

The Manju Dynasty: An Introduction to the Study of the Qing State

ISHIBASHI Takao

I. Introduction

This article constitutes part of an attempt to clarify questions relating to the structure and power of the rule of the Qing 清 dynasty, founded by the Manchus. On first seeing the above title, readers may be reminded of the Japanese puppet state of Manchukuo 滿洲國 established in Northeast China in 1932 (and referred to in China today as “bogus [or illegitimate] Manchukuo” [*wei Manzhouguo* 偽滿洲國]). But the main period to be dealt with here is the period up until 1644, when the Qing dynasty advanced into China proper and transferred its capital to Beijing 北京. This corresponds to what is generally referred to as the prehistory of the Qing’s advance into China proper (or the Qing dynasty in the Manchu period), when the Qing is considered to have been one of several rebel forces active in the final years of the Ming 明 dynasty.¹⁾ According to the account of the founder and establishment of the Qing dynasty recorded in the *Manju i yargiyān kooli* (*Manzhou shilu* 滿洲實錄) 1 (compiled during the reign of the Qianlong 乾隆 Emperor [1736-95]), “[Bukūri Yongšon] called the country ‘Manju’. He was the founder of the Manju kingdom (*Manju gurun*),” and in the Qing dynasty it subsequently came to be held that the name ‘Manju’ had been used from the very start of the dynasty.²⁾ In addition, it has recently been shown that the name ‘Manju kingdom’ was in use when the Jurchens of Jianzhou 建州 were unified.³⁾ Since this article deals with the period before the Qing’s advance into China proper, a period which saw the foundation of the Manju kingdom, the formation of the kingdom of Aisin (Jin 金), and the establishment of the Great Qing (Daicing [Da Qing 大清]), I have deliberately used the term ‘Manju’ in the title of this article, and to avoid misunderstanding I use the form ‘Manju’, which is more faithful to the Manchu language, rather than the usual spelling ‘Manchu’ when referring to the dynasty in question.

As is only natural, any discussion of the Manju dynasty before the Qing’s advance into China proper has direct bearings on the study of the Qing state which later came to rule over China proper and the frontier regions of Mongolia, Chinese Turkestan and Tibet, and it would be meaningless if it did

not. The reason for this is that, as should not need to be pointed out anew, the process which led from the foundation of the Manju kingdom (*Manju gurun*), the formation of the kingdom of Aisin (*Aisin gurun*) and the establishment of the Great Qing Empire (*Daicing gurun*) before the Qing's advance into China proper through to the subsequent subjugation of China proper and the formation of the Qing's greatest territorial extent, which included Inner Asia,⁴⁾ was an unceasing process of territorial expansion, and various political moves to be seen before the Qing's advance into China proper can be seen to be directly related to political moves after the Qing's conquest of China proper.⁵⁾ However, for reasons of space, and also because I have already discussed elsewhere the Qing state after its conquest of China,⁶⁾ here I simply wish to take note of the fact that the two are inseparably linked. This is also the reason for the subtitle "An Introduction to the Study of the Qing State."

Accordingly, with a view to ascertaining first of all that the study of the Manju dynasty cannot be treated in isolation from the study of the Qing state, I wish to consider what I regard as the historiographical significance of the Qing dynasty and the period before its advance into China proper with reference to (1) the historical position of the Qing dynasty, (2) elements of the Qing dynasty linked to contemporary China, and (3) the periodization of the Qing dynasty.

1) The Historical Position of the Qing Dynasty: The Yuan, Ming and Qing Dynasties

Hitherto the historical position of the Qing dynasty has tended to be considered primarily in terms of two distinct aspects, namely, that of China's last 'dynasty of conquest' and that of successor to the Ming dynasty and China's last traditional despotic dynasty.⁷⁾ Moreover, the former has connotations of a dynasty based on tribal society and nomadic society, while the latter implies a typically Chinese dynasty rooted in Han 漢 society and agrarian society, counterposed to the tribal and nomadic society of the former. This being so, it has to be said that the positioning of the Qing involves two contrasting elements, and in point of fact these two elements appear in various forms in the system of rule established by the Qing. For this reason, I myself have previously dealt with issues such as the formation of the powers of the *han* ('ruler') and emperor (related to the structure of Qing rule), the Qing's distinctive civil service recruitment examinations known as "recruitment examinations in translation" (*fanyi keju* 繙譯科舉) (related to the question of the national language of the Qing dynasty), and traditional Chinese rites and traditional Manchu rites performed by the emperor (related to the state rites of the Qing dynasty), and in each case I considered the dual aspects of the Qing dynasty.⁸⁾ At the same time, I also demonstrated that movements after the Qing's conquest of China were inseparably linked to movements before its advance into China proper. Therefore, it is to

be surmised that it was because of the coexistence of these two elements in the Qing dynasty that its long period of unification, lasting more than 250 years, and its expansion and rule over territories of an unprecedented geographical extent were made possible.

However, when considering the Qing dynasty characterized in this manner, one should not overlook the fact that the Qing dynasty ruled over a multi-ethnic nation unified by a people who were not Han Chinese. That being so, it is questionable whether it is adequate to analyze the historical position of the Qing dynasty solely from the perspective that would view it as China's last 'dynasty of conquest' and the perspective that would view it as China's last traditional despotic dynasty. This is because, when situating the Qing on the basis of these two perspectives, there is a danger of failing to take into account the view of China as a unified composite multiethnic state going back to the thirteenth century, a view that cannot be grasped within the confines of either the Han-Chinese world or the world of North Asia alone. A perspective that may conceivably make up for this shortcoming is a historical positioning of the Qing in the context of the historical vicissitudes of the Yuan 元, Ming and Qing within the world of Asia, which would transcend and integrate the above worlds of the Han and North Asia.⁹⁾ Needless to say, as a premise to this one would have to take into account the vicissitudes of the Liao 遼, Song 宋 and Jin from the tenth century onwards and movements in the Mongol empire during the thirteenth century, for it was within this current of history that the vicissitudes of the Yuan, Ming and Qing dynasties took place, and likewise there also emerges a positioning of the Qing as the end result of this historical current.¹⁰⁾ At the same time, I am also of the opinion that an analysis and examination in terms of the Yuan, Ming and Qing dynasties can also provide leads for reconsidering the view of the Qing dynasty as a 'dynasty of conquest'.¹¹⁾ Be that as it may, I next wish to touch on elements of the Qing dynasty that have been carried over into contemporary China so as to provide a view of the position of the Qing dynasty from a different angle.

2) Elements of the Qing Dynasty Linked to Contemporary China: The Extent of Its Rule and Multiethnicity

It is possible to point out various elements from the Qing dynasty that have bearings on contemporary China. But owing to limited space, and also in view of the subject with which we are primarily concerned, I shall restrict myself to comments on the extent of the Qing's rule and its multiethnicity.

It goes without saying that the Qing dynasty was a unified dynasty that brought about a major change in the conception of the territorial extent of 'China'. The consequences of the fact that, among all the dynasties that ruled over China, the Qing was the first to extend its rule over the Mongolian

steppes, East Turkestan and Tibet, thereby resulting in the greatest territorial expansion in Chinese history, have direct links with contemporary China, consisting as it does of Northeast China, China proper, Inner Mongolia, Xinjiang 新疆 and Tibet. Therefore, the multiethnicity evident in contemporary China¹²⁾ may be regarded as an extension of the formation of a multiethnic state during the Qing dynasty. Furthermore, a distinctive feature of the structure of Qing rule was “a form broadly composed of Manchuria (Manchus, Mongols and Han in the northeast), the Han (in China proper), and the frontier regions (Mongolia, Tibet and the Uighurs).”¹³⁾ Among these, ‘Manchuria’ and the ‘Han’ were under direct rule, while the ‘frontier regions’ were under indirect rule. When this is compared with contemporary China, we find that the former two are generally administered by a system of ‘provinces’ (*sheng* 省), while the latter ‘frontier regions’ are under a system of ‘autonomous regions’ (*zizhiqu* 自治區), and the similarities are most interesting. Not only does this hint at the profound influence exerted by the Qing dynasty on contemporary China, but it also indicates that changes in the structure of rule during the Qing cannot be overlooked when considering the political structure of contemporary China.

Under what political changes, then, did this formation of a multiethnic state during the Qing occur? The dominions of the Qing dynasty reached their greatest territorial extent during the reign of the sixth emperor Gaozong 高宗 Qianlong, about one century after the Qing’s advance into China proper, but signs of its shift to a multiethnic state could be said to have been already apparent in various political moves before its advance into China proper. For instance, in Tianming 天命 1 (1616) Taizu 太祖 Nurhaci, the founder of the Qing dynasty, received the title of *Genggiyen Han* (‘Wise Ruler’) from the Jurchens (Jušen [Nüzhen 女真]; renamed ‘Manchus’ [Manju] during the reign of Nurhaci’s successor Taizong 太宗 Hong Taiji) and assumed the position of *han*, but already in Wanli 萬曆 34 (1606) of the Ming he had been given the title of *Kundulen Han* (‘Respected Ruler’) by a delegation from the five Khalkha tribes of Mongolia;¹⁴⁾ after having unified the Jurchen tribes, Nurhaci invaded and occupied the extensive lands of Han agrarian society to the east of the Liao River 遼河, moved his capital to Liaodong 遼東, where Ming control of the northeast was based, and implemented policies for dealing with the Han (shifting from initial Jurchen-Han co-occupancy to subsequent segregation)¹⁵⁾ as well as various land policies;¹⁶⁾ the Six Ministries (*liubu* 六部) established during the reign of his successor Hong Taiji were staffed by Manchus, Mongols and Han;¹⁷⁾ and the Eight Banner (*jakūn gūsa*) system, considered to have underpinned the Qing’s system of rule, was extended so that it came to consist of Eight Manchu Banners, Eight Mongol Banners and Eight Chinese Banners¹⁸⁾—these are all examples that clearly point to the Qing’s development as a multiethnic state.

Additionally, although the Qing dynasty is generally referred to as a Manchu dynasty on account of the fact that it grew out of the kingdom of Aisin

founded by the Tungusic Jurchens (= Manchus) of Northeast Asia, it should be borne in mind that from the very outset the position of *han* in its predecessor Aisin was an issue not only concerning Jurchen society, but also closely related to neighbouring peoples like the Mongols, and that the Eight Banner system itself, which underpinned the Qing system of rule, was from an early stage inherently multiethnic, incorporating as it did the Han as well. In particular, the fact that Hong Taiji was installed as emperor by the Manchus, Mongols and Han in the tenth year of his rule and changed the dynastic name to 'Great Qing' is of considerable importance when considering the multiethnicity of the Qing dynasty. It should also be noted that when the third emperor Shizu Shunzhi 世祖 順治 advanced into China proper in the year after his accession to the throne and really began ruling as emperor of China, the Qing dynasty was confronted with the problem of its legitimacy, a problem arising from the Chinese notion of 'civilization' (i.e., Chinese) versus 'barbarism' (i.e., non-Chinese) (*huayi* 華夷), and a politico-ideological interpretation was provided by the fifth emperor Shizong Yongzheng 世宗 雍正, who declared that China was a multiethnic state composed of both Chinese and non-Chinese.¹⁹⁾

Having taken due account of the above issues pertaining to the character of the Qing dynasty, I next wish to consider the periodization of the Qing dynasty with a view to ascertaining the significance of the so-called Manchu period before its advance into China proper.

3) The Periodization of the Qing Dynasty: With a Focus on the 'Early Qing'

There has been considerable discussion of the periodization of Chinese history.²⁰⁾ However, even though the period equated with the dawning of the modern age in China falls during the Qing dynasty, studies dealing directly with the periodization of the Qing dynasty itself would appear to be quite limited in number, and when it comes to the periodization of the entire span of the Qing dynasty, from the foundation of the kingdom of Aisin by Nurhaci to the fall of the Great Qing Empire as a result of the 1911 Revolution, there has hitherto been, to the best of my knowledge, virtually no treatment of the subject. This would seem to be chiefly because "the Qing dynasty after its advance into China proper was placed into the category of Chinese history as an extension of the Ming dynasty and was considered to be a continuation of this line."²¹⁾ Be that as it may, let us next summarize the main views of earlier scholars on the subject of the periodization of the Qing dynasty.

