

2021

The Textual Architecture of Empire in Two Early Qing Anthologies

Jessica D. Moyer

Smith College, jmoyer@smith.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.smith.edu/eas_facpubs



Part of the [East Asian Languages and Societies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Moyer, Jessica D., "The Textual Architecture of Empire in Two Early Qing Anthologies" (2021). East Asian Languages & Cultures: Faculty Publications, Smith College, Northampton, MA.
https://scholarworks.smith.edu/eas_facpubs/13

This Article has been accepted for inclusion in East Asian Languages & Cultures: Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Smith ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@smith.edu

The Textual Architecture of Empire in Two Early Qing Anthologies

JESSICA DVORAK MOYER

Abstract During the first half century of the Qing dynasty, Manchu emperors commissioned massive publication projects on the Chinese classics. In early Qing interpretation of classics on the family, negotiations between Manchu and Han family and gender norms furthered the empire-building project. This article compares the spatial form of the *Yuding Nei ze yanyi* 御定內則衍義 (1656), an expansion of the “Inner Standards” chapter of the *Classic of Rites* commissioned by the Shunzhi emperor, to that of the *Yuding Xiao jing yanyi* 御定孝經衍義 (1682), an expansion of the *Classic of Filial Piety* commissioned by the Kangxi emperor. These works are textual spaces where the cultural and political negotiations of the early Qing empire play out; they use spatial strategies of juxtaposition and hierarchy to balance different messages for different constituencies, creating textual models of empire.

Keywords Manchu, empire, gender, filial piety, textual space

During the first half century of the Qing dynasty, Manchu emperors strategically blended Manchu and Han Chinese political institutions and cultural norms, consolidating power over the Chinese heartland while gaining recognition as supreme rulers from Manchu tribal leaders and Inner Asian allies. As part of this process, the Shunzhi and Kangxi emperors commissioned massive publication projects on the Chinese classics.¹ Classical scholarship had long had a mutually legitimizing relationship with imperial power.² But the early Qing publication projects, which have been described as a strategy for “inculcating submissiveness on a newly-conquered and restive people”³ and for channeling the “ethical puritanism” of Qing scholars toward support

of the state,⁴ represented not a wholesale adoption of the Chinese classical tradition but a strategic promulgation of the aspects of Han culture most useful for strengthening Manchu rule.

Two such imperially commissioned works offer a unique view into the ideology of empire in the early Qing: the *Yuding Nei ze yanyi* 御定内則衍義 (Imperially Commissioned Expanded Meaning of the “Inner Standards,” 1656), an expansion of the “Inner Standards” chapter of the *Classic of Rites* commissioned by the Shunzhi emperor, and the *Yuding Xiao jing yanyi* 御定孝經衍義 (Imperially Commissioned Expanded Meaning of the “Classic of Filial Piety,” 1682), an expansion of the *Classic of Filial Piety* commissioned by the Kangxi emperor. Both works emphasize the political significance of the performance of gendered family roles, and both work to suture the gap between Manchu and Han ideals and practices of feminine virtue and filial piety.

Differences in family and gender norms between Manchu and Han cultures contributed to Manchu and Han consciousness of themselves as distinct people groups, a consciousness that remained strong even as cultural practices changed.⁵ Manchu rulers used this group consciousness to maintain their hold on power through a strategic balance of acculturation and self-distinction. On the one hand, Qing emperors reformed Manchu marriage and burial practices to more closely resemble Chinese norms⁶ and urged chastity and filial piety on Manchus.⁷ They asked their Manchu subjects to conform to Han ethical norms in order to uphold the idea that the Aisin Gioro and their banner forces ruled by right of virtue. On the other hand, Manchu rulers from Hung Taiji to the Qianlong emperor also worked to maintain a distinctive Manchu identity, and this distinction was crucial to the Qing hold on power, in a dynamic Mark Elliot has termed “ethnic sovereignty.”⁸ This article analyzes scholarship commissioned by early Qing emperors as examples of the philosophical frameworks that Manchu emperors promulgated, a wide lens on

the process by which they adopted certain Chinese norms and institutions while rejecting or changing others. It also highlights the active role of Han scholar-officials in adapting, in the textual realm, to Manchu ethnic and cultural differences. The *Nei ze yanyi* and the *Xiao jing yanyi* show the simultaneous, strategic processes of adaptation and differentiation at work and the simultaneous agency of Manchu rulers and Han Chinese scholars in shaping those processes.

The *Nei ze yanyi* and the *Xiao jing yanyi* are modeled on the Song work *Da xue yanyi* 大學衍義 (Expanded Meaning of the *Great Learning*): they present and interpret excerpts from the classics and histories to illustrate and expound the principles of the “*Nei ze*” and the *Xiao jing*. But because gender norms and family structure help constitute ethnic difference, their interpretations of women’s virtue and filial piety also intervene in contemporary political and cultural dynamics. These anthologies were commissioned by Manchu emperors, compiled by Han scholar-officials, and then published with Imperial prefaces. Both take the inhabitants of the palace as their central readership—the palace women as exemplars of female virtue for the *Nei ze yanyi* and the emperor as filial ruler for the *Xiao jing yanyi*. But their prefaces describe an empire-wide audience, and the *Nei ze yanyi* was published in both Chinese and Manchu. Both anthologies contain multiple messages for distinct audiences in the form of virtues and character types that meant different things to different Qing constituencies, such as warrior women and filial emperors. They constitute textual spaces where the cultural and political negotiations of the early Qing empire played out. These spaces signify independently of the words they contain, just as a building’s architecture signifies independently of the conversations that take place within its rooms. The editors of the *Nei ze yanyi* and the *Xiao jing yanyi* used spatial organization and page layout to make space for new interpretations of their source texts and to organize the multiple

messages of each anthology, shaping visions of empire that balance ideological and cultural tensions.

Texts as Spaces

What does it mean to think about books as spaces? We might start with Leibniz's definition of space: "Space denotes, in terms of possibility, an order of things which exist at the same time, considered as existing together; without inquiring into their manner of existing. And when many things are seen together, one perceives that order of things among themselves."⁹ Space has, then, two defining characteristics: *simultaneity* and *order*. Speech is temporal: by the time a speaker begins her or his {Please restore original wording or use singular "their"} second word, the first is gone. But the words in a book exist simultaneously, making it possible to perceive a stable pattern of relationships between them. In the *Nei ze yanyi* and the *Xiao jing yanyi*, the spatial form of the text embodies political, cultural, and familial hierarchies.

As a tool of literary criticism, spatial analysis opens up a variety of approaches. In a seminal 1945 article, "Spatial Form in Modern Literature," Josef Frank argued that the spatial apprehension of literature represented a qualitative modernist break with traditional literature and criticism. But in 1980, W. J. T. Mitchell applied Frank's insights to all literature: "Far from being a unique phenomenon of some modern literature, and far from being restricted to the features which Frank identifies in those works (simultaneity and discontinuity), spatial form is a crucial aspect of the experience and interpretation of literature in all ages and cultures."¹⁰ Mitchell detailed several approaches to spatial form in literature, two of which are especially illuminating for a reader of the *Nei ze yanyi* and the *Xiao jing yanyi*.

The first is to consider those aspects of the text that determine the global gestalt of the reader's experience, an experience that is, in Mitchell's terms, "tectonic" rather than "linear."¹¹ This does not mean that a reader encounters all aspects of the text simultaneously; we experience all spaces (physical or textual) through the medium of time. The question is how the sequential experience of the text builds up the sense of a coexistent whole. The editors' deliberations about sequence are explicit, but the sequence of contents in each book helps create the overarching textual order. The second, related approach is to take seriously our common perception that a complicated work has multiple "levels" by thinking about the ways that the text builds and arranges those layers.¹² Spatial analysis has much in common with structuralist analyses of traditional Chinese fiction such as Andrew Plaks's *Four Masterworks of the Ming Novel*, and also with Ming and Qing critics' attention to the fine-grained connections that knit the literati novel into an intricate whole.¹³ All these approaches highlight the connections and tensions between parts of a text. But the analysis of spatial form has a particular emphasis: not on the structure of the text itself, but on the space between to which the structure gives form.

In attempting to describe the spatial form of these early Qing anthologies, the *Nei ze yanyi* and the *Xiao jing yanyi*, I shall necessarily spend time on the structures that shape the spaces. But my goal is to show how the structures of each anthology shape an open space, where their words do not reach, within which unexpected encounters and negotiations might be possible. In the *Nei ze yanyi*, the main spatial strategy is deliberate juxtaposition of culturally distinct patterns of feminine virtue. In the *Xiao jing yanyi*, the editors use sequence and relative space to draw the reader into the multidimensional political symbolism of filial piety. In both works, the structure of the anthology makes space for competing cultural ideals and political imperatives.

