

On the Date of the Kidarites⁽¹⁾ (1)

By Kazuo ENOKI

I

The Kidarites dominated the Tokhârestân and Gandhâra regions, *i.e.* both north and south of the Hindûkush, sometime between the end of the Kushân Dynasty and the rise of the Ephthalites. The former, which is famous for its great king Kaniška, declined by the attack of the Sasanids in the twenties of the third century A.D., while the latter rose to power between the middle of the fifth century and the early sixth. The Kidarites are so called by the name of Kidâra, the founder of their dynasty. The only record own available concerning their dynasty is the chapters on the Great and Little Yüeh-shih 大月氏・小月氏 in the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of *Wei-shu* (= *Pei-shih*) 魏書 (=北史) 西域傳.⁽²⁾ Under the Great Yüeh-shih, it is stated: 1) that Chi-to-lo 寄多羅 (Kidâra) established a kingdom dominating the north and south of the Hindûkush, 2) that merchants from the Great Yüeh-shih came to Tai 代, the capital of the Northern Wei 北魏, during the reign of Wu-ti 武帝 (424-452) and made liu-li 琉璃 or glass of five colours,⁽³⁾ with which the Emperor T'ai-wu 太武, *i.e.* Wu-ti had a glass-inlaid palace constructed; and under the Little Yüeh-shih 小月氏, 3) that Kidâra let his son reign at the city of Fu-lou-sha 富樓沙城, *i.e.* Puruṣapura or what is now Peshawar in Gandhâra, and 4) that

(1) The article was published originally in the *Tôyô Gakuhô* 東洋學報, Vol. 41, No. 3, (1958), pp. 283-334, under the title *Kidâra-ôchô no nen-dai ni tsuite* キダラー王朝の年代について. In publishing here its English translation, some revisions were made. The readers are asked to take the author's opinions expressed here as his latest ones.

(2) *Wei-shu* (smaller *Po-na-pên* ed.), Bk. 102, pp. 1321-1322, 1322-1323; *Pei-shih*, Bk. 97, pp. 1295, 1296.

(3) Here *liu-li* 琉璃 obviously means glass. The text says as follows: "At the time of Emperor T'ai-wu, merchants of that country (*i.e.* the Ta-yüeh-shih) traded in the capital (of Wei, *i.e.* Tai). They themselves said that they could cast the stone into *liu-li* of five colours. So the raw ore was collected in the mountain and it was casted in the capital. When (*liu-li* was) produced, the lustre was more brilliant than that of what was imported from the West. Therefore, by the Imperial order was built (with *liu-li*) a *hsing-tien* 行殿 or a temporary palace, which could contain a hundred and odd people, and it was so transparent that the light could come in and the colour was seen. Those who saw the palace were all surprised and thought that it was built by super-human being. After this, *liu-li* in the country (*i.e.* Wei) were devaluated and people did never make much of them". 太武時, 其國人商販京師, 自云, 能鑄石爲五色琉璃, 於是採礦山中, 於京師鑄之, 既成, 光澤乃美於西方來者, 乃詔爲行殿, 容百餘人, 光色映徹, 觀者見之莫不驚駭, 以爲神明所作, 自此國中琉璃遂賤, 人不復珍之。(北史 Bk. 97).

his son's country was called the Little Yüeh-shih.⁽¹⁾ As to the date of their dynasty, we have two theories—one putting it in the fourth century and the other in the fifth.

It is Martin that fixed the date of the Kidarite Dynasty in the latter half of the fourth century.⁽²⁾ At first, based on historical records, he fixed the date of Kidâra's rise at 356 to 367/8, that of the reign at Peshawar by Kidâra's son at prior to 409, and that of the expulsion of the Kidarites from Gandhâra by the Ephthalites at circa 400. He further tried to verify the above datings by the type of coins, issued by Kidâra and his successors, as well as by satrapal rulers considered to be belonging to the Kidarite Dynasty, which he believed to have copied the type of coins of Sasanid kings of the above chronology. His discussions are so orderly and systematic, as his classification and typology of coins are, that anyone who have gone through his article would have been impressed that the chronology of the Kidarite Dynasty was decisively fixed. That is why many of recent publications have dated the Kidarite Dynasty in the fourth century after Martin's theory.⁽³⁾

- (1) As to the original texts, see p. 15. note (1). As for *liu-li* (>Sogdian *virtûlya*, cf. P. Pelliot, *Un fragment du Suvarṇaprabhâsa-sûtra*, (*Études linguistiques sur les documents de la Mission Pelliot*, fasc. IV, *Extrait des Mémoires de la Société de linguistiques de Paris*, T. XVIII, Paris: H. Champion 1913, p. 26), see Yule and Burnell, *Hobson-Jobson*, pp. 88-89: Toyohachi Fujita 藤田豊八, *Tôzai Kôshôshi no Kenkyû*, Saiiki-hen, 東西交渉史の研究, 西域篇, pp. 277-279: *TP*, XIII, pp. 442-444 and XXIV, pp. 356-357.
- (2) M.F.C. Martin, *Coins of Kidâra and the Little Kushâns*, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, Letters*, Vol. III, (1937), No. 2 *Numismatic Supplement*, No. XLVII, pp. 23-50, with 5 plates.
- (3) For instance, R.C. Majumdar and A.S. Altekar, *A New History of the Indian People*, VI. *The Vakataka-Gupta Age*, Lahore: Moti Lal Banarsi Dass 1946, pp. 21-24; J. Marshall, *Taxila*, Cambridge 1951, Vol. 1, pp. 73-74; R.C. Majumdar, ed. by, *The History and Culture of the Indian People, The Classical Age*, Bombay: Bhâratiye Vidhâ Bhavan 1954, pp. 55-59. Professor L. Petech's reference to Kidâra also seems to have based upon Martin's theory (*Northern India according to the Shui-ching-chu*, Roma: IsMEO 1950, p. 60; G. Tucci, ed. by, *Le civiltà dell' Oriente*, Storia, Roma: Cherardo Casini Editore 1956, p. 617, 620, 932). (Professor Petech writes in *Northern India, etc.* that [the Dynasty] lasted "till the middle" of the fourth century, but it would be a misprint of "till the end"): R. Ghirshman accepts the opinion of Martin and places the date of Kidâra at the same period of Shâpûr II (309-379) on the basis of similarity of type of their coins (*Les Chionite-Hephthalites*, Le Caire, 1948, p. 79; also see Index under Martin). On this point, see the criticism of R. Curiel, *Trésors monétaires d'Afghanistan*, Paris 1953, pp. 119-123. Curiel is of opinion that Kidâra's coins were casted in imitation of those of Yazdgerd II (438-457). It is curious that Gavin Hambly, *Zentralasien (Fischer Weltgeschichte, Bd. 16)*, Frankfurt am Main 1966, p. 67, maintains, quoting Curiel, that the Kidarites were in the same period as Shâpûr II (309-379), Ardashîr II (379-383) and Shâpûr III (383-388). Robert Göbl, *Dokumente zur Geschichte der iranischen Hunnen in Baktrien und Indien*, Bd. 1, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz 1967, pp. 24, 29 ff., is also of opinion that the Kidarites belonged to the period ca. 385-ca. 440 N. Chr. Cf. also Franz Altheim, *Geschichte der Hunnen*, Bd. 1, Berlin: Walter Gruyter & Co., 1959 p. 420, and V.M. Masson and V.A. Romodin, *Istoriya Afganistana*, 1, Moskva: Izdatel'stvo «Nauka» 1964, pp. 166-168. V.G. Gafurov and B.A. Litvinsky, *Istoriya tadzhikskago naroda*, 1, Moskva 1963, p. 369, attributes the date of the Kidarite dynasty either to the end of the 4th century according to R. Ghirshman

However, there seems to be a remarkable fallacy in his treatment of Chinese records, the major premise of his dating. He thinks that the Ephthalites appeared in Gandhâra in about 400, which made the Kidarite Dynasty collapse, based on the following statement of Fa-hsien 法顯 in his *Record of the Buddhistic Kingdoms* 佛國記: "Travelling four days southwards from Chien-t'ò-wei 犍陀衛 (Gandhâra=Puṣkalāvati), I reached Fulou-sha 弗樓沙 (Puruṣapura=Peshawar)... the Buddha's bowl is here in this country. In old days, a Yüeh-shih king raised a big troop and rushed to this country in order to get this Buddha's bowl. When he finished the conquest of this country, he faithfully believed in the law of Buddha and intended to take away the bowl (with him)." (1)

It is in 402 that Fa-hsien visited the Gandhâra region, (2) and Martin who understood the Yüeh-shih King to be an Ephthalite took the above as the description of Ephthalites' occupation of Gandhâra in circa 400 (p. 36). But the Yüeh-shih King here mentioned should be regarded as Kaniṣka and never as an Ephthalite. The passage "in old days a Yüeh-shih king, etc." can not be taken as meaning an event which took place only a few years earlier, and the Ephthalites' appearance in Gandhâra took place, as I shall state later, sometime after 477 and before 520. In this way, Martin's theory that the Kidarite Dynasty was destroyed in about 400 by the Ephthalites can not be accepted as true. Martin also puts the date of the enthronement of Kidâra's son in Peshawar before 409, as he considered the statement on the Little Yüeh-shih in the *Wei-shu Hsi-yü-chuan* 魏書西域傳 to have been derived from the Great Yüeh-shih merchants who turned up in Tai during the reign of Emperor T'ai-wu 太武帝 (which Martin writes Tai-von [for Tai-vou?]), whose date again, according to him, is fixed at 398-409 (p. 20). But this date is actually that of the Emperor Tao-wu 道武帝, while the real reign of the Emperor T'ai-wu dates 424-451. Therefore, according to his theory, one can say that Kidâra's son ruled over Peshawar sometime before 451, but not 409 in reality. Martin further puts the rise of Kidâra in the middle of the fourth century based upon the following reasons. An inscription found at Persepolis tells that, in 356 (?), a certain Slök, a high judge, prayed for the then King Shâpûr II (309-379) to come back safely to Kâbul after completing his successful campaigns, (3) while Ammianus Marcellinus (c. 330-391-?) (XVI. 9. 4)

or to the 5th century according to others. The latest supporter of Martin's chronology is Czeglédy Károly who fixed the date of the rise of Kidarites as 350 or 360 (Czeglédy Károly, *Nomád népek vándorlása Napkeletől Napnyugatig*, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó 1969, pp. 73, 143, 156 [Kőrösi Csoma Kiskönyvtár 8]).

