

通報

T'OUNG PAO

ARCHIVES

CONCERNANT L'HISTOIRE, LES LANGUES, LA GÉOGRAPHIE,
L'ETHNOGRAPHIE ET LES ARTS DE L'ASIE ORIENTALE

REVUE DIRIGÉE PAR

J. J. L. DUYVENDAK

Professeur à l'Université de Leyde

ET

PAUL DEMIÉVILLE

Membre de l'Institut

Professeur au Collège de France

THE LIBRARY OF
CONGRESS
SERIAL RECORDS

OCT 10 1952

VOL. XLI

Livr. 4—5



LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL

1952

通 報

T'OUNG PAO

ARCHIVES

CONCERNANT L'HISTOIRE, LES LANGUES, LA GÉOGRAPHIE,
L'ETHNOGRAPHIE ET LES ARTS DE L'ASIE ORIENTALE

REVUE DIRIGÉE PAR

J. J. L. DUYVENDAK

Professeur à l'Université de Leyde

ET

PAUL DEMIÉVILLE

Membre de l'Institut

Professeur au Collège de France

THE LIBRARY OF
CONGRESS
SERIAL RECORDS

OCT 10 1952

VOL. XLI

Livr. 4-5



LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL

1952

A SOGDIAN COLONY IN INNER MONGOLIA

BY

EDWIN G. PULLEYBLANK

The men of Sogdiana, says the *New T'ang History*, "have gone wherever profit is to be found".¹⁾ Pre-eminently traders, but also carriers of arts and crafts and of new religions, they travelled and settled not only along the trade routes of Central Asia but also deep in the interior of China and among the nomads of the steppes. Much of this, for instance their important civilizing influence among the Uigurs, is already known. What does not seem to be known at all in the west, and only very imperfectly among Far Eastern scholars²⁾, is the part they played among the Northern Turks who preceded the Uigurs. Later these partially Turkicized Sogdians formed a colony on the northern Chinese frontier whose unexpected and fascinating story I propose to tell.

When the Turks (T'u-chüeh) abruptly appeared at the middle of the sixth century, destroyed the power of the Jou-jan, and went on with the co-operation of the Persians to wipe out the

1) 利所在無不至, *HTS* 221B.1.2.

2) In 1923 T. Haneda 羽田 pointed out some of the most important evidence of Sogdian presence and influence among the Northern Turks (*Shinagaku* 3, 1923, pp. 319-333). Kuwabara 桑原 in his article *Zui-Tō jidai ni Shina ni raijū shita s. iikijin ni tsuite* (*Shinagaku* ronsō in honour of T. Naitō 内藤, Tōkyō, 1926, pp. 565-660) and Hsiang Ta 向達 in *T'ang-tai Ch'ang-an yü Hsi-yü wen-ming*, Peking, 1933, have contributed further items. Ch'en Yin-k'o 陳寅恪 has independently discussed the matter in *T'ang-tai cheng-chih shih sūn-lun kao*, Chungking 1944 and Shanghai 1947.

Hephthalite kingdom further south, they became overlords of Sogdiana. Sogdian merchant interests soon persuaded the Turkish *qaghan* of the importance of the silk trade and a Sogdian, Maniach, was in charge of embassies in this connection from the Turkish ruler to Persia and to Byzantium. Chavannes has already pointed this out and in addition has provided evidence from Byzantine sources of faint Christian influences exerted, presumably by Sogdians, on Turkish soldiers serving in Sogdiana. ¹⁾ But Sogdian association with the Turks went far beyond such quite external relations between the subject people and its conquerors. We find evidence in fact that what must have been considerable numbers of them lived at the court of the *qaghan*, not of the Western Turks who controlled Sogdiana, but of the Northern Turks in present Mongolia.

Some achieved positions of great influence. An early example is found in the story of An Sui-chia 安遂迦 who lived at the court of Tu-lan 都濫 Qaghan, one of the rival chiefs of the Northern Turks at the end of the sixth century, and became the paramour of his Chinese consort. This lady was a princess of the Ch'en dynasty. After Sui put an end to Ch'en, she and her lover conspired with a Chinese émigré against the new regime. In 592 a Sui ambassador who was visiting the *qaghan* revealed to Tu-lan his wife's guilty conduct. An Sui-chia and the Chinese émigré were handed over to the Chinese for execution. ²⁾

There can be no doubt that An Sui-chia was a Sogdian. He is called a 'hu-jen' 胡人 and from about this time the word *hu* 'barbarian' becomes specialized to mean the Iranian peoples of Central Asia, or even specifically the Sogdians, as opposed to

1) E. Chavannes, *Documents sur les Tou-kiue (Turks) occidentaux*, St. Petersburg, 1903, pp. 234-235 and 245.

2) *TCTC* 178, K'ai-huang 13/7/-; *Sui-shu* 51 (biography of Chang-sun Sheng). Sui-chia was anciently pronounced zwi-ka.

Turkish or Mongol speaking peoples. We do find it used, it is true, in a wider sense in vague literary expressions for barbarians in general and occasionally, usually in combination, to refer specifically to other peoples. Thus the Khitan are sometimes called *chieh-hu* 羯胡 (or *jung-chieh* 戎羯, *hu-chieh* 胡羯 etc.). Used as in the present case, however, without any qualification and in implied contrast to T'u-chüeh, *hu* certainly means Central Asiatic. ¹⁾

The surname An removes any last doubt of the significance of *hu*. An, which in the T'ang dynasty was the Chinese name for

1) In earlier times *hu* was used particularly to refer to the Hsiung-nu. Occasional survivals of this usage can be found in the Sui dynasty and even later. Thus the T'u-chüeh themselves, the successors of the Hsiung-nu, are on one or two occasions referred to as *hu*. Cf. *TFYK* 984.18.b and 990.16.a referring to the years 583 and 582; *Sui-shu* ch. 1 also reads 'hu' but *TCTC* 175, Chih-te 1/8/ *jen-wu* and T'ai-chieh 14/12/ *i-yu* reads 'T'u-chüeh'. See also page 326 note 3. The later usage is shown clearly in many examples in Chavannes, op. cit., see index under *hou*. See also Pelliot, *T'oung Pao*, 1923, p. 109, n. 2.

Chieh-hu, *jung-chieh*, etc., are simply compounds of two words meaning barbarians—cf. *jung-ti*, *fan-i*, etc., etc. *Chieh* originally meant a Hsiung-nu tribe which formed one of the 'Five Barbarians' (五胡) of the 4th century A.D. in north China. It was used in various combinations as a literary expression for the Khitan at the time of their invasions of Ho-pei in 696-697 (*CTS* 93.2.b, biography of T'ang Hsiu-ching; *Chang Yen-kung chi* 11, p. 128, 論神兵軍大總管功狀; *Fa-tsang ho-shang chuan* in *Taisō Tripitaka* 50, p. 283.3).

Later it was used similarly to refer to the rebels under An Lu-shan. This was probably due in the first place mainly to the fact that the rebels came from the north-east, the region of the Khitan, though the fact that An Lu-shan was a *hu* in the restricted sense and had many *hu* under him may also have been a factor in increasing the currency of the combination *chieh-hu*. In one text coming from near the end of the rebellion *chieh* in such compounds seems to have become equivalent to the simple *hu* 'Sogdian', or at least 'Central Asiatic' (*Chi-men chi-luan* 蘭門紀亂 quoted in *Tsu-chih f'ang-chien k'ao-i* 222, Shang-yüan 2/3/-). This does not mean that it meant 'Sogdian' earlier when referring to the Khitan invasions, as Ch'en Yin-k'o supposes. His argument is based on a supposed connection between *chieh-hu* and *che-chieh* 柘羯, which also occurs once or twice referring to some of An Lu-shan's soldiers. But *che-chieh* is a transcription of the Iranian word *chākar* (see Appendix) and in spite of the fact that in two passages referring to the same event the simple narrative has used the technical expression *che-chieh* but a memorial to the throne has substituted the more literary *chieh-hu* one cannot possibly equate the two words (*T'ang-tai cheng-chih shih shu-lun k'ao*, pp. 31-22 and 34). See also p. 328, note 4 on Ch'i-hu.

Bukhārā, was commonly adopted by natives of that region as a surname when they came to China. The Sogdians were known collectively as the 'Hu of the Nine Surnames' (Chiu-hsing Hu 九姓胡). The significance of the 'Nine Surnames' is not quite clear, but at least we find the following used by Sogdians in China: K'ang 康 (Samarkand), An 安 (Bukhārā), Shih 石 (Tāshkend), Shih 史 (Kish), Mi 米 (Māimargh), Ts'ao 曹 (Kabūdhān) and Ho 何 (Kushāniya).¹⁾ All of these surnames except Mi can have a

1) HTS 221B.1.a says under K'ang (Samarkand): "The rulers have the surname (*hsing*) Wen. They were originally Yüeh-chih men. Earlier they lived in the city of Chao-wu north of the Ch'i-lien [mountains]. They were overthrown by the T'u-chüeh and moving southwards along the Ts'ung-ling, possessed this country. The branch lines [of the royal house] became separate kings, namely An, Ts'ao, Shih 石, Mi, Ho, Huo-hsün (Khwarizm), Wu-ti (Anc. pron.: m̄u-d'i) and Shih 史. [Together with K'ang] they are commonly called the 'Nine Surnames'. They all have the surname (*shih*) Chao-wu." 君姓溫。

本月氏人。始居祁連北昭武城。爲突厥所破。稍南依葱嶺。卽有其地。枝庶分王曰安曰曹曰石曰米曰何曰火尋曰戊地曰史。世謂九姓。皆氏昭武。 The parallel passage in *Sui-shu* 83.5.a reads: "Their kings originally had the surname Wen. They were Yüeh-chih men. They formerly lived in the city of Chao-wu north of the Ch'i-lien Mountains. Because they were overthrown by the Hsiung-nu they went west across the Ts'ung-ling and possessed this country. The branch lines [of the royal house] all became separate kings and so all the countries surrounding K'ang have the surname Chao-wu to show that they do not forget their origin It is known as a strong country. Most of the countries of the western regions submit to it. Mi, Shih 史, Ts'ao, Ho, An, Lesser An (Kharghān), Na-se-po (Nakhshab), Wu-na-ho (Anc. pron.: uo-nā-yāt), Mu (Anc. pron.: m̄juk), are subject to it." 其王本姓溫。

月氏人也。舊居祁連山北昭武城。因被匈奴所破。西踰葱嶺。遂有其國。支庶各分王。故康國左右諸國。並以昭武爲姓。示不忘本也 名爲強國。而西域諸國多歸之。米國史國曹國何國安國小安國那色波國烏那曷國穆國。皆歸附之。 Cf. *Pei-shih* 97.15.b. *Wei-shu* 102.12.b contains this

same text. Hirth assumed that this *Wei-shu* text dated from near the beginning of the Wei dynasty in 437. This would in any case be unjustifiable, but in fact it is clear that the

non-Sogdian origin but, particularly in the case of An and K'ang, we can usually suspect Sogdian origin when we find these sur-

Wei-shu has been supplemented from the *Pei-shih*, which in its turn was based on the *Sui-shu* (see *Ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu tsung-mu* 45.11.a). It is important to point out this old error because it has been taken over by others, e.g. the *Encyclopedia of Islam*, article Samarkand. (See Marquart, *Die Chronologie der alttürkischen Inschriften*, p. 58.)

