ACTA ORIENTALIA

A MAGYAR TUDOMÁNYOS AKADÉMIA
ORIENTALISZTIKAI KÖZLEMÉNYEI

SZERKESZTŐSÉG ÉS KIADÓHIVATAL: BUDAPEST V., ALKOTMÁNY U. 21.

Az *Acta Orientalia* német, angol, francia és orosz nyelven közöl értekezéseket az orientalisztika köréből.

Az *Acta Orientalia* változó terjedelmű füzetekben jelenik meg. Több füzet alkot egy kötetet.

A közlésre szánt kéziratok, lehetőleg géppel írva, a következő címre küldendők:

Acta Orientalia, Budapest 502, Postafiók 24.

Ugyanerre a címre küldendő minden szerkesztőségi és kiadóhivatali levelezés.

Az *Acta Orientalia* előfizetési ára kötetenként belföldre 80,— Ft, külföldi címre 110,— forint. Megrendelhető az „Akadémiai Kiadó"-nál (Budapest V., Alkotmány utca 21. Bankszámla 05-915-111-46), a külföld számára pedig a „Kultúra" Könyv és Hírlap Külkereskedelmi Vállalatnál (Budapest I., Fő utca 32. Bankszámla: 43-790-057-181) vagy külföldi képviseleteinél és bizományosainál.

Die *Acta Orientalia* veröffentlichen Abhandlungen aus dem Bereiche der Orientalistik in deutscher, englischer, französischer und russischer Sprache.

Die *Acta Orientalia* erscheinen in Heften wechselnden Umfanges. Mehrere Hefte bilden einen Band.

Die zur Veröffentlichung bestimmten Manuskripte sind an folgende Adresse zu senden:

Acta Orientalia, Budapest 502, Postafiók 24.

An die gleiche Anschrift ist auch jede für die Redaktion und den Verlag bestimmte Korrespondenz zu richten.

Abonnementspreis pro Band: 110 Forint. Bestellbar bei dem Buch- und Zeitungs-Aussenhandels-Unternehmen »Kultúra« (Budapest I., Fő utca 32. Bankkonto 43-790-057-181) oder bei seinen Auslandsvertretungen und Kommissionären.

ACTA ORIENTALIA

ACADEMIAE SCIENTIARUM HUNGARICAE

(ACTA ORIENT. HUNG.)

ADIUVANTIBUS

K. CZEGLÉDY, A. DOBROVITS, L. FEKETE, J. NÉMETH, S. TELEGDI

REDIGIT

L. LIGETI

TOMUS XVII

UNIVERSITÄTS BIBLIOTHEK WIEN

UIGURS AND TIBETANS IN PEI-T'ING (790—791 A. D.)

BY

HILDA ECSEDY

Around 790—791, the Chinese, in spite of the Uigur help, were worsted in their struggles against the Tibetans. In consequence of this defeat China lost its fortresses in Eastern Turkestan, i.e. the territories north of 天山 T'ien-shan, whose centre was 北庭 Pei-t'ing, and also the completely isolated Turfan defended by 安西 An-hsi till that time. These territories fell into the hands of the Tibetans, and the Uigurs — despite some temporary successes — could not dislodge the Tibetans. It was some decades later that flying from the Kirghiz troops they finally succeeded in doing so (about 840).

The battles, fought in 790—791, are mentioned in the inscription of the monument of Qara-Balghasun;[1] their first detailed description can be found in the chapters on the Uigurs and the Tibetans (cxcv and cxcvi) of the *CTS*.[2]

CTS cxcvi, B 1468

"In the 6th year (790) (of 貞元 *Chêng-yüan* period)[3] the Tibetans (吐蕃 *t'u-fan)* invaded our province (都護府 *tu-hu-fu)*[4] of Pei-t'ing.[5] Formerly, as Pei-t'ing and An-hsi,[6] taking their way through [the territory of] the Uigurs (廻紇 *hui-ho)*,[7] had been able to come to the court for audience,[8] they had belonged to our provinces.[9] The Tibetans (蕃 *fan)* were of greedy and cruel nature; in their demands there was no measure.[10] Pei-t'ing was near the 羌 Ch'iang [tribes]; they took by force all the clothes and food and everything, necessary for living, from them [i.e. from the inhabitants of Pei-t'ing]; people had nothing to live on.[11] — Moreover more, than 6000 tents of the 沙陀 Sha-t'o tribes lived in peace with Pei-t'ing and were dependants of the Uigurs;[12] but the Uigurs let them rob and pillage, and that was why [the population] had rather enough of grievances. The Karluk (葛祿 *ko-lu)*[13] tribes and the Turks (突厥 *t'u-chüeh)* of white dress[14] generally lived in harmony with the Uigurs, but they were also dissatisfied with their robberies and invasions. Therefore the Tibetans cajoled them by abundant presents in order to annex them (to Tibet). Then the Tibetans led the army of the Karluks and of the [tribes of] white dress;[15] the year before[16] they all came and invaded Pei-t'ing. The Uigurs' chief minister (大相 *ta-hsiang)* Il bügäsi (頡干迦斯 *Hsieh-kan-*

chia-szŭ)[17] led troops to reconquer [Pei-t'ing]; he was defeated in several battles.[18] The Tibetans offended and closed him about; he was in desperate straits. As the inhabitants of Pei-t'ing had suffered from the Uigurs, this year the whole town surrendered to the Tibetans; the Sha-t'o tribes, too, surrendered.[19] The military commander (節度使 *chieh-tu-shih)*[20] of Pei-t'ing, 楊襲古 Yang Hsi-ku[21] with more, than 2000 men,[22] commanded by him, sallied and ran to 西州 Hsi-chou.[23] Il ügäsi returned without success.[24] — In the autumn of the 7th year (791)[25] all the grown-up men[26] [of the Uigurs], 50—60 000[27] men went to reconquer Pei-t'ing, then they called for [Yang] Hsi-ku to take part in the campaign. Suddenly they were attacked by the Tibetans, Karluks and so on;[28] they suffered a great defeat, most of them died.

CTS cxcv, 1453

Il ügäsi (頡干利 *Hsieh-kan-li)*[29] gathered the survivors[30] and returned fleeing day and night. The remainder of the army of [Yang] Hsi-ku, 160 men altogether,[31] went back to Hsi-chou.

CTS cxcvi, B 1468

But Il ügäsi *(Hsieh-kan-chia-szŭ)*[32] cajoled him [i.e. Yang Hsi-ku], saying: "If you come with me to the residence of the *kaghan*,[33] we shall accompany you when you return to the court of your emperor." [Yang] Hsi-ku yielded to him, but arriving at the residence of the *kaghan* he was hindered, he was not sent home; finally he was killed.[34] From that time An-hsi was cut off, nobody knew whether it was still holding out or had been lost. Only the population of Hsi-chou were defending themselves steadily. After Il ügäsi[35] had been defeated, the troops of the Karluks used the victory to conquer the valley 浮圖 Fu-t'u[36] of the Uigurs. The Uigurs got frightened very much and they brought all their tribes, sheep and horses of Hsi-chou southward from the residence of the *kaghan* to hide them.[37]

CTS cxcv, 1454

In the 8th month of the 7th year (791)[38] the Uigurs sent delegates and offered to the emperor the prisoners and the livestock seized, taken among the Tibetans and Karluks, defeated at Pei-t'ing. Previously the Tibetans had invaded 靈州 Ling-chou[39] and were defeated by the Uigurs;[40] at the violent attack at night they had withdrawn in panic.[41"42]

All this is accounted by the *THY* lxxiii, 1330 and by the *TCTC* (789—791) in a similar detailed manner; their texts are related to that of the *CTS*. The short reference of the *TFYK* cmxcv, 11 687 to the battle between Uigurs and Tibetans in 791 can also be connected with the above-mentioned sources. The chapter of the *HTS*, reporting about the Uigurs (ccxvii, A 1524—1525) by shortenings and omissions recounts the same events as can be read in the chapter on the Uigurs of the *CTS*, and the parallel parts of the *WHTK* (xxiv, 141*b*) and of the *PIT* (cxxvi, 48*a*) originate from the *HTS*. (Shorter references occur elsewhere too in the sources, mentioned above.)

The events in question have been translated already by Bičurin, I, pp. 329—330 on the basis of the *HTS* ccxvii, A; they have been translated by Bushell[43] in the chapter on the Tibetans of the *CTS*; Chavannes *(Chinese Documents)* has translated and commentated on some parts of the *TCTC* concerning this time; Abe Takeo (pp. 150—169) compiles the history of Pei-t'ing and its neighbourhood in the second half of the 8th century from different passages of several Chinese sources (from parts of our quotation of *CTS* too: pp. 159—164); *Satō Hisashi*[44] summarizes the events of the years 789—791 mainly by the help of the *CTS* cxcvi (II, pp. 662—665). Recently the history of 790—791 has been translated by Pelliot *(Histoire ancienne du Tibet*, pp. 59—60).

The chronological order of these events, not quite clearly described in the *CTS*, can be established by the help of other sources, especially by the help of the text of *TCTC* (see the notes of our quotations from the *CTS*, mainly note 25!) as follows:

At the end of 789 near Pei-t'ing the Sha-t'o, Karluk and other Turk tribes, living in the neighbourhood of the fortress, revolted against the Uigurs; by their help the Tibetans attacked and captured Pei-t'ing at the beginning of January, 790, but the Uigur troops, led by the chief minister Il ügäsi, reconquered it.

In the first half of 790 Il ügäsi led an unsuccessful campaign against the Tibetans. The defenceless Pei-t'ing was attacked by Tibetans and other allied Turk troops (i.e. Karluk, Sha-t'o and other tribes of Turk origin) in the second half of June — in the first half of July; the inhabitants of the town surrendered, and the commander of the Chinese garrison, Yang Hsi-ku with his 2000 soldiers fled to Hsi-chou.

Il ügäsi returned from his campaign against the Tibetans in the second half of July — in the first half of August, 790. During the next two months he gathered an army of several thousands, and together with Yang Hsi-ku he went to reconquer Pei-t'ing, but without success. At the end of October—at the beginning of November the defeated troops marched away from Pei-t'ing; Yang Hsi-ku, being invited by Il ügäsi, accompanied the Uigurs, who soon killed him.

In the next year (791) the Karluks settled down on the Uigur territories near Pei-t'ing, and the Uigurs were forced to go southward. By the autumn the Uigur troops regained their strength to such an extent that at the end of September they beat off the Tibetans' attack in Ling-chou, and afterwards they could beat the army of Tibetans and Karluks too in Pei-t'ing. A little later — at the end of September or in October — their deputation offered the prisoners to the Chinese court; they sent a Tibetan prisoner to the court as late as on 6th January 792. (At that time the temporary military successes

of the Uigurs and of the Chinese, trying their luck again and again, could be explained by the Tibetans being occupied in their campaigns in the South, cf. *TCTC* ccxxxiii, 7524—7525.)

