

NOTES ON MARVAZĪ'S ACCOUNT ON CHINA

CHOU YI-LIANG

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

In 1937 Dr. A. J. ARBERRY discovered the manuscript of the *Ṭabāʾi' al-hayawān*, "The Natural Properties of Animals," by Sharaf al-Zamān Ṭāhir al-Marvazī (d. c. 1120). Five years later, in 1942, Professor V. MINORSKY of London University published an English translation of five chapters of Marvazī's work with commentary and the original Arabic text of those chapters that he had transcribed. The book was published as volume XXII of James G. Forlong Fund by the Royal Asiatic Society under the title *Sharaf Al-Zamān Ṭāhir Marvazī on China, the Turks and India*. The five chapters are on China, on the Turks, on India, on the Ethiopians and on Remote Countries and Islands. It is the chapter of China (MINORSKY's translation: pp. 13-29, commentary: pp. 61-92) that I intend to deal with in this short article.

Marvazī himself had never gone to the East. His account was largely based on the records of earlier Arabic geographers or what he had heard from his contemporaries returned from the East.¹ Since his sources are not homogeneous one should not be surprised at finding contradictions or confusions in his work. Although he lived in the latter part of the Northern Sung dynasty his account on China really extends throughout the T'ang and Northern Sung dynasties, i. e. from the seventh to the eleventh centuries. Nevertheless, Marvazī provides us with many valuable materials that are not found in Arabic travelogues hitherto made available. This chapter on China consists of forty-three sections; I shall discuss the contents of these sections in numerical sequence, and point out whether or not they are in agreement with Chinese sources. Some mistakes in the commentary are also pointed out. There are, however, a few important but puzzling passages, such as section 19 on the route to China and section 35 on the names of nine

¹ MINORSKY's Introduction 6-8.

tribes living in the northeastern part of China, which are not touched upon here. It is my hope that a more thorough study of this chapter will be made by some competent sinologues, both of the East and West, particularly Professor Paul PELLIOU with whom I had the pleasure of discussing this text during his brief visit to Cambridge.

In section 6, explaining why the Chinese did not allow strangers to enter their country, Marvazī says that it was due to the teaching of Manichaeism because Mani (should be the Manichaeans) "feared lest strangers should come to them and explain to them the futility of this faith and convert them from it." This statement, as well as sections 9 and 17, evidently exaggerates the position of Manichaeism in China. The translator points out this exaggeration in his commentary (p. 65) but he also says that this supposition of Marvazī "indicates A. D. 843 as the terminus ante quem of the original report." This, however, is not necessarily true. Manichaeism was flourishing in China as late as the Sung dynasty.² In the *Sung hui-yao kao* 宋會要稿 we find many imperial edicts persecuting the followers of this religion throughout the Northern and Southern Sung dynasties. In 1120 A. D., the year of Marvazī's death, it is said that in Wen-chou 溫州 alone there existed more than forty Manichaean temples.³ Two more edicts were issued in the following year to arrest the believers who were specially numerous in the south-eastern provinces along the seacoast, and to burn all the Manichaean sutras.⁴ It seems that Marvazī might have obtained his information about the Manichaeans from his friends who travelled to the East during his life time. Therefore the sources of information need not necessarily be dated before 843 A. D. In reviewing this book, Mr. H. A. R. GIBB also raises his objection to this remark⁵ but no reason is given by him.

In section 7 Marvazī records that a merchant who had been to

² Ed. CHAVANNES et P. PELLIOU, Un traité manichéen retrouvé en Chine, JA eleventh series (1913), 292-314.

³ *Sung hui-yao kao*, hsing-fa 刑法 2. 78a.

⁴ Ibid. 2. 81b, 83a. I wish to thank my friend Mr. Lien-shêng YANG for the above references in *Sung hui-yao kao*.

⁵ JRAS (1944), 94.