These passages have given rise to a good deal of conjecture. It has been assumed too readily that the list of nine countries which were subject to K'ang in Sui were somehow connected with the 'Nine Surnames' of the *Hsin T'ang-shu* and attempts have been made to eliminate one of them so that with K'ang they would make the total nine. In fact there is no mention in the *Sui-shu* text of 'Nine Surnames'. *Sui-shu* does say that K'ang's neighbouring states were ruled by kings of the same Chao-wu family. As the *Hsin T'ang-shu* appears to connect the 'Nine Surnames' so closely to the Chao-wu name, it might seem natural to suppose that the 'Nine Surnames' existed also in Sui times and to try to identify them with nine states mentioned in the *Sui-shu*. But this immediately raises a host of difficulties. Besides the nine countries submitted to K'ang, two more — Ferghana and Ts'ao 漕 (a country north of the Ts'ung-ling)—are mentioned in the *Sui-shu* as having the Chao-wu surname. Shih 石 (Tāshkend) is not included in the *Sui-shu* list, yet it is one of the Ordos Sogdian surnames (see below), which must date from Sui times. The arguments that have been advanced for picking a particular nine and eliminating the others seem arbitrary (see Marquart, *op. cit.*, p. 60; Shiratori, *Keleti szemle*, 1902, pp. 122-123 and *Mem. of the Res. Dept. of the Tōyō Bunko*, 1928, p. 102 ff.).

The whole argument is greatly weakened when we realize that the *Hsin T'ang-shu* cannot in fact be relied upon as evidence that there was any connection between Chao-wu and the 'Nine Surnames'. It should already be obvious that the *Hsin T'ang-shu* is largely based on the *Sui-shu*. If we bring into account the texts of the *T'ung-tien* and the *Chiu T'ang-shu*, the evolution of the text becomes even clearer. *T'ung-tien* 193.1.a has: 其王姓温 自被匈奴所破. 西踰葱嶺. 遂有此國. 枝庶各分王. 故康國左右諸國米國 (list as in *Sui-shu*). . . . 凡九國. 皆其種類並以昭武爲姓. 示不忘本也. *CTS* 198.13.a has: 其王姓温氏 爲突厥所破. 南依葱嶺. 遂有其地. 枝庶皆以昭武爲姓. 不忘本也. We see that the editor of this passage in the *T'ung-tien* merely copied the words of the *Sui-shu* but rearranged them on the assumption that the nine states subject to K'ang were identical with the states of the Chao-wu surname. The *Chiu T'ang-shu* was based independently on the *Sui-shu* which it abridged, notably omitting the list of subject states. The *Hsin T'ang-shu* adopted many of the changes of wording introduced by the *Chiu T'ang-shu* but retained the characters 分王, thus showing that its editor referred back either to the *T'ung-tien* or to the *Sui-shu*. He also

names occurring in texts of the T'ang period. The occurrence of inserted the passage: 曰安 . . . 九姓, thus substituting a new list for the one contained in the T'ung-tien.

There is nothing to tell us the source of this addition. There is certainly nothing to assure us that the editor of the *Hsin T'ang-shu* had any good grounds for inserting it where he did and identifying his nine surnames with the countries of the Chao-wu kings. In view of the patchwork methods of the Chinese historians in general and the composite nature of the *Hsin T'ang-shu* in particular, it is at least as likely that he arbitrarily inserted a quite unrelated list. Other cases are known in which misconceptions have been introduced into the *Hsin T'ang-shu* by just such arbitrary interpretations of the editors.

I know of no occurrence of the term 'Nine Surnames' in any form, referring to Sogdians, before the eighth century. The earliest case I know refers to the Ordos Sogdians who are called the 'Nine Hu' in one text relating to the events of 721 (see p. 337, note 4). The date of the list in the *HT* text is of course unknown, but I should think it unlikely that it was before the eighth century. It is also noteworthy that apart from the *HTS* text all occurrences of the expression that have been noted refer to Sogdians on the Chinese frontier, not in their native land. Besides the cases mentioned in the present article referring to the Ordos colony, the expression is used of Sogdians living under the protection of the Uigurs at Ch'ang-an (see Appendix) and of a certain An Men-wu 安門物 (Anc. pron.: muən-mjuət; or 'gate goods'?) who was a leader in a revolt at Liang 涼 Chou in Kansu in 757 (in support of An Lu-shan's rebellion?) (*TCTC* 219, Chih-te 2/1/ ping-yin). This may be explained by the comparative rarity of any need to refer to the Sogdians of Sogdiana. On the other hand it suggests that the expression may not have been indigenous to Sogdiana at all, but may have been applied by the Chinese to Sogdians in China because of the Chinese surnames they adopted. Seven of the nine surnames mentioned by the *Hsin T'ang-shu* actually occur in Chinese sources applied to Sogdians (see Kuwabara and Hsiang Ta), and An and K'ang are even found in Sogdian script (W. B. Henning, *BSOAS* XII (1948), p. 603). It is true that the two double surnames Huo-hsün and Wu-ti are not found, which may weaken this hypothesis a little.

The expressions *Chiu-fu* 九府 and *Chiu-hsing-fu* 九姓府 sometimes found referring to the Ordos Sogdians (or to a part of them) are mysterious. *Fu* suggests an administrative arrangement. Is it possible that the Chinese organization of the Ordos colony in the eighth century had something to do with the origin or at least with the propagation of the expression 'Nine Surnames'? After all the expression is first found in connection with them. I should not however wish to venture any definite answer to this question. (See p. 341, note 2 and p. 345, note 2).

Since there is no need to connect the 'Nine Surnames' with Chao-wu, I need not enter into the vexed question of the interpretation of that term (see Marquart, *op. cit.*, pp. 65-71; Chavannes, *op. cit.*, p. 312; Shiratori, *Mem. of the Res. Dept. of the Toyō Bunko* 2 (1928), p. 102 ff.). If Radloff and Marquart are right (*pace* Thomsen) in connecting Chao-wu (Anc. pron.: tsjäu-mju) with *čub* of the *alli Čub Soydaq* of the Orkhon inscriptions, it is even more difficult to think of the 'Nine Surnames', which are contemporary and later than the 'Six Čub', as referring to the Chao-wu states.

any of them together with the ethnic description *hu* may be taken as a certain indication of Sogdian origin.

The main evidence for the importance of Sogdians among the Northern Turks comes from the time of Hsieh-li, the last *qaghan* of the first empire, who was captured by the Chinese in 630. Before the Chinese gave him the coup de grâce, his power had been collapsing from within. In 629 the Chinese governor of Tai 代 Chou (modern Tai Hsien in northern Shansi), in a memorial to the throne concerning the situation among the Turks, alleged as one reason for expecting their imminent defeat that Hsieh-li's own people were resentful of the high favour shown to the *hu* at their expense.¹⁾ Only a summary of this memorial appears to exist, but it evidently formed the basis for the following statement of the *T'ung-tien* and the *Old T'ang History*: "Hsieh-li entrusted everything to the various *hu* and put his own people at a distance. The *hu* are grasping and presumptuous and by nature uncertain and changeable. So the laws were multiplied and the army was put into motion year after year. The people of the nation (i.e. the Turks) resented it and the tribes deserted."²⁾

These *hu* were not merely a few isolated individuals; they formed a separate 'tribe' (*pu* 部). We are told that Hsieh-li's nephew, T'u-li Qaghan, the second most important person among the Northern Turks at that time, had, before receiving the dignity of *qaghan* and being made governor of the Khitan and Mo-ho 靺鞨, been governor successively of the Sir Tarduš (Hsüeh-yen-t'o), the Hsi 霫, the *Hu* 胡, and the Hu-hsüeh 斛薛

1) CTS 68.7.b, biography of Chang Kung-chin.

2) 頡利每委任諸胡，疎遠族類，胡人貪冒，性多翻覆，以故法令滋章 (CTS: 彰)，兵革歲動，國人患之，諸部攜貳。 *T'ung-tien* 197.5.a; CTS 194A.4.a.b.

(a Tölös tribe). ¹⁾ Ample confirmation will appear presently for the assumption that this 'Hu pu' consisted of Sogdians.

The 'hu' K'ang Su-mi 康蘇密 who, when Hsieh-li's end was near in 630, surrendered to the Chinese bringing with him members of the Sui royal house who had taken refuge with the Turks, must have been one of the favoured *hu*. ²⁾ That same year when the defeated Turks were settled along the Chinese frontier in 'protected' (*chi-mi* 羈縻) prefectures under Chinese administration, "K'ang Su" (evidently a mistake for K'ang Su-mi) was made Governor of Pei-an 北安 Tu-tu-fu ³⁾, one of the eight divisions that were set up. ⁴⁾ Since it was the normal practice to make

1) HTS 215A.9.b.

2) CTS 194A.4.b; *T'ung-tien* 197.5.a; TCTC 193, Chen-kuan 4/1/-. The *T'ung-chien* also tells how a 'surrendered hu' tried to accuse certain Chinese of having plotted with the former Sui empress. Professor Henning suggests that Su-mi (Anc.: suo-mjēt) may possibly represent **Sumit*, borrowed from the Middle Indian *Sumitta* = Skr. *Sumitra*, a common name. Another individual case of a Sogdian chieftain who submitted with the Turks in 630 is that of An T'u-han 安朮汗 (Anc. pron: tuət (or k'uət)-γán), who came over with 5,000 tribesmen and was made prefect (*ts'e-shih*) of Wei 維 Chou. (This Wei Chou was presumably a "small prefecture" (*hsiao-chou*) under one of the *tu-tu-fu* set up in the Ordos [Pei-an Chou?]. It cannot have been the Wei Chou established near present Li-fan 理番 in Szechwan in 624 from surrendered White Dog Ch'iang 白狗羌.) This family is explicitly stated to have come from An-hsi. T'u-han's father Wu-huan 烏喚 (Anc. pron.: 'uo-γuán) held the office of *hsieh-li-t'u-fa* under the Turks. One of his grandsons, An Ssu-kung 思恭, was Prefect of Lu Chou, one of the Six Hu Prefectures (see below). This shows that in at least one instance a Chinese official was *not* in charge of one of these prefectures. See *Ch'üan T'ang-wen* 435.5a, *T'ang Wei Chou Ts'e-shih An Hou Shen-tao pi* by Li Chih-yüan 李至遠; cf. Hsiang Ta, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

3) TCTC 193, Chen-kuan 4/6/ *jen-yin*.

4) CTS 194A.7.a says, "In the territory of Shuo-fang 朔方, from Yu 幽 Chou (present Peking) to Ling 靈 Chou (south-west of present Ling-wu 武 Hsien in Ning-hsia), were established the four prefectures (*tu-tu-fu*) of Shun 順 Chou, Yu 祐 Chou, Hua 化 Chou and Ch'ang 長 Chou. In addition Hsieh-li's territory (the Ordos) was divided into six prefectures. On the left was established Ting-hsiang 定襄 Protectorate (*tu-hu-fu*) and on the right Yün-chung 雲中 Protectorate to govern his tribes". This would seem to mean that ten prefectures altogether were established. With minor variations the same passage appears in *T'ung-tien* 197.6.b; TCTC 193, Chen-kuan 4/4/

barbarian chiefs governors of their own tribes, we may suppose that K'ang Su-mi was in charge of the *hu* who had been among the Turks. The exact location of Pei-an Tu-tu-fu cannot be determined, but it was one of the six *tu-tu-fu* in the Ordos region within the loop of the Yellow River. ¹⁾

The decision to settle the former enemy in the Ordos, so close to the capital, had been strongly opposed by many persons in 630 ²⁾, and after an 'incident' in 639, a member of the Turkish royal house, A-shih-na Ssu-mo 阿史那思摩, was made *qaghan* and ordered to take "the Turks and the *hu* who had settled in the various prefectures" (突厥及胡在諸州安置者) north across the Yellow River. ³⁾ Ssu-mo was hard pressed by the Sir Tarduš, who had taken over the old grazing grounds of the Turks, and moreover was unable to control his own people. In 643 (or 644) they revolted against him. They asked and received permission to return to the Ordos. Ssu-mo himself had to flee to Ch'ang-an for safety. ⁴⁾ It is interesting to note that Ssu-mo

wu-ksü and *Chen-kuan cheng-yao* 9.20.a. *HTS* 43B.4.a, however, states that only four additional prefectures were established in the Ordos, namely Pei-k'ai 開, Pei-ning 寧, Pei-an 安, and Pei-fu 撫. Moreover, in recording the appointments made in 630, the *T'ung-chien* mentions these four and Feng 豐 Chou, which was later part of the regular prefecture system but was originally over the Turks. According to *CTS* 38.15.a, b Pei-k'ai Chou was changed to Hua Chou in 633 and Ch'ang Chou was not established until that year. This makes a total of six prefectures in the Ordos including two of the first four mentioned.

