The Qing Dynasty and Its Central Asian Neighbors

ONUMA TAKAHIRO

Tohoku Gakuin University, Japan

Volume 12, 2014

Through a series of military campaigns in the middle of the eighteenth century, the Qing dynasty encountered various groups in Central Asia. This essay discusses some issues related to Qing policy toward Central Asia. The Qing evaluated its conquest of the “New Dominion” (Xinjiang) as a great achievement and conceptualized an ideal imperial vision of Central Asian people. With respect to Qing communication with Central Asia, one of the remarkable facets of their negotiations was the use of non-Chinese languages, e.g. Manchu, Mongolian, Turki (Chaghatay), and Persian and Qing government established systems of translation. To say nothing of their content, the very existence or possession of Qing imperial edicts had great significance for local leaders of Central Asia. On the other hand, according to the circumstances, alterations and interpretations convenient to the Qing were often added to the statements from Central Asia. In addition, this essay conducts basic research on how the people of the Qing and Central Asia viewed each other. The arguments can provide some new perspective for reconsidering the relationship between the Qing dynasty and its Central Asian neighbors.

清朝与其中亚邻居

小沼 孝博

日本东北学院大学

透过十八世纪中叶的一系列战争，清朝在中亚遭遇了许多不同的人群。本文讨论了清朝中亚政策中的几个议题。清朝视其征服新疆一事为重大成就，并且对中亚民族的理想帝国远景怀有概念。在清朝与中亚之间的通讯中，其特点之一就是运用汉文以外的文字来进行协商，例如满文、蒙文、突厥文（察合台文）与波斯文，并且清廷还建立了翻译系统。不消提其内容，拥有清朝皇帝谕旨这件事本身对于中亚的地方统治者而言就已经具有重大意义。另一

方面，根据不同情况，来自中亚的陈述也常会加入一些修改与诠释以合乎清朝所需。此外，本文对于清朝与中亚的人群间对彼此的看法也进行了初步探讨。本文的论证将能为重观清朝与其中亚邻国间的关系提供一个新的视角。

清朝與其中亞鄰居
小沼 孝博

日本東北學院大學

透過十八世紀中葉的一系列戰爭，清朝在中亞遭遇了許多不同的人群。本文討論了清朝中亞政策中的幾個議題。清朝視其征服新疆一事為重大成就，並且對中亞民族的理想帝國遠景懷有概念。在清朝與中亞之間的通訊中，其特點之一就是運用漢文以外的文字來進行協商，例如滿文、蒙文、突厥文（察合臺文）與波斯文，並且清廷還建立了翻譯系統。不提其內容，擁有清朝皇帝諭旨這件事本身對於中亞的地方統治者而言就已經具有重大意義。另一方面，根據不同情況，來自中亞的陳述也常會加入一些修改與詮釋以合乎清朝所需。此外，本文對於清朝與中亞的人群間對彼此的看法也進行了初步探討。本文的論證將能為重觀清朝與其中亞鄰國間的關係提供一個新的視角。

Beginning with the first military confrontation in 1690, the Qing fought the Junghars for hegemony over Inner Asia. In 1755, a Qing expedition successfully overthrew the Junghars. Then, in 1759, the Qing conquered the Kashgaria oasis towns to the south of the Tianshan Mountains, in which the Turkic-speaking Muslims (today's Uyghurs) lived. The Qing northwestern territory, obtained through a series of military campaigns in the middle of the eighteenth century, came to be called Xinjiang (Ma. *ice jecen*), or "New Dominion." After these events, the Qing presence rose in prominence in Central Asia.¹

In recent years, increasing interest in Qing history and improving access to primary sources has urged a reconsideration of the relationship between the Manchu Qing dynasty and Central Asia. Manchu-language sources have played an important role in this reconsideration, as it was in Manchu that most correspondence between the central administration in Beijing and territorial officials in Xinjiang was written, and Manchu was also the language into which most Turkic and Persian correspondence was translated for Qing emperors to consult. In particular, one of the most noteworthy sources is a document category called Junjichu Manwen lufu zouzhe 軍機處滿文錄副奏摺 (hereafter JMLZ) at the First Historical Archives of China in Beijing. JMLZ were made at the Grand Council (*Junjichu* 軍機處) as reference copies of the *Zhupi zouzhe* 硃批奏摺

1. In this essay, the word "Central Asia" refers to "historical Central Asia," which is nearly equivalent to the area covering the northern part of Afghanistan and Pakistan, the five republics of Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Kirghizstan, and PRC Xinjiang.

(Palace Memorials) in Manchu. The total number of JMLZ reaches about 180,000, and the catalogue listing 120,000 documents on the issues of the “frontier” (*bianjiang* 邊疆)—Manchuria, Mongolia, Xinjiang, Tibet, and Southwest China—was published in 1999.² Moreover, in 2012, most of the Xinjiang-related documents were published in facsimile.³ Thanks to this improved access to original sources, classical and well-known images of history have begun to be revised. This essay, on the basis of the new perspectives, outlines Qing policies toward Central Asia and conducts basic research on how the people of the Qing and Central Asia viewed each other.

The Qing Advance into Central Asia

I would like to begin my argument with the question of how the Qing evaluated its conquest of the “New Dominion.” At the end of 1759, a report arrived in Beijing that the Kashgar Khwāja brothers, who kept up the resistance against the Qing army, had finally been killed in Badakhshan. The Qianlong emperor (r. 1736–1795) immediately “declared the conquest of the Muslim Region (*Huibu* 回部, or Kashgaria),” stating the following:

Formerly, we conquered each [Oyirad] tribe under the Junghars and incorporated the entire [place of Jungharia] into our territory. Then, the Eastern- and Western-Burut [i.e., Kirghiz] and the Left- and Right-Kazakh also submitted [to us] sincerely. However, because only the Khwāja Jahān brothers acted against my favor and raised a rebellion, we had to send an army and accuse them of crimes . . . This is not an action to exert military powers to covet war . . . The Muslims of Andijan and Badakhshan, who understood receiving my favor and felt awe for our power, also submitted sincerely. And now, obeying orders, they exerted themselves and sent out the head of the rebel [i.e., Khwāja Jahān] to present to me. Thus, frontier land in remote regions will be quiet and every tribe will eternally live a peaceful life. Power and virtue spread throughout the remote region, owing to the protection of Heaven and the great blessing of the ancestors. I inherited the event that the Imperial grandfather and Imperial father could not achieve and, at last, completed it.⁴

2. Zhongguo diyi lishi dang'anguan 中国第一历史档案馆 et al., eds., *Qingdai bianjiang Manwen dang'an mulu* 清代边疆满文档案目录 (Guilin: Guangxi shifan daxue chubanshe, 1999). Actually, besides the Memorial (*zouzhe* 奏摺), JMLZ include the Imperial Edicts (*shangyu* 上諭), Records of Deliberation [by the Grand Council] (*yifu* 議覆), and Reports [between the administrative offices/officers] (*ziwen* 咨文). The documents on Xinjiang issues, the total of which is about 60,000, include records written in Manchu, Chinese, Mongolian, Oyirad, Turki, and Persian.

