

On the Date of the Kidarites (2)

By Kazuo ENOKI

V

According to the *Hsi-yü-ch'uan* of *Wei-shu* 魏書西域傳, the Great Yüeh-shih expanded their territory to the south of the Hindûkush at the time of Chi-to-lo 寄多羅 (Kidâra) and subjugated five countries to the north of Gandhâra. But when did the expansion actually take place? Chinese sources will provide us with more or less substantial information regarding the question. First, the *Fo-kuo-chi* 佛國記 of Fa-hsien 法顯 records the following information obtained in the year 402 A.D. when he visited the Gandhâra regions:

"I reached the Chien-t'o-wei Country 犍陀衛國. This is the place where Fa-i 法益 (Dharmavardhana), Aśoka's son, governed. Also, when the Buddha was a Boddhisattva, he dedicated his eyes in this country to the people and at the spot (people or Fa-i) constructed a big stûpa which was decorated with gold and silver. Many people of the country follow the Hîmayâna sects."⁽¹⁾

Further, after describing Ch'a-shih-lo 剌尸羅 (Takṣaśilâ=Taxila) to the east of Gandhâra and modern Mânikyâla, famous for a Jâtaka story that the Buddha fed there a hungry tiger with his own flesh, he writes:

"Travelling southwards from the Chien-t'o-wei Country for four days, I reached the Fu-lou-sha Country 弗樓沙國 (Puruṣapura)."⁽²⁾

There he writes of the big stûpa in the country, as well as of the bowl of the Buddha's treasured in the stûpa, and the story that once a Yüeh-shih king attempted to carry it away by military force, but, since it was too heavy to be moved, he built the great stûpa for it. Martin takes this Yüeh-shih king for an Ephthalite, but the king actually corresponds, as was discussed in the first chapter, to King Kaniṣka of the Kushâns. The Chien-t'o-wei 犍陀衛 Country described by Fa-hsien is Puṣkalâvatî or what is now Chârsadda to the northeast of Peshawar and the Fu-lou-sha Country is Puruṣapura (=Peshawar). Fa-hsien further describes the Buddha's skull enshrined in Hsi-lo 醯羅 (Hilo=Hidda, Haḍḍa) on the border of the country of Na-chieh 那竭國

(1) 到犍陀衛國，是阿育王子法益所治處，佛爲菩薩時，亦於此國以眼施人，其處亦起大塔，金銀校飾，此國人多小乘學。(*Tripitaka Taishô*, Vol. 51, p. 858b)

(2) 從犍陀衛國南行四日，到弗樓沙國。(*Tripitaka Taishô*, Vol. 51, p. 858b). Cf. *M.T.B.*, 27, p. 28 note 1.

(Nagarahara=Jelalabad) to the west of Fu-lou-sha, as well as the city of Na-chieh-kuo and the Cave of the Shadow of the Buddha 佛影窟 to the south of the city. It should be noted that the accounts are written as if these countries were independent of each other and that there had never existed a power to unite them. It shows a good contrast when Fa-hsien clearly records that the Middle Country (Madhyadeśa), that is, regions along the Gangetic Basin, had been under the reign of a king (of the Gupta Dynasty).⁽¹⁾ One should consider, therefore, that the unification of the north and south of the Hindūkush by the Kidarites had not yet been achieved by the time Fa-hsien visited there.

This is also proved by the *Ta-chih-tu-lun* 大智度論 (*Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa*) translated by Kumārajīva 鳩摩羅什 between the fourth and (the 27th day of the twelfth month of) the seventh year of Hung-shih 弘始 (*viz.* 402–Feb. 1, 406) of the Later Ch'in 後秦 Dynasty. Book 11 of the *Ta-chih-tu-lun* reads:

“For instance, in Fu-chia-lo City 弗迦羅城 of the Great Yüeh-shih (Country), there was a painter named Ch'ien-na 千那. He went to the eastern country of To-ch'a-t'o-lo 多剌陀羅 and stayed there to paint for twelve years, receiving thirty *liang* 兩 of gold.”⁽²⁾

This Fu-chia-lo City is the same as the Great City of Fu-chia-lo-p'o-to 弗迦羅婆多大城 in the *Ta-chih-tu-lun*, Bk. 3,⁽³⁾ which denotes Puṣkalāvātī. The identification is also confirmed by the statement that To-ch'a-t'o-lo 多剌陀羅, or actually To-ch'a-shih-lo 多剌施羅, (*Takṣaśīlā*) is to the east of it.⁽⁴⁾ The *Ta-chih-tu-lun*, Bk. 9, also says:

“It is just like going to the country to the west of the Great Yüeh-shih, where the Buddha's *jou-chi* 肉髻 or *uṣṇīṣa* is preserved.”⁽⁵⁾

Thus, Hsi-lo 醯羅城, where the Buddha's *uṣṇīṣa* preserved, is recorded as being to the west of the Great Yüeh-shih. Further, the *Ta-chih-tu-lun*, Bk. 9, states:

“(The Buddha Śākya-muni) sometimes came for a short period to the country of *the Yüeh-shih in North India* and gained control over the Nāga King A-po-lo 阿波羅 or Apalāla, and, going to the west of the country

(1) *Tripitaka Taishō*, Vol. 51, p. 859b. This is under the reign of Chandra-gupta II. Concerning Fa-hsien's statements to this effect, see R.C. Majumdar, ed. by, *The Classical Age (The History and Culture of the Indian People, Vol. III)*, Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan 1954, pp. 22, 346 and D.D. Kosambi, *Ancient India*, N.Y.: Pantheon Books 1965, p. 193.

(2) 譬如大月氏弗迦羅城中有一畫師，名千那，到東方多剌陀羅國，客畫十二年，得三十兩金。(下略)。(*Tripitaka Taishō*, Vol. 25, p. 141 c)

(3) *Tripitaka Taishō*, Vol. 25, p. 76 c.

(4) In other editions, this is written as To-li-shih-lo 多利施羅 and To-ch'a-lo-shih 多剌羅施 (see the collations of *Tripitaka Taishō*). In the *Ta-chih-tu-lun* 大智度論, Bk. 10, as quoted in the *Ching-lü i-hsiang* 經律異相, Bk. 44 (*Tripitaka Taishō*, Vol. 53, p. 228 c), it is written as To-li-t'o-lo-kuo 多利陀羅國. The correct form is To-ch'a-shih-lo 多剌施羅.

(5) 如大月氏西佛肉髻住處國。(*Tripitaka Taishō*, Vol. 25, p. 126 c)

of the *Yüeh-shih*, he defeated the female *lo-ch'a* or rakṣasī. The Buddha spent a night in the stone cave and his figure is still there at present. If one goes into (the cave) to see it, he does not see it, but, if he comes out of the cave, he sees the luminous figure far off."⁽¹⁾

Thus, the area where the Buddha controlled Apalāla, Nāga King, that is to say, the riverhead of the Swāt according to the *Records of the Western Regions* 西域記, is called the country of the *Yüeh-shih* and Nagarāhara where the Cave of the Shadow of the Buddha existed is recorded as being situated at the west of the country of the *Yüeh-shih*.⁽²⁾ It is uncertain whether 'the west of the Great *Yüeh-shih*' or 'the west of the *Yüeh-shih* Country' means the western neighbour of the Great *Yüeh-shih* or *Yüeh-shih*, or the western part of the region called the Great *Yüeh-shih* or *Yüeh-shih*; but most probably the latter.

In this way, Kumārajīva refers to Gandhāra and the riverhead region of the Swāt as the Great *Yüeh-shih* or *Yüeh-shih* in the *Ta-chih-tu-lun*, while he translates the Tokhārestān area as the Little *Yüeh-shih*. In the *Ta-chih-tu-lun*, Bk. 25, it is stated that "An-t'o-lo 安陀羅, Shê-p'o-lo 舍婆羅 (which is the country of the naked), Tou-ch'ü-lo 兜咄羅 (the Little *Yüeh-shih*), Hsiu-li 修利, An-hsi 安息, Ta-ch'in-kuo 大秦國, etc. are among these countries on the frontier."⁽³⁾ It is needless to say that Tou-ch'ü-lo 兜咄羅 is a transliteration of Tokhāra, that is to say, Tokhārestān, the ancient Bactrian region. This part of the *Ta-chih-tu-lun* seems to have originally had notes for each country listed as is shown by the *Fan-fan-yü* 翻梵語, in which the following notes are given as for Bk. 25 of the *Ta-chih-tu-lun*:

- (1) (釋迦牟尼佛) 有時暫來北天竺月氏國, 降阿波羅龍王, 又至月氏國西, 降女羅刹, 佛在彼石窟中一宿, 于今佛影猶在, 有人就內看之則不見, 出孔遙觀光相。(下略). (*Tripitaka Taishō*, Vol. 25, p. 126 b & c). This statement is quoted in the *Ching-lü i-hsiang* 經律異相, Bk. 6, as from the *Ta-chih-tu (-lun)*, Bk. 12. See the *Tripitaka Taishō*, Vol. 53, p. 27c. As to the Cave of the Shadow of the Buddha, see the *Shih-chia-p'u* 釋迦譜, Bk. 3 (*Tripitaka Taishō*, Vol. 50, pp. 67-68) and Yüan-chuang 玄奘's *Hsi-yü-chi* 西域記 (ed. Kyoto University), Bk. 2, p. 23.
- (2) Watters, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, I, pp. 184-186: Kentoku Hori 堀謙德, *Kaisetsu Saiikiki* 解說西域記, Tokyo 1912, pp. 166-168.
- (3) 安陀羅 (Andhra), 舍婆羅裸國也, 兜咄羅小月氏 (Tokhāra), 修利 (Sūli=Soghdiana), 安息 (Parthia), 大秦國 (the Roman Orient) 等, 在此邊國中生. (*Tripitaka Taishō*, Vol. 25, p. 243 a). It is the Reverend Benkyō Shiio 椎尾辨匡 that first gave his attention to this account. He took this Little *Yüeh-shih* for those who remained in the western part of Kan-su 甘肅 when the Great *Yüeh-shih* moved westwards in the Han Dynasty, and believed this account to be one proof that the *Yüeh-shih* were the same as Tokhāra or the Tokharians (*Tokara no Minzoku Chiri Nendai* 觀貨羅の民族地理年代, *Shigaku-Zasshi* 史學雜誌, Vol. 23 (1912), pp. 685-686). Later, Wang Kuo-wei 王國維 (*Hsi-hu-kao* 西胡考, in the *Kuan-t'ang chi-lin* 觀堂集林, Bk. 13, p. 11 verso, contained in the *Wang Chung-ch'üeh-kung wei-shu* 王忠愍公遺書) and S. Lévi (*Le "Tokharien"*, *JA*, 1933, I, p.24-25 = *Fragments de textes koutchéens, Cahiers de la Société Asiatique*, II, Paris 1933, p.24-25) came to the same conclusion. P. Pelliot (*Le Tokharien et Koutchéen*, *JA*, 1934, p.44-45) is of the opinion that this Little *Yüeh-shih* should be interpreted as those in North-western India, but, since it was the time of

