From Barbarians to the Middle Kingdom: The Rise of the Title "Emperor, Heavenly Qaghan" and Its Significance

Han-je Park*

INTRODUCTION

The entrance of the Five Barbarians (*wuhu* 五胡) people into the Central Plain of China is a historical event of great significance in the East, comparable in importance to the migration of Germanic tribes into the Roman Empire. The Five Barbarians became the main actors in the establishment of an array of dynasties throughout the periods of the Sixteen Kingdoms of Five Hu, the Northern Dynasties, and eventually the cosmopolitan empires of the Sui (隋) and the Tang (唐). With the passing of time, they lost their original culture and customs, and many came to lose their ethnonym. This phenomenon is described as their sinicization (*hanhua* 漢化), although there is also a contrary view that the Han (漢) people in China were barbaricized (*huhua* 胡化) and thus widened the range of Chinese culture. But, we may ask, do the terms "sinicization" and "barbaricization" adequately convey what really happened? Aside from arguments regarding sinicization or barbaricization, what role did the Five Barbarians actually play in the history of China? Were they indeed a people without a culture, who could therefore not bring anything novel to China itself,[1] or were they a civilization with a sophisticated culture of their own?

*Seoul National University (Seoul, Korea)

Journal of Central Eurasian Studies, Volume 3 (October 2012): 23–68

The Han and Tang empires are often joined together and referred to as the "empires of the Han and the Tang," implying that these two dynasties have a great deal in common. But do they? The emergence of the Great Tang Empire (大唐帝國) marks a turning point in Chinese history, and cannot lightly be taken as a continuation of the past as is implied in the use of the term "empires of the Han and the Tang." In this paper, I explore the differences between these two dynasties by juxtaposing the terms they employed for their supreme rulers—"Emperor" (*huangdi* 皇帝), and "Emperor, Heavenly Qaghan" (*huangdi tian kehan* 皇帝 天可汗). The Tang emperors were not called "Emperor, Heavenly Qaghan" for long, as the Tang dynasty's days as the Great Tang Empire were short: yet the imprints this left in Chinese history were enduring.

The connection between the migration of nomadic people into the Central Plain of China and the rise of the Great Tang Empire is quite obvious. The building of the Great Tang Empire has been considered the crowning achievement of the people of the Middle Kingdom (*zhonghua minzu* 中華民族), but there are certain things regarding the process whereby this accomplishment became possible which require further explanation. In particular, there is the question of why the Tang imperial house—who were either the direct descendants of nomadic people, or were at least people whose ancestral background was as good as nomadic—transformed themselves into Han.

The Han dynasty exhausted all its strength in annihilating the Xiongnu (匈奴). The underlying reason why Emperor Wu of the Han (武帝 r. BCE 141–87) implemented such massive economic policies as the imposition of a monopoly on salt and iron, "equal supply" (*junshu* 均輸法), and "price stabilization" (*pingzhun* 平準法), was the need to fund the conquest of the Xiongnu, who had an army of 300,000 archers.[2] Despite the difference in the populations of the two states (the entire Xiongnu population numbering less than the population of one Han commandary (*jun* 郡)),[3] Han efforts against Xiongnu had generally been unsuccessful. But the Tang was the only Chinese dynasty to have wiped out a nomadic empire in the north—the great empire of the Turks (*Tujue* 突厥), which had the unprecedented military strength of a million archers and looked down upon the Middle Kingdom.[4]

A direct comparison between the strengths of Han and Xiongnu, and Tang and Turks, is hardly possible, but if we consider the strength of Xiongnu and Turks to be similar, the crucial difference must lie between Han and Tang. Population size was the most significant marker of a state's strength in the premodern era, and the first surviving population record in China is from

2 AD, with a figure of 12 million households,[5] while the Tang population just after the establishment of the dynasty was just 3 million households,[6] 3.8 million in the early reign of Emperor Gaozong (高宗 r. 649–83).[7] It seems strange that a mere 3 million Tang were able to crush the mighty nomadic empire and reign as a world empire, while the much more numerous Han could not. The fact that the title "Emperor, Heavenly Qaghan" was used in the early Tang period may help to explain this accomplishment, and in this article I trace the process which led to the establishment of this title and examine its significance.

I. "EMPEROR" AND "EMPEROR, HEAVENLY QAGHAN"

1. The emperor's "land ruled by scholar-officials" and the chanyu*'s "land ruled by archers"*

After unification under the First Emperor of Qin, the emergence of the title "Emperor" (*Huangdi* 皇帝) reflected a great change in Chinese perceptions of the world. As is indicated by the saying "There is none who is not a subject wherever humanity can be traced,"[8] the horizons of the Chinese world had been extended to the maximum. This ideology was realized by the establishment of a system whereby "all under heaven" was incorporated into the Qin commandaries and counties, all individuals came under unitarian rule, and lands inhabited by other ethnic groups were organized into the commandary-county (*junxian* 郡縣) system. The Qin set up commandaries and counties in neighboring Xiongnu and Baiyue (百越) lands, sinifying other ethnic groups and territories, and disallowing non-Chinese existence within its territory.[9]

But the situation changed during the Han dynasty, both circumstantially and ideologically. First, there was the appearance of the idea of strictly distinguishing between the interior (*zhong* 中) and the exterior (*wai* 外), a principle known as Differentiation of *Hua* and *Yi* (*huayi fenbie* 華夷分別論). The argument was that the *hua*, the flowery or the elegant and cultured (i.e., China) and the *yi*, alien people or barbarians, possessed different qualities in terms of character, culture, and the lands in which they lived, and thus should be perceived as different in politics. This stemmed from recognition of the diplomatic reality of the time, which was characterized by the pluralistic egalitarian coexistence of the Han with the Xiongnu, Nanyue (南越), and Chosŏn (朝鮮).

Second was the ideological change. Liu Bang (劉邦), or Emperor Gaozu (高祖) of the Han, had no choice but to set up a commandary-feudatory system (*junguozhi* 郡國制), which was an amalgamation of the commandary/county and the feudal systems, due to the necessity of sharing the fruits of success with meritorious retainers at the founding of the dynasty.[10] Also, for the Confucians, who opposed this overbearing and homogeneous rule[11] and promoted a dualistic worldview which distinguished interior from exterior,[12] the commandary-county system of the First Emperor of Qin was considered as originating from the motivation of privatizing all under heaven,[13] so they could not acknowledge it as worthy of an imperial institution.

Nevertheless, Jia Yi (賈誼)[14] during the reign of Emperor Wen (文帝 r. BCE 180–157), or Sima Xiangru (司馬相如)[15] and Dongfang Shuo (東方朔)[16] during the reign of Emperor Wu, did maintain that virtue, grace, and culturing rule should be extended to the exterior barbarians (*yi*). Yet this worldview was abandoned after such events as the death of Emperor Wu, the surrender of Li Guangli (李廣利) to the Xiongnu, and the salt and iron debate.[17] Especially as the debate over the protocol for Huhanya (呼韓邪), the surrendering Xiongnu *chanyu*, was concluded to follow Xiao Wangzhi's (蕭望之) opinion, treating Huhanya as a guest (客) (i.e., non-subject (不臣), or more precisely neighboring enemy (隣敵)), the relations between China and barbarians from then on were systematized as a host–guest (主客) relationship.[18] This eventually meant that the ideology of Emperorship set up by the First Emperor of Qin was forsaken.

Regarding this, a passage in the "Biography of Xiongnu" in the *Records of the Grand Historian* (*Shiji* 史記) is worthy of our attention.

> The late emperor has said thus: north of the Great Wall is a land ruled by archers under the *chanyu*'s orders, south of the Great Wall is a land ruled by scholar-officials under my orders.[19]

In other words, the Great Wall being the line of division, there is a clear distinction between the northern land ruled by archers under the *chanyu*'s dominion, and the southern land ruled by scholar-officials under the Han emperor. Distinctions of culture and custom were not only manifest between the *chanyu* and the emperor, but also among the people under their rule. In addition, the Han observed that the Xiongnu lands were hard and salty and that the five grains could not be cultivated there;[20] meanwhile, the Xiongnu commented that even if they should seize control of the Han lands, the *chanyu* could not reside there permanently.[21] Under such circumstances, the

Han Empire's worldview, especially towards the nomadic peoples, became symbolized by a stone statue named *Horse Treading upon Xiongnu* (馬踏匈奴像), erected in front of the tomb of Huo Qubing (霍去病), an annex of Emperor Wu's tomb. This statue reflected both the reality and the aims of the era.

Neither could the tributary model of the Qin be maintained. International relations are expressed symbolically in the format of the correspondence between rulers. First, then, let us look at the correspondence between Han and Xiongnu. Emperor Wen's letter to Laoshang (老上), the third Xiongnu *chanyu*, opens with a greeting, "the emperor respectfully inquires if the Xiongnu grand *chanyu* is well,"[22] while the letter from Laoshang *chanyu* to Emperor Wen begins, "the Xiongnu grand *chanyu* who is born from heaven and earth, set up by the sun and the moon, respectfully inquires if the Han emperor is well."[23] The correspondence thus reveals that Han and Xiongnu were neighboring equals (隣對國). It is worthwhile noting that the Xiongnu *chanyu* claimed he was born from heaven and earth, being thus the Son of Heaven, just as the Han emperor did, implying that to the *chanyu* the Han emperor was merely the emperor, not the Son of Heaven. It is well known that the Han ruler called himself the Son of Heaven to exterior subjects (外臣) and referred to his letters to them as "edicts." So the Han emperor and the Xiongnu *chanyu* did not recognize each other as the Son of Heaven, but only as neighboring rulers of equal authority.[24]

In the correspondence between Emperor Wen and Zhao Tuo (趙佗), king of Nanyue (南越王), Emperor Wen uses the greeting, "the Emperor respectfully inquires after the King of Nanyue."[25] He also refers to his missive as a "letter" (書) rather than an "edict," and refrains from addressing Zhao Tuo by his name, instead using "King," thus affording him the status of an equal, as in the case of the Xiongnu. But when Zhao Tuo reverted to being an exterior subject, he wrote, "Tuo, your subject, dares death in bowing twice and writing to your majesty the Emperor . . . I have submitted my tributes according to time."[26] He then expressed his subordination.

This suggests, then, that there was a perception that the Han emperor's domain had deviated from the worldview characteristic of when the First Emperor of Qin claimed the title "emperor" (*huangdi*), and it is obvious that the neighboring nomadic empire of the Xiongnu was considered to be a different world.

2. "The Emperor, Heavenly Qaghan" and the statues of subjects at imperial tombs

1) The title "Qaghan" and its nomadic features

There are marked differences between the early Tang period and the classic Han period after the reign of Emperor Wu. Let us start with Du You's (杜佑) opinion as recorded in *The Encyclopedic History of Institutions* (*Tongdian* 通典).

> During the Zhenguan [貞觀 626–49] period of the Great Tang, the Ministry of Revenue reported that more than 200,000 men and women who were originally Chinese and returned from outside the border, or barbarians of the four directions, following the Turks, surrendered and became registered in prefectures and counties. At the time the chieftains of various barbarians came to the palace and bowed down their heads, requesting Taizong to become the Heavenly Qaghan. Taizong answered, "I am the Son of Heaven of the Great Tang. How can I also carry out the affairs of qaghan?" The numerous officials and barbarians of the four directions shouted ten thousand years for the emperor, and from then on when the imperial sealed letter was bestowed upon the chieftains of the west and north, in all he addressed himself "the Emperor, Heavenly Qaghan" [皇帝天可汗]. When a chieftain of the various *fan* died, an edict was always issued to establish a successor. The rulership [臨統] over the barbarians of the four directions began from here.[27]

Of course this record is written from the point of view of the Tang, and thus its literal truth might be called into question; but it contains two points on which I wish to focus. First, we see that in 630 (Zhenguan 4),[28] Taizong began calling himself both "Son of Heaven of the Great Tang" and "Heavenly Qaghan"; second, we note that the "Emperor, Heavenly Qaghan" exercised real rulership in nominating the chieftains' successors. Borrowing Du You's expression, we may say that this was the first time in Chinese history that such a degree of rulership had been exercised over barbarians. By combining the titles of the supreme rulers of both the nomadic and sedentary worlds, Taizong was claiming that his sovereignty extended over both—a stark contrast with the case of the Han.

For how long was the title of Heavenly Qaghan in use, and what specific implications are bound up in the term "rulership" (臨統)? After the first use of the title in 630 (Zhenguan 4), in 646 (Zhenguan 12), following the pacification of the north and the fall of Xueyantuo (薛延陀), eleven peoples, including the Tiele (鐵勒), Uighur (回紇), and Bayegu (拔野古), came to address Taizong

using the title "Qaghan."[29] Later still, in 765 (Yongtai 永泰 1) of Daizong (代宗), when Pugu Huaien (僕固懷恩) joined with Uighur and Tibet (吐蕃) and attacked the Tang, the Uighurs were calling the Tang emperor "Heavenly Qaghan."[30] How long did this relationship continue between the Tang and the nomadic states? "The Biography of Northern Barbarians" (北狄傳) in the *New History of the Tang* (*Xin Tang shu* 新唐書) seems to support the understanding that it was only up until Kaiyuan period (開元 713–41) that the Tang emperor exercised "rulership" as Heavenly Qaghan,[31] since "From Tianbao period [天寶 742–56] on, China was weakened, and the imperial army could not cross over the Yellow River to the north, and halted at Qin [秦] and Bin [邠] to the west."[32]

There is also the question of what was implied by the expression "rulership" (臨統).[33] "The Biography of Northern Barbarians" in the *New History of the Tang* explains that to the ends of heaven's covering, all were subjects of the dynasty; that to the ins and outs of the sea, nowhere was not part of the empire's districts and counties; and that the chieftains of the wastelands depended on the Tang seal to legitimize their rule and none considered the Tang a guest country. Commenting on Tang rule over the frontier peoples, the biography adds: "never has it surpassed this degree from the times of the Three Kings" (三王以來, 未有以過之). These records point out that the Tang's relations with the nomadic states were completely different from the Han's.

What kind of "rulership" (臨統) did the heavenly qaghan exert in reality?[34] According to Du You, it was the prerogative of the heavenly qaghan to designate the successor in the event of the death of a chieftain among the barbarians, a power he exercised through issuing an edict. This was the most potent expression of Tang rule over the nomadic chieftains, both symbolically and as a matter of political fact. For the nomadic states, the struggle over succession was a critical issue with profound implications, bearing even on the continued existence of the state itself; the ability to intervene in the succession process thus shows that Tang influence here ran far deeper than mere rhetoric. Without a clear and decisive resolution of the succession process, diplomatic relations such as tributes or military cooperation could be undermined.[35]

As well as this, the heavenly qaghan was the overlord of the barbarian chieftains, and the leader of the military confederation which together they comprised. This coalition had been formed to prevent the restoration of the Turks' military potential in the period from 630 (Zhenguan 4) to 657 (Xianqing 顯慶 2) of Gaozong, when the Western Turks were finally

conquered. Subsequently, after 661 (Longshuo 龍朔 1), the Tang established military garrisons in the sixteen states of the Western Regions (*xiyu* 西域) and the Nine Surnames of Zhaowu (昭武九姓) in order to coordinate their military responses to invasions by the Arabs (大食) and Tibetans (吐蕃). The battle of Talas, led by Gao Xianzhi/Ko Sŏnji (高仙芝) in 752 (Tianbao 11), was also part of that cooperation.[36] Those states which acknowledged the suzerainty of the Tang emperor are described as wanting to serve the heavenly qaghan and to provide troops and resources to assist him in conquest, just as the Tang people do:[37] this indicates that participation in military campaigns was the paramount obligation of states which were subject to Tang "rulership."

