導言：重探「帝國」與「地方社會」

——「華南研究」與「新清史」的對話

編者按：2016年，在日本京都舉辦的亞洲學會亞洲年會(AAS-in-Asia)上，邱源媛、盧正恆、蔡偉傑、許臨君組織了一場以「華南研究」與「新清史」兩個流派對話為思路的討論，邀請耶魯大學蕭鳳霞教授擔任會議主持人、日本東北學院大學小沼孝博教授為評議人。與會學者對此議題表現出很大的興趣，紛紛從不同角度發表議論，這讓四位組織者萌發了邀請更多學人加入，以筆談的形式深化對話的想法。這一提議得到陳博翼、孔令偉的大力支持，共同策劃了此次組稿。同時，我們又有幸邀請到蕭鳳霞、定宜莊、何翠萍、趙世瑜、羅新五位教授進行評論，希望這11篇不同年齡、不同視域、受不同學術傳統影響、不同研究面向的文章能給讀者帶來一場富有啟發的對話。

本文由邱源媛依據原會議內容撰寫背景介紹及提出兩大流派的差異和交融問題，陳博翼補充相關背景和方法論並擷取六篇研究專論的摘要、串聯主題，再經由蔡偉傑潤飾及撰寫綜合各篇的兩段總括性文字，最後由陳博翼撰寫最後兩段總結並統稿。英文版由邱源媛撰寫開頭段落，陳博翼補充完成剩餘段落，許臨君潤飾修改並統稿。筆者感謝兩位匿名評審人熱情的鼓勵和中肯的修改意見，感謝五位在專業領域傑出的前輩學者在繁忙的工作中抽空撰寫交流意見、觀點、評論，以及展望未來研究的方向，也感謝程美寶教授撥冗指正。

《歷史人類學學刊》第十五卷　第二期（2017 年 10 月），頁1-15

在晚期中華帝國史領域中，近二十多年來從「明清社會」出發的「華南研究」與近十餘年來從「清帝國」出發的「新清史」成果頗為突出，作為研究實踐頗引人注目，所產生的衝擊與影響有目共睹。對於何為「華南研究」、何為「新清史」，不同學者有不同的界定或認定。作為新一代學者，我們對於當前學界一般固有印象的感知，大概是二者的差異為「華南研究」主要關注宗族、地方社會、科儀實踐、區域差異、國家與地方的相互關係等問題，倡導田野調查，重視傳統與地方文獻結合，強調以自下而上及自中層行政組織向下的視角思考中國歷史；而「新清史」則試圖將清帝國放置在內亞視角之下，更注重國家與制度層面的思考，通過解讀非漢文史料，反思以「漢人」為中心的傳統清史研究。儘管前輩學者並未預設任何學術風格或取徑，但這兩類研究範式在問題意識、關注對象、史料利用、研究取徑等方面存在一些明顯的差異，自身都有一定的學術特色，而互相之間有意識的交流則相對缺乏。就我們所知，似乎僅在1996年，部份被歸為兩大流派的學者於達特茅斯學院(Dartmouth College)共同舉辦研討會，交流彼此的想法與觀點，其後由柯嬌燕(Pamela K. Crossley)、蕭鳳霞(Helen F. Siu)和蘇堂棟(Donald Sutton)三位主編將會議論文結集出版，是為 *Empire at the Margins: Culture, Ethnicity, and Frontier in Early Modern China* 一書。隨着研究層次的豐富和研究領域的拓展，近年來我們看到相關研究取徑的交集日益增多，更充份的交流與對話也成為可能。就研究時段而言，「華南研究」由宋明綿延至近現代，與「新清史」研究着眼於清代的歷史時段有交疊之處；就研究對象而言，清代中國也是一個單元客體，因而兩者對於時段和對象重合的研究應該有相當多的共同話題。無論是「交集」還是「對話」，我們要強調的都不是什麼「楚河漢界」，而是希望通過這種嘗試和實踐，思考一些學術交流和發展的可能性。近十餘年來「華南研究」「走出華南」的口號已在新一代學者中成為實踐並有相應成果，而「新清史」研究的視野也逐步從國家層面拓展到地方社會，兩大流派的交匯或交融已見端倪。「華南研究」現在強調的更是一種多年實踐積累的方法，因而自然可以用來研究華南、華北、西南以外包括內亞等地的區域，從而觀照所謂「中華帝國」形成及與周邊互動的問題；「新清史」所強調的「內亞」視角和使用滿蒙藏文等多語史料（也是元史等具有深厚研究傳統的領域一直以來所追求和實踐的），在「華南研究」近十來年西南、西北、漠南等區域研究的實踐中也被重視。

