

Su-chou in Late Ming

By Kazuo ENOKI

I

It is a well-known fact that Su-chou 肅州 (Chiu-ch'üan 酒泉) was flourishing since the Han period⁽¹⁾ and even earlier as an important centre on the route of communication linking Central Asia and China. It was already suggested by Tomaschek that the word 'Drösakhē' found in the passage on Serica in *Ptolemaios* should be interpreted in the meaning of 'wine fountain'

(1) In the *Ti-li-chih* 地理志 of the *Han-shu* 漢書, *chüan* 28, the establishment of the *chün* 郡 of Chiu-ch'üan 酒泉 is placed in the first year of T'ai-ch'ü 太初 (104 B.C.), whilst in the *Wu-ti pen-chi* 武帝本紀 of the *Han-shu*, *chüan* 6, it is stated that the *chün* of Wu-wei 武威 and that of Chiu-ch'üan were established after the acceptance of the surrender of the Hsiung-nu King, K'un-hsieh 昆威 in the second year of Yüan-shou 元狩 (121 B.C.). In regard to this there is the view putting it at around the sixth year of Yüan-ting 元鼎 (111 B.C.), and the view placing it after the first year of T'ai-ch'ü and before the third year of Ti-chieh 地節 (67 B.C.). For details see Takeo Hibino 日比野丈夫, Kasei Shigun no Seiritsu ni tsuite 河西四郡の成立について (On the Establishment of the Four Provinces of Ho-hsi), *Töhö Gakuhö* 東方學報, Kyoto, Vol. 25; Lao Kan 勞幹, *Chü-yen han-chien k'ao-shih* 居延漢簡考釋 (*Documents of the Han Dynasty on Wooden Slips from Edsinsgol*), Part 2, 1960, pp. 24-27, *Special Publications*, 40, the *Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica*; and M. Loewe, *Records of Han Administration*, 1, Cambridge 1967, pp. 4, 59-60. In the *Shih-chi* 史記, *chüan* 110, and the *Han-shu*, *chüan* 94, part 1, the Account of Hsiung-nu, it is stated as follows: 'At that time the Han established the *chün* of Chiu-ch'üan in the west, by which to interrupt the route of communication between the Hu and the Ch'iang (tribes).' 是時, 漢...西置酒泉郡, 以隔絕胡與羌通之路. This indicates that the province of Chiu-ch'üan lay on the route of communication between the Hsiung-nu of the Mongolian Plateau and the Ch'iang of the upper reaches of the Yellow River. In the documents of the Han from Edsinsgol it is stated that the Han soldiers stationed in Chü-yen went out to Chang-i 張掖 and Chiu-ch'üan and bought provisions for their families living there. Cf. Lao Kan, *Han-chien chung-ti Ho-hsi ching-chi sheng-huo* 漢簡中的河西經濟生活 (Economic Life in Ho-hsi Province as seen in the Han documents on wood slips), *Chi-k'an* 集刊 (*Collectanea*) No. 11 of the *Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica*, 1943, p. 72; and *ditto*, *Chü-yen han-chien k'ao-shih*, 1960, pp. 15 691 and 141 6828; and Ying-shih Yü, *Trade and Expansion in Han China, A Study in the Structure of Sino-barbarian Economic Relations*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967, p. 96. At any rate it is clear that this area was an important strategic point from the Hsiung-nu period onwards.

and be considered equivalent to the Chinese name 'Chiu-ch'üan',⁽²⁾ and this indicates that this region was also well-known to the merchants of the West.

Subsequently the name Su-chou (Chiu-ch'üan) is found in the records of the successive dynasties in China, and also appears frequently in the records

(2) Drösakhē seen in *Ptolemaios*, V.16.7, is spelt in the various recensions as *δρωσάκη*, *ῥοσαχή*, *ῥασακή*, *δρσαχή*, *δρσαχή*, *δρσαχή*, *δρσαχή*, *δρσαχή*, *δρσαχή*, *δρσαχή*, *δρσαχή*, *δρσαχή*, *δρσαχή* ἢ *ῥοσάκη* (Italo Ronca, *Ostiran und Zentralasien bei Ptolemaios*, Mainz, 1968, S.104–105; *Do.*, *Ptolemaios Geographie* 6, 9–21, *Ostiran und Zentralasien*, 1. Rom: ISMEO 1971, S.57). The name Drösakhē also appears in VIII.24.6. In the Former Han Dynasty there were the nine *hsien* 縣 of Lu-fu 祿福, Piao-shih 表是, Lo-kuan 樂官, T'ien-i 天依, Yü-men 玉門, Hui-shui 會水, Ch'ih-t'ou 池頭, Sui-mi 綏彌 and Ch'ien-chai 乾齋 within the *chün* of Chiu-ch'üan, and the administrative centre of the province of Chiu-ch'üan was in the county of Lu-fu. By cross-reference with other records it is known for certain that it was called Lu-fu in the Han and Wei periods. (Cf. Wang Hsien-ch'ien 王先謙, *Han-shu pu-chu* 漢書補注 and *Hou Han-shu pu-chu* 後漢書補注.) In the *Hsü Han-shu chün-kuo chih* 續漢書郡國志 it is written as Fu-lu 祿祿, and that this is an error has already been pointed out by forerunners (Cf. *Han-shu pu-chu*). However, when one considers that in the *Shih-san chou-chih* 十三州志 compiled by K'an Yin 關駟 of the Northern Wei (Chang Chu's 張澍 recension contained in the *Tsung-shu chi-ch'eng* 叢書集成 p.6), the *Sui-shu ti-li chih* 隋書地理志 and elsewhere it is written as Fu-lu, it appears that what was originally Lu-fu was inverted and written also as Fu-lu. If it is true that Lu-fu (**luk-b'iük*, in Karlgren, *Grammata Serica Recensa*, 1208 h, 933a) and Drösakhē represent the same name, it is possible that Lu-fu is a corruption of Drösakhē, or that on the other hand what was originally called Lu-fu was corrupted to Drösakhē. W. Tomaschek considered Drösakhē to be a compound of *Zend.* *draṣā*, *draša*; *Čitr.* *drōš*; *Dz.* *drāh* corresponding to *Skt.* *drākṣa* "wein-stock" and *Zend.* *ṣa*; *Skt.* *kha* "Grube, Quelle, Brunnen", and interpreted it in the meaning of "wine fountain". (*Kritik der ältesten Nachrichten über den skythischen Norden*, 1, Sitzungsber. der philosophisch-historischen Classe, Akademie der Wissenschaften, 116, Wien, 1888, p.743; *Pauly-Wissowas Realencyclopädie*, V, 3, 1721). A. Herrmann, *Das Land der Seide und Tibet im Lichte d. Antike*, Leipzig 1938 S.138 Anm. 5, suggests that it could be a Saka word. In any case it is the accepted opinion that Drösakhē corresponds to Chiu-ch'üan (Su-chou) (Cf. the studies given in A. Herrmann, *An Historical Atlas of China*, New ed., by Norton Ginsburg, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press 1966, pp. xxxi, 14–19). In addition H. W. Haussig, 'Die Beschreibung des Tarimbeckens bei Ptolemaios', *ZDMG*, 109, 1959, also takes the view that Drösakhē (*drašakha*) corresponds to Su-chou, but his taking Su-chou to be 蘇州 (p.190) is no doubt a misprint.

The beginning of the name Su-chou goes back to the establishment of Su-chou in the former province of Chiu-ch'üan during the Jen-shou 仁壽 years (601–604) of the Sui Dynasty (Cf. the *Sui-shu* 隋書, *chüan* 29, *Ti-li chih*), but there is the possibility that the *su* 肅 of Su-chou is a transliteration of the *sakhē* of Drösakhē. In way of passing, it may be noted that the word *Suṛču* appearing in the Turkish documents discovered at Mīrān by A. Stein is the first example known at present of the name Su-chou appearing in records outside of Chinese works (V. Thomsen, Dr. M. A. Stein's Manuscripts in Turkish [Runic] Script from Miran and Tun-Huang, *JRAS*, 1912, pp. 186, 188, 189 [=Samede Afhandlinger, III, København, 1922, pp. 223, 224, 226]; A. Stein, *Serindia*, I, p. 473, II, p. 1127 n. 7). That the spelling *Saukju* in *Ḥudūd al-'Ālam* is an error has been pointed out by V. Minorsky, *Ḥudūd al-'Ālam. The Regions of the World*, London 1937, p. 232; yet in *Ḥudūd al-'Ālam. Min al-Mashriq Ila al-Maghrib*, edited by Manoochehr Sotoodeh, Tehran: Tehran University Press 1969, p. 61, the original *Saukjū* is adopted without any emendation.

of the West. However, as far as regards extant records describing in some detail its state as a city, they appear to begin with the accounts given by Europeans and Central Asians since the thirteenth century, *i.e.* since the Yüan period. The first is *The Description of the World* by Marco Polo (1254–1324);⁽³⁾ the second is the travels of an embassy sent by the third ruler of the Timūrid dynasty, Shāh Rukh (reigned 1405–47), in 1419 (the seventeenth year of Yung-lo 永樂)⁽⁴⁾; the third is the account said to have been given by Ḥajji Muḥamad to Ramusio in about 1550;⁽⁵⁾ and the fourth is the record by the

