

A New Attempt at the Solution of the Fu-lin Problem

Introduction

There are lots of questions which have been raised in various endeavours to interpret the accounts of the Western Countries furnished by the successive Chinese histories. But perhaps none has called forth more labour from earnest students than those pertaining to Ta-ch'in 大秦 and Fu-lin 拂菻. To some they may now appear as if entirely solved, but I should think that they are still as obscure as ever in certain important details. It was in 1904 that I first ventured on the subject with an article "*About the Countries of Ta-ch'in and Fu-lin*," contributed to the *Shigaku-Zasshi* 史學雜誌⁽¹⁾; but now, after the lapse of about thirty years since, I find the work to contain a number of mistakes and inadequacies requiring amendment and alteration. Not long ago, however, I had an occasion to publish two separate monographs on Ta-ch'in.⁽²⁾ Now my intention is to follow them up with another study on the problem of Fu-lin. It is hoped that the results of some new researches embodied there will assist us to the final solution of the mystery.

It is evident that in the days when CHANG Ch'ien 張騫 paid a visit to the court of the Ta-yüeh-chih 大月氏 monarch, by order of Wu-ti 武帝 of the Han 漢 dynasty, there were thriving in the westernmost part of the "Western Region" 西域 two eminent powers, Syria with Antioch as its capital on one hand and Egypt under the Ptolemaic dynasty with Alexandria as its capital on the other. The latter was first introduced to the Chinese by CHANG Ch'ien under the name Li-kan kuo 黎軒國; for, as I attempted to prove elsewhere, this was an abbreviated transcription of *Alexandria*, and the country mentioned as Li-kan kuo must have been one having its centre of affairs at Alexandria. As for the other kingdom, Syria, it was represented in early Chinese records, so far as my inference goes, by the name T'iao-chih 條支, which was also a

(1) *Taishin-hoku oyobi Futsurin-hoku ni tsukite* 大秦國及び拂菻國に就きて *On the Countries of Ta-ch'in and Fu-lin* (*Shigaku-Zasshi*, Vol. XV, 1904).

(2) See the second and third articles of this volume.

term imparted by CHANG Ch'ien, and which I should regard as contraction of *Antiochia*. It is true that at a later period the name Ti'ao-chih only applied to a small particular section of the territory which Parthia had taken over from Syria; but, although, about 128-9 B. C., at the time of CHANG Ch'ien's sojourn at the royal court of the Ta-yüeh-chih, the eastern portion of the Syrian territory including Mesopotamia, Babylonia, Mésène, etc., had already passed into the hands of Parthia (An-hsi 安息), it is not improbable that the old term T'iao-chih (Antiochia) still remained a popular name for the former Syrian domain. Before long, however, the Roman supremacy advanced to the east, putting an end to the Syrian kingdom in 65 B. C. and demolishing the Ptolemaic monarchy in 30 B. C., until her dominions in that direction ranged continuously from the western border of Parthia to the Mediterranean coasts. Rome, with her Imperial regime just commenced, was now the mistress of the world, comprising western Asia over and above her possessions both in the west and south of Europe and on the Mediterranean coast of Africa; and it was not only in the extensiveness of territory, but also in the enormity of military strength and the vast accumulation of wealth that she knew no rival. On the Chinese side, it was just the time when PAN Ch'ao 班超 was residing at his western post as Tu-hu 都護, the Governor-general of the Western Region, namely, during the reign of Chang-ti 章帝 of the Later Han (A. D. 76-88), and it must have been at this period that the Chinese, taking notice of this wonderful western power, and deeply impressed by what they learned of her splendid civilization, were prompted to invent for her a very respectable name Ta-ch'in 大秦 (Great Ch'in=Great China), which meant a great country even comparable to their own Celestial Empire.

It has been probed, however, that this name was not intended for the whole extent of the Roman Empire but only for as much of it as lay within the Oriental region. This Roman Orient comprised both Egypt and Syria and so must have been practically coextensive with what was known as Ta-ch'in by the Chinese of the Later Han period. This implies that the country of Ta-ch'in was not exactly identical with Li-kan, notwithstanding the assertion to the contrary by several historians. At the same time, however, it is almost inevitable for us to assume the capital of Ta-ch'in to have been Alexandria itself. Such is a necessary conclusion we reach after a careful examination of the account of Ta-ch'in in the *Wei-liao* 魏略, which forms the primary source of information on the subject of Ta-ch'in; and the description given there of the roads leading to the Ta-ch'in capital from different directions would otherwise be inscrutable. Moreover, we find in the scripture, *Na-hsien-pi-ch'iu-ching* 那先比丘經, this passage, which seems to support the above inference: "The King asserted that he was born in the country of Ta-ch'in. The country is (also) called A-li-san 阿荔散."⁽³⁾ The work was the Chinese translation, dating

(3) 王言，我本生大秦國，國名阿荔散。

from the epoch of Ssü-ma Chin 司馬晉 (A. D. 265–316), of the *Milinda Pañhā*, the Pāli scripture; and according to the Pāli text, it was in the village of Kalasi in the province of Alasanda that the king was born. We have no means to locate Kalasi, but as for the term Alasanda, as well as its Chinese equivalent A-li-san, we may be justified in assuming it to be the contraction of *Alexandria*. Now, the Chinese word A-li-san is given as another name of Ta-ch'in simply because, I am sure, A-li-san (=Alexandria) was the general capital for the country of Ta-ch'in or the Roman Orient. Just as the earlier reproduction of *Alexandria*, Li-kan, stood for the whole Egyptian region that looked up to the city of Alexandria, at the time of CHANG Ch'ien, or as the name T'iao-chih, the corruption of *Antiochia*, once covered the whole Syrian territory, so must A-li-san have represented the country of Ta-ch'in, now that Alexandria became the capital not only for Egypt but for all the Roman Orient. As remarked before, when Rome had made provinces of Egypt and Syria, the Chinese bestowed their chosen designation Ta-ch'in on the Roman Orient brought about thereby, but in the meantime, the popular name of the same region current among the natives of western Asia seems to have been A-li-san or Li-kan, both derived from *Alexandria*. As regards T'iao-chih, it no longer existed in the former sense of the Syrian Kingdom after the Roman conquest of the Orient, but now the Chinese learned to apply the name to those parts of the old Syrian territory which formed those outlying possessions of An-hsi,—Mesopotamia, Babylonia, Mésène, etc., but more especially to the state of Mésène Kharacène in the south, which bordered on the Persian Gulf, and was the very locality the Chinese were best acquainted with for commercial reasons.

Chapter I

Textual Criticism of the *Ta-ch'in-chuan* in the *Wèi-shu*

As I argued while discussing the geography of *Ta-ch'in* in an article printed in the *Shigaku Zasshi*⁽⁴⁾, it is certain that the earliest and most fundamental source of information about the country of *Ta-ch'in* to be found in literature is in the *Ta-ch'in-chuan* 大秦傳 of the *Wèi-liao* 魏略. What is related there, so far as historical truth is concerned, must have been first introduced to Chinese knowledge during the reigns of Hardrianus and Antonius Pius (A.D. 117-161) in Roman history, and therefore between the year of *Yung-ch'u* 永初 of An-ti 安帝 and the 4th year of *Yen-hsi* 延熹 of Huan-ti 桓帝, of the Later Han. The *Wèi-liao* itself being a work by Yü Huan 魚豢 of the *Wèi* period, its main portion consists in the annals of the *Wèi* dynasty running through the three generations from Ts'ao Ts'ao 曹操 to Ming-ti 明帝; but, strange to say, *Ta-ch'in-chuan* forming part of the history seems to imply no intelligence on Rome received in the current period. A later description of *Ta-ch'in* is found in the *Hsi-jung-chuan* 西戎傳 of the *Chin-shu* 晉書, but very plainly all we see there is an adaptation or contraction from the *Ta-ch'in* account of the *Hou-han-shu* 後漢書 as well as of the *Wèi-liao*, except the statement in its closing passage that during the era of *T'ai-k'ang* 太康 (A.D. 280-289), Wu-ti's court received an envoy with tribute from *Ta-ch'in*. This seems to have been the only new item which the *Chin* epoch added to the old stock of experience about *Ta-ch'in*. During the succeeding period of the Northern and Southern Dynasties (ca. A.D. 439-589), we do not know any important change to have happened in the relation between China and the Western Region, and as we find no fact of tribute-carrying from *Ta-ch'in* to the Northern *Wèi* 北魏 court mentioned either in the main annals or in the biography section of the *Wèi-shu* 魏書, the dynastic history, we might naturally expect that the historian had nothing to build his own *Ta-ch'in-chuan* upon; but in point of fact, we are confronted in the Western Region section of the history with a rather full description of the country of *Ta-ch'in*, which even appears at first sight to contain some fresh information which had been available for no previous author. Yet a scrutinizing inspection of the text will reveal to us that it was really a disguised reproduction of the *Wèi-liao* account. And it will be worth while to guess what was the idea of the historian in this matter. He had indeed nothing new to tell about *Ta-ch'in*, but when he was ever to write a history of the Western Region, he could not

(4) See the third article of this volume.

afford to leave out Ta-ch'in, which was perhaps the most attractive feature in that section of the horizon. The story of Ta-ch'in handed down by the earlier authors was highly agreeable to the national sense of self-conceit, glorying in the supposed kinship with that Utopean-looking people; and moreover well tuned with the favorite theme of folk-lore that there existed an earthly paradise at the western extremity of the world. To make up an article on Ta-ch'in, however, our author had nothing to draw upon but the old *Wèi-liao*, or perhaps also the *Hou-han-shu* account if he chose. He knew that the historian of the *Chin-shu*, prior to him, had simply abridged the *Wèi-liao* description in order to furnish an article on Ta-ch'in in his own history; but the same practice could not be repeated. Our author, then, would shorten the *Wèi-liao* account on one hand and add something from imagination on the other so as to heighten the ideal colour of the country. To justify this conjecture, nothing will be better than to compare the text of the *Ta-ch'in-chuan* of the *Wèi-shu* with that of the *Wèi-liao*, and this will be our task in the following paragraphs.

As I endeavoured to prove elsewhere, the *Ta-ch'in-chuan* of the *Wèi-liao* was not altogether a record of historical truth, but contained a good deal of fiction originating from Chinese conception, and this was mostly inspired by the national tradition about the three famous early emperors, Yao 堯, Shun 舜, and Yü 禹. Now the author of the *Wèi-shu* knew how to distinguish those two elements in the material he had before him. He was aware that the historical facts related there belonged to a date too far removed to warrant repeating in his account, and so he would draw as little as possible from this side; but there was ample room for him to develop the fiction started by the earlier writer. To take up the *Wèi-shu* text concerned, we read in the opening passage: "Its capital is the city of An-tu 安都."⁽⁵⁾ This mention of the specific name of the Ta-ch'in capital, not discoverable in any previous record, may appear to be an index of the later addition of information, but most probably it was due to nothing but mere invention on the part of the author, perhaps suggested by the familiar name of the city of An-i 安邑, where tradition says the celebrated emperor Yü had his residence in antique times. Further on we read: "The king goes out once in three years to observe the moral state of the country. If a man is wrongly accused, he may go to the king with his complaint. The officer in responsibility for the matter is reprimanded if the error is small; but degraded and discharged if the maladministration is serious; a wise man is selected to fill the place."⁽⁶⁾ This being a fact unmentioned in any earlier account, it might well seem that the author owed this to more knowledge of Ta-ch'in being acquired in the current period. But in this case also, I cannot but have reason to decide it to be

(5) 大秦國一名犁軒，都安都城。(魏書，卷一百二，西域傳大秦傳)

(6) 王三年一出，觀風化。人有冤枉，詣王訴訟者，當方之臣，小則譴責，大則黜退，令其舉賢人以代之。(ibid.)

a mere story. Its germ may be pointed out in a passage of the *Shun-tien* 舜典, a sacred book of the nation, where this is said of the prefect administration enjoyed under the emperor Shun: "On the lapse of every three years, officials are appraised as to the manner and quality of their services, whereupon the ignominious are discharged and the wise advanced."⁽⁷⁾ Describing the Ta-ch'in capital, the *Wèi-shu* historian says: "The capital, the royal city, is divided into five cities (wards), each measuring five *li* 里 square, and the city as a whole is 60 *li* around. The king resides in the middle ward."⁽⁸⁾ This is comparable with the *Wèi-liao* passage: "The city where the king resides is over 100 *li* in circumference.....The king had five palaces, which stand ten *li* apart from one another."⁽⁹⁾ This plan of the city, as I explained elsewhere, the author of the *Wèi-liao* had laid out freely from his own fancy, guided by the traditional idea of five principles regulating the universe, and here we see the *Wèi-shu* historian was content with reducing the scale of the city by half and changing some details in the description. The same *Wèi-shu* passage goes on: "To each ward are attached eight officers so that they may govern the four divisions. The king's own city has also eight officers, who divide among themselves the superintendence over the four wards. If a matter concerning the state or any of the four divisions is deliberated upon without reaching any decision, then the officers of the four wards meet together in the place of council, and the king himself hears the discussion."⁽¹⁰⁾ This was what might be easily developed from the corresponding passage in the *Wèi-liao*: "There are established thirty-six generals. When there is a question to be deliberated upon, they refrain from consulting if one general is absent."⁽¹¹⁾ It may be noted that the *Wèi-liao* gives the number of generals only in the total, as 36; while our author, a little more elaborate, numbered eight officers for each of the five divisions of the city, and naturally this implies a slight increase in the total, from 36 to 40. Then comes the description of the people: "They are well proportioned in physique and tall in stature," says the *Wèi-shu*, "their costume, carriages and flags are also fashioned after those of the Middle Kingdom. Therefore they are called Ta-ch'in by other foreign peoples."⁽¹²⁾ Obviously this was an abridged combination of the two separate passages in the *Wèi-liao*: "They are tall and well-proportioned in figure, and look like the people of the Middle Kingdom, although they are dressed *hu* 胡 (barbarian) fashion. They say for themselves that they are an issue of the Middle Kingdom (race)"⁽¹³⁾ and "their flags

(7) 三載考績，黜陟幽明。(書經，舜典)

(8) 其王都城，分爲五城，各方五里，周六十里，王居中城。(魏書，卷一百二，西域傳大秦傳)

(9) 其王所治城，周回百餘里，.....王有五宮，一宮間相去十里。

(10) 城置八臣，以主四方，而王城亦置八臣，分主四城。若謀國事及四方，有不決者，則四城之臣，集議王所，王自聽之。(ibid.)

(11) 置三十六將，每議事，一將不至則不議也。

(12) 其人端正長大，衣服車旗，擬儀中國，故外域謂之大秦。(ibid.)

(13) 其俗，人長大平正，似中國人而胡服。自云，本中國一別也。

and banners, drums, small carriages with white canopies, their system of postal stations and *t'ing* 亭 and *chih* 置 stages resemble those of the Middle Kingdom."⁽¹⁴⁾ Perhaps our author also consulted the *Hou-han-shu* in this respect, which says of the Ta-ch'in people: "They are all shaven-headed and wear embroidery, drive white-canopied small carriages and pairs. When they go in and out, they beat drums, hoist flags, banners, and pennants..... They are all tall and well-proportioned, and resemble in a way the people of the Middle Kingdom, hence they are called Ta-ch'in."⁽¹⁵⁾ It is a matter deserving attention that both in the *Wèi-liao* and the *Hou-han-shu*, stress is unmistakably laid on the resemblance of the Ta-ch'in to the Chinese people, in physical appearance and otherwise, but at the same time there is mentioned something to remind us of their difference in customs,—the *hu* 胡 (barbarian) costume in the one case and the shaven head in the other; whereas in the *Wèi-shu* such discrimination is totally suppressed. The *Wèi-shu* account is continued: "The land is good for all sorts of grain, and mulberry-trees and hemp-plants; the people work hard in sericulture and farming."⁽¹⁶⁾ Compare this with the *Wèi-liao* passage: "The land produces the trees *sung* 松 (pine), *po* 柏 (cypress), *huai* 槐 (sophora), *tzu* 梓 (a kind of euphorbia), bamboos, rushes, willows, the *wu-t'ung* 梧桐 tree, and all kinds of other plants. The people are generally occupied in cultivating grain, their live-stock consisting of the horse, the ass, the mule, the camel, and the silk-worm."⁽¹⁷⁾ It might seem strange to find sericulture identified in both cases with the Ta-ch'in people, who, as a matter of fact, did not produce any silk; but as I remarked elsewhere, this serves to show how strong the inclination was in the Chinese historians to represent Ta-ch'in as a twin of their own country, and it is noticeable that the author of the *Wèi-shu* even seems to give more conspicuity to the mulberry and sericulture. Now he proceeds to mention as produced in abundance in Ta-ch'in: *ch'iu-lin* 璆琳 (a kind of jadestone); *lang-han* 琅玕 (a kind of coral); divine turtles; white horses; vermilion-mane; *ming-chu* 明珠 (shining pearls); *yeh-kuang-pi* 夜光璧 (the jewel that shines at night).⁽¹⁸⁾ All the names are included in the long list of Ta-ch'in products furnished by the *Wèi-liao*, and in picking up those seven from among the fifty-nine in the *Wèi-liao*, our author chose only such articles as had been highly prized by the Chinese from time immemorial, that is, before they had any intercourse with the Western Region. And here again we see that his design was to lend more ideal and intimate colour to his account of Ta-ch'in. As to the channels of intercourse coming forth from Ta-ch'in, he says:

(14) 旌旗擊鼓，白蓋小車，郵驛亭置，如中國。

(15) 皆髡頭而衣文繡，乘輜軒白蓋小車，出入擊鼓，建旌旗幡幟，.....其人民皆長大齊正，有類中國，故謂之大秦。(後漢書，卷一百十八，西域傳)

(16) 其土宜五穀桑麻，人務蠶田。(魏書)

(17) 其土地有松·柏·槐·梓·竹·葦·楊柳·梧桐·百草。民俗田種五穀，畜有馬·騾·驢·駱駝，桑蠶。

(18) 多璆琳·琅玕·神龜·白馬·朱鬃·明珠·夜光璧。(魏書)

“Toward the south-east traffic is open to Chiao-chih 交趾 (Tong king); and there is also a water passage for going to Yung-ch'ang-chün 永昌郡 in I-chou 益州 Province. So from Yung-ch'ang come rare commodities in abundance.”⁽¹⁹⁾ Plainly enough, this is an abstract from the *Wèi-liao* passage: “There is already a land-road to and from Ta-ch'in by way of Hai-péi 海北. Again, by traversing along the sea (from Ta-ch'in), one may reach in the south the outer barbarians in the seven prefectures of Chiao-chih. Toward the north, there is a water-route leading to Yung-ch'ang in I-chou Province. In consequence, Yung-ch'ang abounds in rare articles.”⁽²⁰⁾ Apart from this, the *Wèi-liao* tells us much about the topography of Ta-ch'in and the routes of traffic to and from there, but our *Wèi-shu* author does no more than mention the roads leading from Ta-ch'in to the southern frontier of his own empire, because he deemed that sufficient for his own purpose, which was in the main to give a familiar aspect to Ta-ch'in. For the same reason he could not well have omitted to connect with Ta-ch'in the favorite story of Hsi-wang-mu 西王母, the fairy queen-mother in the western paradise. “To the west of the sea west of Ta-ch'in there is a river which flows southwest,” he says, “West of the river, there is a range of hills running from north to south. West of the range there flows the Ch'ih-shui 赤水 (Red Stream). West of this ranges the Pai-yü-shan 白玉山 (White-jade Mountains). West of these there is the hill of Hsi-wang-mu. Her palace is reported to be built of jade-stone.”⁽²¹⁾ Evidently this is nothing but an abbreviation of the corresponding passage in the *Wèi-liao*: “To the west of Ta-ch'in there is a sea, west of which is a river. West of the river, there is a range of lofty hills running from north to south. To the west of it, there flows the Ch'ih-shui (Red Stream). To the west of the Ch'ih-shui, there stands Pai-yü-shan (White-Jade Hill), on which there is (the home of) Hsi-wang-mu. West of Hsi-wang-mu there is Hsiu-liu-sha 修流沙 (to be corrected as Liu-sha 流沙). West of Liu-sha, there are the four countries of Ta-hsia 大夏; Chien-sha 堅沙, Shu-yao 屬緜, and Yüeh-chih 月氏. West of these there is the Hêi-shui 黑水 (Dark or Black Stream) which is reported to mark the western extremity of the world.”⁽²²⁾ The author of the *Wèi-liao* treated Hsi-wang-mu's paradise as if it were a geographical existence, and in associating it with Ta-ch'in record, his intention was to idealize so much more the country he was describing; but we may notice that in the same breath he also mentioned those four countries which were really known to exist in that quarter of Asia during the Han and Wèi periods,—for Ta-hsia was Bactria; Shu-yáo, Sogdiana; Yüeh-chih, Kušan, and Chien-sha,

(19) 東南通交趾，又水道通益州永昌郡，多出異物。

(20) 大秦道既從海北陸通，又循海而南與交趾七郡外夷。北又有水道，通益州永昌，故永昌出異物。

(21) 大秦西，海水之西，有河，河西南流，河西南北山，山西有赤水，西有白玉山，玉山西有西王母山，玉爲堂云。(魏書)

(22) 大秦西有海水，海水西有河水，河水西，南北行有大山，西有赤水，赤水西有白玉山，白玉山有西王母，西王母西有修流沙，流沙西，有大夏國·堅沙國·屬緜國·月氏國，四國西有黑水，所傳聞西之極矣。

probably Kešš. In adapting the above passage, however, our *Wèi-shu* historian excluded every trace of those real countries, so that this part of his account completely became a guide to the paradise of Hsi-wang-mu, the object of yearning cherished by the people for long ages. In a further passage, he asserts: "Observing the sun and the moon and the constellations in the country, one will find that they are quite the same as in the Middle Kingdom."⁽²³⁾ We discover no statement comparable with this either in the *Wèi-liao* or the *Hou-han-shu*, and moreover, we do not feel that this was really meant to add anything to the knowledge of Ta-ch'in. Once more we may observe that such was the enthusiasm of the author for encouraging common interest in the supposed affinity between Ta-ch'in and his own country. Finally, thus he winds up his account: "The former historians say that going a hundred *li* west from T'iao-chih, one comes to the place where the sun sets, but this must be far short of the real distance, or far from being true."⁽²⁴⁾ This remark may be easily traced to the following passage in the *Wèi-liao*: "Formerly it was also erroneously believed that going over two hundred days west from T'iao-chih, one comes near the place where the sun sets."⁽²⁵⁾ Probably our author was also aware of this passage in the account of Wu-i-shan-li 烏弋山離 of the *Han-shu*: "If you go by water over a hundred days west from T'iao-chih, it is reported, you come near the place where the sun sets."⁽²⁶⁾ It may be taken for granted that in the *Wèi-shu* text above quoted, "going a hundred *li* west from T'iao-chih" was an error due to miscopying, for which we should read "going a hundred *days* west from T'iao-chih."

The above comparison between the *Wèi-liao* and the *Wèi-shu* accounts of Ta-ch'in is sufficient to show that the latter is a mere adaptation of the former, that nothing is added in the way of real facts, but some imaginary details are expanded or elaborated as if to give fuller scope to the fictional spirit of the original work. There is in the opening section of the *Ta-ch'in-chuan* of the *Wèi-shu*, however, a passage relating to the geography of Ta-ch'in which we have left unexamined. Immediately following the mention of the Ta-ch'in capital, as above cited, the author says: "(To reach it) from the west of T'iao-chih, one goes 10,000 *li* crossing a *hai-ch'ü* 海曲 (sea-curve, arm of the sea). (Ta-ch'in) is 39,400 *li* away from Tai 代. The sea referred to stretches immensely out, like the P'o-hai 渤海. It is an arrangement of nature that they (T'iao-chih and Ta-ch'in) should both face the P'o-hai (the far-stretched arm of the sea) on the east and the west. The country (of Ta-ch'in) covers an area of six thousands of *li*, and is situated between two

(23) 於彼國，觀日月星辰，無異中國。(魏書)

(24) 前史云，條支西行百里，日入處，失之遠矣。(魏書)

(25) 前世又謬以爲，從條支西行二百餘日，近日所入。

(26) 自條支，乘水西行百餘日，近日所入云。(漢書，卷九十六上，西域傳烏弋山離國)

seas."⁽²⁷⁾ Nothing equivalent to this is found in any previous Ta-ch'in-chuan; and to a casual reader it might seem that this must have come from later experience of travel in the region during the current period. But a little reflection will show that there is much room to doubt that such was the case. It is a famous fact related in the *Hou-han-shu* that in the 9th year of Ho-ti 和帝 of the Later Han, KANG Ying 甘英, the subaltern to PAN Chao 班超, the governor-general of the Western Region, who was sent out by his master on a diplomatic mission to Ta-ch'in, had arrived at T'iao-chih, and before taking his intended passage across the western sea (Hsi-hai 西海) to Ta-ch'in, he was informed by a Parthian sailor that the voyage would take three months with favourable winds, and might last two years in adverse weather. It is noticeable that the story does not give the number of miles to Ta-ch'in and it must be simply because the Chinese did not know it. The period of PAN Chao's service in the Western Region was one in which the state of affairs among the western nations was comparatively well known to the Chinese, and in which it seems that China stood in closer commercial relation with Ta-ch'in than ever before or after. And yet her knowledge of the geographical position of Ta-ch'in was so scanty and indefinite. The intercourse between the two peoples, however, had steadily languished by the time of the *Wèi-shu*; and how, we may well ask, it can be probable that the contemporary Chinese were so much better informed of the whereabouts of Ta-ch'in, as to enable the historian to declare positively: "10,000 *li* from T'iao-chih across the arm of the sea," or: "39,400 *li* from Tai." I have reason to suspect that those figures had nothing whatever to do with any experience of traveling to Ta-ch'in, but were a guess-work on the part of the author, based on certain data provided in the earlier records. It appeared from the story of KAN Ying in the *Hou-han-shu* that it took three months to reach Ta-ch'in from T'iao-chih, and although the *Wèi-liao* puts it as a voyage of two months, the comparison seemed to be in favour of the *Hou-han-shu*. Now it was a reasonable estimate that a sea-faring vessel would make a little over 100 *li* per day, and at this rate it would cover a distance of about 10,000 *li* in three months. This must be how our author, seeking the number of miles from T'iao-chih to Ta-ch'in, arrived at that figure. Let us now examine the alleged distance from the Wèi capital to Ta-ch'in, 39,400 *li*. We may refer to this passage of the *T'iao-chih-chuan* 條支傳 he gives elsewhere in his own history: "Its distance from Tai is 29,400 *li*."⁽²⁸⁾ Apart from the question which might be raised as to the origin of this figure, we can easily see that 29,400 *li*, the distance from Tai to T'iao-chih, plus 10,000 *li*, the distance from T'iao-chih to Ta-ch'in, would result in 39,400, the total

(27) (大秦國，一名黎軒，都安都城)，從條支西，渡海西一萬里，去代三萬九千九百里。其海傍 (to be corrected as 滂) 出，猶渤海也，而東西與渤海相望，蓋自然之理。地方六千里，居兩海之間。(魏書)

(28) (條支國，在安息西)，去代二萬九千九百里。(魏書，卷一百二，西域傳條支國)

distance to Ta-ch'ín.

As remarked above, the *Wèi-shu* furnishes an account of the country of T'iao-chih, which, it asserts, was situated west of An-hsi 安息, and at a distance of 29,400 *li* from Tai. This is very strange, for An-hsi (Parthia) was supplanted by Persia under her Sassanian dynasty as early as A.D. 226; and T'iao-chih, though the region so called varied in area from period to period, was annexed by Persia soon after the rise of her new powerful dynasty; and in point of fact, there was neither the country of An-hsi nor that of T'iao-chih during the period concerned, i.e. that of the Northern and Southern Dynasties. On one occasion, indeed, our author shows himself to have been aware of this truth, for he remarks, while describing Po-ssü 波斯 (Persia), that the country was identical with what had formerly been that of T'iao-chih. But still we see him locating T'iao-chih at a distance of 29,400 *li* from Tai, the capital of the Pèi-wèi 北魏 dynasty, and since he gives the distance from Tai to Po-ssü as 24,220 *li* on the other hand, it must be implied that T'iao-chih and Po-ssü were several and coeval countries, apart from each other by the balance of their respective distances from China, i.e., 5,180 *li*. I shall not attempt to account for this perplexing attitude of the writer or to examine into the authority of his numbers of miles; but at all events, it seems almost certain that when he declares that one may reach Ta-ch'ín by going for more than 10,000 *li* from T'iao-chih across the arm of the sea, he must be speaking of the T'iao-chih of old, that is, of the Later Han period. So it becomes the more evident that, although it is for the first time in the *Wèi-shu* that the distance from T'iao-chih to Ta-ch'ín is ever given in a definite number of miles, we need not ascribe it to any freshly-acquired information; it is more reasonable indeed, to regard the figure as an invention of the author's very likely suggested by the old data he had available in the *Wèi-liao* and the *Hou-han-shu*.

There is still another passage we have left unnoticed in the *Wèi-shu* account of Ta-ch'ín. It occurs near the close of the same: "From the western frontier of An-hsi, one may reach Ta-ch'ín also by traversing along a *hai-ch'ü* 海曲 (sea-curve, = arm of the sea) for over 40,000 *li*."⁽²⁹⁾ As already remarked, there was no longer An-hsi (Parthia) in the corresponding northern Wèi period, and nevertheless we find it forming a subject of account in the dynastic history, and described there as: "The country of An-hsi lies to the west of the Ts'ung-ling (Parthia), has its capital in the city of Wèi-sou 蔚搜. On the north, it adjoins K'ang-chü, and on the west Po-ssü; and it is situated to the north-west of the Ta-yüeh-chih. It is 21,500 *li* away from Tai. In the 2nd year of *T'ien-ho* 天和 of Chou 周 (A.D. 567), its king sent to China an embassy to offer tribute."⁽³⁰⁾ Since An-hsi was a country con-

(29) 從安息西界，循海曲，亦至大秦，四萬餘里。(魏書，卷一百二，西域傳大秦國)

(30) 安息國，在葱嶺西，都蔚搜城，北與康居，西與波斯接，在大月氏西北，去代二萬一千五百里。周天和二年，其王遣使朝獻。(魏書，卷一百二，西域傳安息國)

terminous with, and therefore distinct from, Po-ssü, we can hardly suppose that it referred to the ancient An-hsi, which had been completely superseded by Persia, but we must assume that it meant some other country. As it is located to the east of Persia and at the same time to the northwest of the home of the Ta-yüeh-chih, we cannot but seek it either in the district of Merv or that of Bokhara, of to-day. If it is to be identified with the former place, it must have been a dependency of Persia, and if coincident with the latter, it must have been included in the territory of I-ta 悒怛. But when our author remarks in his Ta-ch'in account: "From the western frontier of An-hsi, one may reach Ta-ch'in also by traversing along an arm of the sea for over 40,000 *li*,"⁽³¹⁾ what does he mean by An-hsi? If we were to apply to this An-hsi the same interpretation as above, then the whole statement would be entirely inscrutable; on the other hand, it can be well accounted for by referring to An-hsi of the Later Han times, and I think, thus alone. We may now proceed to see what was meant by "the western frontier of An-hsi 安息西界." So far as I am aware, this phrase occurs three times within the compass of the *Hou-han-shu* and of the *Wei-liao*. The first instance happens in that passage of the *Hou-han-shu* where we read how KAN Ying was advised as to the voyage to Ta-ch'in by a "sailor at the western frontier of An-hsi."⁽³²⁾ Secondly, the *Wei-liao*, in its description of T'iao-chih has: "It is now attached and subjected to An-hsi and proclaimed to mark the western frontier of An-hsi."⁽³³⁾ In both cases, it is clear that the term referred to T'iao-chih. Finally, in the article on An-hsi included in the *Hou-han-shu*, where a road leading from the capital of An-hsi to the country of Yü-lo 于羅 is described, we read: "From Ssü-pin 斯賓 you go south and cross a river. Again you go on southwest and you will reach the country of Yü-lo after a journey of 960 *li*. Here terminates the western frontier of An-hsi. From here, you may go south by sea to reach Ta-ch'in."⁽³⁴⁾ It is beyond doubt that in this case "the western frontier of An-hsi" identifies itself with the district of Yü-lo instead of T'iao-chih. We have already noticed how our author asserts that a voyage of over 10,000 *li* across an arm of the sea will take one from T'iao-chih to Ta-ch'in, and in the case under review he remarks that one has to traverse over 40,000 *li* along an arm of the sea to reach Ta-ch'in from the western frontier of An-hsi. If we are to take that wide difference in the number of miles between these two statements just as it is, it must seem after all that our author could not possibly have meant T'iao-chih by the "western frontier of An-hsi." It is however, in the

(31) See note 29.

(32) 和帝永元九年，都護班超遣甘英使大秦，抵條支，臨大海欲度，而安息西界船人，謂英曰，……(後漢書，卷一百十八，西域傳安息國)

(33) 前世謬以為，條支在大秦西，今其實在東。前世又謬以為，疆於安息，今更役屬之，號為安息西界。

(34) 從斯賓南行度河，又西南至于羅國，九百六十里，安息西界極矣。自此南乘海，乃通大秦。(後漢書，卷一百十八，西域傳安息國)

Pêi-shih, a part of which is another standard history of the same dynasty, partly consisting in a literal reproduction of the *Wèi-shu*, that we find what seems to throw a good light on the question. Where the *Wèi-shu* says "over 40,000 *li*" as above observed, the corresponding passage of the *Pêi-shih* reads: "over 10,000 *li*;" and, as I argued on another occasion,⁽³⁵⁾ there is sufficient reason to believe that, so far as this particular passage is concerned, the genuine original text is preserved in the present edition of the *Pêi-shih* rather than in that of the *Wèi-shu*. If we accordingly read "10,000 *li*" for "40,000 *li*" in the *Wèi-shu*, then the "10,000 *li*" will become a term common to those severally described routes of traffic to Ta-ch'ín, one leading from T'iao-chih and the other from the western frontier of An-hsi; and as it is by no means improbable that what the author stated in the opening part of his account of Ta-ch'ín was repeated in different context within the same article, we may now take it for granted that in the *Wèi-shu*, no less than in the *Wèi-liao* and *Hou-han-shu*, the western frontier of An-hsi as a starting point for a passage to Ta-ch'ín was really nothing other than T'iao-chih.

I may now call attention to the term "hai-ch'ü (sea-curve)" 海曲 which I have rendered by "an arm of the sea" in those two passages from the *Wèi-shu*. It applies to the sea which the country of T'iao-chih is stated to have bordered on and which is invariably mentioned by the name of Hsi-hai 西海 (Western Sea) in the earlier histories, such as the *Shih-chi* 史記, the *Han-shu* and the *Hou-han-shu*; and it is for the first time in the *Wèi-shu* that we see that body of water expressed by that novel term. As we learn from the *P'ei-wên-yün-fu* 佩文韻府, "hai-ch'ü" is a set phrase occurring not infrequently in ancient literature. It is used in various senses, and sometimes signifies an island, but, never, outside the *Wèi-shu*, a bay or gulf. But there is no reason to doubt the meaning intended for it in the *Wèi-shu*. Perhaps the author took the initiative in giving a new import to the known term; or he may have invented it independently for the occasion, that is, if he was regardless or unconscious of its existence in classics. In any case, we seem to be enabled to guess where he took a hint for that expression. The *Hou-han-shu*, in its *T'iao-chih-chuan*, has: "The capital of the country of T'iao-chih is situated on a hill. It is a little over 40 *li* in circumference. It faces the Western Sea. The sea-water curves and circles (hai-shui ch'ü-huan 海水曲環). It (the city) is cut away from all traffic on the south and on the northeast, that is, on three sides; only in the northwestern corner, it has access to a land-road."⁽³⁶⁾ Evidently this shows how the city stood on a peninsula, undoubtedly that of Kharax, which was formed by a deep indentation of the sea from the southeast. Considering, however, how little was

(35) See the third article of this volume.

(36) 條支國城，在山上，周回四十餘里。臨西海，海水曲環。其南及東北三面路絕，唯西北隅通陸道。（後漢書，卷一百十八，西域傳條支國）

known of the general geography of that part of Asia at that period, it is hard to expect that the author of the *Wei-shu* could reach the same interpretation as ours. He may more easily have taken the phrase "the sea-water curving and circling" as referring to the general aspect of the western sea, and then he might be led to suppose that the sea-water in question formed an extensive gulf separating the country of T'iao-chih from that of Ta-ch'in; and then to contract the whole phrase into the shorter form "hai-ch'ü 海曲" (sea-curve) and apply it in the sense just observed. If this is a fact, he must be adjudged to have misread the *Hou-han-shu*, but in doing so, he also chanced to let his notion of the western sea agree with that of the author of the *Wei-liao*. As I explained at length in my article "*On the Geography of the Western Region Studied on the Basis of the Ta-ch'in Accounts*,"⁽³⁷⁾ what is said of the *hsi-hai* 西海 (the western sea) in the *Wei-liao* can only be understood by supposing that the contemporary Chinese had a peculiar idea of the western sea, owing to their utter ignorance of the Arabian Peninsula, that is, they imagined a continuous arm of the sea in the place where there actually lay the Persian Gulf, Arabia, and the Red Sea. Our *Wei-shu* historian was no better informed of the real state of things in that quarter, and even if he used that new term *hai-ch'ü* in the sense of the western sea, it is no indication to the contrary. He was but elaborating his material, and this fact is further evidenced in his adoption of the term *P'o-hai* in the same passage. It is a word denoting a big arm of the sea thrusting itself far into land, and it formed as such an expressive variation for the term *hai-ch'ü* or sea-curve. But that was not all. *P'o-hai* was likewise the proper name used for that well-known gulf in the northeast of China, and he must have taken advantage of it to emphasize the supposed affinity of Ta-ch'in with the Middle Kingdom, which was apparently his chief aim in describing Ta-ch'in. Now coming to the close of the passage, we have this remark on Ta-ch'in: "The country covers an area of six thousands of *li*, and lies between two seas."⁽³⁸⁾ To take up the last half of the statement, we may say that this is the first instance that such situation of the country is explicitly mentioned in history, but here again we need not ascribe the idea to any fresh source of information; it was an obvious conclusion from the data already on record. It was inevitable that the country was bounded on the east by the so-called western sea, which separated it from T'iao-chih; and as for the other sea, it was already noticed in the *Wei-liao* passage: "To the west (of Ta-ch'in) there is again a great sea,"⁽³⁹⁾ which unmistakably referred to the Mediterranean. Now returning to the first half of the above *Wei-shu* passage, one may be struck by the definiteness with which the extent of the area of Ta-ch'in is given, that is, in the phrase "six thousands of *li*."⁽⁴⁰⁾ For the earlier authorities only say:

(37) The third article of this volume.

(38) 地方六千里，居兩海之間。(魏書，卷一百二，西域傳大秦國)

(39) (大秦) 西又有大海。

"It stretches thousands of *li* from east to west and from north to south", (*Wèi-liao*);⁽⁴¹⁾ or "The country covers an area of thousands of *li*," (*Hou-han-shu*);⁽⁴²⁾ giving no exact number of thousands. It would be futile, however, to attempt to know where our author derived his comparatively precise figure, or even to assume that he owed it to any new source of information. For it is clear that all he wanted was to secure as much appearance of exactitude as possible for his account of Ta-ch'in, and therefore that he could not afford to leave much in vagueness. We have already seen that where the *Wèi-liao* and the *Hou-han-shu* historians were contended with stating that it took two or three months to sail to Ta-ch'in from T'iao-chih, our author took trouble to compute the distance as 10,000 *li*; and that he stated the distance from the Wèi capital (Tai) to the Ta-ch'in in such an exact term as 39,400 *li*, though on doubtful authority too. And now it was the same spirit that made him substitute "six thousands of *li*" or "thousands of *li*". Nobody was more conscious of the spurious nature of his own *Ta-ch'in-chuan*, and it is natural that he did what he could to disguise it by seeming accuracy.

From the foregoing analysis we know that the *Ta-ch'in-chuan* of the *Wèi-shu* was shaped primarily after the model of that of the *Wèi-liao*, although attended with some alterations suggested by the corresponding account in the *Hou-han-shu*; and that in spite of its seeming to the contrary at first sight, it embodies no later information acquired about the state of things in the far west. As for the nature of the *Wèi-liao* account referred to, it was the main subject of discussion in my another study; "*Chinese Ideas Reflected in the Accounts of Ta-ch'in*,"⁽⁴³⁾ where I pointed out that it was a record of observed facts most freely intermixed with fictitious ingredients, which were not doubt dictated by the characteristic vanity of the nation and the popular belief in the existence of the western paradise. As the intercourse with Ta-ch'in went on waning from the period of the Three Kingdoms on, the Chinese scholars gradually lost touch with the reality of the country, but on the other hand Ta-ch'in as represented in its brilliant picture in the *Wèi-liao* remained a tradition in the Chinese mind. So, when a later description of Ta-ch'in is furnished in the *Hou-han-shu*, a compilation less old than the *Wèi-liao*, it is not surprising that much is eliminated on the side of serious history, while the fictitious elements receive more stress. This tendency of the *Ta-ch'in-chuan* in Chinese history prevails more conspicuously in the *Chin-shu* 晉書, a later dynastic history, but reaches a climax in the *Wèi-shu*, where, as we have been observing, Ta-ch'in as a real historical existence is almost entirely lost, and what is presented in its place is a community which can only

(40) See note 38.

(41) 東西南北數千里.

(42) 地方數千里. (後漢書, 卷一百十八, 西域傳大秦國)

(43) The second article of this volume.

flourish in the world of imagination. In a word, the history of Ta-ch'in in the *Wèi-shu* is a fable in disguise, and in this respect offers a parallel instance to that of the country of Fu-sang 扶桑, contained in the *I-mo-chuan* 夷貊傳 of the *Nan-shih* 南史 (the Annals of the Southern Dynasties). This had its primary foundation in the fable of Mu-kung 木公 (prince of Wood), the fairy king who is also known by the name of Tung-wang-fu 東王父 (Eastern King Father), the opposite of the Hsi-wang-mu 西王母; but the inhabitants ascribed to the country are fitted up with customs and manners reminiscent of the Chinese, and their alleged history rendered more plausible by blending it cleverly with known facts about the eastern barbarians, such, for instance, as the Kao-chü-li 高句麗, whose history is given in the *Wèi-chih* 魏志. Product of pure forgery, Fu-sang was nevertheless accepted as a country really existing in some remote part of the Eastern Sea, and at length it found its way into the pages of the standard history. In this case it was not the dynastic historian, but some charlatan traveller, who was responsible for the making of the false account, for the historiographer was so deeply deceived as to admit it into history. For aught I know, the same may have been the case with the *Wèi-shu* historian and his account of Ta-ch'in; but however this may be, it is beyond dispute that Ta-ch'in so much falsified as in the *Wèi-shu* was no more a matter entitled for a place in serious history than the more obvious fiction of Fu-sang.

Chapter II

Persia and the Northern Wèi Dynasty

Among the series of standard histories pertaining to the successive dynasties prior to the T'ang, those which give a separate article to Ta-ch'in are: the *Wèi-liao*, the *Hou-han-shu*, the *Chin-shu*, the *Wèi-shu*, the *Sung-shu* 宋書, and the *Liang-shu* 梁書. Of these, it is the *Wèi-liao* in which we find embodied the earliest and the most circumstantial information ever recorded of the country. The accounts of Ta-ch'in in all the other works add practically nothing to the *Wèi-liao* knowledge, with the only exceptions, so far as I know, that the *Hou-han-shu* makes mention of the arrival at the Chinese court of a messenger from a king of Ta-ch'in, by the name of An-tun 安敦, as occurring in the 9th year of *Yen-hsi* 延熹 of Huan-ti 桓帝 (A.D. 166); that the *Chin-shu* reports the country to have once sent tribute during the *T'ai-k'ang* 太康 era (A.D. 280-289) of Wu-ti 武帝; and that the *Liang-shu* enters the fact that in the 5th year of *Huang-wu* 黃武 (A.D. 226) of Sun-ch'üan 孫權 of the Wu 吳 Kingdom a merchant from Ta-ch'in by the name of Ch'in-lun 秦論, was received at the Wu capital, now Nanking 南京. As regards the *Wèi-shu* account of Ta-ch'in, we have been observing how entirely void it is of later independent information about the country. The above facts, taken together, clearly suggest that the intercourse between China and Ta-ch'in, which was most flourishing during the Later Han age, became less active as time progressed until it at last fell into that dormant condition which marked it during the epoch of the Southern and Northern Dynasties. In my view, this change was chiefly due to the fact that in the beginning of the Three Kingdom Age (A.D. 214-264) the Persian people under the Sassanian dynasty succeeded in overthrowing Parthia and that in course of time the rising nation seized upon the monopoly of the commercial transactions between the east and the west. Previous to this, it is true, the same position of vantage on the route of the world-commerce had been utilized by their predecessor An-hsi (Parthia), who made a point of intermediating in the supply of Chinese silk to the farther western countries, and it is quite natural that they persistently endeavoured to interrupt direct communication between the Middle Kingdom and Ta-ch'in. This situation is fairly evident from the following passage of the *Hou-han-shu*: "The king (of Ta-ch'in) had always wished to send an envoy to Han (China); but An-hsi was so eager to monopolize the trade with Ta-ch'in in Chinese silk that her positive interruption had hitherto been keeping his people from direct intercourse with China."⁽⁴⁴⁾ It seems,

(44) 其(大秦)王常欲通使於漢,而安息欲以漢繒綵與之交市,故遮闕不得自達。(後漢書,卷一百十八,西域傳大秦國)

however, that this referred only to overland traffic; in the direction of sea trade, it is to be doubted that An-hsi's monopoly was so complete. For the *Wei-liao* account of Ta-ch'in has: "She always finds it profitable to obtain Chinese silk, which her people unravel to be rewoven into *hu* 胡 (barbarian) silk cloth. For this reason, she frequently trades in the sea with An-hsi and other peoples."⁽⁴⁵⁾ Then the corresponding passage in the *Hou-han-shu* reads: "She trades with An-hsi and T'ien-chu 天竺 (India) in the sea, deriving ten-fold profit from the business."⁽⁴⁶⁾ So it may be fairly assumed that in the sphere of sea trade, Ta-ch'in merchants had still in those days more or less chance to deal directly with the T'ien-chu people at least, besides the An-hsi, and they were still allowed to make a very lucrative business of it, too. But there came a turn of fortune with Persia stepping into the shoes of An-hsi as a middleman. She outdid her predecessor in exploring the commanding position in the world's traffic, and tightening hold of her interests both in overland and sea trade. An episode is preserved which tells us much. In A.D. 568, a chief of Sogdiana, by the name of Maniach, persuaded the K'o-han 可汗 (*Qayan*) of the western T'u-chüeh 突厥 to send him to the court of the Persian king Khosroes, in order to solicit the royal grant for transporting Chinese silk to be delivered to the Roman importers through (part of) his kingdom. Not only did this request meet with a flat refusal, but one of Maniach's party had to be poisoned to atone for the crime of impertinence. The date of this incident corresponds in China with the 3rd year of *T'ien-ho* 天和 (A.D. 568) of the Northern Chou 北周 reign, and so belongs to the last section of the Epoch of the Northern and Southern Dynasties, but in spite of its comparative lateness, it is enough to indicate how inveterate was the policy of the Sassanian dynasty to guard with most acute jealousy the monopoly of silk-trade on land between the east and the west. Besides, there is a circumstance which allows us to guess that Persia was no less exclusive in her maritime trade. The Ta-yüeh-chih race, occupying the northern section of India during the Later Han period, adopted the Roman system of coinage from the time of King Kanishka onward. Their coins were inscribed in the Greek alphabet alone. This indicates that they had fairly close commercial intercourse with the Roman Empire, and although it must have been largely confined to sea trade on account of the interruption by Parthia in overland traffic, still we may be sure it was of vital importance to the people. We find them, however, in a fast-declining condition soon after the Parthian power had given place to that of the newly-risen Persia. Diverse causes may be suggested, but what was the most fatal must have been the cessation of their sea trade with the Roman empire, which had been the essential factor of their prosperity, but which was now rendered unavailable by Persia's annexation of maritime trade in that quarter of the world.

(45) 又常利得中國絲，解以爲胡綾，故數與安息諸國，交市於海中。

(46) 與安息·天竺，交市於海中，利有十倍（後漢書，卷一百十八，西域傳大秦國）

Whatever merchandise of the far east may have passed through the hands of the Persians on their way to the Roman empire, Chinese silk must always have been the most lucrative article of trade to her, and this was sufficient reason to induce her to establish and maintain friendly relations with China. No wonder that a visit of a Persian envoy to the Chinese emperor's court occurs on record with such frequency in the Dynastic Annals of the *Wèi-shu*; and besides, in the Account of the Western Countries in the same history, Persia receives a more detailed description than any other foreigners. Notice, for example, the following passage in the *Hsi-yü-chuan*: "During the era of *Shên-kuei* 神龜 (A.D. 518-519) the country (of Persia) sent an envoy carrying a letter of the king addressed to the imperial throne, besides sundry article of tribute. The letter said; 'May the T'ien-tzŭ 天子 (Son of Heaven=Emperor) of the most magnificent country in existence continue to reign where the sun rises, as the heaven-born T'ien-tzŭ of the central Han (China). This homage is humbly offered by the King of Persia, Chü-ho-to 居和多, repeating thousands of times his most reverential obeisance.' This the Court accepted with approval."⁽⁴⁷⁾ Here seems to be a most tangible index to the attitude of Persia toward the Northern Wèi dynasty. In the above passage, the exact date of the occurrence is unmentioned, but looking into the Annals of *Su-tsung* 肅宗 in the same history, we find there, entered under the first year *Shên-kuei* 神龜 (A. D. 518), the fact of Persia sending an envoy with tribute, and no doubt this refers to the identical occasion. As the Persian monarch at that time is known to have been King Kobād, it is naturally inferred this name was the original of the transcription Chü-ho-to. Now what was the motive of his sending that excessively polite letter to the Wèi emperor? Certainly it was not so much the desire to fall back on the Chinese sovereign's influence in his military struggle with his neighbours as the commercial requirement for securing the good will of the master of the silk-producing country. Still another thing worth notice in the above epistle is the presence there of the term T'ien-tzŭ. This Chinese title of supreme honour was known by the Persians, undoubtedly through their frequent contact with the T'o-pa Wèi 拓跋魏 people during the Sassanian dynasty, and perhaps we can say most confidently that here was the origin of the word Baghbŭr (or Faghfŭr) in old Persian and Arabic speech, meaning the Chinese emperor, which is ascertained to have been derived from the original form of Bagh-pŭr (Heaven-son), obviously a literal translation of the Chinese term "T'ien-tzŭ" in the Persian language.⁽⁴⁸⁾ Equally noteworthy is the fact that at about the same period the T'u-chŭeh and other peoples of the western region began to call China by the name *Tamghāč* and the like. Those T'u-chŭeh stone tablets erected in memory of Kül Tägin and Bilgä Qayan in the time corresponding to the reign of the

(47) 神龜中，其(波斯)國遣使，上書貢物。云，大國天子，天之所生，願日出處，常爲漢中天子，波斯王居和多，千萬敬拜。朝廷嘉納之。(魏書，卷一百二，西域傳波斯國)

(48) YULE-CORDIER; *Cathay and the Way thither*, I, p. 141, note 1.

T'ang emperor Hsüan-tsung 玄宗, bear the word *Tabyač* denoting the Chinese and we may believe that this is probably the form representing the correct pronunciation of the term. This foreign name for the Chinese must have been in use even earlier than the T'ang period, for Theophylactus Simocatta, who flourished in the 7th century A.D. or during the Sui period, speaks of China as *Taugas*, which is apparently a corruption of *Tabyač*. As for the origin of the term *Tabyač*, I may be allowed to recall that in my article "About the Countries of *Ta-ch'in* and *Fu-lin*" printed in 1904,⁽⁴⁹⁾ I expressed my opinion that *Tabyač* was the T'u-chüeh transcription of T'ò-pa 拓跋, the name of the ruling barbarian family which finally succeeded in invading China, and that the foreigners continued to call China by that name even after the T'ò-pa house, as the founder of a northern dynasty, assumed the title Wêi. Later on, I found PELLIOT offering a similar view on the subject, in the T'ung-pao 通報 in 1912, and felt my own interpretation borne out thereby. At all events, it seems clear that the evidence of the western words *Baghpûr* and *Tabyač*, meaning respectively the Chinese emperor and the country of China goes a great length to demonstrate that China held most frequent and lively intercourse with the western countries, above all with Persia, during the period that the T'ò-pa Wêi dynasty was in power.