3. Zhongguo bianjiang shidi yanjiu zhongxin 中国边疆史地研究中心 and Zhongguo diyi lishi dang'anguan 中国第一历史档案馆, eds., *Qingdai Xinjiang Manwen dang'an huibian* 清代新疆满文档案汇编 (Guilin: Guangxi shifan daxue chubanshe, 2012). However, this published collection does not contain the documents written in Mongolian, Oyirad, Turki, and Persian.

4. Fuheng 傅恆 et al., comps., *Jun gar i ba be necibiyeme toktobuha bodogon i bithe, jinkini banjibun*, 81.21b–23b; *Pingding Zhunge'er fanglüe* 平定準噶爾方略, *zhengbian*, 81.13a–14a, QL 24.10.gengzi [1759/12/12].

The Qianlong emperor hailed the event as a great achievement; it had been the earnest wish of his grandfather, the Kangxi emperor (r. 1662–1722), and father, the Yongzheng emperor (r. 1723–1735), and was expected to bring peace to Central Asia. After the conquest, a cultural project was initiated by the Qing government, including the compilation of military history and topography, the building of temples and monuments, and the creation of artistic work. Through the dynasty-led project, the conquest of Xinjiang was evaluated as the most symbolic event of the Qianlong emperor's "Age of Prosperity" (*shengshi* 盛世), and the legitimacy of conquest and rule was affirmed loudly and repeatedly.⁵ Thereafter, Xinjiang was regarded by the Qing government as a "place gained by a great achievement of the Imperial ancestors" (*zuzong weiye zhi di* 祖宗偉業之地).

Some of the sources created by the project include records related to the local customs and language of the Kashgarian Muslims, which have attracted scholars' attention.⁶ With respect to the Qing image of Central Asia, it is worth examining the visual arts. For example, the *Illustration of Victory* (*Desheng tu* 得勝圖) portrays the suppression of the Junghars and the conquest of Kashgaria on sixteen sheets of copperplate print. The *Portraits of Periodical Offering to the Qing* (*Huangqing zhigong tu* 皇清職貢圖), which depict local and foreign people paying tribute to the Qing court, also includes the inhabitants of Central Asia. The people from several towns of Central Asia coming to Beijing appear in the *Drawing of Many Nations Coming to Court* (*Wanguo laichao tu* 萬國來朝圖). In addition, it is interesting that the horses presented by the rulers of Kazakhs, Torguuts, and Afghans were painted.⁷ This reflects the fact that the Qianlong emperor was a horse lover; however, it has another meaning as well. The Qianlong poem composed to commemorate the Kazakhs' "submission" begins with the following passage:

The Kazakh correspond to the Dayuan 大宛.⁸ They had had no relationship with China since ancient times. Although Emperor Wu of Han dispatched an army and mobilized people, he gained only the horses. He then changed his facial expression and admired the achievement. Why was it given high praise?⁹

5. Peter C. Perdue, *China Marches West: The Qing Conquest of Central Eurasia* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005), pp. 409–94; Joanna Waley-Cohen, *The Culture of War in China: Empire and the Military under the Qing Dynasty* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2006), pp. 23–47.

6. For example, Saguchi, mainly based on Qing materials, analyzes the major aspects of Islam in Kashgaria in the late eighteenth century. See Saguchi Tōru 佐口透, *18–19 seiki higashi Tōrukisutan shakaishi kenkyū* 18–19世紀東トルキスタン社会史研究 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1963), pp. 531–39.

7. For example, there are "Kazakhs Presenting Horses" (*Hasake gongma*, 哈薩克貢馬), stored at the Guimet Museum in Paris, and "Four Afghan Horses" (*Aiwuhan sijun*, 愛烏罕四駿), stored at the National Palace Museum in Taipei, both painted by Giuseppe Castiglione (Lang Shining).

8. This assertion is incorrect. The place of Dayuan is generally accepted as relating to the Fergana Valley.

9. Fuheng et al., comps., *Qinding huangyu Xiyu tuzhi* 欽定皇輿西域圖志, 44.10a.

In ancient China, the Central Asian region called *Xiyu* 西域, or the “Western Region,” was known for breeding good horses. There is a famous story that Emperor Wu (r. 141–87 B.C.) dispatched an army to Dayuan in the Western Region to gain “Blood-Sweating Horses” (*hanxuema* 汗血馬). The offering of horses from Central Asia against a background of its “submission” implies that the Qianlong emperor was superior in power and virtue to the distinguished monarchs of ancient China.

However, the images depicted in artifacts from the dynasty-led project do not always show actual phases of the relationship between the Qing and Central Asia. Rather, they were created by the Qing to conceptualize an ideal imperial vision of Central Asia. In fact, we can often find artificial manipulation in those sources.

After the conquest, some of the Turkic-speaking Muslims were also taken from Xinjiang to Beijing. The Turkic Muslim residence in Qing Beijing came to be called *Huiziying* 回子營. In the *Huiziying* site, a mosque was built on the Qianlong emperor’s orders. On the premises, a stone inscription was erected, which was inscribed in four languages: Chinese, Manchu, Mongol, and Turki. In the inscription, the Qianlong emperor remarked:

According to an ancient historical book, the [people of] *Huihe* 回紇 first entered China during the beginning of the Kaihuang era of the Sui dynasty. During the beginning of the Yuanhe era of the Tang dynasty, some Mani [monks] came to pay tribute. At that time, a temple was built in Taiyuan at their request, and the tablet was hung, on which was written, “Great colorful clouds are shining brightly.” This was the first worship-temple [i.e., mosque] ever built [in China].¹⁰

We cannot find any record that the *Huihe*, namely the Uyghurs in ancient Mongolia, first paid tribute to the Sui dynasty during the Kaihuang era (581–600). After all, the Sui dynasty at the time opposed the Turkic khaganate (*Tujue* 突厥), and the Uyghurs were known only as a part of the Toquz Oghuz. Here, however, it is not so important whether the historical interpretation of the Qianlong emperor was correct. More noteworthy is that, basing his judgment on the fact that both words contained the component *Hui* 回, he considered the *Huihe* to be the first Muslims to enter China and, in the Turkic version, the word “Mani” was engraved as *mullā* (Islamic schoolmaster, priest).¹¹ Therefore, in his interpretation, the Mani temple built for the *Huihe* was an

10. For the texts in Chinese, Manchu, Mongol, and Turki and the translation, see Onuma Takahiro, *250 Years History of the Turkic-Muslim Camp in Beijing* (Tokyo: The University of Tokyo, 2010), pp. 9–24. Tristan Brown also discusses Qianlong’s conception of Islam on the basis of this inscription in his “Towards an Understanding of Qianlong’s Conception of Islam: A Study of the Dedication Inscriptions of the Fragrant Concubine’s Mosque in the Imperial capital,” *Zhongguo wenhua yanjiusuo xuebao* 中國文化研究所學報 53 (2011): 137–53.

