

A Study on Su-t'ê (粟特), or Sogdiana.

by

KURAKICHI SHIRATORI

INTRODUCTION

That portion of Central Asia which is generally called Russian Turkestan, and is roughly circumscribed by the Caspian Sea on the west, by the Sir-Darya on the north, and by the Pamirs and the Hindu Kush on the east and south, is a geographical division marking itself out with fair distinctness. It occupies the heart of the continent and commands the highways of inland communication, and no wonder it has played an important part in oriental history through all ages. Yet a little observation of its soil and physical formation will show that there are but a few tracts within its extensive area that might have ever afforded opportunity for civilized life or any polity to speak of. We can distinguish barely five such, namely: that part of the lower Oxus basin which is now covered by Khiya Khanate; the land which extends from the middle course of the river to the edge of the Pamirs, forming the northern section of the present Afghanistan and corresponding with medieval Toxaristan; the valleys of the Zarafšan and the Kaška, approximately fitting with Božara Khanate to-day; that part of the Jaxartes basin from Khodjend eastwards which is now Ferghāna; and lastly the lower basin of the Murgab, that is Merv.

Towns and villages are very scarce in Turkestan considering its vast area, and this is because it lies in deserts for the most part, the rest being those few districts watered by the streams from the eastern and southern mountains, and which are all that is arable. If we compare the whole of the sandy region to an ocean, Khiya and Merv will be islands in the midst of it; and Božara Khanate, a peninsula projecting from the Pamirs, being itself nearly hemmed in on either side by lofty ridges. On the north we see the Kizil Kum spreading along the Jaxartes into Ferghāna; and on the south, the Kara Kum, bordering on the Oxus and penetrating the interior of Toxaristan. Ferghāna and Toxaristan, though not altogether barren, yet are only productive so far as watered by the numerous streams and rivulets from the mountains surrounding each, and where that advantage fails, they are no better than deserts. To our imagined ocean, they are rather bays or inlets. This

view will give us some notion of how those districts in historical ages were circumstanced regarding mutual intercourse between them. They were cut off from each other by sandy wastes as completely as if by high steep mountains. From this it may be easily expected that the populations of those localities, if subjected to the same rule, would be bound to differentiate in custom and speech in the long run, or if unified under one government, would still necessitate the handling of each as an independent element.

It is not to be supposed that outside of those few districts fit at all for agriculture and town-building, the region was altogether uninhabited. The deserts harboured nomadic savages, who would lose no opportunity to fall on the towns and villages for plunder, just as pirates from their island homes would swoop down upon the coast. The mountain valleys on the east and south, too, were inhabited by many wild tribes, whose sudden raids must have been a constant menace to the life and property of the settled peoples. Neither at the present time is that part of Central Asia entirely rid of such danger. Thus here was another cause which hindered the intercourse between those more favoured climes and communities within that historic region.

Such is the topographical outlook of Russian Turkestan, and since it is a universal law that history is governed by geography, we can guess to some extent how the region fared in the past ages. In spite of being situated at the centre of the continent, however, it was so far away from headquarters of ancient civilization like Babylonia and Assyria that their antique literature bears no record of it, and in consequence its earliest history is entirely unknown. Yet it was the cradle of the Iranian race, and there are a number of place-names about the land which found their way into the Avesta, having lingered in traditions and legends with the racial cults and beliefs. For example, Quairisām discovered in the scripture, being equivalent to Uwarazmia on the Behistun monument of Darius, Uvarazmiya in the Persepolis, Uvrazmis in the Nakš-i-Rustam inscription, and also to *Ḥorasmiya* of Herodotus, is what was later called *Ḥorazm*, or *Khiva* in our days. *Mōuru* found in the same book agrees with *Margiana* in Greek writings and with modern *Merv*. *Sughda*, also mentioned there, is comparable with *Sugude* in the Behistun, *Sugda* in the Persepolis, *Suguda* in the Nakš-i-Rustam inscription, and with *Soghdo* of Herodotus, all the names referring to the land which broadly corresponded with the present *Boḫāra* Khanate. There is also *Bayḏi*, which was without doubt identical with *Bactris* as on the three above-mentioned monuments, and with *Bactria* of Herodotus, corresponding with medieval *Toḫaristan*. As for *Ferg-hāna*, it does not seem to occur any more in the Avesta than in Greek writings. A few years ago I ventured in my "Study of *Ta-wan*" to suggest that the name *Tapura* we saw on Ptolemaeus's map might have pertained to a people who inhabited that particular district. It is very possible, at any rate, that the land in question had no name of its own at the epoch of Darius, perhaps

because it was then merely part of Sogdiana, or because it was abandoned to the nomadic tribes from the surrounding mountains.

It seems undeniable that this quarter of Asia was in some communication with China even before the Han period; there are certain elements of Chinese civilization which necessitate that inference. True, Chinese history previous to that dynasty records no place-names belonging to that region beyond the Pamirs, but this was perhaps only because the earlier intercourse was indirect, or if ever direct, anything but frequent. It was when Čang K'ien returned from his famous travels that China began to know anything definite about the far west, and thenceforth more information was obtained through the medium of embassies sent and received, military expeditions, and travels of merchants and scholastic pilgrims. The successive governments were always attentive to foreign communication in that direction, and thus every dynastic history from the Han period downwards included a special chapter titled *Hsi-yü-čuan* (西域傳, History of the Western Region), which was in fact a compendium of intelligence regarding the western countries. It need hardly be said that they furnish very valuable materials for the students of the ancient history of Central Asia, there being many old countries and peoples there which one could never hope to identify without bringing together evidences from both eastern and western sources.

By what name, then, did Chinese history call each of the districts selected as above in Turkestan? That Ta-hsia (大夏) found in the Han to Čin annals meant Bactria is a fairly well acknowledged fact, though it is not yet ascertained from what original name it was transcribed. Po-čih (薄知) used for the same country in the *Hsi-yü-čuan* of the *Wei-šu* (魏書) is without doubt the transliteration of Baḡdi, which name was thus known to China as early as the Northern and Southern dynasties. Xwarizm had its reproduction in the *T'ang-šu* (唐書), abridged as Huo-hsin (火尋) and Kuo-li (過利), and also in full as Huo-li-hsi-mi (貨利習彌); while Hu-ssü-mi (呼似密) in the *Hsi-yü-čuan* of the *Wei-šu* may be regarded as another transcription of the same original, evidence that the Wei dynasty was cognizant of that country. It was probably even known in the Han period, too, for the *Ta-wan-čuan* of the *Ših-č'i* (史記) mentions Huan-č'ien (驩潛), which we may assume to be a contracted transcription of Xwarizm, no less than were Huo-hsün and Kuo-li. Then the name Mu-lu (木鹿) mentioned in the *Hsi-yü-čuan* of the *Hou-han-šu* (後漢書) must have referred, as Hirth suggested, to what is Merv nowadays, indication that the Han historian knew the place by its old name *Mōwuru*. Scholars are not agreed as to the etymology of *Ta-wan*, the name applied in Chinese history to Ferghāna, as observed above, yet there is no doubt that P'olo-na (破洛那) and P'ohan (鑿汗) on record from the Northern and Southern dynasties downwards were phonetic reproductions of Ferghāna.

After we have seen that four of those five districts in Russian Turkestan

are represented in old Chinese history, it must seem very remarkable that Sughda has left no mark there. This absence appears more curious when we remember that Sughda was a land of great historical significance. As may be gathered from the Avesta, it was the first abode of the Iranians after leaving their very cradle in Aryana Vajjo. It was there that they imbibed the spirit of Zoroastrianism and offered the longest resistance to the encroaching influence of Buddhism, Christianity, and Islam. Remember also what an important position the land held in continental intercourse, and how its leading cities, such as Samarkand, Boḡāra, and Kešš were recognized by Chinese historians as early as the Northern and Southern dynasties. Certainly it is very improbable that old China knew nothing of Sughda itself, so well-known a name in the western region. The fact may be that the name really is recorded somewhere in Chinese annals, though never yet identified,—it was this idea that led me to an attempt to discover that missing name, and after carrying researches through all available literature with this object in view, I believe I have been able to attain what I sought. The following chapters embody the results of my investigation.

CHAPTER I

K'ang-kü Distinguished from Sogdiana.

It has been the practice with many western sinologues to connect every mention of K'ang-kü found in Chinese history with Sogdiana, no matter to what particular period the record belonged. They have always been too ready to accept what such later histories as the *Sui-šu* (隋書) and the *T'ang-šu*, said about it, and do not seem to have given due regard to the accounts of it in the *Ših-č'i* and the *Han-šu* (漢書), both of which dealt with the periods in which the western state in question was existent. The result is that they regard Sogdiana as the home of the K'ang-kü people, but let us see if that theory will stand before the following passage from the *Ta-wan-č'uan* of the *Ših-č'i*: “K'ang-kü (康居), situated about 2,000 *li* north-west of Ta-wan, is an itinerant country (行國). The popular customs are the same as those of the Ta-yüeh-ših (大月氏). There are 8,000 to 9,000 archers. The land is contiguous with Ta-wan, and they are subject to the Yüeh-ših on the south, and to the Hiung-nu on the east.”¹⁾ Ta-wan corresponded with Ferghāna, and going 2,000 *li* north-west from its capital, one could but reach the north of the Jaxartes. It follows that Kang-kü, which was situated thereabout, must

1) *Ših-č'i*, chap. 123, p. 2 r°, edition of Chi ku ko 汲古閣.

have been different from Sogdiana, for it is undeniable that the latter's position was to the south of the stream, and south-west of Ferghāna.

What casts further light on this question may be quoted from the *Hsi-yü-čuan* of the *Han-šü*: "The king of K'ang-kü resides in the land of Lo-yüeh-ni (樂越匿) in winter. Pei-t'ien (卑闐) City is 12,300 *li* away from Čang-an. It does not belong to the Governor-General. To reach the land of Yüeh-ni, one goes seven days on horseback. To Fan-nei (蕃內 *literally* "within the enclosure") where the monarch resides in summer, it is 9,104 *li*. The population is 600,000, with 120,000 trained soldiers. Eastwards it is 5,550 *li* to the residence of the Governor-General. The people, with the same customs as the Ta-yüeh-ših, are subject to the Hiung-nu on the east."¹⁾ K'ang-kü was an itinerant country, that is, no doubt a nomadic tribe moving about in pursuit of grass and water. Sogdiana, on the other hand, was the home of the Iranians, whose habits were agricultural and commercial, and who constituted what the *Han-šü* termed a "walled state" (城郭國). Now we learn that the K'ang-kü people changed their country from summer to winter, and the same thing is actually observed in our days in the Kasak Kirghiz pasturing on the Kirghiz steppe. The winter on that wilderness is too rigorous for animals, so that the nomads strike their tents when the weather becomes chilly, and go southwards to pasture in a milder climate. The most suitable sort of place is the edge of water grown over with the saxaul bush, and for this reason the shore of the Sir Darya is mostly preferred.²⁾ It seems very probable the same was the case with the old K'ang-kü tribe, and if so, their winter home called *Lo-yüeh-ni* may well correspond to the Kasaks' *Kislak*, and the summer abode *Fan-nei* to the Kasaks' *Yailak*. Both the Han histories thus combine to suggest that the K'ang-kü people were one with the Kasak Kirghiz in their geographical position and habits of life.

The manners and customs of a people are often considerably affected by their geographical surroundings, and though we admit the coincidence between the mode of life of the old K'ang-kü and that of the Kasak, it might be hasty to conclude at once that the former belonged to the Turkish stock as do the latter. But the question of racial identity in this case can be approached from the etymological side too. The characters forming the name 康居, pronounced *K'ang-kü* in the current Chinese, probably sounded much the same in the Han period too. Now what suggests itself as most comparable with this name in sound is *Kängäres*, the Turkish tribe recorded on the T'u-čüeh (突厥) monument³⁾. This is a term to be further associated with *Kenger* mentioned by VÁMBÉRY as a Turkish people inhabiting the Russian province of Trans-Kaukasus, and with *Köngör* of the Tekke Turkoman family in Central

1) Chap. 96 a., p. 10 v°.

2) SCHWARZ, Turkestan, pp. 82-83.

3) Das Türkenvolk, pp. 572, 576.

Asia, and also with *Kengerlu*, the Turkish tribe found in the district of Kōkčai Kuba as well as in the territory of Teheran.¹⁾ We read, on the other hand, in Ibn Xordādhbih's account of the Saihun River that it was once called *Kankar*, down below the upper limit of the land of Čač; in other words, the Jaxartes, below modern Taškend, was named *Kankar*, and it was not improbable because the lower basin of the stream was occupied by a people of that name. Among many analogous instances in this part of Asia there is that of the Sir Darya which owed its medieval name Čač to the country of Čač, of which it formed the southern boundary. About the same period, too, the Caspian is known to have been called the Xazar Sea after the Xazar tribe who dwelt on its northern coast.

The Roman emperor Constantin Porphyrogenetus's *De Administrando Imperio* tells us that it was the three superior clans called Kangar (or Kankar) that ruled over the Pečeneg race. Tracing the movement of those Kangar-Pečeneg people, MARQUART demonstrated them to have still been holding the lower Jaxartes basin and the coast of the Aral Sea in the 8th century.²⁾ Since racial migration in Central Asia tended as a rule in the westerly direction from very ancient to comparatively recent times, we may reasonably suppose that the Kangar previously had lived further east, that is, their country extended from the middle course of the Sir Darya northwards to the Kirghiz steppe. This gives rise to the suggestion that the K'ang-kü were the Kangar themselves, and therefore that the Turkish descent already recognized for the Pečeneg will also be set down for the K'ang-kü.

The K'ang-kü, as known in the Han period, we may assume, were none other than the ancestors of those Pečeneg intruders into Eastern Europe who left such a warlike record in history from the 9th to the 10th century, and if so, the name *K'ang-kü* may be safely decided to be Turkish in origin. TOMASCHEK proposed to interpret it as an Iranian word, but in doing so, he was unmistakably biased by the notion that the home of the K'ang-kü was Sogdiana.³⁾ VÁMBÉRY compared it with the Uigur *käng* and the Čagatai *kän*, both of which meant "extensive";⁴⁾ while Abulgazi compared *käng* of Kangar to the Turkish *kang*, which denoted a carriage. But certainly those suggestions had no more ground than phonetic resemblance. So far as identity is admitted between *K'ang-kü* and *Kangar*, we may say that the question of the etymology of *K'ang-kü* was settled by the Emperor Constantin, when he remarked that *Kangar* was a Pečeneg word with the sense of "valour" and "nobility." This was no idle interpretation, seeing that "prowess" is *kongar* in Čagatai and *kingir* in Osman speech. Besides, it has been pointed out that

1) MARQUART, Die Chronologie der alttürkischen Inschriften, p. 5.

2) Die Chronologie, p. 10.

3) Die Centralasiatische Studien, I, p. 135.

4) Ursprung der Magyaren, p. 109.

there are certain Turkish tribes in Central Asia bearing such names as Kängäres, Köngör, and Kenger. We may now safely conclude that K'ang-kü in Chinese history was the transcription of Kangar, which was the Pečeneg tribe name with the original significance of "prowess" or "nobility."

As regards the name *Pei-t'ien*, mentioned in the *Han-šü* apparently as the capital of K'ang-kü, its etymology is not to be explained with much certainty, though the characters in it were most likely pronounced then much the same as in modern times, that is *Pei-t'ien*. After we have seen, however, reason to believe that the K'ang-kü people were the Kangar themselves, and therefore the ruling part of the Pečeneg race, it is not impossible that the name of their capital had some phonetic relation with *Pečeneg*. The latter name was also written *Bečenek* by the Arabs, *Patsinakitai* by the Greeks, *Pečeneg* by the Russians, and *Besenyö* by the Magyars, while VÁMBÉRY compared it with the Osman-Azerbaizan word *bažinak*, "brother-in-law."¹⁾ But his case was not sufficiently proved, and on the other hand, the name rather reminds us of the Čagatai *bičin* and the Osman *bizan*, both of which meant "castle."²⁾ I think these are more comparable with the name of the K'ang-kü city *Pei-t'ien* (or perhaps *Pi-ten*), and this granted, it will seem possible that the name Pečeneg had its origin in the same city.

We learn from the *Han-šü* that the land where the king of K'ang-kü resided in winter, with the capital of *Pei-t'ien* in it, was called *Lo-yüeh-ni*. This name needs explanation, and we must begin with the inquiry as to how the characters 樂越匿 were pronounced in the Han period. The first character sounds *lo* in current Chinese, *lok* in Canton dialect, *lak* in Annamese, and *laku* in Japanese, while it sounded *lok* or *luk* as indicated by the annotation provided in the 册府元龜 to 樂越匿, saying "樂是來谷 by phonetic spelling." The second is pronounced *yüeh* in Chinese, *yüt* in Canton dialect, *yër* (or *yët*) in Corean, and *yetu* or *otu* in Japanese. The last character is *ni* in current pronunciation, *nik* in Canton, and *nak* in Annamese; while the transliteration of the name of the western state of Kušanik by the characters 貴霜匿 (*Kuei-šuang-ni*) indicates that it sounded either *nik* or *nak* in the T'ang period. There is, however, equal chance that its archaic sound may have been something like *tok*; for its Japanese pronunciation is *toku*, and the pronouncing dictionary *Či-yün* (集韻) says about it "phonetic spelling 暢得切 (*ték*), sounds like 忒 (*ték*)." Evidences differ so much, and it is not easy to decide which sound was proper to the Han period. In the life of Su Wu (蘇武) in the *Ših-č'i*, however, we read: "As King *Yü-kin* (於靳) liked him, he provided him with food and clothes. It was for more than three years, and during that period he fell ill three times. The king bestowed on him gifts of horses,

1) Ursprung der Magyaren, p. 112.

2) Sejx Sulejman Efendi, Čagatai-Osmanisches Wörterbuch, p. 26.

fu-ni (服匿) and tents.”¹⁾ The Chinese commentators remarked that the term *fu-ni* was a Hiung-nu word denoting a kind of pot (缶 *fou*), and our Dr. MIYAZAKI went further to compare it with the Japanese equivalent of *fou*, *hotogi* (or *fotogi*) and with the Corean equivalent *patangi*.²⁾ I may venture to add that it might also be referred to *boton* or *butun* in Mančū and Mongol languages. At all events it seems fairly clear that 服匿 (*fu-ni*) was transcribed from the Hiung-nu word *butok*, which meant the same thing, and this makes us suspect that the character 匿 was pronounced *ték*, *tök* in the Han period rather than *ník* or *nak*. The whole term spelt 樂越匿, then, may quite possibly have sounded *lok-üt-tök* or *luk-öt-tök* at the time of record, and this *üt-tök* puts us in mind of the word *ottok* in Teleut speech of the Turkish family,³⁾ and *otok* in Mongol,⁴⁾ both of which signify “village.”

There are evidences to indicate that among some old western Asiatic tribes there was a kind of community designated *otok*. Describing the customs of the Ê-lu-tê (厄魯特) people in Dsungaria, the *Hsi-č'ui-tsuny-t'ung-ših-liao* (西陲總統事略) says: “Formerly, when the Ê-lu-tê were still in existence, their rule was divided among four Wei-la-tê (衛拉特) states, each of which had a Ta-t'ai-č'i (大臺吉) as its head, who was also styled *λan*. The other rulers were Hsiao-t'ai-č'i (小臺吉), whose positions were held by the kinsmen of *λans*. The liegemen of a *λan* were called Tsai-sang (宰桑). The prime minister was T'u-mo-ših (圖墨什), and next was Ča-êrh-hu-č'i (札爾扈齊), whose function was to assist the former in managing affairs. The villages subject to a *λan* were called O-t'o-k'ó (鄂拓克), and those subject to a T'ai-č'i, Ang-č'i (昂吉), which meant ‘part.’ The O-t'o-k'ó pastured around the place where a *λan* resided, and the Ang-č'i around all the O-t'o-k'ó.”⁵⁾ I may further quote from the *San-čou-č'i-liao* (三州輯略) on the same subject: “In the old system of Dsungaria, there were four Wei-la-tê states, with 24 O-t'o-k'ó (鄂拓克) and 21 Ang-č'i. The four Wei-la-tê divided the rule of the whole of Dsungaria, each headed by a Ta-t'ai-č'i, who was also styled *λan*. The other rulers were T'ai-č'i, whose positions were held by the kinsmen of *λans*. The O-t'o-k'ó were subject to a *λan* and the Ang-č'i to a T'ai-č'i. The pasture of the O-t'o-k'ó surrounded I-li (伊犁, probably the seat of a *λan*), and that of the Ang-č'i surrounded again all the O-t'o-k'ó.....‘Ang-č'i’ was a Dsungaria term meaning ‘part.’”⁶⁾ It is evident that 厄魯特 (Ê-lu-tê) and 衛拉特 (Wei-la-tê) both of them were transcriptions of *Oirat*, which meant Kalmuck Mongols as known to the western authors, and accordingly the peculiar designations above observed in connection with the people are to be explained as Mongolic words.

1) Chap. 54. p. 12 r°.

2) Šigaku-Zasshi, 17. p. 661.

3) RADLOFF, Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türkdialekte, I, p. 116.

4) KOWALEWSKI, Dictionnaire Mongol-Russe-Français, I, p. 387.

5) Chap. 12.

6) Chap. 7.

Thus O-t'ò-k'ò is identified with otok; T'ai-čì with taiži; Tsai-sang with zaisang; Ang-čì with anggi; and Ča-èrh-hu-čì with žarghučì. At first, o-t'ò-k'ò as a unit of community may seem to have been peculiar to the Mongolic people, yet it is worth notice that the "Origin and History of the Kasak" (哈薩克源流) forming another section of the *Hsi-č'ui-tsung-t'ung-ših-liao* mentions a number of Kasak village names which have the term O-t'ò-k'ò as a component. It is, moreover, remarkable that those other terms above identified with Mongol words show coincidence with Turkish words also; as: O-t'ò-k'ò with ottok, Tsai-sang with zaisan, Ča-èrh-hu-čì with žarghučì or yargučì, and T'u-mo-ših with temečì. We may take this as an indication that the political system including the o-t'ò-k'ò community was one shared by the Turks and the Mongols. Again there is this significant circumstance, that of all the Mongolic tribes the Wei-la-tê were the only people in connection with whom that particular system was so minutely mentioned in history, and moreover that they were the nearest Mongolic neighbours of the Turks. It is very possible, then, that the system rather originated with the Turks, and was merely adopted by the Wei-la-tê. After these observations, there seems to be more reason to assume that the K'ang-kü were a Turkish tribe, the name of their place, *Luk-öt-tök*, being referable to the Teleut Turkish word *ottok*.