- (3) In regard to the account given by Marco Polo, see L. F. Benedetto, *Marco Polo Il Milione*, Firenze 1928, pp. 47–48, and A. C. Moule and Paul Pelliot, *Marco Polo, The Description of the World*, I, London 1938, p. 60. Both works have Succiu. Moule and Pelliot, *op. cit.*, II, p. xx, has Succio. In addition, Ramusio, *Delle Navigazioni et Viaggi*, II, Venetia 1583, has Succuir (Introduction, f. 15, etc., Text p. 13), and Yule-Cordier, *Marco Polo*, I, p. 217, has Sukchur.
- (4) In regard to the account on the sending of an envoy to Ming China by Shāh Rukh, especially on the section referring to Su-chou, see Yule-Cordier, *Cathay and the Way Thither*, I, p. 275. This is based upon E. M. Quatremère, *Notice de l'oeuvre persan qui a pour titre: Maṭla' al-sa' dain wa-majma i baḥrain et qui contient l'histoire des deux sultans Schah-Rokh et Abou-Said*, Notices et Extraits de Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque du Roi et autres bibliothèques, 14 (1843), and the original text referring to Su-chou (Soktchéou) is found on pages 314–315, with a translation on pages 394–395. *Maṭla' al-sa' dain wa-majma i baḥrain* is a record of the history of the Timūrid Dynasty from 1304/5 to 1470 compiled under the supervision of 'Abd al-Razzāq Samarquandī (816/1413–887/1482), and the section as far as 1426 to 1427 is based upon the *Majma'u' ttawārikh* of Ḥāfiz-i Abrū (+833/1430). Cf. S. A. Storey, *Persian Literature*, II, 2, p. 293. See also Yu. E. Bregel's supplement and Russian translation, *Персидская Литература*, II, Москва 1972, and W. W. Bartol'd, *Сочинения*, VIII, Москва 1973 p. 582 (= 'Abd al-Razzāk in *Encycl. of Islām*). In regard to Ḥāfiz-i Abrū and his works, see Хафиз-и Абри и его сочинения included in Bartol'd, *op. cit.*, pp. 74–97, and *Encyclopaedia of Islām*, 2nd ed., under Ḥāfiz-i Abrū. In Bartol'd's work, pp. 317–318, there is also a note on the manuscript of the *Maṭla' al-sa' dain* in the collection of the St. Petersburg University. Its account of the dispatch of the envoy to Ming China is also taken from the record of one of the members of the envoy, Khwāja Ghiyāthu'ddīn Naqqāsh, recorded in *Zubdat-tawārikh-i Bāysunghurī*, Part IV of Ḥāfiz-i Abrū's work (Jan Rypka, *History of Iranian Literature*, ed. by K. Jahn, Dordrecht 1968, p. 452); however Ḥāfiz-i Abrū's account is more detailed, and there are some differences in minor points. As indicated by its title. K. M. Maitra's *A Persian Embassy to China, being an Extract from Zubdatu't Tawarikh of Hafiz Abru*, Lahore 1934 [Reprinted by Paragon Book Reprint Corporation, New York 1970], gives Ḥāfiz-i Abrū's original text with an English translation, and the passage dealing with Su-chou appears on pages 27 to 33. But this does not mean that the value of the translation and notes by Quatremère has been decreased; rather, as pointed out *passim* by H. Serruys in his *Sino-Mongol Relations during the Ming*, II, *The Tribute System and Diplomatic Missions* (1400–1600), (*Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques*, XIV), Bruxelles 1967, it is necessary to refer to it as well as to K. M. Maitra's translation, which depends a lot upon Quatremère's work. As for the travel account of the envoy dispatched to Ming China by Shāh Rukh, see the works given in *BS*², III, 2050–51, and D. Dunlop, *Hāfiz-i Abrū's Version of the Timurid Embassy to China in A.D. 1420*, Glasgow University Oriental Transactions, 1946.
- (5) In Gio Battista Ramusio, *Delle Navigazioni et Viaggi*, II, Venetia 1583 f. 14 ff., it is recorded that Ḥajji Muḥamad (Chaggi Memet) was a native of Gilān (Chilān) in Persia,

Jesuit, Bento de Goes (1562–11.IV.1607), who reached this region at the beginning of the seventeenth century and died of illness there. These records are all already well known. However, in contrast to the first three, which are no more than prosaic descriptions of town-scenes, the fourth account by Goes contains details which are not noted upon not only in the other accounts but even in the Chinese gazetteers relating to Su-chou, and which indicate Su-chou's character as an international centre. It is this point which the present writer would like to examine.

II

Bento de Goes was born in Villa Franca on São Miquel, one of the islands of the Azores Archipelago, belonging to Portugal. He became a soldier at a young age and was serving in India.⁽⁶⁾ When one day, whilst praying in a local chapel upon reaching Travancore on the Malabar Coast, he experienced a moment of sudden realization, and, after deciding to join a religious order and thus spend the remainder of his life, he entered the Jesuit Order in Goa. At the time it was 1584.⁽⁷⁾ Having completed the necessary training, he became Brother (Irmão), and upon orders followed Father Jerónimo Xavier into the Mughal Empire, where he pursued missionary work, mastering the Persian language at the same time. He won the confidence of the Emperor of the times, Akbar, and was even included in a delegation sent by the Mughal

and that after going to Su-chou and buying rhubarb there, he came to Venice, where he spoke in detail to Ramusio and two of his acquaintances about Su-chou (Succuir), Kan-chou (Campion) and the rhubarb there. The English translation and notes of this appear in Yule-Cordier, *Cathay and the Way Thither*, 1, pp. 290 ff. In regard to Su-chou this account is the most detailed one. However, facts noted by Goes are not mentioned. As for Hajji Muhammad's account, see the works given in *BS*², III, 2060–61.

- (6) There are various accounts regarding Goes' birthplace, childhood, the events surrounding his going to India, and the motives for his conversion. See P. Tacchi Venturi, *Opere Storiche*, 1, Macerata 1911, p. 527 n. 2; C. Wessels, *Early Jesuit Travellers in Central Asia, 1603–1721*, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff 1924, pp. 6–10; Pfister, *Notices biographiques et bibliographiques*, 1, p. 95. J. Dehergne S. J., *Répertoire des Jésuites de Chine de 1552 à 1800*, Roma-Paris 1973, p. 111, gives his year of birth as 1563, but the grounds for this are not clear.
- (7) This is according to the relevant part of the English translation, C. H. Payne, *Akbar and the Jesuits. An Account of the Jesuit Missions to the Court of Akbar*, of Pierre du Jarric, S. I., *Histoire des choses plus memorable advenues tanz et Indes Orientales*, etc., Bovrdeavs 1610 (not yet seen by the present writer) (Cf. Index under Goes, Xavier, Father Jerome); C. Wessels, *Early Jesuit Travellers in Central Asia, 1603–1721*, The Hague 1924, p. 42; Sir Edward Maclagan, *The Jesuits and the Great Mogul*, London 1932 (Reprinted in New York in 1972, p. 339). According to these works, he left the Order for a time and re-entered in 1588. Pfister, 1, p. 95, states that he joined the Order in 1588.

Imperial Court to the Portuguese Governor-General of India in Goa,⁽⁸⁾ as well as expounding the doctrine of Christianity to Akbar at the latter's request.⁽⁹⁾

As it happened, one of the problems being ardently discussed at the time by the Jesuits of India was the question whether Gran Cataio (Cathay) and its capital Cambalù, and Cina (China) and its capital Pechino signified the same country and metropolis or were completely different. Members with contacts with the Mughal Empire heard from Moslem traders and others that Cathay was to the east of the Mughal Empire but a little north, and that many Christians were defending their faith there, and so they thought that this was a country different from China. On the other hand there had been a letter from Matteo Ricci in China stating that both were the same country. However, the ruling opinion of the Jesuit Order in India was that since there were not supposed to be any Christians in China, it was difficult to regard them as the same, and furthermore, if there were in fact Christians in Cathay, it was the duty of the Order to send members there to lead them in the right direction.⁽¹⁰⁾ And so it came about the Portuguese Government Office and the Jesuit Order in India sent a mission to explore Central Asia, which resulted in not only the solution to this question, but also in the discovery of the overland route to Peking, avoiding the dangerous sea route.⁽¹¹⁾ The mission consisted of three members, and as leader Goes was chosen. Expenses were provided for by the Spanish King of the time, Philippe III (1598–1621), who was also ruling Portugal at the same time, and by the Mughal Emperor, Akbar. Thus they set out on the expedition with Peking as their goal. Goes disguised himself as an Armenian merchant, calling himself Abdullà Isai, 'a Christian slave of God',⁽¹²⁾ and set out on the 29th of October in 1602 from Agra together with a Greek deacon, Leone Grimano (Lëon Grimanos), a Greek merchant, Demetrio (Demetrios), and four Indian servants, Christians converted from Islam, as well as various goods procured in India and letters addressed by the Emperor Akbar to rulers within the dominions, demanding a guarantee of

(8) Wessels, *op. cit.*, p. 11; Pfister, I, p. 96; Trigault, *China in the Sixteenth Century: The Journals of Matthew Ricci: 1583–1610* translated from the Latin by Louis J. Gallagher, S. J., N. Y., 1953, p. 519; Sir Edward Maclagan, *op. cit.*, p. 329. Of these the present writer used for the sake of convenience Gallagher's recent English translation in regard to Trigault. As for the translations in various languages, see note (21).