In his study of peasant rebellions during the Qing,²²⁾ Sano Manabu 佐野學 presents a method of periodization in which "the development of popular rebellions during the Qing period" is divided into five periods: period of the movement to expel the Manchus and restore the Ming (Shunzhi's reign and first half of Kangxi's 康熙 reign), period of a subsidence of popular rebellions

(second half of Kangxi's reign to first half of Qianlong's reign), period of a gradual rise in popular rebellions (second half of Qianlong's reign), period of the heyday of popular rebellions (Jiaqing's 嘉慶 reign to Tongzhi's 同治 reign), and period of the transformation of popular rebellions into a revolutionary movement (Guangxu's 光緒 and Xuantong's 宣統 reigns). Although Sano does take into account trends before the Qing's advance into China proper when discussing the characteristics of the Qing state, the prime focus of his interest lies in Qing China as the final period of Old China, going back to the Qin 秦 and Han 漢 dynasties, and his periodization is one that forms part of an analysis of the social history of the Qing dynasty as seen in this light after its advance into China proper and focusses primarily on popular rebellions, which Sano regards as concentrated manifestations of the contradictions that recurred periodically in Old Chinese society.²³⁾ Therefore, as it stands, it cannot really be adopted as a periodization of the historical vicissitudes *per se* of the Great Qing, but nonetheless it contains much that is instructive for considering Qing policies towards China proper in the post-Manchu period.

Next, Abe Takeo 安部健夫, in "Shinchō shi no kōzō to sono dōin,"²⁴⁾ states that in a broad sense the 'Qing dynasty' refers to the body politic of Manchu sovereignty spanning the period from Nurhaci to Xuantong, while in a narrow sense it refers to the Qing period after the advance into China proper.²⁵⁾ Moreover, the history of the Qing dynasty in a broad sense is said to consist of two periods, the first, from the Qing's foundation to about 1830 (late Jiaqing era), of a character that ought to be understood in terms of "a confrontation between a small, newly-rising military-style society and a large, mature low-level industrial society" and the second subsequent period of a character that ought to be understood in terms of "a confrontation between a single low-level industrial society and several high-level industrial societies"; the first of these two periods is further subdivided into a fortuitous North China period (Qing's foundation to Taizong's Chongde 崇德 era), an active North China period (Shunzhi's advance into China proper to end of Kangxi's reign), and a passive North China period (Yongzheng's to Jiaqing's reigns), while the second is subdivided into the years 1834-62 (eve of Opium Wars to Taiping 太平 rebellion), 1862-95 (Tongzhi's restoration to Sino-Japanese War), 1895-1901 (rapid switch by Western powers to an offensive using financial capital and failure of national counteroffensives by both progressive and reactionary factions), and 1901-11 (attempts at modernization of the overall political structure and 1911 Revolution). The second of Abe's two main divisions corresponds to that period in Chinese history when China is considered to have entered the modern age, and it is generally referred to as the 'late Qing'. What directly concerns us here, however, is the subdivision of the first of Abe's two main periods, which he understands in terms of a confrontation between the newly rising Great Qing and Han society in China proper, the latter of which had inherited a situa-

tion going back to the Ming. When one considers the state of research on Qing history in 1951 (when Abe wrote this article), one can recognize the value of his threefold subdivision of this first period, linking the Manchu period to the zenith of Qing power and identifying the advance into China proper and Yongzheng's reign as major turning points. But today, when we possess the results of many detailed studies of the history of Aisin and the Great Qing, it has to be said that Abe's interpretation of changes before the advance into China proper is inadequate. His view of the reigns of Yongzheng, Qianlong and Jiaqing as being all of the same character is also difficult to accept.

Suzuki Chūsei 鈴木中正, on the other hand, in a section entitled "Shinchō chūki no shakai mondai" 清朝中期の社會問題 (Social problems in the mid-Qing) in his study of the mid-Qing,²⁶⁾ first defines the 'mid-Qing' as the period from the suppression of the rebellion of the Three Feudatories (*sanfan* 三藩) and the revolt on Taiwan 臺灣 during Kangxi's reign to the end of Qianlong's reign and then goes on to subdivide this into the period up until the end of Yongzheng's reign, corresponding to the first half of the mid-Qing, and Qianlong's reign, corresponding to the second half of the mid-Qing. The 110-odd years covered by this periodization span the period from the unification of China proper by the Great Qing to the year before the outbreak of the White Lotus Society rebellion in Jiaqing 1 (1796), and they correspond to the periods of a subsidence of popular rebellions and a gradual rise in popular rebellions as defined by Sano.²⁷⁾ In Suzuki's case, his prime objective was to elucidate the character and historical significance of the White Lotus Society rebellion during Jiaqing's reign, as a premise for which he also examined various issues in contemporary Chinese society, and his periodization must be understood in this context. It should be said, however, that it has had an enormous influence on the periodization of the Qing dynasty, for in subsequent research it has generally been implicitly followed and the same period (although often extended to the eve of the Opium Wars) is treated as the mid-Qing. Several factors would seem to have contributed to this widespread acceptance—Suzuki's book is the only study to have focussed directly on the history of the mid-Qing; this periodization not only covers the heyday of the Qing, but also corresponds to Sano's periods of a subsidence of popular rebellions and a gradual rise in popular rebellions and roughly to Abe's active and passive North China periods; and in the field of research dealing with the socio-economic history of the Ming and Qing, which has been most productive in the postwar era, the Qing dynasty after its advance into China proper has been understood as an extension of the Ming dynasty in the context of Chinese history as a whole. But whatever the reasons may be, in the study of Qing history since the publication of Suzuki's book it would seem to have become common practice to treat the period before the advance into China proper as a special period distinct from the rest of the Qing, which has then been divided into the early Qing (corresponding to the period

from the advance into China proper to the unification of China proper under Kangxi),²⁸⁾ the mid-Qing (corresponding to the period from the unification of China proper to the eve of the Opium Wars), and the late Qing (corresponding to the period from the Opium Wars to the 1911 Revolution).

In contrast to the above methods of periodization, Ishibashi Hideo 石橋秀雄 has presented a completely new method of periodization, focussing in particular on the early Qing, which he has developed in the course of his research on historical changes in Aisin and the Great Qing from the Manchu period through to the reign of Qianlong. Initially, when dealing with the question of banner lands in the metropolitan area during the reigns of Yongzheng and Qianlong, he equated this same period with the mid-Qing.²⁹⁾ But later he came to focus on the formation of China as composed of the five peoples (Han, Manchus, Mongols, Tibetans and Uighurs) connected with the main areas encompassed by contemporary China, and in a subsequent study³⁰⁾ he not only admitted for the first time the inappropriateness of his earlier periodization, but also pointed out with much supporting evidence that the attainment of the Qing's greatest territorial extent during the third decade of Qianlong's rule (late 1750s), encompassing the Manchus, Mongols, Han, Tibetans and Uighurs, might be regarded as a turning point in the history of the Qing, and he defined the period up until this time as the early Qing and the subsequent period of preservation of this territorial aggrandizement as the mid-Qing. At the same time, whereas the fall of the Ming and the advance of the Qing into China proper in 1644 is normally regarded as a dividing point, with the foregoing period being called the late Ming and the subsequent period the early Qing, Ishibashi pointed out that the late Ming and early Qing overlapped with one another insofar that the early Qing under Nurhaci had already begun during the late Ming, while the late Ming, marked by conflict with the Southern Ming (former Three Feudatories), the Three Feudatories rebellion by Han generals from Liao who had submitted to the Qing (later Three Feudatories), struggles with the Zheng 鄭 clan based on Taiwan, and the unification of China proper by the Qing, continued into what is normally referred to as the early Qing. In a later article³¹⁾ Ishibashi reiterated his definition of the early Qing as corresponding to the period up to the attainment of the Qing's greatest territorial extent in the third decade of Qianlong's rule, and he also presented a new view, dividing the early Qing into two periods separated by the Qing's advance into China proper. At the same time, he also touched on the differences in the *han's* powers in the cases of Nurhaci and Hong Taiji, putting forward the view that after his accession Hong Taiji consolidated the power of the *han* among the Jurchens and succeeded in "establishing the Great Qing with the support of the Manchus, Mongols and Han" as "a result of changes in the *han* during the early Qing under Taizu Nurhaci and Taizong Hong Taiji," and that the establishment of the Great Qing by Hong Taiji "indicated the formation of a dynasty to

the north of the Great Wall ready to replace the Ming and opened the way to emperors of China.”

Whereas there has in the past been a tendency to regard the Qing dynasty as discontinuous, being divided into two discrete periods before and after its advance into China proper, Ishibashi's above views clearly demonstrate in terms of periodization the need to understand the Qing's Manchu period (before its advance into China proper) in direct relation to its later heyday, and they also merit attention in that, when discussing how the evolution of the Qing into a multiethnic state was inseparably related to the formation of the powers of the *han* and emperor, he shows that in the Manchu period, directly linked to the heyday of the Qing, Hong Taiji's accession to the imperial throne has great significance as a turning point. In the earlier prevailing view of Chinese history, which looked upon the Qing dynasty after its advance into China proper as an extension of the Ming dynasty, the period from the advance into China proper to the unification of China proper had been vaguely defined as the early Qing on the grounds that invasions from without had come to a provisional halt, while the subsequent period up until the eve of the Opium Wars had been equated with the mid-Qing, but this periodization put forward by Ishibashi, on the other hand, who regards the Qing dynasty as an end result of the history of North Asia and China since the tenth century, transcending the bounds of Ming and Qing history, deserves to be recognized as the first attempt at periodization to have been made on the basis of a clear-cut view of the historical changes of the Qing, especially in its capacity as a multiethnic state. In other words, it could be said to be of great significance in that it has provided us with a basis for fresh inquiries into the periodization of the Qing and the history of the Qing through discussion of different interpretations of his views.

Like Ishibashi, I too have a deep interest in the multiethnic character of the Qing and, as regards the historical changes of the Qing, I consider the founding of the Manju kingdom to be the symbol of the unification of the Jianzhou tribes to which Nurhaci belonged, the formation of the kingdom of Aisin to be the symbol of the unification of the Jušen (later Manju) tribes in the northeast, the establishment of the Great Qing to be the symbol of the unification of the Manchus, Mongols and Han in the northeast, the unification of China proper by Kangxi to be the symbol of the amalgamation of the Han in China proper after the conquest of China, the establishment of the absolute authority of Yongzheng to be the symbol of the establishment of control over the banners (Manchus, Mongols and Chinese) and the Han in China proper against the background of the unification of China proper, and the attainment of greatest territorial expansion in the third decade of Qianlong's rule to be the symbol of the amalgamation of the frontier regions of Mongolia, Tibet and the Uighurs against the background of the establishment of this control. As for the subsequent period, I regard the time up until the Opium Wars, when external

pressure of a different nature from that in the past started to become quite pronounced, as a period of preservation of the fruits of the foregoing period and the remaining years up until the collapse of the Qing after much trial and error as a period during which the Qing was on the defensive, but hitherto I have been unable to present my understanding in terms of a clear-cut periodization. In this sense I regard Ishibashi's scheme, which defines the early Qing as the period up until the attainment of the Qing's greatest territorial extent and divides it into two periods separated by the Qing's advance into China proper, as apposite, and I shall follow his view here.

In my eagerness to emphasize the significance of the Qing dynasty and its Manchu period, I have ended up burdening the reader with a rather longwinded introduction, and I now wish to move on to questions pertaining to the Manju dynasty, the subject with which we are here concerned. When we define the early Qing as that period extending from Nurhaci's rule to the attainment of the Qing's greatest territorial extent in the third decade of Qianlong's rule, what are the distinctive features and issues relevant to a consideration of the Qing dynasty as a multiethnic state that can be detected in its Manchu period, corresponding to the first part of the early Qing? The political changes in the first part of the early Qing that led from the formation of the kingdom of Aisin by Nurhaci to the establishment of the Great Qing by Hong Taiji involve a variety of issues relating to politics, military affairs, the economy, ethnicity, culture and so on, and many detailed studies have already been published by previous scholars.³²⁾ Among these various issues, I shall in the following focus especially on the structure of rule during the first part of the early Qing, taking up the question of the powers of the *han* and the emperor, but before doing so I wish to touch on the structure of the society of bannermen and some ethnic and economic issues, which must be borne in mind as premises for our subsequent discussion.

