PROJECT MUSE®

Reimagining Qing Space: Yongzheng's Eurasian Atlas
(1727–29)

Mario Cams

Late Imperial China, Volume 42, Number 1, June 2021, pp. 93-129 (Article)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/late.2021.0001>

➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/796762>

Reimagining Qing Space: Yongzheng's Eurasian Atlas (1727–29)*

Mario Cams, University of Macau

A series of unusually large atlases produced by and for the Qing court during the eighteenth century reflect the court's growing desire for new representations of its imperial space as it projected its power and influence into Inner and Central Asia. The first of these, printed in several editions at the end of the Kangxi period (1662–1722), followed empire-wide land surveys covering the Manchu homelands up to the Amur River, all of the Chinese provinces, and the lands of the Khalkha Mongols, as well as depicting (largely unsurveyed) Korea, Tibet, and parts of what we today call Xinjiang. The production of a significantly reworked version under the Yongzheng emperor (r. 1723–35) radically expanded the Kangxi-era atlas's geographical scope without ordering new surveys, incorporating areas far beyond the Qing regime's reach: the entire Junghar and Russian Empires from Kamchatka to Riga and down to the Black Sea (Figure 1). Versions from the Qianlong reign (1735–96) revised the Yongzheng atlas's depictions of Inner Asia — based upon limited new surveys — and extended its scope to incorporate the Northern Subcontinent and parts of the Arabian Peninsula.¹

* I thank Juul Eijk and Fresco Sam-Sin at Leiden University for their help with the Manchu language; Zhang Xinyu and Song Hanxiao, students at the University of Macau, for their practical assistance in arranging source materials; and John Cirilli and Elke Papelitzky for their help with the final text.

1. One may view, explore, and search the three large multi-sheet atlases on QingMaps.org. Cams, Rodenburg, and Sam-Sin, *QingMaps.org*. Maps on this platform were digitally assembled with permission from Wang Qianjin and Liu Ruofang, *Qingting san da shice quantu ji*.

The literature surrounding mapmaking at the Qing court has centered primarily upon one specific version of the first so-called Kangxi atlas, known in Chinese as *Huangyu quanlan tu* (*Overview Maps of Imperial Territories*).² As this atlas incorporated draft regional maps produced locally by large surveying teams of Qing officials and Jesuit missionaries, arguments relating to Jesuit cartography, Chinese science, and Eurasian early modernity have all mobilized it in support of a wide spectrum of perspectives.³ Despite this overwhelming emphasis on the Kangxi-era mapping project and its scientific significance, however, this the debut of a new mode of mapmaking was limited to the Qing court. James Millward and, more recently, Matthew Mosca have contributed to this greater narrative, exploring later surveys and mapmaking at the Qianlong court in the context of the Qing's gaze into, respectively, Central and South Asia.⁴ The understandably scant attention paid to the atlas that the intermediate Yongzheng court produced without ordering any — seemingly concomitant — new surveyance has, also understandably, left unexplored the question of why exactly it did so. That lacuna draws this study's attention squarely onto the Yongzheng atlas, to sketch its context and production process and to gauge its circulation and intended audience by examining related archival materials. Illuminated against the background of Qing-Russian and Qing-Junghar rivalries, this mapping project emerges as profoundly more discursive, even propagandistic, than utilitarian in its purpose.

Even though the Yongzheng atlas sheds new light on mapmaking at the Qing court, as an artifact it remains inseparable from its Kangxi predecessor. The initial mapping project had in fact yielded two distinct lineages of cartographic descendants. The first combined numerous

2. For a full socio-cultural account of the Kangxi mapping project and its resultant atlases, see Cams, *Companions in Geography*.

3. For arguments on the difference between Chinese cartography and European (or Western) cartography, to which the Qing court atlases supposedly belonged, see Needham, *Science and Civilization in China. Volume 3*, 583–86; Cordell Yee, “Traditional Chinese Cartography.” For scholarship on the atlases' place within a distinctly Jesuit cartography, particularly in relation to China, see Foss, “A Western Interpretation of China,” and, more recently, Batchelor, “Introduction: Jesuit Cartography.” For a reevaluation of the court atlases in light of the Qing rule and its participation in Eurasian early modernity, see Hostetler, *Qing Colonial Enterprise*; Hostetler, “Early Modern Mapping at the Qing Court.”

4. Millward, “Coming onto the Map”; Mosca, *From Frontier Policy to Foreign Policy*, 101–32.

Figure 1. The full extent of the Yongzheng map after digital reassembly of its ninety-eight separate sheets. Retrieved from QingMaps.org.

Chinese-language regional maps and came with a textual companion, a route book synthesizing and ordering references from a wide range of contemporary and past geographical works (catering to the tastes and expectations of the Han literati who dominated the Chinese book-printing industry).⁵ The second lineage of printed atlases consists of impressively large multi-sheet maps, of which the Kangxi (1717 and 1719) and Yongzheng (1727–28 and 1729) editions record place names inside the Great Wall in Chinese script, but those beyond in Manchu.⁶ As regards format, style, and presentation, this second lineage belonged straightforwardly to no existing mapping tradition in East Asia, so different from previous maps that, as I have suggested elsewhere, they constitute specifically Manchu representations created principally for

5. The Yongzheng map used as a basis for map analysis is the one available on the QingMaps platform. Cams, Rodenburg, and Sam-Sin, *QingMaps.org*.

6. Although a multi-sheet map is not technically an “atlas,” in this case the map’s sheer size (measuring c. 7.5x3.5m when assembled) and the quantity of information presented have led many to use the term. The first lineage, executed in a materially very different woodblock version, does in fact operate like an atlas. Both versions from the Kangxi era exist in two editions apiece. Cams, *Companions in Geography*, 180–85.

courtly eyes.⁷ The Yongzheng map, cut from woodblock and consisting of ninety-eight sheets (Figure 1), fits readily within this second lineage of multi-sheet maps.⁸ Because the Yongzheng atlas, in its materiality, clearly and essentially belongs to a specifically Qing-Manchu family of maps, we must understand it, as a cultural product, in light of the imperial project to which it gave voice. As this detailed study of the Yongzheng multi-sheet map will illustrate, the Kangxi-, Yongzheng-, and Qianlong-era atlases constitute snapshots of a rapidly evolving, specifically Manchu spatial imaginary rooted entirely in the geo-administrative make-up of the Qing polity.

Qing-Russian Rivalry as Impetus for Mapmaking

Inner Asian relations, the principal catalyst for Manchu-Qing expansion, provided the larger context for mapmaking at the eighteenth-century Qing court. Even the initial impetus to improve mapmaking practices is traceable directly to the court's rivalry with the Russians and, by extension, with the Junghar (who occupied territories in between the two powers).⁹ In the mid-seventeenth century, around the time the Qing invaded the territory of Ming China, the Manchus also established first contact with pockets of Cossacks who had ventured into the Amur River basin. These men traded primarily with the local Mongol populations but soon met Qing resistance to the perceived threat to their Manchu homelands' northern frontiers. Early clashes came to a head in the 1680s when Qing troops besieged and destroyed the Russian fortress of Albazin.¹⁰ Positioned on the Qing's northwestern flank was the Junghar Khanate under the leadership of Galdan (1644–97), who regularly

7. Cams, "Not Just a Jesuit Atlas of China."

8. Feng Baolin, "Ji jizhong butong banben de Yongzheng *Huangyu shipai quantu*," 77. The number of sheets is nearly double that of the Kangxi-era multi-sheet map. To mark the differences from the prior Kangxi and the later Qianlong editions, which count eight and thirteen rows of sheets respectively, Chinese-language scholarship refers to the Yongzheng atlas as the *Yongzheng shipai tu* (Yongzheng-era map in ten rows). In contemporary palace memorials it is simply *Huangyu quantu* (*Complete Map of Imperial Territories*).

9. Perdue, "Boundaries, Maps, and Movement"; Perdue, "Empire and Nation in Comparative Perspective." For a comprehensive account of Qing-Russian relations, see Mancall, *Russia and China*.

10. Before the Albazin conflict, Russian representatives had visited Beijing in 1618 (Petlin), 1656 (Baikov), 1654/1662/1668 (Albin), and 1671 (Milovanov). Afterwards, and especially following the Treaty of Nerchinsk, the two powers enjoyed regular contact via trading caravans, at times including envoys and ecclesiastical missions. Afinogenov, *Spies and Scholars*.

projected his power toward the east by attacking the Qing-friendly Khalkha Mongols. Attempts to neutralize the combined Russian and Junghar threats to its northwestern frontier drew the Qing ever deeper into Inner Asia. By the end of the seventeenth century, the existential need to control its Inner Asian frontier led the Manchu court to incorporate the Khalkha and their lands as a strategic buffer between the Qing and its Russian and Junghar rivals.¹¹

The incorporation of Khalkha lands following the Qing's military adventures on its fast-advancing northwestern flank proved formative to the establishment of new cartographic practices under the Kangxi emperor. In 1688 a group of French Jesuits, some trained at the Parisian Academy of Sciences, arrived in Beijing shortly before upcoming Qing-Russian negotiations (called, in part, to allow the court to focus on the increasingly ambitious Junghar). Some months later, Jean-Francois Gerbillon (1654–1707), one of the “royal mathematicians” appointed and dispatched by Louis XIV, left Beijing as part of the Qing negotiating team. Under the aegis of this diplomatic mission to the far north, which eventually culminated in the Treaty of Nerchinsk (1689), Gerbillon recorded road distances and used precision instruments designed and manufactured in Paris to observe latitudes, facilitating communication of territorial claims during negotiations and to the emperor on return.¹² These negotiations with the Russians were the beginning of the Kangxi emperor's push for new representations of his realm and spurred his efforts, in the shadow of the Qing-Junghar wars of the 1690s, to improve the court's mapping practices.

