The romanization of the early Manchu regnal names
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The founding emperors of the Ch’ing Dynasty were revered as T’ai-tsu 太祖 and T’ai-tsung 太宗 by the Manchus. Their personal names in Manchu have been romanized in different ways. For T’ai-tsu, he is generally rendered as either Nurhaci or Nurgaci,¹ and for T’ai-tsung, Hung Taiji (sometimes Tayiji) or Hong Taiji.² This confusion in romanization is due to the fact that Manchu materials have not been readily available for scholarly research. With the increasing accessibility of the Manchu archives it has become much easier than before to establish the correct forms of the regnal names. Of these Manchu materials, none can rival the Imperial Genealogies, (çan-i uqsun-i ejexe; Yü-tieh 玉牒), which faithfully list the names of the successive emperors and their descendants in tables.

The Imperial Genealogies were compiled by the Imperial Household Department (Uqsun-be qadalara yamun; Tsung-jen fu 宗人府) every ten years. The first volume began from the eighteenth year of the Ijigçon Dasan (Shun-chih 順治) period (1661), and the last one appeared in the thirty-fourth year of the Badarangya Doro (Kuang-hsü 光緒) reign (1908). Each of the Imperial Genealogies consists of three similar copies, and each copy consists of two versions written separately in Manchu and Chinese. In the Ch’ing period, they were placed in the custody of the Imperial Archives (Gurun-i suduri-be asarara yamun; Huang shih ch’eng 皇史宬), the Board of Rites, and the Shou-huang Palace 壽皇殿 on the Ching Hill 景山; the one kept by the Board of Rites was later transferred to the Muqden Palace. It is due to this transference that today these documents are housed separately in the First Historical Archives at Peking and in the Archives at Liao-ning.³

The two versions of the Imperial Genealogies we use here are found in works recently published in China. One version, which was partially reproduced in facsimile in Yen Ch’ung-nien’s Nu-erh-ha-ch’i chuan 閻崇年, 努兒哈赤傳, is dated the thirty-sixth year of the Elxe Tayifin (K’ang-hsi 康熙) period (1698). I call this Version A (Fig. 1).⁴ The other version is the one used by An Shuang-ch’eng 安雙成 to compile the «List of Princes» attached as an appendix to his Man-Han ta ts’u-tien 滿漢大辭典.⁵ Unfortunately, An has not given us the date of the version he
uses. Nor has he given us a facsimile of the original. Nonetheless the imperial names appearing in the List are quite useful as a control. To distinguish An's version from Version A, I call his Version B.

Fig. 1. Genealogical table showing the personal names of T'ai-tsu and T'ai-tsung.

Before discussing which form of the two regnal names is a better choice, we need to distinguish between two types of romanization, i.e., transliteration and transcription. While transliteration is intended to give a letter-for-letter equivalent of the spelling of a word, transcription is used to represent its pronunciation. As such, the former enables us to reconvert a romanization into its original form, but not the latter. If one is concerned by orthography and not phonetics, transliteration is preferable to transcription.

Nurhaci vs. Nurgaci

The use of the form Nurgaci for T'ai-tsu's name has a history much longer than one may expect. The American historian Pamela Crossley, who has been using it consistently in her writings, is not its first exponent, although her popular book *Orphan Warrior: Three Generations and the*
End of the Qing Dynasty has directed scholarly attention to its existence. More than a decade before Crossley’s works, Jerry Norman, the American linguist, had already identified T’ai-tsung’s personal name as such. But Norman himself was preceded by European scholars, who had adopted the form Nurgaci as early as the 1950s, if not earlier. Louis Ligeti, the Hungarian philologist, when referring to T’ai-tsu in his seminal article on Manchu writing, called the Manchu khan Nurgaci. Erich Hauer, the German lexicographer, who also noticed this variant form, pointed out that Nurgaci is the archaic equivalent of Nurhaci. Unfortunately, none of the scholars mentioned above gave us the sources for this less popular form, Nurgaci.
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Fig. 1ab. The names of Nurgaci (a) and Hong Tayiji (b).

