

## Articles

Conferences  
& LecturesResearch  
Activities

# The Nature and Significance of Manchu-Language Documents of the Qing Era

Author ISHIBASHI Takao

## Introduction

The Great Qing Empire (Da Qing Guo), established in the seventeenth century by the Manchu people, who lived outside the Great Wall, came to be known as China's last absolute dynasty. Before and after making Beijing its capital in 1644, the Qing dynasty pushed forward on a path of relentless territorial expansion, reaching its apogee in the mid-eighteenth century, with territorial borders that encompassed the Mongolian Plateau, East Turkestan, and Tibet. The constituent parts of the modern Chinese nation (Northeast China, China proper, Inner Mongolia, and the Xinjiang Uyghur Region) are all directly based on the Qing dynasty's territorial borders. Thus, not only did the Great Qing Empire dramatically transform the territorial concept of "China," it also changed the concept of "East Asia," and furthermore the strange new technical term of "East Eurasia," used frequently in recent years. Regarding the relationship between the Qing dynasty and East Asia, a new and important issue is proposed by Yoshizawa Seiichiro. Taking a broad perspective of "the military and economic rise of Japan after the end of the nineteenth century," he notes,

If we are to consider the transition process of Qing as a continental state, we will need to be mindful of the problematic nature of the "East Asia" framework; a pitfall for many Japanese people.<sup>1</sup>

As the dynasty that reigned supreme in China, the Qing dynasty controlled a territorial area of an unprecedented scale. When we focus on this fact, we can identify in the Qing dynasty the quality of a unique multi-ethnic state, a quality that cannot be properly understood if we only consider Qing through the framework of its rule of Inner China.<sup>2</sup> In fact, reflecting on this aspect of Qing, there have traditionally been two ways of positioning historical Qing: first, as China's final non-Han dynasty of Conquest (the Manchu dynasty), and second, as China's final traditional, absolutist dynasty.

So how is this double-faceted nature of the Qing dynasty reflected in Qing-era historical documents? If we take a tentative look at documents related to the Manchu language, the first official language of the Qing dynasty, we will find certain features, including the following:

- There are a great many translations of Chinese classics, as represented by Confucian writings.
- Aside from documents written in a single language (Manchu, Mandarin Chinese, etc.), there are also many multilingual documents in which the same content is presented in multiple languages (Manchu-Chinese, Manchu-Mongolian, etc.)
- There are a great many officially and privately compiled dictionaries of Manchu, Chinese, Mongolian, Tibetan, and Uighur.

These facts should be understood as reflective of the issues the Qing dynasty faced in its rule of China, issues related to traditional Chinese culture and issues related to the national language of the multi-ethnic state.

The Qing dynasty ruled by amalgamating into its territory a number of different ethnic groups including the Manchu, Han Chinese, and Mongolians. Such an enterprise made the task of translating Manchu texts into Chinese and Chinese texts into Manchu very important, and so it was necessary to set up a translation institution and appoint official translators. However, as it had become apparent that the changing times had led to a decreasing number of Qing bannermen practicing martial arts (their traditional duty) and speaking their mother tongue, the Qing dynasty implemented an official translation examination to test the bannermen's language proficiency. The aim of this measure was to prevent the decline of Manchu and Mongolian language proficiency and to promote the distinct culture of the bannermen. It also aimed to make it easier to widen the scope for recruiting and promoting bannermen.<sup>3</sup> There remains a lack of clarity as to the nature of the transitional process for the bannermen's language proficiency during the Qing era. However, official documents written in Manchu, the first official language of the Qing dynasty, continued to exist unchanged until the establishment of the Republic of China following the Xinhai Revolution. In addition, as the nature of the writing itself made it impossible to determine the contents from a quick glance, there were, in particular, many examples of documents written in Manchu in situations where information leaks needed to be strictly prevented. A major characteristic of the Qing era Manchu documents is that, because only roughly one hundred years have elapsed since the fall of the Qing dynasty, there remains a daunting volume of diverse materials ranging from primary sources, such as imperial archives, through to historical compilations, such as veritable records.<sup>4</sup>

Thus, an effective way of studying the history of the Qing dynasty is to gather, examine, and make full use of Manchu documents in addition to Chinese documents, as opposed to relying only on Chinese documents. However, Manchu documents of the Qing era are currently scattered across a number of regions. The current situation can be summarized as follows: "A large proportion of valuable Manchu documents were damaged following the Xinhai Revolution, and the documents that still remain in the world today represent only a drop in the ocean compared to those published before."<sup>5</sup> For this reason, surveying and examining the Manchu documents that are still kept in the various regions has become a matter of urgency.

I will therefore discuss the nature and significance of documents written in Manchu, the first official language of the Qing dynasty, and by doing so, I aim to contribute to the search for a new way of studying the history of the Qing dynasty system.

## I Manchu Translations of Chinese Classics

I should first mention the fact that there are a great many translations of Chinese classics (as represented by Confucian writings). The volume and types of such translations are staggering. An idea of the sheer scale can be gaged from the content listed in catalogues such as the following: Li Deqi (ed.), *Man wen shu ji lian he mu lu*,<sup>6</sup> Fu Li (ed.), *Shi jie Man wen wen xian mu lu: chu bian*,<sup>7</sup> Huang Runhua and Qu Liusheng (chief ed.), / Wang Xiaohong and Li Song Ling (ed.), *Quan guo Man wen tu shu zi liao lian he mu lu*,<sup>8</sup> Watanabe Shigetaro, *Zōtei manshūgo tosho mokuroku*,<sup>9</sup> Kawachi Yoshihiro and Zhao Zhan (ed.), *Tenri Toshokan zō manbun shoseki mokuroku*,<sup>10</sup> and *Tōkyō Daigaku Bungakubu kanseki kōnā manshūbun shoseki mokuroku*.<sup>11,12</sup> Even if we confine our search to those documents stored in Gakushuin University under class number "334," we still find a

great volume, which includes *Fan yi gu wen* (334-8, the same content as in 334-29), *Man Han he bi Lu yu ji cui si juan* (*Manju nikan hergen kamcibuha lioi ioi ji z'ui bithe*) (334-9), *Xiao xue* (in Manchu) (334-23, Diagram 1), *Man Han he bi gu wen* (334-29, the same content as in 334-8). So what do these Chinese classics (as represented by Confucian writings) teach us about the nature and significance of Manchu literature?