Apart from Taizong and Xuanzong (玄宗 r. 712–56), no other Tang emperors seem to have used the title "Heavenly Qaghan." One might question whether the political, diplomatic, and military superiority Tang emperors derived from the title was maintained throughout the first half of the Tang period.[38] However, it should be noted that other emperors often acted as if they had the title, although their use of the title is not confirmed in textual sources. The case of Gaozong is one such example. He was accompanied by thirty chieftains, including Geluolu Sheli (葛邏祿社利), the governor-general of Langshan (狼山都督), when he performed the Feng and Shan sacrifices (封禪) in Mount Tai (泰山) following the suppression of the rebellion of Ashina Helu (阿史那賀魯).[39] Equally, one might consider Zhongzong's (中宗 r. 684, 705–10) visit to the imperial ancestral shrine, accompanied by Li Duozuo (李多祚): when the censor Wang Di (王覿) challenged Li's ethnic origin,[40] the emperor answered that he had made Li a confidant. This recalls Taizong's decision to include new nomadic chieftains in the ceremony of visiting the imperial tomb in 639 (Zhenguan 13).[41] The presence of nomadic chieftains at important state rituals served as a diplomatic symbol of the subordination of barbarians of the four directions,[42] and also represents the Tang emperor as transcending the exclusive and racist *hua–yi* ideology and unifying *hua* and *yi* in one (*huayi datong* 華夷大同).

Although Gaozong did not receive the title "Heavenly Qaghan" from the nomadic chieftains, he entitled himself "Heavenly Emperor" (*tianhuang* 天皇) in 674 (Xianheng 咸亨 4).[43] It has been argued that the title "Heavenly Emperor" indicates the influence of Daoism,[44] but to me it seems more probable that Gaozong's title was intended to indicate that his achievements were equal to those of a heavenly qaghan: pacifying various barbarians, suppressing the Turks by putting down the rebellion of Ashina Helu, and stabilizing the Western Regions through subjugating Sule (疎勒) in alliance with Tibet and Yinmian (咽麪).

Let us delve further into the origin of the title "Qaghan" and the history of its adoption. It is well known that this title emerged with the eclipse of prestige of the title *chanyu*. Following the downgrading of *chanyu* to a level lower than kingship, the first use of the new title is understood to have been by the Rouran (柔然) chief Shelun (社崙), who expanded his territory by annexing adjacent tribes while calling himself Qiudoufa Qaghan (丘豆伐可汗).[45] The *History of the Wei* (*Weishu* 魏書) records only the title "Emperor" (皇帝) in use throughout the existence of the dynasty, but Hu Sansheng (胡三省), a commentator on the *Comprehensive Mirror to Aid in Government* (*Zizhi tongjian* 資治通鑑), has pointed to an earlier use of "Qaghan" by the tribal chiefs of the Tuoba (拓跋) tribe of Xianbei (鮮卑).[46] Recent findings have also provided evidence that ancestors or chiefs of the Tuoba tribe were called "Qaghan," as well as the Northern Wei (北魏) emperor. On his tomb inscription, erected in 507 (Zhengshi 正始 4), it is recorded that Xizhi (奚智) called his ancestor Emperor Wei "Puhui Qaghan" (僕牏可汗).[47] The written prayer discovered at Gaxian cave (嘎仙洞), an ancient residence of Xianbei Tuoba, found in 1980, includes a sentence containing the words "qaghan" and "qatun."[48] Further, *The Song of Mulan* (木蘭詩),[49] a Tuoba folksong, uses the titles "Son of Heaven" and "Qaghan"[50] in a context which implies that the Northern Wei emperor is both of these simultaneously, since they refer to a single person.[51] I suspect that the title "Qaghan" was used from the Dai (代) period of Tuoba, and at least from Shamo han (沙漠汗)/Wendi (文帝) onwards, until the end of the Northern Wei.

The reason for picking Shamo han as the beginning is that he held the title "Han" (汗), and the basis for the claim that use of the title endured up to the end of the dynasty is that Tuyuhun's (吐谷渾) use of it was a contested diplomatic issue until the end of the Northern Wei.[52] A look at the history of diplomacy between Tuyuhun and the Northern Wei may help clarify things. "Qaghan" was used during the era of Tuyuhun (?–317) and Shuluogan (樹洛干 405–17), but it was dropped when Fulianchou (伏連籌 r. 490–529) subjugated himself to the Northern Wei during Zhengguang period (正光 520–25). Then, during the late Northern Wei, Kualü (夸呂 535–91), the son of Fulianchou, adopted the title once again.[53]

In view of this history, the emergence of the title "Heavenly Qaghan" carries special significance. Adding "heavenly" (天) to "qaghan" (可汗) yields the meaning "Qaghan of Qaghans,"[54] thus implying that the Tang emperor is higher in rank than the nomadic qaghan.[55] If Xiongnu had wanted to call the Han emperor Chanyu or Heavenly Chanyu, would the Han have accepted it? Probably not. Could this, then, be the difference between the Han and the Tang emperors?

2) The statues of subjects at the tombs of Emperor Wu of the Han, and Taizong and Gaozong of the Tang

The gap between the Han and Tang worldviews is exemplified by three (sets of) stone statues: *Horse Treading upon Xiongnu* at Huo Qubing's tomb, annexed to Maoling, the tomb of Emperor Wu of the Han; *Stone Statues of Fourteen Chieftains* in front of Zhaoling, the tomb of Taizong; and *Statues of Sixty-one Barbarian Subjects*, standing before Qianling, the tomb of Gaozong. It was rare for statues of barbarians to be erected before an imperial tomb prior to the Tang dynasty, and only Emperor Wu's tomb has one. Comparing the statues of the two dynasties reveals considerable disparity between the ways the Han and the Tang viewed alien peoples. For the Han, the nomadic Xiongnu people were not candidates for equal coexistence; whereas for the Tang it was different.

First, let us consider the statues at Zhaoling. The *Stone Statues of Fourteen Chieftains* were carved on Gaozong's orders after Taizong's death during Yonghui period (永徽 650–55), representing the rulers of fourteen states who either subjugated themselves to the Tang Empire or had diplomatic relations with it.[56] A commentator describes the statues as follows: "they all have deep eyes and a big nose, stalwart with bows and swords, truly a rare sight to behold."[57] From this we can infer that most of them were from the nomadic or oasis peoples of the northwest. Two facts support this assumption: first, in the fourth month of 630 (Zhenguan 4), various peoples of the northwest requested Taizong to accept the title "Heavenly Qaghan" as their common chief. And second, in the first month of 647 (Zhenguan 21), various chieftains north of the great desert requested the opening of a road called *The Road to Visit the Heavenly Qaghan* (*can tian kehan dao* 參天可汗道), running from the south of the Uighur to the north of the Turks, and the establishment of sixty-eight relay stations along it.[58]

The design of the statues certainly betrays an intention to exaggerate Tang majesty. Among the fourteen chieftains, four—Srongbtsan sGampo (Songzan ganbu 松贊干布), Kim Jindeok (金真德, Queen Jindeok of Silla), Fan Touli (范頭利), and Yinan (夷男 Zhenzhu piqie 真珠毗伽, qaghan of Xueyantuo)—never visited Chang'an in their lives. Srongbtsan sGampo, Ashina Sheer (阿史那社爾), Nuohebo (諾曷鉢), Helibushibi (訶黎布失畢), Fuduxin (伏闍信), and Long Tuqizhi (龍突騎支) were ruling in their homelands in the period when the statues were being carved, and the rest, except for Kim Jindeok, Fan Touli, and Yinan, were living in Chang'an.[59] Yet the Tang emperor remained determined to assert that he was the *de facto* leader of the neighboring dynasties' rulers.

Next, the *Statues of Sixty-one Vassal Subjects* at Qianling. The disparity in the names given to these statues—variously *fan xiang* (蕃像), *zhufan junchang xiang* (諸蕃君長像), *binwang xiang* (賓王像), or *fanchen chengshixuanjinzhe xiang* (蕃臣曾侍軒禁者像)—results from slight differences in understanding of the statues' significance. The statues are known to have been carved in 705 (Shenlong 神龍 1), standing at the south gate of Qianling, half to the east and half to the west, in four rows from north to south and eight columns from east to west. Most represent peoples from the northwest regions,[60] which indicates the ethnic composition of the Tang Empire during the reigns of Gaozong and Wu Zetian (武則天 r. 690–705).

Originally there were sixty-four statues, each with their name and official title carved on the back. In the Northern Song (北宋) era, the Shenxi transportation commissioner Yu Shixiong (游師雄) noticed the erosion of the inscriptions and visited an old family in Fengtian (奉天) county to recover the surviving rubbings, which he had inscribed on four stele,[61] named *Illustration of Qianling* (*Qianling tu* 乾陵圖). That the number of statues at Qianling surpasses Zhaoling is remarkable, considering the situation at the time. Thus, already in the Song period, this disparity was blamed on Wu Zetian's ignorance of the fact that the majesty of Gaozong's reign was merely derived from the remaining glory of Taizong's,[62] and certainly there must have been some degree of exaggeration.[63]

Regarding the identity of the sixty-one statues, the *Illustration of the Record of Chang'an* (*Chang'an zhi tu* 長安志圖) by Li Haowen (李好文) of the Yuan contains names and official titles for thirty-nine of them, and *A Supplement to the Collection of Inscriptions* (*Jinshilubu* 金石錄補) by Ye Yibao (葉奕苞) of the early Qing for thirty-eight. At present, only six statues survive with their official title on the back. Thirty-six of the statues can be identified through the available sources, and among them there are two chieftains each with Tibetan, Turkic, and Tuyuhun origins, the rest being from the protectorates of Anbei (安北), Beiting (北庭), Anxi (安西), and chieftains of minor peoples. The official ranks of these chieftains are very high, most of them being grand officials above the third rank.

Although there is an element of hyperbole in the construction of these statues, the general trend of the era cannot be denied. Still, alternative explanations have been proposed for the identity of the people represented therein: perhaps they are contributors in the construction of Qianling,[64] or ambassadors attending a memorial ritual for Gaozong.[65] But since some official titles carry the word "late," signifying that they were deceased before Gaozong or Wu Zetian passed away, these explanations cannot be valid.

The most reasonable interpretation is that they are the chieftains of various peoples who submitted to the Tang, and who thereby became high officials during Gaozong's or Wu Zetian's reign. Among the confirmed identities, one is a chieftain from the four *yi* who was nominated as a grand general of Twelve Guards of the Tang court, and another a chieftain named as a local official. The phrase *shixuanjinzhe* (侍軒禁者) from one of the inscriptions reveals that most were employed by and served the Tang court. The persons represented by the statues come from a wide area, extending beyond the great desert to the north, beyond Pamir, and as far as Syr darya to the west. They were either the highest officers among the palace guards, or grand-generals of the protectorates of Anbei, Beiting, and Anxi.

II. FROM DISCRIMINATION TO GRAND HARMONY

1. From "Treatise on Relocating the Barbarians" to "All Are the Subjects of Us"

As the *Stone Statues of Fourteen Chieftains* and *Statues of Sixty-one Barbarian Subjects* indicate, many alien people served in the Tang court. Of course this phenomenon did not appear suddenly in the Tang dynasty. The Northern Wei had actively adopted a policy of accepting and embracing all.[66] This policy began even before they occupied north China[67] and is credited with being the source of the strength they needed to conquer the Southern Dynasty and unify China.[68]

As recorded by *The Record of Buddhist Monasteries in Luoyang* (*Luoyang qielan ji* 洛陽伽藍記), which described Luoyang in that period, this policy resulted in the immigration of 3,000 foreign clergymen from the western lands of Great Qin (大秦 Eastern Roman Empire) and elsewhere, who were housed in more than 1,000 *jian* (間), and a further 10,000 households who emigrated to the Northern Wei from areas west of Pamir to Great Qin.[69] In particular, people from Geying guo (歌營國) in the south came to China for the first time since the Han. The *Luoyang qielanji* contrasts these phenomena with the situation of Han Chinese dynasties like the Han or the Cao Wei (曹魏).[70]

The foreigners who came to China during the Northern Dynasties consisted of clergymen and people with various skills. Among the immigrants, many were called merchant *hu* (胡)[71] or wealthy *hu*, and trading was their most prominent occupation. The term "merchant *hu* of the Western Regions" (西域商胡) refers broadly to Sogdian merchants, who were very

active in Tang trade and who rose to form a political interest group during the Eastern Wei (東魏) and Northern Qi (北齊) periods.

The ruler's personal favorites (*yinxing* 恩倖) were key political actors during the Northern Qi, and many of them were deeply related to the Western Regions. They can be classified into two groups: first, those who were called the merchant *hu* of the Western Regions, *hu* musicians, and various entertainers of Qucha, represented by He Shikai (和士開) and He Hongzhen (何洪珍); second, eunuchs, slaves, singers and dancers, and ghost-seers, among whom were the people who were called the "three dignitaries"[72] of the Northern Qi.[73] Infatuation with western music grew stronger from Gao Cheng (高澄 i.e., Emperor Wenxiang 文襄) to Emperor Wucheng (武成帝) and the Last Lord (*Houzhu* 後主), eventually contributing to the fall of the dynasty.[74] There were also western sharpshooters in the vanguards of Northern Qi army,[75] implying that a considerable number of westerners served in the army overall. The alien immigration to the Central Plains during the Northern Wei and Eastern Wei/Northern Qi era continued on into the Tang.

