

The Development of the Junghars and the Role of Bukharan Merchants

Onuma Takahiro*

The grasslands to the north of the Tianshan Ranges in Jungharia (northern Xinjiang) have been used as the headquarters for tribes of nomadic people for many years.¹ In the early fifteenth century, this area came to be occupied by the Oyirads (Kalmyks/*Qālmāqs*). In the seventeenth century, the Junghar tribe emerged as the most powerful Oyirad tribe. They established a dominant state that was able to subjugate not only the other Oyirad tribes but also their non-Oyirad neighbors. Over time, this nomad state came to be the preeminent force in Central Eurasia, in direct competition with two other expanding empires: the Qing and the Russian empires.

The Junghars' successful expansion was predominantly a result of their vast military power, which was based on the superior mobility of the Junghar cavalrymen.² Nomadism, however, was an unstable way of life; it was very dependent on natural conditions, which were often unpredictable. In order to become stable societies, it was essential that nomadic tribes engage in economic activities such as agriculture and trade. In Central Eurasia, the people who had traditionally played this role were the settled inhabitants of the Central Asian oases. Traditionally, these settled inhabitants tended to be ruled over and exploited by their nomadic neighbors, who surpassed them in military strength. Despite their martial inferiority, the oasis-dwellers often

*Tohoku Gakuin University (Sendai, Japan)

developed stable economies and advanced cultures, which their nomadic neighbors, including the Junghars, lacked.

The Junghar period saw a remarkable rise in the prominence of the commercial activities of the Turkic-Muslims—known as the Bukharans—who were settled in the Central Asian oases. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Europeans, especially the Russians, referred to Western Turkistan as “Great Bukharia” and Eastern Turkistan as “Little Bukharia”; the Turkic-Muslims (today’s Uyghurs and Uzbeks) in these areas were generally referred to as the “Bukharans.”

Many previous studies have investigated the role of the Bukharans in the Junghar period.³ It is clear that, in their various roles as peasants, merchants, craftsmen, and soldiers, they supported the development of the Junghars. However, the precise role and development of the Bukharans in Junghar history remains unclear. The purpose of this analysis is to gain a better understanding of the process through which the Bukharans were incorporated into the political and economic system of the Junghars. In addition, I also conduct a case study of the Bukharans’ commercial activities in the Junghar’s trade with Qing China to gain a deeper understanding of the role of the Bukharans at that time.

I. THE CONSTRUCTION OF WALLED TOWNS BY THE JUNGHARS

In any analysis of the relationship between nomad states and their neighboring oasis-dwellers, a close examination of the development of the walled townships that were constructed on grassland is essential. The Uighur khaganate (745–840) had begun the practice of building large-scale towns, such as Ordu Baliq and Bay Baliq. After this time, every nomad state in Central Eurasia had its own core town. However, most of the inhabitants who lived in these towns were, in fact, non-nomadic people who were originally from the Central Asian oases, the Chinese heartland, and other settled places, and who supported the nomad states both economically and culturally. At this stage, I would like to discuss how the construction of walled towns by the Junghars affected their expansion.

1. The “Rock Town” at Khoboqsar

Since the middle of the sixteenth century, the Oyirads had been dominated

by the Mongols, especially the Khalkha tribe, a neighbor of the Oyirad tribes. In the early seventeenth century, however, Khara Khula (?–1635?), the founder of the Junghar tribe and a member of the Choros clan, together with other Oyirad chiefs, began to wage war against the Khalkhas. Finally, in 1623, the Oyirads managed to liberate themselves from Mongol rule. According to Miyawaki Junko, a specialist in Oyirad history, the name “Junghar,” which means “left wing” (Mo. *jegün yar*), originated from the fact that they were regarded as being positioned on the left wing of the Dorbet tribe, who were also members of the Choros clan, or the eastern front of the Oyirads.⁴

Under the reign of the first son of Khara Khula, Batur Hongtayiji (r. 1635–53), the Oyirads’ strength increased even further. Before the beginning of the seventeenth century, it is unclear whether the Oyirads were a nomad state that had a fixed power structure; however, after Batur Hongtayiji’s succession, the Junghar tribe and the Khoshuut tribe became two of the most influential of the Oyirad tribes.⁵ At this time, the Gelug school of Tibetan Buddhism (Yellow Hat), headed by the Dalai Lama, spread rapidly throughout Oyirad society.⁶

Most scholars agree that the *ulus* (territory with subjects) of Batur Hongtayiji extended from the upper reaches of the Irtysh River all the way to Khoboqsar, and that his *orda/ordu* (camp, court) was situated at the opening of the Emir River on the northern side of the Tarbaghatai Mountain. Tomila Petrof, the Russian envoy who was dispatched to Jungharia in 1616, observed that, originally, the Oyirads had no town.⁷ However, during the reign of Batur Hongtayiji, this changed when he initiated the construction of a “Rock Town” (Ru. *kamennyĭ gorad*) at Khoboqsar in 1637–38. This “Rock Town,” built by Chinese and Mongol captives, was enclosed by square brick walls (each side was 108 m long and 4.3 m high) that were topped with four iron cannons. The town included a Tibetan temple and a network of irrigation canals. There were only around 300 inhabitants, primarily composed of craftsmen and peasants of Chinese, Mongolian, and Bukharan origin, as well as Lamas and their Oyirad followers. Batur Hongtayiji often asked Russia to supply livestock, artisans, and weapons as investments in the infrastructure of his new town. By 1644, the number of Junghar towns had increased to four, and it was a day’s journey on horseback from one town to another.⁸

In nomadic societies, settled townships that lacked mobility were very likely to be attacked and plundered. Therefore, for these newly settled nomad towns, a strong leader and a stable society were indispensable if the town was to survive. The construction of the Khoboqsar towns by Batur Hongtayiji reflects his high status among the Oyirad leadership; his confident

construction of such a town reflects his power and should be regarded as the first step by the Junghars in the construction of a nomad state.⁹

2. *The Junghars move south*

Batur Hongtayiji died at the end of the year 1653. His son Sengge (r. 1654–70) ascended to the Junghar leadership; however, soon after, there arose a dispute with his elder half-brothers over the succession.¹⁰ The ensuing power struggle ended around the year 1660 with Sengge claiming victory.