It is therefore not surprising that champions in favour of the prevalent romanization Nurhaci would not accept the form Nurgaci as correct. In support of their choice, they maintain that the Chinese equivalent of Tai-tsu’s name is Nu-erh-ha-ch’i, a form that T’ai-tsu himself used when writing to his neighbours such as the Koreans in 1596. In addition, they contend that the fricative in T’ai-tsu’s name in Sibe script is also marked with a circle, showing that it is a «ha», not a «ga». But documents written in Chinese, including those published in Korea, as well as literature in Sibe, which appeared only after 1947 when the Sibe script was adapted from the Manchu script, are not Manchu sources per se; they therefore cannot be taken as conclusive evidence proving that «Nurhaci» is the original form.

The reason why these scholars rely on non-Manchu evidence to support their argument is that T’ai-tsu’s personal name, owing to taboo reasons, does not appear in most Manchu materials. In early Manchu sources such as the Tongki fuqa aqò xergen-i dangse (Wu ch’üan tien tzu tang)
T’ai-tsu is only addressed by his various titles including Sure Beyile, Sure Amba Genggiyen and Sure Kundulen. Even in sources published as late as the eighteenth century like the trilingual Manju-i yargiyan qooli (Manju-yin ünen mayad qooli; Man-chou shih-lu 满洲實錄), his personal name is not written out in Manchu, Mongol, or Chinese, the three languages in which it is copied, but simply left blank in the various texts with the empty spaces covered with yellow stickers.

Hence the Imperial Genealogies, where avoidance of the imperial names is not required, are unique as a source in resolving the issue. In Version B, T’ai-tsu’s personal name is recorded as Nurgaci. Its accuracy can be verified by the facsimile of Version A, which shows unmistakably that T’ai-tsu’s name is Nu-erh-ha-ch'i (Fig. 1a).

But if Nurgaci is T’ai-tsu’s name in Manchu, why is it always written as Nu-erh-ha-ch'i in the Chinese sources, including the Chinese version of the Imperial Genealogies? The answer to this question can be found in the Manju Niqan xergen-i cing wen-ni ki meng bitxe (Ch'ing wen ch'i-meng 清文啟蒙). In this Manchu primer, it is clearly stated in the section dealing with the mudan encu-i Manju xergen (i shih Ch'ing tsu 異施清字) that the syllable «ga», when it does not stand alone, is to be read like «ha». For instance, the last syllables of jilayan and jooliyan are to be pronounced as [han 韩] not [gan]. This is corroborated by the Manju xacingya bitxe (Man-chou lei shu 满洲類書). In this glossary, words such as amaqa and dabaqan are written as amaça and dabçaan.

As a further proof, in the Manju-i yargiyan qooli, the name of T’ai-tsu’s brother Shuryaci is written in Chinese as Shu-erh-ha-ch’i 舒兒哈齊, and the names of Jiryalang, χ’öriyaci, χ’öriyan as Ch’i-erh-ha-lang 惠爾哈郎, Hu-erh-ha-ch’i 祜爾哈奇, Hu-erh-han 惠爾漢, just to name a few. It is interesting to note that this alternation between velars and fricatives, which occurs frequently between voiced segments, is also evident in the dialects spoken in today’s Northeastern regions. For example, saryan, gergen yarqan, tugi, fèbige, boyiçon, temgetu, urqan are read as sarqan, gergen yarqan, tuxi, fèbixi, boyiçon, temxetu, urçun.

In light of the above discussion, it is not difficult to understand why T’ai-tsu’s personal name, though recorded as Nurgaci in Manchu in the Imperial Genealogies, is transcribed into Chinese as Nu-erh-ha-ch’i by the Chinese scribe, who recorded the name according to its actual pronunciation. This Chinese transcription might have been copied subsequently into the Sibe language through reverse borrowing. It is equally possible that the Sibe form, just like its Chinese counterpart, is a
transcription of the Manchu original. T'ai-tsu's name thus appears also as Nurhaci, not Nurgaci, in the Sibe literature.

