# On the Nationality of the Ephthalites

By Kazuo Enoki

## I. Chinese Sources

As to the origin of the Ephthalites or their blood relationship with other tribes, it would seem no sufficient information was accessible even to their contemporary Chinese who identified them as either a kind of the Ta-yüeh-shih 大月氏, or a branch of the Kao-ch'ê 高車, or descendants of Pa-hua 八滑, a general of Ch'ê-shih 車師 in the second century A. D., or descendants of K'ang-chü 康居 of the Former Han. The diversity of opinions itself clearly shows the unreliability of these identifications. Actually, one of the authors frankly states that he can not make clear their origin.(1). However, first of all, it is necessary for us to know the reason why these different identifications have been made.

(1) *The Ch'ê-shih* 車師 *or Turfanese theory*

Among them the theory which looks the Ephthalites as descendants of Pa-hua 八滑, a general of Ch'ê-shih 車師, is obviously based upon an arbitrary identification of the name Hua 滑, by which the Ephthalites had been known by the Chinese under the Liang 梁, with the Pa-hua 八滑. The *Liang-shu* 梁書, Bk. 54, (=*Nan-shih* 南史, Bk. 79) says: "The country of Hua is another branch of Ch'ê-shih 車師 (Turfan). In the 1st year of Yung-chien 永建 (126 A.D.) of the Han, a Ch'ê-shih man named Pa-hua 八滑, who under (the Chinese general) Pan Yung 班勇 had rendered distinguished services in conquering the northern savages (i.e. the Hsiung-nu), was promoted to Hou-pu Ch'in-han-hou 後部親漢侯 (or Marquis of Posterior Ch'ê-shih who is friendly to the Han) by the arrangement of Pan Yung. Since the Wei 魏 and Chin 晉, no envoy came (from the country of Hua) to China.....While the Yüan Wei 元魏 (or the T'o-pa Wei) had their capital at Sang-ch'ien 桑乾(2) (i.e. 398–494 when the capital was situated at P'ing-ch'êng 平城 to the north of the present Ta-t'ung 大同), the Hua was still a small subject community under the Jui-jui 芮芮; but, waxing more and

(1) Wei Chieh 韋節, *Si-fan-chi* 西蕃記 cited in the *T'ung-tien* 通典, Bk. 193, under I-ta-t'ung 挹怛同. Concerning the description, see p. 6-7.

(2) Sang-ch'ien is the name of upper stream of the river Yung-ting 永定. Here Sang-ch'ien means the valley of the river Sung-ch'ien (桑乾川). *Cf.* The *Wei-shu*, Bk. 2, under the 1st year of Huang-shih 皇始. But the *Sung-shu* 宋書, Bk. 95 (fol. 1 a), *So-lü chuan* 索虜傳 writes 代都桑乾縣之平城.

more powerful in the course of time, they succeeded in conquering the tribes in the neighbourhood such as Po-ssŭ 波斯 (Sasanid Persia), P'an-p'an 盤盤 (Warwâlîz?), Chi-pin 罽賓 (Kashmir), Yen-ch'i 焉耆 (Karashar), Kuei-tzŭ 龜玆 (Kucha), Shu-lê 疎勒 (Kashgar), Ku-mê 姑墨 (Aksu), Yü-t'ien 于闐 (Khotan), and Chü-p'an 句盤 (Karghalik), and expanded their territory by more than a thousand *li*."(1) According to the *Liang-shu*, five envoies were sent from the country of Hua to the court of Liang between the 15th year of T'ien-chien 天監 (516) and the 7th year of Ta-t'ung 大通 (541)(2) and the above informations were probably got from them. At that time, the Ephthalites were at the climax of their power and they put under their sway the countries here mentioned. The date of the rise of the Ephthalites is not known exactly, but it may have been at the end of the fourth century or at the beginning of the fifth, seeing that the Ephthalites were known to China for the first time in 456 when they sent the first embassy to the Northern Wei and that in the *T'ung-tien* 通典, Bk. 193, it is stated that this was eighty or ninety years after the establishment of their empire.(3) So the statement of *Liang-shu*, which tells us that the country of Hua or the Ephthalites had existed in 398–494, is not inaccurate, but there is no other evidence to prove that during the same period they had been under the rule of the Jui-jui or Juan-juan 蠕蠕 probably at, or in the neighbourhood of, Posterior Ch'ê-shih or what is now Urumchi. About 485–486 the Kao-ch'ê 高車 became independent from the Juan-juan to the north of Urumchi(4) and they were invaded by the Ephthalites some time after the 14th year of T'ai-ho 太和 (490), when the Northern Wei sent an embassy to the independent Kao-ch'ê(5). Thus,

(1) 滑國者車師之別種也，漢永建元年，八滑從班勇擊北虜有功，勇上八滑爲後部親漢侯，自魏晉以來，不通中國……元魏之居桑乾也，滑猶爲小國，屬芮芮，後稍彊大，征其旁國波斯，盤盤，罽賓，焉耆，龜玆，疎勒，姑墨，于闐，句盤等國，開地千餘里. (*Cf.* Ed. SPECHT's translation in *JA*, 1883, 2, p. 335–337 and A. HERRMANN's in *Asia Major*, II. p. 168,568–569.)

(2) The Annals of *Liang-shu*, Bk. 3, registers their embassies under the fiirst and 7th year of P'u-t'ung (520 and 526), and the first and 7th year of Ta-t'ung (535 and 541). The embassy of 516 is recorded only in Bk. 54.

(3) 至後魏文成帝時，已八九十年矣. Here "the time of Emperor Wên-ch'êng" means 456 A.D. when the Ephthalites sent the first embassy to the Wei. But the authority on which this chronology was based is not known. The *Wên-hsien t'ung-kao*, Bk. 338, writes 七八十年矣. 文成帝 is written as 文帝 in the *T'ung-tien* 通典 as quoted in the *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan* 太平御覽, Bk. 96 (ed. *Ssŭ-p'u t'sung-k'an*, 3rd series). However, Wên-ti, being on the throne from 471 to 499, does not fit in. According to Syrian sources, the date of the Ephthalites also can not go back earlier than about 460. (N. PIGULEVSKAYA, *Siriĭskie intochniki po istorii narodov SSSR. Izv. Ak. Nauk SSSR.: Trudy Inst. Vostokoved.*, XLI. *Moskva-Leningrad*, 1941, p. 47–79, quoted by Czeglédy KÁROLY, *IV–IX. századi népmozgalmak a steppén, A Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság*, 84. *szám, Budapest* 1954, p. 1). So do Armenian sources. (K. V., TREVER, *Kushany, khionity i eftulity po armyanskim istochnikam IV–VII vv., Sov. Arkheologiya*, XXI, 1954, p. 145–146.)

(4) Dr. Hisao MATSUDA 松田壽男, *Kôsha Dokuritsu Nendai kô* 高車獨立年代考 (*The date of independence of the Kao-ch'ê*), *Kaikyôken* 回教圈, Vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 14–20.

(5) *Wei-shu*, Bk. 103 (=*Pei-shih*, Bk. 98.)

prior to 490 no trace of the Ephthalites is found in the neighbourhood of Urumchi or in the eastern region to the north of T'ien-shan mountains. So it is quite unlikely that the Ephthalites originated at or near Urumchi where they had been under the rule of Juan-juan in 398–494. The Ephthalites appeared near Urumchi as the result of their expansion in the north-west from Tokhârestân which was the centre of their power. This fact is the contrary evidence against the statement of *Liang-shu*, which holds that the Ephthalites originated in the neighbourhood of Urumchi.

The *Liang-shu* states the Ephthalites originated from the Ch'ê-shih 車師 tribe and gives as their direct ancester PA-HUA 八滑, the son of NUNG-CH'I 農奇, king of the Posterior Ch'ê-shih 車師後部, who in the 1st year of Yung-chien 永建 (126) of the Later Han 後漢 helped PAN Yung 班勇 in conquering Hu-yen-wang 呼衍王 of the Northern Hsiung-nu 北匈奴. An account of PA-HUA occurs in the *Hou-han-shu* 後漢書, Bk. 118, *Hsi-yü-chuan* 西域傳, but it is evident that the statement of *Liang-shu* is nothing but an ungrounded story made up through arbitrarily identifying PA-HUA with Hua, the term the Liang used for the Ephthalites(1). And such an arbitrary identification of name of a country in the Western Regions also occurs in the case of Po-t'i 白題 or Bakhdhi (Balkh). The *Liang-shu*, Bk. 54, says: "The country of Po-t'i, of which the king is named CHIH Shih-chi-i 支史稽毅, is probably descended from a branch of Hsiung-nu. KUAN Ying 灌嬰 of the Han fought with the Hsiung-nu and killed a cavalryman under Po-t'i. At present, (the country) exists to the east of the country of Hua 滑 at the distance of six days' journey. To the west it extends as far as Po-ssŭ 波斯 (Persia). The land produces such foodstaff as rice, wheat, watermelon and other kinds of fruits almost alike in the country of Hua. In the 3rd year of P'u-t'ung 普通 (522) they sent an envoy to present their own products."(2). KUAN Ying's account is recorded in his biography both in the *Shih-chih* 史記, Bk. 95, and in the *Han-shu* 漢書, Bk. 41, in which it is stated that his man killed a Hsiung-nu general (of?) Po-t'i(3) It is not clear if Po-t'i means a personal name or a Hsiung-nu title or something else,(4) but it was identified with the country Po-t'i by P'EI Tzŭ-yeh 裴子野 (471–532) on the understanding that it was a personal name. In

(1) Hua 滑 was a family name of the Hsien-pei 鮮卑 under the T'o-pa Wei. A HUA Chi 滑稽 is recorded in the *Sung-shu* 宋書, Bk. 93 (fol. 1 b), and a HUA Hêi-nu 滑黑奴 on a wall of grots of Tun-huang (謝柳稚, 敦煌藝術敍錄, Shanghai 1955, p. 155).

(2) 白題國, 王姓支, 名史稽毅, 其先蓋匈奴之別種胡也, 漢灌嬰與匈奴戰, 斬白題騎一人, 今在滑國東, 去滑六日行, 西極波斯, 土地出粟麥瓜菓, 食物略與滑同, 普通三年, 遣使獻方物. The family name CHIH of the king of Po-t'i is obviously an abbreviation of Ta-yüeh-chih 大月支 under which the region was known to the Chinese at the period.

(3) The SHIH-CHIH reads: 復從擊韓信胡騎晉陽下, 所將卒斬胡白題將一人. (服虔曰, 胡名也)." The *Han-shu* reads 信 instead of 韓信 and 師古 instead of 服虔.

(4) In the *Han-shu pu-chu* 漢書補注, Bk. 41, WANG Hsien-ch'ien 王先謙, quoting 秦州雜事詩 of TU Fu 杜甫, wonders if *po-t'i* means (a Hsiung-nu with) forehead painted white.

the biography of P'EI Tzŭ-yeh it is stated as follows : " At the time (when he took service to Kao-tsu 高祖 of Liang) embassies came via Min-shan-tao 岷山道 from Po-t'i 白題 and the country of Hua 滑, both of which existed outside the north-western frontier, to pay a tribute. These two countries had never sent an envoy (to China) for generations and no one knew of their origin. (P'EI) Tzŭ-yeh referring to Po-t'i, a general of Hsiung-nu, which is commented by FU Ch'ien 服虔 as personal name of a Hsiung-nu killed by Ying(?)-yin-hou 潁陰侯 (i.e. KUAN Ying 灌嬰), and also referring to PA-HUA 八滑 who attacked Hsiung-un under Ting-yüan-hou 定遠侯 (i.e. PAN Yung), wondered if these two countries were descended from them. The people admired his wide knowledge. Kao-tsu, therefore, ordered him to compile a book entitled *Fang-kuo-shih-t'u* 方國使圖, which described twenty countries in all, covering from Yao-fu 要服 frontier to the sea, in order to explain that so many countries came to (the Liang) to pay respect."(1) From this statement we know that the description and identification of Po-t'i and Hua in the *Liang-shu* is based on the *Fang-kuo-shih-t'u*, edited by P'EI Tzŭ-yeh.

However, Hua is the name of a country, of which the king was named Yen-tai-i-li-t'o 嚥帶夷栗陁 (*Yeptailitha).(2) As I have cited above, the *Liang-shu* locates it at the distance of six days' journey to the west of Po-t'i or Bakhdhi (Balkh). In the *Liang-shu*, Bk. 54, it is also stated that Po-ssŭ (Persia) is situated to the west of Hua : K'o-pan-t'o 渴盤陁 (Tashkurgan) to the east of Hua : and Chou-ku-ko 周古柯 (Karghalik), Ho-po-t'an 呵跋檀 (Kabâdiyân), and Hu-mi-tan 胡蜜丹 (Kumêdh in Wakhân) are in the neighbourhood of Hua. From these statements we can guess that Hua existed somewhere in the neighbourhood of the middle waters of the Oxus. O. FRANKE and MARQUART, reading Hua as Wart and OAT respectively,(3) take it as transcribing Warz, an Ephthalite

(1) 是時，西北徼外，有白題及滑國，遣使由岷山道入貢，此二國歷代弗賓，莫知所出，(裴)子野曰，漢潁陰侯斬胡白題將一人，服虔注曰，白題胡名也，又漢定遠侯擊虜，八滑從之，此其後乎，時人服其博識，敕仍使撰方國使圖，廣述懷來之盛，自要服至于海表，凡二十國. *Liang-shu*, Bk. 30 (=*Nan-shih* 南史, Bk. 33). Yao-fu, the fourth of the five fu, means, according to one explanation, the territory at the distance of 1,500–2,000 li from the metropolis. The *Liang-shu*, Bk. 54 (fol. 9b), states that Po-ssŭ 波斯 (Sasanid Persia) descended from King Po-ssŭ-ni 波斯匿, * Pasenig for Pasenadi, Prasenajit, who ruled at Śrâvastî at the time of Buddha. This explanation, too, shows the same attitude of identifying as in the *Fang-kuo-shih-t'u*. Under the Liang, there was another important work concerning foreign countries, whch was the *Chih-kung-t'u* 職貢圖 by Emperor Yüan-ti 元帝. The book was compiled in 526–541. But it is not known if there is any information about the Ephthalites in this book. As for the *Chih-kung-t'u*, see K. SHIRATORI, *Seiikishi Kenkyû* 西域史研究, II, Tokyo 1944 p. 667–670 (*Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko*, 15, p. 240–251) : P. PELLIOT in *TP*, 1932, p. 265 note 1 : F. HIRTH in *WZKM*, 1896 p. 227.

(2) *Liang-shu*, Bk. 54 (fol. 8b).

(3) The theory which takes *hua* as a transcription of *Hûṇa* or *xion*, etc. is no longer tenable. Now, see M. BUSSAGLI, *Osservazioni sul problema degli Unni*, *Accademia naz. dei Lincei*, *Rendiconti d. Classe di Scienze morali, etc.* VIII, V, 3–4, 1950, p. 212 ff.

king, and War of Warwâlîz which was near what is now Kunduz.(1) Though Marquart's reading and identification is generally followed, I am of the opinion that Hua 滑, *$\gamma^{\omega}$ *at* represents *Ghwâr> *Ghôr which is to be located on the upper waters of Hari Rûd. I can not locate exactly Hua as no detailed report has so far been available concerning the geography and archaeology of this region, but Ghôr, situated to the south-west of Balkh and to the east of Persia, seems to fit well for Hua. At the middle of the 7th century, the T'ang established *Ta-han Tu-tu-fu* 大[太]汗都督府 or the Government of Ta-han at Huo-lu-ch'êng 活路城 which was the centre of communities of the Ephthalites.(2) This Huo-lu will also represent Ghôr or Ghûr, as has been suggested by Chavannes,(3) or it may be a transcription of Hari Rûd, if this name had already existed at the time.

(1) O. FRANKE, *Geschichte des chinesischen Reiches*, III, Berlin-Leipzig 1937 p. 312: J. MARKWART, *Wehrot und Arang*, Leiden, 1938, p. 45. Warz (?) being an Ephthalite king who was killed by Sinjibû Khakân in the latter half of the 6th century, there is no proof that he ruled in 522.

(2) As for the establishment of tu-tu-fu 都督府 and chou 州 by the T'ang in Russian Turkestan and Afghanistan at the middle of the 7th century, see K. ENOKI, *Tôdai no Hutsurinkoku ni kan suru ichi mondai* 唐代の拂菻國に關する一問題 (*A study of Fu-lin-kuo during the T'ang*), *Kita Ajia Gakuhô* 北亞細亞學報, II, pp. 225–233. The location of the country of Hua is a bit complicated question as Hua 滑 (*$\gamma^{w}$at) is very similar to Huo 活 (*$\gamma^{w}$ât) of HSÜAN-CHWANG (*Records*, Bk. 1, p. 27; Bk. 12, p. 6–7, ed. Kyoto University) in its reading. However, Huo of HSÜAN-CHWANG is to be located at Warwâlîz to the north of what is now Kunduz, because *Hsüan-chwang* writes that from Huo one can reach K'ou-hsi-to 闍悉多 (Khost) and An-ta-lo-fu 安呾羅縛 (Andarâb) in the south-east and Fu-ch'ieh-lang 縛伽浪 (Bâghlân) Bk. 1, p. 27) in the south-west, which shows that Huo cannot be Ghôr on the upper reaches of Hari Rûd or the region of Chor or Ghorî to the south of Bâghlân. Moreover, the *Liang-shu*, Bk. 54, does not mention the Buddhism at Hua 滑, while *Hsüan-chwang* describes Huo as a centre of Buddhism, with more than ten Buddhist temples and several hundred priests. In this way, Hua and Huo cannot be looked upon as the same place, inspite of the resemblance of name. Huo of HSÜAN-CHWANG is the same as A-huan-ch'êng 阿緩城 (with several variants), where the *Yüeh-shih Tu-tu-fu* 月氏都督府 was established for the reason that it was the centre of Tokhârestân. The *Yüeh-shih Tu-tu-fu* was governed by a Turkish yabγu and it put the area of Balkh and Badhakhshân under its control, Fu-ch'ih (for t'o?)-ch'êng 縛叱(吒?)城 or Bakhdhi and Pa-t'ê-shan-ch'êng 拔特山城 or Badakhshân being the location of government of Ta-hsia-chou 大夏州 and Fan-t'ang (yüan?)-chou 范湯(陽?)州 under the *Tu-tu-fu*. Under the T'ang, T'u-hou-lo 吐火羅 means the whole of Tokhârestân on one hand and A-huan-ch'êng, its centre, on the other. Nothing is mentioned about the Ephthalites in relation to Huo 活 or *Yüeh-shih Tu-tu-fu*, though the inhabitants of Tokhârestân at the time of Sui and T'ang consisted of Tokharians and the Ephthalites as is stated in the *Sui-shu*, Bk. 83 (fol. 4), the *T'ang-shu*, Bk. 221b (fol 3a) and othre sources. MARQUART and HERRMANN locate the *Ta-han Tu-tu-fu* in the present Badhakhshân and to the east of it respectvely, where Sung-yun saw the king and queen of the Ephthalites in 519 (MARQUART, *Wehrot und Arang*, p. 46–48 note: HERRMANN, *Asia Major*, II, p. 576.) But, this locating is untenable as Badakhshân was under the *Yüeh-shih Tu-tu-fu*. MARQUART (*Ērānšahr*. p. 65: followed by J. WALKER, *A catalogue of the Arab-Sassanian coins*, 1941. p. IXIX) says that the Ephthalites penetrated by force of arms as far as Badhghîs and Herât in 578. I am afraid that here he is mistaking the Khakhân of Turks of ṬABARÎ (I, p. 991 ed. De Goeje: NÖLDEKE, p. 269) as the king of the Ephthalites.

(3) *Documents sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) occidentaux*, p. 69.

This shows that the region of Ghôr was inhabited by the Ephthalites as late as the 7th century. It is, however, to be remembered that Hua can not be looked upon as *the* center of the Ephthalite empire at the beginning of the 6th century, but it was a country under the rule of the Ephthalites who occupied Khôrasân, Tukhârestân, Sogdiana, Gandhâra, north of the T'ien-shan Mountains and a part of Chinese Turkestan. The Ephthalites were nomad and their king, having no fixed residence, removed from one place to another every month.(1) For some reason unknown to us, Hua was received as, or pretended to be, the Ephthalites empire itself. That the envoy of Hua told the Liang that their king was named YEN-TAI-I-LI-T'O (*Yeptailitha) will only show that the country was under the control of this king. So when the LIANG-SHU says that Tashkurgan, Karghalik, Kabadiyân, Kumêdh are in the neighbourhood of Hua, it will mean that these countries were bordering Tukhârestân which was under the rule of the Ephthalites. But, seeing that many Ephthalites communities existed in Huo-lu 活路 or Ghôr in the 7th century and that PROCOPIUS (I, III, 2 ; I, IV, 10) tells us that the Ephthalites has a city named Gorgo,(2) which may also be identified with Ghôr, Hua had been undoubtedly an important centre of the Ephthalite empire.

The language of Hua was not understood by the people of Liang, and the people of Ho-nan 河南 or Kuku-nor Region, that is to say, the T'u-yü-hun 吐谷渾, acted as interpreters.(3) This coincides with the statement of the biography of P'EI Tzŭ-yeh that the envoy of Hua came via Min-shan-tao 岷山道 or the road by the Min-shan Mountains in Ssŭ-ch'uan 四川 by which the Southern Dynasties had been communicating with the Western Regions including the T'u-yü-hun. But the interpreters of T'u-yü-hun probably could not explain the origin of the Ephthalites, which resulted in an arbitrary identification of P'ei Tzŭ-yeh.

(2) *The K'ang-chü* 康居 *theory*

The second theory which can easily be ruled out is the K'ang-chü theory which looks upon the Empthalites as descendants of K'ang-chü. WEI Chieh 韋節 says in the *Hsi-fan-chi* 西蕃記(4) as follows : "I had a personal talk with some Ephthalites and knew that they also called themselves I-t'ien 悒闐. In the *Han-shu* 漢書 it is stated that the viceroy of K'ang-chü, named I-t'ien 悒闐, plund-

(1) *Pei-shih*, Bk. 97 (= *Wei-shu*, Bk. 102). Cf. *Asia Major*, II, 1925, p. 570–571.

(2) Gorgo (Γοργώ) is usually identified with Gurgân in ancient Hyrcania. But it may be Gorga (Γόργα) of PRISCUS (*F. H. G.*, IV, p. 106, frag. 33), an operation base of YAZDEGERD and PÊRÔZ against the Kidarites, that is to be identified with Gurgân.

(3) The T'u-yü-hun played an important rôle to connect countries in the Western Regions with Northern and Southern Dynasties. See Dr. Hisao MATSUDA 松田壽男, *Toyokukon kenshikô* 吐谷渾遣使考, *Shigaku Zasshi* 史學雜誌, Vol. XLVIII, p. 1373–1409, 1481–1505.

(4) As for the *Hsi-fan-chi*, see the *Sui-shu*, Bk. 83 (fol. 1); *Pei-shih*, Bk. 97 (fol. 16); Ed. CHAVANNES, *Les Documents sur les Tou-kiue occidentaux*, p. 375 under Wei Tsieh : A. HERRMANN, in *Asia Major*, II, 1925, p. 579–580.

ered provisions and arms under CH'ÊN T'ang 陳湯 who marched against Chih-chih (Shan-yü) 郅支 (單于). This may mean that they are descendants of K'ang-chü. However, the information has come from remote countries and foreign languages are subject to corruption and misunderstanding and, moreover, it concerns the matter of very ancient time. So we do not know what is certain. (In this way) it is impossible to decide (the origin of the Ephthalites)."(1) WEI Chieh took service to Yang-ti 煬帝 of Sui (605–616), who sent him to western countries. The *Hsi-fan-chi* compiled by him was a collection of informations about countries in Central Asia, of which only fragmentary citations are left in the *T'ung-tien* 通典.

I-t'ien 悒闐 (**iep-t'ien*) is a Chinese transcription of a name of Ephthalites, which is also written as I-ta 悒怛 (**iep-tât'*)(2) in the *Sui-shu* 隋書, Bk. 83, *T'ang-shu* 唐書, Bk. 221 b, and *T'ung-tien*, Bk. 193, after the *Sui-shu*. WEI Chieh combines this name with that of the viceroy of K'ang-chü in the Former Han, but, as he himself confesses, there is no solid ground for this combination except the resemblance of name.