China says that the Chinese capital is called Y.njūr near which is another greater city called Kwfwā. The translator identifies Y.njūr with Lo-yang and Kwfwā with K'ai-fêng (p. 71). For the first identification he says, "The western capital was at that time Ho-nan-fu, which was then called Hsi-king, but during the period A. D. 907-23 Yung-chou [雍]. Our Y.njūr (*Yun-jū) is a perfect Arabic equivalent of Yung-chou and a close indication of the date at which the original authority visited China." In a note to this statement, he offers as evidence the fact that Prof. J. MULLIE quotes for him the *T'ai-p'ing huan-yü chi* 太平寰宇記. Nevertheless, Lo-yang was never called Yung-chou and the translator's identification is merely based on an erroneous interpretation of the text which Prof. MULLIE and he quote. The *Huan-yü chi*,⁶ under Ho-nan-fu, reads: "In the first year of T'ien-pao [742 A. D.] Tung-tu 東都 was changed to Tung-ching 東京. The Liang dynasty of the Chu [family], in the early years of K'ai-p'ing period [907-10 A. D.] had their capital in Pien-chou 汴州. Hsi-ching 西京 [Ch'ang-an] was changed to Yung-chou whereas Tung-ching was changed to Hsi-ching. In the first year of T'ung-kuang [923 A. D.] of the Later T'ang dynasty Lo-yang became Tung-tu again." It is clear that in the Liang dynasty the Western Capital or Hsi-ching of the T'ang dynasty was changed to Yung-chou, an old name for that part of the country. At the same time Lo-yang, the former Eastern Capital, was changed to Hsi-ching or Western Capital because it was situated to the west of the new capital Pien-chou. The translator confuses the two Hsi-ching in this passage and so errs in saying that Lo-yang was once called Yung-chou during the Liang dynasty. If he had looked up the *Hsin wu-tai shih* 新五代史,⁷ he would have known that Lo-yang is mentioned as the Western Capital of the Liang dynasty and immediately after it is listed the name Yung-chou. Mr. Lionel GRUES in his review of this book⁸ suggests that Y.njūr may refer to Yang-chou, yet he gives no definite proof. Albiruni [al-Bīrūnī] (d. 1049 A. D.), quoted in Abulfeda's (1273-1131 A. D.) work, also says that Yanjū is the

⁶ 3. 5b (Chin-ling shu-chü ed.).

⁷ 60. 17a.

⁸ BSOS 11. 1. 233.

residence of the Chinese king.⁹ It seems to me quite possible that Y.njūr in Marvazī corresponds to Yanjū in Albiruni, though their reference to Yang-chou as the residence of the king is groundless. If Y.njūr should be Yang-chou the identification of Kwfwā with K'ai-fêng would have to be reexamined. Marvazī also records that Y.njūr "is crossed by a great river which divides it into two parts. The king with his retinue, army and attendants resides in one part, while in the other are the dwellings of the subjects and the merchants." According to the traditional plan of the Chinese capital city, the imperial palace is generally located in the northern part of the city with government offices clustered around it. On the other hand the markets are situated to the south.¹⁰ Marvazī's account on the plan of the capital city seems to agree with this tradition.

In section 10 Marvazī quotes the merchant again by saying that some Chinese merchants go about the city selling goods and ride on carts that can go by themselves without any animals to draw. This is an interesting information that I have not so far found mentioned in any Chinese books, even in the section dealing with merchants' carts in the *Tung-ching mêng-hua lu* 東京夢華錄.¹¹ In section 15 Marvazī says that the horn of the rhinoceros "is the most precious freight for China because they make of it girdles, and the price of each such girdles reaches high sums amongst them." This statement is corroborated by many Chinese books. *Tu-yang tsa-pien* 杜陽雜編¹² says that Emperor Ching-tsung of the T'ang dynasty had a girdle made of the rhinoceros horn that shined brightly at night. CH'ÏEN Shu 錢俶 presented a belt of the rhinoceros horn to the Sung emperor.¹³ Such a belt is also mentioned in several works of the Sung dynasty, such as *Ch'un-tu chi-wên* 春渚紀聞,¹⁴ *Fêng-ch'uang hsiao-tu* 楓窗小牘,¹⁵ *Hui-chu*

⁹ H. YULE and H. CORDIER, *Cathay and the Way Thither* 1, 256.

¹⁰ Cf. *Kuwabara hakase kanreki kinen tōyōshi ronsō* 桑原博士還曆紀念東洋史論叢 94, 1241-2.

¹¹ 3. 5b-7a (*Hsüeh-chin t'ao-yüan* ed.).

¹² 2. 10a (*Pei-hai* ed.).

¹³ *Sung-chih* 480. 5a (*T'ung-wên* ed. This edition is used for all other dynastic histories).