After the collapse of the Turkic empire the Turks fled northward to Xueyantuo and westward to the Western Regions (西域), but more than 100,000 surrendered to the Tang.[76] Taizong ordered officials to debate how the surrendered masses should be dealt with, and numerous opinions were aired. The vice president of the Central Secretariat Yan Shigu (顏師古), the vice president of the Board of Rites Li Baiyao (李百藥), the governor-general of Xiazhou (夏州), and Wei Zheng (魏徵) objected to the idea that the surrendered should be admitted into Tang territory. Wei Zheng drew upon the Western Jin (西晉) period's Guo Xin (郭欣) and Jiang Tong's (江統) *Xironglun* (徙戎論) to warn of a potential catastrophe similar to the Yongjia (永嘉) Disorders.[77]

> Now the number of surrendered is near 100,000, but after a few years they will multiply two times and will certainly be an irreversible disease inside the belly. In early Jin various *hu* mingled with people and resided in China and Guo Xin and Jiang Tong pleaded with Emperor Wu [武帝] to drive all of them outside the border and cut off the sprout of trouble, but Emperor Wu did not follow their advice. After twenty some years the area between the rivers Yi and Luo [伊洛之間] turned into the land of fur coats. This past is a bright mirror of the present![78]

Wei thus compared their present situation with the Western Jin's just before the Yongjia Disorders. Guo Xin had argued a similar point before Emperor

Wu in 280 (Taikang 太康 1),[79] and Jiang Tong had again raised the issue during Emperor Hui's (惠帝) reign in 299 (Yongkang 永康 9).[80] Deng Ai (鄧艾) of Cao Wei[81] and Fu Xuan (傅玄) of the Western Jin[82] were of the same opinion, namely that in order to solve the dilemma of barbarians coming to comprise half the population of Guanzhong (關中), the barbarians should be moved to their original lands. This solution may have commended itself in theory, but in reality would have been impossible to implement, indicating a certain naivety in their understanding of the problem.

The essence of Liu Xuan's (劉宣) advice to Liu Yuan (劉淵), a grandson of Xuan's brother and the founder of the Han/Former Zhao (漢/前趙), the first dynasty of the Sixteen Kingdoms of the Five Barbarians, was that "the Jin imposed atrocity upon us, drove us like slaves, . . . we should revive the achievement of Huhanya *chanyu*."[83] The underlying motive of the rise of the Sixteen Kingdoms of the Five Barbarians was to escape the shackles of slavery and recover the ancient achievement of Huhanya.[84] Huhanya represented an age when the nomadic Xiongnu and agricultural Han were on friendly terms, and what the nomadic peoples sought was not slavery but to be equal neighbors or equal subjects. It is indeed true that the Chinese dynasty and the nomadic dynasty had remained hostile to each other until the Western Jin, and Wei Zheng's argument turned on this history of mutual understanding.

However, the Han-Jin period and the Tang period present a significant contrast in terms of the atmosphere at the court. Many of the court officials now proposed that the Tang settle the surrendered *hu* and transform them into farmers.[85] Taizong rejected Wei Zheng's and the other officials' opinions, and instead chose Wen Yanbo's (溫彥博) preserve-and-nurture policy.[86] The Tang settled the surrendered Turks in a region stretching from the eastern Youzhou (幽州) to western Lingzhou (靈州), where Tuli (突利) had ruled before, set up four prefectures of Shunzhou (順州), Youzhou (祐州), Huazhou (化州), and Changzhou (長州), and made Tuli the governor-general of Shunzhou. Meanwhile, with respect to Illig's (Xieli 頡利) old domain, the Tang established six prefectures divided between the government-general of Dingxiang (定襄) on the left and the government-general of Yunzhong (雲中) on the right. Ashina Sunishi (阿史那蘇尼失) and Ashina Simo (阿史那思摩) were enfeoffed as Commanderial Prince of Huaide (懷德郡王) and Commanderial Prince of Huaihua (懷化郡王). The records say that the remainder of the chieftains who arrived at Chang'an were appointed as commanders of the palace guards. When they lined up at the court, more than a hundred were above the fifth rank, almost as many as half of the existing court officials. Thus almost 10,000 households moved into

Chang'an.[87] This, then, was the Tang approach following the fall of the Turkic empire.

Wen Yanbo's principle was "after a few years, all will be our people" (*shunian zhi hou xi wei wumin* 數年之後 悉為吾民), based upon Confucius' ideal of "teaching with no classification" (*youjiao wulei* 有教無類). This approach is similar to that of Fu Jian (符堅) of Former Qin (前秦),[88] especially as regards what he did after conquering the rival state of Murong (慕容). Although Fu Jian's dynasty fell partly due to his tolerance policy, this was not the case for the Tang. We can thus see that the Han and the Tang had very different approaches towards the four *Yi*.

2. *From "unification of the Six Directions" to "northern and southern barbarians becoming one family"*

The Six Directions, or *liuhe* (六合), is a way of understanding the world as it appeared to the historical Chinese mind. This phrase made its first appearance in the *Zhuangzi*, there meaning heaven (above), earth (below), and the four cardinal directions.[89] Other vocabulary was also employed to indicate the dominions of the supreme Chinese ruler, such as "All Under Heaven" (*tianxia* 天下), "Four Quarters" (*sifang* 四方), "Nine Provinces" (*jiuzhou* 九州), and "Middle Kingdom" (*Zhongguo* 中國).[90] Until the Spring and Autumn period, the distinction between the *hua* and the *yi* was unclear, thus both (the *yi* including Qin, Chu 楚, Wu 吳, and Yue 越) were included under the concept of the Four Quarters. But from late Spring and Autumn, or the Warring States era, the concept of *hua* and *yi* developed, leading to the emergence of the idea of the Middle Kingdom as the *hua*, set in contrast to the *yi*. The definition of the Four Quarters altered correlatively, now meaning a relative space comprising the Middle Kingdom alone, and from which the *yi* had been excluded.

The Six Directions, or other similar terms such as *fangwai* (方外), *liuji* (六極), and *yunei* (宇內), now appeared, conceptualizing a region of space that was wider than *sifang* and its likes. According to research by Kim Hankyu,[91] this concept of space emerged first in the *Zhuangzi*. *Fang* means the secular world or world of common sense, thus *fangnei* (方內) is in the category of physical things, and corresponds to the notion of *sifang* in Confucian writings. In contrast, *fangwai* is in the category of metaphysical things, and corresponds to the notion of *Zhuangzi*, which is the totality of space outside the Confucian *sifang* and where the absolute *dao* (道) is realized. Thus the *fangwai* in *Zhuangzi* does not mean the duality of the world but the

expansion of the world. The concept of *fangwai* and its likes were created in *Zhuangzi* to describe the new world which Zhuangzi himself (i.e., the author) had found, and they framed a three-dimensional concept of space where the horizontal *sifang* and vertical heaven and earth were integrated into one.[92]

The First Emperor of Qin was the first to use the Six Directions, a metaphysical space in which the absolute *dao* is realized, to mean the dominion of China. After the unification by the First Emperor of Qin, the institution of "emperor" emerged and its domain expanded conceptually to "within the Six Directions."[93] And as we know from the words of Li Si (李斯)—"in the land there were no four corners, and among the people there were no other states"[94]—the Qin desired not only to expand by conquest but also to unify the culture and customs of the conquered.[95]

Nevertheless, the term "Six Directions" was mere rhetoric. Heaven is included in the term, but cannot be placed under dominion; and even if Li Si's sentiments had been carried out in earnest, the territory would not have extended further than the newly annexed six states.[96] The other conquests of the First Emperor had limits—west to Juyan (居延) county of Zhangye (張掖),[97] north to Taiyuan (太原).[98] The Qin's construction of the Great Wall, intended to block the northern nomads' entry into the Central Plain, is itself testimony of the limitations of their domain.

After the Qin, the term "Six Directions" was seldom used to indicate the imperial domain, and the barbarians were increasingly understood as separate from China, and not to be placed under its dominion. The Confucians in particular limited the range of the Chinese ruler's dominion to within the Four Seas (四海), excluding all barbarians. From the Han period, the *Tradition of Gongyang* (*Gongyang chuan* 公羊傳) and *Tradition of Guliang* (*Guliang chuan* 穀梁傳) promoted a graded worldview which contrasted with the immoderate aspirations to unitary rule, and reflected the reality that, despite the imperial claims, they were unable to rule the barbarians.[99]

Thus the remark of Emperor Wen of the Han that "the Six Directions share the same custom, all under heaven becoming one family" began to be used as an idiom to mean the unification of China,[100] and phrases such as "purifying and harmonizing the Six Directions" (*qinghe lihe* 清和六合)[101] and "relieving and saving the Six Directions" (*ningji liuhe* 寧濟六合) were meant similarly. From then on to the age of division—the Wei, Jin, Northern, and Southern Dynasties—the term "Six Directions" came to mean unification within China or peace within the borders, as in the phrases "unifying the Six Directions" (*hunyi liuhe* 混一六合) or "unifying and purifying the Six Directions" (*hunqing liuhe* 混清六合).[102] Some argue that although in the

Three Kingdoms period the Six Directions excluded the barbarians, in Fu Jian's times they became once again included within it;[103] however, this is a misreading of the sources.[104] For instance, Helian Bobo (赫連勃勃) used the term when he made known his determination to unify China in coalition with the nomadic people who had immigrated into it.[105] In the Eastern Jin (東晉) and following Southern Dynasties, and also in the Northern Dynasties, the term just meant unification of China, and it was thus used in the Sui to refer to the conquest of Chen (陳) and the resulting unification of China.[106]

A new term arose to include agrarian China, the land of nomadic tribes, and the southern region of *man* (蠻) people: this was *hu yue* (胡越). While the Six Directions was a spatial concept, *hu yue* is specifically racial. *Hu yue* was an old term which gained a new meaning during the Wei, Jin, Northern and Southern Dynasties, and Sui-Tang periods. Originally during Qin and Han it meant outside the boundaries of China—north from the Great Wall and south from Wuling (五嶺).[107] The range of Wuling begins in the west from the south of Hengshan (衡山) and ends in the east at the sea, so they are five mountains consisting of the southern border of Hunan and Fujian provinces. Present-day Guangdong is located south of it.[108] Thus the term *hu* indicated the nomadic peoples north of the Great Wall, while *yue* stood for beyond Wu (吳) area, which later became part of the Chinese domain.

Li Yuan (李淵), Emperor Gaozu (高祖) of the Tang, famously remarked, "There was no such instance since ancient times that the *hu* and the *yue* became one family!" His comment, which brings us back to the usage of the title "Heavenly Qaghan," was made in 633 (Zhenguan 7) when, as the abdicated emperor, he made the surrendered Turkic Illig (Xieli) Qaghan dance and the southern *man* chieftain Feng Zhidai (馮智戴) recite a poem at a banquet hosted by Taizong.[109] It is interesting that the place to which Taizong invited the abdicated Li Yuan was Weiyang Palace (未央宮). Taizong seemed to be humbling himself in comparison to Han Gaozu, crediting him with having made the barbarians of the four directions surrender and become subjects of the Tang. But although the situation was apparently designed to console the abdicated emperor, Taizong was in fact boasting of his achievements through comparing himself with Han Gaozu regarding the degree of dominion over the barbarians. In Han Gaozu's time, all under heaven was not yet stabilized, and it was in these circumstances that Gaozu reprimanded Xiao He (蕭何) for having constructed Weiyang Palace too extravagantly; Xiao replied that the Son of Heaven makes the Four Seas his home and without grandeur no authority can be shown.[110] Weiyang Palace was where the banquet was held, implying that it was Taizong's intention to

underscore the difference between Han and Tang in their rule of the nomads.

Taizong makes similar insinuations elsewhere as well. In 639 (Zhenguan 13), upon receiving tribute from Sule, Taizong spoke to Fang Xuanling and others, saying "before, the First Emperor of Qin and Gaozu of the Han were the only two who unified all under heaven and overcame the barbarians of the four directions. We lifted up a three-foot sword and pacified the four seas, and the distant barbarians subjugated themselves voluntarily, not any less than the two rulers."[111] By saying that his achievements were no less than those of the First Emperor of Qin and Han Gaozu, he was expressing the difference between the Han and the Tang: and with respect to subjugating the barbarians of the four directions, Taizong's feat did indeed surpass them. He had actually conquered the *hu* and *yue*, and *The Encyclopedic History of Institutions* expressed appreciation of this achievement thus: "The rulership over the barbarians of the four directions began from here."

As mentioned above, the terms *hu* and *yue* did not appear for the first time during the Northern Dynasties or the Tang,[112] but previously the terms had been rather unspecific in their reference, while by the time of the Tang they had a much clearer meaning. If Taizong was the one who truly realized the ideal of "*hu* and *yue* becoming one family," his forerunners were Fu Jian of Former Qin, and Emperor Xiaowen (孝文帝) of the Northern Wei, who carried out the policy of accepting and embracing all under the perception that the people of *hu* and *yue* could become as close as brothers.[113]

3. Plurality of the zhonghua *and the southward/westward expansion of the title "Qaghan"*

I have argued in another article that a multi-layered *zhonghua* world became established in East Asia due to the influx of nomadic peoples to the Central Plain. The Northern and Southern Dynasties vied with each other, both calling themselves *zhonghua* and contemptuously referring to the other as "barbarians of isles" (*daoyi* 島夷) or "rope-headed barbarians" (*suolu* 索虜), and refusing diplomatic relations. Finally they settled into a relationship of equal neighbors, with the Northern Wei calling themselves *huang Wei* (皇魏)[114] and the Liu Song (劉宋) *huang Song* (皇宋).[115] Following this, Koguryŏ and Japan also claimed themselves to be *zhonghua*. While the sedentary world was witnessing the emergence of "emperors" with limited domains,[116] the nomadic world was undergoing change. The title of the supreme nomadic ruler was "Qaghan," but the application of this title was now expanding into the Central Plain.

First, let us consider the phenomenon of rulers of the Central Plain using the title "Qaghan." I have explained above that the Northern Wei monarchs entitled themselves "Qaghan" and throughout the dynasty did not give up this title. Further, the Sui emperor and almost all the rebel leaders of late Sui were called "Qaghan" either by themselves or by others. Qimin (啓民), qaghan of the Turks, addressed Emperor Wen of the Sui as Moyan Qaghan the Sage of the Great Sui (Da Sui shengren Moyan Qaghan 大隋聖人莫緣可汗),[117] and the rebel leaders Xue Ju (薛舉), Dou Jiande (竇建德), Wang Shichong (王世充), Liu Wuzhou (劉武周), Liang Shidu (梁師都), Li Gui (李軌), and Gao Kaidao (高開道) assumed the title as well.[118] This shows both that the title was overused, and also that it was spreading onto the Central Plain. Among the rebel leaders, there is no record of Li Yuan calling himself "Qaghan." At that time, the principal reason for taking the title was to demonstrate a connection with the Turks. Most of these rebels faced north and called themselves subjects of the Turks, and the latter thus approved their use of the title "Qaghan"—albeit that the rebel leaders in fact adopted the title on their own initiative. Li Yuan, who also subjugated himself to the Turks, would have been little different, raising the possibility that he too called himself "Qaghan," notwithstanding the absence of records.

Let us now turn to the nomadic empires of the northwestern steppe, which sat outside the boundary of the *zhonghua* world. A key example is the empire of the Rouran, who called themselves *huang Rui* (皇芮), raised the banner of reviving the *zhonghua*, and were expanding their conceptual boundaries into the Central Plain. In a letter to Xiao Daocheng (蕭道成)[119] they expressed their desire to march out and conquer the areas Bing (并), Dai (代), Qin (秦), and Zhao (趙) of the Northern Wei and achieve the revival of *zhonghua*, and forever be as neighbors with the Southern Qi (南齊).[120] The letter said that the Rouran and Southern Qi were of a pair like heaven and earth or *yin* and *yang*;[121] and although located in the different lands of southern China and the steppes they were like lips and teeth, and wanted to enjoy good relations just as the Qi and Lu (魯) did in the Spring and Autumn period. Unlike the Xiongnu, who segregated themselves from the Han,[122] the Rouran were determined to participate in the *zhonghua* world. This phenomenon signifies the northwestern nomadic world, which had hitherto existed separate and apart, emerging as a member of the *zhonghua* world,[123] driven by the inner fission of China.