If the negotiations at Nerchinsk first impelled the Qing court to improve its mapping practices, incorporating Khalkha lands into the Qing polity quite literally provided the space for achieving that ambition. During his diplomatic and military campaigns of the 1690s to absorb the Khalkha and to defeat the Junghar, the emperor personally oversaw what eventually became the integration of two distinct land surveying practices. To better follow his location and progress along his journeys, he ordered the Jesuits and Qing officials in his entourage to practice their respective techniques of route surveying simultaneously under his watchful eye: As Qing officials calculated road distances measured using graduated ropes, Jesuit experts determined polar and solar heights

11. Perdue, *China Marches West*, 133–208.

12. Jaskov, “Negotiated Geography.”

using mobile precision instruments manufactured in Paris.¹³ On several occasions, the emperor noted that he understood the distances calculated on the basis of rope measurements and those deduced from differences in observed latitudes to be commensurable. In 1698, following the Qing armies' defeat of the Junghar, he therefore ordered the Jesuits and Qing officials to map his new Khalkha territories in the same joint fashion. These lands' vastness and relative emptiness enabled detection of incompatibilities between the two practices and the articulation of a solution: a re-standardizing of Qing units of length that, when completed in 1702, cleared the way for the large-scale Kangxi mapping project and thence for the lineage of multi-sheet maps under discussion. Threats from Russia and the Junghar and the consequent incorporation of Khalkha territories as a buffer thus profoundly shaped both a newly integrated surveying practice and its corresponding mode of mapping.¹⁴

In the 1720s, renewed Qing-Russian rivalry once again catalyzed mapmaking in Beijing. After the Yongzheng emperor took over his father's legacy in dealing with the Inner Asian frontier, the Nerchinsk system, which had defined common borders and regulated the caravan trade from 1689, was breaking down: The court had grown suspicious of Russian activity in Central Asia in the face of renewed Junghar strength in the Altai region and as a direct result of Russian ambitions toward the Qing. A failed attempt by Saint Petersburg to send an Orthodox bishop into Beijing in 1723, disputes with Khalkha intermediaries, and market saturation in Beijing made matters worse, leading to complete suspension of the caravan trade.¹⁵ By the mid-1720s, as Saint Petersburg contemplated yet another embassy to Beijing to salvage its trading interests, the Yongzheng court decided to gather fresh intelligence on its two old rivals as part of a renewed strategy aimed at stabilizing its northwest frontier. Prince Yinxiang (1686–1730), Kangxi's thirteenth son and brother to the Yongzheng emperor, directed the intelligence operation.

One of Yinxiang's early objectives was to better understand the geography of the Qing's vast frontiers. To that end, he naturally turned

13. The use of graduated ropes built upon the work of Pei Xiu (224–71), Minister of Works for the state of Wei.

14. For detailed discussion of this technical integration, see Cams, *Companions in Geography*, 20–85.

15. Widmer, *The Russian Ecclesiastical Mission*, 52–69; Ye Baichun and Yuan Jian, "The Sino-Russian Trade and the Role of the Lifanyuan," 263–76.

to the court's go-to personnel in matters related to world geography and mensurational mapmaking: the Jesuit missionaries employed by the Imperial Household Department.¹⁶ Early on, the prince approached two Jesuits still living in the capital who had actively contributed to the Kangxi emperor's mapping project, Xavier Ehrenbert Fridelli (1673–1743) and Jean-Baptiste Régis (1663–1738), to produce a map of the lands between Hami and the Caspian Sea based on information from “Calmucq” officers and Manchu route books.¹⁷ These efforts gained further momentum following the arrival in Beijing of the merchant-diplomat Savva Lukich Vladislavich-Raguzinsky (1669–1738), one of Peter the Great's most trusted men.¹⁸ Vladislavich-Raguzinsky, appointed ambassador to China on June 18, 1725 (not long after Peter the Great's death), left Saint Petersburg on October 12.¹⁹ He finally reached the Qing capital in November 1726, accompanying a trading caravan. In an effort to rebuild relations, the two sides entered negotiations that would last for about six months.²⁰ When negotiations at the capital concluded, officials traveled to the frontier, surveying the border and eventually signing a new border treaty in the summer of 1727.²¹ All of this eventually culminated in the Treaty of Kyakhta (signed in 1728), yet the peak in intelligence-gathering and the implicit mapmaking had occurred months before the

16. The Jesuits tutored the Kangxi emperor and his sons in “Western learning” and its associated areas of expertise, such as geography, calendar-making, clock-production, and mapping. Jami, “Western Learning and Imperial Control.”

17. Gaubil, *Correspondence de Pékin*, 173. Gaubil's use of the “Calmucq” denominator, a term that may refer to all Oirats (including the Junghar), here likely refers to what Qing sources call the Torghut, one particular group of Oirats, living just north of the Caspian Sea.

18. Vladislavich-Raguzinsky, born in Bosnia, had come to Peter the Great's attention as a successful merchant. Mancall, *Russia and China*, 245.

19. At the border, his embassy joined up with the trading caravan of Stephan Tert'iakov and started negotiating with the Qing side. Widmer, *The Russian Ecclesiastical Mission*, 70–73.

20. Tulišen (1667–1741), vice-president of the Board of War, Te-ke-te, the Manchu president of the Lifanyuan, and Chabina, of the Imperial Household Department, conducted negotiations at Beijing on the Qing side.

21. Known as the Treaty of the Bura for the river where its signing occurred. One year later, the Treaty of Kyakhta incorporated the contents of this treaty and the border markers set up in the surveying work leading up to it (later incorporated into the different Qianlong-era multi-sheets maps, all based directly on the Yongzheng map under discussion and held at the British Library, IOR/X/3265/10 [c. 1740]) and Maps/Tab/1b [c. 1773]). Vladislavich-Raguzinsky signed the Treaty of the Bura with Qing officials (including Tulišen) after leaving the capital for the border on May 4, 1727.

two delegations started mapping the border, during the Russian envoy's stay in the capital in the winter of 1726–27.²²

The collected correspondence of Antoine Gaubil (1689–1759), one of the missionaries employed at the court, illustrates the regular summoning of Gaubil and his fellow French Jesuits Joachim Bouvet (1656–1730), Dominique Parrenin (1665–1741), and Joseph Marie Anne de Moyriac de Mailla (1669–1748) (also the Portuguese André Pereira [1689–1743]), in aid to the consultation, compilation, and translation of information and maps regarding Russia.²³ What follows is a selection from Gaubil's narrative concerning the first weeks of 1727.

9th of January

The 13th Prince, brother of the emperor, sent over a notice... to take a few Europeans to the palace and discuss a pressing matter, without saying what....

The Prince interrogated us about several countries of Asia... he ordered us to go to his residence, and a mandarin was ordered to follow us and to bring along atlases and maps of Europe, Africa, Asia, and America....

He wanted to be informed about the limits of Persia, Turkey, and Russia. He wanted to see the distance from Russia and from Portugal....

He ordered Father de Mailla, Pereira, and me to make a map of the lands situated between the Shahalien oula [Amur], the seas of the [far] North, and the Eastern Seas.²⁴

22. The Treaty of Kyakhta essentially replaced the Nerchinsk-based caravan system with a permanent Russian ecclesiastical mission in Beijing, established direct correspondence between the Russian Governing Senate and the Lifanyuan, and strongly regulated trade on the frontier. Disagreements over the final text delayed formal exchange of the treaty until June 14, 1728, beside the Kyakhta River. These new border and trade regulations would remain in force for more than a century, until the Treaty of Kulja (Yili), signed in 1851.

23. French Jesuits Bouvet, Parrenin, and de Mailla had all been involved in the Kangxi-era mapping project, while Andre Pereira was a director at the Board of Astronomy.

24. My translation from Gaubil, *Correspondence de Pékin*, 172.

This episode marked the beginning of a month of intensive mapmaking and intelligence-gathering. A mere two days later, the prince, wishing to see the fruits of his initiative, provided the Jesuits with further materials and requested that they come to the palace every day to work on creating the “best map possible.”²⁵ That same day, January 11, he expressed reservations about the intentions of the visiting Russian envoy and his retinue of fifty Europeans: “I doubt whether these men came for trade; they came to inform themselves on the state of affairs.” One week later, his focus shifted squarely to the Russian Empire and its territories. It became clear that, for Prince Yinxiang, mapmaking was part of a push to gauge Russian positions vis-à-vis Qing territories.

19th [of January]

The Prince made us examine, in his presence, an atlas that had been offered [to the court] by the Russians. It is the one by Jean Hotman [sic], printed not long ago at Nuremberg. The Prince paid great attention to the new outline given to the Caspian Sea and to the land of Jesso, which is called Campsatalia [Kamchatka] by the Russians.

20th

The Prince had me go [to the palace] to be present when questions were put forward to a Tartar Count about the lands around Lake Baikal, and others to two Tartar mandarins who had been to the mouth of the Sahalien Oula [Amur], and to a land which they said was across from the mouth of the river [Sakhalin]....²⁶

24th

The Prince told [us] that the emperor had seen and approved of our map, especially of what I had added from Lake Baikal to the sources of the Oby. He told us that the emperor wanted to have, in our way, a map of Siberia and of Russia until Saint Petersburg. We spent more

25. “la Meilleure carte qu’il se pourroit.” Gaubil, *Correspondence de Pékin*, 172.

26. Gaubil elsewhere records the atlas’s printing in 1722. Cordier, “De la situation de Japon et de la Corée,” 5. These were perhaps the Qing officials who had traveled all the way to Sakhalin during the Kangxi emperor’s mapping project. See Cams, *Companions in Geography*, 111–18.

than twenty-five days on that map and, after many difficulties, finished it. The emperor had it engraved.²⁷

The excerpts above, written in the fall of 1727, describe “news from Beijing” since the beginning of that year. Although far from an impartial narrative, Gaubil’s account reveals that, after some work on Central Asia, he and the other missionaries drew a map of the lands “in between Hami and Saint Petersburg,” or a map of “Siberia and Russia up to Saint Petersburg,” which required twenty-five days’ preparation and which the emperor later ordered engraved.²⁸ Thus, not only was the Russian Empire central to Qing frontier policy and to the first consistent mapping of its imperial territories under the Kangxi emperor, but, due to the court’s ongoing restlessness with regard to its northwestern frontier, it also again became a focus of the Qing strategic agenda in the 1720s. This sustained gaze toward the northwest would prompt the court to expand the scope of its imperial atlas all the way to Riga and Saint Petersburg.²⁹ By mentioning a specific atlas, printed by Johann Baptista Homann (1663–1724) in Nuremberg and transmitted to Beijing as a diplomatic gift from Vladislavich, Gaubil’s narrative provides crucial information about this process.

