A Reconsideration of the Leilou – Longbian Debate: A Continuation of Research by Nishimura Masanari

Phạm Lê Huy

Vietnam National University-Hanoi

h1995vn@gmail.com

Abstract

In 111 BCE, the Han Dynasty destroyed the Nanyue Kingdom and put the region under the Jiaozhi Commandery. The headquarters of the Jiaozhi Commandery was originally Miling, but was later moved to Leilou and then to Longbian. There have been many hypotheses regarding the location of Leilou and Longbian. In particular, many scholars have identified the remains of the old citadel (Lũng Khê Citadel) located in Thuận Thành District (Bắc Ninh, Vietnam) with the Leilou Citadel. Based on archaeological evidence, the late Dr. Nishimura Masanari advanced a new hypothesis that these remains were not the citadel of Leilou, but that of Longbian. This article will review historical documents about Leilou and Longbian and introduce two inscriptions recently discovered in Bắc Ninh Province to provide further support for Nishimura's hypothesis.

Keywords

Jiaozhi Commandery – Leilou – Longbian – Lũng Khê citadel – Nishimura Masanari

Literature Review

In 111 BCE, the Han Dynasty (206 BCE–220 CE) destroyed the Kingdom of Nanyue and annexed its territory. Inheriting the administrative system of Nanyue, the Han put the region of Nanyue under the Jiaozhi Commandery (交趾郡). The headquarters of the Jiaozhi Commandery was originally Miling (麋泠, Vietnamese: Mê Linh), but was later moved to Leilou (羸樓, Vietnamese: Luy Lâu) and then to Longbian (龍編, Vietnamese: Long Biên). So far, there

have been several hypotheses concerning the location of the Leilou and Longbian citadels.

The first hypothesis (hereafter Hypothesis 1), proposed by Henri Maspero, holds that the Leilou Citadel was located south of Hanoi. Maspero cited a note in *Yuanhe junxian tuzhi* (元和郡縣圖志) that suggested that Leilou was located 75 *li* (里) northwest of the Tang's Protectorate Citadel.¹ This hypothesis, however, has been criticized for its lack of evidence, as it relies on a single piece of evidence.²

The second hypothesis (hereafter Hypothesis 2, simplified as “Lũng Khê = Leilou”), proposed by Claude Madrolle based on fieldwork by Henry Wintrebert, holds that the Leilou Citadel was located at the same place as the later Lũng Khê Citadel (Thuận Thành, Bắc Ninh).³ This hypothesis has been backed and developed by many other scholars,⁴ based on the following sources. First, *Việt sử thông giám cương mục* (越史通鑑綱目) and *Đại Nam nhất thống chí* (大南一統志), compiled under the Nguyễn (1802–1945), both affirm that the Lũng Khê Citadel was the Leilou Citadel under Han rule. Second, *Việt điện u linh* (粵甸幽靈), compiled under the Trần (1225–1400), suggests that Shi Xie (士燮, Vietnamese: Sĩ Tiệp/Nhiếp, 137–226), the head of Jiaozhi Commandery, based his headquarters in Leilou. *Ngụy Việt ngoại kỷ* (偽越外紀), cited in *Annan zhi* (安南志), which was compiled under the Ming (1368–1644), also states that Shi Xie built the Leilou Citadel. In fact, the inner and surrounding areas of the Lũng Khê Citadel include many relics and legends related to Shi Xie. Also, as Sakurai Yumio observed, the view that Leilou was located at Lũng Khê does not contradict the notes on rivers in *Shuijing zhu* (水經注).⁵

Based on Hypothesis 2, scholars such as Đỗ Văn Ninh argue that the Leilou Citadel was also the Longbian Citadel under the Han, and that both were the same as the Lũng Khê Citadel (hereafter Hypothesis 3, simplified as “Lũng

1 Henri Maspero, “Etudes d'histoire d'Annam,” *BEFEO* 18 (1918): 11–12.

2 Sakurai Yumio 桜井由躬雄, “A Reconsideration of Lạc điền—A Discussion of the Reclamation of the Red River Delta in the Ancient Period” (らく田問題の整理: 古代紅河デルタ開拓試論), *Journal of Southeast Asia Studies* (東南アジア研究) 17, no. 1 (1979): 19.

3 Claude Madrolle, “Le Tonkin ancien. Lei-leou 羸 (音連) 隳 et les districts chinois de l'époque des Han. La population. Yue-chang,” *BEFEO* 37 (1937): 267–271.

4 Trần Quốc Vượng, “A Geographical-Historical Issue: Political Centres of our Country in the Ancient Era (From the late Primitive Communism to the Han Rule),” (Một vấn đề địa lí học lịch sử: Những trung tâm chính trị của đất nước ta trong thời cổ đại), *Journal of Historical Studies* (Nghiên cứu Lịch sử) 6 (1959): 36–37; Đào Duy Anh, *Vietnam through Ages: A Historical and Geographical Study of Vietnam* (Đất nước Việt Nam qua các đời) (Hanoi: Science Publisher (NXB Khoa học), 1964), 51; Sakurai, “A Reconsideration of Lạc điền,” 18–19.

5 Sakurai, “A Reconsideration of Lạc điền,” 19.

Khê = Leilou = Longbian”). The equation of Leilou with Longbian is based on records in *Đại Việt sử ký toàn thư (Toàn thư)* (大越史記全書).⁶ However, this hypothesis was criticized by Trần Quốc Vượng because in many historical documents from the Han to the Song period (960–1279), Leilou and Longbian are described as two different administrative units.⁷

In 2011, based on his excavation at Lũng Khê, Nishimura Masanari proposed a new theory, arguing that the Lũng Khê Citadel is the Longbian Citadel, and both are distinct from the Leilou citadel (hereafter Hypothesis 4, simplified as “Lũng Khê = Longbian ≠ Leilou”). Nishimura’s hypothesis is based on three lines of reasoning. First, although he did not pursue an in-depth analysis, Nishimura did question the reliability of historical documents (the earliest being *Việt điện u linh*) that hold that Lũng Khê was Leilou. Second, in reference to Jiaozhou department heads such as Bu Zhi (步騭), Nishimura recognized that these mandarins’ titles often included the names of the places where they established their headquarters. As Shi Xie received the title of “Longbian marquess” (龍編侯), Nishimura believed that Shi Xie’s headquarters was at Longbian. Therefore, the Lũng Khê Citadel, with many relics and legends associated with Shi Xie, should be at Longbian, not Leilou. Third, results from archaeological excavations by Nishimura and Vietnamese archaeologists have also suggested that the Lũng Khê Citadel was occupied in the period between the Late Han (25 CE–220 CE) and the Sui period (581–618), which coincided with the period when the Longbian Citadel was occupied according to historical records.⁸

A review of the literature on the Leilou–Longbian–Lũng Khê question highlights several shortcomings. First, when discussing the issue of Leilou and Longbian, it is crucial to note that Leilou and Longbian were the headquarters of the Jiaozhi Commandery. As will be discussed in the second section of this paper, under Han rule there were two parallel administrative units in the region: the Jiaozhi Commandery and the Jiaozhi Department, headed respectively by the Jiaozhi *taishou* (交趾太守) and the Jiaozhi *cishi* (交趾刺史). Differentiating between the two headquarters of these two administrative units, the author will analyze their relationship, changes in their location over time, and the relationship between Leilou, Longbian, and Shi Xie.

Second, although many works mention Leilou and Longbian, no study has offered a comprehensive and systematic analysis of the relevant historical

6 Đỗ Văn Ninh, *Ancient Towns in Vietnam* (Đô thị cổ Việt Nam) (Hanoi: Institute of History, 1989), 82–84.

7 Trần Quốc Vượng, “The Position of Luy Lâu” (Vị thế Luy Lâu), *Journal of Historical Studies* (Nghiên cứu Lịch sử) 315 (2001): 3–7.

