

SOME REMARKS ON THE COUNTRY OF TA-CH'IN AS KNOWN TO THE CHINESE UNDER THE SUNG¹

by KAZUO ENOKI

The so-called Ta-ch'in 大秦 problem has been earnestly discussed by Orientalists since the middle of the sixteenth century when the Nestorian monument was first introduced to the learned world. And, even to-day, it seems that not a few are still interested in it.² This is probably because, owing to the development of knowledge in modern times concerning the history and geography of western Asia, one can correct and add something new to the interpretations previously made concerning the country of Ta-ch'in, which was considered for many centuries by the Chinese as the biggest and the most prosperous country in the westernmost part of the world known to them.

According to F. Hirth and K. Shiratori, who are among the scholars who have contributed most to the study of Ta-ch'in,³ under the Han and the Three Kingdoms, the Chinese knew the so-called Roman Orient, including Syria and Egypt, under the name of Ta-ch'in, of which the centre was Alexandria in Egypt; in the fifth and sixth centuries, according to Shiratori, Ta-ch'in became an idealized country which had no connexion with the real place, while after the middle of the fifth century the Roman Orient was called Fu-lin 拂菻 with its centre at Antioch; after the middle of T'ang, the dominion of the Eastern Roman empire in Asia Minor was also called by the name of Fu-lin; Ta-ch'in, which had thus become obsolete, was revived officially in 745 as the designation of Ctesiphon and its neighbouring region, whence Nestorianism came to China, and the name survived until 845 when the Chinese government pro-

¹ In the *Shigaku Zasshi* 史學雜誌 (LVI, pp. 473-523) for the year 1945 I published a detailed study on the country of Ta-ch'in under the Sung. This number of the *Shigaku Zasshi*, of which the circulation was very small owing to difficulties after the War, is rather rare in libraries and private collections in Europe and the lapse of years since its publication has enabled the author to improve his opinion on some points. This is the reason why I am republishing here, by the kind permission of the editor, my study on Ta-ch'in in English, which would be much easier for my colleagues in Europe to understand. Nevertheless, my former article in the *Shigaku Zasshi* is worth being referred to.

² In the XI Deutsche Orientalistentag held at Marburg in 1950, Dr. Stange of Göttingen gave a lecture "Zur Ta-ts'in-Frage" (ZDMG Bd. 100 (NF 25), 1950, p. 3). I hope that he will publish it as soon as possible.

³ For the contributions of Hirth and Shiratori concerning the study of Ta-ch'in, cf. a bibliography of Hirth's writing in the Hirth Anniversary Volume (*Asia Major*, 1923, pp. liv-lv), *Ostasiatische Zeitschrift*, 1920, pp. 25ff. and that of Shiratori in the *Tōyō Gakuhō*, XXIX, pp. 391-406. The main articles of Shiratori on Ta-ch'in are collected in his *Seikishi Kenkyū* 西域史研究, II, Tokyo, 1944, pp. 167-846.

hibited Nestorianism. Thus the name of Ta-ch'in disappeared in Chinese records for some time until it reappeared under the Sung (960-1279).

In 995, a merchant and ship-master of Ta-shih 大食, named P'u-ya-t'o-li 蒲押陀黎, came to the Chinese court, which was at what is now K'ai-fêng 開封, to pay tribute.¹ P'u-ya-t'o-li explained to the Emperor T'ai-tsung 太宗 that his native country and the country of Ta-ch'in adjoined one another. Judging from the statement of P'u-ya-t'o-li that his native country lay between thesea and mountains where one could catch elephants and rhinoceroses, as well as obtain perfumes and certain materia medica,² and also considering that Ta-shih meant generally at that time the Arabs or Persians, or those who came from regions formerly under the Abbāsids, P'u-ya-t'o-li's native country might have been somewhere on the coast of the Persian Gulf or of the Arabian peninsula or of eastern Africa. But, at any rate, as his native country is not exactly known, we cannot identify this Ta-ch'in.

In the *Wên-ch'ang-tsa-lu* 文昌雜錄 (Bk. 1) by P'ang Yüan-ying 龐元英, who served as a chu-k'o-lang-chung 主客郎中 or official in charge of foreign visitors to the court during the period of Yüan-fêng 元豐 (1078-85),³ we find the following description of Ta-ch'in:—"Fu-lin 拂菻 is also named Ta-ch'in 大秦. It is situated to the north of the Western Sea".⁴ This

¹ The date of arrival of P'u-ya-t'o-li at the Chinese court is mistakenly fixed in 993 in *Chau Ju-kua*, p. 117, by Hirth, who has confused Li-ya-hu 李亞忽, another envoy of Ta-shih, with P'u-ya-t'o-li. As for the date, cf. *Sung-shih* 宋史, Bk. 490, *Wên-hsien-t'ung-kao* 文獻通考, Bk. 339, *Sung-hui-yao-kao* 宋會要稿 under Fan-i, Li-tai-ch'ao-kung 蕃夷歷代朝貢, [and *Wên-ch'ang-tsa-lu* 文昌雜錄, Bk. 1, by P'ang Yüan-ying 龐元英. According to the *Sung-shih*, Bk. 489, and the *Sung-hui-yao* (Fan-i, Li-tai-chao-kung), a P'u-ya-t'o-li came to the Chinese court as an envoy of the king of San-fo-ch'i 三佛齊 or Çrivijaya in Sumatra-Java. If this was the same man, he must have been a very big and influential merchant in the region of the Southern Seas at that time, cf. *Chau Ju-kua*, p. 122, n. 17.

² According to the *Sung-shih*, Bk. 490, he replied to the Emperor T'ai-tsung as follows: 太宗因問其國對云，與大秦國相隣，爲其統屬，今本國所管之民，纔及數千，有都城，介山海間，又問其山譯所出，對云，惟犀象香藥，Hirth is wrong when he reads this as 與大秦國相隣，爲其統屬今本國所管之， which he translates as "it was conterminous with Ta-ts'in, which, being a dependency, was now governed by his native country". (*Chau Ju-kua*, p. 123, n. 18. cf. *JASOS*, XXX, 1909-10, p. 16, n. 3). The meaning is that the native country (of P'u-ya-t'o-li) is a dependency of the country of Ta-ch'in, which is conterminous with his native country, and the population under the protection of the government of his native country is numbered only by thousands at present. Hirth, basing himself on his wrong translation, tried to identify this country of Ta-ch'in with Syria under the Fātimids at Cairo (*JASOS*, XXX, p. 16, n. 3). Concerning the method of catching elephants and rhinoceroses, which was peculiar to the natives of his country, cf. B. Laufer, *Chinese Clay Figures*, I, p. 82 and n. 1.

³ On the author and the date of compilation of the *Wên-ch'ang-tsa-lu*, which is cited as *Wên-ch'ang-lu* 文昌錄 in the *Yen-fan-lu hsü-chi* 演繁露續集, Bk. 1 of Ch'êng Ta-ch'ang 程大昌, cf. T. Fujita 藤田豊八, *Tōzai Kōshōshi no Kenkyū* 東西交渉史の研究, Nankai-hen 南海篇, Tokyo, 1932, p. 263.

⁴ 拂菻一名大秦，在西海之北，

refers to Fu-lin, of which embassies came to China in 1081. However, this is nothing but an adaptation of the statement of the *Chiu T'ang-shu* 舊唐書 (Bk. 198) or of the *Hsin T'ang-shu* 新唐書 (Bk. 221b) on Fu-lin under the T'ang and has nothing to do with Fu-lin under the Sung, which is described as situated to the south of a big sea. So it is very doubtful whether the country of Fu-lin was also called Ta-ch'in by other Chinese than P'ang Yüan-ying.¹ As for Fu-lin under the Sung, I am preparing an article which I hope to be able to publish soon.