The parts of *CTS* quoted above, too, contract the events which had taken place during two years; making further abbreviations, in references now and then, the sources reduce the history of the two years (and of their antecedents) to a single battle between Chinese and Tibetans, where the Chinese were defeated because of the betrayal of the Uigurs.[45]

It is true that in 790—791 the Chinese and the Uigurs were allies. On the north-west frontiers, in the region of Pei-t'ing, where Uigurs took a firm stand since the middle of the 8th century *(i.e.* since the downfall of the Western Turk empire), and where the Chinese defended their last military posts at the end of the same century, in consequence of the Tibetan threat, the Uigurs were natural confederates of the Chinese. But despite their mutual interests, the friendly relations of the two empires had not been undisturbed even in the period between the two major Tibetan attacks. In that time the Uigurs kept even the power struggle around the person of the *kaghan* in secret from China:

CTS cxcv, 1453[46]

"The 鴻臚卿 *hung-lu-ch'ing*[47] 郭鋒 Kuo Fêng,[48] who was 御史大夫 *yü-shih-ta-fu*[49] too, became the delegate to recognize the *kaghan* 忠貞 Chung-chêng of the Uigurs. In the 4th month of this year (19th April—18th May 790) the *kaghan* Chung-chêng was killed by his younger brother, and he usurped the rank [of his elder brother]. In that time the chief general of the Uigurs (廻紇 *hui-ho)* Il ügäsi (頡干伽斯 *Hsieh-kan-chia-szŭ)* attacked the Tibetans on the West and had not returned yet. The other ministers[50] and the high officers[51] of the empire that had cut the usurper down, made the son of the *kaghan* Chung-chêng *kaghan ;* in this year he was but 16—17 years old.[52] In the 6th month (17th July—14th August 790) Il ügäsi, returning from the western campaign, had almost arrived at the residence of the *kaghan ;* the ministers and the others were frightened, that he would drive the *kaghan* away. They did not want the Chinese delegate to know it;[53] they hindered [Kuo] Fêng for several months, [before] they let him return home.[54] When Il ügäsi arrived, the *kaghan* and the others welcame him, bringing the letter of alliance,[55] the [precious] vessels and the silks,[56] presented by Kuo Fêng, to the field, surrounding the residence of the *kaghan*. The *kaghan* and all the minor leaders[57] and ministers threw themselves down and they told him themselves why they had dethroned the [former] *kaghan*, and they asked him to command [them]: "Our life and death depend only on our chief minister!" And they gave all the aligned [precious] vessels and silks to Il ügäsi, in order to please him."

Thus the imperial court could not obtain knowledge of the fact that — in consequence of the increased power of Il ügäsi — the friendship with the Uigur *kaghan* (reflected in a Chinese order of appointment, i.e. the recognition of the Uigur *kaghan)* was not more a guarantee of the Uigur alliance for the Chinese, and as they did not know that the Uigur military forces were busy in Il ügäsi's campaign and occupied by the troubles about the person of the *kaghan*, they could count on military help from the Uigur empire in Eastern Turkestan with good reasons. But for the Uigurs this alliance was by no means as advantageous as for the Chinese. Compared with Il ügäsi's army of 50—60 000 soldiers, Yang Hsi-ku's 2000 men were a negligible force, so the historiographer is exaggerating, when he says that the Uigurs asked the escaped part of the garrison of Pei-t'ing for help. Naturally in China too, one had no doubt about the power relations, that is why the relation of the Chinese court to the Uigurs remained unchanged after Kuo Fêng's arrival on 29th November 790. The delegate Kuo Fêng, sent on 31st December 789 to recognize the *kaghan* Chung-chêng, could report he had been kept in prison for months at the time of the internal riots, and that he had not been allowed to return home until the defeat at Pei-t'ing had weakened the Uigurs to such an extent that the Karluk tribes had conquered their territories north of the town. Likewise it must have been Kuo Fêng who informed the court about Yang Hsi-ku's death and also about its circumstances. However, not much later (on 21st March 791) a Chinese delegate set out to the weakened and treacherous Uigurs in order to recognize a son of the *kaghan* Chung-chêng as the ruler of the Uigurs and to give him the name 奉誠 Fêng-ch'êng. Further on there was no sign of the emperor's grudge or of the Uigurs' apology. Just as till then, Uigur deputations brought the prisoners, taken in battles, to the capital, and brought the Chinese silks or the plentiful dowry of the Chinese princesses home. The exchange of princesses (that is to say, a Chinese wife in the residence of the Uigur *kaghan* and the female relatives of the Uigur *kaghan* in the imperial court), the relationship, emphasized by titles too and the mutual presentations, in which the generosity of the Chinese was out of all proportion, strengthened the friendship, which was always in need of being strengthened, in the same way, as it had done during three decades, since 762—763, when the Uigurs had defeated the rebels. All this shows that the Uigurs' behavior towards China in 790 is to be attributed first of all to the weakness of the Chinese frontier troops; — the Uigurs realized this and took advantage of it, and naturally the Chinese could not even try to retort.

The hopes of the Chinese about an alliance between themselves and the Uigurs originated partly from the friendly politics of China to the Uigurs for a few years before 790. Since 784 the relation between China and the Uigurs had become more friendly indeed; the main strength of this policy was represented by the powerful chief minister[58] 李泌 Li Pi.[59] He obstinately

the pro-Tibet party, which — referring to the Tibetans' power and to the heavy consequences of their attacks — was admonishing the emperor to be indulgent towards the Tibetans.[60] But by dint of obtaining full powers in 787 (cf. *TCTC* ccxxxii, 7490), Li Pi succeeded in concluding an agreement between the Chinese court and the Uigurs in the autumn of 787; on the day 癸亥 *kuei-hai* of the 9th month (28th October) the princess 咸安 Hsien-an was promised to the *kaghan* Chung-chêng as a wife (cf. *TCTC* ccxxxiii, 7505), and soon the younger sister of the *kaghan* arrived at the court; in the 4th year of *Chêng-yüan* period, on the day 戊子 *wu-tzŭ* of the 10th month (16th November 788) or earlier, in the 7th month, see note 7) the emperor agreed to write the Chinese name of the Uigurs from that time in a new form, changed according to the desire of the Uigurs. It seems, that Li Pi's sympathy towards the Uigurs can be explained by the fact that the trade and levy routes led through the territories of the Uigurs (see note 8), and that the minister took a considerable advantage of the roads until he was deprived of the controlling of roads in the 12th month of the 4th year of *Chêng-yüan* period (1st—30th January 789), when he was accused of pilfering taxes and of hoarding private property (cf. *TCTC* ccxxxiii, 7510). It is understandable that he made many enemies, and after his death (1st April 789) his friendly policy to the Uigurs was not continued consistently by the court; it was rather used only in case of need, — e.g. in 790, despite the betrayal of the Uigur general.

Li Pi's name is connected with a proposal which prevailed on the emperor not to relinquish An-hsi and Pei-t'ing to the Tibetans in August, 784.[61] The Tibetans demanded the frontier region as their due because of having suppressed the rebellion of 朱泚 Chu Tz'ŭ,[62] on the basis of a treaty, concluded in the 4th year of 建中 Chien-chung period, on the day 丁亥 *ting-hai* of the 1st month (15th February 783), at the river 清 Ch'ing[63] (cf. *TCTC* ccxviii, 7338); for in 783 the emperor wanted to obtain at any cost the help of the Tibetans against Chu Tz'ŭ and his supporters. Then the rebels attacked the capital with the allied Uigur troops, with those Uigurs who were called into China by the emperor in 762—763 to put down a rebellion against the dynasty; (in those times it was the Tibetans who took advantages of the troubles, and that is why they could infiltrate between the capital 長安 Ch'ang-an and the region of the frontiers).

The relation between Tibetans and Chinese on the one hand and between the Uigurs and the Chinese on the other was determined by a number of factors in the second half of the 8th century too.

From the middle of that century to the beginning of the 780's the Tibetans were hostile towards China; in 783—784 they fought and defeated the rebels (and the Uigurs), in defence of the emperor; afterwards (as they became disappointed in their hopes to obtain territories) they were again enemies of China; and in 789—790, when they succeeded in gaining the tribes who lived

on the north-western frontier, they conquered the region of the frontiers, formerly defended by the two fortresses An-hsi and Pei-t'ing.

The Uigurs had been China's (disobedient) allies from the middle of the 8th century to the beginning of the 80's; in 783—784 they took part in the predatory campaign of the rebels; and about 787 — partly because of Li Pi's indulgent politics — they were again friends of China, but this friendship — as it was proved in 790 — could not be relied on for any longer period of time.

The many treaties, broken now by this and then by that party, and the repeated changes of tendency of China's foreign policy had their cause not only in the robbing, pillaging way of life of the Uigur, Tibetan etc. troops, but first of all in the fact that since the middle of the 8th century, in connection with the inner troubles, China was not only at the mercy of the attacking armies but also that of the foreign troops called in to help. Even the population of the inner provinces could not feel secure, and the situation in the frontier regions was even more threatening.

The frontier fortresses were cut off from the capital by the Tibetan expansion from the 60's of the 8th century, so that the garrisons could not count on reinforcements. A few garrison commanders held out to the last, but even the news of their act of heroism reached the imperial court too late.[64] The commander of An-hsi and Pei-t'ing 李元忠 Li Yüan-chung[65] and the commander of the "four fortresses" (cf. note 6) 郭昕 Kuo Hsin[66] found the way leading to the capital through the territories of the Uigurs only in 781. From that time this way was passable, but not without dangers. It was fit rather for travellers and tradesmen than for armies. At any rate the small number of Yang Hsi-ku's garrison of Pei-t'ing proves that the frontiers were not provided with troops of such numbers, that would have been sufficient to defend the place. The distances between the fortresses made control almost impossible, and so it increased the power of the governors of frontiers, but it also sealed their destiny.

The auxiliary troops could not arrive from the capital for the very reason that they were needed inside the country because of the Tibetans, marauding there and because of the danger of further rebellions (e.g. see *TCTC* ccxxxiii, 7507) and also of the taxes that had to be collected.

In consequence of 安祿山 An Lu-shan's rebellion (755—757) and of the Tibetan invasion, which followed it, the taxes had not been collected in a satisfying quantity for a long time; at least the taxes were not enough to keep an army of sufficient number, beside of maintaining the officers.

The treasury became almost empty, because the much of the collected taxes got lost en route. (Cf. *TCTC* ccxxx, 7419—7420.) The "presents", depending on the officers' pleasure, that is to say, the extra taxes (cf. *TCTC* ccxxx, 7417) were increased by the continually

too who were necessary, as Li Pi urged, for although only the two thirds of the population remained on their land (in consequence of the battles and of the emigration), but they were to be restrained with ten times as much difficult than formerly (cf. *TCTC* ccxxxii, 7490—7491). From the decreasing taxes the court could not pay the army; several troops did not receive their provisions for months (they lived from robbery as the foreign troops did), and the soldiers' salary was often delayed and only paid through raising money from loans (782: cf. *TCTC* ccxxvii, 7325; 786: cf. *TCTC* ccxxxii, 7469—7471).