It has been noticed above that the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of the *Wêi-shu* gives a fuller account of Persia than of any other people in the world west of the Pamir, and now one of its outstanding features calling our attention is the long list provided of Persian products, and this is set off by total absence or brevity of the information of this kind in the case of every other country. For the Persian list contains thirty seven items;⁽⁵⁰⁾ and if we are to count together those six articles from Persia mentioned for the first time in the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of the *Sui-shu* 隋書,⁽⁵¹⁾ it will make the total of forty-three Persian products known to contemporary China. This naturally reminds us of that catalogue of *Ta-ch'in* products, still longer, furnished in the *Wêi-liao*. As has been already explained, many of the items named in it did not really belong to *Ta-ch'in*: some were objects of pure fancy, as, for example, *ch'ih-ch'ih* 赤螭 'the red dragon,' *hsüan-hsüing* 玄熊 'the mysterious bear,' *shên-kuei* 神龜 'the divine turtle,' and *pi-hsieh-shu* 辟邪鼠 'the charming-evil-away rat'; some were those particular kinds of jewelry which the Chinese had tradition-

(49) See note 1.

(50) Gold, silver, t'ou-shih 鎔石, coral, amber, ch'ê-ch'ü 車渠, agate, big pearls, p'ò-li 頗梨, liu-li 琉璃, crystal, sê-sê 瑟瑟, diamond 金剛, huo-ch'i 火齊, pin-t'ieh 鑛鐵, copper, tin, chu-sha 朱砂, mercury, gold-brocade, t'ieh-ho 疊駝, ch'ü-shu 黠菴, t'a-têng 鼯鼯, ch'ih-chang-p'í 赤蠟皮, hsün-liu 薰陸, yü-chin 鬱金, su-ho 蘇合, ch'ing-mu 青木, pepper, pi-po 華撥, shih-mi 石蜜 (stone honey), c'ien-nien-tsao 千年棗, hsiang-fu-tzú 香附子, ho-li-lê 訶梨勒, wu-shih-tzú 無食子, yen-ssü 鹽絲, tz'ü-huang 雌黃.

(51) Hu-lo-chieh 呼洛羯, lü-t'êng 呂騰, hu-na 護那, yüeh-no-pu 越諾布, t'an 擅, and the chin-lou 金縷.

ally held to be the most precious, namely, ming-yüeh-chu 明月珠, yeh-kuang-chu 夜光珠, ch'iu-lin 璆琳, lang-kan 琅玕, etc; and again some turn out to be products more properly identifiable with some other countries in the west nearer than Ta-ch'in, as, for instance, wên-hsiu-pu 溫宿布, fêi-ch'ih-pu 緋持布, etc. And, as remarked before, this forced inclusiveness of the *Wêi-liao* catalogue was due to nothing but to the author's design to display the richness of Ta-ch'in in everything good and desirable. It is quite different, however, with the Persian products mentioned in the *Wêi-shu* and the *Sui-shu*. They were really of Persian origin, and what the contemporary Chinese actually knew by sight or hearing. This inference may be further supported by the knowledge that most or the non-Chinese names in the list are reducible to Iranian origin, which we owe to LAUFER's study embodied in his illustrious work, *Sino-Iranica*.

After the foregoing observations, our impression of Persia in the Northern Wêi times is that her national wealth and prosperity was such as could only be matched by what had once distinguished Ta-ch'in in the Later Han period. It is even probable that the world's centre of commerce, now lay in Persia, with Madain as its capital city, just as it must have formerly been located in Ta-ch'in, either at Alexandria of Egypt or at Antiochia of Syria. And here it will be well to emphasize the truth that Persia flourished at a later period than Ta-ch'in, and not contemporaneously, as might be expected on a casual reading of the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of the *Wêi-shu*. For, though Ta-ch'in is described then as if it were a current existence, this was in reality a mere modification of the tradition of the old Ta-ch'in which had been handed down from the Later Han period. In a word, Persia was the only country with notable riches and prosperity that the contemporary Chinese really knew to be existing in the Western Region.

Chapter III

The Interpretation of the Name Fu-lin

“Ta-ch’in” was a peculiar designation given by Later Han Chinese to the Roman Orient, and as a matter of course, there was no nation calling herself by that name anywhere. We have seen how the *Wèi-su* account of Ta-ch’in presented a mere ghost of the Ta-ch’in of the earlier times, and this intimates how the Chinese had by that time lost touch with Ta-ch’in as a real existence. In the mean time, however, the Roman Orient, once truly represented by Ta-ch’in, continued in flourishing condition. To whatever extent her old command over oriental commerce may have passed to the hands of the ascendant Persians during the Northern Wèi period, still the Eastern Roman Empire held her own in the east, as the owner of a vast territory in western Asia and as a formidable rival to the Persian power beyond the Euphrates. It would be surprising, therefore, if the Chinese had ceased to know anything of the Roman Orient, with the passing of Ta-ch’in into mere tradition during the epoch of the Southern and Northern Dynasties. We suspect that on the contrary they must have retained cognizance of it under some other name than Ta-ch’in. Now the historian of the *Sui-shu* makes mention of a country called *Fu-lin* whose location, apparently falling in the westernmost part of the western region, seemed to correspond with that recorded of the old Ta-ch’in. No wonder the Chinese historians of the succeeding T’ang 唐 period were ready to recognize this Fu-lin as identical with what had been termed Ta-ch’in by the earlier authors, and that this interpretation has been unanimously followed by subsequent writers. But it remains for us to question whether that interpretation was well-grounded, and what was the origin of the name Fu-lin. This problem, indeed, has been frequently discussed by modern sinologues, but, so far as I am aware, without reaching any final solution as yet.

Inasmuch as Fu-lin on record is located as the western extremity of the world then known to the Chinese, that is to say, in the same position assigned to Ta-ch’in in the Han and Wèi times, it is quite natural that the western savants began at an early date to take interest in its identification; and it will be instructive to see what variety of opinions had been offered on the subject before the consensus was reached that Fu-lin referred to the Eastern Roman Empire. PHILIPPE tried to identify the term Fu-lin with El Hira; SMITH regarded it as a transcription of *Philistine*; not to speak of some other scholar who suggested Persia.⁽⁵²⁾ These interpretations, however, were only

(52) E. BRETSCHNEIDER, *On the Knowledge possessed by the Ancient Chinese of the Arabs and the Arabian Colonies and Other Western Countries mentioned in Chinese Books, 1871*, p. 26.

based on the idea of phonetic similitude, and it is natural that little heed was given to them. DEGUIGNES thought that the term Fu-lin, being a phonetical reproduction of *France*, signified the territory occupied by the French during the Crusades.⁽⁵³⁾ P. VISDELOU, referring to the rector of Claudiopolis, according to whom *Fu-lin* was a corruption of the term which was more faithfully represented by *Hua-lin* 花林 on the Nestorian stone, argued that since *Hua-lin* was a transcription of Hellen, Fu-lin must have meant the Eastern Roman Empire.⁽⁵⁴⁾ It was, however, E. JACQUET who opposed the above opinions by claiming that *Fu-lin*, being the transcription of the Greek term *Polin*, represented Constantinople,⁽⁵⁵⁾ and this line of interpretation was further pursued, seven years later, by PAUTHIER with his argument that since the name Constantinople of the capital of the Eastern Roman Empire, meant "the city (polis) of Constantin", and since the dative case of *polis* was *polin*, he was bound to seek the origin of Fu-lin in this direction.⁽⁵⁶⁾ This view was participated by many scholars, among whom may be mentioned H. YULE, the well-known authority on the geography of the regions surrounding the Middle Kingdom. He pointed out that according to Masūdi of the 9th century A.D., the Greeks used to call their capital city not by the name of Constantina but that of Bolin (city) (perhaps as the Londoners usually speak of London just as Town), while the fuller title Stanbolin was reserved for the occasion to represent it in its metropolitan dignity; and he went on to remark that the Chinese of the T'ang period must have applied the name Fu-lin to the Roman Empire because the Romans at about the time of Heraclius were in the habit of speaking of their eastern capital as Bo-lin, of which Fu-lin was a phonetic reproduction.⁽⁵⁷⁾ Another notable advocate of the Bolin theory was BRETSCHNEIDER, whose first opinion, however, had favoured the interpretation of Fu-lin as a phonetic equivalent of Frank. After outlining the history of the ancient Franks who, in their best day, had more than half of the European continent at their command; and suggesting that the Mohammedan term *Ferehghi* for the Europeans in general may easily have come from *Frank*, he called attention to the probability that the archaic sound of the 拂菻 was *fu-lan* rather than *fu-lin*, and concluded that the term Fu-lin, thus originally pronounced *fu-lan*, was no less adequate reproduction of *Frank* than the form *Fo-lang* 佛郎 used in the *Yüan-shih* 元史 and other records.⁽⁵⁸⁾ His later

(53) J. DEGUIGNES, *Recherches sur les chrétiens établis à la Chine dans septième siècle*. Rec. d'Ac. des Ins., Mem. XXX., 1780.

(54) P. VISDELOU, *Monument du christianisme en Chine*. Supp. à la Bib. Or. de M.D' HERBELOT, 1780.

(55) E. JACQUET, *Origine de l'un des noms sous lequel l'Empire romain a connu à la Chine*. J.A. 2ème série, IX, 1832.

(56) M. PAUTHIER, *Examen méthodique*. J.A., 3ème série, VIII, 1839, P. 398, Note 3.

(57) H. YULE, *Cathay*, I. p. 44, n. 30; IV, p. 8, n. 1.

(58) E. BRETSCHNEIDER, *Notes on Chinese Mediaeval Travellers to the West*. Chinese Recorder, IV. 1875. p. 8 Note 31.

interpretation of the term Fu-lin, however, was that, although it was in the T'ang period that the name became fully established, it made its first appearance in the *Hsi-yü-t'u-chi* 西域圖記, the geographical compilation by P'ei Chü 裴矩 under the preceding Sui dynasty, and there seemed to be the more likelihood that Fu-lin represented the Byzantine Empire, or Rum, as it was called by the Mohammedan writers.⁽⁵⁹⁾

Thus the term Fu-lin was reduced to the two different origins, Frank and Polin, but it was the Polin theory which became ever more widely accepted and seemed eventually to settle the question. But before long an entirely new line was struck by HIRTH in his *China and the Roman Orient* (1885), where he argued that, since the original pronunciation of the characters composing the term 拂菻 was *but-lim* or *but-lüm*, instead of *fu-lin*; since it took the place of the term Ta-ch'in in the T'ang period; and since that statement on the Nestorian inscription, "A virgin gave birth to the Holy One in Ta-ch'in,"⁽⁶⁰⁾ was a sure indication to the identity between Ta-ch'in and Syria, he might safely trace *Fu-lin* to *Bethlehem*, the name of the birthplace of Christ.⁽⁶¹⁾ This theory of HIRTH's was opposed by CHAVANNES who maintained that Fu-lin did not refer to Syria, but to the Eastern Roman Empire as a whole. HIRTH denied to date the term Fu-lin farther back than A.D. 635, the year that the Nestorian missionaries first arrived at the T'ang metropolis, on the ground that the *Sui-shu*, in which the term Fu-lin receives the earliest mention, was not compiled until the years from A.D. 629 to 636 within the T'ang epoch; but CHAVANNES revealed that the name occurred in the preface to the geographical work by P'ei Chü, which most certainly dated from late in A.D. 607 and further suggested that the term had been available some time before the author of the *Sui-shu* adopted it, and consequently the introduction of the name to the Chinese dated earlier than HIRTH supposed. He further noticed that in the preface of the *Hsi-yü-t'u-chi* referred to, there were mentioned three different routes of traffic leading from Tun-huang 燉煌 to the Western Region, and that the northern road was described as passing through I-wu 伊吾 (Hami), P'u-lêi 蒲類 (Barkul) and the territory of the T'ieh-lê 鐵勒 tribe until he arrived at the seat of the T'u-chüeh 突厥 Qa'jan and thereafter as crossing a north-flowing river and finally reaching Fu-lin. From this it seemed to him that, in the Sui times and afterwards, Chinese travellers could proceed to the headquarters of the T'u-chüeh by the northern route; while western records showed that the T'u-chüeh's royal court was visited twice by envoys of the Byzantine empire; and therefore he had sufficient reason to suspect that such Chinese magistrates or merchants as happened to visit the T'u-chüeh's headquarters had ample chance to hear of the Eastern Roman Empire, and that, since this was most likely done under the name Po-lin, it must have been this

(59) Ditto; *Mediaeval Researches*, I. p. 143-144, Note 391.

(60) 室女誕生於大秦.

(61) HIRTH, *China and the Roman Orient*, p. 289-290.

term which was finally conveyed to the Chinese historians to be represented by the transcription 拂菻.⁽⁶²⁾ I felt fully justified in accepting CHAVANNES' suggestion that the Chinese knowledge of the name Fu-lin came through the medium of the T'u-chüeh, and ventured to support it in my old article on Ta-ch'in and Fu-lin,⁽⁶³⁾ at the same time offering a linguistic observation of my own. I pointed out that in the languages of the Altaic family, which were unaccustomed to the *r* sound at the head of a word, it was usual to reproduce a foreign term with such initial by prefixing a vowel to the original, as may be illustrated by the modification of the term Rus (Russia) in the Mongolian and Turkish languages, into Oros (Urus), whose Chinese equivalent appears in the variety of spellings, Ê-lo-ssü 鄂羅斯, Ê-lo-ssü 俄羅斯, Wo-lu-ssü 鞏魯斯, Wu-lu-ssü 兀魯斯, Ko-lê-ssü 葛勒斯, etc. and tried to suggest that the T'u-chüeh tribe, of the Turkish stock, very probably used such forms as Urum, Hurum, or Burum as a reproduction of Rum, which was the name applied to the Eastern Roman Empire by the natives of western Asia and that they must have been directly responsible for the Chinese transcription Fu-lin. I also remarked that, later on, the Chinese authors of the Yüan period used the form Wu-lin 兀林 to represent Rum, as the current name used for Asia Minor by the peoples of western Asia, and that this Wu-lin must be regarded as directly traceable to the original from Hurum or Gurum.⁽⁶⁴⁾ Ten years later, when PELLIOU published his interpretation of *Fu-lin*, I found it similar on the whole to my opinion above outlined, but notwithstanding I could not but notice that there was much novelty in his observation of the manner in which the original Rum found its way into *Fu-lin*. He held that the name *Röm*, commonly applied to the Eastern Roman Empire, must have been first imparted to the Chinese in the corrupted form *Fröm* and this meant that the Chinese were not responsible for adding the initial *f*. In the Armenian language, *Röm* passed in the *Hrom* (or *Horom*), and in the Pahlavi into *Hröm*; and as it was usual in the Iranian dialects of the Parthian type to substitute the *h* sound for the *f* sound in a Persian word, he thought it presumable that the Armenian term *Hröm* was apt to chance to *Fröm* in the Kharizmian and Sogdian languages. He further endeavoured to bring forward three actual instances of the use of the term *Fröm*, in the sense of Rom. In the first place, he took notice of a rector of Merv recorded as attending a Nestorian conference of A.D. 486, under the name Fromi, and as his comment goes, this was not a personal name, but simply meant that he was a Roman by birth, and therefore corresponded to the later form *Rumi*. Next he called attention to the name of a country, *Pur^m* (Por^m), mentioned in the T'u-chüeh inscription on the memorial stone of Kül Tägin erected in the 8th century,

(62) ÉD. CHAVANNES; *Notes additionnelles sur Tou-kiue (Ture) occidentaux*. TP., 1904, p. 37-39 note.

(63) See note I.

(64) *ibid.*

and regarded it as the modification of From (Rōm), in the T'u-chüeh tongue, which lacked the sound *f* and *ph*. Lastly he referred to "Ge-sar of Phrom", the title of an epic poem famous among the Tibetans and Mongols, and suggested that *Ge-sar* being evidently a corruption of Kaisar, *Phrom* was easily reducible to Rum. And all these evidences, as it seemed to him, confirmed the idea that Frōm was the direct original for the Chinese transcription Fu-lin.⁽⁶⁵⁾

LAUFER, though approving of PELLIOU's opinion on the whole, still differed from it in believing that the immediate original of Fu-lin was not Frōm, but *Frim* (or *Frīm*), a dialectal form of Rūm. The Russian term *Rim* for Rome was suggestive in its own way, he remarked, but what seemed to him more noteworthy was the Pahlavi place-name *Sairima* in the *Farvardin Yašt*, which was evidently identical with the term Rum in the *Bundahisn* as well as in the *Sahnameh*, and this led him to the inference that the Mediaeval Persian language denoted Rome by the form *Rima* or *Rim*, that this passed into *Frim* in the Iranian dialects (probably of the Parthian type), and that it was this form *Frim* that was finally reproduced by Fu-lin.⁽⁶⁶⁾ He also objected to PELLIOU's interpretation of the term Phrom forming part of the title of the epic, "Ge-sar of Phrom", because the story of King Ge-sar was one still unaccounted for.⁽⁶⁷⁾ As for PELLIOU's acknowledgement of the term Pur^m on the Kül Tāgin stone as identical with Frōm, I may venture to assert that it was not well-founded, for that T'u-chüeh term was only discoverable in this solitary case, and we knew nothing of the race or tribe so named.

It might appear that LAUFER's theory regarding Frōm as the immediate original of Fu-lin gained where PELLIOU's proposition left unexplained the obvious discrepancy in the use of the vowel between Frōm and Fu-lin (Fut-lim). But there is a great deal more to be ascertained on the subject before we can properly decide which way right.

Fu-lin takes the characters 拂菻 in the *Sui-shu*, the *T'ang-shu*, etc., but also different pairs of characters in certain other works, namely: Fu-lin 拂廩 in the *Hsi-yü-chi* 西域記 by Hsüan-chuang 玄奘, Fu-lin 拂林 in the Nestorian scripture, *Hsü-t'ing-mi-shih-so-ching* 序廳迷詩所經, and Fu-lin 拂臨 in the *Wang-wu-t'ien-chu-chuan* 往五天竺傳 by Hui-chao 慧超. Throughout these cases we perceive that it is only the second character that varies, but not accompanied by any vocal change; and all the forms above mentioned were pronounced in the T'ang period *fut-lim*, or according to KARLGRÉN's more minute description, *ph'uat-liam*. And so far, it may seem better to take *Frim* as the original of Fu-lin, as suggested by LAUFER, but, there is a certain consideration which goes against it. It is the fact, first noticed by PELLIOU, that the *Wei-shu* mentions a western country, by the name of 普嵐 P'u-lan, which may be

(65) P. PELLIOU; *Sur l'origine du nom Fou-lin*, J.A., 1914, p. 497-500.

(66) B. LAUFER; *Sino-Iranica*, p. 437-438.

(67) *ibid.*, note 1.

assumed to refer to one and the same thing with Fu-lin. PELLIOU remarked that that name occurred several times in the Wèi history, but going through the whole work, I found it only in three places. First, the Annals of Wên-ch'êng-huang-ti 文成皇帝, under the 11th month of the 2nd year of *T'ai-an* 太安 (A.D. 456) says: "Both Ya-ta 噠嗟 (Ephthalites) and P'u-lan sent to China embassies to offer tributes."⁽⁶⁸⁾ Further, under the 4th month (in summer) of the 6th year of *Ho-p'ing* 和平 (A.D. 465) says "P'u-lan sent (to the Chinese court) a present of a treasure sword."⁽⁶⁹⁾ Then Annals of Hsien-wên-huang-ti 獻文皇帝, under the 9th month of the 1st year of *Huang-hsing* 皇興 (A.D. 467) has this passage: "The countries of Kao-chü-li 高句麗, Yü-t'ien 于闐, Pu-lan 普嵐, and Su-t'é 粟特 each sent an envoy (to the Chinese court) to pay respects and offer presents."⁽⁷⁰⁾ PELLIOU was contented with suggesting that this P'u-lan must be identical with Fu-lin, showing nothing to guess what formed the basis of his idea. Apart from the linguistic similarity between the two names, however, I must call attention to the statement that a sword was brought as tribute from P'u-lan, which may be profitably compared with the fact of a later date that an envoy of Fu-lin offered a sword, along with other articles of tribute to the Chinese emperor.⁽⁷¹⁾ It seems to me that in view of the historic reputation of Damascus blades, the present of a sword by P'u-lan is closely associated with Fu-lin or Syria. This leads us to the suspicion that P'u-lan was an earlier term corresponding to Fu-lin, both being transcriptions of the same original. And so far as this idea is acceptable, it is clear that LAUFER's theory of Frīm would not stand, for it may apply to Fu-lin, but hardly ever to P'u-lan.

It is now obviously preferable to take Frīm as the original term to which both Fu-lin and P'u-lan are reducible. Plainly enough, however, the characters 普嵐 (*p'u-lan* or *p'u-lam*) offered no closer copy of Frīm than did the characters 拂菻 (*fu-lin*), and there still remains the question of how to explain the apparent looseness of transcription, which might have been avoided by a more judicious choice of characters. Perhaps our task of solving the problem will be facilitated by resuming the examination of the form Wu-lin 兀林, adopted by the Yüan historians to represent Rum, the current Persian and Arabic term for Asia Minor then ruled over by the Seljuk Turks. As for the first character Wu 兀, we do not know exactly how it was pronounced in the Yüan period. It is ascertained, however, that its T'ang pronunciation was *ngwat*, while in the Ming period which immediately followed

(68) 噠嗟·普嵐，並遣使朝獻。(魏書，卷五，文成皇帝紀)

(69) 普嵐國，獻寶劍。(ibid.)

(70) 高句麗·于闐·普嵐·粟特國，各遣使朝獻。(魏書，卷六，獻文皇帝紀)

(71) The *Sung-shih*, in its article of Fu-lin, related as an occurrence in the 10th month of the 4th year of *Yüan-feng* 元豐 (A.D. 1081) that the king of Fu-lin sent in an embassy with tribute to the emperor, the articles presented being specified as a saddle horse, sword and pearls. 元豐四年十月，其王滅力伊靈改撒，始遣大首領伊爾都令厮孟判，來獻鞍馬·刀劍·眞珠。(宋史，卷四百九十，外國傳拂菻國)

the Yüan, we find it already assuming the full *u* sound. On the other hand, in the *Yüan-shih*, the history of the Mongolian dynasty, the transcription Hsü-lieh-wu 旭烈兀 is used for χ ula γ u, the name of the founder of the I-êrh-han 伊兒汗 monarchy. It seems that the final syllabic γ u in this case marks the transition from *nguat* to the pure *u*, and we may well regard it as representing the Yüan pronunciation of the character 兀. Accordingly the name Wu-lin 兀林 reduces itself to the sound γ u-lim (or γ u-lim), and so, it becomes more likely that it was a transcription from some Mongolian corruption of Rum rather than from Rum itself. Perhaps the first thing which comes to our mind is that Armenian substitute for Rum, Hrum (or Hurum), which is directly associated with γ u-lim. In point of fact, however, we know that the Mongols, whose country was nearer to Persia than to Armenia, conquered the former all the earlier, and it was in that country they established their I-êrh-han State to rule over the Iranian natives thereabout. Judging from this circumstance, it is almost certain that they must have first learned the term Rum, the Persian name for Asia Minor, even before hearing of Hrum, its Armenian corruption. We have already remarked, that it was customary in the Mongolian and Turkish languages, as in the rest of the Altaic family, to prefix a vowel to an alien term which began with an *r* sound of the aspirated nature and this may be again illustrated by the Mongolian form for Russia, Urus or Oros. In a similar way, the Persian Rum must have been altered to Urum (or Orom) on the Mongolic lips, and then this Urum reproduced by the characters 兀林 γ u-lim. It may be noted in addition that when the Chinese transcribed a foreign term with an initial vowel they often placed before the vowel an additional character with a guttural sound. Thus the Sanscrit word *rāja* was reproduced by 曷羅闍 (γ at-la- \acute{z} ia); the T'u-chüeh word *ala ât* denoting a swift horse by 曷刺 (γ at lat); and the Mongolian *Oros (Rus)* by 葛勒斯 (Ka-lə-sī), as already observed.

From the foregoing observation it follows that in the spelling 兀林 the character 林 stood for *rum* of Urum (or *rom* of Orom), just as the character 菽 represented *rum* of Furum (or *rom* of Fröm) in the Sui and T'ang periods. And this makes it unavoidable to suspect that the use of the character 林, or others similarly sounded for reproducing *rum*, was always owing to some linguistic circumstances which prevented the choice of characters of nearer pronunciation. But here is still another instance which goes a great length to confirm this view. It is that of the name Ho-lin 和林, by which the *Yüan-shih* among other works mentions the capital of the Mongolian State, which is now generally known as Caracorum.⁽⁷²⁾ The history, in the Annals of T'ai-tsung 太宗, accounts for the origin of the city saying: "In spring in the seventh year, I-wêi 乙未 by cyclic index, there was built the city of Ho-lin 和林, and

(72) I owe most profound thanks to my colleague Mr. WADA for reminding me of this term.

erected the Wan-an Palace 萬安宮.”⁽⁷³⁾ Then in another section of the same history, that of geography, the name of the city is thus explained: “Ho-ning-lu Province 和寧路 was firstly called Ho-lin. The city had on its west the river Ha-la-ho-lin 哈刺和林, and it was from this that it took its name.”⁽⁷⁴⁾ This shows that Ho-lin was an abbreviation of Ha-la-ho-lin. The unabridged name of the city, however, was introduced to the Europeans as Caracoron by the Roman priest Planò CARPIN who, by order of Pope Innocent, visited the court of the Mongol qayan in A.D. 1246. Then it takes the form Caracarum at the hand of RUBRUCK, the ecclesiastical envoy sent by King Louis to the Mongol capital in A.D. 1255. Again, Marco POLO, once in the service of the great Mongolian emperor, represents it as Caracoron in his famous *Travels*. These reproductions, all rendered credible by their authors, recognized acquaintance with the Mongols, might still be suspected of more or less deviation from the original. It is, however, in the *Yüan-ch'ao-pi-shih* 元朝秘史, the Mongol dynastic history written by the contemporary Mongolian authors in their own language, that we find what seems to be the most exact representation of the term found on record. The history narrates how Wo-ko-tai Khan 斡歌歹可汗 returned in triumph from his conquest of the Chin 金 State, and in the passage concerned, we meet with the phrase: “合刺豁魯麻保兀罷”.⁽⁷⁵⁾ This reads “Qaracorum-a baḡuba,” and its meaning is that the hero dismounted at Qaraqorum. This makes it manifest that the true original of the Yüan historians' Ha-la-ho-lin was Qaraqorum (or ḫaraḫorum), the second half 和林 corresponding to *qorum*.

It is apparent in the above case that the character 林 is applied to the Mongolian syllable *rum*, and this evidence, combined with that from Wu-lin mentioned before, greatly advances the idea that there must have been some linguistic circumstances to make it unavoidable for the writers concerned to rest contented with such unsatisfactory approximations to the Iranian term Frōm (or Furum or Forōm) as 拂菻, 拂林, 拂臨, and 拂廩, all sounding *fu-lim*, or 普嵐, whose pronunciation was *P'u-lan* (p'uo-lam).

Perhaps more light will be thrown on the subject if we are to observe how the Chinese Buddhistic works deal with the Sanscrit term *Lumbinī*, the famous garden identified with the birth place of Buddha,—more especially the initial syllable *lum*. As the devout tradition goes, Buddha or Shih-chia-mou-ni-fo 釋迦牟尼佛, was born to Śuddhodana, the Lord of the City of Kapilavastu and his Lady Māyādevī, on the eighth day of the fourth month under a Wu-yu 無憂 (no sorrow) tree in the garden of Lumbini. We are to see what forms are given to this celebrated name of the garden in Chinese literature. A passage of the *Wêi-liao* quoted in the *Wêi-chih* remarks: “The

(73) 七年乙未春, 城和林, 作萬安宮。(元史, 卷二, 太宗紀)

(74) 和寧路, 始名和林, 以西有哈刺和林河, 因以名城。(元史, 卷五十八, 地理志)

(75) 合中刺舌豁中魯舌。The first four characters 合刺豁魯 are respectively marked on their side with the phonetic signs: chung 中 (middle) shê 舌 (tongue), 中 and 舌.

country of Lin-êrh 臨兒: according to the Fu-t'ü-ching 浮屠經 (Buddhist Bible), the king of the country gave birth to Fu-t'ü 浮屠 (Buddha), and Fu-t'ü became the Crown Prince. His father's name was Hsieh-t'ou-hsieh 屑頭邪, and his mother's Mo-hsieh 莫邪.⁽⁷⁶⁾ The term Lin-êrh here introduced as the name of the country was probably identical with Lumbinī as justly observed by LÉVI. In the annotated edition of the *Shih-chi* 史記, where the old authority *Shih-chi-chêng-i* 史記正義 is quoted as commenting on the country of Shên-tu 身毒 (India), we come across a similar passage on the birth of Buddha, and there we find Lin-êrh 臨兒 replaced by the spelling Lin-p'í 臨毘. As for Lumbinī as the name of the sacred garden, it occurs in Chinese Buddhistic literature *passim*, and all cases taken, the form of transcription shows a great variety. On a certain linguistic principle, they may be grouped into the four classes. Lin-êrh 臨兒, Lin-p'í 臨毘, Lan-p'í-ni 嵐毗尼,⁽⁷⁷⁾ Lan-p'í-ni 嵐韓尼,⁽⁷⁸⁾ Lan-p'í 嵐毗,⁽⁷⁹⁾ Lan-p'í-ni 藍毗尼,⁽⁸⁰⁾ Lan-fan-ni 藍鞏尼,⁽⁸¹⁾ Lin-wéi-ni 林微尼,⁽⁸²⁾ and La-fa-ni 臘伐尼,⁽⁸³⁾ fall in the same category in having the initial *lum* represented by a single character like *lin* 臨, *lan* 嵐, etc. To another group belonging Liu-mi-ni 流彌尼⁽⁸⁴⁾ and Liu-mi-ni 留彌尼,⁽⁸⁵⁾ where *lum* is divided to be reproduced by one character corresponding to *lu* and another standing for *m*. Then the third group comprising Lou-p'í 樓毘⁽⁸⁶⁾ and Liu-p'í-ni 流毘尼⁽⁸⁷⁾ is characterized with the dropping of the final *m*. Lastly Lung-pin 隆顛⁽⁸⁸⁾ and Lung-p'í-ni 龍毗尼⁽⁸⁹⁾ have the common peculiarity of replacing the original *lum* by *lung*. Now comparison of these groups is instructive. The first one is remarkable for the fact that in every case the initial character such as 臨, 嵐, 臘, etc., sounding *lim*, *lan*, or *la* (*lap*), applies but loosely to *lum*, so far as the vowel is concerned; while in the second, *lum* finds a more exact expression in a couple of characters applied to it. Again of the third and fourth groups with the characters sounding *liu* and *lung* it may be remarked that they do justice to the vowel at the expense of the final consonant *m*, which is either dropped or shifted to *ng*; while the reverse is the case with the first group. In short, in no case where a single character is applied to *lum*, the latter finds adequate reproduction; and this deepens suspicion that the Chinese language was destitute of the means to

(76) 臨兒國，浮屠經云，其國王生浮屠，浮屠太子也，父曰屑頭邪，母云莫邪。

(77) 釋迦下生時，嵐毗尼園，先現十瑞相。(華嚴經，1, 746)。

(78) 嵐毗尼，譯云斷，又嵐韓尼，亦云林毗。(翻梵語第九)

(79), (80), (81) 嵐毗，藍毗尼，藍鞏尼。(可洪音義第十上)

(82) 嵐毗尼，或言流毗尼，或言林微尼。(玄應音義第二十三)

(83) 大唐西域記卷六。

(84) 嵐毗尼，或云流彌尼。(慧苑音義 下)

(85) 流彌尼者，無正翻，……或作留彌尼。(華嚴探玄記第二十)

(86) 翻梵語第九，長阿含第四。

(87) 玄應音義第二十三。

(88) 雜阿含第二十三。

(89) 方廣大莊嚴經第三，

copy the foreign syllabic *lum* more exactly by a single character.

The same suggestion applies also to the cases of Ho-lin and Wu-lin already observed. Qorum, as the abbreviation of Qaraqorum, the name of the Mongolian capital, was spelt 和林 (Ho-lin) because there was no alternative to 林 better fit for copying the final syllable *rum*. When, however, a couple of characters were employed to represent separately its two components *ru* and *m*, the transcription approached closer to the original, as witnessed in the last two characters of Ho-la-huo-lu-ma 合剌豁魯麻 (Qaraqorum-a i.e. at Qaraqorum). As for the other case, when Urum, as a corruption of Rum, received the transcription Wu-lin 兀林 at the hands of the Yüan historians, the use of 林 against *rum* was an expedient adopted under just the same circumstances. In contrast to this, notice may be taken of the instances belonging to the Sung and Ming periods where the name Rum in its original form is more successfully represented by a pair of characters, 胡盧沒 Hu-lu-mo in the *Wen-ch'ang-tsa-lu* 文昌雜錄 by P'ANG Yüan-ying 龐元英 of the Sung period is really a transcription of *Furum* or *Hrōm*. Lu-mei 蘆眉 in the *Chu-fan-chih* 諸蕃志 by CHAO Ju-kua 趙汝廷, the Sung author, and Lu-mi 魯迷 in the *Hsi-yü-chuan* 明史 were justly identified with Rum both by BRETSCHNEIDER and HIRTH. After seeming so much, we can easily conclude that it was always difficult for Chinese writers to express with adequacy the alien syllable *rum* by means of a single character. So far, we have been dwelling on the question of the transcription of the syllable *rum*, but if we are to replace *rum* by *rom* or some intermediate series of sounds, the result will certainly be the same.

After all the foregoing observations, we may now safely accept the opinion offered by PELLIOT that the direct original of the term Fū-lin was ascribable to the Iranian form Frōm (or Furum), and be further affirmed in this view on ascertaining the fact that it was on account of the absence in the Chinese language of a character sounding closer to *rum* that Frōm (or Furum) invariably received rather loose transcriptions, in so far as the syllable *rom* (or *rum*) goes, namely, 拂菻, 拂林, 拂臨, 拂孛, etc. during the Sui and T'ang periods and 普嵐 under the preceding, Wēi, dynasty.

Chapter IV

The Country of Fu-lu-ni in the *Wèi-shu*

The Chinese of the Later Han period recognized the Roman Orient under the name of Ta-ch'in. The tendency, however, to idealize the country, discernible in the earliest descriptions of it, grew ever more conspicuous with the lapse of time, until at last, in the epoch of the Northern and Southern dynasties, we find it converted into a pure Utopia. Ta-ch'in was no longer a real country, but a mere conception in the Chinese mind. It was not long, however, before the Chinese rediscovered the Roman Orient under the name Fu-lin 拂菻. This term, the probable transcription of *From*, takes its earliest appearance in an author of the Sui period, but we meet in the *Wèi-shu* with a country by the name of P'u-lan 普蘭, obviously identical with the name Fu-lin, and this induces us to take the rediscovery of the Roman Orient as far back as the 5th century, that is, even earlier than the Sui epoch. One might object that the information of P'u-lan in the *Wèi-shu* is too meagre to justify such inference, but I think the same history affords us with what seems to confirm the idea. It is the account of a country named Fu-lu-ni 伏盧尼, given in its *Hsi-yü-chuan*, as follows: "The country of Fu-lu-ni, with the city of Fu-lu-ni as its capital, is situated north of the country of Po-ssü, at a distance of 27,420 *li* from Tai 代. The city is built of stones piled upon one another. To the east (of the city), there is a great river flowing south. In the stream there lives a species of bird, resembling a human being in form; and another appearing like a camel (T'o-t'o-ma 橐駝馬). Both are furnished with wings, but always live in water; if they leave it, they will instantly die. North of the city there is the Yün-ni-shan 云尼山 Mountain. The country produces silver, corals, and amber; and is inhabited by large numbers of lions."⁽⁹⁰⁾ This account of Fu-lu-ni, so brief and seeming insignificant as it is, has not been sufficiently noticed by students, and no wonder that there has been no attempt to identify the country. The *Wèi-shu*, in its *Hsi-yü-chuan*, takes notice of Po-ssü, T'iao-chih, and Ta-ch'in besides Fu-lu-ni, all as countries in the far west, while there are given their respective distances from the Chinese capital, according to which Ta-ch'in was the farthest (39,400 *li*), T'iao-chih the next farthest (29,400 *li*), Fu-lu-ni nearer (27,320 *li*) and Po-ssü the nearest (24,228 *li*). From this it might seem as if these four countries were contemporaneously flourishing during the period concerned by

(90) 伏盧尼國，都伏盧尼城。在波斯北，去代二萬七千三百二十里。累石爲城。東有大河南流。中有鳥，其形似人。亦有如橐駝馬者，皆有翼。常居水中，出水便死。城北有云尼山，出銀珊瑚·琥珀，多師子。(魏書，卷一百二，西域傳伏盧尼國)

the history, but we know that such was not the case. For T'iao-chih had been long extinct by that time, and Ta-ch'in was no longer a name representing any real country in the west, but a Utopian land fabricated by the Chinese. So we may dismiss them as anachronic, and there remain Po-ssü and Fu-lu-ni as the westernmost countries in the Western Region, and as the latter was 3,092 *li* farther, as inferred from the balance between the distances stated respectively for the two countries, it must have formed the very westernmost country in the world known by the contemporary Chinese.

The *Wei-shu* locates the country of Fu-lu-ni to the north of Po-ssü, and it is plain this direction of compass referred to the relative positions of the capitals of the two countries. Now the Persian capital at that time is known to have been the city of Madain, situated south of the present Baghdad.⁽⁹¹⁾ And starting from this point and going in a northerly direction over a distance of 3,092 *li*, one is likely to arrive at the northern section of Mesopotamia. It is certain, however, that Mesopotamia itself formed part of the Persian territory at that time, and so far as Fu-lu-ni was a country distinguished from Persia, we can hardly be allowed to place it in Mesopotamia. In the northwestern corner of Mesopotamia, it is true, there existed the state of Edessa, but this was but a small province of Rome, by no means likely to have a separate article in the Chinese history, and besides, it is hard to discover any linguistic relation between the term Fu-lu-ni and Edessa, or its vernacular name, *Ruha*. So it will be natural for us to modify the given direction a little and to attempt to see if the other data given of Fu-lu-ni do not apply to Antiochia and the Roman Orient. Let us first consider that great river mentioned as flowing on the east of the country, and running in a southerly direction. I think this on the whole fits the Euphrates, whose course is due south from the west of Samosta to Balis, then nearly due east as far as the neighbourhood of Rakka,

(91) "The country of Po-ssü, with its capital at the city of Su-li 宿利, is situated to the west of of Niu-mi 忸密," says the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of the *Wei-shu*. "It corresponds in area with the former country of T'iao-chih.....A river flows through the city, and goes on southward." Then we read in the *I-yü-chuan* 異域傳 of the *Chou-shu*: "The country of Po-ssü is governed by a branch of the Ta-yüeh-chih race, the ruler's residence being in the city of Su-li 蘇利. The country occupies the same area formerly covered by the country of T'iao-chih;" and in the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of the *Sui-shu*: "The country of Po-ssü has its capital in the city of Su-lin 蘇蘭 lying to the west of the Ta-ho-shui Stream 達曷水. It occupies the former territory of T'iao-chih." HIRTH was fully justified in taking those different names of the Persian capital as variant transcriptions of the same original and identifying all of them with the city of Madain, composed of Seleucia and Ktesiphon, and also in tracing the Ta-ho-shui to the Digtat, which was the vernacular name for the Tigris. (*The Mystery of Fu-lin*. J. of the American Oriental Society, XXXIII, 1913, p. 197-188, notes 3, 4.) I think PELLIOU was equally right when he compared those names of the capital with *Su-lin* 蘇隣 in the *Lao-tz'u-hua-hu-ching* 老子化胡經 (Chap. 1), *Su-la-sa-tang-na* 蘇刺薩儻那 in Hsüang-chuang's *Ta-t'ang-si-yü-chi*, and *Su-li-hsi-tan* 蘇利悉單 in the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of the *T'ang-shu* and acknowledged all of them as transcriptions of *Suristān*. (*Un traité manichéen retrouvé en Chine*, p. 146, note 1.)

whence it pursues a southeasterly direction up to the sea. As for the Yün-ni-Mountain noticed as rising in the north of the city, it is hard to identify it, but since Antiochia stood on the Orontes where it took a sharp elbow through a gap at the southern end of a mountain-range which springs from the Taurus in Mt. Amanus, it may easily have referred to some or other of those mountains or systems. The term *Yün-ni*, or Yüen-ni as in archaic pronunciation, does not seem to have any linguistic connection with either Amanus or Taurus, but on the other hand it is phonetically associated with *Yünāni*, the name applied to the Greeks by the contemporary Syrians and Arabs, while they spoke of Greece as Yünān. Now it will not be a very wild conjecture that this term *Yünāni* should have been transferred so as to mean Antiochia, which was the city of Greeks; and though we know that the Roman conquest of western Asia introduced the name Rūmī for both the Greek and Roman inhabitants there, and that Antiochia was the formal names of the city given by its founder Seleucus Nikator from his father Antiochus, these circumstances do not preclude the idea that the natives kept up among themselves the name *Yünāni* for that Greek city. Then we may go further to suspect that it was this *Yünāni*, as the other name of Antiochia, that gave rise to the alleged name or mountains bounding the city of Fu-lu-ni on the north.

Perhaps the most important factor in determining the identity of Fu-lu-ni is the consideration of its own name. I believe it can be reduced to Furum (or Furumi). The obvious objection will be the insufficient correspondence between Fu-lu-ni and Furum (Furumi), or more exactly, the discrepancy between *m* and *n* in the final syllable. But to my mind, this is of little consequence. The consonants *m* and *n* are no less easily interchangeable in the Chinese language than in many others. There are perhaps too many examples to be quoted of the Chinese characters sounding *mi*, *mao*, etc. in one dialect, and *ni*, *nau*, etc. in another;⁽⁹²⁾ and it would not be surprising to see the final syllable *mi* of Furumi replaced by *ni* in the transcription Fu-lu-ni. But this is not the only way to explain the discrepancy in question. For it is quite as conceivable that Furumi was at first more faithfully reproduced by the spelling 伏盧尾 (Fu-lu-mi), the final character of which, however, may have been later confused with the character 尼, on account of the formative resemblance. Interpreted either way, therefore, Fu-lu-ni may be regarded as a

(92) The character 錨 sounds *mao* in Mandarin, but *nau* in Cantonese; 璫, *mi* in Mandarin, but *ngwoi* in Fu-chou; 彌 and 彌 *mi* in Mandarin, but *nei* or *mei* in Cantonese; 璜, *mi* in Mandarin, but *mai* or *nei* in Canton, *ni* or *nei* in Fu-chou, and *me* or *nyi* in Sino-Annam; 乚 *mieh* in Mandarin, but *nieh* in Yang-chou; 謬 *miu* in Mandarin, but *mau* or *nau* in Cantonese, and *miu* or *niu* in Yang-chou; 彌 *ni* in Mandarin, but *ngi* or *mi* in Wên-chou; and 醬, *nieh* in Mandarin, but *miek* in Fu-chou. (See GILES, *Chinese-English Dictionary*). Compare also the Japanese term 壬生, correctly *nim-bu*, but customarily *mibu*, and 任那, correctly *nim-na*, but with the traditional reading *mima-na*.

direct transcription of Furumi, which we have above acknowledged as the Iranian corruption of Rumi.

If the city of Fu-lu-ni was identical with Antiochia and if at the same time the term Fu-lu-ni is ultimately traceable to Rumi, it must logically follow that Antiochia was at times called Rūmī by some or other people in the west; and that such was the case, I think, is what may be gathered from a certain circumstance we happen to know. According to Tabarī, the Persian monarch Chosrau Anōšarwān, soon after his successful capture of the Syrian metropolis, Antiochia, created a new town near Madain, his own capital, in order that the Roman and Greek citizens of Antiochia might be transported and made to settle down there. This Persian city, however, was laid out in so clever imitation of Antiochia itself that the new comers on their arrival were constrained to feel as if they were still in their mother city, and therefore, says our author, the town was designated Rūmīya, which meant the city of the Romans.⁽⁹³⁾ Now the thought which will easily occur to us is that the Persian founder of that mimic Greek city would have been more thorough or consistent in this matter if he had named it Antiochia directly after the Syrian capital, instead of introducing the new name Rūmīya for it. This gives rise to the suspicion that in reality the latter was no novel name invented for that occasion, but what had been for some time in common use as another name of Antiochia, and that it was now adopted for that replica of the Syrian capital. If I am not mistaken in this inference, then something has been done to confirm the identity of Fu-lu-ni with Antiochia and at the same time to reveal the fact that Antiochia was also spoken of as Rūmī or Rūmīya in the Syrian district.

Another aspect to be observed about the name Fu-lu-ni is that it was applied at once to the country and the capital, and no doubt this was an instance, not infrequent in Chinese records of foreign countries, where a country and its capital city are referred to by the same designation, perhaps following the usage of the peoples nearer the country in question. Then it may be naturally asked whether the name Fu-lu-ni was originally proper to the city and then applied to the country having it as its centre, or *vice versa*. It seems clear that the former was the case, after we have seen the fact, that in the times of CHANG Ch'ien, the term Li-kan, being an abbreviation of *Alexandria*, was employed so as to cover the whole of the Ptolemaic Egypt; and that in about the same ages the name T'iao-chih, which I claim to interpret as a corruption of Antiochia, was applied to the general area of the Syrian Kingdom.

The statement about the country of Fu-lu-ni: "It produces silver, corals,

(93) According to the comment by NÖLDEKE, the common name of the city was *Rumiya* in Arabic, but *Rūmakān* in Persian. (Th. Nöldeke, *Die Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sasaniden*, S. 165. und Anm. 4).

and amber, and is inhabited by large numbers of lions",⁽⁹⁴⁾ is quite reconcilable with Syria or the Roman Orient. All the objects named there are what is also ascribed to Ta-ch'in in earlier records, and to Fu-lin in later literature.⁽⁹⁵⁾

But what puzzles us in the account of Fu-lu-ni is the passage: "In the river there is a species of bird, resembling a human being in form, and another looking like a camel. Both are furnished with wings, but always stay in water. Coming out of water, they will instantly die."⁽⁹⁶⁾ So far as the latter species is concerned, this statement may be partly explained by referring to the ostrich. There is evidence that the Chinese had known something of this bird since the time of CHANG Ch'ien, although it was not until far later that the Chinese name for it got established. To the ancient author of the *Shih-chi*, it was a "large bird whose eggs are like urns, found in the country of T'ai-o-chih."⁽⁹⁷⁾ Under the reign of Wu-ti, the *Han-shu* records that an envoy from An-hsi offered the eggs of "the large bird 大鳥" as a tribute to the throne. In the Later Han period, the court of Ho-ti received from the king of An-hsi the present of a large bird of T'ai-o-

(94) 出銀·珊瑚·琥珀，多師子。As this statement immediately follows the passage: "To the north of the city is the Yün-ni-shan, 城北有云尼山." LAUFER thought it referred to the mountain, not to the country at large. (*Sino-Iranica*, p. 521, note 9). Such interpretation may be well as far as grammar goes, but plainly denied by the information contained. It may be noted by the way that he takes the two characters 尼山 alone for the name of the mountain, without, however, giving any reason for excluding the other character 云. (ibid.)

(95) For the mention of silver see the *Wei-liao* account of Ta-ch'in and the *Sung-shih*, Chap. 490; for amber, the *Wei-liao* loc. cit., and the *T'ang-shu* Chap. 221 B, and the *Chiu-t'ang-shu*, Chap. 198. For corals, see the *Wei-liao* loc. cit., especially this statement: "South of Chi-shih 積石, there is a great sea from which corals and pearls are taken. 積石南, 有大海, 出珊瑚·眞珠." The *T'ang-shu*, loc. cit., furnishes rather particularized information about the coral-fishing in the sea bordering the country of Fu-lin; and in my own translation, which differs in some respects from that of HIRTH's, the passage runs: "In the sea there are coral reefs. The seamen, going forth in large vessels, lower some iron nets (perhaps nets loaded with iron at their lower edges) down to the sea-bottom. As the coral just being to grow on the rocks, they are white as mushrooms. In a year they turn yellow and in three years red. Their branches get interlaced and entangled together, growing to a height of three to four feet. Now the iron digs up their roots and the net hanging from the vessel is wrung and twisted so as to draw them out. 海中有珊瑚洲·海人乘大舶, 墮鐵網水底·珊瑚初生磐石上, 自如菌·一歲而黃, 三歲赤·枝格交錯, 高三四尺·鐵發其根·繫網舶上, 絞而出之." Lastly, as for the large numbers of lions found in the country, see the *Wei-liao* account of Ta-ch'in, where particular notice is taken of the danger from lions as well as from tigers feared by travellers passing the country (但有猛虎獅子爲害·行道不群, 則不得過其國), and also the *Chiu-t'ang-shu* Chap. 198, where mention is made of a tribute brought from the king of Fu-lin, including a couple of lions (開元七年正月, 其主遣吐火羅大首領, 獻獅子·羚羊各二).

(96) See note 90.

(97) 有大鳥, 卵如甕 (史記, 卷一百二十三, 大宛列傳條支國)

chih, which was styled An-hsi-ch'iao 安息雀 (Parthian sparrow).⁽⁹⁸⁾ Then the *Wèi-shu* itself, apart from the account of Fu-lu-ni, gives in connection with Persia the description of a bird-species inhabiting the country, which resembled the camel in form, and, in spite of being furnished with a pair of wings, could not fly up high, fed on grass and meat, and was capable of eating fire.⁽⁹⁹⁾

It is in the *T'ang-shu* that we find the inception of the term *t'o-niao* 駝鳥 (ostrich). The country of T'u-huo-lo 吐火羅 (Tokhara) sent this bird as present to the T'ang court, and the history remarks "the native people call it *t'o-niao* (=camel-bird)."⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ This may be taken together with the passage of the *Chiu-t'ang-shu* stating that the people of K'ang-kuo 康國 (Samarkand) offered to the Chinese court "the eggs of the *t'o-niao*," among other articles.⁽¹⁰¹⁾ and it was justly asserted by BRETSCHNEIDER that the term *t'o-niao* was a literal translation of the Persian word *šatur-murgh* (=camel-bird).⁽¹⁰²⁾ Later on, we find the *Pên-ts'ao-kang-mu* 本草綱目 (Chap. 49), the botanical cyclopedia of Li Shih-chên 李時珍 in the Ming Period, describing the *t'o-niao* as a bird which eats copper, iron and stone, and whose double-hoofed feet are strong enough to injure people upon whom they are dashed, and placing their habitation at A-tan 阿丹 (=Aden) and Chu-pu 竹步 (=Djubo on the coast of Africa). And still later, the *Ming-shih* (Chap. 326) mentions the bird under the same name, ascribing its home to Hu-lu-mo-ssü 忽魯謨斯, i.e., Hormus on the Persian Gulf. The above observations give us a general idea of the distribution of the ostrich in the world known to the ancient Chinese. Probably the bird was mostly found in Mesopotamia, but at the same time its sphere extended eastward to Persia and the other countries of Central Asia, and westward to the south-western extremity of the continent, or still further

(98) (和帝永元)十三年,安息王滿屈復獻獅子及條支大鳥,時謂之安息雀。(後漢書,卷一百十八,西域傳安息國)

(99) 又出白象·獅子·大鳥卵。有鳥形如橐駝。有兩翼,飛而不能高。食草與肉,亦能噉火。(魏書,卷一百二,西域傳波斯國) There must be an error in the phrase "eating fire." The *Chiu-t'ang-shu*, in its description of the country of Persia, gives a similar notice of the bird obviously identical: "It can also bite dogs and clutch upon sheep, making itself a grievous nuisance to the native people. 亦能噉犬攬羊,土人極以為憂 (舊唐書,卷一百九十八,西戎傳波斯國)." The textual comparison between the two passages tends us to assume that what had been Ch'üan 犬 (dog) in the original edition of the *Wèi-shu* became vitiated by *huo* 火 (fire) which is a character liable to be mistaken for it. By the way, BRETSCHNEIDER's translation of the same passage of the *Wèi-shu*, has "bites men" in the place of "bites fire" or "bites dogs". (E. BRETSCHNEIDER, *Notes on Chinese Mediaeval Travellers to the West*, Chinese Recorder, vol. VI, p. 9-10, note 132.) Probably the character *jên* 人 corresponding to *men* must have existed in the edition he consulted, and no doubt this was another corruption of 犬.

