

Hsieh 謝, Fu-Wang 副王 or Wang 王 of the Yüeh-shih 月氏

A Contribution to the Chronology of the Kushans

By Kazuo ENOKI

(1)

For the moment, it is Chinese records that furnishes us with substantial basis for the establishment of chronology of the Kushans⁽¹⁾, which is one of the most controversial problems in ancient Central Asian history.

According to the *Shih-chi* 史記 (*Record of History*), Bk. 123, in a year of Chien-yüan 建元 (140–135 B.C.), Chang Ch'ien 張騫 was dispatched to the Ta-yüeh-shih 大月氏, which were said to have removed somewhere in Central Asia to avoid the attack of the Hsiung-nu 匈奴, and he came back to China in the third year of Yüan-shuo 元朔 (126 B.C.) after thirteen years' stay abroad. This means that Chang Ch'ien left China in 139 B.C. when the Ta-yüeh-shih started to migrate westwards. The Ta-yüeh-shih, it is generally believed, removed at first to the region of Ili where they stayed for some time and then again migrated to the north of the Oxus and subjugated the Ta-hsia 大夏 which was situated to the south of the river. Whether the subjugation of Ta-hsia means that of the Bactrian kingdom or that of some tribe or tribes which had destroyed the Bactrian kingdom before the arrival of Ta-yüeh-shih is not clearly known. Chang Ch'ien visited the Ta-yüeh-shih in the north of Oxus and Ta-hsia, where he stayed for more than a year. On his way back to China, he was detained for more than a year by the Hsiung-nu. This will mean that Chang Ch'ien went to the Ta-yüeh-shih in 129 or 128 B.C., which must have been just after their subjugation of the region on both sides of the Oxus.

As to this Ta-yüeh-shih 大月氏, the *Han-shu* 漢書 (*Standard History of the Former Han*, 206 B.C.–A.D. 8), Bk. 96a, states that they established five *hsi-hou* 翕侯 or *yabghus* among the Ta-hsia which they had subjugated and that the Kuei-shuang 貴霜 (i.e. Kushan) was one of these five *yabghus*. According to the *Han-shu*, the Kushan *yabghu* ruled at Hu-tsao-ch'êng 護燥城 or city of Hu-tsao, which is identified with Ch'ien-tun 鉞敦, that is to say, Kandhut in Wakhan by the *Wei-shu* 魏書 (*Standard History of the Northern Wei*), Bk. 102.

(1) L. Renou et J. Filliozat, *L'Inde classique*, I, Paris, 1947–1949, pp. 234–237.

Though nothing is known about the authority on the basis of which Wei Shou 魏收 (506–579), the compiler of the *Wei-shu* 魏書, made the identification six hundred years later, this is the only identification so far made of the original location of the Kushan yabghu.

So long as the Chinese text goes, the *Han-shu* 漢書 states that these five yabghus were not of Ta-yüeh-shih origin, but of Ta-hsia 大夏. It says that the Ta-hsia originally had had no big leaders, but small leaders who had been occasionally placed at some cities and towns; the people were weak and afraid of warfare: for this reason, when the Ta-yüeh-shih migrated (to the place), they subjugated all of Ta-hsia people and equally (with the Ta-hsia) accepted the embassies of China: there were five *hsi-hou* 翕侯 (yabghus), and all of these five *hsi-hou* (yabghus) all belonged to the Ta-yüeh-shih. Here, “all belonged to the Ta-yüeh-shih” does not mean “All were of the Ta-yüeh-shih,” but “All were under the rule of the Ta-yüeh-shih.”⁽²⁾ It is clear from the context that the five yabghu were some of the small leaders who were placed at some cities and towns.

