

Arab Soldiers in China at the Time of the An-Shi Rebellion¹⁾

INABA Minoru

1. An-Shi Rebellion

The famous An-Shi Rebellion broke out in 755 CE, when An Lushan (安祿山), who held the offices of Military Commissioner (節度使) of Pinglu (平盧), Fanyang (范陽), and Hedong (河東) simultaneously, rose against the Tang, professing to punish Yang Guozhong (楊國忠), a cousin of Yang Guifei (楊貴妃), the most favorite mistress of the Emperor Xuanzong (玄宗). Quickly capturing Luoyang (洛陽), An Lushan's army approached Changan (長安) the next year. Xuanzong then escaped from Changan toward Sichuan (四川) following the advice of Yang Guozhong. On his way, with the earnest wish of the people to resist, Prince Heng (亨) separated from the party of Xuanzong and went to Lingwu (靈武) in Shanxi (山西), where he was enthroned as the seventh Emperor Suzong (肅宗). Based on Lingwu, Suzong commanded the counter operation against An Lushan. Military commanders such as Guo Ziyi (郭子義, Military Commissioner of Shuofang 朔方, Hexi 河西, and Longyou 隴右), Li Siye (李嗣業, Military Commissioner of Beiting Mobile Brigade 北庭行營), and Wang Sili (王思禮, Military Commissioner of Guannei Mobile Brigade 關內行營) came under the command of Suzong. The Emperor designated his eldest son Chu (俶), the Prince of Guangping (廣平) and the future Daizong (代宗), to be Grand Marshal (大元帥) of those armies.²⁾

Various people from the northern nomads and Western people of Iranian origin joined the army of An Lushan (see below). Similarly, soldiers from the Uighurs (Huihe 回紇), the Arabs (*Dashi* 大食),³⁾ and Nanman (南蠻) were enlisted in the army of the Prince of Guangping, who eventually succeeded in recovering Changan and Luoyang. The presence of Arab soldiers in this army has been referred to several times in relation with the origin of Chinese Muslims. Zhang Chengzhi describes the situation as follows:

For suppressing the rebellion, the Tang dynasty asked for help from Arabs and others. After the rebellion was over, these foreign soldiers remained in China. The Tang granted a place called Shayuan (沙苑), south of Changan, as a special settlement for them. Since then, this Shayuan has been a home for the Hui (回) people who believe in Islam. (Zhang 1993: 15)

Here Zhang regards the Arab soldiers who came to China at that time as the remote ancestors of Chinese Muslims. It is well known that in 751, about four years before the An-Shi Rebellion, the Tang army led by General Gao Xianzhi (高仙芝) and the ‘Abbāsīd army led by Ziyād b. Ṣāliḥ fought each other on the Talas river, and the former was completely defeated. Then, who were those Arabs who fought for the sake of the Tang Emperor under such circumstances? To the best of my knowledge, there is no detailed examination of this question which is of special interest in regard to the migrations and relocations of people between the East and West in the eighth century. Besides, the propriety of the assertion that those Arabs remained around Changan and became the remote ancestors of the Hui people should be considered only after the identity of those Arabs is somehow clarified. This paper will discuss who those Arabs really were by re-examining the Chinese sources and the political circumstances surrounding Arabs in the corresponding period.

2. Soldiers

(1) *Dashi* in China

Unfortunately, the description of Zhang cited above does not contain a reference. It is probable, however, that he based it on the following statement of Yang Huaizhong:

In the 14th year of Tianbao (755), An Lushan rebelled against the Emperor, and two capitals (Changan and Luoyang) successively fell to him. In the first year of Zhide (756) of Suzong’s era, the ‘Abbāsīd Caliph al-Manṣūr sent an army to China responding to the request of the Chinese Emperor. The army helped Suzong to suppress the rebellion and recover both the Western Capital (Changan) and the Eastern Capital (Luoyang). This army remained in China after the rebellion was over and the soldiers got married and settled down.

(Yang Huaizhong 1982: 118)

The sources for Yang are the description of *Dashi* in *Jiu Tangshu*, the account of Suzong in *Xin Tangshu*, and *Cefu Yuangui*. The description of *Dashi* in *Jiu Tangshu* reads:

In the first year of Zhide, an envoy [from *Dashi*] arrived with the tributes. [The future] Daizong was designated as Grand Marshal around that time and he won over the two capitals employing the army from that country (*Dashi*). (*Jiu Tangshu* Vol. 198, p. 5316; also in *Tang Huiyao* Vol. 100, p. 1790)

The same account is found in the description of *Dashi* in *Xin Tangshu* (Vol. 221b). The account of Suzong in *Jiu Tangshu* says:

On the day of Dinghai (丁亥) of the ninth month of the second year of Zhide (29th, October, 757), the Prince of Guangping, the Grand Marshal, proceeded to the east and defeated the rebels, commanding about two hundred thousand soldiers from Shuofang, Anxi, Huihe, Nanman, and *Dashi*. On the day of Renyin (壬寅) [of the same month] (13th, November, 757), the Prince's army fought against the rebel army led by the commanders An Shouzhong (安守忠) and Li Guiren (李歸仁) to the northwest of Xiangji-si temple (香積寺), and won over the enemy, killing sixty thousand of them. Zhang Tongru (張通儒), another commander of the rebels, abandoned the capital (Changan) and fled to the east. On the day of Guimao (癸卯) (14th, November), the Prince of Guangpin recovered Changan. (*Jiu Tangshu* Vol. 10, p. 247)

The account of Suzong in *Xin Tangshu* reads:

On the day of Jiayin (甲寅) of the intercalary month of the second year of Zhide (26th, September, 757),⁴⁾ An Qingxu (安慶緒) plundered Haozhi (好畤) but was defeated by Li Guangjin (李光進), the Military Commissioner of Weibei (渭北). On the day of Dingmao (丁卯) (9th, October, 757), Chu, the Prince of Guangpin, was designated as Grand Marshal. Being supported by Guo Ziyi, he defeated An Qingxu with the soldiers from Shuofang, Anxi, Huihe, Nanman, and *Dashi*. (*Xin Tangshu* Vol. 6, p. 158)

The account of Daizong in *Xin Tangshu* is more detailed:

Although Suzong had already been enthroned and Guo Ziyi and others were about to attack An Qingxu, the decisive victory had not yet been gained. In Qi (岐), Suzong designated the Prince of Guangpin as Grand Marshal in the ninth month of the second year of Zhide, and ordered the Prince to advance with about two hundred thousand soldiers from Shuofang, Anxi, Huihe, Nanman, and *Dashi*. All the officers came out of the palace to see them off. The Prince dismounted from his horse when he passed the gate of the palace, walked through the Muma Gate (木馬門), and mounted on his horse again. Li Siye, the Military Commissioner of Anxi and Beiding Mobile Brigade was in command of the Army of the Front, while Guo Ziyi, the Military Commissioner of Shuofang, Hexi, and Longyou was in command of the Middle, and Wang Sili, the Military Commissioner of Guannei Mobile Brigade, of the Rear. They were camped at Shangji-si temple. They defeated the rebel commander An Shouzhong and killed sixty thousand enemies. The rebel commander Zhang Tongru was in charge of the defense of Changan, but on hearing of the defeat of An Shouzhong, abandoned the city and fled to the east. The Prince finally recovered the capital. He made Wang Sili stay there, and advanced to the east with a large army. An Qingxu dispatched his commander Yanzhuang (嚴莊) to hold them off in Shanzhou (陝州). Daizong, Ziyi, and Siye fought with the enemy at Shanxi and crushed them. Qingxu fled to Hebei (河北). [Daizong] recovered Luoyang as well. (*Xin Tangshu* Vol. 6, p. 166)

The account in *Cefu Yuangui*, which is slightly different, reads:

In the ninth month of the second year of Zhide, ...the Prince of Guangpin, the Grand Marshal, commanding one hundred and fifty thousand soldiers from Shuofang, Anxi, the Uighurs, and *Dashi*, intended to recover Changan. ...On the day of Guimao (14th, November, 757), the Prince of Guangpin, the Grand Marshal, entered into Changan with his marshaled army. Pugu Huairen (僕固懷恩), the Commander of the Middle Army, passed through the south of the capital with the armies of Huihe, Nanman, and *Dashi*, and set up camp at the east of the Chanshui (澆水) river. On the day of Renxu (壬戌)⁵ of the tenth month (3rd, December), the Prince finally recovered Luoyang. (*Cefu*

Yuanguai Vol. 973, p. 11434)

What should be noted here is that all the “authoritative” sources unanimously mention the presence of *Dashi*/Arabs in the army of the Prince of Guangpin, i.e., the main force of the Emperor’s army.