8 Nishimura Masanari, *Archaeology and Ancient History of Vietnam* (Betonamu no Koko-Kodaigaku) (Tokyo: Doseisha, 2011), 155–176.

records. Information about Leilou and Longbian is distributed across a tremendous amount of material dated between the early Common Era and the early twentieth century. Within this vast historical time span, it seems that at certain points, in addition to the original data, some misinformation about Leilou–Longbian emerged and was later taken to be reliable. The subsequent use and interpretation of the original data and the later misleading information has yielded sedimentary layers of material in conflict with each other. It is difficult to locate Leilou and Longbian without properly distinguishing these layers. Indeed, it was the accumulation of undifferentiated historical and non-historical data that gave rise to the diverse hypotheses on Leilou, Longbian, and Lũng Khê.

In this context, Nishimura Masanari proposed some important steps toward solving the problem by combining archaeological evidence with written records. Based on the existing scholarly literature and particularly the ideas advanced by Nishimura, the author will try to separate the accumulated data into the sedimentary layers that led to each hypothesis. The author thereby attempts to recover the original sources in order to shed further light on the issue of Leilou and Longbian.

The Headquarters of the Jiaozhi Commandery and the Jiaozhi Department

To clarify the relationship between Leilou and Longbian, it is important to distinguish between two administrative units, the Jiaozhi Commandery and the Jiaozhi Department, and their respective headquarters.

The name Jiaozhi originated from the name of one of the two commanderies established on the territory of Âu Lạc (甌雒) by the Nanyue Kingdom, namely, Jiaozhi (交趾) and Jiuzhen (九真). The Nanyue administrated the two commanderies via two representatives, known as the “two envoys” (二使者). After the conquest of the Nanyue in 111 BCE, the Han Dynasty maintained the system of two commanderies, Jiaozhi and Jiuzhen, designating the heads of both commanderies as *taishou* (太守).

In parallel with the Jiaozhi Commandery, the Han established a new administrative unit with the same name, the Jiaozhi Department.⁹ Five years after the conquest of the Nanyue, in 106 BCE, the Han divided the whole country into thirteen “departments” (刺史部), each headed by a *cishi* (刺史). The Jiaozhi Department included seven commanderies: Nanhai (南海), Cangwu

9 The Jiaozhi Department is mentioned in the chapter Zhu Jun 朱儁 in *Houhan Shu*. 「會交趾部羣賊並起，牧守輒弱不能禁」(『後漢書』卷 71, 朱儁傳).

(蒼梧), Hepu (合浦), Yulin (鬱林), Jiaozhi (交趾), Jiuzhen (九真), and Rinan (日南).¹⁰ It is noteworthy that out of the thirteen departments, apart from Jiaozhi and Shuofang (朔方), the other eleven departments had the suffix *-zhou*, such as the Qingzhou (青州) Department or the Xuzhou (徐州) Department. Therefore, the Jiaozhi Department was equal to a *zhou*, and the headquarters of the Jiaozhi Department was regarded as the center of a *zhou* (州治). In 203 CE, for the sake of consistency, the Jiaozhi Department was renamed Jiaozhou (交州) (also known as the Jiaozhou Department).

Thus, under Han rule, in the period between 106 BCE and 203 CE, there were two administrative units with the name Jiaozhi: the Jiaozhi Commandery (交趾郡) and the Jiaozhi Department (交趾[刺史]部). The Jiaozhi Department was the higher-level unit, supervising the Jiaozhi Commandery. The head of the department was the Jiaozhi *cishi*, and the head of the commandery was the Jiaozhi *taishou*. In 203 CE, Emperor Xian of the Han, on the advice of the Jiaozhi *cishi*, Zhang Jin (張津), and the Jiaozhi *taishou*, Shi Xie, decided to rename the Jiaozhi Department the Jiaozhou (Department).¹¹ This crucial issue has not received sufficient attention, and confusion has arisen over the headquarters of these two administrative units.

As highlighted above, the headquarters of the Jiaozhi Commandery was the commandery center (郡治 or 郡守) of the Jiaozhi *taishou*. The headquarters of the Jiaozhi Department, meanwhile, was the department center (州治) of the Jiaozhi *cishi* (and later the Jiaozhou *cishi*). As the Jiaozhi *cishi* ruled over all seven commanderies, the department center could have been located anywhere within the boundaries of the seven commanderies. The headquarters of the Jiaozhi *taishou*, however, had to be somewhere within the boundaries of the Jiaozhi Commandery. The following paragraphs trace the shifting location of the headquarters of the Jiaozhi Commandery and the Jiaozhi Department.

According to *Jiaozhou waiyujì* (交州外域記), cited in *Shuijīng zhu*, initially the headquarters of both the Jiaozhi Commandery and the “original” headquarters of the Jiaozhi Department (州本治) were located in Miling County.¹² Wang Fan’s (王範) *Jiaoguang chunqiu* (交廣春秋), written under

10 *Shuijīng zhu* states that the appointment of the Jiaozhi Department head was made in 116 BCE (元鼎 2), which might be a mistake because at that time the Nanyue was still in power. 「漢武帝元鼎二年，始并百越，啟七郡於是，乃置交趾刺史，以督領之，初治廣信」(『水經注』卷 37).

11 「建安八年，張津為刺史，士燮為交趾太守，共表立為州，乃拜津為交州牧」(『晉書』卷 15，交州)。

12 「麋泠縣，漢武帝元鼎六年開都尉治，交州外域記曰(中略)交趾郡及州本治於此也」(『水經注』卷 37)。

the Western Jin (265–420) and cited in *Shuijing zhu*, holds that in 106 BCE, the headquarters of Jiaozhou (the Jiaozhi Department) was moved from Leilou to Guangxin (廣信) in Cangwu (蒼梧).¹³ That is, the headquarters of the Jiaozhi Department was in Miling for a very short period before relocating to Leilou, and was relocated again to Guangxin in 106 BCE. However, the headquarters of the Jiaozhi Commandery (and the Jiaozhi *taishou*) had to remain in the territory of the Jiaozhi Commandery. Where was it, and was it still located in Miling?

Many texts mention that Zhou Chang (周敞) moved the headquarters from Leilou to Longbian in the first half of the second century. However, it is vital to clarify that what was moved was the headquarters of the Jiaozhi Commandery or the Jiaozhi Department. According to *Jiu Tangshu* (舊唐書) and *Taiping huanyu ji* (太平環宇記), Zhou Chang was the Jiaozhi *taishou*, and the relocation from Leilou to Longbian was the relocation of the commandery center (郡守).¹⁴ Therefore, this event was the relocation of the headquarters of the Jiaozhi Commandery. This evidence shows that by the time of Zhou Chang, the headquarters of the Jiaozhi Commandery was no longer in Miling, but Leilou. This may be confirmed by the remark in *Hanshu* (漢書) that Leilou was the most important county of the Jiaozhi Commandery.¹⁵ In addition, Zhou Chang relocated the headquarters of the Jiaozhi Commandery from Leilou to Longbian, and consequently in *Hou Hanshu* (後漢書) Longbian was listed as the leading county of the Jiaozhi Commandery.¹⁶

Furthermore, according to *Jinshu* (晉書), in 141 CE Zhou Chang again proposed that the royal court establish Jiaozhi as a *zhou*. Although the court did not approve his proposal, it made a concession and promoted Zhou Chang to Jiaozhi *cishi*, therefore making him head of the department.¹⁷ This meant that in 141 CE, the headquarters of the Jiaozhi Commandery and the Jiaozhi Department were combined in the same location, which was in Longbian. This

13 「王氏交廣春秋曰，元封五年，交州自羸樓縣移治于此」(『水經注』卷37所引王氏『交廣春秋』)。

14 「龍編，漢交趾郡守治羸樓，後漢周敞為交趾太守，乃移治龍編」(『舊唐書』卷41，安南府)。「龍編縣，東南四十五里十鄉，漢交趾郡守治羸樓，後漢周敞為交州太守，乃移治龍編，言立城之始有蛟龍盤編於江津之間，因為武城」(『太平寰宇記』卷170，龍編縣)。

15 「交趾郡，(中略)縣十，羸樓，有羞官，安定，苟漏，麋冷，都尉治，曲易，此帶，稽徐，西於，龍編，朱鸞」(『漢書』卷28下，交趾郡)。

16 「交趾郡武帝置，即安陽王國，雒陽南萬一千里，十二城，龍編，羸樓，安定，苟漏，麋冷，曲陽，北帶，稽徐，西於，朱鸞，封谿(建武十九年置)，望海(建武十九年置)」(『後漢書』志第23，交趾郡)。

17 「順帝永和九年，交趾太守周敞求立為州，朝議不許，即拜敞為交趾刺史」(『晉書』卷15，交州)。

concurs with what *Songshu* (宋書) records, namely that in 203 CE, the headquarters of the Jiaozhi Department was located in Longbian. When the Jiaozhi Department was renamed Jiaozhou, the headquarters was moved again from Longbian to Guangxin (Cangwu).¹⁸ In 211 CE, the headquarters of Jiaozhou was moved to Panyu (番禺). In 226 CE, Sun Quan (孫權) tried to separate Guangzhou from Jiaozhou, but in the same year, he had to give up the plan because of the rebellion in Jiaozhou. In 262 CE, under the reign of Sun Xiu (孫休), Jiaozhou was finally separated from Guangzhou, and the headquarters of Guangzhou was located in Panyu.¹⁹ Jiaozhou at the time only included counties from Jiaozhi southward, and the headquarters of Jiaozhou was moved back to Longbian.²⁰

Based on the texts cited above, Table 1 summarizes the changes in the location of the headquarters of the Jiaozhi Commandery and the Jiaozhi Department.

