Constructing Political Order and Universal Empire in Early Modern China

Macabe Keliher, Ph.D.

In the summer of 1633, state-makers of the emergent Qing empire (1636-1912) faced a dilemma. Two Chinese generals offered to surrender with thousands of their troops. A successful agreement would not only relieve pressure on the southeastern flank in skirmishes with the Ming dynasty (1368-1644) to the south, but if played right could aggrandize control of northeastern Eurasia and alleviate economic difficulties. Yet what to do with these political and cultural outsiders? The polity that would become the Qing initially consisted only of Manchu military families—groups of semi-nomadic peoples living in northeastern Eurasia, or what is sometimes today referred to as Manchuria. In the beginning, state-makers placed the surrendered into socio-military units called banners, which structured all aspects of life, and grouped them by clan affiliation, with the tribal chief being made captain of the unit. While new tribes were easily absorbed into this structure, settled agrarian communities under the Ming were not. In fact, conquered agrarian populations were often enslaved or forced to migrate south to areas of Ming control. In effect, there was no political or social space in the nascent Qing state for outsiders.[1]

The generals' offer of surrender presented a new twist. The generals were not defeated, only exhausted and gambling on one side emerging victorious in an increasingly intense frontier conflict. Under such circumstances, the generals and their armies would certainly not accept terms of enslavement. Furthermore, the Manchu leader, Hong Taiji, was locked in a

[1] Throughout this article I use "Chinese" to refer to settled agrarian peoples that lived under the Ming tax-office state, and "Manchu" to refer to groups of formerly dispersed peoples called Jurchens, who lived in northeastern Eurasia and engaged in migratory trade, hunting and gathering, or light agriculture. For more nuanced discussions see Pamela Kyle Crossley, *A Translucent Mirror: History and Identity in Qing Imperial Ideology* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999); Mark C. Elliott, *The Manchu Way: The Eight Banners and Ethnic Identity in Late Imperial China* (Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 2001). Prior to the announcement of the founding of the Qing in 1636, the Manchu organization was called the latter-Jin. See Gertraude Roth Li, "State Building before 1644," in *The Cambridge History of China: The Ch'ing Empire to 1800*, ed. Willard J Peterson, vol. 9 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 9–72.

struggle for political and military control with his relatives, who commanded their own armies and thwarted Hong Taiji's state-making efforts.[2] This situation led Hong Taiji to devise a means to undermine his competitors by bring the Chinese generals and their troops under his command. Not only would this increase his political and military capabilities at the expense of his relatives, but as a by-product also expand the composition of the Manchu state. Rather than just Manchus, the polity would now include other culturally distinct groups.

In many ways, this was the beginning of the Qing multiethnic empire. It was the origins of a diverse imperial polity that would conquer and rule China and parts of Inner Asia, self-consciously constructing culturally distinct ethnic groups, and developing a form of universal kingship to rule over them. It was in this early decision in the fifth lunar month of 1633 to incorporate outsiders that the Qing multiethnic administration and military was formed and came to be invested with a sense of common purpose to conquer and rule half a continent for nearly three centuries. But how to do it? How to integrate newcomers into an exclusive social system that was premised on a particular cultural organization? Indeed, how to make outsiders insiders? And in doing so, how to convince the insiders to not only accept the newcomers, but also re-conceptualize the social order?[3]

The multiethnic character of the Qing dynasty is no secret. As of late, historians have come to see the Qing not simply as another Chinese dynasty at the end of a long list of other dynasties that ruled China proper; they have demonstrated the Qing to be an imperial formation that not only ruled over culturally and ethnically diverse peoples stretching from the Sea of Japan to

[2] Struggles among the Manchu imperial relatives is discussed in Macabe Keliher, "The Problem of Imperial Relatives in Early Modern Empires and the Making of Qing China," *American Historical Review* 122, no. 4 (October 2017): 1001–37.

[3] In many ways, modern inquiry into social order hinges on the question of group inclusion and exclusion. See Roberto Mangabeira Unger, *Law in Modern Society: Toward a Criticism of Social Theory* (New York: Free Press, 1976), 137-155.

deep into Inner Asia, from the Mongolian steps to the Southeast Asian jungles and forests, but also employed Manchus, Mongols, and Chinese in the administration and running of the state apparatus.[4] Whereas scholars once saw the Qing dynasty as a continuation in structure, organization, and practice of the previous Ming dynasty, research over the past few decades has shown a much different imperial formation that doubled the territory under the control of the Beijing metropole, and innovated in ruling, administrative, and fiscal techniques and methods. Rather than the Manchus simply replacing the imploded Ming by assuming the Mandate of Heaven and occupying the imperial palace in Beijing, historians have detailed how Qing state-makers constructed a new imperial state that conquered and ruled not just the central China plains, but also Mongolia, Xinjiang, Tibet, the southwest region, and the coastal areas and islands, such as Taiwan—and did so quite effectively for nearly three centuries.[5]

While it has become clear that the Qing empire was of a different form and nature than previous Chinese states, it turns out to be quite similar to other large land-based Eurasian empires of the early modern period.[6] Beginning in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, there was a sharp reduction in the number of independent polities throughout the Eurasian continent as formerly independent territories and kingdoms were absorbed. This led to the centralization of authority under a single political formation represented and ruled by a monarch; but rather than insist on cultural uniformity these emergent empires developed new types of ruling practices and techniques that preserved and often solidified cultural and

[4] While this view is generally accepted among scholars of China, it is not without controversy, especially within China today. For a clear statement of the position see R. Kent Guy, "Who Were the Manchus? A Review Essay," *The Journal of Asian Studies* 61, no. 1 (February 2002): 151–64; Joanna Waley-Cohen, "The New Qing History," *Radical History Review*, no. 88 (Winter 2004): 193–206; for a thoughtful critique see Shen Weirong, "Shen Weirong Kan 'Xin Qingshi' de Renao He Mendao: 'Qing Shijie Zhuyi' de Yiyi," *Pengpai xinwen*, September 2017.

[5] See Pamela Kyle Crossley, "The Rulerships of China," *The American Historical Review* 97, no. 5 (1992): 1468–83; James A. Millward and Ruth W. Dunnell, eds., *New Qing Imperial History: The Making of Inner Asian Empire at Qing Chengde* (New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2004); Evelyn S Rawski, "The Qing Formation and the Early-Modern Period," in *The Qing Formation in World-Historical Time*, ed. Lynn A Struve (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Asia Center, 2004), 207–41.

[6] The problem of comparison and an articulation of the Qing as an early modern empire is made in Keliher, "The Problem of Imperial Relatives in Early Modern Empires and the Making of Qing China."

linguistic difference while monopolizing material and symbolic resources.[7] The Qing empire, for example, ruled Manchu, Mongol, Uyghur, Tibetan, and Chinese peoples, and the Qing sovereign became at once the khan of khans, the Buddhist Bodhisattva, and the Chinese emperor. The Ottoman ruler, to give another example, similarly cast himself as all things to all people: a sultan to Muslims, a khan to central Eurasian groups, a shah or padishah to the French, and even a Caesar, tsar, and imperator to others.[8] In short, imperial sovereigns became universal rulers as they made grand claims over vast territory and diverse people.[9]

In each of these cases, from the Qing to the Hapsburg, historians have explained the formation of early modern empires through the impression of military might and bureaucratic governance.[10] The conquest, or threat of conquest, facilitated the incorporation of new territory and populations. In doing so, new peoples were not assimilated but dignified and held up as a constituency of the imperial center. In order to effectively govern such territory and populations, rulers built multiethnic administrations and developed new ruling techniques and strategies. This governing of larger territories and more peoples and groups necessitated more robust administrative and communication apparatuses, not to mention translators, scribes, and archivists, which were drawn from all over the empire.[11]

This all seems quite obvious to us now, and historians have done a fine job in describing these developments and practices. Scholars are now in a position to ask how it all started. To rely on an explanation of war misses the moment of capitulation and integration—the

[7] These characteristics empire are discussed in Richard Lachmann, "What Empires Can and Can't Do," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 60, no. 4 (2018): 16.
[8] Dariusz Kołodziejczyk, "Khan, Caliph, Tsar and Imperator: The Multiple Identities of the Ottoman Sultan," in *Universal Empire: A Comparative Approach to Imperial Culture and Representation in Eurasian History*, ed. Peter F. Bang and Dariusz Kołodziejczyk (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 175–93.
[9] These claims were often articulated through state ceremony that worked to transcend cultural particularities. See Pamela Kyle Crossley and Gene R. Garthwaite, "Post-Mongol States and Early Modern Chronology in Iran and China," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 26, no. 1–2 (2016): 297.
[10] The emphasis on war and bureaucracy in state-formation is surveyed and critiqued in Philip S Gorski, *The Disciplinary Revolution: Calvinism and the Rise of the State in Early Modern Europe* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), ch. 1; Macabe Keliher, *The Board of Rites and the Making of Qing China* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2019), ch. 1.

importance of negotiation where the insider agreed to open the social circle for the outsider. Indeed, what is the mechanism that not only enabled the inclusion of new groups to expand the social polity, but also facilitated the equal recognition by the insider of the newcomer? This article explores the beginning of the process of the Qing expansion of personnel in the 1630s, and identifies a form of surrender ritual used to expand the social order and acclimate insiders and outsiders. It looks closely at the case of 1633, as well as a number of other high-profile surrenders in order to theorize a mechanism of inclusion. The evidence points to ritual: A structured surrender ritual did the work of instructing each actor on his place in the new political order, and showed insiders how to interact with the outsiders. What emerges is a glimpse of the moment of formation of the Qing multiethnic administration, and an explanation that points towards the making of the composition of the early modern empire.

