

DEVELOPMENT OF CENTRAL EURASIAN STUDIES IN JAPAN DURING 2000–2015*

This article aims to present research trends in Central Eurasian Studies in Japan during 2000–2015, following an earlier analysis by Komatsu Hisao 小松久男 [Komatsu 2003].¹ My focus is on how Central Eurasia was placed in historical research in Japan during the period in question. In addition, I also focus on several topics that have recently been extensively discussed in Japanese academia.

In terms of recent Japanese research trends, an introductory overview has been published [Komatsu, et al. 2018]. In relation to this, we also have introductory works categorized under other categories like the Introduction to Mongol studies (see [Yokkaichi 2011]) and the Introduction to Russian history (see [Uyama 2012]).

1. SILK ROAD AND CENTRAL ASIA / INNER ASIA / CENTRAL EURASIA

When considering regional historiography, how regions are divided is evidently quite important. In Japan, the term Central Eurasia (Chūō Yūrashia 中央ユーラシア) is comparatively new. *History of Central Eurasia*, published in 2000 [Komatsu 2000], and *Cyclopedia of Central Eurasia* [Komatsu, et al. 2005] decisively fixed the framework for how Central Eurasia is perceived in Japan. Central Eurasia is a distinctly larger geopolitical region

than the one referred to by the previously used terms Inner Asia and Central Asia (Nairiku Ajia 内陸アジア and Chūō Ajia 中央アジア; here, the five *-stans* plus Xinjiang) and includes parts of the former Soviet Union as well as the Caucasus. *Slavic Eurasian Studies* [Hokkaidō Daigaku Surabu Kenkyū Sentā 2008] and *New approaches to Eurasian Studies* [Shiokawa, et al. 2012], the series that were published later, are close to the framework of the newly established Central Eurasian Studies in Japan. Significantly, the region contains a large Muslim population. In this sense, locating Manchuria, Mongolia, and Tibet within the Central Eurasian context is problematic [Moriyasu 2011]. It is dangerous to simply discard these regions in the east. Therefore, this article tries to cover these “eastern” regions as much as possible.

The discussion on a geographical region should focus on the role and system. Due to its location, it has a role in connecting large territories by transportation networks. According to Seo Tatsuhiko 妹尾達彦, who focuses on surface transportation networks connecting the north and south, the pre-modern history went by the understanding that the nomadic zone in the north and the agricultural zone in the south sandwiched the agro-pastoral zone [Seo 2014: 187]. This image is analogous to the “Silk Road” mentioned later in the paper.

Further, systems or institutions have to be focused on. For example, are military systems like the steppe nomadic cavalry of the Mongols and imperial guards in the royal courts [Kubo 2014]. In relation to the former, Hirata Yōichirō 平田陽一郎 located the Twenty-four Armies (Ershisi-jun 二十四軍) system of the Western Wei and Northern Zhou in the genealogy of nomadic military systems referring to the tradition of Xianbei 鮮卑 [Hirata 2011]. Iwao Kazushi 岩尾一史 also related a group of 10,000 houses in the Old Tibet to the military systems of nomadic states in Central Eurasia [Iwao 2004]. In this sense, Kawaguchi Takushi’s 川口琢司 analysis of the early period of the Timurid rule examines the inheritance of the systems since the Mongol Empire as well [Kawaguchi 2007].

Moreover, there have been efforts to deconstruct these regions. Although his main topic is not Central Eurasia, Haneda Masashi’s 羽田正 attempt to deconstruct the “Islamic Area” (Isurāmu chiiki イスラーム地域) or “Islamic World” (Isurāmu sekai イスラーム世界) might have had an impact on Central Eurasian Studies since the region has a large Muslim population [Haneda 2005].² While some researchers like Hamada Masami 濱田正美 gave careful consideration to this [Hamada 2006a], the general tendency of a deconstructive analysis cannot be changed. Further, Uyama Tomohiko 宇山智彦 considered constructivism in the context of the regional epistemology. He emphasizes the importance of a “broader perspec-

tive” for research on Central Eurasia. The author of this article agrees with his opinion [Uyama 2008: 28].

Modern Japan, due to its own interest in northeast China, has had an apparent prejudice toward this region. As a result, the “*Man-Mō*” 満蒙 (Manchuria and Mongolia) and the independence movements in these regions were perceived with much factiousness in Japan [Nakami 2013]. For northwest China, in Japan, “*Saiiki*” 西域 (*Xiyu* in Chinese, Western region) and “Silk Road” are very widely known terms. However, such terminology is to be deconstructed. For example, recent research on the Ōtani expeditions clearly shows the relationship between the policy and the perception regarding the region [Shirasu 2012].

Here, it is inevitable to remember the disputes on the Silk Road in Japan that began in the 1970s. Mano Eiji 間野英二, insisting on the “de-Silk-Road” and emphasized agriculture and north-south relations [Mano 2008]. While Mano was specializing on the Western Turkestan side in the beginning of the disputes, he criticized the Oasis theory of Matsuda Hisao 松田壽男 who presented a theory focusing on the oasis in the Eastern Turkestan. Uyama, who had previously supported Mano’s opinion, recently mentioned that researchers in the modern era were “opposed to the tendency that Central Asia was regarded simply as a relay point of trade or cultural interaction,” focusing on the epistemology of the region [Iwasaki and Uyama 2015: 247].

Moriyasu Takao 森安孝夫 is one of the opponents of Mano and has repeatedly criticized his narrative. However, if the basis of their insistence originally has a disagreement as mentioned above, it is rather better to consider the strategic use of the “Silk Road” in explanations of historical facts. It is because the remaining historical material in local languages is still “not enough to narrate the history of the region in the self-contained manner” [Yoshida Y. 2012: 394]. In this regard, the opinion of Arakawa Masaharu 荒川正晴 is worth considering too. He mentioned that it is necessary to investigate the Central Asian history from the viewpoint of a “wider region” that is connected with the outer sphere [Arakawa 2010: 4–5]. Such viewpoint has sufficiently clarified the details of broader trade and migration. Even in the modern era, the long-distance route for trade has certainly existed. On this point, Shiotani Masachika 塩谷昌史 revealed that the Russian Empire “utilized the network of Asian merchants” including the Bukharan merchants in Central Asia [Shiotani 2014: 272]. In my view, it is important to balance the indigenous perspective regarding a region with the wide-ranging relationships the region may have had.

As a new trend in research on the Silk Road, much attention is paid to the role of Sogdians before the Mongol Empire. Above all, we can consider

the monograph by Moribe Yutaka 森部豊 who highlighted the existence of the “Sogdian Turks” [Moribe 2010]. Sogdians were devoted to the Silk Road trade as well, a point raised by Arakawa. He now suggests that Sogdians dispatched by nomad groups as diplomatic representatives or attendants were accepted by the oasis states. He calls such relations “symbiotic relations,” which could be a new narrative in historiography in Japan [Arakawa 2010: 544, 615].

2. WHAT IS INTEGRATED BY THE HISTORY OF THE MONGOL EMPIRE

The global history³ during the Mongol period is apparently in line with that of the former “Silk Road.” Arakawa showed that the 13th century followed the interconnection that had been there between the Islamic region and the Steppe route since the 9th century, the activities of Sogds, and those of their successors, the Uyghur merchants [Arakawa 2010: 551]. First of all, the widespread trade and international commerce are worth noting. Moriyasu traced the origin of the *Ortuγ* merchants in the Mongol era back to the Uyghur Buddhist merchants [Moriyasu 2015: 430]. Yokkaichi Yasuhiro 四日市康博 found that the *Ortuγ* merchants sometimes consisted of Chinese diasporas as well and that such merchants worked together with the Muslims. Consequently, he showed that the activities of the *Ortuγ* merchants in long-distance trade derived from the “contract of mutual assistance and a safety guarantee among the nomads and the merchants” [Yokkaichi 2008: 75]. From the perspective of the continuity since the Uyghur period, Matsui Dai 松井太 suggested that the taxation systems of the Uyghurs provided the basis for those of the Mongol Empire [Matsui 2005: 79]. Kuroda Akino-bu 黒田明伸 analyzes the role of silver, whose circulation increased with the development of international commerce [Kuroda 2009].

The work of Sugiyama Masaaki 杉山正明, which clarified the system of the Mongol Empire, has an important place in Japanese studies on the Mongol Empire [Sugiyama M. 2004]. Particularly, the appanage system for royal families and the tripartite division of the Empire into the Central, Left, and Right wings became the standard for the studies on the Mongol Empire. In the context of regional institutions mentioned above, this period also can be categorized as the period of north-Asian nomadic societies. This is partly proved by the relationship between the members of the royal family and nomadic commanders (analogous to the “*Gokenin*” 御家人 organization in the medieval Japan), which was discussed by Shimo Hirotoishi 志茂碩敏 [Shimo 2013]. Kawamoto Masatomo 川本正知 also tries to pres-

ent an overview of the rule of the Mongol Empire from the viewpoint of military organizations and expeditions [Kawamoto 2013].

