

## Yin-lu

legality or illegality of Emperor Shih-tsung's succession to the throne. And if there was irregularity in carrying out the last will of Shêng-tsu (see under Yin-chên and Lungkodo), it was necessary to reward Yin-lu liberally to insure his silence.

Yin-lu was useful to the Emperor in other ways also. Having studied some mathematics and music, he was ordered to head a commission to re-edit and print the *Lü-li yüan-yüan* (see under Ho Kuo-tsung) and perhaps also the *Ku-chin t'u-shu chi-ch'êng* (see under Ch'ên Méng-lei). Both works had been compiled by scholars under the direction of Yin-chih [q. v.]—scholars who perhaps had antagonized Emperor Shih-tsung by espousing the cause of one or another of the princes in their struggle for the throne. Yin-lu was therefore entrusted with the task of erasing their names and, if possible, all memory of their connection with these important works.

In 1736 Emperor Kao-tsung made Yin-lu one of four regents to direct national affairs during the period of mourning for the death of his father. Early in 1738 Yin-lu was rewarded with the additional hereditary rank of a prince of the fifth degree (鎮國公) which he gave, not to his own son, but to Ning-ho 寧赫, a descendant of Šose. And when Ning-ho was deprived of his rank for certain offenses (1739), Yin-lu bestowed upon him some land and houses. Hence by his generosity Yin-lu won a degree of popularity. However, he lost the favor of Emperor Kao-tsung for a time, when in 1739 it was discovered that he was associating with Hung-hsi (see under Yin-jêng), a likely pretender to the throne. In 1741 Yin-lu and Chang Chao [q. v.] were commissioned to revise the *Lü-lü chêng-i* (see under Chang Chao) and were also appointed supervisors of the Board of Music. After his death (1767) Yin-lu was canonized as K'ò 恪.

Among descendants of Yin-lu may be mentioned I-mai 奕賁, the fifth Prince Chuang who in 1838 was deprived of his rank and was banished for smoking opium in a nunnery. I-kêng 奕膺 (H. 愛蓮居士, 墨香書屋主人, 鶴侶主人), a brother of I-mai, was a historian who left a number of works important for a study of the Ch'ing Imperial House. His manuscripts were obtained by Yenching University, and printed in 1935 under the title 佳夢軒叢書 *Chia-mêng hsüan ts'ung-shu*. This work contains eleven items, among which are the following: 東華

## Yin-ssü

錄綴言 *Tung-hua lu chui-yen*; 寄楮備談 *Chi-tu pei-t'an*; and 管見所及 *Kuan-chien so-chi*.

The ninth Prince Chuang, Tsai-hsün 載勛, who inherited the rank in 1875 was a prince who sponsored the Boxers in 1900, throwing open his house as their headquarters, and representing them to the Empress Dowager (see under Hsiao-ch'in) as formidable foes to foreigners (see under Jung-lu). His punishment consisted in being ordered to commit suicide, which he did by hanging, February 21, 1901.

[1/170/25b; 1/225/4b; *Ch'ing Huang-shih ssü-p'u* (see Fu-lung-an), 3/16b.]

FANG CHAO-YING

YIN-ssü 胤祺, Mar. 29, 1681–1726, Sept. 30, was the eighth son of Emperor Shêng-tsu. His mother (*née* Wei 衛, title, Liang-fei 良妃, d. 1711), born of a plebian family, entered the Palace as a maid, but before the birth of Yin-ssü she was made an imperial consort. In 1698 Yin-ssü was made a prince of the third degree and began to assume a position of prominence among the Emperor's sons. When Yin-jêng [q. v.], the Heir Apparent, was deposed in 1708, several of his brothers began to assert their claims to the throne; among them was Yin-ssü who, as an active rival, had the support of several brothers and of certain high officials. For having dispatched agents to purchase books in Kiangsu he achieved the reputation of being a scholar. He is said to have held secret interviews with astrologists, physiognomists and other magicians, intending perhaps to solicit their help when necessary. His aggressiveness, however, displeased the Emperor who rebuked him severely for asserting his claims and accused him of being under the domination of his wife, a granddaughter of Yolo [q. v.]. The Emperor deprived Yin-ssü for a time of all rank. The latter, however, claimed the support of powerful officials who, when asked to express their opinion in the matter stood wholeheartedly for Yin-ssü. So great was their influence, especially that of Maci and K'uei-hsü [qq. v.], that their opinion prevailed over that of many other officials. The Emperor was displeased with the recommendation and ignored it on the ground that Yin-ssü's mother was descended from a family of low degree. But when Yin-jêng, the heir-presumptive, was released from confinement, Yin-ssü was restored to his rank of prince of the third degree. Those who had previously recommended Yin-ssü

were not molested, except Maci who was suspected by the Emperor of being the prime mover.