11. In this stela, only the Chinese version used the word *Mani* 摩尼 meaning “Mani.” The *molo* and *molu* in the Manchu and Mongolian versions correspond to a translation of *mullā*.

Islamic mosque. This is a representative example of a ruler altering history in order to accomplish the submission of his new subjects.¹²

Qing Communication with Central Asia: The Language Used in Negotiations

In the process of advancing west, the Qing encountered various groups in Central Asia: the Kashgarian Muslims, Kazakhs, Kirghiz, Khoqandis, Badakhshanis, and so on. One of the remarkable facets of their negotiations was the use of non-Chinese languages.

To communicate with Central Asia in the early Ming period, the Muslim Office (*Huihuiguan* 回回館) for translation of Persian, which belonged to the Bureau of Translators (*Siyiguan* 四夷館), opened in Beijing. Although it continued to exist until the early Qing period,¹³ we can find little sign of activity. In 1755, the Qianlong emperor indicated his belief that imperial edicts issued to the Oyrads and the Turkic-speaking Muslims should be written in their own languages. In those days, however, since few people in Beijing had the ability to write Todo-script Mongolian (Oyirad) and Arabic-script Turki (Chaghatay), the emperor issued an order to “select several persons with a high ability to write the Todo script and Muslim [i.e., Arabic] script and send them with their families to the capital city.”¹⁴ In the following year, the Qing government established a government-managed Muslim School (*Huizi guanxue* 回子官學) in order to provide Turkic- and Persian-language training for the members of the Imperial Household (*Neiwufu* 內務府).¹⁵ The Huiziying residents also participated in administrative affairs related to frontier control as secretaries and interpreters.¹⁶

In the administration of Central Asia, the Qing consciously utilized many concepts from Inner Asia and avoided the surface use of Han Chinese concepts.¹⁷ Ideally, every high-ranking Qing *amban* in Xinjiang was to draft all documents in the Manchu language. In 1763, the Qianlong emperor stated, “If they do not master the Manchu language, they will lose the face of a Manchu and will be certainly laughed at by [Kash-

12. Onuma, *250 Years History*, pp. 42–43.

13. The collection of the Academia Sinica in Taipei includes a word-by-word translation from Chinese characters into Persian made by the *Huihuiguan* student Li Santai 李三台. See Neige daku dang'an 內閣大庫檔案 (Fu Sinian Library, Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, Taipei), no. 186729-001.

14. Junjichu Manwen shangyu dang 軍機處滿文上諭檔 (First Historical Archives of China, Beijing), *junwu*, 3–17 (1), QL 20.9.16 [1760/10/31], edict of the Qianlong emperor.

15. For further details on the institutions to translate the languages of Central Asia in the Ming and Qing periods, see David Brophy, “The Junghar Mongol Legacy and the Language of Loyalty in Qing Xinjiang,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 73.2 (2013): 234–38, 243–47.

16. Onuma, *250 Years History*, p. 38.

17. Onuma Takahiro, “Political Relations between the Qing Dynasty and Kazakh Nomads in the Mid-18th Century: Promotion of the ‘*eken-albatu* Relationship’ in Central Asia,” in *A Collection of Documents from the Kazakh Sultans to the Qing Dynasty*, by Noda Jin and Onuma Takahiro (Tokyo: The University of Tokyo, 2010), pp. 86–125.

garian] Muslims and Kazakh tribes.”¹⁸ The Qing government was probably conscious of some degree of intolerance toward Han Chinese and Confucian culture in Islamic Central Asia. However, another important point is the fundamental Qing strategy toward Central Asia. In 1761, the Qing government decided to cast official seals for the *hākim begs* (high-ranking Muslim governors) in Kashgaria. Each seal was carved in three scripts—Manchu, Todo, and Arabic—arranged from left to right. We should note that Todo script was used in place of Chinese characters. In view of this, we can determine that the Qing was strongly conscious of its position as successor to the Junghars, the former power in Central Asia before the Qing advance.¹⁹

In the late eighteenth century, whenever the Qing emperor and the administrators in Xinjiang sent a letter to leaders in Central Asia, a translation into Turki or Oyrad was made from the official text written in Manchu.²⁰ At present, the only known extant document in almost perfect condition is the 1788 imperial edict issued to the ruler of the Khoqand khanate, Narbuta Bī (r. 1768/69–98/99), which is stored at the Liaoning Provincial Museum. This document consists of one sheet of yellow paper, 1615 mm wide by 945 mm long, and is written in Manchu, Oyrad, and Turki from left to right.²¹ It can be said that the Turkic text is a literal translation from the Manchu text. I will save the details of the contents for a future occasion, but there is one item that is relevant to our current discussion. The Manchu version begins with this sentence: “Decrees of the emperor holding the stream of time by the order of *Heaven*” (Ma. *abkai hesei forgon be aliha hūwangdi i hese*). In the Turkic version, this section is written as, “Decrees of the emperor holding the [stream of] time by the order of *God*” (Tu. *khodāning farmāni bilā waqt-zamānni igälägän pādshāhning yarligi*). Surprisingly, the Qing emperor’s words were transmitted to the Muslims in Central Asia in the name of God.

We should not disregard the influence of Qing imperial edicts. Today, three imperial edicts, addressed by the Kangxi, Yongzheng, and Qianlong emperors to the Torguut khans, are stored at the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region Archives in Urumchi.²²

18. Qinggui 慶桂 et al., comp., *Daqing Gaozong chun-huangdi shilu* 大清高宗純皇帝實錄, 698.11a–b, QL 28.11.xinyou [1763/12/12].

19. Onuma Takahiro, “A Set of Chaghatay and Manchu Documents Drafted by a Kashgar Hakim Beg in 1801: A Basic Study of a ‘Chaghatay-Turkic Administrative Document,’” in *Studies on Xinjiang Historical Sources in 17–20th Centuries*, ed. James A. Millward et al. (Tokyo: Toyo Bunko, 2010), p. 195.