An Empire of Female Exemplars

The *Nei ze yanyi* was published in 1656, into a society where different groups of political and cultural elites held different ideals of feminine virtue and where the accommodations between those ideals were still under construction. In the early and high Qing, Han officials governing southern border regions like Taiwan and Yunnan explicitly sought to transform local non-Han populations into “civilized” people, instructing them in Chinese ritual norms such as female seclusion and chaste widowhood.¹⁴ Han and Manchu officials agreed that the border peoples needed civilizing, transformative education 教化 (*jiaohua*). But Han and Manchu cultures also differed with respect to some of the same gendered practices that Han officials used to identify border peoples in need of civilizing. Manchus allowed women to mingle more freely with men outside the home, practiced the levirate, and, until the 1740s, actively encouraged the remarriage of banner widows in order to maintain the minority Manchu population.¹⁵ These ritual differences were politically sensitive. Influential Han scholars of the seventeenth century like Wang Fuzhi 王夫之 (1619–1692) considered the Manchus barbarians, morally inferior to the Han people.¹⁶ Qing emperors’ edicts about widow chastity awards reveal that Manchu rulers were conscious of the differences between Manchu and Han gender norms and their political ramifications.¹⁷ And changes in Qing policy on female suicide shows that the Shunzhi, Kangxi, and Yongzheng emperors actively manipulated both Han and Manchu customs, shaping the discourse on virtue according to the statecraft needs of the moment.¹⁸ Womanly virtue in the early Qing was complex, contested, and political.

The *Nei ze yanyi* is not a policy document; rather it works to create the interpretive framework within which such strategic policy shifts operated. It negotiates between Inner Asian

and Han ideals of feminine virtue by presenting a set of exemplars who enact contrasting virtues. Biographies drawn from the *houfei* 后妃 (empresses and consorts) and *lienü* 列女 (exemplary women) sections of the dynastic histories make up most of the work. I will focus not on the biographies themselves but on the ways that the *Nei ze yanyi* frames and presents them through categorization and commentary. The text offers a comprehensive vision of multiethnic feminine virtue, not by explicitly discussing the different gender norms of different people groups but by deliberately juxtaposing them.

The authors, languages, audiences, and contents of the *Nei ze yanyi* all reflect the multiple constituencies of the early Qing empire. Dowager Empress Xiaozhuang 孝莊 (Bumbutai, 1613–1688), a member of the Mongolian Borjigit clan, requested the book; her son the Shunzhi emperor (Fulin, 1638–1661, r. 1644–1661) commissioned and wrote a preface for it; and the Han official Fu Yijian 傅以漸 (1609–1665, *jinshi* 1646) edited and compiled it. Fu was a Shandong native, the top-ranked candidate 狀元 (*zhuangyuan*) in the first palace examination of the Qing dynasty in 1646; the text shows both his encyclopedic knowledge of the Chinese classics and his firm loyalty to his Manchu lieges. The *Nei ze yanyi* circulated bilingually in Chinese and Manchu, a fact that symbolically reflected its multiple imagined audiences.¹⁹ The book was composed in Chinese and translated immediately into Manchu; there is an extant Manchu manuscript version dated to 1656, the same year its first Chinese edition was printed, and a partial bilingual manuscript.²⁰ The imagined audience was multiple but hierarchical: the book aims first at the palace women, who during the Shunzhi reign were mostly Manchu and Mongolian,²¹ and secondly at the rest of the women in the empire, who were mostly Han Chinese. As to the book's actual readership, the relatively small number of reprints suggests that

it was not widely read.²² It is important not as a direct view of what women did or read but as a model of a multilingual, multiethnic empire seen through the lens of feminine virtue.

We can see a hierarchy of imagined audiences in the preface, which begins in the voice of the Shunzhi emperor and is continued by Fu Yijian. The emperor states: “In ancient times, sagely empresses and worthy consorts began to cultivate inner government, in order to bring about the transformation of practices and the beautification of customs; they are recorded in the volumes of the Classics” 三代以前，聖后賢妃肇修內治，以致化行、俗美，具載典冊。²³ Fu Yijian then reiterates his emperor’s claim that it is the personal virtue of the empress and consorts that transforms the family life of the empire: “[The ‘Nei ze’] first states: ‘The sovereign and king orders the chief minister to send down his virtue to the millions of the people.’ That is to say, the empress’s and crown prince’s personal behavior and attainments can serve as the model for the people” 首曰，「后王命冢宰降德於衆兆民。」謂此乃王后世子所躬行心得而可為民法者 (*NZYY*, preface). The book aims to cultivate the personal virtue of palace women, who were primarily non-Chinese: this is a transformative education program aimed at the non-Chinese center of imperial power instead of the periphery but one that acknowledges the power of the center over the periphery.

But Fu Yijian takes care not to make his message too pointed. He avoids the terms “Manchu” and “Han.” Instead he specifies that his book is for readers of all social classes: “Reaching from the palace women’s quarters to the village alleys, whoever takes their standards from this will certainly all have their nature developed and their character gradually shaped in accordance with principle” 自禁壺達乎閭巷，咸於斯取則焉，必皆感發其性情漸摩乎理 (*NZYY*, preface). The preface emphasizes some differences between Fu’s imagined readers—class and geography—but says nothing about others such as language and ethnicity. Instead the

symbolic work of signaling a multiethnic audience is done by the bilingual publication process in both Chinese and Manchu. The dual languages of publication combine with the explicit statements about social class to send a clear political message that this work is for both the Manchu rulers and the Han ruled, that both are governed by the same principle (*li* 理), and that that principle is to be found in the Chinese classical tradition.

But Fu Yijian's editorial approach makes of that tradition a very broad umbrella indeed; throughout the book he deliberately juxtaposes competing cultural ideologies of gender under the same rubric of virtue. The *Nei ze yanyi* has sixteen *juan*, organized into sections and subsections by category of virtue.²⁴ Each subsection begins with an excerpt or two from the "Nei ze" and several excerpts from the other Five Classics relating to the virtue under discussion, followed by selections from biographies of women that illustrate that virtue. Fu places competing, culturally different visions of feminine virtue in the biographies within each subsection. He also places biographies of both Han and non-Han women next to each other as exemplars of each virtue. Finally he places subsections dealing with contrasting patterns of behavior side by side within each major section. This juxtaposition is a central aspect of the book's spatial form, and it does the most sensitive ideological work of communicating Fu's vision of empire, the part that he never makes verbally explicit: the fact that the empire includes both Manchu and Chinese constituencies, who had different ideas about women. The *Nei ze yanyi* negotiates these contrasting gender norms in order to construct a model of feminine virtue for the whole empire.

The *Nei ze yanyi* includes biographies of women from the Liao, Jin, and Yuan dynasties in almost every subsection. This aligns with the early Qing emperors' habit of looking to those three conquest dynasties to learn from their successes and failures in governing the Chinese heartland.²⁵ But Fu uses these exemplars from conquest dynasties not to suggest specific policies

but to shape an intellectual framework acceptable to Manchu and Han audiences alike. In this framework the family functions as the foundation of the imperium but accommodates variations in family structure and female behavior. Fu uses the same strategy of juxtaposition to handle three key points of divergence between Han and Manchu cultures: female suicide, widow chastity, and ritual norms. Qing imperial attitudes to female suicide and widow chastity have been well studied by others, so I will simply mention that Fu Yijian's approach to these issues acknowledges their practical and political complexity.²⁶ Here I will focus on the way that Fu Yijian uses side-by-side juxtaposition to navigate the tensions between Manchu gender roles and family structure, on the one hand, and Chinese ritual norms of status and gender, on the other.

Ritual propriety is the heart of Fu Yijian's anthology. The *Nei ze yanyi* has eight major sections, on filial piety 孝 (*xiao*), respect 敬 (*jing*), teaching 教 (*jiao*), ritual propriety 禮 (*li*), yielding 讓 (*rang*), kindness 慈 (*ci*), diligence 勤 (*qin*), and learning 學 (*xue*), each divided into subsections. This categorization system, especially noteworthy for the fact that chastity does not appear as a major heading, is unique to Fu Yijian.²⁷ The section on ritual propriety is the longest by far: it begins in the fifth *juan* and continues through the end of the twelfth, occupying nearly half the book. But Fu includes sharply different issues and behaviors within the category of ritual propriety. For example, the second and third subsection within the section on ritual propriety are "Treating Household Management Solemnly" 肅家政 (*Su jiazheng*), which challenges Manchu cultural norms by praising women's strict observance of status hierarchies, and "Stabilizing Crises" 定變 (*Ding bian*), which challenges Chinese gender norms by normalizing women's active interventions in political and military crises. But Fu includes both Chinese and non-Chinese exemplars in each section, treating both kinds of virtue as applicable to all kinds of women.