Even before it succeeded in making Beijing its capital in the first year of Shunzhi (1644), the Qing dynasty had already established the Literature Institute<sup>13</sup> and had begun the work of translating Chinese classics into Manchu. By the sixth year of Tienzong (1632), it was already undertaking the translation of *Mengzi* into Manchu together with *Zi zhi tong jian*, *Liu Tao*, and *San guo zhi ji jie*.<sup>14</sup> It would appear that this enterprise was undertaken for the same reason that the Yuan dynasty (founded by the Mongolians in the thirteenth century) wasted no time in translating a large volume of Chinese classics. Furthermore, the enterprise was a measure to deal with the ideological issue surrounding China's traditional Sino-centrism (the Sino-barbarian dichotomy), which challenged the legitimacy of the Qing dynasty, and as such was an issue that Qing had to face in order to rule Inner China. At this point, we should discuss a range of issues, including a comparative analysis with the Yuan dynasty. However, due to constraints of space, I will provide only one example of a reference to the ideological issue of the legitimacy of the Qing dynasty. This reference is from *Lun yu*, one of *Si shu* of Cheng-Zhu School Confucianism, which continued to be the state religion during the Qing dynasty, as it was in the Ming dynasty. Below, I have provided a line from *Lun yu* 3.5 in its original form.

子曰、夷狄之有君、不如諸夏之亡也。

Yoshikawa Kojiro has written a concise commentary on the issues concerning the interpretation of this saying, so I will quote it here despite its length.

(Confucius says) The Yi and Di barbarian tribes (夷狄) with rulers are not as viable as the various Chinese states (諸夏) without them.

“Various Chinese states” (諸夏) refers to the land of China thought at the time to be the center of the world, and as such it has connotations of jingoism and self-confidence. “The Yi and Di” (夷狄), on the other hand, denote the uncivilized tribes that lived on the periphery of China. The Yi and Di are the barbarians, and the Chinese states represent the civilized realm. Even with rulers, the Yi and Di lack civilization. As for the Chinese states, even if they were to lack rulers, the civilization there would continue to flourish unabated. Thus, the barbarian tribes with rulers do not even come up to the level of China without them. Such was the view of pre-Song scholars such as Huang Kan and Xing Bing, who stated the ancient commentaries, specifically He Yan's *Ji jie*. However, the ancient commentaries, citing Bao Shi, simply mention that “諸夏” means “various Chinese states” and that “亡” means “without” (as in “without rulers”). It is thus uncertain whether the ancient commentaries themselves shared this view.

The idea that civilization only existed in China and that all other lands were uncivilized is what is known as Sino-centrism, and this ideology existed in China from very early on in its history. Thus, this passage of the analects would normally have been read in the way described above.

However, having probably reflected on the excessively provocative nature of such a view, Neo-Confucian scholars came up with a new interpretation. The new interpretation was that even the Yi and Di barbarian

tribes have their rulers, and they are not like present China without rulers or a system of government. In other words, the Yi and Di with rulers cannot be compared to China without rulers.

Moreover, when China was ruled by the “foreign tribes” of the Yuan and Qing dynasties, this *Lun yu* would often pose a problem. Take for example, the case of Huang Kan’s *Lun yu ji jie yi shu*. This text, which had been lost in China early on, was first printed in Japan in the mid-eighteenth century by Ogyu Sorai’s student Nemoto Sonshi, and then imported back to China. At the end of the century, after the order by the emperor Qianlong a court edition was printed. In this court edition, Huang Kan’s original commentary was thoroughly reworded so that it became very similar to Cheng-Zhu’s view. Huang Kan’s interpretation was that even with rulers, the barbarians could never come up to the level of Chinese civilization, and as such, it was an inconvenient interpretation from the perspective of the Qianlong emperor, since he happened to be a “barbarian ruler” from Manchuria.

This *Lun yu* would also have aroused various controversies in Japan. It is my hope that political historians and historians of political ideas take note of this.<sup>15</sup>

Yoshikawa’s argument could not be any clearer. In fact, in *Yu zhi fan yi Si shu*, which contains “Yu zhi xu”, which was compiled with a preface by the Qianlong emperor dated the fourteenth day of the twelfth month of the twentieth year of Qianlong (1755), *Lun yu* is translated as follows (The Möllendorff transliteration of the Manchu text and the translation below were done by the author).

fudz hendume, tulergi aiman, ejen bisire be sara bade, dulimbai gurun i elemangga akū i gese adali akū kai.

The Master said: In the condition that the foreign tribes understand that they have rulers, do not be fooled into thinking that their situation is equivalent to China in the opposite condition, that is to say, without rulers.

As you can see, this translation is in line with the new interpretation. So other than the Analects, what were the circumstances and characteristics of the Manchu translations of *Si shu*?

I have already mentioned how *Mengzi* was already being translated into Manchu before the Qing dynasty began. It appears that the Manchu translations of *Si shu* reached a certain state of completion later on during the reign of emperor Kangxi, and the “thirtieth year of Kangxi (1691) edition” of *Si shu* (Manchu-Chinese) is now stored in the library of the Minzu University of China. A number of revisions were made to this bilingual publication. After *Xin ke Man Han zi si shu* was published in the eleventh year of Yongzheng (1733), and the six volumes of *Si shu* (Manchu only) were published in the sixth year of Qianlong (1741), the *Yu zhi fan yi Si shu* (in Manchu and Chinese) finally appeared in the twentieth year of Qianlong. What requires attention here is the fact that the content of the translation published before the Qianlong years differs considerably from the content of the translation published after the Qianlong years. For example, the emperor’s preface to *Yu zhi zeng ding Qing wen jian*, dated the thirty-sixth year of Qianlong (1771), states the following:

綜計統入新定國語五千余句。若古官名、冠服、器用、鳥獸、花果等、有裨參考者、別為補篇、系之卷末。

The preface says that the book contains “over 5,000 newly established words (relating to Manchu translations).” In addition, the Imperial Edict, dated the fifty-second year of Qianlong (1787), contained in *Fan yi xiang hui*

