

The Mobility of Mongolian Banner Subjects in the Mid-Qing Era*

OKA Hiroki

Introduction

After the death of the last Mongolian great qayan Lingdan in 1634, the Mongolian chieftains of the tribes in the southern and northeastern parts of Mongolia officially accepted the Manchu Han's rule at the assembly held in Mukden in 1636. It was the beginning of the so-called Manchu Era of Mongolian history. Later, Mongolian historians evaluated this era in a highly negative manner as "the most difficult era in the history of the Mongolian people."¹⁾ On the other hand, Chinese historiography considers the Qing's conquests as the final stage in the unification of China and describes in a more positive fashion. Whatever the case may be, it is undeniable that the Qing's rule over the Mongols was highly stable and successful. In this era, there were no major revolts or uprisings in the Mongolian part of the Empire. Thus, what brought such success to the Qing's rule over Mongolia? The traditional answers given to this question are "protection" and "separation." It is said that the Qing emperors were highly aware of the merits of the Mongolian nomads as a source of the Empire's military forces, and accordingly, tried to keep their nomadic lifestyle intact to maintain the Mongolians' skills as cavalymen. In this context, "protection" refers to the preservation of nomadic Mongolian culture from the influence of sedentary Chinese civilization. On the other hand, the Manchu court was cautious of rebellion against its rule by the united Mongols and any trans-ethnic alliances between Mongolian and Chinese subjects. It was with this purpose that the "separation" policy was introduced. It is generally called the "Fengjin 封禁" (blockade) policy by modern historians. Chinese historian Ma Ruheng 馬汝珩 listed the items of this policy in the most comprehensive manner as follows:²⁾

Demographic blockade

1. The prohibition of arbitrary immigration among farmers of the inner provinces into Mongolia and the cultivation of land

2. The prohibition of arbitrary mercantile activity and trade by Chinese merchants in Mongolia
3. The prohibition of subjects of the inner provinces entering Mongolia with their families, construction, permanent residence, marriage to Mongolian women, use of Mongolian names, or joining the Mongolian registration
4. The prohibition of entry into the inner provinces by Mongolian subjects
5. The prohibition of kidnapping, hiding, or inviting farmers of the inner provinces by Mongolians
6. The prohibition of the human trade of subjects among the Mongolian banners and the hiding of escapees
7. The prohibition of private exchange, marriage, and trade between the subjects of different Mongolian banners
8. The concealment of thieves

Regional blockade

1. The prohibition of unauthorized cultivation of pasture
2. The prohibition of cross-boundary pastoral migration and hunting over the borders of banners
3. The prohibition of arson in grazing land
4. The prohibition of unauthorized trade with Russia

Resources blockade

1. The prohibition of unpermitted tree cutting
2. The prohibition of unpermitted mining of mineral resources
3. The prohibition of carrying metalware, arms, and ironware into Mongolia

The equivalents of the Chinese term *Fengjin* in Manchu and Mongolian were “fafulambi” and “čayaǰalamui,” respectively, both of which literally mean “to prohibit by law” (Ma. *fafun*, Mo. *čayaǰa*). In contemporary legal sources, this word was used for prohibiting any unpermitted entry into places where resources such as ginseng, furs, and trees were harvested, and to enclosed areas reserved for royal hunting. In the Mongolian banners, where agricultural cultivation had been developed, a certain amount of land was reserved for grazing livestock and was also called “prohibited land.”³⁾ Such a usage of this word shows that the prohibition was introduced within a limited area. However, Ma Ruheng’s interpretation of *Fengjin* covers all of Mongolia. There are two dimensions of the restrictions. One was the prohibition of crossing the borders

between the territories of Mongolia and the “inner land” of China proper and the Three Northeastern Provinces, which was separated by the Great Wall in the West and by the Willow Palisade in the Northeast. Another dimension was the separation of the Mongolian banner territories from each other through the demarcation of borders that were authorized by the Qing government. Accordingly, the policy is alleged to have been created to regulate the trans-boundary movement of both Mongolian and Chinese subjects. Chinese subjects were prohibited from crossing the Mongolian border and entering Mongolia on the one hand, while on the other hand, Mongolian subjects were prohibited from crossing the banner borders and moving into other banners’ pastures or the inner provinces.

The demarcation of the banners’ pasture lands is considered to have been highly effective in limiting the movements of the nomadic Mongolians, who had often invaded China in previous times, and this policy contributed to the Qing’s success in the pacification of this once hostile nomadic population.⁴⁾ Under the policy, the Mongolians did not have the right to move freely throughout the banner territories and they lived their entire lives within the strictly limited space of their home banner. In this respect, the policy is deemed to have been highly effective.⁵⁾

Strangely enough, this policy is said to have had quite different consequences for the Chinese subjects. As is well known, the crossing of the border by Chinese immigrant farmers was a frequent occurrence, especially in the second half of the Qing era, and Chinese merchants were highly active all over Mongolia. In this respect, the policy was not workable.⁶⁾ Thus, a basic question arises. Why did the same policy have such differing consequences for the two different populations?

Such a discourse about the *Fengjin* policy discusses two quite different types of movement. First, regarding the nomadic migration of Mongolian pastoralists, we need to pay attention to the fact that nomadic pastoralism was a highly organized means of production. For the nomads, migration was an indispensable part of their daily life, and the movements and locations of nomadic camps were under the control of the local communities.

In contrast, the movement of migrating Chinese farmers took place in quite a different manner. In most cases, the migration north of the Great Wall occurred beyond the control of the county administrations to which they originally belonged; furthermore, government control of this migration was almost impossible. When they reached their destination, they tried to survive initially not as independent farmers, but as employed laborers or small traders. After several years of eking out an existence, they may have had the chance to

become tenants on somebody's farmland. Thus, in the beginning, the immigrants were not farmers but worked as laborers or traders. The small amount of trading they did with the local habitants made it possible for them to save resources for their future. They were also employed by larger scale merchants as vendors.⁷⁾ The uncontrollability of the emigrants annoyed the government a lot, because they were not controlled by either the local governments to which they had originally belonged or the governments of the Mongolian banners where they lived; therefore, they appeared as runaways from the standpoint of the administrative system.

It is without doubt that the mercantile activities of the Chinese itinerant traders were legal. When they traded in the Mongolian banners, they were required to have an official document issued by the Lifanyuan, and later by the local governors of Zhangjiakou, Kökeqota, and Dolonnuur.⁸⁾ In due course, they established trading bases called *maimaicheng* 買賣城 in Mongolia. This proves that the Qing did not prohibit their entry into Mongolia, but only tried to control them. The merchants' business enjoyed the official approval of the local Mongolian administration.⁹⁾

We have to pay attention to this asymmetric composition of the discourse of the *Fengjin* policy. Even when the transgression of banner borders by nomadic families occurred, their activity was easily observed and intervened in by the local banner administration, who took the intruders back to their home banner.¹⁰⁾ This thus occurred within the scope of the local area. The movement of Chinese farmers to Mongolia had quite a different nature. They left their home and evaded the control of their original administration. While the nomads moved with their property, that is, their livestock, the Chinese migrant farmers abandoned their homes and possessions and started new lives from zero as migrant workers.

Such an asymmetry seems to be caused by restricting the discussion on the movement of the Mongols to nomadic pastoralism. When we enlarge the scope of the discussion to include other types of movement that occurred among the Mongols as migrant workers, traders, and other kinds of activities that were not directly motivated by nomadic pastoralism or caused by the loss of livelihood, what can we learn about the movements of the Mongols?

In this article, we study cases that show the real nature of the Mongols' movements during their lives away from their home banners in the mid-Qing era when the *Fengjin* policy was alleged to have been implemented. The cases analyzed here were reported in the memorials presented by the Lifanyuan¹¹⁾ to ask the Emperor to provide a final judgement on the results of the Lifanyuan's investigation of the cases of livestock theft among Mongolian subjects.¹²⁾ All the

cases discussed here occurred in the Qianlong era (1736–1795). The Emperor Qianlong is generally said to have tried to enforce the *Fengjin* policy more rigorously than previous emperors, including Kangxi and Yongzheng.¹³⁾

The Qing treated livestock theft as a very serious crime in Mongolia. The thieves were punished by death by hanging in the early years. Later, the severity of the punishment was modified according to the number of livestock stolen, and ranged from banishment to the inner provinces or execution by hanging.¹⁴⁾ Because of the seriousness of this crime, cases were reported to the Emperor and the final decision was enacted by imperial edict. In most cases, the convicts were not professional criminals. They were ordinary but poor Mongolians and their criminal acts were impulsive and haphazard, so the cases are somehow different from those of the “Mongolian bandits” discussed by Sechin Jagchid as “anti-Chinese” or “anti-feudal” insurgencies.¹⁵⁾ What is important for us is the fact that the majority of the cases took place in the course of the Mongolian subjects’ daily lives and were committed when the criminals were outside of their own banners. Most of the thieves were living in dire poverty and left their home banner to seek a livelihood. Some of them visited neighboring cities for shopping and trade, and the villages to look for short-term wage labor. Therefore, these cases demonstrate the conditions and circumstances of ordinary banner subjects’ cross-boundary activities beyond the borders of their home banners.

1. The Legal Setting and the Actuality of Leaving One’s Home Banner

Despite the widely accepted view of life in Mongolia under the *Fengjin* policy, it was not always illegal for Mongolian subjects to leave their home banners.

The procedure for leaving was clearly outlined in the Qing’s Mongol Code (*Menggu li* 蒙古例). When Mongolian subjects had to travel to different banners, they were required to report it to the banner princes and officers.¹⁶⁾ The *Lifanyuan zeli* 理藩院則例 prescribed as follows:

各旗蒙古人出境、必於本旗稟明。違者將失察之管旗章京・副章京・參領・佐領・十家長、照疎於約束例、分別議處。

When Mongolians cross the border of their home banner, they must notify their local banner officials. If they do not do so, the mismanaging lieutenant governor (*guanqi zhangjing* 管旗章京), deputy lieutenant governor (*fu zhangjing* 副章京), the chief of regiment (*canling* 參領), the

chief of company (*zuoling* 佐領), and the chief of ten households (*shijiachang* 十家長) should be investigated and punished according to the precedent of mismanagement.

Furthermore, leaving one's banner for trade purposes was legal. The Qing legal code says:

凡蒙古人等貿易、稟明扎薩克王公等並管旗章京・副章京、擬一章京爲首領、令十人以上合夥而行。若夥中無首領之人、或被傍人拏獲、或滋生事故、各坐應得之罪。

Generally, trade by Mongolians should be reported to the *jasay* princes, the lieutenant governor, and the deputy lieutenant governor, and the trading caravan should be headed by one *janggin* and consist of more than ten traders. If the caravan does not have a head trader and is captured by somebody because they caused trouble, they will receive the appropriate punishment.¹⁷⁾

In addition, it was possible for Mongolian banner subjects to obtain legal permission to visit other banners for various purposes.