- (1) 從犍陀衛國南行四日至弗樓沙國, (中略), 佛鉢即在此國, 昔月氏王大興兵衆, 來伐此國, 欲取佛鉢, 既伏此國已, 月氏王等篤信佛法, 欲持鉢去, (下略), (*Tripitaka Taishō*, Vol. 51, p. 858).
- (2) Ryōtai Hadani 羽溪了諦, *Saiiki no Bukkyō* 西域之佛教, p. 109; Ch'ên Chung-mien 岑仲勉, *Fo-yu-t'ien-chu-chi k'ao-shin* 佛遊天竺記考釋 (*Commentaries on Fa-hsien's Record of the Buddhist Kingdoms*), Shanghai: Commercial Press, 2nd ed. 1934, p. 46.
- (3) E. Herzfeld, *Kushano-Sassanian Coins*, (*Memoirs of the Archeological Survey of India*, No. 38), Calcutta 1930, p. 36.

records that Shâpûr II was waging wars in his eastern frontiers with tribes called Chionitae and *Cuseni till about 358.⁽¹⁾ Martin considers that the statement of the inscription found at Persepolis refers to Shâpûr II's battle with these two tribes, and that the *Cuseni should be the Kushâns led by Kidâra (pp. 30–31). This is certainly a possible interpretation and that Kidâra was a king of the Kushâns is well assumed by the inscription on his coins, which reads *Kidâra Kushâna Shâ[hi]* (Kidâra, the Kushâna King⁽²⁾ or Kidâra of the Kushâns). Thus, it is quite possible that the Kushâns that fought with Shâpûr II were those led by Kidâra, but it is also possible that they were those governed by another leader. Therefore, Martin's interpretation can not be accepted as decisive in this respect. He also claims that Kidâra's coins copied the style of those issued in the middle period of Shâpûr's reign (pp. 29–30),⁽³⁾ but they are also regarded by Cunningham as to be of the same style as those issued by Bahrâm V (420–438),⁽⁴⁾ while R. Curiel takes them as copied the coins of Yazdgerd II (438–457).⁽⁵⁾ Therefore, even in numismatic evidences, Martin's theory can not be taken as conclusive. It is Cunningham who had already paid an earlier attention to Kidâra's coins and maintained that the date of Kidâra was in the fifth century. He at first discussed the following points in his article *Coins of the Tochari, Kushâns, or Yue-ti*:⁽⁶⁾

- 1) the paleographical style of Brâhmî inscriptions on Kidâra's coins can not be earlier than the fifth century;
- 2) the numismatic style of Kidâra's coins is the same as that of Bahrâm V's (420–438);
- 3) Kidâra, according to the chapter on the Great Yüeh-shih in the *Wei-shu Hsi-yü-chuan* 魏書西域傳, moved westwards being attacked by Juan-juan 蠕蠕, the White Huns, who became to be very powerful at the time of Ch'ih-lien K'o-han 敕連可汗 [430–444] for the first time and fought a battle with Bahrâm V of the Sasanid. His son Ch'u K'o-han 處可汗 [444–464] or Konkhas of Priscus was a strong ruler,

(1) On this point, see Kazuo Enoki, *Sogdiana and the Hsiung-nu* (ソグディアナと匈奴), *Shigaku-Zasshi* 史學雜誌, Vol. 64, Nos. 6, 7 & 8.

(2) There is a question in the reading of this inscription. A. Cunningham reads it as "Kidâra Kushâna Shâhi" (*Coins of the Tochari, Kushâns, or Yue-ti, Numismatic Chronicle and Journal of the Numismatic Society*, 3rd Series, No. 35 (1889, Pt. III) p. 279 ff.; *Later Indo-Scythians, Ibid.*, 3rd Series, No. 51 (1883, Pt. III) p. 184 ff.), while J. Allan considers it as misreading and reads it as "Kidâra-Kuṣaṇaṣa" (*A note on the name Kushan. JRAS*, 1914, p. 410). Martin reads it as "Kidâra Kushâna Shâ". See Chapter VII of the present article.

(3) Martin's view is supported by R. Ghirshman and G. Hambly. See p. 2, note 3.

(4) *Numismatic Chronicle and the Journal of the Numismatic Society*, 1889, p. 280.

(5) R. Curiel et D. Schlumberger, *Trésors monétaires d'Afghanistan*, (*Mémoire de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Afghanistan*, XV), Paris 1953, p. 122–123.

(6) *Numismatic Chronicle and the Journal of the Numismatic Society*, 1889, Pt. III, 3rd Series, No. 35, pp. 279–293.

who gave support to King Pêrôz [457, 459-484] of the Sasanids and made him fight against [his brother] Hormizd III [457-459]. It would well be this Konkhas that took over the territory of Kidâra. It was in 446-447 when Priscus had heard about *Οἰννοὶ Κιδαρῖται* or the Ephthalite Huns—namely when he was staying in Attila's camp. Therefore, the date of Kidâra's move might coincide with the date of Ch'u K'o-han 處可汗, *i.e. circa* 450;

- 4) the abandonment of Gandhâra by the Kidarite Dynasty is due to a raid of the Ephthalites, which took place, according to Sung-yün 宋雲, in *circa* 470.

In this way Cunningham concluded that the date of Kidâra and his dynasty fell in the fifth century. Four years later, he revised the previous theory and published an article entitled *Later Indo-Scythians, Little Kushans*.⁽¹⁾ There he discussed:

- 5) that Kidâra's coins have numerical signs decipherable as either 239 or 339, which, referred to the era of A.D. 78, would give either A.D. 317 [316?] or 417 [416?]. The latter is the preferable date;
- 6) that since it is in 428 when the Ephthalites were expelled by Bahrâm V of the Sasanids, it would be prior to that date, perhaps in about 425, that Kidâra had abandoned Tokhârestân being pressed by the Ephthalites and removed southwards across the Hindûkush;
- 7) and that *Οἰννοὶ Κιδαρῖται* mentioned by Priscus could mean both the Ephthalites and the Kidâras.

Though it is wrong that Cunningham confused the White Huns or the Ephthalites with the Juan-juan 蠕蠕, he is perfectly right when he regarded the Kidarites as direct predecessors of the Ephthalites, and that the Kidarites had to abandon Tokhârestân because of the rise of the Ephthalites in this region in the first half of the fifth century. Also it is probably right that he fixed the date of the Ephthalites' occupation of Gandhâra in about 470 according to the statement of Sung-yün 宋雲. But, as Kidâra was ruling both north and south of the Hindûkush then, one should consider that Kidâra abandoned northern part of the Hindûkush due to the rise of the Ephthalites and that Kidâra's territory was confined only to the south of the Hindûkush, and that Kidâra did not expand his domain to the south of the Hindûkush, *i.e.* the Gandhâra region, for the first time due to the same reason. This will be discussed in detail later. Further, Cunningham's argument that there is struck on Kidâra's coins a year-mark decipherable as 339, *i.e.* A.D. 417 [416?]⁽²⁾

(1) *Ibid.*, 1893, Pt. III, 3rd Series, No. 51, pp. 184-202.

(2) There is a question in reading of these numerical signs. Even if Cunningham's reading is right, still we can not look upon this number as the basis of chronology until it is elucidated which is the first year they adopted. Martin adopts the reading of 239, which he takes it, following Sten Konow, for corresponding to 366/7 on the basis that the first year was of the Kaņiṣka Era in 128/9 (Martin, p. 32, 39 No. 4). Therefore, as Martin rightly says, this number may be put aside of our discussion.

is contradictory to his statement that the style of the coins is copied after that of the coins of Bahrâm V (420–438) who came to the throne four years later. Furthermore, he does not mention how early the origin of the Kidarites can be traced back. In this way, there is room for argument in connection with Cunningham's viewpoint, but his conclusion to place Kidâra in the fifth century is considered to be right. This will be clarified by my chronological discussions to be followed in Chapter II and on.

I have since long tried to make clear the date of the Kidarites and referred to it twice in my former articles.⁽¹⁾ But, since my discussions had immaturity and misunderstandings, I would like to present here my latest opinions.

In 1954, an Indian scholar Śrî Buddha Prakash discussed on the same subject in his article *The Kuṣâṇa Invasion of India under Kumâragupta*.⁽²⁾ He quotes a passage of the *Candra-garbha-paripṛcchâ-sûtra* cited by Bu-ston in his *History of Buddhism* (Buddha Prakash, *ibid.* pp. 231–233; Bu-ston, *Chos-ḥbyun*, Fol. 133a & b),⁽³⁾ of which the outline runs as follows:

“When the son of King Mahendrasena had passed the age of twelve, three foreign powers, Yavanas, Palhikas (Pahlikas) and Śakunas, invaded his kingdom. Though they were at first fighting each other, but soon

(1) Kazuo Enoki 榎一雄, *Origin of the Ephthalites* エフタル民族の起源, *Wada Hakushi Kanrekikinen Tôyôshi Ronsô* 和田博士還暦記念東洋史論叢, pp. 143–144; Kazuo Enoki, *Sogdiana and the Hsiung-nu*, II, ソグディアナと匈奴, II, *Shigaku-Zasshi* 史學雜誌, Vol. 64, No. 7, pp. 36–39.

(2) *Indian Historical Quarterly*, XXX, No. 3, (Sept., 1954), pp. 219–236.

(3) The passage in question in Bu-ston's *History of Buddhism* runs as follows: “At that time, 3 kings, neither of Indian, nor of Chinese descent, Yavana, Palhika and Çakuna will appear. These will not act according to the Highest Doctrine, will conduct wars, fight and quarrel and will lay waste many districts in the west and in the north. The sanctuaries and temples in these countries they will destroy, and burn down with fire, and rob the objects of worship, the property of the 3 Jewels, etc. These 3 kings will be in mutual strife and the reign of each of them will not be happy. But then, at a certain time, they will become allies, unite in one kingdom, collect a great army, and take possession of Gândhâra, Mahâdeça, and other countries lying on this side of the Ganges. At that time, on the other side of the Ganges, to the south, in the country of Kauçambi, there will be a king named Mahendrasena. This king will have a son called Duḥprasahasta (Dusprasahasta) with an iron mark on his forehead and with the lower part of his body, up to the elbows stained with blood. ..(ellipsis).. Thereupon, after 12 years will have passed away since the birth of the prince, the allied forces of the 3 kings mentioned before, Yavana and the rest, 300,000 in number with the kings at their head, will invade the realm of the king Mahendrasena. Thus war will break out, and the king will be distressed and lament. ..(ellipsis).. At the time of battle, the iron mark on the prince's forehead will appear distinctly, the whole of his body will become of iron, with terrible fury he will charge and conquer. After the victory, the army of Duḥprasahasta will return ..(ellipsis).. Thereafter, during 12 years he will fight with the armies of the 3 kings and will gradually vanquish a great number of these forces. He will capture the 3 kings themselves and cause them to be put to death. Thereupon he will make himself emperor of Jambudvîpa. (E. Obermiller, *History of Buddhism by Bu-ston*, Heidelberg 1932, pp. 173–174).

occupied Gandhâra. The young son of Mahendrasena defeated them and on his return his father crowned him king. For twelve years after this the new king fought with these foreign enemies and ultimately captured and executed the three kings. After that he ruled peacefully as the Emperor of Jambu-dvîpa."