Next to the *Standard History of the Former Han*, there comes the *Hou-*

(2) It is Jitsuzô Kuwabara 桑原隲藏 who insisted upon that the Kushan yabghus were not of the Ta-yüeh-shih 大月氏 origin but of the Ta-hsia 大夏. (See J. Kuwabara, *Chôken no ensei* 張騫の遠征, first published in 1916 in the *Zoku Shiteki Kenkyû* 續史的研究 and later included in his *Tôzai Kôtsûshi Ronsô* 東西交通史論叢, 1933, pp. 42–47.) Tôru Haneda 羽田亨 agreed to Kuwabara's view which he emphasized in his *Taigesshi oyobi Kisô ni tsuite* 大月氏及び貴霜に就いて, first published in the *Shigaku Zasshi* 史學雜誌, XLI, 9, (1930), and later translated into French and published in *Bulletin de la Maison Franco-Japonaise*, IV, 1–4, 1933, under the title of *A propos des Ta Yué-tche et des Kouei-chouang*. Kuwabara tries to strengthen his view by quoting the *Han-chi* 漢紀, Bk. 12, under the Sixth year of Yüan-shuo (123 B.C.), of Hsün Yüeh 荀悅 (148–209) who writes about the five yabghus as follows: “The Ta-hsia have had originally no leaders. They occasionally placed small leaders. There are five *hsi-hou* 翕侯 (in the Ta-hsia) which are Wei (for Hsiu)-mi *hsi-hou* 未(休)密翕侯, Shuang-mi *hsi-hou* 雙靡翕侯, Kuei-shuang *hsi-hou* 貴霜翕侯, (Pa-tun) *hsi-hou* (昏頓) 翕侯 and Kao-fu *hsi-hou* 高附翕侯” (edition *Ssü-pu ts'ung-k'an* 四部叢刊). According to Kuwabara, Hsün Yüeh summarized the statement of *Han-shu* 漢書 and so, if there is any ambiguous point, Hsün Yüeh should be followed. Kuwabara's opinion was accepted by Sten Konow (*Notes on Indo-scythian chronology*, *Journal of Indian History*, 1933, pp. 13–14) and Paul Pelliot (*Tokharien et Kutchéen*, *JA*, 1934, p. 38 note), with G. Haloun reserving his judgment (*Zur Üe-tsi-Frage*, *ZDMG*, XCI, 1937, p. 257 note 7). However, there is a strong criticism against this interpretation. As is well known, the *Hou-han-shu* 後漢書, Bk. 88, says: “At the beginning, the Yüeh-shih 月氏 were destroyed by the Hsiung-nu 匈奴 and, at last, migrated to Ta-hsia which they divided into five *hsi-hou* (yabghu), Hsiu-mi 休密, Shuang-mi 雙靡, Kuei-shuang 貴霜, Pa-tun 昏頓 and Tu-mi 都密. One hundred years and odd after (the migration), Ch'iu-chiu-chieh 丘就卻 (Kujula Kadphises), the Kushan yabghu, attacked and destroyed the (other) four yabghus and became independent to be a king. His kingdom was called Kuei-shuang-wang 貴霜王 (the King of the Kushans). etc. etc.” *L'Inde classique*, I, p. 232, is of opinion that if the Kushans were not of the Ta-yüeh-shih, they ought to have destroyed the Ta-yüeh-shih in order to be independent, but, as there is no record to such an effect, the Kushans could not be different from the Ta-yüeh-shih. Yes, it is true that the Ta-yüeh-shih disappeared sometime between their conquest of Ta-hsia and the destruction of four yabghus by the Kushans. This is an enigma in ancient history of Central Asia, of which the solution may be made by the appearance of new evidences in the future. However, so long as the statement of *Han-shu* is concerned, Kuwabara is right.

han-shu 後漢書 or the *Standard History of the Later Han*, in which, as is well known, is recorded the history of the Kushans who (replaced the Ta-yüeh-shih,) subjugated the other four yabghus and unified Central Asia and north-western part of India under their rule. The *Hou-han-shu*, Bk. 88, says: "One hundred years and odd after (the conquest of Ta-hsia by the Ta-yüeh-shih), Ch'iu-chiu-chieh 丘就卻 (Kujula Kadphises), the Kushan yabghu, attacked and destroyed the (other) four yabghus and became independent to be a king. His kingdom was called Kuei-shuang-wang 貴霜王 (the King of the Kushans). He invaded An-hsi 安息 (Parthia), occupied the territory of Kao-fu 高附 (Kâbul), destroyed P'u-ta 濮達 (Portosthana, i.e. Kâbul) and Chi-pin 罽賓 (Gandhâra), and annexed all of these countries. Ch'iu-chiu-chieh died at the age of eighty and odd. His son, Yen-kao-chên 閼膏珍 (Wima Kadphises), succeeded him and became the king. He, then, destroyed T'ien-chu 天竺 (India) where he placed a general to govern it. The (Ta-) Yüeh-shih (大)月氏 became the richest and most prosperous after this. Other countries all called them Kuei-shuang-wang 貴霜王 (King of the Kushans), but the Han 漢 continued to call them Ta-yüeh-shih according to their old appellation. So it is said."⁽³⁾ The Ta-yüeh-shih migrated to Ta-hsia 大夏 in or a little before 129 or 128 B.C. when Chang Ch'ien 張騫 visited them in Ta-hsia. So it was one hundred and odd years after it, that is to say, some years later than 28 or 29 B.C., that the Kushans destroyed the other four yabghus to establish their own kingdom.

The last piece of Chinese evidence relating to the chronology of the

(3) In the preface to the description of Western Regions of *Hou-han-shu* 後漢書, it is stated that it is based on what Pan Yung 班勇 recorded at the end of the reign of emperor An 安 (A.D. 107-125). (Chavannes, *Les pays d'occident d'après le Heou Han chou*, TP, VIII, 1907, p. 168). This means that the description is limited to prior A.D. 125 and R. Ghirshman probably based on this statement when he wrote that the annals of the Later Han was "rédigées vers 125 après J.C., peu après la mort de Kujula Kadphises" (*Bégram*, p. 116). B.N. Puri, *India under the Kushânas*, Bombay, 1965, which is one of the latest publications on the Kushans, also writes that the *Hou-han-shu* annals cover the period only between A.D. 25 and 125 (p. 20), and that the death of Wima Kadphises seems to have occurred about A.D. 125 or so (p. 27). However, in the description of Western Regions of the *Hou-han-shu* there are many statements later than A.D. 125, the latest one being that of the embassy of Ta-ch'ing 大秦, which came to Lo-yang 洛陽 in A.D. 166 (Chavannes, *op.cit.*, p. 185). Pan Yung is quoted probably because his record was one of the sources utilized by Fan Yeh 范曄, compiler of the *Hou-han-shu*. This will be clear by a comparative study of the description of *Hou-han-shu* with that of the *Hou-han-chi* 後漢紀, Bk. 15, f. 5a-7b (edition *Ssü-pu ts'ung-k'an* 四部叢刊), which seems to have based on Kan Ying 甘英, who was sent by Pan Ch'ao 班超 as far as Hai-hsi 海西, Pan Yung, and on some other sources.

