

spread everywhere. The land produces beans and corn; it favours trees and fruits; it produces excellent horses. The people's eyes show a greenish iris. . . . This territory is on the route which leads from the 'Four Garrisons' (or Chinese Turkestan) to the Tu-huo-lo (or Tokhāristān). At one time it was dependent on the Tibetans.'

Historical
data of
T'ang
Annals.

It requires no detailed demonstration to recognize how closely the geographical data here furnished agree with Wakhān. The mention made of the great route leading through it and the reference to the Tibetan influence at one time exercised possess distinct historical interest. The capital *Sai-chia-shen* undoubtedly corresponds to the present Ishkāshim, a large group of villages on the western extremity of Wakhān.⁸ The historical data which the T'ang Annals' notice furnishes, and of which a brief summary will suffice here, help to bring out on the one hand the hold exercised by the Chinese administration over Wakhān during the seventh and eighth centuries, and on the other the strong Turkish influence prevailing in the ruling family, probably through the close connexion with Badakhshān. When the territory in A.D. 656-60 was turned into a Chinese administrative district under the designation of *Niao-fei* with the king as prefect, his name is given with the Turkish title *Chieh-li-fa*. A string of Turkish names and titles is borne also by the king who is mentioned in A.D. 720 as receiving his brevet of investiture from the Emperor. Offerings of homage are recorded in the years A.D. 728 and 729, and in 741 the king Hu-chên-t'an came in person to the Imperial Court.

For the year A.D. 742 the encyclopaedia *Ts'ê fu yüan kuei* has preserved the text of a brevet issued by the Imperial chancellery to an envoy from Hu-mi or Wakhān, who had been sent by the son of the ruling chief to express his desire of breaking with the Tibetans.⁹ From this it is clear that Tibetan aggression must have made itself felt on the uppermost Oxus years before Kao Hsien-chih started on his memorable expedition of 747 to close the Tibetan line of advance across the Darkōt and Barōghil Passes. Probably in consequence of this great success Hu-chên-t'an presented himself again at court in A.D. 749 and obtained the honour of a command in the Imperial guards. Even as late as 758 the visit of a Wakhān 'king' to the Imperial capital is recorded. That during this whole period Wakhān was directly dependent on Tokhāristān, just as in modern times it always shared the political fortunes of Badakhshān, is made evident by a petition which the brother of the Jabgu of Tokhāristān in A.D. 718 addressed to the throne and of which the text is preserved in the *Ts'ê fu yüan kuei*.¹⁰ In this Hu-mi is distinctly claimed as one of the chiefships which for generations past have acknowledged the suzerainty of Tokhāristān.

Hsüan-
tsang's name
for Wakhān.

The same close connexion with Tokhāristān is reflected in the detailed account which Hsüan-tsang has left concerning Wakhān.¹¹ The identity of Wakhān with the territory of *Ta-mo-hsi-t'ie-ti* 達摩悉鐵帝, through which the pilgrim passed on his way from Badakhshān to the Pāmirs and Sarikol about A.D. 642, was recognized from the first by General Cunningham and accepted by all those who, like V. de Saint-Martin and Yule, followed him in the elucidation of this part of Hsüan-tsang's itinerary. Though a satisfactory explanation of the name *Ta-mo-shih-t'ie-ti* still remains to be sought,¹² its application to Wakhān is established beyond doubt by

⁸ The identity of the names was first recognized by Marquart, *Ērānshahr*, p. 224. Most editions of the *T'ang shu* give the erroneous form *Han-chia-shen* 寒迦審; see Chavannes, *Turcs occid.*, p. 165.

⁹ Cf. Chavannes, *Turcs occid.*, p. 212.

¹⁰ See *ibid.*, p. 200.

¹¹ Cf. Julien, *Mémoires*, i. pp. 201 sqq.; Watters, *Yuan Chwang*, ii. pp. 279 sqq.

¹² For attempts to connect this name with Mastūj, see V. de Saint-Martin in Julien, *Mémoires*, ii. p. 425; Yule in *J.R.A.S.*, N.S. vi. p. 112; Marquart, *Ērānshahr*, p. 225. But there is no evidence that Wakhān or the uppermost part of it ever bore the name of **Darah-i-Mastūj* or **Dar-i-Mastūj*, as has been assumed. The use of this term would be particularly strange in the case of Hsüan-tsang, who did not even visit that part of the valley from which the route