‘An-t’o-lo 安陀羅 is translated as blind,
 Tou-ch’ü-lo 兜咄羅 is translated as Hsiao-yüeh-shih 小月氏 or the Little
 Yüeh-shih,
 Shê-p’o-lo 舍婆羅 is translated as naked,
 (of) Hsiu-li 修利 and An-an-hsi 安安息 (for 安息), Hsiu-li is translated as
 hu 胡.’’⁽¹⁾

The above would not be interpretations given by the editor of the *Fan-fan-yü*, but an actual reproduction of what was recorded in the *Ta-chih-tu-lun* which he referred to. The Sanskrit text of the *Ta-chih-tu-lun* had already been lost, and the *Ta-chih-tu-lun* itself seems to have had not a few differences in such as volume numbers, etc. as is seen by the comparison of the present edition with what is quoted in the *Ching-lü i-hsiang* 經律異相 compiled

Emperor T’ai-wu 太武帝 (436-451) and later than 413 when Kumārajīva died that merchants of the Ta-yüeh-shih came to the Northern Wei and told about the Peshawar region where Kidāra’s son ruled, there exists a chronological contradiction. Therefore, Pelliot considers that the Little Yüeh-shih in Kan-su were the only Yüeh-shih known to the Chinese at the time of Kumārajīva and that they might have been accordingly identified with the Tou-ch’ü-lo 兜咄羅. G. Haloun (*Zur Üe-tši Frage*, ZDMG, 1937, p. 276-280, 290, especially p. 280 note) quotes the *Ta-chih-tu-lun* 大智度論 which names the Gandhāra and Swāt regions as the Great Yüeh-shih or the Yüeh-shih and claims that, since the name of (Great Yüeh-shih or) Yüeh-shih is used in Buddhistic documents at that time to mean a country in the Bactria-Indian area, the region specifically designated as the Little Yüeh-shih should be in Kan-su. W. B. Henning (*Argi and the “Tokharians”*, BSOS, IX, 1937-38, p. 562 note), not taking Haloun’s interpretation as conclusive, tries to solve the problem in a way similar to Pelliot’s. According to him, Kumārajīva naturally ought to have translated it as the Great Yüeh-shih, but he might have applied the name Little Yüeh-shih to the (actual) Yüeh-shih whom he knew to have been occupying the western border of Kan-su and who were referred to in Tibetan records as Thod-kar, Thod-gar: Drug-cun=*Tuγr-cun=Little Tuγr=Little Üe-tši.

- (1) 安陀羅譯曰盲也。兜咄羅譯曰小月氏也。舍婆羅譯曰裸也。修利安安息譯曰修利者胡 (*Tripitaka Taishō*, Vol. 54, p. 1034 b). Though it is obvious that 修利安安息 is meant for 修利安息, the passage 譯曰修利者胡 is a bit different in its style from the three translations preceding it. In any case, Hsiu-li means the Hu 胡 or Iranians, especially Soghdian. Cf. Su-li 率利 of Hsüan-chuang 玄奘 (Watters, *On Yuan Chwang’s Travels in India*, I, p. 71: *Hsi-yü-chi* 西域記, Bk. 2, p. 18, ed. Kyoto University), Su-li 速利 of I-ching 義淨 (*Ta-t’ang hsi-yü ch’iu-fa kao-sêng-chuan* 大唐西域求法高僧傳 under Hsüan-chao 玄照, and Fo-t’o-ta-mo 佛陀達摩 (Buddhadharma); also Kiroku Adachi 足立喜六, *Daitō Saiiki Guhō Kōsōden*, Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 1942, pp. 45-46), and Su-li 蘇哩 given as an equivalent to hu 胡 in the *Fan-yü ts’a-ming* 梵語雜名 (*Tripitaka Taishō*, Vol. 54, p. 1236 a). A. Herrmann explains Su-li 率利 of Hsüan-chuang and Su-li 速利 of Hsüan-chao as an equivalent to *Sogdik? (Soghdier), Tibetan Su-lig and Shulik (*Southern Tibet*, 8, p. 448). I-ching writes Tu-huo-su-li 觀貨速利. Tu-huo being an abbreviation of Tu-huo-lo 觀貨羅 (Adachi, *op. cit.*, pp. 2, 46), I-ching considered Su-li or Soghdiana to be a part of Tokhārestān, but, under Hsüan-chao 玄照, he writes that Hsüan-chao travelled via Su-li and Tu-huo-lo. This shows that I-ching also considered Su-li to be different from Tu-huo-lo. In this way, Tou-ch’ü-lo 兜咄羅, listed together with Hsiu-li 修利 (Soghdiana), An-hsi 安息 (Sasanid Persia) and Ta-ch’in-kuo 大秦國 (the coastal region of the eastern Mediterranean Sea under Byzantine rule), can not be considered to be a country at the western border of Kan-su 甘肅, but as the region of Tokhārestān to the north of the Hindūkush.

by Pao-ch'ang 寶唱 and others during the Liang 梁 (502–556). It can also be doubted as to whether the interpretation of 'the Little Yüeh-shih' given for Tou-ch'ü-lo 兜呒羅 was given by Kumârajîva himself or not. But, going through the *Ma-ming p'u-sa chuan* 馬鳴菩薩傳 or *Aśvaghōṣacarita*, also translated by Kumârajîva (344–413), Kaniṣka, patron of Aśvaghōṣa, is called the King of the Little Yüeh-shih Country (and the King of the Yüeh-shih as well):

"After that, the King of the *Little Yüeh-shih Country* in North India attacked Madhyadeśa. As he maintained the siege for a long time, the King of Middle India (=Madhyadeśa) sent him a message to inform him that, if he wanted anything, he would give it to him, for he could not bear to see sufferings of the people for such a long time. . . . (The King of the Little Yüeh-shih) replied; "There are two precious treasures in your country; one is the begging bowl of the Buddha's and the other is Bhikṣu Sarasvatī 辯才比丘. If you give them to me, they will suffice to what is equivalent to two hundred million gold (coins)". . . . (The King of Madhyadeśa) then gave these (two) to the King of the Yüeh-shih and made him return to his own country."⁽¹⁾

This account is well known as a basis for the theory of Staël-Holstein, Sten Konow and others who looked upon Kaniṣka as a descendant of the Little Yüeh-shih which remained near the western border of the Kan-su 甘肅 Province.⁽²⁾ However, the Little Yüeh-shih in the *Ta-chih-tu-lun* and *Ma-ming p'u-sa chuan*, which is not that of the period of Han, but that of the time of Kumârajîva, indicates the Tokhârestân region, north of the Hindûkush. One should, therefore, consider that Kumârajîva described Kaniṣka as the King of Tokhârestân or the Little Yüeh-shih Country only because he understood that the Kushan Dynasty to which Kaniṣka belonged had originated in that area. King Kaniṣka, as is seen in the *Fo-kuo-chi* 佛國記 of Fa-hsien quoted above, was described as having invaded and conquered Gandhâra. 'The King of the Little Yüeh-shih Country in North India' in the *Aśvaghōṣacarita* must mean none other than the King of the Little Yüeh-shih Country, who conquered North India. In this way, we now can clarify that it is Kumârajîva himself who translated the Tou-ch'ü-lo 兜呒羅 of the *Ta-chih-tu-lun* 大智度論 into the "Little Yüeh-shih". Kumârajîva called the Gandhâra and Swât regions the Great Yüeh-shih or simply Yüeh-shih probably because these areas, particularly the Gandhâra region around Puṣkalâvatî, had been the most prosperous since the Kushan Dynasty (=the Great Yüeh-shih). In the

(1) 其後北天竺小月氏國王，伐於中國，圍守經時，中天竺王遣信問言，若有所求當相給與，何足苦困人民久住此耶，(中略)，答言，汝國內有二大寶，一佛鉢，二辯才比丘，以此與我，足當二億金也，(中略)，即以與之月氏王，使還本國。 (*Tripitaka Taishō*, Vol. 50, pp. 183 c and 184 a).

(2) S. Lévi in *JA*, 1899, p. 475–76: Benkyō Shiiō 椎尾辨匡 in *Shigaku Zasshi*, 23, (1912), p. 69: Baron A. von Staël-Holstein in *SBAW*, 1914, p. 6483 ff.: S. Konow, *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions*, (*Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, Vol. II, Pt. 1), Calcutta 1929, p. lxxvi: P. Pelliot in *JA*, 1934, p. 45 n. 1: G. Haloun in *ZDMG*, 1937, p. 262 n. 4.

Biography of Kumârajîva (314–413) in the *Ch'u-san-tsang-chi-chi* 出三藏記集, Bk. 14, it is stated as follows:

“When (Kumârajîva) attained the age of twelve, his mother took him back (from Kashmir) to Kuei-tzû 龜茲 (=Kuči). They arrived at the mountain to the north of the Yüeh-shih 月氏北山, where they met a *lo-han* 羅漢 or arhat who admired Kumârajîva very much.”⁽¹⁾

This mountain to the north of the Yüeh-shih obviously indicates a place in the Hindûkush and the Yüeh-shih the Gandhâra region. This means that in 365 the Gandhâra region was known as Yüeh-shih to the Chinese.

Thus, the fact that Kumârajîva distinguishes Gandhâra from Tokhârestân by mentioning the former as the Great Yüeh-shih and the latter as the Little Yüeh-shih is to show that the north and south of the Hindûkush had not yet been united under a single political power during the period of 402–406 when he translated the *Ta-chih-tu-lun*.

In the meantime, Fa-hsien stayed in Ceylon from 410–412⁽²⁾ and recorded what he heard there about the whereabouts of the Buddha's begging bowl from then onwards:

“I, Fa-hsien, while in this country, heard an Indian priest, sitting on a high seat, recite (Buddhist) canons. He said that the Buddha's begging bowl originally had been in P'i-shê-li 毘舍離 (Vaiśālī = Besârh), but has been in Chien-t'o-wei 健陀衛 (Gandhâra) for some hundred years (when Fa-hsien first heard about this, a more precise number of years was given, but are now forgotten). It was then to arrive in *the Western Yüeh-shih Country* 西月氏國 and stay there for some hundred years, and then on to the Yü-t'ien Country 于闐國 (Khotan), (where it will be) for some hundred years, and then to Ch'ü-tz'ü 屈茨 (Kuči = Kucha), (where it will be) for some hundred years, and then to the land of China, where it will stay for some hundred years, then to the Shih-tz'ü or Lion Country 師子國 (Simhala = Ceylon), (where it will be) for some hundred years, then come back to the Middle India (Madhyadeśa), and then finally it will go up to the Tuṣita Heaven 兜術天, . . . etc.”⁽³⁾