These two notices are all that I have come across in relation to Ta-ch'in under the Northern Sung dynasty. Under the Southern Sung, we find very detailed descriptions of Ta-ch'in in the *Ling-wai-tai-ta* 嶺外代答 by Chou Ch'ü-fei 周去非 and in the *Chu-fan-chih* 諸蕃志 by Chao Ju-kua 趙汝适. Of these, the *Chu-fan-chih* by Chao Ju-kua is very well known to the learned world through an English translation by F. Hirth and W. W. Rockhill, which was published in 1911.² Prior to the publication of this translation, the statement of Chao Ju-kua on Ta-ch'in had already been noticed and studied by several scholars such as Huc, Julien and Pauthier in the 50s of the nineteenth century³ and by Hirth who made reference to Chao Ju-kua in his memorable work entitled *China and the Roman Orient* (Shanghai and Hongkong, 1885, pp. 92-96, 120-122). But since K. Tsuboi made it clear in 1889 that Chao Ju-kua's authority was Chou Ch'ü-fei, who wrote his book about fifty years before Chao Ju-kua,⁴ it has become obvious that, so far as Ta-ch'in is concerned, Chao Ju-kua added nothing new to the description of Chou Ch'ü-fei, but just extracts of statements made by authors before the Sung, and that Chao Ju-kua misunderstood the original in some places. Thus we may say that Chou Ch'ü-fei provides us with the basic material on Ta-ch'in as it was known under the southern Sung.

Now, there have been two identifications of the country of Ta-ch'in as described by Chao Ju-kua, that is to say, by Chou Ch'ü-fei. Hirth identified it at first with Syria in his *China and the Roman Orient* (1885) and then he re-identified it with Baghdad under the Nestorian patriarch when he published

¹ The *Hsü-tz'ü-ch'ü-t'ung-chien-ch'ang-pien* 續資治通鑑長編, Bk. 317, *Sung-hui-yao-kao* 宋會要稿 under Fan-i 蕃夷 and the *Sung-shih*, Bk. 490 (cf. Hirth, *China and the Roman Orient*, pp. 108-109) never refer to its identity with Ta-ch'in. Ma Tuan-lin is right when he considers that this Fu-lin is different from that under the T'ang (Hirth, *op. cit.*, pp. 91-120).

² F. Hirth and W. W. Rockhill, *Chau Ju-kua: His work on the Chinese and Arab trade in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, entitled Chu-fan-chi*, St. Petersburg, 1911. For other publications by Hirth concerning Chao Ju-kua, cf. a bibliography of his writings in the Hirth Anniversary Volume.

³ A. Huc, *Le christianisme en Chine, en Tartarie et au Tibet*, I, Paris, 1857, pp. 73-74; S. Julien in E. Renan's *Histoire générale des langues sémitiques*, 1st ed., Paris, 1855, p. 271; G. Pauthier, *De l'authenticité de l'inscription nestorienne de Si-ngan-fou*, Paris, 1857, pp. 51-53.

⁴ *Chou Ch'ü-fei's Aufzeichnung über die fremden Länder, etc. Actes de XIIe congrès international des Orientalistes*, Rome, 1889, II, pp. 69-125, cf. also, *JASOS*, XXX, p. 12; *Chau Ju-kua*, p. 22, etc.

the "Mystery of Fu-lin" in the *J.A.O.S.* Vol. XXX (1909-10), pp. 13-14. He emphasizes the accuracy of his new identification in the *Chau Ju-kua*, pp. 102-110. On the other hand, Shiratori, criticizing Hirth's former view, identified it as early as 1904 with Baghdad, not under the Nestorian patriarch, but under the Caliph.¹ Unfortunately, the opinion of Shiratori has not been brought to the attention of European scholars, including Hirth, solely because it was published in Japanese. And it seems to me that it is Hirth's view that has been accepted as correct up to the present.² I agree with the conclusion of Shiratori, who looks upon the king of Ta-ch'in as the Abbāsīd Caliph, for several reasons, many of which were not referred to by him, and I believe that Ta-ch'in of Chou Ch'ü-fei means the Islamic world under the spiritual protection of the Caliph, as well as under the political and military administration of the Seljuqs. I earnestly hope to have my opinion criticized not only by sinologues, but also by those who are interested in the history of the Middle East in the twelfth century.

The *Ling-wai-tai-ta* of Chou Ch'ü-fei is a memoir of what the author had heard and seen during his general-secretaryship at Kuei-lin 桂林 in the present province of Kuang-hsi 廣西, as is stated in the author's preface dated 1178. Chou Ch'ü-fei, a native of Yung-chia 永嘉 in Chê-chiang 浙江, passed the civil service examination in 1163 and took service as t'ung-p'an 通判 or general secretary at Kuei-lin from about 1172 to 1178 under the successive governors, Fan Ch'êng-ta 范成大 (1172-73) and Chang Shih 張栻 (1173-78).³ Seeing that there is a mention of a matter that occurred in

¹ *Taishin-koku oyobi Futsurin-koku ni tsukite* 大秦國及び佛菴國に就きて (studies on Ta-ch'in and Fu-lin) *Shigaku Zasshi*, XV, 1904, which is now collected in the *Seikishi Kenkyū*, II, pp. 167-271, especially pp. 250-265. It is rather strange that Shiratori mentions nothing about Chou Ch'ü-fei and the *Ling-wai-tai-ta*.

² Pelliot in the *T'oung Pao*, XII, 1912, pp. 446-481 and J. Kuwabara 桑原隲藏 in the *Shirin* 史林, I, 1916, pp. 321-331, both of whom published detailed reviews of *Chau Ju-kua*, say nothing about Hirth's view on Ta-ch'in. A. Herrmann, who misunderstood Chao Ju-kua's text on Ta-ch'in as that of Chou Ch'ü-fei, identified this Ta-ch'in with the empire of the Seljuqs in Iraq, only because he considered *ma-lo-fu* 麻囉弗, the title of the king of Ta-ch'in, to be a transcription of malik, cf. "Ta-ch'in oer das China des fernem Westen." *Monumenta Serica*, VI, 1941, pp. 268-269. But *ma-lo-fu* cannot be looked upon as a transcription of malik as I shall show below.

³ The career of Chou Ch'ü-fei is not quite clear (*Chau Ju-kua*, p. 22, n. 2; Tsuboi in the *Actes du XI^e congrès*, II, p. 70, n. 3). According to the *T'ung-chih Yung-chia-hsien-chih* 同治永嘉縣志, Bk. 13, Chou Ch'ü-fei who received the degree of chin-shih 進士 in 1163, was chief disciple of Chang Nan-hsien 張南軒, i.e. Chang Shih; he took service as t'ung-p'an at Kuei-lin during Ch'un-hsi 淳熙 (1173-89); his final position was t'ung-p'an at Shao-hsing-fu 紹興府; he is the author of the *Ling-wai-tai-ta* in 10 chüan. Ch'üan Tsu-wang 全祖望 writes in his supplementary notes to the *Sung-Yüan-hsüeh-an* 宋元學案, Bk. 71, that Chou Ch'ü-fei studied and took service at Kuei-lin under Chang Shih, etc. As Chang Shih was the governor of Kuei-lin from the first year of Ch'un-hsi (1173) to the fifth (1178) (*Yu-wên-tien-hsiu-chuan Chang-kung shên-tao-pei* 右文殿修撰張公神道碑 in the *Chu-wên-kung wên-chi* 朱文公文集, Bk. 89, cf. Wu T'ing-hsieh 吳廷燮,

1181,¹ it is clear that some additions were made by the author after the composition of the preface, but generally speaking, the description made in the *Ling-wai-tai-ta* may have been based on his own experience in Kuei-lin unless a similar description was found in the *Kuei-hai-yü-hêng-chih* 桂海虞衡志 by Fan Ch'êng-ta, which Chou Ch'ü-fei says he referred to when he compiled his book. And Chou Ch'ü-fei may have got information about foreign countries by hearsay as is pointed out in the *Wên-chou-ching-chi-chih* 温州經籍志.