(9) H. Bernard, *Le Frère Bento de Goes chez les Musulmans de la Haute Asia (1603–1607)*, Tientsin 1934, pp. 24–27.

(10) Luis de Guzman, *Historia de las misiones que han hecho los religiosos de la Compañia Jesús*, etc., I, Alcalá de Henares 1601, pp. 271–272; P. D'Elia, *Fonti Ricciane*, II, pp. 391–392; Trigault, tr. by Louis J. Gallagher, *China in the Sixteenth Century*, pp. 499–500; Pfister, I, pp. 96–97. Also see Jarric, *etc.* given in (7).

(11) Pfister, I, p. 97, and others.

(12) P. D'Elia, *Fonti Ricciane*, II, p. 399 n. 1. However, according to Guerreiro (II, f. 63. Cf. note (24)), Goes at first called himself 'Banda Abdula', which means 'servant of God' (servo de Deus). 'Banda' is the Persian word for servant or slave.

safety and exemption of customs fees for the group. Passing through Lahore, Kābul and Badakhshān, they crossed the Pamirs, and reached Hiarcān (Yarkand), the capital of the kingdom of Casār (Kashghar) in November of 1604. During the journey the four servants, who had proved to be of no use, were dismissed at Lahore, and an Armenian, Isac, who was living together with his wife in Lahore, was taken on in their place. It was this Isac who served Goes most faithfully during the length of the journey to Su-chou, who was present at his death, and to whom most of the credit is due for the reproduction of the records of Goes' travels in Central Asia, in relating them to Matteo Ricci, after the greater part of them had been lost. For the sake of safety and efficiency, journeys were carried out by caravan, and in this case, after breaking up once in Kābul, they formed a new caravan bound for Kashghar. Since it is said that the merchants who took part in this caravan numbered five hundred, the number of their followers must have been in excess of this, and if one adds the commodities and pack-horses to this, one can well imagine that this caravan must have been of considerable size. At Kābul Grimano returned and Demetrio remained, and so it was only Goes and Isac who continued the journey to Yarkand.

Yarkand was the capital of the kingdom of Kashghar, ruled over by Mahamethān (Sultan Mahomet), the successor to the Chaghatai Khanate,⁽¹³⁾ and at the time the whole of the Tarim Basin as far as Hami in the east was ruled by this royal family. Yarkand was its centre no doubt because it was the meeting point of the trading routes leading in the direction of Kābul and Lahore in the west, beyond Khotan to Kashmir in the south with its centre at Srinagar,⁽¹⁴⁾ to the western part of the Mongolian Plateau in the north, and to Ming China in the east. Goes' travel account is an invaluable source of material for acquainting oneself with the situation in Central Asia at the time, especially the state of trade, but here the writer does not intend touching upon this point.

At Yarkand the caravan from Kashghar was disbanded. A native of Kashghar, Agi Afis (Ḥajji Asiz.)⁽¹⁵⁾ had bought the rights from the King of Kashghar to serve as envoy bearing tributes to Ming China, and as caravan leader (Caravān Başçı, Kāravānbāshi) was recruiting people to join the caravan and go to China. Naturally a fee for participation was required. The writer will not go into details, but Goes too joined this caravan and continued his journey to the east.

(13) In Ricci's original work it is clearly stated that Yarkand is the capital of the kingdom of Kashghar (*Fonti Ricciane*, II, p. 411).

(14) Gunnar Jarring, *A Tall Tale from Central Asia, Scripta Minora*, Regiae Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis, 1972-1973, 3, pp. 5-6.

(15) P. D'Elia, *Fonti Ricciane*, II, p. 418 n. 4. However, the reason for D'Elia's reconstruction of Afiz as Asiz is not clear. Afiz is perhaps Ḥāfīz, and could mean a keeper, preserver, guardian; a commander, governor (Steingass).

They arrived in Cialis, present-day Karashahr,⁽¹⁶⁾ but since the stay of the caravan became too protracted, Goes requested special permission from the king of that region, Signore della terra, to set out alone, when a caravan of Moslems returning from Cathay happened to arrive. Dissembling as tributary envoys, they had gone to the Court of Cathay in 1601 and had stayed at the *Hui-t'ung-kuan* 會同館 (the government guest house for foreign envoys), where some Jesuits including Matteo Ricci were also staying. They were unable to give the names of the Jesuits, but described their features in detail, and displayed a slip of paper written on in Portuguese by one of them. Goes, who had heard in India that Matteo Ricci and others were in Peking at the time, knew without doubt that those people must be Jesuits, and was furthermore able to ascertain that Cathay was identical with China and that Cambalù was none other than Peking.

And so the party after passing through Turfan and Hami reached Su-chou (Socceo, Socetà) at the end of 1605, and there confirmed that Gran Cataio was another name for Gran Cina. Goes and Isac, as well as five servants, two youths (ex-slaves whom they had bought on the way), ten horses, and goods worth two thousand five hundred gold ducats was all that made up the party. Here too they learnt from Moslem merchants returned from Peking that Jesuit fathers and others were still in Peking, and so Goes immediately sent a letter to Matteo Ricci requesting him to arrange to get them out of Su-chou. At that time it was not permitted for all the members of an embassy bearing tribute from Central Asia to enter Peking; only a limited number of people were allowed to enter whilst the rest were made to sojourn in Su-chou and Kan-chou 甘州. It was however laid down that the expenses for the stay be supplied by the Ming Court;⁽¹⁷⁾ yet when one considers that Goes required a large amount of money for the purchase of foodstuffs,⁽¹⁸⁾ it is possible that this grant was not sufficient, or that he was dispossessed of it by the officials. Although Goes had been included in the group proceeding to Peking, he still requested the aid of Matteo Ricci, perhaps because he was concerned about living expenses, or perhaps because he was unable to wait not knowing when the permission to enter Peking would be granted. Thus the first letter to Matteo Ricci was sent, but did not arrive, and on Easter in 1606 the second was sent. This reached Matteo Ricci, but since it was difficult to send a Portuguese father to meet Goes, a Chinese brother, Chung Ming-li 鐘鳴禮, with the Christian name of Giovanni Ferdinando (correctly Fernandes or Fernandez),⁽¹⁹⁾ who had entered the Jesuit Order and was studying at the

(16) *Ibid.*, p. 416 n. 4; p. 424 n. 2. Also Ramusio, *Delle Navigazioni et Vaiggi*, II, f. 16 r.

(17) See material (1) and (2) quoted in Section IV. For further details, see Henry Serruys, C.I.C.M., *Sino-Mongol Relations during the Ming*, II, *The Tribute System and Diplomatic Missions (1400-1600)*, Bruxelles 1967, pp. 372-407, 408-442.

(18) *Fonti Ricciane*, II, p. 437.

(19) *Ibid.*, II, p. 435 n. 6. In regard to Chung Ming-li, see the passages indicated in *ibid.*, III, p. 110 (Index); Pfister, I, pp. 121-123; Dehergne, *Répertoire des Jésuites de Chine de 1552 à 1800*, p. 88, etc.

time, was dispatched instead.

Fernandes reached Su-chou on the thirty-first day of March in 1607, but by this time Goes was on his death-bed due to serious illness, and despite the nursing of Isac and Fernandes he died on 11th (according to some other information 10th) April of the same year. The cause of death is said to have been a natural illness, or poisoning by fellow Moslem traders.

On the announcement of Goes' death, the fellow Moslem merchants took over all of Goes' possessions and, in order to destroy all proof of their own guilt, they destroyed all of Goes' diaries. Thus the record which ought to have imparted in the most detail the state of affairs in Central Asia at the start of the seventeenth century was lost overnight. Chung Ming-li and Isac underwent such hardships as being thrown in prison by the local officials who had been bribed by the Moslem merchants, but were at length able to return to Peking. There, on the basis of the few remaining records and mainly on what Isac told him, Matteo Ricci managed to compile Goes' travel account, which he included in his major work *Storia dell' Introduzione del Cristianesimo in Cina* as the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth chapters. This *History of the Introduction of Christianity in China* was edited and translated into Latin by P. Nicolas Trigault (alias Chin Ni-ko 金尼閣) and published in 1615, and was used as material for his collecting of funds in European countries for missionary work in China.⁽²⁰⁾ At the same time it swept Europe as the first accurate and detailed account of Chinese affairs based upon actual observations, and was reprinted several times as well as being immediately translated into French, German, Spanish, Italian and English.⁽²¹⁾ Furthermore the section on Goes was welcome as the first account since Marco Polo to give information on the situation in Central Asia from India to China, which had been closed in darkness, and in matters relating to Central Asia this was used as the principal source of evidence until scientific surveys of Central Asia were carried out at the end of the nineteenth century.⁽²²⁾ That the accounts

(20) Edmond Lamalle, S. L., La propagande du P. Nicolas Trigault en faveur des missions de Chine (1616), *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu*, IX, 1, 1940, pp. 49-120.