As seen in Table 1, prior to the tenth century, there is no historical evidence that after the term of Zhou Chang, the headquarters of the Jiaozhi Commandery was relocated back to Leilou. In other words, there is no indication that Shi Xie (137–226) made Leilou his headquarters.

Second, Leilou and Longbian could not have been the same county (縣) (Leilou ≠ Longbian). As illustrated in Table 1, in both *Hanshu* and *Hou Hanshu*, Leilou and Longbian were listed as two distinct counties. *Shuijing zhu* (compiled in the early sixth century CE) describes a river that ran through the north of Leilou County, connecting with the King River that originated from the high grounds (高山) of Longbian County. Thus, *Shuijing zhu* also differentiates Leilou from Longbian, seeing the two as separate units.²¹ *Jiu Tangshu* and *Taiping huanyu ji* (both compiled in the tenth century) clearly note the relocation of the headquarters of the Jiaozhi Commandery from Leilou to Longbian.

However, after Vietnam became independent from China in the tenth century, a new opinion emerged in *Toàn thư*, according to which Leilou was the same as Longbian (“Leilou = Longbian”). In *Toàn thư*, the chapter on Shi Xie

18 「交趾刺史治龍編，漢獻帝建安八年，改曰交州，治蒼梧廣信縣，十六年，徙治南海番禺縣，及分為廣州，治番禺，交州還治龍編」（『宋書』卷38，交州）。

19 「吳黃武五年，割南海，蒼梧，鬱林三郡立廣州，交趾，日南，九真，合浦四郡為交州，戴良為刺史，值亂不得入，呂岱擊平之，復還并交部，赤烏五年，復置珠崖郡，永安七年，復以前三郡立廣州」（『晉書』卷15，交州）。

20 「陳襲臨淮人，永安七年為交州牧，值孫諸虐政後，復分海東四郡為廣州，以熊牧為刺史，海南三郡為交州，以襲為刺史，移治龍編」（『安南志略』卷7）。

21 「其次一水東逕封溪縣南，又西南逕西于縣南，又東逕羸陵縣北，又東逕北帶縣南，又東逕稽徐縣，涇水注之，水出龍編縣高山，東南流入稽徐縣，注於中水」（『水經注』卷37）。

TABLE 1 *Relocations of the headquarters of the Jiaozhi Commandery and the Jiaozhi Department*

Year	Headquarters of the Jiaozhi Commandery 交趾郡 郡治・郡守	Headquarters of the Jiaozhi Department (Jiaozhou) 交趾・交州刺史部 州治	Headquarters of the Guangzhou Department (廣州刺史部) 州治
111 BCE (元封5年)	Miling 麋泠	Miling?	
106 BCE (元鼎6年)	Leilou 羸婁	Miling→Leilou→ Guangxin 麋泠→羸婁→廣信	
First half of the second century CE 交趾太守周敞	Leilou→Longbian 羸婁→龍編	Guangxin 廣信	
141 CE (永和6年)	Longbian 龍編	Guangxin→Longbian 廣信→龍編	
203 CE (建安8年) (交趾刺史部→交州)	Longbian 龍編	Longbian→Guangxin 龍編→廣信	
211 CE (建安16年)	Longbian 龍編	Guangxin→Panyu 廣信→番禺	
226 CE (黃武5年) 交州→(交州+廣州)	Longbian 龍編	Panyu→Longbian 番禺→龍編	Panyu 番禺
226 CE (黃武5年) (交州+廣州)→交州	Longbian 龍編	Longbian 龍編	
262 CE (永安7年) 交州→(交州+廣州)	Longbian 龍編	Longbian 龍編	Panyu 番禺

states, “(Shi Xie) was appointed Jiaozhou taishou, received the title of Long Độ Đình hầu (龍度亭侯), and situated his headquarters in Leilou (also known as Longbian).” With the words “Leilou (also known as Longbian),” *Toàn thư* established the equation “Leilou = Longbian.” As *Toàn thư* was the official historical book of the state, the idea of “Leilou = Longbian” was officially and widely accepted from the fifteenth century onward. And in the twentieth century, some scholars, notably Đỗ Văn Ninh, building on *Toàn thư*, put forth Hypothesis 3: “Leilou = Longbian.”²²

The view that “Leilou = Longbian,” however, was evidently in conflict with the idea that Leilou ≠ Longbian, which is well established in earlier sources, including *Hanshu*, *Hou Hanshu*, *Shuijing zhu*, and *Jiu Tangshu*. Thus, the earliest sources provide no support for Hypothesis 3: “Leilou = Longbian.”

Leilou in Historical Records

Tested against materials written before the tenth century, Hypothesis 3 does not hold water. Leilou and Longbian under the Han were two different citadels. Before considering the relationship between Leilou, Longbian, and the Lũng Khê Citadel, it is necessary to review the locations of Leilou according to pre-tenth century literature.

Before the Tenth Century: Leilou Located in the West of Hanoi

Generally speaking, before the tenth century, it was believed that the Leilou Citadel and Leilou County in the Han were located west of Hanoi.

Although Leilou County was established during the Han and existed until the sixth century CE,²³ the earliest work that mentions the location of the Leilou Citadel is *Yuanhe junxian tuzhi*, a geographical text compiled in the early ninth century. *Yuanhe junxian tuzhi* wrote that “the old Leilou Citadel was located 75 *li* in the west of Songping (宋平) County—formerly a county under the Han, a part of the Jiaozhi Commandery. In the Later Han, the Jiaozhi *cishi* located the headquarters here, but it was later moved to Longbian.”²⁴ So *Yuanhe junxian tuzhi* holds that Leilou was situated approximately 37 km to the west of the Protectorate Citadel (modern Hanoi) under the Tang Dynasty.

22 Đỗ Văn Ninh, *Ancient Towns in Vietnam*, 82–84.

23 *Nanqi shu* 南齊書 (compiled in the sixth century CE) still listed Leilou as one of the eleven counties in the Jiaozhi Commandery.