Control over the nomadic lands shifted from Xiongnu to Xianbei and then to Rouran,[124] and in the Northern Wei, which had already become a Central Plain state, relations between Rouran and Wei were understood in a

manner similar to the previous Xiongnu–Han relations.[125] However, although similar in exterior appearance, these relations were completely different in content. Xiongnu–Han relations were usually hostile,[126] with both sides seeing themselves as equal powers. Xiongnu, as the country of archers, stood in the north against the south.[127] For Xiongnu, the Central Plain was for plundering, not occupying. The Rouran, in contrast, saw the Central Plain as their potential dominions. The term "Qaghan" also spread southwestward when Tuyuhun, a branch of the Xianbei, claimed the title.

Later, when the northwestern nomadic chiefs presented the title "Heavenly Qaghan" to Taizong, it meant that they acknowledged the ruler of the Central Plain in their south as master of both China and the steppes. This change was partly due to the character of the Tang imperial house, which originated from the *hu*/nomadic people and consequently had special interest in the nomadic lands, but it was also connected to the influence of the Rouran view of the Central Plain and *zhonghua*, which was distinct from the Xiongnu conception of a purely nomadic dynasty. The nomadic peoples thus began interfering with matters inside the Great Wall.

Among the 369 chancellors of the Tang, from ninety-eight families, most have a sinicized nomadic origin, and this tendency did not change until the end of the Tang era. In the case of Gaozu, among the sixteen chancellors at least nine had marital relations with nomadic people. Cui Shenyou (崔慎猷), who was chancellor from the Dazhong period (847–59) during Xuanzong's (宣宗) reign to Yizong's (懿宗) reign (860–74), said that all the chancellors appointed from the Dazhong reign to Xiantong (咸通) reign (847–74) were nomadic people,[128] which shows just how many individuals with nomadic origins were significant actors in the Tang era.

With the Tang Empire encompassing both the nomadic and agricultural realms, people from seventy-two nations[129] flocked to Chang'an, the capital of the world, and elsewhere within the empire, to compete with others on skill and knowledge. In a somewhat exaggerated fashion, this phenomenon is called "ten thousand countries coming to the court,"[130] or "*hua* and *yi* in grand harmony."[131]

At the beginning of this article, I raised the question of how the Tang managed to find the strength to establish the Great Tang Empire with such a small population at the beginning of the dynasty; the answer I think lies in the Tang policy of transforming aliens into an asset of the empire.

III. THE TRANSFORMATION FROM BARBARIAN TO *ZHONGHUA*

1. Breaking away from "different species of barbarians"

When the Emperor Xiaowen of Northern Wei used the phrase *hu yue*, the Xianbei Tuoba people were already neither *hu* nor *yue*. His relocation of the capital to Luoyang was a necessary step to become *zhonghua*, showing that he was different from the Five Barbarians. But this notion was not shared by everyone. One did not cease to be one of the Five Barbarians by affirmation alone. After the establishment of the Sixteen Kingdoms of the Five Barbarians it took a long time for the northern nomadic dynasties to break away from their barbarian identity. I have explained this matter in detail in another place,[132] but summarize it here by means of an introduction to the topic.

When Fu Jian announced that he wanted to study, his grandfather Fu Hong retorted: "You are a barbarian, a different kind, so people will think you like to drink, and now you seek to study!"[133] This episode shows that studying was the only way for Fu Jian to become free from the label of barbarian. But it also implies that there were certain limitations which could not be overcome by cultivation in traditional Chinese culture.[134] The common perception of both *hu* and *han* at the time was that there was not one barbarian who had become a legitimate ruler, although some had gained merit as famous ministers.[135] Even *hu* rulers could not escape this perception, as can be seen in the cases of Shi Le[136] and Yao Yizhong;[137] like Fu Jian, all they could do was pour their efforts into studying. Being learned was the only way to accumulate the virtue which a ruler should possess; furthermore, acquiring Chinese traditional culture was virtually the only path by which one could escape being *hu*. *Hu* rulers sought consolation in the essays of Mencius and others regarding the birthplaces of legendary sages of ancient China.[138] Mencius' assertion that the sages Shun (舜), Yu (禹), and King Wen (文王) were born in the lands of barbarians was the only support upon which *hu* rulers could lean.[139]

Zhao Yi (趙翼) pointed out that the barbarian "usurpers" excelled in learning,[140] which reflects *hu* rulers' efforts to leap the wall between *hua* and barbarians. The common characteristic of Xiongnu rulers of Han/Former Zhao such as Liu Yuan (劉淵),[141] Liu He (劉和),[142] Liu Xuan (劉宣),[143] and Liu Cong (劉聰)[144] was that all liked to study and enjoyed reading classics and history. Liu Yuan and Liu Xuan had the Han literati Cui You (崔游)

and Sun Yan (孫炎), respectively, as teachers. Liu Cong was well versed in calligraphy and poetry, having composed 100 poems of expressing feelings (*shuhuaishi* 述懷詩). Much the same was true for the three generations of Xianbei Murong: the founders of Qian Yan (前燕) Murong Huang (慕容皝)[145] and Murong Zun (慕容儁),[146] the founder of Southern Yan (南燕) Murong De (慕容德),[147] and Murong Bao (慕容寶), the crown prince of the founder of Later Yan (後燕) Murong Chui (慕容垂).[148] All were widely read and possessed a high level of Chinese culture. The objective of pursuing study was perhaps less to do with the fulfillment of curiosity than it was about gaining recognition as a possessor of virtue and culture. As the result of his efforts, Shi Le was praised highly by his advisor Zhang Bin (張賓), who said that Shi was the only general among the many he had known who was prepared to take on the task of being a ruler.[149] Fu Jian also gained the complete trust of his advisor Wang Meng (王猛).[150]

2. "I am not one of the Five Barbarians": Implications

The *hu* people during the Wei, Jin, and Northern and Southern Dynasties period are collectively called Five Barbarians (*wuhu* 五胡) and their dynasties the Sixteen Kingdoms (*shiliu guo* 十六國), thus combining to make the term Sixteen Kingdoms of Five Barbarians (*wuhu shiliu guo* 五胡十六國), the dynasties built by *hu* people. But, strictly speaking, not all of the Sixteen Kingdoms were established by the Five Barbarians. Cheng (成) was built by *Cong* (賨) people and Northern Yan (北燕) and Western Liang (西涼) by Han people. The Western Yan (西燕) by Xianbei is not included in the Sixteen Kingdoms.

The earliest example of the term "Five Barbarians" (*wuhu*) is found in Fu Jian's remark.[151] It appears in a context where Fu says that he is already the Son of Heaven and that there is variation in rank within the Five Barbarians, but that Yao Chang (姚萇) of the Qiang (羌), whose people are not even included within the ranks of the Five Barbarians, dares to demand the imperial seal. The term "Sixteen Kingdoms" comes from *The Spring and Autumn Annals of the Sixteen Kingdoms* (*Shiliuo guo chunqiu* 十六國春秋) of Cui Hong (崔鴻). The criteria according to which he chose dynasties for inclusion were quite clear—to be included, a state had to have established a dynasty, made a name for itself, and have significant capacity for waging war—and did not necessarily require that they be of the Five Barbarians.[152] Still, the Sixteen Kingdoms of Five Barbarians are perceived as being closely related to the *hu* people of the age.

The *hu* rulers of the dynasties tried hard to shake off the label *hu*, but faced difficulty in doing so. Fu Jian was told his efforts would be in vain both by his grandfather and his brother.[153] The fact that few rulers successfully escaped their *hu* identity shows indeed that the path was hard.

During the Northern Wei another attempt was made to differentiate the dynastic rulers from the Five Barbarians (*wuhu*). This was carried out primarily by the third emperor, Emperor Taiwu (太武帝), who had accomplished the great feat of unifying north China. Although he did not deny his Xianbei identity, which is one of the Five Barbarians,[154] he announced a separation from the ways of the Xiongnu (also one of the Five Barbarians), who represented all the atrocities inflicted upon China from the Three Dynasties (三代) to the Qin and Han. This was along the same lines as Fu Jian's comment to Yao Chang regarding the Qiang people, perhaps because the Xianbei Tuoba people had not participated in the Yongjia Disorders in which the Han people had been deeply traumatized. In a sense, it was logical for Emperor Taiwu to degrade Jin emperors as having lost the way of ruler, so as to separate himself[155] from previous *hu* rulers who had massacred Han people.[156] It was in this context that he suppressed Buddhism and nominated Daoism as the national religion, since it meant taking a position opposite to Shi Hu (石虎) of Later Zhao (後趙), who was a *hu* and felt affinity with Buddhism[157]—both the *hu* people and Buddhism being alien to China.

Emperor Xiaowen took the policy even further, proclaiming Northern Wei to be the successor of Western Jin, something which the regimes of Five Barbarians had considered illegitimate. Previously, Northern Wei had chosen earth as their dynasty's virtue from among the five elements,[158] but had not clarified which dynasty they had succeeded. Emperor Xiaowen now adopted water, making it clear that Wei was claiming succession from Western Jin, whose virtue was metal.[159]

Another issue pertains to the forgery of lineage. This was tried by many dynasties of the *Wuhu*. Emperor Xiaowen emphasized that they were the descendants of the Yellow Emperor and declared the restoration of the rule of Fuxi (伏羲) and Shennong (神農).[160] He took advantage of the traditional Han belief that the ancestors of barbarians were of the same race as the Han, only exiled to distant lands, thereby aiming both to escape from the *hu* identity and to recruit Han literati on a massive scale. This scheme proved successful: he won over the hearts of the Han literati, who praised Emperor Xiaowen as a sage ruler[161] qualified to be the fourth Sovereign of the Three Sovereigns (*Sanhuang* 三皇) and the sixth Emperor of the Five Emperors (*Wudi* 五帝);[162] in addition, Gao Lü (高閭), from a famed family of Bohai (渤海),

recommended that Emperor Xiaowen perform the Feng and Shan sacrifices, and also said that south of the Yangzi river was not the Central Kingdom.[163]

By relocating the capital to Luoyang, Emperor Xiaowen laid claim to being the successor of the Divine Province. The reason why he insisted upon Luoyang over the much more advantageous Ye (鄴) was that Luoyang had been the capital of a unified China and was the place where the true meaning of the Central Kingdom could be manifested;[164] in contrast, Ye had been the capital of rulers who only ruled parts of China, such as Shi Hu or the Murong family. This, then, was Northern Wei proclaiming itself to be the legitimate dynasty of the Central Plain and successor to Western Jin.[165]

Wei divergence from the Five Barbarians was brought to a new level in Western Wei-Northern Zhou (北周), which was founded upon a coalition of the local magnates of Guanlong (關隴) and the generals from northern garrisons. Yuwen Tai (宇文泰) adopted a series of policies engineered via delicate negotiations between the *hu* and the Han, restructuring the state to center on Chang'an instead of Luoyang and designing the official system according to *The Rites of Zhou* (*Zhouli* 周禮), which was believed to originate from the Three Dynasties period.[166] These policies were also an ideological retort to the Southern Dynasties' assertion that they were the legitimate successors. The underlying motive in adopting the official system described in *The Rites of Zhou* was to discard the Han-Cao Wei system which was the basis for the Southern Dynasties' claim of legitimacy,[167] in the sense that the Western Zhou was an era when the *hua* and the barbarians were not separated.[168] By enacting policies such as the revival of *hu* surnames, the granting of surnames, and the creation of new towns in Guanzhong (關中) area, he tried to merge both the *hu* and the Han people into one extended family or townsfolk,[169] marked by mutual pride and communal affinity.[170] The manipulation of lineage, which was a specialty of nomadic people, played a key role in this pursuit.[171] This project resulted in a continuous dynasty comprising Western Wei-Northern Zhou-Sui-Tang, which some researchers name "states of *fubing* system,"[172] the *fubing* system acting as the engine for the unification and maintenance of the Sui-Tang world empire. The emergence of the *fubing* system meant the end of division between the roles of the *hu* and the Han in the military.

We encounter another aspect of lineage manipulation in the Northern Zhou. The Yuwen clan connected their ancestry[173] to Shennong,[174] and when he prohibited Buddhism Yuwen Yong (宇文邕), Emperor Wu of the Northern Zhou, said: "From the entrance of Five Barbarians into China the number of followers of the Buddhist teaching increased and became extremely popular. I

am not one of the Five Barbarians, so there is no reason to uphold Buddhism, and this is why I prohibit it."[175] Although it seems strange that he would say he is not one of the Five Barbarians given that his surname is Yuwen and he spoke the Xianbei language, this marked the middle phase of the lineage manipulation project which had begun in the early Northern Wei and was completed with the publication of *The History of the Jin* (晉書) by Tang Taizong.

During the process of nomadic influx into the Central Plain, the merger between *hu* peoples happened first, and then between *hu* and the Han, while the standards for the identification of race underwent a clear shift from a criterion based on geography to one based on culture.

3. From a Tuoba dynasty to a zhonghua *empire*

1) The lineage of the Tang imperial house and its problems

By the time of the Sui-Tang era, a person's culture played a more important role than his race.[176] The ethnic origin of the Yang (楊) clan of the Sui and the Li clan of the Tang did not have much to do with their policies. They might well have descended from prominent Han families, but it is certain that these clans, a few generations back from the dynastic founders, had lived in the Wuchuan garrison, north of Yinshan (陰山) mountain for quite a long period of time. This historical fact seems to have given rise to the suspicion that the Sui and Tang imperial houses were of barbarian origin.

The suspicion about the origin of the Li clan had existed from the very beginning of the dynasty, because they had once had the *hu* surname Daye (大野).[177] The Buddhist monk Falin (法琳) declared before Taizong that the Tang imperial house originated from Xianbei Tuoba Dadu (達闍 i.e., Li in Chinese) which was a noble scion of Yinshan, i.e., a barbarian lineage.[178] Although Taizong reprimanded Falin,[179] during the war of unification an enemy, Dan Xiongxin (單雄信), called Taizong's brother Yuanji (元吉) a *hu* child,[180] and a Tang minister Sun Fuqie (孫伏伽) let slip that when Gaozu Li Yuan was a child his friends were all queue-haired[181] because the royal family was deeply imbued with *hu* custom.