In his opinion, Mahendrasena is obviously identical with Kumâragupta Mahendrâditya [c. 414-455/6] who entrusted the defence of the country to his valiant son Skandagupta [+c. 467] and Skandagupta resisted the invaders and routed them from the country inflicting on them a crushing defeat; the Yavana are the Greeks who had lived with the Iranians, coming eastwards since the time of Achaemenid; the Palhikas (Palikas) and the Śakuna are evidently the Sasanids; and the Kuṣâṇa (Kidarites) who had come close each other. According to him, the above passage shows that the Kidarites existed in the time of Kumâragupta and his son Skandagupta or the first half of the fifth century. As no argument concerning the identification of Śakuna and Kuṣâṇa is given, I do not quite understand whether i) the author considered Śakuna as a phonetic transposition of Kuṣâṇa, or ii) he took the Śakuna for the Kuṣâṇa, because of its being enumerated with the Yavana and the Palhika, or iii) he made the identification for some other reasons.⁽¹⁾ If Śakuna is rightly Kuṣâṇa, Buddha Prakash gives us no reason why he should take it for the Kuṣâṇa led by Kidâra, or belonging to the Kidarites. And even if we admit that his assumption is correct and that the above passage states that the Kidarites invaded during the reign of Kumâragupta I and Skandagupta, it may simply mean that the Kidarites existed sometime in the first half of the fifth century. We must here discuss when the Dynasty had started and how long it lasted. Furthermore, Kâśī-Prasâda Jâyaswâl,⁽²⁾ referring to the same passage as quoted by Buddha Prakash, considered the battle as one against the Hūṇas, while R. C. Majumdar⁽³⁾ avoids the discussion saying that legends of this sort are for

(1) Śakuna corresponds to Khotanese Śśakauna, i.e. "Śaka, Saka" (Sten Konow, *Primer of Khotanese Saka*, Oslo 1949 [reprinted from *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap*, Vol. XV], p. 124), which must have derived from Śakuna. E. Leumann, *Das nordarische (sakische) Lehrgedicht des Buddhismus*, Leipzig 1933-1936, p. 333 [XXV, 393], in which Śśakuna, Yavanâ and Palvalâ (=Pahlava) are mentioned together as three Mlecchas, all of them will be kings in the last time. Leumann therein takes Śśakauna for a composite word of 'Śaka Yavana', which was corrected as meaning 'Śaka' by H.W. Bailey in *BSOS*, IX, p. 74. I wonder if this Śakuna is a composite word of Śaka and una (=Huṇa) and means the Huns called Śaka, just like Carauanas or Carauanas of Marco Polo (L.F. Benedetto, *Marco Polo, Il Milione*, Firenze 1928, p. 28), which may be interpreted as Qaraunas or Black Huns. Concerning Śśakuna, now see H.W. Bailey, *Prolexis to the Book of Zambasta*, (Indo-Scythian Studies, Khotanese Texts VI), Cambridge 1967, p. 335, and R.E. Emmerick, *The Book of Zambasta, A Khotanese Poem on Buddhism*, (London Oriental Series, 10), London 1968, p. 399.

(2) *Imperial History of India*, Lahore 1934, p. 36.

(3) *The Classical Age, History and Culture of the Indian People*, Vol. III, Bombay 1954 pp. 26-27 note.

the most part unreliable. Under the circumstances, I am sure that my discussions of the chronology of the Kidarites will be of some interest to those who are engaged in the study of history of Central Asia in the fourth to sixth centuries.

II

As was mentioned before, the only statements on the rise and growth of the Kidarites are those on the Great Yüeh-shih 大月氏 and Little Yüeh-shih 小月氏 in the *Chapter on Western Regions* of *Wei-shu* 魏書 (= *Pei-shih* 北史) 西域傳. Concerning the Great Yüeh-shih, it says as follows:

"The Great Yüeh-shih Country, of which the capital had been situated at Lu-chien-shih City 盧監氏城 (according to the *Pei-shih* 北史, *lu* is written *shêng* 贍), lies to the west of Fu-ti-sha 弗敵沙 (Badakhshan), 14,500 *li* away from Tai 代 (the capital of the Wei). In the north it touched the Juan-juan 蠕蠕, which invaded (the Great Yüeh-shih) so many times that the Yüeh-shih had at last to remove the capital westwards as far as Po-lo City 薄羅城, 2,100 *li* away from Fu-ti-sha 弗敵沙 (Badakhshan). The King Chi-to-lo 寄多羅 (Kidâra), who was a brave warrior, at last organized troops and marched to the south to invade the Northern India, crossing the Great Mountains [Hindûkush] and completely subjugated five countries to the north of Ch'ien-t'o-lo 乾陀羅 (Gandhâra). In the reign of Emperor Shih-tsu 世祖 (424-451), men of the country [Ta-yüeh-shih] came up to the capital (Tai) to trade, . . . etc."⁽¹⁾

There is an exhaustive study already made by Professor Hisao Matsuda 松田壽男 on this account.⁽²⁾ He clarified that this account on Chi-to-lo 寄多羅 was brought by Tung Wan 董琬 who was sent to the western countries in 437; that the distance between Lu-chien-shih City 盧監氏城, and Tai 代, which is said to be 14,500 *li*, is considered to be a total of 11,600 *li* (according to H. Matsuda, this is a corruption of 12,600 *li*), the distance between Chien-shih City 監氏城, the capital of the Great Yüeh-shih, and Ch'ang-an 長安, as is described in the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of *Han-shu* 漢書西域傳, and 1,900 *li*, the distance between Tai 代 and Ch'ang-an 長安. According to him, distances similarly calculated are given to many countries related to

(1) 大月氏國，都盧（北史作贍）監氏城，在弗敵沙西，去代一萬四千五百里，北與蠕蠕接，數爲所侵，遂西徙都薄羅城，去弗敵沙二千一百里，其王寄多羅勇武，遂興師，越大山南侵北天竺，自乾陀羅以北五國，盡役屬之，世祖（424-451）時，其國人商販京師，（下略）。

(2) Hisao Matsuda 松田壽男, *Text-critique of the Hsi-yü-chuan of Wei-shu and the Direction of Yüeh-pan-kuo* (魏書西域傳の批判と悦般國の方位), *Taishô-Daigaku-Gakuhô* 大正大學學報. Vol. 10; Do., *On the Kidarite Yüeh-shih* (寄多羅月氏に就いての考), *Kokushigaku* 國史學, No. 33: Now see Hisao Matsuda, *Geo-Historical Studies of the Ancient T'ien-shan* (古代天山の歴史地理學的研究), Tokyo: Waseda University Press 1957, pp. 164-194.

the embassy of Tung Wan 董琬.⁽¹⁾ I believe that his opinion is correct, but still I am doubtful whether or not all the statements except the description of traders who came to Tai 代 from Ta-yüeh-shih in the above quotation had been exactly as they were reported by Tung Wan. For instance, the part in which Lu-chien-shih City 盧監氏城 is mentioned as being to the west of Fu-ti-sha 弗敵沙 (=Badakhshan), and where Po-lo City 薄羅城 is recorded as lying 2,100 *li* away from Fu-ti-sha 弗敵沙, were probably not in the original report of Tung Wan, but added later; as the name of Fu-ti-sha 弗敵沙 is not to be found among the sixteen countries reported by Tung Wan.⁽²⁾ In the fourth and fifth centuries A.D., both north and south regions of the Hindükush (Tokhârestân and Gandhâra) had been known as Yüeh-shih, and many Buddhist monks passed through these regions on their way to India. So, it is quite natural that Tung Wan would have taken notice of the situations of this area. In any way, the main part of the description on Chi-to-lo in the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of *Wei-shu* 魏書西域傳 is considered to have been based upon the information brought by Tung Wan, and, considering the context of the statement, it might have been not so long after the unification of north and south of the Hindükush by Chi-to-lo. Namely Chi-to-lo and his descendants' dynasty seems to have already been existent at the time of Tung Wan's embassy in 437.

Now, what is recorded in the *Wei-shu* 魏書 might mean nothing but that the Great Yüeh-shih which originally had their capital at Lu-chien-shih City 盧監氏城 had to remove westwards to transfer their capital to Po-lo City 薄羅城 due to the frequent invasions of the Juan-juan 蠕蠕 who shared the northern border. Namely, Lu-chien-shih City and Po-lo City were considered to be two entirely different places. But would it be truly right? Lu-chien-shih 盧監氏 of the *Wei-shu Hsi-yü-chuan* 魏書西域傳 is written Shêng-chien-shih 贛監氏 in the *Pei-shih* 北史, and this is apparently derived from a passage "The Yüeh-shih Country, of which the king governs at Chien-shih City 監氏城" in the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of *Han-shu* 漢書西域傳; and both Lu-chien-shih 盧監氏 and Shêng-chien-shih 贛監氏 are undoubtedly scribal errors of Chien-shih 監氏. The present *Hsi-yü-chuan* of *Wei-shu* is based upon the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of *Pei-shih*, but the *Pei-shih* 北史 itself is supposed to have had various editions, of which a certain edition might have written Lu-chien-shih 盧監氏, while the other Shêng-chien-shih 贛監氏. I am therefore of opinion that at an edition of the *Wei-shu* supplemented on the basis of the former have survived to the present day, while the *Pei-shih* based on the latter has also been handed down to us; or even other circumstances can be thought of for the causes of occur-

(1) The location of the five countries north of Gandhâra conquered by Chi-to-lo are not exactly known. It might be a result of association with the Five Hsi-hou 五翕侯 of the Great Yüeh-shih in the Han Dynasty.

(2) Kazuo Enoki, *The Chapter on the Country of Su-t'ê of Wei-shu and the Problem of Hsiung-nu~Huns Identity* (魏書粟特國傳と匈奴・フン同族問題), *Tôyô-Gakuhô* 東洋學報, Vol. 37, No. 4, pp. 11-22.

ance of such a difference.⁽¹⁾ The original text of the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of *Wei-shu*, however, should have simply had the name of Chien-(or Lan-)shih-ch'êng 監(藍)氏城. This is confirmed by the *T'ung-tien* 通典, Bk. 192 and the *T'ai-p'ing huan-yü-chi* 太平寰宇記, Bk. 184, both of which are considered to have referred to the original text of *Wei-shu*, and have no name but Lan-shih-ch'êng 藍氏城 and Lan-shih-ch'êng 藍市城 respectively as the appellation of the capital of the Great Yüeh-shih, and, actually, the latter records the name Po-lo 薄羅 as an alias of Lan-shih 藍市. Chien-shih 監氏 in the *Han-shu* 漢書 corresponds to Lan-shih 藍市 recorded in the *Ta-yüan-chuan* of *Shih-chi* 史記大宛傳 as the capital of Ta-hsia 大夏 and to Lan-shih in the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of *Hou-han-shu* 後漢書西域傳, the capital of the Great Yüeh-shih, both referring to the city Bactra. Some takes Chien-shih 監氏 for an abridged form of Alexandria⁽²⁾ or a transliteration of 'kand' of Samarkand,⁽³⁾ while the other takes Lan-shih 藍市 for a translation of Puşkalâvatî (city of blue lotus).⁽⁴⁾ Toyohachi Fujita identified Chien-shih = Lu-chien-shih with Lâwakand (Lawkend)⁽⁵⁾ and Markwart with Iskîmišt.⁽⁶⁾ There is also an opinion that lan 藍 (*lâm) represents Khulum.⁽⁷⁾ However, I myself am of opinion that it was originally written Mo-ti 莫氏 or Mo-ti 膜氏, which has been miswritten in such forms as Lan-shih 藍氏, Lan-shih 藍市, Chien-shih 監氏, Shêng-shih 贍氏 or Lu-shih 盧氏 and these names had again been miswritten Lu-chien-shih 盧監氏 and Shêng-chien-shih 贍監氏. The original forms should have represented Bâxtri or Bâxdî, an Iranian appellation of Bactra. Whatever it might have been, during the period of Northern Wei, the name of Bactra had not already been known by Chinese as Chien-shih 監氏 or other similar names, but as either Bâxdî or Baxl ~ Baxlo.