¹⁴ 2. 13b (*Hsüeh-chin t'ao-yüan* ed.).

¹⁵ 1. 1b (*Pei-hai* ed.).

ch'ien-lu 禪塵前錄¹⁶ and *Hsia-jih chi* 暇日記.¹⁷ In *Ch'i-tan kuo chih* 契丹國志¹⁸ it is said that a belt of rhinoceros horn is to be granted to the king of a tributary country while a golden or silver one is to be granted to his envoy. It is evident that during the T'ang and Sung dynasties and also among the Kitans, the rhinoceros was regarded as precious. In section 17 Marvazī records that all Chinese are of one faith, which is the faith of Mani, contrary to the Qitay and Uyghur, among whom there are other faiths, except Judaism. We know that besides Shamanism the Kitans also believed in Buddhism. There is also proof that the Uyghurs in Kao-ch'ang 高昌 believed in several religions including Manichaeism, Buddhism and probably Mazdaism.¹⁹

In section 22 we have a letter to the Sultān Maḥmūd of Ghazni from Emperor Shêng-tsung of the Liao dynasty. The letter is dated the year of the mouse which corresponds to 1024 A. D., but according to Marvazī the envoy reached Ghazni in 1027 A. D. The Arabs had sent an embassy to the Liao court as early as 924 A. D., during the time of T'ai-tsu.²⁰ Emperor Shêng-tsung who reigned from 983 to 1031 A. D. was very ambitious. He took every possible measure to cultivate friendship with distant countries and exhibited his military power in conquering neighboring state. CHANG Chien 張儉 in an obituary eulogy 哀册文 summarizes this emperor's career: "[He] broadened the boundary [of his empire] and tranquillized the whole world. In the east [he] exhibited his martial prowess so that Ch'ên 辰 and Pien 卞 [= Korea] surrendered. In the west [he] spread his fame and culture so that Kua [-chou] 瓜 and Sha [-chou] 沙 presented precious things. The Ch'iang 羌 and Hun 獯 of Hsia 夏 dispatched missions and Wu 烏 and Shê 舍 [=India?] sent envoys."²¹ In 1020 and again in 1021 A. D. the Arabs sent envoys to ask for the favor of

¹⁶ 3. 10b (*Hsüeh-chin t'ao-yüan* ed.).

¹⁷ Cited in *Shuo-fu* 說郛 4. 38b (Commercial Press ed.).

¹⁸ 21. 3a (*Sao-yeh shan-fang* ed.).

¹⁹ Cf. account of WANG Yen-tê translated by CHAVANNES and PELLIER, JA eleventh series (1913). 270-1.

²⁰ *Liao-shih* 70. 2b.

²¹ *Liao-wên hsi-shih* 遼文續拾 1. 9a.

a marriage alliance and the daughter of an officer was made a princess to be married to the caliph.²² It was probably from the Arabic ambassadors that Shêng-tsung heard of Maḥmūd's military achievements. Maḥmūd is said to have vowed to undertake every year an expedition against the Hindu idolators, and he did lead his army into India for more than ten times since 1001 A. D. In the winter of the year 1024 A. D. he set out for his most famous expedition into India.²³ There might have been Arabic ambassadors to the East again at this time, which was the reason why Shêng-tsung's letter praised Maḥmūd so heartily and the Yughur-Khan's letter also said, "We hear about his conquests over the lower countries (down) to the lands of Hind." No Chinese book has any account on this mission to Ghazni. Scholars who will hereafter compile the prose of the Liao dynasty will have to include this interesting letter preserved in translation. In *Tōkoku tsūgan 東國通鑑*,²⁴ an imperial edict sent by Shêng-tsung to the Korean king in 1030 A. D. is recorded. It says: "It must have been due to the obstruction of travel route that you have not sent envoys recently. Now the traitors of Po-hai²⁵ have all been besieged and have surrendered. You ought to send your ministers to our court. Certainly there will be no fear or worry." The phraseology and attitude expressed in this edict remind us of the letter to Maḥmūd. It seems that after the Liao dynasty the Chinese also knew something about Ghazni. This name appears among the Ta-shih 大食 countries in both *Chu-fan chih 諸蕃志* and *Ling-wai tai-ta 嶺外代答*.²⁶ The heroic king of Ghazni mentioned in *Chu-fan chih* as feared by "Arabia and various countries of India 西天" may refer to Maḥmūd as HIRTH and ROCKHILL suggest.²⁷ But their translation of the word hsi-t'ien as "the West" is inadequate. It is the word hsi-t'ien that further supports the identification of this king with Maḥmūd. Among the textiles that the Kitan envoy had

²² *Liao-shih* 10.5b, 4a, 70.16b, 17a.