- (1) 至年十二, 其母携還龜茲, 至月氏北山, 有一羅漢, 見而異之. (*Tripitaka Taishô*, Vol. 55, p. 100 b). Cf. the *Biography of Kumârajîva* in the *Kao-sêng-chuan* 高僧傳, Bk. 2, *Tripitaka Taishô*, Vol. 50, p. 330 b, which seems to have been based either directly on the *Ch'u-san-tsang-chi-chi* or on common sources. As to Yüeh-shih of the *Ch'u-san-tsang-chi-chi*, a variant Yüeh-ti 月氏 is given. The date of compilation of Kumârajîva's biography is not known. But it must be either just after he died at the end of Yao-ch'in 姚秦 or some time under the (Southern) Ch'i 齊 (479–501) for the reason that, at the beginning of biography, the name of Kumârajîva is explained as 'T'ung-shou 童壽 or child's life in the language of the Ch'in 秦言 or that of the (Southern) Ch'i 齊言'.
- (2) Ch'en Chung-mien 岑仲勉, *Fo-yu-t'ien-chu-chi k'ao-shih* 佛遊天竺記考釋, Shanghai: Commercial Press, 2nd. ed., 1934, pp. 112, 115, 116; Ho Ch'ang-ch'ün 賀昌群, *Ku-tai hsi-yü chiao-t'ung yü Fa-hsien Yin-tu hsün-li* 古代西域交通與法顯印度巡禮, Wu-han 武漢: Hu-pei jên-min ch'u-pan-shê 湖北人民出版社, 1956, p. 66.
- (3) 法顯在此國, 聞天竺道人於高座上誦經, 云, 佛鉢本在毘舍離, 今在健陀衛, 竟若干百年 (法顯

According to Fa-hsien,⁽¹⁾ the Buddha's begging bowl was in the Fu-lou-sha Country 弗樓沙國 (Puruṣapura or Peshawar) at that time and not in Gandhâra which was situated four days' distance to the north of Puruṣapura, but Gandhâra in this statement would mean Gandhâra in the wider sense, including Puruṣapura. Fa-hsien was told that there was a country called Western Yüeh-shih between Gandhâra and Khotan and that the Buddha's begging bowl then in Gandhâra was later to reach this country. The Western Yüeh-shih Country should, therefore, have been a big centre of Buddhism, well qualified to receive this bowl. Such an area can not be found at any other place than Bactria (Balkh). How prosperous Buddhism had been there is very minutely described in the chapter on Fu-k'o-kuo 縛喝國 in Hsüan-chuang's *Hsi-yü-chi* 西域記, Bk. 1, as well as in Hui-ch'ao 慧超's *Wang-wu-t'ien-chu-kuo-chuan* 往五天竺國傳.⁽²⁾ The city was once called Hsiao-wang-shê-ch'êng 小王舍城 or Little Rājagṛha.⁽³⁾ Western Yüeh-shih Country means the Yüeh-shih Country in the West and the name applies to the region of Bactria. This is because both the north and south of the Hindûkush had been called the Great Yüeh-shih (or Yüeh-shih) Country since the time of the Kushan Dynasty, the region of Bactria was named the Western Yüeh-shih Country since it was situated at the (north-) western part of the Yüeh-shih Country.⁽⁴⁾ Though it is uncertain whether a term 'Eastern Yüeh-shih' as opposed to 'Western Yüeh-shih' had ever existed or not, we know by the Western Yüeh-shih Country that the Bactria region in 410-412 was treated as an independent area, and that the north and south of the Hindûkush had not yet been united.

It is Dharmavikrama 曇無竭 or 法勇 who visited Gandhâra in the early twenties of the fifth century.⁽⁵⁾ According to the *Ch'u-san-tsang-chi-chi* 出三藏

聞誦之時，有定歲數，但今忘耳），當復至西月氏國，若干百年，當至于闐國，住若干百年，當至屈茨國，若干百年，當復來到漢地，住若干百年，當復至師子國，若干百年，當還中天竺，到中天已，當上兜術天上。（下略）（*Tripitaka Ssü-ch'i* 思溪 of 1131, reprinted by Wên-hsüeh ku-chi k'an-hsing-shê 文學古籍刊行社 in 1955, pp. 46-47a). Tou-shu-t'ien 兜術天 is one of the translations of Tuṣita. Cf. Hui-lin 慧琳, *I-ch'ieh-ching yin-i* 一切經音義, Bk. 6, (*Tripitaka Taishô*, Vol. 54, p. 342 c) under San-tu-shih-to 珊觀史多; also Hui-huang 慧晃's *Fan-yü tzü-tien* 梵語字典 (本名 枳橋易土集), edited by Enjun Fujii 藤井圓順 under the title *Bongo jiten*, Tokyo: Tetsugakukan Daigaku 1905, pp. 305-306.

- (1) 從犍陀衛國南行四日，至弗樓沙國……（闍賦伽）王作塔，成已，小塔即自傍出，大塔南，高三尺許，佛鉢即在此國。（法顯傳，pp. 8b-9a of the edition quoted in note (1)）.
- (2) *Hsi-yü-chi* 西域記, Bk. 1, p. 28ff, ed. Kyoto University 1911: *Wang-wu-t'ien-chu-kuo-chuan* 往五天竺國傳, 1931, Fol. 58 v.
- (3) J. Markwart, *Wehrot und Arang*, Leiden 1938, p. 44, translates the name simply as 'die Kleine Königsresidenz'. But it should not be taken as a common name, but as a name in imitation of Rājagṛha.
- (4) The Hsi-yüeh-shih-kuo 西月氏國 is also interpreted as meaning the Yüeh-shih Country situated in the West. Hui-lin (*Tripitaka Taishô*, Vol. 54, p. 576 a) explains Su-mochê 蘇莫遮 as having originated in the Hsi-kuei-tzū-kuo 西龜茲國 which does not mean the country of Western Kuei-tzū or Kuči in opposition to the country of Eastern Kuei-tzū, but the country of Kuei-tzū which existed to the West of China. I should think that Hsi-yüeh-shih-kuo may be interpreted in the same way.
- (5) *Tripitaka Taishô*, Vol. 50, p. 338 c.

記集, Bk. 15, he left Kuei-tzū 龜茲 (Kuči) with twenty-five companions in the first year of Yung-ch'ü 永初 (420) and entered Chi-pin 罽賓 (Kashmir) via the Hindûkush 雪山 and the Hsüan-tu Pass 懸度. Staying there for more than a year, they moved westwards to cross the Indus, and entered Yüeh-shih Country 月氏國 where they paid their respects to the Buddha's uṣṇīṣa. As has been already stated, the uṣṇīṣa was in Hsi-lo 醯羅 or Haḍḍa and it is clear that Gandhâra was then called the Yüeh-shih Country. However, we can not determine from this fact whether or not the whole of Gandhâra was then under the domination of one political power.⁽¹⁾

Under the circumstances, Kidâra's unification of the north and south of the Hindûkush is considered, so far as the Chinese records are concerned, to have taken place some time between 412 and 437.

VI

Now, the Gandhâra-Tokhârestân regions had been the territory of the Kushan Dynasty till the first half of the third century A.D., when the Tokhârestân region, which made up the northern half of it, seems to have been conquered by the Sasanid in their rise to power. According to Ṭabarî,⁽²⁾ Ardashîr I (224–241), the first king of the Sasanid, conquered the whole of Îrân defeating the Parthians, ascended to the throne of 'King of Kings' in 226, and extended the territory to the east. The King left Istakhr and advanced to Sijistân, Gurgân, Abarshahr,⁽³⁾ Marw and Balkh, to reach Khwârizm. Thus, he conquered the territory at the easternmost border of Khorâsân and came back to Marw where he offered the heads of people whom he had killed in great number to the altar of the fire-god in Anahêdh, and finally returned to Pars. It is said that the kings of Kûshân, Ṭûrân and Makrân sent him their envoys to express the will of obedience. Among the names given, Sijistân corresponds to what is now Sîstân, a region around the Helmand Lake (Hâmûn-i-Helmand) in Southwest Afghanistan. It had also been called

(1) The *Shui-ching-chu* 水經注, Bk. 1 (Kuo-hsüeh chi-pên ts'ung-shu 國學基本叢書 edition, p. 17), states as follows: "And according to Chu Fa-wei 竺法維, tao-jên 道人 or the priest, the Buddha's begging bowl is kept in the Ta-yüeh-shih 大月氏 Country in which (people or Kaniṣka?) established a seven storied stûpa of thirty *chang* 丈 in height. The bowl is on the second floor. (又按道人竺法維所說, 佛鉢在大月氏國, 起浮圖高三十丈, 七層, 鉢處第二層)." This Ta-yüeh-shih Country means Puruṣapura. In the biography of Hui-yüan 慧遠 (†416) in the *Kao-sêng-chuan* 高僧傳, Bk. 6, a reference is made to the city of Na-chieh-ho-ch'êng 那竭訶城 (Nagarahara) in the Yüeh-shih Country which means the western region of Gandhâra (*Tripitaka Taishô*, Vol. 50, p. 358 b). Also refer to S. Lévi, *Notes sur les Indo-Scythes*, *JA*, 1897, 1, p. 10–11 note and *Do.*, *Notes chinoises sur l'Inde*, *BEFEO*, V, 1905, p. 289–290.

(2) Th. Nöldeke, *Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sasaniden*, Leiden: E.J. Brill 1879, p. 17–18.

(3) Nöldeke calls this Abrašahr (see note (2)) and A. Christensen, *L'Iran sous les Sassanides*, Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard 2nd ed. 1944, p. 220, Abharshahr.

Sakastân as the Sakas had been occupied the area. Gurgân is the ancient Hyrcania on the south-eastern coast of the Caspian Sea; Abarshahr is the later Nîshapûr; Marw and Balkh respectively correspond to modern Merv and Balkh; and Khwârizm is the present Khiva, a central region in the lower reaches of the Amu. Khorâsân includes not only the present region bearing the same name (centering around Sabzavâr) which forms a north-eastern border of Îrân, but also was used as a general and wider term for the region further to the east as well, stretching from Merv to Pamir via Herât, Balkh, etc. In other words, Khorâsân included the territory to the north of the Hindûkush and to the south of the Amu.⁽¹⁾ Kûshân corresponds to the Kushâns, and Tûrân to what is now Quzdâr to the south of Quetta in North Balûchistân, while Makrân is the region along the Bay of Oman and the Indian Ocean. According to the above account, Ardashîr I was to have conquered as far as the eastern end of the Iranian Plateau and the whole of the north of the Hindûkush along the Amu, subjugating the kings of the Kushâns and Balûchistân. The Kushân Dynasty had reigned over both the north and south of the Hindûkush, but, according to this, the territory to the north of the Hindûkush was taken by the Sasanid, while the south, that is, the Gandhâra and Panjâb regions, narrowly escaped the ravages of Ardashîr I by sending messengers to him pledging obedience to him.

As regards the statement of Ṭabarî, some scholars doubted the authenticity of it, taking it to be much too exaggerated, while others claimed that it should be accepted as more or less true, and still some others were of the opinion that Ardashîr I had conquered as far as Panjâb.⁽²⁾ Recently, however, archaeological investigations by Russian scholars at sites in the Khorazm and Bactrian regions have clarified that Kushan coins unearthed from these parts do not include any later than Vâsudeva I, and, especially, that the coins of a Khorazm king from a Khorazm site included some copied after coins issued by Ardashîr I, on which the King's figure is facing to the right exactly as on those issued by Ardashîr I, thus convincing scholars that both Bactria and Khorazm had been conquered and governed by Ardashîr I.⁽³⁾ Nevertheless, Ṭabarî's descriptions are difficult to understand from the geographical point of view. It would be natural that he proceeded from Istakhr to Sîstân, but it is strange

(1) E. Herzfeld in *Der Islam*, XI, 1921, p. 107 ff.

(2) Enoki in *Shigaku Zasshi* 史學雜誌, Vol. 64, No. 6, p. 8.