The Mongol expansion reached the Rus', and the topic of the Russia under the Mongol rule is frequently discussed in Japan. From the viewpoint of Russia, Kuryūzawa Takeo 栗生沢猛夫, using the *baskak* system as a reference point, considers that the rule of the Mongols over the Russians was indirect [Kuryūzawa 2007]. By contrast, from the perspective of the Jochi-ulus, while Akasaka Tsuneaki 赤坂恒明 emphasized the unification and Islamization under the reign of Ozbeg Khan in the first half of the 14th century [Akasaka 2005], Kawaguchi and Nagamine Hiroyuki 長峰博之 highlight the “two-winged” regime of *Ulus-i Juci* [Kawaguchi and Nagamine 2013].⁴

The Mongol rulers had converted to Islam [Yajima 2000]; and we know about the mutual relations between some Mongol rulers and Muslim merchants [Yokkaichi 2006]. Thus, the Mongol Empire and its successors were trying to be connected with the Islamic world but did not fully experience Islamization. It has to be noted that the Mongol mainland and the Yuan Dynasty did not accept the Islam.⁵ With the fall of the Empire, Eastern Turkestan and the regions further west were clearly disconnected from the eastern Buddhist world.

Various types of historical materials are also relevant for studying the Mongol Empire. Shiraishi Noriyuki's 白石典之 consideration based on archaeological expeditions and his discussion on the “Peri-Urban Area of Kharakhorum” are highly convincing [Shiraishi 2002]. Rashid al-Din's *Jāmi' al-tavārīkh* is still considered an important historical material. Uno Nobuhiro 宇野伸浩, analyzing the “tale of Oghuz Khan” mentioned in *Jāmi' al-tavārīkh*, tried to show the connection of Mongols with the Islamic world [Uno 2002]. Significantly enough, Ōtsuka Osamu 大塚修 made a clear reference to a work by Qashani, based on which Rashid al-Din had completed his World History [Ōtsuka 2014].⁶

3. THREE PERSPECTIVES FOR MODERN CENTRAL EURASIA: ISLAM, CHINA, AND RUSSIA

The development of Islam and the extension of the Iranian world into Central Eurasia were simultaneous processes. “Historical Iran” includes a part of Central Eurasia [Kimura 2008]. Moreover, the usage of Persian as a literary language indicates that this region was situated in a “Persinate society” [Morimoto 2009].

Islam in Central Eurasia is characterized by the prosperity of Sufi or-

ders such as Naqshbandiya. These orders were, through Eastern Turkestan, linked with Islam in China or Islam of the Hui Muslims. In this regard, the research connecting Ferghana with Xinjiang is worth mentioning here [Shinmen, et al. 2013]. It is safe to say that Islam bridges Eastern and Western Turkestan. Sufism in Central Eurasia frequently produced “holy families” for whom were composed a large number of hagiographies to establish their religious authority. Hamada Masami clearly shows the role of hagiographies as fictive stories made to demonstrate the ideology of the religious authority of Khojas, which had resulted in the Khans submitting to the political power of Khojas [Hamada 2006b: 28].

It is quite significant how those who related with Sufism were engaged in political affairs. Kawahara Yayoi’s 河原弥生 paper, using the cases in the Khoqand Khanate (or Ferghana), clearly indicated the influence of Sufism from India, and relations between rulers and Sufis. She distinctly pointed out that Khoja traditions are preserved even today [Kawahara 2005]. Sufi saints also participated in the anti-colonial movements [Hamada 2008: 86]. This is in contrast with the Muslim intellectuals or ulama under the Russian or Qing rule who sometimes responded to imperial rule positively [Komatsu 2007]. Revival of Islam after the collapse of the Soviet Union is still being researched. Here, I only present the findings of anthropologists [Yoshida S. 2004; Fujimoto 2011; Kikuta 2013].

Next, reviews focus on China from the perspective of the Qing Empire as a Manchu state.⁷ Ishibashi Takao 石橋崇雄, without a detailed discussion, presented the structure of the empire as a “unified multi-ethnic state” [Ishibashi 2000: 52]. Sugiyama Kiyohiko 杉山清彦 extensively discussed the Eight Banners (Baqi 八旗) system of the Qing within the Central Eurasian history [Sugiyama K. 2015]. His opinion is clearly expressed in his comment that “the Eight Banners system is just the Manchu version of the federal structure of the Central Eurasian military-political consistency” [Sugiyama K. 2015: 301]. Simultaneously, Tanii Yōko 谷井陽子 published her monograph on the Eight Banners, emphasizing that they have to be seen as a centralized organization under the unified rule [Tanii 2015]. Thus, the two books deal with different phases. What is more important is that Manchuria is seen within Central Eurasia in this context, and so is Tibet.⁸

The Jungar era (the 17th and the first half of the 18th centuries) is of significance, which can be seen as the connection between the post-Mongol era and the changes thereafter. Shibuya Kōichi 澁谷浩一 researches the relations among Qing, Russia, and Jungar [Shibuya 2011]. The expeditions by the Empire, including that of Jungaria, were a part of the expansion of the imperial self-identification [Chengzhi 2009]. Onuma Takahiro’s 小沼孝

博 work, clarifying the circumstances of the Jungar expedition in the middle of the 18th century, described the process of the integration of the Qing authority into Central Eurasia [Onuma 2014]. His analysis is important since it covers not only the perspective of the Qing court but also the opinions of local officials in Xinjiang based on their direct reports (*Lufu zouzhe* in Manchu). Noda Jin 野田仁, from the viewpoint of the Kazakhs, considering their relations with Russia, indicated the shifts in the relationships between the Qing Empire and the Kazakhs [Noda 2011].

What is important is the multiethnic policy of the Qing Empire, which led to the geopolitics of modern Central Eurasia. Apparently, there was pluralism. Here, I cannot enter a deep discussion on the Mongols and Tibet. However, researchers on other regions can refer to Oka Hiroki's 岡洋樹 work regarding the Qing rule over the Khalkha Mongols, which presents in detail the difference between the perspective of the Qing central court and the traditional indigenous governing system [Oka 2007]. In Xinjiang, the indirect rule was adopted, which can be compared with the colonial rule of the Russian Empire in Western Turkestan.

As Uyama clearly indicated [Uyama 2012], the characteristics of the Russian Empire have been much discussed recently. It may be due to the increased access to the archives in Russia and the former Soviet countries. In particular, researchers pay much attention to the interrelationships between the Empire and the Muslims under the imperial rule, far from the previous perception of the imperial rule as the “Prison of Nations.” For the 17th and 18th centuries, Hamamoto Mami 濱本真実 analyzed the acceptance of the Russian Orthodoxy by the upper classes of the Tatars, who by that time were Muslims and considered that the Christianization since the middle of the 17th century attempted the assimilation of the Tatars into Russians [Hamamoto 2009].

For the late imperial period, Naganawa Norihiro 長縄宣博 explained that the Russian imperial rule, defining the “orthodox” school based on their knowledge of the Muslim society, tried to exclude the new Muslim intellectuals [Naganawa 2013]. He also paid attention to the development of Muslim networks within the Empire and highlighted their connection with secular education [Naganawa 2014].⁹ Isogai Masumi 磯貝真澄 also examined the Muslims in the Volga-Ural region, showing the religious and educational connection between Bukhara and the Volga [Isogai M. 2012]. One of the ways to consider the impact of the imperial rule on the local society of Central Eurasia is to research the legal systems, in particular, the transformation of the indigenous legal systems (Sharia and nomadic customary laws) under the Russian colonial rule [Horikawa, et al. 2014].

In terms of the interrelations between the Empire and the peripheral

ethnicities, Akiyama Tetsu 秋山徹 focused on the role of *manaps* among Kyrgyz as the “collaborator” connecting the imperial rule and indigenous groups [Akiyama 2011].¹⁰ Naganuma Hideyuki 長沼秀幸 investigated the relations between the royalties and the duties of the Kazakh *sultans* [Naganuma 2015]. Besides discussing relations between the local government (Khiva Khanate) and Russia, Shioya Akifumi 塩谷哲史 discussed the participation of various actors in the economic history of the Khanate of Khiva, including the enterprisers and their confrontation with the nomadic people under the rule of Khanate [Shioya 2014].

