

Mongol Rule over Hu-kuang 湖廣 Province during the Yüan Dynasty

—Control over the *Hsi-tung* 溪洞 People—

By Ritsuko OSHIMA

Prologue

It has been doubted if the Yüan 元 dynasty established by the Mongols could actually dominate and hold China whose habitants were mainly *Han-tsu* 漢族 and which had been under the Chin 金 and Southern Sung 南宋 dynasties until the Mongols took over. Also the problem is most obvious in its management of the region in the south of the Ch'ang-chiang 長江 (hereafter referred to as the Yangtze River). There are several reasons why these doubts arise. Firstly, in the Chiang-nan 江南 the Mongols could not succeed in forming its own tax system which had already been implemented in the northern China. For example, the Yüan dynasty failed to levy the *k'e-ch'ai* 科差, one of the main taxes of the Yüan dynasty, upon Hu-kuang province as well as the northern part of China, after she defeated the Sung. As a result she had no alternative but to follow the *liang-shui* 兩稅 system of the Sung. Secondly, main cities of the provinces of the southern China situated in and around the Yangtze Valley. The zone of their jurisdiction extended from north to south, and their boundaries were at right angles with the Yangtze Valley. Therefore, it is thought that the Yüan dynasty could not govern all over the Southern Sung territory.¹⁾

Even now, in south of the Yangtze River, live many non-*Han* tribes whom contemporary Chinese call 'minorities'. They have lived in Yün-nan 雲南 and Ssü-ch'uan 四川, the very first to meet with the Mongol invasion. At that time Yün-nan was not governed by the Sung, but came under the Kingdom of Ta-li 大理 which was ruled by the *Pai-tsu* 白族. Also there were many regions in her territory which the Sung herself could not manage. They were inhabited by the non-*Han* tribes who were called *Hsi-tung* 溪洞, *Tung-man* 洞蠻, *Lao-man* 獠蠻, *Yao-man* 獠蠻 and so on as cited in the Yüan written records (hereafter referred to as *Hsi-tung*).²⁾ In these regions the Sung appointed officials among the local people, called the *t'u-ssü* 土司 or *t'u-kuan* 土官.³⁾ In other words, they were granted autonomy. Such being the case, we cannot say that these regions were in the full grasp of the Sung

dynasty. Therefore, it was not only the Yüan dynasty that could not control the southern China completely. Also, the Yüan dynasty could not govern it completely because of being the Mongol dynasty.

Yün-nan has been in Chinese possession since the Yüan had conquered it, and the *Shê-tsu* 畬族 in Chiang-hsi 江西 and Fu-chien 福建 became obedient to the Chinese dynasties after the Sung and Yüan periods. I believe that the period during the Sung and Yüan was an important epoch when the southern non-*Han* tribes accepted the influence of Chinese culture and were politically dependent on the Chinese dynasties. Bearing the above-mentioned, I will examine the process of the submission of Hu-kuang province to the Yüan dynasty.⁴⁾

I

The zone of the jurisdiction of the Hu-kuang *têng-chu hsing chung-shu-shêng* 湖廣等處行中書省 (hereafter referred to as Hu-kuang province) of the Yüan dynasty was very vast, it extended as far south to the island of Hai-nan 海南 and as far north as Kuei-chou 歸州. It included part of present day Hu-pei 湖北 province, Hu-nan 湖南 province, Kuei-chou 貴州 province, part of Chiang-hsi 江西 province, Autonomy of Chuan tribes in Kuang-hsi 廣西壯族自治區 and Kuang-tung 廣東 province. And a passage in the *Chih-chêng chi* 至正集 written by Hsü Yu-jên 許有壬, *chüan* 卷 52, in 'Ku T'ung-fêng Ta-fu Hu-kuang *têng-chu hsing chung-shu-shêng ts'an-chih chêng-shih Chêng-kung shên-tao pei-ming ping hsü* 故通奉大夫湖廣等處行中書省參知政事鄭公神道碑銘并序' reads:

"Hu-kuang province adjoins Tien 滇 and Shu 蜀, it is too mountainous [for the *Han-tsu*] to enter, and it is the place of residence of *Yao* 獠 and *Lao* 獠 peoples."

It is quite clear that Tien is another name for Yün-nan, and Shu for Ssü-ch'uan, and that both *Yao* and *Lao* were non-*Han* tribes. Most of the *Han-tsu* thought that it was an uninhabitable place because of the severe nature and that it was a place for the barbarians.

First, I would like to examine the establishment of Hu-kuang province and her history. The section on the 'Hu-kuang *têng-chu hsing chung-shu-shêng*' in the *Yüan-shih* 元史,⁵⁾ *chüan* 91, '*pai-kuan chih* 百官志' states:

"In *Chih-yüan* 至元 11, Pai-yen 伯顏 (Bayan), the *Yu-ch'êng-hsing* 右丞相 of the Mongol government, led an attack against the Sung dynasty. The office of the headquarters was situated in Hsiang-yang 襄陽 [and Pai-yen was appointed as the general plenipotentiary.] He ordered another general to set up a branch office in Ê-chou 鄂州. [The office in this Hsiang-

yang was named the Ching-hu *têng-lu hsing chung-shu-shêng* 荆湖等路行中書省.”

The *hsing chung-shu-shêng* in the above passage was not a division of the *chung-shu-shêng* 中書省 or *shang-shu-shêng* 尙書省⁶⁾ which became an administrative province and indicated its office later. The Mongols often had the *hsing chung-shu-shêng* or *hsing shu-mi-yüan* 行樞密院 during her expedition, and invested full powers to the general who was appointed as the chief of these offices. Scholars call them the *chün-ch'ien hsing-shêng* 軍前行省.⁷⁾ This Ching-hu *hsing-shêng* was also one of these *chün-ch'ien hsing-shêng*, and it had been named the *hsing-yüan* 行院 since *Chih-yüan* 10.⁸⁾ Concerning this military office, the biography of Pai-yen in the *Yüan-shih*, *chüan* 127, also states:

“In [*Chih-yüan* 至元] 11, [the Mongol army] attacked the Sung in full force. [Pai-yen 伯顏] and Shih T'ien-tsé 史天澤 had been *chung-shu tso-chêng-hsing* 中書左丞相, and [Pai-yen] was nominated as the chief of the Ching-hu *hsing-shêng* 荆湖行省. As at that time the *hsing-shêng* 行省 were located in both Ching-hu 荆湖 and Huai-hsi 淮西, T'ien-tsé stated that the orders lacked coherence [because of having two office] and it led to the defeat. [The Emperor, therefore,] decreed to change the name of Huai-hsi *hsing-shêng* to *hsing-yüan* 行院.”

This shows that Pai-yen, as the chief of the Ching-hu *hsing-shêng*, had absolute say on the subjugation of the Sung dynasty. That is to say at that time the Yüan dynasty had not yet defeated the Sung dynasty, so that this *hsing-shêng* was the *chün-chien hsing-shêng*, not a division of the *chung-shu-shêng* which was for the civil administration in peace time. It was, however, the origin of Hu-kuang province as the administrative district, after suppressing the Sung.

I do not know when Hu-kuang province as the division of the *chung-shu-shêng* was established. The passage in the *Yüan-shih*, *chüan* 7, reads:

“On the day of *Hsin-mao* 辛卯, the 3rd lunar month of *Chih-yüan* 至元 14, Hu-kuang 湖廣 province states that the 24 districts in Kuang-hsi 廣西 have already been laid down.”

This is the first time that the name of Hu-kuang province appears in the *Yüan-shih*'s '*pên-chi* 本紀'. And the biography of Sai-tien-ch'ih-shan-ssü-ting 賽典赤瞻思丁 (Sayid Edjel Samsudin) in the *Yüan-shih*, *chüan* 125, relates:

“Chiao-shih 交趾 (i.e. present day Vietnam) is still quite rebellious. Although Hu-kuang 湖廣 province dispatched forces, often they were not successful.”

This description was about what happened from *Chih-yüan* 13 to 16. Judging from the above two passages, Hu-kuang province was established after *Chih-yüan* 14, when the Yüan dynasty suppressed the Kuang-hsi region, that is to say, at that time most of the territories of the Sung dynasty had submitted. However the name of Ching-hu *hsing-shêng* was also still in use. It is further stated in the biography of Hu-tu-t'ieh-mu-lu 虎都鐵木祿 (Qutu Temur) attached to T'ieh-mai-ch'ih 鐵邁赤 (Temegeci) in the *Yüan-shih, chüan* 122:

“In *Chih-yüan* 至元 22 . . . at that time [the Ching-hu Chan-cheng *têng-chu* 荆湖占城等處] *hsing-shêng* 行省 had three names, which were Ching-hu 荆湖, Ching-hu Chan-cheng 荆湖占城 and Hu-kuang 湖廣.”