As to the Chinese transcription of the name of Kujula Kadphises and that of Wima Kadphises, see the revisions proposed by P. Pelliot (*TP*, 1929, pp. 201-203, *TP*, 1930, p. 201, and *JA*, 1934, pp. 88-89 note).

As to An-hsi 安息, Kao-fu 高附, P'u-ta 濮達 and Chi-pin 罽賓, see Kurakichi Shiratori 白鳥庫吉, *Keihinkoku kô 罽賓國考 (On Chi-pin)*, in *Saikiishi Kenkyû* 西域史研究, I, Tokyo, 1941, pp. 377 ff., especially pp. 441-443.

Kushans is the *Standard History of the Three Kingdoms* or *San-kuo-chih* 三國志, of which the chronicle of the Wei 魏 records under the day of *kuei-mao* 癸卯 (24th) of the twelfth month of the third year of T'ai-ho 太和, that is to say, the 25th January, A.D. 230, that Po-tiao 波調, king of the Ta-yüeh-shih, sent an embassy to the court of Wei 魏 (i.e. Lo-yang 洛陽) to bring tribute and the Emperor of Wei entitled Po-tiao *Ch'in-wei Ta-yüeh-shih-wang* 親魏大月氏王 or the King of the Ta-yüeh-shih 大月氏, who was closely allied to the Wei. This king Po-tiao is usually and rightly identified with Vāsudeva who was the last king of the Kushans which were defeated and lost their territory to the north of the Hindukush by the Sassanians.⁽⁴⁾

In this way, so long as the Chinese standard histories are concerned, the date of the Kushans covers the period from about 29 or 28 B.C. or a year little later to A.D. 230 or a little later. During this period of nearly 260 years, Chinese historians only record three Kushan kings: Kujula Kadphises, Wima Kadphises and Vāsudeva. Nothing is known about the duration of their reign, except that Kujula Kadphises died at the age of more than eighty and was succeeded by his son Wima Kadphises.

(2)

In addition to the records above mentioned, there is a group of statements concerning the relations between the Later Han Dynasty and the Kushans in the *Hou-han-shu* 後漢書. Though these statements are already well known through the translation and commentary by Éd. Chavannes,⁽⁵⁾ I am of opinion that it is worth while reinvestigating them.

According to the annals of *Hou-han-shu*, Bks. 3 and 4, in the first year of Chang-ho 章和 (A.D. 87) of Emperor Chang 章, the Yüeh-shih 月氏 sent an embassy to the Chinese court to present *fu-pa* 扶拔 (符拔) (bubalis mauretanicus)⁽⁶⁾ and *shih-tzū* 師子 (lion) and in the fifth month of the second year Yung-yüan 永元 of Emperor Ho 和 (June 14–July 12, A.D. 90) the Yüeh-shih sent armies to attack Pan Ch'ao 班超 (33–102), Protector General of the Western Regions,

(4) See R. Ghirshman, *Bégram*, p. 100 et note 6. However, John Brough, *Comments on third-century Shan-shan and the history of Buddhism*, *BSOAS*, XXVIII, 3, 1965, pp. 597–598, denies that this Vāsudeva was the Kushan ruler of Kanishka's line. However, I am still sticky to the traditional belief that he was of Kanishka's line because of such a big title as the *King of the Ta-yüeh-shih* 大月氏, who was closely allied to the Wei 魏. Under the Wei, only Pei-mi-hu 卑彌呼 who was the female king of the Wo 倭 (Japanese) and Po-tiao 波調 of the Ta-yüeh-shih were given such a high title. On this point, see Takayoshi Tezuka 手塚隆義, *Shingi waō kō* 親魏倭王考 (*On the King of the Wo who is closely allied to the Wei*), *Shien* 史苑, XXIII, 2, 1963, pp. 118–131.

As to the relationship between the Kushans and the Sassanians, see R. Ghirshman, *Le problème de la chronologie des Kouchans*, *Cahiers d'Histoire Mondiale*, III, 3, 1957, pp. 708–709,

(5) *Trois généraux chinois de la dynastie des Han orientaux*, *TP*, VII 1906, p. 232.

(6) B. Laufer, *The Language of Yüe-chi or Indo-Scythians*, Chicago, 1917, pp. 4–5.

