

Title	The Identity of the Turkish Rulers to the South of Hindukush from the 7th to the 9th Centuries A.D.
Author(s)	INABA, Minoru
Citation	ZINBUN (2006), 38: 1-19
Issue Date	2006-03
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2433/48824
Right	© Copyright March 2006, Institute for Research in Humanities Kyoto University.
Type	Departmental Bulletin Paper
Textversion	publisher

The Identity of the Turkish Rulers to the South of Hindukush from the 7th to the 9th Centuries A.D.*

Minoru INABA

1. The Turkish Rulers of Eastern Afghanistan

At the beginning of the 1990's, many Bactrian documents were discovered in the northern area of Afghanistan which was still in the middle of a civil war. There is no doubt that those documents will, together with the Bactrian inscription from Rabatak near Surkh Kotal and Buddhist documents from the caves north of Bamiyan, help us to improve our understanding of the history, religion and the society of ancient Afghanistan. A number of those Bactrian documents have been introduced by N. Sims-Williams with transliterations and translations, which will surely stimulate further research (Sims-Williams 2000).

Just before that discovery, being inspired by Sh. Kuwayama's work on the history of Kāpīśī and the Gandhāra area prior to the Islamic period (Kuwayama 1990), I published a paper on the history of eastern Afghanistan, specially focusing on Ghazni/Zābulistān from the 7th to the 8th century A. D., scrutinizing materials available at that time (Inaba 1991). A framework of the history of that area during the period in question was deduced as follows:

In the latter half of the 6th century, the Hephtalite empire in Tokhāristān collapsed due to Turkish attack, i.e. Western Tu Jue. Gandhāra, which had also been under the control of the Hephtalites, and Kāpīśī which was adjacent to Gandhāra, were greatly affected by that event. The dynasty labeled the Khingalides by Kuwayama (or Nezakides by some scholars based on the leg-

* I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Y. Yoshida and Dr. A. Palumbo, who provided me with invaluable instruction and suggestions, and, as always, to Dr. Sh. Kuwayama who has never failed to kindly and with great generosity discuss with me at great length. And I am also grateful to Mr. Anthony R. Black for improving my English.

end of the coins) had been established in Kāpīśī and was exerting its rule over the Kābul valley as far as Gandhāra. When in the first half of the 7th century Xuanzang visited there, the king of Kāpīśī was of this lineage. In the 650's, Arab Muslims reached as far as Sīstān and intended to make their way further north, which resulted in considerable strategic importance being placed on the southern border of the Kāpīśī kingdom, namely Kābul. At that time, Kābul was under the rule of the Turks who had been reported by Xuanzang to have lived in the mountain area between Zābulistān and Kāpīśī, that is, Fulishisatangna 弗栗特薩儻那. Gradually having extended their power, they came to be independent and, eventually, deprived the Khingalide King of almost the whole of his territory. It was they who were referred to as the Turk Šāh in the Islamic sources.

In the 680's, a prince from Kābul fled southward down to Zābulistān, probably due to the conflict surrounding succession to the throne, and established his independence there (Cf. Kuwayama 1999). The new rulers of Zābulistān were denoted in the records of Arab and Persian historians by the name رتبیل *rtbyl*. It has been maintained that this title should be read زنبیل *znbyl* which might have some relation with the cult surrounding the God Zhūn (*śunā* of Xuanzang). Considering the Turkish situation mentioned above, however, this title should be understood as a corrupted form of the Turkish title *iltābār*.¹

Thus, the two kingdoms of Kābul and Zābulistān were of the same Turkish origin and both acted as an impregnable rampart against the Muslims for almost two centuries following.

Nevertheless, there remain several problems unsolved and unmentioned, one of which is the origin of those Turks. The Bactrian documents mentioned above and some archaeological findings of the area in question from the last century seem to indicate the Turkish tribe named the Khalaj as a possible candidate for the origin of those Turks.² The primary purpose of this paper is to verify this identification.

As a matter of fact, the idea of identifying the Turks in question with the Khalaj tribe is not very recent. L. Petech (1964) already suggested this identification and referred to the expressions “He-da-luo-zhi 訶達羅支” and “Ge-da-luo-zhi 葛達羅支,” which appeared in Chinese sources. A. Rehman (1988) also connected the Turks of Kābul and Zābulistān with the Khalaj utilizing the materials cited by J. Marquart (1901). Though fascinating the idea of those two

¹ Cf. Bombaci 1970: 59; Rehman 1988: 180; Inaba 1991: 53–55; Sims-Williams 2002: 235.

² Cf. Lee & Sims-Williams 2003; Verardi & Paparatti 2004; Inaba 2004.

THE IDENTITY OF THE TURKISH RULERS

scholars may be, they seem not to have succeeded in examining it sufficiently, as Petech never produced a comprehensive comparison of information from the Chinese sources and that of the Arabic and Persian sources, nor did Rehman bring material in the Chinese sources to light. However, Y. Yoshida (2000 [2003]) recently has suggested the assumption that the Chinese Hedaluozhi and Gedaluozhi can be connected with the word “kharalāča” which appears on the legends of the Nezak Šāh coins, considering the latter to be some kind of Indianized form of the word “Khalaj.” I will take this suggestion as my starting point.

2. Hedaluozhi

To begin with, let us consider the Chinese expressions Hedaluozhi and Gedaluozhi. However, since each has variants, it is first necessary to examine the expressions themselves to decide which should be taken as the correct form or whether there are multiple correct forms.