As is shown above, the name of this province was not official.

Next I will examine the process of the Mongol invasion in this region. As I have said before, the Yüan government established the Ching-hu and Huai-hsi *hsing-shêng* for the subjugation on the Sung, and the armies were dispatched from there to various parts. As for Hu-kuang province, in *Chih-yüan* 11 Chu Kuo-pao 朱國寶 under Pai-yen suppressed Ê-chou 鄂州 and Han-chou 漢州, in *Chih-yüan* 12 conquered Huang-chou 黃州, Ch'i-chou 蘄州, and advanced south to subdue Ying-chou 鄧州, Kuei-chou 歸州, Ch'ang-tê-chou 常德州, Li-chou 澧州, Yüeh-chou 岳州, Chên-chou 辰州, Ching-chou 靖州. Furthermore in *Chih-yüan* 13 and 14 Wu-kang 武岡, Pao-ch'ing 寶慶, Ching-chiang 靜江 and also the Kuang-hsi region were invaded by the Mongol army. Concerning this Mongol invasion and the submission of the Sung, the biography of Chu Kuo-pao in *Yüan-shih, chüan* 165, states:

“At that time almost all cities of the Sung protested and would not surrender to [the Mongols], but [Chu] Kuo-pao 朱國寶 sent a letter of admonishment and ‘invitation’ [to surrender], resulting in their pacification in the next month.”

This shows that the suppression of this region owed not only to the Mongol forces but also Chu's letter admonishing surrender to the Yüan. The similar event is reported in the *Yüan-shih, chüan* 129, the biography of Li Hêng 李恒 as:

“[Li Hêng 李恒] followed A-li-hai-ya 阿里海牙 (Arikh-khaya), the *You-ch'êng*, 右丞 of the Mongol government, to Tung-ting 洞庭 and there he captured Kao Shih-chieh 高世傑. Li Hêng pacified Yüeh-chou 岳州 and advanced and conquered Sha-shih 沙市. Kao Ta 高達 who was the *Chih-chih* 制置 of the Sung government led the Chiang-ling 江陵 [people] surrender [to the Mongols]. [A-li-hai-ya] had Li Hêng remained there in defence. [Li Hêng] dispatched letters to Chên 辰, Yüan 沅, Ching 靖,

Li 澧 and Ch'ang-tê 常德 *chou* 州 with the result that all of them surrendered [to the Mongols], and soon moved the office to Ch'ang-tê-chou."

After Yüeh-chou was captured, all cities in the southwest region surrendered successively to the Mongols.⁹⁾

Furthermore, the following description in the biography of Kuo Ang 郭昂 in the *Yüan-shih*, *chüan* 169, states:

"Next [Kuo Ang 郭昂] was promoted to the *tung-chih* 同知 of Yüan-chou *an-fu-ssü* 沅州安撫司... [he] captured more than 80 *Hsi-tung's* 溪洞 villages... *Shan-yao* 山徭, *Mu-mao* 木猫, *T'u-lao* 土獠 and the other tribes surrendered entirely."

According to the context of this biography, this happened before *Chih-yüan* 16. And a passage in the *Yüan-shih*, *chüan* 9, 'Shi-tsu *pên-chi*' states:

"On the day of *Chia-tzu* 甲子, the 4th lunar month of *Chih-yüan* 至元 14, Ts'en Ts'ung-i 岑從毅, mayor of Lai-an-chou 來安州, surrendered [to the Yüan], with 147 *Hsi-tung* 溪洞 families and 256,000 men who were under his jurisdiction."

As is shown above, the non-*Han* tribes also surrendered to the Yüan dynasty simultaneously with the Sung dynasty. But I doubt that this conquest was perfect, and that the surrender of these tribes indicated their subservience to the Yüan dynasty.

According to the section '*ti-li-chih* 地理志' in the *Yüan-shih*, at first the Yüan dynasty established the *an-fu-ssü* 安撫司 to most of the cities in the Southern Sung territories which submitted to the Mongols. What is the definition of the *an-fu-ssü* of the Yüan dynasty? We cannot find any explanatory note in the *Yüan-shih*. The section titled '*chih-kuan k'ao* 職官考' in the *Hsü Wên-hsien tung-k'ao* 續文獻通考, *chüan* 60, reads:

"In the Yüan, the *hsüan-wei-shih ssü* 宣慰使司 took charge of the military and civil administration... at the frontier there were also the *chao-t'ao-shih* [ssü] 招討使[司], *an-fu-shih* [ssü] 安撫使[司] and *hsüan-fu-shih* [ssü] 宣撫使[司]."

This description suggests that the *an-fu-ssü* for both the army and civil administration was posted at the frontier. In fact, according to '*pai-kuan-chih* 百官志' and '*ti-li-chih*' in the *Yüan-shih*, we cannot find the *an-fu-ssü* except in the residential regions of non-*Han* tribes in Ssü-ch'uan, Yün-nan and Hu-kuang provinces after *Chih-yüan* 16.¹⁰⁾ Although the *an-fu-ssü* was established just after the fall of the Sung; it had the same functions as the *chün-ch'ien hsing-*

shêng during her expedition. For example, it is recorded in the *Yüan-shih*, *chüan* 165, the biography of Chu Kuo-pao as follows:

“[In *Chih-yüan* 至元 12 Chu 朱] captured the right part of the lake [Tung-ting 洞庭], by an Imperial decree, he was named *Hsüen-wu Chiang-chün* 宣武將軍 in charge of all the Mongol zones, and stayed in Ch’ang-tê fu 常德府 as *an-fu-shih* 安撫使.”

According to ‘*ti-li-chih*’ in the *Yüan-shih*, most of the *an-fu-ssü* of this character was abolished in *Chih-yüan* 16, and in the same city was established the *tsung-kuan fu-lu* 總管府路 which only took charge of civil administration. This indicates that it was *Chih-yüan* 16 when her expedition was abolished and the Mongols held the whole of Hu-kuang province.

However, the section of ‘Ch’ing-yuan Nan-tan *Hsi-tung téng-chu chün-min an-fu-ssü* 慶遠南丹溪洞等處軍民安撫司’ in ‘*ti-li-chih* 地理志’ of the *Yüan-shih*, *chüan* 63, reads:

“In *Chih-yüan* 13 [the State] established the *an-fu-ssü* 安撫司, in *Chih-yüan* 16 it became Ch’ing-yuan-lu 慶遠路 *tsung-kuan-fu* 管總府, [in *Ta-té* 大德] it was changed again to the Ch’ing-yuan Nan-tan *Hsi-tung téng-chu chün-min an-fu-ssü*.”

Judging from the above passage, the *tsung-kuan fu-lu* was again changed back into the *an-fu-ssü*. There were many *an-fu-ssü* which were given the tribe’s name. And there were many *hsüen-wei-ssü* and *hsüen-fu-ssü* all over Hu-kuang province except the central zone. As I have mentioned above, these offices took charge of both the military and civil administration so that in general these were established during the political instability or at the frontier. Some parts of Hu-kuang province were indeed the frontier of the Yüan dynasty. But why was the *tsung-kuan fu-lu* changed again into *an-fu-ssü*? Perhaps it was done especially for the *Hsi-tung*, whose tribe’s name is attached to the title, while the *tsung-kuan fu-lu* was entitled after only the name of the place. In the *Yüan-shih*, *chüan* 165, the biography of Chu Kuo-pao, it is stated:

“Only Chên [-chou] 辰 [州], Yüan [-chou] 沅 [州], Ching [-chou] 靖 [州], and Chên-yüan [-chou] 鎮遠 [州] have not surrendered yet. The general Li Hsin 李信 and Li Fa 李發 conspired with *Tung-man* 洞蠻 in Wu-kang 武岡, divided and held the forts, but Kuo-pao 國寶 defeated them.”

This document shows *Hsi-tung* tribes resisted the Mongol forces with the Sung army. In Fu-chien 福建 the *Shé* 畬 people’s army also helped the Sung army to resist the Mongol forces.¹¹⁾ I think this does not show that non-*Han* tribes

preferred the Sung to the Mongols. They probably protested against the upsetting of their stable lives. Therefore, as is written in the *Yüan-shih, chüan* 163, the biography of Chang Hsiung-fei:

“Li[-chou] 澧[州] ajoins the *Hsi-tung* 溪洞 residential region on the southwest. The *Yao-jén* 徭人 (*Hsi-tung* tribe), taking advantage of this opportunity, plundered the inhabitants.”