It was in vain that in 780 the chief minister 楊炎 Yang Yen[67] made the taxation more rigorous, initiating the so-called 兩稅法 *liang-shui-fa* "method of twofold taxation"; the greatest part of the extremely overburdened peasantry flew away from the too high taxes, mostly to the frontiers, which were comparatively independent (cf. Balázs, 1931, pp. 25—32). The deserted fields that had not produced enough even when cultivated gave now less taxe; and the peasants, having run to the frontiers, escaped from the sphere of authority of the taxe-collector officers too.

The population of the frontiers consisted partly of foreign tribes, partly of not numerous Chinese garrisons of a fate to serve for life, because they would never be replaced by new troops. So these soldiers settled down, established a family and even cultivated the soil of that region (cf. *TCTC* ccxxxii, 7494—7495); finally the Chinese exiles and the peasants, who emigrated from their fields also came to live in the border regions. We can understand from the composition of the population, why e.g. the inhabitants of Pei-t'ing surrendered to the Tibetans in 790: the Chinese garrison could not defend them, they could not expect help from inside the country and they, left alone, did not continue the fight for this territory which had been till then only loosely connected with China and whose people — the most part of which consisted of foreigners and of escaped or exiled Chinese — did not wish to prolong the war just for the sake of belonging to China.

Accordingly the loss of Pei-t'ing and An-hsi was a direct consequence of China's weakness for several decades at home and abroad. The fields — in case of unchanged productive methods — could not be forced to produce more, and the taxes were to be increased if only because of the wars; the people of the fields had flown away from the charges, so there remained very few peasants to serve as soldiers and to pay taxes; the number of the troops diminished day by day, and the taxes, necessary to keep the enormous apparatus of officers, were not enough even to sustain the army, still less to increase it, — and this army could not resist the foreign tribes threatening inside the country and on the frontiers; and much less support was given to the frontier garrisons that could hold out for a short time only by desperate individual heroism. For this reason it was not an accident that at the end of the 8th century, when the Tibetans succeeded in turning the frontier tribes against

China, Turfan and the northern region of T'ien-shan were definitively lost for China.

The same unsolved internal problems, in consequence of which China could not keep its westernmost fortresses, in a few decades produced a discontent of such proportions that at the beginning of the 9th century those secret groups, which pushed the T'ang dynasty to an inescapable fall at the end of that century, began to organize.

NOTES

[1] Cf. Schlegel; Chavannes-Pelliot, *Un traité*, pp. 177—199; O. Hansen, *Zur soghdischen Inschrift auf dem dreisprachigen Denkmal von Karabalgasun : JSFOu.* LXIV (1930), pp. 1—39.

List of abbreviations used in this paper:

Chinese sources:

CTS — 劉昫 Liu Hsü, 舊唐書 *Chiu T'ang-shu:* 縮印百納本二十四史 *So-yin po-na-pên êrh-shih-szŭ shih* XII, 商務印書館 Shang-wu yin-shu-kuan, Peking 1958.

HTS — 歐陽修 Ou-yang Hsiu, 宋祁 Sung Ch'i etc., 新唐書 *Hsin T'ang-shu: So-yin po-na-pên êrh-shih-szŭ shih* XIII, Shang-wu yin-shu-kuan, Peking 1958.

PIT — 邊袞典 *Pien-i-tien* in 古今圖書集成 *Ku-chin t'u-shu chi-ch'êng,* 中華書局 Chung-hua shu-chü, Peking 1934.

TCTC — 司馬光 Szŭ-ma Kuang, 資治通鑑 *Tzŭ-chih-t'ung-chien* I—X, 古籍出版社 Ku-chi ch'u-pan-shê, Peking 1956.

TFYK — 王欽若 Wang Ch'in-jo, 楊億 Yang I etc., 冊府元龜 *Ts'ê-fu-yüan-kuei* I—XII, Chung-hua shu-chü, Peking 1960.

THY — 王溥 Wang P'u, 唐會要 *T'ang-hui-yao,* I—III, Chung-hua shu-chü, Peking 1955.

WHTK — 馬端臨 Ma Tuan-lin, 文獻通考 *Wên-hsien t'ung-k'ao,* Shanghai 1903.

(In the quotations the Roman numerals mean the number of *chüan* "chapter", the Arabic numerals indicate the page of the passages referred to.)

Other abbreviations :

Abe Takeo — 安部健夫 Abe Takeo, *Sei-uiguru kokushi no kenkyū (A Study on the History of the West Uigurs), Nakamura Insatsu Kabushiki-gaisha Shuppan-bu,* Kyoto 1958.

Balázs — S. Balázs, *Beiträge zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte der T'ang-Zeit* (618—906): *MSOS* XXXIV (1931), *Ostas. Studien,* 1—92; XXXV (1932), *Ostas. Studien* 1—73; XXXVI (1933), *Ostas. Studien,* 1—62.

Barthold, *Turkestan* — W. Barthold, *Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion : E. J. W. Gibb Memorial Series* V, Luzac and Co., London 1928.

Bičurin — N. Ya. Bičurin, Собрание сведений о народах, обитавших в Средней Азии в древние времена, I—III, Издательство Академии Наук СССР, Moscow—Leningrad 1950—1953.

Chavannes, *Chinese Documents* — E. Chavannes, *Chinese Documents from the Sites of Dandān-Uiliq, Niya and Endere* in A. Stein, *Ancient Khotan. Detailed Report of Archaeological Explorations in Chinese Turkestan,* I—II, Oxford 1907, The Clarendon Press.

Chavannes, *Turcs occid.* — E. Chavannes, *Documents sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) occidentaux,* St. Pbg. 1903.

Chavannes—Pelliot, *Un traité* — E. Chavannes—P. Pelliot, *Un traité manichéen retrouvé en Chine : JAs.* XVIII (1911), November-December, 499—617; I (1913), January-February, 99—199; March-April, 261—394.

Demiéville — P. Demiéville, *Le Concile de Lhasa. Une controverse sur le quiétisme entre bouddhistes de l'Inde et de la Chine au VIII^e siècle de l'ère chrétienne : Bibliothèque de l'Institut des Hautes Etudes Chinoises* VII, Imprimerie Nationale de France, Paris 1952.

Des Rotours — R. des Rotours, *Traité des fonctionnaires et traité de l'armée. Traduits de la Nouvelle Histoire des T'ang (chap. XLVI—L)* I—II: *Bibliothèque de l'Institut des Hautes Etudes Chinoises* VI, Leyde 1947.

Enc. of Isl. — *The Encyclopaedia of Islam* I. E. J. Brill — Luzac et Co., Leiden—London 1960.

Franke — O. Franke, *Geschichte des Chinesischen Reiches. Eine Darstellung seiner Entstehung, seines Wesens und seiner Entwicklung bis zur neuesten Zeit*, I—V, Verlag von Walter de Gruyter et Co., Berlin—Leipzig 1930—1952.

Hamilton — J. R. Hamilton, *Les Ouïghours à l'époque des Cinq Dynasties d'après des documents chinois : Bibliothèque de l'Institut des Hautes Etudes Chinoises* X, Imprimerie Nationale, Paris 1955.

Lévi—Chavannes, *Voyages* — S. Lévi—E. Chavannes, *Voyages des pélerins Bouddhistes. L'itinéraire d'Ou-k'ong* (751—790): *JAs.* VI (1895), September-October, 341—384.

Pelliot, *Histoire ancienne du Tibet* — P. Pelliot, *Histoire ancienne du Tibet : Oeuvres posthumes de Paul Pelliot, publiées sous les auspices de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres et avec le concours du Centre national de la Recherche Scientifique* V, Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient, Paris 1961.

Pelliot, *Neuf notes* — P. Pelliot, *Neuf notes sur des questions d'Asie Centrale : T'oung Pao*, XXVI (1929), 201—266.

Schlegel — G. Schlegel, *Die chinesische Inschrift auf dem uigurischen Denkmal in Kara Balgassun : MSFOu.* IX (1896), I—XV + 1—142.

Stein, *Innermost Asia* — A. Stein, *Innermost Asia. Detailed Report of Explorations in Central Asia, Kan-su and Eastern Īrān*, I—IV, Oxford 1928, The Clarendon Press.

[2] The excerpt of the chapter on Tibetans that seems to be the oldest of our texts referring to this event (see notes 11 and 17), is completed by two excerpts of the chapter on Uigurs of the *CTS*, which were not included in the text of the *CTS* the second time.

[3] According to the *THY* lxxiii, 1330 it happened in the 12th month of the 6th year of *Chêng-yüan* period (9th January—7th February 791). The *THY* draws two events together: the two big Tibetan attacks against Pei-t'ing. One of them took place in the 12th month, but in the 5th year of *Chêng-yüan* period (between 31st December 789 and 14th January 790, cf. *TCTC* ccxxxiii, 7520); the *CTS*, too, refers to the attack of the "last year", i.e. the 5th year of *Chêng-yüan* period (cf. note 16). The other battle took place in the 6th year, but in about the 7th or 8th month (15th August—12th October 790, cf. *TCTC* ccxxxiii, 7521); the beginning of this excerpt, quoted from the *CTS*, refers to the latter battle. (See note 25.)

[4] 都護府 *tu-hu-fu* "un protectorat général . . ." (Des Rotours, p. 719). It is a frontier province. Pei-t'ing was a *tu-hu-fu* from the 2nd year of 長安 Ch'ang-an period (702), cf. *HTS* xl 281.

