

# On Pei-t'ing 北庭 (Bišbaliq) and K'o-han Fu-t'u-ch'êng 可汗浮圖城

By Akira Shimazaki

The complete conquest by the T'ang 唐 of the Kingdom of Kao-ch'ang 高昌 situated in the Turfan Basin in the year 640 was succeeded by putting it under the Chinese direct command and the land was named Hsi-chou 西州 or the Hsi Prefecture. At the same time, T'ing-chou 庭州, the T'ing Prefecture, was established at the northern foot of the T'ien-shan 天山 Range to the north of the Turfan Basin.

[This is an abridgement of article entitled *Kagan Futojô kô* 可汗浮圖城考 published in *Tôkyô Gakuhô*, Vol. 46, 1963, pp. 151-185, 323-357, by the late Professor Akira Shimazaki (1914. IX. 24-1974. III. 3). When Professor Shimazaki died from cancer, two draughts were found unpublished. One is this abridgement and the other is a catalogue of Chinese manuscripts collected by A. Grünweder and A. von Le Coq from archaeological sites in the Turfan Basin and now preserved in the Academy of Democratic Republic of Germany in Berlin. The abridgement seems to have been prepared for the publication in some learned journal not in Japan but in Europe probably by someone under the supervision of the author sometime after his return from Europe in March, 1966, when Shimazaki was busily engaged in administrative works of the Chûô Daigaku University to which he belonged successively as Dean of the Department of Humanities, Chairman of the Committee of Postgraduate Course, Member of the Central Committee and finally President of the University. This is easily guessed from the abridgement itself which is always too brief to let the reader understand well the process of his establishing a new theory that T'ing-chou 庭州, where the administrative centre of Pei-t'ing tu-hu-fu 北庭都護府 was settled in 702, was located at the north of what is now Jimsa from 640, when it was conquered by the T'ang 唐 without any removal and that K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng was situated not at Pa-no-p'a Valley as has hitherto been identified but at what is now Guchen. The subject is very important for the understanding of history of the region to the north of T'ien-shan Mountain Range under the T'ang and Sung 宋, which is studied in detail and in an undeniable way.

Professor Shimazaki was specially interested in the history of the Turfan Basin before its occupation by the Uighurs in the latter half of the 9th century. He published many articles and commentaries concerning it and, among others, his study on K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng is the best article in which he fully displayed his scholarship. In case the reader come across any point of which he wants to know much better, he may be suggested to refer to the original article in Japanese.

The editor who well knows the eminence of the late Professor Shimazaki as man and scholar and deeply regrets his passing away which is a great loss to the scholarly world decided to publish here in his memory this abridgement in spite of its insufficiency.

The additions between brackets [ ] were made by the editor for the better understanding of the abridgement. Kazuo Enoki]

In the T'ang period, China was divided into so many prefectures (*chou*) and each of them was subdivided into sub-prefectures (*hsien* 縣)<sup>(1)</sup>. The capital of a prefecture with its headquarters was located in a town belonging to one of its sub-prefectures. The administrative office of the sub-prefecture was also established there. In case of Hsi-chou, which consisted of five sub-prefectures, the capital was placed in the town Qara-khoja or Kao-ch'ang-hsien 高昌縣. On the other hand, T'ing-chou had two sub-prefectures at the beginning of its establishment. These were Chin-man-hsien 金滿縣 and P'u-lei-hsien 蒲類縣. The headquarters of T'ing-chou were established in the capital of Chin-man-hsien. Later, to these two another sub-prefecture, Lun-t'ai-hsien 輪臺縣, was added. Subsequently, Pei-t'ing tu-hu-fu 北庭都護府 or the Headquarters of the Protectorate of Pei-t'ing was established in 720 at the town of Chin-man-hsien, the capital of T'ing-chou, as the base of military operations for Zungaria.<sup>(2)</sup>

According to a note on Chin-man-hsien of *Chiu T'ang-shu* 舊唐書, Bk. 40 (Geography), there was the court of Kū-shih Hou-wang 車師後王 or 'the Posterior Kingdom of Kū-shih' in the Later Han 漢 period there and that this barbarians' court originally consisted of five towns, whence came its popular designation Wu-ch'êng-chih-ti 五城之地, the 'Territory of Five Towns'. No doubt, this Chinese designation is identical with the Turkish bišbalīq, meaning 'five towns', which first appears in the inscription of Bilgä qaγan in 735.<sup>(3)</sup> I suppose that the Chinese Wu-ch'êng is the translation of bišbalīq, which must have been derived from the fact that the territory consisted of five towns. I regret, however, that I cannot as yet definitely identify what were the then five towns.<sup>(4)</sup>

(1) Though the number of *chou* and *hsien* often changed during the T'ang, there were always more than 300 *chou* and over 1500 *hsien* in inland China in this period. China was first divided into 10 provinces (*tao* 道) (in 627), and then into 15 (in 733). During this period the provinces (*tao*) were administrative units convenient for periodical inspection of the Central Government and had no permanent governors.

(2) See Hisao Matsuda 松田壽男, *Kodai Tenzan no Rekishi-Chirigakuteki Kenkyū* 古代天山の歴史地理學的研究 (*The Geo-Historical Studies on the Ancient T'ien-shan Region*), Part III, Chap. 3: *Tō no Teishū no Ryōken o ronzu* 唐の庭州の領縣を論ず (*The Transition of Sub-Prefectures Administered by the T'ing Prefecture in the T'ang Period*), 1st ed., Tokyo, 1956, pp. 296-299, 307-309.

(3) See V. Thomsen: *Inscriptions de l'Orkhon déchiffrées*, Helsingfors, 1896, p. 124.

(4) Matsuda (*op. cit.*, pp. 314-315) proposes that the five towns were K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng 可汗浮圖城, Mu-ho-ch'êng 莫賀城, Chin-ling-ch'êng 金嶺城, Hsi-yen-ch'êng 西延城 and Chin-man-ch'êng 金滿城. [It is stated in *Chiu T'ang-shu*, Bk. 40, under Hsi-chou 西州, that there were five towns at the time of Later Han in the territory of the Posterior Kingdom of Kū-shih which was the origin of the name of Five Towns (西州...後漢車師後王庭, 胡故庭有五城. 始號五城之地). This means that, at the time of T'ang, there were not necessarily five towns which constituted the Five Towns and that Five Towns was used as a name of the territory. There are so many towns called by the name of "Five Towns" both in China (see Sadao Aoyama 青山定雄, *Shina Rekidai*

Pei-t'ing tu-hu-fu had been generally called just Pei-t'ing, while the name Bišbaliq had also been applied to the town of Pei-t'ing by the natives.

As to the location of Pei-t'ing (Bišbaliq), several identifications have hitherto been made.<sup>(6)</sup> What is generally accepted is one which puts it at a site in the north of what is now Jimsa. This is based on the view of Hsü Sung 徐松 (1781-1848), who states that Pei-t'ing was situated at a *p'o-ch'êng* 破城, 'ruined town', near Hu-p'u-tzū 護堡子 about 20 *li* direct north to Jimsa.<sup>(6)</sup> This was accepted by Ed. Chavannes<sup>(7)</sup> and the *p'o-ch'êng* was also recognized as the site of Pei-t'ing by A. Stein who visited and surveyed the site in 1914.<sup>(8)</sup>

In Japan, in 1931 Prof. Hisao Matsuda 松田壽男 confirmed Hsü Sung's opinion by producing evidences from Chinese sources,<sup>(9)</sup> while in 1955 the late Prof. Takeo Abe 安部健夫 published a different opinion which identifies Bišbaliq

*Chimei Yóran* 支那歷代地名要覽, Reprinted ed., Tokyo, 1965, p. 206; Yoshirō Saeki 佐伯好郎, *Keikyō no Kenkyū* 景教の研究, Tokyo, 1935, pp. 525-26, 582, 586-87, and *Nestorian Documents and Relics in China*, Tokyo, 1951, see Index under Wu-chün 五郡) and in Central Asia (Penjkent or Pyanjkent near Samarkand). In Tibetan records, of which one concerns the history of Khotan, there appears Gu-zan which Thomas identifies with Guchen. See W. W. Rockhill, *The Life of the Buddha*, London, 1884, p. 240 and F. W. Thomas, *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, 1, London, 1935, pp. 119, 254, 261-2, etc., cf. Index under Gu-zan. Though R. E. Emmerick doubts the identification of Thomas on the basis of R. Stein's opinion (*Tibetan texts concerning Khotan*, London, 1967, p. 94), it is not unlikely that both Gu-zan and Guchen are derived from Wu-ch'êng or Five Towns. The first appearance of designation of Five Towns for the later Bišbaliq is in *Hudūd al-'Ālam*, written in 982 A.D., which states Panjikath (Five Towns probably in Sogdian) was the name of summer residence of Toghuzghuz kings (see Minorsky's translation and commentary, pp. 94 etc.). *Hudūd al-'Ālam* also records a town on the River Chu named M. Ijkat (p. 98) which is probably a corruption of Manjkat i.e. Banjkat or Panjkat. Originally, there must have been five towns, but later it became an appellation of a single town.]