*shi shang li an* of the 59th volume, “Translation,” of “*Qin ding ke chang tiao li*,” published in the second year of Xianfeng (1852), states the following:

項拋喀甯等考試八旗各處滿洲教習人等、進呈試卷。內風俗字樣、俱繙 *an kooli*, 此雖係旧定成語。但初定時已失字意矣、久行不易者、始謂之 *kooli* 隨時人之常習謂之風俗。理宜繙作 *geren i tacin*. 所有進呈試卷已經改正、將此著交繙譯房、將清文鑑照依改正、宣示各處遵行。從前德通在時所繙清語內、阿岱不曉者甚多。阿岱善於清語何至不曉。究係德通固執漢文、拘泥成語、不能取意、以至繙成漢文語氣、阿岱始不能明晰。是以彼時會降旨曉諭衆人。凡繙清必順滿文取意繙譯。方可令人易曉不然棄舍滿文氣。因循漢文繙譯、則竟至失卻滿文旧規、著將此通行各處。嗣後一切繙清、必遵朕屢次訓旨、遵照滿文旧規取意繙譯。斷不可拘泥漢文繙譯。欽此。

A loose translation is as follows:

In the answer sheets issued in the Translation Examination, the Manchu translation of the Chinese word 風俗 (customs) is ‘*an kooli*.’ Since this is an idiom established a long time ago that has already lost much its meaning today, it is an inappropriate word choice. 風俗 should instead be translated as ‘*geren i tacin*.’ This rescript shall be conveyed to the translation office in charge. The national language dictionary, that is to say the Qing Language Survey, shall be revised, and the relevant departments shall be instructed to comply. It is highly regrettable that there seems to be a tendency to select Manchu words without paying due attention to their original meaning. Henceforth, thoroughgoing efforts must be made to ensure that future translations are carried out with due regard to the original meaning of the Manchu words, and translators must not be influenced too much by the Chinese (source text.)

Thus, the translated content was changed significantly during the years of Qianlong as a result of major revisions made to the translations of the classics (for example, new translated terms that used the Manchu language more accurately were established).<sup>16</sup> There is, therefore, a considerable disparity between the content of the Chinese classics translations before Qianlong and the content afterward, making it difficult to judge the situation of translations before the Qianlong years. Incidentally, Manchu translations of *Si shu* published before the Qianlong years are extremely rare, particularly the ones published during the years of Kangxi. Upon seeing with my own eyes the edition from the thirtieth year of Kanxi translation of *Si shu* (in Manchu and Chinese), which is stored in the library of the Minzu University of China, I found many interesting details that are of great interest to anyone investigating the circumstances in which the Qing era translations of *Si shu* were carried out. For example, not only was this edition entirely different from the translated content of the *Yu zhi fan yi Si shu* (in Manchu and Chinese) published in the twentieth year of Qianlong, in the Manchu text the changing of lines takes place from right to left in accordance with Chinese transcription form, which is the reverse of the original Manchu transcription form. Moreover, the beginning of the book contains a preface by the Kangxi emperor regarding the translation of *Si shu* into Manchu. Such a characteristic is not only witnessed in *Si shu*, but also in the *Five Classics* and other classic Chinese literature. When using the original Chinese texts as a basis to examine the interpretation of Chinese classics through various, multi-angled approaches, it is extremely helpful to use the Mongol and Manchu translations to get an idea of how these classics were interpreted during the Yuan and Qing dynasties. As far as I can tell, however, there is scarcely any research based on such a method. Therefore, the

Manchu translations of Chinese classics in the Qing era hold immense significance, and there is an urgent need to shed light on the full facts.

## II Manchu Material Published in the Multilingual Format

We will now discuss the nature and significance of the Manchu material that was published in the multilingual format. Because the multilingual format is focused on discussion, as the Chinese classics discussed earlier were originally written in Chinese, a large proportion of the translations of such texts were published in the multilingual format. We have just discussed how there are discrepancies in the translated content and how such discrepancies are reflective of the changing times. The point that I wish to make in this chapter concerns a separate issue. Multilingual material generally refers to books in which the same content is presented in multiple languages. In some cases, the same book contains multiple languages, and in other cases, Manchu books and Chinese books were produced separately. Examples of the former include imperial archives, such as palace memorials, and examples of the latter include veritable records, such as “precedents.” When researchers study such documents, it is imperative that they make a comparison of both language versions. It cannot, however, be said that such comparative analysis has ever really been undertaken. The lack of comparative analysis can probably be attributed to a notion among scholars that it is simply a case of the same content being presented in two different forms. Such an attitude leaves scholars prone to believing that it is sufficient to rely exclusively on either the Chinese text or the Manchu text alone. However, if one actually attempts such a comparative examination, one will find that there are many cases where the contents of the two language versions differ from each other. Furthermore, since Manchu is very different from Chinese linguistically, such a comparison will offer up new insights. For example, it will resolve and clarify much that would have remained opaque if one was only studying one or the other of the language versions. I would like to cite two cases that demonstrate this point. The first is an example of how the content of a document can be better understood precisely because it presents the same content in two languages.