Yao invaded Li-chou where the inhabitants were probably *Han-tsu*, when the government could not maintain public peace. A passage in the biography of Shih Kê 史格 attached to Shih T'ien-tsê 史天澤 in the *Yüan-shih, chüan* 155, reads:

“[Shih Kê 史格] in one attack, conquered 13 *chou* 州 in Kuang-hsi 廣西 and 3 *chou* in Kuang-tung 廣東. When Ching chiang 靜江 was attacked, all of the *Hsi-tung* 溪洞 tribes surrendered to the Yün-nan 雲南 government.”¹²⁾

Why did *Hsi-tung* surrender to Yün-nan? The cities in Yün-nan had officials who were *Hsi-tung* people, or the *t'u-ssü* 土司 or *t'u-kuan* 土官. *Hsi-tung* wanted to be ruled directly their own people rather than by the Mongol or *Han* officials. They wanted self-government. In Hu-kuang province there scattered many *Hsi-tung* tribes who had such a desire as I have mentioned above. They were always on a lookout for a chance to free themselves from the foreign rule. Therefore, it must have been very difficult for the Mongols to keep peace there.

II

Concerning the passages about Hu-kuang province 湖廣行省 in the section of '*pên-chi* 本紀' in the *Yüan-shih* 元史, after *Chih-yüan* 至元 13, we can find that most of these are about the rebellions by the *Hsi-tung* 溪洞 tribes and their submission.¹³⁾ Especially the revolts happened in *Chih-yüan* 20 to 30. The chief general of their punitive forces was Liu Kuo-chieh 劉國傑, whose biography in the *Yüan-shih, chüan* 162, relates:

“In *Chih-yüan* 至元 23, as Hu-kuang province is in an important position and also there were numerous cases of banditry, the Emperor named Kuo-chieh 國傑 the *tso-chiang* 左丞 of this province. As soon as he arrived, he subdued Li Wan-erh 李萬二 who was a bandit in Hu-nan 湖南. The next year, bandits rose in Kuang-tung 廣東, and invaded Tsao-ch'ing 肇慶. One of their chiefs, Têng T'ai-lao 鄧太獠 encamped in the fore fortress and another chief, Liu T'ai-lao 劉太獠 occupied the rear fortress. Both of them helped each other in defence. Kuo-chieh at-

tacked the rear fortress and crushed it. After that he struck down the fore fortress, captured and killed these two chiefs. He arrested their followers and beat them to death with sticks In [*Chih-yüan*] 25, Chan I-tsai 詹一仔 who was a bandit in Hu-nan 湖南 allured people living in Hêng-yung 衡永, Pao-ch'ing 寶慶 and Wu-kang 武岡 and gathered them in Ssü-wang-shan 四望山. The official armies could not attack them for a long time, but finally Kuo-chieh beat them."

During *Chih-yüan* 23, 24 and 25, Liu Kuo-chieh spent his time pursuing the bandits and rebels all over Hu-kuang province. As I am going to mention below, many rebellions one after another happened, until the time when Ch'êng-tsung 成宗 ascended the throne after his grandfather Shih-tsu 世祖 died.

The following is a description of some of the rebellions that happened at that time.

One on the largest scale in Chên-chou 辰州 was led by T'ien Wan-ch'ing 田萬頃. It is recorded in the biography of Liu Kuo-chieh in the *Yüan-shih*, *chüan* 162, as follows:

"At the coronation of Ch'êng-tsung 成宗, Ho Shih-hsiong 何世雄 of Pa-tung 巴洞 invaded Li-chou 澧州, T'ien Wan-ch'ing 田萬頃 of Po-ai-tung 泊崖洞 and Meng Tsai-shih 孟再師 of Nan-mu-tung 楠木洞 invaded Chên-chou 辰州 The imperial court had subdued them once, and [after that] elevated the status of Po-ai-[tung] to *chou* of which name was Shih-rong-chou 施溶州, and appointed Wan-ch'ing as a mayor."

Although T'ien Wan-ch'ing was designated to the post of mayor after he surrendered to the Mongols, he rebelled against the government again. Concerning this, the section 'Miao-fang 苗防' in the *Chia-ch'ing Hu-nan t'ung-chih* 嘉慶湖南通志, *chüan* 63, states:

"In *Chih-yüan* 至元 21 the *Man-lao* 蠻獠 who live in the boundaries of Nan-shih 南施, Tien 點, Ting 鼎, Li 澧, Chên 辰 and Yüan 沅, being south of Ssü-po 思播, sometimes rebelled against the government."

This shows that the government did not trust the *Hsi-tung* tribes. T'ien Wan-ch'ing's rebels took the lead in a string of rebellions in Hu-kuang province during the *Chih-yüan* 20 to 30. Although the rebellion by T'ien Wan-ch'ing was subdued soon, he rebelled again as I am going to mention below. The section titled '*p'ing-Miao kao* 平苗考', in the *Chien-lung Chên-chou fu-chih* 乾隆辰州府志, *chüan* 13, reads, quoting from the *Hou-chih* 侯志 as follows:

"This year (*Chih-yüan* 至元 29), when the army of *wan-hu fu* 萬戶府 took

part in the campaign against Java, Lu Wan-chou 魯萬丑 with his brother San-tai 三代 took this opportunity and invaded [to Chên-chou 辰州] by boat.

This year the armies set out for Chiao-chih 交趾 (i.e. present day Vietnam). T'ien Wan-ch'ing 田萬頃, the mayor of Shih-rong-chou 施溶州, Lu Wan-chou and Meng Tsai-shih 孟再師 revolted, and the other *Hsi-tung* tribes rose in rebellion."

And the biography of I-la Yüan-chên 移刺元臣 attached to I-la Nieh-chien 移刺捏見 in the *Yüan-shih, chüan* 148, also states:

"[In *Chih-yüan* 至元 30, Yüan-chên 元臣] was appointed as an official of the Hu-kuang *shu-mi-yüan* 湖廣樞密院. At that time *Man-lao* 蠻獠 in *Hsi-tung* 溪洞 Shih-rong 施容 and others had rebelled Yüan-chên himself invaded their territory, and made them realize the consequences of resistance and surrender. Lu Wan-chou 魯萬丑, a chief, surrendered accordingly."

From these passages, it is evident that although the *Hsi-tung* tribes surrendered voluntarily to the Mongols, they were always on the lookout for a chance to escape from the Mongol control. The expeditions to Java and Vietnam proved to be good opportunities for them to do so.

The rebellion occurred in *Chih-yüan* 25 in Wu-kang *hsien* 武岡縣, south of Chên-chou. It is written in the *Yüan-shih, chüan* 16, 'Shih-tsu *pên-chi*' as follows:

"On the day of *Keng-shên* 庚申, the 4th lunar month of *Chih-yüan* 至元 25 in Wu-kang *lu* 武岡路 and Pao-ch'ing *lu* 寶慶路, where rebellions happen often . . ."

Lu Sên-kuei 陸文圭 reported the same event in his own words as follows, in '*Chung-fêng ta-fu* Kuang-tung *hsüan-wei-shih tu-yüan-shuai mu-shih-ming* 中奉大夫廣東宣慰使都元帥墓誌銘' in the *Ch'iang-tung lei-kao* 牆東類稿, *chüan* 12:

"[In *Chih-yüan* 至元 27] *Yao-man* 獠蠻 in Wu-kang *lu* 武岡路 held Ch'ing-ch'êng 青城 in Sui-ning *hsien* 綏寧縣 and formed into fifteen groups. They occupied a vital position in the mountain and would not surrender [to the government]. The army officials of Ching-chou 靖州 hoped to win honours by capturing [the rebels], so they crossed the boundary and challenged them. Li Wei-chai 李威寨, leader of the bandits, refused to surrender and beat drums in defiance. Liu, the *you-cheng* 右丞 of Hu-kuang province, ordered Sun Ting-yüen 孫定遠, *wan-hu* 萬戶, to dispatch an army from Pao-ch'ing 寶慶, while he himself hoped to gather

about a thousand voluntary soldiers from Wu-kang, [and join forces] to repulse the enemy. But *Kung* 公 (Hui-ho Yang-chu-fu-ha 輝和揚珠布哈) insisted that this should not be done and added that the naive people are ignorant therefore it would be expedient to win them over by offering them benefit and trust, which would also change their attitudes. If violence is used in capturing them, surely there will be much injury. Also, they are human beings so it will not be proper to offer rewards to have them killed. As a result, the army encamped at Wu-kang 武岡. People were sent into the enemy's camp to put up notices which made understood the consequences of resistance and surrender. The rebels were good [to hear this]. There was a leader, Shen Nan-ch'iang 沈南強, who led his men, under the pretext of negotiation, to surrender their weapons to the government forces. Other rebels, dispersed into Ching-chou 靖州 and other places, were granted amnesty of the government. The rebellions came to an end."