(5) Besides the identification with Jimsa, which I am criticizing in this article, four other identifications have been proposed so far, but none of them seems to be acceptable:

(1) Urumchi by J. Klaproth, *Mémoires relatifs à l'Asie*, Tom. 2., Paris, 1826, pp. 355-363.

(2) Ch'i-t'ai 奇臺 by G. E. Grum-Grjimaïlo, *Opisanié puteshestviya v zapadnyi Kitai*, Tom. 1, S.-Peterburg, 1896, s. 225.

(3) Yen-ch'i 焉耆 or Qara-shaha by Shao Yüan-p'ing 邵遠平, *Hsü-hung-chien-lu* 續弘簡錄 (Yüan-shih lei-pien 元史類篇), Bk. 42, 1699.

(4) Fu-k'ang 阜康 by Yü Hao 俞浩, *Hsi-yü K'ao-ku-lu* 西域考古錄, Bk. 8, 1847.

(6) *Hsi-yü shui-tao-chi* 西域水道記, Bk. 3, under Barkölnor 巴爾庫勒淖爾, and *Han-shu hsi-yü-chuan pu-chu* 漢書西域傳補注, Bk. 2, under Kü-shih Hou-wang 車師後王.

(7) Ed. Chavannes: *Documents sur les Tou-kiue [Turcs] occidentaux*, St.-Petersbourg, 1903, pp. 11-12; Do.: *Les pays d'occident d'après le Wei-lïo*, T'oung Pao, Sér. II, Tom. 6, 1905, p. 558, n. 1.

(8) A. Stein: *Innermost Asia*, Vol. 2, Oxford, 1928, pp. 560 ff.

(9) H. Matsuda: *Tenzan Hokuro ni okeru Tō no Shūken ni tsuite* 天山北路における唐の州縣について (On the Prefectures and Sub-prefectures in T'ien-shan Pei-lu 天山北路 [the Northern Route of the T'ien-shan] in the T'ang Period, *Shigaku-Zasshi* 史學雜誌, Vol. 42, Nos. 6, 8, 1931. This article was included in his splendid publication in 1956, quoted above (note 2), under the title of *Tō no Teishū no Ryōken o ronzu*.

with Guchen (Ku-ch'êng 古城).<sup>(10)</sup> The writer of the present article would like to settle the dispute.

In records of T'ang and Sung 宋 periods, there are three itineraries, leading from Chiao-ho 交河 or the Yâr-khoto site [Kona Shahr or 'Old Town'] in the Turfan Basin, to the capital of the T'ing Prefecture 庭州 or the town of Pei-t'ing 北庭, traversing the T'ien-shan 天山 Mountain Range. The first one is called T'a-ti-tao 他地道 described in *Hsi-chou t'u-ching* 西州圖經 of the T'ang period, which is one of the manuscripts discovered in Tun-huang 敦煌.<sup>(11)</sup> The second one is an itinerary recorded in *Hsin T'ang-shu* 新唐書, Bk. 40, under Chiao-ho-hsien 交河縣 of Hsi-chou 西州.<sup>(12)</sup> These two passed through the same place called Liu-ku 柳谷 or the Valley of Willows. The third one is the route taken by Wang Yen-tê 王延德, who visited Pei-t'ing to see A-ssü-lan-han 阿斯蘭漢 or \*Arslan Qân, Uighur ruler of Kao-ch'ang 高昌, in 981-984. Wang Yen-tê's itinerary is quoted in [*Hui-chu-ch'ien-lu* 揮麈前錄, Bk. 4, and] *Sung-shih* 宋史, Bk. 490.<sup>(13)</sup> Though no Liu-ku appears in it, Wang Yen-tê passed over Chin-ling 金嶺, the Gold Peak, which corresponds to Chin-sha-ling 金沙嶺,<sup>(14)</sup> the Gold Sand Peak, of *Hsin T'ang-shu*. This means that it was the same route as the first two in the T'ang period. In this way, these three itineraries indicate the same route, which was followed by A. Stein in 1914 when he went from the north side of the T'ien-shan by way of Pa-no-p'a Pass down to the Turfan Basin.<sup>(15)</sup>

On the other hand, in *Hsin T'ang-shu*, Bk. 40, under I-chou 伊州, there is a passage of a route which leads from Na-chih-hsien 納職縣 (Lapchuk of today)<sup>(16)</sup> of I-chou 伊州, the capital of which was located in what is now the town of Hami, to the capital of the Protectorate of Pei-t'ing.<sup>(17)</sup> This route

(10) Takeo Abe: *Nishi Ugurukokushi no Kenkyû* 西ウイグル國史の研究 (*A Study on the History of the Western Uighurs*), Kyoto, 1955.

(11) 右道出交河縣界, 至西北向柳谷。通庭州四百五十里, 足水草, 唯通人馬。 (Fonds Pelliot Chinois (Touen-houang), No. 2009, Bibliothèque National.) [*Catalogue des manuscrits chinois de Touen-houang*, 1. Paris, 1970, p. 5]. See facsimile reproduction and notes by Lo Chen-yü 羅振玉 in *Ming-sha shih-shih i-shu* 鳴沙石室遺書 [and reproduction in *Tun-huang shih-shih i-shu* 敦煌石室遺書 and *Shih-shih-pi-pao* 石室秘寶].

(12) 自縣北八十里, 有龍泉館。又北入谷百三十里, 經柳谷, 渡金沙嶺, 百六十里, 經石會漢戍。至北庭都護府城。

(13) See the text collated by Wang Kuo-wei 王國維: *Wang Yen-tê Shih-Kao-ch'ang-chi Hsiao-lu* 王延德使高昌記校錄. [It reads as follows: 歷交河州, 凡六日至金嶺口。寶貨所出, 又兩日至漢家(冢)砦, 又五日上金嶺, 過嶺, 即多雨雪, 嶺上有龍堂, 刻石記云, 小雪山也。嶺上有積雪, 行人皆服毛罽, 度嶺至北庭.]

(14) In the opinion of the late Professor Abe, the name of Jimsa is certainly a derivation of Chin-sha(-ling). (See T. Abe: *op. cit.*, p. 336).

(15) A Stein: *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, pp. 560 ff. [Now, see Sven A. Hedin, *Central Asia Atlas, the Sino-Swedish Expedition*, Publ. 47, 1, 1, K45-XIa.]

(16) P. Pelliot: Le 'Cha theou tou fou t'ou king' et la colonie Sogdienne de la région du Lob nor, *Journal Asiatique*, Sér. XI, Tom. 7, 1916, jan.-fév., pp. 117 ff. See also A. Stein: *Serindia*, Vol. 3, Oxford, 1921, pp. 1155-1158, [and *Innermost Asia*, p. 917.]

(17) 別自羅護守捉西北, 上乏驢嶺百二十里, 至赤谷, 又出谷口, 經長泉・龍泉, 百八十里, 有獨山守捉, 又經蒲類百六十里, 至北庭都護府。

ran in a north-westerly direction at first and, after crossing the Mts. T'ien-shan, led directly to the west along the northern foot of the same mountain. The text runs as follows: 納職…自縣西, 經獨泉·東華·西華·駝泉, 渡茨其水, 過神泉, 三百九十里, 有羅護守捉, 又西南經達匪草堆, 百九十里, 至赤亭守捉, 與伊西路合。別自羅護守捉西北, 上乏驢嶺, 百二十里, 至赤谷, 又出谷口, 經長泉·龍泉, 百八十里, 有獨山守捉, 又經蒲類, 百六十里, 至北庭都護府。 This route indicates one which starts from Hami and reaches the T'ing Prefecture via Lo-hu 羅護 or Na-k'u 納庫 or Na-hu 納呼 under the Ch'ing 清, which is situated between Ch'i-chüeh-ching 七角井 and Chik Tam, from which the road goes north-westwards as far as Kao-chüan Dawān 高泉達坂 and, passing this mountain pass, goes westwards along the northern foot of the T'ien-shan mountains to get to the T'ing Prefecture. The most important point of this passage is the calculation of distance from Tu-shan shou-cho 獨山守捉 or the Garrison at Tu-shan to P'u-lei 蒲類 and Pei-t'ing tu-hu-fu 北庭都護府 or the T'ing Prefecture. Tao Pao-lien 陶保廉 and Prof. Matsuda take the distance between P'u-lei and Pei-t'ing tu-hu-fu as 160 *li*,<sup>(18)</sup> while other scholars including the writer of the present article<sup>(19)</sup> are of the opinion that 160 *li* should be taken as the distance between T'u-shan shou-cho and Pei-t'ing tu-hu-fu. Actually, this is the key point to fix the location of P'u-lei(-hsien) 蒲類縣 which should have been at a place 80 *li* to the east of the T'ing Prefecture, as will be explained in a moment.

Prof. H. Matsuda states that, when the T'ing Prefecture was established in 640, P'u-lei-hsien was established at the Pei-t'ing site, while Chin-man-hsien 金滿縣, which became the capital of this prefecture, was located in K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng which was situated at the Pa-no-p'a Valley, about 20 *li* south of the Pei-t'ing site, and later when Pei-t'ing tu-hu-fu was reestablished in this region, the capital of the T'ing Prefecture was removed to the town of P'u-lei-hsien 蒲類縣 which changed its name into Chin-man-hsien, and, at the same time, P'u-lei-hsien was removed to what is now Mu-lei-ho 木壘河, 160 *li* east to the former place.<sup>(20)</sup> According to this statement, there happened to take place a

(18) Tao Pao-lien, *Hsin-mao shih-hsing-chi* 辛卯待行記, Bk. 6: Matsuda, *op. cit.*, pp. 301-302.