²³ Cf. *The Cambridge History of India* 3.13, 23. A slightly different date is given by Muhammad Nāzīm in *The Life and Times of Sultān Maḥmūd of Ghazna* 115.

²⁴ Ch. 16 (2.419).

²⁵ This refers to the rebellion of TA Yen-lin 大延琳, cf. *Liao-shih* 17.6b, 8b.

²⁶ F. HIRTH and W. W. ROCKHILL, *Chau Ju-Kua* 138-40.

²⁷ *Ibid.* 139, note 2.

brought to Maḥmūd the word "zhunki" seems to be quite close to the word *chin-ch'i* 錦綺 in the list of gifts from the Liao emperor to foreign ambassadors.²⁸

A letter from the Yughur-Khan Ilig to Maḥmūd is preserved in section 23. The translator identifies the Yughur-khan with the southern principality of Uyghur in the region of Kansu, which is generally known in Chinese history as the Uyghur of Kan-chou 甘. His reason is that the Kitan "attached more importance to the Kan-chou branch" (p. 78). As "indirect arguments in favor of this hypothesis," he also points out that a title one would expect to be used by the Uyghur khan of Khocho is not mentioned in the letter, while the two names which appeared therein seem to be quite similar to what are used by the Uyghur of Kan-chou. His arguments nevertheless are rather weak and I am inclined to believe that this Uyghur-khan refers to the khan of the northern branch of Uyghur in Khocho, known in Chinese history as the Uyghur of Hsi-chou 西, Ho-chou 和 or Kao-ch'ang. There are four grounds for this belief. In the first place both Shêng-tsung's and the khan's letters say that the ambassador of the Liao court will pass through the Uyghur territory on his way to and from Ghazni. If one goes westward from Lin-huang fu 臨潢府, the Upper Capital of the Liao dynasty, to Afghanistan, it would only be natural to go by way of Kao-ch'ang. It would be absurd if he should go southward to Kan-chou first and then turn to north-west again. In the second place section 19 says: "He who intends going to *Qocho, which is the city of the Yughur-khan, turns away towards the left after Sājū (*Sha-chou)." This information might have been obtained from the Kitan or Uyghur ambassador. It seems that the Yughur-khan whom Marvazī had in mind was none other than the khan of the Uyghur of Kao-ch'ang and it was possible that he did not even know of the existence of the southern branch of Uyghur. Thirdly, in the year 1124 A. D. when YEH-LÜ Ta-shih 耶律大石 intended to advance westward to Arabia, he wrote to Pi-lo-ko 畢勒哥, the king of Uyghur, for permission to

²⁸ *Ch'i-tan kuo-chih* 21.3b. According to *Sung hui-yao kao* (fan-i 緡夷 1.36b), it was after the first years of the eleventh century that the Kitan began to make good textiles.

pass through his territory.²⁹ Since the southern branch of Uyghur was already conquered by Hsi-hsia then, this Uyghur must have referred to that of Khocho. We also have evidence showing that in the year 1130 A. D. Ta-shih was actually in Khocho.³⁰ It is clear that Khocho, not Kan-chou, was the place that the Liao people had to pass through in order to go to the West. Later travellers of the Yüan dynasty such as YEH-LÜ Ch'u-ts'ai 耶律楚材, CH'IU Ch'ang-ch'un 邱長春 and CH'ANG Tê 常德 all took more or less the same route.³¹ Fourthly, according to the Shu-kuo piao 屬國表 or tables of tributary nations in the *Liao-shih*,³² the embassy of the Uyghur of Khocho frequented the Kitan court while the Uyghur of Kan-chou, on the other hand, were not at all times on friendly terms with the Kitan. In the *Sung hui-yao kao*, a letter from the khan of the Uyghur of Kan-chou dated 1015 A. D. is preserved. He calls himself nephew and regards the Sung emperor as his maternal uncle. He also promises that he will never dare to betray the emperor and that he has severed diplomatic relations with the Kitan. In the next year again came a letter saying that the Kitan had sent more troops to Sha-chou. He suspects the Kitan's intention and reiterates his severance of relations with them.³³ In 1023, 1024, 1025, 1027 and 1028 A. D. the Uyghur of Kan-chou sent tributaries to the Sung court.³⁴ The evidence seems to indicate that the Uyghur of Khocho were allies of the Kitan while the Uyghur of Kan-chou were on good terms with the Sung court. In the year 1008 A. D., Shêng-tsung sent Hsiao T'u-yü 蕭圖玉 to attack the Uyghur of Kan-chou. The khan Yeh-la-li 耶刺里 surrendered but revolted again soon after.³⁵ In 1026 A. D. Hsiao Hui 蕭惠 was sent to conquer them. Hsi-hsia also sent troops to help the Kitan. This expedition, however, ended in failure.³⁶ In 1028 A. D. the Uyghur of Kan-chou were finally conquered by Hsi-hsia.³⁷ At that time relations between Liao and Hsi-hsia were very smooth. In 1029 A. D. the king of Hsi-hsia

