

CENTRAL ASIATIC JOURNAL

INTERNATIONAL PERIODICAL
FOR THE LANGUAGES, LITERATURE,
HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY OF
CENTRAL ASIA

VOLUME V

Nr. 3

1960

joint publication of

MOUTON & CO.
THE HAGUE

OTTO HARRASSOWITZ
WIESBADEN

absent from the monastery religious services for extended periods of time is, for him, no problem. And whenever neither influence, commercial power, nor the application of financial pressure is sufficient to advance monastery interest, it is not out of character for him to busy himself with the procurement of arms and ammunition and then lead the troops.

In all these strictly secular activities the *Ban Log* (priest rebel) significantly strengthens the centripetal attraction toward the monastery, which the *sPrul sKu* (emanation body[s]) create in the religious frame of reference. However widely he may range, the monastery is, spatially, the base from which he operates, to which he returns, and to which he draws the attention, the interest, and, ultimately, the presence of those with whom he deals.

Finally, the *Ban Log* (priest rebel) may extend the influence of his monastery in a far reaching, though tentative and somewhat amorphous manner far beyond the limits set by factors of geography and political affiliation. The *Ban Log* (priest rebel) may take a managerial position, either commercial or political, with some other monastery or some noble or chief far from the monastery of his origin, yet there will always remain a link between him, in his new position, and the monastery where his status as a resident *Ban Log* (priest rebel) is signaled by the house he may still own and by the personal relationships he continues to have with the individuals and the management of his old monastery. In such case his function as a link may be much diluted but will continue to exist and to help tie together the segments of Tibetan society.

This brief description and discussion of the status and function of the three categories of inmates within a Tibetan monastery will, it is felt, help reconcile the many descriptions of Tibetan monastic life which appear conflicting and contradictory when it is assumed that the inmates of the monasteries all belong to one all-inclusive, loosely defined category. It may also shed light on the over-all role of the monasteries in the turbulent scenes of Tibetan history and in the tumult and change of contemporaneous events.

THE CHING LU SHEN SHRINES OF HAN SWORD WORSHIP IN HSIUNG NU RELIGION

by

KAO CH'U-HSÜN*

Academia Sinica, Taipei

If we accept as evidence what is recorded in the *Shih chi*, *Han shu*, and *Chin shu* concerning the activities of the shaman priests (*wu*) of the Hsiung nu, then there is no question but that the Hsiung nu people believed in what we today technically term shamanism.¹ According to the *Feng shan shu* of the *Shih chi*, "The shaman priests (*wu*) of the Nine Heavens sacrifice to the Nine Heavens." And the Exegesis (*So yin*) of Szu-ma Chen contains the quotation: "Shaman priests of Northern People (*hu*) sacrifice to the Nine Heavens at the altar Shen Ming T'ai."

From this we can see a similarity in the kind of belief in shamanism between the Hsiung nu of that time and the moderns.² The Hsiung nu thought that the world of heaven was divided into nine levels, and that each level had its own heavenly spirits. However, of the many heavenly spirits which the Hsiung nu worshipped, the name of only one has come down to us. This is Ching lu shen, the Ching lu spirit. In the present state of our knowledge Ching lu shen appears to have been a kind of ancient war divinity. As such, he ought to have occupied a reasonably high position in the pantheon of a warlike nomad people. This Ching lu shen worshipped by the Hsiung nu is not mentioned in the Hsiung nu Account (*Hsiung nu chuan*) of either the *Shih chi* or the two histories of Han. In the *Ch'ien Han shu*, however, we do read that at Yün Yang,

* The author was in residence for the academic year 1958-59 at the University of California, Berkeley, under the Inter-University Scholar Program. This paper has been read at the campus of the University of California at Berkeley. The English text is mainly prepared by Russell Maeth. Criticism and suggestions made by Shih-hsiang Chen, Donald H. Shiveley, Lien-sheng Yang, and Kun Chang are incorporated in the final revised version.

¹ Mircea Eliade, *Le chamanisme et les techniques archaïques de l'extase* (Paris, 1951).