A highly significant Manchu-Chinese document from the imperial archives that gives an account of the history of China-Ryukyu relations is *Ge ke shi shu*, which is stored in the National Palace Museum of Taiwan. In *Ge ke shi shu*, various types of memorials are arranged chronologically and filed under each of the six ministries of the Censorate (the ministries of Personnel, Revenue, Rites, Defense, Justice, and Works). There are a total of 234 volumes stored in the Palace Museum. In all of these volumes, each memorial is presented in both Manchu and Chinese. Shown below is the breakdown of the volumes by year according to *Qing dai wen xian dang an zong mu, National Palace Museum*.<sup>17</sup>

### Records of the Ministry of Personnel:

Daoguang Year 17 (1 volume)

Daoguang Year 22 (1 volume)

Daoguang Year 23 (1 volume)

Xianfeng Year 8 (23 volumes)

Xianfeng Year 9 (11 volumes)

Xianfeng Year 10 (12 volumes)

Xianfeng Year all years (1 volume)

Records of the Ministry of Revenue:

Qianlong Year 4 (3 volumes)

Qianlong Year 6 (2 volumes)

Qianlong Year 20 (32 volumes)

Records of the Ministry of Rites:

Qianlong Year 20 (4 volumes)

Qianlong Year 53 (2 volumes)

Records of the Ministry of Defense

Qianlong Year 20 (2 volumes)

Jiaqing Year 6 (3 volumes)

Jiaqing Year 25 (4 volumes)

Daoguang year 17 (1 volume)

Daoguang Year 18 (1 volume)

Daoguang Year 21 (1 volume)

Daoguang Year 22 (1 volume)

Daoguang Year 23 (1 volume)

Xianfeng Year 6 (18 volumes)

Xianfeng Year 7 (25 volumes)

Xianfeng Year 8 (21 volumes)

Xianfeng Year 9 (11 volumes)

Xianfeng Year 10 (12 volumes)

Records of the Ministry of Justice:

Qianlong Year 20 (34 volumes)

Records of the Ministry of Works:

Qianlong Year 20 (6 volumes)

As can be seen, nearly a third of the volumes are from the twentieth year of Qianlong.

As an example of a specific memorial from *Ge ke shi shu*, I will show the memorial dated the twenty-first day of the twelfth month of the third year of Qianlong (1738), filed under the “Records of the Ministry of Revenue.” It should be noted that since a “rescript” was issued on the eleventh day of the second month of the fourth year of Qianlong (the following year), the memorial itself was actually filed under the fourth year of Qianlong, the year of the rescript. Due to constraints of space, it is not possible to provide the whole of the memorial. I will therefore provide only the beginning. I will first provide the Manchu version followed by its meaning in (English). I will then provide the Chinese version. The Manchu version is as follows.

○ coohai jurgan i aliha amban bime, uheribe baicara yamun i ici ergi ashan i baicara amban kamciha, fugiyan, jegiyangni jergi ba i coohai baita be uheri kadalara, jeku ciyanliyang be kamcifi

icihiyara, jalan sirara baitalabure hafan, nadan jergi nonggiha, gūsin jakūn jergi ejehe, gung de emu jergi nonggiha, fu jeo fu de tehe, amban hoo ioi lin i gingguleme wesimburengge, dergi hese be gingguleme dahara jalin. amban bi tuwaci, abkai wehiyehe ilaci aniya ninggun biyade, tai jeo fu i harangga kadalara lin hai hiyan i hai men guwan furdan i bade eyeme isinaha jung šan gurun i i i niyalmai cuwan emke, cuwan i da niyalma sin yuwan žin ye, cuwan i dorgi cuwan i uncehen be tuwancihiyara, cuwan, šurure niyalma, ioi na ling ni jergi orin sunja niyalma, kamciha hūdai niyalma ši men i jergi duin niyalma gung gu doo sere baci je bele, kubun, morin uđafi cuwan be šurume gurun de bederere de, amba edun delasihubufi siltan moo mokcofi eyeme jegiyang ni mederi de isinaha manggi, cuwan efujehe turgunde, neneme harangga hiyan ci alanaha manggi, nenehe tušan i dzungdu gi dzeng yūn, gūnin akūmbume bilume gosi, hacin acinggiyafi cuwan be dasatame weile, anggalai bele, etuku, jaka bahabufi bithe bufi fugiyan de unggifi gurun de bederebu seme pilehe,

In (English)...

○ Hao Yulin, Minister of Defense, Right Vice Censor-in-Chief of the Censorate, Governor-General of Fujian and Zhejiang Provinces and Surrounding Areas, Overseer of Food Production, 世襲騎都尉, raised by seven ranks, 紀錄三八次, 功加一等, Minister resident to Fuzhou-fu, 臣, shall solemnly present a memorial to the throne. This is done in reverent compliance with the Imperial Edict. An investigation by the official (the Viceroy of Min-Zhe who was in Fuzhou, Fujian Province) discovered the presence of a ship carrying Yi people from Zhongshan adrift in the waters of Linhai, which is within the jurisdiction of Taizhou-fu. The captain's name was 新垣仁也. There was a crew of twenty-five men; twenty-four oarsmen, and one helmsman named 与那嶺. The ship was also carrying four passengers, one of whom was a merchant named 石門. Having purchased crushed rice (millet), cotton, and horses from a place called Miyakojima, the crew set sail for home. Midway through their return voyage, their ship was battered by a heavy storm, their mast broke, and they fell adrift. After drifting all the way to the waters off Zhejiang, the ship was in a heavily damaged state. Therefore, after making a report from Linhai, the former viceroy Ji Cengjun affixed a postscript to the report that stated, "Make an earnest effort to assist the sailors. Use funds to repair the ship. See to it that the men have sufficient rice, clothing, and other necessities, ask them to take with them the *ziwen* (report delivered by the head of a government on affairs of state) send them to Fujian and then on home."

Finally, the Chinese text:

兵部尚書·兼都察院右副都御史·總督福建浙江等處地方軍務·兼理糧餉·世襲騎都尉·加一級·紀錄三十八次·功加一等·駐劄福州府·臣·郝玉麟、謹題為欽奉上諭事。該臣看得乾隆三年六月內、<sup>マ</sup>合州府屬之臨海縣海門關地方飄到中山國彝船一隻、船主新垣仁也·船內舵水与那嶺等二十五名·附搭客人石門等四名、在宮古島、買有小米·棉花·馬匹、開船回國、遭飄折桅飄泊浙洋、船隻損壞。先拋該縣具詳、經前督臣嵇曾筠批飭、加意撫恤、動項修整船隻、資給口糧衣裝、給咨赴閩、歸國去。



This memorial is a report by Hao Yulin concerning a derelict ship that had drifted from Ryukyu in the sixth month of the third year of Qianlong. Let us now compare the Manchu version with the Chinese version.

- In the Manchu version, Hao Yulin is “nadan jergi nonggiha” (“raised by seven ranks”), whereas in the Chinese version he is “加一級” (“raised by one rank”).
- In the Manchu version, the location where the ship drifted to is “tai jeo fu” (Taizhou-fu), but in the Chinese version it is “合州府” (Hezhou-fu).