THE MANCHU SOCIO-MILITARY ORDER

Prior to the 1630s, Ming subjects who surrendered or were captured were often killed, enslaved, or made to serve the Manchu banner forces in some servile capacity.[12] There were anomalies, of course, with ethnic Chinese agents in the Liaodong area working under Nurhaci in the early years,[13] and before Nurhaci's westward expansion began some Chinese military personnel received welcome.[14] But by and large, non-tribal individuals and groups were treated harshly—any Chinese not killed in a raid or the sacking of a city were either turned

---

[11] On importance of bureaucratic operations in early modern empires see Kaya Şahin, *Empire and Power in the Reign of Süleyman: Narrating the Sixteenth-Century Ottoman World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

[12] See Liu Chia-chü, "The Creation of the Chinese Banners in the Early Ch'ing," *Chinese Studies in History* 14, no. 4 (July 1, 1981); Mo Dongyin, *Manzushi luncong* (Beijing: Renmin chubanshe, 1958), 136-139; Zheng Tianting, *Qingshi tanwei* (Taipei: Dali, 1983), 60-63; Wakeman, *The Great Enterprise*, 45-46.

[13] See Crossley, *A Translucent Mirror*, 95-96. There was also an attempt by Nurhaci to conscript Chinese males for military service in the early 1620's, but was quickly ended after a Chinese revolt in 1625. See Guo Chengkang and Zhang Jinfan, *Qing ruguanqian guojia faluzhidu shi* (Liaoning: Liaoning renmin chubanshe, 1988), 299-301; Gertraude Roth Li, "The Rise of the Early Manchu State: A Portrait Drawn from Manchu Sources to 1636" (PhD Dissertation, Harvard University, 1975), 67-96.

[14] Guo and Zhang, *Qing ruguanqian*, 301; Frederic E Wakeman, *The Great Enterprise: The Manchu Reconstruction of Imperial Order in Seventeenth-Century China* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), 60-62, 168-169.

into serfs under the ownership of banner personnel, or placed into indentured servitude supporting Manchu military troops and their families. Even the high profile generals who surrendered prior to Kong and Geng, and were given official positions, such as Li Yongfang, Tong Yangxing, and Shi Tingzhu, were not entirely trusted, and their troops were disbanded.[15] Similarly, the early surrenders of Chinese literati, such as Fan Wencheng, found that they did not have any real position or influence until their tenure under Hong Taiji. It was not until 1631 with the establishment of the six boards administration structure, and the creation of the Chinese-martial (Hanjun), who were used to drag heavy cannon into the field, that Han Chinese began to become incorporated into the early Manchu state.[16]

Such treatment is not surprising given the socio-military organization of banners that made up the early Manchu state.[17] Having formed, by some accounts, as early as the late sixteenth century, the banner organization was more than just a military formation; it embraced entire family and tribal units to encompass all aspects of life.[18] The banners had formed and expanded based on the incorporation of entire tribes and villages. Led by the tribal or village head, a group of people would be mobilized as a whole in service of the banner. Thus, the group would be made into a company (niru) that was part of a regiment (jalan) that combined to form the banner. The company would consist of a hundred to three hundred fighting men (later this was standardized at three hundred) but would also include the families of these men who would accompany them in support on campaign.[19] The

[15] Zheng Tianting, *Qingshi tanwei* (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 1999).
[16] For a good discussion of ethnicity in the banners see Mark C. Elliott, "Ethnicity in the Qing Eight Banners," in *Empire at the Margins: Culture, Ethnicity, and Frontier in Early Modern China*, ed. Pamela Kyle Crossley and Donald S. Sutton (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), 27-57.
[17] For discussions of the formation of the early Manchu organization see Ch'en Wen-shih, "The Creation of the Manchu Niru," *Chinese Studies in History* 14, no. 4 (July 1, 1981): 11–46; Pamela Kyle Crossley, *The Manchus* (Blackwell Publishers, 1997); Crossley, *A Translucent Mirror*; Elliott, *The Manchu Way*; Liu Xiaomeng, *Manzu cong buluo dao guojia de fazhan* (Beijing: Zhongguo shekexue, 2007); Yao Niansi, *Qingchu zhengzhishi tanwei* (Liaoning: Liaoning minzu chubanshe, 2008); Zhou Yuanlian, *Qingchao xingqi shi* (Guilin: Guangxi shifan daxue, 2006).
[18] On this point see especially Elliott, "Ethnicity in the Qing Eight Banners," 30; Liu, *Manzu cong buluo dao guojia.*
[19] Liu, *Manzu cong buluo dao guojia*, 146-151.

structure drew on the native tribal organization to incorporate new members, and in this way, the banners consisted of all members of society: free and unfree, soldiers and farmers, wives and slaves, children and old folks, the healthy and sick. The banner unit would mobilize soldiers and do military drills, but it would also distribute pay and grain, and allocate housing, as well as enforce restrictions and pass judgment on crimes and social transgressions. The banner unit would also be in charge of registering births, marriages, and deaths, as well as arranging burials. In short, there were no outsiders, for incorporated groups would come under control and work in service of the banner organization.

In the early seventeenth century, conquered and surrendered Manchu tribes were quickly absorbed into the banner system, as were various Mongol groups.[20] Nurhaci began to gain regional influence in the late 1580s as more and more groups came under his control. In the mid 1590s he had a decisive battle with the largest federation of tribes, the Hūlun, as well as the alliances of the Haiši federation and Mongols. In 1599 he defeated the Hada groups, and in 1611 subjugated the Hūrha and Warka confederations. Given that the nomadic and semi-nomadic tribe and village was the original social unit that came to form the banners, and the basis upon which expansion depended, such peoples were easily accommodated. With victories over these groups their acceptance of defeat and the authority of Nurhaci, they could be placed under the command of a banner and be trusted to partake in the effort of military conquest under their same commander. In fact, there was little immediate change for the majority of these peoples after subjugation or surrender beyond their professed allegiance to Nurhaci. Their motivation was a share in booty obtained through conquest.

Mongols were readily incorporated into this system but Chinese were not.[21] Mongols shared similar cultural practices as the Manchu tribes, and had similar units of social organization, namely nomadic or semi-nomadic tribes under a headman. As Nurhaci put it on

[20] See Liu, *Manzu cong buluo dao guojia*, esp. ch. 2.

more than one occasion, "The language of our two countries, Mongol and Jurchen, is different, but the clothes we wear and the ways that we live are all the same."[22] To accept the surrender of the northeastern tribes and to incorporate them into the banner system involved a process of assigning the group a unit, or of forming a company out of it. When the numbers of Mongol units reached a critical mass, the Eight Banner Mongols were formed in one motion in 1635, consisting of eighty-two companies.[23] The Chinese, however, could not be dealt with in the same way, as their unit of social organization diverged too greatly. They were either freebooters pursuing trade, and thus independent and unattached,[24] or settled-agrarian peasants with an immediate or extended family but not part of a tribal structure. They could not be readily incorporated into a banner system that relied upon affiliation with a unit based on personal loyalties to an immediate superior and with hierarchical allegiances from the rank and file soldier up through the ranks to the khan because they lacked any such affiliation. To whom should they pay allegiance and why? Wherein lay their loyalties? Even more so, how to organize them at all? Even if they could be rounded up and placed within a unit based on their village or city affiliation, who was going to undertake such an endeavor? Nurhaci and his staff, not to mention the relatives, had other things on their mind, namely the mobilization of the banners for further conquest. The easiest thing to do with the surrendered and subjugated Chinese, therefore, was to assign them a social status based on existing categories of slave or servant, and to attach them in servitude to existing banner units. Even after the process of their incorporation into the socio-military order began in the 1630s, as argued below, the formation of a Chinese banner system was a long time in coming, taking place over more than a decade.

---

[21] Early attempts to integrate Chinese led to protests by Manchus and a series of revolts in the 1620s. See Roth Li, "The Rise of the Early Manchu State," 67-97.

[22] *Manbun rōtō*, ed. Kanda Nobū, 7 vols. (Tōkyō: Tōyō Bunko, 1955–1963) (hereafter MR), 1.160, Tm4.6; MR 1.192, Tm4.10; MR 1.211, Tm5.1.17.

[23] On the Eight Banner Mongols see Guo and Zhang, *Qing ruguan qian*, 263-299; Elliott, *The Manchu Way*, 72-78.