(3) On Khorazm, see S. P. Tolstov, *Moneti shakov drevnego Khorezma*, *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii*, 1938, 3/4, p. 127-128 (not accessible to the writer; as quoted in R. Ghirshman, *Le problème de la chronologie des Kouchans*, *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale*, III, 3, 1957, p. 701); *Do.*, *Drevniï Khorezm*, Moskva 1948, p. 117, pl. 84. On archaeological sites in the Bactrian region and those to the south of the Hindûkush which are to be compared with the former, see Ghirshman, *op. cit.*, p. 707-709, which is based on the results of excavation obtained by Soviet archaeologists and himself. The writer of the present article regrets that he does not have at hand articles by Soviet archaeologists published between the end of the nineteen-thirties and the early forties, which were utilized by Ghirshman.

that he is said to have advanced from Sîstân to Gurgân on the south-eastern coast of the Caspian Sea, while he is said to have turned back from Gurgân in order to advance his troop to Merv and Nîshapûr, both of which are on the way from Istakhr to Sîstân. Therefore, even if it is right to consider that those names mentioned by Ṭabarî are the places actually conquered by Ardashîr I, the statement might have put together the results of campaigns which actually took place at different times, which Ṭabarî described as that of a single campaign. The coming to China of the embassy of the Great Yüeh-shih king Po-t'iao 波調 (Vâsudeva I of the Kushâns) in January 5, 230 A.D.⁽¹⁾ seems to be a reflection of the uneasy situation caused by the easterly expansion of the Sasanid Dynasty under Ardashîr I.

However, when Ardashîr I died and was succeeded by his son Shâpûr I (241–272), many countries on the eastern frontier rebelled and the king had to reconquer them. This situation is well understood from what is written in the following records.

- (a) "In the first year of his reign, the king (Shâpûr I) fought a battle with the Khorazmians and the Medians in a mountainous area (Gebirgsmedern) and defeated them after a fierce fight. The king advanced further to the east from there and subjugated the Gelians (Gelen), the Delamitians (Delamiten) and Hyrcanians (Hyrkanier). These peoples were living in a distant mountainous district near the sea outside (=the Caspian Sea). The whole world feared the King. He also fought the Romans several times." (*Die Chronik von Arbela*, Übersetz. von E. Sachau, *Abhdl. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Klasse*, 1915, Nr. 6, p. 64)
- (b) "The King (Shâpûr I) fought a battle against a Ṭûrân king named Pahlîzagh in Khorâsân to put him to death and constructed a fortress there named Nêv-Shâhpûr (Nishapûr).⁽²⁾ This served as a centre of Abharshahr where lived the Aparnis." (*Shahristânîhâ i Êrânshahr* [J. Markwart, *A Catalogue of the Provincial Capitals of Êrânshahr*, ed. by G. Messina, *Analecta Orientalia*, III, Roma 1931, p. 52⁽³⁾])
- (c) "According to what has been told, the King proceeded to the town of Neşîbîn (Nesîbis) after eleven years from his enthronement (=the twelfth regnal year ?=252 ?).⁽⁴⁾ As there were Roman troops there,

(1) The *Wei-chih* 魏志, Bk. 3, Annals under 太和三年十二月癸卯.

(2) Nishapûr is also said to have been built by Shâpûr II. See A. Christensen, *L'Iran sous les Sassanides*, 2nd ed., p. 220 n.l.

(3) According to N. Pigulevskaya, *Goroda Irana v rannem srednevekov'e*, Moskva-Leningrad 1956, p. 115 n. 2, the text utilized by Markwart is different on some point from that utilized by E. Blochet, *Liste géographique des villes de l'Iran* (*Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes*, Paris 1895, 17ème Année, pp. 145–176). However, the writer of the present article can not have access to Blochet's text.

(4) According to W. Ensslin, *Zu den Kriegen des Sassaniden Schâpûr I* (*Sitzungsber. d. Bayer. Akad. d. Wissensch. Philosophisch-histor. Klasse*, 1947, Hft. 5), München 1949, p. 18–19, the war between Shâpûr I and the Romans started in 252.

the King laid a long siege to the town. However, the King, who heard that the situation required his presence in Khorâsân, went there and, giving orders as to what to do, came back to Neşîbîn." (Ṭabarî [Th. Nöldeke, *Geschichte der Perser und Araber*, Leiden 1879, p. 31-32])

Among these three records, it is clear that the (a) describes his campaign in the first year of his enthronement to Khorazm, Media and the (Southern and Southeastern) coastal area of the Caspian Sea, and that (c) describes his expedition to Khorâsân after eleven years from his enthronement (252?), while it is not clear with which of (a) and (c), the description (b) is actually concerned. (a) does not refer to the expedition to Khorâsân, but since the rebels in Khorazm, Media and Hyrcania signify the separation of the Khorâsân region from the mainland Îrân, one can understand that the Khorâsân expedition also took place then and that (b) concerns (a) and (c). Or (b) might have concerned a different expedition to Khorâsân having nothing to do with (a) or the (c). Be that as it may, the result of reconquering Khorazm and Khorâsân brought the remarkable expansion of the eastern border to the Sasanid, which meant the recovery of almost the whole territory of the Achæmenid in its earlier period. In 1936, the expedition of Chicago University Oriental Institute to Persepolis headed by Erich F. Schmidt discovered an inscription of Shâpûr I, which enumerates the eastern territories of the Sasanid. This inscription is written in Parthian, Greek and Mediaeval Persian, of which the Parthian text is taken as standard among the three. Here is the English translation of Martin Sprengling of the Parthian text relating to the eastern boundary of the Sasanid.

[Line 2] Of the Aryan empire the principalities and provinces (are) these: Pars, Parthia, . . . Mâd (Media), Varkân (Gr. Gourgân), Margû (Merv), Khrêv (Herat), and all Aparkhshatr (MP. perhaps Aparshatr; Gr. "all of the uppermost ethnê"), Karmân, Sakastân (Gr. Segistâne), Tûgrân (Gr. probably Tourênê; MP. perhaps Tûrastân), Makûrân, Pâratân, Khindastân (Gr. India; MP. perhaps Khind), Kûshânkhshatr (*i.e.* the Kushân empire: Gr. Kousan ? . . .) until forward to Pashkabûr (Gr. Paskibouroi, *i.e.* Peshawar) and up to Kash, Sûgd (Gr. Sôdikênê, *i.e.* Sogdia) and the Châchastân (Gr. Tsatsênê) mountains. . . . And these many lands (Parth. khshatr; Gr. ethnê) and lordships (Parth. khshatrdâr; Gr. despotas tôn ethnôn) and provinces (Parth. Patikôspân; Gr. tôn ek pantos merous) have become tributary and subject to us. (Martin Sprengling, *Third Century Iran, Sapor and Kartir*. Prepared and distributed at the Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago 1953, pp. 14-15)

This interpretation by Sprengling has been claimed by himself as "fuller and more definitive edition" than the decipherments he made previously, but there seems to be a divergence of views among scholars in its readings and the

interpretations. First, he took 'all Aparkhshatr' for an independent term along with the names listed before and after it, but W. B. Henning,⁽¹⁾ on the basis that the Greek version writes "all of the uppermost ethnê (ἸΑΝΤΑ ΤΑ ΑΗΩΤΑΤΩ ΕΘΝΗ)", took it for a general term for the regions enumerated after it and interpreted this portion as follows:

"and all the upper countries: Kermân, Sakastân, Tuḡrân and Makurân, Pâratân and Hindastân (ḥndstn, Gr. Ἰνδία; = Sind), and the Kušân country up to Peshawar and up to the limits of Kashghar, Sogdiana, and Tashkend".

The "khshatr" of "Aparkhshatr" is the same as OP. khshaça—"kingship, kingdom" (Av. khshathra, NP. shâhr 'city') denoting a region or regions forming an administrative or governmental unit,⁽²⁾ and in the Greek version corresponding to this part, it is written as "ἔθνος" (pl. ἔθνη).⁽³⁾ As "apar" is the same as OP. *apara* adj. 'posterior' and *upairy* adv. 'suferne, oben, oben über',⁽⁴⁾ the Aparkhshatr, therefore, as in the Greek version, may be translated as 'upper or uppermost countries'. A term very similar to Aparkhshatr is Aparshahr (=Nîshapûr) which is said to have been conquered by Shâpûr I in the *Shâhristânîhá i Êrânshahr*. Aparshahr is a region inhabited by the Aparnîs⁽⁵⁾ to which the Parthian royal family belonged, and it is also a place conquered by Ardashîr I. But, since Aparshahr should have been included within the region of Parthia, it can not be the same as 'Aparkhshatr' which is written separately from Parthia in the inscription of Shâpûr I. While Herodotus (III, 91) writes that Sattagydae, Gandarii, Dadicae, Aparytae formed the seventh province of the Achaemenian territory, which corresponds to the people who occupied the Upper Kâbul Valley (Sattagydae), Middle and Lower Kâbul (Gandarii) and the Hindûkush (Dadicae, Aparytae).⁽⁶⁾ The Aparytae

(1) W. B. Henning, *Two Manichaean Magical Texts*, BSOAS, XII, 1947/48, pp. 53-54.

(2) As to the provincial administrative unit under the Achaemenid, refer to Mortéza Ehtésham, *L'Iran sous les Achéménides*, Freiburg; Imperimerie St. Paul 1946, 110-120 and, as to that under the Sasanid, see Geo Widengren, *Recherches sur les féodalisme iranien*, *Orientalia Suecana*, V, 1956, p. 133ff., especially 135-139.

(3) ἔθνος usually means 'a number of people living together, a nation, a people'. The provincial administrative unit under the Achaemenid is referred to as νόμος in Greek sources. See Herodotus, III, 90, and Pauly-Wissowa, RE, II, 1. 3, under Satrap. Rostovzeff writes that it is very important to study carefully the meaning of ethnos in the inscription of Shâpûr I. (M. Rostovzeff, *Res Gestae Divi Saporis and Dura, Berytus*, VIII, 1943, p. 24 n. 20). However, ethnus is always used as the translation of khshathra (government or the region ruled by the government) of the Parthian text.

(4) C. Bartholomae, *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*, p. 76, 394: R. G. Kent, *Old Persian*, 2nd ed. New Haven 1953, p. 176.

(5) A. Christensen, *L'Iran sous les Sassanides*, p. 220: Markwart, *A Catalogue of the Provincial Capitals of Êrânshahr*, ed. Messina, 1931, p. 52. Abharshahr in a Manichaean fragment deciphered by J. C. Andreas and W. B. Henning, *Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan*, II, SBAW, 1933, p. 303, means Nîshapûr and can not be taken as having been used as a general term for a wider region.

(6) A. Horneffer-H. W. Haussig, *Herodot Historien*, Stuttgart; Alfred Kröner Verlag, 1955, p. 678 n. 80 u. Karte.

