

for the most part through well-cultivated village tracts, and a short one next morning along the orchard-lined banks of the river, brought me back once more to the hospitable shelter of Chīnī-bāgh, the British Consulate General at Kāshgar, and the base of all my Turkeṣtān journeys.

After this brief survey of the line actually followed by the high road from Ak-su to Kāshgar, we may turn to the only early account that I am able to trace, of the route connecting these two places. It is furnished by a Chinese itinerary contained in the T'ang Annals to which M. Chavannes makes a passing reference,¹⁸ and of which Dr. L. Giles has very kindly provided me with a translation. This itinerary runs as follows: 'From Po-huan 撥換 and Sui-shê 碎葉 you go south-west and cross the Hun river 渾河. 180 *li* from here is Chi-cho Kuan 濟濁館, the ancient Ho-p'ing P'u 和平鋪. Continuing you pass through the old city of Ta-kan 達幹, and after 120 *li* arrive at Yeh-chê Kuan 謁者館. 60 *li* farther on you reach the city of Chū-shih-tê 據史德 in the territory of Kuchā 龜茲. One account says that Yü-t'ou Chou 鬱頭州 is on the Ku-shih (Orphan Rock) Hill 孤石山 on the north bank of the Ch'ih Ho (Red River) 赤河. Crossing the Red River and passing Mount Ch'i 岐山, after 340 *li* you arrive at Chia-lu Kuan 葭蘆館. Farther on you pass the city of Ta-man 達漫, and after 140 *li* arrive at Su-lo Chên 疏勒鎮, which is surrounded by mountains on three sides, south, north, and west.'

The starting and closing points of the itinerary are definitely fixed. There can be no doubt that *Po-huan* 撥換 corresponds to the present Ak-su, and *Su-lo* (Su-lê) 疏勒 to Kāshgar; while the mention of *Sui-shê* 碎葉, a town which, as preceding passages of the text clearly show, must be looked for in the vicinity of the modern Tokmak, may, according to M. Chavannes, be considered a faulty interpolation. Nor is it possible to doubt that the itinerary describes a route which, in its general direction, agrees with the present high road; for in the first place the south-westerly bearing of the latter at the start is correctly indicated, and in the second the only alternative route which might come into consideration—that which leads first westwards to Uch-Turfān and thence up by the Taushkan river and across the hills past Kara-jol and Sughun to Kalta-yailak and so on to Kāshgar¹⁹—is, in its initial portion, separately described in a preceding passage of the same Chinese text.²⁰ The Hun river 渾河, the crossing of which is mentioned at the outset, can safely be identified with the united Ak-su river; for this is clearly indicated by two other passages in the same text of the *T'ang shu* which mention the river by its full name of *Ssü-hun Ho* 思渾河, and correctly place it to the south of Po-huan or Ak-su and its river, the present Kum-arik-daryā.²¹

But once beyond this safe start on the route leading towards Marāl-bāshi, we are confronted by uncertainties as regards the identification of the localities successively named in the itinerary. None of them are to be found in the other Chinese texts accessible to me in translation, and it is impossible to place much reliance on the distances indicated between them. If judged by their aggregate, 840 *li*, they are hard to reconcile with the actual distance of about 301 miles between Ak-su and Kāshgar, as measured on our marches by the present high road, and the ratio of 5 *li* to the mile which evidence derived from the other Chinese itineraries in and near the Tārīm basin indicates as that to be adopted for road measurements of the T'ang period.²² At the same time we cannot feel sure whether the enumeration of distances is complete; for at least two places are named in the itinerary without mention of separate distance measurements. For these reasons the following

¹⁸ Cf. Chavannes, *Turcs occid.*, p. 10, note. The itinerary is quoted by Dr. L. Giles from *Hsin T'ang shu*, XLIII B. p. 18.

¹⁹ See Maps 7. A. 3; B. C. 2; 4. B. C. 4, D. 3; 5. A. B. I.

²⁰ See Chavannes, *Turcs occid.*, p. 9; also *Serindia*, iii. pp. 1299 sqq.

²¹ See Chavannes, *Turcs occid.*, pp. 8 sq. The identification with the Tārīm there proposed is due to the erroneous location (subsequently abandoned) of Po-huan at Yaka-arik; cf. above, ii. p. 835, note 3.

²² Cf. *Serindia*, ii. pp. 734 sq.; also iii. p. 1544, s. v. *li*.