

and of Gilgit. The most detailed account is to be found in two diplomatic documents which the great encyclopaedia *Ts'ê fu yüan kuei*, published in A.D. 1013, reproduces, and which M. Chavannes' research has rendered accessible.<sup>17</sup> One of these supplies the text of a representation which Shih-li ch'ang-ch'ieh-lo, the ruler (*jabgu*) of T'u-ho-lo or Tokhāristān, corresponding roughly to the present Badakhshān, addressed in A.D. 749 to the Imperial Court through an envoy charged with presents.

His application ran thus: 'Near my territory there is a barbarian (*ku*) kingdom called Chieh-shuai 竭帥; it is situated amongst mighty mountains. Relying on the natural obstacles which offer it protection it resists the holy transformation (i.e. submission to the Imperial power); it allies itself with the Tibetans (*T'u-po*) and aids them. It knows that the territory of [Little] P'o-lü (i.e. Yasin and Gilgit) is limited, its population dense; that the area for cultivation is small, and that consequently, when garrison troops are placed there, the supplies prove inadequate. It then becomes necessary to purchase salt and rice in Kashmīr (*Ku-shih-mi*), and it is thus that the difficulty is met. The traders' caravans, in going and returning, all pass by the kingdom of Chieh-shuai; its king has therefore accepted the presents offered by the Tibetans, who claimed to establish a stronghold in his territory with a view to getting possession of the important route that leads into P'o-lü. Since Kao Hsien-chih has opened up P'o-lü, there are three thousand more troops there, and P'o-lü has been exhausted by their presence. The king of Chieh-shuai, in alliance with the Tibetans, has taken advantage of the exhausted condition of P'o-lü and decided to invade it. I am constantly pre-occupied by the idea of destroying these perverse people once for all.'

Representa-  
tion of  
Tokhāristān  
ruler,  
A.D. 749.

The ruler of Tokhāristān in the further course of his representation then develops a bold plan of operations, which, if supported by Imperial forces from the 'Four Garrisons', i.e. Chinese Turkestan, would enable him 'to open up and conquer the Great P'o-lü (or Baltistan), and the countries to the east of it'. This would bring him in a straight line to Khotan, Kara-shahr, Sha-chou, and beyond into Kan-su, places where the Tibetans could then no longer maintain themselves. He requests the dispatch of Chinese troops to reach Little P'o-lü in the fifth and Great P'o-lü in the sixth month (roughly, June and July respectively). He solicits also that the king of Kashmīr, being a loyal ally of the Chinese and having great resources in troops, a dense population and abundant supplies, be encouraged by an Imperial edict and special presents to lend his aid to the enterprise.

The Emperor (Hsüan-tsung) is said to have accorded the request of the T'u-ho-lo prince, and in fact the same encyclopaedia reproduces an Imperial brevet, dated A.D. 750, which invests Su-chia with the title of king of Chieh-shuai in place of his rebel brother P'o-t'ê-mo.<sup>18</sup> This interesting document from the Imperial chancellery is addressed to Su-chia, elder brother of P'o-t'ê-mo, king of Chieh-shuai, and amidst much stately phraseology about Imperial recognition of merit mixed with paternal advice, tells him: 'You and your ancestors, from generation to generation, have been full of loyalty and sincerity. Residing apart in a distant country, you have for a long time loved wisdom; you were early renowned for your braveness and justice. Recently, since P'o-t'ê-mo was not filial towards you and not faithful towards the Empire, you were a victim of grave injustice, and for a long time were submerged and rejected. Now the perverse faction has been annihilated, the wicked conspirators have been made prisoners. You have at once offered your loyalty and your devotion to the Empire. You have shown your kindness and your benevolence towards your barbarian people,' &c.

Imperial  
brevet to  
king of  
Chieh-shuai.

The same events are narrated in a briefer fashion by the notice which M. Chavannes has

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Chavannes, *Turcs occid.*, pp. 214 sq., 296.

<sup>18</sup> See *Turcs occid.*, pp. 215 sq.