20. In the early stages of the Qing-Kazakh negotiations, the Kazakh letters addressed to the Qing were written in Oyrad. However, after the 1770s, Turki came to be the most commonly-used language. See Noda and Onuma, *A Collection of Documents*, pp. 3–6.

21. Only the text in Manchu has been already introduced with its translation in Chinese by Li Qinpu 李勤璞 in “Qianlong wushisan nian gei Haohan Boke santi chiyu Manzhouwen shiyi” 乾隆五十三年給霍罕伯克三體勅諭滿洲文試譯, *Manyu yanjiu* 滿語研究 1999.2: 81–90. In October 2012, I examined the document at the Liaoning Provincial Museum, whose staff I wish to thank for their kindness.

22. The facsimiles were published in *Zhongguo dang’an wenxian yichan minglu* 中國檔案文獻遺產名錄, ed., Guojia dang’anju zhongyang dang’an guan 國家檔案局中央檔案館 (Beijing: Zhongguo dang’an chubanshe, 2002), pp. 74–77.

The Kangxi edict is a historic document that was passed on by the Injana Mission, in which Tulišen (1667–1741), the author of the journey record *Lakcaha jecen de takūraha babe ejehe bithe* (Chinese title: *Yiyulu* 異域錄), also took part as a member, to Ayuki Khan at the Volga River in 1712.²³ The Yongzheng edict was passed on by the Mantai Mission to Ayuki's son, Tseren Donduk Khan, in 1729.²⁴ When Tseren Donduk's son, Ubashi Khan decided to return to Jungharia and submit to the Qing in 1771, he brought the two edicts. After that, these two edicts and the Qianlong edict issued to Ubashi in 1771 were preserved by successive Torguut khans until their “rediscovery” in 1979. In 1777, a Kazakh leader Abulay dispatched his follower to Tashkent with a forged Imperial edict, in which the Qing emperor ordered the people of Tashkent to pay their taxes to Abulay.²⁵ In the 1860s, Ya'qūb Beg (1820?–77), a military commander from the Khoqand khanate, arrived in Kashgar and established a political regime (1867–77) over the oasis cities of Xinjiang. According to *Tārikh-i Ḥamīdī* (hereafter TH) written by Mullā Mūsā Sayrāmī (1836?–1917?), who once participated in the Ya'qūb Beg regime, the descendants of *begs* were classified as common people under Ya'qūb Beg's rule. However, they were able to recover their ancestors' positions after the Qing's reconquest because they had preserved the old imperial edicts issued to their ancestors.²⁶ These facts suggest that the very existence or possession of imperial edicts, to say nothing of their content, had great significance for local leaders.

Letters from Central Asia to the Qing are also stored at the archives in Beijing and Taipei, some of which have been studied.²⁷ Here, I limit the argument to the problem of translation. In the Turkic letter from the Khoqand ruler, Irdana Bī (r. 1758?–68/69?), to the Qing *amban* of Yarkand in 1760, there is a passage with a tone indicating his subordination, stating, “As long as we exist, we will be friendly and sincere toward the [Qing] emperor as a protector of the world; we never break our word” (*Tā-tirikmiz, shāh-i 'ālam-panāhgha yarlik wa durustlik qilip, sözüimiz khilāfmiz* [*sic.* < *khilāf*]

23. Ma Dazheng 马大正 and Guo Yunhua 郭蕴华, “Kangxi yu Ayuqi han chishu' shixi” 《康熙谕阿玉奇汗敕书》试析, *Minzu yanjiu* 民族研究 2 (1984): 18–23.

24. Ma Ruyan 马汝楠 and Ma Dazheng 马大正, “Shilun ‘Yongzheng yu Tu'erhute han chishu' yu Mantai shituan de chushi” 试论《雍正谕土尔扈特汗敕书》与满泰使团的出使, *Minzu yanjiu* 1988.1: 79–86.

25. Onuma Takahiro 小沼孝博, “1770 nendai ni okeru Shin-Kazafu kankei: tojiyuku Shinchō no seihoku henkyō” 一七七〇年代における清—カザフ関係: 閉じゆく清朝の西北辺疆, *Tōyōshi kenkyū* 東洋史研究 69 (2010): 8–9.

26. Mullā Mūsā Sayrāmī, *Tārikh-i Ḥamīdī* (Lund University Library, Jarring Collection, Prov. 163) [hereafter TH/J], 25b–26a; Mullā Mūsā Sayrāmī, *Tārikh-i Ḥamīdī*, in *Zhongguo xibei wenxian congshu, er bian* 中国西北文献丛书, 二编, ed. Gansu-sheng guji wenxian zhengli bianyi zhongxin 甘肃省古籍文献整理编译中心 (Lanzhou: Xianzhuang shuju, 2006), vol. 41 [hereafter TH/Z], pp. 61–62; Mulla Musa Sairami, *Tārikhi Ḥamīdī*, ed. Änwär Baytur (Beijing: Millādār nāshriyati, 1986) [hereafter TH/Ä], pp. 146–47. TH/Ä is the Modern Uyghur translation based on the text of TH/Z.

27. The recent studies include, for example, Hamada Masami 濱田正美, “Pekin dai'ichi rekishi tōankan shōzō Kōkando kankei monjo kyū shu” 北京第一歴史檔案館所蔵コーカンド関係文書9種, *Seinan Ajia kenkyū* 西南アジア研究 68 (2008): 82–111; Noda and Onuma, *A Collection of Documents*; and Onuma Takahiro, Shinmen Yasushi 新免康, and Kawahara Yayoi 河原弥生, “Kokuritsu kokyū hakubutsu'in shōzō 1848 nen Kōkando monjo saikō” 国立故宫博物院所蔵1848年コーカンド文書再考, *Tohoku gakuin daigaku ronshū: Rekishi to bunka* 東北学院大学論集: 歴史と文化, 49 (2013): 1–24.

bolmas).²⁸ However, it is translated in Manchu as, “We are the *albatu* [i.e., “subject” in Mongolian] of the Great Master for generations to come. We will do everything, following [the Qing emperor]” (*Be jalan halame gemu amba ejen i albatu oho. Eiten de gemu dahame yabumbi*).²⁹ Another letter in Turki sent from Ya‘qūb Beg to the Tongzhi emperor (r. 1861–75) in 1871 carefully explains how his conquest and rule of Xinjiang were legitimate; his actions were rationalized as the “favor of God” (*khudāni[ng] iltifāti*) and thus beyond human intellect. However, the Chinese translation by the Qing authorities explains Ya‘qūb Beg’s actions as a result of the “Will of Heaven” (*tianyi* 天意). On the basis of Qing logic, “under Heaven” (*tianxia* 天下), a man possessing the “Will of Heaven” was none other than the Qing emperor, who was referred to as the “Son of Heaven” (*tianzi* 天子); hence, even a Muslim was also one among the many people to enjoy the benefits bestowed by the Son of Heaven. In short, the Qing reinterpreted the contents of the letter within the framework of its own worldview.³⁰ These examples suggest that, according to the circumstances, alterations and interpretations convenient to the Qing were often added to the statements from Central Asia. While access to Qing archives is much improved, scholars must maintain a critical approach to reading and analyzing these texts and the circumstances of their production.