[5] In the *THY*, *TFYK* and *TCTC* the name of 北庭 Pei-t'ing is written as in the *CTS ;* in the *HTS*, *WHTK* and *PIT* it is written 北廷. — In the T'ang-period it was the centre of the district 庭州 T'ing-chou, a frontier province of China. — In the Han-period its name was 金滿 Chin-man, later on it was called 車師後王庭 Chü-shih hou-wang-t'ing; in the 7th century it was the residence of the Western Turks, then named

可汗浮圖城 K'o-han-fu-t'u-ch'êng *(Qayan-stūpa) ;* from the 14th year of 貞觀 *Chêng-kuan* period (640), after the conquest of 高昌 Kao-ch'ang (Kočo), it was named T'ing-chou; after the 2nd year of *Ch'ang-an* period (702) it was the central fortress of the province Pei-t'ing; from the end of the 9th century it was the centre of the Uigurs, named Bešbalïq in the epoch of Mongols; and its Iranian name was *Panjīkath* (cf. V. Minorsky, *Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam "The Regions of the World". A Persian Geography 372 A. H. — 982 A. D. : E. J. W. Gibb Memorial New Series* XI, Luzac et Co., London 1937, pp. 271—272). It lay in the territory of 孚遠 Fu-yüan of the present province Hsinchiang, on the site of 護堡子 Hu-pao-tzŭ, near 保惠 Pao-hui, i.e. 濟木薩 Chi-mu-sa (cf. Chavannes, *Turcs occid.*, p. 11), northwest of 古城 Ku-ch'êng (its correct name was Ku-ch'êng, not 古城子 Ku-ch'êng-tzŭ, as mentioned in Stein, *Innermost Asia*, II, pp. 553—554; such a place-name can be met in the present provinces *Shenhsi* and *Kansu)* and north-east of Urumči. (Cf. E. Bretschneider, *Mediaeval Researches from Eastern Asiatic Sources. Fragments towards the Knowledge of the Geography and History of Central and Western Asia from the 13th to 17th Century*, Trübner et Co., London 1888, I, p. 66; Chavannes, *Turcs occid.*, pp. 11—12; Stein, *Innermost Asia*, II, pp. 534, 549, 553; L. Giles, *A Chinese Geographical Text of the Ninth Century : BSOS* VI [1932], p. 846.) — *Pei-t'ing* and its region was the key to the northern roads (towards South-Siberia) and to the western roads (towards the basin of Tarim) between the mountains *T'ien-shan* and Altai (cf. Stein, *Innermost Asia*, II, pp. 534, 553); that is why it changed hands so many times, according to the balance of forces of the powers appearing in the area.

[6] 安西 An-hsi, *i.e.* the region of Turfan, westward of 吐魯番縣 T'u-lu-fan-hsien of the present province Hsin-chiang; 交河 Chiao-ho (Yar-Khoto: cf. Stein, *Innermost Asia*, II, p. 555) had been the old centre of this territory. — It became a part of China in the 14th year of *Chêng-kuan* period (640); in the 11th month of the 2nd year of 顯慶 *Hsien-ch'ing* period (11th December 657—9th January 658) a *tu-hu-fu* was established on its territory, and in the 5th month of the 3rd year of *Hsien-ch'ing* period (6th June—5th July 658) 龜茲 Chiu-tz'ŭ (Kucha) became the centre of the province. — The "four fortresses" (四鎮: Chiu-tz'ŭ [Kucha] was China's fort from the 22nd year of *Chêng-kuan* period [648]; 畋沙 T'ien-sha or 于闐 Yü-tien [Khotan] was one of the Chinese forts from the 1st month of the 2nd year of 上元 *Shang-yüan* period [10th February—10th March 761]; and on the territory of 疎勒 Su-lê [Kashgar] and 焉耆 Yen-ch'i [Karashar] Chinese provinces were established in the *Shang-yüan* period [760—761]) were governed by An-hsi, and the territories westward of the fortresses, too, belonged to it, — now in fact but then only in name. In the 1st year of 至德 *Chih-tê* period (756) the name of the province was changed to 鎮西都護府 Chên-hsi tu-hu-fu, but about 780 it is mentioned as An-hsi again. In that time from an administrative point of view it was a part of 隴右道 Lung-yu-tao. (Cf. *CTS* xl 453—454; *HTS* xl 281; Chavannes, *Turcs occid.*, p. 7.) — An-hsi, like Pei-t'ing, was always a threatened frontier zone.

[7] The name of the Uigurs is written 廻紇 *hui-ho* only by one of the sources, informing us about the years 790—791, the *CTS* (both in chapters cxcvi B and cxcv), in other sources the second syllable is transcribed by the character 鶻 *hu.* (Cf. *THY :* 廻鶻, *TFYK:* 廻鶻; *TCTC, HTS, WHTK, PIT:* 回鶻 *hui-hu ;* about the former transcriptions of the name cf. Hamilton, p. 1.) — The different forms of the name of the Uigurs are not always used consistently by the Chinese. Numerous sources mention that the 2nd character of the Chinese transcription of the name *uiγur* had been changed owing to the request of the Uigurs themselves, but the various sources of information concerning the date of the change of name are different. According to the *CTS* (cxcv 1454) the Uigurs adressed their request to the court in the 4th year of the 元和 *Yüan-ho* period (809); but in the passages of *CTS*, following this request, containing already the name 廻鶻

hui-hu, the name *uiyur* occurs in the form 廻紇 *hui-ho* too. (So the way of transcription of the name can not decide in itself the period from which the original text of one or another part of the *CTS* originate.) In other sources the date of the change of name is an earlier one. The *THY* xcviii, 1746 refers to the 7th month of the 5th year of *Chêng-yüan* period (27th July—24th August 789) and the *TFYK*, too, (cmlxvii, 11 373) refers to the 5th year of *Chêng-yüan* period. — According to Chavannes—Pelliot, *Un traité*, p. 180 the *HTS* ccxvii, A 1524 places the event in question between 785 and 788. Immediately before it there is no date; right after it the first one is the 5th year of *Chêng-yüan* period (789), and the passages before and after it (according e.g. to the chronological order of the chapter ccxxxiii of the *TCTC* too) lead to the conclusion that it happened in 788. — In the *TCTC* (ccxxxiii, 7515) the deputation, requesting the change of name, arrived to 長安 Ch'ang-an in the 4th year of the *Chêng-yüan* period, the day 戊子 *wu-tzŭ* of the 10th month (16th November 788); another work by 司馬光 Szŭ-ma Kuang, the 通鑑考異 *T'ung-chien-k'ao-i* (quoted in the chapter ccxxxiii of the *TCTC)* informs us about the dates of other sources too: the 續會要 *Hsü-hui-yao* by 崔鉉 Ts'ui Hsüan, like the *THY*, gives the 7th month of the 5th year of *Chêng-yüan* period, so does the 統紀 *T'ung-chi ;* the 鄴侯家傳 *Yeh-hou-chia-chuan* refers to the 7th month of the 4th year of *Chêng-yüan* period (6th August—4th September 788) and so does the 北荒君長錄 *Pei-huang-chün-ch'ang-lu* by 李繁 Li Fan (the chief minister Li Pi's son) too. According to the *TCTC*, as the chief minister Li Pi died next spring (789), his biography (北荒君長錄) would not contain the change of Uigurs' name unless it had not happened but in the summer of the year 789. (Li Pi died on 1st April 789, cf. note 58.) — The *WHTK* xxiv, 141*b* repeats the text of the *HTS* almost word for word in this point too, and it, too, marks the time before the 5th year of *Chêng-yüan* period (788). — The *PIT* is evidently mistaken, when stating, that the Uigur deputation, asking for the recognition of the new *kaghan* 忠貞 Chung-chêng and for the change of name, went to the court for an audience in the 1st year of *Chêng-yüan* period (785), because the *kaghan* Chung-chêng had not become the ruler of Uigurs till 789, and according to the collateral evidence of the sources, the deputation, requesting for the change of name and the information about the change of *kaghan* arrived to the imperial court almost simultaneously. — Most of the sources place the event in question in the years before 790. The argumentation of the *TCTC* (i.e. that it must have happened before 789, because it can be found in Li Pi's biography) is strengthened by the consideration that in that epoch a manifestation of such a friendly relation between the Chinese and the Uigurs might be expected during the power of the minister Li Pi (787—789), a supporter of the Uigurs. — On the basis of the above-mentioned facts it seems that the imperial decree was issued in the 2nd half of the 4th year (788) of *Chêng-yüan* period (in the 7th month: 6th August—4th September or later on), ordering, that the 2nd character of the name 回紇(廻紇) *hui-ho* should be written 鶻 from that time, expressing, that the Uigurs were so rapid in fight, as the falcons (鶻), just as it was demanded — according to the evidence of numerous sources — by the Uigurs themselves.

[8] In the years following the rebellion of 安祿山 An Lu-shan (755—757), mainly from 764 on, the Tibetans used the chaos to conquer the most part of the provinces *Kansu* and *Shenhsi:* 河 Ho, i.e. 河西道 Ho-hsi-tao and 隴 Lung, i.e. 隴右道 Lung-yu-tao (in the Chinese sources these territories are also mentioned as 關隴 Kuan-Lung instead of 河隴 Ho-Lung). By this clever strategy the Tibetans separated the Chinese fortresses near the western frontier, so that about 766 their connection with China was broken for a long time. The commanders of Pei-t'ing and An-hsi (cf. notes 65 and 66) could not send ambassadors to the capital Ch'ang-an only in 781 for the first time, through the northern territories, inhabited by the Uigurs. (Cf. Chavannes, *Chinese Documents*, pp. 533—536; Demiéville, pp. 169—172.) This route was followed by the famous pilgrim 卓奉朝 Chüo Fêng-ch'ao, known by his monk name 法界 Fa-chieh, who received the name 悟空 Wu-k'ung at the end of his pilgrimage, in 790 (cf. Lévi-Chavannes, *Voyages*, pp. 341—368).

[9] *CTS*, *THY* : 因附庸焉; 附庸 means a small territory, country or province, belonging to a great empire. Pelliot, *Histoire ancienne du Tibet*, p. 59: "ils restaient ainsi dans la dépendance (?) de l'empire". — *TCTC*: 故與之連和 "therefor we lived with them in continuous (undisturbed) peace".

[10] The *THY*, too, writes about 蕃 *fan* ("Barbarians"). In the chapter on Uigurs of the *CTS* (cxcv, 1453) we find *t'u-fan* ("Tibetan") here, thus the original text must have been about the Tibetans: 吐蕃徵求無厭 "The Tibetans are insatiable in demandig" (厭~饜). In the *CTS* of 新華書局 Hsin-hua shu-chü edition (Shanghai 1923) 吐蕃 *t'u-fan* is corrected to 廻紇 *hui-ho (uiyur)* in the text of the chapter on the Uigurs. (Probably elsewhere too, and it could lead to further errors, cf. note 11.) — The *HTS*, *WHTK* and *PIT* do not mention any name, they write only about the arbitrary demands of the "Barbarians" (蕃). — Here the *TCTC* ccxxxiii, 7520 writes about something else: 北庭去回鶻尤近誅求無厭 „*Pei-t'ing* was rather near the Uigurs; (the Uigurs) were insatiable in ravaging and in demanding" (see note 11).