(21) *BS*⁹, II, 809-811. However, it is necessary to add the French translation of 1908, and the English translation of 1625, and also 1942 to this (J. Gernet, *La politique de conversion de Matteo Ricci en Chine*, *Archives de Sciences Sociales des Relations*, No. 36, 1973, p. 73 n. 2). The English translation of 1942 was reprinted as *China in the Sixteenth Century: The Journals of Matthew Ricci: 1583-1610*. Translated from the Latin by Louis J. Gallagher, S. J., with a foreword by Richard J. Cushing, D. D., L.L.D., Archbishop of Boston, pp. xxii, 616, (1), New York: Random House 1953. There are a total of fifteen editions. Together with J. Gonzalez de Mendoza, *Historia de las cosas mas notables, ritos y costumbres, del Gran Reyno de la China*, Roma 1583, Trigault's had been considered to be the basic work of European knowledge of China.

(22) *BS*⁹, III, 2072-74. However, it is necessary to add the following work to this. Berigt van een/Mahometaans Koopman,/aangaande/Cambalu./Mitsgaders de maeijelijke Reys van/Benedictus Goes,/Gedaan van Lahor over Land door/Tartaryen na China./In't Jaar 1598. en vervolgens./Nu aldereerst uyt her Portugys vertaald, met nodige/Konst-Printen

on Central Asia in the *Chih-fang wai-chi* 職方外紀 (A Geography of the World), which first introduced the geography of the world to China, depend mainly upon this work is a fact previously discussed by the present writer.⁽²³⁾

III

The circumstances in which Matteo Ricci compiled Goes' travel account from meagre materials, which Trigault edited and translated, is as described above. But Trigault did not translate Matteo Ricci faithfully word for word, but added in places facts not recorded by Matteo Ricci. The same applies to the relevant sections of *Dell' Historia della Compagnia di Giesu: La Cina. Terza Parte dell' Asia* (Roma 1636) by Daniello Bartoli (12.II.1608–13.I.1685) and *Relação anual das coisas que fizeram os Padres da Companhia de Jesus, etc. nos anos de 16000 a 1609*, a work based largely upon the letters of missionaries by Fernão Guerreiro (1550–1617);⁽²⁴⁾ and no doubt can be said of

en een Register verrijkt./Te Leyden:/By Pieter Vander Aa, Boekverkoper, 1706./Met Privilegie./Cols. 1–18. Two maps on the same leaf: de Land Reyse, door Benedictus Goes, van Lahor gedaan, door Tartaryen na China and Constantinopolen en Egypten, door Nicolaus Schmidt In een Zes Jarige Reystogt, uyt Duytsland Besogt, en beschreven. (Toyo Bunko shelf number: 0-3-A-173). In regard to the bibliography on Goes, see the relevant passages in Robert Streit, *Bibliotheca Missionum*, V, XIII; and in J. Dehergne, *Répertoire des Jésuites de Chine de 1552 à 1800*, Roma-Paris, 1973, p. 111, more recent works are listed. As for the discovery of what was said to be Goes' grave and the fact that it cannot be considered to be Goes' grave, see G. Wessels, *The Grave of Bento de Goes*, *Archivum Historicum Societatis Jesus*, IV, 1935, pp. 337–339. This discusses the unreliability of the report made by Miss Mildred Cabb who was engaged in missionary work in the region of the Gobi Desert and Inner Mongolia; yet P. Sykes, *The Quest for Cathay*, London 1936, p. 262, accepts without criticism this report as being true.

(23) Kazuo Enoki, *Shokuhōgaiki no Chūō-Ajia Chiri* 職方外記の中央アジア地理 (Statements Concerning Central Asia in the *Chih-fang wai-chi*), in *Wada Hakushi Koki Kinen Ronbun-shū* 和田博士古稀記念論文集 (*Oriental Studies Presented to Dr. Sei (Kiyoshi) Wada in Celebration of His Seventieth Birthday*), Tokyo: Kōdansha 1960.

(24) *Relação anual das coisas que fizeram os Padres da Companhia de Jesus*, etc. was originally published in five volumes, which are as follows:

- Part I (1600–1601), publ. em Evora por Manuel de Lyra, 1603.
- Part II (1602–1603), publ. em Lisboa por Jorge Rodrigues, 1605.
- Part III (1604–1605), publ. em Lisboa por Pedro Crasbeeck, 1607.
- Part IV (1606–1607), publ. em Lisboa pelo mesmo, 1609.
- Part V (1607–1608), publ. em Lisboa pelo mesmo, 1611.

Of these, the Spanish translation of Part I by Padre António Colaço was published in 1604 at Valladolid, and the Spanish translation of Part V by Saurez de Figueroa in 1613 at Madrid (Cf. R. Streit quoted below). The accounts relating to Goes' travels appear in Part II (folios 50, 61 verso–65), Part IV (folios 162–167), and Part V (folios 23–28). That used by the present writer was the new edition by Artur Viegas (Tomo I [1600–1603], Coimbra 1930; Tomo II [1604–1606], Coimbra 1931; Tomo III [1607–1609], Lisboa 1942). At the end of Part III there is an index, and the indication on each page of the number of the corresponding leaf of the original edition is most helpful; furthermore the phrase 'until 1608' mentioned in the original edition has been corrected to 1609.

the relevant parts of the works of Antonio de Gouvea (1592–1677),⁽²⁵⁾ although the writer has not had the opportunity to examine them directly. In other words there is no doubt that it was Matteo Ricci who put together Goes' travel account of Central Asia, but at the same time it is certain that other information was also known at that time to Jesuits of related fields, and that there were cases in which the same facts were known in forms with slightly different nuances. However this applies to Goes' travelogue as a whole, and as far as regards the section with which we are here concerned, all accounts seem to have been similar.

At one stage the whereabouts of the manuscript of Matteo Ricci's *Storia dell' Introduzione del Cristianesimo in China* had become unknown, but it was discovered in 1909 by Pietro Tacchi Venturi, who later added notes to it and published it together with a collection of Ricci's letters. Still later, D'Elia brought out a more correct version with copious notes. Since then a number of studies on Goes' travel account based upon Ricci's text have been made public.⁽²⁶⁾ According to the account of Matteo Ricci, it goes as follows:

'Groups of traders from Cascàr [each] led by their leader frequently come to this land [*i.e.* Su-chou]. And according to an old agreement with China, seventy-two members of these groups come every six years as envoys from the seven or eight kingdoms in the region of Cascàr, present *pietra iaspe*,

(The English translation of the accounts relating to Goes should be C. H. Payne, *Jahangir and the Jesuits. With an Account of the Travels of Benedict Goes and the Mission to Pegu from the Relations of Father Fernão Guerreiro*, S. J. [*The Broadway Travellers*], London 1930, but the present writer has not yet had the opportunity to see it.) Although the original edition of this work seems to be extremely rare (*Akbar and the Jesuits. An Account of the Jesuit Mission to the Court of Akbar* by Father Pierre du Jarric, S. J., Translated with Introduction and Notes by C. H. Payne. *The Broadway Travellers*. London 1926, pp. xxxii–xxxiii). The Toyo Bunko possesses Part V (1607–1608) (shelf number: 0-17-e-91). Guerreiro's title of the work varies slightly with each volume. This is because the rules for the spelling of the Portuguese language were not yet fixed at the time of the publication of this work. For details, see for example R. Streit, *Bibliotheca Missionum*, V, Nos. 43 (1603), 57 (1605), 85 (1607), 109 (1609), 154 (1611). The point in common to them all is that the opening of the title is given in the singular form *Relaçam*, *Relação*. Eduardo Brazão, *Em Demanda do Cataio, A Viagem de Bento de Goes à China 1603–1607*, Lisboa 1954, p. 95 n. 1, gives this in the plural form *Relações*, but this cannot be considered as being faithful to the original. In the present article, the title given in Viegas' new edition has been adopted.

- (25) Gouvea's manuscript *Asia extrema*. Cf. Yoshitomo Okamoto 岡本良知, *Porutogaru o otozureru* ポルトガルを訪れる (*Visiting Portugal*), Tokyo: Japan-Portugal Society, November 1930, p. 128.
- (26) C. Wessels, S. J., *Early Jesuit Travellers in Central Asia, 1601–1721*, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff 1924; Henri Bernard, S. J., *Le Frère Bento de Goes chez les Musulmans de la Haute Asie (1603–1607)*, Tienstin: Hautes Études 1934 (Cf. RC. par P. Pelliot in *T'oung Pao*, xxxii, p. 80–81.); Eduardo Brazão, *Em Demanda do Cataio. A Viagem de Bento de Goes à China 1603–1607*, Lisboa: Agência Geral do Ultramar, Divisão de Publicações e Biblioteca 1954.

ponte di diamanti, calor turchino and other things to the King of China as gifts and tributes, go to the court and stay there according to the agreement, and have all the expenses incurred in transporting by vehicle all the goods they bring and buy paid for by China; in addition the Chinese King pays a high price, several times that of their value, for the stones and other commodities received from them. Furthermore the King gives each of these people more than one ducat a day in advance. For this reason a large number of traders vie to be include within [these] seventy-two, and give more than one hundred scuti to the leader of the group possessing the right of decision. When the time comes, [the leader of the group] submit the letters from the kings and certificates [indicating that they are the formal envoys of the kings] to the official in charge.