Early in 1709 Yin-jêng was reinstated as Heir Apparent, only to be degraded again in 1712. Yin-ssü, probably finding his claims of no avail, transferred his support to a younger brother, Yin-t'i [禔 *q. v.*]; never ceasing, however, to press his own claims as opportunity offered. One of the scholars accused of undue friendliness with Yin-ssü was Ho Ch'o [*q. v.*] whose daughter seems to have been adopted into the prince's household. For having permitted his relations with the prince to go so far, Ho was for a time imprisoned in 1715. Meanwhile Yin-t'i was appointed commander-in-chief of the armies in the northwest and was regarded by many as the Emperor's real choice for the throne.

Emperor Shêng-tsu died late in 1722. Yin-t'i was then absent from Peking, and it was Yin-chên [*q. v.*] who ascended the throne. As the latter was supported by Lungkodo [*q. v.*], commander of the gendarmerie in Peking, the adherents of Yin-ssü had no way to assert their claims. The new Emperor was sagacious enough to make Yin-ssü a prince of the first degree with the designation Lien (廉親王). He also appointed him Supervisor of State Affairs and president of the Board of Colonial Affairs. Yin-ssü was aware that these distinctions were heaped upon him to allay popular suspicion and that there could be no hope of a lasting reconciliation between himself and the Emperor. He is said to have appeared stunned when his brother ascended the throne and to have been dazed and deep in thought when the Emperor ordered him to take charge of the funeral of their father. His wife, when congratulated on the prince's new honors, is said to have remarked that she was more concerned over when they would both be beheaded. The Emperor was angered by the attitude of the prince and the princess, but refrained from action until his power was consolidated and the opposition was weakened. For more than three years Yin-ssü was frequently reprimanded and humiliated, and his supporters, Yin-t'ang, Sunu [*qq. v.*], and others, were either arrested or banished.

Early in 1726 Yin-ssü was interrogated about his relations with his brother, Yin-t'ang. When he swore, by the lives of the imperial family, that he had not corresponded with Yin-t'ang, he was nevertheless cut off from the imperial clan because the Emperor, who believed him guilty, did not wish the curse to fall on the entire

family. This, of course, was only a pretext for tormenting Yin-ssü, who before long was placed in confinement on various charges and forced to alter his personal name to Acina ('cur' in Manchu). On July 2, 1726 he was accused by courtiers of forty "crimes", including neglect of duty, formation of a coalition, planning assassinations, heaping blame on the Emperor, etc. His chief supporter, Yin-t'ang, was condemned on twenty-eight counts and imprisoned in Paoting. The Emperor evidently approved of the accusations, but was unwilling to incur the blame of publicly sentencing his brothers. He gained his ends, however, by keeping them in confinement. Yin-ssü died on September 30 in the prison of the Court of the Imperial Clan, and Yin-t'ang, eight days earlier at Paoting (see under Li Fu). The cause of Yin-ssü's death was given officially as "vomiting". The Emperor merely issued a statement that both had been "called to justice by the nether world".

It is recorded that during his confinement Yin-ssü declared at every meal that he did not expect to die a natural death. Courtiers suggested that his body should be dismembered, but the Emperor declined to order it so. In 1778 Emperor Kao-tsung decreed that Yin-ssü and Yin-t'ang be posthumously restored to the imperial clan and that the same rights be accorded their descendants. He asserted that although these two uncles had coveted the throne, there was no proof that they had engaged in treasonous activities. He admitted that his father (Emperor Shih-tsung) had in his later days expressed regret at the severity of the treatment they had received.

[1/226/7b; *Ch'ing Huang-shih ssü-p'u* (see under Fu-lung-an) 3/13b; *Tung-hua lu*, K'ang-hsi 47:9, 10, Yung-chêng 4:1-9; *Yün-ssü Yün-t'ang an* (The Case of Yin-ssü and Yin-t'ang) in *Wên-hsien ts'ung-pien* (see bibl. under Dorgon) no. 3, pp. 26-34.]

FANG CHAO-YING

YIN-t'ang 胤禔, Oct. 17, 1683-1726, Sept. 22, was the ninth son of Emperor Shêng-tsu. During the struggle among his brothers for the throne (see under Yin-jêng and Yin-chên), he took the side of Yin-t'i (禔) and Yin-ssü [*qq. v.*] and opposed another aspirant, Yin-chên [*q. v.*]. In 1709 he was made a prince of the fourth degree (貝子). Like his half brothers, he had his own retainers and supporters. One of his proponents

## Yin-t'ang

was the Portuguese missionary, Jean Mourao or João Mourão 穆敬 [經, 景] 遠 (T. 若望, 1681-1726), who informed Nien Kêng-yao [q. v.] during the years 1718-22 that Yin-t'ang would probably succeed to the throne. Among others who supported Yin-t'ang and his faction were Sunu [q. v.] and Yin-ê 胤俄 (1683-1741), the tenth son of Emperor Shêng-tsu who was at one time a prince of the second degree with the designation Tun (敦郡王).