and Pan Ch'ao defeated them and made them surrender. In the biography of Pan Ch'ao (*Hou-han-shu*, Bk. 77), the encounter of Pan Ch'ao with the Yüeh-shih 月氏 is described as follows: "To begin with, the Yüeh-shih helped the Han 漢 to attack Ch'ê-shih 車師 (in Turfan Basin) and rendered meritorious service. In this year (i.e. the third year of Yüan-ho 元和, A.D. 86), they brought rare treasures, *fu-pa* 扶拔(符拔) (bubalis mauretanica) and *shih-tzū* 師子 (lion) and asked the hand of a royal princess of Han. Pan Ch'ao 班超 refused the request and made the embassy go back. The Yüeh-shih nursed a grudge (against the Han). In the second year of Yung-yüan 永元 (A.D. 90), the Yüeh-shih sent Hsieh 謝 who was *fu-wang* 副王 (sub-king) to attack Pan Ch'ao 班超 with an army of seventy thousands. Pan Ch'ao's army was much less numerous. So (Pan Ch'ao's) people were much afraid. Pan Ch'ao told to his army: 'Though the army of Yüeh-shih is numerous in number, they have come (here) passing the Ts'ung-ling 葱嶺(=嶺) Mountains (the Pâmîr), which extend over several thousands of *li* 里 and have no means of (direct) transportation (with their native country). It is not worth while to worry. We should only collect cereals (in our fort or fortified town which we should) hold firmly. They will starve and have to make themselves surrender. The issue will be decided in less than scores of day.' Hsieh advanced in the end to attack Pan Ch'ao who did not surrender himself. Hsieh tried to plunder, but in vain. Pan Ch'ao presumed that Hsieh would certainly ask Kuei-tzū 龜茲 (Kucha) for help, when he had shortage of food, and sent several hundred soldiers to the eastern frontier to ambush (the Yüeh-shih). As was presumed, Hsieh sent mounted soldiers to bring to Kuei-tzū gold, silver, pearls and jade to bribe (Kuei-tzū). Pan Ch'ao's men in ambush attacked and killed them and showed their heads to Hsieh. Hsieh was very much surprised and sent an embassy (to Pan Ch'ao) to ask to punish himself and to arrange to let him return alive (to his native country). Pan Ch'ao set him free and let him return. The Yüeh-shih were greatly shocked and (since then) sent tribute (to the Han) annually." No other records are available concerning the so-called meritorious contribution of Yüeh-shih to the conquest of Ch'ê-shih (in Turfan), as well as concerning the Yüeh-shih's tribute of rare treasures, *fu-pa* and *shih-tzū* in the third year of Chang-ho 章和 (A.D. 86), but, in reference to the encounter, we know that it took place in the fifth month of the second year of Yung-yüan (June, 14–July, 12, A.D. 90) or a little earlier. (See *Hou-han-shu*, Bk. 4). The place of the encounter is not indicated, but it is likely that it was some-where near Su-lu 疏勒(疏勒) (Kâshghar).

On the other hand, the *Hou-han-chi* 後漢紀, Bk. 13, states that Hsieh, *wang* 王 (king) of the Yüeh-shih, attacked Pan Ch'ao in the second year of Yung-ho. The description of the encounter is the same as that of the *Hou-han-shu*, but what is different is that Hsieh is described not as *fu-wang* or sub-king but as *Wang* 王 or the king of Yüeh-shih. The *Hou-han-chi*, which is a chronicle of the Later Han Dynasty, was compiled by Yüan Hung 袁宏 (328–276) who died

twenty two years earlier than Fan Yeh 范曄 (398–445), compiler of the *Hou-han-shu*. For the moment, there is no way to decide whether Hsieh was *fu-wang* (or sub-king) or *wang* 王 (or king). So we have to take these two capacities of Hsieh 謝 into our consideration.

Now, it goes without saying that here the Yüeh-shih 月氏 means the Ta-yüeh-shih 大月氏 or Kushans. As to Hsieh, Ed. Chavannes translated it into "leur vice-roi Sie" according to the *Hou-han-shu* 後漢書 and pointed out that the king who instructed Hsieh to invade against Pan Ch'ao 班超 might have been Kanishka I, whose enthronement was dated by Boyer at the end of the first century. It is obvious that Chavannes took Hsieh as the personal name of the general.⁽⁷⁾

In 1913, that is to say, seven years after the publication of Chavannes' translation of the biography of Pan Ch'ao, S. Lévi dealt with this passage of *Hou-han-shu*, identifying Hsieh with Sâhi.⁽⁸⁾ The Sâhi, being the same as Sâhi (Çâhi), is a title which means king. In vice-roi Sie, Lévi saw a vassal king under the Great King of the Kushans, taking Sie not as a proper name as Chavannes did but as a title.

That, under the Kushans, there had been a viceroy is recorded in the *Hou-han-shu* in connection with a general who was placed by Wima Kadphises in India to govern it.⁽⁹⁾ This general must have been a viceroy posted in India. So, from this point of view, *fu-wang* Hsieh 副王謝 can be looked upon as a viceroy. The meaning of *fu-wang* is not clear as there had been no such title in Chinese history. In the time of Former and Later Han, *wang* meant a local feudal lord appointed by the Emperor, who ruled his own country independently or under the supervision of the Central Government, but there existed no *fu-wang* which literally means sub-king.⁽¹⁰⁾ In the biography of Ch'ên T'ang 陳湯 of *Han-shu*, Bk. 70 (p. 858 above, ed. *Smaller Po-na-pên* 縮印百衲本), a mention is made to Pao-t'ien 抱闕 who was *fu-wang* of K'ang-chü 康居 and fought with Ch'ên T'ang. Unfortunately, no corresponding statement is given about this *fu-wang* in the chapter on K'ang-chü of *Han-shu*, Bk. 96a (p. 1163–1164) and we do not know of the status and function of this *fu-wang*. If a sub-king is equal to a viceroy in its status and function, Chavannes and Lévi are right when they translated *fu-wang* as viceroy. Actually, one of Chinese commentators says that *fu-wang* 副王 is just like a *pei-wang* 裨王 or adjutant king.⁽¹¹⁾ However, *fu-wang* or sub-king may also mean a joint-king.

(7) *Trois généraux chinois de la dynastie des Han orientaux*, TP, VII, 1906, p. 232 et note 2.

(8) *Le "Tokharien B," langue de Kutch*, JA, 1913, II, p. 330.

(9) Ed. Chavannes, *Les pays d'occident d'après le Heou Han chou*, TP, VIII, p. 192.

(10) Under the Han, the royal heir was called *fu-chün* 副君 (*Han-shu*, Bk. 71, p. 867 below, *Smaller Po-na-pên* edition, biography of Su Kuang 疏廣) and under the Han and the Later Han he was also called *fu-chu* 副主 (*Han-shu*, Bk. 82, p. 988 below, biography of Shih Tan 史丹, and *Hou-han-shu*, Bk. 37 (or 67), p. 550 below, biography of Huan Yung 桓榮). But *fu-wang* can not be identical with either *fu-chün* or *fu-chu*.