1) See also the Appendix regarding another group of Sogdians who came over to the Chinese from the Turks in 630.

2) See the discussion reported in *T'ung-tien* 197.6.a, b; *CTS* 194A.6.a, b; *Chen-kuan cheng-yao* 9.18.a ff.; *TCTC* 193, *Chen-kuan* 4/4/ *wu-ksü*.

3) *CTS* 3.5.b; *TCTC* 195, *Chen-kuan* 13/7/ *keng-ksü*; *Chen-kuan cheng-yao* 9.21.b; *CTS* 194A.7.b; *T'ung-tien* 197.6.b.

4) *CTS* 194A.8.a and *T'ung-tien* 197.7.a date this in 643 but *TCTC* 197, end of *Chen-kuan* 18, dates it in 644. *TCTC* 196, *Chen-kuan* 15/1/ *i-ksü* and 11/ *jan-shen* record how earlier Ssu-mo had, when threatened by the Sir Tarduš, been permitted to bring his people temporarily south of the Yellow River and even south of the Great Wall.

probably had Sogdian blood. We are told that he looked like a *hu* and not like a Turk. ¹⁾ Under Hsieh-li this had prevented him from exercising the military functions usually given to royal princes. He had been the most loyal of all Hsieh-li's entourage and they had been taken prisoner together. It was allegedly because of this loyalty that T'ai-tsung rewarded him by making him *qaghan*. Was it also that, being somewhat estranged by blood and perhaps by upbringing from his fellow Turks, he might have been thought more likely to remain loyal to the Chinese emperor?

The tribesmen who returned to the Ordos were again organized into a system of 'protected' prefectures. ²⁾ We find no specific mention of the *hu* but it is evident from what later appears that they must have been there. In 679 were established the Six Hu Prefectures (六胡州) — Lu 魯 Chou, Li 麗 Chou, Han 含 Chou, Sai 塞 Chou, I 依 Chou and Ch'i 契 Chou — "from surrendered Turks". The exact locations cannot be determined, but they were in the southern part of the Ordos region between Ling 靈 Chou (south-west of present Ling-wu 武 Hsien in Ning-hsia) and Hsia 夏 Chou (west of present Heng-shan 橫山 Hsien in Shensi). They were not the ordinary type of 'protected' prefecture, for they had Chinese officials directly over them (以唐人爲刺史). ³⁾ Proof that the *hu* in question were Sogdians, in

1) 以其貌似胡人。不類突厥。疑非阿史那族類。CTS 194A.7.a; T'ung-tien 197.6.b.

2) Details of the organization are difficult to discover because later changes have become confused with what was done in 649-650. HTS 43B.1.a ff. seems to give the clearest account. Cf. also CTS 194A.8.b; T'ung-tien 198.1.a; TCTC 199, Chen-kuan 23/2/ ping-ch'en, 23/10/-, Yung-hui 1/9/ heng-tsu; HTS 215A.11.b, 12.a. CTS 38.12.b gives a hopelessly jumbled account.

3) HTS 37.8.b; Yüan-ho chün-hsien chih 4.15.b; CTS 38.16.a. T'ai-p'ing huan-yü chi gives a divergent account of the origin of the Six Hu Prefectures. Ch. 39.1.a ff. states: "Thereafter (after Han), within the bend of the river in Ling, Hsia and Yüan 原 (present

spite of being included under the term T'u-chüeh, will appear later when we find Sogdian surnames associated with them.

Another event of 679 reveals the probable significance of this administrative change. In this year A-shih-te Wen-fu 阿史

Ku-yüan 固原 Hsien in Kansu) Prefectures there were barbarian (蕃胡) tribes. Wu-ti of Later Chou (561-578) accordingly established the Six Hu Prefectures to govern them. From Chen-kuan onwards T'ang gradually occupied this territory. In the middle of Yung-hui (650-655), Lu, Ch'i, I Sai, She 舍 (for Han 含) and Li — six prefectures — were again established with Chinese as prefects to govern them. They were called the Six Hu Prefectures." Ch. 39.3.b gives a fuller account of the establishment under Northern Chou: "The *Hou-chou-shu* says, 'Wu-ti once established the Six Hu Prefectures in the territory of Ling Chou and Hsia Chou to control the various *ku*. In Sui the three prefectures, Lu, I and Ch'i, were divided and Ch'ih 斥 Chou was also established in the territory of Ma-ling 馬領 Hsien to control the *ku* people. In T'ang before Yung-hui the names of the seven prefectures still existed." I have been unable to find the above quotation from the *Chou-shu* either in the *pen-chi* of Wu-ti or in the chapters on foreign tribes, nor have I found any other reference to the establishment of the Six Hu Prefectures under Northern Chou and the establishment of Ch'ih Chou in Sui. This detailed account from the Sung geography cannot be lightly brushed aside, but there are certain difficulties which throw doubts on its total accuracy. In the first place it is certainly in error in placing the re-establishment of the Six Prefectures in the period 650-655. Earlier sources are unanimous in placing it in 679. Moreover the location of Ch'ih Chou at Ma-ling, i.e. present Ma-ling Chen 鎮 120 li south of Huan 環 Hsien in Kansu, and the necessary implication that Lu, I and Ch'i were also in that region does not agree with the statement that the six prefectures were established in the territory of Ling Chou and Hsia Chou. Ma-ling was in fact in the territory of Yüan Chou mentioned in the first passage. One is led to suspect that the *T'ai-p'ing huan-yü chi* is not quoting the *Chou-shu* exactly and that the location it gives to the establishment under Chou is influenced by the position of the Six Prefectures under T'ang. It seems highly probable that the establishment under Northern Chou was not in the Ordos at all, but entirely in the mountainous territory of eastern Kansu, and that the new establishment under T'ang had nothing in common with the old except its nomenclature. The *ku* in question under Northern Chou can hardly have been Sogdians, but there is little to tell us what they really were. They cannot have been Tangut (Tang-hsiang) for it was only at the beginning of T'ang that elements of this people moved north under pressure from the Tibetans (*CTS* 198.2.b). They may have been Hsiung-an or Hsien-pei remnants, perhaps mixed with indigenous Ch'iang 羌 tribes. The A-shih-na, the ruling tribe of the Turks, are said to have originally been *tsu-ku* of P'ing-liang 平涼 (approximately the same as T'ang Yüan Chou) who fled into the steppe at the time of the defeat of Liang by Northern Wei in 439 (*Sui-shu* 84.1.a; cf. *Pai-shih* 99.1.b). The use of the term *ku* must belong to the earlier practice (see p. 319, note 1).

德温傅 and other Turkish chiefs settled in the Ordos and immediately to the north of it, threw off their allegiance to China and made the first attempt to re-establish an independent North Turkish state.¹⁾ One naturally infers that the *hu* did not join in this revolt and that in order to see that they remained loyal they were placed under direct Chinese control. From this time on our colony of Sogdians is commonly known as the Six Hu Prefectures, a term which persists even after the administrative organization has changed.

A-shih-te Wen-fu's revolt was suppressed but was soon followed by that of Qutluq and A-shih-te Yüan-chen 元珍 (Tonyuquq), which led to the founding of the second empire of the Northern Turks.²⁾ The Six Hu Prefectures remained loyal to the Chinese and were, it seems, an important factor in the defence of the northern frontier. The Ordos region is indeed sometimes called the 'Hu Park' (胡苑) at this period.³⁾ At the time of the Khitan invasion of Ho-pei in 696 a memorial deploras the weakening of the defences of Kuan-chung (modern Shensi), because the troops of the Six Hu Prefectures have all been sent to the north-east.⁴⁾

1) *CTS* 194A.8.b; *T'ung-tien* 198.1.b; *HTS* 215A.12.a; *TCTC* 202, T'iao-lo 1/10/-.

2) The identification of A-shih-te Yüan-chen with Tonyuquq, Chinese T'un-yü-ku 敦欲谷, in whose honour one of the Orkhon inscriptions was erected, was first made by Hirth, *Nachworte zur Inschrift des Tonjukuk*, p. 2 (in Radloff, *Die Altürkischen Inschriften der Mongolei*, Zweite Folge, St. Petersburg, 1899). It cannot be absolutely proved, but seems very probable and has been generally accepted. Cf. A. von Gabain, *Stadt und Steppe im Leben der ältesten Türken*, *Der Islam*, 29 (1949), pp. 30-62, for an outline and interpretation of this revolt.

3) See *Ch'en Po-yü wen-chi* 9.2.a, 諫靈賀入京書, and *Chang Yen-kung chi* 17, p. 179, 撥川郡王神道碑. The first of these pieces uses *hu-yüan* to refer to the Ordos in Han times. This might suggest that it was an old term dating from the time when the Hsiung-nu, often called *hu*, roamed in that area. I have been unable to find any evidence, however, of the use of the term before the seventh century. Chang Yüeh's use of it clearly refers to the present.

4) 今國家爲契丹大發河東道及六胡州綏延

An individual example of a Sogdian, probably from the Ordos colony, who served in the Chinese army is An Tao-mai 安道買. Early in 696, as Deputy Commissioner of the P'ing-ti 平狄 Army, he repelled a Turkish attack on Sheng 勝 Chou in the north-east corner of the Ordos. ¹⁾ Later in the same year he took part with the rank of Commander (Tsung-kuan 總管) in an expedition against the Khitan. ²⁾ We are told elsewhere that he was a *hu*. ³⁾ No doubt he was a leader of the colonists of the Six Hu Prefectures who commanded a body of his people serving in the Chinese army.

The Khitan invasions of Ho-pei in 696 and 697 caused serious alarm, and when Mo-ch'o 默啜 (Qapaghan Qaghan), Qutluq's successor, offered an alliance against the invaders, the Chinese court felt unable to refuse the high terms which he demanded. One of these was the handing over of the Six Hu Prefectures. This was acceded to and we are told that 'several thousand tents' were

丹隰等州稽胡類兵。悉赴營州。而緣塞空虛。靈夏獨立。 *Ch'en Po-yü wen-chi* 8.12.a.

The Ch'i-hu 稽胡 of Sui Chou (present Sui-te 德 Hsien in Shensi), Yen Chou (present Fu-shih 膚施 Hsien in Shensi), Tan Chou (present I-ch'uan 宜川 Hsien in Shensi) and Hsi Chou (present Hsien in Shansi) who are here associated with the Six Hu Prefectures were a non-Chinese but literate and settled people who had long been resident in those areas of eastern Shensi and western Shansi. They were also known as the Pu-lo-ch'i 步落稽 (Anc. pron.: b'uo-lâk-kiei). According to one account they were descendants of a Hsiung-nu tribe. They set themselves up as an independent state in 525 and played a part in the struggles between Northern Chou and Northern Ch'i. At the beginning of T'ang some supported the rebel leader in northern Shensi, Liang Shih-tu 梁師都, and one of their chiefs, Liu Tzu-chen 劉子真, set himself up independently for a time. See *T'ung-tien* 197.1.b; *Pei-shih* 96.13.b ff.; *CTS* 56, biographies of Liang Shih-tu and Liu Tzu-chen. The term *hu* as applied to them is of course merely a survival of an earlier usage. During T'ang they seem to have been absorbed by the Chinese or the Tangut, but as late as 774 we hear of troops being raised from them (*CTS* 196B.1.b).

1) *HTS* 4.8.a; *TCTC* 206, Shen-kung 1/1/ *Kuei-hsi*.

2) *Chang Yen-kung chi* 13, p. 139.

