

Some Central Asian Words of the Time of the An Lu-shan and Shih Ssu-ming Rebellion

By Shinji MAEJIMA

I

It appears in contemporary records that there was a *corps d'élite* called *yeh-lao-ho* 曳落河 under the banner of An Lu-shan 安祿山. In Yao Ju-neng's 姚汝能 *An lu-shan shih-chi* 安祿山事迹 (Traces of An Lu-shan) when we are told that An Lu-shan has gradually reached the point of intending to rebel at the end of the *T'ien-pao* 天寶 period of Hsüan-tsung 玄宗, we read, 'Then he built the Hsiung-wu 雄武 Fortress at Fan-yang 范陽, outwardly demonstrating his intention to defend the country against enemies, but inwardly for stocking arms on his own account. He maintained some 8,000 T'ung-lo 同羅, and surrendered Hsi 奚, Kitans 契丹 and *yeh-lao-ho* and made them his adopted sons. He also trained more than a hundred young slaves as skillful archers. As he extended bounty and made generous payment, all were deeply moved and very grateful to him, so that one of them could fight against a hundred enemies.' 乃於范陽築雄武城, 外示禦寇, 內貯兵器. 養同羅及降奚契丹曳落河八千餘人, 爲假子. 及家童教弓矢者百餘人. 以推恩信, 厚其所給. 皆感恩竭誠, 一以當百. (*Ou-hsiang ling-shin* 藕香零拾 edition, Ch. 1, p. 10a) And there is this explanatory note on *yeh-lao-ho*: 'Western barbarians call their vigorous youths *yeh-lao-ho*.' 蕃人健兒爲曳落河. In the *Tzu-chih t'ung-chien* 資治通鑑 (Ch. 216), under *T'ien-pao* 10 (751) 2nd month, there is the following information: '(An) Lu-shan supported some 8,000 T'ung-lo, Hsi and Kitans who had surrendered to him, and called them *yeh-lao-ho*. *Yeh-lao-ho* is a *Hu* 胡 (Soghdian) word for daredevillads. He had also over a hundred personal retainers who were all so brave and warlike that one was worth a hundred foes.' 祿山養同羅奚契丹降者八千餘人, 謂之曳落河. 曳落河者, 胡言壯士也. 及家僮百餘人, 皆驍勇善戰, 一可當百. This might be thought to be a citation of the *An lu-shan shih-chi* with some distortion of its meaning, but in his *Tzu-chih t'ung-chien k'ao-i* 資治通鑑考異 (Critical notes on the *Tzu-chih t'ung-chien*), Ssu-ma Kuang 司馬光 says, 'According to the (*An lu-shan*) *Shih-chi*, he maintained these men and made them his adopted sons, but since so great a number as 8,000 adopted sons is something that could not be, I do not accept this.' 祿山事迹云, 養爲己

子。按養子必無八千之數，今不取。 It is not necessarily impossible, however.

In the *Hsin T'ang-shu* 新唐書 (Ch. 225, Pt. 1, Life of An Lu-shan 安祿山傳) also there is an item that might be thought to be based on this passage in the *Shih-chi* (*An lu-shan shih-chi*, hereafter referred to simply as the *Shih-chi*), and this reads: 'He maintained 8,000 T'ung-lo and surrendered Hsi, Kitans and *yeh-lao-ho*, and adopted them as sons.' 養同羅降奚契丹曳落河八千人爲假子。

This corps of *yeh-lao-ho* seems hereafter to have fought everywhere in An Lu-shan's army. Also in the *Shih-chi* we find: 'On the 9th day of the 11th month of T'ien-pao 14 (755), Lu-shan rose in armed rebellion. To the T'ung-lo, Kitans, Shih-wei 室韋 and *yeh-lao-ho* were joined bodies from Fan-yang, P'ing-lu 平盧, Ho-tung 河東 and Yu-chi 幽薊 and these were called the army of a father and his sons. Horse and foot, 100,000 altogether, they marched westward beating their drums and declaring that their purpose was to kill the wicked Yang Kuo-chung 楊國忠.' (天寶十四載) 十一月九日，祿山起兵反。以同羅契丹室韋曳落河，兼范陽平盧河東幽薊之衆，號爲父子軍。馬步相兼十萬鼓行而西，以誅楊國忠爲名。 In the *T'ung-chien* 通鑑 (Ch. 217) under day *chia-tzu* 甲子 of the 11th month of that year, however, we find: 'Lu-shan raised an army of about 150,000 men, composed of the troops under his direct command and the militiamen of the tribes, such as the T'ung-lo, Hsi, Kitans and Shih-wei. He exaggerated the number of the warriors to be 200,000, and rebelled at Fan-yang.' 祿山發所部兵及同羅奚契丹室韋凡十五萬衆，號二十萬反於范陽。 And here there is notably no mention of *yeh-lao-ho*. But in the same chapter of this work, at the end of T'ien-pao 14, there is an account of how Yen Kao-ching 顏杲卿, governor of Ch'ang-shan 常山, who had already surrendered once, was encouraged by Yen Chen-ching 顏真卿, and others, to raise loyal troops and attempt to cut off the retreat of An Lu-shan's army, which had already taken Lo-yang 洛陽. Concerning this event, the *K'ao-i* 考異 to this work quotes fairly detailed supplementary information drawn from a work entitled *Ho-lo ch'un-ch'iu* 河洛春秋. This work, along with the *Hsing-shu-chi* 幸蜀記 and the *Chi-men chi-luan* 薊門紀亂, also often invoked in the *K'ao-i*, would seem to have been one of the contemporary documents not so very far removed from the time of the An Lu-shan and Shih Ssu-ming rebellion. According to this supplementary material, when An Lu-shan first moved south from Fan-yang and reached Kao-ch'eng 藁城 in Ho-pei 河北, Yen Kao-ching sent him a letter saying that Yang Kuo-chung's crimes were so heinous that he should naturally be executed; that Lu-shan's raising his troops was truly worthy of recognition as a heroic deed, and, moreover, that he admired Lu-shan's deed saying that his future should be as limitless as the ocean. Overjoyed, Lu-shan restored Kao-ching to his former post of governor of Ch'ang-shan and inspector of the five army groups and appointed him to the defence of Ching-