作為在「華南研究」和「新清史」等學術潮流中成長的後輩學人，我們的思維、視角和研究方式深受它們的多重啟發，深感相互學習和彼此借鑒的

必要。更重要的是，無論被稱為流派或學派，這些研究團體都是由很多學者個體組成，每個人的研究路徑和方法都有自己的特點、對問題的認知也並不相同，其多樣性的研究對我們的啟發和影響不言而喻。如此，這些不同的看待明清甚或中國的視角如何構成我們對晚期帝制時代的認知，我們的工作又可以從哪些角度豐富怎樣的歷史認識呢？在具體研究過程中，我們嘗試不僅在「華南研究」與「新清史」之間搭建某種橋樑、進行嘗試性對話，更希望能藉由過去二十多年紛繁錯雜的學術史給我們的遺產，超越學界內的一些固有印象、呈現我們所認知的早期近代或晚期帝制時代。這是本次組稿的初衷，也是我們六位青年學者的心願與訴求。我們的討論分別涉及了直隸、京師、福建、蒙古、新疆、藏區等不同類型的區域社會、地方人群或制度衍變，力圖從不同的維度，利用多種不同的語言文獻，對傳統意義上的「漢文化地域」與「非漢文化地域」、「漢文化人群」與「非漢文化人群」，以交錯縱橫的多重視角，就清帝國、八旗制度、流動性、沿海邊界、移民、邊疆社會的形成、律例流轉等問題進行思考和討論。

邱源媛的文章〈土地、繼承與家族——八旗制度影響下的華北地方社會〉以遍佈畿輔地區爲數甚眾的八旗莊園人群爲主體，通過考察他們的身份地位、土地屬性、分家、繼承等問題，反思八旗制度對清代乃至近現代華北農村的作用與影響。有清一代，大量旗人居住在華北，八旗制度對該區尤其是直隸鄉村社會的滲透，戰亂人口的流失以及治平時期新進人口在八旗制度下的補充，似乎導致旗人社會愈加難以形成強大的地方宗族勢力。作爲王朝的政治權力輻射中心，較明顯的「國家在場」是華北區域的顯著特性。莊園旗人如何在八旗制度下形成獨特的家族規約、國家權力如何通過八旗制度而非州縣行政制度作用於地方社會、從非八旗層面體察八旗／滿洲影響因素的多維度與差異性是作者思考的重點。

盧正恆的文章通過使用「華南研究」所強調的田野文獻資料（譬如族譜）、滿文材料（譬如清代官方爵位承襲冊），以比較帝國史「中間人」(intermediary) 的視角，試圖重新了解施琅及其家族如何在定居北京、隸屬八旗制度的同時，仍與原鄉的閩南宗族間保持聯繫。〈雙面刃——清代施氏旗人家族與施氏漢人宗族研究〉將滿文材料與宗族族譜結合，體現了以往想像中的「帝國」與「地方社會」實彼此交融、密不可分，滿文材料有層級或地域上局限性的刻板印象也不攻自破。此文在架構上體現了兩種學術脈絡：「華南研究」中富有特色的社會史取向——譬如宗族研究和地方社會如何利用官方制度的「套利」(arbitrage)，以及「新清史」強調的視角——清帝國

應被置於全球史以及早期近代史脈絡下進一步思考。藉由分析在清帝國統治泉州這一邊區的過程中，施氏家族因軍功而成為帝國底下一個透過八旗制度主導福建舊有體制所確立的「中間人」角色，作者認為施氏的例子可以作為一個合適的案例，顯示清帝國實與同一時期歐亞諸帝國（譬如西班牙和奧斯曼帝國）一樣，均是透過中央制度連結舊有地方制度傳統，以期在邊區達到成本最低卻效率最高的統治。

