



西交通史料匯篇 第一冊

This work  
is gratefully dedicated to  
President Dr. G. B. O' Toole and Prof. Dr. F. Clougherty  
of the Catholic University of Peking,  
through whose munificence this work  
is made accessible to the reading public  
of China.

The Author.

## PREFACE

It affords me not a little pleasure to have been chosen by Professor Chang Hsing-lang to present to Foreign readers the work entitled *The Materials for a History of Sino-Foreign Relations*. The author has signally honored Doctor Clougherty and myself by dedicating to us this work. Professor Chang is the scion of a distinguished family of scholars whose native province is Kiang-su. His father, Mr. Chang Wei-hsi, who was the founder of the Chinese Geographical Society and who still edits *The Chinese Geographical Magazine*, was connected with the Catholic University of Peking in 1925. Professor Chang Hsing-lang himself is a historian of national reputation. He made his studies not only in China but also in Europe and America, taking postgraduate courses at Harvard and receiving his Master's Degree at the University of Berlin. Returning to China, he became Dean of the Department of Advanced Chinese Studies at Amoy University, and later, Head of the Department of History at the Catholic University of Peking.

The present work is concerned with historical records bearing on the theme of China's *relations* with other countries. Professor Chang is, so far as my personal knowledge goes, the first *Chinese* historian to deal with

this subject *ex professo*. Foreign writers, such as Sir Henry Yule, Henri Cordier, Jean Pierre Guillaume Pauthier, and Friedrich Hirth, have been his predecessors in this field, but Professor Chang, being thoroughly conversant with the Chinese records, makes a genuine contribution to the subject, which it is practically beyond the power of Western scholars to duplicate.

A *relation* signifies a bond or link of connexion between two extremes, known respectively as the *subject* and *term* of the relation. Moreover, in order that two extremes should be related, it is necessary that they present some common ground or basis by reason of which the one may be referred to the other. Things may be compared as regards time (e. g. the relations of concomitance, priority, and posteriority) or as regards dependence (e. g. causal relations), on the ground of quantity (e. g. the relations of equality and inequality) or on the ground of quality (e. g. the relations of similarity and dissimilarity), etc. What especially interests the historian are the relations based upon time and dependence, that is, the relations of *temporal* and *causal* sequence, the latter being of far greater interest than the former. To discern between the two the historian

must be thoroughly acquainted with all three elements in each particular relation, namely, the subject, the term, and the grounds. If we know, for example, only the subject and not the term, or *vice versa*, the term and not the subject, the whole relation eludes us.

In the case of *Sino-Foreign Relations*, the subject of reference is obviously China, the term is some particular foreign country influencing, or influenced by, China, and the grounds of reference are travel, commerce, diplomacy, military conquest, migration, religious propaganda, and all other forms of intercourse conceivable between one nation and another. To evaluate the relations resulting from these different forms of interaction, the historian must be well-acquainted with both extremes; otherwise, it will be impossible for him to synchronize Chinese and Foreign records, or to co-ordinate the single events of a given period in the framework of their proper time-persepctive and causal interconnection.

Now, Yule and Cordier were, for the most part, restricted in their knowledge of Chinese records to that fraction of the latter which had been translated into European languages. Pauthier could, indeed, consult the original Chinese records, but his interpretation of

dependent incidents, he may well be pardoned for shouting: *Eureka!* and one can understand why he feels amply compensated thereby for days and nights of patient and painstaking research. To arrive at *new* conclusions by referring effects to their causes, this, after all, is the work *par excellence* of the scientific historian. Lloyd Morgan, in his *Emergent Evolution*, quotes the following pregnant lines from Browning :

*And I know not if, save in this, such gift be allowed to  
man*

*That out of three sounds he frame, not a fourth sound, but  
a star.*

By a "star," as Morgan explains, Browning meant to lay poetic emphasis upon the *original* character of a *chord*, which is *something more* than the mere additive resultant of the three component tones—something genuinely *new*.

To have established definitively, not as a timid hypothesis, nor even as a highly-plausible theory, but as a certain, irrefragable conclusion, the historic identity of the *Hsiung-nu* of Central Asia with the terrible Huns whose retreat before the conquering arms of China set in motion the Migration of Nations and whose descendants survive in modern Europe as the Magyars of Hungary,

that is what I mean by the discovery of a *new truth*, and that is what Professor Chang has done over and over again in the course of the present work.