hsing-k'ou 井陘口; and, at this point it is recorded: 'He left behind a hundred T'ung-lo and yeh-lao-ho, with a commander for each.' 留同羅及曳落河一百人, 首領各一人. It is not clear whether there were a hundred T'ung-lo and yeh-lao-ho altogether or whether there were a hundred of each, but at any rate he appointed a leader for each of them and left them in his rear, while his main body moved on Lo-yang.

It need hardly be said that Ch'ang-shan was a strategic point 18 *li* to the south west of the present Cheng-ting 正定 prefecture in Ho-pei, and that Ching-hsing-k'ou is the gate to the region of Shan-hsi 山西 to the west of this. Thus, according to the *T'ung-chien* (under the 11th month of *T'ien-pao* 14), An Lu-shan, having accepted Yen Kao-ching's surrender, took Yen's sons and brothers as hostages and charged him with the defence of Ch'ang-shan; and he sent his own general, Li Ch'in-ts'ou 李欽湊, to Ching-hsing-k'ou with several thousand men to hold it and to guard against the government troops coming from the west.

Although for the time being he had submitted to An Lu-shan, in this same year Yen Kao-ching broke with him and raised loyal troops; he contrived to enter into relations with Wang Ch'eng-yeh 王承業, prefect of T'ai-yüan 太原 by secretly sending messengers to him, and he also entered into contact through emissaries with Yen Chen-ching of P'ing-yüan 平原, who was his cousin. According to the *T'ung-chien* (Ch. 217) Yen Kao-ching's original intention in raising troops was to get rid of Li Ch'in-ts'ou, the general holding Ching-hsing-k'ou. It is recorded: 'Kao-ching, pretending to be acting under the orders of An Lu-shan, summoned Li Ch'in-ts'ou to come personally to the commandery at the head of his men and receive some reward for their services. (12th month) day *ping-wu* 丙午, evening: Ch'in-ts'ou arrived. Kao-ching ordered Yüan Li-ch'ien 袁履謙, Feng Ch'ien 馮虔 and others to go to meet them with wine and food with the musical band of courtesans and to entertain them. In due time, all the visiting party was very drunk. Ch'in-ts'ou's head was then cut off, their armors and weapons were confiscated and all his followers were tied up. They were all slain the following day, and the whole force of Ching-hsing-k'ou was dispersed.' 果卿以祿山命召李欽湊, 使帥衆詣郡受犒賚. 丙午薄暮, 欽湊至. 果卿使袁履謙馮虔等攜酒食妓樂往勞之. 并其黨皆大醉. 乃斷欽湊首, 收其甲兵, 盡縛其黨, 明日斬之, 悉散井陘之衆. According to the *Ho-lo ch'un-ch'iu*, quoted in the *K'ao-i*, we are in a position to know in more detail about the circumstances at this time. According to this material, Kao-ching, encouraged by his supporters, enticed Li Ch'in-ts'ou and others to come by falsely saying that this invitation was by the order of An Lu-shan. Heng-chou 恆州 was the place chosen for the massacre, and there one evening a banquet was prepared. To quote the account of the work itself: 'They went to Heng-chou and set up a banquet for the chieftains. Each was given 300 lengths