To put this in perspective, strategy up into around the 1620s was one of raid and pillage, not of subjugating settled populations and annexing territory. The work of conquering and holding territory came later, in a gradual policy shift that is outlined in the next section. Here it is important to highlight the meaning of the khan as a keeper and distributer of slaves and goods, rather than a ruler of men. It was a position at the head of a confederation of tribes or clans, and was held with the corporate acquiescence and cooperation of the leaders of those tribes. Such a role meant the regular expression of power through conquest, and the ability to deliver capital in the form of booty and slaves.[25] The khan thus had to continue to wage war, to expand areas under his control in order to be able to give his constituencies more goods and people. In the words of one modern-day historian, "He had no choice but to conquer, and to plan new conquests to feed the mouths he had acquired in his last."[26]

The strategy was to destroy cities and enemy bases, and to grab booty and take captives. This loot was then removed from the raided territory and transported back to Manchu controlled areas. A few examples from the *Shilu* will illustrate. In 1616, Nurhaci captured Fushun, but rather than occupy and govern the city he left four-thousand troops to destroy the place while he led the rest of his army eastward and divided up three-hundred thousand captives amongst the banners as a reward to use as slaves.[27] Four years later, Nurhaci sent out armies to destroy Ming bases and military camps in the region,[28] and in 1625, he ordered three relatives to lead six thousand troops to attack Shunkou. "Conquer it; obliterate the Ming troops; and destroy the city then return," he ordered.[29] Hong Taiji followed a similar policy early in his reign. In 1628, banner forces attacked Jinzhou and Songshan, where they took out three major bridges, destroyed thirteen military stations, killed thirty guards, and brought

---

[24] Wakeman referred to them as "transfrontiersmen." Wakeman, *The Great Enterprise,* 37-49.
[25] See Joseph Fletcher, "Turco-Mongolian Tradition in the Ottoman Empire," in *Eucharisterion: Essays Presented to Omeljan Pritsak on His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. Ihor Ševcenko and Frank E. Sysyn (Cambridge: Ukrainian Research Institute, Harvard University, 1980).
[26] Crossley, *The Manchus*, 54. See also Crossley, *A Translucent Mirror*, 138-167.
[27] *Da Qing shilu* (hereafter SL), 71.1, Tm1.4.4.

back eight hundred prisoners and animals.[30] Even as late as 1631, operations at Dalinghe were no different: Manchu forces destroyed the city, and surrendering Ming troops and generals were dispersed among the banners.[31]

The Chinese at the receiving end of these missions of raid and destruction found themselves in a bad spot. Most often those captured in raids were divided among the banner units to serve as household slaves or farmhands, as was the case in the 1616 sacking of Fushun. Even high profile surrenders during this time, such as Ming commander Li Yongfang, or gentry Fan Wencheng, could not be incorporated into the socio-military order and had little place in Nurhaci's state. Although they avoided enslavement, they were marginalized and continued to find themselves subjected to the authority of the banners. In the case of the former, he got gifts and honors, but no command and no real social position. In the case of the latter, he had no voice or position until Hong Taiji employed him in the Literature Hall (wenguan), and even then it was as but a translator and record keeper.[32]

CHINESE SUBJECTS AND THE CHANGING SOCIAL POLITY

There is a marked contrast in the treatment of the Chinese pre-1633 and that of Kong and Geng. As outlined above, early Chinese people were subjugated and enslaved. Kong and Geng, however, kept their troops, were given independent command, had the ability to promote and demote, were granted titles, and had a place in ceremony alongside the banner lords. In effect, they were situated within the social order.

This change of attitude and action is seen reflected in a policy shift due to the occupation of territory and increasing number of Chinese subjects under Manchu control. Beginning

---

[28] *Manzhou shilu* (hereafter MZSL), 279.2, Tm4.8.19.
[29] MZSL, 376.1, Tm10.1.14.
[30] SL, 50.1, Tc2.5.23.
[31] *Da Qing taizong wenhuangdi shilu* (*Chuzuanben shilu*), National Palace Museum, Taipei, catalog #103000136-76 (hereafter CZBSL), 8.18b, Tc5.11.9.
[32] Biographies in *Ming-Qing Name Authority File* database, National Palace Museum, Taipei.

around 1615, Nurhaci and the banners faced economic difficulties that left them with food shortages and dwindling supplies. A few years later, this situation was compounded when the Ming closed the Liaodong border markets. Rather than continue to raid and pillage, the response was to push west and south into the agrarian areas of Ming-controlled territory in search of more arable land with agricultural producers and their products. The decision to do so was a shift in policy from raid and pillage for booty and slaves towards one of occupation and exploitation. As Nurhaci told his banner lords in 1615 when pressed to attack the Mongols, "We do not even have enough food to feed ourselves. If we conquer, how will we feed them?" He continued to argue that already too many captives and animals were under Manchu protection than they had resources to accommodate. "During this time, let us first take care of our people, shore up our territory, make borders, till fields, and fill the granaries."[33] A few years after this conversation, however, Nurhaci and his forces began their march on Liaodong, sacking Fushun and Qinghe in 1618, and taking prisoners and provisions. In 1621, they took the major towns on the peninsula and except for the very tip, occupied the entire area.[34]

With territory came population. The conquest of Liaodong in 1621 left the conquerors with over a million Chinese peasants to administer. Similarly, Hong Taiji's siege of Jinzhou in 1627 ended with the surrender of two thousand Ming guards, which he sent off to Shanhaiguan pass, telling them to find their own way back to the Ming. Hong Taiji sent the commoners marooned from that conquest to Jinzhou, but they were rejected, which forced Hong Taiji to send them back to the Ming via Shanhaiguan pass as well.[35] Then, the capture of Dalinghe in 1631 put the Manchus in control of a large population of commoners and peasants, as well as a number of Ming military leaders who willingly submitted.[36]

[33] MR 1.46-48, WL43.6.
[34] Gertraude Roth Li, "State Building before 1644," 40-42.
[35] SL, p. 46.1, Tc1.5.11.
[36] The narrative of Dalinghe is recounted in detail in Wakeman, *The Great Enterprise.*

Economic pressure and military success can speak to the phenomenon of the expansion of the Manchu operation, but it does not explain the organization of individuals under their expanding jurisdiction. What these actors aimed to achieve and why the policy of inclusion began to take the form that it did lies at the heart of the inquiry here. To assume a necessary progression from Jurchen tribes to agrarian-bureaucratic state that would by definition expand, hold territory, and include Chinese subjects only rationalizes a phenomenon that needs to be explained. The alternative to accepting the surrender of Chinese generals was to do what they had been doing for so long: raiding and pillaging while maintaining a mobile organization sourced on booty, trade, and slaves. And yet they did not.

The answer to the question about the emergence of the Manchu state is part social and part political.

The social composition

Socially, the early Manchu polity was changing as a result of military success. Initially, the incorporation of other tribes and peoples under Nurhaci expanded his operation and the territory under his control. This led to the formation of a socio-military system that would enable the permanent mobilization of society. Evan as the number of incorporated groups grew, the organizational structure deepened through the expansion of ranks and units, but the constancy of the original banner system of immediate allegiance to tribal head, banner commanders, leaders, and owners remained in tack. As long as the incorporated shared a similar culture of violence and reward, as well as in the practice of social life, then the system could, theoretically, continue to uphold this type of social expansion indefinitely along these organizational lines.[37] Doing so would mean the greater mobilization of men, the control of territory, populations, and economic resources, including trading markets, but most

[37] Or at least until the passing of the khan. See Fletcher, "Turco-Mongolian Tradition in the Ottoman Empire."

importantly, the solidification of power over groups in a region, who had long been in conflict among themselves. Nurhaci was building, by all intents and purposes, a regional hegemony.[38]

It is doubtful that Nurhaci had intentions to conquer the Ming and set up a Chinese-style dynasty.[39] Economic pressures and the Ming closing of border markets forced him into open hostilities with the Ming, however, and the issuing of seven grievances in 1618 seemed to indicate that he had intentions to attack the Ming and extend territorial control. This began with the conquest and occupation of Ming controlled areas of the Liaodong peninsula. A tightening economy and the need to continue to supply his followers with food and booty forced the incursion and eventual administration of settled agrarian Chinese there. The governing of arable land and agrarian producers brought with it new challenges, however, not only for the governing apparatus, but also for the composition of the polity. Most immediately was the administration of more territory and more people of settled agrarian culture and practice, who differed from nomadic and semi-nomadic tribes that upheld personal loyalties and a socio-military form of life. Thus, where sedentary subjects were at one time enslaved or killed, the Manchus now began to leave them on their land and attempted surplus extraction. When sacking Fushun in 1618, for example, Nurhaci issued promises to the Chinese population that they would not be harmed and would be allowed to continue their ways of life untouched.

A more complete transition of attitude and policy is seen in Hong Taiji. When he became khan in 1627, he distanced himself from atrocities committed against Chinese and blamed his father for such acts, indicating that he would rule more humanely over subject populations.[40] What exactly he would do, however, was not entirely clear, and he took some time to develop

[38] Crossley, *A Translucent Mirror,* 158.
[39] See Crossley, *A Translucent Mirror*, 138-145; Li Xuezhi, "Qing taizu shiqi jianchu wenti de fenxi," *Siyuyan* no. 8:2 (July 1970): 1–9; Wada Sei, "Some Problems Concerning the Rise of T'ai-tsu, the Founder of the Manchu Dynasty," *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko* 16 (1957): 35–73.

a strategy. His actions and words indicate a shift in consciousness from the accepting of surrenders but not knowing what to do with them, to the desire and encouragement of newly surrendered populations, which would become a tax base, and finally to having an institutionalized system in place in order to deal with them—the Eight Banner Hanjun.[41] As mentioned above, in his initial conquests in 1626, Hong Taiji was unclear on how to handle surrendered populations, and sent them away to other areas or back to the Ming. A few years later, he had to warn his military not to kill those who surrendered:

> Do not kill those who refuse to fight. Those who surrender, although they may have chickens and pigs, do not invade and harass them. In taking prisoners, do not separate them from their fathers, sons, and wives. Do not sexually harass the women. Do not take people's clothes, destroy their homes, or steal their utensils and ironware.[42]

When attacking Yongping in 1630, Hong Taiji similarly ordered the banner lord leading the charge to allow people to surrender and not to harass them. He put Chinese official Fan Wencheng in charge and issued an order to give non-military affiliated commoners grain and let them live outside the city. He told the lord in charge specifically not to harm the people or their fields. "Those who have surrendered," Hong Taiji said, "are a model to see for those Chinese who have not surrendered. I fear losing this model."[43]