(19) Ch'in Chung-mien 岑仲勉, *Hsi-t'u-chüeh shih-liao pu-chüeh chi k'ao-chêng* 西突厥史料補厥及考證, Peking, 1958, p. 165.

(20) H. Matsuda: *The Geo-Historical Studies*, pp. 292 ff. He also justified his view by considering that Mu-lei (-ho) is derived from P'u-lei (*loc. cit.*, p. 302) (*ho* originally means 'river', but here Mu-lei-ho is not a river but a place-name). I agree with him that Mu-lei is a transformation of P'u-lei. The name of P'u-lei-hai 蒲類海 (P'u-lei Sea) (Barköl-nor of today) situated in the eastern part of the northern foot of the T'ien-shan Mountain Range already appears in *Han-shu* 漢書 and it is the origin of the name P'u-lei-hsien. However, a P'u-lei-chên 蒲類鎮 (P'u-lei Quarters) located to the west of the P'u-lei-hsien is recorded in *Yüan-ho chün-hsien t'u-chih* 元和郡縣圖志, Bk. 40, under T'ing-chou 庭州. In this way, in this region in the T'ang period there were at least two places bearing the name derived from P'u-lei-hai and it does not necessarily mean that the town of P'u-lei-hsien was located in the present Mu-lei-ho [which is today the seat of Mu-lei Kazak autonomous county. Cf. Sven Hedin, *Central Asia Atlas, Memoir on Maps, Sino-Swedish Expedition*, Publ. 49, 1, 3, p. 58].

very complicated removal of sub-prefectures administered by the T'ing Prefecture. Prof. Matsuda located the former town of P'u-lei-hsien at the Pei-t'ing site on the basis of the statement of *Yüan-ho chün-hsien t'u-chih* 元和郡縣圖志, Bk. 40, which runs as follows: "The town of P'u-lei-hsien is situated 18 *li* to the north of the capital of the Prefecture (*i.e.*, Chin-man-hsien)." And he located the second town of P'u-lei-hsien at what is now Mu-lei-ho on the basis of the statement of the above-mentioned *Hsin T'ang-shu* to the effect that one reaches Pei-t'ing tu-hu-fu by going 160 *li* from P'u-lei-hsien.<sup>(21)</sup> Actually, in the region at the northern foot of Mts. T'ien-shan to the east of the present Jimsa there are Guchen which lies 80–90 *li* east of Jimsa (or Jimasa, or Fu-yüan-hsien 孚遠縣), Ch'i-t'ai 奇臺 90 *li* to the east of Guchen, and Mu-lei-ho 90 *li* to the east of Ch'i-t'ai.<sup>(22)</sup> Therefore, the distance of 160 *li* from the ruined town or *p'o-ch'êng* is absolutely unsuitable for the distance between Guchen and Mu-lei-ho, which should have been 260 *li* or so.<sup>(23)</sup> Moreover, the 160 *li* given by *Hsin T'ang-shu* should be taken not as the distance between Pei-t'ing and the Garrison of Tu-shan 獨山, but as the distance between Pei-t'ing and P'u-lei-hsien. The statement of the *Yüan-ho chün-hsien-chih* which places P'u-lei-hsien at 18 (一十八) *li* north of the capital of the T'ing Prefecture should be read as 80 (八十) *li* east of the capital of the Prefecture as related in *T'ai-p'ing huan-yü-chi* 太平寰宇記, Bk. 156.<sup>(24)</sup> So, P'u-lei-hsien should be located at a distance of 80 *li* to the east of the capital of the T'ing Prefecture. This means that P'u-lei-hsien was situated at what is now Guchen and that, in this connection, the Garrison of Tu-shan should have been situated at the present Ch'i-t'ai or thereabouts.

On the other hand, Prof. T. Abe is of the opinion that P'u-lei-hsien was

(21) H. Matsuda: *op. cit.*, pp. 301–302. Cf. the text quoted in (17).

(22) According to the records of the Ch'ing 清 and the Republic of China, the distance between Jimsa and Guchen is given generally as 90 *li* and sometimes as 60 *li* or 70 *li*, but the distance between Guchen and Ch'i-t'ai and between Ch'i-t'ai and Mu-lei-ho is unexceptionally 90 *li* respectively.

(23) There are differences on the length of one Chinese *li* at different periods, but distances recorded in Chinese itineraries were generally measured on the basis of making a day's journey equal to 100 *li*, and this basis is the same from ancient times to the present. See H. Yule: *Notes on Hwen T'sang's Accounts of the Principalities of Tokharistan*, JRAS, N.S. VI. 4, 1872, p. 92; Jitsuzô Kuwabara: *Tôzai Kôtsûshi Ronsô* 東西交通史論叢 (*Studies on the History of Intercourse between the East and the West*), Kyoto, 1933, pp. 89–91. [However, according to *Liu-tien* 六典, Bk. 3, Hu-pu 戶部, during the period of T'ang, the distance covered by one day's journey by land was fixed to be calculated as 70 *li* on horse back, as 50 *li* either on foot or on the back of mule, and as 30 *li* on waggon.]

(24) The Chinese characters of 18 *li* in the *Yüan-ho chün-hsien-t'u-chih* are written as *i* (one)-*shih* (ten)-*pa* (eight)-*li* 一十八里, and the first *i* is the surplus character often fixed at the beginning to express the numerals from 10 to 19. The 18 *li* is a mistake for 80 *li*, as is rightly noted in *T'ai-p'ing huan-yü-chi*, ed. 1882 (Chin-ling shu-chü 金陵書局).

located in Mu-lei-ho;<sup>(25)</sup> that it was at this place that K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng was situated;<sup>(26)</sup> and that Pei-t'ing was located in Guchen.<sup>(26)</sup> However, this argument is based on the misinterpretation of the statement of the *Hsin T'ang-shu*. He calculates, as Prof. H. Matsuda, the distance between Pei-t'ing and P'u-lei-hsien as 160 *li*. Had he interpreted correctly that 160 *li* is to be taken as the distance just between Pei-t'ing and the Garrison of Tu-shan, he might have reached the same conclusion as mine which looks upon the Jimsa region as Pei-t'ing.

Now, we should take up the location of K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng or the Town of Qayan Fu-t'u. This town had been under the control of I-p'i to-lu Qayan 乙毗咄陸可汗 (=Yü-ku Šad 欲谷設) of the Western Turks, who had stationed there a garrison under a yabγu to oppose the T'ang, as well as to command the Kingdom of Kao-ch'ang 高昌 in the Turfan Basin.<sup>(27)</sup> But, in 640, the T'ang conquered K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng and established T'ing-chou not exactly at K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng as usually considered but in the region where K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng existed.<sup>(28)</sup>

In Chinese records the name of K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng never appears before the year of 628.<sup>(29)</sup> *Chiu T'ang-shu*, Bk. 194b, and some other records about

(25) T. Abe: *op. cit.*, pp. 165-168. Here he states the town of P'u-lei-hsien was located in the present-day Mu-lei-ho, as Mu-lei must be a transcription of P'u-lei (*cf.* note 16), and he considers K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng was situated in Mu-t'u-ku 務塗谷 or the Mu-t'u Valley, where the base of Kū-shih Hou-wang 車師後王 was located in the Former and Later Han periods, for Fu-t'u is regarded as the corruption of Mu-t'u (see later on). Moreover, there is a gloss to Mu-t'u-ku in a statement concerning Kū-shih of *T'ung-tien* 通典, Bk. 191, which runs as follows: "The town of P'u-lei-hsien located in the Mu-t'u Valley was founded in Mu-lei-ho, where K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng was situated".

(26) T. Abe: *op. cit.*, pp. 527 ff.

(27) *T'ung-tien*, Bk. 191, under Kū-shih 車師; *Chiu T'ang-shu*, Bk. 198, under Kao-ch'ang 高昌. See also my article, *Tô no Kôshôkoku Seitô no Gen'in* 唐の高昌國征討の原因 (*Motives of Kao-ch'ang Expedition of the T'ang*), *Chûô Daigaku Bungakubu Kiyô* 中央大學文學部紀要, Vol. 14, 1958, pp. 68-72.

(28) *T'ung-tien*, Bk. 174, states concerning the establishment of T'ing-chou as follows: "During the period of Chên-kuan 貞觀 (627-649 A.D.), the T'ang conquered Kao-ch'ang. At this time, the Western Turks, stationing a garrison at K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng, were in conspiracy with Kao-ch'ang against the T'ang. And when Kao-ch'ang was conquered by the T'ang, they (the garrison) surrendered to the T'ang for fear of the conquering of T'ang. The T'ang established in this *ti* 地 T'ing-chou". 大唐貞觀中, 征高昌, 於時西突厥屯兵於可汗浮圖城, 與高昌相影響, 及高昌既平, 懼而來降, 以其地爲庭州. The word *ti* means 'earth', 'place', 'land', 'region', 'spot', etc. Prof. H. Matsuda interprets it as 'spot' and thinks that T'ing-chou was established in the very place of K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng. But I am of the opinion that T'ing-chou was established in the region where K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng existed.