(*tuan* 段) of silk, one horse, a gold and silver vessel and a beautiful girl, and to the rest were distributed 10,000 lengths of textiles. The preparations were made at the Chiao-t'ung 焦同 station south of the town. From dawn to dusk they made merry, with several hundred singing girls. Poison was secretly introduced into the liquor which they were given to drink; they were thus all made drunk so that none of them was conscious of anything. All their weapons were then confiscated, and they were tied up one by one. The next day there were all decapitated and their corpses thrown into the river Hu-t'ò 滹沱.' 就恆州宴設酋長, 各賜帛三百段, 馬一疋, 金銀器物各一牀, 美人各一, 其餘通賜物一萬段。設於州南焦同驛, 自曉至暮, 并以歌妓數百人, 悅其意, 密於酒中致毒與飲, 令盡醉, 悉無所覺。乃盡收其器械, 一一縛之。明日盡斬棄尸於滹沱河中。

It may be taken from the context that those referred to as chieftains in the above passage were the chiefs of T'ung-lo and *yeh-lao-ho* units left behind by An Lu-shan. As to what their relationship was with Li Ch'in-ts'ou, the sources provide a variety of statements. Even as regards Li Ch'in-ts'ou, the main text of the *T'ung-chien* gives 李欽湊, but in Yin Liang's 殷亮 Life of Yen Kao-ching 顏杲卿傳, quoted in the *K'ao-i*, he appears as Chiang Ch'in-tso 蔣欽奏, governor of Ch'ung-chün 崇郡; the *Su-tsung shih-lu* 肅宗實錄 give 欽湊, younger brother of Li Kuei-jen 李歸仁; the *Chiu T'ang-shu* 舊唐書 (Ch. 187, Pt. 2) gives Chiang Ch'in-ts'ou in the Lives of Loyal and Dutiful 忠義傳, while in Ch. 128, the Life of Yen Chen-ching 顏真卿傳, it gives Li Ch'in-ts'ou 李欽湊. Anyway, the question arises whether the men left behind by An Lu-shan to defend Ching-hsing-k'ou were the hundred T'ung-lo and *yeh-lao-ho* or whether they were the 7,000 (5,000 in the *Su-tsung shih-lu*) under the command of Li Ch'in-ts'ou. On this point the *T'ung-chien hu-chu* 通鑑胡註 has the following considerations:

'The *Ho-lo ch'un-ch'iu* has it that he left a hundred T'ung-lo *yeh-lao-ho* to guard Ching-hsing-k'uo in order to check the advance of the emperor's Shan-hsi forces, but how could only a hundred men, charged with so important a duty, have conducted a defence? Yin Liang's Life of Yen Kao-ching states that there were 7,000 men in defence, but it is not a possible thing that Yüan Li-ch'ien should have tied up one by one all of these 7,000 men in one evening. Presumably An Lu-shan left a hundred picked men as Ch'in-ts'ou's most trusted troops, while the rest would have been local militia, who could do no other than to obey him. If this be the case, then it is possible that Li-ch'ien should have served them liquor till they were intoxicated, and have killed Ch'in-ts'ou and the hundred men, while dispersing the rest. The *Ho-lo ch'un-ch'iu* has it that poison was introduced into the liquor, but it is to be noted that Li-ch'ien and the others drank with

Ch'in-ts'ou, so that the introduction of poison into the liquor of the guests only would not have been possible. I do not, therefore, accept this statement. Again, in the matter of Ch'in-ts'ou's surname, both Yin Liang and the Lives of the Loyal and Dutiful in the *Chiu T'ang-shu* give Chiang, but the *Hsüan-tsung* and *Su-tsung shih-lu* and the *T'ang-li* 唐曆 give Li, and I therefore accept the latter. Again there are two statements as to the day of Ch'in-ts'ou's murder, the 15th day (*i-hai* 己亥) of the 12th month, and the 22nd day (*ping-wu*) of the same month; I prefer the latter.' 河洛春秋云, 留同羅及曳落河百人, 彼鎮井陘, 遏山西之軍, 重任也, 豈百人所能守乎. 殷傳云, 七千人守土門, 此七千人又非履謙一夕所能縛也. 蓋祿山留精兵百人以為欽湊腹心爪牙, 其餘皆團練民兵脅從者耳. 故履謙得醉之以酒, 誅欽湊及百人而散其餘耳. 河洛春秋云, 酒中置毒, 按時履謙等與欽湊同飲, 豈得偏置毒於客酒中乎. 今不取. 舊傳及殷傳皆云欽湊姓蔣, 今從玄宗肅宗實錄唐曆姓李. ……十二月己亥, 果卿殺賊將李欽湊, ……按己亥十五日也. …(今從舊傳) 為二十二日丙午殺欽湊.

These seem to be on the whole reasonable considerations.