(100) 永徽元年,獻大鳥。高七尺,色黑。足類橐駝。翅而行,日三百里。能噉鐵。俗謂駝鳥。(唐書,卷二百二十一,西域傳吐火羅國)

(101) 開元六年遣使貢獻.....駝鳥卵及越諾之類。(舊唐書,卷一百九十八,西戎傳康國)

(102) BRETSCHNEIDER, loc. cit.

to the eastern shore of Africa. We may wonder, then, why no mention of the bird ever occurs in any accounts of Ta-ch'in or Fu-lin in Chinese history. In all probability, this was simply accidental, and not to be taken as a sign of the absence of the bird from the country. On the other hand, it is pointed out by BRETSCHNEIDER that, according to XENOPHON'S *Anabasis*, the ostrich was witnessed on the shores of Euphrates; and that, in the modern times, a report of a Prussian consul resident in Damascus alluded to the fact about five hundreds of ostriches were annually caught in the deserts about that town.⁽¹⁰³⁾ Now the Euphrates of XENOPHON only represented the portion of the stream lying within Mesopotamia, and its shores frequented by ostriches were destined, so far as the right bank is concerned, to fall under the rule of the power whose Chinese appellation was at first Ta-ch'in and subsequently Fu-lin. As for Damascus, whose neighbourhood yielded such numbers of ostriches, it corresponds with Fan-fu 汜復 mentioned in the *Wèi-liao* account of Ta-ch'in, where the country of the same name, Fan-fu, appears as a dependency of Ta-ch'in. In short, it would be a mistake to suppose the ostrich was strange to the country of Ta-ch'in or Fu-lin; and therefore we should not be surprised that the bird is mentioned in connection with Fu-lu-ni, which we assume to be identical with Fu-lin.

What is strange in that account of Fu-lu-ni, however, is that, together with the ostrich, is mentioned a human-formed bird species, and that both are assigned to the water element, emergence from which meant instantaneous death. We cannot but surmise that all this came from a current tradition concerning some fictitious water creature. Trying to see whether a kindred idea occurs in any Chinese account of the western countries, our attention is arrested first of all by the "shui-yang-ts'ui 水羊羖" (water-sheep's wool) mentioned in the *Wèi-liao* account of Ta-ch'in, as the material which yielded a fine cloth peculiar to Ta-ch'in known by the name of Hai-hsi-pu 海西布. This, however, would have remained another insoluble mystery unless BRETSCHNEIDER'S insight led him to suggest that it referred to "a cloth-stuff woven up to the present time by the inhabitants of the Mediterranean coast, especially in southern Italy, from the thread-like excrescences of several seashells, especially *Pinna Squamosa*."⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ There was, however, no attempt to account for the origin of the odd term "water-sheep" (shui-yang 水羊), and it was left for CHAVANNES to assert, on the authority of Istakhri of Arabia, that the Chinese term "shui-yang-ts'ui" 水羊羖 meant the down of the pinna and that the idea of the water-sheep was of Arabic origin.⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ But it is to LAUFER that we owe a perfect elucidation of the subject, which is furnished in his admira-

(103) BRETSCHNEIDER, *op. cit.*, p. 10, note 132.

(104) E. BRETSCHNEIDER, *On the Knowledge possessed by the Ancient Chinese of the Arabs*, p. 24.

(105) T'oung Pao, 1904, p 183, note 4.

ble work, "*The Story of the Pinna and the Syrian Lamb*,"⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ There he gives an exhaustive information on the origin and development of the tradition of the water-sheep, clarifying it beyond doubt, I think, that its various reproductions and modifications prevalent in Arabia and China alike had their ultimate origin in a tradition which took rise in western Asia during the Hellenistic days. And although I suspect that his comprehensive researches have passed that curious couple of bird species in the *Wèi-shu* unnoticed, still I feel that the key to its explanation must lie with him, and it is in this hope that I now propose to go through the whole range of his discussion in substance.

In the first place he points out as remarkable that the classical Greek and Roman authors, while thoroughly acquainted with the pinna as a species of edible millusk, are entirely reticent about the employment of its filaments for textiles. This industry is foreign to the classical epoch, and does not appear before the second century A.D.; it is an offshoot of Hellenistic, not of Greek culture. But the first Greek author to testify to the fabrication of textiles from the pinna fibres is the sophist Alciphron of the second century, who, in the collection of his letters, styles them "*woolen stuffs out of the sea*." The principal wool-furnishing animal of the ancient was the sheep; and the term used by Alciphron is either the index of a belief existing at that time in a marine sheep that furnished the wool of the pinna, or directly responsible for the formation of such a notion. Then, after remarking that the same idea turns up in Father Tertullian, of about the contemporary period, who alludes to the fact of fleeces being obtained from the sea where shells of extraordinary size are furnished with tufts of mossy hair, our author concludes that the Chinese terms "water-sheep" and "cloth from the west of the sea"⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ (or "cloth from within the sea")⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ and the Arabic designation "wool of the sea"

(106) *Journal of the American Folklore*, XXVIII, 1915.

(107) This is the literal translation of the term "hai-hsi-pu" 海西布 in the *Wèi-liao* account of Ta-ch'in. But, as I attempted to demonstrate elsewhere, "Hai-hsi" 海西, signifying the region west of the sea, practically served as another name of Ta-ch'in, and therefore the hai-hsi-pu simply meant "the cloth of Ta-ch'in." As for the relative terms "Hai-hsi", "Hai-tung" 海東, and "Hai-pèi" 海北, and the fundamental idea which gave rise to them, see the preceding article of this volume.

(108) This is literally translated from "Hai-chung-pu" 海中布 in the *Wèn-hsien-t'ung-k'ao* 文獻通考 Chap. 339. Noticing the difference of this expression from the *Wèi-liao*'s "cloth from the west of the sea," our author suggests that the alteration was presumably effected under the Arabic influence, since Ibn al-Baitār calls the product yielded by the Pinna Nobilis or Pinna Squamosa "wool of the Sea" (suf-el-bahr), after Greek model. I suspect, however, the alteration on which he lays so much stress is only superficial and insignificant. For it is obvious that the compiler of the *Wèn-hsien-t'ung-k'ao* was simply copying the passage concerned from the text of the *Wèi-liao*, and we may assume that the alteration, being far from intentional, was an error unconsciously committed. Accordingly, *Hai-chung-pu*, if taken as really intended, means nothing but "the cloth of Hai-hsi," or, in other words,

(suf el-bahr) are immediately to be connected with the descriptions of Alciphron and Tertullian, and present the outflow of the Hellenistic tradition which inspired their statements. The water-sheep of the Chinese records is by no means a Chinese invention, but the spontaneous reproduction of a popular term current in the Hellenistic Orient.

It is correct to interpret shui-yang of the *Wèi-liao* as *pinna*, and the wool of *shui-yang* as its byssus. It is a key to solve the problem I have at present that LAUFER showed some examples of the stories that *pinna* becomes a bird or a man. Qazwīnī, in his book of ornithology, introduces a novel bird styled *Abū Barāqish*, with a plumage glittering in various colours, in imitation of which were woven garments styled *abū qalamūn* and exported from Romaei. LAUFER's verdict on this subject is that the bird was plainly fictitious, and reconstructed on the basis of real and alleged byssus textiles. As the term *pinna* (properly *pinna*), the name of the bivalve in question, is phonetically similar to the classical Latin word *penna* (feather) from which the Italian *pinna* 'feather' was derived, he argued that this ambiguity may have given rise among the Arabs to the conception of the filaments of the *pinna* as bird plumage. Over and above this linguistic reason, he gives a commercial one which is certainly as forcible, observing that, as stated by Qazwīnī, textiles obtained from the *pinna* were exceedingly scarce, made stealthily, and were a sort of royal prerogative, their exorbitant price was prohibitive to the masses, so feather fabrics were passed off as byssus textiles, and a wonderful bird was invented to boom the sale of this product.⁽¹⁰⁹⁾

LAUFER quoted a legend in which *pinna* appears as a man. In the *Talmud* we find a passage that a being called *adne sadeh*, i.e. the lord of field, is considered to be a kind of animal. Rabbi Simeon, who lived in the middle of 13 century, commented on this passage, saying that the *Jerusalem Talmud* mentions this being as 'the man of mountain'; it takes nourishing food from the earth by means of its umbilical cord; when the cord is cut off, it cannot maintain its life. Further Rabbi Meir supplemented to this commentary as follows: There is an animal called *Yedua*, with the bones of which a fortune-teller performs divination; it grows out of the earth as if it were a stem of a cucumber; this *Yedua* has a human figure even with human limbs; no being cannot approach within the sphere of its activity, because the *Yedua*

"the cloth of Ta-ch'in." I may take this occasion to add that according to my interpretation, the term "Hai-hsi-pu" and "Hai-chung-pu" have no direct association with the sea itself, and this affords us enough room to suppose that in the Chinese tradition the water-sheep was not conceived as inhabiting the sea exclusively, but more widely the water element in general. This marks indeed a departure from the original western idea of the water-sheep; and when the *Wèi-liao* asserts that in Ta-ch'in all domestic animals issue from the water, we cannot but take it as a case of Chinese superaddition to the original notion.

(109) B. LAUFER, op. cit., p. 111-113.

catches and kills it, and this animal eats up grass growing within the reach of its umbilical cord; no one can come near to its presence in order to catch it, but it dies as soon as the umbilical cord is struck so much that it is broken.⁽¹¹⁰⁾ LAUFER cited an example quite similar to this legend out of Chinese histories. It is the legend of a vegetable lamb alleged to be found in Fu-lin. As described in the *Chiu-t'ang-shu*, this animal sprouts from the soil, just as does a plant, is timely guarded and fenced in by the natives against the attack of wild beasts, but being firmly rooted in the earth by its umbilical cord, can only be released, without the destruction of its life, by alarming and terrorizing it with the heavy stamping of horses with armoured men on their backs, accompanied by the beating of drums; and then it may be taken to pasture at large.⁽¹¹¹⁾ The story is recorded in a more abridged form also in the account of Fu-lin in the *Hsin-T'ang-shu*. LAUFER regarded these two stories as variants of the *pinna* legend.

Thus if we admit the interpretation of LAUFER who held that *pinna* was metamorphosed into a water sheep, a lamb, a bird, or a man according to time and place, we may be justified in regarding the legend about a mythical bird endowed with human shape in the *Wèi-shu* as another variant of the *pinna* legend. In the account of Fu-lu-ni of the history the bird is told to live in water. In this respect this legend coincides with that of a water sheep. We can understand the characteristics of this legend that the bird has a human shape with wings, if we suppose this legend to be a combination of the pinna-bird variant and the pinna-man variant. In the variants, in which *pinna* appears as a water sheep or a lamb, we can easily understand how the byssus of the bivalve symbolized wool. Likewise we can well imagine how the byssus was taken as the feathers of a bird. Only in the variant regarding *pinna* as a man, the process is rather complicated. LAUFER argued that the being of human form mentioned in the *Talmud* was in reality a lamb which symbolized the Saviour, but it is not certain whether he is right or not. Whatever it may be, another way of interpreting the mythical bird in the account of Fu-lu-ni is conceivable. In this legend *pinna* is a bird. This is due to the interpretation regarding the byssus of the *pinna* bivalve as feathers of a bird, of which human clothing was made. What are feathers to a bird, is a clothing to a man. Therefore it is psychologically natural that, if feathers were metamorphosed into a clothing, a bird would become a man. It is characteristic of the legend that the mythical being is a bird, or a man, that lives in every case in water, and that, as soon as it leaves water, it dies. This characteristic idea was based upon the existence of the bivalve *pinna*. According to the *Wèi-shu* the camels of the country Fu-lu-ni also lived in water. Likewise six domestic beasts came out of water in Ta-ch'in according to the

(110) *ibid.* p. 120.

(111) 有羊羔，生於土中。其國人候其欲萌，乃築牆以院之，防外獸所食也。然其臍與地連，割之則死。唯人著甲走馬，乃擊鼓以駭之，其羔鳴而臍絕，便逐水草。（舊唐書，卷一百九十八，西域傳拂菻國）

Wêi-liao. And if we observe historically the variants of the *pinna* legend, the world of the legend was located in water or in sea in the water sheep legend of the Later Han period, while in the lamb legend of the T'ang period it was on land. In the intervening periods of these two, e.g. in the Northern Wêi period, the abode of the mythical being was in river. Thus *pinna* changed its abode from the sea to river and from river to land as the time went on. According to LAUFER this bivalve is produced in Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean Sea, but it is not clear where it began to weave cloths with the byssus. Seeing that the cloth is called Hai-hsi-pu 海西布 in the account of Ta-ch'ín of the *Wêi-liao*, the origin must be sought in the Roman Orient—i.e. Ta-ch'ín according to my opinion—along the Mediterranean. And the facts that the lamb legend is related in the account of Fu-lín of the *T'ang-shu*, and that, as Qazwini mentioned, Abū Qalamūn made of the byssus of *pinna* was exported from Romei, i.e. the country of the Romans, suggest us that it was originated from Syria or Phoenicia on the coast of the Mediterranean. If the legend of a mystical bird recorded in the account of Fu-lu-ni of the *Wêi-shu* is certain to be a variant of the *pinna* legend, as I suppose, my identification of Ta-ch'ín of the Later Han period with Fu-lín of the Sui and T'ang periods can be justified.

As stated above, since the Chinese histories, such as the *Wêi-liao*, the *Wêi-shu* and the *T'ang-shu*, make mention of *pinna*, it is easily imagined how the Hai-hsi-pu 海西布 was appreciated among the Chinese as the special product of the Roman Orient. When I endeavoured to find records about the cloths of Hsi-yü in various documents, as I thought that, since the name Hai-hsi ceased to be used already in the periods of the Northern and Southern Dynasties, the Hai-hsi-pu would be known with a different name in the subsequent eras, Mr. Mikinosuke ISHIDA collected kindly for me materials concerning Shui-ts'an-ssü 水蠶絲 and Huo-ts'an-ssü 火蠶絲. This Shui-ts'an-ssü 水蠶絲, i.e. the thread of water silk-worm, was just what I had looked for,—the thread made of the *pinna* byssus. The cloth woven of this thread is mentioned as Ping-ts'an-ssü 冰蠶絲 in the *Yüeh-fu-tsa-lu* 樂府雜錄.⁽¹¹²⁾ This book was written by TUAN An-chieh 段安節 of the T'ang period. According to his biography annexed to that of TUAN Ch'êng-shih 段成式 in the *T'ang-shu*, TUAN An-chieh was a son of TUAN Ch'êng-shih; he was appointed Ch'ao-yi Ta-fu 朝議大夫 in A.D. 894–897; he was versed in music and composed several songs; he was the author of the *Yüeh-fu-tsa-lu*. The Ping-ts'an-ssü 冰蠶絲, i.e. the thread of ice silk-worm, was the thread known among the T'ang Chinese. In another edition of the *Yüeh-fu-tsa-lu* another reading, i.e. Shui-ts'an-ssü 水蠶絲, is adopted instead of Ping-ts'an-ssü. Shui-ts'an-ssü appears in the *Yang-t'ai-*

(112) 康老子本長安富家子，酷好聲樂，落魄不事生計，常與國樂游處，一旦家產蕩盡。因詣西郭遇一老嫗持舊錦褥貨蠶，乃以半千獲之。尋有波斯，見大驚，謂康曰，何處得此至寶，此是水蠶絲所織，若暑月陳於座，可致一室清涼。即酬價千萬。康得之，遽與國樂追歡。不經年復盡。尋卒。後樂人嗟惜之，遂製此曲，亦名得至寶。（樂府雜錄，康老子）

chên-wai-chuan 楊太真外傳 by Yüeh-shih 樂史, also of the T'ang period.⁽¹¹³⁾ *Yung-t'ai* 永泰 appearing in the text is a name of year under the reign of Emperor Tai-tsung 代宗, and the first year of *Yung-t'ai* corresponds to D.A. 765. The Mo-ho-mi-lo 末訶彌羅, from which Shui-ts'an-ssü was presented to the imperial court, cannot be exactly identified. But mo-ho 末訶 is certainly the transcription of Sanskrit *mahī* 'great'. Mi-lo 彌羅 may be the transcription of Sanskrit *Maitreya*, as mi-lo is interpreted as a synonym of Chinese *tsü* 慈 'benevolent' in the *Ming-i-chi* 名義集 (Vol. XI). If this interpretation is justified, the country may have been a country in India. Another instance is recorded in the *Tu-yang-tsa-p'ien* by a T'ang man called Su Ê 蘇鶻. In A.D. 813 the country Ta-chên 大軫 brought as a tribute *Shên-chin-ch'in* 神錦衾 woven of Ping-ts'an-ssü 冰蠶絲, i.e. Shui-ts'an-ssü.⁽¹¹⁴⁾ This *Tu-yang-tsa-p'ien* consists of three volumes and describes the events taken place during the reign of the ten emperors, from Tai-tsung 代宗 to Yi-tsung 懿宗, from 763 to 873 A.D. What country was Ta-chên? No records mention this country. But as the pronunciation of *chên* 軫 is reconstructed as *tsiën* and this phonetic value resembles to that of 秦, we are safe to suppose that Ta-chên 大軫 is identical with Ta-ch'in 大秦. The name Ta-ch'in was well known among the contemporary Chinese; it appears in the famous Nestorian Inscription. One may question why the name was changed to Ta-chên, but it is possible that Ta-ch'in 大秦, i.e. 'the great China', was intentionally avoided and thus it was replaced by Ta-chên.

Shui-ts'an-ssü was of course the name of thread; the cloth woven with this thread was called Ch'êng-shui-po 澄水帛, as seen in the *Tu-yang-tsa-p'ien* or in the *Ch'ang-an-chih* 長安志. The latter quotes a passage from the former and says: "The daughter of Emperor I-tsung 懿宗 was married to Prime Minister Wêi Pao-hêng 韋保衡. The *Tu-yang-tsa-p'ien* says, '.....The Wêi family held once a great clan assembly at Kuang-hua-li 廣化里. It was very hot on that day. Princess ordered to fetch Ch'êng-shui-po and to soak [in water]. When the cloth was hanged on the southern eaves, all the people attending the assembly wanted to wear wadded clothes. Ch'êng-shui-po resembles hemp cloth. It is bright, thin and transparent. It contains Lung-hsien 龍涎. Therefore it can relieve the heat."⁽¹¹⁵⁾ From this it can be imagined that Ch'êng-shui-po was a cloth woven with bright and very fine yarn and was of such nature as was kept dry even if soaked in water. It

(113) 妃子琵琶逼沙塵，寺人白季貞使蜀，還獻其木。溫潤如玉，光耀可鑒。有金縷紅文，聲成雙鳳，絃乃末訶彌羅國永泰元年所貢者，浚水蠶絲也。光瑩如貫珠。（樂史，楊太真外傳）

(114) [元和]八年，大軫國貢.....神錦衾.....神錦衾冰蠶絲所織也。方二丈厚一寸。其上龍紋鳳彩，殆非人工。（蘇鶻，杜陽雜編，中卷）

(115) 懿宗女降宰相韋保衡。杜陽編曰，.....大會韋氏一族於廣化里。暑氣特甚。公主命取澄水帛，以蘸之，挂于南軒。滿坐則思挾纒。澄水帛似布，明薄可鑒。其中有龍涎，故能消暑。（長安志，卷十，昌化坊同昌公主條）The *Sui-shih Kuang-chi* 歲時廣記, Vol. 2, 11 reverse, (*Nan-Pu Hsin-shu* 南部新書, 辛), quotes also this passage and reads 以水蘸之 instead of 以蘸之. The *Ch'ang-an-chih* has dropped the character 水.

is certain that such yarn was not of vegetable kind such as hemp. That this was of western origin can be guessed from the narration of K'ang-lao-tzŭ 康老子 which relates that a man of Po-ssŭ 波斯 judged it was a cloth of Shui (or Ping)-ts'an-ssŭ and that it was brought as a tribute to the Chinese court from Ta-chên or Mo-ho-mi-lo. The material of clothing produced in Hsi-yŭ was either wool or hemp, or cotton, and what was like the Chinese silk was mountain-silk produced in Syria. This was called *bombycinae* in Ancient Europe and the way of spinning was quite different from that of the Chinese silk. The thread was coarse and had no lustre such as silk had. The *Yeh-chien-ssŭ* 野繭絲 in the account of Ta-ch'in in the *Wêi-liao* was the same thing. In the western countries no other thread equaled to the Chinese silk in quality than the byssus of the *pinna* bivalve. I think that this thread was invented in Syria, stimulated by the Chinese silk and intended to rival against it, about 1 or 2 century, when the Chinese silk was in vogue in Ta-ch'in. From these points I have concluded that Shui-ts'an-ssŭ in the T'ang documents was the yarn spun from the byssus of *pinna*. The reason, why this yarn which had been believed to be made of the wool of water-sheep in the Han and Wêi periods became later to be called the yarn of water-silkworm, is this: as stated above, it is due to the ideas of the Roman Orient to call the yarn of Hai-hsi-pu as the wool of water-sheep, for, as the usual material of clothing in the west was wool, it is quite natural that they named the byssus of *pinna* as 'fleece wool'. On the other hand, in China the cloth of best quality was chiefly silk, so they gave the name of Shui-ts'an-ssŭ to the *pinna* yarn,—a very Chinese idea.

In the T'ang period it is to be observed that two kinds of cloth resembling silk were imported from the west to China. The one was the *pinna* cloth. The other was cloth made of asbestos which was called in Ancient China as Huo-huan-pu 火浣布. It is a matter of question whether Shui (or Ping)-ts'an-ssŭ was really *pinna* or asbestos. MASPERO regarded both Ping-ts'an-ssŭ mentioned in the *Yüeh-fu-tsa-lu* and Ping-ts'an 水蠶 in the *Shih-i-chi* 拾遺記 by WANG Chia 王嘉 as asbestos.⁽¹¹⁶⁾ The reason for this inference is given in the description in the *Shih-i-chi* about Ping-ts'an where it is told that it did not get wet even if entered into water and that it was not burnt even if thrown into fire.⁽¹¹⁷⁾ If it is true, we must admit Ping-ts'an-ssŭ was asbestos. But seeing that the *Shih-i-chi* is a kind of Taoistic books and a kind of Wêi-shu 緯書, its description cannot be taken seriously. Since the whole text in question is no doubt an imaginary fiction, we cannot regard a part of the text as real. Yüan-chiao-shan 員嶠山 in the text is a mythological mountain in the Eastern Seas. If it were the origin of Ping-ts'an, it is contradictory to the fact that Huo-huan-pu was originated from the west. Why then, was the

(116) B.E.F.E.O., XV, p. 46.

(117) 員嶠山有水蠶，長七尺，黑色，有鱗角。以霜雪覆之，然後爲繭。其色五采，織爲文錦。入水不濡，投火不燎。(拾遺記)

sacred mountain of the east regarded as the original place of Ping-ts'an? According to the Taoistic tradition, the east was believed to have the 'virtue of tree' (木德) and therefore to be the place where the Fu-sang 扶桑 tree grew. The same thing can be observed in the tale of the bonze called Hui-shên 慧深 in the Liang period who crossed over the sea to the country Fu-sang where he found a silk-worm that produced a huge cocoon. Thus WANG Chia's explanation about Ping-ts'an is entirely a fiction and cannot be regarded as a reality, but Ping-ts'an itself must be a real thing known at that time. The problem is to judge whether this Ping (or Shui)-ts'an was the *pinna* byssus or asbestos. The *Tu-yang-tsa-p'ien* mentions Huo-ts'an-ssü 火蠶絲 as well as Ping-ts'an-ssü.⁽¹¹⁸⁾ The Huo-ts'an-ssü here clearly denotes asbestos. According to RÉMUSAT, the Po-ssü country presented Huo-mao-hsiu 火毛繡 to the court of Emperor Hsüan-tsung 玄宗. This must be made of asbestos, too. Thus the cloth made of asbestos was called in China either Huo-mao-hsiu or Huo-huan-pu, the name comprizing in both cases the word *huo* 火, 'fire'. Therefore the Huo-ts'an-ssü in question must be also the yarn made of asbestos. Especially seeing that the *Tu-yang-tsa-p'ien* records both Huo-ts'an-ssü and Ping-ts'an-ssü in the same passage, it is inferred that the two things were entirely different things and that the former was asbestos and the latter the *pinna* byssus. Further Huo-shu 火鼠 was used in contrast to Ping-ts'an in T'ang and Sung poems.⁽¹¹⁹⁾ Since the Huo-shu which appears in our classics is asbestos, the Ping-ts'an in contrast to it can be easily guessed to be the byssus of the *pinna*.

(118) 火蠶繅出火州。絮衣一襲，止用一疋。稍過度，則熯蒸之氣不可奈。(太平廣記，卷二百三十七)

(119) 火鼠重收布，水蠶乍吐絲。(唐，王貞白)
水蠶不知寒，火鼠不知髻。(宋，蘇軾)

Chapter V

The Country of Fu-lin in the Sui Period

What was called Ta-ch'in by the historians of the Han and Wèi dynasties was a tract of country which comprised the Roman province of Syria south of the Taurus range and part of Egypt adjoining it on the southwest, that is to say, the Roman Orient of the western scholars; while it is as evident that their term "the capital of Ta-ch'in" referred to Alexandria of Egypt. In the epoch of the Southern and Northern Dynasties, however, all the accounts of Ta-ch'in provided by the successive standard histories became vitiated, as already remarked, by letting the utopian condition fancifully ascribed to Ta-ch'in outweigh the real history of the country and the true state of things there, of which there was ever less information as time went on, until at last the description of Ta-ch'in became that of a vision the Chinese were delighted to see. In the meanwhile, as we have seen too, the Roman Orient became introduced afresh to the Chinese under the new names P'u-lan 普嵐 and Fu-lu-ni 伏盧尼. As the account of Fu-lu-ni we have above read in the *Wèi-shu* points to Antiochia of Syria for the site of its capital, it will seem that the primary centre of affairs in the Roman Orient had by that time shifted from Alexandria to Antiochia. Later on, in the Sui period, we find the same region referred to by another name, i.e. Fu-lin. But this, with the above-mentioned names, P'u-lan and Fu-lu-ni were all identical at the bottom, for they were only so many different transcriptions of Frōm or Furum, which was a corruption of Rum. The *Wèi-shu* records three times in the Dynastic Annals the arrival of an envoy from the country of P'u-lan; and gives in its *Hsi-yü-chuan*, a description of the same country under the different name Fu-lu-ni, and this suggests that these were other cases, earlier or later, than those mentioned in the Dynastic Annals, where the Chinese court received embassies from the country in question, and that the introduction of the other name Fu-lu-ni belonged to those different occasions. So we may be sure that in the epoch of the Northern and Southern Dynasties, there was still for the Chinese some channel of intercourse with the Roman Orient. But it seems that the same was not the case in the succeeding Sui dynastic period. "At the time of Yang-t'í 煬帝 of the Sui, P'ên Chü 裴矩 was sent out to invite the western peoples to open communication with China. All the others consented, but T'ien-chu and Fu-lin did not, and this was regarded by the emperor with deep regret,"⁽¹²⁰⁾ says *T'ang-shu* in its account of T'ien-chu. It

(120) 隋煬帝時，遣裴矩通西域諸國，獨天竺·拂菻不至，爲恨。（唐書，卷二百二十一上，西域傳天竺國）

is natural that the contemporary Chinese knew very little of Fu-lin with which they had no direct intercourse; and hence the *Sui-shu* furnishes no special account of the country in its *Hsi-yü-chuan*. But in spite of that, we find the name Fu-lin mentioned more than once in the same division of the Sui history. This occurs in the accounts of some other countries, and what little is said about Fu-lin there may still help us much in our attempt to know the position of Fu-lin, and to ascertain whether the term Fu-lin denoted exactly the same thing as the name Fu-lu-ni in the *Wèi-shu*.

The *Hsi-yü-chuan* of the *Sui-shu* opens its account of Po-ssü (Persia) with the passage: "The country of Po-ssü, having its capital in the city of Su-lin 蘇蘭 on the west of the Ta-ho-shui 達曷水, covers the same area that was formerly occupied by the country of T'iao-chih."⁽¹²¹⁾ Our attention may be called to the name Su-lin 蘇蘭 (Suristan) mentioned for the capital, but what is more particularly noteworthy is this remark toward the close of the account: "To the northwest (of Po-ssü), it is 4,500 *li* to Fu-lin,"⁽¹²²⁾ which no doubt refers to the distance and direction from the capital of Po-ssü to that of Fu-lin. It will be noted that this statement is at variance with what we have gathered from the *Wèi-shu* as to the relative positions of Po-ssü and Fu-lu-ni that the latter lay at a distance of 3,092 *li* north of the former, and this of course must seem to throw doubt on our previous assumption that Fu-lu-ni was identical with Fu-lin, even after amending the alleged direction of the compass, north, by northwest, as we have found it necessary to do in identifying the position of the city Fu-lu-ni. So we may better look about to see what the later histories say about Po-ssü and Fu-lin. The *Chiu-t'ang-shu* 舊唐書, the *Ta-t'ang-hsi-yü-chi* 大唐西域記, and the *T'ang-shu* all agree in describing Po-ssü as conterminous on its northwest with Fu-lin, and this corroborates the direction from Po-ssü to Fu-lin given by the *Sui-shu*.⁽¹²³⁾ As for the distance to Fu-lin, the other T'ang records are silent about it, but the *T'ang-shu* says, "It is a little over 4,000 *li* to Fu-lin."⁽¹²⁴⁾ But this falls short of the distance given by the *Sui-shu* by 4,500 *li*, and this difference is rendered the more inscrutable by the fact that the *T'ang-shu* account of Po-ssü was otherwise a complete reproduction from the *Sui-shu*. Suppose we take the *T'ang-shu* figures as an amendment to the exaggerated number in the *Sui-shu*, and still it leaves far behind the distance of 3,092 from Po-ssü to Fu-lu-ni. It is a question, however, how far we must stick to an alleged number of miles in determining the position of a western country described by the Chinese of those times, and in this case we might

(121) 波斯國，都達曷水之西蘇蘭城，即條支之故地也。(隋書，卷八十三，西域傳波斯國)

(122) 西北去拂菻四千五百里。(ibid)

(123) 西北拒拂菻。(舊唐書，卷百九十八，西戎傳波斯國); 波刺斯國，周數萬里，國大都城，號蘇刺薩儻那，……西北接拂憐國。(大唐西域記，卷十一，波刺斯國); 西北羸四千里拂菻也。(唐書，卷二百二十一，西域傳波斯國)

(124) See note 123.

be allowed to neglect that discrepancy, and go on to maintain that Fu-lin and Fu-lu-ni referred to the same place, that is, Antiochia, the Syrian Metropolis. There is nothing, however, within Chinese literature, to help us to solve this problem, but it is western records that seem to lend us some light by supplying information as to the distance from the Persian capital to the Syrian Antiochia.

An ancient traveller who started from the Persian capital, Seleucia (Suristan) or Madāin (about one *li* south from later Baghdad), to reach Antiochia would at first go northwest up to the shore of the Euphrates, and thence proceed north along the stream as far up as Nicephorum; at this point he would part with the river course and make his way in a northwesterly direction until he reached Zeugma (corresponding to the present Birezik), where he would cross the river, and then, shifting his course a little to the southwest, go on to Antiochia. Now, this route measured 171 *schoeni* between Seleucia to Zeugma, according to the "*Parthian Stations*" by ISIDORUS of Charax, dated about the beginning of the Christian era.⁽¹²⁵⁾ The *schoenus*, alike to the *parasang*, was the name of the Persian mile. This Persian unit, however, had a changeable value varying with places and periods. STRABO equalled one *schoenus* (or *parasang*) to 40 stadia, but among the later authors it ranges from 30 to 60 stadia. MASSON's estimate showed that the *schoenus*, as ISIDORUS used it within the boundaries of Persia, approximated $2\frac{1}{3}$ English miles; but used by the same author on the shores of the Euphrates, it corresponded with $3\frac{1}{4}$ miles. On the other hand, SCHOFF remarks that, as the *farsak*, the current Persian unit which agrees with the old *parasang*, is varied from $3\frac{1}{3}$ to 4 miles, it will be better to place the *schoenus* between $3\frac{1}{4}$ and $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles.⁽¹²⁶⁾ As a matter of course, we cannot expect to determine with anything like definiteness the value of the *schoenus* in the case referred to in the "*Parthian Stations*." But we may, as an experiment, take the shortest distance conceivable for the *schoenus*, i.e. the $3\frac{1}{4}$ miles, and apply it to the 171 *schoeni* between Seleucia and Zeugma, then the result will approximate 666 English miles. As for the distance from Zeugma to Antiochia, there is no indication of it in western records, but on the authority of STRABO who (XVI, p. 749) placed Zeugma at 1,400 stadia from the Gulf of Issos, HIRTH was enabled to estimate it to be 1,400 stadia, or about 110 English miles, assuming about one mile for every ten stadia.⁽¹²⁷⁾ Adding this 110 miles to the 666 miles above-mentioned, we shall get a total of 776 miles and this may be taken as the whole distance from Seleucia, or Madāin as it was called in the Sui and Tang periods, to Antiochia by way of Zeugma. On the other hand, if we are to take the *schoenus* at the other extreme of the range, then the 171 *schoeni* mentioned by ISIDORUS as the distance between Seleucia and

(125) W. H. SCHOFF, *Parthian Stations by Isidore of Charax*. p. 3.

(126) *ibid.*, p. 22.

(127) HIRTH, *China and the Roman Orient*, p. 191, note 2.

Zeugma will correspond to some 794 miles, and added up with the auxiliary 110 miles, it will make the total of some 904 miles from Seleucia to Antiochia. Again if we apply to the *schoenus* the medium number of miles, $3\frac{1}{2}$, then it will appear that Zeugma was some 709 miles away from Seleucia, and consequently that it was some 819 miles from Seleucia to Antiochia. In short, the result of the measurement seems to differentiate as 776, 819, and 904 miles according to the different methods of estimate. And it remains for us to see whether this variety has any relation with that represented by the distance from the Persian capital to Fu-lu-ni, 3,092 *li*, on one hand, and the distance from the Persian capital to Fu-lin, mentioned differently by the *Sui-shu* and the *T'ang-shu* as 4,500 *li* and over 4,000 *li*, on the other. Of course, the first requisite is to ascertain the value of the Chinese *li* in the periods concerned. According to a Japanese authority, it was, in the Northern Wêi as well as in the Han period, equal to our 4 *chō* (one *chō* = $1/36$ of one *ri* = 2.44 some English miles),⁽¹²⁸⁾ while another author compares one *li* in the Han period to our 3.8 *chō*.⁽¹²⁹⁾ Computing on these bases severally, we find that the 3,092 *li* measurable between the Persian capital and Fu-lu-ni, reduces itself to 343 *ri* (= 836.92 miles) and 326 *ri* (= 795.44 miles) respectively. Now compare these figures with the shortest and the medium distance measured above as between Seleucia and Antiochia, that is to say, 776 and 819 miles; and we shall be compelled to acknowledge that there is a general agreement between the two groups. Moreover, if we try to follow on the modern map the route above suggested as leading from Seleucia to Antiochia, we shall find that, making due allowance for the lesser windings of the road, the distance covered approximates a little over 700 miles, and certainly this does not show any considerable difference from those figures above referred to. I believe that these observations go to affirm that we were justified in regarding the city of Fu-lu-ni as identical with Antiochia.

As for the name Fu-lin introduced during the Sui and T'ang periods, there can be no doubt that it pointed to the Eastern Roman Empire, but it is a question whether it applied only to that portion of the Roman eastern territory which lay south of the Taurus, that is to say, to the same tract of country that was represented by Ta-ch'in in the Han and Wêi periods and by Fu-lu-ni in the epoch of the Southern and Northern dynasties, or the name covered as a whole the Eastern Roman Empire with its capital at Constantinople. We have seen that the *Sui-shu* places Fu-lin at a distance of 4,500 *li* from the Persian capital, while the corresponding distance appears as over 4,000 *li* in the *T'ang-shu*. Now, the *li* in the Sui and T'ang periods was equal to our 5 *chō* (= some 0.34 miles), according to the established interpretation and consequently the 4,500 *li* in the *Sui-shu* is translatable as 724

(128) Motoharu FUJITA 藤田元春; *Shakudo-sōhō* 尺度綜考, p. 381.

(129) Kiroku ADACHI 足立喜六; *Chōan-shiseki no Kenkyū* 長安史蹟の研究, p. 38.

of the continent. At any rate, the definition of "northern-flowing" does not apply to any of the three largest rivers in that quarter, the Ural, the Volga, and the Don; but with some modification, only to the Syr, which takes in reality a northwesterly course. In the description of the two other roads, there was no gap of space to be imagined between the country at once bordering the western sea and making the journey's end on one hand and the country named last but one on the other. In case of the middle way Mu-kuo, i.e. Amol on the Amu, was conterminous with Po-ssü; and in the southern road T'ao-kuo, i.e. Kabul, bordered on North-India; and if the same idea is applied to our interpretation of the northern road, then it might appear that, crossing the Syr, which is the last thing mentioned before Fu-lin though under a vague term, one immediately entered the boundaries of the Fu-lin. But it is obviously impossible that the country of Fu-lin, even identified with the East Roman Empire as a whole, should have extended her area so far east. So what we are enabled to ascertain from the above is that in the mind of the contemporary Chinese historians and geographers there was a considerable obscurity about the region from west of the Syr to the country of Fu-lin.

The *Sui-shu*, however, in still another section, contains a passage which perhaps obliges us a little to modify the above view. For, while describing the distribution of the T'ieh-lê tribe, it remarks: "To the east of Fu-lin, there are Ên-ch'ü 恩屈, A-lan 阿蘭, Pêi-ju-chiu-li 北褥九離, Fu-wên-hun 伏嚙昏, etc."⁽¹³³⁾ The four countries, or rather clans, seem to have been situated to the east of the country of Fu-lin, and perhaps in the order from west to east, and it is not improbable that they, or some of them at least, lay on that northern road mentioned by P'ên Chü; and this leads us to the hope that further examination of the whereabouts of the four countries will assist us to know more about the northern road and Fu-lin itself. But we must first try to get a general idea of what channels of traffic had been used in that particular part of Central Asia. At first thought it might seem that P'ên Chü's northern road went along the northern borders of the Aral and of the Caspian before it reached the Black Sea; but a little reflection will show that the idea is hardly possible, nothing was more obvious than the difficulty of travelling along that line, owing to the obstacles offered there by the rough steppes, the intricate chains of morasses, the danger from savage marauders of the wilderness, etc. The two other roads, southern and middle, agree with what the western scholars are wont to term "the Silk Road". They were the channel by which Chinese silk was carried to the far west, and therefore well known to the Chinese themselves. But the northern road has no such history. Nor do the western people seem to have known much about the northern borders of the Aral and the Caspian. Prior to the Christian era, HERODOTUS, ARISTOTLE and DIODORUS, and in the later ages, PTOLEMAEUS (A.D. 160) and the Armenian

(133) 拂菻東有恩屈·阿蘭·北褥九離·伏嚙昏等。(隋書, 卷八十四, 鐵勒傳)

historian Moïse de Khoren (A.D. 450) were the only authors who recognized the Caspian as an inclosed body of water. It was more generally believed that the Caspian was a gulf having its outlet in the Arctic Ocean; and as for the Aral Sea, nobody dreamed of its existence. It is therefore hardly conceivable that, even in the Sui period, there could have been a beaten route of traffic leading through the Aral and the Caspian region, and available for the eastern traders to reach the Eastern Roman Empire. In Central Asia, however, there occurred during the few years preceding the foundation of the Sui dynasty an important event concerning the transportation of Chinese silk to the Roman market. In those days as well as in the earlier, the export of Chinese silk was not direct from the Chinese traders to the far west; it had to go through the medium of the merchants of Central Asia, more particularly of Bactria and Sogdiana, before it reached Persia on the west or India on the south, and it was always the Persian traders that sold it to Rome and gained so great profit that they were much envied by the silk-dealers in Central Asia. Toward the end of the 6th century, however, after the Sogdian people became subject to the T'u-chüeh K'o-han, it happened that Sogdian chief Maniach proceeded to the Persian king's court as an envoy of the K'o-han and tried to obtain the royal grant of passage for Sogdian traders who would carry Chinese silk through the country of Persia. This attempt was a failure because the Persian king Khosrau would not hear of it, but Maniach had another course to fall back upon, and presently succeeded in bringing Dizabul Qayan into an alliance with the East Roman Empire. On the surface, it had a military aim against the formidable Persia, but the real motive of the Sogdian chief himself was to realize the direct export of Chinese silk to the East Roman Empire. As a result, there was an exchange of embassies between the east and west, and it was Zemarchos who was despatched by Justin to the court of the T'u-chüeh K'o-han. Commencing his overland journey at the eastern shore of the Black Sea, he went through the north of the Caspian and the Aral, until he came to his destination in the T'ien-shan Mountains. This was indeed the first time that this part of the continent was ever trodden by European feet, and the precious record of the travel has been preserved in the works of Menander Protector in the second half of the 6th century. But what is most instructive to us is the account of Zemarchos's return journey to Byzantium, and on his account it may be introduced by summarizing it as follows:—Zemarchos having taken leave of Dizabul, hastened to join the Roman who were waiting for him in the country of Choliates. The chief of the country had obtained permission from Dizabul to let a number of Choliates accompany the Roman party to Byzantium and witness the condition there. The Roman party started, first crossed a river called Oech (Oikh), and then marched for a considerable distance until reaching the shore of a vast lake. Zemarchos stayed here for three days, but in the mean time, he despatched his subordinate, George, to the Byzantine court, to offer a preliminary report on the results of

his mission. Accompanied by twelve T'ou-chüeh men, George ventured through a desolate, dry tract of land, because he had to prefer the shortest way. Presently Zemarchos himself resumed his journey by crossing the desert which surrounded the lake referred to, and after a dozen of days of travelling through rough dangerous spots, arrived at the Ich. Advancing further he crossed the Daich, and after passing a number of swamps, gained the Attilas. Soon after, he arrived in the country of the Ugurs, and they informed him that there were in a forest on the banks of the Cophes some four thousand Persians lying in ambush for his party with the intention to annihilate it. The chief of the Ugurs, who was a vassal to the T'ou-chüeh master, Dizabul, kindly provided Zemarchos and his men with skin bottles filled with water, which would be indispensable in travelling across an extensive desert without any springs in it. Starting again, the party went along the shore of a lake of remarkable size, and proceeded toward a marsh which received the Cophes. Precautions were taken to keep away from the forest against which they had been warned and at the same time to avoid the Ormoschos, the wild inhabitants of the neighbouring hills; and in this way they hurried into the country of the Alans. By this time, their monarch, Saros, had been stealthily incited by the Persian king Chosroes (i.e. Khosrau), with an offer of a large sum of money, to put an end to the Roman party as it arrived. Far from accepting such proposal, however, Saros gave a cordial reception to the Romans, although the Turks (i.e. T'ou-chüeh men) accompanying the party were not treated so favorably, because the king looked down upon them as barbarians. Further on, the shortest and the least difficult passage might have been performed along the land of Suanie and through the country of the Misimians; but knowing that there were a large number of Persians lying in wait for them on the path, Saros advised them to take the Darnēs road instead. Accordingly, Zemarchos shifted his course to the right hand to take the Darnēs road, and proceeded in such a manner as to keep the country of Misimia on his left-hand side. He passed Apsilie, gained Rogatorium, and presently came upon the shore of the Pont-Euxin. Then he took a sail on the sea, and after calling at the mouth of the Phasis on the way, arrived at last in the port of Trebizond. The party landed and returned to Constantinople by post-horses.⁽¹³⁴⁾

It has been already that those streams mentioned in the above account, i.e., the Ich, the Daich, the Attila, and the Cophes were respectively identical with the Emba, the Ural, the Volga, and the Kuban. As for the Och, which was crossed sooner and, consequently, farther east than the Ich, opinion is divided as to what river it was, but I have no reason to doubt that it was the Syr. And if so, the Choliates must have had their home in the lower basin of the Syr, that is, on the east of the Aral. We do not know exactly how far west the T'ou-chüeh race had extended its territory by that time, but

(134) LEBEAU; *Histoire du Bas-Empire augmentée par M. de Saint Martin* X, p. 62-71.

as the abode of the Choliates seems to have formed the western frontier of its sphere, we may be certain that the K'o-han's jurisdiction stretched at least as far west as the Syr. The Daich, which the party crossed on advancing farther west, owed its name to the corrupted form of Zaikh, which was in its turn a corruption of Jaikh, the Turkish word denoting 'vast'; while the Attila next reached by the expedition derived its name from a corruption of the Turkish word Etil or Edil, which signified a river and was specifically applied to the Volga by the Turks of the district. It must be that the Turks had already scattered themselves as far as the Volga, but then they were still a subject people contained within the T'u-chüeh empire. As for the Ugurs who, called on by the Roman party on the west of the Attila, showed themselves very ready to give them accommodation, they had been obedient subjects of the K'o-han ever since they yielded to the warlike pressure of the T'u-chüeh, shortly after the latter's rise in power. It was different with the Alans, however, whose abode the Romans found near the Cophes, after marching from the Ugurs' place. Their king, who refused to give audience to the T'u-chüeh members of the party on account of their being unworthy of it, could not well have been a faithful vassal of the T'u-chüeh K'o-han. Neither was he a friend of the Persian king Chosroes, since he defied the latter's proposal against the Romans and took care of their safety. It is rather important to study the contemporary situation of the Alans in western Asia. The Persians had pushed their territory up to the middle section of the Caucasus range and Iberia, so that it adjoined on the west Misimia and Souanie both attached to the Roman Lazik. This Lazik, as well as Aprilia, bordered the Black Sea at the south of Caucasus, and both, corresponding with the Cholcis of the earlier ages, formed a very important outpost on the eastern frontier of the empire; it was the only gateway for going out from the direction of Asia Minor to that of Siberia. It was natural that great attention was paid to the guard-works there, and when, in A.D. 557, the chief of the Pseudo-Avars sent a request by the Alan monarch Saros to Justinianus for permission to visit the court of Byzantine, we shall not be surprised to see that the general in command of the garrison of Lazik was no less than the person who was destined to be the Emperor Justinus. It does not appear on record by what road the Avars' envoy, Kandikh, came, but very probably by the same route that was taken later by Zemarchos. Now what we can conjecture of the Alans' position is that at about the times of Justinianus and Justinus, their abode was near where the respective spheres of the T'u-chüeh, the Persian, and the Roman powers met or approached one another. Still we see they held themselves independent of any of their powerful neighbours and perhaps this was partly owing to the advantages afforded by the roughness of their country in keeping out invaders, and partly to the courage and daring characteristic of the race.

Certainly Zemarchos's expedition was performed through the region east

of the Syr, along the northern borders of the Aral and the Caspian, and by a mountain pass in the Caucasus, but when we learn that it had been only accomplished through tremendous difficulty, we are inclined to suspect that this was really an unprecedented event, and then we can see why western literature had so far been silent on the route of traffic in that direction. Neither is it known that this northern passage was ever resumed by western travellers, until far later, except by another Roman envoy, Valentinus, who visited the T'u-chüeh a few years after Zemarchos (A.D. 580). One of the later adventurers was Plano de Carpini, who was despatched by Innocent IV in 1245 to the court of the Mongolian Khan. He departed from Lyon, entered Poland, and from its capital Cracow, repaired to the lower Don, via Kiev, whence he marched eastward, first crossing the lower Volga and then the lower Ural, and going round by the north of the Aral, reached the lower basin of the Syr; then he proceeded south of the Kara-Tau, and then skirting the northern foot of the Alexander Range eastwards he reached his journey's end, the Mongolian capital Karakorum. The other was the French priest Rubruck, sent out by Louis IX in 1253 on a similar mission. Starting at Constantinople, he sailed on the Black Sea as far as Soldaia of Crimea, crossed in turn the middle stream of the Don, (the lower) Volga, and the upper Emba; reached the southern slope of the Kara-Tau by the northern borders of the Aral, and proceeded ever eastward until at last he arrived at the seat of the great Mongolian Khan.⁽¹³⁵⁾ It is remarkable that these adventures were dated about six and a half centuries later than Zemarchos's, and that during that lapse of time the world never heard of an attempt made to travel by the north of the Caspian and Aral. And what is equally noticeable is that those holy envoys, in spite of their same destination, chose different courses from each other; and, for the matter of that, Zemarchos in his time reached the Black Sea by a different route from that taken by his precursor, George. So it is almost certain that as far as that part of the continent was concerned, there was no regular line of traffic habitually resorted to for the intercourse between east and west; but, on the contrary, that each time the line of the least resistance was preferred. We may also remember that the exchange of envoys between the Byzantine and the T'u-chüeh court and no less the despatch of the priestly ambassadors, was effected under specially favored conditions. The international importance of their mission tended to safeguard their journeys, and more particularly in the case of Zemarchos, where every stage of their progress lay within the sphere of influence belonging to the Roman if not to the T'u-chüeh., and such was of course a privilege denied to common merchants of either nationality, and consequently the ultimate end of the mutual alliance as conceived by the enterprising Maniach, the export of Chinese silk to the Byzantines had no chance to materialize. Perhaps the short-livedness

(135) ROCKHILL, *The Journey of William of Rubruck*, Map.

of the alliance was in a way responsible for this failure, but the chief obstacle must have been the forbidding nature of the intended tradé-route. Apart from this, we seem to have here some data for guessing how far west the T'u-chüeh had expanded their influence by this time. That stage of the journey between Constantinople and the northern borders of the Caspian might have been effected with most facility by a sail on the Black Sea to or from the mouth of the Don. As a matter of fact, however, we have seen the T'u-chüeh and Roman envoys did not adopt that course, but the difficult pass across the Caucasus, and that at the risk of the Persian assault, and the reason must have been that the influence of the T'u-chüeh K'o-hän, though coming up to the west side of the Volga, still had not reached westward enough to overpower the Utigurs and other ferocious tribes who inhabited the eastern shore of the Azof and the lower Don. It appears, however, that the Utigurs eventually succumbed to T'u-chüeh supremacy, for the Byzantine envoy Valentinus, going to the T'u-chüeh court in A.D. 580, was astonished to hear the T'u-chüeh minister, Turxanth, bragging of the expansion of the T'u-chüeh empire, saying: "Toute la terre, depuis les extrêmités de l'orient jusqu'à celle de l'occident m'est soumise. Les nations des Alains et des Outigours, toutes braves qu'elles soient, n'ont pu résister aux armées invincibles des Turcs."⁽¹³⁶⁾ Those two peoples must have been specifically mentioned, because their surrender came last among the other neighbours. We have above seen that at Zemarchos's time the Alans had not yet been subject to the T'u-chüeh, and likewise the Utigurs appear to have still maintained their independence, but, when Valentinus visited, the two peoples must have been subordinate to the T'u-chüeh. Thus envoys of both the Romans and the T'u-chüeh need not go through the difficult pass across the Caucasus, and his successor Valentinus did not follow the old track but his own line via the Black Sea, the southern point of Cremia, and the mouth of the Don, and reversely for his return. So the conditions might have grown more encouraging to the communication between east and west by the time of Tiberius II, but, on the contrary, there came a rebuff to the prospect with the cooling of the enthusiasm for maintaining the alliance on the part of the T'u-chüeh, and Valentinus's visit to the eastern court in A.D. 580 proved the last of the kind.

Now this point of time falls, in Chinese history, on the 1st year of *Ta-hsiang* 大象 of the last emperor Ching-ti 靜帝 of the Northern Chou dynasty, which was soon to be replaced by the new Sui dynasty, the founder of which was Wên-ti 文帝. It was his successor Yang-ti 煬帝 who distinguished himself by the extraordinary ambition and enthusiasm for expanding his imperial sphere of influence, and this circumstance as well as that of his profound reliance on P'ên Chü's service in this endeavour is clearly seen from the following passage of the latter's biography included in the *Sui-shu*. "With Yang-ti's accession to the throne, there commenced the work of constructing the Eastern

(136) J. DE GUIGNES; *Histoire générale des Huns*, II, p. 397.

