

On the Relationship between the *Shih-chi*
史記, Bk. 123 and the *Han-shu* 漢書,
Bks. 61 and 96.

By KAZUO ENOKI

I

Doubts that the extant version of the Bk. 123 on Ta-yüan of the *Shih-chi* was that produced by Ssu-ma Ch'ien 司馬遷 have been raised since T'ang times. The T'ang scholar Ssu-ma Chên 司馬貞 in his *Shih-chi so-yin* 史記索隱 states:

"Investigation indicates that this book, i.e. *Book on Ta-yüan* ought properly to be placed after the *Account of South-Western Barbarian Tribes* (*Hsi-nan-i chuan* 西南夷傳). It should not be located between the *Biographies of Rigoorous Officials* (*K'u-li* 酷吏) and those of *Chivalrous People* (*Yu-hsia* 遊俠). In all probability, this error occurred when Master Ch'u 褚先生 (or Ch'u Shao-sun 褚少孫) used the book to fill in a gap in Ssu-ma Ch'ien's arrangement. Fortunately the mistake is not one for which he need be taken terribly to task."

What Ssu-ma Chên is suggesting here is that although the *Bk. on Ta-yüan* is currently located between Bks. 122 and 124 on *Biographies of Rigoorous Officials* and on *Chivalrous People* respectively, it originally came after Bk. 116 on *South-Western Barbarian Tribes* and that the order as we now have it resulted from Ch'u Shao-sun's error in the replacement of a missing element.

In his service as author of *Shih-chi so-yin* Ssu-ma Chên held the official position of *Ch'ao-san ta-fu Kuo-tsu po-shih Hung-wên-kuan hsüeh-shih* 朝散大夫國子博士弘文館學士 and has been previously argued by Ch'ien Ta-hsin 錢大昕 and Takikawa Kametarô 瀧川龜太郎, since that post of *Hung-wên-kuan hsüeh-shih* was first established in the seventh year of K'ai-yüan 開元 (719), the compilation of the *Shih-chi so-yin* must be dated subsequent to that year.¹⁾ Ssu-ma Chên's frequent claims for the "incompleteness" of the *Shih-chi* refer to two different situations. In one he is indicating a situation in which the materials used in the original compilation of the *Shih-chi* were inadequate. In the other, he is referring to the situation in which there was

an actual loss, after the time of Ssu-m Ch'ien, of parts of the completed manuscript. His "incompleteness" with reference to Bk. 123 on Ta-yüan, the "gap" belongs in this latter category, for he remarks that this book had been temporarily lost and then in Later Han times replaced by Ch'u Shao-sun into the mistaken location we find it today, between Bk. 122 and Bk. 124; not, as it was originally found, after Bk. 116 on *South-Western Barbarian Tribes*. Since this book order is the same as recorded in the author's preface (*T'ai-shih-kung tsu-hsü* 太史公自序), if we accept Ssu-ma Chên's argument, it follows that Ch'u Shao-sun had managed to work his influence on the preface as well.

According to Bk. 62 of the *Han-shu* 漢書, that is to say, the *Biography of Ssu-ma Ch'ien*, ten of the 130 *Shih-chi* books were missing—"records exist, but not texts". In his notes to the Bk. 62 of *Han-shu*, Yen Shih-ku 顏師古 cites Chang Yen 張晏 in reference to these ten:

"After the death of (Ssu-ma) Ch'ien, the following books were lost: *The Annals of Emperor Ching* (*Ching-chi* 景紀), *The Annals of Emperor Wu* (*Wu-chi* 武紀), *The Book on Ceremonies* (*Li-shu* 禮書), *The Book on Music* (*Yüeh-shu* 樂書), *The Book on Warfare* (*Ping-shu* 兵書), *A Chronology of Generals, Ministers (and Eminent Officials) from the Beginning of the Han* (*Han-hsing i-lai chiang-hsiang* (*ming-ch'en*) *nien-piao* 漢興以來將相(名臣)年表), *Biographies of Augurs* (*Jê-chê lieh-chuan* 日者列傳), *Accounts of Three Llegendry Kings* (*San-wang shih-chia* 三王世家), *Biographies of the Oracles* (*Kui-ts'ê lieh-chuan* 龜策列傳), and *Biographies of Fu K'uan* 傅寬, *Chin Hsi* 靳歙, and *Mêng Ch'êng* 蒯成 (*Fu Chin lieh-chuan* 傅靳列傳). Between the times of (Emperors) Yüan 元 and Ch'êng 成 (49 B.C.—A.D. 7), Master Ch'u 褚先生 wrote for supplementation *The Annals of Emperor Wu*, *Accounts of the Three Legendary Kings*, *Biographies of the Oracles*, and *Biographies of Augurs*. The writing is of a vulgar standard, not as originally intended by (Ssu-ma) Ch'ien (司馬)遷."

to which Yen Shih-ku adds his personal comment that "the *Preface* originally mentions no *Book on Warfare*. Chang (Yen)'s claim that it was lost cannot be." Or so he would say, but according to Takikawa, this *Book on Warfare* refers to the *Book on Law* (*Lü-shu* 律書), and so Yen Shih-ku's rejection of Chang Yen's claim on the basis of the lack of mention of it in the *Preface* would itself be in error,²⁾ while Chao I 趙翼 does not stop at Ch'u Shao-sun's having supplemented with a mere ten books. He gives a number of further examples, including *Accounts of Imperial Maternal Relations* (*Wai-ch'i shih-chia* 外戚世家), *The Biography of T'ien Jên* (*T'ien Jên lieh-chuan* 田仁列傳), *The Biographies of Ministers Chang Ts'ang* 張蒼 and *Shên T'u-chia* 申屠嘉 (*Chang Ch'êng-hsiang lieh-chuan* 張丞相列傳), *Accounts of King Yüan of Ch'u* 楚元王世家 and *The Book on the Hsiung-nu* (*Hsiung-nu lieh-chuan* 匈奴列傳),

and he assigns the 10 books previously noted to have been missing to the status of having been present in Ssu-ma Ch'ien's original but having subsequently been lost. Armed with the fact that Ch'u Shao-sun's supplementation was incorporated into the main text of the *Han-shu*, he concluded it to have been received as part of the *Shih-chi* rather early on.³⁾

While it is plain that Ch'u Shao-sun did it is not necessarily so very clear whether this supplementing covered the entire range of the ten books indicated by Chang Yen or whether it ended with only a part of them, or, assuming that other than these specific ten books were involved, just how much of which of them might in reality have been affected. However, Ssu-ma Chên is the sole claimant for the *Book on Ta-yüan* (*Ta-yüan lieh-chuan* 大宛列傳) being Ch'u Shao-sun's supplementary material. No one else has ever stepped forward to propose the theory, and we might reasonably wonder how Ssu-ma Chêng came to do so. His reasons are nowhere specifically made known, but, judging from what he does say, we may assume his objections have much to do with the unnaturalness of putting the *Book on Ta-yüan* between the *Biographies of Rigorous Officials* and those of *Chivalrous People*. The extant version of the *Shih-chi* contains the following four-series-biography arrangement: *The Southern Yüeh* 南越, *The Eastern Yüeh* 東越, *Chao-hsien* 朝鮮 (Korea), and *South-Western Barbarian Tribes* 西南夷. Now since the *Book on Ta-yüan* is an account of Western countries (Hsi-kuo 西國, later Hsi-yü 西域),⁴⁾ the book ought to be in some sort of continuous arrangement with these other accounts of foreign countries. That it is located at a distance of six books from the *Book on South-Western Barbarian Tribes* and in between the *Biographies of the Rigorous Officials* and those of the *Chivalrous People* is, indeed, unnatural. What else are we to think but that in making his replacements Ch'u Shao-sun mistakenly located the *Book on Ta-yüan* far further back than the setting to which it was obviously originally called, that following the *Book on South-Western Barbarian Tribes*?

It is certainly true that the placement of the *Book on Ta-yüan* between the *Biographies of the Rigorous Officials* and the *Biographies of the Chivalrous People* puts the book in odd company. Following Bk. 120 on the Hsiung-nu tribes, however, similarly odd groupings become conspicuous. The *Book on the Hsiung-nu tribes* is, for instance, the first of the biographical series to treat foreign people or foreign countries, and so it is only natural that it should be followed by the Southern Yüeh, Eastern Yüeh, Chao-hsien (Korea), and South-Western Barbarian Tribes Accounts, yet between it and the Southern Yüeh are sandwiched two others, the *Biography of Wei Ch'ing* 衛青 (*Wei Chiang-chün p'iao-ch'i lieh-chuan* 衛將軍驃騎列傳) and the *Biography of Kung-sun Hung* 公孫弘 (*P'ing-chin-hou Chu-fu lieh-chuan* 平津侯主父列傳). In further example, we may look at the series of biographies of *Benevolent Officials* (*Hsün-li* 循吏), *Confucian Scholars* (*Ju-lin* 儒林), *Rigorous Officials* 酷吏, *Chivalrous People* 遊俠, *Flattering Retainers* (*Ning-hsing* 佞倖), *Joking and*

Comical Retainers (*Hua-chi* 滑稽), *Augers* 日者, *Oracles* 龜策, and *Fortune Makers* (*Hua-chih* 貨殖). Here they are biographies of men arranged according to group types, and yet right in their midst we find the *Biographies of Chi An* 汲黯 and *Chêng Tang-shih* 鄭當時 and the *Book on Ta-yüan*, while between the *Book on South-Western Barbarian Tribes* and the *Biographies of Benevolent Officials* are sandwiched the *Biography of Ssu-ma Hsiang-ju* 司馬相如 and the *Biography of Liu Chang* 劉長 (*Huai-nan Hêng-shan-wang lieh-chuan* 淮南衡山王列傳).

We may, however, think of this as something other than the disorder produced by a later generation's supplementation, for as the *Preface* clearly records an arrangement of Biographies identical to these groupings, we would seem to be justified in assuming it to have been the order of Ssu-ma Ch'ien's original. There can be no doubt that the group of "foreign biographies" beginning with the *Book on the Hsiung-nu* and the group of biographies beginning with *Biographies of Benevolent Officials*, which is constructed according to the type of social function of its personages, were both so placed in accordance with Ssu-ma Ch'ien's original scheme for the work, and there are two possible explanations for why we find biographies of a very different character incorporated into the locations we have here noted. First of all, the *Biography of General Wei Ch'ing* so closely connected to the subjugation of the Hsiung-nu, and the *Biography of Ssu-ma Hsiang-ju*, identically closely connected to the bringing to allegiance of the south-western barbarian tribes, may have been positioned following, respectively, the *Book on the Hsiung-nu* and the *Book on South-Western Barbarian Tribes* out of consideration for the depth of their mutual relationships. Secondly, it could also be that the books in this section were simply arranged according to the order in which each's writing was completed. The *Biographies of Kung-sun Hung* and *Liu Chang* and the *Book on Ta-yüan* might be such, while the *Biography of Chi An* and *Chêng Tang-shih* (*Chi Chêng lieh-chuan* 汲黯列傳), with both Chi and Chêng being such faithful practitioners of the teaching of Huang 黃 and Lao 老, might have been placed where they are by way of association with or contrast to the preceding *Biographies of Benevolent Officials* or the subsequent *Biographies of Confucian Scholars* and *Rigorous Officials*. Chao I, in the first volume of his *Notes on the Twenty-two Histories* (*Nien-êrh-shih cha-chie* 廿二史劄記) under the heading "Arrangement of the *Shih-chi* (*Shih-chi pien-tz'u* 史記編次), remarks:

"As for the ordering of the *Shih-chi* series biographies, they were most probably entered one-by-one as each was completed, not first given order after having waited for the completion of the entire text. As a result, the *Book on the Hsiung-nu* is abruptly placed after the *Biography of Li Kuang* 李廣, and following that, we have the *Biographies of Wei Ch'ing* and *Huo Ch'u-ping* 霍去病. It is already the height of impropriety to have Court

Ministers and foreign barbarians succeeding one upon the other, but this is as if to say that the affairs of the various Ministers are all somehow interconnected with the Hsiung-nu. Placed abruptly after *Kung-sun Huang* are the *Book on Southern Yüeh, Eastern Yüeh, Chao-hsien* (Korea), and *South-Western Barbarian Tribes*, while further down is placed the *Biography of Ssu-ma Hsiang-ju*, and after him we find the *Biography of Liu Chang*; the *Biographies of Benevolent Officials* are followed abruptly by the *Biographies of Chi An* and *Chêng Tang-shih*. Following the *Biographies of Confucian Scholars* and *Rigorous Officials* it is suddenly the *Book on Ta-yüan*. These arrangements are all without significance, and the books may be assumed to have been entered in the order in which each one was completed in its turn."