(29) A-shih-na Shê-êrh 阿史那社爾 occupied K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng in 628, according to *Chiu T'ang-shu*, as stated below. This is the earliest record of it. Moreover, *Ta-t'ang ta-tz'ü-ên-ssü san-tsang fa-shih-chuan* 大唐大慈恩寺三藏法師傳 (*The Life of Hsüan-chuang* 玄奘), Bk. I, says that Hsüan-chuang intended to start for K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng from I-wu 伊吾 (Hami), but by the invitation of the king of Kao-ch'ang, he left I-wu and went to Kao-ch'ang. Then he met (T'ung 統) Yeh-hu 葉護 Qayan at Suy-âb, who died in 628. The date of Hsüan-chuang's departure from Ch'ang-an 長安, as Prof. H. Matsuda has fixed (*op. cit.*, p. 288, n. 98), was 627. Thus, it seems to me that Hsüan-chuang passed through I-wu and Kao-ch'ang in 628. No earlier record is available.

the Western Turks state that they had two courts, one in the south and the other in the north. The South Court was at a distance of seven days' journey to the north-west of Yen-ch'i 焉耆, Qara-shahr, and the north one was of eight days' journey to the north of the same place.<sup>(30)</sup> Seeing that this statement is given at the beginning of the chapter, it may be dated at the beginning of the T'ang. The distance covered in a day's journey in Chinese itineraries is calculated generally as 100 *li*.<sup>(31)</sup> So, it can hardly be doubted that the South Court was situated at 700 *li* to the north-west of Yen-ch'i, which obviously indicates a place in the Great Yulduz Valley where the qayans of the Western Turks held their royal court.<sup>(32)</sup> And as to the North Court, of which the location is not so clearly recorded, should be located at K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng.<sup>(33)</sup> It was under the reign of T'ung Yeh-hu (Yabγu) Qayan 統葉護可汗 (616~619—628)<sup>(34)</sup> that the Western Turks held these two courts. At that time, the Eastern Turks in Mongolia extended their authority as far as Lapchuk to the west of Hami,<sup>(35)</sup> and this might have been the reason why T'ung Yeh-hu Qayan established the North Court in the eastern part of the northern skirt of the T'ien-shan Mountains to defend his territory from the invasion of the Eastern Turks. In my opinion, the North Court (K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng) was the eastern base of his operations against the Eastern Turks. However, during the reign of

(30) Chiu T'ang-shu states as follows: 自焉耆國西北，七日行至其南庭，又正北八日行，至其北庭。This may also be interpreted as stating the distance from Yen-ch'i to the South Court, as well as that to the North Court via the South Court. (cf. Ed. Chavannes, *op. cit.*, p. 21, n. 3. and pp. 236-237.) We find the same expression in both *Hsin T'ang-shu*, Bk. 215 and *Ts'ê-fu Yüan-kuei* 冊府元龜, Bk. 958, and, seeing that *T'ung-tien*, Bk. 199, states that the North Court was situated at the distance of eight days journey to the north of the South Court (自焉耆國西北七日行，至其南庭，自南庭又正北八日行，至其北庭), it seems that one should follow this interpretation. However, considering historical conditions, I should think that the former interpretation is reliable and that *T'ung-tien* intentionally changed the original.

(31) See note 23.

(32) Prof. H. Matsuda's opinion (*op. cit.*, p. 270, n. 61).

(33) As to the two royal courts of the Western Turks, Prof. H. Matsuda published a detailed study (*op. cit.*, pp. 248 ff), but he does not clarify their location. He only says that it is likely that the North Court was located in the Jimsa Region (*loc. cit.*, p. 270, n. 61). By the way, some time after 638 I-p'i To-lu Qayan once established the North Court and I-p'i sha-po-lo 乙毗沙鉢羅 Qayan the South one (see Chavannes: *op. cit.*, pp. 28-30). This time, the Ili river formed the boundary between the two. So these must be distinguished from the two courts of which I am discussing here.

(34) Concerning the accession to the throne of this qayan, see H. Matsuda: *op. cit.*, p. 283, n. 88. As to the year of his death, see Chiu T'ang-shu, Bk. 199, on the T'ieh-lê 鐵勒 and *Hsin T'ang-shu*, Bk. 217, on the Hsüeh-yen-t'ô 薛延陀, in which it is stated that (T'ung) Yeh-hu Qayan died in the second year of Chên-kuan (628).

(35) See the paragraph on Na-chih-hsien 納職縣 of a MS. quoted in Tôru Haneda 羽田亨: *Tô Kôkei Gannen shosha Sashû Ishû Chishi Zankan ni tsuite* 唐光啓元年書寫沙州伊州地志殘卷について (On a MS. Remained copied in 886 of a geographical work on Sha-chou 沙州 and I-chou 伊州, Haneda Hakushi Shigaku Ronbunshû, Rekishiheh, Kyoto, 1957, pp. 585-605) (cf. L. Giles: *Descriptive Catalogue of the Chinese Manuscripts from Tun-huang in the British Museum*, London, 1957, p. 234, No. 7140).



T'ung Yeh-hu the domain of the Western Turks seems to have reached to the south of Amu-darya and even to what is now Afghanistan. This resulted in the removal of the court of the Western Turks first to Ch'ien-ch'üan 千泉 or the Thousand Springs which was situated to the north of Šaš or Tashkent and then to the town of Sui-yeh 碎葉 (Suy-âb) near Tokmak to the east of the Thousand Springs.<sup>(36)</sup> At that time, K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng was no longer their court, but it continued to play an important role as a base of military operations against the Eastern Turks, as well as against the T'ang.

K'o-han fu-t'u was closely connected with the Kingdom of Kao-ch'ang (442-640)<sup>(37)</sup> in the Turfan Basin. As I stated before, I-p'i to-lu Qaγan of the

(36) H. Matsuda: *op. cit.*, pp. 285-289. [Also refer to Louis Hambis, *Le nom turc des "Mille Sources"*, *JA*, 1970, pp. 315-317.]

(37) The rise of the Kingdom of Kao-ch'ang is described as follows: After the Pei Wei 北魏 or Northern Wei conquered the Kingdom of Pei Liang 北涼 (397-439) in western Kan-su 甘肅, Chü-ch'ü Wu-hui 沮渠無諱 and Chü-ch'ü An-chou 沮渠安周, two brothers of the royal family of Pei Liang, escaped to Shan-shan 鄯善 in the Lob region and then they advanced to the Turfan Basin in 422, occupying the town of Kao-ch'ang (Qara-khoja). At that time, the Kingdom of Kū-shih 車師 had been ruling the north-western part of the basin since the period of Former Han. However, the army of Chü-ch'ü An-chou, who, after succeeding his brother Chü-ch'ü Wei-hui, who died in 444, captured the town of Chiao-ho (Yâr-khoto or what is now Kona Shahr), the capital of the Kingdom of Kū-shih, in 450 Chü-ch'ü An-chou was entitled Liang-wang 涼王 or the King of Liang and expanded his power to the whole basin. Thus, a new kingdom, namely the Kingdom of Kao-ch'ang, was founded. Exactly, the establishment of the kingdom may be dated in 442, when the brothers of the Chü-ch'ü Family occupied the town of Kao-ch'ang.

The family of Chü-ch'ü is said to be of the Hsiung-nu origin. Nevertheless, they seem to have been completely sinicized for the reason that they had lived for centuries among the Chinese in the western part of China and already adopted the Chinese culture for a long time before they established the Kingdom of Pei Liang which they organized according to the Chinese pattern.

A Chinese family K'an 闐 took over the kingdom from the Chü-ch'ü Family for a while. Then, two Chinese kings named Chang Mêng-ming 張孟明 and Ma Hsü 馬儒 respectively ruled the kingdom. These two were succeeded by Ch'ü Chia 麴嘉, a Chinese of the origin of the vicinity of Lan-chou 蘭州 in Kan-su 甘肅, who ascended the throne in ca. 498. The Ch'ü Family governed the kingdom till 649, when it was conquered by the T'ang.