Capital. Chü was appointed to oversee the erection of the departmental offices, which was finished in ninety days. At that time the district of Chang-yeh 張掖 was frequented by great numbers of merchants belonging to various western tribes who came to trade with the Middle Kingdom; and accordingly the emperor ordered Chü to go and regulate the affairs there. Chü saw how his master's mind was bent upon the scheming for the expansion of his empire. Therefore, he allured those various foreigners who came to Chang-yeh to give information of their own peoples, that is to say, on their manners and customs, the roughness or feasibility of their countries. Thus he was enabled to prepare his geographical work, the *Hsi-yü-t'u-chi* 西域圖記, in three volumes, upon the completion of which he repaired to the court and offered it to the throne."⁽¹³⁷⁾ In the original text of the *Sui-shu*, this narration is followed by the insertion of that description, quoted before, of the three roads leading to the western sea, but then is thus continued: "The emperor was highly pleased, and gifted his servant with five hundred pieces of fabrics out of the imperial wardrobe. Every day he ordered Chü to proceed near the throne, and made him talk of the western affairs. Chü particularly emphasized the fact that there were abundant treasures in the barbarian countries and dwelt upon the advisability of conquering the T'u-yü-hun 吐谷渾. Greatly delighted by this report, the emperor ordered him at once to take charge of the work of opening intercourse with the western regions and the whole question of the conquest of barbarian neighbours. Chü was given the office of *Min-pu-shih-lang* 民部侍郎, and shortly after, this was changed for the post of *Huang-mên-shih-lang* 黃門侍郎. Subsequently, the emperor commanded Chü to repair to Chang-yeh that the western barbarians might be induced to send their compliments to his majesty's court. And there came in more than ten different peoples. In the third year of *Ta-yeh* 大業, the emperor proceeded to the Hill of Hêng-yüeh 恆岳 to perform the ritual of heaven-worship there, when all those foreigners came to assist in the affair. Now the emperor contemplated an excursion to the Ho-yu 河右 region, and accordingly Chü was ordered to go to Tun-huang 敦煌. There Chü sent out messengers to Chü-po-ya 麴伯雅, the king of Kao-ch'ang 高昌 T'u-t'un-shê 吐屯設 of I-wu 伊吾, etc., in an attempt to entice them by an offer of large rewards to send envoys to China; and when they did arrive, he led them to the imperial court. Later, when the emperor, out on his itineration in the western districts, was staying at the mount of Yen-chih 燕支, there gathered the king of Kao-chang, T'u-t'un-shê of I-wu and other chiefs, as well as those of twenty-seven western barbarian countries, to whom the emperor gave audience as they were arrayed on the left side of the road. He ordered them to be ornamented with gold and jewels and to be dressed in gold brocade and fine silk. There was incense-

(137) 楊帝即位，營建東都。矩職修府省，九旬而就。時西域諸蕃，多至張掖，與中國交市。帝令矩掌其事，矩知帝方勤遠略，諸商胡至者，矩誘令言其國俗山川險易，撰西域圖記三卷，入朝奏之。（隋書，卷六十七，裴矩傳）

burning and music, singing and dancing, and much shouting and merriment. Besides he commanded that the better people of either sex in the Wu-wêi 武威 and Chang-yeh districts should attire themselves in finery and come to see the spectacle. They rode up in multitudes, filling an area several tens of *li* around. The glorious state of the Middle Kingdom was fully demonstrated, and the emperor was greatly rejoiced at the sight of it. Afterwards, he took measures to overthrow the T'u-yü-hun 吐谷渾. He annexed thereby a tract of country extending over thousand of *li*. This was garrisoned with troops expressly despatched, and the provisions transported there amounted to millions in value. The sight of all this event so greatly terrified the different barbarians that they followed one another in sending envoys and tribute to the Chinese court."⁽¹³⁸⁾ From the above quotation we may gather how the duty imposed upon P'ên Chü by the emperor made it necessary for him to keep on collecting information from western traders, and it was the knowledge thus amassed that eventually found embodiment in his *Hsi-yü-t'u-chi*. As for the date of compilation of the work, we are guided by the above record of the author's activities to place it between the accession of Yang-ti in the first year of *Ta-yeh* 大業 (A.D. 605) and his conquest of the T'u-yü-hun 吐谷渾, in the third year of the same era (A.D. 607).

Now let us resume the consideration of the three roads, more especially of the northern road mentioned by P'ên Chü. It seems improbable that it was a silk road like the others, still we have no reason to doubt that it was a trade-route in some sense or other. We have seen, however, that nothing is told of the portion of it from the lower Aral basin on to the Black Sea, and that, although a passage through the northern borders of the Caspian was actually effected for the exchange of embassies between the Byzantine and the T'u-chüeh court some fifteen years before the beginning of the Sui dynasty, it was not one to be commercially utilized under ordinary circumstances, and thus we are led to suspect that the obscure half of the northern road lay in a quite different direction. Trade-routes always owe their origin to the desire of distant peoples to exchange their products. Thus the other two roads were kept open by the demand of western peoples for Chinese silk on the one hand and that of the Chinese for various commodities of India, Persia, the Roman Empire, etc., on the other. What was, then, the corresponding factors which gave the reason of existence to the northern road? Chinese silk and western products could be far more easily carried for exchange through the others, and they would not have resorted to

(138) 帝大悅，賜物五百段，每日引矩至御座，親問西方之事。矩盛言胡中多諸寶物，吐谷渾可併吞。帝由是甘心，將通西域，四夷經略，咸以委之。轉民部侍郎，未視事，遷黃門侍郎。帝後令矩往張掖，引致西蕃，至者十餘國。大業三年，帝有事於恆岳，咸來助祭。帝將巡河右，復令矩往敦煌，遣使說高昌王麴伯雅及伊吾吐屯設等，啗以厚利，導使入朝。及帝西巡次燕支山，高昌王·伊吾〔吐屯〕設等及西蕃胡二十七國，謁於道左。皆令佩金玉被錦罽，焚香奏樂，歌儷諷諫。復令武威張掖士女盛飾縱觀，騎來填咽，周亙數十里，以示中國之盛。帝見而大悅，竟破吐谷渾，拓地數千里，並遣兵戍之。委輸以億萬計，諸蕃懼，朝貢相續。(ibid.)

the northern road, which was certainly more roundabout and more difficult to pass. In my opinion the article of trade which is most closely associated with the northern road is the furs yielded by the Ural and Siberian regions. Traders from the east and the west who wanted furs went to and came from those districts by the northern road; and, accordingly, in distinction from the silk roads, it might be called 'fur-road.' The ancient Greek colonists on the shore of the Black Sea seem to have fetched furs from Siberia from rather early times; but it is from HERODOTUS that we first learn that there was a route of traffic leading from the shore of the Euxin to northeastern quarter of Asia. It started from about where the Tanais river entered the sea of Maeotis, ran in a northeasterly direction past Sauromat and Budini to Tyssaget. Then turning towards the southeast, it went on through Iurkai, Scythia, and Agrippai until it terminated at Issedon.⁽¹³⁹⁾ According to TOMASCHEK's interpretation, which is accepted, as a final one of this Greek record, a western traveller set out from the mouth of the Don, and after going along this river northeastward for some distance and then passing on to the shore of the Volga, followed it up until reaching its tributary Kama, and again pursuing this up towards the northeast, he arrived in the vicinity of Jekaterinburg. Here he turned to the southeast, to go up the Irtisch and march via Tarbagatai to the southern slope of the Altai Mountains; and after proceeding further south across the T'ien-shan range, he entered the Chinese province of Hsin-chiang. I do not think that the route thus described was ever utilized for direct intercourse between the Black Sea region and the far east, but it only marked the line by which the eastern and western traders reached the Ural district, the famous centre of fur-trade. We have no corresponding record in Chinese literature of a contemporaneous date. It is noticeable, however, that the *Han-shu*, in the introduction to its *Hsi-yü-chuan*, gives account of the two roads which might be used for reaching the far west by starting from the Gates of Yü-mên-kuan 玉門關 and Yang-kuan 陽關, situated in the present Sha-chou 沙州 province: "From Yü-mên-kuan and Yang-kuan Gates, there are two roads by which one may go out to the western regions," it says, "The one which leads from Shan-shan 鄯善 along the northern slope of the Nan-shan range, and then crossing a river, goes further west until reaching Sha-ch'ê 莎車 is called the southern road. This southern road, if pursued still further west and across the Ts'ung-ling, will take one to the country of the Ta-yüeh-chih and An-hsi. The other leads from the seat of the king of the Anterior Ch'ê-shih 車師前王, goes skirting the foot of the Pêi-shan, and then crossing a river proceeds westwards until reaching Su-lê 疏勒, and this is termed the northern road. The northern road, if followed further west across the Ts'un-ling, will take one to Ta-yüan 大宛, K'ang-chü 康居, Yen-ts'ai 奄蔡."⁽¹⁴⁰⁾

(139) Vol. IV of his complete works, Article on Melpomene.

(140) 自玉門·陽關，出西域有兩道。從鄯善，傍南山北，波河西行，至莎車，爲南道。南道西踰葱嶺，則出大月氏·安息。自車師前王庭，隨北山，波河西行，至疏勒，爲北道。北道西踰葱

If considered in modern terms, the southern road, leading westward from the south of Lob-nôr, ran along the northern slope of the Nan-shan, past Yarkand and Tashkurgan in the Pamir, again along the northern foot of the Hindu-Kush, until it reached Persia. This corresponds with the so-called silk road. The northern road led from Turfan westward along the southern foot of the T'ien-shan, passed Kashgar, crossed the Pamir, and then after passing Ferghana and Tashkend reached the northern shore of the Aral about the mouth of the Syr. The record does not take us any further, for the country of Yen-ts'ai mentioned last on this route is known to have lain in the steppe extending on the north of the Aral. Plainly enough, however, this was not the real terminus of the northern road, as far as it existed for commercial purposes, and we are obliged to suppose that in reality it had its continuation either in the west or in the north. But nothing is given in the above account to enable us to trace it, and this circumstance is in marked contrast with the case of the southern road, which can be easily guessed from later records to have stretched beyond An-hsi, to reach T'iao-chih, by advancing southwest, and from this country by sea to proceed to Li-kan, or Alexandria of Egypt. There is a statement in the *Shih-chi*, however, which may be considered in connection with our problem of the unknown destination of the northern road. It is in the passage: "To the west (of An-hsi) there is T'iao-chih; to the north, Yen-ts'ai and Li-kan."⁽¹⁴¹⁾ What is remarkable here is that Li-kan is mentioned abreast with Yen-ts'ai as lying to the north of An-hsi. We might doubt the correctness of this statement, for we have already seen that the name Li-kan, being an abridged transcription of Alexandria, referred to the Ptolemaic Kingdom for which that city was the capital, and the country of Li-kan could not well have been situated north of An-hsi. It is possible, however, that the term Li-kan is used here in a modified sense, that is to say, CHANG Ch'ien, the chief source of information about the western countries for the *Shih-chi*, applied the name in a peculiar manner. Perhaps it may be that he found the Ta-yüeh-chih and Bactrian people with whom he sojourned calling the Greeks in general by the name of Li-kan, by extension from its

嶺，則田大宛·康居·奄蔡焉(耆)。(漢書，卷九十六上，西域傳) In the original text the passage ends with Yen-ch'i 焉耆, the name of another country, but very obviously it was quite misplaced here, and must be regarded as a later addition by some ignoramus. We might, however, admit the first character as genuine on the assumption that it was used here, as is often the case, as a term of asseveration concluding the whole statement.

- (141) 其(安息)西則條枝，北有奄蔡·黎軒。(史記，卷一百二十三，大宛列傳安息國) This passage is continued as "T'iao-chih lay thousands of *li* west of An-hsi and borders the western sea 條支在安息西數千里，臨西海." HIRTH, however, divided the sentences differently, reading them as: "To the west there is T'iao-chih, and to the north, Yen-ts'ai. Li-kan and T'iao-chih are thousands of *li* west of An-hsi, and border the western sea." (*Mr. Kingsmill and the Hiungun*, p. 36) But this is an obvious misreading because it is clear from the context that the latter statement must belong to T'iao-chih alone.

original use for the Greek citizens of Alexandria; and that as he happened about that time to hear of the Greek colonies on the shore of the Black Sea, he was naturally induced to assume the name Li-kan for the Black Sea region at large, and this led to that mention of Li-kan as lying alike with Yen-ts'ai on the north of An-hsi. Li-kan, in that modified sense, must have been situated west of Yen-ts'ai, and in all probability it was here, that is to say, the Black Sea region, that we may seek the destination of the northern road in the Han times. But of course we have no information in the contemporary records to assist us to guess how this road was continued from the lower Aral basin as far as the Black Sea region. It is not necessary, however, to conceive that it went straight from the one place to the other. It may possibly have taken a detour toward the north. Now what is noteworthy in this respect appears in the *Hou-han-shu*, though it must be admitted that the description it gives of the northern road is no more than a copy of the corresponding passage of the *Han-shu*. Elsewhere in its *Hsi-yü-chuan*, however, the *Hou-han-shu* says: "The country of Yen 嚴, situated north of Yen-ts'ai, is dependent on the K'ang-chü. It produces sable furs (=shu-p'i 鼠皮), which are transported to the latter people. The country of Yen-ts'ai has changed its own name to A-lan-liao 阿蘭聊. The people live within an earthen wall. The climate is mild and equable, and abounds in *chên* and *sung* 楨松 and *pai-ts'ao* 白草 grass. The manners and customs and the mode of dress there are like those of the K'ang-chü."⁽¹⁴²⁾ This needs commentation, but let us first compare it with this passage in the *Wei-liao*: "Besides, there is the country of Liu 柳, of Yen 嚴, and of Yen-ts'ai, or A-lan as it is called otherwise. They all resemble the K'ang-chü in the manner of living. To the west, they adjoin Ta-ch'in, and to the southeast, K'ang-chü. They abound in fine sables. The people are occupied in pasturing and go seeking after grass and water, their countries bordering upon an extensive marsh. Formerly they were subject to the rein of K'ang-chü, but now independent of it."⁽¹⁴³⁾

The comparison of these two historical passages will suggest that the country of Yen 嚴 in the one corresponds with that of Yen 嚴 in the other; while the country of Liu 柳 in the latter refers itself to the last member of the alleged new name of Yen-ts'ai, A-lan-liao 阿蘭聊 in the former passage. We may well suspect that the author of the *Hou-han-shu* was responsible for an error of confusion in representing the other name of Yen-ts'ai in that manner. It was Dr. NAKA in Japan⁽¹⁴⁴⁾ and CHAVANNES in the west⁽¹⁴⁵⁾ that first paid attention to this fact, and thought it almost certain that the new name

(142) 嚴國在奄蔡北，屬康居。居出鼠皮以輸之。奄蔡國改名阿蘭聊國。居地城，屬康居。土氣溫和，多植松白草。民俗衣服，與康居同。(後漢書，卷一百十八，西域傳)

(143) 又有柳國，又有嚴國，又有奄蔡國，一名阿蘭，皆與康居同俗。西與大秦，東南與康居接。其國多名貂，畜牧逐水草，臨大澤。故時羈屬康居，今不屬也。

(144) *Jingisukan-Jitsuroku* 成吉思汗實錄 pp. 524-525.

(145) T'oung-Pao, 1905, p. 559 note 1.

of Yen-ts'ai was Alan 阿蘭, while Liao 聊 was attributable to another country; and now we may be justified in believing that there were two countries of Yen 嚴 (or Yen 嚴) and Liao 柳 (or Liu 聊) near that of Yen-ts'ai. And I hope the ascertainment of their geographical position will greatly assist us with our present subject of study, namely, the lay of the northern road in the Han and Later Han periods. Let us first take the country of Yen. Its assignment to the north of Yen-ts'ai, that is, north of the lower Aral basin, is instructive in its own way, but what is still more suggestive is the mention of its abundant yield of sable furs; for where could we conceive a sable-producing country in that direction unless in the district of the Ural mountains, or rather in their well-wooded slopes stretching from its middle section down to the south, instead of the northern half, which was mostly bare and rocky. Moreover, there is something about the name of the country which seems to advance this idea. According to KARLGREN, the characters 嚴 and 嚴 sounded in the T'ang period *ngiam* and *ngam* respectively. But on the other hand we know that in the same period the character 獫, of which 嚴 formed the phnoetic was pronounced *χijem*, and then that the character 敢, the phonetic determinant for 嚴 in turn was always sounded *kām*, and as for the pronunciation of the characters 嚴 and 嚴 in the Han and Wèi times, it may have been something like *kēm* (*kom*) and *kām*. Now what is worth notice is that the names, thus pronounced, agrees with that of the river Kama, which rises in the Ural Mountains and flows into the Volga. This will mean that the people in question inhabited the valley of the Kama, so that it was named Kam or Kem after its own abode. This valley of the Kama, which had evidently been frequented from very ancient times by fur-traders from the east and the west, is known to have been inhabited by the Budini at the time of HERODOTUS. According to TOMASCHEK, it was probable that the name Budini was a Finnish word, perhaps cognate with *wetinen* in the Suomi language, *wedinä* in the Esten, *weden* in the Mordwin, and *wüdüm* in the Čeremis, all of which denote the idea, "of water."⁽¹⁴⁶⁾ Again we learn from KLAPROTH that the Wotjack name of the river Kama was Bodim Kama, that is, Great Kama,⁽¹⁴⁷⁾ and we may well suspect that the name Budini came from a corruption of this Bodim. At any rate it seems almost certain that the name Budini was related to the Kam in some way or other. We may further observe the fact that, among the various races belonging to the Finno-Ugor linguistic family, the group of tribes which are the most intimately affiliated with each other, is that composed of those three tribes, the Wotjaks, the Perms, and the Syräs; the Wotjaks with their centre of habitation about the Wjatka, the Perms concentrating themselves on the Kama, and the Syräs who were immediate neighbours of the latter on the north. Situated in such

(146) W. TOMASCHEK, *Kritik der ältesten Nachrichten über den skythischen Norden*, II, S. 20.

(147) H. J. KLAPROTH, *Asia Polyglotta*, 1831, p. 185.

manner, it is natural that Syrāns alike with the Perms call themselves Komi-murt (i.e. the people of the Kama); while the Wotjaks assume for themselves the name Kam-Kusyp, which means the people in (the valley of) the river.⁽¹⁴⁸⁾ We may now even suppose that the ancient people of the country of Yen, who also owed their name to the same river Kama, were ancestors to those three modern tribes, Perm, Wotjak and Syrān.

As regards the other country under review, included in the name A-lan-liao in the *Hou-han-shu*, and separately named 柳 in the *Wei-liao*, our task of identifying it will be harder than it was with the country of Yen, neither of the two histories showing its relative position with Yen-ts'ai even indefinitely. If, however, we divide the name Liao from that of Alan in the *Hou-han-shu*, then, the subsequent statement evidently refers to Liao alone. Thus the given circumstance that "the country abounded in *chên* and *sung* 楨松 and *pai-ts'ao* 白草 grass" cannot well apply to Yen-ts'ai, or the country of the A-lan at least. For this A-lan, certainly identical with the Alans mentioned in western records, was a purely nomadic people ranging over the wild steppes on the north of the Caucasus and the Caspian, where we can hardly conceive an abundant growth of *chên*, *sung* and *pai-ts'ao*. The country of Liao, on the contrary, must have been situated in a wooded region on the north of the steppes referred to, and most likely not far from the country of Yen. And in this case too, the study of the name will turn out helpful. The characters 聊 and 柳, now sounded *liào* and *liú*, were archaically pronounced *liau* and *lau* probably, and we are led to ask whether those names of the country were not alike traceable to the name Rha, which used to be applied to the Volga in those days. To-day the Mordwins call that river by the name *Rau* or *Raw*; and according to TOMASCHEK its uncorrupted form was *Rawš*, and this agrees with 'P α ς in PTOLEMBOS'S geography and 'P ω ς in AGATHEMERUS'S work, which meant the Volga. He also asserts that the Mordwin word *raw* or *nawa*, by taking the suffix *ks* or *kš*, is developed into a word denoting the inhabitants of the Volga, viz., *Rawakš*; and moreover that a corrupted form of this *Rawakš* was responsible for 'ροβοσκ \omicron υ in PTOLEMEOS, *Ravasci* in OROSIUS, and *Ragaus* in JORDANES.⁽¹⁴⁹⁾ This leads us to draw the natural inference that the Chinese term Liao (聊) or Liu (柳) was an abridged transcription of the Mordwin word *Rawakš*, and consequently referred to a Finnish people in the middle valley of the Volga, situated west of the country of Yen in the valley of the Kama.

Then the other statement given of the country A-lan-liao in the *Hou-han-shu*, that the people lived within an earthen wall (ti-ch'êng 地城) must no doubt properly belong to the country of Liao alone. The Yen-ts'ai was one of those peoples which the Chinese historians not seldom called Hsing-kuo 行國 (moving people), and, as such, could not have been found walling them-

(148) W. TOMASCHEK, *Kritik.*, II, S. 21.

(149) W. TOMASCHEK, *ibid.*, II, S. 20.

selves in any way. On the other hand, we know that among the ancient Finnish tribes in the valley of the Kama and of the middle Volga there were some who had the practice of building walls or forts to defend themselves against invaders. It is recorded by HERODOTUS that when the Persian king Darius gave chase to the Scythians who fled to the abode of the Budini on the Kama and the Volga, he found the Budini well sheltered within ramparts; and that Darius himself commenced to build forts on the banks of the Oarus, or the Volga, but soon after seeing the Scythians escaping into their own home, he withdrew his expedition and thus his defence-work remained unfinished, leaving, however, some traces of the enterprise to be discerned even at the time of the historian.⁽¹⁵⁰⁾ The alleged attempt at fortifying by Darius has been called in question by many students, more especially by TOMASCHEK, in whose opinion what HERODOTUS thought to be the ruins of Darius's unfinished forts was in reality those of the Budini's earthworks evidently erected against the aggression of the hordes in the neighbouring wilderness.⁽¹⁵¹⁾ The ancient Budini, whose name is handed down by HERODOTUS, were a people mostly inhabiting the lower valley of the Kama, which formed the centre of its home, but this also extended so far southwest as to embrace the valley of the middle Volga; and so it seems that its abode on the whole corresponded with the countries of Yen and Liao in the Han and Wèi periods taken together. And since the Budini, belonging to the Finnish stock as it did, and so situated geographically, are known to have erected earthworks for their safety in the fifth century B.C., we shall not be surprised to see the people of Liao, inhabiting the middle Volga basin during the Han and Wèi periods, described as living within ramparts built of earth.

In the *Hou-han-shu* the name of Yen-ts'ai is changed into *A-lan-liao* 阿蘭聊. This is due to the carelessness of the compiler who combined A-lan and Liao as the name of a country, as stated above. Also in western histories we find names uniting the names of both countries. One of them is *Rhoxolan*, or *Rhoxalan*, which appears for the first time in the book of STRABO. This is a combination of Rhox and Alan, and no scholar has objected against it. But many opinions have been offered in regard to Rhox. At first it was argued that the Rhox of Rhoxalan were the Russians, because the Greeks of the East Roman Empire called the Russians as *Rhôs*. But this view was refuted, for it is improper to identify the Rhoxalans occupying the lower basin of the Tanais i.e. the Don, in the first century with the Russians. EICHWALD observed that 'Rhoxalan' meant the Alans on the *Rha*, i.e. the Volga. SCHAFARIK was one of his supporters. Against this view BOECK offered a new opinion that 'Rhoxalan' meant the 'Alans on horseback', as Rhos was identical with the word *roes* 'a male horse'.⁽¹⁵²⁾ I cannot approve all these

(150) Complete works, Vol. IV.

(151) TOMASCHEK, *ibid.*, II. S. 20.

(152) Vivien de St. MARTIN, *Études de géographie ancienne*, II, p. 123, note 1.

theories. Although EICHWALD came near to the correct solution, I like to interpret the name of Rhoxalan as a name combining Alan and Rhox, i.e. *Rawakš*, which was the appellation of the people inhabiting the bank of the Rha, more correctly Rhaw.

In this connection, I can cite a more suitable example. This is *Alanorsi* which appear also for the first time in STRABO. No objection has been seen among scholars to the statement that this name comprizes Alan and Aorsi. According to STRABO, the steppe extending in the north of the mountain range of Caucasus was for the most part occupied by the Sarmatae, but among the neighbouring peoples of different stock were the Aorsis and the Siraks. And these two peoples were said to have descended from their home land Aorsi, a plateau lying in the north. As the plateau must have been the Ural, the Aorsis and the Siraks probably had come down to the south along the Volga. As to this Aorsi, some scholar consider that the Ersas, one of the Mordwin races, inhabiting now the basin of the Volga are the descendants of the Aorsi. But I think that 'Aorsi' is a transcription of *Oarus*, the ancient name of Volga. The people Aorsi were so called, as they occupied along this river. Whatever it may be, they were no doubt a kind of the Finnish races. It was HIRTH who pronounced the name 奄蔡, finding its first mention in the *Shih-chi, yen-ts'ai* (or perhaps *an-ts'ai*) and traced it phonetically to Aorsi in western records, the name of a people located by STRABO in the steppes north of the Caucasus.⁽¹⁵³⁾ This opinion of HIRTH's had long been regarded as conclusive until G. SCHLEGEL came in to refute it by claiming that 奄蔡 could not be reduced to Aorsi, as the archaic sound of the component characters was *am-ts'ai*, instead of *an-ts'ai*.⁽¹⁵⁴⁾ I think this was certainly a very reasonable objection, but I do not know HIRTH to have ever changed his first thought. My study of the name, however, shall be carried through a different channel. The Biography of the General CH'EN T'ang 陳湯 included in the *Han-shu* has this passage: "The Hsiung-nu master Chih-chih-shan-yü 鄧支單行 sent messengers to the countries of Ho-su 闐蘇 and Fa-yüan to exact annual tribute from them."⁽¹⁵⁵⁾ Annotating upon this, the T'ang scholiast YEN Shih-ku 顏師古 cites Hu Kuang's 胡廣 comment as: "About a thousand *li* north of K'ang-chü, there was a country called Yen-ts'ai, or Ho-su by another name"⁽¹⁵⁶⁾ and on this earlier authority he makes an assertion that Ho-su was identical with Yen-ts'ai. By the way we may also notice this remark quoted from the *Han-shu-chieh-ku* 漢書解詁 by the *Shih-chi-chêng-i* 史記正義: "Yen-ts'ai was identical with Ho-su."⁽¹⁵⁷⁾ We find, however, this identification of Yen-ts'ai with Ho-su opposed by SHÊN Ch'in-han 沈欽韓, whose opinion is quoted in WANG Hsien-ch'ien's 王先謙 *Han-shu-pu-chu* 漢書補注 as: "According to the

(153) F. HIRTH, *China and the Roman Orient*, p. 139 note 1.

(154) G. SCHLEGEL, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Iran*, II. S. 85.

(155) [匈奴] 鄧支單于, 遣使責闐蘇·大宛諸國歲遺. (漢書, 卷七十, 陳湯傳)

(156) 康居北可一千里, 有國名奄蔡, 一名闐蘇. (ibid.)

Hsi-yü-chuan of the *Hou-han-shu*, Yen-ts'ai renamed itself A-lan-liao; and from the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of the *Pèi-shih*, we learn that the country of Su-t'ê 粟特 was called Wên-na-sha 溫那沙 on account of its being situated west of the Ts'ung-ling; while both the *Huan-yü-chi* 寰宇記 and the *Shih-san-chou-chih* 十三州志 remark that Yen-ts'ai and Su-t'ê 粟特 were ruled over by different chiefs, and this shows that WÊI Shou 魏收 has been erroneous in regarding them as one country. We know also that both Su-t'ê 粟特 and Wên-na-sha 溫那沙 were phonetical transformations from Ho-su 闐蘇; hence the conclusion that Hu Kuang's opinion was erroneous."⁽¹⁵⁸⁾ As I attempted fully to explain in my old "*Study on Su-t'ê-kuo*",⁽¹⁵⁹⁾ however, both the terms Su-t'ê 粟特 and Wên-na-sha referred to Sogdiana, and so it is hard to relate them in any way with the Yen-ts'ai who must have been found north of the Aral. Therefore let us prefer Hu Kuang's opinion acknowledging Ho-su as identical with Yen-ts'ai as being more justifiable than the opposite view of SHÊN Ch'in-han 沈欽韓. Thus we see that, as the records of the Han and Wêi periods go, Ho-su was identical with Yen-ts'ai, and Yen-ts'ai in its turn with A-lan. It is also noticeable that in the *Ti-li-chih* 地理志 (Geography) of the *Yüan-shih* there occur the two names A-lan 阿蘭 and A-ssü 阿思 written continuously A-lan A-ssü as if they were one name; while in western records, too, Alan often appears in combination with *As*. It was in view of this circumstance that our Dr. NAKA drew the conclusion that the term Ho-su was identical with A-su 阿速 in later authors.⁽¹⁶⁰⁾ In my opinion, this identification may be established between Ho-su and A-su alone, so far as the current pronunciation of the characters 闐蘇 is *ho-su* and the ancient one *Xap-su*, but it would not be easy to compare A-su with Yen-ts'ai, which was evidently another phonetic reproduction of the same original term which gave rise to the transcription Ho-su. In favour of our author's decision, one may make this suggestion that Yen-ts'ai and Ho-su might be recognized as referring alike to A-lan without ever assuming that they were identical with each other. But I believe that their mutual identity is a matter not very hard to prove. Let us first take the name 奄蔡 and consider the initial character 奄. Its ancient value is commonly defined as *am* or *yem*, but more accurately *iam* by KARLGREN. Then going to the established phonetical authorities, we find it described by fan-ts'ies 衣檢切 or 於檢切, with the explanatory remark that the character had a common sound with character 厭.⁽¹⁶¹⁾ Now the ancient sound of 厭 was *yem*, or *iam* according to KARLGREN, while GILES shows us that its Cantonese sound is *ym*, *ap*, *yp*; the Hakka 客家, *yam* or *ap*; the Sino-Korean,

(157) 奄蔡即闐蘇也。(史記, 卷一百二十三, 大宛列傳奄蔡國注)

(158) 沈欽韓曰, 後漢書西域傳奄蔡改名阿蘭聊。北史西域傳粟特國在葱嶺之西, 故名溫那沙。寰宇記·十三州志云, 奄蔡·粟特各有君長。而魏收以爲一國謬也。粟特·溫那沙, 皆闐蘇聲之轉, 胡廣所言謬也。(王先謙漢書補注, 卷七十)

(159) *Zokutoku-hoku-ko* 粟特國考。(Tōyō-gakuhō 東洋學報 XIV, 4, 1924)

(160) *Jingisukan-Jitsuroku* 成吉思汗實錄 pp. 524-525.

(161) 廣韻·集韻·韻會, 衣檢切, 正韻, 於檢切, 並音厭。(康熙字典)

yöm or *yöp*; and the Sino-Annamese *yem* or *ap*. We may also refer to the historical name 嚙蹉, which meant the Ephthalite, whose first character was obviously identical with 厭. The pair of characters composing the whole name of the people was anciently pronounceable either *ïäm-dat* or *ïäp-dat*. But in this case it must have rather sounded *ïäp-dat*, since the same foreign name was also transcribed by 悒怛, whose old sound was *ïöp-tat*. And this examination of the character 厭 will allow us to conclude that the ancient values justly ascribable to the character 奄 itself were, *ïöp* and *ïäp*, besides *ïäm*. As regards the other component of the name, or the character 蔡, we find two indexes of its ancient sound in the classical comments made on the name of a Ta-yüan general Méi-ts'ai 昧蔡, who is mentioned both in the *Shih-chi* and the *Han-shu*. As the name appears in the former, the So-in 索隱, a commentary of the *Shih-chi* describes the sound of 蔡 by 先葛反 (= *siat, sat*); while YEN Shih-ku commenting on the name as mentioned in the latter history, phonetically defines the same character by 千曷反 (= *ts'at*). Therefore we may be sure that the name 奄蔡 was in the Han period pronounced either *ïöp-ts'at* or *ïäp-sat*. Now we have to consider the other name 闐蘇. The ancient sound commonly ascribed to the component character is *Xap-su*, but we seem to have an evidence that the final character 蘇 was also pronounceable as *sa*. For the K'ang-hsi-tsü-tien 康熙字典, defining the character 蘇, evidently of the same sound as 霞, remarks: "It also satisfies 桑何切, and then will sound the same as 娑 (*sa*)."⁽¹⁶²⁾ And if we apply this suggestion to the character 蘇, then the whole name 闐蘇 will sound *Xap-sa*. So we are obliged to recognize a considerable phonetic affinity between the two terms 奄蔡 (*ïäp-ts'at* or *ïäp-sat*) and 闐蘇 (*Xap-sa*), and this naturally takes us to the conclusion that they were two different transcriptions of the same original. But what can have been this original name? What people in central Asia was it that assumed it as its name? This is of course a head question, but I hope that if a general idea can be formed of the racial distribution of the inhabitants of the borders of the Aral and of the wild plains stretching east and west of it during the Han and Wêi periods, it will greatly assist us in solving our problem.

We have seen that both the *Hou-han-shu* and the *Wêi-liao* mention A-lan as another name for Yen-ts'ai, but there are circumstances which have always made me doubt that such was the case. As observed by CHANG Ch'ien, staying at the Ta-yüeh-chih court about 128-9 B.C., the Yen-ts'ai were leading a nomadic life in their sphere about 2,000 *li* to the northwest of the K'ang-chü. Contrary to the general opinion of western students, the contemporary K'ang-chü were not the inhabitants of Sogdiana, but a people having its proper home in the region north of the Syr, whose chief had his headquarters near the present Chimkend or Tashkend. And if the Yen-ts'ai were found at a distance of 2,000 *li* northwest of the place of the K'ang-chü, it seems

(162) 又叶桑何切, 音娑.

inevitable to locate them at the north of the Aral. According to the *Wèi-liao*, they had formerly been subject to the K'ang-chü, and probably this refers to the state of affairs existing at the time of CHANG Ch'ien in the Han period. As for the other name A-lan, it never appears in Chinese records until later in the Later Han period or that of the Three Kingdoms, and evidently CHANG Ch'ien did not hear of it during his travels in the far west. We do not know exactly when and where the people bearing that name made its first appearance, but it is toward the close of the Former Han period that it receives notice for the first time in western records under the name Alan. In those days, its main abode lay in the steppes north of the Caucasus, and the people was none of considerable importance. As the researches of modern orientalist have revealed, the Alan people were tall in stature, and had blue eyes and red hair, while their language was Iranian. If the Yen-ts'ai were identical with this Alan, or the A-lan after the Chinese manner, then it must have been an Aryan race, and it follows that the Aryan sphere still stretched as far east as the Aral sea in the Han period. The idea would not seem strange at all to the western scholars who are accustomed to regard the Wu-sun 烏孫 and the Ta-yüeh-chih people then inhabiting the northern slope of the T'ien-shan as Aryans, while assuming the Iranian origin for the K'ang-chü people, which they erroneously believe to have inhabited Sogdiana. To me, however, who maintain that the Wu-sun and the Ta-yüeh-chih, and indeed the K'ang-chü also were Turkish, it seems very doubtful that the Yen-ts'ai was Aryan, when the people was observed to be leading a nomadic life, with manners and customs similar to the K'ang-chü, which was its immediate neighbour and once its overruler. As pointed out by TOMASCHIEK, PTOLEMAEOS's geography, dated about 150-60 A. D., mentions the present Ural under the names *Δαιξ* (*Daiχ*)⁽¹⁶³⁾ and this corresponds with *Daich* in MENANDER, *Geich* in CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS, *Jaich* in PLANO DE CARPINI, and *Jaiac* in FRIAR BENEDICT⁽¹⁶⁴⁾; and on the eastern side with *Jajaχ* (*cha-ya-hêi* 札牙黑) in the *Yüan-ch'ao-pi-shih* 元朝秘史, and the Kirghiz term *Jaih*, both of which represent the name in its proper form. It was what the Turks called the Ural by, and according to VÁMBÉRY, the Turkish word *Jaih*, denoting "extensive" or "expanding", was a derivative of the verb *jaj-* which meant "to expand" or "to stretch."⁽¹⁶⁵⁾ Now by the time that PTOLEMAEOS wrote his book, which was a little after the middle of the Later Han dynasty, the Alans had grown so strong and powerful that all the plains north of the Caspian were its own. And that the Ural was referred to by the Turkish name *Jaiχ* must betoken the previous occupation of the same region by the Turks.

We may further notice that in PTOLEMAEOS the name Rha, which was

(163) W. TOMASCHIEK, *ibid.*, II. S. 36-40.

(164) W. W. ROCKHILL, *The Journey of William of Rubruck*, p. 120 note 2.

(165) A. VÁMBÉRY, *Das Türkenvolk.*, S. 383.

a corruption of the Mordwin term Rau or Raw, the Finnish appellation of the Volga. We have already seen, however, that the Byzantine envoy to the T'u-chüeh court, Zamarchos, passing the region in A.D. 569 spoke of the river as Attila, a transformation of the Turkish term *ädil* or *etel*, which denoted a river; while he mentions the Ural by the name Daich, which was identical with *Daiχ* in PTOLEMAEOS. And the foregoing facts must mean that the westward movement of the Turkish race, which had reached the borders of the Ural by the Later Han period, went on steadily and still further until the lower basin of the Volga lay within the racial sphere at the end of the epoch of the Northern and Southern Dynasties.

In view of the fact the spread of the Turks had come up to the borders of the Ural by the Later Han period, does it not seem natural to infer of the Yen-ts'ai, which was in the Former Han times situated north of the Aral and northeast of the Caspian as an adjacent neighbour of the K'ang-chü of the Turkish race, that it was another Turkish people rather than an Aryan. And if we assume the Turkish origin of the Yen-ts'ai, it will be easy to account for its name in Turkish. We have above ascertained the ancient pronunciation of 奄蔡 to have been *äp-ts'ai* (or *iap-sat*) and that of another transcription of the same name 闐蘇, *xap-su* (or *xap-sa*), and what seems most intimately to agree with them is the Turkish term *Xapçat* or *Xapçak*. It is an acknowledged fact that in the days of the Mongolian empire, there was in the north of the Caspian a nomadic people called either Kapçak or Kipçak. It is mentioned as *Ch'i-pu-ch'a-hêi* 乞卜察黑 (Kipçax) in the *Yüan-ch'ao-pi-shih*, *Ch'in-ch'a* 欽察 in the *Yüan-shih*, *Chia-fu-ch'a* 加弗叉 in the *Hsi-yu-lu* 西遊錄, *Kipchat* in the travels of RUBRUCK, *Xapçak* or *Xabçak* in Mohammendan literature; while *Kipçak* or *Kapçak* was the name applied to it by the eastern Turks. The Chinese transcription Ho-su 闐蘇 (*Xap-su* or *Xap-sa*) is nearer to *Xapçak*; and Yen-ts'ai 奄蔡 (*äp-ts'ai* or *äp-sat*) to *Xapçak*, whose initial syllable might easily have been softened into *ya*, *ja*, or *ia*. According to CHARMOY, *Kipchak* was a Čagatai word meaning a desert;⁽¹⁶⁶⁾ while VÁMBÉRY observes that *kapçak* or *kıpçak* in the same language signifies the idea of emptiness.⁽¹⁶⁷⁾ I think that the latter was the primary sense of the word, and the connotation of 'desert' was of later development. The same sense of 'desert' or 'wilderness' is distinct both in the Russian name *Polovtsy* for the country of Kipçak, and in the Persian *Desht*, and the term *Comania*, applied to that country in the times of the Mongolian Empire, was most likely a corruption of the Turkish *kum* (desert), or of the Mongolian *Xumak* (sands). It is plain enough, therefore, that the country of Kipçak in the Mongolian period owed its name entirely to its geographical feature, and that the appellation had nothing to do with the ancestry or chieftaincy of the inhabitants, or any other historical

(166) E. BRETSCHNEIDER, *Mediaeval Researches*, II, p. 68.

(167) A. VÁMBÉRY, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch.*, S. 71.

or ethnological circumstance. It will not be very surprising, then, the name of such nature, Kipčak, should have been applied to a Turkish people occupying the same region in the Han times and appearing in Chinese records under the name of Yen-ts'ai or Ho-su which, considered in ancient pronunciation, proves reducible to Kipčak after all. As a matter of course, the Yen-ts'ai, thus acknowledged as a Turkish race, cannot be at the same time identical with the Alans who were the inhabitants, evidently Iranian, of the steppes on the north of the Caucasus. But why the statement by the Chinese historians that A-lan was another name of the Yen-ts'ai or that the Yen-ts'ai renamed itself A-lan? In my opinion, this was in effect but another way of saying that the Yen-ts'ai made itself a dependency of the Alans. It is recorded to have been in subjection to its neighbour K'ang-chü once in the Han period, and, when the Alans had grown a formidable power during the Later Han period, it may have yielded itself to the rule of the latter, and I think this accounts for the alleged change of its name from Yen-ts'ai to Alan. And this idea again goes to explain the statement in the *Wèi-liao* that Ta-ch'in was situated west of Yen-ts'ai. Since the country of Yen-ts'ai formed part of that of Alans, this must necessarily mean that Ta-ch'in lay west of the latter, that is to say, west of its proper section stretching on the north of the Caucasus.

After the foregoing observation of the position of the countries of Yen, Liao and Alan, together with the separation of the last-mentioned name from that of Yen-ts'ai, I hope, we are a little better prepared to interpret the northern road. The *Han-shu* follows it only as far as Yen-ts'ai, but the mention together of both Yen-ts'ai and Li-kan to the north of An-hsi in the same history has enabled us to guess that it was vaguely known to have extended further to the shore of the Black Sea. It is, however, the *Hou-han-shu*, which, though still tracing the northern road no further than Yen-ts'ai, gives us valuable data for conjecturing its continuation by introducing the countries of Yen, Liao, and Alan, which must have lain on the way from Yen-ts'ai to Ta-ch'in. I think those remote countries would not have been noticed but for the important position they occupied on the route of traffic from the east to the west. It must have been, then, through those countries that the northern road extended itself further than the place of Yen-ts'ai. But on account of its great detour northward into a comparatively unknown region, it may well have been lost sight of by the Chinese historians. Perhaps the rest of the route led from the north of the Aral not straight to the northern border of the Caspian, but northwest to the valley of the Kama via the vicinity of Orënbürg and further west to the shore of the Volga, and then one might either go down this river and then down the Don southward to the Black Sea or march away southwestwards from the lower Volga, and then cross the Caucasus at its western pass, to enter Asia Minor. Surely this was the unrecorded section of the fur road, by which eastern and western

traders,—from both Turkestans on one side and from the Black Sea on the other—came and went from the valley of the Kama, or the neighbourhood of Peim, the emporium for the fur products yielded by Siberia and all the Ural region. This must have been true also of the northern road in the Former Han period, so imperfectly recorded in the *Han-shu*; and indeed also of the northern route of traffic noticed earlier by HERODOTUS, which existed for the same purpose. There was this difference, however, that HERODOTUS's route ran from the middle section of the Ural range southeast to Chinese Turkestan, but the northern road in the Han and Wèi period led from Chinese Turkestan, across the Pamir, to the lower Syr, and then northwest to the Ural region. It remains to be seen, however, whether the northern road in the Sui period was exactly the same as that in the Han and Wèi periods. It is evident that as the middle and southern roads in the Sui period corresponded in the nature of their utilization with the southern road in the Han and Wèi times, for they were all silk roads, so the northern road in both cases had the same object in view, namely, the coming and going for furs of Siberian and Ural origin. But the northern road in the Sui period is described with no more accuracy than that in the earlier periods, and from that account it might seem as if one entered the country of Fu-lin directly after a north-flowing river, probably the Syr, was crossed. In other words, the portion between the Aral and the Black Sea is blank, and the reason must be that it was difficult for the historians to follow it into and out of the Ural region. But as we were in the case of the earlier period much assisted in our tracing of the northern road by the introduction of the countries of Yen and Liao; so we seem to have similar advantages for the Sui period. For, the *Sui-shu* mentions four countries or tribal abodes, named Ên-ch'ü 恩屈, A-lan 阿蘭, Pèi-ju-chiu-li 北褥九離, and Fu-wên-hun 伏溫昏 as all lying east of Fu-lin, and perhaps along the northern road, and a knowledge of their respective positions and identities will go far to determine the course of its last portion in the period. There can be no doubt that the term A-lan in the *Sui-shu* referred to the same thing as the Alans in western records, but the latter's abode was changeable with different ages, and it is a question where it was situated in the Sui period. It was in A.D. 569 that Zemarchos found the people in the valley of the Kuban north of the Caucasus. And the mention of it in the *Sui-shu*, together with the other three peoples, may be safely attributed to P'êi Chü, who gathered information about the western region during the early years of Yang-ti's reign (A.D. 605-616). Therefore we may take it for granted that the A-lan at the time that it was mentioned in the *Sui-shu* was inhabiting the basin of the Kuban. At the frontier of the Eastern Roman Empire came up at the period to the western end of the Caucasus, it must follow that of all the four peoples mentioned together to the east of Fu-lin, the A-lan was the most adjacent neighbour of Fu-lin.

“To the east of Fu-lin there are Ên-ch'ü 恩屈, A-lan 阿蘭, Pèi-ju-chiu-li

北褥九離 and Fu-wên-hun 伏唄昏, etc.”⁽¹⁶⁸⁾ goes the *Sui-shu* text, but seeing A-lan in the second place, it is obvious that the four names were not mentioned in the order of their proximity to Fu-lin, though we do not know what it was that guided their arrangement as above. Now let us take the first-mentioned name, 恩屈. Its Mandarin pronunciation is ên-ch’ü, but HIRTH took it in the Canton sound *yan-wat*, finding it traceable either to Avars, the name of a people which withdrew itself from Europe into the Caucasus about A.D. 600 or to *Ongur*, i.e. *Ονογουροι*.⁽¹⁶⁹⁾ We may notice in the above statement the index of HIRTH’s belief in the identity of *Ongur* with *Onogur*, which, I am sure, is open to question; I claim, on the other hand, to reduce the name to *Ongur* alone, and this was a corruption of *Ugur* mentioned in the record of Zemarchos’s expedition, and therefore also identical with *Oγδρ*, applied by Theophylactus SIMOCATTA to a people living about the Til, as the Volga was called in ancient times, which must have meant the *Ugur* of the Finnish stock exclusively.⁽¹⁷⁰⁾

In the point of time, too, the name Ên-ch’ü 恩屈, first introduced early in the Sui period, well agrees with Zemarchos’s *Ugur*, noticed a few decades earlier, and also with *Oγδρ* of SIMOCATTA, dated at latest from the early T’ang period. We may also consider that Byzantine literature used the form *Ογγροσι* (*Ongroi*), which represented the *Ugur* as well as did *Oγδρ*; that in the ancient Slav language, the corresponding term was *Ugri* and in medieval Latin *Uguri*, *Ugrus*, or *Hungarus*;⁽¹⁷¹⁾ and that though the Hungarians call themselves *Magyars*, still they are recorded by the Russian historian Nestor under the name *Ugri*, while *Ongrie* and *Ungar* are their current names in French and German. And now we may be justified in tracing the term as follows: *Ugur* or *Oγδρ*, which was the original, was transformed into *Ongur* or *Ungur*, and it was this form that was reproduced by 恩屈, sounded anciently as *in-k’iut*, and by the way, *On-ku* (tsu) in current Sino-Japanese. There is a circumstance, however, which makes it quite as conceivable that was the immediate transcription *Ugur* or *Oγδρ*, not an indirect one which went through *Ongur* or *Ungur*. It is this fact that when the ancient Chinese reproduced a foreign name, beginning with a simple vowel they had an occasional practice of using a character representing a syllable in *-n* for the vowel of the word. The illustration, perhaps the most suitable for the present occasion, may be pointed out in this passage, which the *T’ang-shu* provides for the Hui-hu 回鶻: “The Yüan-hu 韋紇 used to be called Wu-hu 烏護, or Wu-ho 烏訖; but in the Sui period it is expressed by Wêi-ho 袁恩.”⁽¹⁷²⁾ It is ap-

(168) 拂菻東則有思屈·阿蘭·北褥九離·伏唄昏等。(隋書,卷八十四,鐵勒傳)

(169) F. HIRTH, *Nachwort zur Inschrift des Tonjukuk*, S. 37-40.

(170) This is at variance with the widely accepted theory regarding Til and *Oγδρ* to be rather ascribable to the Tola river in Mongolia and to the Uigurs of the Turkish race, but I should ask to reserve my explanation for another occasion.

(171) DIESENBACH, *Volkerkunde Osteuropas*, II, S. 287-288.

(172) 袁紇者亦曰烏護,曰烏訖,至隋曰韋紇。(唐書,卷百十七上,回鶻傳)

parent that the forms mentioned as alternative of the first-mentioned were direct transcriptions of Uguz, the form witnessed on the T'u-chüeh inscriptions, and as this must have been the same with the standard name given, whose initial character is 袁 (*ün*), this evidence seems to satisfy the above proposed inference.

As for the name *Onogur*, which I claim to distinguish from *Ongur* in opposition to HIRTH, it occurs in PRISCUS's *Excerpta de Legationibus*, there it is related how the Avars were driven, under the pressure from a certain formidable people on their east, to fall on their western neighbours, Sabjr, who in their turn receded westward, and how this gave rise to a general migratory movement among the three tribes west of the Sabirs, namely, Saragur, Urôgoi, and Onogur, which went on pushing each other further to the north of the Caucasus. According to Vivien de SAINT MARTIN this general westward movement set in during 462 A.D., while MARQUART dates it from the next year.⁽¹⁷³⁾ Now the last-mentioned name Onogur agrees with *Unugur* in SIMOCATTA, and *Hunugor* in JORNANDES; while the one just preceding, *Urôgoi*, is acknowledged as an error for what should have been *Ugôroi*, and this *Ugôroi* is identifiable with none other than ZEMARCHOS's *Ugur* or SIMOCATTA's *Oγôr*. It is clear from the above narration that the Onogur and the *Ugôroi* were two distinct peoples, and therefore that the name Onogur was one thing and the name Ugur or Ongur was another.

There is no ascertaining the exact position of the Onogur people in the region north of the Caucasus during the Sui period; all we know about it is that it finally settled down on the eastern shore of the ancient Maeotis, or the present Sea of Azof, the particular quarter called Patria Onogoria, no doubt after its occupants, by the geographer of Ravenna.⁽¹⁷⁴⁾ As for the abode of the other people, Ugur, just before the Sui dynasty, we are guided both by ZEMARCHOS's experience of the Ugur and SIMOCATTA's record of the *Oγôr* to place it in an area extending from the lower valley of the Volga westwards. The Onogur and the Ugur must have been found in close neighbourhood with each other on the north of the Alans' place; and in view of this, we may admit that, in spite of his mistaking of Onogur for Ongur, HIRTH was still justified in tracing Ên-ch'ü 恩屈 to Onogur, which was quite as likely a term as Ugur for the original of the transcription. But whichever may have been the case, it does not affect the opinion that Ên-ch'ü was a people found in the Sui period inhabiting the region between the Caspian and the Black Sea and at the same time on the north of the A-lan, whose abode was in turn nearest to the frontier of Fu-lin. It was not at random that we divided the names of the peoples on the east of Fu-lin, which are given in an unbroken series of eleven characters, as 恩屈·阿蘭·北褥九離·伏温昏. There is no question about the first two. HIRTH, however, preferred to read the rest as

(173) V. de SAINT-MARTIN, *Études sur les peuples nomades*, pp. 291-300; J. MARQUART *Erânšahr*, S. 98.

(174) J. MARQUART, *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge*, S. 43-44.