Chao I's view here would seem to be sound.

Approached in this way, it is no longer possible to express unguarded approval of Ssu-ma Chên's assumption that the unnatural positioning of the *Book on Ta-yüan* made it an addition supplied by Ch'u Shao-sun.

II

The first person publicly to proclaim the view that Bk. 123 on Ta-yüan of the *Shih-chi* was simply a transcription of Bk. 61 dealing with the *Biographies of Chang Ch'ien and Li Kuang-li* 李廣利 of the *Han-shu* was Tsui Shih 崔適.⁵⁾ According to Bk. 8 of his *Shih-chi t'an-yüan* 史記探源, prefaced 1910 by Chu Tsu-mou 朱祖謀 and published by the Peking University in 1922:

"The (*Shih-chi*) *so-yin* states that the *Book on Ta-yüan* ought rightly to be located after the *Book on South-Western Barbarian Tribes* and is not properly located between the *Rigorous Officials* and the *Chivalrous People*, and that this was probably the result of Ch'u Shao-sun's filling in a gap left by Ssu-ma Ch'ien. It seems to me that, rather than this having been an addition by Ch'u Shao-sun, it was a case of the *Han-shu biographies of Chang Ch'ien* 趙鞫 and *Li Kuang-li's* 李廣利 having been written in directly by a later person. With Chang Yen 張晏 not referring to this or to the *Li-shu* 律書 as lost, Hsiao Ssu-ma 小司馬 (that is to say, Ssu-ma Chên 司馬貞) did well to recognize that they were not the work of T'ai-shih-kung 太史公 (that is to say, Ssu-ma Ch'ien). The title *so-yin* 索隱 (which means to disclose things concealed or unnoticed) is, therefore, well fit to its content."

Tsui Shih praises Ssu-ma Chên's insight in detecting, despite the fact that Chang Yen had not listed it among the missing, that the *Book on Ta-yüan* was

not the work of Ssu-ma Ch'ien. At the same time, he goes on to conclude that neither was it the supplementation of Ch'u Shao-sun. It was, he says, a transcription yet another, later person from the *Han-shu's* biographies of Chang Ch'ien and Li Kuang-li though he fails to mention a single reason for making the claim.

In 1929, just 19 years later than Tsui Shih, Paul Pelliot made the very same claim—that the *Book on Ta-yüan* of the *Shih-chi* was a transcription of the *Biographies of Chang Ch'ien and Li Kuang-li* of the *Han-shu*. In that year he offered opinions of such purport in two separate publications. The first was reference to the idea in a *T'oung Pao* article introducing and reviewing the *Collected Works of Wang Kuo-wei* (*Hai-ning Wang Chung-ch'üeh-kung i-shu* 海寧王忠愨公遺書⁶⁾) and the second was included in a discussion, of ancient Siberian and Chinese bronzes, carried in the first volume of a publication known as *Documents*.⁷⁾ Since the former is quoted in the latter, we may assume, at the very least, that the former was written first. The latter is simpler in content.

In the Supplementary Remarks, Section 3, to Chapter 16 of his *Studies in Sung Yüan Drama* (*Sung Yüan hsieh-ch'u k'ao* 宋元戲曲考), Wang Kuo-wei cites the song named *Ma-ho-tou-lé* 摩訶兜勒, which had been brought back to China by Chang Ch'ien, as the oldest song ever brought into the nation from a foreign country.⁸⁾ Pelliot took issue with this, saying:

“The transliteration *Ma-ho-tou-lé* itself may be considered the product of times later than those of Chang Ch'ien. A report that Chang Ch'ien was the bearer of this song may be found in the second volume of the *Ku-chin chu* 古今注 of Tsui Pao 崔豹 (ca. A.D. 300). Much ‘Chang Ch'ien Legendry’ (legendes tchangkieniennes) is cited in the *Ku-chin chu*, which even quotes the patently spurious *Chang Ch'ien ch'u-kuan chih* 張騫出關志 or the *Account of the Travels of Chang Ch'ien*.”

“This *Account of the Travels of Chang Ch'ien* is no more than a purveyor of the Chang Ch'ien's story at the secondary level. As I see it, the stories therein were received as historical fact extremely early on and appear to have been accepted in China in the 1st century A.D. in the form of a kind of historical novel (roman historique). It was a part of this novel which formed the *Chang Ch'ien Biography* of the *Han-shu*; it was not the Chang Ch'ien biography (that is to say, the *Book on Ta-yüan*) found today in the *Shih-chi* which provided those makings. Rather, the *Han-shu* account of Chang Ch'ien itself was likely introduced into the *Shih-chi* by a post-1st century A.D. forger. This may be an extremely revolutionary conclusion to have arrived at, and yet there is no other way to resolve the question of the Chang Ch'ien Biography as it is currently found in the *Shih-chi*. I expect to discuss this problem in detail at some future date.”

According to Pelliot, then, a novelistic account of Chang Ch'ien's travels through Central Asia was produced, and this was first of all, introduced into the *Han-shu*, becoming the *Biography of Chang Ch'ien*. Later it formed the *Account of the Travels of Chang Ch'ien* (*Chang Ch'ien ch'u-kuan chih* 張騫出關志), while the *Book on Ta-yüan* of the present *Shih-chi* was based on the *Han-shu's biography of Chang Ch'ien*, having been prepared and inserted into the *Account of the Travels of Chang Ch'ien*, is quoted in the *Ku-chin chu* and that the song *Ma-ho-tou-lê* was brought to China from the Western countries by Chang Ch'ien were the subjects of immediate scholarly attention,⁹⁾ but his later inferences—that the Chang Ch'ien legends which had come to be recorded in the pages of the *Account of the Travels of Chang Ch'ien* had even earlier been incorporated into the *Han-shu* as its *Biography of Chang Ch'ien*, and further, that this *Biography of Chang Ch'ien* in the *Han-shu* was inserted into the present *Shih-chi* as the *Book on Ta-yüan*, these appeared as a bolt out of the blue. The *Book on Ta-yüan* consists of a first half which focuses on Chang Ch'ien's mission to the West and a second half dealing with Li Kuang-li's conquest of Ta-yüan. While Pelliot refers exclusively to the first half and entirely ignores the second half, we may imagine that in this case his readers simply awaited, with intense anticipation, the appearance of the detailed discussion he had promised for a future date, a treatise which would most certainly provide a splendid explanation for this apparent lapse.

In a 1939 issue of *T'oung Pao*, Pelliot published "*The name X^wârizm in Chinese Texts*",¹⁰⁾ an article in which he collected Chinese character transliteration of X^wârizm (Khorazm) as they occurred through successive generations of Chinese writings. To these he added his own explanatory comments. While Pelliot argued that Huan-ch'ien 驩潛 of the *Book on Ta-yüan* passage 及宛西小國驩潛·大益, 宛東姑師·杆罕·蘇雍之屬, 皆隨漢使獻見天子 (*Reduced Pona-pên* ed. p. 1143, upper column) is a sound equivalent of X^wârizm, he neglected to mention that this identification originated with Shiratori Kurakichi 白鳥庫吉¹¹⁾. Be that as it may, having here quoted the *Book on Ta-yüan*, Pelliot writes, "Passages referring to Chang Ch'ien and his travels make up the better part of Bk. 123 of the *Shih-chi*, yet I cannot feel that these passages merit our complete faith", to which he adds the note "See page 250 of Haloun's article in the 1937 issue of the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* for the very latest discussion of the *Shih-chi* Book 123." Pelliot passed away on October 26, 1945, without ever having published the detailed discussion he had promised, and there appear to be no reports of such a study's having been left among his unpublished manuscripts.

One section of the *Chang Ch'ien ch'u-kuan chih* is quoted in the third volume of the *Ku-chin chu* and another section is quoted in Bk. 12 of the *Ch'üan-chih* 泉志 of Hung Mai 洪邁, The *Ku-chin chu* quotation is a reference to a certain plant, *chiu-pei-t'êng* 酒杯藤, found in the Western Regions 西域, but quite naturally no passage of a similar nature is be found

in the *Book on Ta-Yüan*, nor in the *Biography of Chang Ch'ien* of the *Han-shu* or the *Accounts of Western Regions* (*Hsi-yü chuan* 西域傳). By way of contrast, the *Ch'üan-chih* passage reads:

"The *Chang Ch'ien ch'u-kuan chih* states, 'In general, the currency in the various countries is commonly made with *chiao* 蕉, *yüeh* 越, *hsi* 犀, and *hsiang* 象 [which do not make sense and the meaning is unclear]. Metallic currency (*chin-pi* 金幣) is usually fashioned with the image of the king or patterned with the image of the queen. In commerce with women, that of the queen. Upon the death of the king, coins are re-minted."

The An-hsi 安息 section of the *Han-shu*, Bk. 96 a, *Hsi-yü chuan* 西域傳 reads, "And money is made from silver. The face of the coin bears the image of a single king and its back that of his wife," (Reduced *Po-na-pén* ed., p. 1162, lower column), the point of similarity here being the minting with images of both the king and his wife.

The Chi-pin 罽賓 section of the *Han-shu*, Bk. 96 a, *Hsi-yü chuan*, has, "Money is made from silver and gold. The face of the coin bears the likeness of a horse and its back bears a human countenance" (pp. 1160-1161), and in the Wu-i 烏弋 section which immediately follows, we have the similar passage, "The money here (in contrast to that of Chi-pin) bears the head of a single person. On the backside is a horse" (p. 1162, upper column), but since it is unclear whether or not information about Chi-pin and Wu-i came within Chang Ch'ien's acquaintance, we will leave these last points outside the sphere of our considerations. Still, the *Biography of Chang Ch'ien* of the *Han-shu*, Bk. 61 has not one single passage in common either with the extant quoted passages from the *Chang Ch'ien ch'u-kuan chih* or with the existing *Ku-chin chu*.

Pelliot stated that there were numerous Chang-Ch'ien-legend-like passages in the *Ku-chin chu*. By this term is meant those dealing with things said either to have been described by him or brought back by him, or with knowledge about those things. The passage cited earlier about the *Ma-ho-toulé* expressly states that he brought the song back with him, and though the story about the fruit stone *ch'ing-t'ien-ho* 青田核 from the country of the Wu-sun 烏孫 in the second volume is not specific, a Chang Ch'ien connection is certainly plausible. While here the overall shape of the fruit unknown, it was said to be the size of 6 *shêng* 升 gourd and to turn water with which it was filled into wine. Liu Chang 劉章 was claimed to have owned two of the stones and to have put them to use at banquets. Assuming this Liu Chang to be Chu-hsü-hou Chang 朱虛侯章, son of Fei 肥, who was himself the eldest son of Emperor Kao-tsu 高祖, he is the man who got wind of the Lu 呂 Clan's plot, known as the Lu Rebellion 呂氏之亂 to destroy the Liu Clan following

the death of Empress Lu in 180 B.C. and who thereafter directed his efforts to suppressing that uprising. Therefore, even if he were still alive at the time of the accession of Emperor Wu (141 B.C.), it is far from certain whether or not he was in fact still around in 126 B.C. for Chang Ch'ien's return home. It would seem even less likely than that by the time of Chang Ch'ien's return from his Wu-sun mission in the second year of Yüan-ting 元鼎¹²⁾ (115 B.C.) that the old man had not already gone the way of all flesh. For Liu Chang actually to have got hold of a product from the country of the Wu-sun would seem nothing short of miraculous. However, traffic between the western countries, such as Kang-chü 康居, and Han had begun before Chang Ch'ien's first mission to them,¹³⁾ and so it is not at all unthinkable that products of the Wu-sun had by the time in question been brought into Han. If that were the case, there would be no direct link between Chang Ch'ien and Liu Chang's obtaining a *ch'ing-t'ien-ho*.