II. The Structure of Bannermen's Society and Ethnic and Economic Issues in the First Part of the Early Qing

It should go without saying that the term 'bannermen' refers to members of the Eight Banners, a system of military organization distinctive of the Qing which also functioned as a form of political and social organization and was an important mainstay of the structure of Qing rule, and in Qing documentary sources they are frequently described as "the basis of the nation" (*gurun booi fulehe da* [*guojia genben* 國家根本]).³³⁾ Therefore, the examination of the structure of the society of bannermen is an important task in the elucidation of changes in the structure of rule during the Qing dynasty.³⁴⁾ Especially during the first part of the Qing dynasty (i.e., the Manchu period) political moves and changes in the Eight Banner system were closely interconnected, and political changes

could be said to have been directly reflected in the society of bannermen. The changes in the Eight Banner system, which was established under Nurhaci and then expanded into Eight Manchu Banners, Eight Mongol Banners and Eight Chinese Banners by Hong Taiji, could in fact be seen to reflect the political changes that led from the formation of the kingdom of Aisin to the establishment of the Great Qing.

Let us first consider the formation of the kingdom of Aisin by Nurhaci, which consisted of two stages, namely, the unification of the Jianzhou tribes and the unification of the Jurchen tribes. During the Ming (when the Jurchens were known as 'Nüzhi' 女直) the Jurchens had been broadly divided into three groups, called Jianzhou Jurchens, Haixi 海西 Jurchens and Yeren 野人 ('Wild') Jurchens, and this has created the false impression that these three groups were each in some way internally united. But this was not at all the case. The Jianzhou Jurchens (called the "Manju kingdom" in the *Manzhou shilu*) consisted of five tribes, the Haixi Jurchens (called the "Hülun kingdom" in the *Manzhou shilu*) consisted of four tribes, and the Yeren Jurchens also consisted of four tribes. Thus "they were divided into thirteen tribes, and within each tribe consanguine kinship groups and territorially defined hamlets vied for autonomy."³⁵) The tribes that were eventually united by Nurhaci were originally independent countries that had been individually established, and by nature they were such that "consanguine or ethnic connections cannot be recognized among these groups."³⁶) Therefore, the process of unification by Nurhaci, which began with the Jianzhou tribes and ultimately extended to all the Jurchens, was no mere intratribal power struggle, but represented a struggle for hegemony among the independent countries scattered throughout the north-east. This means that the resulting unified state was a composite tribal state with an inherent element of instability in that it was made up of several tribal groups that were neither consanguinely nor ethnically related. An inevitable consequence of this was that it became necessary to build a new internal order so as to ensure post-unification stability and to demonstrate the new state's authority as a unified state both domestically and abroad. When one considers that this struggle by Nurhaci for hegemony "was a lone [struggle] for which he failed to win the consent of even the Aisin Gioro lineage to which he himself belonged, let alone that of the Jianzhou tribes,"³⁷) this need would presumably have been all the greater. In point of fact Nurhaci, in addition to creating during the course of unification a new script (—the Manchu script) for writing the Jurchen language, also used his accession to the position of *han* in the final stage of unification, after having been conferred the title of *Genggiyen Han* by the Jurchens, to invent a founding legend³⁸) and adopted the dynastic name of 'Aisin', thereby showing that it was the legitimate successor to the Jin dynasty of the twelfth to thirteenth centuries,³⁹) and it is to be surmised that these actions were not simply attempts to lend authority to his own person, but were meant

to symbolize the unity and authority of the newly unified state. The founding legend was an adaptation of a legend prevalent among Tungusic tribes and typified by that of Puyō 夫餘 (similar to the legend of Chumong 朱蒙, progenitor of Koguryō 高句麗, with connotations of skill in archery), to which were added some historical facts relating to the Jianzhou Left Guard (*zuowei* 左衛), and it identified Nurhaci as an incarnation of the bodhisattva Mañjuśrī, as well as incorporating “the world of Manchu shamanism embellished with Lamaist Buddhism.”⁴⁰⁾ Moves such as this show that from the very outset this unified state transcended the bounds of mere unification of the Jurchens and possessed the character of a multiethnic state.

After the fall of the Jin dynasty, the Jurchen script had gradually fallen into disuse among the Jurchens, and up until the time when Nurhaci borrowed the Mongolian script to create a new Manchu script they had been drawing up documents by translating them into either Mongolian or Chinese. This fact would suggest that the Mongols and Han exercised considerable influence among the Jurchens at this time. Therefore, relations with the Mongols and Han should also be taken into account when considering the establishment of Aisin by Nurhaci, and there are indeed numerous points illustrative of the fact that the worlds of the Mongols and Han impinged closely on the character of Aisin—for instance, when Nurhaci began his campaign for hegemony in Wanli 11 (1583) under circumstances such that he could not count on assistance even from his own tribe, he secretly formed an affiliation with Li Chengliang 李成梁, the Ming regional commander (*zongbingguan* 總兵官) of Liaodong,⁴¹⁾ in an attempt to extend his influence; seeing that Nurhaci was carrying forward his plans for unification, the Ming in Wanli 17 (1589) conferred on him the rank of assistant commissioner-in-chief (*dudu qianshi* 都督僉事), and in Wanli 34 (1606) the five Mongol Khalkha tribes gave him the title of *Kundulen Han*; and there is evidence of the influence of Tibetan Buddhism, closely connected to both the Mongol and Han worlds, in the founding legend of Aisin.

Next, to provide the foundations of a new domestic order in this emergent composite tribal state, the Eight Banner system was created. Qing historical sources all state that this occurred in Wanli 43 (1615), the year before Nurhaci was given the title of *Genggiyen Han* by the Jurchens and acceded to the position of *han*, and there is a considerable body of research that supports this. But it has also been suggested that the Eight Banner system was established in Tianming 1 (1616) or Tianming 3 (1618),⁴²⁾ and together with problems surrounding the date of the introduction of the era name ‘Tianming’ and dynastic name ‘Aisin’⁴³⁾ there is much that remains unresolved. At the present point in time, I take the view that references to the establishment of the Eight Banner system have been interpolated in Qing historical sources in their accounts of the year prior to Nurhaci’s installation as *han* in order to emphasize the significance of the fact that Nurhaci was installed as *han* by Jurchen society, already unified un-

der the Eight Banner system, and to highlight his character as *han* of a society organized on the basis of the Eight Banner system (i.e., *han* of a unified state), and that in actual fact the Eight Banner system developed as he contrived to consolidate, preserve and stabilize his rule after his installation as *han*, a direct background factor being the need to create a military organization in preparation for the direct confrontation with the Ming that he encountered in the final stage of unification.⁴⁴⁾ At any rate, the society organized on the basis of the Eight Banners that was now established was one in which a plurality of mutually unrelated Jurchen tribes, Mongol tribes and Han groups lived together, and thus it was from the first confronted with problems of ethnic compositeness. In the first part of the early Qing, Jurchen (or Manchu) society as a whole is considered to have had the following structure:

han—beile—amban, hafan—jušen, irgen

This, however, will be dealt with in the following section together with the question of the *han's* powers.

As has just been noted, in the final stage of his unification of the Jurchens Nurhaci was forced into direct confrontation with the Ming, and following his victory in the decisive Battle of Sarhū he not only succeeded in unifying the Jurchens, but also gained the chance to advance into Liaodong, as a result of which the kingdom of Aisin underwent fresh political developments. These were, namely, control for the first time of Ming territory (i.e., Han farmlands) and accompanying changes in relations with the Mongols.⁴⁵⁾ The southward advance of Aisin increased the threat to its flank and rear posed by Lindan Han of the Chahars, who was a direct descendant of the Great Yuan, received annual gifts from the Ming, and was promoting the unification of Inner Mongolia. For this reason Nurhaci formed an alliance with the eastern Mongol tribes for the overthrow of the Ming so as to counter the Chahars.⁴⁶⁾ This schema of a society of bannermen made up of Jurchens, Mongols and Han and counterposed to the Han and Mongols not affiliated to the Eight Banners could be regarded as the starting point of the later multiethnic state structure peculiar to the Qing.

The aim of Nurhaci's advance into Liaodong may be considered to have lain in a desire to seek and thereby stabilize the economic foundations of Aisin in Han agrarian society,⁴⁷⁾ and this could be said to have had links with the causes of strife among the Jurchens when Nurhaci began his struggle for hegemony. A major reason for strife among the Jurchens, who "were dependent on a typically northern hunter-gatherer economy which required bartering," was "the acquisition of imperial writs showing bartering rights" with the Ming,⁴⁸⁾ and in reality the violent struggle for hegemony was an economic struggle for even slightly more stable economic conditions in unstable economic circumstances. Also related to this may have been the fact that the Jurchens, unlike

the Mongols, were engaged in farming, albeit not very highly advanced, and they also had an understanding of landownership. All the same their management skills with regard to landownership fell far short of those of the Han. It was presumably for this reason that particular importance was attached to the existence of the Han as the mainstay of an economic base, and steps were taken both to introduce a Chinese system of control aimed at direct exploitation and to advance into Ming territory. At any rate, after having attacked and occupied the vast lands of Han agrarian society to the east of the Liao River and having moved his capital to Liaodong, which had been the base of the Ming's control of the northeast, Nurhaci began constructing a new capital at Liaodong and implemented various policies directed towards the Han, which included a variety of land policies such as the establishment of banner lands. As can be seen in the paternalistic policy of settling Jurchens and Han together, these policies did not deviate greatly from existing administration policies. But they led to social and economic confusion, and having been compelled to withdraw from Liaodong after having lost the economic war in Han agrarian society, Nurhaci moved his capital to Mukden (Shenyang 瀋陽), switching to policies aimed at repressing the Han as he did so, starting with the enforcement of segregation of the Han, in an attempt to recover from the failure of his earlier policies.⁴⁹⁾ But Nurhaci's sudden death meant that these problems were carried over into Hong Taiji's reign.

Nurhaci's death and Hong Taiji's accession led to fresh developments that resulted in the establishment of the Great Qing in the place of Aisin. The introduction of a Chinese-style system of government during Nurhaci's time would have had a revolutionizing effect on the traditional tribal system operating in contemporary Jurchen society, and within the centralized system of rule by Jurchens, which had been reinforced by the Eight Banner system that had been simultaneously implemented, the power of Nurhaci (i.e., the *han*) grew. But it is also to be surmised that the *beile*, or chieftains, who had enjoyed a political voice in the traditional tribal system based on decentralization and a council system, would have entertained apprehensions about the possibility that their right to participate in government might be lost if the concentration of power in the hands of the *han* were to advance any further. Therefore, their choice of Hong Taiji, who was only the fourth-ranking of the so-called 'four senior *beile*', as Nurhaci's successor⁵⁰⁾ could be seen as an attempt to curb the expansion of the *han*'s powers and return to the former system of government practised under the traditional tribal system, for Hong Taiji's accession to the position of *han* had the result of clearly showing that the system of government was one in which power was shared by the four *beile*, a system characterized by the fact that in Jurchen society, or the society of bannermen, the *han* was no more than the leader of a single banner.⁵¹⁾ It was under such circumstances that Hong Taiji forcibly carried into simultaneous effect the centralization of power

among the Jurchens and the consolidation of the *han*'s powers among the bannermen, but his position at the start of his power struggle was such that he could not expect any strong support from within the tribe, and in this respect it could be said to have been similar to Nurhaci's position when he first took up arms. Nurhaci had extended his power through extratribal relationships, and in the same way Hong Taiji looked for a new power base in the political, economic and military strength of the Han and the mobility of the Mongol cavalry, both of which had not yet been firmly established in the society of bannermen by Nurhaci's political moves.