There are interesting accounts in *Zizhi Tongjian* which read:

Though he already had secured the soldiers of Shuofang in his command, the Emperor Suzong wanted to reinforce his army by borrowing soldiers from abroad. Thus, he installed Chengcai (承案), son of Shouli (守禮), the Prince of Bin (邠), as the Prince of Dunhuang (敦煌) and sent him with Pugu Huaïen as an embassy to Huihe to ask for reinforcements. Besides, recruitment was carried out in Farghāna, and messengers went around the principalities [in the West] to encourage the people to enlist in the army with good rewards. Those people [from the West] arrived with the army of Anxi. (*Zizhi Tongjian* Vol. 218, p. 6998)

The Emperor was informed that the soldiers from Anxi, Beiding, Farghāna, and *Dashi* had arrived up to Liangzhou (涼州) and Shan-shan (鄯善). (*Zizhi Tongjian* Vol. 219, p. 7014)

In short, on the request of Suzong for reinforcements, soldiers of Anxi, Beiding, the Uighurs, and Farghāna, had arrived and *Dashi*/Arabs were with them. A couple of interesting points come out of these accounts: 1) The Arabs came not through the maritime route, but the overland route, as they arrived with the soldiers of Anxi, Beiding, and Farghāna. 2) Suzong did not make any direct request for aid to the Arabs. 3) There is no mention of sending reinforcements to China by the ‘Abbāsīd Caliph. The first point may allow us to safely assume that the point of departure of the Arab soldiers was somewhere in Central Asia or Khurāsān at the furthest. The second and third points directly concern who were those Arab soldiers, and this will be discussed in detail later in this paper.

(2) The Battle on the Talas river

Then, the relation between the Tang and the Arabs in the mid-eighth century is to be examined. As mentioned above, the armies of both parties fought each other on the Talas river in 751, and the Tang army was

crushed partly because of the betrayal of the Karluqs. The general Gao Xianzhi made a narrow escape with a few soldiers and reached Changan (*Jiu Tangshu* Vol. 109). At first glance, it seems strange that under such circumstances the Tang asked for help from the Arabs and that the latter responded. However, Shinji Maejima, criticizing the “traditional” view of considering this battle as critical for deciding which of the two superpowers in the East and the West would hold the hegemony over Central Asia, considers the battle not as a result of a planned and prepared operation, but as an accidental encounter between two parties, which had no significant influence on the subsequent events in Central Asia (Maejima 1971: 192). It is true that *Cefu Yuangui* records the frequent visits of the embassies from *Dashi* or *heiyi Dashi* (黑衣大食 “Arabs in black garments”) to the Tang court immediately after the Battle on the Talas. Remarkably, four embassies sent by *Dashi* were recorded in 753. Deducing the situation from these frequent visits, Kōdō Tasaka considers that the relation between the Tang and the Arabs was not hindered by the Battle on the Talas, but was rather favorable even after the battle, and he tries to explain the reinforcing with Arab soldiers in that context (Tasaka 1964: 44–50).

Nevertheless, relations between the Tang and the ‘Abbāsids do not seem to have been as uniformly good as Tasaka assumes, but more tangled. Yuri Karev recently has discussed that Abū Muslim, the governor general of the ‘Abbāsids in the east, intended to make a further invasion into China after the victory, and prepared for that (Karev 2002: 22). That being the case, one can not simply conclude that the embassy from *Dashi* was the “official” embassy of the Caliph, or that the Arab reinforcement to China was sent by the Caliph, without examining the state of affairs in the eastern territory of the ‘Abbāsids. Thus, in the next section, we will have a general look over the West.

3. Rebels

(1) The ‘Abbāsīd Revolution

What happened in the Islamic world during the period from the Battle on the Talas to the outbreak of the An-Shi Rebellion? To say nothing of the statement of Yang Huaizhong cited above, even Maejima and Tasaka, seemingly being affected by the signal victory of the Arabs, have not given sufficient consideration to the circumstances of the Arab side after the battle. As a matter of fact, in the first half of the 750’s, the ‘Abbāsīd

dynasty seems to have had little scope for lending military support to China, being confronted with a fateful crisis of its own immediately after its establishment.

After more than twenty years of preparation, the anti-Umayyad movement, or the ‘Abbāsīd Revolution, went into full-scale operation when Abū Muslim, an ‘Abbāsīd *dā‘ī* in Khurāsān, raised a black banner in Marw in 747. After only three years, the last Umayyad Caliph Marwān b. Muḥammad was captured and killed in Egypt, which signaled the appearance of the new dynasty in the Islamic world. This “revolution” had been based in Khurāsān from its very early stage. Abū Muslim, a central figure of the movement, gathered his forces there. This army provided the movement with a strong driving force, which contributed to the final success of the “revolution.”⁶⁾

However, the state of affairs in Khurāsān at the time of the “revolution” was fairly complicated. According to Elton J. Daniel (1979), there were various groups of people involved in the movement. The Shī‘ites (or the ‘Alīds) originally had close relations with it. As is observed in the tradition which says that, in the beginning of the eighth century, the *imāma* was transferred to Muḥammad b. ‘Alī of the ‘Abbāsīds from the ‘Alīd Abū Hāshim, the “revolution” took its first step when the ‘Abbāsīds joined hands with the Hāshimites, i.e., the radical Shī‘ites. Then, people such as the Arabs who were not content with the rule of the Umayyads and the superiority of the Syrian army, the Iranian *dihqāns* who disliked the Arabs’ rule, other Iranians who still did not have a predilection for Islam, and the lower class Arab peasants⁷⁾ participated in the movement and constituted the Revolutionary Khurāsānī Army. It is well known that the ‘Abbāsīds utilized the Shī‘ite propaganda in vague terms. They did not explicitly disclose the name of the Imām who should replace the position of the Umayyad Caliph, so all the groups in the movement assumed that the choice of Imam was as they themselves wished, and fought for establishing ideal societies of their own. When the Umayyads were overthrown, however, the newly established dynasty was different from that desired by each group other than the ‘Abbāsīds. The Shī‘ites especially had a deep discontent with the establishment of a dynasty by the ‘Abbāsīds, who were not the descendants of ‘Alī.

As early as 750–51, the anti-‘Abbāsīd revolt broke out in Bukhārā by Sharīk b. Shaykh al-Mahrī, who had participated in the “revolution.” He is said to have collected more than thirty thousand people from the Arab settlers in Bukhārā, demanding rule by the ‘Alīd *imām*. Abū Muslim or-

dered Ziyād b. Ṣāliḥ to suppress the revolt. Ziyād could gain the cooperation of Bukhār Khudā and successfully settled the situation, after which he was to advance toward the Talas river (Ṭabarī: vii, 459–460; Ya‘qūbī: ii, 425; Narshakhī: 86–89; Williams 1985: 197; Frye 1954: 62–65; Daniel 1979: 88–89; Karev 2002: 8–11).

Though not having actually broken out like Sharīk’s revolt, there were many other potential threats for the ‘Abbāsids, such as Shaybān, who was the Khārijī and had fled to Khurāsān; Bīhāfarīd, who is said to have aimed for the reconciliation of Zoroastorianism with Islam; Abū Khālid, a follower of Khidāsh who once had been a *dā‘ī* of the ‘Abbāsids and made an anti-Islamic *da‘wa*; and Ibn Mu‘āwiya of the ‘Alīds. Most of them had fought with the Umayyads in cooperation with the ‘Abbāsids, but they were strenuously eliminated (Daniel 1979: 78–92).

(2) Abū Muslim

These operations for the centralization of power under the ‘Abbāsids by eliminating explicit and implicit enemies, were conducted chiefly by Abū Muslim, who thereby gained unparalleled power. He originally had been entrusted with the task of *da‘wa* in Khurāsān by Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad b. ‘Alī al-‘Abbāsī. The actual origin of Abū Muslim was obscure. Some said that he was a descendant of certain Sasanian nobles, but others related that he was a *mawālī* of slave origin.⁸⁾ Unexpectedly, Ibrāhīm died just before the final victory over the Umayyads, which consequently made Abū Muslim the most powerful figure in the movement, being enthusiastically supported by the Khurāsānī army and people. He was substantially “the king of Khurāsān” until he was murdered in 755. He held power to appoint and dismiss all the offices, and he issued his own coins, over which no restriction could be exercised even by the Caliphs.