I do not think for a moment that Professor Chang would venture to claim that his study of the *Chinese sources* for a history of Sino-Foreign Relations has been literally exhaustive, but it is perfectly safe to affirm that it is far more complete and comprehensive than any similar effort that has preceded it.

I feel sure, too, that he would be the last to claim that his study of the records of the particular countries that constitute the *terms* of the *relations* of which China is the common *subject*, has been nearly so exhaustive and extensive as his study of the Chinese records themselves. Indeed, the day is far distant when a detailed collation of these with the surviving documents in Sanskrit, Pali, Arabic, Syriac, Tibetan, Mongolian, Manchu, and the languages of other peoples contiguous to China, can even be reckoned as a feasible undertaking. But whenever that day comes, historians will be deeply indebted to Professor Chang for having lightened the task of comparison by collecting, systematizing, and interpreting the vast amount of materials contained in the present volumes.

BARRY O'TOOLE

Rector of the Catholic University



# 中西交通史料匯篇序

朱希祖

余友張君亮塵，稟承其尊甫蔚西先生家學，深通國故；又嘗留學歐洲，旁通數國語言。十餘年來，專攻中西交通史學，薈萃歐亞故書雅記，成中西交通史料彙篇一書，積稿三十有七巨冊；又嘗譯英人亨利玉爾所注馬哥孛羅遊記，民國十三年，僅印成一冊，流傳於世，其業已譯成而未付印者，尙有數巨冊，皆藏於家。去年夏，造其廬，悉見其稿，驚其博綜，成此巨業，歎爲近今學術界所未有，低徊留之不能去。嘗有意爲之游揚，冀得好事者出巨資爲之刊印，以慰喜讀是二書者饑渴之思；會國軍北伐，百業凋滯，未果厥願。今年初冬，有任刻中西交通史料彙篇者，張君以余深好其學，乃裒其全稿示余，且囑余爲之叙。余自媿薄殖，不能敷輕塵以益泰岳；惟幸今年春，購得日本木村泰彥君所著日支交通史兩巨冊，得悉數千年來中東交通始末；今又得張君是書，中西數千年來交通始末，又羅陳於目前，一年之內，得覩此兩

大名著，東西文化相互灌注之伏流，一旦宣露其晶光，而無晦塞隔閡之患，其有裨於史學，實非淺尠；此余所以不辭淺陋而樂爲一言。謹案張君此書，以今日中國以西，迄於歐洲，皆在交通之列，與歐亞交通史意義迥別，故以地理區域，分段記載，自遠及近，先歐洲，次非洲，次阿拉伯，次亞美尼亞，次猶太，次伊蘭高原，次西部土耳其斯坦，而以印度終焉。或有疑其敘次顛倒者，以爲交通途徑，交通時代，皆當先近而後遠；凌躐亂行，體裁恐未盡善？余謂張君自敘，已說明自遠及近之理；蓋張君此書，固以揮中歐之文化，明相互之灌注，其主要意旨在是，其他不過附庸而已。或又謂張君此書，一方采瑞典人安特生及赫丁之考古報告書，用最精之科學方法，鑑別史材；一方又采兩漢六朝神異怪誕之書，與西人之說相附會，取材恐未盡真？余謂山海經之神話，莊周書之寓言，東方朔神異經之僞託，王嘉拾遺記之臆造，此等書籍，雖不免致人疑惑；然慎取精擇，確能相互證明，亦不妨備爲一說；況張君此書，如此類者不過百分之一二，其他實精確絕倫。蓋其搜