(Aparytae) may appear to be related to Aparkhshatr, but the places inhabited by these four peoples not only partly overlap the 'Kûshânkshatr until forward to Pushkabûr (Peshawar)' of the inscription of Shâpûr I, but also further cover the region to the northeast of it. So the Aparytae can not be taken to be the same as Aparkhshatr.⁽¹⁾ In this way, 'all Aparkhshatr' can not be the name of one single region listed along with the names to follow, but a general term to include those regions listed below it. In the Orkhon Inscriptions of Kül Tâgin and Bilgä Qaγan (IE4–IIE5), which lists the name of the countries and peoples who came to mourn for the death of Bumïn Qaγan (=Ili Qaγan T'u-mên 伊利可汗土門), founder of the Türkish Empire, in 552, and that of Istâmi Qaγan (=Dizaboulos), the most ancient qaγan of the Western Türks, who died in 572, mentions Apar as well. "Mourning and grieving arrived from the front, from the side of sunrising, bökli, čölüg il, tabγaç, tüpüt, apar, purum, qırqız, üç qurıqan, otuz tatar, qıtany, tatabi, these peoples came to mourn and grieve." Of the peoples mentioned here, bökli (or bükli) means the people of forest, čölüg il⁽²⁾ the people (or country) of desert (or steppe), tabγaç China (under the T'ang), tüpüt Tibet (T'u-fan 吐蕃), purum the Roman Empire (Fu-lin 拂菻), qırqız the Kirgiz, üç qurıqan the Qurıqan of three clans 三姓骨利幹, otuz tatar the Tartars of thirty clans 三十姓韃靼, qıtay the Ch'i-tan 契丹, tatabi the Hsi 奚.⁽³⁾ As regards Apar, there are various theories. It is

- (1) The Aparytae may mean the 'uppermost inhabitants' among these four peoples who lived in the north-easternmost mountains.
- (2) As to the meaning and usage of *il* (=tribal group in the true Turkish language), see G. Doerfer, *Türkische und Mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*, II, Wiesbaden.: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH 1965, p. 194 ff.
- (3) As to the meaning of bökli (or bükli), I followed H. N. Orkun, *Eski Türk yazıtları*, I, İstanbul 1936, p. 31, 75 note 10. According to Orkun, even in modern Anadol dialect *bük* means forest. Other interpretations of bökli or bökli čölüg il are quoted in Hidemi Onogawa 小野川秀美, *Tohketsu Hibun Yakuchû* 突厥碑文譯註, *Manmôshi Ronsô* 滿蒙史論叢, IV, 1948, pp. 97–98. Recently, S. E. Malov, *Pamyatniki drevnetyurkskoï pis'mennosti*, Moskva-Leningrad 1951, p. 29, 36, translates bökli čölüg il as *narod stepi Bëkliïskoï*. It is W. Bang, *Aus dem Leben der Türksprachen*, *Festschrift Hirth*, 1920, OZ, VIII, p. 31 note 1 that took bökli as synonymous to Čaγatai Turkish *bök* (forest) and Qarakirgiz Turkish *bök* (hill), both of which, according to Bang, are antonyms of *čöl* (steppe). In Turkish, there is an expression *aγaç-âri* (people of forest) in contrast to *qum-âri* (people of desert). (Cf. P. Pelliot, *Quelques noms turcs d'hommes et de peuples, etc.*, *Oeuvres posthumes*, II, Paris 1950, p. 210–214: G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, II, 1st ed., Budapest 1943, p. 65: E. Herzfeld, *Paikuli*, p. 136: D. Sinor, *Autour d'une migration des peuples, etc.*, *JA*, 1946–47, p. 3). So it may be right to understand bökli as people of forest in contrast to čölüg il which means people or country of desert or steppe. As to the other identifications of peoples or countries than *apar*, see Onogawa, *op. cit.*, p. 41. H. W. Haussig, *Theophylaktus Exkurs über die skythischen Völker*, *Byzantion* XXIII, 1953, p. 349, is of the opinion that bökli is the Turkish name given to a region which is called *sung-mo* 松漠 in Chinese. Onogawa agrees with Seiichirô Iwasa's opinion that bökli meant Kao-chü-li 高句麗 (Onogawa, *op. cit.*, pp. 41, 97–98). Concerning the meaning of *čöl*, see P. Pelliot in *TP*, XXVII, 1930, p. 18–20.

identified either with the Avars,⁽¹⁾ or with Persia⁽²⁾ or with Gandhâra⁽³⁾ or with Aparshahr⁽⁴⁾ or with a Turkish tribe,⁽⁵⁾ but, seeing that Apar is written in-between Tibet and Roman Empire, it is certain that it denotes the areas of Western Turkestan, Gandhâra and Persia. The theory that it means Persia claims that the scripts in the inscription can as well be read as "Par" and that Persia is a representative country in this part of the world. But Persia (Pârs, Pârsa) has never been called "Par", though it could have been called either Pas or Pâsa.⁽⁶⁾ Moreover, the Türks defeated the Ephthalites in alliance with Persia some time between 558-561,⁽⁷⁾ they invaded the territory of Persia and entered into an alliance with Justin II (565-578) of the Roman Empire and attacked the Sasanid from both sides;⁽⁸⁾ thus it is quite unlikely that Persia ever sent a messenger to mourn the death of Istâmi Qayan. On the other hand, W. Bang, on the basis of E. Sieg's correspondence, surmised that the word "yipar" is used in Tokharian documents as the translation of Sanskrit *gandha* (scent), as well as on the consideration that Gandhâra had formerly been known as Yeh-po-lo 葉波羅 according to Sung-yün 宋雲, and on the correspondence of *yî~* to *a~* in the Turkish language, considered that "Apar" of the Orkhon inscriptions might have been a name of Gandhâra, and arrived at the conclu-

- (1) W. Thomsen identified Apar with the so-called true Avars described by Theophilactus Simocatta (*Inscriptions de l'Orkhon déchiffrées, Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne*, V. 1896, p. 140: *Gammel-Tyrkiske Indskrifter fra Mongoliet in Samlede Afhandlinger*, III, København 1922, p. 465, 512). Németh, *A honfoglaló magyarság kialakulása*, p. 105, accepted Thomsen's theory (cf. Orkun. *op. cit.*, p. 75). The same identifications are made by J. Marquart, *Êránšahr*, p. 53, by A. v. Gabain, *Alltürkische Grammatik*, Leipzig 1941, p. 295, and by S. E. Malov, *Pamyatniki drevnetyurkskoĭ pis'mennosti*, p. 395.
- (2) Seiichirō Iwasa 岩佐精一郎, *Iwasa Seiichirō Ikō* 岩佐精一郎遺稿, pp. 61-76.
- (3) W. Bang, *Über die türkischen Namen einiger Grosskatzen, Keleti Szemle*, XVII, 1917, p. 142-146.
- (4) H. W. Haussig, *Theophylaktus Exkurs über die skythischen Völker, Byzantion*, XXIII, 1953, p. 328-332. Haussig looks upon Apar (Abar) as a name of a tribe and Aparshahr as the general appellation of the south-western territory of the Western Turkish Empire. However, Aparshahr means nothing but Nishapur.
- (5) V. M. Nadelyaev and others, *Drevnetyurkskii slovar'*, Leningrad 1969, p. 47b. However, no reasons are given.
- (6) In the Iranian language, *r* before a consonant is unstable and it has been noticed that *-rs-* becomes *-s-*. For instance, see N. Hübschmann, *Persische Studien*, Strassburg 1895, p. 260-262 and P. Pelliot, *Le Tokharien et Koutchéen, JA*, 1934, p. 30. In Turkish, too, *-r-* before a consonant is not stable. See W. Bang, *Aus türkischen Dialekten, Keleti Szemle*, XVIII, 1918-19, p. 18-19.
- (7) E. Stein in *Le Muséon*, 1940, p. 126 note 6. But Stein, *Histoire du Bas Empire*, II, Paris-Bruxelles-Amsterdam: Desclée de Brouwer 1949, p. 218 note 1 gives the date of *vers 560* and B. Spuler, *Geschichte Mittelasiens (Geschichte Asiens)*, München: F. Bruckmann 1950 p. 324 that of 562, while S.D. Skazkin, etc., *Istoriya Bizantii*, III, Moskva 1967 p. 395 that of 563-567. Also see G. Widengren in *Orientalia Suecana*, I, p. 9.
- (8) A. Christensen, *L'Iran sous les Sassanides*, 2nd ed., p. 373-374: G. Widengren in *Orientalia Suecana*, I, p. 9: G. Ostrogorsky, *Geschichte des byzantinischen Staates*, 3rd ed., München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung 1963, p. 63.

sion that one must wait for the further investigations of historians as to whether the term was to include Tokhârestân or not.⁽¹⁾ But it was before Sung-yün's visit to Gandhâra in 520 that the place was called Yeh-po-lo 業波羅, and it has not yet been clarified as to why the name of Yeh-po-lo reappears in the Orkhon inscriptions set up in the thirties of the eighth century, while the place was called Gandhâra only after 520. But if the inscription of Shâpûr I records all the uppermost countries of the Sasanid easternmost frontier, such as Kermân, Sakastân, Tuγrân and Makurân, Pâratân and Hindastân, and the Kushan country up to Peshawar and up to the limits of Kashghar, Sogdiana, and Tashkend, under the name of Aparkhshatr, would it not be most appropriate to identify Apar of the Orkhon inscriptions as an abbreviation of Aparkhshatr? These areas being situated between Tibet and Roman Empire fit well geographically in the Apar of the Orkhon inscription. In this way, I also understand that Aparkhshatr is a general term for the several regions which follow in the list, just as proposed by Henning. According to this interpretation, the Sasanid territory to the east of the line connecting Kermân, Herât and Merv, including Kermân, had been generally termed Aparkhshatr. This is related to the fact that the Kâbul Valley regions, including Gandhâra, had been once called Paruparaesanna, "(the land) beyond the (Hindûkush~Himalayan) mountains" (>Paropamisadae, etc.) by the ancient Iranians, originally denoting the regions on the other (southern) side of the Hindûkush; but it would have come to mean the Persian (Parthian and Sasanian) territory that lies around the north and south of the range.

Another controversial point of the inscription is the interpretation of Kûshânkhshatra and the part following, which Sprengling translates as "Kûshânkhshatr (*i.e.* the Kushân empire) until forward to Pashkabûr (*i.e.* Peshawar⁽²⁾) and up to Kâsh, Sûgd (*i.e.* Sogdia) and the Châchastân mountains". I do not want to go into the details of the controversies, but I would like to follow here Henning who translates this passage as "(Pâratân and Hindastân and) the Kušân country up to Peshawar and up to the limits of Kashghar, Sogdiana, and Tashkend", as quoted above, though it is yet to be clarified whether the Kushân country was a part of "all Aparkhshatr" or was independent of Aparkhshatr and whether there is any other evidence that Kashghar was really conquered by Shâpûr I. As nothing is mentioned of Khorazm in the inscription, it is clear that it had already been lost to the Sasanid. The date of the inscription is supposed to be 262 on the basis of the description

(1) W. Bang, *Über die türkischen Namen einiger Grosskatzen*, *Keleti Szemle*, XVII, 1917, p. 142-146. As to my opinion that Yeh-po-lo seems to be a scribal error of *奇汰羅 or *基汰羅 and so on, see *MTB*, 27, p. 26.

