

EDITORIAL BOARD

Denis Twitchett†

Ch'en Jo-shui

Chu Hung-lam

Nicola Di Cosmo

Joseph Esherick

Huang Chin-shing

Hsing I-tien

Hsu Cho-yun

Wilt Idema

John Kieschnick

Lee Jen-der

Susan Naquin

Willard J. Peterson

William T. Rowe

Stephen F. Teiser

Hoyt Cleveland Tillman

Wang Ming-Ke

Yü Ying-shih

EDITOR

Jeng-Guo S. Chen (Academia Sinica)

Asia Major, Third Series (issued semi-annually), is published by the Institute of History and Philology of the Academia Sinica, Taiwan. It is a continuation of *Asia Major*, New Series, published in England from 1949 to 1975. It covers all periods of Chinese history, literature, ideas, and culture in general. Included are the histories and cultures of other East, South, and Central Asian peoples in their relations with China.

SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

Upper limit is 65 typescript pages, total (using MS Word). Both main text and notes must be double-spaced. All citations must be complete, and all text complete.

Include Chinese (standard form only, no simplified characters) and Japanese directly in the text. With various exceptions, we require the Pinyin system for transliteration. Full publication data are required at the first citation of a work; thereafter short titles may be used. Frequently cited sources may be given acronymic abbreviations; please supply a list. The typescript should be submitted as e-mail attachment with an abstract. Please include a cover letter with your postal address and e-mail address, but make sure that your name does not appear in the text itself.

Send the submittal, abstract, and cover letter to the Editor:

amajor@mail.ihp.sinica.edu.tw

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND BACK ISSUES

All inquires and orders by mail are addressed to Sheridan Press, PO Box 465, Hanover, PA, 17331, USA. Telephone inquires: (717) 632-3535; ask for Subscription Services.

Subscription Service may also be reached by E-mail at pubsvc.tsp@sheridan.com. All payments must be made payable to "THE SHERIDAN PRESS" with clear indication for ordering *Asia Major*.

Subscription rates per volume-year (two-issues):

\$45 (\$80 for two yrs.) for individuals; \$30 students (to academic address, no 2-yr. discount); \$115 Institutions and Libraries (no 2-yr. discount). Add \$4 per vol.-yr outside U.S. and Canada.

Back issues:

Back issues of the Third Series (since 1988) are \$20 per item (shipping adds \$4 per order for domestic; \$8 for domestic express or overseas surface); 20% reduction for full sets, or 30 or more books.

Asia Major is now included in JSTOR

Please see our website for further information:

<http://www.ihp.sinica.edu.tw/~asiamajor/>

PERMISSIONS

Write directly to *Asia Major*, Editor, Academia Sinica, Institute of History and Philology, Nankang 11529 Taipei, TAIWAN, R.O.C.

E-mail: amajor@mail.ihp.sinica.edu.tw

JOURNAL AND COLLECTANEA ABBREVIATIONS USED BY *ASIA MAJOR*

<i>AM</i>	<i>Asia Major</i>	<i>OE</i>	<i>Oriens Extremus</i>
<i>AO</i>	<i>Archiv Orientalni</i>	<i>QHXB</i>	<i>Tsinghua Journal</i>
<i>AOASH</i>	<i>Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae</i>	<i>SR</i>	<i>Shirin</i>
<i>BEFEO</i>	<i>Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient</i>	<i>SZ</i>	<i>Shigaku zasshi</i>
<i>BIHP</i>	<i>Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology (Academia Sinica)</i>	<i>TASJ</i>	<i>Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan</i>
<i>BMFEA</i>	<i>Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities</i>	<i>THGH</i>	<i>Tōhō gakuho</i>
<i>BSOAS</i>	<i>Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies</i>	<i>TP</i>	<i>T'oung pao</i>
<i>CAJ</i>	<i>Central Asiatic Journal</i>	<i>TS</i>	<i>Tōhō shūkyō</i>
<i>CEA</i>	<i>Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie</i>	<i>TSK</i>	<i>Tōyōshi kenkyū</i>
<i>EC</i>	<i>Early China</i>	<i>TYGH (Kyoto) or (Tokyo)</i>	<i>Tōyō gakuho</i>
<i>EMC</i>	<i>Early Medieval China</i>	<i>WSZ</i>	<i>Wenshizhe</i>
<i>FEQ</i>	<i>Far Eastern Quarterly</i>	<i>WSZXB</i>	<i>Wenshizhe xuebao</i>
<i>HJAS</i>	<i>Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies</i>	<i>WW</i>	<i>Wenwu</i>
<i>JA</i>	<i>Journal asiatique</i>	<i>YJXB</i>	<i>Yenching Journal of Chinese Studies</i>
<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>	<i>ZDMG</i>	<i>Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i>
<i>JAS</i>	<i>Journal of Asian Studies</i>		
<i>JRAS</i>	<i>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society</i>		
<i>KG</i>	<i>Kaogu</i>		
<i>LSYJ</i>	<i>Lishi yanjiu</i>		
<i>MCB</i>	<i>Melanges chinois et bouddhiques</i>		
<i>MN</i>	<i>Monumenta Nipponica</i>		
<i>MS</i>	<i>Monumenta Serica</i>		
<i>MTB</i>	<i>Memoirs of the Research Department of Toyo Bunko</i>		

The following are standard collectanea abbreviations:

<i>CSJC</i>	<i>Congshu jicheng</i>
<i>DZ</i>	<i>Daozang</i>
<i>SBBY</i>	<i>Sibu beiyao</i>
<i>SBCK</i>	<i>Sibu congkan</i>
<i>SKQS</i>	<i>Siku quanshu</i>
<i>SSJZS</i>	<i>Shisanjing zhushu</i>
<i>T</i>	<i>Taishō shinshū daizōkyō</i>

ASIA MAJOR

THIRD SERIES • VOLUME XXXII • PART I • 2019

Table of Contents

Hairstyle and Headgear Transgressions, and the Concept of <i>Fuyao</i> (Ornamentation Anomaly) in Early China REBECCA DORAN	I
Representations of Descent: Origin and Migration Stories of the Ninth- and Tenth-century Turkic Shatuo MADDALENA BARENGHI	53
The Great Kingdom of Eternal Peace: Buddhist Kingship in Tenth-Century Dali MEGAN BRYSON	87
A Geographic History of Song-Dynasty Chan Buddhism: The Decline of the Yunmen Lineage JASON PROTASS	113

MADDALENA BARENGHI

Representations of Descent: Origin and Migration Stories of the Ninth- and Tenth-century Turkic Shatuo

ABSTRACT:

Modern scholarship has explored aspects of the origin stories of the Shatuo. The latter were the military elite of Turkic extraction who dominated northern China in the second half of the ninth century and built the foundation of four of the northern regimes of the first half of the tenth. This article compares three specific origin stories that differ significantly: 1. the entombed epitaph of Li Keyong (856–907); 2. the *Jiu Wudai shi*'s chapter “Wuhuang ji” (“Basic Annals of the Martial Emperor [Li Keyong]”); and 3. the “Shatuo liezhuan” (“Shatuo Memoir”), namely, chapter 218 of *Xin Tang shu*. The primary argument here is that each of these narratives has uniquely reassessed Li Keyong's historical role and political legitimacy. Moreover, the article questions the narrative of the alleged southeastward migration of the Shatuo–Zhuxie from territories northwest of Beiting to Hedong during the second half of the eighth century and early-ninth century, arguing that this narrative was enhanced in the “Shatuo liezhuan” as a means to create an image of the Shatuo as “subjugated barbarians.”

KEYWORDS:

Shatuo, Li Keyong, Chinese historiography, funerary biography, epitaph, migration, Turkic peoples, medieval elite, Hedong

INTRODUCTION

Yao Runeng's 姚如能 early-ninth-century *An Lushan shiji* 安祿山事迹 (*Deeds of An Lushan*) states that:¹

The Hexi and Longyou military governor and prince of the peaceful west Geshu Han was made vice-commander; he had control over all the non-Chinese units of the He and Long region: the Nula, the Xiedie, the Zhuxie, the Qibi, the Hun, the Dailin, the Xijie, the Shatuo, the Pengzi, the Chumi, the Tuyuhun, and the Sijie,² [in all]

► Maddalena Barengi, Institut für Sinologie, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität

I WANT to thank *Asia Major*'s two anonymous reviewers for their valuable suggestions. I am also grateful to Shao-yun Yang, Hans van Ess, Yuri Pines, and Alexis Lycas for their insightful remarks on various versions of the manuscript.

¹ Edwin G. Pulleyblank, “The *Tzjyjh Tongjiann Kaoyih* and the Sources for the History of the Period 730–763,” *BSOAS* 13 (1950), pp. 448–73, here 460 ff.

² These are names of Tegreg/Tiele 鐵勒 groupings. For the sake of this article I have only provided the romanization of the names in the translation. Xiedie 頡跌 appears in the Chinese

thirteen units; he was the superintendent in charge of 208,000 men of the foreign and Han troops and stationed [them] at the Tong Pass. 以河西、隴右節度使、西平王哥舒翰爲副元帥，領河、隴諸蕃部落奴刺、頡、跌、朱邪、契苾、渾、躡林、奚結、沙陀、蓬子、處蜜、吐谷渾、思結等十三部落，督蕃漢兵二十一萬八千人，鎮于潼關。³

The event this excerpt refers to, namely, the control of Tong Pass 潼關 by the Tang general of Turko-Khotanese descent Geshu Han 哥舒翰 (d. 757), with his army of mostly foreign 蕃 troops who faced An Lushan 安祿山 (d. 757) in 755,⁴ is very well documented; moreover, *An Lushan shiji* does not add any relevant details.⁵ It does include a list of the thirteen units that constituted Geshu Han's troops. Among them were two distinct units, the Zhuxie 朱邪 and the Shatuo 沙陀, names that became associated with a single kinship group called the Shatuo-Zhuxie in tenth- to eleventh-century sources: Shatuo served as a designation of geographical origin and Zhuxie as a surname or appellation. Leaving aside the questions concerning the reliability of *An Lushan shiji*,⁶ this brief mention is indeed one of the earliest references to the Shatuo and Zhuxie.

The first extensive accounts of the Turkic Shatuo are to be found in the historical records of the tenth century. Transmitted and excavated sources attest to a Shatuo settlement, originally a unit of the empire-

source as a variant of Edie 阿跌 (Àdiz); see James Hamilton, *Les Ouighours à l'époque des Cinq Dynasties d'après les documents chinois* (Paris: Imprimerie National, Presses Universitaires de France, 1955), pp. 1–2, n. 2. Dailin 躡林 refers to Dailin prefecture 躡林州, a “loose-rein” prefecture established by Taizong 太宗 (r. 976–997) for the Tegreg grouping Abusi 阿布施; see Liu Xu 劉昫 (888–947) et al., *Jiu Tang shu* 舊唐書 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1975; hereafter, *JTS*) 195, p. 5196. For a general discussion on the Tegreg groupings, see: Jonathan Skaff, *Sui-Tang China and Its Turko-Mongol Neighbors: Culture, Power, and Connections, 580–800* (Oxford: Oxford U.P., 2012), p. 37, n. 2; Peter Golden, “The Migration of the Oghuz,” *Archivum Ottomanicum* 4 (1972), pp. 45–84; idem, *An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples: Ethnogenesis and State Formation in Medieval and Early Modern Eurasia and the Middle East* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1992), pp. 142 ff; and Edwin G. Pulleyblank, “Some Remarks on the Toquz-Oghuz Problem,” *Ural-Altische Jahrbücher* 28 (1956), pp. 35–42.

³ Yao Runeng and Miao Quansun 繆荃孫 (1844–1919), *An Lushan shiji*, in *Xuxiu siku quanshu* 續修四庫全書 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1995), vol. 550, p. 13; see also Sima Guang 司馬光 (1019–1086), *Zizhi tongjian* 資治通鑑 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1956 [rpt. 2010]; hereafter cited as *ZZTJ*) 217, p. 6943.

⁴ Zhang Qun 章群, *Tang dai fanjiang yanjiu* 唐代蕃將研究 (Taipei: Lianjing, 1986), pp. 266 ff.

⁵ According to Edwin Pulleyblank's reconstruction, *An Lushan shiji* was based on the same sources used in the compilation of the biography of An Lushan in *Jiu Tang shu*, mainly *Suzong shilu* 肅宗實錄 (“The *Izzyh Tongjiann Kaoyih*,” p. 61; see also idem, *The Background of the Rebellion of An Lu-shan* [London: Oxford U.P., 1955], pp. 3 ff).

⁶ Zhang Qun maintains that here the text is incorrect and that Shatuo and Zhuxie refer to the same group (Zhang, *Tang dai fanjiang yanjiu*, p. 266); see also Huang Yingshi 黃英士, “Shatuo de zushu ji qi zushi” 沙陀的族屬及其族史, *Deming xuebao* 德明學報 14.2 (2010), p. 56.

founding Western Turks, from as early as the first half of the seventh century in the region north of Beiting 北庭 protectorate (*duhu fu* 都護府) and Ting prefecture 庭州, whose township is also known by its Turkic name Beshbalik (in present-day Jimsar county, Xinjiang).⁷ The Chinese sources say that they were organized into *buluo* 部落, a term that is conventionally translated as “tribe” or “tribal confederation.” As recent scholarship has aptly pointed out, *buluo* is used in the Chinese official sources to refer to both the social and administrative structure of the steppe regimes,⁸ as well as the units of Turko-Mongol settlements under Tang emperor Taizong’s 太宗 (r. 626–649) so-called “loose rein” (*jimi* 羈縻) system of protected prefectures and area commands. This wording distinguished the steppe structures from Tang “regular prefectures.”⁹ Christopher Atwood proposes the more suitable solution of translating *buluo* as “local followings” or “militia settlement,” which confers the idea that until the late-medieval period, the term *bu* 部 in the Chinese sources “was used in the sense of a body of armed men, a military (or bandit) unit under one leader. *Luo* 落 was meant in the sense of a sedentary or semi-sedentary small village or large camp.”¹⁰

⁷ Fan Wenli 樊文禮, *Li Keyong pingzhuan* 李克用評傳 (Jinan: Shandong daxue chubanshe, 2005; hereafter, Fan), pp. 5 ff; Christopher P. Atwood, “The Notion of Tribe in Medieval China: Ouyang Xiu and the Shatuo Dynastic Myth,” in Denise Aigle, Isabelle Charleux et al., eds., *Miscellanea Asiatica: Festschrift in Honour of François Aubin* (Sankt Augustin: Institut Monumenta Serica, 2010), p. 601.