24 「連陟（音蓮箋）故城，在縣西七十五里，本漢縣，屬交州郡，有羞官，後漢交趾史理於此，後徙龍編」（『元和郡縣圖志』卷38，安南，宋平縣）。

Previously, scholars dismissed what was written in *Yuanhe junxian tuzhi* as unreliable, because it is the only historical record that suggests that Leilou was situated west of Hanoi.²⁵ However, several other sources also indicate that Leilou County under the Han was to the west of Hanoi. *Jiu Tangshu* states that part of Leilou County of the Han overlapped with Jiaozhi County of the Tang after 627 CE.²⁶ *Shitao zhi* (十道志), cited in *Xin Tangshu*, indicates that to travel from the Protectorate Citadel to Fengzhou (峯州, Phú Thọ), it was necessary to pass Jiaozhi County.²⁷ Because Fengzhou was northwest of Hanoi, part of Jiaozhi County had to be situated west of Hanoi. Besides, the rubbing of the Nhật Tảo (日早) Bell, dated to 948 CE and discovered in Đông Ngạc (Từ Liêm district, Hanoi), also suggests that the area west of Hanoi was part of Lower Từ Liêm hamlet, Jiaozhi County (交趾縣下慈廉村) by the tenth century.²⁸

The territory of Jiaozhi County under the Tang Dynasty partly overlapped with the area northeast of Hanoi. According to *Jiu Tangshu*, 10 *li* (5 km) to the northeast of the Protectorate Citadel was Fusheng (福生), which belonged to Jiaozhi County.²⁹ The same thing was noted in *Tongdian* (通典) by Du You (杜佑).³⁰ Combining these sources, it is clear that Jiaozhi County under the Tang spanned a vast territory that overlapped the area west and northwest of Hanoi, as well as part of the area to the northeast. According to *Jiu Tangshu* and *Yuanhe junxian tuzhi*, the territory of Jiaozhi County under the Tang included both Leilou and Longbian counties of the Han.³¹

Furthermore, Leilou County under the Han was partly located southwest of Hanoi. According to *Yuanhe junxian tuzhi*, Nanding (南定) County (established in 791 CE) was a part of Leilou County of the Han. Geographically, Nanding

25 Sakurai, “A Reconsideration of Lạc điền,” 19.

26 「交趾，漢交趾郡之羸陵」（『舊唐書』卷41，安南都督府）。When investigating the case of Jiaozhi County, it is important to note that the location of Jiaozhi County changed many times. The Jiaozhi County that we mention here was the one established in 627 (貞觀1) under the Tang, named on the basis of “the old Jiaozhi citadel under the Han” (which we believe is the Leilou citadel).

27 「安南經交趾太平，百餘里至峯州」（『新唐書』卷43下，峯州都督府）。

28 「交趾縣下慈廉村」。Claudine Salmon and Phan Văn Các, eds., *Épigraphie en chinois du Viêt Nam*, vol. 1, *De l'occupation chinoise à la dynastie des Lý* (Paris: Presses de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient, 1998), 47.

29 「東北至交趾縣界福生去十里也」（『舊唐書』卷41，安南都督府）。

30 「東北到交趾縣十里」（『通典』卷184，安南都護府）。

31 *Yuanhe junxian tuzhi* assumes that Jiaozhi County under the Tang was a part of Longbian County under the Han. 「交趾縣本漢龍編縣地」（『元和郡縣圖志』卷38）。

County under the Tang was situated “60 *li* to the northeast of the Protectorate Citadel,” meaning approximately 30 km southwest of Hanoi today.³²

Therefore, Leilou County under the Han was partly located to the west and southwest of Hanoi. This concurs with *Yuanhe junxian tuzhi*, which located the old Leilou Citadel 75 *li* west of the Protectorate Citadel. In Jiaozhi County under the Tang, according to *Jiu Tangshu*, there was also “the old Jiaozhi Citadel of the Han.”³³ “The old Jiaozhi Citadel of the Han” mentioned here did not refer to the Longbian Citadel, because as noted earlier, the Longbian citadel was situated in the territory of Longbian County during the Han-Tang period. Therefore, “the old Jiaozhi citadel under the Han,” situated in Jiaozhi County under the Tang, could only be the Leilou Citadel.

In short, in pre-tenth century literature, it was widely accepted that Leilou County and the Leilou Citadel under the Han were located west of Hanoi.

After the Tenth Century: Leilou = Lũng Khê

From the beginning of the eleventh century, however, new sources appeared that suggested that Leilou was located at the position of the Lũng Khê Citadel (Leilou = Lũng Khê). The earliest sources that contain this view are *Thiền uyển tập anh* (禪苑集英) and *Toàn thư*.

First, the Pháp Hiền (法賢) chapter in *Thiền uyển tập anh* referred to Pháp Vân Pagoda as Pháp Vân Pagoda of Leilou (羸隲法雲寺), implying that the Pháp Vân Pagoda (which overlaps with the area of the Lũng Khê Citadel) was part of Leilou County.³⁴ Although the chapter of Thông Biện (通辨) did not directly suggest that “Leilou = Lũng Khê,” it mentioned that Khâu Đà La (丘陀羅), Ma La Kỳ Vực (摩羅耆域), and Pháp Hiền, the famous Zen masters associated with Pháp Vân Pagoda, once practiced Buddhism in the Leilou area.³⁵ Thus the view that “Leilou = Lũng Khê” already appeared in the two chapters of *Thiền uyển tập anh*.

However, in *Thiền uyển tập anh*, the chapters on Tỳ Ni Đa Lưu Chi (毘尼多流支) (Vinītaruci, the master of Pháp Hiền) and Sùng Phạm (崇範) referred to

32 「南定縣（中下，東北至府六十里）本漢羸隲縣地，貞元七年于此置南定縣，其舊南定縣，在今縣東南二百餘里，羈縻長州側近，開元十年後廢」（『元和郡縣圖志』卷 38）。

33 「武德四年，於宋平置宋州，領宋平，弘教，南定三縣，五年，又分宋平置交趾，懷德二縣，自貞觀元年，廢南宋州，以弘教，懷德，交趾三縣省入宋平縣，移交趾縣，名於漢故交趾城置」（『舊唐書』卷 41，安南府）。

34 「羸隲法雲寺」（『禪苑集英』法賢傳）。

35 「佛法初來江東，未被而羸隲又重創興寶刹二十餘所，度僧五百餘人，譯經一十五卷，以其先之故也，于時則已有比丘名摩羅耆域，康僧會，支僵良，牟搏之屬在」（『禪苑集英』通辨傳）。

Pháp Vân Pagoda of Cổ Châu Hamlet of Longbian (龍編古州鄉法雲寺), implying that Pháp Vân Pagoda was situated in the Cổ Châu hamlet of Longbian.³⁶ Although the chapter on Thiền Nham (禪岩) mentions the location of another pagoda, Trí Quả (致果), it shares the view that Cổ Châu hamlet was situated in the Longbian area.³⁷ Therefore, there are two views that coexist in *Thiền uyển tập anh*: “Lũng Khê = Leilou” (the chapters on Pháp Hiền and Thông Biện), and “Lũng Khê = Longbian” (the chapters on Tỳ Ni Đa Lưu Chi, Sùng Phạm, and Thiền Nham).

Second, according to *Toàn thư*, in 1188 CE, Emperor Lý Cao Tông went to Pháp Vân Pagoda of Duềnh Bà (瀛婆法雲寺). Duềnh Bà (瀛婆) was believed to be an error for Leilou (羸樓), so this text has been considered as evidence that “Lũng Khê = Leilou.” However, in the same text, the note of Ngô Sĩ Liên, the main editor of *Toàn thư*, reads: “at the beginning of our dynasty [i.e., the Lê], we still had this custom” (今朝國初猶乃舊俗). Meanwhile, in *Đại Việt sử lược*, compiled during the Trần, Pháp Vân Pagoda was never called “Pháp Vân Pagoda of Duềnh Bà (or Leilou)” but “Pháp Vân Pagoda of Cổ Châu” (古州法雲寺). This implies that the text of *Toàn thư* was edited by Ngô Sĩ Liên in the fifteenth century.³⁸

Third, in the Shi Xie chapter of *Toàn thư*, Ngô Sĩ Liên suggests that the Leilou Citadel was situated in Lũng Khê. First, in the account of the life of Shi Xie, Ngô Sĩ Liên states that Shi Xie located his headquarters in Leilou, noting that “(Leilou) means Longbian” (“Leilou = Longbian”). Then, in his comments at the end of the Shi Xie chapter, Ngô Sĩ Liên remarks that the shrine dedicated to Shi Xie (located in the area of Lũng Khê) was once part of “the former Longbian Citadel” (“Lũng Khê = Longbian”). In other words, by combining the two equations “Leilou = Longbian” and “Lũng Khê = Longbian,” Ngô Sĩ Liên indirectly suggests that Leilou was Lũng Khê (“Leilou = Lũng Khê”).

The question, however, is whether Shi Xie really based his headquarters in Leilou. As demonstrated in the previous section, pre-tenth century literature never mentioned Shi Xie’s headquarters in Leilou. So where did this idea come from?