Drawing in the Russian and Junghar Empires

Homann lived his entire life in Nuremberg, where he founded a publishing house in 1702, initially specializing in engravings but later emerging as the leading publisher of maps and atlases in the German-

27. My translation from Gaubil, *Correspondence de Pékin*, 174. Europeans rendered “Ezo,” the old name for Hokkaido, “Jesso,” “Jeso,” “Ieso,” “Jedso,” and “Jeço” due to great confusion as to Northeast Asia’s geography. As a result, Jeso was the subject of fierce discussion throughout the eighteenth century, identified alternately as Hokkaido, Kamchatka, or Sakhalin. Gaubil explicitly identified it as Kamchatka.

28. I have found no references to this map in catalogues. Gaubil, *Correspondence de Pékin*, 174–75.

29. Fuchs has noted the presence of a Russian map of Siberia bearing Manchu transcriptions of place names at the Palace in Beijing in the 1930s. Fuchs, “*Materialen zur Katographie de Mandjuzeit I*,” 413–14. It was marked *Eluosi tu*, Sig. 00063 & 00036, 53.8 x 36.7cm. Another sign of the court’s interest in representations of Russia is a Manchu memorial reporting the court’s seeking (in vain) maps from the Russian ecclesiastical mission. An Shuangcheng, *Qingchu Xiyang chuanjiaoshi Manwen dang’an yiben*, 282.

speaking world. Together with Guillaume Delisle (1675–1726) and Nicolas de Fer (1646–1720) in France, Homann stood at the forefront of the European map market in the earliest decades of the eighteenth century. His first atlas, which debuted in 1707, already included a map of the Russian Empire entitled *Imperium Moscoviticum* (*The Empire of Muscovy*).³⁰ He followed this in 1712 with the *Atlas von hundert Charten* (*Atlas of a Hundred Maps*), reproducing the same map of the Russian Empire. In 1716, after his appointment as imperial geographer and member of the Prussian Academy of Sciences, Homann published his famous *Grosser Atlas ueber die ganze Welt*, or the *Grand Atlas of the Entire World*. It included the same map, as well as a more detailed map of Western Russia down to the Black Sea, the *Pars Russiae Magnae cum Ponto Euxino* (*Tataria Minor*). None of Homann's early Russia maps, however, seem to have had any connection to the empire's depiction as found on the Yongzheng multi-sheet map.

In contrast, considered alongside Gaubil's narrative, Homann's later work on Russia suggests a closer link. A map added to the Homann atlas after 1716, the *Maris Caspii et Kamtzadaliae tab[ula]* (*Map of the Caspian Sea and Kamchatka*), captures and juxtaposes on one sheet the two major recent developments in the mapping of the Eurasian landmass and must have been the basis for the discussion of "the new outline given to the Caspian Sea and to the land of Jesso, which is called Campsatalia by the Russians" in the Jesuits' audience with Prince Yinxiang. Surveying work led by Karel van Verden (d. 1731), of Dutch-Danish descent, who in the service of Saint Petersburg navigated and mapped the shores of the Caspian Sea in 1717–21, dramatically improved depictions of that sea.³¹ In the same decade, the journey across the Sea of Okhotsk by the Cossack Kozma Sokolov and his team improved knowledge of Kamchatka in 1716–17.³² Homann was able to insert these latest data because of the privileges accompanying his commercial success, which ensured him a wide network of elite contacts as far-flung as Saint Petersburg. Archival documents dating back to February 1723 even refer to him as an "agent of

30. Remarkably, this map traces the entire route of a prior Russian envoy to China.

31. Sometimes written as Karl van Werden.

32. Gibson, *Feeding the Russian Fur Trade*, 11. The map may be traceable to a map by L'Vov (1711). See Bagrow, "The First Russian Maps of Siberia," 92–93.

Muscovy,” perhaps a consul for the Russian Empire.³³ These connections in turn ensured that Homann’s latest atlas reached the Qing court as a diplomatic gift in the hands of Vladislavich.

A close reading of Gaubil’s comments thus indicates that the Beijing missionaries had access to the Homann atlas during their work for Yinxiang. Beyond Homann’s *Map of the Caspian Sea and Kamchatka*, which seems to have intrigued the prince, the atlas also contained further groundbreaking work. Between 1721 and 1724, Homann gave his old map of Russian territories a new title and a thorough revision, and also updated its depictions of the Caspian Sea and Kamchatka. The map’s new title, *Imperii Russorum*, reflected both this and yet another change: the official establishment in 1721 of the Russian Empire from the Russian Tsardom, the latter often referred to as Muscovy.³⁴ Might this updated Russia map have been the object of translation at the Qing court and later incorporated onto the imperial map? An initial comparison of the outlines of the Caspian Sea and of Kamchatka on both the *Imperii Russorum* and on the Yongzheng map shows strong similarities. Complicating identification, however, are the two undated extant editions of Homann’s map of Russia, differing most clearly in their depictions of the different administrative borders, a slightly different cartouche, and the disappearance of the list of thirteen administrative divisions the earlier map bears in its top-left corner.³⁵ The two editions differ only slightly in their toponyms, such that a full and detailed comparison with the totality of Russian toponyms on the Yongzheng map has not only confirmed an almost one-to-one relationship with the second, revised edition of *Imperii Russorum* (Figure 2), but has also provided a more detailed picture of the missionaries’ work for Prince Yinxiang.

33. Sandler, “Johann Baptista Homann,” 336–62.

34. The full title of the map reads *Generalis Totius Imperii Russorum Novissima Tabula Magnam Orbis terrarum partem à Polo Arctico usque ad mare Iaponicum et Chinae Septentrionalis confinia exhibens cum Via Czaricae nuper Legationis ex urbe Moscua per universum Tartariam ad magnum Chinae Imperatorem; Cum Privilegio Sac. Caesariae Majestatis / ex conatibus Iohannis Baptistae Homanni*. The production of the updated Russia map coincided with the death of Johann Baptista in 1724, after which his son Johann Christopf took charge of the family business.

35. The second, revised edition is figure 2; the first edition can be viewed on the website of Barry Lawrence Ruderman (raremaps.com). The lists of maps included in the Homann atlases as recorded in Sandler, “Johann Baptista Homann,” 345–48 & 382–84 confirm all of the above.

Figure 2. Revised edition of *Generalis Totius Imperii Russorum*.... Nuremberg, c. 1721–24, c. 22.5 x 19.5 inches. Courtesy of the University of Minnesota's James Ford Bell Library.

To illustrate how toponyms circulated from the Homann map, via the missionaries' manuscript map for Prince Yinxiang, eventually onto the printed Yongzheng atlas, Table 1 lists all toponyms found on sheet Row 2/West 2 (*er pai xi er*) together with those found within the corresponding section on the revised edition *Imperii Russorum*. If we ignore words such as *bira* for “river”/“fl” [the Latin *Fluvius*] or *omo* for “lake”/*osero* [the Russian озеро], we can trace the transliteration and translation of the toponyms, already Latinized by Homann from the Russian originals, into Manchu. Table 1 reveals the Manchu transliterations' separation into syllables, suggesting Chinese as an intermediate stage of their rendering into Manchu, a possibility further supported by the fact they employ letters originally developed for rendering Chinese sounds.³⁶ The key

36. Visible in the transcription above by the <g'> in *g'a*, or the <y> in *sy*.

problem with this assertion is that certain syllables end with a consonant, such as *Bal* in *Bal we den g'a bira*, making it less likely Chinese served as a tool language during transcription.³⁷ Most probably, then, the toponyms' rendering was directly into Manchu through pronunciation, syllable by syllable.³⁸ The table also suggests transcription work by someone unfamiliar with the Russian language: The Russian word for lake, "osero," for example, simply appears repeated in transcription, followed by "omo," the Manchu word for "lake," effectively rendering this toponym as "lake Iesi lake," suggesting Prince Yinxiang's Jesuits transcribed from Homann's Latin map directly into Manchu without assistance from the Russian translators residing in the capital.³⁹

Table 1. Comparison of toponyms between one sheet of the Yongzheng atlas and Homann's revised *Imperii Russorum*. Words meaning "lake" or "river" are in italics. The number mentioned for the Yongzheng atlas's sheet is based on that in Wang and Liu, *Qingting san da shice quantu ji*, Vol. 2.

<i>Yongzheng Atlas</i> (ca. 1727–8) Sheet row 2 / west 2	<i>Homann's revised</i> <i>Imperii Russorum</i> (ca. 1724)
G'o wa we <i>bira</i>	[Orko] Kowao
Cu cun <i>bira</i>	Zuzun
Wei tui <i>bira</i>	Witui <i>fl</i>
Ar a g'a <i>bira</i>	Warka <i>fl</i>
Biya si da <i>bira</i>	Piasida <i>fl</i>
Bal we den g'a <i>bira</i>	Balwidenka <i>fl</i>
Ne ba <i>bira</i>	Neva
G'o res g'o ye <i>bira</i>	Koreskoie
O sy ro r'e so <i>omo</i>	<i>Osero</i> Iesi
Bol sa r'a ye ri <i>bira</i>	Bolsajaierima

37. I thank Juul Eijk at Leiden University for his helpful insights in this regard.

38. Despite the linguistic capabilities available to the Qing court, which patronized instruction in the Russian language. See Stary, "A Manchu Document Concerning Manchu Teachers."