Hung Taiji or Hong Tayiji

The romanization of T'ai-tsung's personal name in Manchu is as varied as there are combinations of the two components of his appellation. The two most common ones are Hong Taiji and Hung Taiji (including the less frequent Hung Tayiji). The form ṝowang Tai Ji which appears in Version B is rare, being the result of the progressive Chinese influence prevailing during the post-conquest era. It is debatable if the first component hong/hung is derived from the Chinese word huang 皇; but the second component taijilaayiji is undoubtedly borrowed, via Mongolian, from the Chinese term t'ai i zu 太子.

Unlike T'ai-tsu, T'ai-tsung's personal name is not as esoteric as his father's. To be certain, it is not found in the Tongki fuqa sindayx xergen-idxangse, where he is known by his title Duyici Beyile «The Fourth Prince»; but it can be located easily in the older Tongki fuqa agó xergen-idxangse. This is because the taboo did not apply to T'ai-tsung who had not yet become the Manchu khan when this latter source was compiled. In this older Manchu source, the first component of T'ai-tsung's personal name is recorded as Hong, a form that is corroborated by both Version A and Version B of the Imperial Genealogies. The Mongolian word qong from which Hong is derived bears upon the spelling of the Manchu reflex.

Although Hong is the correct form, the variant spelling Hung is gradually gaining currency. This is evident in a recent work Manchu Studies, An International Bibliography, where the compiler finds it necessary to list this variant form side by side with the headword «Hung Taiji» in the index. The widespread use of this incorrect form can be traced to an inadvertent mistake made by Gertraude Roth, whose pioneering study of the early Manchu state is often cited by Ch'ing historians.

The main cause of this mistake is attributable to the ambiguity inherent in the Möllendorff system currently used by most scholars. This system does not distinguish between the two types of fricatives: the uvular [χ] appearing before the yang vowels a, o, or ø, and the velar [x] appearing before the yin vowels e, i, or u. Instead of using two different symbols to denote the two allophones [χ] and [x], it uses only the symbol h to represent them. One may argue that by using the rule of vowel harmony as a guide during the conversion, the correct form of the fricative can be recovered. Yet these fricatives are not necessarily followed by their respective vowels. Orthographically incompatible forms such as nexø
and welxôme are cases in point. Furthermore, the similarity in the sound quality of the two fricatives makes it difficult to detect any possible mixing up of the two symbols. This is why the form Hung, though incorrect, has been perpetuated until now without being noticed.

With regard to the second component in T'ai-tsung’s name, it is better to transliterate it as tayiji than to transcribe it, after the Möllendorff system, as taiji. The Manchu geminate ii, besides appearing at the end of a syllable, occurs anomalously at word-final position after a vowel as well as a consonant. The two instances below demonstrate that it is necessary, for the sake of accuracy and consistency, to represent fully the geminate ii, which can as well be considered a ligature.

In accordance with the orthographic convention, an i needs to be doubled after a vowel; but no doubling takes place if it occurs at word-final position. Based on this principle, the geminate ii is represented in the Möllendorff system by only i since the other one can be easily deduced from the presence of the preceding vowel. The hidden i, however, is not always predictable. This is best illustrated by the peculiar word kuyiyi «spoon». The form of this word is so unusual that the Manju gisun-i uyeri isabuxa bitixe (Ch'ing wen tsung hui 清文總彙) registers it as kuyini, on the assumption that there is a point on the left side of the last syllable showing that it is a ni, not a yi. This assumption is, however, wrong.