² Egami Namio, "The Sacrifice of Hsiung Nu", in *Yūrashiya Kodai Hoppō Bunka* (Tōkyō, 1948), pp. 225-79.

not far from the capital, the Imperial House of Han kept an establishment for sacrifice to Ching lu shen.

A passage in the Treatise on Geography (*Ti li chih*) in the Han shu under Tso P'eng I states: "Yün Yang yu hsiu ch'u chin jen chi ching lu shen tz'u san so." As it stands the passage is ambiguous. The Japanese scholar, Egami Namio, interprets it to mean that at Yün Yang there was a shrine each for the putative Hsiu ch'u and Chin jen divinities and one for Ching lu shen, making three places (*so*) or shrines in all. Egami would translate this passage something like: "At Yün Yang there is a triad of shrines (for) Hsiu ch'u, Chin jen, and Ching lu shen." My feeling is that this interpretation cannot be right. It would be better, I think, to take the citation to mean "At Yün Yang there are the Hsiu ch'u Prince's metal men for the worship of Heaven and three Ching lu shen shrines." There is another quotation to be considered. The Treatise on Intramural Sacrifices (*Chiao szu chih*) in the Han shu states: "At Yün Yang there are the Ching lu shen shrines; they are for sacrifice to the Hsiu ch'u Prince (*Wang*)."

From the fact that the Treatise on Geography takes special pains to state clearly that in Yün Yang hsien there were both "The Hsiu ch'u Prince's metal men for the worship of Heaven and three shrines for Ching lu shen", we can see that at that time the shrines were regarded as very special and out of the ordinary. Pan Ku, the Han historian and principal author of the Han shu, knew well the true nature of the "metal men for the worship of Heaven". What unfortunately happened, however, was that Chinese historians after the Nan pei ch'ao period mistakenly took the metal men to be an image of Buddha. Pan Ku's theory, however, that the Ching lu shen shrines were used for sacrifice to the Hsiu ch'u Prince is in my opinion questionable. It is this point that I shall discuss in the remainder of this paper, though I shall not now declare categorically whether Pan Ku was wholly right or wrong.

From the text of the Treatise on Intramural Sacrifices in the Han shu, it is clear that the Ching lu shen shrines established in Yün Yang by the Imperial House of Han were not used for the worship of a deity native to Chinese soil. A relevant note of Yen Shih ku of the T'ang dynasty which states that: "'Hsiu ch'u' is the appellation of a Hsiung nu prince; the Ching lu shen was originally a Hsiung nu sacrifice" is correct.

How these two dissimilar things, however, got linked together, and why the Ching lu shen shrine was used for the worship of Prince Hsiu ch'u were never explained by Yen himself. Wang Hsien ch'ien of the

Ch'ing dynasty in his Supplements to the Notes on the Treatise on Geography in Han shu states: "For information on the Hsiu ch'u Prince's metal men for the worship of Heaven and the Ching lu blade (*tao*) see the Hsiung nu Account. Moreover, the Treatise on Intramural Sacrifices states: 'At Yün Yang there are the Ching lu shen shrines; they are for sacrifice to Prince Hsiu ch'u.' Ching lu, then, is the name of Prince Hsiu ch'u who died and became a divinity worshipped by the Hsiung nu, and later on by the Chinese too. It was not the precious blade that they worshipped. The divinity left a precious blade behind, and it only acquired its name from his own given name, Ching lu." Wang Hsien ch'ien's intention was to supplement the insufficiencies of Yen Shih ku's note, but his assertions are pure speculation and are not to be given credence.

Ching lu was originally the name of a kind of Hsiung nu weapon. The Hsiung nu Account of the Han shu states: "Han Ch'ang and Chang Meng together with the Shan yü and his great officers ascended the mountain east of the No River, and there they put a white horse to death. The Shan yü took the Ching lu blade and a metal spoon and [stirred the horse's blood in with] wine. Then, using as a drinking utensil the skull of the Yüeh chih King shattered by the Lao shang Shan yü, they drank together to the Oath of Blood." Yen Shih ku's note which states: "Ying Shao declares: 'Ching lu is the name of a precious blade of the Hsiung nu,'" is quite believable, for the use of blade and spoon to stir wine is also seen in the Wei Hsiao Account (*Wei hsiao chuan*) in the Han shu.

