

punished with death; for other offences compensation by fine was allowed. Taxes were paid in clothing materials, an observation illustrated by what a native informant, in the Report of the Yarkand Mission, notes of the barter carried on in Sarīkol with cotton goods imported from the plains⁴. The military force of the territory was reckoned at a thousand men. Its ruling family is stated to have originally come from Kāshgar, and to have transmitted its power from generation to generation.

During the period corresponding to 435-439 A. D., under the later Wei dynasty, Ho-p'an-t'o is said to have first entered into relations with China. 'In the ninth year Cheng-kuan (635) it sent an envoy to do homage at the Imperial court. During the period K'ai-yüan (713-741 A. D.) China conquered and pacified this kingdom; it established there the military post of Ts'ung-ling, which is the extreme point under military occupation on the frontier of An-hsi', i. e. of the Chinese protectorate then comprising Eastern Turkestan. M. Chavannes, in his comments on this notice, points out that another passage of the T'ang Annals distinctly identifies the 'military post of Ts'ung-ling' with the ancient kingdom of *Chieh-p'an-t'o*; and it is under this appellation or simply 'Ts'ung-ling' that we find Sarīkol repeatedly mentioned in the Chinese records translated by him⁵.

Fa-hsien's
notice of
Sarīkol.

The earliest Chinese travellers of whose visit to Sarīkol we have any record are the pilgrims Fa-hsien and Sung Yün. But in the case of the former our knowledge is not only exceedingly brief, but dependent on a conjectural identification⁶. Fa-hsien and his fellow-pilgrims, when proceeding, about 400 A. D., from Khotan towards India, reached first the kingdom of *Tzū-ho* 子合. A notice of the T'ang Annals translated by M. Chavannes plainly shows *Tzū-ho* to be identical with the territory known under the T'ang as *Chu-chü-po*, i. e. the present district of Karghalik⁷. From there the pilgrims 'went south for four days, when they found themselves among the Ts'ung-ling mountains, and reached the country of Yu-hwuy, where they halted and kept their retreat'⁸. The name *Yü-hui* 於磨, otherwise wholly unknown, presented a puzzle until M. Chavannes, by a slight emendation, restored it to *Yü-mo* 於摩, an abbreviated form of the name *Ch'üan-yü-mo* 權於摩, under which *Tāsh-kurghān* is mentioned in the *Pei shih*. We shall have occasion to follow elsewhere the ingenious and convincing arguments by which M. Chavannes further traces Fa-hsien's route from *Tāsh-kurghān* to *Chieh-ch'a* or Kāshgar, where he appears to have gone in order to rejoin some companions before attempting the passage of the Pāmirs. But it may be noted that the four days' march south of *Tzū-ho* or Karghalik to where the Ts'ung-ling mountains were entered, could well be explained on the assumption that Fa-hsien's party for the journey to *Tāsh-kurghān* chose a route which first took them to *Kök-yār*, south of Karghalik, and from there westwards into Sarīkol through the mountains adjoining the course of the Upper Yarkand river⁹.

Sung Yün's
passage
through
Sarīkol.

The account which the next Chinese traveller, the pilgrim Sung Yün, has left us of his passage through Sarīkol (519 A. D.), is less laconic. But a want of proper sequence in the

⁴ See *Yarkand Mission Report*, p. 56 ('the rate is one sheep for thirty yards of cloth. . . . No coin is current in Sarīgh Kūl, everything is by barter').

⁵ See Chavannes, *Turcs occid.*, p. 125 note; also the passages quoted, s. v. Ts'ung-ling, p. 373, especially the one bearing on Kao Hsien-chih's expedition to Gilgit, p. 152 note.

⁶ I am indebted for the first information concerning Fa-hsien's probable route from Khotan to the confines of India to M. Chavannes, who was kind enough to communicate to me,

in a letter dated Sept. 4, 1903, the main points as discussed by him in a note of his forthcoming translation of Sung Yün's itinerary. [See now *Voyage de Song Yun*, p. 54, note 3.]

⁷ See Chavannes, *Turcs occid.*, p. 123.

⁸ Compare Fâ-hien's *Travels*, transl. Legge, p. 21.

⁹ The route here suggested would partly coincide with the one discussed below in connexion with Sung Yün's account of Sarīkol; see note 13, p. 30.