In the Chapter on Tu-hu-lo (Toxâra) Country 吐呼羅國 in the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of *Wei-shu* (= *Pei-shih*), it is stated that: "In the country, there is the city of Po-t'i 薄提, of which the circumference measures 60 *li*. To the south of the city, there is a big river which flows towards the west and is named the Han-lou 漢樓".⁽⁸⁾ The Po-t'i is evidently a transliteration of Bâxdî which denotes Bactra, and the river Han-lou is the Bactrus that flows at the south of the city Bactra, of which the name is derived from that of the river.⁽⁹⁾ Han

(1) *Tôyô-Gakuhô* 東洋學報, Vol. 37, No. 4, pp. 9-10.

(2) E. Specht in *JA*, 1897, 2, p. 161. On that the account that Alexander constructed Alexandria in Bactra is hard to be denied, vide the *Encyclopedia of Islâm* on Balkh.

(3) Jitsuzô Kuwabara 桑原隲藏, *Tôzai Kôtsûshi Ronsô* 東西交通史論叢, pp. 94-95, 193, 313.

(4) S. Lévi, *Notes sur les Indo-Scythes*, *JA*, 1897, p. 9, note 42. However, Puşkalâvatî was a city of the Kushâns, now north of Peshawar.

(5) *Tôzai Kôshôshi no Kenkyû* 東西交渉史の研究 (西域篇), pp. 41-42.

(6) *Wehrot und Arang*, p. 86.

(7) E.G. Pulleyblank, *The Consonantal System of Old Chinese*, *Asia major*, IX, 1, 1962, p. 122.

(8) 吐呼羅國... 國中有薄提城, 周卅六十里, 城南有西流大水, 名漢樓河.

(9) A.T. Olmstead, *The History of the Persian Empire*, [Achaemenid Period], Chicago: The University of Chicago Press 1948, p. 48.

漠 of Han-lou must be a mistake of *mo* 漠 or *p'u* 濮, thus Mo-lou (*mâk-lâu, *bâk-lâu) or p'u-lou (*p'uk-lâu) well stands for the transliteration of Baxl or Baxlo.⁽¹⁾ There is also an account in the same book on Po-chih 薄知, which runs as follows: "The Po-chih Country, of which the capital is Po-chih, is situated in the south of Ch'ieh-sê-ni 伽色尼 (Kušani[k]=Kišš, Šahr-i-Sabz), lying 13,320 *li* away from Tai".⁽²⁾

This Po-chih is also a transliteration of Bâxdi⁽³⁾ which means Bactra. And even Po-lo 薄羅, the capital of the Great Yüeh-shih in 437, where they were said to have removed their capital from Lu-chien-shih 盧監氏, and situated to the west of Lu-chien-shih, can not be any other place than Baxl or Bactra itself.⁽⁴⁾ Marquart followed Tomaschek who identified Po-lo with βαλαάμ, which was, according to Priscus,⁽⁵⁾ a city of the Kidarites and where the Sasanian King Pêrôz defeated the Kidâra Huns (Κιδάριτας Οδύνοους) to occupy it in *circa* 468. Marquart and other scholars locate βαλαάμ either at Balxân or *Balaxan which is probably what is now Balkan to the east of the Bay of Krasnovodsk on the east coast of the Caspian Sea⁽⁶⁾ or at some place to the north of the Caucasus.⁽⁷⁾ In the Chapter on T'u-hu-lo Country 吐呼羅國, the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of *Wei-shu* gives the distance from T'u-hu-lo to Fan-yang 范陽 (Bâmiyân) and also to Hsi-wan-chin 悉萬斤 (Samarkand) as 2,000 *li*. As the centre of the T'u-hu-lo Country was situated at Po-t'i 薄提 or Balkh, the distance between Po-t'i and Samarkand is roughly the same as that between Fu-ti-sha 弗敵沙 and Po-lo 薄羅. Actually, according to the *World Atlas*, Moscow, 1967, 143-144, the direct distance from the present Balkh to Samarkand is 325 km. and that from Balkh to Faizabad (Badakhshan) is 350 km., which will show the accuracy of calculation of distance between Fu-ti-sha and Po-lo. From this

(1) I owe to Professor K. Shiratori this emendation. However, in the *Chiu-t'ang-shu* 舊唐書, Bk. 40 and the *T'ang-shu* 唐書, Bk. 43b, and the *T'ang-hui-yao* 唐會要, Bk. 73, Han-lou-chou 漢樓州 is listed as one of the provinces under the Yüeh-shih Tu-tu-fu 月氏都督府, which will show that in the *Wei-shu* referred to by the compilers of these books the name had already been given as Han-lou 漢樓. Markwart, *Wehrot und Arang*, p. 38, takes Han-lou 漢樓 for a scribal error of p'ok-lâ 漢(濮)樓 which, according to him, corresponds to Weh-rôt or the Oxus. However, this river should be looked upon as Bactrus, a tributary of the Oxus, which is called today Balchâb (*Der Kleine Pauly*, I, pp. 814a under Baktrian, and 815a under βάκτρος).

(2) 薄知國, 都薄知城, 在伽色尼南, 去代一萬三千三百二十里。

(3) Marquart, *Ērânšahr*, Berlin 1901, pp. 55, 214 n.1.

(4) De Goeje in *WZKM*, 16 (1902), p. 190; Chavannes in *TP*, 1907, p. 187-189; Pelliot in *JA*, 1934, p. 42 n. 3. cf. R. Ghirshman, *Les Chionites-Hephthalites*, p. 76.

(5) Priscus, 41 (*Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, 4, p. 109).

(6) W. Tomaschek, *Central Asiatische Studien*, SKAW, Wien 1877, p. 176; J. Marquart, *Ērânšahr*, pp. 55, 214, and literatures quoted in G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, II, Berlin: Akademie Verlag 1958, p. 85. On Balxân, see W. Barthold, Balkhân in *Encyclopedia of Islâm* (First edition), which is not reproduced in Barthold's collected works, Vol. V, Moskva, 1968.

(7) D.M. Dunlop, *The History of the Jewish Khazar*, Princeton: Princeton University Press 1954, p. 20.

point of view, Po-lo should be identified with Balkh. This will also show that the distance given is too short as that between Badakhshân and Krasnovodsk, thus making this identification very difficult to be accepted.⁽¹⁾ Moreover, as Chi-to-lo 寄多羅, starting from Po-lo 薄羅, conquered the Gandhâra region right crossing the Hindûkush, it was only possible when Bactra was used as his base and it is hard to believe that such a westernmost place as Krasnovodsk was the centre for the campaign. The statement on the Great Yüeh-shih in the *T'ai-p'ing huan-yü-chi* 太平寰宇記, Bk. 184 runs as follows:

“The Great Yüeh-shih Country sent envoys [to Chinese court] during the time of Han 漢. (Its capital) is situated at Lan-shih-ch'êng 藍氏城, alias Po-lo-ch'êng 薄羅城. (Chin-ling shu-chü 金陵書局 edition; other editions write Po-wei-ch'êng 薄維城).

It is right to take Po-lo 薄羅 for an alias of Lan-shih 藍氏 or Chien-shih 監氏. The author of the *T'ai-p'ing huan-yü-chi* has certainly referred to the original text of the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of *Wei-shu* 魏書西域傳, and the above identification must have been based on the description in the latter. Actually, there have been two orders of description for the name to denote Bactria:

- 1) Av. Bâxdî: O. Pers. Baxtri- (Baxtriš, Bâxtriya); Elam. ba-ak-ši-iš, ba-ik-tur-ri-iš: Akk. ba-aḥ-tar: Gr. βακτρα: Mid. Pers. *Bâxdiyâ
- 2) Skt. Bâhlîka, Bâhûlaka, Bâhlî: Mid. Pers. Baxl, Balx: Arm. Bałx, Bałh, Bahl, Baxl, Baht: Syriac Balḥ or Balkh: Arab.-Pers. Baxl: Christian Sogd. Bhl: Kushano-Sasanian and Hephth. Baxlo: Gr. Παχλ: Tib. Bag-la⁽²⁾.

(1) Chavannes also disagrees with Marquart and adopted the Po-lo=Balkh theory (*TP*, 1907, p. 187-189).

(2) This list is prepared on the basis of H.W. Bailey, *Kanaiška*, *JRAS*, 1942, pp. 22-23, to which are added some new forms which have come to the knowledge of the present writer. New forms and the reference sources are as follows:

a) Mid. Pers. *Bâxdiyâ (Fu-ti-yeh 縛底野, *b'iwak-ṭiei-ia in the *Yu-yang tsa-tsu* 酉陽雜俎, 前集, Bk. 14, and Fu-ti-ya 縛底耶, *b'iwak-ṭiei-ia in Hui-ch'ao 慧超's *Wang-wu-t'ien-chu-kuo-chuan* 往五天竺國傳).

b) Skt. Bâhlî (S. Lévi, *Le catalogue géographique de Yakša dans le Mahâmayûri*, *JA*, 1915, 1, p. 56). Syr. Balkh (Nestorian Monument 大秦景教流行中國碑 of 781. See Y. Saeki, *The Nestorian Documents and Relics in China*, Tokyo 1951, p. 70, and A.P. Moule, *Christians in China before the Year 1550*, London 1930, p. 48).

Kushano-Sasanian and Hephthali Baxlo (E. Herzfeld, *Kushano-Sasanian Coins*, Calcutta 1930, p. II: H. Junker, *Die hephthalischen Münzinschriften*, *SPAW*, 1930 p. 652).

Gr. παχλ (Faustus in *Frag. Hist. Graecorum*, V, p. 298, cf. R. Ghirshman, *Les Chionite-Hephthalites*, p. 74).

Tib. Bag-la (P. Pelliot, *Tokharien et Koutchéen*, *JA*, 1934, p. 43 note: H.W. Bailey, *Ttagara*, *BSOS*, III, 1937, p. 887).

In the meantime, there is a view that Bâhlîka has not primarily signified Bactra (R. Schafer, *Ethnography of Ancient India*, Wiesbaden; Harrassowitz 1954, p. 141). As regards Bâhlîka denoting Bactra, see S. Lévi, *Notes chinoises sur l'Inde*, *BEFEO*, V, 1905, p. 31 and W.B. Henning, *Argi and the "Tokharians"*, *BSOS*, IX, 1937-1939, p. 546.