However, according to the *Yu-yang tsa-tsu* 酉陽雜俎, *ch'ien-chi* 前集, Bk. 7, fol. 2 v, (ed. *Ssu-pu ts'ung-k'an* 四部叢刊), the *ch'ing-t'ien-ho* was used not by Liu Chang of the Former Han but by another Liu Chang who was the second emperor of the Shu 蜀 (reg. 223–263). If it is right, the *ch'ing-t'ien-ho* is to be related to Chang Ch'ien in much more remote way.

Even, for the sake of argument, considering the *ch'ing-t'ien-ho* in the broadest sense as an example of Chang Ch'ien Legendry, there are still only two examples of what can be seen as such—the *chiu-p'ei-t'êng* 酒杯藤 plant story, said to have been incorporated from the *Chang Ch'ien ch'u-kuan chih*, and the *ma-ho-tou-lê* story, its source unindicated, as was that of *ch'ing-t'ien-ho*. That makes three examples in all, hardly sufficient to support Pelliot's statement that the *Ku-chin chu* was replete with Chang Ch'ien legendry.

Properly speaking, the extant *Ku-chin chu* is the re-editing of the lost original through transcripts of the *Chung-hua Ku-chin chu* 中華古今注 made in the late T'ang times by Ma Kao 馬縞. One theory holds that the *Chung-hua Ku-chin chu* was based on the *Su-shih yen-i* 蘇氏演義 of Su Ê 蘇頌,¹⁴⁾ while another denies that and argues for the separate independence of the three works.¹⁵⁾ Since Bk. 14 (in the original notes to *Tai-yüeh-shu* 大樂署 section) of the *T'ang Liu-tien* 唐六典 gives the story of the *ma-ho-tou-lê* as having come from the *Ku-chin chu*, it would seem safe to assume it was found in the original, but it is not clear what other stories were there.¹⁶⁾ Under these conditions, how could anyone possibly demonstrate that the *Biography of Chang Ch'ien* of the *Han-shu*, Bk. 61, had as had the *Ku-chin chu*, transcribed Chang Ch'ien legendry? Pelliot's promised detailed explanation never appeared most certainly for the reason that it was impossible to write.

Now, Haloun had the following to say about the formation of the *Book on Ta-yüan* 大宛列傳 of the *Shih-chi* when he touched on the subject in his 1937 tour de force studies of the Yüeh-shih 月氏¹⁷⁾:

“The very authenticity of the *Book on Ta-yüan* has from time of Ssu-ma Chên's *Shih-chi so-yin*, through Tsui Shih's *Shih-chi t'an-yüan*, and up to Pelliot been seen as doubtful. My own view of the true state of affairs is this—that the extant text is in its entirety (bis auf geringe Reste) an amalgam produced from the *Han-shu*, Bk. 61 (*Biographies of Chang Ch'ien* and *Li Kuang-li*) and 96 (*Hsi-yü chuan*) and mistakenly incorporated into the *Shih-chi*. Further, I believe that the only true biographical record of Chang Ch'ien consists of the mere two line passage found in the addendum to the *Biography of Wei Ch'ing* 衛青 of the *Shih-chi*, Bk. 111”.

“General Chang Ch'ien had gone as emissary to Ta-hsia 大夏 and upon his return became Captain of the Imperial Guard (*Hsiao-wei* 校尉). Having performed meritoriously in service to the Great General (Wei Ch'ing), he was invested as Prince Po-wang 博望侯. Three years later he became a general and proceeded to Yu-pei-p'ing 右北平, but failed to appear on time. The usual punishment of beheading was redeemed, and he was reduced to commoner status. Following that, he went on his mission to the Wu-sun 烏孫, later became Superintendent of State Visits 大行, and died. His grave is to be found in Han-chung 漢中.”

“The *Biography of Chang Ch'ien* of the *Han-shu*, Bk. 61, subsequently compiled in the 1st century A.D., is naturally altogether different from other records of that age. It is no difficulty to divide it into several parts and examine the source, age and merits of each. Bks. 61 and 96 of the *Han-shu* are the basis for the *Book on Ta-yüan* of the *Shih-chi* with which they comply. The time of its compilation ought to be considered that of the reign of Emperor Kuang-wu 光武, referred to as Shêng-shang 聖上 (which is an honorary appellation of the contemporaneous Emperor) in the *Han-shu*, Bk. 96, that is to say, from 25 to 57 A.D., and everything pre-dates the death of Pan Piao 班彪 in 54 A.D. In order to utilize more extensively the *Shih-chi*, Bk. 123, and the *Han-shu*, Bk. 61, as historical material, it is first necessary to produce revised texts.”

The opinion that the extant version of the *Book on Ta-yüan* of the *Shih-chi* was not produced by Ssu-ma Ch'ien has now emanated from Ssu-ma Chên, Tsui Shih, Pelliot and Haloun, and each of them, with the exception of Ssu-ma Chên, claims that it was a piecemeal composite of Books 61 and 96 of the *Han-shu*, but not one of them offers any grounds whatsoever for maintaining so.

III

The first attempt to demonstrate the correctness, by providing detailed reasons, of the above scholars' conclusions was Anthony François Hulsewé,

Professor Emeritus of Leiden University. In 1973 he came to Japan and presented to the Tōhō Gakkai 東方學會 an address entitled “*On the Relationship between the Han-shu Bk. 61 and the Shih-chi Bk. 123*”, the full text of which is carried in the *Tōhōgaku* 東方學, No. 57 (January, 1974), pp. 119–133). Then, in Volume 61 of *T’oung Pao*, 1975, Hulsewé published “*On the Authenticity of the Shih-chi Bk. 123*”,¹⁸⁾ in which, on the basis of a detailed critique of the text, he stressed the correctness of the theory we have seen here. And finally, in 1976 he published an annotated translation of the *Han-shu*, Bk. 96 a and b, on Western Countries, in the introduction to which it was argued for the third time that the *Book on Ta-yüan* of the *Shih-chi* is no more than a transcription from the *Biographies of Chang Ch’ien* and *Li Kuang-li* and *Accounts of the Western countries* of the *Han-shu*.¹⁹⁾ This introduction was provided by the University of Cambridge’s M.A.N. Loewe, a Hulsewé collaborator in his *Han-shu on Western Regions* research and a contributor to the annotated translation effort.

Among works of a similar variety, Professor Hulsewé’s annotated translation is the finest achievement ever; in it are gathered together into a single fabric all the separate threads of related research that the world’s scholars have to date produced—at a glance one can get an overview of the current state of modern knowledge at its highest level. I offered my congratulations on the appearance of this very trustworthy work in a simple introductory piece in *Tōhōgaku*, No. 64 (Aug., 1982), but at the same time I explained some of the grounds for my inability to agree with the Professor’s opinion that the *Shih-chi*’s *Book on Ta-yüan* had been transcribed from the *Han-shu*’s *Biographies of Chang Ch’ien* and *Li Kuang-li*, as well as *Han-shu*’s *Accounts of Western Regions*. What I wish to set forth here does not differ greatly in its broad outlines from what I discussed in that introduction, but considerations of space there determined that a certain number of points would have to be curtailed. I would like to take the opportunity right now to expand on those points. Since there are limitations of space here as well, however, rather than try to refute Prof. Hulsewé’s arguments one-by-one, I will instead attempt to enumerate what are, from my perspective, the grounds for affirming the age-old view that the *Han-shu*’s *Biographies of Chang Ch’ien* and *Li Kuang-li* and a part of the *Han-shu*’s *Accounts of Western Regions* are taken from the *Book on Ta-yüan* of the *Shih-chi*. The space available here determines that only my own views will be aired on this occasion, but I have the best of expectations that Prof. Hulsewé will before long be good enough to provide us with a very instructive response. Such is the hope with which I write.

(A) The Existence in the *Shih-chi* of Older Terminology:

The fact that in the *Shih-chi* there exists terminology older yet than that of the *Han-shu*’s *Biographies of Chang Ch’ien* and *Li Kuang-li* indicates that the *Han-shu* took material from the *Shih-chi*. Moreover, the *Han-shu* has in some cases renovated that terminology or used it with different meaning.

It is recorded in the *Shih-chi* on Ta-yüan that when Li Kuang-li reached Tun-huang 敦煌 on his return from his failed first attempt to subjugate Ta-yüan, the furious Emperor sent a messenger to intercept the force at Yü-mên 玉門 with the admonishment to "slay at once any of the army who should dare attempt entry." A fearful Li Kuang-li remained in Tun-huang. In the *Biography of Li Kuang-li* of the *Han-shu*, the same episode is recorded in precisely the same form, except that "intercept at Yü-mên reads "intercept at the Yü-mên Barrier 玉門關." Chavannes used this passage as grounds for establishing the Yü-mên Barrier as lying east of Tun-huang, a theory with which Wang Kuo-wei 王國維, among numerous others, agreed. This Yü-mên of the *Book on Ta-yüan* is properly understood, however, as referring to the Yü-mên district²⁰) 玉門縣, and the fact that the *Han-shu* records it as the Yü-mên Barrier reflects a later tendency to interpret references to Yü-mên as being to that barrier station (*i.e.* the 玉門關) through which traffic to and from Western countries passed. This would most certainly seem to be a phenomenon post-dating the enormously flourishing growth in intercourse with Western countries that accompanied an ever more total Han supremacy (that supremacy arising with the successful subjugation of Ta-yüan in 102-101 B.C.) over the nations of Central Asia.

The *Book on Ta-yüan* of the *Shih-chi* also records the following celebrated incident. It seems there were no water wells within the confines of the Ta-yüan fortress and the people drew their needs from running water coming from the outside. When the Han forces, having observed this, took the opportunity at the source to divert those waters elsewhere, Ta-yüan employed a captured Chinese to dig them a well, which thereafter provided a supply. With this it appeared that Ta-yüan would be capable of withstanding a prolonged siege. Li Kuang-li, further judging it only a matter of time before troops from Kang-chü 康居 would arrive to reinforce the enemy, accepted a Ta-yüan ceasefire offer, one which Ta-yüan had been sincere enough to tender along with the head of the King Wu-kua 毋寡 or Mu-kua 毋寡. The *Book on Ta-yüan* notes that:

"At this time, the Kang-chü army had observed the Han forces to be stronger than ever and dared not advance. The General (*Êrh-shih* 貳師) conferred with Chao Shih-chêng 趙始成 and Li I 李哆. 'It is reported,' he said, 'that Ta-yüan has within its fortress a newly captured Ch'in-jên 秦人 or Chinese from whom they have learned to dig a well, and, moreover, that they still possess abundant stores of food. The purpose of our campaign has been to put to death their villainous chief, Wu-kua. We already have his head. If, nonetheless, we should refuse to consent to the disengagement of troops we may expect continued strong resistance. Should the Kang-chü forces then learn of our being thus stopped short and come to Ta-yüan's rescue, they would inevitably destroy our army. Each of

the officers agreed this to be so, and the pledge [offering surrender] was accepted." (p. 1145, lower column).