如果說前兩文審視了八旗制度在串聯直隸、京師和福建的結構性和功能性特點，陳博翼則是對另一項在清初幾十年實行若干次的制度「遷海」及一項貫穿明清數百年時斷時續的制度「保甲」在結構和功能上的進一步揭示。〈漳浦遷海考——堡寨所見遷界範圍與社會變遷〉顯示的不僅是一項制度對基層社會的重塑，更是短期制度激起的「浪花」如何在另一種長期制度下體現為「漣漪」、深刻沉澱為關於帝國的遺產和記憶。在廣泛運用碑刻、族譜、方志、文集、實錄、口傳文本、祠堂和堡寨等建築遺跡等「華南研究」常見的材料文類之外，該文也潛在展現了其對於易代之時「清」對「中國」之「影響」和「繼承」疊加的思考。作者以系統內在性聯繫的視角看一隅，帶出整體史的厚度：漳浦的編戶和保甲既建立在地方堡寨歷史演化的基礎上，又與東南其他地區共用相似的安民防寇路徑和程式。在傳統認為的漢人地區，帝國同樣需要依靠區域特性和歷史「遺產」處理如同「非漢」地區一樣的「邊界」與社會重組問題，這個過程其實也是「國家」形成的過程。由此，這三篇文章構成的自京師、直隸至於東南沿海「中原本土」的制度性結構、聯結和施行的場景也躍然紙上。

後三篇論文對於京師與「藩部」的制度性聯繫和地方區域性衍變的揭示同樣引人入勝。基於兩大流派皆處理的是邊陲與中心、地方社會與中央政府的關係，皆重視研究個人或組織如何構建身份，以及如何跨越由這種身份所帶來的地理、族群與法律邊界或限制等可供對話的議題，三位作者各有精彩的發揮。在「新清史」的「非漢」視角以及「華南研究」的「民間」視角（姑且用這兩個臉譜化的「標籤」）兩種取向的啟發下，蔡偉傑〈居國中以避國：大沙畢與清代移民外蒙古之漢人及其後裔的蒙古化（1768-1830）〉一文將研究地域移到清朝的內亞邊疆，利用烏蘭巴托與臺北的檔案館庋藏的蒙漢文民間文書，以清代漢人移民及其後代在外蒙古的蒙古化為主題，探討了清代蒙古佛教組織作為次官方權威在滿洲統治者、蒙古原住民與漢人移民三方的互動中所起的關鍵作用。通過對蒙漢雙語檔案和民間文書的研究，作者揭示出清代邊陲漢民極具個體選擇合理性的蒙古化抉擇：由於其病重或衰老而

無法回到關內原籍，擔心妻小孤苦無依，故將其妻子、兒孫與家產奉獻給哲布尊丹巴呼圖克圖，成為大沙畢（蒙文 yeke šabi）的屬民與財產。這些漢商的後代藉此由民籍轉入蒙旗籍，在法律上成為蒙古人的一份子，並取得在蒙古合法居留的權利，也得到蒙古社會的接納。透過訴諸蒙古當地佛教制度的權威，這些漢商得以保全自己的家產，避免因清朝官府追緝或內地親戚要求瓜分財產而蒙受損失，並保證其妻小生計無虞，因而達到「居國中以避國」的目的。