The biggest obstacle for the Caliphs to purging Abū Muslim was his military force and the strong support for him by Khurāsānīs. Abū Ja‘far Maṣū‘, the future Caliph, strove to exclude Abū Muslim from the front stage. In 752–53, the Caliphate succeeded in inspiring Ziyād b. Ṣāliḥ, the victor of the Battle on the Talas and the governor of Bukhārā, to revolt against Abū Muslim, through Sibā’ b. Nu‘mān, a retainer of Abū Muslim. However, Abū Muslim rushed to Bukhārā from Marw commanding his army, successfully suppressed the revolt and killed Ziyād. Being informed of the failure of the plot, the Caliphate then enticed ‘Īsā b. Māhān to

revolt against Abū Muslim by promising him the office of the governor of Khurāsān. ʿĪsā was a retainer of Abū Dāʿud, the governor of Balkh, and was in Mā warāʾ al-nahr at that time to suppress the revolt. However, soon he too was killed by Abū Dāʿud (Ṭabarī: vii, 466–67; Williams 1985: 205–208; Karev 2002: 25–26).

In 754, Abū Muslim travelled to the west for the pilgrimage. Incidentally, ʿAbdullāh, the uncle of the Caliph and the governor of Syria, revolted against the Caliph and Abū Muslim was entrusted to suppress him. After his victory over the rebels, he was invited to the military camp of the Caliph al-Manṣūr, where the “king of Khurāsān” was arrested and eventually executed.

(3) *Sepīd jāmegān and baiyi*

After the execution of Abū Muslim in 755, the situation in Khurāsān and Mā warāʾ al-nahr became more confused. Anti-ʿAbbāsīd revolts⁹ successively broke out there. Some of the rebels had once responded to the *daʿwa* of the ʿAbbāsīds and fought against the Umayyads. The participants in each revolt varied in motivation and aim. Some of them were the *ghulāt*,¹⁰ others were motivated by “popular” sentiment. Even those who had an anti-Islamic outlook, rejecting religious duties and practices and encouraging polyandry, were involved.¹¹

In the beginning of 756, only two months after the death of Abū Muslim, Sunbādh the *magi* revolted in Nishāpūr. Almost one hundred thousand people gathered and the rebel army captured not only Nishāpūr but also Qūmis and Rayy. The Caliph al-Manṣūr ordered Jahwar b. al-Mirrār al-ʿIjlī to suppress the revolt. Sunbādh declared that he would avenge the death of Abū Muslim on the ʿAbbāsīds. He proclaimed that Abū Muslim actually had not died but was hiding in a secret place with Mazdak and Mahdī waiting for the Advent (Ṭabarī: vii, 495; Yaʿqūbī: ii, 441–442; Nizām al-Mulk: 279–281; McAuliffe 1995: 44–45).

Similarly, other revolts also rallied those who were discontent with the ʿAbbāsīd rule, by appealing for revenge for Abū Muslim, or proclaiming he was the *imām*. Having a sense of impending crisis, al-Manṣūr employed a harsh repressive policy. As a result, those rebels shifted their sphere of activities to the east, i.e., the frontier region of the Islamic world at that period. Ibn al-Nadīm relates as follows:

Among the creeds which developed in Khurāsān after [the establishment of] Islām, there was that of Muslimīya. They were followers of Abū Muslim, who believed in his *imamate* and declared that he was alive and prospering. When al-Manṣūr killed Abū Muslim, he caused his propaganda agents and adherents loyal to him to flee to the frontiers of the land. (Ibn al-Nadīm: 408; Dodge 1970: 822–823)

It is also read in *Mujmal al-Tawārikh wa al-Qiṣaṣ*:

There was no child for Abū Muslim but two daughters, one of whom was Fāṭima, and the other was Asmā' bt. Abū Muslim. In the reign of al-Manṣūr, a group of *bāṭini* appeared in Khurāsān. This sect could rally people. They carried out their *da'wa* in many places. al-Manṣūr ordered that they be killed wherever they were found. (*Mujmal*: 328–329)

Fleeing from the repression of the Caliphate, *ghulāt*, Khurramīya/Muslimīya, and other rebel people moved to Mā warā' al-nahr. In 755–56, a person called Ishāq is said to have spread the teaching of Muslimīya among the Turks. Probably as a consequence of this activity, a certain Barāz revolted at Marw in 757–58 (Ibn al-Nadīm: 408; Dodge 1970: 822–823). In 767, Ustādhīs revolted at Herāt rallying almost three hundred thousand people (Ṭabarī: viii, 29–32; Ya'qūbī: ii, 457; Kennedy 1990: 44–49).

These movements attained their zenith in the revolt of al-Muqanna'. It is usually explained that his revolt started in 777, however, he seems to have been active from about 759 (Daniel 1979: 138). He rejected prayer and the fasting. He required his adherents to accept that only he was the *imām*.¹²⁾ Consequently, his teaching became a kind of shelter for those who were suppressed by the 'Abbāsids, which contributed in expanding the influence of al-Muqanna' in Mā warā' al-nahr. Turkish nomads also participated in the revolt. The adherents and supporters of al-Muqanna' were clothed in white against the 'Abbāsīd color black, and were called *mubayyida*, or *sepid jāmegān* ('those who wear white garments') (Ṭabarī: viii, 135; Narshakhī: 89–104; Gardīzī: 277–280; Niẓām al-Mulk: 310–311; Kennedy 1990: 196–197; Frye 1954: 65–76).¹³⁾ The white garments and white banner were believed to be the symbol of the Umayyads and could have helped to win over the anti-'Abbāsīd sentiments in Mā warā' al-nahr to the side of the *muqanna'ī* (Cf. Daniel 1979: 86). Even when Ishāq was

preaching in Mā warā' al-nahr (see above), anti-'Abbāsīd people were said to have been clothed in white. Abū Dā'ud, who succeeded to the position of the governor of Khurāsān after the death of Abū Muslim, was murdered in 756–57. Gardīzī relates that it was *sepīd jāmegān* who murdered Abū Dā'ud (Gardīzī: 273).¹⁴ This would mean that as early as the second half of the 750's, the people called *sepīd jāmegān* were active.

There is an interesting record found in *Cefu Yuanguī*:

In the twelfth month of the first year of Shanyuan (January, 761), an audience was granted to eighteen embassies including Poyeshi (婆謁使), the ambassador of *baiyi* (白衣, white garment). (Vol. 971, p. 11414)

Yang Huaizhong considers this Poyeshi as an ambassador from the Caliphate of Cordoba (Yang 1982: 115). Tasaka assumes that *heiyi* was erroneously recorded as *baiyi* here, as there is little probability of an embassy from the Caliphate of Cordoba to China (Tasaka 1964: 346). Tasaka may be right in pointing out the possibility of some kind of error here, however, juxtaposing this *baiyi* with *sepīd jāmegān* is tempting. H. A. R. Gibb suggests that not a small proportion of the embassies from *Dashi* to China were actually dispatched not by the Caliph himself but by the governor of Khurāsān in the name of the Caliph (Gibb 1921–23: 621). For instance, among the four embassies which arrived in China in 753, embassies dispatched by Abū Muslim, who was substantially “king of Khurāsān,” could have been included, as four embassies were too many. Ṭabarī records the tradition that when Qutayba b. Muslim made an expedition into Farghāna (probably in 713), the general sent an embassy to the Chinese Emperor (Ṭabarī: vi, 501). Gibb supposes that the practice of sending embassies to China by the governor of Khurāsān was inherited by the later governors (Gibb 1921–23: 621). As a matter of fact, Karev identifies Xieduo Hemi (謝多訶密) of *heiyi Dashi*, who is recorded in *Cefu Yuanguī* (Vol. 975, p. 11458) as a sender of the embassy in January 753, with Sa'īd b. Ḥumayd, who was entrusted the governorship of Ṭarāz (Talas) by Abū Muslim at that time (Karev 2002: 23).¹⁵ Then, if we consider the fact that most of the anti-'Abbāsīd revolts which broke out in Khurāsān and Mā warā' al-nahr after 755 utilized the figure of Abū Muslim as a means of justifying themselves, and that their leaders proclaimed themselves to be his successors,¹⁶ it is possible that embassies from those people were included among those dispatched thereafter. It seems to be, on the other

hand, difficult to connect the embassy from *baiyi* in 760 directly with the revolt of al-Muqanna‘, as the latter established his power later than 760. Nevertheless, as described above, there could be people called *sepīd jāmegān* already in the second half of the 750’s. Therefore, the present author rather hesitates to discard the record of *baiyi* in *Cefu Yuanguī* as a simple error.