The following table compares the notes in *Việt điện u linh*, *Toàn thư*, and *Sanguo zhi* in order to prove that the idea that “Shi Xie’s headquarters = Leilou”

36 「龍編古州鄉法雲寺」(『禪苑集英』比尼多流支傳・崇範傳)。

37 「龍編古州智果寺」(『禪苑集英』禪岩傳)。Trần Quốc Vương, “The Historical and Geographical Book of Hanoi Region (before the eleventh century),” *Journal of Historical Studies* 15 (1960): 50.

38 「夏五月旱，帝親幸瀛婆法雲寺，祈雨，因迎法雲佛像歸報天寺，今朝國初猶乃舊俗」(『大越史記全書』本紀卷4，戊申天資嘉瑞3年〈1188年〉5月條)。

in *Toàn thư* originated from *Việt điện u linh*. What was written in *Việt điện u linh*, however, was largely unsubstantiated. Table 2 cites specific sentences in *Việt điện u linh* and compares them with parallel statements in *Toàn thư* and *Sanguozhi*.

TABLE 2 *Shi Xie in Sanguo zhi, Việt điện u linh, and Toàn thư*

No.	Sanguo zhi 三國志	Việt điện u linh 粵甸幽靈	Toàn thư 大越史記全書
1	士燮字威彥，蒼梧廣信人也	王姓士名燮，蒼梧廣信人也	姓士諱燮，字威彥，蒼梧廣信人也
2	其先本魯國汶陽人	其先魯國汶陽人	其先魯國汶陽人也
3	至王莽之亂，避地交州	值王莽亂，避地於此	北朝王莽之亂，避地於我越
4	六世至燮，父賜，桓帝時，為日南太守	世至王，父名賜，漢桓帝時，為日南太守	六世至王，父賜，漢桓帝時，為日南太守
5	燮少游學京師，事潁川劉子奇	王少游學漢京	王少遊學漢京，從潁川劉子奇
6	治左氏春秋	治左氏春秋	治左氏春秋為注解
7	察孝廉，補尚書郎，公事免官	舉孝廉，補尚書郎，以公事免官	舉孝廉，補尚書郎，以公事免官
8	父賜喪闋後，舉茂才，除巫令	居父喪闋後，舉茂才，除巫陽令	父喪闋（音缺，盡也）後舉茂才，除巫陽令，
9	遷交阯太守，	獻帝時，遷交阯太守	遷交州太守，封龍度亭侯
10	漢遣張津為交州刺史，	時張津交州刺史	及漢帝遣張津為刺史津（守任在漢建安六年）
11		漢末三國交爭，王治羸樓及廣信二所	都羸樓（樓一作樓，即龍編），後陳朝追封善感嘉應靈武大王
12	津後又為其將區景所殺	後張津為賊帥區景所害	為其將區景所殺
13	而荊州牧劉表遣零陵賴恭代津，是時蒼梧太守史瓚死，表又遣吳巨代之，與恭俱至	荊州牧劉表遣零陵賴恭攝交州	而荊州牧劉表遣零陵令賴恭代津

No.	Sanguo zhi 三國志	Việt điện u linh 粵甸幽靈	Toàn thư 大越史記全書
14	漢聞張津死，賜璽書曰	獻帝聞之，賜玉璽書曰	漢帝聞津死，賜王璽書曰
15	交州絕域，南帶江海	交州絕域，南帶江海	交州絕域，南帶江海
16	上恩不宜，下義壅隔	上恩不宜，下義壅塞	上恩不宜，下益壅塞
17	知逆賊劉表又遣賴恭闕看南土	逆賊劉表又遣賴恭窺看南土	如逆賊劉表，又遣賴恭窺看南土
18	今以變為綏南中郎將，董督七郡，領交阯太守如故	今以卿為綏南中郎將，董督七郡，領交阯太守如故	今以卿為綏南中郎將，董督七郡，領交州太守如故
19	後變遣吏張旻奉貢詣京都	王遣張旻詣隔京，貢獻方物	王遣吏張旻奉貢，請漢京都
20	是時天下喪亂，道路斷絕	是時天下喪亂，道路阻絕	是時天下喪亂，道路斷絕
21	而變不廢貢職	而王能修職貢	而王不廢職貢
22	特復下詔，拜安遠將軍，封龍度亭侯	漢帝復下詔，拜安遠將軍，龍度亭侯	漢帝復下詔，拜安遠將軍，封龍度亭侯
23	後巨與恭相失，舉兵逐恭，恭走還零陵，	後蒼梧太守吳巨與賴恭相失，舉兵逐之，恭走零陵	後蒼梧太守吳巨與恭相失，舉兵逐之，恭走還零陵
24	建安十五年，孫權遣步騭為交州刺史	孫權遣步騭為交州刺史	吳王孫權遣步騭為交州刺史
25	騭到，變率兄弟奉承節度	騭到，王率兄弟	騭到，王率兄弟奉承節度
26	而吳巨懷異心，騭斬之，權加變為左將軍，建安末年，變遣子廡入質，權以為武昌太守，變又誘導益州豪姓雍闓等，率郡人民使遙東附	誘導豪姓雍闓等，率郡民附吳	後王遣子廡（魚錦反）入質于吳王，吳王以為武昌太守，王又誘導益州豪姓雍闓（可亥反）等，率郡民人，使遙東附吳
27	權益嘉之，遷衛將軍，封龍編侯	吳益嘉之，升衛將軍，龍編侯	吳王益嘉之，遷衛將軍，封龍編侯

TABLE 2 *Shi Xie in Sanguo zhi, Việt điện u linh, and Toàn thư (cont.)*

No.	Sanguo zhi 三國志	Việt điện u linh 粵甸幽靈	Toàn thư 大越史記全書
28	變每遣使詣權，致雜香細葛，輒以千數，明珠，大貝，流離，翡翠，瑇瑁，犀，象之珍，奇物異果，蕉，邪，龍眼之屬，無歲不至，壹時貢馬，凡數百匹	王遣使詣吳，貢雜香細葛，明珠，玳瑁，翡翠，犀象及檳榔，龍眼之類	王每遣使詣吳，致雜香細葛，輒以千數，明珠，大貝，琉璃，翠羽，瑇瑁，犀象之珍奇，及異果，蕉椰，龍眼之屬，無歲不至，又貢馬，凡數百匹
29	權輒為書，厚加寵賜，以答慰之	吳王賜書，慰答之	吳王作書，厚加寵賜，以慰答之
30		王之弟有三子	王之弟三人
31	變乃表壹領合浦太守，次弟徐聞令，黼領九真太守，黼（音于鄙反，見字林，）黼弟武，領南海太守	一領合浦太守（今廉州），一領九真太守（今清化），一領南海太守（今廣州）	王乃表一領合浦太守，黼領九真太守，武領南海太守
32	變體器寬厚，謙虛下士	變性寬厚，謙虛下士	器禮寬厚，謙虛下士
33	中國士人往依，避難者以百數	漢朝名儒多往依之，以避亂者數百人，州人呼王曰大王	國人愛之，皆呼士王，漢之名士避難往依者以百數
34	陳國袁徽與尚書令荀彧書曰	時孔袁徽與尚書令荀彧書曰	丁亥二十一年，漢建安十二年，漢袁徽遺尚書令荀彧書曰
35	交趾士府君，既學問優博，又達於從政	交州士府君，學問優博，達於從政	交州士府君，既學問優博，又達於從政
36	處大亂之中，保全一郡	大亂之中，保全一方	處大亂之中，保全一郡
37	二十餘年，疆場無事，民不失業，羈旅之徒，皆蒙其慶	二十餘年，疆場無事，民不失業，羈旅之徒，皆蒙其賜	二十餘年，疆場無事，民不失業，羈旅之徒，皆蒙其慶