(2) R. Ghirshman, *Le problème de la chronologie des Kouchans*, *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale*, III, 2, 1957, p. 705; J. H. Kramers, *Peshdwar*, originally published in *Annual Bibliography of Indian Archaeology* (1940-47) and now reprinted in his *Analecta Orientalia*, I, Leiden: E. J. Brill 1954, p. 366 ff.

of the war between the Roman Empire and the Sasanid in the inscription.⁽¹⁾ As the war with the Roman Empire started in 252⁽²⁾ and Shâpûr I concentrated his power in it, it must have been in 252 that the eastern boundary of the Sasanian Empire was fixed as described in the inscription. This shows that Shâpûr I reconquered many of the eastern dominions obtained by Ardashîr I and, in addition to them, he conquered Gandhâra, Sind, Sogdiana, Tashkend and Kashghar. In this connection, let me quote from the *T'ai-ch'ing chin-i shên-tan ching* 太清金液神丹經, attributed falsely to Ko Hung 葛洪 (284-363),⁽³⁾ the following passage:

"An-hsi 安息 lies 8,000 *li* to the west of Yüeh-chih 月支. Its lands, manners and customs are all the same as the Yüeh-chih. Men and horses are energetic and brave. The territory is of 5,000 square *li*. The gold and jewels (there) are as common as stones. They are casted into coins. When the king dies, (new) coins are casted. There are dogs and horses and big sparrows (in the land). To the left (=east) of the country there is a land where more than a hundred kings rule. (All of these kings) live in different places and do not belong to the Yüeh-chih."⁽⁴⁾

This means that, between the An-hsi or the Sasanid, which succeeded Parthia, and the Yüeh-chih 月支 or the Kushâns, there were more than a hundred independent kings belonging to neither the Sasanid nor the Kushâns, and that many parts of the so-called Aparkhshatr and the neighbouring area had been independent either from the Sasanid or from the Kushâns in the beginning of Ardashîr I's reign or in later years. The *T'ai-ch'ing chin-i shên-tan ching* 太清金液神丹經, which contains a detailed description of lands and products of various countries in the Western Region 西域 and the South Seas is considered to have been compiled in the present form in the latter half of the seventh century.⁽⁵⁾ Among twenty-one countries in this volume, however, fourteen including the Yüeh-chih are described on the basis of the *Nan-chou i-wu chih* 南州異物誌 compiled by Wan Chên 萬震 of the Wu 吳 Dynasty (222-280).⁽⁶⁾ In this way, the statement concerning An-hsi quoted

(1) W. B. Henning, *The Great Inscription of Šâpûr I*, BSOS, IX, 1937/1939, p. 845.

(2) W. Ensslin, *Zu den Kriegen des Sassaniden Schapur I*, München 1949, p. 15, dates the start of the war 241. However, so long as we follow Tabarî (Th. Nöldeke, *Geschichte der Perser und Araber*, p. 31-32), Shâpûr I started the war with the Roman Empire 11 years later than his enthronement (in 241). Hence I can not follow Ensslin's chronology.

(3) As to the date of Ko Hung, see Chiang Liang-fu 姜亮夫 and T'ao Ch'iu-ying 陶秋英, *Li-tai jên-wu nien-li pei-chuan tsung-piao* 歷代人物年里碑傳綜表, Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü 中華書局 1959, p. 49.

(4) 安息, 在月支西八千里, 國土風俗, 盡與月支同, 人馬精勇, 土方五千里, 金玉如石, 用爲錢, 國王死輒更鑄錢, 有犬馬, 有大爵, 其國左有土地, 百餘王治, 別住不屬月支也。(上海影印道藏第五八二冊, 太清金液神丹經卷下 第十七丁 a)

(5) H. Maspero, *Un texte sur l'Orient romain, Mélanges posthumes sur les religions et l'histoire de la Chine*, III, Paris 1950, p. 100-101.

(6) See H. Maspero, *op. cit.*

above could also have been based on this earlier record. The date of Wan Chên is not clear, but the *Nan-chou i-wu chih* seems to have described countries in the Western Region and the South Seas in around the middle of the third century. Shâpûr I's conquest of the Aparkhshatr must have been made just after the compilation of this work.

No records are available as to how the Gandhâra region, the centre of administration of the Kushâns, was conquered at the time of Shâpûr I. According to the inscription of Shâpûr I, Narsakhy, son of the king, was listed either as "the King of India (xndy), Sakastan (Skstn), and Tûristân (tvrgstn)⁽¹⁾ to the seashore" (Line 19) or as "the Sacans' King (Skn MLK)" (Lines 19, 21, 22, 23). Tûristân is Tûgrân, *i.e.* Tûrân or Tourênê, or what is now the Quzdâr region to the south of Quetta in North Balûchistân. "To the seashore" would include the region extending from there up to the southern seashore. Though Gandhâra is located between Sakastân and Hindustân, it is not clear whether it had been within the dominion of Narsakhy. E. Herzfeld considered, on the basis of the numismatic inscription, that Pêrôz, younger brother of Shâpûr I, Hormizd I (272-273), crown prince of Shâpûr I, Bahrâm I (273-276), prince of Shâpûr I, and Bahrâm II (276-293), son of Bahrâm I, were all entitled vazuruk kûshânshâh (the great Kûshân king) before they were enthroned;⁽²⁾ that up to the time of Narsêh (Narsakhy of the Inscription of Shâpûr I and succeeding to Bahrâm II on the throne 293-302), those who had occupied the crown prince's position ruled the Kushâns, and were entitled 'the Great Kûshân King' and after Narsêh crown princes were appointed to the Sakânshâh (the King of the Sakas) and governed what is now Sîstân.⁽³⁾ According to the Inscription of Shâpûr I, however, Narsêh was the "King of India, Sakastân (*viz.* the Sakas) and Tûristân (tvrgstn) to the seashore" as quoted above, while Pêrôz is recorded as the "Royal Prince" (Line 21), Hormizd (Hormizd-Ardashîr of the Inscription) as "the Great King of Armenia" (Lines 18, 20), and Bahrâm I as "the King of Gîlân (western part of the southern coast of the Caspian Sea)" (Line 20). It is, therefore, certain that they were not entitled 'the Great Kûshân King' in 262 when the monument was set up. Accordingly, it may well be sometime before or after 262 that Pêrôz and the other princes were entitled 'the Great Kûshân King' or Pêrôz, Hormizd, Bahrâm, etc. may be princes in later times bearing the same names. In any way, there was certainly a period when the title of 'the Great Kûshân

(1) Sprengling, p. 17, reads Tvrgrstn as Tûristân, Ghirshman as Tourêne (*Cahiers d'histoire mondiale*, III, 2, 1957, p. 704) which he identifies with the southern part of Balûchistân, and Henning (*BSOS*, IX, pp. 846, 848 note 2) as Taḡwarastân of which the location is not known. I am of the opinion that it should be looked for somewhere in Balûchistân for the reason of the order of place names, India, Sakastân, and Tvrgrstn to the seashore. Anyway, this Tvrgrstn may have nothing to do with Tokhârestân. Herzfeld, *Kushano-Sasanian Coins*, p. 36, reads the word as Tuxaristân.

(2) Among these, Pêrôz was not enthroned. (See additional notes.)

(3) *Kushano-Sasanian Coins*, p. 33 ff. Also see Marquart, *Érdânšahr*, p. 49.

King' was set up to rule the Kushâns, but it is not certain whether this had been started at the time of Shâpûr I or not.

Hormizd I (272-273) who succeeded Shâpûr I died a few months after the enthronement and his younger brother Bahrâm I (273-276) became the King of kings. According to Mas'ûdî, Chapter 24, this king fought a battle with kings in the east,⁽¹⁾ that is to say, in Khorâsân, which means that, at the time of Bahrâm I, the Kushâns in Khorâsân rose in revolt. Next, at the time of Bahrâm II (276-293), there were greater rebellions of eastern tribes. Vopiscus, chronicler of the Roman Emperor Carus (282-283), relates that Bahrâm II had been utterly occupied with a 'domestic rebellion' in 283, and Claudius Mamertinus records under the year 291 that, not so earlier than this year, Bahrâm II's younger brother Ormies or Hormizd rose in arms against the King with the help of the Sakas, Kushâns and Gîlâns, and that Bahrâm II accordingly ceded Armenia and Mesopotamia to restore peace with the Roman Empire and suppressed the rebellion.⁽²⁾ It was in 283 that peace was restored with the Roman Empire. The Sakas were the people in Sakastân or Sîstân and the Gîlâns were those occupying the western part of southern coast of the Caspian Sea. The Sakas and Gîlâns were thus conquered by the Sasanid, but the Kushâns seem to have become independent again since then or sometime later than this time. The Paikuli Inscription, set up in memory of the enthronement of Narsêh (293-302) who drove away Bahrâm III (293), son of Bahrâm II, the nephew of Narsêh, counts the King of the Kushâns at the top of the independent forces calling him "Kûshânsâh".⁽³⁾ Coming down to the time of Shâpûr II (309-379), two generations later than Narsêh, the Sasanid met invasions of the "Chionitae" and *Cuseni" between 356 (or 357) and 358 (or 359) at the eastern border. The King took the field in person to drive them out, but, when the Roman Empire tried to sue for peace with the Sasanid, Shâpûr II immediately concluded peace with those two tribes to secure their cooperations and attacked with them the Roman troops in the upper Tigris. It seems the central base of Shâpûr II's military operations for the east at that time was in Kâbul. As has been mentioned in Chapter I, in an inscription dated 356 (?), discovered by Herzfeld in Persepolis, it is written that Slók (Seleucus), high Judge in Kâbul, prayed for the safe return to Kâbul of Shâpûr who was the elder brother of Shâpûr II and entitled the Sakânsâh. Herzfeld is of the opinion that this inscription is closely related to the rebellion of the Chionitae and *Cuseni⁽⁴⁾ and that Kâbul

(1) *Mulûk al-šarg. Maçoudî, Les prairies d'or, II*, Paris 1861-1914, p. 167. Now, see Mas'ûdî, *Les prairies d'or, Edition Barbier de Meynard et Pavet de Courteille, revue et corrigée par Charles Pellot*, 1, Beyrouth 1966, p. 291.

(2) E. Herzfeld, *Kushano-Sasanian Coins*, pp. 34-35.

(3) E. Herzfeld, *Paikuli*, pp. 119, 204-205.