3) *CTS* 200A.1.a, biography of An Lu-shan; *An Lu-shan shih-chi* A.1.a.

forced to go out across the Yellow River to join the Turks. ¹⁾ For a number of years therefore Mo-ch'o raided at will into the Ordos ²⁾, until in 708 the Chinese general Chang Jen-tan 張仁亶 took advantage of the absence of the Turkish armies campaigning in the west to erect three forts and a system of defence posts along the northern course of the Yellow River, which thenceforth kept the Turks out. ³⁾ It would seem that the Six Hu Prefectures were not entirely emptied in 697. In 703 they were administratively combined into two prefectures and in 708 the two were combined into Lan-ch'ih 蘭池 Prefecture which was divided into six counties (*hsien*). ⁴⁾ This certainly seems to indicate a loss of population but not a complete denudation. The new name of 708 sug-

1) *CTS* 185A.7.b states that in 698 T'ien Kuei-tao 田歸道 was a member of an embassy to Mo-ch'o to conclude peace. According to this, Mo-ch'o demanded the Six Hu Prefectures but was refused. *CTS* 194A.10.a and *T'ung-tien* 198.2.a make it clear that the request was ultimately granted, but they merely speak of the Six Prefectures, leaving out the word *ku*, and are in some confusion as to what was meant. They explain that in the period Hsien-heng (670-673) Turkish tribes which surrendered were settled in Feng 豐 Chou (in the north-west corner of the Ordos), Sheng 勝 Chou (in the north-east corner), Ling Chou, Hsia Chou, Shuo 朔 Chou (present *hsien* in Shansi) and Tai 代 Chou (present *hsien* in Shansi). It seems clear that the editor of this passage did not himself understand the term 'Six Hu Prefectures' or 'Six Prefectures' and invented an explanation that seemed to him reasonable. There is no mention elsewhere of Turks surrendering in the period 670-673. All other circumstances suggest that it was the Six Hu Prefectures that were meant. *HTS* 215A.13.b repeats the same explanation but makes it absurd by speaking of the 'Six Prefectures of the River Bend' (*Ho-ch'ü* 河曲). *Ho-ch'ü* can only refer to the Ordos, and Shuo Chou and Tai Chou were certainly not there. *TCTC* 206, Shenkung 1/3/-, follows the interpretation of the *T'ung-tien* and the *Chiu T'ang-shu* but combines it with material from T'ien Kuei-tao's biography and elsewhere. In the *K'ao-i Ssu-ma Kuang* argues that the date should be 697, not 698.

2) In 702 Mo-ch'o ravaged Yen 延 Chou (present Yen-ch'ih 延 Hsien) and Hsia Chou on the south side of the Ordos (*TCTC* 207, Ch'ang-an 2/1/-).

3) *CTS* 93.4.b, biography of Chang Jen-yüan 張仁亶 (i.e. Chang Jen-tan); *CTS* 194A. 12.a; *T'ung-tien* 198.3.a.

4) *CTS* 38.17.b; *HTS* 37.8.b; *Yü-ho chün-hsien chih* 4.25.b. According to *HTS* 43B.3.a, Lan-ch'ih Chou was a 'chi-mi' prefecture over the Tangut. If this is not simply an error, it may represent a later establishment.

gests that the direct Chinese administration was abolished and replaced by a 'protected' prefecture under non-Chinese chiefs. At least it is normal for 'protected' prefectures to have two-character names as opposed to the one-character names of prefectures in China proper. Perhaps it was not felt necessary after the new frontier defence system erected by Chang Jen-tan to keep such a direct supervision of the *hu* that remained in the Ordos.

Another piece of evidence which suggests that the *hu* had not all left the Ordos is provided by a proposal made at the Chinese court in 714 to buy horses in the 'Six Hu Prefectures' (the term remained even after the administration had changed). It was proposed that honorific military titles should be offered in exchange for the animals.¹⁾ This provides interesting corroboration to the other suggestions we have that the *hu* had been partly Turkicized, that is, they did not live in cities as traders and artisans as we might normally expect of Sogdians, but were herdsmen. It was of course the most natural way of life for them to adopt in their new habitat.

There are indications that under Mo-ch'o Sogdians may have played a role similar to that which they played under Hsieh-li, though probably to a lesser degree. We hear of no substantial body of them close to the throne, but about the time that Mo-ch'o was killed and his nephew K'ül-tegin was ensuring the power of his elder brother Bilgä by a purge of all the late ruler's immediate family and close advisers,²⁾ several Sogdians, including a son of An Tao-mai, An Hsiao-chieh 孝節, sought refuge in China. Presumably An Hsiao-chieh had been forced to join the Turks along with the Six Hu Prefectures in 698. Another son, An Chen-chieh 貞節, had remained in China and, having become Vice-

1) T'FYK 999.24.b.

2) CTS 194A.12.b; T'ung-tien 198.3.b; HTS 215A.16.a.

Governor (Pieh-chia 別駕) of Lan 嵐 Chou in northern Shansi, was able to give protection to Hsiao-chieh and his friends. ¹⁾

Among these friends were members of another Sogdian family, including the boy An Lu-shan 安祿山, who later became perhaps the most notorious of all Chinese rebels. An Lu-shan's father was named Yen-yen 延儼. ²⁾ According to a eulogistic decree conferring posthumous honours on him after his son had become an important Chinese general, "he was for long famed as a brave warrior in the Gobi". ³⁾ His wife, An Lu-shan's mother, was a member of the A-shih-te clan, second among the Turks only to the royal A-shih-na. It will be remembered that A-shih-te Wen-fu led the first revolt of the Northern Turks and that A-shih-te Yüan-chen (Tonyuquq) was Qutluq's chief assistant in the second. ⁴⁾ Even if we discount the eulogy it is evident that Yen-yen must have been a man of some importance to marry into such a family. Tonyuquq, who had been a close adviser of Mo-ch'o as well as of Qutluq, was threatened by Kül-tegin's purge, though because of his personal eminence he was able to survive to become an elder statesman under Bilgä. It seems probable that Yen-yen too was threatened, or perhaps even killed, in the purge and that this was the occasion for the flight of his family and relatives.

It is noteworthy that while most of the personal names of

1) *An Lu-shan shih-chi* A.1.a; *CTS* 200A.1.a; *HTS* 225A.1.a.

2) The biographies of An Lu-shan make him only the stepson of Yen-yen but, as I have shown in an unpublished thesis, *The Background and Early Life of An Lu-shan*, this comes from confusion with a myth about his birth which grew up, probably in connection with a cult in Ho-pei. There appear to be no substantial grounds for doubting that Yen-yen was his real father — as was quite unquestioned during his lifetime.

3) *An Lu-shan shih-chi* A.6.b.

4) Several A-shih-te chieftains are mentioned in connection with the Turks during the time they were under Chinese rule. According to *T'ung-chih* 29, p. 476.1, the A-shih-te were descendants of 'Shih-shan 始善 Qaghan', but I have been unable to identify this personage.

the Ordos Sogdians that are mentioned in our sources are understandable as Chinese, Yen-yen and Lu-shan appear to be transcriptions of Sogdian.¹⁾ This might mean that Yen-yen had come directly from Sogdiana—which would have been quite possible since Mo-ch'o's conquests extended that far. The name of Yen-yen's brother, Po-chu 波注, could perhaps be taken as Chinese and Po-chu's sons had names of conventional Chinese type—Ssu-shun 思順 and Yüan-chen 元貞, but these names may have been adopted in China. The argument in itself is quite inconclusive, but if Yen-yen came from the Ordos it is interesting to find that he and his son still kept Sogdian names; if he came directly from Sogdiana it is interesting to find his family associating with the family of An Tao-mai, which must have been away from Sogdiana

1) An Lu-shan's non-Chinese personal name is given as Ya-lo-shan 軻樂山 or A 阿-lo-shan (Anc. pron.: 'ät ('ä)-lāk-šan). Professor Henning has suggested to me that both these forms and Lu-shan (Anc. pron.: luk-šan) are good transcriptions of Sogdian *roxšan* 'light', the same Iranian word that appears in 'Ρωξάνη, the name of Alexander the Great's Bactrian queen. I have fully discussed this question in *The Background and Early Life of An Lu-shan*. The interpretation given in his biographies as a Turkish word meaning 'god of battle' or 'battle' is connected with the myth of his divine birth. The explanation given by W. Eberhard and L. Bazin (*Oriens I* (1948) p. 220) may have significance as a folk-etymology. Yen-yen (Anc. pron.: jān-ʃen) resembles several other Chinese transcriptions of Sogdian names in ending in the sound -ien (or something similar). E.g. (1) I-yen 逸偃 (Anc.: jēt-ʃen), the name of An Lu-shan's grandfather (*An Lu-shan shih-chi* A.1.a); (2) K'ang Yen-tien 鞏典 (Anc.: jān-tien) (see Appendix); (3) K'ang Jan-tien 染顛 (Anc.: nījām-tien) (Chavannes, *op. cit.*, p. 142n); (4) K'ang Fu-tan-yen 敷耽延 (Anc.: p'juat-tām-jān) (Pelliot, *J.A.* 1916, VII, p. 115). Professor Henning informs me that p'juat-tām-jān must certainly represent Sogdian Partam-yān 'First Gift' (suitable for a first born), a name which actually occurs in the meagre existing stock of Sogdian names, spelt 'prmys' (P 8,183). Assuming that 延 also represents yās 'gift' in the other example and giving full value to the glottal stop in ʃen, which indicates that the j- is not to be taken as consonantal, Professor Henning suggests the following equivalents for I-yen, Yen-yen and Jan-tien:

jēt-ʃen = Yazdēn (common Middle Persian name)

jān-ʃen = Yānēn (hitherto unknown derivative from yās 'gift')

nījām-tien = Zimtēn (derived from *fiṣat*, name of a town, also name of a Sogdian month).

for at least a hundred years. In either case we can see that the Ordos Sogdians still retained a consciousness of their origin at the beginning of the eighth century.

As with Hsieh-li, Mo-ch'o's power was collapsing from within before his end. By 715 there were considerable defections among the peoples subject to him and some chiefs with their followers came over to China. Some of them were settled in the Ordos. No Sogdians are mentioned but it appears that some *hu* who had left the Ordos in 698 must have been among them.¹⁾ After Mo-ch'o's death in 716, the new *qaghan*, Bilgä, attempted to win over tribes which had deserted and was in communication with the 'surrendered households' (降戶) of the Ordos. Wang Chün 王駿, the Chinese governor of T'ai-yüan, became alarmed at this and sent a memorial to the throne suggesting that the 'surrendered households' should be moved south into the interior of China to prevent their revolting. In his memorial he sometimes uses the term 'surrendered *hu*' (降胡) instead of 'surrendered

1) In 714 the Qarluq surrendered to the Chinese at Liang 涼 Chou allegedly because of Mo-ch'o's cruelty (TCTC 211, K'ai-yüan 2/9/ jen-tzu; HTS 215A.15.b). The Western Turks, who had been subject to Mo-ch'o also came over to the Chinese. Early in 715 Hsieh-tieh Ssu-t'ai 跌跌思泰 (i.e. Ssu-t'ai of the Hsieh-tieh, a Tölös tribe), a notable of the former Korean state of Kao-kou-li, a chief of the T'u-yü-hun and others came over and were placed in the Ordos. A son-in-law of Mo-ch'o, A-shih-te Hu-lu 胡祿, also came (TCTC 211, K'ai-yüan 3/2/-; T'ung-tien 198.3.a; CTS 194A.12.b; HTS 215A.15.b). In the ninth month a leader of the Ssu-chieh 思結 (= Sikär, cf. Henning, BSOAS IX p. 556), one of the Chiu-hsing 九姓 (Tojuzoghuz) of the Tölös, and others surrendered (TCTC 211, K'ai-yüan 3/9/ chi-wei; cf. Wen-yüan ying-hua 459.5.b which contains a decree which must date from late 715 or early 716 ordering a Chinese expedition against Mo-ch'o with the co-operation of the Chiu-hsing). More of the Chiu-hsing surrendered in 716 after the Bayirqu had killed Mo-ch'o and sent his head to the Chinese. Five of their tribes, the Bayirqu 拔曳固, the Uigurs 回紇, the Tongra 同羅, the Hsi 霫 and the P'u-ku 僕固, were settled in northern Shansi (TCTC 211, K'ai-yüan 4/6/ kuei-yu; T'ung-tien loc. cit.; CTS 8.7.a and 194A. 12.b; cf. TCTC 212, K'ai-yüan 6/2/ wu-tzu and Ch'üan T'ang-wen 21.28.b ff., where the chiefs of these five tribes are mentioned along with the Chinese titles they were given).

households'. He also says, "If [the Turks] reassemble their scattered members and come to threaten our armies and prefectures, the *lu* 虜 will bear down and the *hu* will respond and join them" ¹⁾, thus seeming to think of the people in the Ordos as chiefly *hu*. On the other hand his use of terms is not quite consistent. Thus he uses *lu* mainly to refer to the Turks in the north but in one instance clearly to mean the 'surrendered households'. The fact that Turkish peoples were also among those who had surrendered may account for some obscurity of expression, but we may not be wrong in finding in this document some indication that *hu* had come back into the Ordos with the leaders who deserted Mo-ch'o.