Pèi-ju 北徯, Chiu-li-fu 九離伏, and Wên-hun 嚙昏; and adopting the Cantonese sound *pak-yuk* for the first, referred it to Buljar (Bulyar), which was a corruption of the name Bulgar. But this theory is weak in this that the pronunciation of the component characters in the Sui and T'ang period, being *pak-ńziwok*, does not so well agree with proposed original. Then what he holds to be the next name Chiu-li-fu 九離伏, he proposes to recognize it as a transcription of Kara Kalpak. Again the ancient sound *kiu-ljiq-b'juk* is an objection, which is even augmented by the consideration that the Turkish tribe called by the name of Kara Kalpak had not come on the scene until more recently. As for the last name *Wên-hun* 嚙昏, he suggests the probable counterpart *wut-hul*, and though thinking it quite possible to compare it with Wogul, rather chooses to reduce it to Utigur or Ugur. In point of fact, however, the name Wogul was of quite modern introduction; and as regards Ugur, it was what we have above identified Ên-ch'ü 恩屈 with. As the four names in question represent a series of T'ieh-lê peoples living to the east of Fu-lin and perhaps extending as far as the eastern shore of the Black Sea, our task of eliciting more information as to their respective positions and indentities, must begin with a brief survey of the general distribution in Asia of the tribes styled T'ieh-lê. The term "was in the Sui period a generic name applied to various Turkish peoples, some of which were then in subjection to the eastern T'u-chüeh, and others to the western T'u-chüeh tribe. The *Sui-shu* gives their names in seven groups, formed apparently on the geographical basis; and HIRTH in his attempt to elucidate the question, names the groups: Tola, T'ien-shan, Altai, Transoxus, Aralo-Caspia, Ponto-Caspia, and Kirghiz. I believe these terms are on the whole appropriate. I should suggest, however, that the fourth one, Transoxus, had better be replaced by Syr, since the *Sui-shu* allots the corresponding group to the north of K'ang-kuo, by the side of the A-tê-shui 阿得水,⁽¹⁷⁵⁾ which no doubt means both sides of the stream. We have already seen that K'ang-kuo referred to Samarkand, and a notable river flowing north of it can only point to the Syr. It might be remarked that the Syr is known to have been represented by Chih-ho 質河, Chên-chu-ho 眞珠河, or Yao-sha-shui 藥殺水, but never by A-tê-shui 阿得水. I should think, however, that A-tê was intended for *ätıl* (or *ädel*), which was a Turkish word denoting a river. It was once applied to the Volga, obviously in the sense of a representative river, and not to the Syr, the greatest river in that quarter. PÊI Chü's northern road is noticed to have crossed a northflowing river, evidently the Syr, and it may be reasonably suggested that why the Turkish group on the shores of the river received notice is explained by the probability that the northern road passed through or near its abode. What HIRTH names Aralo-Caspia is the fifth group, which is mentioned in this passage of the *Sui-shu*: "East and

(175) 康國北，傍阿得水，則有訶啞曷等。(隋書，卷八十四，鐵勒傳)

west of the Tê-i-hai 得嶷海 there are the Su-lu-chieh 蘇路羯, the San-so 三索, the Yen-mieh 咽蔑, the Ts'u-lung-hu 促隆忽, etc., the total population being eight thousand."⁽¹⁷⁶⁾ He thought Tê-i-hai 得嶷海 referred to the Caspi. The name, with its ancient sound *tek-ngji*, reduces itself to the Turkish term *tegiz* or *dengiz*, which signified 'a large lake' or 'a sea', and which the Turks are inferred to have applied to the Caspi. For in the Biography of Su-pu-t'ai 速不台 included in the *Yüan-shih*, the Caspi is represented by *K'uan-t'ien-chi-ssü* 寬田吉思, and certainly the last three characters T'ien-chi-ssü were correspondent with *tengiz*.⁽¹⁷⁷⁾ But it must be noted at the same time that the Caspi was not the only body of water in Central Asia to be spoken of as Tengiz. Lake Balkash is often called so nowadays, and quite probably in the Sui period as now. From among the specific names in the group under observation, we may take in particular Yen-mieh 咽蔑. This must have belonged to the same people that appears under the name Yen-mien 咽麩 in the Biography of P'ên Hsing-chien 裴行儉 in the *T'ang-shu*; and it was CHAVANNES who placed the abode of this people between Balkash and Ala Kul.⁽¹⁷⁸⁾ And if the Yen-mieh is thus recognized to have lived about Balkash, it must have been the case with its neighbours mentioned together, and so the whole group was in reality what might be termed Balkash-Tarbagatai, instead of Aralo-Caspia; Now Ponto-Caspia was the name HIRTH adopted for the group assigned by the *Sui-shu* to the east of Fu-lin, but after the above observations it seems clear that its abode extended from the Aral to the Black Sea, and so we may suspect that HIRTH's term Ponto-Caspia pointed to a place too far west for the group, and that Uralo-Caspia would have an appropriate use here. We have been enabled to see that the group in question as a whole occupied the area extending from the eastern shore of the Black Sea to the north of the Aral, and since the two members, A-lan and Ên-ch'ü have been already placed between the Black Sea and the Caspian, the remaining two must naturally allot themselves to the area lying between the Volga and the Aral. Now what deserves attention is the consideration that such far-off peoples as they were might not have been noticed by the Chinese unless they lay on a main route of traffic. In the earlier periods, the countries of Yen 嚴 and Liu 柳 received particular mention on account of their position in the valley of the Kama and in the middle basin of the Volga, which was traversed by the detour of the northern road. And we might expect with good reason that it was the same with the T'ieh-lê people east of Fu-lin, and so their identification much depends on the knowledge of what peoples recorded by western authors were found in the same region during the Sui period.

It is an acknowledged fact that in the mediæval ages there was in the middle basin of the Volga a people known by the name of Bulgar. It takes

(176) 得嶷海東西, 有蘇路羯·三索·咽蔑·促隆忽等諸姓八千餘人. (ibid.)

(177) E. BRETSCHNEIDER, *Mediaeval Researches*, I. p. 297, note 722.

(178) Éd. CHAVANNES, *Documents sur les Tou-kiue occidentaux*, p. 212.

its earliest appearance in European records in A.D. 485, when a section of the population crossed the Tanais (i.e. the Don, nowadays), and skirting the northern shore of the Black Sea to the north of the Danube, attained and occupied the region of Moldo-Wallachia.⁽¹⁷⁹⁾ In A.D. 487, they advanced beyond the Danube in an attempt to encroach upon the Eastern Roman Empire, only to be beaten back by the king of the Ostrogoths, Theodoric.⁽¹⁸⁰⁾ It was, however, only a part of the Volga-Bulgar that showed such activity, and in the meanwhile the bulk of the people must have remained in its original home. Later on, we hear of the country of the Bulgars occupying the basin of the Kama and that of the middle Volga, and it was Ibn Fozlân who visited it in 921 as a member of the embassy sent by the Khalifa of Baghdad that furnished us with the earliest detailed information of the country. The country had its capital city, where there is at present the government of Kazan, at a spot about four miles east of the Volga, and 83 miles away from the city of Kazan. This country, however, came to an end, when the Mongolian general Su-pu-t'ai came and conquered it after attacking it twice, in 1222 and 1236. As for its national title, it was Biler or Magna Bulgária according to Plano DE CARPINI; and RUBRUCK puts it as Majori Bulgária. Again, it is represented by *Pu-li-a-êrh* 不里阿耳 (as restored from the obvious corruption *Pu-ssü-a-êrh* 不思阿耳) on the map of the region included in the *Ching-shih-ta-tien* 經世大典, and *Po-la-êrh* 孛剌兒 in the *Yüan-ch'ao-pi-chih*.⁽¹⁸¹⁾ We have seen above the country was flourishing in the basin of the Volga and the Kama during the tenth century, but nothing is known of the date of its foundation. CORDIER, in his commentaries on Marco PÓLO, remarks that a part of the Bulgars moved to the Balkans, but the rest remained in their proper home on the Sea of Azof, and made themselves subjects of the Khazars; and that early in the ninth century, they receded northward to establish in the basins of the Kama and the Volga their great Bolgar state. This statement of CORDIER's seems to have been made on the authority of RECLUS, and yet he does not show on what ground it was that RECLUS so dated the origin of the state.⁽¹⁸²⁾ As, according to BEKER, about A.D. 200 the Bulgars migrated from the Turan plateau to the shores of the Black Sea, it will seem that the very place of their origin was not in the shores of the Black Sea, but must have lain about the juncture of the Kama with the Volga. And even if the establishment of the Bulgar's state in the valley of the Volga and the Kama took place in the early years of the ninth century, as suggested by RECLUS, it would be none the less probable that the people had long been inhabiting the region by that time.

(179) V. DE ST. MARTIN, *Études de géographie ancienne*, II, pp. 10-11; W. W. ROCKHILL, *Journey of Friar William of Rubruck*, p. 130 note 2.

(180) H. J. KLAPLOTH, *Tableaux historiques de l'Asie*, p. 260-261.

(181) BRETSCHNEIDER, *Mediaeval Researches*, II, pp. 81-84.

(182) H. YULE & H. CORDIER, *Marco Polo.*, 3^{ed}, I. pp. 7-8.

It is possible that the Bulgars had not yet founded their country by the Sui period, but there can be no doubt that they were already occupying the middle basin of the Volga as a people of more or less importance. So we may take it for granted that their abode lay within the region traversed by the northern road, and since we have reason to believe at the same time that those T'ieh-lê peoples east of Fu-liñ must have had their homes near that main route of traffic, it is a very natural expectation to discover the Bulgars among the group, and I maintain that their name finds representation in the last three characters Fu-wên-hun 伏嗛昏, in the given series of names. The ordinary ancient pronunciation of these characters was *bjuk-um-Xum*; but according to phonetic classic sound authorities, the second character 嗛 had another ancient sound described by fan-ts'ies 乙骨切 or 烏沒切, that is, *uət* (ot), and thus it becomes as probable that the name sounded *bjuk-uət-Xum*, and it is in this pronunciation that the name is recognizable as a phonetic reproduction of Bulgar. As for the use of the character 嗛 for transcribing the syllabic *or* in a foreign name, we may give an example from T'ang records. The geography of the T'ang-shu, after describing the road leading from the direction of Ordos to the headquarters of the Hui-hu 回鶻, says: "One arrives at the principal camp of the Hui-hu, which is backed on the west by Wu-tê-chien-shan 烏德健山, and on the south by the Wên-hun-shui 嗛昆水. Going 600 or 700 *li* northward one reaches the Hsien-ê-ho 仙娥河. The Wên-hun 嗛昆 and Tu-lo 獨邏 Rivers flow northeast by a meandering course, until they come into confluence at 500 *li* northeast of the chief's headquarters."⁽¹⁸³⁾ The term Wu-tê-chien-shan here points to what is represented in the T'u-chüeh inscriptions as Ütekän Hill, while the Hsien-ê-ho, refers to the Selenga, and the Tu-lo to the Tuglak (=the present Tola); and from this it is evident that the Wên-hun 嗛昆 was identical with the Orxon, and accordingly that the one name was the transcription of the other. In this case, we find that the character is sounded *uət*, and stands for the first syllabic *or* in Orxon.⁽¹⁸⁴⁾ But it is not improbable that the characters 伏嗛昏 may have been pronounced *bjuk-um-Xum* in an ordinary way and still make a reproduction for Bulgar, for we have an instance of the replacement of the *r* sound in a foreign term by the *n* sound in the transcription of *Arsak* by *An-hsi*. Besides, the forms Burgan and Borgan occur as variants of Bulgar in western literature, and the former Burgan may well have been the original for the transcription 伏嗛昏. At all events, we may be sure that there is sufficient linguistic evidence for identifying the Chinese term with the Bulgars.

Our task is now reduced to that of interpreting the remaining four characters Pêi-ju-chiu-li 北禿九離. They are as likely to represent a single

(183) 至回鶻牙帳。東有平野，西據烏德健山，南依嗛昆水。北六七百里，至仙娥河。嗛昆·獨邏，屈曲東北流，至牙帳東北五百里合流。(唐書，卷四十三下，地理志)

(184) G. SCHLEGEL, *Die Chinesische Inschrift auf dem Uigurischen Denkmal*, S. 20.

name as include two names. In transcribing foreign names, the ancient Chinese most frequently used two characters, a fact too common to need illustration, but the employment of three characters too is occasionally witnessed, as, for example, in the terms Fu-lu-ni 伏盧尼 (=Furum) and Fu-wên-hun 伏嚙昏 (=Bulgars) just observed; and even the combination of four characters is not entirely unknown, and the best illustration of this may be had in the term Wu-i-shan-li 烏弋山離, which is applied in the *Han-shu* to a country in the south of Afghanistan. So we are free to take the remaining four characters together and trace them to a single original name, which I claim to discover in *Başkir*. The people of that name is now found spread over the area extending from the upper valley of the River Ural to the basin of the Kama, an area which must have bordered the sphere of the ancient Bulgars on its southeast, and which was in all probability passed by P'ÊI Chü's northern road. It is not certain, however, whether in the Sui period the Baškirs inhabited the same place as they do now. According to VÁMBÉRY, however, it was from time immemorial that they spread themselves over both slopes of the Urals in the southeast part of Russia, that is, from the neighbourhood Jekaterinburg southward to that of Orsk, more especially in the area covered at present by the governments of Orenburg, Ufo, Wiatka, Perm, and Samara.⁽¹⁸⁵⁾ And besides, there is evidence that in the days of the Mongolian Empire, they were found in almost the same area they occupy now. They were mentioned by Plano DE CARPINI as Bascart, by RUBRUCK as *Pascatir*, and in Mohammedan literature as *Başkgird*, *Başgird*, *Baskird*, and *Başgard*. They called themselves by the name Baškurt, while the *Yüan-chao-pi-shih* represents them by *Pa-ssü-chi-t'i* 巴思吉楊, an obvious corruption of Baškirt. The earliest mention of the people in western literature is due to Ibn FOZLÂN, who passed what he called the country of the Başgird and had a chance to observe their mode of living, when he was despatched to the country of the Bulgars in 921. It is certain that they were the occupants of the southern Ural districts at that time, and this consideration encourages the idea that it was also the case in the Sui period. Viewed in this way, it seems a natural inference that the Baškirs, so situated then as now, could not well have been excluded from the T'ieh-lê group of peoples noticed in that quarter. And the remaining four characters, sounded *pək-nzi^wok-kizu-ljje* in the Sui and T'ang period, and *fok(u)-ziok(u)-ku-ri* in the current Sino-Japanese, make an adequate equivalent of Baškurt. As the Fu-wên-hun 伏嚙昏 (=the Bulgars) was situated in the middle valley of the Volga and the lower basin of the Kama, and the Pêi-ju-chiu-li (=the Baškirs) in the area from the upper valley of the Ural river to the basin of the Kama, they remind us very intimately of the countries of the Liao 聊 (or the Liu 柳) and of Yen 嚴 (or the Yen 嚴) which we have located in the corresponding districts respectively. We

(185) A. VÁMBÉRY, *Das Türkenvolk*, S. 496.

may admit that there was certain coincidence between them in the point of habitation, but I think that we are not allowed to assume the relationship of ancestors and descendants between them. The Budini of HERODOTUS, who had inhabited probably the same area covered by the countries of Liao (or Liu) and Yen in the Han and Wêi periods, were Finnish; and the terms Kam and Rau (or Raw), to which we have reduced Yen and Liao (or Liu), are also Finnish and these facts, taken together, must betoken the Finnish stock of the Yen and Liao (or Liu). On the other hand, the Bulgars and the Baškirs are acknowledged by consensus of ethnologists to be a hybrid between Finnish and Turkish lines, and in this respect they are clearly distinguished from the Yen and the Liao (or Liu). I am sure the presence of these Turko-Finnish peoples in the area once inhabited by those of pure Finnish blood is an index of the westward expansion and conquest the Turks were effecting in those days. That PTOLEMAEOS records the Ural by its Turkish name Daikh (Jaiz), and yet the Volga by the Finnish term Rha (Rau) must be due to the fact that the westward advance of the Turks on the north of the Caspian had already reached the Ural, but not the Volga by the Later Han period. If, therefore, we are to sum up what we have gathered as to what peoples were inhabiting what regions during the Han and Wêi periods, the general situation will appear something like this; the steppes stretching from the middle course of the Ural river down to the Caspian were already penetrated by the Turks; while the upper valley of the Ural together with the basin of the Kama on the one hand and the main basin of the Volga on the other were respectively occupied by the Yen and the Liao (or Liu), both of Finnish origin. And as for the area between the lower Volga and the Caucasus, it was the sphere left to the Alans of the Iranian race. Since that time, however, the Turks had been pushing on farther west until at last they had by the Sui period taken hold of the territory from the Ural and the Kama to the middle Volga, and consequently given rise to the cross-bred race, inclusive of the Bulgars (=Fu-wên-hun) and the Baškirs (=Pêi-ju-chiu-li), by intermarriage with the old Finnish inhabitants there. And it is natural that the current appellation of the Volga was the Turkish term Atil (=Attila, Ädel, Ätil), and not the old Finnish name Rha as before.

We have already taken it for granted that the northern road in the Sui period as well as in the earlier extended, further than the Aral Sea, went through the southern Ural regions by detour, and then reached the shore of the Black Sea. Now if we try to arrange those four countries in question by this standard line of traffic, our foregoing observations made of each of them will help us to this conclusions that the traveller coming from the east first passed the country of the Pêi-ju-chiu-li (=Baškirs) and next that of Fu-wên-hun (=Bulgars), and then that of the Ên-ch'ü (=Ugurs) and lastly that of the Alans. And this brings us to contemplate the development of the Chinese knowledge of the northern road. In the Han period, it terminated at Yen-

ts'ai, but, as we have already seen, the statement made elsewhere that Yen-ts'ai and Li-kan both lay on the north of An-hsi is a suggestion that CHANG Ch'ien must have been informed, however slightly, of the continuation of the route up to Li-kan. In the *Hou-han-shu*, however, we have the first chance to supplement the old obscurity about the northern road by the information given of the countries of Liao (or Liu), Yen, and A-lan, all known by inference to have intervened between Yen-ts'ai and Ta-ch'in. And as for the Sui period we have seen how the *Sui-shu* mentions the several peoples east of Fu-lin, while it asserts that it finally reached Fu-lin. And from all the above data it must seem that Fu-lin lay on the shore of the Black Sea. This idea, however, may be taken in a broad or a narrow sense, and it is as likely that the country did not extend beyond the limits of Asia Minor, or, on the contrary, even embraced part of the Balkans, inclusive of Constantinople of course.

It is not easy to decide which was the case, but we are not without any guidance in dealing with the question. It is remarkable that it is invariably Li-kan, Ta-ch'in, or Fu-lin which is asserted by the successive annalists to be the westernmost country in the world; and what is equally noteworthy is the regular attempt, however imperfect, to record the two different roads as northern (fur road) and southern (silk road), of contemporaneous existence, as taking one from the western frontier of the Middle Kingdom to the country, where lay their ultimate destination. But is it not possible that the different avenues to traffic reached the frontier of the country in different points, provided that it had any considerable extent, and hence that the reference of the name was not always precisely the same? Thus, the country of Li-kan 黎軒 mentioned by the *Shih-chi* as lying together with Yen-ts'ai on the north of An-hsi, may only have meant the Black Sea region colonized by the Greeks, which was the particular part of the whole known to the Chinese through the channel of the northern road. On the other hand, when the *Han-shu* places Li-kan 犁軒 along with T'iao-chih on the west of the country of Wu-i-shan-li, the reference must have been to the Hellenistic country with Alexandria as its capital, and the information come from the experience of the southern road. Again the term Hai-hsi-kuo mentioned both in the *Hou-han-shu* and the *Wei-liao* as another name of Ta-ch'in, applied to the particular portion of Ta-ch'in lying south of the Taurus, and of course this was reached by the southern road. It may be noted that the *Wei-liao* on one occasion gives Ta-ch'in as a country adjoining that of the A-lan on its west, and no doubt this meant the Ta-ch'in as reached by the northern road, limiting the territory to the north of the Taurus. Later on, we come across the country of Fu-lu-ni in the *Wei-shu*, and this being identical with the Syrian region with Antiochia as its capital and therefore the portion of the Roman Orient south the Taurus, information furnished of it was owing to the southern avenue. Lastly we come to our main question: what was the import of the

term Fu-lin in the Sui period? When Fu-lin is given as the terminus of P'ên Chü's northern road and when it is mentioned in connection with its eastern neighbours of the T'ieh-lê race, there is no doubt that it referred to the portion of the Roman Orient bounded by the Taurus on its south. It is different, however, when the *Sui-shu* account of Po-ssü says: "To the north-west of the country, it is 4,500 *li* that is Fu-lin."⁽¹⁸⁶⁾ This evidently speaks of Fu-lin as a country accessible by the southern avenue, and the given direction and distance must seem to take us either to the Syrian section of the Roman Orient with Antiochia as its capital or to the Byzantine Empire as a whole. But as the statement of the distance is suspicious of exaggeration, as observed before, it will be safer to assume that Fu-lin in this case referred to the former of the above alternatives.

(186) 西北去拂菻四千五百里。(隋書，卷八十四，西域傳波斯國)

Chapter. VI

Fu-lin as mentioned in the records of
the Southern Dynasties

Ta-ch'in during the Han and Wèi Dynasties was a country actually existed. Known as the so-called Roman Orient it included Syria situated to the south of the Taurus range and Egypt which stretches to the southwest of Syria. However, since the development of the Southern and the Northern Dynasties, it has become more of a visionary and fictive country, resulting in the Roman Orient region becoming known newly in China under the names of P'u-lan 普嵐, Fu-lu-ni 伏盧尼, Fu-lin 拂菻, and the like. All these names, it should be noted, are the transcriptions of Frōm which was the name for the Eastern Roman Empire used by various peoples of Central Asia. However, the country which they really indicate is not the main part of the Eastern Roman Empire with Constantinople as its capital, but the eastern territory of the country once known as Ta-ch'in.

Now, the various countries which maintained incessant connections with the western regions during the Southern and the Northern Dynasties were, as a matter of fact, those of the Northern Dynasties favoured with facilities for overland transportation. The names P'u-lan 普嵐, Fu-lu-ni 伏盧尼, and Fu-lin 拂菻 are found respectively in the records of the Northern Dynasties such as *Wèi-shu* 魏書, *Pèi-shih* 北史, *Sui-shu* 隋書, and the like. However, there is hardly any reason to believe that the name of Frōm, which was known as the then great country in the farthest west, even if it had not been favoured with such facilities as those of the Northern Dynasties, was not known to the Southern Dynasties which had contacts with the various countries of the western realm through both land and sea routes. In studying the records of those days and having regard to the grave doubt above-mentioned, we actually find an account of this country in the *Liang-kung-chih-t'u* 梁貢職圖 quoted in the *Shih-chia-fang-chih* 釋迦方志 by *To-hsüan* 道宣 of the T'ang Dynasty as follows:

“Northwest from here [*Lang-chieh-lo-kuo* 狼揭羅國 (Lankar?)] lies Persia (not India). It is forty or fifty thousand *li* in circumference; the environs of the capital reach to about forty *li*. The country is populous with abundant resources. There are three temples with a few priests and also a great many heathen shrines. The country produces gold, silver, cupriferous pyrites, *P'o-ti* 頗胝, and rock crystals. When one dies, the corpse is often thrown away. In the palace is kept what is called Buddha's bowl. *Hao-mo-ch'êng* 鶴秣城 (Hamadan?) is on the eastern frontier; the circumference of the castle-wall

is about sixty *li* and it has a large population. The northwestern frontier of the country borders on *Fu-lin* 拂廩 (or 琳 by another text) *kuo* (not India) which produces a kind of lap-dog, and originally there were red-heads dwelling in caves. According to the *Kung-chih-t'u* 貢職圖 of the Liang Dynasty, it lies at a distance of ten thousand *li* to the north from Persia. *Hsi-nü-kuo* 西女國 (not India) is on an island to the southwest of Persia; men are being sent every year from *Fu-lin* 拂廩 to *Hsi-nü-kuo* 西女國 to secure wives.¹⁸⁷

The greater part of the *Shih-chia-fang-chih* 釋迦方志 is an abbreviated and extracted record of the *Ta-t'ang-hsi-yü-chi* 大唐西域記; most part of the above account is that taken from the *Ta-t'ang-hsi-yü-chi*. Now, in order to compare the relations between the two, I shall quote from the *Ta-t'ang-hsi-yü-chi* as follows: "To the northwest from here [*Lung-chieh-lo-kuo* 狼揭羅國] lies Persia. (It is not one of the countries of India; I stopped off there on my way. The country was formerly called Po-ssü 波斯 which is an abbreviation of Po-la-ssü 波刺斯). The country is forty or fifty thousand *li* in circumference and the capital is called *Su-la-sa-t'ang-na* 蘇刺薩儻那. Its environs extend about forty *li*. As the river is large and the land is vast, its climate differs locally but it is generally warm. Water is piped to the paddy fields. It is a populous country, and produces gold, silver, cupriferous pyrite, *p'o-ti* 頗胝, rock crystals and other rare precious stones and cloth, coarse brocade or closely-woven woollen fabrics, and the like. Fine horses and camels are to be found in abundance. For currency, large-sized silver coins are in circulation. The people are rude and discourteous by nature in general. The writing and language differ from those of other countries. They are ignorant but handy; so their various products are valued by neighbouring countries. Marriages are irregular and corrupt. When one dies, the corpse is often thrown away. The people are of gigantic physique with their hair dressed and bareheaded; they wear skin or fur coats. Taxes are levied on houses and everybody is subjected to a poll-tax of *Ssü-yin-ch'ien* 四銀錢. There are many shrines, worshipped by heathens called *T'i-na-po* 提那跋. There are also two or three Buddhist temples with several hundred priests all of whom learn exoteric Buddhism and preach the *I-ch'ieh-yu-pu-fa* 一切有部法. The bowl of Śākya is kept in the palace here. *Ho-mo-ch'êng* 鶴秣城 is on the eastern frontier of the country. The castle inside the wall is not spacious but the circumference of the castle outside the wall covers about sixty *li*, in which reside many wealthy inhabitants. The northeastern part of the country borders on *Fu-lin-kuo* 拂廩國. The customs of the country are similar to those

(187) 自此〔狼揭羅國〕西北，卽至波刺斯國(非印度)。周數萬里。都城周四十餘里。人物甚盛。寺有三所，僧數人。天祠甚多。土出金·銀·鑰石·頗胝·水精。死多棄尸。佛鉢在王宮中。東境有鶴秣城，郭周六十餘里。人衆盛。西北接拂廩(一本作琳)國(非印度)。出伯狗子。本赤頭鴨生於穴中。案梁貢職圖云，去波斯北一萬里，西南海島有西女國(非印度)，拂廩年別送男夫配焉。(道宣，釋迦方志，下卷)

of Persia, but the countenances of the people and languages are somewhat different. The country is also rich in rare resources. *Hsi-nü-kuo* 西女國 is situated on an island to the southwest of *Fu-lin-kuo* 拂懷國. It has a female population only and no males; the country abounds in various treasures. As it is subject to *Fu-lin-kuo* 拂懷國, kings of *Fu-lin-kuo* 拂懷國 sent males to that island every year to secure wives. Habitually, no males are reared here."⁽¹⁸⁸⁾

In comparing these two, we find that the following passage in the *Shih-chia-fang-chih* 釋迦方志 is lacking in the *Ta-t'ang-hsi-yü-chi* 大唐西域記: "..... which produces a kind of lap-dog, and originally there were red-heads dwelling in caves. According to the *Kung-chih-t'u* 貢職圖 of the Liang Dynasty, it lies at a distance of ten thousand *li* to the north from Persia."⁽¹⁸⁹⁾ Namely, Tao-hsüan 道宣 who was summarizing the circumstances of Persia from the *Ta-t'ang-hsi-yü-chi*, and came across the statement that *Po-la-ssü-kuo* 波刺斯國 is bounded by *Fu-lin* 拂懷 in the northwest, made it clear by quoting the *Liang-kung-chih-t'u* 梁貢職圖, mentioned that the country was situated ten thousand *li* in the north and described the circumstances of *Hsi-nü-kuo* 西女國 again by the *Ta-t'ang-hsi-yü-chi*. It is unnecessary to explain that this *Fu-lin-kuo* 拂懷國 is another variant of *Fu-lin-kuo* 拂菻國. In one of the volumes of the *Tz'ü-ên-chuan* 慈恩傳, we find the country mentioned as *Fu-lin* 拂琳 and, according to the original explanatory note of the *Shih-chia-fang-chih* 釋迦方志, it is described as *Fu-lin* 拂琳, Tao-hsüan 道宣 only quotes the phrase "Fu-lin-kuo 拂懷國 lies at a distance of ten thousand *li* to the north from Persia", but he does not state explicitly the source of the passage: ".....produces a kind of lap-dog, and originally there were red-heads dwelling in caves." As I shall refer to later, I conclude that the clause "produces a kind of lap-dog" is supplemented by Tao-hsüan himself and the clause "red-heads so and so" has been taken from *Liang-kung-chih-t'u* 梁貢職圖 or other records in the Northern and Southern Dynasties period. But at any rate, it is clear that *Fu-lin-kuo* 拂懷國 was mentioned in the *Liang-kung-chih-t'u* 梁貢職圖.

The *Liang-kung-chih-t'u* 梁貢職圖 is another name for *Liang-chih-kung-t'u* and as mentioned in the *T'ang-shu Ching-chi-chih* 唐書經籍志 as "the *Chih-kung-t'u* 職貢圖 is compiled by Yüan-ti of the Liang Dynasty 梁元帝", it is a

(188) 自此〔狼獨羅國〕西北，至波刺斯國（雖非印度之國，路次附見，舊曰波斯，略也）。波刺斯國，周數萬里。國大都城號蘇刺薩儻那，周四十餘里。川土既廣，氣序亦異，大抵溫也。引水爲田，人戶富饒。出金·銀·鎗石·頗貳·水精·奇珍異寶，工織·大錦·細褐·氈絨之類。多善馬驃駝。貨用大銀錢。人性躁暴，俗無禮義。文字語言，異於諸國。無學藝，多工伎。凡諸造作，鄰境以重。婚姻雜亂，死多棄屍。其形偉大，齋髮露頭，衣皮褐，服錦氈。戶課賦稅，人四銀錢。天祠甚多，提那跋外道之徒，爲所崇也。伽藍二三，僧徒數百。並學小乘教，說一切有部法。釋迦佛鉢，在此王宮。國東境有鶴秣城。內城不廣，外郭周六十餘里。居人衆，家產富。西北接拂懷國。境壤風俗，同波刺斯。形貌語言，稍有乖異。多珍寶，亦富饒也。拂懷國西南海島，有西女國。皆是女人，略無男子。多諸珍寶貨。故拂懷國王歲遣丈夫配焉。其俗產男，皆不舉也。（大唐西域記，卷十二）

(189)出伯狗子，本赤頭鳴生於穴中。案梁貢職圖云，去波斯北一萬里。

book written by Shih-tsü Yüan-ti HSIAO I 世祖元帝蕭繹 and we find in the biography of the Emperor in *Liang-shu* 梁書 and *Nan-shih* 南史 respectively, that the book is mentioned as one of his works.

Its date of publication and the nature of this book are clarified respectively in the preface quoted in the *I-wên-lêi-chü* 藝文類聚. According to the preface, this book was compiled by Yüan-ti 元帝 in the fortieth year of the reign of his father.⁽¹⁹⁰⁾ Yüan-ti 元帝 is the son of Wu-ti 武帝. Accordingly, the fortieth year of the reign of his father corresponds to the fortieth year from his accession to the throne, i.e., 7th year of the *Ta-t'ung* 大同 era (A.D. 541). The reason for writing this book, he explains in the preface, is that, when he held office as governor of *Ching-chou* 荊州刺史, he instituted inquiries into the countenances and customs of *Hu-jên* 胡人 when visiting the area. In case they failed to visit Han-nan, namely *Ching-chou* 荊州, though they visited Chien-k'ang 建康, the capital, he especially sent men to the capital to institute an investigation and thus completed the compilation of this book. Yüan-ti held governorship of *Ching-chou* twice; the first time from the 10th month of the 7th year of the *P'u-t'ung* 普通 (A.D. 526), to the 6th month of the 5th year of *Ta-t'ung* 大同, when he was An-yu-chiang-chün Hu-chün-chiang-chün Ling-shih-t'ou Shu-chün-shih 安右將軍護軍將軍領石頭戍軍事 and in December, the 12th month, of the following year, when he again assumed the office of governor of *Chiang-chou-tz'ü-shih* 江州刺史, remaining there for the second time from the 1st month of the first year of *Tai-ch'ing* 太清 (A.D. 547) to the time of his accession to the throne in the 9th month of the first year of *Ch'êng-shêng* 承聖 (A.D. 552). Consequently, if the *Kung-chih-t'u* 貢職圖 was assumed to be a work compiled in the fortieth year of Wu-ti (A.D. 541) with the date collected during Yüan-ti's term of office as governor of *Ching-chou*, it corresponds to the period of his first governorship of *Ching-chou*, and it is probable that he had started preparation of the book in the fifth year of *Ta-t'ung* on his return to the capital after having fulfilled his duties, and completed the writings in the 7th year of *Ta-t'ung*. This book seems to have been handed down as late as the Sung 宋 Dynasty and is mentioned in the *I-wên-chih* 藝文志 of the *Sung-shih* 宋史; moreover, we can see the explanations about it in the *Yü-hai* 玉海 (Bks. 5, 6 & 152) with the quotations from the writings of Li Kung-lin 李公麟 and from the account of the bibliography of Chung-hsing-kuan-ko 中興館閣, but the number of foreign countries mentioned in it is said to be either one hundred or thirty and it is claimed that in the Nan-sung 南宋 Dynasty, most of those countries had decreased in number to only twenty

(190) 梁元帝職貢圖序曰，……皇帝君臨天下之四十載，垂衣裳而賴兆民，坐殿廊而彰萬國，梯山航海，交臂屈膝，占雲望日，重譯至焉。……臣以不佞推轂上游，夷歌成章，胡人遙集，款開蹶角，沿泝荆門，瞻其容貌，訴其風俗。如有來朝京籟，不涉漢南，別加訪探，以廣聞見，名爲職貢圖云爾。(藝文類聚，卷五)

seven or twenty two. The book gives picture and contains an explanatory note on barbarians. It seems to be of a similar kind to the *Huang-ch'ing-chih-kung-t'u* 皇清職貢圖 and others. PELLIOU, in his treatise,⁽¹⁹¹⁾ puts the date of the compilation of the *Liang-kung-chih-t'u* 梁貢職圖, as after A.D. 542 (8th year of *Ta-t'ung*) and before A.D. 552 (1st year of *Ch'êng-shêng* 承聖). This statement seems to be founded on a study of JÄGER, but as I was unable to examine JÄGER's original text, no details could be clarified. It is regretted that it lacks full details. JÄGER, probably interpreting ".....the fortieth year of the reign of my father, the Emperor....." as the 8th year of *Ta-t'ung* 大同 (A.D. 542), set this for some reason as the commencement date of the compilation and fixed the date for the collection of the date during the term of governorship in Ching-chou as his second governorship in Ching-chou. However, two years after Yüan-ti's assumption of the governorship of Ching-chou for the second time, i.e., March of the third year of *T'ai-ch'ing* 太清 (A.D. 549), Hou Ching 侯景 captured Chien-k'ang 建康, throwing the country into complete confusion. At that time Yüan-ti was engaged in important affairs of the country as the head of the rehabilitation activities of the Liang Dynasty, so could not have had time to write a book. Moreover, the preface of the *Kung-chih-t'u* cannot be interpreted as JÄGER has done it. I might have added that HIRTH is the first author to give attention to this book.⁽¹⁹²⁾

Assuming that the compilation of the *Liang-chih-kung-t'u* 梁職貢圖 covered the period from the 7th year of *P'u-t'ung* (A.D. 526) to the 7th year of *Ta-t'ung* (A.D. 541), the name of 拂廩(拂琳) must have been given in it. As mentioned in the preface, if the *Liang-chih-kung-t'u* 梁職貢圖 referred only to the barbarians who actually brought tribute to the court of Liang, Fu-lin-kuo 拂廩國 can also be said to have actually brought tribute to the Southern Dynasty. We fail to find the name of this country in either the *Pên-chi* of the *Liang-shu* 梁書本紀 or the *Chu-i-chuan* 諸夷傳 of it, but according to the *Pên-chi* 本紀 of the *Wèi-shu* 魏書, P'u-lan-kuo 普嵐國 brought tribute in November of the second year of *T'ai-an* 太安 (A.D. 456), in the 4th month of the 6th year of *Ho-p'ing* 和平 (A.D. 465) and in the 9th month of the first year of *Huang-hsing* 皇興 (A.D. 467). Such being the case, even if we admit that the *Pên-chi* 本紀 of the *Liang-shu* 梁書 is lacking in a tributary account, it may not necessarily mean that Fu-lin-kuo failed to have brought tribute. However, it seems that books of this kind not only always tend to exaggerate but to purposely include those countries which to the contrary did not bring tribute. A good example illustrating this fact is that Japan which had closed its doors to all foreigners at that time and prohibited its people from going over to China is claimed in the *Huang-*

(191) PELLIOU, *Notes sur quelques artistes des six dynasties et les T'ang*, T. P., 1923, p. 265, note. 1.

(192) HIRTH, *Ueber die Chinesischen Quellen zur Kenntniss Central-Asiens unter der Herrschaft der Sassaniden etwa in der Zeit 500 bis 650*, W.Z.K.M. 1896, S. 227.

ch'ing-chih-kung-t'u 皇清職貢圖 as a tributary country. Accordingly, although we find the above statements, it is doubtful whether or not Fu-lin-kuo actually brought tribute, though there is no doubt that the name of this country was at least known and that it was understood it lay ten thousand *li* to the north of Persia. As long as the location of this country has already been mentioned with Persia as the centre, we admit that the writings of those days on Persia might refer to this country. Considering this account and tentatively looking up the chapter on the Po-ssü-kuo 波斯國 in the *Chu-i-chuan* 諸夷傳 in the *Liang-shu*, we find the following account as expected: "The east of the country (Po-ssü) borders on Hua 滑, the west and the south on P'o-lo-mên 婆羅門, and the north on *Fan-li-kuo* 汎慄國. In the second year of the *Chung-ta-t'ung*, 中大通 (A.D. 530), the country presented the Emperor with the teeth of Sākya entrusted to an emissary."⁽¹⁹³⁾ It is noticeable that the above is mentioned in the *I-mo-chuan* 夷貊傳 of the *Nan-shih* 南史 as follows: "The west and south of the country (Po-ssü) borders on P'o-lo-mên 婆羅門 and the north on *Fan-li-kuo* 汎慄國. It was not until the second year of the *Chung-ta-t'ung* 中大通 of the Liang Dynasty that the country presented the Emperor with the teeth of Sākya by dispatching an emissary after having maintained communications with the southern districts of the Yangtse River."⁽¹⁹⁴⁾ According to KARLGRÉN, the words *fan* 汎 and *fan* 汎 were pronounced as *P'iwom* and the word *li* 慄 as *liēt* during the T'ang period, but *li* 慄 is an error for *lin* 懷 and *P'iwom-liām* 汎(汎)懷 will have to be taken as the transcriptions of *Frōm*, like *P'iuat-liām* 拂懷 and *P'iuat-liām* 拂菻. As will be seen from the following passage in the *Ts'ê-fu-yüan-kuei* 冊府元龜: "Su-lin-ch'êng, 蘇蘭城, the Persian capital, lies to the west of the Ta-ho-shui 達曷水 and it is the land once owned by T'iao-chih 條支. There is a castle thirty-two *li* in circumference; it is 4 *chang* 丈 high with a lofty building and a watch-tower. The buildings within the castle extend over several hundred thousand *chien* 間. There are two or three hundred Buddhist temples outside the castle. The east borders on Hua-kuo 滑國, the west and south on P'o-lo-mên 婆羅門 and north on *Fan-li-kuo* 汎慄國. The west is several hundred *li* distant from the sea and the latter about four thousand *li* from Mu-kuo 穆國, the northwest four thousand and five hundred *li* from *Fu-lin* 拂林, and the east 11,700 *li* from Kua-chou 瓜州."⁽¹⁹⁵⁾

In which *Fan-lin-kuo* 汎懷國, i.e., *Fan-li-kuo* 汎慄國 and *Fu-lin-kuo* 拂林國 are distinctly mentioned as apart from each other, so there might be some

- (193) [波斯] 國東與滑, 國西及南俱婆羅門, 國北與汎慄國接。中大通二年, 遣使獻佛牙。(梁書, 卷五十四, 諸夷傳波斯國)
- (194) [波斯] 國西及南俱與婆羅門, 國北與汎慄國接。梁中大通二年, 始通江左, 遣使獻佛牙。(南史, 卷七十九, 夷貊傳下, 波斯國)
- (195) 波斯國, 都達曷水西蘇蘭城, 即條支故地也。有城, 周三十二里。城高四丈, 皆有樓觀。城內屋宇數百千間, 城外佛寺二三百所。東與滑國, 西及南俱婆羅門, 北與汎慄國接。西去海數百里, 東去穆國四千餘里, 西北去拂林四千五百里, 東去瓜州萬一千七百里。(冊府元龜, 卷九百五十七, 外臣部)

people who try to assume these two countries as being different from each other. However, as this account of the *T'sê-fu-yüan-kuei* 冊府元龜 has been compiled from two books, i.e., the passages quoted above covering "There is a castle.....and the north on *Fan-lí-kuo* 汎慄國" were adopted from the *Liang-shu* and the rest from the *Sui-shu*, it is incorrect to discuss the difference between *Fan-lin-kuo* 汎憐國 and *Fu-lin-kuo* 拂林國 with this account as basis. Dr. FUJITA was the first to compare and decide *Fan-lí-kuo* 汎慄國 in the *T'sê-fu-Yüan-kuei* 冊府元龜 as *Fu-lin-kuo* 拂菻國, but it was wrong of him to have thought it the mainland of the Eastern Roman Empire.⁽¹⁹⁶⁾ When I published a treatise,⁽¹⁹⁷⁾ I mentioned *Fan-lin* 泛憐 as being one of the transcriptions of Frōm, but this was simply to prove the conclusion reached above.

Now, it will be observed that *Fu-lin-kuo* 拂菻國 is mentioned in the *Liang-chih-kung-t'u* 梁職貢圖 as lying ten thousand *li* from the north of Persia, which coincides with the description of the *Pèi-shih* and the *Wèi-shu* in which *Fu-lu-ni-kuo* 伏盧尼國 is defined as lying to the north of Persia, and "north" therein should of necessity be taken as the "northwest." The capital of Persia in those days was Madain (Seleucia and Ktesiphon) and the distance of ten thousand *li* to the northwest from there corresponds to the neighbourhood of either Rumania or Hungary. However, as there is no reason to believe that *Fu-lin-kuo* was located in such a place, it will be comprehended that the figure of ten thousand *li* as mentioned by the compiler of the *Kung-chih-t'u* 貢職圖 who had no knowledge of the exact position of that country tried to indicate vaguely that the country lay to the farthest of Persia. My opinion that Frōm country which was introduced to the Northern Dynasty under the names of *P'u-lan* 普嵐 and *Fu-lu-ni* 伏盧尼 is Syria with Antiochia as its centre, can be admitted as unerring and it might be justified that *Fu-lin-kuo* which was known during the Liang Dynasty period at about the same time meant also this district.

As noted above, it has come to our knowledge that the account regarding *Fu-lin-kuo* is found to have been mentioned in the *Liang-kung-chih-t'u* 梁貢職圖, but how should we comprehend the account relating to *Fu-lin-kuo* as quoted in the *Shih-chia-fang-chih* 釋迦方志 which fails to be found in the *Ta-t'ang-hsi-yü-chi* 大唐西域記? Let us first realize that *Pai-kou-tzū* 伯狗子 was introduced from this country. The *Pai* 伯 in *Pai-kou-tzū* is used for 貊 which possibly means a lap-dog. According to the *Kao-ch'ang-chuan* 高昌傳 of the *Chiu-t'ang-shu*, we come across the following passage: "In the 7th year of *Wu-tê* 武德 (A.D. 624), [Ch'ü] *Wèn-t'ai* 文泰 again presented

(196) Dr. T. FUJITA; *O-gotenjikukoku-den Senshaku* 往五天竺國傳箋釋 or *Annotation on the Wang-wu-t'ien-chu-kuo-chuan* by Hui-ch'ao 慧超.

(197) *Taishin no Mokunanshu to Indo no Nyoishu* 大秦の木難珠と印度の如意珠 or *On munan-chu* 木難珠 of *Ta-ch'in* and *Ju-i-chu* 如意珠 of *India* (Ichimura Hakushi Kokikinen Tōyōshi Ronsō 市村博士古稀記念東洋史論叢, 1933).

the Emperor with a male and a female dog, standing as high as six *ts'un* 寸, the length of their trunks being a little more than one *ch'ih* 尺. They are so clever as to be able to pull horses or hold a lantern between their teeth. It is said that they come from the country of Fu-lin-kuo, and no dogs have ever been introduced from that country to China before this."⁽¹⁹⁸⁾ From the above passage we learn that a lap-dog was a special product of Fu-lin-kuo, imported to T'ang through Kao-ch'ang 高昌. If the account in the *Chiu-t'ang-shu* can be justified, we can conclude that as this was the first time that the animal was imported, it ought, as a matter of course, not to have been known to the Southern Dynasty. According to the preface, the *Shih-chia-fang-chih* 釋迦方志 is said to have been written forty years after the founding of the T'ang Dynasty, hence corresponding to the second year of *Hsien-ch'ing* 顯慶 under Kao-tsung 高宗 (A.D. 657) and the author, Tao-hsüan 道宣, would surely have been well acquainted with Fu-lin-kou 拂菻狗. My preceding remark that Tao-hsüan himself supplemented the clause is based on such a ground. There is a story in the *Yu-yang-tsa-tsu* 西陽雜俎 which tells that, on a summer day during the *T'ien-pao* 天寶 era, the Emperor Hsüang-tsung 玄宗 had a game of chess (*ch'i* 棋) with a prince of the blood. As the match progressed, the story proceeds, the tide seemed to have been turning against Hsüang-tsung when YANG Kuei-fêi 楊貴妃 who had been observing the game, released a lap-dog 獬子 of K'ang-kuo 康國 with the object of its getting on the chessboard for the purpose of throwing the game into confusion, thus succeeding in saving the emperor from the ignominy of defeat. In my opinion, the lap-dog of K'ang-kuo (Samarkand) was not one from that country but probably a Fu-lin-kou 拂菻狗, brought by a merchant from K'ang-kuo. In the *Chi-yün* 集韻 which was compiled by TING To 丁度 and others during the *Chih-p'ing* 治平 era (A.D. 1064-1067) of the Sung Dynasty, we see 獬 described as “烏戈切, 音倭, 歌韻, 小犬也.” Accordingly, 獬 was pronounced as *ua*, but when one takes into consideration that 高, 媯, 媯, 剛 are pronounced at present as either *kua* or *ua* respectively and its pronunciation during the T'ang Dynasty was *k^wa* and 鍋 is pronounced as *kuo*, *uo*, and 過 as *kuo* and its pronunciation during the T'ang Dynasty is *kua*,⁽¹⁹⁹⁾ it may be admitted that the pronunciation of 獬 during the T'ang Dynasty was also *kwa*, *kua*, and the like. In the Sogdian language, a dog is called either 'kwty' or 'kwt'; in Yagnobi *kut*, *kud*,⁽²⁰⁰⁾ and in Sanglechi-Ishkashmi *kuδ*, in Shughni *kut*, *kud*.⁽²⁰¹⁾ *Wo-tzu* 獬子 is probably the transcription of 'kwt', 'kwty' in Sogdian and the character *tzu* 子 seems to be used also as the diminutive, copying the suffix *t'*, *ty'* at the same time. In importing a lap-dog, the merchants of K'ang-kuo 康國 called

(198) [武德]七年, [魏]文泰又獻狗。雄雌各一, 高六寸, 長尺餘, 性甚慧, 能曳馬銜燭。云, 本出拂菻國。中國有拂菻狗, 自此始也。(舊唐書, 卷一百九十八, 西戎傳高昌國)

(199) B. KARLGREN, *Analytic Dictionary*, p. 437.

(200) R. GAUTHIOT, *Essai d'une grammaire sogdienne*, 1. p. 51.

(201) G. MORGENSTIERNE, *Indo-Iranian Frontier Languages*, II, p. 18.

it simply a dog, but the Chinese thought it to be a special name for a lap-dog, and probably applied it in making a new word “獠”. It is also interesting that the name of *Fu-lin-kuo* 拂菻狗 has been introduced to Japan as one of the names of a lap-dog.⁽²⁰²⁾

So much for the circumstances of the introduction of the lap-dog, the noted product of *Fu-lin-kuo* during the T'ang Dynasty. What must be considered next is the tradition that “there are red-heads dwelling in caves” in *Fu-lin-kuo*, which brings to my mind the following account mentioned in the *Pèi-shih* and *Wèi-shu*, the record of *Fu-lu-ni-kuo* 伏盧尼國 relating to the subject:

“There is a large river in the east which flows to the south. Birds dwell in the river. They are of human shape and sometimes resemble camels; all are feathered and always dwell in water; they die as soon as they get out of it.”⁽²⁰³⁾ The great river flowing to the south of *Fu-lu-ni-kuo* 伏盧尼國 is the Euphrates, and the birds in human-shape dwelling there were associated with the idea of having assumed such shapes because the byssus of *pinna* bivalve from the Mediterranean Sea and the Indian Ocean were considered to be birds' feathers, serving as material for the clothes of men. Again, “the bird like T'o-t'o-ma 橐駝馬” stands for an ostrich and the reason for the domestic animals being mentioned as if dwelling in water comes from the account in the *Hsi-jung-chuan* 西戎傳 of *Wèi-liao* which states that all the six kinds of live-stocks in Ta-ch'in are aquatic animals, this, moreover, being based on a similar story in the *Ching-hsing-chi* 經行記 by Tu Huan 杜環 that in *Nü-kuo* 女國 located to the west of *Fu-lin-kuo*, men are born by water. As I have dwelt on this already, I shall not repeat it here. I think that the statement “red-heads dwelt in caves” in the *Shih-chia-fang-chih* 釋迦方志 is a misprint of “red-heads dwelt in water” and it seems to me that, like the record of *Fu-lu-ni-kuo*, it is probably an endeavour to tell the story that birds live in water but die immediately on leaving it. As a comparison with the text of the *Ta-t'ang-hsi-yü-chi* 大唐西域記 reveals, the *Shih-chia-fang-chih* 釋迦方志 has been compiled by simplifying greatly the passages of the original. The record relating to red-heads must have originally been more lengthy. As the story of *yang-kao* 羊羔 (sheep and lambs) which is the more developed form of this story is recorded in regard to *Fu-lin-kuo*, so if the foregoing study is to the point, the story of red-heads is one of its variants of the water fowl legend in *Fu-lu-ni-kuo* which probably was handed down to the Southern Dynasties at about the same time.

(202) B. LAUFER, *Chinese Pottery of the Han Dynasty*, p. 280 and note 2.

(203) 東有大河南流。中有鳥，其形似人。亦有如橐駝馬者，皆有翼。常居水中，出水便死。（北史，卷九十七，西域傳伏盧尼國；魏書，卷一百二，西域傳伏盧尼國）

Chapter VII

Ta-ch'in during the T'ang Dynasty

I have already mentioned many times that during the period of the Northern and Southern Dynasties Ta-ch'in, which had constantly been recorded in historical works of the successive reigns as the great country lying in the farthest west, was transformed into a visionary one and *P'u-lan* 普嵐, *Fu-lin* 拂菻, and *Fu-lu-ni* 伏盧尼, i.e. Frōm, began to be used as a new name indicating the Roman Orient, and with the prevalence of Nestorianism in the T'ang Dynasty, Ta-ch'in revived newly as a country. As this New Ta-ch'in is of a different type from that which existed during the Han and Wèi Dynasties, I shall make reference to it.

When we read the famous epitaph, *Ta'-chin' Ching-chiao Liu-hsing Chung-kuo-pèi* 大秦景教流行中國碑, we, in the first place, come across the following passage describing the Nativity of Christ in Ta-ch'in: "The virgin gave birth to the Holy One in Ta-ch'in. A Bright Star announced the blessed event. Persians saw the splendour and came forth with their tribute."⁽²⁰⁴⁾ Secondly, this epitaph describes that Nestorianism was introduced into China and was warmly received through *Shang-tê A-lo-pên* 上德阿羅本 of Ta-ch'in in the 9th year of the *Chên-kuan* 貞觀 (A.D. 635). Furthermore, emphasizing that Ta-ch'in is the most auspicious place fitted for becoming the home of the Holy Church, it relates as follows: "According to the descriptive Records of the Western Lands 西域圖記 and the historical works of the Han Wèi Dynasties, the Kingdom of Ta-ch'in is bounded on the south by the Coral Sea, and reaches on the north to the Mountain of all Precious Things 衆寶之山; on the west it looks toward the Gardens of the Immortals and the Flowery Forests 仙境花林. On the east it lies open to the Long Winds and the Weak Waters (to be corrected as the Weak Waters of the Long Winds) 長風弱水. The country produces asbestos cloth, the soul-restoring incense, the bright-moon pearls, and night-shining gems. Robberies and thefts are unknown among the common people, whilst every man enjoys happiness and peace. None but the Luminous teachings prevail; none but virtuous rulers are raised to the sovereign power. The territory is of vast extent; and its refined laws and institutions, as well as accomplished manners and customs, are gloriously brilliant."⁽²⁰⁵⁾

(204) 室女誕聖於大秦，景宿告祥，波斯觀耀以來貢。

(205) 案西域圖記及漢魏史策，大秦國，南統珊瑚之海，北極衆寶之山，西望仙境花林，東接長風弱水。其土出火浣布·返魂香·明月珠·夜光璧。俗無寇盜，人有樂康。法非景不行，主非德不立。土宇廣闊，文物昌明。(The translation by P. Y. SAEKI, *The Nestorian Monument in China*, p. 167.)

Again, the epitaph outlines the circumstances under which Nestorianism obtained great influence through the cordial protection from the successive emperors of the T'ang Dynasty, not to speak of T'ai-tsung 太宗; it also tells us in particular that in the 6th month of the 9th year of the *Chên-kuan* 貞觀 (A.D. 635), Ta-ch'in-ssü 大秦寺 was built at I-ning-fang 義寧坊 in Ch'ang-an 長安 by Imperial command.