In a similar manner come [envoys] from other countries too (*Altri sono ni queste et altre parti*). For example as in the case of those who come in the names of the kings of Cochin China, Siam and Loochoo (Leuchieu), there are closer countries whence they come in the names of other kings three times in three years. Among those who come every year, there are those such as certain people from Tartar.

As for those who come two or three times a year, there are such as Koreans (*Coriani*). However the expenses for their lodgings and travel (*luoghi dove passano*) reaches an enormous sum.

And [but] [the Chinese government officials] consider that the whole world belongs to the king of China, and that they pass through great dangers in bringing tributes to the king. Whilst recognizing that in actual fact it is China who is presenting tributes to these countries, they hide such imposture from the Chinese king and keep it up.⁽²⁷⁾

Trigault points out that the credentials brought by these false envoys are full of 'clientelare obsequim'.⁽²⁸⁾ Chinese of the time ought to have been fully aware of the fact that these envoys of tribute were not true envoys of tribute; yet for the very reason pointed out by Matteo Ricci, in order to show that the virtue of emperor was pervading the whole world, they did not take the trouble to expose the imposture. It was as described in the Account of Khotan 于闐傳 in the *Ming-shih* 明史, *chüan* 332,⁽²⁹⁾ which goes as follows:

(27) *Fonti Ricciane*, II, pp. 422-433.

(28) N. Trigault, *De Christiana Expeditione apud Sinas*, 1615, p. 562. L. J. Gallagher, *China in the Sixteenth Century*, p. 515, translates it as "The letters are filled with the highest praise of the Emperor of China". In regard to this, refer to the view of J. F. Fletcher (J. K. Fairbank, ed. by, *The Chinese World Order*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press 1968, p. 347 n. 9).

(29) The fact that merchants from countries in Central Asia came to China in order to carry out trade whilst feigning to be envoys bearing tribute dispatched by their kings was noticed by the Chinese at least at early as the beginning of the third century A.D.

'Previous to this, during the time of Yung-lo 永樂, Ch'eng-tsu 成祖 desired that there be none of all the remote countries that should not pay obeisance (to him). Envoys from the Western Regions thereupon continued (to arrive) year after year. The barbarians covet Chinese products and make enormous profits by trade and the roads are packed with them. In most cases these merchants pretend to be tributary envoys. Many of them bring with them horses, camels and jade (to sell), but declare that these are tributes to submit (to the Chinese Court). And after entering the Pass, they receive travel expenses for boats and carts, and funds for food and drink every morning and night, from Chinese officials. (The local officials) are put to great difficulties in transporting them from one station to another. People both military and civil are exhausted with transporting them. When the time comes for them to return to the west, they loiter along the route (within the Pass) in order to trade goods. Thus, the route of several thousand *li* 里 linking the east and the west is always in great disorder and an enormous amount of official and private money is wasted away. And there is none, from the highest to the lowest, who does not reproach and lament (this state of affairs). However, since no court official makes this known (to the Emperor), His Majesty does not take pity (upon the people).' 先是，永樂時，成祖欲遠方萬國無不臣服，故西域之使，歲歲不絕，諸蕃貪中國財帛，且利市易，絡繹道途，商人率僞稱貢使，多攜馬駝玉石，聲言進獻，既入關，則一切舟車水陸晨昏飲饌之費，悉取之有司，郵傳困供億，軍民疲轉輸，比西歸，輒緣道遲留，多市貨物，東西數千里間騷然，繁費公私，上下罔不怨咨，廷臣莫爲言，天子亦莫恤也。

During the reign of Jen-tsung 仁宗 (1424-1425) following Yung-lo there had been someone who had reported the state of affairs to the Emperor, and for a period the number of people calling themselves envoys of tribute diminished. But later there was a return to the former situation, and that there were attempts in repetition at control during the China-ching 嘉靖 (1522-1566) and Wan-li 萬曆 (1573-1615) periods is clear from the memorials presented to the Emperor.⁽³⁰⁾

The passage in Goes' travelogue which describes well the character of Su-chou as an international centre is as follows:

'The city of Su-chou (città di Socceo) is divided into two sections. In one of these, Cathayans (Catai) are living. These people are those whom we have previously been calling by their old name of Chinese (Cinesi). In the other [section] Saracens (Saraceni, *i.e.* Moslems) who have come from other areas of Kashghar (Cascàr) and Persia in order to trade with

(Biography of Ts'ui Lin 崔林傳 in the *Wei-chih* 魏志, *chüan* 24, of the *San-kuo-chih* 三國志. Cf. Kazuo Enoki, *Tōzai Bunmei no Kōryū* 東西文明の交流 (Exchanges between the Civilizations of the East and West), Tokyo: Kōdansha, November 1977, pp. 72-73.)

(30) See for example materials (1) and (2) quoted in Section IV of the present article.

China are living. And a large number of them have already become natives (*fatti naturali*), living together with their wives and children, just as the Portuguese living in the town of Macao in Canton (Quantone), although they are more submissive (*soggeti*) [than those Portuguese]. That is to say, at night they remain within their city walls without venturing forth, and in all matters are ruled and punished by the Chinese officials in the same way as all the other Chinese. If one lives here for nine years, it is not permitted that one leave here in order to return to one's own country.'⁽³¹⁾

Trigault records the same facts in somewhat more detail as follows:

'Su-chou (Soccu) is divided into two sections. The Chinese, whom the Saracens call Cathayans, live in one part of Su-chou, whilst the Saracens, who have come here from the kingdom of Kashghar (Cascar) and other countries of the west in order to trade, live in the other section. Many of these merchants take wife and bring up their children here. Therefore they are looked upon as natives who will never consider returning to their own country. They are like the Portuguese who have settled in Macao in the province of Canton. The difference is that whereas the Portuguese have laid down their own laws and have their own judges, these Saracens are ruled by the Chinese. Every night they are shut up within the city walls of their own section, but in other respects they are dealt with as natives [*i.e.* Chinese], and follow the Chinese administrative officials in all matters. According to the law, it is not permitted for people who have lived here for nine years to return to their own land.'⁽³²⁾

Bartoli also writes that Saracens live in one half of the city of Su-chou.⁽³³⁾

According to these accounts, in Su-chou of the early seventeenth century there was a special area where Saracens, *i.e.* Moslems, lived; these Saracens had come for the purposes of trade from Kashghar and further west; they had settled here with their families, some were living here even longer than nine years; and they were extremely submissive to the rule of the Ming authorities.⁽³⁴⁾ It was this section in which Goes too sojourned. A. Stein, who passed

(31) *Fonti Ricciane*, II, p. 431. Taking '*fatti*' of '*fatti naturali*' in this passage for the plural of '*fatto*', the present writer on a previous occasion translated as '*as natural facts*' (*Programme of the Seventy-first Convention of the Historical Society*, p. 23). That error is here rectified.

(32) This follows Gallagher's English translation (*China in the Sixteenth Century*, pp. 514-515). The French translation and Yule's English translation (*Cathay and the Way Thither*, IV, pp. 241-242) do not differ in their main purport, but there are slight differences of nuance.

(33) Daniello Bartoli, *Dell' Historia della Compagnia di Giesu, La Cina, Terza Parte dell' Asia*, Roma 1663, Libro Secondo, p. 470.