The in-laws of the royal family were completely of the *hu* line. Li Yuan's mother was a daughter of Dugu Xin (獨孤信), the Grand Marshal of the Northern Zhou, and a sister of Empress Dugu of Emperor Wen of the Sui, making Li Yuan nephew-in-law to Yang Jian (楊堅) and maternal cousin of Emperor Yang (煬帝). Li Yuan married the daughter of Dou Yi (竇毅), who was of the Xianbei line and a prefectural commander of the Sui. The mother

of Empress Dou was the elder sister of Emperor Wu of the Northern Zhou, Senior Princess Xiangyang (襄陽長公主).[182]

The lifestyles of Taizong and his crown prince Chengqian (承乾) were not much different from those of the *hu* people. During the incident of Xuanwu Gate (玄武門), Taizong killed his younger brother Yuanji and made Princess Yang, Yuanji's wife, his own; Zhu Xi's remark on this behavior is well known.[183] Chengqian followed *hu* custom as well. He stole and slaughtered cattle and horses, and acted like a Turk qaghan, eating with his guards, wearing Turkic clothes, and speaking Turkic.[184] During Zhenguan period when the Tang royal ancestral temple was being set up, the ministers were discussing who should be the progenitor, and Yu Zhining (于志寧) objected to the suggestion that it be Li Gao (李暠).[185] If Li Gao was their true ancestor, why would the early Tang emperors not want the family of Li Bao of Longxi (隴西), who were descendants of Li Gao, included in the imperial clan lineage?[186] And why did Gaozong further lower the family rank of Li Bao? Thus it has been argued that the ancestors of the Tang imperial house must have been a degraded household of the Lis of Zhaojun (趙郡), or had just borrowed the surname of Li of Zhaojun.[187] Given the fact that Gaozong suppressed Li Bao and did not honor the lineage of Zhaojun Lis,[188] it is most likely that the actual pedigree of the Tang imperial house was quite different from what it claimed to be and that it was ethnically non-Han Chinese.

The Tang was ruled by the Han people in name, but in reality was a multi-racial regime,[189] so the Sui-Tang dynasty was still seen as a Xianbei state by the nomads of Eurasia or the people from the western regions, and Tang was called Taugas, Tamhaj, or Tabgaĉ which stood for Tuoba.[190] The dynasties from the Dai (代) through Northern Wei and on to the Tang are separate according to the Chinese-style names for dynasties, but in fact form a continuous Tuoba state. Considering the continuity and commonality between these dynasties, placing them under the single heading of the Tuoba state seems appropriate. In this aspect, westerners from the fifth to the ninth century who called China Taugas, Tamhaj, or Tabgaĉ, were closer to the truth.[191] Taizong's acquisition of the title "Heavenly Qaghan" after the destruction of the Eastern Turks, Gaozong's being addressed thus by nomadic rulers,[192] and the fact that the majority of the early Sui-Tang imperial clan and high officials came from the military leaders of northern tribesmen, all provide further support to the Tuoba state argument.[193]

2) Fabricating history and the rise of the *zhonghua* sovereign

The imperial houses of Sui and Tang saw themselves as traditional Han

Chinese, although they were genetically descendants of nomadic tribesmen such as the Xianbei and others. But no matter how they identified themselves and their dynasties, few saw them and their dynasties as purely Han Chinese.

It is clear now that the Li house of the Tang did not descend from a renowned clan, even if they had been Han Chinese. Why then did the Tang imperial house want to fabricate a lineage to appear as if it had been one of the renowned Han aristocratic clans? Throughout Chinese history, a certain degree of sinicization has been necessary for anyone or anything alien to come to China and earn a place there. This was the case for Buddhism as well as Nestorian Christianity, but this did not mean they ceased to be Buddhism or Christianity. In addition to the issue of sinicization, the Wei-Jin-Northern and Southern Dynasties era was an age of pedigree. Chen Yinke (陳寅恪) has raised questions about Taizong's re-publication of the *History of the Jin* and his ordering the writing of *The Record of Clans and Lineages in the Zhenguan Reign Period* (*Zhenguan shizu zhi* 貞觀氏族志), suggesting that the motive behind the omission, among the Sixteen Kingdoms, of Former Liang (前涼) and Western Liang (西涼) from the *History of the Jin* was the same as that behind *The Record of Clans and Lineages in the Zhenguan Reign Period*: namely to exalt the Li clan of the Tang and prove that they had a long and glorious pedigree.[194]

Many dynastic histories were written during Taizong's reign; these were generally dynastic histories from after the era of the Three Kingdoms or from the *History of the Jin*, now re-written to conform to Tang legitimacy. The Tang imperial house strove to dispel the doubt that they originated from the Xianbei Tuoba tribe, and influenced the planning and compilation of dynastic histories, sometimes even down to the wording of the contents.

First, let us look at the chronological records (*zaiji* 載記) of the *History of the Jin*. There are thirty chapters of chronological records in the book. The name originated from *The Eastern Watch Records of the Han* (*Dongguan Hanji* 東觀漢記), written by Ban Gu (班固) under order of Emperor Ming,[195] and the number of thirty chapters seems to have been taken from the thirty chapters of biographies of feudal lords and eminent people (*shijia* 世家) in *The Records of the Grand Historian*. While the *shijia* is a record for each feudatory, the *zaiji* is a chronicle for the independent political entities in China which were not enfeoffed by the Chinese emperor.[196] By including the Sixteen Kingdoms with the *zaiji*, Taizong set them in a different category and treated them as extraneous to the legitimate Jin dynasty, clearly taking the Han Chinese attitude of degrading alien regimes.

The source for Taizong's *History of the Jin* was *The Spring and Autumn*

Annals of the Sixteen Kingdoms by Cui Hong of the Northern Wei, and in this book one record was devoted to each state;[197] notably, though, two states which were recorded in the *Annals* were omitted in the *zaiji* of the *History of the Jin*. They are Former Liang (301–76), which was established by a Han Chinese, Zhang Gui (張軌) of Anding (安定), and which occupied the Hexi corridor (河西回廊), and Western Liang (400–421) which was established by Li Gao of Longxi.[198] The latter was the person later manipulated to become the ancestor of the Tang imperial house, and omitting him and his state[199] was surely Taizong's intention.

Another example is the compilation of the *History of the Southern Dynasties* (南史) and the *History of the Northern Dynasties* (北史), which concealed two underlying intentions. The first was to tie the Southern Dynasties (南朝) and Northern Dynasties (北朝) into one term, the Southern and Northern Dynasties (南北朝). If Taizong had truly been in favor of the Han Chinese point of view, he could have given legitimacy to the Southern Dynasties; but he could not ignore his own racial origins in the Northern Dynasties, and thus merging the two was the better option. Second, by including the Sui dynasty, the unifier of China, among the Northern Dynasties, he wanted to minimize the credit they received for having accomplished that unification.

Many histories were published in the early Tang. Taizong's reign saw the compilation of the so-called History of the Five Dynasties, namely *History of the Liang, History of the Chen, History of the Northern Qi, History of the Zhou, History of the Sui,*[200] and in 646 *History of the Jin* (these six historical works are known as the *Six Histories*). Then, during Gaozong's reign, still under the shadow of Taizong, the *History of the Southern Dynasties* and the *History of the Northern Dynasties* were completed. Among the twenty-four histories that are considered official dynastic histories, eight—a third of the total—were published at this time. Taizong had opened up a new era in Chinese history publication by beginning the tradition of government-sponsored official history, and also by permitting the incumbent emperor to inspect the records about himself, something that had previously been forbidden,[201] and giving instructions on how to write about the incident of Xuanwu Gate.[202]

Taizong's manipulation of history was along the same lines as Gao Huan (高歡) of the Northern Qi, who distorted history and transformed his family into the renowned Bohai Gao clan; but it was successful. Tang monarchs managed to transform themselves from racially and culturally *hu* rulers into *zhonghua* emperors to such an extent that people of later times accept without doubt that the Tang was a legitimate Chinese dynasty.

Taizong's satisfaction with the effectiveness of official histories is manifest in the edict ordering the re-publication of *History of the Jin*: "How great is the usefulness of historical books!"[203]

3) The concept of "Han people" and the emergence of "Tang people," "*Hua* people"

The largest ethnic group among the present-day Chinese is the Han people (*Hanren* 漢人) or Han race (*Hanzu* 漢族).[204] The term *Hanzu* only appeared in the early modern age,[205] while the history of the term *Hanren* is much longer. Occasional use of the term *Hanren* can be found in texts from the Han,[206] but the term means no more than the people of the Han dynasty. "Qin people" (*Qinren* 秦人) was more generally used instead of "Han people" even in the Han period, and also in the Northern and Southern Dynasties period: the Xiongnu and Central Asians' use of this term to refer to the people of the Central Plain was due to the lasting impression of Qin unification.

From the Later Han onwards the words *hu* and "Han" were paired to represent contrast,[207] but here "Han" did not mean the same as *Hanren* or the later term *Hanzu*. Just as the *Jin* in *Yi Jin* (夷晉) meant people of the Jin dynasty (*Jinchao ren* 晉朝人), the term "people of the Han dynasty" (*Hanchao ren* 漢朝人)[208] was often used when surrounding peoples referred to the people of the commandaries and counties (郡縣之民).[209] Yet the term *hu* seems to have expanded its meaning from exclusively referring to Xiongnu to a broad sense of the non-Chinese including nomadic peoples, with the usage of *Yi* being the same.

The terms *Han* or *Hanren* began to be used in a racial/ethnic sense from the Wei-Jin-Northern and Southern Dynasties period when alien rule began.[210] From the fact that the term "Han" was used despite the fall of the Han dynasty, we can see that the original connotation of the term, "people of the Han dynasty," had already disappeared. We can narrow down the moment of change to the middle of the Northern and Southern Dynasties period, around the reign of Emperor Xiaowen of the Northern Wei, because it is at this point that "Han people" begins to appear paired with Xiongnu, and Han language (*Hanyu* 漢語) with Barbarian language (*huyu* 胡語 or *luyu* 虜語).[211]

The change took place because the previous term for the people of the Central Plain, (people of) the Middle Kingdom (*Zhongguo* [*ren*]), had become ambiguous due to the influx of border peoples into the Central Plain. Shi Le and Fu Jian based their regimes on the two traditional capitals, proclaimed themselves to be the rulers of the Middle Kingdom, and took the unification of China to be their duty,[212] and Emperor Taiwu of the Northern

Wei denigrated the Eastern Jin, calling them the presumptuous self-titled gang of Wu-Chu (吳楚) region, and set unification as his goal;[213] and also, as previously mentioned, many of the so-called barbarian usurpers were just as or even more versed in learning when compared with the *Hanzu* emperors, the supposed protectors of traditional culture.

After "Han" turned into a racial name, it was used as a derogatory term when tension rose between the *hu* and the Han.[214] The high point of this tension after the Yongjia Disorders was the period of the rebellion of Six Garrisons (六鎮). The Xianbei of the Six Garrisons came to possess an intense racial self-consciousness, calling themselves Xianbei or Northern people (*Beiren* 北人) and their language Xianbei language (*Xianbei yu*) or the "National Language" (*guoyu*), in differentiation from Han, Han people (*Hanren*), Han language (*Hanyu*), and the language of *hua* (*huayu* 華語). They drew a strict distinction between the so-called "nature of Han"[215] and the "character of Xianbei" and overcame their previous ethnic inferiority complex.[216] In these circumstances, derogatory terms aimed at the Han, such as Han children (*Han'er* 漢兒) or Han dogs (*Hangou* 漢狗),[217] came to be used by *hu*.

The tension between the two groups quickly materialized in action. In 527 (Xiaochang 孝昌 3) in late Northern Wei, Ge Rong's (葛榮) forces attacked Jizhou (冀州), driving the residents outside the city and forcing sixty to seventy percent to starve or freeze to death,[218] and in 528 attacked Cangzhou (滄州), killing eighty to ninety percent of the residents.[219] The residents must have been Han people, as Gao Huan referred to the brutalities of Ge Rong's rebel forces as "deceiving the Han children" and attributed Ge's failure to this.[220]

The tension was more pronounced in Eastern Wei-Northern Qi than in Western Wei-Northern Zhou, where a combined group of *hu* and Han ruled. The rivalry of Gao Ang (高昂) and Liu Gui (劉貴) is a good example of the strife between *hu* and Han in Eastern Wei. Liu was descended from Xiongnu who had become Xianbei, and he looked down upon Han people. One day he saw Han workers drowning in the Yellow River and remarked that the life of a Han man had no monetary value, and so they should be left to die.[221] Gao Ang, a Han Chinese, took a sword and tried to strike him, and Liu Gui ran away, returned to his camp and mustered his troops to attack Gao.[222]

In Northern Qi, when the Han side gained the upper hand, Gao Dezheng (高德政) and Du Bi (杜弼) of the Han elite proposed that more Han people be recruited. But Gao's words and actions had an air of deliberate contempt for the Xianbei people, promoting the appointment of Han with the

aim of eliminating the Xianbei, and as a result he was killed.[223] Du Bi was also killed for saying Xianbei were no good at ruling, and that Han people should be promoted in their place, which angered Gao Yang (高洋), the Emperor Wenxuan (文宣帝).[224] The fact that the mutual contempt between the parties was so openly and freely expressed during Northern Qi shows how severe the fissure between *hu* and Han was.

Gao Yang's younger brother Shi (湜), the Prince of Gaoyang (高陽王), treated with disdain his father-in-law who did not have an official position, saying "He's a Han without an official post, and how could I pay respect?"[225] The Xianbei did not hesitate to use derogatory vocabulary like "Han worth a coin" (*touqian jia han* 頭錢價漢), "Han without an official post" (*wu guanzhi han* 無官職漢), "Han child" (*haner* 漢兒),[226] and "what kind of Han lad" (*hewu hanzi* 何物漢子)[227] against the Han Chinese, and the fact that the Northern Qi tried to use Han as human shields[228] whenever there was war with Northern Zhou adds further evidence of Xianbei's studied contempt towards them. So the term "Han" or "Han people" had strongly negative connotations in Eastern Wei-Northern Qi society, and was thus the counterpart of the term *hu*, the derogatory term which the Han Chinese used for aliens.

In Western Wei-Northern Zhou and Sui-Tang society the terms "Han" and "Han people" were not used in this disparaging sense. From the Sui-Tang era and onwards the term *fan* (蕃) came to be used instead of *hu*, and *han* no longer carried negative implications but found a new place as the counterpart of *fan*, which indicated non-Han people. The term *fan* (藩) simply means fence, and thus although the term does not imply a completely equal relation with the Han, it does have the neutral sense of a counterpart or parallel which is very different from such derogatory terms as the four *yi* or *man*, *yi*, *rong*, and *di*.[229] In Sui-Tang times the people of the Central Plain referred to themselves as Han, in contrast with *Fan*.[230] For example, in accounts of Tang–Tibet relations we find such expressions as "*fan* and Han share the border,"[231] or "Han people cannot work the field without cattle, while *fan* people cannot go anywhere without horse."[232] In line with this change, the combined word *fanhan* (蕃漢) came to replace the analogous pairing of the Middle Kingdom and the four *yi*.[233] Another paired term, *huhan* (胡漢), had disappeared by the Song dynasty.[234] As the word "Han" began to be used in relation to the surrounding peoples, the following periods saw the increasing use of "Han" in a racial context,[235] and from then on "Han" became a fixed term for indicating Chinese, resulting in the establishment of the present-day usage of *Hanren* or *Hanzu* as an ethnonym.