Regarding the latter discrepancy, it is quite clear that “Hezhou-fu” (in the Chinese version) is a mistake and that it should have been “Taizhou-fu.” Regarding the former discrepancy also, comparing the text to other records confirms that the Manchu version (“raised by seven ranks”) is correct. As for the passengers onboard the ship, whereas the Chinese version states “附搭客人石門等四名” (“the ship was also carrying four passengers, one of whom was named 石門,”), the Manchu version makes it clear that 石門 was a merchant in the phrase “kamciha hūdai niyalma ši men i jergi duin niyalma” (“The ship was also carrying four merchants, one of whom was a merchant named 石門”). We can therefore conclude that the Manchu version gives a more precise account than the Chinese version.<sup>18</sup>

The second example we will look at is *han i araha gucu hoki i leolen* (Chinese title: *Yu zhi peng dang lun*). Around the time of the accession to the throne of the emperor Yongzheng (temple name: Shizong), the fifth Qing emperor, there was a trend among officials to form factional affiliations. *Han i araha gucu hoki i leolen* (Chinese title: *Yu zhi peng dang lun*) was published by Emperor Yongzheng himself in the second year of his reign (1724) as an admonition against such a practice. It appears in this case that the text was first produced in Manchu and that the Chinese publication was based on this Manchu version. Both language versions of *han i araha gucu hoki i leolen* (Chinese title: *Yu zhi peng dang lun*) appeared, respectively, in a chapter of the 22nd volume of the Manchu and Chinese publications of *Da qing shi zong xian huang di shi lu* (hereunder “Records of Shizong”) entitled “Sixteenth Day of the Seventh Month of Yongzheng.” Both language versions of *han i araha gucu hoki i leolen* (Chinese title: *Yu zhi peng dang lun*) were also published in book form. Comparing (both language versions of) the contents of the discourse that appear in the “Records of Shizong” with (both language versions of) *han i araha gucu hoki i leolen* (Chinese title: *Yu zhi peng dang lun*) does reveal a number of disparities in the contents outside of the main section. However, in both the Manchu and Chinese versions, there does not appear to be any major difference between the main text of the contents in the “Records of Shizong” and the main text of *han i araha gucu hoki i leolen* (Chinese title: *Yu zhi peng dang lun*). On the other hand, if we compare the main text in the Manchu version with the main text in the Chinese version, we will find a number of discrepancies, such as content in the Manchu version that is missing in the Chinese version or content that differs between the two versions. Such discrepancies are particularly noticeable in the section that references *Peng dang lun* that was written by Ouyang Xiu, the well-known man of letters of the Song period who was one of the Eight Great Prose Masters of Tang and Song. Accordingly, I will show only this section.<sup>19</sup> In this comparison, I will compare the relevant section from the Manchu language version of *han i araha gucu hoki i leolen* with the Chinese version that appears in “Records of Shizong” both of which are stored in the special collection of the Liaoning Provincial Library.

First, the Manchu text.

sung gurun i o yang sio i gucu hoki i leolen de, miosihon gisun be fukjin banjibufi, ambasa saisa

doro uhe be gucu obumbi sehebi, dergi be eiterere, cisu be yabure be, adarame doro obuci ombi, o yang sio i doro sehengge, inu buya niyalmai doro dabala, ere leolen be araha ci ebsi, buya niyalma i gucu ohongge, gemu bahafi doro uhe sere gebu de aname, ini aisi be uhelere yargiyan de tusa obuhabi, mini gūnin de, ambasa saisa de gucu akū, damu buya niyalma de bi sembi. tuttu bime o yang sio i leolen i songkoi oci, hokilame duhembuhengge be uthai ambasa saisa obure, facali samsifi hokilame duhembuekūngge be nememe buya niyalma obure de isinambi. gucu hoki i tacin, badarafi ten de isinafi maribuci ojurakū ohongge, yargiyan i o yang sio i deribuhe jobolon kai. aikabade o yang sio, ten i forgon de banjifi ere leolen be araci, bi urunakū wafi terei jalan be hūlimbuha weile be tuwancihiyambi.

Ouyang Xiu, in his *Peng dang lun*, which was written during the Song dynasty, first set forth the iniquitous doctrine that “factions of gentlemen are based on the ‘common Way.’ However, how can deceiving authority and acting arbitrarily ever be considered the Way? What Ouyang Xiu considers the Way is nothing more than the Way of petty men. Ever since this discourse was first preached, all those who form factions of petty men have simply acted as they pleased, claiming it is the common Way, and though they affiliate for mutual gain they have all the while pursued their own private interests. In my view “there is no such thing as a faction of gentleman; they only exist among petty men.” However, if Ouyang Xiu’s discourse is followed through to its logical conclusion, those who formed factions and maintained them until the very end would be regarded as gentlemen, and those who, having disbanded, did not maintain the faction they formed until the very end, would be regarded conversely as petty men. The fact that the practice of factional affiliation has now swelled to such an extent that it can no longer be pushed back is in truth a great woe, the seeds of which were first planted by Ouyang Xiu. If Ouyang Xiu had been born in this age and had put forth such a treatise, I would most surely have had him put to death as a way of righting his great crime of misleading the public.

Secondly, the Chinese text.

宋歐陽脩朋黨論、創為異說曰、君子以同道為朋。夫罔上行私、安得謂道。脩之所謂道、亦小人之道耳。自有此論、而小人之為朋者、皆得假同道之名、以濟其同利之實。朕以為君子無朋、惟小人則有之。且如脩之論、將使終其黨者、則為君子。解散而不終於黨者、反為小人乎。設脩在今日而為此論、朕必飭之以正其惑。

A comparison of the Manchu and Chinese versions reveals that the section in the Manchu text which reads “The fact that the practice of factional affiliation has now swelled to such an extent that it can no longer be pushed back is in truth a great woe, the seeds of which were first planted by Ouyang Xiu” is missing from the Chinese version. Furthermore, while the following sentence in the Manchu version uses harsh language, saying “If Ouyang Xiu had been born in this age and had put forth such a treatise, I would most surely have had him put to death as a way of righting his great crime of misleading the public,” the equivalent sentence in the Chinese version has a softer tone.