39. On the Russian community in Beijing at the time, as well as the translators working for the Lifanyuan, see Widmer, *The Russian Ecclesiastical Mission*, 88–114, esp. 103–10.

The Qing court's reliance on the Beijing Jesuits tallies with its general tendency to enlist Jesuits in translating messages and official documents to and from Latin, Chinese, and Manchu, as it indeed did throughout negotiations with Vladislavich.⁴⁰ For their part, the Jesuits in Beijing understood clearly that they owed their allegiance and services first to the Qing court, even though Vladislavich, visiting the Jesuit residence while in Beijing, had promised them access to Siberian overland routes to Europe and later even requested their help teaching Russian students Chinese and Manchu.⁴¹ This generation of Jesuits, under increasingly strict scrutiny by the Yongzheng emperor (who had forbidden missionary activities in the provinces), remained employed by the Inner Court as translators and technical experts as their entire China Mission now depended on cultivating the restoration of imperial goodwill.⁴² The Russian Empire, in contrast, which under Peter the Great had expelled the Jesuits in 1719 and failed to honor its promises to open its overland route, offered them little in return.⁴³ A more institutional rationale against involving Russian translators in translating the Homann map is that the Jesuits, as experts in the service of the imperial family, belonged to the Imperial Household Department, whereas any Russian translators in Beijing worked for the Lifanyuan, a wholly distinct institution responsible for relations with all peoples to the north and the west of the

40. E.g., in late February 1727 the Qing court tasked Parennin with the translation into Latin of a Manchu document for Vladislavich. Gaubil, *Correspondence de Pékin*, 175. In 1729, Parennin was asked to open a Latin school in Beijing. Sary, "Guangyu Manzu lishi he yuyan de ruogan wenti."

41. Vladislavich eventually sent three students to Beijing: Luka Voeikov, of the Moscow Academy; Ivan Pukhot, a page from the ambassador's suite; and Feodor Tret'iakov, the 16-year-old son of a Russian translator of Mongolian. All of these men knew Latin and received support from the Lifanyuan upon their arrival in Beijing. Widmer, *The Russian Ecclesiastical Mission*, 76–87.

42. In 1706 and 1721, Rome also sent two papal legates to Beijing, both of which aroused suspicion and irritation at the Qing court. The Yongzheng emperor finally introduced a prohibition on Christianity in 1724, explicitly banning bannermen and officials in the capital from visiting Jesuit quarters. Menegon, *Ancestors, Virgins, and Friars*, 116–24.

43. In the spring of 1727, when Vladislavich asked the Qing court to send two Jesuits with him to the border for the conclusion of the final treaty, the Jesuits squarely objected and the court did not dispatch them.

Qing's core territories, the Russians included.⁴⁴ All Russian translators in Beijing were thus institutionally separate from the Inner Court, which directed intelligence-gathering and the map translation project.

Even as the Jesuits stood squarely by their employer, their participation in the prince's intelligence project did raise concerns given the complexity of relations of each with the Russians. According to Gaubil, de Mailla anticipated potential conflict should visiting Russian embassies ever learn European missionaries were actively producing intelligence for the Qing court through the translation of maps, even as Prince Yinxiang demanded revisions in the missionaries' map: "The map was drawn, not as we would have wanted, but as he wanted. He wanted absolutely that we place the cities of Krasnoyarsk and Tobol at a distance from Lake Baikal that we could not support."⁴⁵ Whereas the majority of Siberian toponyms on the Homann and Yongzheng maps identify rivers, intelligence-gathering naturally focused on Russian frontier towns. In the context of Qing-Russian and Junghar-Qing rivalry, their exact positions constituted highly sensitive information in clear need of mediation. The better to serve the prince in this regard, and undoubtedly to gather more intelligence himself, Gaubil carefully asked for further information:

After the emperor had given us the order to make a map from the north of Hami until Saint Petersburg toward the west and the northern seas toward the north, the regulo one day ordered me to visit him and have a conversation with one of his main eunuchs. The latter told me that the prince wanted to be informed of the accounts I had [collected] for this map. I answered that I had rather exact and new accounts on the positions of Saint Petersburg, Moscow, and Archangelsk, as well as of the lands between those three cities; that I could not yet have ascertained the distance from Astrakhan to Moscow, or Tobol, or

44. Russians had worked as translators for the Lifanyuan since the 1680s. Widmer, *The Russian Ecclesiastical Mission*, 16–17. The Board of Rites (Libu) dealt with other Europeans and tributary states. For the Lifanyuan and Qing frontier policy, see Schorkowitz and Ning, *Managing Frontiers in Qing China*. For the Lifanyuan's managing of contacts with Russia, see Crossley, "The Lifanyuan and Stability during Qing Imperial Expansion," 106–7; Ye Baichun and Yuan Jian, "The Sino-Russian Trade and the Role of the Lifanyuan." Around the same time as the establishment of the Lifanyuan (1638), the Russians established the Sibirski Prikaz or Siberian Department (1637) to deal with their Amur frontier.

45. Gaubil, *Correspondence de Pékin*, 183.

Hami; that I only had imperfect accounts on the kingdoms of Kasan and Siberia; and even that several of these accounts did not match. *I added that I was only very little informed on the lands of Tsewang Raptan.* The eunuch went to answer, and the prince had me come to his presence.... [He] ordered to have a route book in Manchu brought over and presented it to me, ordering me to read it in front of him....⁴⁶

Gaubil's narrative confirms the Jesuits' recognition of the Qing court's strategic concerns relative to both the Russians and the Junghar, mentioned here as "the lands of Tsewang Raptan" after the new Junghar Khan.⁴⁷ They implemented the requested adjustments in the positions of Russian frontier towns along the upper Irtysh, Ob, and Yenisei Rivers, all relatively near the Russian-Junghar frontier. Whereas the Yongzheng map places the town of Yeniseysk at more or less the same latitude as on the Homann map, Krasnoyarsk, much farther south along the Yenisei River, is entirely absent; meanwhile it relocates the town of Tomsk six full degrees farther north. This illustrates that mapping the Russian Empire for the Inner Court necessitated careful handling of potentially sensitive information, especially concerning common frontiers and lands in-between, where Russian and Qing spheres of influence overlapped with those of the Junghar.

The question of depicting the Russian-Junghar frontier naturally shifted attention to the intermediate Junghar-controlled lands from the Altai region to the Taklamakan desert. Here the missionaries and Prince Yinxiang adopted less-straightforward tactics: As the map reveals, toponyms in the Altai region are of Tungusic origin, in line with Gaubil's remark about the use of Manchu-language route books for those parts of Central and Inner Asia not directly controlled by either the Russians or the Qing. Another important indication of the use of route books for Central Asia is the depiction of actual routes further to the south, in what today makes up most of Xinjiang, where a cluster of dotted lines runs across the map between Hami (Cumul) and Kashgar, branching off toward the Ili and Irtysh Rivers and into Tibet and Kokonor.⁴⁸

46. My translation and emphasis from Gaubil, *Correspondence de Pékin*, 182–3.

47. Tsewang Rabtan (1643–1727) was the nephew of the above-mentioned Galdan.

48. Kangxi's mapmakers, years earlier, had also employed route books connecting "the extremities of Shaanxi to [a region] 80 or 100 *lieues* northeast of the Caspian Sea," acquired by Jean-Baptiste Régis, who took the lead among them. Gaubil, *Correspondence de Pékin*, 117.

Data distilled from interviews with Qing envoys who had traveled to Tibetan and Junghar lands also informed depictions of these lands.⁴⁹ All of this illustrates that the missionaries' work for Prince Yinxiang not only entailed a carefully mediated translation of one specific map of Russia — produced by the Homann workshop in Nuremberg and brought to Beijing by Vladislavich — but also required the mapping-out of information from very different geo-spatial discourses. The Jesuits thus created a new map — eventually combined with the Kangxi atlas to form the Yongzheng atlas — as part of an intelligence-gathering project by the Inner Court. This episode reveals the unique position of eighteenth-century Beijing as a key node in global networks of knowledge circulation.⁵⁰

Articulating Eurasian Empire

Notwithstanding the Jesuit missionaries' central role in the translation of a European map and in the mapping-out of geographical information from a variety of Inner Asian sources for Yinxiang, there is no evidence that they participated in the combining of their map of the Russian Empire and adjacent frontier regions with the Kangxi atlas. Instead, the Imperial Workshop's map room (Zaobanchu Yutuchu) directed the map's integration with its Kangxi cartographic predecessor. Archives from the workshops record increased mapmaking activity from mid-1727 to early 1728, with Intendant Hai-wang presenting to the throne maps in Chinese script, including reprints of the Kangxi-era atlas and one large map of the fifteen provinces "without frontier areas."⁵¹ Comparisons between the overlapping depictions on the Kangxi and Yongzheng multi-sheet maps indicate a thorough revision, as evinced, for example, by the presence of additional toponyms along the defensive line to the west of Ningxia.⁵²

49. Gaubil, *Correspondence de Pékin*, 182. In 1725, Régis learned from visiting Kalmuk envoys in Beijing about the lands between Kashgar and the Caspian Sea. A description of the resulting map clearly also made it onto the Yongzheng map (row 5, west 6–7). Gaubil, *Correspondence de Pékin*, 117.

50. See Mosca, "The Qing Empire in the Fabric of Global History."

51. Zhu Jiajin, *Yangxindian zaobanchu shiliao jilan*, 96–97.

52. A comparison of place names between Beijing, Tianjin, and Baoding also supports that conclusion, with more than sixty place names counted in the area on the Kangxi atlas versus more than ninety on the Yongzheng atlas. This increase may be due to the mapping of river

The court missionaries' apparent exclusion from material production at the Yongzheng workshops contrasts sharply with their central roles in map production at the Kangxi and Qianlong courts, both of which relied heavily on Jesuit personnel, not only for conducting field surveys, but also for integration and material production of the resulting atlases.