Fu Yijian opens “Treating Household Management Solemnly” with selections from the “*Nei ze*” that emphasize the importance of segregating men and women and of maintaining status distinctions between the main wife and concubines, as well as between the wife’s sons and concubines’ sons (*NZYY* 6.1a–3a). This emphasis on the family order reflects a common anxiety among Chinese statesmen of the early Qing to reform the social order after the supposed cultural decay of the late Ming. But to Manchu readers, the emphasis on female seclusion and status hierarchies would have been relatively foreign. Manchu women were not strictly segregated from men, and though Manchus distinguished between several different status roles of wife, concubine, and female servant, the distinctions were less sharp than those between the wife and concubines in Han families. A Manchu man early in the seventeenth century could have multiple wives, not only one wife and multiple concubines as in Chinese law.²⁸ And, though Manchu marriage norms did shift after 1644,²⁹ the *Nei ze yanyi* was written at a time when this process had only recently begun. Since the consorts of the Shunzhi emperor were mostly daughters of Mongolian allies or banner officials, their dominant cultural framework was not Chinese.³⁰ Fu Yijian’s commentary here was an active intervention in cultural transformation, not preaching to an already-converted choir.

Fu Yijian’s first cluster of biographies under this subheading includes empresses from three dynasties: the Song, Khitan Liao, and Jurchen Jin. All strictly managed the palace women and observed careful distinctions of rank. His commentary on their biographies reiterates their dynastic identity while emphasizing the importance of strict ritual propriety:

These empresses of the Song, Liao, and Jin, whether in the palace proper or in the vassal states, or before gaining full imperial power, nevertheless their way of governing the household is recorded in the histories, and not one but is noted for her orderly solemnity.

Now the right conduct of the household values togetherness, but without distinction there can be no togetherness; the emotion of the household values harmony, but without strictness there can be no harmony.

觀宋、遼、金諸后，或已正中宮，或猶在藩服，或未承大統，然其治家之道，載在史冊，未有不以整肅著者。蓋家之義貴合，而非辨則不合；家之情貴和，而非嚴則不和。(NZYY 6.4)

Fu Yijian's deliberate inclusion of (Khitan) Liao and (Jurchen) Jin empresses makes it clear that he saw strict observation of Han-style ritual hierarchy in the palace as mandatory for empresses and consorts of all cultural backgrounds.

In the next subsection, "Stabilizing Crises," Fu shifts focus to women's capable crisis management, which encompasses both military strategy and martial courage. Of the twenty-two biographies in the subsection, most show women intervening in politics, and seven show women personally leading soldiers in battle. Although biographies of women warriors are scattered throughout the *Nei ze yanyi*, this is the largest cluster of such biographies in the book. Ritual propriety is a common virtue used to praise and categorize female exemplars, but it is an unusual section under which to categorize women who led armies. In other didactic books for women, women noted for their ritual propriety carefully observe ritual norms: mourning obligations, marriage ceremonies, and above all, the separation of men and women.³¹ They do not put on armor and ride out to fight with men. Fu Yijian's placement of women warriors here, immediately after a section on proper household management, represents a conscious break with the organizational norms of Chinese didactic texts for women. This surprising subsection is immediately followed by the two longest subsections in the anthology: the first on chaste widows and the second on chastity martyrs. So Fu does allot the lion's share of space in his anthology to

exemplars of feminine virtue as normatively defined in late imperial China. It is not the content of his anthology, but his organizational schema, that is radical. What does this schema communicate? Why does he define warrior women as exemplars of ritual, sequentially prior to exemplars of chastity?

Fu's commentary on these biographies avoids common Chinese tropes surrounding women's martial courage. In the Chinese tradition, tales of women warriors often portray them as exceptions filling in for absent or inadequate men. And in the early Qing, literati writing about women's courage facing soldiers often refracted Chinese scholars' sense of failure in the wake of dynastic fall.³² But for Fu Yijian, women's military prowess is only superficially exceptional. It expresses a fundamental loyalty and justice that is gendered not by nature but only in its normative modes of expression:

Women govern the inner matters; the affairs of outside are not their proper business, how much more border battles and attacks? Nevertheless, Heaven's gift of a loyal and just nature, how could it make a distinction between men and women? . . . Indeed, there are those before whom men who would yield to their martial courage.

女治內事，寢門之外非其職業，況封疆戰伐之事乎？然天賦忠正之性，何分男女？……固有男子讓其武者。(NZYY 6.25b–26a)

Fu's commentary here is his fullest discussion of the ways in which warrior women are, and are not, exceptional. The Chinese tradition makes space for female military heroes, and Fu Yijian uses this space. But unlike many Chinese narratives of female martial courage, he does not employ the discourse of exceptionalism or point to brave women in order to criticize male cowardice. Rather he emphasizes the fundamental similarity of loyalty and justice in men and

women, stating that women's virtue in certain circumstances will naturally find expression as military heroism.

As in the previous subsection on household government, Fu includes both Han and non-Han exemplars. These warrior women include Han 韓 *shi*, the mother of the Jin 晉 dynasty prefect Zhu Shu 朱序 (d. 393), who led over a hundred of her maids and other women in defense of a besieged city; Princess Zhao 昭 of Pingyang (d. 623), daughter of the Tang founder Gaozu, who marshaled the army that captured Chang'an and was given a military funeral at her death; Xi 奚 *shi*, wife of the Tang prefect Zou Baoying 鄒保英 (dates unknown), who led a force of women to help her husband fight off an attacking Khitan warlord; three Tang dynasty girls celebrated by the prefect of Huapu for helping fight off rebels; Empress Renyi 仁懿 (d. 1076) of the Khitan Liao dynasty, who personally led troops to defeat a rebel army; Shilizhi 實哩質, sister of the Jurchen general Wangnichuhe 王尼楚赫 (Wanyan Yinshuke, 1072–1140), who successfully led a troop of five hundred to defend a city during a rebellion using a carpet for armor and a robe for a banner; and Aluzhang 阿嚕章 (dates unknown), a Jurchen widow who dressed in men's clothing and commanded a troop to defeat an invading force (NZYY 6.21b–25b). Like the ritually proper empresses of the previous section, these women present a vision of virtue that is both culturally loaded and ethnically balanced.

Women warriors were not the norm in Khitan, Jurchen, or Manchu culture, but they were more common in steppe cultures than in Han China.³³ Fu Yijian's selection of biographies insists that martial courage is not optional for Chinese women in a crisis, and it suggests to his audience of Manchu and Mongol consorts that Chinese women can match them for courage. At the same time, Fu Yijian deliberately includes women who fought on behalf of conquest dynasties such as

the Khitan Liao and Jurchen Jin alongside Chinese women who fought against Khitan invaders. By juxtaposing their biographies, he gives increased space and normalization to warrior women of multiple backgrounds.

Finally, by placing the section “Stabilizing Crises” adjacent to the section “Treating Household Management Solemnly,” which also juxtaposes the biographies of both Han and non-Han women, and by categorizing both groups as exemplars of ritual propriety, Fu makes a powerful set of unwritten claims. First, he asserts that these very different actions, from strictly observing status boundaries to defending city walls, all exemplify the same fundamental virtue of ritual. He never defines ritual itself, leaving the reader to make connections between its manifestations in different subcategories.³⁴ Second, he suggests that women of all ethnic backgrounds are equally capable of ritual propriety in general and of good household management and martial courage specifically—and this in a social context where ritual norms, marital status categories, and female seclusion were actually markers of ethnically and culturally specific group membership. Third, he brings together women whose lives were separated by a thousand years of history, creating a textual space in which these different ways of being a woman in the world coexist simultaneously and harmoniously. Thus he subtly adapts and expands the Chinese classical text to accommodate multiple gender norms.

The *Nei ze yanyi* never verbally explains how to harmonize the differences between Han and Manchu cultures. It simply presents exemplars of both side by side on the page, their simultaneity and similarity a fait accompli. Thus the spatial form of the *Nei ze yanyi* communicates meanings above and beyond those contained in the commentary in each section. It embodies a vision of differences coexisting within the multicultural empire, under the benevolent

and transformative influence of an empress whose virtue is imagined to incorporate all cultural norms.