⁸ The Chinese medieval sources use a variety of terms to indicate the nomadic and semi-nomadic sociocultural and political units of the steppe peoples (*bu* 部, *luo* 落, *buluo* 部落, *buzuo* 部族, *zhong* 眾, *xing* 姓), all of which are generally and somewhat improperly translated with the English term “tribe.” (In particular, the single words *bu*, *luo* and *zu* have connotations that cannot be rendered with the term “tribe.”) Jonathan Skaff contends that “the term must be taken critically, yet medieval Turkic usage supports retention of the term to describe socio-political units of nomads” (*Sui-Tang China*, p. 33, n. 9). For a discussion on the meaning of *buluo* and “tribe,” see also Ildikó Ecsedy, “Tribe and Tribal Society in the 6th Century Turk Empire,” *AOSH* 25 (1972), pp. 245–62, and Mihály Dobrovits, “The Thirty Tribes of the Turks,” *AOSH* 57.3 (2004), pp. 257–62. *Buluo* is also the Chinese word used in Dunhuang manuscripts to refer to the military units of 1,000 households in which the population of Sha-zhou 沙州 was divided after its conquest in 762–765; Gertraud Taenzer, *The Dunhuang Region during Tibetan Rule (787–848): A Study of the Secular Manuscripts Discovered in the Mogao Caves* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2012), pp. 50 ff. Christopher Atwood believes that it was with the historiographical sources produced at the court of the 10th-c. Shatuo rulers that *buzuo* 部族 came into use as a substitution for *buluo*, thus conforming “their own Zhuxie ancestry to the Chinese idea of the multigenerational corporate lineage of officials” (Atwood, “Notion of Tribe,” pp. 608 ff), which in his analysis reflected “a new conception of barbarian society as based on descent groups” (p. 595). Atwood continues, stating that in Chinese sources the term *buzuo* in fact first appears in the 10th c., precisely in *Jiu Tang shu*, which was produced at the court of the Shatuo Later Jin 後晉 (936–947), and suggests that the occurrences of the term in *Jiu Wudai shi* 舊五代史 “raise the possibility that the binome *buzuo* was coined as a way to describe the adherents to the Shatuo cause in a respectably kin-based way” (pp. 610 ff).

⁹ Skaff, *Sui-Tang China*, pp. 61 ff.

¹⁰ Atwood adds that only in later times would *buluo* be used to refer to nomads and that “the *buluo* is indeed seen as different from Chinese administrative units, but the ethnographic

According to the eleventh-century *New Tang History* (*Xin Tang shu* 新唐書), over the final decades of the eighth century the conquest of China's Western Regions by the Tibetan empire led to an eastern migration by the Shatuo, acting as head of other Turkic and Central Asian units. At the beginning of the ninth century, the Tang court moved the Shatuo and other settlements to the defensive zone of Guanzhong 關中. The Turkic military clique was subsequently relocated to northern Hedong 河東 as part of the army of the military governor, and the settlements were divided into different prefectures. The story of the alleged migration east is part of the origin story of the Shatuo as narrated in chapter 218 of the *New Tang History* that was titled "Shatuo liezhuan" 沙陀列傳 ("Memoir on the Shatuo," and referred to for convenience as "Shatuo Memoir," occasionally "Memoir").¹¹

It is notable that this migration is not mentioned in the *Old Tang History* (*Jiu Tang shu* 舊唐書),¹² nor in sources prior to the tenth century. The first appearance of the Shatuo in this standard history is dated to the end of the first decade of the ninth century, during the Yuanhe 元和 era (806–820) of Tang Xianzong's 憲宗 (r. 805–820) reign, when Turkic units became an integral part of the defense system of the Tang regional military command of the north and northwestern frontier.¹³

descriptions associated with the earliest use of these terms highlight not the idea of kinship (vs. territoriality) or common (vs. individual) property, but the fusion of military leadership with civil leadership" ("Notion of Tribe," pp. 594 ff).

¹¹ Song Qi 宋祁 (998–1061), Ouyang Xiu 歐陽修 (1007–1072) et al., *Xin Tang shu* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1975; hereafter, *XTS*).

¹² *Jiu Tang shu* was produced at the court of the Shatuo Later Jin, first under the patronage of Shi Jingtang 石敬瑭 (Gaozu 高祖, r. 936–942) and subsequently under the reign of his son, Shi Chonggui 石重貴 (r. 924–946). Its compilation is attributed to Liu Xu 劉昫 (888–947), although most of the work was done by the historian Zhang Zhaoyuan 張昭遠 (j.s. 877) and the court diarist Jia Wei 賈緯 (d. 952). On the compilation of *Jiu Tang shu*, see Denis Twitchett, *The Writing of Official History under the Tang* (Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 1992), pp. 160 ff.

¹³ It has already been remarked by previous scholarship that Chinese institutional and geographical sources traditionally showed only a marginal interest in borderland communities and tended to treat borderland non-Chinese communities only in their function as components of the Tang defensive system. (The formulaic definition of the role of foreign military elites, "employing [surrendered] barbarians to defend the frontiers *yi yi shou bian* 以夷守邊," summarizes what sources have to say about them.) This disinterest is mirrored, e.g., in Du You's 杜佑 (735–812) preface to his comprehensive compendium *Tongdian* 通典, compiled at the beginning of the ninth century. In naming the institutional and administrative priorities of the state, Du lists as primal the "financial administration" (*shihuo* 食貨) and "selection by examination" (*xuanju* 選舉), and as last the "local administration" (*zhoujun* 州郡) and "border defense" (*bianfang* 邊防). Even in the geographical work commissioned by Xianzong and compiled by Li Jifu 李吉甫 (758–814), namely, *Yuanhe junxian tuzhi* 元和郡縣圖志, which aimed at recovering knowledge and control over the provinces, there is but a vague treatment of the old Turkic family clans that controlled the prefectures of former Anbei 安北 and Chanyu 單于 protectorates in northern Hedong (Li Jifu, *Yuanhe junxian tuzhi* [Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1933] 4, p.

As will be discussed in more detail in the present article, this context might suggest that the narrative of the migration originated within a historiographical project undertaken by Mingzong 明宗 (r. 926–933), the second Shatuo emperor of the Later Tang dynasty.

The migration east can be argued to have taken place in several waves, rather than one single migration. But more importantly, several textual elements suggest a complex picture in which multiple settlements existed under the name of Shatuo in different parts of northern and northwestern China. Shatuo settlement units that joined the imperial troops may have already relocated to the northern border region and to northern Hedong in the aftermath of the An Lushan rebellion.

Throughout the ninth century, the dominant Shatuo military clans consolidated their power over the northern borderlands of Daibei 代北, in northern Hedong. The Shatuo came to dominate the heterogeneous non-Chinese elites, which included Sogdian, Tangut, and Qarluq groups, and became an integral part of the northern ruling elites, adopting some of the social conventions and aspects of the capital elites. Furthermore, they accumulated military titles and administrative responsibilities in the local communities.¹⁴

Zhuxie Chixin 朱邪赤心 (d. 887),¹⁵ for example, was awarded the title of great protector-general of Chanyu 單于大都護 and military governor of Zhenwu 振武軍節度使,¹⁶ in the second half of the ninth cen-

21a; see also Lin Bao 林寶, annot. Cen Zhongmian 岑仲勉, *Yuanhe xinzuan fu si jiaoji* 元和姓纂附四校記 [Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1948] 1, pp. 578 ff].

¹⁴ This article is limited to the history of the Shatuo until the beginning of the ninth century; it thus does not deal with the events concerning the hegemonic power exerted over Hedong by the Shatuo-Lis throughout the second half of the century, a topic that will be the object of a future study. On this subject, see Zhang, *Tang dai fanjiang yanjiu*, pp. 324 ff; Fan; and especially Nishimura Yoko's 西田祐子 extensive work on the subject: "Tōmatsu Godai no Daihoku ni okeru Sada shūdan no naibu kōzō to Daihoku suiunshi: 'Keihitsu Tsū boshimei' no bunseki wo chūshin toshite" 唐末五代の代北における沙陀集團の内部構造と代北水運使, "契 [ヒツ] 通墓誌銘"の分析を中心として, *Nairiku Ajiashi kenkyū* 内陸アジア史研究 23 (2008), pp. 1–24; "Tōmatsu 'Shi Mo boshimei' to Sada no dōkō: kyū seiki no Daihoku chiiiki" 唐末 "支謨墓誌銘"と沙陀の動向, 九世紀の代北地域, *SZ* 118.4 (2009), pp. 513–50; and "Tō kōhan kahoku Shohanchin no Tetsuroku shūdan: Sadakei ōchō seiritsu no haikai" 唐後半華北諸藩鎮の鐵勒集團, 沙陀系王朝成立の背景, *TSK* 74.4 (2016), pp. 678–715.

¹⁵ As noted by Michael Drompp, the name Chixin, which literally means "red-hearted," appears as the personal name or official title of non-Chinese figures in several sources. For more details, see Michael R. Drompp, *Tang China and the Collapse of the Uighur Empire: A Documentary History* (Leiden, Boston: E.J. Brill, 2005), p. 41, n. 6.

¹⁶ Ouyang Xiu 歐陽修 (1007–1072), *Xin Wudai shi* 新五代史 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974 [rpt. 2011]; hereafter, *XWDS*) 4, p. 31; *XTS* 75B, p. 3453, has Dabeī military governor 代北節度使, the "Shatuo Memoir" records that Chixin was first named military governor of Fu and Yan 鄭延節度使 (*XTS*, 218, p. 6155). On the creation of the protector-general of Chanyu, and the protectorate system see Swee Fo Lai, "Tang Military and Defense System," Ph.D. diss. (Princeton University, 1986), pp. 98 ff.

tury, for his having suppressed the military mutiny of Pang Xun 龐勳 (d. 869);¹⁷ the Tang court would later also bestow upon him the imperial surname Li 李 and formally register his family clan as one of the branches of the imperial family that traced its lineage to Tang Gaozu 高祖 (r. 618–626). Sources claim that a genealogical record of the Shatuo kinship group (*zongji* 宗籍) was subsequently created.¹⁸ In the late-Tang period, his son Li Keyong 李克用 (856–907) reached the high-ranking position of grand preceptor (*taishi* 太師), and Ouyang Xiu 歐陽修 (1007–1072) includes him and two generations of ancestors in his “Genealogical Table of Grand Councilors” (“Zaixiang shixi biao” 宰相世系表; see table 3, appended below) as belonging to the Daibeili 代北李 family clan.

Following the conferral of the imperial surname, “the next generations of Li grew in importance and the barbarians considered the Shatuo as being of noble stock 李氏後大, 而夷狄之人遂以沙陀為貴種云,” as reported by Ouyang Xiu. The latter also stated that the clan of Zhuxie Chixin, now Li Guochang 李國昌 (literally “Glory of the State”), acquired prestige among the peoples in the north thanks to the family’s new imperial surname.¹⁹ By the late-Tang period, however, bestowing the imperial surname as a form of political adoption had become common practice.²⁰ As Richard Davis notes with regard to the Shatuo Li family clan, this practice “acquired an added layer of cultural meaning as the Shatuo leaders became a symbolic extension of the ruling family and assumed its titles and offices.”²¹

¹⁷ *ZZTJ* 251, p. 8150.

¹⁸ Li Keyong’s father was registered as a member of the branch of the family descended from the prince of Zheng 鄭王, Li Yuanyi 李元懿, one of Gaozu’s sons; see Wang Pu 王溥 (922–982), *Tang huiyao* 唐會要 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1991) 65, p. 1141.

¹⁹ *XWDS* 4, p. 40. My translation is adapted from that of Richard Davis, *Historical Records of the Five Dynasties* (New York: Columbia U.P., 2004), p. 39. On another occasion, Ouyang Xiu reports that, since the barbarians regarded the Shatuo as being noble, some individuals would declare that they are of Shatuo extraction (*XWDS* 46, p. 515).

²⁰ On the practice of bestowing the imperial surname as “another means by which emperors sought to increase the size of the patrimonial political family,” see Skaff, *Sui-Tang China*, pp. 235 ff. The biographies in the dynastic histories record many cases in which the Tang court bestowed the imperial surname on Chinese and non-Chinese individuals. The histories of some of the most influential of these families who prospered during late Tang are grouped into the “Shixi liezhuan” 世襲列傳 section of *Jiu Wudai shi* 舊五代史, alternatively titled “Chengxi liezhuan” 承襲列傳 in the reconstruction of Chen Shangjun 陳尚君, *Jiu Wudai shi xinji huizheng* 舊五代史新輯會證 (Shanghai: Fudan daxue chubanshe, 2005; hereafter cited as Chen), vol. 11, pp. 4035–51. Two of the most important ones are those of the family clans of Li Maozhen 李茂貞 (856–924), military governor of Fengxiang 鳳翔, and the Tangut Li Renfu 李仁福 (d. 933), military governor of Dingnan 定南, whose family claimed descent from the Xianbei rulers of the Northern Wei 北魏 (386–534).

²¹ Davis, *Historical Records*, p. 11.