Image of the Neighbors

Traditionally, there was a trend among the scholar-officials of China to seek the origin of different ethnic groups in China or other groups who once had a connection with China.³¹ As an example in the Qing period, the people of the *Khūn-kārs* (the Ottoman empire) were said by some scholars to have originated from the Western Liao (Qara-Khitai).³² From the Qing view, Russia was also treated as one of the peoples originating in Inner Asia. The Mongol Bannerman Sungyun (Ch. Songyun 松筠, 1752–1835), who successively held high-ranking posts in Qing Inner Asia like the Councilor of Khüree and the Governor-general of Yili, writes the following in his *Emu tanggū orin sakda i gisun sarkiyān*:

The Russians look like the Muslim tribes [of Xinjiang], but they are not people who don’t eat pork . . . Their character is slovenly, evil, and wily. They like to pursue only

28. Junjichu Manwen lufu zouzhe 軍機處滿文錄副奏摺 (First Historical Archives of China, Beijing) [hereafter JMLZ], 1819.15.1, 56: 2288, QL 25.4.

29. JMLZ, 1819.15, 56: 2290–91.

30. Shinmen Yasushi and Onuma Takahiro, “First Contact between Ya‘qūb Beg and the Qing: The Diplomatic Correspondence of 1871,” *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 84 (2012): 5–37.

31. Matsuda Hisao 松田壽男, *Kodai tenzan no rekishi chirigakuteki kenkyū* 古代天山の歴史地理学的研究, rev. ed. (Tokyo: Waseda daigaku shuppanbu, 1970), p. 232.

32. Zhao Lian 昭槤, *Xiaoting zalu* 嘯亭雜錄 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980), pp. 52–53.

their happiness. The clothes are the same as those of *si yang*. There are *si yang* people in their region [i.e., Russia]; and they respect the religion of *si yang*.³³

In the Qing period, *si yang* (< *xiyang* 西洋) people were considered “Westerners who come via the southeast sea area”—Jesuits, for example. Songyun explained that Russians were not *si yang* people but had common characteristics with Inner Asian people. This image still existed during the process of modernization. Miao Yousun 繆祐孫, who stayed in Russia in 1887–88, also explained in his report that Russians were the descendants of the *Tufan* 吐蕃 and that the Cossacks were descendants of the *Kesas* 可薩, namely the Khazars, of the Turks.³⁴

As mentioned above, the Qianlong emperor linked the Turkic-speaking Muslims (*Huizi*) from Xinjiang with the Uyghurs (*Huihe*) in ancient Mongolia. This understanding was adopted more widely in Qing China. In 1780, Pak Chi-wŏn 朴趾源 (1737–1805) was dispatched to the Qing court as one of a group of envoys from the Chosŏn Kingdom to celebrate the Qianlong emperor’s seventeenth birthday. When taking part in the ceremony in Chengde, he met a Mongolian official named Po-lao-hui-hui-tu 破老回回圖 and had a conversation with him as follows:

At that instant, some *Huizis* came to take tea. I asked [Po-lao-hui-hui-tu], “Are they also people from *Xifan* 西番 [i.e., Tibet]?” He said, “The *Huizis* correspond to the *Huihes* in the Tang period. They contributed to the Tang dynasty and were also a great trouble to the Central Kingdom [*zhongguo* 中國]. They were also called *Huihu* 回鶻. In the Wudai period, they invaded the *Tujue* [i.e., Turk] in the west and, finally, obtained the Western Region, previously ruled by the Han dynasty, and moved there. Islam is also one of the heterodox teachings [in Qing China].”³⁵

It had been said that the term *Uyghur* as a modern nationality was officially decided under the initiative of the Soviet authorities at a meeting in Tashkent in 1921. However, from 1913, Nazār Khwāja, who was a *Taranchi* living in Ghaljat,³⁶ near Jarkent in Semireche, already used the pen name *Uyghur balasi* (lit., Child of the Uyghur, or descendant of the Uyghurs) and contributed articles to newspapers in Turki such as *Shūrā* and *Waqit* from Orenburg. The earlier articles by other authors in *Shūrā* and *Waqit* in 1913 regarding the “lost” history and language of ancient Uyghurs probably provoked Nazār Khwāja into starting to use *Uyghur balasi*.³⁷ It is difficult to find direct relevance

33. Sungyun, *Emu tanggū orin sakda i gisun sarkiyān* (San Francisco: Chinese Materials Center, 1982), pp. 416–18.

34. Sasaki Yō 佐々木揚, *Shinmatsu Chūgoku ni okeru Nihonkan to seiyōkan* 清末中国における日本観と西洋観 (Tokyo: Tokyo daigaku shuppankai, 2000), p. 232.

35. Pak Chi-wŏn 朴趾源, *Yŏrha ilgi* 熱河日記 (Beijing: Beijing tushuguan chubanshe, 1996), p. 355.

36. Ghaljat had been a part of Qing territory until the Treaty of Saint Petersburg, also known as Treaty of Yili, in 1881.

37. Ōishi Shin’ichirō 大石真一郎, “Tyurukugo teiki kankōbutsu ni okeru minzoku meishō ‘Uiguru’ no shutsugen to tei-

between his concept and the image in Qing China that the *Huizis* were the descendants of the *Huihes*. Although it was a casual coincidence, we cannot deny the possibility that some local Muslims, especially the nobilities having ties with the Qing court, had already adopted this Qing view.

On the other hand, what kind of image did the people of Central Asia have of the Qing dynasty or emperor? Up until the overthrow of the Junghars, some local Muslims favorably appraised Qing power.³⁸ However, subsequent events, such as the conquest of Kasgharia and the murder of Kashgar Khwājas, gave a great shock to Central Asian Muslims, and caution and opposition were aroused among them. Under the initiative of Aḥmad Shāh Durrānī (r. 1747–72), the movement for a Muslim “alliance” against the infidel Qing spread throughout the area from Central Asia to Afghanistan. Some of their leaders called for *jihād* against the Qing.³⁹ According to Laura Newby, the strong Qing forces engraved a fearsome image of the Qing in the minds of Central Asians. By the mid-nineteenth century, although Qing power in Xinjiang had weakened, the traditional image of Qing power still partially remained and sometimes influenced the behavioral patterns of Central Asians.⁴⁰

Some scholars have had interest in the relationship between the Qing emperor as an infidel ruler and his Muslim subjects in Kashgaria. The realization of an Islamic State (*Dār al-Islām*) is the general aim of all Muslims. However, some of the Turkic-speaking Muslims under Qing rule, especially local officials and intellectuals, did not necessarily regard the Qing emperor as a target who was to be defeated by means of *jihād*; rather, they showed confidence in his “fair rule” and were rewarded by his grace for their loyalty.⁴¹ They were standing in a precarious position between their ideal and reality.