The last part of the name 樂越匿 having been identified with the Turkish *ottok*, we may reasonably imagine that the initial character 樂 (*luk* or *lok*) was transcribed from some Turkish attributive, may be *ulu* or *ulug*, which meant "great." We know how often Chinese transliterations of foreign names have dropped an initial vowel; for example, the Sanscrit *Arahat* is reduced to *la-šan* (羅漢); the Khitan *atirkan* to *tê-èrh-kien* (忒兒蹇); and the T'u-čüeh *Āštemi* to *Sê-ti-mi* (瑟帝迷). In the same manner the Turkish word *ulug* may easily have lost the initial *u* in transcription and been shortened to *lug*. If so, the whole term *Luk-öt-tök* must have been equivalent to "major ottok," signifying the population directly subject to the K'ang-kü master and the land occupied by them. The *K'ang-kü-čuan* of the *Han-šü* shows that besides the sovereign monarch, there were over the tribe five petty kings who were subordinate to him, and this presents a parallel to the coexistence of major and minor T'ai-čì, as observed in the case of Dsungaria. As in the latter country the village communities under the supreme ruler were O-t'ò-k'ò and those under the inferior masters were Ang-čì, so among the K'ang-kü the former class of people may well have been called "great ottok," and the latter simply "ottok." The name of the land where the K'ang-kü king resided, *Luk-öt-tök*, thus interpreted, will suggest how old that community system was, and at the same time confirm the Turkish descent of the K'ang-kü people.

There is still another ground on which it may be proposed that the

language of the K'ang-kü was Turkish. The *K'ang-kü-čuan* of the *Čin-šu* (晉書) mentions a king of the K'ang-kü who sent tribute to the Chinese court under the name of Na-bi (那鼻). This is a term comparable to the Wu-sun (烏孫) word which was transcribed as 泥靡, whose pronunciation in the Han period was most likely *nai-bi*; for the current Canton sound of the character 泥 is *nai*, while we find on record several names connected with Wu-sun kings which terminated with the character 靡, whose pronunciation, though *mi* at present, is admitted to have been *bi* in the Han times. Now *bi* was a Turkish title borne by chiefs and that this use of the word was not confined to the Wu-sun people is clear from what the T'ang scholar Yen Ših-ku (顏師古) says commenting on the name of a Ta-wan general found in the *Han-šu*: "In Ta-wan, noblemen who showed themselves brave generals were styled *Čien-mi* (煎靡)." There can be little doubt that the second component of the title was the Turkish *bi* itself. As for the first character *čien*, I once compared it with the T'u-čüeh *šöngüis*, the Čagatai *ženäl*, the Osman *ženk*, the Uigur *šugus*, and the Kuznezsk *sag*, all of which signified "war." But now I think it may be more properly connected with the Persian word for "battle," *ženg*; the Osman and Krim-Tartar word *ženk*, which has the same sense, being assumable as an adaptation from the Persian original. This will appear more probable in view of the Ta-wan people being of the Iranian race, which is a fact to be inferred from this statement in the *Sih-čü*: "From Ta-wan westwards to An-hsi (安息), the several peoples, though considerably diversified in speech, follow similar customs and can understand each other's talk. They have all of them deep-set eyes and are thickly bearded."¹⁾

After the considerations that the K'ang-kü in the Han period inhabited the Kirghiz steppe to the north of the Jaxartes; that their mode of life resembled that of the Kasak Kirghiz now; and that their words can be interpreted as Turkish; it is a reasonable conclusion that they belonged to the Turkish stock. Needless to say, this makes the idea impossible that their home was in Sogdiana, which was obviously situated to the south of the Sir Darya and inhabited by the Iranians, not by the Turks.

CHAPTER II

The Seats of the Five Petty Kings of K'ang-kü.

So far we have seen reason to assign the home of the K'ang-kü to the north of the Sir Darya, but this does not deny the possibility that their

1) Chap. 123, p. 7 r°.

dominion may have covered the other side of the river, including Sogdiana, and there is even an indication that such was the case. The *Han-šu*, while describing the Čang K'ien's travels, says: "Ta-wan gave consent to K'ien and despatched stage horses for him. The road led to the K'ang-kü, who then forwarded him by relays to the Ta-yüeh-ših."¹⁾ The capital of Ta-wan recorded as Kuei-šan (貴山) City corresponds with modern Kasan, while the court of the Ta-yüeh-ših is shown to have been north of the Oxus and to the south of the Iron Gate, and therefore situated in medieval Termid. To reach the place of the Ta-yüeh-ših from Ta-wan, the ancient traveller must naturally have gone first westwards through Xožend and Ura-tüpü to the pass of Tamerlan, whence turning south, he must have passed through Samarkand and Kešš, and then proceeded still further south until he came to the northern shore of the Oxus. It is clear this route passed through Sogdiana in its middle course, and it must have been in this district that the K'ang-kü people had anything to do with the Chinese explorer on his way to the Ta-yüeh-ših. We do not see why they should have done so unless the land was occupied by them at that period. It will be appropriate to conclude, therefore, that while the K'ang-kü had their proper home further north, their territory extended so far south as to include Sogdiana.

After the above observation of the relation of Sogdiana to the K'ang-kü people, it will not be surprising to see some cities in this district marked as previous seats of feudal lords of the K'ang-kü race. At any rate, the compilers of the *T'ang-šu* fixed here the sites of three of those old cities of five petty kings of the K'ang-kü mentioned in the Han chronicle. The Han record reads as follows: "The first is King of Su-hsieh (蘇隴), residing at Su-hsieh City, 5,776 *li* from the seat of the Governor-General, and 8,025 *li* from Yang-kuan (陽關); the second, King of Fu-mo (附墨), in Fu-mo City, 5,767 *li* from the Governor-General, and 8,025 *li* from Yang-kuan; the third, King of Yü-ni (罽匿) in Yü-ni City, 5,266 *li* from the Governor-General and 7,525 *li* from Yang-kuan; the fourth, King of Či (罽), in Či City, 6,296 *li* from the Governor-General and 8,055 *li* from Yang-kuan; and the fifth, King of Ao-čien (奧鞬) in Ao-čien City, 6,906 *li* from the Governor-General and 8,355 *li* from Yang-kuan; all the five kings belonging to the K'ang-kü."²⁾ From this text itself there is no ascertaining the whereabouts of the cities, in spite of all the definite statements of distance. Yet it seems the T'ang historians managed somehow to assign the site of each in some country or other which was recognized in their own times. Thus the first city was connected with the state of Č'ü-ša (佐沙), as we read in this passage: "Ših (史), also called Č'ü-ša and Čieh-šuang-na (鷓霜那)

1) Chap. 61, p. 1 v°.

2) Chap. 96 a, p. 10 v° -11 r°.

lies to the south of the Tu-mo (獨莫) stream. It is the site of Su-hsieh (蘇薤) City of the petty king of the K'ang-kü."¹⁾ It goes without saying that Č'ü-ša was Kešš of the Arabs, and what is now Šahr-i Sabz. The history goes on to assign Fu-mo City to Č'ü-šuang-ni-čia (屈霜你迦), Kušāniya of the Arabs and Kušanik of the Iranians, lying west of Samarkand; Yü-ni City to Čè-sé (柘折), the Arabian Čač and the Persian Šaš, and modern Taškend; Či City to *Pu-huo* (布豁), apparently corresponding with Božāra; and lastly Ao-čien City to *Huo-hsin* (火尋) or *Huo-li-hsi-mi* (貨利習彌), which was *χwārizm* or what is nowadays Khiva. It will seem from this passage of the *T'ang-šu* that of the five cities belonging to K'ang-kü petty kings, one was at Taškend, another at Khiva, and the rest in Sogdiana, and this might appear only natural since it is presumable Sogdiana was then in the possession of the K'ang-kü. Nevertheless there is something that makes us question whether the compilers of the history based their identification of the sites of the cities on any authentic data.

It is clear that they did not take trouble to conform with the historical facts in the Han annals. A quotation from the *Ta-wan-čuan* of the *Sih-č'i* will assist to illustrate this point. "Huan-č'ien (驩潛) and Ta-i (大益), small states west of Wan, as well as Ku-ših (姑師), Han-mi (扞婁), and Su-hsieh (蘇薤) on its east, sent each of them an envoy in company with the Han messenger, to bring gifts to the emperor and seek an audience of His Majesty."²⁾ The small state Su-hsieh mentioned above, was apparently one and the same with Su-hsieh (蘇薤) City, that seat of a petty king of the K'ang-kü. It may be remarked that this place could hardly have been due east of Ta-wan, as stated there, but more probably to its north-east or north, for Ta-wan is known to have been adjacent to Wu-sun on the east side. At any rate, we may be sure here was what should have been associated with that Su-hsieh City, but on the contrary the *T'ang-šu* identified it with Kešš, which, being south of Samarkand, was in quite a different quarter from Su-hsieh of the Han history. Then the name *Huan-č'ien* (驩潛) found in the above quotation was, alike with the *T'ang-šu* spelling *Huo-hsin* (火尋) the transcription of *χwarizm*, and *χwarizm* lay in the lower basin of the Oxus, together with Ta-i, also mentioned there. Now the Han history shows no sign of *χwarizm* having been related to the K'ang-kü, always mentioning the two in clear distinction. Here again the *T'ang-šu* ignored the ancient record, for it assigned to *χwarizm* the old Ao-čien City of a petty king of the K'ang-kü.

It is also certain that in the chronicles written from the Northern and Southern dynasties downwards there was nothing that might have been drawn

1) Chap. 221 b, p. 4 r°.

2) Chap. 123, p. 6 v°.

on by the compilers of the *T'ang-šü* for determining, as they did, the sites of the old K'ang-kü cities. True, the *Hsi-yü-čuan* of the *Sui-šü* represented some states in the northern section of Sogdiana, such as Samarkand, Maimargh, Kešš, Ištikān and Kušanik, as former K'ang-kü territories; and the southern states of Boḡara, Wu-na-ho (烏那曷), and Amol as what had been domains of An-hsi, thus giving us the impression that Sogdiana in the Han period was divided between the K'ang-kü possession in the north and that of An-hsi in the south, which seems too improbable a thing from geographical considerations.¹⁾ At any rate, however, the *T'ang-šü* did not follow the *Sui-šü*, when it described Boḡāra as the old site of the K'ang-kü city, Či (鬲). We may notice that the same district is represented in the *Wei-šü* as a former territory of the K'ang-kü, but no other states or cities in Sogdiana except Samarkand and Taškend this history connects with that people in any way. Certainly the T'ang historians had no authority in the earlier records to rely upon for determining the sites of those old cities, and so long as it is unbelievable that they had any other sources of information as to the conditions in that region during the Han period, we cannot but decide their identification was a spurious one dictated by mere fancy.

It is in the *Han-šü* alone that those five cities of the petty kings of K'ang-kü were mentioned during the Han period, the other history, *Ših-č'i*, saying nothing whatever about them, either in its *Ta-wan-čuan* or anywhere in the whole work. In all probability this was because the intelligence was not supplied by Čang K'ien, otherwise there is no reason why it should not have been recorded in the *Ših-č'i*. It is moreover remarkable that none of the names of those cities agrees with any place-name recorded by the western writers, while the Chinese explorer must have seen many famous cities in that quarter, such as Samarkand, Kešš, etc. No doubt the information was brought in at a later date, but when and under what circumstances? Most presumably it was when China came into closer contact than ever with the K'ang-kü people. Within the period from Čang K'ien's time to the close of the epoch covered by the *Han-šü*, the most likely occasion was when in the 3rd year of Čien-čao (建昭) under Yüan-ti (元帝) (36 B.C.) the Chinese general Č'en T'ang (陳湯) cooperated with the Governor-General Kan Yen-šou (甘延壽) in attacking Čih-čih Šan-yü (郅支單于) on the eastern boundary of the country of the K'ang-kü. The enemy's headquarters were Čih-čih City on the Tu-lai (都賴) Stream or the Talas, it is told, and the expedition 40,000 strong and composed of Chinese and barbarian units being divided into six battalions, three took the southern route to proceed across the Pamirs to Ferghāna, while the others advanced by the northern road through the land of Wu-sun up to the eastern boundary of K'ang-kü. China had secured

1) Chap. 83, p. 11 r°.

the alliance of fifteen kings of walled cities, but the monarch of the K'ang-kü sided with the Šan-yü, and therefore the Chinese must have found it necessary, besides reconnoitring their chief enemy, to know the internal condition of the K'ang-kü. Perhaps it was thus and then that among others those data were obtained about the people that their capital was Pei-t'ien City, that they were accustomed to change their abode from summer to winter, and that there were five cities of petty kings in their country.

From these observations it is more presumable that those five cities were all situated within the proper country of the K'ang-kü to the north of the Jaxartes, in spite of the *T'ang-šu* statement to the contrary. Its identification of Su-hsieh City with Kešš has been criticized already, but here is a more positive proof against it provided in this passage of the *Hsi-jung-čuan* (西戎傳) of the *Čin-šu*: "K'ang-kü, lying about 2,000 *li* northwest of Ta-wan is adjacent to Su-i (粟弋) and I-lieh (伊列). Its king resides at Su-hsieh City."¹⁾ *Su-i*, as will be later explained, was the transcription of *Sugduk*, while *I-lieh* meant a country on the lower course of the Ili river. It is evident from this extract that the city in question could not have been in Sogdiana, and in consequence it must needs have been somewhere within the proper home of the K'ang-kü on the other side of the river. We have indeed no materials for estimating the whereabouts of those five cities, still this fact is worth notice that the district from the north of the Sir Darya to Kara Tau now embraces such cities as Turkestan, Čimkend, Taškend, etc., while history shows that in the period from the 13th to the 14th century there were in the same quarter the thriving cities of Sairam, Otrar, Barčın, Yangikand and so forth. Attention may be turned also to the fertile tract lying to the north of the Alexander Mountains. Seeing that Čih-čih Šan-yü built his own city on the upper course of the Talas, there is ample room for supposing that some cities of the K'ang-kü may have been situated in this part of Central Asia.

CHAPTER III

Su-i (粟弋) Identified with Sogdiana.

We have already alluded to those five districts in Russian Turkestan as the only ones that were suitable at all for the establishment of anything like a state. All of them were recorded at an early date by Western authors, but Bactria and Sogdiana were particularly prominent. It might therefore

1) Chap. 97, p. 10 r°.

seem very curious that the Han annals are void of either name, but a glimpse at the contemporary history of Central Asia will explain why. For the period of about a century from the latter half of the 2nd century B.C., the conditions in this region was constantly disturbed by the inroads of northern hordes, and in consequence the barbarians of alien descent were supreme everywhere, predominating over the native Iranian inhabitants. It is very likely that these foreign people called their new territories in their own fashion rather than continuing the indigenous names; and as the Chinese envoys sent to that region must have come into contact with the ruling class in the respective countries, they must have learned and reported the substituted names. This will explain why the name *Ta-wan* occurs in the Han histories instead of *Ferghāna* for the upper Jaxartes basin, and the name *Ta-hsia* for Bactria; and why the country of Gadhāra, occupied and renamed by the Saka race coming from the north, had always appeared under the name *Ki-pin* (罽賓), the original name *Gandhāra* being late in coming on record.

It is hardly conceivable that names of such renown as *Gandhāra*, *Bactria*, and *Sogdiana* as old even as the countries themselves, should fall into permanent oblivion, however long they might be obscured for political reasons. Thus we find the name *Gandhāra* restored in Chinese records from the Čin period onwards in the transcription *Kan-ŋo-lo* (乾陞羅); and Bactria represented from its own name as *Po-čih* (薄知) in the Northern and Southern dynasties. And if we find no trace of the name *Sogdiana* whatever in Chinese literature, it is not improbable that the absence is more apparent than real.

There is a noteworthy passage in the *Hsi-yi-tšuan* of the *Hou-Han-šu* which reads: "The country of Li-i (栗弋) belongs to the K'ang-kü. It produces excellent horses, cattle, sheep, and grapes. Its water is beautiful and therefore its wine is particularly famous."¹⁾ The name of the country, reading *Li-i* in the current pronunciation and probably *lit-yok* in the archaic, has certainly nothing in itself to be associated with *Soghda* or with any of its variants. But there is a possibility of corruption in this spelling, as will be expounded later; apart from that question, however we may notice how strongly that description of the country reminds us of the land of Sogdiana. In the first place, it belonged to the K'ang-kü and as there is small doubt that it was an adjacent country to K'ang-kü, it will follow that it was situated south of K'ang-kü. For we learn from the *Ših-č'i* and the *Han-šu* that the K'ang-kü were neighboured on the east by the Wu-suns, on the northeast by the I-lieh (伊列), and on the north-west by the Yen-ts'ai (奄蔡), all nomadic tribes, while the region to the north was certainly beyond the sphere of Chinese records. Secondly, those characteristic features mentioned

1) Chap. 88, pp. 8 v°-9 r°.

of Li-i, namely; rich soil, beautiful water, and famous wine, point unmistakably to a tract south of the Sir Darya. It is a matter of history that the land of Sogdiana was a wine-producing country. "The right and left of Ta-wan make wine from grapes," remarks the *Hsi-yü-čuan* of the *Han-šü*. "The rich families store up as much as 10,000 gallons of wine. Kept several tens of years, it will not turn bad. People are as fond of wine as horses of clover (苜蓿)."¹⁾ *Ta-wan* being identical with Ferghāna, the said neighbours may have generally meant Sogdiana. The *Pei-ših* (北史) is more explicit in this respect, when it speaks of K'ang (康國), which was Samarkand itself, as will be seen, and therefore representative of all Sogdiana: "It produces quantities of wine, the richer families sometimes attaining 1,000 gallons. It keeps good for years."²⁾ Then the *T'ang-šü* in its account of K'ang, provides another allusion to its characteristic wine, saying: "The soil is rich and fit for cereals. It produces fine horses. It has stronger soldiers than other countries. The people are fond of wine."³⁾ The last, but not the least important point is the mention of "beautiful water" regarding Li-i. The well-irrigated, fertile soil of Sogdiana is often emphasized by old Greek writers on Central Asia, while the Arabian geographers were enthusiastic admirers of its landscapes with beautiful water scenes, some counting Soghd together with Biwān in Fars, Bhawtah in Damascus, and the dale of Obullah, calling them the four paradises of the world.

"Soghd is a magnificent district with the capital Samarkand," says Maqadassī. "There are continuous villages, surrounded by trees and garden, all the way from Samarkand to near Boḡāra; one sees no village before one enters it for the trees about it. It is the most beautiful land on God's earth, abounding in trees, pervaded with streams and resounding with birds' songs." Then Istachri in the same tone, as: "Soghd stretches from the border of Boḡāra, running right and left along the Wadi of Soghd, to that of Buttam, in a continuous line as long as eight days' journey. It is full of meadows, gardens, and farms, with channels and brooks running everywhere. Soghd as a whole is like a dress of green brocade, stitched in with blue veins of flowing water and adorned with the white colour of castles and houses." Nor does Radloff, the modern investigator of this part of Central Asia, fall behind in expressing wonder at its fertile soil, rich vegetation, abundant produce, and its charm of landscape, thus ascribing all those excellences to the supply of water: "And all this splendour and magnificence is owing to the water, which running like silver threads through the steppes, transforms them into a paradise. Nowhere on earth one could more clearly see the

1) Chap. 96 a, p. 12 r°.

2) Chap. 97, p. 19 v°.

3) Chap. 221 b, p. 1 r°.

benign action of water.”¹⁾ TOMASCHEK suggested the name *Sughda* was an Iranian word meaning “luminacy” and “purity,”²⁾ and most likely it was at first attached to that venerable stream to which the district owed so much of its life; just as the Greek name for the Zarafšān, *Polytimetos*, with the signification of “precious water,” reflected the high appreciation that was entertained for the river.

Now compare the statement about Li-i (栗弋) above observed in the *Hou-han-šu* with this passage of the *Hsi-jung-čuan* (西戎傳) of the *Čin-šu*: “The country of K’ang-kü, situated about 2,000 *li* north-west of Ta-wan, is adjacent to Su-i (栗弋) and I-lieh (伊列).”³⁾ It is remarkable how closely the names 栗弋 and 栗弋 resemble each other while both countries agree in the contiguity with K’ang-kü. The natural inference is that the two names were identical, it being very presumable that one form was corrupted from the other. In all probability, the *Čin-šu* form was correct, since it is provable that the characters 栗弋 were pronounced in those times *Suk-yok*, which is associated with *Sugdak* more intimately. This same form is also found in TU YU’s (杜佑) *T’ung-tien* (通典) in the passage: “*Suk-yok* communicated with the Hou Wei (後魏) dynasty. Its other name is *Su-té* (粟特).”⁴⁾ This last form will be studied in a later paragraph.

HIRTH was the first to point out the linguistic relation between *Suk-yok* and *Sugdak*. But he was preoccupied with the idea of identity between K’ang-kü and Sogdiana, and now finding that *Suk-yok* thus distinguished from K’ang-kü in history could not be well assigned together with K’ang-kü in Sogdiana, he saw fit to modify his supposed position of K’ang-kü. The result was his proposition that the country of K’ang-kü in the Čin period, though its capital Su-hsieh (蘇薤) may recall *Sugdak*, was not situated exactly in Sogdiana, but by that time had shifted southwards, so as to lie between the Zarafšān and Derbend, covering the district of Kešš.⁵⁾ This is an ingenious theory, but evidently not very tenable. To confine the country of K’ang-kü to the basin of the Kaška may serve to give room for that of *Suk-yok* in the limits of Sogdiana, but must at the same time contradict the historical statement that it adjoined I-lieh, which was Ili. In his later study “*Ueber Wolga Hunnen und Hiung-nu*,” however, he radically changed his interpretation of the name *Suk-yok*. While holding to the opinion that *Su-i* (*Suk-yok*) in the *Čin-šu*, as well as *Su-té* (粟特) in the *Wei-šu*, was the transcription of *Sugdak*, he now started the new idea that the original term in both cases did not mean Sogdiana, but a district on the northern coast of

1) Central-asiatische Studien, I, pp. 127-128.

2) Id. pp. 74-75.

3) Chap. 97, p. 10 r°.

4) Chap. 193, p. 20 r°.

5) Nachworte zur Inschrift des Tonjukuk, pp. 85-86 Anm. 2.

the Black Sea. This was returning to the old assumption that Chinese literature bore no traces of the name Sogdiana, but at any rate, we must see whether there is sufficient reason why *Suk-yok* should be placed in such a remote region on the Euxine coast.