To start with, let us proceed with a passage from *Xin tangshu* Vol. 221b:

“Xieyu 謝颺 lies southwest of Tokhāristān. It was formerly called Caojuzha 漕矩吒 or Caoju 漕矩 but renamed Hedaluozhi in the Xianqing period. Empress Wu again changed the name to the present one. About 400 *li* to its east lies Jibin 罽賓 and to its northeast lies Bamiyan at almost the same distance. India lies to the south, Persia lies to the west and Guzman lies northwards. The king resides in Hexina (鶴悉那 *γak-sit-na) which is 7,000 *li* wide. The king also sometimes resides in the Aponi (阿婆你 *a-bua-niə) castle. The land produces plenty of saffron and water springs irrigate the fields. People from Tu Jue, Jibin and Tokhāristān (吐火羅) live there. Jibin is recruiting young soldiers from this country to protect against the Arabs. They sent an envoy and presents in the 1st year of the Jingyun era (710 A.D.) and later subjugated themselves to Jibin. In the 8th year of Kaiyuan (720), the Emperor mandated Gedaluozhi *xielifa* Shiquer and made him the king. They have sent several envoys until the Tianbao era.”

Here three names for Zābulistān in the Tang period are mentioned, i.e., Caojuzha, Hedaluozhi (Gedaluozhi) and Xieyu. The Chinese names applied to Zābulistān have been analyzed by Yoshida (Kuwayama 1992: 135–139), according to whom Caojuzha and Xieyu, as well as Caoli (*Xu gaoseng zhuan*, Vol. 4), Xieyue (*Huilin yinyi*, Vol. 100) and Zhewutusatana (*Xuanyin yinyi*, Vol. 18) are transcriptions for *dzāul < Zābul(-istān), while Hedaluozhi and Gedaluozhi (and Geluodazhi in the *Jiu tangshu*; see below) must have been

transcriptions for a word completely different from *dzāul < Zābul. As for the latter transcriptions, É. Chavannes (1969: 160, n. 4) presumes that Hedaluozhi could be an erroneous transcription for Daluohezhi 達羅訶支 which might correspond to al-Rukhūdh < al-Rukhkhaj appearing in Islamic sources, especially in geographical works written during the 9th and the 10th centuries, as a place name of southern Afghanistan around the present Qandahar. As mentioned above, Petech suggested connecting the form to Khalaj. While Kuwayama (1990: 253–54), distinguishing Hedaluozhi from Gedaluozhi, supposes the former to be a place name and the latter to be a kind of Turkish official title, the *Qaratači.

Hedaluozhi also appears in the *Zizhi tongjian*, Vol. 200:

“On the day *guiwei* of the 6th month [of 661], eight *dudufu* and seventy-six *zhou* 州 had been placed in the sixteen countries, i.e. Tuhuoluo (Tokāra), Yanda (Hephtal), Jibin, Bosi (Persia) etc.”

This account concerns the reorganization of Anxi *duhufu* and sixteen countries in the West in the 1st year of Longshuo (661), which is discussed below. The *Tang huiyao* Vol. 73 also makes reference to the same event:

“Zhaozhi 條枝 *dudufu* has been placed in the Fubaoshidien 伏寶瑟顛 castle, the capital of the king of Hedaluozhi.”

The same source lists the names of *zhou* and villages put under the control of this *dudufu*. One can find almost the same account in the *Xin tangshu* Vol. 43, as well.

It is obvious from these accounts that Hedaluozhi was the name applied to Zābulistān during the Xianqing era, and a Zhaozhi *dudufu* was stationed at the castle of the king of Hedaluozhi when sixteen western *dudufu* were positioned in the 1st year of Longshuo (661).

Recently, A. Palumbo (2001: 122–24) has drawn attention to the fact that Hedaluozhi appears in the Dunhuang manuscript of the *Laozi huahujing* 老子化胡經 (British Library Or. 8210/s. 1857). The name “*daoshi* Suo Daoxuan 道士索洞玄” is written at the end of this manuscript. This Suo Daoxuan is known to have copied two other scriptures, one of which is a non-titled Daoist sutra (British Library Or. 8210/s. 2999) and the other the second volume of the *Taixuan zhengyi benji jing* 太玄真一本際經 (British Library Or. 8210/s. 3563). The date these two documents were copied is the “25th of the 11th month in the 2nd year of Kaiyuan (5th, January of 715)”, from which one can infer that the manuscript of the *Huahujing* also belongs to the same period.

3. Gedaluozhi, Geluodazhi and Geluozhi

The form Gedaluozhi, which is nearly identical to Hedaluozhi excluding the initial character, appears in the *Cefu yuangui* Vol.964 as well as the *Xin tangshu*. The *Cefu yuangui* has:

“In the 9th month [in the 8th year of Kaiyuan (720)], an envoy was sent to approve the enthronement of Gedaluozhi *xielifa* Shiquer 葛達羅支頡利發誓屈爾 as the king of Xieyu and that of the Gedaluozhi *tegin* 特勤 as the king of Jibin.”

However, the *Jiu tangshu* Vol. 198, which contains almost the same content though slightly abridged, reads:

“[Jibin has] sent an envoy to China in the 7th year of Kaiyuan (719), presenting one scroll of astronomical texts, a book of secret and foreign medicines. [The Emperor] issued an order of investiture, sending an envoy in return to approve the king [of Jibin] to be the Geluodazhi 葛羅達支 *tegin*.”

Here, we find the form “Geluodazhi”. While the similar account in the *Tang huiyao* Vol. 99 (*Wudedian* version) provides the form “Geluozhi 葛羅支,” the *Siku quanshu* version of the same source has “Geluodazhi,” which may mean that the character “da 達” was just dropped from “Geluodazhi” to become “Geluozhi” in the *Wudedian* version.³

³ It should be noted that there is another variant for this word. The *Siku quanshu* version of *Tang huiyao* Vol. 73 has:

“The Zhaozhi *dudufu* has been placed in the Fubaoshidien castle, the capital of the king of Aluoluozi 阿落羅支.”

Much is obscure concerning the formation of the present text of the *Tang huiyao*. T. Furuhashi (1989; 1998) points out that the manuscripts which were used as the base for constructing the *Siku quanshu* version could preserve an older form. Furuhashi mentions three manuscripts belonging to this lineage, two of which are now in the National Central Library of Chinese Taipei and the other being in the Seikado Bunko Library, Japan. In these three manuscripts, the word in question is written Aluoluozi. All three could be dated to the Qing period, while, according to Furuhashi, this lineage of manuscripts could date back to the Southern Song dynasty. If that is the case, the form Aluoluozi could also be fairly old. Comparing with other forms, the first character 阿 could be interpreted as an error for 訶 (or, possibly 呵 which has the same sound as 訶). Though the second character 落 is completely different from other forms, it is possible that this character reflects the existence of l-/r- as a second consonant in the original word, which is quite interesting (See below). Yet this form is found only in the *Siku quanshu* version of the *Tang huiyao* and is not very easy to connect with other forms via a satisfying explanation. That is why it is omitted from the discussion here.