Yin-t'ang is described as possessing only moderate ability or intelligence, but his great wealth made him a desirable ally for any ambitious prince. He accumulated his fortune partly through commercial enterprises—some of them perhaps illegal. Moreover, he controlled a due share of Banner companies which were in duty bound to supply him with funds. Furthermore, his daughter was betrothed to Yung-fu 永福 who was probably a son of K'uei-hsi [q. v.] and therefore a grandson of the opulent minister, Mingju [q. v.]. According to Yin-t'ang's treasurer, Ch'in Tao-jan (see under Ch'in Hui-t'ien), Yin-t'ang, in consequence of this relationship, obtained from Mingju's estates a fortune of about five hundred thousand taels. This sum, together with the two hundred thousand taels he had already accumulated, enabled him to exert a powerful influence in favor of Yin-t'i, much to the discomfiture of the other aspirant, Yin-chên. When Yin-t'i was favored by Emperor Shêng-tsu with appointment as commander-in-chief of the troops at Sining (1718) he received much financial aid from Yin-t'ang. At the same time he repeatedly requested Yin-t'ang to keep him informed of developments at Peking, particularly in the event of the aged Emperor's death.

When Emperor Shêng-tsu died unexpectedly late in 1722 Yin-chên, who was residing in Peking, was fully prepared to ascend the throne. Though Yin-t'i had a large army at his command, he was too distant to be kept informed and, moreover, was being observed by Nien Kêng-yao. In Peking Yin-chên's henchman, Lungkodo [q. v.], commanded the gendarmerie and was ready for the emergency. For this reason Yin-t'ang and Yin-ssü were powerless to make effective opposition and their faction was dispersed. Yin-ssü was nominally elevated, but was always under the surveillance of the Emperor; Yin-ê was dispatched to Mongolia on a mission; Yin-t'i was relieved of his command and was recalled to Peking; and Yin-t'ang was com-

## Yin-t'ang

manded to go to Sining in order that he might be under the close watch of Nien Kêng-yao.

Yin-t'ang did not leave immediately for Sining, as ordered, but loitered in Peking on various pretexts. In March 1723 he was sharply reprimanded and sent on his way. Several of his servants were banished to Kwangsi. For attempting to defend him, two of his supporters, sons of Sunu, were also banished to Sining. At first, Yin-t'ang enjoyed some liberties in Sining, though his movements were always reported to the Emperor. In 1724 his entire family joined him, with the exception of his son, Hung-yang 弘陽, who was allowed to remain in Peking to look after household affairs. By this time (May, 1724) Yin-ê was deprived of all ranks and sentenced to life imprisonment, ostensibly for disobeying orders, but actually because he kept up communication with Yin-t'ang. In a letter which Yin-t'ang wrote to Yin-ê, and which was found among the latter's effects, there appeared the words, "the opportunity is gone, and repining for it to come again is useless". Whatever import the words may originally have had, their disclosure doubtless confirmed the Emperor in his suspicions.

Early in 1725 a Manchu official, Cujung 楚宗 (仲), was sent by imperial decree to Sining to guard Yin-t'ang, at a time when Nien Kêng-yao was found to have secretly communicated with him. One reason for Yin-t'ang being guarded more closely was the fact that he soon established, in the region where he lived, a reputation for fair-dealing. Upon his arrival, Cujung reported that Yin-t'ang was infuriated by the edict, did not show due respect when the edict was read to him, and declined to admit having conducted himself in a way to warrant such treatment. A few months later, the Emperor, after listing his grievances against Yin-t'ang, ordered all his ranks to be taken from him and the Bannermen allotted to his service recalled.

Among Yin-t'ang's followers who were banished with him was the missionary, Mourao, who lived in a courtyard adjoining that of Yin-t'ang. Taking the precaution not to communicate with him through the front gates, Mourao sometimes joined him by climbing through a window. From the missionary, Yin-t'ang learned the Latin or Portuguese alphabet, and used it either to romanize Chinese words or to devise a code with which to communicate with his son, Hung-yang. Early in 1726 such a letter from Hung-yang was intercepted by the

Emper  
eviden  
condu  
treaso  
issued  
expelle  
liable t  
Ordere  
by tal  
meanir  
impris  
was no  
suggest  
decide  
meanin  
was br  
Chihli,  
the cus  
There  
house  
locked  
of pulle  
to rema  
were i  
he had  
month  
appetit  
coma,  
memori  
added  
"called  
anyone  
arrested  
(Septem  
Yin-t'  
speak in  
on evide  
extracte  
testimon  
Ch'in T  
edict (iss  
"crimes"  
lists fort  
recomme  
Emperor  
having d  
preferred  
endured  
probably  
Even du  
told Mo  
jected to  
The fc  
separately