In the above passage the rebellion happened in *Chih-yüan* 27, but I would say that it was the same one recorded in '*pên-chi*' we saw in the above passage, although it was recorded to have happened in *Chih-yüan* 25. In my opinion, it was in *Chih-yüan* 27 that the Yüan government reviewed the suppression of the rebellion. According to this document, the conciliatory policy was more effective than military force.

Concerning the south of the Kuang-hsi region, it is recorded in the *Chih-chêng chi* 至正集, *chüan* 52, '*Ku T'ung-fêng Ta-fu Hu-kuang têng-chu hsing chung-shu-shêng ts'an-chih chêng-shih Chêng-kung shên-tao pei-ming ping hsü* 故通奉大夫湖廣等處行中書省參知政事鄭公神道碑銘并序':

"During *Ta-tê* 大德, when Sung Lung-chi 宋隆濟, the *t'u-kuan* 土官 of Shun-t'ien 順天, betrayed the State and rebelled, A-nü 阿女 gathered the barbarians, and set up barriers to stall the soldiers. *Shu-mi-yüan* 樞密院 ordered him (Chêng Ang 鄭昂) to attack from divided routes. First the barricade [of the rebellion] was broken. Daily, prisoners were taken and the army lived on the food provided from them [the prisoners]. He did not stop till all the rebels were wiped out."

We can find other sources that describe the same event.¹⁴⁾ After Huang Shêng-hsü 黃聖許, one of the leaders of the above rebellion, escaped to Chiao-chih 交趾, this rebellion was finally stamped out.

The rebels, majority of whom were the *Hsi-tung* tribes, swept over the whole of Hu-kuang province but ceased during *Ta-tê*. After that this region was peaceful until *Yen-yü* 延祐 when rebellions started again.

Next I will examine how the State dealt with the above-mentioned rebellions. The passages in the *Yüan-shih*, *chüan* 12, '*Shih-tsu pên-chi*' read:

“On the day of *Jên-yin* 壬寅, the 2nd lunar month of *Chih-yüan* 至元 19, [His Majesty] granted *Hsi-tung chao-tuo-shih* 溪洞招討使 Kuo Ang 郭昂 and the other eight persons possession the ‘tiger tablet’ pass.

On the day of *Mou-wu* 戊午, the 7th lunar month of *Chih-yüan* 19, was established *hsing shu-mi-yüan* 行樞密院 in Yang-chou 揚州 and Ê-chou 鄂州.

On the day of *Keng-wu* 庚午, the 1st lunar month of *Chih-yüan* 21, was established Chiang-huai 江淮, Ching-hu 荊湖, Chiang-hsi 江西 and Ssü-chuan 四川 *hsing shu-mi-yüan* 行樞密院 in Chien-k’ang 建康, Ê-chou, Fu-chou 撫州 and Ch’eng-tu 成都.”

Tiger tables were granted to authorize the dispatch of soldiers. Regarding the *hsing shu-mi-yüan*, the Yüan dynasty did not establish in times of peace. Therefore, the establishment of the *hsing shu-mi-yüan* meant that a large scale expedition would begin soon. At that time the State set up the *hsing-yüan* 行院 in all provinces which had been the late Southern Sung territories. It is evident that the structure at that time was on a very large scale. In such regions, there had been numerous disturbances which sometimes resulted in rebellions against the Mongol government for several years after the fall of the Sung dynasty.¹⁵⁾

The State determined to sweep away all the distributing elements, so that she set up *shu-mi-yüan* in every province. However, the State had once taken a firm attitude against the disturbances in Chiang-nan region before. It is evident from a passage in ‘*chin-yüeh tso-ting tsé-jên* 禁約作歹賊人’ of ‘*mou-p’an* 謀叛’ in the *Yüan-tien-chang*, *chüan* 41, *hsing-pu* 刑部:

“On the 12th, the 7th lunar month of *Chih-yüan* 至元 17, in one of the memorials to the throne by *chung-shu-shêng* 中書省, Shih Ta-la 史塔刺 complained that the undesirable elements [people] in the new territory rebelled, and the people’s lives were threatened. *Chung-shu-shêng* instructed to put the chiefs of the rebels to death, forfeit their properties and arrest their families. Why were not their neighbors, who had known about their deeds but did not inform the authorities, inflicted the same penalty?”

It is natural that the chiefs of the rebels might be sentenced to death in pre-modern China, and it was so in the Yüan dynasty. Then, why did the State announce this law again? According to this document, clearly the rebellions in the new territory were the target. Although the Sung Emperor with his government was defeated by the Mongol army, people who would not surrender formed large or small groups in order to continue a rebellion to the authorities. The State at first wanted to suppress them by calling to their attention of the above severe punishment but was not effective, so they decided

to send punitive forces to crush them thoroughly.

When did this structure for the unsettled condition finished? According to the passage in the *Yüan-shih, chüan* 13, 'Shih-tsu *pên-chi*':

"On the day of *I-mi* 乙己, the 2nd lunar month of *Chih-yüan* 至元 22, [His Majesty] decreed to change and separate the Chiang-huai 江淮 and Chiang-hsi 江西 *yüan-shuai chao-tao-ssü* 元帥詔討司 into three *wan-hu fu* 萬戶府, which were classified into high, middle and low levels."

And in the same document but *chüan* 14:

"On the day of *Mou-wu* 戊午, the 2nd lunar month of *Chih-yüan* 23, [His Majesty decreed] the inclusion of *hsing shu-mi-yüan* 行樞密院 in Chiang-nan into the *hsing-shêng* 行省."

During *Chih-yüan* 22 and 23, the military offices *chao-tao-ssü* and *hsing-yüan*, which were established in the unsettled condition, were abolished, and changed into the military service of normal times or into the administrative machinery. The State regarded this period as a time of peace. Also the biography of Li Hu-lan-chi 李忽蘭吉 in the *Yüan-shih, chüan* 162, states:

"[In *Chih-yüan* 至元 22] the armies advanced separately in order to encircle five *Hsi-tung man* 溪洞蠻, [because] at that time *Man-lao* 蠻獠 who live in the frontier of Nan-shih 南施, Ch'ien 黔, Ting 鼎, Li 禮, Chên 辰 and Yüan 沅, being south of Ssü-po 思播 sometimes rebelled against the State. They often robbed the people (*Han-tsu*) who live in these frontier regions. . . . In November . . . the chieftains led their tribes in surrender [to the State.]"

The above documents show that in the end of *Chih-yüan* 22, the rebellions of *Hsi-tung* tribes in Hu-nan were stamped out. However, this conquest was not complete. Therefore, *hsing-yüan* had to be reestablished soon. The passage in the *Yüan-shih, chüan* 16, 'Shih-tsu *pên-chi*', states:

"On the day of *I-yu* 乙酉, the 2nd lunar month of *Chih-yüan* 至元 28, [His Majesty decreed] the establishment of Chiang-huai 江淮, Hu-kuang 湖廣, Chiang-hsi 江西 and Ssü-chou 四川 *hsing shu-mi-yüan* 行樞密院."

Concerning this Hu-kuang *hsing-yüan*, the passage in the same document also states:

"On the day of *I-wei* 乙未, the 4th lunar month of *Chih-yüan* 28, [His Majesty decreed] to remove [the main office of] Hu-kuang *hsing-yüan* 行院 to Ê-chou 鄂州."

And the biography of Liu Kuo-chieh 劉國傑 in the *Yüan-shih, chüan* 162, relates:

“After the Ch’êng-tsung’s 成宗 ascendance to the throne, [His Majesty] established again *hsing-yüan* 行院 in Hêng-chou 衡州.”

The fact that the main office of the Hu-kuang *hsing-yüan* moved probably means that numerous rebellions sporadically broke out. The State subdued them one by one, moving the headquarters.