Before any action could be taken on Wang Chün's request some of the 'surrendered households' did in fact start to move north towards the Turks. Wang Chün coming from the east hastened to intercept and put to death some of them and other forces from the west tried to prevent their escape, but it seems that a good many of them got back across the Yellow River. Only Turkish tribes are specifically mentioned in connection with this revolt and there is no way of knowing whether the *hu* were involved. ²⁾ It is clear from the events of 721 that a large number of *hu* remained in the Ordos but we know that some *hu* were with the Turks after

1) 儻收合餘燼. 來逼軍州. 虜騎憑凌. 胡兵應接。CTS 93.7.b, biography of Wang Chün.

2) CTS 93.8.a merely says, "Before [Wang Chün] had had a reply, the surrendered *lu* did revolt", and does not specify further who were involved. Judging by Wang Chün's memorial *lu* meant more particularly Turkish tribes rather than the *hu* but this cannot be regarded as a very reliable criterion. TCTC 211, K'ai-yüan 4/10/-, CTS 194A.13.a and T'ung-tien 198.3.b speak of the 'surrendered households' and mention as their leaders Hsieh-tieh Ssu-t'ai (see p. 334, note 1) and A-hsi-lan (i.e. Turkish *arslan* 'lion'). HTS 215B.1.a speaks of the Turks as having recovered the 'surrendered *lu*' but the wording of the Hsin T'ang-shu is frequently altered from that of its sources and cannot be regarded as having authority without other support. We may note that the Hsieh-tieh who revolted in 716 were again under Chinese suzerainty, but just north of the Yellow River, in 730.

this time. ¹⁾ The latter may either have remained with the Turks in 715 or have gone back to them in 716. Relations between Chinese and non-Chinese in the Ordos must have been somewhat strained after this and they were made worse in 720 when Wang Chün, now Military Governor of Shuo-fang, that is the portion of the frontier comprising the Ordos and the region beyond it, treacherously put to death chiefs and others of the Hsieh-tieh and P'u-ku tribes which were located, subject to the Chinese, just north of the bend of the Yellow River. ²⁾

Whether this incident was in any way responsible we do not know, but in the following year, 721, the *ku* of the Six Prefectures revolted. It is at this time that we get our clearest view of them and our clearest proof that they were Sogdians. Five leaders who are mentioned, K'ang Tai-pin 康待賓, An Mu-jung 安慕容, Ho Hei-nu 何黑奴, Shih Shen-nu 石神奴 and K'ang T'ieh-t'ou 康鐵頭 ³⁾ all had Sogdian surnames, as did K'ang Chih 植 who captured K'ang Tai-pin and surrendered to the Chinese. ⁴⁾ An Ch'ing 慶, apparently another Sogdian, was sent by the Chinese as a commissioner to try to win the *ku* back to sub-

1) See pp. 339-341 below.

2) *TCTC* 212, K'ai-yüan 8/6/-; *CTS* 93.8.b; 97.8.a,b, biography of Chang Yüeh (relates how this massacre nearly caused a revolt of the Chiu-hsing (see p. 334, note 1) in northern Shansi).

3) *CTS* 8.9.b; *TFYK* 986.19.a.

4) K'ang Chih's part is not mentioned in the accounts of the insurrection, but his grandson K'ang Jih-chih 日知 and Jih-chih's son and grandson were officers in the Chinese army and have biographies in the *Hsin T'ang-shu*, ch. 148, in which their ancestor's action is briefly recorded. Jih-chih's home is given as Ling-wu. Chih's deed, which was the beginning of the family fortune, probably estranged them from the rest of their people. But in 868, when the great-great-grandson, K'ang Ch'eng-hsün 承訓, was given the task of suppressing the rebel P'ang Hsün 龐勛, he asked to have the Sha-t'o, into which the Six Hu Prefectures had by then been incorporated, and associated tribes placed under him in the campaign. This appears to be the first time that Sha-t'o troops were employed inside China and it is just possible that K'ang Ch'eng-hsün's racial origin may have been a factor in suggesting the step to him (*TCTC* 251, Hsien-t'ung 9/11/-).

mission. 1) A decree of this time says, "The *hu* of Lan-ch'ih have long been attached and enregistered. They are all simple and gentle people, so [we have treated them] the same as Chinese". 2) Thus they are clearly distinguished from the Turkish tribesmen. It is interesting to note the mixture of Chinese and Turkish influences which they show. All personal names appear to be Chinese — or at least have been translated into Chinese. 3) On the other hand the titles they assumed were partly Turkish — *yabgu*, *shad* — and partly Chinese — *chiang-chün* and *ta Chiang-chün*.

The detailed course of this revolt is obscure and need not concern us. K'ang Tai-pin, the first leader, was captured and executed in 721. 4) His son K'ang Yüan-tzu 顧子 continued the revolt in

1) TFYK 986.20.a.

2) 蘭池胡久從編附. 皆是淳柔百姓. 乃同華夏。 TFYK 986.19.

3) Tai-pin, Yüan-tzu 顧子 (the name of his son), Chih (and the names of his descendants) and Ch'ing are indistinguishable from ordinary Chinese personal names. Hsi-nu 'Black Slave', Shen-nu 'Slave of God' and T'ieh-t'ou 'Iron Head' are perhaps translations of non-Chinese names. Compare T'ieh-hu 鐵胡 'Iron Hu' which we find as the 'childhood name' of An Ch'ung-jung 重榮, a descendant of the Ordos Sogdians in the Five Dynasties period (*Hsin Wu-tai-shih* 51). Professor Henning gives me the following note on 'Slave of God': "Common western type of name, e.g. Hebrew 'Abdi-El, Arabic 'Abdu'Allah, Persian *Khudā-bande*; in Iran usually with the name of a divinity as the first part of compounds, e.g. Armenian *Mehrcvandan* "slave of Mithra", or Sogdian *Nansai-ruvandak* "slave of Nanai" (among the Sogdians of western China at the beginning of the 4th century)." Mu-jung is itself a two-character surname, originally of Hsien-pei origin. Cf. Hu-ssu 斛斯, also a two-character surname of non-Chinese origin which appears as the personal name of Wang Hu-ssu, who served as a general in the Chinese armies during the K'ai-yüan period (713-739). He has no biography and there is no information about his family background (see Wu T'ing-hsieh 吳廷燮, *T'ang fang-chen nien-piao*, pp. 1383, 1501, 1513 in *Erh-shih-wu shih pu-pien*, K'ai-ming Press, Shanghai, 1937). Is it possible that this type of given name indicates intermarriage between two clans? On the other hand Mu-jung could be given meaning as a normal type of Chinese given name.

4) CTS 8.9.b; 93.8.b; TCTC 212, K'ai-yüan 9/4/ and ff.; TFYK 986.19.a ff. Other details which are not always easy to fit into the above accounts are given in *Cai-tien Tang wen* 263.11 b, inscription by Li Yung 李邕 in honour of Tsang Hui-ling 張懷

the following year but was finally defeated. ¹⁾ Wang Chün's proposal of 716 was now carried out and the *hu* were moved into prefectures of Ho-nan, Shan-nan and Huai-nan provinces. ²⁾ This was not the end of the Ordos colony, however, for in 738 Yu 宥 Chou ('Pardon' Prefecture) was established at the old location of Lan-ch'ih Chou (some 300 *li* north-east of present Yen-ch'ih 鹽池 Hsien in Ning-hsia). ³⁾ In the decree authorizing this it is acknowledged that many had already found their way back illegally. ⁴⁾

Seventeen years later came the rebellion of An Lu-shan, who, as we have seen, was half-Sogdian, half-Turk, and possibly belonged to the Six Hu Prefectures. The Ordos colony as such was not greatly involved in the rebellion, but there were certainly many Sogdians in An Lu-shan's armies. This is not the place to elaborate

亮 (this is interesting in that it refers to the "Nine Hu of the Six Prefectures" (六州九胡), thus specifically identifying them with the Sogdians (*chiu-hsing hu*) — it is also the earliest example I know of the number nine connected in this way with Sogdians, see p. 320, note 1), *Chang Yen-kung chi* 17, p. 179, inscription in honour of the Tibetan Lun Kung-jen 論弓仁, and *Chang Yen-kung chi* 16, p. 170, inscription in honour of Kuo Chih-yün 郭知運.

1) *CTS* 8.10.b; 97.8.b, biography of Chang Yüeh; *TCTC* 212, K'ai-yüan 10/8/-.

2) *CTS* 38.17.b (*Ti-li chih*) mistakenly records K'ang Tai-pin's revolt in the 11th year of K'ai-yüan (723). It states that in the 10th year Lan-ch'ih Chou was divided into four prefectures, Lu 魯 Chou, Li 麗 Chou, Ch'i 契 Chou and Sai 塞 Chou. It mentions the deportation after the rebellion but states that in the 18th year (730) K'uang 匡 Chou and Ch'ang 長 Chou were reconstituted in the old place. *HTS* 37.8.b also mentions the four prefectures set up in 722 and places their establishment before the final defeat of the revolt which it correctly dates in 722. It also mentions both the deportation and the two prefectures set up in 730. We may suppose that the establishment of the four prefectures was a measure taken after the defeat of K'ang Tai-pin and before the second flare-up under his son. It is not clear what the administrative change of 730 signifies but it may mean that some *hu* (perhaps the ones who had not joined the revolt?) were allowed to remain. Cf. also *Yüan-ho chün-hsieh chih* 4.15.b.

3) *CTS* 38.17.b; *HTS* 37.8.b; *Yüan-ho chün-hsien chih* 4.15.b.

4) *Ch'üan T'ang-wen* 35.19. b.

that point, but it is important to point out one slender thread of evidence connecting the Sogdians under him with the Ordos colony. At the beginning of the period T'ien-pao (742-755), just when An Lu-shan was coming to prominence in the north-east, a new 'protected' prefecture, Lin 凜 Chou, was attached to Yu Chou (modern Peking). It consisted of 'surrendered *hu*' (降胡).¹⁾ Now just at this time the Northern Turks were in the process of final dissolution and in 742 a number of their leaders surrendered to China. Among them was K'ang A-i K'ül-tarqan 阿義屈達干. There are several things besides his surname to suggest that he was a Sogdian. Indeed it is very probable that he was a great-grandson of K'ang Su-mi, whom we met at the time of Hsieh-li's collapse. He was attached to the north-eastern sector of the frontier and on An Lu-shan's recommendation was put in charge of his tribe (*pu-lo*) in that area. He later served in An Lu-shan's armies but changed sides during the rebellion and rendered valuable service to the imperial cause.²⁾ It is most likely that he and his

1) HTS 43B.5.b.

2) On the dissolution of the Northern Turks see CTS 194A.15.b; HTS 215B.3.a; TCTC 215, T'ien-pao 1/8- (n.b. K'ao-i); CTS 103.7.b, biography of Wang Chung-ssu.