It is notable that the *Old Tang History* and the *Old Five Dynasties History* (*Jiu Wudai shi* 舊五代史) do not describe the Shatuo as a neatly defined elite group characterized by (real or forged) kinship relations in any way. This is in contrast with the attempt in the eleventh century to outline a “Shatuo identity” in a clearer way. In the last lines of the biography of Kang Fu 康福, a minor official presumably of Sogdian origins who served at the Later Tang court, Ouyang Xiu reports the following anecdote:

Fu’s ancestors were originally barbarian: as the barbarians considered the Shatuo to be of noble stock, he always said of himself that he was a Shatuo. One time, when Fu was suffering from a disease and lying down in his bedroom, an attendant entered the room to ask about his condition and saw his colorfully patterned coverlet. They looked at each other, and he [the attendant] took the liberty of joking by saying: “That patterned coverlet is worn-down indeed!” Hearing this, Fu angrily said: “I am of Shatuo stock, how can you call me a Xi?” Those who heard this story laughed at it.²²

福世本夷狄，夷狄貴沙陀，故常自言沙陀種也。福嘗有疾臥閣中，寮佐入問疾，見其錦衾，相顧竊戲曰：“錦衾爛兮！”福聞之，怒曰：“我沙陀種也，安得謂我爲奚？”聞者笑之。²³

Recent scholarship has highlighted the way in which the sources of Shatuo history are markedly inconsistent in their representations of descent.²⁴ Some researchers have aptly pointed out that these differences reflect contrasting political agendas.²⁵ However, whereas the “Shatuo Memoir” (“Shatuo liezhuan”) chapter of the *New Tang History* has been read mostly as a source of reliable factual information – in contrast to the fabricated account provided in the chapter of the *Old Five Dynasties History* titled “Wuhuang ji” 武皇紀 (or, “Martial Emperor’s

²² Kang Fu misunderstands the archaic exclamatory particle *xi* 兮 as the ethnonym Xi 奚 (Qay). His ignorance of literary Chinese and his ethnic snobbery were laughed at by those who heard the story. I am grateful to Shao-yun Yang for pointing this out to me.

²³ *XWDS* 46, p. 515.

²⁴ Fan, and idem, “Zai lun Tang mo Wudai Daibeijituan de chengli” 再论唐末五代代北集团的成立, *Tantai daxue xuebao* 3 (2014), pp. 90–99; Huang Shuwen 黃淑雯, “Shatuo zaoqi lishi yu dong qian Daibeijituan kaoshu” 沙陀早期歷史與東遷代北考述, *Kainan daxue tongzhi jiaoyu zhongxin* 開南大學通識教育中心 6 (2009), pp. 115–32; Huang, “Shatuo de zushu ji qi zu shi,” pp. 49–76; Li Fang 李方, *Tang Xizhou xingzheng tizhi kaolun* 唐西州行政体制考论 (Harbin: Heilongjiang jiaoyu chubanshe, 2002).

²⁵ Atwood, “Notion of Tribe.” On Ouyang Xiu’s critical stance, see also Xin Wen, “What’s in a Surname? Central Asian Participation in the Culture of Naming of Medieval China,” *Tang Studies* 34.1 (2016), pp. 97–98.

Annals”) – little attention has been given to its function as a narrative interpretation of the Shatuo’s early history.²⁶

The present article attempts to shed some light on questions concerning the function of the “Shatuo Memoir.” How does it relate to what it seeks to represent? Despite its title and its location within the *New Tang History*, the Memoir is mostly an account of two generations of the Shatuo Daibei Li – Li Guochang and Li Keyong – during the second half of the ninth century, when they each reached the high-ranking position of military governor in the Tang provincial system: out of the more than 7,000 characters contained in it, about 5,000 are dedicated to the deeds of these two figures. The remaining characters, which form the beginning of the chapter, provide a sketchy account of Shatuo individuals, purporting to follow a line of succession that covers two hundred years from the second half of the seventh century to the early-ninth century. It can be argued that the “Shatuo Memoir” draws a clear line of distinction between late-medieval Tang elites and the Shatuo Li by framing the latter as culturally and politically closer to foreign peoples (namely, Turks, Tibetans, and Uighurs) precisely because of where the chapter is positioned in the *New Tang History*. The latter’s arrangement of the relevant sections in fact separates the Shatuo from the Tang elites: “Shatuo Memoir” 沙陀列傳 (chapter 218) is positioned *after* “Tujue Memoir” 突厥列傳 (chapter 215), “Tufan Memoir” 吐蕃列傳 (chapter 216) and “Huihu Memoir” 回鶻列傳 (chapter 217). (See table 1, opposite.) Such textual positioning in the *New Tang History*, along with its representation of the Shatuo’s alleged southeastward migration from the northwestern territories to Daibei, can be argued as having constituted a reassessment of Li Keyong’s role and position in the course of the dynasty’s history. The present article argues that the narrative of the “Shatuo Memoir” reassesses the role of the northern military elites of non-Han extraction by reframing their ancestral history to be located at the margins of the Tang institutions. To a broader extent, the Memoir indicates a general historiographical shift to an exclusivist approach towards the role of non-Chinese elites in the Tang empire that reflects the eleventh-century need to define clear conceptual and cultural boundaries between what was a core part of the Chinese empire and what was at its margins.

²⁶ The understanding of epigraphic and historiographic sources as narrative representations (or “organizations of knowledge”), in which the Shatuo portrayed their ancestral memory and were portrayed by later historians, is enriched by and borrows from the notion of historicism and historical narrative developed by F. R. Ankersmit, *History and Tropology: The Rise and Fall of Metaphor* (Berkeley: U. California P., 1994), pp. 33–43. This article seeks “historical

Table 1: Arrangement of Chapters on Foreign Peoples in the Two Tang Histories(Numerals refer to the chapter numbers given in each *History*.)

OLD TANG HISTORY	NEW TANG HISTORY
突厥 194	突厥 215
迴紇 195	吐蕃 216
吐蕃 196	回鶻 217
南蠻, 西南蠻 197	沙陀 218
西戎 198	北狄 219
東夷 199	東夷 220
北狄 200	西域 221
	南蠻 222

LI KEYONG'S FUNERARY AND STANDARD-HISTORY BIOGRAPHIES

The tenth-century historical accounts of the Shatuo are largely a product of historiographical projects patronized by Shatuo rulers,²⁷ or by other rulers whose sovereignty was built on support from Shatuo military forces. The picture these accounts provide of the Shatuo as historical agents is blatantly biased, and the claims of descent are most certainly fabricated. One particular matter, however, is made transparent, namely, the Shatuo's Turkic origins. Christopher Atwood argues that "the emphasis of the Zhuxie on their Turk ancestry was probably a response to the extreme heterogeneity of the Shatuo, within which Iranian (Hu 胡) elements actually predominated, in number if not in status."²⁸ At the same time, the Shatuo emphasized that they had served as area commanders (*dudu* 都督) in the region of Beiting since the beginning of the Tang, without interruption. It may be argued that the combination of being both non-Chinese and having a pedigree within the respected ranks of officialdom was valued across borders among

insight" by comparing the different interpretations of the past, and only to a lesser degree it deals with ascertaining the truth of historical facts.

²⁷ The board involved in its production included Li Fang 李昉 (925–996) and his team of fellow historians, Lu Duoxun 盧多遜 (934–985), Hu Meng 扈蒙 (915–986), and Zhang Dan 張澹 (919–974), among others, and was supervised by the minister Xue Juzheng 薛居正 (912–981). *Jiu Wudai shi* was compiled in less than two years; Li Fang and his co-workers brought the Veritable Records together section by section without too much editing; see Wang Gung-wu, "The *Chiu Wu-tai shih* and History-writing during the Five Dynasties." *AM* ns 6.1 (1957), pp. 1–22. On the early-Song compilation of standard histories, see Johannes Kurz, "The Consolidation of Official Historiography during the Early Northern Song Dynasty," *Journal of Asian History* 46.1 (2012), pp. 13–35.

²⁸ Atwood, "Notion of Tribe," p. 612.

potential allies in neighboring states. At the same time, by depicting their family members as loyal officials in the Tang administrative system, the Shatuo defined themselves as culturally akin to the Tang elites. Their definition of a patrilineal family line thus functioned to affirm the prestige of their uninterrupted service.

The funerary biography of Li Keyong, an epitaph (hereafter referred to as “Li Keyong Epitaph”) presumably written shortly before or after his death in 907,²⁹ identifies the progenitor of the clan as “Lord of the Xue–Yantuo (Sir–Yantuo),³⁰ and a general without enemies 薛延陀國君、無敵將軍.”³¹ The standard-history biography, titled “Wuhuang ji” (introduced, above), compiled under the patronage of the Song emperor Taizong 太宗 (r. 976–997),³² revises this and claims instead that Baye 拔野, possibly a chieftain of the Bayegu (Bayarqu),³³ was the First

²⁹ The epitaph was drafted by Lu Rubi 盧汝弼, a member of the prominent Fangyang 范陽 Lu family clan; see Iwami Kiyohiro 石見清裕, Moribe Yutaka 森部豊, “Tōmatsu Sada ‘Ri Kokuyō boshi’ yakuchū, kōsatsu” 唐末沙陀 “李克用墓誌” 訳注, 考察, *Nairiku Ajia gengo no kenkyū* 内陸アジア言語の研究 18 (2003; hereafter, Iwami and Moribe), p. 31; Fan, pp. 18 ff. The epitaph was archeologically retrieved in 1989 in Dai county 代縣 (Xinzhou 忻州, Shanxi) during the excavations at Li Keyong’s tomb. To the best of my knowledge, Iwami and Moribe published the first transcription of it. Fan follows the transcription of Iwami and Moribe, as does Chen. The transcription given in Zhou Agen 周阿根, *Wudai muzhi huikao* 五代墓誌彙考 (Anhui: Huangshan shushe, 2012), pp. 1–4, provides some variants.

About Lu Rubi, Ouyang Xiu states, “His father Jianqiu had been military governor of Hedong; as part of a famous Tang family Lu Rubi had great knowledge of the old affairs of the Tang 其父簡求爲河東節度使, 爲唐名家, 故汝弼亦多知唐故事” (*XWDS* 28, p. 311). For this reason, Lu Rubi was appointed vice-governor of Hedong under Li Keyong and his son. *ZZTJ* 269, p. 8781, records a peculiar event that involved Lu Rubi: Li Keyong ordered Lu to cut out the heart of his archenemy, Liu Rengong 劉仁恭 (d. 914), and sacrifice his blood on the burial mounds of his ancestors in Daizhou 代州 (also *XWDS* 39, p. 427).

³⁰ The Xue–Yantuo 薛延陀/Sir–Yantuo are first mentioned in *Suishu* “Bei di liezhuan” 北狄列傳, chapter 84. As in the case of the other Tegreg tribes, the text regards the Sir–Yantuo as military units and, counting them together with other groups, reports a total of more than ten thousand soldiers located southwest of the Altai Mountains; see Wei Zheng 魏徵 (580–643) et al., *Suishu* 隋書 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1973; hereafter, *SS*) 84, pp. 1879–80). Atwood proposes Ser–Yian[da] (“Notion of Tribe,” p. 601, n. 24); Skaff, *Sui–Tang China*, pp. 36 ff and p. 335.

³¹ Here I follow the transcription of the epitaph in Iwami and Moribe, p. 21, also followed in Fan, p. 211, and Chen, pp. 712–15. Zhou, *Wudai muzhi hui kao*, p. 1, has “wuxian jiangjun 無限將軍.”

³² When the adopted son of Li Keyong, Li Siyuan 李嗣源, posthumously known as Mingzong 明宗 (r. 926–933), ascended to power in 926, he supported the reorganization of the Historiographical Office and provided patronage for a large project of history writing that included the compilation of three chronicles (*jinian lu* 紀年錄), now lost, that were dedicated to the life and deeds of the last three generations of Shatuo forefathers: Li Keyong, Zhuxie Chixin (Li Guochang) and Zhuxie Zhiyi. They would later be used as sources for the compilation of the history of the Five Dynasties period during the early-Song period (see Wang Pu 王溥 [922–982], *Wudai huiyao* 五代會要 [Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 1978; rpt. 2006] 18, pp. 298–99; Wang, “The *Chiu Wu-tai shih*,” pp. 10 ff). As we see, below, some fragments of the texts are preserved in the commentary to *Zizhi tongjian*.

³³ Four variants of *bayegu* using different characters may be found in the sources: 拔也古,

Ancestor (*shizu* 始祖) of the Shatuo. Both of Li Keyong's biographies trace the origins of the Shatuo back to the Turkic Tegreg tribal confederation, known in the Chinese sources as Tiele 鐵勒,³⁴ which dominated the Mongolian steppe at the beginning of the seventh century. In the second decade of the century, units of Tegreg revolted against the Turks of the First Turk Empire and established an independent regime under the leadership of the Sir-Yantuo Zhenzhu Bilgä qaghan 真珠苾伽 (r. 628–645).³⁵ Almost a half-century later, when the Turks of Inner Mongolia led by the Ashina 阿史那 clan revolted against the Tang and established the second Turk empire, Tegreg units including Uighurs, Sir-Yantuo, and Bayarqu relocated to the Tang frontier region. These Tegreg then began to establish long-term relationships with the Tang,³⁶ which would last until the units eventually fell under the dominion of the Uighurs during the first and second Uighur empires (646–90 and 744–840).³⁷

For some unknown reason, the “Martial Emperor’s Annals” amended the “Li Keyong Epitaph,” tracing the progenitor of Li Keyong to another of the Tegreg confederations under Tang influence. It specifies that a person named Bayarqu served as army commissioner under Tang Taizong and fought against the rebellions of the Koguryō kingdom and the Sir-Yantuo.³⁸ Bayarqu, thanks to his accomplishments in

拔曳固, 拔野古, and 拔野固. There is general agreement on the phonetic transcription *Bayarqu*, although Yukiyo Kasai proposes *Baryaqu* (“The Chinese Phonetic Transcriptions of Old Turkish Words in the Chinese Sources from 6th–9th Century: Focused on the Original Word Transcribed as Tujue 突厥,” in *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages* 29 [2014], p. 101). Édouard Chavannes has *Bayirkou* (*Documents sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) occidentaux* [Paris: Librairie d’Amérique et d’Orient, 1903; hereafter cited as Chavannes], p. 87), and Atwood has *Bayarghu* (“Notion of Tribe,” p. 601). The earliest mention of the Bayegu units is in Li Yanshou 李延壽 (fl. 650), *Beishi* 北史 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974) 99, p. 3303 and Suishu; they report that military units of some 20,000 soldiers formed by the Bayegu, the Pugu/Buqu 僕骨, the Tonglu/Tongra 同羅, and the Weihe 韋紇 (i.e., the Uighurs) were located north of the River Duluo 獨洛 (Tuul), in the Mongolian Plateau. (“North of the Duluo River there are the Pugu, the Tongluo, the Weihe, the Bayegu, whose chieftains all have the title of Irkin 獨洛河北有僕骨、同羅、韋紇、拔也古、覆羅並號侯斤”; *SS* 84, p. 1879; *Beishi* 99, p. 3303.)