However, even if the connection between *baiyi* and *sepīd jāmegān* is put aside, one can no more simply assume that all of the embassies from *Dashi* to China were sent by the Caliphs, nor that the Arab soldiers who arrived in China were “regulars” sent by the Caliph, considering the state of affairs in the eastern territory of the ‘Abbāsids in the first half of the 750’s; that is, there were two centers of power, in ‘Irāq and in Khurāsān, until the death of Abū Muslim, and numerous anti-‘Abbāsīd revolts broke out in Khurāsān thereafter. In the next section, the identity of those Arab soldiers is discussed.

4. Exiles and mercenaries

Unfortunately, to date, we have no direct evidence indicating the identity of those Arab soldiers. Still, it is possible to discuss the milieu which could enable those Arabs to appear in the political and military scene in the mid eighth century China; namely, the presence of irregular Arabs in Central Asia, the implications of the soldiers from Farghāna, and the Eurasian-wide influence of Central Asian *chākar*, which has recently been brought to light.

(1) Arabs in Central Asia

As was mentioned above, examining the situation of Mā warā’ al-nahr after the Battle on the Talas and up to the murder of Abū Muslim, Karev suggests that Abū Muslim intended further expansion to the east, by firmly installing the governor Sa‘īd b. Ḥumayd and a garrison at Ṭarāz (Karev 2002: 22–24). Thus, it can not be completely excluded that a part of such forces were sent to China in 757 by the order of Caliph al-Manṣūr, who by that time became an autocrat in the Islamic world. However, as Karev also points out, Sa‘īd seems to have been dismissed sometime after 755, and we know nothing about the fate of the military post on the Talas river thereafter. Thus, the present author is rather skeptical of the hypothesis that any substantial rule by the Caliphate continued in such a remote

region after the death of Abū Muslim, especially when we consider the turbulence in Mā warā' al-nahr which eventually lead to the revolt of al-Muqanna'.

Instead, what should be noted here is that the Arab soldiers came to China in the very period when the activity of *ghulāt* people in the west was appreciably vigorous. Gibb refers to the arrival of these Arab soldiers in China while giving a general description of the Chinese records on Arabs in the Umayyad period. Pointing out that there is little mention in the Islamic sources of the military activities of the Arabs, which are mentioned in the Chinese sources, in the first half of the eighth century, Gibb assumes that those records in the Chinese sources could be related not to the regular army of the Arabs but to the mercenaries or the people who had fled from the Umayyad territory. It is reported in the account of Xieyu (謝颺) in *Xin Tangshu*:

Various people of Turk, Jibin (罽賓), and Tuhuoluo (吐火羅/Tokhāristān) origin reside in this country (Xieyu). [The king of] Jibin arms their youth for defending themselves against *Dashi*. (Vol. 221, p. 6253)

Here Xieyu stands for Zābulistān in Eastern Afghanistan and Jibin denotes the area around the mid-high valley of the Kabul river. Gibb supposes that the Arabs who participated in the revolt by Ibn al-Ash'ath, who was defeated and killed in 702, could have fled under *rtbyl*, the king of Zābulistān. He suggests that those Arabs were part of the people of the Jibin mentioned in the above report of the *Xing Tangshu* and that they were included in the army of Jibin when it fought against other Arabs marching from Sīstān. Gibb further discusses that the Arabs who appear in the following account of the *Zizhi Tongjian* must have been mercenaries:

[In the seventh month of the fifth year of Kaiyuan (August, 717)] Tang Jiahui (湯嘉惠), the Vice Protector-general of Anxi reported to the Emperor that the Türgish had besieged Bohuan (鉢換) and Dashi (大石) castles, together with the Arabs and the Tibetans (吐蕃) aiming at seizing all of the Four Garrisons. (Vol. 211, p. 6728)

From this example, Gibb deduces that the Arab soldiers who came to China at the time of the An-Shi Rebellion were not from a regular army despatched by the Caliph but a group of Arabs who were attracted by the

Emperor's promise of good rewards (Gibb 1921–23: 614–619).

Gibb's understanding of the account of *Xin Tangshu* cited above is based on that of Josef Marquart, which is no more creditable, and it is difficult to agree with Gibb's position on the relation between Jibin and Xieyu (Cf. Inaba 1991). Still, his assertion of the various activities of the Arabs other than the regular army, seems to get the point. The present author accepts the supposition of Gibb as to the identity of the Arab soldiers in question, to which the other supporting instance can be cited from the account of Nanzhao (南詔) in *Xin Tangshu*:

In the spring of the seventeenth year [of Zhenyuan] (Spring of 801), [the joint army of the Tang and Nanshao], after crossing the Lüshui (瀘水) river at night, made an attack on the camp of Lu (虜=Tibetans) and killed five hundred enemies. The Tibetans tried to defend themselves at Luwei mountain (鹿危山) but Du Piluo (杜毘羅), [a general of Nanzhao] ambushed them and gave a crushing defeat to the Tibetans. At this time, all the Tibetan commanders as well as the soldiers from Kangguo (康國=Samarqand) and the *heiyi Dashi*, surrendered. Twenty thousand armed enemies were killed. (Vol. 222, p. 6277)

Jitsuzō Kuwabara supposes that those soldiers from Samarqand and the Arabs could have been captives caught by the Tibetans during the warfare in Central Asia (Kuwabara 1968: 289–290). Some of them could have been mercenaries as Gibb suggests. In any case, this is at least an instance of the Arab soldiers other than the regular army of the Caliph.

As was discussed above, the Emperor Suzong tried to gain reinforcements from the West. He despatched an envoy to the Uighurs, ordered the recruitments in Farghāna, as well as in *chengguo zhuguo* (城郭諸國), which were the City States and small principalities in the West.¹⁷⁾ As a result, the soldiers belonging to Anxi and Beiding Protectorates, the soldiers recruited in Farghāna, and the Arab soldiers arrived. This sequence of the events indicates that, differing from the soldiers of the Uighurs and those from Farghāna who were designated from the outset, the Arab soldiers came to China on their own, attracted by the high rewards.¹⁸⁾ As Gibb rightly supposes, this kind of soldiers can not be a regular army dispatched by the Caliph.

(2) Farghāna

Another point deserving the attention is that the Arab soldiers came together with the soldiers of Farghāna. In the beginning of the eighth century, there were two kingdoms in Farghāna, one of which is reported to be Turkish ruled to the north of the Syr Darya, while the other to be Iranian to the south of the river.¹⁹⁾ According to *Zizhi Tongjian* (Vol. 211), around 715, the Arabs and the Tibetans supported A Liaoda (阿了達), who was the Iranian king, and made a joint attack against the Turkish king of northern Farghāna. The latter fled to Anxi Protectorate to ask for the help. The Chinese army advanced from Kucha and defeated A Liaoda. As a result, the Syr Darya seems to have become the border between two kingdoms (Cf. Maejima 1971: 155–159).

It was Farghāna which actually triggered the Battle on the Talas.²⁰⁾ According to Ibn al-Athīr, Ikhshīd, the king of Farghāna sought a help from the Tang because of the conflict between him and the king of Shāsh (Tashkent). The Tang dispatched a large army to attack Shāsh and the latter was urged to surrender, which eventually caused the expedition of Ziyād b. Ṣāliḥ (Ibn al-Athīr: v, 449). *Zizhi Tongjian* also relates:

Gao Xianzhi captured the king of Shiguo (石國, Tashkent). The prince of Shiguo escaped and went around the City States in *xiyu* (西域) to appeal to them for a help censuring for Xianzhi's deceit and rapacity. All of those states felt indignation [against Xianzhi] and secretly became allied with the Arabs to attack the Four Garrisons. Being informed of this, Xianzhi decided to attack the Arabs with an army of thirty thousand Chinese and non-Chinese soldiers. They marched more than seven hundred *li* to the west and reached the city of Talas, where they encountered the Arab army. (Vol. 216, p. 6907)

Thus, the intervention of the Tang in the conflict between Farghāna and Shāsh, was a direct cause of the battle. Needless to say, Ikhshīd mentioned by Ibn al-Athīr was identical with the Turkish king of the northern Farghāna.²¹⁾ At the beginning of 750, the Tang still exercised a kind of suzerainty over the northern Farghāna, which must have been a reason why Suzong specifically designated Farghāna as a place where soldiers were to be levied. In addition, it could also be implied that Farghāna was executed to repay the aid provided by the Tang for the conflict with Shāsh.