In addition to "Han people" (*Hanren*), the term "Tang people" (*Tangren*)

also appeared. The term originally meant people of the Tang dynasty, but was used more in the sense of an "international person"[236] rather than a person of the Central Plain. We cannot overlook the significance of the emergence of the term in this international sense, since other possible candidates like *Songren* (宋人), *Yuanren* (元人), *Mingren* (明人), or *Qingren* (清人) did not supplant the use of *Tangren*. For this reason, a recent author has defined the concept of *Tangren* as "not *hu*, not Han,"[237] meaning there was no difference in the lifestyles of *hu* and Han: the *hu* wearing a Han hat and the Han a *hu* hat.[238] The term *Tangren* spread much more widely than in the previous era, even as far as the Arabic lands, thanks to the expansion of Tang culture and influence overseas. As sea trade gradually gained superiority over land trade, from the Song onwards people outside China called China *Tang* and Chinese *Tangren*,[239] this heritage surviving in the use of the name "Chinatown" for overseas Chinese, *Tangren jie* (唐人街).[240]

Another term worth mentioning in this regard is *hua* (華) or *huaren* (華人). The word *zhonghua* (中華) first appeared during the Wei-Jin era.[241] It came into use in astronomy, later coming to mean the middle gate of a palace,[242] and geographically the Central Plain area.[243] It became a synonym for *zhongguo* and the antonym of the frontier, meaning the interior lands of commandaries and counties, or the middle plain. In the time of unification it referred to the whole country, but during the age of division only to the Central Plain. *Zhonghua*, then, was a combination of the original core (*hua*) *xia* (華夏) with added geographical concepts such as the Middle Kingdom (*zhongguo* 中國) and Central Plain (*zhongyuan* 中原). Later, however, the emphasis moved to the Central Plain (*zhongyuan*), which was the real meaning of the Middle Kingdom (*zhongguo*), and became a word which also signifies the culture flourishing there and the people who preserve and maintain that culture. The following accounts support this version of the formation of the meaning of *zhonghua*: Fu Jian once commented, "It was not that we [*hu*] rebelled but that the Jin themselves deserted *zhonghua*."[244] On the subject of the *zhonghua* manner of dress, there was an argument that if a *zhonghua* literati belonged to Eastern Jin he would lose the qualification *zhonghua*, since he would become a short-haired and tattooed denizen of Wuyue (吳越) region.[245] From these two accounts we can see that being physically located in the Central Plain and upholding the traditional culture were important criteria for being *zhonghua*.[246] Nevertheless, the aliens who immigrated to the Central Plain asserted themselves to be *zhonghua*, on the grounds that they occupied the Central Plain and supported the traditional culture, disparaging the Southern Dynasties as southern fakes.[247] By the

end of the Northern Dynasties, people from Xianbei, Wuhuan (烏桓), and Xiongnu had all been included as literati of *zhonghua* after demonstrating their attainments in traditional culture and learning.[248] Accordingly, *zhonghua* was no longer monopolized by Han Chinese but became a common possession of all peoples who coexisted with them.[249] Thus, in chapter twenty-two of the *Interpretation of Tang Code*, Wang Yuanliang (王元亮) of the Yuan period wrote as follows regarding the definition of *zhonghua*:[250]

> *zhonghua* is the Middle Kingdom. Personally accepting the civilizing transformation of the king and voluntarily belonging to the Middle Kingdom, the way of dressing dignified and grave, the custom filial and respectful, the body conforming to the ritual, thus we name him *zhonghua*. It is not even remotely close to the customs of barbarians which are scattered hair, wearing clothes opening on the left, and tattooing.[251]

The first occurrence of the term *huaren* seems to be in Jiang Tong's *Treatise on Relocating the Barbarians*:

> During Jianwu (建武) period, [the emperor] made Ma Yuan (馬援) the governor of Longxi and [directed him to] suppress the rebellious Qiang people. The remaining Qiang people were relocated to Guanzhong and settled in the empty lands of Fengyi (馮翊) and Hedong (河東) and became mixed with *huaren*. After a few years their kind multiplied and relying on their fatness and strength, they again invaded *Hanren* and brought suffering.[252]

Jiang uses two different words, *huaren* and *Hanren*, in the same sentence. Do these refer to two different people? In the Northern Wei period the non-*yi* people living in Gaochang (高昌) area were called *huaren*.[253] Then the word was used as a parallel pair with *man*,[254] with Jihu (稽胡), a branch of Xiongnu,[255] and Xianbei in Eastern Wei-Northern Qi era.[256]

Similar usage can be observed in the Tang period: the *Tangren* prisoners captured by Tibet were called *huaren*,[257] and *Tangren* who went northward to the Turks were called *huaren*.[258] If *huaren* was applied to the people who entered the Chinese domain in this manner, this is an issue that we cannot overlook. This topic deserves a separate article in its own right, but my view is that we can define *hua* as a cultural concept: not just as someone living in the same area, but as someone who absorbs Chinese culture and maintains Chinese order.

From then on *zhonghua* was used by people in times of political upheaval—such as during the era of Zhu Yuanzhang (朱元璋) or Sun Wen

(孫文)—as the parallel of *hulu* (胡虜) or *saiwai* (塞外), but in general it became something distinguishable by culture. In the early Republican period, Zhang Taiyan (章太炎) defined *zhonghua* as distinguishing between high and low culture with the division into *hua* and barbarians (*yi*),[259] and Liang Qichao (梁啓超) said, "If one meets another race and a concept of 'we Chinese' strikes one right away, he is *Zhonghua minzu* . . . So all Manchus are now part of *Zhonghua Minguo*."[260] We may say, then, that the concept of "the Framework of Diversity in Unity of the Chinese Nationality" (*zhonghua minzu duoyuan yiti geju* 中華民族多元一體格局), as used in present-day China, began to take rudimentary form during the Tang period.

CONCLUSION

The entrance of the Five Barbarians into the Central Plain was a grand historical event of the East; these peoples subsequently become key actors in the establishment of many dynasties, from the age of the Sixteen Kingdoms of the Five Barbarians and Northern Dynasties to the Sui-Tang world empire.

Despite the tendency to assimilate the Han and the Tang empires into a single unit, they were in fact very different with respect to their conceptions of domain, worldview, and international relations. The Han limited their domain to within the Great Wall, which came to divide the nation of people who wore ceremonial caps and belts and were ruled by the emperor from the nation of people who pulled bows and were ruled by the *chanyu*. This reflected the reality that the Han and the Xiongnu were equal neighbors, and their domains were accordingly divided into the emperor's and the *chanyu*'s. The diplomatic correspondence between them reflects this. But the Tang empire differed from the Han regarding relations with the nomadic empires, and the Tang supreme ruler proclaimed himself "Emperor, Heavenly Qaghan," reflecting the reality that the Tang ruler's domain included not only the agrarian lands of the emperor but also some of the nomadic lands ruled by the qaghans. I propose that the stone statue *Horse Treading upon Xiongnu* at Huo Qubing's tomb as annexed to Han Wudi's tomb Maoling, the *Stone Statues of Fourteen Chieftains* in front of Tang Taizong's tomb Zhaoling, and *Statues of Sixty-one Barbarian Subjects* standing before Tang Gaozong's tomb Qianling, are symbolic of the gap between Han and Tang. The former asserts that Han and Xiongnu cannot coexist in the same area, while the Tang statues suggest that nomads could coexist in the emperor's court.

The Tang emperor exercised rulership over the people within the domain

of the qaghans. *The Encyclopedic History of Institutions* wrote, "rulership over the barbarians of the four directions began from here," meaning that it had happened for the first time in Chinese history. The period for which the Tang emperor claimed to be Heavenly Qaghan and exercised rulership befitting the title did not last long, yet it laid the foundations of an open and cosmopolitan Tang empire.

Such divergence between the Han and the Tang did not come about suddenly in the Tang period, but developed gradually during the influx of the Five Barbarians into the Central Plain. The immigration of these nomadic groups began after the division of Xiongnu into north and south, and by the Western Jin era the nomads comprised half the population of Guanzhong. Fearing impending catastrophe, the Western Jin officials proposed a relocation policy to send the nomads back to their original lands, but this was no solution. It was not only impracticable, but also increased dissension between the two parties. In the end, the catastrophe referred to as "The Five Barbarians brought chaos to *hua*" (*wuhu luanhua* 五胡亂華) befell the Western Jin, and the Sixteen Kingdoms of the Five Barbarians were subsequently established. People learned that there was no benefit to either side from dissension between the *hu* and the Han, and eventually advanced to the path of compromise and coexistence, resulting in a mass influx of northern nomads and western oasis dwellers. In the Northern Wei capital Luoyang there were more than 10,000 households who came from west of Pamir, and people from the Western Regions made a significant mark in the Northern Qi court.

The Tang adopted the policy "All Are the Subjects of Us," which was fundamentally different from the Western Jin's *Treatise on Relocation*. There were many high officials of foreign origin in the Tang court, and *fanfang* (蕃坊)—residential areas for foreigners—were set up in many places throughout the empire, including Dunhuang (敦煌), Guangzhou (廣州), Quanzhou (泉州), and Yangzhou (揚州). Chang'an, as the capital of the world empire, was overflowing with foreigners.

The emergence of the Tang Empire heralded a shift in worldview. The Ancient Chinese worldview is often represented by the term *liuhe*, or the Six Directions. The term "unifying the Six Directions" was briefly used as a concept to encompass the agrarian and nomadic lands during the time of the First Emperor of Qin, but soon changed to mean the unification of China itself. After the immigration of the Five Barbarians into the Central Plain, it was replaced by the concept of "*hu* and *yue* becoming one family." The term symbolized union between the *hu* who dwelled in the Central Plain

and steppes and the *man* who dwelled in the southern mountains. Emperor Xiaowen of Northern Wei identified this ideal as the objective of his policy, and Taizong of Tang proclaimed the completion of Xiaowen's vision when he claimed the title "Emperor, Heavenly Qaghan."

The qaghan was the supreme ruler of the nomadic world, and the Tang emperor's taking of the title was closely related to the northern nomads' entrance into the middle plain, which had been underway since the previous age. The influx of nomads meant an influx of those who used the title "Qaghan." The first use of the title is thought to be by the Rouran ruler, the conqueror of the northern steppe, following the decline in authority of the Xiongnu title *chanyu*. But recent findings show that the title was also used by the Tuoba Wei from the early stage of Dai kingdom to the end of the dynasty. The Rouran proclaimed the revival of the *zhonghua* by entering into alliance with the Southern Qi and routing the Tuoba Wei, so expanding the dominions of the qaghan into the Central Plain. The Tuyuhun, a branch of Xianbei, used the "Qaghan" title as well. This expansion of the title into inland China and southwestward stimulated the emergence of the title "Heavenly Qaghan" in the Tang.

The Tang and the Han are thought to be the greatest empires of Han Chinese in Chinese history. But suspicions surround the origins of the Tang ruling elite, including the imperial house of Li. Zhu Xi of Southern Song even declared that the Tang ruling house was of barbarian origin. Whatever their genesis, the emergence of the Great Tang empire was certainly the end product of the influx of the Five Barbarians into the Central Plain, and it was a branch of the Five Barbarians which built the Tang empire. In the face of such facts, then, why consider the Tang as a state of Han Chinese? This illusion was the result of the successful transformation of the Five Barbarians into *zhonghua*. It is well known that any foreign element which came to China had to undergo sinicization in order to take root. Buddhism trod that path, as did the so-called Three Foreign Religions (*san yi jiao* 三夷教) which was popular in Tang times, as well as Nestorian Christianity; but even after sinicization, Nestorian Christianity was still Christianity: in a similar manner, the sinicized Five Barbarians should be seen as *zhonghua hua* (中華化) rather than *Hanhua* (漢化).

The Five Barbarians themselves acknowledged that they were different kinds and maintained their barbarian identity during the early phase of immigration into China, but gradually took the path of sinicization. The Yongjia Disorders, for which the Five Barbarians were responsible, initially had a traumatic impact upon the dynasty of the middle plain. Thus Emperor

Taiwu of Northern Wei proclaimed separation from the Five Barbarians in order to embrace the *Hanren*, and Emperor Wu of Northern Zhou announced that he was not of the Five Barbarians. People of the Western Regions at the time called the Tang empire Tabgaĉ, which is synonymous with Tuoba, revealing that they saw the Tang as another dynasty in the line of those built by the Tuoba people. Tang Taizong played a decisive role in washing away the thick *hu* bloodline that ran through the Tang ruling house. He initiated a government project to re-publish all the official histories of China from the *History of the Jin* to the *History of the Sui*. He sought to stabilize Tang rule by the manipulation of history and lineage, purposefully omitting the history of his chosen ancestor Li Gao and his state the Western Liang from the relevant official history, and sneaking the Sui into one of the Northern Dynasties and effacing their unifying role, in order to diminish the Sui's feat of unifying China. His manipulation was so successful that he was led to exclaim: "How great is the usefulness of historical books!"

Racial problems surfaced due to the entrance of the Five Barbarians into the Central Plain, and during the process the racial identity of Han became defined. Previously, *Hanren* had just meant people of the Han dynasty, but as conflict increased between the Five Barbarians and the people of the Han dynasty, *Hanren* acquired a new meaning as a term of disparagement by the *hu*, especially during the Eastern Wei-Northern Qi era. Yet by Tang times the term "Han" had found a new place as the counterpart of the newly adopted word *fan*. *Fan* literally means fence, and when set alongside it, the term *Han* no longer carried overtones of contempt.

The new term *Tangren* was the fruit of the open and compromising character of Tang diplomacy and culture, and the internationality of the Tang empire. The Tang did not simply accept foreign culture, but used it as an opportunity to reach outward. The emergence of the term *huaren* deserves our attention. This term is closely related with the term *zhonghua*, which first appeared during the Wei-Jin period. *Zhonghua* first meant the Central Kingdom (*zhongguo*), specifically the interior commandaries and counties, but gradually grew into a concept encompassing culture and race, eventually coming to mean someone who upholds traditional culture in the Central Plain. From the late Northern Dynasties period, people from Xianbei, Wuhuan, and Xiongnu identified themselves as *zhonghua* literati after attaining traditional culture and learning. In times of political upheaval the term was used as a counterpart for *hulu*, but generally it retained the meaning of any race who upheld the traditional Chinese culture.

In Early Republican era, Zhang Taiyan saw the term *huayi* as

distinguishing high from low culture, and Liang Qichao asserted that even if someone is of a foreign race, so long as one can maintain the concept of "us Chinese" in one's mind upon meeting him, that person is *zhonghua minzu*.