Table 1. *iltäbär* in various languages

	Language	Source
<i>*iltäbär</i>	Turkic	
頡利發 <i>xielifa</i>	Chinese	<i>Jiu tangshu, Xin tangshu</i> etc.
υλιτοβηρο	Bactrian	Bactrian Documents
<i>hitivira</i>	Middle Indic (?)	Nezak Šāh Coins
رتيل	Arabic/Persian	Balādhurī, Ṭabarī etc.

From the sources cited above, it is obvious that Gedaluozhi and Geluodazhi are transcriptions of the same word. On the other hand, comparing Gedaluozhi (whose Middle Chinese sound is **kat-dat-la-tǝie*) with Hedaluozhi (whose MC sound is **ha-dat-la-tǝie*), only the initial sound is different. As discussed below, the difference can be explained by the difference in the date of transcription and how the information was transmitted. Therefore, it is warranted that we tentatively take these two forms to be slightly different transcriptions of the same word.

4. *hitivira* kharalāča

As a result of the discussion above, Hedaluozhi/Gedaluozhi are thought to be the most appropriate forms. Next let us consider what word these terms must have transcribed. There is a clue in the so-called *nyčky MLK'*=Nezak Šāh coins found chiefly to the south of Hindukush. The coins which bear the Pahlavi legend *nyčky MLK'* have been scrutinized by R. Göbl (1967). Among them, one group of coins, categorized by him as Emission 208 (referred as NumH 208 hereafter), has a Brahmi legend associated with it as follows:

“śrī hitivira kharalāva pārameśvara śrī vahi tigina devakāriṭam” (Göbl 1967-i: 142–145)

The second word *hitivira* is, according to H. Humbach (1966: 60), the Middle Indic form of the Turkish title *iltäbär*. This seems to be highly probable taking into account that Sims-Williams (2000: 254) identifies the word υλιτοβηρο *hilitber* appearing in the Bactrian documents with *iltäbär*.⁴

According to M. Mori (1967: 427), *iltäbär* was the title given to the chiefs of clans other than the Ashina in Eastern Tu Jue. As for Western Tu Jue, the

⁴ As for the form *hilitber*, see Sims-Williams 2002: 235.

THE IDENTITY OF THE TURKISH RULERS

Jiu tangshu Vol. 194 reads:

“Tong Yabǔ Qaǵan was brave and smart, very good at warfare. In the north, he conquered Tie Lu 鉄勒, in the west, he repelled the Persians, and in the south, his territory stretched as far as the border of Jibin. All of these countries submitted to him. He possessed hundreds of thousands of archers, being dominant over the Western Regions 西域. First, he resided at the old home of Wu Sun 烏孫, then moved his palace to Qian Quan north of Shiguo (Čāč). He gave the title *xielifa* to all the kings of Western Regions and also dispatched a *tutun* 吐屯 to each of these regions to collect taxes and tributes. He held unparalleled power in the West.”

This record informs us that not only were the Turkish chiefs but also the rulers of the city-states in Transoxiana and Bactria given this title (Cf. Kuwayama 1990: 234). The local ruler of the city of Rob (*khār* of Rob) was described by the title υλιτοβηρο in three of the Bactrian documents dated to the 7th century (Doc.N, Doc.P and Doc.Q of Sims-Williams 2000). According to the *Xin tangshu* Vol. 221 and the *Cefu yuangui* Vol. 964 quoted above, the King of Xieyu=Zābulistān was given the title *xielifa*. Assuming that this *xielifa* is identical with *iltābār* (Cf. Mori 1967), along with υλιτοβηρο and *hitivira*, we can consider this title to be the “*iltābār* of Gedaluozhi.”

On the other hand, on the words “*hitivira* kharalāva” appearing on the legend of NumH 208, there seems to be no discussion of the word “kharalāva” besides that of Humbach (1996 [1998]: 251) who suggests the possibility of this word being a kind of erroneous transcription for the name of some tribe, possibly the Kharlukh=Qarluq. However, the first half of the 8th century to which these coins have been attributed is, to the best of our knowledge, too early to be the date of Qarluq’s appearance even to the south of Amu Darya.⁵ Moreover, no information, prior or subsequent, has surfaced implying their

⁵ V. Minorsky (1982: 287–88) says that a group of Qarluq were reported by al-Ṭabarī to be located to the south of Amu Darya. What is meant here is the “Jabǵūya” who helped Sulu Qaghan of Türgiś who were fighting with the Arabs in Tokhāristān in the 730’s (Cf. Ṭabarī-ii: 1547, 1590–91, 1604, 1609). Minorsky thought that this Jabǵūya was a Yabǔ of the Qarluq, which lead him to assume that in the beginning of the 8th century, there already was a group of Qarluq lead by their Yabǔ living in Tokhāristān. Actually, al-Ṭabarī, mentions this Yabǔ as “Jabǵūya al-Kharlukhī” on one occasion. However, as in other instances, since he only used the term “Jabǵūya” or “Jabǵūya al-Ṭukhārī,” it seems not to be a firm enough basis to infer the existence of Qarluqs in Tokhāristān at such an early date. O. Pritsak (1951: 274 & n. 2, 275) criticizes this supposition and points out that it was after 766 that the Qarluq became an heir of Western Tu Jue.

Table 2. Khalaj in various languages

	Language	Source
Khalač	?	
訶達羅支／葛達羅支	Chinese	<i>Jiu tangshu, Xin tangshu etc.</i>
χαλασο	Bactrian	Bactrian Documents
Kharalāča	Middle Indic (?)	Nezak Šāh Coins
خلج	Arabic/Persian	Iṣṭakhrī, Mas'ūdī etc.

activity to the south of Hindukush.