[11] 北庭近莧 „Pei-t'ing was near the Ch'iang [tribes]", or "as to the Ch'iang [tribes] near Pei-t'ing . . ." In the chapter on the Uigurs of the *CTS* (cxcv) the same passage can be found as follows: 北庭差近凡生雷之資必强取之 "[The people, living] immediately near Pei-t'ing, took away [from the inhabitants] everything necessary for living." Who committed it? The name of the tribe is missing, and the expression 北庭差近 is not usual. — Abe Takeo connects the above-mentioned passage with an allusion of the *TCTC* (cf. note 10); it tells, that Pei-t'ing was rather near the Uigurs. But that passage of the *TCTC* can not be inserted in the text of the *CTS*, for in that case we have to refer the statement about the tormenting of the population to the Uigurs, though we can read about them a few sentences further on, in connection with the Sha-t'o tribes, and the two passages are evidently separated (by the conjunction 又, which usually opens a passage about a new event or a new remark). Besides in that time the Uigurs were at home both in Pei-t'ing and in the region of Pei-t'ing, not only as China's allies but as the effective possessors of this territory; it also explains why it would not be worth while to remark that Pei-t'ing was "near" the Uigurs. We may rather consider that Szŭ-ma Kuang, who generally adheres to the text of the *CTS*, but several times gives an interpretation instead of a certain passage of the *CTS* (cf. e.g. note 9), tries to elucidate the obscure expression 北庭差近 in this way: 北庭去回鶻尤近. — If on the basis of the *CTS* of 百納 *Po-na* edition and of the *THY* we accept that the beginning of our excerpt originally concerned the Tibetans, and if we consider that it has been altered when it was inserted in the text of the chapter on the Uigurs [see the remark at the end of the chapter cxcv in the *CTS* of Hsin-hua shu-chü edition, stating, that the Uigurs must have been the people in question and that is why the name of the arbitrary demanding Barbarians 吐蕃 *t'u-fan* (Tibetan) was corrected to 廻紇 *hui-ho* (Uigur) !], then we can understand how the expression 北庭差近 originated: it may very well come from the text of the chapter on the Tibetans, from the expression 北庭近莧. When the Uigurs were mentioned at the beginning of our text, the presence of the Ch'iang tribes, relatives and confederates of the Tibetans, was not quite obvious, and when a copy was made, the characters 北庭差近 may have got to the new text instead of 北庭近莧. It shows that the chapter on the Uigurs of the *CTS* (at least parts of it) takes its origin from the text of the chapter on the Tibetans of the *CTS* (or from its sources). This consideration helps us to explain another passage of the chapter on the Uigurs of the *CTS* too (the variant 頡干利 of the Uigur chief minister Il ügäsi, cf. note 17).

[12] The *CTS* (cxcv, 1453) once writes the name of the tribe in the form 沙陁 Sha-ch'ih. — *CTS*, *THY*, *TCTC* : "more than 6000 tents"; *HTS*, *WHTK*, *PIT* : "6000 tents"; in the chapter on the Sha-t'o of the *HTS* (ccxviii, 1532) and in the *WHTK* (xxiv, 143*b*): "7000 tents". — The tribes 沙陀 Sha-t'o parted from the Western Turks and they lived on the southern slope of the mountain 金娑 Chin-so, east of 蒲類 *P'u-lei* (Barkul) (cf. *HTS* ccxviii, Chavannes, *Turcs occid.*, p. 97). At the end of 789 they joined the Tibetans, but in the 3rd year of the 元和 *Yüan-ho* period (808) they were expelled by the Tibetans themselves from this territory. They asked the Chinese for protection, who settled them in the territory of 鹽州 Yen-chou (in the province Shenhsi, somewhat south of 靈州 Ling-chou) and of Ling-chou (see note 39). (Cf. *WHTK* xxiv, 143*b*; Franke, II., pp. 482—483; their descendants probably live in the neighbourhood of the present 西寧 Hsi-ning and 清海 Ch'ing-hai: Franke, III, pp. 410—411.) — According to the chapter on the Tibetans of the *HTS* (ccxvi, B 1517) the Tibetans chose just that time for a military expedition against Pei-t'ing, when the Sha-t'o tribes, living near it, rebelled against the Uigurs.

[13] 其葛祿; in the *CTS* cxcv, 1453: 其先葛祿 "Previously the *ko-lu* . . ." *THY* : 其三葛祿; *TCTC*, *HTS*, *PIT*: 三葛祿 "the three [tribes] *ko-lu*", i.e. the Karluks; their oldest Chinese name is 歌邏祿 or 歌羅祿 *ko-lo-lu*, the most often used one is 葛邏祿 or 葛羅祿 *ko-lo-lu*. The transcription of the name, consisting of two characters, occurs first in the reports from the 2nd half of the 8th century. — The name 三葛祿 "three Karluks" refers to the three tribes of the Karluks; elsewhere they are mentioned as 三姓葛邏祿 "Karluks of three tribes" (cf. *üč-qarluq:* G. J. Ramstedt, *Zwei uigurische Runeninschriften in der Nord-Mongolei: JSFOu.* XXX [1913—1918], pp. 17, 25). The three tribes are as follows: 1. 謀落 *mou-lo* 謀剌 *mou-la* (*HTS* ccxvii, 2529), 謀雒 *mou-lo* (*TFYK* cmxcii, 11650): *bulaq* (cf. K. Czeglédy, *A karluk törzsek nevei [=The names of the Karluk Tribes]): Magyar Nyelv (=Hungarian Language)* XLV (1949), p. 168; L. Ligeti, *Egy karluk törzs neve kínai átírásban [=The Name of a Karluk Tribe in Chinese Transcription]: Magyar Nyelv* XLV (1949), pp. 168—170). — 2. 熾俟 *chih-szŭ* (*HTS* ccxvii, B 1529): *čigil* (cf. Pelliot, *Neuf notes*, pp. 222—223), but the other variant of the name 朱斯 *chu-szŭ* (cf. *TFYK* cmxcii, 11650) does not support this reading. The other name of this tribe is 婆 (~娑) 匐 *p'o[so]-fu: säbäg* (cf. Pelliot, *Neuf notes*, p. 243). — 3. 踏實力 *t'a-shih-li* (*HTS* ccxvii, B 1529—1530): *tašlïq?* (cf. Schlegel, p. 109). — About 742—744 the Karluks, separated from the tribes of the Western Turks, took part in the overthrow of the Turk empire as members of the confederation of Uigur tribes. They gradually grew stronger and after a decade they became independent. Part of them were subjects of the Uigurs near the mountain 烏德鞬 *Wu-tê-chien (Ötükän)*, part of them fought with the Uigurs near the mountain 金山 *Chin-shan* (Altai) and in the region of *Pei-t'ing* for the possession of this territory; after the 至德 *Chih-tê* period (756—758) they expanded westwards and conquered the region 碎葉 *Sui-yeh (Sūyāb)* and 怛邏斯 *Ta-lo-szŭ* (Talas) according to the *HTS* ccxvii, B 1530; — but the *HTS* ccxv, B 1509 writes that they arrived there only after the 大曆 *Ta-li* period (766—780). At any rate after 766 they settled down in the valley of the river *Ču*, and they grew to a menacing power between the empires of the Tibetans and the Uigurs (cf. V. Y. Barthold, *Karluk : Encyklopaedie des Islam. Geographisches, ethnographisches und biographisches Wörterbuch der muhammedanischen Völker*, E. J. Brill—O. Harrassowitz, Leiden—Leipzig 1913—1938, II, p. 820; *Four Studies on the History of Central Asia, Translated from the Russian by V. and T. Minorsky*, E. J. Brill, Leiden 1956, I, pp. 91—92). From here they made incursions towards Tibet and India too. According to the Tibetan sources the tribes *gar-log* (in the early Tibetan sources this name refers mostly to the Karluks

cf. L. Ligeti, *Tibeti források Közép-Ázsia történetéhez (Tibetan Sources on the History of Central Asia) : KCsA (Archives Csoma de Kőrös)* I. compl. vol. [1935—1939], p. 102) troubled the Tibetans much from the 8th century onwards (cf. G. Tucci, *Tibetan Painted Scrolls*, La Libreria dello Stato, Roma 1949, I, p. 257; H. Hoffmann, *Die Qarluq in der tibetischen Literatur : Oriens* III [1950], pp. 198—201). As it is to be seen from their subsequent history they used the battles in 790—791 to get the power from the Uigurs over the northern part of the mountains T'ien-shan.

[14] *CTS* (cxcv, 1453 too), *THY* lxxiii, 1330 and *TCTC* ccxxxiii, 7520: 白服突厥 "Turks of white dress" The *HTS* ccxvii, A 1524 and the *PIT* cxxvi, 48*a* mention 白眼突厥 "Turks of white eyes" instead; 岑仲勉 *Ts'ên Chung-mien* would recognize in it a name of tribe created like the Turkish name of the tribe *Qaraqözlü* "[Tribe] of black eyes" (cf. Ts'ên Chung-mien, 突厥集史 *T'u-chüeh-chi-shih*, Chung-hua shu-chü, Peking 1958, I, p. 495). But we have no reason to believe the data of the *HTS* (and that of the *PIT*, copying the *HTS)* rather than the data of the *CTS* and *THY*, both being nearer in time to the event here described than the *HTS* is. Instead the 2nd character of the expression 白服突厥 (服 'clothes, dress') the copyist must have written 眼 'eyes' by mistake, for in China by the 11th century the "Turks of white dress" would most certainly be forgotten, though they had played a great part in the history of Central Asia from the second half of the 8th century. — This passage of the *CTS* informs us about the *Oghuz* tribes, living at the lower reaches of the Syr-Darya; they went westward from the neighbourhood of China after the fall of the Western Turk empire (742—744), and they often attached themselves to other empires as allies. In the second half of the 8th century they helped the sect of "white dress" in fight against the Abbasids. The followers of the governor of Khorasan Abū Muslim dressed in white and unfurled white flags against the Abbasids (whose governmental colour was the black), when the 2nd caliph of Abbasids, Al-Manṣūr had his most faithful, but too powerful adherent killed in 755. (The white colour has been also a holy colour of the Manichaean religion, a religion spreading then by the day, cf. Chavannes—Pelliot, *Un traité*, p. 262.) The sect still existed in the 12th century. Its religious ideas are still not cleared up; Abū Muslim, who was looked upon as a prophet, was not a founder of religion: his name was written first on the flags of the movements of peasants, opposed to the Abbasids (cf. Barthold, *Turkestan*, pp. 193—201; S. Moscati, *Enc. of Isl.*, p. 141). About 780—783 Turk troops also joined the rebellion of the sect of white dress in Bokhara (cf. Barthold, *Turkestan*, pp. 199—200). After the defeat, as it seems, they tried their luck on the side of the Tibetans, fighting against the Chinese and the Uigurs. In 806 they played a significant part in the rebellion of Rāfi b. Layth in Samarkand (cf. Barthold, *Turkestan*, pp. 200—201), and from 820 they got more and more power within the Abbasids' army (cf. Barthold, *Turkestan*, p. 211; B. Lewis: *Enc. of Isl.*, p. 18). — They are mentioned as "Turks of white dress" by the Chinese sources. — (A remark of Hamilton, p. 50 suggests that the designation 白服突厥 is to be connected with the Turks of white dress, mentioned by Barthold.)

[15] 白服 '[tribes] of white dress' *i.e.* 白服突厥 'Turks of white dress'.