F. Hirth in his *Ahnentafel Attilas*³ believes that the term *ching lu* has some relation to the word *kyngrak* which means small knife in Teleut, one of the Turkic family of languages; and also to the word *qingrak* which means the same thing in the language of East Turkestan. Ching lu is their phonetic equivalent in Chinese. Moreover, in *The Ancient History of China*,⁴ Hirth reconstructed the ancient pronunciation of *ching lu* as *king luk*, which appears to be the equivalent of *kingrak*,

³ *Sinologische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Türk-Völker*. I. Die Ahnentafel Attilas nach Johannes von Turocz. Ein Versuch, die vom ungarischen Chronisten aufbewahrten Namen der Vorfahren Attilas in der Regententafel des Hsiung-nu-Volkes wiederzufinden. Im Oktober 1899 den vereinigten zentral- und ostasiatischen Abteilungen des XII. Internationalen Orientalisten-Kongresses in Rom (vgl. Actes du douzième congrès international des orientalistes, II Florence 1902, p. 225-236) mitgeteilt, und am 19. November 1899 der Kaiserl. Akad. d. Wissensch. in St. Petersburg vorgelegt. *Bull.* XIII, no. 2 (1900), pp. 220-261.

⁴ F. Hirth, *The Ancient History of China; to the end of the Chou dynasty* (New York, 1908).

the term used in modern Turkic dialects to describe a double-bladed knife worn at the waist. The Japanese scholar Shiratori⁵ believes that the Hsiung nu *ching lu* is related to the Mongolian *kingara*, which means double-bladed sword; and, moreover, that both *kingara* and *qingrak* possibly derive from Iranian and Persian words for sword. B. Karlgren's *Philology and Ancient China*⁶ approves Hirth's observations, but suggests the reconstruction *kieng luog* would make a better comparison with *kingrak*. From all this we know, consequently, that *ching lu* has close connection with both the Turkic *kingrak* and the Mongolian *kingara*, proving the dependability of both Hirth's and Shiratori's assertions.

Turning now to the province of archeology, a short sword of definite style has been unearthed in the valley of the Danube, in southern and eastern Russia, in Syria to the south, and Siberia and Inner Mongolia in the east. This type of sword is generally termed Perso-Scythian. The classical Greek term for this type of sword is *akinakes*. Some scholars believe that the *ching lu* of the Hsiung nu must be the *akinakes* of the Greeks. However, the only study I know of based on comparative phonology is Professor Egami Namio's. Accepting Hirth's reconstruction of *ching lu* as ancient *king luk*, Egami adduces examples to show that the initial *a-* of *akinakes* was unstressed and therefore very easily lost, and that the final *-es* was simply a grammatical particle suffixed to certain nouns. According to his theory, furthermore, the *ki-* in the root, *kinrak*, was transliterated by the Chinese syllable *king*, with a nasal final; while the *-rak* of the root was rendered *luk*, a justifiable assumption owing to the interchangeability of *l*, *r*, and *n*. As I myself am a comparative outsider where questions of ancient phonology are concerned, I cannot present you any opinions on Professor Egami's position. However, by comparing Herodotus' record of Scythian sacrifice to the *akinakes*, the use of the *akinakes* by the Saka for stirring blood and wine together during the blood oath, the existence of Hsiung nu shrines honoring the Ching lu, the Hsiung nu practice of stirring wine with the *ching lu* during the oath, we may well be led to believe that the *ching lu* of the Hsiung nu and the *akinakes* of the Greeks were the same thing, namely, the Perso-Scythian style sword.

⁵ Shiratori Kurakichi, "The Territory of the Hsiung Nu Prince Hsiu Ch'u and His Metal Statues for Heaven Worship (Kyōdo no kyūsho-ō no ryōiki to sono saiten no kinjin ni tsuite)", in *Miyake hakushi koki shukuga kinen rombunshū* (Tōkyō, 1929), pp. 245-306.