Eventually Hong Taiji and his allies would push a policy of inclusion. This policy set the basis for composition of the Qing state and how it would operate amongst, within, and through different cultural groups and their practices. It is hard to tell how premeditated it

---

[40] Guo and Zhang, *Qing ruguanqian,* 302-311.
[41] This can be seen in statements over the course of a sixteen-year period from the first year of his khanship in 1627 to the formation of the Eight Banners Hanjun in 1642. For some examples see SL, 46-1, Tc1.5.11; SL, 93-1, Tc4.2.22; Jiu Manzhou dang, ed., Chen Jiexian (1636. Reprint, Taipei: Guoli gugong bowuyuan, 1969), 156, Tc9.5.27; *Baqi tongzhi jichu,* ed., Ortai (1739. Reprint, Taipei: Taiwan xuesheng shuju, 1968), v. 1, Cd5.7.
[42] SL, 75.2, Tc3.10.20.

was—how much this system came about by design and how much it was a situation of circumstance. Although food shortages in the 1620s and 30s actively forced the need to expand the basis of operation in order to secure food for Qing forces, it is not the case that there was only one path open to Manchu rulers.[44] Nomadic and semi-nomadic peoples had encountered such conditions before and they made different decisions. Indeed, Hong Taiji's brothers at various points suggested splintering off and taking command of their own raid and pillage operations across the northeast. But Hong Taiji argued for the occupation and rule of sedentary populations, and ultimately for their full incorporation into the Qing polity.[45]

The politics

With this shifting social composition came a struggle over politics. What would society look like? How would political resources be divided? Who would be included and who be excluded? The lack of detailed records on such debates obscure the intensity of the conflict, but enough peripheral evidence remains to give a sense of the different positions, and to understand the terms of the settlement in who won and who lost. Hong Taiji and his supporters worked to expand the social base of the early Manchu state in order to solidify political position and further marginalize the military power and autonomy of the banner lords. Not only did this mean the diminishment of the independence and power of the banner lords over administration and policy, but it also began to reorganize the socio-military organization of the banners. If control could be redirected to Hong Taiji and the state, and command of human and financial resources taken out of the hands of the banners, then not

[43] MR 4.383-386, Tc4.5.13.
[44] This argument of economic pressures is developed by Roth Li, and taken up by Wakemen to a degree as well. Their analysis leans heavily towards a conclusion about the necessity of the choices made and the institutions created. Roth Li, "The Rise of the Early Manchu State*;"* Wakeman, *The Great Enterprise.*
[45] There is an open question here about Hong Taiji's vision and whether it was cohesive or just piecemeal, made up as he went along in order to secure positions and power for himself and his staff.

only would the influence of the lords be curbed, but the state would also become more centralized, and command over human and financial resources further institutionalized.

One way of doing this was to begin to disrupt the power base of the lords themselves. By granting Chinese generals charge of their own armies and independence outside the socio-military structure of the banners, the influence of the banner lords over politics diminished, as did their resources, for the men and goods that would have been distributed amongst the banners were now made independent. Not only did this deprive the lords of command of more resources, but it also began to construct a parallel military structure that was directly under the command of the khan, Hong Taiji. Hong Taiji even went so far as to grant the newcomer generals princely titles and to seat Kong and Geng at the same level as the lords during imperial ceremony.[46] Relying on the ritual to assert authority and organize political relations, Hong Taiji used these newly surrendered generals in his political struggles against the lords and his relatives, granting them power and autonomy at the expense of his political rivals.

THE RITUAL OF SURRENDER

It is one thing to marginalize political competitors, but it is quite another to enact a new practice of politics and order. The expansion of the structure of Manchu society beyond the banners necessitated a means to incorporate others. Outsiders needed to be given a place within society, and the social order had to come to terms with new cultural groups. Different means were employed to do so, including violence, honors, and economic incentives.[47] For Hong Taiji and the early Manchu state, ritual did this work.

[46] Kong and Geng were given rank of beile; and in ceremony given positions alongside the eight banner beile. NGSY, p. 1, Tc8.1.1.

[47] There are a substantial number of studies on the surrender of Ming subjects to the Manchus in the pre-conquest period. These studies give primacy to economic incentives and the promise of position. Two examples are Chen-main Wang, *The Life and Career of Hung Ch'eng-ch'ou*; Yeh Kao-shu, *Xianqing Mingjiang yanjiu (1618-1683)* (Taipei: Shifandaxue, 1993.)

The subjugation of former enemies and their incorporation into the political order took place through ritual. Ritual worked as a facilitating mechanism, serving as the means through which violence could be deployed, by which honors would be granted, and rewards and gifts given. The ritual practice showed the surrendered how they would fit into the order, offering instruction on how to relate to others and where the lines of power were drawn. Similarly, the rituals told the existing political actors how to view and treat these outsiders; it showed what role the newcomers would play in the existing order and how they would be incorporated.

The case of the surrender of Kong Youde and Geng Zhongming in 1633 speaks to this matter. The two Chinese generals had served the Ming dynasty in Liaodong, defending the area northeast of the Great Wall from uprisings and Manchu incursion. But with the death of their superior, Mao Wenlong, they and their troops became dissatisfied with the turn of events and gone rogue to wreak havoc on the Liaodong peninsula and cities on the Bohai sea coast.[48] Pinched between Ming naval forces, they moved to arrange a surrender with Hong Taiji.[49] They were warmly welcomed, and by order of the khan received lavish gifts and banquets.[50] Then, on the third day of the sixth month of 1633—almost two weeks after the initial surrender—Hong Taiji as khan led all the imperial relatives out of the capital to the mouth of the Hun river to greet the surrendering generals. There on the coast, the Manchus set up camp, where the khan stood at the head of the ranking Manchu lords and their banners, and led all in performing the rite of three genuflections and nine prostrations to give thanks to

[48] Kong Youde's rebellion against the Ming is taken up in Christopher S. Agnew, "Migrants and Mutineers: The Rebellion of Kong Youde and Seventeenth-Century Northeast Asia," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 52, no. 3 (2009): 505–541. On the disruption in Liaodong see Hong Taiji's statement to the beile on Tc7.6.3, where he says that Kong and Geng seized Dengzhou city thus creating great disorder. Kanda Nobuo, ed., *Naikokushiin Tō : Tensō 7-Nen* (1633. Reprint, Tōkyō: Tōyō Bunko, 2003), 75 (hereafter NGSY1).
[49] Details of the surrender are discussed in Yeh Kao-shu, *Xiang Qing Mingjiang yanjiu*; Hosoya Yoshio, "The Han Chinese Generals Who Collaborated with Hou-Chin Kuo," *Acta Asiatica* 52 (1988): 39–61; Hosoya Yoshio, "Guishun yu Qingchao de Hanren," in *Qingshi guoji xueshu taolunhui wenji* (Shenyang: Liaoning renmin chubanshe, 1990), 51–59; Kanda Nobuo, "Kou Youtoku no gokin he no raiki: 'Tensō nananentō no kentō o tsūshite," in *Shinchō shi ronkō*, ed. Kanda Nobuo (Tokyo: Tamakawa Press, 2005), 179–192.
[50] Hong Taiji gave clothing and ordered the banner lords to present horses.
Qingchu neiguoshiyuan Manwendang'an yibian (Guangming ribao chubanshe, 1989)
(hereafter NGSY), 1.14, Tc7.5.6; NGSY 1.17, Tc7.5.22; CZBSL 11.35a; SL, 191.2; NGSY, 1.19-20, Tc7.6.3; CZBSL 11.41a; SL, 192.1). Details of extensive banqueting in NGSY 1.20, Tc7.6.5; CZBSL 11.41b.

Heaven. Hong Taiji and his staff then retired to the main tent and prepared to receive Kong and Geng. When they were ready, Kong and Geng lined up their men in order of rank. The two generals advanced in front and knelt and bowed in the proper rite for greeting the Ming emperor.[51]

At this point, Hong Taiji did something even more unusual. He requested that Kong and Geng come to the foot of his throne so that they might perform the embracing rite (Ch. baojian li 抱見禮; Ma. tebeliyere doro). They first kowtowed once more and then embraced the khan. Then they performed the same rite with the imperial relatives, embracing the senior relatives and the other relatives in turn. When this rite was complete, all performed the three genuflections and nine prostrations to Hong Taiji as khan. Kong and Geng then sat beneath the khan's throne and presented their gifts of gold and silver cast objects, clothing, and textiles. The ritual came to a close with the holding of a banquet and the khan pouring wine from his own hand and holding it to the lips of the surrendered.[52] As the banquet ended, they were given more gifts.

This surrender ritual set a standard and was repeated for the acceptance of the surrender of Ming generals in this early period. The ritual was comprised of a number of basic parts, which included the following: the sending of emissaries to greet and accept the formal surrender, the khan traveling out of the capital to meet the surrendered, an imperial audience, the giving of gifts, and banqueting. As seen in Hong Taiji's acts during the imperial audience with Kong and Geng, these aspects of the ritual had cultural components of particular importance, including the khan leading kowtows to Heaven, the use of Chinese and Manchu practices to interact with the sovereign, and acceptance by the banner lords. Before discussing these components in greater detail, it is important to first outline the surrender of

[51] Documents do not describe what exactly they did here, only say that they knelt as they would in the rite for audience with the Ming emperor. See NGSY 1.19.
[52] Manchu customs dictated that the host pour and offer wine to the guest. If the guest was younger, he would kneel and receive the wine. See Xiao Yishan, *Qingdai Tongshi* (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshu guan), 71.

two other Ming generals, Shang Kexi in 1634 and Shen Zhixiang in 1638, increasing the repertoire of cases under observation.