(34) According to the *Chien-wen-lu* 見聞錄, *chüan* 2, by Ch'en Chi-ju 陳繼儒 (Mei-kung 眉公, 1558-1639), *Kan-Su hsün-fu* 甘肅巡撫 (Provincial Governor of Kan-chou and Su-chou) Li K'un 李昆, taking pity upon the Ming soldiers stationed in Kan-Su, who did

through Su-chou in August of 1907, also writes that this city was divided into a section where the Chinese lived and a section where the Moslems who had come from the western regions lived, just as stated by Goes.⁽³⁵⁾

IV

On the other hand the only gazetteer dealing specifically with Su-chou which the present writer has been able to find is the *Ch'ung-hsiu Su-chou hsin-chih* 重修肅州新志 (Newly Revised edition of the Gazetteer of Su-chou), 12 volumes (revised in 1737 and supplemented in 1762), with a preface dated the second year of Ch'ien-lung 乾隆 (1737). According to the preface this is a revised and enlarged edition of the work compiled in the forty-fourth year of Wan-li (1616). Apart from this the present writer has not heard of any work dealing exclusively with Su-chou or the *hsien* 縣 of Chiu-ch'üan. In the fifth volume (folio 2, right) there is a passage explaining the term *i-ch'ang* 夷廠 as follows:

I-ch'ang lies to the northwest of the *Tung-kuan-hsiang* 東關廂. It was built in the twenty-fifth year of Chia-ching (1546) under the supervision of *Ts'an-chiang* 參將 (Local Commander) Liu Hsün 劉勳, with an office of administration and *i-kuan* 夷館 (the government lodge for foreign envoys) within it, and the gate regulations are extremely well laid out. In the thirty-fourth year of Chia-ching (1555) *Fu-shih* 副使 (Surveillance Vice Commissioner) Ch'en Ch'i-hsüeh 陳其學, seeing the foreigners grinding wheat outside the *i-ch'ang* (foreigners' section) and thinking it most inconvenient, placed more than ten stone mortars (碾磨十餘盤) within the section for the benefit of the flour (or rice) of the foreigners.⁽³⁶⁾

Kuan-hsiang 關廂 is a city section built outside and connected to the city, and could be called the annex of the city. *Tung-kuan-hsiang* in this case is

not have the necessary funds for marriage and were thus for a large part unmarried, carried out an investigation of each *wei* 衛 (out-post) and gave funds for marriage to over one thousand of them, thus enabling them to have families; for this deed he was held in high regard. Within this account, there is the passage 肅地邊夷, 婿多論財, 軍貧未娶者, 公查各衛得千餘人, 量給銀布助之, indicating that it was *p'ien-i* 邊夷 of Su-ti 肅地 (foreigners living in the border lands of the Kan-Su region) whom the soldiers took as wives, and that the marriage differed to that within Chinese territory, in that it took the form of the husband buying the wife. When one considers that the Kan-Su region had been since former times an area where various peoples from Sino-Mongolia, East Turkistan and the upper reaches of the Yellow River had been living together, it is easy to imagine the complicated elements making up those inhabitants. The women who married merchants from Central Asia in Su-chou no doubt had such complex elements. In passing, it may be noted that Li K'un served as Governor of Kan-Su in the tenth year of Cheng-te 正德 (*Ming-shih* 明史, *chüan* 185).

(35) *Serindia*, II, p. 1127 n. 7.

(36) 夷廠, 東關廂西北, 嘉靖二十五年, 參將劉勳督建, 內有官廳夷館, 門樓規制具備, 嘉靖三十四年, 副使陳其學見諸夷野外磨麪不便, 又於廠內安置碾磨十餘盤, 以便諸夷粒食。

the new streets built next to and to the east of Su-chou. It was also abbreviated to *tung-kuan* 東關 (see the passage of the Kuei-hua-ssu 歸華寺 Temple below). *I-ch'ang* was the name of a building and the surrounding district within its north-west section. *I-kuan* was probably the lodging quarters for foreign envoys arrived in Su-chou, and since it was the rule that only a set number of people within an envoy were permitted to go to Peking, whilst the rest were divided and forced to sojourn in Su-chou and Kan-chou, no doubt the people made to wait in Su-chou stayed in this *i-kuan*. *Kuan-t'ing* 官廳 signifies a government office of administration supervising such foreigners, and could say that *i-kuan* was a state-operated caravanserai under the Ming. If one looks at the passages in materials later quoted as (4), stating, '*Han-tung tso-wei tu-tu t'ung-chih* 罕東差衛都督同知 (Vice Commissioner-in-Chief of the Left Guard of Han-tung) A-shu-pa-li 阿束把力 who sojourned in the *Tung-kuan-hsiang* section in Su-chou-wei.' 肅州衛東關廂寄住罕東左衛都督同知阿把力, and (9), stating, 'Che-yu-lu-po-la 訛右祿孛刺 and others, thirty-five (in number), who were tributary foreigners (from Hami) and sojourned in the *Tung-kuan* section in Su-ch'uan 肅川 (an error for *chou* 州) . . . , 肅川東關寄住(哈夷)貢夷訛右祿孛刺等三十五名, and quoted later, it seems that various foreigners were settled in the *Tung-kuan* section, but they were not in the *i-kuan*, being probably within the area called the *i-ch'ang*, which included the *i-kuan*.

In this *Tung-kuan-hsiang* there was a Buddhist temple called Kuei-hua-ssu 歸華寺, which the foreigners had built. The passage on the Kuei-hua-ssu Temple in the *Ch'ung-hsiu Su-chou hsin-chih*, Vol. 5 (folio 16, right) is as follows:

'Kuei-hua-ssu lies in the *Tung-kuan-hsiang* (section). It was built by Pai-yen-pu-la 拜言卜刺, the son of *Ching-hsiu kuo-shih* 淨脩國師 Pi-ya-la-shih-li-wa 必牙刺失力娃 of Ha-mi-wei 哈密衛. Pai-yen-pu-la's father, after suffering several invasions from Turfan in Ch'eng-hua 成化 times (1456-1487), led his colony to Su-chou at the beginning of the Cheng-te 正德 Era (1506), where he surrendered to submission. Since the *Tu-tu* 都督 (Commissioner-in-Chief of a Military Commission) [of Hami living in Su-chou], Che-chi-pu 訛吉卜, and Pai-yen-pu-la (also *tu-tu*) were ruling the old and new Ha-la-hui 哈刺灰 tribes and one of the Uyghur tribes, they built a temple in the *Kuan-hsiang* section (written as *Tung-kuan-hsiang* above), which they called Kuei-hua-ssu (Submission-to-China Temple), and Pai-yen-pu-la claims that they built it on imperial order.'⁽³⁷⁾

However, 'the beginning of the Cheng-te Era' mentioned above is in

(37) 歸華寺, 哈密衛淨脩國師必牙刺失力娃子拜言卜刺所建, 拜言卜刺父在哈密居住, 成化間 (1465-1487), 被土魯番王子速瓦亦思速壇阿力節次搶掠難存, 正德 (1506-1521) 初, 率領部落投順, 肅州准其進貢, 今都督訛吉卜與拜言卜刺管束新舊哈刺灰二種, 並畏兀兒一種夷人, 故於關廂建寺曰歸華寺, 彼以爲奉勅而建。

actual fact the eighth year of Cheng-te, and Pai-yen-pu-la seems to refer to the *Tu-tu* of Ha-mi, Yen-k'o po-la 奄克李刺 mentioned under the day *i-wei* 乙未 of the twelfth month of the eighth year of Cheng-te in the *Wu-tsung shih-lu* 武宗實錄 (Veritable Record of Wu-tsung). Furthermore it is also worthy of note that within the walls of Su-chou there was also a mosque. In the same *Ch'ung-hsiu Su-chou hsin-chih*, Vol. 5 (folio 10 right), the passage on *i-hsüeh* 義學 (the community-operated school), it is stated as follows:

'I-hsüeh. According to the *Su-chou chiu-chih* 肅州舊志 (the Old Gazetteer of Su-chou) it was originally one of the *she-hsüeh* 社學 (school run by rural community), and was situated in the north-east corner of the city of Su-chou. It was built by the *Hsün-fu* 巡撫 (Provincial Governor) [of Kan-su 甘肅], Ch'en Chiu-ch'ou 陳九疇. Previous to that, a mosque [li-pui-ssu 禮拜寺] belonging to the Moslems of the Western Regions had stood there. It was discovered that the Moslems, whilst claiming to worship, were assembling at night and dispersing early in the morning in an attempt to start a revolt. As a result, Ch'en Chiu-ch'ou removed the mosque and established a *she-hsüeh* there. However both the *chün* 軍 (people on the military register) and *min* 民 (people registered as civilians on the civil register) were poor and unable to continue providing the expenses for the running of the *she-hsüeh* school, and now it has already fallen into disuse. The above is a summary of the passage on *she-hsüeh* in the *Su-chou chiu-chih*. Later, a *Wen-ch'ang-kung* 文昌宮 (a shrine in honour of *Wen-ch'ang ti-chün* 文昌帝君) was erected on the site. It is that which is now in the north-east corner of Su-chou.'⁽³⁹⁾

It goes without saying that the *Su-chou chiu-chih* mentioned here is the work compiled in the forty-fourth year of Wan-li. It was from the day