Finally, let us consider the ruling system of the Russian Empire in Turkestan and the Steppe. Obiya Chika 帯谷知可 analyzed the integration of ethnicities other than Russians in Turkestan from the Russian viewpoint [Obiya 2005]. It is necessary to take into consideration the differences among the administrative units. In relation to this, Uyama presented the “particularist policy” of the colonial administration according to the classification of people based on the orientalist stereotypes [Uyama 2007]. For an insight into Russians’ perception of the people of Central Eurasia, the discussion on Eurasianism is worth referring to [Hama 2010]. Due to my limited ability, this review lacks comments on the Caucasian study. I only mention that Caucasus is viewed as a frontier, a boundary, and it belongs to both Europe and Asia, which is well demonstrated by Maeda Hirotake’s 前田弘毅 attempt to bridge the Russian and Iranian histories by tracing the genealogy of Armenians in Tbilisi [Maeda 2012].

4. NATIONALITIES OR ETHNICITIES IN THE SOVIET UNION AND CHINA

An important opportunity to define the national identities in Central Asia was the national demarcation in 1924. Obiya, based on a discussion by A. Haugen, analyzed the claims of each nation [Obiya 2012]. From a similar viewpoint, Kumakura Jun 熊倉潤 pointed out that the plan of unification was rejected in Central Asia using the argument of the right to self-determination [Kumakura 2014]. Interestingly, for Armenians, because they were present both in the Russian and Ottoman Empires, it is better to consider the issue of their nationalism from the viewpoint of the diaspora [Yoshimura 2009].

Shiokawa Nobuaki 塩川伸明 greatly contributed to the discussion on the formation and definition of nations in the Soviet Union as a whole [Shiokawa 2004]. The results of his research partly touched on the Soviet language policy. This was closely connected with the *Korenizatsiya* (nativ-

ization) and resulted in an education system in national languages, which led to bilingualism (accordingly, emphasis was put on Russian) as well [Shiokawa 2015: 255]. Arai Yukiyasu 荒井幸康 tried to investigate the interrelations between the language (and the letter) policy and national identities, comparing the Buriats and Volga-Kalmyk cases [Arai 2006].

Timur Dadabaev from Uzbekistan tried to reconstruct the confrontation between the Soviet Union as a state and “nations” under its rule based on the oral history [Dadabaev 2010]. The confrontation was also found in the field of history. Tateishi Yōko 立石洋子 analyzed the difference between the ethnic histories and the Soviet “national” history from the perspective of the Soviet national integration [Tateishi 2011]. In this context, the revolts by Shamil and Kenesary were sometimes evaluated negatively. The relationships between the national histories in the new independent countries and historiographies were discussed by Uyama [Uyama 2005]. It goes without saying that this is also connected with the issue of nationalism [Obiya 2003]. For the ethnic conflicts, Hirose Yōko 廣瀬陽子 considered the Nagorno-Karabakh issue as a place of confrontation of territorial nationalisms [Hirose 2004].

The Comintern played a crucial role in controlling the nations lying outside the territory of the Soviet Union. As Aoki Masahiro 青木雅浩 indicated, it was important that T. Ryskylov, a Kazakh communist and the representative of the Comintern in Mongolia, included Xinjiang, which contained Turkic populations, in his activities [Aoki 2011]. The Soviet policy to attract Outer Mongolia and Xinjiang, which were previously under the Qing rule, through Comintern enables us to see the region as more diverse.

Recent research has revealed that up to mid-20th century, the Soviet Union remained influential in Xinjiang or Eastern Turkestan next to Soviet Central Asia. Especially during the first half of the reign of Sheng Shicai 盛世才 (governor of Xinjiang during 1934–44), the Soviet Union controlled Xinjiang by dispatching officials through its general consulate [Terayama 2015]. Additionally, Terayama Kyōsuke’s 寺山恭輔 work succeeded in illustrating the affairs of Xinjiang during the interwar period by effectively using the Soviet archival documents. One of the reasons for the Soviet interest in Xinjiang was the latter’s importance as a source of supplies. Here, the connection between the Soviet Central Asia and Xinjiang has to be taken into consideration again.

In contrast, how can we regard nations in Modern China, above all, in Xinjiang? The collapse of the Qing Empire led to its dissolution into ethnic communities. For example, Outer Mongolia was split from China, and the ethno-national identity became uncertain. Merse, from Hulunbuir and of Daur origin, who had a vague identity in the Inner Mongolia, embodied

this uncertainty [Nakami 2001]. After 1949, not all of the ethnic policies of China had their origin in those of the Soviet Union. China clearly adopted not the ethnic self-determination but the ethnic autonomy. Nevertheless, at least the language policy discussed below was in accordance with the Soviet system.

The Regional Ethnic Autonomy System (Minzu Quyu Zizhi zhidu 民族区域自治制度) has been the basis of Chinese ethnic policies. According to Okamoto Masataka 岡本雅享, the system attempts to achieve national integration through Chinese language education [Okamoto 2001]. It is true that some scholars believed that the system was established for affirmative action for the ethnic minorities, similar to what was attempted in the Soviet Union [Mōri 1998]. Nevertheless, national integration has been a major issue for China. Thus, we have to always consider the conflicts between integration and ethno-nationalisms. Further, in northwest China, the problem of imbalance or disparity among ethnic minorities was really noticed after a significant amount of development, including the Great Development of the West (*Xibu dakaifa* 西部大開發), occurred [Kagami 2008; Kojima 2009].

As in the case of Soviet Union, language education played a major role in addressing the ethnic problem. In China, there is much focus on “bilingual education” (*xuangyu jiaoyu* 雙語教育). The emphasis is basically on the Han Chinese language and ethnic minorities are required to learn to use Chinese. The bilingual education for the Uyghurs was analyzed by Guljanat Anatulla, an Uyghur scholar [Guljanat 2015]. Their Sinicization can be a topic for research. According to Kojima Yūsuke 小嶋祐輔, the Uyghurs in Xinjiang had a negative perception regarding Sinicization [Kojima 2010]. Research on ethnic minorities in Xinjiang, above all the Uyghurs, is restricted. Among other possibilities, attempts to relativize national identities by focusing on the influential figures like Isa Alptekin and Muhammad Imin Bughra, who played political roles before 1940s, are notable [Shinmen 2001; Shimizu, et al. 2007]. Mizutani Naoko’s 水谷尚子 interview on the relations between the Soviet rule and the Uyghurs is of importance [Mizutani 2012].

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS: FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

The following fields are expected to develop further with new methodologies: environmental history [Chida 2009], data processing based on GIS [Ueda 2013], and gender study [Suda 2011]. So long as the research is conducted in Japan, the topic would be related to Central Eurasia’s connection

with modern Japan and its foreign policy. Research on Japanese policy toward the Muslims in Asia will be a model case, which is being reconstructed based on the new materials [Sawai 2014; Levent 2015].¹¹

Since the dissolution of the Soviet Union, regional transformation is still ongoing. In writing the history of the region, it is necessary to consciously refer to current political affairs. The influence of Russia and China is still significant. Thus, regional unions like Eurasian Economic Union led by the Russian initiative or Shanghai Cooperation Organization are to be considered. The latter is cautious about the Islamic factor generally associated with Central Eurasia. Moreover, the local perception is worth noting. An example of this was the “Eurasian” policy of the ex-Kazakhstani President N. Nazarbaev.

Therefore, it is necessary to distinguish researching the regional history from understanding and narrating the region (for instance, CIS, former communist bloc, and People’s Republic of China). The Silk Road discussed earlier is also a case in point. In other words, it is important to consider the region regardless of current national borders. Taking the ethnic minorities in China as an example, they are greatly influenced by trends of national integration, and their histories tend to be veiled under the “national history.” However, when considering the traditional regions that are located beyond the national border (in the ex-Soviet territory as well), their histories should not be viewed using frameworks generally applied to modern China [Shimizu, et al. 2007]. As mentioned before, the Islamic perspective is also inevitable.

In relation to the multilingualism of Central Eurasia, one can study the history of Central Eurasia from the viewpoint of languages. Researchers have already begun to analyze the extensive use of Persian and Chagatay-Turkic. For the pre-Mongol Empire period, the development of the Sogdian language is worth mentioning. Yoshida’s discussion on the language contacts is referable for this point [Yoshida Y. 2011].

It is true that there is a split between the pre-modern and modern times in terms of historiography. Thus, when considering the entire Central Eurasian history as one continuous flow of events, the issue of Islamization is unavoidable. It is easy to argue that Islamization split the history. Nonetheless, there has to be another view to connect the indigenous factors with the Islamic elements. A long-term historical perspective seems to be required to accomplish this.