³⁴ I follow Atwood’s reconstruction of Tegreg/Tiele (“Notion of Tribe,” p. 602). Skaff notes that the Chinese sources gradually abandoned the use of the term Tiele, and by the 8th c. the tribal union was referred to as “Jiu xing 九姓,” literally “Nine surnames” (Skaff, *Sui-Tang China*, p. 40, n. 12).

³⁵ *SS* 84, p. 1880; Chavannes, pp. 94 ff.

³⁶ Denis Sinor, “The Establishment and Dissolution of the Turk Empire,” in Denis Sinor, ed., *The Cambridge History of Early Inner Asia, Vol. 1* (Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 1990), pp. 285–316.

³⁷ See Colin Mackerras, *The Uighur Empire (744–840) According to the Tang Dynastic Histories* (Canberra: The Australian National University, Centre of Oriental Studies, 1968); Albert Kamalov, “The Moghon Shine Usu Inscription as the Earliest Uighur Historical Annals,” *CAJ* 47.1 (2003), pp. 77–99.

³⁸ Chen, vol. 3, p. 623.

the military campaign, is said in the text to have been named vice-protector-general of Jinfang circuit 金方道副都護 and to have subsequently established himself in Guazhou 瓜州.³⁹ The text continues as follows:

After Taizong pacified all the divisions of the Sir-Yantuo, he established protectorates-general in Anxi⁴⁰ and Beiting [military garrisons]⁴¹ and subordinated them [the Sir-Yantuo] to them [the protectorates]; he separated the people of the Tongra and Buqut [groupings]⁴² and established the Shatuo Area Command. In Beiting there probably were sandy slopes called “shatuo”; this therefore became the name [of the clan]. In the Yonghui era [650–55], Baye was made area commander and his sons and grandsons inherited the title for five generations. 太宗平薛延陀諸部，於安西、北庭置都護屬之，分同羅、僕骨之人，置沙陀都督府。蓋北庭有磧曰沙陀，故因以爲名焉。永徽中，以拔野爲都督，其後子孫五世相承。⁴³

The “Martial Emperor’s Annals” states that Tang Taizong created a Shatuo area command and that Bayarqu acquired the title of area commander under the reign of Gaozong 高宗 (r. 649–683). The title was to be inherited by his progeny for five generations without interruption.⁴⁴ This account was refuted as inaccurate by eleventh-century historians, as will be shown, below.⁴⁵ The *New Tang History* in particular provides a very different narrative of the ancestry of the Shatuo that is only partially mentioned in Ouyang Xiu’s *New Five Dynasties History*, a narrative Sima Guang 司馬光 (1019–1086) would follow in his historical work *Zizhi tongjian* 資治通鑑.

The “Martial Emperor’s Annals” portrays the Shatuo as having been loyal members of the Tang ruling house all along. This is one of the chapters that, in my opinion, makes the *Old Five Dynasties History*, compiled in 974, more a product of the Five Dynasties period (and of the reigns of Shatuo rulers) than an expression of early-Song historiography. It may be argued that its early-Song compilers had

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ My translation of *duhu* 都護 as “protector-general” and *dudu fu* 都督府 as “area command” follows Skaff, *Sui-Tang China*, 248 ff). The Protectorate of Anxi was located at Turfan at the time the Sir-Yantuo were subjugated.

⁴¹ The military headquarters of Beiting, also known as Ting prefecture 庭州, was a Tang prefecture located in the Dzungarian Basin.

⁴² Tongra/Tongluo 同羅 and Pugu/Buqut 僕骨 are names of Tegreg groupings who lived on the steppe, along the Tuul and Kerulen rivers.

⁴³ Chen, vol. 3, p. 623.

⁴⁴ Atwood, “Notion of Tribe,” p. 601.

⁴⁵ Ouyang Xiu points out these inaccuracies for the first time in *XWDS* 4, p. 39. See also Atwood, “Notion of Tribe,” pp. 601 ff.

merely copied over an early-tenth-century text compiled at the court of the Shatuo rulers, without much alteration.⁴⁶ The Annals states that Bayarqu's position as area commander indeed "was passed down hereditarily to his sons and grandsons for five generations."⁴⁷ In this manner the text bypasses the more than one hundred years of history leading up to Li Keyong's great-grandfather (*zengzu* 曾祖), Jinzhong 盡忠 (literally "Loyal to the Utmost"), which may have been an exhortatory name bestowed on him by the Tang court.⁴⁸ We read that in the Zhenyuan era (785–805) Jinzhong held the title of area commander of the Shatuo prefecture:

The great-grandfather was Jinzhong [Loyal to the Utmost]. In the Zhenyuan era (785–805) he succeeded [his father] as area commander of the Shatuo command. Soon after, they were invaded by the Tibetans; thereupon he took up leadership of his clan of seven thousand units and moved to Gan prefecture. Jinzhong at last led a unit of 30,000 [households]⁴⁹ and fled east; shortly thereafter, the Tibetan troops who were in pursuit arrived in great numbers, and Jinzhong died in battle. The grandfather, Zhiyi,⁵⁰ who was the eldest son of Jinzhong, reunited the remaining troops and arrived at Ling prefecture. Dezhong bestowed upon him the title of area commander of Yinshan command. At the beginning of the Yuanhe era (806–820), [Zhiyi] entered [the court and was installed] as general of the imperial insignia guard, [and then was] transferred [to the position of] prefect of Wei and pacification commissioner of the Daibei mobile encampment. When [the Later Tang emperor] Zhuangzong ascended to power, he bestowed upon [Zhiyi] the posthumous title of Bright and Illustrious Emperor, and the temple title of Virtuous Ancestor.

曾祖盡忠，貞元中，繼為沙陁府都督。既而為吐蕃所陷，乃舉其族七千帳徙於甘州。盡忠尋率部眾三萬東奔，俄而吐蕃追兵大至，盡忠戰歿。祖執宜，即盡忠之長子也，收合餘眾，至於靈州，德宗命為陰山府都督。元和

⁴⁶ Ouyang Xiu calls this account a *zixu* 自序 (*XWDS* 4, p. 39), which Atwood understands to mean the "author's preface" to the Veritable Records of the Later Tang dynasty ("Notion of Tribe," p. 601, n. 24, and p. 608). I argue that *zixu* means "self-account" and possibly refers to the Veritable Records of Zhuangzong or to the three commemorative *jinian lu* dedicated to the three Later Tang ancestors (discussed later in this article; see n. 32, above).

⁴⁷ Chen, vol. 3, p. 623.

⁴⁸ On the bestowal of given names in the medieval period see Skaff, *Sui-Tang China*, p. 230.

⁴⁹ This group included other divisions, such as the Dangxiang/Tangut, who are also known to have migrated eastwards around the same period.

⁵⁰ The "Li Keyong Epitaph" has Zhi Yi 儀 (Zhou, *Wudai muzhi huikao*, p. 1; Iwabi and Moribe, p. 21).

初，入爲金吾將軍，遷蔚州刺史、代北行營招撫使。莊宗即位，追諡爲昭烈皇帝，廟號懿祖。⁵¹

The “Martial Emperor’s Annals” briefly reports that sometime in the late-eighth century, the Shatuo area command suffered an invasion by the Tibetan army, which at that time occupied Beiting,⁵² and that for this reason, the then area commander Jinzhong, at the head of his people, moved to the south and fled east soon after. Pursued by the Tibetan troops and decimated in battle, the Shatuo relocated to Ling prefecture 靈州 under the guidance of Jinzhong’s son, Zhuxie Zhiyi 執宜. The then Shuofang 朔方 military defense had already been moved there as a consequence of the Tibetan invasion.⁵³ Tang emperor De-zong 德宗 (r. 780–804) then bestowed upon Zhiyi the title of area commander of Yinshan 陰山.

To be sure, the “Li Keyong Epitaph” is even vaguer in its depiction of the early history of the Shatuo, omitting all information concerning the migration east. Moreover, there is no mention of Beiting or the original geographical location of the Shatuo. The text imparts the following instead:

The taboo name of the prince was Keyong, his style was Yisheng, and he was from Chengji in Longxi.⁵⁴ ... [His ancestor] from the fourth generation, Yidu, [had the title of] lord of the Sir-Yantuo and general without enemies. The great-grandfather was Sige; he took the place [of his father] in [the leadership of] the state, inherited the enfeoffed rank and territory, and exercised hegemony over Yinshan. The grandfather was Zhiyi; the emperor appointed him great area commander of Yinshan command, military commissioner of the Shatuo three armies, and palace aide to the censor-in-chief. 王諱克用，字翼聖，隴西成紀人，... 自四代祖益度，薛延陀國君無敵將軍。曾祖思葛，繼國襲爵，霸有陰山。祖執儀，皇任陰山府大都督，三軍沙陝都知兵馬使兼御史中丞。⁵⁵

⁵¹ Chen, vol. 3, p. 623.

⁵² On the Tibetan invasion of Beiting, see Ildikó Ecsedy, “Uighurs and Tibetans in Pei-t’ing (790–91) A.D.,” *AOASH* 17 (1964), pp. 83–104.

⁵³ Lai, “Tang Military,” p. 116.

⁵⁴ The “Martial Emperor’s Annals” has Longyou 隴右 (Chen, vol. 4, p. 623). The place of origin does not indicate Li Keyong’s place of birth but rather the place of origin of the Longxi Li 隴西李, the prestigious aristocratic family clan from which the Tang also claimed descent. *Beimeng suoyan* 北夢瑣言 records that Li Guochang, when asked by the Tang emperor Yizong about his family origins, replied that they were people from Jincheng in Longxi, to which the emperor replied, “My ancestors and yours were fellow villagers 我先與汝同鄉里” (see Sun Guangxian 孫光憲 [900–968], *Beimeng suoyan* [Beijing: Zhonghua shuju] 17, p. 317).

⁵⁵ Zhou, p. 1.

The Epitaph inscription lists four generations of ancestors, yet their investiture as area commanders by the Tang only starts with the third generation. Accordingly, until the fourth generation the Shatuo held key positions in the Sir–Yantuo confederation without official recognition from the Tang. Moreover, the inscription records the name of two ancestors who do not appear in the official sources – Yidu 益度, the ancestor of the fourth generation, and Sige 思葛, the ancestor of the third generation (table 3, below).⁵⁶ The fact that it records the non-Chinese given names of the ancestors who “exercised hegemony over Yinshan” may mean that the Shatuo used their non-Chinese names in a social context. Furthermore, it clearly exposes the military nature of the Shatuo by stating that Zhiyi was named military commissioner of the Shatuo three armies (*san jun Shatuo* 三軍沙陀),⁵⁷ a term that rarely appears in the official sources, where we usually find “Shatuo *san buluo* 沙陀三部落” or “Shatuo *san bu* 沙陀三部.”

As shown in table 3, the “Li Keyong Epitaph” covers four generations of ancestors over almost two centuries, from the first half of the seventh to the mid-ninth century, with a gap of more than fifty years between Sige and Zhiyi. While Li Keyong’s “Martial Emperor’s Annals” claims the direct patrilineal descent of Shatuo officials under Tang jurisdiction for more than five generations of ancestors, the Epitaph highlights the last three generations (*san shi* 三世) of officials, who progressed from area commander (Zhuxie Zhiyi) to general commander (Li Guochang) to prince of Jin 晉 (Li Keyong).⁵⁸ The Epitaph thus draws a line between the Shatuo–Li and the rulers of the state of Jin, one of the largest of the northern states in the Spring and Autumn period (ca. 770–475 BC). During the reign of lord Wen (636–628 BC), the state of Jin exercised hegemonic control over the other states; it extended over most of what constituted northern Hedong in the late-

⁵⁶ Iwame and Moribe, p. 32; Fan, p. 18, which argues that Sige might be Gele Abo 葛勒阿波, younger brother of Jinzhong (p. 20). This hypothesis is based on the account recorded in the “Shatuo Memoir,” which states that Gele Abo, also chased by the Tibetans, “at the head of the remaining contingent of seven hundred, kowtowed before [the] Zhenwu [military governor] and surrendered; he obtained the title of great general of the militant guard and area commander of Yinshan Command 盡忠弟葛勒阿波率殘部七百叩振武降, 授左武衛大將軍, 兼陰山府都督” (Fan, pp. 20 ff; *XTS* 218, p. 6155; *JTS* 14, p. 426; Wang Qinruo 王欽若 [962–1025], comp., *Cefu yuangui* 冊府元龜 [Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1986] 170, p. 2056). However, Fan, p. 20, concludes that this hypothesis is purely speculative and not backed by any further evidence. Nevertheless, it supports the idea that, by the end of the eighth century, the Shatuo were not a unitary family clan, but rather a congregation of military units whose chieftains might have alternately taken leadership.

⁵⁷ On the meaning of *jun* as a “large army unit of permanently stationed troops” in the context of the Tang defense system, see Lai, “Tang Military,” pp. 103 ff.

⁵⁸ Iwame and Moribe, p. 21; Zhou, *Wudai muzhi huibian*, p. 1.