The text of the Nestorian monument was written by *Ching-ching* 景淨, a Nestorian priest, in 2nd year of *Chien-chung* 建中 (A.D. 781) during the reign of Tê-tsung 德宗. According to this epitaph it might seem that Nestorianism was made a religion of Ta-ch'in from its first introduction to China by the Nestorian priests; and that, not to speak of Christ himself, the founder, the Nestorian priests who came over to China to propagate the gospel, were known as the people of Ta-ch'in; and in consequence, its temple was named Ta-ch'in-ssü 大秦寺, but this is not actually the case. Naturally, Nestorianism is a Christian sect, but as it is somewhat inconsistent with the orthodox school from the view-point of doctrine, it was considered heretical and persecuted. In consequence, it looked for a sphere in the east for propagation, resulting later in the establishment of the centre of propagation at its capital, Ktesiphon, under the protection of the Sassan Dynasty. Such being the case, we conclude that Nestorianism was in fact a religion introduced to China from Persia. Accordingly, there is no reason to doubt in particular that Christ who was born in Judea hailed from Ta-ch'in, but it strikes us as very strange to find that A-lo-pên 阿羅本 is described as *Shang-tê* 上德 (a high priest) of Ta-ch'in and the centre of Nestorianism is located in Ta-ch'in.

If we pursue a study of the records of the T'ang Dynasty bearing in mind the foregoing doubts, we notice that the epitaph mentions: "Bishop A-lo-pên 阿羅本 of the Kingdom of Ta-ch'in, bringing with him the Sûtras and Images, has come afar and presented them at our Capital,"⁽²⁰⁶⁾ in quoting the Imperial rescript of T'ai-tsung 太宗 regarding the building of Ta-ch'in-ssü 大秦寺. On the other hand, it is described in the *T'ang-hui-yao* 唐會要 as "A-lo-pên 阿羅本, a Persian priest, bringing with him the Sûtras and Teachings, has come from afar and presented to them at our Capital,"⁽²⁰⁷⁾ quoted from the same Imperial rescript, and Ta-ch'in-ssü 大秦寺 erected at I-ning-fang 義寧坊 at that time is given as Po-ssü-ssü 波斯寺 in the *Hsi-ching-hsin-chü* 西京新記 by WEI Shu 韋述 and the *Ch'ang-an-chih* 長安志. It would have been well known from the following Imperial rescript in the *T'ang-hui-yao* that the time when Po-ssü-ssü 波斯寺 was renamed Ta-ch'in-ssü 大秦寺, was none other than the 9th month of the 4th year of *T'ien-pao* 天寶 (A.D. 745): "An Imperial edict of the 9th month of the 4th year of *T'ien-pao* 天寶 runs in part: *Po-ssü-ching-chiao* 波斯經教 originated from Ta-ch'in and has been prevailing

(206) 大秦國大德阿羅本，遠將經像，來獻上京。

(207) 波斯僧阿羅本，遠將經教，來獻上京。(唐會要，卷四十九，大秦寺)

in China ever since its introduction. We hereby build a temple of the name of Ta-ch'in and desire to have people learn by every means possible the fundamental doctrine. The temple Po-ssü-ssü 波斯寺 of the both capitals should be called Ta-ch'in-ssü 大秦寺 hereafter. Those which have been built in local centres should be renamed likewise."⁽²⁰⁸⁾ That is to say that Nestorianism prevailed as a religion in Persia up till then, but as it was clarified that it had originated from Ta-ch'in, it was made a religion of Ta-ch'in for the purpose of squaring it both in name and reality. As the 9th month of the 4th year of *T'ien-pao* 天寶 was the date for the official proclamation of such a change in name, it seems likely that Nestorian priests had noticed closer relations already existing between Nestorianism and Ta-ch'in a little prior to this.

It is natural for Nestorianism which was introduced from Persia to be known as *Po-ssü-chiao* 波斯教 and its influence prevailed for one hundred and ten years from the 9th year of *Chên-kuan* 貞觀 (A.D. 635). Especially, a religion originating in Persia, Hsien-chiao 祆教 (Zoroastrianism) prevailed in China for a long time from the period of the Northern and Southern Dynasties. Moreover, Mo-ni-chiao 摩尼教 (Manichaeism), a sect of Hsien-chiao 祆教 existed in China, and on the conquest of the Sassan Dynasty by Arabia in A.D. 651, Persia came under the control of the Caliph of Mohammedanism. Especially, in the domination of new Mohammedanism over Western Asia, in consequence of the power of Arabia which extended to the Western Turkestan area in the first half of the 8th century, it was felt as undesirable in many respects to call Nestorianism as *Po-ssü-chiao* 波斯教. There is no doubt that the Nestorian missionaries who not only became by degrees conversant with Chinese affairs as well as the classics of that country, but learned that the name Ta-ch'in had been known as the Utopia of the farthest West from ancient days, mentioned Ta-ch'in as the home of Nestorianism with more embellishment. The fact that Ta-ch'in was described in the *Ching-chiao-pêi* 景教碑 on the basis of a study of the records appearing in the *Hsi-yü-t'u-chi* 西域圖記 and the historical works during the *Han* and *Wèi* periods, shows that Ta-ch'in had not only a close association with the Chinese from the earliest times, but seems to clarify their intention of emphasizing the superiority of Nestorianism which originated from such a happy paradise. As a matter of fact, it is hard to ascertain whether or not the missionaries who brought Nestorianism into closer relations with Ta-ch'in, comprehended correctly that Ta-ch'in meant the eastern territory of the Roman Empire, but they at least fully comprehended that traditionally successive dynasties regarded that country as the westernmost utopia the Chinese had dreamt, of which they took successfully advantage. I shall refrain from dwelling on the account

(208) 天寶四載九月，詔曰，波斯經教，出自大秦。傳習而來，久行中國，爰初建寺，因以爲名。將欲示人，必修其本。其兩京波斯寺，宜改爲大秦寺，天下都府郡置者，亦準此。(ibid.)

of Ta-ch'in which appeared in my treatise entitled "*Chinese Ideas Reflected in the Ta-ch'in Accounts*."⁽²⁰⁹⁾

The nature of Ta-ch'in which was revived by the Nestorian priests during the T'ang Dynasty is on the whole similar to that just referred to above, but the birth-place of Christ which had been assumed to be in the Ching-chiao-pèi 景教碑 was Ta-ch'in and is described in the Nestorian Scripture *Hsü-t'ing-mi-shih-so* (correctly *ho*) - *ching* 序聽迷詩所(訶)經 as *Wu-li-shih-lien-ch'êng* 烏梨師斂城 in *Fu-lin-yüan* 拂林園. Needless to say, *Fu-lin-yüan* 拂林園 is a misprint of *Fu-lin-kuo* 拂林國; *Wu-li-shih-lien-ch'êng* 烏梨師斂城 is the transcription of Jerusalem. Dr. Tōru HANEDA 羽田亨 maintains this scripture was compiled at about the same time with the *I-shên-lun* —神論, the Treatise on Monotheism, written in the 15th year of *Chên-kuan* 貞觀 (A.D. 641),⁽²¹⁰⁾ whereas Dr. Yoshirō SAEKI holds the view that it had been compiled by A-lo-pên 阿羅本 and others before the publication of the *I-shên-lun*.⁽²¹¹⁾ At any rate, there is no room for doubt in concluding that this scripture is a work written during the initial stage of the introduction of Nestorianism. We come across *Fu-lin* 拂菻 mentioned several times in the *I-shên-lun*, but above all, the passage: "For instance, as if to go to Persia from here and to *Fu-lin* from Persia",⁽²¹²⁾ shows clearly the fact that in those days *Fu-lin-kuo* existed to the west of Persia. That the city of Jerusalem is mentioned in the *Hsü-t'ing-mi-shih-so(ho)-ching* 序聽迷詩所經 as that of *Fu-lin-kuo* and not that of Judea, may probably be due to the fact that *Fu-lin-kuo* was quite familiar to the Chinese at that time. And if we take the renaming of *Po-ssü-ssü* 波斯寺 to *Ta-ch'in-ssü* 大秦寺 in the 4th year of *T'ien-pao* 天寶 (A.D. 745) into consideration, the change of the birthplace of Christ from *Fu-lin-kuo* to *Ta-ch'in* must naturally be fixed as about the same time. Thus, on the re-birth of *Ta-ch'in* through the efforts of the Nestorians and its becoming to symbolize another name for *Fu-lin-kuo* at the same time, all things which had hitherto been introduced as those of *Ta-ch'in*, suddenly turned into those of *Fu-lin-kuo*. For instance, the story of coral-fishing from the water to the (southwest) of *Ta-ch'in* is described at first in the *Hsüan-chung-chi* 玄中記 by a certain *Kuo* 郭 during the Chin 晉 period and it is described in the *T'ai-p'ing-yü-lan* 太平御覽 as follows: "It says in the *Hsüan-chung-chi* 玄中記 that the sea to the west of the country of *Ta-ch'in* produces corals which grow on stones in the water. At first they are white; in the first year they change to yellow, in the third year to red and in the fourth year they are eaten by worms and decompose."⁽²¹³⁾ Again, the *T'ai-p'ing-yü-lan* 太平御覽 quotes from the book

(209) See the second article of this volume.

(210) *Keikyō-Kyōten Jōchōmeishisho-kyō ni tsuite* 景教經典序聽迷詩所經に就いて [On the Nestorian Scripture *Hsü-t'ing-mi-shih-so-ching*] (NAITO Hakushi Shōju-kinen Shigaku Ronsō 内藤博士頌壽記念史學論叢, 1930).

(211) SAEKI, 景教の研究 *Study on Nestorianism*, p. 675.

(212) 喻如從此至波斯, 亦如從波斯至拂菻.

(213) 玄中記曰, 珊瑚田大秦國西海中. 生水中石上. 初生白, 一年黃, 三年赤, 四年蟲食敗. (太平御覽, 卷八百七, 珍寶部珊瑚)

called the *Hai-chung-ching* 海中經 as follows: "Corals grow in the sea. To get them, iron nets are prepared and are submerged to the bottom of the sea, corals begin to grow through the nets; they attain as high as two or three *ch'ih* 尺, they have branches but no leaves, and look like small trees. On drawing the nets together and pulling them out of the water, broken corals are found caught in the nets."⁽²¹⁴⁾ It is well known that the combined accounts of these two are mentioned in the *Ta-ch'in-kuo-chuan* 大秦國傳 in the *T'ung-tien* 通典. Whereas, we notice that the *T'ai-p'ing-kuang-chi* 太平廣記 quotes the following account from the book called the *Hsia-wên-chi* 洽聞記 in which the name of Ta-ch'in is changed to Fu-lin-kuo: "There is a flying bridge over the sea in the country of Fu-lin-kuo, two thousand *li* from the capital. If we proceed to the west across the sea, we reach *Ch'ieh-lan-kuo* 且蘭國, next to which lies *Chi-shih* 積石 and to the south there is a great ocean; corals grow at the bottom of it. Large vessels loaded with iron nets submerge the latter into the sea. In their infancy, corals resemble mushrooms, but one year later they steal out from the meshes of the nets and their colours change to yellow, branches grow thick and reach as high as three *ch'ih* 尺 and some of them as high as one *chang* 丈. Three years afterwards the colours change to red and about that time their roots will be dug up by iron pincers; windlasses are fitted on board to draw up the nets from the water and the corals are taken therefrom. Hence the name of the Coral Shoal. Corals decompose if not dug out for a long time."⁽²¹⁵⁾

According to the *I-wên-chih* 藝文志, of the *T'ang-shu* 唐書 and the *Sung-shih* 宋史, the *Hsia-wên-chi* 洽聞記 is said to have been compiled in one volume by CHENG Sui 鄭遂, and in the *Chün-chai-tu-shu-chih* 郡齋讀書志 we find it maintains that the book consists of three volumes selected by CHENG Ch'ang 鄭常 of the T'ang Dynasty with the records of about one hundred and fifty six accounts on things mysterious and wonderful, but that the tradition that it was compiled by CHENG Sui 鄭遂 alone is more correct. It is not clearly known when CHENG Sui 鄭遂 lived in the T'ang Dynasty, but seeing that in the above quoted account, the name of Ta-ch'in which naturally should appear, is being changed to Fu-lin-kuo, we can conclude that his existence must be put after the 4th year of *T'ien-pao* 天寶 (A.D. 745). As the wording of the *Hsia-wên-chi* 洽聞記 differs somewhat from the expressions in the *T'ung-tien* 通典, it appears to me that the former would have been based on the text of either the *Hsüan-chung-chi* 玄中記 or the *Hai-chung-ching*

(214) 珊瑚生海中。欲取之，先作鐵網沈水底。珊瑚貫網而生，歲高二三尺，有枝無葉，形如小樹。因絞網出之，珊瑚皆摧折在網中。(ibid.)

(215) 拂菻國海去都城二千里，有飛橋。渡海而西，至且蘭國。自且蘭有積石，積石南有大海。海中珊瑚，生於水底。大船載鐵網，下海中。初生之時，漸漸似菌。經一年挺出網目間。變作黃色，支格交錯。高者三尺，大者丈餘。三年色青 (read 赤)。似 (read 以) 鐵鈔發其根。於船上為絞車，舉鐵網而出之。故名其所為珊瑚洲。久而不採，却蠶爛糜朽。(太平廣記，卷四百三，珊瑚)

海中經. Little is known as to the author and the date of compilation of the *Hai-chung-ching* 海中經, but it would be safe to say that it was written on the heels of the other. Again, we notice that in the *Fu-lin-chuan* 拂菻傳 in the *T'ang-hui-yao* 唐會要 and *T'ang-shu* and *Chiu-t'ang-shu*, various accounts are reproduced from the *Ta-ch'in-chuan* in the *Wei-liao* and the *T'ung-tien* 通典, under the headings of "Fu-lin-kuo, alias Ta-ch'in" or "Fu-lin-kuo is a former Ta-ch'in," and moreover, the fact that the *Ta-ch'in-kuo-chuan* 大秦國傳 in the *T'ai-p'ing-huan-yü-chi* 太平寰宇記 was written according to the accounts mentioned in the *Ta-ch'in-kuo-chuan* in the *T'ang-hui-yao* and *Chiu-t'ang-shu* and those in the *T'ung-tien*, is the most obvious illustration showing that, as a result of both Ta-ch'in and Fu-lin-kuo having been regarded as being one and the same country, the record has become mixed. Accordingly, in order to grasp the entity of Fu-lin-kuo during the T'ang Dynasty, it is necessary for us at the outset to exclude the records which pertain to Ta-ch'in from the accounts relating to Fu-lin-kuo.

First of all, it is the *Ta-ch'in-chuan* in the *T'ung-tien* which stirs up a discussion in trying to carry out the foregoing procedure. Needless to say, the *T'ung-tien* is an elaborate book compiled by Tu Yu 杜佑 under the T'ang Dynasty after about thirty-six years' effort. It is said that the date of the presentation of the book to the emperor on completion was the 17th year of *Chên-yüan* 貞元 (A.D. 801).⁽²¹⁶⁾ However, we find the *Ta-ch'in-chuan* but no *Fu-lin-chuan* mentioned in this work. In addition, there are some accounts in this *Ta-ch'in-chuan* which have not hitherto been mentioned in the accounts about Ta-ch'in in the previous historical records. Moreover, as these accounts are introduced in the *T'ang-hui-yao*, the *T'ang-shu*, the *Chiu-t'ang-shu* and others as those of Fu-lin-kuo, it is quite impossible to ascertain whether they had really been introduced newly as those of Fu-lin-kuo in the T'ang Dynasty or are a collection of the accounts relating to Ta-ch'in other than those mentioned in the authentic records. Nevertheless, I have confirmed that they are all nothing but records of the time when the Roman Orient was called exclusively Ta-ch'in before the Northern and Southern Dynasties. That is to say, the first story of the wild beast called *hsüan* 贊(贊) is taken from the commentary by Kuo P'ò 郭璞 to the word *hsüan* in the chapter *Shih-shou* of *Érh-ya* 爾雅釋獸, the second story of *Yang-kao* 羊羔 which grows spontaneously out of the earth is reproduced from the accounts of the *I-wu-chih* 異物志 by SUNG Ying 宋膺, and the third story of coral fishing is based on the *Hsüang-chung-chi* 玄中記 by a certain Kuo 郭 of the Chin Dynasty. Though the source of the fourth story of jugglery is unknown, the fifth story of *Mu-nan-chu* 木難珠 is almost an exact adoption of the writings of the *Nan-yüeh-chih* 南越志 by SHEN Huai-yüan 沈懷遠 of the Chin Dynasty. Judging

(216) Korehiro TAMAI 玉井是博 *Daitō-rikuten oyobi Tsuten no Sō-kanbon ni tsuite* 大唐六典及び通典の宋刊本に就いて [On the Editions of *Ta-t'ang-liu-tien* and *T'ung-tien* published in the Sung period.] (Shinagaku 支那學 Vol. VII, p. 383).

from the fact the related accounts pertaining to the story of jugglery date from the time prior to the Northern and Southern Dynasties, the story may also be assumed to have occurred at the same time. I have already written on this subject in my treatise entitled, "*Mu-nan-chu* 木難珠 of Ta-ch'in and *Ju-i-chu* 如意珠 of India."⁽²¹⁷⁾ At that time I stated that the *Ta-ch'in-chuan* in the *T'ung-tien* 通典 was written by Tu Yu 杜佑 who had collected and compiled from the *Hsi-jung-chuan* 西戎傳 of *Wèi-liao*, the accounts of Ta-ch'in recorded in the authentic histories of successive dynasties together with the infinitesimal accounts relating to Ta-ch'in, which are found here and there in the above books other than authentic records. However, in the *Hou-wèi-shu* 後魏書 quoted in the *Yüan-chien-lèi-han* 淵鑑類函, we find that, starting from the story of many lions endangering travellers, it contains all stories, except the first one, including the foregoing second story on *Yang-kao* 羊羔 and the writing is exactly similar to the *T'ung-tien*, with a slight difference of characters. It includes two accounts which are not found in the *T'ung-tien*; (1) the people in that country were simple-minded and honest and no two prices prevailed in the market with abundant grains at cheap prices to supply the home demand, and (2) *An-hsi* 安息 (*Parthia*), for the purpose of insuring the interests of the silk trade, had been interrupting the facilities of communication between Ta-ch'in and Han. The only difference found in the account is the lack of the first half of the *T'ung-tien* up to the story of lions and of the story of *hsüan*. It is a well-known fact that as the *Hsi-yü-chuan* 西域傳 is missing in the existing *Wèi-shu* by Wèi Shou 魏收 from early days, it has been supplemented with the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of Pèi-shih at the beginning of the Sung Dynasty, but under the name of the *Hou-wèi-shu* 後魏書, there are the one compiled by Wèi Tan 魏澹 in the reign of Wên-ti 文帝 of Sui Dynasty (A.D. 581-604) and the other by CHANG T'ai-su 張太素 who had a brilliant career during the period of the *Lung-shuo* 龍朔 of the T'ang Dynasty. According to the *Chih-chai-shu-lu-chieh-t'i* 直齋書錄解題 and others, the latter two books are said to have already been lost in the Nan-sung 南宋 Dynasty, but at any rate, the *Hou-wèi-shu* quoted in the *Yüan-chien-lèi-han* 淵鑑類函 represents some scattered and lost passages of these three books, and Tu Yu might have compiled the *Ta-ch'in-chuan* on the basis of the *Hou-wèi-shu*. However, it is not at all clear from what source the *Yüan-chien-lèi-han* actually quoted this account; moreover, as the accounts relating to *Hsi-yü* 西域 in the *Hou-wèi-shu* quoted in the *T'ai-p'ing-yü-lan* 太平御覽 coincide with those of the *Pèi-shih* and the *Hsi-yü-chuan* in the *Pèi-shih* seems to have been written originally according to the *Hsi-yü-chuan* in the *Wèi-shu*, I think it might be excused from not drawing a conclusion as to the relation between the *Ta-ch'in-chuan* in the *T'ung-tien* and the *Hou-wèi-shu* quoted in the *Yüan-chien-lèi-han*. Again, if the *Ta-ch'in-chuan* in the *T'ung-tien* be assumed to be none other than the

(217) See note 197.

copy of the *Hou-wêi-shu* quoted in the *Yüan-chien-lèi-han*, it only serves to affirm more my conclusion that there exists no information regarding new knowledge gained in the *T'ung-tien* during the T'ang Dynasty.

The nature of the *Ta-ch'in-chuan* in the *T'ung-tien* has been clarified above, but we find that the text of this book contains the *Ta-ch'in-chuan* but no *Fu-lin-chuan*. Fu-lin-kuo is only referred to in the note at the end of the *Ta-ch'in-chuan*, quoting the *Ching-hsing-chi* 經行記 by Tu Huan 杜環 which is a record of his personal experiences during about ten years from A.D. 751. This is simple evidence showing that Tu Yu regards Fu-lin-kuo in the same light as Ta-ch'in and it will serve to explain the reason for the *Ta-ch'in-chuan* and no *Fu-lin-chuan* in the *T'ung-tien*. However, messengers from Fu-lin-kuo used to visit China often during the T'ang Dynasty, and there also ought to have existed besides the *Ching-hsing-chi* 經行記 not a few books of travel by priests, such as the *Ta-t'ang-hsi-yü-chi* 大唐西域記, the *Wang-wu-t'ien-chu-kuo-chuan* 往五天竺國傳 by Hui-ch'ao 慧超 and others. Yet the lack of indication of reference to such books of travel by Buddhists is due to the fact Tu Yu would not consult, as a rule, the travel descriptions by priests which he himself describes as follows: "In describing things on *Hsi-yü* 西域, many writers quote the accounts of tours made by priests..... They all freely set forth the miracles of the priests, but when we refer to other writings, we find them erroneous; so I have omitted most of them."⁽²¹⁸⁾ Consequently, I shall make a study of the *Wang-wu-t'ien-chu-kuo-chuan* 往五天竺國傳 by Hui-ch'ao 慧超 to which Tu Yu would not refer to, and of the accounts of Fu-lin-kuo in the *Ching-hsing-chi* 經行記 quoted from the notes of the *T'ung-tien*, and try to elucidate the extent of the knowledge possessed by the Chinese people during the years of *K'ai-yüan* 開元 and *T'ien-pao* 天寶 regarding Fu-lin-kuo.

(218) 諸家纂西域事，皆多引諸僧遊歷傳記，.....皆盛論釋氏詭異奇迹，參以他書，則紕謬，故多略焉。(通典，卷一百九十一，西戎總序注)

Chapter VIII

Fu-lin During the T'ang Dynasty (Part I)

The fact that in A.D. 618, T'ang-kung (the prince of T'ang) LI Yüan 唐公李淵 brought the country under a single authority after having overthrown the Sui Dynasty and established the great T'ang Empire which continued for over three hundred years, was in reality a great turning point in the history of East Asia. Just at the same time, in Arabia Mohammed established the Saracenic Empire, after having unified the people through religion, and this marks a new epoch in the history of East Asia. On the death of Mohammed in A.D. 632 after having completed the unification of the Arabian Peninsula, the three succeeding Caliphs, Abū Bakr (A.D. 632-634), Omar (A.D. 634-643) and Othman (A.D. 643-756) extended their influence by degrees to Asia and the African continent. An army invaded Syria and captured Damascus in A.D. 634, occupied Jerusalem in 638, and conquered Antiochia. In 640, it expelled the influence of the Eastern Roman Empire from Syria by conquering Caesaria; it annexed Egypt through the capture of Alexandria in 634, thus occupying what is called the Roman Orient. Another army advancing toward Mesopotamia, struck the final blow at the unfortunate Sassan Dynasty. The country was thrown into complete confusion on the assassination of Khusrō II in 628 who had been the leader during the last period of prosperity of this dynasty. It was said that twelve Emperors mounted the throne during the short period of four years by the time Yezdegerd III, the grandson of Khusrō, ascended the throne officially.⁽²¹⁹⁾ The internal disorder seemed to have been put down for the time being by this enthronement when the country had to face an attack by the Saracenic army. The Iranian army which had been boasting of its martial tradition since the time of King Darius was no match for the new Arabian army, and within a year after the invasion of Mesopotamia was started in 636, Ktesiphon, the capital, fell; and with the fall of Nihavand in 642, the mainland of the Sassan Dynasty all came into the hands of the Arabian army. Yezdegerd III who had fled from the capital roamed about in an attempt to elude the enemy's pursuit, escaping from Media to Sijistan and then in moving to Khurasan tried to take refuge in Merv. At that time, Merv was a province bordering on the east of the territory of the Sassan Dynasty,⁽²²⁰⁾ but the lord of the manor who had learned of the decline in the fortunes of the Sassanid tried to capture the king by despatching troops in

(219) W. GEIGER & E. KUHN, *Grundriss der Iranischen Philologie*, II, p. 546.

(220) Ed. CHAVANNES, *Documents sur les Tou-kiou occidentaux*, p. 252; A. CHRISTENSEN *L'Iran sous les Sassanides*, p. 495.

collusion with the feudal lord of Badghis, for the fear that if he should take the king under his wing, he might be subject to rebuke by the Arabian army. On getting scent of this plan, the King fled to the southeast of Merv, and it is said that he was either murdered by a miller while asleep at a water-mill or fell by the hand of the men under the command of the feudal lord of Merv.⁽²²¹⁾ This was in A.H. 31 (A.D. 651-652) and thus the Sassanid Empire which had enjoyed prosperity for five centuries in an unbroken line since Ardashir, as the leader of western Asia, came to an end.

The Arabian army which swept over Persia, soon after extended its influence to the territories of Western Turkestan to the northwest. At the beginning, Herat and Badghis fell to the Arabian army, then Jūzjān, Fāryāb, Talaqūm, and Balkh, strategic points in Khursān, and farther Khwarizm, Siminjan, Māimargh and other strategic points in Tukharistan and Sogdiana, were attacked, but owing to the successive intensive revolts of the feudal lords together with the internal dissension in Arabia, Arabian supremacy failed to be established fully in these districts.⁽²²²⁾ Othman, the third Caliph, reigned over the Saracenic Empire at that time. Born into a distinguished family of Mecca, the Banū Omayyad family, was specially singled out to become the head of the new empire in recognition of his merit in facilitating greatly the unification of the land after having early been converted to the Mohammedanism. However, as he was of mediocre character with no administrative ability worthy of mention, lost the confidence of the people also in the sphere of religion and was murdered during an insurrection. Thus it came about that 'Ali (A.D. 656-661), a kinsman of Mohammed and his daughter's husband, became the fourth Caliph. However, Muāwiya, a nephew of Othman, who had played an active part with Yazid, his elder brother, in subjugating Syria with the Arabian army and had been residing in Damascus as Governor of Syria since 639, dared not recognize the accession of 'Ali. Opposing 'Ali, he mustered friendly parties and at last in 661 established a new dynasty what is called Omayyad, completely overthrowing 'Ali. Muāwiya was known also in China under the name of *Mo-yi* 摩拽, and Damascus, the site of his government, continued to be prosperous for more than ninety years thereafter as the capital of the Mohammedan Empire. Thus with the suppression of internal disorder by the accession of Muāwiya to the throne, and the arrival of Ziyād b. Abihi at Merv to assume his post as chief of the garrison of the east, the control and conquest of Western Turkestan was started again.

Needless to say, the eastward advance of Arabian influence had brought a serious menace to the various countries of Western Turkestan, which devoting itself to providing means to meet this menace on the one hand, endeavoured

(221) A. G. & E. WARNER, *The Shahnāmah of Firdausi*, IX, p. 107 seq.; *Ṭabarī*, p. 2897 sq. ed. DE GOEJE.

(222) H. A. R. GIBB, *Arab Conquest in Central Asia*, p. 15-17.

on the other to turn to the T'ang Dynasty for help. Soon after the capture of A-shih-na-ho-lu 阿史那賀魯 in the 2nd month of the third year of *Hsien-ch'ing* 顯慶 (A.D. 658), which resulted in the overthrow of the influence of *Hsi-t'u-chüeh* 西突厥, Western Turkestan which had hitherto been under the control of *Hsi-t'u-chüeh* fell naturally into the hands of the T'ang Dynasty, which set up a Government-General in the district and placed it under the control of An-hsi Tu-hu-fu 安西都護府, dividing it at the same time into provinces and prefectures.

At that time, as the struggle between 'Ali and Muāwiya in the Saracenic home-land prevented the Saracens from devoting the time and attention to the affairs occurring in the east, the influence of the T'ang Dynasty spread without any difficulty to the west of *Ts'ung-ling* 葱嶺 (the Pamir).

Thus, the relations between the T'ang Dynasty and *Hsi-yü* 西域 became more intimate; with many travellers proceeding to western Turkish districts. With the publication of the records of their personal experiences one after another, the knowledge regarding Fu-lin-kuo at last began to increase. Above all, with the publication of the *Wang-wu-t'ien-chu-kuo-chuan* 往五天竺國傳 by Hui-ch'ao 慧超, it came to the people's knowledge that there existed two kinds of Fu-lin-kuo, one large and one small, and that the name of Fu-lin-kuo which had hitherto been limited to mean the districts of Syria and Palestine, come to cover the mainland of the Eastern Roman Empire. This epochal fact contributed immensely toward furnishing the Chinese with the new knowledge regarding western Asia. In the *Wang-wu-t'ien-chu-kuo-chuan* by Hui-ch'ao who returned to China in the 15th year of *K'ai-yüan* 開元 (A.D. 727), crossing the Pamir after travelling through India and Tukharestan, we find the existence of Persia to the west of T'u-huo-lo 吐火羅, and also of two Fu-lin-kuo, great and small, neighbouring on it, mentioned as follows:

"Again, if we proceed northward and travel for ten days through mountains, we shall reach *Ta-shih-kuo* 大窰國. The king of this country does not live in his native land but at present resides in the Small Fu-lin-kuo, for not only did he conquer that country, but also it lies on a mountain and an island with only a small area of land available. The Small Fu-lin-kuo produces camels, donkeys, sheep, horses, cloth and woolen fabrics; treasures are there also. The people wear loose cotton shirts of fine texture, over which they wear pieces of cloth as the upper garments. There exists no distinction of dress between the king and the people, for they are all dressed alike. Women also wear loose shirts. Men cut their hair and wear moustaches; women dress their hair. They take meals together in one bowl irrespective of rank; they use spoons and chopsticks, but their manners are very bad. To the northwest of the sea near the Small Fu-lin-kuo lies the Great Fu-lin-kuo; its king is powerful and the country is not subject to any other; *Ta-shih* 大窰 has attacked it several times but in vain; *T'u-chüeh* 突厥 also has invaded the land, but failed in its effort. The land has many treasures,

and richly produces camels, donkeys, sheep, horses, textiles and the like. It resembles Ta-shih 大寔 in respect of dresses, but the people speak different languages."⁽²²³⁾ As the capital of the Saracenic Empire was moved to Damascus from Medina then, the above passage to the effect that the king of Ta-shih did not reside in his homeland but actually in the Small Fu-lin-kuo, clearly indicates the existence of two Fu-lin-kuo. Though there is no doubt that a part of the above passage just quoted above running ".....did he (the king) conquer that country" refers to the occupation of Syria by the Arabian army, yet the meaning of the succeeding passage running ".....but it lies on a mountain and an island with only a small area of land available" is not invariably clear. HIRTH interprets "that country" as being the Eastern Roman Empire, entertaining the view that this might have meant the retreat of the Byzantine army to Asia Minor and Europe after having been driven away from Syria. He writes as follows:

"On account of their having gained possession of that country by overcoming it, that country has retreated to places in the hills (on the continents?) and on island but rarely visited"⁽²²⁴⁾ A. HERRMANN, like HIRTH, comprehended "that country" as also being the small Fu-lin, for he wrote:—

"Ihr König wohnt jetzt nicht mehr in Heimatland, sondern er hat sich nach Klein-Fu-lin gewandt und hält sich dort auf. Durch Kämpfe hat er jenes Land in Besitz genommen. (Die Bewohner) jenes Landes haben sich in Berge (Kleinasien?) und auf Inseln (Cypern?) zurückgezogen, wohin man sehr selten gelangt"⁽²²⁵⁾

But he entertains a doubt as to the passage referring to "that country" on mountains and islands, if it might not mean Asia Minor and Cyprus. W. FUCHS who recently published a complete translation of the biography of Hui-ch'ao 慧超, puts it as follows:

"Da (die Araber) jenes Land erobert haben, haben sich die Einwohner auf Inseln und in die Berge zurückgezogen; und weil diese Gegenden äusserst eng und schmal sind, haben sich deshalb dorthin begeben. Deshalb ist er dorthin gegangen," and interprets "that country" in ".....that country lies on a mountain and an island....." as being Arabian, without indicat-

(223) 又從波斯國，北行十日入山，至大寔國。彼王住不 (correctly 不住) 本國，見向小拂臨國住也。爲打得彼國，彼國復居山島，處所極窄，爲此就彼。土地出驢·騾·羊·馬·疊布·毛毯，又有寶物。衣著細疊寬衫，衫上又披一疊布以爲上服，及王百姓衣服，一種無別，女人亦著寬衫。男人剪髮在鬚，女人在髮。喫食無問貴賤，共同一盆而食，手把匙筋，取見極惡。又小拂臨國，傍海西北，卽是大拂臨國。此王兵馬強多，不屬餘國。大寔數廻討擊不得，突厥侵亦不得。土地足寶物，甚足驢·騾·羊·馬·疊布等物。衣著與大寔相似，言音各別不同。(慧超，往五天竺國傳)

(224) HIRTH, *The Mystery of Fu-lin*, J. A. O. S., XXXIII, 1913, p. 205.

(225) A. HERRMANN, *Die Weltländer in der chinesischen Kartographie*, p. 259.

ing clearly where the mountain and the island lie.⁽²²⁶⁾ Generally speaking, the usage of "that" (pi 彼) and "it" (ch'i 其) by Hui-ch'ao is ambiguous in several points. To cite an example, passage in the *T'u-huo-lo* 吐火羅 reads as follows: "I visited *T'u-huo-lo-kuo* 吐火羅國; the city in which the king lives is called *Fu-ti-na* 縛底那 and is now garrisoned by the army of *Ta-shih* 大食. That (ch'i) king having been subjugated by that (ch'i) king, lives in *P'u-t'ê-shan* 蒲特山, a distance of one month's journey eastward from *T'u-huo-lo-kuo*."⁽²²⁷⁾ In this, the first "that king" means king of *T'u-huo-lo-kuo* and the succeeding "that king" king of *Ta-shih*. Such being the case, I conclude that there might be no objection to admit that "that country" in ".....that country..... lies on a mountain and "an island" means *Ta-shih* 大食. In those days, Cyprus was within the sphere of Saracenic influence, but in view of the fact that the king of *Ta-shih* had never made his home there, the mountain and island in question probably meant the Medina district in the Arabian Peninsula and "窄" in "處所極窄, 爲此就彼" in the text quoted above is, as stated by FUCHS, an error of "窄" meaning "narrow", from which we may conclude that the above passage meant that as the land was narrow, the king lived in the Small *Fu-lin-kuo*. Now, according to Hui-ch'ao, the Great *Fu-lin-kuo* can be reached from the Small *Fu-lin-kuo* by heading for the northwest along the seashore; the former is an independent country of formidable strength and the repeated attacks of *Ta-shih* ended in failure; *T'u-chüeh* 突厥 also failed to subjugate it. Hence, it is quite clear that this Great *Fu-lin-kuo* means Constantinople which can be reached by proceeding to the northwest after touching Asia Minor from Syria, and this is the first time that Constantinople is clearly recorded in China. The Saracenic army during the Caliphate of Mu'awiya besieged Constantinople twice, i.e., in 662 and 672, and during the Caliphate of Suleiman twice, i.e., in 717 and 718 respectively, but in vain; the Arabian army at last failed to advance to the peninsula of Asia Minor and the Taurus. *T'u-chüeh* which is said to have invaded large *Fu-lin* was what is called the *K'o-sa-t'u-chüeh* 可薩突厥, and it is no other than the Khazars mentioned in Occidental history. This is the same race as the Bulghar, a powerful one, holding the area extending from the lower basin of the Volga to the Caucasian range. In 627, this race invaded the Sassan Dynasty in co-operation with the Eastern Roman Empire and after the fall of the Sassanid held a latent influence in the north as the powerful enemy of the Eastern Roman Empire as well as the Saracenic Empire. Such facts as Constantine V Copronymus (A.D. 741-775), the Emperor of the Eastern Roman Empire, married to a princess of Khazār, and their son, Leo IV (A.D. 775-780) known as the Khazār, and

(226) W. FUCHS, *Huet-ch'ao's Pilgerreise durch Nordwest-Indien und Zentral-Asien*, Sitzb. d. Preussischen Akad, d. Wiss., Phil.-histr. Klasse. 1938, p. 450-451.

(227) 至吐火羅國, 王住城名爲縛底那. 見今大寔兵在彼鎮押. 其王被其王被逼, 走向東一月程, 在蒲特山住. (慧超, 往五天竺國傳)

again Yazid b. Ubaid al-Sulami; who was the Governor of Armenia at about the same time, is said to have sought to maintain public peace in the northern region by marrying the Princess of King Khazār at the earnest request of the then Caliph, al-Mansūr (A.D. 754-775),—these will show how this tribe was regarded with awe by Eastern Rome and the Saracenic Empire.⁽²²⁸⁾ Khazār was called by the historians of Eastern Rome as Türk or Eastern Türk.⁽²²⁹⁾ Ibn KHALDUM also tells that this tribe was of Turkish race.⁽²³⁰⁾ We find that the tribe is mentioned also in the Chinese records in the T'ang Dynasty as K'ò-sa-t'u-chüeh 可薩突厥,⁽²³¹⁾ K'ò-sa-pu of T'u-chüeh 突厥之可薩部,⁽²³²⁾ T'u-chüeh-ho-sa 突厥曷薩,⁽²³³⁾ and the like. This seems to be the result of this tribe which was originally of Finnish race, being put under the control of Hsi-t'u-chüeh 西突厥 with which it got racially mixed, but I shall leave it to be discussed later on. The invasion of Eastern Rome by this tribe as described by Hui-ch'ao appears lacking in the records of the West, but if it is admitted as a fact, this account is the one duly supplementing the defects and omission of Occidental history. At any rate, there is no room for doubt that this large Fu-lin means the Eastern Roman Empire.

Now, the suppression of Western Turkestan by the Arabian army had constantly been undertaken from the accession of Muawiya to the throne. Above all, as a result of the conquest by Qutayba, extending from 707 to 715, and by Nasr b. Sayyār, from 738 to 751 respectively, Saracenic influence extended southward as far as Sijistan and northward as far as Ferghana area, an upper basin of the Syr River. It is widely known that the Arabians at last defeated the T'ang army under KAO Hsien-chih 高仙芝 in a battle on the banks of the Talas, maintaining their supremacy to the west of *Ts'ung-ling* 葱嶺. At that time, however, within the Saracenic Empire, the adherents of 'Ali, not recognizing Muāwiya and his successors as legitimate Caliphs, revolted in concert with the rebellion of Abū Muslim which broke out at Khurasan, and forced a new dynasty to be established in support of Abul Abbas who himself claimed to be a descendant of 'Ali. This was no less than the Abbas Dynasty, and *Hèi-i-ta-shi* 黑衣大食 mentioned in the *T'ang-hui-yao* 唐會要, the *T'ang-shu* and *Chiu-t'ang-shu* means this dynasty. Taking place in the year 750, the country's capital was transferred from Damascus to Kūfa and thence to Baghdad in the reign of Mansūr II in 762; Baghdad enjoyed unprecedented prosperity as the centre of what is called the Eastern

(228) *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, II, p. 935.

(229) LEBEAU, *Histoire du Bas Empire*, augmenté par M. de ST. MARTIN, X, p. 116 note 3; J. KLAPROTH, *Mémoire sur les Khazars*, J. A., 1823, p. 154.

(230) *Prolégomènes d'Ibn Khaldoun*, Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale, etc., XIX, 1, p. 157.

(231) 杜環, 經行記. (通典, 卷一百九十三, 邊防典九, 大秦國注)

(232) 舊唐書, 卷一百九十八, 西戎傳波斯國; 新唐書, 卷二百二十一, 西域傳波斯國; 唐會要卷一百, 波斯國.

(233) 唐書, 卷二百二十一, 西域傳康國.

Caliphate for about five hundred years until its conquest by Hulāgu in A.D. 1258. Tu Huan 杜環 who was captured by the Arabian army in the battle of the Talas River and sent to the Arabian mainland, stayed in the Saracenic Empire until just prior to the transference of Baghdad as the capital. On his return to his native land, he compiled his observations into a book and published it under the title of the *Ching-hsing-chi* 經行記. As a complete book, however, it no longer exists, but some scattered passages of it relating to Fu-lin-kuo are quoted in a note in the Chapter on Ta-ch'in in the *T'ung-tien* 通典. This is the most detailed record of Fu-lin-kuo next to the *Wang-wu-t'ien-chu-kuo-chuan* by Hui-ch'ao, and is most valuable from the viewpoint of both the authenticity of the ages recorded therein and the accuracy of accounts.

"The country of Fu-lin-kuo is to the west of the Chan country screened off by a range of mountains several thousand *li*; it is also called Ta-ch'in. The countenances of inhabitants are rosy and white; the men all dress in white clothes and all women adorn themselves with beautiful dresses. They are fond of drinking and value crackers. Their products are replete in workmanship thoughtlessly embellished; the people are skilled in the textile industry. Even if they happen to be detained in foreign countries as prisoners, they dare not change the customs and manners of their own country. The country produces exquisite glass which are without rival throughout the world. The king's palace is eighty *li* in circumference and the area of the country extends on all sides as much as several thousand *li* in each direction with the palace as the centre. The country has a picked army of about a million which is always on the alert against attack from *Ta-shih* 大食. The country extends as far as the West Sea in the west and the South Sea in the south and borders on *K'o-sa-t'u-chüeh* 可薩突厥 in the north."⁽²³⁴⁾ The above account is also quoted in the *T'ai-p'ing-huan-yü-chi* 太平寰宇記, the *Chu-fan-chih* 諸蕃志, the *Wên-hsien-t'ung-k'ao* 文獻通考 and the *T'ung-chih* 通志 with some differences in the characters. HIRTH, after having first translated the accounts in the *Chu-fan-chih* 諸蕃志 and the *Wên-hsien-t'ung-k'ao* 文獻通考, assumed this Fu-lin-kuo to be Syria,⁽²³⁵⁾ and then strengthened his belief more and more by studying the *T'ung-tien* 通典 during his translation of the *Chu-fan-chih* into English in collaboration with ROCKHILL.⁽²³⁶⁾ As HIRTH is a writer who puts Fu-lin as the phonetic transcription of Bethlehem, the birth-place of Christ, and limits the country's boundary to Syria, he always tends to associate Syria

(234) 拂菻國，有 (correctly 在) 苦 (correctly 苦) 國西，隔山數千里，亦曰大秦。其人顏色紅白。男子悉着素衣，婦人皆服珠錦。好飲酒，尙乾餅。多淫巧，善織絡。或有俘在諸國，守死不改鄉風。琉璃妙者，天下莫比。王城方八十里，四面境土各數十 (correctly 千) 里。勝兵約有百萬，常與大食相禦。西枕西海，南枕南海，北接可薩突厥。(通典，卷一百九十三，邊防典九，大秦國)

(235) HIRTH, *China and the Roman Orient*, p. 83, 91 etc.

(236) HIRTH & ROCKHILL, *Chau Ju-kua*, p. 108-110.

with Fu-lin when speaking of the latter even admitting some unreasonableness for doing so. But now that it has already been clarified that Fu-lin is no more the phonetic transcription of Bethlehem but the Chinese version of Frōm for the Eastern Roman Empire, and as HIRTH has admitted too that Constantinople has been called the Great Fu-lin, consideration should be given from an entirely new standpoint in order to determine whether the Fu-lin mentioned in the *Ching-hsing-chi* 經行記 is Syria or if it meant Constantinople.

HIRTH translated correctly the passage of 拂桑 (correctly 蒜) 國在苦國西 in the *Ching-hsing-chi* 經行記 which was quoted in the *Chu-fang-chih* 諸蕃志 as follows: "The country of Fu-lin is in the west of the Chan (苦) country"⁽²³⁷⁾ and interpreted that Chan 苦 is the phonetic transcription of *Sham* or *Ash-Shām*, meaning Syria, in a narrow sense meaning Damascus; but as the "west" indicated herein neither means the north nor the northwest but due west, and Fu-lin-kuo is the western part of Syria (or Damascus). Moreover, taking cognizance of the same sentence quoted in *T'ung-tien* 通典 from the *Ching-hsing-chi* 經行記 which runs 拂蒜國有苦國西, 隔山數千里, he translates it as follows: "In the country of Fu-lin there is the country of Chan (Sham), in the west screened off by (a range of) mountains several thousand *li* (in length)."⁽²³⁸⁾ Regarding the quotation in the *T'ung-tien*, as in the original text of the *Ching-hsing-chi*, he goes to say that according to it, it seems as if Fu-lin-kuo was included in Syria. As the *Ching-hsing-chi* is not found in the records during the Sung Dynasty, not to speak of the *I-wèn-chih* 藝文志 in the *Sung-shih*, it seems to have already disappeared in the Sung Dynasty. And the passage of the *Ching-hsing-chi* quoted in the *T'ai-p'ing-huan-yü-chi* 太平寰宇記, the *T'ung-chih* 通志, the *Wèn-hsien-t'ung-k'ao* 文獻通考, and others are all found in the quotation of the *T'ung-tien*. It is true that the *Ching-hsing-chi* which is quoted in the *T'ung-tien* most closely resembles the original text of Tu Huan 杜環. However, there are quite a number of errors to be found in the popular edition of the *T'ung-tien* many of which have been rectified in the books published later. The above mentioned is an example of such a case, and it is incorrect to state that Fu-lin was in the country of Chan (有 means 'to exist'). It should be amended to the effect that it was situated (在 means 'be located or situated') to the west of Chan. In the popular edition of the *T'ung-tien*, the character 苦 is written as 苦, though it is evidently given as 苦 in the *Chu-fan-chih*. The character 苦 is, as HIRTH states, the phonetic transcription of *Sham*, meaning Syria, but as he interprets it as if Chan was in Fu-lin, the above sentence dealing with the *Ching-hsing-chi* is not a description of Fu-lin but should be taken as an account of Chan. However, as there is an account dealing with the Chan country in particular in the *Ching-hsing-chi*, we must conclude that Fu-lin-kuo and Chan were dis-

(237) *ibid.*, p. 104.

(238) *ibid.*, p. 109, note 14.

tinguished clearly in the writings of Tu Huan. In the description of Ta-shih 大食 in the *T'ung-tien* quoted from the *Ching-hsing-chi*, we come across the following:

“The country of Chan lies to the west of *Ta-shih* 大食 being several thousand *li* in circumference. The people build houses, tile the roofs, and construct walls by heaping stone. The price of rice is especially cheap. There is a large river flowing eastward which empties at *Ya-chü-lo* 亞俱羅 into the Sea. Merchants and customers sell and buy goods by auction amidst the congested traffic. The country is populous and the people are of big physique; dresses are comfortable and bear some resemblance to those of Chinese scholars. There are five generals in the country of Chan with soldiers and war horses numbering more than ten thousand. The country borders on *K'o-sa-t'u-chüeh* 可薩突厥 in the north.”⁽²³⁹⁾

What Tu Huan says therein that five military districts existed in Chan indicates vividly the boundary of Chan, that is to say, on the occupation of the districts of Sham by the Omayyad Dynasty, the actual civil government affairs would be left in the hands of the natives, with the dynasty only accepting tribute but having general control over administration.⁽²⁴⁰⁾ The dynasty governed these occupied areas by dividing them into five military districts (djund), holding undivided military authority, these districts being Kinnasrīn, Hims (Emesa), Damascus, al-Urdum (Jordania) and Palestine. As the five military districts referred to in the *Ching-hsing-chi* doubtless meant the governors of these districts, which idea entirely coincides with what was called the district of Sham of the Arabian geographers in the Middle Ages, they, at the same time, are no other districts than were called Fu-lin in the early days of the T'ang Dynasty. However, according to the foregoing quotation, we notice that Chan borders on *K'o-sa-t'u-chüeh* 可薩突厥 in the north and when we consider that *K'o-sa-t'u-chüeh* is no other country than Khazār which bounded the Saracenic Empire by the Caucasus mountain range at that time, we may conclude that Tu Huan had included the mountainous region of Armenia located between the Caucasus mountains and Syria into Chan. Such being the case, if Fu-lin were meant to indicate a wider area than Chan, there is no particular objection to admit that Chan was included in Fu-lin. But if the territory of Chan coincides with what has been written by Tu Huan, we cannot say that Chan was included in Fu-lin; especially when we compare this account of Chan with that of Fu-lin, we conclude that Fu-lin was a great country surrounded by territories extending over several thousand *li* each, with victorious army of one hundred million men, whereas, Chan is several

(239) 苦 (correctly 苦) 國在大食西界。周廻數千里。造屋兼瓦，壘石爲壁，米穀殊賤。有大川，東流入亞俱羅。商客糶此糶彼，往來相繼。人多魁梧，衣裳寬大，有似儒服。其苦 (correctly 苦) 國有五節度，有兵馬一萬以上。北接可薩突厥。(通典，卷一百九十三，邊防典九，大食國注)

(240) J. WELLHAUSEN, *Das Arabische Reich und sein Sturz*, 1902., S. 20.

thousand *li* round with an army of less than four or five thousand in all, even if we assume that each governor of a military district held about ten thousand,—a small country which cannot bear comparison with Fu-lin. In view of this, we fail to believe the great country, Fu-lin, to have been included in this small country, Chan.

Next, HIRTH, commenting on the foregoing quotation in which Fu-lin is mentioned as being always on the alert against invasion from *Ta-shih* 大食, gives a lame interpretation saying that this indicates that Syrians planned a revolt against the new Abbas Dynasty at the end of the Omayyad Dynasty. But this can naturally be interpreted with no difficulty as referring to the struggle between the Eastern Roman Empire and the Saracenic Empire. Two violent assaults by the Saracenic army against Constantinople were made in 662 and 672 respectively in the region of Muāwiya, and twice in 717 and 718 in the region of Suleiman, but each failed to secure complete success; especially, the annihilation of her navy in the offensive in 718, forced the Saracenic Empire to abandon the conquest of the Eastern Roman Empire; whereas, the Eastern Roman Empire also, due to internal circumstances, failed to make a counter attack on the Saracenic Empire. HIRTH, on the basis of these facts maintains that as there existed no struggle between *Ta-shih* and the Eastern Roman Empire when Tu Huan proceeded to the former, the account in question cannot be interpreted as being the relation between the Eastern Roman Empire and *Ta-shih*. However, this appears to be quibbling and there is no objection at all to admit that Tu Huan referred to the struggles against the Roman Empire by *Ta-shih* from the time of its foundation. In governing a new territory, the Arabians oppressed the conquered nations by establishing a powerful military authority, but what they administer directly was confined to financial affairs only, the rest having left in the hands of the natives. Needless to say, the control by Arabians strengthened and expanded as time went on, but at least in the initial stage of administration, the newly acquired areas were governed as mentioned above, and Syria under the Omayyad Dynasty enjoyed considerable freedom and privilege. But it never remained as an independent country in relation to *Ta-shih*, but lying to the west of *Ta-shih*, it remained under the strict supervision of its generals. The remarks: "The country of Chan lies to the west of *Ta-shih*.....There are five generals.....", in the *Ching-hsing-chi* give a good idea of it. If Fu-lin-kuo were Chan, would Tu Huan who was well acquainted with these circumstances, say in describing the revolt of the Syrians, that Fu-lin was always on the alert against invasion from *Ta-shih*? It is a fact that on the fall of the Omayyad Dynasty, the Syrians rose for the purpose of recovering the country and opposed the Abbas Dynasty; moreover, it is well known that there was a rebellion by Christians in Lebanon districts groaning under heavy taxation during A.D. 759-760, but it does not mean that there were always revolts in Syrian districts. HIRTH's interpretation seems to be too unnatural.