This Ch'in-jên is the name by which Chinese were known in Central Asia at this time. The *Biography of Li Kuang-li* of the *Han-shu*, however, in giving what is very nearly the precisely same passage, changes Ch'in-jên 秦人 to Han-jên 漢人. By Han-jên is meant, quite literally, a person of Han; it refers to those Chinese who were subject to the rule of the Han Dynasty. It should not be necessary to make further note here that even after the overthrow of that dynasty and, in fact, to this very day, the term Han has continued to be used as a general designation both for China proper and for the Chinese people.²¹⁾ The fact that the designation Han-jên is used in the *Biography of Li Kuang-li* of the *Han-shu* synonymously with "Chinese" may indicate that, at the time of its compilation, the term was used with that same meaning in Central Asia as well. When the *Hsien-pei* 鮮卑's T'o-pa 拓跋 Clan came to dominate Northern China, such terms as *Tamghadj*, *Taugas*, and others of their general type came into use among the peoples of Central and Western Asia to designate China or the Chinese.²²⁾ Similarly, as is well known, with the foundation of the T'ang state and the dominance of the Ch'ieh-tan 契丹 in Northern China, such related terms as T'ang-chia 唐家, T'ang-jên 唐人, and Ch'ieh-tan (*Kitani*, *Kitai*, *Catai*, etc.) came into force, while in a parallel situation, we find in general currency over all the historical periods such Ch'in 秦 originated terms as *Chin* and *China*. In other words, the Ch'in-jên of the *Book on Ta-yüan* is older than the Han-jên of the *Biography of Li Kuang-Li* of the *Han-shu*, a fact which indicates that the latter work contains revisions, based on more recent knowledge, of passages from the former.

In the *Han-shu* Bk. 94 a, Hsiung-nu chuan 匈奴傳, is found the following lines: "At this, Wei Li 衛律 set to work on behalf of the King Hu-yen-te 壺衍鞮, digging wells, constructing fortresses, inspecting lookout towers, and storing grain. These things he protected against the Chinese 秦人 and their allies," (p. 1142, upper column). In the same fashion, Bk. 96 b (西域傳下) in its Wu-lei 烏壘 section has "the Hsiung-nu bound their horses by the front and back legs and, placing them at the foot of the Wu-lei fortress, dispatched them saying, 'Chinese 秦人! We give you our horses,'" (p. 1171, lower column). This latter example appears in an Imperial edict "Lamenting the past" from the later years of the reign of Emperor Wu 武 (141-87 B.C.), while the latter is from 83 B.C. (始元 4), during the reign of the succeeding emperor, Chao 昭. That the term Ch'in-jên 秦人 was still in use at about this time is clear from the fact that the *Book on Ta-yüan* uses Ch'in-jên to refer to the Chinese who passed on his well-digging techniques at the time of Li Kuang-li's conquest of Ta-yüan (104-102 B.C.), and we can only attribute to a later rewriting the *Biography of Li Kuang-li* of the *Han-shu* having this as Han-jên 漢人.

The first references to Lou-lan 樓蘭 and to regions west of it as Hsi-yü

西域 began in the Han Period, after which the practice continued to be followed, but even then the designation had not been used from the very beginning of the period. During the time of Emperor Wu, the terms Hsi-pei 西北, Hsi-pei-kuo 西北國, or Hsi-kuo 西國 were used. The firm settling on the term Hsi-yü may be presumed to have taken place at the time of the establishment of the office of *Hsi-yü tu-hu* 西域都護 or Protector General of the Western Regions in 60 B.C. (Shên-chüeh 神爵 2) during the reign of Emperor Hsien 宣.²³⁾ As a consequence, Hsi-yü is nowhere to be seen in the *Shih-chi*, making its first appearance in the *Han-shu*. The *Book on Ta-yüan* of the *Shih-chi* tells how Chang Ch'ien, during his second mission and on his own, proceeded to Wu-sun, proposed an alliance with Han, and dispatched deputy emissaries to the various area nations. Traffic between Han and the nations of Central Asia was opened for the first time then as a result of those emissaries returning with envoys from the countries they had visited. "With this," it says, "the Northwest Nations 西北國 first entered into relations with Han, but it was Chang Ch'ien who opened the way for this," (*Shih-chi*, Reduced *Po-ha-pên* ed., p. 1141, lower column). Describing then how Emperor Wu had captured Wu-sun's horse, had next taken Ta-yüan's, and was out to acquire still more, it tells us that:

"For the first time the Emperor consulted a book of divination, which stated 'The Horse of Miracles (*shên-ma* 神馬) will come from the Northwest 西北. He was pleased with the horses taken from Wu-sun and named them 'Horses of Heaven' (*t'ien-ma* 天馬), The blood-sweating horses obtained from Ta-yüan were even more magnificent yet, and so he renamed the Wu-sun horses 'Western Reaches' *Hsi-chi* 西極 and dubbed the Ta-yüan horses 'Horses of Heaven.' Han then first built fortifications west of Ling-chü 令居 and for the first time established the Chiu-ch'üan 酒泉 District. As a result, relations with the Northwest Nations 西北國 were established. Following this, increasing numbers of envoys were sent out—to An-hsi 安息, Yen-ts'ai 奄蔡, Li-hsien 黎軒, T'iao-chih 條枝, and Shên-tou 身毒. The Emperor loved the horses of (Ta-) Yüan [大]宛 and his emissaries searched them out in their travels . . . Lou-lan 樓蘭 and Kushi 姑師 were but small countries, yet the Han envoys were assaulted and threatened on the high ways 空道 . . . Periodically, the Hsiung-nu guerilla force ambushed envoys sent to the Western Nations 西國." (*Shih-chi*, p. 1142).

The *Preface* 太史公自序 states that "Proceeding against Ch'ü-sai 曲塞, he broadened Ho-nan 河南, destroyed Ch'i-lien 祁連, established communications with the Western Nations of *Wei Ch'ing* and conquered Northern barbarians (Pei-hu 北胡). The *Biography* was written." (*Shih-chi*, p. 1203). In contrast to this, the *Biography of Chang Ch'ien* of *Han-shu* has "With this

the Northwest Nations 西北國 established communications for the first time with Han," as well as "The Chiu-ch'uan Governorship was established for the first time, and thus were relations with the Northwest Nations 西北國 formed. (*Han-shu*, p. 751, upper column).

While it is true that the wordings here are precisely the same as in the *Book on Ta-yüan*, we also find in this same *Biography of Chang Ch'ien* the use of Hsi-yü as in "The stories are all told in the *Accounts of Western Regions*" (p. 749, lower column), and "The stories are in the *Accounts of Western Regions*." This joint use of Hsi-pei-kuo 西北國 and Hsi-yü may indicate that the Hsi-pei-kuo usage is based on the *Book on Ta-yüan* of *Shih-chi*. If the *Biography of Chang Ch'ien* of *Han-shu* had appeared first, it probably would contain only Hsi-yü, and not Hsi-pei-kuo.

(B) Differences in Versions:

There are cases where the *Book on Ta-yüan* of the *Shih-chi* and the *Biography of Chang Ch'ien* of the *Han-shu* give differing versions of like incidents. We may look, for instance, at how are described the events surrounding Chang Ch'ien's reaching the Ta-yüeh-shih 大月氏 on his first mission. The *Book on Ta-yüan* says, "The King of the Ta-yüeh-shih had already been slain by the Hu 胡 or the Hsiung-nu and so his child (*Wang-tzŭ* 王子) succeeded to the throne," while the *Biography of Chang Ch'ien* says, "The King of the Ta-yüeh-shih had already slain by the Hu, so his wife (*fu-jên* 夫人) succeeded to the throne." P'ei Yin 裴駟 notes in his *Shih-chi chi-chih* 史記集解 says that Hsü Kuang 徐廣 states, 'It is said in one (一云) the wife becomes monarch, which indicates that the barbarians have a woman ruler. Hsü Kuang is the author of the *Shih-chi yin-i* 史記音義 in eight volumes, but it is not entirely clear here whether by "It is said in one" he means "it is said in one edition of the *Shih-chi*," or rather that he means "it is said in a separate tradition." If the former may be thought to be true, we have then a passage identical to that reported in the *Biography of Chang Ch'ien* and are at liberty to consider this particular portion free of version.

The biggest variation of all occurs in how Chang Ch'ien is made to describe the circumstances surrounding the formation of the Wu-sun state and his recommended policy for its utilization. The *Book on Ta-yüan* gives it this way:

(1) "This is what I heard when I was with the Hsiung-nu. 'The King of the Wu-sun is named K'un-mo 昆莫. His father ruled a small country in the western regions of the Hsiung-nu territory. The Hsiung-nu pursued and killed him.'

"K'un-mo was born out in the plains and abandoned.²⁴ Ravens flew to him with meat in their beaks, and wolves came to suckle him. The *Shan-yü* 單于 stood in deep wonder at this and considered the boy a supernatural being, *Shên* 神. He took him in and raised him. When K'un-mo

reached manhood, he took charge of an army and often achieved great honors with it. The *Shan-yü* restored to him his father's people and gave him extended protectorship over the Western region. K'un-mo took charge of those people, caring for their needs, and attacked the neighboring small communities 小邑. His archers numbered in the tens of thousands and were skilled in assault warfare. Just then the *Shan-yü* happened to die, and K'un-mo led his people to a distant place where, standing neutral, he refused to participate in the assembly of vassals in the Hsiung-nu. The Hsiung-nu commando raids sent against him were unsuccessful, and the Hsiung-nu came to consider him a supernatural being, subsequently keeping their distance; they made him a dependent and no longer attacked him with great force."

"Now the *Shan-yü* suffers a new at the hands of Han, and no people are to be found in the old domain of Hun-yeh 渾邪. K'un-mo covets, in the manner of the barbarian, the wealth and goods of Han. Now is indeed the time to prepare a great offering to be sent to him with the invitation that he move even further east yet, into the Hun-yeh domain, to be joined with us as a younger brother. He will surely respond to such forcefulness, and when he does, it will be as if we had cut off the right arm of the Hsiung-nu. Should we thus join together with the Wu-sun, we could then invite all the Ta-hsia 大夏 groups to come to be made our foreign vassals." (*Shih-chi*, p. 1140, lower column).

The *Book on Ta-yüan* records conditions in Western Regions in a report submitted by Chang Ch'ien after his first mission. Within that report we find a passage of similar import to the one just cited. It reads:

(2) "The Wu-sun lies to the northeast of the Hsiung-nu at a distance of about 2000 *li* 里. The nation is nomadic and the people *follow their herds*. In customs they are much like the Hsiung-nu. *Their archers number in the tens of thousands* and are daring in battle. From ages past they have been *subject to the Hsiung-nu, but even though under great pressure they accept dependency, they refuse to attend the vassal assemblies.*" (*Han-shu*, p. 1138, upper column).

The opening to the Wu-sun section of the *Han-shu*, Bk. 96 b, *Hsi-yü chuan* contains a very closely corresponding passage:

(3) "The Wu-sun people...neither till fields nor make plantings. *They follow their herds* in pursuit of water and pasture. *In customs they are much like the Hsiung-nu.* From ages past *they have been subject to the Hsiung-nu, but even though in later times under great pressure they accepted dependency, they refuse to attend the vassal assemblies.*"

(*Han-shu*, p. 1166, lower column).