⁶ B. Karlgren, *Philology and Ancient China* (Oslo, 1926).

That the name of one of the most venerated heavenly spirits the Hsiung nu possessed was also the word for sword, led me to suspect that the Ching lu shen shrines, contrary to Wang Hsien ch'ien's speculation, were places for the worship of a precious blade, and that this religious practice of the Hsiung nu was very like that of the Scythians, who also used a precious blade as a symbol or image of the God of War. This I realized as I was first reading Ellis H. Minns' *Scythians and Greeks*, in which the worship and sacrifice to an *akinakes*-like sword are described as taking place among the nomadic peoples of the northern regions, especially among the Scythians and, later, among the tribes of the Hsiung nu King Attila. Afterwards, happening to read Professor Shiratori's article, "The Territory of the Hsiung Nu Prince Hsiu Ch'u and His Metal Statues for Heaven Worship", and Professor Egami's, "Examination of the Ching Lu Tao",⁸ I found out that both, basing themselves on Herodotus, had decided that the Ching lu shen shrines mentioned in the Treatise on Intramural Sacrifices in the Han shu were places for the worship of the precious blade of the Hsiung nu. Professor Egami, moreover, citing the Hsiung nu-account in the Han shu that the Hsiung nu killed the Chinese general Li Kuang li to offer sacrifice to the weapon, concludes that this was no more than the *ching lu* blade to which the sacrifice was offered. For this reason he supposes that there was a shrine set up in the Shan yü's court for the worship of Ching lu shen. In my opinion Professor Egami's hypotheses are correct. Although the Hsiung nu-account does not explicitly state that Li Kuang li was killed and offered as sacrifice to the Ching lu deity shrine, the importance of the word *ping*, weapon, cannot be underestimated.

We know that a number of customs, habits and items of material culture that the Hsiung nu possessed were similar to those of the other peoples who roamed the Eurasian steppes; namely, the Scythians and the Saka. In recent years very few Hsiung nu architectural remains have been unearthed by archeology. This supports in a negative way the tradition of the Han shu and Shih chi that the Hsiung nu were not given to building walled and fortified settlements. Moreover, the Hsiung nu gave special attention to trees. These two facts cause us to believe that possibly the Ching lu shen shrine of the Hsiung nu was like the shrines of the Scythians, that is, it was a high platform made of the branches of trees upon which was placed the precious blade

⁷ Ellis H. Minns, *Scythians and Greeks* (Cambridge, 1913).

⁸ Egami Namio, "Examination of the Ching Lu Tao", in *Yūrashiya Kodai Hoppō Bunka* (Tōkyō, 1948), pp. 133-63.

to be worshipped. What the Ching lu shen shrine that the Chinese had at Yün Yang was like, however, is a question that we cannot hypothesize upon, since there is not so much as a clue in the historical records.

What we know of ancient ethnography permits us to believe that the Hsiung nu Ching lu shen shrines were places for the worship of the God of War symbolized by the *ching lu* blade. The questions now remain, why does the Treatise on Intramural Sacrifices in the Han shu state that there were the Ching lu shen shrines at Yün Yang, and why does it state that the shrines were for the worship of the Hsiu ch'u Prince?

We know that Hsiu ch'u Prince was merely the title of the leader of one of the Hsiung nu tribes. Compared to the other Hsiung nu princes his position was not very high. Moreover, as he had been defeated on numerous occasions by the Chinese general Huo Ch'ü ping, he feared that he would soon be murdered by the Hsiung nu Shan yü, and so he conspired with the Hsiung nu Hun yeh Prince to surrender to the Chinese. Before the plot came off, however, the Hsiu ch'u Prince had a change of heart and was murdered by his fellow conspirator, the Hun yeh Prince.

Now, the only relations that the Hsiu ch'u Prince had ever had with the Chinese had been on the battlefield, so I doubt very much that such a person could ever become the object of worship in the Ching lu shen shrines of the imperial house of Han. As for the explanation given by Wang Hsien ch'ien, I believe it is wholly mistaken. In the first place, *ching lu* is the name of a sword used by the Hsiung nu; secondly, there is no proof that the Hsiu ch'u Prince's personal name was Ching lu; so it seems even less likely that the name of the *ching lu* sword was given it on account of the posthumous influence of the Hsiu ch'u Prince.