NOTES

- * This is the revised and translated version of my previous article in Japanese, “Chūō Yūrashia-shi kenkyū no tenkai” 中央ユーラシア史研究の展開, in *Sekaiishi-zō no saikōsei* 世界史像の再構成 (Perspectives on world history), Dai 4-ji gendai rekishigaku no seika to kadai 第4次現代歴史学の成果と課題 (Historical Studies in Japan from 2001 to 2015: Trends and Perspectives), vol. 2, ed. Rekishigaku Kenkyūkai 歴史学研究会 (The Historical Science Society of Japan), pp. 34–47, Tokyo: Sekibundō Shuppan 績文堂出版 (2017).
- 1 A small part of this article reviews the same literature as that covered in Kubo’s reviews [Kubo 2003]. For a specific overview on modern history, please refer to Uyama’s comments [Uyama 2015].
 - 2 Haneda also refers to the perception of the Russian orientalists, which is very much related to Central Eurasian Studies.
 - 3 In relation to the spatial perception at that time, Sugiyama pointed out that the map ignored the existence of the Ulus of Juchi in the analyses on the map “*Hunyi Jiangli Lidai Guodu zhi Tu*” (Map of Integrated Regions and Terrains and of Historical Countries and Capitals) [Sugiyama M. 2007].
 - 4 Republished in English, see [Kawaguchi and Nagamine 2016].
 - 5 Importantly, recent research on the epigraphs revealed the existence of those related to *waqf* and tombs of Sufis as well [Isogai K. and Yajima 2010].
 - 6 His monograph in Japanese was published later in [Ōtsuka 2017].
 - 7 See [Sugiyama K. 2014].
 - 8 Nevertheless, some researchers object to the theory of “integration of ethnicities” by China or Manchus from the viewpoint of the Tibet-Qing relations [Ishihama 2011: 9]. On the contrary, the shift in the attitudes of the emperors to Tibet after the Qianlong period is pointed out [Murakami 2012].
 - 9 Later, his works were published as a book [Naganawa 2017].
 - 10 He also published his works as a book [Akiyama 2016].
 - 11 Terayama also touches upon this issue in his monograph [Terayama 2015].

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Akasaka Tsuneaki 赤坂恒明. 2005. *Juchi-ei sho-seiken-shi no kenkyū* ジュチ裔諸政権史の研究 (Study on Jochid dynasties). Tokyo: Kazama Shobō 風間書房.
- Akiyama Tetsu 秋山徹. 2011. *Kuruguzu yūboku shakai ni okeru Roshia tōchi no tenkai: Tōchi no chūkaisha to shite no Manapu no ichiduke wo chūshin*

- ni クルグズ遊牧社会におけるロシア統治の展開：統治の仲介者としてのマナプの位置づけを中心に (A study on the evolution of Russian imperial rule over the Kyrgyz nomads: Clues from transformations in the position of *Manaps* as collaborators in Russian rule). *Suravu Kenkyū* スラヴ研究 (Slavic Studies) 58: 27–59.
- . 2016. *Yūboku eiyū to Roshia Teikoku: Aru Kuruguzu shuryō no kiseki* 遊牧英雄とロシア帝国：あるクルグズ首領の軌跡 (Nomadic hero and the Russian Empire: The path of a Kyrgyz leader). Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai 東京大学出版会.
- Aoki Masahiro 青木雅浩. 2011. *Mongoru kingendaishi kenkyū 1921–1924 nen: Soto-Mongoru to Sovieto, Kominterun* モンゴル近現代史研究 1921–1924年：外モンゴルとソヴィエト、コミンテルン (Outer Mongolia's relationship with Soviet Russia and the Comintern: From 1921 to 1924). Tokyo: Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu 早稲田大学出版部.
- Arai Yukiyasu 荒井幸康. 2006. '*Gengo*' no tōgō to bunri: 1920–1940 nendai no Mongoru, Buriyāto, Karumuiku no gengo seisaku no sōkan kankei no chūshin ni 「言語」の統合と分離：1920–1940年代のモンゴル・ブリヤート・カルムイクの言語政策の相関関係を中心に (Integration and separation of 'language': Language policies of Mongolian peoples in the USSR and Mongolia, 1920–1940). Tokyo: Sangensha 三元社.
- Arakawa Masaharu 荒川正晴. 2010. *Yūrashia no kōtsū, kōeki to Tō Teikoku* ユーラシアの交通・交易と唐帝国 (Tang Empire and communications and trade in Eurasia). Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku Shuppankai 名古屋大学出版会.
- Chengzhi (Kicengge) 承志. 2009. *Daichin-Gurun to sono jidai: Teikoku no keisei to Hakki shakai* ダイチン・グルンとその時代：帝国の形成と八旗社会 (The Great Qing state and its epoch: The structure of empire and banner society). Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku Shuppankai.
- Chida Tetsurō 地田徹朗. 2009. Sengo Sūtārin-ki Torukumenisutan ni okeru unga kensetsu keikakuto Araru-kai mondai 戦後スターリン期トルクメニスタンにおける運河建設計画とアラル海問題 (Grandiose canal construction projects in Turkmenistan and the Aral Sea problem in the post-war Stalin period). *Suravu Kenkyū* 56: 1–36.
- Dadabaev, Timur ダダバエフ, ティムール. 2010. *Kioku no naka no Soren: Chūō Ajia no hitobito no ikita shakai-shugi jidai* 記憶の中のソ連：中央アジアの人々の生きた社会主義時代 (Remembering Soviet past: Everyday life in Soviet Central Asia). Tsukuba: Tsukuba Daigaku Shuppankai 筑波大学出版会.
- Fujimoto Tōko 藤本透子. 2011. *Yomigaeru shisha girei: Gendai Kazahu no Isurāmu fukkō* よみがえる死者儀礼：現代カザフのイスラーム復興 (The Revitalization of Memorial Rituals: Dynamics of Islam in Contemporary Kazakhstan). Tokyo: Fūkyōsha 風響社.
- Guljanat, Anatulla グリジャナティ, アナトラ (古力加娜提, 艾乃吐拉). 2015. *Chūgoku no shōsū minzoku kyōiku seisaku to sono jittai: Shinkyō Uiguru Jichiku ni okeru Sōgo Kyōiku* 中国の少数民族教育政策とその実態：新疆

- ウイグル自治区における双語教育 (China's education policy for ethnic minorities and its reality: Bilingual education in the Xinjiang Autonomous region). Tokyo: Sangensha.
- Hama Yukiko 浜由樹子. 2010. *Yūrashia-shugi toha nanika* ユーラシア主義とは何か (What is the Eurasianism?). Yokohama: Seibunsha 成文社.
- Hamada Masami 濱田正美. 2006a. Konan, Bokugaku, 'uchi' to 'soto' 湖南・樸学・「内」と「外」 (Naito Konan, "Plain Science," inner history, and outer history). *Shirin* 史林 89-1: 1-21.
- . 2006b. *Higashi Torukisutan, Chagatai-go seijaden no kenkyū* 東トルキスタン・チャガタイ語聖者伝の研究 (Chagatay hagiographies of Eastern Turkestan). Kyoto: Kyōto Daigaku Daigakuin Bungaku Kenkyūka 京都大学大学院文学研究科.
- . 2008. *Chūō Ajia no Isurāmu* 中央アジアのイスラーム (Islam in Central Asia). Tokyo: Yamakawa Shuppansha 山川出版社.
- Hamamoto Mami 濱本真実. 2009. 'Seinaru Roshia' no Isurāmu: 17-18 seiki *Tatārujin no seikyō kaishū* 「聖なるロシア」のイスラーム: 17-18世紀タタール人の正教改宗 (Islam in holy Russia: The Tatar conversion to the Russian Orthodox Church). Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai.
- Haneda Masashi 羽田正. 2005. *Isurāmu Sekai no sōzō* イスラーム世界の創造 (Creating the notion of the Islamic world). Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai.
- Hirata Yōichiro 平田陽一郎. 2011. Sei-Gi, Hoku-Shū no nijūyongun to 'Fuheisei' 西魏・北周の二十四軍と「府兵制」 (The twenty-four army system and the *fubing* system of the Western Wei and Northern Zhou). *Tōyōshi Kenkyū* 東洋史研究 (The journal of Oriental researches) 70-2: 225-259.
- Hirose Yōko 廣瀬陽子. 2004. Nagoruno-Karabahu Funsō no isō: Reisen shūketsu no eikyō to wahei no mosaku wo chūshin ni ナゴルノ・カラバフ紛争の位相: 冷戦終結の影響と平和の模索を中心に (The phases of Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict: Focusing on the impacts of the end of the Cold War and searching for the peace settlement). *Shakai Kagaku Kenkyū* 社会科学研究 (Journal of Social Science) 55-5/6: 131-165.
- Hokkaidō Daigaku Surabu Kenkyū Sentā 北海道大学スラブ研究センター (Slavic Research Center, Hokkaido University), ed. 2008. *Kōza Surabu Yūrashia-gaku* 講座スラブ・ユーラシア学 (Slavic Eurasian Studies). 3 vols. Tokyo: Kōdansha 講談社.
- Horikawa Tōru 堀川徹, et al., eds. 2014. *Sharīa to Roshia Teikoku: Kindai Chūō Yūrashia no hō to shakai* シャリーアとロシア帝国: 近代中央ユーラシアの法と社会 (Sharia and the Russian Empire: Law and society of modern Central Eurasia). Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten 臨川書店.
- Ishibashi Takao 石橋崇雄. 2000. *Dai-Shin Teikoku* 大清帝国 (The Great Qing Empire). Tokyo: Kōdansha.
- Ishihama Yumiko 石濱裕美子. 2011. *Shinchō to Chibetto Bukkyō: Bosatsuō to natta Kenryūtei* 清朝とチベット仏教: 菩薩王となった乾隆帝 (The Qing Dynasty and the Tibetan Buddhist world). Tokyo: Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu.