Spatial Hierarchies in the *Xiao jing yanyi*

Like the *Nei ze yanyi*, the 1682 *Xiao jing yanyi* uses spatial organization to accommodate culturally distinct ideals of virtue. In the *Xiao jing yanyi*, there are two sets of distinct ideals in play: different manifestations of filial piety and different ways of conceiving the political order in family terms. Both the practices of filial piety and the ideological connection between family and state differed in Han and Manchu cultures. The *Xiao jing yanyi* engages with these differences by placing different messages in different sections of the text. Framing content, such as the chapters that open the work and the passages that open each chapter, is more abstract. It bolsters imperial authority by emphasizing the authoritarian nature of both the father-son relationship and the ruler-minister relationship, drawing parallels between the dyads of father and son, ruler and minister, and heaven and earth. But the internal chapters and the commentary to specific biographical excerpts within each chapter are much more concrete and specific. They emphasize the intimacy and reciprocity of both the father-son and the ruler-minister relationships in order to advocate for specific policies advantageous to ministers. Combined with the two-dimensional hierarchies of page layout, this kind of organization creates a third dimension of depth that helps to shape the space of the text.

In this section I compare two different ways that the *Xiao jing yanyi* frames the ruler-minister relationship in terms of the father-son relationship: the first from *juan* 9, “Ruler and Minister” (*Junchen* 君臣), and the second from *juan* 26, “Treating Ministers as One’s Body” (*Ti chengong* 體臣工). These sections differ markedly in their approach to filial piety. The *Xiao jing*

yanyi uses filial piety both to articulate the philosophical foundations of imperial rule and to plead for higher salary and more generous mourning leaves for ministers. And both these ways of extending the father-son relationship to the political realm were ethnically significant because of the differences in Manchu and Han mourning practices and political ideology. The editors of the *Xiao jing yanyi* placed distinct messaging in different locations within the text, allowing the reader to navigate between them at will.

The *Xiao jing yanyi* was commissioned by the Kangxi emperor (r. 1661–1722) in filial fulfilment of his father the Shunzhi emperor's wishes. It was compiled by a team of Chinese scholars including Ye Fang'ai 葉方藹 (1629–1682), Zhang Ying 張英 (1638–1708), and Han Tan 韓荃 (1637–1704). The text is massive, one hundred *juan* in length, and the editors organize it in several ways. First, they provide a table of contents with three levels of headings: there are nine major (A-level) sections, each of which is subdivided into B-level sections, the longest of which are further divided into C-level sections.³⁵ Each subsection consists of short excerpts from the classics, histories, and scholarly treatises, along with selections from earlier commentaries on many of these excerpts. Finally, the Qing editors provide their own commentary on each excerpt or cluster of excerpts. Page layout indicates the provenance of each excerpt: Higher status texts like the Classics start at the top of the line; excerpts from respected earlier commentators start one space down, and the Qing editors' commentary starts two spaces down. These common printing conventions work in concert with other, more ideologically laden organizational choices to create a complex textual space.

One such consciously ideological choice is the order in which the *Xiao jing yanyi* presents its material. Following the *Xiao jing* itself, the A-level sections address the filial piety of the emperor, then the nobles, then ministers, then lower officials, and then the common people.

This order of presentation reinforces the hierarchy of these five social groups. The order in which key concepts are discussed within the text is also important, both at the section level and the sentence level: the editors often explain that X is discussed before Y because X is more important than Y. Next, within each C-level section, selections from the Five Classics are presented first, followed by those from dynastic histories, and finally those from more recent scholarly treatises. This order of presentation reinforces the hierarchies of the literary canon. Throughout the text the sequence of information enacts several hierarchies simultaneously: social, logical-philosophical, and literary.

Another form of explicit spatial hierarchy in the *Xiao jing yanyi* is the relative space devoted to different topics: more important topics get more space. Most striking is the imbalance in the lengths of the A-level sections. “The Filial Piety of the Son of Heaven” (*Tianzi zhi xiao* 天子之孝) has fifty-five *juan*, more than half of the work, while the sections on the other social roles have between three and nine *juan* each. The editors explain in their guidelines to readers that because the personal virtue of the Emperor transforms all his subjects, “therefore, this book goes into detail when expanding the meaning of the Son of Heaven’s filiality, but for the nobles and lower classes, summarizes more sparingly” 故是書詳于衍天子之孝，而諸侯以下，則少略焉。³⁶ More important ideas and people take up more textual space.

Each spatial form of hierarchy seems clear-cut, but they often work against each other. For example, although the editors’ commentary is lower on the page and always comes after the source it comments on, it also takes up the most space and sometimes authoritatively critiques the sources it responds to. The relative space devoted to different items can also cut both ways. The massive space dedicated to the emperor not only shows his importance and places him at the center of society but also makes the book look less like a general scholarly commentary and

more like a lesson aimed at one student. We know, too, that one of the *Xiao jing yanyi*'s editors, Zhang Ying, had been one of the Kangxi emperor's diarists starting in 1673, and one of his duties was to expound the classics to his ruler.³⁷ Thus the spatial form of the text embodies the teacher-student dynamic that was one aspect of the relationship between the editor and the emperor, putting the emperor below the text. The spatial arrangement of the text creates hierarchies of meaning, but these hierarchies are multidimensional and sometimes subvert each other.

The text's multiple hierarchies make space for the multiple meanings of filiality in the early Qing political context. Filial piety was integral to early Chinese conceptions of political authority in a philosophical framework termed by Norman Kutcher the "parallel conception of society," in which the filial devotion of officials to their parents was seen as the root of their political loyalty to the ruler.³⁸ Though originally reciprocal in emphasis, the philosophical connection between filial devotion and political loyalty shifted over time, becoming increasingly authoritarian during and after the Han dynasty.³⁹ The *Xiao jing yanyi* shifts between reciprocity and authoritarianism. In the opening sections, the *Xiao jing yanyi* outlines an authoritarian alignment of the emperor with heaven and with the father, the minister with earth and with the son. But when it returns to the ruler-minister relationship nearer the middle of the work, the *Xiao jing yanyi* emphasizes reciprocal obligation and identifies the ruler with the filial son. These ideological shifts within the text arise not only from the inherent complexity of filiality in the Chinese tradition but also from the ongoing political negotiations in the early Qing, in which both rulers and ministers worked strategically to blend Manchu and Han approaches to rulership. The spatial form of the text incorporates multiple messages with distinct goals and audiences.

The text opens on an authoritarian note. It begins with two short A-level sections on key phrases from the first passage of the *Xiao jing*, “Expanding the Meaning of the Ultimate Virtue” (*Yan zhi de zhi yi* 衍至德之義) and “Expanding the Meaning of the Essential Way” (*Yan yao dao zhi yi* 衍要道之義). “Expanding the Meaning of the Essential Way” is divided into five B-level sections on the Five Relations (*wulun* 五倫), and in the B-level section titled “Ruler and Minister,” the editors quote Cheng Yi’s 程頤 (1033–1107) commentary on the *Yi jing* 易經 (Classic of changes): “Heaven is the ancestor of the ten thousand things; the king is the ancestor of the ten thousand territories” 天爲萬物之祖，王爲萬邦之祖 (*XJYY* 9.1a). They comment as follows:

The Way of the ruler adheres most closely to the principle of Heaven (*qian* 乾); the Way of the minister adheres most closely to the principle of Earth (*kun* 坤). Heaven controls the great beginnings, so the ruler is called the first origin; Earth brings forth all things, so the minister is called the agent of completion. Nevertheless, the Way of the ruler is non-action; the one who acts is the minister. The reason that [the minister] does not dare to take lasting credit for his achievements is this: Earth yields credit to Heaven, the minister yields credit to the ruler, the son yields credit to the father.

君道莫著於乾，臣道莫著於坤。乾知大始，故君曰首出；坤作成物，故臣曰代終。然而君道無爲云爾。爲之者，臣也。所以不敢居其成功者，地讓善於天，臣讓善於君，子讓善於父。(*XJYY* 9.2a–b)

The set of parallels is clear: Ruler = father = heaven; minister = son = earth. This authoritarian approach to the father-son relationship as a framework for the political order is a highly conventional reading of the *Yi jing* in the Cheng-Zhu tradition. But in the early Qing context, the

father-son metaphor meant different things to different constituencies. It carried separate, important messages from a Manchu emperor to his Manchu and Chinese subjects.