輯史材，自英人巴爾克之中歐交通紀略，以及陳援庵先生之元也里可溫攷，開封一賜樂業攷攷，摩尼教火祆教入中國攷，元西域人華化攷，貫穿中西，取材精博；又如采希臘羅馬著作家所記中國古事，有云『絲爲貿易大宗，遠販至羅馬』，又載『近代西人在山西掘地，得羅馬古錢，西方貨幣之入中國，可以證明當時商販往來之繁』，印證古今，不事穿鑿。凡此皆非專攻中史之舊學者，或專攻西史之新學者所能幾及，此非余一人之諛言，國內外史學家，皆當爲之心服者也。況史料彙篇云者，固供學者之參攷別裁，其謙而未稱史，正可以覘張君之虛衷雅量，有殷殷期待後學之意焉。昔者馬驢專治三代古籍，著成繹史，蔚爲巨觀。余嘗爲中國史學史，敘吾國史學之漸次進化。以馬氏繹史爲之殿，蓋以其書爲吾國史學體裁之最進化者也。其淵博駿偉，亦並世無兩。今張君此書，視繹史更爲進化；而其學殖之淵博，識見之駿偉，以視馬氏又何多讓耶！

中華民國十七年十二月八日海鹽朱希祖敘。

# 中西交通史料匯篇

## 自序

中華立國處於亞洲之極東，其東南兩面，有瀛海環之。北則爲西伯利亞窮荒。冰天雪地。狐狸所居，豺狼所噪。惟西面陸地相連，不知其幾千萬里。踰流沙，涉峻嶺，則可通大宛，康居，大夏，安息，天竺，大秦諸國，然以天氣地理之障礙，西通之道，亦不易易。故自軒轅垂衣以來，即可謂爲閉關自守，不與他人聞問也。溯自有明中葉，歐人東漸，海禁大開。西方諸國。鱗集鬻聚，喧賓奪主。清宣宗道光二十年，鴉片戰爭，金陵條約，五港通商，香港割讓，尤爲中外交涉史上之大紀念。自是以後，無役不喪師，割地賠款。以前中國士人皆龐然自大，以爲覆載之內，日月所臨，惟華夏居土中，受氣正。誕生聖賢。立君臣長幼之序，備五常十倫之教。衣冠文化，惟我獨有。其餘四裔，皆地偏氣梗，不生聖哲，蠢蠢然鹿豕也。而至今日，則大夢既

醒，漸知華夏之外，尙別有天地，別有文明之邦也。列國鼎峙，各不相讓，相競相摩，武裝及於爪牙。人幾以玷上肉，釜中魚視我矣。世界交通，北京上海與倫敦紐約，可用無綫電話，猶如促膝對面而談。昔時雁海龍堆，炎方朔漠，天以絕夷夏，地以限內外者，今僅堂奧門闕耳。由是中國士人思想丕變。讀書目光，異於前人矣。昔時讀書，注意於本國歷朝理亂興衰之故，典章經制之相因。至六合之外，則存而不議也。今則舉國所最驚心怵惕者，外交失敗及如何救亡耳。

稍研究近世史者，皆知今日世界牛耳，操之歐羅巴諸國。今之歐羅巴卽昔之大秦拂菻。其人開化甚早。聲明文物，不亞中華。吾人自昔觀念西方卽異於東夷，北狄，南蠻。上古之世，西王母之邦，相傳有不死之藥，爲人主所甘心。堯禹二君，皆嘗西遊，以謁西王母。舜時，西王母來賓。夏時羿亦西求不死之藥於王母。周時，穆王親率六軍之士，朝西王母。漢魏以後，史策所載，大秦國土宇廣闊，文物昌明。西望仙境花林。俗無寇盜，人有康樂。六

廟隋唐以後，佛教大熾，交通亦便。於是吾人之視西土，較前尤爲崇尚。天竺則聖賢疊軫，仁義成俗。我國高僧留學其境者，指不勝屈。西方淨土，爲吾人歸真後，魂魄之所依附。大秦則地方萬里，宮宇柱櫳，皆以水晶琉璃爲之。王非賢不立，法非景不行。機制巧密，人莫之知。凡此皆古人崇拜西國之記載，流露於紙上者也。時至今代，則學子負笈，涉鯨波，渡大洋，求學歐美者，接踵途間。誠中國有史以來，所未有之現象也。

史學（History）地學（Geography）與立於史地！學中間之史地學（Historical Geography）皆爲吾國固有之學。研究斯學者，代有其人。至於清代，乃更輝煌。研究域外史地者有魏源，徐松，何秋濤，張穆，洪鈞，屠寄，丁謙等。雲蒸霞蔚。史地學可謂臻於開明之境矣。庚子拳匪亂後，創痛鉅深。大夢既醒，歐風美雨，猶如怒潮而來。新時代既啟，留學外國者，何啻數萬人。歐美之拜金主義，機械生活，隨回國留學生而輸入華夏。至如文學，史學，地學，史地學，以及高尚之道德，宏毅之精神，則輸入者遠不如機械學之多。