Shang Kexi. With the fate of Ming control in the northeast becoming increasingly dire in the face of Manchu strength in the 1630s, other Ming generals also began to envision their future with the Qing instead of the Ming. Shang Kexi was one such general. He had served with Kong and Geng under Mao Wenlong and led Ming forces on Liaodong, where he was charged with the holding of Pi Island.[53] Within four and a half months of the surrender of Kong and Geng, Shang also began to express his intent to join Hong Taiji.[54] In the second month of the following year (1634), the Board of Rites president was dispatched with a welcoming party to greet the general.[55]

On the tenth day of the fourth month of 1634, the khan led the lords and his officials 10 li out of the capital to meet the arriving Shang Kexi. A camp was set up in a similar manner to that of the Kong and Geng ceremony, and the khan led his officials, along with Shang and his subordinates in bowing to Heaven in the Manchu three genuflections and nine prostrations. The khan then took his place on a throne in a yellow tent. Shang did five kowtows from afar, and then two kowtows when he approached. An embracing rite ensued, whereby Shang hugged the knees of the emperor before doing one kowtow and retreating. The rite was then extended for Shang to perform one kowtow to the senior relatives, and to embrace them. When he had finished, his subordinate officials did five kowtows from afar, and his troops one kowtow. Shang presented the khan with gifts of textiles, of which a quarter were accepted, and then sat on the left of the khan, while his officials and troops reposed in blue

[53] For more on Shang Kexi see Sun Wenliang and Li Zhiting, "Shang Kexi Yu Shangshi Zongpu Yanjiu," *Dongbeishi Yanjiu* 1 (1983).
[54] He sent two emissaries to Mukden in the tenth month of 1633, see NGSY1, 174, Tc7.10.24.
[55] Kusunoki Yoshimichi and Matsumura Jun, eds., *Naikokushiin Tō : Tensō 8-Nen* (1634, Reprint, Tōkyō: Tōyō Bunko, 2009), 59-60, Tc8.2.5 (hereafter NGSY2). See also NGSY2, 78-9, Tc8.2.16.

tents on the left side. For the ritual banquet, ox and sheep were slaughtered and wine presented. After the banquet, the emperor gave rich rewards to Shang for his submission, including court clothing, belts, hats, bows and arrows, furs, saddles, and horses and other animals. Shang led his officials in three kowtows before retiring. Over the next five days, the junior relatives also hosted banquets for Shang.[56]

Shen Zhixiang. The Ming general Shen Zhixiang surrendered in 1638. Much like the surrender of Kong and Geng, and Shang, the ceremony for Shen consisted of reporting, welcoming, banqueting, and imperial audience that occurred over the course of many months. In addition to these practice, the extant records on Shen also detail officials attempting to bring this former enemy into the fold of the Qing state. They help answer the question of the background of the employment of the surrender ritual and the implementation of li.

The story of Shen Zhixiang's fate begins with the Qing invasion of Korea in 1637. En route to the Korean capital, Manchu troops defeated Ming forces on the coast, and in the process killed Shen's uncle, general Shen Shikui. Shen Zhixiang, who was serving as vice general under Shikui, requested that the Ming appoint him to Shikui's command and to receive his seals. Upon being denied, Shen appointed himself general, and the Ming sent troops to attack him.[57] At this point he entered into surrender discussions with Hong Taiji, which concluded some eight months later with an agreement.[58]

In the middle of 1638, the Board of Rites vice president was sent to welcome Shen. He prepared a banquet, consisting of various cakes, wine, and forty sheep.[59] The emperor wrote expressing his intentions to meet him in Anshan, but due to a measles epidemic could not

[56] NGSY2, 117-119, Tc8.4.10. See also CZBSL 14.12b-13b. The beile hosting banquets were Yoto, Abatai, Mandahai, and Sahaliyan. NGSY 1.76.
[57] For bibliographical information on Shen see *Qinding guishi erchen biaozhuan*, National Palace Museum, Taipei, catalog # 030179, v. 5; Zhao Erxuan, *Qing shigao* (1927), 9416-9417; Wakeman, *The Great Enterprise*, 210.
[58] NGSY3, 300-303, Cd3.4.1.

travel.[60] The greeting ceremony was thus pushed back, and Shen traveled to the capital. The Board of Rites president and vice president greeted the party 5 li outside of the city, where they hosted a banquet and brought them in.[61] On the eleventh day of the seventh month, Shen had his imperial audience with emperor Hong Taiji.[62]

Much like those for Kong and Geng, the ceremonial process is structured. The same practices were undertaken, if in a slightly different order. All the relatives and officials lined up in sequence of rank on each side of the Chongzheng Hall. Shen entered and placed his gifts of silk and textiles on a table and lined up his people outside the Daqing gate. The khan then came out and sat on the throne in the Chongzhen Hall. Shen led in his men in kowtowing. He then presented his gifts to the emperor, who politely refused and returned them all. The emperor then gave Shen rewards of clothing and furs, bow and arrows, and horses and other animals. Shen put on the ritual clothing and kowtowed again to the khan. The emperor exited and the Board of Rites prepared a banquet for Shen and his men.[63] Over the next few weeks, Shen was treated to numerous welcoming banquets.[64]

There were other surrenders, of course, along with the accompanying rituals to carry them out. One of the other high profile surrenders, for example, was the Manchu encirclement of Songshan in 1642, which brought about the surrenders of Zu Dashou and Hong Chengchou, among others.[65] The rites that helped incorporate the defeated generals followed an abbreviated version of the basic format of the three surrenders outline above. These three examples are of the richest and provide sufficient material across a long enough time frame to

[59] Kawauchi Yoshihiro, ed., *Naikokushiin manbun tō'an yakuchū: sūtoku ni san nen bun* (Kyoto: Shoukadoh Book Sellers, 2010) (hereafter NGSY3), 283, Cd3.4.2; CZBSL 27.36b.
[60] NGSY3, 295, Cd3.4.20; CZBSL 27.44a-b.
[61] NGSY3, 424, Cd3.7.9; CZBSL 10b.
[62] NGSY3, 425-7, Cd3.7.11; CZBSL 28.10b-11a.
[63] NGSY3, 425-7, Cd3.7.11; CZBSL 28.10b-11a.
[64] See SL 558.1, Cd3.7.16; SL 558.2, Cd3.7.22.

give a sense of the structure of the ritual and how it was employed during this formative state-making period.

The ritual structure

From the ritual of surrender practiced during the Hong Taiji era, four basic structural parts can be identified: welcoming the surrendered, an imperial audience, the exchange of gifts, and extensive banqueting.[66] The process of the ritual usually played out in a particular order of a welcoming party sent out and which often included an initial banquet, the holding of the imperial audience, the surrendered offering gifts, the emperor hosting a banquet, the emperor giving gifts, and more banquets hosted by imperial relatives. This order could vary, however, as in the case of Shen Zhixiang who received gifts before the banquet rather than after, as was often the practice. The components of this structure and how they worked to both reflect and create a social order are discussed below.

Welcoming the surrendered. The process of bringing the enemy over to the Qing side began with a welcoming party sent out by the khan from the capital to greet the surrendering general and his troops. This welcoming party consisted of high-level officials with a knowledge about the ritual protocol. Board of Rites officials handled the surrender of Shen Zhixiang, as well as that of Xia Chengde in 1642.[67] The welcoming almost always included a banquet, as can be

[65] The ritual acts for these surrenders can be found in SL 2.799/2a, 2.842/2, 2.837/2b-838/1a. For further discussions of these surrenders see Wakeman, *The Great Enterprise,* 221; Wang, *The Life and career of Hung Ch'eng-ch'ou*, ch. 4.

[66] This analysis of the ritual structure is reminiscent of the work of James Hevia and Angela Zito. Whereas they detailed the logic of Qing ritual, I focus on the work that ritual did to bring actors together to co-create a sociopolitical order. James Hevia, *Cherishing Men from Afar: Qing Guest Ritual and the Macartney Embassy of 1793* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1995); Angela Zito, *Of Body & Brush: Grand Sacrifice as Text/Performance in Eighteenth-Century China* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997).

[67] The role of the Board of Rites in welcoming Xia Chengde is detailed in SL 2.799-2a.

seen from the examples, but could also include a separate event of gift giving, as seen in the surrenders of Kong Youde and Shen Zhixiang.