The surname of K'ang A-i K'ül-tarqan suggested to Hsiang Ta that he was a Sogdian. Hsiang Ta makes much of the fact that he is called a man of Liu-ch'eng 柳城 (present Ch'ao-yang 朝陽 in Jehol), An Lu-shan's reputed birth-place, where we know 'shang-hu, existed, at least after 717, but A-i's family connection with this region probably means nothing more than that his 'tribe' was located thereabouts under Chinese administration (see *T'ang-tai Ch'ang-an* p. 14). A-i's family is said to have been a "noble race among the Twelve Surnames of the northern barbarians" (北蕃十二姓之貴種). We do not often hear of the Twelve Surnames of the Northern Turks, but they were presumably a tribal division analogous to the Ten Surnames of the Western Turks, etc. Cf. *An Lu-shan shih-chi* B.1.b where the Twelve Surnames are mentioned apparently meaning the Northern Turks (see also Hsiang Ta, *loc. cit.*). It is not quite clear from the wording of the above passage whether it means that the K'angs formed one of these twelve divisions. If it does mean that, it might seem surprising to find Sogdians so intimately incorporated into the Turkish tribal structure. It seems clear that in Hsieh-li's time the *hu* were an attached dependent people not part of the Turks proper. On the other hand the division of the Northern Turks into twelve does not appear to be mentioned before the middle of the

tribe were the *hu* of Lin Chou and that they were members of the

eighth century and quite possibly dates from some time in the Second Turkish Empire. By this time the *hu*, or some of them, may have become sufficiently Turkicized to be included in the twelve.

A-i's ancestors are mentioned for three generations back. His father held the title of Hsieh-li-fa 頡利發 under Mo-ch'o but we are not told his name. He is described as 衛衙官部落都督 which might perhaps be translated as "guard officer and tribal governor". The grandfather's name was Jan 染. He is called son-in-law of an unnamed *qaghan* (可汗附馬) and 都知兵馬使 (as a Chinese title this does not exist before the eighth century, here it is presumably a Chinese translation of a high Turkish military title). (I assume that Jan is the personal name of A-i's grandfather. It could equally well be taken as the name of the *qaghan*, but I know of no Jan Qaghan). The great-grandfather, who is also unnamed, is said to have been Governor (*tu-tu*) of the (or a) Hsieh-li tribe. Now there was no 'protected' *tu-tu-fu* known as the Hsieh-li Tu-tu-fu, but after his defeat in 630 Hsieh-li's personal appanage, that is the Ordos, was divided into five *tu-tu-fu* (a sixth was added in 633, see p. 324, note 4). It would seem to fit the text quite well to suppose that A-i's great-grandfather was put over one of these. In fact we know the names of the five *tu-tu* who were appointed in 630 and one of them was "K'ang Su" who must almost certainly be the K'ang Su-mi who came over to the Chinese before the fall of Hsieh-li with members of the Sui imperial house. While a rigorous demonstration is not possible it can be considered very likely that K'ang A-i was descended from K'ang Su-mi.

What little we know of A-i's family history (*Yen Lu-kung chi* 9.7.a ff., inscription in honour of K'ang A-i) is consistent with the assumption that they belonged to the Ordos Sogdians. It is noteworthy that the father is not mentioned as serving under Qutluq, but only under Mo-ch'o—as if he had come over to the Turks with the Six Hu Prefectures in 698. May the *qaghan* to whom the grandfather was related by marriage perhaps be A-shih-na Ssu-mo?

A-i was born in 690. From the age of 23 (712) he is said to have served Mo-ch'o as chief minister (*tsai-hsiang*), no doubt a piece of eulogistic exaggeration. We are told that he was forced to retire for a time because of slanders and can perhaps connect this with Kül-tegin's purge of Mo-ch'o's intimates and supporters. We are told nothing but the vaguest generalities about his career between then and 742, when he came over to the Chinese.

Another circumstance which suggests that he was a Sogdian is the fact that his wife had the family name Shih 石. Her family came from Chiao-ho 交河 (Hsi 西 Chou, near Turfan) where we know there were Sogdians. Her father and grandfather are both said to have been officers in the Chinese army. Her father's name, San-nu 三奴 'Three Slaves', reminds one of some of the names found among the Ordos Sogdians (p. 337, note 3).

Professor Henning adds the following comment, "Cf. the Middle Persian name *Sābuxt* 'saved by the three (viz. divinities)'. Hence San-nu = 'The slave of the three (deities)' (a known 'trinity' being referred to—i.e., if he was a Christian, the Christian trinity is implied)."

Ordos colony who either did not come over to the Chinese in 715 or returned to the Turks in 716. We do not hear explicitly of Lin Chou again and I have not come across evidence of the continued existence of a *hu* colony in the north-east after the rebellion. There was a massacre of 'high-nosed' *hu* at Yu Chou in 761 that may have done away with most of them. ¹⁾

The one brief appearance of the Six Hu Prefectures in the story of the rebellion of An Lu-shan came in 756 after the rebel troops had occupied Ch'ang-an. Some Turks (T'u-chüeh) and Tongra (T'ung-lo 同羅) stationed in Ch'ang-an deserted from the rebels and, led by the Turk A-shih-na Ts'ung-li 從禮, went north into the Ordos. There they roused the Six Prefectures and led them to invade Shensi. This presented a serious threat to the new emperor Su-tsung, only just established at Ling-wu on the western edge of the Ordos and trying to gather his forces. ²⁾ The insurrection was only put down by the timely intervention of the Uigurs on the side of the Chinese, making their first appearance in the rebellion. ³⁾

We hear no more of the Sogdian colonists until 786 when they at last permanently left the Ordos. They were moved, still carrying with them the designation Six Hu Prefectures, from the

1) TCTC 222, Shang-yüan 2/3/-, n.b. quotation from the *Chi-men chi-luan* 晉門紀亂 in the *K'ao-i*.

2) TCTC 218, Chih-te 1/7/ *chia-ksü* (and *K'ao-i*); Chih-te 1/9/-; CTS 120.2.a, biography of Kuo Tzu-i. *Chiu Tang-shu* speaks of the "河曲九府六胡州部落"; *T'ung-chien* has "九府六胡州". The "Nine *fu*" or "Nine Surname *fu*" must certainly refer to the "Nine Surname *ku*" or Sogdians. It is not easy to explain *fu*. It would be natural to suppose that it referred to some Chinese administrative arrangement and it is probably a survival of this that we find in the An-ch'ing Chiu-fu Tu-tu-fu which we find in the ninth and tenth centuries (see below).

3) TCTC 219, Chih-te 1/11/ *hsin-yu*; CTS 120.2.a; HTS 217.3.a. I do not propose to deal here with the question of the Sogdians who joined the Uigurs and played such an important part among them, but it seems to me extremely likely that many of them came from the Ordos colony.

Ordos to the region of Shuo 朔 Chou (present *hsien* in northern Shansi) and Yün 雲 Chou (present Ta-t'ung 大同). The occasion of the transfer was a Tibetan invasion of Shensi which penetrated as far as the Ordos. The *hu* of the Six Prefectures, apparently fleeing from them, crossed into Shansi and 'surrendered' to the Chinese Military Governor of Ho-tung (northern Shansi) at Shih 石 Chou (modern Li-shih 離石 *Hsien*).¹⁾ Yu 宥 Chou now ceased to exist for a time and when it was restored in 814 it was to govern the Tang-hsiang 黨項 (Tangut) who had previously been neighbours of the *hu* and now apparently occupied the whole region.²⁾

About twenty years after this transfer the *hu* were joined in their new location by the Sha-t'o 沙陀 Turks. This tribe, which had originally been part of the Western Turks and had been located near Lake Barkul, had come under Uigur rule in 789 but had gone over to the Tibetans in 790. Finding themselves ill-used by their new masters, they came over to the Chinese in 808. They were favourably received by the Chinese Military Governor at Ling Chou (Ling-wu), Fan Hsi-ch'ao 范希朝, and settled in the Ordos as a Chinese army. This was felt to be too close to the Tibetans and in 809, when Fan Hsi-ch'ao was transferred to Ho-tung, they too were moved to northern Shansi.³⁾

1) *TCTC* 232, Chen-yüan 2/12/ *ping-yin*.

2) *CTS* 38.17b; *HTS* 37.8.b; *Yüan-ho chün-hsien chih* 4.15.b (where the circumstances of Yu Chou's re-establishment are fully narrated). The date of the suppression of Yu Chou is not mentioned in the geographies. They merely say that it disappeared "after Pao-ying" (762). The decree ordering the re-establishment is also contained in *Ch'üan T'ang-wen* 60.9.a. Some Tangut tribes were located in the vicinity of the Six Hu Prefectures from early in the T'ang dynasty. They joined the *hu* in the revolt of 721. Others moved from Shih 石 Chou, east of the Yellow River, into the Ordos region in 799, thus filling the gap left by the *hu* (*TCTC* 235, Chen-yüan 15; *CTS* 198.3.a). The new Yu Chou was later the centre in which Tangut power grew until it spread into Kansu and founded the Hsi Hsia state.

3) *HTS* 218.1.b f.; *TCTC* 233, Chen-yüan 5; Chen-yüan 6/5/-; *TCTC* 237, Yüan-ho 3/6/-; 4/6/-.

There they soon became the dominant non-Chinese element and from 830 onwards were largely entrusted by the Chinese with the defence of that part of the frontier.¹⁾ We hear of our *hu* in close association with them. Thus in 830 we are told that the "Nine Surname *hu* of the Six Prefectures" (九姓六州胡) feared them.²⁾ In 874 "in order to pacify the Sha-t'o and Six Prefecture tribes" (以宣撫沙陀六州部落) who were then refusing to obey the orders of the Chinese government, Li Chün 李鈞 was appointed Military Governor of Ling-wu and ordered to take action against them. A decree issued at that time begins, "Since the Sha-t'o are courageous and have repeatedly given meritorious service in war, and since the barbarians (*jan-hun* 蕃 渾)³⁾ of the Six Prefectures have been washed in our kingly influence" ⁴⁾ The two peoples are clearly distinguished but closely associated. *Other evidence shows beyond any doubt that the Sogdians had in fact been incorporated into a tribal complex under the leadership of the Sha-t'o and were referred to collectively as the Three Tribes of the Sha-t'o (沙陀三部落).*

The first mention I have found of the Three Tribes occurs in 837 ⁵⁾ and they are very frequently encountered from then onward. The names of the individual tribes are only occasionally mentioned but in 880 we are told not only their names but also the names of their chiefs. Besides the Sha-t'o proper, which constituted the first of them, there were the Sa-ko 薩葛 and the An-ch'ing 安慶. The chiefs are called by the Chinese title *tu-tu*, evidence

1) HTS 218.2.b; TCTC 244, T'ai-ho 4/3/ i-hai; CTS 165.5.a, biography of Liu Kung-ch'o.

2) TCTC, *loc. cit.*; HTS and CTS have 九姓六州.

3) *Hun* was the name of a Töböa tribe. Here, in combination with *jan*, it must simply be used as a vague general term for 'barbarian'. Cf. p. 319, note 1 on *ch'ieh-hu*.

4) CTS 19B.2.b.

5) CTS 161.10.a, biography of Liu Mien. Cf. TCTC 245, K'ai-ch'eng 2/7/ hui-hai 2.

that the 'tribes' were constituted as 'protected' prefectures under Chinese administration. ¹⁾ The chief of the Sa-ko was called Mi Hai-wan 米海萬. There cannot be the slightest doubt that we have here to do with Sogdians. Not only is the surname Mi not known to have another origin, but the name of the tribe (Anc. pron.: sât-kât) must surely be a transcription of Soghd. Prof. Henning points out to me that the properly Sogdian pronunciation of their own name was dissyllabic, *suγuδ*, which fits even more closely. Elsewhere we find the variant forms *hsüeh-ko* 薩葛 ²⁾ (Anc.: sjät-kât) and *So-ko* 索葛 ³⁾ (Anc.: sâk-kât). The final -t- in sât and sjät is not an insuperable obstacle to the identification, for we find Samarkand transcribed as Sa-mo-chien 薩末建 (Anc.: Sât-muât-kien). ⁴⁾ As further corroboration that Sogdians belonged to this tribe we find that in the tenth century An Ts'ung-chin 從進 came from the So-ko tribe.