Tang period. For this reason, the sources often use the old name of the region of Hedong, referring to it as Jin. For the same reason, Li Keyong is called the prince of Jin. The Epitaph says that “[Li Keyong] carried on the honorability of the three audiences of lord Wen of Jin; he cut the leaves and appointed the meritorious 繼晉文三命之尊, 剪葉策勳.”⁵⁹ I translate *san ming* 三命 as “three audiences,” since the Epitaph here refers, arguably, to the three audiences of lord Wen with the king of Zhou in the aftermath of the victory over the state of Chu 楚 at Chengpu 城濮 in 635 BC. The three audiences constituted the culmination of Jin’s hegemonic power, as in this occasion lord Wen received from the Zhou king the written command to govern the domains.⁶⁰ The Epitaph also draws a line connecting the Shatuo to Tang (the former name of Jin) and links Li Keyong to the legacy of Shu Yu 叔虞, the younger prince of Tang 唐 and Jin.⁶¹

REPRESENTATION OF SHATUO GENEALOGICAL HISTORY IN THE “SHATUO MEMOIR”

The “Shatuo Memoir,” a chapter written for *New Tang History*, is by far the most detailed account of the history of the Shatuo. It is a novelty among the numerous chapters on foreign peoples in that work,⁶² and, as previously mentioned, it does not appear at all in the *Old Tang History* (see table 1, above). Compiled in the mid-eleventh century and presented in 1060 by a team of historians that included Song Qi 宋祁 (998–1061) and Ouyang Xiu, the *New Tang History* was the product of a historiographical project under the patronage of the Song emperor Renzong 仁宗 (r. 1023–63). It reflected an attempt to rewrite the *Old Tang History* (a name retrofitted by later historians). The latter was considered inadequate in many respects, mostly because it did not present the issues surrounding the Tang in ways that reflected contemporary

⁵⁹ Iwame and Moribe, p. 21.

⁶⁰ I am very grateful to Yuri Pines for suggesting to me this reading of the text. As he pointed out, acting as the de facto ruler on behalf of the emperor was the maximum to which Li Keyong could aspire as a military governor of the Tang dynasty, just as the historical lord Wen had become the de facto ruler under the nominal aegis of the Zhou king. For a translation of the account on the three audiences, see Stephen Durrant, Li Wai-ye and David Schaberg, trans., *Zuo Tradition: Zuo zhuan. Commentary on the “Spring and Autumn Annals”* (Seattle and London: U. Washington P., 2016) 1, pp. 420–21.

⁶¹ Iwame and Moribe, pp. 21 and 34. As Tang was the old name of the state of Jin, in the “Hereditary House of Jin” (“Jin shijia” 晉世家) he is called “Yu, the younger prince of Jin and Tang 晉唐叔虞” (William H. Nienhauser, Jr., ed., *The Grand Scribe’s Records, Volume 5.1: The Hereditary Houses of Pre-Han China*, Part I [Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana U.P., 2006], p. 297, n. 3).

⁶² Chavannes, pp. 96 ff., made a partial translation of the “Shatuo Memoir.”

problems.⁶³ It had been compiled in 941, more than a century earlier, under the patronage of the second Shatuo dynasty, the Later Jin ruler Shi Jingtang 石敬瑭 (Gaozu 高祖, r. 936–942), under the supervision of Liu Xu 劉昫 (888–947), and completed during the reign of Shi Chonggui 石重貴 (r. 943–946) in 945.⁶⁴ With the compilation of the *Old Tang History*, the Later Jin was arguably looking back to the Tang legacy for its own legitimacy.

Furthermore, it can be argued that there was a certain enmity between the Sogdian/Central Asian Shi clan and the Shatuo Li because Shi Jingtang himself had rebelled against the last Later Tang ruler, Li Congke 李從珂 (r. 934–936), a stepson of Mingzong. We can see evidence of this enmity between the Shatuo Li and the Shi in the treatment of such sensitive issues as the Shatuo's early history, as well as the genealogical history of Shatuo individuals in the *Old Tang History*. Indeed, that work records but little information about members of the Shatuo clique. Historical narratives concerning Shatuo members can be found scattered among two other genres – the basic annals and memoirs (also called “collective biographies”) – yet not a single chapter is dedicated to Li Guochang or Li Keyong, despite their high-ranking positions in government and their primary roles in the last decades of the dynasty.

Song Qi and his colleagues were commissioned to produce the *New Tang History* in the mid-1040s, and it was concluded in about two decades – in 1060. Earlier, in 1054, Ouyang Xiu had joined the team and took charge of compiling the basic annals, treatises, and tables. The sources uniformly attribute the compilation of the collective biographies, or memoirs, to Song Qi;⁶⁵ they cite Ouyang Xiu's respect for Song Qi as the reason he ultimately declined to revise those biographies; nonetheless, the possibility that Ouyang Xiu may have been involved in the compilation and revision of some of them cannot be ruled out completely.⁶⁶

⁶³ See Peter K. Bol, *This Culture of Ours: Intellectual Transitions in T'ang and Sung China* (Stanford: Stanford U.P., 1992), p. 197.

⁶⁴ Twitchett, *Writing of Official History under the T'ang*, pp. 160 ff; Wang, *Cefu yuangui* 557, p. 6693.

⁶⁵ Yan Zhongqi 顏中其, “*Xin Tang shu xiuzhuan kao*” 新唐書修撰考, *Shixue shi ziliao* 史學史資料 4 (1980), pp. 6 and 29. Among other sections, Ouyang Xiu compiled the “Zaixiang biao” 宰相表, “Fangzhen biao” 方鎮表 and “Zongshi shixi biao” 宗室世係表 (ibid., p. 22). See also Robert des Rotours, *Le traité des examens: Traduit de la Nouvelle Histoire des T'ang, Chap. XLIV, XLV* (Paris: Librairie Ernest Leroux, 1932), pp. 57 ff.

⁶⁶ Bol, *This Culture of Ours*, p. 197; Chia-fu Sung, “An Ambivalent Historian: Ouyang Xiu and His *New Histories*,” *TP* 102.4–5 (2016), pp. 389–402.

Song Qi's and Ouyang Xiu's notions about the chapters on foreign peoples probably did not diverge from one another much. In fact, Ouyang's biographical accounts of Shatuo notables in his *New Five Dynasties History* (compiled in about 1053 and published later, posthumously, in 1077) mostly follow the narrative in the *New Tang History's* "Shatuo Memoir," one reason to support the possibility that he was involved in the compilation and/or editing of the Memoir. In the *New Five Dynasties History*, he briefly discusses the Shatuo's line of descent in the first part of the chapter "Zhuangzong ji" 莊宗紀, which is the annals dedicated to Li Cunxu 李存勳 (who reigned as Zhuangzong 莊宗, r. 923–926), the founder (in 923) of the Later Tang dynasty. "Zhuangzong ji" ends with a well-known statement in which Ouyang Xiu says that the genealogical narrative in the "Martial Emperor's Annals," which he may have regarded as a product of Shatuo historiography, was a forgery.⁶⁷ He blames the genealogical forgery on the fact that "barbarians lack a written language to preserve their past 夷狄無文字傳記," and claims that "the Zhuxie were too insignificant to be noted [elsewhere], their posterity having lost touch with their own legacy 朱邪又微不足道錄, 故其後世自失其傳."⁶⁸ Ouyang Xiu also highlights the notion that "barbarians have no surnames 夷狄無姓氏": Zhuxie was simply the designation of the clan, and Shatuo a designation of a geographical origin.⁶⁹

The Shatuo never constituted an independent regime and were subjects of the Tang for most of their predynastic history; furthermore, by the late-medieval period, the Shatuo Li held high-ranking offices in the Tang system and had become an integral part of the upper echelons of the Tang military aristocracy. Nonetheless, the authors of the *New Tang History* clearly distance themselves from the Shatuo, portraying the group as culturally and politically other. This distance is also indirectly applied to the ruling class of northern China during the Five Dynasties period, which had grown and developed in the political milieu of northern Hedong and was mostly of Shatuo "extraction."

⁶⁷ *XWDS* 4, p. 39; as discussed previously (see n. 46, above), Ouyang Xiu talks of a "self-account" that probably refers to some official records compiled at the court of the Shatuo rulers (such as the *jinian lu*) that were extant in the eleventh century.

⁶⁸ *XWDS* 4, p. 40; Davis, *Historical Records*, p. 39.

⁶⁹ *XWDS* 4, p. 39; Davis, *Historical Records*, pp. 38 ff (all changes are my own). Atwood, "Notion of Tribe," p. 616, maintains that "Ouyang Xiu's rejection of the Five Dynasties culture centered on what he saw as the related corruption in both kinship and state. The prevalence of political adoption (*cixing* 賜姓, i.e., the bestowal of a patron's surname on his client) subverted the true feeling of kinship in the imperial family which in turn led to a general abandonment of morals in the society as a whole." On the bestowal of the imperial surname in the medieval period see Skaff, *Sui-Tang China*, pp. 227 ff. On the use of Chinese surnames by non-Chinese "surname-less" peoples in medieval China, see Xin, "What's in a Surname?" pp. 97 ff.

In addition, the “Shatuo Memoir” promotes the idea that the Shatuo were part of the Chuyue/Chong’al 處月, a small Tegreg grouping that was part of the Western Turk empire.⁷⁰ Ouyang Xiu would later endorse this idea privately in his *New Five Dynasties*.⁷¹ The hypothesis presented here, that the name “sandy slopes” was used to refer to the wasteland “which is now south of the Jinsha 金沙 Mountains and east of the Pulei 蒲類 Sea,”⁷² corresponding to the area of modern Barköl Lake in Xinjiang (a hypothesis also endorsed by Sima Guang), is now the most widely supported hypothesis among modern scholars.⁷³

The Memoir narrates the history of the Shatuo from the beginning of the seventh century. During the reign of Tang Taizong, several of what are loosely defined as Chuyue units that inhabited the area east of Barköl Lake came under the protection of the newly-established “Northern Court,” Beiting 北庭, located west of Mount Chuohe 鑛曷山. At that time, Beiting was under the control of Libi duolu 利怛咄陸 (Ashina Nishu 阿史那泥孰; d. 634), who had been invested as qaghan by Taizong.⁷⁴ In 638 Yipi Duolu qaghan 乙毗咄陸 (Yipi Tardush) proclaimed himself qaghan without the official recognition of Tang Taizong. After he attacked Tang-controlled Yiwu 伊吾 and was defeated by the protector-general of Anxi, Guo Xiaoke 郭孝恪 (d. 649),⁷⁵ Yipi Duolu fled to Tuhuluo 吐火羅 (Tokharistan).⁷⁶ Following this event, Ashina Helu 賀魯, the son of one Shekui 射匱 tegin,⁷⁷ submitted to the Tang and the emperor made him area commander of Yaochi 瑤池都督.⁷⁸ Ashina Helu’s divisions were relocated to the Fortification of Mohe 莫賀 in Ting prefecture 庭州. The Chuyue chief, titled as *sijin* 俟斤, *irkin*,⁷⁹ namely

⁷⁰ According to Atwood (“Notion of Tribe,” p. 602, n. 27), the Chuyue should be identified with the Chigil branch of the Oghuz. Wang Xiaofu 王小甫 reconstructs Chuyue as Chöl Ört, theorizing that the name includes the meaning of “fire,” an element of worship in Turkic tradition, and that it is connected to Zoroastrianism; see Wang, *Tang Tufan Dashi zhengzhi guanxi shi* 唐吐蕃大食政治關係史 (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 1992), pp. 224 ff.

⁷¹ Chavannes notes that, although the text says that the Tujue lived east of Barköl Lake, they probably also occupied the east side (p. 97, n. 4).

⁷² *XTS* 218, p. 6153.

⁷³ *XWDS* 4, p. 39; *ZZTJ* 210, p. 6678; Chavannes, p. 97.

⁷⁴ His full title transliterated into Chinese is 吞阿婆拔奚利怛咄陸可汗, “Duolu qaghan” for short.

⁷⁵ Chavannes (p. 97, n.7) says that, according to *Zizhi Tongjian gangmu* 資治通鑑綱目 (1172), this event occurred in 642.

⁷⁶ *XTS* 218, p. 6153.

⁷⁷ *XTS* 215, p. 6060.

⁷⁸ It lay in the region east of Lake Balkhash in modern-day Kazakhstan (Victor Cunrui Xiong, *Historical Dictionary of Medieval China* [Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow Press, 2009], p. 754).

⁷⁹ On this Turkic title see Skaff, *Sui-Tang China*, pp. 34 and 265.

Zhuxie que/kül 朱邪闕 (also called Ajue 阿厥),⁸⁰ similarly volunteered to submit to Tang rule.⁸¹

The “Shatuo Memoir” documents that in 650, following the rebellion of Ashina Helu against Tang authority, Zhuxie Guzhu 朱邪孤注 killed the pacification commissioner sent by the court,⁸² and led his troops to occupy Mount Lao 牢山.⁸³ Guzhu was presumably a son of Zhuxie Ajue (see table 3). Meanwhile, the chieftain of another small branch of the Turkic Shatuo, Shatuo Nasu 沙陀那速 (the *irkin* of the Shepi 射脾 grouping),⁸⁴ was awarded the title of area commander of Yaochi by emperor Gaozong 高宗 (r. 649–683). In the following year, the general of Tegreg extraction named Qibi Heli 契苾何力 (d. 677?) led Tang forces in an attack in which Zhuxie Guzhu was killed and his troops captured.⁸⁵ The Area Command of Yaochi was then dissolved, and the territories of the Chuyue units divided into two protected administrative units – Jinman 金滿 and Shatuo 沙陀 prefectures – each under an area commander (*dudu* 都督), a status quo that persisted until the Shatuo overtook Jinman.⁸⁶ At the beginning of the eighth century, Shatuo Jinshan 沙陀金山 was appointed area commander of Jinman and enfeoffed with the title of lord of Zhangye 張掖 commandery. Upon Shatuo Jinshan’s death, his son Fuguo 輔國 (whose given name literally means “Sustainer of the Kingdom”) inherited his titles.⁸⁷ In the years 712–13, under the reign of Xuanzong 玄宗 (r. 713–756), Fuguo moved his units to Beiting to escape from the attacks of the Tibetans. Archeological evidence attests that the Zhuxie units relocated to Xi prefecture 西州 (Turfan) around the year 728.⁸⁸

⁸⁰ Zhuxie Ajue would be executed by the then military commissioner of Ting prefecture, Liu Huan 劉渙 (d. 734). *Que* 闕 is arguably part of Zhuxie Ajue’s Turkic title, kül irkin 闕俟斤. See Shao-yun Yang, “What Do Barbarians Know of Gratitude? The Stereotype of Barbarian Perfidy and Its Uses in Tang Foreign Policy Rhetoric,” *Tang Studies* 31 (2013), pp. 61 ff. See also Luo Xin 羅新, “Lun Que Tele zhi ‘Que’” 論闕特勒之闕, *Zhongguo shehui kexue* 中國社會科學 3 (2008), pp. 192–208.