There is a different view on the reading of the final consonant of this word. The characters transcribing the sound *v-* and *č-* are very similar in the Brahmi script and sometimes not easy to discern. The coins of this type were already reported in the 19th century and A. Cunningham, J. Princep and E. Thomas have shown their readings (Cunningham 1962: 269), which are “Airána cha,” “Airán cha” and “Kharala cha” respectively. All of them read the final consonant as *ch-* = *č-*. Recently, J. Harmatta (1996: 378–9)⁶ and Yoshida (see above) also agree in their reading “kharalāča.”

Khalaj is written in Arabic script as خلج. As is known, ح in the Arabic script transcribes the sound *j-* and *č-*. In the Bactrian documents, the name is written as χαλασο, the Bactrian σ transcribing the sound *s-* and *č-*. With this in mind one can safely assume the original name of Khalaj as Khalač. This tribe was living in the southwestern region of Afghanistan in the 10th century (Cf. Minorsky 1940). Meanwhile other passages in the Bactrian documents indicate the existence of that tribe in the northern skirt of Hindukush in the 7th and the 8th centuries (Sims-Williams 2000: 82, 98–104; Cf. Sims-Williams 2002: 234). Therefore, if “kharalāva/kharalāča” of NumH 208 is taken as the name of some tribe, Khalaj is a more appropriate candidate than Qarluq.

These considerations lend support to the reading “*hitivira* kharalāča” from the legend of NumH 208 as the “*iltābār* of Khalaj”.

5. Khalaj and the Tang

Of the two phrases discussed above, i.e. “Gedaluozhi *xielifa*” and “*hitivira* kharalāča”, *xielifa* and *hitivira* are different transcriptions of the same word.

⁶ However, Harmatta identifies this with *Qargilacī 曷纒支 which is the name of the king of Kāpiśī mentioned in the *Jiu Tangshu* and takes it as a name for the royal family.

THE IDENTITY OF THE TURKISH RULERS

Hereafter, the plausibility of identifying Gedaluozhi, which may be identical with Hedaluozhi, with *kharalāča* should be discussed. For that purpose, taking a look at the political and diplomatic relations between the Tang and Tu Jue would be useful, as it is important to consider under what circumstance these Chinese transcriptions appeared in the sources.

After the breakup of Eastern Tu Jue by the Tang, the latter gradually expanded their influence further west, while Western Tu Jue reestablished its power under Tong Yabǵu Qaǵan at the beginning of the 7th century. After the death of Tong Yabǵu, Yipi Duolu Qaǵan 乙毘咄陸可汗 established his rule over the Western Tu Jue. However, in 642, the Tang brought Yipi Shekui Qaǵan 乙毘射匱可汗 into power and crushed Duolu Qaǵan. Ashina Helu had been a *yabǵu* for Duolu Qaǵan but surrendered to the Tang after Duolu Qaǵan's defeat. Nevertheless, Helu rebelled after the death of Emperor Tai Zong 太宗. He invaded the territory of Shekui Qaǵan and tried to conquer Gaochang 高昌 and Tingzhou 庭州 (650–651). The Tang dispatched armies under the command of Su Dingfang 蘇定方, Ashina Mishe 阿史那彌射 and Ashina Buzhen 阿史那步真. In 657, Su Dingfang won a sweeping victory over Helu at Suyāb. The latter fled to the west but eventually was captured at Čāč by Xiao Siye 蕭嗣業.

Subjugating Helu's rebellion, the Tang immediately set into postwar management, including the relocation of the Anxi *duhufu* to Kuča and the rearrangement of Helu's former territory under the new *duhufu*. The *Xin tangshu* Vol. 215b reads:

“After Helu's downfall, his former territory was divided into some *zhou* and *xuan* 縣 to which many clans were made to immigrate. The Mukun 木昆 clan was refashioned into the Fuyan 匭延 *dudufu*, along with the Tuqishi Suogemohe 突騎施索葛莫賀 clan being refashioned into the Walu 嗚鹿 *dudufu*, the Tuqishi Alishi 突騎施阿利施 clan being refashioned into the Jieshan 梨山 *dudufu*, the Huluwu Que 胡祿屋闕 clan being refashioned into the Yanbo 鹽泊 *dudufu*, the Shesheti Tun 攝舍提墩 clan being refashioned into the Shuanghe 雙河 *dudufu*, and the Shunishi Chuban 鼠尼施處半 clan being refashioned into the Yingsuo 鷹娑 *dudufu*. Then, the two *duhufu*, Kunling 崑陵 and Mengchi 蒙池, were placed in control of these *dudufus*. In every country, which was subjugated by the Tang, a *zhou* was set up, being put under the control of the Anxi *duhufu* up to the border of Persia in the West.”

The reorganizing project of Western Regions began in the year following Helu's subjugation, i.e. 658 and was brought about in the 1st year of Longshuo

(661) according to the *Tang huiyao* Vol. 73:

“On the 2nd day of the 5th month in the 3rd year [of Xianqing] (7th, June of 658), the Anxi *duhufu* was moved to Kuča. The former Anxi [*dudu*] was transformed into the Xizhou 西州 *dudu*, to which Qu Zhizhan 麴智湛 was appointed to govern the old place of Gaochang. As Western Regions were being subjugated, envoys were dispatched to Samarqand (Kanguo) and Tokhāristān (Tuhuoluo) to investigate the situation, the products of those countries (訪其地風俗物產), and the history of the creation and abolition of *zhou* or *xuan* there as well. They submitted drawings and plates as reports of their missions, which were utilized by the officers to compile the sixty volumes of the *Xiyu tuzhi* 西域圖志.”