In this paper I will not discuss the origin of the swords of China and northern Eurasia. But I do feel that it is necessary to explain that the Perso-Scythian style sword was known in China before the Ch'in and Han dynasties. In 1937 as we were excavating a Warring States (Chan kuo, 403-221 B.C.) tomb in Hui hsien, Honan, a sword of this style was unearthed, from which it can plainly be seen that Chinese were using this type of sword long before Ch'in and Han. The name *ching lu* was also known by the Chinese long before Ch'in and Han. Comparatively good evidence for this is an episode in Shih chi which describes Chou Wu Wang's annihilation of the Shang dynasty: Chou Wu Wang took a *ch'ing chien* and struck the corpse of the Shang king Hsin with it. Among pre-Ch'in texts the same story is told in the Conquest of Yin

Chapter (*K'o yin p'ien*) of the Lost Books of Chou (*I Chou shu*). Here the *ch'ing chien* used by Chou Wu Wang is recorded as *ch'ing lü*. K'ung Chao's commentary says: "*ch'ing lü* – a name for sword", which is correct. Hirth believed that the ancient pronunciation of *ch'ing lü* was *king lu*, and further, that *king lu* and *king luk* (the ancient pronunciation of *ching lu*) were the phonetic equivalents of the Turkic *kingrak*. In the *Grammata Serica*,⁹ Karlgren reconstructs *ch'ing lü* as *k'ien glio*, and *ching lu* as *kieng glâg*. My friend Professor Tung T'ung-ho reconstructs the ancient pronunciation of *ch'ing lü* as *k'ien gliag*, and *ching lu* as *kieng glâg*.¹⁰ From this we can see that in ancient times *ch'ing lü* and *ching lu* were nearly identical in sound and belonged to the same rhyme. Further, there is no doubt that they were both terms for the Perso-Scythian style sword. Since the term *ch'ing lü* was already known by the Chinese long before Ch'in and Han, the theory of Wang Hsien ch'ien that it had its origin from the personal name of the Hsiu ch'u Prince naturally falls to the ground.

There now remains the question of why the Treatise on Intramural Sacrifices in the Han shu states that the Ching lu shen shrines were used for the worship of the Hsiu ch'u Prince. There are two schools of thought on this subject. The first, represented by the Japanese scholar Shiratori, frankly declares that the Treatise on Intramural Sacrifices is mistaken. The second both accepts *ch'ing lü* as a word for sword and acknowledges the Treatise on Intramural Sacrifices to be correct. And, in addition, it produces a seemingly reasonable explanation that is far in advance of Wang Hsien ch'ien's. Professor Egami, a proponent of the latter opinion, believes that after the Hsiu ch'u Prince was killed, his tribe was surrendered to the Chinese by his murderer, the Hun yeh Prince; and that the House of Han, in order to soothe and appease this group of surrendered barbarians, at Yün Yang erected shrines to Ching lu shen and therein sacrificed to their late leader, the Hsiu ch'u Prince. This is his explanation of the sentence in the Treatise on Intramural Sacrifices: "At Yün Yang there are the Ching lu shen shrines; they are for sacrifice to the Hsiu ch'u Prince."

Another proponent of the second point of view is Professor Homer H. Dubs. In his article "The Golden Man of Former Han Time"¹¹ he

⁹ Bernard Karlgren, *Grammata Serica* (Stockholm, 1940).

¹⁰ Tung T'ung-ho, *Phonology of the Archaic Chinese* (*Shang ku yin yün piao kao*), 1st edition (Li chuang, Szechuan, 1944).