This part of the ritual was more than just a formality: it had both practical and sociopolitical aspects. Practically, it was a show of force by the Manchu military, both safeguarding Qing personnel from a trap and deterring any hesitation of the surrendering generals about the initial decision to surrender. When Kong and Geng submitted, for example, Hong Taiji sent three imperial relatives at the head of a large military force to the coast as a welcoming party. Lying in wait were Ming troops backed by Korean units prepared to attack Kong, Geng, and the Manchus come to accept their surrender. So intimidated by the size of the Qing force, however, the enemy backed down without a fight.[68] Shen Zhixiang, by contrast had continually expressed doubt about his position, and mentioned numerous times his desire to return to the Ming.[69] The party and troops sent to welcome Shen Zhixiang thus remained in the area after the giving of gifts and banqueting, waiting for the khan's orders.[70] The ritual thus provided the pretext for a form of sanctioned violence. The welcoming party was a military force sent under the guise of ritual protocol of welcoming. It was non-hostile in practice, but could wield force if necessary.[71]

Sociopolitically, the banner lords and high-ranking officials at the head of the welcoming party helped project the hierarchy of the Qing state. Not only was the political order formed in practice of the ranks of various officials and their subordinates, but also the assertion of the order of hierarchical ranks in the initial rituals ensured that the incoming outsiders began to know their place in the political order. This was immediately expressed in

[68] NGSY1, 56-7, Tc7.5.22; CZBSL 11.35a.
[69] See Hong Taiji's letter to Shen on Cd2.9.6. CZBSL, 26.39b-40b; SL, p. 501/1b-2a.
[70] NGSY3, 259-260, Cd3.2.27.
[71] On the intersection of ritual and violence see Avron A. Boretz, "Martial Gods and Magic Swords: Identity, Myth, and Violence in Chinese Popular Religion," *Journal of Popular Culture* 29, no. 1 (1995): 93–109; T. Kleeman, "Licentious Cults and Bloody Victuals: Sacrifice, Reciprocity, and Violence in Traditional China," *Asia Major* (1994): 185–211; James L Watson, "Fighting with Operas: Processionals, Politics, and the Spectre of Violence in Rural Hong Kong," in *The Politics of Cultural Performance: Essays in Honour of Abner Cohen*, ed. David Parkin, Lionel Caplan, and Humphrey Fisher (London: Berghahn Books, 1996).

the banquet. As a highly formalized event that put actors in specific relations with one another based on their political position, the banquet began to help actors identify themselves and their positions vis-a-vis others. Tables and seating were organized by rank in statement of position and authority, and which also determined the quality and quantity of food and drink.[72]

Imperial audience. Meeting with the emperor was at the core of the surrender ritual, for it at once established the relationship of power and authority between sovereign and his new subject, while at the same time began to establish the bonds of loyalty of the newcomer. There were four components to this part of the ritual: arrival, entering, meeting, and exiting.

This part of the ritual began with the surrendered coming to imperial audience. This first took the form of the emperor traveling a certain distance to the site of surrender, as in the cases of Kong and Shang. These two cases are the only ones on record in which the emperor left the capital to greet the surrendered and hold the ceremony at a distant location, however. In the former case, the emperor led the relatives and his officials out of the city in a procession complete with parasols and ritual instruments to a location of 10 li.[73] In the cases of the latter, Hong Taiji intended to travel but was prevented by a measles epidemic, and thus sent a welcoming party to meet the surrendering general and escort him into the city. A Board of Rites president or vice president would always be a member of the welcoming party, and most often at the head of it. They would arrange to meet the surrendered at a point of a certain distance from the city—for Shen it was 5 li, for Xia Chengde it was 15 li—and at that point a banquet would be set up and held before bringing them into the capital.

[72] The importance of banquet seating is discussed in Emil Esin, "Oldrug-Turug: The Hierarchy of Sedent Postures in Turkish Iconography," *Kunst Des Oriens* 7, no. 1 (1970): 1–29.
[73] For a general discussion of ritual implements for the imperial procession see Li Li, "Lun Qingchu yizhang zhi zhi de yanbian," *Liaoning Daxue Xuebao* 5 (1992): 42–46.

When camp was set up, or the surrendering general had arrived, the emperor would then appear on the scene. When the emperor traveled outside of the capital, he led the imperial relatives, officials, troops, and the surrendered in performing prostrations to Heaven. Here the emperor acted as a sovereign at the head of an order of ranked civil and military officials. At this moment, in front of all, he undertook practices required of the sovereign as head of the state. He stood at the top of the political order, and the newly surrendered generals took their place in that political order allowing themselves to be led in an act of reverence while simultaneously subjugating themselves to the command of the ritual and the authority of their new sovereign. When the emperor held audience for the surrendered in the capital, it is likely that he also led a performance of three genuflections and nine prostrations to Heaven, even if accounts are lacking on the matter. What can be said is that the hierarchy of lords and officials lined up in the wings of the hall, along with the placing of the surrendered in a sequence, and the entrance of the emperor to take his place on the throne, had the effect of situating actors within a certain political order. The emergent imperial order was being projected through a ritual as it was simultaneously coming into being.

The third component of the imperial audience was the face-to-face meeting of the sovereign and the surrendered general. Some form of kowtow was always involved, whereby the general approached the emperor and performed prostrations. The idea was to express a proper form of respect and servitude to the sovereign. The Ming form of kowtow was deemed appropriate for Kong and Geng, and explicitly stated as such. For Shang, he did five kowtows from afar and then two when he was near. Editors of records of subsequent surrender rituals did not make this point very clear, noting merely that the surrendering generals kowtowed.[74] Nonetheless, such acts of one party kneeling and prostrating while the other party stood in acceptance helped establish the relationship of subordination to authority. In both the Kong

[74] The flexibility and variation of Qing audience rituals is discussed in Hevia, *Cherishing Men from Afar*.

and Shang surrenders Hong Taiji used an embracing rite—a Manchu practice used among kin and close allies for greeting after long absences.[75] This embracing rite was employed to build a patrimonial relationship between Hong Taiji and these former Ming generals, and to welcome them into the fold of the emerging sociopolitical order. But it did more than just that. It also signaled to Manchu political actors that these Chinese surrenders were being accepted into the Manchu polity.[76] Hong Taiji insisted on using it, much to the dismay of the relatives, who thought the use of the Manchu custom to greet the Chinese was unacceptable, and far beyond the respect that these turncoats deserved.[77]

As the imperial audience came to a close, the honored generals would perform more kowtows to the emperor and wait for the next stage of the ritual to commence. This last act of the imperial audience would take the form of the Manchu style of three genuflections and nine prostrations performed to the emperor by the generals at the head of their troops. This rite was the same one that the emperor led everyone in performance to Heaven, and symbolically it was here repeated with the sovereign standing in the spot of Heaven as everyone else symbolically subjugated themselves to the sovereign. Thus, once again, political relationships were expressed in the ritual by delineating the lines of power drawn from the emperor down through the ranked subjects—the generals leading their subordinates and troops in kowtowing to the sovereign. The ritual was here a site to reinforce the political relationships that had been determined in the settlements of conflicts, both between Hong Taiji and his brothers, as well as between the Manchus and their enemies.

---

[75] This definition of the embracing rite is given in MZSL, 281.2, Tm5.8.19. "In Manchu custom, those who meet after a long absence must embrace in an expression of endearment."

[76] The embracing rite is further discussed in Du Jiaji, "Cong ruguanqian dang'an kan Manzu baojianli su," *Lishidang'an* 2 (1998); Wei Ze, "Manzu de baojianli," *Manyu yanjiu* 1 (2007); Zhao Gang, "Qingdai gongting baojianli mantan," *Zijincheng* 2 (1992).

[77] Disagreements over the use of the embracing rite between Hong Taiji and the beile occurred right after the entering stage of the audience rite with Kong and Geng. Hong Taiji insisted on using the rite despite beile opposition. NGSY1, 74-75, Tc7.6.3.

Gifts. The third part of the surrender ritual was the exchange of gifts.[78] On some occasions Hong Taiji was inclined to send gifts to generals immediately upon their surrender, as in the cases of Kong and Shen, but this was rare.[79] More often, the gift giving would commence with the surrendered general offering goods to the khan after the imperial audience ceremony, which were then reciprocated by the khan offering gifts of greater quantity and value after the banquet. In the latter situation, the generals would always accept, usually quite readily as the gifts could be quite lavish, and, as discussed below, the gifts had a political function. The khan would not always receive the gifts of the surrendered generals, however. He received all of Kong and Geng's gifts, but not those of Shang, among whose gifts he only accepted twenty of eighty silks and one hundred of the eight hundred bolts of cotton offered.[80] Similarly, he refused all of the silks and textiles offered by Shen.

The logic behind the emperor's acceptance or rejection of gifts is not entirely clear, but it does point to the formation of political relationships and the exertion of imperial control in the relationship. If the emperor held the surrenderer in high regard and wished to create a close relation with the new general, he might accept his gifts. It was a sign that the sovereign fully accepted the submitted. This was the case with Kong and Geng, whom he also made a forceful argument to use the embracing rite, and would go on to treat them as nobles in ritual ceremonies and grant them titles. By contrast, the 1642 surrender of Zu Dashou, Hong Chengchou, and their subordinates, were less cordial. These were Ming strongmen who for years refused to submit and only did so after a long fruitless siege resulting in a great loss of troops and slow starvation. The generals presented a rich array of gifts to the khan including

[78] For a general discussion of the giving and receiving of gifts in the Chinese context see Yun-xiang Yan, *The Flow of Gifts: Reciprocity and Social Networks in a Chinese Village* (Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 1996). In the Inner Asian context see Donald P. Little, "Diplomatic Missions and Gifts Exchanged by Mamluks and Ilkhans," in *Beyond the Legacy of Genghis Khan*, ed. Linda Komaroff (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 30–42. In early modern Europe see Michael Yonan, "Portable Dynasties: Imperial Gift-Giving at the Court of Vienna in Eighteenth Century," *Court Historian* 14, no. 2 (n.d.): 177–88.
[79] Upon learning of the surrender of Kong and Geng, Hong Taiji told the beile that they had to offer gifts of horses, and he instructed them on how many and what kind. NGSY1, 48-9, Tc7.5.6.
[80] NGSY2, 118, Tc8.4.10.

jewels, silver, and gold, furs, silks, clothing, and horses among other things, all of which Hong Taiji refused. “We are uneasy,” the generals said, “and beg that you receive what little we have given.” In the end, Hong Taiji found that they were sincere and decided on “one or two items” while declining the rest.[81]

The emperor’s gifts to the surrendered, on the other hand, were always received. There are no cases in which the surrendered party declined the gifts bestowed by the emperor. Such an act would be hierarchical sacrilege, whereby a subordinate attempted to subvert authority by refusing his superior. In fact, the very language used to discuss the exchange of gifts highlights the difference. When the surrendered gave, he “offered” (Ch. xian 獻; Ma. jafaha). When the emperor gave, however, he “bestowed” (Ch. ci 賜; Ma. šangnaha). In the language of the former, the surrendered presented gifts for the emperor as a subject wishing to be brought into the imperial embrace. The offering was a wish for acceptance. In the language of the latter, the emperor graced the subject. In this way, the gifts from the emperor where not something to be accepted or rejected, but rather burdened as a responsibility of the patron-client relationship by creating ties that strengthened the hand of the superior and further subjugated the subordinate.