There are some passages in the *Hsi-yü-čuan* of the *Wei-šü* and in the *I-yü-čuan* (異域傳) of the *Čou-šü* (周書) which seem to offer evidence contrary to the identification of *Suk-yok* with Sogdiana, and as these were what made Hirth retract his former theory, it will be worth while to give them close examination. The *Wei-šü* text runs as follows:

“The country of *Su-tê* (粟特) is situated west of the Pamirs. It is what was *Yen-ts'ai* (奄蔡, spelt 庵祭 in the *Pei-ših*) of old, and its other name is *Wên-na-ša* (溫那沙). It lies in extensive marshes, north-west of *K'ang-kü*, 6,000 *li* away from *Tai* (代). Previously the *Hiung-nu* killed its monarch and took the country. King *Hu-i* (忽倪) made the third generation of the reign. Merchants of this country had used to go to the country of *Liang* (涼) in numbers to trade, but on the capture of *Ku-tsang* (姑臧) were all of them taken prisoners. At the beginning of *Kao-tsung's* (高宗) reign (the *Pei-ših* puts it as ‘at the beginning of *Wên-čeng* (文成) era’), the king of *Su-tê* sent an envoy asking to be allowed to ransom the prisoners, and the emperor ordained to grant the request. Since then no envoy has ever arrived to offer tribute.”¹⁾ The *Čou-šü* statement is briefer, running: “The country of *Su-tê* is west of the Pamirs. Presumably it was *An-ts'ai* (庵蔡) of old. Its other name is *Wên-na-ša*. It lies in extensive swamps, north-west of *K'ang-kü*. In the 4th year of *Pao-ting* (保定), its monarch sent an envoy with a tribute of native products.”²⁾

The name *Su-tê* (粟特), whose old pronunciation is inferred with reason to have been *Suk-dök* or *suk-dëk*, is very likely to have corresponded with *Sughdak*. As for its relation with *Suk-yok* (粟弋), we can agree with *TU YU* in regarding the one as alternative with the other.³⁾ Although the old pronunciation of 粟弋 is generally assumed to have been *Suk-yok*, yet we can infer from the Annamese sound of the character 弋, *dok*, that the name may easily have read *Suk-dok* as well.

What was the country of *Yen-ts'ai*, the identity with which is so assumed for *Suk-dok*? It is described in some other histories. The *Hsi-yü-čuan* of the *Han-šü* says of it: “About 2,000 *li* north-west of *K'ang-kü* is the country of *Yen-ts'ai* (奄蔡). There are more than 100,000 archers. The people have the same customs as the *K'ang-kü*. The country lies in an extensive swamp, which is without limit, and which is perhaps the northern

1) Chap. 102, p. 8 v°.

2) Chap. 50, p. 8 v°-9 r°.

3) *T'ung-tien*, chap. 193, p. 20 r°.

sea.”¹⁾ Another account of it occurs in the *Hsi-yü-čuan* of the *Hou-han-šü*: “Yen-ts'ai is the country of A-lan-liao (阿蘭聊) by its renovated name. The area it occupies belongs to the K'ang-kü. The climate is mild and makes pines and *pei-ts'ao* 白草 (white grass) grow in abundance. The popular manners and costumes are like those of the K'ang-kü.”²⁾ Then in the *Wei-č'i* (魏志) we read the following quotation from the *Wei-liao* (魏略): “There is also the country of Yen-ts'ai, whose other name is A-lan (阿蘭). The customs are similar to those of the K'ang-kü. The country adjoins Ta-ts'in (大秦) on the west and K'ang-kü on the south-east. It produces famous sables. The people go pasturing in pursuit of grass and water. The land borders on extensive swamps. Formerly it was attached to the K'ang-kü, but no longer now.”³⁾ All these descriptions of Yen-ts'ai, with its other name *A-lan*, exactly answer to what the western authors recorded as Alan, a nomadic tribe inhabiting the steppe north of the Aral and the Caspian Sea, and if Suk-dok was really coincident with Yen-ts'ai, it is very plain that it could not have been Sogdiana.

It is a question, however, to what extent we can trust in the *Wei-šü* and the *Čou-šü* statement which identified Suk-dok with old Yen-ts'ai. For the two countries are provided with separate descriptions in the *Hou-han-šü*, and besides, we read in the *Ših-san-čou-čih* (十三州志): “Yen-ts'ai (奄蔡) and Suk-dok (粟特) have each of them a chief master.”⁴⁾ We may further notice that the *Wei-liao*, while giving an account of Yen-ts'ai, alias A-lan, on one hand, mentions on the other an apparently separate country whose name is highly suggestive of Suk-dok. It is in this passage of the history: “West of Liu-sha (流沙) there are the country of Ta-hsia (大夏), the country of Čien-ša (Kien-ša) (堅沙), the country of Šu-yu (屬繡), and the country of Yüeh-ti (月氏),—the four countries.”⁵⁾ Obviously Ta-hsia referred to Točāra or Bactria, and (月氏) Yüeh-ti should be regarded as a corruption of 月氏 (Yüeh-ših). As for Čien-ša, we may look over the country names recorded from the Tree Kingdom age to the T'ang dynasty and select as most similar ones these three: Č'ü-ša (佉沙, *Kašgar*) in the *Hsi-yü-č'i* (西域記) of *Hsiian-čuang*; Čia-šê (*Kia-ša*) (迦舍, Taškurgan) in the *Šui-čing-čü* (水經注); and Č'ü-ša (*Kia-ša*) (佉沙, Šahr-i-Sab) in the *T'ang-šü*. Of these, Kašgar and Taškurgan are to be dismissed as out of the question, for the *Wei-liao* represents the former as Su-lei (疏勒), while the country of Čieh-ših (竭石) mentioned in the history as a dependency of Su-lei was identical with Taškurgan, if I was not mistaken in my demonstration set forth in my “Study of

1) Chap. 96 a, p. 11 v°.

2) Chap. 88, p. 9 r°.

3) Chap. 30, p. 21 r°.

4) *Ših-san-čou-čih* (ed. of the 二酉堂叢書) p. 5 v°.

5) Chap. 30, p. 20 v°.

the Western Regions.” Then what remains to be connected with Čieh-ša is 佉沙 of the *T'ang-šu*, that is, Kešš, a country in the basin of the Kaška, south of Samarkand. It might be remarked as possible that Čien-ša was a shortened transcription of *χwarizm*, but we remember that Chinese reproductions of the name in most cases retained some trace of the final *zim*, as, for instance, Huan-č'ien (χuan-č'iem) (驩 僂) and Huo-hsin (χua-sim) (火 尋) in the *T'ang-šu*, and this consideration will decide in favour of Kešš being the country referred to. Seeing that of the four countries mentioned together in the *Wei-liao*, the three,—Ta-hsia, Yüeh-č'i, and Čieh-ša or Kešš—were situated west of the Pamirs, we may be justified in seeking to identify the fourth Šu-yu, in the same quarter. The old sound of the name 屬 緜 is admitted to have been *šuk-yo*, nevertheless from the Annamese pronunciation of the second character, *tra*, we can infer a possibility of variation, and by the analogy of the relation between *Suk-yok* and *Suk-dok* above noticed, we may be allowed to assume that the character *yo* (緜) may have sounded *do* as well, and therefore that the name of the country in question have read *Šuk-do*. Take this name together with the location roughly reckoned for this country, and it will appear highly probable that it was *Suk-dok* itself, and we may therefore safely assume that *Suk-dok* received a separate mention from Yen-ts'ai in the *Wei-liao* too.

After these observations, it seems we are obliged to admit that both the *Wei-šu* and the *Čou-šu* statements were erroneous in representing *Suk-dok* as identical with Yen-ts'ai. To my mind, what gave rise to such misrepresentation is not unaccountable, but this question will be treated of in a separate chapter. Let it be remarked, in the meanwhile, that that item of description of *Suk-dok* in both histories *i.e.* that it lay in an extensive swamp north-west of the K'ang-kü, was derived from the *Hou-han-šu* account of Yen-ts'ai, on account of the assumed identity. A similar mistake may also be pointed out where the *Kua-ti-čih* (括地志) as quoted in the *Ših-č'i-čeng-i* (史記正義) says that “Yen-ts'ai was a wine country,”¹⁾ which statement was apparently due to the confusion of Yen-ts'ai with *Suk-dok*.

CHAPTER IV

The Nine, and the Six, States under the Čao-wu (昭武) Family in Sogdiana.

We have seen that the *Wei-šu* identified *Suk-dok* with Yen-ts'ai and wonder what could have occasioned such an obvious error, since all the

1) *Ših č'i*, chap. 123, p. 28 r°.

preceding histories from the Han to the Northern and Southern dynasties make clear distinction between the two countries. I think the only reasonable conjecture respecting this discrepancy is that which comes from the other name mentioned for Suk-dok, *viz.* Wên-na-ša (溫那沙). It was perhaps the phonetic resemblance of this term to Yen-ts'ai that tempted the pen which described Suk-dok to arbitrarily connect it with the older country. And what was the nature of the name Wên-na-ša, or what was the original term for that transcription? An attempt to answer this question involves the study of the whole history of Sogdiana down to the T'ang period, but in my opinion, the primary key to this problem lies in the account of the country of K'ang provided in the *Hsi-yü-čuan* of the *Sui-šü*. It requires to be quoted and discussed at length.

“The people of K'ang are successors to those of K'ang-kü. They move about without any permanency, adhering to no old home. Their descent has nevertheless been inherited unbroken ever since the Han period. The king, whose proper family name is Wên (溫), is a man of the Yüeh-ših race. Originally they occupied Čao-wu (昭武) City to the north of the Č'i-lien Mountains (祈連山). As they were defeated by the Hiung-nu, they crossed the Pamirs to the west, and came at last into possession of their country. Branches of the family each made a subsidiary king, and therefore the countries right and left of K'ang assumed Čao-wu as the family name, thereby showing that they did not forget their origin. The king, Tai-ših-pi (代失畢) by personal name, being a generous and gentle character, has won the popular heart. His wife is daughter of Ta-t'ou (達頭) Kaghan of the T'u-čüeh. He has his capital in A-lu-ti (阿祿迪) City on the Sa-pao (薩寶) Stream, with a large population. The state affairs are conjointly handled by three ministers. The king wears plaited hair, is crowned with seven kinds of jewels and gold flowers, and dressed in silk, brocade and white cotton. His wife has a knot of hair, which is veiled over with black cloth. The adult males have their hair cropped short, and are clothed in brocade robes. They are called a powerful nation, many of the countries in the western region being subject to them. The countries of Mi (米), Ših (史), Ts'ao (曹), Ho (何), An (安), Na-sé-po (那色波), Wu-na-ho (烏那曷), and Mu (穆) are all attached to them. They have a barbarian code of laws (胡律), which they preserve in a Zoroastrian shrine (祆祠) and take out to decide penalties as occasion may arise. For the worst criminal, it is the death of all his family, for the next in heinousness his own death; robbers and thieves have their feet cut off. The people have deep-set eyes, prominent noses, and thick beards. They are good traders, and various barbarian tribes gather for exchange in their country.”¹⁾

1) Chap. 83, p. 6 r°.

From the above extract it might seem that the country under description occupied the same area as old K'ang-kü, which we have determined to have been to the north of Sir Darya, but we can clearly see that such was not the case. "K'ang is also called Sa-mo-čien (薩秣鞬 or 颯秣建), and is what was recorded as Hsi-wan-č'in (悉萬斤) in the Yüan-Wei period,"¹⁾ says the *T'ang-šü*, and it is an established fact that those alternative names were all transliterations of *Samarband* itself. Nothing then was less permissible than to identify this country with old K'ang-kü, but, as we must repeat, the compilers of the *Sui-šü* and the *T'ang-šü* were under the false impression that Sogdiana was the proper home of the K'ang-kü people. As for the name *K'ang*, many speculations have been made respecting its etymology by western scholars, but it is my claim that there was in reality no such indigenous name. I hold that the term *K'ang-kuo*, is a combination of the Chinese word for "country," *kuo*, with the proper name *K'ang*, which was merely an abbreviation of K'ang-kü, and that simply on account of the supposed identity of Sogdiana with K'ang-kü, the historian represented Samarkand by that more Chinese-like name.

The next point to be scrutinized in the above account of K'ang is the alleged descent of the ruling family of the country from the Yüeh-č'i, who are declared to have started from "Čao-wu City" north of the Č'i-lien Mountains. This is to be regarded as doubtful for more than one reason. For there is no reliable evidence in history that the Yüeh-č'i race did at any time occupy Sogdiana, still less that their descendants maintained their reign for generations there. Moreover, even if K'ang were to be identified with K'ang-kü as done by the historian, it would be none the less impossible to relate K'ang with Yüeh-ših, for the K'ang-kü and the Yüeh-ših people were clearly distinguished from each other, as is ascertainable from the Han annals.²⁾ When the Yüeh-ših were driven out by the Hiung-nu, it is known, they moved westwards until they forced entrance into Bactria and settled there. They would have taken Sogdiana sooner, but, as suggested above, the district was then in the hands of the stout K'ang-kü people, and finding it so, they could not but turn southwards in quest of a new home. As for the alleged origin of the Yüeh-ših race, we know from the Han chronicles that they had founded a state in early times somewhere between the Č'i-lien range and Tun-huang, but "Čao-wu City north of the Č'i-lien mountains" is never heard of until we meet it in the *Sui-šü*.

All these considerations lead us to suspect that in relating the origin of the family then ruling in Sogdiana, the *Sui-šü* was telling a mere fable. Seeing that Č'i-lien Šan and Čao-wu City in the story are terms found

1) Chap. 221 b, p. 1 r°.

2) *Han-šü*, chap. 96 a, pp. 9 v°-10 v°.

exclusively in Chinese literature, we may readily conclude that it was not recorded from a legend told among the inhabitants of Sogdiana themselves, but was an invention on the part of the Chinese. It has been noticed how the old Chinese authors seem to have been addicted to the practice of tracing the origin of a foreign country to something native to their own country or some name found in their own literature. Thus the Hiung-nu race was proclaimed as descendants of Hsia-hou-ših (夏后氏), one of the earliest royal houses in China; the Japanese as offspring of Tai-po of Wu (吳太伯), an ancient feudal lord; and also Ta-ts'in (大秦), the people of the Roman Orient, as having issued from the Celestial Kingdom; while Po-han (鑿汗, Ferghāna) was identified with the old country of Č'ü-sou (渠搜), found mentioned in the *Wu-kung* (禹貢) of the *Šu-čing* (書經). Now, the author of the *Sui-šu* saw that the feudal lords in Sogdiana shared among themselves a family name which sounded something like Čao-wu (昭武) and, we may presume, that name was seized upon and connected with Čao-wu district (昭武縣) in Čiu-č'üan Prefecture (酒泉郡) in China, where the Yüeh-ših were known to have dwelt once in the Han period. In probability this laid the foundation for that story of their racial origin.

As a matter of course, the family name of the ruling house in Sogdiana was not a Chinese name, as the *Sui-šu* pretends, but nevertheless it may be admitted that it was at any rate some word which had a sound more or less similar to the characters Čao-wu 昭武, which was Čao-bu in old pronunciation. Various speculations have been made about what this original term was, without reaching, however, any consensus of opinion. Once I was in favour of, and supported in my "Study on the Wusun people," CUNNINGHAM's suggestion that the word Šao inscribed on the coin of the Ta-yüeh-ših monarch Kaniška was that,¹⁾ but now I am aware there are certain objections to it not easy to answer. The Iranian word Šao means king, and as such it would hardly make a family name. Moreover, the sound is hardly reconcilable with the characters Čao-wu 昭武, which sounded Čao-bu in olden times as remarked before. We may also consider that the Iranian word šah was in many instances transcribed by the single character 殺 or 沙, but is never known to have taken two characters.

Čao-wu as the royal family name in K'ang seemed to Tomaschek to be traceable to the traditional hero of the Iranian race, *Siyāwuš*. He saw in the Avesta a place named *Kanha*, to the east of Lake Vourukaša; in the Šah-Nāmah, the capital of the Turan king Afrāsiāb by the name of Kang, and further east behind the Sea of Čin, an angelic region called Gau Kangdiz, with a stone castle built by King *Siyāwuš* in it. Those place names, although mythical all of them, were in some cases related to historical facts, our

1) Num. Chron. p. 65.

scholar observed, and moreover the Iranians were known to have occasionally applied those legendary names to some real places in their northern and eastern habitats. Thus Taškurgan was once called Kang, as RAWLINSON ascertained; the Arabic geographies mentioned Kang-dhi between Isping-āb and Fār-āb, north of the Jaxartes; and the Šah-Nāmah showed that Baikand of Boḡāra and ḡwārizm were both styled Kang-diz, and Soghd as one of the four paradises of the world, Kang. It was the knowledge of this fact of Samarkand being called Kang in Iranian legend that led our author to draw the inference that the family name of the K'ang king was, in its native form, *Siyāwūs*, originally the name of the Iranian traditional hero, which was adopted in order to glorify his royal family.¹⁾ This argument is essentially dependent on the supposed relation between the historical name *K'ang* and the legendary *Kang* and yet we have already observed that *K'ang* was a name fabricated by the Chinese historians by the abridgment of *K'ang-ku*, and therefore totally unknown in the western region itself.

There is another objection to Tomaschek's theory, which arises from the ethnological consideration of K'ang. Untrustworthy as we have found the K'ang account in the *Sui-šu* as regards the statement identifying K'ang with old K'ang-kü and declaring its monarch to be of the Yüeh-ših race, still what we can infer from the reference it makes to a nomadic race in the Han period as the founders of the state is that the ruling class in the country was not Iranians, but of some nomadic tribe who had pushed in from the north and subjugated the native Iranians. This may be affirmed by examining what the *Sui-šu* tells of the customs of the K'ang people. The common people wore cropped hair, so we learn, but the king's was plaited into a queue or queues; and the queue was a fashion customary with the T'u-čüeh people. It must not be supposed that this alone is sufficient to decide the T'u-čüeh descent for the king. The history says that his wife was a daughter of the T'u-čüeh kaghan, and, besides, judging from the general situation in that region at that period, it seems highly probable that the ruler of K'ang was under the suzerainty of the T'u-čüeh kaghan; and under such circumstances, the king, even if he had been of Iranian birth, might well have imitated the T'u-čüeh mode of hair-dressing. It is, however, his personal name *Ta-ših-pi* that seems to speak his origin more eloquently. It sounds so Turkish, and especially suggestive of *Taš-bi*, which, being composed of *taš* (stone) and *bi* (lord), is equivalent to "Lord of Stone."²⁾ We may presume that this *bi* was the same title that was transliterated by 鼻, as seen in the

1) Centralasiatische Studien, I. p. 136.

2) In the K'ang account in the *Hsi-yü-tuan* of the *Pei-ših*, Chapter 97, which was apparently copied from the *Sui-šu*, the name is written 世夫畢, instead of 代夫畢. As 世 is synonymous with 代, and 夫 is 失 less one stroke, we may safely assume the *Pei-ših* form was a corruption.

case of a K'ang-kü king, *Nā-bi* (那鼻), and that it was also akin to that Wusun title *bi* (駝), and therefore identifiable with the word *bi* in a dialect of those Turks who have dwelt from very remote times to the present in the Kirghiz steppe and on both sides of the T'ien-šans. That this word was a modification of *bāg* in the T'u-čüeh language may be testified by the T'u-čüeh inscription, and most likely the same was the case in the dialect of the western T'u-čüeh, under Ta-t'ou Kaghan. We may conjecture the monarch of K'ang spoke a dialect belonging to the same language as did the Turks above mentioned, which was perhaps more or less different from the T'u-čüeh speech used in the Altai and in the Orxon valleys.

The Turkish nature of the king's personal name, the queue he wore, and the circumstantial evidence of his family having originated from some nomadic people or other, these, taken together, give strong indication that he was a man of the Turkish race. It is then fairly clear the founders of the K'ang state, none other than his forefathers, were a Turkish tribe who came from the north to supersede the Iranians in Sogdiana. Over and above this fact, taking into account the probability that the K'ang king looked up to the T'u-čüeh kaghan as his overlord, there remains very small chance that he or any of his predecessors on the throne undertook to connect his family with the legendary hero of the subjugated race by naming it after him.

It was MARQUART who associated *Čao-wu* with "*Kušana Javugasa*" inscribed on the coin of a Yüeh-ših sovereign. *Javugasa* being the genitive case of *Javuga*, the phrase meant "of the *Javuga* of Kušana," and it seemed to him that as *Javuga* was the royal family name of the Yüeh-ših at the time of King Kaniška, it was also adopted by the ruling house at Samarkand as their own; and that although it was lost among the Kušana people a few centuries after, it survived in Sogdiana long enough to enter Chinese records.¹⁾ This was plainly suggested by the idea of the Yüeh-ših having occupied Sogdiana previous to their conquest of Bactria, but we have already seen the improbability of this. Our author went further to refer to the marriage of a K'ang-kü king into the Ta-yüeh-ših family mentioned in the *Pan-čao-čuan* (班超傳) of the *Hou-han-šu*, remarking that this afforded an opportunity for the adoption of the Kušana family name in Sogdiana. We are not ready to accept this suggestion either. For my part, I am more inclined to believe with Hirth that *Javuga* was an official title of Kušana, which was reproduced in the *Han-šu* as *Yap-hou* (翮侯), and which corresponded with the T'u-čüeh title *Jabgu* (葉護 in Chinese transcription).

Another noteworthy attempt made at the etymology of *Čao-wu* was that of CHAVANNES. He read in Tabari that in the eleventh year of Hormizd

1) Chronologie der alttürkischen Inschriften, pp. 70-71.

IV, who was successor to Khosroû Anošchirvān, the king of the Turks by the name of Šāba attacked Bādghis and Herat with 300,000 soldiers, but was defeated by the Persian general Bahrām Tchoubin, who not only succeeded in destroying the enemy king, but also in capturing his son Barmotdha in his castle of Baikand and carrying away his treasures; and in Thaalibi that a Kaghan named Šaba-Šah carried out a raid upon Iran, advancing to Balkh at the head of 100,000 horsemen. The comparison of these historical statements led our scholar to the conclusion that the invader by the name of Šāba must have been in reality, not the great king of the Turks, but the master of Sogdiana, a country under Turkish suzerainty. The name Šāba was Arabic, while its Persian form was Šāwa, and with this term he thought Čao-wu was identifiable, as had been suggested by ABEL RÉMUSAT.¹⁾ This theory seems to be more solid than any other so far reviewed, though it has yet to be confirmed from other sources.