As was discussed above, a various kinds of revolts broke out in the

‘Abbāsīd territory in the second half of the 750’s. Most of them were put down and the consequent repression by the ‘Abbāsīds forced the remaining rebels to move eastward, i.e., to Khurāsān and Mā warā’ al-nahr. From the number of the participants in those revolts, one can deduce that the number of such refugees could still have been large, and a considerable portion of those people might have come to Farghāna, referring to the fact that the propaganda was spread by Ishāq to the Turkish region which was most probably the valley of the Syr Darya. According to Daniel, there were a lot of Turks who participated in the revolt of al-Muqanna‘ and some sources call him “the king of Farghāna and the Turks,” which suggests the strong connection of *ghulāt/sepīd jāmegān* with Farghāna (Daniel 1979: 139). Combined with Gibb’s assumption about the activities of irregular Arabs on the eastern frontier of the Islamic world, the revolts in the ‘Abbāsīd territory could reveal the background of the account of *Zizhi Tongjian* concerning the reinforcements from the West. The Emperor’s request for reinforcements was directed toward Farghāna and adjacent City States in Mā warā’ al-nahr. The rebels who had been repelled by the ‘Abbāsīds had just entered those regions and some of them were likely to have advanced to the east together with the soldiers levied in Farghāna. It should be noted here that the nine States of Mā warā’ al-nahr, together with Tuhouluo Yabghu Wunaduo (吐火羅葉護烏那多), eventually sent reinforcements in August, 758. The Emperor ordered them to join the Shuofang Mobile Brigade (*Cefu Yuangui* Vol. 973, p. 11434). The Arabs were more than one year ahead of the army from Mā warā’ al-nahr. This may imply that the Arab soldiers could respond instantly to the request of the Emperor, because they had already been in Farghāna and were ready and even willing to move eastwards, probably being attracted by good rewards or seeking a new field of activity.²²⁾

(3) *Chākars*

Given that the Arab soldiers who arrived in China were such people, there were grounds for accepting them on the Tang’s side, more precisely, in the region where East Asia and Central Asia join. It is on this part of Eurasia that recent research has brought about a new perspective.

Previously, Michio Tanigawa, comparing the components of the rebel army and of the Tang army, pointed out that amongst the most important forces for the former was the *yelouhe* (曳落河) corps consisting of Qidan (契丹), Xi (奚), Tongluo (同羅), and Shiwei (室韋), eight thousand

in number. They were loyal troops, being “adopted sons (假子 *jiāzhi*)” of An Lushan. Étienne de la Vaissière pays special attention to the soldiers called Zhejie (柘羯/赭羯), or Zhije (拓羯), in the army of An Lushan, and identifies them with the *chākar*, a kind of mercenary, broadly observed in Sogdiana in the 7th and the 8th centuries (la Vaissière 2007: 59 ff.). As to this Sogdian *chākar*, Beckwith (1984) already had pointed out that the ‘Abbāsīd Caliph al-Ma’mūn and al-Mu’taṣim adopted the use of such military personnel and composed a corps which was a prototype of the military slave system known as *mamlūk*. Then, la Vaissière has successfully juxtaposed that noteworthy military system of the Islamic world with that of China by placing Sogdian *chākar* as a link between them, and observes the common feature of incorporating those soldiers within their masters’ extended family. As a matter of fact, Moriyasu suggests that *yelouhe* was a rendering of *chākar* in the language of Khitai (Moriyasu 2002: 129–130, n.19).

On the other hand, the Sogdians who settled down on the northwestern frontier of the Tang and adopted some nomadic customs have been described as Sogdian-Turks by Japanese scholars such as Moribe, who has elucidated that those people played important politico-military roles in the history of Tang and Post-Tang China (Cf. Moriyasu 2008: 13 ff.). La Vaissière, also referring to such circumstances, by the term “Turco-sogdian *mileux*,” points out the same kind of hybridization in the Sogdian frontier adjoining the nomadic area (la Vaissière 2005: Chap. 7). Therefore, recent scholarship in this field has illuminated that the broad activities of Iranian people mingled with Turks played significant rolls both in the political and military affairs of a considerably wide area in Eurasia from the 7th century.

The Zhejie/*chākar* in the Chinese sources have been discussed so far as chiefly related to An Lushan’s army. La Vaissière (2007: 79) supposes that the *chākars* in the Tang army who were rewarded by the Emperor in 759 (*Cefu Yuanguai* Vol. 976, p. 11461) were those who surrendered themselves to the Tang after the murder of An Qingxu by Shi Siming (史思明). Yutaka Yoshida recently has pointed out that the *chākar* mentioned in the poetry of Dufu (杜甫) (*Quantangshi* [全唐詩] Vol. 225, No. 12) together with Huamen (花門), which means the Uighurs, were the original reinforcements to the Tang army coming from areas in the Western Region, such as Farghāna, and it was they whom the Emperor honored in 759 (Yoshida 2007: 53–54 & n. 21).²³ Yoshida is right, as it seems more plausible to consider that the same kind of soldiers were also enlisted in

the Tang army. Before the revolt, An Lushan himself was a Military Commissioner of the Tang, which means that the recruitment of *chākars*, i.e., mercenaries, as their private forces was not completely new to the Tang military system. Moreover, following Tanigawa in regarding those private mercenaries as the core of An Lushan's army, it is quite understandable if the Tang, who had witnessed the formidable strength of that troop, tried to take countermeasures. The request for aid to the Uighurs and the levy in the Western Region was nothing but that. The recruitment of Central Asian *chākars* could be reasonably assumed to be one of their intentions, and it is highly probable that the soldiers from Farghāna included such people. According to la Vaissière, not only Sogdians but also Turks and Sogdian-turks were included in the Sogdian *chākar*, from which we can deduce that when the Tang tried to compose the troops to oppose to the *yelouhe/chākar*, the resources were sought within various kinds of people. Therefore, those rebels and *ghulāts* who had been repelled from the 'Abbāsīd territory and had fled to *Mā warā' al-nahr*, could have arrived in China as a component of those mercenaries and could have been designated as *chākar* (Cf. Nakata 2007: 50, 64, n. 36).

5. Muslim ancestors ?

Finally, the supposition that those Arabs were the remote ancestors of Chinese Muslims is to be examined. According to Yang Huaizhong, the mixed army of the Uighurs, Arabs, and others was stationed at Shayuan, which may have been located to the south of present Dali (大荔) prefecture of Shanxi province. This Shayuan was the grazing ground of the Emperor's horses. Those soldiers settled there, cultivating and pasturing. The Uighurs were not Muslims at that time, however, the religion was spread among them by the Arabs residing together with them. In the Ming period, this region became a large settlement of Chinese Muslims and the center of Islamic studies in China. The famous Hu Dengzhou (胡登州) was also from this area (Yang 1982: 118–120). However, the related accounts of *Jiu Tangshu* (Vol. 195, p. 5199) and *Zizhi Tongjian* (Vol. 220, pp. 7043–7044) read that the army of the Uighurs was stationed at Shayuan while the Yabghu took a temporal leave from Changan. There is no mention of the Arabs army here, nor in any other sources.²⁴⁾ Yang supposes that the Arabs were also stationed at Shayuan with the Uighurs but only the name of the latter was mentioned as they were the main body of the troop. He quotes the description of Kāmil Ayad, which is as follows:

When the An-Shi Rebellion broke out, the Emperor of the Tang requested the Arab Empire for aid. The latter supported the Tang by sending an army. After the revolt was suppressed, the Emperor allowed those soldiers to reside in Changan as a reward for their help. He married them with Chinese ladies and constructed Islamic temples (清真寺) in 762 (the first year of Baoying). (Ayad 1958: 49)