豈中國固有之物，已足抵制舶來品歟？抑外國所產者，實不足學歟？彼之史與彼之地，不必知歟？中國固有之物，誠爲佳美。然中國學者，多偏重書籍，展轉抄錄。舊時謬誤，能加改正者，實甚尠也。縱有改正確當，亦僅偶然。不重實地探測，費力多而效果少。西洋人重實驗。有各種學會輔助進行，各種雜誌以便播布討論。故攻讀工夫，未必如中國學者之勞，而所得結果，則精確過於中國也。六合之外，存而不議。故正史外夷傳，以及私家外國著錄自古爲士大夫所不屑道。迄於今日，古人所存而不議之史料，視爲紕繆不經者，西人皆代吾一一證明。甚至中國版圖以內多種問題，中國學者爭論不定。西洋人代爲調查探測，清理判決者，不一其事也。例如蒙古初起時之都城，喀拉和琳地址所在，張穆，何秋濤，李文田，丁謙等，引古證今，議論紛紛。攷其究竟，終無結果。西曆一千八百九十年，（清光緒十六年）芬蘭俄國之探險隊，專往蒙古鄂爾坤河沿岸攷查。和琳舊址，即今額爾德尼昭之說，始確定矣。

參觀馬哥孛羅遊記卷一第四十六章注。

本國問題，且待他人爲之解決。則本國固有之

實，或外國記載，證以中國事實。於是乃全信矣。上下古今數千年，數千百條之記載，雖不能條條有證，而作書精神，則在於是。故吾書尤致意於注釋也。

中國之西，自古卽有大宛，康居，大夏，安息，天竺，大秦諸國。据近代人種學家之攷證，皆爲印度日耳曼系人種。(Die Indogermanen) 今之與我交接者卽昔時與我交接者之同宗也。僅所居之地域有異，而人種則同也。欲述古代中西交通史，固不可僅以歐羅巴一洲概之也。余作此書，凡葱嶺以西，古代印度日耳曼系人種所居舊壤，在今中華民國版圖以西者，皆在範圍以內。爲便利研究之故，乃依地理區域，分段記之。先歐羅巴，次非洲，次阿拉伯，次亞美尼亞，次猶太，

猶太阿拉伯皆塞米忒人種。既在西方，故不得不述之。

次伊蘭高原，次西部土耳其

斯坦，次印度。由遠而近者，則以今代外患，俱來自歐洲。歐洲今爲印度日耳曼系人種之中心。制度文物，可以作我模範。與彼之交通，尤爲吾人所急欲知也。至若大宛，康居，大夏，安息，天竺諸國，雖與我爲較近，而至今



代則皆衰敗陵夷。殷虛毀壞，禾黍油油，徒增過客之悲傷。攷證歷史，作弔古者之詠嘆而已。然之數國者，皆爲今代歐羅巴之印度日耳曼系人種東來之先鋒隊。研究之，足覘彼我勢力之消長。我所受之於彼，彼所受之於我究若何也。夫攷古卽所以知今，固非徒摹倣已渡之雲，圖影已逝之波也。

翻譯西書易，而清理中國載籍難。蓋西國各種學術，皆已有專家清理。分門別類，條序井然。翻譯云者，僅由西文易之爲漢文而已。至若清理中國舊籍一事，其難何啻十倍。中國書籍之多，雖畢全生之年，亦不敢云盡見。況以余駑駘淺學，所見書籍之數，不及太倉一粟。加以中國舊日之野史筆記等書，無事不錄，全無條序。人名地名，又無目錄。從事搜查，猶之泐海底而探珍珠。往往搜查叢書一部，耗費光陰數月，而所得僅一二條可以適用，甚至無一條可用者，亦有之也。以一人有涯之生，從事斯業，殆而已矣。編輯此書，自始搜材料之日，迄今十餘年矣。年當而立，爲家庭鹽米之故，南北奔波，挾稿以隨。稍有餘暇，捉筆書之。盛暑揮汗，嚴冬呵凍，未嘗輟筆。淒