The last but not the least important is the clue which has been detected in the T'u-čüeh monument of Kül-tegin in the passage "*alty Čub Sogdyq tapa sülädimiz.*" It is the first three words that concern us most, Čub being the very term associated with Čao-wu (Čao-bu). RADLOFF read them "*six Čub of Sogdyq,*"²⁾ and MARQUART, slightly differing, "*Sogdyq of six Čub.*"³⁾ THOMSEN, however, who did not acknowledge any idea of "of," interpreted "alty Cub" as the name of another district. He pointed out that it was nearer the T'u-čüeh than was Sogdiana, and that it was situated on the upper course of the Ču or, as the T'ang history represented it, Su-yeh (素葉), at no great distance from Issik Kul, to the south of the home of the Türghes tribe; so that the T'u-čüeh had to pass through the country when they invaded Sogdiana.⁴⁾ This view of Thomsen's would of course preclude the association with Čao-wu, but the question is whether it is reasonable to connect Čub with the Ču at all. The river was recorded as *Su-yeh* in the *T'ang-šü*, as above observed, and the native appellation in the contemporary period was *Suj-āb*. This was a compound word made up of *Sui* and the suffix *ab* (river), and certainly a name very little likely to be reduced to Čub. For another opinion on the phrase in question we may mention Bartholdt, who thought it just as reasonable to read it "Sogdyq of alty Čub" as to read it "alty Čub of Sogdyq," but who did not support the identity between Čub and *javuga* of the Ta-yüeh-ših, as was claimed by Marquart.⁵⁾

It seems to me the T'u-čüeh phrase, no matter in which way of the two it is read, must signify the fact that Sogdiana was composed of six states of

1) Documents sur les Tou-kiue Occidentaux, pp. 242-243.

2) Die alttürkischen Inschriften der Mongolei, Neue Folge, p. 177.

3) Die Chronol. pp. 71-72.

4) Inscriptions de l'Orkhon, p. 154, n. 38.

5) Die alttürkischen Inschriften und die arabischen Quellen, pp. 16-17.

the Čao-wu family at that period. In that passage, indeed, of the above-quoted extract from the *Sui-šü*: “the countries right and left of K’ang, assumed Čao-wu as the family name” we have testimony to the existence of a chain of Čao-bu states in the district. Then that a similar situation prevailed there in the T’ang period may be gathered from the K’ang account of the *T’ang-šü* which runs as follows: “K’ang is also called *Sa-mo-čien* (薩末鞬: 颯秣建) as well, being what was represented as *Hsi-wan-čien* (悉萬斤) in the Yüan Wei period. To its south is Ših (史), 150 *li* away; to its northwest, Ts’ao (曹), over 100 *li* away; to its south-east, the domain of Mi, (米) 100 *li* away; and to the north that of Middle-Ts’ao (中曹), 50 *li* away. K’ang lies to the south of the Na-mi (那密) Stream, with 30 larger castles and 300 smaller forts. The monarch, Wén by family name, is a man of Yüeh-ših origin. In the beginning they abided in Čao-wu (昭武) City north of the Či-lien Mountains, but as they were defeated by the T’ü-čüeh, they moved a little way southwards to fall back upon the Pamirs, and thus came to possess their country. The branches of the family made subsidiary kings who ruled respectively: An (安), Ts’ao (曹), Ših (石), Mi (米), Ho (何), Huo-hsin (火尋), Mou-ti (戊地), and Ših (史). These are commonly called “Nine Houses” (九姓), sharing the family name Čao-wu (昭武) all around.”¹⁾ This shows how the branches of the Čao-wu family divided rule in Sogdiana, and how “the nine houses of the Čao-wu family” was a known name. We remember that the *Sui-šü* also named nine states in Sogdiana,—K’ang and its eight dependencies, but comparison shows the list partly differs in the two cases. This must mean that there was a change in the group of Čao-wu states from the one period to the other. And if this was so between the Sui and the T’ang, what vicissitudes had the group undergone in its composition since the Northern and Southern dynasties? Is it not possible, too, that during some part of the T’ang period, contemporaneous with the T’ü-čüeh monument, there were, not nine, but six Čao-wu states in Sogdiana, so as to give rise to the phrase “*alty Čub Sogdyq*”; and if so, how may they be compared or reconciled with the “Nine Houses” recorded in the T’ang history? In order to answer these questions, we must collect and use what information we can regarding every recorded country in Sogdiana which was ever connected with the family name of Čao-wu. I shall begin with the examination of K’ang and proceed to take up, one by one, those states which the *Sui-šü* mentions as its dependencies, and for most of which we can find separate descriptions in the same history.

1 K’ang (康國)

It is evident from what we have read in the extracts from the *Sui-šü* and the *T’ang-šü* that this country was the centre of the Čao-wu group of

1) *Hsi-yü-čuan*, Chap. 221 b, p. 1 r°.

states in Sogdiana, being governed by the main line of the royal house whose branches were rulers of other parts of the region. That it was Samarkand itself is also ascertained beyond doubt from its other name given in the *T'ang-šu*, viz., Sa-mo-čien, which we find identified there with Hsi-wan-č'in, as was the Yüan Wei mode of expressing it. The *Pên-č'i* (本紀) of the *Wei-šu* records occasional payments of tribute by *Hsi-wan-č'in*, while a separate account is furnished for it in the *Hsi-yü-č'uan* of the same history as follows: "The country of Hsi-wan-č'in, with its capital, Hsi-wan-č'in City, lies west of Hsi-mi (悉蜜), at a distance of 12,720 *li* from Tai. To its south there is a mountain called Č'ieh-sê-na (伽色那), which produces lions. This country regularly sends embassies and tribute."¹⁾ South of Samarkand, north of Kešš, there is actually a mountain which may be connected with that mentioned there, whose name Č'ieh-sê-na is perhaps referable to *Kašāni*, the other name of Kešš. *K'ang*, the name the Chinese historians habitually used for Samarkand from the close of the Northern and Southern dynasties to the Sui and T'ang periods, I have already asserted to have been the Chinese abbreviation of *K'ang-kü* with the suffix *kuo* (country), with the application of which name the inhabitants of Sogdiana themselves had of course nothing to do. It must have been this same misapprehension of Sogdiana being identical with old K'ang-kü in the Han record that was responsible for the fact that in the reign of Kao-tsung 高宗 (650-683 A.D.) Samarkand was declared the seat of the "Governor-General of K'ang-kü."

The *Sui-šu* says that the capital of K'ang stood on the Sa-pao (薩寶) River, while the *T'ang-šu* locates the country to the south of the Nami Stream, and it is plain both names meant the Zarafšān itself. *Na-mi* (那密) was probably derived, as TOMASCHEK suggested, from the Iranian word *Namîdh* or *Namiq*, which signified honour, celebrity, worth, etc. The river was called Polytimetos by the Greeks at the time of Alexander, and as the word had a similar connotation, we may assume that they used the translation of *Namîdh*. This tends to indicate that this name of the river was older than *Sa-pao*. It was CHAVANNES who associated the latter name with *Sa-pao*, by which the Zoroastrian priest seems to have been called in the T'ang period.²⁾ "At the south-western corner of Pu-chêng Quarter (布政坊) (in Č'ang-an), there is the barbaric Zoroastrian shrine (祆祠)", says SUNG MIN-č'ü (宋敏求) in his *Č'ang-an-č'ih* (長安志): "It was set up in the 4th year of *Wu-tê* (武德) in dedication to the heavenly god of the western region. Attached to the shrine is the functionary of Sa-pao (薩寶), whose duty it is to attend to the Zoroastrian deity. This office is also occupied by a foreign priestly." The Persian religion had its birth-place in Sogdiana and Bactria, and its prevalence there in the Sui and T'ang periods is illustrated by

1) Chap. 102, p. 8 r°.

2) Documents sur les Tou Kiue Occidentaux, p. 132, n. 5.

Chinese records. The K'ang account in the *T'ang-šu* alludes to the worship of the Zoroastrian god, while in the above quotation from the *Sui-šu* we have read about the same country that the barbaric code of laws the people had was kept in a Zoroastrian shrine. We may also consult what the *T'ung-tien* (通典) quotes from WEI ČIEH's (韋節) *Hsi-fan-č'i* (西蕃記) regarding the same people: "They worship the heavenly god with very deep reverence and great piety. The child of the god died in the 7th month of the year, and its bones were lost. With every return of the month, those who are the servants of the god put on black cotton, go barefooted, stroke their own breasts, and wail and bemoan, with tears rolling down. Men and women, three to five hundred in number, scatter themselves about on the grassy field and seek the bones of the celestial child for seven days running, and then stop. Outside of the state castle, there are over 200 households living by themselves, it being their special business to perform funerals. There is also an isolated building, in which dogs are kept. Whenever there is a dead man, the body is carried and placed in this house to be eaten by the dogs. Then all the bones left are gathered and buried, but no coffin is used for the purpose."¹⁾ Leaving dead bodies to dogs and birds is the rule of Zoroastrianism, and the antiquity of this peculiar custom may be conjectured from the fact that such an early writer as Onesikritos mentions about Sogdiana and Bactria the custom of abandoning superannuated persons to dogs to be devoured, and of keeping the animals for that express purpose. About the Zoroastrian worship in Sogdiana, we may also refer to TU HUAN's (杜環) *Čing-čing-č'i* (經行記) as quoted by the author of the *T'ung-tien*: "K'ang is situated 300 *li* southwest of the country of Mi. Its other name is Sa-mo-čien. The soil is fertile and the people rich. The country is small. They have a sacred shrine, which is designated *po* (*bat*) (拔)."²⁾ Perhaps the term was transcribed from *bat* or *pat*, which is the Persian word for "throne." There is thus every evidence that K'ang was a Zoroastrian country, and the priestly office Sa-pao, though mentioned only for the Zoroastrian shrine in the Chinese capital, must have had its origin in the western home of the religion. This consideration enables us to suspect that the Zarafšān may have owed its other name Sa-pao to some famous shrine which stood on its banks.

2 Mi (米國)

The *Sui-šu* thus describes the country: "Mi has its capital to the west of the Na-mi Stream. Formerly it was a territory of K'ang-kü. There is no king of the country. The lord of the city, whose family name is Čao-wu, is an issue of the royal house of K'ang, his personal name being Pi-čo (閉拙).

1) Chap. 193, pp. 2 v°-3 r°.

2) Chap. 193, p. 3 r°.

The capital city is 2 *li* square, and is provided with several hundreds of good soldiers. To the north-west is K'ang, 100 *li* away; to the east, the country of Šu-tui-ša-na (蘇對沙那), 500 *li* away; to the south-west, the country of Ših, 200 *li* away; and to the east, Kua-čou (瓜州), 6,400 *li* away. During the era of *Ta-yeh* (大業), this country sent tributes of local products at frequent intervals."¹⁾ Then, the *T'ang-šü* states about the country: "Mi may as well be named Mi-mo (彌末) or Mi-mo-ho (弭抹賀). It is 100 *li* away from K'ang, which is to its north. The master of the country resides in Po-hsi-tê (鉢息德) City."²⁾

It is clear that the country thus described was that of Mā marg or Māimarg, as the Arabs called it. Abel Rémusat explained that *Mi* (*Mai*) was the Chinese abbreviation for *Māimarg*, and TOMASCHEK determined its location at modern Ğumâ-a-Bazar.³⁾

3 Ts'ao (曹國)

"The country of Ts'ao has its capital a few *li* south of the Na-mi Stream," says the *Sui-šü*. "The country has no master, so that the king of K'ang lets his son Wu-čien (烏建) hold it as his estate. The city is 3 *li* square, with over 1,000 trained soldiers. In the country there is the deity Tê-hsi (得悉神), worshipped in many countries from Hsi-hai eastwards. The deity has attached to him the *metal man* (金人). The *Čin-po-lo* (金波羅) measures 15 feet in breadth, with a height in proportion. Every day a sacrifice is offered to the god of 5 camels, 10 horses, and 100 sheep. There are always 1,000 people to eat it, but they never consume it. To the south-east is K'ang, 100 *li* away; to the west, Ho (何國), 150 *li* away; and to the east Kua-čou, 6,600 *li* away. During the era of *Ta-yeh*, the state sent embassies with tributes of local products."⁴⁾ The *T'ang-šü* gives instead of Ts'ao, the three names—Tung-Ts'ao, (東曹) Hsi-Ts'ao, (西曹) and Čung-Ts'ao (中曹), and describes each as follows: "Tung-Ts'ao is alternatively called Šuai-tu-ša-na (率都沙那), Su-tui-ša-na (蘇對沙那) Čieh-pu-tan-na (劫布坦那); or Su-tu-shih-ni (蘇都識匿), which make four names in all. It is situated to the north of the Po-hsi (波悉) Mountains, and is identical with Ērh-ših (貳師) City in the Han period. To the north-east is Čü-čan-t'i (俱戰提), 200 *li* away; to the north, Ših (石國); to the west, K'ang; to the north-east Ning-yüan (寧遠); each about 400 *li* away; and to the south, T'u-huo-lo (吐火羅), 500 *li* away. Hsi-Ts'ao is what was Ts'ao in the Sui period. It adjoins on the south Ših (史) and Po-lan (波覽). It has its capital in Sê-ti-hên (瑟底痕) City. In the city of Yüeh-kan-ti (越干底) which is to the north-

1) *Hsi-yü-čuan*, chap. 83, p. 10 r°.

2) *Hsi-yü-čuan*, chap. 221 b, p. 3 v°.

3) *Centralasiatische Studien*, I, p. 145.

4) *Hsi-yü-čuan*, chap. 83, p. 10 v°.

east, there is the temple of Tê-hsi, the deity worshipped by the countrymen. Čung-Ts'ao is situated to the east of Hsi-Ts'ao, and to the north of K'ang. The king resides in Čia-ti-čên (迦底眞) City."¹⁾

All the alternative names for Tung-Ts'ao mentioned as above in the *T'ang-šü*, except Čieh-pu-čü-na, may be connected with Šu'ai-tu-sê-na (率堵瑟那) in HSÜAN-ČUANG's (玄奘) *Hsi-yü-č'i* (西域記), as well as the Arabians' Osurušana or Sutrušana, and therefore also with modern Ura-tüpä, as King Baber was justified to assert. The *T'ang-šü* explicitly does not relate this country to the Čao-wu family, but since it is identified, as we see, with Ts'ao as in the Sui dynasty, and since the *Sui-šü* says the latter was ruled by a son of the K'ang king, we may reasonably suppose the master of Tung-Ts'ao belonged to the same Čao-wu line. *Sê-ti-hên*, the name attached to the capital of Hsi-Ts'ao may be regarded as a transcription of the Arabian name *Istexan* or *Istexanğ*, with the initial vowel omitted. TOMASCHEK located the city on the shore of the Ak-darya, one of the principal tributaries of the Zarafšän, identifying it thereby with the present İstikhan between Kattah Kurgan and Čiläk, and also with Astakan on Ptolemaeus's map. It is to be gathered from some Arabic books of travels that the city was once the metropolis of the whole of Sogdiana.²⁾ The Chinese knowledge of it during the period of the Northern and Southern dynasties, moreover, is apparent from this passage of the *Hsi-yü-čuan* of the *Wei-šü*: "Sê-čih-bsien (色知顯), with its capital Sê-čih-hsien, lies north-west of Hsi-wan-č'in, at a distance of 12,940 *li* from Tai. The land is level and yields five fruits in abundance."³⁾ No doubt *Sê-čih-hsien* was the transliteration of *Istexan*, though we must allow for more or less corruption.

It appears from the *T'ang-šü* that Čieh-pü-tan-na was another name of Tung-Ts'ao, but the *Hsi-yü-č'i* distinguishes it from Šu'ai-tu-sê-na, which was as we have seen none other than Tung-Ts'ao. We may be sure the latter was right, for *Čieh-pü-tan-na* was obviously a reproduction of the Arabic name *Kapütana*, and the site of old *Kapütana* is assigned to Gubdan or Gubdun in the valley of the Bulanghyr, at the foot of the Kodym Tau, due north of Samarkand.⁴⁾ That this country was heard of during the Northern and Southern dynastic period seems clear from the following passage of the *Hsi-yü-čuan* of the *Wei-šü*: "Č'ieh-pu-tan (伽不單) with its capital, Č'ieh-pu-tan City, lies north-west of Hsi-wan-č'in, at a distance of 12,780 *li* from Tai. The land, being smooth, suits rice and barley, and yields five fruits."⁵⁾

As to what the god Tê-hsi (得悉) was there is no agreed opinion.

1) *Hsi-yü-čuan*, chap. 221 b, p. 2.

2) Central. Stud. I, pp. 152-153.

3) Chap. 102, p. 10 r°.

4) Central. Stud. I, p. 144.

5) Chap. 102, p. 10 v°.

HIRTH thought it comparable with Tös (plural form, Töstör), which VAMBÉRY had asserted on the authority of Pallas to be an idol which it was the custom of the Altai tribes to set up at the east side of their tents.¹⁾ It seems, however, CHAVANNES was not satisfied with that view, for he declared the question to be still unsettled.²⁾ It is worth notice that nearly twenty years ahead of Hirth, TOMASCHEK proposed to connect Tê-hsi with Teštar (or Tištrya) of the Persian faith,³⁾ but so far as I know, this opinion was not regarded to be any more conclusive than the other. I am inclined to believe both were right; that *Töstör* and *Teštar* were identical and both may be connected with *Tê-hsi*. At first sight it might appear that *Töstör*, worshipped by the Altai tribes of the Turkish race was clearly distinct from the Iranian god *Teštar*. But we may conclude otherwise when we consider the probability that the Turks were not altogether free from the influence of the Iranian cults and beliefs. It is a known fact that the Turks and the Mongols had a kind of necromancy called *Jada*, and this term unmistakably indicates its Iranian origin. Again the Turks called heaven *Hormuzda*, which was certainly an Iranian denomination. It is then quite possible that the Turks learned to worship the Iranian deity *Teštar*, which name may have been easily corrupted to *Töstör* among them. The interpretation of *Tê-hsi*, therefore, may largely depend on that of *Teštar*. Fortunately SPIEGEL gives a very studious description of the Iranian god, which may be quoted in outline as follows:⁴⁾

It appears from the Zend text that he was in the beginning a mere star god, but acquiring in course of time the power of distributing water, he came up to the same rank as of the sun and the moon, and thereafter he figures in the Avesta as the superintendent of all stars. In the Vendidad we see him represented in the shape of a bull with gold horns and hoofs, and at other times of a sacred star, qualified in the latter capacity with the term "bright" and "stately." Again in the Yasht he is the embodiment of the spirit of water, worshiped as a guardian against *Daeva*, *Pairika*, and other devils, whose influence brought on droughts and lean years, and of whom the stoutest one was *Daeva Apasha*, whose business it was to baffle all his efforts to supply mankind with water. It happened regularly on the tenth day of every month, that the good god went through a series of metamorphoses, from a youth to a bull and then to a horse, and in this last form accepted from men the offer of *haoma* wine and meat, promising them in return the multiplication of men, horses and cattle, and the cleansing and refreshing of souls.

1) Fremde Einflüsse in der chinesischen Kunst, p. 33, Anm. 1; VAMBÉRY, Das Türkenvolk, p. 123.

2) Docum. p. 139. n. 3.

3) Central. Stud., I, p. 152.

4) Eranische Alterthumskunde, I, pp. 71-72.

This sacrifice was necessary to sustain him through the battle he had to fight for their sake. When he goes to the lake of Voūruka to draw water for mankind, he is waylaid and challenged by the arch-enemy, in the disguise of an abominable-looking black horse. During the combat which follows, however, the strength of the friend of man begins to fail through the insufficiency of the sacrifice he is receiving, and for a while the enemy is the master of the situation, which means for mankind a spell of no rain. In the nick of time, however, the mighty god Ahura Mazda comes to aid, with his weapon, lightning, and puts the enemy to flight. The devil groans as he runs away, which is thunder.

We understand that Teštar was above everything the distributor of rain, and this is good reason for identifying him with the favourite idol in the district of Sogdiana, where life depended so much on the magic power of water to convert the desert into a paradise. We may also notice how the enormous size of the daily sacrifice offered to Tè-hsi can be accounted for by the story of Teštar whose fight would suffer for want of sacrifice. SPIEGEL points out that apart from his virtue as watergiver, Teštar was the guardian god of every quarter of the compass, but especially strong in the easterly direction.¹⁾ This knowledge confirms what has been suggested as to the relation between Teštar and Töstör. For we learn about Töstör that the Altai tribes customarily had his image set up at the east side of their dwellings, and certainly it was because he was one and the same god as Teštar himself.

4 Ho (何國).

This country is thus described in the *Sui-šü*: “Ho, with its capital situated several *li* south of the Na-mi Stream, is a former territory of K’ang-kü. The king, Čao-wu by family name, is another kinsman of the king of K’ang. The city is 2 *li* square, and has 1,000 trained soldiers. The monarch sits on the *Gold-Sheep-Throne* (金羊座). To the east, it is 150 *li* to Ts’ao; to the west, 300 *li* to Hsiao-An; to the east, 6,750 *li* to Kua-čou. During the era of *Ta-yeh*, the state sent an envoy with tribute of local products.”²⁾ Then we read in the *T’ang-šü*: “Ho is also called Č’u-šuang-ni-čia (屈霜你迦) or Kuei-šuang-ni (貴霜匿). It is the former site of Fu-mo (附墨) City of the petty king of K’ang-kü. In the east of the city there stands a two-storied building, on the northern wall of which are portrayed the former emperors of the Middle Kingdom; on the eastern, the monarchs of Tu-čüeh and Po-lo-mên (波羅門); and on the western, those of Persia and Fu-lin (拂菻), etc. The chief of the city every morning comes to pay homage to them and then retires. In the 15th year of Čên-kuan (貞觀), the state sent an envoy with tribute. During the

1) Eranische Alterthumskunde, I, p. 73.