From a Manchu emperor's point of view, the persona of emperor-as-father was calculated to gain the loyalty of Chinese subjects. Chinese observers noted the personal, intimate quality of early Qing monarchs' relationships with their subordinates. The playwright Kong Shangren described an encounter with the Kangxi emperor as follows: "He dispersed the awesome air of his surroundings; sovereign and minister became like father and son."⁴⁰ Fredric Wakeman describes this intimate ruling style as a Manchu cultural characteristic that contrasted strongly with the ruling style of late Ming emperors, who were close to their eunuchs and very distant from their ministers. Qing rulers used paternalism as a political strategy to ensure their ministers' personal loyalty and forestall factionalism.⁴¹ Although the *Xiao jing* already frames the ruler-minister relationship in affective terms, in the late Ming dynasty, intimacy was absent from the actual ruler-minister relationship. The Manchus' intimate treatment of their ministers was a shift from late Ming reality, and this change in behavior gives new significance to the discursive emphasis on intimacy in both the classic and its early Qing expansion. As a message to Han ministers, using the *Xiao jing* to frame the ruler-minister relationship as a father-son relationship legitimizes Manchu rule by highlighting its contrast with the failings of late Ming rule. The authoritarian aspects of the metaphor would not have been noteworthy to Chinese observers in the early Qing; more striking was the way that Manchu emperors strategically deployed its latent intimacy.

But the emphasis of the *Xiao jing yanyi* on filial piety as the model for a minister's relationship to his ruler makes a very different statement to the emperor's Manchu subjects. In the context of Manchu culture, the metaphor does not emphasize intimacy but rather creates

strategic distance between ruler and subject. The fundamental political metaphor of Manchu culture was the master-slave relationship, in which the benevolent paternal master gave protection and sustenance, while the childlike slave returned loyalty and obedience.⁴² For Manchus the father-son relationship was a secondary metaphor activating the primary metaphor of the master-slave relationship, which was already understood in affective and passionate terms. But Manchu and Mongolian tribal leaders did not submit so profoundly to the Aisin Gioro without a struggle. The early Manchu rulers Dorgon (1612–1650) and Hung Taiji (1592–1643) not only had to convince their Han subjects that they had the Mandate of Heaven but also had to convince their Manchu and Mongolian followers that they should govern as emperors rather than as khans or princes (*beile* 貝勒). They wanted a much greater power differential between themselves and their ministers than between a khan and other tribal leaders.⁴³ Manchu sponsorship of scholarship on the Chinese classics helped early Manchu rulers naturalize the idea of emperorship. For example, Hung Taiji sponsored translations of Chinese history and political philosophy into Manchu, and these translations emphasized the importance of Jurchen and Mongolian imperial rule in order to communicate that emperorship as a form of government was not specific to China.⁴⁴ In this context the *Xiao jing yanyi* uses the three-way parallel linking father and son, heaven and earth, and ruler and minister to further naturalize a wide gap between ruler and minister. It strengthens the ethical foundation for the choice of emperorship as a mode of rule, defining a social hierarchy in which the ruler is not first among equals or first by right of conquest but the son of heaven and father of his people.

Thus when the *Xiao jing yanyi* precedes its discussion of the emperor as filial son with a reassertion of the metaphor of the emperor as father, it sends strategically different messages to Chinese and Inner Asian subjects of the Qing. In later sections, however, the *Xiao jing yanyi*

turns from discussing the emperor as a father to treating him as a filial son, and it becomes clear that the emperor's filial piety was a strategically useful concept for the Chinese scholar-officials who edited the book as well.

The middle chapters of the *Xiao jing yanyi* emphasize the intimate aspects of the parallel conception of society rather than its authoritarian overtones. For example, a C-level section titled "Treating Ministers as One's Body," in the A-level section "The Filial Piety of the Son of Heaven" and the B-level section "Cherishing Parents," features biographies of emperors who respect their ministers, raise their salaries to encourage honesty, and give them bonuses when they have sick family members or funeral expenses. The editors open the chapter by drawing another analogy between ruler and minister and father and son:

The classics state that the Way of father and son contains the meaning of ruler and minister; the *Book of Ceremonies* says that father and son are one body, with the father as the head and the son as the feet; the difference between ruler and minister is analogous to that between cap and shoes, and ruler and minister are also like hands and feet. The father has many sons, just as the four limbs assist each other; the ruler has many ministers; this is also just like the four limbs' assisting each other.

經言父子之道有君臣之義，《儀禮》言父子一體，父首子足，君臣之分喻于冠履，君臣亦手足也。父之有衆子如四體之相輔，君之有羣臣亦猶四體之相附也。(XJYY

26.1a)

The editors begin by returning to the analogy of ruler with father and minister with son. But in contrast to their emphasis on hierarchy in the commentary on the father-son analogy within the subsection "Ruler and Minister," here they emphasize closeness. Ruler and minister are one body.

Throughout “Treating Ministers as One’s Body,” the editors use the metaphor of the minister as the ruler’s body to emphasize the trust that a ruler should have in his ministers. This message emerges with particular clarity in the editors’ commentary to two memorials submitted to Tang Taizong by his minister Wei Zheng 魏徵 (580–643). In these memorials Wei Zheng admonished his emperor for failing to trust his ministers. This message evidently struck a nerve with the Qing editors; their commentary on these passages takes the form of a 1,105-character screed, the longest single passage of commentary in the *Xiao jing yanyi*. The editors explain “the ruler of the people is like the heart-mind of the body” 夫人君者，猶身之有心也 (XJYY 26.22a). And they elaborate:

Now the principle by which the limbs take their orders from the heart-mind, and by which the heart-mind puts the limbs to work, yet without conscious thought, resembles the principle that responding to the subtlest signals is the utmost agility. As people say nowadays “trusting one’s hands, trusting one’s steps.” “Trust” means not doubting what they are doing. Even those under heaven who are prone to doubts certainly do not doubt their own legs, arms, ears, and eyes; thus the limbs are able to be useful to each other and not separate from each other. Now the ruler’s ability to govern all things and to make use of all their motions likewise stems from treating them as one body.

夫四肢百骸之聽命于心，心之能役使四肢百骸，乃不期然而然之理，相喻于甚微相感者至捷，如今人之言，「信手信步」。信之云者，不疑其所為也。天下之善疑者，必不自疑其股肱耳目，故能相為用而不相離。然則人主之能宰制萬物，役使羣動，惟其以之為一體故也。(XJYY 26.23b - 24a)

The idea that an emperor should both cherish his ministers as his own body and trust them as instinctively as he trusts his hands and feet to move at his desire, forms the philosophical core of

this section. It balances hierarchy with the closest intimacy. And judging by the relative space the editors devote to expounding it, it is one of their most urgent concerns. The surrounding passages offer clues to its importance: the excerpts from dynastic histories that precede and succeed this passage all feature emperors granting generous salaries and mourning leaves to their officials, not only caring for their needs but also trusting them honestly to declare their needs.

Two biographies in particular, one of a Han emperor and one of a Jurchen emperor, allow the editors to speak to a particular policy debate of the Kangxi era. This was the question of mourning leaves for officials, which placed Han and Manchu norms in tension and pitted filial piety against bureaucratic efficiency. In the chapter “Treating Ministers as One’s Body,” the *Xiao jing yanyi* pairs the biographies of Emperor Zhang 章 of the Han dynasty (r. 75–88 C.E.) and Emperor Shizong 世宗 of the Jin 金 dynasty (r. 1161–1189), who both urged ministers to return home to visit sick parents. The editors’ commentary on Jin Shizong is especially pointed. “Jin Shizong can be called one who knew how to treat a minister like his body. When a parent is ill, one cannot but serve them; then when in mourning, how can one cut short the time of mourning?” 世宗可謂能體其臣矣。親疾不可不侍也，則居喪豈可以奪情哉 (*XJYY* 26.30a). This statement was ethnically and politically loaded. For Han Chinese filiality was manifested in long mourning periods, over two years for a parent’s death, during which officials had to leave office to observe austerities. Within the ideological framework of the parallel conception of society, rulers who enforced filial and mourning rituals despite the bureaucratic difficulties involved strengthened the foundations of their own power. But Manchus mourned differently. Their funeral practices were more diverse and less codified, and they did not observe lengthy mourning periods; instead they observed mourning by cutting their queues. And Manchu rulers periodically criticized the extravagance of Chinese funerals or denied Chinese officials’ requests

for long mourning leaves.⁴⁵ So for the editors of the *Xiao jing yanyi* to select a Jurchen emperor as an exemplar who enabled his ministers' filial piety was a pointed message indeed: allowing ministers to return home to care for and mourn their parents was simply good policy for any emperor—Chinese or not.

But this assertion ran counter to the Kangxi emperor's developing approach to mourning. The *Xiao jing yanyi* was completed in 1682 but not published until 1690. Between the two dates, in 1688, Kangxi's grandmother the Dowager Empress Xiaozhuang died. Kangxi mourned her as a parent for a full twenty-seven months, going beyond traditional norms. But that mourning consisted of wearing mourning clothes in private and avoiding auspicious functions, not of the traditional withdrawal from government affairs. His mourning was both highly publicized and deeply private, and it did not interfere with his job. Kangxi's mourning for Xiaozhuang was a key stage in his development of new expressions of filial piety that framed mourning as a personal affair. In subsequent decades of his reign, he would require his officials to "mourn at their posts" rather than make the trip home that had previously been an integral part of the mourning process.⁴⁶ In this way he attempted to coopt the parallel conception of society and its powerful psychological foundation for political loyalty while also reducing the practical governance problems caused by officials' long leaves of absence.