(3) *The Ta-yüeh-shih* 大月氏 *theory*

The theory that the Ephthalites were derived from the Ta-yüeh-shih is recorded in the *Wei-shu* 魏書, Bk. 102, *Chou-shu* 周書, Bk. 50, *Sui-shu* 隋書, Bk. 83, and *Pei-shih* 北史, Bk. 97. As is well known, the *Hsi-yü-chuan* 西域傳 of the *Wei-shu* has long been lost and the present text has copied the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of *Pei-shih*.(3) So, strictly speaking, we do not know what was written on the Ephthalites in the original *Hsi-yü-chuan* of *Wei-shu*. However, it is not impossible for us to reconstruct it to a certain extent from a comparative study of the *Hsi-yü-chuan* of *Pei-shih*, which was compiled from the *Wei-shu*, *Chou-shu* and *Sui-shu*. The relationship between them is illustrated as follows :

*Wei-shu* (the original *Hsi-yü-chuan* 西域傳, now lost)
*Chou-shu* (*I-yü-chuan* 異域傳)
*Sui-shu* (*Hsi-yü-chuan* 西域傳)
} *Pei-shih* (*Hsi-yü-chuan*) > *Wei-shu* (the present *Hsi-yü-chuan*)

(1) 又韋節西蕃記云，親問其國人，並自稱悒闐，又按漢書，陳湯征郅支，康居副王挹闐，抄其後重，此或康居之種類，然傳自遠國，夷語訛舛，年代綿邈，莫知根實，不可得而辯也, etc. (通典, Bk. 193). In every edition now available of *Han-shu*, Bk. 70 (Biography of CH'ÊN T'ang), I-t'ien 挹闐 is written I-pao 挹抱.

(2) Concerning the name of the Ephthalites in Chinese sources, see HERRMANN, *Asia Major*, II, p. 572. It seems that I-t'ien 挹闐 was adapted by WEI Chieh and I-t'a 挹怛 by P'EI Chü 裴矩 (See his preface to the *Hsi-yü t'u-chi* 西域圖記 in the *Sui-shu*, Bk. 67, fol. 36). Also see PELLIOT in *JA*, 1920 (1), p. 143 note 1 on the phonetic value of 怛.

(3) YANG, Lien-sheng, *Topics in Chinese History* (*Harvard-Yenching Institute Studies*, IV), *Cambridge*, 1950, p. 34. As for the patching up of lost chapters, see the *Tôyô Gakuhô* 東洋學報 XXXVII, p. 431–432, 466 note 10.

Now, let us compare the description of the *Pei-shi* with that of the *Chou-shu* and *Sui-shu*.(1)

| | 北史卷九十七<br>噘噠 國 | 周書卷五十<br>噤噠 國 | 隋書卷八十三<br>挹怛 國 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | 大月氏之種類也. | 1. 大月氏之種類. | 2. 大月氏之種類也. |
| 2. | 亦曰高車之別種. | | |
| 3. | 其原出於塞北, 自金山而南. | | |
| 4. | 在于闐之西. | 2. 在于闐之西. | |
| 5. | 都烏滸水南二百餘里. | | 10. 都烏滸水南二百餘里. |
| 6. | 去長安一萬一百里. | 3. 東去安一萬百里. | |
| 7. | 其王都拔底延城. 蓋王舍城也. | 4. 其王治拔底延城, 蓋王舍城也. | |
| 8. | 其城方十里餘. | 5. 其城方十餘里. | 6. 其國都城方十餘里. |
| 9. | 多寺塔, 皆飾以金. | | 7. 多寺塔, 皆飾以金. |
| 10. | 風俗與突厥略同. | 6. 刑法風俗與突厥略同. | |
| 11. | 其俗兄弟共一妻. | 7. 其俗又兄弟共娶一妻. | 8. 兄弟同妻. |
| 12. | 無兄弟者, 戴一角帽. | 8. 夫無兄弟者, 其妻戴一角帽. | 9. 婦人有一夫者, 冠一角帽. |
| 13. | 若有兄弟者, 依其多少之數, 更加帽焉. | 9. 若有兄弟者, 依其多少之數, 更加帽角焉. | 10. 夫兄弟多者, 依其數爲角. |
| 14. | 衣服類加以纓絡, 頭皆剪髮. | | |
| 15. | 其語與蠕蠕高車及諸胡不同. | | |
| 16. | 衆可有十萬. | | 3. 勝兵者五六千人. |
| 17. | 無城邑, 依隨水草. 以氈爲屋, 夏遷涼土, 冬逐煖處. | | |
| 18. | 分其諸妻, 各在別所. 相去二百三百里. 其王巡歷而行. 每月一處. 冬寒之時, 三月不徙. | | |
| 19. | 王位不必傳子. 子弟堪者, 死便受之. | | |
| 20. | 其國無車, 有輿. 多駝馬. | | |

(1) The comparison has been made by A. HERRMANN, *Die Hephthaliten und ihre Beziehungen zu China*, *Asia Major*, II, 1925, pp. 566–571 and K. FUNAKI 船木勝馬, *Ehutaru ni kansuru Chûgoku shiryô ni tsuite* エフタルに關する中國史料について (*Chinese sources concerning the Ephthalites*), *Shien* 史淵, Vol. 61, pp. 57–77. On several points I am repeating not exactly the same reasoning, but the same conclusion already arrived at by my predecessors.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 21. 用刑嚴急, 偸盜無多少, 皆要斬. 盜一責十. | | | |
| 22. 死者富家累石爲藏, 貧者掘地而埋, 隨身諸物, 皆置塚內. | | | |
| 23. 其人凶悍, 能鬪戰. | 10. 其人兇悍, 能戰鬪. | 4. 俗善戰. | |
| 24. 西域康居于闐沙勒安息及諸小國三十許, 皆役屬之. | 11. 于闐安息等大小二十餘國, 皆役屬之. | | |
| 25. 號爲大國. | | | |
| 26. 與蠕蠕婚姻. | | | |
| 27. 自太安以後, 每遣使朝貢. 正光末, 遣貢師子一. 至高平, 遇萬俟醜奴反. 因留之. 醜奴平, 送京師. 永熙以後, 朝獻遂絶. | | | |
| 28. 初熙平中, 明帝遣朁伏子統宋雲沙門法力等, 使西域, 訪求佛經. 時有沙門慧生者. 亦與俱行, 正光中還. 慧生所經諸國, 不能知其本末及山川里數. 蓋擧其略云. | | | |
| 29. 至大統十二年, 遣使獻其方物. | 12. 大統十二年, 遣使獻其方物. | | |
| 30. 廢帝二年, 周明帝二年, 並遣使來獻. | 13. 魏廢帝二年, 明帝二年, 並遣使來獻. | | |
| 31. 後爲突厥所破, 部落分散, 職貢遂絶. | 14. 後爲突厥所破, 部落分散, 職貢遂絶. | 5. 先時國亂, 突厥遣通設字詰强領. | |
| 32. 至隋大業中, 又遣使朝貢方物. | | 12. 大業中, 遣使貢使方物. | |
| 33. 其國去漕國千五百里, 東去瓜州六千五百里. | | 11. 南去漕國千五百里, 東去瓜州六千五百里. | |

It is obvious that *Pei-shih* 29–33 (numerals show the number of passages in the above list) copied *Chou-shu* 12–14 and *Sui-shu* 12 and 11, because *Pei-shih* 27, enumerating envoies from the Ephthalites, says that after Yung-hsi 永熙 (533–534) of Wu-ti 武帝 of Wei no embassy came from the Ephthalites. So it may be that the embassies in the 12th year of Ta-t'ung (549), the 2nd year of the dethroned emperor (553) and the 2nd year of Ming-ti of Chou (558) were

originally recorded in the *Chou-shu*.(1) *Pei-shih* 28, which has nothing to do with the Ephthalites, is a misplaced introduction to the descriptions of Chu-chü 朱居 (Karghalik), K'o-p'an-t'o 渴槃陁 (Tashkurgan) and other countries, which are extracted from SUNG-YÜN 宋雲, which follow the statement concerning the Ephthalites.

It is certain that *Pei-shi* 6 was taken from *Chou-shu* 3 because Ch'ang-an was the capital of Chou, and not of Wei.(2) *Pei-shi* 7–9 have also copied *Chou-shu* 4–5(3) and *Sui-shu* 6–7, as *Pei-shih* 17–18 says that there had been neither cities and towns in the country of the Ephthalites nor fixed residence of their king. I think that *Pei-shih* 10, which states that manners and customs of the Ephthalites are almost similar to those of the T'u-chüeh 突厥, is taken from *Chou-shu* 6 for the Wei had no close connections with the T'u-chüeh until after the split of their empire into Eastern and Western Wei in 534.(4)

As for the rest of *Pei-shi*, which are passages of the same phraseology as in the *Chou-shu* and the *Sui-shu*, it will be right to say that they were copied from the last two, but it may go too far to decide that the original *Wei-shu* lacked descriptions to the same effect. However, I should think that *Pei-shi* 4, which states that the country of the Ephthalites is situated to the west of Khotan, did not exist in the original *Wei-shu*, but taken from tne *Chou-shu*.(5) It is because the *Chou-shu* describes the Ephthalites after Khotan, hence this indication makes sense. I am also of the opinion that *Pei-shi* 5, which informs of the location of the Ephthalite capital, has copied the *Sui-shu* 1,(6) for the reason that it contradicts the statement that the Ephthalites had no fixed capital (*Pei-shih* 17–18). On the other hand, *Pei-shih* 11–13, which, from the phraseological point of view, are obviously copied from *Chou-shu* 7–9, may be looked upon as a replacement of some passages of the original *Wei-shu* to the similar effect for the customs of polyandry and their women's horn-like hair decoration are too specical a custom of the Ephthalites to be passed unrecorded. *Pei-shi* 23 may be a repetition of *Chou-shu* 10. But, *Pei-shi* 24, which is a bit different from *Chou-shu* 11, probably has come down from the original *Wei-shu* which ought to have had such a passage.

(1) Actually, the *Chou-shu* records the history of Western Wei 西魏, which starts in the 1st year of Ta-t'ung (535). The embassies here mentioned came to both the Western Wei and the Chou which succeeded the former.

(2) FUNAKI, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

(3) FUNAKI, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

(4) FUNAKI, p. 69. According to CH'ÊN Chung-mien 岑仲勉, the T'ü-chüeh appeared in the Chinese record for the first time in the 8th year of Ta-t'ung (542). See the biography of Yü-wên Ts'ê 宇文測 (*Chou-shu*, Bk. 27). (*T'u-chüeh chi-shih* 突厥集史, Vol. 1, Peking 1958 p. 15.)

(5) FUNAKI, *op. cit.*. p. 64.

(6) HERRMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 573 ; *Funaki, op. cit.*, p. 64.

From these comparisons, we may conclude that the *Pei-shih* has copied the *Chou-shu* and *Sui-shu*, so long as the passages of the same phraseology are concerned; that the *Pei-shi* has followed the passages of the original *Wei-shu*, of which parallel sentences are found neither in the *Chou-shu* nor *Sui-shou*; that, in some cases, the original *Wei-shu* seems to have had statements which the editor of the *Pei-shih* has replaced with the passages to the same effect of the *Chou-shu* or *Sui-shu*.

In this way, the *Pei-shih*'s description that " (the Ephthalites) are a branch of the Ta-yüeh-shih " may be considered either as copied from the *Chou-shu* and the *Sui-shu* or as was written in the original *Wei-shu*. However, in both cases, it is not clear why the Ephthalites were looked upon as a sort of the Ta-yüeh-shih or what the Ta-yüeh-shih meant to the authors of these books. As is well known, in Chinese records, the Ta-yüeh-shih is used for three meanings. First, it was the name of tribe who emigrated from Kan-su to what is now Russian and Afghan Turkestan. Then it was used as a designation of the Kushanian and some of their successors. And, at the same time, it meant the territory occupied and ruled by the first Ta-yüeh-shih and the Kushanian, that is to say, Tokhârestân and Gandhâra. And in the 5th and the 6th centuries (Ta-)yüeh-shih usually meant the territory on both sides of the Hindûkush Mountains.(1) It is quite unlikely that the Chinese knew at that time what the first Ta-yüeh-shih tribe was like. So I am of the opinion that the Ta-yüeh-shih origin of the Ephthalites was invented either because the Ephthalites occupied the region which was known to the Chinese as Ta-yüeh-shih or because the Ephthalites were looked upon as a sort of the Kidârites who were called Ta-yüeh-shih under the Wei.(2) The Kidârites dominated Tokhâristân and Gandhâra until they were conquered by the Ephthalites.(3) The resemblance of the name Yen-ta 噘噠 to Yüeh-shih 月氏 would have encouraged the identification.

The Ta-yüeh-shih=Ephthalites theory was justified by several authors of the 19th and 20th centuries.(4) Many of them not only based upon the statement

(1) See, for instance, P. PELLIOT, *Tokharien et Kutchéen*, *JA*, 1934, p. 44: G. HALOUN, *Zur Üe-tşi Frage*, ZDMG, 1937 p. 277–278 note: K. ENOKI, *On the date of the Kidârites*, Tôkyô Gakuhô, XLI, 1958, p. 301–305.

(2) FUNAKI, *op. cit.*, p. 60, holds the latter view. The *Chou-shu*, Bk. 54 (fol. 3b), identifies Po-ssŭ 波斯 (the Sasanid Persia) with a branch of the Ta-yüeh-shih, which is omitted in the *Pei-shih* (Bk. 97, 5a).

(3) The Kidârites unified Tokhârestân and Gandhâra some time between 412 and 437. But the Ephthalites deprived them of Tokhârestân at the middle of the 5th century and Gandhâra some time between 477 and 520. See K. ENOKI, *On the date of the Kidârites*, *Tôyô Gakuhô*, XLI, 1958, p. 283–334.

(4) Here is a list of main articles:
—FÊNG, Chia-shêng 馮家昇 in *Yeng-ch'ing Hsieh-pao* 燕京學報, XIII, 1933, p. 233–238.
—FUJITA, Toyohachi 藤田豐八, *Echô-den senshaku* 慧超傳箋釋, Peking 1910, fol. 36b–38b.

of *Pei-shi*, *Chou-shu* and *Sui-shu*, but also tried to establish the phonetical identity of the name of Yüeh-shih 月氏 and Yen-ta 噘噠. For instance, FUJITA Toyohachi 藤田豐八 says that Yüeh-shih is a transcription of Ghuttal which changed into Yuttal, Yettal, Haythal, Ephthal, Khuttal, Khottal and Khottalan and that Khottal or Khottalan, situated between the Wakhsh-âb and the Panj, was so named because it had been the centre of the Yüeh-shih.(1) On the other hand, S. P. Tolstov has advanced a theory that the name of Ephthalite was derived from *Gweta-äli* which means in Turkish "people of Gweta or Yüeh-shih".(2) I do not want to bother the reader with getting into detail of the complicated controversy on the true name and nationality of the Yüeh-shih tribe. I myself follow the reconstruction of G. Haloun who reads Yüeh-shih as **Skudja* which means the Scythians.(3) But, in any way, the phonetical equivalence of Yüeh-shih and Yeh-ta is yet to be fixed and there is no positive evidence to prove that the Ephthalites were descendants of the Yüeh-shih.

(4) *The Kao-ch'ê* 高車 *theory*

We see from the textual comparison of *Pei-shih*, *Chou-shu*, and *Sui-shu* that this theory was advanced in the original *Wei-shu*, which runs as follows: "It is also said that (the Ephthalites) are a branch of the Kao-ch'ê. They originated from the north of the Chinese frontier and came down south from Chin-shan 金山 mountain." The Kao-ch'ê was a union of Turkish tribes which pastured on the basin of the Selenga and, having unified Turkish tribes in the west of the Altai mountains and in the north of the T'ien-shan mountains, became independent from the Juan-juan 蠕蠕 about 485 or 486. So Chin-shan mountain mentioned here in connection with the Ephthalites means the southern branch of the Altai mountains, which makes the western boundary of the present Mongolian People's Republic.

The Kao-ch'ê had been well known by the T'o-pa Wei 拓跋魏 from the end of the 4th century, when the T'o-pa Wei empire was established, to the end of

(FUJITA confuses the Ephthalites with the Kidârites.)
—Do., *Daien no Kizan-jô to Gesshi no ôtei* 大宛の貴山城と月氏の王庭 (*Tôzai Kôshôshi no Kenkyû, Seiiki-hen* 東西交涉史の研究, 西域篇, p. 38–39).
—Do., *Gesshi no kochi to sono seii no nendai* 月氏の故地とその西移の年代 (*Ibid.*, p. 94–96) (The same confusion is repeated here.)
—KINGSMILL, Thos. W., *Migration and early history of the White Huns*, *JRAS*, X, 1878, p. 285–304.
—RICHTHOFEN, F. F. von, *China*, I, Berlin 1877, p. 439–441.
—ST.-MARTIN, V. de, *Les Huns Blancs ou Ethphalites*, Paris 1849, p. 64
—Do., *Mémoire analytique sur la carte de l'Asie centrale et de l'Inde* (*Mémoire sur les contrées occidentales*, II, Paris 1858, p. 285–286) (He insists that the Ephthalites were Tibetan.)
—TOLSTOV. S.P., *Drevniĭ Khorezm*, Moskva 1948, p. 276.
—Do., *Po sledam drevnekhorezmĭskoĭ* tsivilizatsii, Moskva-Leningrad 1948 p. 211 (See L. PETECH's recension *Rivista degli studi orientali*, XXV, 1950, p. 142)

(1) See FUJITA's article referred to in Note (4) of p. 11.
(2) See TOLSTOV's books in Note (4) of p. 11.
(3) An outline of my view is published in *Monumenta Serica*, XVII, 1958, p. 483–484.

the 5th century, when the Kao-ch'ê was destroyed by the Ephthalites. They used to invade the territory of T'o-pa Wei which had to fight against them.(1) But the Ephthalites came to the knowledge of the T'o-pa Wei in 456/457 when their first embassy reached P'ing-ch'êng 平城(5). And it was not until some time after 490, when the Ephthalites conquered the Kao-ch'ê to the north of Urumchi,(2) that the T'o-pa Wei could have some information of the relationship between these two tribes. As I have mentioned, the Ephthalites expanded their power from Tokhârestân as far as Urumchi in the last decade of the 5th century and some part of Kao-ch'ê people came under the control of the Ephthalites.(3) Prior to this date, no direct connection had ever existed between both of them. It is not clear why the Ephthalites were identified with a branch of Kao-ch'ê, while it is recognized that the language of the Ephthalites was different from that of Juan-juan 蠕蠕, Kao-ch'ê and other tribes of Central Asia (諸胡) (see *Pei-shih* 15). There is no evidence, both literal and archaeological, which shows us that the Ephthalites originated in the neighbourhood of Altai mountain or anywhere to the north of the T'ien-shan mountains. So far as we know for the moment, the Ephthalites had risen to power in Tokhârestân where the Ephthalites continued to live even after the destruction of their empire. This will show that the origin of the Ephthalites should be looked for in, or in the neighbourhood of, Tokhârestân. It may be because of resemblance of their manners and customs that the Ephthalites were connected with the Kao-ch'ê. *Chou-shu* 6, says that penalties and manners and customs among the Ephthalites are almost the same as among the T'u-chüeh 突厥, of which the Kao-ch'ê was a kindred tribe. It was not the Ephthalites but the Kao-ch'ê who originated from the north of the Chinese frontier and came down south from Chin-shan mountain.(4)

If one comes to think of such circumstances, it will be said that the Chinese accounts concerning the origin or homeland of the Ephthalites are all so inaccurate that they can not be readily believed. The *Hsi-yü-t'u-chih* 西域圖志(5) compiled in 666 writes on the Ephthalites: "As to its origin, some say it is a branch of the Ch'ê-shih 車師, others say it is a branch of the Kao-ch'ê 高車, and still others say it is a branch of the Ta-yüeh-shih 大月氏."(6) The *Hsi-yü-*

(1) *Pei-shih*, Bk. 98, fol. 7a (= *Wei-shu*, Bk. 103, fol. 6a). (2) *Pei-shih*, Bk. 98, fol. 7b (= *Wei-shu*, Bk. 103, fol. 6b–7a.) (3) *Pei-shih*, Bk. 98, fol. 8a (= *Wei-shu*, Bk. 103, fol. 7a).

(4) On this point, see *Additional Notes*.

(5) The date of compilation of the *Hsi-yü-t'u-chih*, which is also called *Hsi-yü-chih* 西域志 or *Hsi-kuo-shih* 西國志, is given in the *Fa-yüan-chu-lin* 法苑珠林, Bk. 100 and 5 (*Tripiṭaka Taishô* LIII, p. 1024 a–b, 310b). On this book, see S. Julien, *Mélanges de géographie asiatique*, etc., Paris, 1864, p. 203: F. Hirth, *Ueber chinesischen Quellen*, etc., *WZKM*, X, p. 23 : P. Pelliot, *Notes sur quelques artistes des Six dynasties et des T'ang*, *TP*, 1923, p. 274–276 : and K. Enoki, *Tôdai no Hutsurin-koku ni kansuru ichi mondai*, *Kitaajia Gakuhô*, II, p. 233–235. This was the most authentic accounts of the Western Regions in the 7th century.

(6) 其本或車師之種，或云高車之種，或云大月氏之種. (quoted in the *T'ai-p'ing huan-yü-chi* 太平寰宇記, Bk. 183, under Yen-ta-kuo 噘噠國).

*t'u-chih* was a complete collection of information concerning Central Asia at the time and still it merely repeated the accounts in the (original) *Wei-shu*, the *Liang-shu*, *Chou-shu* and so on. From this it will be seen that the accurate origin of the Ephthalites was not known even in the period of T'ang: the rapid and extensive development of the tribe gave rise to various conjectures which came to be recorded in the above mentioned form.

But, in the *T'ang-shu*, Bk. 221b (fol. 3a–b), one comes across the following statement about the Ephthalites. "The country of I-ta 悒怛 is of the race of Ta-yüeh-shih in the time of Han 漢. The Ta-yüeh-shi was deprived (of their territory) by the Wu-sun 烏孫, and emigrating westwards by way of Ta-yüan 大宛, attacked Ta-hsia 大夏 which they subjugated. They set up their capital at Lan-shih-ch'êng 藍氏城. Ta-hsia is nothing but T'u-ho-lo 吐呼羅 (Tokhâres-tân). Yen-ta 嚥噠 is their king's family name. The descendants made the family name (the name of) the country, which corrupted into I-ta 悒怛. It is also called I-t'ien 悒闐. Their manners and customs resemble to those of the Tu-chüeh 突厥. During the period of T'ien-pao 天寶 they sent embassies to pay tribute."(1) This might give casual readers an impression that the Ephthalites were finally established to be descendants of the Ta-yüeh-shih of the Han. However, the compiler of *T'ang-shu*, undoubtedly basing on the *Sui-shu*, Bk. 83,(2) fixed on his own judgement that the Ephthalites were descendants of the Ta-yüeh-shih, to which he added a story of their emigration as is described in the *Han-shu* 漢書, Bk. 96.(3) He also copied the *Liang-tien* 梁典 of Liu Fan 劉璠 concerning the name of the Ephthalites.(4) The statement about the manners and customs of the Ephthalites may have also copied the *Chou-shu*.(5) Thus, what is new in the *T'ang-shu* is the theory of Ta-hsia=T'u-ho-lo identity, as well as the account of the embassies from the Ephthalites(6) during the T'ien-pao period. So the *T'ang-shu* can not be expected to give us an evidence in support of the Ephthalites and Ta-yüeh-shih identity.

---

(1) *Cf.* Ed. Chavannes, *Documents sur les Tou-kiue occidentaux*, p. 158.
(2) *Sui-shu* 2, of the list on p. 8.
(3) *Han-shu*, Bk. 9 6b, fol. 1a (under Wu-sun), 96a, fol. 4b (under Ta-yüeh-shih).
(4) The *Liang-tien*, compiled by Liu Fan and completed by his son after his death in the 3rd year of T'ien-ho 天和 (568), is a history of Liang (see the biography of Liu Fan and his son in the *Chou-shu*, Bk. 42, fol. 4a–b: *Êrh-shih-wu-shih pu-p'ien* 二十五史補篇 (new ed. IV, p. 4958–4959, 4265–4266; V, p. 6688). It says as follows: "滑國姓嚥噠, 後裔以姓爲國號, 轉訛又謂之悒怛焉" (The family name of (the king of) the country of Hua is Yen-ta. The descendants made this family name the name of the country. It is also called I-ta in a corrupted form.) (Quoted in the *T'ung-tien* 通典, Bk. 193 under I-ta-t'ung 挹怛同).
(5) *Chou-shu* 6 (see p. 8).
(6) According to the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei* 册府元龜, I-ta 挹達 sent an envoy in the 6th year of K'ai-yüan 開元 (718) and I-ta 挹怛 in the 7th month of the 7th year of T'ien-pao 天寶 (748) and I-hêng 挹恒 (for I-ta 挹怛) in the 6th month of the same year (册府元龜封臣部奉使部索引, p. 645). As for the last one, see Chavannes, *Les documents*, (Paris edition) p. *80.