至探望親戚及有事故行走之人、各稟明管旗王貝勒貝子公台吉、或管旗章京・副章京、將緣由註明、給與執照前往。若持照前往之人、往返途間行竊爲匪、各坐應得之罪。其給照之王公等管旗章京・副章京、照失察例治罪。

If somebody goes (out of the banner) to visit relatives or has any need to leave, each of them should go only after reporting it to the *wang*, *beyile*, *beyise*, *güng*, or *tayijis*, who are in charge of administering the banner, or the lieutenant governor or the deputy lieutenant governor. Their reason (for departure) should be recorded in the documents issued to them. If any persons who were given these documents committed thievery during their journey, each of them will be appropriately punished. In addition, the princes, the lieutenant governor, or the deputy lieutenant governor who had issued them the document will be punished for their mismanagement.¹⁸⁾

Under the former law, traders were ordered to report their purpose for leaving to the banner princes and officers, and to acknowledge that if they caused

trouble they would be punished. The latter was the regulation for somebody who was going to leave their banner with the purpose of visiting relatives or because of some other necessity. They were also required to report it to the banner officials and to carry an official document. Again, the law warned that the committing of any illegal act, including thievery, would be punished. It is obvious that these codes did not prohibit people from leaving their banner, but they did ensure that travelers were under the control of the local administration.

From some cases, we can see that the travelers did have the consent of local officials.

On the 2nd day of the 1st month of the 22nd year of Qianlong (1757), two cattle were stolen from the relay station of Bedune,¹⁹⁾ a city located in the jurisdiction of Girin Ula General 吉林烏拉將軍 on the shore of the Sunggari river, opposite the Mongolian Gorlos Banner of Jirim League. The thieves were three Mongolians: Orhoda, Darhan, and Neremungke.²⁰⁾ They belonged to different banners of Jirim League. Orhoda and Darhan were the subjects of the Rear Banner of the Right Flank of Qorčin, and Neremungke belonged to the Middle Banner of the Right Flank of Qorčin (Tüsiyetü wang's Banner). In the 4th month of the previous year, Neremungke visited his sister who had married Darhan's father and stayed there. On the 26th day of the 12th month of the 21st year of Qianlong (1757), Darhan and Neremungke left the banner with their friend Orhoda for Bedune with the purpose of looking for wage labor, but they could not find any work. Then, they stole two cattle from the relay station on the border of the Gorlos Banner and they were arrested by a Bedune bannerman soon after. Upon the investigation of the banner office, the local officers who charged Neremungke answered that Neremungke had left his banner to visit his sister and had not returned yet. Obviously, they knew about Neremungke's visit to the other banner and his purpose. Thus, Neremungke's visit had been authorized by them.²¹⁾

Dondob's case of livestock theft is an interesting one, in which the permission of the banner administration to their subjects to leave the banner is expressly mentioned. Dondob was a subject of Jasaytu qan Ciwangbaljai's banner of Western Qalq-a Mongolia.²²⁾ He was arrested because he had stolen livestock in the Jaqačin banner.²³⁾ Ciwangbaljai reported the case to the office of Governor Lieutenant General of Uliyasutai. He wrote:

In the spring of last year (the 45th year of Qianlong, 1780), Dondob, a subject of our banner, asked me for permission to visit his relatives living in the banners of güng Wangcinjab²⁴⁾ and Jasay Dasicerin.²⁵⁾ Although the allotted time for his visit had ended, he did not come back. So, when we

were about to pursue him...²⁶⁾

Ciwangbaljai permitted Dondob's departure and he did not begin to search for him until the allotted period of his trip had ended. In his confession, Dondob himself affirmed that he had lied and his real purpose was to find a labor opportunity with Chinese merchants. It is also interesting that Jasaytu qan Ciwangbaljai did not mention any document that should have been issued to Dondob according to the Qing legal code. Supposedly, Mongolian subjects used to leave their banner with unwritten permission from their banner administration, and written documents were not issued.

Many cases suggest that thieves were not always runaways. We make this assumption because the crimes took place on their way back to their home banner.

On the 14th day of the 6th leap month of the 19th year of Qianlong (1754), a Mongolian called Minjur was placed under arrest for having stolen two horses from a Chinese merchant named Jang Ds-i. Minjur was a subject of *jasay* Gūrjab's banner of Tüsiyetü qan's *ayimay* of Qalq-a Mongolia.²⁷⁾ Before he stole the horses, he had been working for a Chinese merchant in Uliyasutai since the 6th month of the previous year. Then, he decided to return home and committed the theft on the way to his banner.²⁸⁾

On the 16th day of the 11th month of the 15th year of Qianlong (1750), one ox of Sideku, a bannerman of the Plain Yellow Banner of Butha, was stolen. The thieves were two Mongolian subjects of the Dörbed Banner of Jirim League,²⁹⁾ Undurhai and Ubasi. In the 5th month of the same year, they had been employed by a Butha bannerman and worked for him. After their term of work ended, they returned to their home banner. On the way to their home, at Tabunger village they saw Sideku's ox on the plain and stole it.³⁰⁾

In these cases, the thieves committed the acts of theft on their way back to their home banners. It means that they did not escape from their home banner, but their purpose had been to earn money through wage labor. Such long absences were searched for through official channels along with runaways. A document of the Vice Governor General of Sahaliyan Ula 黑龍江副都統 dated in the 5th year of Qianlong (1740) records the list of runaways and missing subjects presented by the Jalayid Banner of Jirim League that asked the Governor General to search for and arrest them. This list named 98 missing subjects. 69 of them were reported as runaways, the other 8 as job seekers and 21 as the subjects who left the banner for eking out their lives.³¹⁾ The runaways and job seekers were recorded in different ways, as follows:

meni gūsai ilaci jergi tayiji jamiyan i harangga gabala, gabutu, janggiya, ilan nofi honin aniya hūsun turime genefi jidere unde tayiji bihe tekunggel i harangga kabu honin aniya ninju juwe se, (挿入 honin) sukū i jibca, šanggiyan hūci mahala ihan sukū i gūlha etuhebi. honin aniya ukaka.

Gabala, Gabutu, Janggiya, these three belonging to tayiji of the third rank, Jamiyan, of our banner have not come back yet after they left to seek work in the year of the sheep. Kabu, who belongs to late tayiji Tekunggel, 62 years old and born in the year of the sheep, ran away in the year of the sheep. Then, he wore a fur caftan, hūci hat, and boots made of cattle hide.

This description shows that the banner administration clearly discriminated the runaways from job seekers whose purpose for leaving their home banner was known by the officials.

These cases show that the banner subjects had the opportunity to leave their banner with the written or unwritten consent of their local administration and that they did so for various purposes, including visiting relatives, seeking work opportunities, and so on.

2. Vagabondage and Seeking Shelter

To earn a living or find a means for subsistence was main reason for the departure of indigent Mongolian banner subjects. It is quite possible that the Mongolian pastoral society itself had enough capacity to accept and support such poor economic fugitives. However, we have only a small number of cases in which Mongolian subjects availed these opportunities. One of them is the Arabtan's case of thievery, which happened in the 34th year of Qianlong (1769). Arabtan was originally a subject of the Dalad Banner (the Rear Banner of Ordos Left Flank). After his father's death, his mother, Jab, left her banner with her sixteen-year-old boy, Arabtan. They lived two years in the neighboring Urad Banner by begging.³²⁾ Two years later, when Arabtan was eighteen years old, one lama called Erdemun Dalai of Subargan temple (Mo. Suburyan sūm-e)³³⁾ of the banner of Urad Western Güng (Urad Front Banner) took them under his care. After his mother's death, twenty-four-year-old Arabtan married a widow by Erdemun Dalai's arrangement and grazed her livestock. They had four daughters. Later, Arabtan was sent to the Qalq-a Dalai Dügüregči wang's banner³⁴⁾ to sell grain, which had been borrowed by Erdemun Dalai from a man called Bayatai. The grain that remained unsold was given to Arabtan as his share. In the 8th month of the 34th year of Qianlong (1769), Arabtan visited

the Urad Middle Banner for trade. On the way, his horse was exhausted and unable to go forward. On the 27th day of the 8th month, he came across three camels of tayiji Babai and his subject Jambarasi in their pasture land of Urad Middle Banner, and stole them. On the 2nd day of the 9th month, Arabtan was arrested by a Chinese merchant Ijintai while he was on the way to Kōkeqota, where he planned to sell the camels he had stolen.³⁵⁾

Arabtan's case was investigated by his original banner of Ordos and he was banished to a relay station of Huguang 湖廣 province. Previously, Arabtan had lived in a foreign banner for 32 years under the care of a Buddhist monk. This case shows that impoverished Mongolians were accepted by the Buddhist community, wherein they found a way to earn a living. However, this role of the Buddhist community should not be overestimated, because we find plenty of theft cases committed by the subjects of šabi (the subjects of the Buddhist temple) who conceived of thievery under the pressure of poverty.

The insufficiency of banner administration was the reason of its subjects' vagabondage, which led to thievery. On the 11th day of the 3rd month of the 58th year of Qianlong (1793), three cattle of a Chinese merchant called Biliktu were stolen in Qalq-a Sayin noyan's ayimay. Two thieves were followed and put under arrest by Biliktu's employee Šarab and four of his neighbors of güng Lobsangdorji's banner.³⁶⁾ The thieves were Minjur and Gendun of beyise Sundubdorji's banner of Tüsiyetü qan's ayimay.³⁷⁾ Six years ago, Minjur had been sent by his banner to Uliyasutai on duty to graze the camels of the Governor Lieutenant General of Uliyasutai.³⁸⁾ Gendun also had been on the same duty for two years. In the autumn of the previous year, they had been dismissed from their duty at the same time, but they could not go back to their home banner because of their poverty, and this incident happened when they were roaming in neighboring banners of Uliyasutai.³⁹⁾

3. Cities and Villages as the Destination of Mongolian Banner Subjects: The Cases in Eastern Inner Mongolia

The opportunity of waged labor motivated poor subjects of Mongolian banners to move into cities and sedentary agricultural villages in which there was demand for labor. We have records of several cases of theft by such migrant workers.

For the Mongolian subjects of the eastern part of Inner Mongolia, the cities and villages belonging to the Eight Banners administered by the three Generals of Mukden (Shengjing 盛京), Girin Ula (Jilin wula 吉林烏拉), and Sahaliyan Ula (Heilongjiang 黑龍江) were places where they could find work.

The Jirim League was close to the cities of Cicihar and Hulan under Sahaliyan Ula General's jurisdiction to the northeast and the city of Bedune under the jurisdiction of the Girin Ula General to east. To the southeast, the Willow Palisade, or "Mukden's Great Wall," separated the banners of Jirim and Josutu Leagues from the Mukden General's jurisdiction in which were the large cities of Mukden, Kaiyuan 開原, Jin zhou 錦州, Yi zhou 義州, Guangning 廣寧, and so on surrounded by the bannermen's agricultural villages. The Mongolian subjects of the neighboring banners usually visited these cities for various purposes.