- Isogai Ken'ichi 磯貝健一 and Yajima Yōichi 矢島洋一. 2010. Hijura-reki 732 nen Karakorumu no Perushia-go hibun ヒジュラ暦732年カラコルムのペルシア語碑文 (The Persian inscription of 732 A.H. from Qara-qorum). *Nairiku Ajiashi Kenkyū* 内陸アジア史研究 (Inner Asian Studies) 25: 167–177.
- Isogai Masumi 磯貝真澄. 2012. 19 seiki kōhan Roshia Teikoku Voruga, Uraru chiiki no madorasa kyōiku 19世紀後半ロシア帝国ヴォルガ・ウラル地域のマドラサ教育 (Madrasa education in the Volga-Ural region of the Russian Empire, the second half of the 19th century). *Seinan Ajia Kenkyū* 西南アジア研究 (Bulletin of the Society for Western and Southern Asiatic Studies) 76: 1–31.
- Iwao Kazushi 岩尾一史. 2004. Toban no banko (khri sde) ni tsuite 吐蕃の万戸 (khri sde) について (On the old Tibetan Khri sde). *Nihon Chibetto Gakkai Kaihō* 日本西藏学会会報 (Report of the Japanese Association for Tibetan Studies) 50: 3–15.
- Iwasaki Ichirō 岩崎一郎 and Uyama Tomohiko 宇山智彦. 2015. Kingendai: Chūō Ajia: 19–21 seiki 近現代：中央アジア：19–21世紀 (Modern Central Asia: 19–21 centuries). In *Ajia keizaiishi kenkyū nyūmon* アジア経済史研究入門 (Introduction for the Asian economic history), ed. Mizushima Tsukasa 水島司, et al., pp. 246–262. Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku Shuppankai.
- Kagami Mitsuyuki 加々美光行. 2008. *Chūgoku no minzoku mondai: Kiki no honshitsu* 中国の民族問題：危機の本質 (Ethnic problems in China: Essence of crises). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店.
- Kawaguchi Takushi 川口琢司. 2007. *Timūru Teikoku shihaisō no kenkyū* ティムール帝国支配層の研究 (The study of the Timurid Empire's ruling stratum). Sapporo: Hokkaidō Daigaku Shuppankai 北海道大学出版会.
- Kawaguchi Takushi and Nagamine Hiroyuki 長峰博之. 2013. Jochi Urusu-shi saikō ジョチ・ウルス史再考 (Rethinking the history of *Ulus-i Juci/Joci*). *Nairiku Ajiashi Kenkyū* 28: 27–51.
- _____ and _____. 2016. Rethinking the political system of the Jöchid. *Acta Orientalia* (Academiae Scientiarum, Hungary) 69-2: 165–181.
- Kawahara Yayoi 河原弥生. 2005. Kōkando Hān-koku ni okeru Marugiran no Tora-tachi: Nakushubandī Kyōdan-kei no seija ichizoku ni kansuru ichi kōsatsu コーカンド・ハーン国におけるマルギランのトラたち：ナクシュバンディー教団系の聖者一族に関する一考察 (Tūras of Margilan in the Khoqand Khanate: A consideration on a Naqshbandi saint family). *Nihon Chūtō Gakkai Nenpō* 日本中東学会年報 (Annals of Japan Association for Middle East Studies) 20-2: 269–294.
- Kawamoto Masatomo 川本正知. 2013. *Mongoru Teikoku no guntai to sensō* モンゴル帝国の軍隊と戦争 (The Mongol Empire and its armies and wars). Tokyo: Yamakawa Shuppansha.
- Kikuta Haruka 菊田悠. 2013. *Uzbekisutan no seija sūkei: Tōki no machi to Posuto-Sovieto jidai no Isurāmu* ウズベキスタンの聖者崇敬：陶器の町とポスト・ソヴィエト時代のイスラーム (Veneration of Pir saints in Uzbeki-

- stan: Rishton and post-Soviet Islam). Tokyo: Fūkyōsha.
- Kimura Satoru 木村暁. 2008. *Chūō Ajia to Iran: Shiryō ni miru chiiki ninshiki* 中央アジアとイラン：史料にみる地域認識 (Central Asia and Iran: Epistemology of region in the historical materials). In *Hokkaidō Daigaku Surabu Kenkyū Sentā* 2008, vol. 2, pp. 39–72.
- Kojima Yūsuke 小嶋祐輔. 2009. ‘Minzoku’ka sareru kakusa: Shinkyō Uiguru Jichiku wo rei ni (民族) 化される格差：新疆ウイグル自治区を例に (Ethnicized inequalities: The case of Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region). *Chūgoku 21* 中国21 (China 21) 30: 193–212.
- _____. 2010. Uiguru-zoku to ‘Kanka’: Bunka no nibunhō wo koete ウイグル族と「漢化」：文化の二分法を超えて (Uyghurs and “Sinicization”: Beyond the cultural binary). In *Chūgoku ni okeru shakaishugi kindaiika: Shūkyō, shōhi, esunishiti* 中国における社会主義的近代化：宗教・消費・エスニシティ (Socialist modernization in China: Religion, consumption, and ethnicity), ed. Konagaya Yuki 小長谷有紀, et al., pp. 221–245. Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan 勉誠出版.
- Komatsu Hisao 小松久男. 2000. *Chūō Yūrashia-shi* 中央ユーラシア史 (History of Central Eurasia). Tokyo: Yamakawa Shuppansha.
- _____. 2003. Modern Central Eurasian studies in Japan: An overview 1985–2000. In *Research trends in modern Central Eurasian studies (18th–20th centuries): A selective and critical bibliography of works published between 1985 and 2000*, ed. S. A. Dudoignon and Komatsu Hisao, pp. 69–86. Tokyo: Toyo Bunko.
- _____, et al., eds. 2005. *Chūō Yūrashia wo shiru jiten* 中央ユーラシアを知る事典 (Cyclopedia of Central Eurasia). Tokyo: Heibonsha 平凡社.
- _____. 2007. Dar al-Islam under Russian rule as understood by Turkestani Muslim intellectuals. In *Empire, Islam, and Politics in Central Eurasia*, ed. Uyama Tomohiko, pp. 3–21. Sapporo: Slavic Research Center.
- _____, et al., eds. 2018. *Chūō Yūrashia-shi kenkyū nyūmon* 中央ユーラシア史研究入門 (Introduction for the research on the history of Central Eurasia). Tokyo: Yamakawa Shuppansha.
- Kubo Kazuyuki (久保一之). 2003. Central Asian history: Japanese historiography of Islamic Central Asia. *Orient* 38: 135–152.
- _____. 2014. Mīru Arī Shīru no kakei ni tsuite: Timūru-chō ni okeru kinshin, chikyōdai, fudai no reishin, amīru ミール・アリーシールの家系について：ティムール朝における近臣・乳兄弟・譜代の隷臣・アミール (Mīr ‘Alī-šīr’s ancestry: Close vassals, foster brothers, hereditary servants and Amirs under the Timurid Regime). *Kyoto Daigaku Bungakubu Kenkyū Kiyō* 京都大学文学部研究紀要 (Memoirs of the Faculty of Letters, Kyoto University) 53: 141–233.
- Kumakura Jun 熊倉潤. 2014. Minzoku jichi to renpōsei: Soren Chūō Ajia no kokka kensetsu (1923–1924 nen) 民族自決と連邦制：ソ連中央アジア地域の国家建設（1923–1924年） (The national self-determination and the federation: The nation building in the Soviet Central Asia). *Roshia-shi Kenkyū* ロシア史研究 (Study of Russian History) 94: 3–21.