## II. Modern Theories

The Ephthalites attracted scholars' attention since 1697 when D'HERBELOT published the *Bibliothèque Orientale* in which he wrote about the Haïetelah or Ephthalites.(1) Then ASSEMANI mentioned the Haithal in the *Bibliotheca Orientalis* published in 1719–1728. But it was not until DE GUIGNES that the references were made to Chinese sources in conection with their origin and history. In his monumental work "*Histoire générale des Huns*", tome 1er 2e partie, Paris 1756 p. 282, 325ff, DE GUIGNES explained that the name of Ephthalites came down from Ab-te-le or T'ieh-lê 鐵勒 of water. The T'ieh-lê being the same as the Kao-ch'ê 高車 tribe, it is obvious that DE GUIGNES considered the Ephthalites as a kind of Kao-ch'ê. In 1776–88 GIBBON, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, XXVI,(2) identified the Ephthalites with a group of Huns, of which the western federation came under the control of Attila, but the identity was denied by RAWLINSON, *The Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy*, London 1876, p. 295, for the reason of physical and cultural difference between the two peoples. On the other hand, V. de ST. MARTIN read a paper on the Ephthalites at the Académie des Inscriptions et Belle Lettres in 1849, which was published in Paris in the same year under the title of *Huns Blancs ou Ephthalites des auteurs byzantins*. He looked upon the Ephthalites as identical with the Ta-yüeh-shih, which was accepted and repeated by Reinaud (1849 and 1863),(3) Kingsmill (1878),(4) Richthofen (1879)(5) and some others.(6) It was in 1895 that Ed. DROUIN elaborated the relationship between the Ephthalites and the Sasanid Persia in the *Mémoire sur les Huns Ephthalites dans leur rapports avec les rois perses sassanides* (*Le Muséon*, XIV, 1895, p. 73–84, 141–161, 232–247, 277–288). Concerning the ethnographical origin of the Ephthalites, DROUIN wrote: "From the point of view of ethnographical and geographical origin of the Ephthalites, we have some indictions thanks to Chinese historians only. The Chinese authors are, it is true, very modest on the statement of this Tartare tribe, but the small thing which they have left to us (so long as the documents discovered up to this date are concerned) is enough to supress completely the confusion made by the ancient authors in connection with the relationship between the Ephthalites and other

(1) B. D'HERBELOT, *Bibliothèque Orientale*, II, 2nd ed. A La Haye, 1777, p. 179.
(2) Vol. 3, p. 91–92, 522, Ed. BURY.
(3) J. T. RÉINAUD, *Mémoire sur l'Inde, Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belle-Lettres*, 1849, p. 103; *Do., Relations politiques et commerciales de l'Empire Roman avec l'Asie orientale, Paris*, 1863, p. 294.
(4) Thos. W. KINGSMILL, *Migration and Early History of the White Huns. JRAS*, X, 1878, p. 285*ff*.
(5) F. F. von RICHTHOFEN, *China*, 1, Berlin, 1877, p. 439.
(6) See p. 11 Note (4).

peoples" (p. 74–75). And, following *Specht*,[1] he concluded that the Ephthalites were a branch of the Ta-yüeh-shih. However, as I have explained in the preceeding chapter, the Chinese sources concerning the origin of the Ephthalites are too divergent from each other and too untrustworthy to be taken as well-grounded. And it is impossible to decide if the Ephthalites were more Ta-yüeh-shih than Kao-ch'ê, though they had obviously no relationship in their origin to Ch'ê-shih 車師 at all.

Three years earlier than DROUIN, A. CUNNINGHAM read a paper on "*Ephthalites, or White Huns*" at the 9th International Congress of Orientalists, which was later published in the *Transactions of the Congress*, *Journal of Numismatic Society* and *Archaeological Survey of India*.[2] But, CUNNINGHAM's opinion, starting with grave misunderstanding that the Ephthalites were nothing but the Juan-juan 蠕蠕, could be ignored nowadays so far as the origin of the Ephthalites is concerned,[3] though on some other points his suggestions are very useful.

(1) *The Hun theory*

As is stated by DROUIN, it is Chinese authors that give us some indications about the origin of the Ephthalites. The only indication given by Byzantine and Indian authors is that the Ephthalites were called White Huns (λευκοὶ οὖννοι) or White Hûṇa (Sita Hûṇa, Sveta Hûṇa), which means that they considered the Ephthalites as a sort of the Huns. This view, once justified and denied by GIBBON and RAWLINSON respectively, was taken up again by A. STEIN who published an article entitled "*A fehér Hunok és rokon törzsek Indiai szereplése*," *Budapest Szemle*, 91, 1989, which was later translated into English as "*White Huns and Kindred Tribes in the History of India North-west Frontier*," *Indian Antiquary*, 34, 1905, p. 73–87. In this he argues that the Ephthalites were Hsiung-nu 匈奴 and should be classified as a Turkish tribe. The gist of his argument is: (1) that the fact that PRISCUS in about 530 called the Ephthalites λευκοὶ οὖννοι refers to the period about a century after the rise of ATTILA and has something to do with the Huns under his command; (2) that the name Hûṇa appears in India about 448–466 in the reign of King Yaśodharman, and this Hûṇa refers to the Ephthalites, and the inscription on the monument for the victory of King YAŚODHARMAN over MIHIRAKULA, king of the Ephthalites, describes White Huns (the Ephthalites) as Hûṇa; (3) that the Chinese documents also describe the Ephthalites

(1) See *Additional Notes*.

(2) Sir A. CUNNINGHAM, *Archaeological Survey or India*, Vol. II, 1871, p. 75–82, *Ephthalites: Do., Ephthalites, or White Huns, Transactions of the Ninth International Congress of Orientalists, held in London, 5th to 12th September* 1892, *I*, London, 1893, p. 222–244: Do., *Later Indo-Scythians; Ephthalites, or White Huns, Numismatic Chronicle and Journal of the Numismatic Society*, 3rd series, No. 55 (1894, Part III), p. 243–293 with plates IX–XII.

(3) See the criticism by Isoki MIYAZAKI in *Seikyû Gakusô* 青丘學叢, VI, 1931, p. 73–80. The view that the Ephthalites were Juan-juan is still adopted by K. S. LATOURETTE, *The Chinese: Their History and Culture*, I, (1st ed.), p. 161.

as Hsiung-nu 匈奴; (4) that, according to the study of A. VÁMBÉRY, the Huns that invaded Europe were Turk-Tartars; (5) that Jaûvla, the title of Toramâna the Ephthalite king who reigned in Northwest India and also the title of his dynasty, is a genuine Turkish word, according to the study of KARABAECK of Vienna; (6) that AL-BIRUNI's "*India*" writes of "Turkish King's rule over Kâbul during the invasion of the Islam forces after 664, and that WU-K'UNG 悟空 mentions the rule of the T'u-chüeh 突厥 over Gandhâra and Kâbul in about 753. Of these points, (6) refers to the rule of Central Asia and North-western India by the Western T'u-chüeh, and has nothing to do with the Ephthalites. KARABAECK's explanation on (5) says that JI[ !] in Jaûvla means a hawk, and Taramâna (tûramûn, toremen,) means rebellion or rebel, but the Turkish language has no such words meaning hawk and rebellion respectively. The meaning of Jaûvla is yet to be fixed. As to (3), the *Pei-shih*, Bk. 98 (*Wei-shu*, Bk. 103) cites a view which takes the Kao-ch'ê 高車 as descendants of a nephew of a Hsiung-nu, but neither in the *Pei-shih* (*Wei-shu*) nor in any other Chinese documents could be found an account which directly connects the Hsiung-nu with the Ephthalites. Moreover, there is no positive evidence which shows MIHIRAKULA and TORAMÀNA were Hûṇa.(1) The Ephthalites were called White Huns, but this does not necessarily mean that they were the same Huns as Attila and his people. The name Hun had been applied to so many different tribes in Eurasia that it is impossible for us to conclude that any people called by this name means the same tribe as the Hsiung-nu or Huns.(2) If he wanted to prove the Ephthalites=Huns identity, STEIN should have explained how he extracted the Ephthalites from the Huns. It has been admitted that the Ephthalites called themselves Huns on the basis of numismatic evidence.(2) But, we have to establish what kind of Huns were ethnologically the Ephthalites.

(2) *The Mongol theory*

On the other hand, J. MARQUART, who, seeing the Ephthalites called Sveta Hûṇa and Hârâ Hûṇa in the Indian documents and taking Hâra as Qara, the Turkish or Mongolian word which means "black",(3) explains that Hârâ Hûṇa

(1) K. G. SANKAR, *The Hun Invasion of Hindustan, New Indian Antiquary*, IV, 36–43. K. ENOKI, *The date of the Kidârites, Tôyô Gakuhô*. LXI, p. 299–300 is of the opinion that SKANDAGUPTA fought with Kidârites which were called Hûṇas by the Indian.

(2) For instance, see G. MORAVCSIK, *Byzantinoturcica*, II, Budapest, 1943, p. 199–204: K. ENOKI, *Sogdiana and the Hsiung-nu, Shigaku Zasshi*, LXIV, p. 777–778.

(3) See, for instance, E. HERZFELD, *Kushano-Sasanian Coins* (*Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India*, 38), p. 19: Do., *Zoroaster*, II, Princeton, 1947, p. 772: R. GHIRSHMAN, *Les Chionites-Hephtalites*, Le Caire, 1948 p. 9–21: M. BUSSAGLI, *Osservazioni sul problema degli Unii, Atti della Academia Nazionale dei Lincei*, 1950, *Rendiconti, classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, V, 3/4, p. 219–221, 226–232: CZEGLÉDY Károly. *IV–IX. századi népmozgalmak a steppén*, Budapest, 1954, p. 3–4, 6–8.

must be Qara Qûn, and Sveta Hûṇa should have been originally called Čaγan Qûn or White Qûn, and the place name Čaγaniyân in Tokhârestân came from the occupation of the place by the Ephthalites, and as Čaγan means white in Mongolian, the Ephthalites were a Mongol tribe and this is also a proof that the northern tribes were extensively called Qûn.(1) On this view of MARQUART's, several criticisms have appeared.(2) Here is a leap in argument which makes it difficult for us to follow. MARQUART, identifying Hua 滑, another Chinese name for the Ephthalites, as the transliteration of *Οὐαρ* of *Οὐαρχωνῖται* which is considered the real name of Avars who invaded Europe, and also identifying Huo-kuo 活國 in the *Records* of HSÜAN-CHWANG and A-huan-ch'êng 阿緩城 in the *T'ang-shu* 唐書 as the same name and, connecting it with Warwâlîz in the neighborhood of Kunduz in Tokhârestân(3) and further identifying *Οὐαρ* as identical with the Hun 渾, a branch of the Kao-ch'ê 高車, interprets *Οὐαρχωνῖται* as the inhabitants on the banks of the Orkhon (Warxon) River(4). It is impossible to comprehend his true intention, but his several interpretations may well serve to prove the possibility of forming various views through connecting names which resemble one another.

Nevertheless this view of MARQUART's seems to be generally taken up in the academic circle of Western Europe. For instance, GROUSSET considers the Ephthalites as "une horde turco-mongole, plutôt turque que mongole "(5); "de race mongole comme le Jouan-juoan "(6); and also "proto-mongols "(7); "the Avars must have been the Ephthalites "(8); or "*Οὐαρχωνῖται* (Avars) must be the Ephthalites who migrated to the West(9) ". In A. HERRMANN's *Atlas of China, Cambridge, Mass.*, 1935, p. 30, Hua 滑 is also assigned for the Avars. However, there is no positive evidence which would directly connect the Ephthalites with the Avars, and the Avars with Hua 滑. Hua is not the name of tribe, but the name of country.(10)

(1) J. MARQUART, *Über das Volkstum der Komanen*, Berlin 1914, p. 70–71.
(2) P. PELLIOT, *A propos des Comans*, *JA*, 1920, 1, p. 140; W. BARTHOLD, *Novyi trud o Polovčah, Russkij Istoričeskij Jurnal*, 7, 1921, cf. *Wehrot u. Arang*, S. 39*–40*; W. BARTHOLD, *12 Vorlesungen*, etc., Berlin 1935, p. 27–28.
(3) See p. 5, note (2); p. 32*ff.*
(4) *Chronologie der alttürkischen Inschriften, Leipzig* 1898, p. 95: *Über das Volkstum der Komanan*, p. 74, 76, 77; *Wehrot u. Arang*, p. 44*ff.*
(5) R. GROUSSET, *L'empire des steppes*, Paris 1938, p. 110.
(6) *Ibid.*, p. 227.
(7) R. GROUSSET, *L'empire mongol*, Paris, 1941, p. 2: L. PETECH, *Asia centrale* in *Civilità dell'Oriente, Stroia*, Roma, 1956, p. 932, also writes that "it seems that their (Ephthalites') ruling class was proto-turk or proto-mongol ".
(8) *L'empire des steppes*, p. 226–227.
(9) *Ibid.*, p. 127.
(10) L. LIGETI is of the opinion that 滑 Hua, **γuad* represents *uar* (see C. KÁROLY, *IV–IX, századi népmozgalmak a steppén*, Budapest, 1954, p. 8). I think he is right in this point, but it is a mistake to look upon this *uar* as a transcription of Οὐαρ (*Και* Χουννί) which is a name of tribe, as CZEGLÉDY has elaborated. (*op. cit.*, p. 8–11).

(3) *The Turk theory*

It was J. KLAPROTH who conjectured that the Ephthalites were a Turkish tribe as early as 1824 (*Tableaux historiques de l'Asie*, Paris, 1824, p. 258). In Japan, Shunshô SHIGEMATSU 重松俊章 published in 1917 "*Ehutaru shuzoku kō* 嚈噠種族考 (*A Study of the Ethnology of the Ephthalites*)", *Shigaku Zasshi* 史學雜誌, XXVIII, 1916, p. 20–50, 115–154, in which he tried to prove the accuracy of the Turk theory. His arguments will be summarized as follows: (1) The name of the tribe which corresponds to the Ephthalites is given in Ṭabarî as Turk; (2) The ruler of the Ephthalites who had their headquarters in Gandhâra is called t'ê-ch'in 特勤 or tigin, "prince" in SUNG-YÜN 宋雲,(1) which is a Turkish word and the official title of T'u-chüeh 突厥 tribe: (3) According to Târanâtha, in the days of Asanga and Vasubandhu, the founders of Mahayâna Buddhism, there was a Turkish king named Mahâsammata in Kashmir who, occupying Tokhâra and Gaznî, governed the secular world for a century and constituted towers and temples everywhere to promote Buddhism. His father who had reigned over Multan and Lahore had persecuted Buddhism eagerly. Vasubandhu prospered in the Gupta Dynasty (320–455), and the Turkish king in Kashmir is generally believed to be an Ephthalite: (4) The *Wei-shu*(2) under Yen-ta 嚈噠 says that the manners and customs of the people are similar to those of the T'u-chüeh tribe: (5) The *Wei-shu* also represents the Ephthalites as another branch of the Kao-ch'ê 高車, a Turkish tribe. On these five grounds, SHIGEMATSU holds that the Ephthalites were a Turkish tribe.

Again Isoki MIYAZAKI 宮崎五十騎 published a lengthy article in *Seikyū Gakusō* 青丘學叢 (Nos. 4, 6, 21, 1931–1935) entitled "*Ehutaru shuzoku no hatten* 嚈噠種族の發展 (*The development of the Ephthalites*)", in which he probves the inadequacy of several past discussions on the nationality of the Ephthalites and contends that the sheer fact that the Ephthalites migrated south from the Chinshan 金山 area proves that they were a Turkish tribe.

Now, even though SHIGEMATSU rightly points out that (2) T'ê-ch'in 特勤 is a Turkish word and the official title, and (4) the manners and customs of the Ephthalites are said to have been similar to those of the T'u-chüeh tribe, the Ephthalites could not be set down as a Turkish tribe on that strength. Moreover, how much authenticity could be accepted in the history of Buddhism of Târanâtha, a writer of the 18th century, in determining this question? Also

(1) As for SUNG-YÜN's travel, now see CHOU Tsu-mo 周祖謨, *Lo-yang chia-lan-chi chiao-shih* 洛陽伽藍記校釋 which is the best text we have ever had. The description of the rule of the Ephthalites in Gandhâra is on p. 107. *T'ê-ch'in* is written as *t'ê-lê*. 特勒 in the *Pei-shih* (*Wei-shu*). Concerning the *t'ê-ch'in* and *t'ê-lê* question in Chinese records, see CHANG Yüan-chai 張元濟, *Chia-shih sui-pi* 校史隨筆, Shanghai 1957 p. 61a–63b.

(2) The *Wei-shu* (*Pei-shih*) has copied the statement of *Chou-shu*.

the authenticity of (5) is very much questioned as I have discussed in the first chapter. Thus, among the five grounds produced by SHIGEMATSU, the first one remains to be examined.

According to ṬABARÎ,[1] the Khâkân, king of the Turks, invaded the territory of Persia at the time of BAHRÂM GÛR (420–438) with 250,000 Turks, but he was finally destroyed[2] by BAHRÂM GÛR who deprived of him his dominion which had belonged to the Turks. BAHRÂM GÛR established a marzbân in the land thus conquered ; accepted the subjugation of inhabitants in the regions adjoining the territory of Turks ; set up a gate as a boundary-post between the land of Persia and the territory of the aforesaid people ; and sent a general to the region beyond the river (Oxus) in order to subjugate the inhabitants there. It is not stated where the Khâkân of Turks invaded, but it was obviously in Khorâsân as the Marzbân thus appointed is called Marzbân-i-Kushân in the Codex Springling quoted by NÖLDEKE.[3] ṬABARÎ wrote that BAHRÂM GÛR appointed his brother NARSÊ the governor of Khorâsân at Balkh (to meet the new situation after the conquest)[4]. It is generally known that ṬABARÎ is based on Arabic translations of the *Khodhâinâme*[5], a semi-official history of Sasanid Persia compiled under the reign of KHOSRŌ I (531–578) and his successors up to YAZDEGERD III (632–651/-652) and the *Khodâinâme* itself and its Arabic translations have long been lost. So it is impossible to know what was the original statement of the *Khodâinâme* in connection with the Turkish Khâkân who invaded Persia under BAHRÂM GÛR. But the same event is recorded by MAS'ÛDÎ[6] who tells us that Khâkân, king of the Turks, invaded Soghd and tresspassed the territory of BAHRÂM as far as Rey, but BAHRÂM conquered him. On the other hand, FIRDÛSÎ[7] says that, at the time of BAHRÂM GÛR, the Khâkân of Čîn invaded his territory, but he was defeated at Kashmîhan, near Merv ; BAHRÂM, taking advantage of this, conquered countries in Sogdiana and established a pole with cement and stone at Fârâb on the north of Jîhûn (Syr) and established a boundary-line between the Jîhûn and such countries as Irân, Khalaj and Turkestân, which he ordered not to be tresspassed unless the imperial order of the Persian king. Firdûsî describes in full

(1) Th. NÖLDEKE, *Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sasaniden*, Leiden, 1879, p. 98–102.
(2) According to the Persian ṬABARÎ (ZOTENBERG, *Chronique de Tabari*, II, p. 12), the version adapted from the original Arabic by BAL'AMI of the 10th century, the Khân was put to flight.
(3) NÖLDEKE, *Geschichte der Perser und Araber*, p. 102, note 2.
(4) *Ibid.*, p. 103.
(5) Concerning the *Khodâinâme* (*Khvatâinâmak*), see A. CHRISTENSEN, *L'Iran sous les Sassanides*, 2nd ed., Copenhagen, 1944, p. 59ff. I could not get access to V. R. ROSEN, *K voprosu ob arabskikh perevodakh Khudâi-name*, *Vostochniya Zametki*, Saint-Petersburg, 1895 (cf. S. INOSTRANTSEV, *Sasanidski etudi*, SPb., 1908, p. 85).
(6) *Prairie d'or*, II, p. 190.
(7) A. G. WARNER and E. WARNER, *The Shâhnâma of Firdausî*, *VII*, London, 1915, p. 84–90.

the fighting between the Persian king and the Khâkân of Čîn. It must be noticed that FIRDÛSÎ is much more detailed than MAS'ÛDÎ who is more factually concrete than ṬABARÎ. This shows that, as time went on, more details were added to the tradition concerning the invasion of Turkish Khâkân at the time of BAHRÂM GÛR. And it seems that the Khâkân was considered, as in MAS'ÛDÎ, to have come down via Sogdiana on the ground that the Khâkân of T'u-chüeh 突厥 actually invaded the Sogdiana and Tokhârestân under the Ephthalites in 558–561.(1) It will also be due to the fact that the emperor of T'ang put under his nominal control the whole of Russian and Afghan Turkestân at the middle of the 7th century(2) that FIRDÛSÎ writes that the Khâkân of Čîn, that is to say, the emperor of China (i.e. T'ang), advanced with his army as far as near Merv. The name of T'u-chüeh was first known to China about 542, a hundred years later than the time of BAHRÂM GÛR,(3) and it was not until 546 that the T'u-chüeh became independent from the Juan-juan 蠕蠕, to which they had been subjugated.(4) From chronological point of view, it is quite impossible for the Khâkân of Turks to invade Persia at the time of BAHRÂM GÛR. If the Khâkân of Turks had been mentioned in the *Khodâinâme*, it may have been because of rationalization or anachronism of the compilers who wrote the book more than one hundred years later than the time when the event took place. Moreover, we do not know if the king of the Ephthalites took the title of Khâkân. Actually, ṬABARÎ himself distinguishes the Turks from the Ephthalites (Haitâl). He writes that the gate constructed by BAHRÂM GÛR as boundary-mark between the Persian and Turkish territory was removed in the land of Turks at the time of PÊRÔZ (457, 459–484)(5) who at the beginning of his reign got the help of the Ephthalites and later fought against them. He also refers to a writer, conversant in the history of Persia, who states that PÊRÔZ marched against AKHSHUNWÂR,(6) king of the Ephthalites, as far as the gate which was set up by BAHRÂM GÛR as boundary-mark between Khôrasân and the country of the Turks. This means that ṬABARÎ distinguished the so-called Turks from the Ephthalites. I, therefore, am of the opinion that the Turks who invaded Persia at the time of BAHRÂM GÛR meant a non-Persian tribe who lived to the north-west of Persian territory. In this connection, I would like to call readers' attention to that the people to the

(1) E. STEIN in *Le Muséon*, 1940, p. 126, note 6 (cf. A. CHRISTENSEN, *L'Iran sous les Sassanides*, 2nd ed., p. 373 and G. WIDENGREN in *Orientalia Suecana*, I, p. 9).
(2) See K. ENOKI in *Kitaajia Gakuhô* 北亜細亜學報, II, p. 224–233.
(3) See on p. 10, note 4.
(4) *Tôyôrekishi Daijiten* 東洋歷史大辭典, VI, p. 535c.
(5) NÖLDEKE, *op. cit.*, p. 102.
(6) Concerning AKHSHUNWÂR, see F. W. K. MÜLLER, *Sogdische Texte*, I, *Sitzb. Preuss. A. W.*, 1913, p. 108 : W. HENNING, *ZDMG*, 90, 1936, p. 17, n. 2 : R. CHIRSHMAN, *Les Chionites-Hephtalites*, Le Caire, 1948, p. 19 : G. WINDENGREN, *Orientalia Suecana*, I, 1952, p. 75, note 1.

north-west of Persia was generally called Turks(1); that in the *Shâhnâme* the name Turk means something like Turân which is a contrast to Iran(2); and that Islamic authors usually applied the name Turk to any people bad or obstinate.(3)

At the time of BAHRÂM GÛR, the Kidârites just unified or were unifying Tokhârestân and Gandhâra(4) and the Un-na-sha 溫那沙 or Chionites ruled in Sogdiana.(5) So it may be either the Kidârites or the Un-na-sha that invaded the territory of Persia.(6) In any way, the Khâkân of Turks in ṬABARÎ should have been a chief of some other tribe than the Ephthalites.

Neither the account in the *Wei-shu* (*Pei-shih*) which described the Ephthalites as a branch of the Kao-ch'ê, nor the statement that they migrated from the Chin-shan 金山(5) mountain, which Isoki MIYAZAKI favours, could be taken as true as has been pointed out in the first chapter.(7)

(3) *The Altaic people theory*

It is F. ALTHEIM and his school who are trying to establish that the Ephthalites were an Altaic people (probably Turks or Mongols). Unfortunately, I do not know the detail of ALTHEIM's argument,(8) but, as far as I can gather from H. W. HAUSSIG's laborious work entitled *Theophylakts Exkurs über die skythischen Völker*, *Byzantion*, XXIII, 1953, p. 320–327, it seems the opinion is based on two grounds: (1) the final *-l* of *haftal* or *haptal* (i.e. the Ephthalites) is an Altaic collective suffix and (2) in Chinese records it is stated that the Ephthalites

(1) C. A. MACARTNEY, *BSOAS*, XI, 1943–46, p. 272: P. K. HITTI, *History of the Arabs*, 5th ed., p. 210, note 3.

(2) T. KOWALSKI, *Les Turcs dans le Sâh-nâme*, *Rocznik Orientalistyozny*, XV, 1939–1940, p. 84–99.

(3) I. GOLDZIEHER, *Mohammedanische Studien*, I, Halle, 1889, p. 270–271.

(4) K. ENOKI, *On the date of the Kidârites*, *Tôyô Gakuhô*, XLI, p. 19–23.

(5) K. ENOKI, *Sogudiana to Kyôdo*, II, *Sigaku Zasshi*, LXIV, p. 672–676.