It is interesting to see that Kao-ch'ang was a Chinese colonial kingdom. From the beginning of the fourth century to the year 439, when the Empire of Pei Wei unified North China, North China had been divided into many independent countries and a considerable number of Chinese emigrated from the western Kan-su to the Turfan Basin. During this period several kingdoms in Ho-hsi 河西, the region to the west of the Yellow River (*i.e.*, western Kan-su), expanded one after another their power further westwards and established local governments in the town of Kao-ch'ang, which was also called Kao-ch'ang-chün 高昌郡. Roughly speaking, *chün* 郡 at that time corresponded to *chou* 州 in the T'ang period. The Chü-ch'ü 沮渠 of Pei Liang were the last one which set up Kao-ch'ang-chün and which reorganized into the Kingdom of Kao-ch'ang, of which the governing class were the Chinese. The nationality of its natives is not clear, but the majority of them were probably of Turkish origin. [As

Western Turks dominated Kao-ch'ang from this town which was the base of his military operations. Kao-ch'ang, situated on the high way along the southern foot of the T'ien-shan Mountain Range, had been playing an important role in the political, economic and cultural activities in the Tarim Basin. Sogdian merchants were always crowded there and many of them travelled to China and other parts of Central Asia. Kao-ch'ang was very rich and prosperous and was successively invaded and dominated by nomadic tribes.<sup>(38)</sup>

Before the Western Turks, the Juan-juan 蠕蠕 or Ju-ju 茹茹 in Mongolia and the Kao-ch'ê 高車, a Turkish tribe in Zungaria, alternatively dominated Kao-ch'ang.<sup>(39)</sup> Probably the town of K'o-han fu-t'u already existed at that time.<sup>(40)</sup> And, at the period of the Kingdom of Kao-ch'ang, a route passing through one Liu-ku, which was situated to the east to Liu-ku of T'a-ti-tao, led to K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng.<sup>(41)</sup> The Juan-juan and Kao-ch'ê might have used this

to the inhabitants in the Kingdom of Kao-ch'ang, see A. v. Gabain, *Das Leben im uigurischen Königreich von Qočo* (850–1250), Wiesbaden, 1973, pp. 18–33.]

Concerning the history of this kingdom, also see Prof. Walter Fuch's article: *Das Turfangebiet, seine äusseren Geschichte bis in die T'ang=Zeit*, *Ostasiatische Zeitschrift*, Neue Folge III, 1926, S. 124–166. [Concerning the history and culture of Kao-ch'ang before its occupation by the Uighurs, Monique Maillard has published a monograph entitled *Essai sur la vie matérielle dans l'Oasis de Tourfan pendant le Haut Moyen Âge* in *Arts Asiatiques*, XXIX, Numéro spécial, 1973. This may be the latest publication on the subject. But, it is not yet available at the Toyo Bunko. A brief description of its contents is made by Professor Ch'ên Tsu-lung 陳祚龍 in *Shih-huo Yüeh-k'an* 食貨月刊, Vol. IV, No. 8 (November, 1974), pp. 1–3.]

- (38) For instance, *Sui-shu* 隋書, Bk. 83, on Kao-ch'ang, refers to the control of Kao-ch'ang by the T'ieh-lê 鐵勒, which temporarily took the place of the Western Turks at the end of the Sui 隋 period. It runs as follows: "The T'ieh-lê tribe always stationed an important chief in Kao-ch'ang to make him levy taxes on shang-hu 商胡 or the Sogdian merchants, which were sent to (the head of) the tribe." This important chief must have been a *tudun*, one of the high officials of the Turks, or some one of this rank. These *tuduns* were stationed in foreign land under the control of T'ieh-lê in order to superintend local kings and levy taxes. Concerning this, see my article, *Zuisho Kôshôden Kaisetsu* 隋書高昌傳解說 (*Commentaries on the Records of Kao-ch'ang in Sui-shu*), *Yûboku Shakaishi Tankyû* 遊牧社會史探究, XV, 1961, p. 13.

- (39) H. Matsuda, *op. cit.*, pp. 143–216.

- (40) In the east boundary of Kao-ch'ang, there was a town called Po-li 白力. We can trace this name of the town back to the year 422 in Chinese records, when the Kingdom of Kao-ch'ang was not yet established and the power of the Juan-juan was predominant in the Turfan Basin. According to B. Karlgren, the pronunciation of Po-li in the T'ang period was \*b'ph-liək (*Analytic Dictionary*, Nos. 685, 523), and it is considered as the transliteration of balîq, which means 'town' in Old Turkish, as well as in Mongol. It must have situated at the town of K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng which the Juan-juan occupied and was used as the base of their command of Turfan Basin. For details, see my article, *Kôshôkoku no Jyôyû ni tsuite* 高昌國の城邑について (*On the walled towns in the Kingdom of Kao-ch'ang*), *Chûô Daigaku Bungakubu Kiyô*, Vol. 17, 1959, pp. 80–82.

- (41) See my article, *Kôshôkoku no Ryûkoku ni tsuite* 高昌國の柳谷について (*On Liu-ku in the Kingdom of Kao-ch'ang*), *Chûô Daigaku Bungakubu Kiyô*, Vol. 20, 1960, pp. 73 ff.

route to control Kao-ch'ang from the north side of the T'ien-shan Mountain Range.

In 626-627,<sup>(42)</sup> all tribes of the T'ieh-lê 鐵勒 under the rule of the Eastern Turks revolted against the Eastern Turks and, eventually, the Eastern Turks were subjugated by the T'ang in 630. And, at the same time, A-shih-na Shê-êrh 阿史那社爾 of the Eastern Turks was defeated by the Yen-t'o 延陀 and other tribes of the T'ieh-lê. He fled westwards and occupied the town of K'o-han fu-t'u.<sup>(43)</sup> It seems quite certain that he took advantage of a confusion among the Western Turks caused by the death of T'ung Yeh-hu Qaṛan. After this, he dominated Zungaria for some time. But he was defeated by the tribe Yen-t'o which he attacked and took flight to Kao-ch'ang. At last he, too, surrendered voluntarily to the T'ang in 635<sup>(44)</sup> and the town of K'o-han fu-t'u was occupied by Yü-ku 欲谷 Šad of the Western Turks.

Now, Hsü Sung 徐松 considered that the town of K'o-han fu-t'u was located in what is now a ruined town to the north of Jimsa and that the administrative office of Chin-man-hsien 金滿縣 was established there,<sup>(45)</sup> while Prof. H. Matsuda located it in the Pa-no-p'a Valley, as stated before. In my opinion, however, K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng cannot be looked for in this valley as no piece of evidence is available about the existence of such an important town in the three itineraries mentioned above, of which all passed through this valley.

Here are some other reasons why I believe that K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng was not situated in this valley.

Succeeding the Eastern Turks, which resumed its domination of Mongolia from the end of the seventh century to the first half of the eighth century, the Uighurs, one of the tribes of T'ieh-lê, built their Empire in Mongolia and in the latter half of the eighth century, they expelled the Basmil, a Turkish tribe, from Pei-t'ing which they had been occupying for some period.<sup>(46)</sup> In the eighth century the power of T'u-fan 吐蕃 or the Tibetans became predominant in the western part of China, as well as in the Tarim Basin, and they

(42) Hidemi Onogawa: *Tetsuroku no Ichi Kôsatsu* 鐵勒の一考察 (*A study on the T'ieh-lê*), *Tôyôshi Kenkyû* 東洋史研究, Vol. 5, No. 2, 1940, pp. 111-112.

(43) The Biography of A-shih-na Shê-êrh in both *Chiu T'ang-shu*, Bk. 109, and *Hsin T'ang-shu*, Bk. 110.

(44) The Biography of A-shih-na Shê-êrh. See note (43).

(45) Hsü Sung: *Hsi-yü shui-tao-chi* 西域水道記, Bk. 3, [fol. 25r-26r. 又東五十里, 爲濟木薩, 西突厥之可汗浮圖城, 唐爲庭州金滿縣, 又改後庭縣. 北庭都護治也. 元於別失八里, 立北庭都元帥府, 亦治於斯, 故城在今保惠城北二十餘里, 地曰護堡子, 破城有金滿縣殘碑, 唐造像碣, 元造像碣. cf. *Han-shu hsi-yü-chuan pu-chu* 漢書西域傳補注卷下, Bk. B, fol. 23v. under Kù-shih hou-wang-kuo 車師後王國. Here, *po-ch'êng* 破城 which means 'a ruined-walled town' or 'a ruined site of a walled town', must be taken as a common name.]

(46) According to *Chiu T'ang-shu*, Bk. 194a, T'un-yü-ku 暾欲谷 (Tonyuquq), who took service to Bilgä Qaṛan, ruler of the Eastern Turks, states that the Pa-hsi-mi 拔悉密 (Basmil) were occupying Pei-t'ing. The statements bears the date of 720. Concerning the expulsion of the Basmils from Pei-t'ing by the Uighurs, see T. Abe: *op. cit.*, pp. 148-150.

even attacked violently the neighbourhood of Pei-t'ing. In 790, the Uighurs tried to take back Pei-t'ing, but they were defeated by the Tibetans. The Uighurs sent troops there again in the same year, but they were again driven back by the Tibetans, as well as by the Ko-la-lê 葛羅祿 or the Qarluqs, allies of the Tibetans, which eventually ended in the capitulation of Pei-t'ing by both the Tibetans and the Qarluqs.<sup>(47)</sup> And, at the same time, the Qarluqs occupied Fu-t'u-ch'uan 浮圖川 of the Uighurs.<sup>(48)</sup> As the Qarluqs were ruling in Semirechie,<sup>(49)</sup> they must have attacked Pei-t'ing from the west, which means that Fu-t'u-ch'uan was situated to the east of Pei-t'ing. The *ch'uan* in Fu-t'u-ch'uan means 'river', but it also means 'plain'. I think that Fu-t'u-ch'uan was not a river or valley,<sup>(50)</sup> but a plain, and that its name was derived from K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng located in the same plain. The Uighurs were terrified by the loss of Fu-t'u-ch'uan and removed their 'north-western tribes'<sup>(51)</sup> to the south of their court at Qara-balghasun on the River Orkhon to defend their land against the attack of the Qarluqs.<sup>(52)</sup> These facts clearly tell us the importance of the situation of Fu-t'u-ch'uan, which is also illustrated by the following fact. When Yeh-lü A-pao-chi 耶律阿保機, the T'ai-tsu 太祖 of the Liao 遼, who stayed at Pa-li-ssü-shan 霸離思山 in Mongolia, despatched his army westwards in 924, crossed the Liu-sha 流沙 or the Moving Sands<sup>(53)</sup> and took Fu-t'u-ch'êng, which resulted in the occupation of all the tribes in the westernmost part [of Mongolia and Zungaria].<sup>(54)</sup> It can hardly be doubted that Fu-t'u-ch'êng was nothing

(47) T. Abe: *Ibid.*, pp. 161-164.