“On the 17th day of the 6th month in the 1st year of Longshuo (7th, July of 661), *zhou* and *xuan* were placed in Tokhāristān. The envoy Wang Mingyuan 王名遠 submitted the *Xiyu tuji* 西域圖記. He requested placing *dudufu* in the sixteen countries west of Khotan and east of Persia, laying 80 *zhou*, 110 *xuan* and 126 military stations 軍府. He also erected a stone monument in Tokhāristān to record the Emperor’s achievements and virtues.”

The mission of Wang Mingyuan was also recorded in the *Xin tangshu* Vol. 58:

“*Xiyu tuzhi*, sixty volumes. Gaozong 高宗 dispatched envoys to Samarqand and Tokhāristān to investigate the situation and the products of those countries, after which he ordered drawings to be submitted. The Emperor also ordered the officers to compile [the book on Western Regions]. Xu Jingzong 許敬宗 received this order and completed it in the 3rd year of Xianqing.”

Likewise, the *Tang huiyao* Vol. 36 reads:

“On the 9th day of the 5th month in the 3rd year of Xianqing (14th, June of 658), as Western Regions were being subjugated, envoys were sent to Samarqand and Tokhāristān to investigate the situation, products and the history of creation and abolition of *zhou* or *xuan* there. As a result, maps and drawings were submitted, which were utilized by the officers in compiling the sixty volumes of the *Xiyu tuzhi* under the direction of Xu Jingzong. When the book was completed, all the scholars highly admired its extensiveness.”

According to the *Jiu tangshu* Vol. 198, Wang Mingyuan had been a governor of Nanyou *xuan* 南由縣, Longzhou 隴州. He was dispatched to Tokhāristān at the commencement of the reorganization project in 658 and returned to

THE IDENTITY OF THE TURKISH RULERS

China in 661 submitting the *Xiyu tuji* as a report of his mission.⁷

The *Xiyu tuzhi* compiled by Xu Jingzong and other officers was also referred to as the *Xiguo zhi* 西國志. It was completed as sixty volumes, which later, with the addition of forty volumes of plates and drawings, was enlarged to one hundred volumes in 666 (the 3rd year of Linde = the 1st year of Ganfeng) (*Faen zhulin* Vol. 5).

According to the *Xin tangshu*, the edict to compile the book was issued in the 3rd year of Xianqing and the sixty-volume version was completed within that very year, which may mean that the first version of the *Xiyu tuzhi* was the verbatim compilation of the various sources concerning to the Western Regions offered to and accumulated by the Central Government (Cf. Uchida 1965: 143). The *Faen zhulin* Vol. 29 supports this conjecture, as it relates that the *Xiyu tuzhi* was compiled based on the travel reports of Xuanzang, Wan Xuansuo 王玄策 and others. Together with these works, prior works like Pei Ju's *Xiyu tuji*⁸ and the biographical data from the *Gaoseng zhuan* might also have been utilized, with information passed between the embassies and the Tang. The passage "When the book was completed, all the scholars highly admired its extensiveness" in the *Xin tangshu* seems to indicate that, under the direction of Xu Jingzong who had much experience in the compilation of the Histories like *Suishu*, *Jinshu* and etc., this book was compiled from various sources available at that time.

The *Xiyu tuji* submitted by Wang Mingyuan must have been a part of the forty-volume supplement. This report by Wang Mingyuan, though titled *tuji*, had to contain not only plates and drawings but also other information collected during his three year mission. For instance, the *Jiu tangshu* Vol. 198 reads:

"In the 3rd year of Xianqing, when investigating the situation of that country (=Jibin), they note that the founder of the royal family was Xinnie 馨孽, and that down to the present king Hejiezhi 曷纒支, the throne was passed from father to son for twelve generations."

The original Chinese of the sentence underlined is 訪其國俗, which cor-

⁷ G. Uchida thinks that Wang Mingyuan was sent to Tokhāristān twice, i.e. in the 3rd year of Xianqing and the 1st year of Longshuo (Uchida 1965: 142). Nevertheless, considering the purpose and results of his mission, it is more appropriate to think of it as having been carried out for three years.

⁸ Pei Ju's *Xiyu tuji* is supposed to have been referenced in the description of the Western countries in the *Suishu*. The book was completed by 606 (Kuwayama 1990: 125–126).

rectly corresponds to what is mentioned in the *Xin tangshu* Vol.5 and the *Tang huiyao* Vol.73, namely, that the envoys dispatched to Samarqand and Tokhāristān in the Xianqing era “investigated the situation and the products of those countries (訪其地風俗物產).” Therefore, the information concerning Jibin in the *Jiu tangshu* is thought to be derived from Wang Mingyuan’s report. Moreover, from the account of the *Tang huiyao*, it can be deduced that the report provided invaluable data for refashioning the sixteen *dudufu* in the Western Regions.

The account found in the *Xin tangshu* Vol. 221b on Zābulistān says that the name Hedaluozhi appeared in the Xianqing era. Considering the above leads us to assume that the alternate name was the result of Wang Mingyuan’s mission in Tokhāristān. Unfortunately, no information reveals how his investigation was carried out. It is also unknown whether he himself explored from Tokhāristān to the south of Hindukush or he collected the data through informants. Nevertheless, it is clear that his mission was almost concurrent with the emergence of the Khalaj power to the south of Hindukush and he recorded the name as Hedaluozhi.

6. Hedaluozhi/Gedaluozhi, kharalāča and Khalaj

Though it is not evident why the name was recorded in the, so to speak, Indianized form Hedaluozhi, there are two possibilities. The first is that Wang Mingyuan or his informant recorded the name in the Indianized form. The second is that the Khalaj=Khalač themselves referred to their own name in Indianized form. The latter may be rather probable as the Khalaj themselves used the Indianized form “kharalāča” in their own coins about a half century later.