Despite the missionaries' lack of involvement in the Yongzheng map's final integration, Gaubil's collected correspondence contains enlightening comments furnishing insights into how Prince Yinxiang construed the final product. As Gaubil reports, regarding the issue of grids, the prince instructed the missionaries that he did "not necessarily want a map with curved lines," in an apparent reference to the Kangxi atlas.⁵³ This comment would prove foundational for the printing of the Yongzheng atlas: The multi-sheet maps include only straight gridlines with no explicit references to degrees of latitude and longitude. From comparing the positions of towns and rivers with those on the Homann map, the Jesuits apparently satisfied the prince's requirement by employing an equirectangular projection. In the eyes of the court, such a projection, shown on the map as an equally spaced grid of meridians and parallels, may even have harkened to a tradition of drawing grid-based maps extending back at least to the twelfth century.⁵⁴ During the Kangxi period, the missionaries had taken on the technical integration of the final multi-sheet map in addition to their role in the surveying of Qing-controlled territories, employing their mathematical expertise to execute a sinusoidal projection to enable direct measurement of north-south distances on the map, according nicely with the Kangxi emperor's early emphasis on calculating latitudinal distances.⁵⁵

Not only did the projection for Kangxi's multi-sheet map require the Jesuits' expertise, but a European missionary (albeit not a Jesuit) had also been the first to introduce the technique of copperplate printing on large

courses and water works in the area in the early years of the Yongzheng reign. See Wang Qianjin and Liu Ruofang, *Qingting san da shice quantu ji*, 3–4.

53. "pas absolument une carte à lignes courbes." Gaubil, *Correspondence de Pékin*, 172.

54. The well-known Song-era *Yuji tu* (*Map of the Tracks of Yu*) is a case in point. During the Ming, Luo Hongxian's *Guang yutu* (*Enlarged Territorial Maps*) also employed the distance-based grid system.

55. Also called the Sanson-Flamsteed projection, this projection sports straight parallels but curved meridians. See also Cams, *Companions in Geography*, 200–01.

rectangular sheets to the court.⁵⁶ Printing Yongzheng's multi-sheet map, on the other hand, utilized woodblock printing on square sheets. Along the dividing lines, toponyms, rivers, and mountain ranges overlap or do not match precisely (Figure 3), indicating that the Imperial Workshop carved each woodblock individually rather than coordinating such that they matched precisely when printed and assembled — pasted — onto ten horizontal scrolls.⁵⁷ From the outset of the production process, the designing of the map would have progressed in this way: The blocks overlap on their left and right margins but not on either their bottom or top margins (the bottom margin of each sheet bears a numbering system for the vertical parallels). Taken together, the prince's request for straight lines on the map effectively obviated precisely that expertise in printing and mathematics that was the court missionaries' exclusive purview, and that had positioned them at the center of map production at the Kangxi court.⁵⁸ We find further evidence of their marginalization in the fact that, thus far, no known Yongzheng-era sheets reside in any European or American library or archive, whereas several such institutions boast sheets from both Kangxi- and Qianlong-era editions.

The fact that the court excluded missionaries from the map's final production process, however, does not mean that the map only circulated within Beijing's highest echelons. Analysis of memorials to the throne referencing the map — twelve in total — shed light on how it operated in the first place as a discursive rather than a practical implement.⁵⁹ Provincial administrators at the highest levels, governors-general, and regular governors with a banner background, authored most of these memorials in reply to, and expressing gratitude for, having received copies

56. The Lazarist Matteo Ripa (1682–1746) introduced copperplate printing at court in the context of producing the thirty-six views of the imperial retreat at Rehe. See Strassberg, *Thirty-Six Views*. Pierre Jartoux (1669–1720) led final mathematical integration of the Kangxi atlas. See Cams, *Companions in Geography*, 152, 185–90.

57. Scrolls dwelt together in a specially designed box. *Qing neiwufu zaobanchu yutufang tumu chubian*, 1. This finds further confirmation from Yongzheng's top provincial officials, who received the map as gifts, see *infra*.

58. At the same time, the grid, closely resembling that of the Kangxi map, retained its function: enabling easy reckoning of distances directly from the map. Cams, *Companions in Geography*, 185–96.

59. *Gongzhongdang Yongzheng chao zouzhe*, vol. 10, 136–37, 160, 214–15, 226, 254, 342, 433–35, 798, vol. 11, 152–53, 194, 708–09.

Figure 3. Detail showing the bottom of row 8 from the Yongzheng multi-sheet map, depicting the border of Guangdong and Huguang provinces. Sheets printed from different woodblocks were pasted along the vertical line, shown by the significant overlap in placenames (which appear highlighted). On the bottom margin, we find a numbering system for the parallels showing the same overlap. Retrieved from QingMaps.org.

of the map directly from the emperor.⁶⁰ One such memorial recapitulates parts of the original instructions sent along with the maps: “We bestow the geographical map on the governors-general, governors, provincial commanders-in-chief, and brigade generals of all provinces, as a special favor. When these governors-general, governors, provincial commanders-in-chief, or brigade generals transfer to other provinces or return to their native places, they must carry it with them. Those who are removed from their posts or demoted, however, are not allowed to take it with them,

60. As Table 2 conveys, the only four men who received copies of the map but did not carry the title of governor-general were: Selengge, of the Manchu Plain White Banner; Hiyande, of the Mongol Plain White Banner; Pan Zhishan, a military general (see *infra*); and Chen Yanzheng, of the Hanjun Bordered White Banner.

but must leave it at the local yamen and hand it over to their successors. It must be stored respectfully, together with imperial edicts and other documents.”⁶¹ Clearly, the court attached great importance to limiting this map’s circulation to only its very top provincial officials, thereby communicating a standard, set by the center, for mapmaking, as well as inspiring awe and admiration for its expansionist project among its highest officials outside the capital. These men’s replies reflect this. The governor-general of Henan province, Tian Wenjing, for example, received the box containing the ten rolls constituting the map in February 1728 and made the following comments: “This vastness of the country and the grand reach of the administration has never before been achieved since antiquity.”⁶²

We see this sentiment echoed by several provincial officials, who similarly express their commitment to the careful “secret preservation” (*micang*) of these maps so generously bestowed upon them. Sometimes, for those sharing a personal bond with the emperor, the imperial gift came amongst others. The general at Anxi, for example, received a box of medicine alongside his map, while Ortai, the governor-general in Yunnan, received his box along with twenty pieces of porcelain, a casket of melons, and a casket of cakes.⁶³ In his vermilion rescript to several of these memorials, the Yongzheng emperor once again placed great emphasis on the map’s importance, explicitly attributing the atlas to his father (although we know that he in fact only dispatched copies of his own version of the atlas, confirmed by the fact that each governor received ten rolls). In other words, since this map was by and for the court, employing a new Manchu-Qing discourse of imperial space, the Yongzheng emperor used it as an instrument of discursive power toward his main officials, gifting to each an awe-inspiring representation of Qing imperial space.

61. *Gongzhongdang Yongzheng chao zouzhe*, vol. 11, 708.

62. *Gongzhongdang Yongzheng chao zouzhe*, vol. 10, 136–37. Tian Wenjing (1662–1733), stationed in Henan since 1724, became governor-general of the province in 1727. The following year, his jurisdiction expanded to include Shandong province.

63. *Gongzhongdang Yongzheng chao zouzhe*, vol. 10, 342. Ortai or E’ertai (1677–1745) of the Manchu Sirin Gioro clan held several official posts in southern China before becoming governor-general of Yunnan and Guizhou in 1727, although the memorial mentions only the Yunnan title. In 1728, the year he received the atlas, his jurisdiction as Yunnan-Guizhou governor-general was expanded to include Guangxi. Along with Tian Wenjing, Ortai was one of the Yongzheng emperor’s most trusted officials.

Table 2. List of Memorials to the Throne Confirming Receipt of the Atlas in 1728. Taken from *Gongzhongdang Yongzheng chao zouzhe*.

<i>Date</i>	<i>Recorded Title</i>	<i>Name</i>
Yongzheng 6.3.6	Henan governor-general	Tian Wenjing
Yongzheng 6.3.27	Shandong governor	Selengge (Sai-leng-e)
Yongzheng 6.4.6	Zhejiang governor-general	Li Wei
Yongzheng 6.4.15	Sichuan-Shaanxi governor-general	Yue Zhongqi
Yongzheng 6.4.26	Yunnan governor-general	Ortai (E-er-tai)
Yongzheng 6.5.10	Jiangnan acting governor-general	Fan Shiyi
Yongzheng 6.6.8	Huguang governor-general	Mai Zhujin
Yongzheng 6.7.6	Fujian governor-general	Gao Qizhuo
Yongzheng 6.8.26	Anxi brigade general	Pan Zhishan
Yongzheng 6.8.26	Sichuan governor	Hiyande (Xian-de)
Yongzheng 6.11.6	Guizhou/Yunnan acting governor	Shen Yanzheng

Some documentary evidence suggests that the ten-scroll multi-sheet map that the Yongzheng emperor circulated among his provincial administrators was not the only edition produced. In two short bibliographical articles from the 1980s, Yu Fushun and Feng Baolin differentiate two closely related printed editions, dating back, respectively, to late 1727 and to mid-1729, through an analysis of Chinese place names.⁶⁴ Although I have been unable to consult any of these maps at mainland libraries or archives, the enhanced version may reflect in part a new map produced by the general at Anxi, Pan Zhishan, who had received his map from the Yongzheng emperor (see Table 2) in late September 1728 and then had moved immediately to gather