This *Han-shu* passage (3) generally conforms to the *Book on Ta-yüan* account (2), but the *Han-shu* report corresponding to the *Book on Ta-yüan* quote (1) describes events somewhat differently than its counterpart:

"This is what I heard when I was with the Hsiung-nu 'The King of the Wu-sun is named K'un-mo. K'un-mo's father, Nan-tou-mi 難兜靡 (*Tardu-bi) ruled a kingdom that originally lay, with the Ta-yüeh-shih, in the area of Ch'i-lien and Tun-huang. His was a small nation. The Ta-yüeh-shih attacked, killed Nan-tou-mi and took his land away, whereupon the people fled quickly to the Hsiung-nu. Nan-tou-mi's child, K'un-mo, was then born. The child's guardian Pu-chiu hsi-hou 布就翕侯²⁵) fled with him out into the plains, where he left the boy and went to search for food. When he returned, he found him being nursed by a wolf while ravens flew to the boy's side with morsels of meat in their beaks. This caused him to consider the child a divine being, and in the end he returned his charge to the Hsiung-nu where the boy was lovingly raised by the *Shan-yü*. When K'un-mo reached manhood, the *Shan-yü* restored to him his father's people and gave him charge of an army, with which he often gained great honors. At one time, when the Yüeh-shih were just about to be destroyed by the Hsiung-nu, they moved west and attacked the king of the Sai 塞 who quickly fled to relocate in a distant land to the south, and the Yüeh-shih occupied his territory. K'un-mo's forces were by now in good fighting condition. Requesting the *Shan-yü*'s permission to avenge his father's bitter legacy, K'un-mo at length attacked to the west and defeated the Ta-yüeh-shih, who fled further west yet to settle in the land of Ta-hsia 大夏. K'un-mo seized control of those people and remained there in occupation. His forces were strong, and when just then the *Shan-yü* happened to die, K'un-mo was bold enough to refuse to pay further court to the Hsiung-nu. The troops they dispatched to attack him were unsuccessful, and the Hsiung-nu came even more to consider him a divine being, subsequently keeping their distance.' Now the *Shan-yü* suffers anew at the hands of Han, and the lands of K'un-mo are empty. A barbarian will long for his ancient homeland and covet Han goods. Now is indeed the time to prepare a great offering to be sent to K'un-mo with the invitation that he resettle in his own ancient homeland and take for a wife a princess of our sending, whereupon he would be joined with us as a younger brother. Should this be offered, K'un-mo would surely respond to such forcefulness, and when he does, it will be as if we had cut off the right arm of the Hsiung-nu. Should we thus join with the Wu-sun, we could then invite all the Ta-hsia groups to the west come to be made our foreign vassals," (*Han-shu*, p. 750, lower column).

In other words, while this passage has portions and individual expressions similar to those of the *Book on Ta-yüan*, its central plot is entirely different. The *Book on Ta-yüan* has the Wu-sun originally attacked by the Hsiung-nu, temporarily surrendering to their control, and then staging a comeback to regain independence. Chang Ch'ien attempts then to get Han to utilize that situation by taking the Wu-sun in as its younger brother and getting the people to relocate in the original homeland of King Hun-yeh (the Chiu-ch'üan 酒泉 and Tun-huang area), thus cutting off the right arm of the Hsiung-nu and severing the links among the various nations of the Western Regions. In contrast to this, the *Biography of Chang Ch'ien* of the *Han-shu* version has the Wu-sun attacked by the Ta-yüeh-shih at the time that it occupied, together with the Ta-yüeh-shih, the area of Mt. Ch'i-lien and Tun-huang. They then fled to the Hsiung-nu, where they were protected and resored to vigor. From there they attacked the Ta-yüeh-shih, who had under previous assault from the Hsiung-nu been forcibly moved west, and moved this group once again, this time to the Ta-hsia area. Such being the situation, Chang Ch'ien tried to bring about the linking of Han and the Wu-sun in an elder-brother/younger-brother relationship, aiming to get the Wu-sun to keep the Hsiung-nu in check on their western side.

The *Shih-chi's* idea to move the Wu-sun into the original domain of King Hun-yeh becomes the *Han-shu's* idea to call the Wu-sun back to their own original homeland.

The indication one gets from the *Han-shu* version is that it was based on the perceived actuality of linked migrations among the Hsiung-nu, Ta-yüeh-shih, and Sai peoples, and that it attempted to understand the Wu-sun situation by forcing the Wu-sun into that same relationship. In the Chi-pin 屬賓 section of the *Han-shu*, Bk. 96 a, on *Western Regions*, we find:

"In ages past the Hsiung-nu defeated the Ta-yüeh-shih, who then moved west to Ta-hsia, and the Sai king moved south as far as Chi-pin. The Sai tribes dispersed, going their separate ways to form a number of nations. To the northwest of Su-lê 疏勒, the Hsiu-hsün 休循 and Chüan-tu 捐毒 were both Sai groups in their origin". (*Han-shu*, p. 1160, lower column)."

Similarly, the Wu-sun section of the *Han-shu* on *Western Regions*, has:

"(The country of the Wu-sun) was originally the area of the Sai. The Ta-yüeh-shih moved west forcing the king of the Sai to flee. The king moved south and crossed the Hsien-tu 縣度 (to settle themselves in Chi-pin), and the Ta-yüeh-shih occupied the region. Later K'un-mo of the Wu-sun defeated the Ta-yüeh-shih, forcing them to relocate to the west, where they made a vassal of Ta-hsia, and K'un-mo of the Wu-sun occupied

the region. It is said that among the Wu-sun peoples are found Sai and Ta-yüeh-shih groups. It was Chang Ch'ien who first noted that the Wu-sun were originally located with the Ta-yüeh-shih in the Tun-huang area" (*Han-shu*, p. 1166, lower column).

This clearly gives further confirmation to the fact that the *Han-shu* compilers considered linked migrations among the Hsiung-nu, Ta-yüeh-shih, Wu-sun and Sai peoples to have been an undeniable fact. These scholars were of the mind that the contemporary home to the Wu-sun, which was the region running from the Lake Issyk area to the Ili River basin, had been taken over by the Ta-yüeh-shih from its original inhabitants, the Sai tribes, who were then forcibly removed westward.

It was in 177 or 176 B.C., that is to say, in the 3rd or 4th year of the Early Reign 前 of the Emperor Wên 文, that the Hsiung-nu inflicted a blow to the Ta-yüeh-shih punishing enough to be described as nearly bringing about their total annihilation.²⁶⁾ The Wu-sun were at this time also under the control of the Hsiung-nu. By then the Hsiung-nu had seen their "right-hand kings and generals in the west, facing westward from Shang-chün 上郡 (presently a part of northern Hsien-hsi Province 陝西 and the Autonomous Region of Inner Mongolia), in contact with the Yüeh-shih, *i.e.* the Ta-yüeh-shin, Ti 氏, and Ch'iang 羌," (*Shih-chi*, Book 100 on the Hsiung-nu, p. 1034, upper column), and so we may assume that at this time the Ta-yüeh-shih were driven even further west from the He-hsi 河西 region or from the western area of the Mongolian plateau. If we accept the thinking of the *Han-shu* compilers, we have no choice but to believe that the arrival of the Wu-sun in the Lake Issyk and Ili River basin region (after having attacked the Ta-yüeh-shih and forced them even further west yet) was later in time still.

Since Chang Ch'ien claims to have heard this when he was interned by the Hsiung-nu on his first mission to the west it would have occurred before his return to Han in 126 B.C. (the 3rd year of Yüan-shuo 元朔), and if we put his stay with the Ta-yüeh-shih and his second internment by the Hsiung-nu on his return route at over a year each, remembering, too, that his return arrival was to Chang-an 長安, this would seem to be at the very latest three years earlier than the 3rd year of Yüan-shuo (126 B.C.), in other words 129 B.C. (the 6th year of Yüan-kuan 元光) or even earlier still. Such being the case, then, all these great Central Asian national migrations resulting from the westward development of the Hsiung-nu—the Ta-yüeh-shih push the Sai west and are in turn attacked by the Wu-sun and forced into a second westward movement which drives the Sai southward as far as Chi-pin crossing over the Hsien-tu—would in actuality have taken place within the forty-some year period from the 3rd or 4th years of the Early Reign of the Emperor Wên (177–176 B.C.) to the 6th year of Yüan-kuan (129 B.C.) or to some point earlier yet. Given the further necessity of some ten-plus years for the Wu-sun's K'un-mo, a

babe-in-arms at the time of the Hsiung-nu attack, to mature sufficiently to assume command of his late father's people, we need only subtract them from the forty-some years to see that these great national migrations would all have had to have occurred within a period of only about thirty years.

Now, for the Sai, Ta-yüeh-shih, and Wu-sun to have accomplished these movements at the dizzying pace which such a time frame would demand cannot be considered, by historical precedent, to be necessarily impossible. In December of 1770, for example, Ubasi 渥巴錫 Khan led 169,000 Torguts from the lower Volga Valley on a migration which suffered successive attacks from the Russian troops, the Kazaks, and the Buruts. In the process the Torguts lost half of their people and two-thirds of their herds and other possessions but still managed to arrive in Ili Valley by July of the following year.²⁷⁾ It is not necessarily impossible for our groups here to have done the whole thing in a mere thirty years, but whether this traditional account squares consistently with what is indicated by no-Chinese data is a question requiring separate investigation. The Sai, for instance, is a Chinese transcription of Saca or Saka which is the Iranian name for the people the Greeks referred to as Scythians and is the Turan in relation to Iran.²⁸⁾ This is a collective noun encompassing reference to a large number of tribes and peoples distributed over an extensive region. There is no single people which can be referred to individually as just Saca. Since the Hsiung-nu and Ta-yüeh-shih, as well as the Wu-sun must be a type of Saca, it becomes necessary to establish clearly just what specifically was the Sai which the *Han-shu* claims to have been attacked by the Ta-yüeh-shih and pushed west.

Setting that question aside for separate discussion, however, what I wish to point out here is the fact that *Shih-chi* on Ta-yüan and the *Han-shu's Biography of Chang Ch'ien* represent different traditions. Noteworthy among the differences is the fact that the existence of the Sai people, to whom the *Shih-chi* makes not the tiniest reference, is described in the *Han-shu* in the significant detail of actuality. We have, "to the northwest of Su-lê, there are such countries as Hsiu-hsün and Chüan-tu, which are both inhabited by people formerly classified as Sai or by people who are Sai in their origin" (*Han-shu*, Bk. 96 a, p. 1160, lower column, under Chi-pin); "therefore, it is said that among the population of Wu-sun there are the Sai and the Ta-yüeh-shih" (*Han-shu*, Bk. 96 b, p. 1166, lower column, under Wu-sun); "(the inhabitants of) the country of Hsiu-hsün are originally Sai" (*Han-shu*, Bk. 96 a, p. 1165, upper column, under Hsiu-hsün); and "(the inhabitants of) the country of Chüan-tu are originally Sai" (*Han-shu*, Bk. 96 a, p. 1165, upper column, under Chüan-tu).

Phrases like 本故塞種 and 故塞種 may be interpreted either as "the Sai tribe once lived in . . ." or as "in origin the inhabitants are Sai," but when one says that in the Wu-sun nation there are Ta-yüeh-shih and Sai, it obviously means that the country is inhabited by Ta-yüeh-shih and Sai besides the Wu-sun

people. If such were the case, then besides Sai as a general term designating collectively a number of peoples, it also must have existed as the name of a specific individual people. Can that have been possible? If I may say so, the compilers of the *Han-shu* have misunderstood general term Sai as individual name which they applied to specific peoples in the Pamirs. The countries of Hsiu-hsün and Chüan-tu existed in the Pamirs which were inhabited by peoples generally called Sai. The compilers of the *Han-shu* could not understand that the Ta-yüeh-shih, Hsiung-nu and Wu-sun were collectively called Sai and they tried to explain the activities of the Sai as an individual tribe. I wonder, if such was the reason, why the *Han-shu* wrote about the Sai and their migration. Whatever the case may be, the information about the Sai would have had to have been acquired after conditions in Western Regions had become known to Han in significant detail.