[16] The year before, i.e. in the 5th year of *Chêng-yüan* period, the Tibetans had already attacked Pei-t'ing, according to the *TCTC* ccxxxiii, 7520 in the 12th month of the 5th year of *Chêng-yüan* period (21st December 789—19th January 790); on the basis of the dates before and after the event in question (戊寅 and 壬辰) it took place between 31st December, 789 and 14th January, 790.

[17] 頡干迦斯; it is written in the same way in the *THY* lxxiii, 1330; *HTS* ccxvii, A 1524; *TCTC* ccxxxiii, 7520; *PIT* cxxvi, 48*a*. — In the *CTS* cxcv, 1453: 頡干伽斯 *Hsieh-kan-chia-szŭ*, and here it occurs as 頡干刹 *Hsieh-kan-li* too; it is shortened several times by the *HTS* and *PIT*: 迦斯 *Chia-szŭ* (in the *HTS*

by mistake 頡干迦 *Hsieh-kan-chia)*. Though in the inscription of the monument of Qara-Balghasun the 2nd character of the name is 干 *yü* and not 干 *kan* (內相頡干伽思 *Hsieh-yü-chia-szu* inner minister, i.e. *ičräki*, cf. Chavannes—Pelliot, *Un traité*, p. 182), Schlegel considered the data of the *CTS* and *HTS* to be authentic and he inferred the form *Qïrqan qaš* from it (cf. Schlegel, pp. 11—12), he completed a hardly legible passage of the inscription (. . .紇伽哩伽. . .) by the help of the evidence of 頡干利 *Hsieh-kan-li* of the *CTS* cxcv, 1453 in a manner, that it should resemble the name of the minister: 頡紇伽哩伽思, by Schlegel's correction: 頡紇伽哩伽思; — the method and the inferred name *Qïrqan qarï qaš* are unacceptable. — F. W. K. Müller *(Uigurica II : Abh. der Königl. Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1910, pp. 93—94) considered the inscription to be authentic in connection with the name of the Uigur minister instead of the Chinese sources (rightly, for it was made still during the life-time of the minister), and he recognized the title *il ügäsi* 'Ruhm des Reichs' in the name of the inscription 頡干伽思 *Hsieh-yü-chia-szŭ (γiet-jju-kja-się)*. His opinion is supported by the data of other sources too: 頡干迦斯 *Hsie-yü-chia-szŭ* is written by the *THY* cxvi, 1746—1747; *TFYK* dclxiii, 7937 and *WHTK* xxiv, 141*b*; the same form must have been written in the original text or in the source of the *TCTC* ccxxvii, 7330 too, for at the hands of copyists it changed to 頡子斯迦 *Hsieh-tzŭ-szŭ-chia* (the character 干 was read 子, and the last two characters were inverted). So rather numerous data strengthen the authenticity of those variants of the name which are the transcriptions of the title *il ügäsi*. (Besides, the characters 干 and 子 are often confounded by the Chinese sources, e.g. in the case of the title 達干~達子 *tarqan.)* — The name of *Il ügäsi* occurs twice as 頡干利 *Hsieh-kan-li* in the *CTS* cxcv, 1453, giving the account of two of his defeats. — We read in the *CTS* cxcvi, B 1468, which seems to be our earliest text from other points of view (see notes 10 and 11): 頡干迦斯不利而還 "*Hsieh-kan-chia-szŭ* (Il ügäsi) returned unsuccessfully". The same point of these events can also be read in the *CTS* cxcv, 1453: 頡干利亦還 „*Hsieh-kan-li* returned too". — The transcription of foreign names is often used by the Chinese sources in a shortened form, like the Chinese names, i.e. the family name may be omitted in the course of a story; therefore the end of the name (cf. 迦斯 *Chia-szŭ : HTS* and *PIT)* can serve as a name, but its beginning, too, can replace the whole name (e.g. the name of the *kaghan* 烏蘇米施 *Wu-su-mi-shih* (Ozmiš) is represented now by its first part 烏蘇, then by its second part 米施). The second half of the name 頡干迦斯 *Hsieh-kan-chia-szŭ* could be omitted in the same way. When from the side of the new name 頡干 *Hsieh-kan* the character 不 was omitted, the text was not understandable, the character 利, too, was considered a part of the name, and the character 而 was corrected to 亦, that it should fit in the context. — This sentence can be found in the parallel text of the *TCTC* ccxxxiii, 7521 too: 回鶻頡干迦斯與吐蕃戰不利 "The Uigur Il ügäsi battled with the Tibetans, but unsuccessfully." The *HTS* (and following it, the *WHTK* xxiv, 141*b*; *PIT* cxxvi, 48*a*) tells the same: 頡干 *(WHTK :* 干) 迦斯與戰不勝 "*Il ügäsi* battled with them [i.e. with the Tibetans], but did not win." — The parallel texts of mostly the same contents before and after the quoted passage of our sentence render it probable that the sentence, including the name 頡干利, too, was of the same contents, and that according to these facts the designation 頡干利 is not a variant of the name of *Il ügäsi* but a mere mistake. (Its second occurence, in the same text, cf. note 30, is an adoption of this mistake.) — *Il ügäsi* was the chief minister of 頓莫賀 *Tun mo-ho (Tun baya). Tun baya*, the uncle of the *kaghan* 登里 *Têng-li (Tängri)*, used the discontent in the empire, and when in 780 the soldiers killed the *kaghan*, he himself replaced him under the name 合骨咄祿毗伽可汗 *Ho ku-tu-lu p'i-chia k'o-han (Alp qutluγ bilgä qayan) ;* on 28th July, 780 he received the name 武義成功 *Wu-i-ch'êng-kung* from the Chinese. (Cf. *CTS* cxcv, 1453; *HTS* ccxvii, A 1523; *TCTC* ccxxxvi, 7282.) *Il ügäsi* appeared on his side; in 782 he received

a Chinese delegation (cf. *HTS* ccxvii, A 1524; *TCTC* ccxxvii, 7330), and by 789 he obtained such a great power at the head of the Uigur army that his consent was necessary to confirm the new *kaghan* in his office (see this paper further on). He is one of the authors of the inscription of *Qara-Balghasun* (prepared between 808 and 821, cf. Chavannes—Pelliot, *Un traité* 199). — We meet another Uigur leader of the same dignity — *il ügäsi* 頡干伽斯 — in 841 too (see *TCTC* ccxlvi).

[18] *Il ügäsi* started to recapture *Pei-t'ing* before 14th January, 790 (cf. note 16 and *TCTC* ccxxxiii, 7520), as it seems, with success; it is borne out by the fact that in the second half of 790 the Tibetans attacked the town again. The Uigur chief minister engaged with them in several unsuccessful battles in the 5th month of the 6th year of *Chêng-yüan* period (17th June—16th July 790, cf. *TCTC* ccxxxiii, 7521).

[19] In the *TCTC* ccxxxiii, 7521: "With the Sha-t'o chieftain, 朱邪執忠 *Chu-yeh Chih-chung* together, they all went over to the Tibetan side." — 朱邪 *Chu-yeh :* a name of tribe of the Sha-t'o (姓: cf. *TCTC* ccxxiii, 7169).

[20] 節度使 *chieh-tu-shih :* "gouverneurs militaires"; "commissaire impérial au commandement (d'une région)" (cf. Des Rotours, pp. 656—657).

[21] The more complete title of 楊襲古 Yang Hsi-ku is (cf. *CTS* cxcv, 1453): 節度使檢校工部尚書 *chieh-tu-shih chien-chiao kung-pu shang-shu.* —

檢校 *chien-chiao :* "faisant fonction" (cf. Des Rotours, p. 3).

工部 *kung-pu*: "le ministère des travaux publics, le bureau des travaux publics (cf. Des Rotours, p. 123).

尚書 *shang-shu :* "président de ministère; chef de service" (cf. Des Rotours, p. 916).

In 789, in the time of the pilgrimage of the monk 法界 Fa-chieh (悟空 Wu-k'ung) Yang Hsi-ku was the commander of the district of Pei-t'ing (cf. Lévi—Chavannes, *Voyages*, p. 365).

[22] Elsewhere (in the *TCTC) :* "2000".

[23] 西州 Hsi-chou, i.e. Turfan, the region of Qara-khodjo during the Han dynasty belonged to 車師前王庭 *Chü-shih ch'ien-wang-t'ing*, during the T'ang dynasty to 交河郡 Chiao-ho-chün (Yar-khoto, cf. Chavannes, *Turcs occid.*, pp. 6, 8). It lay in the territory of 吐魯番縣 T'u-lu-fan-hsien and 善鄯縣 Shan-shan-hsien of the present province Hsinchiang.

[24] Il ügäsi returned in the 6th month of the 6th year of *Chêng-yüan* period (17th July—14th August 790), cf. *TCTC* ccxxxiii, 7521.

[25] In the *CTS* cxcv, 1453 we find 十 "ten" instead of 七 "seven" by mistake. — An error crept into the chronological order of the *CTS*. Il ügäsi and Yang Hsi-ku started to recapture Pei-t'ing not in the 7th year of *Chêng-yüan* period, but in the autumn of the 6th year (7th—9th month of 790: 15th August—10th November). In the part 本紀 of the *CTS* (xiii, 120) the battle is mentioned in the proper time, in the 6th year; although only at the end of the year, but we find 是歲 „this year" as a designation of time, so we need not place it in the 12th month, as the *THY* does, probably on the basis of the *CTS* (cf. note 3.) — According to the chapter on the Tibetans of the *CTS* (cxcvi B) Pei-t'ing was attacked by the Tibetans in 790 (i.e. in the 6th year of *Chêng-yüan* period), and in the previous year (according to the chapter cxcv of the *CTS* and the *THY :* in the previous winter) it was looted by the Tibetans and by the tribes allied with them. If on the basis of the *CTS* we suppose that Il ügäsi did not gather an army only a year later, in the 7th year (791) and Yang Hsi-ku went with him for the campaign only after having stayed in Hsi-chou for a year, so many events would accumulate in the autumne of 791 that this fact itself would make us suspicious regarding the authenticity of the dates. — It presents no difficulty in the chapter on the Tibetans of the *CTS* that the army