- (38) 義學，按肅州舊志，本有社學一所，在城東北隅，巡撫使陳九疇建，向西正廳三間，南北對面，齋房各三間，廳後又為宅舍二間 (mistake for *chien* 衙)，其木植因肅州城西漢回子同 (probably means the same as *t'ung* 間, streets or quarters)，西域回夷夜聚曉散，托為禮拜，謀不道，事發，遂折禮拜寺為之，(中略)，但軍民貧苦，順派糧差，今已久廢，惟臨水有之，此舊志社學之大略也，後此基因為文昌宮，在肅城東北隅，即其地也。
- (39) As an example there is the following passage under the day *chi-hai* 己亥 of the sixth month of the fourth year of Chia-ching in the *Shih-tsung shih-lu*, *chüan* 48: 巡撫甘肅都御史陳九疇言，頃土魯番所以敢犯甘肅者，以我納其朝貢，縱其實販，任其遷往，使得稔知我之虛實而啓其戎心也，先是寫亦虎仙逆謀已露，姦黨就擒，虎仙乃輸貨權門，轉蒙寵幸，以犯邊之寇為來王之賓，而鎮巡等官又復怵於利害，謂回夷一左右其足而我遂有安危，所以拱手聽命，館為上客，轡聯駁擊，邊郡騷(?)騷，遂致寄住之夷勾引接連以有今日，為今日計，即不能為武帝貳師之兵，亦當効光武閉關以絕西域之貢，倘或涵容隱忍，不絕如故，臣恐河西十五衛所之地，永無息肩之期也，然誠欲謝絕，必先固防之策，有二，一日，去心腹之疾，番夷節次貢使來歸者，無慮數百人，其冒名撒馬 (兒罕 = Samarkand) 天方 (Mecca) 諸國者，請羈 (mistake for 羈) 置內郡勿遣，係土魯番 (Turfan) 哈密 (Hami) 者，則遷之而粵 (= 廣東省) 而籍其材，其謀逆諸回，再行覈實，亟誅之，其二曰，備侵襲之患，閉關之後，虜必合謀求逞而河西土馬單弱久矣，宜發帑銀召募勇健，以充卒伍，購易西馬，以充戰騎，如此則醜夷失所憑藉而心腹之疾可除，我軍足為攻守而侵襲之患可無矣。

ting-mao 丁卯 of the first month of the first year of Chia-ching (13.II.1522) to the day *ting-yu* 丁酉 of the sixth month of the fourth year of Chia-ching (9.VII.1525) that Ch'en Chiu-ch'ou was the *Hsiün-fu Kan-Su Tu-yü-shih* 巡撫甘肅都御史 (Provincial Governor and Censor-in-Chief of Kan-Su) (as recorded in the Veritable Record of Shih-tsung 世宗實錄, *chüan* 10, folio 52). Therefore it is not clear when the mosque was demolished or when it was built. However the fact that a mosque was erected indicates a considerable number of Moslems must have been living there, and this was nothing other than a result of the settlement of Moslem merchants from the Western Regions in Su-chou. The fact that this mosque was situated in the north-east corner of the city of Su-chou no doubt indicates that the quarters for Moslems lay in that direction. Furthermore following the above explanation of the construction of the *she-hsüeh* school in the *Su-chou chiu-chih*, it is noted that the trees planted there had been brought from the quarters for Chinese Moslems in the western part of the city of Su-chou (其木植因肅州城西漢回子同). The character *t'ung* 同 of *Han hui-tzu t'ung* 漢回子同 is also written as *t'ung* 衙, meaning streets or quarters, and *Han hui-tzu t'ung* means nothing other than the quarters of Chinese Moslems. If this interpretation is correct, there were Moslem quarters in the western part of the city of Su-chou as well.

Ch'en Chiu-ch'ou always held the strong conviction that China should cut off relations with the countries in the Western Regions since the recognition of their tribute and permission to sell their goods caused disturbances in the border region and was a threat to China's safety.⁽⁴⁰⁾ The demolition of the mosque was an expression of this hard-line policy. There is no sign that the mosque was rebuilt, and although the number of foreigners settling in Su-chou gradually rose, there is not any indication that they decreased. In the *Ming-shih-lu* there are several passages illustrating this course of events.

(1) [神宗實錄] 卷 502, 萬曆四十年閏十一月己巳 (31. XII. 1612), 禮部覆, 按臣徐養量條陳, 處貢夷以省糜費, 肅州哈密等處, 各種夷人住居者幾四百名, 歲費糧二千餘石, 又有土魯番等國貢夷, 除赴京七十人外, 尚留三百名, 半住甘州, 半住肅州, 每名月食糧一石五斗, 歲支五千餘石, 自三十六年入貢, 今尚未回, 嘉峪關至會同館六千餘里耳, 豈有四年不能往返者, 不過假此市物營利, 徒爲郵驛騷擾, 昨歲番王遣夷使來, 促之使歸, 令宜勅遣速回, 且令以後往返定三年爲限, 踰期, 先將食糧住止, 仍轉諭番王知會奉旨, 如議行。

According to this passage, approximately four hundred foreigners were living semipermanently in Su-chou, Hami and other places, and received over two thousand *shih* 石 (piculs) from the (Ming) government each year. Further-

(40) The following passage from the *Li-pu chih-kao*, *chüan* 90, also deserves reference: [議處貢夷八事] 嘉靖二十四年十月, 瑪哈穆特蘇勒坦赴關款納, 土魯番夷使和卓阿克力等八百餘人, 因而叩關, 總兵官仇鸞都御史傅鳳翔不能阻回, 盡驗入安插於甘州, 故事夷人五年一貢, 貢夷入關, 半留肅州, 半留甘州, 及都御史楊博代鳳翔, 諸夷固欲先期起送, 且不願分住肅州, 博省諭止之, 仍半分其肅州住, 至是有詔議處, 云云….

more, of the envoys from Turfan, etc., seventy members went on to Peking, whilst three hundred people separated, living in Kan-chou and Su-chou, and each of them was given one *shih* and five *tou* 斗 of food every month. These people had not returned to their home-countries for the past four years since coming with tribute, and were engaged in trade and making a profit.

(2) [禮部志稿] 卷 90, 議究貢夷弊源, 嘉靖七年四月 (IV-V. 1528), 巡撫甘肅都御史唐澤言, 哈密等處進貢夷人, 每沿途寄往販易謀利, 經年不歸, 甚有前貢者, 充後貢人數, 更改冒進起送者, 騷擾驛路, 有留者耗費月糧, 殊非中國邊防之體, 乞爲議處, 禮部尚書李時覆言, 欲革其弊, 當清其源, 四夷入貢惟利是圖, 而導之爲奸, 則伴送通事諸人是也,⁽⁴¹⁾ 今宜令肅州兵備及鎮巡諸司, 每遇貢使入關, 必驗其方物之數, 併籍諸夷年貌, 委官押送入京, 計程定限, 逾期者罪之, 及貢還則禮兵二部各委一官, 查核賞賜諸物, 有夾帶別物者, 俱爲禁革, 仍令序班送至甘州驗放出關, 如是則禮法兼盡, 弊端可革而撫順柔遠之道得矣, 詔如議行。

According to this passage, foreigners bearing tribute were always sojourning (*chi-chu* 寄住) in the towns along the way, carrying out transactions, without returning for years on end, and in extreme cases, eager for the imperial gifts, they joined the new groups bearing tribute; a method to control this was laid before [the Emperor] and accepted, but according to the report of the Ministry of Rites in the fortieth year of Wan-li quoted in (1), that control was at this time no longer in effect. The word *chi-chu* mentioned here means the settlement of foreigners within Chinese territory. It was also called *chi-chü* 寄居.⁽⁴²⁾ Below are a few examples of the sojourn of foreigners in Su-chou.

(3) [神宗實錄] 卷 46, 萬曆四年正月丁巳 (4. III. 1576), 陝西肅州衛寄住正副使阿納的約等十二員名及大崇教等七寺刺麻番僧割掛那節三十五名進貢, 宴待如例。

It is not clear of which country A-na-ti-yüeh 阿納的約 and others, twelve (in number), were the envoy and the vice-envoy, but this passage indicates that the envoy and the vice-envoy bearing tribute sojourned in Su-chou, and then went on to present their tribute.

(4) [神宗實錄] 卷 47, 萬曆四年二月乙酉 (31. III. 1576), 肅州衛東關廂寄住罕東左衛都督同知阿東把力并隨貢正副使虎都帖木兒等入貢, 賞給如例。

(41) *T'ung-shih* 通事 (interpreters) at the time were *se-mu-jen* 色目人 (foreigners of various origins). In a section of the *Li-pu chih-kao*, *chüan* 90, headed 覈詭冒更通事二議, in which one reads in regard to 土魯番 (Turfan) 天方 (Mecca) and 賽瑪爾堪 (Samarqand) as follows: "*Se-mu-jen* serves as interpreter for foreigners" 外夷通事者以色目人爲之. As seen in the passage for the day *chia-hsü* 甲戌 of the tenth month of the third year of Cheng-te in the *Wu-tsung shih-lu* 武宗實錄, *chüan* 43, there were *ta-t'ung-shih* (senior interpreters) and *t'ung-shih* (junior interpreters).

(42) In the passage under the day *ting-hai* 丁亥 of the fifth month of the eighth year of Yung-lo in the *T'ai-tsung shih-lu* 太宗實錄, *chüan* 104, it is stated as follows: "This day, Mohammedan Ha-la-ma-ya and others who sojourn in Su-chou-wei have risen in revolt." 是日肅州衛寄居回回哈刺馬牙等叛, 云云。

In this example the *Han-tung tso-wei tu-tu t'ung-chih* and others sojourned in Su-chou and then went on to pay tribute. *Tung-kuan* 東關 is related to *kuan-hsiang* 關廂 found in the next extract (5), and is the same as the *tung-kuan* found in (9). *Kuan-hsiang* are city quarters connected to and situated outside a walled city, and as mentioned above the *tung-kuan* was the living quarters for foreigners within the city of Su-chou. (H. Serruys translates *tung-kuan* as 'eastern suburb' in his *The Tribute System and Diplomatic Missions 1400-1600*, Bruxelles, 1967, p. 380.)