(6) J. MARKWART, *A catalogue of the provincial capitals of Êrânšhahr*, edited by G. MESSINA (*Analecta Orientalia*, 3), Roma, 1931, p. 43 is of the opinion that the Turkish king killed by BAHRÂM Gûr must be identified with "the T'ai-kan (Great Kan) of the A-but 阿弗 whose capital, according to the *Pei-shih*, ch. 97, lay W. of Nok-mit 忸密 (*Nok-mêthân, Bukhara) 23720 *li* from Tai, the capital of the Northern Wei." And MARKWART looks upon A-but as a transcription of Avar or Juan-juan. However, A-fu-t'ai-han 阿弗太汗 is given as a transcription of the name of country which existed between Niu-mi 忸密 and Hu-shih-mi 呼似密 (Khorazm?) and it has nothing to do with the Avar or Juan-juan. According to the *Pei-shih*, Bk. 97 (fol. 5a), Niu-mi lies to the west of Hsi-wan-chin 悉萬斤 (Samarkand) and its distance from Tai 代 is 22,828 *li*. As Hsi-wan-chin is situated at the distance of 12,720 li from Tai, Niu-mi is 10 108 *li* off Samarkand. In the same way, it is calculated that A-fu-t'ai-han is 892 *li* distant from Niu-mi and Hu-shih-mi (Khorazm?) 980 *li* off from A-fu-t'ai-han. This will show that both Niu-mi and A-fu-t'ai-han were located in the region of Khorazm.

(7) I do not know the reason why Fuad KÖPRÜLÜ, *Les institutions juridiques turques au moyen âge*, *Istanbul* 1937, p. 10, 12, 26, classifies the Ephthalites as a Turkish tribe together with the Bulgars and the Onogurs.

(8) I have not at hand ALTHEIM's *Aus Spätantike und Christentum*, Tübingen, 1951, in which he discusses the matter.

came down from the Chin-shan 金山 mountain and they were a branch of the Turkish Kao-ch'ê. As for (2), I have already explained how unreliable are the Chinese records concerning the origin of the Ephthalites. As to (1), I can not understand why we have to take *haftal* or *haptal* as a combination of *hafta* or *hapta* and *-l*. I have not yet come across the word *hafta* or *hapta* as a name of the Ephthalites.(1) On the contrary, *'Εφθαλῖται* of THEOPHANUS and Yen-tai-i-li-t'o 厭帶夷栗陁(2) of the *Liang-shu* may be explained as a combination of *Eftal* or **Yeptal* and *-itae* or *-ithae* which is an Iranian plural suffix(3) and, hence, we may say the Ephthalites were an Iranian tribe.

In any way, the origin of the Ephthalites, of which nothing definite has been recorded, should be studied from another angle than an uncertain interpretation of their name. For this purpose, it is necessary for us to study the history and, if any, cultural characteristics of this people.(4)

## III. The Geographical Origin

For some time I had been considering the Ephthalites an Iranian tribe, and at the 1944 meeting of the Shigakukai (Society of Historical Science) I gave the outline of my argument in an address entitled "*Efutaru no Jinshu ni tsuite* エフタルの人種について (*On the Ethnology of the Ephthalites*)", and at the general meeting of the Tôyôshi Kenkyûkai (Society of Oriental History), Kyôto University, in November, 1950, I presented my view in an address entitled "*Efutaru Minzoku ni okeru Iran-teki Yõso* エフタル民族におけるイラン的要素 (*Iranian Elements of the Ephthalites*)". My grounds for assigning the Ephthalites as an Iranian tribe are twofold: (1) that the original abode of the Ephthalites, so far we can trace it at present, had been in the Tokhârestân area, (2) that some Iranian elements are observed in the physical and cultural aspects of the Ephthalites. As to (1), I gave an outline of my argument in two papers entitled "*Efutaru Minzoku no*

(1) As for variants of the name, see Czeglédy KÁROLY, *IV–IX. századi népmozgalmak a steppén*, Budapest, 1954, p. 4–5. F. W. HAUSSIG interprets that *hafta* or *hapta* means "seven" in Middle Persian and that it is the title of king who called himself "*der Grosse Herr der sieben Geschlechter und der Gebieter über die sieben Klimata der Welt*" (p. 323, 319, 324–325). However, the title of Grosser Herr, etc. is that of the Qaγan of T'u-chüeh as Thephylact states (*Haussig*, p. 282, 6–8; 286) and there is no evidence that it was used by the Ephthalites.

(2) This may be for Yen-tai-li-i-t'o 厭帶栗夷陁

(3) Or Eftali or **Yeptali* and -thae or- tae. Concerning this plural suffix, which is identical with the Osset pl. suffix -te, see J. MARQUART, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Eran*, II, *Göttingen* 1890 p. 77–96: G. MORAVCSIK, *Byzantinoturcica*, II, *Budapest* 1943 p. 47.

(4) According to *Kâtib al-Khwârezmî* and *Isma'îl al-Janharî al-Jârârî*, Khallukh (Qarluq) is recorded as one of the Ephthalite tribes in Badakhshân. But, I am not in the position to analyse why and how the Qarluq in Tokhârestân was connected with the Ephthalites. See H. HOFFMANN, *Die Qarluq in der tibetischen Literatur*, *Oriens*, 3, p. 200–201.

*Kigen* エフタル民族の起源 (*The Origin of the Ephthalites*)" in the *Wada Hakushi Kanreki-kinen Tōyōshi Ronsō* 和田博士還暦記念東洋史論叢, Tokyo 1952, p. 133–150 and "*The Origin of the White Huns*" in *East and West*, VI, 3, 1955, p. 231–236. Though there are a few points to be revised in these articles, I still hold that the Ephthalites originated in the eastern part of Tokhârestân and pressed the Kidârites westwards to grow up a powerful nation.

In 456/457, the Ephthalites sent the first embassy to the court of T'o-pa Wei and for the first time they were known to the Chinese.(1) Twenty years earlier than this, *i.e.* in 437, the T'o-pa Wei dispatched Tung Yüan 董琬 and Kao Ming 高明 to Central Asia, whose report was used as one of the basic materials of the original *Hsi-yü-chuan* 西域傳 of the *Wei-shu*.(2) According to the introductory note of Tung Yüan and Kao Ming to their report (*Pei-shih*, Bk. 97, fol. 1b=*Wei-shu*, Bk. 102, fol. 1b), there were sixteen countries in Central Asia at the time of their embassy (437) and these countries were divided into four regions: (1) the region to the east of Ts'ung-ling 蔥(葱)嶺 and to the west of Liu-sha 流沙, (*i.e.* Tarim Basin), (2) the region to the west of Ts'ung-ling and to the east of Hai-ch'ü 海曲 or Sea-bend, (*i.e.* Sogdiana, Khôrasân, Persia and countries on the eastern and northern coast of the Mediterranean Sea), (3) the region to the south of Chê-shê 者舌 (Tâshkent) and to the north of Yüeh-shih 月氏 (Tokhârestân), (*i.e.* the Tâshkent-Tokhârestân Region excluding Sogdiana), and (4) the region between the two seas (Mediterranean Sea divided into two by the Italian Peninsula) and to the south of Shui-tsê 水澤 or marsh (a sea which was combination of Aral, Caspian and Black Seas), (*i.e.* a territory including the Asia Minor, Balkan and Italian Peninsula, which was identical with Ta-ch'in 大秦).(3) Thirteen of these sixteen countries were Kui-tzŭ 龜玆 (Kucha), Su-lê 疏勒 (Kâshgar), Wu-sun 烏孫, Yüeh-pan 悅般, K'o-pan-t'o 渴槃陁 (Tashkurgan) Shan-shan 鄯善, Yen-ch'i 焉耆 (Karashar), Ch'ê-shih 車師 (Turfan), Su-t'ê 粟特 (Sogdiana), P'o-lo-na 破洛那 (Fârghâna), Chê-shê 者舌 (Tâshkent), Ta-ch'in 大秦, and Yüeh-shih 月氏 (Tokhârestân), and the other three may have been Chê-i 遮逸, Hsi-chü-pan 悉居半 (Karghalik), and Po-ssŭ 波斯 (Persia).(4) It must be noted that nothing was known about the Ephthalites in 437.

At the time, Su-t'ê 粟特 or Sogdiana, which was also called Wên-na-sha 溫那沙 or (H)ûn-na-shâ "king of the Huns",(5) was under the rule of king

(1) 太安二年十有一月 (Dec. 13/14, 456—Jan. 11, 457), 噘噠普嵐國並遣使朝獻 (*Wei-shu*, Bk. 5, fol. 2a).

(2) As for the compilation of *Hsi-yü-chuan* of *Wei-shu*, see *Tôyô Gakuhô*, XXXVII, 4, p. 430–444.

(3) Concerning the location of these four regions, see *Tôyô Gakuhô*, XXXVII, 4, p. 437ff.

(4) *Ibid.*, p. 435–437.

(5) K. Enoki, *Sogdiana and the Hsiung-nu*, I. *Central Asiatic Journal*, I, p. 43–62: Do., *Gisho Zokutoku-koku-den to Kyôdo Hun dôzoku mondai* (*Wei-shu on Su-t'ê* or *Sogdiana and the problem of Hsiung-nu=Huns identity*), *Tôyô Gakuhô*, XXXVII, 4, p. 423–470.

Hu-i 忽倪, the third descendant of the first Hsiung-nu king who conquered the country. And I take this Hsiung-nu as identical with the Chionites of Ammianus Marcellinus, which was different from the Ephthalites.(1) In Tokhârestân, which was called Yüeh-shih 月氏 or Ta-yüeh-shih 大月氏, the Kidârites were prosperous and they had already extended their territory as far as Gandhâra.(2) Under the circumstances, the Ephthalites had not appeared in Sogdiana and Tokhârestân until 437, but at the middle of the 5th century they were active and powerful in Tokhârestân. Ṭabarî informs us that Pêrôz, king of Persia (457, 459–484), fled to the lands of the Ephthalites to ask for help to recover his throne usurped by his brother Hormizd III (457–459).(3) The land of the Ephthalites to which Pêrôz fled must have been Tokhârestân to the north-west of the Persian frontier. This shows that the Ephthalites were powerful enough to intervene in the struggle for the Persian throne at the middle of the 5th century. And it was just at this period that the Ephthalites sent their first embassy to the T'o-pa Wei in 456/457.

The Ephthalites extended their power as far as Zungaria some time between 493 and 508, where the Kao-ch'ê 高車 had just accomplished their independence from the Juan-juan 蠕蠕, and then the Ephthalites put Kao-ch'ang 高昌 (Turfan) and Yen-ch'i 焉耆 (Karashar) under their control. They killed Ch'iung-ch'i 窮奇, chief of the southern Kao-ch'ê, and attacked the northern Kao-ch'ê to force them to accept Mi-ê-t'u 彌俄突, who was the son of Ch'iung-ch'i and had been under their protection, as their king.(4) In 522, P'o-lo-mên 婆羅門, a Juan-juan

(1) K. Enoki, *Sogudiana to Kyōdo* (*Sogdiana and the Hsiung-nu*), *Shigaku Zasshi*, LXIV, p. 540–567, 663–681, 757–780.

(2) K. Enoki, *Kidāra-ōchō no nendai ni tsuite* キダーラ王朝の年代について (*On the date of the Kidârites*), *Tōyō Gakuhō*, XLI, p. 289ff.

(3) Th. Nöldeke, *Geschichte der Perser und Araber*, p. 115ff.

(4) The exact date of the first Ephthalite invasion of Kao-ch'ê is not clear, but it was probably between 493 and 508. According to the *Pei-shih*, Bk. 98 (fol. 7b) (= *Wei-shu*, Bk. 103, fol. 7a), the Wei was informed of Kao-ch'ê's independence in the 14th year of T'ai-ho 太和 (490), whereas they sent a mission to inspect the situation under the leadership of Yu-t'i 于提. Yu-t'i returned to the Wei, accompanied by Kao-ch'ê embassy named Po-chieh 薄頡, and again went to Kao-ch'ê together with Chu Chang-shêng 朱長生, who was also named Ho-tsu-hun Chang-shêng 可足渾長生. A-fu-chih-lo interned them for three years (*Wei-shu*, Bk. 87, fol. 1b). After that Ch'iung-ch'i 窮奇, the king of the southern Kao-ch'ê, was killed by the Ephthalites and Mi-ê-t'u 彌俄突, his son, was captured (*Pei-shih*, Bk. 98, fol. 7b : *Wei-shu*, Bk. 103, fol. 7a). So we gather from these events that the first Ephthalite invasion of Kao-ch'ê took place at least three years later than 490, i.e. 493. A-fu-chih-lo fought with his eldest son whom he killed, but he himself was murdered by his people because of cruelty and was replaced by Po-li-yen 跋利延, one of his tribe's men. More than one year later, the Ephthalites again invaded Kao-ch'ê, which resulted in the enthronement of Mi-ê-t'u in place of Po-li-yen (*Ibid.*). On the other hand, in the 1st year of Yung-p'ing 永平 (508), Fu-t'u 伏圖, khaγan of Juan-juan, attacked Kao-ch'ê in the west and was killed by Mi-ê-t'u (*Pei-shih*, Bk. 98, fol. 3a = *Wei-shu*, Bk. 103, fol. 3a). Prior to this, Fu-t'u sent an envoy to the Wei to pay a tribute which was refused by emperor Hsüan-

chief who was placed by the T'o-pa Wei in Hsi-hai-ch'ün 西海郡 to the north of Tun-huang, fled to the Ephthalites to ask for their protection and his three sisters married to the king of the Ephthalites.(1) Thus, the Ephthalites were predominant in the region to the north of T'ien-shan mountain, as well as in the Yen-ch'i～Kao-ch'ang territory from the end of the 5th century. In the first quarter of the 6th century they were at the climax of their power. SUNG-YUN wrote that in 519 the dominion of the Ephthalites extended as far as Tieh-lo 牒羅 in the south, Ch'ih-lê 勅勒 (i.e. Kao-ch'ê) in the north, Yü-t'ien 于闐 (Khotan) in the east and Po-ssŭ 波斯 (Persia) in the west and more than forty countries came to them to pay a tribute.(2) It is also the situation of this period that the *Liang-shu*, Bk. 54 (fol. 8b) states that the Ephthalites conquered their neighbouring countries such as Po-ssŭ 波斯 (Persia), P'an-p'an 盤盤 (Warwâliz?), Chi-pin 罽賓 (Kashmir), Yen-ch'i 焉耆 (Karashar), Kuei-tzŭ 龜玆 (Kucha),

---

wu 宣武 (*Ibid.*), which may have been the envoy recorded in the *Annals of Wei* nuder the 9th month of the 1st year of Yung-p'ing (November, 508) (*Pei-shih*, Bk. 98, fol. 3a= *Wei-shu*, Bk. 8, fol. 4b). So the death of FU-T'U and the enthronement of MI-Ê-T'U took place some time after and before this date respectively. In this way, we can say vaguely that the first and second Ephthalite invasion of Kao-ch'ê were made between 493 and 508. See also the *Tzŭ-chih t'ung-chien* 資治通鑑, Bk. 104 under the 7th year of T'ien-chien 天監.

It is also not clear when the Ephthalites put Kao-ch'ang 高昌 and Yen-ch'i 焉耆 under their control. Kao-ch'ang was subjugated to Kao-ch'ê when Kao-ch'ê killed FU-T'U of Juan-juan in 508 and the *hu* 胡 population of Kao-ch'ang was removed to Yen-ch'i. But later Yen-ch'i, too, was destroyed by the Ephthalites, and CH'Ü Chia 麴嘉, king of Kao-ch'ang, installed his second son to the throne of Yen-ch'i at the request of its people who migrated from Kao-ch'ang (*Pei-shih*, Bk. 97, fol. 3a= *Wei-shu*, Bk. 101, fol. 5b). And, in the 1st year of Yung-p'ing 永平 (February, 508–January, 509), CHÜ Chia asked the Wei for permission to remove inside the frontier of Wei (*Wei-shu*, Bk. 8, fol. 5a under the 1st year of Yung-p'ing). The *Pei-shi*, Bk. 97, fol. 3a= *Wei-shu*, Bk. 101, fol. 5b describes the event under the 1st year of Hsi-p'ing 熙平, of which hsi 熙 is to be read yung 永). Thus, we may say that Yen-ch'i came under the prestige of the Ephthalites in 508 or by the beginning of 509. As for the relationship between Kao-ch'ang and the Ephthalites, no mention is made either in the *Pei-shih* or the *Wei-shu* except that Shih-tsu 世祖 or Hsüan-wu 宣武, emperor of Wei, said to an embassy of MI-Ê-T'U 彌俄突, chief of Kao-ch'ê, that Juan-juan, Ephthalites and T'u-yü-hun 吐谷渾 were having intercourse via Kao-ch'ang (*Pei-shih*, Bk. 98, fol. 8a= *Wei-shu*, Bk. 103, fol. 7a). This means that at the time the Ephthalites had been very influencial in Kao-ch'ang.

(1) Hsi-hai-chün 西海郡 was located at Chü-yen 居延 or near what is now Khara-khoto. As for the location and importance of this region, see *Pei-shi*, Bk. 98 (fol. 4b)= *Wei-shu*, Bk. 103 (fol. 4b) and the biography of YÜAN Fan 袁翻 (*Wei-shu*, Bk. 69, fol. 5b–6a=*Pei-shih*, Bk. 47, fol. 2a). YÜAN Fan, governor of Liang-chou 涼州 at the time, initiated to place PO-LO-MÊN there when PO-LO-MÊN came to Liang-chou to ask for protection for fear of attack of I-fu 伊匐, brother of MI-Ê-T'U who was killed by Juan-juan (*Pei-shih*, Bk. 98, fol. 8a= *Wei-shu*, Bk. 103, fol. 7a). It was in the 2nd year of Chêng-kuang 正光 (521) (*Pei-shih*, Bk. 98, fol. 4a= *Wei-shu*, Bk. 103, fol. 4a), but PO-LO-MEN revolted against the Wei to surrender himself to the Ephthalites some time between the 12th month of the 2nd year and the 12th month of the 3rd year of Chêng-kuang (522). See *Pei-shih*, Bk. 98, fol. 4b= *Wei-shu*, Bk. 103, fol. 4b.)

(2) SUNG-YUN: see 周祖謨, 洛陽伽藍記校釋, p. 100.

Su-lê 疎勒 (Kâshgar), Ku-mê 姑墨 (Aksu), Yü-t'ien 于闐 (Khotan), and Chü-p'an 句盤 (Karghalik) and extended their territory by more than a thousand *li*.

The Ephthalites sent the second embassy to the T'o-pa Wei in 507, that is to say, just fifty years later than the first one. And from 507 to 531 they dispatched 13 embassies to the same court. This will mainly be due to the influence of the Ephthalites who became predominant in the region of Tarim Basin and T'ien-shan mountain.

The conquest of Sogdiana of the Ephthalites was made, in my opinion, in the latter half of the 5th century, after the establishment of their power in Tokhârestân and before the extension of their dominance in the T'ien-shan=Yen-ch'i area. According to the Annals of Wei, Su-t'ê 粟特 or Sogdiana sent ten embassies to the T'o-pa Wei from 435 to 479, while Hsi-wan-chin 悉萬斤 or Samarkand also ten embassies from 473 to 509. This may be interpreted as either that Sogdiana was conquered by the Ephthalites between 473 and 479 or that Sogdiana was priviledged to send embassies to China for some time after the Ephthalite conquest which may have taken place as early as 473.(1) In any way, the disappearance of the name of Su-t'ê in the Annals of Wei may mean that the Hsiung-nu or Chionites, who had been ruling Sogdiana, were deprived of their political power by the Ephthalites.

The Ephthalites conquered Gandhâra between 477 and 520. In 477 the Kidârites (in Gandhâra) sent the last embassy to the court of T'o-pa Wei(2) and in 520 when SUNG-YÜN visited Gandhâra it was already under the control of the Ephthalites.(3)

We do not know exactly when the Ephthalites put Khotan and Kâshgar under their dominance, but it was probably in the latter half of the 5th century.

In this way, the Ephthalites grew up a powerful nation in Tokhârestân by the middle of the 5th century and then extended their territory as far as the T'ien-shan=Yen-ch'i area and Gandhâra, but no trace of them is found in the Altai=T'ien-shan region earlier than the end of the 5th century.

This will naturally lead us to the conclusion that the Ephthalites originated somewhere between Sogdiana and the Hindûkush, *i.e.* in Tokhârestân or in Khôrasân, which coincides with statements of Armenian and Arabo-Persian sources. Armenian sources locate the original place of the Ephthalites in Bactra (Balkh) and Arabo-Persian sources in Tokhârestân and Chaghâniân (in Transoxiana).(4) Then, in which part of Tokârestân originated the Ephthalites? In

(1) K. ENOKI, *The origin of the White Huns or Hephthalites, East and West*, VI, 3, 1955, p. 233–234.

(2) 太和元年 (477) 九月, 車多羅·西天竺·舍衛·疊伏羅諸國, 各遣使朝貢 (*Wei-shu*, Bk. 7a, fol. 3b). On this, see *Tōyō Gakuhō*, XLI, 3, p. 298, 328.

(3) 周祖謨, 洛陽伽藍記校釋, p. 107.

(4) Th. NÖLDEKE, *Geschichte der Perser und Araber*, p. 115 note 2.

order to solve this question, I would like to examine contemporary Chinese sources concerning the central places of the Ephthalites.

(1) *Ghôr* (*Ghûr*)

As I have explained in the first chapter, it is under the country of Hua 滑 (*$\gamma^{w}$at) that the *Liang-shu* (Bk. 54, fol. 8b–9a) describes the Ephthalites. Hua is situated to the west of Po-t'i 白題 at the distance of six days' journey. As Po-t'i (*b'ɒk-d'iei) is undoubtedly a transcription of Bakhdhi, Hua must be situated in the region to the west of Balkh, which I have located at Ghûr in the upper reaches of the Hari Rûd for the reason of resemblance of name.(1) The locating is also justified by the description of the *Liang-shu* (Bk. 54, fol. 9b) that Po-ssŭ 波斯 (Persia) and Mo 末 or Marw adjoins Hua in the east respectively.(2) This Hua is identical with Huo-lu (*$\gamma^{w}$ât-lu) 活路 where the T'a-han tu-tu-fu 大汗都督府 was established at the middle of the 7th century to control the Ephthalites there,(3) which means that the place remained the biggest centre of the Ephthalite population as late as the 7th century.

However, Hua is the name of country which was under the rule of the Ephthalites and it was not *the* centre of their empire, because the Ephthalites had some other centres in Tokhârestân. The *Liang-shu* does not tell us why Hua sent embassies to the Liang as, or pretending to be, the representative of the Ephthalites. It may have been because Hua was under the direct rule of the Ephthalites, the native ruling family having been destroyed. In any way, the Ephthalites were known to the Liang under the name of Hua,(4) while they were

(1) There are Ghori on the upper reaches of the Surkhâb or Kunduz river and Ghorbad to the north-east of Bâmiyân (*Map of Kâbul*, 2nd ed. published by War Office, 1944). G. JARRING reports that the population in Ghor (or Ghur) is very mixed (*On the distribution of Turk tribes in Afghanistan*, Lund, 1939, p. 15, 16). I do not know how old these two names are, but both of them can not be identified with Hua of the *Liang-shu* from geographical point of view.

(2) 波斯國……東與滑國……接 (*Liang-shu*, Bk. 54, fol. 96). 末國, 漢世且末國也. ……北與丁零, 東與白題, 西與波斯接 (*Ibid.*). The *Liang-shu* mistakes Mo 末 for Ch'ieh-mo 且末 during the Han 漢. But, adjoining Po-ssŭ in the west and Po-t'i 白題 (Balkh) in the east, it should be identified with Marw. The statement of the *Liang-shu* that Mo adjoins Ting-ling 丁零 or Kao-ch'ê 高車 in the north is based on the misunderstanding that Mo was located at Ch'ieh-mo or what is now Cherchen in Chinese Turkestan. As Po-ssŭ adjoins Hua and Mo (Marw) in the east, Hua should be placed in the neighbourhood of Marw and in the eastern frontier of Persia. The region of Ghur fits for it.

(3) See p. 5.

(4) In the *Liang-tien* 梁典 of LIU Fan 劉璠 (510–568) and his son LIU Hsiu-chêng 劉休徵 (or Hsiang 祥) (534–580) it is stated that the family name of (the king of) the country of Hua is Yen-ta 嚈噠 which their descendants have made the name of the country (*T'ung-tien*, Bk. 193 under I-ta-t'ung 挹怛同). However, this does not necessarily mean that the name of Yen-ta was known to the Liang, because LIU Fan and his son, being men of the Northern Dynasties (Wei and Chou), probably replaced Yen-tai-i-li-t'o 厭帶夷栗陁 of the *Liang-shu* with Yen-ta 嚈噠 which was familiar to them. As for the *Liang-tien*, see biographies of LIU Fan and his son in the *Chou-shu*, Bk. 42, fol. 4a–b, *Pei-shih*, Bk. 70, fol. 6a–b, and *Êrh-shih-wu-shih pu-p'ien* 二十五史補編, IV, p. 4958–59, 4265–66. The *I-nien-lu wei-pien* 疑年錄彙編, Bk. 2, fol. 11b (ed. 1925), based on the 3rd series of *I-nien-lu*, gives the date of birth and death of LIU Hsiu-chêng as his father's. *cf.* p. 14 Note 4.

known as Yen-ta 嚈噠 or Hsien-ta 嬐噠 or I-ta 挹怛 to the Northern Dynasties. And the description of the *Liang-shu* concerning the Ephthalites should not be taken as limited to the country of Hua 滑, but as relating to the whole of Tokhârestân which constituted the heart of the Ephthalite empire. According to the *Liang-shu*; it is mild in the country of Hua : there are many rivers and mountains : five cereals are produced : people's main food consists of *shaò* 麨 or parched oat flour and mutton meat : lions, camels with two legs and horned wild asses are their beasts.(1) These statements well fit to the region of Ghûr, as well as to the whole of Tokhârestân.