(48) *Chiu T'ang-shu*, Bk. 195, on the Uighurs.

(49) T. Abe: *op. cit.*, pp. 152-153.

(50) Ed. Chavannes interprets Fu-t'u-ch'uan as 'vallée' of Fu-t'u (*op. cit.*, p. 305); Prof. H. Matsuda (*op. cit.*, p. 317) and Prof. T. Abe (*op. cit.*, p. 165) agree to this opinion and identify Fu-t'u-ch'uan with Wu-t'u-ku 務圖谷 of *Han-shu* 漢書, Bk. 96b, under Kū-shih hou-wang-kuo 車師後王國. Further, Wang Kuo-wei takes it as a 'stream' which flows between Guchen and Jimsa (*Hsi-yü tsa-k'ao* 西域雜考 in *Kuan-t'ang pieh-chi* 觀堂別集, Bk. 4. [It is true that in Chinese texts in many cases *ch'uan* 川 means a plain, but always a plain at the middle of which a river runs. Professor Shimazaki seems to have taken a valley as a narrow piece of earth between two mountains or mountain ranges, while it is not always so. There can be a large valley which may be called a plain in Shimazaki's sense.]

(51) Hsi-pei pu-lo 西北部落. I think they were some of the Uighurs in Fu-t'u-ch'uan and that the T'ang named them so, seeing their district situated in the north-westerly direction of China. [However, actually *Chiu T'ang-shu* states that the Uighurs removed to the south of their *ya-chang* 牙帳 'tent of the chief' or 'headquarters' not just Hsi-pei pu-lo 西北部落, but Hsi-pei pu-lo yang-ma 西北部落羊馬 'sheep and horses belonging to tribes in the North-West.']

(52) *Chiu T'ang-shu*, Bk. 195.

(53) Here, the region of Liu-sha indicates what is now the Zungarian Desert (see my article, *Hakuryūtai kō* 白龍堆考 (*On Po-lung-t'ui*), *Chūō Daigaku Bungakubu Kiyō*, Vol. 3, 1955, pp. 79-81).

(54) *Liao-shih* 遼史, Bk. 2, under the 3rd year of T'ien-tsan 天贊 (924): (天贊三年十月丁卯), 軍于霸離思山, 遣兵踰流沙, 授 (read 拔) 浮圖城, 盡取西鄙諸部. Mr. Kazutoshi Nagasawa 長澤和俊 identifies 霸離思山 or Mt. Pa-li-ssü with a mountain near the Lake Barköl

but the plain in which K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng formerly existed. Taking all these into account, K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng must have been situated in a plain to the east of Pei-t'ing and played an important role to connect Mongolia and Zungaria.

In this way, the importance of K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng from the strategic point of view will easily be understood from the facts that (1) the Qarluqs allied with the Tibetans attacked it and took it from the Uighurs under the T'ang and that (2) the first emperor of Liao occupied it in 924 A.D. This is entirely due to the geographical position of K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng which had been the starting point of road uniting the Zungaria Region with the northern part of Mongolia. According to *Yüan-ho chün-hsien-chih* 元和郡縣志, Bk. 40, under T'ing-chou 庭州, a highway called Hui-hu-lu 迴鶻路 or the Uighur Road which led to the capital of the Uighurs, i.e. Qara-balghasun on the River Orkhon, from P'u-lei(-hsien) 蒲類 (縣) via Ho-chê-chên 郝遮鎮 and Hsien-ch'üan-chên 鹹泉鎮, situated respectively at 40 *li* and 200 *li* to the north-east of P'u-lei-hsien.

The Hui-hu-lu had been used for the communication between China and T'ing-chou to the north of the T'ien-shan Mountain Range and Hsi-chou 西州 in the Turfan Basin since the Tibetan invasion of Tun-huang and its neighbourhood in the latter half of the 9th century.<sup>(55)</sup> As I stated above, P'u-lei-hsien, being situated 80 *li* to the east of Pei-t'ing, is to be identified with what is now Guchen. A man following the Uighur Road to Mongolia from Pei-t'ing, might have reached, at first, the town of P'u-lei-hsien along the northern foot of the T'ien-shan, and then advanced to the north-east as far as Mongolia.<sup>(56)</sup> During the Ch'ing 清 period, a Chinese post-road went from Kobdo, situated to the east of the Altai Mountain Range, to Guchen,<sup>(57)</sup> where joined

---

which was called P'o-hsi-hai 婆悉海 (Bars Sea or Lake) in the period of T'ang. However, I cannot accept this interpretation, because *Liao-shih* 遼史, Bk. 2, says that on the 28th day of the ninth month of the 3rd year of T'ien-tsan (Nov. 5, 924), that is to say, three days earlier than the Emperor's staying at Pa-li-ssü-shan, he saw the stone inscription in memory of P'i-ho k'o-han 闕曷可汗 or Bilyä Qayan (on the throne 716-734 A.D.) on the River Orkhon and that he ordered to have the original inscription erased to replace them by new inscriptions in characters of Ch'i-tan 契丹, T'u-chüeh 突厥 and Han 漢 to record his own achievements. If Mt. Pa-li-ssü was situated near the Barköl Sea, it means that the Emperor of Liao reached the neighbourhood of this lake in two days from the River Orkhon, which is quite impossible. Mt. Pa-li-ssü should be located somewhere near the River Orkhon.

- (55) Kazutoshi Nagasawa: *Toban no Kasei Shinshutsu to Tôzaikôtsû* 吐蕃の河西進出と東西交通 (*The Invasion of the West side of Hwang-ho by the T'u-fan and the Intercourse between the East and the West*), *Shikan* 史觀, Vol. 47, 1956, pp. 72-76.
- (56) Just a glance to such books as Sung Yün's 松筠 *Hsin-chiang chih-lüeh* 新疆識略 (Bk. 2) or Hsieh Pin's 謝彬 *Hsin-chiang yu-chi* 新疆遊記 (pp. 315-321) and one can easily understand how Guchen is important a place for the traffic and communication in the T'ien-shan region.
- (57) G. N. Potanin: *Ocherki sievero-zapadnoi Mongolii*, Tom. 1, S.-Peterburg, 1881, s. 128 ff. See also *Hsin-chiang chih-lüeh*, Bk. 2.

three other roads crossing the Altai through three main passes or Urmogaiti, Ulan, and Dabistan.<sup>(58)</sup> The route from Mongolia to Western Asia followed by Ye-lü Ch'ü-ts'ai 耶律楚材 who accompanied Chinghiz Khan on his expedition to western countries in 1219 and another followed by Ch'ang-ch'un 長春 who made a long journey by the order of Chinghiz, from Shan-tung 山東 in China through Mongolia and Central Asia to the encampment of Chinghiz in the Hindukush Mountains in 1222, must have passed in all probability Guchen.<sup>(59)</sup> They probably took the Uighur Road in the period of T'ang as far as Guchen. Moreover, the army despatched westwards by the Emperor T'ai-tsu of the Liao might have reached Fu-t'u-ch'êng by the same road.

Thus, I conclude that K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng which was in a plain to the east of Pei-t'ing was located just in what is now Guchen, and that the administrative office of P'u-lei-hsien of T'ing-chou was established there.

Let me make some conjectures with respect to K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng. In the Former Han period when the Han often fought with the Hsiung-nu 匈奴 to conquer the eastern region of the T'ien-shan, there was a country called Kü-shih Hou-ch'êng-ch'ang 車師後城長, the 'Chief of the Posterior Town of Kü-shih', which was to the north of Mts. T'ien-shan and used as the base of military operations of the Han against the Hsiung-nu. I agree to the opinion of Hsü Sung 徐松 who considers that this country was established by the Han<sup>(60)</sup> and I would like to identify it with what is now Guchen. According to *Han-shu*, Bk. 96b, there is a country named Kü-shih Hou-wang 車師後王 or Posterior Kingdom of Kü-shih in the neighbourhood of the country of Kü-shih Hou-ch'êng-ch'ang and its capital was situated at Wu-t'u-ku 務塗谷. It was also Hsü Sung who first identified this Wu-t'u with (K'o-han-) Fu-t'u. The same identification was made independently of Hsü Sung by Toyohachi Fujita 藤田豊八, Wang Kuo-wei 王國維 [and F. W. Thomas].<sup>(61)</sup> The identification is right. But, in *Wei-liao* 魏略 the capital of this kingdom (named as Kü-shih Hou-pu-wang 車師

(58) G. N. Potanin: *op. cit.*, Tom. 1, s. 30 ff., 124, 128 ff.; E. Bretschneider: *Mediaeval Researches*, Vol. I, pp. 13-14, n. 5. [The importance of Guchen as a commercial terminus for Chinese-Mongolian-Central Asia trade in the twenties of this century may be seen from the description of O. Lattimore, *The Desert Road to Turkestan*, London, 1928.]