To begin with, most Manchu dictionaries and glossaries containing this word register it as kuyiyi, including the Manju isabuxa bitixe (Ch'ing wen hui shu 清文彙書), Niqan xergen-i uballyambuxa Manju gisun-i bulekü bitixe (Yin Han Ch'ing wen chien 音漢清文鑑), Ilan χacini-gisun qamciuxa tuwara-de ja abuxa bitixe; Duyin χacini-xergen qamciuxa bulekü bitixe (Dörben jüyil-ün üsüg qabsuruysan toli biçig; Skad bžhi shan sbyar-bai me-long-gi yi-ge; Ssu t'i ho-pi Ch'ing wen chien 四體合璧清文鑑), χan-i araxa duuyin χacini-xergen qamciuxa Manju gisun-i bulekü bitixe (Qayan-u biçigsen dörben jüyil-ün üsüg-iyer qabsuruysan Manju ügen-ü toli biçig; rGyal-pos mžad-pai skad bžhi shan-sbyar-gyi manydzui skad gsal-bai me-long; Yü chih ssu t'i Ch'ing wen chien 御製四體清文鑑), and χan-i araxyu sunja χacini-xergen qamciuxa Manju gisun-i bulekü bitixe (Qayan-u biçigsen tabun jüyil-ün üsüg-iyer qabsuruysan Manju ügen-ü toli biçig; rGyal-pos mžad-bai skad inga shan-sbyar-gyi manydzui skad gsal-bai me-long; Yü chih wu t'i Ch'ing wen chien 御製五體清文鑑).

More important, the Nonggime toqtobuxa Manju gisun-i bulekü bitixe (Tseng ting Ch'ing wen chien 增訂清文鑑) duly gives its transcription, lacking in most Manchu dictionaries, as [k’u-wu-i-i 柵鳥 衣依]. The accuracy of this transcription is confirmed by the trilingual dictionary
The romanization of Manchu regnal names

If this word is romanized as kuii according to the Mollendorff system, the hidden i in the last syllable cannot be restored in the Manchu script. The geminate ii occurring after a consonant, though just as odd, is devised to serve a special purpose. In the early Manchu source Tongki fuqa aqø xergen-i dangse, the Ming Emperor Wan Li 萬曆 is written as Wan Li and the family name Li 李, as Li. Yet in the Manju-i yargiyøn qooli, the Ming emperor is recorded as Wan Li and in the Jaqøn yøsai tung jy-i sucungya weyilexe bitxe (Pa-ch'i t'ung-chih ch'u chi 八旗通志初集), the family name Li is invariably written as Lyi. This orthographic
discrepancy is not difficult to explain. Since the latter two works were compiled during the reign of Ch’ien-lung 乾隆 Emperor whose personal name was χong Li 弘曆, it is clear that the extra i was added to avoid repeating the imperial name, which was taboo.56 In order to reflect the taboo connotations implicit in it, this additional i needs to be denoted clearly in the romanization. Thus Li is perforce transliterated as Lii in the Möllendorff system, notwithstanding its incongruity with the system’s principle of using transcription to represent the phonemes.

Fig. 3. Copper coin minted during the Sureχan period.

It should be emphasized that Hong Tayiji, as attested in the Imperial Genealogies (Fig. 1b), is T’ai-tsung’s only personal name, even though he is widely known in western literature as «Abahai».57 This latter appellation is thought to be T’ai-tsung’s taboo name, but this is not substantiated in the sources.58 It is otherwise believed to be derived from «Abqai Sure», T’ai-tsung’s reign title in Manchu,59 on the assumption that it is the equivalent of its Chinese counterpart T’ien-ts’ung 天聰. Unfortunately, Tai-tsung’s reign title in Manchu is Sure χan, not «Abqai Sure». This is borne out by Manchu sources such as the Old Manchu annals60 and the Manchu copper coins minted during his reign (Fig. 3).61 In Mongol sources, his reign title is always written as Sečen Qayan.52 Chinese sources published as far back as the Doro Eldengge (Tao-kuang 道光) period also record T’ai-tsung’s reign title as Su-le Han 蘇勒罕.63