Chou Ch'ü-fei describes Ta-ch'in as follows: "The country of Ta-ch'in is the general mart of the countries of Hsi-t'ien (or the Western Heaven), the place where the foreign merchants of the Ta-shih assemble. Their king is styled Ma-lo-fu 麻囉弗. He wears a turban of silk with gold embroidered characters, and the throne he sits upon is covered with a silken rug. The city is walled, in which the people live. In the residence where the king dwells they use plaster in guise of tiles, and wall-hangings abound. The circuit (of the king's residence) is pierced with seven gates, each guarded by thirty men. Tribute bearers from other countries pay homage below the platform of the (palace) steps, whence they withdraw after offering their congratulations. Underneath the palace they have dug a tunnel through the ground communicating with the hall of worship at a distance of a *li*. The king rarely goes out. He does nothing but chant the liturgy and worship the Buddha. On every seventh day he goes by way of the tunnel to the hall of worship for the divine service, being attended by a suite of fifty men. But few among the people know the king's face. When he goes out, he rides horseback, shaded by a blue (or green) (ch'ing 青) umbrella with threefold eaves. The head of the horse is ornamented with gold, jade, pearls and other jewels. Every year the king of the country of Ta-shih, who is styled su-tan 素丹, deposes men to pay tribute (to the king of Ta-ch'in) and, if trouble is apprehended in the country, (the king of Ta-ch'in) orders the Ta-shih to use their military force to keep order. The food consists principally of boiled rice, bread (p'ing 餅) and meat. He does not drink wine. He

Nan-sung chih-fu nien-piao 南宋制撫年表, Bk. b), it is certain that Chou Ch'ü-fei was acting as t'ung-p'an at Kuei-lin during the governorship of Chang Shih from 1173 to his retirement in 1178 when he compiled his book. But if we examine the statement of the *Ling-wai-tai-ta*, Bk. 10, which says that, in the year of ting-hai 丁亥 of Ch'ien-tao 乾道, i.e. 1167, when the Yao 饒 people under the control of the government at Chung-chiang 靜江, that is to say, Kuei-lin, invaded the frontier, "Fan Shih-hu 范石湖, i.e. Fan Ch'êng-ta 范成大, asked me (Chou Ch'ü-fei) to report the matter to the military governor", we can see that Chou Ch'ü-fei was already acting in 1167, perhaps, as t'ung-p'an under Fan Ch'êng-ta who was the predecessor to Chang Shih. However, as it was in the third month of the eighth year of Ch'ien-tao (1172) that Fan Ch'êng-ta arrived at Kuei-lin (cf. preface to the *Kuei-hai-yü-hêng-chih* 桂海虞衡志) where he stayed as governor until 1173 (Wu T'ing-hsieh, *op. cit.*, Bk. b), there must be an error in this sexagenary cycle. At any rate, Chou Ch'ü-fei may have been at Kuei-lin from the time of the governorship of Fan Ch'êng-ta. This conjecture is supported by the fact that reference is made in the *Ling-wai-tai-ta*, Bk. 2 and 5, to Fan Ch'êng-ta and Chang Shih as governors of Kuei-lin while no mention is made of any of their predecessors.

¹ Bk. 1, Section on geography, under the River Kuei-shui 葵水.

makes use of vessels of gold and silver, helping himself to the contents with ladles. After eating, he washes his hands in golden bowls full of water. The native products comprise opaque glass, coral, native gold, brocades, sarsenets, red cornelian and pearls. The country of T'ien-chu is its tributary. In the country (of Ta-ch'in) there is the sacred water which can still the wind and waves. When the people get in a rough sea, they still it by sprinkling on it this water which they carry in a glass bottle". This translation is based on that of Hirth (*Chau Ju-kua*, pp. 102-104) with some alterations which are discussed below.

(1) The first reason why I want to identify the king of Ta-ch'in with the Caliph is his costume which has already been discussed by Shiratori.¹ It is stated that the king wears a turban of silk with gold embroidered characters. Hirth wonders if this turban is identical with the *biruna*, which is described by Assemani as an embroidered turban used by the Nestorian patriarch.² But he himself was not sure whether the *biruna* could be regarded as a turban or not, because someone had said that it was a sort of burnous or a large cloak with a hood. The statement of Chou Ch'ü-fei, which runs literally "(the king of Ta-ch'in) wears round his head a piece of silk, on which gold characters are woven out", clearly means that the king wore a turban. This is more appropriate to the Caliph than to the Nestorian patriarch.

(2) The second reason is that the palace of the king of Ta-ch'in had seven gates in its circuit. On this point, Hirth gives a reference to the description of Baghdad in the *Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, pp. 30-31, by Le Strange.³ Le Strange writes here about the gates of the so-called Round City on the western bank of the Tigris. But this city was ruined by a flood in 836 (221 A.H.) and at the time when the *Ling-wai-tai-ta* was compiled the capital of the Abbāsīd Caliphate was situated at the so-called Eastern Baghdad on the Eastern bank of the Tigris.⁴ So the description of Le Strange has no connection with the Baghdad of the time of Chou Ch'ü-fei. Moreover, according to Le Strange, the round city had but four gates. Now, in the Eastern Baghdad, the palace of the Caliph was at the west end of the city, facing the Tigris. According to Yaqūt, who was contemporaneous with Chou Ch'ü-fei, the wall of this palace was pierced with seven gates.⁵ The seven gates may have been based on a Mohammedan idea which divides the world into seven.⁶

¹ *Seikishi Kenkyū*, II, p. 258.

² *Chau Ju-kua*, p. 106, n. 3.

³ *Chau Ju-kua*, p. 106, n. 4.

⁴ G. Le Strange, *Baghdad during the Abbasid Caliphate*, Oxford, 1924; *Encyclopaedia of Islām*, under Baghdad. For the description of Baghdad, I have mainly referred to these two works.

⁵ *Jacūts geographisches Wörterbuch*, ed. F. Wüstenfeld, under Baghdad; Le Strange, *Baghdad*, pp. 264-265.

⁶ Shiratori, *Seikishi Kenkyū*, II, p. 260. It is well known that Balkh had seven gates on its walls before its destruction by the Ghuzz Turks in 1155 (Le Strange, *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, p. 421). Incidentally, it may be due to the destruction of Balkh by the Ghuzz Turks that nothing is mentioned about this city in the *Ling-wai-tai-ta* and the *Chu-fan-chih*.

The Christian citizens in Baghdad,¹ consisting of the Jacobites and the Nestorians, of whom the latter were the more numerous, lived in a special quarter called Dār ar-Rūm or Dār ar-Rūmiyīn in the north-eastern corner of the city.² The Jacobite patriarch was not allowed to live inside the city. Nothing is recorded about the gate of this special quarter of the Christians or about that of the residence of the Nestorian patriarch, if there was any. The existence of seven gates fits perfectly the palace of the Caliph.

(3) It is stated that tribute-bearers from other countries pay homage below the platform of the (palace) steps,³ whence they withdraw after offering their congratulations. Hirth does not pay any attention to this statement, but I am of opinion that this refers to the custom of the threshold-kissing or *āstān-bōsī*, and it suggests strongly that the king who was offered congratulations was not the Nestorian patriarch, but the Caliph of the Abbāsīds. It is well known that all ambassadors of foreign sovereigns who came to Baghdad solemnly kissed the threshold of the Bāb al-'Atabah or Gate of the threshold, which was the nominal threshold of the residence of the Caliph. The Gate of the threshold was, strictly speaking, the name of the inner portal of the Bāb al-Nūbī or Nubian Gate, which was one of the seven gates mentioned above. The threshold (*cāsītān*) was a block of white marble, like a column, laid across in front of the inner gate. From 1120 to 1180 the Nubian Gate was the only gate through which one could come into the palace.⁴ It is very usual and, therefore, might not be worth mentioning for a special act of politeness to be required when one is received in audience by a sovereign; so it is noteworthy that Chou Ch'ü-fei should have made such a special reference to the audience ceremony at Ta-ch'in. This may well have been because the threshold-kissing was very famous among the people at that time.

¹ About the Christian citizens under the Abbāsīds, cf. D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, III, p. 272 et seq.; A. Frh. v. Kremer, *Kulturgeschichte des Orients unter den Chalifen*, II, Wien, 1877, pp. 172-176; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, etc., Chap. XLVII; G. Le Strange, *Baghdad under the Abbasid Caliphate*, pp. 207ff., 337.

² Dār ar-Rūm was explained by Flügel (*Kitāb al-Fihrist*, Vorwort, S. XII-XIV, text, p. 329) and G. Ferrand (*Textes arabes, persans et turcs relatifs à l'Extrême-Orient*, I, p. 129, n. 3) as identical with Constantinople, but I cannot accept this explanation for the reason that there is no other proof that Constantinople was called by this name, while the Christian Quarter in Baghdad is mentioned under this appellation in other works (Le Strange, *Baghdad*, p. 214, n. 1).