(59) Concerning the passing of Guchen of Ch'ang-ch'un who travelled from the Altai Mountains to Bišbalıq, E. Bretschneider already noticed it (*op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 64-65, n. 151). I am of the opinion that Ch'ang-ch'un took the same way in crossing Zungaria as Ye-lü Ch'ü-ts'ai who reached Guchen before his arrival to Bišbalıq (see E. Bretschneider: *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 13-15, 62-65).

(60) *Han-shu hsi-yü chuan pu-chu*, Bk. 2, under Chü-shih Hou-ch'êng-ch'ang-kuo.

(61) Toyohachi Fujita, *Gesshi no Kochi to sono Seii no Nendai* 月氏の故地とその西移の年代 (*A study on the original territory of the Yüeh-shih and the date of their western removal*), *Tôyô Gakuhô* 東洋學報, VI, (October, 1916), p. 333. (Now, see the collection of his articles, *Tôzai Kôshôshi no Kenkyû* 東西交渉史の研究, *Saiiki-hen* 西域篇, pp. 50-51. Wang Kuo-wei quoted in note (50). [Also see P. Pelliot's view in *T'oung Pao*, XXV, 1929, p. 151, note 2 and F. W. Thomas, *Bogdo*, *JRAS*, 1937, pp. 309-313].

後部王) is recorded as situated at Yü-lai-ch'êng 於 (or 于) 賴城.<sup>(62)</sup> Yü-lai must be a transformation of P'u-lei 蒲類 and derived from the name of P'u-lei-hai 蒲類海 or Lake Barköl in the neighbourhood.<sup>(63)</sup> The removal of capital from Wu-t'u-ku in the period of Han to Yü-lai in the Three Kingdoms may mean the construction of a walled town Yü-lai in the country of Kü-shih Hou-wang, of which the people had been living a pasturing life in the Valley of Wu-t'u in the period of Former and Later Hans and had no walled towns. It must be after the period of Three Kingdoms that it became a political centre in the eastern part of the northern skirt of Mts. T'ien-shan. This is an earlier history of K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng. Later, the Mongol and Turkish tribes used to occupy the place of Guchen, where K'o-han fu-t'u-ch'êng had existed, in order to extend power over the T'ien-shan region from Zungaria or Mongolia and invade the Turfan Basin across the T'ien-shan. This was because such was the most efficient way to establish the supremacy over the Tarim Basin. When the T'ang extended their power to the north of Mts. T'ien-shan, the capital of T'ing-chou was established in the Jimsa region and the town of P'u-lei-hsien was founded as a guard against the north in the place of Guchen.

Concluding the article, some remarks can be made about the name of Fu-t'u. The word Fu-t'u is usually regarded as a transcription of [Buddho=] Sanskrit buddha, [which has a derived meaning of stūpa]. Ed. Chavannes translated K'o-han fu-t'u as 'Kagan buddha' or 'Kagan stoūpa'.<sup>(64)</sup> But there is nothing to prove that T'ung Yeh-hu Qaṛan 統葉護可汗 was a Buddhist.<sup>(65)</sup> I

(62) [Ed. Chavannes, *Les pays d'occident d'après le Wei-liao*, T'oung Pao, 1905, p. 558].

(63) Yü-lai-ch'êng appears in *Wei-lüeh hsi-jung-chuan* 魏略西戎傳 quoted at the end of Bk. 30 of *San-kuo-chih* 三國志. Concerning the derivation of Yü-lai from P'u-lei, see H. Matsuda: *op. cit.*, p. 318, n. 55; T. Abe: *op. cit.*, p. 166. Also cf. note 15.

(64) E. Chavannes: *op. cit.*, pp. 11-12, 305.

(65) So far as I know T'o-po 佗 [他] 鉢 Qaṛan, who died in 581, was the only Buddhist among the qaṛans of the Turks (see Hiroshi Yamazaki 山崎宏: *Shina Chūsei Bukkyō no Tenkai* 支那中世佛教の展開 (*A study of History of Buddhism in Mediaeval China*), Tokyo, 1942, pp. 882-885). The qaṛans of the Turks generally rejected Buddhism for fear that it might weaken their tribes (see the statement of Tonyuquq who objected to the construction of Buddhist temples in *Chiu T'ang-shu*, Bk. 194). At the time of T'ung Yeh-hu 統葉護 Qaṛan, Po-lo-po-chia-lo-mi-to-lo 波羅頗迦羅密多羅 (Prabhākaramitra) arrived at his court from India to propagate Buddhism, (see his biography in *Hsü Kao-sêng-chuan* 續高僧傳, Bk. 3), and Hsüang-chuang 玄奘 met him at the court of Sui-yeh (Suy-āb) 碎葉 (*The Life of Hsüang-chuang*, Bk. 2). But all these facts do not necessarily mean that he was a Buddhist. [As to Prabhākaramitra, however, *Hsü Kao-sêng-chuan* says as follows: (波羅頗迦羅密多羅) 承北狄貪勇未識義方, 法藉人弘, 敢欲傳化, 乃與道俗十人, 展轉北行, 達西面可汗葉護衙所, 以法訓勸, 曾未浹旬, 特爲教主深所信伏, 日給二十人料, 旦夕祇奉, 同侶道俗, 咸被珍遇, 生福增散, 日倍於前, 武德九年 (626), 高平王出使入蕃, 因與相見, 承此風化, 將事東歸, 而葉護君臣留戀不許, 王即奏聞, 不勅徵入, 乃與高平同來謁帝, 以其年十二月達京 (*Tripitaka Taisho*, L, p. 440a). This means that T'o-po Qaṛan was a good pupil of this Indian monk and believed deeply in Buddhism. As has been clarified by Professor Yamazaki, T'o-po Qaṛan decided to establish a Buddhist temple when he learnt the essential teaching of Buddha from Hui-lin 惠琳, Buddhist monk of Northern Ch'i 北齊, and quite probably

should like to agree to Hsü Sung's opinion that Fu-t'u was a corruption of Wu-t'u in Wu-t'u-ku 務塗谷 or the Wu-t'u Valley<sup>(66)</sup> or Pa-no-p'a<sup>(67)</sup> Valley, where the base of Kü-shih Hou-wang 車師後王 was located in the Former and Later Han periods. I wonder if Wu-t'u and Fu-t'u could be interpreted as a transcription of some word as *böd* (*büd*?) which means 'throne'.<sup>(68)</sup>

In my opinion, in the eastern part of the north side of the T'ien-shan Range the political centre was transferred from Wu-t'u Valley to what is now Guchen, as a result of change of political conditions, which occurred some time at the end of the Later Han period or at the beginning of the period of Three Kingdoms. Under the T'ang when, at first Chin-man-hsien 金滿縣 of T'ing-chou 庭州 and later Pei-t'ing tu-hu-fu 北庭都護府 was established in *p'o-ch'êng* or a ruined town near Hu-pao-tzŭ 護堡子 to the north of the present Jimsa, there occurred the second transfer of political and military centre of this part of the world.<sup>(68)</sup>

---

received a Turkish translation of *(Ta-pan-)nieh-p'an-ching* (大般涅槃經 or Mahā-parinirvāpa-sūtra by Liu Shih-ch'ing 劉世清. Moreover, Yü-wên T'ai 宇文泰 (505-556), the first emperor of Northern Chou 北周, and his nephew Yü-wên Hu 宇文護 (515-572) built a Buddhist temple named T'u-chüeh-ssü 突厥寺, in Ch'ang-an 長安 for the happiness of Mu-han 木杆 Qayan as is described in an inscription entitled *Ching-shih T'u-chüeh-ssü pei* 京師突厥寺碑 and written by Wang Pao 王褒 (+577 A.D.). Mu-han (+572 A.D.) is the elder brother of T'o-po who succeeded him. As to this inscription, see Mikinosuke Ishida 石田幹之助, *Tokketsu ni okeru Bukkyō* 突厥に於ける佛教 (*Buddhism among the T'u-chüeh Tribes*), *Shigaku Zasshi* 史學雜誌, LVI, 1946, pp. 1045-47. These facts are the evidence of strong influence of Buddhism among the Turkish tribes in Mongolia in the 6th century. Besides Yamazaki and Ishida, reference may be made to A. von Gabain, *Buddhistische Türkenmission, Asiatica, Festschrift Friedrich Weller*, Leipzig, 1954, pp. 161-173, especially pp. 162-164. However, Professor Shimazaki is of the opinion that the Turkish people in Mongolia and Central Asia in the 10th century seem not so much enthusiastic in Buddhism and that T'o-po was the only exception.]