After the death of Batur Hongtayiji, there are no further records pertaining to Khoboqsar towns. For this reason, the historian John Baddeley suggests that the Yili Valley might have been the preferred location for subsequent Junghar rulers.¹¹ According to the biography of Zaya Pandida written by Ratnabhadrā, in the summer of 1662 Sengge's camp was located around Osuk and Samul.¹² Both were west of the Gulja; these names correspond to *Ösök* (No. 138) and *Sāmūl* (No. 137) on the Renat Map 1.¹³ The majority of the evidence from this period suggests that the Junghar tribe began to move south during Sengge's time. Understanding why this might have been will help us in our quest to understand how the Junghars' influence began to extend over the Central Asian oases.

According to the study conducted by Wakamatsu Hiroshi¹⁴ and David Brophy,¹⁵ which was primarily based on the history of the Moghūl khanate written by Shāh Maḥmūd b. Faḍīl Churās in the late seventeenth century,¹⁶ some Oyirad chieftains began a gradual invasion of the Eastern Turkistan oases in the 1640s. At first, this movement was initiated mainly by Solton Tayshi (Sulṭān tayiji), also known as Yeldeng Tayshi, the leader of the Khoyid tribe, who were located on the Yulduz River. In the early 1660s, Sengge launched his first attack on Eastern Turkistan, invading Keriya with five thousand soldiers.¹⁷ Subsequently, Sengge decided to intervene in the struggle between 'Abdullā Khān (r. 1638–67, d. 1675), the Moghūl ruler of the Yarkand khanate, and 'Abdullā's son, Yolbars, who ruled Kashgar. Sengge supported Yolbars, who had previously been banished by his father. It is worth noting that Sengge himself was able to initiate this interception because of his own rise within the Junghar tribe, for it was around 1660 that Sengge overthrew his rivals and assumed unquestioned leadership. It was common for a nomadic group, after gaining strength within the steppe grasslands, to advance into a fertile and stable society with the intention of improving their economic abilities. This was exactly the intention of Sengge.

However, another important point, which we must not overlook, is

the relationship that Sengge had with the Khoshuut leader Ochirtu Khan, who was one of Sengge's foremost supporters. From the winter of 1661 to the summer of 1662, Ochirtu Khan, who had overcome his younger brother Ablai in 1661,¹⁸ passed through the area known as "Talghar of Yili" (Mo. *Yili-yin Talyar*),¹⁹ which is located near modern-day Almaty. Ochirtu Khan had also supported Yolbars, and he had invaded Eastern Turkistan around 1667. The Junghars' advance to Yili occurred against the background of the alliance with Ochirtu Khan rather than solely on the basis of Sengge's own power. In addition, although the Junghars did tend to move south during Sengge's reign, it is far from clear whether this movement was the result of a proactive and planned migration. The Russian envoy Kurivinskii, while visiting Sengge's camp in September 1667, wrote that Sengge's *ulus* was still located less than two days' travel from the Irtysh River.²⁰

In 1668, Sengge had moved south again. Yolbars, having ousted his father, became the khān in Yarkand. However, Yolbars's uncle Ismā'il, who had opposed his succession, arrived in Aqsu, also naming himself a khān, with the support of Solton Tayshi. The power union of Ismā'il and Solton Tayshi was significantly threatened by Yolbars and Sengge's association. According to the chronicle written by Maḥmūd Churās, after this victory "Yolbars Khān had brought with him all manner of regalia appropriate to the exercise of kingship. He gave them to Sengge and took leave to return to the seat of his own sultanate."²¹ This was a very symbolic gesture, and, as Brophy supposes, the influence of Sengge on the Yarkand khanate became even greater.²² However, at the end of 1669, Yolbars was killed by supporters of Sengge, and then Yolbars's son and successor 'Abd al-Laṭīf was also executed by Ismā'il, who entered Yarkand and acceded to the throne in April 1670. In the same year, Sengge was also assassinated by his half-brothers. In consequence, the Junghars' influence over the south fell dramatically.

3. *Yili (Gulja)*

The Yili region forms a natural basin between the Tianshan Range in the south and its offset in the north. The Yili River flows from the east to the west through the center of this basin; the slopes surrounding the river used to be beautiful pastures, and today they are used as farmland. The Yili Valley functioned as a natural fortress, surrounded as it is by mountains on three sides. Moreover, this region functioned as an effective tactical base, which, if secured, ensured that expeditions to oasis cities in the Tarim Basin and Mā Warā' al-Nahr could be undertaken with great ease; for this reason, many

nomadic groups established their headquarters here.

One of the most famous walled towns built in Yili was Almaliq, which was constructed during the Chaghatay period. The Chinese envoy Changde, who visited Almaliq in the middle of the thirteenth century, describes the city as having a canal system inside the township; he noted that fruit was widely cultivated, and that among Almaliq's inhabitants were many Chinese—most of whom had perhaps initially been held as captives.²³ However, descriptions of Almaliq have disappeared from the historical record because of its devastation, which was caused by the internal conflicts that occurred among Chaghatay's successors and the attacks that were waged by the nomadic Uzbeks.²⁴ As a result, there is no evidence of the existence of a large-scale walled town in Yili until the Junghar period.

After Sengge was assassinated in 1670, his younger brother Galdan (r. 1671–97) returned from Tibet and succeeded him as head of the Junghar tribe. In 1676, he defeated and imprisoned Ochirtu Khan (d. 1680), who had formerly been an ally of Sengge.²⁵ In the following year, the fifth Dalai Lama conferred the title of “Boshoqtu Khan” on Galdan. Galdan ruled over the majority of the Oyrat tribes,²⁶ and he also started to invade many oasis cities in Central Asia. After this period of successful conquest, Yili became the unassailable headquarters of the Junghars.

Since historical materials offer very little information on the walled towns in Yili during the Junghar period, and because insufficient archaeological research has been conducted on these towns, our knowledge of the construction process, structure, and scale of these towns is still unclear. However, there is no doubt that the towns built under Galdan's leadership were formed around religious institutions. Galdan established three Tibetan schools on the riverside of the Yili, and, under Galdan, the number of Lamas rose to five thousand.²⁷ Further, Galdan Tsering (r. 1727–45), one of Galdan's successors, initiated the construction of the Jinding (Golden Roof) Temple at Gulja on the northern side of the Yili River and the Yinding (Silver Roof) Temple at Khayinugh on the southern side. Six thousand lamas lived at these temples, under four chief lamas known as *širetü*.²⁸ Based on these facts, Haneda Akira suggests that the temples would probably have had peasants to plow the fields and craftsmen to build the temples. Moreover, markets were set up around the temples, which were attended by visiting pilgrims.²⁹ On the Renat Map 1, Gulja and Khayinugh are represented by large and peculiar marks that differentiate them from other places; this might be evidence of the development of the Yili towns.

II. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE BUKHARANS AND THE JUNGHARS

As we have discussed, the walled towns that were constructed on grasslands were inhabited predominantly by settled people who had come from outside the nomadic tribes. In both Khoboqsar and Yili, the Junghar leader did not take up his residence inside the townships, but continued to lead a nomadic life in the surrounding grasslands.³⁰ In Yili during the Junghar period, the Junghars gradually developed a relationship with the Bukharans. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the term “Bukharan” was usually used as a general term for the Turkic-Muslims from the Central Asian oases; however, most of those who lived and worked within the Junghar system came from Eastern Turkistan.³¹ In this section, we shall examine the emigration process of the Bukharans to Yili, and analyze their role and establishment in the city.

1. The emigration of the Bukharans to Yili

Whereas the Bukharans had tended to be employed as peasants and craftsmen in the “Rock Towns” of Khoboqsar, Galdan’s conquest of Eastern Turkistan in 1680 gave them their first opportunity to emigrate *en masse* to Jungharia. In the late sixteenth century, the *khwāja* clans (*Makhdūm-zāda*), or leaders of an Islamic Sufi order (*Naqshbandīya*) from the Bukhara and Samarqand areas, started arriving in the Eastern Turkistan oasis towns. These *khwājas* exerted great influence in Eastern Turkistan. There were two main sects: the *Ishākīya* and the *Āfāqīya*. According to the *Tadhkira-i khwājagān* (or *Tadhkira-i ‘azizān*),³² Khwāja Āfāq, the founder of the *Āfāqīya*, reached *Jū* (Lhasa in Tibet) after being banished by Ismā’il Khān, the patron of the *Ishākīya*. There, aided by the mediation of a *Brahman* priest (the fifth Dalai Lama), Khwāja Āfāq went to Yili and asked Galdan for help. Accepting his request, Galdan attacked Yarkand jointly with Āfāq. This event is described in the following lines of the *Tadhkira-i khwājagān*:

[The Qālmāqs] took Ismā’il Khān together with all his followers and returned. In this way the khān and the men began to reside in Ili.³³

This passage suggests that the Junghars took many Muslim inhabitants away to Yili besides Ismā’il Khān.

However, in regard to this famous narrative, David Brophy recently provided evidence that calls the account's historicity into question. Brophy finds that, on the basis of other Islamic sources, Āfāq's visit to Galdan is unlikely to have occurred. Instead, he finds it far more likely that Āfāq's alliance was formed with 'Abd al-Rashīd Khān in Turfan and that, together, they advanced to Yarkand from Turfan by order of Galdan.³⁴ Brophy's argument is persuasive and I concur with his findings almost entirely. However, there is the following observation, made in his conclusion, which I believe is untenable:

Nor would the Zünghar Khan Galdan Boshogtu have required any further persuasion to develop ambitions toward the Tarim Basin oasis towns, which were already under Oirat, but not yet Zünghar, hegemony.³⁵

The Junghars' connection with the Tarim Basin oasis towns had been broken off once, in 1670. If those towns had not yet been under Junghar control, Galdan would have been anxious to conquer them in the years around 1680, after he had already gained control of the Oyirad tribes in Jungharia. Bearing in mind that not only Ismā'īl Khān but also many Muslim inhabitants had been captured and sent to Yili, it cannot be denied that the 1680 event involved enormous military power from the Junghars, regardless of whether Galdan himself had actually traveled to Yarkand. In addition, from the perspective of a nomadic society, the main aim of launching attacks on oasis towns must be to gain economic wealth—goods, crops, and people—rather than political control. If this is not the case, it is difficult to account for the Junghars' motivation in reconquering Eastern Turkistan around 1700³⁶ and the repeated expeditions to oasis towns in Western Turkistan that were undertaken by Galdan and his successors.

2. *The Bukharans in Yili*

Most of the Bukharans in Yili were peasants who cultivated grains and fruits. They were known as *Taranči*, from the Mongolian and Turki word *taran* meaning "farmland, seed, or grain." The Russian envoy Unkovskiĭ, while staying in Yili during 1722–24, said the following:

Until about thirty years ago, the Kalmyks had only a few grains because they did not know about agriculture. Now their arable land continues to increase incessantly. Not only do the conquered Bukharans cultivate grains, but many

Kalmyks, too, are engaged in agriculture because there is an order of *Kontaisha* (Mo. *Qongtayiji*, or Tsewang Rabdan).³⁷

Here, “thirty years ago” refers to the period around 1690. This is ten years after the 1680 conquest of Eastern Turkistan and the emigration of the Bukharans to Yili; it is clear that this was the turning point after which agriculture came to be practiced on a large scale in Jungharia. This trend extended to and influenced the Oyrads as well, resulting in an increase in the amount of their land that began to be cultivated.³⁸ According to Unkovskii, around two thousand Bukharans were living a nomadic life following the then Junghar leader Tsewang Rabdan.³⁹ This may indicate that the *Taranči* population had grown to a considerable size. An estimate by Saguchi Tōru—a pioneering Japanese scholar in this field—that the total number of Bukharans in Yili at this time was around twenty to thirty thousand⁴⁰ seems likely to be relatively accurate.

In addition to the Bukharans, Yili was also home to foreign captives of Russian, Swede, Chinese, and Manchu origin.⁴¹ These residents introduced new techniques to the Oyrads in terms of the manufacture of silver, copper, and iron. By the early eighteenth century, weapons (matchlocks, cannons, bullets, and armor), cargo boats for rivers, and paper for writing were all being produced in Yili.⁴² Furthermore, the Junghar’s artillery units—the *puučin[ar]*—seem to have been organized mainly by the Bukharans and the Kirghiz (*Burut*).⁴³

It is known that Bukharan merchants were called *bederge[n]* among the Junghars. The origin of this word can be traced to the Persian term *bāzārgān* (*bāzāragān*, *bāzāra* [a merchant] + *gān* [plural in Persian]). The *Tadhkira-i khwājagān* describes that a *bāzārgān* proceeded into the grassland of an Oyrad tribe in Yili.⁴⁴ However, originally, the word *bāzārgān* was not such a specialized term. For example, the Timurid mission dispatched by Shāh Rukh and other princes to Ming China in 1419–22 was recorded as being accompanied by five hundred *bāzārgānān*.⁴⁵ Moreover, after the Qing’s conquest of Eastern Turkistan, in the Persian letter from the Khoqand ruler Nārbūta to Yarkand in 1760, there is a passage that describes Murād Kūchak Šūfī, who had been dispatched to Yarkand together with *bāzīrgān*, as being plundered by Kirghiz bandits.⁴⁶ The word *bāzārgān* seems likely to have been a general term referring to merchants, traders, and caravans in Islamic Central Asia.