- Kuroda, Akinobu (黒田明伸). 2009. The Eurasian silver century, 1276–1359: Commensurability and multiplicity. *Journal of Global History* 4-2: 245–269.
- Kuryūzawa Takeo 栗生沢猛夫. 2007. *Tatāru no kubiki: Roshia-shi ni okeru Mongoru shihai no kenkyū* タタールのくびき：ロシア史におけるモンゴル支配の研究 (The “Tatar yoke”: Russian historiography on the Mongol rule over Russia). Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai.
- Levent, Sinan レヴェント, シナン. 2015. *Senzenki, Senchūki ni okeru Nihon no ‘Yūrashia seisaku’: Tūran-shugi, ‘Kaikyō seisaku’, Han-So Han-Kyō undō no shiten kara* 戦前期・戦中期における日本の「ユーラシア政策」：トゥーラン主義・「回教政策」・反ソ反共運動の視点から (Japanese Eurasian policy in the pre-war and inter-war periods: Turanism, the “Islamic policy,” and anti-Sovietism and anti-communism). Tokyo: Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu.
- Maeda Hirotake 前田弘毅. 2012. Tsāri to Shā ni tsukaeta Arumenia-jin ツァーリとシャーに仕えたアルメニア人 (Armenian people who served the Russian Tsar and Iranian Shah as well). In *Higashi to Nishi* 東と西 (East and West), ed. Shiokawa Nobuaki 塩川伸明, et al., pp. 127–152. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai.
- Mano Eiji 間野英二. 2008. ‘Shirukurōdo shikan’ saikō: Moriyasu Takao-shi no hihan ni kanren shite 「シルクロード史観」再考：森安孝夫氏の批判に関連して (A reconsideration of Central Asian history centered on the Silk-Road theory, in light of Takao Moriyasu’s criticism). *Shirin* 91-2: 402–422.
- Matsui, Dai (松井太). 2005. Taxation systems as seen in the Uigur and Mongol documents from Turfan: An overview. *Transactions of the International Conference of Eastern Studies* 50: 67–82.
- Miya Noriko 宮紀子. 2006. *Mongoru jidai no shuppan bunka* モンゴル時代の出版文化 (The publishing culture of the Mongol period). Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku Shuppankai.
- Mizutani Naoko 水谷尚子. 2012. *Kakumei-teki Higashi Torukisutan-shi no Tatāru-jin kisha Munīru Ibragimovichi Yeruzin kaisōroku* 『革命的東トルキスタン』紙のタタール人記者ムニール・イブラギモヴィチ・イエルズイン回想録 (Munir Ibragimovich Yezin: A Tatar journalist from the “Revolutionary East Turkestan News”). *Shakai Shisutemu Kenkyū* 社会システム研究 (Social Systems Studies, Ritsumeikan University) 24: 181–222.
- Mōri Kazuko 毛里和子. 1998. *Shūenkara no Chūgoku: Minzoku mondai to kokka* 周縁からの中国：民族問題と国家 (Ethno-nationalism in contemporary China). Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai.
- _____, ed. 2001. *Chūka sekai: Aidentiti no saihen* 中華世界：アイデンティティの再編 (Transfiguration of China identity). *Gendai Chūgoku no kōzō hendō* 現代中国の構造変動 (Structural change in contemporary China), vol. 7. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai.
- Moribe Yutaka 森部豊. 2010. *Sogudo-jin no tōhō katsudō to higashi Yūrashia sekai no rekishiteki tenkai* ソグド人の東方活動と東ユーラシア世界の歴史

- 史的展開 (The activities of Sogds in East Asia and the historical development of the east Eurasian world). Suita: Kansai Daigaku Shuppanbu 関西大学出版部.
- Morimoto Kazuo 森本一夫, ed. 2009. *Perushia-go ga musunda sekai: Mō hitotsu no Yūrashia-shi* ペルシア語が結んだ世界：もうひとつのユーラシア史 (The world tied by the Persian language: A new framework for Eurasian history). Sapporo: Hokkaidō Daigaku Shuppankai.
- Moriyasu Takao 森安孝夫. 2007. *Shirukurōdo to Tō Teikoku* シルクロードと唐帝国 (The Silk Road and the Tang Empire). Tokyo: Kōdansha.
- _____. 2011. *Nairiku Ajiashi kenkyū no shinchōryū to sekaishi kyōiku genba heno teigen* 内陸アジア史研究の新潮流と世界史教育現場への提言 (New currents in the study of Inner Asian history in Japan and some proposals for the teaching of world history). *Nairiku Ajiashi Kenkyū* 28: 3–34.
- _____. 2015. *Tōzai Uiguru to Chūō Yūrashia* 東西ウイグルと中央ユーラシア (Eastern and western Uighurs and Central Eurasia). Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku Shuppankai.
- Murakami Nobuaki 村上信明. 2012. *Takei-chō no Shinchō, Chibetto kankei ni kansuru ichi kōsatsu: Chūzō Daijin to Darai Rama no kankei ni tsuite no ninshiki wo chūshin ni* 嘉慶朝の清朝・チベット関係に関する一考察：駐蔵大臣とダライラマの関係についての認識を中心に (A study of the relationship between the Qing Dynasty and Tibet during the Jiaqing age: Focusing on the recognition of the relation between the Ambans of Lhasa and Dalai Lama). *Shikyō* 史境 (En Marge de l'Histoire) 64: 55–77.
- Naganawa Norihiro 長縄宣博. 2013. *Kindai teikoku no tōchi to Isurāmu no sōgo renkan: Roshia Teikoku no baai* 近代帝国の統治とイスラームの相互連関：ロシア帝国の場合 (Interrelations between the rule of the modern empires and Islam: Case of the Russian Empire). In *Gurōbaru hisutori to teikoku* グローバルヒストリーと帝国 (Global history and empires), ed. Akita Shigeru 秋田茂 and Momoki Shirō 桃木至朗, pp. 158–184. Suita: Ōsaka Daigaku Shuppankai 大阪大学出版会.
- _____. 2014. *Isurāmu kyōiku nettowāku no keisei to hen'yō: 19 seiki kara 20 seiki shotō no Voruga, Uraru chiiki* イスラーム教育ネットワークの形成と変容：19世紀から20世紀初頭のヴォルガ・ウラル地域 (Form and transformation of the Islamic educational network: The 19th–early 20th centuries Volga Ural region). In *Roshia Teikoku no minzoku chishikijin* ロシア帝国の民族知識人 (National intellectuals in the Russian Empire), ed. Hashimoto Nobuya 橋本伸也, pp. 294–316. Kyoto: Shōwadō 昭和堂.
- _____. 2017. *Isurāmu no Roshia: Teikoku, shūkyō, kōkyōken, 1905–1917* イスラームのロシア：帝国・宗教・公共圏 1905–1917 (Islamic Russia: Empire, religion, and public sphere 1905–1917). Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku Shuppankai.
- Naganuma Hideyuki 長沼秀幸. 2015. *19 seiki zenhan Kazahu Sōgen ni okeru Roshia Teikoku tōchi taisei no keisei: Genchi kenryoku kikan to chūkai-sha no kakawari wo chūshin ni* 19世紀前半カザフ草原におけるロシア帝国統治体制の形成：現地権力機関と仲介者のかかわりを中心に (The for-