³ The original word for the (palace) steps is *chieh-i* 階兒. There is no doubt that *chieh* means step or steps. In the *Kuang-ya* 廣雅 under Shih-kung 釋宮, *i* 兒 is explained as *ch'i* 砌. Wang Nien-sun 王念孫 (*廣雅疏證*, 卷七上) quotes Yen Shih-ku 顏師古 who says *ch'i* 砌, which is identical with 砌, is a bar at the gate (切門限也), which would be taken off when a carriage comes in. According to Hui-yūan 慧苑, *chieh* 砌 or *i* 兒 means stones, either flat or cut, which are put on both sides of steps (*I-ch'ieh-ching yin-i* 一切經音義, Bk. 21, *Taishō Tripitaka*, LIV, p. 434c). I think that *chieh-i* of Chou Ch'ü-fei means "steps and stones on both sides of the step" and accept the translation made by Hirth.

⁴ G. Le Strange, *Baghdad*, pp. 274-275. As for the custom of threshold kissing, cf. Hammer-Purgstall, *Geschichte Wassaf's*, I, Wien, 1856, p. 51 (D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, III, p. 208); Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, etc., chap. LII, LVIII; Vüllers, *Lexicon Persico-Latinum*, under *āstān-bōsī*.

(4) Chou Ch'ü-fei says that underneath the palace they had dug a tunnel through the ground communicating with the hall of worship at a distance of a *li* (Chinese mile), and the king went by way of the tunnel to the hall of worship for divine service. Hirth has identified this king with the patriarch Elias III, ordained in 1176, that is to say, two years before the compilation of Chou Ch'ü-fei's work, and suggested that it was quite likely that Elias III, who was very fond of architectural enterprises, had such a tunnel dug. Hirth has made reference to the *Mar Amr*, which records that Elias III rebuilt the patriarchal residence in the Christian quarter in Baghdad, as well as the church, after he was ordained.¹ The date of this rebuilding is not clear, but it is not impossible that information about it might have reached Chou Ch'ü-fei before the completion of his book. However, nothing is recorded about a tunnel between this new patriarchal residence and the church.

On the other hand, there was a long subway which connected the palace Ḥasani, where the Caliph usually lived, with the palace Thurayyā, situated outside the city at a distance of two Arabian miles to the north of the palace Ḥasani.² This subway, which was constructed by Caliph Mu'tadid (892-902)³ and was used exclusively by the Caliphs, their families, and their attendants, was destroyed by a flood, which occurred in 1074 (466 A.H.) according to one tradition or in 1256 (654 A.H.) according to another.⁴ I think that the tunnel mentioned by Chou Ch'ü-fei should be equated with this subway, which must have been still in use in his time, *i.e.* in the latter half of the twelfth century, in which case it may have been by the flood of 1256 that the subway was destroyed.

But this tunnel was between two palaces and not connecting the king's residence with the hall of worship where he went every seventh day for divine service. It seems that there is some misunderstanding of the author or of the informant. As is generally known, there are two kinds of mosques. One is for use in daily prayer and the other is for prayer on Fridays. The hall of worship mentioned by Chou Ch'ü-fei is obviously the latter. In the twelfth century, there was a Friday mosque called Jāni al-Qasr, which was quite near the palace of the Caliph⁵ and was counted among the three greatest mosques in Baghdad. This mosque was built on the site of a dungeon where prisoners had been kept.⁶ The misunderstanding may have been based on a confusion between information about this dungeon and that concerning the subway mentioned above.

(5) The statements that the king of Ta-ch'in rarely goes out and that

¹ JAOS, XXX, 1909-10, pp. 13-14; *Chau Yu-kua*, pp. 107-108.

² G. Le Strange, *Baghdad*, pp. 250-251.

³ Mu'tadid is said to have been interested in nothing but women and architectural enterprises (*Mas'ūdi, Prairie d'or*, VIII, p. 116).

⁴ G. Le Strange, *Baghdad*, pp. 250-251; D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, III, p. 249.

⁵ Map attached to Le Strange, *Baghdad during the Abbasid Caliphate*.

⁶ G. Le Strange, *Baghdad*, p. 252.

few among the people know the face of the king; that when he goes out he rides horseback, shaded by a blue (or green) umbrella with threefold eaves;¹ that the head of the horse is ornamented with gold, jade, pearls and other jewels—all these are much more applicable to the Caliph than to the Nestorian patriarch.

I think that Hirth² is quite right when he compares these statements with the description concerning the Caliph by Benjamin of Tudela, who visited Baghdad in the middle of the twelfth century, which runs as follows: "The Caliph goes out of the palace only once a year, on that Festival day or Easter, which they call Ramadan. . . . He is carried upon a mule, attired in princely garments, intermingled with gold and silver, having his head adorned with a mitre (head-dress), shining with stones of incomparable price; but he wears a black handkerchief upon the mitre. . . . All that whole year after, he is contained within the palace, never to go forth to any other place".³ This corresponds amazingly to the description of Chou Ch'ü-fei, except as to the umbrella of which Benjamin says nothing. But Hirth hesitated to compare the king of Ta-ch'in with the Caliph and made reference to another passage of Benjamin, concerning the chief of a small Jewish community in Baghdad, which is as follows: "When the chief of the Captivity (*i.e.* the chief of the community) comes forth to visit the Great King (*i.e.* the Caliph), he is guarded with a number of horsemen, Jews and gentiles accompanying him, a crier going before him. . . . But he is carried upon a horse clothed with silken and embroidered garments, he adorns his head with a mitre, upon the mitre he wears a white sash and upon the sash a chain".⁴ It seems that Hirth intends to say that this passage concerning the Jewish chief may also be compared with the description of Chou Ch'ü-fei. And he tried to establish that the king of Ta-ch'in must have been the Nestorian patriarch and was neither the Caliph nor the Jewish chief. According to him, the umbrella carried to shade the king of Ta-ch'in is identical with certain sacred garments to be put on the Nestorian patriarch at his coronation. Having made reference to some authorities, he established that the maaphra or kaphila, that is to say, rain cloak, and the biruna, which is, he explains, a turban primarily used for protection from the rain, were put on the patriarch in the final stage of the ceremony. According to him, these two sacred garments could have been confused with an umbrella.

¹ 若出遊，騎馬，打三層青繖。Ta-san 打繖 (which means in modern Chinese "to put up an umbrella") meant under the Sung to have an umbrella held by an attendant (從者執傘曰打傘), cf. Ou-yang-hsiu 歐陽修, *Kuei-t'ien-lu 歸田錄*, Bk. 2. The umbrella was made of silk. Hui-lin 慧琳, referring to the *T'ung-su-wen 通俗文*, says that san 繖 is made of silk for the purpose of protecting one from the rain (*I-ch'ieh-ching yin-i*, Bk. 11, *Taishō Tripitaka*, LIV, p. 373a).

² *Chau Yu-kua*, p. 106.

³ Purchas, *His Pilgrimes*, (Glasgow, 1905) VIII, pp. 559-560; Le Strange, *Baghdad*, p. 332.

⁴ Purchas, *His Pilgrimes*, *op. cit.*

He has assumed that Chou Ch'ü-fei probably got the information from a native of Baghdad whom he met in China, and mistook what was originally a rain cape or rain cloak for an umbrella. In 1176, that is to say, two years before the completion of Chou Ch'ü-fei's book, the patriarch Elias III was elected and ordained at Madain and his vestment was of pistachio-green colour. And Hirth wonders if this colour had something to do with the colour of the umbrella of the king of Ta-ch'in.¹

Hirth's explanation is rather overstrained. I think that the statement of Chou Ch'ü-fei must be taken as it is and the king of Ta-ch'in, whoever he was, was shaded by an umbrella of blue (or green) colour when he went out. In connection with the country of Pai-ta 白達 or Baghdad, Chou Ch'ü-fei informs us that the king carried a black umbrella with a handle of gold, on the top of which was a jade lion with a golden moon on its back, shining like a star and visible from afar off (*Chau Ju-kua*, p. 135). As this golden moon is supposed to have been a crescent, I am rather inclined to consider that the king who took this umbrella was not the Caliph, but the chief of the Seljuqs who was ruling Baghdad in the twelfth century (1118-94).² Whether it was the Caliph or the king of the Seljuqs, it is not to be doubted that luxurious umbrellas were really used in Baghdad at this time. The umbrella or parasol was used in India and western Asia as a symbol of authority or prestige. They were of various colours and sizes.³ It is well known that sultans and amirs of many countries rode through the streets of their towns and cities on a mule's back and were shaded by umbrellas when they were invested by the Caliph.⁴

Moreover, in China it was a fashion under the Sung to carry umbrellas when people went out. Under the northern Sung (960-1126) higher officials were ordered to put on hats and parasols from 990 to 1012 when the use of umbrellas was limited to the royal family. In 1013 officials of highest rank, belonging to the Chung-shu-shêng 中書省 or Office of general internal affairs and to the Shu-mi-yüan 樞密院 or Office of military affairs, were also allowed to make use of umbrellas.⁵ As time went on, umbrellas became more

¹ *Chau Ju-kua*, p. 107; *JAOS*, XXX, 1909-10, pp. 13-14.