Hong Taiji made considerable changes to the policy of Han suppression that had been in force during Nurhaci's final years, and he adopted a policy of Jurchen-Han segregation which "separated the Han, regarded as the same *irgen* ('people'), from the Manchus, placed them under the jurisdiction of Han bureaucrats, and banned access by Manchus,"⁵²⁾ as well as reappointing members of the Han gentry and elite who had escaped the large-scale massacres that had been carried out under Nurhaci's repressive policies. While promoting the appointment of Han bureaucrats and the introduction of Chinese-style administrative institutions such as the Six Ministries, Hong Taiji consolidated his military power with the help of artillerymen under Han commanders who had joined the Manchus⁵³⁾ and cavalry forces commanded by Mongol princes, and at the same time he divested the other three leading princes of their political power and gradually built up the basis of his own power as *han* within the society of bannermen. Furthermore, in view of the fact that trade with the Ming at Shanhaiguan 山海關 had not materialized on account of Nurhaci's death, he set about making advances into Inner Mongolia and captured the Chahar stronghold. The Chahar leader Lindan Han moved to the west, and after having united most of Inner and Outer Mongolia, he died of illness in Tiancong 天聰 8 (1634) en route to Tibet. The Chahar princes, thrown into confusion by his death, surrendered to Hong Taiji, who also brought Lindan Han's eldest son Ejei to submission in the following year outside the borders of Gansu 甘肅.⁵⁴⁾ Once the subjugation of the Chahars had thus been completed, the forty-nine *beile* of the sixteen tribes of Inner Mongolia voted to confer the title of *Bokdo Secen Han* on Hong Taiji and submit to him.⁵⁵⁾ Having acquired the jade seal of the Great Yuan Empire during his subjugation of the Chahars of Inner Mongolia, Hong Taiji took this opportunity to change the name of his people from Jušen (Jurchen) to Manju (Manchu), and in Tiancong 10 (1636) he was installed as emperor of the Great Qing by the Manchus, Mongol princes, and Han generals and altered the era name to Chongde.⁵⁶⁾ Thus was established the Great Qing. Around the same time he reorganized the Eight Banner system so that it was made up of Manchus, Mongols and Han, with Eight Manchu Banners, Eight Mongol Banners and Eight Chinese Banners, and then in Chongde 3 (1638) he restructured the Mongol Agency (*Menggu yamen* 蒙古衙門),

in charge of relations with tribal groups of Mongol allies in Inner Mongolia (organized into banners and companies along the lines of the Eight Banner system) and renamed it Court of Colonial Affairs (*lifanyuan* 理藩院).⁵⁷⁾

The structure of rule under the Great Qing which had thus come into being incorporated the Manchus and their banners (Manchus, Mongols and Chinese), the Han (farmlands north of the Great Wall), and frontier regions (Inner Mongolia), with the Han farmlands to the north of the Great Wall being placed under direct rule and the Mongol allies of Inner Mongolia under indirect rule, and not only did this symbolize the unification of the Manchus, Mongols and Han in the northeast, but it already provided a model for the structure of rule during the period of the Qing's greatest territorial expansion after its advance into China proper. These political moves before the advance into China proper were in fact the wellspring of a political current that led, through the advance into China proper, to the period of greatest territorial expansion during the third decade of Qianlong's reign, and if the period up until the attainment of greatest territorial expansion is equated with the early Qing, then this first part of the early Qing was directly linked to the second part. But although the Great Qing took the political structure of Aisin one step further with regard to the formation and expansion of a multiethnic state, when considered from the perspective of the establishment of an underlying economic base through control of Han farmlands, it left virtually untouched the economic problems that went back to the days of Aisin. Now that Hong Taiji had ascended the throne as emperor of the Great Qing ruling over the Manchus, Mongols and Han, his next objective was the acquisition of an economic base by advancing into China proper.

It is easy to look upon Hong Taiji's enthronement as an expression of his leanings towards China due to an awareness of the presence of the Ming, that is to say, as no more than an example of Sinification. It is true that prior to his enthronement he introduced Chinese-style administrative institutions such as the Six Ministries, and it is also true that the dynastic name 'Great Qing' and the new era name 'Chongde' adopted at the time of his enthronement were thoroughly Chinese designations based on a typically Chinese way of thinking⁵⁸⁾ and that he incorporated traditional Chinese ceremonies and rites on the occasion of his enthronement,⁵⁹⁾ all actions that would appear to support the above view. But is this interpretation really to the point? In the following final section I wish to consider this question in connection with issues pertaining to the powers of the *han* and the emperor in the first part of the early Qing.

III. The Powers of the *Han* and the Emperor in the First Part of the Early Qing

When political changes in the Qing dynasty in its capacity as a multiethnic

state are examined in light of the character of the Qing dynasty and moves in the first part of the early Qing as outlined in the foregoing sections, it is of vital importance to elucidate the evolution of the powers of the *han* and the emperor in the first part of the early Qing. As regards the powers of the *han* and the emperor during the Qing dynasty, it may be assumed that the dual character and multiethnic nature of the Qing are clearly exemplified by the fact that the *han*, rooted in the distinctive society of the Manchus typified by the Eight Banners (composed of Manchus, Mongols and Chinese), was simultaneously emperor of China. It is generally held that the dictatorial powers of the emperor, standing at the pinnacle of a centralized system of rule, were established in the Qing after the advance into China proper during the reign of Yongzheng. But this leaves unexplained the status of *han*, which had merged with that of emperor of China. If we therefore examine changes in the use of the title of emperor in the early Qing, we find that three stages are distinguishable: (1) the stage when Nurhaci is believed to have used the title of emperor in diplomatic correspondence while remaining *han* on the domestic front; (2) the stage when, in the tenth year of his reign, Hong Taiji was installed as emperor by the Manchus, Mongols and Han, changed the dynastic name to Great Qing and the era name from Tiancong to Chongde, and began to rule domestically too as both *han* and emperor; and (3) the stage when Shunzhi advanced into China proper in the year following his enthronement and began to rule literally as emperor of China. Among these three stages, it is stage (2), touched on in the previous section, that represents the starting point of the *han's* domestic rule in his capacity as a person also doubling as emperor, and not only is it important for any examination of the shift to a multiethnic state, but it also clearly shows that an examination of the first part of the early Qing (before the advance into China proper) is indispensable for an investigation of political moves after the advance into China proper. That being so, what sort of problems were involved in the evolution of the *han's* powers, which began during Nurhaci's period of rule? And is it fair to regard Hong Taiji's enthronement as emperor and his establishment of the Great Qing as no more than examples of Sinification prompted by his consciousness of the Ming dynasty? In the following I wish to consider these questions in relation to changes in the Eight Banner system.

As has already been noted, in the course of his prosecution of ethnic unification Nurhaci was first given the title of *Kundulen Han* in Wanli 34 (1606) by the five Khalkha tribes of Mongolia, and then in Tianming 1 (1616) he received the title of *Genggiyen Han* from the Jurchen *beile* and assumed the position of *han*. Up until Wanli 34 Qing archival sources refer to Nurhaci as *Sure Beile* ('Wise Prince'), but from Wanli 34 onwards he is called *Sure Kundulen Han* and then, from Tianming 1 onwards, *Sure Genggiyen Han*. These changes in appellation have been explained in various ways, and although none of the explanations goes beyond the hypothetical stage,⁶⁰ I interpret these changes in the following

manner. After having completed the unification of the Jianzhou Jurchens in Wanli 16, Nurhaci was in the following year accorded recognition of this achievement by the Ming through the conferment of the rank of assistant commissioner-in-chief of the Jianzhou Guard, and then having in Wanli 20 crushed the combined 'nine-nation' forces composed of Jurchen and Mongol tribes fearful of an increase in his influence, he established himself as a major force in the Jurchen world. Then in Wanli 29 he created the *niru* ('arrow') system, which transformed the organization of customary hunts into a centralized military and social organization (which eventually became the basic unit of the Four Banner system, although the date of this development is unclear), and in Wanli 31 he shifted his capital from Fe Ala to Hetu Ala and extended his control over the Jianzhou tribes. It is to be surmised, however, that the title of *han* which he received from the five Khalkha tribes in Wanli 34 did no more than show that Nurhaci, having increased his influence to this degree, was now recognized by the Khalkhas as ruler of Jianzhou and had entered into amicable relations with them, and although it may have lent authority to Nurhaci's own person, it certainly did not signify his assumption of the position of *han*. In fact, in Wanli 34 political power in Jianzhou was still being shared by Nurhaci and his brother Šurgaci, and it was only after the latter's downfall in Wanli 37 that there was a shift to a system of exclusive rule by Nurhaci alone. Thereafter Nurhaci, while furthering the unification of the Jurchen tribes, consolidated his own political power by introducing a system of five counselors (*sunja amban*) and ten *jargūi* (*juwan jargūi*) and a trial system requiring threefold verification,⁶¹ eventually unifying the majority of Jurchen tribes and in Tianming 1 being given the title of *han* by the Jurchen *beile*. Hence it could be said that it was actually the *han* title conferred in Tianming 1 that symbolized the fact that he was now ruler of all the Jurchen tribes and that it was on this occasion that he assumed for the first time the position of *han*. At any rate, having been installed as *han* in Tianming 1, Nurhaci applied the *niru* and Four Banner system devised when he was still ruling over only the Jianzhou tribes to the Jurchen tribes as a whole, creating the Eight Banner system, and by means of this centralized military and social organization he consolidated his own system of rule in the new composite tribal state.

Of importance when considering subsequent changes in the Eight Banner system is the fact that Nurhaci's Eight Banner system represented a tribal confederation, as it were, composed of eight mutually independent banners, while the reorganization of the *niru* carried out at the same time led to the emergence of two types of *niru*, namely, the ordinary *niru* and the *booi* ('house's') *niru*.⁶² In addition, in Tianming 6-7, when the Eight Banner system was being introduced, Nurhaci appointed mainly his own sons as the 'eight princes' (i.e., eight *hošoi beile* who each controlled their own banner and participated in the administration of state affairs) and established the principle whereby the appointment and

dismissal of the next *han* would be entrusted to consultation among the eight princes.⁶³) This not only “became a factor in bringing about the centralization of power by placing Nurhaci’s sons at the centre” of the Eight Banner system,⁶⁴) but it also shows that in a society organized on the basis of the Eight Banner system the *han* was a representative chosen by the mutual agreement of the leaders of the Eight Banners and did not stand out from the leaders of the Eight Banners like the emperor in the Chinese world, and this is an important point when considering Hong Taiji’s succession to the position of *han*. Although the Eight Banner system provided a basis for centralization during Nurhaci’s lifetime, it also “held the possibility that [after his death] a situation would arise in which each of his sons might set himself up independently as the leader of a banner.”⁶⁵) As it turned out, Hong Taiji, chosen as *han* by the mutual agreement of the eight princes, was in fact initially merely the leader of a single banner and, unlike Nurhaci, found himself placed under a system of decentralized rule by the four *beile*, and his position was far removed from any establishment of the *han*’s powers.

In order to facilitate our understanding of changes in the *han*’s powers in the first part of the early Qing and the significance of Hong Taiji’s accession to the position of emperor, let us briefly consider the basic structure of relationships of subordinacy in a society based on the Eight Banners. According to the results of previous research, Jurchen (or Manchu) society at this time had three basic relationships:

1. The relationship between *han* (‘ruler’) and *irgen* (‘people’), rooted in the *gurun* (‘nation’); this corresponds to the relationship between the ruler and the ruled.
2. The relationship between *beile* (‘prince’ or ‘chieftain’) and *amban* (‘counselor’) on the one hand and *jušen* (‘bondsman’) on the other, rooted in tribal or clan groups; this corresponds to the relationship between the chieftains of tribes or clans and tribesmen or clansmen.
3. The relationship between *ejen* (‘master’) and *aha* (‘slave’), rooted in the *boo* (‘house’); this corresponds to the relationship between master and servant in the household.

Among these three relationships, that between *ejen* and *aha* was the most stringently enforced. Furthermore, the overall relationship among these was as follows:

han—beile—amban, hafan (‘official’)—*jušen, irgen*

It is, moreover, considered that the *ejen-aha* relationship obtained between each of these.⁶⁶) It is to be observed, in other words, that the *irgen* rooted in the *gurun*

is bracketed with the *jušen* rooted in the tribal or clan group, while the *hafan* within the kingdom of Aisin is bracketed with the *amban* within the tribal or clan group, by which means the relationships of subordination in the *gurun* and tribal or clan groups were interlinked in an attempt to extend the traditional tribal system of the Jurchens to the overall structure of Aisin in its capacity as a composite tribal state, and at the same time an attempt was also made to integrate the nation as a whole on the basis of the *ejen-aha* relationship rooted in the *boo*. What is more, this overall structure provided the framework for the structure of rule in the Manju dynasty during the first part of the early Qing. Problematic, however, was the relationship between the *han* and the *beile*, for although in the context of this overall structure their relationship would seem to have been that of a superior and his inferiors, this was in fact not the case. Within these relationships the power base of the *han*, who was originally merely the leader of a single banner, was on a par with that of the *beile* of other banners within the ruling family, and the *han* too was bound by the constraints of a tribal system in which the principle of *seniores priores* operated. In other words, although nominal distinctions of status existed between the *han* and the *beile*, there was no real difference in their powers. In addition, a further unique feature of the Eight Banner system was that the members of each banner pledged allegiance only to the leader of the banner to which they belonged.⁶⁷⁾ Therefore, in order to seize full and absolute political power and stand at the pinnacle of a society based on the Eight Banners, it was imperative for Hong Taiji to establish first of all the powers of the *han* himself within the ruling family.