64. Yu Fushun, "Qing Yongzheng shipai *Huangyu tu* de chubu yanjiu," Feng Baolin, "Ji jizhong butong banben de Yongzheng *Huangyu shipai quantu*." Besides the well-known and published (in facsimile) 1727 woodblock edition in the Chinese Academy of Sciences, I have noted the following copies: 1) a print and a manuscript version, dated to 1729, at the First Historical Archives; 2) two colored woodblock editions in the Palace Museum in Beijing, printed around 1725 and 1729, respectively; and 3) another two manuscript editions in the same museum, drawn before 1727 and after 1730, respectively. Walter Fuchs mentions a manuscript copy measuring 7.07 meters by 5.2 meters whose description matches the content of the Yongzheng map. It was at the South Manchurian Railway Library in Dalian in 1933. Fuchs, "Ueber enige Landkarten mit Mandjurischer Beschriftung," 13–15.

supplementary data for a new map of the Gansu-Hami frontier.⁶⁵ On December 6, 1728, he wrote a memorial to the throne, enclosing his new map covering the entire frontier area from the Gansu corridor to the towns on the edge of the Taklamakan desert:

Because [your servant] cannot cover all places [of the frontier] himself, but only rely on what he has seen or heard, he has repeatedly and with an eye for detail increased his inquiries, painstakingly correcting [information], not just once but over and over again. Now, your servant is considerably and comprehensively well informed of the geographical situation and [has] ordered an artisan-painter to draw an overview map, starting from the wells outside the Jiayu Pass to where the Russian olives grow in the desert. Between those, cities new and old, encampments large and small, all that belongs to the territories of the emperor appear, with the border traced in yellow. Beyond this yellow core, whether roads or patrolling tracks, all that is on the map is within the reach of our military forces. As for the boundaries of seasonal floods, as well as road distances, river courses, mountain ranges, dangerous passes, and roads frequented by locals, all have been marked, and all territories from here to there have been annotated....⁶⁶

Besides such locally produced and localized new maps, records from the Imperial Workshop also show an update in the depiction of the Chinese provinces in the summer of 1729 including small changes to reflect administrative reforms.⁶⁷ The court even called upon the Jesuits, yet again, to provide information on the routes from Asia Minor, Persia, and Tibet into Central and Inner Asia.⁶⁸ All this activity over the course of 1728 and 1729 may therefore indicate the production of a slightly updated version in the summer of 1729 after a repetition of the same

65. In 1710, Pan Zhishan (d.1733) had served under the Kangxi emperor in Hami, a desert town whose local ruler (or *beg*) had only just submitted to Qing rule. He later fought against the Junghar and in Tibet, and finally served as the general in Anxi from 1727. Anxi lay beyond the Great Wall on the road to Hami and was crucial for the military push toward points beyond. On the Yongzheng map, a double square, found nowhere else on the map, places distinct emphasis.

66. *Gongzhongdang Yongzheng chao zouzhe*, vol. 11, 695.

67. Zhu Jiajin, *Yangxindian zaobanchu shiliao jilan*, 174.

68. Gaubil, *Correspondence de Pékin*, 235–37.

technical procedures.⁶⁹ Soon thereafter, however, the flurry of mapmaking at the Qing court abruptly halted with the death of Prince Yinxiang in 1730, after which all maps, including those still unfinished, remained in storage at the Imperial Workshop for the rest of the Yongzheng reign.⁷⁰ Taken together, the 1727 edition of the Yongzheng multi-sheet map and, if confirmed, its close relative of 1729, would constitute the principal printed court maps produced during the Yongzheng years.⁷¹

Thus, the initial intelligence and map translation project directed at the Russian Empire, commissioned by Yinxiang and executed by the Inner Court's Jesuit experts, raised the question of how to depict Junghar territories and other lands in-between where Qing and Russian interests collided. The missionaries had permission to consult route books and were present at envoys' interviews, enabling them to piece together new maps encompassing large parts of the Eurasian landmass beyond the Qing court's military reach. The final product, however, Yongzheng's multi-sheet map, printed for the first time in the winter of 1727, circulated as gifts to top officials throughout the empire while remaining out of the reach of the court's Jesuit experts and their European contacts. This suggests that, in contrast to the Kangxi atlas, which circulated across Eurasia, the Yongzheng map was for internal use only, a discursive tool to articulate and communicate an ambitious vision of empire.

The Quandaries of Mapping Qing Space

Unpacking the Yongzheng map's production context and process as well as its circulation raises the question of how the map's intended audience of top imperial officials understood this enlarged Qing space. One clue is the deployment of two different scripts to indicate place names in two clearly differentiated areas, on the Yongzheng map as on its Kangxi-era predecessor: Place names appear rendered in Manchu script for all areas north, east, or west of the Great Wall, whereas for the areas "within" (south of) the Great Wall place names appear in Chinese script.⁷² In

69. *Qingdai neifu keshu tulu*, 30.

70. Feng Baolin, "Ji jizhong butong banben de Yongzheng *Huangyu shipai quantu*," 77.

71. Other versions kept at Chinese institutions are likely either preparatory versions or derivative copies. Further research should confirm this. Yu Fushun, "Qing Yongzheng shipai *Huangyu tu* de chubu yanjiu," 74–75; *Aomen lishi ditu jingxuan*, 46.

72. The Manchu and Chinese scripts on the map gloss over the many languages that divide the "outer" territories. Eijk, "Mapping in Manchu."

other words, place names in the provinces of the preceding Ming state are in Chinese whereas the representation of all other territories of the Manchu-Qing Empire, as well as of the vast areas outside its direct administrative or military control, employs Manchu. To some extent, this is characteristic of Qing rule, whereby a Manchu elite stood above a federation-like empire uniting a Chinese majority with the peoples of Inner Asia. Following this logic of early Qing empire-building, known in the literature as “ethno-dynastic rule,” the early Qing court aimed to administer different peoples separately, ideally within clearly demarked territorial boundaries.⁷³ During the Yongzheng reign, the imperial administration continued to distinguish between “inner” and “outer” territories. Surrounding these territories, all under both administrative and military control by the court, lay another band of lands designated as “outer vassals” (*waifan*).

This geo-spatial arrangement, already articulated in the Kangxi-era atlas, is apparent on the Yongzheng multi-sheet map. The map includes no external borders, but emphasizes — in fact exaggerates — borders internal to the Qing. One such boundary is the Willow Palisade, running from the Great Wall northeast of Beijing all the way around Mukden (Shenyang) and Kirin Hoton (Jilin), separating Manchu from Mongol lands, with one stretch branching off toward the (undepicted) boundary with Korea, limiting Han migration into the Jilin region.⁷⁴ Another is the Great Wall itself, the bulk of it constructed during the late Ming specifically to keep the Manchus at bay.⁷⁵ Like the Willow Palisade, this boundary appears greatly exaggerated, giving the impression of one uninterrupted, uniform wall from east to west. No boundary appears drawn between the old Ming provinces and the Tibetan and Korean lands apart from the river

73. Michael Chang, *A Court on Horseback*. Migration between territories was strictly forbidden during the early Qing period. Starting from 1723, this gradually changed following the establishment of sub-prefectures (*ting*) in Kalgan (Zhangjiakou), Dolon Nor (Duolun), Hohhot (Guihua, now Huhehaote), and elsewhere beyond the Great Wall, reflecting the reality of Han Chinese migration and permanent settlement there. Muping Bao, “Trade Centers in Mongolia,” 215; Edmonds, “The Willow Palisade,” 613–16.

74. Edmonds, *The Willow Palisade* (esp. 613–16), first argued for the Willow Palisade as an internal border maintained and enforced during the early decades of Qing rule. During the Yongzheng period, it became increasingly obsolete in its original function to prevent Han migration.

75. Waldron, *The Great Wall of China*.

systems physically separating them. In other words, besides their use of both the Chinese and the Manchu scripts to distinguish inner territories from those beyond, these maps also deploy borders to emphasize doubly, as a second layer, the separate administrations, defined territorially, of the Manchu, Mongols, and Han (or, perhaps more accurately, former Ming subjects).

Secondary internal borders, signified less prominently with dotted lines, also appear, but only within the well-defined inner territories.⁷⁶ In the southwest, dotted lines trace the border that Yunnan province shares with what are now Myanmar, Laos, and Vietnam (long since tributaries of the Chinese state). Similarly, dotted lines surround blank unmapped pockets in Guizhou province that constituted tribal lands of the Miao. In the southwest, therefore, what appears to the modern reader to be a dotted line denoting an external border in this reality signifies boundaries internal to the inner territories (south of the Great Wall) and distinguishing between direct administration and the immediate lands beyond (the latter left blank). The fact that the same dotted lines separate inland provinces — where no natural boundary is present — confirms this thesis. The printed map, then, indicates the borders surrounding Ming China's old tributary lands just as it does those between the Chinese provinces. Together, primary and secondary borders, on both the Kangxi and Yongzheng maps, do not define the outer extent of imperial territories but instead reflect the Qing's administrative makeup and thus convey a particular logic and order constitutive of Qing imperial space. In other words, it is not at the margins of the map but at its very center that we find the borders that mattered most.

The Yongzheng map, despite depicting all of these various internal borders, includes no whisper of any border with the Russian Empire. This seems problematic at first sight given the existence of the treaties of Nerchinsk (1689) and Bura (1727), each demarcating a common border, at the time of this map's printing (late 1727).⁷⁷ From the perspective of the

76. Dotted lines can also be found beyond the Great Wall, where they instead trace routes, such as those followed by the Kangxi emperor's mapmakers. Cams, *Companions in Geography*, 111–18.