² Concerning the use of parasols among the Seljuqs and the spread of this custom to other dynasties, see Fuad Köprülü, *Les institutions juridiques turques au moyen-âge*, Istanbul, 1937, p. 32.

³ E. Quatremère, *Histoire des Sultans Mamluks*, I, 1, p. 134, n.; Do., *Histoire des Mongols de la Perse*, I, pp. 206-211, n. 57, cf. Vüllers, *Lexicon Persico-Latinum*, I, pp. 561-562; Yule and Burnell, *Hobson-Jobson*, 2nd ed., p. 185. In the *Fan-yü tsa-ming* 梵語雜名 (*Taishō Tripitaka*, LIV, p. 120a) skt. Chhatra or chhatra is translated kai 蓋, that is to say, umbrella or parasol, and in the *Fan-fan-yü* 翻梵語 the same word is translated san 傘.

⁴ D'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols*, III, p. 210.

⁵ *Sung-shih*, Bk. 150; *Shih-lin-yen-yü* 石林燕語, Bk. 3; *Ch'un-ming-t'ui-ch'ao-lu* 春明退朝錄, Bk. b. Wang Tê-ch'ên 王得臣 points out in his *Chu-shih* 塵史 Bk. a, of which the preface is dated 1115, that inside the capital, i.e. the present K'ai-fêng 開封, only the royal family and ministers are allowed to put up umbrellas, but, as for the royal family, even nurses attending to them, when they go out in carriages, have umbrellas held on horses.

and more popular, and under the southern Sung, that is to say, after the middle of the twelfth century, not only the royal family and officials of higher rank, but officials of minor rank and even the common people carried them and vied with one another in their size and luxuriousness. The government tried several times to prohibit these luxurious umbrellas, which were quite often bigger and more finely finished than those for the use of the emperor, but in vain.¹ According to a decree of prohibition issued in 1188, it is stated that huge umbrellas with double eaves and thirty or forty ribs were in general use. The colour of the umbrellas is not mentioned in this decree, but, according to the *Ch'un-ming-t'ui-ch'ao-lu* 春明退朝錄 (Bk. b), umbrellas of blue (or green) colour were most favoured. At the time of Chou Ch'ü-fei such blue (or green) umbrellas with double eaves were greatly in fashion and they were regarded as a sign of the power and wealth of the people who carried them. It is natural that Chou Ch'ü-fei should have been interested in the blue (or green) umbrella with threefold eaves of the king of Ta-ch'in.

At any rate, the description is much more appropriate to the Caliph than to the Nestorian patriarch.

(6) Chou Ch'ü-fei says that there is the king of the country of Ta-shih, who is styled *su-tan* or sultan; every year he deposes men to send tribute (to the king of Ta-ch'in); if trouble is apprehended in the country, (the king of Ta-ch'in) orders the Ta-shih to use their military force to keep order.

It is clear that Chou Ch'ü-fei is describing the relationship between the king of Ta-ch'in and the king of the country of Ta-shih. Hirth takes it as the relationship between the king of the country of Ta-shih, i.e. sultan, and his emirs or feudal provincial kings under the sultan. According to Hirth, Chou Ch'ü-fei wants to say that the Sultan receives tributes from his emirs and, if he finds it necessary, orders the Ta-shih, under these emirs, to use their military force to keep order.² But, if we read the original text carefully, we can easily see that such an interpretation is quite impossible. I think that Shiratori is right when he rejects Hirth's view on this point.³

¹ *Sung-hui-yao-kao*, Hsing 刑 II, fol. 13b, 136b, registers prohibitions issued in 1188 and in 1211. According to the former, on the fifth day of the twelfth month of the fifth year of Ch'un-hsi 淳熙 (1188), ministers asked the Emperor as follows: "Recently every official and the common people who live inside the capital (i.e. the present Hang-chou 杭州) carry umbrellas of blue or green colour. The umbrella, which was at the beginning of two or three feet in length, is now of huge size with two-fold eaves. Moreover, when provincial governors, either of military or economic and home affairs, and provincial general secretaries come in and out (of the capital), they ride a horse which they take behind their sedan-chair. When it is clear and hot, they usually shelter themselves with umbrellas of silk, waterproofed with black oil, which they have held by their attendants. These umbrellas are sometimes provided with thirty or fifty ribs. All, who look at these umbrellas with admiration, murmur that even the Emperor has not such umbrellas. We should say that such extravagance is harmful to keeping the people respectful to the Emperor and to setting a good example in the world. I beg Your Majesty to order the officials in charge to prohibit this".

² *Chau Ju-kua*, p. 108; *China and the Roman Orient*, p. 299.

³ *Seikishi Kenkyū*, II, pp. 261-262.

According to Chou Ch'ü-fei, Ta-shih is a collective appellation for several countries, of which the total number amounts to more than a thousand.¹ But among them only six were actually known to him. They were Merbat on the Hadramaut Coast of Arabia, Mecca, Baghdad, Ghazna, Mulhidün (Constantinople?)² and Egypt. Then what does Chou Ch'ü-fei mean by Ta-shih-kuo-wang hao su-tan 大食國王號素丹? It may be translated either that there is among the kings of the Ta-shih country he who is styled Su-tan, as Hirth has translated it,³ or that there is the king who rules countries of Ta-shih and is styled Su-tan. If we take the latter view, we can say that he was superior to the kings of other Ta-shih countries.⁴ No matter which he was, he was styled sultan, took charge of the military administration of the country of Ta-ch'in, and used to send tribute to the king of Ta-ch'in, who did nothing but chant the liturgy and worship the Buddha. Such a description is quite fitting to the relationship between the Abbäsids and the sultan of the Seljuqs. It goes without saying that the Seljuqs, ruling Hejaz where Mecca is situated, Baghdad, Ghazna and a part of Asia Minor, all of which are included under the name of Ta-shih by Chou Ch'ü-fei, were the leading power in Central and Western Asia in the twelfth century and that their chiefs were styled sultan. The Caliph was the head of the Islamic world so far as religious matters were concerned, but he was under political and military administration of the sultan of the Seljuqs. If we take these circumstances into consideration, we may say that the king of Ta-shih who sent tribute to the king of Ta-ch'in, i.e. the Caliph, was a sultan of the Seljuqs. In the twelfth century, Baghdad was under the control of the so-called Seldjuqs in Iraq and their sultan stayed either in Baghdad or Isfahän until they removed to Hamadän in 1156-7

¹ 大食者諸國之總名也，有國千餘，所知名者，特數國耳，
Ling-wai-tai-ta, Bk. 3.

² *Chau Ju-kua*, pp. 141-142. The identification is not certain. Mulhidün is a designation given by the Mohammedans to the infidels. T. Fujita has identified this with Naw-Bahär, inhabited by the Zoroastrians, in the suburbs of Balkh, cf. *Tōzai Kōshōshi no Kenkyū*, *Nankai-hen*, pp. 276-279.

³ *Chau Ju-kua*, p. 103.

⁴ It seems that Chou Ch'ü-fei thought that the countries of Ta-shih were under the control of a supreme king. He tells us that Pai-ta 白達 or Baghdad is the metropolis of the countries of Ta-shih; the king (of Baghdad) is the descendant of the Buddha Mahsia-wu 麻霞勿, i.e. Mohammed; when the king appears in public, a black umbrella is carried over him; its handle is of gold and on the top is a jade lion with a golden moon on its back, shining like a star and visible from afar off (cf. *Chau Ju-kua*, p. 135). Here the descendant of Mohammed clearly means the Caliph who lived in Baghdad, but, as Hirth has pointed out, the golden moon of the top of the umbrella seems to have been the crescent which was favoured by the Seljuqs. And I am of the opinion that Chou Ch'ü-fei confuses the Caliph with the king of the Seljuqs who really governed Baghdad. At any rate, from this statement it is possible to guess that Chou Ch'ü-fei understood Ta-shih to consist of several countries, each of which had its own king (possibly a feudal lord) and Baghdad to be the metropolis of Ta-shih, where the supreme king lived. If so, the *Ta-shih-kuo-wang hao su-tan* may mean the supreme king, styled su-tan, who reigns over the whole of the country of Ta-shih. But Chou Ch'ü-fei did not understand the political position of the Caliph and his relationship with the Sultan of the Seljuqs. This brought about the confusion and vagueness of the statements of Chou Ch'ü-fei.