Viewing the history of the east from the third century, one sees continuous waves of reformation and integration enduring for about four hundred years, flowing over the boundaries of the Central Plain and uniting the steppe and southern mountains as one. A researcher has lauded this period as the era of new state movement, transcending *hua* and *yi*.[261] The traditional perspective on the immigration of aliens into the Central Plain in this period has been disparaging, represented in terms like *wuhu luanhua* (五胡亂華), *siyi luanhua* (四夷亂華), or *yidi luanhua* (夷狄亂華);[262] but, in conclusion, it is interesting to note the recent publication of a book titled *Wuhu Xinghua* (五胡興華)—"*Wuhu* promoting *Zhonghua*."[263]

NOTES

[1] The traditional Chinese viewpoint is well represented in *Mengzi*, 3B4: "I have heard of using the *xia* to transform the *yi*, but have not heard of transforming into *yi*."
[2] Sima Qian, *Shiji* 99:2719 and 110:2890. All references to official histories are to the Zhonghua Shuju editions.
[3] *Shiji* 110:2899.
[4] Liu Xu, *Jiu Tang shu* 194a:5153; and Ouyang Xiu and Song Qi, *Xin Tang shu* 215a:6028.
[5] Du You, *Tongdian* (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1988), 7:144.
[6] *Xin Tang shu* 50:1344.
[7] *Jiu Tang shu* 4:70.
[8] *Shiji* 6:245.
[9] Kim Han-kyu, *Cheonha Gukga* (Seoul: Sonamu, 2005), 81–83.
[10] *Shiji* 97:2695.
[11] Yoshimoto Michimasa, "Chūgoku kodai ni okeru kagi sisō no seiritsu," in Fuma Susumu hen, *Chūgoku higashi Ajia gaikō kōryūshi no kenkyū* (Kyoto: Kyōto daigaku gakujutsu shuppankai, 2007), 19.
[12] *Chunqiu fanlu xiaoyi* (Jinan: Shandong Youyi Chubanshe, 1994), 1:14.
[13] *Du Tongjian lun* (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1998), 1:2.
[14] Ban Gu, *Han shu* 48:2240.
[15] *Shiji* 117:3051.
[16] *Shiji* 126:3206.
[17] The debate was not limited to the policy of maintaining a monopoly on salt and iron, but extended to whether resting with the reality of the peace and stability of the dynasty was preferable to pursuing the ideal of ultimate peace including the interior and the exterior.
[18] *Han shu* 78:3282.
[19] *Shiji* 110:2902.
[20] *Han shu* 64a:2800.
[21] *Shiji* 110:2894.

[22] *Shiji* 110:2902.
[23] *Shiji* 110:2899.
[24] Kurihara Tomonobu, "Kan teigoku to shuhen minzoku," in *Jōdai Nihon taigai kankei no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1978), 34–35.
[25] *Han shu* 95:3849.
[26] *Han shu* 55:3851.
[27] *Tongdian* 200:5494.
[28] *Jiu Tang shu* 3:39–40; *Xin Tang shu* 2:31.
[29] *Jiu Tang shu* 3:59.
[30] *Jiu Tang shu* 120:3462.
[31] Luo Xianglin, "Tangdai Tian Kehan zhidu kao," in *Tangdai wenhuashi* (Taibei: Taiwan Shangwu yinshuguan, 1974), 56.
[32] *Xin Tang shu* 219:6183–84.
[33] The *Tang Huiyao* (100:2134) uses the word *tongzhi* (統制) for *lintong* (臨統).
[34] Luo Xianglin ("Tangdai Tian Kehan zhidu kao," 56) distinguishes between cases in which the nomadic chiefs called the Tang emperor "Qaghan" as opposed to "Heavenly Qaghan," noting that the former was used in requesting inclusion of their territory into China and its administrative system, and the latter in concluding alliances between polities whose populations were not listed in the Tang registry.
[35] *Xin Tang shu* 221b:6256.
[36] Luo Xianglin ("Tangdai Tian Kehan zhidu kao," 56–57) divides the era of the "Heavenly Qaghan" into three periods: the first lasting from 630 (Zhenguan 4) to 657 (Xianqing 2), up until the conquest of the Western Turks; the second from 661 (Longshuo 1), when the Tang installed prefectures in the sixteen states of the Western Regions and Nine Surnames of Zhaowu, to 752 (Tianbao 11), when Gao Xianzhi lost the battle of Talas; and the third from 755 (Tianbao 14), when An Lushan's rebellion began, to 781 (Jianzhong 2), when Daizong and Guo Ziwei died.
[37] *Xin Tang shu* 221b:6245.
[38] Zhang Jun, "Ping Tian Kehan zhidu shuo," in *Tangdai fanjiang yanjiu* (Taibei: Lianjing chuban shiye gongsi, 1986), 366.
[39] *Jiu Tang shu* 194a:5166.
[40] *Xin Tang shu* 110:4125.
[41] *Jiu Tang shu* 25:972.
[42] Tang Taizong had composed a verse, "雪恥酬百王, 除兇報千古." *Quan Tang shi* (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1960), 1:20.
[43] Sima Guang, *Zizhi Tongjian*, 202:6372–73.
[44] Kurihara Tomonobu, "Higashi Ajia shi kara mita 'Tennō' kō no seiritsu," in *Jōdai Nihon taigai kankei no kenkyū*, 286.
[45] Shiratori Kurakichi, "Kakan oyobi katon shōgō kō," *Tōyō gakuhō* 11, no. 3 (1921).
[46] *Zizhi Tongjian* 77:2459.
[47] Zhao Wanli, *Han Wei Nanbeichao muzhi jishe* (Taibei: Dingwen shuju, 1972), vol. 5.
[48] Mi Wenping, "Xianbei shishi de faxian yu chubu yanjiu," *Wenwu* 1981-2.
[49] Lin Lüzhi, *Xianbei shi*, 2nd ed. (Hong Kong: Bowen shuju, 1973), 367; Park Hanje, "Moklanshi ui shidae—Bukwi Hyomoonje shigi dae Yuyeon jeonjaeng gwa gwanryeonhayeo," in *Osong Lee Gongbeom seonsaeng jeongnyeoun ginyeom Dongyangsa ronchong* (Seoul: Jisik sanopsa, 1993).
[50] Park Hanje, *Joongguk Joongse Ho Han cheje yeongu* (Seoul: Iljogak), 175.
[51] Ibid.
[52] Ibid., 192–96.
[53] *Wei shu* 101:2233.
[54] *Xin Tang shu* (217a:6116–17) records that Tang Suzong, as "Heavenly Qaghan," appointed the

Uighur chief as "Qaghan," indicating that there was a difference in prestige between the two titles.
[55] Liu Yitang, "Tian Kehan tanyuan," in *Zhongguo Xiyü yanjiu* (Taibei: Zhengzhong shuju, 1997), 96.
[56] *Tang huiyao* 20:458.
[57] Lin Tong (Qing), *Tang Zhaoling shiji kaolüe*, re-quoted from Liu Xiangyang, *Tangdai diwang lingmu* (Xi'an: San Qin chubanshe, 2003), 41.
[58] *Zizhi tongjian* 198:6245.
[59] Liu Xiangyang, *Tangdai diwang lingmu*, 55.
[60] Wang Shuanghui and Fan Yingfeng, "Tang Qianling yanjiu," *Qianling wenhua yanjiu* (Xi'an: San Qin chubanshe) 1 (2005): 21.
[61] Ye Yibao, *Jinshi lu bu* (Taibei: Xinwenfeng chubanshe, 1982), 22:9098 (vol. 12 of *Shike shiliao xinpian*).
[62] For Zhao Jie (Song)'s comment regarding the *Qianling tu*, see Li Haowen, *Chang'an zhi tu* (*Song Yuan fangzhi congjian*) (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1990), 215.
[63] Shen Qing'ai (Qing), ed., *Shenxi tongzhi* 71:43.
[64] Adachi Kiroku, *Chōan shiteki no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Tōyō bunko, 1933), 259.
[65] Li Qiushi, "Tan Zhanghuai Yide liangmu de xingzhi deng wenti," *Wenwu* 1972-7.
[66] Zhou Yiliang, "Beiwei yongren jianrong bingbao," *Wei Jin Nanbeichao shi chaji*, reprinted in *Zhou Yiliang ji* (Shenyang: Liaoning jiaoyu chubanshe, 1998) 2:555–58.
[67] *Wei shu* 23:599.
[68] Zhou Yiliang, "Beiwei yongren jianrong bingbao", 558.
[69] *Luoyang qielanji* 3:161.
[70] *Luoyang qielanji* 4:235–36.
[71] *Bei Qi shu* 34:457.
[72] *Bei shi* 92:3052.
[73] Among the three, Han Feng and Gao Anagong are classified as Northern origin favorites since they were from the founding families of Northern Qi. See Iwamoto Atsushi, "Seisoku to onkō—Hokusei shakai no bunseki," *Shiteki* 18 (1996): 54.
[74] *Sui shu* 14:331.
[75] *Chen shu* 31:409–10.
[76] *Zizhi tongjian* 193:6075.
[77] *Zizhi tongjian* 193:6075–77.
[78] *Zizhi tongjian* 193:6076.
[79] *Zizhi tongjian* 81:2575–76.
[80] *Zizhi tongjian* 83:2622–28.
[81] *Sanguo zhi* 28:776.
[82] *Jin shu* 47:1320–22.
[83] *Jin shu* 101:2648–49.
[84] Tanigawa Michio, *Zōho Zui Tō teikoku keisei shi ron* (Tokyo: Chikuma shobō, 1998), 30–35.
[85] *Zizhi tongjian* 193:6075.
[86] *Zizhi tongjian* 193:6076–77.
[87] *Zizhi tongjian* 193:6078.
[88] Park Hanje, *Joongguk Joongse Ho Han cheje yeongu*, 88–94.
[89] *Zhuangzi jishe* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2000), 85, 496.
[90] Kim Han-kyu, *Godae Joongguk jeok segye jilseo yeongu* (Seoul: Iljogak, 1982), chap. 1.
[91] Ibid., 19–20.
[92] *Zhuangzi*, 267, 914.
[93] *Shiji* 6:245.
[94] *Shiji* 87:2545.
[95] *Shiji* 87:2541–42.

[96] *Shiji* 6:239.
[97] *Shiji* 1:11–12.
[98] *Shiji* 6:245–46.
[99] Hong Seunghyeon, "Bu Gyeon ui yookhap gaenyeom gwa gwisokmin tongchi," *Hanseong sahak* 24 (2009): 137.
[100] *Jin shu* 48:1340–42; *Han shu* 72:3063–64.
[101] *Han shu* 22:1054.
[102] *Jin shu* 10:268, 21:656–57, 34:1020–21, 35:1040, 114:2914, 52:1449.
[103] Hong Seunghyeon, "Bu Gyeon."
[104] Hong's basis for this argument is in *Zizhi tongjian* 103:3267: "(苻堅)報曰: 朕方混六合爲一家, 視夷狄爲赤子, 汝宜息慮, 勿懷耿介." Here Fu Jian's saying "視夷狄爲赤子" is rhetorical emphasis necessary given concerns of soft treatment towards their former rival Murong, and he was not actually including the barbarians in the Six Directions.
[105] *Jin shu* 130:3207.
[106] *Sui shu* 4:79.
[107] *Han shu* 27:1472, 32:1831.
[108] *Han shu* 32:1832.
[109] *Zizhi tongjian* 194:6103–4.
[110] *Shiji* 8:385–86.
[111] *Xin Tang shu* 221a:6233.
[112] The term was first used during the Qin. See *Shiji* 83:2473, *Han shu* 51:2346–47.
[113] *Wei shu* 7b:186.
[114] *Wei shu* 19:461.
[115] *Song shu* 14:346.
[116] *Đại Việt sử ký toàn thư* (Chin Keiwa, ed., *Daietsu shiki zensho kōgōbon*, Tokyo: Tōkyō daigaku tōyōbunka kenkyūjo busetsu tōyōgaku bunken senta, 1985), "Annals" chapter 10, the entry of the seventeenth day of the twelfth month of 1427 (Xuande 2).
[117] *Sui shu* 84:1873.
[118] *Sui shu* 84:1876.
[119] *Nan Qi shu* 59:1023.
[120] *Nan Qi shu* 59:1024–25.
[121] *Jin shu* 92:2373.
[122] *Shiji* 110:2896.
[123] Park Hanje, "Joonghwa ui bunyeol gwa ingeun gakgook ui daeung—dajoongjeok Joonghwa segye ui seongrip," *Joongguk hakbo* (2006): 264.
[124] The term translated as "nomadic lands" is *saiwai* (塞外), which indicates a nomadic area in contrast with the agricultural area. See *Nan Qi shu* 59:1023.
[125] *Wei shu* 24:617.
[126] *Shiji* 110:2890.
[127] *Shiji* 110:2896, 2897.
[128] Sun Guangxian, *Beimeng shuaiyan* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2005), 5:97.
[129] *Tang huiyao* 49:1007, *Xin Tang shu* 135:4577.
[130] Song Minqiu (Song), ed., *Tang da zhaoling ji*, 3:13.
[131] Ibid., 10:56.
[132] Park Hanje, "Jeon Jin Bu Gyeon jeonggwon ui seonggyuk," *Dong-a munhwa* 23 (1985); "Buk Wi daewoe jeongchaek gwa Ho Han cheje," *Yeoksa hakbo* 116 (1987); "Wi Jin—Su Dang shidae Ho jok goonju ui Joonghwa jewang euroui byeonsin gwajeong gwa geu nonri," *Joong-ang Asia yeongu* 9 (2004).
[133] *Jin shu* 113:2884.