(11) Wang Yu-hsieh 王幼學 quoted by Hui Tung 惠棟 in his *Hou-han-shu pu-chu* 後漢書補注, Bk. 12 (edition Kuang-ya shu-chü 廣雅書局).

The Seleucid realm had been familiar with joint-kings who governed eastern provinces from Sleucia.⁽¹²⁾ In the khanate of Khazars there had been double kingship⁽¹³⁾ and the Karakhanides were divided into eastern and western khanate, which was governed by a chief khan and a co-khan respectively.⁽¹⁴⁾ In this connection, I remember of the system of dual rulers (dvairājya) which had not been uncommon among the Sakas and Parthians, both of which ruled India, as well as among the Kushans. A. S. Altekar writes; "An interesting practice popularized by the Scythian rulers was the system of dvairājya. This practice was not unknown to the Hindu polity but was rather rare. Under the Sakas and the Parthians, the king and the heir-apparent both ruled with almost equal powers. As instances of this dvairājya we may refer to the joint rule of Spalyrisis and Azes, Hagâṇa and Hagâṃashka, Gondopharnes and Gad, and Kanishka and Huvishka."⁽¹⁵⁾ In Hou-han 後漢 China where there was no such system as dvairājya, it is quite likely that one of the dvairājya was understood as viceroy or adjutant king. Under the circumstances, *fu-wang* Hsieh can be taken either as (one of) the viceroy(s) or one of the dual rulers.

If Hsieh 謝 was not *fu-wang* 副王 but *wang* 王 or king, as is recorded in the *Hou-han-chi* 後漢紀, it is obvious that he was the king of the Kushans in A.D. 90.

(3)

Then, what was this Hsieh 謝? Was it a personal name or a title? If a personal name, who was it? If title, what was it? This is the point which I would like to investigate.

Hsieh is the transcription in Wade system of pronunciation in Peking dialect of character 謝 "to apology, to thank, to wither," of which the final *h* means the prolongation of the final vowel. According to Karlgren, *hsieh* was pronounced as *zia' in Ch'ang-an 長安 during the T'ang 唐.⁽¹⁶⁾ On the other hand, the right-hand radical of this character, which makes phonetic, that is to say, 射, which means "(1) shooting an arrow, (2) to shoot with bow, (3) to dislike, tired of," is pronounced as (1) *shé*, (2) *shih*, and (3) *i* and *yeh*, respectively. The pronunciation of this character during the T'ang was (1) *d'z'ia'*, (2) *d'z'ia'k*, and (3) *ia'k* respectively.⁽¹⁷⁾ Karlgren suggests that an older pronun-

(12) W. W. Tarn, *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, Cambridge 1938, p. 203.

(13) D. M. Dunlop, *The History of the Jewish Khazars*, Princeton 1954, pp. 20ff, 37n.

(14) O. Pritsak in *Oriens*, III, 1950, pp. 227-228: *Do.*, *Die Karachaniden, Der Islam*, XXXI, 1953-1954, pp. 34ff.

(15) A.S. Altekar, *State and Government in Ancient India*, Varanasi-Patha-Delhi, 4th ed., 1962, p. 335, also see p. 38 and J. W. Spellman, *Political Theory of Ancient India, A Study of Kingship from the earliest times to circa A.D. 300*, Oxford 1964, pp. 63-64.

(16) B. Karlgren, *Analytic Dictionary of Chinese and Sino-Japanese*, No. 865.

(17) B. Karlgren, *Ibid.*

ciation of *hsieh* 謝 was *dz-g*. Karlgren reconstructs the so-called Archaic pronunciation of character *shê* 射 (*shih*, *i*, and *yeh*) as **ḍ'iäg* "shoot with bow; archer," **ḍ'iäk* "hit with bow and arrow"; loan for **ḍiäk* "be satiated with, dislike," and that of *hsieh* 謝 as **dziäg*.⁽¹⁸⁾ Here the Archaic pronunciation means the pronunciation during the Chou 周 and Pre-Han (anterior to 213 B.C.) period.