(551 A.H.).¹ So it was necessary for the sultan to depute men to send tribute to the Caliph in Baghdad in the latter half of the twelfth century. It was probably on the New Year's day or Nauröz.

Then, who was the sultan mentioned by Chou Ch'ü-fei? Pauthier identified him with Malik al-'Adil Saif al-Din Abū Bakr who ruled Egypt and Syria between 1200 and 1218.² Hirth hesitates to decide who this sultan was for the reason that there was more than one who was styled sultan at the time of Chou Ch'ü-fei. According to him, Saladin of the Ayyūbids, who was styled sultan in 1175 (570 A.H.), and Arslānshāh (1161-75) and Tughril (1175-94), sultans of the Seljuqs in Iraq, could claim to be mentioned by Chou Ch'ü-fei.³ Shiratori insisted that the king of Ta-ch'in must have been Caliph al-Muqtadi (1075-94) and the sultan of Ta-shih Malikshāh (1072-92).⁴ Among these, Pauthier's opinion is out of the question, because we can not expect any reference to the thirteenth century in the *Ling-wai-tai-ta* which was compiled in the last quarter of the twelfth century. Shiratori's view also cannot be accepted, because it is based on the idea that the king of Ta-ch'in, styled Ma-lo-fu, was identical with the king of Fu-lin who sent an embassy to China in 1081. But the king of Fu-lin had nothing to do with the king of Ta-ch'in. I think that Hirth's opinion is reasonable, except in his mention to Saladin who had no concern with Baghdad. It is quite possible that the sultan referred to by Chou Ch'ü-fei was one of the sultans of the Seljuqs in Iraq. But, as I shall show later, the situation of Ta-ch'in as understood by Chou Ch'ü-fei is to be considered as the situation of Central and Western Asia at the time of Sultan Sanjār (1118-57).

(7) Chou Ch'ü-fei informs us that the king of Ta-ch'in did not take alcoholic liquor. This is also appropriate for the Caliph, because it is forbidden for Mohammedans to take alcoholic liquor. Tu Huan 杜環 who stayed at Kufah as a prisoner of war in the latter half of the eighth century, also remarks on the same custom among the Mohammedans.⁵

(8) Chou Ch'ü-fei makes mention of the sacred water of Ta-ch'in, which was believed to have magical power to still the wind and waves. Chao Ju-kua wrongly rearranges this statement under T'ien-chu or India, but the water has nothing to do with India, but with Mecca. As Hirth pointed out,⁶ this refers to the famous well in Mecca, named Āb-i-Zāzmām. Similar information about the power of the water of this well is also made in Chinese records of the

¹ *Encyclopaedia of Islām*, under Seljuqs. The Seljuqs at Isfahän are recorded as Ts'êng-t'an-kuo 層檀國 in Chinese records under the Sung, cf. T. Fujita, *Tōzai Kōshōshi no Kenkyū*, *Nankai-hen*, pp. 257 et seq.

² *De l'authenticité*, etc., Paris, 1857, p. 51, n. 3. According to Lane-Poole, he became the ruler of Damascus in 1196 and of Egypt in 1199 (*The Mohammedan Dynasties*, pp. 77-78). Further, see *Encyclopaedia of Islām*, under al'Adil.

³ *Chau Ju-kua*, p. 108.

⁴ *Seikishi Kenkyū* II, pp. 263-65.

⁵ *T'ung-tien*, Bk. 193; cf. Shiratori, *Seikishi Kenkyū*, II, pp. 703-704.

⁶ *Chau Ju-kua*, p. 113.

fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, such as the *Tao-i-chih-lieh* 島夷誌略, the *Shih-lin-kuang-chi* 事林廣記, the *Ying-ya-shêng-lan* 瀛涯勝覽, and so on.¹ In the twelfth century, Hejaz, the region to which Mecca belongs, was tributary to the Seljuqs until 1171 when the Ayyūbids derived it from them. The existence of this well in the domain of Ta-ch'in shows that Ta-ch'in had much more connection with the Caliphate and either the Seljuqs or the Ayyūbids than with the Nestorian patriarch.

(9) These eight reasons are, I think, sufficient evidence that the king of Ta-ch'in was the Caliph and that the references have nothing to do with the Nestorian patriarch. And here is one final proof of the identification of the king of Ta-ch'in with the Caliph. This concerns the title of the king of Ta-ch'in, which is written *Ma-lo-fu* 麻囉弗. Hirth has explained this as an excellent transliteration of the Syrian word Mar Aba, a title by which the Nestorian patriarch could be addressed. Mar Aba means "Venerable father" and is equivalent to Patricius in Latin and πατρικιος in Greek.² I admit that Hirth's explanation is very excellent so far as the phonetic identification is concerned. But I do not know whether the Nestorian patriarch was really addressed as Mar Aba or not.

Shiratori wonders if *Ma-lo-fu* is a corrupted transcription of Amīr al-Mu'minīn or leader of the believers by which the Caliph was called.³ But this title or appellation is transcribed in Chinese records sometimes as kan-mi-mo-mo-ni 曠密莫末膩 (kām-miet-māk-muət-nji)⁴ or hei-mi-mou-ni 黑密牟尼 (yək-miet-mieu-nji)⁵ and sometimes as mao-mên (wang) 茂門 (王) (mæu-muən)⁶ or mu-mên 暮門 (muo-muən),⁷ of which the latter two correspond to mu'minīn. So it is difficult to accept the explanation of Shiratori. A. Herrmann considers with some reserve that ma-lo-fu may be a transcription of Malik and that Chou Ch'ü-fei might have misunderstood

¹ T. Fujita was the first to identify this sacred water with that of the well at Mecca, cf. *Tō-i-shi-ryaku hō-chū*, 島夷誌略校注, p. 107. Concerning this well, vide E. Bretschneider, *Mediaeval Researches*, II, p. 303 and note; H. A. Giles, *Adversaria Sinica*, pp. 55-57, 115; W. W. Rockhill, *Notes on the relations and trade of China*, etc., TP, 1915, p. 620, n. 3; J. L. Duyvendak, *Ma Huan re-examined*, p. 73; P. Pelliot, *Les grands voyages maritimes chinois au début de l'Ve siècle*, TP, 1934, p. 444; *Shigaku Zasshi*, LVI, 1945, p. 495; Chêng Hsu-shêng 鄭鶴聲, *Chêng-ho i-shih hui-pien* 鄭和遺事彙編, Shanghai, 1948, p. 178.

² JAOS, XXX, 1909-10, pp. 12-13; *Chau Ju-kua*, p. 105.

³ *Shigaku Zasshi*, XLII, p. 607.

⁴ *Chiu T'ang-shu*, Bk. 198 (Chap. on Ta-shih). *Hsin T'ang-shu*, Bk. 221b, writes mi instead of mi 密, cf. *Chau Ju-kua*, p. 119.

⁵ *Ts'ê-fu-yüan-kuei*, Bk. 971, under the year 716. J. Kuwabara, *Tōzai Kōtsūshi Ronsō* 東西交通史論叢, Kyoto, 1933, p. 374, and *Sappu-genki Sakuin* 冊府元龜索引, Kyoto, 1938, p. 805b, take hei 黑 as corruption of i 異.

⁶ Chia Tan 賈耽 in the *Hsin T'ang-shu*, 43b, cf. *Chau Ju-kua*, p. 14; Kuwabara, *Tōzai Kōtsūshi Ronsō*, pp. 374-375.

⁷ Tu Huan 杜環 in the *T'ung-tien*, Bk. 193.

that malik was superior to sultan.¹ However, it is quite obvious that ma-lo-fu can never be a transcription of Malik.

On the other hand, we know that the Caliph was called by his people Maulānā, that is to say, "Our Lord". Benjamin ben Jonah of Tudela, who was a contemporary of Chou Ch'ü-fei, tells us that when he visited Baghdad in the latter half of the twelfth century the Caliph was called by his people "Our Lord".² I believe that the Ma-lo-fu 麻囉弗 of Chou Ch'ü-fei is a scribal error for *Ma-lo-na* 麻囉那 which would be an exact transliteration of Maulānā.