[134] *Zizhi tongjian* 104:3304.
[135] *Jin shu* 104:2715.
[136] *Jin shu* 104:2721.
[137] *Jin shu* 116:2961.
[138] *Mengzi*, 4B: "孟子曰: 舜生於諸馮, 遷於負夏, 卒於鳴條, 東夷之人也, 文王生於岐周, 卒於畢郢, 西夷之人也. 地之相去也, 千有餘里, 世之相後也, 千有餘歲, 得志行乎中國, 若合符節, 先聖後聖, 其揆一也."
[139] *Jin shu* 101:2649.
[140] Zhao Yi, *Ershiershi zhaji*, vol. 8, 晉書 "僭僞諸君有文學."
[141] *Jin shu* 101:2645–46.
[142] *Jin shu* 101:2652.
[143] *Jin shu* 101:2653–54.
[144] *Jin shu* 102:2657.
[145] *Jin shu* 109:2815.
[146] *Jin shu* 110:2831.
[147] *Jin shu* 127:3161.
[148] *Jin shu* 124:3093.
[149] *Jin shu* 105:2756.
[150] Park Hanje, *Joongguk Joongse Ho Han cheje yeongu*, 69–76.
[151] *Jin shu* 110:2928.
[152] *Wei shu* 67:1503–4.
[153] Park Hanje, *Joongguk Joongse Ho Han cheje yeongu*, 78–79.
[154] Emperor Taiwu used the phrase "We, Xianbei" (我鮮卑) in a letter to the Liu Song dynasty. See *Song shu* 95:2347–48.
[155] Yet the Southern Dynasties, Eastern Jin, and others did not distinguish Northern Wei from the Five Barbarians, since during the Liang dynasty Northern Wei was still called Five Barbarians. See *Luoyang qielanji* 2:117–18.
[156] During the late Western Jin period, when Liu Yao conquered Luoyang, more than 30,000 were killed, and when Shi Le defeated the King of Donghai Sima Yue, a massacre of more than 100,000 took place. See *Jin shu* 5:123, 59:1625.
[157] Emperor Taiwu saw Buddhism and Daoism as the same. See *Wei shu* 114:3034–35.
[158] *Wei shu* 1:1, 2:34, 108–1:2734.
[159] *Wei shu* 108-1:2744–47. See Lü Simian, *Liang Jin Nanbeichao shi* (Taibei: Kaiming shudian, 1969), 1470–72, for the meaning of the policy of Emperor Xiaowen.
[160] *Wei shu* 1:1, 114:3034.
[161] *Nan Qi shu* 57:991–92. In the records, Li Yuankai was speaking against Emperor Xiaowen, but still betrays the Northern Wei Han elites' pride in the dynasty.
[162] *Wei shu* 62:1394–96.
[163] *Wei shu* 54:1208.
[164] Lu Yaodong, "Bei Wei Xiaowendi qiandu yu qi jiating beijü," *Cong Pingcheng dao Luoyang* (Taibei: Lianjing chuban shiye gongsi, 1979), 104–5; W. J. F. Jenner, "Northern Wei Loyang: An Unnecessary Capital?" *Papers on Far Eastern History* 23 (1981): 164–65.
[165] This was the reason why the *Wei shu* called the Eastern Jin "fake" (僭偽) rather than "barbarians of the isles" (島夷).
[166] Zheng Qiao, *Tongzhi* (Taibei: Xinxing shuju, 1963), 30:484.
[167] The accession edict of Emperor Wu of the Northern Zhou praised Yuwen Tai's adoption of the *Rites of Zhou* as an achievement equaling that of the Duke of Zhou. See *Zhou shu* 5:64.
[168] Miyazaki Ichisada, *Kuhon kanninhō no kenkyu—Kakyo zenshi* (Kyoto: Dōhōsha, 1956), 490.
[169] Park Hanje, "Seo Wi Buk Joo shidae Ho Han cheje ui jeongae—Ho seong jaehang ui gyeonggwa wa geu euimi," *Joonggook hakbo* 42 (2000): 68.

[170] Ibid., 74–75.
[171] Park Hanje, "Xi Wei Bei Zhou shidai de sixing yu xiangbing de fubing hua," *Lishi yanjiu (*1993–94).
[172] Tanigawa Michio, "Fuheisei kokka ron," *Zōho Zui Tō teikoku keisei shi ron* (Tokyo: Chikuma shobō, 1998).
[173] Most probably they were remote descendants of the Xiongnu southern *chanyu*. See Zhou Yiliang, "Lun Yuwenshi zhi zhongzu," *Wei Jin Nanbeichao shi lunji* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1963).
[174] *Zhou shu* 1:1.
[175] *Guang hong ming ji* (Taibei: Zhonghua shuju, 1970), 10:3b–4a.
[176] Wan Shengnan, *Chen Yinke Wei Jin Nanbeichaoshi jiangyanlu* (Guiyang: Guizhou renmin chubanshe, 2007), 197–248.
[177] Nunome Chōfū, "Zui Tō teigoku no seiritsu," *Iwanami kōza sekai rekishi 5* (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1970), 263–64.
[178] Yan Cong (Tang), *Tang hufa shamen Falin biezhuan*, cited in Chen Yinke, "Li Tang shizu zhi tuize," *Jinmingguan conggao 2* (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1980), 283.
[179] *Quan Tang wen* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983), 6:77-ab.
[180] Liu Su (Tang), *Sui Tang jiahua* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1979), vol. a:9.
[181] *Jiu Tang shu* 75:2636–37.
[182] The Southern Xiongnu had continuously maintained their influence over North China after destroying the Western Jin in the early fourth century. The empress of the first Tang emperor Li Yuan, Empress Du, was from Southern Xiongnu, and the Tang relied upon the military strength of the Turks as well as Southern Xiongnu during its rise as a dynasty. See Iwami Kiyohiro, "Tō no kengoku to Hunnu no hiyazu," *Tō no hoppō mondai to kokusai chitsujyo* (Tokyo: Kyūko shoin, 1997), 17–63.
[183] *Zhuzi yulei* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1994), 136:3245.
[184] *Xin Tang shu* 80:3564–65.
[185] *Jiu Tang shu* 78:2693–94. Yu presented an indirect objection on the basis that Li Gao was a remote ancestor and had made no contribution to the founding of the dynasty, but his real target was to argue against Taizong's manipulations of genealogy.
[186] *Xin Tang shu* 95:3842.
[187] Chen Yinke, *Tang dai zhengzhishi shulun gao* (Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1982), vol. a:11.
[188] *Quan Tang wen* 31:353ab.
[189] Fei Xiaotong, *Zhonghua minzu de duoyuan yiti geju* (Beijing: Zhongyang minzu xueyuan chubanshe, 1989), 14.
[190] Henry Yule and Henri Cordier, *Cathay and the Way Thither: Being a Collection of Medieval Notices of China*, 4 vols. (London: Hakluyt Society, 1914), 1:29.
[191] Sugiyama Masaaki, trans. Lee Jinbok, *Yumokmin i bon segyesa—minjok gwa gookgyeong ul neomo* (Seoul: Hakminsa, 1999), 198–99 (originally *Yubokumin kara mita sekaishi—minzoku mo kokkyō mo koete*, Tokyo: Nihon Keizai shimbunsha, 1997).
[192] Okada Hidehiro, *Sekaishi no tanzō* (Tokyo: Chikuma shobō, 1992), 161.
[193] Yoshioka Makoto, "Zui Tō zenki ni okeru shihai kaisō," *Shigaku kenkyu* 155:1982.
[194] Chen Yinke, "Li Tang shizu zhi tuize," *Jinmingguan conggao 2* (Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1980), 291–94.
[195] The *zaiji* contain records of rebels of late Xin. See *Hou Han shu* 40a:1333–34.
[196] As the *Wudai shiji* has ten volumes of *shijia* and *shiguo shijia nianpu* (十國世家年譜) set for the ten regional regimes, the *shiguo* (十國), *zaiji*, and *shijia* are similar categories.
[197] The *Spring and Autumn Annals of Sixteen Kingdoms*, or *Shiliu chunqiu*, was lost during the Song dynasty, and the surviving edition of 100 chapters is a forgery from Ming period written by Du Qiaosun and Xiang Lin. Later in Qing, Tang Qiu supplemented it with reliable sources.

[198] Li Gao of Western Liang was included in Cui's *annals* (*Wei shu* 67:1502–3), and is still included in Tang Qiu's revision.
[199] Of course the Five Barbarians and Sixteen Kingdoms should not automatically be considered to have a connection, but most of the Sixteen Kingdoms are dynasties founded by the Five Barbarians, and being included within would not be considered an honor.
[200] In 629, the Inner Secretariat was established to compile the History of the Five Dynasties (*wudai shi*). Later the History Office was set up to write the dynastic history and the Inner Secretariat was abolished.
[201] *Ershiershi zhaji*, vol. 19, 天子不觀起居注.
[202] Taizong asserted that his actions were along the same lines as the renowned duke of Zhou and Ji You, who both had to kill their own siblings for the good of the dynasty. See *Zhenguan zhengyao* 7:223–24.
[203] *Tang da zhaoling ji* 81:422.
[204] The term *Hanzu* derived from the dynastic name Han, but the term was used only from the modern era, and earlier than this the term *Hanren* was used instead, which began to carry ethnic meaning during the Northern dynasties. See Du Yuheng, "Zhonghua minzu yingquli lunlue," *Zhongguo minzu xuehui di sici xueshu taolunhui lunwenji* (Beijing: Zhongyang minzu xueyuan chubanshe, 1993), 18. Instead of the term *minzu*, a modern newcomer, traditionally terms like *ren*, *zhongren*, *zulei*, *buluo*, and *zhongluo* were used.
[205] Although Lü Simian and Lü Zhenyu argue the Chinese only began to be called "Han" in the Han dynasty, they have in mind the precise term *Hanren*; the first appearance of the term *Hanzu* is in a work by Li Shixian, the Taiping Shi King, entitled *Zhi geguo lingshi shu*, followed by a discourse on the five races during the Xinhai revolution. Thus it seems that the term *huzu* also stems from this period. See Lü Simian, *Xian Qin shi* (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1983), 22; Lü Zhenyu, *Zhonghua minzu jianshi* (Beijing: Sanlian shudian, 1950), 19; and, on the latter point, Xu Jieshun, "Han minzu xingcheng sanbuqu," *Han minzu yanjiu 1* (Nanning: Guangxi renmin chubanshe, 1989), 178.
[206] *Han shu* 61:2701.
[207] *Hou Han shu* 73:2363.
[208] The term *yi Jin* still coexisted, so the term *hu Han* was not yet fixed in its racial meaning. See Chang Ju (Jin), *Huayang guozhi xiaobu tuzhu* (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1987), 3:216.
[209] Chen Liankai, "Zhongguo, Huayi, Fanhan, Zhonghua, Zhonghua minzu—yige nei zai lianxi fazhan bei renshi de guocheng," *Zhonghua minzu duoyuan yiti geju* (Beijing: Zhongyang minzu xueyuan chubanshe, 1989), 97.
[210] Li Ziming, "Taohua sheng jie yan riji," *Yuemantang riji* 29:51b–52a.
[211] *Nan Qi shu* 47:819, 57:985.
[212] *Jin shu* 105:2753.
[213] *Wei shu* 2:37.
[214] The term *Hanren* along with other words such as *Hangou* (漢狗), *yiqianhan* (一錢漢), and *Hanzi* (漢子) began to be used as curse-words from the Five Barbarians period. See Kuwabara Jitsuzō, "Rekishi jō yori mita nanboku Sina," *Tōyō Bunmeishi ronsō* (Tokyo: Kōbuntō, 1934), 50.
[215] *Bei Qi shu* 5:73.
[216] *Zizhi tongjian* 171:5319.
[217] *Bei shi* 92:3053.
[218] *Wei shu* 9:247.
[219] *Wei shu* 9:249.
[220] *Bei Qi shu* 1:7.
[221] 頭錢價漢, 隨之死.
[222] *Bei shi* 31:1146–47.

[223] *Bei Qi shu* 30:410.
[224] *Bei Qi shu* 24:353.
[225] *Bei Qi shu* 10:138.
[226] *Bei Qi shu* 22:322.
[227] *Bei Qi shu* 23:332.
[228] *Tongdian* 200:5495.
[229] For the meaning of the character *fan*, see 釋文 ("蕃本又作藩"), 書經 ("以蕃王室"), and 國語 ("以蕃為軍"). We can assume from the meaning of the word that its emergence during the Tang to represent all the minority peoples signifies the development of the Tang emperor into the "Emperor, Heavenly Qaghan" who now incorporates the nomadic *hu* lands as the fence of the realm as well as the agricultural Han lands. See Chen Liankai, "Zhongguo," 99–100. This shift is related to the Tang installment of "loose rein prefectures" (羈縻州), which Tanigawa emphasizes as the signature institutional characteristic of the Sui-Tang world empire (Tanigawa Michio, *Zōho Zui Tō teikoku keisei shi ron*, 16), and the new Greater China policy which diverged from the previous frontier policy. The shift of terms from *Hu Han* to *Fan Han* seems to be due to these circumstances.
[230] *Jiu Tang shu* 67:2492. Among the descendants of Li Jingye, grandson of Li Ji, there was one named Xu Sheren (Li Ji's original surname was Xu, but he was given the imperial clan name due to merit) who fled to Tibet after Li's execution. He called himself *Hanren*.
[231] *Jiu Tang shu* 67:2492.
[232] *Jiu Tang shu* 196b:5247.
[233] Chen Liankai, "Zhongguo," 96.
[234] Deng Xiaonan, "Odae, Song cho Hwabuk jiyeok Ho hwa moonje ui haeso," *Wi Jin Soo Dang sa yeongu* 10 (2003); "Lun Wudai Songchu Hu Han yujingde xiaojie," *Wenshizhe* (2005-5).
[235] In *Jin shi* 75:1715, 契丹漢人久為一家. In 番漢合時掌中珠, a Xi Xia dictionary, 不會漢語, 則豈入漢人之情. The people of the Central Plain were also called *Hanren* in the Yuan period.
[236] Xu Jieshun, "Han minzu xingcheng sanbuqu," 178.
[237] Fu Yongqu, "Lun Tangdai Hu Han minzu zhi jian de hunrong hubu," *Shandong daxue xuebao* (1992-3).
[238] *Da Tang xin yu* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1986), 9:138.
[239] Chen Liankai, "Zhongguo," 94.
[240] Muramatsu Kazuya, "Tōjin kō," (*Tōkyō doritsu daigaku*) *Jinbun gakuhō* 98 (1974).
[241] Wang Shumin, "Zhonghua minghao suoyuan," *Zhongguo lishi dili luncong* 2 (1985): 12–13.
[242] *Jin shu* 11:292.
[243] *Jin shu* 61:1674–75.
[244] *Zizhi tongjian* 100:3172.
[245] *Zizhi tongjian* 115:3616.
[246] Zhang Chang retorted that the Southern Dynasties were the upholders of traditional culture. See *Song shu* 59:1602.
[247] *Wei shu* 60:1341.
[248] Chen Liankai, "Zhongguo," 107.
[249] Du Yuheng, "Zhonghua minzu," 18.
[250] *Tanglü suyi* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983), reprinted as an appendix in Wang Yuanliang, *Shiwen* 3:626; Chen Liankai, "Zhongguo," 108; Dai Jianguo, "Songren jizhang zhidu tanxi," *Lishi yanjiu* (2007-3): 42n7.
[251] Hong Hao, *Songmo jiwen*, *Congshu jicheng chubian* (Zhonghua shuju, 1985), vol. a:5.
[252] *Jin shu* 56:1531.
[253] *Wei shu* 101:2243.
[254] *Bei shi* 95:3156.
[255] *Bei shi* 96:3194.

[256] *Sui shu* 24:676.
[257] *Jiu Tang shu* 13:365.
[258] *Jiu Tang shu* 68:2507.
[259] Zhang Taiyan, "Zhonghua minguo jie," in *Taiyan wenlu chubian, Zhangshi congshu* b (Taibei: Shijie shuju, 1985), appendix 1:781.
[260] Liang Qichao, "Zhongguo lishi shang minzu zhi yanjiu," in *Yinbingshi wenji* (Kunming: Yunnan jiaoyu chubanshe, 2001), 3211.
[261] Sugiyama Masaaki, *Yumokmin*, 204.
[262] *Jin shu* 56:1529–34.
[263] Liu Xuediao, *Wuhu xinghua—xingshuo Zhongguo lishide yizu* (Taibei: Zhishufang chubanshe, 2004).