⁸¹ *XTS* 218, p. 6153.

⁸² This is Shan Daohui 单道惠 (*XTS* 3, p. 54).

⁸³ Chavannes, p. 98, n. 2.

⁸⁴ On this unidentified tribal unit, see also *XTS* 215B, p. 6061, and Chavannes, p. 61, n. 2.

⁸⁵ *XTS* 218, p. 6154; see also *XTS* 110, p. 4119.

⁸⁶ Although *New Tang History* is vague on this, scholars generally agree that Shatuo units were initially located in and in charge of the Shatuo prefecture; on the other hand, there is not general agreement on the hypothesis that Jinman prefecture was under the command of Zhuxie chieftains (for a discussion see Li, *Tang Xizhou xingzheng tizhi kaolun*, pp. 380 ff).

⁸⁷ On the bestowal of auspicious given names and surnames during the reigns of empress Wu and Xuanzong, see Skaff, *Sui-Tang China*, p. 230.

⁸⁸ On the archeological evidence attesting to the presence of Zhuxie units in Turfan by the eighth century, see Li, *Tang Xizhou xingzheng tizhi kaolun*, pp. 377 ff.

Shatuo Fuguo is believed to have established particularly good relations with the Tang court, so much so that he was invited to a court audience around the year 714, where he was invested with the titles of area commander of Jinman and prince of Yongshou commandery 永壽郡王. His mother, Shunishi 鼠尼施,⁸⁹ was invested with the honorific title of lady of Shan kingdom 鄯國夫人.⁹⁰

The two generations of Shatuo chiefs, Jinshan and Fuguo, cemented relations with the local powerful Turkic elite through marriages with members of their families. Though the “Shatuo Memoir” only offers glimpses of such kinship relations, entombed epigraphy provides evidence that the Shatuo were part of powerful local elites whose influence extended even to the capital in Chang’an. In fact, as shown in table 2, below, the Shatuo intermarried with the Qarluq Chigil and the Turk Ashina, the leading clan of the Western Turks, to which the *qaghans* belonged.⁹¹ One of Fuguo’s sisters was married to Chisi Hongfu 熾俟弘福, a Qarluq,⁹² and Fuguo himself was married to the eldest daughter of Ashina Huaidao 阿史那懷道 (670–727), who was the son of Ashina Buzhen 阿史那步真,⁹³ a cousin of Ashina Nasu, who had served as protector-general of Beiting and had been invested as qaghan by Taizong. Fuguo’s marriage to a woman of the Ashina clan indicates that he belonged to a family of some status. The entombed epitaph of his wife reads that Fuguo was invested with the titles of “grand master of splendid happiness of Yinqing, area commander of Jinman prefecture, and grand commissioner of the Helan army 銀青光祿大夫金滿州都督賀蘭軍

⁸⁹ According to Chavannes, p. 99, Shunishi is the name of a tribe of the Qarluq Chigil.

⁹⁰ *XTS* 218, p. 6154. In his eulogy for the lady, the poet Wang Wei 王維 (701–761) praised her for adopting Chinese clothing and customs (Dong Gao 董誥 et al., eds., *Quan Tang wen* 全唐文 [Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983] 327, p. 3321). For a partial translation of the eulogy see Charles Holcombe, “Immigrants and Strangers: From Cosmopolitanism to Confucian Universalism in Tang China,” *Tang Studies* 20–21 (2002), p. 106.

⁹¹ For a list of funerary biographies of members of the Ashina and Chigil family clans, see Zhu Zhenhong 朱振宏, “Sui Tang shiqi Tujue ren Hanwen muzhiming de chubu zhengli” 隋唐時期突厥人漢文墓誌銘的初步整理, *Zhongguo Tang dai xuehui* 中國唐代學會 19 (2012), pp. 1–24.

⁹² Rong Xinjiang 榮新江, “Cong xin chu muzhi kan ru Tang xiyu ren de huodong: yi Geluolu Chisi (Qarluq Cegil) jiazou wei zhongxin” 從新出墓誌看入唐西域人的活動, 以哥邏祿熾俟家族為中心, *Senshū daigaku kodai azuma yūrashia kenkyū sentā nenpō* 專修大學古代東ユーラシア研究センター年報 3 (2017), pp. 81 ff. Evidence of the practice of intermarriage between Qarluqs and Shatuo is also found in epigraphic material from the ninth century. For information on this subject, see Nishimura Yoko, “Tang mo Wudai Daibei diqu Shatuo jituan neibu gouzao zai tantao: yi Qibi Tong muzhiming wei zhongxin” 唐末五代代北地區沙陀集團內部構造再探討, 以契苾通墓誌銘為中心, *Wenshi* 文史 4 (2005), pp. 211–28; idem, “Tōmatsu Godai no Daihoku ni okeru Sada shūdan,” pp. 1–24; and idem, “Tōmatsu ‘Shi Mo boshimei’ to Sada no dōkō,” pp. 513–50.

⁹³ Zhou Shaoliang 周紹良, ed., *Tang muzhi huibian* 唐代墓誌彙編 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1991–92), vol. 1, p. 1223. Ashina Buzhen had received the title of area commander (*du* 都督) of Mengchi 濛池 (Xinjiang); see his epitaph in *ibid.* 1, pp. 601–3.

大使。⁹⁴ Fuguo's wife seems to have borne a title as well, namely "lord of Jincheng county 金城縣君."⁹⁵

Table 2: Turkic People Related by Blood to the Shatuo in the First Half of the Eighth Century

NAME	KINSHIP RELATION TO SHATUO	BURIAL DATE	SOURCES
Chisi / Ćigil Hongfu 熾俊弘福	Shatuo Jinshan's son-in-law	706	Rong Xinjiang ⁹⁶
Ashina Huaidao 阿史那懷 道, great protector-general of Mengchi 濛池大都護 (670-727)	Shatuo Fuguo's father-in-law	727	Qian Qunli ⁹⁷
Wife of Ashina Huaidao	Shatuo Fuguo's mother-in-law	727	Yue Qi and Zhang Dechen ⁹⁸
Lady Ashina 阿史那氏	Shatuo Fuguo's wife	721	Zhou Shaoliang, Rong, Iwami Kiyohiro, ⁹⁹ <i>Quan Tang wen</i> ¹⁰⁰

Upon Fuguo's death, Shatuo Guduozi 骨咄支 inherited the latter's titles.¹⁰¹ The "Shatuo Memoir" reports: "At the beginning of the

⁹⁴ Zhou, *Tang muzhi huibian* 1, p. 1223. As part of the reorganization of the frontier commands, in the second decade of the Tang court, several chiefs of Tegreg units who had established themselves on the Tang border were invested with the title of Dashi 大使 (grand commissioner), *ZZTJ* 212, p. 6732; Pulleyblank, *Background of the Rebellion of An Lu-shan*, p. 108.

⁹⁵ Zhou, *Tang muzhi huibian* 1, p. 1223.

⁹⁶ Rong, "Cong xin chu muzhi kan ru Tang xiyu ren de huodong," p. 81.

⁹⁷ Qian Qunli 錢春麗, "Tang Mengchi da duhu Ashina Huaidao muzhi kao" 唐濛池大都護阿史那懷道墓誌考, *Wenbo* 文博 1 (2016), pp. 76-80.

⁹⁸ Yue Qi 岳起, Xie Gaowen 謝高文, "Kaiyuan shiwu nian Ashina Huaidao fugui mu" 開元十五年阿史那懷道夫婦墓, *Zhongguo wenwu bao* 中國文物報 1994; Zhang Dechen 張德臣, *Weicheng wenwu zhi* 渭城文物志 (Xi'an: Sanqin chubanshe, 2007), pp. 118 ff.

⁹⁹ Zhou, *Tang muzhi huibian* 1, p. 1223; Rong, "Cong xin chu muzhi kan ru Tang xiyu ren de huodong," p. 81; Iwami Kiyohiro 石見清裕, "Tōdai 'Sada kō fujin Ashinashi boshi' yakuchū, kōsatsu" 唐代"沙陀公夫人阿史那氏墓誌"譯注, 考察, *Murayama Yoshihiro kyōju koki kinen Chūgoku koten gaku ronshū* 村山吉廣教授古希記念中國古典學論集 (Tokyo: Kyuko shōin, 2000).

¹⁰⁰ Dong, *Quan Tang wen* 65, p. 11105.

¹⁰¹ The name Guduozi is most certainly the Chinese version of a Turkic name. It appears also in Wang, *Cefu yuangui* 456, p. 11252.

Tianbao era (742–756,) the Uighurs submitted to the [Tang] authority; at the same time, Guduozhi held the title of vice-protector-general of the Uighurs 天寶初, 回紇內附, 以骨咄支兼回紇副都護。¹⁰² Thus it may be argued that Guduozhi was very close to the Uighurs and that the Tang took advantage of this relationship. Moreover, it appears that the Shatuo were affected by the attempted revolt in 734 by the protector-general of Beiting, Liu Huan, 劉渙,¹⁰³ an event that is only briefly mentioned in the histories of the Tang.¹⁰⁴ It is highly probable that the Shatuo troops also joined forces with the joint army of Qarluqs and Uighurs that overthrew the Eastern Turks between 742 and 744, and that they then took part in the defeat of the Qarluqs by the Uighurs, the event that led to the establishment of the Uighur empire in 744.¹⁰⁵ The military importance of the Shatuo grew as result of their military support in repressing An Lushan's rebellion.

Unfortunately, the “Shatuo Memoir” is silent on most of these events and limits itself to a few sketchy biographical details concerning Shatuo individuals. Upon Guduozhi's death, the text tells us that his son Jinzhong inherited the titles and was also named great general of the imperial insignia guard 金吾 and lord of Jiuquan 酒泉.¹⁰⁶ Nothing is said in the Memoir about the situation of the Shatuo and Zhuxie settlements in Beiting and Xi prefecture in the aftermath of the An Lushan Rebellion. Nor does it refer directly to the conquest of the Gansu corridor in 764–776, but merely reports that “the Central Lands (i.e., north China) had many problems [to deal with],” and that for this reason Beiting was isolated from the Guanzhong central region, and that the only route to the capital was through the Uighur territories. Relations between the Uighur and Turkic administrative units under Chinese dominion in the border regions were far from peaceful. At the end of the 780s, Turkic units in Beiting including the Shatuo revolted against the Uighurs and sought the patronage of the Tibetans. Furthermore, the Tang court lost control of the northwestern protectorates after the second Tibetan invasion of Beiting in the early 790s. The Tibetans would rule this region and the Gansu corridor from 787 to 848. According to the *New Tang History*, settlements of Turkic units were subsequently relocated from

¹⁰² *XTS* 218, p. 6154.

¹⁰³ Pulleyblank says that they might have participated in the revolt (*Background of the Rebellion of An Lu-shan*, p. 155). The Shatuo were in all likelihood forced to move from Beiting, as a consequence of the revolt (Wang, *Quan Tang wen* 284, p. 2883). For the context of Liu Huan's “revolt” see Yang, “What Do Barbarians Know of Gratitude?” pp. 61 ff.

¹⁰⁴ *JTS* 8, p. 201; *XTS* 5, p. 138.

¹⁰⁵ On these events, see Chavannes, p. 94.

¹⁰⁶ *XTS* 218, p. 6154.

Beiting to the borders of the Tang empire.¹⁰⁷ The Tibetan invasion of Beiting is narrated in the Memoir as follows:

Between the Zhide (756–758) and Baoying (762–763) eras, as the Central Lands (i.e., north China) had many problems [to deal with], Beiting and Xi prefecture were cut off [from the court]; envoys [from Beiting and Xi prefecture] bearing memorials to the court had to pass through the Uighurs, but the [Uighur] caitiffs often seized their property opportunistically and they [the envoys] suffered extremely from this. Even those among the Shatuo who were aligning with Beiting were similarly burdened by their [the Uighurs'] excessive tax levies. In the Zhenyuan era (785–805), 7,000 tents of Shatuo units subordinated themselves to the Tibetans, and [they] jointly attacked Beiting and captured it. The Tibetans moved the [Shatuo] units to Gan prefecture and made [Shatuo] Jinzhong senior counselor. Whenever the Tibetans plundered the frontier territories, they would often use the Shatuo as a vanguard.

至德、寶應間，中國多故，北庭、西州閉不通，朝奏使皆道出回紇，而虜多漁擄，尤苦之，雖沙陀之倚北庭者，亦困其暴斂。貞元中，沙陀部七千帳附吐蕃，與共寇北庭，陷之。吐蕃徙其部甘州，以盡忠爲軍大論。吐蕃寇邊，常以沙陀爲前鋒。¹⁰⁸

Although the information on these events is very fragmentary, the “Shatuo Memoir” attests to the fact that the Shatuo were under the patronage of the Tibetans for several years and documents that they were eventually employed as army units to attack and plunder Tang territories. According to it, those units in Beiting actively sought Tibetan protection as a means of escaping their greedy Uighur patrons. After being relocated to Gan prefecture 甘州,¹⁰⁹ Jinzhong accepted the title of senior counselor 軍大論 (*blon chen*) from the Tibetans. The Memoir provides further context:

In previous times, the Shatuo had served the Tibetans as subjects; they [the two peoples] were roughly similar in their placing of the elderly in [the less favorable] left position and the strong in [the more favorable] right position, and in confusing male and female

¹⁰⁷ On this subject see also Huang, “Shatuo zaoqi lishi.” Some Tibetan sources report the names of certain Turkic peoples that have been identified with the Tuyuhun 吐谷渾, Uighurs, and Hu 胡 (“Central Asian” or “Sogdian”); see Géza Uray, “The Old Tibetan Sources of the History of Central Asia up to 751 A.D.: A Survey,” in J. Harmatta, ed., *Prolegomena to the Sources on the History of Pre-Islamic Central Asia* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1979), p. 303. However, no mention is made of the Shatuo.