However, there are two statements which remain to be considered. The one is that Ta-ch'in was the mart of the countries of Hsi-t'ien 西天 or the Western Heaven, the place where the foreign merchants of Ta-shih assemble. The other is that T'ien-chu 天竺 or India was tributary to Ta-ch'in. Hsi-t'ien means T'ien-chu which is to the West of China.³ Chou Ch'ü-fei uses this as a general name for what is now India.⁴ If Ta-ch'in is to be identified with Baghdad, how could it be the mart of the country of India? And how could India be its tributary? Moreover, Chou Ch'ü-fei has given a special description of Baghdad under the name of Pai-ta 白達 that is to say, Baghdad, which is explained as the metropolis of the countries of Ta-shih. If Ta-ch'in is identical with Baghdad, why has Chou Ch'ü-fei given another description of Baghdad? And why was Ta-ch'in not counted one of the countries of Ta-shih which is explained by Chou Ch'ü-fei as a general name of more than a thousand countries, including Merbet on the Hadramaut coast, Mecca, Baghdad, Ghazna, Mulhidūn (Constantinople?) and Egypt?

According to Hirth, the Katholikos in India was appointed by the Patriarch in Baghdad and this was the reason why India was looked upon as a

¹ Pauthier identified this king of Ta-ch'in with Malik al-'Adil Saif al-Dīn Abū Bakr (*De l'authenticité*, etc., p. 51, n. 3). It seems that Pauthier was also of the opinion that ma-lo-fu might be a transcription of malik.

² *Purchas, His Pilgrimes*, VIII, p. 558; M. N. Adler, *The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela*, London, 1907, pp. 36-37. As for maulānā, cf. Dozy, *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes*, II, p. 624; *Encyclopaedia of Islām*, under Mawla.

³ *Ts'u-yuan* 辭源 under 西天. India is also called, in modern Chinese, Hsi-chu 西竺, cf. J. M. Oshanin, *Kitaisho-russkii slovar'*, Moskva, 1952, p. 191a.

⁴ The name of Sung, Hsi-t'ien is used as a general name for what is now India and translators of several Buddhist canons are called "(native) of Hsi-t'ien" whenever they were natives of India. Under the Ming, Hsi-t'ien became exclusively the appellation of India. In the *Kao-ch'ang-kuan i-yü* 高昌館譯語 (MSS. Société Asiatique in Paris) ang-ta-k'o 昂答克, ānātkā (cf. F. W. K. Müller, *Uigurica*, II, p. 51, n. 1; F. W. K. Müller and E. Sieg, *Maitrismit und "Tocharisch"*, *SBAW*, 1916, p. 414; H. W. Bailey, *T'augara*, *BSOS*, VIII, p. 894, n. 2), that is to say, India, is translated Hsi-t'ien. In the Addenda on the Section of Geography of the *Hsi-fan-kuan i-yü* 西蕃館譯語 (MSS. Tōyō Bunko), rgya-gar (< rgya-dkar), which is a Tibetan designation for India, is translated Hsi-tien. Moreover, as is well known, in the Translators' Office, there was a special department named Hsi-t'ien-kuan 西天館, which dealt with the translation of Indian language (Sanskrit) into Chinese. The *Hsi-t'ien-kuan i-shu* 西天館譯書 was a textbook or a vocabulary used there, cf. N. Tsuji, *Seiten-kan yakusho chōsa hōkoku*, *Tōyō Gakuhō*, XXXI, pp. 181 et seq.

tributary to Ta-ch'in.¹ But he himself is not sure whether the Katholikos of India was appointed by the Patriarch of Baghdad. Further T'ien-chu was a general name of India and not that of the Christians who lived in India. I cannot accept his opinion.

Chou Ch'ü-fei enumerates Quilon, Ta-ch'in, Wang-shê-ch'êng 王舍城 of Magadha, T'ien-chu, Chung-yin-tu 中印度 or Middle India, Chola (Coromandel Coast) and Nan-yin-tu 南印度 or Southern India as countries belonging to Hsi-t'ien, of which the total number is said to amount to several hundreds.² Among these, T'ien-chu is a general appellation of India and I can not understand why Chou-Ch'ü-fei gives this name as a country of Hsi-t'ien or India. It may quite likely be because under the Sung the name Hsi-t'ien was usually used as a general appellation of India, and Chou Ch'ü-fei thought it necessary to refer specially to T'ien-chu which had been the general name of India in previous times. He says that there are several countries to the west of Ceylon, of which Quilon was in the southern region and that Ta-ch'in, Wang-shê-ch'êng and Chung-t'ien-chu or Middle India were in its northern part.³ Here Middle India may mean the region on the waters of the Ganges, as is clearly shown by Hsüan-tsang.

The knowledge of Chou Ch'ü-fei about India was rather scanty. Quilon, Ta-ch'in and Chola are the only countries which appear for the first time in his account. And, as I have shown, Ta-ch'in, being a country under the Caliph, is closely connected with Islam. If we take these circumstances into consideration, we may assume that the Ta-ch'in described in connection with India may have been the Ghaznavid empire, which had its capital at Ghazna in the present Afghanistan and ruled the Panjab and the plain of Hindustan in northern India.

The Ghaznavids were at their apogee under King Mahmūd (998-1031), who conquered the territory covering the Panjab and the plain of Hindustan, Persia and the so-called Persian Iraq, including Baghdad.⁴ Ghazna, the capital of the empire, was most prosperous under Mahmūd. Unfortunately, no record is left about Ghazna of his time, but it was the most important city uniting India and the western Asia. Iṣṭakhri, an Arab geographer who lived a century before Mahmūd, describes Ghazna as the "Port of India",⁵ and Ibn Ḥawqal in the tenth century writes that "Ghazna était le rendezvous des marchands

¹ *Chau Ju-kua's Ethnography*, *JRAS*, 1896, pp. 496-499; *JAOS*, XXX, 1909-10, pp. 10-12; *Chau Ju-kua*, pp. 105-106, 112.

² *Ling-wai-tai-ta*, Bk. 3, under Hai-wai chu-fan-kuo 海外諸蕃國 and Hsi-t'ien chu-kuo 西天諸國. Bk. 2 under Chu-lien-kuo 注輦國 (Chola, i.e. Coromandel Coast).

³ 細蘭海中，有一大州，名細蘭國，渡之而西，復有諸國，其南為故臨國，其北為大秦國王舍城天竺國。

⁴ *Encyclopaedia of Islām*, under Ghaznavids; M. Nāzım, *The Life and Times of Sultan Mahmud of Ghazna*, Cambridge, 1931; W. Barthold, *Turkestan down to the Mongol invasion*, p. 269 et seq.

⁵ G. Le Strange, *The lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, p. 348.

indiens".¹ These descriptions may have been applicable to Ghazna under Mahmūd and his successors. The statement of Chou Ch'ü-fei that Ta-ch'in was the mart of the countries of the Western Heaven or India is also quite appropriate to Ghazna. Chou Ch'ü-fei states that the foreign merchants of Ta-shih assemble there. The territory called Ta-shih by Chou Ch'ü-fei covers Central and Western Asia, including Ghazna, Baghdad, Mecca, Merbat on the Hadramaut Coast, Muḥidūn (Constantinople?) and Egypt, and it is quite possible that merchants came to trade at Ghazna from various parts of this vast region.

Ghazna and the Ghaznavids were under the control of the Seljuqs from 1117 to 1137. It was Sultan Sanjār of the Seljuqs that conquered Ghazna. In 1117, Sanjār attacked and dethroned Arslānshāh of the Ghaznavids and put on the throne Bahrām Shāh, who belonged to the same family as Arslān Shāh. It is told that Sanjār ordered Bahrām Shāh to begin public prayer (khutba) with the name of Sanjār and that in 1134 he again attacked Ghazna because Bahrām Shāh was not faithful to this order. When Sanjār succeeded his brother, his nephews in Iraq became independent from the so-called Great Seljuqs under the direct rule of Sanjār (1118), but, to the end of his life (1157), Sanjār was dominant over other Seldjuq rulers. However, the prestige of the Seljuqs, who were now divided into several powers, began to decline with the rise of the Kara Khitai and the Khwārizm Shāh in Central Asia. And during the period from 1157, when Sanjār died a tragic death, to 1194, when the Seljuq empire was destroyed, the greater part of their domain was conquered by the Khwārizm Shāh. As for the Ghaznavids, Ghazna was conquered by the Ghūrīds in 1152. It was regained soon after, but in 1173-74 was lost again and for ever to the Ghaznavids, who removed to the Panjab and were destroyed by the attack of the Ghūrīds in 1186.²

The time dealt with in the *Ling-wai-tai-ta*, that is to say, from about 1172 to 1178 (or 1181),³ corresponds to the time of these important changes in Central and Western Asia. But Chou Ch'ü-fei seems to have known nothing about them.