Emperor's agents. The Emperor, alert for such evidence, issued a long edict concerning the conduct of Yin-t'ang, designating his activities as treasonous. At the same time an edict was issued against Yin-ssü. The two were then expelled from the Imperial Clan, and thus made liable to the punishment meted out to commoners. Ordered to change their names, Yin-ssü complied by taking the name Acina, a Manchu word meaning 'cur', a chastisement supplemented by imprisonment in Peking. Because the Emperor was not satisfied with the name which Yin-t'ang suggested for himself, a grand council of princes decided to confer on him the name Seshe 塞思黑, meaning "pig". In the meantime Yin-t'ang was brought in irons from Sining to Paoting, Chihli, where on June 14, 1726 he was put under the custody of Li Fu [q. v.], the governor-general. There he was confined in a small three-room house surrounded by high walls with the gate locked and sealed, food being delivered by means of pulleys. At first four servants were permitted to remain with him but on July 25 the servants were imprisoned elsewhere. On August 12 he had an attack of dysentery and less than a month later showed weakness and lack of appetite. On September 20 he lapsed into a coma, and two days later he died. To Li's memorial concerning this event the Emperor added the comment that Yin-t'ang had been "called to justice by the nether world", and that anyone who came to mourn his death should be arrested and investigated. A few days later (September 30), Yin-ssü also died in confinement.

Yin-t'ang and Yin-ssü were never allowed to speak in their own defense. They were convicted on evidence proffered by the Emperor himself or extracted from their former supporters. The testimony against Yin-t'ang, given by Mourao, Ch'in Tao-jan, and others was the basis of an edict (issued on July 2, 1726) listing twenty-eight "crimes" of Yin-t'ang. The same edict also lists forty "crimes" of Yin-ssü. The courtiers recommended that they be executed, but the Emperor, unwilling perhaps to be branded as having decreed the execution of his own brothers, preferred to let them die in prison. What they endured during those summer months was probably less tolerable than outright execution. Even during his exile at Sining Yin-t'ang had told Mourao that the indignities he was subjected to were worse than death by the sword.

The followers of Yin-t'ang were convicted separately. Mourao died in confinement on

August 18, 1726, in far-distant Kansu. Ch'in Tao-jan was convicted, not only for having been associated with Yin-t'ang, but on the charge that he had obtained a large sum of money unlawfully. He was imprisoned, but was released early in the Ch'ien-lung period. In like manner Yin-ê was released in 1737. Little is known of the fate of other members of Yin-t'ang's faction. Yin-t'ang's family remained commoners until 1778 when Emperor Kao-tsung re-instated them in the Imperial Clan. In 1782 Yin-t'ang's eldest son, Hung-chêng 弘晟, was made a prince of the eighth degree, but was deprived of the rank in the following year.

[See bibliography under Yin-ssü].

FANG CHAO-YING

YIN-t'i 胤禔, Mar. 12, 1672-1734, Nov. 25, was the eldest son of Emperor Shêng-tsu: He often accompanied the Emperor on the latter's tours, and in 1690 was sent to assist his uncle, Fu-ch'üan [q. v.], in the expedition against Galdan [q. v.] in Jehol. He was recalled, however, before the battle of Ulan-butung took place because he had disputed with Fu-ch'üan. At the time of the expedition against Galdan in Mongolia in 1696 he was sent with Songgotu [q. v.] to command the advance guard awaiting the Emperor at Torin, and after the Emperor returned to Peking he remained behind to make awards to the victorious troops. Made in 1698 a prince of the second degree with the designation Chih 直, he began to live outside the Palace in his own establishment.

Before long there ensued among the princes a struggle for the throne. Yin-jêng [q. v.], the Heir Apparent, was evidently unsuited for the position. Nevertheless it seems that he had the support of a brother, Yin-chih [q. v.], whereas Yin-t'i and several other princes took up the case of another brother, Yin-ssü [q. v.]. In 1708 when Yin-jêng, after a spell of insanity, was degraded as he was returning from Jehol, he was placed in the custody of Yin-t'i. While exercising this responsibility Yin-t'i reminded the Emperor that physiognomists had predicted Yin-ssü's succession to the throne and that it would be easy to get rid of Yin-jêng without leaving any imputation of blame upon the Emperor himself. For this malevolent suggestion Yin-t'i was severely reprimanded. Late in the same year (1708) he was accused by Yin-chih of employing a Lama sorceress to cast a

*The Library of Congress*

**EMINENT CHINESE**  
of the  
**CH'ING PERIOD**  
(1644-1912)

*Edited by*  
**ARTHUR W. HUMMEL**

**VOLUME II**  
**P - Z**

**UNITED STATES**  
**GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE**  
**WASHINGTON: 1944**