77. Although no border is explicitly indicated, there is a small pictogram of a stele that was placed together with the Manchu word *bei* (from the Chinese for “stele”) not far from Nerchinsk on the Amur river. This is discussed in Cheng Zhi, “Nibuchu tiaoyue jiebei tu de huaning.” Likewise, in the southwest, there are three similar pictograms on the border

Qing court, however, this apparent contradiction followed a clear logic. As discussed above, Qing frontier formation and expansion in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries vectored toward the northwest along a line arcing from Kokonor in the west all the way to Nerchinsk in the north, fully geared toward the Khalkha and, beyond, the Russian and Junghar threats. To deal comprehensively with these northwestern peoples and with the region as a whole, the Manchu rulers expanded the operations of the Lifanyuan, a Manchu institutional innovation almost exclusively responsible for relations with, and the administration of, the peoples to the northwest, including the Russians.⁷⁸ This important institution, “an essential tool for stabilization of the frontiers and continued expansion of Qing territory,” articulated a specific discourse reflective of Manchu overlordship and the Qing’s geo-spatial order.⁷⁹ In one telling example, the Lifanyuan referred to the Russian Empire as a *wai fan xiaoguo*, a “little state among [our] outer vassals.”⁸⁰ According to the institutional-administrative logic of the Qing, therefore, the Russians merely occupied a comparatively remote spot along the continuum of outer vassals, even as direct threats and frontier management problems compelled the court to negotiate border treaties and trade agreements with them.

In this light, the Qing court had clear precedent for incorporating the Russian Empire into the Yongzheng map of its imperium: the inclusion of Khalkha lands on its Kangxi-era predecessor. While the Khalkha entrée onto the Kangxi map had followed straightforwardly the Khalkha clans’ and lands’ tangible absorption into the Qing polity, the Yongzheng court clearly exerted no such control over Russian territories; weaving the Russian Empire into the imperial map therefore required a different approach, reliant not on field surveys but on the translation of preexisting maps and the mobilizing of diverse expertise concentrated in Beijing from across the Eurasian continent. To perceive the map through the eyes of the Yongzheng court and its agents, then, we must take one

with Annam, known as the “iron pillars.” Baldanza, “De-civilizing Ming China’s Southern Border.”

78. After the siege of Albazin, for example, some one hundred Albazinian families became Qing subjects incorporated beneath the Manchu Bordered Yellow Banner in accordance with the logic of Lifanyuan policy toward the peoples of the northwest.

79. Crossley, “The Lifanyuan and Stability during Qing Imperial Expansion,” 106.

80. *Qing shilu*, YZ 5.10.5; *Yongzheng qijuzhu*, YZ 5.10.

final step and consider the distinction between imperial administration and territorial control and the prerequisite imperial spatial imaginary enabling their coexistence. On the one hand, the depiction of primary and secondary boundaries reflects this minority-ruled empire's internal makeup, articulating a specific logic regarding those territories it already effectively controlled; on the other hand, the multi-sheet map magnifies and extends this logic (just as had its Kangxi-era predecessor, albeit less pronouncedly), conveying Qing imaginary space and thus discursively retaining the option of further (legitimate) expansion and conquest. Thus, by considering the Yongzheng multi-sheet map as a discursive tool and its representation of empire as a spatial imaginary rooted in its geo-administrative order, the absence of existing legally defined external borders from the map combined with its strong emphasis on internal borders makes perfect sense.

Conclusion

There was, on the one hand, the actual physical outside world which could be put to political, economic, and strategic use; there was also the outside world onto which all identification and interpretation, all dissatisfaction and desire, all nostalgia and idealism seeking expression could be projected.⁸¹

—Henri Baudet

The quote above, from Dutch historian Henri Baudet's reflection on European portrayals of non-European peoples, examines the manners in which they represented, knew, and made sense of foreign subjects. The implied tension between real and imagined also highlights this study's significance as regards the entire Qing lineage of multi-sheet court maps. The production process of the material map as well as its representation of imperial space, with the Russian and Junghar Empires safely locked onto the Qing-Manchu compass as *wai fan* and correspondingly integrated onto the imperial map, reflects the Yongzheng court's priorities with regard to unfinished business on its northwestern frontier. Qing expansion and frontier formation in the northwest therefore help to

81. Baudet, *Paradise on Earth*, 55.

explain why these maps present a borderless imperial space, most visibly toward the northwest, whilst underlining the imperial order by drawing clear distinctions among imperial territories under separate administrations in their deployment of scripts and borders. Qing space in these atlases is an open-ended collection of separately administered territories, an unfinished house of many rooms. Based upon this understanding, I argue that the large multi-sheet maps of the Kangxi, Yongzheng, and Qianlong reigns first and foremost communicate, over the course of the eighteenth century, progressive stages in the articulation of a geo-spatial imaginary.

Even so, the Yongzheng court's spatial imaginary as articulated on the map stands in stark contrast to the administration's highly pragmatic management of the frontier, including the contemporaneous negotiations building toward the Treaty of Khyakta. While the run-up to the final treaty necessitated the real-life surveying and demarcating of a common border on the frontier, the logic underlying the Qing's geo-administrative makeup dictated that the Russian Empire could only enter the eighteenth-century Yongzheng imperial map as it had entered official Qing discourse in the seventeenth century, as a *wai fan xiaoguo*, a "little state among [our] outer vassals." To achieve this, the Inner Court relied on a complex network of connections established through wide-ranging activities, from military conquest and diplomacy to the employment of technical experts at court. Thus the Yongzheng map emerges as an interwoven patchwork of differing epistemologies of space that provide us a window back onto carefully orchestrated exchanges of knowledge and information: from its Kangxi-era discursive predecessor, to a map of the Russian Empire translated from an atlas printed in Nuremberg, to mediated information from Qing informants and route books. Following integration and printing, this patchwork transmuted into an entirely novel *gestalt*, an artefact echoing an evolving vision of Qing space as imagined perhaps only in the halls and corridors of the Forbidden City. This tension between realpolitik on the frontier and the evolving Qing spatial imaginary also explains why the court kept the final map from the hands of Jesuit missionaries, limiting its circulation strictly among the emperor's confidants.

The articulations of Qing space conveyed in these large eighteenth-century court maps reflected a redirection of the court's attention toward the northwest that expanded its contacts and broadened the scope of

its operations along that bearing. In turn, this necessitated a further reimagining of that space to create a discursive frame of reference for those activities. In other words, through the inclusion of the Russian and Junghar Empires as well as their frontier zones in the Yongzheng atlas, the court kept the path toward further conquest in Central and Inner Asia securely (epistemologically) unobstructed. The death of the Junghar Khan Tsewang Rabtán in 1727 and the signing of the final Treaty of Kyakhta in 1728 strengthened that momentum. One year later, the emperor even commenced a new anti-Junghar push that eventually resulted in the annexation, under the Qianlong emperor, of the lands known today as Xinjiang. This process initiated yet another period of intense mapmaking, this time at the Qianlong court, prompting further extension of the Qing's geo-spatial horizons to include the Northern Subcontinent and the Arabian Peninsula.⁸² Thus, whereas these small-scale court atlases present the modern historian with an apparent contradistinction between strategic utility and cartographic content, Yongzheng's multi-sheet map illustrates their primary, essential purpose: to articulate the court's evolving vision of Qing space even as it faced more immediate problems in frontier management and control.

82. Noteworthy, the Qianlong multi-sheet maps also include Qing-Russian border markers established in the Bura border treaty, as part of yet another thorough reinterpretation of the Qing's spatial imaginary. For more on mapmaking at the Qianlong court, see Millward, "Coming onto the Map;" Mosca, *From Frontier Policy to Foreign Policy*, 101–32.

GLOSSARY

Anxi	安西
E-er-tai	鄂爾泰
er pai xi er	二排西二
Fan Shiyi	范時繹
Gao Qizhuo	高其倬
Hai-wang	海望
<i>Huangyu quanlan tu</i>	皇輿全覽圖
Li Wei	李衛
Lifanyuan	理藩院
Mai Zhujin	邁柱謹
micang	秘藏
Pan Zhishan	潘之善
Sai-leng-e	塞楞額
Shen Tingzheng	沈廷正
Tian Wenjing	田文鏡
waifan	外藩
waifan xiaoguo	外藩小國
Xian-de	憲德
Yinxiang	胤祥
Yue Zhongqi	岳鍾琪
Zaobanchu Yutuchu	造辦處輿圖處

WORKS CITED

- Afinogenov, Gregory. *Spies and Scholars: Chinese Secrets and Imperial Russia's Quest for World Power*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2020.
- An Shuangcheng (ed.) (trans.). *Qingchu Xiyang chuanjiaoshi Manwen dang'an yiben* (Translated Manchu archival material concerning the Western missionaries during the early Qing). Dengzhou: Daxiang chubanshe, 2014.
- Aomen lishi ditu jingxuan* (Selection of historical maps of Macao). Beijing: Huawen chubanshe, 2000.
- Bagrow, Leo. "A Few Remarks on Maps of the Amur, the Tartar Strait and Sakhalin." *Imago Mundi* 12 (1955): 127–36.

- . “The First Russian Maps of Siberia and Their Influence on the West-European Cartography of N.E. Asia.” *Imago Mundi* 9 (1952): 83–93.
- . *History of Cartography*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964.
- . “Spawenfeld’s Map of Siberia.” *Imago Mundi* 4 (1947): 65–70.
- Baldanza, Kathlene. “De-civilizing China’s Southern Border: Vietnam as Lost Province or Barbarian Culture.” In *Chinese History in Geographical Perspective*, edited by Yongtao Du and Jeff Kyong-McClain, 55–69. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2015.
- Bao, Muping. “Trade Centers (*Maimaicheng*) in Mongolia, and Their Function in Sino-Russian Trade Networks.” *International Journal of Asian Studies* 3, no. 2 (2006): 211–37.
- Batchelor, Robert. “Introduction: Jesuit Cartography.” *Jesuit Studies* 6, no. 1 (2019): 1–13.
- Baudet, Henri. *Paradise on Earth: Some Thoughts on European Images of Non-European Man*. Westport, Ct.: Praeger, 1977.
- Cams, Mario. *Companions in Geography: East-West Collaboration in the Mapping of Qing China (c.1685–1735)*. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- . “Not Just a Jesuit Atlas of China: Qing Imperial Cartography and Its European Connections.” *Imago Mundi* 69, no. 2 (2017): 188–201.
- Cams, Mario, Leon Rodenburg and Fresco Sam-Sin. *QingMaps.org*. Digitally redesigned from Wang Qianjin and Liu Ruofang, *Qingting san da shice quantu ji* (Collection of the Qing court’s three large survey maps). 3 vols. Beijing: Foreign Languages Press, 2007.
- Chang, Michael G. *A Court on Horseback: Imperial Touring and the Construction of Qing Rule, 1680–1785*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2007.
- Cheng Zhi. “Nibuchu tiaoyue jiebei tu de huanying: Manwen ‘Heilongjiang liuyu tu’ yanjiu” (The illusion of the Nerchinsk Treaty boundary-stone: The map of the Amur region in Manchu). *National Palace Museum Research Quarterly* 29, no. 1 (2011): 1–74.
- Cordier, Henri. “De la situation du Japon et de la Corée. Manuscrit Inédit du père A. Gaubil S.J.” (On the location of Japan and Korea. Original manuscript by Father A. Gaubil, S.J.). *T’oung-pao* 9, no. 2 (1898): 3–16.
- Crossley, Pamela Kyle. “The Lifanyuan and Stability during Qing Imperial Expansion.” In *Managing Frontiers in Qing China: The*