Thus, the fact that the same content is presented in different languages makes it all the more essential to conduct a comparative analysis of the two languages. Indeed, as we have seen and in particular, viewing the Manchu text can reveal many new insights that would have remained obscure if only the Chinese text were studied.

### III Manchu Dictionaries of the Qing dynasty

Finally, we will discuss the dictionaries<sup>20</sup> published during the Qing dynasty. As discussed earlier, the Qing dynasty often revised terminology related to political systems, and it is therefore essential that we get an accurate picture of this transitional process. An effective way to do this is to refer to the dictionaries published in the various time periods of the Qing dynasty. The most representative dictionary of the Qing period is the national language dictionary compiled by the state entitled *Qing wen jian*.<sup>21</sup> *Qing wen jian* was recompiled and republished a number of times during the Kangxi period and the Qianlong period, as listed below.

- han i araha manju gisun i buleku bithe (Chinese title: *Yu zhi Qing wen jian*), forty-seventh year of Kangxi (1708), with imperial preface.
- han i araha manju gisun i buleku bithe (Chinese title: *Yu zhi Manzhou Menggu he bei Qing wen jian*), fifty-six year of Kangxi (1717), with preface.
- nikan hergen i ubaliyambuha manju gisun i buleku bithe (Chinese title: *Yin Han Qing wen jian*), thirteenth year of Yongzheng (1735), with preface.
- emu be tacifi ilan be hafukiyara manju gisun i buleku bithe (Chinese title: *Yi xue san guan Qing wen jian*), eleventh year of Qianlong (1746), with preface.
- han i araha nonggime toktobuha manju gisun i buleku bithe (Chinese title: *Yu zhi zeng ding Qing wen jian*), thirty-sixth year of Qianlong (1771), with imperial preface
- han i araha manju monggo nikan hergen ilan hacin i mudan acaha buleku bithe (Chinese title: *Yu zhi Man zhu Menggu Han zi san he qie yin Qing wen jian*), forty-fifth year of Qianlong (1780), with imperial preface.
- han i araha duin hacin i hergen kamciha manju gisun i buleku bithe (Chinese title: *Yu zhi si ti Qing wen jian*), Qianlong period.
- han i araha sunja hacin i hergen kamciha manju gisun i buleku bithe (Chinese title: *Yu zhi wu ti Qing wen jian*), Qianlong period.

It is worth noting that the process of these compilations ran parallel to the start and completion of the construction of the “summer palace mountain resort,” which was built north of the Great Wall and served as the seat of the Qing emperor in his capacity as Great Khan who reigns over the Fanbu (colonies or vassal tribes).

The construction of the summer palace was initiated in the forty-second year of Kangxi (1703) by the fourth Qing emperor, Kangxi (temple name: Shengtsu), who unified Inner China. Thirty years later, in the eleventh year of Yongzheng (1733), Emperor Yongzheng changed the name of the province of Rehe to Chengde (virtue bearer) in honor of the benevolent rule of his father, the late emperor Shengtsu Kangxi, marking the origin of the name Chengde. During the reign of the sixth Qing emperor Qianlong (temple name: Gaozong) a great many ornate towers and palace buildings were constructed in the mountain resort, and the summer palace was finally completed in the fifty-fifth year of Qianlong (1790). As for the timeline of the Qing language survey compilations, it began with the publication of *Qing wen jian*, a glossary that explained the Manchu lexicon in Manchu and was affixed with an imperial preface dated 1708 (forty-seventh year of Kangxi). This publication was followed by *Yu zhi Manzhou Menggu he bei Qing wen jian* (Qianlong period), which showed terms in Manchu and Mongolian, *Yin Han Qing wen jian* (Yongzheng period), *Yi xue san guan Qing wen jian* (Qianlong period), and *Yu zhi*

*zeng ding Qing wen jian* (Qianlong period), which included terms in Manchu and Chinese, *Yu zhi Man zhu Menggu Han zi san he qie yin Qing wen jian* (Qianlong period), which included terms in Manchu, Mongolian, and Chinese, the *Yu zhi si ti Qing wen jian* (Qianlong period), which included terms in Manchu, Mongolian, Chinese, and Tibetan, and, the final of these publications, *Yu zhi wu ti Qing wen jian* (Qianlong period), which included terms in Manchu, Mongolian, Chinese, Tibetan, and Uighur. After the fifth publication, *Yu zhi wu ti Qing wen jian*, all subsequent publications were made after the construction of the entrance gate Lizhengmen (“Beautiful Portal”). The year when Lizhengmen was constructed, 1754, happened to be the year before the first dispatch of the Dzungar army, which marked the final stage of the formation of the Fanbu, and came only five years before the Qing dynasty reach its territorial apogee. Since territorial expansion had brought many different ethnic groups under Qing’s rule, in order to govern effectively, the translation of the various languages used in productions of official documents (the translation of Manchu into Chinese, the translation of Chinese into Manchu, etc.) became a very important matter. Accordingly, the Qing dynasty found it necessary to designate a range of expert translation institutions and specialist translation officials (called “*bitieshi*”). As an example of one of the systems related to the appointment of these translation officials, I have already mentioned that the Qing dynasty went so far as to set up the imperial translation examination, an imperial examination that was unique to the Qing dynasty. This imperial translation exam reflected the influence of Qing’s territorial expansion process, which encompassed the various peoples in Northeast China, Inner Mongolia, Inner China, Tibet, and Uighur, and the process by which the Qing dynasty coped with the situation of having to rule such an ethnically diverse set of subjects. We should therefore consider this series of language surveys to be the reflection of these two processes. In fact, after the Qianlong period, *Qing wen jian* began to appear as one of the required reading materials for those preparing to take the translation exam, and the *Yu zhi zeng ding Qing wen jian* affixed with an imperial preface dated the thirty-sixth year of Qianlong (stored in Gakushuin University, 334-1, photograph 2) came to be the definitive edition in the series.

