Chinese terms and names below are given in *Hanyu pinyin* and Manchu ones according to the Möllendorff system. For Mongolian terms, I use Antoine Mostaert’s scheme as adapted by Francis W. Cleaves, except that γ is here written “ǧ” and “j" printed without the haček. However, for Mongol names I have sacrificed technical accuracy for recognizability and readers’ ease, and thus have Torghut, Khoshuut, and Chinggis Khan instead of Torğut, Qoşuut, and Činggis Qa’an. For romanization of Uyghur (Eastern Turki) I follow the system used by Reinhard Hahn in his *Spoken Uyghur*, which is generally recognizable to Turkologists. For practical reasons, “ng” is substituted for Hahn’s η (the eng). Foreign terms in the text are generally given in Chinese, unless otherwise noted. Where versions are given in more than one language or where confusion might be possible, the language is identified as follows: Ch. = Chinese; Ma. = Manchu; Mo. = Mongol; Tu. = Eastern Turki, that is, Uyghur.

Researchers working on Qing Inner Asia often encounter non-Chinese personal names for which only the Chinese, and not the spelling in the original language, is available. It is inappropriate to write these as if they were Chinese names (that is, as “Fu Heng” or “Na Yancheng,” for example). For such names, I adopt the following convention: the Chinese characters are transliterated in *pinyin* and linked by hyphens. Another method, now common among scholars who use *pinyin* in preference to the Wade-Giles system, is to run the Chinese characters of transliterated non-Chinese (especially Manchu) names together. However, I believe Gen-chu-ike-ze-bang to be somewhat more manageable than Genchukezebang. This convention also instantly distinguishes non-Han from Han personages, while preventing confusion in those occasional cases where a spelling might be a transliteration from either Chinese or an Altaic language (as with Fukanggan or Nayanceng, for example). Of course, the best course of all is to provide both non-Chinese and Chinese spellings; unfortunately, this is not always feasible.

Where possible, names of major East Turkestanı and Kokandi historical figures and some terms have been given in Arabic transcription, to conform
to the precedents established by Joseph Fletcher and Saguchi Tōru. There are no universally accepted spellings for non-Chinese Xinjiang place-names, and, indeed, many of those names have been changed frequently over the past two centuries. After an analysis of the spellings in the *Xiyu tongwen zhi* and modern Uyghur-language maps of Xinjiang, I have determined that there is no strong linguistic or historical basis to adopt either of these sources as a standard for place-name spellings; today’s official Chinese versions (Kashi for Kashgar, Shache for Yarkand) are unfamiliar and not in popular use even in Xinjiang; some, like “Urumqi” for Urumchi, are based on a P.R.C. system for romanizing Uyghur that has now been abandoned. Thus, again for continuity, I follow Fletcher’s spellings in the *Cambridge History of China*, volume 10. It is hoped that these will in any case be the forms most familiar to readers.

I refer to Qing emperors primarily as the Qianlong emperor, the Jiaqing emperor, the Daoguang emperor, and so on. When stylistic concerns require another name in order to avoid cumbersome repetition, I follow many Chinese scholars in employing the temple names Gaozong (for Qianlong), Renzong (for Jiaqing), and Xuanzong (for Daoguang).

Finally, a word on the terms “Inner Asia,” “Central Asia,” and “Xinjiang.” Once, Europeans referred to a geographic and cultural entity known as Tartary. Though few agreed on where Tartary began and ended, or whether it included Cathay or not, everyone knew where it was. Our terminology today is hardly more concrete; thus it is with a certain arbitrariness that I adopt the following usages. In this book, “Inner Asia” is used for those northern and western territories that the Qing dynasty, in building its empire, added to the lands of former Ming China. Thus, Inner Asia comprises Manchuria, Mongolia, Xinjiang, and Tibet. I use the term “Central Asia” here to indicate the geographically central regions of the Eurasian continent, especially the Islamic lands once known by such names as Trans-Oxiana or Turkestan, including the former Soviet Central Asian republics of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan, as well as Afghanistan. In the nineteenth and early twentieth century, the region known in Chinese as Xinjiang was commonly called Eastern Turkestan or Chinese Central Asia, and I therefore also include it within my definition of Central Asia. Xinjiang thus falls within a zone of overlap between Inner and Central Asia. I refer to Xinjiang in my title as “Central Asia” for the benefit of browsers or readers who are not China specialists; I intend no political message by this or any other terminological usages in this book.