- Lifanyuan and Libu Revisited*, edited by Dittmar Schokowitz and Chia Ning, 92–115. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Di Cosmo, Nicola. “The Qing and Inner Asia: 1636–1800.” In *The Cambridge History of Inner Asia: The Chinggisid Age*, edited by Nicola Di Cosmo et al., 333–62. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Edmonds, Richard L. “The Willow Palisade.” *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 69, no. 4 (1979): 599–621.
- Edney, Matthew. *Cartography: The Ideal and Its History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2019.
- Eijk, Juul. “Mapping in Manchu: The Development of Usage of the Manchu Script and Language on Qing Imperial Mapping Projects.” *East Asian Science, Technology and Medicine* 52 (2020): 72–115.
- Feng Baolin. “Ji jizhong butong banben de Yongzheng *Huangyu shipai quantu*” (Notes on several different editions of the Yongzheng *Complete Map of Imperial Territories in Ten Rows*). *Gugong bowuyuan yuankan* (1986): 73–78.
- Foss, Theodore. “A Western Interpretation of China: Jesuit Cartography.” In *East Meets West: The Jesuits in China 1582–1773*, edited by Charles E. Ronan and Bonnie B.C. Oh, 209–51. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1988.
- Fuchs, Walter. *Der Jesuiten-atlas der Kanghsi-zeit: Seine Entstehungsgeschichte nebst Namensindices für die Karten der Mandjuren, Mongolei, Ostturkestan und Tibet* (The Jesuit atlas of the Kangxi reign: The history of its origins together with name indices for the maps of Manchuria, Mongolia, Eastern Turkestan, and Tibet). 2 vols. Beijing: Fu-jen University, 1943.
- . “Materialien zur Kartographie der Mandjuzeit I” (Materials on cartography from the Manchu period I). *Monumenta Serica* 1, no. 2 (1935): 386–427.
- . “Materialien zur Kartographie der Mandjuzeit II” (Materials on cartography from the Manchu period II). *Monumenta Serica* 3 (1938): 189–231.
- . “Ueber einige Landkarten mit Mandjurischer Beschriftung” (On some maps with Manchu script). *Manzhou xuebao* 2 (1933): 1–17.
- Gaubil, Antoine (ed. Renée Simon), *Correspondence de Pékin 1772–1759* (Correspondence from Peking 1772–1759). Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1970.

- Gibson, James R. *Feeding the Russian Fur Trade: Provisionment of the Okhotsk Seaboard and the Kamchatka Peninsula, 1639–1856*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.
- Gongzhongdang Yongzheng chao zouzhe (Rescripted palace memorials from the Yongzheng period). 32 Vols. Taipei: National Palace Museum, 1978.
- Heinz, Markus. "A Programme for Map Publishing: The Homann Firm in the Eighteenth Century." *Imago Mundi* 49 (1997): 104–15.
- Hostetler, Laura. "Early Modern Mapping at the Qing Court: Survey Maps from the Kangxi, Yongzheng, and Qianlong Reign Periods." In *Chinese History in Geographical Perspective*, edited by Yongtao Du and Jeff Kyong-McClain, 15–32. Lanham, Md.: Lexington Books, 2015.
- . *Qing Colonial Enterprise: Ethnography and Cartography in Early Modern China*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- Huang, Fei. "The Making of a Frontier Landscape: The 'Ten Views of Dongchuan' in Eighteenth-Century Southwest China." *Late Imperial China* 35, no. 2 (2014): 56–88.
- Jami, Catherine. "Western Learning and Imperial Control: The Kangxi Emperor's (r. 1662–1722) Performance." *Late Imperial China* 23, no. 1 (2002): 28–49.
- Jaskov, Helena. "The Negotiated Geography of the Treaty of Nerchinsk." *Late Imperial China* 40, no. 2 (2019): 45–88.
- Mancall, Mark. *Russia and China: Their Diplomatic Relations to 1728*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971.
- Menegon, Eugenio. *Ancestors, Virgins, and Friars: Christianity as a Local Religion in Late Imperial China*. Harvard-Yenching Institute Monograph Series 69. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2009.
- Millward, James A. "Coming onto the Map: 'Western Regions' Geography and Cartographic Nomenclature in the Making of Chinese Empire in Xinjiang." *Late Imperial China* 20, no. 2 (1999): 61–89.
- Mosca, Matthew. *From Frontier Policy to Foreign Policy: The Question of India and the Transformation of Geopolitics in Qing China*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2013.
- . "The Qing Empire in the Fabric of Global History." In *The Prospect of Global History*, edited by James Belich et al., 108–23. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

- Needham, Joseph. *Science and Civilization in China. Vol. 3*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1959. Reprint 1979.
- Perdue, Peter C. "Boundaries, Maps, and Movement: Chinese, Russian, and Mongolian Empires in Early Modern Central Eurasia." *The International History Review* 20, no. 2 (1998): 263–86.
- . "Boundaries and Trade in the Early Modern World: Negotiations at Nerchinsk and Beijing." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 43, no. 3 (2010): 341–56.
- . *China Marches West: The Qing Conquest of Central Eurasia*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 2005.
- . "Empire and Nation in Comparative Perspective: Frontier Administration in 18th Century China." *Journal of Early Modern History* 5, no. 4 (2001): 283–304.
- Qingdai neifu keshu tulu* (Catalogue of Qing-era printed books from the Inner Court). Beijing: Beijing chubanshe, 2003.
- Qing shilu* (Qing veritable records). 60 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1986.
- Qing neiwufu zaobanchu yutufang tumu chubian* (First edited list from the Map Room at the Qing Imperial Household Department's Workshops). Beijing: Guoli Beiping gugong bowuguan, 1936.
- Sandler, Christian. "Johann Baptista Homann: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Kartographie" (Johann Baptista Homann: A Contribution to the history of cartography). *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin* 21 (1886): 328–84.
- Schorkowitz, Dittmar, and Chia Ning eds. *Managing Frontiers in Qing China: The Lifanyuan and Libu Revisited*. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Sebes, Joseph. *The Jesuits and the Sino-Russian Treaty of Nerchinsk (1689): The Diary of Thomas Pereira, S.J.* Rome: Institutum Historicum S.I., 1961.
- Stary, Giovanni. "Guanyu Manzu lishi he yuyan de ruogan wenti" (About certain problems regarding Manchu history and language). *Manxue yanjiu* 2 (1994): 218–26.
- . "A Manchu Document Concerning Russian Teachers of the Manchu Banners' 'Russian Company.'" *Central Asiatic Journal* 43, no. 1 (1999): 140–46.
- Strassberg, Richard E. *Thirty-Six Views: The Kangxi Emperor's Mountain Estate in Poetry and Prints*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2016.

- Sunderland, Williard. "Imperial Space: Territorial Thought and Practice in the Eighteenth Century." In *Russian Empire: Space, People, Power, 1700–1930*, edited by Jane Burbank et al., 33–66. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007.
- Tolmacheva, Marina. "The Early Russian Exploration and Mapping of the Chinese Frontier." *Cahiers du Monde russe* 41, no. 1 (2000): 41–56.
- Waldron, Arthur. *The Great Wall of China: From History to Myth*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Wang Qianjin and Liu Ruofang. *Qingting san da shice quantu ji* (Collection of the Qing court's three large survey maps). 3 vols. Beijing: Foreign Languages Press, 2007.
- Wanner, Michal. "First Russian-Chinese Diplomatic Relations and Business Relationship 1689–1728." *Prague Papers on the History of International Relations* 18, no. 2 (2014): 35–49.
- Whiteman, Stephen. "Kangxi's Auspicious Empire: Rhetorics of Geographic Integration in the Early Qing." In *Chinese History in Geographical Perspective*, edited by Yongtao Du and Jeff Kyong-McClain, 33–54. Lanham, Md.: Lexington Books, 2015.
- Widmer, Eric. *The Russian Ecclesiastical Mission in Peking During the 18th Century*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University East Asian Research Center, 1976.
- Ye Baichuan and Yuan Jian. "The Sino-Russian Trade and the Role of the Lifanyuan, 17th–18th Centuries." In *Managing Frontiers in Qing China: The Lifanyuan and Libu Revisited*, edited by Dittmar Schorkowitz and Chia Ning, 254–89. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Yee, Cordell. "Traditional Chinese Cartography and the myth of Westernization". In *The History of Cartography, Volume 2 Book 2: Cartography in the Traditional East and Southeast Asian Societies*, edited by John B. Harley and David Woodward, 170–202. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Yu Fushun. "Qing Yongzheng shipai *Huangyu tu* de chubu yanjiu" (Initial research on the ten-row Yongzheng *Maps of Imperial Territories*). *Wenwu* 12 (1983): 71–75, 83.
- Zhu Jiajin, ed. *Yangxindian zaobanchu shiliao jilan: di yi ji* (Edited historical materials from the Imperial Workshop at the Yangxindian: Vol. 1). Beijing: Zijincheng chubanshe, 2003.