The gifts themselves also carried meaning. While the acts of giving or receiving were cast into ritual practice, the objects given by the emperor were calculated to prepare the outsider to become an insider. Take for example the list of items bestowed upon Kong Youde:

- 1 brocade robe
- 1 grass summer hat with a freshwater pearl and gold Buddha on the front and flower on the back
- 1 gold belt with a handkerchief, pouch, and knife

[81] SL 2.824/2a-b, Cd7.5.5.

- 1 pair of silk socks folded into silk boots
- 1 gold engraved quiver with bow and arrows
- 1 horse with engraved saddle and bridle
- 1 horse with plain saddle and engraved bridle
- 1 gray fox-fur coat
- 8 black sable-fur coats
- 8 plain sable-fur coats
- 8 lynx-fur coats
- 16 fox-fur coats
- 200 horses
- 1,000 sheep

This gift list is typical of the kind and number of goods bestowed upon those in an imperial audience after submitting. As with other gift lists, a robe and hat are at the top. These two items were the staple court dress of Qing officials—the embroidered robe and the grass hat with top decoration. The granting of this uniform to the surrendered general was a political act in that it incorporated him into the political hierarchy. For instance, after receiving his gifts, Shen Zhixiang put on the robe and donned the hat to perform the final kowtows of the ceremony. In effect, he completed the transformation of himself into a subject. The rest of the gifts were also of Manchu cultural significance—the knife, the socks and boots, the bows and arrows, horses, and all the different furs. The ownership of these items had profound meaning traditionally, where it could boost one's status in the tribe and secure political support regionally. Furs represented wealth and could be used as marriage dowries, bride prices, or

even to cement political allies.[82] The reception and owning of these things worked to make the outsiders insiders both politically and culturally.

Banquets. Banquets had a highly political function. Everything from the seating to the food reflected and constructed the political order. In welcoming the surrendered, the banquet helped inculcate the new generals into the political order. The focus here is on the timing and frequency of the banquet rather than the practices of the banquet itself.

There were at least three opportunities for banqueting: at the time of welcoming, immediately following the imperial audience, and in the subsequent days after the imperial audience. The welcoming banquet was hosted by a Board of Rites official and imperial relative on the site of surrender. These personnel were dispatched to receive the surrender and would bring all the necessary food and implements to set up a grand banquet in the field, and then host the surrendering general and his subordinates. Sometimes there would be more than one occasion for a welcoming banquet, as in the case of Shen Zhixiang, where his emissaries were feasted when they came to report Shen's intent to surrender—the formal welcoming banquet was held when Shen came over, submitting all his men and weapons, and then another banquet was given for him three weeks later when he was posted to Anshan Fort (although this last banquet was held in expectation of the imperial audience that had been canceled due to the measles epidemic).

The audience banquet was held after the ceremony of the imperial audience. If the emperor had traveled out of the capital and set up tents in the field for the audience, the banquet would be held immediately after the ceremony. If the audience was held in the capital, a short interval between the ceremony and the banquet would lapse, whereby the emperor would exit and the Board of Rites would set up festivities. In either case, the

[82] On the use of pearls and fur in Jurchen culture see Herbert Franke, "Chinese texts on the Jurchen: A Translation of the Jurchen Monograph in the San-ch'ao pei-meng hui-pien," *Zentralasiatische Studien* 9 (1975).

emperor acted as the host of the banquet, sitting at the top of the hierarchy, pouring and offering wine. Upon the conclusion of this banquet, the emperor would instruct the relatives to each host a separate banquet for the surrendering party, with themselves in the position of superior and placing the surrendered in political submission in the hierarchy. Thus, for example, we see relatives hosting banquets for Shang Kexi on the eleventh, fourteenth, and fifteenth of the fourth month of 1638.[83]

The general structure of the surrender ritual has been deduced mainly from the three different surrenders of Ming generals Kong, Shang, and Shen across a seven-year period. Other surrenders have been referenced when applicable, based on the availability of information about those surrenders. Altogether, the documentary evidence shows the importance of the ritual in conducting the surrender of former Ming generals, and how the ritual practices worked to make the Chinese outsiders Qing insiders, giving them a place in the social hierarchy and integrating them into the political system, while at the same time instructing insiders on how to relate to the new additions.

THE SOURCE OF THE RITUAL OF SURRENDER

Where did these ritual practices come from and why did actors employ them? Without direct reference by contemporaries it is difficult to determine where the ideas for practices were sourced, or why certain acts were mobilized and not others. It does appear, however, that conscious decisions were made to employ certain practices, and done so with trust in their efficacy.

Ming influence?

[83] NGSY2, 119, Tc8.4.10.

The Ming influence is questionable. It is well known that Ming precedence was ever present in the building of the Manchu state, and many Qing state rituals were sourced form Ming precedent. Many officials that were eventually employed in the Qing administration came over from the Ming in the 1640s and 50s, and Qing officials relied heavily on the Ming administrative code until 1690.[84] Although the Qing Board of Rites, which was modeled on the Ming organization of the same name, was very present in the surrender rituals, it seems doubtful that the form of this rite was borrowed from or even inspired by the Ming.

Ming texts outlining surrender rituals articulate a much different ceremony. Consider the seventeenth-century draft of the Board of Rites gazetteer, *Libu zhigao*.[85] The text on the surrender ritual is based on the surrender of Ming Sheng, a warlord in the south who surrendered to Ming founder Zhu Yuanzhang in 1371. It reads as follows:

> The emperor went to Fengtian gate. [Ming] Sheng and his subordinates knelt outside Wu gate waiting for their guilty proclamation…When they were called, Sheng and his subordinates prostrated on the ground…They knelt listening to the abrogation of their guilt. Sheng and his party bowed five times and yelled "Long live the emperor" three times. The official recipient of edicts bestowed them with robes and caps; the ceremonials official led them to the center stairs, where they bowed four times. The ceremonials official transmitted the edict while they listened to the announcement and prostrated four times and called out "long live the emperor" three times before bowing again four times and exiting.[86]

[84] See Keliher, *The Board of Rites and the Making of Qing China*.
[85] For more on this text see Naitō Torajirō, "Reibu shikō kaidai," in *Dokushi Sōroku* (Kyōto: Kōbundō, 1929), 433–439.
[86] Yu Ruji, *Libu zhigao* (Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshu guan, 1983 [1620]), 68.21a-22b.

The most immediate difference from the Qing ceremony is that the sovereign does not have much of a role. Whereas the Qing rite made a point of injecting the emperor into the ceremony, both in greeting and in leading sacrifice, the Ming emperor only appears at the opening, coming to the gate of the Forbidden City, and then has but a shadowy presence over the rest of the ceremony. As such, there is no intimate imperial audience. Furthermore, there are no banquets and no gifts. Whereas the Qing ceremony was designed to express the political order and situate the newly surrendered into that order, transitioning them from enemy to friend, and making them subjects, the Ming ritual appears to be a brute expression of submission, where the surrendered beg and grovel before being led away.[87]

Manchu practices

Rather than following the Ming, the Qing surrender ceremonies appear have developed out of a practice used throughout the Nurhaci period for the acceptance and incorporation of Jurchen and Mongol tribes. Nurhaci's activity in the early seventeenth century consisted of forming alliances with surrounding clans, and conquering those who refused, bringing them into a socio-military organization. This operation often involved marriage alliances, whereby a tribe would send a bride to Nurhaci or one of his brothers or sons, which would serve as a link between the two. A marriage alliance would entail the reception of a bride, who would be received with ceremony and lavished with honors, as well as a great feasting between the two tribes in question. In the case of a military surrender, or an outright submission of a group before arms were taken up (usually by threat or as a result of the growing military reputation of Nurhaci), the submitting tribe and its leaders would be received respectfully and given gifts. In the case of the former, the tribe was folded into the socio-military system, whereby they became slaves or servants of soldiers, as was the situation of those who were conquered,

[87] The *Ming History* follows this text word for word. *Mingshi*, p. 1434.

or, in the case of those who submitted willingly or under favorable conditions, the tribe formed a military unit in the banners and was accompanied by their families in support roles.[88]

The reception of a bride or submitting group was always accompanied by a ceremony. In the case of the marriage alliance, some type of travel to receive the bride was always undertaken by the receiver or other high-ranking individuals, and banqueting always occurred. Records from as early as 1588 show Nurhaci accepting a bride from the Yehe tribe. He led his relatives out to welcome her and held a grand banquet. She was also given a title.[89] Similarly, in 1623, a Mongol tribe sent a bride to Nurhaci's son, Ajige. Nurhaci ordered two other sons to travel 60 li to receive her. A banquet was held.[90] These examples make clear that both traveling to greet the bride and her tribe, and a banquet were key aspects of this practice.