The names of the first order which are older in date than those of the second gradually came to be unused while the names of the second becoming more popularized. It would be assumed that the transference started during the fourth to sixth centuries, *viz.* the Northern Wei Dynasty, by the evidence of the mixed usage of the names belonging to the both orders in the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of *Wei-shu*. At least, as far as Chinese records are concerned, the admixture had been confirmed till the ninth century. Namely, P'o-ch'ü-lo 婆佉羅 in the *Chêng-fa nien-ch'u ching* 正法念處經 or *Saddharma-smṛtyupasthāna-sūtra* translated by Gautama Prajñāruci 瞿曇般若流支 in 539;⁽¹⁾ and Po-ch'ü-lo 薄佉羅 in the biography of Dharmagupta 達摩笈多 (of the Sui 隋 Dynasty) in the *Hsü-kao-sêng-chuan* 續高僧傳, Bk. 2,⁽²⁾ and also in Hsüan-ying 玄應's commentary on the *Mi-chi chin-kang-li-shih ching* 密迹金剛力士經, Bk. 2 in his *Commentaries on Tripitaka* 一切經音義, Bk. 4;⁽³⁾ and Fu-k'o-lo 縛渴羅 in the Chapters on Hsüan-chao 玄照 and Hsüan-hui 玄會 of the *Hsi-yü ch'iu-fa kao-sêng-chuan* 西域求法高僧傳;⁽⁴⁾ all the above seem to transliterate Bâhûla[ka] or Baxl. And Fu-k'o 縛喝 (*b'ïwak-xipt) in the *Biography of Hsüan-chuang* 玄奘, Bk. 2,⁽⁵⁾ *Records of Western Countries*, Bk. 1,⁽⁴⁾ and in the biography of Hsüan-chuang in the *Hsü-kao-sêng-chuan*, Bk. 4,⁽⁶⁾ seems to represent the sound of Bâhû[la]ka or Bâhû[la]ka or an abbreviation of Fu-k'o-lo 縛渴羅.⁽⁷⁾ On the other hand, Po-t'i 白題 in the biography of P'ei Tzû-yeh 裴子野 of the *Liang-shu* 梁書, Bk. 30, and the *Nan-shih* 南史, Bk. 33, and the same in the *Liang-shu*, Bk. 54, the *Nan-shih*, Bk. 79, and the *Liang-chih-kung-t'u* 梁職貢圖;⁽⁸⁾ also Fu-ch'ih(-ch'êng) 縛叱(城), where the governmental centre of T'ang-hsia Province 大夏州 under Yüeh-shih tu-tu-fu 月氏都督府 was placed,⁽⁹⁾ Fu-ti yeh 縛底野 in the discription of Hsieh-yüeh 謝颺 (Zâbul, Ghazna)⁽¹⁰⁾ in the *T'ang-shu* 唐書, Bk. 221 b, Fu-ti-ye 縛底耶 in the *Wang-wu-t'ien-chu-kuo-chuan* 往五天竺國傳 by Hui-ch'ao 慧超 who passed this quarter in the 15th year

(1) *Tripitaka Taishô* 大正新脩大藏經, Vol. 17, p. 404.

(2) *Tripitaka Taishô* 大正新脩大藏經, Vol. 50, p. 435.

(3) 縮藏, 爲快, 第六冊, 十六左.

(4) Kiroku Adachi 足立喜六, *Daitô Saiiki Guhō Kōsōden* 大唐西域求法高僧傳, Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 1942, pp. 11, 30, 59.

(5) *Tripitaka Taishô* 大正新脩大藏經, Vol. 50, p. 228.

(6) *Tripitaka Taishô* 大正新脩大藏經, Vol. 50, p. 448.

(7) According to Shinjō Mizutani 水谷眞成, *Parallel Sound of Shêng-mu 聲母 of hsiao 曉 and hsia 匣—A Study of Transcriptions of Foreign Words in the Ta-t'ang hsi-yü-chi*, No. 2 (曉匣兩聲母的對音——大唐西域記夷語音譯稿その二) *Tōyō Gakuhō* 東洋學報, Vol. 30, No. 4, p. 50, the original name of Fu-k'o 縛喝 can not be decisively identified.

(8) On the *Liang-chih-kung-t'u*, see the articles by the present author, published in *Tōhōgaku* 東方學, Vol. 26 (1963), pp. 31-46, Vol. 27 (1964), pp. 12-32, and *Kamata Hakushi Kanrekikinen Shigakuronō* 鎌田博士還曆記念史學論叢, Tokyo, 1970, pp. 131-144.

(9) *T'ang-shu* 唐書, Bk. 43, and *T'ang-hui-yao* 唐會要, Bk. 73. Cf. T. Fujita, *Hui-ch'ao-chuan chien-shih* 慧超傳箋釋, 1910 edition, p. 56, takes it for miswriting of Fu-ch'a 縛吒.

(10) 颺 *jih*, *nizjēt should be read 颺, *yüeh*, *üt*, *jivpt, otherwise it can not represent -bul of Zâbul. On this point, see K. Shiratori, *Saikiishi Kenkyū*, 1, pp. 448-449.

of K'ai-yüan 開元 (727), and Fu-ti-yeh(-ch'êng) 縛底野(城) in the *Yu-yang tsatsu* 酉陽雜俎, First Series, Bk. 14 (ed. *Ssü-pu ts'ung-k'an*), which is a work of the date of circa 860,⁽¹⁾ all the above mentioned may be to transcribe the sound of either Bâxdî or Bâxdiyâ.

Since Lu- (or Shêng-)chien-shih 盧(贍)監氏 is considered to be a scribal error of Chien-shih 監氏 and actually denotes Bactra, and Po-lo 薄羅 also means Bactra, the statement that the Great Yüeh-shih transferred the capital from Lu-chien-shih 盧監氏 to Po-lo 薄羅 because of the invasion of the Juan-juan 蠕蠕 is to be taken as an explanation of the difference of names of the capitals of the Ta-yüeh-shih during the Han and the Northern Wei Dynasty, which is far from the truth. It can also be confirmed by the lack of evidence that the Juan-juan 蠕蠕 had ever extended their power not only as far as the Bactrian region, but even Sogdiana. Therefore, Cunningham's interpretation that Chi-to-lo 寄多羅 moved westwards by the expansion of Juan-juan 蠕蠕 during the time of Ch'ih-lien K'o-han 敕連可汗 or Tegri Qayan (430-444) and Ch'u K'o-han 處可汗 or Dje Qayan (445-463)⁽²⁾ can not be accepted as true.

In this way, the facts obtainable from the statement concerning the Great Yüeh-shih in the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of *Wei-shu* are as follows:

- 1) In 437 the capital of the Ta-yüeh-shih was situated at Po-lo City 薄羅城 or Bactra;
- 2) The troops of Ta-yüeh-shih crossed the Hindûkush and expanded their territory to the south of it during the time of their King Chi-to-lo 寄多羅 who subjugated five countries to the north of Gandhâra;
- 3) So in 437 the territory of the Ta-yüeh-shih included Bactria (Tokhâ-restân), Gandhâra and four countries⁽³⁾ to the north of Gandhâra.

III

Next, the statement of the Hsiao-yüeh-shih 小月氏 in the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of *Wei-shu* (= *Pei-shih*) runs as follows:

"The Hsiao-yüeh-shih has their capital at Fu-lou-sha 富樓沙 (Puruṣapura, Peshawar). The King is originally the son of Chi-to-lo 寄多羅, king of the Ta-yüeh-shih. Chi-to-lo was forced to move westwards by the attack of the Hsiung-nu 匈奴 and later made his son guard this city. For this

(1) B. Laufer, *Sino-Iranica*, p. 247.

(2) Concerning the names of these Juan-juan kings, see K. Shiratori, *Tôko Minzoku kô* 東胡民族考, (*A Study of the Tung-hu Tribes*), 10, *Shigaku Zasshi* 史學雜誌, Vol 23, No. 10, and T. Fujita, *Zen-zen no Kokugô oyobi Kakangô ni tsukite* 蠕蠕の國號及び可汗號に就きて (*Notes on the Name of the Country of Juan-juan and on the Names of their Qayans*), *Tôzai Kôshôshi no Kenkyû* 東西交渉史の研究, *Saiiki-hen* 西域篇, pp. 192-193.

(3) According to the Chinese way of expression, the five countries are to include Gandhâra.

reason, the kingdom was named the Hsiao-yüeh-shih. It is situated to the south-west of Po-lu 波路 (Bolor) and 16,600 *li* away from Tai 代. Their ancestors had lived between Hsi-p'ing 西平 and Chang-yeh 張掖. Their clothings are very similar to those of the Ch'iang 羌. The people use gold and silver coins as currency. They remove from place to place breeding their cattle like the Hsiung-nu. At 10 *li* to the east of the city there is a stûpa, the circumference of which being 350 *pu* 步 and the height 80 *chang* 丈. From the time when the stûpa was built up to the eighth year of Wu-ting 武定 (550), 842 years elapsed. This is the so-called Stûpa of 100 *chang* 百丈佛圖⁽¹⁾."

The description of the stûpa concerns the *Ch'iao-li fu-t'u* 雀離浮圖. Another mention is made about the *Ch'iao-li fu-t'u* in the paragraph of Ch'ien-t'o-kuo 乾陀國 or Gandhâra in the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of *Wei-shu*, which is actually an abbreviation of Sung-yün 宋雲's account reproduced in the *Lo-yang ch'ieh-lan chi* 洛陽伽藍記, Bk. 5.⁽²⁾ This is an information obtained in the eighth year of Wu-ting 武定 (550) when the Eastern Wei Dynasty collapsed, and the story was added there only because the stûpa was in Peshawar. The description of the stûpa, therefore, may be omitted from the present considerations. As regards the other statements, there are detailed text-critical studies by Pelliot, Haloun and Matsuda,⁽³⁾ which clarify the following points:

- a) The statement that "their ancestors had lived between Hsi-p'ing 西平 and Chang-yeh 張掖" is copied from the *Shih-san-chow-chih* 十三州志 by K'an Yin 闕駟 (Haloun, Matsuda).
- b) The statement that "their clothings are very similar to those of the Ch'iang 羌" is taken from the *Hsi-ch'iang-chuan* 西羌傳 of the *Hou-han-shu* 後漢書, Bk. 117 (Pelliot, Haloun, Matsuda).
- c) The statement that "the people use gold and silver coins as currency; they remove from place to place breeding their cattle like the Hsiung-nu" was written on the basis of the paragraph on Ta-yüeh-shih in the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of *Han-shu*, Bk. 96a (Haloun).

All the above accounts, therefore, are to be regarded as those on the Little and Great Yüeh-shih in the Han Dynasty. But in the *Han-shu* there is a description on the currency among the Great Yüeh-shih that it is the same as in An-hsi 安息 or Parthia, while in the paragraph on An-hsi it is

(1) 小月氏國，都富樓沙城，其王本大月氏王寄多羅子也，寄多羅爲匈奴所逐西徙，後令其子守此城，因號小月氏焉，在波路西南，去代一萬六千六百里，其先居西平張掖之間，被服頗與羌同，其俗以金銀錢爲貨，隨畜牧移徙，亦類匈奴，其城東十里，有佛塔，周三百五十步，高八十丈，自佛塔初建計，至武定八年，八百四十二年，所謂百丈佛圖也。

(2) Concerning the *Ch'iao-li fu-t'u*, see P. Pelliot, *Tokharien et Koutchéen*, JA, 1934, p. 75-90, and Fan Hsiang-yung 范祥雍, *Lo-yang ch'ieh-lan chi chiao-chu* 洛陽伽藍記校註, Shanghai 1958, pp. 334-337, in which related Chinese texts are collected.

(3) P. Pelliot, *Tokharien et Koutchéen*, JA, 1934, p. 43 n. 1; G. Haloun, *Zur Üe-t'ü-Frage*, ZDMG, 1937, p. 206 n. 1; Hisao Matsuda 松田壽男, *On the Kidâra Yüeh-shih* (寄多羅月氏に就いての考), *Kokushi-gaku* 國史學, No. 33, pp. 37-39.

stated that “(the people) use silver as coins, etc.”, not referring to the use of gold coins.⁽¹⁾ Accordingly, the statement that “the people use gold and silver coins as currency” and be regard as that the gold and silver coins were actually in use among the Little Yüeh-shih in the period of Northern Wei Dynasty. Now then the following four points are the newly obtained informations of the Little Yüeh-shih during the Wei Dynasty:

- (1) Their capital was at the city of Fu-lou-sha 富樓沙城;
- (2) the King was a son of Chi-to-lo, the Great Yüeh-shih king, who made his son guard the city after he fled westwards due to the expansion of the Hsiung-nu, and the kingdom was called the Little Yüeh-shih;
- (3) the country was to the south-west of Po-lo 波路 (Bolor), 16,600 *li* away from Tai 代; and
- (4) gold and silver coins were in use.