In other words the Kangxi emperor actively worked to transform Chinese political culture, even those aspects of it that he adopted. His sponsorship of the *Xiao jing yanyi* is one example of his strategic promulgation of the virtue of filial piety, which must be understood in the context of his ongoing alteration of the content of filial piety. The editors' pointed pleas for more generous leave would go unheard. Their presence in the *Xiao jing yanyi*, published with the emperor's imprimatur of approval yet denied in his later practice, is a road not taken, a loose end

from a political order in transition. Reading the commentary here against the backdrop of the Kangxi emperor's changes to mourning leave policy shows that classical scholarship was an arena for political and cultural negotiation in the early Qing; as in the political dialogue of edicts and memorials, the emperor had the final say, but Han scholar-officials had a voice.

The other biographies in “Treating Ministers as One’s Body,” and the commentary thereon, are equally politically pointed. Their protagonists are emperors who gave ministers financial gifts to support their ailing parents and raised their salaries so they could support their parents without taking bribes. For example, Emperor Wu 武 of the Jin 晉 dynasty (r. 266–290) increased his officials’ salaries specifically so that they could better support their parents. The Qing editors comment approvingly: “To support one’s parents generously is the filial piety of filling their bellies. To give weight to public matters and forget private ones is the filial piety of fulfilling their ambition. Therefore, increasing salaries truly can spread filial piety” 養親施惠，養口體之孝也。奉公忘私，養志之孝也。故重祿真可以廣孝 (XJYY 26.16a). The question of salary, like that of mourning leaves, was a timely one in the early Qing. For centuries official salaries had not kept pace with inflation, making corruption difficult to avoid. And although official corruption was a policy focus of the Dorgon, Shunzhi, and Kangxi reigns, they emphasized punishment for corrupt officials; it would take until the Yongzheng era before an emperor actually raised salaries as a way of addressing corruption.⁴⁷ In this light the editors’ long and impassioned plea for emperors to treat their officials with generosity and trust rather than suspicion takes on a new and urgent meaning.

The biographies selected for inclusion in “Treating Ministers as One’s Body” consistently emphasize that the emperor’s financial generosity enables ministers to care for their parents as filial sons. The emperor enacts filiality through his care for his ministers as his own

body, just as the heart-mind enacts its virtues through the four limbs. The ministers' filiality is the manifestation of the emperor's filiality. Thus, through an emphasis on intimacy and reciprocal obligations, the section works its way through a logical progression from the emperor as father to the emperor as son, and this ideological framework articulates and justifies the editors' demands for higher salaries and mourning leaves. Of course, the idea that an emperor should express care for his ministers through concrete generosity does not directly contradict the more authoritarian uses of the metaphor expressed in earlier sections of the *Xiao jing yanyi*. But this section emphasizes the reciprocal obligation of the emperor to his subjects much more strongly. Furthermore, in this section the emperor is more closely aligned with the filial son doing the cherishing than with the parents being cherished. The text moves easily from respecting the emperor as a father to respecting him for his filial piety to admonishing him toward greater filial piety in the form of greater care for his impoverished ministers.

It is significant that this message is buried deep within the text, in the middle of *juan* 26. Both the earlier *juan* and the opening passages of this *juan* contain messages that are more abstract and more authoritarian, while the commentary in the middle of the middle chapters contains the Chinese ministers' pleas related to their specific problems and experiences. I confess to some skepticism about how many of those middle chapters and chapter middles the Kangxi emperor actually read, and how carefully, before writing his preface of imperial approval to the hundred-*juan* tome. These passages are not "peripheral" to the text in the sense of being on the margins. But I suggest that we consider the text not merely as two-dimensional space, from top to bottom of the page and from right to left of the book, but as three-dimensional space with the added dimension of depth: A-level titles at the surface, where a skimming reader would readily encounter them, and middle passages of middle chapters at the bottom, where only a diligent

reader would penetrate. This third dimension shows where less-privileged voices and messages are located within the book: not pushed out but pushed down, not marginalized but buried.

The *Xiao jing yanyi* orders its contents spatially from top to bottom on the page, from right to left in the book, from more space to less space, and from surface to depth. These spatial hierarchies operate simultaneously to communicate different messages. We do not need to think about the text as a space in order to perceive the tensions within it; close reading does that. Rather what spatial analysis allows us to see is how the three-dimensional architecture of the book makes space for those contradictions, allowing the reader to experience all of them tectonically. Just as, in a cube, six squares all meet at right angles—impossible in a two-dimensional projection of a cube—the three-dimensional architecture of the anthology allows the emperor to be both on top and at the center, both a father and a son, both the text’s ultimate author and its ultimate reader. In this way the book commissioned by a Manchu emperor and compiled by Han ministers makes space for messages between the multiple constituencies of the early Qing.

Conclusion

What do women warriors and filial emperors have in common? Both are politically symbolic figures, meaningful to both Han and Manchu audiences but meaning different things to each. Their presence helps the *Nei ze yanyi* and the *Xiao jing yanyi* appeal simultaneously to multiple audiences. These anthologies are textual spaces that work to underpin and frame the sociopolitical relationships that were in flux in the early Qing. The space of each text transcends the tensions between specific passages within each text; it organizes the multiple meanings of culturally loaded patterns of virtue. Unlike Han scholars who asserted the fundamental

superiority of Han or Hua civilization over “barbarians,” the Chinese editors of these anthologies sought not only to “transform” or “civilize” their new overlords but also to “expand the meaning” of Chinese classics by deliberately making space for aspects of steppe political culture and family norms, as well as by using them to intervene in the practical controversies of early Qing governance.

In both the *Nei ze yanyi* and the *Xiao jing yanyi*, the editors use the physical arrangement of text on the page to shape a mass of material from the classics and histories, in which exemplars from many dynasties and people groups enact a wide range of culturally specific virtues. Their organization and page layout are not unique. Neither is the presence of competing values within a single text nor the printing of different textual voices on the same page. But a spatial approach to these particular anthologies shows how early Qing editors combined established organizational techniques to shape textual spaces suited to the political and ethnic pressures of the moment. They create ideological edifices founded on the Chinese classics yet constructed with examples from both Chinese and steppe dynasties. The details of page layout and chapter sequence are the building blocks of the elaborate textual architecture that encompasses a multiplicity of messages and audiences, governing the relationships between the many actors involved in each book’s creation and reception. The spatial form of the *Nei ze yanyi* embodies the empire’s capacious containment of multitudes, while that of the *Xiao jing yanyi* articulates its competing hierarchies. In both cases the result is a multidimensional orthodoxy, a temple of empire.

Smith College

jmoyer@smith.edu

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Yuanfei Wang and Guojun Wang, as well as the two anonymous reviewers for *JCLC*, for invaluable feedback on earlier versions of this article. All remaining errors are my own. The initial research for this article was supported by a Jean Picker Fellowship from Smith College.

Appendix

Table 1: Categories and Subcategories in the *Neize yanyi* (16 *juan*)

Category	Located in <i>juan</i>	Pages in SKQS	Subcategory	Located in <i>juan</i>	Pages in SKQS
孝之道 Filial Piety	1–2	45	事舅姑 Serving In-laws	1	21.5
			事父母 Serving Parents	2	23.5
敬之道 The Way of Reverence	3	29.5	事夫 Serving Husbands	3	10.5
			勸學 Persuading to Study	3	1.5
			佐忠 Assisting Loyalty	3	8.5
			贊廉 Praising Incorruptibility	3	3
			重賢 Valuing Worthiness	3	6
			教之道 The Way of Teaching	4–5	44.5
勉學 Urging Study	5	6.5			
訓忠 Training in Loyalty	5	6			
禮之道 The Way of Ritual	5–12	224.5	敬祭祀 Reverence in Sacrifices	5	14
			肅家政 Treating Household Management Solemnly	6	8.5
			定變 Stabilizing Crises	6	19.5
			守貞 Maintaining Chastity	7–8	55
			殉節 Chastity Martyrs	9–11	94
			端好尚 Uprightness	12	7
			崇儉約 Revering Thrift	12	14
			謹言 Caution in Speech	12	3
			慎儀 Care in Ceremony	12	9.5
讓之道	13–14	33.5	崇謙退 Revering Modesty	13	11