If «Abahai» is not derived from the phantom reign title «Abqai Sure», it probably comes from the Mongolian word abayai or its reflex abuyat,
which is often used as a title of respect when addressing one’s senior, including a prince.\textsuperscript{64} In this sense, its use is quite similar to the Manchu word *age* ~ *agu*.\textsuperscript{65} It could have been that Westerners, most probably missionaries, learnt of this honorific referring to T’ai-tsung through the Mongols, who simply replaced the Manchu title *age* ~ *agu* with *abayai* ~ *abuyai* in their own language. Indeed, this is how he was addressed in the work of V. Gorskij, a member of the Russian ecclesiastical mission in Peking.\textsuperscript{66}

**Conclusion**

For taboo reasons, the two founding emperors of the Ch‘ing Dynasty, especially T‘ai-tsu, are usually referred to in the sources by their titles. The Imperial Genealogies, being authoritative records of royal succession, show conclusively that the personal names of the two emperors are spelt as Nurgaci and Hong Tayiji. To ensure that the original forms of the regnal names (and indeed any other Manchu vocables) are recoverable from their romanized counterparts, the adoption of a system giving full justice to the orthography is necessary. For this purpose, the Möllendorff system currently used by most scholars leaves much to be desired. A workable system of romanization, one that is based on the principle of transliteration, is in order. But before such a system appears, I will basically follow the one developed by Louis Ligeti and transliterate the two regnal names as Nøyaci and Χöng Tayiji.\textsuperscript{67}

**Notes**

1. The two Manchu regnal names are romanized according to the Möllendorff system since most readers are familiar with these forms; but the word *taiji* will sometimes be transliterated as *tayiji* according to the context. All other romanizations are based on the system developed by Louis Ligeti, with some of the diacritical marks removed and special signs such as \(i\) replaced.


6 Mr. Chü Liu-sheng 屈六生, Head of the Manchu Section of the First Historical Archives and one of the compilers of the Man-Han ta tz’u-tien tried to help me search for both versions of the Imperial Genealogies when I visited the Archives on August 25, 1998 but to no avail. He, however, told me that so far as he could remember Version B should belong to the later period of the Ch’ing rule.


14 For a discussion of the titles of these early Manchu annals, see Yen Ch’ung-nien 1988. «Wu chuân tien lao tang chi Ch’ien-lung ch’ao-pen ming-ch’eng chuân-shih» 無圈點老檔及乾隆抄本名稱詮釋; in: Li-shih yen-chiu 歷史研究, no. 3, pp. 49–64.
15 It has been suggested that the term *genggiyen*, which is derived from the Mongolian term *gegegen*, reflects Nurgaci’s belief in Tibetan Buddhism. (See Samuel M. Grupper 1984, “Manchu patronage and Tibetan Buddhism during the first half of the Ch’ing Dynasty: A review article”, *The Journal of the Tibetan Society*, vol. 4, p. 64, note 13). In Mongolian, the core meaning of *gegegen* is ‘bright(ness)’, which connotes ‘brilliance/brilliant’, ‘wisdom/wise’ and, by extension, ‘a person having such qualities, as an incarnate lama’. As used here in Nurgaci’s title, the word *genggiyen* means ‘wise’; it has nothing to do with a Tibetan prelate. This can be verified by his Chinese title Ying-ming (‘Wise’) Han 玉明汗, which is equivalent to Genggiyen 額, as well as by his previous appellation Sure Beyile (‘Wise Prince’), upon which the title Genggiyen 額 was based.