No.	<i>Sanguo zhi</i> 三國志	<i>Việt điện u linh</i> 粵甸幽靈	<i>Toàn thư</i> 大越史記全書
38	雖竇融保河西，曷以加之	雖竇融保河西，曷以加之	雖竇融保河西，曷以加之
39	變兄弟並為列郡，雄長一州	王之弟並為郡守，雄長一州	兄弟並為列郡，雄長一州
40	出入鳴鍾磬，備具威儀	王出入鳴鐘磬，備儀杖	出入鳴鐘磬，備具威儀
41	笳簫鼓吹，車騎滿道	笳簫鼓吹，車騎滿道	笳鼓簫吹，車騎滿道，
42	胡人夾轂焚燒香者，常有數十	州人夾轂焚香迎送，	胡人夾轂焚香者，常有數十
43	當時貴重，震服百蠻，尉他不足踰也	當時貴重，威服百蠻，尉他不能踰也	當時貴重，震服百蠻，尉佗不能逾也
44	變在郡四十餘歲，黃武五年，年九十卒	王在位四十年，壽九十年	在位四十年，壽九十年

As seen in Table 2, except in the case of sentences 11 and 30, *Việt điện u linh* copied almost every word in the Shi Xie story in *Sanguo zhi*. In *Việt điện u linh*, only some characters were modified: for example, Jingshi (京師) in *Sanguo zhi* in sentence 5 was changed to Hanjing (漢京), and the character *cha* (察) in sentence 8 was changed to *ju* (舉). In *Việt điện u linh*, some content from *Sanguo zhi* was also removed—for example, the section about Liu Ziqi (劉子奇) in sentence 5. In the case of sentences 31 onward, the order of the sentence was changed. In *Sanguo zhi*, these sentences were in the first section, but in *Việt điện u linh* they were relocated to later sections.

Sentence 30, “wang zhi di you sanzi” (王之弟有三子), was inferred from sentence 31 in *Sanguo zhi* (Shi Xie had three younger siblings), but *Việt điện u linh* mistook “the three siblings” as “the three children of his younger brother.”

In Sentence 11, *Việt điện u linh* added a new sentence with no equivalent content in *Sanguo zhi*—“wang zhi leilou ji guangxin ersuo” (王治羸隴及廣信二所)—stating that Shi Xie located the headquarters in the counties of Leilou and Guangxin. Comparing the content of the Shi Xie chapter in *Toàn thư* with *Việt điện u linh* and *Sanguo zhi* in Table 2, it is clear that the idea of “Leilou = Longbian” in *Toàn thư* was based on *Việt điện u linh*.

In the Shi Xie chapter, although *Toàn thư* makes reference to *Sanguo zhi*,³⁹ in general it largely copies *Việt điện u linh*. This is evidenced by the fact that *Toàn thư* retains almost every modification that *Việt điện u linh* made when copying *Sanguo zhi*, notably Hanjing in sentence 5, or *ju* in sentence 8.

Toàn thư also copied from *Việt điện u linh*, as the comments by Ngô Sĩ Liên in the chapter on Shi Xie show. In the comments, Ngô Sĩ Liên mentioned the event of Linyi warriors unearthing Shi Xie's tomb at the end of the Jin. When compared with the contents of *Việt điện u linh* (Table 3), it is apparent that Ngô Sĩ Liên copied almost the same contents from *Báo cực truyện* (報極傳), cited in *Việt điện u linh*.

When copying from *Việt điện u linh*, Ngô Sĩ Liên modified sentence 11 (王治羸隲及廣信二所) in *Việt điện u linh* into 都羸隲 (隲一作樓, 即龍編), meaning “situate the headquarters in Leilou, which was Longbian.” In short, *Toàn thư*'s idea that “Shi Xie's headquarters = Leilou” was inherited from *Việt điện u linh*.

“Shi Xie's Headquarters = Leilou” in *Việt điện u linh*

The above sections have shown that the idea that “Shi Xie's headquarters = Leilou,” a premise that the editors of *Toàn thư* including Ngô Sĩ Liên used to establish that “Leilou = Lũng Khê,” was actually adopted from *Việt điện u linh*. The question, then, is how reliable the information in *Việt điện u linh* is.

As shown above, regarding the life of Shi Xie, in addition to the idea that he established his headquarters in Leilou, *Việt điện u linh* took most of its details from *Sanguo zhi*. However, the sentence 王治羸隲及廣信二所 is in conflict with a historical fact: Shi Xie never situated his headquarters in Guangxin County.

All the historical records concerning Shi Xie in *Hou hanshu* or *Sanguo zhi* agree that Shi Xie was not the Jiaozhou *cishi* (Department Head), but only the Jiaozhi *taishou* (Commandery Head). Both *Hou hanshu* and *Sanguo zhi* indicate that the position of Jiaozhou *cishi* existed—it was held by Zhang Jin and Bu Zhi, for example. After the Jiaozhou *cishi* Zhang Jin died, to prevent Shi Xie from taking the side of Liu Biao (劉表), Emperor Xian of the Han—but in practice Cao Cao (曹操)—tried to gain the loyalty of Shi Xie by granting him the authority to “supervise seven commanderies” (董督七郡). The question is whether Shi Xie could possibly have situated the headquarters in Guangxin.

39 That *Toàn thư* did make reference to *Sanguo zhi* is shown by the fact that *Toàn thư* added some contents that had been removed from *Việt điện u linh*, such as the part about 劉子奇 in sentence 5, and an erratum that suggests that the phrase 王之弟有三子在 *Việt điện u linh*, sentence 30 should be 王之弟三人.

TABLE 3 Comparison of Ngô Sĩ Liên's comments and *Việt điện u linh*

No	<i>Việt điện u linh</i> (Báo cực truyện) 粵甸幽靈 (報極傳)	Toàn thư 大越史記全書
1	至晉末，凡百六十餘年	至晉末，凡百六十餘年
2	林邑入寇，掘王陵塚	林邑人入寇，掘發王塚
3	見王體不壞	見其體面如生
4	大懼，復埋	大懼，乃復封瘞
5	土人以為神，立廟祀之	土人以為神，立廟事之
6	號曰土王僊	號土王僊

First, although Emperor Xian granted Shi Xie the authority to “supervise seven commanderies,” Shi Xie was retained as “the Jiaozhi *taishou* as normal” (領交阯太守如故). Meanwhile, Liu Biao appointed Lai Gong (賴恭) as the Jiaozhou *cishi* in place of Zhang Jin, and Wu Ju (吳巨) as the Cangwu *taishou* in place of Shi Huang (史瓚). This meant that even after the death of Zhang Jin, Shi Xie was not the Jiaozhou *cishi* and his power did not extend to the area of Guangxin (Cangwu).⁴⁰

In short, all historical records in *Houhan shu* affirm that Shi Xie was never appointed as a Jiaozhou *cishi* who ruled over all seven commanderies, and that his highest position was only as a Jiaozhi *taishou* who ruled over the Jiaozhi Commandery. Guangxin County was part of the Cangwu Commandery, the headquarters of the Jiaozhi (Jiaozhou) *cishi*. Shi Xie, as the Jiaozhi *taishou*, could not have established his headquarters in Guangxin. The misleading information in *Việt điện u linh* might originate from the fact that Shi Xie's homeland was Guangxin, or because the author of *Việt điện u linh* mistook Shi Xie's position of Jiaozhi *taishou* for Jiaozhi *cishi*.

In conclusion, the viewpoint that “Leilou = Lũng Khê” was established very early; passages in the Pháp Hiền and Thông Biện chapters in *Thiên uyển*

40 「津後又為其將區景所殺，而荊州牧劉表遣零陵賴恭代津，是時蒼梧太守史瓚死，表又遣吳巨代之，與恭俱至，漢聞張津死，賜變璽書曰，交州絕域，南帶江海，上恩不宣，下義壅隔，知逆賊劉表又遣賴恭闖看南土，今以變為綏南中郎將，董督七郡，領交阯太守如故，後變遣吏張旻奉貢詣京都，是時天下喪亂，道路斷絕，而變不廢貢職，特復下詔拜安遠將軍，封龍度亭侯」(『三國志』吳書，卷49)。

tập anh and in *Toàn thư* provided the basis for the conclusion that “Leilou = Longbian = Lũng Khê.” However, considering *Thiên uyển tập anh* as a collection of chapters that were written in different periods, it is clear that that claim that “Leilou = Lũng Khê” in the Pháp Hiền and Thông Biện chapters was not very popular. Other chapters offered a different opinion, namely, that the area of Lũng Khê was part of Longbian (“Longbian = Lũng Khê”).