The Way of Yielding			和妯娌 Harmony with Sisters-in-law	13	7.5
			睦宗族 Harmony with the Clan	13	4
			待外戚 Treatment of Relatives	14	11
慈之道 The Way of Kindness	14-15	38.5	逮下 Treatment of Inferiors	14	9
			慈幼 Kindness to the Young	14	14
			敦仁 Sincerity and Humaneness	15	6.5
			愛民 Cherishing the People	15	6
			宥過 Forgiving Errors	15	3
勤之道 The Way of Diligence	15	14	女工 Womanly Work	15	9
			飲食 Food and Drink	15	5
學之道 The Way of Study	16	24.5	好學 Love of Study	16	13.5
			著書 Authoring Books	16	11

Table 2: A-level and B-level headings in the *Xiao jing yanyi* (100 *juan*)

A-level Heading	Located in <i>juan</i>	Number of <i>juan</i>	B-level Heading	Located in <i>juan</i>	Number of <i>juan</i>
衍至德之義 Expanding the Meaning of the Ultimate Virtue	1–6	6	仁 Humaneness	1–2	2
			義 Righteousness	3	1
			禮 Ritual	4	1
			智 Wisdom	5	1
			信 Trust	6	1
衍要道之義 Expanding the Meaning of the Essential Way	7–12	6	父子 Father and Son	7–8	2
			君臣 Ruler and Minister	9	1
			兄弟 Elder and Younger Brother	10	1
			夫婦 Husband and Wife	11	1
			朋友 Friends	12	1
衍教所由生之義 Expanding the Meaning of the Source of Teaching	13–20	8	禮 Rites	13–14	2
			樂 Music	15–16	2
			政 Government	17–18	2
			刑 Punishment	19–20	2
天子之孝 The Filial Piety of the Son of Heaven*	21–75	55	愛親 Cherishing Parents	21–41	21
			敬親 Respecting Parents	42–75	34
諸侯之孝 The Filial Piety of Nobles	76–79	4	愛親 Cherishing Parents	76	1
			敬親 Respecting Parents	77	1
			不驕 Avoiding Arrogance	78	1
			不溢 Avoiding Excess	79	1
卿大夫之孝 The Filial Piety of Great Ministers	80–89	10	愛親 Cherishing Parents	80–82	3
			敬親 Respecting Parents	83	1
			法服 Regulating Clothing	84	1
			法言 Regulating Speech	85	1
			德行 Virtuous Conduct	86–89	4
士之孝 The Filial Piety of Officials	90–95	6	愛親 Cherishing Parents	90	1
			敬親 Respecting Parents	91	1
			事君忠 Serving Rulers Loyally	92–93	1
			事長順 Serving Elders Submissively	94–95	2
庶人之孝	96–98	3	愛親 Cherishing Parents	96	1
			敬親 Respecting Parents	97	1

The Filial Piety of Common People			用天道、分地利、謹身、節用 Following the Course of Heaven; Distinguishing the Advantages of Soils; Careful Conduct; Sparing Expenditure	98	1
大順之徵 The Signs of Great Compliance	99–100	2			

*Headings in bold are further subdivided into C-level categories (see table 3).

Table 3: C-level Headings in the *Xiao jing yanyi*

A-level and B-level heading	Located in <i>juan</i>	Number of <i>juan</i>	C-level heading	Located in <i>juan</i>	Number of <i>juan</i>
天子之孝： 愛親 The Filial Piety of the Son of Heaven: Cherishing Parents	21–41	21	愛親 Cherishing Parents	21	1
			早諭教 Training the Young	22	1
			均慈愛 Fairly Distributing Love	23	1
			敦友恭 Sincerity in Brotherly Love	24	1
			親九族 The Nine Degrees of Relation	25	1
			體臣工 Treating Ministers as one's Body	26	1
			重守令 Valuing County Magistrates	27	1
			愛百姓 Cherishing the Common People	28	1
			課農桑 Diligence in Agriculture and Sericulture	29–31	3
			薄稅斂 Light Taxation	32–35	4
			備凶荒 Disaster Preparation	36–37	2
			省刑罰 Sparing Punishments	38–39	2
			恤征戎 Pitying Soldiers	40–41	2
天子之孝： 敬親 The Filial Piety of the Son of Heaven: Respecting Parents	42–75	24	敬親 Respecting Parents	42	1
			事天地 Serving Heaven and Earth	43–44	2
			法祖宗 Emulating Ancestors	45–47	3
			隆郊配 Solemnity in Dynastic Sacrifices	48–50	3
			嚴宗廟 Strictness in Ancestral Sacrifices	51–53	3
			重學校 Valuing Schools	54–55	2
			崇聖學 Revering Sagely Learning	56–59	4
			教官闈 Teaching the Imperial Harem	60–61	2
			論官材 Selecting Officials	62–65	4
			優大臣 Respecting Great Ministers	66	1
			設諫官 Accepting Remonstrance	67–68	2
			正紀綱 Rectifying Relationships	69	1
			別賢否 Distinguishing the Worthy	70	1
			制國用 Limiting State Expenditures	71–72	2
厚風俗 Making Customs Sincere	73–75	3			

<A>Notes

1. The Shunzhi emperor sponsored at least fifteen didactic treatises, and the Kangxi emperor engaged in even more extensive scholarly patronage.
2. The Tang and Song founders both carried out large publication projects. Wechsler, *Mirror to the Son of Heaven*, 110–15, 140–42; Johannes, “Politics of Collecting Knowledge,” 301–6.
3. Hummel, *Eminent Chinese of the Ch’ing Period*, 258–59.
4. Wakeman, *Great Enterprise*, 1094.
5. Pamela Crossley has cautioned that the term *ethnicity* can be misleading when applied to the early Qing, when ideas of shared descent were much less important than they became in the eighteenth century. But, as Mark Elliott points out, ethnic discourse in general shifts contingently and strategically over time. Manchu and Han awareness of themselves as distinct people groups was important in establishing the Qing state from the beginning. Crossley, *Translucent Mirror*, 47–50; Elliott, *Manchu Way*, 16–20.
6. Chow, *Rise of Confucian Ritualism*, 165–66; Rawski, *Last Emperors*, 6.
7. For example, in a 1698 edict, the Kangxi emperor urged banner officials to report chaste widows and filial sons for state awards, asking rhetorically, “How could it be that among the Eight Banners there are no filial sons” 八旗豈無孝子? *Da Qing Shengzuren huangdi shilu*, 191:24.
8. Elliott, *Manchu Way*, 2–8.
9. Clarke, Leibniz, and Newton, *Leibniz-Clarke Correspondence*, 25–26.
10. Mitchell, “Spatial Form in Literature,” 541.
11. *Ibid.*, 560.
12. *Ibid.*, 549–50.
13. Plaks, *Four Masterworks of the Ming Novel*; Rolston, *Traditional Chinese Fiction and Fiction Commentary*.
14. Examples include Lan Dingyuan 藍鼎元 (1680–1733) in Taiwan and Chen Hongmou 陳宏謀 (1696–1771) in Yunnan. G. Li, “Control of Female Energies,” 48–53; Rowe, *Saving the World*, 423–26.
15. Ding, “Guanyu Qingdai manzu funü”; Lai and Xu, “Qingdai qiren funü”; Elliott, “Manchu Widows and Ethnicity in Qing China,” 54–57.
16. The Yongzheng emperor later borrowed the same logic, pointing to the Qing emperors’ successful rule as evidence that they had been transformed (*hua*) in the course of their history. Crossley, *Translucent Mirror*, 247–50, 55–57.
17. Elliott, “Manchu Widows and Ethnicity in Qing China,” 38–42.
18. Theiss, “Managing Martyrdom,” 49–60.
19. This analysis focuses on the Chinese edition, both to facilitate comparison with the *Xiao jing yanyi* and because Chinese was the language of composition.
20. It was reprinted once in Manchu and three times in Chinese. Huang and Qu, *Quanguo manwen tushu ziliao lianhe mulu; Zhongguo guji zongmu*.
21. Starting in 1653, consorts for the Aisin Gioro were selected through the *xiunü* 秀女 (beautiful women) draft for the daughters of banner officials, and the Shunzhi emperor denied keeping Chinese women in his harem; however, Shuo Wang has found that he did have two Chinese consorts. Rawski, *Last Emperors*, 130–31; Wang, “Qing Imperial Women,” 141.
22. It seems likely, however, that Xiaozhuang herself either read the Manchu version of the book or had it read to her. Her biography in the *Draft History of the Qing* not only mentions that she