2) Chap. 83, pp. 10 v°.

era of *Yung-hui* (永徽), as they heard that the T'ang was about to despatch an expedition to conquer the west, it petitioned to be allowed to carry the supply of provisions to the army. Thereupon China suddenly declared the country to be Kuei-šuang Province (貴霜州), conferring on its chief Čao-wu Ta-ti (昭武達地) the governorship thereof. They sent Po-ti-ših (鉢底失) as envoy to return thanks to the court."¹⁾

Of the names of the country mentioned in the *T'ang-šu*, *Č'u-šuang-ni-č'ia* corresponds to *Kušānika* in Arabic, *Kušānī* in Persian, and *Kušānik* in medieval Iranian speech, while *Kuei-šuang-ni* seems to be a slightly modified form. Istachri says that *Kušānī* was the most civilized place in Soghd, forming a centre for all the towns and cities in the region.²⁾ The *Sui-šu* name *Ho* was no doubt an abbreviated transcription, but what was the original name? We know that the method the history used for abbreviating the names of western countries was in some cases to take one, mostly the first, character of a transcription previously on record, as, for instance, K'ang (康) of K'ang-kü (康居), and An (安) of An-hsi (安息); and in other cases to transliterate directly from the original name one sound or syllable in it, as *Mai* (米) from *Māimarg*, *Mo* (穆) from *Amol*, and *Šš* (史) from *Kēšš*. Now it is plain *Ho* does not belong to the former class, and if we compare it with *Kušānī*, its contemporary sound, which was probably *ħa*, does not seem to sufficiently agree with any part of *Kušānī*. Thus we are induced to appreciate TOMASCHEK's identification of it with *Gao*, mentioned in the Avesta,³⁾ and also MARQUART's suggestion to connect it with *Qai*, which Ibn Hauqal pointed out as lying in the heart of Sogdiana.⁴⁾

There is in the *Yu-yang-tsa-tsu* (酉陽雜俎), compiled in the T'ang period, a description of a western country by the name of Hsiao-i (孝億). It is to be noted that the characters, reasonably supposed to have been pronounced *ħau-ok* in those times, show considerable similitude to *Gau* or *Gava*. We may then examine to what extent the description itself applies to the country of *Hō* or *Kušānī*. It reads: "The country of Hsiao-i, over 3,000 *li* in circumference, is situated in (the basin of) a level river (平川). They erect a palisade of wood over ten *li* in circumference, within which there are 2,000 houses for the populace. The country is surrounded by over 500 great palisades. The climate is ever warm, and winter knows no withering or falling of vegetation. It is good for sheep and horses, though there are no camels or cattle. The people are honest and candid, and like to have guests and company. They are tall and big, with a prominent nose, yellow hair, green eyes, and red

1) Chap. 221 b, pp. 3 v°, 4 r°.

2) MARQUART, *Die Chronol.*, pp. 59-60.

3) *Cent. Stud.* I. SBWA. Ba. 87.

4) *Die Chronol.* p. 60.

beard, their complexion being like blood. As for weapons, they use spears exclusively. The land is good for cereal crops, and yields gold and iron. They dress in linen, and follow the 妖 teaching, not knowing Buddhism. There are over 300 (some say 1,000) 妖 temples. They have 10,000 armed horsemen and foot-soldiers, do not esteem trade and commerce, call themselves *Hsiao-i*. Men and women carry their vituals with them, preparing them on every first day to be eaten during the month. Thus they live on stale food.”¹⁾

Granting 妖 to be a corruption of 袄, the 300 Zoroastrian temples in the country speak for the predominance of that worship there. Since the sphere of that religion in the contemporary period, to the west of the Pamirs, comprised Persia and the Iranian countries in Russian Turkestan, and since Persia was always represented as Po-ssü (波斯) or Po-la-ssü (波刺斯), this Zoroastrian state *Hsiao-i* must necessarily have meant some country in Turkestan, and quite possibly Kušāni. Then the “level river” in *Hsiao-i* may be assumed to correspond to the Na-mi stream within a few *li* of which the country of Ho was located. In other respects, however, it might seem that the above description does not fit the Sogdiana country. We are told that there were no camels or cattle in *Hsiao-i*, but we can hardly believe anything like that could have been true in any country in that quarter of Asia, and therefore may dismiss it as obvious misinformation. Another point, which is not so negligible, is the statement that the *Hsiao-i* people were indifferent to commerce. This is a trait not to be easily attributed to any settled tribe in Russian Turkestan. For we must admit they were always distinguished for their commercial tendency, which belonged to them by nature and also on account of the position of advantage they commanded on the continental highway of communication. Let me quote for illustration the description of Ta-hsia from the *Ta-wan-čuan* of the *Ših-č'i*: “Ta-hsia lies to the south of the Oxus, over 2,000 *li* south-west of Ta-wan. They are a settled people, and have castles and horses. The popular manners and customs are similar to those of Ta-wan. They have no supreme chieftain, but some of their cities have minor lords over them. Their soldiers are weak and afraid of fighting; the people are good at trading. When the Ta-yüeh-ših came moving westwards and subjugated the country, all the people became their vassals and slaves. The population is very large, exceeding 1,000,000. The capital is Lan-ših (藍市) City, where various commodities are marketed.”²⁾ This was written about Bactria, where the Ta-yüeh-ših, being a nomadic Turkish tribe which originated in the western part of Kan-su (甘肅) Province, conquered and ruled over the Iranian natives, and from it we may easily perceive the peaceful, commercial disposition of the people, which was in striking contrast with the fierce warlike character of the invaders.

1) Chap. 4, p. 3.

2) Chap. 123, pp. 2 v°-3 r°.

Still more characteristic is what the *Hsi-yü-čuan* of the *T'ang-šü* says about K'ang: "They are good at trading, and fond of gain. When the men are twenty years of age, they leave for the neighbouring countries, and go to any place where there is gain."¹⁾ This indicates how great was the commercial propensity of the people of Samarkand in that period. We may now quote again this statement about Su-tê (粟特) from the *Hsi-yü-čuan* of the *Wei-šü*: "Formerly many merchants of this country used to go to the country Liang (涼土) to trade. At the conquest of Ku-tsang, however, they were all taken prisoners."²⁾ It is a matter which I intend to explain later, that Su-tê, the transcription of *Sugdok*, meant in the Northern and Southern dynastic periods, not the whole of Sogdiana, but the particular state Kušānik or Ho, and if their merchants went so far east as Liang-t'u or the present Liang-čou, it shows they did not yield to the Samarkand people in their zeal for trade. Now we see the people of Hsiao-i represented as slighting trading pursuits, and moreover there is the mention of a large army of horsemen and foot-soldiers, which puts us in mind of the relative importance attached to military life in the country. Neither can we overlook the habit described of the people of carrying provisions to last a month, which seems a sure sign of a nomadic tribe, not of any people settled down to commerce or agriculture, as must have been the case in Kušāni.

There is on the other hand this important consideration that the populations in Bactria and Sogdiana, must, as far as history goes, have always consisted of two elements,—a ruling class, of foreign origin in every case, which were given to warlike activity, and the governed class of Iranian natives, who were more inclined to the peaceful pursuits of life. The foreign rulers, were, in order of succession from the Fighting States period of Chinese history downwards, the Greek soldiers, the Ta-yüeh-ših, K'ang-kü, Ephthalites, and T'u-čüeh, who occupied the country one after another. The rule of the T'u-čüeh lasted until the reign of *Kao-tsung* of the T'ang-dynasty, but then the Arabian general Kotaiba entering on the conquest of both Turkestans, finally succeeded in bringing all south of the Oxus under Arabian supremacy. In the *Yu-yang-tsa-tzu*, written in the first half of the 9th century, we read how the Arabian king tried to demolish a bronze horse which was greatly worshipped at a Zoroastrian temple in the province of Čü-tê-čien (俱德建).³⁾ The last-mentioned name, presumably an alternative spelling for 久越得犍 (Čiu-yüeh-tê-čien) found in the Book of Geography (地理志) of the *T'ang-šü*,⁴⁾ has been identified by CHAVANNES with Kowadhijan of the Arabs, a district on

1) Chap. 221 b, p. 1 r°.

2) Chap. 102, p. 8 v°.

3) Chap. 10, p. 9 r°.

4) Chap. 43 b p. 10 v°.

the lower course of the Kafirnagân, a northern tributary of the Oxus.¹⁾ The story is an indication of how the Arabs, who conquered Bactria, attempted to eradicate the Persian faith from the land. We may reasonably suppose the condition was very similar in Sogdiana, and assume that it was the Arabian princes and warriors who constituted the predominating class, lording it over the native Iranians there. We may therefore interpret the habit of life ascribed to the people of Hsiao-i as referring to the foreign half of the community in the country of Kušānī, who might well have despised commercial pursuits, which was characteristic of the other half. After these observations, we can still reasonably connect Hsiao-i with the country of Kušānī. In conclusion, the characters *Hsiao-i* (𠵽ao-ok) (孝億) were the complete transcription of the Zend name *Gau* or *Gava*, corresponding with Ibn Hauqal's *Qai*, which would have been more properly written *Ga'i*, while *Ho* or 𠵽a (何) was the abbreviated reproduction of the same. This means that the *T'ang-šu*, recording *Ho* and *Kuei-šuang-ni*, introduced the two different names of the same country.

5 An (安國).

“An is what was An-hsi (安息) in the Han period,” says the *Sui-šu*. “The king, Čao-wu by family name, is kindred of the king of K'ang. His individual name is Šē-li-têng (設力登) and his wife a daughter of the king of K'ang. The capital is situated on the south of the Na-mi Stream. The castle is five-storied and is surrounded by running water.”²⁾ The *T'ang-šu* describes the country as: “An, also called Pu-huo (布豁) or Pu-ho (捕喝), is what was spoken of as Niu-mi (柎密) in the Yüan-Wei period. To its north-east is Tung-An (東安) and to the south-west, Pi (畢), each about 100 *li* away. On the west it borders the Wu-hu (烏訶) Stream. The capital is A-lan-mi (阿濫識) City, the former seat of the King of Či (Ka) (罽), a petty king of K'ang-kü. There are in the country 40 larger castles and more than 1,000 smaller forts. The king, Ho-ling-čia (訶陵迦) sent a gift of fine horses, announcing that his family line had descended for 22 generations. In the same year, the country of Tung-An also sent an envoy and tribute, declaring that their royal family was 10 generations old. Tung-An, also named Hsiao-An (小安, Minor An) or Ho-han (喝汗), is located north of the Na-mi Stream. To the east, it is about 200 *li* to the river, and to the south-west, 400 *li* to Ta-An (大安, Major An). The capital is Ho-han City, whose other name is Hu-č'in (纒斤). The country has 20 larger castles and 100 smaller forts. During the *Hsien-čing* 顯慶 era, China established A-lan as the Province of An-hsi (安息州), nominating its king Čao-wu-ša (昭武殺) the Governor

1) Documents sur les Tou-Kiue Occidentaux, pp. 71, 201, 279.

2) Chap. 83, pp. 6 v°, 7 r°.

thereof; while Hu-č'in was declared the Province of Mu-lu (木鹿州), its king Čao-wu Pi-hsi (昭武閉息) being appointed to the governorship thereof."¹⁾ As is evident from the *Sui-šu*, *An* was no indigenous whole name, but an abbreviation of the transcribed name *An-hsi* found in the Han history, though this abridged form is misapplied in this case, as will be seen. The names *Pu-huo* and *Pu-ho*, which the *T'ang-šu* mentions as alternatives for *An*, correspond with *Buḡāra* in Arabic, *Boḡaraq* in medieval Iranian, and *Buḡaraq* in T'u-č'ieh speech, showing that the country was that of *Boḡāra* itself.²⁾ True, none of these names is found in the *Sui-šu*, but nevertheless the Chinese of the time of the Northern and Southern dynasties seem to have heard of *Boḡāra*, since the *Hsi-yü-čuan* of the *Wei-šu* and that of the *Pei-ših* both have this passage: "Fu-huo (副貨) is 17,000 *li* from Tai. To the east, is A-fu-ših-č'ieh (阿副使且) (spelt 阿富使且 in the *Pei-ših*), and to the west Mu-šui (沒誰), each at a distance of 1,500 *li*. On the south, it is bounded by a mountain range whose name is unknown. To the north is the state of Č'i-ša (奇沙), 1,500 *li* away. There is in this country (of Fu-huo) Fu-huo City."³⁾ Very obviously this was written of *Boḡāra*. The neighbouring country *Mu-šui* was probably identical with *Mou-č'ih* (牟知) as mentioned in the *Wei-šu* and also with *Mou-ti* (戊地) found in the *T'ang-šu*; while the name of the other country *Či-ša* seems traceable to *Kešš*, which we see represented elsewhere by the abbreviation *Ših* (史). As for the mountains of unknown name to the south of the country, they may have meant the Hindu Kush. It is strange, however, that the *Wei-šu* gives a separate account of the country of *Niu-mi*, which we have seen the *T'ang-šu* identify with *Boḡāra*, as if it were a different country. "*Niu-mi* (紐密), with its capital *Niu-mi* City, lies west of *Hsi-wan-č'in*, at a distance of 22,828 *li* from Tai," reads the passage. No doubt *Niu-mi* was transcribed from the *Numiğ* or *Numiğ-kat*, the name used by the Arabians as alternative for *Boḡāra*, but the historian furnished an account for it without seeing its identity with *Boḡāra*.

In the *Sui* and *T'ang* histories we perceive not a few instances in which the names of western countries as mentioned in the Han records are misidentified, but as the present case of the country of *An* is perhaps the most glaring example, it is worth while to dwell on it. Now what the *Sui-šu* represented as *An* was very obviously *Boḡāra*. The historian declares it as identical with *An-hsi* on the Han record, and applies to it the abbreviation of that Han name. It is an undeniable fact, however, that *An-hsi* meant Parthia, and that *Boḡāra* was in no way related with Parthia, for it belonged to the Greco-Bactrian Kingdom up to the time of Han emperor Wu-ti, and then

1) Chap. 221 b, pp. 1 v°, 2 r°.

2) MARQUART, Chronol. p. 61.

3) *Wei-šu*, Chap. 102, pp. 13C°; *Pei-ših*, Chap. 97, p. 16 v°.

passed into the possession of the K'ang-kü people, and it is never known to have made part of the Parthian domain. It is clear the *Sui-šu* historian made a gross mistake in naming the country *An*, and no less erroneous in their respect was the *T'ang-šu*, which must have followed the example of its predecessor without questioning it. The later history even contradicted itself, when it identified the capital of *An* with the seat of an old K'ang-kü lord, for it is evident from the Han annals that K'ang-kü and *An-hsi* were different countries. We can also see what a strange irrelevance the T'ang government committed in denominating the capital of *An*, that is of Boḡāra, as *An-hsi* Province, but they must have only followed the official historian's identification. And the same thing may be said of the establishment of Hu-č'in City as Mu-lu Province, for the Han historian's Mu-lu meant the modern Merv. It limited the east of Parthia, and was not reasonably to be connected with Hsiao *An*, a district in the south-western part of Sogdiana. All these examples serve to illustrate how often the attempt of the Sui and T'ang historians to identify the western countries and cities found on earlier records ended in absurd confusion and spurious revelation.

An and Hsiao *An* are mentioned together not only in the *Hsi-yü-čuan* of the *Sui-šu*, as we have seen in the quoted passage on K'ang, but also in that of the *Wei-šu*. The *Pei-ših*, however, records only Hsiao *An*, making no mention of *An*. But when we consider that the *Wei-šu* borrowed its *Hsi-yü-čuan* from the *Pei-ših*, and the *Pei-ših* owed its own *Hsi-yü-čuan* to the *Sui-šu*, it is hardly conceivable that the middle history did really not record *An*, and so we may assume the omission was a scribe's mistake and was confined to the existing edition of the history. Again if the *Sui-šu* furnishes a description for *An* alone, doing no more than mention Hsiao *An*, the *T'ang-šu* describes Hsiao *An* side by side with *Ta An*, so calling *An* for the sake of distinction; and we may be assured the country of *An* was divided into *An Major* and *An Minor* from the Sui period. In the *T'ang-šu* account, we notice that Hsiao *An*, being identified with *Ho-han*, was also designated *Tung An* (Eastern *An*). No doubt this was intended as an antithesis to *Hsi An* (Western *An*), but then it seems strange that we discover no such name as the latter in the same history. It is, however, in the *Hsi-yü-č'i*, in the note on the country of *Fa-ti* (伐地) that we find the statement: "The T'ang (the Chinese) called it *Hsi-an-kuo*."¹⁾ Thus we understand that the Chinese of the T'ang period gave the names *Tung An* and *Hsi An* respectively to Hsiao *An* or *Hohan* and to *Fa-ti*. Now the country of *Fa-ti* is described in the *Hsi-yü-č'i* as follows: "The country of *Fa-ti* is over 400 *li* in circumference. In climate and popular customs it is similar to *Sa-mo-čien* (*viz.* Samarkand). To the south-west, it is over 500 *li* to the country of *Huo-li-hsi-mi-č'ia* (貨利習彌伽)."²⁾

1) Chap. 1, p. 23. Kyoto-Daigaku edition.

2) Chap. 1, p. 23.

As the last-mentioned country meant Khiva, geographical consideration makes it inevitable to assume the word "south-west" to be a miscript for what should have been "north-west." Now the *T'ang-šu* name for Khiva being *Huo-hsin*, as we have already observed, we find this said by the *Hsi-yü-čuan* of that history about *Huo-hsin*: "To the south-east, it is 600 *li* to Šu-ti (戍地)."¹⁾ What is very remarkable is the close resemblance there is between the transcriptions *Fa-ti* (伐地) and Šu-ti (戍地), while the countries represented by them were so much the same in the relative position with Khiva. Most probably the two names were identical and each may equally be suspected of being a corruption of the other, but in trying to find out which was genuine, we must also take into account another name no less similar in spelling, that is *Mou-ti* (戊地), which the *T'ang-šu* mentions as one of the Nine Čao-wu states related to K'ang, and which seems to have much chance for being identical with the other two. There is besides, a country which the *Wei-šu* names *Mou-čih* (牟知), thus describing it: "With its capital *Mou-čih* City, it lies to the south-west of *Niu-mi* (紐密), at a distance of 22,920 *li* from *Tai*. The land is level, its fauna and flora resembling those of the Middle Kingdom."²⁾ The identity of *Niu-mi* with *Pu-ho* or *Ta An* is as already observed, and the direction of *Mou-čih* from it may be taken as agreeing with that of *Fa-ti* and of Šu-ti as above noticed. And the name *Mou-čih* (牟知) has a very similar sound to *Mou-ti* (戊地), brought into comparison with *Fa-ti* and Šu-ti as above. These things taken together, we may safely decide *Mou-ti* (戊地) was the correct form and right alternative for *Mou-čih* (牟知), and *Fa-ti* and Šu-ti its corruptions. Now *Mou-čih* was 22,920 *li*, and *Niu-mi* 22,828 *li*, from *Tai*, according to the *Wei-šu*. As both lay in approximately the same direction from *Tai*, the distance between themselves may be measured by the difference in mileage from *Tai*, which is 92 *li*. We know on the other hand that the *Hsi-yü-čü* places 400 *li* between *Pu-ho* (= *Niu-mi*) and *Fa-ti* (more correctly *Mou-ti* = *Mou-čü*), and must recognize the discrepancy thus presented. But we may at the same time assume that *Bočāra* (捕喝), *Garčan* (喝汗), and *Mou-ti* (戊地) were located fairly close together, as their mutually related names, *Ta An*, *Tung An*, and *Hsi An* suggested.

6 *Wu-na-ho* (烏那曷國) (spelt 烏那曷國 in the *Pei-sih*).

The *Sui-šu* says: "The country of *Wu-na-ho*, with its capital situated west of the *Wu-hu* Stream, was once a territory of *An-hsi*. The king, Čao-wu by family name, is kindered of K'ang, his personal name being *Fo-ših* (佛食). The city is 2 *li* square, with hundreds of trained soldiers. The sovereign seats himself on the *Gold Sheep Seat* (金羊座). To the north-east,

1) Chap. 221 b, p. 4 r°.

2) Chap. 102, p. 10.

it is 400 *li* to An; to the north-west, over 200 *li* to Mu; and to the east, 7,500 *li* to Kua-čou."¹⁾ The *T'ang-šu* does not mention this country.

7 Mu (穆國).

"The country of Mu, with its capital to the west of the Wu-hu Stream, is also a former territory of An-hsi," says the *Sui-šu*. "The land adjoins Wu-na-ho. The king, being of the Čao-yu family, is another kinsman of the king of K'ang, his individual name being A-lan-mi (阿濫密). The city is 3 *li* square, with 2,000 trained soldiers. To the north-east it is 500 *li* to An; to the east, over 200 *li* to Wu-na-ho; to the west, over 4,000 *li* to Po-ssü (Persia); and to the east, 7,700 *li* to Kua-čou. In the *Ta-yeh* era, this country sent an embassy with a tribute of local products."²⁾ The *T'ang-šu* gives no mention of this country either.

Wu-na-ho and Mu are perhaps the most difficult to identify of all the nine states enumerated by the *Sui-šu* as subsidiary to K'ang, although there seem to be comparatively more clues regarding the latter. The biography of P'ei Čü (裴矩) in the *Sui-šu*, describing the three routes for reaching the Hsi-hai from Tun-huang, says of the middle one: "Starting from Kao-č'ang (高昌), one passes through Yen-č'i (焉耆), Kuei-tzū (龜茲), Su-lei (疏勒), and after crossing the Pamirs, goes on through Po-han (鑾汗), Su-tui-ša-na (蘇對沙那), K'ang, Ts'ao, Ho, Ta and Hsiao An, and Mu, until one enters Po-ssü and then reaches the Hsi-hai."³⁾ In terms of modern geography, it must mean that one departed from Ša-čou (沙州), and taking to the south side of the T'ien-šan range, proceeded through Turfan, Kara-šahr, Kuča and Kašgar, and crossing the Pamirs, descended the Alai plateau into the valley of Ferghāna; then turning westwards, one passed through Čodjend, Ura-tüpä, Samarkand and Božāra; crossed the Oxus so as to attain Čardžui, and further advanced through Merv and Mešed in the dominion of Persia until one came at last to the head of the Persian Gulf. It is clear that Mu marked the last stage before reaching Persia. According to the *Sui-šu*, this country was 500 *li* away from An, i.e. Božāra, or some five days' journey; while BYRŪNĪ's calculation, measuring 5 farasung from Božāra to Baikand, 12 farasung from Baikand to Ferebr, and 2 farasung from Ferebr to Āmūye, showed the total distance between Božāra and Āmūye to be 19 farasung, which corresponds to 500 Chinese miles in round numbers.⁴⁾ On the strength of this coincidence, MARQUART thought Mu identifiable with Āmūye, which was Amul or Amui in the middle ages, and which is to-day Čardžui, and I believe he was justified in doing so.

1) Chap. 83, p. 11 r°.

2) Chap. 83, p. 11 r°.

3) Chap. 67, p. 38 v°.

4) SPRENGER, Post- und Reiserouten des Orients, No. 1.