¹⁰⁸ *XTS* 218, p. 6154.

¹⁰⁹ According to *Zizhi tongjian*, settlements of Shatuo already existed in Ganzhou during the Guangde 廣德 (763–764) era of the reign of Tang Daizong 代宗 (ZZTJ 223, p. 7169).

[in their treatment of the two]. But in horse riding and shooting, in being fast and courageous, [the Shatuo] surpassed [the Tibetans]; the [Tibetan] caiffiffs relied on their [Shatuo] troops, and often [used them] to harm the frontier territories. When [the Shatuo] turned to the Tang, the Tibetans fell into decline for this reason. 始, 沙陀臣吐蕃, 其左老右壯, 溷男女, 略與同, 而馳射趨悍過之, 虜倚其兵, 常苦邊. 及歸國, 吐蕃繇此亦衰.¹¹⁰

The *New Tang History* affirms that the Shatuo were under the patronage of the Tibetans for at least a decade. The Tibetans relied on the military forces of the Shatuo to such an extent that the decline of the Tibetan empire is reported to have begun when the Shatuo returned to the patronage of the Tang.

Whereas both the “Martial Emperor’s Annals” and the “Li Keyong Epitaph” omit all references to the relations between the Shatuo and the Tibetans, the “Shatuo Memoir” gives a quite detailed account of their interactions. It could be argued that the funerary and official records carefully polished the Shatuo origin story, eliding the most shameful events concerning their connection with the Tibetans and their role in the fall of the Tang garrison at Beiting. If this is the case, however, then what is the *New Tang History*’s source? Surprisingly enough, the earliest account of the relations between the Shatuo and Tibetans is yet another early-tenth-century product of the Later Tang dynasty’s historiographical enterprise, a source roughly a decade older than the Epitaph, namely, *Hou Tang Yizu jinian lu* 後唐懿祖紀年錄 (*Annalistic Record of the Later Tang Virtuous Ancestor*). This is a chronological, celebratory account of the deeds of Zhuxie Zhiyi that was compiled in 929 under the supervision of then chief minister Zhao Feng 趙鳳. It is part of a trilogy of texts dedicated to the forefathers of the Later Tang rulers – Li Keyong, Li Guochang, and Zhuxie Zhiyi.¹¹¹ Their compilation followed Minzong’s formalization of the Shatuo’s ancestral pantheon; as such, the three annals/records are celebratory in nature. Although the work is lost, a fragment preserved in Sima Guang’s *Kaoyi* 考異 commentary to his *Zizhi tongjian* attests to the Later Tang historians’ attempt to construct a positive narrative concerning the Shatuo’s relations with the Tibetans:

¹¹⁰ *XTS* 218, p. 6155.

¹¹¹ *Tang Taizu jinian lu* 唐太祖紀年錄 (*Chronological Records of Taizu Emperor of [Later] Tang*) commemorates the life and deeds of Li Keyong, *Tang Xianzu jinian* 唐獻祖紀年錄 (*Chronological Records of Later Tang Xianzu*) of Li Guochang, and *Tang Yizu jinian lu* 唐懿祖紀年錄 (*Chronological Records of Later Tang Yizu*) of Zhuxie Zhiyi. See also Wang, *Wudai huiyao* 18, pp. 298–99; Wang, “The *Chiu Wu-tai shih*,” pp. 10 ff; Twitchett, *Writing of Official History under the Tang*, pp. 191 ff.

The taboo name of the Virtuous Ancestor was Zhiyi; his father's taboo name was Jinzhong [Loyal to the Utmost]. From the time when his great-grandfather had been received at court by the emperor,¹¹² they were in charge of the troops north of the desert. In the fifth year of the reign of Dezong (789), the Uighur Qarluqs¹¹³ and the white-eyed Turks¹¹⁴ rebelled against the Uighur Loyal and Pure qaghan [Tolosu],¹¹⁵ and sought the patronage of the Tibetans; consequently, they became the vanguard administrative unit¹¹⁶ and advanced with 3,000 soldiers of the Tibetan troops to plunder our [Tang] Beiting. The Eminent Father [of Zhiyi] said to the Zhongzhen [Loyal and Pure] qaghan: "Last year the Tibetans massacred and destroyed [the people of] Ling and Yan [prefecture]. I heard that the Son of Heaven wishes to form a marital alliance with the Tsenpo; [you] the qaghan have collected merit for several generations and have married a princess. You enjoy grace as a favorite son; if the Tsenpo becomes favored by the Tang, then [you] as qaghan will certainly no longer have the favor you had before." The Loyal and Pure [qaghan] said: "What is to be done?" The Eminent Father said: "The Tang general Yang Xigu, who has tenaciously held Beiting, does not have roads to return to the court; right now, the Tibetans and the Turks have attacked him together. If he does not receive help his destruction and death will be inevitable. If Beiting is lost, we will be next in line. Is it possible that [you], Loyal and Pure, have not thought of this?" Zhongzhen was afraid and then ordered his general Il Ügäsi¹¹⁷ to lead the troops together with the Eminent Father to give relief to Beiting. In the sixth year of the Zhenyuan era (790), they fought a battle with the Tibetans at the mouth of the desert; Il Ügäsi retreated without success. The Eminent Father kept his ranks together at the feet of the fortress so as to protect [Yang] Xigu. The Tibetans attacked and put [the fortress] under siege for

¹¹² According to *Xin Tang shu*, this must be Gduozhi (*XTS* 218, p. 6154, see below).

¹¹³ Some Qarluqs (Geluolu 歌邏祿) who lived on Ötükän Mountain were subjects of the Uighurs. Other units of Qarluqs lived in the region of Beiting (between the Altai and Beiting) and were called *gelu* 葛祿 (Ecsedy, "Contribution to the History of Karluks in the T'ang Period," p. 29).

¹¹⁴ *ZZTJ* 233, p. 7520, has White-clothed (*bai fu* 白服) Turks.

¹¹⁵ This is Tolosu (Duoluosi 多邏斯; d.790), who became qaghan in the year 789 (Mackerras, *Uighur Empire*, p. 157).

¹¹⁶ On the role of small administrative units as local militias, see Su Hang 蘇航, "Tangdai beifang neifu fanbu yanjiu" 唐代北方內附蕃部研究, Ph.D. diss. (Beijing University, 2006).

¹¹⁷ Il Ügäsi (Jiegan Jiasi 頡干迦斯) was a general of the Uighur army (*JTS* 195, pp. 5208–10; *XTS* 217, pp. 6124–25).

a full year, after which all the military divisions successively were lost. In the twelfth month, the troops of Beiting forced the Eminent Father to surrender to the Tibetans, and for this reason [Zhiyi's father] moved 7,000 tents to Gan prefecture, where he served as a subject of the Tsenpo. In the thirteenth year of the Zhenyuan era (797), the Uighur Fengcheng [Respectfully Sincere] Qaghan¹¹⁸ regained Liang prefecture and soundly defeated the Tibetan army. Someone questioned the Eminent Father's loyalty in front of the Tsenpo, saying: "The Shatuo were originally a division of the Uighurs. Now, if they hear that the Uighurs are powerful, they will certainly conspire with them within our ranks." The Tsenpo was about to move the Eminent Father's troops to the other side of the Yellow River.

懿祖諱執宜，烈考諱盡忠，自曾祖入覲，復典兵於磧北。德宗貞元五年，回紇葛祿部及白眼突厥叛回紇忠貞可汗，附于吐蕃，因為鄉導，驅吐蕃之眾三十萬寇我北庭。烈考謂忠貞可汗曰：“吐蕃前年屠陷靈、鹽，聞唐天子欲與贊普和親，可汗數世有功，尚主，恩若驕兒，若贊普有寵於唐，則可汗必無前日之寵矣。”忠貞曰：“若之何？”烈考曰：“唐將楊襲古固守北庭，無路歸朝，今吐蕃、突厥併兵攻之，儻無援助，陷亡必矣。北庭既沒，次及于吾，可汗得無慮乎！”忠貞懼，乃命其將頡干迦斯與烈考將兵援北庭。貞元六年，與吐蕃戰于磧口，頡干迦斯不利而退。烈考牙於城下以援襲古，吐蕃攻圍經年，諸部繼沒。十二月，北庭之眾劫烈考降於吐蕃，由是舉族七千帳徙於甘州，臣事贊普。貞元十三年，回紇奉誠可汗收復涼州，大敗吐蕃之眾，或有問烈考於贊普者云：“沙陀本回紇部人，今聞回紇強，必為內應。”贊普將遷烈考之牙於河外。¹¹⁹

This long and colorful narrative, filled with direct speeches depicting the Shatuo as considerate intermediaries between two mutually antagonistic regimes, is a product of the Later Tang historiographical project to celebrate the memory of the dynastic forefathers; as such, it obviously cannot be taken at face value. Nonetheless, it was arguably one of the few sources on Shatuo–Tibetan relations, if not the only one, available to the eleventh-century historians who compiled the *New Tang History*. The *Annalistic Record of the Later Tang Virtuous Ancestor* and the “Shatuo Memoir” present story-lines so similar that eleventh-century historians can be assumed to have drawn on this source. The original text of the *Annalistic Record of the Later Tang Virtuous Ancestor* was nonetheless heavily edited and its narrative consistently modified. For in-

¹¹⁸ This was Achuai 啊啜, who became Fengcheng Qaghan in 790 (Mackerras, *Uighur Empire*, p. 157).

¹¹⁹ *ZZTJ* 237, p. 7651.

stance, it moves up the date of the eastward movement of the Shatuo to the final years of the reign of Dezong. Moreover, the dialogue between Zhuxie Zhiyi (Virtuous Ancestor) and his father, in which the former confesses his wish to regain his status as subject of the Tang, appears in both texts, with some variation.¹²⁰ Sometime at the beginning of the ninth century, seemingly as a result of this (improbable) conversation between the two leaders, Zhuxie Zhiyi led his division of 30,000 troops eastward from the Ötükan Mountains 烏德鞬山.¹²¹ When the military governor Fan Xichao 范希朝 (d. 814) heard that Zhuxie Zhiyi had arrived, according to the *Annalistic Record*, he immediately informed the court. The latter work portrays Zhuxie Zhiyi's alleged "turn to the Tang" as a celebrated event in which Tang Dezong is personally involved, and states that upon hearing the news, the emperor "sent an imperial commissioner to grant [Zhiyi] an audience at court and express his regards, and rewarded him with several tens of thousands of tin items."¹²² The court then "established a Yinshan Command in Yan prefecture and made the Virtuous Ancestor area commander, with the titles of tegin,¹²³ and

¹²⁰ *Jinian lu* has: "Our family have been subjects of the Tang for generations, but unfortunately was conquered by the [Tibetan] caitiffs. We served them [the Tibetans] loyally, risking our lives, and in return were met with suspicion. We might as well take advantage of their not yet having taken precautions and return to our [Tang] dynasty 吾家世爲唐臣, 不幸陷虜, 爲他效命, 反見猜嫌, 不如乘其不意, 復歸本朝"; *ZZTJ* 237, p. 7652. *XTS* 218, p. 6154, has: "Jinzhong and Zhuxie Zhiyi planned a strategy, and [the latter] said: 'We have been subjects of the Tang for generations, but unfortunately we were invaded; if we now go to the Xiao Pass and return [to the Tang] of our own accord, wouldn't that be better than [letting] our race [be] extinguished?' Jinzhong said: 'Very well'" 盡忠與朱邪執宜謀, 曰: "我世爲唐臣, 不幸陷汗, 今若走蕭關自歸, 不愈於絕種乎?" 盡忠曰: "善."

¹²¹ It is notable that the migration narrative of *Jinian lu* (followed by *XTS* and *ZZTJ*) reports that the Shatuo passed the Ötükan Mountains, the sacred mountains of the Turks presumably corresponding to part of the Khangai Mountains on the steppe. In the Orkhon Inscriptions the Ötükan Mountains are depicted as the sacred center of legitimizing charisma; see Talat Tekin, *A Grammar of Orkhon Turkish* (Bloomington: Indiana U.P., 1968), pp. 231, 234, 261 ff; Michael R. Drompp, "Breaking the Orkhon Tradition: Kirghiz Adherence to the Yenisei Region after A.D. 840," *JAOSS* 119.3 (1999), p. 391; Peter Golden, "Courts and Court Culture in the Proto-urban and Urban Developments among the Pre-Chinggisid Turkic Peoples," in David Durand-Guedy, ed., *Turko-Mongol Rulers, Cities and City Life* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), p. 42; also Wang, *Tang Tufan Dashi zhengzhi guanxi shi*, pp. 229 ff). Since the mountains are placed far north of Gan prefecture and definitely not *en route* to Ling prefecture, the Shatuo would not have needed to pass them in order to get to Ling prefecture. As suggested by Shaoyun Yang in a personal communication (for which I owe a debt of thanks), the fact that the migration narrative says that the Shatuo passed the sacred mountain on their way back to the Tang empire might carry some sort of symbolism, as though they were reconnecting to both their Turkic roots and their Tang roots at the same time. References to the Ötükan Mountains as place of origin of the ancestors can also be found in some funerary biographies (see Dong Chunlin 董春林, "Anshi zhi luan hou Hexi Tiele buzuo de qianxi, yi Tangdai Qibi zu wei li" 安史之亂後河西鐵勒部族的遷徙, 以唐代契苾族爲例, *Qinghai minzu daxue xuebao* 青海民族大學學報 38.1 [2012], pp. 81-84).

¹²² *ZZTJ* 237, p. 7652.