The An-ch'ing tribe probably also consisted of Sogdians but in this case we cannot be quite so certain. Their chief in 880 was Shih Ching-ts'un 史敬存. The surname Shih 史 is certainly one of the Sogdian surnames but it is also quite often found as an abbreviation for A-shih-na, the name of the royal family of the Turks, and we might think that a remnant of the T'u-chüeh had also been incorporated into the Sha-t'o. Certain other considerations incline me against this solution. In the *Old* and the *New Histories of the Five Dynasties* we have biographies of Ching-ts'un's son Chien-t'ang 建瑋 and grandson K'uang-han 匡翰. It is stated that they were hereditary governors of the Chiu-fu

1) TCTC 253, Kuang-ming 1/6/ keng-tsu. Cf. HTS 218.3.b.

2) CTS 19B.7.b.

3) Hsin Wu-tai-shih 51.7.b, biography of An Ts'ung-chin.

4) T'ung-tien 193.1.b, quoting the Ching-hsing chi 經行紀 of Tu Huan 杜環, ca. 762.

九府 Tu-tu-fu. ¹⁾ The epitaph of K'uang-han also exists. It shows that there was in fact no contradiction and that the full name of the 'tribe' was An-ch'ing Chiu-fu. ²⁾ The Chiu-fu obviously suggests the *chiu-hsing hu*. The name An-ch'ing is Chinese — the sort of complimentary name that was often given to 'protected' prefectures. We might of course conceivably have to do with remnants of the Nine Surnames of the Tölös who had remained on the Chinese frontier and not joined the Uigurs. I think that is rather unlikely. The Ch'i-pi 契苾, for instance, a former Tölös tribe, were under Chinese rule north of Shansi but are clearly distinguished from the Three Tribes of the Sha-t'o. ³⁾ Finally if these Shih were descended from the noble A-shih-na we should surely expect some mention of it in their biographies and on the epitaph. Instead we find on the epitaph an attempt to trace the family back to an early Chinese origin, as in the case of Shih Ching-t'ang 石敬瑭 discussed below. The most reasonable conclusion seems to be that the Six Hu Prefectures went to make up both the Sa-ko and the An-ch'ing.

The frequent occurrence of Sogdian surnames associated with the Sha-t'o has been pointed out by Kuwabara, though, as he did not know of the Ordos colony, he supposed that the Sogdians had joined the tribe when it was near Lake Barkul. ⁴⁾ It will not be necessary to note here all such occurrences in the many wars of the later part of the T'ang dynasty or in the history of the Five

1) *Chiu Wu-tai-shih* 55 and 88; *Hsin Wu-tai-shih* 25. Shih Ching-ts'un's name is given as Shih Ching-ssu 思 in these biographies. This is probably because ts'un occurred in the personal name of Chuang-tsung of Later T'ang.

2) *Ch'üan T'ang-wen* 863.20.a, inscription by T'ao Ku 陶穀. *Chiu Wu-tai-shih* 98.1.b, biography of An Ch'ung-jung, also mentions the Sha-t'o An-ch'ing Chiu-fu which, if we had not proof elsewhere that An-ch'ing Chiu-fu was a single name, might be taken as two (or three) distinct tribes. The Nine fu recall the same term used in 756, see p. 341, note 2.

3) See, for instance, *CTS* 18A.6.a.

4) Kuwabara, *op. cit.*, p. 631.

Dynasties in which the Sha-t'o played such a prominent part. An, K'ang, Shih 石 and Shih 史 occur again and again. They are fairly prominent during the Later T'ang dynasty founded by the Sha-t'o, but have their greatest flowering (judging by the number who have biographies in the official histories) in Later Chin.

This short dynasty (936-941) was indeed founded by one of them. Shih Ching-t'ang 石敬瑭, the first emperor, was the son-in-law of Ming-tsung of Later T'ang, whose adopted son he pushed aside. We are naturally told a good deal more about his ancestry than in the case of more ordinary persons. An attempt was made to connect him with famous men of Chou and Han times but this is obvious fabrication. A vague tradition of coming from the Western Regions had persisted and it is noted that the surname was common in Kan 甘 Chou (Kansu). But apparently all recollection of the century and a half spent in the Ordos had died out for he is supposed to have come from Ling-wu along with the Sha-t'o in the time of Hsien-tsung (805-820). (It is of course possible that this particular family of Sogdians had joined the Sha-t'o earlier but, I think, much less probable.) Surnames of the wives of his ancestors for four generations back are given and all but the first (Ch'in 秦) were Sogdian (An, Mi and Ho).¹⁾

Sogdian surnames are particularly frequent during Later Chin. Under Later Han (947-951), a true Sha-t'o dynasty, they become

¹⁾ *Chiu Wu-tai-shih* 75.1.a, b. After mentioning his supposed ancestor in Han his biographer says, "At the decline of Han when Kuan-fu (the three commanderies around Ch'ang-an) were in disorder, his descendants migrated to the western frontiers. Therefore there are some who live in Kan Chou" (漢衰關輔亂. 子孫流汎西裔. 故有居甘州者). *Hsin Wu-tai-shih* 8.1.a states that his family originated among the western barbarians (西夷). The non-Chinese name of Shih Ching-t'ang's father was Nieh-lieh-chi 泉振雞 (Anc. pron.: nglät-liet-kiel, but note the late date). Cf. Kuwabara, p. 642.

far less common. It would presumably be fruitful to study the history of the three Sha-t'o dynasties from the standpoint of this internal division of the ruling people into Turkish and Sogdian elements.

This and other possible implications of the existence of our Sogdian colony for the history of the Turkish peoples, of the Chinese frontier and, on several occasions, of China itself, during the seventh, eighth, ninth and tenth centuries must be left aside to be worked out in the detailed study of particular periods. I have been concerned here merely to outline the bare narrative. It is, I think, sufficiently remarkable. Moreover I believe it is possible to continue it even further through Sung-Liao-Chin into Mongol times. I hope on another occasion to be able to present this additional chapter.

APPENDIX.—THE SOGDIANS OF HAMI AND LOP NOR.

T'ung-tien 197.6.a (T'u-chüeh A) contains a passage which has been much abridged in the parallel text in *CTS* 194A.6.a. It begins: "At the defeat of Hsieh-li his tribes fled, some to the Sir Tarduš, some to the Western Regions; but those who came to surrender were very many. *The chiefs and leaders who arrived were all appointed generals and given ranks at the court. There were more than one hundred over the fifth rank and they made up nearly half the [military?] court officers. Only the che-chieh 柘羯 did not come. It was decreed that envoys should be sent to persuade them to come. The Governor of Liang 涼 Chou (present Wu-wei 武威 Hsien, Kansu) Li Ta-liang 李大亮 considered it was of no use and would only cause profitless expense to the Central Kingdom. So he sent a memorial*" Then follows the text of the memorial. *Chiu T'ang-shu* omits the portion in italics above (the substance of the first two sentences in italics is introduced later) and

contains only the last part of the memorial, which it introduces without mentioning Li Ta-liang. *Chen-kuan cheng-yao* 9.20.a contains nearly the same text as the *T'ung-tien* but changes 柘羯 to T'o-pa 柘拔. *CTS* 62.9.a, biography of Li Ta-liang, introduces the memorial somewhat differently. "He was sent out to be Governor of Liang Chou.... At the time Hsieh-li Qaghan had been defeated. All the tribes of the northern wastes were one after another coming to submit. There were Ta-tu 大度 Shad 設, T'o 柘 Shad, Ni-shu 泥熟 Tegin 特勤 (read: 勤, as often) and the tribes of the seven surnames (七姓種落) still scattered about I-wu 伊吾 (Hami). Ta-liang was made Grand Commissioner for Pacifying the North-west Sector 西北道安撫大使 to assuage them."

These passages present a number of obscurities. The first is *che-chieh*. *T'o-pa*, the reading of the *Chen-kuan cheng-yao*, would be more familiar. It is, of course, the name of the ruling house of Northern Wei (and during T'ang, of a Tangut tribe — *CTS* 198.1.a). One might reasonably think that some members of this tribe had become part of the Turkish confederacy, though there is no other evidence to support such a supposition. It is much more likely that *che-chieh* has been altered to *T'o-pa*, because the latter was a more understandable term. *Che-chieh*, however, though not of frequent occurrence and apparently not understood by the editor of the chapter on the Turks in the *Chiu T'ang-shu* or by Wu Ching, the author of the *Chen-kuan cheng-yao*, is nevertheless a well established word. It occurs in several texts relating to Sogdiana. Thus in *HTS* 221B.1.b, under An (Bukhara), we have, "They enroll brave and strong men to be *che-chieh*; the expression *che-chieh* is equivalent to the Chinese 'warrior'" (募勇健者爲柘羯。柘羯猶中國言戰士也). In the *Ta T'ang hsi-yü chi*, ch. 1, Hsüan-tsang says of Samarkand, "Their army

is powerful; it is largely made up of *che-chieh*. *Che-chieh* men are by nature fierce and courageous. They look upon death as if they were returning home" (兵馬強盛。多是精羯之人。其性勇烈視死如歸). Marquart explained *che-chieh* (Anc.: tsja-kjet) for Chavannes as a transcription of Persian *chakar* 'servant' "qui avait en Sogdiane le sens spécial de 'guerrier' (garde du corps)" (Chavannes, *Documents sur les Tou-kiue Occidentaux*, p. 313; see also W. Barthold, *Turkestan*, p. 180). Ch'en Yin-k'o, who does not mention Marquart's interpretation, feels that the quotation from the *Hsi-yü chi* proves that *che-chieh* is an ethnic name and that the *Hsin T'ang-shu's* explanation is to be rejected. This does not seem necessary. Hsüan-tsang merely speaks of "*che-chieh* men", perhaps not understanding himself the significance of the word (*T'ang-tai cheng-chih shih shu-lun kao*, pp. 21-22).

The appearance of this term in the passage from the *T'ung-tien* can only mean that there was a body of elite Sogdian troops under the Northern Turks. Several circumstances lead me to the conclusion that, whether or not they were originally part of the same 'Hu pu' under the Northern Turks, these *che-chieh* were distinct from the Sogdians who settled in the Ordos. I think they are rather to be connected with another Sogdian colony at Hami and Lop Nor, whose existence at least at the latter place has already been pointed out by Pelliot (*J.A.* 1916, vii, pp. 111-123).

The *che-chieh* are mentioned by way of introduction to Li Ta-liang's memorial. The passage in his biography introducing the same memorial connects it specifically with 'tribes' around Hami but does not explicitly mention the *che-chieh*. The memorial itself is particularly concerned with persuading the court of the uselessness of incorporating Hami into Chinese territory. The actual personages mentioned in Li Ta-liang's biography are

not all clearly recognizable. T'o Shad we know was A-shih-na She-erh 𠵽 𠵽, who after the fall of Hsieh-li led an independent existence around Turfan until 636 (CTS 109.1.b f.; HTS 110.2.a; see Chavannes, *op. cit.*, p. 174). Ni-shu Tegin was presumably A-shih-na Ni-shu who was later made one of Ssu-mo's deputies (CTS 194A.7.b). I have found no record of his activity immediately after Hsieh-li's fall. I have found no clue to the identity of Ta-tu Shad. The 'tribes of the seven surnames' are also quite mysterious, but I shall show reason below for connecting them with the *che-chieh*.