Now, during the Hou-han 後漢 (A.D. 25–220) and San-kuo 三國 (A.D. 221–264) period, character *hsieh* and character *shê* were used interchangeably. For instance, in the *Hou-han-shu* 後漢書, Hsieh Kao 謝嵩 (+147 A.D.) is also written as *Shê Kao* 射嵩,⁽¹⁹⁾ and in the *Wu-shu* 吳書 (*History of Wu* 吳) of the *San-kuo-chih* 三國志 (*Standard History of Three Kingdoms, Wei 魏, Wu, and Shu 蜀*), Hsieh Tz'ü 謝慈 is also written as *Shê Tz'ü* 射慈.⁽²⁰⁾ In the *San-fu chüeh-lu chu* 三輔決錄注 or *Commentary to San-fu chüeh-lu* 三輔決錄, quoted by P'ei Sung-chih 裴松之 (372–451 A.D.) in his commentary to the *Shu-shu* 蜀書 (*History of Shu*) of the *San-kuo-chih*, an interesting story concerning the family names Hsieh 謝 and *Shê* 射 is recorded. It runs as follows: "Shê Yüan 射援, whose *tzü* 字 (common appellation) is *Wên-hsiung* 文雄, is a native of *Fu-fêng* 扶風. His original family name was Hsieh and his family was of the same origin as so many Hsieh families in *Pei-ti* 北地 (-*chün* 郡 in *Kan-su* 甘肅). Hsieh Fu 謝服, his ancestor, was appointed general and went to war. The emperor thought Hsieh Fu was not a suitable name and ordered to change it into *Shê Fu* 射服. Since then, his descendants made *Shê* their family name."⁽²¹⁾ Actually, Hsieh means "to apology, to thank, to wither," and *Fu* 服 means "to surrender, to surrender oneself, to obey." So the emperor considered that the name Hsieh Fu is not suitable for a name of general who is going out to the front to fight with the enemy and ordered to change it into *Shê* which means "to shoot with an arrow" or "to attack." The story is quoted in *Yüan-ho hsing-tsuan* 元和姓纂, Bk. 9, under the family name *Shê* as from *San-fu chüeh-lu* 三輔決錄 in a bit different way. It states: "At the end of Han 漢, *Shê Fu* who was serving as *hung-lu* 鴻臚 (official to receive guests) was appointed as general to go out to the front. His family name *Shê* and his personal name *Fu* being inauspicious, (the emperor ordered him to) change his family name into Hsieh and surname into *Hsien* 咸."⁽²²⁾ The psychology of this story is very contrary to that of the former one. According to this, the emperor thought that *Shê Fu*

(18) *Grammata Serica Recensa* (reprinted edition), No. 807a and g.

(19) Hsieh Kao in the *Hou-han-shu*, Bk. 55 (p. 800 below) and Bk. 7 (p. 127 below) and *Shê Kao* 射嵩 in the *Hou-han-shu* 後漢書, Bk. 101 (p. 1456 above).

(20) Hsieh Tz'ü in the *San-kuo-chih* 三國志, Bk. 59 (p. 688 below) and *Shê Tz'ü* 射慈 in the *San-kuo-chih*, Bk. 48 (p. 558 above). In this connection, see P'ei Sung-chih's 裴松之 commentary to the biography of Sun Fên 孫奮 (*San-kuo-chih*, Bk. 59, p. 668 below) and Lu Tê-ming 陸德明, *Ching-tien shih-wên hsü-lu* 經典釋文序錄, Bk. 1, fol. 23b (edition *T'ung-chih-t'ang ching-chieh* 通志堂經解).

(21) *San-kuo-chih* 三國志, Bk. 32 (p. 431 above).

(22) Edition 1880, Bk. 9, fol. 13.

was not auspicious because it meant to surrender the enemy through shooting with bow, that is to say, by force, while Hsieh Hsien 謝威 meant either to pacify the enemy in a peaceful way, or to let all of the enemy surrender in a thankful way, hsien 威 signifying “all, to pacify, and to become peaceful.” As is well known, in Confucianism force is always despised and peaceful way appreciated. Both the *San-fu chüeh-lu* which was compiled by Chao Ch’i 趙岐 (+A.D. 201) and its commentaries, *San-fu chüeh-lu chu* 三輔決錄注, which were compiled by Chih Yü 摯虞 (+A.D. 311), have been lost since the Sung and we can not check which one is the right tradition. However, this is one of the evidences which prove an interchangeable use of *hsieh* and *shê* in the time of Former Han. Another evidence is available in the *Lu-tzū ch’un-ch’iu* 呂子春秋 and *Shuo-yüan* 說苑. In the *Lu-tzū ch’un-ch’iu*, Bk. 16, a statement is made about Hsieh-tzū 謝子 who went westwards to see king Hui 惠 of Ch’ing 秦 and the same person is named (Ch’i) Shê-tzū (祁)射子 in the *Shuo-yüan*, Bk. 17.⁽²³⁾

The interchangeable use of *hsieh* and *shê* in the time of Former Han, Later Han, and San-kuo 三國, which covers the period from the third century B.C. to the middle of the third century A.D., means that the name Hsieh of Ta-yüeh-shih 大月氏 could be pronounced in the same way as Shê. In this connection, the story of Hsieh Fu which was changed into Shê Fu will suggest us that it is possible that the name Hsieh, *fu-wang* of the Yüeh-shih, was originally written as Shê 射 which was changed into Hsieh 謝 because he was the leader of army defeated by Pan Ch’ao 班超. The name Shê 射, “to shoot with an arrow” or “to attack” might have been unsuitable for him for the reason that he surrendered himself to Pan Ch’ao to beg for mercy. He was thankful and obedient to Pan Ch’ao. Hence his name may have been written not as Shê but as Hsieh.

This will mean that the character *hsieh* (Archaic *dziäg/Ancient *zia’) could be pronounced in almost the same way as the character *shê* (Archaic *d’iäg, *d’iäk/Ancient *d’ziä’, d’z’iäk, iäk) and that in case of Hsieh, *fu-wang* 副王 of the Yüeh-shih 月氏, it is probable that it was pronounced in the same way as *shê*. Though it is not clear how *hsieh* and *shê* were pronounced in the time of Later Han, it is most likely that *Hsieh* was pronounced either as *d’z’iä’ ~ *zia’ or as *d’z’iäk ~ *dziäg or *d’iäg ~ *d’iäk

In case Hsieh was pronounced *d’z’iä’ ~ *zia’, it may have represented shâhî which was used by the old Sakas who founded an empire in the Indus country some time before the beginning of the Vikrama era (commencing 58 B.C.) and which was revived by Kanishka after his conquest of Eastern India, as well as by his successors.⁽²⁴⁾ According to Sten Konow, it is met for the first time in Kanishka’s Brâhmî inscription of the year 7, and it is used in the

(23) The *Lu-tzū ch’un* 呂子春秋 was compiled by Lu Pu-wei 呂不韋 (+235 B.C.) and the *Shuo-yüan* 說苑 by Liu Hsiang 劉向 (77-6 B.C.).