A ceremony was also instrumental in accepting surrenders. As Nurhaci and his army conquered and absorbed neighboring tribes through reputation and conquest, they folded these individual, families, and small societies into the banner system. The means for doing so was a practice similar to that outlined above for the Chinese generals: welcoming, audience, gifts, and banquet. The details are not as full, and description of the ceremonies were certainly less lavish, but the basic structure is outlined. Consider two cases.[91] In 1618, the head of the Hūrha tribe led a hundred households to submit. Nurhaci sent two hundred people to welcome them, and when the tribe arrived, Nurhaci came forth to give them an audience. The surrendered kowtowed to Nurhaci and were treated to banquets and furnished with gifts of horses, cows, embroidered robes, furs, belts, and boots, among other things.[92] Similarly, a few years later, two Mongol chiefs led 645 households in submission. They received an

[88] The distinction of those who submitted willingly (shou) and those who were captured (huo) are discussed in Zheng Tianting, "Qing ruguanqian Manzhouzu de shehui xingzhi." Also see Ch'en Wen-shih, "The Creation of the Manchu Niru;" Zhou Yuanlian, "Guanyu baiqi zhidu de jige wenti," *Qingshi Luncong* 3 (1982): 140–154.
[89] SL, 36.1, WL16.9.1.
[90] SL, 119.2, Tm8.5.17.
[91] For examples of other cases see MR 1.83, Tm3.2; MR 1.100, Tm 3.4.13; MR 1.164-165, Tm 4.7.1.

imperial audience, where the two leaders kowtowed in submission and offered their allegiance to the khan. They were then given a banquet and lavished with gifts of furs, pelts, embroidered clothes, textiles, boots, and saddles, as well as draft animals. Both were granted the military title of general and put in charge of a military unit.[93]

These marriage and surrender ceremonies of the early Jurchens contain key elements meant to incorporate outside groups. The traveling to welcome the incoming party secured the agreement; the audience with the khan established power relations and identified superiors and inferiors; banqueting entailed certain attendance and seating arrangements, which gave indication to both insiders and outsiders their place in the polity and further told each how to act in relation to the other. The presentation of various degrees of wealth in the form of food also expressed the hierarchical relationship of one nourishing another; and the bestowal of gifts by the khan on the new subjects not only provided material incentive for their subservience, but also enabled their participation in the social order through the donning of prized goods, such as furs, and the solidification of their authority over their own subjects with both the outward expression of favor in wearing the clothes and the increase in their ability to nourish their subjects through the gifts of grain and farm animals. These early practices were similar to those employed by Hong Taiji in the acceptance of the surrender of the Chinese generals in the 1630s.

CODA: THE FORMATION OF THE EIGHT BANNER HANJUN AND THE CESSATION OF THE SURRENDER RITUAL

There were other surrenders, of course; the greatest number began after the Ming lost Beijing and the Qing began conquest of China proper.[94] By that time, however, the basic structure of

[92] MR 1.112-113, Tm3.10.11. Also in the MZSL, 220.1-221.2, Tm3.4r.12.
[93] MZSL, 336.2-338.1, Tm6.11.18.
[94] For a full list of surrendered officials see Yeh Kao-shu, *Xiangqing Mingjiang yanjiu* (Taipei: Guoli Taiwan shifan daxue lishi yanjiusuo, 1993), 29-49.

the Manchu state had been established and the lines of power drawn. The groups that needed to be incorporated were given a place in the polity and their positions, relations, and interactions institutionalized. The emperor no longer needed to make an argument for the spoil of his division of political resources and the hierarchical organization of the state. The new social order had been given shape and its transformation into law had already begun.

At this point in the Qing history record, documentary details of surrender ceremonies become thin. Even high profile cases, such as the Kangxi-era surrender of navy admiral Shi Lang are vague.[95] In fact, after Shen's surrender in 1638, records on the use of the surrender ritual begin to wane, and, after Zu Dashou and Hong Chengchou in 1642, there is very little mention of such ceremonies at all. This trend is further highlighted by an absence of any mention of surrender protocol in either of the first two editions of the Qing administrative code.[96] Even when the ritual practice became codified in the mid-eighteenth century, it was much different from the practices of the 1630s.[97] How to account for this phenomenon: Why was the interest and intensity of the surrender ritual of the 1630s suddenly deflated?

There are no extant materials that can speak directly to these questions. What can be said is that as formal institutions were set up to deal with the incorporation of Chinese subjects the surrender rituals ceased. It is as if the social order, having been transformed, no longer needed a mechanism to continue transforming. Instead it drew on other cultural forms and practices to preserve the transformed state. Instead of surrender rituals, a rigorous program of ceremonies and rites continued to do the work of socialization in organizing the diverse political and cultural actors.

[95] The Shilu gives no mention of any surrender ceremony for Shi Lang.
[96] There are sections on military rites for ordering generals off to battle, and for victory celebrations, but nothing on surrenders. *Da Qing huidian (Kangxi chao)* (1690, Reprint, Taipei: Wenhai chubanshe, 1992), 716.2165; *Da Qing huidian (Yongzheng chao)* (1733, Reprint, Taipei: Wenhai chubanshe, 1992), 770.3939.
[97] In fact, surrender rituals in the eighteenth century came to mirror those of the Ming. *Qinding Da Qing huidian zeli* (1764), 74.1176.

There is an institutionalization aspect as well. The formation of the Chinese banners corresponded directly to the declining use of the surrender ritual. In 1637, two Chinese units were formed with Chinese troops under the jurisdiction of the Manchu banners. In 1639, four Chinese banners were formed. In 1642, four more Chinese banners were added, bringing the total to eight.[98] At this point, the Chinese personnel integrating into the Manchu order had a point of contact and could be fully incorporated into the polity. The Chinese banners gave them status and registration. The generals surrendering would be placed under the Chinese banners and their troops fully incorporated—although often the companies would be scattered throughout the different banners. The rituals no longer needed to perform the same function of full social incorporation and political subjugation; nor did Hong Taiji need to circumvent the banner owners in order to implement his policies. It is for this reason that the onslaught of surrenders from the conquest of Songshan in 1642 did not have such an elaborate ritual, and that after this date, the surrender ritual is hardly ever mentioned. The Qing polity had been revised successfully enough to the extent to be able to integrate Chinese subjects, and the Hanjun banners gave those Chinese now being incorporated a place within the polity and a position in the rituals.

CONLCUSION

Despite its disappearance, the early Qing surrender ritual was highly effective. It both incorporated outsiders and changed insiders, and in doing so facilitated the construction of a multiethnic state. Originally, the banners served as the basic social unit for all members of the emergent Qing polity. Prior to the surrenders of the 1630s, all outsiders were brought in through the banners, either assigned as a military unit, or made slaves of bannermen households. Thus, if the surrender of Ming generals and their troops and families in 1633

[98] A narrative of the formation of the eight banner Hanjun can be found in Elliott, *The Manchu Way*, 74-78; Yao Nianci, "Luelun baqi Menggu he baqi Hanjun de jianli," *Zhongyan minzu daxue xuebao* 6 (1995).

were to be accepted in a way that would keep them from increasing the power and resources of the banner owners, then they had to be incorporated by some other means—they had to assume social roles and be given places that made them liable in the political hierarchy.

An elaborate and highly structured ritual of surrender was one way of achieving this. The ritual incorporated new subjects into the social order, while at the same time expanding the organizational types of society and its functions.[99] New actors were given a social station that was mediated through the interpersonal relations acted out in the ritual. At the same time, existing actors played their roles and learned new ones in relation to the recruits through the ritual. The ritual then was just as much a clarification of the state and the position of actors as it was a mechanism to incorporate the surrendered. The sovereign leading the ceremony, the bowing to heaven and to the sovereign, the acts of subjugation and submission, the banquets, the ranks—all these acts and staging constructed the political order and the relations of power and communicated to all how to relate in the emergent order. In many ways, the ritual here was the social order put into practice, for it facilitated the incorporation of new groups and the expansion of the body-politic.

Ritual was not the final answer, of course—the centralization of the military was a drawn out affair as the banners were slowly brought under the centralized command of an administrative bureaucracy and decision-making council. This process relied on the formalization of a system of ranks, titles, and honors, which were handed out and guaranteed by the state. The power of assignment and pay was eventually stripped from the banner lords and given to a centralized administrative decision making body. The original system of loyalties and independent banner control were transferred to the state, and jurisdiction over banner policy and social life became bureaucratized. It remains unclear exactly how this

[99] At issue here is not the transformation of the individual, but rather the performance of political and social order through ritual. The effects of ritual on the individual psychology in the early Qing is taken up in Gazi Islam and Macabe Keliher, "Leading Through Ritual: Ceremony and Emperorship in Early Modern China," *Leadership* 13, no. 1 (February 2017).

happened, for the process was a long time in the making, and not until the Yongzheng emperor articulated a set of codes in the early eighteenth century was the entire operation formalized.[100] What is evident is that the incorporation of outsiders was key in the process, and new ruling technologies were developed to achieve desired ends. The result was a centralized military in support of a multiethnic empire.

[100] The two seminal articles on this process are Meng Sen, "Baqi zhidao kaoshi," Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology 6, no. 2 (1936): 343–412; Hosoya Yoshio, "Shichō ni okeru hakki seido no suii," *Tōyō gakuho* 51, no. 1 (June 1968): 1–43.