(2) *Balkh*

Another centre of the Ephthalites was at Balkh. According to the *Sui-shu*, Bk. 83 (fol. 4a), the country of I-ta 悒怛 (or the Ephthalites) lies to the south of the river Wu-hu 烏滸 (Oxus) at the distance of 200 and odd *li* and its capital is ten and odd *li* square in width, with many Buddhist temples and pagodas which are all decorated with gold.(2) It goes on to say that the country of I-ta is at the distance of 6,500 *li* from Kua-chou 瓜州 (fol. 4a–b).(3) The *Sui-shu* describes I-ta 挹怛 separately from T'u-huo-lo 吐火羅 which is situated at the distance of 5,800 *li* from Kua-chou and located, as I shall explain in a moment, at Warwâlîz to the north of what is now Kunduz. So, I-ta at the distance of 200 and odd *li* to the south of the Oxus and 700 (=6,500–5,800) *li* to the west of T'u-huo-lo or Warwâlîz ought to be located at Balkh. The information about I-ta was brought to the Sui by their embassies who came to China in the years of Ta-yeh 大業 (605–617) and so Balkh was a big centre of the Ephthalite population at the beginning of the 7th century. As the *Sui-shu* writes that there are five or six thousand Ephthalite warriors in the country, the total number of the Ephthalites there may have amounted to 50,000 or 60,000, if one warrior's family consists of ten people.(4)

Balkh had been the most important city in Tokhârestân from ancient times and it must have been one of the centres of the Ephthalites from the middle of the 5th century when they conquered Tokhârestân. The *Annals of the Wei* records that in 509 an embassy came to the Wei from Po-chih 薄知 (Bakhdhi) of Yen-ta 嚈噠 or the Ephthalites(5) and SUNG-YÜN also states that in 519 the

(1) (開地千餘里), 土地溫暖, 多山川樹木, 有五穀, 國人以麨及羊肉爲糧, 其獸有師子, 兩脚駱駝, 野驢有角. (*Liang-shu*, Bk 54, fol. 8b.)

(2) See p. 8.

(3) See p. 9.

(4) I. MIYAZAKI 宮崎市定, *Tokushi Sakki* 讀史劄記, *Shirin*, XXI, p. 139, says that one *lo* 落 or a family of northern tribe consists of more than 10 people in the 3–4th centuries.

(5) 永平二年正月壬辰. 嚈噠薄知國遣使來朝. 貢白象一 (*Wei-shu*, Bk. 8, fol. 5a). Here 嚈噠薄知 does not mean 嚈噠 and 薄知, but 薄知國 of 嚈噠. In the *Annals of Wei*, when embassies from more than one country were received at the same time, it is recorded with the word 並 "together" or 各 "each", in such a way as A and B together or each sent an embassy to pay a tribute.

Ephthalites ruled the territory extending from Persia to Khotan,(1) which obviously means the Ephthalite control of Balkh at the time. Moreover, Balkh was a big centre of Buddhism at the beginning of the 7th century as HSÜAN-CHWANG describes it in detail,(2) which fits to the statement of the *Sui-shu*.

In his introduction to the *Hsi-yü t'u-chi* 西域圖記, P'EI Chü 裴矩 writes that the southern road (of Hsi-yü) leads to Northern P'o-lo-mên 婆羅門 (or Northwestern India) via Hu-mi 護密 (Kumêdh in Wakhân), T'u-huo-lo 吐火羅 (Warwâlîz), I-ta 挹怛 (Balkh), Fan-yen 帆延 (Bâmiyân) and Ts'ao 漕 (Ghazna), and, just like the *Sui-shu*, Bk. 83, he says nothing about Hua 滑 or Ghûr.(3) It is, therefore, not clear if I-ta of the *Sui-shu* and *Hsi-yü t'u-chi* includes the region of Ghûr, while the country of Hsien-ta 嚈噠 (or the Ephthalites) of the *Chou-shu* is plainly identical with I-ta of the *Sui-shu*. The *Chou-shu*, Bk. 50 (fol. 3b) states as follows: "The country of Hsien-ta.....is situated to the west of Yü-t'ien 于闐 (Khotan) at the distance of 10,100 *li* from Ch'ang-an 長安 (the capital of Chou). The king governs at *Pa-ti-yen-ch'êng* 拔底延城 which probably means Wang-shê-ch'êng 王舍城 (or king's residence). The city is ten and odd *li* square in width."(4) MARQUART identifies *Pa-ti-yen* with New Persian *paθiyân*, "of king, imperial", which rightly corresponds to Wang-shê-ch'êng.(5) The Hsien-ta= I-ta=Balkh identity is established for the following reasons: (1) 10,100 *li*, the distance between Ch'ang-an and Hsien-ta, equals to the total of distance between Ch'ang-an to Kua-chou 瓜州 (3,600 *li*) and that between Kua-chou and I-ta (6,500 *li*);(6) (2) the width of the capital of Hsien-ta and I-ta is equally 10 and

(1) 周祖謨, 洛陽伽藍記校釋, p. 100.

(2) *Records of Western Countries*, ed. Kyoto University, Bk. 1, p. 28–31: WATTERS, I, p. 108ff.

(3) *Sui-shu*, Bk. 67 (fol. 3b). (4) See p. 8. (5) *Wehrot und Arang*, p. 36, 38, etc.

(6) This is obvious from the comparison of distance given in the *Chou-shu* and *Sui-shu*:

| To | from Ch'ang-an (*Chou-shu*) | from Kua-chou (*Sui-shu*) | From Ch'ang-an to Kua-chou |
|---|---|---|---|
| 焉　耆 | 5,800 | 2,200 | 3,600 |
| 龜　玆 | 6,700 | 3,100 | 3,600 |
| 嚈　噠 | | 6,500 | (3,600) |
| 挹　怛 | 10,100 | | (3,600) |
| 波　斯 | 15,300 | 11,700 | 3,600 |
| 于　闐 | 7,700 | 2,800 | 4,900 |

From this the distance between Ch'ang-an and Kua-chou is calculated as 3,600 *li*. The only exception is the distance to Khotan from Ch'ang-an and Kua-chou, which is given as 7,700 and 2,800 respectively. In this case, the distance between Ch'ang-an and Kua-chou is 4,900. However, this may have been due to the difference of way, one being via Kucha and another via Cherchen.

odd *li* square[1] : (3) Balkh was called Hsiao Wang-shê-ch'êng 小王舍城 or Small Wang-shê-ch'êng because of prosperity of Buddhism there in the 30ies of the 7th century when HSÜAN-CHWANG passed the city, which corresponds to *Pa-ti-yen-ch'êng*, the name of the capital of Hsien-ta.[2]

As I have quoted above, the *Liang-shu* states that Po-t'i 白題 or Bakhdhi was ruled by CHIH Shih-chi-i 支史稽毅 who sent an envoy to the Liang in the 3rd year of P'u-t'ung 普通 (522).[3] But the *Liang-shu* never refers to its subjugation to the Ephthalites, while Balkh was undoubtedly under the rule of the Ephthalites. It may have been because the king of Balkh wanted to make more profit from his direct intercourse with China which usually tried to limit the frequency of foreign embassies, as well as the number of staff of their mission. If he sent embassies to China as a part of the Ephthalite mission, he could not expect so much repayment from the Chinese government as he would from his individual mission. And not only Po-t'i but also so many countries subjugated to the Ephthalites intercoursed with China independently for the same reason. THEOPHANES tells us that the Ephthalites deprived of Persia many marts and ports (?) frequented by the Seres or the Chinese, which were later occupied by Turks.[4] And it is probable that each of these marts and ports (?) communicated with China as an independent country.

(3) *Huo* 活 *or A-huan-ch'êng* 阿緩城 *or Wârwalîz*

Another centre of the Ephthalite empire was at Huo or A-huan-ch'êng or

(1) The circuit of Balkh is given in such a different way as follows :

(a) 吐呼羅國……薄提城, 周匝六十里 (*Pei-shih*, Bk. 97, fol. 6b=*Wei-shu*, Bk. 102, fol. 5a). The description of T'u-hu-lo of *Pei-shih*, which is not found in both the *Sui-shu* and *Chou-shu*, must have copied the original Wei-shu. The *Annals of Wei* registers an embassy from T'u-hu-lo 吐呼羅 under the 12th month of the 5th year of Ho-p'ing (464–465) (*Wei-shu*, Bk. 5, fol. 3b) and, as this is the only record of this country in the *Annals of Wei* and the name is transcribed in the same characters, the information about T'u-hu-lo and its capital must have come to the Wei in 464–465. At that time, Po-t'i 白題 or Bakhdhi (Balkh) was the centre of Tokhârestân as before.

(b) 薄提城可十四五里 (韋節西蕃記, quoted in the 太平寰宇記, Bk. 186 under T'u-huo-lo 吐火羅). This information obtained by WEI Chieh 韋節, who went to Western Countries as an ambassador of Yang-ti (605–616) during the Sui. But, " about fourteen or fifteen *li* " will mean " about fourteen and fifteen *li* square " and the circuit of the city comes to about 60 *li* as (a).

(c) 噘噠國……其王治拔底延城, 蓋王舍城也. 其城方十餘里 (*Chou-shu*, Bk. 50, fol. 3b). See p. 8.

(d) 挹怛國……其都城方十餘里 (*Sui-shu*, Bk. 83, fol. 4a). See p. 8.

(e) 縛喝國……國大都城周二十餘里, 人皆謂之小王舍城 (HSÜAN-CHWANG, *Records*, ed. Kyoto University, Bk. I, p. 28). By the way, I am of the opinion that Fu-ho 縛喝 (*b'iʷak-xât) is transcribing *Bax(l)-kâθ or the city of Baxl.

(2) According to P. HARTMANN, HSÜAN-CHWANG's Hsiao Wang-shê-ch'êng is for Persian shâh-wârân (*Encyclopaedia of Islâm* under Balkh).

(3) *Liang-shu*, Bk. 54 (fol 9a) and Bk. 3 (fol. 1b).

(4) *Frag. Hist. Graecorum*, IV, p. 270 : YULE-CORDIER, *Cathay*, I, p. 204–205.

Warwâlîz[1] to the north of what is now Kunduz. At the middle of the 7th century, the T'ang set up there Yüeh-shih Tu-tu-fu 月氏都督府 to control the Tokhârestân region.[2] A-huan is also written as Ê-huan (**ât-xuân*) 遏換[3] or Po-huan (**puât-xuân*) 撥換,[4] all of which are transcriptions of Warwâr. This is T'u-huo-lo 吐火羅 of the *Sui-shu*, Bk. 83 (fol. 4a) and Huo 活 of HSÜAN-CHWANG's *Records of Western Countries* (ed. Kyoto University, Bk. 12, p. 6). However, the circuit of the capital of Huo 活 was twenty and odd *li* while the *Sui-shu* says that the capital of T'u-huo-lo was two *li* square in width. The discrepancy will be made up if we take the letter êrh 二 or two of the *Sui-shu* as a scribal error of letter wu 五 or five, because five *li* square means twenty *li* in circuit.[5]

---

(1) MARQUART, *Êrânšahr*, p. 60, note 4: Do., *Wehrot und Arang*, p. 44. Cf. *Géographie d'Aboulféda*, trad. REINAUD, II, 2, p. 207: "Walwâlidj est la capital du Tokhâristân, qui fut anciennement le royaume des Hayâtilah." (CHAVANNES, *Documents*, p. 155 note 6). HSÜAN-CHWANG writes that the country of Huo is situated at the side of the Oxus and forms the eastern boundary of Tokhârestân: its capital is on the south bank of the river Oxus. As Kunduz lies about thirty miles to the south of the Oxus (E. BARGER and P. WRIGHT, *Excavations in Swat and Explorations in the Oxus territories of Afghanistan, Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India*, 64, p. 44) and there is no river which flows in the north of Kunduz, it is with some hesitation that one locates the capital of Huo at Warwâlîz or Kunduz. This question will not be solved satisfactorily until we know the geography of the place in detail. In any way, Huo should be situated at Warwâlîz, both being the capital of Tokhârestân. In his *Records Hsüan-chwang* says Huo was under the rule of T'u-chüeh who governed small countries to the south of the Iron Gate and, removing from one place to another, had no fixed residence, while in the *Life* he writes that he saw the grandson of the Yabγu Khaγan at his residence in Huo.

(2) 唐書, Bk. 43 (fol. 4b) says: "月支都督府, 以吐火羅葉護阿緩城置. 領州二十五." (CHAVANNES, *Documents*, p. 68–69).

唐書, Bk. 221b (fol. 3a) says: "吐火羅……顯慶中, 以其阿緩城, 爲月氏都督府, 析小城, 爲二十四州, 授王阿史那都督" (CHAVANNES, *Ibid.*, p. 69)

太平寰宇記, Bk. 186 says: "吐火羅……高宗……以所理阿緩大城爲月氏都督府, 各分其小城爲二十四州, 以 [葉護] 鳥濕波爲都督."

(3) 旧唐書, Bk. 40 (fol. 19b): 月氏都督府, 於吐火羅國所治遏換城置. 以其葉護(領)之, 於其部內, 分置二十四州. 都督統之. The *T'ang Hui-yao* 唐會要, Bk. 73, also writes 遏換.

(4) 岑建功旧唐書校勘記所引太平寰宇記 (T. FUJITA 藤田豐八, *Tôzai Kôshôshi no Kenkyû*, 東西交涉史の研究 *Seiiki-hen*, 西域篇 p. 27).

(5) In 1938, British Expedition led by Professor Evert BARGAR of the University of Bristle and Mr. Philip WRIGHT of the Indian Section of the Victoria and Albert Museum to Swat Valley and northern Afghanistan explored three ruins near Kunduz, of which the biggest one is likely to be identified with the ruin of Warwâlîz, though nothing is mentioned to this in their report which runs as follows: "On the following day we returned to Kunduz to survey an enormous mound about a mile and a half to the north of the town. It was, with the single exception of Balkh, by far the largest complex of ancient remains that we saw in Northern Afghanistan. *It is an oval "castle" with mud walls about two miles in circumstance*, which rise about 100 feet above a moat some 30 yards in breadth. There are four gateways, and the interior consists of a series of shallow undulations or "mounds" well-rounded by the weather, which indicate the remains of mud buildings. There are alighned along two roads which intersect at the centre, and which connect the four gates. ……In appearance this impressive ruin is very similar to the Parthian fortress of Takht-i-

Hsüan-chwang explains that the country of Huo was such an important place as the T'u-chüeh established their yabγu to control the area to the south of the Iron Gate,(1) that is to say, Tokhârestân and a part of Transoxiana. The yabγu of the T'u-chüeh continued to rule Tokhârestân even after the destruction of the T'u-chüeh empire by the T'ang. The Yüeh-shih Tu-tu-fu ruled twenty-five *chou* 州 or provinces, including Badakhshân and Bakhdhi or Balkh.(2) This means that Balkh became a mere local political centre in Tokhârestân under the T'ang and that Huo-lu 活路, where the T'a-han Tu-tu-fu 大汗都督府 was established to rule the Ephthalite population, can not be located in the region between Balkh and Badakhshân.(3)

According to the *Sui-shu*, Bk. 83 (fol. 4a) and *T'ang-shu*, Bk. 221b (fol. 3a), Tokhârestân had been inhabited both by the natives, which we may call Tokharians, and by the Ephthalites. There was also population of T'u-chüeh who ruled the region even after the destruction of the empire of Western T'u-chüeh. Among the twenty-five *chou* under the Yüeh-shih Tu-tu-fu, Hsi-jung-chou 西戎州 was established at Shih-ta-k'uei-ch'êng 施怛駄城 of the T'u-chüeh(4)

---

Suleiman, which Mr. Pope has recently surveyed on the western marches of the Sassanid Empire.....The ruin at Kunduz is a site of which nothing more can be said at present than it offers great promise for excavation. It may well prove to be one of those strongholds by which the Sasaanid kings maintained a shaky hold on the Bactrian frontier." (*Excavations in Swat and Explorations in the Oxus territories of Afghanistan. Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India*, No. 64, Calcutta 1941, p. 43–44). Two miles roughly equal to six *li* or so of the T'ang (see Adachi, Kiroku 足立喜六, *Chôan shiseki no kenkyû* 長安史蹟の研究, Text, *The Tôyô Bunko Ronsô*, No. 20, p. 40). So from the point of view of the circuit, the ruin is a bit too small to be that of Huo, of which the circuit is said to have been 20 *li*. Barger and Wright mention another ruin, a mile and a half north-east of the town, where there is the remains of a Buddhist monastery, no doubt, according to them, one of the (more than) ten the existence of which Hsüan-chwang records in the Kunduz region (*Ibid.*, p. 44). No information is available as to the detailed history and width of the present Kunduz. So I can not tell if the above ruins are nothing but strongholds by which the Sassanid kings maintained a shaky hold on the Bactrian frontier as Barger and Wright suggest (p. 44) or one of them is the site of Warwâlîz.

(1) *Life*, Bk. 5 (fol. 19a), ed. Tôhô Bunka Gakuin Kyôto Kenkyûsho. See also the *T'ang-shu*, Bk. 221b (fol. 2b).

(2) Ta-hsia-chou 大夏州 was established at Fu-ch'ih-ch'êng 縛叱城, that is to say, Bakhdhi (Balkh) and Yüan-t'ang-chou 苑湯州 at Pa-t'ê-shan-ch'êng 拔特山城 or Badakhshân. Fujita is of the opinion that ch'ih 叱 or Fu-ch'ih is a scribal error of ch'a or **t'a* 吒 (慧超傳箋釋, ed. 1910, fol. 56a). But I think Fu-ch'ih (*b'iwak-*t'ši*) stands for Bakhdhi and, as Pelliot has pointed out, Yüan-t'ang is an error of Fan-yang 范陽 or Bâmiyân under the Wei (cf. *Pei-shih*, Bk. 97, fol. 6b, under T'u-ho-lo= *Wei-shu*, Bk. 102, fol. 4b : Pelliot in *TP*, XXVI, 1929, p. 184 note 2).

(3) Marquart looks for Huo-lu in the west and south of Badakhshân (*Wehrot und Arang*, p. 47, note), to which I can not agree. Marquart is also of the opinion that Huo-lu comes from *ordu* (*Ibid.*, p. 48 note). Herrmann is more prudent because he doubts locating the T'ai-han Tu-tu-fu in Badakhshân and its neighbourhood (*Asia Major*, II, p. 576, note 1).

(4) *T'ang-shu*, Bk. 43 (fol. 4b), etc.

and the yabγu of T'u-chüeh continued to rule Tokhârestân till the 8th century. Hui-chao 慧超, who passed Balkh in the 15th year of Kai-yüan 開元 (727) via Bâmiyân, wrote that the king of T'u-ho-lo had lived in Balkh, but was forced to remove to Badakhshân by the Arabs.(1) This king of T'u-ho-lo must be the same as the yabγu of T'u-huo-lo, who asked the emperor of T'ang for help against the Arabs in the same year.(2) In the 17th year of Kai-yüan (729) the T'ang entitled the chief of T'u-huo-lo the yabγu of T'u-huo-lo and the king of the I-ta 挹怛.(3) As the title means the recognition by the emperor of T'ang of the authority of the chief of T'u-huo-lo over Tokhârestân and the I-ta lived there, this chief may have been the same yabγu as in 727. However, Balkh stopped to be the residence of the ruler of Tokhârestân at the middle of the 6th century when the T'u-chüeh occupied the region. So I do not know if Hui-chao is right when he says that the king of Tokhârestân had lived at Balkh until he was forced to remove by the Arabs.

In any way, Warwâlîz had been the centre of Tokhârestân under the T'u-chüeh and the T'ang.

(4) *Hsi-mo-ta-lo* 呬摩呾羅 *to the west of Badakhshân*

The last and the biggest centre of the Ephthalites in Tokhârestân was in Hsi-mo-ta-lo to the west of Badakhshân. In his *Records of Western Countries* (ed. Kyoto University, Bk. 12, p. 8–9) Hsüan-chwang writes about this country and its people as follows "The country of Hsi-mo-ta-lo is formerly a part of the country of T'u-huo-lo 都貨邏. It is 3,000 and odd *li* in circuit. There is a stretch of mountains and rivers. The land is fertile and good for cereals and their harvest. Wheat-over-the year (*hsiu-mai* 宿麥)(4) is widely cultivated. All kinds of flowers flourish and many sort of fruits are abundantly produced. It is severely cold. People are of rude and harsh disposition. They are not conscious of sin and happiness. Their features are mean and ugly. Their manners and customs, as well as their wears made of felt, skin and coarse cloth, are very similar to the T'u-chüeh's. Their (married) females put wooden horn on their head, which is of three *ch'ih* 尺 high.(5) The horn has got two branches in front,

(1) 藤田豐八, 慧超傳箋釋, ed. 1910, fol. 54b. Cf. also W. Fuchs in *SBAW*, 1933, and Haneda, Tôru 羽田亨, *Haneda-hakushi Shigaku Rombunshu*, Vol. 1, p. 622.

(2) Chavannes, *Documents*, reprint in Paris, p. 206–207, *47.

(3) *Ibid.*, p. *49. The name of the yabγu is written as Ku-tu-lu Chieh-ta-tu 骨咄祿頡達度 in the *Tsê-fu yüan-kuei*, but chieh 頡 is written tun 頓 in the *T'ang-shu*, Bk. 221b (fol. 3a) (Chavannes, *Ibid.*, p. 158), *T'ai-ping huan-yü-chi* 太平寰宇記, Bk. 186 under T'u-huo-lo and *T'ang-hui-yao* 唐會要, Bk. 99.

(4) As for the meaning of *hsiu-mai*, see Pelliot in *TP*, XXVI, 1929, p. 185–187.

(5) There are two kinds of *ch'ih* 尺 during the T'ang. One equals to about $\frac{10}{33}$ metre and another is ten twelfth of the former. According to the *Liu-tien* 六典, Bk. 3, under Hu-pu 戶部, the measurement concerning ceremonial head-dress of officers is conformed to the longer *ch'ih*. (Adachi, Kiroku, *Chôan shiseki no kenkyû* 長安史蹟の研究, *The Tôyô Bunko*

which symbolize parents of her husband, upper branch representing the father-in-law and the lower one the mother-in-law. When one of them dies, one branch will be taken off. When both of them die, she stops to wear the horn cap. Their ancestors established a strong country, of which the king was of Shih 釋 (Śâkya) origin. Many (countries) to the west of Ts'ung-ling 葱嶺 or Pamirs(1) had been subjugated. As their territory adjoins the T'u-chüeh's, they have been influenced by manners and customs of the latter. In addition, they made invasions and plunders while keeping their own territory. For this reason, the people of this country have migrated and scattered in foreign countries where they rule scores of strongly walled cities and towns under so many cheifs. They (also) live in tent of felt and remove from one place to another. The country adjoins Ch'i-li-shê-mo 訖栗瑟摩 in the west.(2) By travelling eastwards through valleys 200 and odd *li*, one reaches Po-to-ch'ung-na 鉢鐸創那 or Badakhshân." HSÜAN-CHWANG also tells us that one of the four Śâkyas of Kapilavastu, who survived the massacre of Virûḍhaka, king of Kosala, became the king of Hsi-mo-ta-lo(3) and that the king of Hsi-mo-ta-lo of T'u-huo-lo conquered the Ch'ih-li-to 訖利多 or Kritâ in Kashmir in the 600th year after the death of Kanishka.(4)

Hsi-mo-ta-lo, which means " foot of the snow mountain ", stands for Himatala " snow plain ".(5) And CUNNINGHAM, MARQUART and WINDEKENS have reason to consider that it is a Sanskritized form of Hephthal or some of its variants.(6) The history of Hsi-mo-ta-lo told by HSÜAN-CHWANG is undoubtedly the history of the Ephthalites who once conquered not only the territory to the west of the Pamirs, but also a large part of the Chinese Turkestan and a part of what is now Zungaria. The horn cap worn by women of Hsi-mo-ta-lo is unmistakably the one used by females of the Ephthalites, which is recorded by the

---

*Ronsô*, No. 20, text, p. 30–33.) So three *ch'ih* would mean about one metre. SUNG-YÜN also writes that the Ephthalite queen whom he saw wore a wooden horn of three *ch'ih* in length. (SUNG-YÜN, ed. Chou Tsu-mo 周祖謨, p. 101).

(1) HSÜAN-CHWANG means by Ts'ung-ling a mountain group which adjoins the Hindûkush in the south, Issik-kul and Ch'ien-ch'üan 千泉 (Aulie Ata) in the north, Huo 活 in the west and Wu-sha 烏鎩 in the east. (Wu-sha is situated to the east of K'o-pan-t'o 喝盤陁 or Tashkurgan.) Cf. *Records*, Bk. 12, p. 20 (ed. Kyoto University).