II

With the change in the war situation, the activities of the *yeh-lao-ho* appear in the sources from time to time. Under the 1st year of *Chih-te* 至德 (756) in the *T'ung-chien* (Ch. 218), 5th month (the reign name was changed to *Chih-te* in the 7th month of this year), it is related that Kuo Tzu-i 郭子儀 and Li Kuang-p'i 李光弼 fought with the leading general of An Lu-shan's forces, Shih Ssu-ming 史思明, in the region of Ch'ang-shan in Ho-pei, and that they were victorious in the neighbourhood of the river Sha 沙河, which flows between the prefectures of Hsin-lo 新樂 and Hsing-t'ang 行唐. And on this occasion, it says, 'Tsai Hsi-te 蔡希德 reached Lo-yang. An Lu-shan gave him 20,000 foot and horse and ordered him to march northward to come under Shih Ssu-ming's command. He also ordered Niu T'ing-chieh 牛廷玠 to raise more than 10,000 militiamen from Fan-yang and other counties and go to the help of Ssu-ming. There were over 50,000 men altogether, of whom one fifth were T'ung-lo and *yeh-lao-ho*.' 蔡希德至洛陽. 安祿山復使將步騎二萬人北就思明. 又使牛廷玠發范陽等郡兵萬餘人助思明. 合五萬餘人, 而同羅曳落河居五分之一. And so we may take it that the T'ung-lo and *yeh-lao-ho* in this force amounted to about 10,000. Having thus obtained reinforcements, Shih Ssu-ming fought a decisive battle with the government forces at Chia-shan 嘉山 which was to the east of the county town of Ch'ang-shan-chün 常山郡. The *Ho-lo ch'un-ch'iu*, as quoted in the *T'ung-chien k'ao-i*, says of the composition of the army: 'Ssu-ming's army was warlike, with a total of more than 50,000 men. Among them were 10,000 picked cavalry, all of them T'ung-lo and *yeh-lao-hu*, skilled in

mounted charges.' 思明軍既壯，共五萬餘人。其中精騎萬人，悉是同羅曳落河，精於馳突。 Even so, the outcome of the engagement was a severe defeat, and of the rebel forces '40,000 were decapitated and more than 1,000 became prisoners'; Ssu-ming himself was unseated from his horse and fled barefoot, with a broken spear as a stick, to Po-ling 博陵。 At this time An Lu-shan's army had advanced west from Lo-yang and was already in occupation of the T'ung-kuan 潼關 Pass, but the news that the government troops had secured Ch'ang-shan and cut their communications with Yü-yang 漁陽, their base, aroused consternation; An Lu-shan himself was said to have been in a state of keen anxiety and fury.

An Lu-shan's army was soon pressing on Ch'ang-an 長安; Hsüan-tsung fled to Szechwan, and in the 7th month the Crown Prince acceded to the throne at Ling-wu 靈武。 Under the 10th month of the 1st year of *Chih-te* the *T'ung-chien* (Ch. 219) records that Fang Kuan 房琯 submitted a memorial requesting that he himself should lead a force with a view to recovering the two capitals. The emperor acceded to this request and appointed him Military Governor for the Recovery of the Western Capital and simultaneously Commander of Infantry and Cavalry for the Defence of the P'u-kuan 蒲關 and T'ung-kuan Passes. Fang Kuan chose his own aides, taking the secretary Liu Chih 劉秩 as his Chief of Staff, and the Junior Secretary of the Board of Census Li I 李揖 as Commander of the Columns on the March. We are told that at this time Fang Kuan said: 'However numerous the *yeh-lao-ho* in the rebel army, they shall never be a match for our Liu Chih!' This remark of Fang Kuan's appears in his Life both in the *Chiu T'ang-shu* (Ch. 111) and the *Hsin T'ang-shu* (Ch. 139). This leads one to imagine that the *yeh-lao-ho* in An Lu-shan's army had gained widespread fame for their military prowess.

Though Fang Kuan's army failed to recover Ch'ang-an and was dispersed, in the 1st month of the following year, *Chih-te* 2, An Lu-shan was killed in Ch'ang-an by his son Ch'ing-hsü 慶緒 and others, and the time was ripe for a counter-attack by the government forces. In the 9th month the rebel forces were annihilated in the western outskirts of Ch'ang-an, and An Ch'ing-hsü 安慶緒 moved to Lo-yang; and at the end of the 9th month he abandoned this place too and fled to Ho-pei. In the *T'ung-chien* (Ch. 220) under *Chih-te* 2, 12th month, we find:

'With An Ch'ing-hsü's flight to the north, his great general Li Kuei-jen, Prince of Pei-p'ing 北平, and the élite *yeh-lao-ho*, T'ung-lo and Soghdian troops from the Six Provinces, several tens of thousands in all, returned pellmell toward Fan-yang. In many of the districts through which they passed, they plundered and captured so thoroughly that no-one and nothing was left intact. Shih Ssu-ming strongly reinforced the defenses against them. At the same time, he sent a messenger

to advise them on the Fan-yang frontier to become his followers. The *yeh-lao-ho* and the Soghdians from the Six Provinces all submitted. But the T'ung-lo did not obey. Shih Ssu-ming led his forces against them. The T'ung-lo were heavily defeated, and all their plunder was seized from them. The survivors fled home to their native place.' 安慶緒之北走也，其大將北平王李歸仁及精兵曳落河同羅六州胡數萬人皆潰歸范陽。所過俘掠，人物無遺，史思明厚爲之備。且遣使逆招之范陽境。曳落河六州胡皆降。同羅不從，思明從兵擊之，同羅大敗，悉奪其所掠。餘衆走歸其國。