(4) *Kushano-Sasanian Coins*, p. 36. Herzfeld mistook this Shâpûr as Shâpûr I (241-274).

still belonged to the Sasanid under the rulership of Sakânshâh. The *Cuseni or Kushâns who invaded then are generally considered to have been in the Gandhâra area and the Chionitae in the Bactria-Merv region, but no evidence has so far been available to decide whether the Kushâns mentioned in the inscription were in Gandhâra or Bactria, or even in both.⁽¹⁾ As regards the Kushâns who revolted at the time of Bahrâm II or the Kûshânshâh who was listed first among the independent forces at the time of Narsêh, nothing is known of their exact locations. In 367–8, ten years later, Shâpûr II fought a battle again with the Kushâns. According to Faustus, the King (or the great king) of the Kushâns, descendant of the Arsacid, who lived in the town of Pahl, challenged Shâpûr II and caused severe damage to the Persian troops.⁽²⁾ As Pahl is Bakhli or Bactra, it is obvious that these Kushâns were in the Bactria region. The Kushâns, who fought against Shâpûr II with the Chionitae, might have stayed in Bactria, too. No records are available concerning the situation of the eastern frontier of the Sasanid from Shâpûr II (309–379) to the time of Bahrâm V (420–438) when a Turkish king Khâkân, leading some 250,000 Turks, invaded the Sasanian territory. Ṭabarî records that Bahrâm V attacked them, killed Khâkân, and then appointed his younger brother Narsêh as marzbân (Governor) of Khorâsân with his government at Balkh.⁽³⁾ The year is not recorded, but since the case is given first place among the achievements of Bahrâm V, it would seem to have taken place in the early period of his reign. On the other hand, Mas'ûdî⁽⁴⁾ relates that a Turkish king Khâkân invaded Sogdiana and came down as far as Rey (or Ray) making raids on Bahrâm V's territory, but was killed by Bahrâm V, while Firdausî⁽⁵⁾ records that a khâkân of Chîn (China) invaded the Sasanid territory but was completely defeated in Kashmîhan near Merv by Bahrâm V, who then conquered the countries in Sogdiana and reached the River Jîhûn or Syr-Daryâ.⁽⁶⁾ That is, according to Ṭabarî, it seems to be Khorâsân that the Turkish khâkân invaded, and as the result of Bahrâm V's victory over the Turks, Narsêh governed in Balkh as Marzbân, while, according to Mas'ûdî and Firdausî, it is Sogdiana that was invaded by the Khâkân who was conquered by Bahrâm V. The ending years of Bahrâm V (420–438) rightly coincide with the year (437) when Tung Wan 董琬 and Kao Ming 高明 of the Northern Wei Dynasty 北魏 were sent as ambassadors to Central

(1) I am of the opinion that the Kushâns mentioned here were in the Bactria region and that the Chionitae was in the Bactria-Merv region to which they had advanced from Sogdiana. See *Shigaku Zasshi* 史學雜誌, LXIV, 6, p. 24: 7, p. 33 ff.

(2) *Fragmenta historiarum graecorum*, V, p. 285–286, 298. (= *Collection des historiens anciens et modernes de de l'Arménie*, 1, Paris 1867, p. 285–286, 298).

(3) Nöldeke, *Geschichte der Perser und Araber*, p. 98–103.

(4) Maçoudî, *Les prairies d'or* (Société Asiatique Collection d'Ouvrages Orientaux), II, p. 190.

(5) A. G. Warner and E. Warner, *The Shâhnâma of Firdausî*, VIII, London 1915, p. 84 ff.

(6) For the details of these traditions and their criticism, see K. Enoki, *On the Nationality of the Ephthalites*, *MTB*, 18, 1959, pp. 20–21.

Asia and reported on the situations there. According to them, Su-t'ê 粟特 or Sogdiana had been governed by the people called Hsiung-nu 匈奴 already for two generations,⁽¹⁾ while Bactria had been occupied by the Great Yüeh-shih led by Chi-to-lo 寄多羅 or Kidâra. It is, therefore, quite doubtful whether or not Bahrâm V's conquest and rule in Khorâsân and Sogdiana really took place as recorded by Ṭabarî and Mas'ûdî. However, as we are here dealing with the chronology of the Kidarites' rule in Bactria, we may put this question aside for the time being; still it is difficult to believe that the Bahrâm V's conquest of Sogdiana had ever taken place. Subsequently, even though the invasion of Khorâsân actually took place, it could well be by the king of so-called Hsiung-nu 匈奴 in Sogdiana or by the king of the Kushâns in the eastern part of Khorâsân and not by the Turkish khâkân.⁽²⁾

To sum up chronologically the above considerations:

- (1) At the time of Ardashîr I (224-241), the Kushâns to the north of the Hindûkush were conquered;
- (2) At the time of Shâpûr I (241-271), the north of the Hindûkush was reconquered, and the Kushâns to the south of the Hindûkush (Gandhâra) were also conquered;
- (3) But Bahrâm I (273-276) fought with the kings of Khorâsân (including the Kushâns ?);
- (4) And in 283 during the reign of Bahrâm II (276-293), the Kushâns, along with the Sakas and Gîlâns, interfered in a civil war of the Sasanid and fought a battle with Sasanian troops, while Bahrâm II suppressed them, making peace with the Roman Empire;
- (5) At the time of Narsêh (293-302), the King of the Kushâns became independent calling himself Kûshânsâh;
- (6) In 356/7-358/9 during the reign of Shâpûr II (309-379), the *Cuseni or Kushâns invaded the eastern border of the Sasanid along with the Chionitae, but later these two tribes made peace with Shâpûr II and entered the war against the Roman Empire;
- (7) Also at the time of Shâpûr II (367-8), the Great King of the Kushâns in Pahl (Bakhl) challenged the Sasanid to a war and badly defeated them;
- (8) Bahrâm V (420-438) is said (probably in the early period of his reign) to have conquered Khorâsân where he appointed the marzbân at Balkh, and it may well mean that there was a war with the Kushâns.

Unfortunately, the name Kidâra does not appear in these records and there is no clear information as to the independence of the Kidarites. However, if we include in our considerations that international relations between the Northern Wei and Central Asia started in the first year of T'ai-yen 太延 (435) and, in the third year of the same T'ai-yen (437), Tung

(1) K. Enoki in *Tôyô Gakuhô* 東洋學報, XXXVII, 4, p. 40 ff. and *Shigaku Zasshi*, LXIV, 7, p. 40 ff.

(2) *MTB*, 18, p. 22.

Wan 董琬 and Kao Ming 高明 were sent as ambassadors to Central Asia where they possibly learned of the situation in Tokhârestân which was known to the Chinese under the name of Ta-yüeh-shih 大月氏; that, at the time of the Emperor T'ai-wu 世祖太武帝 (423-452), merchants from the Ta-yüeh-shih came to Tai 代 and taught how to make glass; and that information regarding the Kidarites was brought to China sometime during this period (I put it in 437), we can not but conclude that the independence of the Kidarites took place sometime after Bahrâm V's conquest of Khorâsân as indicated in (8), which was most probably in the twenties or thirties of the fifth century. We can not clarify at present the relations which Kidâra had with the Kushâns of an earlier period. The Kushâns are supposed to have been divided by Ardashîr I's expedition into two parties, one to the north and another to the south of the Hindûkush. The former may be called the Bactrian group and the latter the Gandharian group. It is obvious that Kidâra belonged to the northern or Bactrian group, but it is again not clear how far back one can trace his lineage.⁽¹⁾ We must also admit that nothing is known about the relationship between so many Kushâns which appear from (1) to (8) of the above summary. The Kidarites in Tokhârestân and Gandhâra dealt with in this article may be, therefore, not necessarily an ethnic but a political group organized by Kidâra and his successors in these regions. The account of Bahrâm V's conquest of Khorâsân is quite obscure, as discussed just now, but, if his rule of Khorâsân actually was, judging from the fact that the date of Kidâra as assumed from the *Wei-shu* 魏書 and other Chinese records points to, the first half of the fifth century, we can not but think that Chi-to-lo was a contemporary of Bahrâm V and that he drove away the marzbân established at Balkh by Bahrâm V (420-438) and conquered the Bactrian region at first.

As already stated in Chapter I, Martin misinterpreted the information of *Wei-shu* 魏書 relating to Chi-to-lo 寄多羅 or Kidâra which was brought in at the time of the Emperor T'ai-wu 世祖太武帝 (424-451) as having been brought in during the reign of the Emperor Tao-wu 太祖道武帝 (according

(1) Was Kidâra a Kushân or the king of the Kushâns of other tribal origin than the Kushân?

As has been quoted in Chapter I of this article (cf. *MTB*, 27, pp. 19-21), Priscus calls the Kidarites the Huns. The Kidarite=Hun theory has been followed by many scholars, such as J. B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire from the Death of Theodosius I to the Death of Justinian*, London 1923, p. 7 (according to Dunlop quoted below), E. A. Thompson, *A History of Attila and the Huns*, Oxford 1948, p. 21, who calls them the Black Huns and G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, II, 2nd ed., p. 159. H. W. Haussig, *Theophylakts Exkurs über die skythischen Völker, Byzantion*, XXIII, 1953, looks them as the K'i-tan [Ch'i-tan] 契丹, and D. M. Dunlop, *The History of the Jewish Khazars*, Princeton 1954, pp. 19-20, wonders if they were the Khazars. However, I am of the opinion that Kidâra was originally of the Kushân tribe as has been discussed by Marquart, *Êrânšahr*, p. 53. Compare *The Chronicle of Joshua the stylite composed in Syriac* A. D. 507, tr. and notes by W. Wright, Cambridge 1882, p. 7, in which the Kushâns are called Huns. On this point, compare F. Altheim, *Geschichte der Hunnen*, 1, Berlin 1959, p. 32 ff (also see Index).

to him 398–409, but actually 386–409); connected the affairs (6) of the above summary with the rise of Chi-to-lo; and put the time of the Kidarites in the latter half of the fourth century. In order to confirm the view, he took up Kidâra coins, which he considered closely resembled in their style those of the middle period of Shâpûr II (309–379). He also considered that the coins issued by kings and satraps, who are supposed to have belonged to the Kidarites, definitely copied the style of coins of the Sasanid kings in the latter half of the fourth century. As to Kidâra's coins, however, as have been discussed already (*MTB*, 27, pp. 4–5), Cunningham looks upon them as closely resembling those of Bahrâm V (420–438), while Curiel is of the opinion that the Kidâra coins copied those of Yazdgerd II (438–457). But his view is criticized by R. Göbl as "nicht stichhaltig".⁽¹⁾ In this way, the comparison of the styles of coins is to a great extent subjective, and we must be well aware that, in order to fix the date of Kidâra and the Kidarites, we should put more reliance on documentary sources than on the types of their coins, and, only after some conclusion has been reached, we may check it with the numismatic evidence. It is this method that Martin adopted, but he entertained a misunderstanding in the interpretation of the documents. Cunningham's treatment of the documents is even more inaccurate and Curiel does not even refer to any documentary materials, though his chronology based on numismatic evidence is roughly in accord with mine based on historical records.

Kidâra's coins can be classified into two types: (a) with the king's figure facing to the right and (b) with it facing to the front. Martin identified the former with those issued at the time of Kidâra's subjugation to the Sasanid (as the king's figure on Sasanid coins also faces to the right) and the latter with those of the time when Kidâra became independent of the Sasanid. It is Herzfeld who initiated this method of deciding the political relationship between the Sasanian central government and the kings of neighbouring tribes who issued coins in imitation of those of Sasanian kings. According to this method, Kidâra was once subjugated by Bahrâm V and placed under the rule of Sasanian marzbân in Khorâsân and then became independent. If Kidâra was contemporary with Shâpûr II, this interpretation does not fit. Shâpûr II first fought with the *Kushâns, and then made peace with them. In other words, the *Kushâns had always been independent of the Sasanid at the time of Shâpûr II. But, if Kidâra was contemporary with Bahrâm V who is said to have conquered Khorâsân where he established a marzbân at Balkh, the direction of Kidâra's figure on his coins does fit into the theory that he was first dependent on the Sasanid and then became independent

(1) Robert Göbl, *Dokumente zur Geschichte der iranischen Hunnen in Baktrien und Indien*, I, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz 1967, p. 45. Cf. also Göbl, *Die Münzprägung der Kušân, vom Vima Kadphises bis Bakrâm* in F. Altheim-R. Stiehl, *Finanz Geschichte der Spätantike*, Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann 1957, p. 173–256.

of Sasanian rule.