There is ABEL RÉMUSAT's proposition to assign Mu to the present Merv, but this is not only in discord with the *Sui-šu* statement of distance between Mu and An, but also with the history of the suggested district. As MARQUART pointed out himself, Merv, or Marvi-šahagān in those periods, formed the capital city for the Xorasan territory of the Sassan dynasty, and so far as Mu was a state subordinate to K'ang and ruled by the Čao-wu family, their identity is beyond question.¹⁾

Having recognized the fact that Mu was Amul, we may further connect it with Fa-ti, or more correctly Mou-ti. The *Hsi-yü-č'i* puts the distance between Fa-ti and Boḡāra at 400 *li*, and this is 100 *li* or one day's journey less than that recorded as between Mu and Boḡāra in the *Sui-šu*; but considering the usual chance of inaccuracy in Chinese statements of distance, this is no serious objection. Fa-ti was placed by VIVIEN DE St.-MARTIN at Betik,²⁾ and by MARQUART at Wardān,³⁾ on the right bank of the Oxus in both cases, but it seems more reasonable to assign it to Čardjui on the other side of the river. We have already reason to admit that Fa-ti (伐地) and Mou-ti (戊地) meant the same name; and now we may recognize in *Mou-ti* a contraction of *Amrda*, and in *Mu* a further simplification and more Chinese-like representation of it, which is comparable to the case of *An* and *K'ang* derived respectively from *An-hsi* and *K'ang-kü*. It might be noted by the way that the *Hsi-yü-čuan* of the *Pei-ših* records Mu and Fa-ti separately as if they were different countries. Remembering the fact, however, that this section of the history borrowed both from the Book on the Western Region written in the Wei period and from the *Hsi-yü-čuan* of the *Sui-šu*, there is much likelihood that the author failed to see the identity of the two names because they were given respectively by the two original histories, just as he was misguided with respect to An and Fu-huo.

The question of where to locate Wu-na-ho, we cannot hope to answer half so definitely. Since it lay west of the Wu-hu Stream as the *Sui-šu* testifies, the country must have been situated, like that of Mu, on the left side of the Oxus. The history describes it at the same time to be lying 400 *li* south of An (Boḡāra) and over 200 *li* south-east of Mu (Čardjui); while the passage of the same history on Mu states that Mu was 500 *li* south-west of An and over 200 *li* west of Wu-na-ho. Comparing these data, it would seem that Wu-na-ho was about 100 *li* nearer to Boḡāra than was Mu, but so far as Mu was identifiable with Čardjui, this situation is evidently unaccountable. It is to be plainly seen on the map that the trend of the Amu Darya in this section is such that any point on its left bank upper than Čardjui must be at a

1) *Éranšāhr*, p. 311.

2) *Mémoire Analytique*, p. 282.

3) *Die Chronol.* p. 62.

greater distance from Boḡara than is Čardjui itself. And Wu-na-ho lying east of Čardjui and on the left side of the river, could not possibly have been nearer to Boḡara, and this goes to intensify the problem. At all events we may be sure that among the nine states under review, Wu-na-ho and Mu alone were situated on the left of the Oxus, both being four to five days from Boḡara. I may also remark in passing that the above-cited evidences made it difficult to connect Wu-na-ho with Andchui, as MARQUART proposed.¹⁾

8 Ših (史國).

The *Sui-šū* says: “Ših, with its capital 10 *li* south of the Tu-mo (獨莫) Stream, is a former territory of K’ang-kü. The king, Čao-wu by family name and T’i-čê (逖遮) by individual name, is another issue of the royal house of K’ang. The city is 2 *li* square and has more than 1,000 trained soldiers. The popular customs are like those in K’ang. To the north it is 240 *li* to K’ang; to the south, 500 *li* to T’u-huo-lo (吐火羅); to the west, 200 *li* to Na-sê-po (那色波); to the north-east, 200 *li* to Mi; and to the east, 6,500 *li* to Kua-čou. During the *Ta-yeh* era, this country sent an envoy with a tribute of local products.”²⁾ The *T’ang-šū* description of the country reads: “Ših, also called Č’ü-ša (佉沙) or Čieh-šuang-na (羯霜那), lies south of the Tu-mo Stream. It is the former site of Su-hsieh (蘇雍) City of the petty king of K’ang-kü. To the west, it is 150 *li* to Na-sê-po; to the north, 200 *li* to the domain of Mi; to the south, 400 *li* to T’u-huo-lo. In the *Ta-yeh* era of Sui, its chief T’i-čê (逖遮) made himself the first of the reigning line to communicate with the Middle Kingdom. The report was that his country was strong and prosperous, that he had built, Či-ših (乞史) City, and that his territory extended over several thousands of *li*. In the 16th year of *Chên-kuan* (貞觀), the monarch Ša-sê-pi (沙瑟畢) sent a tribute of native products. During the *Hsien-č’ing* (顯慶) era, the country was established as the Province of Čü-ša 佉沙, its chief Čao-wu Ših-ho-ho (昭武失呵喝) being nominated as Governor thereof.”³⁾

The *T’ang-šū* name of the country, *Čieh-šuang-na*, corresponds with *Kāšāni* or *Kāšāniya* of the Arabs, while the other names in the same history *Či-ših* and *Čü-ša* 佉沙 are apparently transcriptions of *Kešš*. Then the name *Ših* in evidence in both histories was in all probability the abbreviation of *Či-ših* or *Čü-ša*, of which the last syllable was retained. TOMASCHEK suggested that *Kāšāni* was a word having the sense of “winter abode.”⁴⁾ Again the Tu-mo Stream, which ran north of the country, must have meant the *Kaška-rud*,

1) Die Chronol., p. 65.

2) Chap. 83, p. 10.

3) Chap. 221 b, 4 r°.

4) Cent. Stud., I, p. 184.

the largest river in the district after the Zarafšān. It issues from the Sultan-Hazret Tagh, and flows on west until it is joined by the Khazar at Karši, and then disappears in the sands. Kešš as well as Nasaf owed to this river its prosperity, which was in this region only surpassed by that of Boḡāra and Samarkand.

We have already explained that the *T'ang-šu* assignment to Ših of the former old Su-hsieh City of the Han age, ruled by a feudal lord of K'ang-kü, was spurious and incorrect, and yet it is an unfortunate situation that many western scholars have drawn their inferences from this wrong material. MARQUART, who must have been aware of the mention in the *Ših-č'i* of Su-hsieh as one of the countries ranging east of Ta-wan, yet did not doubt the *T'ang-šu* identification.¹⁾ It also led CHAVANNES to connect Su-hsieh with Soghd, and this idea seemed to him confirmed by Marquart's demonstration from Arabian records that Kešš was once the capital of Soghd.²⁾ We have, however, the probability that the characters *Su-hsieh* (蘇薶) were pronounced *su-χai* or *so-χai* in the Han period, which was a sound too far removed from *Soghd* or *Sugda*. We know it is not allowable to identify Kešš with Soghd, for Kešš was confined to the south of the Kaška, whereas Soghd had the Zarafšān basin for its proper area. I may also refer to the mention, observed before in the *Wei-šu*, of the four countries beyond the Pamirs—Ta-hsia, Ta-yüeh-ti, Šu-yo, and Čien-ša and recall the inference we were enabled to reach that Šu-yo (Šuk-do) and Čien-ša meant respectively Sugda and Kešš.

The *Hsi-yü-čuan* of the *Wei-šu* renders the name *Kašani* by another transcription, saying: "The country of Č'ieh-sê-ni (伽色尼), with its capital Č'ieh-sê-ni City, lies south of Hsi-wan-čün; at a distance of 12,900 *li* from Tai. The land produces red salt (赤鹽) and abounds in five fruits."³⁾ This makes it clear that the country was south of Samarkand. Then the same name occurs in the passage on the country of Po-čih (薄知) that is, Bakdi or Bactria, as follows: "With its capital Po-čih, it lies to the south of Č'ieh-sê-ni, at a distance of 13,320 *li* from Tai."⁴⁾ The comparison of the above statements shows that Č'ieh-sê-ni intervened between Samarkand and Balχ, and it was on this ground that SPECHT identified it with Kešš.⁵⁾ The alleged production of red salt will be accounted for by TOMASCHEK's testimony that in the Bašgur-Dagh, which ranges south of Khuzār in the southwesterly direction towards Kālif, there is a spot where Soghd men take rock salt, which they sell under the name of Samarkand salt, and also that IBN KHORDADBIH's list of taxes in Soghd included rock salt.⁶⁾

1) Ēranšahr, p. 304.

2) Documents sur les Turcs Occidentaux, p. 146, Note 3.

3) Chap. 102, p. 10 r°.

4) Chap. 102, p. 10 r°.

5) Etudes sur l'Asie centrale, p. 15.

6) Cent. Stud., p. 180.

9 Na-sê-po (那色波國).

The *Sui-šū* affords no account of this country, but it is described by the *T'ang-šū* as follows: "Na-sê-po is also called Hsiao Ših (小史, Ših Minor), because it is subordinated by Ših. It occupies the former territory of T'u-huo-lo (吐火羅). On the east it is bounded by the Pamirs, on the west it adjoins Po-ssü. On the south are the Snow Mountains (雪山), and the Fu-č'u (縛菴) Stream traversing the country. On the north there is the Čü-mi (咀密) tribe."¹⁾ The *Sui-šū* furnishes no description of this country, though mentioning it among the nine states subsidiary to K'ang. No doubt the name Na-sê-po was a transcription of *Naxšab* of the Arabs, of which *Nasaf* was a native corruption. This name we find mentioned in the Arabian records of war, mostly in company with Kešš. Its capital stood at the juncture of the Khuzâr with the Kaška, and has since the days of the Mongol supremacy also been known by the name of *Karši*. We learn from YAQŪT that Nasaf was a large, populous city with numerous gardens in it, and was situated between Ğaihun (Amu Darya) and Samarkand, and that its other name was *Naxšab*. It follows that the country was limited by Boġāra on the west, and by Samarkand on the north, while on the south-west, it was separated from Čaganiyan in Toġārestan by the Bašgur-dagh range, with its famous pass of the Iron Gate. This, however, differs much from what the *T'ang-šū* tells of the country, and small wonder it does so. It is plain that the *T'ang-šū* started with the false idea that the country was identical with T'u-huo-lo, and described its paper boundaries accordingly, or speaking more properly, copied the following paragraph on Tu-huo-lo in the *Hsi-yü-č'i*: "On the east it is bounded by the Pamirs, on the west it adjoins Po-ssü. On the south are the Great Snow Mountains, on the north it is backed by the Iron Gate. The Great Fu-č'u River flows west through the middle of the country.—Going along the northern shore of the stream one reaches on its lower course the country of Čü-mi."²⁾

Having so far examined in history each and every state mentioned in the *Sui-šū* account of K'ang as subordinate to its suzerainty, we are now assured that besides K'ang itself, Mi, Ho, Mu, Wu-na-ho, and Ših are each described as being attached to a king whose family name was Čao-wu, but not Ts'ao and Na-sê-po. The *Sui-šū* offers no account whatever of Na-sê-po; and as for Ts'ao we learn that it had no king of its own, but that a son of the K'ang sovereign was allowed to hold it as his estate, thus making it scarcely countable as one of the Nine Čao-wu Houses, if there were such in that period too. It is very remarkable, on the other hand, that going through the *Hsi-yü-čuan*

1) Chap. 221 b, p. 4 r°.

2) Chap. 1, p. 24.

of the same history, we meet with two other countries whose rule is explicitly attributed to the Čao-wu family—that is, Po-han (鑼汗) and Ts'ao (漕). Let us now observe how they are described there, also taking into comparison what the *T'ang-šü* says about them.

Po-han (鑼汗). “Po-han, with its capital over 500 *li* west of the T'sung-ling, was the country of Č'ü-sou (渠搜) in ancient times” says the *Sui-šü*. “The king is Čao-wu by family name, and A-li-č'i (阿梨染) by individual name. The city is 4 *li* square and has several thousands of trained soldiers. To the east it is 1,000 *li* to Su-lei (疏勒), to the west, 500 *li* to Su-tui-ša-na (蘇對沙那); and to the east, 5,500 *li* to Kua-čou.”¹⁾ The *T'ang-šü* represents the country as Ning-yüan (寧遠), describing it as follows: “Ning-yüan was originally called Pa-han-na (拔汗那), or Po-han (鑼汗), having been known in the Yüan-Wei period by the name of P'ó-lo-na (破洛那). It is 8,000 *li* away from the Chinese metropolis. The country, with its capital Hsi-čien (西犍) City, lies to the north of the Čen-čü (眞珠, Pearl) River. There are in it 6 larger and 100 smaller castles. The people, most of them, live long. The royal line has descended unbroken since the Wei and Čin periods.”²⁾

The country was known as P'ó-lo-na in the Yüan-Wei period, and the *Hsi-yü-čuan* of the *Wei-šü* has this passage on it: “(P'ó)-lo-na is Ta-wan of the former period. The country, with its capital Kuei-šan (貴山) City, lies north-west of Su-lei, at a distance of 14,450 *li* from Tai.”³⁾ This indicates that the name P'ó-lo-na dated from the Yüan-Wei period, to replace Ta-wan which had represented Ferghāna in previous records. The *Sui-šü* connects the country with Č'ü-sou, the ancient name on record in the *Yü-king* of the *Šü-čing*, but this is easily disproved by mentioning the known fact that Č'ü-sou was a barbaric tribe who inhabited the western section of Kan-su Province in remote antiquity.

Besides Pa-han-na, the *T'ang-šü* introduces elsewhere a country called Pu-han (怖悍), which is thus described: “Over 1,000 *li* south-east of Ših (石), there is what is called Pu-han. It is surrounded by mountains on all sides. The land is fertile and abounds in horses and sheep. To the west it is 1,000 *li* to Tu-li-sê-na (堵利瑟那). On the east it borders on the Yeh-yeh (葉葉) Stream, which, issuing from the northern plateaus of the Pamirs, and being of turbid colour, flows north-westwards until it merges into the great desert. There one sees no water or vegetation, but high mountains at a distance, and there one can find one's way only by marking the dead bodies left lying. It is over 500 *li* to K'ang.”⁴⁾ To account for the proper names in the above account, Tu-li-sê-na was manifestly an abbreviation of Su-tu-li-sê-na (率堵利

1) Chap. 83, pp. 9 r°-9 v°.

2) Chap. 221 b, p. 5 v°.

3) Chap. 102, p. 8 v°.

4) Chap. 221 b, p. 3 v°.

瑟那) as in the *Hsi-yü-č'i*, which, corresponding with *Osrūšna* of the Arabs, meant Ura-tüpä to-day. Then the Yeh-yeh Stream, very probably identical with Yeh (葉) River mentioned in the *Hsi-yü-č'i*, may be identified with the Sir Darya. We assume the river was called *Šaš* or *Čaš* after the country for which it formed a boundary, and that the character *Yeh* (葉), with its old sound *šap*, was intended to represent the name. Thus interpreted, the description of the country answers to Ferghāna, and seeing the phonetic resemblance of Pu-han with Po-han and Pa-han-na, we may be safe to regard them as identical in being transcriptions of Ferghāna. And though the *T'ang-šu* distinguishes Pu-han from Pa-han-na, etc., we may adjudge it a failure of identification on the part of the historian.

In the Wei and Čin periods this country was still known under the old name Ta-wan. For the *Wei-čih* quotes the *Wei-liao* as saying: "Further west are Ta-wan, An-hsi, T'iao-čih, and Wu-i or P'ai-čih—these four countries lying in succession one west of another. Each occupies its original territory, without any gain or loss;"¹⁾ while the *Hsi-jung-čuan* (西戎傳) of the Čin-šu furnishes an account of Ta-wan, crediting it with the production of blood-sweating horses.²⁾ It was in the Yüan-Wei period that the name Po-lo-na was first introduced, the *Wei-šu* recording the country of that name as paying tribute to the court. Now the *T'ang-šu* says that the royal line of the country had descended uninterrupted from the Wei and Čin periods, and this must needs imply that the same family ruled there in the days of Ta-wan, as well. The *Sui-šu* on the other hand tells us that the family was of Čao-wu, which the history holds as descendant of the K'ang-kü and the Ta-yüeh-ših races. This is very improbable, however, when we remember that Ta-wan was always distinguished from K'ang-kü and from Ta-yüeh-ših. We may therefore justly disbelieve the *Sui-šu* connection of the country of Po-han with the Čao-wu family, and this view is furthered by the consideration that the *T'ang-šu* does not include the country in the group of Nine Houses belonging to the family.

It may be noted that there is on record a mountain range represented as P'an-ho-na (潘賀那), which is very suggestive of Ferghāna. Read this passage from the *Hsi-yü-čuan* of the *Wei-šu*: "The country of the Če-čih-pa (者至拔), with its capital Če-čih-pa City, lies west of Su-lei, at a distance of 11,620 *li* from Tai. On the east of the country are the P'an-ho-na Mountains, which produce fine iron and lions."³⁾ We may identify the country with Taškend, interpreting *Če-čih-pa* as a transcription of *Čač-balik*. MARQUART suggested to read it as *Čač-bar*, which meant "the shore of the Čač," or the

1) Chap. 30, p. 20 r°.

2) Chap. 97, p. 9 v°.

3) Chap. 102, p. 8 r°.

Sir Darya,¹⁾ but it must be noticed that Taškend could hardly be said to have fronted on the river. I think there is more reason to suppose it was called Čač-balik, *balik* meaning "city" in Turkish speech, seeing that it was governed by the Turks in the corresponding period. However this may be, it is beyond question that the country was Taškend itself, and if so, the mountains P'an-ho-na, bounding it on the east, must have been so called after P'a-han-na or Ferghana, which was just beyond the range. On PTOLEMAEUS's map we see set down in a similar position the name of a mountain-range *ταπουρα*, and that of the inhabitants thereof *ταπουραι*. TOMASCHEK explained that those names, representing a range running from Marama Tau to Čatqul Tau to the south of Taškend, were Iranian words with the original sense of "ax."²⁾ Now the Persian word for ax is *tawar*, and perhaps we may be allowed to seek here the origin of the old Chinese appellation of Ferghana,—Ta-wan.

Ts'ao (漕國). The *Sui-šü* says: "The country of Ts'ao, lying north of the Ts'ung-ling (葱嶺), is Či-pin (罽賓) of the Han times. The king, Čao-wu by family name and Šun-ta (順達) by individual name, is a kinsman of the king of K'ang. The capital is 4 *li* square, and has more than 10,000 trained soldiers....To the north, it is 700 *li* to Fan-yen (帆延); to the north-east, 600 *li* to Čieh (刮); and to the north-east, 6,600 *li* to Kua-čou."³⁾ The *T'ang-šü* represents this country as Či-pin, describing it thus: "Či-pin, that is Ts'ao of the Sui times, lies south of the Ts'ung-ling. It is more than 12,000 *li* from the Chinese metropolis, and 3,000 *li* from Še-wei (舍衛), which is to its south. The king, residing at Hsiu-hsien (脩鮮) City, is always subservient to the Ta-yüeh-sih....As the tradition of the people of that country goes, the royal family was founded by Hsing-nieh (馨孽) and is in the 12th generation at the time of Ho-čieh-čih (曷擷支). In the 3rd year of *Hsien-č'ing*, China established the country as the Seat of the Governor-General of Hsiu-hsien, and at the beginning of the *Šên-lung* (神龍) era, nominated its king as Marshal in Command of Eleven Provinces of Hsiu-hsien etc. and Governor-General of Hsiu-hsien. In the 7th year of *K'ai-yüan* (開元) the country sent an embassy with gifts of astronomical charts records and mysterious medicines of hidden pharmacy. The Emperor therefore conferred on the king the title of *Ko-lo-ta-ta-čih Têlê-ša* (葛邏達達支特勒灑). Later on Wu-san Têlê-ša (烏散特勒灑), becoming old, petitioned for his son Fu-lin-či-p'ó (拂筮鬪婆) to be acknowledged as his successor, which was granted. In the 4th year of *T'ien-pao* (天寶), China nominated his son (or the latter's son) P'o-fu-čün (勃匍準) as successor to the reign over Či-pin and Wu-č'ang (烏菴). At the commence-

1) MARQUART und DE GROOT, Das Reich Zäbul und der Gott Žun vom 6.-9. Jahrhundert, p. 252.

2) Kritik der ältesten Nachrichten der Skytischen Norden, II, p. 51.

3) Chap. 83, p. 12 r°.

ment of the Čien-yüan (乾元) era, the country sent an envoy with tribute.”¹⁾

From the above it is clear that the country of Ts’ao was identical with Či-pin of the Han period. It is noticeable that the *Sui-šu* locates it to the south of the Ts’ung-ling Mountains, whereas the *T’ang-šu* says north of them, and assuming that the Ts’ung-ling in this case referred to the Hindu Kush rather than the Pamirs, we must decide the latter history was correct. For if the country had been north of the range, as asserted by the *Sui-šu*, it could not possibly have been true at the same time that Fan-yen was 700 *li* north of it.

The *T’ang-šu* name Ka-pin was demonstrated by LÉVI to have meant *Kapiça*, on these grounds: that the *Fan-yü-tsa-ming* (梵語雜名) interpreted Ka-pin as Čieh-pi-sê (劫比舍), viz. *Capiça*; that Či-pin mentioned in Wu-k’ung’s (吳愷) Travels as the summer abode of the king of *Kapiça* must have been identical with Čia-pi-ših (迦畢試), which Hsüan-čuang showed to be such in his book of travel, in view of the fact that both travellers agree in placing the winter residence of the king at Gandhāra; and lastly that the testimony from the *T’u-čüeh-čuan* (突厥傳) of the *T’ang-šu* that the tribal chief T’ung Yeh-hu’s (統葉護) dominion extended to Či-pin helped to identify this district with Čia-pi-ših, to which the *Tz’ü-ên-ssü-čuan* (慈恩寺傳) says the same Kaghan ordered an escort to accompany Hsüan-čuang when the Chinese pilgrim departed from him.²⁾

Thus the identity of Či-pin as in the Sui and T’ang periods with *Capiça* has been well established. It would be a mistake, however, to suppose that the Chinese always meant *Kapiça* by the transcription Či-pin. In the *Hsi-yü-čü*, for instance, we see Hsüan-čuang commenting on the name Čia-ši-mi-lo (迦濕彌羅, Kašmir) as follows: “It was formerly Či-pin, which name is now corrupted,”³⁾ and here evidently Či-pin is connected with Kašmir, not with *Kapiça*. “Či-pin” was first mentioned in the *Hsi-yü-čuan* of the *Han-šu*, but as its description was too vague, the later scholars had great difficulty in finding its whereabouts. So far as I have been enabled to generalize, it was assigned to Gandhāra from the Han to the Čin period; to Kašmir in the Northern and Southern dynasties’ period; and in the T’ang period, it seems some connected it with *Kapiça* and others with Kašmir. In the same passage on Či-pin as above quoted from the *Hsi-yü-čuan* of the *T’ang-šu*, we read: “The king, residing at Hsiu-hsien City, is always subservient to the Ta-yüeh-ših. The climate is hot and dampish, the people ride elephants. They follow Buddhism.”⁴⁾ Knowing this was a mere modification of the *Han-šu* statement about Či-pin, we cannot expect that this description of the climate and popular

1) Chap. 221 a, p. 20 v°.