Among these four points, it is needless to say that Fu-lou-sha 富樓沙 in (1) is Puruṣapura or what is now Peshawar which had been the great centre of the Gandhāra region at that time. It will, therefore, be unnecessary to examine its direction and the distance from Bolor as described in (3).

As regards the coins in (4), those which have hitherto been identified with Kidāra's are all silver and bronze coins,⁽²⁾ but this would not make it difficult to identify the Little Yüeh-shih with the Kidarites. Now according

(1) The *Hsi-yü-chuan* of *Han-shu*, Bk. 96a, says about the *Ta-yüeh-shih* as follows: “The country of Ta-yüeh-shih... its land, scenery, things available there, manners and customs and the currency as the same as in An-hsi 安息 or Parthia 大月氏國... 土地風氣, 物類所有, 民俗錢貨, 與安息同”, and under An-hsi (Bk. 96a) it says that “The country of An-hsi... they made coins with silver 安息國... 以銀爲錢”.

(2) Robert Göbl, *Dokumente zur Geschichte der iranischen Hunnen in Baktrien und Indien*, Bd. I, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz 1967, p. 24. Though Cunningham takes the gold coin bearing the Brāhmī inscription *Kushāna-Kidāra-Kapan* for of Kidāra (*NCh.*, 1893, Pt., III, pp. 199–200), it remains to be decided whether it is truly of Kidāra or not. We must take into our consideration that the name Kidāra appears on the gold coin of Yaśovarman of the Nāga Dynasty in the eighth century Kashmir and it is copied after Kidāra's coin (C.J. Brown, *The Coins of India*, London 1922, p. 54, pl. VI, 16), and that ‘Kidāra’ had become a denomination of the mediaeval Kashmiri coinage (A. S. Altekar and A. K. Narain's informations in 1952). Brown says that the Kidarites at Kābul were driven out by an inroad of the Ephthalites, or white Huns, and settled in Kashmir where they struck coins in much alloyed gold and also in copper... and there it survived in a hardly recognizable form in the later coins, until the muhammadans put an end to the Hindu kingdom in the fourteenth century (*Ibid.*, p. 37). However, this does not mean that Kidāra himself issued gold coins. R. Ghirshman, *Les Chionites-Hephthalites*, p. 78, is of opinion that among the coins discovered at Tépé-Marenjan by Hackin and Carl there are 11 gold coins of Kidāra, which was denied by R. Curiel, *Trésors monétaires d'Afghanistan*, p. 122–123. Curiel confirms that, among the coins found at Tépé Maranjān, there are no coins of Kidāra. In the meantime, Göbl, *Dokumente zur Geschichte der iranischen Hunnen in Baktrien und Indien*, Bd. II, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz 1967, p. 35, says that “Der Fund ist zwar ‘nominalien sauber’ (s.o.), d.h. er enthält nur Sasanidendrachmen und KS-Gepräge, deren einige Kidāra selbst gehören”.

to (2), the king of the Little Yüeh-shih was a son of Chi-to-lo, and governed in the city of Fu-lou-sha after Chi-to-lo fled westwards by the pressure of the Hsiung-nu. But, under the Great Yüeh-shih, as was quoted above, it is stated that the Great Yüeh-shih, being invaded by the Juan-juan, transferred the capital from Lu-chien-shih to Po-lo, only after which Chi-to-lo appeared to subjugate the five countries to the north of Gandhâra, and not that Chi-to-lo himself fled to the west. It can be understood, therefore, the removal to the west of Chi-to-lo as written under the Little Yüeh-shih and that of Ta-yüeh-shih as written under the Great Yüeh-shih denote quite different matters. This presumption may be confirmed by the account that Chi-to-lo was forced to remove by the Hsiung-nu in the chapter on the Little Yüeh-shih, while in the chapter on the Great Yüeh-shih the removal took place by the frequent invasion of the Juan-juan. At the same time, since Fu-lou-sha is the centre of Gandhâra, it must be after Chi-to-lo's conquest of Gandhâra that the Little Yüeh-shih king governed at the city. Then, the removal of Chi-to-lo to the west mentioned in the chapter on the Little Yüeh-shih should have taken place only after he had conquered Gandhâra. Actually, there is a statement concerning the Little Yüeh-shih to the following effect in the *T'ung-tien* 通典, Bk. 192, the *T'ai-p'ing huan-yü chi* 太平寰宇記, Bk. 184, and the *Wên-hsien t'ung-k'ao* 文獻通考 Bk. 338, which copied the *T'ung-tien*: "Chi-to-lo was forced to remove westwards by the invasion of Juan-juan 蠕蠕, and later made his son guard this city (*i.e.* Puruṣapura). Therefore, they called themselves the Little Yüeh-shih". But this statement had been undoubtedly revised by the editor of *T'ung-tien* in order to make the account concerning the Little Yüeh-shih consistent to what is said concerning the Great Yüeh-shih. The original text of the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of *Wei-shu* must have recorded that he was driven out by the Hsiung-nu. The Kidarites, as will be stated in the next chapter, were expelled from the Bactrian region because of the rise of the Hephthalites, and made battles against the Sasanid Dynasty in moving to the Caspian coast. In this way, one may well take the statement of *Wei-shu* that Chi-to-lo was expelled westwards by the Hsiung-nu actually denotes the fact that he lost Bactria due to the Hephthalites.⁽¹⁾ When the Kidarite Dynasty lost the territory to the north of Hindûkush, Gandhâra must have subsequently been separated and became independent and we may well take it for a fact that Chi-to-lo made his son govern at Fu-lou-sha. Since the chapter on the

(1) Cunningham considers that the Hephthalites invaded the Oxus Basin while Kidâra was out on the conquest of Gandhâra and Kidâra returned hastily to fight with them (*NChr.*, 1889, Pt. III, p. 279), while Marquart thinks that Kidâra conquered Gandhâra as the Hephthalites invaded the Oxus Basin (*Érânšahr*, p. 58), and A. Christensen understands that the Kidarites, being defeated by Pêrôz (457, 459-484), Sasanian king, removed to Gandhâra under the leadership of Kungkha who is written to be a son of Kidâra by Priscus (*L'Iran sous les Sassanides*, 2nd ed., Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard 1944, p. 292-293).

Little Yüeh-shih can be assumed as was written on the basis of materials obtained later than those concerning the chapter on the Great Yüeh-shih⁽¹⁾, it is quite natural that the chapter on the Little Yüeh-shih records the later facts than those recorded in the chapter on the Great Yüeh-shih. As will be discussed in the next chapter, the Kidarites had been fighting with the Sasanids probably at the north-eastern border of Persia from 456 to 468. But it was not known by the Chinese. The Chinese knew Gandhâra as the new centre of the Kidarites because they had had relations with the Kidarites there, while they had very little or almost nothing to do with the Kidarites who were fighting with the Persians.

IV

It can be certain that the Kidarites were existent in 437 (the year of Tung Wan 董璇's embassy) and reigning over both north and south of the Hindûkush, but when did their Dynasty start and how long did it last? The end of the Dynasty is comparatively clear. At the middle of the fifth century, the Ephthalites expanded to and finally occupied the Tokhârestân region which formed the northern half of the Kidarites' territory. The expansion of the Ephthalites to this part of the world seems to have started at least by the time of Yazdgerd II (438-457) of the Sasanids. The Kushans in Tokhârestân who were much disturbed by their advance gradually removed to the border of the Sasanids in the west, repeating battles with the Sasanian garrisons. But, by the time of Yazdgerd II's death, the whole part of Tokhârestân fell to the hands of the Ephthalites, and at the time of dispute over the succession between Yazdgerd II's two sons, Hormizd III (457-459) and Pêrôz (457, 459-484), the Ephthalites helped the younger prince Pêrôz who fled to the land of the Ephthalites and put him on the throne, and, as the reward, the land of Tâlakân was given to them. Tâlakân is an important place situated between Balkh (Bactra) and Merv al-Rûd, forming a border between the Sasanian territory and Tokhârestân⁽²⁾. Under these circumstances, the power of the Great Yüeh-shih or the Kidarites must have already been lost in Tokhârestân by this time.

Priscus gives the following accounts as to the movements of the Kidarites between 456 and c. 468. In order to make clear in what contexts the accounts are given, I publish here English translations of all related passages which were edited by Carl Müller in his *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, IV, Paris 1868. These translations were prepared by Professor Masaaki Kubo 久保正彰 of the University of Tokyo, to whom the writer of the present

(1) *Tôyô-Gakuhô* 東洋學報, Vol. 37, No. 4, pp. 19-21.

(2) Th. Nöldeke, *Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sasaniden*, p. 115 ff.: K. Enoki, *On the Nationality of the Hephthalites*, *MTB*, 18, p. 25.

article is infinitely grateful for his kindness.

Priscus Fr. 25 (456. Marciani imperatoris anno 7) Müller, FHG v. p. 102
Excerpta De Legationibus Romanorum p. 73. 74)

Item: After the Romans invaded Kolchis and waged war against the Lazoi, the Roman soldiers returned to their camp, but the generals made preparations for another battle. Their counsels were divided, whether to follow the same path as before, or, after diplomatic negotiation with the monarch of the Parthvoi and upon his consent, to take the path through Armenia, the land on the border of the Persian territory. For they believed it altogether infeasible to sail along the rugged coastline, since no harbour was found in the neighborhood of Kolchis. Gobazes (the king of the Lazoi)⁽¹⁾ on the other hand sent his ambassadors to the Parthvoi as well as to the Roman Emperor. The monarch of the Parthvoi, however, rejected the Lazoi who sought his protection, because he was then engaged in a war with the Hunns known by the name of Kidaritai.

Priscus Fr. 31 (c. 464. Leonis imperatoris anno 8) Müller, FHG v. p. 105
(Excerpta De Legationibus Gentium p. 43).

Item: At the time when the fugitive tribes revolted against the eastern Romans, the Italians sent their ambassadors and said that they would no longer be able to sustain the matter unless they make terms with the Vandals. Also came the envoy from the Persian king (Peiroze)⁽²⁾ and brought complaints in behalf of the Persian fugitives in the Roman territory and of the Magi who had long since inhabited in the Roman land, for allegedly the Romans intended to deprive them of their ancestral customs, laws and ritual ordinances, constantly annoyed them, nor did permit them to light the fire—known by the name of the inextinguishable—in accordance with their ancient law. The envoy claimed in addition that the Romans should see to it that the fortress of Iuroeipaach⁽³⁾ at the Caspian Gates be maintained by their financial expenditure, or else dispatch soldiers to keep garrison, lest the Persians alone should be weighed by the burden of money and soldiers. For if they yielded the fortress, not only the Persians but also the Romans would readily suffer from the inroads of the neighboring tribes. The Romans really should, as the Persians claimed, assist the Persians with money in their war against the Hunns known by the name of Kidaritai. For their victory would mean gains to the Romans as well, because the tribe shall not be permitted to cross the borders of the Roman Empire, either. The Romans answered: a negotiating mission shall be sent to the king of the Parthvoi on all these matters. For there lives no fugitive among the

(1) Words supplied by the translator.