- requested the compilation of the *Nei ze yanyi* but also tells how the Kangxi emperor ordered a scholar-official to translate the Song treatise *Da xue yanyi* and presented it to her; the empress rewarded the scholar richly. This suggests that Xiaozhuang took an interest in classical scholarship through translated editions. Zhao et al., *Qing shi gao*, 88.4b–5a.
23. Fu, *Yuding Nei ze yanyi*, preface (hereafter cited parenthetically as NZYY)
 24. See the appendix for an overview.
 25. Wakeman, *Great Enterprise*, 848; McMahon, *Celestial Women*, 271–74.
 26. For example, his discussion of poor widows who commit suicide names poverty and pressure from in-laws and well-meaning neighbors as factors pushing poor women to remarry (NZYY 11.4b).
 28. Many late imperial didactic books for women are organized either by virtue type (but none with these specific virtues) or by family role; for one discussion of the significance of these organizational schema, see Raphals, *Sharing the Light*.
 28. Ding, “Qingdai manzu funü,” 1–2.
 29. *Ibid.*, 3.
 30. Rawski, *Last Emperors*, 175–94.
 31. One well-known book that offers ground for comparison is the sixteenth-century *Nüfan jielu* 女範捷錄 (Concise record of models for women), one of the *Four Books for Women*. The *Nüfan jielu* is also organized topically and also praises women who ably handle sudden emergencies (in the chapter on wisdom, *zhihui pian* 智慧篇). It even contains a few scattered examples of women who fight battles (in the chapter on loyalty and righteousness, *zhongyi pian* 忠義篇). But none of these are in the section on ritual propriety (*bing li pian* 秉禮篇). Wang and Pang-White, *Confucian Four Books for Women*.
 32. W. Li, *Women and National Trauma*, 230–41.
 33. Johnson, *Women of the Conquest Dynasties*, 121–22.
 34. My own interpretation is that all his heroines heroically maintain the distinctions on which both individual identity and the social order rely. See Zito, “Ritualizing Li.”
 35. See the appendix for an overview.
 36. Ye, Zhang, and Han, *Yuding Xiao jing yanyi* (hereafter cited parenthetically as XJYY).
 37. Hummel, *Eminent Chinese of the Ch’ing Period*, 64.
 38. Kutcher, *Mourning in Late Imperial China*, 2–3.
 39. Tu, *Centrality and Commonality*, 55–56; Hsü, “Myth of the ‘Five Human Relations,’” 37.
 40. Translated in Strassberg, *World of K’ung Shang-jen*, 55–56.
 41. Wakeman, *Great Enterprise*, 1013.
 42. Crossley, *Translucent Mirror*, 140–41.
 43. Wakeman, *Great Enterprise*, 157–67, 203–9.
 44. Crossley, *Translucent Mirror*, 190–91.
 45. Kutcher, *Mourning in Late Imperial China*, 88–104.
 46. *Ibid.*, 96–97.
 47. Wakeman, *Great Enterprise*, 903.

References

- NZYY Fu Yijian 傅以漸. *Yuding Nei ze yanyi* 御定內則衍義 (Imperially Commissioned Expanded Meaning of the “Inner Standards”). Siku Quanshu, Wenyuange ed. Hong Kong: Dizhi wenhua chuban youxian gongsi, 2006.
- XJYY Ye Fang'ai 葉方藹, Zhang Ying 張英, and Han Tan 韓荃. *Yuding Xiao jing yanyi* 御定孝經衍義 (Imperially Commissioned Expanded Meaning of the “Classic of Filial Piety”). Siku Quanshu, Wenyuange ed. Hong Kong: Dizhi wenhua chuban youxian gongsi, 2006.
- Chow, Kai-wing. *The Rise of Confucian Ritualism in Late Imperial China: Ethics, Classics, and Lineage Discourse*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994.
- Clarke, Samuel, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, and Isaac Newton. *The Leibniz-Clarke Correspondence, Together with Extracts from Newton's Principia and Opticks*. Edited by H. G. Alexander. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956.
- Crossley, Pamela. *A Translucent Mirror: History and Identity in Qing Imperial Ideology*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Da Qing Shengzuren huangdi shilu* 大清聖祖仁皇帝實錄 (Veritable Records of Emperor Ren Shengzu of the Great Qing). Taipei: Huawen shuju, 1964.
- Ding Yizhuang 定宜庄. “Guanyu Qingdai manzu funü shi yanjiu de ruogan sikao 关于清代满族妇女史研究的若干思考” (Some Thoughts on the History of Manchu Women in the Qing). *Jilin shifan daxue xuebao (renwen shehui kexue ban)* 6 (2014): 1–7.
- Elliott, Mark. *The Manchu Way: The Eight Banners and Ethnic Identity in Late Imperial China*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002.

- _____. “Manchu Widows and Ethnicity in Qing China.” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 41, no. 1 (1999): 33–71.
- Frank, Joseph. “Spatial Form in Modern Literature: An Essay in Two Parts.” *Sewanee Review* 53, no. 2 (1945): 221–40.
- Hsü, Dau-lin. “The Myth of the ‘Five Human Relations’ of Confucius.” *Monumenta Serica* 29, no. 1 (1970): 27–37.
- Huang Runhua 黃潤華 and Qu Liusheng 屈六生. *Quanguo manwen tushu ziliao lianhe mulu* 全國滿文圖書資料聯合目錄 (Combined Catalog of Manchu Books and Materials in China). Beijing: Shumu wenxian chubanshe, 1991.
- Hummel, Arthur, ed. *Eminent Chinese of the Ch’ing Period*. Washington, DC: US Government Print Office, 1943.
- Johannes, L. Kurz. “The Politics of Collecting Knowledge: Song Taizong’s Compilations Project.” *T’oung Pao* 87, no. 4/5 (2001): 289–316.
- Johnson, Linda Cooke. *Women of the Conquest Dynasties: Gender and Identity in Liao and Jin China*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2011.
- Kutcher, Norman. *Mourning in Late Imperial China: Filial Piety and the State*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Lai Huimin 賴惠敏 and Xu Siling 徐思冷. “Qingdai qiren funü caichanquan zhi qianxi 清代旗人婦女財產權之淺析” (A Preliminary Analysis of Qing Bannerwomen’s Property Rights). *Jindai Zhongguo funü shi yanjiu* 4 (1996): 3–33.
- Li, Guotong. “The Control of Female Energies: Gender and Ethnicity on China’s Southeast Coast.” In *Gender and Chinese History: Transformative Encounters*, edited by Beverly Bossler, 41–58. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2015.

- Li, Wai-ye. *Women and National Trauma in Late Imperial Chinese Literature*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2014.
- McMahon, Keith. *Celestial Women: Imperial Wives and Concubines in China from Song to Qing*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2016.
- Mitchell, W. J. T. "Spatial Form in Literature: Toward a General Theory." *Critical Inquiry* 6, no. 3 (1980): 539–67.
- Plaks, Andrew. *The Four Masterworks of the Ming Novel: Ssu Ta Ch'i-Shu*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987.
- Raphals, Lisa Ann. *Sharing the Light: Representations of Women and Virtue in Early China*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998.
- Rawski, Evelyn Sakakida. *The Last Emperors: A Social History of Qing Imperial Institutions*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- Rolston, David. *Traditional Chinese Fiction and Fiction Commentary*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997.
- Rowe, William. *Saving the World: Chen Hongmou and Elite Consciousness in Eighteenth-Century China*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001.
- Strassberg, Richard E. *The World of K'ung Shang-Jen: A Man of Letters in Early Ch'ing China*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.
- Theiss, Janet. "Managing Martyrdom: Female Suicide and Statecraft in Mid-Qing China." *Nan nü* 3, no. 1 (2001): 47–76.
- Tu, Wei-ming. *Centrality and Commonality: An Essay on Chung-Yung*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1976.
- Wakeman, Frederic. *The Great Enterprise*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.

- Wang, Shuo. "Qing Imperial Women: Empresses, Concubines, and Aisin Gioro Daughters." In *Servants of the Dynasty*, edited by Anne Walthall, 137–58. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008.
- Wang, Xiang Jun, and Ann A. Pang-White. *The Confucian Four Books for Women*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Wechsler, Howard J. *Mirror to the Son of Heaven: Wei Cheng at the Court of Tang Tai-Tsung*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975.
- Zhao Erxun 趙爾巽 et al. *Qing shi gao* 清史稿 (Draft Qing History). Beijing: Qing shi guan, 1927.
- Fu Xuancong 傅璇琮, Yang Muzhi 楊牧之 et al. *Zhongguo guji zongmu* 中國古籍總目 (Comprehensive Catalog of Rare Books in China). Beijing: Zhonghua shuju; Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2009.
- Zito, Angela. "Ritualizing Li: Implications for Studying Power and Gender." *positions* 1, no. 2 (1993): 321–48.