On the 9th day of the 3rd month of the 19th year of Qianlong (1754), two donkeys of Ba šil living in the "tokso" (*guan Zhuang* 官莊, official manor) of Hulan⁴⁰⁾ were stolen.⁴¹⁾ Two days later, one ox and one donkey were stolen from the house yard of Fan Ding moo of the Plain Red Banner. Fan Ding moo followed their trail and found a Mongolian with the stolen livestock at the bent side of the Hulan river and arrested him. The thief was Aharna, a subject of the Gorlos Banner. He had come to Hulan on the 15th day of the 1st month of the year and worked for one month at the house of a relay station soldier, G'u Wan liyang, on a wage of 1 *liang*. When his employment had ended on the 6th day of the 3rd month, he left G'u Wan liyang's house and stole the livestock of Ba šil and Fan Ding moo on the way to his home banner.⁴²⁾

On the 19th day of the 9th month of the 7th year of Qianlong (1742), a horse belonging to Maise of the Plain Yellow Banner of Heilongjiang was stolen by a Mongolian called Teguldur from the house of a bannerman called Šose, who lived in Nicuhun village.⁴³⁾ Teguldur was a subject of the Rear Banner of the Right Flank of Qorčīn. Previously he had been employed by a soldier, ūlet Ubasi, of the Bordered White Banner of Heilongjiang and had worked for him for twenty days. On that day, he was dispatched by his employer, Ubasi, to the house of Acindai, Ubasi's older brother, in a village called Goto to invite Ubasi's younger brother, Sirab, who was living there. While returning to Ubasi's village, Teguldur saw Maise's saddled horse in Šose's house and stole it. In this case, Teguldur, a subject of a Mongolian banner, worked for a soldier of the Eight Banner of Heilongjiang for a short period of twenty days during which he committed thievery.⁴⁴⁾

On the midnight of the 19th day of the 3rd month of the 21st year of Qianlong (1756), two cattle were stolen from the pen of Ginggun, a bannerman of the Plain Red Banner of Cicihar. Ginggun pursued and arrested a Mongolian called Kalja. Kalja was a subject of tayiji Samiya of Jasaɣtu wang's banner (the Rear Banner of the Qorčīn Right Flank). He had come to Cicihar city the previous day looking for work. He then happened to see the cattle in the pen of

Ginggūn's house and stole them. But he lost one of the two cattle in the dark and was arrested together with the remaining one by Ginggūn.⁴⁵⁾ His home banner, Jāsaytu wang's banner, was in the northern part of Jirim League at about 200 km from Cicihar.

Bedune city and its surrounding villages were also visited by Mongolian subjects of neighboring banners who came seeking jobs and to buy daily commodities. We can find several cases related to this city. In the 31st year of Kangxi (1692), the city of Bedune was established in the neighborhood of the relay station of Bedune as the administrative stronghold of the Deputy Lieutenant General (meiren janggin) under the jurisdiction of Girin.⁴⁶⁾ The surrounding land was originally distributed to the soldiers who served at the relay stations. Later, agriculture was developed and three official manors were established in the 51st year of Qianlong (1786).⁴⁷⁾ The city was bordered by the Sunggari river along with the Gorlos Front Banner to the southwest and the Gorlos Rear Banner to the northwest.

On the 15th day of the 12th month of the 7th year of Qianlong (1743), a Bedune bannerman, Badumtu, had his riding horse stolen by a Mongolian thief called Jula while he was shopping at a store. According to his confession to the meiren janggin of Bedune, Jula named himself as a subject of Gorlos Jāsay tayiji Cahūn's banner, that is, the Gorlos Front Banner. On that day, he had come to Bedune city to buy tea leaves and cloth, and catching sight of Badumtu's horse on the street, he stole it.⁴⁸⁾

On the 6th day of the 10th month of the 55th year of Qianlong (1790), Sereng, a subject of tayiji Ubasi of the Gorlos Front Banner, visited Bedune seeking work. When he arrived at the watch post on the bank of the Sunggari river, he found several picketed horses outside the watch post and stole two of them. He brought the horses to Bedune city and tried to sell them, but he was noticed and reported to the original owner of the horses, a Chinese merchant called U Guwangbi; he was then arrested by the patrolling soldiers. The victim of this thievery was Engke, a tayiji of Jāsaytu wang's banner (the Front Banner of Qorčin Right Flank). Engke visited Bedune on the 9th month of the year for shopping. On that day, he decided to go back to his banner, but his horse was exhausted. So, he borrowed a horse from his acquaintance U Guwangbi and stayed the night at the watch post on the bank of river from where his borrowed horse was stolen. This was not Sereng's first act of thievery. He confessed that he had committed thievery twice before in the 43rd year of Qianlong (1778) at Bedune and in the 51st year (1786) at Cicihar. So, Sereng was an ex-convict of the thieveries and he had committed all his acts in the neighboring cities outside his own banner territory. As it became obvious that the supervision of

his master, tayiji Ubasi, was quite lax, Ubasi was punished by having 27 of his livestock confiscated.⁴⁹⁾ This case, together with many other thievery cases committed by poor Mongolians, shows that wage labor was essential for them to survive and that it was possible for them to find someone who would hire them. The victim, Engke, was on the way to home from Bedune where he had gone shopping. He was, moreover, riding a borrowed horse of the Bedune merchant U Guwangbi, who had trustingly lent his horse to Engke. Furthermore, we notice that Engke stayed the night at the watch post stationed on the border of Forlos Banner, and this shows that the border watch post neither prevented Engke from crossing the border nor stopped Sereng from passing to the other side of the river to look for labor.

On the 22nd day of the 1st month of the 25th year of Qianlong (1760), Dolba and his older brother Dolo stole two cattle in the village of Losan tokso, near Bedune. They had been hiding in a graveyard for two days and were arrested by the villagers. Dolba and Dolo were subjects of the Rear Banner of Qorčin Right Flank, which was 250 km to northwest of Bedune. They came to Bedune in the 12th month of the previous year to find employment. Unfortunately, they were unable to find labor and hence resorted to thievery.⁵⁰⁾

The thieves often brought the stolen livestock to the cities of the Three Northeastern Provinces and tried to sell them. On the 18th day of the 1st month of the 60th year of Qianlong (1795), two Mongolian thieves were arrested at Da pu village.⁵¹⁾ The thieves, Dahū and Saintu, were the subjects of Darqan Banner of Qorčin (The Middle Banner of Qorčin Left Flank). On the 2nd day of the month, Dahū visited Saintu's house and proposed to him the idea of stealing horses and selling them in Girin city. On the 7th day of the month, they left their home banner and stole eight horses. After crossing the Sunggari river to the jurisdiction of Girin Ula General, they stole another five horses. When they were passing by the village called Da pu, they were accosted by the banner soldiers, who arrested them.⁵²⁾

As can be seen in the cases mentioned above, the cities along the Mongolian border were the economic centers with markets of livestock and products for daily use; they also provided labor opportunity. In the case of Eastern Inner Mongolian banners, such cities were in the neighboring territories of the Three Northeastern Provinces. Here, the Mongolian subjects of Eastern Inner Mongolia could find labor to sustain their lives and markets where daily commodities, grain, and livestock were available.

In contrast to the western part of Inner Mongolia, where the Mongolian banners were separated from the inner provinces by the Great Wall, the border control between the eastern Mongolian banners and the Three Northeastern

Provinces was less strict and more easily permeable.

The banners on the way to the northeastern cities were meeting points for the subjects of different banners, who thus became acquainted with each other. On the 14th day of the 11th month of the 57th year of Qianlong (1792), three horses of two Cicihar bannermen, Yang Hūng and Wang Sy, of the relay station Moohin,⁵³⁾ were stolen at Hayul village of Gorlos Rear Banner.⁵⁴⁾ They traced and arrested one of the thieves at the Olo holo village in the eastern vicinity of Bedune.⁵⁵⁾ Shortly after, on the same day, another four horses were stolen at Hayul village. The suspects in the former case were Obosi of Qorčīn Tūsiyetū wang's banner (The Middle Banner of Qorčīn Right Flank) and his acquaintance Serendasi of the Gorlos Rear Banner. Obosi met Serendasi on his way home after unsuccessfully looking for wage labor at Bedune and invited him to go along with him to steal livestock. The thieves of the latter case were also Serendasi and tayiji Sainjargalang of Qorčīn Jasaytu wang's banner. Sainjargalang visited Serendasi's house while returning from Bedune, where he had gone to sell his grain. They both knew each other. Serendasi lured Sainjargalang into stealing horses from Hayul village.⁵⁶⁾

The Mongolian banners of Eastern Inner Mongolia, including those of the Josutu League and the Jirim League, were separated from the jurisdiction of Mukden General by the Willow Palisade, and the passages were controlled by thirteen gates.⁵⁷⁾ Cities and villages were already well developed in Liaodong area under the rule of the former Ming dynasty.

Although we do not find any regulations mentioned in the procedures of the Qing Code for Mongolian banner subjects to pass through the gates, there is no doubt that the Mongolian subjects of neighboring banners regularly crossed the palisade and entered the territory under Mukden General's jurisdiction. It is apparent that the Willow Palisade did not function as an impenetrable barrier to stop the trans-boundary activities of the Mongols.

In the 4th year of Qianlong (1739), three thieves, Ubasi, Mujai, and Damba, were arrested by the office of the Deputy Lieutenant General (meiren janggin) of Jin zhou 錦州. They were the subjects of the Tūmed Right Banner of the Josutu League. One day, Mujai was asked by Ubasi to pay back his debt of 2 *liangs*. To pay back his debt, Mujai had to get back his own money of 1 *liang* which he had lent Damba. Damba did not have any money and he proposed that Mujai and he steal livestock. Mujai accepted his proposal and drew Ubasi into the plot. They crossed the Palisade "through the channel of flowing water" and stole six horses and one donkey belonging to Cang Ging, an inhabitant of Ing ceng dz village.⁵⁸⁾ Cang Ging chased them and arrested Ubasi in the north of Yi zhou 義州. Soon Mujai and Damba were also caught by Jin zhou officials.⁵⁹⁾

The case of Arbingsang and Laibao is a record of four successive thieveries in the Right Banner of Tümed, Josutu League.⁶⁰⁾ On the 21st day of the 8th month of the 24th year of Qianlong (1759), five Mongolians met at the house of Dolodai, a subject of Tümed Right Banner. These were Laibao, Losjab, Baijihū, Bandi, and Dolodai. Dolodai, Laibao, and Losjab belonged to different sumus of the Tümed Right Banner, and Baijihū and Bandi were subjects of any one of Qaračin banners. They plotted to steal horses from Laibao's master, Ükin, and carried out their plan on the 22nd day. They then brought Ükin's two horses to Yi zhou⁶¹⁾ and sold them to a Chinese, whose clan name was Lio. On the 27th day, Arbingsang of Tümed Right Banner met Dolodai, Losjab, Laibao, Liošiba, and Burin on the street of Yi zhou. Arbingsang was in Yi zhou to sell his foxtail millets. Liošiba was also a subject of Tümed Right Banner and Burin was a subject of Naiman Banner. On the 30th of the 8th month, they left Yi zhou and spent a night at the gate of Sira tala.⁶²⁾ On the 2nd day of the 9th month, Arbingsang stole two horses from the house of tayiji Olbang together with Laibao and two other Mongolian subjects, Unjun (Nomun) of Qorčin Banner and Namtar of Tümed Right Banner. They gave these horses to Liošiba and Burin, and asked them to sell the horses at Yi zhou. Later, Arbingsang and Namtar gave them meat from a sheep they had stolen from jalan janggin Nasundelger that night. On the same night, Laibao and Namtar also stole jalan janggin Bayansang's donkey and gave it to a Chinese trader called Sui Hūwang in exchange for Namtar's debt. Arbingsang and Laibao were banished to the provinces of Zhejiang and Jiangnan. Their accomplices were arrested and punished with hundred lashes and the confiscation of three sets of nine domestic animals (*sanjiufa* 三九罰) each, and Lifanyuan was ordered to search for and arrest the others who had escaped.