16 *Manju-i yargiyan qool*, in *Ch’ing shih-lu*, 清實錄 vol. 1 (Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1986), 1: 17 (Manchu text: bottom page a, line 5; Mongol text: top page a, line 4); 1: 19 (Chinese text: top page a, lines 1–2); Imanishi Shunju 今西春 秋, *Man-Wa Mō-We taiyaku Manshū jitsuroku* 滿和蒙古和對譯滿洲實錄 (Tokyo: Tōsui Shobō, 1992), pp. 27–28. According to Yamamoto Mamoru 山本守, at least three Manchu taboo names not written out in the trilingual *Manju-i yargiyan qool* are found in a bilingual version which he discovered by chance in Muqden. This particular version is now kept in the library of the Institute of Nationalities Studies, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Peking. See Chūan kuo *Man-wen t’u-shu tzu-liao lien-ho mu-lu* 全國滿文圖書資料聯合目錄, ed. Huang Jun-hua 黃潤華 and Ch’ü Liu-sheng (Peking: Shu-mu wen-hsien ch’u-pan she, 1991), p. 165. Even without the benefit of consulting this bilingual version, I doubt if the personal names of T’ai-tsu and T’ai-tsung are recorded in it. This is because sources compiled much earlier than this work such as the *Tongki fuqa aqô xergen-i dangse* as well as the *Tongki fuqa sindaga xergen-i dangse* observed the taboo, which, during the Ch’ien-lung period when the bilingual version was recopied, should have been even more strictly enforced. For a study of the bilingual version, see Yamamoto Mamoru, «Mankan nitai no Manshū jitsuroku ni tsuite» 滿漢二體[ 滿洲實録] 頁, in *Manshū shigaku* 滿洲史學, vol. 1, no. 2 (1937), pp. 23–30.


18 The point indicating the initial n, though missing from the word Nurgaci, can be found on the left side of the word 繐wangdi above. The misplaced diacritic is a mistake made by the scribe.

19 I have been informed by Mr. Yen Ch’ung-nien that only the form with the fricative, i.e., *Nu-erh-ha-ch’ai* appears in the Chinese versions of the Imperial Genealogies.


21 This work is listed differently as *Manju xergen-i duwali ilpyia bitxe* (no. 0405) in *Chūan kuo Man-wen t’u-shu tzu-liao lien-ho mu-lu*, p. 101.
22 Hu Tseng-i胡增益, "I pu hsi yu ti Man wen tz'u-shu—Man-chou lei-shu" 一部
稀有的滿文書書一滿洲類書, in Chung-kuo min-tsu ku wen-tzu yen-chiu 中國
85.

23 *Manju-i yarγiyan qooli*, 1: 17 (Manchu text: bottom page b, line 2; Mongol text:
top page b, line 1); 1: 19 (Chinese text: top page a, lines 6–7).

24 *Manju-i yarγiyan qooli*, 7: 368 (Manchu text: bottom page a, line 8; Mongol
text: bottom page a, line 7; Chinese text: bottom page b, lines 5–6).

25 *Manju-i yarγiyan qooli*, 7: 369 (Manchu text: top page b, line 8; Mongol text:
bottom page a, line 2; Chinese text: bottom page b, lines 4–5).

26 *Manju-i yarγiyan qooli*, 1: 23 (Manchu text: top page a, line 7, page b, line 2;
Mongol text: top page b, lines 5 and 6); 1: 22 (Chinese text: bottom page b, line 4).

27 Mu Yeh-chün穆曉敏, "A-le-ch’u-k’e Man-yü yü-yin chien-lun" 阿勒楚喀
Ying-sheng 愛新覺羅·瀛生, «T’an t’an Man-yü ti Ching yü» 談談滿語的京
Ch’ien 仲謙, *Hsi-po yü chien chih* 錫伯語簡誌 (Peking: Min-tsu ch’u-pan she,
1986), p. 10; Ch’ing-ke-erh-t’ai 清格爾泰, «Man yü k’ou-yü yü-yin» 滿語口語
語言, Min-tsu yen-chiu wen chi 民族研究文集 (Peking: Min-tsu ch’u-pan she,
1998), p. 249. The Sibe language displays the same alternation between «ha»
and «ga». See Li Shu-lan 李樹蘭 and Chung Ch’ien 仲謙, *Hsi-po yü chien chih* 錫
伯語簡誌 (Peking: Min-tsu ch’u-pan she, 1986), p. 10. For yarγan and boyiγon,

28 The meaning of Nurgaci is open to debate. According to Chin Ch’i-tsung, it
means ‘skin of a wild boar’. Such name-giving practice, Chin maintains, was
prevailing among the Tungusic peoples in Siberia. (See Yen Ch’ung-nien, Nu-
erh-ha-ch’i chuan, p. 1). This interesting theory, though not yet accepted by
scholars in the field, deserves to be further explored.