- mation of Russian rule over the Kazakh Steppe in the early nineteenth century: Focusing on the relationship between the local authorities and Kazakh intermediary). *Suravu Kenkyū* 62: 197–218.
- Nakami Tatsuo 中見立夫. 2001. *Nashonarizumu kara Esuno-nashonarizumu he: Mongoru-jin Meruse ni totte no kokka, chiiki, minzoku* ナショナリズムからエスノ・ナショナリズムへ：モンゴル人メルセにとっての国家・地域・民族 (From nationalism to ethno-nationalism: nation, region, and ethnicity as seen in Merse's works). In Mōri 2001, pp. 119–149.
- _____. 2013. *'Man-Mō mondai' no rekishiteki kōzu* 『「満蒙問題」の歴史的構図』 (Historical context of the “Man-Mō (Manchuria and Mongolia) question” in the international relations of East Asia). Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai.
- Noda Jin 野田仁. 2011. *Ro-Shin Teikoku to Kazahu Han-koku* 露清帝国とカザフ＝ハン国 (The “Kazakh Khanate”: Between Russian and Qing Empires). Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai.
- Obiya Chika 帯谷知可. 2003. *Saikin no Uzbekisutan ni okeru kokushi hensan no megutte: 'Minzoku dokuritsu rinē' no moto deno 'Uzbeku minzoku no kokkashi'* 最近のウズベキスタンにおける国史編纂をめぐる：『民族独立理念』のもとでの『ウズベク民族の国家史』 (Recent compilation of the national history in Uzbekistan: “National history for the Uzbek nation” under the “idea of national independence”). In *Tōō, Chūō Yūrashia no kindai to neishon* 東欧・中央ユーラシアの近代とネイション (Modernity and nations in Eastern Europe and Central Eurasia), vol. 2, ed. Hayashi Tadayuki 林忠行, pp. 35–48. Sapporo: Hokkaidō Daigaku Suravu Kenkyū Sentā.
- _____. 2005. *Osutoroūmofu no mita Roshia-ryō Torukisutan* オストロウモフの見たロシア領トルキスタン (The Russian Turkestan in the eyes of N. P. Ostroumov). *Roshiashi Kenkyū* 76: 15–27.
- _____. 2012. *'Minzoku' no seiritsu to kokkyō kakutei: Chūō Ajia* 「民族」の成立と国境画定：中央アジア (Formation of “nation” and national delimitation: Central Asia). In *Chūō Ajia* 中央アジア (Central Asia), Asakura sekai chiri kōza 朝倉世界地理講座 (Asakura world geography), vol. 5, ed. Obiya Chika, et al., pp. 183–195. Tokyo: Asakura Shoten 朝倉書店.
- Oka Hiroki 岡洋樹. 2007. *Shindai Mongoru meiki seido no kenkyū* 清代モンゴル盟旗制度の研究 (Study on League-Banner System of Qing era Mongolia). Tokyo: Tōhō Shoten 東方書店.
- Okamoto Masataka 岡本雅享. 2001. *Chūgoku no mainoriti seisaku to kokusai kijun* 中国のマイノリティ政策と国際規準 (Chinese ethnic minority policy and international standards). In Mōri 2001, pp. 79–120.
- Onuma Takahiro 小沼孝博. 2014. *Shin to Chūō Ajia sōgen: Yūbokumin no sekai kara teikoku no henkyō he* 清と中央アジア草原：遊牧民の世界から帝国の辺境へ (The Qing and the Central Asian steppe : From the nomads arena to the imperial frontier). Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai.
- Ōtsuka Osamu 大塚修. 2014. *Shijō hatsu no sekaishika Kāshānī: 'Shūshi' hensan ni kansuru shinkenka* 史上初の世界史家カーシャーニー：『集史』

編纂に関する新見解 (Qashani, the first world historian: A new perspective on the compilation process of the Jami al-Tawarikh). *Seinan Ajia Kenkyū* 80: 25–48.

- _____. 2017. *Fuhenshi no henbō: Perushia-go bunkaken ni okeru keisei to hen'yō* 普遍史の変貌：ペルシア語文化圏における形成と展開』(The transformation of the general histories in Persinate societies). Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku Shuppankai.
- Sawai Mitsuo 澤井充生. 2014. Nihon no Kaikyō seisaku to seishinji no kanri tōsei: Mōkyō Seiken-ka no kaimin shakai no jirei kara 日本の回教工作と清真寺の管理統制：蒙疆政権下の回民社会の事例から (Japan's "Islam Campaign" and control of mosque: A case study of Hui Muslim communities in Inner Mongolia from 1937 to 1945). *Jinbun Gakuhō* 人文学報 (The Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities) 483: 69–107.
- Seo Tatsuhiko 妹尾達彦. 2014. Higashi Ajia tojō jidai no keisei to toshimō no henshen: 4–10 seiki 東アジア都城時代の形成と都市網の変遷：4～10世紀 (The formation of the traditional capitals epoch and transformation of urban networks: 4th–10th centuries). In *Afuro-Yūrashia tairiku no toshi to kokka* アフロ・ユーラシア大陸の都市と国家 (Cities and nations in Afro-Eurasia), ed. Seo Tatsuhiko, pp. 73–217. Hachiōji: Chūō Daigaku Shuppanbu 中央大学出版部.
- Shibuya Kōichi 澁谷浩一. 2011. 1734–40 nen no Shin to Jūn-garu no kōwa kōshō ni tsuite: Kyahuta Jōyaku teiketsu-go no Chūō Yūrashia no kokusai kankei 1734-40年の清とジュン＝ガルの講和交渉について：キャプタ条約締結後の中央ユーラシアの国際関係 (On the negotiations for the peace agreement of 1734–40 between the Qing and Zunghar: International relations in Central Eurasia after the conclusion of the Treaty of Kyakhta). *Tōyōshi Kenkyū* 70-3: 608–572.
- Shimizu Yuriko 清水由里子, et al., eds. 2007. *Muhanmado Emin Bogura cho Higashi Torukisutan-shi no kenkyū* ムハンマド・エミン・ボグラ著『東トルキスタン史』の研究 (A study of Muḥammad Āmīn Bughra's *Sharqī Turkistān Tārīkhi*). Tokyo: NIHU Puroguramu 'Isurāmu Chiiki Kenkyū' Tōkyō Daigaku Kyoten NIHUプログラム「イスラーム地域研究」東京大学拠点 (NIHU program "Islamic Area Studies" project, the University of Tokyo).
- Shimo Hirotooshi 志茂碩敏. 2013. *Mongoru Teikoku-shi kenkyū seihen: Chūō Yūrashia yūboku shoseiken no kokka kōzō* モンゴル帝国史研究正篇：中央ユーラシア遊牧諸政権の国家構造』(The political structure of the Mongol Empire). Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai.
- Shinmen Yasushi 新免康. 2001. Uigurujin minzoku shugisha Eisa Yusupu Aruputekin no kiseki ウイグル人民族主義者エイサ・ユスプ・アルプテキンの軌跡 (The life of an Uyghur nationalist, Isa Yusup Alptekin). In Mori 2001, pp. 151–178.
- _____, et al., eds. 2013. *Muslim saints and mausoleums in Central Asia and Xinjiang*. Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient J. Maisonneuve successeur.

- Shiokawa Nobuaki 塩川伸明. 2004. *Minzoku to gengo* 民族と言語 (Nations and languages). Taminzoku kokka Soren no kōbō 多民族国家ソ連の興亡 (The rise and fall of the Soviet Union as a multinational state), vol. 1. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- _____, et al., eds. 2012. *Yūrashia sekai* ユーラシア世界 (New approaches to Eurasian Studies). 5 vols. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai.
- _____. 2015. *Nashonarizumu no uketomēkata: Gengo, Esunishiti, Neishon* ナショナルリズムの受け止め方：言語・エスニシティ・ネイション (Various views on nationalism: Language, ethnicity, and nation). Tokyo: Sangensha.
- Shiotani Masachika 塩谷昌史. 2014. *Roshia mengyō hatten no keiki: Roshia sarasa to Ajia shōnin* ロシア綿業発展の契機：ロシア更紗とアジア商人 (The development of the cotton industry in Russia: Russian printed cotton and the Asian merchants). Tokyo: Chisen Shokan 知泉書館.
- Shioya Akifumi 塩谷哲史. 2014. *Chūō Ajia kangai-shi josetsu: Rauzān Unga to Hiva Han-koku no kōbō* 中央アジア灌漑史序説：ラウザーン運河とヒヴァ・ハン国の興亡 (Irrigation history of Central Asia: The Lawzan Canal and the rise and fall of the Khanate of Khiva). Tokyo: Fūkyōsha.
- Shiraishi Noriyuki 白石典之. 2002. *Mongoru Teikoku no kōkōgaku-teki kenkyū* モンゴル帝国史の考古学的研究 (Archaeological studies on the history of the Mongol Empire). Tokyo: Dōseisha 同成社.
- Shirasu Jōshin 白須淨眞. 2012. *Ōtani Tankentai kenkyū no aratana chihei: Ajia kōiki chōsa katsudō to Gaimushō gaikō kiroku* 大谷探検隊研究の新たな地平：アジア広域調査活動と外務省外交記録 (New research on Otani exploration: Japan's wide-area investigation in Asia and the diplomatic record of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs). Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan.
- Suda Masaru 須田将. 2011. *Sutārin-ki Uzubekisutan no jendā: Josei no ooi to saika no seiji* スターリン期ウズベキスタンのジェンダー：女性の覆いと差異化の政治 (Gender in Stalinist Uzbekistan: Veils for women and political differentiation). Tokyo: Fūkyōsha.
- Sugiyama Kiyohiko 杉山清彦. 2014. Research on contemporary Qing imperial history: The situation and outlook in Japan. *Asian Research Trends New Series* 9: 1–46.
- _____. 2015. *Dai-Shin Teikoku no keisei to Hakkisei* 大清帝国の形成と八旗制 (Formation of the Qing Empire and the Eight Banners). Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku Shuppankai.
- Sugiyama Masaaki 杉山正明. 2004. *Mongoru Teikoku to Dai-Gen Urusu* モンゴル帝国と大元ウルス (The Mongol Empire and Dai-ōn Ulus). Kyoto: Kyōto Daigaku Gakujutsu Shuppankai.
- _____. 2007. Tōzai no sekaizu ga kataru jinrui saisho no daichihei 東西の世界図が語る人類最初の大地平 (The first human great horizon in the Eastern-Western world maps). In *Daichi no shōzō: Ezu, chizu ga kataru sekai* 大地の肖像：絵図・地図が語る世界 (Portrait of the earth: The world described by pictorial maps and geographical maps), ed. Fujii Jōji 藤井譲治, et al., 54–69. Kyoto: Kyōto Daigaku Gakujutsu Shuppankai.