許臨君〈從城隍到戍卒——定湘王在新疆〉探索了湘軍征服新疆之後湘人群體在新疆的宗教活動。作者指出湘人群體所崇拜的「定湘王」和「方神」的傳說反映湘軍兵卒從湖南長沙地區到新疆行軍的經驗和在新疆安居之後的歸屬感。由於官方正史對這種祭祀語焉不詳，也未明顯注意到這一行爲的意義，許氏轉而通過地方志、離散的口述和其他文獻的零星記載來重構這一歷史，並深刻地指出定湘王最初是長沙地區大眾崇拜的神，被當時的社會精英所輕視忽略，不過卻演變成爲湘軍小卒的守護神；湘軍統一新疆後，最終進一步成爲新疆湘人群體的表徵。清廷恢復對該區域的控制不僅是一個政治和軍事事件，這一行動也引起了該地區社會和文化的轉變。定湘王的行宮和焚香活動在新疆不僅產生了漢人的空間（而且是湘人的空間），更把邊疆和內地在傳說和禮拜中聯合在一起。新疆神靈傳說看來並未涉及伊斯蘭教——地方檔案中關於神聖空間的糾紛，大多是漢人群體之間的，遷到邊疆的漢人用神靈和祠廟擠掉多數人口所信仰的伊斯蘭教的事情並未出現。傳統漢人群體通過神靈的傳說來表達和了解自己的歷史和歸屬感：巴里坤保護神的消滅，即是巴里坤人抵抗回民起義經驗在官方文本中的消逝（包括碑銘和地方志上記載）。對湘軍領導人來說，征服新疆是歷史任務；對下層兵卒而言，該事件有宗教活動方面的意涵，涉及群體的共同意識和經歷——收復新疆就像地方神遊境：定湘王從長沙出來隨軍作戰，表示收復失地而把祂變爲善化縣領土和人群群體的延伸。定湘王變成方神的歷史就是湘人在新疆提出和訴說自己的歷史。

孔令偉〈國法與教法之間：清朝前期對蒙古僧人的禁限及懲處〉通過梳理《理藩院滿蒙文題本》，補充了過去漢文編纂史料對藩部管控考量研究的不足，進而考察清政府與蒙古佛寺之間的權力關係，重新檢視了有清一代政治權力與蒙古宗教勢力之間的微妙互動。清朝於蒙古的統治策略中，尊崇藏傳佛教之格魯派，為其關鍵的文化政策。然而藏傳佛教政教合一的特殊思想，往往成為藏傳佛寺佔取人丁牲口、大肆擴張勢力的依據。清廷為避免藏

傳佛教勢力在蒙古過度擴張，進而干預其政治權力，是以雖對特定蒙古高僧加以尊崇，但亦嚴加控制藏傳佛寺勢力的發展。與此同時，清朝中央所支持的官方格魯派勢力，與蒙古自身的佛教傳統之間，亦有着微妙的權力競逐。通過對多語種文獻的研究，作者揭示了宗教話語在蒙古宗教勢力與清朝皇權之間的衝突在司法審判層面的體現。作者認為，華南與西藏、蒙古及新疆等作為清帝國統治下的「邊陲」的比較研究，似乎是一個值得開拓的議題：蒙古、西藏與新疆等內亞文化特殊的地域性與族群性，能為「華南研究」進一步拓展提供多元的參照；而「華南研究」對於諸如碑銘、譜牒與契約等地方文獻的細緻處理，以及對諸如寺觀、宗族與市場等社會組織的深入考察，對過去側重於中央官方檔案的「新清史」研究而言，也能提供社會史視角與地方史脈絡的關照。

上述六篇文章所展現的「視角」，回答了第二段提出的問題——對於帝制晚期中國，我們的歷史認知或看問題的角度固然可以繽紛多彩，然而我們確實也有不少基本「共識」和體認：整體而言，六篇文章顯示，清朝對於不同區域傳統的尊重、介入與改易程度有顯著的差別，這和各地整合進入帝國的程度有所差異有關，也進一步確認了這種差異。清朝國家在內地的整合模式，主要是透過地方傳統（諸如宗族組織）與前代帝國行政組織遺產（諸如里甲和並未完全推行的保甲制度），也有新的滿洲八旗制度的影響。邱源媛提到清朝皇帝直接將滿洲圈地與莊頭制度施行在直隸地區，造就了一批投充的漢人莊丁直屬於內務府，而其中的莊頭身份則從民人轉變為旗人；盧正恆指出清朝皇帝在福建施琅家族中，傳統的漢人宗族制度中引入了八旗制度，以提高清朝在當地的影響力；陳博翼提到清廷為了對抗海寇與鄭氏政權，命令漳浦居民遷界，影響了當地原有的宗族結構，而在亂事平定之後當地社會重新透過保甲編戶的方式整合進入清帝國。這些都揭示了改朝換代之際滿洲人新政權更為直接介入和控制地方社會的努力及其對原有區域格局的影響。