On the other hand, the development of the term *bederge[n]* in the Junghar system is interesting to note. The Qing records report that when

the Qing dynasty conquered Yili in 1755, they “bestowed on the Muslim *beg* (chief), ‘Aziz, having controlled the Bederge *otoy*, the *zongguan* (Supervisor-in-Chief) of third-*pin* grade and gave him 150 silver taels; then, to Yüsf and ‘Abd al-Lahīm the second-ranked *shiwei* (Imperial Guard) were given 120 silver taels.”⁴⁷ The *otoy* (Ma. *otok*), generally meaning a middle-scale nomadic group under the *ulus* or *ayimay*, had been a foundational unit at the center of the Junghar empire.⁴⁸ Within the Junghar system, the Bukharan merchants—the *bederge[n]*—in Yili formed an *otoy*, and some *begs* were appointed for its supervision. This record presents significant evidence to suggest that the Bukharan merchants occupied a position close to the Junghar power.

The role of the Bukharan merchants in Junghar Yili as described here and in the next section is reminiscent of the role of the *Ortoq/Ortaq*⁴⁹ merchants, including the Uighur and Muslim traders from Central Asia, in the Mongol empire. The *Ortoq/Ortaq* merchants transacted and worked in tandem with the Mongol aristocracy. Saguchi describes the Bukharan merchants as the “purveyor merchants patronized by the Junghar empire”⁵⁰; this seems to be accurate. Indeed, Unkovskii described the Junghar sphere of trade in the following terms:

They trade with Russians in Siberia to the north, with Chinese to the west if there is no war, and with Tangut (Tibetan) to the south. Besides, many merchants usually proceed to India and Great Bukharia.⁵¹

It seems possible that this market was, in fact, opened up and maintained by the ingenious network of Bukharan merchants, with the support of the Junghars’ power. The Bukharans organized caravans to remote areas, including the Russian fortresses in Western Siberia, the Qing’s western frontier towns, India, and Tibet. As “business partners” of the Junghars, the Bukharans played an active role in the transit trade between the east and the west. In the next section, I examine the role of the Bukharan merchants in Junghar–Qing trade in greater depth.

III. THE BUKHARANS AS INTERMEDIARIES IN JUNGHAR–QING TRADE

Across Eurasia, the movement of people and goods peaked during the Mongol empire. After the Mongol/Yuan court in China declined and was replaced by the Ming dynasty, the new dynasty adopted a largely passive

foreign policy after the early stages of their rule. After the mid-Ming period, the extensive networks with Central Asia were gradually shut down; despite this, there is some evidence of trading activity conducted by Central Asian traders in China during the Ming and early Qing periods. The *Bābur nāma* provides a wealth of information on Central Asia in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; it describes a caravan returning from China as consisting of one thousand camps.⁵² In 1655, the Russian envoy Baykov was guided to Beijing by a group of Bukharans.⁵³ In 1676, another Russian envoy, Spafarii, witnessed the arrival of four hundred Central Asian traders during his stay in Beijing. According to his report, the most aggressive traders in Beijing were the Bukharan merchants, and their movements in Beijing were unrestricted.⁵⁴ The activities of the Bukharan merchants as transit traders between China and Central Asia, backed up by the power of the Junghars, became more brisk after the late seventeenth century.

In 1682, the Qing government dispatched an envoy named Kitat (Ch. *Qitate*) to Jungharia in celebration of the subjugation of the Three Feudatories revolt (1673–78). Kitat stayed in Galdan's camp for a month at the beginning of 1683. One of the most important topics that was discussed during their talks was the credentials that should be issued to the Oyrad "tribute missions" (Ch. *gongshi*) to the Qing.

During that era, the Oyrad tribute missions tended to approach the Qing frontiers.⁵⁵ The tribute missionaries, in most cases, would introduce themselves as one of "Galdan's missions." However, because they supplied no evidence to prove their assertion, the Qing government demanded that Galdan issue credentials to the missionaries. In response, Galdan claimed that he had not issued credentials to the Dorbet, Torghuut, and Khoshuut tribes because these tribes were too remote. Finally, after debate, Galdan promised to issue credentials to the appropriate missionaries, marked with dates and affixed with his seal. In addition, if missions dispatched by his family without his credentials arrived at the frontier gate of the Qing, he agreed that their entrance should be permitted only at the discretion of the Qing emperor.⁵⁶

After Kitat returned to Beijing, the Qing government decided to grant entry to only two hundred people accredited by Galdan as official missionaries. It was decided that all other missionaries would have to trade in Zhangjiakou and Guihuacheng along the frontier. This decree was issued in response to the increase in the number of people that were involved in the Oyrad tribute missions, which had resulted in troubles with the Mongols along the route. Naturally enough, this regulation was extended to the other Oyrad leaders such as Ghalma Dayiching Khoshuuchi of the

Ölöt (Choros), Borukhuji of the Khoshuut, Aldar of the Dorbet, and Ayuki of the Torghuut; they had experience of dispatching missions to the Qing.⁵⁷ Moreover, the Kangxi emperor (r. 1662–1722) stated in 1686 that only the Oyrads’ “four great *tayijis*,” which included Galdan, were entitled to trade in the Qing capital.⁵⁸ These trade restrictions resulted in other leaders losing the opportunity to trade independently, and this created tensions within the Oyrad tribes.⁵⁹ However, on the other hand, the concentration of the right to trade with the Qing may well have encouraged the growth of Galdan’s powers.

It is clear that the rapid increase in the number of Oyrad missions in the 1680s was a direct result of the Junghars’ conquest of Eastern Turkistan. In 1684, Galdan dispatched a tribute mission consisting of around three thousand people, which was headed by a Turki man named Qurbān Bay.⁶⁰ According to the *Khiṭāy nāma*, written by Sayyid ‘Alī Aqbar Khiṭāī in 1516, “the people going [to China] overland, [particularly] the people from Islamic countries, must always enter after introducing themselves as an envoy.”⁶¹ Taking this tradition into consideration, we can assume that the Junghar missions arriving at the Qing borders included a considerable number of Bukharan merchants.