(2) Ch'i-li-shê-mo is a transcription of Krisma or Kṛśma and is located at either Tâlikân (CHUNINGHAM), Ish-Keshm (ST. MARTIN) and Kishm (YULE). I would like to take Kishm as did HORI, Kentoku 堀謙德, *Kaisetsu Saiikiki* 解說西域記, Tokyo 1912, p. 949.

(3) *Records*, ed. Kyoto University, Bk. 6, p. 17–18. : WATTERS, II, p. 276–277.

(4) *Ibid.*, Bk. 3, p. 30–31.

(5) *Records*, Bk. 3, p. 30. "覩貨羅國羽摩呾羅王, 唐言雪山下," "時雪山下王……令群下曰, 我是覩貨邏國雪山下王也."

(6) A. CUNNINGHGAM, *Later Indo-Scythians, Numismatic Chronicle*, 1894, Pt. III, p. 244 : MARQUART, *Êrânšahr*, p. 239 : Do., *Wehrot und Arang*, p. 32, 47–48 : A. J. van WINDEKENS, *Zur Erklärung der geographischen Benennung Himatala bei Hüan-tsang, Archivum Pragensis*, Jg. 14, Nr. 1–2, p. 152–153. See also Pavel POUCHA, *Arch. Or.*, XIII, 1–2 (1942), p. 146.

*Pei-shih* (=*Wei-shu*), *Sui-shu*,[1] *T'ung-tien*, Bk. 193 under T'u-huo-lo and, above all, by SUNG-YÜN,[2] though the explanations given in these books are different.[3] It was in 664 that HSÜAN-CHWANG passed Hsi-mo-ta-lo, i.e. about one hundred years after the destruction of the Ephthalite empire. And, at that time the Ephthalites were scattered in several parts of Tokhârestân, just as HSÜAN-CHWANG says. In this way, from every point of view, the people of Hsi-mo-ta-lo are to be identical with the Ephthalites.

Hsi-mo-ta-lo is roughly located on the middle reaches of the Kokcha to the west of Badakhshân.[4] And it was probably in what was Hsi-mo-ta-lo at the time of HSÜAN-CHWANG that SUNG-YÜN saw the Ephthalite king and queen in 519.[5] Even today there remain a place named Yaftal and a people called Yaftali.[6]

Of these four places (i.e. Ghûr, Balkh, Warwâlîz and Hsi-mo-ta-lo) where there were centres of the Ephthalite empire, which one is the original region of the Ephthalites? I am of the opinion that it was Hsi-mo-ta-lo. The reasons are as follows: (1) As I have stated above, it was probably in Hsi-mo-ta-lo or its neighbourhood that SUNG-YÜN saw the king and queen of the Ephthalites in the 10th month or November of 519, which is the earliest record about the royal residence of this people. It may have been their winter habitation and, though we do not know where their king stayed in summer, we may say that Hsi-mo-ta-lo had been the most important centre of the Ephthalites. (2) In the latter half of the 5th century, the Kidârites had to remove westwards from Balkh, the capital of their empire, as far as Balaam or Balkhân when they were pressed by the Ephthalites.[7] It will mean that the Ephthalites pressed the Kidârites in

(1) See p. 8.

(2) SUNG-YÜN, ed. CHOU Tsu-mo, p. 101.

(3) No explanation is given by SUNG-YÜN. In all records except HSÜAN-CHWANG, it is said that the number of horn means the number of her husband's brothers to whom she is also to get married. Concerning this, see p. 51*ff*.

(4) If we locate Ch'ih-li-shê-mo 訖栗瑟摩 at Kishm as has been done by YULE, Hsi-mo-ta-lo lies between Kishm and Badakhshân. See HORI, Kentoku, *Kaisetsu Saiikiki* 解說西域記, p. 951.

(5) It was in a large plain between Po-ho 鉢和 (Ishkashm in Wakhân) and Po-chih 波知 (which lies between Zebak and Chitral, according to MARQUART, *Êrânšahr*, p. 245) that SUNG-YUN saw the Ephthalite king.

(6) Yaftal lies to the north-west of Faizabad and is inhabited mainly by Tajiks (G. JARRING, *On the distribution of Turk Tribes in Afghanistan*, 1939, p. 27). But, according to MARQUART, *Wehrot und Arang*, p. 48 note, there is a place named Haftal to the east of Faizabad in the Map of Afghanistan, E. W. N. Section (Calcutta 1904, 1 :1 073 760), which is no longer found in the Map of Samarquand, G.S.G.S. 2555, Sheet N.J.–42, Third edition. Professor IWAMURA, Shinobu 岩村忍 saw a group of people who called themselves Yaftali, but no information about their location.

(7) K. ENOKI, *Kidâra-ôchô no nendai ni tsuite* キダーラ王朝の年代について (*On the date of the Kidârites*), *Tôyô Gakuhô*, XLI, 3, 1958, p. 298–298.

Balkh from the east. (3) HSÜAN-CHWANG explains that Hsi-mo-ta-lo is the place where the ancestors of Hsi-mo-ta-lo people originated and that they had conquered from that place countries to the west of the Pamirs. (4) Hsi-mo-ta-lo remained one of the biggest centres of the Ephthalites after the destruction of their empire. (It may not be impossible to take Ghûr as their original place, as it was of the Ghûrids in the 12th century, but it can not explain the westward migration of the Kidârites in face of the Ephthalites.) (5) The polyandry system of the Ephthalites makes us guess that they had lived isolated from other tribes before they rose to power and that they had really originated in some detached locality in the Hindûkush to the south of Hsi-mo-ta-lo which is situated on the high way in Tokhârestân.

## IV. Iranian Elements

The most important reason why I look upon the Ephthalites as of Iranian or Aryan stock is that they have originated in the area of Hsi-mo-ta-lo to the south-west of what is now Badakhshân or probably somewhere in the Hindûkush. It is true that contemporary Chinese authors describe their manners and customs as resembling to the T'u-chüeh's, but it was because both the T'u-chüeh and the Ephthalites were nomads in Central Asia and it is not surprising that both of them had a very similar mode of life. In this chapter I would like to explain some physical and cultural characteristics of the Ephthalites, which may help my theory.

(1) The physical characteristic of the Ephthalites may be known from the writing of PROCOPIUS, which runs as follows : " The Ephthalites are of the stock of the Huns in fact as well as in name : however they do not mingle with any of the Huns known to us. They are the only ones among the Huns who have white bodies and countenances which are not ugly ".(1) As to the countenance, costumes, manners of living of the Huns, AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS, XXXI, 2 is careful and in full detail. " Since there the cheeks of the children are deeply furrowed with steel from their very birth, in order that the growth of hair, when it appears at the proper time, may be checked by the wrinkled scars, they grow old without beards and without any beauty, like eunuchs. They all have compact, strong limbs and thick necks, and are so monstrously ugly and misshappen, that one might take them for two-legged beasts or for the stumps, rough-hewn into images, that are used in putting sides to bridges. But although they have the form of men, however ugly, they are so hardy in their mode of life that they

(1) *De Bello Persico*, I, 3. ; 2, 4. (*Loeb Classical Library*, Vol. 1, p. 12–15)

have no need of fire nor of savory food, but eat the roots of wild plants and the half-raw flesh of any kind of animal whatever, which they put between their things and the backs of their horses, and thus warm it a little."(1) In this way, the description of their physical character left us by Procopius, who wrote when the Ephthalites were at the height of their power, is decidedly adverse to the view that they were really Huns. They were a light-complexioned race, whereas the Huns were decidedly swart : they were not ill-looking, whereas the Huns were hideous. That the Ephthalites had white bodies is also known from the fact that they were often called White Huns in the Indian and Byzantine literature. That their countenances were not ugly is also guessed from portraits of their kings engraved on the so-called Ephthalite coins, if they have copied the Ephthalite chief to any extent.(2) Most of these coins are after the fashion of Kuṣâṇa, Gupta and Sassanid Persia, and portraits engraved on them resemble to those of their kings. So we should not claim from these portraits the Iranian characteristic of features of Ephthalite kings, but that there is none which make us imagine of their Mongolian and Turkish physiognomy will not be objectionable to the theory that they might be classified as one of the so-called White race.

Of course, the faire skin does not necessarily mean an Aryan or Iranian race. The light-coloured skin might be considered as the convergence of a people living for a long time in the north or as the consequence of intermixture with some other white-skinned people.(3) However, as regards the Ephthalites who are considered to have originated in the eastern boundary of Tokhârestân, such a conjecture would not come in. They might have intermingled with other tribes in Central Asia where they were predominant after the middle of the 5th century, but, up to that, they should have lived in a small society of their own as is guessed from their custom of polyandry.(4)

As I have quoted above, HSÜAN-CHWANG writes that the king of Hsi-mo-ta-lo or the Ephthalites was originally of Śâkya, just as kings of Uḍḍiyâna, Bâmiyân and Shang-mi or Chitral.(5) The ground for this statement is not known, but it will mean that he saw little ethnographical difference among kings of these countries. Bâmiyân and Shang-mi, being situated in the neighbourhood of Balkh and Badakhshân respectively, where there were big centres of the Ephthalites, were probably conquered by the Ephthalites and Uḍḍiyâna was possibly

(1) Edition and translation of *Loeb Classical Libraryed.*, Vol. III, p. 380–383.
(2) As to the so-called Ephthalite coins, see R. GHIRSHMAN, *Les Chionites-Hephtalites*, Le Caire, 1948, p. 9ff.
(3) K. H. MENGES, *Qaraqalpaq Grammar*, Pt. 1, *Phonology*, New York, 1947, p. 8–9.
(4) See p. 37.
(5) *Records*, ed. Kyoto University, Bk. 12, p. 8 : Bk. 6, p. 18 (Hsi-mo-ta-lo) : Bk. 3, p. 8–11 Uḍḍiyâna) : Bk. 12, p. 14 (Shang-mi),

under their prestige.[1] But the king of Uḍḍiyâna, who was a pious believer of Buddhism at the time of Hsüan-chwang, may not have been Ephthalite, but probably of Aryan or Iranian stock. Actually, Hui-chao never notices that the king of Uḍḍiyâna was T'u-chüeh 突厥 and the king of Bâmiyân was Hu 胡 which means Iranian.[2] So the tradition of Śâkya origin of king of Hsi-mo-ta-lo also support the theory of Iranian or Aryan origin of the Ephthalites.

(2) The next point is the matter of the language of the Ephthalites. The *Pei-shih* 北史 (= *Wei-shu* 魏書) says: "Their language differes from that of the Juan-juan, Kao-ch'ê, and various Hu 諸胡."[3] The Juan-juan no doubt spoke Mongolian, and the Kao-ch'ê Turkish; therefore, the language of the Ephthalites was different from either. That this is an important ground on which their ethnological relationship with the Juan-juan or Kao-ch'ê is denied has already been referred to. The expression 諸胡 "Various Hu" is vague, but probably included several Iranian and Aryan tribes in Central Asia and India[4] which were known to the Wei. According to Hsüan-chwang, in Tu-huo-lo 覩貨邏 or Tokhârestân, "the language and letters differ somewhat from those of other countries. The number of radical letters is twenty-five; by combining these they express all objects around them. Their writing is across the page, and they read from left to right. Their literary records have increased gradually, and exceed those of (the people of) Su-li of Sogdiana."[5] This account of Hsüan-chwang formed the centre of controversy among the scholars in connection with the designation problem of the so-called Tokharian. Nowadays it is fixed that the alphabet with 25 letters used in Tokhârestân around the 7th century was nothing but the Greek alphabet with the usual 24 letter and an additional letter for *sh*. This has been noticed by A. Cunningham (*Numismatic Chronicle*, 1893, p. 125), Kentoku Hori 堀謙德 (*Kaisetsu Saiikiki* 解說西域記, Tokyo 1912, p. 76), F. W. Thomas (*JRAS*, 1924, p. 672), L. de La Valée-Poussin

(1) Both the *Pei-shih*, Bk. 97 (fol. 7b) = *Wei-shu*, Bk. 102 (fol. 6a) under Wu-chang-kuo 烏萇國 and the *Hsi-yü-chih* 西域志 (see p. 13n. 5) quoted in the *Fa-yüan-chu-lin* 法苑珠林 Bk. 39 (*Tripiṭaka Taisho*, Vol. 53, p. 597b) write about the mount T'an-t'ê-shan 檀特山 in the southwest of the country and its asses which carry food to the temple on the mountain without a driver. The same thing is recorded in the *Yu-yang-tsa-tsu* 酉陽雜俎, *Hsü-chi* 續集, Bk. 8, as the story of Yen-ta 嚴噠 country of Hsi-yü 西域. This may be because Uḍḍiyâna was known to China as a part of the Ephthalite empire. The excavations of the Swât valley, which is going on under the leadership of Professor G. Tucci, may decide this question.

(2) Fujita, *Hui-chao*, ed. 1910, fol. 44a and 53a.

(3) 其言語與蠕蠕高車及諸胡不同.

(4) In Northern and Southern Dynasties, *hu* 胡 meant foreigners, of which tribes of Hsiung-nu 匈奴 and Iranian stock were best known. See Lü Ssŭ-mien 呂思勉, *Hu-k'ao* 胡考 in *Yen-shih cha-chi* 燕石札記, Shanghai, 1937, p. 163–171.

(5) 語言文字, 稍異諸國, 字源二十五言, 轉而相生, 用之備物, 書以橫讀, 自左向右, 書記漸多, 途廣率利 *Records*, Bk. 1, ed Kyoto University, p. 25) See also *BSOS*, 1937, p. 891.

(*L'Inde aux temps des Mauryas*, Paris, 1930, p. 315–316), H. W. BAILEY (*BSOS*, 1937, p. 891), and P. PELLIOT (*TP*, 32, p. 260–261). The script of Tokhârestân is derived from the quasi-cursive Greek first fully exemplified in India on the coins of the Kuṣâṇa Kaniṣka I[1] and then it is used on the so-called Kushano-Sassanian, Ephthalite and Arabo-Ephthalite coins. Inscriptions of these coin legends have been studied by CUNNINGHAM, SPECHT, JUNKER, HERZFELD, DE MORGAN, WALKER and GHIRSHMAN.[2] In addition, there are some inscriptions of the same type of script both on paper and on stone and a biligual text with Pehlevi,[3] which have been studied by HANSEN, THOMAS and BIVAR.[4] It is this debased form of Greek that is called the Ephthalite script and it is the language written in this script that is called Ephthalite. One of the MSS has come from the Lou-lan site and it can not be later than the 4th century.[5] The so-called Ephthalite scripts had been used up to the latter half of the 7th century when probably Persian or Arabic alphabet took their place[6] and a dialect of Sassanid Persian began to prevail in Tokhârestân.[7] So the Ephthalite writings had appeared much earlier than the appearance of the Ephthalites in Tokhârestân and its disappearance roughly synchronized with the disappearance of the

(1) F. W. THOMAS, *A Tokharî (?) MS. JAOS*, 64, 1944, p. 1.

(2) CUNNINGHAM, *Later Indo-Schythians, Numismatic Chronicle*, 1894, p. 263.
Ed. SPECHT, *Du déchiffrement des monnais Sindo-Ephthalites, JA*, 1901, p. 478–523.
H. JUNKER, *Zur Lesung der Hephthaliten-Münzen, OLZ*, 1926, p. 877.
Do., *Die hephthalitischen Münzinschriften, SPAW*, 1930, p. 641–662.
E. HERZFELD, *Kushano-Sasanian Coins*, Calcutta, 1930.
J. DE MORGAN, *Manuel de Numismatique orientale*, (ed. by K. J. Basmadjian), I, Paris, 1936, p. 447–448.
J. WALKER, *A catalogue of the Arab-Sassanian coins*, London, 1941, p. lxv–lxix.
R. GHIRSHMAN, *Les Chionites-Hephtalites*, Le Caire, 1948, p. 9 *ff.*

(3) GHIRSHMAN in *JA*, 1943–1945, p. 449 : J. FILLIOZAT, *Fragments de textes koutchéens*, Paris, 1948, p. 15 : also FILLIOZAT's information given to Sten KNOW in *Festskrift til Professor O. Broch*, p. 80.

(4) R. CHIRSHMAN, *Les chionites-Hephtalites*, Le Caire, 1948, p. 9 *ff.*
O. HANSEN, *Ein neues Hephthaliten-Fragment, La Parola del Passato*, XX, Napoli, 1951, p. 361–366.
Do., *Die Berliner Hephthaliten-Fragmente, La Nouvelle Clio*, 1951, p. 41–69 (I owe the microfilm of Hansen's second article to Professor L. PETECH of Rome. The fragment here studied is *Orientalische Archiv*, III, 126, at the Ethnographical Museum in Berlin. It was also studied by Sten KONOW in *The White Huns and Tokharian, Festskrift til Professor O. Broch*, p. 77ff. Mentions are made to this MSS by A. von LE COQ in *SPAW*, 1909, p.1049 : F. W. K. MÜLLER, *ibid.*, p. 1061 : Ch. ELIOT, *Hinduism and Buddhism*, III, London, 1921, p. 192 : Juntarō ISHIHAMA 石濱純太郎, *Tōyōgaku no Hanashi* 東洋學の話, Osaka, 1943 p. 137 : and F. W. THOMAS in *JAOS*, 64, 1944, p. 1.)
F. W. THOMAS, *A Tokhri (?) MS. JAOS*, 64, 1944, p. 1–3.
A. D. H. BIVAR, *The inscriptions of Uruzgan, JRAS*, 1954, p. 112–118.

(5) F. W. THOMAS, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

(6) WALKER, *op. cit.*, p. lxix.

(7) MARQUART, *Ērānšahr*, p. 88–89 : H. W. BAILEY in *BSOS*, VIII, p. 893 : GHIRSHMAN, *Les Chionites-Hephtalites*, p. 67.

Ephthalites from the annals.(1)

Many things are yet to be done in connection with what is written in Ephthalite alphabet, but, at present, it is fairly certain that the language written in this alphabet belongs to an Iranian language. However, no positive evidence has been produced so far to prove that it was the language of the Ephthalites. It is possible that some of these writings in Ephthalite alphabet represent the language of the Ephthalites themselves. It is also possible that the Ephthalites borrowed the alphabet and language from other people, just like the Parthians made Greek their official language. As is well known, SUNG-YUN states that the Ephthalites are illiterate, haveing no letters and no politeness and education.(2) And the *Liang-shu*, Bk. 54 (fol. 8b–9a) says: "In Hua 滑 country.....people have no letters, but use a wooden piece as tally. In negotiating with neighbouring tribes, they make use of the Hu 胡 of neighbouring countries in order to prepare a document in the Hu 胡 language (or letters), using sheep-skin instead of paper .....Their language is intelligible only through oral interpretation conducted by the people of Ho-na 河南 (or T'u-yü-hun 吐谷渾)."(3) This is the position of the Ephthalites in the first decade of the 6th century. Who were these Hu 胡 of neighbouring countries? They must have mainly consisted of natives of Tokhârestân which was the centre of the Ephthalite empire and the letters and language of the Hu 胡 people may therefore be Greek and the native language of Tokhârestân respectively. In this sense it is probable that the so-called Ephthalite language is nothing but the language of Tokhârestân, which we may call (true) Tokhârian. The Sogdians might also take charge of the business. And it will be the reason why Sogdian influence is strong in some Ephthalite words left to us.

Under such circumstances, if we want to indentify the true language of the Ephthalites, we have to collect and study examples of the genuine Ephthalite language. For the moment, only a few number of names of Ephthalite kings and chiefs, official titles, and some other words are available for the purpose. However, so little has been done so far in their study.

(1) *Ephthalite:* HENNING is of the opinion that the name of *'Εφθαλῖται* and Yen-tai-i-li-t'o 厭帶栗陁 came from Sogdian plural **Heβtalit* (sing. **Heβtalak*),(4) but it is yet to be decided what is the genuine form of the name(5) and and what is its meaning.

(1) The Ephthalites disappeared from the annals with the downfall of Tarkhan Nezak in A. H. 90. (J. WALKER, *A catalogue of Arab-Sassanian coins*, p. lxix.)
(2) Ed. CHOU Tsu-mo, p. 101. 鄉土不識, 文字, 禮敎俱闕.
(3) 無文字, 以木爲契, 與旁國通則使旁國胡爲胡書, 羊皮爲紙,.....其言語待河南人譯, 然後通.
(4) W. B. HENNING in *ZDMG*, XC, 1936, p. 17 note 2.
(5) Czeglédy KÁROLY, *IV–IX. századi népmozgalmak a steppén*, Budapest, 1954, p. 4–5.

(2) *Axšunvâr*:[1] Title or the name of king who fought with Pêrôz. SALEMANN[2] and F. W. K. MÜLLER[3] have explained that the word is Sogdian *xšâva*, *xšêvan* "king", while HENNING tried to establish that *Axšondâr*—Sog. *Xš'wnder* "Machthaber, Machtträger" is the right form.[4] GHIRSHMAN reads the word *xiyôn.[5] WIDENGREN rejects the reading of GHIRSHMAN and proposed to take the traditional form of *axšunvâr*.[6] Is WARZ,[7] name of another king, a corrupted form of (axšun)var?

(3) *-t'ung* (**d'ung*): In the *T'ung-tien* 通典, Bk. 193, it is stated that I-ta-t'ung 挹怛同 was also called I-ta-kuo 挹怛國 or the country of I-ta at the time of Sui.[8] Hence, *t'ung* may represent an Ephthalite word for country. This *t'ung* (**d'ung*) may be compared with *-tûn*, which means place in Ormuri, Parachi, Yagnobi, Šughni: *-don* or *dôna*,[9] which is a suffix to mean place in Osset[10]: and New Persian *-dân*, Pehlevi *-dân*, Awesta *-dana*, Skt. *-dhâna*, which signify reservoir or storehouse.[11]

(4) ṬARKHAN (NÊZAK): The name of an Ephthalite powerful leader who rose in rebellion in A. H. 90 against the Arabs and was killed by Qutaiba ibn Muslim. ṬARKHAN is obviously identical with *tarqan* or *tarkhan* of the Orkhon Inscriptions and other Central Asian records,[12] which is derived from Chinese *ta-kuan* (**d'at-kuan*) 達官, "high official".[13] It may have been borrowed by the Ephthalites from some Central Asian people or directly from the Chinese.

These few words are too insufficient to identify the language of the Ephthalites. But, the fact that the language of the texts and inscriptions written in Ephthalite scripts is very similar to Iranian and not a single word of Altaic language has been detected from it will show that the language of the Ephthalites

(1) NÖLDEKE, *Geschichte der Perser und Araber*, p. 123, 128.
(2) *Izvestiya Imper. Akad. Nauk*, 1907, p. 542.
(3) *Sogdische Texte*, 1, *Abhdl. PAW*, 1913, p. 108.
(4) *ZDMG*, XC, 1936, p. 17 note 2.
(5) *Les Chionites-Hephtalites*, p. 19.
(6) Geo WINDENGREN, *Xosrau Anôšurvân, les Hephthalites et les peuples turcs*, *Orientalia Suecana*, I, 1952, p. 75 note 1.
(7) NÖLDEKE, *op. cit.*, p. 159.
(8) 挹怛同, 至隋書又謂挹怛國焉. The *T'ung-tien* 通典, Bk. 193, also writes that Hua 滑 was called Hua-tun 滑匝 under the Posterior Wei (Toba Wei) 滑國……至後魏時, 謂之滑匝. 匝 is a scribal error of 囤. But the *Wei-shu* does not refer to Hua-tun and the *T'ai-p'ing huan-yü-chi*, Bk. 183, reads Yen-ta-kuo 噘噠國 instead of Hua-tun. So I wonder if Hua-tun is an error of Yen-ta.
(9) G. MORGENSTIERNE, *Indo-Iranian Frontier Languages*, II, p. *43.
(10) *Grundriss der iranischen Philologie*, I, *Anhang*, p. 94.
(11) *Ibid.*, p. 189, 82. SCHRADER-NEHRUNG, *Reallexikon d. indogerm. Altertumskunde*, II, p. 433 ff. s. v. Stadt.
(12) See S. E. MALOV, *Pamyatniki drevnetiurkskoï pis'mennosti*, Moskva-Leningrad 1951 p. 427. It is identical with *Skt. âmatya* (*Fan-yu tsa-ming* 梵語雜名, *Tripiṭaka Taisho*, LIV p. 1232c).
(13) GHIRSHMAN, *Les Chionita-Ephtalites*, p. 26 n. 1.

was also of Iranian family, if any of these materials is written in Ephthalite. If the homeland of the Ephthalite was in the neighbourhood of Badakhshân, the language of them is supposed to be very similar to the so-called Pamir dialects. From liguistic point of view, therefore, no positive objection is expected to my theory that the Ephthalites were Iranians.

PETECH, who considers the Ephthalites as Proto-Mongol or Proto-Turk, explains that they made Iranian their official language.(1) But, I would like to go one step further and say that their own language was Iranian.

A word may be said here on the relation between the Ephthalites and the so-called Tokharian A, which will be hereafter referred to as the so-called Tokharian. It was MCGOVERN that first assigned the Ephthalites as one of the so-called Tokharian language-group ; and, from the account that the Ephthalites had originated from Ch'ê-shih 車師, namely Turfan, and from the fact that their language differed from that of Juan-juan 蠕蠕 and Kao-ch'ê 高車, he argued that the Ephthalite language was probably the so-called Tokharian.(2) As the ethnological connection of Chê-shih with the Ephthalites can not be established as has been referred to, I could never support this view.