In this case, the thieves went back and forth between the Tümed Right Banner and Yi zhou, a city located in the Mukden General's jurisdiction, and near the Willow Palisade. The fact that the convicts had committed a series of thieveries makes it clear that they were accustomed to committing such crimes. However, at the same time, the purpose of Arbingsang's visit to Yi zhou was not to steal livestock, but to sell his foxtail millets, and obviously it was one of his usual visits to this city.

The Dureng's case of the 59th year of Qianlong is highly interesting because it is an example of Mongolian subjects as migrant workers who regularly worked for the bannermen of the Eight Banners on the farmland around their villages. Dureng, 39 years old, was a slave (*boo i niyalma*) of tayiji efu Yarimpil of the Central Banner of Left Flank of Qorčin. On the 2nd day of the 12th month of the 58th year of Qianlong (1793), the chief of Ši giya pu

village and his men were on the lookout for a thief who had stolen a villager's horse. Ši giya pu was a village in the Southwestern vicinity of Kaiyuan city.⁶³⁾ They found a Mongolian called Dureng at a lodge owned by Wang San. Dureng was interrogated, and he confessed that he had stolen two horses from his own village in his banner. He was arrested together with Wang San, and two other bannermen including Ušici and Yuwanboo who were visiting Wang San and were staying at the lodge. Dureng's employer, Wang San, was a bannerman of the Chinese Bordered White Banner, and he lived with his two sons and their wives in the village. He had his crop field in the western vicinity of the village. Ušici was a bannerman of the Manchu Bordered Red Banner and an inhabitant of Wang San's village. Yuwanboo was an ethnic Šibe who belonged to the Bordered Red Banner and had been working on Wang San's farm. Seven months ago, in the 5th month of the year, Dureng came to Ši giya pu village and was employed by Wang San. Yuwanboo also worked on Wang San's field in the summer. One day, Wang San asked Dureng to find someone who had horse or cattle to sell. In the 11th month, Dureng's work at Wang San's crop field ended, and he went back to his own banner. He then stole two horses and brought them to Ši giya pu. Wang San bought one of them for 60 thousand *qians*. Although Ušici also wanted to buy one, he was worried because he was unsure about the horse's real owner. However, Wang San backed Dureng and said, "He is a man whom I usually employ. He is all right!" Ušici then bought one of Dureng's horses for the same cost. On investigation by the Mukden Court of Justice, Dureng was banished to Shandong or Henan for penal servitude at a relay station. Wang San was fined by 50 *zhangs* 杖 for buying Dureng's horse without paying tax and by 80 lashes for his carelessness in not asking about the origin of the horses he bought. Ušici was not punished because he paid tax for the horse he bought. Interestingly, Wang San was not blamed for employing Dureng. It is apparent that the Court of Justice of Mukden did not consider the employment of Dureng by Wang San as a crime.⁶⁴⁾

As this case shows, Dureng had been repeatedly employed and well trusted by his employer, Wang San. It shows the constancy of their relationship. It is also interesting that despite his status as a slave of a Mongolian *tayiji*, he regularly traveled between Wang San's village and his home banner. Obviously, he was not a runaway and his visits to Ši giya pu were permitted by his master, *tayiji* Yarimpil.

4. The Mobility of Mongolian Banner Subjects: The Cases in Western Inner Mongolia

In contrast to the conditions in Eastern Inner Mongolia, the situation in Western Inner Mongolia was different. In this territory, the Mongolian banners were separated from the inner provinces by the Great Wall, and the cases reporting Mongolian thieves crossing the Wall and entering the inner provinces are quite rare. This can be explained by the existence of big cities on the Mongolian side of the Great Wall. The largest of the cities in this area were Kökeqota and Suiyuan cheng, both in the territory of Kökeqota Tümed Banner. Tümed Banner was densely populated by Chinese and Tümed Mongolian farmers, and agriculture was well developed, especially toward the south of the Daqing shan mountain range. Kökeqota was also the largest religious center of Tibetan Buddhism in Mongolia and the biggest basecamp of Chinese merchants of Shanxi province for their distant trade in Mongolia and Xinjiang too. Kökeqota was bordered by the Western Banners of Čaqar to the east, Dörben keüked Banner and Muumingyan Banner to the north, three Urad Banners to the northwest, and Ordos banners to the west.

Zhangjiakou or Čiyulaltu qayaly-a, where the Governor Lieutenant General of Čaqar Eight Banners was stationed, was another base of the Chinese merchants' Mongolian trade. The military relay route to Uliyasutai and Yeke Küriy-e began in this city.

The Dolonnuur of Eastern Čaqar was a religious center where the temples of Lchan kya Qutuγtu were located, and Chinese merchants established the basecamp in this city for their trade in the banners of Silinyol League and the eastern part of Outer Mongolia.

These cities attracted Mongolian migrant workers, traders, and pilgrims, and offered them opportunities for waged labor and trade. It is easy to understand why most of the thievery cases reported in the memorials were related to these cities in one way or another. These cases were reported to the Lifanyuan from the governing personnel who were stationed in this region, which included the Governor General of Suiyuan cheng, the Lieutenant-General (*dutong* 都統, later Deputy Lieutenant-General, *meiren janggjin* 副都統) of Kökeqota, the Lieutenant-General of Čaqar, and other lower level officials including *tongzhi* 同知 and *tongpan* 通判 stationed in Kökeqota, Saraci, Qoringer, Toytu, Fengzhen, Zhangjiakou, Dolonnuur, and so on, who were appointed to handle the troubles and crimes in which Mongolian banner subjects and Chinese inhabitants were involved. Naturally, the frequency of troubles and crimes was higher here than in more remote areas of Mongolia.

The city of Kōkeqota, especially, and its agricultural hinterland reported most of the thievery cases. Job seekers gathered here from the neighboring banners and often were involved in theft cases.

On the 5th day of the 6th month of the 4th year of Qianlong (1739), two cattle belonging to Bandi and Haraohin, who were living in Orgesun village of Kōkeqota Tümed Banner, were stolen. The thieves were Badaranggūi and Damba. They were subjects of different tayijis of the Urad Middle Banner of Ulančab League. Their banner was about 200 km northwest of Orgesun village.⁶⁵⁾ They were soon arrested while trying to escape, when they were found smoking with a passerby. Badaranggūi had left his banner ten months ago. He had come to Orgesun village and was employed by a Tümed bannerman, Haraohin. On the 1st day of the 6th month, he left Haraohin's house looking for another job and met his landman, Damba, on the 5th day of the month. Damba lived hand-to-mouth in the villages of Kōkeqota Tümed Banner. Badaranggūi suggested to him that they steal Haraohin's cattle, and Damba agreed. That night, they stole two cattle from Haraohin's house yard and were arrested.⁶⁶⁾

On the 11th day of the 6th month of the 4th year of Qianlong (1739), janggin Loojan of Kōkeqota Tümed Banner was stopped by a lama, Nawangjotba, of Urad güng Sirab's banner (Urad Rear Banner). Nawangjotba had come from Dolonnuur to Kōkeqota to buy food. When he camped in the nearby Kara buta village, in the eastern vicinity of Kōkeqota, his mare was stolen.⁶⁷⁾ Loojan and Nawangjotba followed the trail and found a Mongolian man watching Nawangjotba's stolen mare and arrested him. His name was Arabtan, and he was a subject of Muumingyan Banner. He was impoverished in his home banner and was living in Kōkeqota earning wage labor along with another countryman, Bayan. The thieves who stole Nawangjotba's horse were Sirakeo and Kemen of Tümed Banner and Asida and Bayan of Muumingyan Banner. Asida was the subject of tayiji Ubasi of Muumingyan Banner and he was also working in Kōkeqota. On the 10th day of the 6th month, Sirakeo proposed that they steal livestock, and the other three agreed. After stealing Nawangjotba's mare, they gave it to Arabtan and asked him to watch it. Sirakeo, Asida, and Kemen were arrested, but Bayan escaped.⁶⁸⁾ The thieves who committed this crime were three Mongolian subjects of Muumingyan Banner who were working at Kōkeqota and two locals of Kōkeqota Tümed Banner. Sirakeo, Kemen, and Asida said that they were acquaintances of each other and that Asida, Bayan, and Arabtan came from the same Muumingyan Banner. They became acquainted while they were working as wage laborers in a village of the Tümed Banner.

A similar case was reported to the Emperor on the 12th day of the 3rd month of the 5th year of Qianlong (1740). On the 4th day of the 9th month of the 4th year of Qianlong (1739), thirty five sheep of Bandarsi, a slave of Tümed bannerman Wangjal, were stolen. Bandarsi followed the trail and arrested three thieves at the nearby Namurja village. They were Tarba and Amuhūlang of Ordos beyise Ciwangbanjur's banner (Qanggin Banner, The Rear Banner of Ordos Right Flank) and Bandi of Qalq-a Jasaytu qan's banner. Tarba's work was harvesting grain at Casuci village with Amuhūlang and then at Saloo village with Bandi. Bandi came to Tümed after he had lost his parents. He had been employed by a Chinese for logging wood before he worked with Tarba at Saloo village. On that day, they stole Bandarsi's sheep at Ike baising village.⁶⁹⁾ Qanggin Banner was in the northern part of Ordos and it bordered on the Tümed Banner in the east. Bandi left his banner during his childhood when Jasaytu qan Gelekyampil escaped from the war in the border area of the banners of Alaša and Urad toward the end of the Yongzheng reign. So, all of them came from the neighboring areas of Kökeqota Tümed Banner.⁷⁰⁾ This case occurred in the western part of the Tümed Banner neighboring the Ordos banners.

On the 23rd day of 11th month of the 8th year of Qianlong (1743), Ubasi, a subject of Urad Amarlingyui's banner (Urad Middle Banner), visited his sister who was married to Damba, a slave of tayiji Ciwangjab. Damba and his wife stayed in Kökeqota after their pilgrimage to Dolonnuur. On the night of the 23rd day of the 11th month, Ubasi's horse was stolen from Damba's house yard. Ubasi followed the trail and found two thieves in the northern plain of Kökeqota and arrested one of them, Ubasi. On the 27th day of 11th month, a patrolling soldier, Ciyan Ši hi of Suiyuan cheng, and Ubasi caught the escaped thief Šuhur and put him under arrest. One of the thieves, Ubasi, was a slave of tayiji Banjun of Jegün γar Banner of Ordos (The Front Banner of Ordos Left Flank). Šuhur was a subject of Kökeqota Tümed Banner.⁷¹⁾ The two were acquainted with each other. When they were working at Tu ceng ts village together, Šuhur borrowed 800 *qians* from Ubasi and went back to Kökeqota. On the 25th day of the 11th month Ubasi left Tu ceng ts and visited Šuhur at Kökeqota, where Šuhur lived. Ubasi asked Šuhur to repay his debt. Šuhur did not have the money to pay and he proposed that they steal Damba's horse.