至於內亞邊疆與清朝中央之間的整合程度，某種程度上也體現在宗教組織自治權的高低與外來宗教進入與否上。在蔡偉傑與孔令偉的文章中，清朝皇帝給予蒙古的宗教與世俗權威的自治權明顯要高於內地，這種現象也反映在清朝對蒙古佛教制度權威的尊重與法律多元主義上。蔡偉傑指出非法遷入蒙古的漢人家屬能夠透過蒙古佛教組織而轉變為蒙古籍並逃避國家的追捕，但是這類情況在道光朝以後不見於檔案；孔令偉則說明清代初期對於蒙古僧人的各種懲處規定，出於優禮僧人之故並未得到落實，直到乾隆朝以後才逐漸實現。清廷原先也給予新疆當地突厥穆斯林頭人首領（如南疆的伯克與哈

密的和碩郡王）某種程度上的自治權，但是這種自治權在清末則遭到削減。這種變化在許臨君的文章中亦能體現：清末新疆在重新被清朝湘軍收復之後，與清帝國的整合也有所提高，這也反映在湘軍進入新疆的過程中將自己的神帶到了新征服的地區。這種情形與西班牙、英、俄等帝國的作法及呈現的現象有諸多類似。當地宗教組織權力的降低（包括佛教與伊斯蘭教）以及漢人民俗宗教進入的情況，也許正表現了內亞邊疆逐漸整合進入清帝國的架構中。不過，這種整合到清朝覆亡以前都未能完全「成功」。從這個角度上來說，內亞邊疆整合進入清朝國家的程度還是低於內地。

總體而言，「新清史」與「華南研究」都並非具有高度同質性的「學派」，被「強行歸類」的學者們學術背景與關注的議題其實也相當多元。「新清史」對「清帝國性質」和族群認同(ethnic identities)與族群性(ethnicity)的討論最為集中，從制度與宗教文化角度對族群認同的詮釋算是「主流」；「華南研究」則更像是一種從社會史出發、整合人類學及相關社會科學進行動態制度史和歷史演化分析的實踐，而不僅限於特定地域和特殊層級。因此，與其視二者為「學派」，不如將這些流派視為研究者在學術研究的過程中所形成的共同興趣和一些問題意識，或是一種歷史研究實踐傾向的沉澱。我們的研究當然未必都是在什麼「學派」影響下呈現出這種狀態，然而我們的探索在不同程度上繼承了前輩學者的智慧結晶。前人研究的積澱引導我們看問題多元的角度和應當思考的方向，或說教我們如何像一個專業研究人員一樣思考問題。從選題和方法論，到材料選取、運用與解讀，我們受惠於前人，卻也並不會特別認為自己「從屬」於哪個流派。就認識論層面而言，無論是甚或可以將紫禁城視為一個「區域」的「華南研究」，還是在未被引向「大清／中國」爭論「歧途」之前所着意的某些人群如何在某地拓展經營的「新清史」，都帶有從「人」的行為邏輯出發的特點，即個體如何與其他人發生關係、如何形成所謂的組織、社會甚或國家的意涵。這種在認識論上從人群組織活動、生活感覺推導「歷史」形成的思路和以行爲邏輯作爲歷史解釋的傾向，既類似普通的社會科學模型可用以修正歷史學過於依賴「國家」分析框架的傾向，也最容易引領我們穿過「國家」、「社會」、「中國」、「大清」的重重迷霧，進一步反思學科特點、局限和認識論上的困境。

史無定法，從「人」的行為邏輯出發看問題，邱源媛訪談的順義區牛欄山鎮下坡屯村商大爺對於旗民的理解和莊頭權利與義務的認受、盧正恆所揭示的施氏族人保持對閩南的經略、陳博翼筆下遷民對界線內外的選擇和家園