Moreover, he, in commenting on the aforesaid passage: "Even if they happen to be detained in foreign countries as prisoners, they dare not change the customs and manners of their own country", states that this meant that Khusrō II of the Sassan Dynasty captured Antiochia in 540 as a result of the war against the East Roman Empire, and transferred the Christians in that city to Ktesiphon, the capital, and the descendants of these captives retained creditably their faith in Christianity in the face of occasional persecution; he then goes on to remark that in the following year (A.D. 752) after Tu Huan went over to *Ta-shih*, a well-known martyrdom took place, and he concludes that, from this point of view also, Fu-lin-kuo should be regarded as having been located in Syrian districts. Indeed, there is no doubt that in the region of Khusrō II, a number of Syrian people were brought to Persia from Antiochia as captives, but all of the Christians who were in Mesopotamian districts could never be the descendants of the then prisoners of war. In the battles between the Saracenic Empire and the Eastern Roman Empire, a large number of captives must have been brought to Persia and one can conclude that they comprized not only Syrians but also many who came a long way from the mainland of the Eastern Roman Empire. It is said that Khusrō II took the prisoners of war from Antiochia to an absolutely identical city which he constructed near Ktesiphon, the capital.⁽²⁴¹⁾ As Tu Huan mentions the men held in various countries as captives, they would not have meant those held in one district. In short, the prisoners of Fu-lin-kuo cannot necessarily be limited to the people in Syrian districts, but it will be an unerring conclusion to interpret the statement that the captives adhered to the manners and customs of their home even at the risk of their lives as meaning that they never abjured their belief in Christianity in the face of persecution. Again, HIRTH, referring to the foregoing quotation that "The people (of Fu-lin-kuo) are skilled in the the textile industry.....The country produces exquisite glass which are without rival throughout the world", maintains that this account coincides with the well-developed state of industrial arts in Syrian districts. There is no room for doubt that such Syrian and Egyptian cities as Damascus, Tyr, Antiochia, Alexandria, and the like have been noted as great producers of silk fabrics and manufacturers of beautiful glasswares,⁽²⁴²⁾ and we see that great quantities of fabrics and glass manufactures are mentioned in the *Hsi-jung-chuan* 西戎傳 of the *Wèi-liao* as special products of Ta-ch'in. However, from the time of the transference of the capital to Constantinople by the Emperor Constantinus in 330, skilled workers from all countries were called together to this new city. They engaged in the manufacture successfully through royal protection and encouragement, vying with each other in the

(241) TH. NÖLDEKE, *Geschichte der Perser u. Araber*, p. 165, 329; A. CHRISTENSEN, *L'Iran sous les Sassanides*, p. 381.

(242) O. von FALKE, *Kunstgeschichte der Seidenweberei*, 1936, p. 2-3, 11; A. KISA, *Das Glas im Altertum*, 1908, I, p. 96-100, and others.

elaborateness of artistic elegance. In particular, even tradition has it that in the region of the Emperor Justinianus, as a result of the seeds of mulberry trees having been brought from Serindia (Khotan) to Constantinople, the secret of silk culture was revealed and the silk fabric of Constantinople was prized all over the world until the occupation of the capital by the Crusades at the beginning of the thirteenth century. There are also many articles remaining to this day commanding universal admiration.⁽²⁴³⁾ Again, of all glass products, mosaic glass manufactured in Constantinople had no rival in the world literally in its exquisiteness and magnificence.⁽²⁴⁴⁾ Accordingly, the above account can also serve as evidence that Fu-lin-kuo was taken for the Eastern Roman Empire with Constantinople as a centre.

Now in commenting on HIRTH's view, it will be known that his authority to assume Fu-lin-kuo mentioned in the *Ching-hsing-chi* to be Syria is very flimsy; the evidences which he produced tend rather to remind one of Fu-lin-kuo as being the Eastern Roman Empire. In the first place, we see that the *Ching-hsing-chi* points out the location of Fu-lin-kuo as "the country of Fu-lin-kuo is to the west of the Chan country screened off by a range of mountains several thousand *li*". However, as the Mediterranean Sea lies to due west of Chan, the above "west" seems to have meant the northwest. Moreover, as I said before, if TU Huan has been assumed to have included also Armenia in Chan, the west of Chan is no other than the Peninsula of Asia Minor. At any rate, there can be no place other than Constantinople, if it lay, as is claimed, to the west or northwest of Chan, several thousand *li* away from the mountainous region of Asia Minor. That the complexion of the people of Fu-lin-kuo is especially mentioned as rosy and white in the *Ching-hsing-chi* shows that the country is none other than the one being dwelt in by the white race. If this Fu-lin-kuo is assumed to have meant Syria, it does not commend itself to reason to say in general that "the countenances of inhabitants are rosy and white", for the residents in that region ought to have been a mixture of whites and a number of the Semitic races. It may be said in passing that in the supplementary account said to have been written in about 916 by Abū Zayd Hasan and attached to the record of travels by Sulaymān, the merchant, it mentions the Emperor of the Eastern Roman Empire (le rois de Rûm) being called "the king of the handsome people" (le rois des beaux hommes), the reason given for the appellation being that "il n'y a pas sur terre un peuple aussi bien fait que celui des Byzantins, ni qui ait plus beau visage."⁽²⁴⁵⁾ Moreover, it reminds me of a similar account by Mas'ūdī in his

(243) G. MIGEON, *Les arts du Tissue*, 1909, p. 18; YULE & CORDIER, *Cathay.*, 1, p. 203-205.

(244) A. KISA, op. cit., II, p. 376; WALLACE-DUNLOP, *Glass in the Old World*, n. d., p. 91; FELDHAUS, *Die Technik d. Vorzeit*, 1914, Spr. 455.

(245) G. FERRAND, *Voyage du Marchand arabe Sulaymān*, etc., Les classiques de l'orient, vol. VII, 1922, p. 87.

Les Prairies d'Or in which he says ".....le roi de Roum, que nous regardons comme le roi des fantassins, car aucun pays ne possède des homme d'une taille plus parfaite et d'une figure plus belle."⁽²⁴⁶⁾ The original word equivalent to 'infantry' by Mas'ūdi, like the one found in the text of Sulaymān, is *rijāl* (plural of *rājūl* or *rajīl*), which, besides 'infantry',⁽²⁴⁷⁾ means 'a man'⁽²⁴⁸⁾ and especially, "des hommes distingués par leur savoir et leur piété".⁽²⁴⁹⁾ Consequently, it will be better to interpret the meaning rather as "excellent men" than as 'infantry'.⁽²⁵⁰⁾

Next, we note that Mohammedanism imposes a ban on drinking (Koran II 219; V. 90-92; XLVII 15) and the *Ching-hsing-chi* also refers to the manners of *Ta-shih* 大食 as "give up drinking." Accordingly, the people in Fu-lin who were fond of drinking could never have been Mohammedans. HIRTH implies that this is meant for the non-Mohammedans in Syria,⁽²⁵¹⁾ but they were scattered over the land and did not form a country in a body. It is unreasonable to conclude that Syria meant Fu-lin-kuo from the viewpoint of these non-Mohammedans, yet if we interpret this as having meant the manners of the Eastern Roman Empire, no question will arise. According to the *Ching-hsing-chi*, the circumference of the Imperial Palace of Fu-lin-kuo was 80 *li*, the boundary extending scores of miles on every side. This circumference of 80 *li* roughly corresponds to the account mentioned by the BENJAMIN of Tudela that the circumference of Constantinople is 18 miles (i.e., approximately 90 *li*).⁽²⁵²⁾ And from what has been written in the *T'ai-p'ing-huan-yü-chi* 太平寰宇記, the *T'ung-chih* 通志, and the *Wên-hsien-t'ung-k'ao* 文獻通考 we find that the "scores of *li*" in the foregoing statement as to the circumference of the palace is an error of several thousand *li*. But as I have already stated, though it could be applicable to the Eastern Roman Empire, it does not apply to such a very small country as Chan. The same is true of the account: "has an army of about one hundred million". Again, from the passage ".....is always on the alert against invasion from *Ta-shih* 大食", it can very naturally be interpreted to take Fu-lin-kuo for the Eastern Roman Empire. Furthermore, if Fu-lin-kuo means Syria, it is hard to understand the purport of Tu Huan who describes *Chan-kuo* 苦國 separately from the latter. The only statements as seen in the *Ching-hsing-chi* that Fu-lin-kuo borders on *K'o-sa-t'u-chüeh* 可薩突厥 in the north and *Ch'än-kuo* also borders on *K'o-sa-t'u-chüeh* in the north, seem to finish a favorable basis for a writer's assumption when he maintains that the said Fu-lin-kuo means Syria. As I have said already, *K'o-sa-t'u-chüeh*

(246) C. B. DE MEYNARD et P. DE COURTEILLE, *Les Prairies d'Or*, I, p. 315.

(247) E. W. LANE (ed.), *An Arabic-English Lexicon*, I, 3; p. 1043.

(248) H. A. SALMONÉ, *An Arabic-English Dictionary*, I, p. 261-268.

(249) R. DOZY, *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes*, T. I-(2), p. 514.

(250) P. PELLISOT, *La théorie des quatre fils de Ciel*, T. P., 1923, p. 118, note 1.

(251) HIRTH & ROCKHILL, *Chau Ju-kua*, p. 109.

(252) YULE & CORDIER, *Cathay*, I, p. 46, note 1.

is Khazār in occidental history; its name is found as early as the 5th century in "Armenian History" by Moïse de Khorène.⁽²⁵³⁾ Although its youthful years are little known, judging from the tradition that its remote ancestors were brothers of the ancestors of Bulgar, it seems probable that at first the country lay in the lower basin district of the Volga River, gradually expanding its influence as far as the Caucasus mountain range. It already had gained a predominating influence in this district in the first half of the 7th century, subjugating the Sassanide in alliance with Heraclius of Eastern Rome, and on the former's downfall, gained world-wide fame in annexing the northern half of Armenia.⁽²⁵⁴⁾ It was about this time that the Caspian Sea was called the Khazār Sea after their name. As this tribe was mentioned in the then Oriental and Occidental records as a kind of Türk, they were at one time considered as a Turkish race but at present they are considered to have probably been a mixed Turkish and Finn race, with the latter predominating. According to my study, the names of *Ên-ch'ü* 恩屈, *A-lan* 阿蘭, *P'ei-ju-chiu-li* 北褥九離, and *Fu-wên-hun* 伏唄昏 were known during the Sui Dynasty as countries located to the east of Fu-lin. *Ên-ch'ü* 恩屈 was Ongur (Ogur, Ugur), lying to the west from the lower basin of the Volga River. *A-lan* 阿蘭 is Alan in Occidental history, on the north side of the Caucasus mountain range; *P'ei-ju-chiu-li* 北褥九離, and *Fu-wên-hun* 伏唄昏 are Bashkir and Bulgar respectively, located in the basis of the Ural, Kama, and Volga Rivers. However, from the T'ang Dynasty, the names of these countries disappeared, only *K'o-sa-t'u-chüeh* 可薩突厥 becoming to be circulated as a formidable country in these districts. According to the account of *Huo-hsin* 火尋 (Khwarizm) in the *Hsi-yü-chuan* 西域傳, *Huo-hsin* 火尋 is mentioned as "extending to *T'u-chüeh-ho-sa* 突厥嚙薩 in the northwest". Hence it seems as if its influence in the east extended as far as the intermediate district between the Aral Sea, lying to the northwest of Khiva and the Caspian Sea, with *Fu-wên-hun* 伏唄昏, *P'ei-ju-chiu-li* 北褥九離, and the like in the Sui Dynasty, all following the boundary of *K'o-sa-t'u-chüeh* 可薩突厥. We are not certain whether this assumption was based on a lack of knowledge on the part of the people in the T'ang Dynasty regarding the basin area of the Ural and Volga Rivers, the existence of *K'o-sa-t'u-chüeh* 可薩突厥 only being known to them or whether *K'o-sa-t'u-chüeh* 可薩突厥 was actually so formidable a country. However, I wonder if it might probably have been due to the former reason. The fact that the condition of these districts was known can be attributed to the reports of merchants who brought fur from Ural, Kama, and Volga districts in traversing direct along what I call the "Fur Road". In the T'ang Dynasty, however, as the merchants of *K'ang-kuo* 康國 (Samarkand) undertook intermediary sales, fur merchants did not go to the countries of origin, resulting probably in the natural lack of opportunity

(253) P. E. LE VAILLANT DE FLORIVAL, *Moïse de Khorène*, 1841, p. 303, 305.

(254) D'OHSSON, *Des peuples du Caucase*, p. 46.

for the conditions in these districts to be reported to the country. At any rate, there is no doubt that Khazār at that time was most influential in the north of the Caucasus mountain range as an ally of the Byzantine Empire, and an enemy of the new Saracenic Empire. This country saw its best days in the latter half of the 8th century, which corresponds to the time of during Tu Huan's stay in *Ta-shih* 大食, with its boundaries extending from the Carpathian Mountains to the upper basin of the Dnieper River in the west, from the lower basin of the Volga River in the east, as far as the Oka River flowing in the center of Russia in the north and, bounded by the Caucasus in the south.⁽²⁵⁵⁾ That is to say, the territory of Khazār stretched to Syria across the Caucasus and Armenia in the east and was bounded by Asia Minor across the Black Sea in the west. This is what Tu Huan probably meant when he wrote that *Chan-kuo* 苦國 and *Fu-lin-kuo* were bounded by *K'o-sa-t'u-chüeh* 可薩突厥 in the north. Oddly enough, he was not acquainted himself with the existence of the Black Sea; however, the conditions prevailing in the west of the Volga were almost unknown in the T'ang Dynasty. According to the *Ching-hsing-chi*, the western boundary of *Fu-lin-kuo* faced the West Sea and the southern boundary the South Sea. It is clear that the South Sea means the Mediterranean, but as the territory of the Eastern Roman Empire at that time extended west from the Geek peninsula to the southern half of the Italian Peninsula, it is not certain whether the so-called West Sea means the Marmora Sea and the Aegean Sea, or the Ionian Sea, or the Tyrrhenian Sea. However, if we assume that the Caspian Sea was not known to Tu Huan, may we not be allowed to conclude that the West Sea was the general name for the Marmora Sea and the Aegean Sea and that Tu Huan entertained a belief that the peninsula of Asia Minor extended far out to the west, further west of which lay a broad expanse of sea, and that Constantinople was also located at the western end of this peninsula? It strikes us as strange that Tu Huan who stayed in *Ta-shih* 大食 for as long as ten years had only such a vague idea regarding the boundaries of the Eastern Roman Empire, but so far as we can base our knowledge on the scattered and lost passage in the *Ching-hsing-chi*, there is no other alternative than for us to draw the conclusion mentioned. In contradiction to HIRTH's view, I conclude that the *Fu-lin-kuo* mentioned in the *Ching-hsing-chi* 經行記 is not Syria but the Eastern Roman Empire with its capital in Constantinople.

So much for the nature of *Fu-lin-kuo* as described in the *Wang-wu-t'ien-chu-kuo-chuan* 往五天竺國傳 and the *Ching-hsing-chi* from which it comes to our knowledge that *Fu-lin-kuo* which meant a district in the so-called Roman Orient in the early days of the T'ang Dynasty came to mean in the eras of the *K'ai-yüa* 開元 and the *T'ien-pao* 天寶 also the territory of the Eastern Roman Empire with Constantinople as the centre, and that this part of the

(255) SAINT-MARTIN, *Sur les Khazars, Nouvelles années*, 1851, p. 153-154.

country was called Great Fu-lin-kuo or simply as Fu-lin and the Syrian district Small Fu-lin or Chan (Sham). Interpretation of the words and phrases in the *Wang-wu-t'ien-chu-kuo-chuan* 往五天竺國傳 are given with those of the *Fa-hsien-chuan* 法顯傳 in the *I-ch'ieh-ching-yin-i* 一切經音義 which was compiled by Hui-lin 慧琳 of the same school from the end of the *Chien-chung* 建中 era (A.D. 783) to the 2nd month of the 2nd year of *Yüan-ho* 元和 (A.D. 807). Moreover, as its remains have been found in Tun-huang 敦煌 also, the *Wang-wu-t'ien-chu-kuo-chuan* 往五天竺國傳 must have been read by the people at that time, and the *Ching-hsing-chi* together with the *T'ung-tien* 通典, seems to have met with public favour, though I entertain grave doubts as to whether or not such a distinction as the foregoing fully existed in the minds of the people during the T'ang Dynasty when the diffusion of books in general was not so throughgoing as has been the case in the following generations. Even a study of the records after the *K'ai-yüan* 開元 and *T'ien-pao* 天寶 eras reveals that Fu-lin seems to have still been vaguely known as a great country in the farthest west and that the Syrian districts were also called Fu-lin as previously. To cite an instance, we notice in the *Hsi-yü-chuan* 西域傳 of the *T'ang-shu* it is mentioned that at the result of the conquest of *Hsiao-p'o-lü* 小勃律 (Gilgit) by KAO Hsien-chi 高仙芝 in the 6th year of *T'ien-pao* 天寶 (A.D. 747), seventy two countries including Fu-lin and Ta-shih 大食, surrendered to the T'ang Dynasty. But the name Fu-lin therein was used for the purpose of exaggerating the fact that the power of the T'ang Dynasty extended all over the western frontier and was not meant to designate special districts such as Constantinople or Syria. Again, we find that not a few names of plants grown in Fu-lin-kuo are mentioned in the *Yu-yang-tsa-tsu* 酉陽雜俎 by TUAN Ch'êng-shih 段成式, but as most of them could be understood in the Syrian and Armenian languages,⁽²⁵⁶⁾ we might conclude this as one of the proofs that in the early years of *Hsien-t'ung* 咸通 (about A.D. 860)—the date of the compilation of this book⁽²⁵⁷⁾ the Syrian districts were still called Fu-lin. Consequently, Constantinople might have been recorded in China before the time of Hui-ch'ao 慧超, not to mention it being hard to conclude that Fu-lin before the *K'ai-yüan* 開元 and *T'ien-pao* 天寶 eras meant the Roman Orient and Fu-lin after then necessarily meant Constantinople. Accordingly, though we find Fu-lin-kuo is mentioned in the records of the T'ang Dynasty, we cannot conclude what country was really meant by it unless the details of the account can be thoroughly examined and studied.

(256) HIRTH, *The Mystery of Fu-lin*, J. O. A. S., XXX, 1910, p. 19-24; B. LAUFER, *Sino-Iranica*.

(257) cf. P. PELLIOU, *L'auteur d'une traduction sanscrite de Tao-t'ê-king*, T. P. 1912, p. 375 note.

Chapter IX

Fu-lin in the T'ang Period (Part 2)

The most complete account of Fu-lin-kuo 拂菻國 in the T'ang period is the *Fu-lin-chuan* 拂菻傳 included in the *T'ang-hui-yao* 唐會要 and in the two *T'ang-shu* 唐書. As to Fu-lin-kuo in the two *T'ang-shu*, in my paper published in 1904⁽²⁵⁸⁾, opposing Mr. HIRTH who ascribed Syria to Fu-lin-kuo, I emphatically insisted that it referred to the Roman Orient in the west of Asia Minor, with its capital at Constantinople. In view of the fact that Fu-lin-kuo in the T'ang dynasty has since been proved to have referred, not always to one and the same province, but to several varying with the several periods of the dynasty, it is now necessary to investigate the province or provinces to which Fu-lin-kuo actually referred.

First, of these three documents, the one in the *T'ang-shu*, it is evident at a glance, is chiefly based on the *Chiu-t'ang-shu* 舊唐書, to which have been added the *Ta-ch'in-chuan* 大秦傳 in the *T'ung-tien* 通典, the *Ching-hsing-chi* 經行記 quoted in the notes of the *T'ung-tien*, and part of the *Ta-ch'in-chuan* in the *Wèi-liao* 魏略 and *Wèi-shu* 魏書 (*Pèi-shih* 北史). Though the presence of the statement "Fu-lin-kuo is 40,000 *li* from our capital"⁽²⁵⁹⁾ in the *T'ang-shu* alone, might lead some people to consider this a piece of new information which might be accredited to the compilers of the *T'ang-shu*, it is obvious that this is based on: "It is 39,400 *li* from Tai 代, the capital of Wei",⁽²⁶⁰⁾ a phrase in the *Ta-ch'in-chuan* in the *Pèi-shih* and *Wèi-shu*, decidedly not a figure obtained by actual calculations in the T'ang Dynasty. It follows, therefore, that the *T'ang-shu*, in spite of the most abundant contents, often contains confusion and contradiction as the result of compiling various documents of several sources. For instance, the phrase in this account on the topography of Fu-lin-kuo: "It lies to the west of Chan 苫 (Syria); on the north directly bordering on T'u-chüeh-ko-sa-pu (the Khazar Turks)",⁽²⁶¹⁾ is a borrowing from the account in *Ching-hsing-chi*, while the phrase: "On the south-east it borders on Persia",⁽²⁶²⁾ is based on the *Chiu-t'ang-shu*; for if Fu-lin-kuo were to the north-west of Syria, it could not

(258) *Taishin-hoku Oyobi Futsurin-koku ni tsukite* 大秦國及び拂菻國に就きて or *On Ta-ch'in-kuo and Fu-lin-kuo* (Shigaku-zasshi 史學雜誌, XV, 1904.)

(259) [拂菻古大秦也，居西海上，一曰海西國] 去京師四萬里。(唐書，卷二百二十一，西域傳拂菻國)

(260) [大秦國……] 去代三萬九千四百里。(北史，卷九十七，西域傳大秦國；魏書，卷一百二，西域傳大秦傳)

(261) 在苫西，北直突厥可薩部。(唐書，卷二百二十一，西域傳拂菻國)

(262) 東南接波斯。(ibid.)

be Fu-lin-kuo, but Syria that directly bordered on Persia. To begin with, this account in the *Chiu-t'ang-shu* may be considered as based on the *Sui-shu* 隋書 and *Ta-t'ang-hsi-yü-chi* 大唐西域記; and it really refers to Syria. As the *T'ang-shu* is confused with the Fu-lin which refers to Constantinople and with the Fu-lin which refers to Syria, this contradiction has resulted. Such being the case, unless special necessity arises, I should like to make it a rule to avoid use of the *Fu-lin-chuan* in the *T'ang-shu* as a subject of my criticism.

Secondly, the account in the *T'ang-hui-yao* 唐會要 is, after all, an epitome of the *Fu-lin-chuan* in the *Chiu-t'ang-shu*. This does not mean that the former is directly epitomizing the latter, but that both are probably based on another identical document. This may be seen from the following instance. Concerning the tribute paid by Fu-lin-kuo in the 7th year of *K'ai-yüan* 開元, the *Chiu-t'ang-shu* says: "In the 1st month, the 7th year of *K'ai-yüan*, its ruler sent his great chief Tukhara and paid tribute to the Court with two antelopes. In a few months, the ruler again sent a high priest to pay tribute to the Court."⁽²⁶³⁾ On the other hand, the *T'ang-hui-yao* says: "The 1st month, the 10th year of *K'ai-yüan*. It sent the great chief Tukhara and paid tribute to the Court with two lions and two antelopes. In the 4th month of the same year, it again sent a high priest to pay tribute to the Court."⁽²⁶⁴⁾ While the former calls the month unnumbered, the latter puts it down definitely as the fourth month. By the way, the 10th year of *K'ai-yüan* here should no doubt read the 7th year of *K'ai-yüan*, because the *Fu-lin-chuan* in the *Chiu-t'ang-shu* quoted in the *T'ang-shu*, *T'sê-fu-yüan-kuei* 冊府元龜 (Vol. 971), and *T'ai-p'ing-yü-lan* 太平御覽 (Vol. 795), gives this date as the 7th year. There is another instance in which the *T'ang-hui-yao* is independent from the *Chiu-t'ang-shu* in its accounts of foreign tribes. There occurs in its *Ta-shih-chuan* 大食傳 another instance in which the *T'ang-hui-yao* presents in its accounts of foreign tribes a version independent from the *Chiu-t'ang-shu*. While the *Chiu-t'ang-shu* which gives two versions as to the circumstances under which Ta-shih state was founded, gives the latter version as 一曰 "another source", the *T'ang-Hui-yao* definitely gives its source saying: "Another consideration is that the *Ssü-i-shu* 四夷述 by CHIA Tan 賈耽 says....."⁽²⁶⁵⁾ Now, the *Chiu-t'ang-shu* was compiled in the 2nd year of *K'ai-yün* 開運 (A.D. 945) of the Chin 晉 dynasty of the Five-Dynasty period. According to the investigation by CHAO I 趙翼 (*Êrh-shih-êrh-shih-cha-chi* 二十二史劄記 Vol. 16 and *Kai-yü-ts'ung-k'ao* 陔餘叢考 Vol. 10) and the view in the *Ssü-k'u-ch'uan-shu-tsung-mu-t'i-yao* 四庫全書總目提要 Vol. 46, the first half was based on the *Kuo-shih* 國史 (State History) and *Shih-lu* 實錄 (True Record) of the T'ang dynasty, but the

(263) 開元七年正月，其主遣吐火羅大首領，獻獅子羚羊各二。不數月，又遣大德僧來朝賀。(舊唐書，卷一百九十八，西戎傳拂菻國)

(264) 開元十年正月，遣吐火羅大首領獻獅子二羚羊二。四月又遣大德僧來朝。(唐會要，卷九十九，拂菻國)

(265) 又案賈耽四夷述云.....(唐會要，卷九十九，大食國)

last half lacking in these basic materials, it would seem, comprises various incongruous accounts. During the T'ang dynasty, the *Shih-lu* 實錄 (True Record) of all the fifteen reigns from Kao-tsü 高祖 (the Founder) to the 15th Emperor Wu-tsung 武宗 (A.D. 841-846) was compiled, the *Shih-lu* for the five reigns from the 16th Emperor Hsüan-tsung 宣宗 to the 20th Emperor Chao-hsüan-ti 昭宣帝 (Ai-ti 哀帝) was compiled by SUNG Min-ch'iu 宋敏求 later in the Sung dynasty; and there was the *Kuo-shih* (State History) for the two eras, *Wu-tê* 武德 and *Chên-kuan* 貞觀, and for the later eras compiled by WÊI Shu 韋述, WU Ching 吳兢, Yü Hsiu-lieh 于休烈, LIU Fang 柳芳, CHANG Shuo 張說, LING-HU Huan 令狐峒, which, however, terminated with the reign of the Emperor Hsüan-tsung 玄宗 or that of the 6th Emperor or Sü-tsung 肅宗 (A.D. 756-761). No *Kuo-shih* whatever was compiled for any reign after this⁽²⁶⁶⁾. It is true that in the *Chün-chai-tu-shu-chih* 郡齋讀書志 Vol. 5, it is stated that that the *Chiu-t'ang-shu* was made chiefly by referring to the work by WÊI Shu 韋述, but in view of the fact that the work by WÊI Shu was completed by LIU Fang after his death and records the historical facts between the Emperor Kao-tsü 高祖 and the *Chien-yüan* 乾元 era of the Emperor Sü-tsung, it is impossible to think that the whole *T'ang-shu* was made on its basis. At any rate, the *Chiu-t'ang-shu* borrowed much material from the above-mentioned *Kuo-shih* 國史 and *Shih-lu* 實錄. On the other hand, the *T'ang-hui-yao* in the present version, presented to the Court by WANG P'u 王溥 16 years after the *Chiu-t'ang-shu* was completed in the 2nd year of *Chien-lung* 建隆 of the Sung Dynasty (A.D. 961). This work is a book which borrows as its text the *Hui-yao* 會要 compiled by SU Pien 蘇辨 in the 19th year of *Chên-yüan* 貞元 (A.D. 803) under the reign of the Emperor Tê-tsung 德宗, its sequel compiled by TS'UI Hsüan 崔鉉 and others in the 7th year of Ta-chung 大中 (A.D. 853) under the reign of the Emperor Hsüan-tsung 宣宗, to which were added the subsequent facts⁽²⁶⁷⁾. Therefore, it is quite probable that most items up to the Emperor Hsüan-tsung 宣宗 are adopted from the writings by SU Pien 蘇辨 and TS'UI Hsüan 崔鉉 and judging the nature of this book, most of its material was no doubt taken from the *Kuo-shih* 國史, the *Shih-lu* 實錄, or the official records which formed the basic material of these works. In short, the *Fu-lin-chuan* in both works must have a common source in the above-mentioned documents. What this could be, I regret, I cannot tell. At any rate, it is quite evident that the *Fu-lin-chuan* in the *T'ang-hui-yao* is of a lineage, considerably shortened, identical with that of the *Fu-lin-chuan* in the *Chiu-t'ang-shu*. For this reason, unless special reason arises, I desire to proceed, focusing my investigation on the items in the *Chiu-t'ang-shu*.

Now, the fact that the *Fu-lin-chuan* in the *Chiu-t'ang-shu* is a compilation

(266) See 玉海, 卷四十八, 四十六; 郡齋讀書志, 卷六; 直齋書錄解題, 卷四; 四庫全書總目提要, 卷四十六.

(267) See 唐會要, 卷三十六; 書錄解題, 卷十四; 郡齋讀書志, 卷十四, etc.,

which consists of an account selected from Ta-ch'in-kuo 大秦國 in the *Wèi-liao* 魏略 and in the official annals of each succeeding emperor and of an addition of new information obtained in the T'ang Dynasty, I have fully pointed out in my paper entitled "*On Ta-ch'in-kuo and Fu-lin-kuo*"⁽²⁶⁸⁾. As for the new information on Fu-lin-kuo obtained in the T'ang Dynasty, the first item is the account on its topography, the condition of its capital, its politics, and its manners and customs. The second item is the account of its tributes paid to the Court from the 17th year of *Chên-kuan* 貞觀 to the 7th year of *K'ai-yüan* 開元. The first point to be investigated is, when was this information introduced to China? In order to answer this question, it would be necessary first to determine the date of the present book of the *Fu-lin-chuan* in the *Chiu-t'ang-shu*. I am of the opinion that, judging from the opening remark "Fu-lin-kuo also called Ta-ch'in"⁽²⁶⁹⁾, this account was certainly compiled later than the 4th year of *T'ien-pao* 天寶.

As previously stated, it was in the 4th year of *T'ien-pao* (A.D. 745) that Ta-ch'in was officially recongnized as the home of Nestorianism, and the Nestorian Temple which had hitherto been miscalled Po-ssü-ssü (the Persian Temple) was now officially requested to re-christen as Ta-ch'in-ssü (the Ta-ch'in Temple). To begin with, the first Nestorian priest who introduced Nestorianism to China in the T'ang Dynasty was one who had lived some time in Persia. A-lo-pên 阿羅本 who paid tribute to the T'ang Court in the 9th year of *Chên-kuan* (A.D. 635) was at first a Persian priest (*T'ang-hui-yao* Vol. 49); and the high priest Chi-lich 及烈 who paid tribute to the Court in the 20th year of *K'ai-yüan* 開元 was sent by the Persian King. This accounts for the misnomers—the Persian Temple for the Nestorian Temple and the Persian religion (Po-ssü-chiao 波斯教) for Nestorianism. To the Nestorians themselves, however, Persia was only the base of the missionaries sent to them, but not the place at which the religion originated. The place worshipped as the home of the faith was, of course, Fu-lin-kuo. For example, the *Hsü-t'ing-mi-shih-so(ho)-ching* 序聽述詩所(訶)經 assigned Wu-li-shih-lien-ch'êng 烏梨師斂城 in Fu-lin-kuo as the birthplace of Christ while the *I-shên-lun* 一神論 records: "All Fu-lin men nowadays worship the Saviour."⁽²⁷⁰⁾ These instances must certainly throw light on the subject. However, as the Nestorians who gradually came to be acquainted with Chinese culture, became aware that the region including Palestine which had always been treated in historical works as the ideal land in the Far West was identical with Ta-ch'in-kuo, and emphasizing the fact that the home of Nestorianism was the very ideal land in the West which had been intimately related with China from ancient times, endeavored to make their propaganda more fruitful. When this insistence of theirs was finally accepted by the Court, it is most probable

(268) See note 258.

(269) 拂菻國一名大秦。(舊唐書, 卷一百九十八; 西戎傳拂菻國)

(270) 一切拂菻, 如今並禮拜世尊。

Chapter X

Fu-lin in the T'ang Period (Part 3)

As previously stated, the town plan or the special building in the capital represented in the *Fu-lin-chuan* could by no means be explained by supposing them as those of Antiochia or Constantinople. However, if they be taken as a mere creation of fancy based on the condition of Ch'ang-an 長安, the capital of the T'ang Dynasty, they could be explained away most readily. Ch'ang-an, the head capital of the T'ang Dynasty, was an oblong city approximately $6\frac{1}{4}$ miles east and west, and approximately 5 miles north and south. At the northern end of the centre was Kung-ch'êng 宮城 (Hsi-nêi 西內) which was Emperor's permanent residence; to the south, Huang-ch'êng 皇城 with rows of government buildings containing 3 departments and 6 bureaus; to the east, west and south of Kung-ch'êng and Huang-ch'êng, Ching-ch'êng 京城, the residence section of the common citizens regularly divided into 12 chieh 街 (streets), 9 ch'ü 衢 and 110 fang 坊 (blocks). The boulevard running north and south through the centre was Chu-ch'iao-ta-chieh 朱雀大街 (Main Street); as one passed the Ming-tê 明德 Gate provided at the middle of the South wall of the capital, and proceeded straight to the north along this street, he would reach the Huang-ch'êng 皇城 through the Chu-ch'iao 朱雀 Gate, and if he went further north, he would enter Kung-ch'êng 宮城(西內) through the Ch'êng-t'ien 承天 (Shun-t'ien 順天) Gate. The expression "to reach the King's palace passing the great threefold gates" in the account of the Fu-lin capital might be the result of imagining a likely city on the part of the compilers who were conscious of the construction of Ch'ang-an, for the capital of Fu-lin-kuo, the mighty nation in the western world which might well rival the T'ang Dynasty. Incidentally, the gate most used in entering Chang-an were the Ch'un-ming 春明 Gate on the east front and the K'ai-yüan 開遠 Gate on the west front. The Ch'un-ming Gate was the middle gate in the East Wall from which the highway started eastward for Lo-yang 洛陽, the eastern capital, and also northward for Tai-yüan 太原, the northern capital; and those coming from Central China to Ch'ang-an had to pass this gate; whereas the K'ai-yüan Gate was the starting point of the highway leading to Shu 蜀 and Hsi-yü 西域 (the Western Region), and those coming to Ch'ang-an from the west had to pass this gate. Therefore, "the great threefold gates" might have been analogized from the three gates—either the Ch'un-ming or the K'ai-yüan and the Chu-ch'iao 朱雀 and the Ch'êng-t'ien 承天. What would support this inference the more was the Ku-lou 鼓樓 (Drum-tower) built upon the Ch'êng-t'ien Gate. During the T'ang period, in the city as well as in the country, the

street gates were opened and closed at day-break and sunset, and those who without special permission went out into the city during the night, were charged for violating the night regulations. And in Ch'ang-an a special drum was sounded to announce the opening and closing of the street-gates. Under *Tsa-lü-fan-yeh* 雜律犯夜 in the *T'ang-lü-su-i* 唐律疏議 a passage reads: "Government decree. At the 5th night-watch (3-5 a.m.), three strokes are given. At the Shun-t'ien 順天 Gate the drum is sounded. Traffic is permitted. As day time expires, the Shun-t'ien Gate sounds the drum 400 strokes before the gate is finally closed. Then after 600 more strokes are given, the street-gates are all closed. No traffic is allowed. An offender is given 20 whippings."⁽³⁷⁴⁾ The Shun-t'ien Gate here referred to was the Ch'êng-t'ien Gate. The name was so changed in the first year of *Shên-lung* 神龍 (A.D. 705). It is needless to say, that this practice was continued, not only through the whole T'ang Dynasty but also till the end of the Ch'ing Dynasty. In the T'ang period, at first, the custom was, as soon as the drum-beating at the Shun-t'ien Gate was heard, to send out criers in relays until the 10th year of *Chên-kuan* 貞觀 (A.D. 636) when on the recommendation of MA Chou 馬周 this was improved, for in answer to the drum-beating at the Shun-t'ien Gate the drum installed at each street was beaten.⁽³⁷⁵⁾ According to the *Po-kuan-chih* 百官志 in the *T'ang-shu* (49a), says: "At sunset, after 800 strokes of the drum, the gate is closed. At the 2nd night-watch in (9-11 p.m.) the superintendent of streets with mounted soldiers are sent crying out along the streets. Military officers spy stealthily. At the 5th night-watch two strokes are given. A drum is sounded from within. All street-drums succeed the sound. All the street-gates are opened. The drum is beaten 3,000 times. The beating ceases as day breaks."⁽³⁷⁶⁾ So the streets-gates were closed and opened with 800 strokes at dusk, and with 3,000 strokes at day-break. Marco POLO's *Travels* says that in the Ta-tu 大都 (Khanbalik, now Peking) of the Yüan Dynasty there rose at the centre a high tower in which a large bell was hung. The bell was rung every evening, and after it was rung three times no one was allowed to go into the streets.⁽³⁷⁷⁾ By each import bridge in Hang-chou 杭州 there was a watch-house in which were stationed ten watch-men, a night team of five being relieved by a day team of five; to each man was handed a wooden or metal instrument which produced a loud sound; in the watch-house there was installed a water-clock by which hours were measured day and night, the watchmen tolled each hour by striking the instrument, and after dark they paid special attention to fires. These were given in full detail.⁽³⁷⁸⁾

(374) 官衛令。五更三響，順天門擊鼓，聽人行。晝漏盡，順天門擊鼓四百槌，訖閉門。後更擊六百槌，坊門皆閉，禁人行。違者笞二十。(唐律疏議，卷二十六，雜律犯夜)

(375) 舊唐書，卷七十四，馬周傳；唐會要，卷七十一，左右金吾衛。

(376) 日暮，鼓八百聲而門閉。乙夜街使以騎卒循行羈諱，武官暗探。五更二點，鼓自內發，諸街鼓承振，坊市門皆啓。鼓三千槌，辨色而止。(唐書，卷49上，百官志左右街使)

(377) YULE, *The Book of Marco Polo*³, I, 375.

(378) *ibid.*, II, p. 187-188.

The reason why these things were recorded by Marco POLO was no doubt because they were custom unknown in western cities. "*The Travels in India and China of Sulaymān, the Arab Merchant*", compiled in the 5th year of *Ta-chung* 大中 under the Emperor Hsüan-tsung 宣宗 (A.D. 851) records the same customs in the T'ang period. The original of this book is in the possession of the National Library in Paris, and various editions translated, annotated and revised by Messrs. LANGLES, RENAUDOT and REINAUD are widely circulated, but I shall cite here a relevant account from FERRAND's new translation.

"On dit qu'il y a, en Chine, plus de deux cents villes principales qui ont chacune (pour gouverneur) un roi (feudataire) et un eunuque. De ces villes principales dépendent d'autres villes. An nombre de celles-là est Hanfû, où viennent mouiller les navires et dont dépendent vingt villes. On n'appelle *ville* que les centres urbains possédant le *jādam*. C'est une sorte de trompette dans laquelle on souffle. L'instrument est long et de la grosseur des deux mains réunies (autour du corps de l'instrument); il est enduit de la même matière dont sont recouvertes les porcelaines de Chine. Il a 3 ou 4 coudées de long. Son embouchure est mince, de façon à ce qu'un homme puisse la mettre dans sa bouche. Le son du *jādam* porte jusqu'à environ un mille. Chaque ville a quatre portes; à chacune de ces portes, il y a cinq *jādam* dont on sonne à certains moments de la nuit et du jour. Dans chaque ville, il y a également dix tambeurs dont on bat en même temps que sonne le *jādam*. On en use ainsi en guise d'hommage rendu au souverain, et les habitants apparemment en même temps qu'il est tel moment de la nuit et du jour. Ils ont, en outre, des points de repaire (gnomons) et (des instruments) à poids pour compter les heures."⁽³⁷⁹⁾

To explain the custom of tolling the hours in cities by sounding the *jādam* and beating the drum as an expression of homage to the Emperor was analogized from *nouba*, the custom among the Mohammedans who paid homage to the Caliph by beating the drum or blowing the trumpet.⁽³⁸⁰⁾ Incidentally, the origin of the custom to open and close the castle-gate with the beating of street-drums must date from antiquity. An item on this custom in P'ing-ch'êng 平城 under the Pêi-wêi 北魏 Dynasty given under Lêi-sui 灑水 in the *Shui-ching-chu* 水經注 seems to be the oldest record in literature: "In the 3rd year of *Shên-jui* 神瑞 under the Wêi 魏 Dynasty (A.D. 416) a white tower was built. The tower is exceedingly high and steep. A look-out is added to the top. Both the front and back are adorned with white stone powder, shining like hanging white silk, red and white beautifully divided.

(379) G. FERRAND, *Voyage du marchand arabe Sulaymān en Inde et en Chine rédigé en 851, etc.*, 1922, p. 53; cf. aussi, RENAUDOT, *Anciennes relations des Indes et de la Chine, etc.*, 1718, p. 24-25 et M. REINAUD, *Relations des voyages faits par les arabes et les persans, etc.*, 1845, I. p. 32-33.

(380) REINAUD, op. cit., p. 22, note.

For this reason people call it the White Tower. Afterwards a great drum was installed on the top. At dawn and dusk it is beaten a thousand strokes. This is taken as the signal for opening and closing the castle-gates and town-gates. It is called Chieh-ch'ên-ku 戒晨鼓 (the dawn-announcing drum.)⁽³⁸¹⁾ It was through Dr. Shigeru KATO's courtesy that I came across this item.

The street-drum system was so famous that it was known even to the western world. It seems to have been widely practised in the principal cities throughout China. Especially in Ch'ang-an, there was a drum-tower on the Ch'êng-t'ien 承天 Gate from which the drum tolled the morning and evening hours; and this being regarded as the standard time, the street-gates were opened and closed. This fact is considered quite suggestive in the study of the custom in the Fu-lin capital. The existence of the great threefold gates and the installation of a curious clock in the second gate to toll the hours,—all this was probably invented from the drum installed in the Ch'êng-t'ien Gate and tolling the hours. Now, as to whether there was a clock in the Ch'êng-t'ien Gate which tolled the hours from time to time, or an accurate measurement was made at the Astronomy Office and it was reported to the drum-tower in the Ch'êng-t'ien Gate, it is not known. However, as no record testifies to the existence of a clock under the Ch'êng-t'ien Gate, it is likely that the time to open and close the gate was reported by the Astronomy Office which first existed in the Huang-ch'êng 皇城 and later moved to Yung-ning-fang 永寧坊. The fact that while in Ch'ang-an the Ch'êng-t'ien Gate was at the entrance to the Kung-ch'êng and was the third gate to pass for a traveller from the outside, in the case of the Fu-lin capital the clock is represented to be installed in the second gate, would indicate the inventor's special care to make the account read the more plausible. If such inference be accepted, the clock represented as installed there must be the one which actually existed in Ch'ang-an and whose intricate mechanism was the wonder of the capital. That this clock was China-made is easily inferred from the fact that one gold ball was dropped every hour, to toll the twelve hours of the day. In China, since the Han Dynasty, day and night had been equally divided into 100 k'o 刻 (part) which had been equally divided into 12 shih 時 (hour).⁽³⁸²⁾ "The day is counted as 12 hours"⁽³⁸³⁾ in the *Fu-lin-chuan* implied one day-and-night because it must be an account based on the fact that in the T'ang Dynasty one day-and-night was divided into 12 ch'ên 辰 (hours). In the East Roman Empire, one day-and-night was divided into 24 hours; the time from sunrise to sunset equally into 12 hours and the time from sunset to sunrise likewise; therefore, not only hours in the daytime and

(381) 魏神瑞三年，又建白樓，樓甚高竦。加觀榭於其上，表裏飾以石粉。皜曜建素，赭白綺分。故世謂之白樓也。後置大鼓於其上，晨昏伐以千椎，為城里諸門啓閉之候，謂之戒晨鼓也。（水經注，卷十三，灤水）

(382) 日知錄，卷三十，百刻；陔餘叢考，卷三十四，一日十二時始於漢。

(383) 候日之十二時焉。（舊唐書，卷一百九十八，西戎傳拂菻國）

at night varied in length, but also hours in the day or hours at night varied in length according to the seasons. It is said that among the Tahiti people in Australia day and night are each divided into 6 hours.⁽³⁸⁴⁾ If such exceptional cases are excluded, since the medieval days, the countries where division of one day-and-night into 12 hours was adopted were China and other East Asian countries which followed the Chinese method of time measurement.⁽³⁸⁵⁾ Again, as stated later to a Chinese water-clock was always attached a *chin-jên* 金人 (a gold man) which was called *ssü-ch'ên* 司辰 (time-keeper), or a doll resembling it. The fact that beside the clock in Fu-lin-kuo there stood a life-size gold man would certainly convince the reader that it was a Chinese clock.

The exact construction of the clock in question could not be ascertained, of course, but that it was one which availed itself of power of some sort could readily be supposed from the fact that it dropped a gold ball at each hour. In the T'ang period sun-dials and water-clocks were the most commonly used,—especially, among the water-clocks there were not a few most cleverly constructed and with water power utilized. To begin with, the existence of a water-clock in China dates from remote antiquity; for instance, it is recorded in the Hsia-kuan 夏官 in the *Chou-li* 周禮 that Chieh-hu 挈壺 was in charge of water-clocks. SSŪ-MA Jang-chü chuan 司馬穰苴傳 in the *Shih-chi* 史記 (64) gives the following incident. Under the reign of Prince Ching 景公 of Ch'i 齊, in order to defend the country against the troops of Yen 燕 and Chin 晉, SSŪ-MA Jang-chü appointed the time of an interview with CHUANG Chia 莊賈, and waited for the hour as he erected a *piao* 表 or a sun-dial and set the water dropping. Probably this is the first instance in which a water-clock is mentioned in a comparatively reliable document, though it is rather difficult to conclude upon the strength of this account alone the existence of a water-clock by the end of the Ch'un-ch'iu 春秋 period. As a water-clock is said to have been used in Assyria in 640 B.C. at the time of King Ashurbanipal⁽³⁸⁶⁾, it would be tenable to argue for the existence of a water-clock in China at that date. At any rate, the use of a water-clock dates from ancient times, and the construction of various water-clocks used at various times is fully recorded in various books of information, and, as it is certainly useless to discuss the full details of the construction of these water-clocks, I shall omit it here. The principle of a water-clock is to flow in a fixed time a fixed quantity of water from a tank to another, and to tell the lapse of time by means of a fixed graduation indicating the quantity of the water that has flowed. In the case of the Chinese water-clock, three types of indicators were adopted. The first, the commonest, was to float an arrow on the water, and

(384) F.K. GINZEL, *Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie*, II, 1911, p. 131; M.P. NILSSON, *Primitive Time-Reckoning*, 1920, p. 39.

(385) F.K. GINZEL, op. cit. I, p. 465-466, III, p. 88-67.

(386) F.M. FELDHAUS, *Die Technik der Vorzeit.*, Spr. 1236.

to tell the lapse of time by referring to the rising of the arrow with the increase of the water. The second was to use a balance, and to tell the lapse of time by weighing the water which has flowed in. The third was to let a fixed quantity of water flow out and to tell the time by making it revolve to wheel shaft by means of water power. That the water-clock at the Ch'ang-an Astronomical Observatory in the T'ang period adopted this first method is evident from the note given at the end of the item under Chih-kuan-chih Ssü-t'ien-t'ai 職官志司天臺 in the *Chiu-t'ang-shu*, which says: "As for the method of the water-clock, holes are made in the pot and water is allowed to run out; arrows mark parts. There are 48 arrows. Night and day are each divided into 100 parts. In winter and summer they vary in length. On the winter solstice, day is 40 parts, while night is 60 parts. On the summer solstice, day is 60 parts, while night is 40 parts, etc."⁽³⁸⁷⁾ Also from the note on Wu-kuan Ssü-ch'en-shih-wu-yüan 五官司辰十五員 which reads: "..... All are in charge of the water-clocks. Holes are made in the pot, and water is allowed to run out. Arrows are floated to indicate hours. By means of this the hour of midnight, the hour of dusk, and the hour of dawn are announced."⁽³⁸⁸⁾ As a usual thing on a water-clock of this system there was a *chin-jên* 金人 (gold man) called *ssü-ch'ên* 司辰 (clock-officer) into whose hand an arrow was devised to fall. The Lou-k'o-fa 漏刻法 (water-clock method) by Yin K'uei 殷夔 quoted in *Yüan-chien-lêi-hau* 淵鑑類函 reads: "From *wu* 午 (mid-day) to *tzü* 子 (mid-night) it is also 50 parts. There is a lid on the pot. In it water rises. The arrow rises out of the lid. On the lid *chin-jên* 金人 is cast as *ssü-ch'ên* 司辰 (clock-officer)."⁽³⁸⁹⁾ Lou-shui-chih 漏水制 (Method of water-clock) by Chang Hêng 張衡 of the Later Han Dynasty says: "A gold genius is cast and placed on the left pot. A gold page is made and placed on the right pot."⁽³⁹⁰⁾ A poem by Li Shang-yin 李商隱 of the T'ang Dynasty says: "A gem boy holds the night key; a gold foreigner keep the water clock."⁽³⁹¹⁾ *Lou-fu* 漏賦 (Ode on the Water-clock) by Tou Hui 竇鞏 says: "For gold pots were piled up and a copper officer was erected."⁽³⁹²⁾ *Lou-fu* 漏賦 by Fu Tzü-chang 符子璋 says: "The copper officer stand for its direction, while the gold arrow marks its number."⁽³⁹³⁾ *Hsin-lou-k'o-ming* 新漏刻銘 (Inscription on the new water-clock) by Liu Yao 陸倕 of South Ch'i 南齊 says: "The copper officer is in charge of the graduation, while the

- (387) 漏刻之法，孔壺爲漏，箭爲刻，其箭四十有八，晝夜共百刻。冬夏之間，有長短。冬至之日，晝漏四十刻，夜漏六十刻。夏至晝漏六十刻，夜漏四十刻，云々。(舊唐書，卷四十三，職官志二，司天臺注)
- (388)皆掌諸漏刻。孔壺爲漏，浮箭爲刻，以告中星昏明之候也。(ibid.)
- (389) 自午至子，亦五十刻。壺上有蓋，其中水浮載。箭出於蓋，蓋上鑄金人爲司辰。(淵鑑類函，卷三百六十九，儀飾部刻漏二)
- (390) 鑄金仙人，居左壺，爲金胥徒，居右壺。(後漢，張衡)
- (391) 玉童收夜籟，金狄守更籌。(唐，李商隱詩)
- (392) 蓋以重金壺之器，建銅史之司。(唐，竇鞏，漏賦)
- (393) 銅史應其方，金箭刻其數。(符子璋，漏賦)

gold page embraces the arrow.”⁽³⁹⁴⁾ The above are some relevant instances. Incidentally, the *I-wên-lêi-chü* 藝文類聚 quotes the whole text of the inscription by Liu Yao 陸倕 and identifies him as a man of the Liang period⁽³⁹⁵⁾. Now, it may be supposed from the following account from the *T'ien-wên-chih* 天文志 in the *Chiu-t'ang-shu* that the water-clock of the third type existed in the T'ang Dynasty. “Furthermore, the Emperor ordered I-hang 一行 and LIANG Ling-tsan 梁令瓚 and other craftsmen invent an astrolabe. Copper was cast into the circular firmament. Above are arranged the stars, the equator, and graduations for heavenly measurements. Water is poured to move the rings to make themselves rotate. In one day and one night the heavens make one rotation. Then two more rings are introduced, and fastened together outside the heavens, but being tied to the sun and moon. They are made to move round. Each day heavens turn west one round. Every day the sun travels eastwards by one degree, and the moon travels $13\frac{7}{19}$ degrees. Approximately 29 odd rotations make the sun and the moon meet. 365 rotations make the sun travel round once. Then a wooden case is placed to make the horizon. A half of the instrument is left under the ground. Day and night, the first day and the fifteenth day, the slowness or fastness is adjusted. And two wooden men are made to stand on the horizon. In front of them are placed a ball and a drum. Time is divided into *ch'en* 辰 and *k'o* 刻. At each *k'o* 刻 the drum automatically beats. At each *ch'en* 辰 the bell automatically strikes. In the wooden case are placed all the wheel-shafts, with the teeth geared together and the chains holding them together. This has now been connected with the celestial orbits. In those days this device was widely admired in the world. It was cast with metal. It was called *Shui-yün-hun-t'ien* 水運渾天 (water-moved astrolabe.)”⁽³⁹⁶⁾ A similar account appears in the *T'ang-shu* (Vol. 41), *T'ang-hui-yao* 唐會要 (Vol. 42), *Tzu-chih-t'ung-chien* 資治通鑑 (Vol. 213), and *Ch'uan T'ang-wên* 全唐文 (Vol. 223); according to the *Tzu-chih-t'ung-chien*, it was in the 10th month of the 10th year of *K'ai-yüan* 開元 (A.D. 722) that this instrument was constructed. The so-called *Shui-yün-hun-t'ien-i* 水運渾天儀 was a device to show the movement of the heavenly bodies, and to this was attached a clock which as is shown by this account was also moved by water-power. If a wheel with 12 teeth and another with 100 teeth geared together were moved at a fixed rate, it was quite an easy matter to

(394) 銅史司刻，金徒抱箭。(南齊，陸倕，新漏刻銘)

(395) 藝文類聚，卷六十八，儀飾部漏刻。

(396) 又詔一行，與梁令瓚及諸術士，更造渾天儀。鑄銅爲圓天之象，上具列宿赤道及用天度數。注水激輪，令其自轉。一日一夜，天轉一周。又別置二輪，絡在天外，綴以日月，令得運行。每天西轉一市，日東行一度，月行十三度十九分度之七，凡二十九轉有餘而日月會；三百六十五轉而日行市。仍置木匱以爲地平，令儀半在地下。晦明朔望，遲速有準。又立二木人於地平之上，前置鐘鼓，以候辰刻。每一刻，自然擊鼓，每辰則自然撞鐘。皆於櫃中各旋輪軸，鈎鍵交錯，關鑰相持，既與天道合同。當時共稱其妙。鑄成，命之曰水運渾天。(舊唐書，卷三十五，天文志上)

attain the results, for one day-and-night was divided into 100 *k'o* and 12 *ch'en*. It is recorded that quite a few clocks of such construction were made even after the Sung Dynasty.