The *hsing-yüan* in that time were abolished until *Chih-yüan* 31, as the passage in the *Yüan-shih, chüan* 18, ‘Ch’êng-tsung *pên-chi*’ states:

“On the day of *Jên-tzû* 壬子, the 11th lunar month of *Chih-yüan* 31, [His Majesty] decreed to combine civil and military administration. Therefore, the Hu-kuang and Chiang-hsi *hsing-yüan* 行院 were abolished, and corporated into the *hsing-shêng* 行省.”

The rebellions in Hu-kuang province did not come to an end even after then, and the *hsing-yüan* was established once in Yün-nan after *Chih-yüan* 31.¹⁰⁾ However, the rebellions which needed the establishment of the *hsing-yüan* all over the southern China did not occur. This fact shows that it is not just after the fall of the Sung but after the reign of Ch’êng-tsung that the last Sung territories were completely conquered under the Mongols.

The biography of Liu Kuo-chieh 劉國傑 relates:

“In *Yüan-chên* 元貞 1, in Kuang-tung 廣東 and Chiang-hsi 江西 regions, there lived many bandits. It extended three thousands *li* 里 from north to south. Therefore, the armies are stationed at the 38 places in order to defence. From east, Chiao 交 and Kuang 廣 to west, T’ien 黔 throughout Hu-kuang province, many stationary armies were posted. As a result all of the barbarians could not revolt again, and banditry came to an end.

This shows that in *Yüan-chên* 1 the government stationed the armies at the places where the disturbances often happened.

The passage on ‘*ts’ao-tsei shêng-fa tsui li* 草賊生發罪例’ in the *Yüan-tien-chang, chüan* 41, *hsing-pu* 刑部, ‘*mou-p’an* 謀叛’ states:

“In *Yüan-chên* 元貞 1, the document from the *hsing yü-shih-t’ai* 行御史臺, according to the report of each *tao* 道, *tung*’s 洞 bandits agitated the people, killed the civil and military officials whose duty were to arrest bandits, burned the houses and horses of the post houses, snatched the seals of the mayor, and seized the good people. The rebellions rose

against the government successively. [The State] could not subdue them. The officials in this region ran after them, but if the rebels crossed the boundary, they reported the State that the rebellions were laid down."

The *hsing yü-shih-t'ai* in this source is Chiang-nan 江南 *yü-shih-t'ai*. It is stated that the *Hsi-tung* tribes often rose the rebellions, and that the officials would not seek after and capture them completely. This passage also relates that the negligence of the officials caused rebellion to happen. This document, after above, states about the penal regulation to such a negligent officials. This regulation was established after *Yüan-chên* when the Yüan dynasty conquered the southern China completely.

III

How did the State deal with the *Hsi-tung* 溪洞 peoples and their territories which were subdued by or surrendered to the Mongols? According to the above-mentioned regulation in *Chih-yüan* 至元 17,¹⁷⁾ the chiefs of the rebels had to be put to death. In fact, a passage in the *Yüan-shih, chüan* 15, 'Shih-tsu *pên-chi*' states:

"On the day of *Ting-hsi* 丁亥, the 11th lunar month of *Chih-yüan* 25, Huang Tê-ch'ing 黃德清 in Liu-chou 柳州 rebelled.... All of them (bandits) was sentenced to death."

But most people were pardoned, I suppose. On the contrary, there were not a few who were named the mayor such as T'ien Wan-ch'ing 田萬頃. The biography of Lo Pi 羅璧 in the *Yüan-shih, chüan* 166, relates:

"In *Ta-tê* 大德 3, [Lo Pi] allured chiefs of *Tung-man* 洞蠻 by offering them an official rank and promising them a happy life. As a result, all of them surrendered to the State with their people."

This shows that the conciliatory measure that the State adopted was very effective. Then, what kind of posts were given to them? One of them became mayor of *chou* 州 such as T'ien Wan-ch'ing was given. The passage in the *Yüan-shih, chüan* 12, 'Shih-tsu *pên-chi*' states:

"On the day of *Mou-wu* 戊午, the 3rd lunar month of *Chih-yüan* 20, [His Majesty] appointed the chief of *Tung-man* 洞蠻 who has just surrendered to the *ch'ien-hu* 千戶."

Probably the *ch'ien-hu* and mayor which were offered to the chief of the *Hsi-tung* were not the same ones that were given to Mongol, *Han* or Western peo-

ples who were called Hsi-yu *jén* 西域人, or *se-mu-jén* 色目人. They also had not the same system for the promotion, and they could not change the other officials mutually, although the chief of the *Hsi-tung* was appointed the official which had the same name as that of the bureaucracy system, they were not regarded the same officials. That is, as I am going to mention below, they were named because of being local people. Their extend of the jurisdiction was only their own tribe. They were authorized only their own tribe. But we can say that by having the official post, they became a member of the Mongol State, and the Mongol State admitted that they controlled their own tribe and their self-government.

The same thing is reported in the *Yüan-shih*, *chüan* 91, '*pai-kuan chih* 百官志' as:

"Concerning the *ch'ang-kuan-ssü* 長官司 of barbarians, it is established in each place of residence of the *Hsi-tung* 溪洞 in the southwest part of the Yüan territories. The grade is the same as the *ta-lu-hua-ch'ih* 達魯花赤 (darughachi). The chief and sub-chief must be appointed among its own people."

This is to say, the residence of the *Hsi-tung* was controlled by themselves. The *Nan-ning fu-chih* 南寧府志 in the *Yung-lê Ta-tien* 永樂大典, *chüan* 8509, relates:

"When the *Hsi-tung* surrendered [to us,] [we] established *an-fu-ssü* 安撫司 in their regions at first. In [*Chih-yüan*] 16, it improved to *tsung-kuan-fu chien* Tso-yu Liang-chiang *Hsi-tung chên-fu* 總管府兼左右兩江溪洞鎮撫. 18 *hsien* 縣 and 26 *tung* 洞 [belonged to it].

Although this *Hsi-tung chên-fu* was held as an additional post by *tsung-kuan-fu* 總管府, it was established for controlling *Hsi-tung* tribes only. Within its jurisdiction there were *hsien* 縣 and *tung* 洞. Originally, *tung* means village or tribe of 'minority', I suppose. But the *tung* in above source indicates one of the administrative district which was established in the residence of the *Hsi-tung*. The State did not mix *tung* and *chou-hsien* 州縣 and did not control them at the same time.

I have said above, these officials which were appointed to the chief of *Hsi-tung* were different from those of the main bureaucracy system, even though they had the same name, and the system of their promotion and designation was different each other. But it is sure that they were also the officials of the Yüan dynasty. In the statement on '*Wei-wang k'an-ssü p'ing-min* 違枉勘死平民' in the *Yüan tien-chang*, *chüan* 54, *Hsiang-pu*, Hsiao Chien-sun 蕭監孫, chief of the *Hsi-tung* in Long-hsi-ai 龍溪隘 in Wu-kang *hsien* was punished as an official.

The Yüan dynasty follows the policy of the T'ang and the Sung that named system of the *t'u-ssü* or *t'u-kuan*. Giving self-government to the *Hsi-tung* tribes, the State gained the maintenance of public peace. And as above-mentioned, this measure was fruitful. But is it enough to explain the reason why *t'u-ssü* system was established? It is evident from a passage in the *Yüan-shih*, *chüan* 15, 'Shih-tsu *pên-chi*' that there is another reason. This passage reads:

"On the day of *Ping-yin* 丙寅, the 10th lunar month of the *Chih-yüan* 25, Hu-kuang province said that [in the residential regions] of *Hsi-tung* 溪洞 and *Wan-lao* 蠻獠 in Tso-yu Chiang 左右江 are established four *tsung-kuan-fu* 總管府 which took charge of 160 *chou* 州, *hsien* 縣 and *tung* 洞. The officials who were designated these posts would not go because of fear to have *chang* 瘴. So that the *Han-tsu* was asked to be the *ta-lu-hua-ch'ih* 達魯花赤, and have military officers replaced by civil ones, and employ the natives in the administration."