The supposition of Yang Huaizhong seems to be constructed combining this description with the toponym Shayuan and with Shanxi province as a center for Chinese Islam during and after the Ming period. However, the sources of Ayad were probably the texts called *Huihui Yuanlai* (回回元來) and *Xilai Zongpu* (西來宗譜) respectively, which have been criticized in detail for their fictitiousness by Tasaka (1964: 198–199, 349). According to Tasaka, the *Huihui Yuanlai* was composed in the Kangxi (康熙) era of the Qing (1661–1722), and the *Xilai Zongpu* in the Guangxu (光緒) era (1875–1908). The story about the origin of Chinese Islam found in those texts is as follows: In the second year of Zhenguan (628), Emperor Taizong (太宗) saw in his dream the figure of the Muslims with turbans on their heads. The Emperor heard the prediction that those people would save the Tang when a great hardship came. He dispatched retainers to seek a friendship with them. After the negotiation, they chose three thousand Chinese soldiers to emigrate to the west, and invited three thousand Hui soldiers to China to immigrate and settle. At that time, only eight hundred Hui soldiers could immigrate, however, when the An-Shi Rebellion broke out, an additional three thousand Hui people came to aid the dynasty, with whose support, the Tang could settle the revolt. An Islamic temple was constructed in Changan for them. Those Hui people settled down and were married with three thousand Chinese women.²⁵⁾

As is obvious, the story that the dream of Taizong was the cause of the coming of Islam to China is a mere adaptation from the story about the first coming of Buddhism to China in the reign of Mingdi (明帝) of the Late Han, in which Mingdi also dreamed of the figure of a golden person. Given that the description of Ayad is, as Tasaka criticized, based on these questionable texts of a much later period, the plausibility of the story about “the Arab settlement in Shayuan” is all the more to be questioned.

As far as we know now, the presence of Islam in the Shanxi region can date back to the Yuan period at best. The real introduction of the Islam to this region began when Sayyid Ajall Shams al-Dīn, who is also famous for laying the foundation of the Muslim community in Yunnan (雲

南), became the governor there in the 1260's (Cf. Yang Yongchang 1982: 44-45). The process was accelerated when Ānanda the king of Anxi converted to Islam in 1280. Until he was executed in 1331, a considerable number of converts appeared in the Changan region (Tasaka 1964: 626-632). The famous inscription of the Great Mosque of Xian (西安) says that the Mosque was constructed in the first year of Tianbao (742). However, Kuwabara examined the content of the inscription and concluded that the inscription was composed in the Ming period, and, as far as is known from the sources such as the inscription of Zhongyan-si temple (重巖寺) in the Yongxing (永興) prefecture by Shu Yuanyu (舒元興) and *Changanzhi* (長安志 *The history of Changan*) by Song Minqiu (宋敏求) of the Song period, there could not be any explicitly Islamic temple in Changan in the Tang period (Kuwabara 1968: 425-437).

Needless to say, the possibility of a settlement by the Arabs in China in the Tang period can not be excluded.²⁶⁾ However, even if it did exist, the number of those settlers might not have been large. Moreover, it is rather probable that the Arabs, or *Dashi*, who came to China at that time were not those who held the "orthodox" Islam. There would have been a wide variety of faiths among those people, some of whom would have been the *ghulāts* of Shī'a, while others could have had some kind of anti-Islamic tendencies influenced by the Mazdean and/or Mazdakite beliefs, refusing Islamic practices such as prayer, fasting, and pilgrimage while approving the polyandry. If such people really settled in China, the later history of them and their descendants may be another interesting subject to investigate, though there seems to be little trace of them.

Notes

- 1) The original Japanese version of this paper was published in 2001 (Inaba 2001). Since then, a lot of important researches on the activities of Sogdians, Turks, and Sogdian-turks in Central Asia have come out, combining newly discovered materials with new interpretations of known materials. Thanks to those studies, which are to be mentioned in this paper, a completely new perspective on the study of not only Central Asia, but also of East Asia and West Asia has been opened out. Based on the new knowledge and perceptions provided by those studies, the necessary corrections and revisions have been made to the older version. However, the synopsis has not been changed.
- 2) As to the general description of this rebellion, see Tanigawa 1954: 78-80; Pulleyblank 1955. Takao Moriyasu depicts the rebellion from the viewpoint of the Uighurs, whose reinforcement of the Tang was decisive for the con-

sequence of the rebellion (Moriyasu 2002). Yutaka Moribe neatly gives a summary of previous scholarship on the rebellion (Moribe 2010: 10–18), as well as opening out a new perspective on the history of the northwestern frontier of China up to the 10th century. Étienne de la Vaissière and Éric Tronbert describe the rebellion within the broader context of migrations and integration of the Iranian people in China (la Vaissière & Trombert 2004: 961–963).

- 3) In general, *Dashi* in the Chinese sources is applied to the Arabs and/or Muslims. Nevertheless, there was some shifting in whom the word referred to according to the period, the character of the literature, and the contexts of the events described. For instance, Takafumi Shirota points out that *Dashi* in *Liaoshi* (遼史 *The History of Liao*) is applied exclusively to the Qara Khanids (Shirota 1992). Be that as it may, as for the Tang period, especially for the eighth century, it was well understood that *Dashi* were the people who had defeated the Bosi (波斯)/Persians, as the sources such as *Jiu Tangshu*, *Xin Tangshu*, and *Tang Huiyao* explicitly describe them. However, as Jonathan N. Lipman has noted that Bosi in this period could be applied to the non-Muslim Persians in many cases (Lipman 1997: 25, n.6), it may be appropriate to consider *Dashi* in the Tang period as meaning the Arab Muslims and/or Muslim people from the West.
- 4) As a matter of fact, the Prince of Guangpin was designated as Grand Marshal on the ninth month of the first year of Zhide (October, 756) (Cf. *Zizhi Tongjian* Vol. 218, pp. 6995–6996).
- 5) wu 戊 in the text.
- 6) The general descriptions on the “revolution” and the circumstances in Khurāsān are found in Daniel 1979; Shaban 1970: 138–168; Amabe 1995: 31–104. There are still arguments concerning the character of the “revolution,” and new studies are being published. Those which were published in the 1980’s and 90’s are reviewed by Daniel (1997). Karev also gives a summary of previous studies (Karev 2002). As to the new interpretation by Parvaneh Pourshariati on the initial stage of the “revolution” (Pourshariati 2008: 414 ff.), the present author is not competent to pronounce on the propriety of her remarkably new view on the history of the Sasanian dynasty, on which her interpretation of the “revolution” is based. On this, see also Gyselen 2009.
- 7) According to Jōhei Shimada, the names of fifteen thousand Arab *muqātilas* in Khurāsān were deleted from the payroll (*diwān*) when they lost the will to fight against the invading Türgish in 724 (Shimada 1977: 136–138). Some of them revolted against the Caliph supporting Ḥārith b. Sulayj in 734. The rest might have been settled in Khurāsān as peasants.
- 8) Daniel considers that this obscurity was intentionally produced by Abū Muslim himself for gaining support from Iranian *dihqāns* as well as from the lower class people (Daniel 1979: 104).
- 9) Karev (2002: 16–17) rightly criticizes the assertion that the anti-‘Abbāsīd movement was dominant in Mā warā’ al-nahr at that time, by drawing attention to the fact that each revolt had its own aim and initiator. Thus, here the