重建、蔡偉傑所述蒙古漢人移民為保全妻兒家產的選擇和為長輩積德的宗教動機、許臨君對湘人士卒在新疆供奉「方神」和另外一群同為「勝利者」的漢人政治話語卻反而喪失的思考、孔令偉研究的律例構擬體現出的蒙古僧人擴張其權利的追求及蒙古律跨越空間的影響和實踐的差異，何嘗不是經濟學上意義上理性人利益最大化（經濟、宗教、文化、政治理性等）的追求、人類學意義上生物人對於生命延續和繁衍的追求、哲學意義上認知過程的普遍性和「普遍性」想像的個體事實？這些以其行為邏輯為基礎的活生生的例證，構成了我們對人類歷史的認知。無論是盧正恆和蔡偉傑文章體現的上、下層人群對中原本土、藩部制度的利用、邱源媛和陳博翼文章顯示的旗民和遷民對既成制度的選擇適應、孔令偉和許臨君文章反映的帝國對既有法律規制的調控或士卒對既有祭祀規制的創改，還是盧正恆和陳博翼試圖展示的人們利用宗族進行本地勢力重建、邱源媛和許臨君文章顯示的新勢力擴展到新地盤所採取的經濟與祭祀新手段（制度性安排）、蔡偉傑和孔令偉展示的人們對帝國律令在不同層次上的規避和利用，抑或陳博翼和蔡偉傑對「界外」人群的關注、邱源媛和孔令偉對制度在地化實踐的發見、盧正恆和許臨君對個體如何保持原鄉與新「家」兩地聯結的考察，讀者所見的分明不是什麼「流派」、「方法論」甚或「學科」，而是我們在認識論上目前所能達到的程度。帝制晚期豐富多彩的政治制度、法律規訓、軍民遷徙和流散、宗教祭祀、經濟生活，藉由這些微小的努力，得以稍稍冰山一角地在異代讀者眼前「呈現」，早期近代歷史的認知圖景在人們眼前也豐富多彩起來。當然，受制於學術素養和理論視野，我們的努力僅僅是一種嘗試性的探索，由衷希望得到各位前輩的賜教和指正，也由衷期盼得到界內同行和朋友們的中肯批評。

陳博翼（聖路易斯華盛頓大學歷史系）

Introduction: Empire and Local Society Revisited: "South China Studies" and the "New Qing History"

Over the past twenty years, two approaches to late imperial Chinese history, the so-called "South China Studies school" and the "New Qing History school" have made especially notable contributions. The "South China school", at least in terms of how it is perceived by the wider academic community, is generally seen as exploring issues of lineage, ritual practice, local society, regional difference, and the relationship between state and society through fieldwork and the use of locally produced sources. This approach thus emphasizes a bottom-up view of Chinese history. "New Qing History" is generally understood as attempting to situate the Qing Empire in an Inner Asian context by considering the relationship between the state and its institutions, and to emphasize the use of non-Chinese-language sources. This is in contrast to a traditional Sinocentric approach to Qing history. Although scholars from both "schools" have never assumed there were any particular barriers between them, they nevertheless differ in terms of their conceptualization of problems; objects of study; use of sources, and methodological priorities. As a result, there has been little conscious effort to place the two subfields into dialogue, even though they partially overlap in their chronological focus and share a number of common concerns. In the past decade a new generation of "South China" scholars has moved beyond their eponymous region, while the perspective of "New Qing History" has gradually expanded from the imperial state to local society. The intersection or intermingling of these two subfields has already begun.

In terms of epistemology, both "schools" have their own particular approaches with regard to the logic of human behavior. That is, they both address the question of how people build relationships and construct communities, societies, or states. The South China approach is traditionally associated with village-level studies, but it could potentially see even the Forbidden City as a kind of "village" and the emperor as one of its residents. Similarly, even before the "New Qing History" became caught up in the question of whether a given state and its territory should be labelled the "Great Qing" or "China", it was already

concerned with how people moved about and lived within that territory. This epistemological stance derives the object of "history" from the activities of human communities and people's worldviews. A social science model like this, which takes the logic of practice as an explanatory mechanism, may ameliorate the tendency within the discipline of history to overemphasize the role of the "state." In particular, it may help us penetrate the fog of false dichotomies: state and society, China or Great Qing. It may also shed light on the present character, limitations, and dilemmas of the discipline.