As has already been pointed out by a number of scholars headed by Hsü Sung 徐松 (1781–1848), the *Han-shu*, Bk. 96, was mainly compiled by Pan Piao 班彪 (3–54 A.D.) under the reign of emperor Kuang-wu 光武 (reg. 25–57 A.D.). But, it is too far to say that Pan Piao compiled the whole of Bk. 96 on Western countries and it is not unlikely that Pan Ku 班固 (32–92), Pan Chao 班昭 (49–ca. 117), and other members of Pan family such as Pan Ch'ao 班超 (32–92) and Pan Yung 班勇 contributed something to the compilation of Bk. 96 by adding new information as Professor Hulsewé has rightly remarked.²⁹⁾ In connection with the country of Han-mi 扞彌 or Wu-mi 旃彌, the *Han-shu*, Bk. 96 a, states that it is now named Ning-mi 寧彌. (*Han-shu*, p. 1159, upper column). Hsü Sung comments that this "now" means the time of Pan Ku who wrote this part.³⁰⁾ Though one cannot decide whether it was written by Pan Ku or not, it is quite certain that it was added when this part of the *Han-shu* was compiled.

With this in mind, then, and regardless of the authenticity of the accounts, original to the *Han-shu*, of the Wu-sun, Ta-yüeh-shih, and Sai peoples' linked migrations, it is clear that these accounts post-date the completion of the *Shih-chi*.

Kato Shigeru 加藤 繁 has already pointed out that, since the Wu-sun are described in the *Shih-chi* as having lived from times past in the area they were contemporarily known to occupy, the *Han-shu's* revised writing is in error.³¹⁾ Kato's view is supported by Matsuda Hisao 松田壽男.³²⁾ In the final analysis I believe the conclusion discussed by Kato to be correct,³³⁾ but leaving aside for the moment the question of the actuality of the national migrations,³⁴⁾ I wish to put forward here the argument that the *Han-shu's* account of those is newer in information than what is set forth in the *Shih-chi*, and that, such being the case, we do not have in the *Shih-chi* an altered form of the *Han-shu* accounts. Each of the versions should be seen as representing separate traditions.

In the *Shih-chi*, K'un-mo of the Wu-sun is born and abandoned out in

the plains and ministered to by ravens and wolves. This causes the *Shan-yü* of the Hsiung-nu to marvel, and he takes charge of the wonderous boy's upbringing. The *Shih-chi* further notes that it was through this same K'un-mo that the Wu-sun were able to achieve re-independence. Since it is reported that the Wu-sun had for a time been assimilated into the Hsiung-nu, we may imagine that this was, in fact, autonomy regained. It is no wonder, then, that the responsible for the Wu-sun's return to freedom should be celebrated in a story on the order of the fabulous. It is well known, either, that this legend appears as well in *Lun-hêng* 論衡, Bk. 2, *Chapter on Chi-yen* 吉驗 which relates that:

“The King of the Wu-sun is named K'un-mo. The Hsiung-nu had attacked and killed his father, and K'un-mo was born out in the plains and abandoned. Ravens came to him with meat in their beaks. The *Shan-yü* stood in wonder at this, considered the boy a supernatural being, took him in, and raised him. When K'un-mo reached manhood, he commanded an army and often achieved great honours with it. The *Shan-yü* restored to him his father's people and ordered that he assume protectorship over a walled town in the west 西城⁸⁵).”

No wolves are in evidence here, but perhaps there originally never were any, or perhaps they had slipped away at some stage previous to *Lun-hêng*, or perhaps Wang Ch'ung 王充 (27-ca. 100) wrote them out of the story. One of these possibilities is likely at cause for the absence of wolves, but it hardly matters which, for the important thing is that this story is of the same lineage as the legend recorded in the *Shih-chi*, and that it is very clearly not of the same lineage as the legend set down in the *Biography of Chang Ch'ien* of *Han-shu*, in which those who attacked and killed his father were the Ta-yüeh-shih, and in which he was saved by his guardian Pu-chiu hsi-hou, who presented K'un-mo to the *Shan-yü* of the Hsiung-nu. It is unclear whether the *Lun-hêng* is based on source materials common to those of the *Shih-chi* or whether its version was borrowed from the *Book on Ta-yüan* of *Shih-chi* itself, but in this case either explanation will do just as well. Wang Ch'ung, though a contemporary of Pan Ku and Pan Chao, was only a minor provincial official, and as such he could not at that time be expected to have had the opportunity to view a copy of the *Han-shu*, just then completed and not yet widely disseminated. But whether he saw it or not, we are still left with that fact that the *Lun-hêng* gives a legend of the Wu-sun founder in the lineage of that of the *Shih-chi's* *Book on Ta-yüan*, and neither can we deny that the legends of both lineages, coexisted during the same period. This has to be telling us that the legend in the *Book on Ta-yüan* of *Shih-chi* is not a re-casting of the *Biography of Chang Ch'ien* of *Han-shu*. The actual case should be, rather, just the opposite, for it is more natural to see the *Book on Ta-yüan* lineage

legend's getting tied up with the account of the linked migrations of the Sai, Ta-yüeh-shih, and Wu-sun peoples in such a way as to develop into the form in which it is found in the *Biography of Chang Ch'ien* of *Han-shu*.

(C) The Impossibility of Compiling from the *Biography of Chang Ch'ien* of *Han-shu* the Related Parts of the *Book on Ta-yüan* of *Shih-chi*

The *Shih-chi*'s accounts on Ta-yüan may be divided into three portions . . . those included in the *Biography of Chang Ch'ien* of *Han-shu*, those in the *Biography of Li Kuang-li* and those in the *Accounts of Western Countries*. The part of the *Shih-chi* on Ta-yüan, which appears as a report on various nations toured by Chang Ch'ien is not included in the *Biography of Chang Ch'ien* of *Han-shu* but moved to the *Accounts of Western Countries* 西域傳, it having been noted that "the stories are in the *Accounts of Western Countries*" (*Han-shu*, p. 751, upper column). It may be exceptionally easy to divide the *Book on Ta-yüan* of *Shih-chi* into these three portions, but how possible is it to do the reverse, to compile a *Book on Ta-yüan* of *Shih-chi* into the form we have it today from the *Biography of Chang Ch'ien*, *Li Kuang-li* and the *Accounts of Western Countries* of *Han-shu*? It is no supreme challenge to set the *Biographies of Chang Ch'ien* and *Li Kuang-li* into a single clear arrangement, but I cannot imagine it possible to single out and remove from the *Accounts of Western Countries* those portions which had been noted with "the stories are all told in the *Accounts of Western Countries*" (*Han-shu*, p. 749, lower column), or "the stories are in the *Accounts of Western Countries*" (*Han-shu*, p. 751, upper column).

Let us compare, for example, the statement of Wu-i shan-li 烏弋山離 of the *Accounts of Western Countries* of *Han-shu* with that of Tiao-chih 條枝 of the *Book on Ta-yüan* of *Shih-chi*. The *Han-shu* has obviously transposed as the *Shih-chi* account of the country of Tiao-chih into its own account of Wu-i shan-li. This portion corresponds to one of the parts which is noted in the *Biography of Chang Ch'ien* of *Han-shu* as being "in the *Accounts of Western Countries*". It is easy for this to be seen as indicating a portion taken from the *Book on Ta-yüan*, but where only the *Biography of Chang Ch'ien* and *Li Kuang-li* and the *Accounts of Western Countries* existed, it becomes rather impossible to conceive how the report of *Chang Ch'ien*'s first mission could have been recovered from them and restored into the form of its composition as seen now in the *Book on Ta-yüan*.

IV

To this point, I have compared the extant *Book on Ta-yüan* of *Shih-chi* with the extant *Biographies of Chang Ch'ien* and *Li Kuang-li* and the *Accounts of Western Countries* of *Han-shu* and discussed how it is possible to imagine that those *Han-shu* biographies may have come from the *Book on*

Ta-yüan, but how the reverse cannot be, and I have based that discussion on a number of different points. My arguments have been made, however, assuming the extant version of the *Biography of Chang Ch'ien* of *Han-shu* to be the original Pan Ku et al. compilation.

Pelliot, on the other hand and as we have already noted, thought that the *Biography of Chang Ch'ien* of *Han-shu* either had been written into the *Chang-Ch'ien chu-kuan chih* and *Ku-chin chu*, or that it had been put together by someone later than Pan Ku, using for its material Chang Ch'ien legendry of like variety to that found in those two and then subsequently incorporated into the *Han-shu*. In the end Pelliot never did speak to the particulars of this issue, but what I have pointed out here is that, today, when the *Chang-Ch'ien chu-kuan chih* has been lost and the substance of the *Ku-chin chu* cannot be known with certainty, it is difficult to determine just what sort of thing Chang Ch'ien Legendry was that there is no way of rendering substantive corroboration to Pelliot's inferences.

Haloun, in fact, did not even bring up the titles *Chang-Ch'ien chu-kuan chih* or *Ku-chin chu*, but he had something in common with Pelliot, anyway—they considered the extant *Biography of Chang Ch'ien* of *Han-shu* to be someone's later forgery and the extant *Book on Ta-yüan* of *Shih-chi* to have adopted that forgery into its own text. Haloun, as did Pelliot, however, passed away without ever having given a concrete explanation of those views.

By way of contrast to this, we have Hulsewé arguing that while the *Biographies of Chang Ch'ien* and *Li Kuang-li* are not forgeries but rather, the established compilations of Pan Ku et al., the main text as we have it contains major errors in passaging and that given the existence of absolutely identical passaging errors in the corresponding portions of the *Book on Ta-yüan* of *Shih-chi* this *Book on Ta-yüan* had been produced by combining the *Biography of Chang Ch'ien* of *Han-shu* and a *Biography of Li Kuang-li* that post-dated the appearance of those errors. According to Hulsewé, it made no sense to imagine that anyone of Pan Ku's caliber would simply copy over as is a *Book on Ta-yüan* of *Shih-chi* text containing passaging errors; he maintained that the errors in the *Biography of Li Kuang-li* of *Han-shu* were produced after the time of Pan Ku. Thus, he claims, the *Book on Ta-yüan* of *Shih-chi*, containing the very same errors, is most assuredly a transcription from the *Biographies of Chang Ch'ien* and *Li Kuang-li* of *Han-shu* post-dating the appearance of the mistakes.

(D) The Question of Passaging Errors 錯簡

Hulsewé offered contrasts of the main text of the extant *Biography of Li Kuang-li* of *Han-shu*, which he maintained had passaging errors, with his restored text, in which he had corrected those mistakes.³⁶⁾ It gives one an unsettling feeling to find that in his restoration, although he had conducted it with the idea that the *Han-shu* had been composed in passages (*i.e.* written on strips of) from 23–25 characters each, two passages of four characters as

well as two each of eight and nine characters, and, moreover, among them two clearly intended to continue into the next passage to form a single sentence.

The first person to point out passing errors involving some sixty-nine characters in the part restored by Hulsewé was Wang Nien-sun 王念孫 (1744–1832). Stimulated by this, Hulsewé made a detailed examination of the sentences in that general portion, confirmed the existence of large-scale passing errors which had escaped even Wang Nien-sun's observation, and produced a corrected restoration. Needless to say, he included Wang Nien-sun's revisions in it. This was because with those revisions, the *Han-shu* text became logically understandable. However, Wang Nien-sun had amended the *Han-shu* sentences to conform with the *Book on Ta-yüan* of *Shih-chi* text, and so, in this particular portion at least, it is impossible to apply Hulsewé's reasoning that the *Shih-chi* had been transcribed from the *Han-shu* because its passing errors were the same.