- term “anti-‘Abbāsīd revolt” is used to generally describe the revolt which was eventually suppressed by the ‘Abbāsīds.
- 10) As for the term “*ghulāt*,” see Hodgson (*EI*², “GHULĀT”); Babayan 2002: xv–xxxviii, lii, n.38.
 - 11) The movements connected with pre-Islamic Iranian religions, such as Mazdaeism, Manichaeism, and Mazdakism/Khurramdīn, have been generally described by Browne (1977: I, 308–336) and Amoretti (1975). Madelung (1988: 8; *EI*², “KHURRAMIYYA”) describes that the *da‘wa* of Abū Muslim gained numerous Mazdakite/Khurramīya adherents, who after the death of Abū Muslim rose in revolt.
 - 12) al-Birūnī relates that Muqanna‘ made the laws and customs established by Mazdak obligatory for his adherents (Sachau 1984: 194). Nizām al-Mulk tells that, even in the time of the Samanids, there were frequent insurgences by the people called *muqanna‘ī* in Farghāna, who considered polyandry, drinking, and consanguineous marriage as lawful, but prayer, fasting, *zakāt*, pilgrimage, and *ghazā* as prohibited (Nizām al-Mulk: 304).
 - 13) As to the details of the Muqanna‘’s revolt, see, for instance, Daniel 1979: 137–147.
 - 14) In the account of Gardīzī, the *seḫīd jāmegān* who murdered Abū Dā‘ud was led by a certain Sa‘īd Jūlāh. Though it is not known if there is any relation between this Sa‘īd and Ishāq, both of them were active around 757.
 - 15) However, it should be remarked that la Vaissière, referring to L. Petech, considers this Xieduo Hemi to be reconstructed as “Ziyād amīr,” that is, Ziyād b. Šālīḥ, which is phonetically closer to the Chinese transcription (la Vaissière 2007: 55, n.139).
 - 16) The copper coin of al-Muqanna‘, found by Boris Kochnev in the Hermitage, has a legend on the reverse, which relates that the coin was issued by the order of Hāshim (al-Muqanna‘), *walī* of Abū Muslim (Kochnev 2001).
 - 17) See the commentary to *Zizhi Tongjian* by Hu Sansheng (胡三省).
 - 18) For instance, Suzong is said to have promised the Uighurs that while the real estates and male population belong to the Tang, the Uighurs can put their hands on the movable properties and women (*Zizhi Tongjian* Vol. 220, p. 7034).
 - 19) In the 720’s, Huichao records the two kingdoms in Farghāna; one to the south of the River (Syr Darya), belonging to the Arabs and the other to the north, belonging to the Turks (Kuwayama 1992: 24, 43, 173).
 - 20) The series of events which finally led to the battle is thoroughly examined in Beckwith (1987: 108–142) and Karev (2002).
 - 21) Beckwith reconstructs the states of affairs in Central Asia as follows: At the beginning of 750 there arose a conflict between Farghāna and Tashkent. Opposing to Arsīlan Tarqan, the Ikhshīd of Farghāna, who was supported by the Tang, the Türgish provided an aid to the king of Tashkent. Also the king of Khuṭṭal who had been attacked by Abū Dā‘ud, the Arab governor of Balkh, could have lent support to Farghāna (Beckwith 1987: 137–138).
 - 22) The prompt response of the Arabs is also perceived from the accounts of *Zizhi Tongjian* (Vols. 218, 219) cited above. The source records the request of

the Emperor for reinforcements in October, 756, while it reports the news of the arrival of the armies from Anxi, Beiding, Farghāna, and *Dashi* at Liangzhou and Shanshan in the beginning of February, 757. This means that the Arabs came up to Lianzhou and Shanshan within four months.

- 23) This verse was read when the Emperor's army led by the Grand Marshal was about to attack Changan in 757 (Nakata 2007: 50).
- 24) On the other hand, the Arabs were apparently in the army which advanced to Luoyang after capturing Changan (see the account of *Cefu Yuanguai* Vol. 973 quoted above).
- 25) An abridged English translation from the *Huihui Yuanlai* is found in Lipman 1997: 24–25. In the beginning of this decade, various booklets concerning the Islamic religion were distributed in the mosques in Xinjiang, among which was a small book entitled *Tang wang tang dao* (唐王談道 *The Tang Emperor talks about the right path*). This is just a reproduction of the story found in *Huihui Yuanlai*, which means that the story about the first coming of Islam to China in the Tang period is still popular among the Chinese Muslims.
- 26) As a matter of fact, several sources mention the small colonies of Arab traders at the port cities in southern China in the Tang period. Cf. Lipman 1997: 25–29. However, the coming of Muslims to China should not be confounded with the coming of Islam to China.

Bibliography

(English translations of titles made by the authors of articles and books written in Japanese and Chinese are shown as published. As for the rest, English translations are given by the present author.)

Primary Sources

- Cefu Yuanguai* 冊府元龜, Wang Qinruo 王欽若, Yang Yi 楊億 *et al.* (eds.), 20 vols., Taiwan Zhonghua Shuju 臺灣中華書局, Taipei, 1972.
- Gardizī, Abū Sa'īd 'Abd al-Ḥayy b. Zāḥḥāk, *Tārikh-i Gardizī*, 'Abd al-Ḥayy Ḥabībī (ed.), Tehran, 1985.
- Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil fi al-Ta'rikh*, 13 vols., C. J. Tornberg (ed.), Beirut, 1979.
- Ibn an-Nadīm, Abū al-Faraj Muḥammad, *Kitāb al-Fihrist*, Riḍā Tajaddud b. 'Alī (ed.), Tehran, 1971.
- Jiu Tangshu* 舊唐書, Liu Xu 劉昫, Zhang Zhaoyuan 張昭遠 *et al.* (eds.), 16 vols., Zhonghua Shuju 中華書局, Beijing, 1975.
- Mujmal al-Tawārikh wa al-Qiṣaṣ*, anonym. Malik al-Shu'arā Bahār (ed.), Tehran, 1940.
- al-Narshakhī, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Ja'far, *Tārikh-i Bukhārā*, Sayyid Muḥammad Taqī Mudarris Riḍawī (ed.), Tehran, 1985.
- Nizām al-Mulk, *Siyar al-Mulūk*, H. Darke (ed.), Tehran, 1976.
- al-Ṭabarī, Abū Ja'far Muḥammad, *Ta'rikh al-Rusul wa al-Mulūk*, 12 vols., Muḥammad Abū al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (ed.), Beirut, 1966.
- Tang Huiyao* 唐會要, Wang Pu 王溥 (ed.), 3 vols., Shijie Shuju 世界書局, Taipei,

1988.
Xin Tangshu 新唐書, Ou Yangxiu 歐陽脩, Song Qi 宋祁 *et al.* (eds.), 20 vols., Zhonghua Shuju, Beijing, 1975.
 al-Ya'qūbī, Aḥmad b. Abū Ya'qūb, *Historiae*, 2 vols., M. Th. Houtsma (ed.), E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1969.
Zizhi Tongjian 資治通鑑, Sima Guang 司馬光, 20 vols., Zhonghua Shuju, Beijing, 1956.

Secondary Sources

- AMABE, Fukuzo
 1995 *The Emergence of the 'Abbāsid Autocracy*. Kyoto University Press, Kyoto.
- AMORETTI, Biancamaria S.
 1975 "Sects and Heresies." R. N. Frye (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Iran*, Vol. 4, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- AYAD, Kāmil 卡米勒爾·雅德
 1958 "Zhongguo yu Alabo zhi jian de lishi guanxi 中國與阿拉伯之間的歷史關係 [Historical relation between China and the Arabs]." *Lishi Yanjiu* 歷史研究 [*Historical Research*] 1958(11), pp. 45–54.
- BABAYAN, Kathryn
 2002 *Mystics, Monarchs, and Messiahs: Cultural Landscapes of Early Modern Iran*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge Mass. & London.
- BECKWITH, Christopher I.
 1984 "Aspects of the Early History of the Central Asian Guard Corps in Islam." *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 4, pp. 29–43.
 1987 *The Tibetan Empire in Central Asia*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.
- BLANKINSHIP, Khalid Y.
 1989 (tr.) *The History of al-Ṭabarī*, Vol. xxv; *The End of Expansion*. State University of New York Press, Albany.
- BROWNE, Edward G.
 1977 *A Literary History of Persia*. 2 vols., (reprint), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- DANIEL, Elton L.
 1979 *The Political and Social History of Khurasan under Abbasid Rule 747–820*. Bibliotheca Islamica, Minneapolis & Chicago.
 1997 "Review: Arabs, Persians, and the Advent of the Abbasids Reconsidered." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 117(3), pp. 542–548.
- DODGE, Bayard
 1970 (tr.) *The Fihrist of al-Nadīm*. 2 vols., Columbia University Press, New York.
- FRYE, Richard N.
 1954 (tr.) *The History of Bukhara*. Mediaeval Academy of America, Cambridge, Mass.