The perspectives and methodologies presented in these six papers are inspired by both the "South China School" and "New Qing History." Whether they are called "schools" or not, scholars perceived to belong to either subfield vary in terms of their views, perspectives, and methodologies. This has encouraged the authors here to place these research approaches into dialogue with one another. During our research, we have each attempted not only to create some sort of dialogue between the two, but also to transcend informal barriers and polemical disputes that have from time to time arisen within one field or the other. Our discussions touch on a range of different regional societies and communities, includingZhili, Beijing, Fujian, Mongolia, Xinjiang, and Tibet. We have drawn on sources in both Chinese and non-Chinese languages to explore different dimensions of regions and communities traditionally considered Han or non-Han, sinicized or not, simultaneously from top-down and bottom-up perspectives. We consider questions of mobility, migration, Qing Empire, the Eight Banners system, law and the legal code, coastal regions and borderlands, and the formation of Inner Asian frontier societies.

Yuanyuan Qiu's paper, "Lands, Succession, and Clans," illuminates the state-society interface under the Eight Banners system. Following the shift of the political center of Chinese state to North China in the Jin and Yuan dynasties, state power penetrated more deeply into society in this region. In the Qing, two sociopolitical systems predominated in local society: the Eight Banners, into which "bannermen" were organized, and the prefectural system, which held jurisdiction over "commoners." The compositions and social attributes of these populations were significantly different, as were the means of state administration and the penetration of state power. Qiu emphasizes that the Eight Banners system,

not just regional factors, had a decisive impact on the rural grassroots organization of this region, which previous scholarship has assumed to be simply "Chinese," until as late as the twentieth century. Banner social and economic organization offers a fresh perspective for exploring the rural society, ethnic relations, government and other issues of the Qing dynasty.

Cheng-Heng Lu's case study of the Shi Clan bridges not only the two methodologies outlined above, but also the geographic division between North and South China. In the mid-Ming, following the reformation of the salt policy and the *Wokou* (Japanese piracy) crisis in Fujian, the Shi lineage was formally registered in Quanzhou as a salt-producing household. The Ming-Qing transition and the coastal evacuation policy in the early Qing devastated the region's social structure, including the Shi lineage. In 1665, Shi Lang, a member of the Shi lineage, rebuilt the lineage's great ancestral hall in its original location even before the evacuation policy had been repealed. In 1668, Shi Lang and his family were offered a place in the Eight Banners system and moved to Beijing, so a sub-group of the larger lineage, the Shi Banner family, began to live in Beijing as bannermen. The empire gradually began to utilize the Eight Banners system to incorporate existing Chinese lineages. In order to maintain this system of dominance, Qing emperors tolerated the Shi Banner family's illegal conduct.

Boyi Chen further illuminates the Qing coastal evacuation, an early-Qing order that forced people who lived one the southeastern coast to move inland in order to curtail anti-Manchu activities. He uses this case as a means to re-examine the formation of the border in a Han local society. According to Chen, the social transformation of the Zhangpu County under the Ming-Qing transition provides an example of how the evacuation operated in a "small" southeastern local society while demonstrating some distinctive features of the late imperial state. Chen traces the precise boundaries of the evacuation's exclusion zone in a coastal county for the first time. This allows him to show how an existing landscape of forts and fortified villages reflected the rise and decline of local powerholders. Based on this ebb and flow of local power, the Qing state began to regulate the registered households more strictly, insinuating state power at the local level. The author concludes that even in a supposedly "traditional" Han region, the empire still needed to handle "border" problems and social complexity just as it did in the

"non-Han" areas. This was the process of late imperial state formation in practice.

Ranging in geographic focus from the imperial capital and the Zhili region to the southeast coastal frontier, these first three articles constitute a coherent unit. They illuminate the linkages between different institutional structures and policy implementation in "China Proper" under the early Qing regime.

The latter three articles, turn their attention to "Outer China," yet retain this focus on institutional connection and regional differentiation. They address certain crucial points of scholarship in the "South China School" and "New Qing History": the relationship between (frontier) society and the (central) government, or the "periphery" and the "metropole"; the construction and reconstruction of identity, and trans-regional ethnic and legal negotiations.