- Tanii Yōko 谷井陽子. 2015. *Hakki seido no kenkyū* 八旗制度の研究 (A study of the Eight Banner System of Manchu). Kyoto: Kyōto Daigaku Gakujutsu Shuppankai.
- Tateishi Yōko 立石洋子. 2011. *Kokumin tōgō to rekishigaku: Sutārin-ki Soren ni okeru 'kokuminshi' ronsō* 国民統合と歴史学：スターリン期ソ連における『国民史』論争 (National integration and history: The dispute about “national history” of the USSR in the Stalin era). Tokyo: Gakujutsu Shuppankai 学術出版会.
- Terayama Kyōsuke 寺山恭輔. 2015. *Sutārin to Shinkyō: 1931–1949 nen* スターリンと新疆：1931-1949年 (Stalin and Xinjiang). Tokyo: Shakai Hyōronsha 社会評論社.
- Ueda Akira 植田暁. 2013. Teisei Roshia shihai-ki no Kuruguzu no shakai keizai-teki hen'yō: Ferugana-shū ni okeru tensui nōkō no fukyū wo chūshin ni 帝政ロシア支配期のクルグズの社会経済的変容：フェルガナ州における天水農耕の普及を中心に (Socio-economic changes among Kyrgyz nomads under Tsarist Russia: The spread of rain-fed cultivation in Ferghana Province). *Nairiku Ajiashi Kenkyū* 28: 101–126.
- Uno Nobuhiro 宇野伸浩. 2002. *Shūshi no kōsei ni okeru 'Oguzu Kagan setsuwa' no imi* 『集史』の構成における「オグズ・カン説話」の意味 (The significance of “The Tale of Oghuz Khan” in the structure of the Jāmi' al-Tawārikh). *Tōyōshi Kenkyū* 61-1: 137–110.
- Uyama Tomohiko. 2000. *Chūō Ajia no rekihi to genzai* 中央アジアの歴史と現在 (Past and present in Central Asia). Tokyo: Tōyō Shoten 東洋書店.
- . 2005. Kyū Soren Musurimu chiiki ni okeru ‘minzokushi’ no sōzō 旧ソ連ムスリム地域における「民族史」の創造 (The creation of ethnic histories in Muslim regions of the former Soviet Union). In *Isurāmu chiiki no kokka to nashonarizumu* イスラーム地域の国家とナショナリズム (State and nationalism in the Muslim world), *Isurāmu chiiki kenkyū sōsho* イスラーム地域研究叢書 (Islamic area studies), vol. 5, ed. Sakai Keiko 酒井啓子 and Usuki Akira 臼杵陽, pp. 55–78. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai.
- . 2007. A Particularist Empire: The Russian policies of Christianization and military conscription in Central Asia. In *Empire, Islam, and Politics in Central Eurasia*, pp. 23–63 (See Komatsu 2007).
- . 2008. Chiiki ninshiki no hōhō: Orientarizumu-ron wo koete 地域認識の方法：オリエンタリズム論を超えて (The way for epistemology of regions: Beyond Orientalism). In *Chiiki ninshiki-ron*, pp. 11–36 (See Kimura 2008).
- . 2012. Roshia Teikoku-ron ロシア帝国論 (Russian imperiology). In *Roshia-shi kenkyū annai* ロシア史研究案内 (Guide for the study of Russian history), ed. Roshia-shi Kenkyūkai ロシア史研究会 (Japanese Society for the Study of Russian History), pp. 165–179. Tokyo: Sairyūsha 彩流社.
- . 2015. The contribution of Central Eurasian studies to Russian and (post-)Soviet studies and beyond. *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 16-2: 331–344.

- Yajima Yōichi 矢島洋一. 2000. Mongoru no Isurāmu kaishū to Kubrawiyya モンゴルのイスラーム改宗とKubrawiyya (The conversion of Mongols into Islam and *Kubrawiyya*). *Seinan Ajia Kenkyū* 53: 61–75.
- Yokkaichi Yasuhiro 四日市康博. 2006. Genchō to Iru Han-chō no gaikō, tsūshō kankei ni okeru kokusai bōeki shōnin 元朝とイル＝ハン朝の外交・通商関係における国際貿易商人 (On the role of Indian Ocean merchants in the diplomatic and trading relations between Yuan China and Il-khanid Iran). In *Nairikuken, kaiikiken kōryū nettowāku to Isuramu* 内陸圏・海域圏交流ネットワークとイスラーム』(Networks for overland and maritime interchange in East Asia and Islam), ed. Morikawa Testuo 森川哲雄 and Saeki Kōji 佐伯弘次, pp. 79–91. Fukuoka: Kyūshū Daigaku 21 seiki COE Puroguramu (Jinbun Kagaku) ‘Higashi Ajia to Nihon: Kōryū to hen’yō 九州大学21世紀COEプログラム (人文科学) 「東アジアと日本：交流と変容」 (JSPS 21st Century COE Program (Humanities), East Asia and Japan: Interaction and Transformations, Kyushu University).
- _____. 2008. Chinese and Muslim diasporas and the Indian Ocean trade network under Mongol hegemony. In *The East Asian “Mediterranean,”* ed. A. Schottenhammer, pp. 73–101. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- _____. 2011. Mongoru Teikoku jidai no idō to kōryū モンゴル帝国時代の移動と交流 (Migration and interaction in the period of the Mongol Empire). In *Mongoru-shi kenkyū* モンゴル史研究：現状と展望 (Research on the history of the Mongols), ed. Waseda Daigaku Mongoru-shi Kenkyūjo 早稲田大学モンゴル史研究所 (Institute of Mongol studies, Waseda University), pp. 124–149. Tokyo: Akashi Shoten 明石書店.
- Yoshida Setsuko 吉田世津子. 2004. *Chūō Ajia nōson no shinzoku nettowāku: Kuruguzusutan keizai ikō no jinruigaku-teki kenkyū* 中央アジア農村の親族ネットワーク：クルグズスタン・経済移行の人類学的研究 (Relative networks in the Central Asian villages: Anthropological study on the Transition economies in Kyrgyzstan). Tokyo: Fūkyōsha.
- Yoshida Yutaka 吉田豊. 2011. Sogudo-jin to kodai no Churuku-zoku tonokanai ni kansuru 3 tsu no oboegaki ソグド人と古代のチュルク族との関係に関する3つの覚え書き (Three philological notes on the Sogdo-Turkic relationship). *Kyōto Daigaku Bungakubu Kenkyū Kiyō* 50: 1–41.
- _____. 2012. Sogudo-jin no kōeki katsudō no jittai ソグド人の交易活動の実態 (Reality of the trade activities of Sogdians). In *Chūō Ajia*, pp. 393–406 (See Obiya 2012).
- Yoshimura Takayuki 吉村貴之. 2009. Kōkyō wo tsukuru: Arumenia kindaiishi ni miru nashonarizumuto diasupora 故郷を創る：アルメニア近代史に見るナショナリズムとディアスポラ (Creation of the homeland: Nationalism and diasporas in the modern history of Armenia). In *Diasupora kara sekai wo miru: Risan wo kakyō suru tame ni* ディアスポラから世界を読む：離散を架橋するために (Reading the world from diaspora: Bridging separation), ed. Akao Mitsuharu 赤尾光春 and Hayao Takanori 早尾貴紀, et al., pp. 80–113. Tokyo: Akashi Shoten.