It should be noted that *Yu zhi Qing wen jian*, affixed with an imperial preface dated the forty-seventh year of Kangxi, is a very important publication in terms of understanding the situation of translation before the Qianlong period. It is significant in that it is the first of the Qing language surveys, but, aside from this, *Yu zhi Qing wen jian* was also the only Qing language survey to cite as sources some of the Manchu language versions of the Confucian Writings and veritable accounts in vocabulary commentaries; all subsequent Qing language surveys omitted these versions entirely. Up until now, the section containing the Manchu language versions of the Confucian Writings has been considered a major defect of *Yu zhi Qing wen jian*, and scholars have considered it largely worthless as evidence of the meanings of words in the dictionary. However, when considering the transition process of the Manchu language versions of the Confucian Writings throughout the Qing era, the Manchu language Confucian Writings section in *Yu zhi Qing wen jian* is a valuable resource that can help us understand more about the Manchu translations of the Confucian Writings prior to the Qianlong period, and as such it is something that is well worth examining.

Aside from *Qing wen jian*, other Qing-era lexical publications from before the seventh year of Qianlong include the following: *Da Qing quan shu*, twenty-second year of Kangxi (1683) with a preface; *Man Han tong wen quan shu*, newly published in twenty-ninth year of Kangxi (1690); *Tong wen hui ji*, thirty-second year of Kangxi (1693) with a short preface; *Xin ke Qing shu quan ji*, thirty-eighth year of Kangxi (1699) with a preface; *Man Han lei shu*, thirty-ninth year of Kangxi (1700) new publication; *Qing wen bei kao*, sixty-first year of

Kangxi (1722) with a preface by the author; *Man Han tong wen lei ji* (Chinese title: *Tong wen wu ming lei ji*), thought to have been produced in the Kangxi years; *Qing wen dian yao*, third year of Qianlong (1738) new print; *Liu bu cheng yu* (Manchu title: ninggun jurgan I toktoho gisun i bithe), seventh year of Qianlong (1742) print. There is not enough space to show the details, but there are major discrepancies among these lexical publications in terms of how they translate Manchu terms into Chinese and vice versa. There is an urgent need to produce separate indices and an overall index of these terms. If such indices are produced, the benefit they will bring to the study of Qing history will be immeasurable.

## Conclusion

I have discussed the nature and significance of the documents written in Manchu, the primary official language of the Qing dynasty, but unfortunately, I could not quite bring the matter to a clear conclusion. It is, I fear, another case of a promising start ending in anticlimax, for there remain too many unsolved questions and problems. I plan to discuss the matter again in the future after having conducted a further examination.

## Notes

- (1) Yoshizawa Seiichiro, *Qing and the Modern World: The Nineteenth Century*, Papers on Chinese Modern History (1), Iwanami Shoten Publishers, 2010, 22–28 (吉澤誠一郎『清朝と近代世界 19世紀』シリーズ中国近代史).
- (2) Please refer to my own humble works: “Theory of the Manju Dynasty: Forward to Theory of the Qing State,” *Key Issues in the History of the Qing Dynasty*, 1997 (石橋崇雄「マンジュ (manju, 満洲) 王朝論—清朝国家論序説」『明清時代史の基本問題』), *ibid.*, “Theory of the Qing State,” *Iwanami World History* 13, 1998 (石橋崇雄「清朝国家論」『岩波講座世界歴史』), and *ibid.*, “On the Multi-ethnic State of the Qing Dynasty: Focusing on its Historical Positioning, Chronological Classification, Command Structure, and Legitimacy,” *History and Geography: World History Studies* 179, 1999 (石橋崇雄「多民族国家清朝をめぐる——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」『歴史と地理：世界史の研究』) etc.
- (3) Regarding the issues between the Manchu language and the system of rule during the Qing era, please refer to Miyazaki Ichisada, “An Aspect of the Language Issues during the Qing Era,” *Collection of Essays on Oriental History* No. 1, 1947 (宮崎市定「清朝における国語問題の一面」『東方史論叢』). For more on the translation examination, please refer to Higashigawa Tokuji, “The Old Translation Examination for Manchu and Mongolian Bannermen,” *Oriental Culture* 98, 1932 (東川徳治「満洲蒙古の旗人に対する旧特制繙訳科挙」『東洋文化』), Ishibashi Takao, “On the ‘Translation Examination’ of the Qing Dynasty,” *History and Geography: World History Studies* 135, 1988 (石橋崇雄「清朝の「繙訳科挙」をめぐる」『歴史と地理：世界史の研究』), Murakami Nobuaki, “The Translation Examination during the Reign of the Qianlong Emperor and the Entrance of the Mongolian Bannermen Bureaucrats,” *Sociocultural-Historical Studies* 43, 2002 (村上信明「乾隆朝の繙訳科挙と蒙古旗人官僚の台頭」『社会文化史学』), and *ibid.*, *Mongolian Bannermen during the Qing Era: How They Really Were and What Their Duties Were under Imperial Rule*, Fukyo-sha, 2007 (村上信明『清朝の蒙古旗人——その実像と帝国統治における役割』).
- (4) Kanda Nobuo, “Research on the History of the Qing Era and the Imperial Archives,” *Sundai Historical Studies* 50, 1980 (神田信夫「清代史の研究と檔案」『駿台史学』), *ibid.*, *Various Aspects of the Qing Era Archives Extant in Japan*, Toyo Bunko, 1994 (神田信夫編『日本所在清代檔案史料の諸相』) etc.
- (5) Kawachi Yoshihiro & Zhao Zhan (eds.), “Catalogue of Manchu Documents in Tenri Central Library,” *Biblia* 84, 1985, 184 (河内良弘・趙展編「天理図書館蔵満文書籍目録」『ビブリア』).
- (6) The National Library of Peiping/ Library of the National Palace Museum, 1933.
- (7) Chinese Association for Ancient Scripts of National Minorities, 1983.