In *Toàn thư*, Ngô Sĩ Liên inherited from *Việt điện u linh* the idea that “Shi Xie’s headquarters = Leilou,” and he later noted that “Leilou means Longbian (Leilou = Longbian).” So he finally drew on the idea that “the shrine dedicated to Shi Xie was located in the old Longbian Citadel (Lũng Khê)” to establish that “Leilou = Longbian = Lũng Khê.” However, Leilou could not be Longbian. Moreover, the idea that “Shi Xie’s headquarters = Leilou” in *Việt điện u linh* was inserted when the author of *Việt điện u linh* copied *Sanguo zhi*, and is thus not reliable. Apart from this piece of information, however, *Việt điện u linh* copied almost every word in *Sanguo zhi*. It means that *Việt điện u linh* was not informed by a different and new source of material about Shi Xie. Furthermore, the sentence that linked Shi Xie and Leilou in *Việt điện u linh* contained misleading information, particularly as it implied that Shi Xie situated his headquarters in Guangxin.

Although the idea that “Leilou = Lũng Khê” developed very early in Vietnam (possibly since the Trần with the compilation of *Việt điện u linh*), it was not based on reliable material, and it was in conflict with the idea widely held in pre-tenth century literature that Leilou was located west of Hanoi.

Meanwhile, if we assume that “Leilou = Lũng Khê,” we will have difficulty locating the Longbian Citadel. If “Leilou = Lũng Khê,” because “Leilou ≠ Longbian” there must have been another Longbian Citadel different from Lũng Khê. To solve this puzzle, some scholars have tried to locate Longbian in the provincial center of Bắc Ninh or Yên Phong. However, investigations and fieldwork from French colonial rule until the present day have not found any remains corresponding to the location of this hypothetical Longbian Citadel.

“Longbian = Lũng Khê”: Recently Discovered Epigraphic Materials

Compared to the view that “Leilou = Lũng Khê,” the view that “Longbian = Lũng Khê” is even more widely held in the existing literature.

As illustrated above, in *Thiên uyển tập anh*, apart from the two chapters on Pháp Hiền and Thông Biện, other chapters agree that the Lũng Khê area and adjacent areas belonged to Longbian (“Longbian = Lũng Khê”). *Đại Việt sử lược*,

compiled under the Trần, does not contain any information on Leilou in the notes for 1034 and 1161.⁴¹

Although *Toàn thư* embraced the view that “Leilou = Lũng Khê,” the manner in which Ngô Sĩ Liên phrased his notes and his comments indirectly implied that in the fifteenth century, the Lũng Khê area was widely known as “the old Longbian Citadel” (龍編故城). First, it is important to clarify how Ngô Sĩ Liên described the area where the shrine dedicated to Shi Xie was situated (Lũng Khê). He did not call the area “the old Leilou Citadel” but rather “the old Longbian Citadel.” When he mentioned Leilou, Ngô Sĩ Liên noted that “Leilou means Longbian.” This shows that in Ngô Sĩ Liên’s view, in the fifteenth century the location of Leilou was not well known. Hence, he had to use Longbian as a cross-reference, for Longbian (the old Longbian citadel) was widely known as the place where the shrine dedicated to Shi Xie was located.⁴² This fact is compatible with Nishimura Masanari’s view that “Longbian = Lũng Khê,”⁴³ which has been confirmed by recently discovered stele inscriptions.

First, in 2004, an inscribed stele from the Jiaozhou Sarira Stupa (Figs. 1, 2), dated 601 CE, was discovered along with a stone casket in Trí Quả commune (Thuận Thành, Bắc Ninh). In 601 CE, Emperor Wen of the Sui Dynasty distributed *sarira* (relics of Buddhist monks) to all thirty *zhou* across the country, including Jiaozhou. In Jiaozhou a stupa was built to house the *sarira*, and a stone stele was raised to commemorate the burying of the *sarira* and the construction of the stupa. The Sarira Stupa inscription matches the notes in *Guang hong ming ji* (廣弘明集), compiled by Monk Daoxuan (道宣) in the Tang, and this suggests that the place where the stele and the stone casket (presumed to be the original container of the *sarira*) were discovered was 交州龍編縣禪衆寺, namely, the Thiền Chúng Pagoda (禪衆寺) in Longbian County.

However, my research on the stele suggests that the location where this stele was discovered in 2004 was not the original location of the Thiền Chúng Pagoda. Rather, based on the notes in *Thiền uyển tập anh*, the Thiền Chúng

41 「古州法雲寺僧上言，寺中放光數道，隨光掘之，得石函一，函內有銀函，銀函內有金函，金函內有瑠璃瓶，瓶中有舍利」(『越史略』卷中，甲戌天成 7 年〈1034〉條)。「秋七月，起古州法雲寺」(『越史略』卷中，辛巳大定 22 年〈1161〉7 月條)。

42 There is only one place in *Toàn thư*, namely in the notes for 1188, where the authors suggested that Pháp Vân Pagoda was located in Leilou. The notes for 1034 and 1161, however, indicate that Pháp Vân Pagoda was located in Cổ Pháp hamlet. We therefore believe that the note “Leilou” in the notes of 1188 was added by Ngô Sĩ Liên himself.

43 Nishimura, *Archaeology and Ancient History of Vietnam*, 155–176.

FIGURE 1 Area near the Lũng Khê Citadel, showing the original location of the stela bearing the Sarira Stupa inscription and the place where it was discovered, and the location of the shrine built by Tao Huang.
MAP SOURCE: GOOGLE MAPS.

FIGURE 2 Rubbing of the Sarira Stupa inscription discovered at Trĩ Quả commune (Thuận Thành, Bắc Ninh) in 2012.
PHOTO: PHẠM LÊ HUY.

Pagoda in Longbian County under the Sui was located on 天福峯, namely, on Thiên Phúc Mount, one of the eight mounts of Tiên Du Mountain (仙遊山). Tiên Du Mountain was five km north of the area where the stele was discovered in 2004, and approximately 6.5 km northwest of the Lũng Khê Citadel.⁴⁴

This identification of the original location of the *sarira* stele suggests that the area of the Lũng Khê Citadel belonged to Longbian County under the Northern and Southern Dynasties—i.e., in the Sui–Tang periods.⁴⁵ Because Longbian County under the Tang was part of Longbian County under the Han, the area of the citadel was also part of Longbian County under the Han.

Regarding the location of the Longbian Citadel under the Han, *Yuanhe junxian tuzhi* suggests that in Longbian County under the Tang there was a citadel called “the old Jiaozhou Citadel” (交州故城) built by the Jiaozhou *cishi*, Tao Huang (陶璜), during the Wu period, about 14 *li* (7 km) to the east of the Longbian County headquarters.⁴⁶ Although there are still different views on the location of Leilou, the majority of contemporary scholars, including Nishimura, agree that “the old Jiaozhou Citadel” built by Tao Huang was the Lũng Khê Citadel.

This view is further confirmed by a stele inscription discovered in 2013. In the shrine of Tao Huang in Thanh Hoài hamlet (Thuận Thành, Bắc Ninh), near the Lũng Khê Citadel (Fig. 1), Nguyễn Phạm Bằng, a researcher from Bắc Ninh museum, discovered an ancient stone stele. On the front and back of the stele are two inscriptions with different dates. Although the inscription on the front has faded and hence cannot provide much information, the inscription on the reverse has a clear date of 450 CE. It was composed by a person named Tao Zhenzhi (陶珍之), a descendant of Tao Huang, at Tao Huang’s shrine on December 25, 450 CE. Tao Zhen Zhi performed this task at the command of the

44 Phạm Lê Huy, “Nhân Thọ Sarira Stupa and the Recently Discovered Sarira Stupa Inscription in Bắc Ninh” (Nhân Thọ xá lợi tháp và Văn bia tháp xá lợi mới phát hiện tại Bắc Ninh), *Vietnam Archaeology* (Khảo cổ học) 181 (2013): 60–79; Phạm Lê Huy, “The Recently Discovered Jiaozhou Sarira Stupa Inscription in Vietnam” (新発見の仁寿元年の交州舍利塔銘について), in *Bukkyo Bunmei to Sezoku Chitsuzo* (仏教文明と世俗秩序), ed. Shinkawa Tokio 新川登亀男 (Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 2014), 28–64.