Hong Taiji, having succeeded Nurhaci in these circumstances, set about furthering the centralization of power, as described in the previous section,⁶⁸⁾ and gradually strengthened his own power base, which eventually led to the establishment of the Great Qing. Through the adoption of the Chinese-style relationship that obtained between the emperor and princes, his enthronement as emperor can be seen as an attempt to make a clear-cut distinction between the *han* and the *beile* of the ruling family, for upon being installed as emperor of the Great Qing, Hong Taiji immediately introduced a peerage system of nine ranks for the imperial family (*hošoi cin wang* [*heshi qinwang* 和碩親王], *doroi giyün wang* [*duoluo junwang* 多羅郡王], *doroi beile* [*duoluo beiluo* 多羅貝勒], *gūsai beise* [*gushan beizi* 固山貝子], *gurun be dalire gung* [*zhengguogong* 鎮國公], *gurun de aisilara gung* [*fuguo gong* 輔國公], *gurun be dalire janggün* [*zhenguo jiangjun* 鎮國將軍], *gurun de aisilara janggün* [*fuguo jiangjun* 輔國將軍], and *gurun be tuwakiyara janggün* [*fengguo jiangjun* 奉國將軍]) together with the associated regalia and various other institutions, thereby making the distinction between the *han* and other princes quite explicit. However, not only did the distinctive structure of the Eight Banner system, characterized by the autonomy of each banner, remain in place, but the social situation was also one in which the constraints of the tribal system, bind-

ing even the *han* to the rule of deference to seniority, had not completely disappeared.⁶⁹⁾ Therefore, the establishment of the *han*'s real power among the Manchus required the removal of the constraints of the tribal system, and a new stage in this process was reached with Hong Taiji's death. That is to say, when the third emperor Shunzhi entered Beijing in 1644 and transferred his capital there, the *han* (i.e., emperor of the Great Qing) also became literally emperor of China, and this led to fresh developments.

Returning now to Hong Taiji's enthronement as emperor, is it in fact appropriate to understand it simply as a manifestation of Sinification underpinned by a consciousness of the Ming? The reason this question arises is that an examination of the archival sources relating to Hong Taiji's enthronement as emperor reveals that they contain material that cannot be understood simply in terms of Sinification. For instance, according to a memorial dated 8th day, 4th month, Tiancong 10 (1636) and another memorial dated 11th day, 4th month of the same year (both included in the *Fulgiyan singgeri aniya duin biyade* [*narhün bithe*] *han be amba soorin toktobuha tangse*, which records the origins of Hong Taiji's imperial title), his Manchu title—*gosin onco hūwaliyasun enduringge han*—gave special prominence to his benevolence and magnanimity as expressed in the phrase “bestowing benevolence and magnanimity on the myriad people” (*gosin onco be tumen irgen de selgiyefi*) and to his harmoniousness as expressed in the phrase “he harmonized the inner and the outer” (*dorgi tulergi be hūwaliyambuha*), thus extolling him as “benevolent, magnanimous and harmonious” (*gosin onco hūwaliyasun*). This title did not simply indicate that Hong Taiji was endowed with the qualities of an emperor, but also symbolized the fact that he had harmoniously unified peoples both inside and outside his country, and in addition the same sources give as conditions for his accession to the imperial throne control of the lands of the Manchus and the Mongols, the subjugation of Korea, and the acquisition of the jade seal of the Great Yuan, while the existence of the hostile Great Ming Empire is given as an insufficient condition. From these facts it is evident that “the inner and the outer” that Hong Taiji is said to have “harmonized” consisted of the Manju kingdom (Manchus), Mongolia (Mongols), the Han forming part of the Great Ming Empire, and also Korea.⁷⁰⁾ Therefore, although it is generally considered that Hong Taiji's enthronement was underpinned by a consciousness of the Ming and that “the inner and the outer” said to have been “harmonized” by him referred to the Manchus, Mongols and Han by whom he was installed as emperor, ultimately his enthronement may have been underpinned by an awareness of himself as a successor to the emperor of the Great Yuan, who had ruled over Northeast Asia, Inner Asia and China proper.

Following his enthronement as emperor, Hong Taiji performed for the first time a sacrificial offering at the Altar of Heaven (*tiantan* 天壇), corresponding to the imperial sacrifice to Heaven that had since ancient times been regarded as

the highest state rite in China. What must be noted in this regard is that he sought to reconcile the rites of shamanism, the traditional belief system of the Manchus, with Chinese rites by essentially equating the sacrifices to Heaven traditionally performed in temples (*tangzi* 堂子) with the newly instituted sacrifice to Heaven at the Altar of Heaven; that he attempted to change the temple rites from state rites to private rites performed in the homes of individual banner-men; and that the series of rites performed on the occasion of his enthronement included, along with Chinese rites, an archery rite representing a vestige of 'willow-shooting' (*sheliu* 射柳), which the Jurchens of the Jin dynasty (1115-1234) had invariably performed under the influence of an earlier custom of the Liao in conjunction with their shamanistic rites dedicated to Heaven.⁷¹⁾ This would seem to indicate that during the process of acceding to the position of emperor Hong Taiji, having equated the traditional temple rites dedicated to Heaven with the new sacrifice to Heaven at the Altar of Heaven, performed Chinese rites such as the sacrifice to Heaven at the Altar of Heaven alongside rites of the traditional Manchu religion of shamanism and then immediately after his enthronement attempted to reconcile the two and allow them to coexist by making a distinction between their respectively public and private character. Consequently, after Hong Taiji's enthronement the locus of public sacrifices to Heaven in the Great Qing shifted from the traditional temples of shamanism to the Chinese-style Altar of Heaven, with the inevitable result that the rites of the traditional Manchu religion of shamanism, hitherto performed in temples, were transformed from state rites into largely private rites performed in banner-men's homes. Because of the increasingly Chinese coloration of public rites, it is easy to interpret this change simply in terms of Sinification. But it is a known fact that, while on the one hand imperial sacrifices to Heaven typified by the rites at the Altar of Heaven were being performed during the Qing, people ranging from the *han-cum-emperor* of China above to the retainers of company commanders below continued to perform various rites of the traditional Manchu religion of shamanism as rites that held importance for banner-men, especially Manchu banner-men. If one takes into account these two aspects to be consistently observed in the sacrifices and rites of the Qing, then the above change, occasioned by Hong Taiji's enthronement as emperor, may be understood as a manifestation of the active fusion of Chinese elements and elements of the Manchu tribal system during the course of his enthronement.

The above is no more than one of many such examples. However, it could be said to amply illustrate the fact that Hong Taiji's enthronement and ensuing moves in the Great Qing contain elements that cannot necessarily be properly understood in terms of Sinification alone.

IV. Concluding Remarks

In the above, having first drawn attention to the formation of a multiethnic state during the Qing and touched on its historical position and periodization, I pointed out that the period before the Qing's advance into China proper (i.e., the first part of the early Qing) has direct links with the subsequent heyday of the Qing after its conquest of China proper, and then, focussing in particular on the structure of rule during the first part of the early Qing as part of a broader discussion of the Manju dynasty, I took up the issue of the powers of the *han* and the emperor and raised a number of questions. However, because of an emphasis on the raising of these questions *per se*, the corroboration of my arguments has as a whole been inadequate, and there remain many points that have not been fully explained. These matters must be left for a future occasion, and an important key to the elucidation of these issues lies, I believe, in events during the reign of the second emperor Taizong Hong Taiji, especially during the Chongde era after his enthronement as emperor. Unfortunately historical sources on this period have up until now been extremely limited, and the current state of research is still far from adequate. In future research on the first part of the early Qing, and indeed on the history of the Qing as a whole, the advancement of research on Hong Taiji's reign will become an important issue. On this note of self-admonishment I would like to bring this article to a close.

Notes

- 1) See Mitamura Taisuke 三田村泰助, *Shinchō zenshi no kenkyū* 清朝前史の研究 (A study of the prehistory of the Qing dynasty; Tōyōshi Kenkyūkai 東洋史研究會, 1965); Ishibashi Hideo 石橋秀雄, "Seifuku ōchō Shin o megutte" 征服王朝清をめぐって (On the Qing, a dynasty of conquest), *Sekaiishi no Kenkyū* 世界史の研究 54 (1968); *id.*, *Shinchō shi saikō-Minmatsu Shinsho to gozoku no Chūgoku* 清朝史再考—明末清初と五族の中國 (The history of the Qing dynasty reconsidered: The late Ming and early Qing and China as a land of five peoples; Shinchōshi Kenkyū Kankōkai 清朝史研究刊行會, 1989).
- 2) See Mitamura Taisuke, "Manjukoku seiritsu katei no ichi kōsatsu" 滿珠國成立過程の一考察 (A consideration of the establishment of the Manju kingdom), *Tōyōshi Kenkyū* 東洋史研究 2, no. 2 (1936) (repr. in *Shinchō zenshi no kenkyū*); *id.*, "Shinchō no kaikoku densetsu to sono seikei" 清朝の開國傳説とその世系 (The founding legend of the Qing dynasty and its lineage), in *Ritsumeikan Daigaku gojūshūnen kinen ronbunshū* 立命館大學五十周年記念論文集 (Collected articles commemorating the 50th anniversary of Ritsumeikan University; 1951) (repr. with additions and corrections in *Shinchō zenshi no kenkyū*); Wakamatsu Hiroshi 若松寛, *Nuruhachi* 奴兒哈赤 (Nurhaci; Jinbutsu Ōraisha 人物往來社 [*Dainiki Chūgoku jinbutsu sōsho* 第二期中國人物叢書 8], 1967); Matsumura Jun 松村潤, "Sūtoku no kaigen to Taishin no kokugō ni tsuite" 崇徳の改元と大清の國號について (On the change of era name to 'Chongde' and the dynastic name 'Great Qing'), in *Kamata hakushi kanreki kinen rekishigaku ronshō* 鎌田博士還暦記念歴史學論叢 (Collected essays on history commemorating the 60th birthday of Dr. Kamata [Shigeo]; 1969); *id.*, "Shinchō no kaikoku setsuwa ni tsuite" 清朝の開國説話について (On the founding tale of the Qing dynasty), in *Yamamoto hakushi kanreki*

kinen Tōyōshi ronsō 山本博士還曆記念東洋史論叢 (Collected essays on Oriental history commemorating the 60th birthday of Dr. Yamamoto [Tatsuro]; Yamakawa Shuppansha 山川出版社, 1972); Kanda Nobuo 神田信夫, “Manshū (Manju) kokugō kō” 滿洲 (Manju) 國號考 (On the dynastic name ‘Manju’), in *Yamamoto hakushi kanreki kinen Tōyōshi ronsō*; Hosoya Yoshio 細谷良夫, “Manju=gurun to ‘Manshūkoku’ ” マンジュ=グルンと「滿洲國」 (Manju gurun and ‘Manzhouguo’), in *Rekishi no naka no chiiki* 歴史の中の地域 (Regions in history; Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店 [Shirizu “Sekaishi e no toi” シリーズ「世界史への問い」8], 1990); Matsuura Shigeru 松浦茂, *Shin no taiso Nuruhachi* 清の太祖ヌルハチ (Taizu Nurhaci of the Qing; Hakuteisha 白帝社 [Chūgoku rekishi jinbutsu sen 中國歴史人物選 11], 1995); see also n. 3.