The T'ung-lo, who were of Turkish origin, were thus destroyed. The *yeh-lao-ho* for their part together with the Hu foreigners of the Six Provinces of Ordos, of whom Soghdians are thought to have constituted a large part,⁽¹⁾ seem subsequently to have continued to be active under Shih Ssu-ming's banner, but it is hard to find sources from which to obtain information about them. In *Ch'ien-yüan* 乾元 2 (759), 3rd month, An Ch'ing-hsü was killed by Shih Ssu-ming, and in *Shang-yüan* 上元 2 (761), 3rd month, Shih Ssu-ming too was killed by his own son Chao-i 朝義. In the confusion that followed on this occasion we are told in the *An lu-shan shih-chi* and the *Chi-men chi-luan* (quoted in the *T'ung-chien k'ao-i*) that the Hu foreigners who were in Yen-ching met with a huge massacre. The former source says that Kao Chü-jen 高鞠仁, a general on the side of Shih Chao-i 史朝義 gave orders that there would be good rewards for those who killed the Hu foreigners. Thereupon the Kat-Hu 羯胡 foreigners were all slaughtered. Hu children were flung up and pierced through by the spears. A very great number of people were killed by mistake because they had high noses like Hu foreigners (Soghdians). 令城中殺胡者重賞。於是羯胡盡殲。小兒擲於空中，以戈承之。高鼻類胡而濫死者甚衆。 But no information is given specifically about the *yeh-lao-ho*. After the death of Shih Ssu-ming, Chao-i in his turn was pursued by one of his original subordinate generals, Li Huai-hsien 李懷仙, and committed suicide. The great turmoil that had lasted ten years was at last quieted, but with it the *yeh-lao-ho* too disappeared from history.

III

What then was the real nature of the *yeh-lao-ho* who first appear, as described above, as a *corps d'élite* in An Lu-shan's army? Since to my knowledge no study on this point has so far appeared, I would like to present my own view, very incomplete study though it is.

(1) Onogawa Hidemi 小野川秀實, 'Kakyoku Rokushū Ko no Enkaku' 河曲六州胡の沿革 (History of the Hu (Soghdians) of the Six Provinces of the Yellow River Bend), in *Tōa Jinbun Gakuhō* 東亞人文學報, Vol. 1, No. 4, 1942; Pulleyblank, E. G., 'A Soghdian Colony in Inner Mongolia, *T'oung Pao*, 1957, pp. 317-356.

A word *je-lo-ho* 熱洛河, which looks at first glance like *yeh-lao-ho*, appears in the *Hsin T'ang-shu* (Ch. 135), Life of Ko-shu Han 哥舒翰傳, in the *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan* 太平御覽 (Ch. 859) and elsewhere. This was on the occasion of Ko-shu Han's coming to Ch'ang-an in *T'ien-pao* 11. Hsüan-tsung, wishing to reconcile him with An Lu-shan, An Ssu-hsün 安思順 and others with whom he had previously been unfriendly, ordered Kao Li-shih 高力士 to act as intercessor and provide an evening banquet in the eastern suburb of Ch'ang-an. In particular what was known as *je-lo-ho* cooking of which Ko-shu Han was fond, was prepared; in the *An lu-shan shih-chi* we find: 'The official huntsman was ordered to supply a butchered deer and cook its entrails in its blood, and this was called *je-lo-ho*.' 使射生官供解鹿, 取血煮其腸謂之熱洛河. In the *Hsin T'ang-shu* (Ch. 135) we find: 'The official chef was commanded to kill a deer and take its blood, and use this to boil the entrails, which made *je-lo-ho*.' 詔尚食生, 擊鹿取血, 滷 (=煮) 腸爲熱洛河. And in the *T'ai-p'ing kuang-chi* 太平廣記 (Ch. 234) we find: 'Hsüan-tsung ordered the official huntsman to kill a young deer, take its blood and boil the entrails in it for eating. The emperor gave this dish to An Lu-shan and Ko-shu Han.' 玄宗命射生官射鮮鹿, 取血煎鹿腸食之. 謂之熱洛河. 賜安祿山及哥舒翰. And it is remarked that this text was taken from the *Lu-shih tsa-shuo* 盧氏雜說. Cooking which involves boiling a deer's entrails in its own blood is held by Louis Bazin and W. Eberhard to be pronounced **šilrāya*, and they maintain that it is the old form of the *širalṣa* of the *Secret History of the Mongols* studied by Paul Pelliot.⁽²⁾ The old pronunciation of *je-lo-ho* was *nziät-lāk-yä*, and Bazin took this to be a transcription of **šilrāya*; we will leave the correctness or otherwise of this view aside, and simply mention it here for reference. Again, according to Karlgren, the old pronunciation of *yeh* 曳 was *iäi*'.