We are aware of the fact that the Qing emperor was not Han Chinese but Manchu/*Manju*. In 1757, after the Junghar conquest, a Qing envoy arrived at the camp of Abulay. According to Qing records, Abulay said to him, “We have heard, ‘The Manchu Khan in the direction of the sunrise is powerful. *Khūn-kār* Khan (the Ottoman emperor) in the direction of the sunset is also powerful.’”⁴² Two years later, the Khoqand ruler Irdana Bī also showed the same understanding as Abulay toward another Qing

chaku” テュルク語定期刊行物における民族名称「ウイグル」の出現と定着, in *Tōō, chūō yūrasia no kindai to neishon*, II 東欧・中央ユーラシアの近代とネーションII (Sapporo: Slavic Research Center, Hokkaido University, 2003), pp. 54–57, 61.

38. S. K. Ibragimov, N. N. Mingulov, K. A. Pishulina, and V. P. Yudin, *Materialy po istorii Kazakhskikh khanstv XV–XVIII vekov: izvlecheniia iz persidskikh i tyurkskikh sochinenii* (Alma-Ata: Nauka, 1969), p. 422.

39. Ch. Ch. Valikhanov, *Sobranie sochinenii v piati tomakh*, (Alma-Ata: Glavnaia redaktsiia Kazakhskoi Sovetskoi Entsiklopedii, 1985), 3: 136–37, 323–24.

40. Laura Newby, *The Empire and the Khanate: A Political History of Qing Relations with Khoqand c. 1760–1860* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), pp. 43–44, 121, 156.

41. Hamada Masami, “‘Shio no gimu’ to ‘seisen’ to no aida de” 「塩の義務」と「聖戦」との間で, *Tōyōshi kenkyū* 52.2 (1994): 122–48; Hamada, “Jihād, hijra et «devoir du sel» dans l’histoire du Turkestan oriental,” *Turcica* 33 (2001): 35–61.

42. JMLZ, 1717.15, 47: 1347, QL 22.9.14 [1757/10/26], Manchu memorial of Jaohüi.

envoy.⁴³ The rulers in Central Asia believed that the Qing emperor in the east was as powerful as the Ottoman emperor in the west.⁴⁴ Also, regarding the origin of the Manchus, Mullā Mūsā introduces an interesting view in TH:

A Turk is called Yafes Oghlan in some historical books, and all of these books record that he was Kiumars's contemporary. Generally, every blood lineage of several thousand tribes and several thousand races such as Turk, Moghul [i.e., Mongol], Tatar, Qirghiz, Qipchaq, Uyghur, Manju, Nayman, Cherkes, Daching, Daghistān, Torguut, Noghay, Barlas, Churas, Jarayir, Dilim, Jurjut, Yaijuz, and Maijuz lead to Yafes's son Turk.⁴⁵

Some Central Asians notionally considered the *Manju* as a tribe branching off from the Turks. In addition, Mullā Mūsā writes that *Daching* (< *da[i]qing* 大清) was the imperial family of the Qing descended from “Shunjiir [i.e., *Shunzhi* 順治], the son of Tayzong [i.e., *Taizong* 太宗], from the Manju tribe, the descendants of the Mongols,” who sat on the throne in Beijing.⁴⁶ As the misunderstanding that the Manju were descendants of the Mongols shows, confusion and inconsistency is found in his knowledge of the rulers of China.⁴⁷ However, we can say that the Central Asians were aware of the fact that the Qing emperor's origin was Manchu.

At the same time, the country or area ruled by the Qing emperor was called *Chīn* (China, Chinese heartland); the Qing emperor was also known as *Khāqān-i Chīn*. Similar to *khān*, *khāqān* is the title used for a ruler. To be precise, there is a difference between them. As Mullā Mūsā also explains, the origin of *khāqān* was an example of linguistic corruption from *qāʾān* (< *qayan*) in Mongolian, and it implied “*khān* of *khāns*” or “*shāh* of *shāhs*”.⁴⁸ However, a history in Turki, which was written in Kashgar in the mid-nineteenth century, describes the territory of *Chīn* as outside of the Kashgaria region. This means that, at that time, Qing rule was recognized by the Kashgarian Muslims as merely personal subordination to the Qing emperor; they have little sense that their land belonged to a part of *Chīn*.⁴⁹

43. JMLZ, 1793.25, 55: 59–86, QL 24.10.13 [1759/11/12], Manchu memorial of Jaohūi.

44. Onuma Takahiro, “‘Kongge’er guo’ xiaokao: 18–19 shiji Ouya dongbu Aosimanchao renshi zhi yiduan” “控噶尔国”小考: 18–19世纪欧亚东部奥斯曼朝认识之一端, *Minzushi yanjiu* 民族史研究 8 (2008): 153–63; Matthew W. Mosca, “Empire and the Circulation of Frontier Intelligence: Qing Conceptions of the Ottomans,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 70.1 (2010): 147–207.

45. TH/Z, p. 15; TH/Ā, p. 52. Oddly, the same part of another version of TH does not record tribal names of *Uyghur*, *Manju*, and *Daching*; instead, *Qalmaq* (i.e. Oyirad) appears in the place of *Daching*. See TH/J, 5b.

46. TH/J, 10b–11a; TH/Z, p. 27; TH/Ā, pp. 75–76.

47. Hamada, “Shio no gimu,” p. 138.

48. TH/Z, p. 23; TH/Ā, p. 68. In this section, Mullā Mūsā comments that Chinggis Khan (Temüjin) called himself *qāʾān/qayan* for the first time. A commentary of this kind appears in Mongolian and Persian sources. However, according to a recent interpretation, Chinggis Khan himself did not use a title of *qayan* but *qan* while he was alive. Actually, his third son and successor, Ögedei, used *qayan* as “great khan,” which originated from *qaghan* in the ancient Turkic language, to distinguish himself from other *qans*.