After the Qing territories expanded, incorporating the whole of Mongolia, the Junghar–Qing trade centers shifted from Zhangjiakou and Guihuacheng to Suzhou and Xining, in western Gansu.⁶² The Junghar and the Qing concluded their cease-fire agreements in 1734. After this, they demarcated a mutually agreed boundary in Khobdo and re-established regular trade relations in 1739–40. For the next fifteen years, a relatively peaceful relationship was maintained between the Junghars and the Qing rulers; this had the effect of drawing their economies close together. This officially regulated “tribute” trade involved three types of missions: (1) embassies in the capital, (2) border trade in Suzhou, and (3) the “presentation of boiled tea” (Ch. *aocha*) to lamas in Tibet, following a route that went through Xining in Qinghai.⁶³

In these missions, too, we have evidence of the Bukharans featuring prominently. According to the new regulation, three hundred people as tribute missionaries of Galdan Tsering arrived in Beijing at the end of 1742; this mission was headed by a chief envoy named Choinamk’ē and two vice envoys named Mamut and Turdu in Manchu.⁶⁴ However, it is hard to discern Mamut’s ethnicity solely from his name, as Mamut (Maḥmūd?) could be either Oyrad or Turki.⁶⁵ Nonetheless, Turdu (Turdi) is clearly a Turki name. Mamut and Turdu left the capital earlier than Choinamk’ē to supervise the

border trade at Suzhou.⁶⁶ In 1744, Turdu, in his role as chief envoy, reached Beijing again and was permitted an audience with the Qianlong emperor (r. 1736–95).⁶⁷ In addition, Erkin (Ärkin), as a chief envoy of the 1751 mission, was possibly Turki, too.⁶⁸

It is also clear that the Bukharans were active players in the border trade that was conducted in Suzhou. In 1742, Minister (Ch. *shangshu*) Haiwang mentioned to the Junghars' envoy, Halio, that some trouble had arisen in the past year among merchants trading in Suzhou, where an Oyirad named Etegeli had struck a Turkic-Muslim (Ma. *hoise*) named Osman. This clearly indicates the presence of Bukharan merchants at Suzhou. Moreover, in the response to Haiwang's request that the Junghars dispatch some trustworthy leaders to supervise their traders and to conduct the frontier trade in an orderly manner, Halio explained: "This time, [we] have dispatched four or five heads such as the Muslim Eren Hūli (Ärän Qulī?) and others [to Suzhou]."⁶⁹ Again, this is almost certainly a reference to a Bukharan, and it indicates the central role that they played in the Junghar trade. In 1752, Vice Director (Ch. *yuanwailang*) Arbin, stationed in Hami, gave the following report to the Grand Councilors (Ch. *junji dachen*):

Formerly, it was reported from our place that the head trader (Ma. *hūda-i da*) of the Junghars, Erenhūli bek (Ärän Qulī beg?), who came to trade, had arrived in Hami. Until now, the head trader Erenhūli bek had divided his 197 followers, livestock, and burdens for sale into seven parties. [One party] after another left for Suzhou from the thirteenth day of the sixth month to the nineteenth day of this month.⁷⁰

This record shows us that the traders from Junghar arriving at the Qing borders were caravans of Central Asian Turkic-Muslims, or the Bukharans. Obviously, the Junghar's trade was strongly dependent on the Bukharans' commercial activities. Moreover, if, as has been suggested, the head trader Erenhūli bek within this quotation is the same as the Eren Hūli of 1742, this is a clear example of the continuing cooperation between the Junghars and their Bukharan "business partners."⁷¹

CONCLUSION

Mano Eiji, a Japanese specialist in the history of Islamic Central Asia, suggests that the strong states of Central Eurasia were established on the ingenious

combination of two main factors: the military power of the nomads and the economic power of the oasis inhabitants.⁷² As we have seen, these two factors were indeed the foundation of the Junghar empire, which made huge economic profits by protecting and promoting the activities of the Bukharan merchants. The Bukharan merchants played an inconspicuous but vital role in the last brilliant stage of the Central Asian world, which was directed by the “last nomad empire,” the Junghar.

The Qing dynasty’s advance into Central Asia during the period 1755–59 resulted in the extermination of the Junghars and the annexation of the Eastern Turkistan oases. It is very interesting that the *bederge[n]*, evidently, continued to exist even under Qing rule; indeed, some of them were engaged in the Sino–Russian trade at Kyakhta.⁷³ However, after the disappearance of the Junghars, the East Turkistani merchants who had operated in tandem with the Junghar powers faded over time from the scene. Trade with the Chinese heartland was conducted by the Chinese merchants who had advanced into the “New Dominion” (Xinjiang) and who had control of abundant capital assets.⁷⁴ In the international trade markets across Central Asia, the East Turkistanis could no longer claim their erstwhile position as transit traders. After their conquest of the Junghars, the Qing dynasty immediately established a government-managed trade relationship with the Kazakhs in Jungharia. The Qing dynasty did allow the East Turkistanis to engage in trade with the Kazakhs immediately after their conquest of Eastern Turkistan; however, to ensure their own monopoly over the market, they prohibited them from engaging in direct trade in 1767.⁷⁵ Moreover, in all cases of trading with the Kirghiz beyond the *karun*-border, strict restrictions were imposed.⁷⁶ Under Qing rule, the mobility of the East Turkistani merchants deteriorated; they were thus converted into local merchants. Their withdrawal from the international trade networks paved the way for the Khoqandi merchants from the Fergana Valley to progress remarkably in the trade between the Qing and Central Asia over the next one hundred years.

NOTES

¹ The best comprehensive study of this region’s history is V. V. Barto’ld, “Ocherk istorii Semirech’ia,” in *Obshchie raboty po istorii Srednei Azii: Raboty po istorii Kavkaza i Vostochnoi Evropy*, vol. II, pt. 1 (Moskva: Izdatel’stvo vostochnoi literatury, 1963), 21–106.

² The Junghars deployed cannons and guns in battle. Weapons that used gunpowder, being useful in conquering cities or in coercing enemies, were one of the most important factors responsible for the development of the Junghars. See P. Perdue, *China Marches West: The Qing Conquest of Central*

Eurasia (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005), 305; J. Millward, *Eurasian Crossroads: A History of Xinjiang* (London: Hurst & Company, 2007), 89. However, the effect of gunpowder in battle should be discussed in greater detail in subsequent research.