Interestingly, the victim Ubasi had his horse stolen during his stay at his younger sister's house; the sister's husband, Damba, was a slave of tayiji and the couple were on their way home from Dolonnuur, where they had pilgrimaged.⁷²⁾ This is one of the cases showing the mobility of the so-called slave, more literally "a person of the house (boo i niyalma)" or "a slave of house

(boo i aha).” As in the case of Dureng of Darqan Banner mentioned earlier, “slaves” often left their master’s house and moved to distant banners and cities independently, seemingly with their master’s consent. Damba, in this case, went on a pilgrimage to Dolonnuur and then lived in Kökeqota. Damba’s brother-in-law, Ubasi, had his horse stolen during his stay at his sister’s house. The thieves, Ubasi of Ordos and Šuhur of Tümed Banner, were acquainted with each other while they were wage laborers in the village of Tümed. The activities of the people involved in this case include visiting relatives, going on pilgrimages, and earning a livelihood by wage labor.

Thus, we see that large cities like Kökeqota offered vagrants opportunities to eke out a living.

Dondob was a 32-year-old man. Although he knew that he belonged to Ordos Dalad Banner (The Rear Banner of Left Flank), he did not remember his original sumu and the name of decurion, because he left his banner in his childhood. He had lost his parents and had no family. He earned a living by grazing people’s livestock in the neighborhood of Kökeqota city. Interestingly, he lived this way for more than fourteen years. On the 18th day of the 2nd month of the 21st year of Qianlong (1756), he stole an ox belonging to Tümed bannerman Sebten when he was passing through Onggon teg in the north of Daqing shan mountain; he was arrested by jalan Ayusi and decurion Coijab twelve days later.⁷³⁾

Pilgrimages undertaken by poor Mongolians often triggered their involvement in thievery. On the 2nd day of the 2nd month of the 27th year of Qianlong (1762), two Mongolian thieves were arrested in the northern vicinity of Toyto city. Their names were Biliktu and Normajab. Biliktu was a slave of janggi Malur of the Middle Banner of Ordos Left Flank (Giyün wang’s banner), and Normajab belonged to janggi Wcir’s sumu of the Front Banner of Ordos Left Flank (Jegün yar Banner). The previous day, Biliktu had visited Normajab’s house and proposed that they go on a pilgrimage to the Maidari temple of Tümed. On the way to Tümed, on Normajab’s suggestion they stole four cattle of Ombo, a subject of Jegün yar Banner, and brought them to Toyto to sell them at the market. They were arrested there by a patrolling official, Lii Giyün fu.

The involvement of Mongolian subjects in the mercantile activities of Chinese merchants is clearly seen in the case of Daji, who stole three camels in wang Dasipil’s banner, Qalq-a Mongolia, on the 12th day of the 8th month of the 39th year of Qianlong (1774). Daji, 35 years old, was a subject of wang Dasipil of the Rear Banner of Left Flank of Tüsiyetü qan’s ayimay.⁷⁴⁾ In the 8th month of the previous year, he was employed by a Chinese merchant of

Kökeqota, Jao De yan, who was conducting his trade in the Mongolian banners. Jao De yan employed four other Mongolians besides Daji. They were Galdang of Dörben keüked Banner, Cebden of Urad Middle Banner, as well as Sainkeo and Lubts'ang of Dasipil's banner. On the 11th day of the 8th month of the 39th year of Qianlong, Jao De yan arrived at Dasipil's banner with his five Mongolian employees. Later, Daji borrowed one camel and left Jao De yan's camp to bring his invalid wife to her parents' home. The next day, he met his relative Cagana and instigated him to steal the camel and exchange it for Jao De yan's camel. He then went back to Jao De yan's caravan and proposed to him to trade his camel with Cagana's. Jao accepted his proposal and gave a horse to him. Galdang gave his horse to Daji too. That night, Cagana stole three camels of Cereng, a subject of wang Dasipil, and gave them to Daji. Daji brought these camels to Jao's camp and gave two of them to Jao and Galdang. However, they were soon arrested by Cereng and sent to Kökeqota for interrogation by the officers at the seal office of Kökeqota Tümed Banner. When the officers asked why Jao De yan gave his horse to Daji without affirming the quality of Cagana's camels, Daji explained saying "Jao De yan is a born merchant. I have been employed by him. It is a usual matter to trade livestock when they do their business in the place of Outer jasays. I am a person who has never gone bad before, so Jao De yan and his fellow workers immediately trusted me."⁷⁵⁾

Daji's case shows that the Mongolians usually involved themselves in Chinese traders' business and won their confidence. For Jao De yan who used to trade in Dasipil's banner, it was advantageous to have some Mongolian subjects of the banner in his caravan to find various opportunities for his business. At the same time, becoming involved in Chinese trade also offered fellow Mongolians a chance to carry out their own trade.⁷⁶⁾

The caravan route along which Chinese traders developed long-distance trade attracted the Mongolians who belonged to the neighboring banners. Jao De yan employed two Mongolian subjects of Dörben keüked and Urad, both of which were along the main avenue of trade between Kökeqota and the banners of Outer Mongolia.

Mongolians also were in the trading business, and their trade was deeply connected to the Chinese trade network. We see another example in the Dondok's case, which took place in the 55th year of Qianlong (1790).

Dondok was a tayiji of the fourth rank of the Sönid Right Banner. He lived at "Dabatu along the arterial road of Gungju kara (gungju kara i amba jugün i dalbade dabatu sere ba)" with his wife and children. On the 9th day of the 7th month of the 55th year of Qianlong (1790), he left his banner to

Kökeqota to sell his five horses and pay back his debt to a Chinese mercantile store named Wang hing yung. He had four companions including Masijab, Bayartu, Cultum, and Dondok's qamjily-a (retainer), Bardahū. Each of them except Bardahū had been involved in trade previously. Masijab, 35 years old, was a Mongolian who did not know his original banner, which he had left long ago with his parents in his childhood. He bolstered his livelihood by doing wage labor for Chinese merchants. The previous year, he had been employed by the merchant Sui Siyoo el of Zhangjiakou and he worked for his caravan at Qotuuyitu in northwestern Outer Mongolia. In the 6th month of the 55th year of Qianlong, he quit Sui Siyoo el's job and was given an eight-year-old gelding as his wage. He visited Dondok and sold the horse to him for 6 *liangs* of silver. In the 7th month, he again visited Dondok to get the 6 *liangs* of silver, but Dondok planned to pay him only after selling his five horses in the city, and therefore, Masijab accompanied him to Kökeqota.

Bayartu, 26 years old, was originally a subject of Dondok's banner. His biography is interesting. He left his home banner at the age of nine with his father and moved to "the jasaγ Sonom's banner of Uriyangqai." They lived at the house of a nun called Cobo cibaganca. After his father died when he was eleven, he left Cobo's house and earned his living for fifteen years by doing wage labor for Chinese merchants. In the 54th year of Qianlong (1789), he was employed by Chinese merchant Ya Sin jiyang of the Sui Siyoo el shop of Zhangjiakou and he worked for his trading caravan in the Qalq-a Erdeni wang's banner.⁷⁷⁾ In the 7th month of the year, when the caravan came back to Holotu of Sönid Banner, Bayartu told his employer that he was going on a pilgrimage to Jebzundamba's küriy-e, and he quit his job. He left his employer accompanied by a three-year-old mare, which was given to him as his wage. He then met his acquaintance Dondok and accompanied him to Kökeqota.

Another companion called Cultum was a 26-year-old subject of tayiji Lobsang of Sönid Left Banner. He lost his father and lived in poverty with his mother, younger sister, and son at Kureltu (Mo. Küreltü). In the 8th month of the 54th year of Qianlong, he was employed by a Chinese merchant of the He ing ho shop of Hiya Bu lai of Zhangjiakou and worked at his caravan trade in the Daicing wang's banner of Qalq-a.⁷⁸⁾ On the 6th day of the 7th month of the 55th year of Qianlong, when they came back to Sönid Banner, he quit his job to go on a pilgrimage to the Jebzundamba's küriy-e and received a four-year-old mare as his wage equivalent to 7 *liangs*. He then visited his acquaintance Dondok to accompany him and sell his own mare at the horse market of Kökeqota.

Dondok left his banner along with his companions on the 9th day of the

7th month, and arrived at the village called Kara buta⁷⁹⁾ in the eastern vicinity of Suiyuan cheng on the 15th day of the same month. Two Chinese merchants met them and paid for the horse they had bought from Dondok the previous year and said, “Now the price of livestock has come down. If you sell your horses through the sales brokers at the city market, you will not make much money. You will do better selling your horses to us for the same price that we paid in the previous bargain. I will bring the money early morning tomorrow.” Dondok believed them and gave them the five mares for the price of 22 *liangs* and 5 *qians*. Bayartu also sold his mare for 4 *liangs* and 5 *qians*. Cultum’s mare was also bought by them for 5 *liangs* and 5 *qians*. The next day, Dondok and his companions waited for them, but they did not appear. On the 17th day, they went to the horse market of Suiyuan cheng⁸⁰⁾ and sought in vain for them. On the 18th day, they looked for the merchants along the road of Onggon dabagan (Mo. Ongyun dabay-a), the northern passage of Daqing shan mountain, and even stayed a night there. On the 19th day, they reached Huhu ergi (Mo. Köke ergi, present day Wuchuang city), but could not find them. On the 20th day, they turned back to the top of Onggon dabagan and camped there. On the 21st day, they reached Kökeqota and stayed four days. By then, they had exhausted all their money. Dondok had no choice but to sell his riding horse to a shop called Wang hing yung for 5 *liangs* and paid 3 *liangs* and 7 *qians* for his debt. He paid 7 *qians* to Masijab as a part of the price of his horse and bought a tobacco for 3 *qians*. Cultum also sold his exhausted horse for a low price of 2100 *qians* at the shop Wang hing yung, and they used the money to buy food. They borrowed tea leaves and tobacco and left Kökeqota on the 25th day of the 7th month. On the way home, when they reached Cakildak (Mo. Čakilday) of Čaqar Bordered Blue Banner⁸¹⁾ on the 28th day, their food supplies were exhausted too. Driven into a corner, Dondok decided to steal livestock for their food and sent Bardahū, Masijab, and Bayartu to steal a horse. They stole a horse belonging to a Čaqar bannerman, Šodoi, of the Bordered Blue Banner. Šodoi chased them with five neighbors and arrested Dondok and his four companions with the help of the banner soldiers. Dondok was rescinded of his title of tayiji. Bardahū, Masijab, and Bayartu were punished with one hundred lashes, and Cultum was given ninety lashes.⁸²⁾

Tayiji Dondok’s case shows the involvement of Mongolian subjects in trading activities. His banner, Sönid, was located along the trade route connecting Inner Mongolian cities and Mongolian banners of Outer Mongolia. He confessed that he was living along “the arterial road of Gungju kara (Mo. Güngjü qar-a),” which was possibly one of the trade routes. The location of his home banner gave him an easy access to trading activities and the people who

sustained their lives being employed in the caravans of Chinese merchants. The trade of Mongolian banner subjects was rather limited and short range because they sold their own livestock and traded small amounts of commodities for their private use, but the commitment to the Chinese trade gave them the opportunity to visit more distant places. It is visible in the life histories of Dondok's companions, Masijab and Cultum, whose paths reached the remote banners of Qalq-a Mongolia.