¹¹ Homer H. Dubs, "The Golden Man of Former Han Time", in *T'oung Pao* (Leiden) vol. XXXIII, Livr. 1 (1937), pp. 1-14.

expresses the opinion that the Ching lu shen shrines were established by Han Wu Ti as commemorative places for the spirit of the Hsiu ch'u Prince. The reason Han Wu Ti wanted so specially to commemorate the spirit of the Hsiu ch'u Prince, Dubs takes to be the love that Han Wu Ti had for the son of the Hsiu ch'u Prince, Chin Mi Ti. As additional proof, Dubs shows that there were pictures of Chin Mi Ti's mother in the Sweet Springs Palace (*Kan Ch'üan Kung*) also located at Yün Yang.

To summarize, Egami explains the passage in the Treatise on Intramural Sacrifice as government policy designed to pacify the surrendered but still disgruntled Hsiung nu; Dubs' explanation is that the founding of the shrines was the result of Han Wu Ti's affection for Chin Mi Ti, the son of the Hsiu ch'u Prince. Both explanations seem reasonable, yet both are a considerable distance from the true facts.

Their great error, and Professor Shiratori is included too, is their assumption that the Ching lu shen shrines at Yün Yang were established by Han Wu Ti. They have not paid close attention to the true history of the shrines at all. Now, in the Treatise on Intramural Sacrifices in the Han shu there are careful listings of each and every sort of temple and shrine founded by the Han emperors from Kao Tsu (206–194 B. C.) on down. Before the time of Hsüan Ti (73–48 B. C.), there is absolutely no mention of Ching lu shen shrines. It is only when the Hsüan Ti's reign is reached, that at last there is the entry: "Hsüan Ti ascended the throne . . . in Hu Hsien near the capital city there are shrines to Lao Ku, Wu Ch'uang Mountain, the Sun, the Moon, the Five Ancestor Deities, the Sylph Men, and the Jade Woman. At Yün Yang there are the Ching lu shen shrines; they are for sacrifice to the Hsiu ch'u Prince."

Moreover, the Treatise on Intramural Sacrifices also records that Ch'eng Ti (32–6 B. C.) closed all shrines that did not answer to reason or were duplicative. Listing first the shrines established by Han Kao Tsu that were closed, the list goes on to name those established by Wen Ti and Wu Ti which suffered the same fate. At the very last, the account reads: "As to the shrines established by Hsiao Hsüan (i.e., Hsüan Ti), to Ts'an Mountain, P'eng Mountain, Chih Fu, Ch'eng Mountain, Lai Mountain, the Four Seasons, Ch'ih Yu, Lao Ku, Wu Ch'uang, the Sylph Men, the Jade Woman, Ching lu, the Myriad Ancestor Deities, the Heavenly Spirits, the Springs and Waters, and the like: they were all closed."

On the basis of this evidence we may be certain that the Ching lu

shen shrines, whether one or three, were established in the reign of Hsüan Ti and not before; which is to say, they must have been established sometime between 73 and 49 B. C. Moreover, according to both the Annals of Hsüan Ti (*Hsüan Ti Chi*) and the Treatise on Intramural Sacrifices, from the beginning of his reign until the thirteenth year, 61 B. C., the Emperor hardly set foot outside his palace. The text reads: "At that time the Great General Huo Kuang assisted in governing; the One on High (i.e., Hsüan Ti) reverently faced due south. Unless it was to sacrifice at the Ancestral Temple, he did not go out." Since it was only after 61 B. C. that Hsüan Ti began making Imperial Tours to various parts of China to carry out sacrificial observances, it is obvious that the Ching lu shen shrines could not have been founded by him before that year, which, incidentally, was the first year of a new reign period, Shen chüeh.

Now, according to the Hsiung nu Account in both the Shih chi and the Han shu and to the Huo Ch'ü ping Account, the Hun yeh Prince murdered the Hsiu ch'u Prince and surrendered the latter's tribe to the Chinese, all in the second year of the Yüan shou reign of Han Wu Ti, or, in other words, in 121 B. C. As we have seen, the founding of the Ching lu shen shrines could not have taken place earlier than 61 B. C. At least sixty years must separate the two events.

According to the Han shu Chin Mi Ti Account (*Chin Mi Ti chuan*), Chin Mi Ti died in approximately the second year of the Yüan shih reign of Chao Ti, that is, about 85 B. C., fourteen years before the date Hsüan Ti could possibly have begun the establishment of the Ching lu shen shrines.