³ For example, see Haneda Akira, *Chūō ajiashi kenkyū* (Kyoto: Rinsen shoten, 1982), 252–74, 283–87; Saguchi Tōru, *Roshia to ajia sōgen* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1966), 144–60; *Shinkyō minzoku shi kenkyū* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1986), 236–54; Millward, *Eurasian Crossroads*, 93–94.

⁴ Miyawaki Junko, *Mongoru no rekishi: Yūbokumin no tanjō kara mongoru koku made* (Tokyo: Tōsui shobō, 2002), 191.

⁵ Miyawaki Junko, “Mongoru-Oiratto kankeishi: 13 seiki kara 17 seiki made,” *Ajia afurika gengo bunka kenkyū* 25 (1983): 177–78, 182.

⁶ Wakamatsu Hiroshi, “Karumukku ni okeru ramakyō juyō no rekishiteki sokumen,” *Tōyōshi kenkyū* 25, no. 1 (1966): 92–105.

⁷ *Russko-mongol'skie otnosheniia, 1607–1636: sbornik dokumentov*, ed. L. M. Gataullina, M. I. Gol'man, and G. I. Slesrchik (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo vostochnoi literatury, 1959), 52, doc. no. 18; J. Baddeley, *Russia, Mongolia, China*, vol. 2 (London: Macmillan, 1919), 38.

⁸ I. Zlatkin, *Istoriia Dzhungarskogo khanstva (1635–1758)* (Moskva: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1963), 179–83; G. Slesarchuk, “Novye danye o gorodkakh Dzhungarskogo khanstva,” in *Proceedings of the Second International Congress of Mongolists*, vol. II (Ulaanbaatar, 1973), 113–16; Wakamatsu Hiroshi, “Jungaru ōkokuno keisei katei,” *Tōyōshi kenkyū* 41, no. 4 (1983): 100–102. It is said that the ruins of the walled town in Khoboqsar region—referred to today as the “Junghar Old Town” (Ch. *zhunga'er gucheng*)—are the remains of the “Rock Town” built by Batur Hongtayiji.

⁹ Wakamatsu, “Jungaru ōkokuno keisei katei,” 102; Perdue, *China Marches West*, 106, 108–9, 303–4.

¹⁰ For the sons and the wives of Batur Khongtayiji, see Miyawaki Junko, “Was Galdan Boshogtu Khan's mother a Khoshuud or a Torguud?” *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 88 (1999): 103–12.

¹¹ Baddeley, *Russia, Mongolia, China*, vol. 2, 125.

¹² Ratnabhadra, *Dzaya bandita*, ed. Si Norbu (Kökeqota: Öbür Mongyul-un arad-un keblel-un qoriy-a, 1990), 204; Miyawaki Junko, “The Location of a Mobile Monastery and the Chiefs' Camps in the 17th Century Central Asia: In the Biography of Zaya Pandida,” in *Proceedings of the 46th Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference* (Ankara, 2003), 308.

¹³ The Renat Maps 1 and 2 were detailed maps of Central Asia, brought to Europe by a Swedish military and cartographer, Johan Gustav Renat (1682–1744), who had spent seventeen years in Junghar captivity. For further details, see Baddeley, *Russia, Mongolia, China*, vol. 1, clxvi–ccxvi; N. Poppe, “Renat's Kalmuck Maps,” *Imago Mundi: Jahrbuch der alten Kartographie*, XII (1955), 95–108.

¹⁴ Wakamatsu Hiroshi, “17 seiki chūyō no karumāku zoku to higashi torukisutan,” *Nairiku ajiashi kenkyū* 3 (1986): 1–12.

¹⁵ D. Brophy, “The Oirat in Eastern Turkistan and the Rise of Āfāq Khwāja,” *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 16 (2008/2009): 5–28.

¹⁶ Shāh Maḥmūd ibn Mirzā Faḍīl Churās, *Khronika*, trans. and ed. O. F. Akimushkin (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo “Hauka” glavnaia redaktsiia vostochnoi literatury, 1976) (hereafter KH/Akimushkin).

¹⁷ KH/Akimushkin: tr., 232–33; text, 84–85. I cannot agree with Brophy's opinion that this invasion of Sengge took place in 1654–55 (Brophy, “The Oirat in Eastern Turkistan and the Rise of Āfāq Khwāja,” 15). Before the year 1660, Sengge was involved in an internal power struggle. I believe that this would have left him no time to mount an expedition to Eastern Turkistan.

¹⁸ Wakamatsu Hiroshi, “Senge shihaiki no jungaru hankoku no nairan,” *Yūboku shyakaishi tankyū* 43 (1971): 4–8.

¹⁹ Ratnabhadra, *Dzaya bandita*, 104, 204. The Talghar River flows to the east of Almaty, in modern day Kazakhstan.

²⁰ *Russko-mongol'skie otnosheniia, 1654–1685: sbornik dokumentov*, ed. G. I. Slesrchik (Moskva: Izdatel'skaia firma "Vostochnaia literatura" RAN, 1996), 157, doc. no. 71; Baddeley, *Russia, Mongolia, China*, vol. 2, 189–90.

²¹ KH/Akimushkin: tr., 243; text, 94–95. This English translation is quoted from Brophy, "The Oirat in Eastern Turkistan and the Rise of Āfāq Khwāja," 20.

²² Brophy, "The Oirat in Eastern Turkistan and the Rise of Āfāq Khwāja," 20.

²³ Changde, *Xishiji*, comp. Liu Yu (1263); repr. in *Xibei shidi wenxian*, vol. 31 (Lanzhou: Lanzhou guji chubanshe, 1990): 452; E. Bretschneider, *Mediaeval Researches from Eastern Asiatic Sources: Fragments towards the Knowledge of the Geography and History of Central and Western Asia from the 13th to the 17th Century* (London: K. Paul, 1910), 126–27. However, Almalıq was not the site of Chaghatay's camp. Chaghatay set up his camp on the grasslands of the Yili valley, and was periodically on the move; he followed a seasonal cycle. For further details, see Saguchi Tōru, "Chagatai han to sono jidai (ge): 13–14 seiki torukesutan shi zhosetsu toshite," *Tōyō gakuō* 29, no. 2 (1942): 113–30.

²⁴ Mano Eiji, *Bābur nāma (Vaqāyi'): Critical Edition Based on Four Chaghatay Texts with Introduction and Notes* (Kyoto: Shōkadō, 1995) (hereafter BN/Mano), 3.