(24) Sten Konow, *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions*, Calcutta 1929, pp. 175, 163. For instance, Vāsishka is designated as *mahārāja rājātirāja devaputra Shâhî*.

Brâhmî inscriptions of his successors.⁽²⁵⁾

In this case, *fu-wang* Hsieh 副王謝 who marched upon Pan Ch'ao in A.D. 90, can be (1) a viceroy or (2) one of the dual rulers of the Kushans, both of whom with the title of shâhî. The existence of a viceroy or a general who was entrusted with the government in India in the period of Wima Kadphises is recorded in the *Hou-han-shu* 後漢書, but no information is available as to other viceroys, if any. However, it is quite unlikely that the viceroy who governed in India went as far as Tarim Basin to invade Chinese garrison there. So the viceroy in A.D. 90 can not be one in India under Wima Kadphises. If he was one of the dual rulers, it is possible that he was either Vâsishka, who ruled the Kushan empire together with Kanishka, or Huvishka who, succeeding Vâsishka, became installed as king in the eastern provinces. Some scholars do not agree to the dual-rulership between Kanishka and Vâsishka and Kanishka and Huvishka, but, if there was any dual-rulership, it existed between these kings.

In case Hsieh was pronounced as *dziäg~*d'z'ïäk, it is possible that it represented *shk* or *shka* of *ishka* which is the part of the name of Kanishka, Vâsishka and Huvishka. The *ishka* is explained as a change of *ishthaka*, *ishtha* being a suffix which means superlative and *ka* being a meaningless suffix in Central Asian and Indian languages. Thus, Kanishka means the youngest or smallest, Vâsishka the most useful or beneficial and Huvishka the most excellent or something like that.⁽²⁶⁾ Actually, the name of kings with this superlative suffix is a speciality of the dynasty to which these kings belonged. If we call the dynasty to which Kujula Kadphises and Wima Kadphises belonged the first dynasty of the Kushans or the Kadphises dynasty, we may call Kanishka's dynasty as the second dynasty or the *ishka* dynasty for convenience's sake.⁽²⁷⁾

In this case, *fu-wang* Hsieh 副王謝, if he was a viceroy, might have been of the royal family of the second dynasty, of which the name of kings seems to have usually ended in *ishka*, and he may have taken service either to the Kadphises dynasty or to the second dynasty itself. His full name should have been such and such *ishka*, which Chinese records may not have informed fully but in an abridged form. Actually it happened very often that a long foreign name was abridged in one single character in Chinese records. If he was one of the dual rulers, he again could be either Vâsishka or Huvishka, both of whom ruled the empire together with Kanishka.

As I have pointed out, the *Hou-han-chi* 後漢紀 records Hsieh 謝 as the

(25) Sten Konow, *op. cit.*, p. 175.

(26) H.W. Bailey, *Indo-Iranian Studies*, II, *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1954, p. 145; K.L. Janert, *Zu pratikṣāpita- in einer Mathurā-Inschrift*, *Indo-Iranian Journal*, V, 1961-62, p. 309; W.B. Henning, *Surkh-Kotal und Kanishka*, *ZDMG*, CXV, 1965, pp. 82-84. I owe to Professor Naoshirô Tsuji 辻直四郎 the last two articles.

(27) Louis de la Vallée Poussin, *L'Inde aux temps des Maurya*, Paris, 1930, p. 30 calls these kings as les souverains en shka.

king of Ta-yüeh-shih 大月氏. If he was the king of the Kushans and if Hsieh represents *shâhî*, he must be either Kanishka or one of his successors who entitled himself *shâhî*. If Hsieh represents *shk* or *shka*, he must have been one of the kings of the second or *ishka* dynasty. In other words, he can be identified with one of the Kushan kings whose name ends in *ishka*, that is to say, Kanishka, Vâsishka and Huvishka.

The above speculations will be diagrammatized as follows:

Hsieh 謝		Fu-wang 副王 in A.D. 90		(3) Wang 王 (King) in A.D. 90
		(1) Viceroy	(2) One of the Dual Rulers	
*d'z'ia' *z'ia'	shâhî	(1a) Viceroy in Central Asia in the 1st or 2nd dynasty	(2a) (Kanishka) or Vâsishka or Huvishka	(3a) Kanishka or Vâsishka or Huvishka
*dziäg *d'z'ïäk *d'ïäg *d'ïäk	(i) shk (a)	(1b) Viceroy in Central Asia in the 1st or 2nd dynasty	(2b) (Kanishka) or Vâsishka or Huvishka	(3b) Kanishka or Vâsishka or Huvishka

(4)

Here are some explanations and conclusions in connection with the above diagram.

As I have pointed out in the first chapter, the Chinese records show that the Kushan dynasties, which consist of the dynasty of Kadphises and the dynasty of Kanishka, cover the period from about 29 or 28 B.C. to about A.D. 230. From this point of view, it is obvious that A.D. 90 comes in either the first or Kadphises dynasty or the second or Kanishka dynasty.

If Hsieh 謝 was a viceroy, no matter whether Hsieh represents *shâhî* or *ishka* or some other name, he must have been a viceroy who governed somewhere in Central Asia under the first or second dynasty.