Still it must not be forgotten that Hedaluozhi and Gedaluozhi are not exact transcriptions for “kharalāča.” The second character 達 usually transcribes the sound *dâr-* (Cf. 達磨 < dharma) and is not expected to appear here. Though the detailed linguistic circumstance to the south of Hindukush during this period is still ambiguous, it may safely be supposed that Middle Indic and Bactrian were the two main languages there, because they are two of the three languages used in the Nezak Šāh coins’ legends (the third being Pahlavi). According to Sims-Williams (1997: 23), when an *l-* and an *r-* come into direct contact, the *l-* tends to change to *d-* in the Bactrian documents belonging to the 7th century and later. Inferring from this, it can be assumed that when the name Khalač was Indianized to “kharalāča”, or to a form similar to it, and was transmitted

THE IDENTITY OF THE TURKISH RULERS

to Wang Mingyuan, thereby being affected by the Bactrian pronunciation, the second consonant was heard as *d-*. On the other hand, concerning the Chinese transcription of Middle Indic, we find instances where Middle Indic *d-* is transcribed by Middle Chinese *l-/r-* and Middle Indic *l-* is transcribed by Middle Chinese *d-*. According to S. Karashima (1994: 19, 27, 67), this may reflect the fact that in the Middle Indic of northwestern India, pronunciation of *d-* and *l-* had moved closer. The case of Hedaluozhi, Gedaluozhi and *kharalāča* could be explained in this way as well.

Nevertheless, as noticed in both of the explanations, it is not at all an easy task to ascertain in which stage of communication the sound *d-* or the corresponding Chinese character 達 appeared, as this largely depends on the condition of actual communication or conversations.⁹

Concerning the reason why the name of Khalaj was Indianized, we may recall the predominance of Indian culture in the area stretching over the Hindukush during this period. About half of the Nezak Šāh coins' legends are written in Indic with Brahmi script.¹⁰ Besides, Indian culture spread even to Bactria and Sogdiana in the preceding period, i.e., the Kidarite and Hephthalite period. This phenomena was, according to Kuwayama (2002: 154), a consequence of the dispersal of merchants away from Gandhāra to those areas after the fall of the Hephthalites. On the other hand, F. Grenet (2002: 213) regards this to be due to the close relationship of Bactria and Sogdiana with Northwestern India under the rule of the Kidarites and Hephthalites. Harmatta (1996: 370) refers to the coins issued in Khuttal around this period on which the names of the rulers (Hephthalite princes, according to Harmatta) are scribed in Indianized forms. Indianization of the name of Khalaj may well

⁹ Marquart (Marquart & de Groot 1915: 258, n. 1) and Petech (1964: 294) refers to the word *خطلج* which appears in the itinerary of Abū Dulaf Mis'ar b. Muhalhil, quoted by al-Yāqūt in his *Mu'jam al-Buldān* (iii: 443). This is called "the First Letter" of Abū Dulaf and the word in question appears along with the Qarluq in the description of the people who lived along the road from Western Turkestan to the western part of China. Marquart suggests the possible connection between the letter ط with 達 supposing that ج and خ are confused here. However, the "First Letter" of Abū Dulaf is thought to be based on hearsay collected in Bukhārā (Minorsky 1955: 11–18) and the form *خطلج* has not proved to be found anywhere but here. Therefore, though the word which to some extent resembles Hedaluozhi/Gedaluozhi and appears together with the Qarluq is interesting, it is not possible to make any kind of conclusive argument based on this word.

¹⁰ Göbl has classified the Nezak Šāh coins into about eighty groups, more than a half of which utilize Brahmi inscriptions or letters (Cf. Göbl 1967-i: 132–186).

follow the same tendency. They might have thought their name should be Indianized in order to be recognized as one of the rulers of the Indian world. This could be reflected in the fact that in the 8th year of Kaiyuan, about seventy years after the Xianqing era, Khalaj sent envoys to the Tang court who referred to themselves as Gedaluozhi. For them, referring to themselves by such a name was probably proper and befitting a ruler who could send envoys to the great Tang dynasty.

It is not clear, however, why this time a different, though slight, transcription was adopted. To ascribe this change to the difference in period or the whim of a transcriber is a simple remedy. Still, the fact that some Arabic and Persian sources apply the form Qalaj instead of Khalaj should be noted. *Dīwān Luġāt at-Turk*, a Turkish dictionary of the 11th century by Maḥmūd al-Kāšġarī explains the etymology of the name Khalaj through the Turkish words “qal aĉ.” In *Jāmi’ al-Tawārīkh*, a world history of the 14th century compiled by Rašīd al-Dīn, the tribe is called “Qalaj.” The fact that sources written to the west of Pamir differ in their transcriptions of the first consonant seems to correspond to the dual Chinese transcriptions. Maḥmūd al-Kāšġarī also states:

“The Oġuz and Qifĉāq sometimes change *qāf* to *khā*’. They are a section of the Khalaj. They say: KhIYZIM khīzim ‘My daughter (bintī)’ while the Türks say: QYZIM qīzim.” (Dankoff & Kelly 1982-ii: 263)

Meanwhile, in the Middle Chinese transcription, 訶 and 葛 usually transcribe the sound *kha* and *qa* respectively. Therefore, it might be assumed that Hedaluozhi recorded in the Xianqing era transcribed the name Khalaĉ which is attested in the Bactrian, Arabic and Persian sources, while Gedaluozhi recorded in the 8th year of Kaiyuan transcribed the name Qalaĉ which is witnessed in the works of Maḥmūd al-Kāšġarī and Rašīd al-Dīn. It may also be supposed that the original name of the tribe was Qalaĉ, which the Khalaj people themselves pronounced Khalaĉ by changing *qāf* to *khā*’ (Cf. Doerfer 1971: 173).

Be that as it may, my conjecture here concerning the existence of two Chinese transcriptions is that they might be partly caused by the difference in the time of transcription. Those who acted as intermediaters between Khalaj and the Tang each time must have been different as well, which may imply that the pronunciation of those mediators could have differed slightly.

It is now appropriate to sum up the discussion:

First, from the variants in Chinese transcription, Hedaluozhi and Gedalu-

THE IDENTITY OF THE TURKISH RULERS

ozhi should be taken as the correct forms, both of which were transcriptions of the same word.