²⁹ Cf. E. BRETSCHNEIDER, *Medieval Researches* 1.214. For the date cf. LIANG Yüan-tung 梁園東, *Hsi-liao shih* 西遼史 35.

³⁰ *Hsi-liao shih* 39.

³¹ Cf. BRETSCHNEIDER 1. 16, 24, 65.

³² *Liao-shih* 70.

³³ Fan-i 4. 6a-b. Also cf. *Sung-shih* 490. 12b.

³⁴ Fan-i 4. 8b-9a.

³⁵ *Liao-shih* 14. 8a, 93. 5b.

³⁶ *Liao-shih* 93. 1b.

³⁷ *Sung-shih* 485. 12a.

asked that a Liao princess be married to his son and the request was granted. It seemed that during the period 1023 to 1027 A. D. relations between Liao and the Uyghur of Kan-chou were so bad that one could hardly expect Shêng-tsung to permit the marriage of a princess to the Uyghur Khan, or Uyghur to allow the Kitan envoy to pass through their territory. If the Uyghur of Kan-chou had been allied with Liao by matrimony in the year 1027 A. D., as the letter says, and Hsi-hsia conquered them in 1028 A. D., it would be still more difficult to explain why Shêng-tsung granted the princess to Hsi-hsia so willingly. It is on these grounds that I think Ilig Khan is the khan of the Uyghur of Khocho, not of Kan-chou.

In section 26 Marvazī records that in Khān-fū at sunset the drum is beaten as a signal for the Chinese and foreign merchants to retire to their own quarters. According to the *T'ang hui-yao* 唐會要,³⁸ in cities the drum is beaten two hundred times at noon-time for the people to gather in the market. Before sunset the gong is struck three hundred times and the people then leave the market. Marvazī's account seems to be a somewhat modified form of this custom. The tithe levied on merchandise is recorded in this section and it agrees with the statement in the *Sung hui-yao kao*.³⁹ In section 27 Marvazī again says that "Their custom is to levy from the merchants who come to this city three-tenths of whatever they have with them." This agrees roughly with *P'ing-chou k'o-t'an* 萍洲可談 which says that ten percent of the fine merchandise and thirty percent of coarse merchandise are to be submitted to the government.⁴⁰ It seems that the rates of duty varied in accordance with different periods and ports. Marvazī gives a list of goods imported to China, among which dried fruits such as dates and raisins are given. The dates from the West, particularly Basra, are recorded in Chinese books.⁴¹ In section 27 Marvazī tells about the system of storage of goods for six months by the Chinese government before they are allowed to be sold. This custom is also described by Sulayman but so far it has not been found in

³⁸ 86. 12a (Chiang-su shu-chü ed.).

³⁹ Chih-kuan 職官 44. 1b.

⁴⁰ 2. 1a (*Shou-shan-ko ts'ung-shu* ed.).