In the face of such historical facts as these, it becomes very difficult to assert that the motive for the establishment of the Ching lu shen shrines at Yün Yang had any connection with either the Hsiu ch'u Prince's tribe or with Chin Mi Ti.

It is equally difficult to imagine how these shrines came to be places for the worship of the Hsiu ch'u Prince. If we are willing to go a step further in hypothesizing why the House of Han established Ching lu shen shrines in Yün Yang, we may well consider the following three points:

- (1) Ching lu shen was a Hsiung nu war deity and was represented in worship by a *ching lu* blade or Perso-Scythian style sword.
- (2) Whatever the reason for its establishment, the Ching lu shen shrine at Yün Yang could not have been established before 61 B. C.
- (3) The Ching lu shen shrine which the Imperial House of Han estab-

lished at Yün Yang was a national or public shrine, not a private ancestral shrine.

Keeping these three points in mind, if we now examine the history of Sino-Hsiung nu relations from the time when Hsüan Ti assumed an active role in government (61 B. C.) to the end of his reign (48 B. C.), we may perhaps be able to shed some light on the problem.

Beginning with the last years of the reign of Han Wu Ti, the power of the Hsiung nu nation had begun gradually to decline. By Hsüan Ti's time, and especially during the period we have been discussing, the Shen chüeh reign (61-57 B. C.), the Hsiung nu, torn by incessant civil war, had already embarked on the period of semi-independence. According to the Han shu Hsiung nu Account, in the first year of the Shen chüeh reign (61 B. C.) there began a ferment among the Southern Hsiung nu to surrender to the Chinese. The following citations are from the Annals of Hsüan Ti (*Hsüan Ti pen chi*) in the Han shu:

- (1) Shen chüeh 2 (60 B. C.), Autumn. The Hsiung nu Jih chu Prince Hsien hsien ch'an led his people 10,000 and more to surrender. [The Hsiung nu] Shan yü sent a prince of name (Ming Wang) who offered [tribute] goods with reverence. Contractive kinship [that is, the exchange of marriageable princesses] started in the first month of the new year.
- (2) Shen chüeh 4 (58 B. C.), fifth month. The Hsiung nu Shan yü sent his younger brother Hu liu jo Prince Sheng chih to court [to pay homage].
- (3) Wu feng 2 (56 B. C.), eleventh month. The Hsiung nu Hu su lei Shan yü came and surrendered at the head of his host. He was created a *lieh hou*.
- (4) Wu feng 3 (55 B. C.), sixth month. Dependent states (*shu kuo*) were established in Hsi ho and Pei ti to accommodate those Hsiung nu who had submitted to the Han.
- (5) Wu feng 4 (54 B. C.), first month. The Hsiung nu Shan yü used the style "[your] Servant". He sent his younger brother, the Lu li Prince to Han as hostage (*ju shih*).
- (6) Kan lu 1 (53 B. C.), first month. Hsüan Ti made an imperial progress to the Sweet Spring Palace and performed the Intramural Sacrifice at the Holy Place of T'ai. The Hsiung nu Hu han yeh Shan yü sent his son, the Yu hsien Prince Chu lü ch'ü t'ang to Han as hostage (*ju shih*).
- (7) Kan lu 3 (51 B. C.), first month. Hsüan Ti made an imperial progress to the Sweet Spring Palace and performed the Intramural

Sacrifice at the Holy Place of T'ai. The Hsiung nu Hu han yeh Shan yü Chi hou shan came to court [to pay homage].

- (8) Huang lung 1 (49 B. C.), first month. Hsüan Ti made an imperial progress to the Sweet Spring Palace and performed the Intramural Sacrifice at the Holy Place of T'ai. The Hsiung nu Hu han yeh Shan yü came to court [to pay homage]. [The Emperor] bestowed courtesies [on him] as before.