49. Shinmen Yasushi, “‘Tārihi Rashīdī’ Tyurukugo yaku fuhēn no jojutsu keikō ni kansuru ichi kōsatsu: Kashugaru no rekidai

Concluding remarks

In this essay, I have discussed some issues related to Qing policy toward Central Asia. While some aspects of this research are still inconclusive, the arguments can provide some new perspective for reconsidering the relationship between the Qing dynasty and its Central Asian neighbors.

Finally, we shall consider a change of Xinjiang's position within the Qing dynasty. As mentioned above, through Qianlong's project, the evaluation of Xinjiang as a "place gained by a great achievement of the Imperial ancestors" was established. When Jahāngīr Khwāja invaded and obtained western Xinjiang in 1826, the Qing government, based on this theory, dispatched an army to recover control. The cession of the frontier zones and the delimitation of borders in the late nineteenth century gave an unprecedentedly clear outline to Qing territory; it pressed the Qing to change its traditional ways of perceiving space. In the 1860s, a large-scale rebellion by Xinjiang Muslims and the establishment of the Ya'qūb Beg regime caused a temporary upset of the Qing's century-long rule in Xinjiang. A letter from the *amban* of Hami, Wenlin 文麟, to Ya'qūb Beg in 1871 viewed Xinjiang as the Qing's "dynastic territory" (*guojia bantu* 國家版圖) and declared its right to possess it.⁵⁰ In addition, Zuo Zongtang 左宗棠, who proposed to recover Xinjiang, claimed that "the reason to value Xinjiang is for keeping Mongolia; the reason to keep Mongolia is for protecting the Capital."⁵¹ He regarded Xinjiang as the front line of military defense in preventing invasion by Russia. In addition, he historically recognized that "Kashgar corresponds to the nation of Shule 疏勒 in ancient time, which had already belonged to China (*Zhonghua* 中華) in the Han period. It was originally our old territory."⁵² Although further discussion is necessary, from the development of their remarks, we might observe the formation of the theory that Xinjiang is not only a part of present China but also a part of historical China, a theory that has been passed down to today's PRC government.

Hākimu Begu no bubun o chūshin ni" 『ターリーヒ・ラシーディー』テュルク語訳附編の叙述傾向に関する一考察: カシュガルの歴代ハーキム・ベグの部分を中心に, *Seinan Ajia kenkyū* 70 (2009): 119–20.

50. Junjichu zhejian 軍機處摺件 (National Palace Museum, Taipei), no. 107189; Shinmen and Onuma, "First Contact," pp. 26–30.

51. *Zuo Wenxiang gong quanji* 左文襄公全集 (Taipei: Wenhai chubanshe, 1979), *zougao*, 50.75–78, GX 3.6.16 [1877/7/26].

52. *Gongzhong dang Guangxu chao zouzhe* 宮中檔光緒朝奏摺 (Taipei: National Palace Museum, 1982–88), 1: 624, GX 3.9.1 [1877/10/7], memorial of Zuo Zongtang.

Bibliography

Archival and Manuscript Sources

- Junjichu Manwen lufu zouzhe 軍機處滿文錄副奏摺. First Historical Archives of China, Beijing).
- Junjichu Manwen shangyu dang 軍機處滿文上諭檔. First Historical Archives of China, Beijing.
- Junjichu zhejian 軍機處摺件. National Palace Museum, Taipei.
- Mullā Musā Sayrāmī. *Tārīkh-i Ḥamīdī*. Lund University Library, Jarring Collection, Prov. 163.
- Neige daku dang'an 內閣大庫檔案. Fu Sinian Library, Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, Taipei.

Published Sources

- Brophy, David. "The Junghar Mongol Legacy and the Language of Loyalty in Qing Xinjiang." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 73.2 (2013): 231-58.
- Brown, Tristan. "Towards an Understanding of Qianlong's Conception of Islam: A Study of the Dedication Inscriptions of the Fragrant Concubine's Mosque in the Imperial capital." *Zhongguo wenhua yanjiusuo xuebao* 中國文化研究所學報 53 (2011): 137-53.
- Fuheng 傅恆 et al., compilers. *Jun gar i ba be necihiyeme toktobuha bodogon i bithe, jinkini banjibun*. Toyo Bunko, Ma-6-11.
- Fuheng et al., compilers. *Pingding Zhunge'er fanglüe* 平定準噶爾方略, *zhengbian*, 85 juan. Originally 1772. Beijing: Quanguo tushuguan wenxian suowei fuzhi zhongxin, 1990.
- Fuheng et al., compilers. *Qinding huangyu Xiyu tuzhi* 欽定皇輿西域圖志, 52 juan. Originally 1782. Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1983-1986.
- Gongzhong dang Guangxu chao zouzhe* 宮中檔光緒朝奏摺. Taipei: National Palace Museum, 1982-1988.
- Hamada Masami 濱田正美. "Jihād, hijra et «devoir du sel» dans l'histoire du Turkestan oriental." *Turcica* 33 (2001): 35-61. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2143/TURC.33.0.480>
- Hamada Masami, "Pekin dai'ichi rekishi tōankan shozō Kōkando kankei monjo kyū shu" 北京第一歴史檔案館所蔵コーカンド関係文書9種. *Seinan Ajia kenkyū* 西南アジア研究 68 (2008): 82-111.
- Hamada Masami. "'Shio no gimu' to 'seisen' to no aida de" 「塩の義務」と「聖戦」との間で. *Tōyōshi kenkyū* 東洋史研究 52.2 (1994): 122-48.
- Ibragimov, S. K., N. N. Mingulov, K. A. Pishulina, and V. P. Yudin. *Materialy po istorii Kazakhskikh khanstv XV-XVIII vekov: izvlecheniia iz persidskikh i tyurkskikh sochinenii*. Alma-Ata: Nauka, 1969.
- Li Qinpu 李勤璞. "Qianlong wushisan nian gei Haohan Boke santi chiyu Manzhouwen shiyi" 乾隆五十三年给霍罕伯克三体敕谕满洲文试译. *Manyu yanjiu* 满语研究 1999.2: 81-90.
- Ma Dazheng 马大正 and Guo Yunhua 郭蕴华. "'Kangxi yu Ayuqi han chishu' shixi" 《康熙谕阿玉奇汗敕书》试析. *Minzu yanjiu* 民族研究 2 (1984): 18-23.
- Ma Ruyan 马汝楠 and Ma Dazheng 马大正. "Shilun 'Yongzheng yu Tu'erhute han chishu' yu Mantai shituan de chushi" 试论《雍正谕土尔扈特汗敕书》与满泰使团的出使. *Minzu yanjiu* 民族研究 1988.1: 79-86.
- Matsuda Hisao 松田壽男. *Kodai tenzan no rekishi chirigakuteki kenkyū* 古代天山の歴史地理学的研究. Rev. ed. Tokyo: Waseda daigaku shuppanbu, 1970.
- Mosca, Matthew W. "Empire and the Circulation of Frontier Intelligence: Qing Conceptions of the Ottomans." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 70.1 (2010): 147-207.