The region which is mentioned above is now in Kuang-hsi, and in the Yüan period it belonged to Hu-kuang province. The climate has been severe and bad for the health, so that many officials refused to go there. There must be some unavoidable reasons that *Han-tsu* was allowed to be *darughach* which they were forbidden to be.¹⁹⁾ In the Yüan dynasty most military officers were Mongols or Western peoples. As they would not leave for the posts there, military posts were changed into civil ones, and *Han-tsu* was appointed with the local people. We can know how difficult it is to fill the posts. Therefore the government was forced to break the rule. The same thing is stated in a passage on '*ch'ien-t'iao kuan-yüan* 遷調官員' in the *Yüan tien-cheng*, *chüan* 8, *Li-pu*, *hsüan-ké* 選格 as:

"On the 14th, the 12th lunar month of *Yan-you* 延祐 4, though civil administrative officers were assigned to the Fu-chien 福建 and Liang-Kuang 兩廣 regions, they did not hear of it, because of a great distance and a wild sick there."

And according to a passage on '*yüan-tao chuan-kuan* 遠道關官' in the *Chih-chêng chi* 至正集, *chüan* 74:

"The frontier has many severe mountains and river, moreover there live *Hsi* 溪, *Li* 黎, *I* 夷 and *Lao* 獠."

The official posts sometimes were vacant. It is no wonder that people who live in the northern China would not like the idea of living there. Chu Shou-liang 朱守諒 wrote in his poem titled '*Ch'iu-yeh ou-ch'eng shih* 秋夜偶成詩'²⁰⁾ that the expedition there was very hard:

"We went east from Chên-chou 辰州 and Yüan-chou 沅州 and arrived at T'ien-yang 黔陽. At that time it was so terribly hot that the soldiers suffered from dysentery."

Also 'Ku Kuang-hsi Liang-chiang tao hsüan-wei-shih-ssü tu-yüan-shuai-fu ching-li Ma chün mo-shih-ming 故廣西兩江道宣慰使司都元帥府經歷馬君墓誌銘' in the *Yün-fêng chi* 雲峯集 written by Hu Ping-wen 胡炳文, *chüan* 5, relates:

"In that place (Kuang-hsi 廣西) the water and plants are poisonous, so that majority of the soldiers died."

It is therefore understandable why as written the section on 'kuan-yüan ch'ien-chuan li têng 官員遷轉例等' in the *Yüan tien-cheng*, *chüan* 8, *Li-pu*, *hsüan-ké*, the officers in the *Hsi-tung* 溪洞 region in Liang-Kuang 兩廣 and Fu-chien 福建 were given better treatment than others, namely a shorter term of office than the former. As mentioned above, the climate in these regions is one reason for employing the *t'u-ssü* or *t'u-kuan*.

Regarding the policy against *Hsi-tung* 溪洞, it is necessary not only to conciliate them but also subdue them. The biography of Liu Kuo-chieh 劉國傑 states:

"[In *Chih-yüan* 25] Chan I-tsai 詹一仔 who was one of the bandits in Hunan allured people in Hêng-yung 衡永, Pao-ch'ing 寶慶 and Wu-kang 武岡, and gathered them in Ssü-wang-shan 四望山. Although the government armies could not defeat them for a long time, Kuo-chieh could. . . . Kuo-chieh said that [we] should not kill, [instead of killing we should make them surrender.] I have a policy, that is we could station armies at three important places: Ch'ing-hua 清化 in Hêng-chou 衡州, Wu-fu 烏符 in Yung-chou 永州 and Pai-ts'ang 白倉 in Wu-kang 武岡, and admitted the people who surrendered to join in defence of these places. Each army should have 500 soldiers to guard against robbers. They tilled abandoned fields and cleared the thickets. So that the bandits could not set up forts there. If those who surrendered had houses where he had lived before, we should return them, if they had not, we should let them till in the land which belonged to the military."²¹⁾

Liu Kuo-chieh's policy was effective in cultivating the land and making use of those who surrendered. The people were sent into the *t'un-t'ien* 屯田, that resulted in the cultivation of desolate lands which had the tendency of becoming robber's den. A passage on 'tsé-jén fu p'an-ch'i ch'ien fu pei 賊人復叛起遣赴北' in the *Yüan-tien-chang*, *chüan* 41, *hsing-pu*, 'mou-pan 謀叛' states:

"In the 2nd lunar month of *Chih-yüan* 29, according to a summary of

hsing chung-shu-shêng 行中書省 notice in a recent report from Kuang-tung *hsüen-wei-ssü* 廣東宣慰司, sources from Nan-hsiong *lu* 南雄路 said that Hsie Fa 謝發, the *ta-lao* 大老 (i.e. a chief of the *Hsi-tung*) in Pao-ch'ang *hsien* 保昌縣, and his follower Liu T'ung 劉通 came to the main city to yield to and express acceptance of the government. But one of his followers Sun *ta-lao* 孫大老 returned to banditry even after he was supposed to have surrendered, and together with the robbers in Hsün-mei 循梅, they started a rebellion. We determined to separate Hsie Fa and his subjects, Liu T'ung and others, and leave them in the custody of the military office, then dispatch guards to escort them to the *hsing-yüan* 行院 and later to the north. From now on, every official must do the same to bandit chiefs who surrendered."

The government made it a rule that the chiefs of the rebels who surrendered were brought to a distant place from his native land so that the chances of another uprising and the power of the group would be reduced. I could not understand that this rule was adapted to only the chiefs or also the followers. Another document in the *Yüan-shih, chüan* 20, 'Shih-tsu *pên-chi*' states the same event as:

"On the day of *Chia-tzu* 甲子, the 12th lunar month of *Ta-té* 6, Yüan Shun-i 袁舜一 and the others allured two thousand people, invaded and plundered *Ch'ên-chou* 辰州. The Hu-nan *hsüe-wei-ssü* 湖南宣慰司 dispatched soldiers to subdue them, and arrested Shun-i with his followers, and three chiefs were sentenced to death. The other followers were sent to Hung-tse shao-p'i *t'un-t'ien* 洪澤芍陂屯田. The men who were threatened into joining the rebels were told to return to their former work."

Hung-tse shao-p'i was located in north of the Yangtze River. And a passage in the *Yüan-shih, chüan* 17, 'Shih-tsu *pên-chi*' relates:

"On the day of *Ting-wei* 丁未, the 2nd lunar month of *Chih-yüan* 30, Wu Tong-ao 吳動鰲, a *Tung-man* 洞蠻 who surrendered recently, was appointed the T'an-hsi *têng-chu chün-min-kuan* 潭溪等處軍民官... and was attached to Chen-ting *t'un-t'ien* 真定屯田."

Chen-ting was in the northern part of China. Those sources show that the *Hsi-tung* who surrendered to the government were attached to the *t'un-t'ien* far away from their native land, as a result, the powers of their leaders weakend and their solidarity was broken.

I have mentioned above that the *t'un-t'ien* was established in order to defend against the *Hsi-tung*. There are more documents which indicate this fact. For example, 'Shih-tsu *pên-chi*' in the *Yüan-shih, chüan* 16, relates:

“On the day of *Ting-wei* 丁未, the 8th lunar month of *Chih-yüan* 30, an official of Hu-kuang province said that there is much waste land in Hai-nan 海南 and Hai-pei 海北, and we can establish the *t'un-t'ien* 屯田. [His Majesty] decreed to establish it in order to subdue *Li-man* 黎蠻.”

And a passage in 'Kao-ch'ang Hsieh *shih chia-chuan* 高昌侯氏家傳' in the *Kui-chi-wen chi* 圭齊文集 written by Ou-yang Hsüen 歐陽玄, *chüan* 11, states:

“When he (Hsieh 侯) was appointed the *tung-chih* 同知 of the Kuang-hsi *hsüen-wei-ssü shih fu tu-yüan-shuai* 廣西宣慰司事副都元帥, he met with the rebellions by *Yao* 徭 in Liu-chou 柳州, Ch'ing-yüan 慶遠 and Pin-chou 賓州. The enemy led several thousands of soldiers. So he suggested a stratagem that is to lure the rebels . . . and capture the chief, Hou Shih-chiu 侯十九, Long Pan-t'ien 龍半天 and 13 others. Some rebels escaped and fled, but many thousands surrendered [to the State]. [The State] reestablished the *t'un-t'ien* 屯田.”

This *t'un t'ien* system was preventive against rebellions.

Concerning the places where the *t'un-t'ien* was established, the biography of Liu Kuo-chieh states:

“[In *Chih-yüan* 29, in Kuang-hsi] confiscate the land of rebel and turn it into the *t'un-t'ien* 屯田.”

And 'Liu *p'ing-chang shên-tao p'i* 劉平章神道碑' in the *Chih-chêng chi*, *chüan* 48, states:

“In the year of *I-wei* 乙未 in *Yüan-chên* 元貞 2, Huang Shêng-hsü 黃聖許, mayor of Shang-ssü-chou 上思州, rose in rebellion . . . he fled to An-nan 安南. [The State] appeased the people threatened by the rebels and who had come far away from their native land. These people who could not make a living by themselves were sent to till the abandoned land, and established five *t'un-t'ien* 屯田.”