of the Uigurs and Chinese fails at Pei-t'ing in 791, for there we do not find the later battles, — mentioned in the chapter on the Uigurs, — in which the Uigurs defeated the Tibetans and the Karluks. According to the order of the events in the chapter on the Uigurs of the *CTS*, the following events would take place in two months' time in the autumn of the 7th year of *Chêng-yüan* period (7th—9th months of 791), by the end of the 8th month (when the Uigurs brought the prisoners taken among the Tibetans and Karluks, to the court): — The general Il ügäsi raises troops; he calls Yang Hsi-ku and his soldiers back from Hsi-chou, and they arrive; they go to Pei-t'ing together and suffer defeat; Il ügäsi cajoles Yang Hsi-ku into going to the residence of the *kaghan*, he forces him to stay there for a while, then he has him killed; the Karluks conquer a part of the Uigur territories; the Uigurs flee southwards; finally the Uigurs regain strength, they defeat first the Tibetans in Ling-chou and then the Tibetans and Karluks at Pei-t'ing; afterwards they send a deputation to the imperial court in the 8th month. (As there is only one date in connection with the journey of the delegates, probably it is the date of their arrival, — so the delegates arrived to the capital in the 8th month, or — according to the *TFYK* cmxcv, 11 687 — in the 9th month.) — It took a considerable time to cover the distance between the scenes of the events (especially in that time, under the dangerous wayfaring circumstances), and all these events could not have possibly taken place within two months. Above all it is improbable that the Uigurs could win against the Tibetans twice and in two different places only a few days, one or two weeks after their complete defeat. — Besides there is some trouble in the text of chapter cxcv of the *CTS*, referring to 790—791. (In other cases the *CTS* does not change the order of time, as e.g. the parallel part of the *HTS* does, and even if it inverts certain events, it does it only within a year.) — The passages describing the second battle of Pei-t'ing, belong to the 6th year of *Chêng-yüan* period (790); the deputation, offering to China the prisoners after the victory on the same place, is mentioned in the 8th month of the 7th year (791), and the latter date is strengthened by the evidence of the *TFYK* cmxcv, 11 687, slightly different from that of the *CTS* : "In the 9th month of the 7th year of *Chêng-yüan* period (791) during [the rule of the emperor] 德宗 Tê-tsung the Uigurs sent a deputation and offered the defeated Tibetans and Karluks, beaten near Pei-t'ing, to the emperor . . ." — In the chapter cxcv of the *CTS* the nearest date before the victory of the Uigurs is the 5th month of the 7th year of *Chêng-yüan* period (the Chinese delegate, recognizing the *kaghan* 奉誠 *Fêng-ch'êng* was sent in that time; according to the *TCTC* it happened in the 2nd month). The story of the battle of 790 can be found immediately before it, as far as to the expansion of the Karluks and to the escape of the Uigurs. Meantime the *CTS* is mistaken, when telling that the Uigurs' preparation for war and the events following it, took place in the autumn of the 7th year (791). — The *TCTC* corrects it: before the word "autumn" omits the designation "seventh year", and refers this passage to the 6th year (790). (It is probable that the Uigurs and the Chinese went to reconquer Pei-t'ing not too long after the Tibetan attack.) — The *HTS* ranges the events of the years in question according to a not too strict chronological order; before the fights in 790 there is no date, and later on, in the time of the victory of the Uigurs only the words "this year" refer to the date; it may be 790, but (according to the text) 791, 792 or 793 as well. However, the part 本紀 of the *HTS* (vii 63) tells about the unsuccessful campaign of Il ügäsi and Yang Hsi-ku in the 6th year of *Chêng-yüan* period (790) and puts Yang Hsi-ku's death in the 9th month; the *PIT* — perhaps after the *HTS* — writes, that the Chinese commander died in the 9th month, — but in the 7th year (791). — The *THY* follows the *CTS*, and the *WHTK* follows the *HTS*. So from the collation of the passages of the *CTS* and of the *HTS*, referring to these events, and from the consequence of the events it seems that it is the chronological order of the *TCTC*, which corresponds to the

facts; and consequently 1. there was a minor Tibetan attack in the winter of 789—790, 2. Pei-t'ing fell in 790, and 3. by the autumn of 791 the Uigurs gathered their forces for further battles. — The above-mentioned facts make reasonable, that we should regard the *TCTC* as a competent source about the chronological order and the dates of the years in question. — So we can correct the text of the *CTS*, quoted above, as follows: "In the autumn of the 6th year (790) . . .", that is to say after 15th August 790, but before the 9th month (13th October—10th November, i.e. the month of Yang Hsi-ku's death, cf. the *HTS* and the *PIT*). (In the *TCTC* the first date following this is: 10th month.)

[26] According to the *THY* lxxxv, 1555—1556, in the 1st year of 廣德 *Kuang-tê* period an imperial edict, published on the 11th day of the 7th month (24th August 763), ordered the men, aged from 25 to 55 years to be regarded as 丁壯 *ting-chuang*, i.e. adults (whose duty was to pay taxes, to do socage-service and to serve in the army); the *CTS* xlviii, 553, too, dates this edict in the 7th month of the 1st year of *Kuang-tê* period, but the lowest age is 23 years and the upper age limit is 58 years in it.

[27] In the *CTS* cxcv: 50 000; *THY* : 60 000; *TCTC*, *HTS*, *PIT* : "several times ten-thousands".

[28] The chapters cxcvi B and cxcv of the *CTS* write: 俄爲吐蕃葛祿等所擊. The corresponding passage of the *THY* is: 我兵爲蕃吐葛祿所敗 "Our army was defeated by the Tibetans and the Karluks." — In the sentence, quoted from the *THY*, we can observe, how a text can be changed by copying: the two characters of the expression 吐蕃 *t'u-fan* 'Tibetan' were inverted; the character 俄 was replaced by 我, then the sentence was completed by the character 兵, fitting into the context, — though it was not only the Chinese army that suffered defeat, but the Uigurs were defeated too, while the words 我兵 'our army' would underline that it was the Chinese, who got into trouble. (In other cases the text of the *THY* quotes the *CTS* almost word for word.) — In this way we may imagine the origin of a "variant" of Il ügäsi's name too, cf. note 17.

[29] Here Il ügäsi's name is written 頡干利. (Cf. note 17.) — *HTS*, *PIT* : 迦斯奔還 "Il ügäsi fled and returned home".

[30] 餘燼.

[31] *CTS* cxcv, 1453: 六十百. *TCTC* ccxxxiii, 7521: "several hundreds".

[32] In the same passage of the chapter cxcv of the *CTS* Il ügäsi's name is written 頡干伽斯; *PIT* : 迦斯 (cf. note 17).

[33] 牙帳 — the residence of the *kaghan*, the capital of the Uigurs lay on the bank of the river Orkhon, at Qara-Balghasun (cf. V. Minorsky, *Tamīm ibn Bahr's Journey to the Uyghurs* : *BSOS* XII: 2 [1948], pp. 299—300).

[34] According to the *HTS* vii, 63 Yang Hsi-ku was killed in the 9th month of the 6th year of *Chêng-yüan* period (13th October—10th November 790); the *TCTC* does not contradict this information; the *PIT*, too, mentions the Chinese commander to be killed in the 9th month, but — by mistake — in 791 (cf. note 25). — The direct cause of Yang Hsi-ku's death is not revealed in the sources.

[35] In the *CTS* cxcv, 1453 Il ügäsi's name is written 頡干伽斯.

[36] The valley 浮圖 *Fu-t'u* is written in the same way in the *CTS* cxcv, 1453 and in the *TCTC* ccxxxiii, 7521. The *HTS*, *WHTK* and *PIT* write 深圖川; the latter is only a mistake. — 浮圖 *Fu-t'u* is a transcription of Buddha's name. The designation of the valley is related to the name of this territory under the rule of Western Turks: 可汗浮圖城 *K'o-han -fu-t'u ch'êng* (Qaγan-stūpa) (in connection with the identifying of Pei-t'ing with *K'o-han-fu-t'u-ch'êng* cf. Chavannes, *Turcs occid.*, pp. 12, 305). According to 胡三省 Hu San-hsing, the commentator of the *TCTC* (see in ccxxxiii, 7521), the valley lies northwest of the mountain 烏德鞬 *Wu-tê-chien* (*Ötükän*, cf. Pelliot, *Neuf notes*, pp. 212—219; K. Czeglédy, *Čoγay-quzï, Qara-qum, Kök-öng* : *Acta Orient. Hung.* XV [1962], p. 62).

Abe Takeo (p. 166) considers it to be in the territory of 蒲類縣 *P'u-lei-hsien* (the region of Barkul).

[37] 悉遷西州部落. The *CTS* cxcv and the *TCTC* write: 悉遷西北部落 "They brought all the north-western tribes away . . ." — The *HTS*, *WHTK* and *PIT* write: 稍南其部落 "They brought their tribes slightly southward . . ."

[38] The 8th month of the 7th year of *Chêng-yüan* period: 3rd September—2nd October 791. — According to the *TFYK* cmxcv, 11 687 an Uigur deputation went to the Chinese court in the 9th month of that year (3rd—31st October).

[39] 靈州 Ling-chou: it was established during the dynasty Later 魏 Wei (386—535); in the time of the dynasty 隋 Sui (589—618) its name was changed to 靈武郡 Ling-wu-chün; in the T'ang-period it was called 靈州 Ling-chou and 靈武州 Ling-wu-chou. It lay in the neighbourhood of 寧夏 Ning-hsia, south-west of 靈武縣 Ling-wu-hsien.

[40] The *HTS*, *WHTK* and *PIT* write: "In this year the Uigurs attacked the Tibetans and Karluks at Pei-t'ing; they defeated them, then they offered the prisoners to the emperor."

[41] The *TFYK* cmxcv, 11 687 writes: "At night (the Uigurs?) attacked violently the defences of the town, but afterwards they withdrew." — The Uigurs brought a Tibetan chieftain to the court as a present even on the day 甲午 *chia-wu* in the 12th month of the 7th year of *Chêng-yüan* period (6th January 792) too, cf. *TCTC* ccxxxiii, 7524—7525.

[42] The battle of the Uigurs and the Tibetans of 791, in which the Uigurs were victorious, is mentioned in all of our sources, except in the chapter cxcvi of the *CTS* and the *THY* : *CTS* cxcv, 1454; *TFYK* cmxcv, 11 687; *HTS* ccxvii, A 1525; *TCTC* ccxxxiii, 7524—7525; *WHTK* xxiv, 142*a* and *PIT* cxxvi, 48*a*.

[43] S. W. Bushell, *The Early History of Tibet from Chinese Sources* : *Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, New Series* XII (1880), pp. 504—505.

[44] 佐藤長 Satō Hisashi, *Kodai Chibetto shi kenkyū (Historical Study of Ancient Tibet)*, I—II, *Tōyōshi Kenkyūkai*, Kyoto 1958—1959.

[45] The *CTS* xiii, 120 writes: "In this year (790) the Tibetans invaded our province of Pei-t'ing, and the military commander Yang Hsi-ku fled to Hsi-chou. The chief minister of the Uigurs Il ügäsi prevailed on [Yang] Hsi-ku to reconquer Pei-t'ing with united troops, but afterwards he killed [Yang] Hsi-ku. Therefore An-hsi was broken off [from China], and only Hsi-chou remained to defend itself persistently. The Tibetans drove away the Uigurs too, and took the valley Fu-t'u [from them, i.e. from the Uigurs]." — We can see that the abbreviation changes the character of the events: the Uigurs called for the Chinese commander, but afterwards they killed him and that is why the borderland was lost; then the victorious enemy — here, for the sake of simplification: the Tibetans — conquered the territories, formerly belonging to the Uigurs.