Further, when we consider other portions which were maintained to represent passing errors, they turn out to be fully understandable when read as found in the extant text without our hypothesizing any such mistakes. In the second conquest of Ta-yüan, a 60,000 man force led by more than fifty officers was sent off from Tun-huang, and Li Kuang-li's main forces departed later to follow it. The numbers of the main force are not entirely certain, but we may assume they were no less great than those of the advance force. With regard to this departure, the *Shih-chi* states:

“With this, Erh-shih (*i.e.* Li Kuang-li) also set off to follow. Though the number of soldiers was great, small nations everywhere never failed to greet them and provide them well with food.” (*Shih-chi*, Bk. 123, p. 1145, upper column).

And records that:

“When Erh-shih at first set out from Tun-huang to the west, he thought that because he had so many men, the countries along the way would be unable to provide him with food, so he divided his forces into a number of separate armies which advanced along routes lying to his north and south.” (*ibid.*, p. 1145, lower column).

While it is further noted that:

“Erh-shih proceeded afterward. His army did not want for food and the number of battle deaths was not terribly great. Nonetheless, many of his higher officers and officials were so greedy and, having no love for the common soldiers, would often victimize these men.” (*ibid.*, p. 1146, upper column).

The *Book on Ta-yüan* accounts of the second conquest of Ta-yüan are divided into descriptions of the preparations and operations of both the advance force and the main force. The perception of passaging errors here occurs when one does not take the operations of the advance force and these of the main force as each being separate, when one attempts to understand them as being one. In the portion of the *Book on Ta-yüan* treating the advance force, we have "There was no well in the fortress of the Yüan King 宛王, and all drew their needs from a running source coming from outside. Such being the case, then, water engineers were sent and the water route was diverted to make the forters empty (*i.e.* waterless). Thus, the fortress became empty (*i.e.* waterless), which resulted in the emptiness of the fortress," (*ibid.*, p. 1141, lower column). This may be taken as an advance force operation, and as Hu San-shêng 胡三省 and Wang Hsien-ch'ien 王先謙 have said, it may be interpreted as a description of a planned tactic of the advance force. Later, in the *Book on Ta-yüan*, we see:

"(Li Kuang-li) then first proceeded to Yüan where he cut off the water supply and diverted it elsewhere. Yüan had for some time previously been suffering grievously. The fortress was surrounded and the siege went on for more than forty days. The outer fortress was destroyed." (*ibid.*, p. 1145, upper column).

It is possible to take this as describing the realization of the planned tactic, and when we consider the fact that "Yüan had for some time previously been suffering grievously," it appears permissible to interpret this operation as the continuation of advance force tactics, with a separate main force diversion of the water supply. The corresponding portion of the *Biography of Li Kuang-li* of *Han-shu* reads in exactly the same way. According to Hulsewé's restoration, it is correct to make the two passages above those referring to the closing off of the water supply into one single sentence. The results are as follows:

"(Li Kuang-li) then first proceeded to Yüan, where he cut off the water supply and diverted it elsewhere. Yüan had for some time previously been suffering grievously. There was no well outside the fortress. They drew their needs from a running source coming from outside. Such being the case, then, water engineers were sent and the water (route) was diverted to make (the fortress) waterless. Thus, the fortress became empty (*i.e.* waterless)."

The "diverted it elsewhere" seen above can also be read as "attempted to divert it elsewhere," but whichever way it is read, becomes redundant, and feeling of unnaturalness is unavoidable. This happens because Hulsewé has

attempted to understand two separate events by coordinating them into a single one. It becomes useless to pursue his "passaging errors" theory and further, and nothing at all hinders us from reading the related portions of the *Book on Ta-yüan* of *Shih-chi* just as they appear in the extant text. And there are indeed in the *Biography of Li Kuang-li* of *Han-shu*, as Wang Nien-sun has pointed out, passaging errors which ought to be corrected to conform with the *Shih-chi*. Hulswé noted that a stylist with the academic credentials of Pan Ku would never have blindly copied over a *Book on Ta-yüan* containing passaging errors, but perhaps we ought better to imagine that it was indeed for the very reason of his being a stylist with an academic background that he was able to recognize the absence of passaging error in the work.

For the various reasons outlined here, I believe what has been thought over the ages, that the *Biographies of Chang Ch'ien* and *Li Kuang-li* and part of *Accounts of Western Regions* of *Han-shu* were compiled from the *Book on Ta-yüan* of *Shih-chi*, and I cannot believe it to have been the reverse.

It was Professor Edwin G. Pulleyblank who claimed the authenticity of the chapter on Ta-yüan in the *Shih-chi* on the basis of the following six points:³⁷⁾

(1) In the list of contents of the *Shih-chi* in Ssu-ma Ch'ien's autobiographical chapter appears the following: "When Han sent envoys to communicate with Ta-hsia, the distant barbarians of the western extremities stretched out their necks and looked inwards, wishing to see the Middle Land. I made the sixty-third *lieh-chuan* (i.e. Chapter 123) on Ta-yüan." Unless we suppose that the interpolator falsified this chapter as well, we must suppose that Ssu-ma Ch'ien included a chapter covering the subject matter of the present Chapter 123 in his work. Moreover, while in Ssu-ma Ch'ien's day it was perfectly natural to have a chapter with this title, since this was the first western country Chang Ch'ien came to and the country which was the object of Li Kuang-li's spectacular expedition, it would have been quite unnatural in the Later Han period or afterwards when Ta-yüan had long ceased to be of importance. It is presumably the view of those who regard the *Shih-chi* as secondary, not that the idea for such a chapter was invented, but that the chapter was wholly or partially lost and reconstituted from the *Han-shu*. As far as he (Professor Pulleyblank) is aware there is no external evidence for this having occurred, nor has any one suggested who the interpolator might have been.

(2) Being a chapter on Ta-yüan (and related matters about contacts with the west), *Shih-chi* 123 contains not only an account of the activities of Chang Ch'ien and Li Kuang-li but also descriptions of the countries Chang Ch'ien visited or heard about and connecting matter from the time of Chang Ch'ien's death down to Li Kuang-li's expedition to Ta-yüan. In the *Han-shu* the bulk of the material is included in Chapter 61, the *Biographies of Chang Ch'ien and Li Kuang-li*. Certain material has been removed to Chapters 95,

South-Western Barbarians, and 96, *Western Regions*. Where this breaks the continuity of the story, an explicit cross-reference is inserted by the *Han-shu* editor, showing clearly that his source followed the order in the *Shih-chi*. Even after this material had been transferred, the *Han-shu* editor was kept with a residue of materials coming after the death of Chang Ch'ien and before Li Kuang-li. Though it is hardly a part of the *Biography of Chang Ch'ien*, it is retained as if it were. When we come to the point where Li Kuang-li is about to be introduced, the *Han-shu* text breaks off abruptly, concludes Chang Ch'ien's biography with a brief note about Ch'ien's grandson, gives a short introduction to Li Kuang-li and begins once more to follow the *Shih-chi*. All this is perfectly comprehensible in terms of the scissors-and-paste method of compilation used in adapting the *Shih-chi* material to the *Han-shu*. It is much more difficult, indeed impossible, to imagine that, if it had not been based on the existing chapter in the *Shih-chi*, the *Han-shu* would have been constructed in the way it is, neatly sign-posted for someone to construct out of it the *Shi-chi* chapter.

(3) In general the texts of the *Shih-chi* and *Han-shu* are extremely alike. There are minor differences of wording here and there which do not affect the sense. Some may be due to slight textual corruption in one or the other. Often the *Han-shu* editor seems to have tried to tidy up the *Shih-chi* text stylistically by leaving out unnecessary words. In so far as any conclusions can be drawn the evidence points to the priority of the *Shih-chi*.

(4) Much of what appears in *Shih-chi* 123 as Chang Ch'ien's report on western countries and some of the additional material about western countries that appears later in the chapter is repeated in *Han-shu* 96, though sometimes differently arranged. On the other hand the *Han-shu* evidently had a different source for such details as the distances, relative positions, populations, etc., of the various countries. In the case of Yen-ts'ai 奄蔡, however, it quotes the *Shih-chi* verbatim, evidently because no later information was available. It is conceivable that a later forger, in other respects slavishly copying the *Han-shu*, even more, from the geography of his own day. He must have a source antedating the *Han-shu* and identical with the present *Shih-chi*. What else could have been but the present *Shih-chi*?

(5) Much the most important discrepancies between the *Shih-chi* and *Han-shu* occur in relation to the Wu-sun. The *Shih-chi* knows nothing of the enmity of the Wu-sun and the Yüeh-chih, of the Yüeh-chih conquest of the Sai (Sakas) and the migration of the King of the Sai to Chi-pin (Kashmir), nor of the subsequent defeat of the Yüeh-chih by the Wu-sun. If we suppose that the *Shih-chi* text is original, it is easy to see how a subsequent editor has grafted other material on, rationalizing the existing text to make it agree. The contrary hypothesis, that a forger, working from the *Han-shu*, could have skillfully weeded out all trace of these things is incredible.

(6) As far as he (Professor Pulleyblank) can see there is nothing in *Shih-*

chi 123 that is in the least anachronistic if regarded as the work of Ssu-ma Ch'ien. In the following century knowledge of the western world increased greatly. It is very difficult to suppose that a forger could have resisted including information on many more countries than those described in the *Shih-chi*.

Professor Pulleyblank is quite right when he says that the *Shih-chi* 123 is one of the original sources of the sections of the *Han-shu* concerning the Western Regions and the *Biographies of both Chang Ch'ien and Li Kuang-li*. The present article of mine is, therefore, nothing but supplementary remarks in support of the opinion of this eminent scholar.

Notes

- 1) Ch'ien Ta-hsin 錢大昕: *Shih-chia-chai yang-hsin lu* 十駕齋養新錄, Bk. 6 under Ssu-ma Chên 司馬貞 and Takikawa Kametarō 瀧川龜太郎: *Shiki kaichū kōshō* 史記會注考證 (*Shiki sakuin jo*, 史記索隱序, *Shiki sōron Shiba Tei Chō Shusetsu jireki* 史記總論司馬貞張守節事歷).
- 2) *Shiki kaichū kōshō* 史記會注考證 (*Shiki sōron*, *Shiki zanketsu* 史記總論, 史記殘闕).
- 3) Chao I 趙翼: *Nien-ér-shih cha-chi* 廿二史劄記, Bk. 1, under 褚少孫補記不止十篇.
- 4) Hsi-yü 西域 was first called Hsi-pei 西北 or Hsi-pei-kuo 西北國, next Hsi-kuo 西國, and finally Hsi-yü 西域. The firm fixing upon the Hsi-yü 西域 designation may be to have occurred at the time of the establishment of the *Hsi-yü tu-hu* 西域都護 or the Governorgeneralship of the Western Regions. However, the date of the establishment can not be definitely fixed at the moment because of so many different dates available. For instance, the Annals of Emperor Hsüan 宣 of the *Han-shu* 漢書, Bk. 8 (ed. *Po-na-pên*, p. 3, lower column) describes Chêng Chi 鄭吉 as with the title of *Tu-hu Hsi-yü ch'i-tu-wei* 都護西域騎都尉, while the *Po-kuan kung-ch'ing piao* 百官公卿表 (*Han-shu*, Bk. 19 a, p. 161, upper column) states that the *Hsi-yü tu-hu* was established in the second year of Ti-chieh 地節 (68 B.C.), which the *Tung-chien k'ao-i* 通鑑考異 rejects as erroneous. On the other hand, the *Hsi-yü chuan* 西域傳 of the *Han-shu*, Bk. 96 a (p. 1156, lower column) records that the *Hsi-yü tu-hu* was established in the third year of Shên-chüeh 神爵 (59 B.C.) and in a document discovered at Chü-yen 居延 of the date of the fourth year of Yüan-kang 元康 (62 B.C.) it is recorded that an official entitled *tu-hu* existed already in the second year of Yüan-kang (64 B.C.). (See Lao Kan 勞幹: *Chü-yen Han-chien kao-shih* 居延漢簡考釋, *Kao-chêng chih pu* 考證之部, Taipei, 1960, p. 23). As Chang Wei-hua 張維華 rightly observes in his *Han-shih lun-chi* 漢史論集, Shan-tung 山東, 1980, pp. 246-249, the date of the establishment of *Hsi-yü tu-hu* is a problem yet to be decided. I myself am much interested in Chang's opinion that one should divide the question into two, that is to say, the date of Chêng's appointment as *tu-hu* and that of the establishment or opening of his office. Also see Ying-shih Yü, *Trade and Expansion in Han China*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967, pp. 142-143 and note 27.
- 5) Ts'ui Shih 崔適 is a native of Wu-hsiang 吳興 (Hu-chou 湖州), Chê-chiang 浙江. He was a pupil of Yü Yüeh 俞樾 and an enthusiastic advocate of the Chin-wên-hsüeh 今文學 approach to the Confucian classics. Among his other works may be found the *Ch'un-ch'iu fu-shih* 春秋復始 and the *Shih-chi t'an-yüan* 史記探源. Ch'ien Hsüan-t'ung 錢玄同 who was his good friend recommended him to Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei 蔡元培. Ts'ui, thus, taught at Peking University, but students could not understand his Chin-wên-hsüeh. Ch'ien did so much to make Ts'ui known in the academic world, gave him a funeral when he died

