

timber could be found anywhere to the south of this easternmost portion of the T'ien-shan. What precise locality is meant by *Hei-kan-so* I am unable to determine. But evidently some thickly wooded portion of the northern slopes of the range within easy reach of the Barkul pass is referred to.³⁰

M. Chavannes has already pointed out that the inscription does not record the successful issue of the campaign, which was secured later by the taking of Kao-ch'ang in the eighth month of the same year, but the preparation of the siege-train by which this result was effected.³¹ The shortness of the time which elapsed between Chiang Hsing-pên's arrival on the range and the date of the inscription recording his exploit (the 25th day of the sixth month corresponding to July 20, A. D. 670) is explained by the fact that, as noted by his biographer in the *T'ang shu*, the inscription was engraved on a stêlê from which an earlier record of Pan Ch'ao's great achievements had first been removed.³² The famous Han general had, as already mentioned, won his first distinction by defeating the Huns of Hu-yen on the shores of Lake Barkul. Owing to the wish of the T'ang commander, more than five and a half centuries later, that the memory of his own engineering feat should be promptly perpetuated by an inscription on a stone, we have thus probably lost a record of still greater historical interest.

Siege-train
constructed
on heights of
Hei-kan-so.

We may reasonably assume that advantage was taken of the very large forces which the Emperor T'ai-tsung had sent for the conquest of Turfân,³³ to undertake on the same occasion an advance north of the range against the territory which in Han times was known as 'Posterior Chü-shih' and the chief place of which was destined soon to become, under the name of *Pei-t'ing*, one of the 'four garrisons' securing T'ang supremacy over the 'Western kingdoms'. But the T'ang Annals show that this territory submitted after Kao-ch'ang had been taken by the Chinese, and that it was before Kao-ch'ang that the siege-train constructed in the mountains of *Shih-lo-man*³⁴ by the army's engineer-in-chief had been effectively put to use.

The conquest of the Turfân region and the subsequent establishment, during nearly a century and a half, of Chinese control over the 'Western kingdoms' did not make any change in the occupation of the Barkul territory by Turkish tribes. The notice in the T'ang Annals on the *Sha-t'o* 沙陀 shows that this tribe, belonging to the *Ch'u-yüeh* 處月 branch of the Western Turks, 'lived to the south of Mount *Chin-so* 金淩 and east of the lake *P'u-lei*' (Lake Barkul); there was a great stony desert there called *Sha-t'o*; thence they were called *T'u-chüeh* (i. e. Turks) of *Sha-t'o*.³⁵ From another notice in the same text we learn that in A. D. 653 the territory of the *Ch'u-yüeh* was divided into two districts of 金滿 *Chin-man* and *Sha-t'o*. *Chin-man* is identical with the seat of the *Pei-t'ing* protectorate, which can be located with certainty near the present Jimasa, west of Guchen,

Turkish
tribes
occupying
Barkul
territory.

³⁰ *Hei-kan-so* 黑紺所 (literally meaning 'the place of black purple colour') may, perhaps, be the head of the valley towards the Bökunat-dawân (Map No. 34. D. 2), where, judging from the slopes we saw farther north, conifer forest growth is likely to be particularly abundant.

³¹ See Chavannes, *Dix inscriptions*, p. 36. For the use made of these engines of war before Kao-ch'ang, cf. Chavannes, *Turcs occid.*, p. 106.

³² See Chavannes, *Dix inscriptions*, p. 34.

³³ Lines engraved on the side faces of the stêlê mention forces of hundred and fifty thousand men under each of two assistant commanders of the Chinese army; cf. Chavannes, *Dix inscriptions*, pp. 32 sq. Even taking into account the fact that the numbers mentioned comprised big contingents of Turk and Tölös (Uighur) auxiliary cavalry (cf. Chavannes,

Turcs occid., p. 105), it seems very difficult to explain how such large numbers could possibly be fed along desert routes such as those from An-hsi to Hāmi and thence to Turfân.

But, no doubt, they comprised all those employed on the lines of communication—and we have other historical examples of wonderful Chinese performances in the matter of 'transport and supplies', as illustrated by the Êrh-shih general's march through the Lop Desert (see above, pp. 341 sq.) and Kao Hsien-chih's march over the Pāmīrs and Hindu-kush; cf. *Serindia*, i. pp. 53 sqq.; *Geogr. Journal*, 1922, Febr., pp. 109 sqq.

³⁴ For this name as a general designation of the easternmost T'ien-shan, cf. Chavannes, *Turcs occid.*, p. 18, note 2; also p. 305.

³⁵ See Chavannes, *Turcs occid.*, p. 97.