I am not ready to comment on which is right among the opinions of Cunningham, Martin, Curiel and Göbl concerning the numismatic style of Kidâra's coins, but one thing which is clear is the reading of inscription on the coins. Cunningham read it as *Kidâra Kušana šahi*, while Allan revised it to *Kidâra Kušanaša* (Kidâra of the Kušana) as early as 1914 based on actual examination of the coins.⁽¹⁾ He could find no inscription which could be deciphered as *šahi*. Martin read it as *Kidâra Kushâna shâ* which he must have interpreted as 'Kidâra the King of the Kushâns'. Seeing, however, that in Middle Persian 'king' is always called *šâh*, *šâhi* or *šaw*,⁽²⁾ I can not follow Martin's reading. Furthermore, that the inscription is written in Brâhmî script reminds us that it is written in an Indian language. Therefore, it would be right to regard the final *ša* as equivalent to *sa*, genitive declension in Sanskrit, according to Allan's revision. This will also remind us, along with the fact that the sites where these coins were discovered are limited to the south of the Hindûkush, that they were issued essentially to be circulated in the Gandhâra area. This will also show that Shâpûr II, who had never conquered and ruled the south of the Hindûkush, had nothing to do with Kidâra. The Sasanian type of Kidâra's coins must show the influence of Sasanian culture in the north of the Hindûkush, and the Indian inscriptions in Brâhmî script show Kidâra's domination over the south of the Hindûkush, which fits well the Chinese records that Chi-to-lo ruled both the north and south of the Hindûkush.

The second Kushân Dynasty represented by King Kaniška was severely affected by the rise of the Sasanid and their easterly expansion. The movement of the Kushâns after that is one of the most obscure parts in the ancient history of Central Asia. References available to be traced after that are fragmentary records and the coins of Kushân and Kushano-Sasanian styles, and at the present stage, it is still difficult to trace systematically the history of the Later Kushâns on the basis of these materials. It is, therefore, one of the most important problems of their history to determine the date of Kidâra and his successors who glorified the final stage of the history of the Later Kushâns.

To sum up my opinion regarding the chronology of the Kidarites in the regions of Tokhârestân and Gandhâra, it is as follows:

- (1) It is in a certain period after 412 and before 437 that Kidâra (Chi-to-lo 寄多羅) unified the north and south of the Hindûkush, establishing his

(1) J. Allan, *A Note on the name Kushan*, *JRAS*, 1914, p. 410; R. Göbl, *Dokumente zur Geschichte der iranischen Hunnen in Baktrien und Indien*, I, Wiesbaden 1967, p. 45, reads as *Kidâra Kušanaša*. As to the earlier opinion of Göbl concerning Kidâra's coins and their inscription, see F. Altheim-R. Stiehl, *Finanzgeschichte der Spätantike*, Frankfurt am Main, 1957, p. 173-256, especially 229-230, 234, and F. Altheim, *Geschichte der Hunnen*, I, Berlin 1959, p. 135 note 38.

(2) Herzfeld, *Kushano-Sasanian Coins*, p. 10; H. Jacobi in *ZDMG*, 1880, p. 284-286.

- capital at Po-lo 薄羅 (Bakhl or Balkh);
- (2) There is no written record to clarify whether there was a dynasty to which Kidâra had belonged or not, and, if any, how far back one can trace it in dating. But Kidâra himself, as is assumed from the inscription *Kidâra of the Kuṣāṇas* on his coins, may have been the founder of a new dynasty;
 - (3) The Kidarite Dynasty seems to have been established in the early fifth century during the reign of Bahrâm V (420-438);
 - (4) Kidâra was driven away by the Ephthalites in the mid-fifth century, moving westwards and abandoning his territory north of the Hindûkush, and fought with the Sasanid Dynasty in the Caspian coastal area as is recorded by Priscus, Fr. 33. Kidâra was succeeded in this area by his son named Kunggas⁽¹⁾ who was conquered by Pêrôz in about 468 at Balaam;
 - (5) At that time, another son of Kidâra was established at Fu-lou-sha City 富樓沙城 (Puruṣapura or Peshawar) and ruled over the Gandhâra region;
 - (6) Of the two countries, Chü-ch'ang 居常 (Kushân) who brought tamed elephants to the court of the Northern Wei in the fifth year of T'ai-an 太安 (459) and the first year of Ho-p'ing 和平 (460), and Ch'ê-to-lo 車多羅 who paid tribute together with countries in India and Afghanistan, the latter would correspond to the Kidarite occupation of Gandhâra; and
 - (7) The Kidarites in Gandhâra were conquered by the Ephthalites in a certain period between 477 and 520.

(1) J. Marquart identified Kunggas with Hsing-nieh (**Xieng-ngiät*) 馨孽, the ancestor of the ruler of Chi-pin 罽賓 (Kapisa), in *Êrânšahr*, Berlin 1901, p. 285 and note 1 and with *Qunqan in *Ueber das Volkstum der Komanen* (W. Bang und J. Marquart, *Osttürkische Dialektstudien*, Berlin 1914, p. 70). F. Altheim, *Geschichte der Hunnen*, 1, Berlin 1959, p. 32, compares Kunggas with Hu-yi (**Xuät-ngiei*, **γuo-ngiei*) 忽隈, the king of Su-t'ê 粟特 (Sugdâg or Sogdiana) at the time of the Northern Wei 北魏. However, according to the *Chiu T'ang-shu* 舊唐書, Bk. 198 under Chi-pin, Hsing-nieh was the ancestor of Ho-chieh-chih 曷闐支 who was on the throne as the twelfth king of Kapisa in the 3rd year of Hsien-ch'ing 顯慶 (658) (Ed. Chavannes, *Documents sur les Tou-kiue occidentaux*, p. 131 note 4) and this dynasty must have started after the withdrawal of the Hephthalite power from the Gandhâra region, that is to say, at the end of the 6th century. This means that Hsing-nieh can not be identified with Kunggas of the latter half of the 5th century. The identification of Kunggas with *Qunqan is based on the emendation of *Κούγγας* of the original text into *Κούγγαν*. If this emendation is right, it will only justify the Hunnish origin of this chieftain. As to Hu-yi who is stated as the third king of Su-t'ê (*Pei-shih* 北史, Bk. 97 or *Wei-shu* 魏書, Bk. 102), he can not be looked upon as identical with Kunggas who was a son of Kidâra or the second king of the Kidarite Dynasty. In this way, I can not find any relation between Kunggas and Kapisa or Sogdiana in Central Asia.

Additional Notes

M.T.B., Vol. 27, p. 2 note 3: As to the coins of the Kidarites, the author of this article intends to study them directly to decide which opinion should be followed. Concerning the Kidarite coins, see also A. D. H. Bivar's recension of R. Curiel and D. Schlumberger, *Trésors monétaires d'Afghanistan* in *JRAS*, 1954, p. 101–102, R. Göbl, *Dokumente zur Geschichte der iranischen Hunnen in Baktrien und Indien*, Bde. I und II, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz 1967, and the articles of Bivar and Lukonin quoted below. But, for the moment, he follows Curiel's opinion.

M.T.B., Vol. 27, p. 11 notes 4 and 6: As to Balaam, Professor G. Uchida, *Zenzen no Kidâra Gesshi ryô Balkh chihô shinnyû ni tsuite* (*The invasion of the Juan-juan tribe of the region of Balkh which belonged to the Kidârîtes Yüeh-chih*), *Tôyôshi Kenkyû*, Vol. 18, No. 2, 1959, p. 146, agrees to Professor H. W. Haussig who looks upon Balaam as identical with Baḡralam «Stadt des Fürsten» according to the opinion of O. Hansen (*Theophylakts Exkurs über die skythischen Völker, Byzantion XXIII*, 1953, p. 394 note 459). However, Balaam cannot be reconstructed as Baḡalam, but as Balaḡam or Balaḡan (cf. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 2nd ed., II, p. 85).

M.T.B., Vol. 27, pp. 21, 22: Concerning Gorga of Priscus, Frag. 33, see Ernst Doblhofer, *Byzantinische Diplomaten und östliche Barbaren*, Graz-Wien-Köln: Verlag Styria, 1955, p. 82. Doblhofer wonders if the original appellation of Iberia, that is to say, Gurğ, "Georgia", is concealed in the name of Gorga.

M.T.B., Vol. 28, p. 24 note 2: Geo Widengren, *Der Feudalismus im alten Iran. Männerbund-Gefolgswesen-Feudalismus in der iranischen Gesellschaft im Hinblick auf die indogermanischen Verhältnisse*, Köln-Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1969, should be added to the bibliography.

M.T.B., Vol. 28, p. 26, note 7: As to the date of defeat of the Ephthalites by the Turks, H. A. R. Gibb fixes it for between 563 and 568. See H. A. R. Gibb, *Arab Conquest in Central Asia*, London, 1923, p. 3.

M.T.B., Vol. 28, p. 29, notes 2, 3, and 4: As to Kushano-Sasanian coins, on the basis of which we can identify the (vazurk) Kûshânshâh, now see A. D. H. Bivar, *The Kushano-Sassanian Coin Series*, *Journal of the Numismatic Society of India*, Vol. XVIII, Pt. 1, 1956, pp. 13–42 and Plates, and W. G. Lukonin, *Sassanian Rulers of Kushâna State, Bhârâtî*, *Bulletin of the College of Indology, Banaras Hindu University*, Nos. X & XI, 1966–68, pp. 141–173.

M.T.B., Vol. 28, p. 30: As to the decipherment of the date of the inscription of Slók by Herzfeld, W. B. Henning has proposed to read it as the 18th year of Shâpûr (II), instead of [the 47th given by Herzfeld with question mark and of] the 48th year as in [other] older edition. The 18th year of Shâpûr II

corresponds to 317 or 318 A.D. which has nothing to do with the rebellion of the Chionitae and the *Cuseni. See G. Hambly, *Zentralasien (Fischer Weltgeschichte, 16)*, Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Bücherei, 1966, p. 328 note 10.

M.T.B., Vol. 28, pp. 30 and 32: As to the Kûshânshâh at the time of Narsêh, as reconstructed by E. Herzfeld in his *Paikuli*, pp. 119 and 204–205, see remarks of R. N. Frye in *Studi Orientalistici in onore di Giorgio Levi Della Vida, I*, Roma, 1956, p. 322 and *HJAS*, XX, 1957, Nos. 3/4 p. 702.

M.T.B., Vol. 28, p. 35: As to the decipherment of the inscription of Kidara's silver coins, also refer to M.T.B., Vol. 27, p. 4 note 2. Bivar reads it as Ki-da-ra Ku-ša-na Ša in *JNSI*, XVIII, p. 26.

M.T.B., Vol. 28, p. 36 note 1: Concerning F. Altheim's opinion about the identification of Kunggas and Hu-yi, see E. G. Pulleyblank in *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, LIX, 1964, 204–205. Haussig restores *Hu-i* (*Hu-yi*, **χuat-*ngiei**) into *qurun qay* which he interpretes as «*die Qay der Regierungseinrichtungen*», d.h. *die Qay, die die Regierung ausüben (Byzantion, XXIII, 1953, pp. 351–352)*. However, *ng* of *ngiei*, representing a guttural, can not be divided into *n* and *giei*.