[46] See the same event in the *THY* xcviii, 1746—1747; *TFYK* dclxiii, 7937; *HTS* ccxvii, A 1525 (it is translated by Bičurin I, pp. 329—330); *TCTC* ccxxxiii, 7521; *PIT* cxxvi, 48*a*.

[47] 鴻臚卿 *hung-lu-ch'ing*: the head of the office 鴻臚寺 *Hung-lu-szŭ* : "La cour cérémoniale envers les étrangers" (cf. Des Rotours, p. 408); 卿 *ch'ing* : "président (d'une cour . . . 寺)" (cf. Des Rotours, p. 957).

[48] 郭鋒 Kuo Fêng's name is written 郭降 in the *TFYK* dclxiii, 7937 by mistake. The news about the death of the *kaghan* 天親 T'ien-ch'in reached the imperial court on the day 庚午 *kêng-wu* in the 12th month of the 5th year of *Chêng-yüan* period (23rd December 789), and Kuo Fêng was sent on the day 戊寅 *wu-yin* (31st December 789) to recognize in the name of China 忠貞 Chung-chêng as the new *kaghan* of the Uigurs (cf. *TCTC* ccxxxiii, 7520).

[49] 御史大夫 *yü-shih-ta-fu* : the head of the office 御史臺 *Yü-shih-t'ai* ("le président du tribunal des censeurs", cf. Des Rotours, p. 281, note 1).

[50] 次相.

[51] 率國人.

[52] The son of the *kaghan* Chung-chêng, 阿啜 *A-cho* (A-čur) was 17 years old according to the *THY* ; he was 16—17 years old according to the *TFYK* dclxiii, 7937 and 15 years old according to the *TCTC*. The Chinese sent a delegate to recognize him as the *kaghan* 奉誠 Fêng-ch'êng on the day 癸卯 *kuei-mao* in the 2nd month of the 7th year of *Chêng-yüan* period (cf. *TCTC* ccxxxiii, 7523).

[53] It means rather: "they did not want the Chinese delegate to know and to report about it . . ."

[54] Kuo Fêng could not return home till the autumn of 790, after the capitulation of Pei-t'ing; he was accompanied by the Uigur deputation, reporting about the death of the *kaghan* Chung-chêng (his death was announced to the court only then, though the *kaghan* had died in the 3rd month, between 21st March and 18th April). They arrived at the court on the day 辛亥 *hsin-hai* of the 10th month (29th November 790).

[55] 國信: a document of two country's pact.

[56] 器幣.

[57] 次將.

[58] 宰相 *ts'ai-hsiang* : "grand ministre" (cf. Des Rotours, p. 4).

[59] See the biography of 李泌 Li Pi (whose 字 was 長源 Ch'ang-yüan) in the *CTS* cxxx, 999—1000; *HTS* cxxxix, 1129—1131. — He died at the age of 68 (cf. the *HTS)* on the day 甲辰 *chia-ch'ên* of the 3rd month in the 5th year of *Chêng-yüan* period: on 1st April 789 (cf. *TCTC* ccxxxiii, 7518; *CTS* xiii, 119; *HTS* vii, 63), so he born in 722. Till 784 he held greater and smaller offices at the court or — when there he was attacked by his enemies — in the provinces; from 784 his prestige grew greater and greater in the emperor's eyes. In 787 he was appointed to *ts'ai-hsiang* (chief minister) with full powers. His biographers condemn him because of his "magic knowledge", i.e. the alchemy, though in that time even emperors dealt with it. Li Pi made a lot of enemies for himself by his full powers, enforced violently, by his foreign politics, supporting the Uigurs and by his wealth, obtained in uncommon rapidity, and perhaps his enemies' judgements are reflected in the opinion of the historians about him.

[60] In 785 a new series of Tibetan attacks started, with the loss of 鹽州 Yen-chou (in the neighbourhood of Ning-hsia, north of 鹽池縣 Yen-ch'ih-hsien) and 夏州 Hsia-chou (in the province Shen-hsi, west of 橫山縣 Hêng-shan-hsien) (cf. Demiéville, p. 182). In the summer of 787 there were some among Chinese, who would have liked to negotiate with the Tibetans (cf. *TCTC* ccxxxii, 7485); the pact between China and Tibet was almost reached in the same year (cf. *TCTC* ccxxxii, 7486).

[61] Cf. Li Pi's biography in the *HTS* and the *TCTC* ccxxxi, 7442; Chavannes, *Chinese Documents*, p. 535.

[62] 朱泚 Chu Tz'ŭ was a powerful officer; with the help of the Uigurs he tried to gain the throne in 783—784. At the end of 783 the emperor was forced to escape from him to 奉天 Fêng-t'ien (in the province Shenhsi). Chu Tz'ŭ conquered Ch'ang-an; he declared himself to be emperor and established a new dynasty named 漢 Han. With the help of the Tibetan troops the army of the emperor beat Chu Tz'ŭ and set the capital free on 3rd May, 784; Chu Tz'ŭ broke out and ran away. (Cf. Demiéville, pp. 171—172.) He died in August, 785. See his biography in the *CTS* cc, B 1505—1507; *HTS* ccxxv 中 1610—1613.

[63] 清水 Ch'ing-shui was in the province Kansu, in the territory of 秦州 Ch'in-chou; this region was conquered by the Tibetans about 766 (cf. Demiéville, pp. 169—172).

[64] 袁光庭 Yüan Kuang-t'ing who defended 伊州 I-chou (i.e. 伊吾縣 I-wu-hsien, the district of Hami) since the last years of 天寶 T'ien-pao period (742—756), resisted heroically at the time of the Tibetan invasion; when he lost his soldiers and used up all food he killed his wife and children and set fire to the fortress. The court was not informed about all these events but in 781 by a delegate of *Kuo Hsin* (cf. *TCTC* ccxxvii, 7305; Chavannes, *Chinese Documents*, p. 535; see note 66).

[65] 李元忠 Li Yüan-chung's original name was 曹令忠 Ts'ao Ling-chung; he was given his new name (and the family name of the imperial house T'ang: 李 Li in it) as a recompense. He had been already the *chieh-tu-shih* of 伊西 I-hsi (according to Demiéville, p. 171 we should rather consider it 安西 An-hsi, for in that time 伊州 I-chou had been occupied by the Tibetans for a long time) and of Pei-t'ing, when with 郭昕 Kuo Hsin together he could send a delegation to the court through the territory of the Uigurs, going round the region seized by the Tibetans; then on the day 戊午 *wu-wu* in the 7th month of the 2nd year of 建中 *Chien-chung* period (26th July 781) as a recompense he became the 大都護 *ta-tu-hu* (chief governor) of Pei-t'ing and the prince (王) of 寧塞郡 Ning-sai-chün (i.e. the region of 廓州 K'uo-chou in the province Kansu). (Cf. *THY* lxxiii, 1329; *TCTC* ccxxvii, 7303; the imperial edict, including the description of Li Yüan-chung's and Kuo Hsin's merits, was translated by Chavannes, *Chinese Documents*, pp. 533—535.)

[66] 郭昕 Kuo Hsin was a younger brother of 郭子儀 Kuo Tzŭ-i, one of the suppressors of the An Lu-shan's rebellion. Kuo Hsin was the *chieh-tu-shih* and the 留後 *liu-hou* (i.e. "fonctionnaire provisoire", cf. Des Rotours, p. 825) of the "four fortresses" (Kucha, Khotan, Kashgar, Karashar, cf. note 6); he was appointed to the *ta-tu-hu* of An-hsi, the *chieh-tu-shih* and 觀察使 *kuan-ch'a-shih* (i.e. "commissaire impérial à la surveillance d'une région", cf. Des Rotours, pp. 669, 964) of the "four fortresses" and the prince (王) of 武威郡 Wu-wei-chün (i.e. the neighbourhood of 涼州 Liang-chou in the province Kansu) on 26th July, 781 (cf. note 65), when after long years he first succeeded in sending information to the imperial court. (Cf. *THY* lxxiii, 1329; *TCTC* ccxxvii, 7303; Chavannes, *Chinese Documents*, pp. 533—535.)

[67] 楊炎 Yang Yen (whose 字 was 公南 Kung-nan, the 謚 was 平厲 P'ing-li and the Taoist name was 玄靖先生 "master" Hsüan-ching): 727—781. See his biography in the *CTS* cxviii, 940—942; *HTS* cxlv, 1155—1156; cf. Balázs, 1931, pp. 86—87. — It is said that it was he who issued the edict dated on the day 丁卯 *ting-mao* in the 1st month of the 1st year of *Chien-chung* period (11th February 780), demanding that henceforth taxes should be payed in two instalments (the first falling due by the beginning of August, the second by 1st January), in direct ratio to the wealth of the families, devided into "categories of taxation". This "reform of taxation" was practically a raising of the taxes and it was an unsuccessful attempt to fill the empty state treasury. (Cf. Balázs, 1931, pp. 86—92; Balázs, 1932, p. 47.)

TANGSUX IN ARMENIA

BY

E. SCHÜTZ

It is at a very early time, indeed, already from the Vth century, *i.e.* practically from the first written records, that Turkic words begin to appear in Armenian chronicles and, from the XIIIth century onward there are also occurrences of Mongolian names and even of common nouns. Although these words, by means of dating the compositions in which they occur, can mostly be linked with certain ethnic elements, they resist at present a really systematic treatment, which can only be successfully undertaken when the clarification of the inner (textual) problems of the chronicles concerned will have been accomplished.

The incursions in the times prior to the Seljuqs hardly left any linguistic traces in the Armenian language; and the relevant words occurring in the chronicles and colophons are, without exception, the Turkic names or dignitarial designations of the invaders.

The task of identifying various strata in the Turkic stock of words appearing in the Armenian dialects will, at any rate, meet with the special difficulty that, in this case, we have to do with cognate languages or dialects of the Turkic group, let alone the additional snags that, on the one hand, with the later predominance of Ottoman-Turkish, the shades of difference become obliterated, while, on the other hand, we have no exact means of ascertaining wether an Arabo-Persian word directly or indirectly found its way into the Armenian language.

We are in a somewhat different situation as regards the linguistic remains of the Mongolian conquest. The linguistic influence of the hundred years long Il-Khan period can be separated, to a certain extent, from the Turkic material originating from the preceding and subsequent periods. Only to a certain extent, to be sure, as the linguistic influence of the Mongolian period does not necessarily mean a Mongolian linguistic influence. It is to be taken into consideration that the Mongol-Tatars constituted but a rather small part of the conquering army.[1] The troops consisted to a large part of Turkish nomads

[1] At any rate A. J. Jakubovskij rightly warns us (Очерки по истории русского востоковедения, Moscow 1953, p. 76), in connection with the Golden Horde: we