In 1941, A. J. van WINDEKENS published a paper entitled " *Huns Blancs et Ārçi. Essai sur les appellations du " tokharien "* (*Le Muséon*, 54, 1941, p. 161–186), in which he insisted that the so-called Tokharian was nothing but the Ephthalite language ; and in his *Lexique étymologique des dialectes tokhariens* (*Bibliothèque du Muséon*, 11), Louvain, 1941, p. XXI–XXVII, he repeatedly emphasized his view. According to him, *ārçi* (*ārśi*), the word alleged to be the self-assumed title of the so-called Tokharian, was the general term which meant the language, land and populace of the whole area, including Karashar, where the so-called Tokharian was used ; and *ārśi* meant " white ", and exactly as the royal family of Kucha, where the so-called Tokharian B (the Kucha language) was used, was named *Po* 白 (white)～*Po* 帛 (silk), both the people and the royal family of Karashar were Po 白 (white) ; and the White Huns or the Ephthalites, who ruled Karashar, Kâshgar, Khotan and the whole area of Tokhârestân, were decidedly descendants of Tokhara or Yü-shih 月氏 tribe who used the *ārśi* language, and the amazing agreement of the self-assumed titles which both meant " white " should admit that the Ephthalites were of the Tokharian language group. The appellation of the so-called Tokharian A has been one of the most controversial questions on the languages and history of Central Asia ; and it is beyond the scope of this paper to criticize WINDEKEN's views. So I could only touch the point in question. To begin with, it is not yet fixed if *ārśi* really means

(1) L. PETECH in *Le Civiltà dell'Oriente, Storia*, Roma, 1956, p. 932.
(2) H. M. MCGOVERN, *The Early Empires of Central Asia*, N. Y., 1939, p. 404–406.

" white ". In 1935 Naoshirō Tsuji (alias Fukushima) 辻(福島)直四郎, interpreting *ārśi* as meaning " white " and associating this with the fact that the royal titles of Karashar always end in *-arjuna* (*skt.* " white "), inferred that the royal families of Karashar and Kucha originated from one and the same family, and insisted that the so-called Tokharian be called the Ārsi language.(1) In 1939, four years later, Windekens in his " *Note sur l'étymologie de Ārçi* (*Revue bélge de Philologie et d'Histoire*, XIII, 1939, p. 955ff.) arrived at the same conclusion. Even after that, Windekens repeats and emphasizes his view(2). Then Bailey, in 1937, advocated the view that *ārśi* in question was derived from Central Asian Prakrit *ārśa-*, *Skt. ārya*, that it could not be taken as a self-assumed title in the so-called Tokharian, and that what was called the *ārśi* text was nothing but a Sanscrit text.(3) Against this, Sieg,(4) Windekens(5) and Wang Ching-ju 王靜如(6) presented contrary opinions. Sieg insisted that Central Asian Prakrit *ārśa* can not be changed into *ārśi*. Wang Ching-ju tried to establish that Yen-ch'i 焉耆, Chinese name for what is now Karashar from the time of Han, is nothing but a transcription of *ārśi* which is the original name. If *ārśi* means white as Windekens asserts, it can not be related to the " White " Huns who were so called not because " White " was their family name, but because of their light-coloured body. Moreover, the Ephthalites originated in Tokhârestân and not in Kucha-Karashar-Turfan area where the Tokharian B and A were used. Actually, the Po 白 family of Kucha had been famous for its unbroken line from the time of Han up to the T'ang(7) and no evidence is available to prove that any member of their family had ever migrated to Tokhârestân. It may not be impossible that the Ephthalites were descendants of the Yüeh-shih, but it is not certain that the Yüeh-shih were the same tribe as Asioi, Tokhara and Ārśi. The Ephthalites were nomads, while the *ārśi*-speaking people were sedentary. In this way, from every point of view it is difficult to look upon the Ephthalites as the populace of Kuch-Karashar-Turfan region.(8)

(1) N. Fukushima, *On the Designation-Problem of the so-called Tokharian language*, *Memorial Volume dedicated to the late Prof. Katsuji Fujioka*, Tokyo, 1935, p. 7–12.

(2) *Etude morphologique des dialects tokhariens*, p. XVff.; *Encore l'appellation tokharienne Ārçi*, *Le Muséon*, 57, 1944, p. 177–179.

(3) H. W. Bailey, *Ttaugara*, *BSOS*, VIII, 1937, p. 906–980. *Do.*, *Recent Work in* " *Tokharian* ", *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1947, p. 139ff.

(4) *E.* Sieg, *Und dennoch* " *Tocharisch* ", *SPAW*, 1937, p. 130–139.

(5) A. J. van Windekens, *Le problème tokharien et l'hypothèse de M. Sten Konow*, *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap*, 14, 1944, p. 305–312.

(6) Wang Ching-ju, *Ārśi and Yen-ch'i* 焉耆, *Tokhri and Yüeh-shih* 月氏, *Monumenta Serica*, IX, 1944, p. 81–91.

(7) Hsiang Ta 向達, *T'ang-tai Chang-an yu Hsi-yü-wên-ming* 唐代長安與西域文明, 2nd ed., Peking, 1947, p. 11.

(8) Under the Toba Wei, there were some Hsiung-nu family named Po 白 or White. See Yao Wei-yüan 姚薇元, *Pei-chao hu-hsing k'ao* 北朝胡姓考, Peking, 1958, p. 294–296.

Sten KONOW, based on his study of a fragment in the so-called Ephthalite scripts, suggested that the language of the Ephthalites was Tokharian or the language of Tokhârestân.(1) But his suggestion can not easily be accepted as correct, because not only in Tokhârestân, but also in Bâmiyân, Shignan and Shang-mi (Chitral) the same type of scripts was used(5) and it has yet to be fixed that the language of the fragment is that of Tokhârestân. The fragment studied by Sten KONOW is the same one which was later studied and published by O. HANSEN.(2) It came from Turfan. Another fragment studied by F. W. Thomas was discovered in the Lou-lan site.(2) And this will make one imagine exportation of literature in the language of Tokhârestân to Kucha, Karashar, Turfan and Lou-lan. The advance of the Ephthalites to Kuch-Karashar-Turfan region might have encouraged such a movement. The White Huns and Ārçi may have some relation in this sense.(3)

According to HSÜAN-CHWANG,(5) the language of Tokhârestân, which may be called genuin Tokharian, was current only in Tokhârestân in the 7th century.(5) And Hsi-mo-ta-lo, the native place of the Ephthalites making a part of Tokhârestân, it is not improbable that Tokharian was the language of the Ephthalites. However, the fact that the Chinese under the Liang could understand the language of the Ephthalites only by the aid of T'u-yü-hun 吐谷渾 will make us hardly believe that their language was quite the same as Tokharian or the language of Tokhârestân, with which the Chinese must have long been familiar.

(3) The third point is the Iranian elements observed in the religion and customs. In describing the Ephthalites in Badakhshân area, SUNG-YÜN 宋雲 writes: "(The majority of them) do not believe Buddhism. Most of them worship *wai-shên* 外神 or foreign gods. They kill living creatures and eat their flesh raw."(6) Further, of the Ephthalites who ruled Gandhâra SUNG-YÜN says: "The disposition of the people is cruel and vendicative, and they practise the most barbarous atrocities. They do not believe in Buddhism, but love to worship *kuei-shên* 鬼神 or demons."(7) The *Liang-shu* 梁書, Bk. 54 (fol. 8b)

(1) *The White Huns and Tohkarian. Festskrift til Professor Olaf Broch*, Oslo, 1947, p. 77, 82.
(2) See p. 40 note 4.
(3) In this connection, see W. B. HENNING's new theory in *Argi and the "Tokharians", BSOS*, IX, 1938, p. 545–571 and *The name of the "Tokharian" language, Asia Major, N. S.*, I, p. 158–162.
(4) See *Records*, ed. Kyoto University, Bk. I, p. 32; Bk. 12, p. 13; Bk. 12, p. 14.
(5) In 729, HUI-CHAO 慧超 noticed that the language of Tokhârestân was also partly used in Khuttal. It runs as follows: 名骨咄國, 此王元是突厥種族, 當土百姓, 半胡, 半突厥.....言音, 半咄火羅, 半突厥, 半當土. Cf. FUJITA, ed. 1910 fol. 73b. "The country is named Ku-ch'u (Khuttal). The king is originally of T'u-chüeh stock, while the general people who live in the country are partly Hu (or Iranian) and partly T'u-chüeh.....Their language is either T'u-huo-lo or T'u-chüeh or native (Khuttal language)."
(6) 不信佛法, 多事外神, 殺生血食 (洛陽伽藍記, 卷五, ed. CHOU Tsu-mo, p. 101.)
(7) 立性凶暴, 多行殺戮, 不信佛法, 好祀鬼神 (*Ibid.*, p. 107).

says: "They worship T'ien-shên 天神 or heaven-god and Huo-shên 火神 or fire-god. Every morning they first go outside (of their tents) and pray to gods and then take breakfast. They kneel down to bow only once."(1) SUNG-YÜN's account coincides with that of HSÜAN-CHWANG concerning Hsi-mo-ta-lo, which runs as follows: "The disposition of people is rude and harsh. They are not conscious of sin and happiness."(2) It is evident that foreign gods and demons in Sung-yün's account correspond to Heaven-god and Fire-god in the *Liang-shu*, and it goes without saying that fire-worship formed a great characteristic of the Persians and other Iranian tribes.(3)

However, it is not clear what Heaven-god refers to? May this be worship of daevas (Greek Zeus) or true gods, of which stood the sky at the head of the pantheon? Or is it worship of Mithra or Sun, which had long been practised among the Aryan and Iranian tribes? Or is it Tängri-worship among Mongolian, Turkish and other Altaic tribes?(4) As no particulars are given concerning this Heaven-god, it is impossible to decide what it was. But I would like to think that the Heaven-god, worshipped together with Fire-god, was either Mithra-worship or Daeva-worship or both of them for the reason that the religion of Persians at that period is also understood as worship of Fire-god and Heaven-god(5) and that we may recall the practice of the sun-worship among the Massagetae (Herodotus, I, 212) and Kushanians. That the Ephthalites built their tents with their entrance facced to the east would also possibly infer the practice of sun-worship among them.(6)

In this connection, the faith in Shun T'ien-shên 順天神 and Ch'u-na-hsi-lo 褚那呬羅 in Ghazna would be considered. Under Ts'ao-kuo 漕國 or Zâbul (Ghazna), the *Sui-shu* 隋書, Bk. 83 (fol. 5a), reads as follows; "the people worship objectionable gods. In the Ts'ung-ling-shan 葱嶺山 or Pamirs

(1) 事天神火神, 每日則出戶祀神而後食, 其跪一拜而止. I wonder if 每日 "every day" is a scribal error of 每旦 "every morning". (2) See p. 34.

(3) Now see K. ERDMANN's excellent study *Das Iranische Feuerheiligtum*, Leipzig, 1941, 94 pp., with 14 illustr., one map and 8 plates. Fire-worship is also seen among many other peoples, but one among Iranians is the most characteristic in the sense that it is very systematized both in theory and in practice.

(4) See *Tängri* in the *Enclopaedia of Islâm* and P. W. SCHMIDT, *Der Ursprung der Gottesidee*, III Teil, IX Band, *Die Asiatischen Hirtenvölker*, Freiburg, 1949.

(5) The *Pei-shi*, Bk. 97 (fol. 5b) says on Persia that the people worship both Huo-shên 火神 and T'ien-shên 天神. But the *Chou-shu*, Bk. 50 (fol. 4a) says that the people worship Huo-hsien-shên 火祆神.

(6) The *Liang-shu*, Bk. 54 (fol. 8b) says: "They make felt house their dwellings, of which the door is open towards east 氈屋爲居. 東向開戶". The Qaγan of T'u-chüeh also built his tent facing east, which is expalined by the author as to pay respect to the place where the sun rises. (可汗恆處於都斤山, 牙帳東開, 蓋敬日之所出也, 周書, Bk. 50, fol. 1b=北史, Bk. 99, fol. 2a). In the language of T'u-chüeh, "front" means "east (cf. *ilgärü* "in front, in the east" of the Orkhon Inscriptions.) The Indians also built their house with gate open towards east. HSÜAN-CHWANG's *Records*, Bk. 2, p. 6 ed. Kyoto University.

there is a shrine for a deity named Shun T'ien-shên. It is an extremely gorgeous building roofed with gold and silver sheets and floored with silver. Every day more than a thousand people come and worship at the shrine. In front of the shrine is placed a back-bone of a fish so gigantic that one could ride on horse-back through its central hole. The king wears a gold crown in the shape of a fish-head and sits on a gold throne in the shape of a horse."(1) HSÜAN-CHWANG writes about a popular tradition of Ch'u-na-hsi-lo 鞠那呬羅 in Kâpisa, who tried to remain in A-lu-nao 阿路猱 Mountain in this country, but, as the Mountain God trembled in fear and gorgeous shock, had to remove to Ch'u-na-hsi-lo Mountain in Zâbul.(2) And under Ts'ao-chü-ch'a 漕矩吒 (Zâbul) he describes the mighty power of this god as follows: "He is severe or good, causing misfortune and exercising violence. Those who invoke him with faith obtain their wishes; those who despise him reap misfortune. Therefore people both far off and near show him deep reverence; high and low alike are filled with religious awe of him. Foreigners of different customs in neighbouring countries, kings and subjects, officials and common people of this country meet together every year at a season of rejoicing and offer gold and silver and precious objects of rare value, with sheep, and horses, and domestic animals; all which they present in simple and confiding trust, so that though the earth is covered with silver and gold, and sheep and horses fill the valleys, yet no one would dare to covet them. If people only endeavour to make offerings in order to serve the heretics and subdue their minds and mortify their flesh, they will get from the T'ien-shên sacred formulae. By the use of these the heretics are frequently able to control disease and recover the sick."(3) According to WATTERS, A-lu-nao 阿路猱 is *aruṇa* which means a red colour, dawn; Ch'u-na-hsi-lo 鞠那呬羅 is *śuna-śila*, namely *śuna*-rock; probably these refer to Sun-god.(4) HORI 堀 takes hsi-lo as Iranian *hilla*>Sanscrit *śira* "mountain peak".(5) Over against this, Kurakichi SHIRATORI 白鳥庫吉 took Shun T'ien-shên or Ch'u-na-hsi-lo as Viṣṇu or Water-god, and from the fish-bone alloted to Shun T'ien-shên in the *Sui-shu* suspected that the fish-bone deposited in front of the shrine represented the divine body, the incarnated Matsya (Fish).(6) MARQUART also interprets this

(1) 其俗淫祠, 葱嶺山有順天神者, 儀制極華, 金銀鏤爲屋, 以銀爲地, 祠者日有千餘人, 祠前有一魚脊骨, 其孔中通, 馬騎出入, 通王戴金魚頭冠, 坐金馬座.
(2) *Records*, Bk. 1, p. 39.
(3) 其天神昔自迦畢試國阿路猱山, 徙居此國南界鞠那呬羅山中, 作威作福, 爲暴爲惡, 信求者遂願, 輕蔑者招殃, 故遠近宗仰, 上下祗懼, 隣國異俗, 君臣僚庶, 每歲嘉辰, 不期而會, 或賚金銀奇寶, 或以牛馬馴畜, 競興貢奉, 俱伸誠素, 所以金銀布地, 羊馬滿谷, 無敢覬覦, 唯修施奉, 宗事外道, 克心苦行, 天神授其呪, 外道遵行多効, 治療疾病, 頗蒙痊愈. (*Records*, Bk. 12, ed. Kyoto University, p. 3–4).
(4) T. WATTERS, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, I, p. 127.
(5) *Kaisetsu Saiikiki*, p. 940.
(6) Keihin-koku kô 罽賓國考 (*On the country of Chi-pin*), *Seiikishi Kenkyū* 西域史研究, I, p. 450–456.

fish-bone as the symbol of Water-god or Trade-god.(1) On the other hand, R. GHIRSHMAN, identifying Shun and Ch'u-na with Sun, asserted that the faith in this god was nothing but Sun-worship and further suggested that it was brought by the Ephthalites from their original homeland in Chinese Turkestan.(2) He says that the gold fish crown and the throne of gold horse of the king of Ts'ao 漕 (Zâbul), as told in the *Sui-shn*, coincide with the cart drawn by a horse and the ship guided by a fish, on which the sun travels east across the ocean during the night, as was believed among the Indo-Europeans; Shun and Chu'-na represent Sun-god, and the offerings placed in front of the shrine of Ch'u-na T'ien-shên reminds one of the description of Odyssey of Sun-god Helios enjoying cattle in the island of Thrinacia. M. F. C. MARTIN, agreeing to WATTERS, identified Shun T'ien-shên with Sun-god and looked upon the obverse portrait of coins of Shahi-Tigin found in Northern Afghanistan as Sun-god.(3) Martin is of the opinion that Shun T'ien-shên was apparently a Turkish god whose cult was imported from Central Asia by the Western Turks who ruled in various portions of Afghanistan from 567 to 658 A.D.

Against this, J. FILLIOZAT regards the idea of GHIRSHMAN as uncertain and referring to the account of HSÜAN-CHWANG, which shows that Ch'u-na was a Śiva-like God or a god resembling Kumâra, his son who was worshipped as a mountain-god in Tamul, and on the ground that Kumâra's name is observed on a Kushan coin, he argues that this faith seems to have prevailed in Bactria area. He furthermore remarks that this might be considered as a god originated in Central Asia and resembling the Tängri among the Turkish and Mongol tribes.(4)

In this way, the identity of Shun T'ien-shên or Ch'u-na-hsi-lo is yet to be decided.(5) Even if it is Sun-god, it may be too hasty to conclude that the

(1) J. MARQUART-J. DE GROOT, *Das Reich Zâbul und der Gott Žûn vom* 6.–9. *Jahrhundert, Festschrift Eduard Sachau gewidmet*, Berlin, 1915, p. 287.

(2) *Les Chionites-Hephtalites*, p. 120–124.

(3) *Some coins of the Napki Malka class restruck by Shahi-Tigin, J. & P. A. S. of Bengal*, XXX, NS., No. 3, *Numismatic Supplements*, XLVI, p. 6–7.

(4) *JA*, 1948, Fasc. 2, p. 315–317: H. DEYDIER, *Contribution à l'étude de l'art du Gandhâra*, Paris, 1950, p. 111.

(5) I am inclined to agree to SHIRATORI and MARQUART, who consider Shun T'ien-shên and Ch'u-na-hsi-lo as Water-god or Trade-god. HSÜAN-CHWANG tells us a story of a merchant of Ts'ao-chü-ch'a 漕矩吒 who used to worship T'ien-shên and despise Buddhism. While voyaging the South Seas, his ship being wrecked in a tempest and losing its course, drifted for three years and inspite of his praying to T'ien-shên he worshipped, it was in vain. Then all of a sudden a huge mountain loomed and two suns appeared and it became all light. The huge mountain was a huge fish and the two suns were its eyes. However, as he prayed to Avalokiteśvara Bodhisatva, the huge fish disappeared and by the help of a Buddhist priest who came through the air he was saved and able to come home again. The merchant contributed to Buddha a Saffron Stupa which was placed in the neighbourhood of

cult was brought to Zâbul by the Ephthalites or the Western Turks, as Sun-god had been worshipped by the Indo-Europeans in Central Asia from ancient times(1) and there is no positive proof that the belief in Shun and Ch'u-na-hsi-lo was connected with the Ephthalites and Western Turks. What is certain is that the Ephthalites worshipped Fire-god and Heaven-god. And this fact does not only contradict the theory of their Iranian or Aryan origin, but support it.

The Ephthalites did not believe in Buddhism. But mentions are made in contemporary Chinese sources to the prevalence of Buddhism in their country. For instance, the *Sui-shu* says that the capital of the Ephthalites is more than ten *li* square and there are many temples and stupas, all of which are decorated with gold.(2) As I have shown, this refers to Balkh where there was the biggest centre of Buddhist worship in Central Asia. Balkh was also called Small Râjagṛha. HSÜAN-CHWANG writes about the country Huo that many people believe in the san-pao 三寶 or *triratna* and only a few pay respect to other gods or spirits : there are ten sanghâramâs with several hundred followers : they study both the Mahâyâna and the Hinayâna, and practise the discipline of both."(3) The *Yu-yang-tsa-tsu* 酉陽雜俎, *hsü-chi* 續集, Bk. 8, says : " In the country of Yen-ta 厭達 in Hsi-yü 西域 there are families who take charge of maintenance of Buddhist temples. They load several donkeys with provisions and send them up the mountain to the temple. These donkeys go and come back of their own accord and the men need not accompany and drive them along. They leave at *yin* 寅 (4 a.m.) and arrive at the temple at *wu* 午 or noon. They are never earlier or later."(4) But these accounts chiefly concern the people under the administration of the Ephthalites. Most of the populace were Iranians who believed in Zoroastrianism and various other religions, while there was no doubt a fairly number of Buddhists.

In connection with religion, a word may be said about the funeral system. The *Pei-shi* (=*Wei-shu*) says : " If a man dies, a wealthy family will pile up stones to form a house (to keep corpse) ; a poor family will dig the ground for burial. The articles of everyday use are buried with the dead."(5) Again, the *Liang-shu*. Bk. 54 (fol. 9a), says : " In burying the dead, the coffin is laid in a wooden case.

---

the Bodhi-tree in Magadha (*Records*, Bk. 8 under Magadha, p. 39–40, ed. Kyoto University). That the merchant prayed to the T'ien-shên which is obviously the Shun T'ien-shên or Ch'u-na-hsi-lo when his ship drifted in the ocean will mean the god was either Water-god or Trade-god.

(1) See p. 46.

(2) See p. 8.

(3) *Records*, Bk. 12, p. 6 : 多信三寶, 少事諸神, 伽藍十餘所, 僧徒數百人, 大小二乘, 兼功綜習.

(4) 西域厭達國有寺戶, 以數頭驢運糗上山, 無人驅逐, 自能往返, 寅發午至, 不差晷刻. See p. 39 note 1.

(5) See p. 8.

When a parent dies, the child will cut off one of his ears. As soon as the burial is over, things go on as usual (*i.e.* they have no practice of going into mourning for a certain period as Chinese people do.) "(1) PROCOPIUS (1.3) writes that, when a man dies, it is the Ephthalite law to bury alive his companions with him. That a wealthy family built a house (to keep corpse) will make one recall a " ka'ba ", of which remains are found in Iran,(2) but that the Ephthalites constructed a tomb or buried the dead shows that they were not strict Zoroastrians. A Zoroastrian would not bury the dead, but leave the body in the open. The *Chou-shu*, Bk. 50 (fol. 4a), contains the following account of the funeral system of contemporaneous Sassanid Persia. " When a man dies, they usually desert the corpse in a mountain and go into mourning for one month. Outside the castle wall (of the capital) there are some men who, living apart from the common people and exclusively engaged as undertakers, are regarded as unclean people ; when they enter the city, they ring a bell to distinguish themselves from the common people."(3) The custom of immolation which PROCOPIUS writes, as well as that of cutting off an ear,(4) had long been practised among the nomadic tribes in Central Asia and this shows that the Ephthalites were in the same cultural zone with them.(5)

(1) 父母死, 其子截一耳. 葬訖卽吉.

(2) The expression of *ts'ang* 藏 " a storehouse " means that it was a building to keep the dead body. The T'u-chüeh also established in order to mark the graveyard as many stones as the number of men whom the dead killed during his life-time (*Chou-shu*, Bk. 50, fol. 1b). This may refer to *balbal*, stone cylinder, built by Central Asian Turks (S. E. MALOV, *Pamyatniki drevnetiurkskoï pis'mennosti*, p. 368). But the stone *ts'ang* of the Ephthalites has nothing to do with *balbal*.

(3) 死者多棄屍於山, 一月治服, 城外有人別居, 唯知喪葬之事, 號爲不淨人, 若入城市, 捶 (搖 in 北史) 鈴自別. (*Chou-shu*, Bk. 50, fol. 4a, 波斯).

(4) As regards this custom, see Namio EGUCHI 江上波夫, Yûrashia Hoppô Minzokuno sôrei ni okeru Rimen, sai-ji, sen-patsu ni tsuite ユーラシア北方民族の葬禮における剺面, 截耳, 剪髮について (Concerning face-disfiguring, ear-cutting and hair-clipping at the funerals among North-Eurasian tribes), *Yūrashia Hoppô Bunka no Kenkyû* ユーラシア北方文化の研究, Tokyo, 1951, p. 144–157.