(2) Supplied by Müller in his Latin translation.

(3) *Viriparach* or *Viraparach* seems to come nearest truth: for *barach* means a house or a mansion, and *viram* solitude or ruin (Niebuhr).

Romans, nor have they ever annoyed the Magi on account of their religious worship. With regard to the garrison at Iuroeipaach and the war with the Hunns, they have no right to ask money from the Romans since they assumed the burden on their own account.

Now in behalf of the Italians Tatianos was sent as ambassador to the Vandals, a man of high patrician status, and to the Persians Konstantios, who held office of praefectus urbi three times, and was in the consular rank and of the patrician status.

Priscus Fr. 33 (c. 465. Leonis imperatoris anno 9) Müller, FHG v. p. 106 (Excerpta de Legionibus Romanorum p. 75, 76).

Item: The ambassador Konstantios, after waiting for some time in Edessa, was admitted by the Persian king to his territory. The king asked the ambassador to see him, not in the area of towns, but in the border area between the Persian kingdom and the region occupied by the Hunns known by the name of Kidaritai, for the king was staying there now for some time. . . (The king was in war against the Hunns)⁽¹⁾ whom he held guilty for not paying him the tributes which the old rulers of the Persians and the Parthvoi levied upon the Hunns. The father (of the present monarch)⁽²⁾ refused the payment of the tribute and took up arms, and bequeathed the war and the kingdom to the son. In the end the Persians became thoroughly tired of the battles that they wished to deceive the Hunns and thereby end the dispute with them. So Peiroze (which was the name of then ruling monarch of the Persians) sent his envoy to Kouncha, the leader of the Hunns, and pretended to be willing to sign peace-treaty and treaty of military alliance with him, and promised to give him his sister in marriage. Incidentally Kouncha happened to be still quite young, certainly not in age to become father of children. Kouncha accepted the terms and married, not Peiroze's sister, but another woman dressed out in royal attire. The Persian king sent her out on the promise that, if she keeps the secret to herself she shall be provided with the royal rank and wealth, but if discloses the scheme she shall be punished by death. For the ruler of the Kidaritai would not tolerate a servile woman, in substitute for a lady of noble birth, to be kept for his consort. But the scheme defeated itself and Peiroze, though the treaty was signed with the leader of the Hunns, could enjoy only briefly the fruit of the lie. For that woman, cautious as she was lest the ruler of the Hunns should find out the truth about her from others and put her to cruel death, informed him of the contrivance. Kouncha praised her for truthfulness, kept her as wedded wife as before, but sought vengeance upon Peiroze for deceiving. On the pretext of a war with the neighboring tribes he asked (Peiroze)⁽²⁾ to send him, not soldiers trained for battle (since he had

(1) After the text emended by Niebuhr.

(2) Supplied by the translator in order to clarify the sense.

tens of thousand of such soldiers with him), but the generals who might help him on his campaign. Hence Peiroze sent him a number of distinguished men. Some of these men Kouncha put to death, and the rest he mutilated and sent back to Peiroze to tell, that the king himself paid the penalty of the fraud. Back again the war broke out between them like wild fire, and they fought fiercely. Now it was at Gorga (which was the name of the place where the Persians encamped at the time) that Peiroze received Konstantios, and kindly entertained him for a few days before sending him back, without giving him any favorable answer.

Priscus Fr. 41 (c. 468. Leonis imperatoris anno 12) Müller, FHG v. p. 109 (Excerpta De Legionibus Gentium p. 46).

Item: The Romans and the Lazoi came into a grave conflict with the tribe called Sovanni, and a fierce battle was fought against the mound of the Sovanni).⁽¹⁾ Then also the Persians wished to join in the battle on account of the fortresses which had been captured by the Sovanni. They sent an envoy to the Roman Emperor, and asked him to send over a part of the troops keeping garrison in the Armenian territory subject to the Romans, in order that the troops might reach them quickly and they in turn might avoid the danger of expecting the allies of distant areas. Or else, even if the allied troops arrive, they might be burdened by the expense just as it happened on the earlier occasion, if this war is to be fought as before. For, at the time when the allied troops arrived with Heracleios, the Persians and the Iberians on the Persian side had been entirely occupied with the war against other tribes and the Persian king sorely distressed by the expenditure, so the allied troops were asked to withdraw, but with the result that, when the Parthvoi encamped against the Persian king, he had to call in the Roman help. Now when the messengers arrived and reported that the allied troops had been dispatched with a general in charge of them, then came an envoy from the Persians and reported that they defeated the Kidaritai Hunns, and captured their town, Balaam by siege. They announced their victory with such barbaric exaggeration, trying to demonstrate the mighty military power at their disposal. No sooner than their message was delivered the Roman Emperor sent them off, since the affairs in Sicily happened to be his graver concern.

According to Priscus, in 456 (*i.e.* under Yazdgerd II, 438-457), the Kidarites were fighting with the Parthavoi (Fr. 25) who must have undoubtedly been Parthians and to whom (according to Fr. 33) the Kidarites used to pay tribute; in c. 464 Pêrôz (457, 459-484) of the Sasanids was

(1) Classen thinks that a certain proper name of a Sovanni chieftain was corrupted into the reading **machên*. Tillemon however, conjectures that the reading might have been *es tèn kata tou sêmatos* (of a Lazian leader) "around the grave mound of a Lazian king."

fighting with the Kidarites, asking for a financial aid to the Romans whose border had been threatened by the Kidarites (Fr. 31); in c. 465, Pêrôz made peace with Kouncha, the leader of the Huns (*i.e.* the Kidarites), who had succeeded the kingdom and the war with the Persians from his father, the war having been started because his father refused to pay tribute to the Persians (Fr. 33); Kouncha married to Pêrôz's sister, but, when it was revealed that she was not of royal family, Kouncha sought vengeance upon Pêrôz for deceiving and the war again broke out when Pêrôz received the Roman ambassador Konstantios at Gorga, (*i.e.* what is now in the basin of Gurgân or Gorgân River) which was situated at the border area between the Persian kingdom and the region occupied by the Kidarites (Fr. 33); and in c. 468 the Persians reported to the Roman Emperor that they defeated the Kidarites and captured their town Balaam by siege (Fr. 41).

Balaam is located, according to Tomaschek and Marquart, in the vicinity of Krasnovodsk to the north of Gurgân and according to Dunlop, to the north of the Caucasus⁽¹⁾. Marquart identified this Balaam with Po-lo 薄羅, the capital of the Great Yüeh-shih, which is no longer tenable as has been already discussed. It is also needless to say that Balaam can not be looked upon as identical with Balkh which has never been called by such a name⁽¹⁾. Priscus' accounts tell us that the Kidarites had been engaged war with the Parthians and the Sasanians in the period from 456 to c. 468 in the north-eastern frontiers of the Sasanian Empire. As the date coincides with the appearance of the Ephthalites in Tokhârestân, it is obvious that the Kidarites were forced to move to the west or to be active in the western frontier of their kingdom, which might have already been conquered by Kouncha's father, who is to be identified with Kidâra, and made a part of Kidâra's kingdom. The statement concerning the Little Yüeh-shih in the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of *Wei-shu* that Kidâra was forced to remove to the west by the invasion of the Hsiung-nu might well have conveyed this circumstance. According to Priscus, in certain period after 459 (the year of Pêrôz's enthronement) and before c. 465 (the year when Pêrôz made peace with Kouncha) the Hun King (=Kidâra) died and his son Kouncha succeeded him. As Kouncha fought with and was defeated by the Persians at the north-eastern frontier of the Sasanian Empire, it is quite likely that he was not the same person as the king of the Little Yüeh-shih, who governed in Peshawar after the removal of Kidâra to the west.⁽²⁾

Next, we shall see how long the descendants of Kidâra, who ruled at Gandhâra, reigned in that region. The *Pên-chi* 本紀 or Annals of the *Wei-shu* 魏書 register three embassies which came from Chü-ch'ang 居常

(1) It seems that K. Czeglédy, *Nomád népek vándorlása Napkelettől Napnygatig*, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó 1969, p. 143, takes Balaam for Balk's and looks upon the occupation of Balaam by Pêrôz as that of Balkh.

(2) I can not agree with Christensen who identified Kouncha with the Kidarite king in gandhâra. See *L'Iran sous les Sassanides*, 2nd ed., p. 293.

and Ch'ê-to-lo 車多羅 between 459 and 477.

"In the fifth month of the fifth year of T'ai-an 太安 (459), the country of Chü-ch'ang 居常國 sent an embassy and paid tributes (Bk. 5);

"In the tenth month of the first year of Ho-p'ing 和平 (460), the Chü-ch'ang King 居常王 presented tamed elephants (*ibid*);

"In the ninth month of the first year of T'ai-ho 太和 (477), the countries of Ch'ê-to-lo 車多羅, Hsi-t'ien-chu 西天竺, Shê-wei 舍衛 (Śrāvastī) and Tieh-fu-lo 疊伏羅 (Zabula=Gazna) sent embassies to pay tributes respectively (Bk. 7a);"⁽¹⁾

Chü-ch'ang 居常 is undoubtedly a transcription of Kushan and Ch'ê-to-lo is that of Kidāra⁽²⁾. It is yet to be decided where the country of Chü-ch'ang is to be located. It is possible that the Kushans here mentioned were the Kushans in Tokhārestān which had just been put under the control of the Ephthalites or the Kushans in the Gandhāra region⁽³⁾ or the Kushans under the leadership of Kidāra or his son Koucha who had removed westwards by the invasion of the Ephthalites. On the other hand, the country of Ch'ê-to-lo 車多羅 or Kidāra, which sent an embassy in 477 along with the embassies of countries in North India and the southern part of Afghanistan, such as Hsi-t'ien-chu 西天竺 (the western part of Northern India, then under the Gupta Dynasty—perhaps in the reign of Buddha-gupta), Shê-wei 舍衛 (Śrāvastī which was also under the Guptas and was an important provincial centre in the central part of North India) and Tieh-fu-lo 疊伏羅 (Zabula=Gazna), in all probability was the country of Kidarites in Gandhāra (*i.e.* the Little Yüeh-shih of the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of *Wei-shu*). One can admit, there-

(1) 太安五年五月，居常國遣使朝獻 (Bk. 5).

和平元年十月，居常國獻馴象 (*Ibid.*)

太和元年九月，車多羅·西天竺·舍衛·疊伏羅諸國，各遣使朝貢 (Bk. 7a).

(2) It is P. Pelliot, *Tokharien et Koutchéen*, *JA*, 1934, p. 43 et n. 3, who identified Ch'ê-to-lo 車多羅 with Kidāra. In the *Ta-chih-tu-lun* 大智度論, Bk. 3 (*Tripiṭaka Taishō*, Vol. 25, p. 76), translated by Kumārajīva, it is written that "Even though in such great cities as Ou-ch'i-ni 馮祇尼 (Ujjayinī), Fu-lou-na-pa-t'an 富樓那跋檀 (Purunabhadra), A-lan-ch'ê-to-lo 阿藍車多羅 and Fu-chia-lo-p'o-to 弗迦羅婆多 (Puṣkalāvati) there are so many people who live richly and happily, [Buddha] has never lived in those cities; why [Buddha] lived mainly in Wang-shê-ch'êng 王舍城 (Rājagṛha) and the big city of Shê-p'o-t'i 舍婆提 (Śrāvastī)". Once S. Lévi suggested that A-lan-ch'ê-to-lo 阿藍車多羅 might have been written Alexandria in the original text, which was read by Kumārajīva as Alamchatra (*Alexandre et Alexandrie dans les documents indiens*, in *Memorial Sylvain Lévi*, Paris: Paul Hartmann 1937, p. 418 n. 1). As he pointed out, the *Fan-fan-yü* 翻梵語, Bk. 8 (*Tripiṭaka Taishō*, Vol. 54, p. 1038) writes that it should be revised as A-hsi-ch'ê-to-lo 阿喜車多羅 (Ahicchattra), which was a great local cultural centre under the Guptas (*A New History of the Indian People*, 6, 1st ed., p. 427). Chattra means umbrella (san 傘 or san 織). However, ch'ê 車 can also be pronounced as *chiu* (*kiu*) as Pelliot has explained. Therefore, it is right to read Ch'ê-to-lo 車多羅 as Kidāra.