- 3) In his article “Manshū (Manju) kokugō kō,” Kanda Nobuo points out that from Wanli 41 (1613) the original Manchu name of Nurhaci’s kingdom was ‘Manju’, which was used when dealing with the Mongols until the Tiancong 天聰 era, but during the same period the name ‘Aisin’ was used *vis-à-vis* the Ming and Korea, and under the influence of Sinification in the Tianming 天命 and early Tiancong eras the name ‘Aisin’ came to be used domestically as well. In 1991, when examining documents held at the First Historical Archives of China in Beijing, I discovered a document written in the Manchu script without diacritical marks and entitled *Nenehe Genggiyen han i sain yabuha kooli uheri juwan nadan debtelin*. It deals with the exploits of Nurhaci from the founding legend of the Qing dynasty up to Wanli 12 (1584), and not only does it contain information not found in the *Da Qing Taizu Wu huangdi shilu* 大清太祖武皇帝實錄 and *Manzhou shilu*, but it also has many erasures, additions and corrections, making it an important document for the study of the Manchu period of Qing history. Properly speaking, I ought to have used this document to make additions and emendations to the relevant sections of the present article, but since it does not have any great bearings on my overall arguments, I have restricted myself to this passing reference. For further details, see Ishibashi Takao 石橋崇雄, “Shinsho nyūkan mae no mukenten Manshūbun tōan *Sen Gengyen=han kenkō tenrei o megutte—Shinchō shi o saikōchiku suru tame no kiso kenkyū no ikkan to shite—* 清初入關前の無圈點滿洲文檔案『先ゲンギエン=ハン賢行典例』をめぐって—清朝史を再構築するための基礎研究の一環として— (The *Nenehe Genggiyen han i sain yabuha kooli*, a Manchu document without diacritical marks from the early Qing before the advance into China proper: As part of basic research for the reconstruction of the history of the Qing dynasty), *Tōyōshi Kenkyū* 58, no. 3 (1999); *id.*, “Mukenten Manshūbun tōan *Sen Gengyen=han kenkō tenrei, zen jūshichijō*” 無圈點滿洲文檔案『先ゲンギエン=ハン賢行典例・全十七條』 (An annotated translation of the *Nenehe Genggiyen han i sain yabuha kooli uheri juwan nadan debtelin*, a Manchu document without diacritical marks), *Kokushikan Shigaku* 國士館史學 8 (2000).
- 4) Therefore, the interpretation of the Qing’s territorial expansion from the perspective of the incorporation of Inner Asia by the agrarian society of Han China is inappropriate, and it should be considered from the perspective of the expansion of the Manchus from Northeast Asia into China proper and then into Inner Asia. See Ishibashi Hideo, “Shinsho no han-Taiso kara Taisō” 清初のハンHan—太祖から太宗 (The *han* in the early Qing: From Taizu to Taizong), *Sekaishi no Kenkyū* 155 (1993); see also n. 9.
- 5) In the “Preface” to *Shinchō zenshi no kenkyū* Mitamura, having first applied the designation ‘prehistory of the Qing dynasty’ to the history of the Qing before the advance into China proper, writes as follows (pp. 4-5): “The elements to be seen after the advance into China proper are all contained already in the prehistory of the Qing dynasty. Although there can be no doubt that the advance into China proper marks a dividing point in Qing history, the relationship between the two periods must be seen in terms of continuity and development. It is here that the significance of the prehistory of the Qing could be said to lie.” See also Sano Manabu 佐野學, *Shinchō shakai shi* 清朝社會史 (A social history of the Qing dynasty; Bunkydō 文求堂, Part 1: *Kokka to shakai* 國家と社會 (State and society)—Vol. 1, *Kokka* 國家 (The state; 1947); Abe Takeo 安部健夫, “Shinchō shi no kōzō to sono dōin” 清朝史の構

- 造とその動因 (The structure of the history of the Qing dynasty and its driving force), in *Chūgoku shigaku nyūmon* 中國史學入門 (An introduction to the study of Chinese history; Heian Bunko 平安文庫, 1951) (repr. in *id.*, *Shindai shi no kenkyū* 清代史の研究 [Studies in the history of the Qing period; Sōbunsha 創文社, 1971]); Ishibashi Hideo, “Seifuku ōchō Shin o megutte”; *id.*, “Shinchō shōkō-hakki zakkō, sono ichi—” 清朝小考—八旗雜考・その一 (A brief study of the Qing dynasty: Miscellaneous remarks on the Eight Banners [1]), *Sekaishi no Kenkyū* 118 (1984); *id.*, *Shinchō shi saikō*; *id.*, “Shinsho no han”; see also n. 9.
- 6) See Ishibashi Takao, “Shinchō kokka ron” 清朝國家論 (On the Qing state), in *Iwanami kōza sekai rekishi* 岩波講座世界歴史 (Iwanami lecture series: World history; Iwanami Shoten), Vol. 13 (1998); *id.*, “Taminzoku kokka Shinchō o megutte—rekishijō no ichizuke, jidai kubun, shihai kōzō, seitōsei no mondai o chūshin to shite—” 多民族國家清朝をめくって—歴史上の位置付け・時代区分・支配構造・正統性の問題を中心として— (On the Qing dynasty as a multiethnic state: With a focus on questions of its historical position, periodization, structure of rule, and legitimacy), *Sekaishi no Kenkyū* 179 (1999); *id.*, *Taishin teikoku* 大清帝國 (The Great Qing Empire; Kōdansha 講談社 [*Sensho mechie* 選書メチエ 174], 2000).
- 7) See Abe, “Shinchō shi no kōzō to sono dōin”; Sano, *Kokka*; Mitamura, *Shinchō zenshi no kenkyū* (“Preface”); Ishibashi Hideo, “Seifuku ōchō Shin o megutte.”
- 8) See Ishibashi Takao, “Shinchō no ‘honyaku kakyō’ o megutte” 清朝の「繙譯科擧」をめくって (On the ‘civil service recruitment examinations in translation’ during the Qing dynasty), *Sekaishi no Kenkyū* 135 (1988); *id.*, “Shinsho hanken no keisei katei” 清初ハン (han) 權の形成過程 (The evolution of the han’s powers in the early Qing), in *Enoki hakushi shōju kinen Tōyōshi ronsō* 榎博士頌壽記念東洋史論叢 (Collected essays on Oriental history commemorating the 70th birthday of Dr. Enoki [Kazuo]; Kyūko Shoin 汲古書院, 1988); *id.*, “*Han i araha manju gisin i buleku bithe* (Gyosei Shinbunkan) kō-toku ni sono goi kaishaku chū no shuten o megutte—” 『han i araha manju gisin i buleku bithe (御製清文鑑)』考—特にその語彙解釋中の出典をめくって— (A study of the *Han i araha manju gisin i buleku bithe*: Especially on the sources of its interpretations of vocabulary items), *Kokushikan Daigaku Bungakubu Jinbun Gakkai Kiyō* 國士館大學文學部人文學會紀要 Sep. Vol. 1 (1989); *id.*, “Shinsho kōteiken no keisei katei—toku ni Heishi nen shigatsu <hiroku> tō han taii tō ni mieru Taisō Hon=Taiji no kōtei sokui kiji o chūshin to shite—” 清初皇帝權の形成過程—特に『丙子年四月<秘録>登ハン大位檔』にみえる太宗ホン=タイジの皇帝即位記事を中心として— (The evolution of the emperor’s powers in the early Qing: With a special focus on the account of Hong Taiji’s enthronement as emperor in the *Fulgiyan singgeri aniya duin biyade* [*narhūn bithe*] *han be amba soorin toktobuha tangse*), *Tōyōshi Kenkyū* 53, no. 1 (1994); *id.*, “Shinsho saiten girei kō—toku ni Heishi nen shigatsu <hiroku> tō han taii tō ni okeru Taisō Hon=Taiji no kōtei sokui kiroku ni mieru saiten kiji o chūshin to shite—” 清初祭天儀禮考—特に『丙子年四月<秘録>登ハン大位檔』における太宗ホン=タイジの皇帝即位記録にみえる祭天記事を中心として— (A study of rites for the worship of Heaven in the early Qing: With a special focus on references to the worship of Heaven to be seen in the account of Hong Taiji’s enthronement as emperor in the *Fulgiyan singgeri aniya duin biyade* [*narhūn bithe*] *han be amba soorin toktobuha tangse*), in Ishibashi Hideo, ed., *Shindai Chūgoku no shomondai* 清代中國の諸問題 (Issues concerning China during the Qing dynasty; Yamakawa Shuppansha, 1995).
- 9) For instance, in the “Preface” to *Shinchō zenshi no kenkyū* Mitamura writes as follows (p. 4): “When one considers the matter thus, one realizes how difficult it is to gain a proper grasp of it without an adequate understanding of the interrelationship between the ruler and the ruled, especially the former, under the rule of a dynasty of conquest At any rate, the three dynasties of the Yuan, Ming and Qing do not fall under the category of Chinese history. It would seem that they should be understood in terms of universal history, for example, as East Asian history or simply world history. And it should be self-evident that, just as an understanding of the history of the Mongol empire is necessary for an understanding of the history of the Yuan dynasty, so too should a prehistory precede the history of the Qing dynasty.” In addition, Ishibashi Hideo discusses in a series of studies— “Seifuku ōchō Shin o

megutte”; “Taigen, Taimin, Taishin jidai to gozoku no Chūgoku” 大元・大明・大清時代と五族の中國 (The Great Yuan, Great Ming and Great Qing periods and the China of five peoples), *Sekai shi no Kenkyū* 63 (1970); *Shinchō shi saikō*; “Shinsho no han”—the formation of China as composed of the five peoples (Han, Manchus, Mongols, Tibetans and Uighurs) connected with the main areas encompassed by contemporary China, and having first defined the Liao, Song and Jin dynasties as a precursive period for the formation of China as composed of five peoples and the subsequent Great Yuan, Great Ming and Great Qing as a time of unified dynasties spanning three dynasties, he points out that the Liao was the precursor of future expansion into a China composed of five peoples, the Great Yuan was the precursor of the founding of a China composed of five peoples, and the Great Qing established a China composed of five peoples. Furthermore, in “Shinsho no han” Ishibashi alludes to the existence of important differences between the Great Yuan and Great Qing (both of which unified China), including differences between the transition from the formation of the Mongol empire to the founding of the Great Yuan and the process leading from the formation of Aisin to the founding of the Great Qing, as well as other differences in the transmission of the positions of *han* and emperor in the genealogies of these two dynasties, the process whereby they extended their rule over China proper, and the circumstances behind their territorial growth, and he points out that a distinctive feature of the Qing dynasty was that the chain of events leading from the formation of Aisin north of the Great Wall to the transfer of the capital to Beijing and the conquest of China proper and then to the attainment of the Qing’s greatest territorial extent during the reign of the Qianlong Emperor in “a form broadly composed of Manchuria (Manchus, Mongols and Han in the northeast), the Han (in China proper), and the frontier regions (Mongolia, Tibet and the Uighurs)” was an unbroken process of territorial expansion.

- 10) See nn. 9, 11 & 13.
- 11) For example Ishibashi Hideo, in “Sannin no kenkokusha—Chingisu=han, Shu Genshō, Nurubachi—” 三人の建國者—チンギス=ハン・朱元璋・ヌルハチ (Three national founders: Genghis Khan, Zhu Yuanzhang, and Nurhaci [in *Mansuri apurōchi kōsan kōza: shakai mansurī-āpurochi* 高三講座・社會 (A monthly approach: Third-year high school lectures—society; Fukutake Shoten 福武書店) 79, nos. 4-6 (1979)]), compares the Yuan, Ming and Qing from the perspective of their respective founders, while in “Shinsho no han,” having first noted that there are problems with understanding them as dynasties of conquest in the general sense of the term, he compares the Yuan with the Qing. See also nn. 9 & 13.
- 12) On the characterization of contemporary China as a multiethnic state, see Kanbe Teruo 神戸輝夫, “Shōsū minzoku no rikai o megutte” 少数民族の理解をめぐって (On the understanding of ethnic minorities), in Kyūshū Daigaku Bungakubu Tōyōshigaku Kenkyūshitsu 九州大學文學部東洋史學研究室, ed., <1983 Chūgokushi shinpojiumu> *Gen-Min-Shinki ni okeru kokka ‘shihai’ to minshūzō no saikentō-‘shihai’ no Chūgokuteki tokushitsu—* <1983・中國史シンポジウム> 元明清期における國家「支配」と民衆像の再検討—「支配」の中國的特質— (1983 Symposium on Chinese history—A reexamination of state ‘rule’ and images of the general populace in the Yuan, Ming and Qing periods: Chinese characteristics of ‘rule’; 1984); Sasaki Nobuaki 佐々木信彰, *Taminzoku kokka Chūgoku no kiso kōzō-mō hitotsu no nanboku mondai—* 多民族國家中國の基礎構造—もうひとつの南北問題— (The basic structure of China as a multiethnic state: Another north-south problem; Sekai Shisōsha 世界思想社, 1988); Mōri Kazuko 毛里和子, *Shūen kara no Chūgoku—minzoku mondai to kokka* 周縁からの中國—民族問題と國家 (China from the periphery: Ethnic problems and the state; Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai 東京大學出版會, 1998).
- 13) Ishibashi Hideo, “Shinsho no han,” p. 10. In a note added to this passage Ishibashi writes (p. 11): “The Manchus, Han and frontiersmen are an issue that I would like to consider in comparison with the Mongols, *semu* 色目, Han and Southerners of the Yuan.” Cf. n. 4.
- 14) See Ishibashi Takao, “Shinsho hanken no keisei katei.”
- 15) See Ishibashi Hideo, “Shin Taiso no Ryōtō shinshutsu zengo ni kansuru ichi kōsatsu” 清太