It is interesting that Bayartu and Cultum expressed their intention to go on a pilgrimage to the temple of Jebzundamba qutuγtu of Yeke Kūriy-e, one of religious centers of Mongolian Buddhism and the mercantile base of Chinese traders in Outer Mongolia, after quitting their work for the Chinese merchants. Such an intention was possibly caused by their previous experience of a visit to Outer Mongolia. We know from this case that long-distance trade provided poor Mongolians an opportunity for wage labor and encouraged their trans-boundary activities.

The commitment of the Mongolian subjects to the long-distance trade of Chinese traders draws our attention, especially in the western part of Inner Mongolia. The city of Kōkeqota was outside the Great Wall and it functioned as an economic node for long-range trade of Chinese merchants, connecting the inner provinces and the banners of Outer Mongolia and Xinjiang. Chinese merchants needed the labor power and their demands were supplied by Mongolians seeking work and who were impoverished in their own banners. The city of Zhangjiakou also played a similar role as Kōkeqota, together with Dolonnuur, the advance base of Chinese merchants.

Such demographic mobility was sustained by the agricultural hinterland, which developed around the cities. The rural economy demanded laborers on the crop field and this demand attracted migrant workers from the neighboring Mongolian banners.

Conclusion

The cases of livestock theft in mid-Qing Mongolia reveal the high mobility of the Mongolian banner subjects. When impoverished Mongolians wanted to leave their banners, they easily crossed the banner borders and visited the cities and the agricultural villages looking for a means of survival. In these places, there was labor shortage, and these job seekers were welcomed by the Chinese merchants of the cities and the agriculturalist villagers of the cities' hinterland. The more affluent people visited cities for buying daily commodities and selling their products. The fact that most of the theft cases reported in the

Lifanyuan's reports were related to cities and villages reveals the situation in the frontier society. These cities were equipped with administrative institutions in charge of investigating criminal activities of frontier inhabitants. These cases also show the limitations in the efficacy of the institutions, because the thefts were perpetrated by impoverished Mongolians who had no organizational background. The frontier society was well known to attract both bandits and criminal gangs, but we have only a very small number of apprehended cases committed by such professionals. The Qing's facilities deployed on the borders did not really function as an effective blockade against the cross-boundary activities of the Mongols. Especially, the borders between the Mongolian banners and the territories under the jurisdiction of the Eight Banners were easily transitable. In the cases from the Čaqar and Tümed banners, clearly, even entering the banner jurisdictions of the three Generals of the Northeast was an easy task.

Most of the thieves confessed that they were first-time offenders. Some of them committed a crime only after long years of vagabondage. This shows that they had enough opportunity to survive as vagrants. The economic fugitives were not directly deemed as runaways, and the local administration expected them to come back. In fact, the migrant workers went back and forth between their banners and the places where they found wage labors. Their migrations happened with the consent of local administrations, which did not want to confine the subjects in their banner territories, but only tried to control their activities following the related Qing's codes. However, once the assigned time was over, the search was on for the migrant workers together with the runaways through the administrative channels.

All of this leads us to following conclusions.

First, it was common knowledge that the subjects of the Mongolian banners went out of their banner for various purposes including looking for wage labor, visiting cities to trade their livestock for daily commodities, etc. Such activities were not considered illegal by the local administrations. Second, the city markets and the surrounding agricultural villages accepted these Mongolians and offered them opportunities for wage labor and trade. Third, the Mongolian banner subjects were able to become acquainted with people who came from different banners during their journey. Those involved in theft cases often introduced their accomplices as "an i ucuri takara" (lit. usually know each other). Their cross-boundary activities and social circumstances made it possible to forge such relations. Fourth, Chinese trade networks played an important role in promoting the mobilization of the Mongolian subjects, who visited remote banners and cities as employees of Chinese traders. Fifth,

in Eastern and Southeastern Inner Mongolia, the Mongolian subjects sometimes crossed the Willow Palisade and went to the cities and the villages under the jurisdiction of the Eight Banners on the other side of the Palisade. This is explained by the distinctive circumstances of the eastern part of Inner Mongolia. There were no big cities inside the territories of Mongolian banners; all of them were in the territory of the Three Northeastern Provinces. In contrast, we hardly find any cases in which the Mongolian subjects crossed the Great Wall, probably because they could fulfill their needs in the cities within the banners of Tümed and Čaqar on the Mongolian side of the Wall. Sixth, trans-boundary activities were easier between the territories of Mongolian *jasay* banners and those of the Eight Banners including Čaqar and Tümed in the western part and the jurisdictions of the three Generals of the Northeast. Seventh, the trans-boundary activities of the Mongolian subjects occurred under similar circumstances that the Chinese migrants experienced during their journey. In other words, the Qing's rule cannot be considered a preventive factor for Mongolian migrants' move just as it cannot for Chinese immigrants living in the same area. It means that the *Fengjin* policy, even if such a policy existed, did not work effectively for Mongolian banner subjects either. Needless to say, the ineffectiveness in controlling the Mongolian population annoyed both the Qing and the local rulers of the Mongolian banners. It is known that the Qalq-a Mongolian ayimaŷ established a special field office called "kerümel-ün *jasay*-a (the field office for vagabondage)" at Yeke Kuriy-e (present Ulaanbaatar) to gain control over the fugitives living in the city. This problem had not been resolved under the rule of the Qing, but it was finally fixed by a series of reforms in the local administration by the government of Mongolian People's Republic in the 1920s.

Finally, all the cases mentioned in the study result in a sense of skepticism about the view that the Qing's Mongolian policy was directed to restrict the activities of the Mongolian banner subjects within the territory of their home banners. Not only the actuality, but also the legal settings of the so-called *Fengjin* policy itself have to be reconsidered by a thorough investigation of the related laws and the real intention underlying the Qing's approaches to the demographic fluidity in the frontier region, including Mongolia.

Notes

* This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP15H03128.

1) Ш. Нацагдорж, *Монголын феодализмын үндсэн замнал (Түүхэн найруулал)*. Улаанбаатар: Улсын Хэвлэлийн Газар, 1978, 171 тал.

- 2) Ma Ruheng 馬汝珩, *Qingdai Xibu lishi lunheng* 清代西部歷史論衡, Taiyuan: Shanxi Renmin Chubanshe, 2001, pp. 120–121.
- 3) *Lifanyuan zeli* 理藩院則例, vol. 10, 8a–b. This article prohibited all the princes, officers, and ordinary people from permitting Chinese immigrants cultivate “the prohibited pasture land 封禁牧場.” “The prohibited pasture land” is translated as “čayaḟilaγsan belčiger γaḟar” in Mongolian and “fafulaha ongko ba” in Manchu. This word in this article should be understood not as indicating the entire country of Mongolia, but as limited land that was retained for pasturing in a different banner.
- 4) Yano Jin’ichi 矢野仁一, *Kindai Mōkoshi kenkyū* 近代蒙古史研究, Tokyo: Kōbundō Shobō, 1925, p. 76.
- 5) Such understandings became doubtful after Horiuchi Kaori’s argument about the cross-boundary migration of Mongolian nomads. See, Хориучи Каори, Манжийн үеийн монгол дахь нутгийн хязгаар ба нүүдлийн мал аж ахуй: халх баргын жишээгээр, *Евроазийн Нүүдлийн Аж Ахуй. Түүх, Соёл, Хүрээлэх орчин*, Эмхтгэсэн, С. Чулуун, Хурц, Андриан Борисов, Ока Хироки (CNEAS Reports 22), Sendai: Center for Northeast Asian Studies, Tohoku University, 2016, pp. 75–96.
- 6) The problem of the Chinese immigrants in Mongolia has attracted the interest of Japanese historians studying the early stage of Mongolia’s modern history. See, Yano, *Kindai Mōkoshi kenkyū*, pp. 98–188. Tayama Shigeru 田山茂, *Shindai ni okeru Mōko no shakai seido* 清代に於ける蒙古の社会制度, Tokyo: Bunkyo Shoin, 1954, pp. 327–397. Yano and Tayama did not call the Qing’s policy “Fengjin.”
- 7) The recent inspiring work on the activities of the Chinese immigrants in the Three Northeastern Provinces is Aratake Tatsurō 荒武達朗, *Kindai Manshū no kaihatsu to imin: Bokkai wo watatta hitobito* 近代満洲の開発と移民：渤海を渡った人々, Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 2008.
- 8) *Lifanyuan zeli*, vol. 34, Bianjin, 15a–16a.
- 9) М. Санждорж, *Халхад хятадын мөнгө хүүлэгч худалдаа нэвтэрч хөгжсөн нь*. (XVIII зуун), Улаанбаатар, 1963. The Maimaicheng of Yeke Kūriy-e and its relationship with the local banners and the Qing’s office of the resident minister is well discussed in Satō Noriyuki 佐藤憲行, *Shindai Haruha Mongoru no toshi ni kansuru kenkyū: 18 seiki sue kara 19 seiki nakaba no Furē wo rei ni* 清代ハルハ・モンゴルの都市に関する研究 : 18世紀末から19世紀半ばのフレーを例に, Tokyo: Gakujutsu Shuppankai, 2009.
- 10) Хориучи, Манжийн үеийн монгол дахь нутгийн хязгаар ба нүүдлийн мал аж ахуй.
- 11) About the Lifanyuan, see Zhao Yuntian 趙雲田, *Qingdai zhili bianchui de shuniu: Lifanyuan* 清代治理邊陲的樞紐: 理藩院, Wulumuqi: Xinjiang Renmin Chubanshe, 1995. Chia Ning, *Lifanyuan and the management of population diversity in early Qing (1636–1795)*, *Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology Working Papers*, no. 139, 2012, and the articles published in *Managing frontiers in Qing China: The Lifanyuan and Libu revisited*, ed. by Dittmar Schorkowits and Chia Ning, Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2017. This board was originally called “Monggo jurgan” in Manchu and later “ᠲᠠᠳᠠᠭᠠᠳᠤ Mongγul-un törü-yi jasaqu yabudal-un yamun” in Mongolian. Both meant “the Board of Mongolian Affairs.” Such an implication of this board was consistently maintained to the very end of the Qing dynasty. The affair of Tibet, or more precisely the affair of the Tibetan Buddhist order, was adjoined because it was an indivisible factor in handling the Mongolian affairs.