All these entries, especially Hsüan Ti's going three times to the Sweet Spring Palace and the Shan yü's coming twice in person to pay homage, are reminiscent of a practice current in China even in recent times. I speak of the establishment of the many Lamaseries or temples of Tibetan Buddhism found in and about Peking, temples erected by the reigning dynasty to win the hearts of the steppe people. In my opinion, it is very possible that the establishment of the Ching lu shen shrines by the Imperial House of Han at Yün Yang was the expression of Hsüan Ti's policy of pacification towards the surrendered Hsiung nu. The Annals of Hsüan Ti in clear praise of this policy, state: "It pushed aside the dead to make the living firm."

In addition to materials contained in the Han shu itself, archeology, ethnology, and philology have all made me suspect the accuracy of the statement in the Treatise on Intramural Sacrifices: "At Yün Yang there are Ching lu shen shrines; they are for sacrifice to the Hsiu ch'ü Prince." This might have been an erroneous record in Pan Ku's work. Mine, however, is only the opinion of one man, and if there are other explanations to be advanced, I hope we will hear them too.

My paper has amounted, I am afraid, to little more than one footnote to one sentence in the Han shu, seemingly a very small matter. Yet the proper explanation of this one sentence is greatly important in our understanding both of Hsiung nu religion and of Han foreign policy.

IMPORTANT CHINESE EXPRESSIONS IN CHARACTERS:

chin jen 金人
 Chin Mi Ti 金日磾
 ching lu 經路
 Ching lu shen 經路神
 Ching lu shen shrines 經路神祠
 ch'ing chien 輕劍
 ch'ing lü 輕呂
 Hsiu ch'ü Prince 休屠王
 Hu han yeh Shan yü 呼韓邪單于

Hu han yeh Shan yü Chi hou shan 呼韓邪單于稽侯獬
 Hu liu jo Prince Sheng chih 呼留若王勝之
 Hu su lei Shan yü 呼遼累單于
 Hun yeh Prince 昆邪王
 Jih chu Prince Hsien hsien ch'an 日逐王先賢揮
 Lao shang Shan yü 老上單于
 lieh hou 列侯
 Lu li Prince 谷蠡王
 Ming Wang 名王
 shu kuo 屬國
 Supplements to the Notes on the Treatise on Geography in
 the Han shu, 漢書地理志補注
 Wei Hsiao Chuan 隗囂傳
 Yu hsien Prince Chu lü ch'ü t'ang 右賢王銖婁渠堂
 Yün Yang yu Hsiu ch'u chin jen chi ching lu shen tz'u san so,
 雲陽有休屠金人及徑路神祠三所

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

REPORT ON THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF MONGOLISTS IN ULAANBAATAR, SEPTEMBER 1-18, 1959

I

On the initiative of the Institute of Languages and Letters of the Committee of Science and Higher Education of the Mongolian People's Republic, mongolists of many countries met at the First International Congress of Mongolists at Ulaanbaatar, from September 1st to September 18th, 1959. The initiator's aim was the promotion and further development of Mongolistics both philologically and linguistically and the establishment of better communication between mongolists of all countries. Anticipating our conclusion, we can say that both these aims have been realized: this was due to the careful planning on the side of the Mongolian scholars, the high quality of the academical contributions, and the enormous amount of publication work completed previous to the convention – which enabled the participants to obtain all of the relevant material in situ. The heart-warming hospitality extended to the participants created a congenial atmosphere which was most conducive to the desired exchange of ideas and which laid the foundation for further scholarly intercourse.

Though the forces behind the impetus can perhaps not be completely discerned, there is no doubt that Professor Rinchen, Professor Damdin-suren, and Professor Lubsanvandan had a lion's share in these efforts. These scholars were also responsible for the editing of all the contributions, for the creation and publication of three new series, i.e., *Corpus Scriptorum Mongolorum*, *Studia Mongolica*, and *Studia Folklorica*, as well as for the organizational details of the congress; they were furthermore entrusted with the issue of special stamps in token of the Congress and of voluminous publications containing a large series of Mongolian ornamental designs and decorations, etc., etc. All this makes us marvel at the energy and efficiency of these eminent personalities, especially in view of the fact that they are also responsible for the dialogues and