- 祖の遼東進出前後に関する一考察 (A study of the period around the time of the advance into Liaodong by Taizu of the Qing), in *Wada hakushi koki kinen Tōyōshi ronsō* 和田博士古稀記念東洋史論叢 (Collected essays on Oriental history commemorating the 70th birthday of Dr. Wada [Sei]; 1960) (repr. in *id.*, *Shindai shi kenkyū* 清代史研究 [Studies in the history of the Qing dynasty; Ryokuin Shobō 綠蔭書房, 1989]); *id.*, “Shinsho no tai-Kanjin seisaku-toku ni Taizo no Ryōtō shinshutsu jidai o chūshin to shite—” 清初の對漢人政策—とくに太祖の遼東進出時代を中心として— (Policies towards the Han in the early Qing: With a special focus on the period of Taizu’s advance into Liaodong), *Shisō* 史叢 2 (1961) (repr. in *Shindai shi kenkyū*); *id.*, “Shinchō shōkō.”
- 16) See Sudō Yoshiyuki 周藤吉之, *Shindai Manshū tochi seisaku no kenkyū—toku ni kichi seisaku o chūshin to shite* 清代滿州土地政策の研究—特に旗地政策を中心として— (A study of Manchu land policy during the Qing dynasty: With a special focus on the policy concerning banner lands; Kawade Shobō 河出書房 [Tōyōgaku sōsho 東洋學叢書, 1944]; Ishibashi Hideo, “Shin Taizo no tochi seisaku ni kansuru ichi kōsatsu” 清太祖の土地政策に関する一考察 (A study of the land policies of Taizu of the Qing), *Nihon Joshi Daigaku Kiyō Bungakubu* 日本女子大學紀要文學部 11 (1962) (repr. in *Shindai shi kenkyū*); *id.*, “Shinchō shōkō.”
- 17) *Da Qing Taizong Wen huangdi shilu* 大清太宗文皇帝實錄 (comp. early Shunzhi era) 7; cf. Kanda, “Manshū kokugō kō.”
- 18) See Anami Korehiro 阿南惟敬, “Tensō kyūnen no Mōko hakki seiritsu ni tsuite” 天聰九年の蒙古八旗成立について (On the establishment of the Eight Mongol Banners in Tiancong 9), *Rekishi Kyōiku* 歴史教育 13, no. 4 (1965) (repr. in *id.*, *Shinsho gunji shi ronkō* 清初軍事史論考 [Studies in the military history of the early Qing; Kōyō Shobō 甲陽書房, 1980]; *id.*, “Kangun hakki seiritsu no kenkyū 漢軍八旗成立の研究 (A study of the establishment of the Eight Chinese Banners), *Gunji Shigaku* 軍事史學 6 (1966) (repr. in *Shinsho gunji shi ronkō*).
- 19) See Abe Takeo, “Shinchō to kai shisō” 清朝と華夷思想 (The Qing dynasty and civilized/barbarian thought), *Jimbun Kagaku* 人文科學 1, no. 3 (1946) (repr. in *Shindai shi no kenkyū*); Mizuhara Shigemitsu 水原重光, “Yōsei seiji shi no hitokoma” 雍正政治史の一齣 (An episode in the political history of Yongzheng’s reign), *Shien* 史淵 53 (1952); Onogawa Hidemi 小野川秀美, “Yōseitei to Taigi kakumei roku” 雍正帝と大義覺迷錄 (The Yongzheng Emperor and the *Dayi juemi lu*), *Tōyōshi Kenkyū* 16, no. 4 (1958) (repr. in *Tōyōshi Kenkyūkai* 東洋史研究會, ed., *Yōsei jidai no kenkyū* 雍正時代の研究 [Studies of the Yongzheng era; Dōhōsha 同朋舍, 1986]).
- 20) Among the many studies on this subject — e.g., Suzuki Shun 鈴木俊 and Nishijima Sadao 西嶋定生, eds., *Chūgoku shi no jidai kubun* 中國史の時代區分 (The periodization of Chinese history; Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1957)—the following article summarizes all earlier research on the subject and is the most useful: Kasugai Akira 春日井明, “Nihon ni okeru Chūgoku shi no jidai kubun” 日本における中國史の時代區分 (The periodization of Chinese history in Japan), *Sekaiishi no Kenkyū* 107 (1981).
- 21) Mitamura, *Shinchō zenshi no kenkyū* (“Preface”), pp. 1-2.
- 22) Sano Manabu, *Shinchō shakai shi*, Part 3: *Nōmin bōdō* 農民暴動 (Peasant rebellions) — Vol. 1: *Shindai minran no honshitsu narabi ni hatten, Byakurenkyō no ran* 清代民亂の本質並に発展・白蓮教の亂 (The nature of popular rebellions in the Qing period and their development, and the White Lotus Society rebellion; 1947).
- 23) Sano, *Shinchō shakai shi*, Part 1, Vol. 1; Part 3, Vol. 1.
- 24) See n. 5.
- 25) Abe has also pointed out that “when the study of the ‘history’ of the Qing dynasty is at issue, the history of the Nōzhi during the Ming dynasty, representing its prehistory, must also be taken into account” (*Shinchō shi no kenkyū*, p. 6).
- 26) Suzuki Chūsei, *Shinchō chūki shi kenkyū* 清朝中期史研究 (A study of mid-Qing history; Aichi Daigaku Kokusai Mondai Kenkyūjo 愛知大學國際問題研究所 [Aichi Daigaku Kokusai Mondai Kenkyūjo gakujuetsu sōsho 愛知大學國際問題研究所學術叢書 1], 1952 [repr. Ryōgen Shobō 燎原書房, 1971]).

- 27) Suzuki does not make any special mention of the differences between his periodization and that of Sano, who differentiates between the first and second halves of Qianlong's reign.
- 28) Mention may also be made, for instance, of the views of Hosoya Yoshio, who in "Shinchō ni okeru hakki seido no suii" 清朝に於ける八旗制度の推移 (Changes in the Eight Banner system during the Qing dynasty [*Tōyō Gakuhō* 東洋學報 51, no. 1 (1968)]) writes, "Since Taizu called his country Jin and in Chongde 1 (1636) under Taizong it was named Qing, strictly speaking one should follow this, but here I shall refer to the period after the establishment of a government ruling over China (1644) as the Qing dynasty and the entire preceding period as the Latter Jin" (p. 39), and then in "Manju=gurun to 'Manshūkoku'" he uses "'Great Qing' for the Qing before the advance into China proper and 'Qing dynasty' for after the advance into China proper" (p. 133). In addition, Qin Guojing 秦國經, in *Sun Qing huangshi yishi* 遜清皇室軼事 (Zijin Cheng Chubanshe 紫禁城出版社, 1985), identifies Shunzhi as the first emperor of the Qing dynasty.
- 29) Ishibashi Hideo, "Shinchō chūki no kiho kichi seisaku—toku ni Yōsei-Kenryū nenkan no seido jō ni arawareta kichi no hōkai bōshi to kijin no kyūsai ni kansuru seisaku o chūshin to shite—" 清朝中期の畿輔旗地政策—特に雍正・乾隆年間の制度上にあられた旗地の崩壊防止と旗人の救済に関する政策を中心として— (The policy towards banner lands in the metropolitan area in the mid-Qing: With a special focus on policies pertaining to the prevention of the collapse of banner lands and to the relief of bannermen that appeared institutionally in the Yongzheng and Qianlong eras), 1 & 2, *Tōyō Gakuhō* 39, nos. 2 & 3 (1956). Two other studies that equate the same period with the mid-Qing are: Hosoya Yoshio, "Shinchō chūki no hakki koseki hō no henkaku—kaiko o chūshin to shite—" 清朝中期の八旗戶籍法の變革—開戸を中心として— (Changes in registration laws for the Eight Banners in the mid-Qing: With a focus on emancipated households), *Shūkan Tōyōgaku* 集刊東洋學 15 (1966); *id.*, "Hakki beikyoku kō—Shinchō chūki no hakki keizai o megutte—" 八旗米局攷—清朝中期の八旗經濟をめぐって— (A study of the Eight Banners' Rice Office: On the economics of the Eight Banners in the mid-Qing), *Shūkan Tōyōgaku* 31 (1974).
- 30) Ishibashi, *Shinchō shi saikō*.
- 31) Ishibashi, "Shinsho no han."
- 32) Owing to limited space, it is not possible to list all of this research here, and reference should be made to the following bibliographies and surveys: Kawachi Yoshihiro 河内良弘, ed., *Nihon ni okeru Tōhoku Ajia kenkyū ronbun mokuroku* (1895~1968) 日本における東北アジア研究論文目録 (1895~1968) (Bibliography of Northeast Asian studies in Japan [1895-1968]; 1972); Nihon Mongoru Gakkai 日本モンゴル學會 (Japan Association of Mongolian Studies), ed., *Mongoru kenkyū bunken mokuroku* (1900-1972) モンゴル研究文獻目録 (1900-1972) (Bibliography of Mongolia for 1900-1972; 1973); Matsuura Shigeru, "A Bibliography of Works on the Manchu and Sibo Languages," *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko* 38 (1980); Yamane Yukio 山根幸夫, ed., *Chūgoku shi kenkyū nyūmon* 中國史研究入門 (An introduction to the study of Chinese history; Yamakawa Shuppansha), Vol. 2 (1983), Sect. 7: "Shindai" 清代 (The Qing dynasty); Yunesuko Higashi Ajia Bunka Kenkyū Sentā ユネスコ東アジア文化研究センター (Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies for Unesco), ed., *Nihon ni okeru Chūō Ajia kankei kenkyū bunken mokuroku* (1879nen~1987nen 3gatsu) 日本における中央アジア關係研究文獻目録 (1879年~1987年3月) (Bibliography of Central Asian studies in Japan, 1879-March 1987; 1988) (— an index with corrigenda of the same was brought out in 1989). It is to be hoped that supplements bringing these bibliographies up-to-date will eventually be published.
- 33) See, e.g., an imperial edict issued on 27th day, 8th month, Yongzheng 5 and included in the *Shangyu baqi* 上諭八旗; cf. Ishibashi Takao, "Shinsho hanken no keisei katei."
- 34) Cf. n. 32.
- 35) Hosoya, "Manju=gurun to 'Manshūkoku,'" p. 118.
- 36) *Ibid.*, p. 125.
- 37) *Ibid.*, p. 120.