The existence of water-clocks of the first and third types in the T'ang period has been clarified by the foregoing explanations. However, as to the existence at that time of a water-clock in which a balance was used, I regret to say that I have not come across any document to prove it. The *Yüan-chien-lèi-han* 淵鑑類函 quoting from a book by LI LAN 李蘭 entitled *Lou-k'o-fa* 漏刻法 illustrates an instance. "Water is stored in a vessel. Copper is made into the form of a winding pump. It draws the water in the vessel out of a silver dragon's spout and empties it into a measure. As one *shêng* 升 of water is dropped, its weight is one *chin* 斤, and the time that has elapsed is one *k'o* 刻."⁽³⁹⁷⁾ Though it is not known when LI LAN lived, the fact that the clock of Fu-lin-kuo was a large gold beam reminds me that the clock was probably similar to this water-clock here mentioned. As for the clock of Fu-lin-kuo, the whole body was a beam so constructed that on the elapse of each hour, the 12 gold balls one after another on the edge dropped with a loud clang. The dropping of the gold balls was caused either by the weight of the water increased in the measure, or by some apparatus in which water-power was utilized as in the case of the third type. It is true, in Europe, a water-clock had been used since the middle of the 6th century B.C., it would seem that there had been no type in which a weight was used.⁽³⁹⁸⁾ This is an important factor in assuming that the clock of Fu-lin-kuo was in reality was a China-made. What would make one suppose the existence in the T'ang period of not only the sun-dial and the water-clock, but also of the water-clock in which a weight was used in the clock mentioned in the Travels of Sulaymān previously referred to. According to the translation by FERRAND, Sulaymān on the two instruments the Chinese used in measuring time writes as follows: "Ils ont, en outre, des points de repaire (gnomons) et (des instruments) à poids pour compter les heures."⁽³⁹⁹⁾ The same sentence is translated by REAUDOT: "Ils ont aussi des cadrans, et des horloges à poids."⁽⁴⁰⁰⁾ and REINAUD: "De reste, ceux-ci ont des signes et des poids pour connaître les heures."⁽⁴⁰¹⁾ Now, as I refer to the original attached to the book by REINAUD, I find that the original word which Messrs. FERRAND and REINAUD translated 'points de repaire' 'signes' (both mean signs) is 'alāmat which is the plural form of 'alāmet, 'alāme which mean 'sign, symbol, flag; sign-board.'⁽⁴⁰²⁾

(397) 以略貯水，以銅爲渴鳥狀，如鈎典。以引器中水於銀龍口中，吐入權器。漏水一升，秤量一斤，時經一刻。(淵鑑類函，卷三百六十五，儀飾部刻漏三)

(398) GINZEL; *Handbuch.*, III, s. 380-281, II, s. 167, 304-305; F.M. FELDHAUS; *Die Technik der Vorzeit.*, 1203 sqq; PAULY-WISSOWA; *Realencyclop.*, XI, 2, 60-70.

(399) G. FERRAND, *Voyage du marchand arabe Sulaymān.*, p. 53.

(400) REAUDOT, *Ancienne relations des Indes et de la Chine*, p. 25.

(401) REINAUD, *Relation des voyages faits par les Arabes et les Persans.*, p. 33.

(402) ZENKER, *Dictionnaire turc, arabe et persan*, II, p. 63 ab; R. DOZY, *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes*, II, p. 164 b.

Since ancient times in China, it was a custom to call a sun-dial *piao* 表, as seen in *Ssu-ma Jang-chü chuan* 司馬遷傳 in the *Shih-chi* 史記. A sentence read: he erected a sun-dial and set a water clock (立表下漏). In *Wu-lu* 吳錄 quoted in the *I-wên-lêi-chü* 藝文類聚, where SUN Ch'üan 孫權 waits for KUAN Yü 關羽 to surrender, the same sentence is used.⁽⁴⁰³⁾ In either case, it evidently meant that the sun-dial was raised and the water-clock started. A copper sun-dial was called *t'ung-piao* 銅表, and a stone sun-dial *shih-piao* 石表. *I-piao* 儀表 referred to a sun-dial, and as it was to show the standard time to the world, the meaning of model or example was derived from it. Therefore, *'alâmat* used by Sulaymân was a free translation of this term *piao* 表, which meant a sun-dial. REAUDOT translates it *cadrans*, while FARRAND translates it *gnomons* and REINAUD supports REAUDOT's view.⁽⁴⁰⁴⁾ All these seem to be correct translations. The original which is translated "(instruments) à poids," "horloges à poids," or "poids" is given as *wazn*. This is a weight which is used in weighing. *Wazn* as a verb is 'to weigh.' Here it is used as a singular noun (the plural form is *awazân*).⁽⁴⁰⁵⁾ *Waznah* a unit of weight, *wazzân* a man who weighs, *siyzân* average, all these are derivatives of this word *wazn*.⁽⁴⁰⁶⁾ Now, what could be an instrument with a weight? REAUDOT took it to be "horloges à poids". Now "horloge à poids" is an apparatus in which a weight is attached at the end of a long cord which is wound on the axle, and the cord is gradually drawn down by the weight to turn the axle and in turn the clock-hand. Nothing is known about the existence of a clock of this type in China in the T'ang or later times. The so-called tower-clock (Turmuhr, Uhr für Türmen) is of this type, but not until the 13th century was this type used in Europe.⁽⁴⁰⁷⁾ It would seem that this did not exist in medieval Persia.⁽⁴⁰⁸⁾ Probably on account of this consideration, Messrs. FERRAND and REINAUD translated it, as "poids". Only the *Ch'ao-yeh-ch'ien-tsai* 朝野僉載, on a clock called *shih-êrh-ch'ên-ch'ê* 十二辰車 (12 hour wheel), says: "During the *Ju-i* 如意 era (A.D. 692), under the reign of the Empress Tsê-t'ien 則天, Hai-chou 海州 recommends an engineer who has constructed a 12-ch'ên 辰 wheel. When the handle faces the due south, it is *wu* 午 (noon). The gate opens and a horse-headed man appears. It turns round to the four directions. Not a difference of infinitesimal fraction occurs."⁽⁴⁰⁹⁾ As to whether it made use of water-power or was an apparatus using a weight as given in the foregoing,

(403) 藝文類聚, 卷六十八, 儀飾部漏刻。

(404) REINAUD, II, p. 22-23.

(405) G.W. FREYTAGH, *Lexicon arabicolatinum*, IV, p. 463; H.A. SALMONE, *Arabic-English Dictionary*, I, p. 1200; A. HONDJÉRI, *Dictionnaire français-arabe-persan et turc*, III, p. 141 a.

(406) R. DOZY, *op. cit.*, II, p. 800.

(407) FELDHAUS, *Die Technik der Vorzeit.*, Spr., 1233-1235.

(408) G. SARTON, *Introduction to the History of Science*, II, 1931, p. 27.

(409) 則天如意中, 海州進一匠。造十二辰車。廻轉正南則午, 門開馬頭人出。四方廻轉, 不爽毫厘。(朝野僉載, 卷六——According to the text in the *Pao-yen-t'ang-pi-chi* 寶顏堂秘笈)

nothing definite is known. In the Arabic language, the words for weight used in weighing are *wazn*, *sanjah*, and *sanjah el-mīzān*.⁽⁴¹⁰⁾ *Sanjah* (*sanjat*) is derived from the Persian word *seng* (stone) which originally meant a stone used as a weight in measuring weight, but later come to mean any metal weight, or any metal piece in the shape of the weight.⁽⁴¹¹⁾ *Sanjat el-mīzān* probably means "a weight for knowing" since it is considered a word derived from *miza* meaning "to discern," "to know." According to HONDJÉRI's *Dictionnaire français-arabe-persan et turc*, the metal piece attached to the cord of a clock or skewer for the purpose of revolving it, is in French *poids* in either case, but in the Arabian language it is *sanjat esh-shāqul*, distinguished from *wazn*. *Sanjat esh-shāqul* being the *sanjat* (weight) of the *shāqul* (pendulum), a clock provided with a *sanjat esh-shāqul* most probably refer to a pendulum clock, not to the so-called "horloge à poids." If both *sanjah* and *wazn* are words with a similar meaning, it may be said either *sanjat esh-shāqul* or *wazn esh-shāqul*; so the clock with *wazn* may be regarded as a pendulum-clock. Though HONDJÉRI translates the pendulum-clock (horloge à pendule) as *sa'ah bāsh-shāqul* (clock with a pendulum),⁽⁴¹²⁾ because *sanjat* refers exclusively to a pendulum of the pendulum-clock, the clock provided with a *shāqul* and the clock provided with a *sanjat esh-shāqul* must refer to the same clock, after all. But seeing that the pendulum-clock was invented only in the latter part of the 17th century,⁽⁴¹³⁾ it could not have existed in the latter part of the 9th century. Therefore, the clock provided with a *wazn* mentioned by Sulaymān could be neither a "horloge à poids" nor a "horloge à pendule." In view of the fact that Sulaymān called a sun-dial an *'alāmat*, which is a free translation of the Chinese word *piao* 表, it should be understood that what he describes it as one (clock) provided with the *wazn* (namely the weight from measuring weight), refers to the weight in the instrument for measuring time by means of the weight of the increased water in a fixed time. Needless to say, a water-clock was in use in Arabia, Persia, etc., but knowing nothing of the instrument provided with a weight, Sulaymān must have accurately written that the Chinese measured time by means of weight. Nothing is known as to where he saw this, but there is no doubt that such a water-clock existed in China in the T'ang period.

After these considerations on the types of clocks in the T'ang Dynasty, one may wonder which type was the clock in Fu-lin-kuo. Because it is described as a large beam, it may easily be seen that it was a balance instrument. At the end of the beam were placed twelve gold balls. It was devised that on the elapse of each hour, one of the balls might drop and make a sharp clang to announce the hour. When the water reached a fixed weight,

(410) HONDJÉRI, III, p. 141 a.

(411) DOZY, op. cit., II, p. 670-691.

(412) HONDJÉRI, III, p. 68 b.

(413) A. BERTHELOT, *Grande Encyclopédie*, XX, p. 269; FELDHAUS, op. cit., Spr. 1221.

the beam slanted and dropped a ball. The *Ch'ao-yeh-ch'ien-tsai* 朝野僉載 says: "Master engineer, YANG Wu-lien 楊務廉 had a capital idea. Once in the city of Ch'in-chou 沁州, he carved a piece of wood into a priest. This priest, holding a wooden cup in one hand, could automatically walk about begging. As the cup was filled with coins, the hinges abruptly sprang, automatically spoke, and uttered a blessing, 'pu-shih' 布施. Town people competed themselves to have a look at it, and hear it speak. Such donators numbered several thousand daily."⁽⁴¹⁴⁾ This would seem another case in that a fixed weight moved a device to make a sound. Plate No. 769 in "*Die Technik der Vorzeit*" by FELDHAUS and Plate 23 in "*L'Horométrie et le système cosmologique des chinois*" by SAUSSURE, reproduce a Chinese clock respectively styled *Holzerner Kerzenuhr*, and *Horloge à feu et réveil matin*, which has a dragon-like instrument provided on its back with a device for burning incense. A string tied to a small gold ball is hung at any point of time one desires, so devised that as the incense goes on burning until it burns the string off, the ball will drop with a sound upon a metal dish placed below and tell the hour. Mr. Mikinosuke ISHIDA has kindly informed me that IHARA Saikaku, the Japanese novelist (1642-1693), while describing Yaoya Oshichi, one of his "*Ève et Women*", gives a scene where a clock named *Kyōkōban* 行香板, being similar in construction to the above discussed is mentioned. As this most probably came from China, it is certain that such a clock existed in China during the Ch'ing 清 Dynasty. Though its origin is beyond tracing, it proves the existence in China of an instrument which, by dropping a gold ball, told the hours by the sound it made. The *Hsiang-p'u* 香譜 (Po-ch'an-hsüeh-hai 百川學海 edition) by HUNG Ch'u 洪芻 of the Sung 宋 Dynasty, under the title *Po-k'o-hsiang* 百刻香 says: "In recent times those who value curiosities make incense letters. The writing is in accordance with 12 *ch'en* 辰. Each of which is divided into 100 *k'o* 刻. Approximately one day-and-night is thus exhausted."⁽⁴¹⁵⁾ This shows that at least in the Sung Dynasty measuring time by burning incense was practised. Be that as it may, that the clock in Fu-lin-kuo was a water-clock in which a balance was made use of, that a life-size gold man stood as an equipment, and that one day-and-night was divided into 12 parts, all these facts eloquently tell that the clock in question was, not one which existed in Syria or in the East Roman Empire, but one which was in use in China. In short, the compilers of the *Fu-lin-chuan* who supposed that this curious clock of China must also exist in Fu-lin-kuo inserted this item as a particular illustration of the conditions of the Fu-lin capital.

To confirm this inference further, there is the account of Tzū-yü-t'ing 自雨亭 (self-raining villa). As previously mentioned, in the Fu-lin capital, there

(414) 將作大匠楊務廉，甚有巧思。常[嘗]於沁州市內，刻木作僧。手執一椀，自能行乞。椀中錢滿，關鍵忽發，自然作聲，云布施。市人競觀，欲其作聲，施者日盈數千矣。(朝野僉載，卷六)

(415) 近世尙奇者，作香篆，其文準十二辰，分一百刻，凡然一晝夜已。(洪芻，香譜下)

was a special building for avoiding the heat, so constructed that water might gush from the roof and pour down the eaves on all sides. That such a building existed, not in the Roman Orient, but in Persia, is known from the account by THEOPHANES which says that this astonished Heraclius as he discovered it in A.D. 623 at the Fire-God Temple in Azerbaidjan. There is no western record which tells whether this came to be imported to the Roman Orient. However, about one century later a similar building already existed in China in the reign of the Emperor Hsüan-tsung 玄宗 of the T'ang Dynasty, according to the *T'ang-yü-lin* 唐語林 by WANG Tang 王讜 of the Sung Dynasty. The item my friend Mr. ISHIDA quoted for me follows: "After Wu-hou 武后 died, the mansions of the princes, princesses and nobles in the capital daily grew more magnificent and imposing. During the *T'ien-pao* 天寶 era (A.D. 742-755) Yü-shih-ta-fu WANG Hung 御史大夫王鉞 being guilty of a crime was sentenced to death. The district officer confiscated WANG Hung's mansion in T'ai-p'ing-fang 太平坊. Several days were not enough for performing this. In the mansion there was a small arbor called Tzū-yü-t'ing 自雨亭 (self-raining villa). From the roof water ran down in all directions. If you were there in summer, it would feel as chilly as in mid-autumn."⁽⁴¹⁶⁾ This is exactly of the same construction as the Tzū-yü-t'ing in Fu-lin-kuo, and this actually existed in Ch'ang-an during the *T'ien-pao* era. And the same book gives an account of the palace called Liang-tien 涼殿 (Cool Palace) which the same Emperor built for avoiding the heat: "When the Emperor Hsüan-tsung built the Liang-tien 涼殿 (Cool Palace), Remonstrator CH'ÊN Chih-chieh 陳知節, submitting a memorial to the throne, admonished most severely against it. At the request of the Emperor, KAO Li-shih summoned him to the Court. It was when the heat was really extreme. The Emperor was in the Liang-tien 涼殿. In the rear of the Emperor's seat, the water struck the fan-wheels, and the cool air played round one's neck and clothes. Chih-chieh 知節 arrived and was given a seat on a stone chair. A low thunder growled. The sun was hidden from sight. Water rose in the four corners, and forming water-screens, splashed. Inside the hall it became chilly. He was served pieces of ice and *ma-chieh* 麻節 drinks. CH'ÊN's body began to shiver with cold. In his stomach thunder was audible. He again and again asked for leave to go. It was granted. All the while, the Emperor never stopped wiping perspiration. CH'ÊN barely managed to reach the gate. There he relieved nature most shamelessly. Days passed, and he was himself again. This was said: 'When you discuss affairs, be sure to deliberate them thoroughly. Don't ever put yourself in the Emperor's place.'⁽⁴¹⁷⁾ This was

- (416) 武后已後，王侯妃主京城第宅，日加崇麗。天寶中，御史大夫王鉞，有罪賜死。縣官簿錄鉞太平坊宅，數日不能通。宅內有自雨亭子，簷上飛流四注。當夏處之，凜若高秋。（唐語林，卷五）
- (417) 明皇起涼殿，拾遺陳知節上疏極諫。上令[高]力士召對。時暑毒方甚。上在涼殿。坐後水激扇車，風獵衣襟。知節至，賜坐石榻。陰露沈吟，仰不見日。四隅積水，咸廉飛灑。坐內含凍，復賜冰屑麻節飲。陳體生寒慄，腹中雷鳴。再三請起，方許。上猶拭汗不已。陳纔及門，遺洩狼籍。逾日復故。謂曰，卿論事宜審，勿以己方萬乘也。（ibid, 卷四）

also like the Tzŭ-yü-t'ing, no doubt. I am of the opinion that the Tzŭ-yü-t'ing included in the *Fu-lin-chuan* was based, not actual observation in the Fu-lin capital, but upon the supposition on the part of the compilers that a building similar to the one which actually existed at Ch'ang-an, the capital of the T'ang Dynasty, must surely exist in the capital of Fu-lin-kuo, a mighty people of the West; and for the purpose of depicting the Fu-lin capital as a city as mighty and cultured as Ch'ang-an, this building was described. ISHIDA⁽⁴¹⁸⁾, HSIANG Ta 向達⁽⁴¹⁹⁾ and O. FRANKE⁽⁴²⁰⁾ who both follow him ascribe the origin of the Tzŭ-yü-t'ing to Fu-lin-kuo, but I rather think they would rather seek it in Persia.

If my theory that the plan of the Fu-lin capital, the curious clock allegedly installed in the second gate, and the Tzŭ-yü-t'ing which towns-men planned to avoid the heat in, all these were depicted on the basis of the plan of Ch'ang-an, and the apparatus and building which actually existed there, if this theory should be accepted, it would be doubtful whether the following description of the palace of Fu-lin-kuo was based on actual observation in Fu-lin-kuo: "As for the palace, the pillars and windows are mostly made of *shui-ching* 水精 (crystals) and *liu-li* 琉璃 (glass).The pillars of the palace are made of *sê-sê* 瑟瑟. The floor is made of gold. The gate-door (門扇) is of ivory. The ridge-poles and beams are of *hsiang-mu* 香木 (fragrant wood). The principle was to use no common tile. White stone ground into white powder is spread and pasted on the roof. In hardness and brilliance it is like gems."⁽⁴²¹⁾ The *T'ang-shu* has re-written this as follows: "*Sê-sê* 瑟瑟 is used in forming pillars for the palace. *Shui-ching* 水精 and *liu-li* 琉璃 form supports on the beams. *Hsiang-mu* 香木 formed beams. Gold forms the floor. Ivory for the gate-door (闔).It is a house of no tile, but one of white stone powder. It is as solid as gems."⁽⁴²²⁾ Ho 闔 implies a gate-door, being an equivalent to *mên-shan* 門扇 in the *Chiu-t'ang-shu*. The reason why, while the *Chiu-t'ang-shu* says: "As for the palace, the pillars and windows are mostly made of crystals and glass," the *T'ang-shu* says: "Crystals and glass form supports on the beams" is because it is based on the *Wèi-liao* which says: "Of crystals are made the pillars and vessels of the palace."⁽⁴²³⁾ The *Hou-han-shu* says: "For all palace chambers, the pillars are made of crystals and the food vessels also,"⁽⁴²⁴⁾ and the *Chin-shu*

(418) ISHIDA, *Chōan no Haru* 長安の春 or *Spring of Chang-an*, p. 214, etc.

(419) HSIAN TA 向達, *T'ang-tai-chang-an-yü-hsi-yü-wèn-ming* 唐代長安與西域文明, p. 39-40.

(420) O. FRANKE, *Geschichte des chinesischen Reiches*, III. p. 433.

(421) 其宮宇柱樞，多以水精琉璃爲之。.....其殿以瑟瑟爲柱，黃金爲地，象牙爲門扇，香木爲棟梁。其俗無瓦，擗白石爲末，羅之塗屋上。其堅密光潤，還如玉石。（舊唐書，卷一百九十八，西戎傳拂菻國）

(422) 以瑟瑟爲殿，柱水精琉璃爲樞，香木梁，黃金爲地，象牙闔。.....無陶瓦屋，白石堅屋。堅潤如玉。（唐書，卷二百二十一，西域傳下拂菻國）

(423) 以水晶作宮柱及器物。

(424) 宮室皆以水精爲柱，食器亦然。（後漢書，卷一百十八，西域傳大秦國）

says: "All the houses are built with coral supports, glass walls and crystal plinths."⁽⁴²⁵⁾ When the *Chiu-t'ang-shu* says: "The principle was to use no common tile. White stone ground into white powder is spread and pasted on the roof. In hardness and brilliance it is like gems" and the *T'ang-shu* writes: "It is a house of no tile, but one of white stone powder. It is as solid as gems," both were only elaborating the *Hou-han-shu* which says: "Of stone the castle-wall was built. Post-stations were made at all along it. All this was adorned of white mud."⁽⁴²⁶⁾ In either, it has only adopted what we have given as things of Ta-ch'in-kuo in previous histories. Therefore, the only information in this account that might be attributed to the T'ang period is that the palace of Fu-lin-kuo had *sê-sê* as pillars, gold as the floor, and ivory as gate-shutter or door, and *hsiang-mu* (fragrant wood) as beams. It may be seen at first glance that all these are all exaggerating expressions in praise of the grandeur of the palace. It would have been practically impossible to make a floor of gold. Gold, ivory, fragrant wood being luxuries indispensable to the highest class in the T'ang period, this was an attempt to emphasize the wealth of Fu-lin-kuo by saying that these valued rarities in China were abundantly used even in home-building in the country. PAUTHIER is in error when he recognizes this as an actual description of the palace which the East Roman Emperor THEOPHILIUS (A.D. 829-842) built in imitation of the Caliph's palace at Baghdad.⁽⁴²⁷⁾ As to what word *sê-sê* 瑟瑟 was the transliteration of, or what it referred to, no theory has yet been established⁽⁴²⁸⁾. To begin with, *sê-sê* being a game used as personal ornament, there could not be a *sê-sê* large enough to be used as a pillar. To say that the pillars of the Fu-lin palace were made of *sê-sê* was an absurd exaggeration. When LAUFER, ignorant of this plain fact, contends on the strength of this account in the *Fu-lin-chuan* that *sê-sê* being used sometimes as a building material is malachite, I cannot support him. However, in connection with this is recalled the following item in the *Nêng-kai-chai-man-lu* 能改齋漫錄 by Wu Ts'eng 吳曾 of the Sung Dynasty: "The poem entitled *Shih-sun-hsing* 石筍行 by Tu Fu 杜甫 says: 'When it rains much, sometimes *sê-sê* may be obtained.' I consult the *Hua-yang-chi* 華陽記, and it says. 'The K'ai-ming family built a seven-treasure hall. The curtains were made of pearls strung on threads. During the reign of the Emperor Wu-ti 武帝 of the Han Dynasty, in the province of Shu 蜀, a conflagration destroyed several thousand homes. This hall was also burnt down. Nowadays people sometimes find pearls on the sand and mud.' Again, the *Shu-chün-ku-shih* 蜀郡故事 by CHAO Ch'ing-hsien 趙淸獻 says: '*Shih-sun* 石筍 is found out-side the west gate of the city. Two heads crouch in a row.

(425) 屋宇皆以珊瑚爲椽栴，琉璃爲牆壁，水精爲柱礎。(晉書，卷九十七，四夷傳西夷·大秦國)

(426) 以石爲城郭，列置郵亭，皆堅壁之。(後漢書，卷一百十八，西域傳大秦國)

(427) PAUTHIER, *De l'authenticité.*, p. 46, note 1.

(428) B. LAUFER, *Notes on Turquois in the East*, pp. 25-35, 45-55, 67-68; do., *Sino-Iranica*, pp. 516-519; CHANG Hung-chao 章鴻釗, *Shih-ya* 石雅 pp. 63-90.

They are said to have been the foundations of the pearl hall. In ancient times foreigners were here and built a temple called Ta-ch'in-ssü 大秦寺. Its gate-tower was 10 *chien* 間 wide. It was all screened with curtains of pearls and green gems strung. In later days this was damaged and fell down to the ground. Even to this day, the foundations exist. After every heavy rain, in front of and in the back of these people come across a number of pearls, *sê-sê*, and golden green rarities. They are now called *Shih-sun* 石筍. Not that these had been used in building the tower, but that the tower happened to be built in the neighbourhood of the *Shih-sun*. This is because Ta-ch'in-kuo abounds in *chiu-lin* 珍琳, *lang-kan* 琅玕, *ming-chu* 明珠, *yeh-kuang-pi* 夜光璧. The water route runs through Yung-ch'ang-chün 永昌郡 in I-chou 益州 province. The place abounds in the rare gems. Then this temple was the one the Ta-ch'in people built. When Tu T'ien 杜田, testified to this, quoting the *Yu-yang-tsa-tsu* 酉陽雜俎 said 'The small castle of Shu 蜀 was adorned with gold, and green gems, HUAN Wên 桓溫 was angered by this great extravagance, and had it destroyed by fire' he was mistaken."⁽⁴²⁹⁾ This is a comment on the poem entitled *Shih-sun-hsing* 石筍行 by Tu Fu 杜甫. The poem reads: "Don't you see the gate of the I-chou castle? On the street a couple of stone-sprouts crouch high. Ancient tradition says these are *hai-yen* 海眼. Mosses have bitten away the traces of waves. When it rains heavily sometimes *sê-sê* 瑟瑟 may be obtained. This matter is obscure; it cannot be easily ascertained. I wonder if these are not the tombs of some noblemen in ancient times. A stone was erected as a monument which stands to this day."⁽⁴³⁰⁾ This explains the reason why *sê-sê* is exhumed from the neighbourhood of menhir called *Shih-sun* 石筍 outside the west gate of Ch'êng-tu 成都. Although the book called *Shu-chün-ku-shih* 蜀郡故事 by CHAO Ch'ing-hsien 趙清獻 is not included in any other collection, it may be identified with the *Ch'êng-tu-ku-chün-chi* 成都古今記 (30 bks.) included in the *Chih-chai-shu-lu-chieh-t'i* 直齋書錄解題 (Vol. 8) and the *Chün-chai-tu-shu-chih* 郡齋讀書志 (Vol. 8). The book was compiled by CHAO Pien 趙抃 (whose alias was Yüeh-tao 閱道 and whose posthumous name Ch'ing-hsien 清憺) who was Governor of Ch'êng-tu. He was appointed to the position four times during the *Ch'ing-li* 慶曆 and *Hsi-ning* 熙寧 eras of the North Sung Dynasty; and, collecting over one hundred accounts of manners and customs in the province of Shu 蜀, it is said, he completed this book in

(429) 杜石筍行，雨多住住得瑟瑟。按華陽記，開明氏造七寶樓，以真珠結成簾。漢武帝時，蜀郡遭火燒數千家，樓亦以燼。今人往往于砂土上獲真珠。又趙清獻蜀郡故事，石筍在衙西門外，二株雙蹲。云，真珠樓基也。昔有胡人，于此立寺為大秦寺。其門樓十間，皆以真珠翠碧，貫之為簾。後摧毀墜地，至今基腳在。每有大雨其前後人多拾得真珠·瑟瑟·金翠異物。今謂石筍，非為樓設，而樓之建適當石筍附近耳。蓋大秦國多珍琳·琅玕·明珠·夜光璧，水道通益州永昌郡，多出異物，則此寺大秦國人所建也。杜田嘗引酉陽雜俎謂，蜀少城飾以金璧·珠翠。桓溫怒其大修焚之，之事為證，非也。（吳會，能改齋漫錄，卷七）

(430) 君不見益州城門，陌（or 街）上石筍雙高蹲，古來相傳是海眼，苔蘚蝕盡波濤痕，雨多住住得（or 者）瑟瑟，此事恍惚難明論，恐是昔時卿相冢（or 塞），立石為表今仍存。（仇兆鰲，杜詩詳註，卷十）

the 7th year of *Hsi-ning* (A.D. 1074). LAUFER⁽⁴³¹⁾, PELLIOU⁽⁴³²⁾ and MOULE⁽⁴³³⁾ on the sole strength of this account, argue for the existence of the Ta-ch'in Temple at Ch'êng-tu during the T'ang period. As CHAO Piên, however, only records folklore observed in this reign during the *Ch'ing-li* and *Hsi-ning* eras of the North Sung Dynasty, it is by no means certain whether they were the ruins of the Ta-ch'ing Temple⁽⁴³⁴⁾. This poem by Tu Fu 杜甫 (A.D. 712-770) is said to have been composed in the 2nd year of *Shang-yüan* 上元 (A.D. 761). This being 84 years prior to the Buddhism suppression in the 5th year of *Hui-ch'ang* 會昌 (A.D. 845) when Nestorianism was also considerably suppressed, the Ta-ch'in Temple at Ch'êng-tu, if one ever existed there, must surely have existed then, and there was no reason whatever why it should have been destroyed. And there is no reason why Tu Fu himself should have said: "I wonder if there are not the tombs of some noblemen in ancient times." The fact is that because records say that Ta-ch'in-kuo produced *chiu-lin* 珍琳, *lang-kan* 琅玕, *ming-chu* 明珠, and *yeh-kuang-pi* 夜光璧, the locality which produced these gems came to be imagined reversely as the site of the Ta-ch'in Temple. As to the identity of these ruins, as previously stated, the *Hua-yang-chi* 華陽記, the *Yu-yang-tsa-tsu* 酉陽雜俎 etc. have presented various views; they eloquently refuse to identify these ruins as those of the Ta-ch'in Temple. Since use of *sê-sê* as ornaments of furniture or as curtains with it strung on strings during the T'ang Dynasty is mentioned in the *Tu-yang-tsa-pien* 杜陽雜編 and other novels, possibly some *sê-sê* was used in some part of such a building as the Ta-ch'in Temple. Be that as it may, to say that the pillars of the Fu-lin palace were made of this was nothing but an expression for idealizing Fu-lin-kuo. This should not be considered a reality.

According to the *Fu-lin-chuan* there was perched a green bird which warned the king by screeching whenever a food served contained poison: "There was a bird like a goose. Its feather was green-coloured. It was always beside the King, sitting on his pillow. Every time a food served contained poison, this bird screeched."⁽⁴³⁵⁾ According to GIBBON's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, beside the throne of the emperor of the East Roman Empire there sat a gold lion and a number of birds: on the occasion of receiving a foreign envoy, the lion roared and the birds sang to surprise him.⁽⁴³⁶⁾ As to the presence of such bird as represented in the *Fu-lin-chuan* nothing is recorded

(431) LAUFER, *Notes on Turquois*, p. 49-50.

(432) PELLIOU, *Chrétiens en Asie centrale et d'Extrême-Orient*, T.P. XV, 1914, p. 617.

(433) A. CH. MOULE, *Christians in China before the year 1550*, p. 72, note 86.

(434) The *Hsi-ch'i-t's'ung-yü* 西溪叢語 by YAO K'uan 姚寬 of the South Sung Dynasty records the same folklore as *chiu-shuo* 舊說 (an older view). Nevertheless, no record ascribing the ruins in the neighbourhood of *Shih-sun* 石筍 of those of the Ta-ch'in Temple could be traced back beyond the Sung Dynasty.

(435) 有一鳥，似鶉，其毛綠色。常在王邊，倚枕上坐。每進食有毒，其鳥輒鳴。(舊唐書，卷一百九十八，西戎傳拂菻國)

(436) GIBBON, op. cit., VI, p. 81, 77.

in any western literature. As most things treated in the *Fu-lin-chuan* are recorded on the basis of things actually existing in China, so may this bird story be one imagined from a bird which actually existed in Ch'ang-an and elsewhere. During the T'ang Dynasty, from the Court down to the common people, the Chinese used to pet parrots. This vogue is often treated in the novels of that time. For instance, the *Ming-huang-tsa-lu* 明皇雜錄 says that YANG Kuei-fêi 楊貴妃 petted a parrot, while the *T'ai-p'ing-huang-chi* 太平廣記 contains several strange stories concerning parrots. Especially, there is the story of a parrot which witnessed a murder and later informed of the true criminal. This story is told in full detail in the *K'ai-yüan-t'ien-pao-i-shih* 開元天寶遺事 (compiled in the *T'ang-jên-shuo-hui* 唐人說薈 edition) by WANG Jên-yü 王仁裕 of the T'ang Dynasty. An outline will follow. In Ch'ang-an a rich man named YANG Ch'ung-i 楊崇義 lived more extravagantly than a prince. His wife (of the LIU 劉 family) became intimate with a son of their neighbourhood named LI Yen 李兪. They killed YANG Ch'ung-i and threw the corpse into a well. In spite of a rigorous search, the true criminals were not arrested. But when the district officer visited Ch'ung-i house for inspection, a parrot screeched; perching it on his elbow, the officer asked why it screeched, the parrot told him that LIU and LI Yen were the criminals. So the matter was settled. As the Emperor Hsüan-tsung 玄宗 heard of this, he being greatly impressed, appointed the parrot as Lu-i-shih-chê 綠衣使者 (Green-robe-messenger) and kept it in his harem. Afterwards the writer CHANG Yüeh 張說 composed the *Lu-i-shih-chê-chuan* (Biography of the Green-robe-messenger) to commemorate the parrot. The story of a parrot which exposed a crime is given in *the Book of the Thousand Nights and a Night*, in the Story of Sindbad, and was wildly spread in Medieval Persia, Arabia and India.⁽⁴³⁷⁾ This is nothing but a legend which has sprung from the fact that a parrot imitates human speech. When the legend that the bird sitting beside the king is represented as a green bird, and the legend that a parrot was appointed the Green-robe-messenger are considered together, the legend must surely be a fiction based on the parrot. The story of a parrot warning off poison is not found in China, but such a superstition has been observed in India since ancient times, and it has been one of the methods for a ruler to protect himself to keep beside him the parrot or several other birds which are supposed to be able to detect poison. According to Mr. ISHIDA's suggestion, CHARPENTIER, in the 1929 Bulletin of the School of Oriental Study, V. 2 (pp. 233-242), published an article entitled "*Poison-Detecting Birds*" in which he discusses the subject quoting a number of relevant items chiefly from Indian sources. CHARPENTIER holds that the earliest source is the *Arthasāstra* known as a work by KAUTILYA, the premier to Chandragupta Maurya. Now, in this book, in connection with the methods of self-protection

(437) R.F. BURTON, *The Book of the Thousand Nights and a Night*, I, p. 52 and note, VI, p. 132-134 and note; M. BLOOMFIELD, *On Talking Birds in Hindu Fiction*, Festschrift Ernst WINDISCH.

in his harem, the following appears: "The Malabar bird, likewise the parrot and the maina, these birds shriek in high excitement upon seeing poison or snakes; the eyes of the *cakora* partridge change their natural colour at the sight of poison; the curlew becomes most obviously drunk and the amorous cuckoo dies; finally the pheasant falls into a swoon at the sight of poison." A similar account occurs in the *Suśruta* and in Medhātithi's commentary on the *Manu-smṛti*. Of all these, the *Arthasāstra* and the *Suśruta-saṃhitā* have taken the present shape in the 2nd or 3rd century A.D., and Medhātithi is considered a man of the 9th century.⁽⁴³⁸⁾ So it is certain that such a superstition existed in India during the T'ang period, and it may be supposed that the practice of keeping poison-detecting birds beside oneself based on this superstition actually existed. According to CHARPENTIER's quotation, the *Sanatkumāracaritam* revised and published by H. JAKOBI, in describing the manner in which the king took a meal, says as follows: "Courtesans prepare the king's dishes, physicians and various incantators gather together; the table-servants present themselves, offerings are made to demons and gods; the cages of the *cakoras* are speedily carried about,.....⁽⁴³⁹⁾ As *Sanatkumāracaritam* is a chapter in HARIBHADRA's *Nemin thācaritam*, a work dated the middle of the 12th century.⁽⁴⁴⁰⁾ Keeping a poison-detecting bird at table must have been an ancient practice. This superstition is extant even today in India. Especially, the *cakora* being most sensible to poison, is regarded as the greatest enemy of poison snakes. This is a bird mostly found in the west of the Himalaya Mountains, 15 or 16 inches in length, with dark brown wings and back, a pale-indigo tail, red legs and beak, and pale-indigo breast with dark brown spots in it. The scientific term for it is *Ferdix chukor Gray*.⁽⁴⁴¹⁾ GRAY's plates contain a life-size sketch.⁽⁴⁴²⁾ The alleged resemblance of the Fu-lin bird with the goose is perhaps because the speaker is referring to the *cakora*. The *T'ang-sung-pai-k'ung-liu-t'ieh* 唐宋白孔六帖 quoting the *Yu-yang-tsa-tsu* 酉陽雜俎 says: "Prince LI Wēi says: 'A goose warns off a devil',"⁽⁴⁴³⁾ which the *Ku-chin-i'u-shu-chi-ch'eng* 古今圖書集成 ascribes the same expression to the *Hsü-po-wu-chi* 續博物志, and the *Tung-p'o-chih-lin* 東坡志林 contains this item: "A goose can warn off a thief. A goose can not merely warn off a thief, but also drives away a snake, because its excrement will kill a snake. The people of Shu 蜀 keep geese in their gardens and ponds. Snakes run away a long distance."⁽⁴⁴⁴⁾ What was said in India was also

- (438) M. WINTERNITZ, *Geschichte der Indischen Literatur*, III, s. 504-535, 545-547; A.B. KEITH, *History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 507.
 (439) J. CHARPENTIER, op. cit., p. 236.
 (440) M. WINTERNITZ, op. cit., III, p. 604.
 (441) T.C. JERDON, *The Birds of India*, II, 1863-1870, p. 564-567.
 (442) I.E. GRAY, *Illustrations of Indian Zoology*, I, 1830-1832, p. 1, 54.
 (443) 李衛公言, 鵝警鬼。(唐宋白孔六帖, 卷九十五, 鵝)
 (444) 鵝能警盜,鵝不獨能警盜, 亦能却蛇。其糞蓋殺蛇。蜀人園池養鵝, 蛇即遠去。(古今圖書集成, 博物彙編禽蟲典, 卷三十七, 鵝部)

believed in China concerning the goose. When the compilers of the *Fu-lin-chuan* especially said "It resembles a goose," they were certainly conscious of what was in common with the two birds. In short, I am of the opinion that the story of the poison-detecting bird beside the Fu-lin king was certainly composed of the story of the parrot which was a favorite pet with the Chinese of the T'ang period and the story of the so-called poison-detecting birds which had originated in India and been presumably diffused in Central Asia; it could not have been based on the real facts of the East Roman Empire or the Roman Orient.

In the foregoing, I have exhausted my view on nearly every thing that demands explanations in the first half of the *Fu-lin-chuan*. Only, there is this question as to whether the account to the effect that in Fu-lin-kuo twelve noble men together administered the affairs of state, referred to the administration of the East Roman Empire by the governor of the twelve Dioecesis as PAUTHIER⁽⁴⁴⁵⁾ and YULE⁽⁴⁴⁶⁾ have argued, or whether it was analogized by the twelve *mu* 牧 (governors) recorded in *Shun-tien* 舜典 of the *Shu-ching* 書經. This could be explained in either way. As the *Fu-lin-chuan*, however, contains some items on the realities of the Roman Orient, I would rather support the former interpretation. As to the account of *yang-kao* 羊羔 (sheep and lambs) in the *Fu-lin-chuan*, I have already offered my explanation, so I will make no further remarks.

In short, the *Fu-lin-chuan* in the *Chiu-t'ang-shu* is a document based on the identical historical data with the *Tang-hui-yao*, and one of the basic materials on Fu-lin-kuo during the T'ang period, along with the *Wang-wu-t'ieh-chu-kuo-chuan* 往五天竺國傳 and the *Ching-hsing-chi* 經行記. It is composed of two parts: selections from previous historical works on Ta-ch'in-kuo and new facts obtained in the T'ang period. Of the new facts, there are several classes: (1) those which could not be explained away unless Fu-lin-kuo be taken as referring to the Syria area; (2) those which could not be explained away unless it referred to the East Roman Empire with Constantinople as its centre; (3) those which could be explained away by either theory; and (4) those which could be explained away by neither theory. That is, (1) the Fu-lin capital conquered by Mo-i 摩曳 (Muawiya), the great General of Ta-shih, must be located somewhere in the Syria area; (2) the capital facing the sea on the south and surrounded by exceedingly high and precipitous stone ramparts could only be identified with Constantinople. And the area of the country which extended over 10,000 square *li*, the king's costume and the fact that the whole country was divided into twelve provinces and governed by twelve noble men, and that those who had large properties were appointed to high positions,—all these were descriptions of realities in the East Roman

(445) J.P.G. PAUTHIER, *De l'authenticité.*, p. 43, note 1.

(446) H. YULE, *Cathay*², I, p. 47, note 1.

Empire; however, (3) that Fu-lin-kuo was on the west sea and adjoined Persia on the southeast, and had over 100,000 households—all these could be attributed to Syria or Asia Minor. And the men of the country had their hair clipped and wore the *toga* with their shoulders bared, and the women never had their necks open,—all these were certainly descriptions of the manners and customs of the Roman, but as well those of the Roman in Syria or in Constantinople; but contrarily (4) the existence of a great gate rising over 20 *chang* 丈 on the east of the capital, adorned with gold from top to bottom and brilliantly glittering for several *li*, the presence of three gates outside the king's palace, and the installation in the second gate of a curious clock which tolled the hours, and the existence of homes provided with a special cooling system in the hot season—these could be attributed neither to Antiochia nor Constantinople. Now this account might be considered as reflecting the fact that the East Gate in Antiochia commanded the sole strategic point between the city and the exterior world, and the Golden Gate was in the west ramparts in Constantinople. Still I am of the opinion that the writers' keeping his mind on the actual conditions in Ch'ang-an, the capital of the T'ang Dynasty, exaggerated them to a considerable extent. Ch'ang-an, being provided with three ramparts,—Kung-ch'êng 宮城, Huang-ch'êng 皇城 and Ching-ch'êng 京城, when one came from the outside in order to reach the palace, he had to pass three gates no matter from which direction he came. Above all, the Ch'un-ming Gate 春明門 at the middle of the east rampart was the gate which anybody coming from Central China had to go through, and around the Ch'un-ming Gate and the street running west from it to the front of the Huang-ch'êng 皇城, the traffic was heavier than any other place in all Ch'ang-an. Probably this was the reason why in the *Fu-lin-chuan* was this east gate of the capital especially picked up. The Ch'êng-t'ien Gate 承天門, the gate in front of the Kung-ch'êng 宮城, was provided with a drum-tower which tolled the hour from morning to night, and in the mansions of the nobilities and in the interior of the Court there were installed cooling rooms called Tzū-yü-t'ing 自雨亭 or Liang-tien 涼殿. All these formed cardinal points in describing the capital of Fu-lin-kuo. Now, according to the notes on Shang-tu 上都 (capital city) in the *Ti-li-chih* 地理志 in the *T'ang-shu* (Vol 37), the outermost of wall Ching-ch'êng 京城 of Ch'ang-an was 18 feet in height, and even the rampart of Kung-ch'êng 宮城, the innermost section, was 35 ft. in height; therefore the height of the Ch'un-ming Gate 春明門 could not be supposed to have exceeded 30 ft. at most. To say that the East Gate of Fu-lin Castle was over 200 ft. in height was certainly an absurd exaggeration. As for the story of the green bird which sat by the King and by screeching warned off poison, the compilers of the *Fu-lin-chuan*, for the purpose of eliciting the curiosity of the reader, adding their own observations of the parrot to the story of the Poison-Detecting Birds which had originated in India, created this story of the Fu-lin bird. In my previous paper entitled "*Chinese Ideas Reflected in the Ta-ch'in Accounts*"

in which I fully dwelt on the idea that the account on the *Ta-ch'in-chuan* in the historical works of the Han and Wêi Dynasties consisted of the actual information concerning the Roman Orient which is considerably coloured by the traditions of Yao 堯 and Shun 舜 and the spirit of Confucianism; and the compiler's purpose was to satisfy their own vain glory by regarding this land as a tributary province of China, to report of the fact that there was an ideal land in the West no less perfect than China, thereby to cater for the popular belief that there existed an earthly paradise in the Far East and in the Far West of the world. At the beginning of this present paper, I have explained how the *Ta-ch'in-kuo* of the Northern and Southern Dynasties period had become nothing but an image projected on the white screen as the tendency reached its climax in the *Ta-ch'in-chuan* of the *Pêi-shih* and the *Wêi-shu*. The *Fu-lin-kuo* of the T'ang period, which superseded the *Ta-ch'in* of the previous days, was another ideal land—a composite emdodiment of the city life and the curious things which the Chinese of the T'ang period observed in Ch'ang-an, and of the stories about the actual conditions of Constantinople and the Syria area, and of the material adopted from the *Ta-ch'in-chuan* in the previous historical works. The difference between the *Ta-ch'in-chuan* and *Fu-lin-chuan* is that colouring in the former is chiefly conceptual, while what is added to the latter is mostly based on realities.

Before closing I may add a word on the record given towards the end of the *Fu-lin-chuan* concerning the tribute which *Fu-lin-kuo* paid to the T'ang Court. According to this, the tribute paying by the *Fu-lin* king dated from the 17th year of *Chên-kuan* 貞觀 (A.D. 643); it was repeated in the following years: the 2nd year of *Ch'ien-fêng* 乾封 (A.D. 667), the 1st year of *Ta-tsu* 天足 (A.D. 701), and the 7th year of *K'ai-yüan* 開元 (A.D. 719): and in the last twice in the 1st month and the 4th month. Apart from these, the *Ts'ê-fu-yüan-kuei* 冊府元龜 (970–971) says that *Fu-lin-kuo* paid tribute in the 12th month, the 2nd year of *Ching-yün* 景雲 (A.D. 711) under the Emperor Jui-tsung 睿宗 and in the 5th month, the 1st year of *T'ien-pao* 天寶 (A.D. 742) under the Emperor Hsüan-tsung 玄宗. So it follows that so far as the extant records go, *Fu-lin* paid tribute at least seven times to the T'ang Court. It is recorded that in the 17th year of *Chên-kuan* a king name Po-to-li 波多力 paid tribute, and in the 4th month, the 7th year of *K'ai-yüan* and in the 5th month, the 1st year of *T'ien-pao* a high priest visited the Court at the request of the king and in the 1st month, the 7th year of *K'ai-yüan*, the great chief of Tokhara 吐火羅 was dispatched to the Court. However, the Syria area had completely become a province of Arabia after A.D. 640 and since no Western record says that the Emperor of the East Roman Empire communicated with the T'ang Court, it cannot be understood that the Governor of Syria or the Emperor of the East Roman Empire did this. KLAPROTH, however, identifies this *Fu-lin* King Po-to-li 波多力 with Theodorus, the younger brother to the Emperor Heraclius of the East Roman Empire, while CHAVANNES interprets

Po-to-li 波多力 as a misspelling for Po-hsi-li 波悉力 which is a transliteration of βασιλεύς, the Greek title for the East Roman Emperor. Neither could be called well-grounded. Again, PAUTHIER⁽⁴⁴⁷⁾ identifies Po-to-li 波多力 with Pope Theodorus himself who accended to papacy in A.D. 642. There is no positive evidence for this, either. After all, HIRTH is most probably right in ascribing Po-to-li 波多力 to *Patriarch*, the title for the Nestorian Pope.⁽⁴⁴⁸⁾ HIRTH, for the original pronunciation of Po-to-li 波多力, assigns the Persian and the Arabian *bat̄rīq* (pl. *bat̄ārīq*) which is equivalent to *Patriarch*. He could not be wide of the mark, in saying that this Po-to-li 波多力 was none but the head of the Nestorian Cathedral at Ktesiphon.⁽⁴⁴⁹⁾ The fact that the Fu-lin king sent the high priest twice is an evidence that the king was not a layman, and the reason why he sent the great chief of Tokhara was probably because the present Balkh was under the Patriarch's dominion and a Nestorian centre. The inscription on the Nestorian Epitaph says that the Nestorian priest, I-sšū 伊斯 the great donator for erecting that monument came to Chung-hsia 中夏 (China) from the distant Wang-shê-ch'êng 王舍城. He must be the very person mentioned an *Izd-buzid* in the Syriac in the inscription which reads: "In the 1092nd year of the Greek calendar, the priest *Izd-buzid* who was son of the late Priest Milis, a man from Balkh in Tuhuristan, Hsiang-chu-chiao 鄉主教 (the country-bishop) of Khumdan, the Capital, has erected this monument".⁽⁴⁵⁰⁾ That Balkh was called Hsiao-wang-shê-ch'êng 小王舍城 is evident from a passage in the *Ta-t'ang-hsi-yü-chi* by Hsüan-chuang 玄奘 which reads:

"The Fu-ho-kuo 縛喝國 (Balkh) is over 8000 *li* east and west, over 400 *li* north and south, facing Fu-ch'ü 縛芻 (the Waksu, Waχšu) river on the north. The great capital of the country is over 20 *li* in circumference. All people call it Hsiao-wang-shê-ch'êng 小王舍城."⁽⁴⁵¹⁾ That Buddhism was prospering in Balkh may be seen from this, and that the Nestorian high priest came from this place to China show that Nestorianism was in a fair way there. Why, then, was the Nestorian high priest called the Fu-lin King? Nobody has been able to answer this question satisfactorily. Fu-lin in this case was probably used in a sense somewhat like the Nestorian world,—as a general term for the land where Nestorianism prevailed. That Nestorianism was the religion of Fu-lin-kuo is distinctly stated in the Nestorian Scriptures of the T'ang period; hence it was no wonder if the head of the religion should be called the King of Fu-lin. Therefore, the term Fu-lin-kuo in this case must be interpreted as that of a nature entirely different from the

(447) PAUTHIER, *De l'authenticité.*, p. 48, note 1.

(448) HIRTH, *China and the Roman Orient*, p. 293-295.

(449) do., *The Mystery of Fu-lin*, J.A.O.S. XXX, 1910, p. 14-15; XXXIII, 1913, p. 199.

(450) J. ER. HELLER, *Nestorianische Denkmäl.*, p. 36; A.C. MOULL, *Christians in China.*, p. 48.

(451) 縛喝國，東西八百餘里，南北四百餘里。北臨縛芻河。國大都城，周二十餘里。人皆謂之小王舍城也。

other Fu-lin-kuo. According to the Nestorian Epitaph, beginning with the arrival of A-lo-pên 阿羅本 in China in the 9th year of *Chên-kuan*, on several occasions Nestorian priests came to China during the T'ang period and preached the faith. Despite the fact, most of them are not entered into the official histories. This may be due to negligence on the part of the official histories, or the fact that these priests did not come at the request of the Pope to pay tribute to the Court. Be that as it may, it may be considered that up to the 5th year of *Hui-ch'ang* 會昌 when the persecution of Buddhism took place, comings and goings of Nestorian priests had been quite frequent. Why was it then that the Fu-lin king discontinued to pay tribute to the T'ang Court after that 1st year of *T'ien-pao* (A.D. 742)? May I not say that, by the Caliph's order, the Nestorian Cathedral at Ktesiphon in A.D. 762 was transferred to Baghdad, the capital of the Saracen Empire, and placed under the supervision of the Caliph; and consequently, for some reason or other, the political communication with the T'ang Court came to be forbidden? Here I close in some doubt, but expectant of further enlightenment in the future.