- 12) These memorials were published by facsimile in *Qingchao qianqi Lifanyuan Manmengwen tiben* 清朝前期理藩院滿蒙文題本, ed. by Zhongguo Diyi Lishi Dang'anguan 中國第一歷史檔案館 (First Historical Archive of China), and Zhongguo Renmin Daxue Guoxueyuan Xiyu Lishi Yuyan Yanjiusuo 中國人民大學國學院西域歷史語言研究所 (School of Chinese Classics of Renmin University of China), Huhehaote: Nei Menggu Chuban Jitan and Nei Menggu Renmin Chubanshe, 2010 (later "*Tiben*").
- 13) Yanagisawa Akira 柳澤明, Kenryū 13–14 nen no Shinchō ni yoru "Fūkin rei" wo megutte 乾隆十三～十四年の清朝による「封禁令」をめぐって, in *Kingendai Uchi Mongoru tōbu no henyō* 近現代内モンゴル東部の変容, ed. by Mongoru Kenkyūjo モンゴル研究所, Tokyo: Yūzankaku, pp. 71–84.
- 14) See, Shimada Masao 島田正郎, *Shinchō Mōkorei no kenkyū* 清朝蒙古例の研究 (Tōyō Hōshi Ronshū 東洋法史論集 5), Tokyo: Sōbunsha, 1982, pp. 456–542. The reason why livestock thievery should be severely punished was explained by the Emperor Qianlong in his edict issued in the 6th month of the 42nd year of Qianlong (1777), "The Mongols living outside of the Wall rely on their livestock in their livelihood. It is impossible to think in the same way as the case of the Inner realm. The law should be stricter." *Tiben*, vol. 17, Report no. 27, The 3rd day of the 9th month of the 45th year of Qianlong, pp. 385–386.
- 15) Sechin Jagchid, An interpretation of "Mongol bandits" (Meng-fei), *Altaica: Proceedings of the 19th Annual Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference, held in Helsinki, 7–11 June 1976*, Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 1977, pp. 113–121.
- 16) *Menggu lüli* 蒙古律例, vol. 5, *Lifanyuan zeli*, vol. 34, 24a.
- 17) *Menggu lüli*, vol. 5, 3b–4a, *Lifanyuan zeli*, vol. 34, 8a–b.
- 18) *Ibid.*
- 19) Bedune 伯都訥 is in present-day Songyuan 松原 city, Jilin province. The relay station of Bedune was not far from the city, toward the northwest.
- 20) The personal names of Mongolians appearing in the Lifanyuan reports in Manchu are transcribed in this article as it is in the original Manchu texts.
- 21) *Tiben*, vol. 6, Report no. 75, pp. 593–605, 11th day of the 7th month of the 22nd year of Qianlong, "兼管理藩院事務大學士傅恒等題議科爾沁蒙古鄂爾霍達盜牛按律擬絞監候秋後處決本."
- 22) Ĵasaγtu qan Ciwangbaljai's banner was in the territories of the Tayshir, Delger, Khaliun sums of the Govi Altai aimag, Mongolia. Ц. Сономдагва, *Монгол Улсын засаг, захиргааны зохион байгуулалын өөрчлөлт, шинэчлэл (1691–1997)*, Улаанбаатар: МХАУ Танхимын Хэвлэх Үйлдвэр, 1998, 249 тал.
- 23) Ĵaqačin Banner was located in Uyench sum of Khovd aimag, present Mongolia. Сономдагва, *Монгол Улсын засаг*, 378 тал.
- 24) The güng Wangčinjab's banner was the Last Banner of Central Right Flank of Ĵasaγtu qan's ayimaγ and its territory covered the present-day Tonkhill, Bugat, Tögrög sums and part of Dariv, Altai, and Tseel sums, southwestern part of Govi Altai aimag, Mongolia. It bordered Ĵasaγtu qan's banner to the southwest. Сономдагва, *Монгол Улсын засаг*, 272 тал.
- 25) Ĵasaγ Dasičerin's banner was the Rear Last Banner of Right Flank of Ĵasaγtu qan's ayimaγ. This banner was in the territory of present-day Tsokt sum of Govi Altai aimag. It bordered Ĵasaγtu qan's banner to the south. Сономдагва, *Монгол Улсын засаг*, 258 тал.

- 26) *Tiben*, vol. 16, Report no. 51, pp. 469–492, 9th day of the 2nd month of the 45th year of Qianlong, “兼管理藩院事務兵部尚書福隆安等題議扎薩克圖汗旗敦多布倫盜駱駝按律擬罪發配雲南本。”
- 27) Ĵasaġ Ġürĵab’s banner was the Right Last Banner of the Right Flank of the Tüsiyetü qan’s ayimaġ. This banner was in the territory of present-day Baruun büren sum of Selenge aimag, Mongolia, which is 600 km from Uliyasutai to the East. Сономдагва, *Монгол Улсын засаг*, 56 тал.
- 28) *Tiben*, vol. 5, Report no. 35, pp. 312–318, 10th day of the 7th month of the 19th year of Qianlong, “兼管理藩院事務大學士來宝等題議烏里雅蘇台將軍所報盜馬案犯敏珠爾按律擬絞監候秋後處決本。”
- 29) Butha, present-day Morindawa Autonomous Banner of Dahur Nationality of Heilongjiang province is 180 km north from the Autonomous county of Dörbed Mongol nationality of the same province.
- 30) *Tiben*, vol. 4, Report no. 33, pp. 257–263, 30th day of the 5th leap month of the 16th year of Qianlong, “兼管理藩院事務大學士傅恒等題議杜爾伯特部温多爾海盜牛按律擬絞監候秋後處決本。”
- 31) Heilongjiang Jiangjun Yamen Dang’an 黑龍江將軍衙門檔案, no. 23–1740, abkai wehiyehe i sunjaci aniya nadan biyaci jorgon biyade isibume, sahaliyan ula mergen hulun buir meiren i janggin, butha hūlan, giyamun i hafasai baci isinjiha bithe be ejeme araha dangse. 70–78. The microfilms are kept at the Library of Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa (ILCAA), Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- 32) Urad banners and Ordos Dalad Banner bordered each other across the Yellow River.
- 33) Suburyan sūm-e was at “the southern foot of the Wula mountain.” *Wulate Qianqi zhi* 烏拉特前旗志, ed. by Wang Wenzhong 王文忠, Huhehaote: Nei Menggu Renmin Chubanshe, 1994, p. 889.
- 34) Qalq-a Dalai Dügüregċi wang’s banner is possibly the Left Banner of Central Left Flank (Erdene degürügċi wang’s banner) of Ĵasaġtu qan’s ayimaġ. This banner is in present-day Tsagaan uul sum and Tsetserleg sum of the Southeastern part of Köbsgöl aimag and Bayan uul sum, Bayan khairkhan and Bayantes sum of northern part of Zavhan aimag, Mongolia. It was more than 1300 km northwest from the Urad banners.
- 35) *Tiben*, vol. 12, Report no. 19, pp. 163–169, 24th day of the 6th month of the 35th year of Qianlong, “管理理藩院事務大學士傅恒等題議烏喇特部阿喇布坦偷盜駱駝按律擬罪發配湖廣驛站役使本。”
- 36) Güng Lobsangdorċi’s banner was the Left Banner of the Left Flank of Sayin Noyan ayimaġ. Its territory covered present-day Khureemaraġ, Bayanbulag, Gurvan bulag sums, the northwestern part of Bayankhongor ayimaġ, Mongolia. Сономдагва, *Монгол Улсын засаг*, 218 тал.
- 37) Beyise Sundubdorċi’s banner was the Middle Banner of Tüsiyetü qan ayimaġ, which was in the area including present-day Ulaanbaatar city and its neighboring sums of the eastern part of Töv aimag. Ulaanbaatar is about 700 km from Khureemaraġ sum.
- 38) According to Sh. Natsagdorċi, there were two flocks of “Breeding camels” (ürjüülekh temee) which consisted of 65 units grazed by more than 70 families called out from the banners of Tüsiyetü qan ayimaġ and Sayin Noyan ayimaġ. III. Нацагдорж, *Манжийн эрхийгээлд байсан үеийн халхын хураангуй түүх*, 166 тал. Also see: Ц.

- Насанбалжир, *Ар монголоос Манж чин улсад залгуулж байсан алба 1691–1911*, Улаанбаатар: Шинжлэх Ухааны Академийн хэвлэл, 1964, 107–108 тал.
- 39) *Tiben*, vol. 22, Report no. 41, pp. 487–497, the 12th day of the 12th month of the 58th year of Qianlong, “管理理藩院事務大學士和坤等題擬喀爾喀土謝圖汗部敏珠爾等偷盜駱駝按律擬罪發遣并該管扎薩克罰俸本.”
- 40) Hulan 呼蘭 was in the north of present-day Harbin city, and neighbored Gorlos Rear Banner on the northwest.
- 41) “Tokso” or *guanazhuang* 官莊 was the agricultural manor established by the Qing government for feeding the Eight bannermen living in the Three Northeastern Provinces. The “tokso” of Hulan were first established in the 2nd year of Qianlong (1737) under the jurisdiction of the Heilongjiang General. See, Aritaka Iwao 有高巖, Kokuryūkōshō Huran Heiya no kaihatsu ni tsukite 黑龍江省呼蘭平野の開発に就きて, in *Naitō hakase kanreki shukuga Shinagaku ronsō* 内藤博士還暦祝賀志那学論叢, Tokyo: Kōbundō Shobō, 1926, pp. 819–864.
- 42) *Tiben*, vol. 5, Report no. 34, pp. 305–311, 10th day of the 7th month of the 19th year of Qianlong, “兼管理藩院事務大學士來宝等題議郭爾羅斯旗阿哈爾納盜牛按律擬絞監候秋後處決本.”
- 43) Nicuhun village is probably present-day Niqikun 尼其坤, which is about 10 km north-northeast of Cicihar city. On the map made by Japanese in 1933, Nicuhun appears as Niquikun 尼求昆. *Chūgoku Tairiku 10 manbun no 1 chizu shūsei* (II) 中國大陸十萬分の一地図集成 (later *TMCPME*) (II) [Manchuria II]. MC-029-13[0743] “Qiqihaer 齊齊哈爾.” Goto is present-day Gaotou 高頭, which is about 7 km from Nicuhun toward east-southeast. Teguldur’s banner was approximately 200 km southwest of Nicuhun village.
- 44) *Tiben*, vol. 3, Report no. 32, pp. 287–293, 28th day of the 3rd month of the 9th year of Qianlong, “兼管理藩院事務兵部尚書班第羅題議科爾沁部特古勒德爾盜馬欽奉恩詔減免死刑發遣爲奴本.”
- 45) *Tiben*, vol. 6, Report no. 22, pp. 151–156, 24th day of the 9th month of the 21st year of Qianlong, “署理理藩院事務大學士來保等題議科爾沁部喀勒扎盜牛按律擬絞監候秋後處決本.”
- 46) *Daqing Shengzu Ren Huangdi Shilu* 大清聖祖仁皇帝實錄, vol. 155, 7a–8a; Cong Peiyuan 叢佩遠, *Zhongguo Dongbeishi* 中國東北史, vol. 4, Changchun: Jilin Wenshi Chubanshe, 1998, pp. 1304–1307.
- 47) Wang Weixian 王維憲, et al., *Bodune Manzu wenhua gailan* 伯都訥滿族文化概覽, Changchun: Jilin Renmin Chubanshe, 2011, pp. 39–41.
- 48) *Tiben*, vol. 3, Report no. 6, pp. 69–76, 20th day of the 7th month of the 8th year of Qianlong, “管理理藩院事務怡親王弘曉等題議郭爾羅斯部珠拉偷盜馬匹依律擬絞監候秋後處決本.”
- 49) *Tiben*, vol. 19, Report no. 39, pp. 469–477, 4th day of the 7th month of the 56th year of Qianlong, “管理理藩院事務大學士和坤等題擬伯都訥城拿獲盜馬犯色梭按律擬罪發配河南驛站役使本.”
- 50) *Tiben*, vol. 8, Report no. 62, pp. 379–384, 18th day of the 9th month of the 25th year of Qianlong, “署理理藩院事務副都統福奈等題議科爾沁部多羅盜牛按律擬罪發配山東本.”
- 51) Dapu village is on the right bank of the Sunggari river in present-day Dapo Zhen 大坡鎮 of Yushu 榆樹 city of Changchun 長春, Jilin province, 80 km north of Jilin city.