Shortly after Li Ta-liang's appointment, in the ninth month of the same year, Hami submitted to the Chinese. We can discover from other sources something about who were in occupation at that time. *T'ung-tien* 191.3.b says of I-wu (Hami): "In Sui there were merchant *hu* living there intermingled [with the natives?]. It had 1000 excellent soldiers and belonged to the Tölös (T'ieh-le 鐵勒). The people are very proud and fierce. Its land is fertile. At the end of Sui it submitted [to China] and I-wu Commandery was established. When the empire fell into disorder it again became subject to the Turks. In the fourth year of Chen-kuan of Great T'ang (630), because Hsieh-li had been crushed, [its chief (supply from parallel texts)] brought the seven cities attached to him (or it?) and submitted." (Cf. HTS 221B.8.a, translated in Chavannes, pp. 169-170.) CTS 40.36.b says of I 伊 Chou, "It is I-wu Commandery of Sui. At the end of Sui 'mixed *hu*' (雜胡) from the western regions occupied it. In the fourth year of Chen-kuan it returned to allegiance." TCTC 193, Chen-kuan 4/9/ *wu-ch'en* gives the date of the arrival of the chief of I-wu at Ch'ang-an and also mentions the 'seven cities' but adds nothing more. (Cf. also TFK 999.7.b; *Yüan-ho chün-hsien chih* 40.) A fragmentary manuscript of a local gazetteer of Sha Chou and I Chou recovered in the Tun-

huang finds gives us one more precious item of information. The name of the chief of Hami who submitted to T'ang was Shih Wan-nien 石萬年 (British Museum, Stein Collection, Chinese MS no. 936, reproduced and translated by L. Giles in *BSOAS* 6 (1932), pp. 825-846; text published and commented by Haneda, *Shigaku chirigaku ronsō* in honour of T. Ogawa 小川, Tōkyō, 1930, pp. 131-152; see also Pelliot, *J.A.*, 1916, vii, pp. 118 ff.). Shih is of course one of the Sogdian surnames and its appearance in connection with the *hu* of Hami makes it very probable that those *hu* were Sogdians. In any case the term 'merchant *hu*' (商胡) used of Hami in the *T'ung-tien* is even more closely associated with Sogdians than *hu* alone. The term 'mixed *hu*' is interesting. Here it may simply mean that the *hu* were living mixed with other peoples as is stated in the *T'ung-tien*. On the other hand the compound can have, and perhaps more naturally has, a racial implication, i.e. mean a half-breed between Sogdian and (in the only cases where it is found) Turk. Thus An Lu-shan, whose father was a Sogdian and whose mother was a Turk, is described as a *tsa-hu* (*An Lu-shan shih-chi* A.1.a; *HTS* 225A.1.a) or more fully as *tsa-chung hu-jen* 雜種胡人 (*CTS* 200A.1.a). Elsewhere the term 雜種胡 is used to refer to a group of Sogdian merchants living in Ch'ang-an under the protection of the Uigurs after the rebellion of An Lu-shan (*CTS* 127.2.b, biography of Chang Kuang-sheng). *HTS* 217A.7.a and *TCTC* 224, Chien-chung 1/8/ *chia-wu* in recording the same matter use the term *chiu-hsing hu*, specifically 'Sogdian'. Ch'en Yin-k'o attempts to infer from this that *tsa-hu*, etc., were exact synonyms of *chiu-hsing hu* (*op. cit.* p. 23). This seems rather forced. It may be however that *tsa-hu* meant specifically Sogdians who had become racially and otherwise mixed with the Turks. Its use in connection with Hami suggests that the Sogdians in control there in 630 had not come

directly from Sogdiana but had spent some time with the nomads.

Can we tell anything about the 'seven cities' mentioned in the accounts of Hami's submission? We find nothing in the gazetteers under Hami itself which can correspond to them. There were never more than three *hsien* under I Chou. Farther south however in the region of Lop Nor there were seven cities, four of which we know were constructed by Sogdians under 'a great notable of Samarkand, K'ang Yen-tien' (康國大首領康豐典) during the period Chen-kuan (627-649) (Tun-huang MS cited above, see Pelliot *loc. cit.*). Is it not possible that these were the seven cities which were meant? It is true that they are mentioned under Sha Chou not I Chou, but the manuscript tells us that the chief of them was placed under Sha Chou in 675, so that they could very well have belonged to I Chou before that time. In any case these were merely the Chinese administrative arrangements and prove nothing about the state of affairs before 630. Earlier Hami had belonged to the kingdom of Shan-shan 鄯善 which had been centred in the region of the seven cities south of Lop Nor (*T'ung-tien* 191.3.b). It is logical to suppose that the Sogdians should have wished to control both regions since together they controlled the two caravan routes from China to the west.

I think it can be shown that the expression 'Seven Cities' was used to describe the cities of Lop Nor. HTS 43B.17.a, quoting Chia Tan 賈耽, describes an itinerary passing through this region. In it occurs the following: 自蒲昌海南岸西經七屯城漢伊修城也。As the text stands we must take 'ch'i t'un ch'eng' together. From the same manuscript fragment cited above however we know that the name of one of the seven cities was T'un Ch'eng and it is identified with I-hsiu of Han. It seems to me that the discrepancy can be easily explained by supposing that the character 城 has dropped out after 七. Then we should

read, "From the south bank of P'u-ch'ang Hai (Lop Nor) one goes west through the Seven Cities. T'un Ch'eng is the I-hsiu Ch'eng of Han." In fact only three of the Seven Cities actually lie on the itinerary. This seems to show that Seven Cities was a proper name and perhaps explains why the error crept into the text — an editor or copyist who did not know of this name observed that only three cities were mentioned and so supposed that the name of the first should be Ch'i-t'un Ch'eng. The error must be of long standing, for *HTS* 40.11.a, obviously drawing on the itinerary as its source, says under P'u-ch'ang Hsien, "To the west it has Ch'i-t'un Ch'eng and Nu-chih Ch'eng...." (西有七屯城弩支城). Pelliot (p. 116, n. 3) and Haneda (p. 144) supposed that a stray character 七 had crept into the text but its presence in both texts perhaps renders this solution less likely and it seems to me that my emendation is more satisfactory. (The placing of the second passage in the *Hsin T'ang-shu* under P'u-ch'ang Hsien, which belonged to Hsi 西 Chou (Turfan), is a mistake due to a confusion with P'u-ch'ang Hai. The passage should have come under Shou-ch'ang 壽昌 Hsien under Sha Chou.)

The seven cities which submitted to China along with Hami in 630 were then, I suggest, the Seven Cities of the region of Lop Nor, four of which were colonized by Sogdians. Does this not also suggest a solution to the puzzling 'seven surnames' mentioned in Li Ta-liang's biography? It would seem to fit the facts very well to suppose that the text originally read 'Seven Cities'. An editor, who did not know this name, may well have found it puzzling to find cities mentioned along with Turkish chiefs and may have altered it to 'Seven Surnames', thinking it was a tribe like the 'Nine Surnames' of the Tölös or the 'Ten Surnames' of the Western Turks, etc.

From the above argument we can draw the following conclusions:

(1) Already in Sui there were *hu* (Sogdian?) merchants at Hami. (2) If we accept the explicit statement of the *Chiu T'ang-shu*, *tsa-hu* (i.e. Sogdians from the Turks = the *che-chieh* of the *T'ung-tien*?) seized control of Hami after the collapse of Sui and held it under the overlordship of the *qaghan* of the Northern Turks. (3) During this time Sogdians under K'ang Yen-tien colonized Lop Nor, building four cities. K'ang Yen-tien is explicitly stated to have been a notable of Samarkand and to have come from the west. This may indicate that he did not belong originally to the Turkish Sogdians, but took advantage of their presence at Hami to establish himself. (4) On the fall of Hsieh-li the Sogdian chief who controlled Hami surrendered to China with seven cities which were in all probability the Seven Cities of Lop Nor, including K'ang Yen-tien's colony.

POSTSCRIPT

After the completion of the manuscript of this article, while I was visiting Japan, Professor Enoki Kazuo 榎一雄 of the Tōyō Bunko pointed out to me that during the war Mr. Onogawa Hidemi 小野川秀美 had published an article entitled 河曲六州胡の沿革 in 東亞人文學報 1/4 (1942). Mr. Onogawa told essentially the same story as I have done about this Sogdian colony. He has collected more material for certain parts of the narrative for which I refer the reader to his article.

My conclusions differ from his on a number of points of greater or less importance, but I have not on the whole found it necessary to modify my conclusions. I shall not discuss every point in detail but I should like to make one or two remarks. Following an earlier Japanese scholar, Mr. Onogawa was of the opinion that the *hsiang hu* 降戶 of the Six Prefectures, who were handed over to Mo-ch'o by the Empress Wu, did not belong to the Six Hu Prefectures.

I think the evidence and arguments I have presented in the text and in note 1 on page 330 are amply sufficient to justify my retaining the contrary opinion. Mr. Onogawa provides much evidence associating the Hu of the Six Prefectures with the Sha-t'o in the ninth and tenth centuries but he does not go so far as to identify them with two of the three tribes of the Sha-t'o. Again I refer to my argument in this article.

Mr. Onogawa points out an item which I had unfortunately overlooked. When An Ch'ing-hsü, the son of An Lu-shan who succeeded his father as rebel emperor, fled from Lo-yang in 757 to escape the victorious imperial forces, he was accompanied by some Hu of the Six Prefectures, as well as Tongra and other special troops (TCTC 220, Chih-te 2/12/ *chia-tzu*). It is unlikely, though perhaps not impossible, that this refers to the descendants of the Hu of the Six Prefectures at Lin Chou. Assuming that they did come directly from the Ordos, we have nothing to show just when they joined the rebels, but it is possible to surmise a connection with the affair of A-shih-na Ts'ung-li, especially since the Tongra were also mentioned both as followers of A-shih-na Ts'ung-li and as accompanying An Ch'ing-hsü in his flight. This suggests that the A-shih-na Ts'ung-li, or at least some of those led by him, returned to the rebels at Ch'ang-an after their defeat by Kuo Tzu-i and the Uigurs. If there was indeed an addition to the rebel forces of Sogdians from the Ordos, they must have suffered along with the Hu of Lin Chou in the massacre at Yu Chou in 761.

I am not inclined to give as much importance as Mr. Onogawa does to the appearance of *individuals* of apparently Sogdian origin in the armies of Ho-pei and elsewhere after the rebellion. One can never tell whether they still formed part of a Sogdian community or whether they were merely the sinicized, or at least denationalized, descendants of Sogdians who had been enlisted in Chinese armies. Moreover Sogdians who entered Chinese military service did not necessarily come from the Ordos colony, but might

come from such places as settlements in Kansu and Hsin-chiang and in Ch'ang-an or even from Sogdiana itself.

ABBREVIATIONS

- CTS — Chiu T'ang-shu
 HTS — Hsin T'ang-shu
 TCTC — Tzu-chih t'ung-chien
 TFYK — Ts'ao-fu yüan-huei

EDITIONS CITED:

- Dynastic histories and Tzu-chih t'ung-chien — Ssu-pu pei-yao.
 An Lu-shan shih-chi 安祿山事迹 — Ou-hsiang ting-shu 藕香亭檢
 Chang Yü-kung chi 張燕公集 (collected works of Chang Yü-shan 說) — T'ung-shu ch'i-ch'eng.
 Chen-kuan cheng-yao 貞觀政要 — Ssu-pu ts'ung-h'an.
 Ch'en Po-yü wen-chi 陳白玉文集 (collected works of Ch'en Tzu-ang 子昂) — Ssu-pu ts'ung-h'an.
 Ch'uan T'ang-wen 全唐文.
 Ssu-h'u ch'uan-shu tsung-mu 四庫全書總目 — Ta-tung shu-chü 大東書局, Shanghai, 1926.
 Ta T'ang hsi-yü chi 大唐西域記 — Ssu-pu ts'ung-h'an.
 T'ai-p'ing huan-yü chi 太平寰宇記 — edition with preface by Hung Liang-chi 洪亮吉, 1803.
 Ts'ao-fu yüan-huei 册府元龜 — edition of Li Ssu-ching 李嗣京, 1642.
 T'ung-chih 通志 — Shih-t'ung 十通 edition, Commercial Press, Shanghai, 1936.
 T'ung-tien 通典 — T'u-shu chi-ch'eng 圖書集成, Shanghai, 1901.
 Wen-yüan ying-hua 文苑英華 — edition with prefaces by T'u Tse-min 塗澤民 and Hu Wei-hsin 胡維新, 1567.
 Yen Lu-hung chi 顏魯公集 (collected works of Yen Chen-ch'ing 真卿) — Ssu-pu pei-yao.
 Yüan-ho chün-hsien chi 元和郡縣志 — Tai-nan ho 岱南閣 ts'ung-shu.