Thus we know that Ghazna was the "rendezvous des marchands indiens"; the Ghaznavids ruled India; the Seljuqs (under Sanjār) controlled the Ghaznavids; the Caliph was superior to the sultans of the Seljuqs, who were responsible for military administration of their states under the spiritual protection of the Caliph. On the other hand, Chou Ch'ü-fei says that Ta-ch'in was the mart of India; the king of the country of Ta-shih, styled sultan, (whom we suppose to have been the sultan of the Seljuqs) used their military force

¹ Reinaud, *Mémoire sur l'Inde*, pp. 243-244.

² *Encyclopaedia of Islām*, under Sanjār, Seljuq and Ghaznavids; W. Barthold, *Turkestan down to the Mongol invasion*, pp. 302 et seq.; G. Le Strange, *Baghdad*, pp. 332 et seq.; R. Grousset, *L'empire des steppes*, Paris, 1939, pp. 203 et seq.

³ *Vide Note 15.*

according to the orders of the king of Ta-ch'in (whom we identify with the Caliph). By comparing these two series of facts, we can see how Chou Ch'ü-fei mistakenly believed that India was ruled by the Caliph and that the capital of Ta-ch'in must be the central city of India. In this way I am rather inclined to think that the situation of Central and Western Asia at the time of Sultan Sanjār may have been the background of Chou Ch'ü-fei's description of Ta-ch'in.¹

Chou Ch'ü-fei describes the king of Ta-ch'in as doing nothing but chanting the liturgy and worshipping the Buddha, which must have been used by his informant as a substitute for Allah, for the sake of convenience of explanation. Chou Ch'ü-fei may have understood the king of Ta-ch'in as a king of a Buddhist country, and such an understanding would also have made him believe that the country of Ta-ch'in was a country in India where the Buddha was worshipped. The informant who told Chou Ch'ü-fei about Ta-ch'in would have intended to explain about the Caliph as the head of the Islamic world and about his relationship with the Seljuqs, but Chou Ch'ü-fei could not identify the king of Ta-ch'in with the Caliph. Chou Ch'ü-fei had also heard about Baghdad under the Caliph, whom he identified with the descendant of Mohammed. It seems that he understood the king of Pai-ta 白達 or Baghdad as a local chief who was dealing with the administration of Baghdad and he took him to be different from the king of Ta-ch'in. The information about the country of Ta-ch'in and about Pai-ta or Baghdad must have been obtained from different informants.

There was a tradition in China to call India Ta-ch'in. The city of Shé-chieh 舍竭 or Sha-chieh 沙竭, the modern Siākot to the north of Lahore, is described as a city of Ta-ch'in in the *Na-hsien-pi-ch'iu-ching* 那先比丘經, the Chinese translation of the *Milindapañha*.² And in the *Man-shu* 蠻書, ch. 10, Manipur is called Ta-ch'in P'o-lo-mên-kuo 大秦婆羅門國 or country of Brāhman of Ta-ch'in.³ It is not impossible to look upon this Ta-ch'in as a transcription of Dakṣiṇa or Deccan.⁴ However, I am of the opinion that India was called Ta-ch'in through a traditional belief that Ta-ch'in lay

¹ The *Hsiang-chiao-p'i-pien* 象教皮編, a Buddhist encyclopaedia of the Ming dynasty describes Ghazna as situated in the north of India (see *TP*, 1st sér., VI, p. 318; *JRAS*, 1896, p. 496, n. 1). But, during the Sung dynasty, Ghazna was considered quite different from India (see the *Sung-shih*, Bk. 490). So if Ghazna was identical with the part of India and considered a part of India by Chou Ch'ü-fei, it may not have been because Ghazna was looked upon as a part of India.

² *Taishō Tripitaka*, XXXII, p. 695b; V. Trenckner, *Milindapañha*, pp. 1-2; O. T. W. Rhys David, *The Question of King Milinda*, *SBE*, XXXV, pp. 2-3; P. Pelliot, *Les noms propres du Milindapañha*, *JA*, 1914, pp. 401-403; P. Demiéville, *Les versions chinoises de Milindapañha*, *BEFEO*, XXIV, 1924, pp. 90-92, 44-46; W. Tarn, *Greeks in Bactria and India*, pp. 310-311.

³ P. Pelliot, *Deux itinéraires*, etc., *BEFEO*, IV, 1904, pp. 178-180.

⁴ Eitel, *Handbook of Chinese Buddhism*, under Dakchina; T. Fujita, *Tōzai Kōshōsh*; no Kenkyū, *Seiki-hen* 西域篇, Tokyo, 1933, p. 493.

beyond the Chinese frontier at Yung-chang 永昌 in Yün-nan,¹ which has been the most important station on the China-Burma-India road since A.D. 69. I do not know whether Chou Ch'ü-fei located Ta-ch'in in the north of India on the basis of this tradition or not.²

Finally, why was the Caliphate called Ta-ch'in?³ Under the T'ang the name was applied to the centre of Nestorianism at Ctesiphon or Seleucia in the neighbourhood of Baghdad and now, under the Sung, the same name may have been used to designate the Islamic world under the Caliph. And it would not be Chou Ch'ü-fei himself, but the informant that told about the Caliphate, who used this name in this meaning, because Chou Ch'ü-fei did not properly understand the nature of the Caliphate.

I admit that the country of Ta-ch'in of Chou Ch'ü-fei and of Chao Ju-kua is identical with Baghdad, but it had nothing to do with the Nestorian patriarch. Ta-ch'in meant in reality the Islamic world under the spiritual protection of the Abbāsid Caliph, as well as under the political and military administration of the Seljuqs.

Chou Ch'ü-fei did not fully understand the nature of the Caliphate and the relationship between the Caliph and the Seljuqs, but, in general, his information is very accurate. I wish to express my appreciation of his accuracy and of his contribution to the study of the ethnography and trade of his time.

¹ According to the *Hou-han-shu* 後漢書, Bk. 116 (see *China and the Roman Orient*, pp. 36, 98), in A.D. 120 embassies of the king of the country of Shan 攣 came to the Chinese court and introduced themselves as natives of the Hai-hai 海西, that is to say, Ta-ch'in, which was situated in the south-west of the country of Shan. The *Wei-lüeh* 魏略 says that there is also a water-road leading (from Ta-ch'in) to Yi-chou 益州 and Yung-ch'ang 永昌 (see *China and the Roman Orient*, pp. 74-75, 113). These texts show that in the Later Han and the Three Kingdoms it was believed that Ta-ch'in was situated beyond the south-western frontier of China. This may be one of the reasons, even if not the only one, why India, which was reached by way of Yung-ch'ang, was sometimes called Ta-ch'in.

² Fêng Ch'êng-chün 馮承鈞, *Chung-kuo Nan-hai Chiao-t'ung-shih* 中國南海交通史, pp. 65, 75, n. 7, identifies Ta-ch'in of Chou Ch'ü-fei with Deccan in India.

³ J. J. Hess, O. Franke and Prof. H. Schoeder have all held that Ta-ch'in is a transcription of taisefūn, the name of Ctesiphon in Arabic (see *TP*, XXII, p. 119; O. Franke, *Geschichte des chinesischen Reiches*, III, pp. 209-210; A. Herrmann, *Ta-ch'in oder das Reich China*, etc., *MS*, V, p. 215). As I do not know the details of this theory, I am not in a position to criticize it. But, if Hirth's identification is correct, Ctesiphon is transcribed as Ssü-pin 斯賓 (see *China and the Roman Orient*, Index, under Ktesiphon). Ssü-pin is identified with Sophene by Prof. I. Miyazaki (University of Kyoto, Japan), see *Shirin*, XXIV, pp. 68, 84.