²⁵ Galdan had married Sengge's widow, Anu Dara, who was a granddaughter of Ochirtu Khan. See Miyawaki Junko, "The Birth of the Oyrat Khanship," *Central Asiatic Journal* 41, no. 1 (1997): 67.

²⁶ H. Veselovskii, "Posol'stvo k ziungarskomu khun-taichzhi Tsevan Rabtanu kapitana ot artillepii Ivana Unkovskogo i putevoi zhurnal ego za 1722–1724 gody," *Zapiski imperatorskogo Russkogo Geograficheskogo Obshchestva po otdeleniiu etnografii*, vol. X, pt. 2 (Sankt-Peterburg, 1887) (hereafter Veselovskii), 195; Onuma Takahiro, "Jungaru no shihai taisei ni kansuru kisoteki kentō," in *Iri gawa ryūiki rekishi chiri ronshū: Yūrasia shinōbu karano nagame*, ed. Kubota Junpei, Chengzhi, and Inoue Mitsuyuki (Kyoto: Shōkadō, 2009), 35–36.

²⁷ Wakamatsu Hiroshi, "Oirāto zoku no hatten," in *Nairiku ajia sekai no tenkai* (Iwanami kōza sekai rekishi, 13) (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1971), 94.

²⁸ Haneda, *Chūō ajia shi kenkyū*, 278.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 384.

³⁰ Ugrimov, who visited Yili in 1732, made the following comment on Galdan Tsering's movements and the routes traveled by him during the course of one year: "Whilst the envoy was there, Galdan (Galdan Tsering) traveled, towards the end of April, from the Kochighir down the course of the river Yili; and in the last days of May, June, July, and August from Mt. Tumurluk, along various rivers—the Gheghen, the Kharakir, and the Tekes—to the Tsaptsal; and from September, and the whole winter through, to the end of March, along the river Yili; first, downstream; then, up-stream, to where he is accustomed to lingering on till May, at the Kochighir; and in May he goes to Mt. Turmurluk, and thus his round is accomplished—a phenomenon we have witnessed ourselves." All the above-mentioned places are on the south side of the Yili River. See Veselovskii, 234; Baddeley, *Russia, Mongolia, China*, vol. 1, clxxx.

³¹ Baddeley, *Russia, Mongolia, China*, vol. 2, 24–26.

³² For the following description of Khwāja Āfāq's exile and return, I used text and translation of its part belonging to Group B, which was categorized and regarded as the most reliable version by Sawada Minoru. See Sawada Minoru, "Three Groups of *Tadhkira-i khwājagān*: Viewed from the Chapter on Khwāja Āfāq," in *Studies on Xinjiang Historical Sources in 17–20th Centuries* (Toyo Bunko Research Library, 12), ed. James A. Millward, Shinmen Yasushi, and Sugawara Jun (Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko, 2010), 9–30.

³³ Sawada, "Three Groups of *Tadhkira-i khwājagān*," tr., 15; text, 26.

- ³⁴ Brophy, “The Oirat in Eastern Turkistan and the Rise of Āfāq Khwāja,” 21–22.
- ³⁵ Ibid., 26.
- ³⁶ *Tārikh-i Kāshghar*, ed. O. F. Akimushkin (Sankt-Peterburg: “Peterburgskoe vostokovedenie,” 2001), 90.
- ³⁷ Veselovskii, 195.
- ³⁸ For detailed research on agricultural development in Oyirad society, see Cai Jiayi, “Zhungaèr de nongye: Zhungaèr shehui jingji chutan zhi er,” *Menggushi yanjiu* 1 (1985): 53–68.
- ³⁹ Veselovskii, 186–87.
- ⁴⁰ Saguchi, *Roshia to ajia sōgen*, 157.
- ⁴¹ The number of Russian captives that Galdan Tsering returned to Ugrimov in 1732 was around four hundred. See Zlatkin, *Istoriia Dzhungarskogo khanstva*, 386.
- ⁴² Veselovskii, 196.
- ⁴³ Saguchi, *Shinkyō minzoku shi kenkyū*, 238–39.
- ⁴⁴ *Tadhkira-i khwājagān* (Orientabteilung der Staatsbibliothek zui Berlin, Ms. Orient, 4°3357), 115; (British Library, Or. 5338), 23b.
- ⁴⁵ *A Persian Embassy to China: Being an Extract from Zubdatu’t Tawarikh of Hafiz Abru*, trans. K. M. Maitra, with a new introduction by L. Carrington Goodrich (New York: Paragon Book Reprint Corp., 1970), tr. and text, 17–18; Ono Hiroshi, “Giyāsuddīn nakkāshu no tyimūru chō kenmin shisetsukō kiroku: Hāfizu aburū ‘Baisunguru no rekishi seika’ kara,” in *Yūrashia chūōiki no rekishi kōzu: 13–15 seiki no tōzai*, ed. Kubota Junpei (Kyoto: Sōgō chikyū kankyōgaku kenkyūjo, 2010), tr., 301; text, 350.
- ⁴⁶ *Junjichu manwen lufu zouzhe* (Document category of the First Historical Archives of China, Beijing), 1819.15.1, 56: 2289, QL 25, 4 (1760.5.15~6.12).
- ⁴⁷ *Pingding zhungèr fanglüe* (1772) (hereafter PDZF), *zhengbian* 19: 17b–18a, QL 20, 9, *jiashen* (1755.10.18).
- ⁴⁸ It is said that the twenty-four *otoys* were organized during the reign of Galdan Tsering. See Onuma, “Jungaru no shihai taisei ni kansuru kisoteki kentō,” 37–45.
- ⁴⁹ The word *Ortoq/Ortaq* refers to “companion, partner” in Turki, which appears as a technical term for merchant and commerce in the historical record in the Mongol time. Although there were opinions that *Ortoq/Ortaq* had the meaning of something like “corporation, association, organization,” Uno Nobuhiro has criticized this and provided new insight: *Ortoq/Oraq* had the meaning of “business partner of the Mongols as investor.” See Uno Nobuhiro, “Ogodei han to musurimu syōnin: orudo ni okeru kōeki to nishi ajiasan no shōhin,” *Tōyō gaku* 70, nos. 3/4 (1989): 99–100, n. 17. This view has been strengthened by Moriyasu Takao’s elaborate study on the basis of the Uighur document. See Moriyasu Takao, “Shiruku rōdo no uiguru shōnin,” in *Chūō yūrashia no tōgō* (Iwanami kōza sekai rekishi, 11) (Tokyo: Iwanami ghoten): 93–119.
- ⁵⁰ Saguchi, *Roshia to ajia sōgen*, 157.
- ⁵¹ Veselovskii, 196.
- ⁵² BN/Mano, 11.
- ⁵³ Baddeley, *Russia, Mongolia, China*, vol. 2, 132.
- ⁵⁴ Ibid., 374.
- ⁵⁵ A rapid increase of the Oyirads’ tribute missions can be also observed during Esen’s reign (?–1454). Esen was a strong Oyirad leader who ruled Mongolia in the mid-Ming period.
- ⁵⁶ *Yuzhi qinzheng pingding shuomo fanglüe* (1708), 2: 28b–29b, KX 22, 7, *wuxu* (1683.9.19).
- ⁵⁷ *Daqing shengzu ren huangdi shilu* (1731) (hereafter SZSL), 111: 17a–18b, KX 22, 8, *gengzi* (1683.9.21); SZSL, 112: 12a–13b, KX 22, 9, *guiwei* (1683.11.3).
- ⁵⁸ SZSL, 127: 22b–23a, KX 25, 9, *guimao* (1686.11.7). I cannot accept Perdue’s judgment: “Galdan and the four great (Khalkha) princes.” See Perdue, *China Marches West*, 143. The “Four Great Tayijis” here should be identified as Galdan of the Junghar, “Borukhuji *tayiji* of the Khoshuut,