29 Ch’en Chieh-hsien, «A study of the Manchu posthumous titles of the Ch’ing
emperors», *Central Asiatic Journal*, vol. 26 (1982), p. 188; Okada Hidehiro,
«Dayan Khan as a Yüan emperor: The political legitimacy in 15th century
58; Giovanni Stary, «The Manchu emperor ‘Abahai’: Analysis of an historiographic
mistake», *Central Asiatic Journal*, vol. 28 (1984), pp. 296–299 passim. [Originally
written in German, this article is also published in Italian and Chinese. See
Giovanni Stary, *Manchu Studies: An international bibliography* (Wiesbaden:
Kommissionsverlag Otto Harrassowitz, 1990), vol. 1, p. 385, no. 2017.] The
run-on form ‘Hongtaiji’ found in Susan Naquin and Evelyn S. Rawski, *Chinese
4–5 as well as the hyphenated form ‘Hong-taiji’ found in Pei Huang, *Autocracy*
at work: A study of the Yung-cheng period, 1723–1735 (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1974), pp. 60–158 passim, should be separated since the original form consists of two individual words.


32 The term Qong Tayiji was a rather common title used by the Mongols in the 17th century as is evidenced in the Chiu Man-chou tang, vol. 9, p. 4071, line 7 and p. 4434, line 1. See also Ch’en Chieh-hsien 曾捷先, «Shih Huang T’ai Chi 謝皇太極, Man-chou ts’ung-k’ao 滿洲叢考 (Taipei: National Taiwan University, 1963), pp. 137–142 and David M. Farquhar, «The Origins of the Manchus’ Mongolian Policy», The Chinese world order, ed. John K. Fairbank (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968), pp. 203–204; 335–336. It should be noted that the character hung 洪 in Hung Ba-t’u-lu 洪巴圖魯 as mentioned by Ch’en represents the Manchu vocable χòng, and is different from the same character used in the name Hung-t’ai-chi 洪太吉, which represents χong. See Manju-i yargiyan qooli, 2: 107 (Manchu text: bottom page a, line 7; Mongol text: bottom page a, lines 6–7; Chinese text: bottom page a, lines 1–2).


35 An Shuang-ch’eng, Man-Han ta ts’u tien, p. 1146 and p. 1151. Although the form χówang used here looks different from its parallel form Hong, it points to the fact that the rounded vowel used in the first word of T’ai-tsung’s name belongs to the yang group of vowels, which both forms employ.


39 The geminate ii is pronounced either long or short, having no phonemic value. See Chi Yung-hai 李永海, Li Ching-hsien 劉景憲 and Chü Liu-sheng 屈六生, Man-yü yü-fa 滿語語法 (Peking: Min-ts'u ch'u-pan she, 1986), p. 37.

40 Manju Niqan xergen-i cing wen-ni ki meng bitxe, 1: 13a-b.

41 Cf. the word guyiyi ‘ghost’ which exhibits the same orthographic peculiarity. It can be located in the Ilan ɣacini-ɣisun qamciɣa tuwara-de ja abuyə bitxe; Turban jiyül-in iğe qadamal iğekü-dür kilbar bol'yar san biq; San ho pien lan 內合便覽, 10: 19a, but all other Manchu lexicons register it as guyini.


43 Cf. Chin Kuang-p'ing and Chin Ch'i-tsung, Nü-chen yü-yen wen-tzu yen-chiu, p. 125, where the authors try to demonstrate that Jurchen i becomes Manchu ni when i is followed by m and is at word-final position.