- and published his writings, but Ts'ui lived a rather sad life in his late years. Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei took the presidentship of the Peking University twice, first from December 1916 to July 1927, during which he stayed abroad between November 1920 and September 1921, and second from September 1929 to December 1930. (See Kao P'ing-shu 高平叔, *Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei nien-pu* 蔡元培年譜, Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü, 1980.) Ts'ui taught at the Peking University when Ts'ai presided it for the first time. Ku Chieh-kang 顧頡剛 († 1980) attended Ts'ui's lectures on the *Ch'un-ch'iu* in 1916 at the University of Peking. He wrote that Ts'ui was very weak physically but his dignity and kindness gave a deep impression to his students. The lectures were later published under the title of *Ch'un-ch'iu fu-shih*. (See Ku Chieh-kang, *Ch'in Han ti fang-shih yu ju-shêng* 秦漢的方士與儒生, New ed., Shanghai: Ku-chi chu-pan-shê 古籍出版社, 1978, p. 6). The *Shih-chi t'an-yüan* is said to have based on the idea as appeared in his *Hsin-hsüeh wei-ching kao* 新學僞經考 of K'ang Yu-wei 康有爲. (See Shih Ting 施丁 and Ch'en K'é-ch'ing 陳可清, ed. by, *Ssu-ma Ch'ien yen-chiu hsün-lun* 司馬遷研究新論, Chêng-chou: Ho-nan jên-min chu-pan-shê 湖南人民出版社, 1982, pp. 427-428.)
- 6) Pelliot, Paul: L'édition collective des oeuvres de Wang Kouo-wei, In: *T'oung Pao*, XXVI, 1929, p. 178 and note 1.
 - 7) Pelliot, Paul: *Quelques réflexions sur l'art sibérien et l'art chinois à propos de bronzes de la collection David-Weil, Documents*, No. 1, Paris, 1929, pp. 3-6 (Extrait).
 - 8) *Wang Kuang-t'ang hsien-shêng ch'üan-chi* 王觀堂先生全集, Vol. 16, Taipei: Wên-hua chu-pan-shê 文華出版社, pp. 61 and 71. 1957.
 - 9) Kuwabara Jitsuzô 桑原隲藏: *Chôken no ensei* 張騫の遠征, In: *Kuwabara Jitsuzô zenshû* 桑原隲藏全集, Vol. III, Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店, 1968, p. 299. Also B. Laufer, *Sino-Iranica*, Chicago: Field Museum of Natural History, 1919, p. 242; Chang Tsung-yüan 章宗源, *Sui-shu Ching-chi chih kao-chêng* 隋書經籍志考證, ed. *Erh-shih-wu-shih pu-pien* 二十五史補編, Vol. 4, p. 54; Yao Chên-tung 姚振宗, *Sui-shu Ching-chi chih Kao-chêng*, *ibid.*, p. 366.
 - 10) Pelliot, Paul: *Le nom du X^warizm dans les textes chinoises*, In: *T'oung Pao*, XXXIV, 1938, p. 146.
 - 11) *Saku-minzoku kô* 塞民族考, In: *Shiratori Kurakichi Zenshû* 白鳥庫吉全集, Vol. 6, Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, p. 411.
 - 12) Hsü Sung 徐松: *Han-shu Hsi-yü chuan pu-chu* 漢書西域傳補注, Bk. II, fol 3 r.
 - 13) Enoki Kazuo 榎一雄: *Chôken no sakkû* 張騫の鑿空, In: *Tôzai-Kôshô* 東西交涉, Vol. 1, No. 4, 1982, pp. 16-21.
 - 14) *Ssu-ku chuan-shu tsung-mu ti-yao* 四庫全書總目提要, Bk. 118, fol. 4 r - 5 v. The *Ajiya Rekishi Jiten* アジア歴史事典, Vol. 3, Tokyo: Heibonsha 平凡社, 1960, p. 372, also adopts the opinion of the *Ssu-ku*. However, Yü Chia-hsi 余嘉錫: *Ssu-ku ti-yao pien-chêng* 四庫提要辨證, Bk. 15, Peking: Chung-hua shu-tien 中華書店, 1980, pp. 857-865, claims that the current edition of the *Ku-chin chu* may be looked upon as the genuine original of Ts'ui Piao.
 - 15) *Ku-chin chu*, *Chung-hua ku-chin chu*, *Su-shih yen-i* 古今注中華古今注蘇氏演義, Peking: Shang-wu yin-shu-kuan 商務印書館, 1956, revised ed., Explanation, pp. 1-3.
 - 16) In this connection, the study by Yü Chia-hsi may be consulted. Cf. note 14.
 - 17) Haloun, Gustav; *Zur Üe-tsi Frage*, In: *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, XCI, 1937, S. 250 Anm. 1.
 - 18) *The Authenticity of the Shih-chi ch. 123*, *T'oung Pao*, LXI, 1975, pp. 83-147.
 - 19) *China in Central Asia. The Early Stages 125 B.C.-A.D. 23. An Annotated Translation of Chapters 61 and 96 of the History of the Former Han Dynasty*, by A. F. P. Hulsewé, Emeritus Professor for Chinese at Leiden University, with an Introduction by M. A. N. Loewe, Lecturer in Chinese Studies in the University of Cambridge, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979 (*Sinica Leidensia editit Institutum Sinologicum Lugduno Batavum*, Vol. XIV).
 - 20) Hsian Ta 向達: *Hsi-kuan tsa-ka* 西關雜考, In: *T'ang-tai Chang-an yu Hsi-yü wên ming* 唐代長安與西域文明, Peking: San-lien shu-tien 三聯書店, 1957, pp. 373-392; Ch'en Mêng-

- chia 陳夢家: *Yü-mên yu Yü-mên-hsien* 玉門與玉門縣, In: *Kao-ku* 考古, 1965 (September) and the same article in Ch'ên Mêng-chia, *Han-chiang chui-shu* 漢簡綴述, Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü 中華書局, 1980, pp. 195-204.
- 21) With regard to this, see Franke, Otto, *Geschichte des chinesischen Reiches*, Vol. III, Berlin u. Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1937, S. 101-102; Kuwabara Jitsuzō, *Hojukō no jiseki* 蒲壽庚の事蹟, In: *Kuwabara Jitsuzō zenshū*, Vol. V, Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, pp. 115-122, 1968; *Fan-i ming-i chi* 翻譯名義集, In: *Tripitaka Taishō*, Vol. 54, No. 2131, p. 1056 upper column) and *Morohashi Kanwa Daijiten* 諸橋漢和大辭典 under kan 漢.
- 22) Shiratori Kurakichi 白鳥庫吉: *Daishinkoku oyobi Futsurinkoku ni tsuite* 大秦國及び拂菻國に就いて, In: *Shiratori Kurakichi zenshū*, Vol. VII, pp. 169-173, 419; Do., *Tōkominzoku kō* 東胡民族考, *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, pp. 157-159. There are various explanations for the designation Taugas, Tamghadji, etc. (see Kuwabara Jitsuzō: *Hojukō no jiseki*, In: *Kuwabara Jitsuzō zenshū* Vol. IV, pp. 157-159), but since Boodberg has made it clear that the accounts of Theophylactus Simocatto, the first to see the term Taugas, relate conditions in Northern China pre-dating the unification of China by the Sui (Boodberg, Peter A.: *Marginalia to the Histories of the Northern Dynasties*, In: *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, III, 1938, pp. 223-244, and *Selected Works of Peter A. Boodberg*, compiled by Alvin P. Cohen, Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press, 1979, pp. 265-285), Kuwabara's theory to derive Taugas from T'ang-chia-tzu 唐家子 is difficult to maintain.
- 23) See Note 4.
- 24) Some would have this as "K'un-mo was born. He was abandoned in the plains", which may be all right in the meaning, but the actual reading must be "k'un-mo abandoned alive in the plains."
- 25) Shiratori Kurakichi has *pu-chiu* 布就 as the sound equivalent of the Turkish *Abiz.*, meaning "guardian-tutor/scholar" (*Uson ni tsuite no kangae* 烏孫に就いての考, In: *Shiratori Kurakichi zenshū*, Vol. VI, p. 55. See further Schott, W.: *Altäische Studien*, 1870, 4. Heft, S. 296-298 for an account concerning *apus*, *abus*, *abuška*, and *abuška*).
- 26) *Tung-chien* 通鑑 links this to Emperor 文 Wên's Latter Reign Year 6 (158 B.C.).
- 27) *Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period*, II, p. 660.
- 28) There are various theories relating to the origin and development of the Saka and Turan peoples. Some of the most recent pieces of scholarship are Daffinà, Paolo: *L'immigrazione del Saká nella Drangiana*, Roma, Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1967; Biscione, R. and Tosi, M., *Protostoria degli stati turanici*, Supplementi agli "Annali" 20, Napoli, 1979, and Spinozzola, Vittorio, *Turan*, Roma: Edizioni Lerci, 1980.
- 29) Hulswé, A. F. P.: *China in Central Asia*, p. 197 note 713.
- 30) Hsü Sung: *Han-shu Hsi-yü-chuan pu-chu* 漢書西域傳補注, Bk. I, fol. 16 r.
- 31) Kato Shigeru 加藤 繁, *Uson no kyōjūchi ni tsuite* 烏孫の居住地に就いて, In: *Shigaku Zasshi* 史學雜誌, XLII, July, 1931, pp. 103-104.
- 32) Matsuda Hisao 松田壽男: *Kodai Tenzan no Rekishi-chiri-teki Kenkyū* 古代天山の歴史地理的研究, 2nd and augmented ed., Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1970, pp. 30-33.
- 33) Enoki Kazuo: *Katō Shigeru hakushi shōden* 加藤繁博士小傳, In: Kato Shigeru, *Chūgoku keizaishi no kaitaku* 中國經濟史の開拓, Tokyo: Ōgiku shoin 櫻菊書院, 1948, pp. 222-223.
- 34) For the time being, however, see Pulleyblank, E. G.: *The Wu-sun and Sakas and the Yüeh-chih Migration*, In: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, XXXIII, 1, 1970, pp. 154-160.
- 35) Here, Hsi-ch'êng 西城 can also be looked upon as a scribal mistake for Hsi-yü 西域 which means the western part of the territory (of the Hsiung-nu).
- 36) *Tōhōgaku* 東方學, XLVII, pp. 128-129; *T'oung Pao*, LXI, 1975, pp. 122-123; *China in Central Asia*, 1979, pp. 16-17.
- 37) E. G. Pulleyblank: *Chinese and Indo-Europeans*, In: *JRAS*, 1966, pp. 9-39.