- Mullā Musā Sayrāmī. *Tārīkh-i Ḥamīdī*. In *Zhongguo xibei wenxian congshu, er bian* 中国西北文献丛书, 二编, edited by Gansusheng guji wenxian zhengli bianyi zhongxin 甘肃省古籍文献整理编译中心, 41: 1-415. Lanzhou: Xianzhuang shuju, 2006.
- Mulla Musa Sairami. *Tarikhi Hāmidī*. Edited by Ānwār Baytur. Beijing: Millātlār nāshriyati, 1986.
- Newby, Laura. *The Empire and the Khanate: A Political History of Qing Relations with Khoqand c. 1760–1860*. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Noda Jin and Onuma Takahiro. *A Collection of Documents from the Kazakh Sultans to the Qing Dynasty*. Tokyo: The University of Tokyo, 2010.
- Ōishi Shin'ichirō 大石真一郎. “Tyurukugo teiki kankōbutsu ni okeru minzoku meishō ‘Uiguru’ no shutsugen to teichaku” テュルク語定期刊行物における民族名称「ウイグル」の出現と定着. In *Tōō, chūō yūrasia no kindai to neishon*, II 東欧・中央ユーラシアの近代とネイションII, pp. 49-61. Sapporo: Slavic Research Center, Hokkaido University, 2003.
- Onuma Takahiro 小沼孝博. “1770 nendai ni okeru Shin-Kazafu kankei: tojiyuku Shinchō no seihoku henkyō” 一七七〇年代における清－カザフ関係: 閉じゆく清朝の西北辺疆. *Tōyōshi kenkyū* 東洋史研究 69 (2010): 1–34.
- Onuma Takahiro. *250 Years History of the Turkic-Muslim Camp in Beijing*. Tokyo: The University of Tokyo, 2009.
- Onuma Takahiro. “A Set of Chaghatay and Manchu Documents Drafted by a Kashgar Hakim Beg in 1801: A Basic Study of a ‘Chaghatay-Turkic Administrative Document.’” In *Studies on Xinjiang Historical Sources in 17–20th Centuries*, edited by James A. Millward et al., pp. 185-217. Tokyo: Tokyo Bunko, 2010.
- Onuma Takahiro. “‘Kongge’er guo’ xiaokao: 18–19 shiji Ouya dongbu Aosimanchao renshi zhi yiduan” “控噶尔国”小考: 18–19世纪欧亚东部奥斯曼朝认识之一端. *Minzushi yanjiu* 民族史研究 8 (2008): 153–63.
- Onuma Takahiro. “Political Relations between the Qing Dynasty and Kazakh Nomads in the Mid-18th Century: Promotion of the ‘ejen-albatu Relationship’ in Central Asia.” In *A Collection of Documents from the Kazakh Sultans to the Qing Dynasty*, by Noda Jin and Onuma Takahiro, pp. 86-125. Tokyo: The University of Tokyo, 2010.
- Onuma Takahiro, Shinmen Yasushi 新免康, and Kawahara Yayoi 河原弥生. “Kokuritsu kokyū hakubutsu’in shozō 1848 nen Kōkando monjo saikō” 国立故宫博物院所蔵1848年コーカンド文書再考. *Tohoku gakuin daigaku ronshū: Rekishi to bunka* 東北学院大学論集: 歴史と文化 49 (2013): 1–24.
- Pak Chi-wōn 朴趾源. *Yōrha ilgi* 熱河日記. Beijing: Beijing tushuguan chubanshe, 1996.
- Perdue, Peter C. *China Marches West: The Qing Conquest of Central Eurasia*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005.
- Qinggui 慶桂 et al., compilers. *Daqing Gaozong chun-huangdi shilu* 大清高宗純皇帝實錄. Originally 1807. Taipei: Huawen shuju, 1964.
- Saguchi Tōru 佐口透. *18–19 seiki higashi Torukisutan shakaishi kenkyū* 18–19世紀東トルキスタン社会史研究. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1963.
- Sasaki Yō 佐々木揚. *Shinmatsu Chūgoku ni okeru Nihonkan to seiyōkan* 清末中国における日本観と西洋観. Tokyo: Tokyo daigaku shuppankai, 2000.
- Shinmen Yasushi. “‘Tārīhi Rashīdī’ Tyurukugo yaku fuhēn no jojutsu keikō ni kansuru ichi kōsatsu: Kashugaru no rekidai Hākimu Begu no bubun o chūshin ni” 『ターリーヒ・ラシーディー』テュルク語訳附編の叙述傾向に関する一考察: カシュガルの歴代ハーキム・ベグの部分を中心に. *Seinan Ajia kenkyū* 西南アジア研究 70 (2009): 111–31.
- Shinmen Yasushi and Onuma Takahiro. “First Contact between Ya‘qūb Beg and the Qing: The Diplomatic Correspondence of 1871.” *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 84 (2012): 5–37.
- Sungyun. *Emu tanggū orin sakda i gisun sarkiyān*. San Francisco: Chinese Materials Center, 1982.

- Valikhanov, Ch. Ch. *Sobranie sochinenii v piati tomakh*. Alma-Ata: Glavnaia redaktsiia Kazakhskoi Sovetskoi Entsiklopedii, 1985.
- Waley-Cohen, Joanna. *The Culture of War in China: Empire and the Military under the Qing Dynasty*. London: I. B. Tauris, 2006.
- Zhao Lian 昭槤. *Xiaoting zalu* 嘯亭雜錄. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980.
- Zhongguo bianjiang shidi yanjiu zhongxin 中国边疆史地研究中心 and Zhongguo diyi lishi dang'anguan 中国第一历史档案馆, editors. *Qingdai Xinjiang Manwen dang'an huibian* 清代新疆满文档案汇编. Guilin: Guangxi shifan daxue chubanshe, 2012.
- Guojia dang'anju zhongyang dang'anguan 国家档案局中央档案馆, editor. *Zhongguo dang'an wenxian yichan minglu* 中国档案文献遗产名录. Beijing: Zhongguo dang'an chubanshe, 2002.
- Zhongguo diyi lishi dang'anguan 中国第一历史档案馆 et al., editors. *Qingdai bianjiang Manwen dang'an mulu* 清代边疆满文档案目录. Guilin: Guangxi shifan daxue chubanshe, 1999.
- Zuo Zongtang. *Zuo Wenxiang gong quanji* 左文襄公全集. Taipei: Wenhai chubanshe, 1979.