- (8) Catalogue of Literature, 1991.
- (9) *Asia Studies* 3, Osaka Association for Oriental Studies, 1932 (『亜細亞研究』).
- (10) Please refer to note 5.
- (11) Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research on Priority Areas (inundated 2005), “Ocean Trade in East Asia and the Formation of the Traditional Culture of Japan,” Literature Section, Chinese Section of the Faculty of Letters, mathematics group, coproduced with associated companies, 2010 (文科省科研費特定領域研究「東アジアの海域交流と日本伝統文化の形成」).
- (12) For more details on the Manchu document catalogues published prior to 1999, please refer to Seong Baek-in “A Note on Early Manchu Dictionaries,” *Studies on Manchu and Altaic linguistics*, 1999, 233–235 (成百仁「初期満洲語辞典들에 대하여」『만주어와 알타이어학 연구』).
- (13) For a discussion of the Literature Academy “Wenguan,” please refer to Kanda Nobuo, “The Wenguan in Early Qing,” *Oriental History Studies* 19–3, first published 1960 (神田信夫「清初の文館」『東洋史研究』). According to these scholars, the Literature Academy was effectively up and running around the first year of Tianming, and in the final year of Tianming it was officially established as a fully functioning institution in both name and reality. Later on, in the third month of the tenth year of Tianzong (1636), the Three Palace Academies (the Historiographic Academy, the Palace Secretariat Academy, and Palace Academy for the Advancement of Literature) were reformed, and reform continued to take place from the first year of Qing onward, encompassing even the Grand Secretariat. It should be noted that on the eleventh day of the fourth month of the tenth year of Tianzong, Hong Taiji ascended to the imperial throne and became Chong De. The country name was then changed to Great Qing (Da Qing). For more details, please refer to Ishibashi Takao, “The Formation of Power of the Early Qing Emperors: The Significance of the Entry Regarding the Ascension of Hong Taiji as Emperor of the Da-Qing Empire in the Manchu Archives, Fulgiyan Singgeri Aniya Duin Biya (i) DE (Narhun Bithe) Han Be Amba Soorin Toktobuha Tangse,” *Toyoshi Kenkyu* 53–1, 1994 (石橋崇雄「清初皇帝権の形成過程——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」『東洋史研究』), *ibid.*, “The Jitian Ceremony: The Significance of the Entry regarding the Jitian in the Manchu Archives, Fulgiyan Singgeri Aniya Duin Biya (i) DE (Narhun Bithe) Han Be Amba Soorin Toktobuha Tangse,” *Regarding the issues on the History of the Qing Era*, Yamakawa-shuppan, 1995 (石橋崇雄「清初祭天儀礼考——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」石橋秀雄編『清代中国の諸問題』).
- (14) The chapter entitled ‘Fourteenth Day of the Seventh Month of Tianzong’ in Shunzhi Publication of “The Veritable Records of Tai Zong Wen Huang” (Chinese language). For more details on “The Veritable Records of Tai Zong Wen Huang,” please refer to Matsumura Jun, “A Discussion of The Veritable Records of Tai Zong Wen Huang,” *Jubilee Publication in Commemoration of Seventieth Year Since the Founding of Nihon University College of Humanities and Sciences*, 1973 (松村潤「順治初纂清太宗実録について」『日本大学文理学部創立七十周年記念論文集』), and Ishibashi Takao, “On the Manchu Text of Shunzhi Publication of “The Veritable Records of Tai Zong Wen Huang,”” *Collection of Essays on the Qing Era*, Kyuko-shoin Publishing, 1994 (石橋崇雄「順治初纂『大清太宗文皇帝実録』の満文本について」『松村潤先生古稀記念清代史論叢』).
- (15) *Analects Part 1*, Selected Chinese Classics 3, Asahi Shimbun, 1978, 79–80 (『論語上』中国古典選).
- (16) The assertion made here can also be seen in Hosoya Yoshio, “Che-tsou-ch’eng-ya: An Index of Manchu Words,” Hirotsuki University, *Collection of Essays on the Classics* 14–4, 1979 (細谷良夫「摺奏成語」満洲語索引」『文経論叢』).
- (17) National Palace Museum, Taipei, 1982.
- (18) For more on the new findings gained from comparing and contrasting this entry with other historical records, please refer to Ishibashi Takao, “Research on the History of Sino-Ryukyū Relations and Qing Era Imperial Archive Material Written in Both Manchu and Chinese: The Significance of the Memorial Dated December 21 Qianlong Year 3 Filed in the ‘Records of the Ministries,’” The 4th International Conference on Okinawan Studies, *Collection of Essays on the History of Sino-Ryukyū Relations*, 1993 (石橋崇雄「中琉関係史研究と清朝満漢文檔案史料——『各科史書』所収の乾隆三年二月二日付けの題本をめくって」『中琉歴史関係論文集』).
- (19) For the full text, please refer to Ishibashi Takao, “Manchu Language Version of ‘Han I Araha Gucu Hoki Leolen’ (the Imperially Commissioned Discourse on Factions),” *Kokushikan History Studies* 4, 1996 (石橋崇雄「満文『han i

araha gucu hoki leolen (御製朋党論)] 『国士館史学』).

- (20) For more on early Qing dictionaries, please refer to Seong Baeg-in, “A Note on Early Manchu Dictionaries” (see note 12) and *Proceedings of the International Conference on China Border Area Studies*, 1985 (『国際中国边疆学会議論文集』).
- (21) For more on the various “Qing Language Survey” publications, please refer to Imanishi Shunju, “Explanatory Notes on the Qing Language Surveys of Wu-ti,” Jitsuzo Tamura et al. (ed.), *Elucidation of the Language Survey in Five Languages*, first volume, Society for Inner Asian Studies, Faculty of Letters, Kyoto University, 1966 (今西春秋「五體清文鑑解題」『五体清文鑑釋解』上卷) and Ishibashi Takao, “A Consideration of ‘Han I Araha Manju Gisun I Buleku Bithe’ (Imperially Commissioned Qing Language Survey), Focusing on the Sources Used for the Interpretation of This Lexicon,” *Transactions of the Academic Society of the Humanities, Faculty of Letters, Kokushikan University*, Supplement 1, 1989 (石橋崇雄「『han i araha manju gisun i buleku bithe, (御製清文鑑)』考——特にその語彙解釈中の出典をめぐる」『国士館大学文学部人文学会紀要』).