- (66) Hsü Sung's commentary on Kü-shih Hou-wang in *Han-shu*, Bk. 96b. in *Han-shu Hsi-yü-chuan pu-chu*, Bk. B. cf. note (61).
- (67) That Wu-t'u-ku is to be identified with the Pa-no-p'a Valley was confirmed by A. Stein who went to the Turfan Basin from Jimsa through this valley in 1914 (see A. Stein: *op. cit.*, pp. 560 ff.). However, I don't know the original Chinese characters which are transcribed as of Pa-no-p'a.
- (68) P. Pelliot, *Neuf notes sur des questions d'Asie centrale*, *T'oung Pao*, XXVI, 1929, pp. 215-217, n. 7; A. v. Gabain, *Altürkische Grammatik*<sup>1</sup> Glossar, s. 304. [Fujita and Thomas propose to look these as a transcription of *bogdo*, derived from the name of Mt. Bogdo in the neighbourhood. Shimazaki says nothing about the meaning of K'o-han 可汗 of K'o-han fu-t'u. Actually, Fujita (*Tōyō Gakuhō*, VI, p. 333, and *Tōzai Kōshōshi no Kenkyū*, *Saiki-hen*, p. 50-51) looks it upon as a transcription of *kurghan*, more correctly *qurṣan*, which means "fortress" in Turkish. Shimazaki mentioned Fujita's reconstruction and explained Kurghan Bogdo as "Entrance to Mt. Bogdo" (*Tōyō Gakuhō*, XLVI, p. 344). But I can not find the meaning of "entrance" for *qurṣan* in any dictionary of the Turkish language.]



## Obituary Notices

**Yoshito Harada** 原田淑人 (1885.4.5.-1974.12.23):

Professor Dr. Yoshito Harada died from stomach ulcer at the age of eighty-nine. Since 1913 when he took service to the Faculty of Letters, then Imperial University of Tokyo, he was engaged in archaeological studies of Korea, Manchuria, Mongolia, China and Japan, in the field of which he had been one of the most important figures in this country.

Among his excavations of so many sites, the excavation, executed in September to December, 1925, of the tomb of Wang Hsü 王盱 in Lo-lang 樂浪 in the neighbourhood of what is now Pyongyang 平壤 in North Korea, as well as the publication of its report in 1930, gave him a world-wide reputation. It clearly showed to the academic world the standard of date and form of Chinese material culture in the Former Han period, the very cautious and precise way of excavation of Japanese scholars, and the magnificent style of Japanese publication of archaeological reports. In 1925, too, he and his colleagues, both Japanese and Chinese, established the Tōa Kōkogakkai 東亜考古學會 or Far-Eastern Archaeological Society and conducted excavations at such archaeological sites as P'i-tzū-wo 貔子窩 in Manchuria, Mu-yang-ch'êng 牧羊城 in Kantōshū 關東州, Tung-ching-ch'êng 東京城 in Manchuria, Shan-tu 上都 at Chao-naiman sūme Xoton in Inner Mongolia, P'ing-ch'êng 平城 in the neighbourhood of Ta-t'ung 大同 and Kan-tan 邯鄲 in the Province of Ho-pei 河北. After World War II, he supervised the investigation of pre-historic site of Toro 登呂 in Shizuoka Prefecture, of the site of capital Heijō 平城 in Nara Prefecture, and of the tomb of Takamatsuzuka 高松塚 also in Nara Prefecture, in which coloured wall paintings were found in 1972. Splendid reports were published of these sites as a series of publication of the Far-Eastern Archaeological Society, each one of which was appreciated very much by both scholars and amateurs in the world.

Harada taught archaeology at the University of Tokyo first as lecturer (1914-1921), then as associate professor (1921-1938), and finally as professor (1938-1946). After his retirement from the University of Tokyo in 1946, he was appointed professor at the Seishin Joshi Daigaku 聖心女子大學 University and also taught at some other universities. Besides these, he worked as a research member of the Museum of the Imperial Household which was changed into the Tokyo National Museum after World War II and as a member of Research Department of the Toyo Bunko (1924-1974).

He published many books and articles. Four of his book appeared in the Monograph Series of the Toyo Bunko under the title of *Saiiki Hakken no Kaiga ni mietaru Hukushoku no Kenkyū* 西域發見の繪畫に見えたる服飾の研究 (1925), *Kan Rikuchō no Hukushoku* 漢六朝の服飾 (1937), *Zōho Kanrikuchō no Hukushoku* 増補漢六朝の服飾 (1967) and *Tōdai no Hukushoku* 唐代の服飾 (1970) and two of his articles in the *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko* in 1939, 1970 and 1971.

A brief curriculum vitae and a bibliography of his publications appear in *Tōa Kokunka Zeien* 東亜古文化説苑<sup>(1)</sup>, which is a collection of his thirty-one articles and

(1) Compiled and published by the Committee to celebrate the Eighty-eighth Birthday of Professor Yoshito Harada. pp. xxiii, 482, with a portrait, 36 plates, 4 maps, and 160 illustrations. There are three other collections of Professor Harada's articles, which are as follows:

published to celebrate of his eighty-eighth birthday in 1973.

At the graduation from the Tokyo Imperial University in 1908, he produced a B. A. thesis which was entitled *Mindai no Mōko* 明代の蒙古 or *Mongolia under the Ming*. The thesis was published in the same year in *Tōa Dōbunkai Hōkoku* 東亜同文會報告, Nos. 108-112. This is a study of history of Mongolian tribes in Mongolia under the Ming on the basis of *Ming-shih-lu* 明實錄 or the *Real Records of Ming* and, even today, the author is highly appreciated as the pioneer in this field of study. But, Professor Harada discontinued the researches in Mongolian history and converted himself into an archaeologist. However, if one may say so, his writings always reveal that he is a historian, as well as an archaeologist. He was extremely conversant in Chinese literary works and historical literature and, in archaeological studies, tried to establish his opinion on the evidence of written records.

The world has lost an unreplaceable master of Far-Eastern archaeology by the passing away of Professor Dr. Harada. (Kazuo Enoki)

**Mikinosuke Ishida** 石田幹之助 (1891.12.28-1974.5.22):

Professor Dr. Mikinosuke Ishida died from acute pneumonia on May 22, 1974, at the age of eighty-three. In 1917, he was sent to Peking to transfer the Asiatic Library of Dr. G. E. Morrison to Tokyo. The library thus purchased by Baron Hisaya Iwasaki (1865-1955) was renamed as the Morrison Bunko or Morrison Library which was reorganized in 1924 into an incorporation under the name of Toyo Bunko (The Oriental Library). Ishida worked as the librarian of both the Morrison Library and the Toyo Bunko until 1934 when he removed to the Koku-sai Bunka Shinkōkai 國際文化振興會 just established at that time. He did so much to bring up the Toyo Bunko to an Asiatic library in the real sense of word.

At the Kokusai Bunka Shinkōkai, he established a new library of basic works in European languages concerning Japan, which is looked upon even today as one of the most important collections of this kind. He also edited an Encyclopaedia Japonica, which was not completed because of the outbreak of war. He then taught at both the Nihon Daigaku 日本大學 and the Kokugakuin Daigaku 國學院大學 as professor of Asian history and acted as member of so many learned organizations.

His last publication is a collection of his thirty-seven articles published in 1973 as No. 54 of the Toyo Bunko Monograph Series. His wide interest and profound knowledge concerning Asian history is well displayed in it.

In July, 1973, he took the presidency of the Tōhō Gakkai 東方學會 or the Institute of Eastern Culture which published a special number of Tōhōgaku 東方學 or Eastern Studies, No. 49, in his memory.<sup>(1)</sup>

*Tōa Kobunka Kenkyū* 東亜古文化研究, Tokyo: Zauhō Kankōkai 1940

*Tōa Kobunka Ronkō* 東亜古文化論考, Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan 1962

*Kōko Manpitsu* 考古漫筆, Tokyo: Ikubunsha 1970

According to Professor Takeshi Sekino's obituary notice (*Shigaku Zasshi*, Vol. 82, No. 2, 1975, p. 87), the total number of his articles in Japanese amounts to 22.

- (1) Contributors to the memories of the late Professor Dr. Ishida are as follows: Dr. Kiichirō Kanda 神田喜一郎, Dr. Naoshirō Tsuji 辻直四郎, Mr. Moritaka Takahashi 高橋盛孝, Professor Seiji Uemura 植村清二, and Kazuo Enoki 榎 一雄 who is the writer of the present note. *Kokugakuin Daigaku Gakuhō* 國學院大學々報, No. 186 (June 10,

His contribution to the Toyo Bunko is described in the *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko*, Nos. 20 (1961) and 25 (1967) and his biography and a list of his publications are published in a Jubilee Volume issued in celebration of his seventieth birthday under the title of *Ishida Hakushi Shōjukinen Tōyōshi Ronsō* 石田博士頌壽記念東洋史論叢 (1965).<sup>(2)</sup> (Kazuo Enoki)

---

1974) is also a special number in his memory, in which Professor Koyata Iwahashi 岩橋小彌太, Professor Mayumi Ōno 大野真弓, and Kazuo Enoki respectively published memories.

- (2) Also see Postscript by the writer of the present note to Professor Ishida's *Zōtei Chōan no Haru* 増訂長安の春 (*Collection of Tōyō Bunko* by the Heibonsha Publishing Co.)