2) CHAVANNES, Documents sur les Turcs Occidentaux, p. 52, Note 1.

3) Chap. 3, p. 23.

4) Chap 221 a, p. 20 r°.

customs should answer to Kapiça, but to Gandhāra. It may be now asked how Či-pin ever came to be identified with Kapiça. Most presumably it was because the sound of Či-pin (*Ka-pin*) recalled Kapiça, besides the reason that the *Han-šu* description of Či-pin seemed at first sight to apply to Kapiça. All these things have been fully discussed in my separate study on Či-pin.

There is no doubt the *Sui-šu* and the *T'ang-šu* meant Kapiça by their *Či-pin*, but what was the origin of the *Sui-šu* name of the country, *Ts'ao*? This question has been well answered by MARQUART, when he explained that *Ts'ao* (漕) was an abbreviation of *Ts'ao-čü-t'o* (漕矩吒) or *Ts'ao-li* (漕利) as in the *Hsi-yü-č'i*, which must have been transcribed from *Zabul*, *Zawal* or *Zaul*. The country of this name had its capital at Gazna in Afghanistan, but as its territory extended from Gandhāra to Kapiça, its name may have applied to Kapiça in the Sui and T'ang periods, just as its other transcription *Yeh-po-lo* (業波羅) did to Gandhāra in the Northern and Southern dynasties period.²⁾

The *Sui-šu* asserts that the king of *Ts'ao* was of the Čao-wu family. If we consider *Zabul* proper, it is not easy to imagine that the ruler at Gazna belonged to that family. Neither is it any more probable that Kapiça had a Čao-wu master of its own. The *T'ang-šu* names the founder of the ruling house of the country as *Hsing-nieh*, and although MARQUART's proposal to identify this person with *Kunggas*, son of the *Ta-yüeh-ših* king *Kidara* (寄多羅),³⁾ may be open to discussion, it appears still believable that the royal family of Kapiça was more or less related with the *Ta-yüeh-ših* race. Thus we are led to regard the *Sui-šu* identification of *Ts'ao* with the Čao-wu family as highly suspicious, and this view is promoted by noticing the absence of the country from the *T'ang-šu* group of Nine Čao-wu Houses.

If we forbear from accepting *Po-han* and *Ts'ao* as real Čao-wu states in the Sui period, then there remain as such these seven:—*K'ang*, *Mi*, *Ho*, *An*, *Ših* (史), *Mu*, and *Wu-na-ho*. Now compare them with what the *T'ang-šu* enumerates as the Nine Houses belonging to the Čao-wu family,—that is, *K'ang*, *An*, *Ts'ao* (曹), *Ših* (石), *Mi*, *Ho*, *Huo-hsin*, *Mou-ti*, and *Ših* (史). In the latter list we see no more *Mu* or *Wu-na-ho*, but there are newly introduced *Ts'ao*, *Ših* (石), *Huo-hsin* and *Mou-ti*. Of *Ts'ao*, we have above observed the *Tang-šu* description, and now we must examine what accounts the history affords about the other three.

Ših (石國). The *T'ang-šu* records the country as follows: “*Ših* (石), also called *Ših-čih* (柘支) or *Ših-šê* (柘折) or *Čê-ših* (赭時), is on the northern out-skirts of what was *Ta-wan* in the Han period. It is 9,000 *li* away from the Chinese metropolis, *T'u-čüeh* being to its north, and *Po-la* (波臘) to its

1) *Ēranšahr*, p. 285.

2) *Ēranšahr*, pp. 284–285.

north-west. It is about 200 *li* south to Čü-čan-t'í (俱戰提) and 500 *li* south-west to K'ang. It has a circumference of over 1,000 *li*, and is bordered on the right (west) by the Su-yeh (素葉) River. The king, being of the Ših (石) family, resides at Ših-šê (柘折) City, which is the former site of Yü-ni (麻匿) City of a petty king of K'ang-kü. On the south-west flows the Yao-ša (藥殺) Stream, which is known in the Middle Kingdom as Čên-čü (眞珠, Pearl) River, or Čih (質) river.—In the 3rd year of the *Hsien-č'ing* era, K'an-čieh (瞰羯) City was declared the seat of the Governor-General of Ta-wan (大宛都督府).”¹⁾

This country of Ših has been identified with the present Taškend. The above description of it, showing its king to be of the Ših family, is a clear contradiction to the representation of the country in the same history as a Čao-wu state. Apparently this account was derived from this passage of the *Hsi-yü-čuan* of the *Sui-šu*: “Ših is situated on the Yao-ša Stream, its capital being more than 10 *li* square. The king is Ših (石) by family name and Nieh (涅) by individual name.”²⁾ It is improbable, at any rate, that a country ruled by such a king should have been a Čao-wu state at the same time. Still another point which bespeaks the inaccuracy of the T'ang knowledge of the country is the assignment to it of the city of an old K'ang-kü petty king. The historical location of the country on the northern skirts of Ta-wan and the establishment therein of the Seat of the Governor-General of K'ang-kü show how it was supposed to form part of Ta-wan, and then it ought not to have been connected with old K'ang-kü, since Ta-wan was clearly distinguished from K'ang-kü in the Han period. Recognizing the country, as we do, as Taškend itself, we can readily believe it was part of the K'ang-kü territory, for the race occupied in the Han times an extensive area even including half of the Kirghiz steppe north of Xodjend, but then it is still to be questioned what authority the historian had for placing in the country of Ših the site of that particular old K'ang-kü capital.

Such was indeed the nature of the *T'ang-šu* knowledge about Ših, and we may reasonably decline to accept the enumeration of the country among the Nine Čao-wu Houses, which is not justified by any other evidence.

The Chinese cognizance of this country did not date from the Sui period only. For the *Hsi-yü-čuan* of the *Wei-šu* says: “The country of Čê-šê (耆舌), a former territory of K'ang-kü, lies north-west of P'o-lo-na, at a distance of 15,400 *li* from Tai. In the 3rd year of *Ta-yen* (大延), it sent an embassy to pay tribute to the court;”³⁾ and this Čê-šê being, no less than *Ših-čih*, *Ših-šê*, and *Če-ših*, as above observed, an equivalent of the Arabic name Šaš and Čač, meant what is Taškend nowadays.

1) Chap. 221 b, pp. 2 v°-3 r°.

2) Chap. 83, p. 7 r°.

3) Chap. 102, pp. 10 v°-11 r°.

The Su-yeh River which the *T'ang-šu* mentions as bounding the country on the right side must have meant the Sir Darya. As we have seen, the Sir is often represented as the Yeh-yeh (葉葉) or Yeh (葉), no doubt a transcription from another name of the river, and that name was probably Šaš, which must have applied to it on account of its forming the southern frontier of the country. Su-yeh (素葉) here, therefore, may be assumed to be an erratum for Yeh-yeh (葉葉). The former spelling, Su-yeh, occurring in the *Hsi-yü-č'i*, was apparently intended not for the Sir, but for the Sujāb, now the Ču river.

The *T'ang-šu* name of the country Ših (石) was in all probability an abridged transcription of Šaš, though it is not impossible that it came from the family name of the king, reproduced as Ših (石). Taking a hint from the Turkish word for "stone," *taš*, one might suppose that *Taškend* was a combination of it with the Iranian *kend*, castle, thus suggesting identity of meaning between the original name and the Chinese character representing it, Ših (石, stone). But what seems more certain is that *Taš* of *Taškend* was no more than a transformation of Šaš, having nothing to do with the Turkish word. MARQUART partly recognized this proposition, but at the same time retained the hypothesis that the Turks read into the name their own meaning of stone, for he thought that *Sir* of *Sir-Darya* had the original sense of stone, as well as the Saka word *sil* and the Sanscrit *śila*.¹⁾ I am not inclined, however, to regard as he does, the Chinese name of the country Ših as a translation, instead of a transliteration. The Chinese very rarely, if ever, reproduced foreign names by translation. Besides, after seeing that all the countries we have been above examining were recorded by transcribed names, it is more reasonable to assume that it was the same in the present case. Neither do we see any reason to attribute the sense of "stone" to *Sir*. The various transcriptions of the name of the river, Yao-sha (藥殺), Čen-čü (眞珠), and Čih (質), must have respectively corresponded to *Jaxartes*, *Jängčü* and *Sil*. The first has been ascertained by MARQUART and other investigators to be an Iranian term, and it is apparent the second was a T'u-čüeh name. As for the third, *Sil*, MARQUART connected it, as we have seen with the Saka word *sil*, stone, but we must remember this identity was merely suggested by his own presumption of the Chinese name of the country being a translation and signifying stone. I should rather refer for the interpretation of those old appellations of the river, *Sil* and *Silis* to the Čagatai word *silig*, and the T'u-čüeh and Uigur *silik*, which mean "clear."²⁾

Huo-hsin (火尋國). The *T'ang-šu* thus describes the country: "Huo-hsin, also called Huo-li-hsi-mi (貨利習彌) or Kuo-li (過利), is situated north

1) Das Reich Zābul und der Gott Žun vom 6.-9. Jahrhundert. Festschrift EDUARD SACHAU zum Siebzigsten Geburtstage, p. 252.

2) RADLOFF, Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türkdialekte, 712.

of the Wu-hu Stream. To the south-east, it is 600 *li* to Šu-ti (戊地). On the south-west it is conterminous with Po-ssü. To the north-west is the Ho-sa tribe of T'u-čüeh (突厥曷薩). It is the former site of Ao-čien City of a petty king of K'ang-kü."¹⁾

The name Huo-li-hsi-mi, identical with Huo-li-hsi-mi-čia (貨利習彌迦) in the *Hsi-yü-čü*, corresponding to the Sanscrit name Hōrismika, Khārizmik in the medieval Iranian, and Xorasm in Armenian speech, as well as their abbreviations Huo-hsin and Kuo-li, meant what is Khiva to-day. The Greeks called this district Xorasmia, always in distinction from Bactria and Sogdiana, etc.; while the Han history introduced it under the name of Huan-č'ien (驩潛) as lying, alike with Ta-i (大益), to the west of Ta-wan, and thus fairly marking it off from Ta-hsia, Ta-wan, Ta-yüeh-ših, K'ang-kü, and Soghd. In view of this, it becomes very improbable that it should have been the seat of a K'ang-kü petty king, and for the same reason we object to believe the *T'ang-šu*, when the history counts it among the Nine Čao-wu Houses in Sogdiana, after we have seen, too, that the *Sui-šu* connects it in no way with the family.

The Chinese cognizance of this country in the time of the Northern and Southern dynasties as well is apparent from the following passage in the *Hsi-yü-čüan* of the *Wei-šu*: "Hu-ših-mi (呼似密) with its capital Hu-ših-mi City, lies west of A-fu-tai-han (阿弗太汗), at a distance of 24,000 *li* from Tai. The land is level and yields silver and amber. There are lions there and five fruits in abundance."²⁾ Not only does the name connect the country with Huo-hsin, but its situation as described points to the latter place. For although it is hard to identify the district of A-fu-tai-han mentioned in connection, we can at least gather that it was west of Bočāra, from this statement in the same book: "A-fu-tai-han, with its capital A-fu-tai-han City, lies west of Niu-mi, at a distance of 23,720 *li* from Tai,"³⁾ and comparing the two extracts above we can judge Hu-shih-mi itself was situated west of Bočāra.

Mou-ti (戊地國). We have already seen that this name, with its corruptions Šu-ti (戊地) and Fa-ti (伐地), meant the same country as Mou-čih (牟知) in the *Wei-šu* and Mu (穆) in the *Sui-šu*. Now the *Sui-šu* shows Mu as belonging to the Čao-wu family, and this might seem to justify the *T'ang-šu* enumeration of it among the Nine Houses. But when we remember the fact that the Sui and T'ang historians seem to have thought of Mou-čih, Mou-ti, and Mu as so many different countries, our conclusion must be otherwise. The *T'ang-šu* does not present Mu as a Čao-wu state, very likely because the historian did not hear of it as such; and when he included Mou-ti, which

1) *Hsi-yü-čüan*, Chap. 221 b, p. 3 v°.

2) Chap. 102, p. 10 v°.

3) Chap. 102, p. 10 v°.

was supposed by him to be another country from Mu, in the Čao-wu group, we cannot imagine he had any acceptable authority for it. Out of the Nine Houses enumerated by the *T'ang-šü*, then, these three—Ših (石), Huo-hsin, and Mou-ti, must be rejected as spurious.

To make a résumé of what we have just observed about the Chinese record of the Čao-wu states, it is, firstly, that the *Sui-šü* passage on K'ang mentions eight countries as satellite to it, implying by the context that all of them shared with K'ang itself the ruling family name of Čao-wu; secondly, that the same history separately describes nine states, including K'ang, as ruled respectively by Čao-wu kings, but nevertheless that two of the latter nine, being names unmentioned among the former set in the account concerning K'ang, appear on closer examination most unlikely to have been real Čao-wu states; and thirdly, that the K'ang account in the *T'ang-šü* gives eight states as being subsidiary to K'ang, and as constituting with the sovereign country itself what was generally known as the Nine Houses of the Čao-wu family, but that there being only six of them which agree with the *Sui-šü* list given in its K'ang passage, a study of the several descriptions of the three other countries in the same history discloses the fact that they are by no means provable as having been really attached to the family.

The explanation of this phenomenon, it seems to me, is the hypothesis that the Čao-wu states in Sogdiana at first counted nine, which number became so fixed with Chinese chroniclers that even at later periods when the number diminished and in consequence the historiographers heard of fewer countries as being under the family rule, they sought to satisfy the traditional number by guessing certain non-Čao-wu states into the group. We may assume the original nine were those recorded in the *Sui-šü* account of K'ang, that is—K'ang, Mi, Ših (史), Ts'ao (曹), Ho, An, Mu, Wu-na-ho, and Na-sê-po. Perhaps they were not only famed in the western region as the Nine Čao-wu states during the period corresponding to that of the Northern and Southern dynasties, but the name reached the contemporary Middle Kingdom. In the Sui period, however, we have reason to believe that Ts'ao and Na-sê-po had ceased to be regular states, for the *Sui-šü* description of the former shows it to have been without a king of its own, it being then a mere princely adjunct of K'ang, while the latter is allotted no separate account whatever in spite of its being mentioned in the K'ang passage. So the historian made good the supposed deficiency in his own way by representing Po-han and Ts'ao (曹) as being under Čao-wu kings. To come down to the T'ang period, the dynastic history makes no mention of Mu or Wu-na-ho, apparently because they had been by that time annexed by An, and though it gives a description of Na-sê-po, it is only as a dependency of Ših (史), and if Ts'ao (曹) was now supposed to count as a full member of the group, the historian must have found three names still wanting, and this is why we see Ših (石), Huo-hsin, and

Mou-ti brought into the traditional group in the K'ang passage of the *T'ang-shu*.

The first two of these we have detected to be non-Čao-wu, and as for the last-named there is reason to believe that the historian was not aware of its identity with *Mu* as it was known by in the Northern and Southern dynasties. If I am not far away from the right track in drawing this inference, then it may be safely assumed that in the T'ang period, the Čao-wu states in Sogdiana numbered no longer nine, but six in reality.

We may now return to the T'u-chüeh monument phrase "*alty Čub Sogdyq.*" The date of the inscription corresponds to the *K'ai-yüan* era of the T'ang dynasty (713-741 A.D.), and there is every probability that the "six Čub" meant these six Čao-wu states we have recognized as existent in the period,—K'ang, Mi, Ts'ao (曹), An, Ho, and Ših (史). This puts us in mind of another contemporary list of six countries observed in the same quarter. The Hsin-lo priest Hui-č'ao (慧超), who travelled through the region on his way home from India thus writes in his *Wang-wu-t'ien-čü-čuan* (往五天竺傳): "From Ta-ših (大寔) eastwards, they are all Hu (胡) countries, namely—An, Ts'ao, Ših (史), Ših-lo (石驪), Mi, and K'ang. Although each has its own king, they all belong to the jurisdiction of Ta-ših. Each forms a small country, with only a few soldiers and horses, yet they can defend themselves with effect. Their language is different from that of other countries. Furthermore these six countries all adhere to fireworship, without the least knowledge of Buddhism. Only K'ang has one Buddhist temple with one priest, but then nothing is known of piety."¹⁾ Now the conspicuous fact is that these six countries are identical with the above list with the single exception of the new name Ših-lo, which stand instead of Ho. This country of Ših-lo has yet to be identified, but apart from that question, we have reason to assume that these six countries were just what was meant by the Six Čub in the T'u-čüeh inscription. For, unknown as the exact date of the Hsin-lo traveller's journey is, his return to the seat of the Governor-General of An-hsi (安西都護府) is shown by Prof. JUNJIRO TAKAKUSU (高楠順次郎) to have been in the 15th year of *K'ai-yüan* (727 A.D.);²⁾ while on the other hand the event of K'ül Tegin's 關特勤 raid upon Soghd recorded in the monument has been ascertained by MARQUART to have occurred in 701 A.D., corresponding to the 1st year of the *Čang-an* era under the T'ang Empress Tsê-t'ien Wu-hou (則天武后),³⁾ and the brief interval between the two dates allows us to suppose that the situation in Sogdiana did not undergo any considerable change during the period. Now what was the country of Ših-lo, is a question which must be carefully answered. Perhaps

1) Hui-č'ao's *Wang-wu-t'ien-čü-čuan Čien-ših* 慧超往五天竺傳箋釋, p. 43.

2) *Hui-čao-čuan-k'ao* 慧超傳考, (ed. of the Dainihon Bukkyo Zensho), p. 1.

3) Die Chronol., p. 15.

the first idea which suggests itself in the interpretation of the name will be that it meant the same thing as Ših (石). This identification was actually proposed by our Fujita¹⁾ as well as by the Chinese scholar Lo Čen-yü (羅振玉), but the sameness of the first character of the one name as the other name itself, which was pointed out is not sufficient evidence. I should think their argument is untenable before the recognition of Ših (石) as a transcription of Čač or Šas. After our above observations regarding the six Čao-wu states in Sogdiana, what seems to me a more reasonable treatment of the question is to seek identity between Ših-lo and Ho. True the form of Ših-lo has no shadow of resemblance to that of Ho or its original, Gao or Gava, neither to the alternative name Kušānī nor its Chinese transcription Kuei-šuang-ni (貴霜匿); yet it is worth while to consider whether Ših-lo and Ho are not related in some other direction.

There is an Arabic account of Qutaiba's conquest of Central Asia which is very remarkable for the statement it contains that Baikand, Božāra, Kešš, Soghd, and Šaš were subject to Chinese and T'ü-čüeh influences.²⁾ It is strange to see Soghd put on a par with the other countries which we know were mere parts of Soghd itself, and we could account for it only by supposing that there was in Soghd some individual state which assumed the general name of Soghd, perhaps because it was particularly powerful and therefore representative of the region. If it was not K'ang or Samarkand, such country could not have been any other than Kušānī. According to Istachri, it was the most advanced city in Soghd and formed the centre for the whole district. Ibn Hauqal tells us that in all Soghd it was the most refined, most populous, and best fortified city; those other authorities Mukadassi, Istachri, and Byrūni being unanimous in granting it the first place among all the towns there.³⁾ Thus, if any component of Sogdiana deserved the larger name, it was Kušānī itself, and this helps us to assume that the name Soghd meant Kusānī or Gao during some period.

There seems to be reason, on the other hand, to connect the name Ših-lo with Soghd, through the medium of Su-li, which was a variant of the latter name. Chinese literature provides a number of instances of the representation of Soghd by the name Su-li, as:—Su-li (率利) in the Hsi-yü-čü, Su-li (蘇哩) in the Fan-yü-tsa-ming, Hsiu-li (修利) in the Čih-to-lun (智度論), Su-li (速利) in the Nan-hai-čü-kuei-čuan (南海寄歸傳), etc. The etymological explanation of this is that Sugdak corrupted into Sudak or Suda, and this again into Sulak, Surak, or Su-li. In this matter we may draw analogy from the case of Sugdak as the name of an old market town in the Crimean peninsula, which is known to have changed by steps to Sudak, Soldaia, and Solak. The history of language has examples of the commutation between the *l* sound and the *d*,

1) Hui-čao's Wang-wu-t'ien-čü-čuan Čien-ših (慧超往五天竺傳箋釋), p. 43.

2) TOMASCHKE, Centralasiatische Stud., I, p. 143.

3) Dit., p. 162; MARQUART, Die Chronol., pp. 59-60.

and this phenomenon is particularly noticeable in Central Asia, one illustration being the word *balax* (ruby), which originated from the name of the ruby-producing place, *Badaxšan*. Therefore, Sugdak, in the sense of Soghd, may have passed in a similar way to *Sulak*, and then to *Sula* or *Suli*, and in all probability this last form was the original for the transcription Ših-lo (石驪). Ših-lo, then, is to be interpreted as meaning Soghd, in the sense narrowed to the country of Kušānī, and accordingly identified with Ho, in the dynastic histories.

Further to assert that the six Hu countries mentioned by the priest traveller did not include any north of the Jaxartes will serve to confirm the above decision. The explorer writes in the same book of travel: "Eastwards from K'ang, it is the country of Pa-ho-to (Ferghāna) (跋賀訖). There are two kings here again. The great river Fu-yu (縛叉) flows west through the middle of the country. South of the river is ruled by a king who is subordinate to Ta-ših, and north of the river by a king subject to the T'u-čüeh jurisdiction."¹⁾ There is no doubt Pa-ho-to meant Ferghāna, and as for the river Fu-yu, it has been pointed out by LO ČEN-YÜ that the name was a corrupt spelling of Fu-č'a (縛叉), and although this name was proper to the Amu Darya, yet geographical consideration makes it necessary to assume that the author misapplied it to the Sir Darya. Now notice how he ascribes the territory north of the Jaxartes to the T'u-čüeh dominion and south of the river to Arabian suzerainty, and when the same observer describes, as we have seen before, those six Hu states as all belonging to the jurisdiction of Ta-ših or Arabia, it must seem certain that all the countries were situated to the south of the river. It follows that Ših-lo, one of the group of six, could not have been identical with Ših, which, being Taškend itself, was clear away to the other side of the stream.