- The other side of the river was the territory of ʒorlos Front Banner.
- 52) *Tiben*, vol. 23, Report no. 16, pp. 160–171, 16th day of the 6th month of the 60th year of Qianlong, “管理理藩院事務大學士和坤等題擬吉林八旗拿獲盜馬犯達胡等按律擬罪發遣雲南等地驛站役使本.”
 - 53) Moohin 茂興 was the southernmost of the six relay stations established under the jurisdiction of Heilongjiang General in the 25th year of Kangxi (1686). It was at present-day Maoxing zhen 茂興鎮 of Zhaoyuan 肇源 county of Daqing 大慶 city, Heilongjiang province, 48 km north-northwest of Bedune. See; Cong, *Zhongguo Dongbeishi*, pp. 1367–1369.
 - 54) Hayul village appears in the *TMCPME* map published in 1933 as Hayou tun 哈有屯 and is present-day Hayou cun 哈友村 of Zhaoyuan county of Daqing city. *TMCPME* (II), MC-030-04 [0759] “Maoxingzhang 茂興站.”
 - 55) Olo holo village is present-day Aojia huoluo 敖家伙洛 village or Tuanjie cun 團結村 located 9.5 km east of Songyuan 松原 city. See, Wang, et al., *Bodune Manzu wenhua gailun*, p. 55. *TMCPME* (II), MC-030-05 [0760] “Bodune 伯都訥.”
 - 56) *Tiben*, vol. 23, Report no. 10, pp. 97–116, 23th day of the 6th month of the 59th year of Qianlong, “管理理藩院事務大學士和坤等題擬伯都訥城拿獲盜馬犯鄂博錫等按律擬罪發遣江南等地本.”
 - 57) The Willow Palisade separated the jurisdiction of three Generals from the neighboring Mongolian banners including Qaračın Left Banner of Josutu League, the Siregetü küriy-e, three banners of the Left Flank of Qorčın and ʒorlos Front Banner. See, *Qingdai Liutiaobian* 清代柳條邊, ed. by Yang Shusen 楊樹森, Shenyang: Liaoning Renmin Chubanshe, 1978; Li Jiancai 李健才, *Dongbei shidi kaolue* 東北史地考略, Changchun: Jilin Wenshi Chubanshe, 1986, pp. 270–281. Cong, *Zhongguo Dongbeishi*, pp. 1389–1399.
 - 58) Ing ceng dz is probably present-day Yingchengzi cun 英城子村 of Jin zhou 錦州 city of Liaoning province. This village is about 30 km south of Yi zhou and 12 km north of Jin zhou.
 - 59) *Tiben*, vol. 2, Report no. 23, pp. 123–131, 24th day of the 2nd month of the 5th year of Qianlong, “管理理藩院事務怡親王弘曉等題議土默特達爾扎等人偷盜馬匹一案依照盛京刑部審擬處置本.”
 - 60) *Tiben*, vol. 8, Report no. 49, pp. 305–315, 7th day of the 7th month of the 25th year of Qianlong, “管理理藩院事務大學士傅恒等題議土默特貝子旗阿爾賓桑等偷盜馬羊一案應如該旗審擬處置本.” The Right Banner of Tümed was in present-day Beipiao 北票 city of Liaoning province.
 - 61) Yi zhou is the present Yi 義 county of the Liaoning province and about 30 km south of the Qinghe 清河 gate of the Willow Palisade.
 - 62) We are unable to find such a gate in related literatures. Possibly, it is the Jiuguantai 九官臺 gate. It was in the north of Jiuguantai mountain at 36 *li* northwest of Yi zhou. Also see, *Qingdai Liutiaobian*, pp. 49–50.
 - 63) Ši giya pu village is seen as Shijiabu 施家堡 at approximately 20 km southwest of Kaiyuan and 30 km east-southeast of Faku 法庫門 gate which led to the territory of the Central Banner of Qorčın Left Flank (Darqan banner). It was also seen in *Shengjing Tongzhi* 盛京通志 as Shijia bu 史家堡. See, *Shengjing Tongzhi*, vol. 29, 38b, Tieling xian jienei zhubu 鐵嶺縣界內諸堡.
 - 64) *Tiben*, vol. 23, Report no. 9, pp. 84–97, 8th day of the 6th month of the 59th year of

- Qianlong, “管理理藩院事務大學士和珅等題擬科爾沁達爾漢王旗額駙家奴杜稜盜馬按律擬罪發遣河南本.”
- 65) Orgesun village is seen in *Guisui Shilüe* 歸綏識略 as Eergexun 鄂爾格遜 as one of “the seventeen villages of western region of Saraci,” 16 km to the west of present-day Saraqi town (Chi. Salaqi 薩拉齊). *Guisui Shilüe*, vol. 20, Cunzhuang, p. 148. Also see *TMCPME* (IV) [Inner Mongolia] 30, CP-001-030 [1465] “Salaqi xian 薩拉齊縣.”
 - 66) *Tiben*, vol. 2, Report no. 2, pp. 5–12, 10th day of the 10th month of the 4th year of Qianlong, “理藩院尚書納延泰等題議歸化城拿獲盜牛犯烏拉特部巴達琅貴擬絞監禁秋後處決本.”
 - 67) Kara buta village appears in *Guisui Shilüe* as Halabutan 哈喇不炭. *Guisui Shilüe*, vol. 20, Cunzhuang, p. 138. This village appears in *TMCPME* (II) as Heilanbuta. *TMCPME* (IV) CP-001-008 [1443] “Guisui (Guihua cheng) 歸綏 (歸化城).”
 - 68) *Tiben*, vol. 2, Report no. 3, pp. 13–21, 10th day of the 10th month of the 4th year of Qianlong, “理藩院尚書納延泰等題議歸化城土默特旗錫拉扣等偷竊馬匹案首犯擬絞監禁秋後處決本.”
 - 69) *Tiben*, vol. 2, Report no. 29, pp. 182–188, 12th day of the 3rd month of the 5th year of Qianlong, “管理理藩院事務怡親王弘曉等題議鄂爾多斯部塔爾巴等偷盜羊隻案內首犯擬絞監候秋後處決本.”
 - 70) Namurja village is found as Namujia 那木架, one of 73 villages of the eastern region of Toyto (Tuoketuo cheng) in *Guisui Shilüe*, vol. 20, Cunzhuang, Tuoketuo xian, p. 153, and appears in *TMCPME* (II) as Damuerjia 達穆爾架. *TMCPME* (IV) 19, “Lamawan 喇嘛灣.” Ike baising was 26 northwest from Namurja. It appears in the same book as “Yikenbansheng 伊肯板升,” one of the 172 villages of the eastern region of Salaqi. *Ibid.*, p. 147. Casuci (Chi. Chasuqi 察素齊) village was a town in present-day Tümed Left Banner, which is 45 km west of Kökeqota. *Ibid.*, p. 153. In *TMCPME* (II), it appears as Yikebanshen 乙克板申. *TMCPME* (IV) 25, CP-001-025 [1460] “Shuanglong zhen 雙龍鎮.”
 - 71) Ordos Jegün γar Banner was in the eastern part of Ordos and bordered with Tümed Banner by the Yellow River to the east.
 - 72) *Tiben*, vol. 3, Report no. 58, pp. 493–513, 9th day of the 11th month of the 9th year of Qianlong, “兼管理藩院事務兵部尚書班第等題議歸化城土默特左翼舒胡爾盜馬按律擬絞監候秋後處決本.”
 - 73) *Tiben*, vol. 7, Report no. 1, pp. 1–11, 24th day of the 7th month of the 22nd year of Qianlong, “管理理藩院事務大學士傅恒等題議鄂爾多斯蒙古敦多布盜牛按律擬絞監候秋後處決本.”
 - 74) Wang Dasipil’s banner was in the southwestern part of present-day Dundgov’ aimag, and the northeastern part of Ömnögov’ aimag. Сономдагва, Монгол Улсын засаг, 25 тал.
 - 75) *Tiben*, vol. 14, Report no. 29, pp. 276–290, 18th day of the 5th month of the 40th year of Qianlong, “兼管理藩院事務工部尚書福隆安等題議歸化城拿獲偷盜駱駝犯達吉等按律分別擬罪事宜本.”
 - 76) *Tiben*, vol. 14, Report no. 29, 18th day of the 5th month of the 40th year of Qianlong, “兼管理藩院事務工部尚書福隆安等題議歸化城拿獲偷盜駱駝犯達吉等按律分別擬罪事宜本.” Chinese merchants’ activities in Mongolian banners were discussed in the author’s article, Oka Hiroki 岡洋樹, Kenryūki chūyō ni okeru Kanjin Ryomōshō no shōgyō katsudō 乾隆期中葉における漢人旅蒙商の商業活動, in *Tōhoku Ajia ni*

- okeru kōeki kyoten no hikaku kenkyū* 東北アジアにおける交易拠点の比較研究, ed. by Yamada Katsuyoshi 山田勝芳, Sendai: CNEAS, 2001, pp. 17–33.
- 77) Erdeni wang's banner was the Right Rear Banner of Right Flank of Sayin Noyan ayimaγ. It was in present-day Zag and Jargalant sums and part of Buutsagaan and Gurvanbulag sums of Bayankhongor aimag, Mongolia. Сономдагва, *Монгол Улсын засаг*, 183–184 тал.
- 78) Dayičing wang's banner was the Left Banner of Right Flank of Tüsiyetü qan's ayimaγ (Erdene Dayičing wang's banner) which was located in present-day Bulgan aimag, Mongolia.
- 79) See footnote no. 67.
- 80) *Guisui Shilüe* wrote about the livestock market of Kōkeqota and said “There are several livestock markets in Guihua cheng. The horse market is in Suiyuan cheng and called Maqiao 馬橋.” *Guisui Shilüe*, vol. 17, Shiji 市集, p. 122.
- 81) The Bordered Blue Banner of Čaqar neighbored on the Tümed Banner to the east. It was located in present Zhuozi 卓資 country and part of Chahaer Youyi zhongqi 察哈爾右翼中旗 of Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region of China.
- 82) *Tiben*, vol. 19, Report no. 40, pp. 478–496, 7th day of the 7th month of the 56th year of Qianlong, “管理理藩院事務大學士和珅等題擬蘇尼特右翼旗台吉敦多克盜馬照例革職并該管扎薩克罰俸本.”