Second, there are two words which seem to be indicative of the title of some ruler. One is Gedaluozhi *xielifa* recorded in the Chinese sources and the other is “*hitivira kharalāča*” which appeared on the legends of the Nezak Šāh coins, both of which are concerned with almost the same period and area. By assuming the title “*khalāč iltābār*,” it becomes possible to identify both as being different transcriptions of the same title using different languages and scripts.

Third, if these were transcriptions of the Indianized form of Khalaj, the Chinese Hedaluozhi and Gedaluozhi can be understood to correspond to the phonic variants of the original tribe name, i.e. *Khalāč* and *Qalāč*.

The title mentioned above was born by the rulers whom we know from the Islamic sources to have been “Turks”. Identifying these “Turks” with the Khalaj is the most consistent hypothesis to explain the political situation of the area south of Hindukush around that time.

7. Khalaj in Central Asia

As for the question of when and from where these Khalaj came to Afghanistan, regrettably we do not have sufficient information. Still Minorsky’s pioneer work (1940) and other indirect information lead us to the following description.

It has been pointed out that the origin of the Khalaj might be associated with the Hephthalites. This assumption is based on the account in the *Mafātīḥ al-‘Ulūm* (119–120) by al-Khwārizmī which says “The Khalaj and Kanjīna Turks are the remnants of the Hephthalites.” It will not, however, be very promising to expect exact information concerning ethnicity in this statement because this work lumps the Khalaj and the Kanjīna (=Kumēdh) in the same category (Cf. Clauson & Bosworth 1965: 8–9). On the other hand, considering that the sources belonging to the Islamic period generally distinguish the Khalaj from other Turks or Turkmans, and Huicao (Kuwayama 1992: 38, 122–123) also distinguishes Turks in Kābul and Zābulistān from the Turks to the north of Hindukush, it is not very probable to think of the Khalaj as a part of Western Tu Jue. I will confine myself here to say that the Hephthalite empire might well have been an amalgam of various nomadic and non-nomadic people¹¹ and that the Khalaj people, who lived somewhere in Central Asia, had

¹¹ Cf. Maròth 1990; Clauson & Bosworth 1965, loc. cit.

been involved in (or took part in) the rapid expansion of the empire, meaning one section of them moved into Afghanistan.

As Minorsky pointed out, Ibn Khudādhbih (*al-Masālik wa al-Mamālik*: 28, 31) reports that a group of Khalaj and Qarluq was living to the east of Syr Darya. Other sources can be cited as well. The *Xin tangshu* Vol. 217 mentions a tribe called the Boma 駃馬 adjacent to Jiegu 結骨 (=Kirgiz). The former was also referred to as the Elazhi 遏刺支 (*var.* Helazhi 曷刺支) or Bila 弊刺. The *Tong dian* Vol. 200 calls the same tribe Hela 曷刺 (Cf. Shiratori 1970: 615–620). Moreover, al-Idrīsī (*Opus Geographicum*: 714–715) describes that about a couple of days east of Ṭarāz resided the winter quarter of the Qarluq and the winter quarter of the Khalaj adjacent to it. The geographer further records that on the way from Ṭarāz to the territory of Kīmāk there was a castle called *xyxm* which was the residence of the Khalaj king. Although the exact location of the Kīmāk territory is hard to specify, al-Idrīsī and other Arab and Persian geographers tend to connect it to the Irtysh basin. T. Moriyasu (1977: 28–30 & ns. 113–115) suggests the possibility that the tribe mentioned in the Chinese sources might be the same as the Khalaj based on the arrangement of the geographical locations. As a matter of fact, Islamic sources describe the Kīmāk as a western or northern neighbor of Kirgiz (Cf. Minorsky 1982: 305). The latter was, according to the *Xin tangshu*, the neighbor of the Boma/Elazhi/Helazhi.

This evidence seems to indicate that, from the 9th to the 10th centuries, a section of the Khalaj still lived to the east of Ṭarāz and west of the Irtysh basin, possibly around Issik-Kul and eastward. The *Jahān-nāma*, a 13th century Persian manual of geography by Muḥammad Najīb Bakrān, says that the “Khalaj are a kind of Turks who, in ancient times, had come to Zābulistān from the territory of Qarluq.” (*Jahān-nāma*: 73). This also reveals that the original home of the Khalaj was in that area.

Unfortunately, no information is available concerning the later history of the Central Asian Khalaj. From the 10th century on, the Khalaj were mentioned in the area south of Amu Darya, especially in northern India and the eastern section of the Iranian plateau, which has already been described by Minorsky (1940).

THE IDENTITY OF THE TURKISH RULERS

Bibliography

- Bombaci, A. (1970) On the Ancient Turkic Title *Eltäbär*. In: *Proceedings of the IXth Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference*, Naples, pp. 1–66.
- Cunningham, A. (1962) *Later Indo-Scythians*. (reprint), Delhi.
- Chavannes, É. (1969) *Documents sur les Tou-Kiue (Turcs) occidentaux*. (reprint), Taipei.
- Clauson, G. & C. E. Bosworth (1965), *Al-Xwārizmī on the People of Central Asia*. *JRAS* 1965, pp. 2–12.
- Dankoff, R. & J. Kelly (tr.) (1982) *Compendium of the Turkic Dialects*. 3 Vols., Harvard University Printing Office.
- Doerfer, G. (1971) *Khalaj Materials*. Indiana University.
- Furuhata, T. (1989) On the various versions of the *T'ang hui-yao*. *Tōhōgaku* 78, pp. 82–95. (Japanese)
- Furuhata, T. (1998) A Study on Circulation of the *Tang hui-yao*. *The Tōyōshi-Kenkyū* 57(1), pp. 96–124. (Japanese)
- Göbl, R. (1967) *Dokumente zur Geschichte der iranischen Hunnen in Baktrien und Indien*. 4 Vols., Wiesbaden.
- Grenet, F. (2002) Regional Interaction in Central Asia and Northwest India in the Kidarite and Hephthalite Period. In: Sims-Williams, N. (ed.) *Indo-Iranian Languages and Peoples*. Oxford, pp. 203–224.
- Harmatta, J. (1996) Tokharistan and Gandhāra under Western Türk Rule (650–750). In: Litvinsky, B. A., Zhang Guang-da & R. Sh. Samghabadi (eds.) *History of Civilizations of Central Asia III*. Paris, pp. 367–383.
- Humbach, H. (1966) *Bactrische Sprachdenkmäler I*. Wiesbaden.
- Humbach, H. (1996[1998]) Pangul, a Turco-Bactrian Ruler. *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 10, pp. 247–251.
- Ibn Khurdādhbih, *al-Masālik wa al-Mamālik*. ed. de Goeje, M. J., Leiden, 1967.
- al-Idrīsī, *Opus Geographicum (Kitāb Nuzhat al-Muštāq fī Ikhtirāq al-Āfāq)*. ed. Cerulli, E., A. Bombaci et al., Naples & Rome, 1982–1984.
- Inaba, M. (1991) Three Kings of Zābulistān in the 7th–8th Centuries. *Seinan Azia Kenkyū* 35, pp. 39–60. (Japanese)