(5) [神宗實錄] 卷 130, 萬曆十年十一月己卯 (10. XII. 1582), 閱視延寧甘固邊務工科左給事中蕭彥言, ……肅州連年多故, 諸番避居關廂。

Since it says that a number of clans took refuge within the walls of Su-chou because the region around Su-chou was unsettled, one can gather that there was the settlement of foreigners (*chi-chü*) for such reasons, too.

(6) [神宗實錄] 卷 187, 萬曆十五年六月丁卯 (14. VII. 1587), 先是, 東虜麥力良臺吉等流住肅州, 要挾市賞。

Tung-lu 東虜 is an abbreviation of *Tung-t'ao-lu* 東套虜 (Cf. the passage for the day *wu-tzu* 戊子 of the tenth month of the sixteenth year of Wan-li in the Veritable Record of Shen-tsung 神宗實錄, *chüan* 204.), and probably refers to a Mongol tribe in the eastern part of Ho-t'ao 河套 (Ordos). The reason for their wandering into Su-chou and settling there is not clear, but judging from the expression that they sought *shih* 市 (commercial relations) and *shang* 賞 (rewards), it seems that it was thought that their immigration would bring some sort of benefit to the Ming.

(7) [神宗實錄] 卷 279, 萬曆二十二年十一月甲申 (21. XII. 1594), 甘肅寄住回夷頭米爾馬黑麻等進貢, 賜宴如例。

Since it says '*Kan-Su chi-chu*' 甘肅寄住, this would refer to both Kan-chou and Su-chou. This too is an example of foreigners sojourning for a time there and then proceeding to pay tribute.

(8) [神宗實錄] 卷 374, 萬曆三十年七月辛未 (28. VIII. 1602), 宴哈密衛朝貢夷人畏兀兒肅州寄住貢夷李刺等三十六名, 命候文煒待。

'*Su-chou chi-chu kung-i*' 肅州寄住貢夷 no doubt refers to people who had formerly paid tribute and then settled in Su-chou.

(9) [神宗實錄] 卷 379, 萬曆三十年十二月丙午 (30. I. 1603), 宴哈密衛貢夷畏兀兒肅川 (an error for 州) 東關寄住貢夷亂右祿李刺等三十五名, 候陳良弼待。

As indicated in (4), *tung-kuan* is probably the eastern section of the city quarters just outside the city walls of Su-chou. Since the 'Po-la' 李刺 in this passage and that in (8) have the same name, they may perhaps be the identical

person, but then again since the time gap between the two is only short, they are probably different. In any case this too is an example of foreigners sojourning for a time and then paying tribute.

If one attempts to classify the above nine examples, (5) and (6) indicate settlement as a result of refuge and wandering, whereas (1) and (2) clearly show that there were a great number of people who settled there on their return from paying tribute, and although the motives for settlement in (3), (4), (7), (8) and (9) are not clear, judging from the fact that they are all examples of setting out from the settlement areas in order to pay tribute, there is a great possibility that they too refer to people who on the occasion of paying tribute settled down and did not return to their own countries.

The representative example of a person sojourning for a long period of time within China and then going from the place of sojourn to pay tribute is in fact Matteo Ricci himself. On the day *keng-wu* 庚午, the first day 朔 of the second month of the twenty-ninth year of Wan-li (3.III.1601) that Matteo Ricci arrived in T'ien-chin to pay tribute, *T'ien-chin-ho yü-yung-chien shao-chien* 天津河御用監少監 (Junior Director of Port Bureau of T'ien-chin) (it is according to the Veritable Record of Shen-tsung in the *Ming-shih-lu, chüan*, 356, but the *Kuo-ch'üeh* 國權, *chüan* 79, has it as *T'ien-chin tu-shui yü-yung-chien t'ai-chien* 天津督稅御用監太監) Ma T'ang 馬堂 wrote about the dispatch of the articles of tribute of Matteo Ricci to Peking, in which there is a passage as follows:

'(Li Ma-tou of the Far Western Sea) has sojourned (within China) for twenty years and is going (to the capital) to pay tribute. He is unlike other foreigners who come from afar to offer precious treasures (as tribute) in order to show their appreciation of Emperor's benevolence Li Ma-tou is a foreigner who has long resided (in China) and he himself is going to pay tribute. Such (is extraordinary) having no precedent. However, I should think that he should be praised with gifts considering the pains he suffered of a long and arduous journey over lands and waters, as well as the humbleness with which he is intending to serve the Emperor. It may be the way to encourage the people of far-off countries.'

(大西洋利瑪竇) 又寄住二十年, 方行進貢, 則與遠方慕義特來獻琛者不同, 利瑪竇以久住之夷, 自行貢獻, 雖從無此例, 而其跋涉之勞芹曝之念, 似宜加賞齎 (an error for 齎), 以慰遠人。

Since Matteo Ricci came to Ao-men 澳門 (Macao) in the tenth year of Wan-li (1582), it was this year that is referred to in the phrase *chi-chu erh-shih nien* 寄住二十年 (twenty years' sojourn).

According to Goes, it was not permitted for foreigners who stayed in Su-chou more than nine years to return to their own countries. This no doubt refers to the registering of foreigners coming to pay tribute. In a passage in

the *Li-pu chih-kao* 禮部志稿 (Records of the Ministry of Rites), *chüan* 90, under the entry *Chao-kung pei-k'ao* 朝貢備考 (On the Paying of Tribute to the Imperial Court), there is the following example headed *Kung-i ju-chi* 貢夷入籍 (Registering of Foreigners who come to pay tribute):

成化八年 (1472), 福建三司官奏, 琉球夷人, 先因進貢潛居內地遂成家業, 年了不還本國者, 乞盡遣之, 事下禮部集議, 如其人曾承戶部勘合許令入籍者, 仍舊, 餘如所奏, 從之。

According to this passage, those people who were permitted registration upon receiving a check from the registrar of Hu-pu 戶部 (Ministry of Revenue) were allowed to stay, whilst those who had not received such a check were forced to return to their own country. Whether a similar system was applied to the foreigners residing in Su-chou or not is a question deserving more detailed investigation. Elsewhere Matteo Ricci states the period of time to have been seven years.⁽⁴³⁾

In connection with this, there is the expression *kuei-hua-chih-ch'en* 歸化之臣 (foreign subjects who have put themselves under the direct benevolence of the Emperor) In a memorial to the Emperor made by the Li-pu (Ministry of Rites) and recorded in the passage for the day *keng-wu* of the twelfth month of the thirty-ninth year of Wan-li (7.I.1612) in the Veritable Record of Shen-tung 神宗實錄, *chüan* 470, P'ang T'ie 龐迪峇 (Didace de Pantoja) and Hsiung San-pa 熊三拔 (Sabatino de Ursis) are called *ta-hsi-yang kuei-hua-chih-ch'en* 大西洋歸化之臣 (subjects who have come from the Far Western Sea to put themselves under the direct benevolence of the Emperor). Since their arrival in Macao, the former had been already twelve years in China, and the latter nine years.⁽⁴⁴⁾ Is there in fact a connection between *kuei-hua* 歸化 (naturalization) and *ju-chi* 入籍 (registration)? For the time being we shall leave the question at this and wait for further examination.

Furthermore, in describing Su-chou in Ming China, it is also necessary to mention the general state of relations between China of the Ming Dynasty and merchants of the Western Regions, but since the present writer has not yet assembled the necessary data in a manner suitable for publication, the

(43) In Matteo Ricci's letter from Peking dated 15th February 1609 and addressed to vice-provinciale Francesco Pasio, it is stated that "if one resides in China for seven years, one is not permitted to return to one's homeland, even if one wants to" (Pietro Tacchi Venturi, *Opere storiche del P. Matteo Ricci*, II, Le Lettere dalla Cina, Macerata 1913, p. 380). P. D'Elia writes that this is probably an error (*Fonti Ricciane*, II, p. 431 n. 7). As noted in the present article, this query requires further investigation.

(44) The date of their arrival in Macao was 20. VII. 1597 (Pantoja) and 1603 (De Ursis) (J. Dehergne, *Répertoire des Jésuites en Chine de 1552 à 1800*, pp. 193, 75).

reader is requested to refer to Henry Serruys, *Sino-Mongol Relations during the Ming*, II and III.⁽⁴⁵⁾

(45) Henry Serruys, C. I. C. M., *The Tribute System and Diplomatic Missions (1400-1600)*, *Sino-Mongol Relations during the Ming*, II, (*Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques*, XIV), Bruxelles: Institut Belge des Hautes Etudes Chinoises 1967; Do., *Trade Relations: The Horse Fairs (1400-1600)*, *Sino-Mongol Relations during the Ming*, III, (*Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques*, XVII), Bruxelles 1975.