Aldar *tayiji* of the Dorbet, and Ayuki *tayiji* of the Torghuut.” See SZSL, 112: 13a, KX 22, 9, *guiwei*.

⁵⁹ Perdue, *China Marches West*, 143.

⁶⁰ SZSL, 116: 24a, KX 23, 9, *yihai* (1684.10.20).

⁶¹ *Khitāy-namih: A Persian Text Describing a Voyage to China by Ali Akbar Khitāi in 1516–1517*, ed. Iraj Afshar (Tihirān: Markaz-i Asnād-i Farhangī-i Āsiyā, 1979), 143; Sawada Minoru, “16 seiki zengo no chūō ajia niokeru tsūshō nettowāku,” in *Kai’iki sekai no nettowāku to jūsdōsei*, ed. Kawamura Tomotaka, Kobayashi Isao, and Nakai Sei’ichi (Toyama: Katsura shobō, 2008), 59.

⁶² There were also restrictions on the numbers of tribute missions that were permitted in Suzhou. Because of this, Xining and the towns Duoba and Baitaer in Qinghai, which had no restrictions, were allowed to prosper greatly as Junghar–Qing trade-points in the early eighteenth century. See Haneda, *Chūō ajiaishi kenkyū*, 261, 365–72.

⁶³ Perdue, *China Marches West*, 257–70; Cai Jiayi, *Qingdai xinjiang shehui jingji shigang* (Beijing: Renmin chubanshe, 2006), 73–89. For the quantities and the values of the commodities traded between the Junghar and the Qing, see Cai Jiayi, “Zhunge’er tong zhongyuan diqu de maoyi jiaohuan: Liangfen zhunge’er de gouhuo danwei shixi,” *Minzu yanjiu* 6 (1982): 51–57.

⁶⁴ *Junjichu manwen zhunge’er shizhe dang yibian*, ed. Zhongguo diyi lishi dang’anguan and Zhongguo bianjiang minzu diqu lishi yu dili yanjiu zhongxin (Beijing: Zhongyang minzu daxue chubanshe, 2009) (hereafter JZSD), vol. 2, text, 1014–17; tr., 1783–89, QL 7, 11, 22 (1742.12.18), the Manchu memorial of Ortai (Ch. *Ertai*).

⁶⁵ We can observe several Oyirads by the name of Mamut—Mamut, the chief of the Jakhachin tribe, for example. See Onuma Takahiro, “Shindai kenryūchō ni okeru jahachin no dōkō: Shinchō ni yoru mongoru shobu shihai no ichi sokumen,” *Shikyō* 48 (2004): 80–83.

⁶⁶ JZSD, vol. 2, text, 1080–81; tr., 1802, QL 7, 12, 9 (1743.1.4), the Manchu memorial of Ortai.

⁶⁷ PDZE *qianbian* 47: 24b–28a, QL 8, 12, *dīngchou* (1744.2.11); Millward, *Eurasian Crossroads*, 93.

⁶⁸ JZSD, vol. 3, text, 2216–20; tr., 2719, QL 16, 2, 8 (1751.3.5), the Manchu memorial of Akdun (Ch. *Akedun*).

⁶⁹ JZSD, vol. 2, text, 1495–98; tr., 1866–57, QL 7, 11, 19 (1742.12.15), the Manchu memorial of Haiwang (Ch. *Haiwang*).

⁷⁰ JZSD, vol. 3, text, 2509–10; tr., 2776, QL 17, 7, 8 (1752.8.16), the Manchu report of Arbin (Ch. *Aerbin*).

⁷¹ In addition to the officially regulated trade, illegal trade was also being conducted between the “Muslims of the Junghar” (Ma. *jun gar i hoise*) and the Manchu and Khalkha officials of the Qing at the guardposts on the border in Khobdo. *Neige daku dang’an* (Document category of the Fu Sinian Library at the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, Taipei), 204132-001, QL 16, 3, 27 (1751.4.22), the Manchu edict of the Qianlong emperor.

⁷² Mano Eiji, “Nairiku ajia shi sōron,” in *Nairiku ajia* (Chi’iki kara no sekaishi, 6), ed. Mano Eiji, Nakami Tatsuo, Hori Sunao, and Komatsu Hisao (Tokyo: Asahi sinbunsha, 1992), 15–16.

⁷³ Saguchi, *Shinkyō minzoku shi kenkyū*, 242–43.

⁷⁴ J. Millward, *Beyond the Pass: Economy, Ethnicity, and Empire in Qing Central Asia, 1759–1864* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 154–56, 162–75.

⁷⁵ *Daqing gaozong chun huangdi shilu* (1807) (hereafter GZSL), 779: 18a–19a, QL 32, 2, *renxu* (1767.3.27); GZSL, 780: 16b–17b, QL 32, 3, *wuchen* (1767.4.2). I will investigate this issue in subsequent research.

⁷⁶ GZSL, 1464: 1a–3a, QL 59, 11, *yiyou* (1794.11.23).