MINORU INABA

- Inaba, M. (2004) *Nāy Qal'a, Wujīristān and the Khalaj. An Appendix for Verardi & Paparatti 2004.*
- Karashima, S. (1994) *Chou Agon Kyo no Gengo no Kenkyu.* Tokyo. (Japanese)
- al-Khwārizmī, *Mafātīh al-'Ulūm.* ed. van Vloten, G., Leiden, 1968.
- Kuwayama, Sh. (1990) *Kāpiśī-Gandhāra Shi Kenkyu.* Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University. (Japanese)
- Kuwayama, Sh. (ed.) (1992) *Hichao's Wang Wu-Tianzhuguo zhuan: Record of Travels in Five Indic Regions, Translation and Commentary.* Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University. (Japanese)
- Kuwayama, Sh. (1999) Historical Notes on Kāpiśī and Kābul in the Sixth-Eighth Centuries. *Zinbun* 34, pp. 25–77.
- Kuwayama, Sh. (2002) *Across the Hindukush of the First Millennium.* Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University.
- Lee, J. & N. Sims-Williams (2003) The Antiquities and Inscription of Tang-e Safedak. *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* 9, pp. 159–184.
- Maróth, M. (1990) Die politische Geographie Afghanistans im 7.–8. Jahrhundert. In: Harmatta, J. (ed.) *From Alexander the Great to Kül Tegin*, Budapest, pp. 133–137.
- Marquart, J. (1901) *Ērānšahr nach der Geographie des Ps. Moses Xorenac'i.* Berlin.
- Marquart, J. & M. J. de Groot (1915) Das Reich Zabul und der Got Žūn vom 6.–9. Jahrhundert. In: Weil, G. (ed.) *Festschrift Eduard Sachau*, Berlin, pp. 248–292.
- Minorsky, V. (1940) The Turkish Dialect of the Khalaj. *BSOS* 10(2), pp. 417–437.
- Minorsky, V. (tr.) (1955) *Abū Dulaf Mis'ar ibn Muhalhil's Travels in Iran (circa A.D. 950).* Cairo.
- Minorsky, V. (tr.) (1982) *Hudūd al-'Ālam: The Regions of the World.* (2nd ed.), Cambridge.
- Mori, M. (1967) *Historical Studies of the Ancient Turkic People I.* Tokyo. (Japanese)
- Moriyasu, T. (1977) A propos des tribus de l'Asie Centrale qui se trouvent dans les sources tibétaines: DRU-GU et HOR. *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 14, pp. 1–48. (Japanese)
- Muhammad b. Najīb Bakrān, *Jahān-nāma.* ed. Riyahi, M. A., Tehran, 1963.
- Palumbo, A. (2001) La «Scrittura di Laozi che converte i barbari». Sincretismo e conflitto ideologico in un ciclo di letteratura religiosa della Cina medievale. Ph.D.

THE IDENTITY OF THE TURKISH RULERS

Dissertation (Istituto Universitario Orientale, Napoli).

- Petech, L. (1964) Notes su Kāpiśi e Zābul. *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 39(4), pp. 287–294.
- Pritsak, O. (1951) Von den Karluk zu den Karachaniden. *ZDMG* 101, pp. 270–300.
- Rehman, A. (1988) *The Last Two Dynasties of the Śāhis*. (reprint), New Delhi.
- Shiratori, K. (1970) Shina Hondo Shuui Shominzoku. *Shiratori Kurakichi Zenshu* 4, Tokyo, pp. 549–739. (Japanese)
- Sims-Williams, N. (1997) *New Light on Ancient Afghanistan*. School of Oriental and African Studies, London University.
- Sims-Williams, N. (2000) *Bactrian Documents from Northern Afghanistan* I. Oxford.
- Sims-Williams, N. (2002) Ancient Afghanistan and Its Invaders: Linguistic Evidence from the Bactrian Documents and Inscriptions. In: Sims-Williams, N. (ed.) *Indo-Iranian Languages and Peoples*, Oxford, pp. 225–242.
- al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh al-Rusul wa al-Mulūk*. ed. de Goeje, M. J., Leiden, 1879–1901.
- Uchida, G. (1965) Tou Kousou Chokusen Saiikishi Kouroku. *Kenkyu (Kobe Daigaku Bungakukai)* 35, pp. 140–149. (Japanese)
- Verardi, G. & E. Paparatti (2004) *Buddhist Caves of Jāghūrī and Qarabāgh-e Ghaznī, Afghanistan*. IsIAO-Rome.
- al-Yāqūt, *Mu'jam al-Buldān*. 5 Vols., Beirut, 1984.
- Yoshida, Y. (2000[2003]) Review: NICHOLAS SIMS-WILLIAMS. *Bactrian Documents from Northern Afghanistan* I: Legal and Economic Document. Studies in the Khalili Collection, Vol. 3. CIIr. Pt. 2, *Inscriptions of the Seleucid and Parthian Periods and of Eastern Iran and Central Asia*. Vol. 4, Bactrian. *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 14, pp. 154–159.