⁴¹ *Ling-piao lu-i* 嶺表錄異 2. 4b (*Jung-yüan ts'ung-shu* ed.), *Chau Ju-Kua* 137-8.

any Chinese record. The eunuch clerk is mentioned in this section. It is true that during the T'ang and Sung dynasties eunuchs were sent by the emperor to take charge of and supervise the foreign trade in the south.⁴² Marvazī also says that the Chinese "purchase all with money." This seems to be supported by the information that the Persian and Arabic merchants treasured Chinese coins and that their goods could only be bought by money.⁴³

In section 28 Marvazī says: "If a Muslim dies in their country and has no heirs, his property is taken and placed in the king's treasury, . . . And they wait three years and three months and three days and, if his successor comes before the expiration of the term, the property is handed over to him." We know that before the year 817 A. D. the time limit for claiming the property of a dead merchant was only three months. After that year it was changed to an indefinite period.⁴⁴ It is not known at what time this custom recorded by Marvazī was in practice. Marvazī says in this section that the Chinese women outdo men in crafts and commerce. Presumably he refers to the women in Kuang-chou. It seems to agree with a statement in *P'ing-chou k'o-t'an* that in Kuang-chou women are stronger than men.⁴⁵ In section 31 Marvazī says that when the rain was scarce the king would send his men "to the idol-temples to seize the shamans, to imprison them, to put them in irons and to threaten them with death if it does not rain, and keep using them roughly till it does rain." In ancient China it was a custom to burn a witch or expose her to the sun to bring on rain.⁴⁶ There is also a story in *Chiu-t'an lu* 劇談錄 that during the period between 841 and 846 A. D. a magistrate beat a witch and threw her into water, thus rain was caused.⁴⁷ Nevertheless it is not known whether this was an usual practice during the T'ang and Sung dynasties.

In section 32 Marvazī says that in the capital when the sun is

⁴² FUJITA Toyohachi 藤田豊八, *Tōzai kōshōshi no kenkyū, nankai hen* 東西交渉史の研究、南海篇, 289-91, 345-7.

⁴³ *Sung hui-yao kao*, hsing-fa 2. 144b.

⁴⁴ *Ch'ang-li hsien-shêng chi* 昌黎先生集 33. 4b (SPTK ed.).

⁴⁵ 2. 4b.

⁴⁶ J. LEGGE, *The Ch'un-ts'ew* part 1. 180, S. COUVREUR, *Lí Ki* 1. 261.

⁴⁷ 1. 19a. (*Hsüeh-chin t'ao-yüan* ed.).

about to set the drums in the palace are beaten. Then everyone hurries to his house. The government agents disperse themselves in the town wards and on the highways. Anyone out of his house will be beheaded. This account is partly supported by Chinese sources. In the T'ang dynasty, at daybreak the drums are beaten in the palace and then along the streets so that the whole city can hear. After the drums are beaten four hundred times the gates of the city are opened. Before sunset they also start to beat the drums in the palace and then along the streets. After beating the drums four hundred times the city gates are closed. After the closing the drums are again beaten, now for six hundred times. Then the gates of the enclosed wards are closed. No one is allowed to go out of the enclosed wards before the next morning when the drums are beaten again. It is permitted to walk within the enclosed wards. Those who violate the law of going out of the enclosed wards at night, unless with good reason, are punished with twenty strokes.⁴⁸ Marvazī does not seem to know that one can walk within the enclosed wards; perhaps he did not hear of that. The light punishment of twenty strokes is also erroneously reported to him as capital punishment. The system of enclosed wards was still kept in the first quarter of the eleventh century but after that it gradually disappeared, due to the development of great cities.⁴⁹ The custom of beating the drums was abandoned in the period of Hsi-ning (1068-77 A. D.).⁵⁰ The *Sung hsing-t'ung* 宋刑統, following the T'ang code closely, also has the item of violating the law by going out of the enclosed ward, yet judging from the abandonment of the enclosed ward system and the prosperity of various shops at night,⁵¹ the law in the *Hsing-t'ung* must have existed in name only, never being put into practice. In section 37 Marvazī says that a criminal is not killed before he has signed a document saying that he has indeed committed that crime. This agrees with the law code of both the T'ang and Sung dynasties.⁵²

⁴⁸ *Tōryō shūi* 唐令拾遺 360, *T'ang-lü su-i* 唐律疏議 26.13a (SPTK ed.).

⁴⁹ *Kuwabara*° 103-110.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.* 114-5.

⁵¹ *Tung-ching mêng-hua lu* 2. 3b-4b, 6a, 7a, 8a.

⁵² *T'ang-lü su-i* 29.10b, *Sung hsing-t'ung* 29.12b.