If he was a *shâhî*, there is no clue to decide whether he belonged to the first dynasty or to the second. No clue is also available to decide his blood-relation to the royal family of the first or second dynasty. However, if he was such and such *ishka*, he may have belonged to the royal family of the second dynasty and he may have taken service to either the first or the second dynasty. If he took service to the first dynasty, it will mean that a member of the royal family of the second dynasty worked under the first dynasty. Actually, nothing has been known about the relationship between the first and the second dynasty, but it is quite possible, from the point of view of difference of the names of king, that they belonged to different families. And it is likely

that the second dynasty originated in a family which had taken service to the first dynasty.

In case he was such and such *ishka* and a viceroy under the second dynasty, it will mean that he was probably one of the royal family and that the second dynasty had already existed in A.D. 90.

If Hsieh was one of the dual rulers, he may have been either Vâsishka or Huvishka. This is because it is only these two kings who are considered to have ruled the Kushan empire in dual-rulership with Kanishka. Kanishka was one of the dual rulers, too, but I have placed his name in parenthesis for the reason that *fu-wang* 副王 or sub-king means a minor one of the two. In this case, if Hsieh represents *shâhî*, it was the title held by either Vâsishka or Huvishka. And, if Hsieh represents *ishka*, it can be considered as an incomplete representation of name of Vâsishka or Huvishka. In any way, this will indicate that A.D. 90 comes in the period of dual-rulership of Kanishka and Vâsishka or Kanishka and Huvishka. In other words, one of the years of Kanishka's reign should be identified with A.D. 90.

If Hsieh was the king of the Kushan empire in A.D. 90, as is recorded in the *Hou-han-chi* 後漢紀, it means that one of the Kushan kings who held the title of *shâhî* or whose name ended in *ishka* ruled in A.D. 90. Judging from the fact that Hsieh marched into Tarim Basin with seventy thousand soldiers, he could be Kanishka who must have been the mightiest among the Kushan kings.

For the reference of readers, I reproduce here chronological tables prepared by R. Ghirshman, J. E. van Lohuizen-de Leeuw and R. Göbl, which may represent the latest tendency of the study of Kushan chronology. Among these three tables, van Lohuizen's one is the nearest to the chronology proposed by the author of the present article, though she does not recognize the dual-rulership between Kanishka, Vâsishka and Huvishka.

(1) R. Ghirshman (1946):

1. The First Dynasty:

- 1) Heraüs
- 2) Kujula Kadphisès Enthroned about the middle of the first century
B.C. (*Bégram*, p. 121)
- 3) Wima Kadphisès Ruled up to about A.D. 130 (*Bégram*, p. 140)

2. The Second Dynasty:

- 4) Huviška } Coexistent with the First Dynasty
- 5) Vâsiška } Coexistent with the First Dynasty
- 6) Kaniška A.D. 144–172 (?) Beginning of the Second
Dynasty
- 7) Huviška A.D. 172–217 (?)
- 8) Vâsudeva A.D. 217 (?)–241 (*Bégram*, pp. 107, 164)

(*Bégram, Recherches archéologiques et historiques sur les Kouchans*,
Le Caire, 1964)

(2) J. E. van Lohuizen-de Leeuw (1949):

Kujûla Kadphises	±25 B.C.—±A.D. 35
Wima Kadphises	±A.D. 35—A.D. 62 or after
Jihonika	±A.D. 70
Kaniška	A.D. 78—101
Vâsiška	A.D. 102—106
Huviška	A.D. 111—138
Kaniška II	A.D. 119
Vâsudeva I	A.D. 152—176
Kaniška III	A.D. 192
{Vaskușâna	A.D. 200
{Vâsudeva II	Beginning of the Third Century

(*The "Scythian" Period*, Leyden, 1949, p. 388)

(3) R. Göbl (1964):

Kaniška I	Jahre 1—40 (Senior Augustus)=225—266 n. Chr.
(Vasiška)	Jahre 24—28 (Junior Augustus)=249—253 n. Chr.
(Huviška)	Jahre 29—40 (Junior Augustus)=254—265 n. Chr.
Huviška	Jahre 41—60 (Senior Augustus)=266—285 n. Chr.
Vasudeva I	Jahre 61—98 (100) (Senior Augustus)=286—323 (325) n. Chr.
Vasudeva II	± 325—356
Kaniška II	± 325—?

(*Zwei neue Termini für ein Zentrales Datum der Alten Geschichte Mittelasiens, das Jahr 1 des Kușänkönigs Kaniška*. Sonderabdruck aus dem *Anzeiger der phil.-hist. Klasse der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Jahrgang 1964, So. 7, p. 151)

This paper was originally read at the International Conference on the History, Archaeology and Arts of Central Asia in the Kushan Period, held at Dushanbeh, Tajikistan, USSR, in 1968, and it was published in Japanese in a journal named *Orient*, X, Nos. 3—4, pp. 1—15. The author reproduced it here with some revisions and additions. If there is any difference of opinion, the reader is asked to take the view here published as the latest one of the author.

Additional Notes:

p. 1. As to the date of embassy of Chang Ch'ien, I followed the majority opinion which ascribes it to the years 139—126 B.C. But G. Haloun considered that the embassy did not begin until 133 (*Zur Üe-tš'i-Frage*, *ZDMG*, XCI, 1937, p. 243).

p. 2 Note 2. Among the locations of the Five Yabghus, Tu-mi 都密 is recorded only in the *Hou-han-shu*. It may be identified with Tirmedh.