The similar event is stated in the *Yüan-shih*, *chüan* 100, 'ping-chih' 兵志' as:

“In *Ta-tê* 大德 in the Ch'êng-tsung 成宗 reign, Huang Shêng-hsü 黃聖許 started a rebellion and fled to Chiao-shih 交趾. He left behind 545 *ch'ing* 頃 7 *mu* 畝 rice field. Lü Ying 呂英 asked to mobilize *Hsi-tung* 溪洞 and *Yao-tung's* 徭洞 people in Mu-lan 牧蘭, Rong-ch'ing 融慶 and so on to establish the *t'un-t'ien* 屯田 in Shang-lang 上浪 and Chung-chou 忠州.”

Although the dates are different between these two documents, they may indicate the same rebellion. However, Huang Shêng-hsü sometimes showed

obedience to the government at other times rose in rebellions, and he often fled to Chiao-shih. It is highly probable that these two documents refer to one rebellion.

The *t'un-t'ien* was usually established in the land property where the owner, often a rebel, fled across the frontier. Such an establishment prevented rebellions and even if they occurred, the government can nip them at the bud.²²⁾ However this system is not a Yüan original. In fact it had been done during the Sung dynasty. It is all right to say that the Yüan imitated the former. The biography of Liu Kuo-chieh states:

“The early of *Yüan-chên* 元貞 1, Chên[-chou] 辰 [州] and Li[-chou] 禮 [州] adjoin the residential region of *Hsi-tung* 溪洞. The Sung selected some people, established the *t'un-t'ien* 屯田, exempted their corvée and had them defend the *t'un-t'ien*. The people who lived in Li[-chou] were called *é-ting* 隘丁, and those who lived in Chên[-chou] called *chai-ping* 寨兵. After the fall of the Sung, all of them were abolished. Later Kuo-chieh restored this system.”

The establishment of *t'un-t'ien* in the Hu-kuang region during the *Chih-yüan* 10 of the Yüan dynasty and the dispatchment of rebels into them could not be found. However, most sources indicate that there had been such establishment and dispatchment during the *Chih-yüan* 25 and *Ta-tê* period.

I would say that the *t'un-t'ien* system allow the *Hsi-tung* a chance to learn the way of Chinese agriculture.

IV

What were the duties of the *Hsi-tung* 溪洞 tribes toward the state after they were subdued? The biography of A-li-hai-ya 阿里海牙 in the *Yüan-shih*, *chüan* 128, relates:

“[In *Chih-yüan* 12, A-li-hai-ya] sent a written document to Ying-chou 郢州, Kuei-chou 歸州, Hsia-chou 峽州, Ch'ang-tê-chou 常德州 and Li-chou 禮州 to order their surrender, . . . Every one of the *Hsi-tung* surrendered. . . and the *Hsi-tung* tribes and their property were listed in the census register.”

But I discovered another document which indicates that the *Hsi-tung* tribes were not listed. It is a passage in the *Yüan-shih*, *chüan* 58, '*ti-li-chih* 地理志':

“Concerning the census register, the *Hsi-tung* 溪洞 tribes who lived in the mountains were not listed.”

A passage in the *Yüan-shih*, *chüan* 17, 'Shih-tzu *pên-chi*' states:

"On the day of *P'ing-chên* 丙辰, the 1st lunar month of *Chih-yüan* 至元 29, *Tung-man* 洞蠻 in Po-chou 播州 fled because they were apprehensive of being listed in the census register."

We know that they disliked to be listed very much. Therefore, a passage in the same document states:

"On the day of *Ping-yin* 丙寅, the 5th lunar month of *Chih-yüan* 30, [His Majesty] ordered the entrusted officials together with provincial officials to take the census of the barbarians."

But I doubt that the census was successful. I have mentioned above that the State offered an official post to the chief of the *Hsi-tung* tribes in order to administer their own tribe. This shows that the authority of the Yüan could not reach the individual persons of the *Hsi-tung* tribes. Concerning the sources about their submission, for example, the biography of Chu Kuo-pao 朱國寶 in the *Yüan-shih*, *chüan* 165, states:

"The *Li* 黎 tribe who surrendered numbered 300 houses, the *Man-tung* 蠻洞 tribe which surrendered numbered 30."

And the biography of Kuo Ang 郭昂 in the *Yüan-shih*, *chüan* 165, states:

"80 villages of the *Hsi-tung* 溪洞 were 'called' to surrender."

And 'Swu-shou Têng-chou *ch'ien-hu* Yang *kung shên-tao p'i* 戊守鄧州千戶楊公神道碑' in the *Mu-an chi* 牧庵集, *chüan* 18, states:

"[In *Chih-yüan* 至元 twenties Yang 楊] defeated the rebels in Hu-nan 湖南 and captured 45 chiefs."

They recorded the number of villages as well as the number of persons. I discovered that they must have relied on the number of villages as it was difficult to count the individual. In the last mentioned source, the number of chiefs was listed. Probably the number of chief reflects the number of villages or tribes. This also means that the Yüan could not get a total number of their people. Moreover as is stated in the section of 'The biography of *Chi-hsien ta-hsüeh-shih* Wang Yan 集賢大學士王彥' in the *Shan-chü hsün-yü* 山居新語 written by Yang Yü 楊瑀:

"Hu-kuang province asked to dispatch soldiers in order to pacify *Man-tung's* 洞蠻 fighting among themselves. *Kung* 公 (Wang Yan) replied

... It is understood that the barbarians are fighting among themselves but the army is posted at the frontier for defense of the country. Do not dispatch them thoughtlessly.”

This shows that the government has a tendency not to intervene in tribal disturbances.

Regarding the taxation, I find the poem titled that ‘*Man-lao* 蠻獠 not been taxed for a long time 蠻獠負固歲久不供...’ in the *Kui-ch’ao kao* 龜巢稿 written by Hsieh Ying-fang 謝應芳, *chüan* 4. Also *Nan-ning fu-chih* 南寧府志 states:

“After the *Hsi-tung* 溪洞 surrendered [to the Ming], they gradually became obedient and paid tax. ... *Man-lao* 蠻獠 had neither knowledge of administration, nor why they should pay tax. ... From *Hung-wu* 洪武 4, *Man-lao* accepted the influence of Chinese culture, but only that aspect on taxation.”

This shows that tax was not imposed on the *Hsi-tung* by the Yüan dynasty but by the Ming. Then, do they not have any duties toward the Yüan? As mentioned above, we know that some of them were listed as members of armed forces in the *t’un-t’ien*, therefore they had to work as a soldier during war time. ‘*Liu p’ing-chang shên-tao p’i* 劉平章神道碑’ in the *Chih-chêng chi*, *chüan* 48, relates:

“In the year of *I-wei* 乙未 of *Yüan-chên* 元貞, the *hsing-yüan* 行院 was abolished. *Kung* 公 (Liu) became the *p’ing chang* 平章 of Hu-kuang province. Five *Hsi* 溪 [tung] belonged to *hsien* 縣. The T’ang and the Sung dynasties used native people to protect this region from enemies, but this system had been abolished for a long time. Therefore, the bandits could do whatever they liked. When he restored this system, the people lived in peace.”

As was done during the T’ang and Sung periods, the *Hsi-tung* were used to counter the *Hsi-tung* bandits. That is to say, the State subdued ‘barbarians’ with ‘barbarian’ soldiers.

There are many sources which indicate that the State employed the *Hsi-tung* 溪洞 as soldiers. For example, the biography of *Hsi-tu-êrh* 昔都兒 (Sidor) in the *Yüan-shih*, *chüan* 133, relates:

“In the 7th lunar month of [*Chih-yüan* 24], He (Hsi-tu-êrh) followed the King of *Chên-nan* 鎮南, leading the *tung* 洞 army, to attack *Chiao-shih* 交趾.”

And the *P’ing-man chi* 平蠻記²³⁾ written by Yang Kê 楊格 relates:

“[In the year of *Chia-wu* 甲午 in *Chih-yüan* 至元] Kung 公 (Liu) called out the chiefs of the tribes in Huati-tê *fu* 懷德府 and Yung-shun *chou* 永順州 and soon, leading their own army, they came to him.”