¹²³ On this Turkic title see Skaff, *Sui-Tang China*, p. 243.

brave and safeguarding general.”¹²⁴ The *Annalistic Record* goes on to state that when Xianzong 憲宗 (r. 805–820) became emperor, he again summoned Zhuxie Zhiyi to court and bestowed upon him the title of safeguarding general of Jinwu, and kept him and his troops at the capital as imperial bodyguards.¹²⁵

After comparing the *Annalistic Record* with other documents at his disposal, Sima Guang ultimately rejects its historical accuracy and remarks that the *Dezong shilu* 德宗實錄 does not record the move of the Shatuo to the Tang; moreover, he claims that the official documents contain no mention of Zhuxie Zhiyi’s having been invited to court for an audience with the emperor in 806.¹²⁶ In addition, the “Biography of Fan Xichao” in the *Old Tang History* states that at the time of Dezong, Fan Xichao was military governor of Zhenwu 振武; not until 807 did he become governor of Shuofang 朔方 and Ling-Yan 靈鹽,¹²⁷ at which time he recruited the Shatuo to join his troops.¹²⁸

On the other hand, the “Shatuo Memoir” contains narrative differences that remind the reader of the non-Chinese origins of the Shatuo. It mentions, for instance, that Fan Xichao wanted to “use them to defend against the [Tibetan] caitiffs 藉以捍虜,” and

to buy oxen and goats for them, to enlarge their grazing lands in order to give them respite and nourishment. Their children and elders who had come from Fengxiang, Xingyuan, and Taiyuan provinces all returned to their [Shatuo] unit. 爲市牛羊，廣畜牧，休養之。其童耄自鳳翔、興元、太原道歸者，皆還其部。¹²⁹

The “Shatuo Memoir” also mentions a younger brother of Jinzhong, Gele Abo 葛勒阿波, in charge of the remaining legion of 700, who submitted to the Zhenwu military governor,¹³⁰ and was granted the titles of great general of the militant guard and area commander of Yinshan, just like his elder brother.¹³¹ When Fan Xichao became mili-

¹²⁴ *ZZTJ* 237, p. 7652.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*

¹²⁷ *JTS* 151, p. 4058. Fan Xichao was military governor of Zhenwu from 790 to 803, and military governor of Shuofang and Ling-yan from 807 to 809; see Wu Tingxie 吳廷燮, *Tang fangzhen nianbiao* 唐方鎮年表 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980), pp. 165 ff.

¹²⁸ *JTS* 151, p. 4059.

¹²⁹ *XTS* 218, p. 6155.

¹³⁰ According to Wu Tingxie’s reconstruction, Zhang Fengguo 張奉國 was Zhenwu military governor from 808 to 810, and Adie Guangjin 阿跌光進 (Li Guangjin) from 810 to 813 (Wu, *Tang fangzhen nianbiao*, pp. 168 ff). On Li Guangjin, see Su Hang, “Tang houqi Hedong beibu de Tiele shili” 唐後期河東北部的鐵勒勢，從鷄田州的變遷說起, *Tang yanjiu* 唐研究 16 (2010), pp. 261–77.

¹³¹ *XTS* 218, p. 6155. Gele Abo also appears as area commander of Yinshan in *JTS* 14, p.

tary governor of Hedong and moved to Taiyuan, the Shatuo units followed him and became his personal army. Zhuxie Zhiyi then “guarded the Mound of the Yellow Flowers 黃花堆 at the Shenwu 神武 River,” and his units became known as the “Northern Shatuo of Yinshan 陰山北沙陀.”¹³²

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this article I have analyzed the three accounts of Shatuo genealogical descent: the “Li Keyong Epitaph,” the “Martial Emperor’s Annals,” and the “Shatuo Memoir.” I argued that they are discrete representations and self-representations of the ancestral memory of the Shatuo. The three origin stories differ in their respective portrayals of the Shatuo as historical actors in the late-medieval history of Central Asia. The term Shatuo conventionally identifies the very heterogeneous members of a group of settlements of Turkic extraction who were originally semisedentary and went on to play important military and defensive roles throughout the late-Tang period, first in the “loose rein” system of protected prefectures, and then as mercenaries of the imperial and provincial armies, including a short period of time in the Tibetan army. Once the Shatuo rose to a high-ranking position in the provincial system and members of its leading Zhuxie clan had established a dynasty, historians and writers in the tenth and eleventh centuries attempted to shape the origin stories of this heterogeneous group into coherent narratives, both privately and under imperial commission. Because each narrative legitimated a distinct interpretation of the Shatuo’s role within the Tang empire, this article has correspondingly sought to analyze them as different representations. The “Martial Emperor’s Annals,” for instance, portrays the Shatuo as a multigenerational group of patrilineal descent, composed of officials who served under the Tang, a description that elides the more than one hundred years of history preceding Li Keyong’s great-grandfather, who is referred to by the Chinese given name Jinzhong – “Loyal to the Utmost.” On the other hand, in the funerary epigraphic source that I have called the “Li Keyong Epitaph,” Li Keyong’s forefathers are not depicted as descended from the Turkic units of Beiting protectorate, nor do they migrate east to Hedong. Their clan history is territorially bound to northern Hedong for several generations, first as hegemons

426; 170, p. 2056; and 965, p. 11355.

¹³² *XTS* 218, p. 6155.

and “generals of the Sir-Yantuo” and then as Tang generals. They inherit and perpetuate the local tradition of the state of Jin, providing narrative continuity, and their loyalty to a dynastic house appears to be of secondary importance.

At the time the Epitaph was written by Lu Rubi, the Tang dynasty had recently collapsed, and the Taiyuan Jin were fighting against the Later Liang for hegemony over the Central Plains. Moreover, in the Epitaph the term “Shatuo” is used only in reference to the military units “san jun Shatuo,” and not as an appellation of the family clan. To be sure, the surnames Zhuxie and Li do not appear either: Li Keyong is always addressed by the title “Prince of Jin” and his forefathers only by their non-Chinese given names. The Epitaph also shows that Li Keyong’s clan did not consider him to be part of the Tang dynasty until the third generation of his ancestors, namely Zhuxie Zhiyi.

The Epitaph’s omission of the Shatuo eastward migration and of any connection with the northwestern protectorates could suggest that more than one group of settlements went by the name of Shatuo, and that one of these was already located in northern Hedong prior to the ninth century, possibly established there in the aftermath of the An Lushan Rebellion. Another detail that would suggest the existence of several settlements is the ambiguity of the location of Yinshan command.¹³³ The Yinshan mountain range is located in northeastern Xinjiang, but the source texts place the Yinshan command in more than one place in the early-ninth century: in Ling-Yan prefecture (Ningxia) and in northern Hedong. Furthermore, in the “Li Keyong Epitaph” the term Yinshan seems to refer to a broader area that stretches from the Yinshan range to northern Hedong, covering the territorial domain of the Sir-Yantuo. It could be argued that the post of great area commander of Yinshan was a sort of “mobile” prefectural seat: in other words, the Yinshan command did not coincide with a specific geographically identified territory, but rather identified the geographical origins of the settlements under its jurisdiction. According to the “Shatuo Memoir,” the seat of the Yinshan area commander was first established in Ling-Yan prefecture and bestowed upon Zhuxie Zhiyi. Once the Shatuo troops were moved to northern Hedong, the seat moved with them, and Zhuxie Zhiyi kept his title. The Memoir mentions that both Zhuxie Zhiyi and a younger brother of Zhuxie Jinzhong, Gele Abo, were simultaneously (but possibly in two different locations) invested as Yinshan commanders. The

¹³³ I would like to thank one of *Asia Major*’s anonymous reviewers for bringing this issue up in his/her report.

appellation “Northern Shatuo of Yinshan” applied to the Shatuo military groups that relocated to northern Hedong also suggests the existence of multiple Shatuo settlements referred to as Yinshan.

With some differences, both the entombed “Li Keyong Epitaph” and the “Martial Emperor’s Annals” see the Shatuo ancestors as descending from Tegreg units. Both sources carefully polish the Shatuo genealogical history and omit all references to the Shatuo’s service as border guards of the Tibetans, as well as their migration eastward. The “Shatuo Memoir,” by contrast, reports that the “Loyal to the Utmost” ancestor (Jinzhong) served the Tibetans as senior counselor. The latter text states that the Tibetans relied on the military forces of Zhuxie Jinzhong’s troops to such an extent that the decline of their empire was a consequence of his turning to the Tang.

Despite their high-ranking positions in government and their primary role in the final decades of the Tang dynasty, there is little recorded information about members of the Shatuo military group in the *Old Tang History*. Historical narratives concerning Shatuo members are to be found scattered in the Basic Annals and Collective Biographies. The only chapter of a standard-history work that was dedicated to the Shatuo was the “Shatuo Memoir” contained in the *New Tang History*, located at the end alongside chapters dedicated to the Turks, Uighurs, and Tibetans.

While the “Martial Emperor’s Annals” elevates Li Keyong to the rank of emperor, and the “Li Keyong Epitaph” compares his deeds to those of lord Wen of Jin (636–628 BC), the *New Tang History* seems to banish him to the level of a (subjugated) foreign people. Insisting on foreign origins as a marker that excludes the Shatuo from the Tang elites, this representation frames the Daibei Li as culturally and politically akin to the Uighurs and the Tibetans and again places them away from the center of Tang political and cultural power. The “Shatuo Memoir” arguably reassesses the Daibei Li’s identity and role in the dynastic history, and indirectly the role of the northern Turkic military elites, by framing their family history at the margins of the Tang institutions (in accordance with the traditional concentric and hierarchical view of the world). The setting of the Memoir seems to retrospectively freeze the Shatuo into the pre-An Lushan Rebellion “loose-rein prefecture” system, when members of the Shatuo elites were praised for adopting Chinese customs. Most certainly, the neat boundaries established by the “Shatuo Memoir” contributed to the vision of the Shatuo as, in the

words of Wolfram Eberhard, “the smallest tribal federation that ever conquered and ruled north China.”¹³⁴

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Chavannes	Édouard Chavannes, <i>Documents sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) occidentaux</i>
Chen	Chen Shangjun 陳尙君, <i>Jiu Wudai shi xinji huizheng</i> 舊五代史新輯會證
Fan	Fan Wenli 樊文禮, <i>Li Keyong pingzhuan</i> 李克用評傳
Iwami and Moribe	Iwami Kiyohiro 石見清裕, Moribe Yutaka 森部豊, “Tōmatsu Sada ‘Ri Kokuyō boshi’ yakuchū, kōsatsu” 唐末沙陀“李克用墓誌” 訳注, 考察
<i>JTS</i>	Liu Xu 劉昫 et al., <i>Jiu Tang shu</i> 舊唐書
<i>SS</i>	Wei Zheng 魏徵 et al., <i>Suishu</i> 隋書
<i>XTS</i>	Ouyang Xiu 歐陽修 et al., <i>Xin Tang shu</i> 新唐書
<i>XWDS</i>	Ouyang Xiu, <i>Xin Wudai shi</i> 新五代史
<i>ZZTJ</i>	Sima Guang 司馬光, <i>Zizhi tongjian</i> 資治通鑑

¹³⁴ Wolfram Eberhard, *Conquerors and Rulers: Social Forces in Medieval China*, chap. “The Shatuo and Their Culture” (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965) p. 89. It appears that by the end of the 12th c. the Öngüt (White Tartar) ruler claimed descent from Li Keyong. On this topic see Christopher P. Atwood, “Historiography and Transformation of Ethnic Identity in the Mongol Empire: the Öngüt Case Identity,” *Tang Studies* 15.4 (2014), pp. 514–34, and Maurizio Paolillo, “White Tartars: The Problem of the Origin of the Öngüt Conversion to Jingjiao and the Uighur Connection,” in Li Tang and Dietmar Winkler, eds., *From the Oxus River to the Chinese Shores: Studies on East Syriac Christianity in China and Central Asia* (Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2013), pp. 237–55.

Table 3: *Ancestry of the Shatuo According to Tenth- and Eleventh-century Sources*

(Table based on Iwami and Moribe, p. 44, with changes. “gen.” = “generation”)

LI KE-YONG FORBEARS	LI KEYONG EPITAPH	MARTIAL EMPEROR'S ANNALS (JIU WUDAI SHI)	ZAI XIANG SHIXI (XTS)	SHATUO MEMOIR (XTS)	ZHUANGZONG JI (XWDS)
9th gen. (始祖)		Baye 拔野 (Bayarqu) 唐貞觀中爲墨離軍使、金方道副都護、沙陀都督府		Chuyue Zhuxie Que <i>sjin</i> 歲月朱邪闕侯斤 (阿厥)	
8th gen.					
7th gen.				Zhuxie Guzhu 朱邪孤注 (d. 652)	Zhuxie Guzhu 朱邪孤注
6th gen.	Yidu 益度 (薛延陀國君、無敵將軍) Epitaph unclear. Yidu lived sometime in these gen's.	Patrilineal males (names unknown) appeared successively through these 5 gen's.		Shatuo Nasu 沙陀那速 Shatuo Jinshan 沙陀金山 (墨離軍討擊使) 702: 金滿州都督, 累封張掖郡公	
5th gen.				Shatuo Fuguo 沙陀輔國 (金滿州都督、永壽郡王)	
4th gen.				Shatuo Guozhi 沙陀骨咄支 (回紇副都護, 特進、驍衛上將軍)	
3d gen. (曾祖)	Sige 思葛 (續有陰山)	Zhuxie Jinzhong 朱邪盡忠		Zhuxie Jinzhong 朱邪盡忠 (金吾衛大將軍、酒泉縣公) Under Tibetan rule: 軍大論	Zhuxie Jinzhong 朱邪盡忠
2d gen. (祖)	Zhuxie Zhiyi 朱邪執儀	Zhuxie Zhiyi 朱邪執宜	Zhuxie Zhiyi 朱邪執宜	Zhuxie Zhiyi 朱邪執宜	Zhuxie Zhiyi 朱邪執宜
列考	Li Guochang 李國昌	Li Guochang	Li Guochang	Li Guochang	Li Guochang