- 38) See Naitō Torajirō 内藤虎次郎, "Shinchō seishi kō" 清朝姓氏考 (A study of family names in the Qing dynasty), *Geibun* 藝文 3, no. 3 (1912); *id.*, "Shinchō seishi kō (seigo)" 清朝姓氏考 (正誤) (A study of family names in the Qing dynasty [corrigenda]), *Geibun* 3, no. 4 (1912) (– both repr. in *id.*, *Tokushi sōroku* 讀史叢錄 [Miscellaneous writings on readings in history; Kōbundō 弘文堂, 1927] and *Naitō Konan zenshū* 内藤湖南全集 [Collected works of Naitō Konan; Chikuma Shobō 筑摩書房], Vol. 7 [1970]); Mitamura, "Shinchō no kaikoku densetsu to sono seikei"; Matsumura, "Shinchō no kaikoku setsuwa ni tsuite."
- 39) See n. 3.
- 40) Mitamura, "Shinchō no kaikoku densetsu to sono seikei" (*Shinchō zenshi no kenkyū*), p. 49. Cf. Naitō Torajirō, "Shinchō seishi kō" and "Shinchō seishi kō (seigo)."
- 41) Wada Masahiro 和田正廣 has published a series of detailed studies on Li Chengliang, and these have been brought together in the following work: *Chūgoku kanryōsei no fuhai kōzō ni kansuru jirei kenkyū—Min-Shin kōtaiki no gunbatsu Ri Seiryō o megutte—* 中國官僚制の腐敗構造に関する事例研究—明清交替期の軍閥李成梁をめぐって— (A case study of the corrupt structure of China's bureaucracy: The warlord Li Chengliang during the change from the Ming to the Qing; Kyūshū Kokusai Daigaku Shakai Bunka Kenkyūjo 九州國際大學社會文化研究所, 1995).
- 42) See Ishibashi Takao, "Hachi gūsa to hachi gūsa shikibetsu to no seiritsu jiki ni tsuite—Shinchō hakki seido kenkyū no ikkan to shite—" 八 gūsa と八 gūsa 色別との成立時期について—清朝八旗制度研究の一環として— (On the date of the establishment of the eight gūsa and the different colours of the eight gūsa: As part of a study of the Eight Banner system in the Qing dynasty), *Chūgoku Kindaishi Kenkyū* 中國近代史研究 3 (1983).
- 43) Whereas it had been widely held that Nurhaci decided on a dynastic name and changed the era name to Tianming when he became *han* in 1616, Mitamura, in "Tenmei kengen no nenji ni tsuite" 天命建元の年次に就いて (On the date of the establishment of the Tianming era [*Tōyōshi Kenkyū* 1, nos. 2 (1935) & 3 (1936)]), argues that the dynastic name and new era name were introduced in 1619 and then pushed retrospectively back to 1616, when Nurhaci became *han*, while Imanishi Shunjū 今西春秋, in "Tenmei kengen kō" 天命建元考 (A study of the establishment of the Tianming era [*Chōsen Gakuhō* 朝鮮學報 14 (1959) & 20 (1960)]), maintains that Nurhaci was installed as *han* in 1606, ascended the imperial throne in 1616, and established the Tianming era in 1619. See Matsumura, "Sūtoku no kaigen to Taishin no kokugō ni tsuite."
- 44) See Ishibashi Takao, "Hachi gūsa to hachi gūsa shikibetsu to no seiritsu jiki ni tsuite."
- 45) See n. 15.
- 46) See Tayama Shigeru 田山茂, *Shin jidai ni okeru Mōko no shakai seido* 清時代に於ける蒙古の社會制度 (Social institutions in Mongolia during the Qing period; Bunkyō Shoin 文京書院, 1954); Shimada Masao 島田正郎, *Shinchō Mōko rei no kenkyū* 清朝蒙古例の研究 (Studies of Qing Mongol laws; Sōbunsha 創文社 [*Tōyō hōseishi ronshū* 東洋法制史論集 5], 1982).
- 47) See n. 15.
- 48) Hosoya, "Manju=gurun to 'Manshūkoku'," p. 117.
- 49) See Ishibashi Hideo, "Shin Taisō no Ryōtō shinshutsu zengo ni kansuru ichi kōsatsu," "Shinsho no tai-Kanjin seisaku," "Shinchō shōkō," "Shinsho no han."
- 50) See Naitō Torajirō, "Shinchō shoki no keishi mondai" 清朝初期の繼嗣問題 (The question of succession in the early Qing), *Shirin* 史林 7, no. 1 (1922) (repr. in *Naitō Konan zenshū*, Vol. 7); Mitamura Taisuke, "Shin no Taisō no sokui jijō to sono kunshuken kakuritsu" 清の太宗の即位事情とその君主権確立 (The circumstances surrounding the enthronement of Taizong of the Qing and the establishment of his sovereignty), *Tōyōshi Kenkyū* 6, no. 2 (1941); *id.*, "Futatabi Taisō no sokui jijō ni tsuite" 再び太宗の即位事情について (The circumstances surrounding the enthronement of Taizong revisited), *Tōyōshi Kenkyū* 7, no. 1 (1942); Okada Hidehiro 岡田英弘, "Shin no Taisō shiritsu no jijō" 清の太宗嗣立の事情 (The circumstances surrounding the enthronement of Taizong of the Qing), in *Yamamoto hakushi kanreki kinen Tōyōshi ronsō*; Matsumura, "Sūtoku no kaigen to Taishin no kokugō ni tsuite"; *id.*, "Amin

- Beire no shōgai” アミン・バイレの生涯 (The life of Amin Beile), *Nihon Daigaku Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyūjo Kenkyū Kiyō* 日本大學人文科學研究所研究紀要 25 (1981); Ishibashi Hideo, “Shinsho no han”; Ishibashi Takao, “Shinsho hanken no keisei katei”; *id.*, “Shinsho kōteiken no keisei katei”; *id.*, “Shinsho saiten girei kō.”
- 51) See Ishibashi Hideo, “Shinsho no han”; Ishibashi Takao, “Shinsho hanken no keisei katei.”
- 52) Ishibashi Hideo, “Shinsho no han,” p. 7.
- 53) See Hosoya Yoshio, “Kōkinkoku, Shinchō ni raiki shita Kanjin no yōsō” 後金國・清朝に來歸した漢人の様相 (Aspects of Chinese who allied themselves to the Latter Jin and the Qing dynasty), *Chūgoku Shakai to Bunka* 中國社會と文化 2 (1987).
- 54) Matsumura Jun, “Tensō kyūnen no Chaharu seitō o meguru shomondai” 天聰九年のチャハル征討をめぐる諸問題 (Questions surrounding the subjugation of the Chahars in Tiancong 9), in *Kanda Nobuo sensei koki kinen ronshū: Shinchō to Higashi Ajia* 神田信夫先生古稀記念論集 清朝と東アジア (Collected articles commemorating the 70th birthday of Professor Kanda Nobuo: The Qing dynasty and East Asia; Yamakawa Shuppansha, 1992).
- 55) See n. 46.
- 56) See Matsumura, “Sūtoku no kaigen to Taishin no kokugō ni tsuite”; *id.*, “Tensō kyūnen no Chaharu seitō o meguru shomondai”; Ishibashi Hideo, “Shinsho no han”; Ishibashi Takao, “Shinsho hanken no keisei katei”; *id.*, “Shinsho kōteiken no keisei katei.”
- 57) See Shimada, *Shinchō Mōko rei no kenkyū*.
- 58) There are several studies dealing with this issue, and they have been summarized in Matsumura, “Sūtoku no kaigen to Taishin no kokugō ni tsuite.” In this article, Matsumura touches on the fact that the Manchu equivalent of the name ‘Great Qing’ is a phonetic transcription (Daicing) of the corresponding Chinese characters and that there is no distinctively Manchu form of this name, and he puts forward the view that the dynastic name ‘Great Qing’ and era name ‘Chongde’ were based on a completely Chinese way of thinking, having been chosen in contradistinction to ‘Great Ming’ and the Ming era name ‘Chongzheng’ 崇禎, and that they demonstrate Hong Taiji’s leanings towards Chinese culture at this time. As is pointed out by Matsumura, the Manchu equivalent of ‘Great Qing’ in the *Veritable Records* and archival documents of the early Qing is either *Daicing gurun* or *Amba cin gurun*, but Ishibashi Hideo has subsequently noted that in diplomatic credentials of the late Qing the Manchu equivalent of the dynastic name is given as *Amba daicing gurun* (lit. ‘Great Great-Qing kingdom’); see Ishibashi Hideo, “Taishinkoku no kokusho” 大清國の國書 (Diplomatic credentials of the Great Qing), *Sekaishi no Kenkyū* 162 (1995). We await a more detailed examination of this question by Ishibashi.
- 59) See Ishibashi Takao, “Shinsho saiten girei kō.”
- 60) For further details, see Matsumura, “Sūtoku no kaigen to Taishin no kokugō ni tsuite.”
- 61) See Matsuura, *Shin no Taisho Nuruhachi*.
- 62) See Ishibashi Takao, “Qingzhao ‘baoyi’ mingcheng de jieshi” 清朝「包衣」名稱的解釋 (The interpretation of the term *booi* in the Qing dynasty), *Guoli Zhengzhi Daxue Bianzheng Yanjiusuo Nianbao* 國立政治大學邊政研究所年報 18 (1987). I am in the process of preparing a more detailed article on this subject.
- 63) See Kanda Nobuo, “Shinsho no bairoku ni tsuite” 清初の貝勒について (On *beile* in the early Qing), *Tōyō Gakuhō* 40, no. 4 (1958); Ishibashi Hideo, “Shinsho no han”; Ishibashi Takao, “Shinsho hanken no keisei katei.”
- 64) Ishibashi Hideo, “Shinsho no han,” p. 9.
- 65) *Loc. cit.*
- 66) See Ishibashi Hideo, “Shinsho no irugen (Irgen)—toku ni Tenmeiki o chūshin to shite—” 清初のイルゲン (Irgen)—特に天命期を中心として— (*Irgen* in the early Qing: With a special focus on the Tianming era), *Nihon Joshi Daigaku Kiyō Bungakubu* 13 (1964) (repr. in *Shindai shi kenkyū*); *id.*, “Shinsho no jushen (jušen)—toku ni Tenmeiki made o chūshin to shite—” 清初のジュシェン (jušen)—特に天命期までを中心として— (*Jušen* in the early Qing: With a special focus on the period up until the Tianming era), *Shisō* 5 (1964) (repr. in *Shindai shi*

kenkyū); *id.*, “Shinsho no aha—toku ni Tenmeiki o chūshin to shite—” 清初のアハ (aha)—特に天命期を中心として— (*Aha* in the early Qing: With a special focus on the Tianming era), *Shien* 史苑 28, no. 2 (1968) (repr. in *Shindai shi kenkyū*); *id.*, “Shinsho no shakai—toku ni jushen ni tsuite—” 清初の社会—とくにジュシェンについて— (Early-Qing society: With special reference to *jušen*), in *Egami Namio kyōju koki kinen ronshū: rekishi hen* 江上波夫教授古稀記念論集・歴史篇 (Collected articles commemorating the 70th birthday of Professor Egami Namio: History; 1977) (repr. in *Shindai shi kenkyū*); *id.*, “Shinsho no aha—Taisō Tensōki o chūshin ni—” 清初のアハ (aha)—太宗天聰期を中心として— (*Aha* in the early Qing: With a focus on the Tiancong era of Taizong), *Eikyoshū* 盈虚集 1 (1984) (repr. in *Shindai shi kenkyū*); *id.*, “Jushen shōkō” ジュシェン *jušen* 小考 (A brief consideration of the *jušen*), in *Mikami Tsugio hakushi kiju kinen ronbunshū: rekishi hen* 三上次男博士喜寿記念論文集・歴史篇 (Collected articles commemorating the 77th birthday of Dr. Mikami Tsugio: History; Heibonsha 平凡社, 1985) (repr. in *Shindai shi kenkyū*). Owing to limited source materials Ishibashi’s investigations go only as far as the Tiancong era, and it is hoped that he will extend his inquiries to the Chongde era and beyond.

- 67) See Ishibashi Takao, “Shinsho hanken no keisei katei”; *id.*, “Shinsho kōteiken no keisei katei.”
- 68) With regard to this process, two points relating to the Eight Banner system during the Tiancong era merit special attention. Firstly, private *niru* (*niulu* 牛录) were forfeited and concentrated in the hands of banner leaders (*ijen*), and secondly in Tiancong 8 (1634) officials were renamed, with only those in charge of a banner (*gūsa* [*gushan* 固山]) being called *ijen* (*ezhen* 額真) and all lower-ranking officials, in charge of a *meiren* (*meilei* 梅勒), *jalan* (*jiala* 甲喇) or *niru*, being called *janggjin* (*zhangjing* 章京). These two points are important in that they indicate that the position within the Eight Banner system designated by the Manchu term *ijen* had risen in status. See Ishibashi Takao, “Shinsho hanken no keisei katei.”
- 69) See Ishibashi Takao, “Shinsho hanken no keisei katei”; *id.*, “Shinsho kōteiken no keisei katei.”
- 70) See Ishibashi Takao, “Shinsho kōteiken no keisei katei.”
- 71) See Ishibashi Takao, “Shinsho saiten girei kō.” In this article I also point out that the Altar of Heaven (equivalent to the *yuangiu* 圓丘 or ‘circular mound’) constructed on the occasion of Hong Taiji’s enthronement was not three-tiered, as claimed by earlier scholars, but two-tiered and that it was not the same as that used in the late Ming, when Hong Taiji lived, but was akin to that of the early Ming. The background to this and its reasons are unclear, but it is, I believe, noteworthy in that it would suggest that our hitherto understanding of the Altar of Heaven (i.e., *yuangiu*) before the Qing’s advance into China proper must be modified.