We may now take it as fairly established that Sogdiana comprised six states under the Čao-wu family or "alty Čub" as the T'u-čüeh inscription has it, during the period at least from the T'u-čüeh raid there to the priest traveller's passage through the region, 701-727 A.D. As regards earlier ages, we know there were once nine such, giving origin to the traditional term Nine Houses. By what transition the number so diminished can not be known with any exactitude. We have, however, ascertained that in the Sui period there were only seven to be recognized as really belonging to the Čao-wu family rule, and this is the first case in which we perceive any variation in the number. In the T'ang period our acknowledgment of the Čao-wu states is confined to six, and it is evident that this further reduction had been completed before the T'u-čüeh expedition in 701 A.D. The phrase "Soghd of alty Čub" by which the raiders record their field of exploitation suggests how "six Čao-

1) Hui-čao's *Wang-wu-t'ien-č'u-čuan Čien-ših*, p. 48.

wu” was then a famous term that represented Sogdiana. And this leads us to ask whether, in the former times when there were nine Čao-wu states instead of six, “nine Čao-wu” was not the corresponding western term? By analogy with “alty Čub,” this will shape itself into something like “toquz Cub” in Turkish speech.

I think we can detect a trace of this term in the *T'ung-tien*, where it gives as another name for Su-tê or Sukdok the form Tê-čü-mêng (特拘夢). HIRTH interpreted it as a transcription from *Turkoman*,¹⁾ but this presupposed his own identification Su-tê with the Crimean Sugdak, which enabled him to relate the alternative name to the Huns. To my mind, Tê-čü-mêng (Têk-kü-mêng) must have reference to *Su-tê* which occurs in the *Wei-šu* alone, and which therefore means Sogdiana as it was in the Northern and Southern dynastic period, that is, Sogdiana with nine Čao-wu kings. I am inclined to recognize in the first two characters in the name, Tê-čü (*Têk-lü*) (特拘) the transcription of the Turkish word for nine, *toquz*. As for the other member of the name *mêng* (夢), I think it is comparable with *manap* in the Kasak Kirghiz dialect, and with *manab* in the Čagatai speech, both of which mean prince or nobleman, and which are also applied to a celebrated ancestor of the race, sometimes amounting to as much as the Arabic title “Sultan.”²⁾ The whole term, Tê-čü-mêng, then, will read “Toquz manab,” whose meaning is “nine princes.”

It is now time to turn back to resume the question of what was meant by *Wên-na-ša* (溫那沙), which the *Wei-šu* presented as another name for Su-tê or Soghd. We learn on the other hand from the *Sui-šu* that the family name of the king of K'ang was Wên (溫), and putting aside for the moment the question of how this name is reconcilable with the more conspicuous family name of Čao-wu, we may take it for granted that the first member of *Wên-na-ša*, was this very *Wên*. Then the last member *ša* (沙) reminds us of the Iranian word for king, *šah*. The inscriptions on certain coins of the Ta-yüeh-ših and the Ephthalite peoples bear witness to the fact that some Turkish conquerors of Iran sometimes assumed that Iranian title of sovereignty. We know also from Chinese records that certain of the Turkish rulers of Turkestan and Afghanistan during the period from the Northern and Southern to the T'ang dynasty called themselves by that title. For instance, the king of An is represented as Čao-wu-ša (昭武殺) in the *Hsi-yü-čuan* of the *T'ang-šu*,³⁾ and in all probability *ša* was transcribed from *šah*. Possibly this king may have been the same person as Šaba Šah, the powerful Turkish chieftain who waged

1) Über Wolga-Hunnen und Hiung-nu, p. 263.

2) VÁMBÉRY, Etymologisches Wörterbuch, No. 233; Seix Sulejman Efendi, Čagatai-Osmanisches Wörterbuch, p. 143; RUDOGOFF, Srabnitjesnij Slobar Turecko-Tatarskix Narjecij, II, p. 200; RADLOFF, Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialecte, I, 2017.

3) Chap. 221 b, p. 2 r°.

war with the army of the Persian king Šapur, and whom CHAVANNES thought recognizable as a ruler of Boḡāra. In the *T'ang-šu* account of Či-pin (黠賓), again, the name of its king occurs as Wu-san Tê-lê ša (烏散特勒灑), and granted the character 勒 lê was a corruption of 勤 ċin, the last three syllables seem to agree with Tegin Šah. To show by example how the same title was capable of the transcription by the character ša (沙), we may quote from the *Wên-hsien-t'ung-k'ao* (文獻通考) this passage: "The country of Fu-lin leads southwards to (the territory of) Mieh-li-ša (滅力沙)."¹⁾ Beyond question the last term meant Melik Šah, the chief of the Seldjuk Turks. All these observations assist us to recognize in the final member of *Wên-na-ša* the Iranian royal title Šah.

There remains to be examined the middle term *na*, and our attention is naturally called to the Iranian numeral expressing nine. The variants of the numeral within the Iranian family of languages are ascertained to be as follows: *náo* in Wayan and Šignan, *nao* in Sangliés and Mingian, *nau* in Yagnob, *new* in Sari-kol, *nava* in Bactrian, *nuh* in Persian, *noh* in Afghan, and *nou* in Osset.²⁾ We may assume the *na* of *Wên-na-ša* was a modification of one or another of these variations, at all events a transcription from the Soghd equivalent of "nine." This makes us interpret the whole term *Wên-na-ša* as "nine kings of the Wên family," and this we find partly to correspond to the Turkish name of the region, Tê-ü-mêng,—"Nine princes."

Since the *Sui-šu* account of K'ang shows the family name of its king to have been Wên, and since at the same time it is obvious from the context, as also from the *T'ang-šu* description of the country, that the family name Čao-wu was shared all round by the Soghd group of states including K'ang, it must seem that the royal family name was both Wên and Čao-wu. Certainly this is a phenomenon which requires explanation. We have already seen how often in the *T'ang-šu* the name Čao-wu occurs as part of royal personages' names, as, for example, Čao-wu-Ša (昭武殺) of Hsiao-An, Čao-wu Pi-čö (昭武閉拙) of Mi, Čao-wu P'o-ta-ti (昭武婆達地) of Ho, and Čao-wu Ših-ho-ho (昭武失呵喝) of Ših (史); whereas no personage is ever found to be recorded by the name Wên. In view of this it might seem allowable to suppose that *Wên* was the older name which was supplanted by *Čao-wu*. In my opinion, however, it is not impossible the two names were in simultaneous use. For we have already seen how the communities in the region were always composed of two elements, the governing class of foreign origin and the governed Iranian natives, and how they were divided in language and social customs. We may presume that *Wên* was the Iranian term which the native subjects gave to the reigning house, and *Čao-wu* the name by which the Turkish

1) Chap. 339, p.

* 2) TOMASCHKE, Central. Stud., II, p. 321.

rulers and their direct followers called themselves and their masters. We can conclude therefore that the other name of Su-tê *Wên-na-ša* was a purely Iranian appellation meaning "Wên nine Kings" the full equivalent of which in Turkish should have been *Čao-wu Tê-čü-mêng* (昭武特拘夢), though we see only the abridged form on record.

CHAPTER V

Su-tê in the Narrower Sense Identified with Kušānī

We have recognized *Su-tê* as the general name for all Soghd, and have been imagining there a group of Čao-wu states with K'ang or Samarkand as its centre, being the seat and the direct possession of the supreme master of all Soghd. It must be noted, however, that Su-tê did not always mean the whole of Soghd and that Samarkand did not in every period hold such position in the group. When we read in the *Wei-šu* that Su-tê sent tribute in the 1st, the 3rd, and the 5th year of *Ta-yên*, in the 3rd of *Tai-an* and in the 4th year of *Yen-hsiang*, we may not notice anything remarkable in it, but the passage of the same book which relates to the 3rd year of *Tai-ho* (太和) (479 A.D.) excites our curiosity, because, enumerating ten foreign countries which each sent an embassy with tribute to the Wei court, it mentions Su-tê and Hsi-wan-č'in (Samarkand) co-ordinately in the same list.¹⁾

No tribute from Su-tê occurs thereafter in the *Wei-šu*, but the later history *Čou-šu* (周書) testifies to its paying tribute to the Čou dynasty in the 4th year of *Pao-ting* 保定, (564 A.D.) Here arises the suspicion that Su-tê thus distinguished from Samarkand may not mean the whole of Soghd, and this recalls what we have inferred about the *Soghd* mentioned in a certain Arabic record and about its Chinese equivalent *Ših-lo*, that the term *Soghd* during a certain period denoted the particular state of Kušānī. That the same discrimination in sense applies to Su-tê can be more positively attested on Chinese record. The *Hsi-yü-čuan* of the *Wei-šu* and of the *Pei-ših* provides descriptions for the following countries that there were in Sogdiana during the period of the Northern and Southern dynasties:—Mi-mi 迷密, Hsi-wan-č'in 悉萬斤 (=K'ang), Mou-čih 牟知 (=Mu), Č'ieh-pu-tan 伽不單, Sê-čih-hsien 色知顯 (=Ts'ao 曹), Niu-mi 紐密, Fu-huo 副貨 (=An), and Č'ieh-sê-ni 伽色尼 (=Ših 史). Here are present among others five of those six countries ascertained to have been Čao-wu states in the T'ang period, but not Ho, which was no mean member of the group. And what is remarkable is that the

1) *Wei-šu*, chap. 7 a, p. 10 r°; *Pei-ših*, chap. 3, p. 6 v°.

same *Hsi-yü-čuan*, on the other hand bears an account of Su-tê. Here we have an exact parallel to the case of the Hsin-lo priest's list of six Hu states, where Ho was replaced by Ših-lo. Just as Ših-lo was a corrupt transcription of *Sugdik* in its narrower sense of Kušānī, so the *Wei-šu* reproduction of *Sugdik*, *Su-tê*, must have signified that particular state exclusively.

The reason why that individual state assumed the general name for Soghd has been explained above while considering the interpretation of Ših-lo, and here it is enough to quote in addition what TOMASCHEK observes of Kušānī:—that as Samarkand was always the focus of intellectual activities, the rendezvous of merchants, and the storing place of commodities, for Sogdiana; so Kušānī had a peculiar significance and glory as the capital of the Kušāns, and later of the Haital-Huns.¹⁾ It is to be doubted whether Kušānī was at any time the capital of the Kušāns or the Ta-yüeh-ših, but there is testimony in Chinese records to the fact of its being the capital of the Yen-ta (嚙噠) or the Haital-Huns. The seat of the Ephthalite chief of all Soghd, Kušānī may well have been known by the larger name Su-tê to the Northern and Southern dynasties.

Su-tê recorded as a tribute-payer to the Wei dynasty being not Samarkand, but Kušānī, its site is to be assigned to Kota Kurgan to-day. We may also understand that the King of Su-tê who is said by history to have redeemed his countrymen prisoners at Ku-tsang was the monarch of all Soghd who reigned from Kušānī, not the chief of Samarkand, as might have been supposed. As for the racial identity of the Kušānī rule, we read this instructive statement in the *Wei-šu*:—that Su-tê had been taken by the Hiung-nu usurpers, whose descendant by two generations was the contemporary king Hu-ni (忽倪) (忽倪).²⁾ The *Hiung-nu* must have meant the Ephthalites or the Yen-ta of Chinese history, while the king Hu-ni seems to coincide with the King Zušnāwaz of western record. All these subjects will be more fully discussed in my separate treatise on the Yen-ta race, which is now in preparation.

Kušānik was the seat of the Yen-ta government over all Soghd and for this reason identified itself with Su-tê, during at least some part of the period of the Northern and Southern dynasties, but from what we have observed in the foregoing chapters, it is obvious that in the Sui period as well as in the T'ang, the king of K'ang was at once the leader of the neighbouring states in Sogdiana. The movement of the political centre between the two places, we have not enough material to trace out with any exactness, but some light is cast on this question by a study in the *Wei-šu* as to how recurrent embassies and tributes from western countries are on record. As we can gather from

1) Central. Stud., I, p. 160.

2) *Hsi-yü-čuan*, chap. 102, p. 8 v°.

scattered entries in the dynastic history, Su-tê was represented at the Wei court nine times, ranging from the 1st year of *Ta-yen* (435 A.D.) to the 3rd year of *Tai-ho* 太和 (497 A.D.) on the last occasion her envoy presenting himself in company with that of Hsi-wan-č'in. Previous to that time, a representative of Hsi-wan-č'in had visited only twice: in the 3rd year of *Yen-hsing* 延興 (473 A.D.), and in the 1st year of *Č'êng-ming* (承明, 476 A.D.), but thereafter the compliment was paid seven times, ending with the 2nd year of *Yung-p'ing* 永平 (509 A.D.) Thus Su-tê is displaced by Hsi-wan-č'in on the whole, though there is a brief period of overlapping. Does that mean that the Su-tê or Kušānī power was superseded by that of Hsi-wan-č'in about that time? I should rather think it only meant that the ruler of all Soghd moved his capital to Samarkand. This view seems to be confirmed when we see later in the same history that *Hsi-wan-č'in* gives place to *Yen-ta* as a regular visitor at the Wei court. Hsi-wan-č'in sent her last envoy in 509 A.D., while Yen-ta, beginning with the 4th year of *Č'eng-ših* 正始 (507 A.D.), scores eleven visits up to the 12th year of *Ta-t'ung* 大統 (546 A.D.) of Hsi-Wei. The underlying fact must be that the Ephthalite monarch of all Soghd, who had been in Samarkand, abandoned it, about the year 507, for his new seat at Pa-ti-yen (拔底延) or Bactria city, as a result of the southward extension of his territory.

Towards the end of the Northern and Southern dynasties, when the ascendancy of the T'u-č'ieh people supplanted the Ephthalite influence in Central Asia, the chieftains of the Soghd countries were probably suffered by their new northern master to rule their own states as before. We have already read of the king Tai-ših-pi of K'ang, who married the daughter of the T'u-č'ieh Kaghan and who led the other Č'ao-wu states. Samarkand was again the capital city for all Soghd, and no doubt, Kušānī had by this time, lost its old significance. And if in the T'ang period the priest traveller records it by the name of *Ših-lo* or *Sogdik*, it must not be supposed the place still deserved the name by continuing to be the first city in the region; it was called so only by force of usage for some time after its eclipse. We find on record that Su-tê paid tribute to the Čou court in the 4th year of *Pao-t'ing* 保定 (565 A.D.), nevertheless it is true the Ephthalite days were practically ended by that time. So long was the old political centre of Soghd allowed to monopolize the regional name, and perhaps this is why Samarkand was never represented by this appellation, in spite of the predominant position it acquired in time.

CONCLUSION

To take a general review of what representation the region of Sogdiana had in successive parts of Chinese history, it was Su-i 粟弋 in the *Hou-han-šu* and the Čin-šu, Šu-yu 屬絲 in the *Wei-liao*, and Su-tê 粟特 in the *Wei-šu*, the last form applying in the later stage of the Northern and Southern dynasties to Kušānī as the representative state of Soghd. Passing down to the T'ang period, we see the names 率利, 修利, 速利, etc. as various writers transcribed in their own ways *Suli*, the corruption of *Sugdlik*, while HUI-ČAO's travel uses the term "Hu countries" to cover the whole Soghd region. All those T'ang period names may be assumed as befitting the area coextensive with those six Čao-wu countries we have acknowledged in the same period. An exception, however, must be recognized in HSÜAN-ČUANG'S Su-li 率利, which his *Hsi-yü-č'i* defines as follows: "From Su-yeh-šui City to the land of Čieh-šuang-na 羯霜那 there lies what is named Su-li 率利, with the people also so named, and their language and script named accordingly."¹⁾ Apparently *Su-yeh-šui* meant Suj-ab, now the Ču river; and Čieh-šuang-na 羯霜那 represented Kašāniya, or Šahr-i Sabz at present. Then the same book of his gives an account of Kašāniya, in which a description of the Iron Gate is followed by this passage:—Passing outside the Iron Gate you reach the country of *Tu-huo-lo* 都貨邏, whose extent is over 1,000 *li* from north to south, and over 3,000 *li* from east to west. It is bounded by the Pamirs on the east and borders Po-ssü on the west, with the Ta-hsüeh Mountains (大雪山) on the south and the Iron Gate backing its north, and with the great Fu-č'u (縛芻) River flowing west through the middle of the country. Since several hundred years ago, the royal family has been discontinued, and so tribal chieftains contend there with each other, every one pretending to mastership. They protect themselves by rivers and steeps and thus cut up the land into 27 countries."²⁾ HSÜAN-ČUANG'S Su-li extended on the north as far as the Ču river, comprising the northern foot of the Alexander Mountains, Ferghāna, Taškend and Zodjend to the north of the Jaxartes; on the other side of the river, it embraced all the basing of the Zarafšān and the Kaška, having its southern limit, however, at the mountain range of Derbend. The space between Derbend and the Oxus, it did not include, for the author counts among his 27 Točāra countries the following localities drained by the Surčāb and the Panjab:—Čü-mi 咀密, Čü-mi-to (拘謎陁), K'o-tu-lo (珂咄羅), Yü-man (愉漫), Č'ih-é-yen-na (赤鄂衍那), Čü-ho-yen-na (鞠和衍那), etc.³⁾ We must understand therefore HSÜAN-ČUANG'S Su-li 率利 did not exactly correspond with contem-

1) Chap. 1, p. 18.

2) Chap. 1, p. 24.

3) Chap. 1, pp. 25-27.

porary transcriptions of *Soghd*. Neither does it seem any more precisely to agree with the Sogdiana of the western writers. ERATOSTHENES says that the Jaxartes separated Sogdiana from Saka just as the Oxus divided it from Bactria and this shows that the north of the region in question was limited by the Sir Darya.¹⁾ The same fact is also suggested by the story of King Cyrus's building Cyropolis at the present Ura-tüpä as a defence against the Scythian aggression, and by Alexander's establishment of his namesake city at Xodjend for a similar purpose. TOMASCHEK drew the map of Ma-Waral-nahr, the "district between the rivers," as it was under the Samanid dynasty, and we find it to include these seven countries—Boḡāra, Soghd, Nasaf, Kešš, Osrušanah, Čaganiyan, and Xuttal, but not Ferghāna, which is placed outside.²⁾ His depiction of Sogdiana of the Greeks, however, is somewhat different. This contains Ferghāna within the area, while Termid, the country between Derbend and the Oxus, is left out for Bactria. But it is a question whether Sogdiana should be stretched so far north as to embrace Ferghāna. In the conquest of Sogdiana, Alexander despatched an army to Osrušanah, but nothing is known to have been done farther east than Xodjend. We have seen, moreover, the Arabs' Ma-Wara-l-nahr did not include Ferghāna, and that the Han historians recognized Su-i (Sugdik) as distinguished from their Ta-wan (Ferghāna). We may assume the same thing was true with the Greeks' Sogdiana.

The extent of the Han historian's Su-i cannot be easily defined, for they describe the country in but brief and vague terms. Seeing, however, that their Ta-hsia or Ta-yüeh-ših meant Bactria; their Ta-wan, Ferghāna; while their K'ang-kü is assignable to the north of the Jaxartes; their Su-i may be taken as nearly corresponding to the whole area covered by the six Čao-wu states as identified in the T'ang period. It is a question, however, whether Termid should be included. History shows Čang K'ien found the Ta-yüeh-ših monarch holding his court to the north of the Oxus, and this apparently meaning the district of Termid, we should be enabled to decide whether or not it was recognized as part of Ta-hsia by finding out from some other data whether the race had their headquarters then within the limits of the latter.

Reading about Ta-hsia and Ta-yüeh-ših in the *Ših-č'i* and the *Han-šu*, nobody will doubt that they were two distinct powers in the Chinese explorer's eyes, Ta-hsia being Toḡāra, as was indisputably identified by MARQUART, one might naturally suppose that this race after having their period of predominance over the ruins of the Greco-Bactrian Kingdom, was superseded by the invading Ta-yüeh-ših. Chronological consideration, however, does not approve this view. As western investigators have ascertained, the Greco-Bactrian influence was surviving to the north of the Hindu Kush even as late as 140 B.C.

1) Centralasiatische Studien, I, No. 3.

2) id. No. 1.

On the other hand, Čang K'ien's visit to the Ta-yüeh-ših, when he found them flourishing to the north of the Oxus, took place in 129 B.C., as has been justly calculated by our KUWABARA.¹⁾ These dates, are so close that we find it hard to imagine an intermediate period of another race's ascendancy in the same place. This gives rise to the suspicion that Ta-hsia or Točara was in reality of a people identical with the Ta-yüeh-ših themselves. And in fact my investigation of the history of the race has brought out the evidence that in the early days when they dwelt in Ho-hsi (河西), they called themselves Točāra, and that *Ta-yüeh-ših* or *Yüeh-ših* was the name given them by the Chinese. It was they who overthrew the Bactrian rule and fastened their own indigenous name Točāra on the conquered territory. Čang K'ien, however, was in all probability uninformed of this fact. He knew the people by the Chinese name alone, and as for *Točāra* he must have thought it was the original name of the region; otherwise his observation would not have conduced to the historical statement that the Ta-yüeh-ših beat and subjugated Točāra. Now Termid was the seat of their government at that period, and beyond question, it must have been within their own territory Točāra, that is, Ta-hsia. The southern extent of Su-i, therefore, did not go beyond Derbend, which marked it off from Termid. The *Hsi-yü-čuan* of the *Han-šu* contains the following statement about the country of Hsiu-hsün (休循), which occupied the northern plateau of the Pamirs:—"It is 920 *li* north-west to Ta-wan, and 1,610 *li* west to Ta-yüeh-ših,"²⁾ and from this we may infer that the valleys of those northern tributaries of the Oxus, Surkab and Panja, were not part of Su-i, but of Ta-hsia. The lower reach of the Amu Darya, on the other hand, was occupied, as we have already seen, by the countries of 驩潛 Huan-č'ien (Xuan-č'iem) and 大益 Ta-i (Dahe, Dai). In the light of all these observations, it is fairly clear that the term *Su-i* in the Han history applied to practically the same area as was covered by the Čao-wu group of states in the T'ang times.

1) The Mission of Čang K'ien (張騫の遠征), p. 97.

2) Chap. 96 a, p. 13 r°.