44 guyiyi is not listed under the syllable ku in the dictionary Dayicing gurun-i yooni bitxe (Ta Ch'ing chüan shu 大清全書). Nor is it registered in glossaries like ɣan-i araɣa Manju gisun-i buleku bitxe (Yü chih Ch'ing wen chien 御製 清文鑑), 16: 4a and ɣan-i araɣa Manju gisun-i buleku bitxe (Qagan-u biqgesen Manju īgen-i toli biq; Man Meng ho-pi Ch'ing wen chien 滿蒙 合璧清文鑑), 16: 9a, where it is expected to be found listed with words like caχara and sayif as in other Manchu lexicons.

45 Manju isabuγa bitxe, 11: 17b.

46 Niqan xergen-i ubaliyambuya Manju gisun-i buleku bitxe, 16: 194b.

47 Ilan ɣacini-ɣisun qamciɣa tuwara-de ja abuyə bitxe, 10: 6b. For the Mongol and Chinese titles of this work, see note 41 above.

48 Duyin ɣacini-xergen qamciɣa buleku bitxe, 25: 5a.

49 ɣan-i araɣa duyin ɣacini-xergen qamciɣa Manju gisun-i buleku bitxe, 25: 11b.

50 ɣan-i araɣa sanja ɣacini-xergen qamciɣa Manju gisun-i buleku bitxe (Peking: Min-ts'u ch'u-pan she, 1957), vol. 3, p. 3418.

51 Nonggime toqotobuya Manju gisun-i buleku bitxe, in Ch'in ting ssu k'u chüan shu 欽訂四庫全書, vol. 233, 5: 15b/p. 46.

52 ɣan-i araɣa Manju Mongγo Niqan xergen ilan ɣacini-mudan acaɣa buleku bitxe in Ch'in ting ssu k'u chüan shu, vol. 234, 24: 12a/p. 868.
The romanization of Manchu regnal names

53  Chiu Man-chou tang, vol. 1, p. 21, line 5 and p. 85, line 5.
54  Manju-i yargiyan qooli, 5: 252 (Manchu text: top page a, line 1).
57  The closest Manchu word that we can find in the sources to the name ‘Abahai’ is Abaqai. Located in the Manju-i yargiyan qooli (See Ch’ing Shih-lu, vol. 1, p. 118, Manchu text: top page b, line 3; Mongol text: bottom page b, line 7), it is the name of Dorgon’s mother, or the daughter of Mantai Beyile of the Ula nation. An obvious loan from the Mongol term abaqai ‘princess’, it is used here as a personal name, not a title. Seen in this light, it is not unusual for T’ai-tsung to be named after a Mongol appellation such as Qong Tayi.”
58  In his article «Abahaï: An historiographic mistake», p. 297, Giovanni Stary mentions that ‘Abahaï’ has been considered T’ai-tsu’s taboo name, citing as evidence the Ch’ing Shih-lu (T’ai-tsung period), 1: 1b. Yet, instead of A-pa-hai, only A-pa-t’ai 阿巴泰 and Pa-pu-t’ai 巴布泰, names that sound closest to ‘A-pa-hai’, are found in that part of the Veritable Records in question.
60  Chiu Man-chou tang, vol. 6, p. 2562, line 1. It should be noted that the term Sure  onActivityResult is also an abbreviated form of Sure Kundulen  onActivityResult, one of the many titles used by T’ai-tsung, and should not be confused with the reign title of his son, T’ai-tsung. See Chiu Man-chou tang, vol. 1, p. 31, line 5.
61  Arthur Braddan Coole, Coins in China’s history (Kansas: Inter-Collegiate Press, Inc. 1963), p. 54A or (1965), p. 53. On the surface of the coin are inscribed four Manchu words written in the old script without diacritics: Sòre  onActivityResult-ní jìa.  onActivityResult


67 See note 1 above. I am in the process of developing a new system of Manchu romanization. Since the Roman letter x and the Greek letter χ look the same when written in the upper case, I will most probably keep Ligeti’s x but replace his χ with h so that the two allophones can be more clearly distinguished from each other.