(3) It is quite possible that the Kushans in the gandhāra region under the rulership of the son of Kidāra sent embassies separately from the government of the Kidarites in Gandhāra.

fore, that the Kidarite Dynasty was existent in Gandhâra in 477. It is recorded by Sung-yün that "in the second decade of the fourth month of the first year of Chêng-kuang 正光 (520), Sung-yün and his companions entered the country of Ch'ien-t'o-lo 乾陀羅 (=Gandhâra). The land is like that of Wu-ch'ang 烏場 (=Uḍḍiyâna). The country had originally been named Yeh-po-lo 業波羅. The Hsieh-ta 嚙嗟 (Hephthal) destroyed the country and established there a ch'ih-ch'in 勅勤 (tägin) as king. Since his reign, two generations have passed. . . . [The King] relies upon his own bravery and has been contesting territories with Chi-pin 罽賓 (Kashmir) already for three years. . . . The King stays always on the border and never returns [to his own residence] whole day. Thus the soldiers have got weary, the people got tired and the whole of population are grieving and lamenting [over their fate]"⁽¹⁾. This tells us that, when Sung-yün visited Gandhâra in 520, the land had already been under the rule of two Hephthalite kings who were succeeded by the third king reigning then, and that the third king had been in turn fighting with Kashmir for three years. We can not decisively know when the Hephthalites' reign started in Gandhâra from the account of Sung-yün, but since the country of Ch'ê-to-lo paid tributes to the Northern Wei in 477, one may assume that it started some time after 477, or roughly in the last quarter of the fifth century or at the beginning of the sixth.

In this connection, two things will be discussed here. The first one is the period of the Ephthalites' invasion to India. It has been considered so far that the invasion took place in the year of enthronement of Skanda-gupta (455/6-c.467) of the Gupta Dynasty, or in the previous year of it. The above theory is based upon the so-called Bhitari Pillar Inscription, one of the inscriptions of the king, which tells us that the king completely defeated the Hûṇas, who have been identified with the Ephthalites, and saved his kingdom from their devastation. This identification has presented a riddle to the history of the Ephthalites. Namely, as the Ephthalites' conquest of the region to the north of the Hindûkush is considered to have taken place not long before the eleventh month of the second year of T'ai-an 太安 (456. XII. 14-457. I. 12) when they sent their first embassy to the Northern Wei or 457-59 when the Ephthalites helped Pêrôz to fight with his brother Hormizd III for the throne, it seems strange that they had already conquered the western part of Northern India to the south-east of the Hindûkush around the time of Skandagupta's enthronement⁽²⁾. Moreover, as the Kidarites are con-

(1) 正光元年 (520) 四月中旬, 入乾陀羅國, 土地亦與烏場 (Uḍḍiyâna) 國相似, 本名業波羅國, 爲嚙嗟 (Hephthal) 所滅, 遂立勅勤爲王, 治國以來, 已經二世, (中略), (王) 自恃勇力, 與罽賓 (Kashmir) 爭境, 連兵戰鬪, 已歷三年, (中略), 王常停境上, 終日不歸, 師老民勞, 百姓嗟怨 (周祖謨「洛陽伽藍記校釋」p. 107); Ed. Chavannes, *Le Voyage de Song Yun dans l'Udyâna et le Gandhâra*, BEFEO, III, 1903, p. 415-417.

(2) In the Junâgaḍh Inscription (Gupta Year 136-138=455/6-457/8) it is written that the enemies in the 'barbarians' land' (Mleccha deśa) conquered by Skanda-gupta chanted the eulogy of the king who made them loose their prides, while in the Bhitari Inscription

sidered to have still existed in the region of Gandhâra in 477, it is not possible for the Ephthalites to advance to the Gupta territory across Gandhâra before they conquered the Kidarites. It must not, therefore, be the Ephthalites but the Kidarites who had been occupying Gandhâra that fought with and were defeated by Skanda-gupta⁽¹⁾. This will be confirmed by the fact that the Kidarites had been called either the Kidâra-Huns (*Κιδαρίτας Ούννους*) or the Huns of Kidâra (*Ούννοι οἱ Κιδαρίται*) by Priscus.⁽²⁾ The second point is the name of Yeh-po-lo 業波羅 mentioned by Sung-yün and its meaning. According to Sung-yün, Gandhâra had been called by this name before the place was overcome by the Ephthalites. As regards the name, some interpretations have so far been presented, but they are not satisfactory. Marquart took it as a transcription of Ġâbul which he took for a tribal name of the Ephthalites⁽³⁾; Chavannes wondered if this is a transcription of Çibi on the basis of the *Hsi-yü-chuan* 西域傳 of *Pei-shih* 北史 (= *Wei-shu*) which states that the original name of Ch'ien-t'ô 乾隗 (Gandhâra) was Yeh-po 業波, apparently taken from the accounts of Sung-yün⁽⁴⁾; Kentoku Hori

(of no date) records that the King fought with the Hûnas (J. F. Fleet, *Gupta Inscriptions*, Nos. 14 and 13). Thus, both records being generally connected with each other, the enemies in the 'barbarians' land' of the former inscription are considered to be the Hûnas (cf. *A New History of the Indian People*, VI, 1st ed., p. 177), and the Hûnas the Ephthalites, placing their invasion in 455, that is to say, in the first year of the king's reign. But since the Bhitari Inscription has no year inscribed, the battle with the Hûnas should rightly be regarded as having taken place in a certain year during Skanda-gupta's reign (455/6-467/8-±), and it is nothing but an assumption to identify the Hûnas with the Ephthalites. There is actually no evidence to show that the Ephthalites expanded eastwards beyond Gandhâra, and that the Toramâna and Mihirakula, who are usually believed to have established an Ephthalite dynasty in India, were the Ephthalites or the Hûnas. On this problem, see K. G. Śankar, *The Hun Invasion of Hindustân, Indian Historical Quarterly*, 1939, pp. 36-43. In this way, it will not be allowed to take the Toramâna and Mihirakula either for the Ephthalites or the successors of the Hûnas defeated by Skanda-gupta.

- (1) Majumdar considers that the Hûnas who fought with Skanda-gupta might have been a mixed group of the Kushans and the Ephthalites (*The History and Culture of the Indian People*, III, *The Classical Age*, p. 59).
- (2) R. Schafer, *Ethnography of Ancient India*, Wiesbaden; Otto Harrassowitz 1954, pp. 154-166, discusses in detail on Hsiung-nu 匈奴 and other analogous names in connection with the Hûna appearing in the *Mahâbhârata*. He does not refer to why the name of Hûna came to be recorded in the *Mahâbhârata*, which is the point we really want to know. The text of the *Mahâbhârata* had been supplemented with new additions as time went on and the name of Hûna must have been added at a certain stage. What we want to know is which stage it was.
- (3) J. Marquart, *Ērânšahr*, pp. 246-248; J. Marquart und J.J.M. de Groot, *Das Reich Zâbul und der Gott Zim vom 6-9. Jahrhundert, Festschrift Sachau*, Berlin 1915, p. 282. This view is also adopted by K. Shiratori 白鳥庫吉, *Saikishi Kenkyû* 西域史研究, Vol. 1, p. 457; H. Matsuda 松田壽男 in *Kokushi-gaku* 國史學, No. 33, p. 52; Shôshin Ôtani 大谷勝眞, *Sôkoku-kô* 曹國考 in *Ikeuchi-hakushi Kinen Ronsô* 池内博士記念論叢, pp. 272-273.
- (4) Ed. Chavannes, *Le voyage de Song Yun*, *BEFEO*, III, 1903, p. 416.

堀謙德 took it for a transcription of Gopâla⁽¹⁾; Watters for Abâr⁽²⁾; Bang for Apar, an alias of Gandhâra⁽³⁾; while Pelliot took it for Yavana with some reservations⁽⁴⁾. But, if one takes it into consideration that the descendants of Kidâra had been ruling Gandhâra before the Ephthalites' occupation, the appellation of Gandhâra before the occupation of the Ephthalites must have been Chi-to-lo or Kidâra. The characters *yeh* 業 and *po* 波 of Yeh-po-lo 業波羅 may be scribal errors of certain characters representing the sounds of *ki* and *dâ* respectively. *Yeh* 業 might have been written originally either *ch'é* 車, or *chi* 基, or *chi* 寄 while *po* 波 of *t'ai* 汰, *t'o* 陔 or *to* 多. When they edited Sung-yün's accounts in the *Lo-yang ch'ieh-lan-chi* 洛陽伽藍記, these original characters might have been miswritten in the present form.

To sum up the considerations given above, the main branch of the Kidarites which had been occupying Tokhârestân were gradually pressed westwards by the Ephthalites who rose to power there in the first half of the fifth century, and fought with the Sasanians and were defeated by Pêrôz in c. 468 at Balaam which Pêrôz occupied. After c. 468 we hear nothing about them, but their territory south to the Hindûkush had been under the rule of descendants of Kidâra at the earliest up to 477. At the end of the fifth century or the beginning of the sixth, however, Gandhâra also passed to the hands of the Ephthalites⁽⁵⁾.

-
- (1) Kentoku Hori 堀謙德, *Kaisetsu Saiikiki* 解説西域記, p. 172. Chou Tsu-mo 周祖謨, *Lo-yang ch'ieh-lan-chi chiao-shih* 洛陽伽藍記校釋, p. 107, also adopts this theory. On Gopâlo, see *JA*, 1915, I, p. 57.
- (2) T. Watters, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, I, London 1904, p. 200.
- (3) W. Bang, *Über die türkischen Namen einiger Grosskatzen*, *Keleti Szemle*, XII, 1917, p. 142-146.
- (4) *TP*, 1912, p. 456 n. 1; *TP*, 1933, p. 96; *JA*, 1934, p. 26-27 note. Also see E.G. Pulleyblank, *The Consonantal System of Old Chinese*, I, *Asia Major*, New Series, IX, I, 1962, p. 93.
- (5) According to C. J. Brown, *The Coins of India*, London 1922, p. 37, "In A.D. 425 a tribe of the Little Yüeh-shih, under a chief named Kidâra, replaced the great Kustana dynasty at Kâbul; but they were driven out fifty years later by an inroad of the Ephthalites, or white Huns, and settled in the Chitrâl district and in Kashmîr. This means that the Kidarites (in the Gandhâra region) shifted to the Chitrâl district and in Kashmîr in the seventies of the fifth century. His opinion is chronologically right, but the removal of the Kidarites to the above mentioned area is out of the scope of the present article.