- GIBB, Hamilton A. R.
 1921–23 “Chinese Records of the Arabs in Central Asia.” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, London Institution* 2, pp. 613–622.
- GYSELEN, Rika
 2009 “Primary sources and historiography on the Sasanian empire.” *Studia Iranica* 38(2), pp. 163–190.
- INABA, Minoru 稲葉 稜
 1991 “Shichi-hachi seiki Zābulistān no san'nin no ō 七—八世紀ザブリストーンの三人の王 [The three kings of Zabulistan from the 7th to the 8th century A.D.].” *Seinan Ajia Kenkyū* 西南アジア研究 [*Bulletin of the Society for Western and Southern Asiatic Studies*] 35, pp. 39–60.
 2001 “Anshi no ran ji ni nittō shita Arab hei ni tsuite 安史の亂時に入唐したアラブ兵について [The Arab soldiers in China at the time of the An-Shi Rebellion].” *Kokusai Bunka Kenkyū* 国際文化研究 [*Intercultural Studies*] 5, pp. 16–33.
- KAREV, Yury
 2002 “La politique d'Abū Muslim dans le Māwarā'annah. Nouvelles données textuelles et archéologiques.” *Der Islam* 79, pp. 1–46.
- KENNEDY, Hugh
 1990 (tr.) *The History of al-Ṭabarī*, Vol. xxix; *Al-Manṣūr and al-Mahdī*. State University of New York Press, Albany.
- KOCHNEV, Boris
 2001 “Les monnaies de Muqanna'.” *Studia Iranica* 30(1), pp. 143–150.
- KUWABARA, Jitsuzō 桑原 鷲藏
 1968 *Tōyō bunmeishi ronsō* 東洋文明史論叢 [A collection of essays on the history of the civilization of the Orient]. (*Kuwabara Jitsuzō zenshū* 桑原鷲藏全集 [The complete works of Jitsuzō Kuwabara], Vol. 2), Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店, Tōkyō.
- KUWAYAMA, Shōshin 桑山 正進 (ed.)
 1992 *Echō Ōgotenjīkukokuden kenkyū* 慧超往五天竺國傳研究 [*Huichao's Wang Wu-Tianzhuguo zhuan: Record of travels in five Indic regions*]. Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University 京都大學人文科學研究所, Kyōto.
- La VAISSIÈRE, Étienne de
 2005 *Sogdian Traders: A History*. tr. by J. Ward, E.J. Brill, Leiden.
 2007 *Samarcande et Samarra: Élités d'asie centrale dans l'empire Abbaside*. Peeters Press, Leuven.
- La VAISSIÈRE, Étienne de & Éric TROMBERT
 2004 “Des Chinois et des Hu. Migrations et intégration des Iraniens orientaux en milieu chinois durant le haut Moyen Âge.” *Annales. Histoire, Science Sociale* 2004(5–6), pp. 931–969.
- LIPMAN, Jonathan N.
 1997 *Familiar Strangers: A History of Muslims in Northwest China*. University of Washington Press, Seattle & London.

- MADLUNG, Wilfred
1988 *Religious Trends in Early Islamic Iran*. Bibliotheca Persica, Albany.
- MAEJIMA, Shinji 前嶋信次
1971 “Tarasu sen kō タラス戦考 [A study on the Battle of Talas].” *Tōzai bunka kōryū no shosō 東西文化交流の諸相 [Aspects of cultural interaction between the East and the West]*, Seibundō Shinkōsha 誠文堂新光社, Tōkyō, pp. 129–200.
- McAULIFFE, Jane D.
1995 (tr.) *The History of al-Ṭabarī*, Vol. xxviii; ‘Abbāsīd Authority Affirmed. State University of New York Press, Albany.
- MORIBE, Yutaka 森部豊
2010 *Sogudojin no tōhokatsudō 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的展開 [Activities of the Sogdians in the East and the historical development of Eastern Eurasia]*. Kansai University Press 關西大學出版局, Ōsaka.
- MORIYASU, Takao 森安孝夫
2002 “Uiguru kara mita Anshi no ran ウイグルから見た安史の亂 [The rebellion of An Lu-shan (755–763) from the Uighurs’ viewpoint—With special reference to a Uighur document Mains 345].” *Nairiku Ajia Gengo no Kenkyū 内陸アジア言語の研究 [Studies on the Inner Asian Languages]* 12, pp. 117–170.
2008 “Japanese Research on the History of the Sogdians along the Silk Road, Mainly from Sogdiana to China.” *Acta Asiatica* 94, pp. 1–39.
- NAKATA, Mie 中田美繪
2007 “Fukū no Chōan bukyō kai taitō to Sogudo jin 不空の長安佛教界臺頭とソグド人 [Bukong’s rise within Chang’an’s Buddhist circles and Sogdians].” *The Toyo Gakuho 東洋學報 [The Journal of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko]* 89(3), pp. 33–65.
- POURSHARIATI, Parvane
2008 *Decline and Fall of the Sasanian Empire*. I.B. Tauris, London & New York.
- PULLEYBLANK, Edwin G.
1955 *The Background of the Rebellion of An Lu-shan*. Oxford University Press, London, etc.
- SACHAU, C. Eduard
1984 (tr.) *The Chronology of Ancient Nations*. (reprint), Minerva Verlag GMBH, Frankfurt/Main.
- SHABAN, Muhammad A.
1970 *The ‘Abbāsīd Revolution*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- SHIMADA, Jōhei 嶋田襄平
1977 *Isuramu no kokka to shakai イスラムの國家と社會 [The state and society of Islam]*. Iwanami Shoten, Tōkyō.
- SHIROTA, Takafumi 代田貴文
1992 “Ryōshi ni mieru Taishoku koku ni tsuite 遼史に見える大食國に

- ついて [On the Tazi in the Liao-shih].” *Chū’ō Daigaku Ajia Kenkyū*
中央大學アジア研究 [*Chuo Journal of Asian History*] 16, pp. 36-54.
- TANIGAWA, Michio 谷川道雄
1954 “Anshi no ran no seikaku ni tsuite 安史の亂の性格について [On the character of the Rebellion of An Lu-shan & Shi Szu-ming].” *Nagoya Daigaku Bungakubu Kenkyū Ronshū: Shigakuka hen* 名古屋大學文學部研究論集：史學科編 [*The Journal of the Faculty of Letters, Nagoya University: History*] 8, pp. 77-92.
- TASAKA, Kōdō 田坂興道
1964 *Chūgoku ni okeru Kaikyō no denrai to sono gūzū* 中國における回教の傳來とその弘通 [*The transmission and diffusion of Islam in China*]. 2 vols., Tōyō Bunko 東洋文庫, Tōkyō.
- WILLIAMS, John A.
1985 (tr.) *The History of al-Ṭabarī*, Vol. xxvii; *The ‘Abbāsīd Revolution*. State University of New York Press, Albany.
- YANG, Huaizhong 楊懷中
1982 “Tang dai de Fanke 唐代的蕃客 [Foreigners in Tang China].” *Gansu sheng minzu yanjiu suo* 甘肅省民族研究所 (ed.), *Yisilan jiao zai Zhongguo* 伊斯蘭教在中國 [*Islam in China*], Ningxia Renmin Chubanshe 寧夏人民出版社, Yinchuan, pp. 107-138.
- YANG, Yongchang 楊永昌
1982 “Zaoqi Yisilan jiao xueshu zai Zhongguo yunbo qingkuang de tantao 早期伊斯蘭教學術在中國傳播情況的探討 [On the circumstances of the early spread of Islamic knowledge in China].” *Gansu sheng minzu yanjiu suo* (ed.), *Yisilan jiao zai Zhongguo* [*Islam in China*], Ningxia Renmin Chubanshe, Yinchuan, pp. 42-96.
- YOSHIDA, Yutaka 吉田豊
2007 “Sogudo jin to Toruko jin no kankei ni tsuite no Sogudo go shiryō ni ken ソグド人とトルコ人の關係についてのソグド語資料二件 [Two Sogdian materials concerning the Turco-Sogdian relationship].” *Seinan Ajia Kenkyū* [*Bulletin of the Society for Western and Southern Asiatic Studies*] 67, pp. 48-56.
- ZHANG, Chengzhi 張承志
1993 *Kaikyō kara mita Chūgoku: Minzoku, shūkyō, kokka* 回教から見た中國—民族、宗教、國家 [*An Islamic view of China: Ethnicity, religion, nation*]. Chū’ō Kōronsha 中央公論社, Tōkyō.