So we come to the question of what in fact was the word for which *yeh-lao-ho* stood. On this point, as was said above, the *An Lu-shan shih-chi* has, 'Western barbarians call their vigorous youth *yeh-lao-ho*' 蕃人健兒爲曳落河, and the *T'ung-chien* has, '*yeh-lao-ho* is a Hu (Soghdian) word for daredevillads.' 胡言壯士也. At this point one is reminded of the fact that both An Lu-shan and Shih Ssu-ming are said to have been of Hu (Soghdian) blood; that there were a great many Hu people under their command; and men of Soghdiana origin formed the great majority of these Hu people.⁽³⁾ In the Account of the Western Regions in the *Hsin T'ang-shu*, under the Country of An 安國 (Bukhārā) we find, 'They raise courageous and vigorous men and make them *che-chieh* 柘羯. *Che-chieh* is like the word for warriors in Chinese' 募勇健者爲柘羯. 柘羯者猶中國言戰士也.;

(2) W. Eberhard, 'Remarks on *Šilrāya*, *Oriens*, Vol. 1, No. 2, Leiden, 1948, pp. 220-221.

(3) Wang Kuo-wei 王國維, 'Hsi-hu k'ao' 西胡考 (Study of the Western Hu), in the *Kuang-t'ang chi-lin* 觀堂集林, Ch. 13.

the *Ta-T'ang Hsi-yü-chi* 大唐西域記 (Ch. 1), under the Country of Sa-mo-chien 罽靺鞨建國 (Samarqand), has, 'Their infantry and cavalry are powerful. Many of them are *che-chieh*. The *che-chieh* are men of martial spirit, who look on death as going home and fight so bravely that no one dares to stand before them.' 兵馬強盛，多是赭羯，赭羯之人，其性勇烈，視死如歸，戰無前敵。 These passages show that the *che-chieh* (柘羯 or 赭羯) were warriors of contemporary Soghdiana. The *Ts'e-fu yüan-kuei* 冊府元龜 (Ch. 971), however, states that in *K'ai-yüan* 開元 27 (739), Ssu Chin-t'i 斯謹提, king of the country of Shih 史國 (Kish=Shahr-i-Sabz), also in Soghdiana, sent an ambassador to Ch'ang-an, while in Chapter 964 of the same work what is clearly the same man is called King Ssu Chin-t'i 斯謹提 of Chih-chieh 柘羯. In the *Che-chih* 柘枝 poem by Hsüeh Neng 薛能 in the *Yüeh-fu shih-chi* 樂府詩集 (Ch. 56), there appears the line, 'The expeditionary forces vanquish the *chih-chieh* 柘羯' 縣軍征柘羯, while in Tu Fu's 杜甫 'Twenty rhymes rejoicing to hear that the government troops have already confronted the rebels' 喜聞官軍已臨賊寇二十韻, there is, 'The *che-chieh* 柘羯 have crossed the river at Lin-t'ao 臨洮' 柘羯渡臨洮, and it seems that there are quite a number of other instances of the usage.

Further, it does seem that there were also picked troops called *che-chieh* (or *chih-chieh*) in the rebel forces of An Lu-shan and Shih Ssu-ming; in an account of the time when An Lu-shan's army swept on Lo-yang in the 12th month of *T'ien-pao* 14, the *Chiu T'ang-shu* (Ch. 104), in the Life of Feng Ch'ang-ch'ing 封常清, has, 'In the 12th month, An Lu-shan crossed the Yellow River and occupied Ch'en-liu 陳留... His vanguard reached K'uei-yüan 葵園. Feng Ch'ang-ch'ing sent veteran cavalry into a counter-engagement with the *chih-chieh*, and killed several hundred rebels... he submitted a report saying... yesterday we fought at close quarters with the *chieh-hu* 羯胡 (Soghdian *che-chieh*).' 十二月，祿山渡河陷陳留……先鋒至葵園。(封)常清使驍騎與柘羯逆戰，殺賊數百人……上表曰……昨日者與羯胡接戰……。 Again in the Life of Chang Hsün 張巡傳 in the *Hsin T'ang-shu* (Ch. 192), there is an account of how, in *Chih-te* 2 of Su-tsung, An Ch'ing-hsü ordered his general Yin Tzu-ch'i 尹子琦 to select good soldiers from among the T'ung-lo, T'u-chüeh 突厥 and Hsi 奚, and invest Sui-yang-ch'eng 睢陽城, which was being defended by Chang Hsün and others, and it says, '...[in the rebel army] there was a great chief, who wore armour and led a thousand *chih-chieh* cavalry. He mounted the walls, and waving his banner he challenged Chang Hsün (to close combat).' ……(賊軍中)有大酋，被甲引柘羯千騎，磨幟乘城招巡。Ch'en Yin-k'o 陳寅恪, in his *T'ang-tai cheng-chih-shih shu-lun kao* 唐代政治史述論稿 (Discussions of the Political History of the T'ang Period), explains in detail that there were a great many *che-chieh* or *chieh-hu* 羯胡 in An Lu-shan's party, and he says, 'I consider that An Lu-shan's race is always described, both in contemporary writings and in

specialised historical documents about his affairs, as *Che-chieh* or *Chieh-hu*.⁽⁴⁾ According to Ch'en's arguments, it would seem that An Lu-shan himself was a *Che-chieh* (or *Chieh-hu*).