(5) PROCOPIUS and MENANDER PROTECTOR (cf. K. DIETERICH, *Byzantinische Quellen*, etc., I, p. 28, II, p. 16) represent the Ephthalites as a domiciling and town-managing tribe. This does not agree with the following Chinese accounts. 無城郭, 游軍而治, 以氈爲屋, 隨逐水草, 夏則隨凉, 冬則就溫, (宋雲, 洛陽伽藍記, 五) (They have no walled towns ; but they keep order by means of a standing army that constantly moves here and there. These people use felt tents, and live a nomadic life. In summer the people seek the cool of the mountains ; in winter they disperse themselves through the villages. SUNG-YÜN, *Lo-yang-chia-lan-chi*, Bk. 5) and 無城邑, 依隨水草, 以氈爲屋, 夏遷凉土, 冬逐煖處, (北史=魏書) (They have no walled city, but live a nomadic life and use a felt tent. They migrate to a cool climate in summer and to a warm place in winter. The *Pei-shih*=*Wei-shu*.) Here the Chinese accounts are more correct, because considering the whole mode of living of the Ephthalites, they must have been, essentially, a nomadic people who changed their abode in summer and in winter. However, under their rule they had a number of cities, for which they enacted a special law for management and administration, as HSÜAN-CHWANG states about Hsi-mo-ta-lo. The account by PROCOPIUS and others must be speaking of the lives of town-dwellers under the Ephthalites. As the *Chou-shu* (=*Pei-shi*=*Wei-shu*) represents the Ephthalite king as ruling at the city of Pa-ti-yen 拔底延 (see p. 8), the Ephthalites dwelt in cities, too.

The Ephthalites did not cremate the dead, but buried them. In this point, they quite differed from the Chionites who cremated their king's son killed by the Roman at Amida. This is one of the reasons why the Ephthalites can not be looked upon as identical with the Chionites.

Thus from the funeral system we can not deduce any positive evidence that the Ephthalites were Iranians or Aryans, but it will not interfer the Iranian origin of this people who lived a nomadic life in Central Asia.

Of all the customs of the Ephthalites, the most conspicuous is that of polyandry. The *Chou-shu* says: "In this country, brothers jointly have one wife. If her husband has no brother, the wife wears a hat with one horn. If her husband has brothers, as many horns as they are added."(1) The *Liang-shu*, Bk. 54 (fol. 8b) says: "Women are clothed with animal skins, and wear on their heads wooden horn, which is 6 *chih* long, decorated with gold and silver. As women are scarce, brothers have a wife in common."(2) Under T'u-huo-lo 吐火羅 (Tokhâra) a passage of *Sui-shu* 隋書, Bk. 83 (fol. 4a), reads: "The brothers jointly have a wife, sleeping with her by turns. While one is in the wife's bed-room, he hangs his oarment on the door as a signal. A child that is born will belong to the eldest brother."(3) A passage under item T'u-huo-lo 吐火羅 in the *T'ung-tien* 通典, Bk. 193, says: "As the men outnumber the women in this country, the brothers have a wife in common. If a woman has five husbands, she will carry five horns on her head, and if she has ten husbands, she will carry ten horns. A man with no brother will secure another man as a sworn brother; then only he will be permitted to marry a woman. If otherwise, he will never be allowed to get married. A child that is born will belong to the eldest brother."(4) The T'u-huo-lo people are represented as living together with the I-ta 挹怛 (Ephthalites), and this must be a custom among the Ephthalites.(5) And Hui-chao 慧超 writes: "In the territory from T'u-huo-lo 吐火羅 (Tokhârestân) to Chi-pin 罽賓 (Kâpisa), Fan-yin 犯引 (Bâmiyân) and Sieh-yüeh 謝飜 (Zâbul), ten or five or three brothers jointly have one wife and it is not permitted for each of them to get married to one wife separately. This is because of caution to prevent the dispersion of property."(6) In this connection

(1) 其俗兄弟共一妻, 夫無兄弟者, 其妻戴一角帽, 若有兄弟者, 依其多少之數, 更加角焉. Also to the same effect in the *Sui-shu*. See p. 8.

(2) 女人被裘, 頭上刻木爲角, 長六尺, 以金銀飾之, 少女子, 兄弟共妻.

(3) 兄弟同一妻, 迭寢焉, 每一人入房, 戶外柱其衣以爲志, 生子屬其長兄. This concerns T'u-huo-lo, but may refer to the Ephthalites there lived.

(4) 多男少婦人, 故兄弟通室, 婦人五夫, 則首戴五角, 十夫戴十角, 男子無兄弟者, 則與他人結爲昆季, 方始得妻, 不然終身無婦矣, 生子屬其長兄. A very similar passage is found in the *T'ang-hui-yao*, Bk. 99, under T'u-huo-lo.

(5) However, the *Pei-shih*= *Wei-shu* says that the Ephthalite King, with several detached palaces and a wife stationed at each, used to travel from one to another, which shows that the king practiced polygamy.

(6) 慧超傳箋釋. ed. 1910, fol. 70b.

McGovern says: "The fact that the Ephthalites went in for polyandry is of especial interest in as much as this custom was entirely unknown to the other Hunnish tribes concerning whom we have documentary information. Polyandry was also unknown as far as we can tell among all of the Indo-European tribes inhabiting Central Asia, including the Yüeh-chih and the Turfanese, with whom the Ephthalites are supposed to be especially connected. We know, to be sure, that the modern Tibetans practise polyandry and here was probably some cultural filtration between the Ephthalites and the Tibetans in this regard. At the same time we must bear in mind that there is no evidence whatever that the Ephthalites were themselves Tibetans, and the fact that the earliest Chinese records which deal with the Tibetans made no mention of polyandry makes it somewhat doubtful as to just when and among what people polyandry started in Central Asia."(1) The existence of custom of polyandry among various Central Asian tribes has long been known and many people have compared it with that of the Ephthalites. For instance, V. de St.-Martin, referring to the same custom, identified the Ephthalites with the Tibetans(2) and Tomaschek who referring to the existence of the so-called Nü-kuo 女國 (Country of Women) represented in the Sui and T'ang records as an expression of the mighty power of women's rights in Tibet area suggests the practice of this custom among the Tibetan tribes since ancient times(3). Marquart points out the existence of the custom of polyandry among the Hazâr and the Khalaj(4). Ghirshman suspects 婚姻雜亂 (Their marriages are a mere intermingling of the sexes) in Kâpisa 迦畢試(5) as referring to this custom; and futhermore, based on the result of the on-the-spot investigation (yet to be published) by Prince Pierre de Grèce, he says that Little Tibet or Baltistan, (Skard district adjoining Ladak on the north-west) has the custom of polyandry, chiefly because of the necessity to prevent the dispersion of family property, though this is only among the Buddhists, never among the Muslims.(6) The custom of polyandry is frequently observed among the Aryans in India,(7) among the Indo-European(8) and some other tribes(9). Herzfeld, in his excavation of Topé Baku to the north of Persepolis, discovered the ruins

(1) H. M. McGovern, *The Early Empires of Central Asia*, p. 406–407.
(2) *Les Huns blancs ou Ephthalites des historiens byzantins*. Paris, 1849, p. 67, note 3.
(3) W. Tomaschek, *Kritik der ältest. Nachrichten über d. skythischen Norden*, I, *SAW zu Wien*, 1888, p. 751; and, since he takes the Ephthalites as the descendants of Yüeh-shih 月氏, and therefore as Tibetans, he enumerates the instances of polyandry among the Ephthalites as of Tibetans in the Chinese records.
(4) J. Marquart, *Historische Glossen zu den alttürkischen Inschriften*, *WZKM*, XII, 1898, p. 200.
(5) Hsüan-chwang, *Records*, Bk. 1, p. 35 (ed. Kyoto University).
(6) Les Chionites-Hephtalites, p. 125, n. 4, 126–127.
(7) Chōtatsu Ikeda 池田澄達, *Mahābhārata to Rāmāyaṇa*, p. 77–90.
(8) Schrader-Nehring, Reallexikon der indo-germanischen Altertumskunde, s. Polyandrie.
(9) F. Boas, *General Anthropology*, 1938, p. 432–433: *ERE*. under Polyandry.

of a peculiar village composed of a number of adjoining chambers, and surmised the practice of polyandry in pre-historic Iran.(1) Whether HERZFELD's surmise is correct or not, in ancient Central Asia, Massagetae, an Iranian tribe inhabiting the course of the Syr Darya and the north bank of the Aral River had this custom.(2) AL-BÎRÛNÎ of the 11th century, writes "The people inhabiting the mountains stretching from the region of the Panjshir River into the neighbourhood of Kashmir live under the rule that several brothers have one wife in common."(3) Among the Kazak-Kirghiz in the 18th century, "Several men have a wife in common, taking her by turns but enjoying peace. If a boy is born and attains the age of sixteen, property is divided, and cattle are allocated to him, with which he is to make his own living."(4) To cite instance, in the first half of the 5th century, CHÜ-CH'Ü Mu-chien 沮渠牧犍, King of Ho-hsi 河西, of Mongolian stock, had intercoursed with his elder brother's wife, and three brothers one after another had intercoursed with her.(5) The best-known instance is that of Tibet(6) and its neighbourhood. A passage on Bolor in the *Hsi-yü-wên-chien-lu* 西域聞見錄, Bk. 3 (fol. 5a–b), and the *Chih-i-hsin-pien* 志異新編, Bk. 3,(7) based on the former, reads: "The people have deep-set eyes and high noses. So far as their manners and customs are concerned, no difference is observed between men and women. Generally, four or five brothers marry a wife in common, and take turns to sleep with her, and when one's turn comes round, he will hang his shoes on the door of the wife's chamber as a signal. They distribute children by seniority and adopt them as their own, the eldest brother taking the eldest child. A man with no brother of his own pairs with a male member of his relation so that he may marry a wife in common. In this case, age decides their order." According to this, the children who are born are distributed in order among the brothers, beginning with the eldest. Bolor being a region around Gilgit, the inhabitants were not Tibetans, but of an Aryan or Iranian stock.(8) The existence of the custom of polyandry in this region is

(1) E. HERZFELD, *Iran in the Ancient East*, London and N. Y., 1941, p. 9–11.

(2) HERODOTUS, I, 216: "Each man marries a wife, but the wives are common to all."

(3) See *Albīrūnī's India*, tr. *Sachau*, I, p. 108.

(4) *The Hsi-yü-wên-chien-lu* 西域見聞錄, Bk. 3 (fol. 1b): 數人共妻, 輪流晏處, 生子至十六歲, 輒析產予之牲畜, 使自爲計.

(5) *The Wei-shu* 魏書, Bk. 99 (fol. 4b), *T'ung-chien* 通鑑, Bk. 123, under the 3rd month of the 16th year of Yüan-chia 元嘉.

(6) Tairyō ŌBAYASHI 大林太良, *Tōnan Azia Tairiku Shominzoku no Shinzokusoshiki* 東南アジア大陸諸民族の親族組織 (*Kinship system of South-East-Asian tribes*), Tōyōbunka Kenkyūsho, 1955, p. 137–140.

(7) *The Hsi-yü-wên-ch'ien-lu* has got many names and *Chih-i-hsin-pien* is one of them. Cf. CORDIER, *Bib. Sinica*,[2] IV, 2803, 2805 and 鄧衍林, 中國邊疆圖籍錄, Shanghai, 1958 p. 185. 其人深目隆鼻, 其風男女無別, 恆弟兄四五人, 共娶一妻, 次弟 (=第) 歇宿, 以靴懸戶上爲記, 生子女, 亦次弟 (=第) 分認, 無弟兄者, 與戚里顓之, 以齒爲序.

(8) *Katō Hakase Kanreki-kinen Tōyō-shi Shūsetsu* 加藤博士還曆記念東洋史集說, p. 182, 190, 194.

evident from the foregoing account. The valley of the Indus River adjoining Bolor on the southeast is Little Tibet ; and to the south lies Ladak district around Leh. Mention has been made of polyandry in Little Tibet ; and that of Ladak is especially well-known. More recently, LE COQ is envious of the blessings of Ladak women.(1) It is prominently reported by MIR I'ZZET-ULLAH in 1812.(2) Not only among Ladakīs, but also among the Issedones, a Tibetan tribe which is said to have inhabited the eastern district in East Turkestan and Tsaidam district,(3) and the Ku-tsung 古宗 tribe, a Tibetan race in south-west China, the same custom existed.(4) The passage on the Tang-hsiang 党項 of the SUI-SHU, Bk. 83 (fol. 2a), which reads " People are very obsene and brother and sister, and mother and son have sexual intercourse, in which there are no pararells among other barbarians "(5) is said to be related to this.(6) CHAO I 趙翼 in his *Yen-p'u tsa-chi* 簷曝雜記, Bk. 4 (fol. 16a), states in detail that in the Kan-su 甘肅 Province the sexual relationship is very loose : brothers jointly get married to one wife, and they have intercourse in turn every evening : in case they have intercourse in daytime, they hang trousers on the door of the room as signal : one who can not have a wife, but wants a child or a traveller can hire other's wife on contract for a fixed period.(7) According to CHAO I, this story is based on what he heard from CHANG Ch'üan 章銓, governor of Ning-hsia 寧夏. So the custom may be of Ning-hsia. CHAO I attributes the reason to that men outnumbers women in that province. Ning-hsia, now the capital of Hsi-ning 西寧 Province, adjoins Tibet and has been lived by Tibetan population from ancient times. The custom of polyandry there may have its origin among Tibetans.

As this custom was diffused so extensively, it could hardly be used in tracing

(1) A. von LE COQ, *Auf Hellas Spuren in Ostturkistan*, Leip., 1926, p. 153 (Do., *Buried Treasures of Chinese Turkestan*, Lond., 1928, p. 163.)

(2) KLAPROTH, *Magazin asiatique*, II, p. 9.

(3) As to the location of Issedon, A. HERRMANN has offered a new theory of placing it to the east of the Ural mountains and between the Iset and the Tobol. (PAULY-WISSOWA, *Real-enziklopädie*, s.v. Issedones ; *Die Herkunft der Ungarn, Turán*, 1918, p. 344–362.) According to him, Iset, the name of the river, is a remnant of name Issedon.

(4) Kiyoshi SHIRATORI 白鳥清, *Dokuro Inki Shiyō no Fūshū to sono Dempan* 髑髏飲器使用の風習と其の傳播 (*The Custom of Using Drinking Vessels Made of Skulls and Its Difuse*), *Tōyō Gakuhō*, XX, p. 607–608.

(5) 其俗淫穢蒸報，於諸夷中最爲甚.

(6) Kiyoshi SHIRATORI's article quoted in note (4).

(7) 甘省陋俗： 甘省多男少女，故男女之事頗濶略，兄死妻嫂，弟死妻甘婦，比比皆是，同姓惟同祖以下不婚，過此則不論也，有兄弟數人合娶一妻者，或輪夕而宿，或白晝有事，輒懸一裙於房門，卽知廻避，生子則長者與兄，以次及諸弟云，其有不能娶而望子者，則僦他人妻，立券書期限，或二年券，或三年，或以得子爲限，過期則原夫促回，不能一日留也，客遊其地者，亦僦以消旅況，立券書限，卽宿其夫之家，限內客至，其夫輒避去，限外無論夫不許，卽其妻素與客最篤者，亦堅拒不納，欲續好者則更出僦價乃可，亦(章)湖莊(銓)云.

a tribe back to its original source. However, consideration on the circumstances under which the custom was practised would throw much light on the inference of the environment in which a tribe grew up. The custom of polyandry was a phenomenon surviving in a community geographically and therefore culturally isolated from others. Thus, the fact that this custom is conspicuous among the Ephthalites would show that they were originally a tribe in such an isolated environment, and that, prior to their impact into Tokhârestân, they may have inhabited a region inconveniently situated and without frequent contact with other tribes. I would assign a mountain region in Hindûkush as the original homeland of the Ephthalites, and the custom of polyandry among them would serve as a supporter of this inference. More particularly, the extensive practice of the same custom in the mountains adjoining Hindûkush would further justify this inference.

That the Ephthalite women wore horned caps is given in SUNG-YÜN's Travels in connection with description of the head-ornaments of the Ephthalite queen he met.(1) Here is one horned cap, but some caps had many horns which are supposed to have represented the number of the women's husbands or the parents of their husbands as shown in a passage of HSÜAN-CHWANG's *Records* under Hsi-mo-ta-la 呬摩呾羅.(2) But these are only vulgar views and hardly worth trust. Only it must be true that it was a head-decoration to indicate a married woman. According to TOMASCHEK, such horned caps are used even to-day (1888) in Yarkand, and among the Basgali Kafir tribe in West Chitral.(3) The Kafirs in the Basgali or Basgul valley are those who claim themselves as one of the three Kafir tribes (Katir, Kâm, and Wai) of Kafiristan, and the descendants of a tribe which had migrated east from East Afganistan,(4) with a peculiar language which is said to have some ancient characteristics of an Aryan language prior to the separation of the Iranian tribe.(5) Many tribes in this area claim themselves as those who have migrated from the cultured West and are proud of their origin. Though the claim of their origin cannot be trusted, it is a fact that the Kafir women wear horned caps.(6) As for the Ephthalites' horned caps, G. SCHLEGEL says that they were used in Europe in the 15th century and

(1) Ed. CHOU Tsu-mo, p. 101. 頭帯一角, 長三尺, 以玫瑰五色珠裝飾其上 (She wears on her head a horn, three feet in length which is ornamented with *mei-kuei* 玫瑰 or yellow-red coloured jade, as well as with five-coloured jade.)

(2) See p. 34–35.

(3) TOMASCHEK in *SAW zu Wien*, 1888, p. 751.

(4) G. S. ROBERTSON, *The Kafirs of the Hindu-kush*, Lond., 1896, p. 159, 157.

(5) J. WOOD, *A Journey to the Source of River Oxus*, 2nd ed., p. 186 : *Ency. of Islâm*, II, under Kafiristan. But, Sten KONOW pointed out that Kafiri contained traits agreeing with Iranian (G. MORGENSTIERNE in *Acta Orientalia*, XI, I, 1950, p. 6).

(6) ROBERTSON, *op. cit.*, p. 627.

among the Kirghis-Qazaq in the first half of the 19th century, and advanced that Ku-ku (*Kükül*) 固姑 practised in Mongolia was a variegated form.(1) When viewed in this light, it is hardly possible to find any relation between the horned caps and the custom of polyandry of the Ephthalites. As another Iranian element among the Ephthalites, I shall add their custom of clipping hair.(2)

Let me recapitulate the foregoing. The grounds upon which the Ephthalites are assigned as an Iranian tribe are: (1) that their original home was on the east frontier of Tokhârestân; and (2) that their culture contained some Iranian elements. Naturally, the Ephthalites were sometimes regarded as another branch of the Kao-ch'ê 高車 tribe by their contemporaries, and their manners and customs are represented as identical with those of the T'u-chüeh 突厥, and it is a fact that they had several cultural elements in common with those of the nomadic Turkish tribes. Nevertheless, such similarity of manners and customs is an inevitable phenomenon arising from similarity of their environments. The Ephthalites could not be assigned as a Turkish tribe on account of this. The Ephthalites were considered by some scholars as an Iranized tribe,(3) but I would like to go further and acknowledge them as an Iranian tribe. Though my grounds, as stated above, are rather scarce, it is expected that the historical and linguistic materials concerning the Ephthalites are to be increased in the future and most of the newly discovered materials seem the more to confirm my Iranian-tribe theory.

In 1901, in his *Ērānsahr*, p. 253, MARQUART compared the Ephthalites with Abdel, the old name of the Afghan Durrâni tribe, which has also been made by 'ABDUL HAIY, "Habîbî", Almanack de Caboul, 1945–46, p. 200.(4) In 1941,

(1) *Conical Lady's Hats in Asia, China and Europe*, *TP.*, 1892, p. 422–429. As for Ku-ku, see K. SHIRATORI, *The Queue among the Peoples of North Asia*, *Memoirs of the Research Separtment of the Tōyō Bunko*, IV, 1929, p. 35–39 and Namio EGAMI, "*Mōko Fujin no Kanbō Koko ni tsukite* 蒙古婦人の冠帽顧姑に就きて (*On the Mongol Women's Caps Ku-ku*), *Eurasia Hoppō Bunka no Kenkyū* ユウラシア北方文化の研究, p. 221–255.

(2) The clipped hair is the coiffure particular to Iranians, while Tungus, Mongols, Turks and Tibetans usually wore queues. See K. SHIRATORI, *op. cit.*, especially p. 50ff. SHIRATORI is of the opinion that the Ephthalites were a Turkish people and, for this reason, he took their clipped hair exceptional (p. 64).

(3) Shunshō SHIGEMATSU 重松俊章, *Ehutaru Shuzoku kō* 嚈噠種族考 (*A Study of the Ethnology of the Ephthalites*). J. MARQUART, basing on the passage of IŠTAKHRÎ, written in 930–933 (ed. De GOEJE, 244), to the effect that Khalaj, the Turkish tribe who migrated in remote antiquity to the region lying between India and Sijistân region behind Ghūr are pasture-owners and have the character, costume, and language of the Turks. This tribe he takes as the descendants of the Ephthalites, though nothing whatever confirms such surmise. (Cf. V. MINORSKY, *Hudūd al-Ālam*, 1937, p. 317.) The same comment may be made on the view advanced by H. H. HOWORTH, who identifies the Ephthalites with the Saragur (Saroguri) who migrated down to the south (*JRAS*, 1892, p. 623.)

(4) Sten KONOW, *The White Huns and Tokharian*, *Festkrift til Professor Olaf Broch*, p. 77. Cf. also CZEGLÉDY Karoly, *IV–IX. Századi Népmozgalmak a Steppén*, Budapest, 1934, p. 5.

A. J. VAN WINDEKENS tried to establish that the Ephthalites were no other than the true Tokharian language speaking people who were also called Ârçi[1] And in 1948, R. GHIRSHMAN, chiefly rearranging the coins belonging to the Ephthalites, attempted to systematize the history of this tribe and, dechiferring the inscriptions of coins, he insisted upon the Ephthalites being an Iranian tribe.[2] GHIRSHMAN's argument is based on that the language of the Ephthalites is chiefly Iranian ; and he assigns as the homeland of the Ephthalites Kâshgar in Chinese Turkestan and argues that the Ephthalites were the last of the Iranian tribes to migrate down to the south.[3] One year before the publication of GHIRSHMAN's monumental work on the Ephthalites, Sten KONOW published an article entitled "*The White Huns and Tokharian*" (*Festskrift til Professor Olaf Broch*, Oslo, 1947, p. 77–82), in which he insisted that the Ephthalites were an Iranian-speaking people on the basis of his dechiferment of fragment in "Ephthalite" (more strictly, in a language in the so-called Ephthalite writing or debased form of Greek).

These monographs and articles have encouraged me very much. But I am not always in accord with the opinions proposed by these learned scholars and I think it not useless to publish my own view mainly based on Chinese sources. I shall be very happy if this article is of some interest to my colleagues.

*Additional Notes :*

p. 5 : It is Professor Dr. HISAO MATSUDA 松田壽男 who identified Hua 滑 with Ghûr on the ground of phonetical resemblance of the name. See *Kidâra Gesshi ni tsuite no kangae* 寄多羅月氏に就いての考 (*A Study of the Kidāra Yüeh-shih*) *Kokushigaku* 國史學, III, p. 50–51.

p. 11. Note 4 : Some people misunderstand that Ed. SPECHT has established the Yüen-shih-Epthalites identity in his article "*Etudes sur l'Asie Centrale*, *JA*, 1878. (For instance, see L. DE LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, *L'Inde aux temps des Maurya*, Paris 1930, p. 306.) However, SPECHT, interpreting Hua 滑 as representing Hun, took the Ephthalites as a kind of Hunnish tribes (*Ibid.*, p. 319, 340 n. 1).

p. 13 Note 4 : The Kao-ch'ê 高車 lived in Chin-shan 金山 at the beginning of the 6th century. YÜAN Fan 袁翻, Governor of Liang-chou 涼州 at the end of Shên-kuei 神龜 (520), produced a memorandum to the emperor, in which he said that the Kao-ch'ê were living in Chin-shan, situated more than a thousand *li* (to the north of) Hsi-hai-chün 西海郡 (i.e. Chü-yen 居延). Cf. *Wei-shu*, Bk. 69, fol. 5b and *Tzŭ-chih t'ung-chien* 資治通鑑, Bk. 149 under the 2nd year of P'u-t'ung 普通. See p. 26 note 1.

(1) *Huns Blancs et Ārçi*, *Le Muséon*, LIV, 1941, p. 161–186.
(2) *Les Chionites-Hephtalites*, Le Caire, 1948.
(3) *Ibid.*, p. XIII, 81, 116, 118, 119, 120, 131.

p. 16. Note 1 : See Additional Note to p. 11 Note 4.

p. 46 : The sun-worship among the Kushanians is clearly shown by the legend Helios and Mithro or Miiro on Kanishka's coins. See H. H. WILSON, *Ariana Antiqua*, p. 359 : A. CUNNINGHAM, *Coins of the Kushân, or Great Yue-ti*, *NCR.*, 1892, 1, p. 51, 61 : and so on.

p. 53 note 1 : The same type of building was found by S. P. TOLSTOV among the ruins of Khorezm. It is a house of 70 metres long consisting of two long corridors which contain rows of individual hearths. The hearths indicate the existence of so many families living separatery under the same roof. (S. P. TOLSTOV, *Po sledom drevne khorezmiïskoï tsivilizatsii*, Moskva-Leningrad, 1948, s. 89–90.)

The Standard Histories of China, used in this article, is of the smaller Chu-shien-chai 竹簡齋 edition.