Wei-Chieh Tsai's research focuses on Mongolized Han Chinese settlers and their descendants in Outer Mongolia. After Outer Mongolia submitted to the Qing Empire in 1691, the policy of Mongol-Han segregation was extended by the Qing government to Outer Mongolia. In spite of the segregation policy, some Han Chinese settlers (mostly merchants and farmers), in violation of Qing laws, married Mongol women, raised children, adopted Mongol ways of life, and managed to live peacefully with the Mongols in Mongolia. Drawing on Mongolian and Chinese sources, this paper delineates their background and life in Mongolia, demonstrates their changing legal status and culture, and illustrates the critical role of the Great Shabi, the lay disciples of the Jibzundamba Khutugtu, in this process. This paper explores the criteria that Han Chinese settlers and their descendants needed to meet in order to be accepted and integrated into the borderland society, and the way state policies and laws imposed limits on that integration. In this case, we see how Han Chinese responded to local Mongol authority below the central state and even within the state managed to evade state sanction and surveillance.

Eric T. Schluessel describes another type of imperial "infiltration" of the northwestern region. The late-Qing reintegration of Xinjiang into the empire was not only a political and military event, but also one that effected a transformation in the region's cultures and societies. This article investigates the religious life of Hunanese people in Xinjiang during that time, focusing on their worship of the

deities Dingxiang Wang and Fangshen. These two deities' various legends reflect the experiences of Xiang Army soldiers on their march from Hunan and their development of a sense of belonging after settling in Xinjiang. This article reconstructs the origins of Dingxiang Wang through scattered oral histories and written records, placing the two deities' stories into transregional context.

Ling-Wei Kung uses legal cases in *The Manchu and Mongolian Routine Memorials of the Lifanyuan* to discuss interactions between Qing imperial discourse and Mongolian religious traditions from the perspective of legal pluralism and legal practices. The worship of the Gelug tradition was a key tenet of Qing cultural policy in Mongolia. Nevertheless, at times Buddhist monasteries would take advantage of the patron-priest relationship to legitimize the subordination of dependent populations, acquisition of livestock and expansion of socio-economic influence. The Qing dynasty gradually developed methods to regulate Mongolian monks in order to limit the aggrandizement of the monasteries, even as it patronized specific religious leaders in Mongolia. Meanwhile, the indigenous traditions of Mongolian Buddhism actively competed with the Gelug powers that were officially supported by the Qing court. Cases involving Mongolian monks in the recently-published *Manchu and Mongolian Routine Memorials of the Lifanyuan* profoundly reflect the conflicts between Mongolian Buddhism and the Qing imperial order. The tensions between Mongolian Buddhists and the Qing authorities in the legal cases point to the broader dynamic of interactions between the metropole and the periphery.

These six articles, with different perspectives and approaches, integrate earlier scholarship on the late imperial period and indicate how our current work can build on it to further enrich historical understanding. The articles show that while the Qing Empire intervened in different regions, the extent of regional integration varied considerably. In the hinterland, the empire utilized lineage organization and the heritage of previous administrative institutions such as the *lijia* and *baojia* to govern, with some influence from the Eight Banner system. In Outer China, religious organization and legitimization reflected the political and legal authority in a pluralist context. The assimilation of religious frameworks and ritual practices was part of the integration of different peripheries into the empire, although this process was never complete.

"New Qing History" and the "South China School" are not homogenous "schools" and the scholarship within the groups is diverse in their approaches. Although "New Qing History" tends to focus more on "ethnic identity" and "ethnicity", its analysis of identity is generally grounded in religious and cultural institutions. The "South China School" places methodological priority on the intersection of social history, institutional history, and anthropology. There is no reason to see these approaches as intrinsically limited to certain regions or to either "metropole" or "periphery". Hence, it is better to view these "schools" as general tendencies or approaches.

Our articles share a number of common themes and objects of study: the utilization of institutions by groups of higher or lower status (Lu and Tsai), adaptations to new institutions (Qiu and Chen), the adaptation of legal or religious institutions (Kung and Schluessel), how people used lineage to rebuild local power (Lu and Chen), how power expands into new regions (Qiu and Schluessel), and how people utilized imperial and religious laws for their own benefits (Tsai and Kung). Our attention on groups inside and outside the borders (Chen and Tsai), legal practice on the ground (Qiu and Kung), and connections between homeland and new settlements (Lu and Schluessel) reveal a diverse empire in terms of political institutions, law, civilian and military migration, ritual practice, and economic activity.

All errors are our own. We respectfully request your comments.

Boyi CHEN
Department of History
Washington University in St. Louis