi xian Manzu jiapu yanjiu* (Shenyang: Liaoning minzu chuban she, 1988).

Mark Elliott offers a long discussion about reasons for the Manchus’ compilation of genealogies. See his *The Manchu Way*, 326–29. But he seems to have overstated the imperial attempt to retain the Manchu identity.

33. There are at least four editions of the Eidu family records. (1) *Baqi Manzhou Niuhulu shi tongpu*, comp. by Noqin (prefaced in 1747, handwritten, in 12 volumes, with the first six in Chinese and the rest in Manchu); (2) *Xiang huangqi Niuhulu shi Hongyi gong jiapu*, comp. by Aligun (1765, in 10 volumes) as a revised edition of the above compilation; (3) *Kaiguo zuoyun gongchen Hongyi kong jiapu*, comp. by Fulang (handwritten, 1786, in 16 volumes); (4) *Xiang huangqi Manzhou Niuhulu shi Hongyi gong jiapu* (handwritten, 1798, in 15 volumes), with no compiler’s name.

The Chinese title for the Hada Gūwalgiya genealogy is *Zheng hongqi Manzhou Hada Guauerjia shi jiapu*, comp. by Enling (prefaced in 1849, in 8 volumes). In the explanatory note (*fanli*), the compiler acknowledged that he took a leaf from the Eidu family records.


Sin’s account is known in Korean as *Kŏnju kijŏng togi*, originally a long report to the ruler of the Yi dynasty included in *CWS*, vol. 22, reign of Sonjo, 71: 640–44, 29/1/chongyu. It is available in various formats. One appears in *Chin-tan Hakpo*, 10 (1939): 160–75, with annotations and comments by Yi In-yŏng. The Korean title for Yi’s book is *Chaam sŏnsaeng munjip* (N.p., postscript in 1886, 3 volumes). For its coverage, see 6: 1–7 under the subtitle “Kŏnju mun’gyonnonk.” When checked against other sources, this account is accurate.

One royal prince, known as Hyojong (r. 1650–59), later succeeded the Korean throne. The two others were Yi Wang and Yi Jun. The *Shenyang zhuangqi* is known in Korean as *Simyang changgye*, with the second compilation as *Simyang ilgi* (*Shenyang riji* in Chinese). The Korean title for *Shenguan lu* is *Simgwannok*. All the three are reprints and included in the Qingshi ziliao, Series 3, Kaiguo shiliiao (3), respectively as volumes 7, 8, and 9 (Taipei: Tailian Guofeng chuban she, 1970). The Royal Secretariat was called *Sŭngjŏngwŏn* in Korean.

For data on Manchu customs about death and hunting, see *Shenyang riji*, 429 and 494–500; for Korean captives and children of Jurchen-Korean wedlock, see *Shenyang zhuangqi*, 23–25, 87–89, respectively.


Fang’s article is “Qingchu Manzhou jiating lidi fenjiazi he wei fenjiazi,” *Guoli Beijing daxue wushi zhounian jinian lunwen ji* (Peiping: Peking Univer-


44. For a fine work on shamanism, see *A Study of Manchu Shamanism* by Fu Yükuang and Meng Huiying under the Chinese title, *Manzu saman jiao yanjiu* (Peking: Beijing daxue chuban she, 1991).

For Shunzhi’s interest in Chan Buddhism, see *ECCP*, 1: 257. For Yongzheng’s patronage, see Qing Shitzong, *Yuxuan yulu* (Palace edition, 1733, 14
volumes). For the study by Wang Jun-zhong, see his “‘Manzhou’ yu ‘Wenshu’