There are numerous theories as to the origin of the word *che-chieh* (柘羯 or 赭羯 or 拓羯). Influential theories have been offered by J. Marquart, E. Chavannes, Thomas Watters, Shiratori Kurakichi 白鳥庫吉, Fujita Toyohachi 藤田豊八, and Hsiang Ta 向達 etc. Marquart and Chavannes' theory was that it was a phonetic transcription of *chākar*, which is a Persian word meaning slave or servant.⁽⁵⁾ Watters' theory takes the word to have come from the town of Chalak north-west of Samarkand.⁽⁶⁾ Shiratori would give the word the same derivation as the *chien* 煎 in *chien-mi* 煎靡 in the Ta-yüan 大宛 language, and would regard it as the transcription of a word closely related to *sugus* in the Uigur language and *šag* in the Qusnezq language, and, from their meaning of warfare, battle, coming to be the name of a warrior; he would regard this as a Turkish word.⁽⁷⁾ Fujita held that it was probably the Sacae (Saka) race like Shih-chia 釋迦 and Se 塞.⁽⁸⁾ Finally, Hsiang Ta put forward the view that *Chih-chieh* 拓羯 and *Che-chieh* 柘枝 were the same, and that they indicated no less than the Persian Chāch, that is, the Arabs' Shāsh, the country of Shih 石國 (the present Tashkent) which appears in Chinese history.⁽⁹⁾

I am far from having the knowledge to evaluate one by one the theories of these eminent scholars, but if I may be allowed to put forward a personal view, I am inclined to think that the first theory to appear, that of J. Marquart may well be satisfactory. But on this point E. Chavannes said that, though the word was the Persian for *servus*, or *famulus*, it had the meaning of warrior or lifeguard in Soghdiana,⁽¹⁰⁾ and I am doubtful about this. It is my own view that the word was still used in Central Asia too in its original sense.

One ground for considering that *che-chieh* corresponds to the Iranian word *chākar* is as follows: In the passages of the histories of Al-Narshakhi

(4) *T'ang-tai cheng-chih-shih shu-lun kao* 唐代政治史述論稿 (Discussions of the Political History of the T'ang Period), 1956, Pe-ching, p. 29.

(5) E. Chavannes, *Documents sur les Tou-Kiue Occidentaux*, St. Pétersbourg, 1903, p. 63.

(6) T. Watters, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, Vol. I, London, 1904, p. 63.

(7) Shiratori Kurakichi 白鳥庫吉, 'Kōkyō Kō' 康居考 (Study of K'ang-chū), *Seiki-shijō no Shinkenkyū* 西域史上的新研究, Vol. 1, 1909 (=Iwanami ed., *Seikishi Kenkyū*, Vol. 1, pp. 98-99).

(8) Fujita Toyohachi 藤田豊八, 'Shaka to Sai to Shakatsu to Kyūgun' 釋迦と塞と赭羯と紮軍, in *Tōzai Kōshōshi no Kenkyū* 東西交渉史の研究, *Seiki-hen* 西域篇, 1932 pp. 120 et seqq.

(9) Hsiang Ta 向達, *T'ang-tai Ch'ang-an yü hsi-yüeh wen-ming* 唐代長安與西域文明 (Ch'ang-an in the T'ang Period and the Culture of the Western Regions), 1928. (Peking 1957 edition, p. 102 and elsewhere.)

(10) Chavannes, *Documents*, p. 63.

and aṭ-Ṭabari which give information about contemporary Soghdiana there are quite a large number of cases of use of this word or of the word *shākar* (*shākīr*), which may be regarded as its Arabicized form; also, since the mediaeval pronunciation of *che-chieh* was close to *tšia-kiat*, I think that to regard it as a phonetic rendering of *chākar* is much more reasonable than any of the other theories.

May we not regard the *che-chieh* who were well known in Soghdiana in the T'ang period, and who seem, with the eastward movement of many Soghdians, to have been active in the armies of An Lu-shan and Shih Ssu-ming at the time of their rebellion, to have been originally private soldiers of powerful men with the status of slaves? Al-Narshakhi's *History of Bukhārā* was originally written in Arabic and presented to the Sāmānīd amīr in about 943, but the present version was translated into Persian in about 1128, and was subsequently abbreviated and supplemented. If we compare the Persian edition published in Paris by Charles Schefer and the English translation published in the United States of America by Richard N. Frye,⁽¹¹⁾ we find that *chākar* is translated 'servant'.⁽¹²⁾ I find this suitable, but I think rather that it might also well be translated 'slave'. Anyway there would seem to be no necessity to follow the view of Chavannes, and take it as 'warrior'.