45 That Tiên Du Mountain was part of Longbian County corresponds to a note in *Jiaozhou Diaries* (交州記) (cited from *Houhan shu*) that in the west of Longbian County stood Mount Tiên Sơn, and *Taiping huanyu ji* wrote that in Longbian County was located Mount Phật Tích 佛跡山. 「(龍編) 縣西帶江, 有仙山數百里」(『後漢書』志第 23 所引『交州記』), 「佛跡山」(『太平寰宇記』卷 170, 龍編縣).

46 「交州故城, 在縣東十四里, 吳時刺史陶璜所築」(『元和郡縣圖志』卷38).

Jiaozhou *cishi* Xiao Jing Xian (蕭景憲), announced by a person named Wang Fa Ling (王法齡) on November 10 of the same year.⁴⁷

The discovery of this stele indicates that Tao Huang's shrine in Thanh Hoài hamlet was built and redecorated no later than the fifth century. Because the shrine was located only 2 km to the west of the Lũng Khê Citadel, it is important evidence that the Lũng Khê Citadel was the Longbian Citadel built by Tao Huang.⁴⁸

Conclusion

In Vietnam, it has long been held that Leilou and Longbian were the same citadel ("Leilou = Longbian"). However, building on ideas proposed by Trần Quốc Vượng and Nishimura Masanari,⁴⁹ this paper has examined historical documents and reached the conclusion that in pre-tenth century records, Leilou and Longbian were listed as two distinct administrative counties ("Leilou ≠ Longbian"). Early records such as *Hanshu*, *Hou Hanshu*, and *Shuijing shu* provide good evidence for rejecting the view that Leilou and Longbian were the same citadel.

Regarding the location of the Leilou Citadel under the Han, some materials in post-tenth century literature state that the Leilou Citadel and Leilou County under the Han were located west of modern Hanoi. However, as Vietnam entered the era of independence, a new idea emerged that Leilou was located in the area of the Lũng Khê Citadel and surrounding areas, notably in *Toàn thư* and the chapters on Pháp Hiền and Thông Biện in *Thiên uyển tập anh*.

In the fifteenth century, Ngô Sĩ Liên and *Toàn thư* played an important role in disseminating the idea that Leilou was located in Lũng Khê. The equation of Leilou with Lũng Khê in *Toàn thư* was largely based on the statement in *Việt điện u linh* that "Shi Xie situated his headquarters in Leilou and Guangxin." However, this statement cannot be trusted. Throughout his lifetime, Shi Xie's

47 Phạm Lê Huy, "Research on the stele of Đào Hoàng shrine (Thanh Hoài commune, Thuận Thành district, Bắc Ninh province)" (Khảo cứu Bia Miếu Đào Hoàng [Nghè thôn Thanh Hoài, Thuận Thành, Bắc Ninh]), *Vietnam Archaeology* (Khảo cổ học) 199 (2016): 48–59.

48 The assumption that Tao Huang's citadel was the Longbian Citadel also agrees with the notes of *Jinshu*. According to the Wang Liang 王諒 chapter in *Jinshu*, in the fourth century CE, when Wang Liang fought Liang Shuo 梁碩 for the post of Jiaozhou Department head, they fought battles in Longbian. 「諒陰謀誅碩，使客刺之，弗克，遂率眾圍諒於龍編」(『晉書』卷89，王諒傳)。

49 Trần Quốc Vượng, "The Position of Luy Lâu," 3–7; Nishimura, *Archaeology and Ancient History of Vietnam*, 155–176.

highest position was the head of Jiaozhi Commandery, not the head of Jiaozhi Department (Jiaozhou). Shi Xie therefore could not have situated his headquarters in the Guangxin Commandery as written in *Việt điện u linh*. The confusion in *Việt điện u linh* (and later *Toàn thư*) may have originated because Shi Xie's homeland was Guangxin, or because the author of *Việt điện u linh* failed to recognize the difference between the positions of the Jiaozhi *taishou* and the Jiaozhou *cishi*.

When Ngô Sĩ Liên compiled the Shi Xie chapter of *Toàn thư*, he cited the statement in *Việt điện u linh* as evidence that Shi Xie had situated his headquarters in Leilou. Because Shi Xie's shrine was located in the area of the Lũng Khê Citadel, Ngô Sĩ Liên concluded that Leilou was Lũng Khê. And a new body of literature in the later period—*Toàn thư*, stone stele inscriptions (the earliest being the stele 羸陵城重興聖廟碑, 1661 CE), the records in *Việt sử thông giám cương mục*, and *Đại Nam nhất thống chí*—adopted the idea that “Leilou = Longbian = Lũng Khê,” leading to the conclusion that “Lũng Khê = Leilou.”

By examining the texts in *Thiền uyển tập anh* and *Toàn thư*, it can be shown that apart from the idea that “Leilou = Lũng Khê,” there is another, more widely held idea that “Longbian = Lũng Khê.” In *Thiền uyển tập anh*, the view that “Leilou = Lũng Khê” existed only in the Pháp Hiền and Thông Biện chapters,⁵⁰ while other chapters such as Tỳ Ni Đa Lưu Chi, Sùng Phạm, and Thiền Nham all agree that the area of Lũng Khê and the surrounding areas were the same as Longbian. Although Ngô Sĩ Liên adopted the view that “Leilou = Lũng Khê,” he phrased his notes in *Toàn thư* in a manner that demonstrates that by the fifteenth century, the area of Shi Xie's shrine (Lũng Khê Citadel) was widely known as “the old Longbian Citadel,” not Leilou. *Toàn thư* noted that Leilou “means Longbian,” further supporting the above view.

Given the existing evidence, the view that the Lũng Khê citadel was the Longbian Citadel (“Lũng Khê = Longbian”), represented by Nishimura Masanari, is the most plausible opinion and is consistent with what is written in both pre-tenth century texts and recently discovered stele inscriptions. The Sarira Stupa stele inscription of 601 CE clearly shows that the area of Tiên Du Mountain and the surrounding regions (including the Lũng Khê) belonged to Longbian County during the Han, Northern and Southern Dynasties, Sui, and

50 According to Nguyễn Lang (1973), Thông Biện (?–1134), a Zen master of the Ly, was the first to compile the chapters of Tỳ Ni Đa Lưu Chi and his disciple, Pháp Hiền. However, differences in opinion between these chapters regarding the location of Pháp Vân Pagoda show that they were modified at a later stage. For example, in the chapter on Pháp Hiền, there is a note stating, “refer to the chapter on Thông Biện” (詳在通辨禪師傳), which shows that the chapter on Pháp Hiền was edited by someone who lived after Thông Biện.

Tang periods. During the Wu period, the Longbian Citadel was redecorated by Tao Huang, the Jiaozhou *cishi*. Although not of decisive importance, the inscription dated to 450 CE discovered to the east of Lũng Khê in 2013 supports this view. Archaeological findings show that the Longbian – Lũng Khê Citadel was used until the Northern and Southern Northern Dynasties and the Sui. Under the Tang, the Longbian – Lũng Khê Citadel was no longer used as the headquarters of Longbian County, the latter being 14 *li* east of the Lũng Khê Citadel.

If we accept the hypothesis of Nishimura Masanari that the Lũng Khê Citadel was the Longbian Citadel, the question then is how to pinpoint the location of the Leilou Citadel under the Han. If *Yuanhe junxian tuzhi*'s assertion that the Leilou Citadel under the Han was located 75 *li* to the west of the capital of the Protectorate under the Tang is correct, it can be hypothesized that the Quên Citadel in the area of Tuyết Nghĩa commune (Quốc Oai, Hà Nội) had some connection with the Leilou Citadel under the Han. Indeed, fieldwork on the Quên Citadel has shown that it was constructed during the Han period.⁵¹

51 Đỗ Văn Ninh, "Quên Citadel – The Base of Đỗ Cảnh Thạc, One of the Twelve Warlords in the Tenth Century" (Thành Quên, căn cứ của Đỗ Cảnh Thạc, một trong mười hai sứ quân thế kỷ thứ X), *Journal of Historical Studies* (Nghiên cứu Lịch sử) 132 (1970): 93–94; Nishimura, *Archaeology and Ancient History of Vietnam*, 167.