And a passage in the *Yüan-shih*, *chüan* 19, ‘Ch’êng-tsung *pên-chi*’ relates:

“On the day of *Ting-mao* 丁卯, the 2nd lunar month of *Yüan-chên* 元貞 2, the State assigned Pao An-kuo 彭安國, a chief of the *Hsi-tung*, and his son to attack Mayor T’ien 田.”

Also the section on ‘*jên-wu* 人物’ 5 in the *Chie-ch’ing Hu-nan t’ung-chih* 嘉慶湖南通志, *chüan* 129, relates:

“Yang Wan 楊完 who was from Ch’êng-pu 城步 was a *t’u-kuan* succeeding his ancestors . . . he employed *Miao* 苗 soldiers.”

As I have mentioned above, in Hu-kuang province, both of the climate and the nature are not mild but very severe and it was so difficult for the *Han-tsu* to live so that the soldiers of the *Hsi-tung* people, who were familiar with the nature, were employed and became indispensable to the Yüan dynasty.

Conclusion

I have mentioned above, the Yüan dynasty could finally manage Hu-kuang province from Chêng-tsung’s reign. Most ‘minorities’ who were called *Hsi-tung* 溪洞 also surrendered to the Yüan dynasty by this time. Concerning *Hsi-tung*, however, the State could not control thoroughly, but she was forced to offer them autonomy.

As is stated in ‘Shan-nan *lien-fang fu-shih* Fang *kuang tao-p’i* 山南廉訪副使馮公道碑’ in the *Mu-an chi* 牧庵集, *chüan* 20:

“The State have already laid down Chiang-nan 江南. He (Fang 馮) was promoted *i-chêng ta-fu* 議政大夫 and was appointed Shan-nan Hu-pei *tao t’i-hsing an-ch’a ssü-shih* 山南湖北道提刑按察司事 and later as Ling-pei Hu-nan *tao t’i-hsing an-ch’a ssü-shih* 嶺北湖南道提刑按察司事. Both of these districts were in the frontier, and the notorious residential place of the *Hsi-tung* 溪洞. People did not dare venture there, but he moved into such a severe regions. . . In mountainous area where he could not go through on horse back or sedan-chair, so he walked by stick and travelled about several thousands *li* 里.”

It is evident that it was so difficult for the Yüan dynasty to manage the *Hsi-*

tung who lived in the steep and rugged region, and were sparsely located. But I would admit that the *Hsi-tung* accepted Chinese culture gradually, especially through the *t'un-t'ien* system.

Notes

- 1) Otagi Matsuo 愛宕松男, Chinese conquest by Yüan and the Chinese society (Gen no Chugoku shihai to Kan minzoku shakai 元の中國支配と漢民族社會), in *Iwanami's Lecture of History of the World*, (*Iwanami Kôza Sekai Rekishi* 岩波講座世界歴史), Vol. 9 Medieval age (Chûsei 中世), no. 3, 1970, pp. 302-303.
- 2) The classification of non-Han 漢 tribes has not yet been proved scientifically, and I shall not discuss them in this article. The *Hsi-tung* 溪洞 which I used here is a general term for the 'minorities'.
- 3) Yano Jinichi 矢野仁一, About *t'u-ssü* 土司 in China (Shina no doshi ni tsuite 支那の土司について), in *Shina gaku* 支那學, III-3, 1922.
Yu I-tsé 餘貽澤, The system of *t'u-ssü* 土司 in the Ming dynasty (Ming-tai chi *t'u-ssu* chih-tu 明代之土司制度), in *Yu-kung pan-yüe-k'an* 禹貢半月刊, IV-11, 1936.
- 4) Sogabe Shizuo 曾我部靜雄, Shê 畬 army in Fu-chien (Fukken no shegun 福建の畬軍), in *Bunka* 文化 III-7, 1936.
Uematsu Tadashi 植松 正, Shê 畬 tribe's rebellion in the early Yüan (Gensho no she zoku no hanran ni tsuite 元初の畬族の叛亂について), in *Kagawa Daigaku Ippan Kyôiku Kenkyû* 香川大學一般教育研究, no. 25, 1984.
In the section on '*fêng-su* 風俗' in the *Na-ning-fu*, in *Yung-lê ta-tien, chüan* 8509 states:
After the Yüan dynasty, [*Hsi-tung* 溪洞] accepted influence of Chinese culture and improved their old custom finally.
And a passage in the *Wu-chou-fu* 梧州府, in *ibid.*, *chüan* 2329, relates:
After the Sung and Yüan, they knew about learning gradually.
- 5) I use the *Yüan-shih* 元史 in *Tien pan* 殿版.
- 6) During the Yüan dynasty, *shang-shu-shêng* 尚書省 was established three times. When *shang-shu-shêng* was posted, *hsing-shêng* 行省 indicated *hsing shang-shu-shêng* 行尚書省 not *hsing chung-shu-shêng* 行中書省.
- 7) Maeda Naonori 前田直典, The process of establishment of *hsing-shêng* in the Yüan dynasty (Genchô kôshô no seiritsu katei 元朝行省の成立過程), in *Shigaku Zasshi*, LVI-6, 1945, included the *Research of the History of the Yüan Dynasty* later.
- 8) In the *Yüan-shih* 元史, *chüan* 85, '*pai-kuan chih* 百官志', there is a statement that this *hsing-yüan* 行院 was established in *Chih-yüan* 至元 10 and a passage in the *ibid.*, *chüan* 8, states that it was improved into *hsing-shêng* 行省 in *Chih-yüan* 11. But in the *ibid.*, *chüan* 8, we find *hsing-shêng* even before *Chih-yüan* 11.
- 9) Refer to the biography of A-li-hai-ya 阿里海牙, in the *Yüan-shih*, *chüan* 128, and the biography of Kuo Ang 郭昂 in the *Yüan-shih*, *chüan* 165.
- 10) According to sending of the official documents which we can see in the *Yüan tien-chang* 元典章, *tsung-kuan-fu* 總管府 under *hsüe-wei-ssü* 宣慰司 does not belong to *hsing-shêng* 行省 directly.
- 11) Refer to note 4.
- 12) Refer to '*P'ing-chang-chêng-shih* *Shih kung shên-tao-p'i* 平章政事史公神道碑' in the *Mu-an chi* 牧庵集, *chüan* 16.
- 13) Some cities were burned by inhabitants who would not like to surrender to the Mongols. (Refer to the *Yüan-shih*, *chüan* 9, '*Shih-tsu pên-chi*').
- 14) Refer to '*Ku Kuang-hsi* *Liang-chiang-tao* *hsüe-wei-shih-ssü tu-yüan-shuai-fu ching-li* *Ma chün mu-p'i ming* 故廣西兩江道宣慰使司都元帥府經歷馬君墓碑銘' in the *Yün-fêng chi* 雲峯集, *chüan* 5, written by Hu Ping-wen, '*Cha-la-êrh kung-tz'ü-t'ang chi* 札拉爾公祠堂記

- in the *Chih-chêng chi* 至正集, *chüan* 38, and 'Yüan ku chung-shun ta-fu Kuang-tung tao hsüe-wei fu-shih Nie I-tao mu-chih ming 元故中順大夫廣東道宣慰副使聶以道墓誌銘' in the *Shên-ch'i chi* 申齊集, *chüan* 8, written by Liu Yüeh-shên.
- 15) Huang Ch'ing-lien 黃清蓮, *The rebellion in the Chiang-nan 江南 in the early Yüan (1276-1294)* (*Yüan chu Chiang-nan te fan-lun* 元初江南的叛亂, 1276-1294), *Chung-ying yan-chiu-yüan li-shih yü-yan yan-chiu-suo chi-k'an* 中央研究院歷史語言研究所集刊, XLIX-1, 1978 and refer to note 4.
 - 16) During the reign Ch'êng-tsung 成宗.
 - 17) Refer to p. 29.
 - 18) Refer to p. 26.
 - 19) Yanai Wataru 篩内瓦, the three classes in the Yüan (Gendai no san kaikyû 元代の三階級), in *Mansen chiri rekishi kenkyû hôkoku* 滿鮮地理歷史研究報告, 3, 1916, later included in the *Research of the Mongol History*.
 - 20) Included in the Chia-ch'ing *Hu-nan t'ung-chih* 嘉慶湖南通志, *chüan* 218.
 - 21) Refer to the *Yüan-shih*, *chüan* 101, 'ping-chih 兵志'.
 - 22) Refer to p. 35.
 - 23) Refer to the *Kuo-chao Wen-li* 國朝文類, *chüan* 27.