In aṭ-Ṭabari's chronicle, in the article with title 'The account of the killing of Mūsā b. 'Abd Allah b. Khāzim al-Salmī at Tirmidh', the word *shākar* is used particularly often. The killing of Mūsā occurred in about 704, which corresponds to *Ssu-sheng* 嗣聖 21 of the Emperor Chung-tsung's 中宗 reign and that was just before the conquest of Soghdiana by Qutaiba b. Muslim. Barthold reads the word as *shākīr* and makes the Persian form *chākīr*, but would it not be correct to read *shākar* and *chākar*? Barthold put forward the view: '... the *shākīrs* or *chākīrs* (literally 'servants'), but from al-Narshakhi's account of the court Queen of Bukhārā it is evident that this guard was only in the nature of a guard of honour, and was formed by the youthful members of the aristocracy, who fulfilled this obligation by turns at the court of their rulers, like the sons of European knights at the court of their kings and dukes.'⁽¹⁴⁾ But it is not finally clear whether or not all *chākars* in Soghdiana were really of the youthful members of the aristocracy. Again, Barthold quotes aṭ-Ṭabari's account of the Arab knight

(11) *Description topographique et historique de Boukhara*, par M. Nerchakhy, texte Persan publié par C. Schefer, Paris, 1892; R. N. Frye, *The History of Bukhara*, translated from a Persian abridgment of the Arabic original by Narshakhi, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1954.

(12) For example, such passages as p. 37 of the original, p. 39 of the translation, 'the queen of Bukhara fell in love with a slave of her husband.'

(13) W. Barthold, *Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion*, London, 1928, p. 180.

(14) *Ibid.*, p. 180.

Thābit, a supporter of Mūsā who held Tirmidh as his headquarters; Thābit is recorded to have been surrounded with *shākirs* (bodyguards) and Barthold comments: '(shākirs) evidently from amongst the natives, as these *shākirs* are mentioned in opposition to the Arabs.'⁽¹⁵⁾

In my opinion, *chākar* (*che-chieh*) has much the same meaning as the Arabic words *ghulām* or *mamlūk* which mean slaves or servants, and they were also frequently used as private troops. There is also the word *bandah* in Persian and *raqīq* (plural *ariqqā'* and *riqāq*) in Arabic. On the question of slave troops in the Islamic world and the use of the words mentioned above, interesting articles have been published by Ara Matsuo 荒松雄, Fujimoto Katsuji 藤本勝次 and Satō Keishirō 佐藤圭四郎.⁽¹⁶⁾ There is no space here to quote and discuss each example of the use of *chākar* as it appears in the books of aṭ-Ṭabari and al-Narshakhī, so I will conclude by recording my very rash opinion. The *yeh-lao-ho* in the armies of An Lu-shan and Shih Ssu-ming seem to have been of the same nature and the word to have had the same meaning as *che-chieh* (*chih-chieh*), and I suppose that it may well have been a corruption of *ariqqā'*, the plural form of the Arabic word *raqīq*. Of course, it would be necessary to adduce examples and examine them closely in order to give firm support to this theory, but in this article I have simply tried to give a glimpse of my personal view. It is thoroughly shameful on my part, yet I think that, since the period of An Lu-shan and Shih Ssu-ming's rebellion was more than a century later than the beginning of Arab incursions into Soghdiana, it is surely far from unreasonable to suppose that some Arabic words would have been transmitted eastwards across that region.

(15) *Ibid.*, p. 183.

(16) Ara Matsuo 荒松雄, 'Dorei-ōchō no Kunshu-ken to Kizoku Seiryoku' 奴隸王朝の君主權と貴族勢力 (Monarchical Authority and Aristocratic Power in the Slave Dynasty), in *Tōyō Bunka Kenkyū-jo Kiyō* 東洋文化研究所紀要, Vol. 11, 1956 and 'Dorei-ōchō Zenki ni okeru Dorei Kizoku ni tsuite' 奴隸王朝前期における奴隸貴族について (On the Slave Aristocracy in the Early Period of the Slave Dynasty), in *Tōyō Gakuhō* 東洋學報, Vol. 40, No. 4, 1958; Fujimoto Katsuji 藤本勝次, 'Karifu Muutashimu to Toruko Dorei-hei' カリフ・ムウタシムとトルコ奴隸兵 (The Caliph Mu'taṣim and the Turkish Slave Soldiers), in *Ishihama Sensei Koki Kinen Tōyō-gaku Ronsō* 石濱先生古稀記念東洋學論叢, 1958; Satō Keishirō 佐藤圭四郎, 'Sāmān-chō Jidai no Nuboku ʾulām ni tsuite' サーマーン朝時代の奴隸 ʾulām について (On the ʾulām Slaves in the Time of the Samanid Dynasty), in *Tōyō-shi Kenkyū* 東洋史研究, Vol. 18, No. 1, 1959.